

CLARK'S  
FOREIGN  
THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY.

VOLUME XVI.

**Olshausen's Commentary on the Gospels.**

VOL. III.

EDINBURGH :  
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET ;  
LONDON : SEELEY AND CO. ; WARD AND CO. ; AND JACKSON AND WALFORD.  
DUBLIN : JOHN ROBERTSON. NEW YORK : WILEY AND PUTNAM.  
PHILADELPHIA : J. A. MOORE.

---

MDCCCLXIX.

PRINTED BY  
M'COSH, PARK, & DEWARS,  
DUNDEE.

BIBLICAL COMMENTARY  
ON  
THE GOSPELS,

ADAPTED ESPECIALLY FOR  
PREACHERS AND STUDENTS.

BY  
HERMANN OLSHAUSEN, D.D.,  
PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF ERLANGEN.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN, WITH ADDITIONAL NOTES,

BY  
REV. THOMAS BROWN,  
KINNEFF,  
AND REV. JOHN GILL, WITHAM.

VOLUME III.

EDINBURGH:  
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.  
LONDON: HAMILTON, ADAMS, & CO.; SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, & CO.;  
SEELEY & CO.; WARD & CO.; JACKSON & WALFORD, ETC.  
DUBLIN: JOHN ROBERTSON.

---

MDCCCXLIX.

Mr BROWN is responsible for the Translation to p. 159, and Mr GILL from thence to the end of the Volume.



# TABLE OF CONTENTS.

## PART IV.

CONTINUED FROM VOLUME II.

	Page
§ 10. Various discourses of Jesus (Luke xii. 47—59), . . . . .	1
§ 11. Continuation of the discourse. Exhortation to repentance (Luke xiii. 1—9), . . . . .	7
§ 12. Cure of a sick woman (Luke xiii. 10—21), . . . . .	10
§ 13. Conversations of Jesus by the way (Luke xiii. 22—35), . . . . .	12
§ 14. Jesus dines with a Pharisee (Luke xiv. 1—24), . . . . .	23
§ 15. The demands of Jesus on his disciples (Luke xiv. 25—35), . . . . .	31
§ 16. Parables relating to the compassionate love of God (Luke xv. 1—32), . . . . .	36
§ 17. Parables relating to the compassionate love of our fellow- men (Luke xvi. 1—31), . . . . .	44
§ 18. Conclusion of the parabolic discourses (Luke xvii. 1—10), . . . . .	71
§ 19. The healing of ten lepers (Luke xvii. 11—19), . . . . .	74
§ 20. The coming of the kingdom of God (Luke xvii. 20—37), . . . . .	75
§ 21. On the efficacy of prayer, (Luke xviii. 1—44), . . . . .	81

## B. SECTION SECOND.

Common account by the three first Evangelists of the last journey of Jesus (Matth. xix. 1 ; xx. 34 ; Mark x. 1— 52 ; Luke xviii. 15 ; xix. 28), . . . . .	89
§ 1. On marriage (Matth. xix. 1—15 ; Mark x. 1—16 ; Luke xviii. 16, 17), . . . . .	90

	Page
§ 2. On riches (Matth. xix. 16; xx. 16; Mark x. 17—31; Luke xviii. 18—30),	100
§ 3. Of humility (Matth. xx. 17—28; Mark x. 32—45; Luke xviii. 31—33),	119
§ 4. The healing of two blind men in Jericho (Matth. xx. 29—34; Mark x. 46—52; Luke xviii. 35—43),	130
§ 5. Christ's visit to Zaccheus (Luke xix. 1—10),	131
§ 6. The parable of the talents (Luke xix. 11—28; [Matth. xxv. 14—30]),	133

### C. THIRD SECTION.

Christ's entry into Jerusalem and the description of his ministry there (Matth. xxi.—xxv; Mark xi.—xiii; Luke xix. 29; xxi. 38),

§ 1. The entry of Christ into Jerusalem (Matth. xxi. 1—11; Mark xi. 1—10; Luke xix. 29—44; John xii. 12—19),	137
§ 2. The fig-tree cursed (Mark xi. 11—14),	141
§ 3. The purification of the Temple (Matth. xxi. 12—16; Mark xi. 15—18; Luke xix. 45—48),	149
§ 4. On the power of faith (Matth. xxi. 17—22; Mark xi. 19—26),	152
§ 5. Conversations of the Lord with the Pharisees (Matth. xxi. 23; xxii. 14; Mark xi. 27; xii. 12; Luke xx. 1—19),	156
§ 6. New Conversations of Jesus with the Pharisees and Sadducees (Matth. xxii. 15—46; Mark xii. 13—37; Luke xx. 20—44),	159
§ 7. Discourses censuring the Pharisees (Matth. xxiii. 1—39; Mark xii. 38—40; Luke xx. 45—47),	181
§ 8. The gift of the widow (Mark xii. 41—44; Luke xxi. 1—4),	206
§ 9. Predictions of Jesus respecting the last things (Matth. xxiv. 1; xxv. 46; Mark xiii. 1—37; Luke xxi. 5—38),	231
	233

## EXPOSITION OF THE GOSPEL OF JOHN.

	Page
INTRODUCTION, . . . . .	303
§ 1. Of John personally, . . . . .	303
§ 2. Of the genuineness of the Gospel by John, . . . . .	309
§ 3. Of the design of John's Gospel, . . . . .	315
§ 4. Time and place of the composition, . . . . .	320
§ 5. Literature, . . . . .	323

## I.

## PART THE FIRST.

From the beginning of Christ's ministry to his journey to the feast of Tabernacles, . . . . .	325
§ 1. Proœmium (John i. 1—18), . . . . .	325
§ 2. First testimony of the Baptist concerning Christ. Jesus collects disciples (John i. 19—52), . . . . .	357
§ 3. Jesus at the marriage in Cana (John ii. 1—12), . . . . .	371
§ 4. Jesus purifies the Temple (John ii. 13—22), . . . . .	375
§ 5. The visit of Nicodemus (John ii. 23—iii. 21), . . . . .	382
§ 6. Second testimony of the Baptist concerning Jesus (John iii. 22—36), . . . . .	400
§ 7. The conversation of Christ with the woman of Samaria (John iv. 1—42), . . . . .	409
§ 8. The healing of an officer's child (John iv. 43—54), . . . . .	423
§ 9. Healing of the sick man at Bethesda (John v. 1—47), . . . . .	426
§ 10. The feeding of the five thousand. Jesus walking on the sea. Discourses on partaking his flesh and blood (John vi. 1—71), . . . . .	446

## II.

## PART THE SECOND.

From the journey of Christ to the feast of tabernacles till the journey to the last passover (John vii. 1—xi. 57), . . . . .	473
§ 1. Christ's journey to the feast of tabernacles (John vii. 1—36), . . . . .	473
§ 2. Discourses at the conclusion of the feast of tabernacles (John vii. 37 ; viii. 59), . . . . .	484
§ 3. History of the adulteress (John vii. 53 ; viii. 11), . . . . .	518
§ 4. Healing of the man born blind (John ix. 1—34), . . . . .	528
§ 5. Discourses of Jesus concerning the Pharisees (John ix. 35 ; x. 21), . . . . .	538
§ 6. Feast of dedication (John x. 22—39), . . . . .	552

# ORDER OF THE SECTIONS OF THE GOSPELS,

ARRANGED AFTER EACH GOSPEL.

## MATTHEW.

	Page		Page
Chap. xix. 1—15 . . . . .	89	Chap. xxi. 17—22 . . . . .	156
„ xix. 16—xx. 16 . . . . .	100	„ xxi. 23; xxii. 14 . . . . .	159
„ xx. 17—28 . . . . .	119	„ xxii. 15—46 . . . . .	181
„ xx. 29—34 . . . . .	130	„ xxiii. 1—39 . . . . .	206
„ xxi. 1—11 . . . . .	141	„ xxiv. 1—xxv. 46 . . . . .	233
„ xxi. 12—16 . . . . .	152	„ xxv. 14—30 . . . . .	133

## MARK.

	Page		Page
Chap. x. 1—16 . . . . .	89	Chap. xi. 19—26 . . . . .	156
„ x. 17—31 . . . . .	100	„ xi. 27; xii. 12 . . . . .	159
„ x. 32—45 . . . . .	119	„ xii. 13—37 . . . . .	181
„ x. 46—52 . . . . .	130	„ xii. 38—40 . . . . .	206
„ xi. 1—10 . . . . .	141	„ xii. 41—44 . . . . .	231
„ xi. 11—14 . . . . .	149	„ xiii. 1—37 . . . . .	233
„ xi. 15—18 . . . . .	152		

## LUKE.

	Page		Page
Chap. xii. 47—59 . . . . .	1	Chap. xviii. 18—30 . . . . .	100
„ xiii. 1—9 . . . . .	7	„ xviii. 31—33 . . . . .	119
„ xiii. 10—21 . . . . .	10	„ xviii. 35—43 . . . . .	130
„ xiii. 22—35 . . . . .	12	„ xix. 1—10 . . . . .	131
„ xiv. 1—24 . . . . .	23	„ xix. 11—28 . . . . .	133
„ xiv. 25—35 . . . . .	32	„ xix. 29—44 . . . . .	141
„ xv. 1—32 . . . . .	36	„ xix. 45—48 . . . . .	152
„ xvi. 1—31 . . . . .	44	„ xx. 1—19 . . . . .	159
„ xvii. 1—10 . . . . .	71	„ xx. 20—44 . . . . .	181
„ xvii. 11—19 . . . . .	74	„ xx. 45—47 . . . . .	206
„ xvii. 20—37 . . . . .	75	„ xxi. 1—4 . . . . .	231
„ xviii. 1—44 . . . . .	81	„ xxi. 5—38 . . . . .	233
„ xviii. 16—17 . . . . .	90		

## JOHN.

	Page		Page
Chap. i. 1—18 . . . . .	325	Chap. vi. 1—71 . . . . .	446
„ i. 19—52 . . . . .	357	„ vii. 1—xi. 57 . . . . .	473
„ ii. 1—12 . . . . .	371	„ vii. 1—36 . . . . .	473
„ ii. 13—22 . . . . .	375	„ vii. 37—viii. 59 . . . . .	484
„ ii. 23—iii. 21 . . . . .	382	„ vii. 53—viii. 11 . . . . .	518
„ iii. 22—36 . . . . .	400	„ ix. 1—34 . . . . .	528
„ iv. 1—42 . . . . .	409	„ ix. 35—x. 21 . . . . .	538
„ iv. 43—54 . . . . .	423	„ x. 22—39 . . . . .	552
„ v. 1—47 . . . . .	426		

# COMMENTARY

ON

## THE GOSPELS.

---

### § 10. VARIOUS DISCOURSES OF JESUS.

(Luke xii. 47—59.)

Ver. 47, 48. These verses also, in which the contrast between two classes of servants is set prominently forth, belong exclusively to Luke. Most intimately are they connected with the rest of the discourse, and plainly go to prove that its several parts form one compact whole. There is especially an entire correspondence between them and verses 9 and 10. As the admonition to confess Christ is there combined with the warning against denying him, and the degree of guilt is represented as determined by the degree of knowledge, so is it in this passage. (To the adjectives *πολλὰς* and *ὀλίγας*, we must supply *πληγὰς*.) There seems, however, something strange implied in the contrast, and one is tempted to interpret the *μὴ γνοῦς* so as to make it mean *one having no complete and sufficient knowledge*; for, according to the principle here laid down, a man who knew *nothing* could not be punished in any degree. But it is better to leave the contrast between *γνοῦς* and *μὴ γνοῦς* standing in its full force, and to lay the emphasis, instead, upon *δοῦλος*. The very idea of a *δοῦλος* implies dependence on the Lord's will, and an obligation to make exertions for the sake of that will. Even in *ἄγνοια* itself there is involved the guilt of him who knows not the will of his Lord, only, it is naturally less than

his who knowingly transgresses the Lord's will. These words reach equally, in this way, the disciples, who were acquainted with the will of our Lord, and those persons who stood farther off, though well inclined towards him, who took delight indeed in his beautiful parables and discourses full of wisdom, but hypocritically refused to enquire after the will of Christ. The general gnome or sententious saying which concludes ver. 48 is found also at Matt. xxv. 29, but certainly with such a modification of the thought as to make it probable that in that passage of Matthew it stands also in its original connexion. According to the whole nature of the words, they might easily admit of various applications. The idea that the final judgment of men depends as its condition on the extent of their powers and their light, (comp. on Matt. xxv. 14 seqq.) is, according to the nature of a parallelism, repeated in both members of the sentence. No new trait is added in the second half, so that the repetition has no object except to make the thought more impressive. Compared, however, with the foregoing *δοῦλος γνούς* and *μὴ γνούς* the maxim (*Gnome*) forms a step in advance, for the *δοῦλος γνούς* is not, as such, one to whom much is given, he may have only a single little talent entrusted to him. Besides, therefore, the *γινῶναι τὸ θέλημα*, something else falls to be added as that which determines the judgment pronounced, namely, a man's being furnished with greater or lesser powers, and having a wider or narrower sphere of action allotted to him.

Ver. 49, 50. At first sight it might seem to the reader that the thread of connexion had here wholly escaped him. The Saviour comes to speak of himself personally, his destiny, his sufferings, and the effect of his appearance as destroying false peace. These ideas do not seem, however, to belong to the subjects here treated of. But on carefully weighing the leading thoughts of the passage, the following train of ideas presents itself, making it in the highest degree probable that this portion forms equally with the rest an integral part of the whole. The last section of the discourse of Jesus had something in it very earnest and solemn, one might almost say alarming. The consciousness that our responsibility increases with the talents entrusted to us, might have stirred up anxiety on the part of the disciples. This anxiety the Lord *alleviates* by placing himself at their side, with that most exalted commission to impart higher life to the whole human race, but with

the prospect of encountering for this very reason the greatest labours. Before each of his disciples, therefore, the Saviour places, as a thing inevitable, the necessity of entering into a severe struggle, for, this his own appearance entailed on himself. The very thing indeed rebuked by him in his final address to the multitude, which included the conflict-fearing adherents of Jesus, is this, that they stood still in a state of hypocritical indecision; he counsels therefore that they should, without delay, unite with their enemies. According to this view of it, the connecting ideas may have been omitted, but in reality, everything in the discourse stands closely connected. Luke alone has the words *πῦρ ἡλθον κ. τ. λ.* of ver. 49; they contain a reference to passages of the Old Testament, such as Is. iv. 4. The expression *πῦρ* (comp. Matt. iii. 11) denotes here the higher spiritual element of life which Jesus came to introduce into this earth, with reference to its mighty effects which manifest themselves in the way of quickening all that is akin to it, and destroying all that is opposed. To cause this element of life take up its abode on earth, and wholly to pervade human hearts with its warmth, was the lofty destiny of the Redeemer. (The expression *τί θέλω, εἰ* is best explained, as Kuenöl has done, from the Hebrew. As this use of *εἰ* corresponds with *אם*, so does *τί* with *מה*. Comp. Song of Solomon viii. 4.) The true human feeling, far removed from all Stoical indifference, which led Christ to shrink from that hard path of suffering which stood before him, finds expression in the wish that his work were already over, and that the fire might burn itself out without such pain. (Comp. on Matt. xxvi. 39.) The suffering itself is denoted by *βάπτισμα*, as to which word compare the details at the parallel passages, Matt. xx. 22; Mark x. 38. (The term *συνέχσθαι* *constringi* is used with reference to bodily sufferings [Matt. iv. 24; Luke iv. 38], and is also applied, however, to a mental state of distress and inward agony [Luke viii. 37]. Comp. as to the pain of Jesus' soul, and terror in prospect of his sufferings, on Matt. xxvi. 37., seqq.)

Ver. 51—53. The labours of the Messiah, as exciting strife, are further delineated, quite in accordance with Matt. x. 34, seqq., which passage should here be compared. The Jews had been accustomed to associate with their conceptions of the Messiah, the idea of everlasting peace to themselves (*שְׁלֹמֶה* Is. ix. 5), at most they thought of him as a warrior contending against the

heathen. Instead of this, Jesus led them into conflict against the sin which they found within them and around them. Their admitting this element of separation from it, was the condition necessary to their receiving his *εἰρήνη*.

Ver. 54, 55. There comes in here, most appropriately, the transition which Jesus makes in addressing himself to the people. This character of Christ's labours, as raising commotion and strife in the moral world, might well serve as an indication of their nature. Incidents in the physical world are here used by the Lord as figures to illustrate those mighty spiritual movements, to effect and conduct which was the great design of his coming. The connexion of the verses with what goes before is so close, that we cannot doubt the words stand in their original place; but at Matt. xvi. 2, 3, the same thought is also found most appropriately, though in a somewhat altered form. This comparison, obviously presenting itself, and full of deep meaning, may have been more than once employed by Jesus. (Instead of *νεφέλη* and *ὄμβρος*, Matt. speaks of *νότος* and *καύσων* [that is the glowing heat which the south wind is wont to occasion in Palestine, for which reason in the LXX., *καύσων* is used as equivalent to *ἡλιος*. Hos. xii. 2]—of *εὐδία* and *χειμών*, bad and good weather, which may usually be known from the state of the heavens at morning or evening. He avails himself also of the expression *πυρρᾶζειν* to describe the colour and form of the clouds which the rising or setting sun irradiates. The parallel word *στυγνάζω*, from *στυγνός* *austerus*, denotes that dark, lowering aspect of the sky, out of which the *χειμών* arises. This expression stands opposed to the *εὐδία*, a pure, clear, cloudless state of the atmosphere. Suidas, *ἡ ἄνευ ἀνέμων ἡμέρα*. It is found in the New Testament only at Matt. xvi. 2.)

Ver. 56, 57. The address *ὑποκριταί* points markedly back to the commencement of the discourse at ver. 1. The *ὑπόκρισις* of the Pharisees is here charged on the whole people, in so far as they suffered themselves to be prevailed on by that sect to refuse following out the impressions made on their souls and give honour to the truth. The expression implies also the possibility of their attaining true insight and a right decision, which possibility, however, was not realized from their cowardice and aversion to conflict. (Over against the *πρόσωπον τῆς γῆς* there is placed in Matt. the *σημεῖα τῶν καιρῶν*, a characteristic expression, which ascribes to the spiri-



tual world a physiognomy similar to what might be traced in the external. The great coming events of the spiritual world announce themselves to the eye of the soul just as the physical processes of the visible world do to the meteorologist.) That something else is spoken of at ver. 57, is shown at once by the expression *τὸ δὲ καὶ ἀπ' αὐτῶν οὐ κρίνετε*. But this new expression conveys the same idea formerly treated of, only under another similitude. Every exercise of the *κρίνειν* presupposes something of a higher nature from which the discriminating agency (requiring as well insight as power) proceeds, and something lower from which must be removed that intermixture which demands the discriminating effort. This partition may be effected by the man himself (through the help of the Spirit received by him), and in that case he is delivered from the future judgment. (1 Cor. xi. 31.) But this very carrying out of a judgment originating with the man himself, and on his own behalf, is a pure determination in favour of what is good, it is the opposite of *ὑπόκρισις*, the guilt of which Jesus charged upon the multitude, just for this reason, that they *could* not in his ministry recognise the entrance of an unknown spiritual power, inasmuch as they did not *wish* to acknowledge it, for they had not admitted it freely and deeply enough into their own souls, to enable it there to carry out its work. Thus the word *δίκαιον*, in so far as it forms the transition to the following parable, may denote in one respect *the truth* in a matter of legal dispute, but in another respect in the highest and objective sense, it means *that which is righteous*, as it was perfectly manifested in Christ. The term *κρίνειν*, however, here, is equivalent to *διακρίνειν* (Matt. xvi. 3), or *δοκιμάζειν* (Luke xii. 56), as every putting to the proof presupposes a partition, a separation into the original component parts, a value being at the same time set upon them.

Vers. 58, 59. The following parabolic discourse has been incorporated by Matt. v. 25, 26, into the Sermon on the Mount. It would not in itself be at all improbable that such a mode of expression should have been more than once repeated, but the composition of the Sermon on the Mount in general, and the connexion of this passage in particular, may well make it somewhat unlikely that the words in Matthew are in their own place. Here indeed the course of thought at first sight is not easily traced, but it appears all the more close when one penetrates into the meaning of the discourse.

That an idea so rich, however, and manifold in its relations, should be placed by Matthew in his context according to a different view from that which in this passage it was originally intended to bear, is not in any respect surprising, for one special advantage of parabolic and figurative modes of expression lies in this very adaptation to different relations. As respects the connexion in the passage here before us, the antecedent ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν κρίνετε conducts us obviously to the idea expressed in the following verses. "Suffer not yourselves to be judged by any other, but judge ye yourselves." The man who agrees with his opponent, judges himself thus far, that he does his enemy right as against himself, and satisfies him in his demands. The Saviour thus plainly admonishes his hearers to take account of all moral claims on them, (the ἀντίδικος represents the law), and as respects these, to place themselves right while living here on earth, that their position might not be the harder before the holy Representative of these in eternity. When the law, however, appears here in the light of the enemy from whom man is to free himself (ἀπαλλάττεσθαι ἀπ' αὐτοῦ), it is viewed as in that relation in which it subserves generally the accusing principle. The accusation loses its power, when the sinful man abandons the defence of his evil case, with self-accusations enters into the region of the truth, and appeals from the righteousness to the grace of God. Should he fail, however, here in delivering himself by upright repentance<sup>1</sup> from the trammels of the accusation, the judgment would strike him when it is too late. The two expressions ἀρχων and κριτής are clearly so related to each other in the parable, that ἀρχων denotes the inferior magistracy of the city, κριτής the judge in a court of higher jurisdiction.<sup>2</sup> In explaining the similitude accordingly, κριτής means the Supreme Judge, God himself, ἀρχων an earthly power representing the unseen righteousness of God, for example, the Apostles in their spiritual authority. It is next mentioned as a termination of the affair that is fitted to inspire terror, that the guilty one is cast into prison. (The πρᾶκτωρ of Luke corresponds to the ὑπηρέτης of Matthew. The expression occurs only here in the sense of *exactor*, *שָׂרֵף*, from πρᾶσσειν, Luke iii. 13. Instead of κορδάντης = *quadrans*, which

<sup>1</sup> For this reason there follows immediately at Luke xiii. 3, 5, the command, μετανοήτε.

<sup>2</sup> Compare on Matt. v. 21.

occurs in Matthew, Luke has λεπτόν scil. νόμισμα. Mark xii. 42 reckons two *lepta* to one *quadrans*.) As to the meaning of the prison, and the period assigned for his being delivered from it, comp. on Matt. v. 26, xviii. 34. Here the whole is meant to enforce the earnest use of present privileges, and make apparent the danger to which those exposed themselves, who heard Jesus, expressed pleasure in his words, but under the rebukes of their own conscience, refused, from dread of the contest, with their whole hearts to devote themselves to him and his cause.

§. 11. CONTINUATION OF THE DISCOURSE. EXHORTATION TO  
REPENTANCE.

(Luke xiii. 1—9.)

The connexion of what follows with the preceding context, is once more very intimate, and the account bears the same traces of originality. For, as Jesus was thus speaking (ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ καιρῷ), some individuals from amongst the crowd, came up and reported an act of violence of which Pilate had been guilty. They understood Jesus in his speech quite correctly thus far, that he spoke of the unfaithfulness of men, and the punishments which in this way they brought on themselves. But, according to the usual evil practice of the human heart, they thought not of taking home with feelings of penitence that unfaithfulness to themselves, but applied it to others, and in the murder of these Galileans discovered the infliction of a judgment from God. The view which holds sufferings of every kind to be the punishment of sin, is certainly by no means false, for without sin there would be no suffering amongst men. The error, however, lies in this, that sin and punishment are not so distributed here below that each instance of suffering on the part of an individual must be the consequence of *his own* sin. Hence we cannot from such suffering infer the antecedent sin of the *sufferer*, but rather the sin of the *whole body* to which each individual belongs. Hence, the Saviour is at pains to awaken equally in *all* the consciousness of guilt, and preventing them from regarding those on whom some special suffering was inflicted as more guilty than themselves, or than the rest of the community.

By this mode of explanation, the feeling of sympathy for all kinds of suffering was awakened, and true repentance called forth for sin, not only our own, but that of the human race, with which the Saviour specially had to do. For that feeling is nothing more than the consciousness of our need of an atonement, and forms, consequently, an indispensable requisite to our receiving those higher powers of life for the overthrow of sin which Jesus came to bring into the world. From the course, however, which the conversation thus took, it is clear that Chapter xiii. is a sermon on repentance, addressed to the people, and an admonition calling for entire decision on the part of the disciples, only this sermon on repentance bears a character of peculiar strength, it being his last, inasmuch as the period of Jesus' public ministry was now drawing to a close.

Vers. 1-3. Of the fact here mentioned there is historically nothing known. Amidst the numberless cruelties which the Romans permitted themselves to inflict on the Jews, the massacre of a few nameless Galileans disappeared like a drop in the sea. (The expression *ἔμιξε τὸ αἷμα αὐτῶν μετὰ τῶν θυνσιῶν* has in it something horrible. It seems as if the sacred moment of sacrifice must exclude every injury to the offerer. But that God should permit the very death of the offerers appears to betoken frightful guilt on their part. At the same time, however, the expression suggests the idea that those put to death fell, as it were, like victims offered up, as, according to a general feeling prevalent among all nations, the foundations of which lie deep, the malefactor about to be executed is viewed as a *sacer*, a man devoted, offered up for the general sin which in him came out into glaring manifestation.) That these slain men were *ἁμαρτωλοί*, Jesus does not deny, only, they were not more so than others (*παρὰ πάντας*). It may have been that those put to death had committed something criminal, but that would not alter the matter. The germ of such acts lay dormant in all hearts, and of this the Saviour wished to make them aware. The only way to escape such punishments here or elsewhere, is through *μετάνοια*, which must bear reference not only to *peccata actualia*, but also, and above all, to the *habitus peccandi*.

Ver. 4, 5. A similar example of sudden destruction which had overtaken certain Jews is further adduced by Jesus himself. Eighteen persons had been crushed by the fall of a building. As to this incident, also, history has no further information to give.

Such an accident the Saviour once more teaches us here, ought not to be used in drawing harsh conclusions as to those on whom the suffering came, but should form an inducement for each individual to practise repentance. It thus is by no means the opinion of Jesus that such occurrences should, as accidental, physical transactions, be carefully kept apart from all connexion with the moral world. On the contrary, he teaches here, and all Scripture teaches, that sin and suffering stand closely associated, only this connexion must not be viewed as individual, but as general in its nature, for it is when thus viewed that each affliction brings a blessing. (*Πύργος* = *מִצְדָּה* means any large high building standing isolated. [Matth. xxi. 33.] As the building here is described as situated on the brook Siloah—comp. on John ix. 7—it may have been the garden-house of some distinguished man.)

Ver. 6—9. The discourse of Jesus, thus strong in its reproof, is closed by a parable, in which the merciful Son of Man brings the side of grace prominently into view. He appears as the advocate of men before the righteousness of our heavenly Father, and he procures for them space for repentance. This idea of God's final sentence being delayed, that time may be left men to turn, runs throughout all Scripture. Before the Flood, there was appointed a space of 120 years (Gen. vi. 3), Abraham prays in behalf of Sodom (Gen. xviii. 24 seqq.), the destruction of Jerusalem did not follow till forty years after the Ascension of Jesus, and the coming of Christ is delayed through the long-suffering of God (2 Peter iii. 9.) This view brings clearly out as well the freedom of God as the freedom of man, and rescues the course of things in the world from inflexible and cold necessity. In the first instance, the *συκκη* here stands figuratively for the Jewish people, as at Hosea ix. 10. Amidst other nations they appear as especially noble and destined to work out great results, but their abuse of privileges, granted them by the free grace of God, caused them to fail in bringing forth spiritual food; they fell from their vocation and lost their talent. Yet, even on their behalf, did the Saviour go to the death, and time must yet be given that the effect of preaching the suffering and death of Jesus might be seen. But since even the fire of this preaching did not melt their hearts, the people fell under the awful judgment of God. The history of Israel, however, is a type of mankind generally, who are called to spiritual life, and thus far

the parable is to be referred to the great community of the church and its final judgment. Nay, according to the design of our Lord, the whole may be traced in each individual case, and we may therefore say that this parabolic mode of speaking on the part of Jesus admits of applications endlessly diversified. If we are to interpret the period of time mentioned (*τρία ἔτη*) as referring to the era of Jesus' public ministry, then the expression *τοῦτο τὸ ἔτος* which follows, must be taken in a more general sense, namely, as denoting the period between Christ's ascension and the destruction of Jerusalem, during which the means of spiritual quickening and strength were afforded to the people, in the right use of which they both could and should have escaped destruction. (The circumstance that the fig-tree grew in a vineyard [*ἐν τῷ ἀμπελῶνι*] is not to be viewed as contradictory to Deut. xxii. 9, inasmuch as this Mosaic command merely forbids the *mingling* of different sorts of plants. The fig-tree, however, may have had a separate place in the garden to itself. *Καταργέω* is found only at this passage of the New Testament, except in the writings of Paul, where it is of frequent occurrence. It is = *ἀργόν*, i.e., *ἀεργὸν ποιεῖν*, to render useless or fruitless. Paul employs the word in a more comprehensive sense for to abolish. *Σκάπτειν* and *κόπρια βάλλειν* stand for all the means at the disposal of a gardener for advancing the growth of a tree. According to the authority of Manuscripts the reading *κόπρια* is undoubtedly to be preferred to the more common one of *κοπρίαν*. It is from *κόπριον*.—In the concluding words *καὶ μὲν ποιήσῃ—εἰ δὲ μῆγε* there is an Anantapodoton, inasmuch as the addition obviously suggested by the connexion is not given.)

## § 12.—THE CURE OF A SICK WOMAN.

(Luke xiii. 10—21.)

The close connexion of the different paragraphs observed by us in the last chapters, here in some measure disappears. Without any particular note of the time, Jesus is found teaching in a synagogue. This agrees, however, most appropriately with his journey, and another intimation which seems to meet us in what follows, points back to the preceding context. For, the narrative which

hero follows is, as it were, an example of the Pharisaic hypocrisy, which the Saviour rebuked at Chapter xii. Hence, does Jesus at once address the ruler of the synagogue by the title (ver. 15), ὑποκριτά. The writer then must have recorded the occurrence not for its own sake (at Luke vi. 6, a narrative of the same kind had been already given), but, for the purpose of showing how the priests (Pharisees for the most part in sentiment) comported themselves. Quite in accordance with this view do we see once more at ver. 17 the well-inclined ὄχλος, rejoicing it is true in Jesus, but without deciding on throwing off for his sake the spiritual yoke of the Pharisees. The two parables also of the mustard seed and the leaven, which Matt. xiii. 31, seqq., has incorporated with his great parable collection, harmonize most appropriately with this position which Jesus and his little flock occupy betwixt the priests and the people. Its invisible nature, for the most part the losing of the new element of life in the old, and the triumph which it gains through its indwelling power—this all forms the point of comparison between these similitudes and that to which they more immediately refer. We might then with the utmost probability conceive of them as placed here in their original connexion.<sup>1</sup> As respects the narrative itself of the cure, it presents no particular difficulties. The expression πνεῦμα ἀσθενείας, which is more nearly defined by ver. 16, denotes not a merely physical disorganization, but one accompanied by such psychological phenomena as seem to indicate pernicious influences. A disease is never as such attributed to the evil spirit, there must always be suspicious symptoms conjoined with it. The word συγκύπτειν is employed as the opposite of ἀνακύπτειν. The former stands here in an intransitive form. The latter is equivalent to the following term ἀνορθοῦσθαι, which denotes, however, at the same time, the removal of this organic defect. The hypocritical priest does not venture to cast blame on Jesus, but inveighs against the poor blind people, and pretends that his wretched outward service surpassed in value the service of love. The Lord lays open this hypocrisy, by shewing that *the healed woman* had done nothing in the way of labour, that *He* had loosed a chain which held her bound, and done a thing the like of which they did themselves every Sabbath. The use of λύειν and δέειν here is peculiar—the

<sup>1</sup> The parable of the mustard seed with the expression ἔβαλεν εἰς κῆπον ἑαυτοῦ (ver. 10), points back not obscurely to the foregoing similitude of the fig-tree (ver. 6).

meaning of the words being transferred from physical and applied to spiritual relations. Again, however, the Saviour, without any ground or occasion for it, traces back the disease to Satan. Wherefore such accommodations if no truth lay at the foundation of the idea? (Comp., moreover, the parallel narrative at Matth. xii. 10, seqq.; Luke vi. 6, seqq.)

### § 13. CONVERSATIONS OF JESUS BY THE WAY.

(Luke xiii. 22—35.)

This section once more gives us most clearly to see that we have here to do with a journey to Jerusalem (ver. 22), which Jesus was making in company with his disciples,—a journey, also, which must be conceived of as standing at the close of his great public ministry, as the expressions *οὐκ ἰσχύουσιν* and the following *ἀποκλείειν τὴν θύραν* plainly enough indicate (ver. 24, 25.) Moreover, the account again bears all the marks of the most direct mental contemplation drawn from the life. We have here no doctrinal discourses of Jesus, but *conversations* as they arose from the occurrences of the moment, and recorded with great truthfulness (ver. 23, 31.) As Mark shows himself exact in describing the external circumstances of the actions, especially the cures wrought by Jesus, so does Luke (and particularly in the account of this journey), in setting forth the conversations of Christ, their occasions, consequences, course of development, and outgoings (comp. *Intro.* § 6.)

Ver. 22. A perfectly similar form of expression, serving merely to carry forward the narrative of the journey we have already met with at Luke x. 38. (*Πορεία* occurs only here in the sense of *ὁδός*. It is used figuratively at James i. 11.)

Ver. 23, 24. The first conversation here recounted by Luke begins with a question put by an individual as to the number of the *σωζόμενοι*. This question takes for granted at the outset that impression of solemnity which the discourses of Jesus bear, and which must naturally have become stronger towards the end of his public labours. With the idea that the number is small, there stands associated, according to the connexion of the passage, the idea of its being difficult to unite one's self to it. The Saviour, in



his reply, does not say exactly that they were only few who should partake of the σωτηρία (the opposite of ἀπώλεια), for, looked at simply in itself, the number of the σωζόμενοι is even great (Rev. vii. 9); it is only when viewed relatively, and as compared with the lost, that it is small (Matt. vii. 14). Rather does he at once give such a turn to the answer, as to lead the attention of the enquirer, and of all whose minds were in the same state, back to themselves. The enquiry as to the number presupposes a certain bent of mind towards things without. This false position, which proceeds in all cases from self-security, our Lord here rebukes, so that his words may be paraphrased thus, "Look not to others, but to your own selves." To make the thought more keen, it is, however, added further, that not only are those lost who strive not for things divine, but many also who do care for them. As being thus ζητῶντες, the enquirers held themselves secure, but this security Jesus unsettles for them, by remarking that mere striving is not sufficient to attain the end in view. (The comparison of the στενὴ θύρα—other authorities have inserted πύλη, taking it from Matt.—was already explained at Matt. vii. 13, 14. It is of such a kind that Jesus may frequently have used it, and in both evangelists, therefore, it may occupy its original place.) This thought has in it something dark and difficult, especially when one compares such passages as Matt. vi. 33, Luke xii. 31, in which the very ζητεῖν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ is held forth as the only thing required for the attaining of it. The following words, however, which are peculiar to Luke, clear away this obscurity.

Ver. 25. In parabolic language, then, there is here set before us the master of a house expecting at evening the members of his family, and at a fixed hour shutting the doors. (The word ἐγγεῖρθεσθαι = ἤγειρεσθαι denotes merely the transition from a state of rest to one of progressive activity.) The members of the family, then, who have been negligent, remain inexorably shut out. They attempt to avail themselves of their close connexion with the master of the house, but they can only appeal to things external. The want of real love and true obedience to the master, showed that they were no genuine members of the household. Allusions to this parable are found at Matt. xxv. 10, seqq.; Matth. vii. 21, seqq.; viii. 11, seqq. But as a whole it is peculiar to Luke. As regards the exposition of it, it cannot possibly prove satisfactory to say that the

ζητεῖν is to be viewed as an imperfect undecided seeking, for the emphasis here is obviously laid on the οὐκ ἰσχύουσιν to which there corresponds in the parable the expression ἀποκλείειν τὴν θύραν. Nay, in the very κύριε, κύριε ἀνοιξον ἡμῖν, the effort is represented as a very lively and earnest one, but not the less as ineffectual and rejected. It is not the weakness of the endeavour which is blamed, but its being *out of season*, the right time having been squandered away. This is represented as not less culpable, nor less extreme in the dangerous nature of its consequences, than the want of all effort. We are thus led to the idea, that for the thriving of the divine seed, all different seasons are just as little alike as for the growth of the seed-corn in the field. He who has not sowed in spring, must expect no success how earnestly soever he labours in harvest. The Saviour himself marks these seasons by the contrast between day and night (John xi. 9, seqq.), the hour when darkness (or light) bears sway (Luke xxii. 53); the former must be employed for developing the course of life, the latter allows of nothing being done. There was such a period of blossoming in the kingdom of God (when it suffered violence on the part of those who longed after it, Matt. xi. 12), at the time when John the Baptist and Christ arose; but, as the death of Jesus approached, the quickening power of the Spirit was withdrawn, and dark night overshadowed men's hearts. Of this Jesus warns the well-inclined but undecided, who comforted themselves with their ζητεῖν, and reminds them that it must come to a real entrance being made into the kingdom of God,—they must give up all in order to gain all. The alternation of such seasons favourable and less favourable for the growth of what is good, which may be traced in all relations, nations, and individuals, does not involve any thing difficult to be reconciled with the righteousness of God, unless the same rule of judgment were applied to those living in the unfavourable periods as to those who experienced the stirring influences of more favoured times. Taking for granted a separate rule of judgment, however, this idea of a difference in different times, is as certainly based upon experience as it is in accordance with the great designs of God towards mankind, for, just as little as a tree can bring forth blossoms and nothing more—as it is *necessary* rather that the blossoms fall off in order that fruit may be produced, just so little can man be carried to perfection by the joyous influx of heavenly powers. If his life

has become in some degree strengthened, there follow conflicts through means of which his nature is still further developed. The seasons of stirring life, however, must be employed in order to escape from the old state, then comes the hour when darkness bears sway, when the tardy and negligent can no more be brought to the birth, even though it be true that such dark seasons as these may bring a rich blessing for the man awakened to newness of life—as for example is shown by the history of Peter at the time of our Lord's sufferings. According to this view (as was already remarked at Matt. vii. 21, seqq.), the words *οὐκ διδα ὑμᾶς πότεν ἐστέ* are in the highest degree expressive. They correspond to the *οὐδέποτε ἔγνων ὑμᾶς* in Matt., and describe the severance in point of nature between the Lord and these pretended members of the household, their living in the old natural state, their unregenerate condition.

Ver. 26, 27. Instead of that affinity of the whole inner man to our Lord, which alone can bring us into his kingdom, relations merely external are depended on by these men who wished like the Pharisees to be held for something which they were not. But, inasmuch as these means had not brought them into a state of *δικαιοσύνη*, they remained in the old condition of *ἀδικία*, and consequently were shut out from the kingdom of God. We are not here by any means to think of actions peculiarly wicked, the sin of these men consisted in their disobedience and resistance to the light of the truth, which shone in their view from the word of Christ, and through which they might have been made new and different men. They had acquired *too much* knowledge to be unprejudiced, and *too little* to admit of the life from above gaining the ascendancy over them. This intermediate position was the cause of their misery, and their exclusion from the kingdom of God. (Comp. on the passage, Matt. vii. 21, seqq.) Very significantly does Luke subjoin the mention of what was taking place even while he was speaking,—a circumstance peculiarly fitted to bring to a decisive resolution the men whom he addressed, *ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις ἡμῶν ἐδίδαξας*. It was not our Lord's teaching, however, of itself which brought salvation (his teaching might quite as readily serve for their condemnation), but their receiving his words and doing them.

Ver. 28, 29. In its closing verses this discourse of our Lord acquires further a peculiar application, inasmuch as it exhibits in

the light of servants to the *οικοδεσπότης*, the Jews, in the first instance, who, because of their unfaithfulness (as to the great majority of their number) were excluded from the kingdom of God, in order that in their stead the heathen, who received the word with willingness, should be invited to partake its eternal joys. (As to the words see more at length on Matt. viii. 11, 12.) In itself, however, the parable goes further, and may be understood of the heathen as a body, as well as individually, inasmuch as the fundamental idea of it is universally true and universally applicable. Here, where it stands at the conclusion of our Lord's labours among his own people, the restriction of the parable to them is perfectly in accordance with its connexion.

Ver. 30. According to their connexion, the clauses *εἰσὶν ἔσχατοι κ. τ. λ.* which are cast into the aphoristic form, seem to refer to the relation in which the Jews stood to the heathen. They were spoken unquestionably more than once, and stand therefore in different relations. (See more particularly as to the aphorism on Matt. xiv. 30, xx. 16.) Only, it is well to observe that the aphorism is expressed in a form different from that in which it occurs at Matt. xx. 16, *ἔσονται οἱ ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι καὶ οἱ πρῶτοι ἔσχατοι*. This form of it, however, would be best adapted clearly to mark the distinction between Jews and heathen. But since many Jews also took their places in the kingdom of God, and since many lost it (not all) by unfaithfulness, while their room was filled up by Gentiles, the Saviour on this account rather chose the form of expression which here occurs—"there are *some* who, in respect of their vocation, have been placed at a disadvantage, but have been elevated through their faithfulness; and so there are *many* who have an exalted vocation, but through their unfaithfulness have rendered themselves unworthy of it." The form of the aphorism is thus modified in each case according to the connexion.

It was moreover already remarked (Matt. viii. 11) that in this exclusion of the *ζητούντες* from the *βασιλεία τ. Θ.* we are not to see the loss on their part of eternal salvation. The kingdom of God set forth here, is obviously the blessed communion of the saints at the return of the Lord (comp. on Matt. xxv. 12.) The representation given (Luke xiii. 25) shows plainly that it is not intended to represent the love of what is good and delight in it as absolutely wanting (comp. on Matt. xxv. 45.), but only as weak

and undecided, by which means, certainly, an entrance into the *βασιλεία* is rendered impossible—but not by any means does it follow that salvation can be thereby prevented. Thus the *βασιλεία* τ. Θ. in this passage also (as Matt. viii. 11) denotes not eternity as the perfected development of creation, but the dominion of the good made visible on earth, which shall present itself to view as the living communion of all the saints of all times.

Ver. 31. To the reading *ἡμέρα* we ought almost to prefer that of *ῥα*, which is preserved by A.D.L. and many other MSS. The remark of the Pharisees would, in that case, come on more rapidly, and the narrative become more full of life. It is also obvious that the origin of the reading *ἡμέρα* can be more easily accounted for than that of *ῥα*. For, just because what follows when compared with what precedes, appeared altogether foreign to it, a wish was felt to keep the two apart in point of time, and the account of this occurrence was separated from the foregoing. If we suppose that the question asked above (ver. 23) was also put by a Pharisee, its contrast to what follows stands forth so much the more strongly. The sharp sarcasm they traced in the reply of Jesus, made them wish probably as soon as possible to be freed from his presence. Thus the reply of Jesus, in which he declares that he intended yet to remain for a few days, acquires a clear reference to the Pharisees who wished to be rid of him—a view to which ver. 35 also points. It deserves remark, moreover, that here the scene again shifts back to Galilee or Peræa, the region of Herod Antipas. The general remarks made above at Luke ix. 51, to the effect that Luke does not seem accurately to have observed the connexion of time and place, find in this their confirmation.

Ver. 32, 33. That this insinuation expresses not the views of the Pharisees but those of Herod is improbable in the highest degree, especially as Luke afterwards relates (xxiii. 8) that Herod eagerly desired to see Jesus. Besides, it is obvious that he had the means readily within his reach for banishing Jesus, if he had wished to be rid of him. It is far more natural to suppose that the Pharisees, to serve their own wicked ends, had made use of a report as to the evil intentions of Herod, which may easily have arisen after the murder of John. The opinion in question derives much less apparent support from the fact that Jesus calls Herod a *Fox*, than from his charging them to report it to Herod. This circumstance ad-

mits, indeed, of being understood in this way, "Behold I see through your plan, you act as if you would give me good advice, and you are the mere delegates of my cunning enemy." The words, however, have a sarcastic bearing, even if the Pharisees are not regarded as expressly the delegates of Herod. Those who hypocritically pressed themselves on him as good friends and counsellors, he refers to the man whom they denounced as his enemy—he places them consequently on the same footing, so that what strikes him reaches them also, nay, in reality, under the name of Herod, it is they alone who are aimed at. This ought to be held the more probable that it can hardly be believed that Jesus, who was so tender in observing decorum towards all in authority, should have given to his own ruler the opprobrious name of ἀλώπηξ.<sup>1</sup> If, however, the words of Jesus were directed against the Pharisees, who had either for their own ends made use of a mere report, or had at once fabricated it, his reply acquires the striking meaning, that this fox (an expression in which not merely cunning but weakness, and consequently that which is contemptible, forms the point of resemblance), of whom they pretended to give an account, existed nowhere else than in their own hearts; and that while acting the part of his counsellors they cherished real enmity within. This led very naturally (ver. 33) to the mention of Jerusalem, where they laid the scene of their intrigues. This view of the occurrence agrees also with that reproof directed against the Pharisees which runs through all these chapters (from chap. xi. onwards), and which is carried still farther forward in chap. xiv. The words which follow also ἰδοὺ ἐκβάλλω κ. τ. λ. are rendered sharp and pointed if they are applied to the Pharisees, "Ye who are set for the salvation of the people ought to know that my labours are not merely not pernicious, but in the highest degree beneficial, but your wickedness does not cease to persecute me." (Τελειοῦμαι is to be taken transitively, sc. ταῦτα τὰ ἔργα—I fulfil these and all my works). In connexion with this idea, the definition of time is obscure, σήμερον, αὐριον καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ. It is wholly incredible and incapable of proof, that this expression can indicate an entirely indefinite period. Least of all can the passage, Hosea vi. 2 (מִיָּמִים בְּיָוֶם הָאֶחָד), the exposition of which besides is difficult, be adduced in support

<sup>1</sup> Compare, however, on Luke xxiii. seqq., according to which it appears Jesus did not believe himself bound to acknowledge Herod as his governor.

of this view, and other instances are wholly wanting. It follows, however, from the general laws of thought, that to-day, to-morrow, and the day after, is the assigning of a period perfectly definite.<sup>1</sup> One does not see, however, what is meant to be said by this exact announcement, "for three days I still continue to perform miracles here." The idea is made still more obscure by what follows, for instead of *τρίτη* there stands as the parallel expression *ἐχομένη*. (*Ἐχεσθαι* in the sense of to *touch*, to *strike upon*. The expression *ἡμέρα ἐχομένη* occurs at Acts xxi. 26. Compare also Mark i. 38). The *πλὴν δεῖ* forms here a contrast to what goes before, which however will not come clearly out to view, should the words (as Dr Paulus thinks they should) be translated, "See I still require about three days to heal the sick, but (should Herod command it) I will take my departure earlier." For this rendering the context seems to give no ground, not to mention that the idea is very tame, and accords ill with the sarcastic and biting discourse. For the understanding of the passage it is of especial importance to bear in mind, that the whole discourse which the Pharisees were to carry an account of to Herod, is (in this respect) feigned, that, only in point of form therefore does it stand connected with their remark. In respect of the thought contained in it, the address is directed against the Pharisees and their wickedness. Consequently the meaning of the words may be taken thus, "I have to exercise my blessed office for a certain time; for this time, however, I must walk and work, and no power can touch me (mine hour is not yet come); but in Jerusalem it will come, and there will ye gain power over me. Your victory, however, will be your ruin, and Him whom ye shall have rejected, ye shall never more behold, till the time of his final return." The expression to-day, to-morrow, and the day after, is therefore a symbolic description of the whole public ministry of Jesus, which is in point of time exactly measured off, and which no earthly power can shorten. The closing idea of ver. 33 is also remarkable, *ὅτι οὐκ ἐνδέχεται προφήτην ἀπολέσθαι ἔξω Ἱερουσαλήμ*. From ver. 35 it is clear that Jerusalem is viewed as the seat of the Theocracy, and centre of Pharisaic intrigue, so that the sense of the words is "not in Galilee, no! in your chief

<sup>1</sup> The assigning of an indefinite period of time can be effected only by the use of *ἡ*, as is shown in the example quoted by Wetstein on this passage, from Arrian Epict. iv. 10, *ὅτι αἴριον ἢ εἰς τὴν τρίτην δεῖ ἢ αὐτὸν ἀποθανεῖν ἢ ἐκεῖνον*.

city must I die." The Saviour, however, proceeds to extend the idea, so as to include the prophets generally, and explains that it was necessary they should die in Jerusalem. (*Ἐνδέχεται* used impersonally = *ἀνένδεκτόν ἐστι*, Luke xvii. 1. It means, *it is allowable, it is possible*. *Τὰ ἐνδεχόμενα* = *δυνατά*.) In regard to this there is just one thing that seems strange. John the Baptist, who, as the latest instance of a slain prophet, must have stood before every one's view, had been put to death, not in Jerusalem, but precisely in this very territory of Herod. The expression therefore uttered in this general form seems neither correct nor suited to the circumstances. One might be tempted to read *τὸν προφήτην*, so that the person of the Messiah should be alone denoted, but there is no manuscript which has the article, and we must here as elsewhere remain true to our principle of giving admission to no conjecture into the text of the New Testament. Besides, in ver. 34 the idea is immediately extended to include the prophets generally. Hence, we can only say that the Saviour here attributes to the order of prophets, not including himself in it, but standing as its representative (see ver. 34), what is true of the *majority* of its members. In any case, however, a certain obscurity attaches to this mode of expression in the existing circumstances. It is easier finding something satisfactory to say on the idea of its being *necessary* that prophets should die (and especially that *the* Prophet should) in Jerusalem. Jerusalem was the centre of the national, and especially the religious life of the people of Israel (for which reason at ver. 34 the prophets are described as sent to Jerusalem, in so far as this city represented the land and the people), the altar as it were of the whole nation, since no sacrifice was to be offered except in the temple at Jerusalem. In it therefore must the ministry of the prophets concentrate itself, and their last great work also, their death of martyrdom, must be completed there. As the offering of Isaac was of old presented on Mount Moriah (Gen. xxii. 2), so the reality of which it was the type, could be exhibited only in Jerusalem. The free government of God generally fixes itself to time and place, and the freedom of man's actions, without being subverted or restricted, must yet fulfil the eternal arrangements of God. Freedom and necessity mutually pervade, but do not subvert each other in Bible history. To the Pharisees, moreover, as those who had assumed the defence of the Theocracy, nothing



stronger could be said than this, your chief city with its temple and altar is the murderess of all God's servants, a great altar as it were on which the saints have fallen sacrifices. (Comp. Lament. iv. 13.)

Ver. 34, 35. The concluding verses have been incorporated by Matt. xxiii. 37-39, into his great discourse in reproof of the Pharisees. Here, in Luke, they hold undoubtedly their original place. The mention of Jerusalem awakens the deepest sorrow in the heart of Jesus for the unbelief of the city. The murderess of the prophets should in her children have been gathered to the flock of God, but they *would* not. But as by the abuse of their freedom, they frustrated as it were *the one* of God's plans, they against their own will fulfilled *the other*. What they would not take from the *living* Prophet, they must receive from *the dying*. The words πο-σάκις ἠθέλησα κ. τ. λ., describe not merely the pains taken by Jesus himself for the salvation of the people, as represented by Jerusalem, but the expression denotes the whole exertions of the prophets taken together. This leads the Saviour back wholly to himself, in so far as he was in his divine and eternal nature the Prophet of Prophets. (Comp. Luke xi. 49 with Matt. xxiii. 34, where Christ is represented as sending forth all the prophets.) This idea casts back a light which determines the meaning of the expression οὐκ ἐνδέχεται προφήτην ἀπολέσθαι ἔξω Ἱερουσαλήμ, ver. 33. (The beautiful figure of the fowl which gathers its young under its wings is after Ps. xvii. 8; Is. xxxi. 5.) The comparison strikes every mind of deep thought as a tender expression of maternal love in natural life. Thus we read in Euripides *Hercul. fur.* v. 71, οἱ θ' Ἡράκλειοι παῖδες, οὓς ὑποπτέρουσιν σώζω νεοσσούς, ὄρνις ὡς ὑφειμένη, — ὑφίεσθαι, a peculiar expression for *placing the young beneath the mother*. After this apostrophe to Jerusalem, the discourse again turns to the disciples, and the Saviour adds reprovingly, ἀφίεται ὑμῖν ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν. (The addition ἔρημος is taken from the parallel passage in Matt. xxiii. 38.) The expression οἶκος (in its more extended meaning like בֵּית) is certainly selected here in accordance with Psalm lxix. 25 (comp. Acts i. 20), in which passage the house's being left desolate is enumerated along with other imprecations. The οἶκος, however, has in every case a special reference to the Temple as the central point of theocratic life, which, in so far as it was the οἶκος Θεοῦ, might also be appropriately termed the οἶκος ἱερέων. The desolation of the

Temple, however, and the departing from it of the gracious presence of God, was identical with the going down of their entire worldly priestly power, which of necessity must have been associated with the entrance of Christ's spiritual kingdom. The two could not co-exist. Inasmuch as the Pharisees, therefore, seemingly triumphant, put Jesus to death, they in this very act laid the foundations for ever of *His* kingdom, and destroyed *their own*. Further, the concluding words λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν κ. τ. λ. are difficult. The idea, indeed, that they should not see the Saviour, stands as an expression of rebuke in close connexion with what goes before; but, in the first place, there is an obscurity as to what period the ἕως ἂν ᾗξῃ κ. τ. λ. is meant to denote,<sup>1</sup> and next, it seems to contradict the reproving character of the preceding discourse, that the Pharisees themselves are exhibited as saluting the Lord. For, that the words ἐνλογημένος κ. τ. λ. are to be understood as an act of homage, admits (according to Matt. xxi. 9, compared with Ps. cxviii. 26) of no doubt. The first of these difficulties can be removed only after the second has been cleared out of the way. This would be brought about, however, if we were to read something like ὅτε εἴπωσι, so as to make the meaning of the discourse this, "Ye unbelievers shall see me no more (as the soft, mild Son of Man) till *they* welcome me (the pious, namely) at my return as the righteous Judge of the world." In other words, "Ye shall see me again only as your Judge." But this reading is wholly without support from any critical authority, and can therefore have no claim on our assent. The use of the second person leads to an entirely different meaning, which, more closely considered, is remarkably appropriate, and suited, in the highest degree, to the character of the Lord, who walked even amidst his enemies as one πλήρης χάριτος. The passage then promises them a change even of their feelings, and, as flowing from this, an acknowledgment of the Messianic dignity of Jesus. That which here they could not comprehend,—the ministry of Jesus, peculiar in itself, and opposed to their whole nature and disposition of mind, was, according to this promise, to be made clear to them afterwards, and they would raise

<sup>1</sup> Compare what was remarked upon the kindred and striking passage Matt. xxvi. 64, ἀπ' ἄρτι ὁψεσθε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου κ. τ. λ. Matt. xiii. 39, in the passage parallel to that before us, has the words οὐ μὲ ἴδητε ἀπ' ἄρτι κ. τ. λ.—The ᾗξῃ is best taken impersonally "it comes." Some MSS. have supplied ὥρα or ἡμέρα.

their voices in unison with the jubilant tones of those who, waiting for their Lord, would meet Him with the cry **בָּרוּךְ הוֹבֵא בָּשָׁם יְהוָה**. The passage expresses then the final victory of the Saviour over all his enemies, whom he punishes in such a manner that he wins them for himself. It is impossible, however, to determine whether this victory and the coming of Christ was to take place at some point of time near at hand, such as the pouring out of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost, and the conversion of many priests therewith connected (Acts vi. 7), or the destruction of Jerusalem, or whether it be the return of Jesus to his kingdom or to the judgment of the world. For, in the first place, as was already remarked on Matt. x. 23, the idea of the near approach of our Lord's coming runs through the whole New Testament in such a way, that each of the periods above alluded to falls quite within the time when men expected the return of Jesus, and further, the idea itself contains references to so many things, that, in passages like this, no point can be found, which compels us necessarily to conclude in favour of the one or of the other. It is best, therefore, to take the expression in the entire comprehensiveness which it will admit of, and consider the meaning of the Saviour to be this, that at each coming of the Lord, at one or other of those preliminary appearances in which Good is exhibited to view as triumphant, but most completely at that which is final and decisive, the enemies of the Saviour should ever lay themselves down as a footstool beneath his feet. (Comp. on Matt. x. 23, but especially on Matt. xxiv. 1, seqq., where every thing relating to the Return of Christ is treated of connectedly.)

#### § 14. JESUS DINES WITH A PHARISEE.

(Luke xiv. 1—24.)

This new section agrees well with its place in a journal of Travel (comp. ver. 1 with xi. 17), and partakes that style of narrative which we have already learned to trace in it. The healing of one afflicted with dropsy in the house of a Pharisee on the Sabbath, gives rise to a conversation in which Jesus gives instruction

through means of parabolic narratives.<sup>1</sup> In a way uncommonly graphic, Luke represents the discourse as directed first to the guests, and then to the host (ver. 7 and 12), and, finally, the exclamation of one of the guests (ver. 15) calls forth a particular parable applicable to him and those like minded. The peculiar connexion of the whole forms also once more the best voucher for the originality of the narrative.

Ver. 1—6. The cure of the man afflicted with dropsy, which may well be conceived of as completed *before* the time of the repast, contains nothing in itself worthy of remark. It serves merely as a point of connection for introducing the following conversation. As the Pharisees had frequently already blamed the cures wrought by Christ on the Sabbath, He himself starts the question whether such acts of healing could be contrary to the law. As at Matt. xii. 11, Luke xiii. 15, the Lord leads those present to reflect on their own experience, and makes them feel the sharp self-contradiction in which they were landed by casting blame on Christ's free labours of love, inasmuch as they, where their own earthly advantage was involved, did the same things which they objected to in Him. It is not to be overlooked, however, that in this last period in which the hatred of the Pharisees against him was most distinctly expressed, the Saviour does not withdraw from them. Obviously, Jesus hoped, by the power of the truth, to gain over for himself and the cause of God the better disposed, at least, among them. (As to the *φαγεῖν ἄρτον* ver. 1, see the particulars on ver. 15.—On *παρατηρεῖν* see at Luke vi. 7.)

Ver. 7. Throughout the following three comparisons, then, there runs the one great exhortation to humility, which was, above all things, necessary for the proud Pharisees. In the first (ver. 7—11), with reference to the obvious and manifest strife for precedence among those present, it is so put as to teach self-humiliation; in the second (ver. 12—14), looking to the brilliant company which the Pharisee had invited together, it is so put as to make the calling in to him of the poor and miserable appear a duty; and, in the last (ver. 16—24), with regard to the eager hope cherished by the Pharisees for the kingdom of God (ver. 15), it is so managed that

<sup>1</sup> The Pharisee is styled *τις τῶν ἀρχόντων τῶν Φαρισαίων* = *ἀρχισυνάγωγος*. We are not to suppose that those *ἀρχοντες* are here meant who are sometimes spoken of as opposed to the Pharisees, ex. gr. John xii. 42.

the conduct of God in calling men to his kingdom, excluding from it the satiated rich as decisively as He invites into it the hungry poor, is held forth as a rule not to be neglected for similar conduct on our part. Even though there were, therefore, special causes at work in each case for the modification of the fundamental idea, yet the occasion which gave at first this turn to the conversation of Jesus was probably the cure of the ὑδρωπικός. Even though the Pharisees and Lawyers were silent (ver. 4, 6) as to the question of Jesus, yet undoubtedly their look sufficiently expressed contempt for the unfortunate man, and this at once led the Saviour (ver. 5) to bring forward despised animals (ὄνος,<sup>1</sup> and βοῦς) in the similitude—"If ye at once hasten, on the Sabbath, to draw an ass out of the pit, it well becomes me to bring help to a man who will be suffocated by water." In what way the bodily assistance is a type of the spiritual calling of those who were healed, is particularly shown by ver. 21, seqq., where it is just the miserable (such as the cured man in this instance) who are set forth as the called, while the proper guests (the Pharisees, as representatives of the economy of the Old Testament) remain shut out from the feast. And now, as the guests at the commencement of the repast eagerly strove for the highest places (πρωτοκλισίας ἐξελέγοντο), which conduct arose from the same self-sufficiency in which their contempt for the dropsical man originated, Jesus rebukes this in the first instance. (Ἐπέχειν scil. νοῦν *animum advertere*. Acts iii. 5.)

Vers. 8-11. Without much veiling his design, the Lord reproves quite openly the vanity of the Pharisees; throughout the following parable the reference is entirely unconcealed. (As to παραβολή comp. on Matt. xiii. 1. The parabolic form here is not completely carried out.) As respects, however, the meaning of the narrative, it is very strange that so subordinate a motive should be brought forward by means of which to induce self-abasement on the part of

<sup>1</sup> The reading ὄνος has, in point of weighty critical authorities (the MSS. A. B. E. C. H. M. S. give it), much support. The connexion, however, is most in favour of ὄνος. The whole passage contains a conclusion drawn *a minori ad majus*, and with this it is obvious that ὄνος does not agree. The reading ὄνος may easily have originated with persons who overlooked the form in which the inference is drawn in the passage, and supposed that the necessity of healing on the Sabbath would be rendered far more clear by selecting the case of a *child*, love to whom would inevitably constrain his parents to save him on the Sabbath.

man. For it appears to be false humility, and, consequently, concealed pride, to take a seat low down in order that one may gain the honour of being elevated. Christ appears to give here rather a refined prudential rule than a pure ethical precept, and that the more correct course is to take just that seat which properly belongs to one. But the apothegm (ver. 11) which gives finally the fundamental idea of the parabolic narrative, makes obvious the reason why this form of presenting it was adopted. In that single display of self-sufficient vanity our Lord perceived that inner state of the heart which was the fundamental cause of those very appearances they made in spiritual things. The object he has to do with is the purifying of the foundation, and his representations, therefore, take such a form as to involve a warning against spiritual pride. Over against the *ὑψοῦν ἑαυτόν* there must be placed the expression most strongly contrasted to it, and that is not merely to refrain from self-exaltation, but positively to humble oneself (*ταπεινοῦν ἑαυτόν*). In order to bring this contrast clearly out in the parable, the expression *ἀναπέσαι εἰς τὸν ἔσχατον τόπον* is placed over against *κατακλίνεσθαι εἰς τὴν πρωτοκλισίαν*. But that which in the affairs of earth would prove only a half-rule (inasmuch as the sitting low down of set purpose must be held as only another form of displaying vanity,) is, in spiritual things, true and right in its fullest sense, for then, in fact, it is not the mere absence of the positive manifestations of pride that is of effect, but the attack upon secret sin which exists even where it does not show itself. These positive sanctifying efforts<sup>1</sup> carried on in the power of the Holy Spirit are denoted by the *ταπεινοῦν ἑαυτόν*. This expression also presupposes an antecedent *higher* position, (which is, however, to be carefully distinguished from the *ὑψοῦν ἑαυτόν*,) inasmuch as the *ταπεινός* cannot be humbled any more. (Comp. on the apothegm of ver. 10, what is said on Matt. xxiii. 12.)

Vers. 12—14. The statements of our Lord in what follows are not different in substance from the preceding discourse addressed by him to the guests (*ἔλεγε καὶ τῷ κεκληκότι αὐτον*.) For, the following parable is only a continuation of the foregoing. As the guests ought to humble themselves by selecting the lowest place, so should the host humble himself by inviting the poorest. Only, according to the different standing-points of guest and host there

<sup>1</sup> Comp. on this the remarks at Matt. xiii. 2.

stands out in the first similitude more prominently an unassuming disposition ; in the second, a feeling of condescending humble love. Hence one may view the two parables as adapted for persons of different positions in the kingdom of God. It is not to be thought of that we have here an entertainment furnished at the public expense, as Dr Paulus has inferred, from the injunction forbidding the inviting of relations. This prohibition is rather to be held parallel with Luke xiv. 26, "He who hateth not father and mother is not worthy of me." It is merely intended to show the necessity of being delivered from what is merely sensitive and natural in our love ; that higher love imparted in regeneration ennoble all the natural ties of affection. (*Ἀνάπηρος*, maimed, one who wants a member, = *πηρός*, from *πηρώω*, to mutilate. It is found again in the N.T. only at Luke xiv. 21.—Comp. as to the idea of a recompense, in passages which take for granted an evangelical standing-point, on Matt. v. 12, x. 42.) The mention of the *ἀνάστασις τῶν δικαίων*, without any occasion to call it forth, is an evident indication that the distinction made by the Jews between the first and second resurrection was acknowledged by our Lord as correct. Such passages as Rev. xx. 5 (where the expression *ἀνάστασις ἡ πρώτη* occurs) ; 1 Cor. xv. 22, 23 ; 1 Thess. iv. 16, show also that the Apostles themselves had embraced this distinction within the circle of their ideas. In the book of Revelation the whole conclusion of the work would be entirely unintelligible without it. The rationalistic expositors were unprejudiced enough to acknowledge that this doctrine was supported by the New Testament, but they employed it in proof of their view that the Apostles (and in part the Saviour himself) were entangled in Jewish prejudice, or that they accommodated themselves to such errors. (As to the opinions of the Jews, comp. Bertholdt in the Christ. Jud. § 35, p. 176 seqq). We shall afterwards take pains to show (in a preliminary way, indeed, on Matt. xxiv.<sup>1</sup>) that the distinction drawn between the two resurrections stands in closest unison with the whole circle of doctrines as to the final issue of all things, and that only when we adopt it do many passages of Scripture acquire their true meaning.

Ver. 15. One of the guests understood quite correctly the ex-

<sup>1</sup> As to the distinction also between the *ἀνάστασις ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν* and *ἀνάστασις τῶν νεκρῶν*, comp. the observations on Matt. xxii. 31.

pression used by the Saviour as to the *ἀνάστασις δικαίων*. He places in connexion with it, not eternal salvation, which properly is associated with the general resurrection, but life in the kingdom of God. Hence the *βασίλειά τοῦ Θεοῦ* here is, as the context shows, that state in which the will of God shall have dominion on earth,—the restoration of earth to its original condition. In this state did the Jews hope to live in peace under the sway of Messiah, along with the risen saints of the Old Testament, whose representatives, the progenitors of their race, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, are mentioned by name (Matt. viii. 11, Luke xiii. 28.) The joyful hope of Messiah's speedy appearance was usually associated with the blessed anticipation of life in the Messianic kingdom. In substance, this series of ideas was entirely correct, and corresponded as well with the predictions of the Old Testament as with the representations of the New, only, the Jews in general formed grossly material conceptions of the Messiah's kingdom, and forgot the internal conditions which required to be fulfilled in order to their being admitted into it. As members of the nation of God, they believed that they must in any event be incorporated into God's kingdom. From this position of security and self-sufficiency seems to have proceeded the exclamation uttered by one of the guests. When Jesus mentioned recompense in the kingdom of the Messiah at the resurrection of the just, he called out in a transport of joy, including himself as a sharer in the scene of blessedness, *μακάριος ὃς φάγεται ἄρτον ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ*.<sup>1</sup> Nothing like malice, deceit, scorn, or intentional hypocrisy is to be traced in these words; the following parable exposes merely the feeling of worldliness on the part of those who are invited into the kingdom of God, but through their worldliness forfeit their invitation. This comes home to the individual in common with the whole party of Pharisees and lawyers to whom he belonged, but was not aimed at himself personally and alone. The peculiar exclamation, however, and the close connexion of the following parable with it, and with all that goes before, speaks again most decidedly in favour of the originality of this whole account. (The reading *ἄριστον*, instead of *ἄρτον φαγεῖν*, is merely an explanation of the Hebrew mode of speaking for the sake of Greeks, fashioned after the style of ver.

<sup>1</sup> Compare Rev. xx, 6, where in like terms it is said *μακάριος καὶ ἅγιος ὁ ἔχων μέρος ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει τῇ πρώτῃ*.



12.) The expression ἄρτον φαγεῖν stands undoubtedly as equivalent to taking a meal (see ver. 1), and corresponds to אָכַל לֶחֶם, Gen. xliii. 16, 32. Here the context points once more to the great Messianic feast (comp. Matt. viii. 11, Luke xiii. 28), which, according to the passages in the prophets (for example Is. xxv. 6), is viewed as the opening scene of the kingdom of God. (Comp. Bertholdt in the Christ. Jud. § 39, p. 196. Eisenmenger, in his Entd. Judenth. ii. 872 seqq. gives the tasteless fables of the later Rabbins as to this feast. The phrase ἐσθίειν καὶ πίνειν, is to be distinguished from the expression ἄρτον φαγεῖν, the former denoting continued fellowship, a life becoming and suitable [in the kingdom of God.] Comp. on Luke xxii. 30.)

Ver. 16. With great wisdom does our Lord in the following parable guide the Pharisee, who had praised so loudly the joys of the kingdom of God, back from externals to that which is internal. For, he teaches that the mere invitation is not enough, but everything depends on whether a man avails himself of it. The first half of it represents the manifold forms in which worldly men (especially the Jews) abuse the Divine Call; the second half explains the conduct of God, and shows that others instead of those called are invited into the kingdom of God. At Matt. xxii. 1, seqq., there is a parable recorded which is closely allied to that before us, but it is carried out in a way too independent and distinct to allow of our believing it to be the same with that of Luke. Undoubtedly, Jesus has availed himself at different times and in different ways of the same fundamental ideas.<sup>1</sup> If the parable then starts with the idea of the δεῖπνον μέγα this has obviously a retrospective reference to ver. 15, and it stands as the Messianic feast for the kingdom of God generally, to which God causes men to be invited (and the Jews certainly first) by his enlightened ministers and servants. (The καλεῖν here denotes therefore in a dogmatic sense the *vocatio*, and involves both the *announcement* that such a kingdom exists, and also the inward *incitement* to enter into it. Yet this impulse, given by the Spirit according to the will of God, is no compulsory one, it only facilitates the determination of the will. Compare the more detailed remarks on Matt. xx. 16.)

Ver. 17—20. In the form of the narrative, it is a peculiar circumstance that those who had previously been invited, were, at the

<sup>1</sup> Compare as to this the details at Matt. xxii. 1.

moment when the feast commenced, once more put in mind of it (*ὄρα τοῦ δεῖπνου*), and this was evidently selected in order to express the more exactly and impressively that form under which the divine invitation had come to the Jews. Not only had the invitation to God's kingdom come to them generally through the prophets, but when it did arrive they were by the Baptist again specially warned to this effect, *πάντα εἶναι ἔτοιμα τὰ τῆς ζωῆς καὶ σωτηρίας*. The following *παρατεῖσθαι* is therefore so much the guiltier, the more pressing had been the invitation. (*Παρατεῖσθαι* to make excuse is used for *recusare* and *excusare*. The former meaning is found at Acts xxv. 11; the latter is obviously implied at ver. 19, in the expression *ἔχε με παρητημένον*, which corresponds to *habeas me excusatum*. To the *ἀπὸ μῶς* it is best to supply *γνώμης* or *φωνῆς*, for it is intended to bring out the common key-note of them all.) As the invitation, however, was given only to many (ver. 16, comp. the remarks on Matt. xx. 16), this determines the meaning of the *πάντες* (ver. 18)—they are the *πάντες οἱ κεκλημένοι*. It would be to carry the expression too far, however, should we hold that the first invited were the Jews, and that those afterwards (ver. 21) called are the heathen, inasmuch as the Apostles, and all those believers who attached themselves to Jesus himself, were Jews. According to the immediate connexion of the passage, therefore, we must understand those first invited to be the representatives of the Old Testament Theocracy, and under the *πτωχοῖς* (ver. 21), that company of private individuals (among whom also that *ὑδρωπικός* must be included, ver. 2), whom Jesus honoured with his fellowship and prepared for the kingdom of God. In that case the words *ἤρξαντο ἀπὸ μῶς παρατεῖσθαι πάντες* retain their literal meaning, for in point of fact, we do not see a single individual among the advocates of the Theocracy openly and decisively attach himself to the Lord. We are not, however, to think that for this reason all reference of the parable to Jews and heathen is excluded, only this is not its primary and literal application. The various forms of excuse put forward by those invited, denote in general their bondage to the world. The *two first* set forth the gross manifestations of worldliness; the *third* is more refined, but is a mere pretext. The taking of a wife ought not to have withdrawn him from God, but should have aided his advancement in the divine life. According to this view of the construction of the parable, the modes of ex-

pression are arranged in which they severally refuse to come. The former, who suffer themselves to be entangled by gross worldliness, feel conscious of their sin, and give a more refined turn to their excuse—*ἔρωτῶ σε, ἔχε με παρητημένον*; the latter, however, considered the bond which kept him back as sufficient to exonerate him, and simply declares *διὰ τοῦτο οὐ δύναμαι ἐλθεῖν*. In reality, however, all are alike.

Ver. 21—24. With this account of the way in which the unworthy guests conducted themselves, there is connected the carrying out of a call given to others, and especially to the miserable and the poor, who are represented as without shelter or dwelling. (*Πλατεῖα* and *ρύμη* stand together as in the LXX., at Is. xv. 3. The former expression denotes rather streets and open places; the latter, *alleys angiportus*.) From the poor dwellers in the city, the parable passes also over to the despised inhabitants of the country. This inviting of new guests in two sections, with the design *ἵνα γεμισθῇ ὁ οἶκός μου*, sets forth the grace of God, which embraces all, even the most distant and lowly. The selection of such expressions as *εἰσάγαγε ὧδε*, and the still stronger *ἀνάγκασον εἰσελθεῖν*, marks most appropriately the position of the *πτωχοί* relatively to the feast of the exalted *οἰκοδεσπότης*. Regarding themselves as unworthy, they require the most urgent assurances of the gracious disposition of the Lord, that *they* are to have a share in the feast despised by the satiated rich men. Traits which thus fall in, unforced, with the aim and tendency of the parable, are not to be overlooked. Finally, the determination of God as to excluding from the feast is also (ver. 24) brought forward. The words *λέγω ὑμῖν* give no ground for the idea that Jesus had in these verses addressed the Pharisees, for even though in ver. 23 his discourse is directed merely to a single *δοῦλος*, yet is this individual the representative of many. The words *οὐδεὶς τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐκείνων τῶν κέκλημένων* absolutely require that we view them as the conclusion of the parable. It is certain at the same time that the reference to the Pharisees might by look and voice have been made sufficiently obvious to all. (The exclusion from the feast is moreover to be understood here in the same way as at Matt. xxv. 10, seqq., which passage may be compared.)

## § 15. THE DEMANDS OF JESUS ON HIS DISCIPLES.

(Luke xiv. 25—35.)

The new mode of commencement here (*συνεπορεύοντο αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοί*) causes us to see Christ once more as on a journey. It needed no particular remark to inform us that Jesus had left the house of the Pharisee (ver. 1), for that is self-evident. Similar circumstances, however, again lead our Lord to express the same ideas he had uttered at Luke xii. Crowds followed after him with obscure yet favourably disposed feeling towards him, irresolute however and wavering. To them he turns with an earnest address, and summons them to a decision. As, however, his last hour was now approaching, he exhibits to their view the severer aspect of his self-manifestation so openly, that the uncalled must be made to withdraw. And this was better than that the wavering should be induced to enter into an unequal context (ver. 31, seqq.) Moreover, there begins here a new and entire discourse connected together, which extends down to chap. xvii. 10. It differs from the preceding collective discourses (chap. xi. xii.) in this, that the Saviour appears here as the only speaker (except Luke xvii. 5), while in the other case, by means of the remarks of interlocutors, a formal conversation is given. Yet our Lord's continued discourse receives modifications in thus far, that his remarks are addressed now to the Pharisees, now to them and disciples together, and again to the disciples alone. (Comp. Luke xv. 2 ; xvi. 1 ; xvii. 1.)

Ver. 25—27. The opening words in which the Saviour states to the people the necessity of entire decision, we have already had at Matt. x. 37, seqq., in the instructions addressed to the Apostles. It is very possible certainly that Jesus had on several occasions expressed the same thought, especially where he had, as we have already remarked on Matt. (*ut supra*), an Old Testament foundation to proceed upon. (Deut. xxxiii. 9, 10.) Again, also, at John xii. 25, the same idea recurs only in an altered form. These instructions, however, (Matt. x.) are so put together, as plainly to bear the character of a compilation, and it is in this place therefore that we are to view the passage as standing in its original connexion, especially as the circumstances under which the Apostles were first

sent out, are less in harmony with these ideas. As respects, however, the exposition of the passage itself, all that is needful has already been given in our remarks on Matt. x. 37, seqq., and we are called here to consider that only which is peculiar to Luke. To him belongs the expression *μισεῖν* and the extension of the hatred, so as to include the *ψυχή*. This is treated of, however, in a similar way, only under different expressions, at Matt. x. 39, for between the *ἀπολέσαι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ* and the *μισεῖν* no essential difference can be perceived. Instead of *μισεῖν*, however, Matt. x. 37 has *μὴ φιλεῖν πατέρα κ. τ. λ. ὑπὲρ ἐμέ*. It must seem a thing of doubtful propriety simply to reduce the *μισεῖν*, and make it equivalent to the more negative *μὴ φιλεῖν ὑπέρ*. The expression is too cutting for it not to have been chosen intentionally; and in this case we have no title to deprive it of its point. We should also feel the more at ease in leaving this idea untouched, inasmuch as the Son of love can have enjoined no hatred save that which is holy. How such a topic could in the then existing circumstances form the subject of discourse, may be rendered obvious from the following considerations.

The representation of Matt. is so conceived that the Divine is set forth in its superiority as compared with the created, and hence a quantitative expression is chosen to describe our love of the one or of the other. Luke, however, views—as is also allowable—the Divine and the created as standing in simple and direct opposition to each other, an attitude which they always assume whensoever the latter strives to cease being what it really is, a transitory thing, and begins to make itself esteemed eternal and unchangeable. Out of this opposition, then, there springs up of necessity the hatred of the creature as well as the love of the Divine, according to the principle, “no man can serve two masters, he must *hate* the one and *love* the other.” (Luke xvi. 13.) The pure love of the Divine, therefore, involves necessarily the pure hatred of the sinful, which things created become, in so far as they will make themselves pass for what is eternal. The idea, therefore, retains its simple truth when taken with all its point, if it be thus paraphrased, “He who cometh to me (not outwardly, but with the inward turning of his whole being) dare love nothing *apart from* me (but all things *in* me); rather, must he be so situated as to be able to pass on the tenderest ties of this present life, a judgment so discriminating and enlightened by

the Spirit, (and consequently to free himself so far from all the attachment and dependence of feeling and its implied partialities) as to be capable of purely hating what is sinful in them." Thus does the Saviour in these words demand of his followers that they occupy an exalted standing point, looking down from which they may be able clearly to distinguish the Divine from the ungodly, even in the nearest of those objects presented to them (and therefore the most difficult to be judged of.) From this standing-point it is possible to unite both love and hatred towards the same object, as, for example, our Lord, in regard to Mary his mother, and his disciples, hated what was sinful in them as purely as he loved what was godly, and for this reason it is, that the commandment here given does not abrogate the precept to "honour father and mother." In the unrenewed man, on the contrary, neither love nor hatred is pure; in loving the objects of his affection, he loves also their sin; in hating the objects of his dislike, he hates their godliness as well; it is only the purity and discrimination of the Divine Spirit that can teach man to judge *aright*, and to love God and the things of God as decidedly as he hates what is ungodly. Thus, it is obvious that we have here no commandment which a natural man standing under the law should attempt to put in practice, for should he make the endeavour, then, inasmuch as the spiritual gift of discrimination is wanting to him, everything must naturally be thrown into confusion, and that which is most sacred be perverted into that which is most unholy. (On ver. 27, see fuller details at Matt. x. 38.)

Ver. 28—30. The way in which the powers of man must bear a certain proportion relatively to the greatness of his undertaking, is explained by the Saviour in certain parables, which are peculiar to Luke. The first comparison is taken from a building, for the completing of which the necessary sums of money must be provided. The selection of this particular similitude arises assuredly from the frequent comparison of inward spiritual effort and labour to an edifice (*οικοδομή*), and especially to the building of a temple (1 Cor. iii. 10, seqq.) The expression *πύργος* is to be understood of a great palace-like edifice, for, the object of the parable requires something extraordinary which cannot be reached by common means. (The *καθίσας ψηφίζει* sets forth exact pains-taking care in the reckoning.—The substantive *ἀπαρτισμός*, from *ἀπαρτίζειν* = *ἐκτελεῖν* is found only here.)

Ver. 31—33. The second and also very graphic similitude is taken from a *conflict*, which a man undertakes only when he believes himself possessed of powers at least in some measure adequate. Two princes are represented as at war, and if one of them feel himself weak, he sets himself to plead for peace. (*Συμβάλλειν εἰς πόλεμον, μάχην* is a pure Greek form of expression.) The way, however, in which it is intended that these two comparisons should apply to the followers of Christ (ver. 33) is not altogether so clear. Christ requires, in connexion with ver. 26 and 27, the *ἀποτάσσεσθαι πᾶσι τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ ὑπάρχουσι*, inasmuch as he wishes to engross alone the love of man. The *ἀποτάσσεσθαι*, however, appears to be something merely negative, while in the parables there is demanded something positive, namely, *power*. But, even the *ἀποτάσσεσθαι τοῖς ὑπάρχουσι* requires spiritual power also, for the *ὑπάρχοντα* should not be viewed as isolated, but as conjoined with the whole *κόσμος*, and this again as in connexion with the *ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου*. According to the comparison, the struggle to be undertaken is represented as so great, for this reason, that it must be entered into, against a mighty kingdom and its prince, and can therefore be successful only if man bear within him a stronger power. According to this view also, it is easy to understand the obscure point, as to how the Saviour should in these parables seemingly attribute to man the power of working out that which was so difficult (as represented in vers. 26, 27). The scope of the parable is obviously this, to bring it about that a rigorous impartial examination should impress on man the conviction that he is as incapable in his own strength of overcoming the kingdom of creature-life, as a king with ten thousand men would be to conquer twenty thousand.<sup>1</sup> The consciousness, however, of our own inability should lead us to seek after a *higher* power, to attach ourselves to the great kingdom of light and its prince, who, under all circumstances, overthrows the kingdom of darkness. Viewed thus in their connexion with what goes before (ver. 26, 27), the parables amount to this statement, "In wishing to follow me, ye undertake a contest which ye are unable to carry through; seek

<sup>1</sup> Hence Augustine (Confess. viii. 6) says with great truth of some persons who had begun in faith the conflict with the old man, "*œdificabant turrim sumptu idoneo, relinquendi omnia sua et sequendi te.*" The giving up of one's own is identical with the laying hold of Christ.

first to arrive at the conviction of your own weakness, and seek the higher power of the Spirit, then shall ye be qualified for the kingdom of God."

Ver. 34, 35. Here follow most appropriately the concluding words which Matt. has embodied in the Sermon on the Mount (v. 13), and which Mark (ix. 29) has arranged in another connexion. The words are in themselves of such a kind that one can at once suppose them to have been spoken by the Saviour on various occasions, just like the *ὁ ἔχων ὅτα ἀκούειν, ἀκούτω* at the close of this section. At all events, the connexion in which the words stand here in Luke, is most fitting. For, the subject spoken of (ver. 26, 27) had been, admission into the company of disciples, and the qualifications needful thereto. Very appropriate, therefore, is the remark, that great and noble as the vocation was to act on the community like the salt of the earth, quickening and strengthening, so great also would be the danger if a man did not fulfil that vocation, for, in that case he would not only fail of producing any effect on the body, but bring disgrace upon himself. Thus in these words the earnest admonition is again taken up which is contained in the first verses of this section, rather to abandon the purpose of following Jesus than enter on it with divided hearts. (As to the exposition, compare the details given at Matt. v. 13, and at Mark ix. 49.)

#### § 16. PARABLES RELATING TO THE COMPASSIONATE LOVE OF GOD.

(Luke xv. 1—32.)

In the words of transition which connect what follows with what goes before *ἦσαν δὲ ἐργίζοντες κ. τ. λ.*, there is given no distinct statement of the relation in which the former stands to the latter. It may be supposed that a space of time intervened. But the manner in which the parables which follow are placed in contrast with those that went before, makes it in the highest degree probable that they are closely connected together. For, while at xiv. 28, seqq. there was set forth the strong earnestness which is required in order to confess Christ and follow him, the opposite half as it were, supplementary to this, is now brought forward, namely, the compas-



sionate love displayed in the gospel, inasmuch as Jesus calls the poor and miserable to himself. It asks from these the same thing which was laid before those to whom the parables of building the tower and the conflict were addressed, only to these miserable ones the demand is not as it was to the undecided and the irresolute, something burdensome, but it is to them a gain and a pleasure to be *laid under the necessity* of forsaking all and serving him alone whom their soul loves. The compassionate love of God which forms the contrast to the hard-hearted Pharisees, meets here with the entire giving up of himself on the part of the lost (ver. 21), which stands opposed to the calculating adherence of the wavering (xiv. 26, seqq.), inasmuch as he pleads for that as an act of grace, which to the others is a burdensome duty, namely the serving of God. In the first two parables the former reference predominates, in opposition to the Pharisees with their cold condemnations of men, God appears as the compassionate Being who lovingly receives the lost to himself; in the third there is in addition to this, the second point of contrast carefully carried out.

Ver. 1, 2. As Jesus finished the preceding discourses, which were spoken by him without doubt after the journey had been completed for the day, there gathered around him a company of men really in need of aid, not with the view of insidiously listening to him, but of receiving from him life and spirit (*ἀκούειν αὐτοῦ*.) Among these were *τελῶναι* (see on Matt. v. 46), and other persons, who more grossly, or with greater refinement, had transgressed the law. For, in every case where the *ἁμαρτωλός* and the *δίκαιος* (ver. 7) are set in contrast, we are to trace in the former the outward and visible transgression of the law, as in the latter the idea of the outward observance of the law. *Gross* forms of transgression are not excluded here, as is shewn obviously by the parable of the lost son who is intentionally described as one *καταφαγὼν τὸν βίον μετὰ πορνῶν* (ver. 30.) On this contrast depends the whole point of these three parables. The Pharisees, in the consciousness (not merely hypocritical) of their *δικαιοσύνη*, despised the *ἁμαρτωλούς* to whom righteousness according to the law was in fact wanting. But, the relation in which the righteousness of the law and the righteousness of faith stand to each other, is the very point on which the following parables are intended to cast light. (*Διαγογγύζω* is = to the more common *γογγύζω*, to *murmur*, to *be averse*. *Προσδέχεσ-*

θαι and *συνεσθίειν* denotes every kind of contact, closer or more remote; *προσδέχεσθαι* is = to the frequently occurring *δέχεσθαι* [comp. Matt. x. 40], in the sense of to render the services of love, which presupposes an inclination of mind. The term *συνεσθίειν* points to closer contact, in continuous intercourse.) There is truth in the Pharisaic principle of abstaining from intercourse with sinful and defiled men, if it proceed from anxiety to avoid being tempted by their sins. In them, however, it was the result of haughty feeling, which made them keep at a distance from such unfortunate men, even when their minds showed an inclination towards something better.

Ver. 3-7. The first parable recounted to the Pharisees by Jesus, (*εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς* ver. 3 compared with xvi. 1), is derived from a similitude already frequently employed in the Old Testament, according to which the relation between God and the people of Israel is compared to that between a shepherd and his flock. Even for the very form of viewing the comparison which we here meet with, the Old Testament furnishes analogies (Jerem. l. 6; Ezek. xxxiv. 11, xii. 16.) The main reference of the parable then it is quite impossible to mistake, inasmuch as the *ἀπολωλός* which the shepherd seeks after, is just the same with the *ἁμαρτωλοί* whom the Saviour receives in love, while the Pharisees despise them. But the references of the particular portions call for closer examination. For, *first of all*, it may be a question how the seeking and finding of the lost sheep on the part of the shepherd stands connected with the *μετανοεῖν* which at ver. 7 and 10 is attributed to the sinner, for, the parable mentions nothing of a change of state on the part of the lost one. According to the meaning of the parable, however, the labour of the shepherd in seeking and finding the sheep must be understood of God's operations on the sinner's heart, through means of which He awakens in him the *μετάνοια*. This parable, therefore, forms in this respect a contrast to the following one of the lost son, in which there is represented, not what God does, but what man does in the work of conversion. In a similar way (as was remarked on Matt. xiii. 44, seqq.) do the parables of the treasure in the field, and the merchant seeking pearls, stand mutually related to each other. *In the second place*, there is set before us, not merely the seeking of the lost sheep, but also the *καταλείπειν* (ver. 4) of the ninety and nine. To this refers, on the one hand, the

contrast between the ἔρημος and the οἶκος, and on the other hand the circumstance that at ver. 7 the returning sinner is elevated more highly than those who never were lost. (This idea is more fully carried out in the parable of the lost son, ver. 22, seqq.) This certainly seems strange when we consider that those who are not lost are described as, δίκαιοι, οἵτινες οὐ χρεῖαν ἔχουσι μετανοίας (ver. 7), and seeing they had in point of fact never wandered from the close fellowship of the flock, they thus deserved praise for their faithfulness. But, from the connexion of the law and the gospel to each other, this difficulty admits of being easily removed, and the meaning of the parable retained in its literal application. For the law certainly carries with it this design, to incite men to keep it, and if he do keep it he acquires a δικαιοσύνη τοῦ νόμου, and does not need any μετάνοια in regard to the positive transgression of the law. This δικαιοσύνη, however, is incapable of leading to that higher life which the gospel demands, but which it also bestows where there exists a susceptibility for it. There are only two ways, then, in which this can arise, either through such earnestness in the observances of the law, that a man cannot satisfy himself with an *exterior* legality (as the Pharisees did), but must strive also after an *inward* conformity to that law; or, when he, being left to himself, falls into sin. In the first case, he soon experiences his inability to subjugate the hidden world within him, and thus the law works the ἐπίγνωσις τῆς ἁμαρτίας (Rom. iii. 20), and such a δίκαιος (see on Luke i. 5) may then possess at the same time true longing after and susceptibility for the atonement. In the second case, however (which is that here intended), the striking and marked transgression of the law palpably brings his sin home to a man, and he is brought also to μετάνοια, inasmuch as, where sin was powerful, there grace often shows itself the more powerfully (Rom. v. 20.) In both cases, however, there rests on the μετάνοια, on the new birth namely, the possibility of a transition into a state of spiritual life more perfect than the mere δικαιοσύνη τοῦ νόμου can reach; whither this last leads is shown by the righteous brother (ver. 25 seqq.) in the third parable. Thus, what the Saviour means to show the Pharisees is just this, that these sinners whom they despised could, through the mercy of God, be elevated to a higher state of spiritual life than it was possible for *them* to reach in their present condition. That *they* also could come to

μετάνοια, however, if they would only consent to lay aside their coldness and hardness of heart, is intimated at ver. 31. Finally, we must not in the parable overlook the χαρὰ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ (ver. 7), ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀγγέλων τοῦ Θεοῦ (ver. 10), with which ver. 22 seqq. should be compared. The joy of these divinely compassionate beings forms a most strongly marked contrast to the vexation of the Pharisees because sinners were received (ver. 2, 25, seqq.) The kingdom of the good thus appears standing in mutual connexion and living unity, so that if one member rejoices, all members rejoice along with it. Heaven and earth are joined together by the bond of perfectness, love. Consequently, the absence of love must be seen by the Pharisees as implying ungodliness and exclusion from the lively fellowship of heaven. (The comparison is, moreover, found at Matt. xviii. 12, seqq. taken up and incorporated with the context there. It needs no proof, however, that here in Luke it holds its original position.)

Ver. 8—10. The second parable of the lost drachma is obscure. For, I cannot persuade myself that it contributes no new feature to the general picture which the three similitudes hold forth, and that consequently the contrast between the γυνή and the ἄνθρωπος (ver. 4), and the δέκα and ἑκατόν, is merely accidental. The woman denotes probably the community in its ideal form, as caring with a mother's faithfulness for her little child. In the gradually diminishing numbers (100, 10, 2) there is implied, perhaps, an anticlimax which is meant to indicate that there is a possibility of falling away from wider or narrower spheres of spiritual life, but that for all these relations and circumstances, grace is revealed to aid us.

Ver. 11—19. It is by so much the easier to trace what is peculiar in the *third* parable of the lost Son. There is minutely set forth in it the process of his going astray step by step, and his return to repentance and faith, while in the first parable this was merely intimated, and prominence given, instead, to the operations of the Father. Here, these find no place in the picture till they are manifested at the moment of the Son's return, and then, in parallelism with the Father's love, there is the severity of the other son, towards whom, however, the love of the Father still continues the same. With regard to the Pharisees (ver. 1) the first half of the parable is an apology for the τελῶναι and ἄμαρτωλοί whom they despised, inasmuch as it partly leads us to

infer that they are capable of nobler impulses to repentance and faith, and partly, it is made plain that God prizes and willingly receives them. In the strongest manner, then, are these *ἀμαρτωλοί* admonished and encouraged, in the first half of the parable, freely and joyfully to embrace the offered grace. The second half, however, places their own likeness before the eyes of the Pharisees, and contains a sermon of reproof addressed to them. The commencement of the parable *ἄνθρωπός τις εἶχε δύο υἱούς*, purposely places the two parties (the *δίκαιοι* and the *ἀμαρτωλοί*) on a similar footing in relation to God. The description of the sons themselves, however, by the terms *νεώτερος* and *πρεσβύτερος* (ver. 11, 25) may apply appropriately to the heathen and the Jews, although primarily the connexion does not lead us to this contrast. A parable which, like that of the lost son, represents the relation of man to God in its essential points, naturally finds, in general, its fitting application wheresoever these points are developed. The abandoning of his father's house on the part of the son points at once to man's falling away from God, out of which the whole of his other backsliding gradually developes itself. (In the expression *τὸ ἐπιβάλλον μέρος τῆς οὐσίας*, the verb *ἐπιβάλλειν* is used intransitively. In a similar way, Tob. vi. 13, *σοὶ ἐπιβάλλει ἡ κλορονομία αὐτῆς*.—*Bios* as frequently = *οὐσία*, *ὑπάρχοντα*, Luke viii. 43, xxi. 4.) In describing the living in sin, the strong expression *ζῶν ἁσώτως* is designedly chosen, and, according to ver. 30, we must retain it in all its force, for to this does the argumentation of Christ refer, to represent one who is beyond all mistake an *ἀμαρτωλός* as capable of returning to God. (*Ἀσώτως* from *σάω* is like *perditus*, a man who has fallen completely under the dominion of sensual enjoyment.) Without, then, any express mention of it, there is even in this parable a reference to the repentance-awakening grace of God which follows after the lost son. Outward distress, poverty, hunger, the felt consequences of his sin, first awaken in him, according to the Divine dispensation, the consciousness of guilt, and that this consciousness can, in the mind of the sinner, combine with *faith* in the love of God, is necessarily presupposed by the revelation of that love whose consummation is exhibited in the offering up of God's Son, John iii. 16. The aim of the parable, however, causes this to remain in the background, for which reason, also, it can only be supplied from the doctrine of Scripture taken as a whole, and is a thing

here silently understood (ver. 15, *κολλᾶσθαι* = to the Hebrew קָלַף.) He sank down to the lowest depth of earthly misery. (*Κεράτια*, as applied to the tree which is found under the name of *κερατωνία*, *κερωνία*, denotes the fruit of the plant known under the name of John's bread, which in the East is commonly used as fodder.) This suffering, however, called up life in his innermost being, and with sincere self-condemnation and deep repentance, there was combined faith in the Father. In this frame of mind, then, were given the elements of his salvation. (In the characteristic expression *ἔρχεσθαι εἰς ἑαυτόν*, we find his previous state indicated as that of one who had lost himself. In ver. 17, *ἄρτος*, as being human food, stands in contrast to *κεράτεια*, which are intended for lower animals. The *μετάνοια* here is shown to be of a pure character, by the express reference to that which is Divine, implied in the words *εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν*. He discerned sin in its root and essence as the transgression of the Divine will. The words *ἐνώπιον σου* are parallel to the Hebrew עֲנִיָּה, which at 1 Sam. xx. 1, occurs in this very connexion *הִנֵּה עֲנִיָּה לְפָנֶיךָ*.)

Ver. 20—24. If the first movements of repentance are not expressly traced to God according to the above accounts, his Divine compassion and paternal love in receiving the penitent, are all the more touchingly depicted in what follows. (As to *σπλαγχνίζεσθαι*, see on Luke i. 78.) Divine grace hastens to aid the returning sinner, and overwhelms him with its benefits. Thus what the law in its severity could not do—namely, the awakening of the love of holiness within—is effected by grace. It fills the heart of the man who sought happiness in sin and found only bitterness, with a peace and sweetness which tells him that here is to be found what he had erroneously sought in the creature. (The individual traits in ver. 22, are so clearly defined that one cannot mistake them. The *στολή πρώτη* denotes the righteousness of God [Rev. iii. 18; vii. 13; xix. 8], the *δακτύλιον*, the signet-ring, denotes the seal of the Spirit, the testimony that a man belongs to God, the *ὑποδήματα* [Ephes. vi. 15] denote the power of walking in the ways of God. The entertainment made ready points to the *δεῖπνον* to which the *βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ* is so often compared. *Σιτευτός* from *σίτος* means *fed* or *fattened with corn*. The article indicates that it was the single and therefore more valuable animal which the Father in the fulness of his joy dedicated to the Son.)

Ver. 25—30. This account of the younger son's return is followed by a narrative of his elder brother's conduct. The latter was in truth a *δίκαιος* according to the law, he had neither left his father nor transgressed his commandment, but this legal righteousness had rendered his nature cold and unamiable, and induced him without pity to condemn his brother. Amidst the general joy, his soul was full of envy and jealousy. A most graphic emblem of those Pharisees who despised the publicans, and of the Jews likewise in their contempt of the heathen world! In marked contrast to the lowly submissiveness of the younger son who bows unconditionally to the will of the father (ver. 18, 19), there comes out the pride of the elder, who even presumed in his rage to cast blame on the father's appointments, censuring, on the one hand, his mildness to the brother who had gone astray; and, on the other, his (so-called) severity towards himself. It would obviously bring the whole parable into confusion were we to assume here (with Schleiermacher) that the accusations brought by the elder brother against the younger are exaggerated—the one was unquestionably an *ἁμαρτωλός*, the other was as truly (in the view of the law) a *δίκαιος*.

Ver. 31, 32. The concluding verses add an entirely new feature to the picture. The compassion of the father who reproves sin with tenderness, remains unchanged even when brought to bear on the audacity of the elder son, who was bold enough to condemn his proceedings, an intimation being thus given to the Pharisees that for them, as well as others, Divine grace set open the way of *μετάνοια*, but that in their case equally with that of the *ἁμαρτωλοί* it was the path to *πίστις*. For, what they were outwardly, and in a form more gross, that the Pharisees also were inwardly, and in a way more refined, and it is just when assuming such forms that sin becomes most dangerous and ruinous, partly because its real nature is detected with greater difficulty, and partly because, being more spiritual in its nature, it takes a deeper hold at once on the soul and on the outward life. (On this point see at Matt. xxi. 31, in which passage this idea is set forth in express terms.) The father, moreover, in his reproof brings forward certain things which were wrong in the position of the elder son. In the true paternal feeling he views the son as his *fellow-possessor* (*πάντα τὰ ἐμὰ. σὰ ἔστιν*), but the latter, in the spirit of a slave, draws shyly back, and does not venture in his father's sense to view these possessions as

belonging to himself, but stands there avariciously and eagerly demanding, in the confidence of his own self-righteousness, that the father should urge on his acceptance, that which in a filial spirit he should himself have asked for. Thus the perverse position in which the Pharisees had placed themselves towards God and men, is in these words made known to them, and a powerful exhortation to repentance is brought home to their hearts. The account given by Paul of the inability of the νόμος to work out δικαιοσύνη (as set forth in Rom. iii. and Gal. iii.), and of the necessity for another way of salvation through πίστις and χάρις, forms the best commentary on these parables.

§ 17. PARABLES RELATING TO THE COMPASSIONATE LOVE OF OUR FELLOW MEN.

(Luke xvi. 1—31.)

The contents of the following parable, belonging apparently to an entirely different department, might at the first glance render it doubtful whether or not there exists here any demonstrable link of connection. But inasmuch as nothing is indicated in the way of conclusion or commencement, the reference of chap. xvi. 1, 14, 15 to chap. xv. 1, makes it probable that a connexion really does exist; for, Jesus according to these passages, appears to be continually speaking before the same hearers, only addressing himself now more especially to one, now to another party of them. Nor, can one fail to see on a closer examination, how the subject-matter is connected with what goes before. The whole xvi. chap. forms a parallel to the xv. What we were taught in the latter (the xv.) of God's compassionate love, is set forth in the xvi. chap. as the object for man to aim at in his own sphere. This reference to human affairs the Saviour was led very naturally to make, by the position of the Pharisees and Publicans. The former, in their unfeeling coldness, were avaricious (xvi. 14), for which reason this tendency had already been exhibited at xv. 29, in the elder brother, who was intended to represent the Pharisees. The Publicans, on the contrary, though for the most part they had become rich by unrighteous transactions, yet practised charity in their sincere μετάνοια—for



example, Zacchaeus, Luke. xix. 8. Hence does our Lord in the following parables teach the right use of earthly possessions. In the first, however, respecting the unjust steward, the representation given is of such a nature, that true charity, which, when embodied in outward acts, takes the form of an expenditure of one's possessions (the proper contrast to the false expenditure of his goods on the part of the lost son), is seen to be at the same time true *wisdom*, while the want of charity is folly. This view implied, in the first place, a defence of the despised Publicans, who are to be conceived of as belonging to the *μαθηταί* (ver. 1), with an admonition urging them to continue the same use of their property, while it involved, on the other hand, a rebuke to the Pharisees, who considered themselves as wise as they were righteous (ver. 15.) Inasmuch as they wished half to serve God as representing the Theocracy, but at the same time half to serve Mammon (ver. 13), they acted unrighteously, and became fools in their false wisdom. The final results of such false wisdom are delineated in the following parable (ver. 19, seqq.), by the remark which points out the important consequences which true wisdom may produce in behalf of man. (With an allusion to the *δέχεσθαι εἰς τὰς αἰωνίους σκηνάς*, ver. 9.) Should we ask, however, on what grounds the Lord might not have chosen a comparison to show the nature of true wisdom, which might at the same time have exhibited *δικαιοσύνη*, and consequently a liberal application of *his own* means, and not those of another ; the cause of it can have been no other than this, that it would have been impossible otherwise to bring clearly to view that twofold reference to God and the world which to the Saviour was precisely the point of greatest importance. In ver. 13 there lies the key to our understanding the peculiar form of the parable. For, both parties, the Publicans as well as the Pharisees, stand as it were between two poles. On the one side, they stand in connexion with the world and its earthly ties, on the other side, with God and Divine things. The only difference lay in this, that the Publicans (those, namely, who were here present whom Jesus kindly received [xv. 1], and who are now to be reckoned to the number of the *μαθηταί* [xvi. 1]), were outwardly most deeply involved in the world, but their inner man burned with earnest longing after that which is Divine ; the Pharisees, on the other hand, were outwardly chained to things Divine, as the born representa-

tives of the Theocracy, but their inward life was attached to the world, and they even made use of their spiritual character for earthly ends. In order to teach, therefore, what was right in regard to this position betwixt two such attractive forces, our Lord selects the precise representation here employed, which from two opposite points of view, and, for the benefit as well of the Publicans as of the Pharisees, sets in a clear light the idea contained in ver. 13, "No man can serve two masters, he must despise the one in order to cleave to the other." Man has not and never *can* have anything of *his own* (comp. on Luke xiv. 33), he is for ever a mere *οικονόμος*. The only question is whose *οικονόμος* he considers himself to be, whether of the God of tender love (whom chap. xv. sets forth), or of the hard-hearted world and its Prince. In reference to the Publicans, therefore, the parable contains the exhortation entirely to renounce the master with whom, by means of outward circumstances, they continually stood associated. In regard to the Pharisees, however, it involves the reproof that their half-heartedness could lead to nothing like the true service of God. According to this view, the *ἄνθρωπος πλούσιος* (ver. 1) is nothing else than the *κόσμος* or its representative the *ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου*, to whose service the *τελῶναι*, through their external circumstances, are supposed to belong. According to ver. 13, God is to be considered as the other and real master (the representative of the *δεχόμενοι εἰς τὰς αἰωνίους σκηνάς*, ver. 9) who stands opposed to this *οἰκοδεσπότης*. This true Lord has service rendered to him in the right way, even by the wise *διασκορπίζων τὰ ὑπάρχοντα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πλουσίου*, who despises the one in order to belong wholly to the other, and with the possessions of the one labours for the objects of the other. That man acts, however, *in opposition* to his own interests (and is thus unwise) who, like the Pharisees, seeks to place the service of the one on a level with that of the other. The figurative representation of unrighteousness could thus be made use of here without causing any misunderstanding, for this reason, that it so markedly expresses the felt inward experience of the man who feels himself placed between two such opposite attractive forces. On the other hand, however, to expend the things which belong to the *κόσμος* in behalf of God and his objects can never be to act falsely, for the *κόσμος*, as well as its *ἄρχων*, are not the true possessors. As God thus is in the last instance the right-

ful Lord, such an overreaching of the *κόσμος* as Jesus here teaches is the way truly to uphold what is right; all is rendered back to God to whom all belongs. There was no reason to apprehend, however, such a perversion of his words as though a man ought to deprive others of their property in order thus to expend it, for this was already sufficiently prohibited by the commandment "thou shalt not steal." The very delineation of the *ἀδικία* in touches so vivid excludes all possibility of such a misunderstanding. According to this view, the parable, though referring primarily to temporal circumstances, possesses its everlasting truth; in things temporal are shadowed forth things eternal. For, in the same light in which the Publicans are here presented to our view, do men stand at all times, in so far as they are possessed of property. *Possession in itself* as a circumscribed and exclusive right to certain things, is the product of sin in the *κόσμος* of which man knows nothing in the *βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ*.<sup>1</sup> While maintaining, therefore, such a possessory right, man is an *οἰκονόμος* of the *ἀρχῶν τοῦ κόσμου τούτου*. If he prove *true* to this master, he works in his interest, and so heaps up possessions upon possessions, but if he prove *untrue* to him, and pass over as a member into the *βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ*, into the service, consequently, of another Lord, then he labours in the interest of this new master, and squanders the possessions of the first, expending them on spiritual objects. This points again to xiv. 33, where the children of the kingdom were exhorted *ἀποτάσσεσθαι πᾶσι*, and by means of this explanation the connexion is seen to be carried thus far back.

The great mistake, as it seems to me, in the common exposition of the parable, consists in this, that under the *ἄνθρωπος πλούσιος* God is understood to be meant.<sup>2</sup> In this view of it we cannot conceive how two masters should be spoken of at ver. 13, or how

1 It is chiefly the difference of opinion in regard to the rights of property which makes it so difficult for expositors to agree in their understanding of this parable. According to the prevailing opinion, it is only illegal possession which deserves blame, and from the standing-point of law this is correct. In the same way, it is only an act of *perfidy* which is held to deserve punishment. But Christ looks on humanity in a point of view far higher, and contemplates the original state of Paradise as restored. According to this view, no mention can be made of any right of possession which excludes from others the use of the property possessed, and it is in this way that our Lord treats the relation in which man stands to the things of this world.

2 This explanation Jensen has even yet retained in his valuable Treatise (in the Studien und Kritiken by Ullman, ii. vol., 4th part, p. 699, seq.), to the disadvantage of

we should be taught to squander possessions belonging to the God of love. For had it been intended to teach by this a beneficent expenditure of one's means, the steward acting thus would not have been displaced by God, but if it be a false wasteful prodigality of one's possessions that is meant, such as was condemned in the case of the lost son, one cannot see how this is to be reconciled with the declarations at ver. 8—13, in which his faithfulness is in minor matters praised. For, that a parable should teach precisely *the opposite* of what the narrative itself mentions, can never again be maintained after the striking train of reasoning by Schulz (on the parable of the unjust steward, p. 98.) The rich man can represent only *the world* in whose service the Publicans stood. To spend these their riches in such a way as to devote it to the interests of their higher Lord, and at the same time to their own (real and everlasting) benefit, is the only thing that could be enjoined on them for imitation.<sup>1</sup> The exposition of Schulz (*ut supra*) is, in my view, essentially the right one, only this learned critic neglected clearly to refer the *ἄνθρωπος πλούσιος* to the world, and was therefore, in his otherwise correct explanation, forced to have recourse to this turn, "that it is not the man's whole corrupt nature and conduct, nor his worldly standing-point, nor his profligate ungodly feeling and mean selfishness which is praised, but his well-considered, effective mode of dealing with the possessions still standing at his disposal." (*Ut supra*, p. 103.) It seems to me undeniable, however, that the meaning of the parable will fit still more closely into the narrative which contains it, if we hold that the rich man stands parallel to the world and its Prince. By

his general view. On the other hand, there lies much truth in the polemical discussion which the author carries out against Schleiermacher. In exactly the same way does Schneckenburger (*Contrib.* p. 55) understand by the *πλούσιος* God. Very arbitrarily, therefore, must he hold ver. 13 to be a later interpolation.

1 If one were inclined, with De Wette, to say that the *ἄνθρωπος πλούσιος* in the parable was intended to have no meaning, such an opinion might more readily satisfy us were it not that the arbitrary disjunction of particular features from the parable favours a superficial exposition of Scripture. Substantially the exposition of the parable is entirely given up by De Wette, inasmuch as ver. 10—13, which can alone furnish the key to our understanding of it, are explained by him as standing quite unconformably to the remaining portions. He thinks also that there is in the narrative itself an internal improbability which the expositor must be satisfied to take as he finds. After all, the parable, in the opinion of this learned critic, contains something paradoxical, and yet it gives us this idea, which is worthy of Christ, that men should expend their earthly means for the advancement of the kingdom of God.

Schulthess (Theol. Annals Tubig. 1827, March, p. 213 seqq.) this view of the reference has been rightly brought forward. The explanation of Schleiermacher (on the writings of Luke, p. 202 seqq.), according to which the Publicans are meant by the steward, and the Romans by the master, is not specifically different from my own view,<sup>1</sup> inasmuch as the Romans form the representatives of the κόσμος. Only on this point must I refuse to agree with Schleiermacher when he wishes to mitigate the character of the οἰκονόμος τῆς ἀδικίας. In the very aggravation of his ἀδικία lies the whole point of the narrative.<sup>2</sup>

Ver. 1. The expression ἔλεγε καὶ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ points back to xv. 3, where the discourse was directly addressed to the Pharisees. Now, in addition to them, the Saviour turns also to his μαθηταί in such a way that both parties, Pharisees and Publicans, are addressed together, and thus in the parable there may be traced a reference to both. The μαθηταί, however, here embrace in the widest sense all the adherents of Jesus, both the Apostles (who are specially mentioned in xvii. 5) and the well-inclined τελῶναι together. The Apostles, it might be said, had indeed already practised the commandment to free themselves from Mammon (comp. on Matt. xix. 27), but, on the one hand, they were not as yet in their hearts wholly delivered from the love of their possessions, so that an admonition to continue in the renunciation of Mammon cannot seem inappropriate even for them; and on the other hand we may remember that Judas was included among them, who was still the slave of φιλαργυρία, and the parable may be considered at the same time as a warning for him—as it was to the Pharisees. That the ἄνθρωπος τις πλούσιος, then, cannot have been intended to denote God, might be conjectured, first of all, from the word τίς itself, which gives a certain vagueness to the idea, which obviously is inconsistent with such an interpretation. The words might be translated, “some rich man, of whom there are many to be found.” In this way it

<sup>1</sup> Schleiermacher rests satisfied with the contrarieties most near at hand without ascending, as it seems to me we must do, to these opposite forces in their final and highest form.

<sup>2</sup> As to the many other (for the most part wholly untenable) expositions of the parable, compare the well known treatises by Schreiter and Keil. The following recent explanations of this difficult passage are also worth reading, viz., by Grossman, Lips. 1828; Niedner, Lips. 1826; Zyro Stud. und Kritik. Jahrg. 1831, h. 4; and Bahnmeyer (Bahnmeyer in Kleiber's Stud. vol. i. part 1, p. 27, seqq.)

must be some usual connexion such as is wont to subsist in the sinful *κόσμος* which is intended to be denoted. In the *second place*, the comparison in ver. 19 is obviously unfavourable to the view that the rich man denotes the Godhead. For, in this latter parable the *πλούσιος* is the representative of the *κόσμος*, but it is altogether an improbable thing that in two parallel parables the same expression should denote something wholly different or rather opposite. If one considers, further, how there runs through the whole language of Scripture the view that *πτωχός* is to be held equivalent to *εὐσεβής*, and *πλούσιος* to *ἀσεβής*, it must assuredly be confessed that any reference of the expression *ἄνθρωπος πλούσιος* to a noble character seems inappropriate.<sup>1</sup> The common relations of the *αἰὼν οὗτος* are intended to be delineated in the parable, and therefore as is the *οἰκονόμος* such also is the *κύριος*. (Comp. on ver. 8.) There is implied, moreover, in the idea of the *οἰκονόμος* (as Schulz, ut supra, p. 44, shows) that he is more than a mere *δούλος*. He is to be viewed as the administrator and curator (of the master who on some occasion was absent), and as one, therefore, who could the more freely act without control in regard to the possessions of his Lord. The *οἰκονόμος* is thus all the more appropriately the representative of man, in so far as he has to a certain extent the independent management of his possessions. Respecting this *οἰκονόμος*, then, the report went abroad, and there were willing informers who carried it to his master, that he wasted the property entrusted to him. (*Διασκορπίζειν*, as at Luke xv. 13. The *διαβάλλειν*, which occurs in the New Testament only at this place, does not by any means imply an attempt to calumniate by false reports, but rather to inform, to accuse even when the accusation contains what is well-founded.) In the case of this steward, *it is intended* that this very *ἀδικία* should stand forth as a leading feature of his character.

Ver. 2, 3. The rich man calls the *οἰκονόμος* to account (*ἀποδιδόναι λόγον* = *διδόναι λόγον*, Rom. xiv. 12), and announces to him his approaching dismissal (*οὐ δυνήσῃ ἔτι οἰκονομεῖν*) from office. The period that had to elapse previous to his removal, the wise steward seeks still to employ for his own advantage. The

<sup>1</sup> Certainly in the parables of Jesus ignoble characters are sometimes compared to God (comp. Luke xviii. 1, seqq.), but that is in cases where the ground is distinctly made known on account of which this very comparison was chosen.

means of support which happen to be mentioned (σκάπτειν and ἐπαιτεῖν, which last is = לָחַץ [Ps. cix. 10], and bears the sense of stipem rogare), the delicately educated steward finds unsuited to him, partly because he was unaccustomed to hard labour, and partly because he feared the opinions of men. This representation refers primarily to the common opinions of a man, who in a worldly wise way knew how to extricate himself from difficulties, and to cast off every thing burdensome. In the application of the parable there is a delineation of that spiritual wisdom, which chooses the true way to blessedness (that of pure love), which is at the same time the most secure.

Ver. 4—7. Of the liberty still left him in the management of the property, the οἰκονόμος makes this use that he gives abatements to the debtors, and by this mildness gains them over to himself. (Μεθιστάναι literally means merely to dismiss, as at Colos. i. 13, here it is taken in a milder sense for to remove. So also at Acts xiii. 22.) The debts are to be considered as contracted during the time of his stewardship, so that these new acts of unfaithfulness entered into the same great account. (Βάτος = בַּת, according to Ezek. xlv. 14 for fluids. Κόρος = כֹּר or כֶּר, a measure for dry substances. It is equal to the חֲמִישׁ.) The graduated diversity in the remission of the debts refers in the application of the parable to the wise distribution of benefits according to the existing wants of those who receive them.

Ver. 8. When the Lord (that is the ἄνθρωπος πλούσιος, ver. 1) was informed of this new perfidy, he praised (notwithstanding his wrath against the οἰκονόμος, which, according to ver. 2, must be taken for granted) the wisdom with which he had known how to make himself safe for the future. For as the judge would have taken from the steward what he possessed, in order to repay his master in some measure for his losses, there remained nothing for him to do but to make himself friends by such acts of kindness. No one could interfere to prevent them giving to him of their own. Did we view the words καὶ ἐπήνεσεν ὁ κύριος κ. τ. λ. as the language of the Evangelist, so that the ὁ κύριος were to be understood as meaning Christ, the whole representation would be entangled and confused. The address of Christ in which he makes application to his hearers so obviously begins only at ver. 9, with the words κἀγὼ ὑμῖν λέγω that the former view of the words may be

held to be impossible. It might be more questionable whether τῆς ἀδικίας should be connected with οἰκονόμος or with ἐπήνεσεν. Schleiermacher decides in favour of the latter. But the immediately following expression μαμωνᾶς τῆς ἀδικίας of ver. 9, and the analogous phrase κριτῆς τῆς ἀδικίας (Luke xviii. 6) are obviously in favour of the connexion with οἰκονόμος, not to mention that the succeeding words ὅτι φρονίμως ἐποίησεν do not well admit of our assuming the ἀδικία as also an object of *praise*. The whole connexion, however, speaks most strongly in favour of the construction οἰκονόμος τῆς ἀδικίας, inasmuch as the point of the narrative lies in this, that the impure wisdom of the worldly man is contrasted with *the pure* (though *seemingly* impure) wisdom of the children of God. The term ἀδικία, however, forms here the contrast to δικαιοσύνη in the widest sense of the word. All that is unlawful, every transgression of an ἐντολή (such as in this case openly took place) forms the ground of ἀδικία in the relation of man to God. Hence even if the steward's conduct towards his master's debtors did not amount to an act of unrighteousness in the narrower sense of the word, yet in the wider meaning of it which we have referred to it did, for in acting as he did he transgressed the law. Certainly, however, ἀδικία is to be distinguished from literal wickedness (πανουργία πονηρία.) (See further on in this verse.) The *final words* of the parabolic narrative ὅτι φρονίμως ἐποίησεν bring forward the lesson it was mainly intended to teach, namely to inculcate *wisdom* (the opposite of *μωρία*.) The expression φρόνησις (בִּינָה) stands connected with σύνεσις (understanding) in the same way that σοφία (חָכְמָה) does with νοῦς (reason.) Prudence denotes the active exercise of the soul's powers, which shows itself especially in duly making use of outward circumstances in order to attain (good as well as evil) objects. Wisdom denotes the receptivity of the soul—its standing open for the influence of a higher world to act upon it. In cases where the νοῦς is pre-eminently active it is usually a difficult thing to keep the σύνεσις equally in exercise, and this forms the subject of the Saviour's rebuke in what follows. The admonition is thus analogous to that given at Matt. x. 16, "Be ye wise as serpents." The parabolic narrative then concludes with the words ὅτι φρονίμως ἐποίησεν, and at ver. 9 there follows the express application of it for the benefit of the disciples commencing with κἀγὼ ὑμῖν λέγω.



The words therefore inserted between, belong neither to the one portion nor the other, but form an intermediate remark intended to lead the hearers onward to the comprehension of the parable. For, the *υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου* are there set in contrast to the *υἱοὶ τοῦ φωτός* in such a way that the *οἰκονόμος* is obviously included in the former, and is meant to be placed in opposition to the disciples (ver. 1) as the members of the *βασιλεία τ. Θ.* (Comp. as to *αἰὼν οὗτος* on Matt. xii. 31.) That which connects the two is the *φρόνησις*, in which the children of the world surpass the children of light (Christians are often termed the *υἱοὶ τοῦ φωτός*, John xii. 36, 1 Thess. v. 5, as those who have been illuminated by the true light, John i. 4) in reference to their circumstances in life. (The somewhat obscure expression *εἰς τὴν γενεὰν τὴν ἑαυτῶν* is to be referred to both parties in such a way that to each class there is ascribed a *γενεά*, in regard to which they exercise *φρόνησις*. It is best to take *γενεὰ* in the common meaning of *generation*, those of one race living together. The *υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου*, and the *υἱοὶ τοῦ φωτός* must be conceived of as two families having two ancestral heads, God and the world, who impart to each their peculiar character.) From these words, so important for the understanding of the parable, it plainly follows that the relation of the *οἰκονόμος* to the *ἄνθρωπος πλούσιος* (ver. 1) is precisely that which subsists between the world and its children. Worldly men labour in the spirit of the world their master, when they amass treasures for this earthly life. In this respect they often display uncommon prudence. This is easy for them, because they suffer the higher powers to slumber and concentrate all their affections on earthly things. Altogether otherwise is it with the members of the kingdom of God; aiming at a higher life they often are forgetful of what is prudent in regard to the things of earth. The harmonious combination of both would be perfection. The connexion of this with what follows (ver. 13), however, would lead to the inference that the *υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου* are not to be taken as precisely identical with the *πονηροί*. For we must steadfastly keep it in mind that Jesus had the Pharisees in his eye, who vacillated backwards and forwards between God and the world. One who was properly *πονηρός* we must hold to be as decided *against* God, as the child of light is *for* Him. Between the two there stand the *υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου*, belonging, it is true, through the general sinfulness

of man to the *σκότος*, but not absolutely hostile to the *φῶς*, striving rather to combine light and darkness. In this position stood the Pharisees, and our Lord seeks to convince them of the impurity of such a state. At the same time he wishes to prevail on the Publicans unreservedly to decide in favour of God.

Ver. 9. The positive application of the parable, which begins with the words *καὶ γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν*, shows that the exposition given above, to which we are led in the first instance by the connexion, harmonizes also perfectly with the Saviour's own explanation. For the sense of the words *ποιήσατε ἑαυτοῖς φίλους κ. τ. λ.* is obviously to be completed thus—employ the unrighteous mammon in making yourselves friends, with as much prudence as that steward did in the circumstances in which he was placed. There is thus a *μαμωνᾶς τῆς ἀδικίας* presupposed as existing in their case, and the counsel is given that they release themselves from it. The 13th verse adds that this can be done only by despising the one master. The sole question that can arise is, how far the *μαμωνᾶς τῆς ἀδικίας* forms here the subject of discourse. (Comp. as to *μαμωνᾶς* on Matt. vi. 24.) In regard to the Publicans this expression may certainly refer to the circumstance that they (as *ἁμαρτωλοί*) had made much gain in an unlawful way. But the following opposition of *ἐλάχιστον* and *πολύ* leads to some more general inference. The mammon is looked upon as something necessarily as such connected with *ἀδικία*; it is as it were the bond by which every individual is bound to the *αἰὼν οὗτος* and its Prince. This bond must therefore be severed, nay mammon must itself be used with prudence for the furtherance of spiritual ends. Keeping close to and carrying out the representation of the parable, our Lord views the *δέχεσθαι* (ver. 4) as a consequence of the making of friends. Without such a definite intimation given by the Saviour himself, one might have been tempted to regard this as a mere decoration. The primary difficulty here is the *ὅταν ἐκλείπητε*. For, not to mention the reading *ἐκλείπητε*, there are good MSS. (such as A. D. L.) which read *ἐκλείπη*. In that case *μαμωνᾶς* or *βίος* would need to be supplied. This reading does not betray itself as an alteration in conformity to ver. 4, so as to bring out the meaning, "As the steward hopes that his friends on his dismissal will receive him, so ought you also to make yourselves friends who may receive you if you are reduced to starvation." For, it is altogether inappro-

priate that a spiritual reception should be placed in contrast to bodily starvation. Perhaps it is a mere mistake of the transcriber, inasmuch as the *δέ* which follows might give occasion for the omission of the *τε*. The *ἐκλείπητε* is the only reading which agrees to the connexion. It furnishes us with the idea that by means of worldly things he may prepare for himself assistance to meet his spiritual wants. (*Ἐκλείπειν* occurs in the sense of *to want, to be destitute of*, for example Luke xxii. 32; here it means *to want the power of life, to die*. So it is frequently used in the Old Testament for *תָּרַם*. In the New Testament it occurs only here in this sense. The reference to death as the moment of reckoning, as well with a view to punishment as reward, is in this passage exceedingly appropriate. Comp. in the following parable, ver. 22.) The words *δέχεσθαι εἰς τὰς αἰωνίους σκηνάς*, with reference to ver. 4, form an expression for spiritual assistance. There is nothing precisely analogous to the expression in the New Testament, for passages like Heb. viii. 2, Rev. xiii. 6, refer to the Tabernacle of the Covenant, of which there is no mention made here. The nearest parallel is furnished by John xiv. 2, *ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς μου μοναὶ πολλαὶ εἰσιν*. The *σκηναί* denote here the higher and permanent state of being, in opposition to the earthly and transitory. There remains, however, still a difficulty in the idea, as to how the *φίλοι* could receive others into everlasting habitations, and who they are whom we are to conceive of as thus presented to us. Since the discourse is addressed to the *μαθηταί*, we cannot, as it seems to me, think of the Apostles, who were included among the *μαθηταί*, and to them as to all the other disciples—especially the rich Publicans—there is addressed the exhortation to make friends with mammon. Should it appear then improper generally that the privilege is to be conceded to all and every one of receiving into the everlasting habitations, we might refer the words to the person of Jesus himself, in union, however, with the inhabitants of the heavenly world, who previously (xv. 10) and subsequently (xvi. 22) are introduced as actively employed. For that which belongs properly to Christ, may be ascribed also to his people, especially to the Apostles, in so far as Christ's strength is conceived of as purely working in them, and they have received power to bind and to loose (Matt. xvi. 19.) But inasmuch as this power was as yet conferred on them only *in spe* as it were, since

they had not received the Holy Ghost (for which reason also Peter immediately at Matt. xvi. 23 could again give Satan access to himself), therefore also is the commandment in part addressed to them to make friends with mammon. For, were we disposed to consider the Apostles alone as the *δεχόμενοι εἰς τὰς αἰωνίους σκηνάς*, and to view the admonition to make friends with mammon as addressed solely to the Publicans, the representation given in the parable furnishes positively no ground for separating into two halves the *μαθηταί* who are mentioned at ver. 1.

Ver. 10–12. The following words are calculated to dispel any doubts which have not yet been obviated as to the exposition of this parable. For our Lord here first puts forward the general sentiment expressed in the form of a proverb—gives it a turn so as to apply it to the parable, and then reverts again to the general principle. It is obvious at a single glance that the *ἐλάχιστον* and *ἀλλότριον* correspond to the *ἄδικος μαμώνας*, that the *πολύ* however corresponds to *ἀληθινόν* and the *ὑμέτερον*. In the use of the former faithfulness is enjoined, that a man may make himself worthy of the latter, deliverance from another's is represented as the condition of a man's being entrusted with his own, just as at xiv. 33. (The expressions *ἀλλότριον* and *ὑμέτερον* refer to the nobler nature in man which has been awakened in the *μαθηταί*; theirs is the eternal—*ἀληθινόν*—that related to them; the earthly is the other man's.) The conduct of a child of light therefore, who, after the manner of the steward, scatters the mammon, is designated *fidelity*, the keeping of it together would be *unfaithfulness*. Only through such an application of things less important in behalf of Divine objects can a man make himself worthy to receive higher blessings, *i.e.*, to manage aright heavenly powers of soul in humility and love. This then must the Apostles themselves thoroughly learn before receiving from above the fulness of the Spirit. (*Ἄδικος* is here placed in opposition to *πιστός* because of the foregoing use of the word. All *ἀπιστία* is also *ἀδικία*.)

Ver. 13. The concluding words we have already met with at Matt. vi. 24, in the Sermon on the Mount. That their position here is an original one, and not merely that in which they occur in Matt., does not need to be pointed out. Every word of the verse fits here most closely into the whole parable. The *οἰκέτης* points back to the *οἰκονόμος*. The one master is the *ἄνθρωπος*

πλούσιος, the other is the possessor of the ἀλλοθινόν, the contrasted terms μισεῖν and ἀγαπᾶν, as also ἀνδέχεσθαι and καταφρονεῖν refer to the application of the possessions against the one and in favour of the other master. The wavering inclinations of the Pharisees would in this way be wholly excluded, but the Lord means also to exhort his disciples to give up all, and to be wholly for God. The verse completes the explanation given by Jesus of the foregoing parable, and leaves no room for doubt as to the mutual connexion of its parts as one whole.

Ver. 14. Although the parable (according to ver. 1) was addressed primarily to the μαθηταί, yet was it not intended that the Pharisees should be excluded. (Hence the words ἤκουον ταῦτα πάντα καὶ οἱ Φαρίσαῖοι.) Their covetousness was rebuked by this very parable of the wicked steward; and in anger at this reproof they gave expression to their ill-will in mockery of Jesus, not only in looks but also in words. (Ἐκμυκτηρίζειν, the compound verb, occurs also at Luke xxiii. 35. The simple verb is found only at Gal. vi. 7. In the LXX. it stands as = γυγίζω, to scoff, to mock, to turn up the nose.) This incident leads the Saviour to address his discourse again directly to the Pharisees (εἶπεν αὐτοῖς), and in another parable once more to hold before them a view of the consequences of their φιλαργυρία. We thus once more find Luke very accurate here in setting before us the turns of the dialogue, and might at once have inferred from this, that in this case, (vers. 15—18), as in others, we should not fail to find a close connexion. Certainly the verses which follow are very obscure, and it may possibly be that Luke has communicated them to us in a somewhat abbreviated form. Perhaps, however, the Saviour speaks also intentionally in a somewhat obscure way, since he could hardly hope to win over the Pharisees to his side, and for this reason, in order not to make them so deeply responsible, he may have wished only incidentally to touch upon the relation in which the Old Testament economy (to which the Pharisees belonged externally, although inwardly they had no love for it) stood to that of the New Testament, which relation was now unfolding itself before them.

Ver. 15. The very first verse of this dialogue is, in regard to its connexion, obscure.<sup>1</sup> The Saviour blames the Pharisees for their

<sup>1</sup> By the difficulty of tracing a connection in the following verses, De Wette has suffered himself to be misled into agreeing with Straus, who finds in them certain wholly

hypocrisy : they set themselves forth in the view of men as *δίκαιοι* (*δικαιοῦν ἑαυτὸν* = *קִיָּיָה* used here, in the legal sense, to represent one's self as a close observer of the law,) while in the view of God, who looks not like men on that which is without, but on that which is within (*καρδία* = *לֵב*), they are not so. In the concluding words the *ὑψηλόν* is mentioned as the ground of this displeasure on the part of God (*Βδέλυγμα* from *βδέω*, *to stink*, the strongest expression for that which is displeasing to God, it stands for *קִבְיָה*, and is used especially with reference to idols. In the *ὑψηλόν* also there is implied a reference to that which is idolatrous, which robs God of his glory, and gives it to self.) According to what goes before the discourse seems to relate to covetousness or attachment to earthly possessions, but neither to hypocrisy nor to pride. In the same way also, in ver. 15 itself, there does not seem to be any connecting link between the first and second ideas, between hypocrisy and pride. The explanation of this difficulty lies in the more profound conception of *φιλαργυρία* as being *ρίζα πάντων τῶν κακῶν* (1 Tim. vi. 10.) *Φιλαργυρία*, inasmuch as it is attachment to things transitory viewed generally, involves everything evil. Especially and primarily in the case of the Pharisees did it imply hypocrisy, for outwardly they bore a spiritual appearance, and therefore seemed to cherish love for God, the Eternal. Over their love of gold they knew how to cast the garb of careful zeal for God, *i.e.* for the temple. Along with hypocrisy, however, there was further necessarily bound up a selfish pride, for it was their semblance of righteousness on which they founded their claims. Although, therefore, the expression *τὸ ἐν ἀνθρώποις ὑψηλόν* is rather general in its terms, and denotes any form which pride may assume, yet does it primarily point to that most dangerous manifestation of it, Pharisaic selfishness, as exhibited in a fictitious serving of God, which, in His view, is idolatry. Hence the word *ὑψηλόν* is to be regarded as standing in contrast to

unimportant reminiscences of the separate sayings of Jesus. But as Luke shows himself elsewhere an accurate writer, who carefully preserves the connexion, it is inadmissible to suppose that he has written down continuously sentences wholly unconnected, and especially that he has done so between two parables, which are obviously so nearly related to each other. Even though we could not show any connexion therefore, we ought yet to trust in Luke, so far as to believe that in this combination he had before him a train of ideas which we cannot now bring out into view.

*ταπεινόν*: as the latter alone pleases God, so does the former offend Him (Luke xiv. 11.)

Vers. 16—18. The following verses are still more difficult in regard to the connection. Matthew, in the Sermon on the Mount, (v. 18, 32), gives us verses 17, 18, connected in quite a different way. At Matt. xi. 12, however, there occurs something like ver. 16, but also peculiarly connected. Now I cannot by any means bring myself to believe that these three verses are reminiscences which the Evangelist was led to write down, merely because one word led him to another. Hitherto we have found in this account of Christ's journey the closest thread of connexion, and one cannot see for what reason there should here be such an interruption of it, since the same extreme closeness of connexion again shows itself in what immediately follows. On the other side, however, it is not probable that Matthew should have taken these three sentences out of this discourse, and interwoven them into a train of ideas so entirely different as that in which his gospel places them. Rather do I believe that the expressions (intentionally abbreviated by Christ, and perhaps still farther abridged by the narrator) are here in their original position, but at the same time that they are equally so in Matthew. The sentences are of such a kind that they might easily have been spoken more than once. As regards the exposition of this difficult passage, I cannot, in the first instance, assent to the opinion of Paulus and Schleiermacher, that the expression *ἐν ἀνθρώποις ὑψηλόν* refers to Herod Antipas, and the allusion to marriage (ver. 18) points to his connection with his brother's wife, which the venal Pharisees had allowed. For it is difficult to conceive that a fact so special should be referred to in this connexion, in which neither before nor after do we find the slightest allusion to it. Besides, there can hardly be an exposition more unfit than that according to which the *ἐν ἀνθρώποις ὑψηλόν* is referred to Herod Antipas.<sup>1</sup> Mere earthly greatness cannot possibly as such be a *βδέλυγμα* in the view of God; the king may be conceived of as *ταπεινός*, and the beggar may be *ὑψηλός*, the idea is well founded only in spiritual things. Still further, ver. 18 does not agree with the circumstances of history, for Herod's brother

<sup>1</sup> The *ἐν ἀνθρώποις* is not to be taken as meaning *ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ἀνθρώπων*, but it is equivalent to *ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων* (see immediately before.) In the same way we find at 1 Tim. iv. 16, *φανερὸν εἶναι ἐν πᾶσι*.

had not given to his wife her bill of divorce, but Herod had seduced her from him. The clause, therefore, *ὁ ἀπολύων κ. τ. λ.* does not by any means agree with the circumstances supposed to be referred to. Scarcely any other explanation of the passage (ver. 18) can suggest itself, except the following figurative one. Verses 16 and 17 set, in the first instance, the Old Testament economy (*νόμος καὶ προφῆται*) in its temporary and restricted duration (in which respect, as an institute preparatory to the New Testament, it terminates with John the Baptist), over against its everlasting character (in which respect it is in a spiritual sense completed, and still subsists in the New Testament).<sup>1</sup> The reference to it under the former of these aspects announces to the Pharisees the approaching overthrow of that visible theocratic kingdom, for the support of which they wrought, and the blooming forth of a new and higher order of things, into which were pressing all susceptible and tender souls, especially the Publicans, whom the Pharisees despised. The second aspect of it, which brings out into view the everlasting truth, wrapt up in the law, sets before them, on the one hand, the fact that they themselves, as well as the Publicans, might find entrance into this new kingdom, whose future approach the Old Testament had already foretold; and calls their attention, on the other hand, to the circumstance that this same economy on which, as on a sure foundation, they were resting, pronounced on them a sentence of condemnation, inasmuch as the laws of recompense, on which it was grounded (and which are of force even in regard to a coming world), are the eternal laws of God. (This is referred to in the following parable, at verses 29, 31, in which Moses and the prophets are described as a full and satisfying Divine revelation, which leaves without excuse the man who does not make use of the law, or who arbitrarily casts off its authority.) The relation then in which men stand to the Divine law, which is binding on them, is viewed as a marriage; and our Lord denies that there ought ever to be a wilful breaking up of such bonds. The man who does this, and from his own choice enters into another connexion, is guilty of spiritual adultery. Under this comparison our Lord sets forth at once the unfaithfulness of the Pharisees towards God, inasmuch as they loved mammon more than Him; and also their inability to enter into the new element of that life introduced by the gospel,

<sup>1</sup> Compare as to this the remarks on Matt. v. 17.



though they vainly imagined they could do so, being persuaded that they were certainly members of the kingdom of God. For such a transition, however, there was required an inward deliverance of the soul from the law, which in their case did not exist. The unusual nature of this figurative exposition of the passage forms assuredly a less difficulty in the way of our receiving it (inasmuch as Paul at Rom. vii. 1, seqq., describes under the same image the relation in which the soul stands to the law) than does the *form* in which the comparison is here applied. In this there is certainly something to make us doubt its correctness. For in that passage of Paul the law is viewed as the husband and the soul as the wife; here, however, the figure is reversed, the law would be the wife, and the man, who is connected with it, would be the husband. And yet we can easily perceive why this view of the comparison is here adopted. For the thing here spoken of was not so much the standing of the soul as *subordinate to* the law that was the subject of the Apostle's discourse in the passage referred to, for which reason he represented the law as bearing authority, as being the husband; here it is rather the relation in which the Pharisees stood to the whole theocratic institutions of the Old Testament that is spoken of. In these the Pharisees were the ruling power, (the Pharisees being taken for the whole dominant priestly party), and hence the turn here given to the comparison was more appropriate to the relation in which they stood, as seen from this point of view. The word *μοιχέειν*, as used to denote spiritual unfaithfulness to God, is founded on a figure of speech so common that it needed no special mention. The idea that he who leaves his true wife and joins himself to another, breaks the marriage, stands here parallel with the serving of two masters (ver. 13.) Any thing of the kind is incompatible with that oneness of the whole course of life which the true service of God demands. He who thus attempts to hold with both sides, necessarily falls under the sentence of the law, which in this respect has its everlasting retribution, and which still exhibits its power even in the future world (ver. 29, 31.) There still, however, appears another difficulty in the way of the figurative exposition of this passage implied in the circumstance, that while it gives meaning and force to the first half of the verse, *πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ γαμῶν ἑτέραν μοιχέει*, the second half *ὁ ἀπολελυμένην ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς γαμῶν*

μοιχέει seems to be superfluous. But this second half of the verse also acquires meaning and application, when we contemplate the Pharisees in the false and double position which they occupied. For their sin consisted not merely in this, that they failed to hold the law in the everlasting sense of it (ver. 17), inasmuch as they loved gold and goods more than God, but also in this, that now when the time of its dissolution was at hand, they wished to maintain the Old Testament economy under that aspect of it which was transitory (ver. 16), that is to say, the visible theocratic kingdom which it established, and which was to them a source of riches. That which God had loosed they wished still to regard as maintaining its binding power; that which God had bound they wilfully unloosed; and thus they were guilty of a double spiritual adultery. The right thing for them would have been to have let themselves be set free by the Spirit of God from the ancient covenant, and then, with upright souls, to have entered into the new gospel covenant, in which the Old Testament, in so far as it is everlasting in its nature, is still found to subsist. According to this view, the two halves of ver. 18 correspond closely to the two preceding verses, and the whole idea is rendered internally complete. The following parable also acquires in this way, for each of its separate parts, a distinct reference to what precedes, having for its subject the unchanging nature and meaning of the law (ver. 29, 31), which the Pharisees overlooked. (As to the details of the verses, compare the remarks on the parallel passages at Matt. xi. 12, v. 18, 32.)

Ver. 19. That the *following* parable contains a reference to the preceding one of the unjust steward is self-evident.<sup>1</sup> For as in the first, an example was set before us shewing how man must shake himself free from mammon, so is there here given the example of a rich man who applies his possessions merely to his own enjoyment. Intentionally he is represented not as vicious (πονηρός), he is simply worldly-minded. In Lazarus, on the other hand, there is brought before us a person of whom the rich man might

<sup>1</sup> De Wette's view of this parable is altogether perverted and wholly misleading. He thinks that the poor and the rich are apart from all moral desert set over against each other, and that it is maintained that only the poor as such would be saved, while the rich as such would be condemned. How can this gross error of the Ebionites be imputed to the Holy Scriptures, and especially to Luke, who belonged to the Christians from among the Heathen! Von Meyer's exposition of this parable is heart-stirring, as given in the Blätt. f. höh. Wahrh., vol. vi. page 88, seqq.

have made use for the promotion of his heavenly interests (Luke xvi. 9.) Here also then is beneficence, warm-hearted love for the brethren once more enjoined. There is another point referred to in the parable, which, though less clearly brought out, is of great importance as a connecting link with the parable which precedes it. In the conversation between the rich man and Abraham, it is distinctly stated that the former, as being an Israelite (for which reason he calls Abraham his father, ver. 24, 27), considers the latter as his natural helper and protector. The parable is designed to set forth the vanity of this confidence in their natural descent, which all the Pharisees cherished. For Abraham refers him to Moses and the prophets (ver. 16, 17), and condemns him through these. The *jus talionis* which serves as a basis to the whole of the Old Testament, is brought forward by Abraham (ver. 25) in order to convince him of the justice of his sufferings. Moses, on whom the Pharisees rested their hopes, is thus brought forward to pronounce their condemnation. (The parable is consequently a commentary on John v. 45—47.) The parable, however, does not conclude at this point; the rich man still, though abandoning *himself* to his own fate, appeals from righteousness to mercy, and asks that Lazarus should be sent to his brethren. Abraham, however, leaves them also to Moses and the prophets. It is here to be remarked, that what Abraham refuses, God in Christ has performed, so that in this parable we have at once a representation of the essential nature of the law, and also an intimation that one was required, who should go beyond it. In this respect we may see in Lazarus, whose resurrection the rich man longs for, a type of Christ, in whose resurrection the object of his prayer was actually effected. That any special fact should have served as the foundation for this parable is scarcely probable, at least it is unnecessary to assume this, for there is nothing peculiar in the outward aspect of the parable—poor men before the doors of rich men may be found every where. Hence also the name *Ἀάζαρος* is probably symbolical = *לֹא עֵצָר* the *helpless*, the *forsaken*. As the rich man then represents the feelings of the worldly (not gross vice, for this man, who lived after the desires of his own heart, was obviously capable (ver. 27) of nobler emotions), so is Lazarus the type of pious men who are divested of all that is earthly. Hence, in so far as Christ belonged to that number, or rather represented in its perfection this character of complete poverty, in so far

is the parable applicable to himself. But the relation of Lazarus to Abraham, which the parable maintains throughout, does not permit us to extend this application to Christ, except in a general way, unless indeed we were inclined to view Abraham as symbolically representing God the Father. While, therefore, in the first parable, a steward is exhibited in connection with the world and with those who are to receive him into everlasting habitations, the world, on the other hand, is here represented in connection with the needy pious man, in such a way, however, as to show what was the right application to make of the doctrine given in the preceding parable. In this way it is evident how much richer the sense of the narrative becomes when it is viewed as a parable, than when we regard it as history. As a parable, it expresses the general relation in which the pleasure seeking world stands to those pious ones who have not where to lay their heads. (The account of the rich man contains merely the features of a pleasure-seeking worldling—'Ενδιδύσκω occurs only at Luke viii. 27—*Bύσσος* = *בב*, with which *שש* and *בב* are used as synonymous. It means fine cotton. *Πορφύρα*, like *פפף*, denotes the colour, and that which is dyed with it.)

Ver. 20, 21. In contrast to the rich man, Lazarus is described as wanting the most common necessities—he had not where to lay his head. (*Πυλών*, the range of pillars enclosing the court of the palace through which the door opened into it. As to *ψυχία*, comp. Matt. xv. 27. Shut out from human society, he laid claim, along with the lower animals, merely to the crumbs that remained.) Nay, like another Job, he was besides afflicted with disease and covered with ulcers (*ἐλκη*.) But no man attended to him or bound up his wounds, the dogs licked them. (*Ἀπολείχω* is found only in this passage. It does not appear that the expression can refer to the sympathy of the dogs, of which there is no indication in the context. The words denote rather the entire abandonment of him on the part of man, his wounds stand open, and instead of human help, the dogs surround him. Their licking the wounds may denote their eagerness and greediness rather than their sympathy. *Dogs* bear in the Old and New Testament a character *exclusively* evil; they never appear as the symbols of fidelity or even of kindness.) That Lazarus represents at the same time a spiritual character of true piety and godly fear, is not expressly stated, but the connexion

necessarily leads us to infer it. The parable also incidentally contradicts that Jewish prejudice which the Pharisees especially cherished (and which the book of Job had formerly been written to refute), that the sufferings of individuals are the consequence and punishment of their own *individual* sins, and consequently that a sufferer can never represent one that fears God. All sufferings, even those of the pious, are certainly an evidence of the sin of the *whole race*. The saint does not withdraw himself from the consequences of this general sinfulness, but accepts them with patience and childlike resignation, in that form in which God, for the perfecting of the individual and of the whole community, sees it right to lay them on him. Suffering thus appears in the hand of God as an advantage, a means of moral perfection, and he whose efforts are directed to avoiding all suffering here below, gives himself up wholly to self-seeking, hardens his heart against the wretched, whose sufferings might have awakened him to sympathy, and so deprives himself of the blessedness which is implied in loving.

Ver. 22, 23. Short, but in the highest degree striking, is the delineation of the final issues in which these opposite courses of life terminate. Death, that severs all earthly ties, overtook both, and then was seen the inward state of their souls. Lazarus, to whom no man had ministered, was born upwards by heavenly powers;—to the rich man they gave the last outward pomp of funeral obsequies, and sank him down into his grave. Thus, according to the principle of retribution (ver. 25), their state appeared directly reversed, and with the measure with which the rich man had meted, it was measured to him again. (Matt. vii. 2.) As he had failed to refresh Lazarus, so there was none to refresh him in the hour of his sufferings. (*Βάπτειν* is also, by classic writers, construed with the genitive, but only in an intransitive sense. Here it is found construed with *ὄδατος* in a transitive sense.)

Ver. 24—26. This view of the entirely reversed relation of the two men, forms the subject of the following dialogue: the rich man who upon earth was *εὐφραινόμενος καθ' ἡμέραν λαμπρῶς*, pleads now for an act of kindness to himself, which even Lazarus in his poverty had not needed to ask. (*Καταψύχειν*, *to refresh, to cool*, is not found elsewhere in the New Testament.) But even this, according to the inexorable law of retribution (eye for eye and tooth for tooth) is refused him, he has received his *μισθός*

(Matt. vi. 2.) His earthly labours had brought him a rich earthly reward. Along with the whole ground of his labours, however, the reward itself sank down and perished. Besides this law of retaliation, there is also here brought to his mind the existing separation of the elements of good and evil which takes place at death. The *κρίσις* puts an end to the existing mixture of good and evil which is found in this present world, and like gathers itself to like, and finds pain or pleasure in the very circumstance of its being beside that which is akin to it. (*Χάσμα*, from *χαίω*, *to gape, to stand open*, means the gulf, the abyss: it is found in the New Testament only in this passage. In the word *ἐσθήρικται*, there is implied a reference to the fixed and unchangeable nature of this appointment. In the same way Hesiod calls the hall *ἐνθα θεοὶ Τιτῆνες ὑπὸ ζόφῳ ἡεροέντι κεκρύφεται*, in his *Theogony* v. 740, a *χάσμα μέγα*.) Here, however, there arises the difficult question, how in that portion of the parable which rises beyond the sphere of this present life, the figurative and the real stand connected with each other, a question which we are all the more uncertain how to meet, inasmuch as purely didactic passages respecting the state of souls between death and the resurrection are not to be found in Scripture. Keeping hold of the general principle, that the most careful use is to be made of every feature in a parable, it appears to me that the following are the true ideas to be deduced from the figurative representation here given: 1st, That departed souls are assembled together in one appointed place. 2d, That they are separated from each other according to their fundamental characters, for good or evil, but that they are mutually conscious of each other's state. 3d, That after death a transition from the good to the evil, or the reverse, is impossible. On the other hand, we are to view as a parabolic representation, the dialogue which takes place, as well as the description of the pain, and of the wished for refreshment. The former, the dialogue, viz., is to be regarded as representing the living reciprocal action of the natures of the two, the longing after deliverance on the one side, and the voice of the law on the other. It is indeed a representation addressed to the senses, setting forth the analogous experiences of man's psychical being.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Compare the treatise (well worth perusal) by Beckers, "Communications from the most remarkable writings of past centuries, as to the state of the soul after death." Angsburg, 1885.

For the right understanding, however, of the whole delineation, it is of first importance to keep clearly in view that it is not everlasting salvation or condemnation which is here described, but the middle state of departed souls between death and the resurrection. The Bible knows nothing either of the expression, the immortality of the soul (God is *ὁ μόνος ἔχων ἀθανασίαν*, 1 Tim. vi. 16), or of the modern doctrine as to immortality. It is the doctrine with regard to the *ἀνάστασις* which gives its peculiar colouring to the description of the state after death. Down to the *ἀνάστασις*, the soul, stripped of its organ, is in an intermediate state, in which the experience of pain or of joy is regulated according to the moral condition of each individual, but that state is still one merely of transition, and not till the resurrection, and the *κρίσις ἐσχάτη*, does the final decision take effect. The dwelling place of souls when unclothed from the body is termed in the language of Scripture *ἄδης*<sup>1</sup> = *הַשְׁאֵל*, and with special reference to the sinful individuals who are found in this place, *ἄβυσσος, γέεννα, φυλακή* (Matt. xviii. 34; 1 Peter iii. 18), while with reference to the pious it is styled *κόλπος Ἀβραάμ*,<sup>2</sup> *παράδεισος*. (Luke xxiii. 43.) From this *παράδεισος*, we must be careful to distinguish the upper Paradise, as the Rabbins term it, which is spoken of at 2 Cor. xii. 4. (Comp. Eisenmenger's *Etnd. Judenth.*, vol. 2, p. 296, f. 318.) Although separated from each other (ver. 26), yet all departed souls, while awaiting the resurrection, are assembled together in this place, only in a different state of felt joy or suffering according as they have devoted themselves to good or evil, and in different gradations of feeling, according to the degree of their spiritual development. Even in the case of the pious, however, their stay in *School* takes the form of longing desire, inasmuch as union with their bodies in their glorified state is a condition necessary to their being

1 As to the distinction between Hades and Tartarus among the Greeks, see Plato's Republic (Edit. Steph. p. 614, seqq.) In the narrative there given of the Armenian, there is expressed the idea of the necessity that some one should return from the dead in order to assure the living of the reality of the state after death.

2 The expression *κόλπος Ἀβραάμ* is found only in this passage. There is a parallel expression in the passage, John i. 18, where the Son is described as *ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρός*. The phrase is not taken from the feast with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (Matt. viii. 11), for it is not to be conceived of as taking place among the joyful abodes of Hades, but in the *βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ*. It is better to take the expression as denoting figuratively the most intimate immediate union and fellowship.

made perfect.<sup>1</sup> In this way are to be explained those expressions of the Old Testament, as to the staying in Scheol, the misunderstanding of which has led to the mistake that the Old Testament knows nothing of the soul's continued existence after death. It only brings this forward less frequently, because of the low state of development among the people, and, indeed, it could not, so long as the Saviour had not yet appeared, point forward to living with the Lord in the heavenly world. For faith in the Saviour leads the regenerate at once into his heavenly fellowship (John iii. 18 ; v. 24 ; vi. 40, 47 ; xi. 25, 26 ; xii. 26 ; xiv. 2) in such a way, that the imperfection of their state in Scheol appears in the New Testament as overcome. Those passages of Scripture (for example Matt. xii. 32 ; 1 Pet. iii. 18, iv. 6) whose contents the Church, in her doctrine as to the descensus Christi ad inferos, found occasion to embody in the very heart of her doctrinal system, speak of a return from the *φυλακή* (= Scheol, Hades), and of the possibility therein implied of sin being forgiven *after* death. This representation can be construed only on the supposition of an intermediate state lasting till the resurrection, after which there follows the *κρίσις ἐσχάτη*, which presupposes an antecedent judgment. By this *κρίσις ἐσχάτη* evil men are wholly given over to condemnation, which is locally described by the terms Gehenna, or the Abyss in a more restricted sense (*λίμνη τοῦ πυρός*, Rev. xx. 14, 15.) In our parable, therefore, nothing can possibly be said of the everlasting condemnation of the rich man, inasmuch as the germ of love, and of faith in love, is clearly expressed in his words, and obviously the whole standing point of the picture is seen as taken before the Resurrection, and the final manifestation of those who are raised up. Abraham thus appears merely as an inhabitant of Paradise as it exists in Hades, and as the representative of the law. According to it the rich man found himself in pain, but compassionate love might take pity on him, for its responding notes were not wanting in his heart.

The distinction here drawn between Scheol and Gehenna<sup>2</sup> must be taken into account, in order to the understanding of many obscure passages. The ancient Church, which firmly maintained the

<sup>1</sup> "Bodiliness (*Leiblichkeit*) is the end of the work of God," says a Christian thinker; "without bodiliness there is no blessedness," exclaims another.

<sup>2</sup> Compare John Frederick Von Meyer's treatise on Hades (*Frauf.* 1810), and Blätt's *l. höh. Wahrh.* part 6, p. 222, seqq.



doctrine of the resurrection of the body, acknowledged this distinction without qualification. It lies also at the foundation of the Rabbinical writings (comp. Eisenmenger's *Ent. Jud.* vol. 2, sec. 5, 6.) And even in the Roman and Grecian mythology there are found descriptions closely akin to the Hades of the Old Testament (comp. Hesiod in the *Theogony*, v. 713 seqq., and Virgil in the *Æneid*, vi. ver. 540, seqq.) The rationalistic expositors, who are less under the influence of doctrinal truth (see Paulus on the passage), willingly find traces of these views in the New Testament, drawing, however, from this the very false inference that the Saviour and his apostles accommodated themselves to, or were entangled by, Jewish opinions. If, however, without suffering ourselves to be influenced by philosophic or dogmatic opinions, we closely compare the doctrine of the New Testament as to the relation of the *ψυχή* and the *πνεῦμα*, of the resurrection and the *κρίσις*, the result will be not only that the explanation which we have given of the condition of the *ψυχή* after death brings into harmony the various different modes of expression found in Scripture, but that it alone furnishes the key to many an enigma which on any other mode of explanation remains unintelligible. Especially does it enable us to explain the difference of those states into which souls depart at death, and more particularly in the case of those whose minds were undeveloped, and who had not come to a decision in favour either of good or evil, in their relation to blessedness or misery,<sup>1</sup> better than it can be done according to the common view. The doctrine of the Bible as to an intermediate state, in which departed souls pass their time till the Resurrection, enables us to see how the expressions of the law's severity may be combined in the destiny of these souls with the tenderness of forgiving love.

Ver. 27—31. In the concluding verses of this remarkable parable, our Lord makes the rich man present a petition in behalf of his brethren. In this prayer there is clearly expressed a loving remembrance of his brethren, as well as faith in the compassionate

<sup>1</sup> This doctrine as to an intermediate state of the soul after death must not be confounded with the Roman Catholic doctrine of Purgatory. According to Roman Catholic principles, Purgatory refers only to believers who have not yet reached perfect holiness. Of such a purifying fire for the perfecting of believers, Scripture knows absolutely nothing. (See on 1 Cor. iii. 13.) In the middle state of Hades are found only embryo Christians and *unbelievers*. Inasmuch as many are, from no fault of their own, destitute of faith, Divine grace there opens up to them the possibility of their attaining to it.

love of God, things which both shew that in his soul there still remained germs which rendered him capable of entering into the kingdom of love. He merely had not cherished and developed it as he ought to have done, and in the hour of his own need became for the first time conscious of the truth. Upon this prayer being presented, Abraham, who here appears as the representative of the law,<sup>1</sup> sets before him the circumstance that they (the brethren) were in possession of the law, and that they might follow it. That which Abraham leaves unfulfilled, Divine mercy has, through Christ, carried into effect; *He* returned from the dead that he might win men and bring them to God. The prayer of this individual, therefore, may be viewed as the general voice of longing desire which met with its fulfilment in the resurrection of Christ. In reference to the Pharisees, the words taken in this way bear the following meaning: "Thus shall ye also long after that which ye are now refusing." The passage is closely related to Luke xiii. 35; Matt. xxiii. 39, where the Pharisees are also exhibited as overcome by the Saviour. Certainly, however, Luke xvi. 31, *εἰ Μωσέως καὶ τῶν προφητῶν οὐκ ἀκούουσιν οὐδέ ἐάν τις ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῇ πεισθίσονται* involves also a prophecy that many would refuse to believe in this miracle of love implied in his resurrection. Thus it is impossible to conceive of any thing more fitted to arrest the Pharisees than this parable. A Son of Abraham, who knew Moses and the prophets, comes after death, not to the meeting-place of the Fathers, but to the place of woe, where longings after aid manifest themselves in him. The Pharisees must have seen in all this a picture of their own doom. The despised Lazarus, on the other hand (the representative of publicans and sinners), whose sighs the rich man had never listened to, reaches the place of joy, and his assistance is begged for by the sufferer. In the same way shall ye—such is, as it were, the language of the parable—also seek help from those whom here ye despise; but even according to Moses on whom your dependence is placed (John v. 45, seqq.), ye shall be refused. Nothing can pity or aid you but grace, which repays evil, not with evil, but with good.

<sup>1</sup> As such a representative, Abraham might be described as speaking of Moses and the prophets who lived after him. As a dweller in Paradise, into whose bosom all the saints of the Old Testament were gathered, Abraham might well speak of those in whom the Old Testament economy was most fully set forth.

## § 18. CONCLUSION OF THE PARABOLIC DISCOURSES.

(Luke xvii. 1—10.)

Ver. 1, 2. The commencement of this section points obviously back to xvi. 1, 14, and this circumstance must at once make it probable that a link of connexion will not be wanting between what goes before and what follows. The opening sentences form most clearly a sequel to the reproof which had been addressed to the Pharisees. It is they who are represented as giving offence, as preventing many from entering into the kingdom of God—against them is the woe denounced, and the disciples are warned against them. The words are most appropriate as a conclusion to the discourse, inasmuch as our Lord, seeing that his earnest admonitions remained without effect, now gave up all efforts in their behalf, and abandoned them to their own perverted feelings. At Matt. xviii. 6, 7, the same ideas occur on the occasion of Christ's placing a child in the midst of the disciples, only the order of the two verses is inverted. The contents, however, of both verses are of that kind that one can easily suppose them to admit of more than one application. (As to the relation in which the verses stand to the connection in Matt. see the passage itself.) As respects the ideas expressed in the first verse (the detailed consideration of which was not given in Matthew), there is contained in it an interesting notice of the relation subsisting between that necessity which regulates the progress of humanity as a whole, and the freedom of action possessed by men as individuals. For, the ground of the occurrence of *σκάνδαλα* is to be sought, partly in the sin which exists, and partly in the necessity for advancing the church, which must, through this very opposition, be carried forward to perfection. Notwithstanding, however, the necessity for these *σκάνδαλα* on the one hand, yet this does not excuse the *σκανδαλίζων*, inasmuch as evil can take effect in an individual only through the consent of his own will. The wondrous government of God which knows how to bring good out of evil, is thus the only thing which can make the insinuation of that evil intelligible as a means of progress, while it takes place without His active co-operation (*Ἀνεκδεκτόν* = *ἀδύνατον*, comp. Matt. xviii. 7.)

Ver. 3, 4. From the malicious *σκανδαλίζειν*, however (of the Pharisees), our Lord distinguishes the sins of brethren (the Publicans), arising from their weakness. As the former demands severe punishment, the latter call for gentle reproof and continued forgiveness. While we must separate from the former that we may not ourselves receive damage (*προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς*), the latter must be kindly borne with. Kindred statements are found at Matt. xviii. 15, 22 (where see the exposition), but these words also are of such a nature that there is nothing improbable in their being more than once repeated. At both passages they may stand in their right connexion.

Ver. 5. The connexion of what follows with the preceding context seems more obscure. Schleiermacher (p. 213) thinks the expression *εἶπον οἱ ἀπόστολοι τῷ κυρίῳ* suspicious, inasmuch as it does not occur elsewhere. But we can point out distinct grounds for its being chosen here. The more general term (*μαθηταί*, ver. 1) was here to give place to the more special, and the apostles were to be separated from the general mass of the *μαθηταί*, consequently the *ἀπόστολοι* *must* be expressly named as such. As regards the use of the term *ὁ κύριος* as a special name for the Saviour, Luke of all the Evangelists is the one who most generally employs it (see on Matt. xvii. 4.) The only difficulty is the expression *πρόσθες ἡμῖν πίστιν*, with which there is connected (ver. 6) a representation of the power of faith. The Saviour's discourse is at all events abbreviated, but this being assumed, the train of thought may easily be pointed out. The foregoing admonitions, urging the apostles to set themselves right in regard to the Pharisees and their weak brethren, naturally implied a call on them to walk worthily of their high vocation. From the feeling of difficulty then, there arose an earnest desire that they should bear within them in the fullest measure the principle of the divine life, whose possession was their only security for being able to fulfil those admonitions, and hence arose the prayer *πρόσθες ἡμῖν πίστιν*.

Ver. 6. Our Lord acknowledges the correctness and truth of this desire, inasmuch as he sets forth the actings of faith, as that by which even the impossible is rendered possible. This passage also has something analogous to it at Matt. xvii. 20, and the frequent occurrence of these parallel passages from Matthew makes the belief that we have here a compilation of the fragments of different dis-

courses, such as is found in the Sermon on the Mount, easily intelligible. But even though this were granted, there must yet be here some thread of connexion, for we cannot hold that any careful writer would heap up an incoherent aggregate of passages, and then the whole character of Luke is against such a supposition, as clearly as that of Matthew is in favour of it. Especially in the report of this journey is there to be seen a remarkable example of the connected *conversations* (not discourses) of Jesus; and for this reason do I believe that, in general, the original course of the dialogue has been preserved, and the whole history communicated to us in a highly abbreviated form by Luke. The figure, moreover, (compared with Matt. xvii. 20) is somewhat modified. The act of planting in the stormy sea, like the overturning of the mountain in that passage, is the emblem of that which is impossible for human power, and for the laws of earthly development. Once more, therefore, *πίστις* is viewed as a susceptibility for the principle of a higher life. (*Συκάμινος* = *סימון*, the well-known sycamore, which especially in Egypt grows abundantly, and the wood of which was manufactured into mummy cases, comp. Gesenius in his *Lex. sub. voc.*)

Ver. 7—10. After this recommendation of faith, which naturally includes the advice that they should earnestly care and strive for its advancement, there follows a parabolic description of the relation in which the disciples stand to their Lord, which obviously grows out of the context in the following way. According to the *πρόσθεσ ἡμῖν πίστιν*, a certain mournful sense of the difficulty of the struggle awaiting them, and a longing after speedy rest and reward, must be regarded as having formed the prevailing sentiment in the minds of the apostles. In reference to this, Jesus reminds them of the relation in which they were placed; they stood there as *δοῦλοι* to the *κύριος*, and the business of a *δούλος* is to labour for the affairs of his master, and in obedience to his will. This labour of theirs, however, yields no *merit*, it is merely *duty*. Certainly it may seem as if this view contradicted that given by Luke xii. 37, where it is said that our Lord will set down the faithful *δοῦλοι* to table, and will himself serve them. The difference between these representations, however, is to be explained by the different standing points from which the Saviour speaks. In the former passage he spoke from the standing point of grace which blesses us more than we can ask or think. Here he brings out into view the strictly

legal standing point, in order to call the attention of the disciples to their own inward impurity. The lowly Son of Man, therefore, here appears as the commander whom all must serve, and the point of the parable brings home to the apostles, and through them to all the members of the church, the fact that man in the service of God can acquire no merit; that the highest faithfulness is nothing more than duty, and, consequently, that he still continues destitute of all other ground of confidence save the grace of God. (*Ἀποτρίαν* and *ποιμαίνειν*, figurative expressions for those spiritual labours to which the apostles were called.) Intentionally does the Saviour make choice of the relations of ordinary life, in which the servant after labouring must still wait upon his master. The expression *μὴ χάριν ἔχειν* is also intended accurately to characterize the relative condition of a servant. Though the climax of the thought be given in the shape of a formal sentence, yet we must obviously view it as a lively expression of real inward feeling. The word *ἀχρεῖος* occurs at Matt. xxv. 30 in a positive sense, denoting *culpable, useless*. Here it is rather used negatively as applicable to him who performs no (special) *χρεῖα*, but only does what is required of him, and who can receive a reward therefore only through grace. It involves in so far the idea of the *ταπεινός*, in which, according to the usage of Scripture language, there is implied the consciousness of one's own want of desert or merit in relation to the divine Being.

#### § 19. THE HEALING OF TEN LEPERS.

(Luke xvii. 11—19.)

While we have hitherto been able to trace a close thread of connexion, a new section obviously begins at ver. 11. Mention is again made of the journey to Jerusalem (comp. ix. 51), but along with the obscure, incidental remark, that the Saviour travelled *διὰ μέσου Σαμαρείας καὶ Γαλιλαίας* (comp. as to this on Luke ix. 51), while, according to x. 38, he was already in Bethany. Certainly the expression *διὰ μέσου* is not in any case to be understood as referring to his travelling through the countries referred to in their whole extent, but only to his touching upon them near their

boundaries, yet even with this explanation it is difficult to conceive how that was done. The simplest view seems to be, as was already pointed out at ix. 51, to understand the words as applying to incidental journeys made by Him from Ephraim (John xi. 54), for, to connect them with the sending out of the Seventy, and to make Jesus slowly follow them (as Schleiermacher does at p. 214), is in opposition to the passage, Luke x. 30, which represents the Saviour as being already in Bethany. In our view, according to which Luke ix. 51 describes his departure from Galilee, this return of Jesus into the northern districts, after being already at Bethany, x. 38, agrees very well with John, if only we do not restrict his presence to the city of Ephraim itself, but suppose that, according to his usual practice, he made excursions into the neighbourhood. When connected, moreover, with the account of the place of the leper's return, the expression in ver. 14, ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ὑπάγειν αὐτοῦς ἐκαθαρίσθησαν, leaves no room for doubt that the cure was a sudden and remarkable one, that it caused *instantly* the return of the one leper, which is to be conceived of as happening in the κώμη itself. (As to the narrative of the cure, see more detailed remarks on Matt. viii. 2.) In the gospel of Luke, this narrative has a special importance, for this reason, that the single grateful leper who forms the contrast to the nine ungrateful, was an ἀλλογενής. There was thus set forth on this occasion the fact, that the heathen (to whom the Samaritans were nearly allied) were not excluded by the Saviour from the kingdom of God, but were called in some respects *before* the Jews.

## § 20. THE COMING OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

(Luke xvii. 20—37.)

The preceding narrative of a cure is again followed by a conversation, which extends down to xviii. 14, and in which once more a close connection may be traced. It resembles the foregoing great conversation (from xiv. 25 onward) in this respect, that here also the Pharisees appear as opposing the disciples (comp. xvii. 20, 22, 37; xviii. 1, 9.) It is important to understand the connexion of this section with Matt. xxiv., many of the passages of which are paral-

lled to it. The much more close and marked connexion of the verses in the section before us,<sup>1</sup> as well as the relation in which this discourse of Christ stands to that given in Luke xxi. (which obviously corresponds to the discourse in Matt. xxiv.) in this respect that both, though treating of the same theme, are yet entirely apart, and do not in a single passage repeat each other; and, finally, the general character of Matthew as a compiler, and of Luke as a close narrator of facts—are all circumstances which make it in the highest degree probable, that at Matt. xxiv., we have the fragments of various discourses combined into one, all relating to the manifestation of the kingdom of God, while here in Luke we have a discourse accurately recorded (though only perhaps in the form of extracts) as it was delivered. The ideas themselves require to be considered in connexion with the general doctrine, concerning the close of all things, which will be found at Matt. xxiv. Here we confine ourselves to pointing out the connexion in which the words stand in the narrative of Luke, and to the exposition of such passages as are peculiar to the discourse as here given.

Ver. 20, 21. Without more particularly explaining the occasion, the Evangelist opens his narrative with a remark that the Pharisees had enquired at Jesus as to the *πότε* of the coming of the *βασιλεία*. (Whether it was in the *κώμη* itself, ver. 12, or in what other place, is not said.) The Saviour in the first place dismisses the inquisitive and proud inquirers, and then subjoins (at ver. 22) instructions addressed to the disciples. Hence the brevity of Christ's remark (as Schleiermacher rightly says, loc. cit.) is intended to have here an important meaning. For the question *πότε ἔρχεται ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ* obviously expresses not merely the worldly feelings of the Pharisees, but also their selfish ignorance (xviii. 9.) Themselves they regarded as sufficiently by birth and theocratic position constituted the legitimate inhabitants of the expected kingdom. And it therefore merely concerned them to ascertain the opinion of Jesus as to the *time* of its appearance. In opposition therefore to these materialistic views and hopes of the Pharisees, the point to be aimed

<sup>1</sup> See Schleiermacher on Luke, page 217, seqq. Only I cannot agree with him in thinking that in Matt. xxiv. there is no connexion of any kind; it is only more loose, and the whole more freely put together. (See as to this the exposition on Matt. xxiv.) The sections stand related to each other in the same way as in the Sermon on the Mount.



at was to bring forward the ideal aspect of the kingdom of God. This our Lord does by annihilating, *in the first place*, their expectations of its glorious manifestation. All of outward glory which the Pharisees had conceived of as combined in the setting up of an earthly Messianic kingdom, is comprehensively expressed by the term *παρατήρησις* (the expression is in the New Testament found only here, it denotes literally the act of *perceiving*, of *observing*, and then, secondarily, every thing that excites observation. At Exod. xii. 42, Aquila has rendered *οιζήσῃ* by *παρατηρήσεις*.) *In the second place*, the Saviour withdraws the kingdom of God wholly from the visible world, as it exists in space—*οὐδὲ ἐροῦσιν, ἰδοὺ ὧδε, ἰδοὺ ἐκεῖ*; and, *in the last place*, he transfers it to the inner spiritual world (*ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἐστίν*.) The expression *ἐντὸς ὑμῶν* does not make the Pharisees to be members of the kingdom of God, but only sets before them the possibility of their being received into it, inasmuch as its manifestation within the soul is represented as the criterion of it. The explanation of *ἐντὸς ὑμῶν*, by “among you,” which has been adopted not only by Paulus, Fleck, Bornemann, but also by De Wette, must be utterly rejected for this reason, that the clause so understood forms no contrast to the antecedent *ἰδοὺ ὧδε*. The term *ἐστίν* is not meant to convey any further meaning than that the kingdom was at that moment existing in some of them. It may seem, however, that this ideal view of the kingdom of God presents a contradiction to the following discourse (addressed to the disciples), in which the *ἡμέρα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* is referred to in such terms as represent it as an outward fact producing outward effects. These effects, it is true, in so far as they wear an aspect of terror, form a counterpart to the *παρατήρησις* which the Pharisees looked for, and the arrival of the Son of Man is represented in contrast to the *ὧδε* and *ἐκεῖ* (ver. 21) as a thing which suddenly seizes upon all men. Still, however, it remains true that the *βασιλεία* is here represented as external, while at ver. 21 it is termed *ἐντὸς ὑμῶν οὖσα*. (Still more clearly do Matt. xxiv. and Luke xxi. represent the appearance of the *βασιλεία* as an external one.) This double view, however, and representation of the manifestation of God's kingdom (see on Matt. iii. 2), sets forth those two divisions of it which mutually complete each other. The kingdom of God is seen in its origin to be purely spiritual, as distinctly as it is in its completion to be also external. It appeared

in its spiritual form, while Christ was present in his humiliation. And for this reason does the Saviour bring before the Pharisees that aspect of it, in regard to which they were wholly mistaken. In its external manifestation shall the kingdom of God reveal itself, when Christ comes in his glory, and in this form does the Saviour particularly set it forth at Matt. xxiv., and Luke xxi. Here he brings forward the future revelation of the kingdom only in connexion with the fact, that periods of suffering must go before it, and that the appearance of the Son of God himself will bring dismay upon a world entangled in the sensual pursuits of life.

By this means would the disciples, on the one hand, be comforted amidst their approaching struggles, and aroused to watchfulness, that they might encounter them in faith ; while, on the other side, the Pharisees would be impressed with the conviction that the manifestation of the kingdom did not necessarily carry with it any thing of a joyful nature to them ; but, on the contrary, would bring upon them destruction (as happened to those living in the time of Noah and Lot), unless they were enabled to acknowledge and embrace the kingdom of God in its spirituality and inward revelation, as it presented itself in the appearance of the suffering Son of Man. Thus viewed, the following discourse has something so perfect and complete in itself that one cannot doubt that the Saviour uttered it as found here, and Matthew, according to his custom, had worked up the separate portions of it into that lengthened discourse, in which he brings together the statements of Jesus as to his Parousia. Vers. 22—25 are all addressed in the first instance to the disciples. The Saviour in these words takes it for granted, that they knew that the *ἡμέραι τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* (the manifestation of the kingdom of God taken in its ideal aspect) were already come, and merely points them to that dark hour which had yet to overtake them before the inward germ could reach its outward manifestation. Our Lord at the same time warns them against the dangers arising from the false worldly hope of the speedy appearance of the kingdom (*ἰδοὺ ὧδε, ἰδοὺ ἐκεῖ*), inasmuch as he represents this appearance not as standing in connexion with individual persons, or classes of persons, but as an act of Divine Omnipotence, the traces of which were every where to be found, and which blends all that is akin to it into one great living unity. Before, however, this revelation of

divine things in their glory could be effected by the Son of Man, his humiliation must take place (analogous passages to Luke xvii. 25 are to be found at Matt. xvi. 21, xvii. 22; the idea was certainly expressed more than once by the Saviour in different forms), and in this way the contrast between exaltation and humiliation is impressively set forth.

Ver. 26—30. In the following verses Jesus draws a parallel between the last and highest revelation of things divine, in which they are set forth as blessing the pious and punishing the godless on the one hand; and on the other two early partial occurrences of the same kind, and with an obvious reference to the Pharisees, who, at ver. 20, are viewed as belonging to the *κόσμος*, he represents the position of the unbelieving world in relation to the former as the very same which, according to the testimony of history, took place in the latter instances. In their carnal security the manifestation of God was to them a day of destruction.

Ver. 31—36. In order to make the following admonition the more impressive, the sudden inbreaking of that day,<sup>1</sup> and the difficulty of standing its trial is, in the last verses, delineated in pictures addressed to the senses, which, in part, are given also at Matt. xxiv., where the particulars may be compared. The reference to Lot's wife (ver. 32) implies the admonition that we timeously set ourselves free from dependence on all earthly things, and this is strikingly followed up (ver. 33) by a call to self-denial. (This passage we already met with at Matt. x. 39; it also is of such a kind that the very nature of the circumstances might cause it to be more than once brought forward. The peculiar form in which the saying is given in Luke must therefore be considered as a free variation, such as the author of a new characteristic saying constantly permits himself to give to his words. Matthew, instead of the *ζωογονήσει* of Luke, has *εὐρησει αὐτήν*. The term *ζωογονεῖν*, which is found again in the New Testament only at Acts vii. 19, is the more characteristic word; it intimates that the self-denying

<sup>1</sup> The mention of the night (ver. 34) forms no contradiction to the mention of the day (ver. 31); the expression stands merely in general for the point of time. Nor are we, with De Wette, to think of the comparison according to which the coming Messiah is styled a thief in the night. The intention rather seems to be merely to bring forward, vers. 34—36, different situations, in which various individuals find themselves similarly placed, while the state of their souls is altogether diverse, and this diversity is shown by the decisive act which severs them.

effort which is naturally to be conceived of as united to the creative *πνεῦμα*, which quickens and animates them, itself imparts the higher life. This view, according to which the positive and the negative are at once transferred and attributed to the subject himself, is elsewhere rare in scripture. The explanation of *ζωογονεῖν* by *to keep alive*, is to be rejected as an unworthy depreciation of a profound thought.)

Ver. 37. Luke, who constantly gives us conversations rather than discourses, after this representation of the dissociating power of the day of the Son of Man, which loosens the nearest and closest bonds, and gathers every thing into union with that which is congenial to it, makes the disciples enquire as to the *ποῦ*. The characteristic nature of this question as well as of the Saviour's answer (which Matthew has embodied into his context at xxiv. 28, without inserting the preceding question,) speaks in favour of the originality of the narrative as given by Luke; for the disciples must be regarded as partly entangled by the prevailing views concerning the Messianic kingdom. The people of Israel were probably in their estimation possessed of a legitimate title to membership in the kingdom of God, simply by their descent from Abraham. The Saviour's representation, however, did not appear to them to agree with surrounding circumstances, and thus they asked after the *Where*?<sup>1</sup> probably thinking that the heathen world would be the theatre of the events described. The Saviour's answer, however, leads them back from these narrow views to what is of general application, inasmuch as he assigns their moral and religious state of decay (*πτῶμα*) as the ground of the destruction. In so far, consequently, as this corruption had seized on the people of Israel, they were exposed, like other sinners, to destruction. Only that which is living continues in union with the fountain of life, and is capable for this reason of being elevated into the higher sphere of existence which is prepared for it. (On the minuter details see Matt. xxiv. 28.)

<sup>1</sup> By the comparison with Matt. xxiv. some have been falsely led to take the *ποῦ* = *πῶς* in the sense of *quomodo*. No distinct reference, however, to Judea and Jerusalem had gone before, and hence was the question, *Where* should all this take place? very appropriate in the mouth of the terrified disciples. The word *ἔπου*, which follows of itself, sufficiently determines the meaning.

## § 21. ON THE EFFICACY OF PRAYER.

(Luke xviii. 1—44.)

That the following parable, which Luke alone records, stands closely connected with that which goes before, admits of no doubt. The expression *ἔλεγε δὲ καὶ αὐτοῖς* at once points clearly back to xvii. 22, 37. The explanation of the parable, however, (ver. 6, seqq.) contains an express reference to the antecedent discourse, on the troubles which were to precede the Parousia. Intermediate remarks are in the meantime according to all likelihood left out, and these would relate to the dangers of the last time, and the means by which they were to be avoided. (Comp. Schleiermacher, p. 219.) With this the circumstance that the Saviour here refers the disciples to prayer as the means by which to obtain God's protection and assistance against the evil world, very well agrees. As regards, however, the peculiar form of parable here selected by Christ, I refer to what was said in Matt. ix. 17. The Saviour's parables are sometimes set forth not from a standing-point absolutely true, but from one merely relative. From the former God could never have been compared to a *κριτὴς τῆς ἀδικίας*, however much man may attempt to soften the severity of the expression. When regarded, however, from an inferior human standing-point, the comparison has a depth of truth adapted to man's experience when struggling with the difficulties of this earthly life. Inasmuch as the Saviour therefore lets himself down to this standing-point, the parabolic representation contains what is fitted to arrest the innermost feelings, and in this way to move the mind to active exertion. In its struggles with the world and with sin within or around it, while feeling abandoned by God (of which condition we have a picture in the case of Job), and left without earthly support or help, the soul resembles a *χήρα*, who in vain entreats the assistance of a wicked judge. But perseverance in prayer overcomes at last the severity even of heaven. (At Matt. xv. 22, seqq. Jesus appears under an aspect of similar severity.)

Ver. 1. In the New Testament prayer appears not as a business or a service tied to certain hours, but as the expression and condition of spiritual life in the same way that breathing is of physical

life. (Comp. Luke xxi. 36, Eph. vi. 18, 1 Thes. v. 17.) Prayer, *when properly offered*, therefore, is to be viewed not as an utterance of determinate formula, but as the rising of the inmost soul to God; as a living and longing desire after the manifestations of Him; as the breath of the inner man. The Saviour himself is to be regarded as experiencing this continual flux and reflux of the spiritual life (John i. 51; v. 19.) But just as in our Lord's life, though it formed one unceasing prayer, there were not awanting seasons (see on Mark i. 35) in which with special devotedness he poured out his heart in supplication to his heavenly Father, so also the admonition πάντοτε προσεύχεσθαι does not exclude certain seasons in the life of a believer of fervent prayerfulness in which that fervour finds expression in distinct words and direct addresses to God. But inasmuch as the maintenance of a higher spiritual life, in so far as it is seen continually assailed by the world, presupposes a struggle, Jesus adds the exhortation that we do not faint in this inward contest. (The word ἐκκακεῖν belongs entirely to the phraseology of Paul, with which that of Luke is in some measure connected. There is no ground whatever for referring the term, as Schleiermacher, p. 220, does, to worldly avocations and the right management of them; it is to be connected with the πάντοτε προσεύχεσθαι.)

Ver. 2—5. In the exposition of the parable, every thing depends upon our not softening down the force of the expression κριτὴς τῆς ἀδικίας, for ver. 7 places God so markedly in contrast with this κριτὴς that, from the fact of the widow having been heard by the latter, the conclusion is drawn that far more surely shall suffering believers be heard by God. There is implied, also, an intimation that the apparent ἀδικία is still only a wise form in which his love is made manifest. (The formula Θεὸν μὴ φοβούμενος, ἀνθρώπων μὴ ἐντρέπόμενος, is the strongest expression for regardlessness; and yet even this may be overcome by persevering prayer, although the suppliant is satisfied only from a desire to be rid of her importunities. Ἐντρέπεσθαι, in the sense of *revereri*, occurs again at Luke xx. 13; Matt. xxi. 37. al. freq.) Purposely there is also attributed to the κριτὴς, when at last he formed the resolution to do justice to the persecuted widow (ἐκδικεῖν means *to administer*, *to exercise δικη*, then *to avenge*, *to punish*) an impure motive. The love of justice does not move him, but his desire for ease (διὰ τὸ παρέχειν μοι

κόπου) and the fear of her still farther troubling him. (By the words εἰς τέλος, the term ὑπωπιάζειν is marked out as indicating the very climax of urgent entreaty on the part of the persecuted widow. The word ὑπωπιάζειν occurs again only at 1 Cor. ix. 27. It means literally to *strike under the eye*, then generally, *to trouble greatly, to oppress*. The reading ὑποπιάξῃ or ὑποπιέξῃ—ὑποπιάζω is the Doric form of ὑποπιέζω—is supported by a good many authorities. It does not, however, yield an appropriate meaning, inasmuch as it is a softer expression, meaning *to press little or gently*. Probably the term ὑπωπιάζειν appeared to the transcribers too strong an expression as applied to a χήρα, for which reason they substituted a milder word.)

Ver. 6—8. The parable is followed by a few words intended to apply it to existing circumstances. Obviously it was not the Saviour's design to explain the individual features of the parable; he speaks neither of the χήρα nor the ἀντιδίκος. The connection, however, shews that the χήρα is the emblem of the persecuted Church (Isa. liv. 1), and her enemy a symbol for the Prince of this world, in whom we see concentrated every thing opposed to the βασιλεία and its development, which, under the guidance of God, must be carried forward till it reach perfection. Our Lord lays stress merely upon the declaration of the Judge, in contrast to whom are set forth the love and justice of God, in order that the very opposition may bring out more impressively the truth that is to be taught. (The question in which the idea is embodied serves also to express it more strikingly; it awakens a conviction of the truth in the mind of the hearer.) The ἐκλεκτοί (see as to them on Matt. xxii. 14) are mentioned as the object of the Divine care (ἐκδίκησις with reference to ver. 4.) These, down to the time when the Son of Man shall be revealed in glory (according to vii. 22, seqq.) appear exposed to the assaults of sin on the part of the kingdom of darkness, but they shall be delivered with a strong arm by the Lord at his appointed time, inasmuch as they continue in the faith, which finds its necessary expression in unceasing prayer (βοᾶν ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτὸς = the πάντοτε, ver. 1.) In this way it is not their continued supplication which forms the condition of the ἐκδίκησις, but rather their having been elected. The elect are, according to their very nature, the persevering believers whom their Father in heaven will unfailingly deliver. The assistance from on

high is, however, expressly represented with reference to verse 4, as delayed according to the counsel of God. To the expression *οὐκ ἠθέλησεν ἐπὶ χρόνον*, the term *μακροθυμεῖν* of ver. 7 stands parallel. (*Μακροθυμεῖν* corresponds commonly with *נָחַם נֶחָם* or *נִסְחָם נִחָם* in the sense of *to bear with long-suffering and patience*. As applied to God, the expression takes for granted the relation in which he stands to the sins of men. Here the only thing brought forward is the general idea of *delay* which is implied in the exercise of long-suffering. Still, however, it is a remarkable thing that such an expression should have been chosen in this connection. For, since the *ἐκλεκτοί* are to be conceived of as still belonging to sinful humanity, and since the delay of their deliverance is not to be regarded as accidental, but as a thing intended, having for its object the purification of these very elect, the term *μακροθυμεῖν* thus acquires an exceedingly refined meaning.) With the expression *ἐπὶ χρόνον*, however, the words *ἐν τάχει* stand contrasted at ver. 8. It is best to explain the expression in such a way that the time of trial is supposed to be past. “As soon as the object of the sufferings has been gained, deliverance shall also be immediately vouchsafed.” This representation, moreover, stands true as well in regard to the whole body as for each separate *ἐκλεκτός*, inasmuch as the advancing development of the whole body is perfectly analogous to that of each individual member. When an individual is called away from this lower scene, that event is to him the coming of the Lord. This coming of the Lord is spoken of in the concluding verses from ver. 8, onwards in such a way that the divine *ἐκδίκησις* is represented as therein vouchsafed. It is difficult to see, however, how the question expressive of doubt, *ἄρα ἐνρήσει τὴν πίστιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*, is connected with the context. Should we translate the words, “will he find faith?”—that is, will men believe him—the idea thus expressed would be altogether foreign to the connexion of the passage. For the coming of the *υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* was, at xvii. 24, described as *ἄστραπή*, a comparison intended to express the impossibility of mistaking it, and besides, in the act of pronouncing the final sentence, the question is not whether men believe him with whom they have to do to be the Judge. The use of the article (*τὴν πίστιν*, which only a very few MSS. omit, and that for no other reason assuredly than because they mistook the meaning of the passage) points to another explanation of



the words, "will the Son of Man find the (true, requisite) faith?" This, however, would mean, Would there be any *ἐκλεκτοί*?—and thus it appears as if the Saviour himself represented the triumph of his whole work as a questionable thing, which is utterly inconceivable. If, however, we compare Ch. xvii. 26, 28, and especially Matt. xxiv. 22, it would appear that the Saviour hereby meant to set forth in the most impressive way the necessity of earnest prayer, inasmuch as the number of the elect in comparison of those who perish (as in the case of Noah's and Lot's cotemporaries) would be very small, and even this small number would require special divine support to render them victorious. Thus the doubtful inquiry after *πίστις* connects itself closely with the admonitions given in ver. 1. *δεῖν πάντοτε προσεύχασθαι*, inasmuch as the greatness of the danger rendered obvious the necessity of careful effort. The *πίστις* therefore required by the Saviour is not a mere assent to the truth, that Jesus is the Saviour, for at his coming all would clearly recognize him as such, but *πίστις* marks the leading characteristic of the mental state of all those who are found enduring at the coming of the Lord, in so far as their hearts have received the influence of the spirit of Christ, and been transformed into his image. Where this kindred spirit does not pervade the innermost recesses of their personal thought and feeling, they can never be incorporated into the *βασίλεια*, in which the Spirit of Christ is the ruling element.

Ver. 9. It is more difficult to point out the connection between the next parable and that which goes before it. At first sight certainly it seems that the description of those against whom the parable is directed (*πεποιθότες ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς ὅτι εἰσὶ δίκαιοι*), agrees entirely with the Pharisees (xvii. 20); but Schleiermacher rightly reminds us (p. 221) that it contradicts the idea of the parable, to bring before the Pharisees the figure of a Pharisee in a parabolic picture. He conceives therefore that it was some of the disciples themselves who had expressed themselves with undue forwardness, and whom the following parable was intended to reprove. If we suppose, however, that all the preceding context is connected together in the way Schleiermacher assumes, it would also seem an inappropriate thing for the purpose of rebuking the disciples to borrow a figure in the parable from the Pharisees who were actually present (xvii.

20.) Hence it seems to me probable that this parable was originally spoken by our Lord in another connection, but was here inserted by Luke with reference to the Pharisees who are pointed to at ver. 9 in a way too marked to be otherwise explained. Even though Jesus might therefore, in the original connection in which the parable was spoken, have designed to rebuke some other persons, Luke might yet make use of it here to manifest the Saviour's feelings against the Pharisees.

Ver. 10-12. The scope of this parable once more implies (as was observed at Luke xv.) that there was to be ascribed to the Pharisee a *δικαιοσύνη* in point of fact, but certainly one of a merely external and legal kind; to the *τελώνης*, however, in point of fact, there was to be ascribed *ἀδικία*. For in this passage, as in the former (*loc. citat.*), the intention was to set forth the relation of the *βασιλεία* (which reveals itself to him who is penitent, and conscious of his many wants) to the situation of man under the law. The endeavour to view the law and to keep it in mere *externals*, may lead to self-love and self-righteousness, which banishes man more completely from God, than does the transgression of the law, *in the event* of this awakening a longing after an atonement. A shameless and reckless state of mind certainly in which the transgression of the law ends, where repentance and the felt need of an atonement are wanting, is worse than both. The representatives of these two mental tendencies, the self-loving, arrogant fulfilling of the law, and the humble transgressors of it, are viewed in the common connection in which, while engaged in prayer, they stand towards God, and the ideas which in this relation suggest themselves to their minds are taken as the exponents of their real mental nature. (The words *προσηύχετο πρὸς ἑαυτόν* correspond to the *אמר בלבו*. In the expression *σταθεὶς προσηύχετο* a reference is made to the old Jewish practice to pray *standing*, 1 Kings viii. 22, 2 Chron. vi. 12, Mark xi. 25.) The first half of the prayer put into the mouth of the Pharisee might have been the real expression of pure piety, if, in the *εὐχαριστῶ σοι*, there had been implied a genuine acknowledgment that his better moral state was the work of divine grace, and hence that all the honour of it belonged to God, but then such an acknowledgment of what God had done could never have been made without some expression of humiliation for his own

unfaithfulness, which is ever most clearly recognized where God works the most powerfully. It is in all cases the peculiar object of the law to work this *ἐπίγνωσις τῆς ἁμαρτίας*, an object which must necessarily be attained in the case of all who are purified. The impurity of the Pharisees who rested in the outer form, and never entered into the inner nature of the law's operations, draws, as a reward from the keeping of that law, a self-satisfied vanity—a result which nothing but their impurity could have effected. Even the forms of Old Testament piety (the *νηστεύειν*, *ἀποδεκατοῦν*, compare on Matt. xxiii. 23), which ought to lead the soul into hidden truth, and are designed to awaken the sense of poverty and humility, the feeling that man owes his all to God—even these does this self-righteous spirit transform into the delusive works of its own fancied merit. But the more the amount of these accumulates, the deeper does man sink; the only means of elevating himself is to cast off the burden, and exercise repentance even on account of these seeming good works. (As to the meaning of *σάββατον*, *week*, see on Matt. xxviii. 1.)

Ver. 13. In this state of sincere repentance stands the *τελώνης*, whose outward appearance (he stands at a reverential distance, but not as though he were a heathen, for he is to be regarded in every respect as on a footing with the Pharisee, and consequently as possessing the privileges of the law; dares not look up, beats his breast as the symbol of pain, comp. Luke viii. 52), corresponds to his inward state, which finds expression in prayer. Repentance and faith are combined in him, and so he has given to him the elements of a new and more exalted life in a state of New Testament *δικαιοσύνη*. The *ἁμαρτωλός* is nearer to the *βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ* than is the *δίκαιος*.

Ver. 14. On account of the foundation on which he thus stands, the *τελώνης* is styled a *δεδικαιομένος*, because along with repentance and faith there is given to him at the same time the *δικαιοσύνη*, which springs from them. Nothing but a total misunderstanding of the Saviour's meaning, however, can lead us to interpret the words as implying that mere repentance is sufficient to our attaining salvation. Rather does our Lord intend, as at Luke xv., to set forth the fact that only susceptible souls like those of the publican are fitted for the reception of *his own* benefits, while the

Pharisees, on the other hand, exclude themselves from these blessings. Hence does the Gnome (sententious saying) already explained by us at Luke xiv. 11, significantly conclude the parable, for it brings forward as well on the one hand the ruinous consequences of pride, as it does on the other the blessed results of humility. (See also on Matt. xxiii. 12 ; and Acts x. 35.)

## B. SECOND SECTION.

### COMMON ACCOUNT, BY THE THREE EVANGELISTS, OF THE LAST JOURNEY OF JESUS.

(Matt. xix. 1—xx. 34 ; Mark x. 1—52 ; Luke xviii. 15—xix. 28.)

In Luke the connection extends (as we already observed on Luke ix. 51) down to xix. 48, where it seems probable that the great narrative of this journey closes. From this point, however, we follow once more the account of Matthew, who again comes forward as the leading narrator. That we had in Luke, moreover, passed over to the account of Christ's last journey to Jerusalem is now most obvious, inasmuch as Matthew's account leaves no room to doubt that *he* is referring to that last journey, and at the same-time, from this point onwards, he agrees for the most part with Luke in the subject-matter of his narrative. In this section, the only thing peculiar to Luke is the history of Zacchæus ; and he inserts also here (xix. 11, seqq.) a parable which Matthew gives at a later period (xxv. 14, seqq.) As respects, however, the course of the narrative in Matthew, the connection of this section is somewhat obscure, for it is difficult to determine whether or not in what follows the hand of the author is again to be traced, bringing together kindred materials. At first sight this does not seem to have been the case. The two chapters which follow seem to contain merely a train of separate incidents and discourses, without any connecting link to bring them together. As Luke also gives much of what is here recorded, one might think that Matthew, when it came near the end of Christ's ministry, had kept close to the course of the history, and had narrated the incidents successively as they took place. But in opposition to this, there stands the fact, that in the following chapters down to xxv., the character of Matthew as a compiler is again most obviously apparent, so that we could not by any means say that he had adopted a new mode of treatment. We cannot look upon this part of the work as an historic addition (as we did chap.

xiv.—xvii.), inasmuch as the portions of discourse which precede it are two few. In general the historical element which Matthew has embodied in this section, appears in some respects to be so short and incidental (as at Matt. xix. 13–15; xx. 17–19) that we can scarcely conceive it to have been in this form the proper object of the narrative. But such superior prominence is given once more to the discourses of Jesus, that one is tempted to regard the history as a mere subordinate accompaniment. In support of this view, we may discover on a closer examination of the section, one general topic, the bringing out of which may have served for Matthew's guidance in arranging the materials embodied in his work. The Evangelist makes use of the various points in the history, in order that he may interweave into the ever-advancing narrative those ideas which he wishes to carry out, but these historical events are not in themselves the immediate object of his statements. The general topic referred to, is obviously the assigning of *those requisites demanded from Christ's sincere disciples*. There is mentioned as the *first* of these, deliverance from all earthly connections and ties (marriage and riches); as the *second*, humility, which rejoices in being able to do service to others. These requisites demanded of the Messiah's sincere disciples are not, however, set forth in an abstract form, but rather depicted in a concrete shape, by facts to which the descriptive discourses are subjoined. According to this view, therefore, the closest connection appears to subsist between chap. xviii. and the two which follow (comp. the remarks on Matt. xviii. 1.) In the former, namely, the character of the children of the kingdom, as we expressed ourselves, was delineated, and the forgiveness of erring *brethren* was above all things enjoined. In the following chapters, there is set forth rather the relation in which the disciples stand to the temptations of *the world*; and it is asserted, that to shake one's self free from them, is an essential requisite for the disciple of Jesus.

#### § ON MARRIAGE.

(Matt. xix. 1–15; Mark x. 1–16; Luke xviii. 16, 17.)

As regards the commencement of this section (Matt. xix. 1, 2),

the Evangelist, who is followed by Mark, mentions in it shortly the journey of Jesus to Judea. That it is his last journey from Galilee to the Capital, which is spoken of, is shewn by comparing Matt. xx. 17, 29, with xxi. 1. As was formerly remarked, however (on Luke ix. 51), it is only from the narrative of John that we become more closely acquainted with the details of the Saviour's last journey. All the less, therefore, owing to the great brevity of Matthew, ought we, from the words *πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου*, to draw any conclusion as to the direction in which that journey was prosecuted. Unquestionably, Christ on leaving Galilee might, in the first instance, take the direct road through Samaria towards Jerusalem, and yet Matthew might refer to Peræa, inasmuch as the Saviour, according to John xi. 54, again travelled northward from Jerusalem, and abode in Ephraim, from which point he may certainly have made short excursions (comp. on Luke xvii. 11.) Without therefore distinguishing between the main journey and the shorter excursions, Matthew might combine into a *single* expression an allusion to his leaving Galilee, touching on Peræa and coming back to Judea. For the whole mention of the journey is obviously enough a mere formula of transition, as is shewn by the subsequent expression, *ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοί κ. τ. λ.*, and the remark that Jesus cured many, instead of which Mark x. 1 has *taught*. (The expression *πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου*, which stands loosely connected in Matthew, is put in a more determinate form by Mark, who conjoins the *διὰ τοῦ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου* with *ἔρχεται*.)

Ver. 3. On the occasion of a difficult question in controversy being put with an impure view (*πειράζοντες αὐτόν*) by the Pharisees to our Lord, relative to the grounds of divorce, Matthew unfolds (in the words of Jesus) the New Testament idea of marriage, and points out the relation in which the ministers of the New Testament stood to it. This leading point in the narrative is omitted in Mark, who has intended merely to give the naked fact, but afterwards records also the conversation, in a connection however so transposed, as to make it obvious that the narrative appears in his gospel in a form decidedly less original than with Matthew. For, according to Mark, the Saviour refers the enquirers at once to Moses, who had permitted a bill of divorce to be given. The reason of this permission Jesus deduces from the sins of men, inasmuch as in the idea of marriage there is not implied any provision for the possi-

bility of divorce. According to this way of presenting the matter, it would appear as if the only question were, whether divorce should or should not be permitted (as is shown also at Mark x. 2), while Matthew takes it for granted, that according to the opinion of the enquirers divorce was allowable, and makes them merely ask as to the conditions under which it should be permitted. (This is pointed to by the ἀπολύσαι κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν, Matt. xix. 3.) This enquiry, which arose most naturally from the circumstances of those times, (while that of Mark was very inappropriate to them), is most fittingly followed in Matthew, by the declaration which stands equally in decisive opposition to both views, that there ought to be no divorce, and by an appeal to Moses the regulation which permitted it is shown to have been occasioned solely by sin. We have here again an instance, showing that Matthew, when dealing with profounder thought, surpasses in originality Mark, whose power of perception is confined to things external. (The idea that these enquirers meant to refer to the marriage of Herod Antipas, within whose jurisdiction this incident may have occurred [although there is no indication whatever that it really did so] is, according to my view, inadmissible for this reason, that the Saviour would in that case have more speedily dismissed them. The enquiring Pharisees did not tempt our Saviour so much from malice as from the love of novelty; they wished to see what deliverance Jesus would give upon the celebrated Rabbinical point of controversy.) The form of the question as set forth by Matthew εἰ ἔξεστιν ἀνθρώπῳ (is it a regulation valid for all men, comp. ver. 5), ἀπολύσαι τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν, points to the exposition so much contested among the Rabbins, of the words עֲרֵת דִּבְרֵי in the passage Deut. xxiv. 1, in which Moses, in cases of divorce, commands the making out of a bill of divorce. The school of Hillel explained the words as meaning that when anything in his wife displeased a husband, it should form a sufficient reason for his giving her up. The adherents of Rabbi Schammai took the expression in a more restricted sense, as referring only to what was scandalous and dishonourable (according to this view the LXX. render it ἄσχημον πρᾶγμα.) In the words κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν (כָּל-דִּבְרֵי) there is expressed therefore that exposition of the Mosaic law which agrees with the opinions of Hillel's followers, and the question consequently is so put as to request his opinion on the correctness of



*that view.* The lawfulness of divorce itself (according to ver. 7) is taken for granted.

Ver. 4-6. In replying to the question, Jesus takes *no notice whatever* of the conflicting expositions, but unfolds the original view of marriage as founded on the ideal relation of the sexes. In this there is necessarily implied the *indissoluble nature* of the bond, inasmuch as marriage, according to its true import, was intended to be the union of man and woman, both body and soul. Our Lord, with reference to this view, points the Pharisees, to the holy originals of the Old Testament (whose divine nature he openly confirms by thus using them) and refers first of all to Gen. i. 27. (The Hebrew words are given according to the LXX. ; the *αὐτοὺς* corresponds to the *אֱתָם*.—To the *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς* Matthew subjoins *κτίσεως*. He has undoubtedly, according to Gen. i. 1, understood the expression *בְּרָאשִׁית בְּרָא*, as applying to the whole act of creation described in the first chapter, and hence he includes the creation of man, as forming an integral part of the whole work.) Undoubtedly our Lord intended by mentioning the circumstance that man *and* woman were created at once, to intimate that they are therefore to be regarded as forming one connected, and for this reason, indivisible unity, a truth which is expressly stated at ver. 6. This reference to the Mosaic account of man's creation, however, the Saviour follows up by a formal quotation from Gen. ii. 24, which also follows the LXX. (The *καὶ ἔειπεν* is without doubt to be referred to the subject before mentioned, *ὁ ποιήσας*. For, although according to the narrative of Genesis, the words in question are spoken by Adam, yet our Lord refers them to God [as is done all through the Epistle to the Hebrews], and correctly, in as far as he is by His Spirit properly the author and creator of Scripture, and the individuals who speak are to be regarded merely as the organs of his spirit. Only on this supposition is there any force in the argument drawn from Adam's words.) According to the connection this passage points also to the indissoluble nature of the marriage tie which the Lord wishes to bring out in opposition to the low views of it held by the Pharisees. The strength of this bond is represented as being so great and overpowering that the closest ties of another kind (as those to parents) are dissolved by it. (In Adam's words the leaving of father and mother must be understood as directly applicable to his descendants, to whom,

under the feeling of that oneness of nature which connected him with his wife, he could attribute the same emotions, being conscious that they belonged universally to the race of man. The Apostle had a still deeper meaning in view in writing the important passage, Eph. v. 31, 32.) The peculiar characteristic of the marriage tie, however, is set forth by the expression *εἶναι εἰς σάρκα μίαν* which points back to the words *ἐνέκεν τούτου* (על-כן), by which in the second chapter of Genesis ver. 24 stands connected with verse 23. This bodily conformability is the condition of (בְּשָׂרִי מִבְּשָׂרִי), the attractive power uniting man and woman; and we are made to see that the peculiar characteristic of marriage consists in there being between the truly married man and woman not only *ἐν πνεύμα* and *μία ψυχὴ* (which is found also in other kinds of high relations) but also *σὰρξ μία*. Marriage in its ideal form as originally constituted, and as again restored by Christ, appears thus as an union of the entire nature of man in the feeling of love, out of which all union (which consists in giving and receiving) proceeds. It presupposes unity and conjunction of soul and spirit, but has the bodily union of the sexes as its characteristic peculiarity—an union which on the one hand is the lowest form of connexion, for it has its analogies in the animal world, but on the other hand, when it is founded on an antecedent combination of soul and spirit, is the very summit and flower of all union and communion, and for this very reason forms the condition of the continuance of the whole human race. It is owing to the holy nature of this bodily union that it is to be considered as indissoluble, as one which *man* cannot, and which only *God* can dissever, and which the Omniscient does really dissever only in cases (according to the permission given in the Old Testament for divorce), where there did not exist between the parties an union in every respect complete, for example in a marriage where the union of soul was wanting, and consequently where the external union was a mere form. Besides this reference of the passage, however, founded primarily on the context, there is another point contained in it deserving of remark, on account of the peculiar expressions selected. For the words stand thus (in Matthew as well as in Mark) *καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν*. They contain therefore the most decisive declaration on the subject of monogamy, which can alone be considered as in harmony with the true idea of marriage. The permission of polygamy

in the Old Testament can only be considered, like divorce, as a temporary relaxation on the part of God. This declaration, moreover, is so much the more remarkable, as it is given by our Lord himself (though at the same time in the words of the Old Testament) and is to be found only in the translation of the Seventy (the original Hebrew text runs thus, **וְהָיָה לְבִשְׁרָא אֶחָד**.) We have here, therefore, a new instance of this translation being made use of, even where it differs from the original (see on this at Luke iv. 18.) The view which these translators, owing to their correct perception of the Old Testament passage, introduced, is acknowledged by the Saviour as right, and confirmed by his divine authority.

Ver. 7, 8. The Pharisees understood Jesus quite correctly as meaning that he disallowed divorce in *every form* (see on Matt. v. 31), and in opposition they put to him the question, how could Moses then have admitted of divorce? The special question as to the *αἰτία* of divorce, they entirely depart from. On this our Lord informs them that this divine ordinance in the Old Testament was rendered necessary by the *σκληροκαρδία* of men. (In the Old Testament at Ezek. iii. 7, the adjective *σκληροκάρδιος* occurs as equivalent to **קָשָׁה-לֵב**. *Σκληρός, σκληρότης* denotes, in the language of the New Testament, a state of insusceptibility for spiritual harmony or discord. From the blunted state of moral feeling, therefore, the Saviour deduces the *permission* given for divorce, which is a benefit, inasmuch as it often prevents greater sins.) The possibility of the law's severity being thus relaxed by a God of holiness and of truth is easily explained, when one calls to mind that sin has destroyed the ideal of the marriage relationship as a perfect union of spirit, soul and body, so that the holiest marriage among sinful men can only be viewed as an approximation to this ideal. In so far, therefore, as every marriage connection is merely imperfect, wisdom requires that provision be made for the *possibility* of its being dissolved, inasmuch as the outward union of those who are inwardly separate is only a delusion. The divine law, therefore, does not contradict itself when in the Old Testament divorce is permitted, and in the New Testament is forbidden; for, while this latter prohibition has respect to true marriage as corresponding to its ideal, the former permission refers to marriages such as are found in point of fact among sinful men, which carry with them no real union, and

for this very reason demand, among other preliminary suppositions, the possibility that the tie may be dissolved.

Ver. 9. Here Matthew concludes the conversation with the Pharisees that he may make room for subjoining the admonitions which Jesus addressed to his disciples, and which he wished them to lay to heart. Mark x. 10 relates very appropriately the circumstance that the disciples had commenced the following conversation when alone (*ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ*) after retiring from the company of the Pharisees. In the first place, then, our Lord repeats the principle (already expressed at Matt. v. 32) that he who, after a separation, marries again committeth adultery, and he who induces a woman separated to enter anew into marriage causeth her also to commit adultery. This principle stands obviously in closest connection with what goes before. For, since marriage, according to its very nature, is indissoluble, every new connection entered into in consequence of a separation must be considered as adultery; he who wishes to separate must at least, after the separation, remain unmarried. In Mark x. 12 the idea is somewhat modified, in so far as the woman is represented as separating herself from the man, but this does not in any way essentially alter the case. The only case our Lord excepts is that of *πορνεία*, by which we are to understand here every kind of unlawful carnal intercourse on the part of a married person, the man as well as the woman. This forms an abolition in point of fact of the bodily unity, and is therefore not so much a ground for their separation as the separation itself. Where this has taken place, therefore, a second marriage is permitted even by our Lord; but whether this permission only extends to the innocent party is not clear. Undeniably, then, as was already remarked at Matt. v. 31, this passage forms the most important declaration by our Lord on the subject of marriage, for it does not here, as in the former instance, stand connected with commandments the literal carrying-out of which is self-evidently impossible. According to this, therefore, it is easy to see how the marriage tie is held to be indissoluble in the Catholic Church. Not the less, however, had the Reformers a perfect right to act as they did in softening down this strictness, and refusing to carry out exactly the ideal view of marriage as applicable to the visible Church, many of the members of which were still living in the hardness of heart which distinguished Old Testa-

ment times. For, Jesus had never acted the part of a mere external lawgiver, he has enacted no laws which, under all circumstances, must, according to the very letter, be applied to the external relations of life, but he is an inward lawgiver for the Spirit. He who has not the Spirit, and does not live in Him, is not the man for whom the commandments of Christ were given, he stands under the authority of Moses. The relaxation then made by Moses must be still in force in favour of such a man. As not a single other external law, however, has been given by Christ which admits of being at once applied to politico-ecclesiastical relations as does the commandment, Thou shalt not steal, so it is not probable that the only other instance of his giving such precept should be in the case of marriage. That Jesus meant his words thus to apply to the hidden Church, and not indiscriminately to the visible Church, is shown clearly by what follows.

Ver. 10, 11. For, the disciples expressed their astonishment at these strict principles, obviously on the supposition that in this sinful world one may easily be united in marriage with a person from whom he might wish himself separated. To this the Saviour replies *ὅτι πάντες χωροῦσι τὸν λόγον τοῦτον ἀλλ' οἷς δέδοται*. The *λόγος οὗτος* naturally is that which precedes, not that which follows, for the words would not otherwise contain any answer to the question. In that case, however, it is clear that Jesus had not intended to give utterance to any literal commandment, for that would have embraced all. For, these words have no meaning unless it be necessary to reach a particular spiritual standing-point before one can understand the way in which the command of Jesus is to be applied and acted on.<sup>1</sup> (In ver. 10 *αἷτια*, like *הַרְבָּה* and *causa*, is to be understood as meaning "relative connexion in the eye of the law.")

Ver. 12. There is a difficulty here, however, in regard to the

1 Considering the keenness and importance of the discussions as to the severance of the marriage tie, and the re-marriage of those who have been separated, which are carried on even at this moment within the Evangelical Church, I take the liberty, notwithstanding what was said on Matt. v. 31, to add the following remarks. An absolute refusal to marry a second time any who have been separated would be equivalent to the Catholic view, which acknowledges only a *separatio quoad torum et mensam*, but not *quoad vinculum*. In the Evangelical Church this practice has never prevailed, and experience shews that it has not lost anything thereby in regard to the state of its morals as compared with the Catholic Church. The only point, therefore, to be aimed at, is to throw as many difficulties as possible in the way of divorces, but, in cases where they really take place, to admit of a second marriage, for otherwise there would be no real separation. The only exception which must be admitted in regard to this rule is that in case of adultery the adulterer should not marry her with whom he has sinned, but certainly some

connexion of the *εἰς τὸν εὐνοῦχον κ. τ. λ.* with what goes before. How does the remark as to the *εὐνοῦχιζεσθαι* stand connected with what is previously said on the indissoluble nature of marriage. Without doubt it is in this way, that Jesus means to confirm the declaration of the apostle, "it is better not to marry." There is a holy state in which man may continue as a eunuch (although eunuchs are from of old the most despised of men. See Isaiah lvi. 3,) but is not for every individual to attempt it. It is only when man for the sake of God refrains from marriage that a blessing rests on it—he gives up the prospect of earthly posterity that he may have spiritual children. In this case also, therefore, our Lord gives no positive law. Without laying upon any one a burdensome yoke, he merely says *εἰς τὸν εὐνοῦχον*, leaving it for every individual to decide freely as he thinks right, and concludes his discourse with the declaration *ὁ δυνάμενος χωρεῖν χωρεῖτω*, which, taken in connection with the preceding *οἷς δέδοται*, must be understood as re-

other. If, in opposition to this, it be alleged that the Church can in no way give her blessing to a marriage which our Lord, in the passage before us, has described as adulterous, it must not be overlooked that the marriage of those who have been separated is not by any means said to be in itself adulterous, for from this it would follow that God, in the Old Testament, had given liberty to commit adultery, but only that it appears as adultery when seen from the purer standing point of the spirit of Christianity. Those whose marriage tie has been severed stand exactly on the same footing with the murderer. Seen from the standing-point of the spirit of Christianity, he is a murderer who hates his brother, but it is self-evident that in an ecclesiastico-political point of view hatred cannot be dealt with in precisely the same way as murder. And yet it is in this light that the marriage of those who have been separated (which must ever remain an ecclesiastico-political institution) is regarded when in the visible Church every such union is declared to be adulterous. The most that one can say, therefore, is this. Since the Church has it in charge to render the pure spirit of the gospel more and more predominant in the hearts of all her members, and, consequently, to impart gradually to them all the true idea of marriage, so it is her bounden duty to deal with the marriage of those who have been separated in a different way from the case of others who never were separated. The former must be conducted in private, and consummated according to a formula uttered so as to show that the blessing of the Church is bestowed on this kind of union only in the shape of a wish that God by his Spirit would turn their hearts, and lead them now at least to true views of the nature of marriage. As the law of God blessed the adulterous marriage of David and Bath-Sheba, so far as to continue through it the line of the Messiah's descent, so the compassionate One can sanctify unions similar, and in themselves doubtful, without giving man authority to prevent them entirely by his prohibitions. It were to be desired, besides, that *in practice men should wait for a change in the laws of the Church*, and that every separate individual should not take the liberty to innovate on the existing order of things. Should this kind of freedom be generally acted on, it would lead to a state of things similar to that which exists in North America, and marriage would consequently be degraded into a mere civil act. This could not be considered as anything else than a retrograde step of a dangerous kind.

ferring to a special work of grace in this instance, namely of a χάρισμα τῆς ἐγκρατείας, which every one has not given to him. For this very reason, however, there cannot be here any law spoken of for all or for any, such as the clergy, for instance, but the whole idea of the passage is rather to be explained according to 1 Cor. vii., to which chapter we would refer as a commentary on this declaration of our Lord.

Ver. 13, 14. As regards the following verses, and the ideas therein contained, comp. Matt. xviii. 1, seqq. The only question here is, whether we are to consider these verses as a whole complete in itself. In Luke they are so obviously connected with xviij. 14, that it is clear they are not recorded for their own sake, but on account of the antecedent idea which they are intended to explain. I understand the same to be the case with Matthew, although the connection here is not so close, but the expression ὁ δυνάμενος χωρεῖν χωρεῖτω agrees well with a reference to that state of mind in which the χωρεῖν is most successfully maintained, and this is brought very clearly out by what follows. For entering into the kingdom of God, there is enjoined the child-like feeling which enables us most easily to discern the gifts which have been bestowed upon each, and consequently puts us in circumstances to fulfil our calling. In Mark, who omits those important words of Matthew which form the very link of the connection, this little incident certainly does stand by itself as a complete whole, but all through this Evangelist we meet with nothing but an array of facts which have no common bond of union connecting them together. Of that reference to infant baptism which it is so common to seek in this narrative, there is clearly not the slightest trace to be found. The Saviour sets the children before the apostles as symbols of spiritual regeneration, and of the simple childlike feeling therein imparted. (Infant baptism, however, stands connected with regeneration only in so far as we view it in combination with the personal and conscious reception of the gospel, an act which confirmation is intended to represent.) On the part of the parents, however, when they brought their children there was evidently nothing more intended than to have a spiritual blessing bestowed upon them, and this the little ones received by the laying on of Christ's hands. Being conveyed to them through the accompanying prayer, it could not fail to exercise a beneficial spiritual influence.

## § 2. ON RICHES.

(Matt. xix. 16—xx. 16. Mark x. 17—31. Luke xviii. 18—30.)

The similarity of the position which this occurrence holds in all the three Evangelists, and the circumstance that it is followed in each by the same discourses, makes it probable that it really belongs to this point in the history. The discourses, however, are evidently in this case also the principal object of the writers. In these which merely rest upon the previously recorded narrative, we are taught the necessity of being set free from all earthly possessions as another requisite to our being fitted for the kingdom of God. By this reference in Matthew, the connexion is established with sufficient clearness. In Luke the narrative stands unconnected with what precedes, and is therefore to be considered merely as the next in order of those successive narratives taken from the account of Christ's last journey. As respects, however, the *form* in which it is presented to us, we find Mark once more displaying the most uncommon graphic power in depicting the scene. (He describes like a painter the hastening forward of the young man, ver. 17, the liking which Jesus conceived for him, as expressed at ver. 21, and the impressive way in which, after his retirement, the Saviour addressed his disciples, ver. 24.) Matthew, on the other hand, again gives us in the discourses many things of importance which are peculiar to himself, and which once more exhibit his characteristic ability in seizing upon and imparting what is of essential moment.

Ver. 16. During the journey (Mark x. 17, *ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ εἰς ὁδόν*) there pressed forward an *ἄρχων* (Luke xviii. 18, probably a young man of some noble family [Matt. xix. 22,] who had been chosen president of the synagogue at some place not more particularly described) into the presence of Jesus, and asked him for spiritual instruction and assistance. That the zeal of this young man was pure, and the reverence he showed to Jesus (*γυνυπετήσας αὐτόν* according to Mark) was well meant, is clearly seen both from the way in which Jesus treats him, and from the Saviour's own express declaration. (Comp. Mark x. 21.) But the erroneous nature of his religious efforts is sufficiently shown at once by the very question which he puts. Noble in disposition, and filled with ardour



in the pursuit of what is good, he seems to have struggled after holiness and perfection in a legal manner, but being destitute of all deeper insight into the nature of sin or of righteousness, these exertions only filled him with self-satisfaction, and he hoped, through the assistance of Christ, that he would attain in this to still higher advancement, that he would have new work given him to do in order that he might heap up the greater amount of spiritual possessions. The object of his efforts described in general terms, he represents as being the *ζωὴ αἰώνιος*, and he *seemed* to give it the pre-eminence over the life and the blessings of the *αἰὼν οὗτος*; in reality, however, he was still cleaving to the good things of this world. The address *διδάσκαλε ἀγαθὲ*, as well as the enquiry *τί ποιήσω*, are not in themselves of a captious kind, and may have proceeded (like the question Acts ii. 37) from a truly penitential frame of mind. But the decisive remark which Matthew has preserved to us *τί ἀγαθὸν ποιήσω* betrays the inward perversion of his nature. Being utterly unable to discern the true nature of what is really good, he takes it for granted that he possessed in himself the possibility and the capacity of bringing forth something that was *ἀγαθόν* out of the treasure of his own heart, and he merely enquires as to the *τί*. Besides the good things heretofore performed and amassed by him, he wishes to add new forms of splendid good works. Probably he expected and hoped to have some kind of strict legal observances laid upon him, which it would have flattered his pride to have performed in his own strength.

Ver. 17. With astonishing wisdom does our Lord treat this young man. First he awakens in him a conscious perception of the true nature of what is really good. The address of Jesus to the enquirer is given by the gospel history in a twofold Recension, but it admits of no doubt that in Matthew the reading *τί με ἐρωτᾷς περὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ; εἰς ἔστιν ὁ ἀγαθός* is the right one. For, in the first place, it is supported by very weighty authorities (B.D.L. many versions and Fathers), next it is the more difficult, and the reading *τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν* might easily be taken from Mark and Luke. It is more difficult to determine which of the two may have been the original Recension. I consider the form of the question as given by Matthew to be the original one, for according to it Christ subjoins his remark in the closest connexion with the *τί ἀγαθόν ποιήσω*. But the *τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν* contains an idea so peculiar, that assuredly it cannot have proceeded from tradition. To me, there-

fore, it appears most probable that of this conversation on the subject of the *ἀγαθόν* we have, in the two Recensions, only fragments preserved to us, but these sufficiently enable us to form a well-grounded opinion as to the contents of that conversation. For, as regards the leading object of the discourse according to the version of it in Matthew, it is evident that our Lord, by the remark *τὶ ἐρωτᾷς κ. τ. λ.*, means to awaken in the young man a conviction, that there sprang in his heart no fountain of good out of which he could produce, at will, whatever he chose; that in general the *ἀγαθόν* was not diverse, nor manifold, but was, in the highest sense, One, namely, God himself, the *αὐτοαγαθόν*. This idea, rightly understood, carried with it an intimation that there was nothing good in him, (unless perhaps his higher vocation,) and consequently an exhortation to repentance, and still farther the information, that what is good is not to be found by heaping up work upon work, but by coming to God, who, as being the Good, imparts also to men all that is good when he gives them himself. According to the version of this, as given by Mark and Luke, we find the same reference to God as the source of all good, in the very words also of the Saviour himself, but we find in addition an important hint as to the position in which this young man stood to Christ. The address *διδάσκαλε ἀγαθέ* is referred to in the question *τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν*. The young man may have used the *ἀγαθέ* as a mere phrase in order to introduce into his discourse a complimentary epithet. The ignorance thus manifested Jesus reproves in these words, in order that he may lead him to an idea of that which is truly good. For, that the enquirer only saw in Christ a mere (though indeed a distinguished) *διδάσκαλος*, from whom he might acquire information of one kind or other, the Saviour perceived beyond a doubt both from his question, and from the character of the man; but one having such views could not appropriately use the epithet *ἀγαθος*. He rejects this name, therefore, and refers him to Him who was Goodness itself. But in this our Lord does not deny that he himself is the *ἀγαθός*, inasmuch as the one true God stands reflected in him as his image, only it was not fitting that this truth should be presented to the young man in a dogmatic form, but should develope itself as a living reality from his own inward experience. Could he have been prevailed upon to exercise faith in the words of Jesus, as a revelation of the

highest good, and could he have felt it his duty to abandon all in order to follow him (ver. 21), it would in that case have been made clear to him that this one God was not a being distant and inaccessible, before whom he had to adorn himself with good works, but was inexpressibly near to him, inasmuch as He had revealed Himself to him by his Son, and in him by His Spirit.

Without doubt the young man, owing to the impurity of his soul, did not understand the exalted ideas of the Saviour, and for this reason Jesus, in order more deeply to arrest him, refers him to the *ἐντολαί*. (The particular forms in which the νόμος is expressed.) That the Saviour connects the entrance into eternal life with the keeping of the commandments, is founded necessarily on the very nature of the law. (Comp. on John xii. 50, ἡ ἐντολή Θεοῦ ζωὴ αἰώνιος ἐστίν.) As being the expression of the will of God, the fulfilling of it is the highest thing which includes all else. But as being the will of the Highest it demands *perfect* obedience (Gal. iii. 10, cursed is he who continueth not in *all that* is written in the law), and, consequently, presupposes the possession of divine power. As this is wanting in sinful man, the law becomes a curse to him (Rom. vii. 10, 11), and only in the case of the penitent is it transformed into a blessing, by working in them the ἐπίγνωσις τῆς ἁμαρτίας (Rom. iii. 20), and so awakening the felt need of an atonement. For the very purpose of calling forth this feeling in him Christ refers him to the law.

Ver. 18—20. The young man, however, in his moral blindness, believes that he has kept the commandments. Boldly and boastfully does he confess πάντα ταῦτα ἐφυλαξάμην, and he even adds ἐκ νεότητός μου. We must suppose that there was at all events about him a certain external δικαιοσύνη, there was manifestly a moral effort made by him. But, in the first place, he was entirely devoid of an insight into the hidden spiritual nature of the commandments (as that is developed in Matt. v.), and, in the next place, he had no perception of the true Old Testament δικαιοσύνη (as that is described at Luke i. 6.) For, this δικαιοσύνη had, as the companion of earnest legal striving, a deep longing after holiness and perfection, which concentrated itself in the expectation of the Messiah, while in this young man there was exhibited a forward self-satisfaction which led him to ask τί ἐτι ὑστερῶ; Matt. xix. 20. (The Evangelists use great liberty in enumerating the commandments. Mat-

thew gives them most fully ; he has subjoined also the passage Lev. xix. 18. Mark x. 19 has comprehended the latter precepts of the decalogue under the words *μὴ ἀποστερήσης*. The term *ἀποστερεῖν* is used there in the sense of to rob, to appropriate what is another's, just as at 1 Cor. vi. 8, where it is conjoined with *ἀδικεῖν*.)

Ver. 21, 22. After this declaration our Lord lays hold on the weak point of his character, in order to bring him to the consciousness of his sins, and show him the way to perfection, to the possession of the true Good. According to the truthful representation of Mark, our Lord beheld him with a look of affectionate love (*ἐμβλέψας αὐτῷ ἠγάπησεν αὐτόν*) ; he recognised his noble vocation for the kingdom, which brought him close up to the narrow gate, only his eye was not yet opened so as to perceive the nature of sin and righteousness. When his eye was opened, however, by the hard demand made on him by our Lord, the hour of trial came upon the young man. The thing demanded was the free and determined choice of a course of earnest self-denial, and here before his opened spiritual vision there revealed itself (for which reason he felt the sad sense of shame), the secret sin of his heart. The command of the *εἰς Θεὸς ἀγαθός* came home to his heart, but he loved the world more than God. Nevertheless, this treatment of the young man on the part of our Lord presents certain difficulties. It seems as if the demand made upon him were too hard. Certainly it cannot be taken as a general requirement applicable to men in all circumstances, for in the case of a person whose calling had not yet got beyond the Old Testament standing-point, such a demand would have been inappropriate. Under the Old Testament, sacrifice symbolized the consecration of one's whole possessions to God, but in sacrifice the gift always appeared as only partial, while Christ demands that the young man should give up his whole property (*ὅσα ἔχεις* according to Mark and Luke.)<sup>1</sup> This young man evidently stood at the gate

1 It were well to read in connection with this the golden treatise of the able and ingenious Clement of Alexandria, *Quis dives salvetur*, which contains the most profound commentary on this narrative. On the words *πώλησον τὰ ὑπάρχοντά σου*, he remarks, *τί οὖν τοῦτό ἐστιν; οὐχ ἂν προχειρῶς δέχονται τινες, τὴν ὑπάρχουσαν οὐσίαν ἀπορρίψαι προστάσσει καὶ ἀποστῆναι ἀπὸ τῶν χρημάτων ἀλλὰ τὰ δόγματα περὶ τῶν χρημάτων ἐξερίσαι τῆς ψυχῆς, τὴν περὶ αὐτὰ πτολεῖν καὶ νόσον, τὰς μερίμνας, τὰς ἀκάνθας τοῦ βίου, αἵ τὸ σπέρμα τῆς ζωῆς συμπνύγουσιν. Οὐτε γὰρ μέγα καὶ ζηλωτὸν τὸ τινάλλως ἀπορεῖν χρημάτων μὴ ἐπὶ λόγῳ ζωῆς. Οὕτω μὲν γὰρ ἂν ἦσαν οἱ μὴδὲν ἔχοντες μηδαμῇ, ἀγνοοῦντες δὲ Θεὸν καὶ δικαιοσύνην Θεοῦ, κατ' αὐτὸ μόνον τὸ ἀκρῶς ἀπορεῖν μακαριώτατοι καὶ θεοφιλέστατοι (cap. xi.)*

which entered into the New Testament life, and which the Saviour here opens to him, but for that life in the *βασιλεία* there must in all cases be the giving up of all one's own (comp. ver. 24, seqq.) The circumstance that the invitation to enter into the kingdom of God was given to this young man under the form of the injunction *πώλησόν σου τὰ ὑπάρχοντα* arose undoubtedly from this, that this individual was tied to the *κόσμος*, principally through mammon, and therefore at his entrance into the *βασιλεία* this bond must be severed. If we call to mind the leading temptation of this young man involved in another part of his character, he might possibly have been able to fulfil a commandment of this kind, to sell his goods without gaining anything by the act, for the advancement of his inner life; nay, he might have been injured by it, for his pride might have found support from it as from a work performed in his own strength. But, on the other hand, if the young man could have rendered obedience to *this* commandment of our Lord, he could only have been enabled to do so by the strength of God through faith, for it was the main bond which kept him fettered. Irrespective then of the particular form which this commandment assumes, it contains nothing beyond what is comprised in the general law given by Jesus to all his disciples, "he who does not give up all for my sake, is not worthy of me;" and although each is held in bondage by his own separate tie, yet is it incumbent on *every one* to sacrifice *all things*. In this command of our Lord, therefore, requiring the young man to sell his property, we are not to conceive of the external possession as standing apart from the inward love of it. The *latter* would be effectually mortified by the relinquishing of the *former*, and only in thus far is any importance to be attached to the external sacrifice. Again, the selling of his possessions is to be viewed as merely the one side of an act, which is only rendered complete by the following of Jesus consequent thereon. The former is the negative (the deliverance from the *κόσμος*); the latter is the positive (union with the *βασιλεία* and its Lord.) Mark also (x. 21) immediately adds, *ἄρας τὸν σταυρόν*, as denoting continued perseverance in the following of Christ, and the difficulties which are connected with it. In the same way also the self-denial is not to be conceived of as a work standing by itself, but as deriving all its importance from this, that it is done for the sake of Jesus (ver. 29.) It is when viewed in this light also that the *ἔν σοι*

ὅστερεῖ, in the words of our Lord, first acquires its full meaning; for this ἔν is nothing less than the crucifying of the whole old man, (which in the case of this youth existed in the form of attachment to riches), and so is equivalent to πάντα, inasmuch as in the one thing all things are included. The entrance into this one thing is also the way to τελειότης (Matt. xix. 21), for this reason, that it can be effected only in the strength of God, and man can become perfect and good only in this way, that the one perfect and good God make his heart his temple. (Comp. on Matt. v. 48.) The truth of Christ's words, that the new birth into eternal life consists in the giving up of all that is our own, and in the consecration of our whole property and possessions to him who is their Author, must have deeply impressed the young man. For as Jesus outwardly had not to lay any commands upon him, and as in the Old Testament law, no requirement of such a kind was anywhere to be found, it would appear as though he might with a good conscience have refused it. But that he could not do. The spirit who accompanied the words of Jesus had deeply penetrated his heart, had enlightened the darkness within, had revealed to him the true (though hitherto entirely unknown) way of regeneration, and so he found himself taken prisoner by the power of the truth. But the chain which he carried was too heavy, he could not call forth within his heart that free determinate choice in favour of the narrow way, which is absolutely necessary, and the scarcely opened gate of Paradise closed itself again before his weeping eyes.

Ver. 23, 24. Over the subsequent course of this young man's life, there is cast a veil. It is not impossible, however that his feeling of pain may have changed subsequently into pure μετάνοια, and that upon this ground he may afterwards have found deliverance from those bonds in which he lay as yet too firmly fettered. Our Lord, in the meantime, at once employs this impressive incident for the edification of his disciples, but not in such a way as to make the weakness of the young man a subject for scorn or rebuke, but in order that he might lay bare the similar state of feeling which existed in the hearts of many, and so might lead them to

1 If it had been merely the gold as such which had kept him from entering the kingdom of God, the idea would be correct, that God might have set him free from it by a conflagration or something of that nature. But the only thing that would avail was his inward deliverance in soul from earthly possessions, and the God who made man's nature free wishes also to have its free choice in favour of what is good.

humble themselves. With warning looks surveying the circle of his followers (*περιβλεψάμενος*, Mark x. 23), Jesus exclaims, *δυσκόλως πλούσιος εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν*. And when the disciples were astonished, the Saviour once more repeats the same words with the strongest emphasis (according to Mark x. 24.) Obviously the expression, *πλούσιος* (according to Mark and Luke, *χρήματα ἔχων*), points back to the *κτήματα πολλά* of the young man, (ver. 22), but the additional clause of Mark, which more accurately defines it, *πεποιθότες ἐπὶ τοῖς χρήμασιν*, points at once to the right interpretation. Clearly the difficulty of entering the kingdom of God cannot depend upon the *χρήματα* or the *υὑάρχοντα as such*, for, absolute poverty admits of being viewed as a state that brings along with it manifold temptations.<sup>1</sup> (See Matt. xiii. 22.) If understood merely of external possessions, the similitude here chosen would evidently be too strong, for it denotes not so much the difficulty as the impossibility of the rich man, unless he previously becomes, in a spiritual sense, poor, entering into the kingdom of God. It is the state of mind, therefore, in which possessions are held, which the Saviour represents as being such an hindrance. This is not to be viewed, however, as confined merely to what is properly avarice, but as including also the so-called *legitimate* appropriation of the good things of this world (comp. on Luke xvi. 1, seqq.) which is prevalent and permitted in the *κόσμος*, and regarded as the greatest good fortune. In the *βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ*, every individual is merely an *οἰκονόμος* of God, has therefore renounced all his own possessions, and consecrated them to God the only Lord. Hence the Saviour requires this inward renunciation as a condition of the *εἰσερχεσθαι εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ*. For this reason, however, at the same time, the idea of the *πλούσιος* acquires a more extensive meaning, the beggar may be rich in desire and concupiscence, and the possessor of treasures may be poor, (thus David generally in the Psalms is called *poor*, as being *πτωχὸς πνεύματι*, set free from all the ties of possession and property, compare Rev. xxi. 24.) He who is without gold or goods may be rich in so-called good works, in

<sup>1</sup> At the same time, however, it should not be denied that a fulness of earthly blessings carries with it *pre-eminently* the temptation to attach one's self to the world. In all cases, however, the fetter which peculiarly binds a man, must be sought for *within him*, and not in things external.

knowledge, or art, or natural dispositions, if he appropriate such gifts to himself, and do not ascribe them to their Author. Riches, however, whatever form they take, invariably act in the same way, inasmuch as they attach man to the κόσμος, in which things created assume to be separate and independent, while in the kingdom of God this independence is cancelled, and all things ascribed to God. Where the former is maintained, therefore, this union of life with God cannot be realized. (Δύσκολος means primarily *difficult to satisfy*, then in general *difficult*. It is the opposite of εὐκοπος, *without trouble, easy*. The figure of κάμηλος, which is not to be confounded with κάμιλος, *a rope, a ship's cable*, is a common one in the East. Instead of the camel the elephant is also sometimes mentioned [compare Lightfoot and Schöttgen on the passage.] Instead of τρύπημα Mark and Luke have τρυμαλιά from τρύμη, *a hole, an opening*.)

Ver. 25, 26. It is evident that the disciples understood the discourse of our Lord in this more extended application. Their astonishment and the idea τίς ἄρα δύναται σωθῆναι, show plainly that they regard every man in his natural state as a πλούσιος, because of his inward attachment to earthly things. Were we to refer the question merely to those who are *outwardly* rich, it would obviously lose all its force. Ver. 27 also shows that the disciples (although in a literal sense they were no πλούσιοι) had recognized the giving up of all their property as a duty necessarily binding on them, from which circumstance we may see that they understood the idea in a spiritual sense. Accordingly the question τίς ἄρα δύναται σωθῆναι expresses a deep feeling of man's strong attachment to the creature, from which of himself and by himself he cannot set himself free (in the same way as at Rom. vii. 24), and for this very reason requires a σωτήρ. The exercise of this saving power on the part of God is referred to at ver. 26. Here our Lord acknowledges the ἀδύνατον on the part of man (because the ἀσθένεια τῆς σαρκός makes it impossible for him to fulfil the commandment to love God above all, Rom. viii. 3), but refers to the aid of the Almighty. This is to be considered, however, not as a thing manifesting itself *without* a man, but as that which operates *within* him, for which reason the πάντα δυνατὰ παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ is equivalent to the πάντα δυνατὰ πιστεύοντι (comp. Mark ix. 23.)

Ver. 27. The new question of Peter appears at first sight not to



agree with what precedes it. It must seem strange that after the disciples had just asked *τίς ἄρα δύναται σωθῆναι*, they should now consider the difficulty to have been perfectly overcome in their own case. One would be tempted to conclude that Matthew had inserted here what was spoken at another time, were it not that Mark and Luke agree with him, and warrant our believing that we have here the original connection. This connection also admits of being perfectly defended, if we view the remark of Peter here (who again speaks as the representative of all the Apostles) as the expression of the uncertainty of his mind as to whether they had in reality satisfied these difficult demands of the *βασιλεία*. Feeling that much yet remained within him of attachment to the creature, Peter mentions one act of his life which bore a resemblance to that which Christ had required of the young man. But as to whether that act was enough he in the exercise of genuine *μετάνοια*, remained uncertain. The words *τί ἡμῖν ἔσται*, therefore, are not to be understood as referring to a reward, for Peter must otherwise be held to have been in a state of mind in which ver. 25 would be altogether inapplicable to him, and the answer of Jesus also, ver. 28–30, would be transformed into a reproof. Rather must we refer the words to the disciples' state of mind in such a way that their meaning shall be, "What shall fall to our lot, what shall befall or happen to us; wilt thou judge of us as of the young man, or does such a decisive act still remain to be done by us?" This stands most appropriately connected with what follows, inasmuch as Jesus, on the strong ground of comfort which he gives, removes that uncertainty of the disciples which proceeded from their tender faithfulness, and assures them of this that they are his.

Ver. 28. Matthew gives in the most complete form those ideas through means of which Jesus imparts this comfort to his disciples, and in such a way that they closely correspond with the context. For, the Saviour speaks first of the special prerogatives bestowed upon the disciples as the representatives of the kingdom of God in this new order of things, and then (ver. 29) he goes on to mention all those who, for the sake of the kingdom, have given up every thing upon earth. Matthew alone has the first verse, in which the special prerogatives of the disciples are spoken of. One might believe that Luke had omitted the words because he considered them less intelligible for his heathen readers, as referring to views which

were peculiarly Jewish, if he had not also given them at xxii. 28, seqq., in another connection, but in such a way that we cannot conceive of the words having been transferred from Luke into Matthew. The idea has its own peculiar place in both Evangelists. As regards the idea itself, expressed in ver. 28, it is in the first place remarkable that the Saviour, without having any occasion to do so, should have, of his own free inward movement, unfolded it to the disciples, and in this way should obviously have favoured their earthly prejudices concerning the Messiah in opposition to his own views, if he meant to declare that there was no reality in their expectations. This is the more strange, inasmuch as the connection here does not make this declaration at all necessary, for any kind of laudatory acknowledgment of the disciples' faithful strivings would have been enough for them. Even the theory of accommodation, therefore, is here reduced to difficulties, and it is obvious that those act more simply who attribute the idea here expressed to Jesus himself, and recognize him as participating in it.<sup>1</sup> This opinion we must feel all the more inclined to adopt, inasmuch as in this passage there is expressed nothing more than is to be found everywhere stated in the gospels and apostolic writings. The *παλιγγενεσία* denotes merely the coming forth of the *βασιλεία* from its concealment in the inner world of the Spirit, into the outer world, or the spiritualizing of the outer world from within (comp. the remarks on this at Matt. viii. 11 ; Luke xvii. 20.) The selection of the expression *παλιγγενεσία* to denote this arises from the magnificent idea of drawing a parallel between the whole and the individual. In the passage Titus iii. 5, baptism (*λουτρὸν παλιγγενεσίας*) appears as the means which brings about the new birth of the individual. This moral transaction which takes place in the individual is transferred to the whole body, which having been altered by sin, requires and looks forward to a restoration not less than does the separate individual. This restoration naturally has its beginning in the domain of awakened souls, but, as in the progressive advancement of the individual it goes forward from the *πνεῦμα* to the final glorifying of the *σῶμα* (comp. Rom. viii. 11), so also the perfecting power of the Spirit gradually pervades the outward visible world taken as a whole. Without distinguishing the sepa-

<sup>1</sup> The recent attempts to explain the passage as ironical show how difficult it is if the simple meaning of the words be given up. Comp. Fleck de regno divino, pag. 436, seqq.

rate steps, the term *παλιγγενεσία* comprehends the whole in one general expression. Thus, as the Saviour's resurrection is primarily a type prefiguring the final glorifying of the bodily organisation of man, so is the *ἀνάστασις τῆς σαρκός* generally a type of the material world in its glory, which is accurately described by Paul (Rom. viii. 18, seqq.), in a discourse properly didactic, but is in the new Testament taken for granted in the discourses of Jesus, and is at last, in Revelation, described as present. Man, therefore, as a Microcosm, appears as an emblem prefiguring every stage of development in the Macrocosm, and, just as it is only in the glorifying of the body that the development of an individual's whole life has its consummation, even so the glorifying agency of the Spirit reaches its climax only in the pervading of the material world. This rich idea the Saviour sets before his disciples, and, with reference to their sacrificing of the *αἰὼν ὧτος*, points them forward to the *μέλλων* into which they had already in a spiritual sense entered, by the giving up of their possessions, into which, however, they would one day visibly enter on its final manifestation. In this state of things, the Saviour appears as the *βασιλεύς*, inasmuch as the *βασιλεία* therein realized is the whole sphere of life pervaded and ruled over by the Spirit and influence of Jesus. (*Καθίξω ἐπὶ θρόνου* is to be viewed as a symbolic expression for dominion. In the words *θρόνος δόξης*, we may trace—inasmuch as the thing spoken of is the manifestation of what is concealed (comp. Rom. viii. 18) that outward display of light and glory which encompasses every appearance of what is divine. In the *αἰὼν ὧτος*, the *δόξα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* is in its nature entirely inward and spiritual.

Now, the fact that in this ruling power of our Lord (*i. e.*, a decisive spiritual power which authoritatively imposes terms,—see in regard to it on Matt. xx. 20), believers are set forth as partaking, is merely the general idea of the Christian system, according to which nothing which exists in the Saviour lies shut up exclusively in him, but just as the love of God appears as a thing which fully communicates itself through him to others, so does the Redeemer impart himself with the whole fulness of his gifts to his church as his own body. Hence, as his people share his sufferings, they partake also of his *δόξα*. (Rom. viii. 17, *συμπάσχομεν ἵνα καὶ συνδοξασθῶμεν* ; comp. also 2 Tim. ii. 20.) Naturally, therefore,

this applies at once to his disciples generally, but it has also a more special reference to them as apostles in particular. As the representatives of the twelve tribes (comp. Matt. x. 2), they received most directly and purely into their souls that overflowing spiritual element which Jesus brought down to the earth into the midst of mankind (and primarily into the midst of the people of Israel), in such a manner that they themselves became in turn flowing fountains of eternal life (John iv. 14), with which they rendered a world fruitful. Hence *they* most completely partook of the character of Jesus as King, and that is the sense of the symbolical expression, that they were to sit on twelve thrones (as subordinate rulers) surrounding the throne of the Lord. (Comp. on Rev. iv. 4; xxi. 14.) Finally, there is also ascribed to the apostles as the representatives of the church generally, the exercise of *κρίνειν* (a special manifestation of the general expression *dominion*.) This also is at 1 Cor. vi. 2 ascribed to the whole church as such, inasmuch as through the Spirit of the Lord which pervades it, there is given to it at the same time the power of discernment in its own real nature, and so of separating and sifting. As the church already uses this gift of the Spirit in the office of the keys (comp. on Matt. xvi. 19), so, upon being itself made perfect at its final manifestation, does it exercise this gift in a perfect sense in the same office. Thus we must say, that at the foundation of the whole of this peculiar train of thought, there lie Jewish ideas as to the course of the world's development, and the place which the twelve tribes hold in regard to mankind. Views, however, which at the same time perfectly correspond to the decree of eternal wisdom, and are supported by the mode in which these things are viewed and set forth every where in Scripture. Only we must be careful that the gross and material light in which these ideas were viewed by high and low among the Jewish people, is not confounded with the ideas themselves<sup>1</sup>—ideas which obviously

<sup>1</sup> This was the mistake of Hase (*Life of Jesus*, 2d edit., p. 84, seqq.) He finds in this an indication that Jesus, during the earlier period of his ministry, had participated in the political views which generally prevailed among the Jews regarding the Messiah and his kingdom. This, however, by no means follows from the passage before us, and just as little from the immediately succeeding statement, that they were to receive again houses and lands an hundred fold. The rule of the apostles is no political one, but purely spiritual, the receiving of earthly blessings is not external, but the possession of them in the spirit of Christian love, inasmuch as the very peculiarity of the kingdom of God consists in the abolition of all exclusive possession on the part of the individual, and the giving of the whole to each.

penetrate both deeply and powerfully into the whole world of thought.

Ver. 29. From the special, the Saviour passes over to the general, and states that not merely they (the apostles), but every one who renounces the world will receive his *μισθός* (Matt. v. 12.) As to the idea of Christian self-denial, and of self-denial *for the sake of Jesus* (in which way alone it becomes *Christian*), see more particularly on Matt. x. 37, seqq. (Instead of *ἕνεκεν τοῦ ὀνόματός μου*, Matt. has *ἐμοῦ*. *Ὄνομα* = *ὄψ*, is put for the person himself in his proper individuality, Luke has *ἕνεκεν τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ*, as Mark has also added *ἕνεκεν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου*, which in so far is identical with *ἐμοῦ*, as in the person of the Saviour, the gospel and the kingdom are represented in a living form, and as it is only by the power which proceeds from his person that the kingdom is founded apart from or without him.) The idea of recompense shortly alluded to by Matthew, Mark gives, in a very enlarged form—an uncommon circumstance with him, for even when he gives the substance of Christ's discourses, he usually abridges them. Luke has already embodied in the discourse the contrast between *καὶρὸς ὅντος* and *αἰὼν ἐρχόμενος*; Mark, however, enumerates minutely all the individual details of the recompense. One might say that this enumeration is a commentary on 1 Tim. iv. 8. Even in this present life on earth true piety bears within itself its own reward. Especially the giving up of all one's own possessions to the general community is simply for each individual to acquire the whole. (So that in this sense also it is true "*all things are yours*," 1 Cor. iii. 21, 22.) In the church of God, as in a kingdom which is in the course of gradual development, the believer, through true heart-fellowship and brotherly communion, receives back what he lost through the sin which is in that *κόσμος* from which he judicially separated himself (1 Cor. i. 31)—receives it indeed in a higher measure (*ἑκατονταπλασίονα*, Luke has *πολλαπλασίονα*.) (Comp. as to *αἰὼν ὅντος* and *ἐρχόμενος* on Matt. xii. 31.) The addition *μετὰ διωγμῶν* by Mark is peculiar to him alone. (The reading *διωγμόν* is assuredly an alteration made in order to remove the difficulty.) Certainly, therefore, the simplest view which it remains for us to take of these words, is to regard them as added to the discourse, in order to represent the joys of the *αἰὼν ὅντος* even in this form of brotherly Christian love, as in many ways

troubled and disturbed, and in this way to set forth the everlasting life as the untroubled and peaceful state of being. For, the church in which the individual believer already receives back even outwardly what he gave up, is never on earth free from persecution, until the *αἰὼν μέλλον* comes, and with it the *βασιλεία*. Thus the whole statement being transferred and applied to the present state of things as existing in the world has no reference whatever to the hopes set before us in the Apocalypse.

Ver. 30. Matthew and Mark conclude the conversation with a well-known axiom, which in Matthew forms the transition to the following parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard. Apart from this parable, which (xx. 16) again concludes with the same axiom, the words standing at the close of the conversation, as Mark gives them, contain something very obscure, so that here again Matthew appears the more accurate narrator of the discourses of Jesus. It is striking to mark the different forms in which the apothegm appears at the commencement and close of the parable. It runs,

Matt. xix. 30, and

Mark x. 31.

πολλοὶ ἔσονται πρῶτοι ἔσχατοι, καὶ ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι.

Matt. xix. 16.

ἔσονται οἱ ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι, καὶ οἱ πρῶτοι ἔσχατοι.

The first form (Matt. xix. 30) is also analogous to the expression at Luke xiii. 30, *εἰσὶν ἔσχατοι, οἳ ἔσονται πρῶτοι καὶ εἰσὶ πρῶτοι, οἳ ἔσονται ἔσχατοι*. For the distinction of the thought in the two cases is this: according to the first form of the apothegm there are *some* in both the classes (the *πρῶτοι* and the *ἔσχατοι*) who are represented as passing from the one to the other. According to the second form, however, *all* (the article *οἱ ἔσχατοι, οἱ πρῶτοι* is not to be overlooked) are set forth as belonging to the class opposite their own. On closer examination, however, this difference of form in the apothegm is found to be only in appearance, inasmuch as at Matt. xx. 16, the article does not refer to the *πρῶτοι* and *ἔσχατοι* as such, but to the *πολλοί*, who are described (xix. 30) as existing among them. And in this very thing the connection of the passage is sufficiently indicated, for Matt. xx. 20, seqq. sufficiently shows in what way the passage, Matt. xix. 28, might be misunderstood by the disciples, inasmuch as the old man in them

belonging to the *κόσμος* was by no means entirely destroyed, and they therefore interpreted the privileges and prerogatives after a carnal manner. For this reason the Saviour brings forward the circumstance that along with them (the *πρώτοι*), others called at a later period (*ἔσχατοι*) would receive an equal reward, and by this reference warns them against feelings of envy and self-seeking. We are not to think of Judas or other apostates (standing at a distance), since the following parable does *not* represent the first labourers as unfaithful, for which reason they received their *full* reward.

Matt. xx. 1, 2. The immediate object of the following parable,<sup>1</sup> therefore, as the connection shows, is unquestionably this, that the apostles might be taught how their earlier calling of itself conferred on them no peculiar prerogative, and how those faithful labourers in the kingdom of God who were called at a later period, might be placed on an equal footing with them according to the free and unconditional award of divine grace. These doctrinal narratives of Jesus, however, are like many-sided precious stones, cut so as to cast their lustre in more than one direction.<sup>2</sup> As we already remarked that at Luke xiii. 30, the apothegm with which our parable begins and ends, refers to the connection subsisting between the Jews and heathen, so this parable may in like manner denote the relationship in which the heathen, as being called at a later period into the kingdom of God, stood to the Jews as the first-called. And although primarily it refers to the teachers, it is true also in regard to every member of the church, and is universally applicable wheresoever an earlier call in the days of youth co-exists along with the calling of others at the latest period of life. But while it applies to those who live coterminously in the kingdom of God, it refers no less to those who live at successive periods in the history of the church, inasmuch as the earliest years of the church's development involved the greatest hardships, owing to the fiercer hostility of the world, and subsequent generations consequently enjoyed a relief through the means of the toils of their predecessors.

God is here to be considered as the *οἰκοδεσπότης*, inasmuch as at verse 8 the *ἐπίτροπος*, by whom the dividing of the *μισθός* is effected, symbolises Christ. The *ἀμπελών* = *בָּרֵם* however, is

<sup>1</sup> On Matt. xx. i. seqq., compare the treatise by Wilke in Winer's journal, für wissenschaftl. Theol. Sulzbach 1829. Part i. p. 71—109.

<sup>2</sup> Compare the commentary on Matt. xi. 19.

viewed (as at Isa. v. 1.) as the emblem of that spiritual kingdom which the Lord of heaven founds on earth, and causes to be cultivated by his servants.<sup>1</sup> The *ἐργάται*, therefore, are the pastors and bishops of the church of God, all those to whom a spiritual office is intrusted, and the souls of men are the *ἀμπελών* on which their labours are to be expended. It is certain, however, that this reference to the pastors is not to be understood as confined to the outward office-bearers of the church, but as applying to the inward call to spiritual labours; and in so far as this call is not to be understood as awaiting in the case of any living member of the church, the parable has, at the same time, its general application to all believers, only, the *μισθός* is not to be understood as denoting salvation (for nothing is said here of the difference between being saved and lost), but as referring to a special reward of grace, consisting in the difference of place assigned to different individuals in the kingdom of God in allusion to xix. 28, xx. 20.

Vers. 3—7. The idea that there is a *συμφωνεῖν* with those first called in regard to the *μισθός* as compared with the one-sided declaration on the part of the Lord as to the reward to be given to those who were afterwards called, indicates that the *συμφωνεῖν* implies a reciprocal agreement, and consequently a title, as it were, to make demands on the part of the one class of labourers and not on the part of the other. In this way those first called certainly seem in one point of view to be favoured, but not in another, for they are subsequently dealt with according to the strict letter of the law, while the others receive according to the measure of that love which bestows superabundantly. This agrees remarkably well with the reference to the heathen and the Jews, and one might almost suppose that conversations had taken place among the disciples, which caused the parable to be constructed in this way. Perhaps in contrast with others of the disciples who were descended from the heathen, they had proudly appealed to their Jewish descent, and laid claim to that which was promised (Matt. xix. 28) not as the gift of grace but as something which they deserved. The *συμφωνεῖν* applies also strikingly to those covenants into which God entered with his people, in which (according to the Divine condes-

<sup>1</sup> The frequent comparison of the kingdom of God to a vineyard (Matt. xxi. 33, seqq.) is assuredly founded deeply on the fact that the Saviour, according to His profound views of nature, traced in wine and in the vine the fittest analogies in the whole external world to express the highest relations of the spiritual world. (Comp. on John xv. 1, seqq.)



cension) there is an implied reference to mutual engagements and promises. The heathen, on the contrary, were called, without any covenant, into the kingdom of God. Not so much from any need of them, as out of pity for them in their state of idleness, the faithful master of the house from time to time (at marked periods of great advancement in the kingdom of God) called new labourers into his vineyard, and they confided with simple trust in the faithfulness of the Lord. Thus, though apparently at a disadvantage, their childlike faith in such a Lord placed them really at an advantage. In regard to the apostles this is most markedly exhibited in the calling of Paul. The Lord took him from his course of busy idleness, and called him into the vineyard where the Twelve were already at work, and so he laboured more than them all (1 Cor. xv. 10.) The parable lays especial stress (comp. ver. 6, 7, with 12) on those who were called at the eleventh hour. Primarily the intention of this may have been merely to give point to the contrast between the *μία ὥρα* and the whole day. Especial interest attaches to this point of time, as well in regard to the individual Christian, in which case it refers to late conversion, as also to the whole church, in which case it applies to those who are called in the latter days.

Ver. 8—12. This portion of the parable contains the greatest difficulties. *In the first place*, a question arises as to the view which we are to take of the *ὀψίας γενομένης*. As the closing period of the day (viewed as the season of labour), the evening brings the final sentence. Thus, in the case of the individual, the evening is to be understood as denoting death, in the case of the church as the *καιρὸς ἔσχατος*, or the entering into the *βασιλεία*. These things, which to us seem so wide apart, were regarded by the apostles as happening simultaneously, inasmuch as they viewed the coming of Christ as an event about to take place immediately, and our Lord himself did not speak of it in any other way (comp. on Matt. xxiv.) *In the second place*, the circumstance that a Denarius was distributed alike to all, must not be so explained as to imply a denial that there are degrees of future glory, for other parables, and especially that of the talents, at Matt. xxv. 14, seqq. expressly teach this doctrine. Rather does the equal Denarius simply denote the equality of all, in so far as they are partakers of the same blessedness, which completely satisfies the desires of every individual, although the capacities of these separate individuals may

be very different. *In the last place*, however, the most obscure point of all seems to be the possibility of a *γογγύζειν* among the *πρώτοι*. Should a comparison be made between this and Luke xv. 25, seqq., we must remark that in that case the elder son is represented as occupying exclusively the standing point of the law, but here the *πρώτοι* appear as labourers (and faithful labourers, for they receive their denarius) in the kingdom of God. Besides, as the distribution of the *μισθός* takes place in the evening (that is after their training in holiness was complete), it is impossible to conceive that there still existed in these first-called a mixture of the old and the new. We must therefore say that this parabolic representation does not mean to assume that there is anything analogous to this *γογγύζειν* in the real spiritual relationships which it sets forth, but is intended to give instruction by contrast, so that the sense of the whole would be this: inasmuch as such murmuring as the parable shows on the part of the envious labourer against his comrades, is a thing in itself wholly inconceivable amidst the relationships of heaven (inasmuch as he in whom it was found would by that very circumstance show himself to be living beyond the pale of the kingdom of love), therefore all labourers in the Lord's vineyard must betimes give up every claim of their own, and trust themselves simply to the mercy of God. In such a lowly position they would also experience in their own souls feelings of compassion towards their brethren (*Καύσων*, *glowing heat* during the day, comp. Luke xii. 55.)

Ver. 13—15. The closing verses set forth the dealings of the free grace of God, which can be limited by no peculiar privileges of the creature. Righteousness and love are the everlasting forms in which it manifests itself; and the love of God freely imparting itself delights in finding those who are its objects without merit, and in advancing them. But to love others with the postponement of one's own claims, is the highest act of piety, the real giving up of all that is one's own, Matt. xix. 27. (The expression *ὀφθαλμὸς πονηρός* corresponds to the Hebrew *עַי עַי* [comp. on Mark vii. 22], by which we are to understand the evil eye which works destruction.)

Ver. 16. In the concluding words our Lord shortly points back to the apothegm (xix. 30.) Thus, according to this parable, it is as though he had said the first-called (who are described above) stand in a position less favourable than those called at a later period.

With this one apothegm, however, there is conjoined another, which, at xxii. 14, concludes the parable of the king's marriage-feast. There, it refers to the entire failure of some who had been called, to embrace or hold to their call, here it is applied in a modified sense, for, even although those called at the eleventh hour are to be conceived of as *pre-eminently* diligent, yet the parable gives not the slightest hint that those first invited were less assiduous. Rather did they receive their reward along with the others. The contrast between *κλητοί* and *ἐκλεκτοί* cannot here be referred to the invitation to enter God's kingdom, and the actual coming and arraying of one's self for it (as at xxii. 14), but merely to the different relationships which believers themselves hold to the kingdom of God, the distribution and bestowal of which depends upon the free grace of God. The *ἐκλεκτοί* therefore in this case are the *ἔσχατοι*, the *κλητοί* are all the *ἐργάται*, including also the *πρώτοι*. The *κλητοί*, however, labour in a constrained position for the sake of reward, the *ἐκλεκτοί* in a state of freedom, labour in the spirit of inward desire and love. In so far as this more favoured position and the love which they cherish is not their own work, but the work of grace within them, in so far must it be referred to an *ἐκλογή*, which, however, is not to be regarded as a thing *limited* on the part of that love which imparts itself to all, but as a thing straitened only by the narrowness of men's own hearts. Farther, it seems very doubtful whether the apothegm as given in this passage stands in its original connection, at Matt. xxii. 14, at least it has a much more definitely marked position in the context, at which passage our more lengthened remarks may be seen.

### § 3. OF HUMILITY.

(Matt. xx. 17—28 ; Mark x. 32—45 ; Luke xviii. 31—33.)

Referring back to what was said on Matt. xix. 1, we merely observe here that the mention made of the approaching sufferings of Jesus Christ, as given in the context of Matthew, stands once more connected with the succeeding narrative. If we view ver. 17—19 as isolated, they are as it were lost, but, taking them in connection with what follows, they at once acquire a position and a bearing in regard to the whole narrative. They show in the per-

son of the Saviour himself how the character of self-denying humility is an indispensable requisite for the true disciple of Jesus, and in the discourse of Jesus respecting the earthly claims of the children of Zebedee, which follows in connection with the narrative, everything bears equally on the proof of this truth, and for this reason the discourse concludes (ver. 28) with the same thought which forms the commencement (ver. 18, 19) of the passage before us. In this way our Lord's sufferings are mentioned merely for the purpose of showing the disciples that the like sufferings were awaiting them. In the context of Luke certainly the mention of the sufferings of Jesus stands more isolated as a fact which occurred in the course of his last journey (comp. Luke ix. 51), but, according to the whole arrangement of the subject-matter in his account of the journey, this very form of recording it is the appropriate one. Luke gives in it, in point of fact, what successively happened, without selecting any general points of view around which to arrange his materials.

Ver. 17—19. Matthew remarks, as a point in the narrative of external interest, that our Lord by the way (as they were approaching Jerusalem) had taken his Twelve apart (*κατ' ἰδίαν*) and foretold to them what awaited him at Jerusalem. Mark (x. 32) adds this trait, that the disciples had with fear and astonishment (*ἐθαμβοῦντο καὶ ἀκολουθούμεντες ἐφοβοῦντο*) seen the Saviour proceed towards Jerusalem, the seat of his fiercest enemies (comp. John xi. 16.) As respects the prophecy itself regarding the sufferings and resurrection of Jesus, the remarks already made at Matt. xvi. 21 may be consulted. The Christian mind cannot be conscious of having any interest in tracing to the words of Christ himself every separate detail in the traits which are here given of our Lord's sufferings as still future. The great point with which, above all, we have to do, is the contrast between the death and resurrection. But the external evidence goes to support the conclusion that even these individual traits (such as the *ἐμπαῖξαι, μαστιγῶσαι*) are derived from Christ's own words, for the agreement of the three narratives is here so close that we are driven to the supposition of literally accurate reports; vague and uncertain tradition would have called forth greater differences. Besides, the Old Testament representations (especially Ps. xxii.; Isa. l. 6, liii.; Hos. vi. 2) already contain all these traits, and, for this reason, their being brought forward *before*

the event is sufficiently authorized (1 Cor. xv. 3, 4.) Luke remarks (xviii. 34) that on this occasion also (comp. on Matt. xvi. 22) the disciples were once more unable to comprehend the words of Jesus, *i. e.*, they felt themselves incapable of conceiving of such contrasts being united in the life of a single person, the highest glory (in miracles never equalled) with the deepest humiliation, and this again combined with the highest exaltation in his resurrection. To this there was added the fact that the idea of a suffering Messiah, although it did exist among the Jewish people, was yet greatly overlooked, and consequently everything connected with it which Jesus spoke found only a weak response within the circle of their preconceived ideas.

Ver. 20, 21. Immediately after these words of Christ, the Evangelist subjoins the account of the request made by the children of Zebedee, who (according to Matthew), along with their mother (Salome by name, comp. Mark xv. 40 with Matt. xxvii. 56) asked the Saviour for the highest places of honour in his Messianic kingdom. This declaration then causes Jesus to explain the relation which subsists between the reigning and ministering character of the disciples of Jesus Christ,—the whole occurrence, however, contains much that is obscure. In the first place, it is a striking thing to find the humble-minded John acting such a part, which seems to be more in keeping with the character of Peter. Probably, however, the ambitious request proceeded from the mother, who saw herself reflected in the exalted success of her sons. In the case of the two disciples, the whole may have taken a purer form, inasmuch as it is possible that the leading motive which swayed their minds in making the request may have been *this*, that they might enjoy in time to come the same privilege of nearness to the Lord, in regard to which we know (at least in the case of John) that it was the sweetest comfort of their lives. (Compare the introduction to John, § 1.) In the next place, there is something strange in the request *εἰς ἐκ δεξιῶν εἰς ἐξ ἐναντύμων*, for one is tempted to suppose that it refers to some special idea involved in the expectations which the Jews cherished respecting the Messiah, of which, however, there is not the slightest trace to be found.<sup>1</sup> Rather does

<sup>1</sup> Wetstein ad. loc. cites from the Midrash Tehillim the passage *futurum est, ut Deus summe benedictus faciat regem Messiam sedere ad dextram suam et Abrahamum ad sinistram suam*. Here, however, the Messiah appears as Himself sitting on the right

the expression denote merely (according to the general analogy which is every where to be met with, that with great men and princes he whom they honour sits next them) the highest prerogatives, and the influence founded on them. Without doubt the vain mother had formed the opinion, and by means of it had incited her sons, that the inauguration of the Messianic kingdom was about immediately to take place (Luke xix. 11.) Jesus they considered as the Sovereign and possessor of that kingdom, and, therefore, falling at his feet, they requested of him the highest places of honour.

Ver. 22, 23. The most difficult point of all, however, is the circumstance that this enquiry, which seems to proceed from a materialistic view of what was said at Matt. xix. 28, is not rejected by our Lord, for in the first instance the Saviour merely brings forward the difficulties which had to be overcome before they could attain such places of honour; but when the disciples, with child-like simplicity, declared themselves willing to encounter all conflicts, our Lord does not deny that as a general truth there were such places of honour to be had, nor that these places were accessible to them, but he merely declares that the Messiah cannot bestow them, that it is God who gives them, *οὗς ἡτοίμασται*. From the turn thus given to the discourse, it is true, one may conclude with some probability that the Saviour meant to intimate that these places of honour were not intended for *them*, but the surprising thing is that this was not declared to them in the most positive manner, that they were not told that there did *not* exist any such places of honour in the kingdom of God, and farther, that the opinion seems to be favoured that such places really existed. To this it must be added that in what immediately follows Jesus speaks of the *μέγας* and *πρώτος ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ*, as at Matt. v. 19. But as the Saviour at the same time, ver. 22, says to the disciples *οὐκ ὀφείδετε τι αὐτεῖσθε*, he openly blames the position they had assumed. This surprising combination of censure and of remark, coinciding with the ideas of the disciples, finds its solution in what follows (v. 24—27.) Here we have merely to speak of the figures under which the Saviour sets forth the conflict by which the attainment of glory in the kingdom of God must be preceded. In regard to this struggle as applicable to himself personally, our Lord had spoken imme-

diately before, but nothing occurs in the passage respecting two different persons who are to sit at the right and left of the Messiah.

daintly before. A bright contrast to this conflict is presented by the joyful look into coming glory. "The flesh would always be glorified before it is crucified; it would rather be exalted before it is humbled," says Luther. Now in the first place, as regards the state of the text, the figurative expression βάπτισμα in Matthew has without doubt been interpolated from Mark. For Mark in this instance, again (as also ex. gr. ix. 45, seqq.), has given a fuller report of the discourse, without, however, adding to it any ideas peculiar to himself; his important additions belong almost entirely to a fuller statement of the facts (compare on the text of Matthew the N. T. by Griesbach-Schulz ad loc.) The figurative expression ποτήριον =  $\text{סֵּךְ}$ , which is common to both, denotes in the Old Testament already (Isa. li. 22) *punishment, sufferings*, and the fundamental idea is assuredly that of a cup of poison to be drunk.<sup>1</sup> In the New Testament (Matt. xxvi. 42) the Saviour describes his sufferings as a bitter cup given him by the Father. The figurative expression βάπτισμα added by Mark (compare on Matt. iii. 11), refers to baptism by fire, and involves at once the idea of a painful going down (a dying in that which is old), and also of a joyful coming up (a resurrection in that which is new), as Rom. vi. 3, seqq. shows. Such a path of suffering, in order to his being made perfect (Heb. v. 8, 9), our Lord declared (Luke xii. 50) stood as yet before himself. According to the living corporate union, however, which subsists between our Lord and his people, as they have part in the δόξα, so likewise have they in his παθήματα, and only where these latter really take effect can they look forward to the former (Rom. viii. 17, 2 Tim. ii. 11, 12.) To this connection our Lord calls their attention, in order to awaken them to a sense of the magnitude of those conditions under which alone the δόξα of the βασιλεία can be reached. When the disciples, however, on being asked δύνασθε πίνειν τὸ ποτήριον; reply δυνάμεθα, it is by no means to be supposed that they misunderstood the words of Jesus, and took them in a good sense (ποτήριον as meaning the cup of joy—βάπτισμα the washing out of the hand-bason of the king, according to Von Meyer's view ad loc.) The very form of the question δύνασθε πίνειν must at once render such a misun-

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps it might also be referred to a bitter drink of healing medicine, in which case the figure would combine the idea of what was unpleasant with what was at the same time salutary.

derstanding impossible. Undoubtedly they rather meant to express their determination to follow the Lord through all difficulties. Nor are we to consider this declaration as a thing wholly perverse and sinful ; Jesus takes it up and deduces from it the inference that the heart of the disciples was really sincere, and that they were in earnest in their intention to follow him, only they were wanting in a correct insight into the greatness of the sin which still existed within them, as well as into the greatness of the struggle in which they were to be engaged. Their *δυνάμεθα*, therefore, unquestionably expresses a strong feeling of self-righteousness, otherwise they would never in such a conflict have trusted in self.

Ver. 24, 25. The ten other disciples who probably were absent during the scene (ver. 20), were offended at the two brothers when they heard of their request, their envy being undoubtedly excited by the circumstance that James and John had wished to be exalted above them. For this reason Jesus assembled them (the ten) around him (*προσκαλεσάμενος αὐτούς*), and, without uttering one word of direct reproof, spoke to them of exaltation in the kingdom of God, as compared with earthly elevation, in order to make them aware of the real nature of the former, and explained to them this character as applicable to himself (whom they all acknowledged as the *βασιλεύς* of the *βασιλεία* they hoped for), in such a way that his discourse (ver. 28) returns to the point from which (ver. 18) it started. According to this view, however, the following words appear to be not so much a *rebuke* addressed to the two, as a *didactic* discourse addressed to the ten. But, as was already remarked, the idea of a special exaltation and glory in the kingdom of God is not in the least condemned, but is acknowledged as correct. For, the comparison of the *ἄρχοντες* and *μεγάλοι* has positively no meaning, if it was intended that there should be no *πρώτοι* and *μεγάλοι* in the kingdom of God. Their existence is obviously taken for granted by our Lord, only a contrast is drawn between the *κατακυριεύειν* and *κατεξουσιάζειν* which takes place in the world, (words compounded with *κατά* have often a subsidiary meaning of evil import, for example *κατατομή*, Phil. iii. 2. *Κατακυριεύειν* occurs again at 1 Peter v. 3, in the same sense in which it does here, and it is only in appearance that it bears another meaning at Acts xix. 16. *Κατεξουσιάζειν* does not again occur in the New Testament), and the *διάκονος* and *δούλος εἶναι* which prevails in



the kingdom of God. From the parallel thus drawn, however, we can explain the obscurity which attaches to the connection of the Redeemer's whole discourse. Amidst the relations of the *αἰὼν οὗτος* dominion rests on physical force, and the advantage of it is seen in the subjugation of others, and the service rendered by them. In the *βασιλεία* all pre-eminence rests on love and truth, and love teaches us to serve others, and not to let ourselves be served. But inasmuch as love is the mightiest power, so that love which shows itself in its highest perfection as ministering and dying, overcomes every thing, and in union with the Son of love, all those who open their heart to its influence rule in the power of it. But, as different degrees of capacity for its influence exist in different individuals, the ruling power naturally exists at the same time in different degrees, which, however, are dependent on the call of the Father (*οἷς ἡτοίμασται ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς*), not on the mere free will of man. Thus the disciples were not in the wrong in assuming that there were steps and degrees of approximation to the Lord, and in the extent to which men were partakers of his living power, but on the contrary that something of this kind must be supposed, is at once shown by the relation in which Christ stood to his disciples on earth, inasmuch as the Seventy were further removed from him than the Twelve, and among these again three (Peter, John, and James) stood the nearest to him, while only John rested on his bosom. And precisely similar are the results of experience in regard to the different degrees of efficiency in the different members of the church. Thus an Augustine, for example, by the power of the truth, exercised a predominant influence over whole centuries, such as millions of believers never possessed. The mistake of the disciples consisted rather in confounding the character of earthly and divine authority. The former, owing to the sinfulness of human nature, is combined with oppression and slavery; the latter has, as its result, a blessing for all who yield themselves to its influence. But, in order to be delivered from sinful self-will, which often knows how to assert its power even under the form of spiritual influence, man requires to have his soul, in the first instance, thoroughly humbled, and to pass through that baptism of suffering, in which the old man is wholly given over to death. The new man thence arising, who belongs to the kingdom of God, can in that case, according to the measure of his calling, have dominion,

*i.e.* exercise spiritual influence, without falling into the danger of assuming a worldly *κατακυριεύειν*. The Saviour places before his followers the likeness of such a holy self-sacrificing, lowly ministering love, for their imitation; intimating that in it alone lies his royal might and power; and that his kingdom was only to be built up in such a way that its members should bear within them the same love, and in the exercise of it should vanquish and gain over for that kingdom the hearts of men.

Ver. 28. In the remarkable verses<sup>1</sup> which conclude this conversation, the Saviour represents himself in the first place as the pattern of his disciples, so that, according to the principle, "the disciple is not above his Lord," as laid down at Matt. x. 24, the *διακονῆσαι* must form the character of all the sincere disciples of Jesus, but the *διακονηθῆναι* (according to ver. 25) must be dissociated from them as something belonging to the world. The divine dominion is one which only gives, and never, like that of the world, one which demands. In the next place, the idea which in these verses connects itself with the general truth of the gospel *καὶ δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν*, acquires, through this connection with the preceding context, such a reference to what goes before, as can well make it a conceivable thing that one should fail to find in it a statement of the distinctive peculiarity of the death of Jesus, its atoning and vicarious nature. For, while, in the life of believers, there can be found something analogous to the *οὐκ ἦλθε διακονηθῆναι ἀλλὰ διακονῆσαι*, this does not appear to be the case with the *ψυχὴν δοῦναι*, if it be viewed as a vicarious death, and seeing that, in the parallel drawn between Christ and his people, not the slightest hint is given that the resemblance is confined to the former, and does not extend to the latter, one might be led to the erroneous conclusion, that we are to view the death of Jesus here merely as the climax of the *διακονῆσαι*, and consequently to say that the words merely mean that every believer, as a member of the *βασιλεία* must (just as Christ did) sacrifice his individual life to the general body. Besides, as the synoptical gospels (with the exception of Matt. xxvi. 28) do not contain any other similar declaration in Christ's own words, impartiality requires from us the

<sup>1</sup> The Codex D has here also a long passage added, which is transcribed at some length from Luke xiv. 7, *seqq.*, but which cannot, in any case, be considered as belonging to the text in Matthew.

confession, that this passage, taken by itself, cannot *prove* the doctrine of Christ's vicarious death, especially as the same expressions here used to describe it, *may* denote any kind of death in the way of sacrifice. (Comp. Jos. ii. 14, Joseph. de Maccab. c. vi. Wetstein ad loc. has collected other passages from profane writers.) But if the doctrine be elsewhere proved (comp. on Rom. iii. 21, seqq. v. 12, seqq.) then the passage assuredly acquires a high significance, inasmuch as it lays down, in the words of our Lord, the germ of the apostolic doctrine. For, the structure of the words is obviously such, that the doctrine of our Lord's vicarious death *may* be indicated in them. The single point which can be brought forward on the other side, is the idea above-mentioned that the *ψυχὴν δοῦναι* is not really different from the *διακονῆσαι*, and as surely as the latter is appointed for all, so surely must the same view be taken of the former, which yet cannot be said to be true in regard to Christ's atoning death.<sup>1</sup> To maintain that in the latter words something which peculiarly and exclusively refers to Christ, is placed along side of that which is applicable to others, in such a way that the passage must be translated, "As the son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, so ought ye also willingly to serve; but, besides, the Son of Man has given up his life as an atonement for many, which is altogether inapplicable to you," assuredly such a supposition would have no claim to our assent. But the idea admits of being easily explained in the view of the Christian mind without supposing such an uncalled for interpolation, if we only remember that Scripture everywhere views the death of Christ as a type of the death of the old natural man (comp. on Rom. vi. 3), and in this respect the words *ψυχὴν δοῦναι* acquire a sufficient and satisfactory connection with the preceding context (comp. on Matt. x. 39.) On this supposition, however, that there is *one* point in which the death of Christ admits of being compared with the death of all believers in regard to the old man, there is at the same time nothing to prevent our supposing that the death of Christ involves other points, which admit of no comparison, and also that these are referred to in the words before us. The circumstance, however, that Jesus himself seldom brings forward that which is specific in the nature of his own death (comp. nevertheless on John iii. 14; vi. 51; x. 11; xii. 24), arises from

<sup>1</sup> Compare the passage 1 John iii. 16, to which the same thing exactly applies.

this, that any statement of it in a doctrinal form might easily have been misunderstood, for amidst the bulk of the people the Old Testament notices of a suffering Messiah, though not certainly wholly misapprehended, were yet put very much into the back ground, and the apostles on the whole shared in these views. (Compare Hengstenberg on the Suffering Messiah, in his Christology of the Old Test., p. 252, seqq.) As it was not in general, therefore, the peculiar work of Christ to communicate dogmas, but rather to implant in men's souls the element of a heavenly life, to impart to them a spirit of truth, from which all eternal verities were unceasingly to be developing themselves anew, so he gradually and with wisdom led his disciples forward in order that, after his atoning death, they might be enabled to receive such a spirit. Hence the entire form of his earlier ministry bears a legal colouring; Jesus was as it were his own prophet, and led men gradually to himself, the heavenly Christ; but of what importance would abstract statements as to the death of purest love have possibly been to those men who were as yet unable to perceive the very nature of such love? Not until the death of the love itself had revealed to their hearts the glow of that life which dwelt in him, did they understand that the death of the Lord from heaven could be nothing else than *atoning*, the death of the second Adam could be no other than *vicarious*. As regards, moreover, the individual details of this important passage, we must in the first place view the expression *δοῦναι ψυχὴν* as denoting, according to John x. 18, a free-will offering. The use of the term *ψυχή* here, however, is of importance as distinct from *πνεῦμα*. For, although the meaning *life* is here applicable, yet that life is to be regarded as concentrated in the *ψυχή*, and this (which is to be viewed in its connection with the *σῶμα* and its *αἷμα*) appears as the peculiar object offered in the sacrifice (comp. on Luke xxiii. 46.) The term *λύτρον*, as applicable to the *ψυχή* of Jesus, occurs only here; it points to a *δουλεία*, which is in this way (by the giving up of the soul) to be discharged. Hence the term *λύτρον* implies the idea of what is precious (1 Peter i. 18, 19), by which that of highest value, immortal human souls, for whose deliverance no earthly thing sufficeth, might be saved. In the ideas there lies a strong Oxymoron. The *δοῦναι ψυχὴν* on the part of the Saviour lays the foundation for the *λαμβάνειν* or the *σώζειν τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν ἀνθρώπων*. (The word *λύτρον*, however, although the substantive

occurs only here [at 1 Tim. ii. 6, there is *ἀντιλυτρον*], lies at the foundation of all the various expressions used in Scripture for the atoning work of Christ. The term most commonly used by Paul is *ἀπολύτρωσις*; the simple *λύτρωσις*, besides Luke i. 68, ii. 38, occurs also at Heb. ix. 12; *λυτρωτής* only at Acts vii. 35; *λυτρόω* at Luke xxiv. 21; Titus ii. 14; 1 Peter i. 18.) The preposition *ἀντί* here used, occurs only in this passage, and at 1 Tim. ii. 6, in the word *ἀντιλυτρον*. That which most usually, and especially in the language of Paul, denotes the relation of Christ's death to mankind, is the word *ὑπέρ* (Luke xxii. 19, 20; Rom. v. 6, 8; viii. 32; 2 Cor. v. 14, 15 [here it is most obviously equivalent to *ἀντί*]; Titus ii. 14; 1 Tim. ii. 6; 1 Peter ii. 21; iii. 18; iv. 1); but *περί* also occurs (Matt. xxvi. 28; Mark xiv. 24; Gal. i. 4; Rom. viii. 3), and even *διά* (1 Cor. viii. 11.) It is undeniable that from the use of these propositions nothing absolutely decisive can be deduced in support of the doctrine of a vicarious atonement, inasmuch as they may be translated *for the benefit of*, *for the advantage of*. On the supposition, however, that this doctrine is elsewhere proved, it is impossible not to see that the propositions which are used do not exclude this idea. Especially the most obvious and common sense of *ἀντί* is *over against*, i.e., in the case of valuation, *instead of*, *instar* (comp. Homer Il. ix. 116, 117, *ἀντί νυ πολλῶν λαῶν ἐστὶν ἀνὴρ ὄντε Ζεὺς κῆρι φιλήσῃ*. One is instead of many, he out-weighs them, replaces them), and for the use of *ὑπέρ*, as equivalent to *ἀντί*, comp. 2 Cor. v. 20, *ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ πρεσβεύομεν*.—Finally, as respects the use of *πολλῶν* in this passage, and which is found also at Matt. xxvi. 28, Mark xiv. 24 (while at 1 Tim. ii. 6, there stands *πάντων*), the passage, Rom. v. 15, 18, 19, is particularly instructive, for both expressions are there interchanged. We may say, that while *πάντων* points to the divine intention, *πολλῶν* refers to the result. As respects his love, Christ died for *all*, although the power of his death in point of fact only falls to the lot of *many* (compare farther details on the passage referred to.)

#### § 4. THE HEALING OF TWO BLIND MEN IN JERICHO.

(Matt. xx. 29—34 ; Mark x. 46—52 ; Luke xviii. 35—43.)

According to the account formerly given at Matt. xix. 1, of the manner in which, in this Evangelist, the subject matter is connected, it would seem as if there were here an interruption, but that takes place only in order to the connexion being immediately resumed. It is only some notices of a purely historic nature which come between, in order to carry forward the thread of the narrative, and transfer the scene to Jerusalem. And since Luke also inserts the account of the following cure as occurring at the same period of time, we are bound to suppose that it stands here in its right chronological position. The incident, moreover, presents nothing peculiar, for which reason no farther remarks seem called for on the occurrence itself. Mark has in this instance also (x. 46, 49) preserved his character for close attention to details, by adding certain pictorial touches, and giving even the name of the blind man. Respecting the differences between the accounts in the various gospels, in so far as Matthew and Mark, contrary to the statement of Luke, transfer the cure to Christ's departure from the city ; while Mark and Luke, on the other hand, contrary to the statement of Matthew, mention only a single individual as cured, I may refer to the remarks offered in the Introduction, § 8. Every attempt to reconcile the conflicting narratives, whether by supposing that there were two cures, one on His entering and another on his leaving the city, or by assuming that only one man is mentioned, inasmuch as one spoke for both, carries with it something unhistorical, but their very differences on such immaterial points show the genuine historical character of the gospels, and so far from detracting from their character in a higher point of view, they exalt it. Their agreement in every little trait would have been the surest means of awakening suspicion. Farther, it is most probable that in regard to such minor circumstances the anxiously accurate Mark gives on the whole the correct account, so that Luke is right when he agrees with him in mentioning one blind man. Only we must follow Luke in regard to the circumstance that the occurrence took place when

Christ was entering into Jericho. His minute accuracy in this part of the narrative, and the circumstance that there immediately (xix. 1, seqq.) follows another incident also belonging to the entrance into the city, makes this view by far the most probable.

### § 5. CHRIST'S VISIT TO ZACCHEUS.

(Luke xix. 1—10.)

Here again do we find Luke carefully carrying forward his narrative of the journey (comp. on ix. 51), and giving yet another incident from our Lord's stay in Jericho, which stands closely connected with those relations which the Evangelist has mainly in view in this section of his gospel. Jesus turns aside in Jericho to the house of a publican despised by the Pharisees (comp. Luke xix. 5, 6), and this unexpected grace so seizes on the mind of the upright man that an entire change is wrought on him. This abode of Christ with Zaccheus forms a contrast to His presence in the house of the Pharisee, Luke xiv. 1, seqq., which remained unblessed to him, for he was destitute of the disposition to receive the blessing, and in his pride did not believe that he was honoured by the visit of Jesus, but rather supposed himself to have rendered some great service to the Saviour. Zaccheus, on the other hand, in the feeling of his own misery, was deeply ashamed that the Holy One did not think it beneath Him to come under his roof. What the Pharisees, therefore, by their legal preaching and their strict exclusiveness, had been unable to do, is here seen effected by the power of grace, which condescends to the miserable. The visit to Zaccheus is an anti-Pharisaic demonstration exhibited in actual fact, and as a fact it makes a deeper impression than abstract doctrinal statements.

Ver. 1, 2. The city of Jericho lay near Jerusalem (at the distance of 150 stadia), for which reason the entry into the capital is narrated directly at Matt. xxi. 1, seqq. The city itself (יֶרִיכוֹ) is extremely ancient. The Hebrews found it in existence when under Joshua they took possession of the land of Canaan. Their palms and balsam gardens made the inhabitants famous, and brought them trade; for this reason an ἀρχιτελώνης was appointed to their city. The name Ζακχαῖος occurs again at 2 Macc. x. 19; it cor-

responds to the Hebrew זָכַי, from זָכַךְ, *to be pure*, and is frequently interchanged with זָכַי (comp. Gesenius in Lex.)

Ver. 3, 4. The desire of Zaccheus to see Jesus was no doubt external in its manifestation, but that it had a deeper origin in his soul is proved by the following narrative. Zaccheus is in so far a most appropriate representative of an honest though outwardly manifested desire after the Saviour which, as such, bears within itself a deeper germ, and according to the grace of the Lord which has stirred it up, will yet find its full satisfaction. (*Ἠλικία* here means stature—size of body, comp. Matt. vi. 27.—*Συκομορέα* = *συκάμινος*, comp. Luke xvii. 6. The MSS. vary much in the form of the noun, we find also *συκομωρέαν*, *συκομωραίαν*, *συκομοραίαν*.)

Ver. 5, 6. If Jesus addresses Zaccheus, and asks him for lodging, it does not follow necessarily that we are to conclude that he had received reports or information which had made him acquainted with his character. "Christ needed not that any should testify of a man, for he knew well what was in man" (John ii. 25.) It is still *possible* certainly that our Lord was acquainted with him, only we must not suppose that he had heard a good account of him, for the very point of the narrative lies in this, that the Saviour lodged with the *ἀδίκους* (comp. ver. 10, τὸ ἀπολωλός), which is a great offence to the *δικαίους*. Thus the aim of this engaging narrative is to set forth by facts the condescending love of the Redeemer, which impels him to go down into the lowest depths in order to bring up with him the lost. In Zaccheus we have the emblem of lowly humiliation amidst feelings of sin which makes him regard himself as excluded from the communion of the saints. But it was this very feeling of repentance which made him capable of receiving those higher powers of life which Jesus brought him.

Ver. 7, 8. Those in whom the Pharisaic feeling prevailed, could not bear the intercourse of the Messiah with sinners, and murmured. The idea of the *ἀμαρτωλός* is not to be restricted in this passage, not to be referred merely to his rank and connections in life, but as the following context shews us, is to be taken in a personal sense. Schleiermacher, however (on Luke, p. 238), supposes most justly that the declaration of dissatisfaction and the vows of the publican were not uttered till the morning of Christ's departure. The conversations between our Lord and Zaccheus, which must be sup-



posed to have taken place, would, in that case, better account for his engagements, and especially is it true that what follows will find a much more close connection through the expression *ἀκούοντων αὐτῶν ταῦτα* (xix. 11.) Farther, the words of Zaccheus express first the feeling of thankfulness for the mercy which had been shown him, and next the feeling of penitence and the acknowledgment that he was bound as much as possible to make reparation for his sins. The idea that the declaration *εἰ τινός τι ἐσυκοφάντησα κ. τ. λ.* is an expression of his righteousness, and of his having a good conscience, would conduct us wholly to the standing point of the Pharisees. It is rather an acknowledgment of guilt. (As to *καταλύω*, compare Luke ii. 7, ix. 12.—On *συκοφαντέω* see at Luke iii. 14.)

Ver. 9, 10. On these feelings of true repentance and grateful reciprocal love, the Saviour founds the *σωτηρία* of Zaccheus and those belonging to him (in so far as through his conversion the principle of a higher life was introduced into the house, all whose members were brought into contact with it), to which as a descendant of Abraham he had the nearest title, (compare on Matt. x. 6.) This was brought forward in contrast to the conduct of the Pharisees in despising those persons who, by the circumstances of their lives, had been entangled in manifold sins; and finally, the very object of the sending forth the Son of Man is made to consist in this compassionate exercise of love towards those who had fallen under the power of *ἀπώλεια*. This compassionate love effects as well the commencement of the higher life (*ζητῆσαι*) as its accomplishment (*σῶσαι*), so that *all* is its work (comp. on Matt. xviii. 11, ix. 12, 13.)

#### § 6. THE PARABLE OF THE TALENTS.

(Luke xix. 11—28; Matt. xxv. 14—30.)

The following parable is here so expressly joined to the historical connection by distinct historic data (*ἀκούοντων αὐτῶν*, ver. 11, and *εἰπὼν ταῦτα ἐπορεύετο ἔμπροσθεν*, ver. 28), and has besides in its constituent parts so distinct a reference to the prominent circumstances, that we cannot doubt it stands here in its proper place.

For, in the parable the twofold relation in which the ruler stands is kept in view, on the one hand to his δούλοι (ver. 13), and on the other to his πολῖται. Each of these finds its separate development and its peculiar application. The servants represent the apostles and disciples, the citizens the Jewish people. In the case of the former their faithfulness or unfaithfulness to the trust committed to them is praised or blamed; in the case of the latter their disobedience to their rightful Lord is punished. The idea, however, which is brought forward as connecting these two relations is this (ver. 11), that they (αὐτοῖς being used as comprehending both the disciples and the people), were expecting the revelation of the Messianic kingdom immediately (παραχρῆμα) on his arrival at Jerusalem. Without denying that such a revelation would one day take place, our Lord directs the minds of His disciples merely to the future (ver. 12), and draws their attention to that which is most important, namely, to the great final award which it will bring along with it for all; for the faithful servants the fulness of the blessing, but bitter punishment for the unfaithful, a truth which carried with it a solemn admonition for all the disciples; for the rebellious citizens (by whom we are to understand the whole Israelitish people, held under the power of Pharisaic influence and opposed to the Lord) wrath and destruction (ver. 14, 27.) Such representations were fitted to withdraw the attention of *all* from mere externals to that which was internal, in order to prepare them for receiving the right blessing from the appearance of the Messiah. But, inasmuch as Matthew (xxv. 14—30) has inserted the parable into a collection of similitudes, which all have reference to the future kingdom of God, we will consider it more closely in that connection, which will serve so greatly to explain its contents. It is true that Schleiermacher (p. 239) has cast a doubt on the identity of the two parables, but in my view without any sufficient grounds, for, first as respects his remark that what is said of the hostile citizens who would not have the Lord to reign over them forms the leading point in the parable, and that it would not therefore have been left out by Matthew, the manner in which the similitude is carried out by Luke at once shows that this is nothing more than a point of subordinate importance, for it is disposed of and finished in two verses (ver. 14, 27.) The Saviour's great object was to show the disciples that the Parousia (his second

coming) was not so near at hand ; it was only incidentally that the uncalled accusers of the acts of the Messiah (xix. 7) have their attention directed to what they must expect on his return. Matthew therefore might properly leave out the subsidiary point, which was of no importance whatever in his collection of parables (Matt. xxv.), intended as that collection was solely for the members of the *βασιλεία*. It certainly appears to me unlikely that Christ should have brought forward this parable once again in a simpler form. The shape in which Matthew gives it is simply to be set down to the account of that Evangelist. But what Matthew has omitted might be left out without in the least altering the essence of the parable. The one connexion represented as subsisting between the Lord and his servants, does not exclude the idea of another between him and the citizens. There remains, therefore, only this *single* remark, that the parable in Matthew seems to be wholly different, inasmuch as all the servants in Luke receive an equal sum, and the faithful servants severally acquire a different amount of gain, while in Matthew they receive different sums, and all acquire the same amount of gain. Here I am certainly not unwilling to suppose that Luke has retained the original form of the parable, inasmuch, namely, as the mention of *ten* servants is a point which harmonizes well with the *ten* virgins (Matt. xxv. 1), and the equal division of the talents, understood as referring to that calling into the kingdom of God which fell equally to the lot of all the disciples, and the furnishing of them with power from above, which was essentially needful for it, seems most appropriate to the great lesson primarily intended to be taught, (the faithful use of that which a man has received.) But the parable is not in any respect *essentially* altered by the view given of it in Matthew, for if Matthew makes more to be bestowed on one and less on another, he yet adds one other trait (by which, however, the similitude is not rendered a different one), that the powers bestowed on different individuals, for labouring in the kingdom of God, are different; but since less is demanded from those who are less fully furnished, it comes to be, after all, essentially the same thing. For, as respects the main point in the representation of the servants, the contrast, namely, between the faithful and the unfaithful, it is in the two accounts entirely the same. Hence I cannot think (with Schleiermacher, p. 240,) that the Saviour had spoken the parable in the simpler form of Mat-

thew, and at a later period repeated it in the more extended form of Luke. It rather seems to me probable, that while given by Luke here in its original form, and in its chronological connection, Matthew has, according to his usual practice, inserted the parable with slight modifications into a collection of similitudes, which were intended to explain the relations of the Parousia to the servants of God.

## C. THIRD SECTION.

CHRIST'S ENTRY INTO JERUSALEM AND THE DESCRIPTION OF HIS  
MINISTRY THERE.

(Matt. xxi.—xxv ; Mark xi.—xiii ; Luke xix. 29—xxi. 38.)

Although in this section it is easy to see that in all the three Evangelists there is chronologically a movement in advance, inasmuch as everything here recorded (even according to the narrative of Matthew) belongs to the closing period, and although the parallel relationship of the gospels, as mutually supplementing each other, comes unmistakeably into view ; yet Matthew even here is so far from renouncing the peculiar character of his writings, that it can be most clearly discerned from the very contents of this section. Matthew gives, in the first place, (xxi. 1—16), an historical introduction, proceeds, however, in the next place to arrange his materials under several general points of view, and, in particular, gives us extended collections of our Lord's discourses and of his parables. From xxi. 17—xxii. 46, Matthew treats of the attempts made by the Pharisees and Sadducees to lay hold of the Saviour, and the defeat of their impudent and vain attempts. At xxiii. 1—39, there follows a complete account of our Lord's judgment *on* the Pharisees, addressed to his disciples, and finally, in the xxiv. and xxv. chapters, the section is concluded by the discourses of Jesus as to his second coming, and the relations in which men, according to their different positions, stood to that event. Now it is not to be doubted that in these different portions we have only those discourses of our Lord which belong to the last days of his ministry ; for it was only at that closing period that Jesus could feel called on to express himself so fully on the subject of his return, and the topics connected with it ; and only at that same time when the bitterness of the Pharisees had risen to the highest pitch, is it possible to conceive of such malicious attempts on their part, and such strong declarations against them on the part of the Redeemer. But assuredly we must not assume that everything given by Matthew in this section was

spoken precisely during the stay of Jesus in Jerusalem; particular parts clearly belong to a somewhat earlier time, (comp. especially the parable at Matt. xxv. 14, seqq. which is given earlier by Luke xix. 11, seqq. in the midst of a distinct chronological connection.<sup>1</sup>) As respects the connection of Luke in this passage, I think it, along with Schleiermacher, (comp. my remark at Luke ix. 51,) extremely probable, that the great narrative of the journey which he has embodied in his gospel extends to xix. 48. But that as Schleiermacher thinks he can show (p. 250, seqq.) there are plainly to be traced also, in what follows, the joinings together of separate lesser accounts which Luke has inserted, is what I cannot bring myself to believe. If Luke really had before him written documents, he has certainly made no further use of them than to make abstracts of them; and even in that case we have his own account from chapter xx. onwards. Meanwhile Mark, in this section, still entirely preserves his own character as a writer; he follows Matthew and Luke alternately, but endeavours by close description, and by preserving separate traits which had escaped the notice of the others, to give life to the narrative.

As regards the *chronology* of this section, we here find once more that little attention is paid to it by Matthew. He seems to wish, indeed, to connect Christ's entry (xxi. 1,) expressly with his leaving Jericho (xx. 29), but in what follows, all notices of the time when events happen are cast into the back ground, if we except his remark as to the retirement to Bethany and the return to Jerusalem (xxi. 17, 18.) Passages, however, like Matt. xxii. 46, fall back into such vague generalities, that altogether apart from the contents of Matthew's statements, and of the results drawn from a comparison of the other narratives, it is clear that this Evangelist did not set out with the idea of following strictly the order of events and of discourses. The following mention (xxiv. 1) of our Lord's retiring from the Temple is plainly to be viewed merely as a connecting link to introduce the subsequent discourse, so that it is impossible to draw from it the inference that every thing which precedes must have been spoken in the Temple. Not till Matt. xxvi. 2, does the Evangelist give a fixed date (two days before the

<sup>1</sup> Even Matt. xxvi. 6, seqq., who is followed also by Mark, records the account of the supper at Bethany, which we know from John xii. took place at an earlier period.

Passover.) With this last date Mark (xiv. 1) agrees, as he does also in connecting the entry into Jerusalem (xi. 1) with the leaving of Jericho (x. 40.) In regard, however, to the intervening topics, Mark is more minutely accurate than Matthew, inasmuch as he gives the journey to Bethany and the return to Jerusalem more distinctly (xi. 11, 15, 19, 27), and also arranges with greater care the individual facts which occurred during these days. Luke, on the other hand, merely connects the entry of Jesus into Jerusalem, as Matthew and Mark also do, with his presence in Jericho (xix. 1, 29), but beyond this gives no more distinct chronological data, using only such general forms of expression as *ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐκείνων* (xx. 1<sup>1</sup>), and *ἤγγιξε ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν ἁζύμων* (xxii. 1), while Matthew and Mark in the parallel passages distinctly mention two days. Hence, without the more detailed accounts of John, we would have remained entirely in the dark as to the period of the solemn entry of Jesus into Jerusalem, and all that took place immediately before and after it. For, according to John (comp. the remarks on Luke ix. 51), the Saviour, after His journey to the feast of the dedication (in December), never returned back from Jerusalem to Galilee. He remained rather in Peræa (comp. x. 22, 40), and came to Bethany (xi. 7) only for the purpose of raising Lazarus. After that, however, our Lord went to the city of Ephraim (xi. 54, it lay eight miles to the north of Jerusalem), and was found again, six days before the Passover (xii. 1), in Bethany, where they prepared for Him a supper. It was on the day following that the entry into the city took place (xii. 12.) It is true that, according to the account of John, many points still remain undecided, but this very circumstance renders it easier to reconcile his narrative with that of the synoptical gospels. For, first, John is entirely silent as to the length of time Jesus staid at Ephraim, as well as in regard to the road which he took in travelling thence to Bethany. As the synoptical Evangelists merely record the whole journey of Jesus in the most general way, and particularly as they are silent as to the important events which took place at Bethany,

<sup>1</sup> Dr Paulus has certainly been inclined to view this passage as containing the mention of a *distinct date*, understanding it to mean on the first week day, *i.e.* on the first day after a Sabbath (according to the analogy of *μία τῶν σαββάτων*.) But the addition of *ἐκείνων*, which, though wanting in some MSS., undoubtedly belongs to the text, at once renders it impossible for us to adopt this hypothesis, which on other grounds has nothing in support of it. Nowhere do we find a week styled *αἱ ἡμέραι*.

the conjecture already referred to above (at Luke ix. 51) is not improbable (comp. Tholuck on John xii. 1) that Jesus performed short excursions from Ephraim, and even visited Jericho. (See the remarks on Luke ix. 51.) Certainly when one reads the synoptical gospels by themselves (Matt. xxi. 1, Mark xi. 1, Luke xix. 29), the account of the entry sounds as though our Lord had come from Jericho direct to Jerusalem, *ὅτε ἤγγισαν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα*) particularly as according to Mark (xi. 11) the entry took place toward the evening, and Jesus, for this reason, set out immediately with the Twelve for Bethany. But a positive contradiction to John is nowhere to be traced, he merely separates into its minor details what the others shortly compress into a single expression, which, taken by itself, might certainly be understood as meaning that during the interval Jesus had not remained in Bethany. This point, however, is more clearly explained by John, if we only suppose that Jesus went from Ephraim to Bethany, taking Jericho in his way. For as to the *time of day* when the entry took place, according to the account of John (xii. 12, on the day after the supper) there is nothing which compels us to transfer it to the morning, and we may therefore take the notice of Mark (xi. 11), as a more definite explanation of the account of John, and suppose that it took place in the evening. The subsequent narrative of John loses its strict chronological character. For the first time, at xii. 36, he mentions a departure of Jesus (but not expressly to Bethany), and then at xiii. 1, John comes at once to the last supper. Even the accurately marked expression, xii. 1, *πρὸ ἑξ ἡμερῶν τοῦ πάσχα* is again rendered indefinite, by the vagueness of the narrative, inasmuch as both the day of the passover, and also the day of the entry, may either be included in reckoning the six days, or they may be excluded. Still, however, it is in the highest degree probable that the day of our Lord's arrival was the Sabbath, that in the evening there was prepared for him at Bethany a solemn Sabbath-supper, and then towards the evening of the following day (John xii. 12), that is to say of Sunday, he held his entry into Jerusalem. There is thus in my opinion not the slightest ground to suppose with Dr Paulus (ad loc.), and with Schleiermacher (on Luke, p. 240, seqq.), that there was a *twofold* entry, the one on his coming direct from Jericho to Jerusalem (which is supposed to be recounted in the synoptical gospels), the second, the day after on his coming from



Bethany (which is recorded by John.)<sup>1</sup> For, even the remark that the Saviour must have brought the ass on which he made his entry straight with him from Bethany is without weight, for, the vague expression *ἐπὶ ὄναριον*, at John xii. 14, is at once opposed to this idea, and accordingly at Matt. xxi. 1, there is merely a closer definition given to this *ἐπὶ ὄναριον*, and the remark is made that the ass came from Bethphage. In the accounts of Mark and Luke, the conjoining of Bethphage and Bethany certainly seems to indicate that the Evangelists had heard of a stay having been made by Jesus at the latter place, with the details of which, however, they were not acquainted.

### § 1. THE ENTRY OF CHRIST INTO JERUSALEM.

(Matt. xxi. 1—11 ; Mark xi. 1—10 ; Luke xix. 29—44 ;  
John xii. 12—19.)

Looking now to the Saviour as he enters Jerusalem on his way to that bitter death of the cross, which he knew with certainty was there awaiting him (Matt. xvi. 21 ; xx. 18), the first question which naturally suggests itself is this : on what grounds did our Lord not refrain on this occasion from going up to the feast ? On this point there is enough to be gathered, even from the external circumstances, to show that the death of Jesus was no self-sought refined act of suicide. For, friends and foes, with equal earnestness, expected his arrival,—the former, in the hope of seeing him at last come forth in the fulness of his glory ; the latter, in the hope of destroying him, and exposing him as a false Messiah. To have stayed away therefore must have appeared prejudicial to his work, and the conviction of this consequently must have impelled him to meet the danger. The precept also of the Mosaic law, that all males should on the high festivals appear in the Temple, must have caused Christ to go to Jerusalem, unconcerned for the consequences which this journey might bring upon him. (Ex. xxiii. 17.) But

<sup>1</sup> Lücke also (comp. on John xii. 12) is opposed to the idea of a twofold entry. He mentions the additional fact (p. 338), that if we suppose the entry repeated on the morning of the second day, no room would remain for the *δῶπλον* and the visit, for, according to Mark xi. 11, it was not till late in the evening that Jesus came to Bethany.

these ideas are by no means sufficient to account for our Lord's giving himself up to death, which his appearance in the midst of his embittered enemies implied. According to his own distinct declarations, the Saviour's death was the act of his own free will (John x. 18, ἐγὼ τίθημι τὴν ψυχὴν μου ἅπ' ἐμαυτοῦ.) Acquainted with the Father's decree for the redemption of men, Christ of his own free purpose entered into it, and became obedient to the Father even unto death (Phil. ii. 8; Heb. v. 8.) His going to Jerusalem therefore cannot be viewed as standing apart from the necessity of his death itself. According to the predictions of the Old Testament, in which the everlasting counsel of the Father was set forth (Matt. xxvi. 24; Luke xxiv. 26, 27, 46; 1 Cor. xv. 3), it was in *this* way that the Saviour was to be made perfect for himself and for the Church. So long, therefore, as his hour (and the Father's) was not yet come (Matt. xxvi. 45; Mark xiv. 41; John xii. 27; xvii. 1), he avoided all the machinations of his enemies; but when the previously announced will of God (Luke ix. 31), was inwardly and certainly revealed to him, Christ followed it with childlike obedience, (not exerting his might for his own deliverance, Matt. xxvi. 53, 54), and gave himself up a ransom for many (Matt. xx. 28.) The act of Jesus, therefore, in going forward to that death which he looked for with certainty in Jerusalem, is to be explained chiefly from the relation in which he stood to the will of the Father, which must by no means be regarded as the will of a vengeful Being, who from mere self-will selected the innocent as a sacrifice in the room of the guilty, but must assuredly be viewed as *the righteous and holy* will of the Father, who found an everlasting redemption in the *equal balancing* of justice and mercy, in such a way that the righteous one, placing himself in his free love on the same footing with the unrighteous, did, by thus going down to their level, bring them up to his own. The will of the Father (as of pure love) therefore was equally the will of the Son, and the struggle at Gethsemane (Matt. xxvi. 39), is merely to be viewed as this will of the Son victorious in his human nature, the completeness of the victory being resisted by the powers of darkness with all their energy.

Another and more difficult point in regard to this occurrence is the *solemn entry* made by Jesus. By it the Saviour appears to have awakened and nourished those earthly Messianic hopes which on other occasions he combatted. The attempt to represent that entry,

however, as something accidental, is excluded first by *this* consideration, that it must have been as easy for our Lord to reach the city quietly and unobserved, had such been his object. And in the next place, the Christian mind refuses to ascribe to an accident so important an act in the Saviour's life. The intention of the narrators, moreover, is obviously by no means to represent this transaction as having taken place unintentionally; its connection with the prophecies of the Old Testament (Matt. xxi. 5; John xii. 14), at once shows that there was an intention to fulfil them. Certainly, however, it is inconceivable that our Lord should have done anything merely for the purpose of fulfilling a prophecy; it must be possible to point out some connection which the fact has with his person and office, and which forms the deeper foundation on which the prophecy rests. This foundation I find in the whole ordering of our Lord's life on earth. Although he appeared in the form of poverty and humiliation, and although the Jews could discover in him nothing of that external splendour with which they conceived that the appearance of the Messiah would be surrounded, yet even in his outward manifestation there were to be found indications of what his exalted dignity required. This very entry belongs to the number of these indications, and it stands here as the type of what he is one day to do in taking possession of the kingdom of God in glory. Such a type our Lord intended it to be. The disciples at a later period (according to John xii. 16) learned for the first time the meaning of the act, and connected it in consequence with the prophecies of the Old Testament.

As respects the connection of the three narratives with each other, Mark once more appears the most complete and minute. He gives us especially the actings of Jesus, subsequently to the entry, with greater detail than Matthew, who in his account of them keeps much more to general terms. Certainly, however, the narrative of Matthew is enriched by a reference to the Old Testament, which in the view of the two other Evangelists was less significant. Luke also has embodied (xix. 39—44) in his narrative peculiar traits which must have originated with a close observer and near companion of Christ. The passages from the gospel of John, which run parallel to this and the following paragraphs of the section on which we are engaged, will be explained here only in so far as they aid our understanding of the synoptical gospels.

Ver. 1, 2. After the Saviour (according to John xii. 1, seqq.) had staid in Bethany, he went by way of Bethphage (בֵּית פֶּגֶא from *פג* *ags* [Song ii. 13] which grew abundantly there) which was situated in the neighbourhood of Bethany towards Jerusalem. (The joining together of *Βηθφαγή* καὶ *Βηθανία* in Mark and Luke is a loose statement which seems to rest on the circumstance, that the Saviour had stopped also at Bethany, but certainly that was not during his journey, which rather commenced from that place.) John's account, according to which the men came from Jerusalem to meet Jesus, does not stand opposed to that of the synoptical gospels, it only delineates the scene more fully. Some might have accompanied Christ from Bethany and Bethphage, while others came out of the city to meet him. According to the representation of Matthew, it admits of no doubt that the two disciples were sent into Bethphage, which lay at the foot of the Mount of Olives (*Ὅρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν*, הַר הַזַּיִתִּים, Zech. xiv. 4, was situated only a few stadia from Jerusalem, and the road to Jericho lay over it.) Here our Lord commanded them to bring him an ass, which they would find there (John xii. 14 has the expression *ἐρῶν ὄναριον*, which certainly applies to Christ himself, inasmuch as he says nothing of his sending the disciples.) It is a natural and very obvious suggestion here, to suppose that there had been an agreement concerning the ass previously entered into by Jesus, and there is nothing in the Evangelists which expressly contradicts such an idea, although they render it improbable. The word *ἐρῶν* used by John appears to favour the supposition, that it had been accidentally found. The idea of the transaction, and probably also the meaning of the narrators, harmonizes better with *that* account of the matter, according to which the Messiah on his entry found every thing as he wanted it laid to his hand by the care of God, and thus that there was no antecedent agreement in the case. Certainly, however, we must suppose that those to whom the animal belonged were the friends of Jesus. Matthew, closely following the prophecy (Zech. ix. 9), makes mention of two animals; Mark and Luke allude only to the *πῶλον*, adding that it never had been rode upon. (Beasts that never had been used were supposed to possess the character of being pure and unblemished, for which reason they were carefully made use of for sacrifices, Deut. xxi. 3.) From this addition it clearly follows that it was this animal which was to carry our Lord; the mother may

either have been led behind or have followed; but in any case, we may suppose that Matthew was quite right in his statement, that two animals were brought.

Ver. 3—5. The disciples were enjoined merely to mention our Lord to the possessors of the animals, on which statement they would at once be given up to them. (The expression *ὁ κύριος* presupposes an acquaintance with the person of the Saviour on the part of the owners of the ass [comp. on Matt. xvii. 4.] Here, however, the *ὁ κύριος*, although it has the article, is not to be taken in any higher sense, inasmuch as *ἡμῶν* is merely to be supplied.) Matthew immediately adds, that this fact had already been made mention of in the Old Testament. (The formula *ὡς ἐν τῇ προφητείᾳ* has here certainly, according to the sense of Matthew, the literal meaning of an intentional fulfilment. Compare on Matt. i. 22.) The passage Zech. ix. 9 stands in a remarkable prophetic connection. The Messiah is described (ver. 10) as the Prince of Peace to whom the whole earth is subject, and in this character does he make his entry into the Holy City—Jerusalem being viewed as the centre of the spiritual kingdom. Although primarily the account of the entry given by Zechariah appears merely to be figurative (inasmuch as the ass, as the symbol of peace, stands contrasted to the horse, ver. 10, as the symbol of war), yet the guiding hand of Providence loves to reproduce such features with literal accuracy, mingling together things the most exalted and the most minute with the boldest freedom and most careful exactness. As regards the text of the quotation, Matthew is found once more dealing freely with the passage. The LXX. translate almost literally from the Hebrew *χαῖρε σφόδρα θύγατερ Σιών κήρυσσε θύγατερ Ἱερουσαλήμ· ἰδοὺ ὁ βασιλεὺς ἔρχεται σοι δίκαιος καὶ σώζων αὐτὸς πρᾶς καὶ ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ ὑποζύγιον καὶ πῶλον νέον*. The point to which Matthew gives special prominence respecting Jesus is merely the *πρᾶς*, in order to indicate the character of the gracious dominion of his sceptre, which this whole entry symbolizes. Along with the passage from Zechariah, however, Matthew seems to have combined another from Isa. lxii. 11, at least the words *ἔπατε τῇ θυγατρὶ Σιών* are borrowed from it.

Ver. 6, 7. The act of bringing the animal itself is described by Mark, according to his manner, in full detail; he even observes the way in which it was tied. (*Ἀμφοδος* or *ἄμφοδον* = *ῥύμη*, a

*street, a road.* In the New Testament it occurs only here.) The expression also *τινὲς τῶν ἐκεῖ ἐστηκότων* shows great powers of graphic description, in things external. (Luke xix. 33 mentions several *κύριοι*, perhaps they may have been sons of the possessor, who came upon the apostles, and who as such may also have been called owners of the animal.) When they brought the animals to Jesus, they spread (according to the Oriental custom, instead of a saddle) their clothes upon one of them, and set Jesus on it. (In the text of Matthew *ἐπεκάθισεν* is certainly the right reading, but the account of Luke [*ἐπεβίβασαν τὸν Ἰησοῦν*] is undoubtedly to be preferred. In this act of the people they plainly expressed their acknowledgment of Jesus as the Messianic King. The words *ἐπάνω αὐτῶν* of Matthew are merely a loose form of expression. The two animals are viewed as taken together, and thus every thing which happened to one of them [*πῶλον*] is applied also to the other.)

Ver. 8—11. This account of what was done around the person of Jesus before the commencement of the procession is followed by a description of the exulting and triumphant joy which broke forth on the part of the people. They spread their clothes on the road (2 Kings ix. 13, as the token of an honourable reception), and scattered twigs along the way over which Jesus passed. (Instead of *κλάδοι*, Mark has *στοιβάδες*, from *στοίβη*, *copsewood, branches*. John xii. 13 has the more specific expression *βᾶτα τῶν φοινίκων*. See ad loc.) At the same time, however, they received Jesus with salutations addressed to Him as the Messiah. (Luke xix. 37 accurately describes the locality here [it was at the *κατάβασις τοῦ ὄρους τῶν ἐλαιῶν*], and remarks that the *δυνάμεις* of Jesus were the subject of praise to God. Probably this remark refers primarily to the raising of Lazarus, which, according to John xii. 9, had attracted so many to Bethany.) The words of salutation quoted here are taken from a song of triumph<sup>1</sup> (from Ps. cxviii. 26) which refers typically to the Messiah. (The *יְהוָה* is translated by the LXX. *κύριε* *σῶσον* *δή*. Mark has carried out the expressions, inasmuch as he applies the word *ἐνλογημένος* also to the *βασιλεία*, which is ascribed to David as representative of the royal dignity belonging to the Messiah [Ezek. xxxiv. 23, 24.] Luke entirely omits the term *ὠσαννά*, with which

<sup>1</sup> As to this see the remarks on Matt. xxi. 42.

his readers were unacquainted. The last clause is difficult—*ὡσαννά ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις*. It is best to understand the expression along with Fritzsche as meaning that the exclamation of hosanna is supposed to be transferred also to heaven, in order to intimate that Jesus was also to be joyfully acknowledged by the heavenly world.) That, however, which the fickle multitude here praised in Jesus they within a few days denied that they could find in him, after having been disappointed in the expected appearance of that outwardly glorious kingdom towards which their carnal hopes were specially directed. The people thus had to acknowledge and salute Jesus of their own free will, as the Messiah, in order that it might afterwards be said that they had rejected their (acknowledged) King.

Luke xix. 39—44 relates other interesting traits of Jesus during his entry. First he mentions a conversation with some Pharisees who, even at this moment, when men were carried away and intoxicated with joy, uttered certain cold reflections against the rejoicings of the people (compare the entirely similar occurrence, Matt. xxi. 15, 16.) Full of chagrin that the people did homage to Jesus, they ventured to ask Jesus himself to repress the shouts of those who hailed him as the Messiah. Our Lord, however, here indirectly acknowledges his own kingly dignity, inasmuch as he declares that it could not be otherwise, and that he must, amidst triumphant joy and the free acknowledgment of his prerogatives, make his entry into the Holy City. (In consequence of the way in which the expression *λίθοι κεκράζονται* refers to Hab. ii. 11, where the stones in the wall and the beams are represented as speaking, it is to be taken literally, and explained from proverbial usage. It is intended to set forth the necessity there was for the loud expression of public joy even on the part of minds the most inanimate, and thus to show the importance of the moment.) Amidst this general exultation, however, which the Saviour would by no means interfere with, there yet mingled the silent tears of sadness as, descending from the brow of the Mount of Olives, he looked on the Holy City, the *mother* and the *altar* of the saints (Luke xiii. 33.) In mental vision Jesus beheld that same people who now met him with shouts of joy, opening their ears to the hostile influences of the Pharisees, and, by trifling away the opportunity of salvation which had come so near them, preparing for themselves a fearful doom. In the

lively contemplation of these violent contrasts,—the exulting salutation of the rejoicing multitude, and the approaching murderous cry of crucify him,—the peaceful repose of the city as it lay spread out before his view, and the war-storms which were to roll up towards its walls,—the inclination of men (and their need) for the one side, and the power of darkness deciding them to take the other,—amidst such contemplations, feelings the most varied must have filled the Saviour's soul. The relation in which the people stood to his person specially implies the possibility of a free choice on their part *in his favour*, because without such a possibility neither the guilt which the people drew down upon themselves by rejecting our Lord, nor their punishment, could have been applicable to them. Certainly, however, Christ puts their guilt here in the mildest form, when he makes it consist in their *not knowing*,<sup>1</sup> or in having their spiritual views so darkened as not to perceive the importance of the moment. (At Acts iii. 17, 1 Cor. ii. 8, this want of knowledge is extended also to the *ἄρχοντες* who crucified Jesus.) Only, this want of knowledge and blindness must be viewed as also *implying guilt*, inasmuch as it pre-supposes unfaithfulness in the use of the means for enlightening the spiritual perceptions which God had so richly put within the reach of the people. Peculiar to this passage is the expression *ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ σου ταύτῃ*, instead of which there is given at ver. 44, *καιρὸς τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς σου*. It expresses the idea that nations (as well as individuals) have in their advancing development moments, on the use or neglect of which their condition, through long periods of time, depends—periods of crisis, as it were, in which the decisive step for good or evil is taken. Through the preceding periods certainly the decision may have been rendered *probable* on the one side or the other (as was the case here with the Jewish people,) but everything would fall under the dominion of stern necessity, should we maintain the absolute impossibility of its being otherwise than it was. The contest between the small number of noble minds among the Jewish people and the great corrupt mass, was brought out to view by the Redeemer appearing in the midst of them. While the former attached themselves to his heavenly appearance, and found in him life and full enjoyment, the latter saw in it the annihilation of their vain hopes

<sup>1</sup> Compare, however, on Matt. xxiii. 38, as to the connection between the want of *will* and the want of *knowledge*.



and selfish plans. Instead of submitting to self-denial, they offered up the Holy One in sacrifice, and thereby consummated at once their own *destruction* and the *salvation* of the world. (As to *ἐπισκοπή* = פקדה comp. on Luke i. 68, 78.) As respects the representation which our Lord gives, ver. 43, 44, of the consequences of such unfaithfulness, and which he sets forth under an external aspect, they will be more fully considered on the parallel passages, Matt. xxiii. 37, Luke xxiii. 27.

## § 2. THE FIG TREE CURSED.

(Mark xi. 11—14.)

In this and the two following paragraphs Mark shows himself unmistakably the more correct narrator as respects chronology. He remarks (xi. 11) that the entry of our Lord took place towards evening, and owing to this, after he had visited the Temple, he immediately returned with the Twelve to Bethany. Matthew, on the other hand, places the driving out of the merchants and the cures (ver. 14) also on the day of the entry, and not till after these does he recount with Matthew the departure for Bethany (ver. 17.) The account of the Messianic salutation which the children joyously repeated in the Temple agrees, indeed, very well with the day of the entry, but not less so with the following day. The exclamation of the children appears as the *echo* of the people's exulting shout on the preceding day. The unchronological character of Matthew, however, is peculiarly conspicuous in his account of the withered fig tree. He transfers, indeed, as does Mark, Christ's visiting the fig tree to the morning of the day after the entry, but his account of the marked fulfilment of the curse pronounced by Jesus, and the conversation as to faith therewith connected, are immediately subjoined by him, while, according to Mark (xi. 19, 20), a whole day intervened. From such inexactness, however, on the part of Matthew, we are not to conclude that his statements are not to be depended upon, and that the apostolic origin of his gospel is improbable, but rather that his leading aim was not the description of things external, but the portraying of Jesus and his labours under certain general points of view. As was already observed above (on Matt.

xxi. 1), these historic topics which Matthew brings together in this section form only an introduction to his lengthened account of the manner in which our Saviour conducted himself towards his powerful enemies. Hastening on to this account, he describes only in general terms those external circumstances which it is the peculiar gift of Mark fully to pourtray. Luke, however, who shows himself elsewhere so exact a narrator of the conversations of Jesus, in their connection with those incidents in our Lord's life which gave rise to them, here loses all his originality and individual peculiarity, so that there is some foundation for Schleiermacher's conjecture that the account which Luke followed lost its graphic descriptiveness with the entry of Jesus into the city, because the narrator had here left his train, and no farther sources of information were at Luke's command.

As respects the cursing of the fig tree itself, the narrative of Mark in particular, and the whole fact as it stands, presents important difficulties. As regards first the account of Mark there is something strange in the expression, οὐ γὰρ ἦν καιρὸς σύκων (ver. 13.) For, if we refer the expression καιρὸς σύκων to the time in which figs ripen, one does not see how the Saviour, if the period generally had not arrived, should have sought figs on the tree. And further, as the fruit of the fig tree is produced at an earlier period than the leaves, and as Mark expressly tells οὐδὲν εὔρεν εἰ μὴ φύλλα, it appears that the καιρὸς σύκων must have arrived, for in a fruitful fig tree, if the leaves were already expanded, fruit might certainly have been expected. The difficulty is diminished here if we understand by it that kind of figs which remain hanging on the branches all winter, and are gathered in early spring. In that case the sense of the words would be this—while the common kind of figs were not yet ripe, and the time for gathering them in had not come, Jesus yet perceived that this tree on which he sought for figs belonged to that other kind which bore at that time ripe and refreshing fruit, and thus he could rightfully expect figs on the tree. (As to the different kinds of figs, comp. Winer in his *Real Lex. sub. voc.*) But, although the circumstance that there was in Palestine a kind of winter figs is of great importance in explaining how Jesus could have sought for that fruit on a tree before Easter, yet the difficult expression οὐ γὰρ ἦν καιρὸς σύκων is not thereby explained. Equally unsatisfactory are those interpretations of the passage, ac-

cording to which *καρὸς* refers not to the time but to the *place* in this sense, "it was not good ground for growing figs." The simplest explanation of this obscure passage is arrived at by observing that the article is wanting, and that its absence at once precludes all reference to the time of the *ingathering* of figs, for had that been the sense the expression would have been *ὁ καρὸς τῶν σύκων*.<sup>1</sup> This circumstance points to that view of the words according to which the expression *καρὸς* is to be understood as meaning *tempus opportunum*—not the stated and regularly returning period of ingathering, but the *weather* of that particular year. The sense would then be this—it was not a good season for figs—the fig trees had not yet borne.<sup>2</sup> There is, however, still greater difficulty involved in the fact itself. It is not possible in any way to see how our Lord could curse an unfruitful fig tree if we look at the fact only externally. All our conceptions of the Saviour would be deranged were we to adopt so unfitting an application of his miraculous power. But if we understand the expression *μηκέτι ἐκ σοῦ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα μηδεὶς καρπὸν φάγοι* as amounting simply to a remark occasioned by the worthless nature of the tree, which was obvious to the view, then, in the first place, the narrative would be aimless; and in the next place, it is impossible to see how such a remark regarding things external could give occasion to the subsequent instructions on the subject of faith (Mark xi. 22, seqq.) To say nothing of the fact that such an exposition obviously does violence to the text, inasmuch as, according to the view of the Evangelist, the withering of the fig tree was the result of a special exercise of power on the part of Jesus (ver. 21, *ἡ σύκη, ἣν κατηράσω ἐξήρανται*), it is further true that in the more elevated tone, which the Redeemer strikingly and openly assumed in these latter hours of his life, it was impossible that any observation so inane could find a place. In the delineation, therefore, of the Saviour's character, this fact can find a place as a genuine trait only when we regard it as the external representation of an *idea*. (See as to the meaning and

1 Comp. Matt. xxi. 34, where the fruit season is termed *ὁ καρὸς τῶν καρπῶν*.

2 I cannot comprehend how De Wette can allege, in opposition to this view of the words, that it makes the curse appear unfounded. Perhaps he thinks that all the other trees must have borne well, but it is self evident that in a purely symbolical transaction points of this kind are not to be pressed. He further observes that at the time of the Passover, it could not have been decided whether the figs were to be plentiful. If winter figs be here spoken of the clause refers to the preceding year.

importance of many transactions on Luke v. 1, seqq.) As the great and decisive hour approached, the holy soul of Jesus was occupied only with the sins of the people, who at the sublime moment, when all the longings and hopes of their fathers stood fulfilled, remained blind and deaf to the revelation of his glory. He, the Son of their Father in heaven, was come seeking those fruits of true repentance, which the law ought to have produced, but he found them not. As the result of this unfruitfulness, therefore, the penal sentence now took effect after the tree had in vain been cared for by the true Gardener (comp. on Luke xiii. 6)—it must now be rooted out. The whole of this rich combination of ideas lay, as it were, embodied in the apparently insignificant fact, and thus understood, it becomes the symbol of our Lord's relation to the people of Israel and their final doom, which is of extreme importance in connexion with the closing period of Christ's ministry. Only on the supposition that such is the meaning of the transaction do the Saviour's words, which, according to Mark xi. 25, 26, immediately follow the fact, acquire a perceptible connexion with it.

### § 3. THE PURIFICATION OF THE TEMPLE.

(Matt. xxi. 12—16. Mark xi. 15—18. Luke xix. 45—48.)

As respects first the connection of the synoptical gospels here with John (ii. 12, seqq.), Lücke has come at last to maintain the identity of the fact narrated by the former and the latter. But the transposition of an occurrence which took place at the commencement of Christ's ministry to the conclusion of it, seems to me a thing so improbable, that I could consent to it only in a case of extreme necessity. Such a case of necessity does not seem to me to exist here. For, *in the first place*, granting that the narratives of Matthew and Luke are not in this section minutely exact, we must yet all the more decisively maintain that Mark records the occurrences of that particular day with the most careful detail. The manner in which the narrative of the withered fig tree is set before us is so graphic, that it can only have proceeded from an eye-witness, and the account given by Mark of the driving out of the money-changers, has traits so special (ver. 16, 17), that they attest the genuineness

of his account. In a narrative such as this, a misunderstanding like the above is not to be thought of. *In the second place*, however, a transaction such as this on the part of Jesus, both at the *commencement* and the *close* of his ministry, so far from seeming extraordinary, is in the highest degree appropriate. Certainly, however, this transaction, as well as the former, must not be looked at merely in its external aspect, but be regarded as the symbol of our Lord's whole ministry. Regarded in its external aspect, the transaction must always have the appearance of being somewhat aimless, for, though the dealers retired for the moment from before our Lord, yet we cannot form any other supposition than that, when he withdrew, they again resumed their unholy traffic, for the priests were not opposed to it. The whole occurrence, however, acquires an ideal meaning if we view it in its external aspect only as a type of our Lord's spiritual labours. The purifying of the house of God, in the spiritual sense of the word, was his peculiar vocation, and this was symbolized at the commencement and close of his labours, by the act of purifying the outer sanctuary. The more special circumstances in the account which John gives of the act (especially the *ποιεῖν φραγέλλιον ἐκ σχοινίων*, as to which the synoptical gospels are silent) may have had reference to what the Saviour did at the first purification of the Temple exclusively, for it may be supposed that when he came to repeat the act the multitude at once retired before the well known Prophet.

As respects the transaction itself, however (whether it occurred only once or oftener), in its connection with the Saviour, the violence which it manifests may seem out of keeping with the gracious character of Jesus. But, inasmuch as love was completely and truly exhibited in the Redeemer, for that very reason there was displayed in him as well its *severity* as its *mildness*. As the latter was manifested toward the humble, so was the former towards the bold and shameless, and as here in *deed*, so in other passages in *word* (Luke xix. 27., Matt. xxiv.), does our Lord express himself as one who shall destroy the adversaries (comp. on John iii. 17, 18.) The circumstance, however, that the effort of Jesus should be effectual for the external purification of the Temple—that for the time at least during which he was present, the turmoil should have been silenced, this is by no means to be explained by any *special* exercise of our Lord's miraculous power, but from the fact that he was

himself a mighty miracle. Lücke (Part i., p. 536) has well exposed the utter vanity of the attempt which has been incidentally made to refer this transaction of Jesus to the so called right of zealots. The only thing which remains to account for the fact is the personality of the Saviour himself. As Jesus by his word, and by the holy impression of his character, disarmed the band (John vii. 46, xviii. 6) so by his holy anger he drove the unholy men from the precincts of the Temple.

Ver. 12. The so called outer court of the heathen, consisting of a wide-paved space in front of the proper outer court, formed the scene of this transaction. In this space the sellers of animals for sacrifice, and the money changers, had erected their booths (תְּנִיחִי), and thus transferred the turmoil of worldly traffic into the immediate neighbourhood of those who were engaged in prayer. (Κολλυβιστής from κόλλυβος, small coin, change, and then an agio or exchange. John ii. 14 has κερματιστής from κέρμα, small coin, change. Both expressions are parallel to that commonly used, viz., to τραπεζίτης, and occur in the New Testament only in this narrative.) Mark xi. 16 gives in addition the special circumstance, that vessels (σκεῦος) were carried hither and thither probably for the accommodation of the sellers, and that this our Lord also prevented.

Ver. 13. All the three Evangelists equally unite in giving, along with this transaction of Jesus, a reference to two passages of the Old Testament, viz., to Isa. lvi. 7, and Jer. vii. 11. Although the natural contrast implied in these passages is so great as easily to have impressed itself on the memory, yet so minute an agreement in the twofold quotation must be held to prove that the different narratives are founded on one and the same original account. Only Mark gives the words of Isa. lvi. 7 somewhat more fully, inasmuch as he has included also the expression πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν. Even Matthew also, in bringing forward these passages, has not applied to them his usual formula ἵνα πληρωθῇ, and hence we are not to suppose that the words had any special reference to those circumstances which arose in the time of Jesus. They merely oppose the ideal meaning and design of the Temple to the bold abuse of that design as brought about at earlier and later periods by sin (as to καλεῖσθαι, see on Luke i. 32.)

Ver. 14—16. Even in the Temple does Jesus still continue his

healing labours, dispensing blessings so long as he could during his appearance on earth, and by his efforts bestowing life on those who did not set themselves in opposition to the blessed influence which went forth from him. But here does Matthew begin to bring forward the fact, that it was the Pharisaic party which showed itself entirely hardened against all holy impressions. (Only here in the New Testament are the works of Jesus termed *θαυμάσια* = נִפְלְאוֹת.) The account of the continuous assaults of this party on the person of our Lord, forms the leading topic of the whole subsequent narrative of Matthew. It is here related, first, how the Pharisees (just as at the entry of Jesus, Luke xix. 39), sought to silence the Messianic shout of welcome which the children in their simple joyousness were raising, as an echo to that cry of the multitude that had now died away, and by which they were reminded of a truth offensive to them. The Saviour, however, once more reminds them of a Scripture statement (Ps. viii. 3), in which the age of childhood (עוֹלָלִים וְיִנְקִים) is represented as also fitted to proclaim the praise of God. The words of Matthew moreover closely follow the LXX. From the application of these words considered in itself, no inference can be drawn absolutely to prove the Psalm to be Messianic, for Matthew does not intimate here that there was any fulfilment of them. But assuredly the express reference of the Psalm in other passages of the New Testament (1 Cor. xv. 27, Heb. ii. 6, 7), makes it certain that the Messianic exposition of it was that adopted by the apostles. Yet this does not by any means exclude the general reference of it to men as such, but rather does human nature appear in the Messiah (the *υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*) as ideally personified, and hence the human in him is to be viewed as on all sides complete and perfect, while in every individual the human character is set forth only approximately. According to this special reference of the Psalm to the Messiah, the quotation acquires an immediate application to the existing circumstances, which otherwise this passage would not of itself have indicated.

That which Matthew here sets forth by a special and particular reference, Mark (xi. 18) and Luke (xix. 47, 48) express only as a general idea, but they represent the hostility of the priestly party to Jesus, as restrained by the attachment cherished for his person by the more simple multitude who were more susceptible of noble impressions, but were at the same time exceedingly fickle (Luke, λαὸς

ἀπας ἐξεκρέματο αὐτοῦ ἀκούων.) Not until this attachment was weakened by the insinuations of the Pharisees, did they dare to go forward with their dark plans (comp. Mark xxi. 46, and the parallel passages.)

#### § 4. ON THE POWER OF FAITH.

(Matt. xxi. 17—22 ; Mark xi. 19—26.)

As was already remarked above, Matthew does not treat the history of the withered fig tree with minute accuracy, for he makes the Redeemer, on the morning of the day succeeding his entry, go up to the tree in order to seek fruit, and he makes the withering take place immediately on his going up to it (παραχρήμα ἐξαφανθῇ), while the more accurate Mark relates that it was not till next morning that they observed the fulfilment of the Saviour's threatening. But, looking to the whole character of Matthew as a writer, this is not to be regarded as an historic error, but merely as an abbreviated form of recording the fact. The thing which he had in view was not the transaction in itself as such, but the meaning which it was to bear. It was to prepare his readers for his leading theme, viz., Christ's mode of dealing with the Pharisees. That which at chap. xxiii. is fully expressed in *thought*, is embodied in *fact* by this history of the withered fig tree, viz., the destruction of the Pharisees and of the multitude enthralled by their spirit. That part of our Lord's discourse therefore (such as Mark xi. 25, 26), which did not subserve his object, was left out by Matthew. Mark, however, who gives the facts for their own sake, is accurate to the minutest particular. Thus, he even records (ver. 21) that it was Peter speaking for the body of the apostles who gave occasion to the Saviour's discourse. As respects the account of πλῆσις in our Lord's discourse, all that is needful on that point has been set down at Matt. xvii. 20. To the πιστεύειν there stands opposed the διακρίνεσθαι as a state of inward wavering and uncertainty. (Rom. iv. 20, xiv. 23, διακρίνεσθαι τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ. Διακρίνεσθαι denotes primarily to *fight*, to *contend with*, and this meaning is transferred to the state of the soul. Hence διάκρισις is by no means synonymous with ἀπιστία, for this latter expression denotes the entire



absence of faith, the former merely the weakness of faith, which cannot attain to complete internal confidence.) Farther, this state is ascribed to the *καρδία* (as *πίστις* is at Rom. x. 9), for as respects faith we have not primarily to do with ideas or conceptions which are rather to be viewed as the consequences of it, but with the personality of man in its innermost core. (The state of the soul's dispositions and the will, in so far as it is determined by these dispositions.) At the most, therefore, *ψυχή* might here have been put in room of *καρδία*, in so far as it may be viewed as concentrated in the *καρδία*, but in no case could *πνεῦμα* or *νοῦς*.

As respects the connection of the ideas it is not without obscurity. In the first place, regarding the astonishment with which the disciples viewed this occurrence (Matt. xxi. 20), it may well surprise us after the many extraordinary deeds which they had seen done by our Lord. But just as those whose minds are filled with the sense of the Divine Omnipotence, are struck with astonishment as often as they see it displayed in new and exalted manifestations, so do we see the disciples affected whensoever the glory of Christ reveals itself under a new aspect. But the reference to faith does not seem to connect itself appropriately with this astonishment, and with the question *πῶς ἐξηράνθη ἡ συκὴ*. For, were we to understand the reply as meaning, "I perform this through faith, and through faith *you* could do it also," it must be observed that the expression *πίστις* is never used as applicable to the relation in which Christ stood to the Father. The Saviour performs his miracles not through the power of faith in God but from the divine power that dwelt in himself. We must therefore merely say that our Lord meant to lead the disciples away from outward astonishment at the fact, to that which was internal, and refer them to *πίστις* as the source of all power to them for the performance of outward acts. Hence does Mark rightly begin the discourse, with the admonition *ἔχετε πίστιν Θεοῦ*, by which he meant to turn the attention of the disciples to their inward life of faith as the necessary condition for all outward activity. His referring *πίστις* to God, however, does not exclude faith in himself personally, as the Redeemer God was manifested in him (John xiv. 9), and faith in Christ is faith on God in him (comp. Acts iii. 16, where faith in Jesus healed the sick.) Certainly, however, it is also true that the faith of the apostles would manifest itself by outward *ἔργα* (John xiv. 12; *ὁ πιστεύων*

εἰς ἐμὲ, μελίζονα τούτων ποιήσει); and hence the particular form in which the power of faith is here developed.

The representation thus given of faith and its power is followed (Matt. xxi. 22) by the assurance that believing prayer will be heard. The mode of transition in Matthew permits us clearly to see the connection of the ideas. Faith is viewed as the principle of the Christian life in general, and is farther set forth as a condition necessary to the satisfying of the most difficult requirements. The overturning of mountains is to be viewed as something arising from circumstances, something necessarily demanded yet impossible for human power, which becomes as such the object of believing prayer, and by this means the suppliant has conferred on him the powers of a higher world. The thought is merely extended from that which is particular and individual to that which is general (*πάντα ὅσα*.) As respects, however, the idea that believing prayer will be heard, John (xiv. 13, xv. 16, xvi. 24) has given it in its complete form, by adding the clause *ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου* (comp. on Matt. xviii. 19), for in that clause the *pure* origin of such prayer is traced to the mind and spirit of Jesus, and in this very *origin* of the supplication there lies the necessity of its *fulfilment*. For, that which God's spirit prompts us to *ask*, he also naturally *bestows*; self-originated prayer cannot arise from *πίστις*. The connection here obviously again requires that the *πίστις* be not viewed as mere knowledge, but as a state of the soul out of which that knowledge takes its rise. The specific characteristic, however, in this mental state is susceptibility for those powers of a higher world which lie at the foundation of the whole new life—a life which has *πίστις* for its root. Hence the expression *πάντα ὅσα* is only limited by faith, and not by the objects of prayer, inasmuch as, according to the measure of circumstances, things great as well as small, external as well as internal, may be the object of believing supplication.

It would be difficult to tell how the closing verses of Mark (xi. 25, 26) are to be combined with the context, if the symbolical meaning of the withered fig tree be denied. It would in fact be impossible to explain how these words (which Matt. vi. 14, 15 has given in the Sermon on the Mount, at which passage fuller details may be consulted) could have been inserted here by the Evangelist, since that which goes before and that which follows hang so closely together. The best course would be to reject the verses entirely as

an interpolation. But, adopting the symbolic meaning of the fact, they acquire in a moral point of view a beautiful reference. The account of the doom of the Jews, from which the apostles saw themselves exempted, may have produced in them a state of vain self-sufficiency; as πιστεύοντες they may perchance have cherished in their hearts unholy irritation (ἐλ τι ἔχετε κατὰ τινος) against their brethren instead of lowly humiliation because of the unmerited grace bestowed upon them. For this reason does the Redeemer exhort them, above all things, to cherish mild and humble feeling as the condition of their *continuance* in grace, and in believing prayer. Thus, as we are not for a moment to imagine that Israel is wholly cast away (Rom. xi.) so far are the apostles from being ensured against falling, and to make them fully aware of this insecurity is the object of our Lord in these words.

§ 5. CONVERSATIONS OF THE LORD WITH THE PHARISEES.

(Matt. xxi. 23; xxii. 14. Mark xi. 27; xii. 12.  
Luke xx. 1—19.)

In this section there follows an account of the interviews which the Redeemer had with the hostile sacerdotal orders. Their hatred towards the person of the Saviour, and their concern on account of the number of adherents that he found among the people, had risen to the highest degree. Fear alone restrained them from laying violent hands upon him (Mark xi. 18; Luke xix. 47, 48), and they therefore sought to catch him by craft. But the spirit of truth and wisdom enabled him to put all their malice to shame. In the report of these occurrences given by Matthew, which is very full and minute, two paragraphs are to be distinguished; for in Matt. xxii. 15, ff, the Pharisees, as well as the Sadducees, are represented as making a second attempt. The accurate harmony of all three Evangelists in these statements is, undoubtedly, a very important argument for the correctness of the description. Everything seems to have transpired in the order in which the history runs; the only difference being that Matthew relates more particulars than the others, as he inserts two parables (xxi. 28—32; xxii. 1—14) not found in either of them; while, on the other hand, Luke is the

briefest, it being very seldom (e. g. xx. 35, 36) that he makes any additions peculiar to himself, and in one instance he leaves an event (Matt. xxii. 34—40) altogether unnoticed. Even the verbal agreement of the synoptical writers, in these ensuing sections, is often so great, that we are here tempted to suppose one and the same account as lying at the foundation of all the three. But, compared with John, the other Evangelists, here taken together, appear external. That spiritual disciple is the only one who permits us, in these latter seasons of the Lord's earthly life, to look into the quiet circle of his followers, and into the loving heart which now disclosed itself to his own without restraint. It may have been too difficult to comprehend the external and the internal parts of the Saviour's life in one representation, especially in the last deeply agitated circumstances; for this reason each was given separately, but, on that very account, certainly stamped with so much the more genuineness and truth.

Ver. 23—27. The abode of the Redeemer, in the last days before his sufferings, was divided between Bethany—where he endeavoured to ripen the germs of the higher life which he had scattered in the circle of his own—and the Temple. Here in the Father's house, as the appropriate place for the labours of the Son (Luke ii. 49), he went about and distributed his blessings, as he had done before. (Mark xi. 27, ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ περιπατοῦντος αὐτοῦ. Luke xx. 1, διδάσκοντος αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ καὶ εὐαγγελιζομένου.) But to the priests, who hardened their hearts, the works of Jesus became the means of condemnation. (John ix. 39, εἰς κρίμα ἐγὼ εἰς τὸν κόσμον τοῦτον ἦλθον, ἵνα οἱ βλέποντες τυφλοὶ γένωνται.) For, instead of yielding to the Spirit of truth, who spoke through him, they banded together to destroy the Witness by whom the truth was declared. At length, one of the prevailing party of the priests came up to him, and asked for the authority (ἐξουσία) by which he worked. Although the individuals from whom this question came are described as members of the highest tribunal (οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς, οἱ γραμματεῖς, καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι, compare the remarks on Matt. xxvi. 3), yet no *distinct* intimation is given that these men came, not in their personal capacity, but as a deputation of the college. Hence we cannot regard this occurrence as altogether parallel with that which is related respecting the Baptist (John i. 19), to whom priests came, who were officially deputed to interro-

gate him in reference to his prophetic office. At the same time, it is not impossible that the persons who questioned the Lord upon this occasion were expressly delegated by the Sanhedrim, and, if that were the case, it does not appear how this query, as such, can have involved anything false. Indeed, according to the Mosaic law itself, directions were given for the testing of prophets, amongst whom, in the wider sense, the Messiah was to be reckoned, as the Prophet of all prophets (Deut. xviii. 18); according to this provision, it was open for every member of the Israelitish people to try the prophet, upon his appearance, by the standard of God's word; how much more was the same thing permitted to that body in which, according to the Mosaic constitution, the political and spiritual jurisdiction was concentrated! (Comp. Deut. xiii. 1, ff.; xviii. 20, ff.; Ezek. xiii. 1, ff.) Thus the reply of Jesus appears somewhat strange, especially if we regard the interrogators as an officially-appointed deputation from the Sanhedrim, or government. For it seems that, if every one (or the Sanhedrim on behalf of all) possessed the right to obtain information as to the *ἐξουσία* of the prophet, the Redeemer ought to have answered their inquiry, and not to have perplexed them by putting another question in opposition to it. But this difficulty is removed by the remarks which follow. According to the Mosaic regulations, neither the people, nor a college, nor an individual, were placed *above* the rank of the prophet; on the contrary, the prophets themselves were to be the organs of the Divine Spirit, and therefore from them the decisive influence was to proceed. At the same time, however, the prophet certainly was to be, as it were, controlled by the mass of the people, and by every individual as a member of the mass, in order to guard against abuses of the gift of prophecy. The passages already adduced show that two cases were possible in which the prophet was not to be obeyed, and these were liable to a severe punishment. (Comp. J. D. Michaelis, Mos. Recht B. 5, s. 181, ff.) The cases were the following: either if the prophet himself traced his *ἐξουσία* to another god (for example, to Baal) as the true one; or if, although he appealed to Jehovah, he could not prove his authority by miracle and prophecy. According to the wise appointment of God, no prophet could rise without such evidence to shew that his commission was genuine. Men, in their state of sinfulness, needed not only the communication of the truth, but also a *testimony* to

the truth communicated, *which could not be mistaken*;—and both of these were furnished by the prophets.<sup>1</sup> Thus no other means of testing the prophet was afforded but to question him respecting the proof of his authority. Hence the Sanhedrists sent to John the Baptist (John i. 19), and John explained to them that he was the forerunner of the Messiah, of whose presence amongst the people he prophesied. John himself also sent to Christ in a time of doubt (Matt. xi. 1, ff.), and so also now the Pharisees make their inquiry, so far as the form is concerned, in proper order. The words *ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ* referred to the question, whether the commission of the interrogated prophet to teach was derived from the true God or from a false one; the other sentence, *τίς σοι ἔδωκε τὴν ἐξουσίαν*, conveyed the query, whether the prophet himself, to whom it was put, professed to have received his appointment immediately from God, or through any medium,—as, for example, the disciples who went about proclaimed the approach of the kingdom of God in the name of Jesus. But, with all this outward regularity, the *spirit* of the question proposed by the Pharisees was as impure as its *form* was faultless. They asked it, not from necessity and inward uncertainty respecting the vocation of Christ, for themselves and for the people, but from malice. They had felt the power of the truth that proceeded from him in their hearts; they had seen enough of miracles wrought by him, and they knew that his commission was proved;<sup>2</sup> in spite of this, they represented themselves as uncertain, and sought to involve Jesus in perplexity. But, it may be asked, what harm could his question do? Had he replied, *ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ Θεοῦ*, it would not, indeed, have injured him in relation to the people, who were inclined towards him (Matt. xxi. 46), and just as little could the priests have derived anything from such an answer, by which to condemn him. Doubtless, however, the Pharisees wished to induce him to declare himself the *υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ*.<sup>3</sup> This

1 On this account the Lord said: "If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not. But if I do, believe my works." (John x. 37, 38.) At the same time, these words are not to be taken without the others—"He that is of God heareth God's word" (John viii. 47); for only the *ἔργα* and the *ἀλήθεια*, in connexion, have the power of proof. (Comp. the observations on Matt. iv. 12.)

2 Comp. John iii. 2, the language of the *ἀρχων* Nicodemus: *οὐδεὶς δύναται ταῦτα τὰ σημεῖα ποιεῖν, ἃ σὺ ποιεῖς, ἐὰν μὴ ᾧ ὁ Θεὸς μετ' αὐτοῦ*. Here the acknowledgment of the truth, in a well-disposed member of the Sanhedrim, is expressed.

3 As, according to John viii. 17, Christ adduces two witnesses for himself, himself and

was regarded by the Jews of that day—who did not rightly understand the word of God in the Old Testament—as blasphemy against God; and for the purpose of being able to accuse him of this, they fixed upon an apparently legal question, to which they thought an answer might be expected such as they desired. On account of this hypocritical state of mind, the Redeemer justly rejected the question,<sup>1</sup> and instead of it, proposed another to them, which, on the one hand, was adapted to awaken in themselves the consciousness of sin, where that was possible—and on the other, must also have directed the attention of the people to the insincerity of their leaders. The Lord asked them respecting the office of John. (The peculiar office of John may be regarded as concentrated in his *βάπτισμα*, that being the form of his ministry.) They had interrogated this messenger of God concerning his office by a formal deputation; he had answered them and given them a *σημεῖον* (*τῆς*), by which they might test the true divinity of his commission—that the Messiah was amongst them. (John i. 26.) Now, instead of allowing themselves, in accordance with this evidence, to be baptized by John, and earnestly seeking the Messiah pointed out by him, these false shepherds delivered John over to his fate and left the people, whom they ought to have instructed concerning the visitation of God, in perplexity. This hypocritical insincerity the Lord exposes. Thus his counter-question is not to be viewed merely as a rebuff to theirs, but as conveying a positive censure of the Pharisees. They might answer as they would—their duplicity came to light; for even the *οὐκ ᾔδαμεν* was a falsehood, since, after the official dispatch of the deputation, they knew perfectly well who he was. Hence he again severely rebukes them for their dissimulation, ver. 32, because they refused the *μετάνοια* and *πίστις* which John and the Redeemer preached to them, lest they should damage their theocratic sway.

Ver. 28—32. The following parable carries in itself its reference to the connexion (ver. 31, 32), and therefore plainly conveys its

the Father. The following is to be regarded as the difference between Christ and the prophets:—they acted in the power of God, as filled (at times) by his Spirit; but the Lord acted and wrought in his own name, because he is the permanent revelation of God himself. Thus the Redeemer himself (in the parable Matt. xxi. 33, ff.) represents his relation to them as that of *υἱός* to the *δοῦλοι*.

<sup>1</sup> Hengstenberg (Christol. B. iii. s. 484) truly observes, that in this counter-question the answer to theirs lay concealed; for the Pharisees very well knew what witness John had given of Jesus. (Comp. the remarks on John i. 10, ff.)

own interpretation. For the purpose of pointing out to the Pharisees, in the most striking manner, their insincerity in their trials of the prophets, and to show them that they sought only such as were like themselves, but by no means true messengers of the holy God, he instances their behaviour to the Baptist as the professed representative of the *δικαιοσύνη* of the Old Covenant, in contrast with the conduct of the *ἄδικοι* (respecting the antithesis, compare the remarks on Luke xv. 1, ff.), and indicates their different relation to the *βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ* (as a circle of life already spiritually existing and manifesting itself in operation.) The Lord compares the two classes (just as in Luke xv. 1, ff.) to two sons, whom the father sends into his vineyard. (Comp. the exposition of Matt. xx. 1.) The open *ἀδικία* of the one is soon changed into genuine *μετάνοια* and true inward *δικαιοσύνη* springing from thence; the seeming external *δικαιοσύνη* of the other soon discloses itself as open *ἀδικία*. The call to labour in the vineyard of God was addressed to both parties (figuratively represented by the two sons), not only by means of conscience, but also through the revelation of the law, in the fulfilment of which the Pharisees (so far as respects the external part of it) coincided. The voice of John was intended as an alarm to *μετάνοια* for both; but one party alone availed themselves of it; the other disregarded it in their *ἀπιστία*. Hence the character of the *τελῶναι* and *πόρναι* is not to be modified; on the contrary, these are named as the representatives of all forms of common worldliness and gross sin. Those who were legally strict scorned the others as the *ἄδικοι*, and regarded themselves as the natural possessors of the *βασιλεία*, from which they thought sinners were excluded. This view of their relation to the kingdom of God is combated by the Redeemer, in the words before us. Pride in personal righteousness brings with it an icy coldness and unsusceptibility, more difficult to be won to the kingdom of love, than a mind which, through open sin, is led to the humble consciousness of its misery. The description given of the Baptist (*ἦλθεν ἐν ὁδῷ δικαιοσύνης* scil. *πορευόμενος*), indicates the affinity between the form of his religious life and that in which the Pharisees moved; by which means the guilt of their unbelief is rendered strikingly conspicuous. So little were they earnest and rigorous with their legal *δικαιοσύνη*, that they not only failed to perceive the peculiar new form of life in Christ, and were unable to appropriate it to



themselves, but the austere John made the matter too serious for them. (Comp. the remarks on Matt. xi. 18.)

The expression, *προάγουσιν ὑμᾶς* (ver. 31), is by no means to be understood as absolutely denying the possibility of Pharisees and Scribes entering the kingdom of God; for in ver. 32, the words *ὑμεῖς δὲ ἰδόντες κ. τ. λ.* contain an intimation of the possibility of passing into a different state, although indeed it was to be lamented that such a change had not really taken place. (Comp. the similar representation in the parable, Luke xv. 31, 32. There is no essential difference between the term *μεταμελίσθαι*, employed here, and *μετανοεῖν*; only, the latter expression is the more profound, since it points to the *νοῦς* and the previous change occurring there.) As regards the criticism of this passage, ver. 29, 30 are, in several codices (and amongst others in B.), arranged differently, so that it is said of the first son, *ἐγὼ κύριε, καὶ οὐκ ἀπήλθεν*, and of the other, *οὐ θέλω, ὅστερον δὲ μεταμεληθεὶς ἀπήλθεν*. This change of order is incompatible with the parable, because, if the first had promised to go, there would have been no reason for sending the other. What has led to the alteration, it is indeed difficult to say. Either it is a mere error of the transcribers, or it has arisen from the relation of the two sons to the Jews and Gentiles, according to which it appeared that the one who represented the Jews should stand first, because they were first called into the kingdom of God. Now the immediate reference of this comparison is not evident, but a relation analogous to that which subsisted between the Pharisees and the custom-house officers, might be observed between the Jews and the Gentiles; on which account we find ideas occurring (comp. Rom. x. 20, 21), in regard to the Jews and Gentiles, quite correspondent with those expressed as descriptive of the two parties here. Hence in the subsequent parable (Matt. xxi. 41—43), the Lord passes on to the antithesis which was so obvious. (The parable is true also in respect to *δίκαιοι* and *ἄδικοι* generally, in all times and under all circumstances. Comp. the observations on Luke v. 31.)

The following parable of the vineyard (Matt. xxi. 33—46) also belongs to this connexion, as is shown by the harmony of all the three accounts in the *position* of the comparison, as well as in its form. The main difference is, that Mark furnishes rather more details (xii. 5, 6) in the parabolical narrative itself; whilst he is briefer in the application, where Matthew and Mark are more copious. One

discrepancy alone is to be observed in the details given, viz., that according to Matthew and Mark, this parable was directed to the Pharisees, as also the subsequent one (Matt. xxii. 1, ff.) ; whereas, according to Luke xx. 9, it is addressed to the people. On this very account also, Luke (ver. 16) has an expression which cannot be referred to the Pharisees, but is appropriate only to the position of the people. Meanwhile, since Luke observes, at the conclusion (ver. 19), that the Pharisees well understood the parable and were in consequence enraged, the difference between the narrators consists only in this : that, whilst the parables were spoken in the presence of both parties—the people and the Pharisees—Matthew and Mark exhibit more prominently their reference to the latter, while Luke marks chiefly their reference to the former. However, it was intended that both references should be involved, and thus each account served as the complement of the other. The correctness of the position in which the parable that we are about to consider occurs, is still further supported by the connexion with what precedes. It immediately follows the foregoing comparison, but it cuts far more deeply and keenly. The disobedient persons—who, according to the former parallel, hypocritically acceded to the command of the Lord that bade them go and labour—here appear as the murderers of those who went in sincere obedience. As the representatives of the whole people, they are called the *γεωργοί* of the Divine vineyard ; and now their inquiry after the *ἐξουσία* of the prophets (Matt. xxi. 23)—in which they seemed to express a concern for the cause of God—appears in the most flagrant contrast with the fact that *they* are the very murderers of the prophets, nay even of the Son of God himself, and the treacherous robbers of his kingdom. Hence, their dissimulation and lust of power are in this parable exposed, and the atrocious results are unveiled. According to the parabolic description, they were inevitably compelled to pronounce their own condemnation and leave the vineyard to be given to *others*. From verse 42 onwards, the Redeemer himself explains the meaning of the parable, and refers them to the prophecies of the Old Testament. The consequence is, that the rejecters of the prophets are proved to be most unfit and in the highest degree censurable examiners ; for the very thing they reject is that which God has chosen.

Respecting the interpretation of the parable as a whole, there can-

not be any essential difference of opinion ; the relation of the δούλοι and of the υἱὸς to the οἰκοδεσπότης, his ἀμπελών and the γεωργοί, cannot be mistaken. But how far the single features may be applicable, is in this case, as in that of parables generally, a difficult question. Here no boundary line can be drawn throughout with certainty ; for the keenness of the mind of the expositor, in discerning remote relations, depends upon the degree of his inward development in the spiritual life. At the same time reverence for the word of the Lord naturally leads us to take the greatest possible care that we avail ourselves of the individual features of the parable ; for the perfection of the comparison depends upon the copiousness of the references included in it. The parable of the vineyard has an Old Testament basis in the comparison, Isaiah v. 1, ff, on which the Lord has founded a further expansion.

Ver. 33. In the first description Christ strictly follows Isaiah, and thus at once awakens in his hearers the consciousness that he does not aim to put forward anything apart from the sacred ground of the Old Testament, but rather connects himself with it in the closest manner ; this very circumstance, however, rebukes his adversaries. The relation of the οἰκοδεσπότης—the Founder and Lord of the vineyard—to the υἱὸς (ver. 37), clearly shows that the former means God. (Gesenius, in his remarks on Isaiah v. 1, appears to understand the יְדִיד, who possesses the בְּרִים, as signifying Israel ; but according to ver. 7, the בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל is the vineyard, and hence יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת is the possessor. Now the first and second יְדִיד cannot be referred to different objects ; they both relate to God as יְדִיד. The prophet, therefore, speaks of God as his friend, and sings the lamentation over the unfruitful vineyard.) But what does the ἀμπελών designate ? It is natural, in the first place, to suppose the Jews (Isaiah v. 7) ; the Pharisees and Scribes being the γεωργοί. But, ver. 43, the vineyard is given to another ἔθνος ; and if this be regarded as meaning the Gentiles, an incongruity seems to arise—for it surely cannot be said that Israel was transferred to the Gentiles (as γεωργοί.) Meanwhile this difficulty vanishes, if we understand by the ἀμπελών the βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ ; for inasmuch as this was at the first connected with Israel, the vineyard certainly includes Israel ; although this connexion was not a necessary one, as was shown by what took place afterwards. At a

subsequent period the kingdom of God was extended to the Gentiles, and the ἀμπελών then consisted of believers among Jews and Gentiles. However, the ἀμπελών certainly is viewed as distinct from the γεωργοί; the former signifies the mass to be guided and instructed, the latter are the guides and teachers. The charge of the spiritual instruction and training of the people, under the Old Testament, was in the hands of the Pharisees and Scribes, so that the strict reference of γεωργοί is to these. The description of the arrangement of the vineyard may, as a whole, only be intended to express the idea of care and pains bestowed by God in founding his kingdom amongst men; at the same time the φραγμόν περιτιθέναι has, in addition, a reference to the Mosaic law (called Ephes. ii. 14, μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ), of such a special kind that it cannot be regarded as merely incidental.

(Δηνός = דְּבִי, wine-press. Mark has ὑπολήνιον, which means the trough that stands under the wine-press, and catches the wine as it is pressed out. Where the ground was rocky, it was usual to excavate an opening for this purpose in the rock. The word πύργος = מִגְדָּל, signifies a watch-house, which belonged to the complete embellishment of an oriental garden.)

The activity of the Lord which was manifested (ἐφύτευσε) is plainly distinguished from his withdrawment (ἀπεδήμησεν.) Luke represents it as long continued (χρόνους ἱκανούς.) This antithesis is obviously intended to denote the different relation of God to the people of Israel in different periods of their history. The time when the law was given from Sinai, when the Lord of the world visibly manifested himself to the people, and made known his sacred commands by Moses, was that in which the whole was founded and arranged. From that time he did not again visit his people in a similar manner; he awaited the development of germs deposited among them under the instruction of the priests, to whom that duty was intrusted.

Ver. 34—36. Still the Lord did visit his people, even during this withdrawment, by means of his *messengers*. The δούλοι (the prophets) appear as in immediate proximity to the Lord, and only sent for special purposes to the γεωργοί. According to this parable it seems that the purpose was to seek for fruits. (Mark and Luke indicate by their expressions, παρά, ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν, that the vineyard was to be regarded as let for a part of the produce.) It is

by no means to be supposed that by these fruits are meant certain *ἔργα*, or a state of integrity and rectitude ; on the contrary the reference is to *μετάνοια*, and the inward desire after that true, spiritual *δικαιοσύνη*, which the law could not produce. This, however, does not for a moment imply that the law did not tend to rectitude ; it pruned away the gross excrescences of sin, and exposed its internal abomination. Hence *δικαιοσύνη κατὰ νόμον* might pass, under the Old Testament, as *καρπός*. But it was necessary that this, in order to be satisfactory, should be based upon the need of redemption (Rom. iii. 20.) Accordingly here the *δοῦλοι* appear as those who seek after spiritual want, in order that they may follow it up with the promise of the coming Saviour. But these messengers of grace were persecuted and killed by the unfaithful *γεωργοί*, who had employed their commission for wicked purposes (comp. Heb. xi.) In this part of the parable the accounts of the Evangelists are harmonious in everything essential ; the only points of difference being as follows. Matthew leaves us to suppose that several of the *δοῦλοι* came at once, whilst, according to Mark and Luke, one is sent after another ; two different forms of representation, each of which has its truth. And further, Mark and Luke conduct the idea of the persecution of God's messengers through a formal gradation, whereas Matthew treats it in a more simple manner. In Mark, first the *ἀπέστειλαν κενόν* is mentioned, then the *ἀπέστειλαν ἡτιμωμένον*, and lastly *ἀπέκτειναν*. Luke, however, does not go beyond the *τραυματίζειν*. (The word *κεφαλαιόω* signifies literally to divide into sections = *ἀνακεφαλαιόω* ; then, to strike on the head, to wound the head. Not = *κεφαλίζω*, to decapitate, as Passow says in his Lexicon.)

Ver. 37, 38. Up to this point the comparison had reference to the past ; now it relates to the future, and gains a prophetic signification. The *δοῦλοι* are contrasted with the *υἱός*, whom the Lord of the vineyard sent last (*ἔσχατον*, Mark xii. 6), but at whose appearing the sin of the *γεωργοί* manifested itself in its most heinous form. From lust of power they murdered the Son also, that they might appropriate the possession. Here the Lord tells them what the Pharisees previously wished to ascertain, that he was the only-begotten Son of the Father, the true heir of the kingdom of God. This, however, he communicated in such a manner that they could

not pervert his declaration to their wicked designs, but were compelled by it to pronounce their own condemnation.

(The designation of the Son as the only [ἐνα υἱὸν ἔχων = *μονογενής*] and the beloved [ἀγαπητός = *אָהֵב*] are intended to strengthen the contrast between him and the δούλοι, and have reference to the peculiar relation of Christ as the Son of God to the Father. To Christ as such the κληρονομία belongs, as *אֲרָמְכָא* in the highest sense. This heavenly kingdom, indeed, never can be taken from the Son of God; but the impure representatives of the Mosaic theocracy, whose impurity of motive blinded their minds, imagined that they could secure the stability of their external kingdom, the design of which was to prepare the way for the heavenly kingdom about to be founded on the earth; and hence they killed the Saviour, whose spirituality was in direct opposition to their worldliness. Concerning ἐντρέπεσθαι, comp. the remarks on Luke xviii. 2.)

Ver. 39. All the three Evangelists uniformly state that the Son was put to death, *ἔξω τοῦ ἀμπελώνος*. Here it is very natural to suppose a parallel with the Redeemer, of whom the Scripture says that he was led forth without the gate (comp. John xix. 17; Heb. xiii. 12, 13.) It is true the metaphor does not appear perfectly consistent, because the ἀμπελὼν does not mean Jerusalem, but the whole theocratic constitution. However, Zion was a type of the theocracy, and the idea represented by the act of leading out of the gate (as in the Pentateuch expulsion from the camp) is no other than that of exclusion from the people of God and from his blessings. Hence we may regard this feature also of the comparison as containing a prophetic intimation.

Ver. 40, 41. The case is precisely similar in reference to the *advent* of the Lord of the vineyard, which is mentioned only by Matthew. The reference of the expression to the appearing of Christ seems unsuitable, because it is not the Son whom Matthew represents as returning, but the Father, who (according to ver. 33) is Lord of the vineyard. But the hidden Father, who in himself is beyond perception, always reveals himself in the Son; as he made himself known in the pillars of cloud and fire on Sinai, in the eternal Word, so he manifests himself at the end of the days in the glorified Redeemer. Thus the reference, in the com-

ing of the Lord of the vineyard, to the return of Christ is perfectly admissible; only, there is an omission of one particular point, viz., that the Lord will manifest himself to his adversaries in the Son. If, however, the word *ὅταν ἔλθῃ ὁ κύριος* be regarded as relating to the destruction of Jerusalem, the case remains the same; since this judgment upon Israel is a type of the *παρουσία* of the Son (comp. the remarks on Matt. xxiv. 1.) With the punishment of the old *γεωργοί* will then be associated the selection of others, who promise to perform the purposes of the owner. (The phrase, *κακοὺς κακῶς ἀπολέσαι*, is a mode of expression not uncommon with the profane writers. Comp. the passages in Wetstein.) According to Luke xx. 16, the people (to whom, in ver. 9, it is stated that the parable was addressed) understood the feature which represented that the vineyard would be given to other gardeners, very well; and expressed, in a simple and natural manner, the wish that such a judgment upon Israel might be averted. (The *μὴ γένοιτο* corresponds with the Hebrew *לֹא-יִהְיֶה*.) The Pharisees, however (Matt. xxi. 41), answered quite in harmony with the spirit of the parable. Since it cannot be supposed that the meaning of the comparison escaped them, this coincidence only shows their craftiness, which led them to affect ingenuousness where they could not offer contradiction. The form of the conversation, as Matthew gives it, is quite in accordance with this view; for here the Redeemer openly declares that which, with feigned simplicity, they pretended not to have understood. Mark and Luke give the sequel in an abbreviated shape, only presenting the reference to the same passage of the Old Testament, in a question; whereas Matthew adds the explanation of the parable.

Ver. 42, 43. The passage to which the Redeemer refers, is from Ps. cxviii. 22, 23. Matthew and Mark here exactly follow the LXX. Luke does not give the quotation so perfectly. We have already seen (Matt. xxi. 9) that the Jews applied this Psalm to the Messiah. (Comp. de Wette, on Ps. cxviii., who also finds in the use of strophes from this Psalm, at the entrance of Jesus, an intimation that it was interpreted as Messianic in the time of Christ.) Here the Saviour confirms this view, since he applies words from this Psalm to himself. The Psalm strictly describes a victorious king, who, in the power of Jehovah, triumphs over all his enemies. (It is difficult to define the particular king referred to, but the

Psalm cannot, in any case, belong to the time of the Maccabees [as de Wette thinks probable], because the collection of the Psalms certainly was finished at an earlier period.) But in this victory of the pious ruler, allusion is made to the most sublime conquest of the loftiest of all Princes. Reference is had to the same verses of this Psalm, also Acts iv. 11; Ephes. ii. 20; 1 Pet. ii. 6. The contents of the passage here quoted stand in close connexion with the parallel which the Lord had just drawn. With merely a change of the metaphor (comp. the remarks on Matt. xvi. 18), the *οικοδομοῦντες* answer to the *γεωργοί*, the *λίθος* to the servants and the Son, the *ἀποδοκιμάζειν* to the *ἀποκτείνειν*. There is but one point of difference, viz., the simile of the Psalmist expressly adds to the *ἀποδοκιμάζειν* the fact that that which the builders rejected is *chosen*; an idea of which the previous comparison only gave a slight hint, in the judgment inflicted by the Father. (*Κεφαλὴ γωνίας* corresponds with the Hebrew *פֶּנֶה שֹׂנֵי*, corner-stone, the support of the whole building.) In the concluding words of the verse, this election of that which was refused by men, is ascribed to the Lord, and extolled as worthy of wonder. The life of David, as a type of the Messiah, was in consistency with this thought. (The feminine forms *αὕτη*, *θαυμαστή*, are to be explained according to the Hebrew, where the neuter is given by means of the feminine. The word *αὕτη* is equal to *זֹאת*, and the following *θαυμαστή* is formed after *αὕτη*. In the version of the Seventy, this peculiarity frequently occurs; for example, (1 Sam. iv. 7; Ps. xxvii. 4.) Matthew here adds a reference to the parable, which indicates its interpretation. (The words *διὰ τοῦτο* seem to stand only in a slight connexion with what precedes; they serve to unite with that the idea [which, although not expressed, is necessarily involved in the parallel], that the *οικοδομοῦντες* who rejected the costly stone, were themselves rejected.) The *ἀμπελών* now plainly appears as the *βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ*, which is thus recognised as already existing—in its germ—in the Old Testament. The duties and cares associated with the awakening and quickening of the heavenly life in mankind, which, up to the time of Christ, had been devolved upon the Jews, should now be committed to an *ἔθνος* yielding true fruits. The singular here indicates that we are not to understand, by this term, the Gentiles strictly (*ἔθνη* = *גוֹיִם*); although at the same time they are not to be regarded as excluded. This *ἔθνος* is the community of



believers, consisting in part of Jews, but principally of Gentiles. To these the βασιλεία was henceforth to be intrusted, and thus they would take the place of the corporeal Israel. The words, *δοθήσεται ἔθνει ποιοῦντι τοὺς καρποὺς αὐτῆς*, thus understood, have their exact and literal signification. What could not be said of any one Gentile nation—that it would certainly bring forth the true fruits—was perfectly consistent in reference to community of believers, whose nature it is to produce the genuine fruits of faith.

Ver. 44. The words of this verse appear only to have been received into the text of Matthew from that of Luke. For, even although the number of the critical authorities who omit the verse in Matthew is not very great, yet it is so utterly unsuitable in the connexion that it is probable the few authorities have preserved the correct reading. If the words in Matthew be genuine, they ought at least to be placed before ver. 43; but how such a change in the position of the verses can have arisen in the manuscripts, it is impossible to show.

As to the meaning of this verse; it expresses the punishment of the perverse οἰκοδομοῦντες. The metaphor of the λίθος is retained in allusion to the passage already cited (from Ps. cxviii.), and this stone is described as bringing destruction. This description is supported by passages, such as Isaiah viii. 14, 15, Dan. ii. 45. In the first part of the verse, the stone appears as occasioning the fall, and the destruction thence resulting, through the act of him who falls (similarly Luke ii. 34); in the second part, inversely, the stone is represented as destroying by its own movement.

(Under the figure of a piece of rock which—without being touched—loosens itself and hurls itself down, shattering everything it encounters, Daniel [loc. cit.] describes the destroying power of the kingdom of God and its representative, the Messiah, put forth against the world of evil.—*Συνθλάω*, to smash, to dash to atoms.—*Δικμάω* literally to purify the corn from λικμός, then to separate, to divide, to sever generally. This is the only place in the New Testament where the two expressions occur.)

Ver. 45, 46. This threatening rebuke the Pharisees, of course, well understood; but as they would not yield to it in true conversion, it excited their bitterest anger. Still, so long as the people adhered to Christ and regarded him as a Prophet, they could not venture upon any violence (comp. Luke xix. 47, 48; Mark xi. 18.)

Chap. xxii. 1. The narratives of Mark and Luke here conclude the conversation of the Redeemer with the Pharisees, and immediately commence the accounts of the new visit which they made, in order to catch the Lord in his words. Matthew, on the contrary, adds another parable; and this again is expressly understood as addressed to the Pharisees (*πάλιν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς.*) The parable of the banquet is, in part, very harmonious with the connexion; for the murder of the *δοῦλοι* is evidently related to Matt. xxi. 35, and the calling of the *πονηροί* (ver. 10), as plainly has reference to the *τελῶναι* and *πόρνοι* (ver. 31.) On the other hand, however, another part of the parable is not applicable to the Pharisees, namely, that which speaks of the one guest who did not wear a wedding garment; and besides this, as the form of the conclusion (ver. 45, 46) appears to close the conversation, it may be doubted whether Matthew is correct in placing the parable here. This doubt would seem confirmed by a comparison of Luke (xiv. 16, ff.), who has inserted in his history a parable very similar to ours, and which there stands in a distinct connexion. At the same time, as we have already remarked, the parable in Luke also contains so many points of difference from that which Matthew introduces here, that we cannot suppose a mere change of form, from one to the other, by means of tradition. For, if such a conjecture were entertained, it would be necessary to regard the account of Matthew as containing the result of the transformation; but Matthew's mode of description is so peculiar, that we cannot possibly trace it to the vagueness of tradition. Moreover, since in the connexion of Matthew there is no lack of references to what has preceded, it may be the most suitable to suppose that a parable delivered by Christ, at an earlier period, is here again brought forward with somewhat free alterations. Nor are these modifications—for example, the paragraph which cannot be applied to the Pharisees—inconsistent; for the concluding part of the parable has its relation to the disciples, who must be regarded as listening to Jesus with the Pharisees (Luke xx. 9, 16.) It was most appropriate that the followers of the Lord should be reminded by this solemn admonition, of the meaning of union to him; since the rebuke addressed to the Pharisees might so easily lead them to self complacency. Then, the only remaining incongruity is that which we find in the foregoing form of conclusion (Matt. xxi. 45, 46.) It cannot be denied that this would stand better at the end

of the parable (xxii. 14); meanwhile we may suppose that there was a break in the conversation of Christ with the Pharisees, and that the parable of the marriage-feast did not come immediately after the preceding, although it was sufficiently near to render the references to that intelligible. This hypothesis would satisfactorily explain the previous conclusion.

The parable now before us, like that of the vineyard, also has its Old Testament foundation. In Zeph. i. 7, 8, Prov. ix. 1, ff., the Divine wisdom is represented as preparing a feast and inviting guests to partake it.<sup>1</sup> Similar allegories have been formed, after these passages of the Old Testament, by the Rabbins. (Compare the passages in Lightfoot and Meuschen.) According to the remarks already made, the parable of Matthew falls into two parts, which have entirely different relations; the first part is parallel with the parable of the ἀμπελών, and like this, relates to the Pharisees, (the κεκλημένοι are = the γεωργοί and the δούλοι stand in the same relation to them, as in the previous comparison, where they represent the prophets); the other, on the contrary, has reference to those who have followed the invitation, namely the μαθηταί. In the latter part, the sincerity of the Lord's love is specially conspicuous. He did not aim to establish a party, to draw adherents or to retain them; hence he exemplified even towards his own followers the full severity of the kingdom of God at the risk of their forsaking him. (Comp. John vi. 67.)

2. In the several parables addressed by the Saviour to the Pharisees, to the people who were favourable towards him, and to his disciples, the several ideas which he sought to impress on their hearts, became more and more distinctly marked. According to the parable of the vineyard (Matt. xxi. 37,) Christ was designated as the Son of the Lord of the vineyard; here he is expressly called the Son of a King, to whom, as such, royal dignity and power belong. That which Luke (xiv. 16) stated in general terms, ἄνθρωπος τις ἐποίησε δεῖπνον μέγα, is here more strictly defined. The person who gave the entertainment was βασιλεύς, the entertainment was a marriage feast. This last expression is very full of

<sup>1</sup> In the first passage we find something kindred to Matt. xxii. 12, where one of the guests is spoken of as οὐκ ἐνδεδυμένος ἐνδυμα γάμου. The strange garment is called, Zeph. i. 8, מַלְבִּישׁ נָכְרִי.

meaning. The accession of the Prince to his throne is frequently described as a marriage with his people; and the whole appearance of Jesus in humanity may be viewed as a similar installation into his kingdom, of which the entrance of Christ into Jerusalem was only the outward representation. According to the *usus loquendi* of Scripture, the accession of Christ to the throne of the kingdom of God is the visit of the bridegroom to the bride. (Compare the observations on Matt. ix. 15; John iii. 29.) This mutual penetration of the two metaphors is to be retained here; for those who are invited are, in one sense, the subjects of the person who invites, while in another sense, they ought to constitute the bride of the bridegroom. Hence their disobedience to the command of the king is viewed in another light also, as inconstancy to the true object of love; or love of the world instead of love to God.

Ver. 3—6. Accordingly it is in perfect keeping with the other features of the comparison, that the *γάμοι* of the Son, while they are a time for the highest joy (to those who follow the *κλήσις*), are also the very occasion of judgment. The invitation involves the challenge to discard all other love and to be united, in obedient affection, with the true Lord alone. The *δούλοι*, in their distinction from the parties invited, signify (as in the foregoing parable) the prophets, who, as members of the nation, are themselves invited, but stand in such close connexion with the Lord, that they are regarded as belonging to him. So far, however, as others are distinguished from the *κεκλημένοι* (ver. 9), the reference is not to all men, but to the *κλητοί* (ver. 14, where the expression is repeated in a literal form). These *κλητοί* may be, in different senses, on the one hand the Pharisees, in opposition to the *τελῶναι* and *πόρνοι* (Matt. xxi. 31,) and on the other, the Jews in opposition to the Gentiles. In the present instance, according to the nearest connexion, the former sense prevails. The description of the disobedience manifested by the individuals invited is very much stronger in Matthew than in the parallel passage of Luke, where the parable is told in milder antitheses. Here again the mission of the *δούλοι* takes place at intervals, and with a gradual advance in the designation of the sin committed by the disobedient, (as above, Mark xii. 4,) until it is intimated that the general call (addressed by means of the connexion with nation and class) is, by the appointment of God, brought home specially to every individual. (The oriental

custom of frequent invitation to great feasts, furnished an appropriate figure in which to convey these sentiments.) The words *οὐκ ἤθελον* (ver. 4) are followed by the expression, *ἀμελήσαντες ἀπήλθον* (ver. 5), and finally we have the statement, *ὑβρίσαν καὶ ἀπέκτειναν*. The first expression conveys only the disinclination of the will, the second implies a slighting disregard of the divine call, the last denotes actual resistance. "*Ἀριστον* here stands, in the wider sense, for meal generally, = *δείπνον*. It has been adopted in this signification by the Rabbins. (Comp. Buxtorf. lex. s. v. *יִרְמְיָהוּ*.) The expression *σιτιστά* = *σιτευτά*, means fatted beasts in general, except oxen, which are mentioned as the ornaments of a splendid entertainment. The prepared supper is a metaphor, denoting the spiritual preparation of mankind for the reception of the Redeemer.

Ver. 7. Whilst Luke (xiv. 24) only adds the threatening that those who had been invited should not taste the supper, Matthew describes the punishment of the disobedient (who represent the Pharisees especially) in the most fearful terms. (Similarly as in the foregoing comparison, Luke xviii. 20.) The king, upon seeing his favour abused, appears as the Ruler who severely punishes the violation of his will; the persons who were invited stand in the relation of subjects, and are therefore treated as rebels.

Vers. 8—10. The rejection of those who were first invited to the prepared feast, is followed (as Luke xiv. 21) by the invitation of others; a circumstance in which we find a parallel with the transference of the vineyard to other husbandmen (Matt. xxi. 41.) Matthew, indeed, merely mentions the dispatch of the servants; but, according to his account also, the effect is the same as in the other case, viz., the filling up of the places. This supply of the vacancies, occasioned through the absence of the discarded guests, by others who were not in the first instance appointed to those positions, is the same idea as Paul illustrates (Rom. xi.), where he represents the cast-off Jews as severed branches of the olive tree, into whose places others (the *πλήρωμα τῶν ἔθνων*) were grafted. Matthew speaks more expressively than Luke in reference to the persons who were called. The former designates them *πονηροὶ καὶ ἀγαθοί*. (Comp. Matt. xiii. 47.) The latter describes them only as *πτωχοί*, not as in part *πονηροί*. This term points to the sequel, in which the wickedness of some among the called is exhibited. (This is the only instance in which the expression *διέξοδοι τῶν*

ὁδῶν occurs in the New Testament. Διέξοδος literally signifies a passage; in connexion with ὁδοί it probably means the intersection of one street by another; thus *compitum*, where men are accustomed to congregate.)

Ver. 11—13. This second part of the parable, as we have already observed (on ver. 1), does not admit any reference to the Pharisees. It could not possibly be said of them that they participated in the marriage; they were the very men who did not obey the call. The design of the Redeemer, in these words, was to give his disciples (who, as such, may be regarded as called, instead of the persons first invited) an exhortation to earnestness.

As regards the simile, it is evident that allusion is made to the eastern custom observed at feasts, of distributing costly garments. According to this usage, the want of the garment required at the feast was *criminal*, even in the case of the poorest individual, since he must have rejected the one offered him, and self-complacently deemed his own good enough. Now if we analyse the metaphor, we find that the garment (as an external decoration) signifies the internal adornment of the soul, which we may denominate by one expression, the *δικαιοσύνη*. (Isaiah lxi. 10 has the same figure בְּגָדֵי צֶדֶק. Comp. Rev. xix. 8. The use of the word ἐνδύσασθαι in the New Testament, with *χριστόν, νέον ἄνθρωπον, ἀγάπην*, Rom. xiii. 14, Gal. iii. 27, Col. iii. 10, 12, ff., Ephes. iv. 24, has reference to the same comparison.) Hence this inward righteousness is not represented as anything acquired or self-produced, but as something given, imparted, the non-appropriation of which (resulting from inward self-complacency and vanity, as if self were sufficient) is the ground of rebuke. Where this righteousness is wanting, there the necessary consequence is removal from the φῶς of the βασιλεία into the σκότος. (Concerning the words, σκότος ἐξώτερον κ. τ. λ., compare the remarks on Matt. viii. 12.) Nor does the κλήσις by any means appear as *gratia irresistibilis*, but as laying claim to the free spontaneous choice. Even in the case of those who follow the call, sin may remain in the depth of the life, unless the man wholly yields in humble obedience, and, with the invitation, receives also the ornament of righteousness offered by the free grace of God. In adopting this interpretation one difficulty only is encountered; namely, how this parable is to be reconciled with that of the ten virgins (Matt. xxv. 1, ff.) According to the latter, it appears that

not only no one without the wedding-garment—without the inward array of the divine righteousness—but no one remaining without the necessary oil of the Spirit can come into the kingdom of God ; whilst, according to that which is now before us, the *πονηρός* (ver. 10) is admitted into the kingdom of God. It would, indeed, be the shortest method to say that these features are not to be pressed ; but they stand in such intimate connexion with the whole matter of the parable, that if such points are to be put aside as incidental, the entire representation becomes vague. If, however, we only distinguish the varied relations in which the kingdom of God is presented, this difference between the descriptions gains its meaning. In the passage, Matt. xxv. 1, ff., the *βασιλεία τ. Θ.* is treated of in reference to its complete manifestation at the Parousia of the Lord ; this involves the idea of the *κρίσις* for the kingdom of God, by means of which all impurities are separated from it. In our parable, on the contrary, the subject of discourse is the coming of the kingdom of God among men, as it was introduced by the first appearance of the Lord on earth ; in this sense we may apply the parable of the net, in which good and bad fish are included (Matt. xiii. 47, f.) Thus, the fact of being in the external kingdom of God, does not by any means in itself furnish either the right or the certainty of belonging to his internal kingdom. As there was a Judas amongst the disciples, and a Ham in the ark, so in all places and times, while the kingdom of God is in the course of its secret development in the *αἶων οὗτος*, a *πονηρός* appears in the various circles of believers that are formed from time to time. Whether the Redeemer, in this parabolic representation, thought particularly of Judas, it is hard to affirm, although it cannot be positively denied.

Ver. 14. According to Matt. xxii. 14, the Redeemer concludes this parable also (compare the remarks on Matt. xx. 16) with the saying, *πολλοὶ εἰσι κλητοὶ, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί*, which here requires a closer consideration. As to the meaning of *κλητός*, the foregoing comparison shows plainly enough that the term is identical with *κεκλημένοι* (ver. 3.) All, therefore, who are reached by the invitation issued through the prophets to enter the kingdom of God, are included therein. Whether they obey the call (*κλησις ἀγία*, 2 Tim. i. 9) or not, is not implied in the word *κλητός* ; on the contrary the parable of the marriage feast sufficiently proves

that there are persons called who do not obey the call. At the same time the term *κλητοί* is in some instances applied, especially by the Apostle Paul, strictly to those who have followed the call and entered the church of God (Rom. i. 6, 7, viii. 28; 1 Cor. i. 24; Jude ver. 1.) Paul also employs the word *κλητός* in reference to the calling of an individual to a special work in the kingdom of God; for example, Rom. i. 1; 1 Cor. i. 1, *κλητὸς ἀπόστολος*; but this signification needs no further remark here.) In many passages of Scripture (Luke xviii. 7; Matt. xxiv. 22, ff.; Rom. viii. 33; Col. iii. 12; Tit. i. 1; 1 Pet. i. 1, ii. 9) *ἐκλεκτός* stands quite parallel with *κλητός*, as a general designation of the members of the church in opposition to the world. The expression is, in this sense, synonymous with *ἅγιοι*, which also in itself only conveys the fact of separation from a multitude. In the special sense, however, it is applied to angels (1 Tim. v. 21), to Christ (Luke xxiii. 35), and to individual members of the church. In these instances it appears to have a narrower meaning than *κλητός*, because, while all *ἐκλεκτοί* are necessarily *κλητοί*, all *κλητοί* are not *ἐκλεκτοί*. This signification occurs, not only in the saying now before us, but in Rev. xvii. 14, and probably Rom. xvi. 13. It might be thought that the peculiarity of the *ἐκλεκτοί* is a richer endowment with gifts, and hence the appointment to a greater work. In that case, in the parable of the servants (Matt. xxv. 14, ff.), for example, those to whom more talents were given than to the other, would be *ἐκλεκτοί*; or, according to the parable before us we might understand this term as designating those who sincerely avail themselves of the *κλησίς*, in opposition to those who either despise or neglect it; or else, while apparently receiving it, do not properly apply it. But the words *πολλοί εἰσι κλητοί* seem to imply that there are others who are *not* called (the Evangelist does not use the expression *οἱ πολλοί*, which might be taken as bearing much the same signification with *πάντες*, comp. Rom. v. 15 with xviii. 19); while, at the same time, the fact of not being called is only to be viewed as a relative circumstance (comp. the remarks on Matt. xx. 28) since the Scripture knows nothing of any positive decree excluding individual men from the kingdom of God, but on the contrary plainly teaches the universality of God's grace (1 John ii. 2; 2 Pet. iii. 9.) It is true, indeed, that the calling of one people takes place *at an*



*earlier period* than that of the other ; and, among the same people one individual is called *before* another,<sup>1</sup> so that thus far, those who are called may be distinguished from those who are not called (but are to be called.) Hence the vocation, as such, admits of no *merit*, it is a gift of the free grace of God ; while, on the other hand, *guilt* is involved in its rejection. The guilt of the many is intimated in the second part of the apothegm, *οἱ πολλοὶ δὲ ἐκλεκτοί*. It does indeed appear that, since the use of the *κλησίαι* is here pointed out as the peculiarity of the *ἐκλεκτοί*, the term is not appropriate ; it seems as though the more correct expression would be *πιστοί*, in order to mark the spontaneousness of man. But the improvement of the *κλησίαι* is also traced to an *ἐκλογή*, for the purpose of showing that sincerity itself is only an effect of grace, since the activity on the part of man can only operate negatively, and always requires a positive power (namely, the divine) to supply its deficiency. The apophthegm *itself* naturally partakes of the variable applicability of its *parts* ; and hence we must explain the circumstance that here it has reference to the unfaithfulness of those who did not embrace the *κλησίαι* in a measure addressed to them ; whilst in Matt. xx. 16, it was applied to those different relations to the kingdom of God, the distribution of which depends upon God's free grace.

§ 6. NEW CONVERSATIONS OF JESUS WITH THE PHARISEES AND  
SADDUCEES.

(Matt. xxii. 15--46 ; Mark xii. 13--37 ; Luke xx. 20--44.)

All the three Evangelists agree in the statement that the Pharisees, soon after the first interview, made a fresh attempt to embarrass the Redeemer by difficult questions, so as to compromise him in the eyes of the people, and thus draw away the regard which they entertained for him. Here the accounts are in such exact harmony with each other (the only point of difference being that Luke omits the parallel to Matt. xxii. 34, ff. ; comp. the remarks on Matt. xxi. 23), as to leave no doubt that the reports were given in chronological order ; especially as the internal character of the conversa-

<sup>1</sup> This difference in the calls was represented in the parable, Matt. xx. 1, ff.

tions is quite suited to the last days before the sufferings of the Lord. The increasing malignity of the Pharisees led them to make use of the most difficult cases, that they might put Jesus to the proof, and, if possible, entangle him in his words. The love of Christ, which rose in contrast with such daring sin to its highest pitch, is manifested by the following discourses in its gentle form of compassion, sympathizing with blindness, and labouring to remove it, not less than in its holy ardour.

Ver. 15, 16. We have here a positive statement of that which was at least not definitely expressed at the commencement of the first interview between Jesus and the Pharisees (Matt. xxi. 23)—that the persons who interrogated Christ were expressly delegated by the Sanhedrim for that purpose. The Pharisaic party, who ruled the Sanhedrim by their influence, made the formal resolution to entrap Christ, through their deputies, by means of artful questions. (*Παγιδεύω* = *ἀγρεύω*, as if to catch in a net.) In order, however, to conceal their plan, they sent some of their pupils (Matt. xxii. 16), taking care to select those who knew how to present the appearance of a character deserving respect, as if they came from inward want to ask the opinion of the Saviour in a difficult case, in which they desired to know what was right. (Luke xx. 20 describes them as *ὑποκρινόμενοι ἑαυτοῖς δικαίους εἶναι*, and Jesus subsequently, on the same account, calls them *ὑποκριταί*. An *ἐγκάθετος* is a way-layer, lying in ambush [comp. Job xix. 12.] Sirach viii. 14, the phrase occurs, *ἐγκαθίζειν ὡς ἐνεδρον τῷ στόματί τινος*, which is quite analogous to our passage.)

It is singular that Matthew and Mark agree in stating that the Pharisees had united with the Herodians. These adherents of the Herodian family generally, and of Herod Antipas in particular (Mark iii. 6), who, moreover, may have been the immediate attendants of the Tetrarch—for he was present in Jerusalem at the feast of Passover (Luke xxiii. 7)—were the subjects of a political bias altogether different from that which was cherished by the Pharisees. The latter were necessarily opposed to the Romans, in the whole direction of their sentiments, and desired the establishment of an independent Jewish power, because that would afford them greater certainty of exercising the influence which they assumed; and, through their efforts, the mass of the people also were, in the highest degree, prejudiced against the Roman dominion.

On the other hand, the family of Herod, and its adherents with it, had an interest in the very endurance of Roman government; for, by this means, it was protected in the possession of its power; and hence it permitted all oppressions, confidently trusting in the Roman legions, who stood in readiness to defend it against every outbreak of rebellion. It was upon the union of these two parties that their plan was laid. As Herod and Pilate became friends when it was desired to put the Holy One of God to death (Luke xxiii. 12), so also the Pharisees and the Herodians. The deputies of the two political colours were at once to supply the witnesses by whom, according as he might answer, he should be ruined. It is true, a declaration *against* the Romans would have won the attachment of the people still more closely; but the Herodians would then have had occasion to accuse him before the Pagan authorities (Luke xx. 20, τοῦ παραδοῦναι αὐτὸν τῇ ἀρχῇ καὶ τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος), which the Pharisees above all things desired. If, on the contrary, Jesus expressed himself directly *in favour* of the Romans, then the Pharisees hoped to draw away from him the sympathies of the people, and to seize him without any trouble. And now they hypocritically seek to inveigle the Redeemer by insidious language, while they praise the truth and the self-possession with which he replies. But he who knew what is in man (John ii. 25), perceived their πανουργία, as Luke says, xx. 23. (Instead of πρόσωπον λαμβάνειν = נִשְׂא פָנִים, Matthew and Mark have εἰς πρόσωπον βλέπειν, and this does not correspond with שֵׁן פָּנִים וְשֵׁן, Numb. xxiv. 1, which the LXX. correctly translate by ἀποστρέφειν τὸ πρόσωπον. It is better to compare שֵׁן פָּנִים עַל, which is generally used in the good sense, to regard any one with favour. Even this phrase, however, does not exactly answer to the language βλέπειν εἰς πρόσωπον; it would rather be necessary that the words should run: רָאָה עַל פָּנִים,—an expression which does not occur.)

Ver. 17—22. The way in which the interrogators intended that the Lord should be perplexed, is evident from what has preceded. But two questions now present themselves. *In the first place*, how did Christ view the relation of the Jewish people to the Romans and their representative, the Emperor? The inquiry ἐξέσται δοῦναι κῆνσον Καίσαρι, ἢ οὐ, plainly indicates a reference to the views of the Jewish ultra-liberals, of whom the well known Judas of

Galilee (comp. Joseph. Arch. xviii. 1, ff. and Acts v. 37) is to be regarded as the fanatic chief. This man represented the freedom to which he believed the Jewish people called, as consisting in entire exemption from external imposts and contributions to the support of worldly government, their contributions being due only to God—that is, to the Temple and its Pharisaic officials. There was not the slightest ground for the support of this fanatical opinion in Scripture; for the Jews always had paid taxes to their sovereign *in addition to* the Temple subscriptions, and Palestine had also had to bring its tribute as a province of Babylon or Syria. Moreover, the passage Deut. xvii. 15 does not in itself forbid that a stranger (אִישׁ נָכָרִי) should reign over Israel;—indeed, the prophets incessantly prophesied that the unfaithful people would be subjected to foreign rule;—the passage only prohibits the Jews from *themselves choosing* a foreigner as king, while it was quite possible that God might cause them to be brought under the dominion of other nations as a punishment. Hence it is evident that Jesus could not, by any means, coincide with the ultra party; their sedition was a horrible fruit of sin. According to the command of God, even illegitimate and unjust government must be obeyed when it is once established (Rom. xiii. 1.) At the same time, however, Jesus was no friend to the Romans (represented by the Herodians); on the one hand, they had assumed the power over Judæa by gross deeds of violence, and, on the other, their whole political constitution was unholy and directly opposed to everything divine. But the Lord saw in their dominion over Israel the judgment of God, and therefore viewed it as a scourge (like Nebuchadnezzar and his Chaldeans in days before) held in God's hand. And, although the instrument was indeed repugnant, yet the holiness of him who used it—the Lord of heaven and earth—demanded to be adored. Now, according to the prophecies, even Israel was, as a punishment, not only to be without a king (of its own), but, at one time, without sacrifice, altar, ephod, and sanctuary (Hos. iii. 4.) It is true that, if the whole people of Israel had embraced the Lord in genuine faith, then it might be supposed that (according to the Philonean mode of representation) the whole nation—through the inward power of the holy life, which would have been developed within it—would have overcome its conquerors; but the Lord, at this time, knew too certainly that the Jews were rushing to their own destruction (Luke

xix. 42, ff.), and saw in the Romans the instrument of God for the correction of this blinded people. Thus, when the interrogators of the Redeemer propounded to him their opposite opinions—as contraries between which, they thought, he would inevitably be obliged to choose—he took no part with either. He carried in himself that which was true from both, united in a higher and holier view of things, and could not be bound by an antithesis which he soared far above.

*In the second place*, it may be asked, how could the Saviour, with prudence, make known his sentiments?—especially as he did not deal in abstract thoughts respecting the political relation of peoples and states, but conveyed his instruction by means of the sight of the actual material object which represented the particular point in question. He requested the ordinary coin in which the census was taken (hence νόμισμα κήνσου, Matt. xxii. 19), namely a denarius, to be produced. (Δηνάριον, like κήνσος, was adopted from the Latin language into the Greek; the coin [see Matt. xviii. 28] was worth about three Saxon groschen.) This bore the image and name of Cæsar, and therefore its use involved the silent acknowledgment of the influence of the Emperor, and with him, of the Romans. (Comp. the passages in Lightfoot and Wetstein in loco, which lay down the principle, “He whose likeness is borne by the coin, is lord of the land.”) But this acknowledgment expressed, on the one hand, the consciousness of demerit, and, on the other, submission to the will of God; and, therefore, all this could lead to no other conclusion than that, when so much had come to pass, nothing but what existed (the payment of tribute to the Emperor) could follow. This idea, however, involved the other—that, in the first instance, they should not have appropriated the money of the Emperor (but rather have striven after a more solemn and holy object), and then there would have been no necessity (according to the law of justice) for giving the Emperor what was his.

After having directed the thoughts of the interrogators to the facts of their present position, and having thus awakened the sense of guilt and the consciousness of deserved punishment, Jesus led their minds from that which was sensuous to things eternal, and their duties respecting them. To refer the words τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ τῷ Θεῷ to the Temple-offerings (of half a shekel, Exod. xxx. 12) is a disarrangement of the point of view that belongs to the whole nar-

native. For, on the one hand, it would not appear what occasion there could be for wonder in the answer—"both must be paid, the tribute to the Romans and the subscriptions to the Temple;"<sup>1</sup> and, on the other, the Pharisees might have made a fine handle of such a reply, in order to stigmatize Jesus among the people as a deserter to Rome, since he certainly stated that the census must be paid. The word of the Lord is full of spirit and life only when it is spiritually apprehended. Jesus contrasts God, as the heavenly Sovereign—the King of all kings—with Cæsar, as the highest possessor of worldly dominion. The latter, in accordance with his character, claims nothing but what is temporal and earthly (Mammon), which he only whose heart clings around it hesitates in resigning to its origin. But God, as Spirit, requires that which is spiritual—the heart and the whole being. The inward man belongs to God (as the outward belongs to the world, and Cæsar its representative), for it bears the *εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ* indelibly impressed upon it, and that which came from God must return to him. Now, these hypocrites resorted to the Lord, to ascertain how they should act towards Cæsar; but to learn how their immortal souls might be brought to God—to reveal which was the very design of the Saviour's coming—they sought not. This striking contrast, drawn in the power of the Spirit, and spoken with the conquering glance of truth, came home with such power to their consciences, that they stood self-convicted of their own insincerity; they experienced the profound truth of the sublime sentiment uttered by the Lord; they felt that their question would have been frivolous even if it had proceeded from hearts well-disposed,<sup>2</sup> but that now it was wicked, because it came from hearts full of hypocrisy. They may have been sensible that the answer, *ἀπόδοτε τὰ Καίσαρος τῷ Καίσαρι, καὶ τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ τῷ Θεῷ*, may be said to involve the law and the prophets (Matt. xxii. 40), for we cannot conceive of any divine law, which would not belong to one part or the other, of this senti-

1 The peculiarity in the procedure of the Saviour would, in that case, have consisted, not in the sentiment expressed, but in the *exhibition of the coin*; whereas, according to Luke xx. 20, the object of marvel was the *answer*.

2 Claudius, in his ingenious remarks on the history of the tributary Penny (*Geschichte vom Zinsgroschen*, B. ii. § 141), very justly says, "The whole question generally respecting the justice or injustice of the tribute-money was very absurd, and amounted to just as much as if an adulterer should ask whether it were right to pay the legal penalty fixed against adultery." The instance of *adultery* is selected with great appropriateness, for the Jews had committed this very crime, in their unfaithfulness towards the Lord.

ment; to leave what is sinful to the world and to bring that which is eternal to God, is the whole secret of godliness. (Comp. the commentary on Rom. xiii. 7, in which passage Paul seems to have had the same thing in his eye.)

Ver. 23. According to Matt. xxii. 22, the Pharisees now withdrew, and on the same day (*ἐν ἐκείνῃ ἡμέρᾳ*, ver. 23)—but after an interval—the Sadducees came to Jesus. But, as the Pharisees are mentioned again subsequently (Matt. xxii. 34—41), the word *ἀπ᾽ ἑαυτοῦ* doubtless may relate only to those among them who had been expressly deputed; it is likely that others belonging to the general mass remained. According to Mark and Luke, the question of the Sadducees immediately follows the preceding, and hence the interval of which Matthew speaks is, probably, to be regarded as but very brief. The accounts of the three Evangelists respecting the conversation of Jesus with the Sadducees, harmonize in all essentials; the only difference being that Mark, according to his mode, gives a somewhat more extended report, although without adding any peculiar feature. Luke, on the contrary, gives the answer of Christ far more fully than either of the others, and includes some peculiar points.

As regards the relation of Jesus to the Sadducees, the Redeemer evidently acknowledges in them a certain goodness of disposition; they were far from the malignity and shamelessness of the Pharisees, but only because they had less interest in doctrinal controversies and ecclesiastical affairs. Their god was the belly, and since their wealth placed them in a position to enjoy themselves as they liked, their whole activity was concentrated upon temporal things. The debased condition into which they had sunk, while giving themselves up to the pursuit of pleasure, naturally led them to overlook everything superior, and, in regard to understanding, they were far behind the Pharisees. They denied the resurrection,<sup>1</sup> and even the reality of the spiritual world<sup>2</sup> (Acts xxiii. 8); and, (like Philo) among the Old Testament Scriptures, they attached more im-

<sup>1</sup> Mark and Luke expressly add—for the sake of those readers who might not be Jews—that the Sadducees denied the resurrection.

<sup>2</sup> How they may have explained the appearances of angels in the Pentateuch, is indeed doubtful. Neander (Kirch. Ges. Th. i. s. 55) conjectures, with reason, that they regarded these appearances merely as manifestations of God himself which were impersonal, and on that account transitory. (Compare also Dr Paulus on Luke xx. 27.)

portance to the Thorah than to the Prophets. (Joseph. Arch. xviii. 1. 4. Bell. Jud. ii. 8. 14.) Hence, while Christ declares that they have no knowledge of divine things (Matt. xxii. 29), he does not shrink from instructing them; the comparative goodness of their disposition rendered it possible that the words might find entrance to their hearts—a result far less to be anticipated in the case of the vain, high-minded Pharisees.

Ver. 24—28. The question which they propose to Christ obviously proves the shallowness of their argumentation. The tale which they relate (merely a fictitious one) probably belonged to the most striking arguments which they were accustomed to adduce against the *ἀνάστασις*, the object of their polemic attack; and for this reason it may have appeared to them worth the trouble, to try its effect with the famous Prophet of Nazareth. The whole fiction was founded upon the Mosaic law, Deut. xxv. 5, ff. concerning the so-called Levirate-marriage, which, indeed, occurs as in use before the time of Moses, Gen. xxxviii. 6. (The citation is given merely from memory, and hence each of the Evangelists quotes it differently from the other.) The design of this Mosaic regulation was simply to preserve the families (and this was the purport also of the laws respecting heiresses—comp. the remarks on the genealogical tables containing the lineage of Jesus), the number of which was connected with the inheritance in the land of Canaan. On this account, likewise, the first-born was regarded as the heir of the deceased (comp. Michaelis Mos. Recht. Th. ii. s. 194), and treated as his genuine descendant.

(The word *ἐπιγαμβρεύω*, Matt. xxii. 24, literally signifies to ally one's self by marriage, from *γαμβρός*, which denotes all relationships by marriage, as brother-in-law, son-in-law, father-in-law. This is the only place where it occurs, and it corresponds with the Hebrew *יָבֵם*, which usually means to perform an obligatory marriage. Instead of *ἀναστήσει σπέρμα*, the original text has *יָקִים עַל-שֵׁם אָחִיו* *הַמֵּת*; the LXX. also have retained the word *ὄνομα*. *Σπέρμα* corresponds with the Hebrew *זָרַח* in the ordinary signification, posterity.)

Ver. 29, 30. The Lord, in his reply, in the first place (according to Matthew and Luke) reproves the unbelief of the Sadducees, and secondly (according to the more copious account of Luke), gives the



most distinct declaration on the particular case before him. Christ describes the error of the Pharisees as ignorance of the Scriptures and the *δύναμις τοῦ Θεοῦ*. That we are not to understand the latter expression as referring to a mere *knowledge* of the divine omnipotence, which can awaken the bodies of the dead, is evident from the idea itself. Indeed, the general doctrine of the almighty power of God was not contested by the Pharisees; they only wished that the awakening of the dead should not be regarded as forming a part in the operations of the omnipotent divine energy. The knowledge of the *δύναμις* of God is not distinct from *γνώσις* generally; for we cannot conceive of one property of God without the other; all must be viewed as penetrating the divine essence. And just in like manner, the phrase *εἰδέναι τὰς γραφάς* must not be taken as importing an acquaintance with the historical sense of the Scriptures; for it is quite as incredible that the Sadducees should have mistaken this, as that they denied the omnipotence of God. On the contrary, the expression denotes an apprehension of the spiritual contents of the Scriptures; and since this presupposes Spirit—and that, divine Spirit, which no one can have without the *γνώσις τοῦ Θεοῦ*—the knowledge of Scripture is related to the knowledge of God, as the effect to the cause. *Because* they do not know God, they do not understand that which is divine in the Scriptures, knowing only what is external, and not having organs for the apprehension of anything beyond. (Respecting the *ψυχικός* [Jude ver. 10, *πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχων*], comp. 1 Cor. ii. 14, where it is said, *οὐ δέχεται τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ Θεοῦ*.)

In the next place, in regard to the question itself, the Lord unequivocally replies that the life of those who are raised from the dead will be entirely different from earthly life, and hence the difficulty suggested by his interrogators falls to the ground. Now, in this passage, we have, as the main thing, an express confirmation of the *ἀνάστασις*, which, it is to be observed, we must distinguish from the immortality of the soul. Of the latter, the Scriptures say nothing; on the contrary, God is called, *ὁ μόνος ἔχων τὴν ἀθανάσιαν* (1 Tim. vi. 16.) It is true, the doctrine of Scripture recognises an individual endurance of the *ψυχή*, but it always views the separation of the *ψυχή* from the *σῶμα* in death as something destructive, so that even in the case of believers, whose *πνεῦμα* and *ψυχή* live in the light of God, the perfection of the *σῶμα* also is

earnestly desired. (Rom. viii. 32, *ἡμεῖς ἀπεκδεχόμενοι τὴν ἀππλύ-  
τρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν.*) Hence, the unclothing of the body—  
the condition of the life of the *ψυχή* without its organ—is by no means  
an exaltation to men; according to the principle—"corporeity is  
the end of the work of God," everything seeks its corresponding  
body. The body of the resurrection is a true *σῶμα*, but that *σῶμα*  
is *πνευματικόν* (1 Cor. xv. 43, 44.) The Redeemer thus describes  
the corporeality of those who are raised from the dead; for he  
denies, in their case, the *γαμεῖν* (as regards men) and *γαμίζεσθαι*  
(= *γαμίσκεσθαι* or *ἐκγαμίσκεσθαι*, in application to women, to be  
married); whereas both these belong to the *σῶμα ψυχικόν*,  
according to its own nature. Instead of *σώματα*, the Lord men-  
tions (in Luke) *αἰὼν οὗτος* and *ἐκεῖνος* (respecting these terms,  
compare the remarks on Matt. xii. 31), as the regions of existence  
to which the *σῶμα ψυχικόν* and *πνευματικόν* respectively *belong*.  
The expression *αἰὼν ἐκεῖνος* is here equal to *βασιλεῖα τοῦ Θεοῦ*,  
and denotes the state in which the divine *πνεῦμα* rules; on  
which account also, mention is made of worthiness for this *αἰὼν*.  
Wherein this consists, and how it is attained, we are not here in-  
formed; but a general view of the doctrines contained in the Scrip-  
tures leads to the conclusion, that *πίστις* must be regarded as recep-  
tivity for *χάρις*, or the condition of worthiness; in the sight of God,  
nothing affords worthiness but that which is divine, that which  
proceeds from himself. ("Before God nothing avails, but his own  
image.") The proposition thus stated by the Lord, as conveying  
the principle which he propounds, is supported in what follows  
(Luke xx. 36) by proofs. It is true, the clause with the second  
*γάρ* (*ἰσάγγελοι γάρ εἰσι*), only contains a subordinate argument,  
since its immediate reference is to the preceding words, *ἀποθανεῖν  
οὐκέτι δύνανται*; but it has also an indirect reference to the main  
thoughts of the passage. As regards the argumentative force of  
the first clause, there can be no doubt that this lies in the idea of  
propagation, involved in the expressions *γαμεῖν* and *γαμίσκεσθαι*.  
This is appointed by God only for the period during which humanity  
is in the course of its development; with its perfection, which will  
exclude every form of *θάνατος*, propagation also will cease. It  
may justly be deduced from this train of thought, that, according to  
the meaning of Christ, the *σῶμα πνευματικόν* will be modified in  
like manner, and thus the difference of sex will not again appear in

those who are raised from the dead. This, however, can only be affirmed with respect to that which is physical ; so far as the difference of the sexes is manifested also in the psychical nature, there is no ground for the idea that it will be abolished in the resurrection ; for there is no necessity whatever to suppose such an intimate mutual operation between the physical and the psychical as would render it impossible to conceive of the one without the other. But although this passage does not express so much, it does not exclude the conjecture that in those who are raised from the dead there may be such a union of the sexes as existed before the formation of the woman (Gen. ii. 21.)

In regard to the remaining words of this important verse, it may be remarked that the clauses, *ισάγγελοι γάρ εἰσι* and *καὶ υἱοὶ εἰσι τοῦ Θεοῦ* are quite parallel, and serve as compliments to each other ; but both stand in causal relation to the last words, *τῆς ἀναστάσεως υἱοὶ ὄντες*—"Because they are children of the resurrection, they are *ισάγγελοι*."—Hence, in the expression, *υἱοὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως* (the antithesis is *בְּנֵי חַיָּת* 2 Sam. xii. 5), = *υἱοὶ τῆς ζωῆς*, the word *ἀνάστασις* is to be taken as pregnant, like John xi. 25, where Christ says, *ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ ἀνάστασις*, the absolute life which conquers death, and in whose nature those who are raised from the dead have part. On account of this participation, they are called *υἱοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ* (*בְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים*, the ordinary name of angels, comp. the remarks on Luke i. 35), and *ισάγγελοι*. (This is the only instance in which the expression occurs in the New Testament.) The angels are here evidently viewed as *πνεύματα* (*רוּחִים*), who partake the nature of God, the Parent-Spirit ; and with their spiritual nature, those who rise from the dead (clothed with the *σῶμα πνευματικόν*) are described as in kindred relationship. Although this idea may be referred immediately to the words, *οὐκέτι ἀποθανεῖν δύνανται*, so that spirituality appears as the element which imparts immortality ; yet a further reference to the more remote language, *οὔτε γαμοῦσιν κ. τ. λ.* is not excluded. The world of angels (as *κόσμος νοητός*), excludes the idea of development, and hence that of propagation, it being associated only with the *κόσμος αἰσθητός*, to which man belongs by virtue of his *σῶμα ψυχικόν* ; and accordingly the connexion might be taken simply as follows, *οὔτε γαμοῦσιν, οὔτε ἐκγαμίσκονται, ἰσάγγελοι γάρ εἰσι*.

Here, however, it would appear as if prophetic passages—for

example, Isaiah lxxv. 20, 23, in which mention is made of propagation in the *βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ*—were contradictory to the words of the Redeemer.<sup>1</sup> Indeed, it does not appear how this contradiction is to be reconciled without the supposition of a twofold resurrection (comp. the remarks on Luke xiv. 14); while, if this supposition be adopted, such passages are easily explained. In that case, those living in the *βασιλεία* must not, by any means, be regarded as *all* having risen from the dead (comp. Rev. xx. 8); and accordingly descriptions like those in Isaiah lxxv. 20, 23, must be referred only to those who have not risen (and consequently still belong, in part, to the *κόσμος*)—an argument of some importance, in proof of the hypothesis that the authors of the New Testament (and even the Lord himself) taught a twofold resurrection, is furnished by the distinction that appears in our passage between the expressions *ἀνάστασις τῶν νεκρῶν* and *ἐκ νεκρῶν*.<sup>2</sup> The origin of the phrase *ἀνάστασις ἐκ νεκρῶν* (Matt. xvii. 9; Mark ix. 9, 10, xii. 25; Luke xx. 35; Acts iv. 2; Gal. i. 1; 1 Cor. xv. 12, 20; 1 Pet. i. 3), would be inexplicable, if it were not derived from the idea, that out of the mass of the *νεκροί* some would rise *first*. It is true that most of the passages adduced relate to the person of the Redeemer, to which the expression *ἐγείρεσθαι ἐκ νεκρῶν* certainly has its peculiar application<sup>3</sup>; but in the passages, Mark xii. 25; Luke xx. 35, the words *ἀνάστασις ἐκ νεκρῶν* occur in the lips of the Lord himself, in reference to the act of the resurrection, and we are therefore compelled to allow it its force in the present case also. Nor is it anything strange that the degrees in the resurrection are in many instances not distinguished, that under the single term *ἀνάστασις* both are comprehended (Matt. xxii. 23, 28, and parallels, John xi. 24; Acts xxiii. 8), and that in *ἀνάστασις τῶν νεκρῶν* the *ἐκ νεκρῶν* is understood (Matt. xxii. 31; Acts xvii. 32, xxiii. 6; 1 Cor. xv. 12, 42, 52); for the general includes the special, and on

<sup>1</sup> It is probable that such passages of the Old Testament formed the foundation on which those Rabbins rested their notions, who dreamed of marriages among the subjects of the resurrection. But it was by no means a general Pharisaic opinion, that propagation would take place among those who rise from the dead; men of spiritual bias taught the contrary, according to Scripture.

<sup>2</sup> The phrase *ἀνάστασις ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν* never occurs. On the contrary, 1 Cor. xv. 12, 13, 21, we have *ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν*.

<sup>3</sup> There is only one passage (Rom. i. 4), in which the expression *ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν* is applied to the person of Jesus; but in this instance it requires a special consideration drawn from the connexion.

the same principle, the prophets of the Old Testament associated the first and second advents of Christ.

Ver. 31. 32. At the conclusion of the conversation, the Saviour, after having described, as far as the matter under inquiry was concerned, the nature of those who participate in the resurrection, adduces a further argument for the doctrine of the resurrection, from the Scriptures. The prophets would have furnished the Lord with far more decided proofs of this doctrine (comp. Isaiah xxvi. 19; Ezek. xxxvii. 1, ff.; Dan. xii. 2, ff.); but since the Sadducees acknowledged only the Pentateuch, Jesus confined himself to that. (The passage quoted is Exod. iii. 6, [15.] It is only cited as far as the sense goes; it does not exactly agree either with the LXX. or with the original text.) In the Pentateuch the horizon certainly appears limited to this life, and *express* references to the state after death are altogether wanting. But from this circumstance we can form no conclusion as to the individual opinions of Moses, and the most cultivated men of the nation; it merely indicates the view which was within the capacity of the *mass* of the people. In their state of spiritual infancy, it was necessary, in treating of reward as well as of punishment, to point them to earthly circumstances; for they were incapable of contemplating any others as real. And although there are intimations of a life after death, in the Pentateuch,<sup>1</sup> from which we may, with certainty, deduce the existence of the idea of continuance after death among the enlightened men of the Mosaic age; yet, the life after death, in the realm of the shades, appears a joyless thing, and hence the view taken of it in the Pentateuch is altogether different from the descriptions of the New Testament (John xi. 25, 26; Phil. i. 23.) This very disparity, however, perfectly proves the truth of the representations of Scripture in relation to the degrees of human development, differing from those according to which certain parts were composed. In a state of childhood the very predominance of the sensuous over the spiritual is the truth; and in like manner, until the appearance of Him who is himself the life and the resurrection—until the reception of his life and light—the very doctrine that the life after death is joyless and gloomy, is the truth. Hence, if Moses, and the other authors of

<sup>1</sup> See the account of Enoch (Gen. v. 24) and the formulæ *אֶל אֲבוֹתָיו* or *נִאֲסָה אֶל עַמּוּן* which by no means denote merely burial, but signify, to be gathered together in *Sheol* (comp. Gesenius in his *Lexicon*), of which mention is made, Gen. xxxvii. 35; xlii. 38; xliv. 29; Numb. xvi. 30.

the Old Testament, had described the life of the *ψυχή* when divested of the *σῶμα*—like Paul describes it—as a state to be earnestly desired, their representation would not have been true. The New Testament description of the state after death is only true in relation to believers, whose *ψυχή* is illumined by the *πνεῦμα* of Christ, and prepared to be received into his presence. Even in the case of believers, however, the condition without *σῶμα* is still only a state of transition (although relatively happy); they wait for the *ἀπολύτρωσις τοῦ σώματος* (Rom. viii. 23; 2 Cor. v. 4.) It may therefore be said that not merely the *doctrine* of the state after death, but the *state itself*, is viewed as progressive; for even if the *endurance of the substance* of the soul is the same in all the steps of development, yet the *degree of consciousness* in that endurance is modified according to the degree of consciousness in general, that has been attained; and as in the individual, so it is in the mass.

It appears strange that the Lord founds the proof of the *ἀνάστασις*, which he draws from the Pentateuch, on the passage, Exod. iii. 6. That in doing this, he merely followed a Pharisaic custom of arguing from this passage for the resurrection,<sup>1</sup> or that he wished not so much to argue as to dazzle by a splendid thought which he brought the language of Scripture to support, it would be difficult for a Christian consciousness to admit. Undoubtedly the Redeemer recognised in the words of Moses<sup>2</sup> an internal, doctrinal meaning; on which account (according to Matthew and Mark) God is spoken of as the source of the idea. This quotation is not for a moment to be regarded as a mere formula, selected because Moses had introduced God as speaking in the first person; but as an assertion of the divinity of the writings of Moses himself. For the supposition that Moses would have represented God as speaking, if he had not spoken, must be rejected as something utterly untenable; and hence it is certain that the Lord cannot have appealed to anything of that kind. Indeed such a mode of using the divine name would be quite as contrary to the command, "Thou shalt not take

<sup>1</sup> Whether Rabbins of an earlier period employed Exod. iii. 6 in the same manner as Jesus does here, is uncertain. The way in which Rabbi Manasse applies it, in his work on the resurrection from the dead, permits the conjecture that he knew the Christian interpretation. (Comp. Schöttgen on the passage.)

<sup>2</sup> The manner in which Luke (xx. 37) quotes the words of the Lord, refers the citation decidedly to Moses; and this, at any rate, renders it necessary to regard Moses as the author of the substance of the Pentateuch.—The form *ἐπὶ τῆς βάτου* is to be taken, both in Mark and in Luke, as meaning—"in the section where the appearance of God in the bush is the subject of discourse."

the name of the Lord thy God in vain," as to the precept respecting prophets (Deut. xviii. 20.)

If, then, it be the intention of Christ to acknowledge this passage as containing the word of God—that from which he argues in support of divine truths necessarily being so, (for that which is divine can only be proved by what is divine)—the question is, what meaning the Redeemer finds in the words quoted. Now, here all depends upon the signification of the name: God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. If it denoted nothing else than the idea of protection, goodwill, then it would not appear why we should not find in the Scripture the names: God of Adam, of Moses, of David, or other holy men—which is not the case. Similarly in the New Testament the name: God of Jesus Christ,<sup>1</sup> occurs (Rom. xv. 6; Ephes. i. 3); but not: the God of Peter, of Paul—we might even say—the God of Luther or of Calvin. This *usus loquendi*, which is not accidental, indicates a more profound idea, lying at the foundation of the name, and applied by the Lord in the instance before us. The God of Abraham and the God of Jesus is the one true God of heaven and earth; but, as far as the chief forms of his manifestation are concerned, has revealed himself to men in these individuals in different modes. Abraham is regarded, in this name, (and similarly in the expression *κόλπος Ἀβραάμ*, Luke xvi. 22), as the father and representative of the whole pre-Christian life; Jesus Christ as the father and representative of the collective Christian world, which has received his life into itself. Hence the formula *Θεὸς Ἀβραάμ, Θεὸς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* relates to the peculiar position of Abraham and Christ towards humanity as a whole; according to which, both are the progenitors of the people of God—the former of the corporeal, the latter of the spiritual Israel.—The addition of the name, "God of Isaac and God of Jacob," as it appears to me, was designed to indicate that the genuine character of the Abrahamitic life was transmitted only through Isaac (not through Ishmael) and through Jacob (not through Esau); both, therefore, are to be viewed as one with the ancestor Abraham. The name: God of Noah, might be applied in a similar manner, but that Noah must be considered the representative not so much of sanctified humanity, as of a general mass, holy and unholy. His son Shem, however, certainly wears

<sup>1</sup> In order to point out the specific relation of Christ to God, it is added, the God and Father of Jesus Christ.

the character which marks the representative of holy men, and accordingly, *in one instance* (Gen. ix. 26), the name אֱלֹהֵי שָׁם occurs in reference to him ; and on account of the similarity of the positions occupied by Abraham and Shem, this expression is to be taken as identical in meaning with the designation אֱלֹהֵי אַבְרָהָם. From *such* a signification of the name, the Lord could well draw his conclusion. The relation of God to Abraham had not passed away, but was permanent ; on this account God continuously designated himself, in the one form of his manifestation, by the name, God of Abraham ; and for the same reason, the name required the continued existence of him, with whom the peculiar relation, whence it proceeded, was formed.

Accordingly the expression Θεὸς νεκρῶν, ζώντων (without an article), is not to be referred to the *mass* of the dead or of the living, but to the Patriarchs who are mentioned, and should be rendered, "God is not a God of dead persons—since he still calls himself the God of Abraham, after Abraham's death—but of those who are living." Then the idea added by Luke (xx. 38) is strikingly appropriate, πάντες γὰρ αὐτῷ ζῶσιν. For after the relation of God to the saints has been pointed out—as it is expressed in the name—attention is directed, inversely, to *their* relation to God. As God is *their* God (Heb. xi. 16)—having, as it were, given himself to them for a holy possession—so they give themselves again to him as an entire offering. Thus the mutual operation of love is here viewed as the peculiar circumstance of the eternal life. God is in them and they are in God ; and in this union they have the ἀθανασία of Him who alone essentially possesses it (1 Tim. vi. 16.) Hence it is clear that πάντες does not relate to the mass of men (for although all live *through* God, all do not live *to* God, or as in the sight of God), but only to the spiritual seed of Abraham. In these verses there seems to be a play upon the words νεκροί and ζῶντες—the former comprehending not merely those who are corporeally dead, but those who are spiritually dead, and as such separated from God ; while the living include those who are spiritually alive, and, in consequence, live continuously. It is true, it will then appear to follow that those who are spiritually dead are dead in themselves ; <sup>12</sup>

1 That is, *altogether* dead, without any element of life. ΤΑ.

2 The case is similar in the passage, John xi. 26, where the words, ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ, καὶ ἀποθάνῃ, ζήσεται, involve the antithesis ; he that believes not in me, is in the power of θάνατος.



whereas even the wicked will rise again (John v. 29.) Nor is this conclusion, in fact, unscriptural; for the *ἀνάστασις* of the wicked itself is only a part of the *θάνατος δεύτερος* (Rev. xx. 6, xxi. 8) The scriptural ideas of *θάνατος* and *ζωή* are exceedingly profound and spiritual; and on this characteristic the peculiarity of their use is founded, (comp. the remarks on John i. 3.) Death has no reference to the annihilation of the substance, which can never take place; consequently the death of the soul does not involve the cessation of its existence; on the contrary, it denotes only the state of the creature in separation from the fountain of life, the Parent Being. The union of the soul with the absolute Life alone secures its true *ζωή*, the consummation of which is the *ζωοποίησις τοῦ σώματος*. It is only when the words which the Lord addressed to the Sadducees are viewed as resulting from this train of thought, that they are apprehended in their full signification. (On this subject, compare my Festprogramm: antiquiss. eccl. patrum de immortalitate animæ sententiæ. Regiom. 1827, printed in the opusc. theol. Berol. 1833.)

Ver. 33. The sublime thoughts expressed in the words of the Lord were received not only by the more susceptible mass of the people, but (according to Luke) even by some of the better disposed Pharisees. They exclaimed *καλῶς εἶπας*, because they saw that Jesus agreed with their views in opposition to the Sadducees, and so finely supported them. As Luke here concludes his narrative of the attempts of the Jews to entrap Jesus, he already introduces the phrase, *αὐκέτι δὲ ἐτόλμων ἐπερωπᾶν αὐτὸν οὐδέν*, which Mark (xii. 34) and Matthew (xxii. 46) do not employ till afterwards.

Ver. 34, 35. The following account of a Pharisee, who asked Jesus respecting the greatest commandment, is omitted by Luke, but given by Mark with a minuteness which alone serves to place the whole circumstance in its true light. The very brief statements of Matthew would make it appear that the interrogator had evil designs in his interview with the Redeemer,—which, according to Mark, was by no means the case, for Jesus manifested an affection for him, and praised him (Mark xii. 34.) But to conclude, from this difference between the accounts, that the Evangelists refer to two entirely distinct facts, is not at all feasible; for, in the first place, if that hypothesis were correct, two very similar events must have occurred *at the same period*; and, secondly, the discrepancy

between the two narratives is only apparent, and occasioned by the brevity of Matthew. If the words *πειράζων αὐτόν* (Matt. xxii. 35) are only taken as expressive of a well-meaning *inquiry* after the opinion of Jesus, rather than in a malevolent sense, the difference between the accounts is easily solved. Nor is there any more necessity to adopt the view that this interrogator must have belonged to the sect of the Sadducees or the Karaites, because he manifested so little enmity towards Jesus, and publicly applauded him. For, as to the Karaites, it is not only indemonstrable, but in the highest degree improbable, that they existed in the time of Christ. And, as regards the Sadducees, it certainly is true that the comprehensive name *νομικός*, like *γραμματεὺς*, may signify a Sadducee; but in Mark the expression *προσελθὼν εἰς τῶν γραμματέων* so closely follows the preceding statement in Luke xx. 39, and the words *ἀκούσας αὐτῶν συζητούντων, εἰδὼς ὅτι καλῶς αὐτοῖς ἀπεκρίθη* so obviously point out the author of the question as one of those who had heard the immediately preceding conversation, that, according to Mark, we can only regard him as a Pharisee; for it cannot be supposed that any but the Pharisees would have praised the answer of Jesus respecting the resurrection of the dead, as agreeing with their own opinions. In Matthew, indeed, this close connection does not occur; but, instead of this, he expressly mentions the Pharisees, and speaks of the interrogator as one of that party. (The expression *εἰς ἐξ αὐτῶν* can only refer to the *Φαρισαῖοι συναχθέντες*.) Now, since it is natural to suppose that among the Pharisees there were minds of a nobler and more susceptible kind than others, and the words of Jesus may have produced a powerful impression, there is no reason why this individual should not be regarded as a member of the Pharisaic sect. In reference to his person, the more minute statements of Mark are certainly to be taken as correct, and hence it must be admitted that he was a hearer of the previous conversation of Jesus. Nor does the account of Matthew contain anything directly contradictory to this. The language, *ἀκούσαντες ὅτι ἐφίμωσε* (from *φίμος*, the curb, or muzzle; figuratively, to make dumb, to put to silence) *τοὺς Σαδδουκαίους*, may refer to the immediate hearing of the victorious discourse of Jesus; and the words *συνήχθησαν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό* do not necessarily express a change of time and place. This phraseology may be understood as relating to the separate conference of the Pharisees in the presence of Jesus, whom

we must regard as surrounded by crowds of people of all descriptions.<sup>1</sup> This, no doubt, was engaged in by the mass of the Pharisees—as might naturally be expected—in a very unholy and inimical spirit; but nevertheless there may have been, amongst them, a single individual who remained accessible to nobler sentiments. Respecting the expression, *συνάγεσθαι ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό*, comp. Schleusner in his Lexicon to the LXX. [vol. i. p. 501.] Like *ἵνα*, it refers not only to place, but also to oneness of motive. Comp. the version of the LXX. Ps. ii. 2.)

Ver. 36. The question which the Pharisee proposed to Jesus was founded in the distinction made by this sect between great and small commands (comp. the remarks on Matt. v. 19.) There may have been special circumstances which rendered it desirable to the Pharisee to ascertain the opinion of Jesus as to the most important part of the law; but it is also probable that he was actuated by a personal sense of the importance of the inquiry, as the fine observation inserted by Mark (xii. 33, 34), from the lips of the Scribe, seems to indicate. At all events the question contained nothing insidious, for the Pharisees, who exhibited the most open diversity of opinion, called so many different commands the greatest (for example, circumcision, observance of the Sabbath, and the like), that the mention of this or that command could in no way have exposed Jesus to injury.

With regard to the *form* of the query, it may be observed that the word *μεγάλη*, in Matthew, is certainly to be taken as superlative; *one ἐντολή* (the form under which the *νόμος*, for a particular case, is represented) is viewed in contrast with the others (as the minor ones.) The Redeemer, in his reply, unites *μεγάλη* and *πρώτη* (Matt. xxii. 38); although Mark has the latter alone (xii. 29.) In this expression there is a play upon the two significations—of pre-eminence, and priority in the order of the commands. In the question, the term *πρώτη* may, at first, mean only *pre-eminent*; but Jesus speaks of the *first* command as that which is pre-eminent, and thus the words are founded upon the idea, “that command which, according to the arrangement of God, is placed *first in order*, is also the *most eminent in importance*.” (In Mark *πρώτη*

<sup>1</sup> In like manner we must take the words, Matt. xxii. 41, *συνηγμένον δὲ τῶν Φαρισαίων*, which do not suppose any local removal of Jesus, but a gathering together in his presence.

is followed by the addition of πάντων,—a reading certainly preferable to πασῶν, which plainly betrays itself as a correction. Πάντων is best taken as a neuter, which serves to strengthen πρώτη.)

Ver. 37, 38. Jesus, in his reply, directs the mind from the variety of individual commands to the unity of the *principle*, the possession of which involves the fulfilment of them all. He cites the words Deut. vi. 5, in which the acknowledgment of the one true God, and the duty of loving him, are expressed. Mark has quoted the passage more fully, and even inserted the confession of the unity of God in the discourse. If these first words of the Old Testament command do not necessarily belong to the connexion of the conversation, yet they are by no means inappropriate, as they are repeated (ver. 32), according to the account of Mark, by the interrogator. The *unity* of God, which involves the fact that he is incomparable, contains the decisive reason why he is to be loved unreservedly,—because everything worthy of love is in him.

The Evangelists differ (comp. the remarks on Luke x. 27), in a peculiar manner, from the Hebraic text, and from the LXX., in the use of the synonymes καρδία, ψυχή, σύνεσις, διάνοια. It is not probable that the reading of the LXX., which translates תְּנִיחַ by δύναμις, should, by an oversight, have given rise to the term διάνοια, and that then ἰσχύς was added; because Mark (xii. 32), instead of employing the word διάνοια, uses σύνεσις, which cannot have originated in a permutation. It appears to me more likely—as I have already stated, in the remarks on Luke x. 27—that the peculiar mode in which this passage of the Old Testament is treated was derived from a free translation of Luke, and so passed into Matthew and Mark. In regard to the several expressions, the term תְּנִיחַ, according to the original text, relates to the activity of the will, to which also reference is made by ἰσχύς in Mark, while διάνοια = νοῦς denotes the reflective, and ψυχή the sensitive principle in man; so that the words express the great maxim, “Man ought to return all his faculties and endowments, which spring from God, to God in love.” The substitution of σύνεσις for διάνοια, by Mark (xii. 32), as a designation of the thinking principle, merely serves to give prominence to the understanding instead of the reason; and hence the meaning is only somewhat modified. But it is difficult to keep the ideas conveyed by the terms καρδία and ψυχή—which are collocated by Mark

as well as Matthew—properly separate from one another. Commonly, in the language of the New Testament, the *καρδία* is nothing else than the organ through which the *ψυχή* is manifested; and, so far, the two expressions are parallel. But here it is necessary to draw a distinction, or else an instance of tautology arises. Probably *καρδία* may here be understood predominantly as the principle that desires, and *ψυχή* as that which feels.<sup>1</sup> And in this case *ισχύς* must be so fixed in its relation to *καρδία*, that it denotes the expression of the will. Now, when the Lord designates love to God as the greatest or first commandment, it is evident that his intention is not to place it as one amongst several others, and ascribe to it merely a signification higher in degree. On the contrary, the love of God is the command of all commands, and the whole law is only an expansion of the words *ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν Θεόν σου*. And if, in the language of the Old Testament, the love of God is *required*, under the form of a command (which appears contrary to its nature, since it is the most free vital action), the reference here (comp. the remarks on Luke vii. 48) surely is not to a pathological love, but to a purely spiritual love, which consists in the unreserved *surrender* of the whole being, and all the faculties, to their exalted object. Man, as such, carries in himself the ability for such a surrender; it is true this ability is not to be conceived of as *without* grace, but *with* it and *in* it, and the divine command, "Thou shalt love me," at once has its fulfilment where there is no resistance.<sup>2</sup> Hence, while the fact that man *does not love* is a matter of guilt, his *loving* God involves no merit—on the contrary the purer and the more intense this love becomes, it is the more entirely grace that produces it in him. At the same time, of course, love manifests itself in degrees. In the Old Testament, where the command makes its first appearance, it requires at first external obedience; in the New Testament, where it appears perfected, it involves that obedience which is internal, and the surrender of the whole nature to the Author of our being. It is only in the latter sense that *ἀγάπη* completely casts out *φόβος* (Rom. viii. 15), for it is assimilation to the object loved.

<sup>1</sup> Compare the particulars in my dissertation, de naturæ humanæ trichotomia, in the opusc. theol. pag. 135 sqq.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. the profound saying, 1 Cor. viii. 3, "If any man love God, the same is *known* of him."

Ver. 39. It is singular that the Saviour appears to connect with this one command a *second*, and yet immediately does away with the order of precedence, by saying that the latter is *like* (*ὅμοία*) the former. However, he does not by any means intend here to name another command, but only to describe love in its whole extent. The expression *ἀγαπήσεις κύριον* might easily have been misapprehended and taken as indicating that Jesus assigned the first importance to religious duties, such as prayer, sacrifice, fasting and the like; whereas he wished it to be understood that he did not mean by the required *ἀγάπη* certain external or internal *ἔργα*, but a state of mind which is the fountain of all good works. In order, therefore, to prevent such mistaken views, he adds the command to love our neighbour. As the love of God comprehends the commands of the first table, so the love of our neighbour comprehends those of the second table, but both are in reality perfectly one, since none can be conceived of without the others. The only difference is that love to God is the root, and love to our neighbour is the manifestation; whilst love to God, on the part of man, appears negative (John iv. 10), love to his neighbour appears positive. The precise definition of love to our neighbour added in the words *ὡς σεαυτὸν*, is not intended to denote its strength, so much as its purity. For he who commands us to *hate* our own life (Luke xiv. 26), could not make false self-love the model of love to neighbours; genuine self-love, according to the degree of its development, acts towards another as it does to self—it hates what is evil just as much in the neighbour as in self, and in both it loves only that which is of God.<sup>1</sup> Pure love, therefore, according to the words of Scripture, “Hate the evil and love the good” (Amos v. 15; Rom. xii. 9), contains the element of severity as well as that of tenderness. Love thus viewed is the *ἀνακεφαλαιώσις* of all commands, the one thing needful (Rom. xiii. 9.)

Ver. 40. The Redeemer (according to Matthew, who preserves

<sup>1</sup> Accordingly the expression is unsuitable when it is stated that the command to love God means, “love God *above all*.” God is thus placed in a false relation to creatures. Man ought not to love God *more* than creatures, but he ought not to love creatures (as such, in their separation from God) at all; he should love *all* in God and *God* in all. In like manner, man ought to love himself only *in* God (according to the true idea of himself), not according to his character as a creature in a state of defection from God; such love is sin and the root of all sinful actions, and for this reason its end must be death (Luke xiv. 26.)

in this verse a profound thought, which belongs to the completion of the conversation) views love in the same relation to the whole of the divine manifestations. Love involves everything that God requires on the part of man. (The word *κρεμᾶσθαι* quite corresponds with the Latin *pendere*, in the signification to be dependent, to be conditional upon anything.) As the world and man in it exist only through love, so God desires nothing but love, it is the *πλήρωμα τοῦ νόμου* (Rom. xiii. 10.) The *νόμος* and the Prophets are by no means to be understood as meaning merely the Old Testament, as if the New Testament contained something else besides love; on the contrary, the New Testament life has to do with this love in a state of purity like the divine love, and as divine love itself (although only in the germ.) Hence love appears as that which is all-sufficient, in all degrees of development in the moral life; in the highest as well as in the lowest, nothing exceeds it, for *God is love* (1 John iv. 8), and no one can love *out of* God, or *in addition to* God, but only *in* God. (Respecting the relation of love to faith, the remarks on Luke vii. 48 may be compared.) According to the concluding words in Mark, the interrogator rightly apprehended the full meaning of the language of the Lord. He confessed that Jesus had spoken the truth; there is only one God; for this reason he is incomparable, and man must yield himself to him without reserve. Of such inward sacrifice, he well knew that the external offerings, appointed in the statutes of the Old Testament, were but faint emblems. (*Ὁλοκαύτωμα* = *הֶזֶן*, a burnt-offering; *θυσία* = *זֶבַח*, signifies a bloody sacrifice [a sacrifice without blood is called *בִּנְחָה*], but this was not wholly burnt.) The Scriptures of the Old Testament might easily lead to the knowledge of this, since they often contain representations of the superiority of an inward disposition, acceptable in the sight of God, to the external religious form. (1 Sam. xv. 22; Ps. xl. 7; Hos. vi. 6.) The answer of the Pharisee proved that his mind was susceptible of truth.<sup>1</sup> The Evangelist remarks, *ὅτι νουνεκῶς ἀπε-*

<sup>1</sup> De Wette (on Luke xvi. 27—31) adduces this passage, Mark xii. 34, with Matt. v. 10, in support of the erroneous assertion, that "according to the Christianity of the synoptical Evangelists, to repent and to fulfil the law is sufficient for happiness." But the synoptical Evangelists have no other Christianity than that of the other writers of the New Testament. The circumstance that they seldom speak of the sacrificial death of Jesus (comp. the remarks on Matt. xx. 28), results from the fact that Jesus, before the completion of his work, only referred to this point in the way of hints, and left the further

κρίθη. (This is the only instance in which the expression occurs in the New Testament ; but, like the adjective form *νοννεχής*, it is frequently found in profane writers.) But *νοννεχῶς* is not to be taken as identical with *φρονίμως* (Luke xvi. 8) ; the mere wisdom of the reply could never have formed the foundation of such a judgment as is contained in the following words, *οὐ μακρὰν εἰ κ. τ. λ.* On the contrary, we must retain the reference in the word *νοννεχῶς* to the *νοῦς* (reason), which, as the power of discerning that which is divine, and super-sensual, when rightly applied, supposes the possibility of entrance into the super-sensual order of things. (The *βασιλεία* is here viewed in its spiritual character, according to which it is to be regarded as already present and accessible.) At the same time, *οὐ μακρὰν εἶναι ἀπό*, is not identical with *εἶναι ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ*. Being in the kingdom of God involves the possession of love ; but the inquiring Pharisee *knew its necessity* in order to please God, rather than *possessed the thing itself*. Still the correctness of his *knowledge*, united with the open-heartedness of his *confession*, caused the Redeemer to hope that he would yet learn to take the important step from the knowledge to the experience of the power of grace.

Ver. 41—46. After this conversation of the Pharisees with Jesus, in the whole of which the power of the wisdom that dwelt in the Saviour must have struck and impressed the minds of the hearers, they ventured no more to question him. But at the conclusion, Jesus addressed a question to them, for the purpose of exposing to them their ignorance of divine things, which they in vain sought to conceal. The occurrence immediately follows the previous circumstance, so that the *Φαρισαῖοι συνηγμένοι* are those Pharisees who were congregated together in his presence, and near the spot where he stood. (Mark adds, *ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ*, that is, in one of the porches or halls that belonged to the Temple ; in which place, all the preceding incidents may also have transpired.) In the whole account,

incaution of it to the Holy Spirit. After the resurrection there was no lack of instruction on this subject. (Comp. the observations on Luke xxiv. 25, ff. 44, ff.) But the answer of Jesus, in this passage (Mark xii. 34), does not say that the Scribe who proposed the question to him, was, in the state of his soul, prepared for happiness, but only that he was *not far* from the kingdom—that is, he was in such a state that he might be born again and so enter it. Without regeneration no one can enter the kingdom of God (John iii. 3) ; but many a man has become incapable of regeneration, through his insincerity, which has stifled all susceptibility of grace.



it is only necessary to proceed from the supposition that the Pharisaic teachers overlooked the higher nature of the Messiah (comp. John x. 30, ff.) and saw in him merely a distinguished man (*κατ' ἐκλογὴν*, chosen by God to be the Messiah on account of his virtue, as Tryphon says in Justin Martyr<sup>1</sup>), in order to avoid all difficulty. And the possibility of the Pharisees being wedded to this opinion, notwithstanding the passages of the Old Testament quoted by the Lord (and others as clear), is proved by the very blindness of which the Lord here designed to convict them. They universally explained the Psalm as Messianic (for it was on this hypothesis that the whole argument of Jesus rested, and yet the opposition of the Jews did not break out until a subsequent period; compare Hengstenberg's *Christol.* s. 140, f.), but they merely used the magnificent descriptions of triumph which it contains for their own purpose, and being dazzled by the outward splendour, lost sight of the allusion to the higher nature of the Messiah. The Redeemer confirms the Messianic interpretation of the Psalm in so decided a manner, that it would have seemed impossible for any one to attempt to prove from this very passage that Jesus denied the reference to the Messiah. But what does not man *see and fail to see*, when it serves to establish his own favourite opinions? The Redeemer not only mentions David most distinctly, as the author of the Psalm, but ascribes to him prophetic inspiration, as the influence under which he composed it. (*Πνεῦμα* = *רוח*, the principle of all higher illumination and sacred inspiration.) The citation from Ps. cx. 1, is exactly according to the LXX., and occurs again Acts ii. 34; 1 Cor. xv. 25; Heb. x. 13. Hence nothing can be more striking than this passage, as a proof that Jesus attributed the divine nature to himself;<sup>2</sup> as he contrasts himself with Abraham, John viii. 56, so here with David. In quoting the description of the Messiah as triumphing over all enemies, the Lord pronounces upon the Pharisees their condemnation, and thus far this citation

<sup>1</sup> In the work composed by Justin Martyr against the Jews, entitled *Dialogus cum Tryphone Judæo*. Tn.

<sup>2</sup> J. D. Michaelis erroneously thinks that the Lord read, in the Psalm, *לְאֱמִי* instead of *לְאֱמִי*. Sufficient proof to the contrary is furnished by the version *κυριός μου*. The argument for the divine nature of Christ lies in the words, *κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου*, which express participation in the divine government of the world (comp. the remarks on Matt. xxvi. 64.)

forms the transition to the following discourse of Christ against the Pharisees, which is addressed directly to the mass of people assembled around him, and by which the break with the ruling party is avowed as perfectly completed. The people were still devoted to the Redeemer, and heard his discourses gladly (Mark xii. 37.)

### § 7. DISCOURSES CENSURING THE PHARISEES.

(Matt. xxiii. 1—39 ; Mark xii. 38—40 ; Luke xx. 45—47.)

According to the harmony of the three narrators, whose accounts here all consist of anti-Pharisaic elements, it cannot be doubted that the Redeemer, at the conclusion of this interview with the Pharisees, turning to the people, censured that sect. But it is in the highest degree improbable that the *whole* discourse was delivered by the Lord as Matthew here gives it, specially on account of the relation between this and a kindred one in Luke (xi. 39, ff., where the remarks already made may be compared.) It would, indeed, be quite conceivable that Jesus might again utter sentiments against the Pharisees, similar to those he had before expressed ; and hence the two discourses (in Luke, and here in Matthew) might have been thus verbally delivered and precisely repeated. But *in the first place*, this appears to be opposed by the circumstance that the harmony between the two is too great to be explained merely from the repetition of kindred thoughts. In the discourse reported by Matthew, nothing is wanting that Luke has, and the language frequently agrees word for word. And, *secondly*, the discourse in Matthew wears a form which seems to proceed rather from the reflection of the writer than from its immediate delivery. It might be supposed that Matthew purposely placed it in contrast with the Sermon on the Mount, and shaped it accordingly. As the Lord in that sermon *commenced* his instruction of the people, and impressed the truth which he taught upon their hearts ; so with this he *concludes* his public ministry (for all further discourses in Matthew, as in John, are intended for the most limited circle of disciples), and in it he warns against the *appearance* of truth. In the discourse against the Pharisees, the woes (ver. 14—33), as the substance of it, to which both the introduction and the conclusion

rolate, form a counterpart to the beatitudes in the Sermon on the Mount. Whilst the latter, proceeding from the general relation of the Scribes and Pharisees to the theocracy, rebukes their principal moral defects—hypocritical softness towards himself and vain ambition (as the opposite of which, humble earnestness is recommended to the children of God)—the former, in addition to the woes, utters the final threatening. Hence in both of these great discourses, an act of the judicial work of Christ is presented; in the Sermon on the Mount the form is benedictory, in the discourse against the Pharisees it is condemnatory. Both, however, have to do, not with the world as such, but with members of the *βασιλεία* and those who *ought* to be so, and *wished to appear* so. This view also does away with the objection which might be entertained against this discourse by the men of the most mild disposition on account of its great severity. It is true that, without the Spirit of God—who on the one hand instils as pure a hatred of evil as he does love of good, and on the other imparts the ability to discern the inward state of minds—so positive a judgment pronounced upon another individual or a whole company, cannot be conceived of as without sin. (Hence the precept, “Judge not!” Matt. vii. 1, which forbids us to fix *guilt* on our neighbour, the very act that occurs here.) But in the Redeemer the spirit of love as well as truth rests without measure (John iii. 34), and in the power of this spirit he judged upon earth and judges in heaven (comp. something similar in the ministry of the apostles, recorded in the remarkable account, Acts v. 3, ff., which must be explained as resulting from the power of the divine *πνεῦμα* imparted to Peter.) Still it is singular that Jesus censures the *γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι* without exception. (Under the term *γραμματεῖς* the Sadducees are included so far as they were acquainted with the law; comp. the remarks on Luke x. 25.) Among these parties there may have been some individuals of susceptible minds, who were connected with their sect only by external relations; in regard to the Pharisees, we are assured of the fact by the examples of a Nicodemus, a Gamaliel, a Paul; on what ground were not these distinctly excepted by Christ? The most natural answer is, that the Redeemer did not intend to censure *individuals*, but the whole *bias* of the parties who governed the national life of the Jewish kingdom. This bore the character of *ὑπόκρισις*, which Jesus especially exhibits,

because, under the cover of spirituality, it pursued the things of the flesh. Carnality, when manifest as such, is less dangerous than the flesh placed in a spiritual aspect ; and therefore the Lord contends against the hypocritical more than against the vicious. Even those among the Scribes and Pharisees who were better disposed than the rest, in so far as they belonged to that school, must have received some influence from it, and *in so far* the denunciation applied even to the best among them, as Paul justly perceived after his conversion ; but so far as their better self was kept in freedom from such influence, the censure fell upon the party to which they externally belonged, and not on them.

Now, although the whole description of the ungodly character, as manifested by these dissembling theocrats, wears a national and temporal colour ; yet it is founded upon eternal ideas, which equally apply in all periods of the world. As the sin which pertains to man in all times induces many to employ solicitude about sacred things (like the Pharisees did), as a means of promoting earthly, selfish ends ; so the anti-Pharisaic discourse of the Lord is a declamation against hypocrites of all ages, whose form and appearance may vary, but whose real nature (or rather want of reality), ever remains the same.

Ver. 1. According to Matthew and Luke, Jesus addressed himself to his disciples also, and hence to the whole circle of those whose minds were inclined towards him. Mark and Luke begin with the general formula, βλέπετε (προσέχετε) ἀπὸ τῶν γραμματέων, which Matthew omits. This must be supplied from such passages as Matt. xvi. 6 (xi. 12) ; Mark viii. 15 ; Luke xii. 1 (in which warning is given against the ζύμη of the Pharisees) ; since it was not the *personality* of all the individual Pharisees and Scribes that the Lord intended to warn his hearers against in this preface, but their *character*, which, indeed, had, *in many cases*, become completely ingrown with the very person.

Ver. 2, 3. The Lord proceeds from the general relation of the Pharisees to the theocracy, and from that of the people to them. In order to obviate any misapprehension of his censure, he first states that the Pharisees have an organised political influence, and reminds his hearers that to this, inasmuch as it existed, they ought to submit. Accordingly every attempt at arbitrary self-redress was deprived of all appeal to the discourse of Christ. But, in speaking

thus, the Lord by no means affirms that this influence was properly acquired, or that it was conferred by God. For, although the office of priest belonged, by divine appointment, to the representatives of the theocratic system, yet the priests were not in themselves identical with the *γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι*. These, on the contrary, represented a sinful and false application of sacerdotal power, and it was this—not the sacerdotal power itself—that the Lord denounced. But notwithstanding that which was false in the position of the Scribes, Christ would have their actual authority acknowledged (as Rom. xiii. 1); doubtless going upon the principle that any arbitrary human alteration of a political or religious power is more baneful than that power itself, even although viewed in itself it deserves severe censure. All changes of the kind must come from above, that is, through the power of the supreme Spirit, when he has determined that what has been suffered for a time shall be abolished.

(The *καθέδρα Μωσέως* is the symbol of the collective theocratic authority, which was united in Moses, and after him was vested in the body of theocratic representatives, which had the high priest at its head. There appears to be a design in the use of the word *ἐκάθισαν*, as descriptive of what was done by the Pharisees in regard to this power. *Καθίζω* literally means to place, *καθίσεσθαι* to place one's self, that is, to sit. But in the New Testament *καθίζω* also stands intransitively [Matt. xxi. 7; Mark xi. 7; John xii. 14; Acts ii. 3, xiii. 14.] Hence *καθίζουσι* might have been used here. But the aorist better expresses the fact of *having placed* oneself, and consequently the idea of continuous sitting. [For this reason also the aorist *ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ Θεοῦ* is generally employed in reference to Christ's sitting at the right hand of God.] And, moreover, it is in the highest degree probable that the adoption of the expression *ἐκάθισαν* was intended to denote that the position of the Scribes was *chosen by themselves*.)

Upon the principle stated above, Jesus founds the precept to follow the *instruction* of the Scribes, but not their *conduct*, which itself contradicted their teaching. (In the phrase *ὅσα ἂν εἴπωσιν ὑμῖν τηρεῖν*, the word *τηρεῖν* appears spurious. Probably it was designed to render *εἴπωσιν*, which seemed too general, more definite. But there is a distinction between *τηρεῖν* and *ποιεῖν*; the former meaning that which is internal, and the latter denoting rather that

which is external. We may *τηρεῖν*, but cannot *ποιεῖν* a precept which applies simply to the inward life.) Here, however, a difficulty arises as to the way in which this command is meant to be taken. Among the statutes inculcated by the Pharisees there were many (the so-called *δευτερώσεις*, the second legislation, propagated merely by oral teaching, and at a subsequent period permanently established in the Talmud), which were not founded in the word of God under the Old Testament, but were merely human dogmas (called ver. 4, *φορτία δυσβάστακτα*); and this being the case, the question is whether the design of the Redeemer was that the people should seek to follow these dogmas, or whether his words are to be taken with the restriction, "so far as their instructions harmonize with the word of God." I cannot convince myself that the latter view is consistent with the meaning of the Lord; for in that case, the masses of the people would be placed above their superiors, as more accurately acquainted with the law; whereas the very object of the admonition was to prevent such a revolutionary disarrangement. The interpretation, that *all* the directions of the Pharisees were to be obeyed, involves no inconsistency whatever. Although the spirit from which those directions proceeded was a false one, yet the prescriptions themselves contained nothing sinful; they were merely very troublesome, because they encumbered all the relations of life with a multitude of minute regulations, and consequently restrained spontaneous movement. In the law of the Old Covenant, there was, according to the design of God, something similar, which the Scribes only drove to a false extreme. And the Lord, who taught that the ordinances of the Old Covenant were to be observed (Matt. v. 19), was supported, in requiring the same attention to Pharisaic statutes, by the fact that they were decrees of the actually existing spiritual government. Did any sincerely and earnestly try to keep this innumerable multitude of laws (which the hypocritical Pharisees, in contradiction to themselves, did not do), he incurred no guilt by the effort; but on the contrary, the more earnest his endeavour, the more quickly did he attain the full blessing of the law—namely, an insight into his own sin, and the impossibility of the fulfilment at which he aimed (Rom. iii. 20.) Moreover, he was then prepared for the kingdom of God, and after entering it in repentance and faith, might gain the higher position of inward life in the law, to which the outward was intended to conduct him.

Ver. 4. Fidelity to the law is placed in the strongest contrast with the hypocritical faithlessness of the Pharisees. Their precepts are compared to a burden (*φορτίον*, similarly *ζυγός* is used Matt. xi. 29), which they load (*ὄμος*, as the organ by which anything is borne) on the people with its whole weight, while they themselves make no exertion, even from a distance (*δακτύλῳ*) to move it. Now, here it appears as though all the requirements of the Pharisees were trifles in comparison with those of the Saviour. He himself calls (ver. 23) the *inward* duties *τὰ βαρύτερα τοῦ νόμου*, and not only desires the fulfilment of these (comp. Matt. v.), but demands also (Luke xiv. 26) that a man hate father, mother, brothers, sisters, yea even his own *ψυχὴ* for *his sake*. Christ thus claims the *whole* man, with all his power and dispositions for himself, he requires *ἀγαπήσεις με ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ καρδίᾳ σου κ. τ. λ.* (as Matt. xxii. 37, in quotation from Deut. vi. 5, was said of God); whilst the Pharisees only called for *single* actions. It has already been remarked (Luke xiv. 26), that this requirement would involve an assumption surpassing all the assumptions of all the pretenders in the world, if the Lord could not have said, in deed and in truth, "he that seeth me, seeth the Father." (John xiv. 9.) *His* claim to an entire and unreserved surrender of self to him, was the expression of the most exalted grace and mercy; for what the Lord *requires*, he *gives*, enabling man to meet his requirement, and so strengthening him by the power of love, that all his commands are not grievous. (1 John v. 3.) The commands of the Lord illustrate the great principle, *da quod jubes, et jube quod vis*; and indeed such a request can scarcely be made to him, for his command itself *is* power and eternal life (John xii. 50.) But rules laid down by men, however slight and paltry their form, are a burdensome yoke, because they never can instil the power of love into the soul.

Ver. 5—7. The Lord points out hypocritical vanity and ambition as the false but fundamental principles in the Pharisaic character, and in describing them, he purposely dwells upon the most external of all outward duties.<sup>1</sup> (The *φυλακτήρια*, means of preservation, amulets, were verses of Scripture, which, according to

<sup>1</sup> The description is quite parallel in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. vi. 1, ff.), where the true *internality* of the children of God is contrasted with the vain *externality* of the Pharisees.

misunderstood passages of the Old Testament, were written on small scraps of parchment, placed in boxes and bound on the forehead with straps (תַּפְסֵי־לֵבָיִם.) The Jews of the present day still use them. In Lundius jud. Heiligth. s. 800, there is a representation of them. The *κράσπεδα τῶν ἱματίων*, in Hebrew צִיָּצִית [Numb. xv. 38], were purple lappings attached to their garments. These were appointed by Moses himself, as a symbolical memorial of the calling of the children of Israel.) The honour of men is the idol to which they pay homage. (The *רַב* = *רַב־לֵךְ*, as a name of honour, does not occur till after the captivity. It is given to princes as well as to distinguished teachers. The Rabbins, who were eager after titles, subsequently distinguished *רַב*, *רַב־י*, and *רַב־נ*, so that the latter was the highest title of honour. Comp. Buxt. lex. p. 2172 seqq. and 2176.)

Ver. 8—10. Christ follows up this denunciation of Pharisaic vanity by exhorting all his disciples to be humble. No one amongst them should allow himself to be called by the names *ῥαββί, πατήρ, καθηγητής*. As the principle on which this direction is founded, he points out the common relation of all to God, and to God in Christ. All members of the *βασιλεία* form one family, the individuals in which are brethren under one Father and Redeemer. (Ephes. iii. 5, 6.) Every individual should have his own independent centre beyond time, in the heavenly world, but should not confine himself to a centre on earth. (Ver. 8, the reading *διδάσκαλος*, as an interpretation of *ῥαββί* [comp. John i. 39] is undoubtedly to be preferred before *καθηγητής*. *Καθηγητής* probably arose because it was thought that Jesus could not have prohibited the name *διδάσκαλος*. The term *καθηγητής*, from *καθηγέομαι*, corresponds with *ὁδηγός* in the signification of leader, guide. In the old Greek Church, the abbots and abbesses of the monasteries and convents were called *καθηγούμενος, καθηγούμενη*.—As regards the name *πατήρ* for a spiritual teacher, it occurs in the Old Testament, 2 Kings vi. 21. The idea which lies at the foundation of the term is that of spiritual birth, which is, in a certain sense, brought about by means of communication and instruction; for which reason also pupils are called *בְּנֵי, τέκνα*.) But here the question arises, how can this precept of the Redeemer be regarded in connection with the practice of the apostles and of the



later Church? It is true, the fact that Jesus is frequently called Rabbi in the gospels is quite right, according to these words, for Jesus was to be acknowledged as the only Son of God who revealed the One Father, as the true *καθηγητής*;<sup>1</sup> but the division of the members of the Church into teachers and learners prevails throughout the apostolic epistles, and at a very early period, as the want of a church constitution became perceptible, certain gradations arose between the leading persons in the churches, just as in the Old Testament, by divine appointment, the Levites were distinguished from the priests, and these again from the high priests. Indeed, such a distinction of positions seems so unavoidable in every ecclesiastical organization, that it is repeated everywhere, although under various names. Now, if there are different *positions*, it does not appear why *designations* should not be employed to mark the difference; and yet the Lord here so decidedly denies this, that the idea itself will not admit of any alteration. The simplest way of solving the difficulty is to distinguish the ideal state of the Church from that which actually exists (as Matt. v.) In the latter condition, the laws which apply to the true Church cannot fully come into use, because it still bears a legal character. This necessarily requires a constitution resting upon a certain form of subordination, as the Old Testament also shows. But in its ideal state, the Church knows nothing of the kind, not even any subtil distinction, like that which Philo made between *νόμις λόγου* and *τοῦ ὄντος*; on the contrary, it is presumed that in every member of the *βασιλεία* an immediate bond has been formed with the Eternal, and the necessity for intervention is entirely done away. Hence the words of Jesus in this place are similar, in their import, to the prophecy of Jeremiah (Jerem. xxxi. 34) where he says: "No one shall teach the other saying: Know the Lord; but *all* shall know me, both small and great."

Ver. 11, 12. The following language clearly shows that the distinctions of great and small in the *βασιλεία* were not to be abolished, since mention is made of the *μείζων*. The Lord only means to intimate—just as in Matt. xx. 26, where the same words occurred—that in the kingdom of God, according to its ideal, spiritual form, a perfectly different rule obtains in regard to great and small,

<sup>1</sup> John the Baptist is also called Rabbi (John iii. 26); but this was by his own disciples.

master and servant, from that which prevails in the world. In the latter, power and understanding decide the measure of authority ; in the former, the standard is love. This love the Lord now commends to his disciples, and, in contrast with the self-exaltation of the Pharisees, exhorts them to exemplify it in its most sublime manifestation, that of self-abasement, and voluntary subjection to weakness and want. (Comp. the remarks on the rule laid down, Luke xiv. 11.) Both the ideas in these verses are of such a kind that it is likely they would often be uttered. Especially the rule, of which there are intimations even in the Old Testament (Ezek. xxi. 26), appears to have been proverbial ; a kindred sentiment is reported as having fallen from Rabbi Hillel: *humilitas mea est elevatio mea, et elevatio mea humilitas mea*. There is, however, this difference between the rule as laid down in the New Testament and as hinted in the Old—that in the former, the abasement is far more distinctly represented as an act of self-denial, whereas in the latter, it has the appearance of an involuntary humiliation (like that of Job) induced by external circumstances.

Ver. 13, 14. Several modern critics reverse the order of these two verses, and certainly upon just grounds. (Schulz, in his edition of the N. T., follows Griesbach in this respect.) But the genuineness of ver. 14 in Matthew is also generally contested, and it is affirmed that it appears to have been adopted from Mark and Luke. The verse is indeed wanting in the manuscripts B.D.L., &c., and, moreover, the words *καὶ προσευχόμενοι*, which, although quite suitable in Mark and Luke, are not so in Matthew, seem very much to favour this hypothesis. It is probable, however, that the only spurious words in Matthew are *καὶ προφάσει*, which some manuscripts (although not altogether important ones) omit ; for it appears to me hardly likely that the verse should have been interpolated in so many codices. Whereas, if a part of it originally belonged to Matthew, it may easily have been completed from the other two Evangelists. The expression *κλείειν τὴν βασιλείαν* is founded upon the figure of a palace or temple of truth and wisdom, to which the kingdom of God is compared. The Pharisees, by their hypocritical disposition of mind,—which had regard not to inward reality, but to external form,—restrained not only themselves, but others also, from entering the new, holy, living community established by the Redeemer. The same figure, somewhat modified, is

employed, Luke xi. 52, in the parallel passage ἤρατε τὴν κλεῖδα τῆς γνώσεως. (For ἤρατε, cod. D. reads ἐκρύψατε; but this is only an interpretation of ἤρατε, which here signifies to take away, to withdraw.) It is evident that we are not here to understand the term knowledge as meaning the collective contents of the gospel, for the εἰσερχομένοι εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν already possessed these. On the contrary, the γνώσις referred to by the Redeemer is the knowledge of Jesus as the true Messiah promised by all the prophets. The scribes, as interpretes legis divinæ, might and ought to have had this; but in their hypocritical perverseness, they neglected the knowledge which would have enabled them to enter the kingdom of God. It is remarkable that, Luke xi. 52, the aorist is chosen (εἰσήλθετε and ἐκώλυσατε), whereas in Matthew we have the present tense. The latter mode of expression is the stronger (the aorist of Luke favours the supposition that the words he records were uttered at an earlier period than a change on the part of the Pharisees was to be expected); it represents the opposition as continued, permanent, and of such a kind that no alteration could be anticipated. Ver. 14 describes the hypocritical avarice of the Pharisees, which induced them to rob the most needy and defenceless (χῆραι) of the last remaining necessities of life (οἰκίαι), under the form (πρόφασις, pretext, mask) of religion. On account of this combination of hypocrisy and injustice, their guilt (and its consequence, the κρίμα = κατὰκριμα) appears doubly great.

Ver. 15. The Lord, *thirdly*, censures the anxiety of the Pharisees to make proselytes.<sup>1</sup> Here ξηρά is used; τὸ ξηρόν is more common. The only other instances in which προσήλυτοι occurs in the New Testament are Acts ii. 11, vi. 5, xiii. 43. Gentiles who become connected with the Old Testament church are ordinarily called, in the New Testament, φοβούμενοι or σεβόμενοι τὸν Θεόν. Concerning the distinction between proselytes of the gate and proselytes of justice, compare Winer in his Reallex.) The Redeemer again represents it as the most pernicious feature of their character that they injured *others* (those who were converted), for their converts only became still more guilty than those who had

<sup>1</sup> Heathen writers often mention the eagerness of the Jews to gain adherents to their religion. On this subject compare the treatise of Daus (Jena 1083) de cura Judæorum in proselytis faciendis. The same thing is referred to in Meuschenii N. T. c. Talmude illustratum p. 049, seqq.

converted them. This ἀπώλεια of the proselytes forms the antithesis to the σωτηρία which the Pharisees pretended to have in view. (Τῶς γεέννης signifies a son of Gehenna [comp. the observations on Luke xvi. 24], and of the punishment that pertains to it.) Hence the expression has reference to the augmentation of *guilt* in the proselytes. But how the Lord could suppose such a thing in the case before us does not at once appear; for, according to divine as well as human justice, the corrupter is more criminal than the corrupted. If it be said that the false zeal of the converts assumed a stronger form in them than in the very men who converted them,<sup>1</sup> it must be remembered that this would heighten their guilt only in case it was coupled with a knowledge of the perversity it involved,—and this is not to be supposed. The matter may rather be explained as follows: the Pharisees were constantly restrained and guarded by the general spirit which the constitution of the Mosaic religion inspired; this spiritual protection was not enjoyed by the Gentiles who became united with the Jewish church. They received divine truth through a very impure channel, they had not entirely abjured heathenism, and the result was that their religion constituted a wretched mongrel compound, which estranged them further from the divine life than the very men who proselyted them. But this difficulty being set aside, the entire verse still contains some important obscurities. According to its language, it seems as if the missionary operations of the Jews were, *as a whole*, repudiated, and all proselytes contemned, while at the same time, in the Old Testament itself, there are innumerable passages that approve such exertions, and say, that the Gentiles are to be brought into the people of Israel; moreover, in the first century after Christ, the proselytes, so far from appearing as an abandoned class of men, were the first to join the Church of Christ, and the great spread of Judaism among the Gentiles is justly regarded as a principal means, in the hand of Providence, whereby it was rendered possible to transfer the gospel to the Gentiles. Hence, we must confine the words of the Lord to the proselytism of the Pharisees; in doing this work, they connived at the fundamental evil that characterised

<sup>1</sup> Justin Martyr speaks to the same effect in the passage (dial. c. Tryph. pag. 850, edit. Sylb.) where it is said of the proselytes: διαλύτερον Ἰουδαίων βλασφημοῦσιν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἡμᾶς τοὺς εἰς αὐτὸν πιστεύοντας καὶ φονεύειν καὶ αἰκίζειν βόλονται, κατὰ πάντα γὰρ ὑμῖν ἐξομοιοῦσθαι σπεύδουσι.

the sect; they urged on the holy cause with an unholy motive (a striking instance is related in Joseph. Arch. xviii. 5); and these Pharisaic operations can by no means be identified with the sincere efforts of pious Jews, to impart the word of God in the Old Testament to the Gentiles. As regards the meaning of these verses—that the sin of the Pharisees was not only pernicious to themselves but also to others—it may be observed: this is the very curse of sin, that it propagates itself and infects all around it. The circumstance that one sinner takes away the means of salvation from others (ver. 14 hinders the *εἰσερχεσθαι εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν*), may, indeed, appear opposed to the justice of God, and may seem to lead towards the doctrine of *reprobatio*. But the operation of the sinner upon those around him is not, by any means, to be viewed as necessary; on the contrary, if all Jews had the written law, and the Gentiles had the law of God in their heart (Rom. ii. 15), they might have been obedient to its voice, and thus have overcome the baneful influence. If therefore they yielded to sin, it was their own guilt that gave them up to its power; while at the same time, the more vigorously the whole system exerted its destructive tendency, and the more isolated the individuals were, who had to encounter it, the more excuse therē must have been for those whom it conquered.

Ver. 16—22. As a *fourth* point, in the sinful conduct of the Pharisees, the Redeemer specifies their hypocritical trifling with oaths. As, in all ages, avarice, if it has an interest concerned, can contrive to act under religious forms, and to evade the rigour of the truth by deception, so it appeared in this character among the Pharisees. In order that they might turn oaths to their own selfish ends, they distinguished between such as were valid, and such as were not valid. They pronounced the oath by the Temple or the altar of less importance than that which was sworn by the gold of the Temple (by which we are to understand the treasure of the Temple, not its golden ornaments),<sup>1</sup> or the offering on the altar. Matt. v. 34—36, Christ points out the emptiness of such distinctions, by proving that every oath in reality has reference to God as the only True One; and similarly here, an oath by the Temple, by Heaven,

<sup>1</sup> Compare Lightfoot on the passage. This application of the words renders the meaning somewhat piquant; the *φιλάργυροι* thought the oath by their god, mammon, had the greatest force (Luke xvi. 14.)

or by the altar, can have no meaning, except as these created things are viewed in their relation to the Eternal himself.<sup>1</sup> The whole argument is strictly a commentary on the reprimand, *ὁδηγοὶ τυφλοί*, since it shows the Scribes and Pharisees, who assumed the guidance of the people of God, their own blindness in divine things; they did not even know the nature of an oath, and yet they wanted to introduce casuistic distinctions between one oath and another.

Ver. 23, 24. *Fifthly*, Jesus rebukes the Pharisees for their hypocritical attention to little trifles, according to which they manifested the greatest solicitude in regard to the most external minutiae, while they carelessly overlooked the deepest ethical principles. The Mosaic law did not extend the payment of tithes to every trifling item, but the little-minded Rabbins thought their true service to God consisted in applying the instructions given them, in the most rigorous manner that was possible. The plants mentioned are of little use, and without any particular value. (*Ἡδύσμος* is synonymous with *μίνθα* or *μίνθη*, mint, mentha.—*Ἄνηθον* is dill, anethum.—*Κύμινον*, cuminum, cummin. Similar to the Hebrew *קִמְצָן*, Isaiah xxviii. 25, 27.—Luke, in the parallel passage xi. 42, has the general term *πᾶν λάχανον*, under which those plants may be classified; and afterwards the particular *πήγανον*, corresponding with the Latin *ruta*, *rue*.)—Matthew specifies *κρίσις*, *ἔλεος*, *πίστις* as the true difficulties of the law (external precision being represented as merely an evasion of difficulty); Luke, on the contrary, speaks of *κρίσις* and *ἀγάπη Θεοῦ*. The word *ἀφήκατε* (instead of which Luke has *παρέρχεσθε*), necessarily leads to the conclusion that the objects named are matters in the conduct of men. The *ἀγάπη* of Luke is allied to the *ἔλεος* of Matthew, for mercy is only love in its exercise towards the sufferer. This the Pharisees did not practise; they merely maintained strict justice. The term *κρίσις* is equivalent to *δικαιοσύνη* (comp. Isaiah xi. 4, according to the LXX.) This expression, however, does not signify strict justice, for the Pharisees certainly sought to practise that; it is rather to be taken like *הַיָּדָה*, in the signification of “goodness,” “kindness” (comp. the remarks on Rom. iii. 21.) Hence *κρίσις* is the general term, and *ἔλεος* the particular. Matthew adds to both *πίστις*, by which we are not to

<sup>1</sup> This idea, which evidently lies at the foundation of the whole argument of Jesus, forbids the reference of the word *κατοικήσας* (ver. 21) to the kingdom that had its aggregate existence in the Temple.

understand merely right notions concerning God and divine things, for the Pharisees possessed these also ; but that state of mind in which man is capable of receiving divine influences. In conclusion, it may be remarked that the Lord did not repudiate the exact observance of the precepts of the law. In harmony with Matt. v. 19, the Saviour approves of the careful fulfilment even of those commands in the Old Testament, which appear unimportant. But the oppressive spirit cherished by the Pharisees, on the one hand, and the shameless contempt of the law manifested in their conduct on the other, deserved the rebuke which the Lord gave them. The proverbial phrase introduced, ver. 24, is a censure upon this combination of the most glaring unfaithfulness towards the commands of God in things spiritual, with the most irksome exactness in regard to things external.

(*Διῶλίζω*, to filter, to strain through. Concerning the use of the word in the Greek versions of the Old Testament, compare Schleusner in his *Lex. to the LXX.*, vol. ii., p. 177.—*Κώνωψ*, antithesis to *κάμηλος*, a little insect in the wine, which was carefully removed as unclean, by the rigid observers of the law, before they drank. The camel, as a large unclean beast, is contrasted with the insect.)

Ver. 25, 26. The mention of drink leads the Redeemer, *sixthly*, to rebuke the hypocrisy which induced the Pharisees with the utmost solicitude to cleanse the outside (of vessels), while they left the inside in a state of defilement. They viewed the laws of the Old Testament respecting purification, just as they did the rest, merely in their external aspect, and were regardless of the idea on which they were founded. (Instead of *παροψίς*, which the Attics use to signify not the dish but the viand, Luke xi. 39 has *πίναξ*.)—By *ἔσθωθεν* we are to understand the contents of the dish, as acquired by acts of wickedness ; the words *δότε ἐλεημοσύνην*, Luke xi. 41, plainly speak to this effect. But since that property which is obtained by sin does not as such constitute the impurity, except in connexion with the state of the mind, the *ἔσθωθεν* also necessarily has relation to this ; the inward and outward cannot here be separated. And accordingly, ver. 26, the Redeemer, after speaking of internal purification, associates external purification with it, as also in reality deserving to be called the fulfilment of the divine laws.—(The ordinary reading *ἀκρασίας* appears preferable to *ἀδικίας*,

although the latter has been adopted by Griesbach, Schulz, and others. It is true that the manuscripts C.E.F.G.H.K.S. are in favour of *ἀδικίας*, whilst only B.D.L. read *ἀκρασίας*; but the explanation of the origin of *ἀδικίας* from *ἀκρασίας* is evidently easier than the reverse; especially if we suppose that the transcribers—upon comparing Luke, who has *πονηρίας*—wished to form an agreement between the two Evangelists, which *ἀκρασίας* did not seem to allow.—*Ἀκρασία* is here to be taken in the wide sense as signifying inward subjection to passions. 1 Cor. vii. 5, it is used in reference to sexual relations.)

Luke has enlarged upon the above idea in peculiar language (Luke xi. 40, 41), which is not without some difficulties. These very difficulties, however, are the proof that the words certainly were originally uttered in this connexion. In the first place, the question, *οὐχ ὁ ποιήσας τὸ ἔξωθεν, καὶ τὸ ἔσωθεν ἐποίησε*, was designed to convince the Pharisees of the perverseness of their effort to satisfy the laws of purity by external observance, whilst they themselves inwardly violated them. Then ver. 41 contains instruction as to the way in which external and internal purity may be united. The difficulty presented in the question is the suddenness with which the Redeemer passes to the *ποιεῖν*, whereas the preceding connexion does not appear to contain anything that could lead to such a transition. But the intermediate thought seems to be this: the reason why the Pharisees attended so punctiliously to outward purification was simply the fact, that they endeavoured to fulfil the commands of God by the observance of prescribed ceremonies. That God, however, whom they acknowledged as the law-giver (hence as the supreme and original authority) in things external, was the same in the internal world; but in regard to the latter they only dissimulated, and hypocritically withdrew themselves from his government. It cannot be said, in opposition to this view, that *ἔσωθεν* must not be applied to the inward life, because ver. 41, *τὰ ἐνόντα* refers to the viands; for it has already been remarked that articles of food (and earthly possessions generally) as such, cannot be meant, because no *ἀδικία* could be traced to them apart from the state of mind existing in the possessor; and on this account also the appeal to that *usus loquendi*, according to which *ποιεῖν* is used = *ἠπά*, in the sense of purifying, (comp. Gesenius in his Lex. under the word), must here be rejected. (Moreover, in order



to establish that hypothesis, the sentence must be deprived of its interrogative form ; and besides this the aorist ἐποίησε is not compatible with it.) The reference to the one true lawgiver of the internal and external worlds, then very naturally leads to the exhortation that true purity should be sought according to his will. This consists in a change of mind ; and hence the Lord commends, instead of covetousness, a kind and liberal disposition, which devotes the μαμμωνᾶς ἀδικίας to the purposes of philanthropy (comp. Luke xvi. 1, ff.) Here again, therefore, the expression τὰ ἐνόντα relates to that which is external in connexion with the state of the mind ; it is only the change in the latter that gives an ethical importance to the use of the former.

Ver. 27, 28. The inward impurity of the Pharisees in respect to avarice and lust of gain, leads the Lord, *in the seventh place*, to censure that general moral pollution which they endeavoured to conceal under the garb of an apparent δικαιοσύνη. For this purpose he compares them to tombs that contain putrefaction within, but appear bright and handsome without. (Κονιάω or κονιάζω, to coat with lime, to whiten. It occurs again Acts xxiii. 3.) Luke xi. 44 the figure is slightly modified ; the Pharisees are there compared to μνημεῖα ἄδηλα, over which men walk without observing them, and so become defiled. But the comparison in Matthew is the most appropriate, since it expresses the outward appearance of righteousness assumed by the Pharisees.

Ver. 29—33. *In the eighth* and last place, the Saviour passes from the graves with which he compared the Pharisees, to the monuments which they ostentatiously erected in memory of the ancient prophets, arrogantly persuading themselves that the evil principle which had borne such bitter fruits in their fathers had no root in their hearts. From this fact Christ draws the conclusion that they witness against themselves, and acknowledge that they recognise themselves as the posterity of those who murdered the prophets ; so far from seeking to atone for the guilt of their race, they endeavoured to justify themselves by accusing their ancestors, and yet at the same time completely filled up the measure of the guilt to their own destruction.<sup>1</sup>

This passage presents a difficulty as to the relation of the sin of

<sup>1</sup> The use of the form ἡμεθα from ἡμεν is of later date (comp. Winer's Gram. Th. i. s. 34.)

ancestors to their posterity ; the Lord here seems to reproach the Pharisees with that as a matter of guilt to them, whereas it does not appear that guilt is incurred except by personal sin. But in these words Christ expresses nothing more than the Old Testament teaches in the passage, Exod. xx. 5, where it is said : God visits the sin of the fathers upon the children to the third and fourth generation ; the same doctrine as we find fully developed in Rom. v. 12, ff. The **עֲוֹן אֲבוֹתָיִם** necessarily presupposes the existence of the sin of the fathers in the children, since the just God can only punish sin where it exists. The idea is easily explained to the Christian consciousness, if we proceed from the fundamental principle contained in the Scriptures, that the several human individualities must not be viewed as so many single existences standing in complete isolation, but as members of the body ; and hence it is the very curse of sin, as well as the blessing of righteousness, that they do not affect merely the individual sinners or righteous persons, but those connected with them also. As in the external world the extravagance of the father makes the children beggars, so the sin of the parents injures their offspring. The false conclusions that might be drawn from this principle are destroyed by the fact that to every member of the posterity there is the possibility of receiving the forgiveness of sins, if he faithfully use the means of salvation placed within his reach.<sup>1)</sup> Throughout the Old Testament, however, the distinct principle that it is a blessing to have pious ancestors, and a curse to have ungodly ones, prevails ; while, on the contrary, in the New Testament, the corporeal connexion retires into the shade, because the doctrine of a new birth by the Spirit is there clearly developed. But here the Redeemer is addressing persons who belonged entirely to the Old Testament point of view, and therefore adopts an idea which in their case has its full truth. The Lord expressly distinguishes *personal* sin from the sin of the fathers : *καὶ ὑμεῖς πληρώσατε τὸ μέτρον τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν*. Here there is something strange in the words, *μέτρον τῶν πατέρων*,—*μέτρων ὑμῶν* is expected. But as the individual man may fill up the measure of

<sup>1</sup> It is to this that the words *οὐκ ἠθελήσατε* refer in the sequel, Matt. xxiii. 38. They were not given up to the consequences of their own sin, until they had frustrated all attempts to awaken in them the consciousness of it. Concerning the relation of individuals to the mass, compare the more copious remarks in the commentary on Rom. xi. 1.

long-suffering assigned to him by God, and thus come to destruction, so may a people, viewed as a body (or a larger individual.) In this point of view the Redeemer designates the sin of Israel as *one sin of the whole body*, commenced in the fathers and brought to its climax in the dark deeds of the Pharisees towards the Lord. (The reading *πληρώσατε* is, on account of its difficulty, unquestionably preferable to *ἐπληρώσετε*, or *πληρώσατε*, in which the difficulty is relieved. The imperative contains a mournful sarcasm on the contrast formed by the vocation of the Pharisees and their apparent righteousness with their inward sin. After they had stubbornly repulsed every effort of the gentle Redeemer to bring them to repentance, there remained nothing for him to do, but that he should leave them to their own destruction, with the words: now fill ye up the measure of your fathers. His language expresses the divine permission, without which even the Evil One himself cannot complete his malignant designs.

The Pharisees are, in conclusion, undisguisedly called a race of vipers (comp. the remarks on Matt. iii. 7), who carry within them the seed of their father, and do according to his works (John viii. 44.) The words may seem almost too severe in the lips of the Son of Love, but the very manifestation of love (which is justice and truth as well) towards wickedness, is that it hates and condemns it. It is the compassionate Redeemer who treads the winepress of God's wrath (Isa. lxiii. 13; Rev. xix. 13.)

Luke (xi. 47, 48) has a parallel to these verses also; but the peculiar way in which he modifies the idea renders it hardly probable that he has retained the original form of the Saviour's language. According to the meaning in Matthew, the phrase *οικοδομεῖν τὰ μνημεῖα* (the parallel with *κοσμεῖν*, Matt. xxiii. 29, intimates that *οικοδομεῖν* is here to be taken as "to renew" "to restore"), evidently appears to be a symbolical expression for "to recognise with respect." Luke, on the contrary—as is shown by the words, *ἄρα μαρτυρεῖτε καὶ συνευδοκεῖτε τοῖς ἔργοις τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν*—has taken the expression as parallel with *ἀποκτείνειν*, so that the following sense arises, "ye and your fathers are quite of one mind, and ye agree in your works; they killed the prophets and ye build their tombs; thus ye co-operate for their destruction." Hence, in the connexion of Luke, the phrase *οικοδομεῖν μνημεῖα* denotes a hostile act with the accessory idea of hypocrisy. "Ye appear to

be performing a service of affection, while, in reality ye are working hand in hand with your fathers." Storr applied *μνημεῖα οἰκοδομεῖν* to the case of prophets living in the time of the Pharisees themselves, for example, the Baptist; but then arises the difficulty, that *αὐτοί* relates, in the one instance, to the ancient prophets, and in the other to those of later date. It is true, this may be explained by viewing the whole order of prophets as the object of the persecutions, and accordingly regarding the object in earlier and in later times as one and the same; but the difficulty may be entirely removed, if the passage be understood—as we have already interpreted it—so that the Pharisees are represented as accomplices in the murders committed by their fathers; the one killed, the others prepared the grave which was to hide the murder in eternal oblivion. (*Συνευδοκέω* to consent, to agree to anything cheerfully. Acts viii. 1, xxii. 20; Rom. i. 32. It occurs also in the Apocrypha, 1 Macc. i. 60; 2 Macc. xi. 24.)

Ver. 34. After giving utterance to the powerful threatening, *πῶς φύγητε ἀπὸ τῆς κρίσεως τῆς γεέννης*, the Lord adds a remarkable declaration respecting the decrees of God. The mission of divinely-enlightened men, which brings peace and eternal life to those who feel the need of salvation, is an occasion of destruction to the insincere and wicked. Christ is set (even in his messengers) *εἰς πτώσιν καὶ ἀνάστασιν πολλῶν ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ* (Luke ii. 34.) If we compare Luke, the passage is difficult. Whilst, according to Matthew, these words were spoken by Jesus himself, in Luke xi. 49 they appear as a quotation: *διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡ σοφία τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶπεν ἀποστελῶ κ.τ.λ.* But no utterance of the kind is found either in the Old Testament or in any Apocryphal book; and an appeal to a prophecy not extant is by no means advisable, except in a case of extreme necessity. Now, a closer view of the words in Matthew shows, that even they cannot be so understood as to imply that the Saviour, when he uttered them, spoke merely of the future messengers who would be sent forth by him—for example, the apostles and disciples; for, ver. 35, mention is made of Abel and other ancient *δίκαιοι*. Besides which,

1 There are, however, some very kindred passages; for example, 2 Chron. xxiv. 19, which the LXX. render: *καὶ ἀπίσταντες (Θεός) πρὸς αὐτοὺς προφήτας ἐπιστρέψαι πρὸς κύριον καὶ οὐκ ἤκουσαν, καὶ διεμαρτύρατο αὐτοῖς καὶ οὐχ ὑπήκουσαν*. As the account of Zacharias follows, 2 Chron. xxiv. 20, it is still a question whether the Lord had not the citation of the Old Testament in view, and merely expanded it a little.

the aorist *ἐφονεύσατε* has not its signification, unless we understand by Zacharias some just man murdered at an earlier period; and this confirms the hypothesis, that the Lord means by those of whom he speaks as sent forth, not merely the apostles, but also holy men and prophets of the Old Testament sent forth in earlier times. Then, if such be the case, the Redeemer does not speak in Matthew as an individual confined within the limits of the temporal life, but as the Son of God, as the essential Wisdom (Prov. viii. ; Sir. xxiv., comp. the remarks on σοφία in the commentary on John i. 1), who is introduced as speaking in Luke, and by whose intervention all prophets and holy men of God, from the beginning, have appeared (Wisd. Sol. vii. 27.) So that, strictly speaking, there is no essential difference between Matthew and Luke.<sup>1</sup> According to both, the eternal Wisdom, who in Christ became man, declares the eternal purpose (the present tense in Matthew, ἀποστέλλω, denotes the pure eternal presence of God. Luke has the explanatory future), to send messengers to the people of Israel, and predicts the conduct of the people towards them. It is only as regards the form that Luke is original. Indeed the interpretation of the words has already been given in Matthew, and Jesus himself spoken of as the divine σοφία. This very interpretation, however, shows the transition to be somewhat irregular. For the expression διὰ τοῦτο, which, in Luke, is perfectly harmonious with the connexion (the sense being this: "by your conduct ye only fulfil the purpose of the eternal Wisdom; your fathers killed the prophets and ye build their tombs, therefore Wisdom said, &c.") in Matthew stands without any true link. Fritzsche (in loco) carries it back and connects it with πληρώσατε τὸ μέτρον, ver. 32. This certainly gives a good sense, but it appears rather a difficult exegesis, on account of the intervening ver. 33. It seems to me more easy to supply the phrase, εἶπεν ἡ σοφία, a form of quotation which Matthew omits in order that Jesus may appear without any disguise as the speaker.

But now if the form of the discourse in Luke be the original one, it becomes a question why the Lord chose this particular form to

<sup>1</sup> De Wette (in his remarks on Luke xi. 49) hesitates to admit this; he thinks, on the contrary, that the expression contains a more recent dogmatic designation, similar to the word λόγος in John, not suited to the lips of the speaker. But if Jesus, in John, calls himself the truth, the resurrection, the life, why should he not call himself wisdom?

convey the idea which he wished to express. Probably it was out of regard to the people; even those who were well-disposed could not support the thought that the eternal Wisdom spoke in Christ (his disciples themselves found it difficult to conceive this, John xiv. 9): and therefore he drew a veil over it, which preserved the weak from injury, and at the same time did not conceal the deeper knowledge from those whose powers of perception were stronger. It appears remarkable that the Redeemer (according to Matthew) designates some of those who should be sent, *γραμματεῖς* (= סופרים.) The expression is here used in the good sense, and in contrast with the Pharisaic Scribes; we might supply, "I will send you men *truly* acquainted with the Word of God, who are that which ye ought to be and profess to be." One difficulty remains to be observed; it is occasioned by the word *σταυρώσετε* in Matthew. For inasmuch as the Jews did not adopt the punishment of crucifixion, it cannot be supposed that one of the ancient prophets had been crucified, nor has anything of the kind been known in later times. It is true the instance of Simon (the *ἀδελφὸς τοῦ κυρίου*), who (according to Euseb. H. E. iii. 32, edit. Stroth. p. 169) was crucified, has been adduced. But since his death took place after the destruction of Jerusalem, and therefore after the threatened judgments had been executed, it is hardly likely that reference can be made to him. Hence it is in the highest degree probable that the Redeemer includes himself in the number of the messengers sent from God. And the fact that he represents himself as the author of the mission is explained by the twofold relation in which he could speak of himself; on the one hand he could speak of his eternal ideal existence, and on the other his language might apply to his individual temporal appearance.

Ver. 35. The prediction respecting the treatment of the messengers of God is followed by a threatening of punishment. (The form *αἷμα ἔρχεται ἐπὶ τινὰ* [Matt. xxvii. 25] denotes the imputation of murder.<sup>1</sup> *Αἷμα δίκαιον* or *ἀθῶον* = דם נקי. The expression is founded upon the idea that the blood is the supporter of the *ψυχή*, Deut. xii. 23.) The phrase *ὅπως ἔλθῃ* must not be deprived of its peculiar force (as it would be, if taken [*ἐκβατικῶς*] as signify-

<sup>1</sup> Luke xi. 50, 51, has, instead of this, the formula, *ἐκζητεῖν αἷμα ἀπὸ τινος*, according to the Hebrew דם טָמֵא.

ing consequence ; on the contrary, it has reference to *διὰ τοῦτο*, and marks *design*) ; the difficult idea that God sends messengers, *in order* that they may be rejected, and the rejecters punished, is to be explained in the same way as the passage, Matt. xiii. 13, ff., the interpretation of which may be consulted.

The first difficulty in this verse is occasioned by the words *ἐφ' ὑμᾶς*. If *ὑμεῖς* be applied to the Pharisees who were actually present, it does not appear on what ground they were to be answerable for all the blood of righteous persons that had been shed ; and if *ὑμεῖς* be taken as meaning the whole nation, inclusive of previous generations, this does not seem consistent in a discourse addressed to a definite number of individuals. The simplest mode of solving this difficulty is to consider that Jesus looked upon the Pharisees and Scribes as representatives of the whole people, so that the entire body is to be viewed in them. Regarding them thus, Jesus could with propriety say : *ἀποστέλλω πρὸς ὑμᾶς προφῆτας*, because even the Pharisees, in connexion with the nation at large, might have obtained benefit from a mission, whose efficacy extended to the whole mass. But, in the second place, the expression *ἐκχυνόμενον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς* appears hyperbolical, since the Pharisees cannot be deemed responsible for the murder of righteous persons among all nations. Here, however, we must not overlook the circumstance, that in this passage of course no reference is made to individuals distinguished by a natural righteousness, such as even Pagans possessed, but to men enlightened by the Spirit of God. Whatever inclination there may be to follow Justin Martyr in supposing an operation of the *λόγος σπερματικός* in the minds of such men as Zoroaster, Plato, and others, yet we must ever draw a specific distinction between the illumination of wise Pagans like these, and the illumination of the indubitable messengers of God to his people. The central operation of God upon the human *νοῦς* was confined entirely to the prophets and wise men in the nation of Israel, and hence the guilt of Israel in despising and ill-treating the messengers of God, whose vocation to that office had been proved by special evidence, might truly be spoken of as equal to that which had destroyed the holy ones of the earth. Abel is mentioned as the first of these holy ones, because he may be viewed, in contrast with Cain (1 John iii. 12), as the representative of the whole generation of saints. Moreover, it was not unusual with

the Rabbins to regard the antediluvian posterity of Seth, who took the place of Abel, as prophets. (Comp. the remarks on 2 Pet. ii. 5; Jude ver. 14.) Now the first murdered saint, of whom mention is made in Genesis, is here placed in juxtaposition with the last instance of the murder of a prophet recorded in the sacred Scriptures of the Old Testament—viz., that of Zacharias, (comp. 2 Chron. xxiv. 20.) What is there said of him is quite in harmony with the words of Matthew as well as with those of Luke (the latter only has οἶκου instead of ναοῦ); it is stated that he was stoned (at the command of King Joash) in the court of the Temple (according to the LXX., ἐν αὐτῇ οἴκου κυρίου.) The θυσιαστήριον, of which the Evangelists write, is the great altar of burnt offering, that stood in the open air at the entrance to the buildings strictly belonging to the Temple. The agreement of the words before us with that event, as also the use of the aorist (ἐφονεύσατε), render it in the highest degree probable, that the Lord alludes to that passage in the Chronicles. It is, however, a remarkable circumstance that the Zacharias there mentioned was not a son of Barachias, but of Jehoiada (יְהוֹיָדָה, in the LXX. Ἰωδὰς.) The hypotheses that Zacharias had two fathers, a corporeal one and one who performed the duties of a father; or that the prophet Zachariah, whose writings are preserved in the canon of the Old Testament, is meant, because he was a son of Barachias (although nothing is known about his death in the Temple); or that originally the reading was υἱὸς Ἰωδὰς (according to Jerome, the Nazarenes adopted this reading in their gospel; comp. my Gesch. der Ev., s. 77), are all to be rejected as arbitrary. The only question that remains to be considered is, whether the Zacharias mentioned by Josephus (B. J. iv. 6, 4), a son of Baruch, who was murdered by the zealots in the Temple, can be the person referred to. The following reasons lead me to think this altogether improbable: 1, The name Baruch is not identical with Barachias (בְּרַכְיָה); 2, The Zacharias spoken of by Josephus was not a prophet—and in the present case everything depends upon this point, for the subject in hand is the murder of messengers expressly sent to the people by the σοφία τοῦ Θεοῦ; 3, The tense (ἐφονεύσατε) is not consistent with such an interpretation, since at the time when Jesus uttered these words, the murder of the Zacharias of whom Josephus speaks was yet to take place. (The enallage temporum, which some authors have supposed here, is quite



untenable.) Hence, if we simply keep in view the circumstance that it was the intention of Jesus to cite instances from the first and the last books of Scripture (according to the books in the original text), in order to show that this conduct towards the messengers of God in the abandoned portion of the race ran through the whole history of that race from the beginning (according to Luke xi. 50, ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου); then no important objection can be urged against the reference to the passage 2 Chron. xxiv. 20. The supposition that Matthew may have confounded the name of the father of the person murdered with that of the father of Zachariah, whose prophecies are preserved in the canon of the Old Testament, contains nothing at which we need stumble, and it is better to adopt this than to profess adherence to a forced interpretation.<sup>1</sup>

Ver. 36. The Lord declares, that all this innocent blood of the servants of God, that has been shed (πάντα ταῦτα must not be taken as referring to the previous denunciations of woe, as is shown by Luke xi. 51, in the parallel, where ἐκζητηθήσεται is again used) shall now manifest its results in this γενεά. (In Luke xi. 50 also, the words ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης are to be connected with ἐκζητηθῇ, as ver. 51, but not with ἐκχυνόμενον ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου.) By γενεὰ αὕτη we are to understand the men living at that time (a nation is never called γενεά in the New Testament, or even in the profane Greek literature<sup>2</sup>); these are viewed as ripe evil fruit, as persons in whom the sin of the whole body of their ancestors was concentrated, and thus called down the great judgments of God. There is in this no denial of the fact that earlier generations who had died were guilty, or of their being punished also; but the growth of sin is asserted—the children of those who killed the prophets were matured into murderers of Christ.

Ver. 37—39. The last verses of this long discourse have already been explained in the remarks on Luke xiii. 34, 35. There they stood in such a peculiar and exact connexion, that we could not but consider their position in that passage as the original one. Nevertheless Matthew also has used them in a most suitable connexion, and by means of them he has formed a very fine transition to

<sup>1</sup> Kubn (in a treatise on the passage in the Jahrb. f. Theol. und Christl. Phil. erster jahrg. b. 2, s. 346, ff.) thinks that the mention of Zacharias, Son of Baruch, is derived from the author of the Greek Gospel of Matthew, but that Jesus himself spoke of the ancient Zacharias.

<sup>2</sup> Concerning γενεά, compare also the remarks on Matt. xxiv. 34.

chap. xxiv. ; for in ver. 39, mention is made of the return of Christ. And although Jerusalem is here accused as the disobedient and faithless party—whereas, up to this point, the discourse had turned upon the Pharisees—the difference only extends thus far, that instead of individualities, the theocratic centre, in which they ruled, and whence they exercised their influence upon the whole world, is now spoken of.

Another important point in this passage is suggested by the expression *οὐκ ἠθέλησατε*,<sup>1</sup> compared with the kindred passage Luke xix. 42, in which the fact of their slighting salvation is ascribed to ignorance. If either the one or the other statement were regarded as absolute, an inconsistent meaning would arise. Total *ignorance* would exclude *guilt*; total *want of will* would exclude all possibility of conversion. But if both representations be viewed relatively, they mutually explain each other. No one among the Pharisees could have continued without some impression of the divine dignity of the Redeemer; but instead of yielding their minds to this impression, they thrust it away from them; and thus, while all deeper and more substantial knowledge of Christ and of his appointment for their salvation was concealed from them, this ignorance took root in the original unwillingness, and therefore was in the highest degree criminal. Still, however, under such circumstances, there remained a possibility of conversion, since deeper knowledge, if once imparted, might yet produce repentance; hence the discourse is concluded (ver. 39) with a glance at the time when the Redeemer, who was mistaken in his veiled condition, shall appear in glory, and shall then be greeted by many even among those who now rejected him. (Comp. the remarks on Luke xiii. 35.) The agreement between this thought and the foregoing language of ver. 33 is easily seen, if in ver. 33 we assume the case of obdurate perseverance in the old state of mind, and here suppose a change of mind to have taken place; the truth of both passages is then found.

<sup>1</sup> This idea is full of instruction in support of the doctrine of free choice in man. The power of the Almighty appears like impotence before the obstinacy of the creature, and has nothing but tears (Luke xix. 41) with which to overcome it. But these very tears of purest love exert the mightiest energy, for they bend the resisting will into *free* affectionate sympathy; and this cannot be accomplished by omnipotence, because omnipotence cannot will it.

## § 8. THE GIFT OF THE WIDOW.

(Mark xii. 41—44 ; Luke xxi. 1—4.)

The following little narrative of the widow, whom Jesus observed at the treasury, is not merely inserted by Mark and Luke of their own accord ; it is highly appropriate to the connexion. Both Evangelists give but a few notes of the anti-Pharisaic discourse of Christ, before they relate the anecdote of the widow ; but these brief notes contain the very feature that places the avarice of the Pharisees in the most glaring light, viz., that they decoyed away from poor widows all they had, under the pretence of religious objects. Immediately after these hints of the Lord's discourse have been given, there follows a description of a widow, who offered her all to God from spontaneous love, and this poor woman is commended. It was evidently intended that the contrast resulting from this juxtaposition of the two characters should strengthen the picture of the sinful nature of the Pharisees. They strove, with nothing but a worldly aim, after earthly possessions, which they often appropriated to themselves in illicit ways, and then from these they gave a meagre alms to God ; the widow loved God with all her heart and all her mind, and she offered her all to him. The widow, as the symbol of genuine self-denying and self-sacrificing love, is contrasted with the Pharisees, the representatives of hypocrisy and mock-religion. Now, it is singular that in this interesting and instructive little narrative the Lord represents the offerings placed in the *γαζοφυλάκιον* as in reality gifts brought to God ; whereas it seems that these treasures of the Temple were only the property of a selfish priesthood, and that therefore it would have been better not to have given any encouragement to their avarice by fresh contributions. But Christ even here views the theocratic institute in its actual existence and according to its ideal constitution, which, although marred by misuse, could never be destroyed. Accordingly, the treasures of the Temple had a worthy designation in being devoted to the maintenance of the whole external Temple worship, and, in a legal point of view, a contribution to those treasures was justly regarded as an offering brought to God himself. Hence, if the act of the widow be considered only in relation to the

inward motive, and not according to the outward appearance, it is in all respects an illustration of that love which wholly sacrifices itself; and this is what the narrative was designed to inculcate, in contrast with the feigned love of the Pharisees.

The two reports of Mark and Luke are in the main harmonious, and, indeed, often agree so exactly (comp. Mark xii. 44, with Luke xxi. 4), that a use of the same Greek text (probably Mark has here used Luke) must be supposed. Mark, however, according to his custom, has cast his narrative in a somewhat larger mould, and added some single features which enliven it. (For example, see ver. 43, the words *προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ*.) The place in which the incident occurred was the so-called court of the women; there stood thirteen brazen vessels shaped like trumpets (those of this form were called *תְּרֻמָּה*), into which those who visited the Temple cast their gifts. (Comp. Winer in his *Reallex.*) These were distinct from the *γαζοφυλάκιον* strictly so called; this formed a separate compartment of the Temple (*הֶחָפְזִי* comp. Gesenius sub. verb.), where the contributions of money cast into the thirteen vessels were deposited from time to time. But as these vessels stood near one another, and thus resembled a money-store, the Evangelists might speak of them as such. The poor widow (Luke has *πενιχρός* = *πένης*, *רַעֲיָא*, which does not occur in any other instance in the New Testament) dropped in two of the smallest coins (comp. the remarks Luke xii. 59 on the word *λεπτόν*), and these constituted all her property. (Comp. Luke viii. 43, xv. 12, where *βίος* occurs in the same signification. Mark explains it, *πάντα ὅσα εἶχεν*.) Hence it is observed that she gave more (*πλείον*) than the rich,—she gave *ἐκ τῆς ὑστερήσεως αὐτῆς*. This expression forms the antithesis to the *περισσεύον* of the rich, and thus gains its precise meaning. As it is said, *ἐκ τῆς ὑστερήσεως* (Luke has *ὑστερήματος*) *ἔβαλεν*, the statement cannot imply an absolute absence of resource, but merely a relative one; so that the sense is—"under the impulse of self-sacrificing love, she gave so much of her little property, that she had as good as nothing left, while the rich gave but a little in proportion to their vast possessions."

## § 9. PREDICTIONS OF JESUS RESPECTING THE LAST THINGS.

(Matt. xxiv. 1; xxv. 46. Mark xiii. 1—37.  
 Luke xxi. 5—38.)

In regard to the *form* of the great prophetic discourse of Christ, with which Matthew concludes his account of the residence of Jesus in Jerusalem before his sufferings, it may be observed, that this again evidently betrays itself as a composition of the Evangelist. Matthew has here collected together the predictions concerning the Saviour's advent, uttered by him at different times and under various circumstances. It is true there can be no doubt that, during the last sojourn of Christ in Jerusalem, he delivered an unusually long discourse respecting the events to be anticipated. It was involved in the nature of the case, that the Lord, when about to leave his own, would give them some guiding lights as to the future; and the harmony of all three Evangelists in their statements about the time, local circumstances, and general contents of the discourse, is a guarantee for the correctness of their report; but the mode in which Luke (especially chap. xvii.) places elements (occurring, according to Matthew, in this discourse) in their peculiar historical connexion with other local and temporal relations, renders it in the highest degree probable that Matthew here again, in accordance with his custom, has taken kindred thoughts, spoken at different times, and blended them in the last principal discourse. Still, some passages which we find only in Matthew, especially the fine parables concerning the advent of Christ (Matt. xxv.), are so exactly adapted to the last days of Christ's intercourse with his disciples, as to leave no doubt that, in transferring these to this period, he has given a more precise and full account than the other Evangelists. And certain as it is that here, as in other instances, Matthew has given us a compound of different discourses, it cannot be admitted that this discourse, as he reports it, is an incongruous mass. Schleiermacher (über die Schriften des Lc. s. 217, ff.) has taken particular pains to show that these passages of the great discourse (Matt. xxiv.), which stand in a different connexion in Luke, completely interrupt the train of thought in Matthew. This scholar remarks, in the first

place, that Matt. xxiv. 42 is immediately related to ver. 30, and that the intervening verses, received from Luke xvii. 23, ff. into Matthew, are not at all suited to the connexion of the latter Evangelist. The reason assigned for this view is, that, since God commanded Noah to build the ark precisely at the right time, this was just as good as if he had revealed to him the day and hour; and hence the admonition to watch, because they knew *not* the hour, was incongruous with a reference to that subject. But it does not appear that this remark can be substantiated; for the general direction which Noah received to build a ship did not by any means involve a disclosure of the *day and hour*; on the contrary, Noah's faith and obedience was evinced by his following the command of God, without knowing the day or the hour. In like manner, also, the disciples were told that the coming of the Lord was near, and, in conformity with this admonition, they were to prove their faith by watchfulness. The other observation of Schleiermacher, that Matt. xxiv. 27 does not harmonize with ver. 26, is equally untenable. He is of opinion that the disciples could not be warned against going forth to the false Messiah, because Christ would come quickly and everywhere at once; but that, on the contrary, such a warning could only be founded on the fact of his not having come. But the description of the ubiquity of his advent is introduced here, simply because it contains a *sign* (not a *reason* for refraining from going forth) of the true advent, according to which the appearing of the true Messiah may be distinguished from that of pseudo-Christ. And the introduction of such a sign is quite in place here, while the language of the following verse (ver. 28) conveys the same meaning—only under the form of another figure—viz., that the advent of the Son of Man comes suddenly, and its approach is conditional upon the advancing destruction of the world. According to Schleiermacher, however, the most remarkable instance of the want of connexion in Matthew occurs in ver. 29. For, he observes, it appears from this verse that the sign of the Son of Man, and the Son of Man himself, should follow that *παρουσία* which is compared to lightning; whereas, on the contrary, ver. 29 would come very well immediately after ver. 24. But this remark, like the others, is unimportant; for in ver. 27 the *παρουσία* is not spoken of in its historical relation to other events, but there is merely a *preliminary* description of a sign of

the true Parousia, whereby it might be distinguished from the appearance of false Christs. Hence it is quite consistent that in ver. 29 the *fuller* exposition of the historical circumstances that precede the actual Parousia, should follow. In conclusion, it may be observed, that even in this discourse, with all the freedom of its composition, Matthew discovers the gift of arrangement in the order of the thoughts. Proceeding in a strictly logical manner, he speaks first of the political and moral corruption that should take place ; then passes on to those commotions in the heavenly regions which precede the great catastrophe ; and after giving a description of the care exercised by God over his faithful ones at the time of its arrival, finishes with appropriate exhortations.

In regard to the *contents* of this discourse, the *first* point to be briefly considered is the relation of the accounts of the synoptical Evangelists to the representation of John in his Gospel. Now, although John also speaks of the advent of Christ and the judgment (v. 21, ff., viii. 15, 16, ix. 39, xii. 47, ff., xiv. 18), yet in his Gospel we do not find any such descriptions of external occurrences as might be expected in connexion with the mention of those events ; and hence it is undeniable that there is a difference between the mode of expression adopted by the synoptical Evangelists, and that employed by John in reference to the doctrine of the last things. Still, however, it cannot by any means be said, that the mode in which the former express themselves differs from the *general* type of Scripture in regard to this doctrine ; on the contrary, very many of the descriptions in the twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew have their analogies in the Old Testament (the passages will be cited in the exposition of the several verses) ; and the Pauline writings (1 Thess. iv. ; 2 Thess. ii. ; 1 Cor. xv.) as well as the Apocalypse (the latter especially) assume the same view of this subject as Matthew gives in the chapter just mentioned. Now, whoever believes the Apocalypse to be a writing of John has a sufficient security, in the relation of this to his Gospel, for the fact that John did not take a different view, in the latter, from that propounded by the synoptical Evangelists. But even if it be supposed that the Apocalypse is the production of another author (and this is not our opinion), still it must be confessed that the *Gospel* of John affords the only instance of deviation from the general type of the doctrine in the Old as well as the New Testament. And since this

deviation consists merely in the *suppression* of descriptions usually employed, nothing is more natural than to say, that the difference of representation is not founded in a difference of views on the part of the writers, much less in any variation of doctrinal teaching on the part of the Redeemer, but arose simply and solely from the *tendency* of this particular writing. The fact that the Gospel of John was designed for idealizing Gnostics who were not Jews, is quite sufficient to explain this and all other cases in which its peculiarities differ from the descriptions of the synoptical Evangelists.<sup>1</sup>

In the *second* place, as regards the contents of the present discourse, one great difficulty occurring in this section (especially chap. xxiv.), arises from the fact that circumstances which, according to the history, are separated by wide intervals, appear here to be placed in juxtaposition. Obvious descriptions of the approaching overthrow of Jerusalem and the Jewish constitution are blended with no less evident representations of the return of the Lord to his kingdom. It cannot be denied that those commentators who are connected with the ecclesiastical system (among whom we must reckon Schott as the most recent interpreter of this section, particularly in his well-known work, *comment. in Christi Sermones, qui de ejus reditu agunt*, Jenæ 1820), treat the ideas in this section in a far less simple and straightforward manner than the rationalistic expositors.<sup>2</sup>) Doctrinal views lead the former to attempt a separation of the elements that are blended in Matthew and the other Evangelists. For example, Schott thinks the description of the advent of Christ to his kingdom begins with ver. 29, *εὐθέως δὲ μετὰ τὴν θλίψιν κ. τ. λ.*, and refers all that precedes to the destruction of Jerusalem. But apart from the impossibility of interpreting ver. 29 itself as the commencement of something entirely new and different, it is just as certain that the latter part of the description contains the most distinct references to the present generation (comp. ver. 34) as it is that the former part plainly alludes to the last times. Hence we do not hesitate to adopt (with Fritzsche, Fleck, Schulz, de Wette)

<sup>1</sup> Fleck, in his work *de regno divino*, p. 483, exaggerates the differences, and only thinks that Christ *may* have spoken in the one way or in the other. But there is no *actual* contradiction between the synoptical Evangelists and John; the latter merely leaves that road which was not intelligible to his readers, or was not suited to their point of view.

<sup>2</sup> Concerning this doctrine compare the treatise of Baumeister in Klaiber's *Stud. B. i.* h. 2, s. 219, ff., h. 3, s. 1, ff., B. ii. h. 1, s. 1, ff., h. 2, s. 1, ff.



the simple interpretation—and the only one consistent with the text—that Jesus did intend to represent his coming as contemporaneous with the destruction of Jerusalem, and the overthrow of the Jewish constitution. However, this result of the exposition certainly requires a closer consideration, with a view to its being understood in its harmony with the whole circle of Christian doctrine. And in making such an inquiry, much assistance may be gained from observing, that this proximity of the advent of the Lord to the time immediately present is not at all peculiar to the section before us. Besides the passages in the Gospels, most of which have already been discussed (Matt. x. 23, xvi. 27, 28, xxiii. 38, 39, xxvi. 64, and the parallels), statements of the same kind occur in almost all the writings of the New Testament (1 Cor. x. 11.; Phil. iv. 5; 2 Thess. ii. 7; 1 Pet. iv. 7; 1 John ii. 18; James v. 8; Rev. i. 1, 3, iii. 11, xxii. 7, 10, 12, 20), from which it is clear that the apostles expected the return of Jesus in their life-time. And as in the New Testament, so also in the prophets of the Old Testament, we constantly find the idea that the coming of the Messiah was near. (The well-known form יְהוָה יוֹם קָרִיב occurs very frequently, Ezek. xxx. 3; Joel ii. 1, i. 15; Isaiah xiii. 6; Obad. ver. 15; Zeph. i. 7, 14; Hagg. ii. 7.) Accordingly we may say that the coming of the Lord, whether the first or the last, has always been anticipated as vividly near, and in *no single* passage, either of the Old or of the New Testament, is it stated that it will delay *long*; nay, this mode of expression is distinctly condemned, for example, Matt. xxiv. 48. (The passage, Dan. viii. 9, is the only exception here, but even in this case, seventy weeks being given, the metaphorical expression appears to conceal from the multitude the actual distance of the event.<sup>1</sup>) Schott, indeed (loc. cit., s. 413), thinks that intimations

1 The numerical statements in the Apocalypse are not designed to indicate the *time* at which the last great catastrophe will *take place*, but denote single circumstances which will occur as a part of the catastrophe itself; the whole Apocalypse represents the Parousia of the Lord as immediately at hand—that is, as visible to the generation then living. How therefore any calculations of the time of the Lord's advent, which suffice for anything more than to meet our *subjective* need, can be justified by Scripture, it is difficult to understand. At the same time there is no more reason to favour any oversight of the most obvious signs that the great crisis approaches, or to cherish the assurance that the Lord will not yet come for a long season. History shows that in all times in which the conflict between light and darkness has been specially vigorous, there has also been manifested in the minds of believers a lively desire for the coming of the Lord; and yet it is equally true, that when a crisis has passed, the church has made known a conscious-

of the kind are found in the New Testament ; but in this he is mistaken. He appeals to passages, such as Matt. xxiv. 48, xxv. 5, 19 ; but these verses do not speak of the coming of the Lord as absolutely distant, but merely as relatively so, in respect to persons awaiting it. And in Luke xx. 9, in the parable of the vineyard, where the long absence of the Lord is mentioned, the reference is not to the remoteness of the return of Christ, but to the long period during which God did not manifest himself to the people of Israel, since the time of Moses. Hence the difficulty that occurs here is founded in the *collective doctrine* of *Scripture* respecting the last things, and can only be solved by reference to the nature of prophecy generally, as well as to the peculiar character of the particular fact in question—the return of Christ.

Now in regard to *prophecy* generally, we agree with the idea so admirably developed by Hengstenberg (*Christologie* d. A. T. s. 299, ff.), that it is to be viewed as a spiritual sight. By virtue of this sight of the future as something really present to their spirit—the best designation we can give it is that of a perspective sight—that which should occur became actually visible to the prophets, but they certainly did not perceive either the distance of the event foreseen from the present to which they belonged, or the intervals between the individual objects beheld. This explains the fact, that in the prophecies of the Old Testament, the two appearances of Christ in humiliation and in glory—although the prophets acknowledged both—are not separated by wide spaces, but closely connected. The birth of the promised child (Isa. ix. 6, 7) is immediately succeeded by his peaceful reign ; the outgoing of the rod from the stem of Jesse is directly followed by changes of nature (Isa. xi. 1—6), and so everywhere in the Old Testament, the one appearing of the Lord is viewed as only just preceding the full blessing that results from the other (Isa. liii., lx. 1, lxi. 1 ; Jerem. xxiii. 5, ff., xxxi. 31, ff., xxxiii. 14, ff. ; Ezek. xxxiv. 23, ff., xxxvi. 24, ff., xxxvii. 24, ff.)

ness that conditions connected with the last crisis yet remained unfulfilled. Between these two forces (which may be recognised as already at work in the time of the apostles, by comparing both the Epistles to the Thessalonians) a balance has always been preserved, and *indifference* has been opposed as much as *fanaticism*. The circumstance that Jesus did not deliver this discourse in the presence of all the twelve disciples, but only before the three who had made the greatest attainments, shows that the more precise communications respecting his advent are not designed for all.

Meanwhile, during the course of prophecies, we may observe an advance in clearness ; that which in the Old Testament is undistinguished—the difference between the advent of Christ in humiliation and his advent in glory—appears perfectly marked in the Gospels ; and again, those things which are represented in the Gospels as co-existing, viz., the erection of the kingdom of God and the judgment of the world (these two are no more separated in the Gospels than the first and second advents of Christ are in the Old Testament), are in the Apocalypse accurately distinguished. Now, as the hypothesis that the precise time when the last great catastrophies should happen was, and was designed to be, unknown to the prophets and apostles (comp. Matt. xxiv. 36 ; Mark xiii. 32 ; Acts i. 7), is in harmony with Scripture, it remains for us simply to say that the lively ardour of their desire for the manifestation of Messiah, and their immediate vision of the event, induced them to picture it as close at hand. These remarks, however, certainly cannot be applied to the person of the Lord ; for although (Mark xiii. 32) Jesus says of himself that he knows not the day of his coming, this ignorance cannot possibly be regarded as absolute. (Comp. the exposition of the passage below.) Hence, in order to justify such distinct discourses as he delivered concerning the nearness of his advent, a closer view of the nature of the fact is necessary.

Now, the first reason why the declarations of Christ respecting the near approach of his coming, although they were not realized in their utmost sense, yet involve no error, is this—that it is an essential ingredient in the doctrine of the advent of Christ that it should be considered every moment *possible*, and that believers should deem it every moment *probable*. To have taught it so that it should have pointed to an indefinite distance would have robbed it of its ethical significance. The constant *expectation* of the return of Christ is verified by the fact that Christ is constantly *coming* with his kingdom ; it is relatively true that the history of the world is a judgment of the world, without involving the consequence that the judicial activity of God, as it is already manifested in the course of human development, does away with *the* judgment as the concluding act of the whole process. And it is here we find the foundation of the principle that great events in history, wherein either the fulness of the blessing that is in Christ, or his severity against

sin is strikingly manifested, may be viewed as types of the last time—as a coming of Christ. To this category, so far as respects the fulness of blessing revealed by Christ, the outpouring of the Holy Spirit belongs. (It is obvious that in the language of John the word *ἔρχεσθαι* is used in reference to the manifestation of the Lord in the inner world of spirit. Comp. John xiv. 18—23 ; Rev. ii. 5—16, iii. 3. In the last passage the well-known phrase *ἦξω ὡς κλέπτῃς* is employed to designate a spiritual coming.) And, in relation to the manifestation of avenging justice, the fall of Jerusalem with the ruin of the religious and political life of the Jewish people may be viewed in precisely the same light. This latter event, like the flood in the days of Noah and the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, is a cardinal symbol of the approaching separation of all into two classes—the righteous and the wicked ; and hence the Redeemer himself connects the description of the last great catastrophe with this fearful judgment. Nor is it at all consistent with the meaning of the prophetic representations to regard them as restricted in their reference to the one or the other of those events—for example, to look at everything as relating *only* to the destruction of Jerusalem ; on the contrary, each single occurrence is to be viewed in connexion with the whole.

Another circumstance, by which the distinct declarations of the Lord respecting the near approach of his advent are completely removed from the province of error, is the conflict between freedom and necessity, which appears peculiarly prominent in this point of doctrine. On the one hand, the time of fulfilment is represented as fixed in the counsels of God (Dan. xi. 36 ; Acts i. 7) ; on the other, the time seems uncertain, and open to be deferred or hastened by the faithfulness or unfaithfulness of men (Habak. ii. 3 ; 2 Pet. iii.) This diverse and apparently contradictory mode of expression is quite analogous to the general relation of freedom and necessity, according to the aspect in which that relation presents itself in reference to this subject. As everything future, even that which proceeds from the freedom of the creature, when viewed in relation to the divine knowledge, can only be regarded as *necessary* ; so everything future, as far as it concerns man, can only be regarded as *conditional* upon the use of his freedom. As obstinate perseverance in sin hastens destruction, so genuine repentance may avert it ; this is illustrated in the Old Testament, in

the prophet Jonah, by the history of Nineveh, and intimated in the New Testament by Paul, when (like Abraham praying for Sodom) he describes the elements of good existing in the world as exercising a restraint upon the judgments of God (2 Thess. ii. 7) ; and 2 Pet. iii. 9, the delay of the coming of the Lord is viewed as an act of divine long-suffering,<sup>1</sup> designed to afford men space for repentance. Accordingly, when the Redeemer promises the near approach of his coming, this announcement is to be taken with the restriction (to be understood in connexion with all predictions of judgments), "All this will come to pass, unless men avert the wrath of God by sincere repentance." None of the predictions of divine judgments are bare, historical proclamations of that which will take place; they are alarms calling men to repentance,—of which it may be said that they announce something for the very purpose that what they announce may *not* come to pass. This is no more pleasing to the natural man than the grace of the Lord was to Jonah; but it is not less a divine appointment. Sin *must* be condemned, whether God condemn it by resisting man, or man himself condemn it, by receiving the mind of God into himself; and while this depends upon the spontaneity of man, the spontaneity of man does not destroy necessity in God, but consists in it, and by it. All generations, therefore, that have waited in vain, since the time of the apostles, for the fulfilment of the promise of the Lord's external advent, have experienced it internally, if they have spiritually found the Redeemer; and the hour of death will afford every individual a perfect analogy to that which would be involved in the visible return of the Lord to each and all.<sup>2</sup> But to all succeeding generations, the prophecy of the Saviour (like all the parallel predictions of the Old Testament prophets) remains valid in its full sense; for, although names and forms may be changed, the opposing forces continue the same, and must at length bring the conflict, of which we have spoken, to its climax. Hence the prophecies of Scripture that have been, in one sense, fulfilled,

<sup>1</sup> Compare also Acts iii. 19, where it is said: "Repent ye, *that* the time of refreshing may come."

<sup>2</sup> Comp. the words of Hamann in Herbst's Bibl. Christl. Denk. Th. i. s. 85—"The death of every man is the time when the manifestation of the coming of the Lord is in part fulfilled to his soul. In this sense, it is literally true that the time of the fulfilment is near."

still remain as unfulfilled. The oversight of this circumstance accounts for the fact, that many expositors, with a good intention, but contrary to the simple meaning of words, would make a forced separation between events yet future, and that which is described as near—the destruction of Jerusalem. Such a separation can never be substantiated by the rules of grammar; and since the whole teaching of Scripture is in harmony with our passage, nothing is left us but to justify this form of scriptural representation upon deeper grounds.

In regard to the *single thoughts* in the following prophecy concerning the last things, it may be observed, that it is by no means the design of the Lord to give a comprehensive survey of *all* the circumstances belonging to his return. On the contrary, in the first portion of the discourse (chap. xxiv.), he only exhibits that aspect of the phenomenon which is calculated to excite fear, and describes the temptations and wanderings that form a part of its gradual approach (it is but seldom—*e. g.* Luke xxi. 28; Matt. xxiv. 31—that what is consolatory to the saints in connexion with this event is mentioned); whilst the resurrection of the just, the kingdom of God, the general resurrection, and the judgment, are not spoken of. It is not until we come to the subsequent parables (Matt. xxv.) that we find the more definite statement that the event will be productive of happiness to believers, and those living in love, just as much as it will bring condemnation upon those who believe not. And even in these parables the single circumstances are not described in distinct succession, but the whole seems rather to contain one great image into which all kinds of features are compressed. The proper distance between the individual points, as, for example, between the judicial proceedings of the Redeemer in regard to the sheep and the goats, set forth in the last parable, and the scenes depicted in chap. xxiv., can only be inferred from the minute and amplified representation of the Apocalypse.

Ver. 1, 2. According to the unanimous accounts of the three Evangelists, the conversation respecting the advent of the Lord originated in a definite occasion, which was of such a nature that it almost necessarily led to this result. It commenced at the moment when the Redeemer quitted the Temple with his disciples, never again to enter it. As he withdrew, the gracious presence of God left the sanctuary, and the Temple with all its service, and the

whole theocratic constitution allied to it, was given over to destruction. No circumstance in the life of the Saviour could have afforded a more seasonable opportunity to divulge the coming catastrophies, and to leave a legacy with his disciples from which they might derive hints for their conduct in the threatening crisis. The whole of the following discourse is to be viewed in the light of an instruction to the disciples, who, as the appointed leaders of the church, needed an insight into things that would happen in the future; in order that on the one hand they might not suffer shipwreck in their own faith, and on the other might be enabled to conduct the church through the rocky sea. As Jesus and his disciples passed out of the Temple, the latter having a presentiment that they should not enter it again with him, and looking up with an expression of wonder, pointed him to its mighty pile; and upon this followed the declaration of the Redeemer, that the lofty fabric of the Temple was about to fall. (Ver. 1, *ἐξελθὼν* has reference to xxi. 23. Mark xiii. 1 speaks of one of the disciples as the individual who uttered the words; probably it was Peter, who [according to ver. 3] with John, James, and Andrew, questioned the Lord more closely on this great event. The Temple as it then stood owed its completion to Herod, who had been engaged [comp. John ii. 20], for a long time in repairing it. Josephus gives an elaborate description of the magnificence of the Temple. Comp. Winer's Realwörterb. sub verb. The *ἀναθήματα* mentioned by Luke, according to the classic signification of the word, were offerings which were given in great numbers to the Temple in Jerusalem, and displayed on the walls or in the porches and out-buildings [the latter is the meaning of the word *οἰκοδομαί*.] The reading, *οὐ βλέπετε πάντα ταῦτα* in the text of Matthew, ver. 2, is probably inferior to that supported by Fritzsche and Fleck, which omits the negative. Only it is difficult to explain in what manner the *οὐ* can have got into the manuscripts. If it be retained in the text, as Schulz thinks it should, it must be taken, like Matt. vii. 22, as standing for *οὐχί* = *ἰὲρ*.)

Ver. 3. After this glance at the structure of the Temple, the Lord goes with his disciples, as he was accustomed, over the Mount of Olives, to Bethany. On the summit of the mountain from which he could see the city and the Temple, he sat down in the midst of a few of his disciples—those whom he treated with special confi-

dence—and disclosed to them the future in a sublime figure. The question of the disciples that led to these more minute disclosures is given with the greatest precision by Matthew; Mark and Luke comprehend the *παρουσία* and the *συντέλεια*, which are both mentioned by Matthew, under the general expression *πάντα ταῦτα*. But this very relation of the reports of Mark and Luke to the account of Matthew furnishes us with a hint as to the true interpretation. The apostles viewed these two great events in immediate connexion with the destruction of the Temple, and thought of the one as dependant on the other. Hence their inquiry has reference only to two objects. First they seek to know the time of the destruction of the Temple; and secondly they desire a sign (*σημεῖον*), *τίς*), whereby on the one hand they may know the correctness of the prophecy, and on the other may recognise the proximity of the great events themselves. Respecting the time the Lord only says that it is very near; but he gives them more than one sign, and thus puts them in a position to recognize the gradual approach of the fact. Now this fact includes two distinct parts which, although not identical, are so closely connected, that when the one takes place, the other does also. The word *παρουσία* is the ordinary expression for the return of the Lord. (Matt. xxiv. 27, 37, 39; 1 Thess. ii. 19, iii. 13, iv. 15, v. 23; 2 Thess. ii. 1; James v. 7, 8.) With the classic authors *παρουσία* commonly signifies presence; it also has the same meaning a few times in the New Testament in the writings of Paul (2 Cor. x. 10; Phil. i. 26, ii. 12, 2 Thess. ii. 9); in other cases it is used in the sense of advent, and once (2 Pet. i. 16) it denotes the incarnation of the Redeemer, as applied to his first coming. But it generally designates the second coming in glory synonymously with *ἐπιφάνεια* (1 Tim. vi. 14; 2 Tim. iv. 1, 8. The same expression is also employed in the passage 2 Tim. i. 10, in reference to the first advent of the Lord), and with *ἀποκάλυψις* (1 Cor. i. 7; 2 Thess. i. 7; 1 Pet. i. 7, 13; in the passage, Luke xvii. 30, the verb occurs.) In one instance (2 Thess. ii. 8) we have the compound expression *ἐπιφάνεια τῆς παρουσίας*. Now as the prophets (according to the observation already made), did not make any chronological distinction between the coming of Christ in his humiliation, and his coming in glory (and this mode of treating the subject has its relative truth, because, having risen from the dead, he was exalted to the right hand of God, and rules



in his church as the Prince of Peace) ; so in the Gospels the coming of Christ in glory is not distinguished from eternity, or from the creation of the new heaven and new earth. The Apocalypse is the first place in which these events appear in their complete separation. However, their connexion in the Gospels is not less relatively true than the union of the first and the second coming of the Lord in the Old Testament. For such a mighty victory of good over evil is represented as taking place upon the return of Christ at the resurrection of the just, and the establishment of the Lord's kingdom, that this period may be considered as a natural type of the final complete conquest. Accordingly the question, whether the words, *συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος* are to be understood as meaning the commencement of eternity, or the beginning of the Messianic period,<sup>1</sup> must be dismissed (as we have already remarked), for in the representation of the apostles the two are united and immediately associated with the destruction. (In one case only, Heb. ix. 26, the expression relates to the whole time since the appearance of Christ in flesh.) The only instances of its occurrence in the New Testament, are Matt. xiii. 39, 40, 49, xxviii. 20. The LXX. have *συντέλεια καιροῦ* in the passage Dan. ix. 27, for *הַלְבָּ*. The other authors of the New Testament, to express the same idea—the conclusion of the *αἰὼν οὗτος* and the beginning of the *αἰὼν μέλλον*—use the forms *ἔσχαται ἡμέραι* (Acts ii. 17), *ἔσχατοι χρόνοι* (1 Pet. i. 20), *ἔσχατον τῶν ἡμερῶν* (Heb. i. 2), *καιρὸς ἔσχατος* (1 Pet. i. 5), *ἔσχάτη ἡμέρα* (John vi. 39, 40, etc.), *ἔσχάτη ὥρα* (1 John ii. 18), *ἡμέρα ὀργῆς καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως* (Rom. ii. 5 ; Rev. vi. 17, xi. 18), which correspond with the forms of the Old Testament : *הַיָּמִים הָאֵלֶּיךָ* (Gen. xlix. 1 ; Isaiah ii. 2 ; Mic. iv. 1), *קֵץ הַיָּמִים* (Dan. xii. 13), or merely *קֵץ* (Dan. viii. 17, xi. 40) which answers to the Greek *τέλος*, Matt. xxiv. 6, 14. The Lord replies to the question respecting the *time* and the *sign* of his coming, in such a manner, that he describes the approaching commotions as closely connected, and does not draw any distinction between his (invisible) Parousia at the destruction of Jerusalem, and the *συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος* separated from it by hundreds of years ; on the contrary, the advent in its great leading circumstances is immediately as-

<sup>1</sup> It is remarkable that we never find the expression *συντέλεια τοῦ κόσμου* ; the word *αἰὼν* indicates the *time* of the world, which passes away, whilst the *mass* of the world remains.

sociated with the present, and this renders the whole description graphic without treading too near upon the truth.

Ver. 4, 5. The Redeemer now proceeds in his discourse, and exhibits that aspect of coming events which was adapted to restrain the disciples from prying into the future, with mere curiosity, and to direct their thoughts to themselves. Jesus shows them that the approaching events will be of a very perilous nature, and it will require all the earnestness of faith to guard themselves against falling into snares. As the first danger, the Redeemer mentions the fact, that men will rise up who will give themselves out to be the Messiah, and will seduce many. This temptation is again spoken of, ver. 11, 23, 24 (comp. with Mark xiii. 21, 22 ; Luke xvii. 23), because such phenomena will not only present themselves at the beginning of the birth-pangs of the new age, but will recur from time to time, till light gains the dominion over darkness. Moreover, ver. 23, 24 indicate an advance in these sinful phenomena themselves, for there the Lord speaks of wonders wrought in the power of darkness, which are not mentioned here. A great distinction, however, is to be made between the *ψευδόχριστοι* and the *ψευδοπροφῆται*. Individuals may be so carried away by fanatic zeal for the cause of religion, as to delude themselves into the belief that they are messengers of God ; such a case appears to be described, Ezek. xiii. 1, ff., where persons prophecy *out of their own heart* (נְבִיאִי, מִלִּבָּם) or men who follow their own spirit (חֲלָכִים אַחֲרֵי רוּחָם) are spoken of in opposition to true prophets appointed by the spirit of God. But, on the other hand, we may also conceive of wicked and conscious *deceivers*, who boldly pervert the faith of the people of God in the prophets, and in an expected Messiah, to their own avaricious or ambitious aims. It is not improbable that this latter class may have means of getting *powers of darkness* into their possession, and thus become so much the more dangerous, because they blind the eyes of the unwary by *τέρατα*. Both the *ψευδόχριστοι* and the *ψευδοπροφῆται*, however, must always be distinguished from the *ἀντίχριστος* of John.<sup>1</sup>) This epithet does not convey the idea that

<sup>1</sup> I cannot agree with the opinion of Lücke (comp. his remarks on 1 John ii. 18), who thinks the idea expressed by the term *ἀντίχριστος* in John is different from that contained in the *ἀντικείμενος* of Paul (2 Thess. ii. 1, ff.) The description of Paul is quite in harmony with Dan. xi., and does not by any means appear to denote a form of evil out of the Church. In the Apocalypse, the beast out of the sea, that opposes every thing divine, and is full of blasphemy, is parallel with Antichrist. (Rev. xiii. 1, ff.)

the person so named announces himself as Christ, but indicates that proceeding *out of* the Church, and forsaking it, he contends against the whole Christian principle, and the person of the Lord. The *ψευδόχριστοι*, on the contrary, are to be viewed as *having no connexion* with the Church, and merely giving themselves out—either consciously or unconsciously—to be Christ. Hence Antichrist is a more daring and fearful form of sin; inasmuch as it *denies* the idea of Christ itself, whilst the pseudo-christ *acknowledges* it, but seeks to use it for its own ends. The circumstance that there is no record of any one having declared himself to be the Messiah *before* the destruction of Jerusalem (Theudas, Acts v. 36, and the Egyptian, Acts xxi. 38, represented themselves as prophets), is to be regarded as showing that the whole prophecy was not fulfilled at the time of the fall of the city. It is well known that *after* that event many wretched men played the part of Messiah, and deceived credulous persons. I will only mention two: in ancient times Bar Chochba, and in modern days Sabbatai Zebhi, who, in the seventeenth century, in Constantinople, finished his part by going over to Islam.<sup>1</sup>

Ver. 6—8. The Redeemer, having thus described the temptations that will result from the sin of men, proceeds to depict certain terrible physical events. The advent of the Lord appears to be a time of ripeness in evil as well as in what is good (Matt. xiii. 30); everything of a severe and painful kind, that has been poured out upon mankind during the course of the world's history, then comes forth in its mightiest and most aggravated form. But, like evil generally, this form of evil is only the *external* echo of the *internal* discord and confusion in the ethical world; it is only on account of their having this moral source, and because of their possible salutary reaction, that these external circumstances are of any importance. The Rabbins very expressively designated the sufferings and disturbances that will precede the advent of the Lord: תְּבִלֵּי הַמָּשִׁיחַ, the birth-pangs of the Messiah; and reference

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Henke's Kirchengeschichte, Th. iv. s. 359, ff. Von Meyer in the Blatt, f. höh. Wahrh. Th. 7, s. 306, ff., following Peter Beer's history of the Jewish sects, speaks of another man of this description, named Jacob Frank. According to the same authority, Peter Beer, there are still persons among the Chasidim in Russian Poland, who exercise a power over their adherents, from which it may be inferred that they assume Messianic authority. Accounts are given of *fifteen* false Messiahs among the Jews, since the time of Christ.

is made to this expression in the words ἀρχὴ ὠδίνων, Matt. xxiv. 8.<sup>1</sup> They viewed the universe as revolving and eliciting a higher, nobler state of things from sorrow and pain. The endeavour to point out cases of all the forms of human distress mentioned here, as existing in the time previous to the destruction of Jerusalem, is really inconsistent; for even if analogies to all the specified phenomena of suffering are found, yet these are not the very things prophesied. At the coming of the Lord, all will be repeated in the highest measure. The words of the Redeemer here evidently show his aim to divert the minds of his disciples from the importance which man is so fond of attaching to these external commotions and troubles. Twice (ver. 6 and ver. 8) he assures them, that these troubles are not the end itself (concerning τέλος = γῆ, comp. the remarks above on ver. 1), but only the beginning of sorrows,—obviously intimating that what are to follow will be still more severe.

(The words ἀκοαὶ πολέμων relate to wars that have not actually broken out, but the fearful rumours of which keep the mind in a state of alarm. It is better to understand ver. 7 as having reference to insurrections, than to take it as descriptive of wars, which had just been spoken of. The dissolution of all political order is the main thought of the passage. Θροεῖσθαι, instead of which Luke has πτοεῖσθαι, occurs in the parallel, 2 Thess. ii. 2. Πάντα, in Matt. xxiv. 6, is to be taken as standing for τὰ πάντα, or ταῦτα πάντα. The Old Testament affords parallels to the contents of these verses, in the passages, 2 Chron. xv. 5, 6; Isaiah xiii. 13; Joel iii. 3; Zech. xiv. 3. The remark added by Luke, xxi. 11, φόβητρά τε καὶ σημεῖα ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ is introduced by Matthew in a subsequent part of the description [ver. 29], where it is more in harmony with the connexion. The expression φόβητρον does not occur anywhere in the New Testament but in this passage.)

Ver. 9. The Saviour proceeds to specify some of these sharper sufferings to be endured by his disciples, and instances, as such, personal persecutions and martyrdom. He states that the ground of the hatred cherished against them is the name of Christ (here again ὄνομα, like ὄψ, stands for the personality, and the whole

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Eisenmenger's eutd. Judenth., B. i. s. 711.

nature of the personality himself), so that the divine element in believers, like that which was manifested in the person of Christ himself, comes into a conflict with the ungodliness existing in the world, and its children. As in Christ, so also in believers, that divine element can only conquer by death. The observation appended by Luke (xxi. 18), and peculiar to himself, *καὶ θριξ ἐκ τῆς κεφαλῆς ὑμῶν οὐ μὴ ἀπόληται*, cannot have reference to external but to internal inviolability; for previous to this, ver. 16, we have the statement, *καὶ θανατώσουσιν ἐξ ὑμῶν*.<sup>1</sup> (The same metaphor occurs, Luke xii. 6, ff.; and there also, it does not relate merely to the external preservation of the earthly life.) Now, if this hatred on account of the name of Christ is represented as quite *general*, *μισοῦμενοι ὑπὸ πάντων* (Matthew adds *ἐθνῶν*)—then the idea expressed is, that mankind, without the spirit of Jesus Christ, live in the ungodly element of *σκοτός*, and by this very circumstance are prevented from recognizing the light of the Redeemer that has been received by believers, in its true character. In regard to the fuller details given by Mark and Luke (with slight transpositions) respecting the form of the persecutions, and the position of believers in reference to the nearest earthly relations of kindred and friendship, we may observe it is probable that they were originally spoken in the connexion of the discourse, but that Matthew put these thoughts in an abbreviated form, because he had already copiously introduced them in the passages Matt. x. 17, ff, 34, ff. The history of the Church of Christ, as it has been re-

<sup>1</sup> If it be said that the words of Luke are only, *θανατώσουσιν ἐξ ὑμῶν*, so that the sense is: *some* would be killed, but the *rest* would remain unhurt; then an utterly unjustifiable distinction arises, and the dead appear to suffer an injury—which cannot possibly be the meaning of the passage. On the contrary, the words before us represent the hatred of the mass at large in its impotence. As an external force, it can only reach the external man; the true man remains untouched. In the parallel passages, 1 Sam. xiv. 45; 2 Sam. xiv. 11; Acts xxvii. 34, it is said: *θριξ ἐκ τῆς κεφαλῆς οὐ πεσεῖται*,—a form which must be regarded as identical with our own. Grotius, who renders the form thus: *ne hilum quidem damni senties*, also points out another interpretation of the words in the present connexion; he says: *si quid ipsorum ad tempus interire videtur, non tam interit quam apud Deum deponitur, qui cum foenore est redditurus*. Accordingly he seems to understand the passage thus: “Ye will indeed be hated and killed, but nothing of you shall perish—ye will receive it all again at the resurrection.” However, the idea of preservation and restoration can only be applied to what is spiritual; for Scripture says nothing about a revivification of all the parts of the destroyed body; and hence we come back to the meaning: ye will suffer no true injury (not even the slightest); on the contrary, ye will receive advantage from all this, for, by patient endurance of sufferings (ver. 19), ye will gain your souls.

marked in our exposition of those passages, affords numerous confirmations of this prophecy. But to what extent persecutions of believers to the death will be repeated, when the advent of the Lord draws near, time must teach. The possibility of such things, at least, is proved by the persecutions of the faithful at the hands of their sanguinary oppressors during the time of the French Revolution.

Ver. 10—13. The mournful consequences of these persecutions, to the Church, are now minutely described. To many they will prove a stumbling-block, and will lead them into great delinquencies. False teachers will arise, who will seduce many from the Church, and damp the ardour of brotherly love. The exhortation to *ὑπομονή* (or persevering endurance in all these sufferings), suggested by these thoughts, is expressed ver. 13; affliction is represented as that which refines and perfects, so that it is not only the means of separating the insincere, but equally tends to purify the life of the sincere, and thus conducts them to *σωτηρία*.<sup>1</sup>)

That the teachers of error here spoken of (ver. 11) would be in the bosom of the Church is not expressly stated; and it may be supposed that teachers not belonging to the Church will succeed in drawing many feeble and half-hearted members out of it, for fear of persecutions; just as the growing *ἀνομία* out of the Church acts banefully upon the love in the Church itself (ver. 12.) But, as it is not expressly said that they will be out of the Church, the words may be taken indefinitely as we find them, and applied to both cases; so that the general meaning is, that sin and corruption will gain greater power through the persecutions that result from them, and will wound the Church itself in many of its members. (This is the only instance in which the verb *ψύχεσθαι*, to cool, occurs in the New Testament; it is derived from the metaphor according to which love is compared to a fire, Luke xii. 49.) The probability that such phenomena as those described, ver. 10—12, would present themselves before the destruction of Jerusalem, cannot be shewn; the persecutions of that period were not so violent as to prevail in driving many away from the faith and from the first glow of love. If things of a similar kind did take place, that was only

<sup>1</sup> Luke xxi. 19 has, instead of *σώζεσθαι*, the parallel expression *κτᾶσθαι τὴν ψυχὴν*, to gain or win the soul; antithesis to *ἀπολίσαι*. Comp. Matt. xvi. 25, where *εὐρίσκειν* and *σώζειν* occur synonymously. Comp. also the passage Matt. x. 22, where the same words are employed.

a feeble type of the decline of the church predicted here, which Paul (2 Thess. ii. 3) designates as the ἀποστασία. And another proof that this prophecy also will come to pass, in far more fearful phenomena than those of the period prior to the fall of Jerusalem, is furnished by the melancholy fact of the revolution—that the Christian religion was formally abolished, and compelled to give place to the idolatrous worship of reason.

Ver. 14. The discourse of the Lord now takes a turn, and we have the antithesis to the numerous declensions from the Church, that would be occasioned by persecutions and seductions, in the proclamation of the Gospel throughout the world, and its vast extension to all nations of the earth. And here the divine energy dwelling in the word is manifested as infinitely more mighty than all the power by which the Church is assaulted from without. (The expression εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας in Matthew specifies the βασιλεία as the object of the glad tidings proclaimed by the preachers; that message, however, is to be viewed as combining external and internal blessings; only that here the connexion naturally leads to the special observation of one of its features, viz., that the proclamation would invite men to receive the spirit of the new community of life, so that, at the Parousia, when it shall appear in ascendancy, they may be received into it.)

Now, this verse is particularly opposed to that view by which the whole of this portion of the discourse (as far as ver. 29), is referred to the destruction of Jerusalem alone. For the parallel πάντα τὰ ἔθνη prohibits us from applying οἰκουμένη either to the Jewish state or to the Roman kingdom; nor can those who support the above hypothesis allow that there was a proclamation of the Gospel in all the world before the destruction of Jerusalem; while the explanation that the announcement was not made to nations as such, but to individuals *belonging to* them, who came in contact with the apostles (so that the sense would be: “the proclamation shall not then be confined to Jews, but addressed to members of all nations”), is evidently an expedient resorted to from necessity. According to the principle on which our view is founded, the preaching of the Gospel in all the world (as the prophets so often declared that the word of God should come to the remotest isles<sup>1</sup>) is a true sign of

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Isaiah xix. 21, ff., xlix. 6, li. 5, lv. 5, lvi. 7, lx. 3, 9, lxvi. 19, 20; Zechar. ii. 11; Zechar. ii. 11.

the near approach of the Lord's advent, only that, here—like the whole description—it leans against a great historical event which forms the natural type of the final catastrophe. Hence it is here said (with a retrospective reference to ver. 6), *τότε ἔξει τὸ τέλος*, so that the end of the *αἰὼν οὗτος* is connected with this sublime triumph of the divine word over all ungodliness. At the same time, the language before us does not imply that every member of every nation will be converted to the Church of Christ, as is shown by the words *εἰς μαρτύριον πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσι*. (The same phraseology occurred Mark xiii. 9, Luke xxi. 13, in reference to persecutions.) All that is requisite is that the Gospel, as the purest light of the manifestation of God, be shown to all; thus every one is placed under the necessity of deciding and taking part either *for* or *against* it. Hence the proclamation of the kingdom of God is itself a *κρίσις* for the nations, whereby those who are of an ungodly mind are exposed; and this is the precise point expressed in the phrase *εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς*. In the recension of Luke (which here begins to differ widely from Matthew), this idea is wanting; and, instead of it, he has introduced into this discourse the thoughts omitted by Matthew, respecting the support that would be rendered to the preachers of the Gospel by the Holy Spirit; Mark also refers to the same subject, and connects it immediately with the proclamation of the Gospel. Matthew has the words (x. 19, 20), in his account of the instructions to the apostles, and although they are by no means unsuitable in that connexion, yet it must be confessed that the last addresses of Christ, like the great concluding discourses reported by John, afford us reason for considering it very probable that the Lord then made reference to the assistance of the Holy Spirit. Accordingly it appears that Mark and Luke have preserved, in these passages, true elements of the discourse of Christ, which Matthew omitted here because he had introduced them in discourses at an earlier period.

Ver. 15. Immediately after this description of the spread of the Gospel through all nations, there follows a very minute representation of the fall of Jerusalem, without any pause being observed, or any intimation being given that what follows is to be separated from what has preceded. The reference to the destruction of the holy city is so obvious that it cannot be mistaken, especially according to the account of Luke, which presents much that is peculiar. This



blending of the proximate and the remote in one whole can only be traced to the principle we have laid down (ver. 1), as the ground on which our view of this section is founded : viz., that the demolition of Jerusalem is employed as the nearest point with which the last things—necessarily remaining indefinite in their chronology—could be connected ; and that, according to the design of the Redeemer, this event itself was a type of the overthrow of the whole state of things obtaining in the *αἰὼν οὗτος*, including the external institution of the church.

According to Matthew and Mark, the description of the Lord is derived from a prophecy of Daniel. This express reference to the book of Daniel, will always furnish the believer with an important argument for the retention of Daniel's writings in the canon, although he may not yet be able, by any historical means, altogether to surmount the critical doubt respecting them, which, as it seems to me, still remains, even after the most recent and very valuable attempt to demonstrate the authenticity of Daniel's prophecies.<sup>1</sup> It is impossible that Christ should have employed Daniel, as he did here, unless he approved of the importance that has been ascribed to the book bearing his name. (In the text of Mark, the form of citation, τὸ ρηθὲν ὑπο Δανιὴλ τοῦ προφήτου, is spurious, and merely interpolated from Matthew ; but it is evident that Mark has in his eye the same passage of Daniel as Matthew quotes.) The main passage here referred to by the Lord is the remarkable prophecy, Dan. ix. 26, 27, which we find more definitely expressed, Dan. xi. 31 ; xii. 11. According to my conviction, this *cannot* relate to Antiochus Epiphanes, but only to the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans. Although the calculation has its difficulties—and these not slight ones—(difficulties which designedly exist in all matters of reckoning connected with the prophecies of Scripture, because it is intended that the time should remain indefinite, and that nearer light concerning the future should only be given to individuals for special ends) ; yet the reference of the prophecy to this fact is throughout so distinctly expressed, that it never ought to have been

<sup>1</sup> It appears to me that Daniel in the Old Testament, critically speaking, stands parallel with the second epistle of Peter in the New Testament. While it is a difficult matter to prove, in a critical and historical manner, that they are the genuine compositions of the authors to whom they are attributed, this may, in both cases, be done by *forcible means*. Meanwhile it is sufficient to show that the arguments against the authenticity are *not of a forced description*, and then the question of authenticity, in regard to these writings, cannot be solved in a historico-critical manner.

mistaken. And moreover, while this general reference of the prediction has a firm footing, so also the expression, *βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως* (= *בְּדִלְיָמָא דְּעִרְמָא*; the expression is best taken as meaning the abomination that follows universal devastation and destruction; according to the context, attention is directed to something peculiarly horrible taken from the whole circle of the desolation), cannot be applied to events in the time of Antiochus, but can only relate to what transpired when the city was demolished by the Romans. Now since Jesus applies the passage to this particular fact, he here uses the prophetic words in their most literal sense. But what occurrence at the time of the fall of Jerusalem is denoted by this obscure expression (it is chosen in conformity with the LXX.; the version of Theodotion, which, as is well-known, is generally used in the book of Daniel, has *βδέλυγμα τῶν ἐρημώσεων*) we are not definitely informed; and it must necessarily remain a matter of uncertainty, because, according to the prophetic tendency, the actual fact ultimately contemplated, as the immediate precursor of Christ's advent, only had its feeble types in the period of the destruction. Two objects, however, must be decidedly excluded; the passage cannot have reference either to the band of zealots who caused a massacre in the Temple, or to the Roman army. Neither of these have any religious character; but such a character is indicated by the expression *βδέλυγμα* in its connexion with *τόπος ἅγιος*; and the idea that the passage refers to the Roman army is merely occasioned by a mistaken comparison of Luke xxi. 20, which should be treated independently, because he gives another recension of this discourse of Christ. The expression *τόπος ἅγιος* (for which Mark has *ὅπου οὐ δεῖ*, that is, *ubi nefas est*), cannot relate to the Holy Land; it can only be applied to the *Temple*, because in the original text the words are *הַמִּקְדָּשׁ*. And moreover the expression *ἐστός* (with Fritzsche, I prefer the neuter because of the connexion with *βδέλυγμα*) is incompatible with either of the views, that the zealots or that the Romans are meant. The most consistent hypothesis is, that the profanation of the Temple by *idolatrous worship* is the phenomenon alluded to;<sup>1</sup> but as the historical accounts respecting the attempts made to introduce

<sup>1</sup> The expression *βδέλυγμα* is in the highest degree favourable to this view. Suidas explains it thus: *πάν ἰδωλον καὶ πᾶν ἐκτύπωμα ἀνθρώπου οὕτως ἐκαλεῖτο παρὰ Ἰουδαίους*. In the Hebrew also, *גִּדְּוָן* is used especially in application to religious impurity, and *עֲצָבִים* are plainly *idols*. (Comp. Gesenius sub verb.)

it afford us but little satisfactory information, it is difficult to fix upon anything specific. According to Josephus (Bell. Jud. ii. 7) Pilate attempted to set up the statue of the emperor, but not in the Temple. Jerome (in his commentary on the passage) says, that a statue of Adrian occupied the place of the demolished Temple; but this was *after* its destruction, whilst here the discourse is concerning occurrences *before* that catastrophe. Such events, therefore, only furnish feeble analogies to that which is the proper subject of allusion in this prophecy. Paul (2 Thess. ii. 4) affirms this distinctly and beyond all mistake, and the possibility of such a fearful development of sin in times of external civilization and culture is again strikingly proved by the French Revolution, with its idolatrous worship of reason.

A further difficulty is occasioned by the parenthesis in Matthew and Mark, *ὁ ἀναγνώσκων νοεῖτω*. It does not appear to me probable that the Lord uttered these words with reference to the text of Daniel; in this case something more definite would have been added, as, for example, *τὰ τοῦ προφήτου*. But if these are the words of the Evangelist, appended by him in order to direct the attention of his contemporaries to this passage, then the question occurs whether they will not afford a date for the composition of the Gospel. It is by no means improbable that if Matthew recognized the near approach of the dreadful destruction of the metropolis, in the signs that preceded it, he may have felt it right to add such a hint for his readers; this hint, however, gives us no premises from which to deduce anything further than that the Gospel of Matthew must have been composed shortly *before* the fall of Jerusalem; the uncertainty as to the particular events to which Matthew may have referred in what he added does not permit us to fix the time more precisely.<sup>1</sup>)

Here the account given by Luke is peculiar. As we have already remarked, the interpretation of the words quoted in Matthew and Mark, by a reference to Luke, as meaning the Roman army, is evidently forced; Luke follows another recension of the Lord's discourse. Still it is not improbable that the ingredients received by him are genuine constituent parts of the original discourse of

<sup>1</sup> Hug Einl. in's N. T. Th. ii. s. 14, goes too far when he thinks this passage affords the conclusion that the Romans must already have possessed Galilee, and must have been on the point of taking Judæa also, when Matthew wrote these words.

the Redeemer. Luke xix. 43, we find the same idea—that of the city being invested by enemies, and the siege proceeding against it; but that passage cannot be regarded as a *post eventum* description of events that transpired during the siege of Titus, because the Old Testament contains representations of a precisely similar kind. (Comp. Isaiah xxix. 3; Jerem. vi. 6; Ezek. xvii. 17.) Luke xix. 43, not only represents the city as beleaguered, but describes the mode of the blockade, throwing up a dam. (Χάραξ signifies valium or agger, an artificial elevation, by means of which besiegers endeavour to reach the walls of the blockaded city. Ezek. xvii. 17, the LXX. use the expression χαρακοβολία for this form of siege. The passage, Luke xix. 44, is the only instance in which ἔδαφιζω occurs in the New Testament. It signifies literally [from ἔδαφος] to make equal with the ground, then generally to overthrow, to annihilate. According to this wider signification, the expression is extended also to the children of Jerusalem [τὰ τέκνα σου ἐν σοί].)

Ver. 16—21. In the following verses the reference to the destruction of Jerusalem again obviously presents itself in many particular features. The judgment is described as falling so suddenly and inevitably, that the utmost haste is recommended, and this very haste, as well as the entire surrender of all earthly possessions (comp. the same thought Luke xvii. 32), retains its significance in the typical application of this description to the advent of the Lord. The Lord will also preserve believers who yield themselves with child-like confidence to his guidance, in a safe hiding-place (comp. the remarks on ver. 31), against the universal devastation and destruction. (The mountains are mentioned as the places difficult of access to troops making an assault, and it must be borne in mind that the houses were low, so that the inhabitants could make an immediate descent from the roof to the ground, and effect a speedy flight. We have a perfect parallel to this description in Luke xvii. 31, which passage treats of the advent of the Lord under the figure of the destruction of Jerusalem.) The calamity itself appears inevitable, but prayer may secure alleviations; as, for example, that the flight may not take place in the inclement season of the year. Matthew has the peculiar appendix, μηδὲ σαββάτῳ in which we see a true stamp of the Jewish complexion of his Gospel; and in interpreting this it must be observed that Jesus uttered

these words from the point of view taken by the Jews, without declaring their rigid notions concerning the Sabbatic law to be objectively correct. It was not possible to raise their minds to a more spiritual view suddenly; this could only be done gradually; and to this end Jesus had not only often healed on the Sabbath, but even commanded a man whom he cured to carry his bed (comp. the remarks on John v. 8), although he left the law of the Sabbath as a whole untouched. In conclusion, it may be observed that even this special description of the fall of Jerusalem is not without a glance at the coming of the Lord, as is shown by ver. 21, where the term *θλίψις μεγάλη*, as it had not happened since the creation of the world, can only have reference to the *תְּבִלַּי הַפְּשִׁיחַ*; especially as it is added, *οὐδ' οὐ μὴ γένηται*.

Here again the representation of Luke so decidedly differs, that it requires a separate consideration, as a peculiar recension. Jerusalem was named as the besieged city, ver. 20; and so also in the following verses of Luke the same application of the language is decidedly retained, Jerusalem being described, ver. 24, as destroyed by Gentile nations. Even the mention of the great period of suffering is made in such a manner, that it does not convey so express a reference to the coming of Christ as that in Matthew and Mark. It is designated (ver. 23) *ὀργὴ τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ*, and accordingly this destruction appears to be merely a judgment upon the Jews. But if this should be thought to prove that the account of Luke relates *merely* to this fact, without making any reference to the advent of the Lord, such a view is most decidedly opposed by ver. 24 and its immediate connexion with ver. 25. In the former the time of the Gentiles is represented as being fulfilled, and in the latter the *σημεῖα* of the Parousia are described as altogether beyond mistake; so that we cannot admit any *real* difference between the statements of Matthew and Mark and those of Luke. The points of difference have more to do with merely single features of the representation than with the matter itself. (Ver. 21, the words *ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῆς* refer to Jerusalem. The city forms an antithesis with its environs [*χώραις*.] Those believers who were in the city were to flee out of it [and thus it came to pass, for the Christians fled beyond Jordan to Pella], while those who were already out of it were not to seek safety in it, because the city, with everything in it, was to

become the prey of destruction. This is the only instance in which the form *ἐκχωρέω* occurs in the New Testament.

Ver. 22. The destruction of Jerusalem is expressly designated a divine act of judgment (concerning *ἐκδίκησις*, comp. the remarks on Luke xviii. 2, 7] already predicted in the Holy Scriptures of the Old Testament.)

The form *πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα* cannot have reference only to the passage Matt. xxiv. 15, quoted from the prophet Daniel; on the contrary, it comprehends the entire sum of those prophecies and types in the Old Testament, in which the wrath of God against the nation of Israel is set forth. Hence we must begin with the curse pronounced by Moses upon the people when they would not obey the voice of God, and connect with it the threatenings of all holy men and prophets in which they denounced punishments upon unbelief and disobedience. And even if these had their preliminary fulfilment in many oppressions endured by the nation—as may be said, for example, of the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, and the captivity of Israel in Babylon—yet all previous sufferings appear insignificant, when compared with the ruin of the city by the Romans. All prior judgments, therefore, are types of this last and literal act of divine justice, which followed the rejection of the Messiah, the highest and also the final act in the manifestation of the grace of the Lord. (Comp. Matt. xxi. 38, ff., where the Lord, in his parable, connects the judgment with the expulsion of the Son.) And this is especially true of the Babylonish exile, to which there appears to be an allusion in the words of Luke, ver. 24, *αἰχμαλωτισθήσονται εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*. The carrying away of Israel from the land of his fathers to Babylon was only a prelude of the general captivity of the Israelites (predicted by Moses, Deut. xxviii. 64) among all nations, from one end of the earth to the other. Thus the whole world was opened to them, excepting only the holy city—the centre of all their hopes and desires—this (since the time of Adrian) was closed against them. It was accessible to none but Gentiles, who made it a rendezvous of their idolatry. (*Πατέω*, like *καταπατέω*, is also used by the profane writers in the sense of contemptuously treading under the feet, abusing. Hence it involves the idea of audacity and sinfulness, as the only source from which abuse can spring. There is but one other instance of its occurrence, in the same signification, in the

New Testament, viz., Rev. xi. 2, τὴν πόλιν τὴν ἁγίαν πατήσουσι ἔθνη; and this language appears to refer to our passage, thus affording no small confirmation to the view that the words before us, while peculiar to Luke, really belong to the discourse of the Lord.)

The final clause of ver. 24, ἄχρι πληρωθῶσι καιροὶ ἐθνῶν, is of the highest importance. The main idea it expresses is, that nations, like individuals, have a limited time of development, beyond which they cannot pass. As Israel filled up the measure of his disobedience and then was rejected, so also the rule of the Gentiles over Israel has its term. It is true, these words do not contain any express information respecting the relation of Israel to the Gentiles, at the termination of their power over it; but this may be gathered from other passages. According to Rom. xi., the rejection of the Jews is not total, and therefore the fulfilment of the καιροὶ ἐθνῶν is to be viewed as connected with the reassumption of the Jews. And on the other hand, this fulfilment, in relation to the Gentiles, is to be regarded as a judgment poured out upon them for the purpose of punishing and sifting them.<sup>1</sup> (The prophets of the Old Testament speak in a similar manner respecting the nations whom the Lord used as scourges to his own people; for a time they kept the ascendancy, and then they themselves were hurled down. See Isaiah x. 5, 12—15; Zech. i. 14, 15; Dan. ix. 26, compared with xii. 11.) The meaning of the words certainly has its *primary application* to the Romans, as the nation by whom the Lord God permitted the Jews to be chastised. But as the destruction of Jerusalem (according to the principle already laid down in our remarks on Matt. xxiv. 1), was only employed as the nearest great event that would form a historical point of support for the description of the last time, so also the individual circumstances of the former have their further relation to the latter. A more minute view of this subject will be furnished in the interpretation of the passage, Rev. xi. 2, which is quite parallel with Luke xxi. 24, and contains a reference to Dan. xii. 11.

<sup>1</sup> The time of the conversion of the Gentiles is not the period referred to. The Lord does not here speak of the Gentiles so far as they also are objects of the divine favour, but so far as they are instrumentally employed in the divine government of the world. (Comp. Schott in his Comm. p. 338. The passages, Jer. xxvii. 7, l. 31, which Schott quotes, are illustrations in point.) Luke xxi. 25 throws decisive light on the meaning of Luke in these words, for after the description of the sufferings of the Jews, mention is made of the συνοχή ἐθνῶν.

Ver. 22. Whilst Luke immediately follows up the description of the fall of Jerusalem with the mention of prodigies that would be visible in heaven and on earth, Matthew (ver. 22—28) introduces between these points a more amplified description of the distress which he had mentioned, ver. 21 ; and Mark inserts a similar paragraph in the same place, only in a form somewhat more abbreviated. The peculiarity of the ideas is a guarantee for the correctness of their position here, with this exception only, that Luke employs ver. 27, 28 in a more probable connexion than that which they have in Matthew. Matthew xxiv. 22, describes the *θλίψις μεγάλη* as so fearful, that in the mercy of God a special curtailment would be necessary, for without this *οὐ πάντα* = *לֹא כָל* frail man (*σάρξ* = *רֶשֶׁת* certainly signifies mankind generally, but with the accessory idea of weak, perishable elements contained in the mass) would survive the woe. (There can be no doubt that here *σώζεσθαι* primarily refers to the outward, corporeal life, so that the sense is, "all would be destroyed." But since the subject of discourse is a visitation of divine justice, the corporeal destruction involves moral criminality ; the impossibility that the *ἐκλεκτοί* should perish, in this judgment of God, is parallel with the impossibility of their being seduced [ver. 24.] *Κολοβόω*, from *κόλοσος*, signifies literally to mutilate, then to cut off, to shorten. This is the only instance of its occurrence in the New Testament.) Now his abbreviation of the distress comes to pass *διὰ τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς*. Hence the question might be asked, whether the design of the language is to represent the *ἐκλεκτοί* as exercising this influence merely by their *presence*, or whether the effect results from their *prayer*. But wherever the *ἐκλεκτοί* are, they are only to be conceived of as in prayer, so that the two senses coincide. Thus we find the same idea here as that which obtains in the Old Testament (Gen. xviii.), that the saints exercise a restraining influence upon the whole mass. And the truth of this idea is easily seen if, instead of the ordinary view of human relationships, which isolates the individual man, we adopt the more profound one, according to which the whole organization of the human race, as well as the collective existence of single nations, appear founded upon a vital, mutual operation of the individuals that constitute them. For this latter view shows that the forbearance of God with the ungodly for the sake of the godly, does not result from an arbitrary decree of God ; but the natural



connexion of the spiritual life of the mass involves the fact that those individuals in whom the germs of the nobler life are preserved, will keep the whole mass together ; if they become the prey of destruction, all sinks at once. In the fall of Jerusalem this principle was but very imperfectly realised. It is true that the siege might have lasted longer, and it might have been carried to such an extent that not a single person should have escaped ; but how it can be said that this was prevented for the sake of the *ἐκλεκτοί*, does not appear. For the Christians fled to Pella, and this flight was a proof that Jerusalem, with its inhabitants, was given over to destruction as incorrigible (like the world before the flood after Noah's removal into the ark, and like the dwellers in Sodom after the flight of Lot to Zoar) ; but it afforded no reason to conclude that God shortened their tribulation on account of the believers. Schott, indeed, thinks (p. 57) that we are not to understand by the *ἐκλεκτοί* the Christians, but such Jews as were about to go over to the church of Christ. But the relation of the *ἐκλεκτοί*, ver. 24 and 31, to the members of the church, renders this hypothesis quite untenable. This passage also evidently has its final reference to the advent of the Lord, before which the birth-pangs of the Messiah will come to pass ; these will fall at once upon believers and unbelievers, upon the former to perfect them, upon the latter to punish them ; but for the sake of believers the Merciful One will shorten them. It is not till after this (ver. 31), that believers are separated from their connexion with unbelievers, and gathered together in a mountainous place (Zoar) ; then the community of unbelievers having lost its moral foundation, perishes in irretrievable destruction.

Ver. 23—26. The physical sufferings are accompanied by further sharp temptations ; deceiving and deceived men represent themselves as the Messiah and as prophets (comp. the remarks on Matt. xxiv. 4, 5.) The temptation by pretended appearances of divine messengers appears continuous in its operation upon the church, which nevertheless progresses in itself. According to this passage, it is so severe that even the *ἐκλεκτοί* might be deceived, if it did not involve a spiritual contradiction, to suppose that the representatives of the kingdom of light on earth would be overcome by darkness. The application of the term *ἐκλεκτοί* in this passage to any others than the apostles and believing members of the church, is utterly untenable, for all is addressed directly to the apostles themselves.

Hence the words can only be taken as meaning ὥστε πλανῆσαι εἰ δυνατόν, ὑμᾶς καὶ πάντας τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς ;—it is only thus that the force of the admonition can be felt. One remarkable point in this passage is, that σημεῖα and τέρατα are attributed to false prophets. These being signs by which genuine prophets proved their authority, unexperienced persons might easily be deceived by them. Now, the admission that miracles might be performed by false prophets, is an incontestible witness (as we have already remarked in the exposition of Matt. iv. 12) that miracles cannot prove the truth. The truth can only be proved by itself, as the presence of light is attested only by light itself. But the gift of miracles certainly shows the connexion of an individual with the spiritual world, whether with the world of light and truth, or with the kingdom of darkness and lies. The question whether an individual is acting in the spirit of light or of darkness, cannot long remain a matter of doubt to a sincere person ; and, if miraculous powers are united with falsehood, this is to an enlightened mind so much stronger an intimation to keep aloof. The meaning which the Lord here intends to convey is enlarged upon by Paul (2 Thess. ii. 9) and John (Rev. xiii. 12, ff.) ; but without the presupposition of a kingdom of darkness and its operations, no idea can be connected with miracles of pseudo-prophets.<sup>1</sup>

Ver. 27, 28. A contrast is drawn between the forms in which false Christs appear (ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ—ἐν τοῖς ταμείοις are to be taken merely as general expressions for the antithesis between inhabited and uninhabited, concealed and open<sup>2</sup>), and the mode in which the only true Messiah is manifested. The latter is like an all-illuminating flash of lightning, which no one can mistake ; it is as easy to be perfectly acquainted with it, as it is to be deceived by the former. If the metaphor derived from the lightning may also supply another point of comparison,—viz., its sudden, unexpected appearance,—yet the connexion absolutely requires that the main refer-

<sup>1</sup> The expression δῶσουσι σημεῖα forbids the supposition that merely the pretence of being able to work miracles is meant ; it ascribes to false prophets the real power to perform them. Paul speaks expressly, 2 Thess. ii. 9, of the ἐνέργεια τοῦ σατανᾶ which effects them.

<sup>2</sup> This representation of the ministry of false prophets is strikingly descriptive of the spirit that inspires them. Instead of the open, transparent spirit of the true Gospel, they manifest a spirit of sedition which shuns the light, and is constantly under the necessity of hiding this or that from its all-revealing rays.

ence should be to its discernibleness and openness to universal observation. This is contrasted, as the test of the appearing of the true Messiah, with the pretended Messianic advents of impostors; who are always obliged to mask themselves, first in one mode and then in another. Now, in what way this can relate to the so-called invisible advent of the Lord at the destruction of Jerusalem, it does not at all appear; the words have no sense except when applied to the coming of the Lord in the clouds of heaven.<sup>1</sup> In the text of Luke (xvii. 24) this metaphorical allusion to the lightning is worded somewhat differently: ὥσπερ ἡ ἀστραπή, ἡ ἀστράπτουσα ἐκ τῆς ὑπ' οὐρανὸν εἰς τὴν ὑπ' οὐρανὸν λάμπει; whilst Matthew mentions the regions of the earth: ἡ ἀστραπή ἐξέρχεται ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν καὶ φαίνεται ἕως δυσμῶν. (With ἐκ τῆς and εἰς τὴν the word χώρα must be supplied; so that the language denotes those regions of the heavens through which the lightning flashes.)

It is probable, as we have already remarked, that this passage and ver. 28 do not constitute original parts of the Lord's discourse. Luke xvii. 24, the two verses stand in a more exact connexion; and besides this, we have seen that in the whole narrative of Luke, to which this passage also belongs, a closer train of thought is to be observed, which appears to rest upon accurate historical accounts; whilst Matthew, throughout his gospel, treats the elements of the discourses more freely. But ver. 28: ὅπου γὰρ ἐὰν ᾖ τὸ πτῶμα, ἐκεῖ συναχθήσονται οἱ ἀετοί, especially, does not seem to stand in connexion with what precedes it according to Matthew; whilst in Luke<sup>2</sup> the previous question (ποῦ κύριε) renders the proverbial sentence exceedingly appropriate to the description about to be given of the destruction of unbelievers. Now, as in Matthew that coming of Christ, which no one would be able to mistake, was described in the verses immediately preceding, the connection may appear to recommend the untenable interpretation, according to which the πτῶμα means Christ himself, and the ἀετοί are believers

<sup>1</sup> Schott is impartial enough to acknowledge the impossibility of applying ver. 27, 28 to the invisible advent of Christ at the destruction of Jerusalem; but he is inclined (since these verses are wanting in Mark and otherwise associated by Luke) to remove them altogether from the connexion of Matthew, so that ver. 28 shall form the conclusion of the prophecy concerning the destruction of Jerusalem, and ver. 29 the commencement of the prophecy respecting the advent of Christ. (Comp. loc. cit. p. 72.)

<sup>2</sup> In the text of Luke, however, σῶμα is to be preferred to the reading πτῶμα, which has been derived from Matthew.

collected around him.<sup>1</sup> But, apart from the unsuitableness of the figure, no parallel passages can be adduced where the relation between the *πτῶμα* and the *ἄετοί* is viewed in a similar manner. On the contrary, the *usus loquendi* of the Old Testament (comp. Hab. i. 8; Jerem. xlviii. 40, xlix. 22; Job xxxix. 30) indicates the natural idea of the humiliation and destruction of that which is given over to ruin. The only question is how this idea coincides with the connexion. According to the context in Luke xvii. 37, the only way of understanding the passage is, to take *σῶμα* as meaning the Jewish state, deprived of all life, and the *ἄετοί* as the Romans completely putting an end to its existence (it is not improbable that allusion is made to the eagles of the legions); but both the former and the latter point, as types, to the last great catastrophies. In Matthew, however, this signification of the proverb is directly contrary to the connexion; hence it must either be said that the passage is here inappropriately inserted, or else it must be admitted that Matthew and Luke use the apophthegm in different senses. In regard to the first of these views, I must declare myself most decidedly opposed to it; because it would entirely rob the Evangelist of his character as an author of scriptural writings; and it is always observable in his gospel that where he does not preserve the original order, he institutes a new one. Accordingly, I adopt the other hypothesis. But there are two modes in which the connexion with what precedes may be formed. Either *ἄετοί* must be applied (with Fleck, loc. cit. 384) to the *ψευδόχριστοι* (ver. 24), so that the meaning is, “where corruption has become general, there men are immediately found who know how to employ it for their own ends”; or else the *γάρ* must be allowed to decide for the immediate connexion of ver. 28 with ver. 27, and the *ἄετοί* interpreted as descriptive of the Messiah coming to inflict punishment upon the corrupt Israel. The latter view has the most to recommend it, on account of the *γάρ*, which it is more difficult to connect with ver. 26; for this reason Fritzsche adopts it, only, as we have remarked, in such a manner that he applies *πτῶμα* to the person of the Redeemer—an application which appears to me inadmissible. One thing only can be adduced against this view, viz., that the plural (*ἄετοί*) is not suitable for the appearing of Christ. But if the appearing of Christ

<sup>1</sup> So Fritzsche (in loc.) who translates the words, *ubi Messias, ibi homines, qui ejus postestatis futuri sint.*

be understood as connected with the coming of ἀγγέλοι (and, according to Matt. xxv. 31, it must be viewed thus), this difficulty is solved. The nobler expression ἀετός = רָשָׁף, Isaiah xl. 31, is also used metaphorically in the good sense.<sup>1</sup> The figure strictly required, not eagles, but vultures, because the eagle only devours living animals; but the names of kindred animals are not unfrequently interchanged. (Comp. Gesenius in his lex. sub. verb. רָשָׁף.)

Ver. 29. The correctness of our interpretation of the Lord's prophecy respecting his advent, as it has been developed at the beginning of this chapter, is not more evident in any passage than in the difficult verse that now follows. Whatever other explanation is offered, the difficulties are not solved. For if all that is now added be referred, like what has preceded, to the destruction of Jerusalem, without allowing the description of the Lord's advent to be blended with this; then, in the first place, it does not appear how the θλίψις (by which, according to the connexion, we can only understand the events described, ver. 21, and not the temptation by false prophets, ver. 24) can be represented as past (comp. μετὰ τὴν θλίψιν τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐκείνων), since the destruction itself (the so-called invisible coming of Christ) is the θλίψις. And, in the second place, the description of the miraculous signs (ver. 29), and the details of the Parousia itself (ver. 30, 31) are by no means suited to the fact of the destruction of Jerusalem. But if a pause in the representation of Jesus be supposed (as Schott suggests), and the foregoing part be applied to the fall of Jerusalem, while the sequel is taken as belonging to the end of the world, then, although the words μετὰ τὴν θλίψιν gain their right signification, εὐθέως is inexplicable, and ver. 33, 34, refer every thing (πάντα ταῦτα) again to the immediate presence of the apostles. The interpretation that Schott (s. qq.) attempts to give of εὐθέως, when he compares it with the Hebrew סְדָאָה, and takes it in the sense of suddenly, unexpectedly, is only to be regarded as a shift; for this scholar himself sees therein a false rendering by the unknown translator of our Greek Matthew from the original Hebrew writing. If there appeared to be no choice, I would rather

Comp. the remarkable passage Rev. viii. 13, where the term ἀετός is applied to an angel. The text. rec. also reads ἀγγέλος in the passage.

adopt the fine conjecture of Weber (conjecturæ ad Mt. 24. Viteb. 1810), that εὐθέως belongs to the preceding verse, and ver. 29 opens with the words, μετὰ δὲ τὴν θλίψιν κ. τ. λ. ; only, the exact agreement of the manuscripts speaks too strongly for the integrity of the text<sup>1</sup>) to allow of a conjecture being deemed admissible in this passage. But according to the fundamental view of prophecy that we have laid down, this verse coincides with the connexion very simply. The representation of the Redeemer certainly marks a progression in the several events of the future concerning which he speaks, so that the following great signs taking place in the heavens stand in contrast with the commotions on earth previously described, and the distress of all nations (according to Luke) is antithetical to that of the Jewish people ; thus it was proper to speak of these subsequent events as μετὰ τὴν θλίψιν τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐκείνων. Nevertheless this *whole circle* of events succeeding one another is placed within the limit of the unfulfilled present (according to the principles already laid down) ; and therefore εὐθέως (which Mark explains by the words ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις) was used, quite consistently, in its literal sense.<sup>2</sup>) Haggai ii. 6, in a similar manner ascribes the great movements of heaven and earth to the immediate present ; he employs the expression חִי וְעָרָא, that is, after a short time, εὐθέως.) The unity of the whole picture (in which no divisions whatever can be discovered) is most strikingly obvious in Luke, who links the following description to the preceding one, where there is the most distinct reference to Jerusalem, merely by a καὶ ἔσται, xxi. 25. According to the tendency of the whole—and the succeeding verses, 30, 31, do not leave a doubt on this subject—the σημεῖα in the sun, moon, and stars, cannot be interpreted allegorically, as if they represented political or ecclesiastical relations and their dissolution ; for political disturbances have already been spoken of, ver. 7. And just as little is the sense exhausted, if the language is understood as referring to ordinary and frequently returning phenomena, which were only now and then regarded as prodigies (for example, eclipses of the sun and moon, or falling stars.) It would be preferable to explain the signs in

<sup>1</sup> Throughout the whole verse, there is not the slightest difference in the critical aids, which is seldom the case in passages of any importance.

<sup>2</sup> A reference of εὐθέως to the divine chronometry (according to 2 Peter iii. 8), is not here admissible, because the representation is evidently adapted to the ideas of man. (Comp. the question, Matt. xxiv. 8.)

the sun and moon as meaning their obscuration during earthquakes, by evaporations and volumes of smoke ; this is a very extraordinary and terrific phenomenon, and would well correspond with the raging of the sea (Luke xxi. 25), which often accompanies earthquakes. But the parallel passages of the Old Testament furnish too strong indications of another view to allow of our retaining this. The Old Testament—which is followed by the New in the idea alluded to—never isolates our globe, as a separate sphere, from the heavenly world and its orbs, as the modern philosophy of the earth usually does ; on the contrary, heaven and earth make up one perfect whole. Hence great phenomena on earth have their prior and posterior effects in the heavenly world. (Thus it was with the star that led the Magi at the birth of Christ.) On this principle the prophets predict not merely violent commotions on the earth, but with them similar events in heaven ; and these are by no means viewed as incidentally coinciding, but as necessarily belonging together. The Creator of heaven and earth, in the exercise of his sovereign rule, makes the upper and the lower worlds simultaneously tremble from their foundations. Among the passages in which such celestial phenomena are predicted, Isaiah xiii. 10, xxiv. 23, xxxiv. 4 ; Ezek. xxxii. 7, 8 ; Joel iii. 3, 4 ; Hagg. ii. 7, are specially to be noticed. In the last of these, God promises that at the time when he sends the Messiah (whose first and second advents are viewed as coincident, according to the usual mode of representation) he will shake heaven and earth, the sea and that which is dry. Our passage is in perfect correspondence with this language ; Matthew and Mark detail the commotions of the heavenly world, Luke gives greater prominence to the disturbances on earth. Hence the obscurations of the sun and the moon are most correctly viewed as extraordinary phenomena in the celestial regions themselves ;<sup>1</sup> and so also with the expression, ἀστέρες πεισούνται ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. Nothing is said here of stars falling to the earth, as is said of a star, Rev. viii. 10, in symbolical language. Πίπτειν may therefore be taken (as Schott, s. 78, very justly remarks) for ἐκπίπτειν, to sink, to vanish,<sup>2</sup> not that absolute destruction is

1 The term φάγος is used among the Attics, by way of distinction, for moonlight, φάος for daylight. But the distinction is not constantly observed. (Comp. Passow in the lex. sub. verb.)

2 Compare the parallels in the Old Testament, Isaiah xiv. 12 (where the king of Baby-

meant; but simply that violent shakings and fearful commotions of the heavenly bodies will, for a time, withdraw them from the eye of man, and veil everything in awful night. This idea is well supported by the expression *σαλεύεσθαι* (from *σάλος*, *salum*, the rolling sea [this passage and that in Luke are the only instances in which the form occurs in the New Testament], hence to be moved up and down, to be tossed.) Probably the word contains an allusion to the parallel in Haggai (*מְרַעֵשׁ אֶת-הַשָּׁמַיִם*), although the LXX. have rendered it by *σειώ*. The only remaining expression in which there is any difficulty is *δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν*. Since the stars have already been mentioned, this cannot be understood as meaning the heavenly host, the *צְבָא הַשָּׁמַיִם*, without tautology. The best interpretation is, that *δυνάμεις* signifies the world of angels. (Comp. the remarks on Rev. ix. 1.) For *σαλεύεσθαι* may be applied to spiritual commotion (2 Thess. ii. 2), and the idea is so to be viewed that the world of angels, with their dwelling-place—the entire upper sphere—shall appear to be moved. Hence it is not necessary to take the language metaphorically. But as to the remark of Schott, that *δυνάμεις*, in the sense of higher powers, angels, does not occur in connexion with *οὐρανῶν*, Bretschneider (in his *lex. Th. i. s. 262*), shews that in the Apocrypha mention is made of *οὐρανίων δυνάμεων* (comp. also 2 Kings xvii. 16, according to the LXX); and there does not appear to be any reason whatever why that connexion should be inadmissible, especially as it is in the highest degree probable that the designation of stars as God's host is founded in the idea of the ancients, that the stars were animated and inspired by spirits.

Now whilst Matthew and Mark describe the celestial phenomena that will take place before the Parousia, Luke adds an exact account of the earthly commotions that will also precede it. These are designated in opposition to the sufferings endured by the Jews in Palestine, at an earlier period (Luke xxi. 21), as about to come upon the whole earth (*γῆ, οἰκουμένη*), and upon all nations (*ἔθνη*.) (Matt. xxiv. 30, we find instead, *πάσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς*.) The words of Luke, *ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς συνοχὴ ἔθνων ἐν ἀπορίᾳ ἤχους θαλάσσης καὶ σάλου*, contain an important reading, which Schulz has even received into the text. The codices A.B.L.M. and several others describe as a falling morning star, *ἡλὸς ὡς πῦρ*, and xxxiv. 4, where the LXX. have the phrase *πάντα τὰ ἀστρα πεισῖται*.



others read *ἡχούσης*, but the substantive may still be preferable as the more difficult reading. (*Ἀποπλῆ ἡχους* signifies perplexity *on account of* the roaring of the sea. The meaning is, that the dreadful commotion of the elements will render men altogether helpless and bereft of their senses, not knowing what may come next [*προσδοκία τῶν ἐπερχομένων*].) There is only one other instance (2 Cor. ii. 4) in which *συνοχή* occurs connected with *καρδίας*. It is derived from the influence of severe anxiety upon the senses, which is betrayed by organic compression.)

Ver. 30. All three Evangelists agree in connecting the Parousia of the Son of Man immediately with these *σημεῖα* by a *τότε*. But Matthew alone remarks, with reference to the question of the disciples (Matt. xxiv. 3), that immediately before the return of the Lord, another special *σημεῖον τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* will appear in heaven. It is impossible to give a more exact definition of this, because there is no other passage where it is spoken of. It is most probable that a star is meant (in allusion to Numb. xxiv. 17); so that just as before the birth of Jesus a star was seen, which heralded his coming—like the morning star that precedes the sun at its rising—a similar sign will appear before his second advent. However, it is certain (on account of the article) that a *definite* sign is to be understood, so that the expression cannot relate (as Schott thinks) to the signs described, ver. 29; and, in like manner, it cannot be intended to designate an earthly event or an invisible occurrence in the church, since the words *ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ*, which cannot be joined to *υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, are immediately connected with it. But all conjectures for which there is no scriptural warrant (for example, that a cross will be seen in the heavens) are best left in their own uncertainty. The sight of this decisive sign will awaken terror in the (unbelieving) nations of the earth (comp. the remarks on *κόπτεσθαι*, Matt. xi. 17; Luke viii. 52), and they will then behold the solemn Parousia of the Son of Man. It is beyond all doubt, that the following description neither relates to an invisible advent of Christ, nor can be taken in any metaphorical way whatever. For although *ἔρχεσθαι* and *ἦκειν* alone might be taken so (comp. the observations on Matt. xxiv. 1), no passage can be adduced in which the complete phrase, *ἔρχεται ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν νεφέλαις μετὰ δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης*, can with any probability be thus understood. (Comp. Matt. xxvi. 64; Mark xiv. 62;

1 Thess. iv. 16, 17; 2 Pet. iii. 10; Rev. xix. 11; Dan. vii. 13, 14.) Let any one, with an unprejudiced mind, place himself in the circle of ideas familiar to the hearers of Jesus, and he will feel no question that the clouds, in which he promises to appear, are literally clouds of light. (Rev. xix. 11 we find, instead of this expression, the metaphor of a white horse, denoting swiftness of motion and brightness.) These are to form, as it were, the basis on which the Redeemer, descending from Heaven, will rest, while brightness ( $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha = \text{כְּבוֹד}$ ) encircles the whole of the sublime phenomenon. According to the constant custom, deeply founded in the nature of man, all theophania are surrounded with light, in the Old Testament as well as in the New; there is no imagination whatever, individual or national, that can conceive of the Deity under any other image than that of light.  $\Delta\acute{\upsilon}\nu\alpha\mu\iota\varsigma$ , however, is not to be taken merely as a synonyme for  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ ; in this instance it unquestionably has the signification of *host* ( $= \text{צְבָא הַשָּׁמַיִם}$ , which the LXX, in the passage, 2 Kings xvii. 16, translate  $\delta\acute{\upsilon}\nu\alpha\mu\iota\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon \sigma\acute{o}\upsilon\rho\alpha\nu\omicron\upsilon$ ), since it belongs to the pomp of the Parousia, that the Lord does not come alone, but with the host of his holy ones (Matt. xvi. 27, xxv. 31; Jude, ver. 14; Rev. xix. 12.) It is further to be observed, that, in like manner, according to a constant *usus loquendi*, the Redeemer represents himself in his coming as the  $\nu\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon \alpha\acute{\nu}\theta\rho\acute{\omega}\pi\omicron\upsilon$ , not as the Son of God. Here appeal might be made, on the one hand, to the general use which the Saviour makes of this name, when he speaks of himself; and on the other, to passages such as Dan. vii. 13, 14, which the Lord may have had in his eye. But there is a peculiar significance in the fact, that this name—which denotes the ideal humanity of the Lord—is constantly employed in the description of his advent; for by this means, we have the most distinct assurance of the reality and corporeality of his appearing. The return of the Son of Man necessarily presupposes his ascension in a glorified body, and his sitting, in this glorified body, at the right hand of God.

Luke makes the transition to the next thought in a very appropriate manner, xxi. 28. After the impression of the return of the Lord upon the  $\phi\upsilon\lambda\alpha\iota \tau\eta\varsigma \gamma\eta\varsigma$  has been described, there follows a representation of its effect upon *believers*. To the former it is the essence of everything terrific, because of its immediate connexion with the  $\kappa\rho\iota\sigma\iota\varsigma$ ; to the latter, it is the essence of everything de-

sired, because it is the commencement of the happiness promised to believers in the kingdom of God (ver. 31.) The βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, in relation to the sufferings of the present, takes the form of ἀπολύτρωσις to the saints. The same term, indeed, applies (like σώζεσθαι, Matt. xxiv. 22), in the primary sense, to release from the external troubles of the αἰὼν οὗτος; but so far as these are the results of sin, deliverance from the former involves freedom from the latter. (Concerning the expression, ἀπολύτρωσις, comp. the remarks on Matt. xx. 28. There is also mention made of an ἀπολύτρωσις τοῦ σώματος, Rom. viii. 23 [the connexion relates to corporeal glorification, as the deliverance from ματαιότης, ver. 20], but this also presupposes the ἀπολύτρωσις of the spiritual nature.) Believers may joyfully anticipate this attainment of the final goal at the time of the Parousia. (Ἀρχεσθαι is by no means redundant here; on the contrary, the events described are viewed in their gradual development, and treated as affording encouragement and consolation to the members of Christ's kingdom. Ἀνακύπτειν was employed, Luke xiii. 11, to denote the physical act of looking up; here it is a metaphorical expression for a hopeful, confident state of mind.)

Ver. 31. Luke contents himself with indicating the relation of the Parousia to the saints; but Matthew and Mark speak more definitely and copiously on the divine activity by which they will be borne away from all danger and trouble. Whilst the appearing of the Lord is fraught with destruction to unbelievers, the elect will be removed, by a sublime arrangement, from all peril, and collected together in one (safe) place. That this passage does not relate merely to Palestine, and the believers in that land, is shown by the expressions: ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων (רָבַע רוּחוֹת, 1 Chron. ix. 24; Ezek. xxxvii. 9; Rev. vii. 1), and ἀπ' ἄκρων οὐρανῶν ἕως ἄκρων αὐτῶν (= מִקְצֵה הַשָּׁמַיִם וְעַד-קֶצֶה, Deut. iv. 32, xiii. 7; xxviii. 64. In a similar manner, John [Rev. vii. 1] speaks of the τέσσαρας γωνίας τῆς γῆς.) Both of these phrases denote the widest extent of the earth. Just as little can the language mean the diffusion of the Gospel (as an invisible collection of the nations), for it is not the heathen, but those who are already converted, that will be gathered together. (The general proclamation of the Gospel has already been spoken

of, ver. 14.) Nor can this passage be applied even to the general union of all the saints in the kingdom of God, which would presuppose the resurrection. (On that subject, comp. 1 Thess. iv. 17; 2 Thess. ii. 1, where the *ἐπισυναγωγή* of believers with the Lord, after the resurrection, is the subject of discourse.) For, in conformity with the question of the disciples (ver. 3), the whole representation of the Lord refers only to the *πότε* and the *σημεῖα* of the Parousia. Hence the picture embraces all that precedes that event, up to his appearing in the clouds (ver. 30); but the advent itself, and the occurrences connected with it—the resurrection of the dead, the investiture of the living with immortality, and their removal to the presence of the Lord (2 Cor. v. 4; 1 Thess. iv. 17),—are left untouched. In the whole description, the Redeemer contemplates the moral design to excite holy earnestness and vigilance, as well as to afford encouragement in the battle of this life.

The history of the Jewish doctrines leads us to the circumstance which the Redeemer here admits into his description. According to the notions of the Rabbins, founded upon passages of the Old Testament (comp. Isaiah xi. 12, ff.; xxvi. 20, xxvii. 13; Ezek. xxxvi. 24; Zechar. x. 8, ff.), before the resurrection of the just, all the dispersed Israelites will be gathered together. (Comp. Eisenmenger's *Entd. Judenth.* Th. ii. s. 894, 95.) We may suppose that the design of this collection is, first to separate them from the mass of unbelievers, so that they may be removed from the punishments that will fall upon that class<sup>1</sup> (Luke xxi. 36, *ὅνα καταξωθῇτε ἐκφυγεῖν ταῦτα πάντα*); and, secondly, to unite them more closely together, so that the manifestation of the Lord may not be beheld by a few individuals only, but the privilege may be shared in common by the great body of his believing people. In relation to the first object, this separation and collection of believers has its type in the gathering together of Noah's descendants in the ark, of Lot's family in Zoar, and of the Christians of Jerusalem in Pella (comp. the remarks

<sup>1</sup> The book of the Revelation (xix. 11—21) describes this judicial punishment of the wicked at the Parousia. The collection of believers is not mentioned, but according to xviii. 4, it is presupposed, for in chap. xx., they appear preserved and ruling with the Lord. The community of believers is the bride (xix. 7), to whom the Bridegroom comes. The gathering together of the wicked (Rev. xvi. 14, 15) forms the antithesis to that of the saints.

on Rev. iii. 10.) It is only in this view that the following exhortations to fidelity and watchfulness gain their true meaning; for this implies the possibility of escaping the dreadful events at the Parousia, and being protected in the place of safety. As regards the angels sent forth with the strong sounding trumpet by which the collection is accomplished, it has already been remarked in the exposition of Matt. xiii. 51, that the expression ἄγγελος is often used in application to human messengers and instruments of the Lord. But the words μετὰ σάλπιγγος seem to render it improbable that we are here to understand ἀγγέλους as meaning men; for this mode of speech is never employed in reference to the preaching of the Gospel, (comp. Schott. s. 119.) If there be any question as to whether the σάλπιγξ denotes the power of the Spirit by which persons are awakened and brought together for a definite object, rather than the communication of a doctrine; then it does not appear why this effective energy may not as well be ascribed to human individuals who are endowed with the Spirit. In the Revelation also (chap. viii.) the seven angels with trumpets may be regarded as meaning personalities who exert upon the church a specially powerful, awakening energy (comp. Matt. xxv. 31, concerning the angels who accompany Jesus on his return.)

Ver. 32, 33. Here Christ concludes the communication of actual circumstances connected with the Parousia. In a parable (respecting παραβολή see the remarks on Matt. xiii. 3) of a fig-tree—to which the Redeemer may have led those around him—he compares the course of natural development with the seed of God's kingdom. The sappiness of the branches (ἀπαλός literally tender, weak; this is the only instance of its occurrence) is paralleled with what has been stated respecting the near approach of the kingdom. (Hence the words πάντα ταῦτα are not to be applied merely to the concluding statements of the Lord, but embrace *all* that he said in reply to the question of the disciples.) Here, the connexion shows that we must conceive of the βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ (according to Luke xxi. 31) as a state of things, commencing with the return of the Lord, wherein good will be predominant even as regards matters of an external nature (comp. the remarks on Matt. iii. 2.) The element that operated, after the first advent (the humiliation) of the Lord, in the hidden kingdom of the spiritual life, and could only produce comparatively feeble outward effects—because sin still

had the ascendancy in the whole sphere of its operations—will, at the second coming of Christ, reign triumphantly over the natural, as well as the human world. And there is yet another idea comprehended under the one name, βασιλεῖα τοῦ Θεοῦ, which, although not developed here, is brought out very distinctly at a subsequent period (in the book of the Revelation)—viz., the kingdom of the saints upon the renovated earth (Rev. xx.), and the new heaven and new earth (Rev. xxi.) The text of Luke somewhat differs in this parable; but the difference is not essential. (The same parallel is extended to πάντα τὰ δένδρα [ver. 29], and instead of ἐκφύειν τὰ φύλλα, the expression προβάλλειν is used = תִּצְוֶה. [Comp. Gesenius sub. verb.] The words, ἀφ' ἐαυτῶν γινώσκειν indicate that independence which can dispense with the guidance of another: “accordingly ye can judge from *your own* observation concerning the approach of the kingdom of God.”)

Ver. 34, 35. The use of the second person in the foregoing verses, by which the Lord addressed himself directly to the disciples, plainly showed that the fulfilment of his predictions was viewed as taking place in the present; but the following declaration conveys a still more distinct impression that everything previously spoken of (πάντα ταῦτα) will come to pass in the life-time of *this generation* (γενεά = גֵּרָה.) The statements of this passage cannot be applied either to the church (as the spiritual posterity of Christ), or to the people of Israel (as enduring to the end); both of these interpretations are inadmissible, partly upon philological grounds, and partly on account of the parallels, Matt. xvi. 28, xxiii. 36, in the first of which, the expression γενεά is circumscribed by τινὲς τῶν ὧδε ἐστώτων, and μὴ παρέρχεσθαι by μὴ γέυσασθαι θανάτου. The word γενεά is not used in the sense of *nation* in any one passage, either of the New Testament or of the profane writers. If it relates to a particular people, for example to Israel, then it signifies the members of that people living at a particular time. There is only one instance in the version of the LXX. (Levit. xx. 18), where γενεά stands for דָּוָר. (Comp. Schleusner lex. in LXX., vol. ii. p. 11.) But if this application of the term to the generation then living be retained here, then, according to the ordinary interpretation of the passage, it must not be united with the reference to the return of the Lord. Hence Schott (s. 131), most arbitrarily conjectures that here the discourse suddenly turns

back to the destruction of Jerusalem. Such a turn, when there is nothing to occasion it, cannot be supposed in any discourse. The instances adduced by Schott (s. 133) are from the same chapter, and labour under the same arbitrariness; and as to the observation that here the second person is used, whereas ver. 30, where something far later is spoken of, the third is employed (*ὄψονται τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον*)—this proves nothing; for the third person refers to unbelievers, and the second to believers. The only way of explaining these difficulties is that over which we have already travelled—viz., to view the prophecy as given with a view to the immediate present, but in such a manner, that it all includes a further reference to the future.

Jesus (ver. 35) founds the truth of these predictions upon the nature of his words generally. They, being imperishable, form the antithesis to that which is perishable; whatever is capable of perishing, even in the highest and grandest object (heaven and earth = the universe), will perish; the word of Christ cannot pass away. Here the word of Christ and the word of God are viewed as perfectly identical, for the same language was used, Matt. v. 18, in respect to the Old Testament as the word of God. And the sentence: *οἱ δὲ λόγοι μου οὐ μὴ παρέλθωσι* is by no means to be understood as merely meaning that the previous predictions would certainly be fulfilled, and that therefore the word of Christ is true, for then it might be said that all the statements concerning the destruction of Jerusalem, having been fulfilled, have already passed away and perished; on the contrary, the language in question traces the certainty of the fulfilment of the prophecies to the eternal nature of the word of God, spoken by Christ who is the Word of the Father; it follows from the nature of this word that it is never exhausted, and even its fulfilment does not do away with it or change it, but by means of the power that dwells in it, it continually renews its youth, and retains its force in all circumstances as well as in all ages. (John vi. 63.)

Ver. 36. The foregoing general statement, that the *γενεὰ αὕτη* would not pass away till the prophecy was fulfilled (ver. 34), is now more definitely explained by the fact, that it is not designed to furnish any exact dates (*ἡμέρα καὶ ὥρα*); these are absolutely refused as impossible. Hence there is no reason to suppose a contradiction between ver. 34 and ver. 36, assuming which, Schott (s.

131) refers, ver. 34, to the destruction of Jerusalem, but ver. 36 to the return. On the contrary, the mode of expression here adopted is the only one that can be conceived of as suited to the circumstances of the case. For had the Redeemer intended to say that his coming was yet very distant, such a statement would have entirely destroyed the ethical import of the prophecy, viz., the incitement to watchfulness which it was designed to produce ; and if, on the other hand, he had so expressed himself as to say nothing at all about the time when these things would come to pass, this total negativeness would have been no less paralysing in its influence. But the representation given by the Lord was so formed as to act in a two-fold way ; first, to keep before the mind the constant possibility of his coming ; and, secondly, to show the impossibility of fixing upon a precise period ; the former object was accomplished by ver. 34, the latter by ver. 36.

However, it may be said that ver. 34 does not express the *possibility*, but the *certainly*, of the Lord's returning in the time of the generation then alive. But this very decided form of promise (beginning with the phrase, ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν) is explained by the relative truth which the coming of Christ has in reference to that generation in particular, and also to all generations of the world. (Comp. the remarks on Matt. xxiv. 1.) The advent is by no means to be looked upon as an occurrence happening at a particular time in the remote future, for in that case it would only concern the people *living at the precise period when it comes to pass*, and would be of no consequence to previous generations ; on the contrary, it is to be viewed as something extending throughout the history of the world, and *spiritually* near to *every one*, without excluding the fact that the prophecy respecting it will also be *externally* fulfilled in its whole meaning, at the end of the αἰὼν οὗτος.

Special notice is due to the peculiar addition of Mark, οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός. The harmony of the manuscripts and versions is a sufficient guarantee for its genuineness, but its interpretation is not free from difficulty. The first question is, what ought to be supplied after ὁ υἱός—τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, or τοῦ Θεοῦ ? The former supplement seems to be supported by the juxtaposition with οὐδεὶς and ἄγγελοι τῶν οὐρανῶν, for these expressions place the creature in contrast with the uncreated ; to the former ignorance is ascribed, to the latter



knowledge; hence if the Son is represented as participating in the former, it seems more appropriate that this should be said of him as Son of Man than as Son of God. But, on the other hand, *πατήρ* as the correlate to *υἱός*, *strongly* calls for *τοῦ Θεοῦ* to be understood, for if *υἱός* did not occur, there can be no doubt that *Θεός* would be chosen as the antithesis to *ἄγγελοι* and *οὐδεῖς*. It is true it may be said, that in the text of Matthew we find *πατήρ* but not *υἱός*. But the different readings show that the expression was not deemed quite suitable in this connexion; some have received *οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός* from Mark; others have appended *μου*, which Matthew ordinarily associates with the application of *πατήρ* to God in the discourses of Jesus. Now, although these readings are not genuine in the text of Matthew, yet they render it very probable that the reading *πατήρ* is only founded in the circumstance that *οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός* originally preceded in the discourse, but Matthew, from unknown reasons, omitted it. But if the Son of God is here referred to, the ignorance of the *ἡμέρα* and *ὥρα* predicated of him cannot be absolute, because the consubstantiality of the Father and the Son does not permit a specific separation between the knowledge of the Father and that of the Son; on the contrary, it must be understood as designating the *κένωσις* of the Lord in his position of humiliation. Hence, in the parallel passage (Acts i. 7), where the Saviour, after his resurrection, declares that it is not compatible with the human point of view (*οὐχ ὅ μιν ἔστι*) to know the precise period of the Parousia, it must not be concluded, from these words in Mark, that *at that time* the Lord did not know it. (Comp. the exposition of Acts i. 7.)

All three Evangelists finish this prophetic picture with an exhortation to watchfulness; but in the further illustrations which immediately follow the verse before us, they differ so much that their representations must be regarded as independent statements. Mark, indeed, does not say anything different from Matthew, but merely reports the exhortation to watchfulness in an abbreviated form, under a comparison which Matthew, in the last verses of the chapter, gives more at large. Luke, on the contrary (ver. 34—36), has given a perfectly independent account. He first warns against worldliness of life (*κραυπάλη* literally means a clogging of the head by previous *μέθη*; it also has the signification of excessive eating); then follows an admonition respecting the suddenness of the day of judgment, and

its destructive character to all who live in security<sup>1</sup>; and, lastly, he concludes with an exhortation to watchfulness and prayer. As the objects of prayer, he specifies *καταξιοθῆναι ἐκφυγεῖν*, and *σταθῆναι ἐμπροσθεν τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*. *Ἐκφυγεῖν*, as we have already observed, relates to the idea unfolded, Matt. xxiv. 31, that the saints, after having been proved, will be withdrawn from all the calamities which impend at their return itself. But *σταθῆναι*, which has its antithesis in *πίπτειν* (Rom. xiv. 4) denotes recognition and acceptance in the judgment. If an *ἀξιότης* of *ἐκφυγεῖν* and *σταθῆναι* is required, this, according to the fundamental principle of the Gospel, is to be sought, not in a sum of performances, but in *faith*. This faith, however, is to be viewed as a living principle, which, springing from the life of the Lord, satisfies him and his *κρίσις*. Luke xxi. 37, 38, furnish historical notices of the Redeemer's life during the last days in Jerusalem (how he taught in the Temple by day, spent the night out of the city, and again in the morning waited for the people); but these have no reference to the prophetic announcements. (Respecting *ἀνλίζεσθαι* = *לָלַץ*, comp. Matt. xxi. 17. This is the only instance in the New Testament where we find *ὀρθρίζω* = *הִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה*.)

Now Luke xvii. 26, ff., agrees, in the main, with Matthew's representation (xxiv. 37, ff.) of the conclusion of the discourse concerning the Lord's return. And the exact connexion which the passage has in Luke leaves no doubt as to the fact, that it stands there in its original place, Matthew having only removed it in accordance with his custom, and not at all unsuitably, to another position. But, on the one hand, he abbreviates the discourse which Luke gives at large, even in such parts as would have been quite appropriate to the connexion, (for instance, he omits the example of Lot and his wife, so strikingly as it illustrates the reward of faith and the punishment of unbelief [Luke xxi. 28—30, 22]); and on the other, he separates what would not be adapted to his design, although it belongs to the connexion of Luke (comp. Luke xxi. 33, 37.)

Ver. 37—39. In the first place, Matthew draws a parallel be-

<sup>1</sup> Luke here avails himself of the expression *παγίς*, snare, noose, which is often used (1 Tim. iii. 7, vi. 9, and in the Old Testament, Prov. ix. 3, xiii. 14, xxii. 5) for danger, ruin. The verb *κάθημαι* here denotes the easy, comfortable life of men indulging in worldly security.

tween the times of the Parousia, and a kindred period in the history of the old world—the deluge (Luke xvii. 26, 27.) Luke adds a second parallel taken from the destruction of Sodom. In both cases only a few followed the warning voice of God, and assembled in a safe mountain-retreat; the great mass did not repent or undergo any true change of mind, but persisted in the old life of estrangement from God. One thing is remarkable throughout the whole of this representation, that the contemporaries of Noah and Lot are not, by any means, described as wicked and vicious, but merely as sensual men. (*ἔσθιεν, πίνειν κ. τ. λ.*, and according to Luke *ἀγοράζειν, πωλεῖν κ. τ. λ.* denote only the ordinary business of the outward life.) That the vicious will go into perdition is easily understood, but the man who, without any glaring evil deeds, wastes his life upon external things, fancies himself secure, in this very negativeness, from the judgment of God; he little thinks that his whole being is sinful, because it is worldly and alienated from God. (James iv. 4.) The discourse of the Lord is directed against this carnal security, and not against vice, which is condemned by the law.

Ver. 40, 41. This world, full of secure sinners, will be visited by the Parousia, and with it the *κρίσις*, both of which will break in upon them with relentless rigour. Good and evil, which coexisted and were mingled together, will now be separated; things combined in the closest, most immediate relationship, which seemed to belong to one another, will now be made known, as in their inmost nature perfectly different. Matthew gives the example of companionship in the labours of the field or in grinding at the mill; Luke (xvii. 34) adduces the intimate relationship of married persons, who lie on one bed, and yet come under the influence of different elements. (In the text of Luke ver. 36 is wanting in the best and in the largest number of codices, viz., in A.B.E.G.H.K.L.Q.S. Probably it has been received from Matthew into Luke. Instead of the futures *παραληφθήσεται, ἀφεθήσεται* in Luke, Matthew has the present tenses, *παραλαμβάνεται, ἀφίεται*. The latter render the description more vivid and graphic. These are the only passages in the New Testament where the antithesis between *παραλαμβάνειν* and *ἀφίεναι* occurs. The simplest mode of explaining this use of the two words is to take *παραλαμβάνειν*, according to Luke xxi. 36, in the signification “to receive and accept as worthy,” “to admit

into his society," so that it is identical with ἐκλέγειν; and ἀφιέναι, on the contrary, should be understood as denoting the negative act of non-acceptance.)

Ver. 42. An exhortation to watchfulness is now given as a concluding, admonitory thought, drawn from this illustration, and grounded also upon a further reflection—the uncertainty of the *period* (ᾠρα) when the Lord will come. Here again, of course, the conviction, that he will come in the life-time of the generation to whom he speaks, is presupposed (as in Matt. xxiv. 34); for what force would there be in an exhortation to vigilance, that had respect to a period of time far beyond the individual life of the persons addressed?

Ver. 43—51. These thoughts are succeeded in Matthew by two other comparisons, which Luke has xii. 36—40; and in this instance again we must acknowledge that the connexion of Luke is the original one. For it is altogether improbable that the Lord would have frequently repeated these comparisons in such a peculiar juxtaposition. Here, as in Luke, the comparison of the οἰκοδεσπότης and that of the δούλοι are blended together, with this difference only, that Matthew gives the precedence to that of the οἰκοδεσπότης, whereas Luke places it after the other. In regard to the import of this mixture, we have already said as much as is necessary, in the remarks on the passage in Luke; the only point that we now have in view is the relation of the similitudes to the whole representation. It is easily seen that the last of the two, which Luke also has xii. 42—46 (although in another connexion)—respecting the δούλος πιστός καὶ φρόνιμος (ver. 45) and the δούλος κακός—relates to watchfulness (Mark xiii. 34, in his expansion of the parallel, draws a distinction between the managing δούλοι to whom the Lord commits the ἐξουσίᾳ [Matt. xxiv. 45, and Luke xii. 42, view them as superior stewards, to whom the θεραπεία = θεράποντες—the abstract for the concrete—is subordinated] and the θυρωρός, to whom he gives special prominence as the watcher; comp. Matt. xxv. 6.) The faithful and *wise* servant watches, and while he considers the period of the Lord's advent uncertain, deems it equally possible that it may come in his own time. The bad servant (who is also the μωρός, Matt. xxv. 2) negatively fixes the time of the Lord's coming—he thinks it yet distant. (Concerning χρονίζω comp. Luke i. 21, xi. 45.) This procrastination is the

strict unfaithfulness of the servant ; and the *τύπτειν κ. τ. λ.* is to be regarded as its consequence. Ver. 51, this is designated by the term *ὑπόκρισις*, because the *χρονίζειν* contradicts the relation of the *δοῦλος* to the Lord. The true servant desires the return of the beloved Master ; the wicked one, who in reality belongs to another (the world), wishes it to be deferred, because he dreads it. Where there is the glow of ardent love to God, there is a constant expectation of the coming of the Lord ; although in the course of the Christian conflict, the delay is often *too* long even for the sincere heart (comp. the remarks on Matt. xxv. 7.) We have already observed on Luke xii. 46, that Matthew appears to have preserved the true reading in *ὑποκριτῶν* ; Luke has the more general term *ἀπίστων*, which is not so adapted to the connexion in Luke, where *ὑπόκρισις* is the very subject of discourse.

The *second* comparison—that of the *οικοδεσπότης*—involves greater difficulty ; it does not appear to suit the connexion. Ignorance of the time when the thief would come appears to be the circumstance that prevents the master of the house from watching ; now the whole description is designed as an exhortation to vigilance, and therefore it might be argued that the watching thus recommended would be facilitated if the time were known. But the more specific reference of the *οικοδεσπότης* and *κλέπτης* has already been developed in the exposition of Luke xii. 39 ; in this comparison the intention is to represent the other aspect of the Parousia, its relation to the unbelieving world, while that of the *δοῦλοι* describes its relation to believers. In so far, however, as the disciples by no means appear as yet entirely excluded from the worldly principle and its influence ; this aspect of the Parousia also has an application to them. For whilst the parable of the servants gives a direct admonition as to watchfulness, the same thing is indirectly urged by that of the householder. The day of the Lord's coming must be unknown to believers, in order that desire may be kept constantly awake ; unbelievers also are subjected to the same uncertainty, in order that judgment may suddenly surprise them in their carelessness ; but this carnal security, while it forms a temptation to believers, on the other serves to excite their watchfulness by the contrast which it presents. Thus, as the whole Christ is set for the fall and rising of many, so also is his Parousia. (Instead of the general terms *πολεὰ φυλακῇ*, or *ῥῆμα* [Matt. xxiv. 40—44], Mark

xiii. 35, has the expressions, ὁψέ, ἡ μεσονυκτίου, ἡ ἀλεκτοροφωνίας, ἡ πρωΐ. This distribution of the night into four vigils is the more popular form. Comp. the remarks on Matt. xiv. 25. Διχοτομεῖν literally signifies to divide into two pieces; but here, on account of the following words, which are not compatible with the idea of death, the meaning is, to punish severely, to hew, to lash. Μέρος τιθέναι ≡ קָלַף בְּנֵי. Comp. Rev. xxi. 8. Concerning κλανθμός and βρυγμός οδόντων comp. the observations on Matt. viii. 12. It does not appear that the words can be understood here as denoting eternal perdition; they merely designate exclusion from the kingdom of God, which begins with the advent of the Lord, and the torment that results from the consciousness of having deserved it; for the further discussion of the subject comp. the exposition of Matt. xxv. 12—30.)

The following three parables are found only in Matthew; Luke merely has an analogy (Luke xix. 11, ff.) to the second, in another connexion. It is unquestionable that they were all spoken in the last period of the Lord's ministry, since they have such distinct reference to the return; but whether they immediately followed the conversation on the Mount of Olives (chap. xxiv.), cannot be affirmed with certainty. However, the three parables stand in such close connexion both with one another, and with what precedes, as to render it very probable, that they were at least delivered not long after the discourse respecting the return (chap. xxiv.) For the two first—that of the virgins and that of the servants—contain admonitions to be watchful and faithful in expectation of the speedy return of the Lord; and this exactly agrees with the immediately foregoing language. Both comparisons represent the blessing attending true devotedness to the Lord, and the curse resulting from a divided mind. But, in order to understand these two parables, it is in the highest degree important to mark their relation to the *third*. Now, whilst the two first are, so to speak, co-ordinate, the third appears to be designed for quite another point of view. This is shown, in the first place, by the form of transition (ver. 31, ὅταν δέ), which introduces something new and different; whilst the second parable is connected with the first by a ὥσπερ γάρ, and the first with chap. xxiv. by a τότε. Then, in the second place, the expressions παρθένος, δούλος, plainly indicate a special relationship to the Redeemer; in both the first and second parables, the reference is not

to men without distinction, but to the children of the kingdom, concerning whose vigilance and fidelity judgment is passed. In the third, on the contrary, all nations appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, with the exception of true believers (*πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*, ver. 32.) And, finally, in the last parable, the good, in common with the bad, are represented as perfectly unconscious of their relation to the Lord (ver. 37, 44); whilst, according to the two others, both parties appear to act with a consciousness of this relation. These important points of difference forbid the supposition that all the three representations relate to one and the same fact; but they are explained in a simple manner, if—in accordance with the Jewish views (comp. Bertholdt christ. jud. p. 176, sqq.), which the New Testament confirms—we distinguish the general judgment of all nations and individuals (associated with the general resurrection), from the kingdom of God and the resurrection of the just. The establishment of the kingdom of God is connected with a sifting of those who belonged to the earthly Church (comp. Rev. xx. 4, the preliminary judgment); all who stand that trial are members of the kingdom, and participants in the marriage of the Lamb, but those who cannot endure it, although they certainly are excluded from the kingdom of God, are not yet eternally condemned. The final decision respecting them takes place at the general judgment of the world (Rev. xx. 12.) It is true that these two periods are not distinctly separated in the whole of Matthew's representation; on the contrary, they prophetically coincide; the only place in the New Testament where we find the order of succession plainly marked is in the Revelation; but the twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew nevertheless contains sufficient intimations to render it quite clear that it is founded upon the same view of the future.

The ordinary interpretation of this chapter—according to which the same thing substantially is conveyed by all the three representations, viz., that the good will be rewarded and the wicked will be punished, and hence the subject of discourse is merely the general topic of the final account that all must render—has some truth in it, inasmuch as all the positions of men have a similarity to one another, and therefore the different metaphors may be used for all relations. But this general applicability of the parables must not lead us to overlook the immediate and special references that pre-

sent themselves in each one. (Comp. the further particulars in the remarks on Matt. xxv. 14, 31.)

Ver. 1—13. The external form of the parable of the ten virgins is to be explained from the customs of the Jews. The bridegroom, accompanied by his friends (*υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος*, or *φίλοι* τ. ν., John iii. 29), fetched the bride from the house of her father. The bride was surrounded by her companions, who went to meet the bridegroom as he approached, and then accompanied her with torches to the house of the bridegroom, where the marriage-supper was prepared.<sup>1</sup> According to the usual figure, the Lord now represents himself as the Bridegroom who comes to the earthly Church, as the bride, that he may conduct her to his dwelling. As the angels accompany the Bridegroom (ver. 31), so the *παρθένοι*, who await the delayed arrival of the Bridegroom, are distinguished from the bride.<sup>2</sup> Thus the sense of the parable as a whole is easily gained; the only question is, how far the single features are to be observed. The only fixed rule by which we can be guided in the matter is the appropriateness of the reference, and this rule, when applied without any force, presents so many interesting points of relation in this parable, that it must be considered one of the finest in the Gospel. For the more numerous the points of comparison that a parable affords without any unnatural or forced interpretation, the greater is its perfection.

Now, in the first place, as regards the *παρθένοι*, we may remark that the expression certainly has a special reference, which is best perceived when the following parable of the *δούλοι* is placed in connexion with this. The terms *παρθένοι* and *δούλοι* do not by any means designate all members of the Church (Matt. xxiv. 45, the *δούλοι* are expressly distinguished from the *θεραπεία*, who are nevertheless to be viewed as members of the same community—the family of God), but only those among them who stood in a position like

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Jahn's Hebrew Antiquities, Part i. B. 2, § 179. The Rabbins also made use of this custom in similar comparisons. (Comp. Wetstein and Lightfoot on the passage.)  
<sup>2</sup> 1 Macc. ix. 37, ff., there is a description of an oriental wedding.

<sup>2</sup> In the Cod. D., and several authorities,—for example, the Syriac version and the Vulgate,—after the words, *ἐξῆλθον εἰς ἀπάντησιν τοῦ νυμφίου* (ver. 1), we have also, *καὶ τῆς νύμφης*. However, this reading rests upon a false view of the comparison; it was thought that where the bridegroom was, there the bride also must be. But, according to oriental custom, the bridegroom came to fetch the bride, and the maidens conducted her to meet him.



that of the apostles and disciples generally towards the person of the Lord. But even among these, a distinction may be observed between those whose relation to the Lord is chiefly that of passive love, and others who are characterised by greater activity; among the twelve, the former case is represented by John, the latter by Peter. It is true that, in so far as no member of the true Church is without both the one and the other characteristic, both comparisons admit of a perfectly general application; but we must not, on this account, overlook the special reference to particular tendencies in the Christian life (comp. the exposition of Luke xii. 35.) The number *ten*, which Luke xix. 13 specifies as that of the servants also, appears simply to contain the idea of a limited body. According to the Jewish custom, ten form an assembly ( $\text{עֲשָׂרָה}$ ), and hence it was very natural to fix upon this number. (Passages in Wetstein in loc. state, that it was usual to choose just ten bridesmaids. But Jahn loc. cit. remarks, that it was customary to have as many as seventy; of course this only extended to rich families.) The intensity of chaste love to the Lord, which was represented by the virgins, well accords with their awaital of the bridegroom's delayed approach. Whilst the  $\text{δοῦλοι}$  are busily at work, and engaged in a variety of concerns, the  $\text{παρθέναι}$  wait for the beloved, that they may meet him. (Comp. the remarks on Luke x. 42, concerning Mary and her relation to Martha.) The fact that they are all characterised as virgins is a proof that the antithesis  $\text{φρόνιμοι}$  and  $\text{μωραί}$  is not to be taken in the sense of *good* and *wicked*, for the idea of gross transgression is incompatible with love to the Lord. The foolish virgins are merely to be viewed as representing minds who seek that which is pleasing and sweet in the service of the Lord, rather than follow him in right earnest, and hence forget to labour after thorough renewal, and to build in the right way upon the foundation that is laid (1 Cor. iii. 15.) The parable describes this lukewarmness in their nature by saying that they neglected to take any oil in their vessels. (Ver. 4,  $\text{ἐλαίον}$  does not seem consistent with  $\text{λαμπάδες}$ . But it is explained by the form of the ancient torches. They frequently stood in a wooden stick, a vessel being let in at the upper end, containing a wick, which burnt with oil or pitch. [Comp. Jahn loc. cit.] This contrivance united the peculiarities of the torch and the lamp.) The parables explained by the Lord himself (Matt. xiii.) are proofs that we need not be

afraid of going too far, if we take the single features of this comparison into account as strictly illustrative. According to the pervading scriptural symbol, the oil designates the Spirit; the virgins were not altogether destitute of this higher element of life; their *hearts* glowed with love to the Lord, which impelled them to go out and meet him; but their faith had no root except *feeling*, it had not sanctified all their dispositions and faculties, and hence, when feeling was no longer sufficient, and nothing but thorough *self-denial* could avail them, the flame of their love died away. The severe discipline that was necessary is expressed partly by the long delay of the Bridegroom's arrival, and partly by the representation that it was night. This induced slumber, in which (referring to the immediately preceding description, Matt. xxiv. 42) the virgins must be regarded as overcome by temptation. (Ver 5, *νυστάζω* is the feebler expression, which signifies to nod the head from sleepiness; *καθεύδω* is the strict designation of deep slumber.) It might indeed appear that, in this case, sleep did not indicate a negligent state of mind, since *all*, even the *φρόνιμοι*, fell asleep; but, on account of the immediately foregoing and express admonition to watch,—which, according to Mark xiii. 37, was addressed to all,—this is hardly to be admitted; especially since this admonition is again prominently noticed, Matt. xxv. 13, in the winding-up of the narrative. On the contrary, the description becomes much more striking if the meaning is understood thus: "the Bridegroom delayed his coming so long, that at last even the wise virgins slept." This gives great point to the warning *ἀγρυπνεῖτε*. However, the words *μέσης δὲ νυκτὸς κραυγὴ γέγονεν*, ver. 6, show that there were *watchers* in the Church; although here these are not so decidedly distinguished from the virgins as in Mark xiii. 34, where the *θυρωρός* is charged with the special duty of watching. The perplexities occasioned by the surprise of the Lord's arrival discover the difference between the slumbering virgins. The wise ones, who have in every respect completely given themselves up to the Lord, are able not only to rouse themselves at the summons, but to rekindle the glimmering torch into a vigorous flame. This the foolish ones cannot do, because they lack the inward supply of the Spirit. They therefore seek spiritual support from the wise; but in this critical moment each one must stand alone, and hence they are directed to the *πωλοῦντες*. It is perfectly natural to take the sacred Scriptures and their authors

as furnishing the explanation of this feature in the parable; to these the foolish virgins are recommended to resort, that they may find counsel and strength in the distress of their souls. But before the extinct life can be quickened again, the Bridegroom comes, and those who are not ready see themselves shut out. According to this connexion, it is clear that the words *οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς* (ver. 12) cannot denote eternal condemnation, for, on the contrary, the foolish virgins are only excluded from the marriage of the Lamb (Rev. xix. 7); hence they must be viewed as parallel with the persons described, 1 Cor. iii. 15, whose building is destroyed, but who are not thereby deprived of happiness. These virgins possessed the general condition of happiness, faith (from which they cried *κύριε, κύριε, ἀνοιξον ἡμῖν*, ver. 11); but they lacked the requisite qualification for the kingdom of God, that sanctification which proceeds from faith (Heb. xii. 14.<sup>1</sup>) In the concluding verse (ver. 13) the words *ἐν ᾗ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔρχεται* should be removed; they have probably been inserted from parallel passages, such as xxiv. 41.

Ver. 14—30. The external form of the *second* parable—that of the servants—presents no difficulty.<sup>2</sup> The *ἄνθρωπος ἀποδημῶν* (Mark xiii. 34 has *ἀπόδημος*, the antithesis to *ἐνδημος*—this is the only instance in which the expression occurs in the New Testament), according to Luke xix. 12, is an *εὐγενής*, descended from a family of distinguished rank; he is here represented as travelling to a distance to receive a kingdom there (a type of the installation of Christ into his heavenly dominion), but upon his return, his nearest subjects, the citizens of his own city (*πολῖται*) will not obey him. It is quite clear from the parallel in Luke, that the ten *δοῦλοι* (Luke xix. 13) do not mean all men, or even all Christians indiscriminately, but such as possess a distinct qualification for the guidance and government of the Church. The mass under this guidance are the *πολῖται*. Matthew designates the endowments bestowed upon the *δοῦλοι* by the term *τάλαντον*, Luke by *μνᾶ*. This variation merely expresses the freedom exercised by the reporters of the parables of Jesus, in regard to non-essential points.

<sup>1</sup> An interesting interpretation of the parable of the ten virgins is given by Meyer in the *Blätt. für höh. Wahrh.* Th. 7, s. 247, ff.

<sup>2</sup> The transition *ὥστερ γάρ* wants the corresponding member of the sentence. According to Matt. xxiv. 37, we may supply *οὕτως ἔσται καὶ ἡ παρουσία τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*.

The sum entrusted to the servants is here perfectly unimportant ; all that is intended to be shown is, that the reward of the servant depends upon the *use* which he makes of what is committed to his charge. The δούλοι are represented as the active members of the community, who, with the gifts conferred upon them, carry on the external operations for the promotion of the cause of their Lord ; and the parable is designed to describe the opposite cases of fidelity and unfaithfulness. Hence the talents entrusted signify the general gifts of nature, so far only as these form the condition of endowments with gifts of grace. This is referred to in the words, ver. 15, ἐκάστω κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν δύναμιν, scil. ἔδωκε. For he who is without any natural abilities, is not fitted to be a *powerful* instrument of grace ; and a general application of the parable may be made, in so far as it may be said that every one is entrusted with something, for the right use of which an account will be required. But this application of the comparison is not identical with its original reference. According to the very close association with chap. xxiv., the withdrawment of the Lord after the distribution of the gifts, and his return after a long absence (μετὰ χρόνον πολύν), in order to hold a reckoning (λόγον συναίρειν = rationem conferre), relates to the disciples, whom the Lord, when he departed to the Father, invested with spiritual gifts, that being left to themselves they might administer till his return. Hence the whole connexion here also requires the assumption that a return at the time of the apostles is spoken of, so that the words μετὰ χρόνον πολύν primarily refer to the *expectation* of the apostles. As regards the circumstance that the apostles were left to themselves after the withdrawment of the Lord, it may appear that this stands in opposition to such passages as Matt. xxviii. 20, "I am with you alway, even to the end of the world." But this constant spiritual presence of the Lord in the minds of his people is often concealed, and impossible to be traced ; it is never destructive of free choice, and hence does not exclude faithfulness and unfaithfulness. And as to the later generations of δούλοι, who did not see the Lord in the body, their endowment with powers from above, of the use of which an account will at length be rendered, must be regarded as meaning the first living manifestation of Christ in the mind, in the times of abandonment to the prosecution of trusts intended to test the zeal of man for the cause of the Lord. The return of the Lord is the

period of reckoning with the *δοῦλοι*, involving reward for the faithful, and punishment for the unfaithful. The faithful are described as those who have increased what was entrusted to them; that is, with these spiritual powers of Christ, they have carried on his sublime work in his spirit and nature.

(The expressions employed to designate faithful labour are *ἐργάζεσθαι* [Luke xix. 16 has *προσεργάζεσθαι*] and *ποιεῖν*. The latter answers to the Hebrew *פָּעַל* and *לָקַח*, in the signification “to acquire.” Compare Gesenius in his Lex. under *פָּעַל* and *לָקַח*. For *κερδαίνειν*, to make gain, to obtain advantage, Luke xix. 13, 15, uses *πραγματεύεσθαι*, *διαπραγματεύεσθαι*, which does not occur in any other instance in the New Testament; it is the literal word for trade and money transactions, and has even passed into the later Hebrew. [Comp. Buxtorf. lex. p. 1796, sqq.] Thus the parable is founded upon the supposed case of a merchant; an idea similar to that which occurs, Matt. xiii. 45. It is represented as the reward of these faithful labourers, that they will be called to a higher sphere of operation adapted to their desires. The earthly relations of the kingdom of God, upon which the *δοῦλοι* spent their toils, are contrasted, as the *ὀλίγα*, with the *πολλὰ*, that is, the affairs of the kingdom when it shall be manifested in its heavenly, victorious form. Luke xix. 16, 19, we find a more particular statement; the metaphor being adhered to, ten and five cities are specified as the reward.)

The manner in which the parable speaks of the *third* servant is peculiar; without having gained anything he brought back what was entrusted to him. It is evident that the design is not to describe a man entirely fallen from the faith, an apostate; but one who, although he has not dissolved his connexion as a servant, or squandered his talent, yet from false views of his relation to the Lord has not used it to his advantage. Hence he is called, ver. 30, *δοῦλος ἀχρεῖος*; so that he is regarded as a *δοῦλος* of the Lord, but one who has not done his duty. His false view of the Lord consisted in overlooking his love, and supposing in him an inexorable legal rigour.<sup>1</sup> (Instead of *σκληρός*, ver. 24, Luke xix. 21 has *αὐστηρός*, austere, which does not occur any where else in the

<sup>1</sup> *Διασκορπίζειν*, ver. 24 and 28, is not to be understood as synonymous with *σπελναι*; it is better to take it = *πῦρ*, in the sense, to purify by means of a winnowing shovel.

New Testament. Luke somewhat modifies the comparison, by speaking of a *σουδάριον* [sudarium] in which the money was hid; Matthew represents it as buried in the earth. The talent rendered that impossible which might have applied to a mina.) By this view of unfaithfulness, a remarkable contrast is formed between this parable and that of the virgins. Whilst the guilt of the foolish virgins proceeded from thoughtless presumption upon the kindness of the master, this *δοῦλος* failed through an unbelieving assumption of his severity, so that the two comparisons are complements to each other, and describe the two leading temptations of believers in their relation to the Lord, to abuse grace, or to exclude themselves from access to it by false legality.

One point in the rebuke administered by the master to his disobedient servant (ver. 27) requires special notice, viz. the remark, *ἔδει σε βαλεῖν τὸ ἀργύριόν μου τοῖς τραπεζίταις.* (*Τραπεζίτης* from *τράπεζα*, which Luke has here [xix. 23], the banker's table. *Τόκος*, interest, profit. Instead of *ἐκομισάμην* in Matthew, Luke has *ἔπραξα*, which is commonly used in reference to money, in the sense of *exigere*, *extorquere*.) We cannot regard these words as a perfectly idle sentence, for they furnish an appropriate thought. The fearful servant who dreaded his master, had evidently refrained from laying out the property committed to him, in the way of independent activity for the interests of his master, because he was afraid of losing it; that is—to drop the metaphor—the dangers connected with activity for the kingdom of God on earth, on account of the manifold temptations and opposing forces of the world, keep many persons, who lack faith in the help of God, from going believingly to work according to their abilities. These timid natures, who are not adapted for independent labour on behalf of the kingdom of God, are now advised at least to associate themselves with persons of greater strength, under whose guidance they may apply their gifts to the service of the Church. The first thing mentioned as the punishment of total unfaithfulness is the loss of the gift entrusted, which is then committed by the command of the Lord to the servant who was endowed with ten talents. The rule that follows (ver. 29) in connexion with this proceeding, has already been explained in the remarks on Matt. xiii. 12; its recurrence here in an entirely different connexion cannot be considered strange, when it is remembered that the idea it contains is of such a nature, that

the Redeemer could employ it in the most multifarious applications. The fundamental idea of the rule—viz., that goodness is blessed by the certainty of still richer benefits being afforded to him who receives it into his heart, while it is the curse of sin that it makes even poverty poorer still—is perfectly applicable here. Whilst blessings are heaped upon the faithful, the unfaithful man, stripped of all the gifts conferred upon him, is cast out into darkness (ver. 30.) Here again, the immediate reference is not to eternal condemnation, but to exclusion from the βασιλεία, into which the faithful enter. The degree of guilt in the case of the unfaithful, affords the possibility of their being awakened to true repentance. The βασιλεία is viewed as the region of light, which encircles the darkness. And in reference to this point, the metaphorical language of Scripture is very exact in the choice of expressions. Concerning the children of light who are unfaithful to their vocation, it is said that they are cast into the σκότος; but, respecting the children of darkness, we are told that they are consigned to the πῦρ αἰώνιον; so that each one is punished by his own opposite.

As regards the points of difference presented by Luke, in this parable of the δούλοι, we may remark, first, that they consist in the conduct of the accessory party of citizens, who would not that the lord should reign over them. Whilst the one δούλος represents an inactive member of the body of Christ—the Church—who failed to perform his duty, these citizens are open rebels, and hence their lord orders them to be killed. It is evident that this penal proceeding is essentially distinguished from the reproof administered to the one servant. According to the connexion in Luke—as we have already observed—the πολῖται signify the Jews who engaged in a hostile opposition to Jesus, and, in the wider sense, all real enemies of Christ. In the second place, the two narrators differ in the circumstance that, according to Matthew, the distribution of the talents was unequal, but the profit realised upon that which had been received was equal; whereas in Luke, on the contrary, every one receives the same, but the amounts gained are different. It certainly is a superficial mode of interpretation to explain away these points of variation, as features of no importance; there is no doubt that they have their distinct applications. However, I cannot agree with Schleiermacher (comp. the remarks on Luke xix.

11, ff.) in the opinion, that they render the parables specifically different. The representation of Matthew expresses the idea that the Lord himself distributes gifts differently even among his disciples, while he assigns to one a greater, to another a smaller, sphere of operation ; but that the Redeemer only looks at the application which each one makes of what is bestowed upon him. Luke, on the other hand, shows how equal degrees of endowment on the part of the Lord may result in inequality, by means of the different degrees of activity on the part of men. Now, as the tendency of the whole parable is to describe the influence of human fidelity in the kingdom of God, the representation of Luke, which places this most prominently in view, deserves the preference before that of Matthew.

Ver. 31—46. By means of the third and last comparison respecting the coming of the Lord—as we have already remarked on xxv. 1.—we now obtain the proper data from which to fix the meaning of the two preceding ones. The form of transition, *ἔτι* δὲ, indicates something different as the subject of discourse in the similitude that follows ; hence it cannot be admitted that (as Schott thinks, loc. cit. s. 168, ff.), both in the foregoing parables and in the words now before us, the reference is to the last judgment. This learned man has, indeed, given a triumphant refutation of the hypothesis that the comparisons relate to the destruction of Jerusalem ; to which event we cannot refer a single feature throughout the whole three, and which can only be brought into view, in so far as the description in the twenty-fourth chapter represents the coming of Christ as connected with it, although not identified with it. But according to the view he maintains, that all three comparisons have reference to the last judgment, the third cannot be shown to have any peculiar character, the *δίκαιοι* and the *ἄδικοι* of whom it speaks being made perfectly parallel with the faithful and unfaithful servants. If, however, the third parable treats of something different from the previous ones, this cannot be anything else than the judgment of *unbelievers*, while, in the two that precede, the subject is the sifting of believers. It is true that if we understand the persons judged, in the parable of the sheep and the goats, to mean all men without exception, the expression *πάντα τὰ ἔθνη* suits this view very well ; but then, *in the first place*, it does not appear who the *ἀδελφοὶ Χριστοῦ ἐλάχιστοι* (ver. 40)



are. If the assemblage consists of all men, then it follows of necessity that believers themselves must be comprehended under that designation; but it is evident that in these words they are distinguished from the *δίκαιοι* and the *ἄδικοι*. In the second place, according to the above interpretation, the fact that all the *δίκαιοι* could say, *κύριε, πότε σε εἶδομεν πεινῶντα κ. τ. λ.*, ver. 37, is inexplicable. Believers would know that the Lord regards what is done to his brethren as done to himself. If it be said that this is the language of humility, we must oppose such a view, for *Christian* humility is by no means to be conceived of as devoid of consciousness. It *knows* what it does, and it consists in this—that it does not acknowledge its works as its own, but as the works of God in it. (Such was the humility of Paul, who boasted: “I have laboured more than ye all,” but adds, “yet not I, but the grace of God that is in me,” 1 Cor. xv. 10.) And, *lastly*, the hypothesis that all men, even believers and perfectly just men, are here to be understood by the term *δίκαιοι*, is directly contrary to the doctrine of the New Testament, that believers shall not come into judgment (comp. John iii. 18, v. 24; 1 Cor. xi. 31.)

Nor is there any more ground for the opinion, that, in the parable of the sheep and the goats, merely Christians, without unbelievers, are meant. For, in addition to the arguments adduced in refutation of the view just considered—all of which apply to this as well—to take the expression *πάντα τὰ ἔθνη* as referring to the Christian Church, is utterly unsound. It is, indeed, said that it denotes the Church of the Lord collected *out of* all nations; but it is impossible to show that an expression, the fixed meaning of which is so different, can be employed in this sense. Hence, the only alternative is to understand the term as denoting all men, with the exception of believers—that is, *all unbelievers*; and this interpretation being adopted, the parable preserves its own internal harmony, as well as its true position in relation to those which precede.<sup>1</sup> The expression *πάντα τὰ ἔθνη* then perfectly corresponds with the Hebrew *כָּל הָעַמִּים*, in opposition to the people of Israel. The collective body of believers is now viewed as Israel. These do not come into judgment at all, but

<sup>1</sup> This sense of the parable has already been very justly acknowledged by Keil (in his and Tzschirner's *Analekten*, B. i. s. 3.)

at the resurrection of the just enter into the joy of the kingdom of God. Those who are idle and do not practise fidelity to their faith are separated from the kingdom of God ; but this act of separation must not be confounded with the general judgment. Accordingly the ἀδελφοί of Christ (ver. 40) are easily distinguished from unbelievers who appear in judgment ; the ἀδελφοί are believers ; and because the δίκαιοι receive them (δέχεσθαι), they receive the reward of prophets, righteous men, or believers. (Here compare the exposition of the whole passage, Matt. x. 40—42.) There is a meaning in the profession, πότε δέ σε εἶδομεν, when it is taken as the language of unbelievers ; for even the δίκαιοι among them must be viewed as excluded from the higher consciousness wrought by the spirit of Christ ; the power of love was active in their hearts, without their being themselves conscious of what they did. Now if this comparison be taken in connexion with the foregoing ones, it will be seen how well, according to our interpretation, they complete each other. In the two first parables the sifting of believers is represented in conformity with their two leading dispositions, the contemplative and the practical ; then this is followed by the judgment of the mass of unbelievers ; the former is to be viewed as taking place at the resurrection of the just, the latter at the general resurrection of the dead. These two matters make up the whole of the Redeemer's beatific and punitive procedure at his coming.<sup>1</sup>

It is true this explanation of the third parable appears to give rise to other difficulties which do not press upon the first-named hypothesis. For, according to our view, unbelievers (the δίκαιοι) would be received to favour, whereas, Heb. xi. 6, it is said that " without faith it is impossible to please God," and Rom. iii. 28, " Man is justified (alone) by faith." And further, good works would be presupposed in unbelievers, whereas " whatsoever is not

<sup>1</sup> The remarks of De Wette, in opposition to this interpretation of the third comparison, as applying only to the judgment of non-Christians—that is, those who are not the subjects of true regeneration—have not convinced me of its unsoundness. On the contrary, I think the only thing that has led this scholar to reject my exposition is the unhistorical assertion, that Matthew makes no distinction between the millennial and the eternal reigns of Christ. If it be considered that this distinction was a general Jewish idea, it cannot be understood how Matthew could be free from it, especially when we take into account the way in which, as De Wette allows, the whole representation of Matthew is modified by the national element. And if Matthew observed this distinction, the relation of the three parables cannot well be determined in any other manner than that in which I have attempted to define it.

of faith is sin" (Rom. xiv. 23.) But according to the ideas unfolded, Rom. ii. 14, ff., iii. 21, it is by no means consistent with Scripture to view the non-Christian world as absolutely excluded from good works, or from that faith which alone can produce good works; on the contrary, in all nations there are noble minds who follow out their knowledge with great fidelity, and are to be regarded as righteous persons. Only the degree of knowledge and faith in these non-Christian devout men must be estimated as very subordinate, and hence the point of view which they occupy, as such, is in reality nothing but susceptibility for the operations of the grace of God in Christ. Now if, in the providence of God, they do not experience these operations on earth, we cannot on this account consider them excluded from happiness; what they here desired without receiving it, they will realize hereafter. The only persons shut out from salvation are those who, in the full enjoyment of all the actings of grace, without any desire after God, or any fidelity to their knowledge, waste the gifts entrusted to them.

Ver. 31—33. The Parousia of the Son of Man at the judgment is here described just in the same manner as Matt. xxiv. 30. The prophetic form being adopted, the several circumstances *at* and *after* the advent of the Lord, although not exactly interchanged, are not plainly and chronologically distinguished. No precise account of the order is given till we come to the Apocalypse, and the data there supplied are the guide by which the elements in these passages must be separated. In the same way we may explain the circumstance that Matt. xxiv. 30 does not differ at all from this description of the appearing of the Lord at the general judgment, although its primary reference is to an earlier period in the revelation of his glory. (Just in the same manner the prophets of the Old Testament immediately connect with the appearing of the Messiah all those effects of his work which would only be unfolded in thousands of years.) Instead of the ἄγγελοι that here form the retinue (Matt. xxiv. 30, the δύναμις) of Christ, who is described as the Sovereign, in Rev. xix. 14 (comp. this with ver. 8 and Jude ver. 14), the ἄγιοι are mentioned. Now as our passage also (ver. 40) intimates that these will be present, the expression ἄγγελος is probably to be taken here in a comprehensive sense, so as to include also the just made perfect (Heb. xii. 23.) (Compare Zech. xiv. 5, where the description of the advent of the Lord repre-

sents the **מַלְאָכָיו** as appearing with him. It is true that, according to the modern hebraism, this term is understood to mean the angels, but it is a question whether it does not contain an intimation of the idea that those men who were glorified in ancient days will be with the Messiah, and will appear with him. The LXX. render the passage **πάντες οἱ ἅγιοι**. In regard to the form of this similitude, it may be observed that it is but imperfectly worked out. In reality it combines two comparisons which cross each other. The Redeemer is first compared to a king, who sits upon a throne and pronounces judgment; and secondly to a shepherd who divides the sheep. The **ἀφορίζειν** involves the idea of the **κρίνειν**—the separation of elements, mingled up to that time, into the two classes, good and bad. The metaphor of the sheep and the goats is found in the Old Testament (comp. Ezek. xxxiv. 15, ff.; Isaiah xiv. 9); and indeed it is a common Old Testament idea, that the right is that which is approved and loved, the left that which is rejected.

Ver. 34—36. In the first place, the **δίκαιοι** are commended by the king, and represented as heirs of the kingdom (Matt. v. 5.) By the divine kingdom, we are here to understand the perfect state of the creation, called in another place (Rev. xxi. 1, ff.) the new heaven and new earth. There the characteristic of the **βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ**, the dominion of the will of God, which extends by degrees, will be completely perfect (1 Cor. xv. 27); for the very last manifestations of evil will be destroyed, and the harmony disturbed by sin will be restored. Hence the relation between the kingdom of Christ on earth and this eternal **βασιλεία τοῦ πατρὸς** is as follows: in the former, although that which is good *prevails*, yet evil is not entirely separated; in the latter the influence of evil is perfectly annihilated. Here a difficulty occurs, on account of this **βασιλεία** being represented in our passage as prepared for the **κληρονόμοι** (Rom. viii. 17) from eternity (**ἡτοιμασμένη ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου**.) Comp. Matt. xiii. 35; Ephes. i. 4. Similarly, ver. 41, the **πῦρ αἰώνιον** is described as prepared for the wicked. (The reading **ὁ ἡτοίμασεν ὁ πατήρ μου** must yield to the ordinary reading; but it makes no difference in the sense, because **ἡτοιμασμένον** can only be explained by supplying **ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς**.) But in the latter case the **ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου** is wanting, and this is a circumstance that must not be overlooked. Often as the election of believers is represented in the New Testament as eternal and depen-

dant upon the predestination of God, it is never said of the wicked, that they are predestinated as such.

We have fully discussed the relation of the important doctrine concerning the divine determination to the worlds of evil and of good, in the exposition of the principal passage that treats on that subject (Rom. ix.) Here therefore we only offer the following remarks. According to the nature of the opposition between good and evil, which is only relative, no one is *out of* God or *besides* God, but only *through* God and *in* God. Hence the doctrine of Scripture—which proceeds from the deepest knowledge of divine things—traces what is good in the creature to the only eternal Good, and accordingly teaches a predestination of the saints; for he who is good and happy can only become so by God's will and choice. This divine choice, however, does not destroy *freedom*, but establishes it; although the *right of election*, the power to choose evil, is done away by grace, and this *want* of ability to choose is identical with true freedom. But the case is different with evil. God, who is entirely free from evil, determines no one to evil; to deal with evil is the prerogative of the creature. Hence sin, proceeding from the creature, has not the character of being absolute. After evil has come into action through the creature, its punishment may be ascribed to God, but God can never appoint even the wicked themselves to wickedness. The Holy Scriptures, indeed, in perfect harmony with this, teach a *praedestinatio sanctorum* (although without *gratia irresistibilis*), but they say nothing about a *reprobatio impiorum*. He who is happy is so through God and through God alone; he who is unhappy is the sole cause of his own misery.

The works of love performed by the *δίκαιοι* are now mentioned, as the proofs by which they evince their calling to the kingdom of God. (Comp. such passages in the Old Testament<sup>1</sup> as Isaiah lviii. 6, 7; Job. vi. 14, xxii. 6, ff., where also eternal life is connected with works of love.) These, as works of true love, presuppose living faith; for faith and love are as inseparable as fire and warmth; the one cannot exist in its real nature without the other; and if they ever appear isolated (1 Cor. xiii. 2), the object always is to give prominence to the true character of the one or the other. Accordingly the reference is not to external actions of charity—

<sup>1</sup> From these sources the same view has also been received by the Rabbins. Compare Jalkut Rub. fol. 42, quicumque hospitalitatem libenter exercet, illius est paradisus.

these may be *ἔργα νεκρά*;—the subject of discourse is the living effluence of the inward tide of love. It is in such love that godliness consists, for God is love.

Ver. 37—40. The ignorance of the devout men respecting their works is humility, but not *Christian* humility, which cannot be conceived of as unconscious, because the Christian life, in its perfection, presupposes the highest *consciousness*. Such passages as Matt. vi. 3 cannot be applied here, for they do not commend the absence of consciousness, but merely discountenance any appropriation of works as our own. The dialogue of course is to be regarded as the form of the similitude, but it has its truth inasmuch as the interior nature of man will manifest itself, at the judgment, in its proper character and will, as it were, utter a real language. To those who have been actuated by a humble childlike love, there will then be a disclosure of the living connexion that subsists between the Redeemer and his people, so that what is done to his brethren is done to him. (The expression *μικροί*, as we have already shown, in the remarks on Matt. xviii. 6, is applied to believers, partly in reference to the world and its persecutions, and partly in reference to regeneration. But here *ἐλάχιστος* is employed in opposition to *μέγας*, and among the *ἀδελφοί* themselves, great and little are distinguished, as Matt. v. 19. The distinction is designed to point out in a striking manner the difference between the act and the recompense; love exercised towards the *least* of the brethren is followed by the richest reward.) The brethren are represented as present (*τούτων τῶν ἀδελφῶν*) and as distinguished from the *δίκαιοι* to whom the language of the Judge is addressed. Hence the scene may be described as follows: those who are judged stand *before* the *θρόνος* of Christ, on the right and on the left; then *by the side of* the Judge, and therefore not appearing in judgment, stand believers, who do not come into judgment, but in and with Christ judge the world (1 Cor. vi. 2.)

Ver. 41—46. The very same criterion by which eternal life is secured to the *δίκαιοι*, forms the reason why the *ἄδικοι* are consigned to *κόλασις αἰώνιος*. As he who can love has the power to receive love, and love is happiness and eternal life itself, so the privation of love is misery and incapability of happiness. Accordingly the punishment here spoken of is not arbitrary or positive; the punishment of lovelessness is association with the loveless alone,

in that state of discord in the external as well as the internal life, which constantly proceeds from the absence of love. And hence the *κόλασις αἰώνιος* is not identical with exclusion from the marriage (Matt. xxv. 13) ; on the contrary, the expression denotes eternal condemnation. Nor can the strictness of the antithesis be subjected to the slightest exegetic alleviation, on account of the term *ζωή αἰώνιος* ; for the observation of De Wette,—that if a strict antithesis were intended, annihilation must have been specified in opposition to life,—is sufficiently refuted by the fact that here the predominant idea expressed by the word *ζωή* is not that of *existence*, but that of holy and happy being. And in regard to the view founded upon the antithesis between good and evil generally,—that good alone is eternal and rests in the being of God himself, whilst evil is an accident, having nothing substantial in its nature, and therefore the *consequences* of evil which is temporal, can only be temporal—we allow that these ideas certainly are not devoid of truth. But at the same time, it must not be overlooked, that the mode of representation adopted in the Scriptures nowhere favours the hypothesis of the *ἀποκατάστασις τῶν πάντων* by any *positive* declarations, and hence in the exegetic examination of this question—which at last resolves itself into the view taken of free choice and its relation to divine agency—it is best to adhere to the mode of expression which Scripture itself has selected. However, the doctrine of *κόλασις αἰώνιος* is not to be sought in every place where the punishment of sin is mentioned ; this has been done long enough. Throughout the New Testament, *redemption* is the object kept in view, and hence the Lord, here as always, concludes his discourse not with condemnation, but with eternal happiness. And with a glance at this, we will pass on to the consideration of that gospel of love, which the disciple of love has bequeathed to us, wherein the secret things of God, and especially the profound counsels of his grace are disclosed. The eternal Word proceeding from the bosom of the Father, in order that he might bring the happiness of eternal life to those who were lost, fathomed the gulf of all sin and suffering, sealed the bond of peace with his own sacred blood, and thus found an eternal redemption *for all*.

THE  
G O S P E L   O F   J O H N .



**Volat avis sine meta  
Quo nec vates, nec propheta,  
    Goolavit altius.  
Jam implenda, quam impleta,  
Nunquam vidit tot secreta  
    Purus homo prius.**

# EXPOSITION

OF THE

# G O S P E L O F J O H N .

---

## INTRODUCTION.

### § 1. OF JOHN PERSONALLY.

ACCORDING to the evangelic history, the two celebrated brothers among the twelve apostles—John and James—were born in Bethsaida<sup>1</sup> in Galilee. Zebedee and Salome were their parents ;<sup>2</sup> the former supported himself by fishing in the neighbouring sea, but he does not appear to be further mentioned in the Gospels as of any importance spiritually. Salome, on the other hand, was amongst the women, who in outward respects imparted help to the Saviour from their own resources, and whose affection towards him whom they had learned to honour as the Messiah, was so great that they did not forsake him even at his cross (Mark xv. 40.) By this pious mother the first germs of religion may have been dropped into the heart of the son. The parents of John do not appear to have been altogether poor ;<sup>3</sup> the acquaintance which he himself had with

<sup>1</sup> The Hebrew name of the place is בֵּית צִידָה, answering to the German Fischhaus (Fish-house.)

<sup>2</sup> The admission of a relationship between the family of John and that of Jesus, is indeed apocryphal (Thilo Cod. Apocr. vol. i. 363), but yet it throws light upon many things, for example, the otherwise extraordinary act of the dying Saviour in commending Mary to John. Salome must have been the daughter or the sister of Joseph.

<sup>3</sup> The fishing on the Galilean Sea cannot possibly have allowed the acquisition of much wealth. Lücke appears to deduce too much from Luke v. 10, when he under-

the High Priest (not merely with his servants, John xviii. 15) indicates a certain responsibility in the family from which John had descended.

Meanwhile this is a very unimportant circumstance, and we can in no wise infer from it any splendid training which he may have enjoyed, and which seems betrayed by the subsequent bent and the peculiar activity of his mind. The appearance presented by our Evangelist is to be accounted for purely by his elevated calling, which was to attain its most happy and complete development under the influence of the Holy Spirit. This his vocation to act for lofty divine ends, first disclosed itself in conjunction with the Baptist. In him the Evangelist rightly recognised the first rays of the approaching sun, and while he was attracted by their lustre, the light whose power they displayed, led him to the fountain itself from which it gushed forth; John came by means of the Baptist to Jesus. (John i. 35.) John soon belonged, with his brother James and Peter, to the Lord's most select and confidential circle; but he alone rested on the bosom of Jesus, on which account he is commonly called *ἐπιστήθιος*.

The relationship of Christ to James is not precisely known; but what we learn of Peter is quite adapted, on account of the contrast with John's mode of thought and disposition, to place this latter evangelic character in a clearer light.<sup>1</sup> In Peter, manly force and fiery ardour predominated; while John appears like a virginature, gentle, tranquil, wrapped in himself. Ardour continually brought Peter forward as the spokesman of the apostles, so long as the Lord was with them on earth, and after the Lord's ascension to heaven, as the representative and disputant on behalf of the infant Church; while John neither travelled much, nor addressed large masses of people, nor converted great numbers, but rather reposed in quiet and retiring activity—so long as the Lord continued his work upon earth, leaning on his breast—and after he returned to

stands the passage as if the families of John and Peter were in partnership, so as to carry on the trade of fishing on a large scale. The expression, *ἦσαν κοινωνοὶ τῷ Σίμωνι* certainly cannot be rendered, "they were friends, companions of Simon." The dative requires the translation, "they were in association with Simon," namely, in their business; but there is nothing to shew that this association was a permanent one. The simplest plan is to understand the words as meaning that they were at that time carrying on the fishing in combination, perhaps only for a few days.

<sup>1</sup> Compare the Comment on Matt. xiv. 28, ff.

the Father, listening with an open spiritual ear to his secret revelations.

It may therefore be said, that whilst Peter loved Jesus more than the other disciples did (John xxi. 15)—that is, whilst in him the active energy of love possessed greater fulness—Jesus loved John more than he did the rest ; that is, the susceptibility to the powers of the upper world—the negative, passive capability of love—presented itself as predominant in John. Accordingly, whilst the activity of the practical life devolved upon Peter as his appointed occupation, John was the apostolical representative of everything sublime in the mystic and the intellectual. He was not called first to cut the way with the sword of the Spirit, as Peter and Paul, but to conduct those churches which had been founded, which were growing and developing, into the depths of the inner life, and to unfold to them the treasures of knowledge. Grotius meant something similar to this when he termed John *φιλοησοῦς*, but Peter *φιλόχριστος* ; only, in these terms, he did not exhibit so much John's susceptibility of love—the maidenlike feature of his character—as his affection for the human person of the Saviour ; whilst Peter loved not so much his person as his *office* and *function*. Nice as this distinction is, I do not think it altogether *true*, since a stronger impulse of love plainly manifested itself in Peter, even towards the *person* of Jesus ; only, this disciple never betrayed so much womanlike susceptibility as we discover in John.

Much, however, of the information which the Gospels supply concerning John, certainly stands in opposition to this view of his *character* ; so that we might believe this tenderness of love and intenseness of nature to have been founded not so much in his calling and natural disposition, as in a work of grace within him. But while it is undeniable that the power of grace purifies and transforms the sinful peculiarities of man, it is quite as certain that it does not substitute opposite characteristics for the natural disposition. It by no means converts the tender, gentle soul into a Luther, and changes one full of energy and force into a Melancthon ; but it sanctifies and perfects those natural abilities of man which in their first germs are imparted by God.

Hence it certainly cannot be supposed that John, before his second birth, possessed an ardent aspiring temperament like Peter's, for out of this, such a nature as John's never could have been

formed; nor can anything amounting to proof be deduced from those passages which have been appealed to in support of such an assertion. The main passage is Luke ix. 54, compared with Mark iii. 17. According to the first passage, both the sons of Zebedee, John and James, said (when the inhabitants of a Samaritan town would afford no shelter to Jesus), "Lord, if thou wilt, we will command that fire fall from heaven and destroy them, as Elias did." Jesus, however, rebuked them and said, 'Know ye not of what spirit ye are the children?' In the other passage, both brothers are called *υἱοὶ βροτῆς*, indicating a character likely to utter such expressions as that which has just been adduced. But, in the explanation of Luke ix. 54, it has been shown, in the first place, that no connexion subsists between these passages, while the epithet *υἱοὶ βροτῆς* points out nothing censurable, but designates the new name,—that is, the new nature of both Zebedee's children; and, in the second place, that the ebullition of anger against the Samaritans affords no evidence of a peculiarly vehement temperament, but merely indicates a momentary exchange of the spirit of the Old and New Testaments, and of their relative positions. Keeping, then, in view the character of John, as it so frequently appears—affectionate and intense, yet without feebleness or effeminacy—this occurrence will not lead us into any error as to its essential tone. We do not regard the passages Matt. xx. 20, ff., or the parallel, Mark x. 35, ff., as affording any more evidence than those quoted above with respect to the aspiring turn in John's disposition. According to Matthew, the mother asks *with* the two sons; according to Mark, the sons *alone* ask for two places of honour in the kingdom of the Lord, at his right hand and at his left.

It is probable that the propensity, naturally cleaving to every man, to become eminent and exalted, on this occasion was stirring in the minds of the two disciples; but yet, according to the context, this certainly was not the radical principle of their inner life, and the motive of their request; for the Lord did not rebuke ambition and want of purity in this request, but merely their ignorance of the greatness of what they asked. "Ye know not what ye ask," said Jesus, "and what would be the consequence of that which ye desire." It is also more than probable that the inmost meaning of this petition was, that they might ever be, and might have the power of remaining, in immediate nearness to him whom they loved with

all their soul. (The same view has already been indicated in the Commentary on the passages quoted.) It is obvious that it was not so much what the two disciples asked, as the manner in which the Ten expressed themselves in reference to this (ver. 24), that gave rise to the subsequent address of Jesus (Matt. xx. 25, ff.), and the words in which he portrays dominion in the kingdom of God are intended rather to furnish the Ten with a description of the nature of such dominion than to reprove the sons of Zebedee. They express the sentiment: "It is well to strive after dominion in the kingdom of God, since no one rules there but he who is most humble and most lowly; if, therefore, the two disciples seek for themselves places of dignity in the kingdom of God, they desire that which presupposes the deepest humility and the purest love." Accordingly, we can only infer that, while John participated in the general sinfulness of human nature—which is evident of itself—he was endowed by God with the greatest loveliness, in order to exhibit in him, through the transformation of his nature by the regenerating power of grace, that very engaging aspect which has always excited the admiration of the Church.

With regard to the later circumstances of John's life, it appears from Gal. ii. 9 that he spent a considerable time in Jerusalem, and a recent tradition reports that he lived there until the death of Mary, the Lord's mother—who is said to have died in the year A.D. 48—in order that he might completely fulfil the charge of the dying Saviour to take care of his mother. If this information cannot be regarded as founded in history, still the date certainly approaches very closely to the truth.

Many of the journeys attributed to John are not recorded, nor does his character render it likely that they ever were taken. We only know that, probably when the apostles ceased from devoting their chief attention to the Israelitish people, John went to Ephesus, in Asia Minor, where Paul had laboured before him.<sup>1</sup> His residence in this important city of the old world is perfectly demonstrable from history.

After Irenæus, who received the most certain information on this point from his teacher Polycarp, the immediate disciple of John,

<sup>1</sup> Although the second Epistle to Timothy does not refer to John, and Timothy there appears quite by himself, yet it is probable that John went for the first time to Ephesus shortly before the destruction of Jerusalem, at the close of Nero's reign.

it is related by Clemens of Alexandria, Eusebius, Jerome, &c. John lived there till the time of Trajan, towards the end of the first century, and attained the greatest age of all the apostles. For a long period, his grave was shewn there as a sacred relique.<sup>2</sup> Probably it was there that he composed his writings (comp. § 4 in this Introduction), which in their contents and form are suited to the state of things prevailing in Asia Minor. It is only with respect to the Revelation that the assumed banishment of the Evangelist to the Isle of Patmos occasions any difficulties; these, however, can be considered and solved only in the connected inquiry respecting the authenticity of that writing. Among the incidents of John's life that have been reported, is the account of the Evangelist's preservation in boiling oil, which Tertullian (*de praeser. haer.* c. 36) communicates, and which is doubtless to be ascribed to legends. The circumstance that John had no hard sufferings and persecutions to endure—like the fact of his not dying a martyr—is traceable to the peaceful, purely inward character of his course of life; and in this respect, also, a distinction might be established between the characters of Peter and John (comp. John xxi. 18—22.) The intenseness and power of his work as an apostle remove all objections to the credibility of what Clemens of Alexandria relates (*quis div. salv.* c. 42) concerning the admonition to the young man among the robbers, and of the account given by Jerome (*vol. iii.* 314) respecting the exhortation to love into which the disciple of love compressed everything desirable.

With respect to the account of the meeting between the Evangelist and Cerinthus (Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 3, 28, iv. 14), I entirely concur in the view taken by Lücke (*Comment. Th. i.* s. 19, in the second edition, which I always quote), viz., that there is no admissible ground for considering the story untrue; on the contrary, 3 Epis. John ver. 10 appears suggestive of the key to John's conduct towards that heretic, and even this, when rightly understood, contains nothing contradictory to the mild character of the Evangelist. The bias under which this was for a long time viewed as a fabrication proceeded simply and solely from that weakness and in-

<sup>1</sup> *Comp. Iren. adv. haer. iii.* 1—3; Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 14, v. 20; Clem. A. *quis dives salv.* c. 42; Huron. *ad Galat.* vol. iii. p. 314.

<sup>2</sup> Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 25 p. 455, edit. Stroth.

difference with respect to heretics which persons had accustomed themselves to regard as toleration and kindness.

## § 2. OF THE GENUINENESS OF THE GOSPEL BY JOHN.

The Gospel of John possesses, with respect to its genuineness, stronger testimonials in history than any other writing of the New Testament, or, we may say, of the whole of antiquity.<sup>1</sup> For, even if other writings also of the New Testament can exhibit testimonies to their apostolic origin just as old and as numerous, still the Gospel of John has *this* advantage, that its author lived a longer life than the rest of the apostles, while he dwelt and laboured for a considerable period in one of the most flourishing communities of the ancient Church. John, as we have already remarked, lived in Ephesus, and there he died during the reign of Trajan, at the end of the first century of our era, about a hundred years old.

We know from the letters of the contemporary Pliny,<sup>2</sup> to what an extent Christianity prevailed at that time in Asia Minor; everywhere in the cities there were numerous bodies of believers, and even in the rural districts the Gospel had made considerable progress.

Accordingly, John, the last witness of the life of the Lord remaining on earth; must have been held in the greatest esteem by the numerous Christian flocks; his writings must have been frequently read, and thus it must have been rendered next to impossible that a supposititious writing should be attributed to him, and especially one of such importance as the Gospel of John, without immediately calling forth the liveliest opposition. History, however, knows nothing of contest against John's Gospel. Eusebius (Eccl. Hist., iii. 25) enumerates it with the three first Gospels among the Homologoumena, and the oldest teachers of the Church, as early as their time, acknowledge it as a genuine monument of John. Irenæus says that several old teachers gave him information concerning John and his Gospel.<sup>3</sup> He doubtless intended

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Calmberg diss. de antiquissimis patrum proevangelii Joannei *αὐθεντία* testimoniis. Humb. 1822.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. Plin. Epist. x. 97. copied in my Monum. hist. eccl., vol. i. p. 23, ff.

<sup>3</sup> Comp. my Geschichte der Evangelien, s. 210, ff.



among these persons, in the first place, Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, who had known John personally; and, secondly, Papias of Hierapolis in Phrygia. It is true Eusebius (Eccl. Hist., iii. 39) declares that the latter had not known any of the holy apostles, but it is plain that Eusebius had misunderstood the words of Papias, as we have already fully pointed out.<sup>1</sup> It is true that direct quotations from the Gospel of John are not adduced in the fragments of Papias, nor does Eusebius (iii. 39), who had read his writings, inform us that Papias cited John. But it does not thence follow, that the bishop of Hierapolis could not have known anything of the fourth Gospel; on the contrary, Eusebius makes no remark as to whether the teachers of whose writings he gives intelligence knew certain other writings, or did not know them, except in instances where uncertainty existed concerning their origin. This, however, was not the case with the Gospel of John, and he therefore maintained perfect silence as to this writing, and as to their use of it.

Besides these oldest witnesses, we find the writing of the Evangelist John acknowledged and used by very many others, and that in the most diverse districts and regions. Justin Martyr had it in his collection of Memorabilia,<sup>2</sup> Clement of Alexandria used it as a genuine apostolic writing; so did Tertullian in Carthage and Irenæus in Lyons; nor was it less known and used by the Syrian and the old Italian churches, in the primitive canons of which, in connexion with the other Gospels, that of John also is found. This general harmony in the acknowledgment of John's Gospel is not, however, confined to the members of the general Church, but those who belonged to the sects also used the writing as authentically apostolic; the Gnostics, for instance, and the Montanists, and even Pagans (*e. g.*, Celsus) regarded the Gospel of John as an acknowledged fountain of Christian doctrine. Among the former, it is true that the Marcionites, just as the judaizing sects, did not *use* John; this, however, was not because they doubted its authen-

<sup>1</sup> See Olshausen's *Genuineness of Writings of N. T.*, p. 100.—Tr.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. my *Geschichte der Evangelien*, s. 288, ff. What Credner has adduced against this (*Beiträge zur Einl. Halle*, 1832) is so utterly improbable, and so completely unfounded, that no one has acknowledged it. (Comp. Lücke *Comm.*, B. i. s. 29, note.) Justin Martyr, according to Credner, was indeed acquainted with our four Gospels (yet he allows this to be doubtful with respect to that of John), but seldom or never used them! According to him, Justin only made use of the Petrine Gospel.

ticity, but, on the contrary, *because they acknowledged it*. They did not believe that John was to be numbered with those apostles who had properly apprehended the Gospel; the former (the Marcionites) considered only Paul—and the latter (the Ebionites) admitted only Matthew—to be the genuine apostle. Thus the very opposition of these sects to the *use* of John's Gospel is a confirmation of the evidence for its authenticity. The remarks which Bretschneider<sup>1</sup> has opposed to these historical facts, are partly of no importance, and partly rest upon misunderstood passages of the Fathers; and upon this subject I have enlarged in my work, to which frequent reference has already been made (s. 242, ff.)

The only trace of a contest respecting the apostolic origin of John is afforded by the Alogians;<sup>2</sup> an insignificant sect, which rose in opposition to the Montanists. Their opposition, however, is perfectly unimportant, because they rejected the genuineness of the writing without any historical ground, and merely on polemical accounts. Their whole appearance and operations were, moreover, of a trivial character, and no person of consequence belonged to them.<sup>3</sup>

These feeble opponents of John in antiquity, have, however, been succeeded by some in the most recent times, who have produced remarks of a much more shrewd and substantial nature against the writing under consideration. These require a short notice; more especially because they, for the most part, rest upon correct observations,—from which observations, however, false conclusions have been deduced. We notice here only the work of Bretschneider, already alluded to, because it is the most acute of those which have been penned against the genuineness of John's Gospel.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Comp. his *probabilia de evangelii et epistolarum Joannis Apostoli indole et origine*. Lips. 1820, p. 211, sqq.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. my *Geschichte der Evangelien*, s. 255, ff.

<sup>3</sup> Gieseler refers to this sect. See *Translation of his Church History*, by Dr Davidson, vol. i. p. 150. Clark's For. Liby.—Tn.

<sup>4</sup> While Bretschneider has declared himself overcome by the weight of the arguments adduced against his probabilities, de Wette recently repeats his objections to the authenticity; to say nothing of the positive language used by Strauss. De Wette maintains (s. 8) that an apostolic disciple composed the Gospel from the communications of an apostle, only with the unshackled use of his own mind; and that in truth this was a disciple of the Evangelist John. Meanwhile, all that is urged against John himself, might be said with equal propriety against a disciple of his, supposing him to have been

The most important among all the remarks which have been directed against the Gospel of John by this scholar, is that *the Saviour, according to the representation of the fourth Gospel, appears to be a perfectly different person from that which he is described to be in the three other Gospels*. The difference between the Christ of John and that of the three synoptical Evangelists is, in fact, very great. If we compare the Saviour according to John's portrait with that of the three other Evangelists, in the first description his form is as it were etherial, and encircled by enchantment. Everything in him is spiritual and profound. His discourses are replete with genuine *Mystik* and *Gnosis*.<sup>1</sup> All that is partial, narrow, merely national, is at a distance. In the description of the synoptical writers, on the contrary, Jesus appears in a popular aspect, teaching in the mode commonly practised by the Jewish instructors, acting in a manner entirely national. With all the richness of thought in the discourses of Christ, yet most of them, as given by the three first Evangelists, want that peculiarity which we term *Gnostical Mystik* in the noblest sense of the words.

It is true we find also among biographies of human individuals, *e. g.*, in that of Socrates, a similar variation. Plato gives him a more spiritual aspect than Zenophon does; but the difference between the two representations does not stand out so forcibly either in this instance or in any other, and did we recognise nothing more than that which is human in Christ, it might in fact be scarcely conceivable how one amongst his disciples could give a picture of his form so entirely different from that drawn by the others. But

a true disciple of John, and acknowledged by him as such. For, according to de Wette's lax views, there would be no difficulty in admitting that the apostle himself committed all the errors through which that writer has been induced to fix upon a disciple of the apostle as the author of the Gospel. At the same time, de Wette himself, at the conclusion of the passage to which we have alluded, admits the unsatisfactory nature of such internal evidence as he adduces; while, on the other hand, he acknowledges the incontrovertible character of the opposite external evidence. "The recognition of John as the author of our Gospel, even after the most violent assaults, will ever continue prevalent in the Church." I am of the same opinion: the most hostile attacks upon the truth can only place it in a more triumphant light.

1 The author's own explanation of these terms (page 17) is "a more profound, essential knowledge of God." The Mystics and Gnostics professed an inward direct apprehension of the truth in its own purity. See Soames's edit. of Mosheim, vol. i. p. 117, ff, and p. 245. For a full description of the Gnostics, see Gieseler's Eccl. Hist., translated by Dr Davidson, vol. i. p. 134. Clark's For. Lib.; also, Neander's Gen. Ch. Hist. translated by Prof. Torrey, vol. ii. p. 42, ff. Clark's For. Liby.

this phenomenon becomes intelligible to him who believes that in Christ the fulness of the Godhead itself was manifest, while the perfect model of all human beauty and moral greatness was displayed ; then if we connect with this the supposition that all the disciples of Christ—and among them the Evangelists—possessed different personal endowments, it becomes evident how variously, in the different mirrors of their minds, the same elevated, opulent form would present itself, while the *individuals* were not in a position each to catch all the rays that issued from the sun of their spiritual world, and unite them into one image. It was reserved for the profound, inwardly-bent intelligence of John to absorb even the faintest gleam, and thus to form the most spiritual representation of the Saviour. Each of the others apprehended one portion of his great work, all of them, however, taking rather the *external* view than the *internal*.

To this internal evidence we may add the external argument, that John's design in writing was quite different from that of the three first Evangelists, and that the persons for whom he wrote were altogether different from those whom the other Evangelists addressed (which subject is more particularly discussed in the immediate sequel), and on this account his description must naturally appear very different from theirs. Further, while it is shewn that the difference between the description of Christ given by John and that given by the three first Evangelists, does not form any ground for doubting the authenticity of John—but on the contrary goes to prove the sublime character of the appearance which Christ presented to him, and the greatness of the gifts with which the Evangelist was endowed—just as little question of the authenticity can be founded on the remark *that the discourses in John could not have taken place*.<sup>1</sup> Even if this remark were substantiated, it would afford no testimony against the genuineness, since in the apostolic Matthew

1 The inapplicability of the mythical hypothesis to John's Gospel, after the general remarks shewing it to be inadmissible with reference to the evangelic history as a whole (in the Comment., vol. i. 3rd edit.), requires no further demonstration. All that is there adduced only serves to accumulate evidence in favour of John ; since he was from the beginning an eye witness even of the most secret and momentous circumstances in the life of the Lord ; since he took charge of the mother of Jesus, and from her may have learned accurately all the incidents of his history in childhood (the fact that he does not contradict the statements of Matthew and Luke, is moreover to be viewed as a confirmation of them, because he must have known them) ; since, finally, he lived the longest of the apostles, and wrote his Gospel at a time when Christianity had already spread

we meet with discourses framed by the Evangelist himself; if only the spirit who inspired the Holy Teacher animated him who formed the discourses, such freedom in the treatment of them can be no disparagement. In the case of John, however, the fact itself is not established; this view is arrived at only by means of the false supposition that the discourses in John are too profound, too thoroughly digested, to have been delivered to the disciples, or by any means to the people.

Jesus, however, intentionally spoke much that certainly was not in its full sense understood by those around him; but the Holy Ghost was to bring all that he had said to the remembrance of the disciples, in order that an object worthy of investigation to study might be bequeathed to them for a later period, when they and the Church should have made further attainments. If, therefore, I am not at all of opinion that John noted down those discourses which he has recorded word for word, and from these notes inserted them in his work; I still believe that the discourses of Christ given us by John are related *substantially* as the Saviour delivered them. They in nowise resemble the style of Matthew, but are confined so strictly to the historic occasions which called them forth, and are so completely finished off as little wholes in themselves, that every thing seems to me indicative of their originality.<sup>1</sup> With the main arguments which we have thus referred to, may be coupled some subordinate observations of Bretschneider—such as, that the author

through all the regions of the *orbis terrarum*, and that not in a sequestered corner of the earth, but in Ephesus, one of the great centres of business in that day.

<sup>1</sup> Lücke thinks (s. 103) there can be no mistake in the opinion, "that in the discourses of Jesus related by John, the reflection of John's mode of speech and thought, or the reproduction of his mind through the medium of a subsequent development, makes itself manifest." If this be understood as referring merely to the form of the discourses, I perfectly assent to it; but the *contents* themselves appear to me too peculiar to have sustained an alteration in passing through the mind of John. Yet even as it respects the form, there are important passages, such as Matt. xi. 27, 28, which sound quite like John's, while John vi. 1, ff., and xii. 1, ff., come very near to the representation in the synoptical Gospels. The principal cause of the difference between the discourses of Jesus in the synoptical Gospels and in that of John must doubtless be sought in the varied individual characteristics of the reporters, which were variously attracted by different discourses of Christ. In Christ all forms were united, but each one recounted only that which entered most deeply into his own heart. The affinity between the mode of speech and representation in John's Epistles and that in the Gospel, is satisfactorily explained by the susceptible character of John, who knew how to make the sentiments and spirit of his Divine Master all his own.

betrays here and there that he is no eye-witness, appears not to be a native of Palestine, for he makes incorrect statements respecting the last Passover, and so forth.

All these objections, however, have been cleared up already, in the special refutation of Bretschneider's hypothesis,<sup>1</sup> and the substance of them is considered in the exposition, as the several passages occur which have reference to the matter.

Finally, as to the *integrity* of the Gospel, this also has been disputed; for the concluding chapter is contested with plausible arguments; and, besides this, single passages are assailed, such as John v. 3, 4, vii. 53—viii. 11. We reserve the explanation of these paragraphs also until we come to the interpretation of the passages adduced.

### § 3. OF THE DESIGN OF JOHN'S GOSPEL.

In the numerous and important disquisitions concerning the object pursued by the Evangelist John in the composition of his Gospel,<sup>2</sup> it is abundantly evident that a sufficient distinction has not been made between principal and subordinate designs. In a writing of the compass which John's Gospel embraces, an author may obviously keep in view and prosecute several objects at the same time; while he nevertheless ordinarily directs his attention and his aim, from the beginning to the end of his work, towards one thing only as strictly speaking the *main purpose*,—the *subordinate designs* presenting themselves in single passages rather than in the whole. Accordingly I now recognise as the chief object of the Evangelist, that which he himself states (John xx. 31), viz., to place before the eyes of the world the life of Christ the Son of God, neither for the Jews alone as Matthew, nor for the Gentiles alone as Mark and Luke did, but for all those, among Jews and Gentiles, who possessed the ability and the disposition to engage in the deeper speculations respecting divine things, and whom we will designate

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Hemsén über die Authentie des Johannes Schleswig, 1823; and especially L. Usteri Commentatio critica, in qua Evangelium Joannis genuinum esse ex comparatis quatuor Evangeliorum narrationibus de cœna ultima et de passione Jesu Christi ostenditur. Turici, 1823.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. Lücke über die Geschichte of the same, s. 142, ff.

by an appellation, comprising both the true and the false in their tendency, viz., *Gnosticising Mystics*.<sup>1</sup>

Depth of mind prepared the Evangelist to meet the lofty pretensions of these men. On the one hand, he could appreciate what was pure in the attempt to penetrate to a deeper acquaintance with the reality of divine things; while, on the other, he knew the speculative character of this attempt, and the danger of error close at hand with which it threatened mankind. He knew further in what errors these Gnosticising Mystics were already more or less involved, and saw himself in the position to meet these errors in all main points, by profound, unmingled truth; and accordingly it was necessary so to shape his labours as an author, that the polemic element in his writings should be accompanied by doctrinal statement. The affectionate, mild disposition of the beloved disciple not only left no trace of acrimony and bitterness, but even shrank from personal and direct attack. The simple representation of the true, eternal *Mystic* and *Gnosis* (*i. e.*, the deeper, substantial, divine knowledge, in opposition to the merely notional), rightly appeared to him the most suitable agency by which he might refute all false gnosis, and at the same time—while drawing to this knowledge, by means of its own beauty and glory, all those noble minds of whom there were doubtless many amongst the Jewish and Pagan Mystics—he might disengage it from all false images of this kind. We may therefore learn from John what is the purest, noblest form of Christian polemics; it is that which contends against its opposite rather by means of the power attending a disclosure of the truth in its beauty, than by positive assault; and this accomplishes much more than is effected by the latter method, because positive attacks generally call forth and embitter what is sinful in man, while the mere unveiling of the truth makes common cause with what is good in the hearts of the adversaries themselves, and thus enlists them among its friends and defenders.

If, however, agreeably to what has been stated, I recognise, as the

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Shrekenburger's *Beitr. zur Einl. ins N. T.*, s. 60, ff., and Steudel's *Aufsatz über das verhältniss des Johannes zur Christlichen Gnosis*, in the *Tübinger Zeitschr.* Jahrg. 1836, b. 1. Some of the Fathers adopted the same view—viz., Irenæus, Epiphanius, and Philastrius; only they confined their attention too much to one or another Gnostic sect—to Cerinthus, the Nicolaitans, or the Marcionites. In this sense, Irenæus, overlooking the Gnostic elements which existed already in the time of John, says, (*adv. hæer.* iii. 16) that John wrote *providens blasphemias Gnosticorum regulas*.

main object pursued by John in the composition of his Gospel, a doctrinal and polemical aim against a tendency of mind widely prevailing at the time ; I cannot confine my thoughts, either with Irenæus (adv. haer. iii. 12) merely to Cerinthus and his adherents, or with Epiphanius and Philastrius to the Nicolaitans or the Marcionites, or even with some of more recent date, *e.g.* B. Grotius and Herder, merely to the Sabians, the disciples of John ; while at the same time I cannot exclude either of the latter two. For the expressions of the Evangelist respecting the Baptist (John i. 3) evidently raise a polemical opposition to the erroneous opinions of the Sabians concerning their master. J. D. Michaelis, Storr, Hug, &c., certainly took the most correct view, when they maintained that John had in his eye these and the rest of the Gnostics in apostolic times. These learned men, however, appear to have formed too severe a notion of the controversy, overlooking the fact, that the Gospel is just as much an invitation to the true Gnosis as it is a refutation of the false, and the former almost to a greater extent than the latter. This is more than self-evident in the representation which they give. Just in like manner it seems to me that Kleuker's theory of a reference in John to Judaists, who entertained corporeal views, rests upon an exchange of the negative with the positive character of his Gospel. Corporeal Judaism is certainly refuted by the spirituality of the Gospel, but a direct reference to this antithesis does not exist. The peculiarities attached to the language, and to the choice of matter, throughout the entire writing, indicate a pervading reference to personalities of a Gnostic form, and on that very account I do not hesitate to consider this the main object of the Gospel before us ; without, however, wishing to exclude special references, in single passages, which point in a particular direction, as, for example, in the case of the Sabians.

Connected with this main design of the Gospel, there appears to be another of a more incidental character, viz., that of supplying the deficiency in the three first Gospels ;<sup>1</sup> a design spiritual in re-

1 As to the filling up of the synoptical Gospels by John, I quite agree with the sentiments expressed in Hase's *Leben Jesu* (s. 181, note 3.) Eusebius remarks (H. E. iii. 24, edit. Stroth. p. 155) that John wished merely to give an account of the first year of Christ's ministry, since the other Evangelists had commenced their history with the imprisonment of the Baptist. But the mention of the imprisonment is merely a preliminary (comp. the Comm.), not a chronological circumstance in the narration of the synoptical



lation to its tendency, as well as material in relation to the occurrences and discourses. Clemens of Alexandria (in Euseb. H. E. vi. 14) attaches importance only to the former, while Eusebius of Cæsarea regards only the latter; both, however, must be united in order to point out with accuracy the character of John in his relation to the three first Evangelists. In order to depict the form of Christ completely, it was not sufficient to portray him in the spiritual manner of John's representation; to know all that was worth knowing of the Saviour, many material additions were also necessary in the way of incidents and discourses. Yet we cannot regard this latter object, even with both its parts in combination, as the purpose in the composition of the Gospel, because occasionally something is related that has been already touched upon by the other Evangelists; and further, because deviations from the accounts of the synoptical writers occur without being reconciled. (Comp., for example, the history of the resurrection, according to John, with the narration given by the other Evangelists.) Both the facts just mentioned would be inconceivable if John had written his Gospel for the express purpose of completing the three already in use in the Church; moreover, in this case there would hardly be such an entire absence of allusion to the synoptical authors as we find to be the case; but the circumstance is perfectly consistent if we grant that John had in his eye the existing representations of the life of Jesus *in connexion with* his main object.<sup>1</sup> And, moreover, the supply of deficiencies was in part a matter of course; for John's peculiar turn of mind, as well as the difference between his design and the aims of the other Evangelists, necessarily led him towards a different point from that to which they had directed their labours.

writers; besides which, John gives us information concerning the later part of the life of Jesus, and indeed enters far more into details respecting it than the three first Evangelists.

<sup>1</sup> After renewed consideration, I prefer this mode of understanding the relation of John to the synoptical Evangelists before that proposed by Lücke. For this scholar (s. 152, ff.) is of opinion that John presupposes the oral Evangelical traditions, but not our written Gospels. Since, however, according to the testimony of history, these did exist before the composition of John's Gospel (how long before it matters not to this question), it appears inconceivable that John should not have become acquainted with them, in a city like Ephesus, where everything was concentrated; but if he knew them, he could not have avoided mentioning them. The instances adduced by Lücke are not of such a kind as to render it impossible to admit a knowledge of our canonical Gospels on the part of John, if we once allow that the strict design of the apostle was not the filling up of the synoptical writings.

With this supplementary position of the fourth Gospel, I am also inclined to connect its *chronological character*. (Comp. the remarks in the Comm. Introduction, § 7.) It is obvious that to give accurate dates, to separate one part from the other, or to furnish minute information respecting the feasts which Jesus observed in Jerusalem, was unimportant so far as the main object of the Gospel was concerned; for the Gnostics were accustomed to regard such externalism as little and trifling. If, then, we would associate the chronological character of the Gospel with its chief design, we must maintain that it was just on account of this Gnostic neglect of chronology that John was careful respecting it. Now this relation between the two things can scarcely be shown to be probable. But the explanation of the regard which John paid to the chronological part becomes the more natural if it be admitted that he did not find in the synoptical Gospels those particulars concerning the Lord's conduct at the feasts in Jerusalem by which the time of his public ministry is measured. The Evangelist has supplied this by no means unimportant defect, so far, at least, that we are in a position *in some measure* to fix the term of Christ's ministry; although, indeed, we must then abandon the arrangement of the individual facts related by the synoptical writers within the periods between his journeys to the feasts.

In accordance with the resting-points suggested by John himself, we have (in order to facilitate the view of the whole) divided the Gospel into three nearly equal parts. The *first part* extends as far as chap. vi. 71, to the journey to the Feast of Tabernacles; the *second* reaches to chap. xi. 57, the last journey to the Passover, and comprehends a period of six months; the *third* to chap. xvii. 26, the history of the sufferings, and includes six days. The compass of the first part is not *precisely* determined,<sup>1</sup> on account of the uncertainty attaching to the passages chap. v. 1 and vi. 4 (comp. the interpretation there given.) At any rate, however, two Pass-

<sup>1</sup> Several of the Fathers, *e. g.* Irenæus (i. 3, 3, ii. 20, 22), Clemens of Alexandria (Strom. i. 174), Origen (de princ. iv. 5), Tertullian (adv. Jud. c. 18), allow the ministry of Christ to have extended only over one year. But, in coming to this conclusion, they appear to have followed not so much what is intimated in the Gospels, as prophetic passages of the Old Testament, *e. g.* the passage in Isaiah lx. 1, 2. (Luke iv. 18) and Daniel's seventy weeks. A strange contrast with this view is formed by the entirely unfounded assertion that Christ attained the age of *fifty* years! (Comp. Iren. ii. 22; Euseb. H. E. iii. 23.)

over feasts are spoken of, which Jesus attended during his ministry, before the Feast of Tabernacles (vii. 1, ff.), and, accordingly, the first period includes at least more than a year and a half, and perhaps more than two years and a half. This last supposition is at all events the more probable.

#### § 4. TIME AND PLACE OF THE COMPOSITION.

As to the *place* where John may have composed his Gospel, nothing decidedly certain can be determined; but the later history of the Evangelist leads to *Ephesus*, where—as we know—he took up his permanent abode in Asia Minor. On the one hand, the conjecture that John composed his Gospel in this famous commercial city of the old world is confirmed by ancient tradition, while Irenæus (adv. haer. iii. 1) and Eusebius (H. E. vi. 8) mention Ephesus as the place where the Gospel was composed. On the other hand, the design of John's evangelic history, to which we have referred, is also entirely in favour of this city and its neighbourhood. For it was just in and around Ephesus that the Gnostic tendency prevailed, and must have pressed itself upon John's attention, as a phenomenon of importance to the Church; the wants, therefore, of this locality satisfactorily explain the form of representation which he adopted.

From the Gospel itself, we only further learn that it cannot have been composed in Palestine, and for natives of Palestine; for Jewish manners and customs are treated as unknown, and are on this account explained. (Comp. John ii. 6, 13, iv. 9.) Another traditional statement, that John's Gospel was written in the Isle of Patmos, is supported only by doubtful testimony, *e. g.* the writing of Hippolytus “on the Twelve Apostles,” which is spurious. The synopsis of Holy Scripture ascribed to Athanasius represents John as merely inditing the Gospel in the island, and says that it was published by Gaius in Ephesus. (Comp. Lücke's Comm. Th. i. s. 120.) Hence the statement that Ephesus was the place of the composition gains from this only greater probability.

As to the *time* of the composition, the Gospel itself furnishes nothing whatever that can determine it. An appeal has indeed been made to chap. v. 2, in proof that Jerusalem was yet standing when John composed the Gospel; but the words *ἔστι δὲ ἐν τοῖς*

*Ἱεροσολύμοις* may just as well be applied to a recollection of the state of the city and its environs, or to the destroyed city itself, where in fact the *κολυμβήθρα* was still remaining. We therefore only arrive at a determination of the time by means of John's relation to the synoptical Evangelists. According to the foregoing paragraph it is already clear that John must have written later than the first three; and this is also confirmed by the tradition of the ancient Church. (Comp. Clemens of Alexandria in Euseb. H. E. vi. 14, Epiphanius haer. li. 19.) We are thus already brought beyond the time of the destruction of Jerusalem; for since the first Evangelists wrote immediately *before* this catastrophe, John certainly must have composed his Gospel *after* the same. Tradition supplies nothing more definite in reference to the time of the composition; for the accounts of Epiphanius (haer. li. 12) and of Suidas (s. v. *Ἰωάννης*)—that the writing was composed in the year 90, or at least, according to the latter, in the year 100—although they cannot vary much from the truth, yet are of no value to us as *means of proof*; partly because they are not harmonious, and partly because they belong to a period far too late.

There is therefore only one remaining circumstance by which to determine the time, viz., the relation of the Gospel to the other writings of John, *e. g.* to the *revelation*, in which we recognize an authentic document of John's. The contents, no less than the form of the Apocalypse, indicate that its composition was earlier than that of the Gospel. I place it (as will be seen hereafter, when the subject is further prosecuted, and the reasons which actuate me are detailed) between the death of Nero and the destruction of Jerusalem. Between the composition of the Apocalypse and that of the Gospel, however, a period of some length seems to have elapsed, as a considerable increase of facility in writing Greek is exhibited in the Gospel; consequently we cannot be far from the truth in placing the composition of the Gospel between the years A.D. 80 and 90.

The mention of the relation between the Gospel and the Apocalypse leads us to the *language* and *style* of the former writing. It need hardly be mentioned, that the *original language* of the Gospel is Greek; the view taken by Grotius, Bolten, and Bertholdt,<sup>1</sup> that

<sup>1</sup> Bertholdt admits with Bolten errors in the translation from the Aramaic, in John's Gospel, without, however, allowing that the Gospel was originally written *entirely* in Ara-

it was originally written in Aramaic and then translated into Greek, is to be regarded as sufficiently refuted. With regard, however, to the Greek in the Gospel as compared with the style of the Apocalypse, we may remark that it evinces a much greater degree of ability. The language of the Apocalypse is full of harsh and even obviously incorrect forms of speech; in the Gospel, on the contrary, there is nothing of the kind, the language is easy, free, and ready, and has only the general Hebraic complexion of the Hellenistic dialect, and that not in the degree found in Matthew.

Nothing is simpler than to ascribe this increased fluency to longer practice, which must have enabled John to clothe the abundance of his sublime ideas, more and more naturally, in the garb of the language which circumstances must have induced him to use.

On comparing the language of John with the style of other New Testament authors—*e. g.* that of Paul—one thing presents itself as specially characterising the former, viz., the use of a number of words which require, in order to be correctly understood, a knowledge of what is peculiar through the whole writing. To this class belong the words *λόγος*, *φῶς*, *σκότος*, *ζωή*, *ἀλήθεια*, *χάρις*, *κόσμος*, *μένειν*, *γινώσκειν*, &c. These expressions are employed by John in a profound and spiritual sense, in which they are not otherwise applied. The Evangelist certainly has not invented words of his own and applied them to the designation of his own ideas; it must, on the contrary, be admitted that the Lord himself, in his discourses, expressed the depth of his knowledge by means of these and similar terms; and that John so profoundly apprehended the precise ideas conveyed in them, that he could use them with the point and definiteness of meaning characteristic of his language, which here, as always, is to be considered the outward expression of the writer's inward life. This peculiarity in the language of John is closely connected with *another*. The sententious, parabolical, and figurative style prevailing in the three first Gospels, as also the dialectic in the compositions of Paul, to a great extent disappear in the language of our Evangelist; John's thoughts are characterised by the greatest simplicity, combined with a metaphysical spirituality; they carry in themselves a perspicuity by means of which they are to be apprehended without proceeding from the point of view that reflects

naic. He thinks that only the digresses from which John elaborated his work were written in Aramaic.

the naked idea. Drawn out of the depth of meditation, they are yet far removed from the obscurity and confusion of mysticism; expressed in the simplest language, they unite the profoundness of the genuine mystic element with the clearness and acuteness of the truly scholastic. Where, indeed, the organs of contemplation slumber or are undeveloped, there John's depth, with all his perspicuity, may appear like obscurity; for such a medium of vision, however, the Gospel of John was not written; the synoptical writings are more adapted to it.

With these two peculiarities of John a *third* is necessarily connected, viz, that we do not discover in him that absence of comment which so distinctly marks the childlike mode of statement adopted by the other Evangelists. John perpetually hovers with his own consciousness over the facts related, and the discourses reported, examining them from his own point of view; hence the copious explanations and remarks on the words of the Lord, which he draws from his own subjective experience, and which, in a manner peculiar to himself, he contrives so to blend with the discourses of the Lord that it is often difficult to point out with certainty the line of demarcation. Observations of this kind, however, only serve to shew the reader that John has passed beyond the childlike point of view; they never attain a character by means of which the purely objective nature of historical narration would be destroyed or annulled.

Among the modern authors who have penetrated more deeply into John's ideas, Seyffarth deserves special mention, in his *Beitrage zur Specialcharakteristik der Johanneischen Schriften* (Leipzig, 1823.) We shall, throughout the Exposition, take notice of his views. With respect to the grammatical peculiarities, Lücke should be consulted in preference to all others, in his *Comm. Th. i. s. 125, ff.* The work of Schulze (*Schriftstellerischer Charakter des Johannis*, Leipzig, 1803) contains miscellaneous collections which must first be digested.

## § 5. LITERATURE.

Among the Fathers, the labours of Origen, Chrysostom, and Augustine on the Gospel of John are preserved to us. Fragments

of lost patristic commentaries are collected in Corderii Catena patrum in evang. Joannis. Antwerp, 1630. Besides the interpretations of the Reformers, Luther, Melancthon, Calvin, and Beza, the following—in connexion with the general works already mentioned in the first volume<sup>1</sup>—which have resulted from labours on particular points, are worthy of special notice : Lampe Commentarius exegetico-analyticus, Amsterd. 1724, 3 voll. ; Mosheim's Erklärung des Johannes, published by Jakobi, Weimar. 1777 ; Tittmann meletemata sacra. Lips. 1816 ; Lücke's Commentar über das Evangelium Johannis. Bonn. 1820–24, 2 voll. 2d edit., 1833 ; Tholuck's Commentar zu dem Evangelio Johannis, 1st edit., Hamburg, 1827, 5th edit., 1837 ; Klee's Erklärung des Johannes, Mainz, 1828 (the latter work is suited to Catholic divines) ; Matthæi's Auslegung des Johannes, Göttingen, 1837. The first volume contains only the first fourteen verses of the first chapter. On the doctrinal system of John we have, in addition to the disquisition by Grimm (Jena, 1825), only Neander's Darstellung im Apost. Zeitalt. voll. ii.

<sup>1</sup> See Olshausen's Biblical Commentary on the Gospels, Dr Loewe's translation, vol. i. p. 30, ff., Clark's For. Liby.—TR.

## I.

# PART THE FIRST.

FROM THE BEGINNING OF CHRIST'S MINISTRY TO HIS JOURNEY  
TO THE FEAST OF TABERNACLES.

(John i. 1—vi. 71.)

---

### § 1. PROCEMIUM.

(John i. 1—18.)

On comparing the commencement of John's Gospel with that of the other Gospels, we find the peculiar character of the former evangelic history presenting itself in a manner not to be mistaken. The Proæmium contains, as it were, the quintessence of the whole work, in the ideas as well as in the language and form of representation. For, while Matthew and Luke proceed from the genealogy of Jesus, and the history of his childhood, John so completely presupposes the acquaintance of his readers with Jesus, according to his earthly personality, that he speaks of him, and of the sublime character of his work, without even having mentioned his sacred *name*. It is true, he immediately names the Baptist, but in such a way that he introduces him as a really known personality. John's profound representation proceeds from the eternal, original existence of the Word with the Father.<sup>1</sup> Mark's commencement has only an apparent correspondence with this.

This Evangelist also, it is true, presupposes the genealogical notices, and the history of the childhood in Matthew and Luke, as known; he, however, opens his Gospel not with the eternal existence

<sup>1</sup> Yet John was by no means wanting in nationality. Comp. the treatise by Bauer (*Zeitschr. für spec. Theol. Ersten Bandes 2tes Heft. s. 158, ff.*), über den alttestamentlichen Hintergrund im Evangelium des Johannes.



of the Son with the Father, but with the beginning of Christ's *official* work on earth. The mode in which John opens his Gospel is exactly adapted to its assumed design. Those readers who had a Gnostic bias would assuredly feel themselves attracted from the very commencement, and incited to further perusal—so completely do the sentiments of the Proœmium break into their circle of ideas. Its genuineness and internal correspondence with the whole cannot therefore be doubted by any one who possesses the general qualifications for perceiving the oneness of a writing in all its parts. This same effect which the Proœmium must have had upon the Gnostics of the apostolic time, has been produced through the course of the Christian period, and still exercises its influence in the present day, upon all those who long after a deeper and more essential knowledge of God. The unfathomable depth of the words acts as a secret charm upon the mind of the enquirer; we cannot refrain from looking into them in order to descry the bottom and comprehend their extent. As, however, they conduct us to that which is original, neither the one nor the other is to be found, and the enquirer is compelled to turn from the external words into himself, and into the depth of his own mind, and thus to climb from the knowledge of himself as well as from the revelation of the Deity in his own heart, to the original source of all revelation. It is in connexion with this inward experience that the enigmas in the mysterious commencement of our book are first solved; and to seek the solution of the latter without the former would be a vain effort.

As a peculiarity in the *form* of the Proœmium, it may be observed that it is composed of simple, short, condensed propositions, without conjunctive particles. Ver. 1—5, only *καὶ* occurs—from ver. 6, only *ὡς* is found—and in ver. 12, *δέ* occurs for the first time. In this short, concise style—next to the richness and depth of thought—the great difficulty of the Proœmium mainly consists.

As to the *composition* of the Proœmium, it by no means consists of an unarranged mass of thoughts, but is pervaded throughout by a close connexion. This connexion is indeed hidden, and at first sight it appears as if only ver. 1—5, 11 and 14, belonged strictly to the course of thought, ver. 6—9, 10, 12, 13, 15—18, being adjuncts; and it is certainly true that in the verses first mentioned, the main points of the Proœmium are expressed. The manner in which these are related to the subordinate parts is first dis-

covered when we recognize that the commencement of John's Gospel contains as it were a history of the Logos, *i. e.*, of his several, gradually advancing forms of manifestation. This view being taken, the whole gains life, and the connexion presents a distinct aspect. The first four verses contain a pure description of the essence of the divine Logos, drawn forth from the depths of meditation. He is eternally with God, and is himself God, organ of the creation of all things, source of the life and light of men. He is not all this, however, as merely enclosed within himself, but, on the contrary, he reveals himself (ver. 5, *φάσκει*) continuously, although the darkness did not apprehend him. This fifth verse furnishes, in the very idea of *φάσκει*, a general and comprehensive description of the work of the Logos, so far as it respects the incarnation, which, indeed, is also a shining of the light in darkness. In order to distinguish the incarnation of the Logos as the point of his activity in humanity, from his previous activity, and at the same time to shew what the grace of God has done to assist men in receiving the Logos, he mentions the witnesses of the coming light, the prophets. As such, the Baptist only is named as a kind of representative of the prophetic order, because he closed their line, and presented the most recent exhibition of the prophetic character. The Evangelist then proceeds to say, with a reference to the mistakes of John's disciples, that the Baptist was not himself the Light, but merely a witness of the light which was then about to come into the world (ver. 6—9.) True, continues John, v. 10, the light of the Logos had always been active in the world, but the world had not recognized it.

Now, however (at the Incarnation), he came to his own, *i. e.*, to the people of God chosen by him (ver. 11.) As regards the mass even of these, they certainly did not accept him; but yet there were some who did accept him, and these received through him the regeneration; he made men spiritual, while he himself became flesh and dwelt amongst us (ver. 12—14.) This is then confirmed by the testimony of the Baptist himself; in the Incarnation a higher form of the revelation of the Logos presented itself than in the great previous revelation through Moses (ver. 15—18.) In opposition to this view, Bleek (Stud. und Krit. Jahr. 1835, h. 2, s. 414, ff.) is induced by the words, *ἦν ἐρχόμενον* (ver. 9) to understand the Incarnation even in this ninth verse; and Lücke, in his second edition, accords with him; Tholuck, however, on the contrary, has justly opposed them,

and declares himself in favour of that view of the connexion which has been given above. For, according to Bleek's hypothesis, in the first place, the connexion between verses 8 and 9 cannot well be established; in the next place, by means of various phrases, the same thing—viz., the Incarnation of the Logos—would be expressed four times (ver. 9, 10, 11, 14), which is in itself improbable; and especially the words ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἦν are not suited to the idea of the ἐνσάρκωσις—they point to the more general activity of the Logos *before* the Incarnation.

In order, then, to understand the Proœmium, a closer consideration of the leading idea in the term λόγος is necessary.<sup>1</sup> We submit in the outset that what gives the term a strange aspect is, that it evidently is *not* the idea of Divine speech itself which strikes us; for since speech, whether inward or audible, is the customary mode in which the human spirit manifests itself, human speech is also naturally attributed to God as the perfect Spirit. But that which strikes us, is the circumstance that the Divine Word is here treated of as an Entity, a *Person*.

Now, that deeper knowledge of God which apprehends him not as a mere abstraction, but as a living Being, clearly recognizes that the *original Word* of God must be an Entity. For, from the womb of life, only life and being can go forth; moreover, the original word, or original thought of the eternal God, can only be the consciousness of himself, which is as eternal as God, and which as perfect consciousness is quite equivalent to God. The original word of God, therefore, is the entity of God, completely homogeneous with himself. But just because the deeper knowledge of God lies so far from the reach of those who are estranged from him, not only has the revelation of this idea been in multitudes of cases misunderstood by men, but it was only by degrees that the idea itself could be disclosed to them. The Old Testament writers do, indeed, acknowledge the idea of the Divine speech, and in like manner the plurality of persons in God. But the *Word itself* nowhere appears as a *personality*; it is merely referred to as an *activity* of God. Even in the remarkable passage, Psalm xxxiii. 6, where

<sup>1</sup> Compare my Festprogramm, Ostern 1823, über Heb. iv. 12, 13—which contains a development of the idea of the Divine speech—printed in my Opusc. Theol. (Berol. 1833.8) p. 125, sqq. Comp. also Daub's Abhandlung über den Logos. In Ullmann's and Umbreit's Stud. Jahrg. 1838, h. 2, s. 355, ff.

the *Word* is placed in connexion with the *Spirit*, although, in looking back from the New Testament point of view, we recognize the eternal Word, yet, even in this passage, the idea of the personality is not definitely expressed. The same holds good in regard to the echoes of this doctrine among the Hindoos and the Persians. The Hindoo *Oum* and the Persian *Hom* and *Honover*,<sup>1</sup> appear more as spiritual effects produced by the power of the Original Being than as personal existences. In the New Testament itself, moreover, the Divine speech (*ῥῆμα τοῦ Θεοῦ*) up to this point appears merely as Divine activity, whether the term be intended to designate a *single* operation, or the activity of the Divine Being *collectively*. (Comp. Heb. iv. 12, xi. 3.) It is only in the language of John that the idea of the personality of the Word is *definitely* expressed. (Comp. 1 John i. 1; Rev. xix. 13.) The other writers use for the same sublime personality another name;<sup>2</sup> he is called *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ*, as born from the being of God; *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*. = *בֶּר אֱנוֹשׁ* (Daniel vii. 13), as the model of humanity. In one instance only—viz., in the profound Proverbs (comp. chap. viii. 22, ff., with xxx. 4)—the idea of the Logos, which is there introduced under the title of *Wisdom*, appears in a kind of transition from the general impersonal conception to the personal. Still, the term "*Word of God*" for the idea is wanting; in the passage, Prov. xxx. 4, the idea is expressed by the New Testament term, "*Son of God*." It is very remarkable, however, that although the Apocryphal Writings do not in reality go beyond the description of Wisdom in the Proverbs, knowing nothing of the appellation "*Word of God*" (comp. Wisd. of Sol. vii. Jes. Sir. xxiv.), and at the utmost only presenting the personal acceptance of Wisdom *somewhat more distinctly* than it occurs in the Old Testament; yet in the *Targums* (the Chaldee

<sup>1</sup> Compare the collected quotations in Bäumlein (Versuch. über den Logos, Tübingen, 1828.) The *Oum* comprehends Brahma, Vishnoo, and Seeva, and is everything in them; he is the pure manifestation of Brahma, but impersonally. *Hom* corresponds verbally with *Om* or *Oum*. He is called an *effect* of Ormuzd, and is consequently of a more derived nature. *Honover*, again, is the effect of *Hom*, and accordingly stands in a position a degree lower. Among the Chinese, *Tao* would answer to the Logos. (Comp. Bäumlein, s. 30, ff.)

<sup>2</sup> So Seyffarth correctly (loc. cit. s. 51.) This scholar, in another place (s. 63), erroneously intimates that in John *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ* is the Logos clothed with the *σάρξ*. (Comp. John i. 14, 18.)

translations of the Old Testament) which, however, were in part written *before* Christ, and in the Cabbalistic Writings, the personality of the Word of God appears wrought into the most distinct form. This idea of the Word of God as a personality shews itself in them partly in the fact that, in many passages, they directly put **מִימְרָא דִּי יְהוָה** for **יְהוָה**, and partly in the circumstance that they understand "Word of God" as identical with the Shechinah and the Messiah.<sup>1</sup>

The term Schechinah designates the revelation of God in the entire fulness of his life and being;<sup>2</sup> this was considered as appearing in the Messiah, and in him necessarily understood as personal. How the Chaldee Paraphrasts arrived at this profound idea is not evident; but we can scarcely err in conjecturing that the essential knowledge of God, as possessed by enlightened men among the Jews—which had been communicated, by way of tradition, from generation to generation—had descended to these persons; and therefore they were not the first who formed these ideas, or even the only persons who at that time cherished them, but are merely *to us* the earliest who have definitely expressed them. For all the books of the Old Testament are much older than the Targums, and hence they contain the doctrine still more in the germ. Through the same medium of tradition, doubtless, Philo also received the idea of the real, personal Word of God; in whose

1 Comp. Onkelos on Numb. xxiii. 21: *verbum Jehovah adjuvat illos, et Schechina regis illorum est inter eos*. Also Zohar, fol. 237, on Genesis xlix. 10: Nomen Schiloh (*i. e.*, Messias) hic scribitur **שִׁלְהָ** (cum Jod et He), ut significet nomen supremum Schechinæ. (Comp. Bertholdt Christol. Jud. p. 130, sqq.) The kindred expressions **בְּרַחֲמֵי שְׁכִינָה**, **שְׁכִינָה**, **פָּנֵי שְׁכִינָה**, also occur. In Exodus xxxiii. 20, 23, however, **פָּנֵי** is used inversely, in reference to the concealed, invisible God, while the part manifested (consequently his Son) is called **אֲחֵרֵי**, "his back." In Isaiah lxiii. 9, the Revealer of God is termed **פָּנֵי עֵינַי**. The Cabbalists speak of a great and a small countenance of God, an open and a closed eye (comp. Tholuck, s. 50), in order to point out the relation between the hidden and the revealed God.

<sup>2</sup> Bertholdt (*loc. cit.* pag. 120) explains the name Schechinah quite correctly: **דָּוָה** **אֲשֶׁר בָּהּ שָׁכֵן כְּבוֹד יְהוָה**. The glory of God (**כְּבוֹד יְהוָה**) is also called among the Jewish authors **מַטְרֹנָה** or **מַטְרֹנִיָּה**, which terms are derived from the Latin, *matrona* and *metator*. The latter expression has been compared also with *μετάβροπος*, Co-regent; a form, however, which does not occur at all in the Greek language. On the contrary, the principle was looked upon in God as feminine, and the term *σοφία* **חֵכְמָה** also indicates this view. Seyffarth (s. 50) compares the *σοφία*, not with the Logos, but with the *πνεῦμα ἅγιον*. This, however, as a distinct hypostasis, entirely withdraws from view in the Old Testament and in the Apocryphal Writings.

writings we find it attains its highest point of cultivation. (Comp. Grossmanni quæstiones Philonæe, Lips. 1829.4. The whole of the second division treats of the *Logos* of Philo, according to all the relations in which this enquirer conceives of him.) Philo not only uses, with respect to him, the terms familiar to all Jewish thinkers—*σοφία*, *δόξα τοῦ Θεοῦ*, *υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ*—but also, as a Platonic philosopher, adduces in comparison the Divine *νοῦς*, by which Plato understood just that which in the Old Testament is termed *חַכְמָה*,—as it were, God's consciousness of himself, or the self-contemplation of the Divine Being.

Whether Plato himself regarded the *νοῦς* as a personality, is—according to his obscure interpretations—uncertain; but the profound knowledge of God attained by his lofty mind, renders it more than probable that he could not look upon the primal idea which the *αὐτὸ ὄν* had of himself otherwise than as personal.

The idea, then, of the divine Word was already in existence in the time of Christ, and therefore the question arises—why was it that neither the Lord himself nor any of the apostles, *except* John, employed it? rather than why did John use it? The expression *σοφία τοῦ Θεοῦ*, indeed, occurs once (Luke xi. 49, compare the Comm. on the passage) in the discourses of Christ; but the very fact that this occurs so seldom, and that the phrase *λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ*, in reference to the personality of the Word, is not found at all—except in John's writings—tends to show that these terms were not abstained from accidentally. The following seems to me to be the reason of the circumstance. In the Old Testament, express, positive statements respecting the personality of the wisdom of God were avoided so long as the people of Israel were in danger of Polytheism. For a few individuals only, who were capable of deeper penetration, intimations concerning it were given; the Chaldee Paraphrasts and the later Cabbalists give us the result of their investigation; but their writings—especially those of the latter—contain much spurious admixture, derived perhaps even from Christian influence, although probably from the Christian Gnosticism alone. After the exile and at the time of Christ, circumstances were completely changed. The cases were rare in which Israelites had entirely turned from Polytheism; not unfrequently their notions of the Divine Being took the mould of the natural man's knowledge of God, and they regarded him as a mere dead abstraction. This

view would only be favoured by the use of σοφία or νοῦς, while the very next step was simply to think of one among the many *attributes* of God. On the other hand, the terms ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ and ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, which Jesus customarily used when speaking of himself (comp. the Comm. Luke i. 35), express with perfect clearness the consciousness of *personality* in the Revealer of God.

The use also of the name "*Son of Man*," which is predominant in the discourses of Christ himself, led away from all idle refinements concerning the peculiar relation in the Divine Being between Father and Son; while on the other hand it vindicated the moral tendency to resemble the primal model of humanity, which was exhibited in the Son. John certainly *might* have employed in his writings the term σοφία or νοῦς, and in doing so he would also have been quite intelligible to his readers; but he preferred the expression λόγος, probably because in its signification of "*understanding*," it was parallel with σοφία or νοῦς; and further, in the sense of "*word*" it embraced the idea wanting in those terms—viz., that the God who was hidden, shut up within himself, *revealed* himself in this Being, as the human spirit manifests itself in the internal or external word. If it be assumed (and this, if it cannot be demonstrated, cannot be proved untrue), that John was acquainted with the writings of Philo, and that those of his readers whom he had chiefly in view were fond of them, we have then an external reason for the use of this term;<sup>1</sup> only, it cannot be admitted that John gained the *idea itself* through any historical medium whatever; even if he did receive some external notice of it, he obtained it first in reality through the illumination of the Spirit, by his own inward contemplation of the sublime relation. It is only in the choice of the *expression* for the idea, that he allows himself to be led by the necessity of those around him.

If it be further enquired, whether this already existing idea—which John designated by the expression usually employed for it—was not further in a peculiar manner perfected by him; we find that this certainly is the case. For *John has placed the idea of the Divine Word in such express connexion with the idea of the*

<sup>1</sup> Tholuck (Comm. zum Hebr.-Briefe, s. 66, ff.) will not allow the validity of any connexion with Philo. Yet, that John should not have heard of Philo and his doctrines, through the Theosophists in Asia Minor, even though he may not have read his works, seems to me very improbable.

*Messiah, that he points out the Messiah as the incarnate Logos himself.*

These two ideas do not, indeed, appear without any connexion, even among the Cabbalists, and probably such a combination may have existed among the older Jewish enquirers. It has, however, been falsely maintained that this is identical with the union which John teaches in the Proœmium of his Gospel.<sup>1</sup> For the Cabbalists—*e. g.*, in the remarkable book Zohar<sup>2</sup> (lustre, light), which is said to have been written by Rabbi Simeon Ben Jochai, and belongs to the second century after Christ (comp. Tholuck's work, *Wichtige Stellen des Rabbinischen Buches Sohar.*, Berlin, 1824)—use the expressions "Word of God," "Schechinah," "Wisdom," "Glory of God," synonymously with הַקְדוּשָׁה. But this by no means proves that they regarded the Logos as appearing in human personality, and living on earth as a man. They in fact employ the expressions "Messiah" and "Word" synonymously, without admitting a union of the Word with the human nature in the Messiah, as John teaches it. The *higher* divine nature of the Messiah was not doubted by these profound thinkers, but, just because they adhered to this, they erred respecting his *human* nature; in like manner, the common, popular opinion embraced the latter, but on this very account mistook the Messiah's heavenly nature. The fact itself that the more profound Jews were in darkness as to the relation of the higher to the lower in the Messiah, is clearly shown by those passages in Zohar where a twofold Messiah is taught. (Comp. Tholuck in the work above alluded to, s. 47, 73.) The higher element in the Messiah is here called "*the upper height*," the human, "*the lower height*;" but both are contemplated as distinct personalities, that which is divine in the Messiah being Ben David, that which is human being Ben Joseph. The intellectual Jews, however, seem to have regarded the phenomenon of a higher nature in the Messiah (Ben David) as *docetic*<sup>3</sup> (comp. the passages

1 So Kuinoel (in his *Einleitung zum Johannes*, s. 73), Bertholdt *Christol.* p. 129, sqq. and others. Bertholdt even speaks (*loc. cit.*) of a *unio personalis* between the Logos and the Messiah, which was taught by the Cabbalistic book Zohar. On this, however, we cannot enlarge.

2 See an account of this book in Dr Pye Smith's *Scrip. Test.* vol. i. p. 585, third edit.—Ta.

3 Those persons whose views have been designated by the term Docetism (from the Greek word *δόκη*, opinion, decree) regarded Christ as an emanation of thought or purpose from the Deity.—Ta.



in Bertholdt, page 92), for they ascribe to the Messiah a new essence (הַיְהוּדָה הַחַדָּשָׁה.)

The same thing presents itself in Philo. Although with this Theosophist the doctrine of the Logos forms the centre of his system, yet the idea of a personal Messiah is altogether absent in his writings. It is refined into a purely ideal activity of the Logos, which he very frequently terms, as the ideal and pattern of man,  $\delta$  ἀληθής or ἀληθινός ἄνθρωπος,  $\delta$  πρὸς ἀλήθειαν ἄνθρωπος, and even simply ἄνθρωπος. (Comp. Grossmann, loc. cit. p. 40.) Seyffarth is of opinion (loc. cit. s. 68) that Philo teaches an incarnation of the Logos. This view, however, rests upon misunderstood passages (comp. Philon. Opp. edit. Pfeiffer, vol. iv. p. 22, 268), which, when rightly interpreted, state exactly the contrary. In opposition to this idealistic error, as well as to the materialistic notion of the Jews generally, that the Messiah was only an extraordinary man, John sets forth his doctrine—the true *media via*—of *a union of that which is divine with that which is truly human*, as declared by the Incarnation of the Word (John i. 14.)

According to this historical statement respecting the usage of the term Logos, those notions of it which altogether divaricate from its historical meaning are self-refuted. To this class belongs, in the first place, the opinion maintained in recent times by Ernesti and Tittman, according to which  $\delta$  λόγος stands for  $\delta$  λεγόμενος in the signification of “The Promised” =  $\delta$  ἐπαγγελλούμενος, so that it would designate the Messiah announced by the prophets. In that case, however, the Messiah as such must, according to ver. 1, be regarded as in God from eternity; and this is shewn to be incorrect by the only true signification of the word, which points out the union of the divine and the human. In reference to the divine nature only of the Messiah, the opinion certainly is true; but the designation “The Promised” cannot refer to the divine nature of the Messiah alone; it must connect *with* this his humanity, because the promise of him is an announcement of his coming to men as man.

Not quite parallel with this unhistorical view is another, which explains λόγος by means of  $\delta$  λέγων, one who communicates, promulgates. In the earliest period Origen and Epiphanius, in more modern times Döderlein, Storr, and others, have propounded this opinion.

This hypothesis leads to the unscrupulous exchange of the concrete with the absolute; and its incorrectness is involved in the single fact, that, by means of this exchange, Christ is denominated only as one among many, and that also merely under the general notion of a *teacher*. Had he been contemplated as the organ of *all* information concerning divine things, as the teacher of all teachers, then the interpretation might have been retained; and it was just in this way that the Fathers apprehended it. Meanwhile, even to the latter and more suitable mode of understanding the idea, there is *this* to be opposed, viz., that, according to the expression *ὁ λόγος*, the *Father* is considered as the *λέγων*, as Philo customarily expresses himself. Moreover, if *λόγος* be resolved into *ὁ λέγων*, the relation between Father and Son, pointed out by means of the expression selected, is displaced. More recent interpreters have therefore correctly conceived that we ought only to retain the *historical* aspect of the name which John found adapted to indicate his view.

Ver. 1, 2. Concerning this Logos—who, according to the testimony of history, must be apprehended as identical with the essential Wisdom, or the Son of God—John tells us, in the first place, *ἦν ἐν ἀρχῇ*.<sup>1</sup> The *ἦν*, which is employed without change in verses 1 and 2, here designates—by way of antithesis to *ἐγένετο*, ver. 3 (the term used in reference to what is created)—the enduring, timeless existence of the eternal presence. (John viii. 58, it is said accordingly, *πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενεσθαι ἐγὼ εἰμι*. Lücke strangely denies this distinction between the *Seyn* ["to be"] and the *Werden* ["to become," "to be made"]; yet it is common to all languages. The word *ἦν* may indeed often be used in application to created things, as well as *ἐγένετο*, but with respect to that which is eternal, *ἐγένετο* is utterly inapplicable, because in this case the fact of "being" is not, as in the former, the result of the process of "being made.")

Thus the precise idea of the *ἀρχή* is at once determined. The customary comparison of *בְּרֵאשִׁית* (Gen. i. 1) with this passage

<sup>1</sup> Seyffarth (s. 52) terms the description of the Logos here (verses 1 and 2), "his representation in a state of *quiescence*." The idea is correct, but the expression which he has selected is not adapted to its purpose, since the *ζωή* as the highest motion does away with *quiescence*. The ancient term *λόγος ἐνδιώθετος* is better; here the Logos is conceived of, in the first place, as God *inwardly* manifesting himself. The second act of divine energy is the revelation of God *outwardly* (ver. 3) to the world of creatures.

seems to me inappropriate, because it refers to that which is created, whereas our passage has respect to the eternal being of the Son in the bosom of the Father. The words ἐν ἀρχῇ therefore are not to be understood as meaning "in the beginning of the creation," but "in the original beginning," *i.e.*, from eternity. A parallel is formed by John xvii. 5, where the Lord himself speaks of his existence with the Father, πρὸ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον εἶναι.<sup>1</sup> Here, therefore, even the phrase ἀπ' ἀρχῆς could not be employed, although it may be used synonymously with ἐν ἀρχῇ, when a period is spoken of to which something is referred, or from which something is to be reckoned.<sup>2</sup> Here no period is *supposed*; on the contrary, all period of commencement which would lead to previous nonentity is *denied*. This also sufficiently refutes the Socinian acceptance of the passage, "from the beginning of Christianity;" for if, as in Acts xi. 15, according to the connexion, ἐν ἀρχῇ *may* have that signification, this does not furnish the least argument in reference to another passage, where the connexion indicates a different ἀρχή.<sup>3</sup>

With this first definition of the timeless existence of the Logos, a *second* is now connected, *viz.*, ἦν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν. In the parallel of the δόξα of the Son, John xvii. 5, the phrase is ἦν εἶχον πρὸ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον εἶναι παρὰ σοι. (John vi. 46, παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, *i.e.*, *from* God.) Now the prepositions πρὸς with the accusative, and παρὰ with the dative, associated with words of rest, mean "*near*," "*with*." This idea, therefore, expresses the close connexion of the Logos with God, and at the same time also, the hypostatical distinction between the Son and the Father. (Comp. Prov. viii. 22, 30; Sirach xxiv. 10.) This is shewn by the last proposition, καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος. Were it possible so to misunderstand this as to suppose that there is no *distinction* between the Logos and God, and that—according to the Sabellian theory—Father and Son are

<sup>1</sup> The expression is well interpreted by the passage, Prov. viii. 23, which treats of the divine Wisdom. Πρὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος is quite equivalent to John's ἐν ἀρχῇ.

<sup>2</sup> In the passages 1 John i. 1, ii. 13, 14, ἀπ' ἀρχῆς *appears* equal to ἐν ἀρχῇ. There, however, the expression signifies that he *was* from the beginning, throughout the *whole* development of the creation. Meanwhile, in Sirach xxiv. 9, ἀπ' ἀρχῆς certainly stands = ἐν ἀρχῇ.

<sup>3</sup> Cyril and others, as also in the most recent times, Marheinecke (Dogm. s. 134) understand ἀρχή as the Father, the Original; the view is profound, but exegetically untenable. In the New Testament Christ is called ἀρχή (Rev. iii. 14), and, as is known, not unfrequently "angel," but never "the Father." Philo (comp. Grossmann loc. cit. p. 51) and the Gnostics also called the Logos ἀρχή, but the Father προαρχή.

only different modes of operation of the same God, this mistake is obviated by the foregoing sentence. And in order to exhibit in the most forcible manner the intimate oneness, and yet the distinction between the Father and the Son, the Evangelist, ver. 2, repeats the statement. The oneness of the Father and the Son lies in the *essence*, the distinction in the *personality*, *i. e.*, in the *consciousness*, which is the characteristic of personality, and with which duality is necessarily associated.

In the last words, on account of the absence of the article, *Θεός* itself is doubtless a predicate. Tholuck, following the example of Erasmus, justly observes that here the article is wanting, because the Deity is pointed out as substance, not as subject. However, the question is, whether the presence or absence of the article is to be understood as indicating a difference in the signification of *Θεός*. Philo calls the Logos *Θεός*, but *δεύτερος Θεός* (Opp. i. 82, ii. 625), and in another place (i. 683) he says : *εἰ δὲ τὰληθὲς εἰπεῖν, μεθόριός τις Θεοῦ φύσις καὶ ἀνθρώπου, τοῦ μὲν ἐλάττων, ἀνθρώπου δὲ κρείττων*.<sup>1</sup> Origen conceives of the Logos similarly (and in accordance with him the Arian party) as a peculiar Being, standing in the middle between God and creatures, who, on account of his relation to the Most High God, may well be termed *Θεός* but not *ὁ Θεός*. Now, the mere term *Θεός* affords no proof that this view is incorrect, since the same is also employed in a sense widely different, like *Elohim* in the Old Testament. (Comp. John x. 34.) The distinction, however, that is made between *Θεός*, with and without the article, is at any rate arbitrary, and not grounded in the New Testament, as is shewn by verses 6, 13, and 18 in this first chapter ; while the idea of the Logos as an *intermediate Being*, between God and creatures, is completely refuted by all those passages which ascribe to the Son *equal honour* and *equal qualities* with the Father. This, combined with the fixed doctrine of the unity of God, affords a more profound idea of the relation of the Son to the Father, *viz.*, that the Son is not a sublime creature brought forth at the first by the Father, but is the self-manifestation of the

<sup>1</sup> On account also of this view, Philo in many passages calls the Logos *ὑπηρέτης* or *ὁπαδός*, *i. e.* *ἀπολουθός Θεοῦ*—terms which the New Testament never employs with reference to the Son in his heavenly nature. Yet Christ is called, Heb. iii. 1, *ἀπόστολος*, an expression with which Philo's terms are quite parallel. The Old Testament often denominates the Messiah *עֲבֹד יְהוָה*, with which the Greek *παῖς*, in the sense of *δοῦλος*, corresponds.

Father to himself as λόγος ἐνδιάθετος—*outwardly from himself, as λόγος προφορικός*. The self-manifestation of the Father, however, can be nothing less than the pure, perfect image of himself. The perfect God forms a perfect conception of himself, his conception is Being, and his conception of himself is a Being equal to himself.<sup>1</sup> Thus the consubstantiality of the Father and the Son stands upon just as firm a footing as the unity of God; only that according to this view, the personality of the Son may appear exposed to Sabellian error.<sup>2</sup> Let us, however, only abandon the idea of isolated human individuality,—which indeed is inapplicable to the divine personality of the Son, and was always kept at a distance from it by the orthodox teachers of the Church,—and it then becomes manifest, as we have already remarked, that the perfect self-manifestation of God (God contemplated not as an abstraction, but as a living Being) can only be brought forth, Spirit out of Spirit, Being out of Being, and accordingly all those peculiarities which, in the want of a word expressing the sublimity of the relation, we are accustomed to designate by the inadequate term *Person*, are endowed with his spiritual essence also.

The Socinian conjecture, according to which the reading should be Θεοῦ ἣν ὁ λόγος, is self-condemned, and needs only to be known in order to be rejected. On the other hand, the punctuation after ἣν, so as to read ὁ λόγος οὗτος κ. τ. λ. together with ver. 2, gives the same sense as the ordinary reading, if we only complete ὁ λόγος, as subject,<sup>4</sup> from what precedes. However, it is destitute of all critical authority.

Ver. 3. With the description of the being of the Logos is connected the explanation concerning his relation to the world, and that first of all in so far as it came forth *pure* from the hand of God. As created, the world never stands in connexion with the

<sup>1</sup> Melancthon justly says: Logos est imago cogitatione patris genita. Mens humana pingit imaginem rei cogitatae, sed nos non transfundimus essentiam in illas imagines. At Pater æternus sese intuens gignit cogitationem sui, quæ est imago ipsius, non evanescens ut nostræ imagines, sed subsistens communicata ipsius essentia. (Comp. Tholuck, s. 55, note 2, the 5th edition, which is always cited in this work.)

<sup>2</sup> For a detailed account of Sabellianism see Soames' Mosheim Eccl. Hist., vol. i. p. 271, 272.—Tn.

<sup>3</sup> Tholuck (s. 55, note 1) likewise remarks, "if the term Person be understood in the sense of *individual*, it is somewhat dubious, and the scholastic phrase, una substantia in tribus subsistentiis (in the German Selbheit 'self') might be preferable."

<sup>4</sup> In the logical sense, as distinguished from *predicate*.—Tn.

essential term *to be* (εἶναι) ; it always wears the mark of that which is *made* (γένησθαι.) The πάντα is, like τὰ πάντα or τό πᾶν, to be understood as meaning the universe ; that limitation of the expression to the spiritual creation called forth in man by Christ, which the Socinians maintain, is contrary to the meaning of the author, as the second clause distinctly shows ; while, at the same time, it is also opposed to the doctrine which pervades the Apocryphal Writings of the New Testament, viz., that God created the world *by means of* The Wisdom or The Son (comp. Prov. viii. ; Sirach xxiv. ; Wisd. of Sol. viii. ; Colossians i. 16 ; Heb. i. 2, with such passages as Rom. xi. 36 ; 1 Cor. viii. 6 ; Ephes. iv. 6.) We may here compare the expression **וְהָיָה בְּרֵאשִׁית** Gen. i. 3, since according to this the creative Word of God is the Logos himself. At the same time, the precise usus loquendi of Scripture is not to be overlooked, for it is constantly said, “ the Father created the world *through* (διὰ) the Son,” or “ the world is *from* (ἐκ), by (ὑπὸ) the Father, *through* the Son ;” never “ Christ *created* the world.” This uniformly established mode of expression proceeds from the correct contemplation of the relation of the Son to the Father, according to which the Son is the self-manifesting God himself. God therefore always works only *through* the Son, the Son never works independently and as if detached from the Father ; his work is the divine will itself in action, and in God there is no will except the Son. This was very justly acknowledged by the orthodox Fathers, in their rejection of the Semi-Arian Formula, “ the Son was begotten by an act of God’s will ;” the Son is the Father’s *will* itself.

The Evangelist adds, *καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν, δὲ γέγονεν*, not from a mere habit of repeating negatively the sentiments before expressed positively, but with the distinct purpose of carrying the thought further, and defining precisely the relation of the Logos to the world. Lücke, in the 2nd edition, and De Wette have therefore explained themselves as agreeing with me, that, by means of this, the Gnostic doctrine of an uncreated *ἔλῃ* was to be excluded. Tholuck, however, on the contrary, remarks, that the words must then have read, *καὶ οὐδὲ ἓν ἐστίν, δὲ μὴ γέγονεν δι’ αὐτοῦ* ; for as the words run now, the Gnostics might have said, matter is eternal. John certainly might have expressed himself according to the latter reading ; but the words of our text likewise indicate the sentiment with sufficient clearness. For John regarded

evil in its individual appearances, and of these he affirmed that none of them existed without the Logos; by which means the existence of an independent power besides God is perfectly excluded. The very fountain of everything false in the Theosophic Cosmogonies, which were framed in John's time, was the doctrine that an uncreated ἔλῃ besides God was the source of evil. This fundamental error John here combats, and only such a supposition renders the form of the passage intelligible. *All* except God is designated as *made*, and is considered as made *through* the Logos, and thus the doctrine of a *second principle* is entirely rejected; this reference also excellently suits the polemic design of John, and cannot therefore be obliterated. J. G. Müller (vom. Gl. der Chr. B. i. s. 393) decides for the old Alexandrine punctuation, maintained also by Erasmus, Griesbach, and Koppe, according to which ὁ γέγονεν should be connected with ἐν αὐτῷ, so as to give rise to the sense: "that which was by him was life." But then life would be attributed to the created rather than to the Creator, to say nothing of the unsuitableness of the context καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἦν κ. τ. λ., if so understood. Moreover, the sentiment that through him was that which is living, not that which is dead, appears poor.

Ver. 4. The representation places prominently in view one part of the creature in general—viz., the *world of mankind*, and states the relation of the Logos to it. Rieger refers ver. 4 to the original condition of man in Paradise, and therefore takes ἦν decidedly as the imperfect tense. Ver. 5 would then describe the Fall, and the consequent position of mankind, while ver. 6, ff., would delineate the restoring activity of God in its point of consummation, and in the development of this point. The Logos, however, was not the light of men in Paradise merely, but always. Verse 5 does not refer to the rise of darkness, but presupposes its existence. The Evangelist avoids entering minutely into the origin of evil, since it would have led him away from the practical ground.

The first subjects of discourse here are the ideas ζωὴ and φῶς, which are ascribed to the Logos as permanent signs of his entity. It is not needful to read ἔστι for ἦν, as the imperfect tense itself would point out enduring presence. Just as little is it allowable to coin a signification for the ἐν (viz., that it is = διὰ,

1 Comp. my treatise: de notione vocis ζωὴ in libris N. Test. Pfingst programm, 1828. Printed in my Opusc. Theol. p. 98, sqq.

and stands for  $\Xi$ ); on the contrary, the proposition  $\epsilon\upsilon\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\tilde{\omega}\ \zeta\omega\eta\ \eta\upsilon$  is quite parallel with the formula  $\delta\ \lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\acute{\sigma}\tau\iota\nu\ \eta\ \zeta\omega\eta$  or  $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \zeta\omega\eta\varsigma$  (1 John i. 1.) (Comp. the passages, John v. 26, 1 John v. 11, with John xi. 25, xiv. 6, in which the two modes of expression are interchanged.) For the sense of the expression is, that the Logos carries life in himself *independently*; as Philo says, he is the  $\pi\eta\gamma\eta\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \zeta\omega\eta\varsigma$ . (Comp. Psalm xxxvi. 10,<sup>1</sup> where the LXX. have  $\pi\alpha\rho\grave{\alpha}\ \sigma\omicron\iota\ \pi\eta\gamma\eta\ \zeta\omega\eta\varsigma$ .) It is true this applies in the highest sense to the Father (John v. 26,  $\tilde{\omega}\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho\ \delta\ \pi\alpha\tau\eta\rho\ \epsilon\chi\epsilon\iota\ \zeta\omega\eta\upsilon\ \epsilon\iota\nu\ \epsilon\alpha\upsilon\tau\tilde{\omega}$ ), but the Father has given this also, as everything else, to the Son, to be a *self-subsisting Fountain of Life* ( $\delta\upsilon\tau\omega\varsigma\ \epsilon\delta\omega\kappa\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\tilde{\omega}\ \upsilon\iota\tilde{\omega}\ \zeta\omega\eta\upsilon\ \epsilon\chi\epsilon\iota\nu\ \epsilon\iota\nu\ \epsilon\alpha\upsilon\tau\tilde{\omega}$ .)

As to the idea of  $\zeta\omega\eta$  itself; it belongs to the most profound things in the profound language of John.<sup>2</sup> For it designates the only real absolute *Being* (the  $\delta\upsilon\tau\omega\varsigma\ \epsilon\iota\nu\alpha\iota$ ) of Deity, in contrast with the relative *existence* of the creature. The latter, contemplated as in isolation from God, is in  $\theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ , and only has its  $\zeta\omega\eta$  in connexion with God, the fountain of life.<sup>3</sup> God is therefore  $\delta\ \mu\omicron\nu\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\chi\omega\nu\ \tau\eta\nu\ \theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$  (1 Tim. vi. 16);<sup>4</sup> creatures receive it only through conjunction with him; and inasmuch as God communicates it to them through the Logos, Christ is called  $\eta\ \zeta\omega\eta\ \eta\mu\tilde{\omega}\nu$  (Coloss. iii. 4.) For as he contains the life in himself ( $\delta\ \zeta\omega\nu$ , Rev. i. 18), so also he imparts it ( $\delta\ \zeta\omega\sigma\pi\omicron\iota\omega\nu$ .) The sentiment of ver. 4 therefore stands in connexion with ver. 3 thus: "All was made *through* him, *for* in him resides the all-producing, creative power." The signification "*happiness*," which has fre-

<sup>1</sup> English, v. 9.—Ta.

<sup>2</sup> Compare Seyffarth, loc. cit. s. 101, ff.

<sup>3</sup> In order to a thorough apprehension of the idea of  $\zeta\omega\eta$ , it is important to consider the term  $\theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$  in its biblical usage. In reference to creatures, it has a twofold sense. It commonly signifies the *becoming* separate of things belonging together; either of the soul and the body in physical death, or of the spirit and the soul in the inward, spiritual, or eternal death. But  $\theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$  also designates *that which separates*, the power that produces death. (Rev. xx. 14.) While, therefore, death is the unharmonising force which checks individual life in its development, and destroys it, the  $\zeta\omega\eta$  appears as the harmonious, strengthening power, which renders life all congenial. Thus, as life stands on a parallel with *good*, so does death with *evil*. The former only is the eternal and absolute; the latter, like evil, is not anything substantial, still less anything absolute, but yet something *real*—viz., the destruction of the proper relation, and the cause itself of this destruction.

<sup>4</sup> Orig. in Joau. t. ii. Opp. vol. iv. p. 71, very justly says:  $\tau\omicron\ \kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omega\varsigma\ \zeta\eta\nu\ \pi\alpha\rho\grave{\alpha}\ \mu\omicron\nu\omicron\varsigma\ \kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omega\ \tau\upsilon\gamma\chi\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\iota$ .



quently been ascribed to *ζωή*, is only a secondary one; for the possession in himself of divine, absolute being, certainly includes happiness for the creature; but the notion of *ζωή* in itself comprehends more than merely the sense of well being, which is the leading idea in the expression "happiness."

The *ζωή* contemplated in the victory over death striving against life, is called in John *ἀνάστασις*. As, therefore, Christ is the *ζωή* itself, so he is also the absolute *ἀνάστασις*. (Comp. John xi. 25.)

The second important idea in ver. 4 is *φῶς*. By this expression, the essence of the Logos is denominated, as it were, *substantial*. The substance of the Divine Being is inexpressible; the only thing that nature suggests as suitable for comparison with it is Light.<sup>1</sup> No people, no language, no age, has either designated or contemplated the Deity otherwise than as full of light. The visible light is the vivifying, fructifying, preserving principle of the physical world; just so the *φῶς νοητόν* is the living principle of the spiritual world. Thus God, the first cause of all being, is termed *φῶς οἰκῶν ἀπρόσιτον* (1 Tim. vi. 16), and Christ declares: *ἐγὼ εἰμι τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου* (John viii. 12, ix. 5.) Similarly in Wisd. of Solomon vii., the *σοφία* is called, ver. 26, *ἀπάντασμα φωτὸς αἰδίου*; ver. 29, *ἡλίου εὐπεπεστέρα*. Philo also very frequently compares the Logos with the light or the sun (Mal. iv. 2); and also with the *γνόφος* (Grossmann, loc. cit. p. 39), since the excessive abundance of light represents invisibility (1 Tim. vi. 16.) Now the Logos, the Light of all beings, is here contemplated especially in relation to *men*, to which relation the whole following description has reference. As the Saviour ascribes to man even after the Fall an inward *φῶς* (Luke xi. 35), and ver. 9 the Logos appears as the constant dispenser of spiritual light to men; so here he is called the Original Bringer of light, the *φωσφόρος* (2 Pet. i. 19) to their race.

This is pointed out by the *ἦν* in antithesis with the follow-

<sup>1</sup> As the *Father* so also the *Son*, is light; in his brightness we behold the invisible Father. Comp. Ps. xxxvi. 10, *יְהוָה יִלְכֹּץ הַיָּמִים, LXX., ἐν τῷ φωτὶ σου ὀφύμεθα φῶς*. Philo also finely expresses the idea of the perceptibility of the Light by means of itself, in the following manner: *τὸν αἰσθητὸν τούτου ἡλίου, μὴ ἐτέρῳ τινὶ θεωροῦμεν ἢ ἡλίῳ; τὰ δὲ ἄστρα μὴ τισιν ἄλλοις ἢ ἄστροις θεωροῦμεν; καὶ συνολῶς τὸ φῶς, ἂρ' οὐ φωτὶ βλέπεται; τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ τρόπον καὶ ὁ Θεός, ἐαυτοῦ φέγγος δι', ἐπ' αὐτοῦ μόνου (i. e., λόγου) θεωρεῖται, μηδεὶς ἄλλου συνεργῶντος ἢ δυναμένου συνεργῆσαι πρὸς τὴν εἰλικρινῆ κατὰληψιν τῆς ὑπάρξεως αὐτοῦ.*

ing φαίνει (ver. 5.) The resolution of the profound idea of the φῶς into the general notion of a *Teacher* is to be rejected, as destroying all its point. The activity of the Teacher presupposes in the learner a spiritual capacity for instruction, which the former only puts in motion; but the communication of the φῶς is the filling of human nature with a higher spiritual principle, and is, therefore, something far more profound and inward. This, however, may be allowed—that while ζῳή refers more to *power*, φῶς has more reference to *knowledge*; only the knowledge is to be understood as deep and inward, as an actual *possession* of that which is known.

Ver. 5. In opposition to the Logos, as the Diffuser of divine light, is placed the σκοτία, and, while up to this point the Logos has been presented to view as the Creator of the original pure creation, he now appears as the *Restorer* of the fallen race. With respect to the *origin* of the darkness, nothing precise is said; it is only mentioned that the Logos is the Illuminator, the banisher of that darkness. Σκότος, therefore, or σκοτία, designates the being of the creature entirely turned away from God, and consequently fallen into the power of θάνατος, having through sin lost the divine φῶς; σκότος, accordingly, is nothing substantial, as φῶς, but something merely negative, the absence of the light, which, however, presents itself only in a concrete form, and therein has its positive aspect. On this account it is absolutely denied of God and of the divine world (1 John i. 5, Θεὸς φῶς ἐστὶ καὶ σκοτία ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδεμία.) Now, the φαίνει is not to be referred only to the activity of the Incarnate Logos; on the contrary, the expression indicates collectively the operation of the world of light and its Sovereign, in all the forms of its manifestation, upon the darkness. The position of the darkness, however, in relation to these operations of the light was that it did not hold fast the light, and consequently was not illuminated by its energy. (Κατέλαβεν is closely allied to παρέλαβον, ver. 11, and to ἔλαβον, ver. 12.) This statement is, of course, to be understood, like ver. 10, 11, only of the great majority, of whom it is said ἡγάπησαν μᾶλλον τὸ σκότος, ἢ τὸ φῶς (John iii. 19); for there were always some children of light who received it deeply into their hearts.

The several forms in which the light revealed itself are more

precisely described in ver. 10, ff., and John v. 33, is as it were, a further commentary on those verses.

Ver. 6—8. After this mention of the earliest general operation of the Logos upon humanity, in its state of exposure to the influence of darkness, the representation proceeds. God sent John the Baptist as witness of the Light, which was about to manifest itself in a new and peculiar manner to the world. John is placed before all the prophets only as the greatest and last prophet of the Old Testament; the whole of the Old Testament, with its line of prophets, was a *μαρτυρία* of the Light. The *μαρτυρεῖν* does not involve the idea of instruction or communication, but only that of corroboration, solemn declaration; and this not merely outward, but internal also. The prophets were, so to speak, the first rays of the approaching Sun, and John was a ray likewise. He himself was incapable of communicating to the sinful world a higher life; but he knew that there was a fountain of such life, and that it was about to pour forth its fulness into the poverty of the human heart. These words have plainly a polemic direction against an exaggerated estimation of John. The term *ἄνθρωπος* stands in opposition to the predicates of *λόγος*, and *ἐγένετο* in opposition to *ἦν*, Ver. 8, John is carefully distinguished from the *φῶς*, but he is designated as a man who had experienced in himself the operation of the *φῶς* of the Logos. Accordingly (John v. 35), he is called *λύχνος ὁ φαίνων*, and the result of his work is described thus: that through him (*δι' αὐτοῦ*, ver. 7, referring to John) *all* men might believe in the coming Light. (According to ver. 12, *πιστεύσωσι* may be completed by *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ*.)

Ver. 9. Next follows very simply the announcement of the divine decree, that the true Light should come into the world, viz., in personal appearance. The epithet *ἀληθινός* contrasts, as it were, the Logos, as the original Light, with the other derived lights (James i. 17.) John frequently uses the term (iv. 23, vi. 32, xv. 1) to express the sentiment that the earthly was only the imitation of the heavenly, the latter being the essential principle of the former. It stands, therefore, in antithesis, not to the *false*, for the Baptist was no false light, but only to the *relative*, the derived. (In such passages as John xvii. 3, it *appears* used as equivalent to *ἀληθής*. Compare, however, the exposition of the passage itself.) Upon

this depends the more profound acceptance of biblical metaphors, which are not to be understood as though there were a transfer made of earthly relations to the divine, but inversely; men of God contemplating the ἀληθινά, in order to express them, seek for earthly images of the heavenly.

With respect to the construction; as Lücke, Tholuck, and all recent expositors acknowledge, ἐρχόμενον is not to be connected with ἄνθρωπον, for this would occasion a pleonasm,<sup>1</sup> since *all* men must come into the world, *i. e.*, must be born; but it is to be united with ἦν. The participle ἐρχόμενον is then to be taken in a future sense: "The light which was about to come into the world." Here, however, in the first place, is to be determined the meaning of κόσμος,<sup>2</sup> in order to fix accordingly the sense of ἐρχεσθαι εἰς τὸν κόσμον. Κόσμος means, *first*, the material world with all its creatures, so far as they are created and disposed by God. So John xvii. 5, 24, frequently in the phrase πρὸ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον εἶναι, and the like. *Secondly*, however, it embraces by way of synecdoche only men, as the most essential creatures in the world at large, *e. g.*, John iii. 16, οὕτω ἡγάπησεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν κόσμον, vi. 33, ἄρτος ζωὴν διδούς τῷ κόσμῳ. *Finally* (and this is the prevailing signification of κόσμος in the language of John), it is employed in reference to the creature, so far as *that which is sinful in him* is concerned; and in this sense again its use is synecdochic, as applying to men estranged from God. Thus John xvii. 9, οὐ περὶ τοῦ κόσμου ἐρωτῶ (comp. 1 John ii. 15, 16.) Κόσμος is, however, by no means identical with the σκότος; the σκότος is that which is sinful in itself; in the world there is only a *mixture* of σκότος and φῶς. But so far as the σκότος predominates in the αἰὼν οὗτος, so far the διάβολος is called, according to John's phraseology, the ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου (xii. 31.) The customary expression for the Incarnation and personal operation of the Logos is ἐρχεσθαι εἰς τὸν κόσμον (iii. 19, vi. 14, ix. 39, xi. 27, xii. 46.) It designates the descent from that happy heavenly kingdom, which is animated with perfect harmony, into this mingled temporary system. The phrase

<sup>1</sup> The Hebrew מְבָרָכִים אֲנִי may certainly be rendered "all men;" only in that case ἄνθρωπος cannot be added.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. Seyffarth loc. cit. s. 118. In his development the fundamental error alone needs to be mentioned—that he attributes to the apostle the doctrine that *matter is the seat of evil*.

also expresses the self-abasement and self-sacrifice of the Logos. The Rabbins use  $\text{לָּוֹנָה בָּרָא}$  for "to be born;" but the Greek expression comprehends more; it refers to the entire earthly appearance of the Logos, and its meaning is not completed till the return of the glorified Redeemer to the heavenly world. Now the phrase  $\eta\nu \epsilon\rho\chi\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu$ , viewed in itself, certainly may stand as a periphrastic preterite, equal to  $\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon$ , as Bleek and Lücke take it in the present instance. But in the introduction to the Proœmium, we have already remarked that this is inadmissible here; since the participle is to be understood as applying to the future. Tholuck also remarks, in opposition to the above interpretation, that  $\eta\nu$ , where it is employed as a preterite, is not usually placed so far from its participle.

Ver. 10, 11. The Evangelist in the next place reviews the earlier, general operation of the Logos in the world; "he had already been in the world, but had not been acknowledged by it." (The  $\eta\nu$  refers to ver. 5,  $\tau\acute{o} \phi\acute{\omega}\varsigma \epsilon\nu \tau\eta \sigma\kappa\omicron\tau\iota\acute{\alpha} \phi\alpha\iota\nu\epsilon\iota$ , and is to be taken as a pluperfect.) He then, however, declares more precisely his personal appearance, which, ver. 14, is described as Incarnation. The words  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma \tau\acute{\alpha} \dot{\iota}\delta\iota\alpha \eta\lambda\theta\epsilon$  can only relate to the action of the Incarnate Logos, partly because the  $\epsilon\rho\chi\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  is not used in reference to his earlier operations, *e. g.*, the Theophanies (or visible appearances of God); and partly because, ver. 12, 13, regeneration is described, which under the Old Testament can only be regarded as typical, and not as actual. The general mass of his own, even upon this occasion, did not receive him (ver. 5); while those who did receive him<sup>1</sup> reaped rich blessings from the act. The only difficulty here is presented by the words  $\tau\acute{\alpha} \dot{\iota}\delta\iota\alpha$  (scil.  $\delta\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$ ) and  $\omicron\dot{\iota} \dot{\iota}\delta\iota\omicron\iota$ . To me it seems quite certain that the expression forms an antithesis with  $\kappa\acute{o}\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma$  (ver. 10), which is also indicated by the antithesis between  $\eta\nu$  and  $\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon$ . The latter term ( $\kappa\acute{o}\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma$ ) here designates the world of mankind at large; the  $\dot{\iota}\delta\iota\omicron\iota$  are a part of the same, *the Jews*.<sup>2</sup> They are pointed out as kindred and nearest

1 The expression  $\lambda\alpha\mu\beta\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\iota\nu \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\nu$  or  $\mu\alpha\rho\tau\upsilon\rho\iota\acute{\alpha}\nu \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$  is equivalent to  $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\iota\nu$ . These phrases illustrate the idea of  $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ ; they shew that the subjective condition of  $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$  is susceptibility to the operations of the world of light.

2 Bleek (loc. cit. s. 417) correctly observes that the coming of Christ into the world did indeed strictly commence with his Incarnation; but his actual ministry first began at the Baptism. Previously to that he still operated as it were in the same manner as before the Incarnation, and although he was in existence and present. John testified concerning him as to come. This interpretation favours the retention of the progression

friends of the Logos, because (according to Sirach xxiv. 13) he had chosen Israel as his possession and residence. So Theophylact and others. Most recent expositors, however, understand creation in general as meant by *ἴδια* and regard the *ἴδιοι* as denoting the world of mankind related to the Logos by means of the *φῶς* dwelling in it; a sense, at any rate, not unsuitable; only if it be adopted, the gradation ceases, and verses 10, 11 become throughout identical.

Ver. 12, 13. It was, however, impossible for John to make these statements respecting the unbelieving Jews without limitation, because a community of Jewish Christians had nevertheless been formed. In the nature of the case, the appearance of the Eternal Word in the flesh could not be in vain and without effect, because that would suppose the final victory of the Evil over the Good, which is in its nature impossible. If, therefore, according to appearance, the few who did receive him bore no proportion to those who did not receive him, still the divine energy imparted to these few involved a power that overcomes the world. The Logos, therefore, brought with him for men a higher *ἐξουσία*, viz., to become children of God. (*Ἐξουσία* is understood as equal to *τιμή* in the sense of right, prerogative; but no passage occurs in the Scriptures in which this signification is *necessarily* to be adopted. Passages such as John v. 27; 1 Macc. i. 13, xi. 58, indeed admit it, but only so far as the prerogative depends upon a greater power communicated. It is the same here.)

It is intimated that a more copious communication of the Spirit took place under the New Testament, in order to the regeneration which belonged to it, than under the Old Testament. The expression *τέκνα Θεοῦ*, with reference to the regeneration, does not convey so much the idea of dear and precious, as that of being the *progeny of God* (comp. Comm. on Luke i. 35.)<sup>1</sup> The condition of the *reception* of this higher vital power appears to be the *πίστις*, or susceptibility of the operation of the Logos in his own peculiar entity, so that *ὄνομα* is employed = *ὄν* to designate his being

in the Proœmium to ver. 14; for the words *ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο* (ver. 14) must be placed in immediate connexion with the entire completion of his work, which, however, is not *here* expressly exhibited.

<sup>1</sup> See Dr Loewe's Translation of Olshausen's Synoptical Exposition (Clark's Foreign Theol. Library), vol. i. p. 100, ff.—Tn.

itself. (With respect to the *πίστις*, the remarks on Rom. iii. 21 may be consulted.) Ver. 13 now adds a description of the regenerated *πιστεύοντες*, in opposition to the *γεννητοῖς γυναικῶν* (comp. Comm. on Matt. xi. 11.) It is, however, worthy of remark that several of the Fathers, among whom are Irenaeus and Tertullian, read the singular *ὅς*—*ἐγεννήθη*, so as to refer the words to the Incarnate Logos. The latter even intimates that the plural is an alteration of the Valentinians.<sup>1</sup> At any rate, however, the reading is incorrect, for the following *ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο* is not consistent with it. The sentiment of the passage is therefore simply this: the progeny of God is far nobler than that of men (*Αἷμα* = *σπέρμα*, comp. Wisd. Sol. vii. 2.) The only particular description given of human procreation is, that it is through *desire* (*θέλημα* = *ἐπιθυμία*, concupiscentia) of the woman and of the man; and it is here we find the indication of the sinful and impure element that exists in human procreation and passes on to the children. The reference of *ἐκ θελήματος* to *σὰρξ* also, and the parallel juxtaposition of *οὐδὲ*—*οὐδὲ*, appears in favour of the acceptance that *σὰρξ* here designates woman. It is true, Ephes. v. 29, and Jude ver. 7 do not appear to me adapted to prove that *σὰρξ* means woman; but such a proof we do not need, since in order to interpret the passage it is quite sufficient to refer to the view pervading the whole of Scripture, according to which the weak and sinful characteristics of human nature are especially exhibited in woman (1 Tim. ii. 9, ff.) *Σὰρξ* may therefore mean in the special sense the woman, and that were enough for the interpretation of the passage.<sup>2</sup> But since only *οὔτε*—*οὔτε* separates the idea into its parts, *σὰρξ* and *ἀνὴρ* cannot be regarded as summed up in the *αἷμα*. The *οὐδὲ*—*οὐδὲ* furnishes a more precise definition of the *οὐκ ἐξ αἱμάτων*. (Comp. Winer's Gram. s. 456.) But how? Lücke thinks that both are exegetic, *σὰρξ* being Hebraic, and *ἀνὴρ* Hellenistic. It may be said with more propriety that *σὰρξ* opposes

<sup>1</sup> For an account of the Valentinian System, see Mosheim's Eccles. Hist. H. Soames' edit. vol. i. p. 199, ff., and Bp. Kay's Tertullian, 509.—Ta.

<sup>2</sup> Bleek's mode of understanding the passage (loc. cit. s. 422) seems to me somewhat obscure. This scholar thinks that *σὰρξ* denotes that which is common to the race of men and of women—the sinful nature; but that *ἀνὴρ* designates the conscious in opposition to the unconscious, the *σὰρξ*. The meaning would then be, "born neither out of fleshly lust, nor out of the will of a man, in the general sense." I confess, however, that I do not quite understand Bleek's words, "so that man, viewed apart (?) from the sexual propensity and the sinful nature generally, could, through his will, produce such sons." (?)

the sinful, while *ἀνὴρ* opposes the created merely, to the divine. Tholuck's rendering, "not indeed from sensual pleasure, and just as little from the desire of man," well agrees with this view. The expression *ἐκ Θεοῦ ἐγεννήθησαν*, is more strictly determined by the term *μονογενὴς* (ver. 14, 18.) The birth from God is accomplished by means of the First-born and the Holy Ghost; the Logos in it (the Holy Ghost) communicates his being to men; the Logos alone is born *immediately* from the bosom of the Father. Man in his natural condition is therefore no *τέκνον Θεοῦ*, he wears an alien form; he must first be changed into the divine nature through the influence of Christ. (Comp. John viii. 44, iii. 6; 1 John iii. 10, v. 1; Gal. iii. 26, 27) It is remarkable, however, that Scripture expresses the relation of the world, in its origin, to God, in no other phrase than *πάντα ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἔστιν*, and the ecclesiastical mode of expression, "*creation out of nothing*," does not occur in the biblical writings. (Comp. Heb. xi. 3.) The *determination* of the difference between the divine activity through the Logos in the creation generally, and in the regeneration particularly, belongs to the most difficult problems in theology. But the *existence* of the difference is indicated in the usage of biblical language; since in reference to the Son and to the regeneration only *γεννᾶσθαι* is used, while, in reference to the world, *γίνεσθαι* is employed, by which means pantheistic errors are excluded.

Ver. 14. In this important verse, the *ἔρχεσθαι εἰς τὸν κόσμον*, which in ver. 9 denoted the approach towards, and in ver. 11 the advent to the chosen people, is finally set forth in its own peculiar signification: "This Logos (described ver. 1, ff.) now in time *became* (*ἐγένετο* in opposition to *ἦν*, ver. 1) *flesh*." By the expression "*became flesh*," we are to understand, as the remarks on ver. 10 have shewn, not merely the act of birth, but the activity of the Incarnate Logos connected therewith; and this is confirmed by the sequel, since the subject of discourse is the manifestation of his grace and glory, the first complete disclosure of which was after the baptism. This expression is here selected with the utmost care; for, in the first place, *σῶμα* could not have stood in the place of *σάρξ*, because *σῶμα* forms the antithesis to *ψυχή*. Now, the Logos did not unite himself merely with the substance of the *σῶμα*, but also with a human *ψυχή*; *σάρξ* therefore here denotes (= *בָּשָׂר*) the *whole* human nature, in its weak and necessitous condition, and



this he filled with the rich treasures of his divine life. "The Word became flesh, in order to raise the flesh to spirit." This John would oppose to the docetic Gnostics, who explained the corporeal existence of Christ as a mere fancy, thinking it unworthy of him to take to himself the *σάρξ ἀνθρωπίνη*.<sup>1</sup> However he took it, and even with the general *ἀσθένεια*, on which his susceptibility of sorrow depended, yet without its *ἁμαρτία* (Rom. vii. 18. Comp. the remarks on John iii. 6.)

Just as little, moreover, could it have been said: *ἐγένετο ἄνθρωπος*, which would represent the Redeemer as one man amongst many, whilst *he* represented as second Adam, collective human nature in a lofty comprehensive personality.<sup>2</sup> In reference to this appearance, John now proceeds: *ἐκκήνωσεν ἐν ὑμῖν*. This expression presents not merely the general meaning according to which the covering of the Spirit is called *σκήνωμα* (2 Cor. v. 1—4; 2 Pet. i. 13; Wisdom ix. 15), but also the special sense, according to which these words contain an allusion to the שְׁכִינָה (from שָׁכַן, *σκηνοῦν*).<sup>3</sup> (Comp. Rev. vii. 15, xxi. 3.) With this also the *δόξα* of the Logos corresponds, which John describes with deep emotion from his own intuitive perception. (Comp. 1 John i. 1.) It is the divine splendour, the constant attendant of the Shechinah and identical with it, visible to the spiritual eye, issuing from the Logos in amazing grace and tenderness. (With regard to the כְּבוֹד י' compare the remarks on John i. 1.) The apostle beheld

1 If even in our time the idea of the Incarnation of God still appears difficult, the principal reason is, that the fact itself is too much isolated. It is always the impulse of spirit to embody itself, for corporeity is the end of the work of God: in every phenomenon, an idea descends from the world of spirit, and embodies itself here below. It may therefore be said that all the nobler among men are rays of that Sun which in Christ rose on the firmament of humanity. In Abraham, Moses, and others, we already discover the coming Christ.

2 This is all that ecclesiastical doctrine says when it ascribes to the human nature of Christ the impersonalitas; just as the immortalitas asserts his exemption only from the *necessitas moriendi*, not from the *possibilitas*. The Logos was not a man but the man, just as Adam was not one man amongst many, but the original man who included them all, who potentially carried in himself the whole race. To Adam, as well as to Christ, the expression of Augustine applies, in illo uno fuimus nos omnes.

3 Tholuck does not deny this, but thinks that the expression may denote also the *transitoriness* of the abode of the Son of God in lowly humanity. But since John is endeavouring to depict the glory of Christ, the reference to his humiliation is not suitable. Moreover the enshrinement of the Deity in humanity was not transient; on the contrary, Deity and humanity remain united in his person.

this glory, as Lücke finely remarks, with spiritual eyes, and he who is illuminated by the Spirit still beholds the same glory now. (Respecting the *δόξα*, compare also on John ii. 11.) The Evangelist now associates the *δόξα* in its matchlessness with the character of the Logos, as one who is incomparable—as the *μονογενής*.

(Tholuck justly compares the *ὥς* with the Hebrew *פְּ* veritatis, unsuitably so called,<sup>1</sup> “such *δόξα* as belongs to the *μονογενής* alone.”)

This is the first instance in John where the Logos is termed *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ*. Seyffarth is mistaken (loc. cit. s. 38, 73) in supposing that the expression has reference merely to the Incarnation of the Logos. Similarly Schleiermacher expresses himself (Glaubensl. Th. ii., s. 707), “the divine alone in Christ could not have been called Son of God, but it is certain that this term always designated the entire Christ.” Ver. 18 shews the contrary, where the words, *ὧν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς* are to be referred to the eternal existence of the Son with the Father. The difference between this expression and the term Logos consists in this,—that the term *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ* points out more distinctly and expressly the *personality* of the word. In like manner Seyffarth is in error when he interprets the name Christ as denoting a *property* of the Son of God. This term constantly refers to the union of the divine and the human; and this in such a manner that the divine is regarded as the principle which hallows and anoints the human. (Compare the Comm. on Matt. i. 1.) Accordingly, if the expression *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ* in John refers to the divine nature of the Son (as to the few exceptions compare the Comm. on Luke i. 35) then the epithet *μονογενής* likewise must have a deeper meaning than that which has been drawn from it, “*the specially dear*.” According to ver. 18, the *μονογενής* is the only Son of God in the highest and absolute sense, as alone knowing the essence of the Father. Now it is involved in the nature of *knowing*, according to the profound biblical meaning of the word, that it is impossible for the Deity to be known except by those who possess a kindred nature. Hence, absolute knowledge of God presupposes absolute equality of nature. Hence

<sup>1</sup> Meyer on John vii. calls the *פְּ* veritatis an irrational chimera; the term certainly is unsuitable, but the peculiar use of the *פְּ* which it is intended to denote cannot be denied. Comp. Gesenius Gram., s. 846.

none but the regenerate in whom Christ lives, can truly know the Father; for no one knoweth the Father save the Son (comp. Matt. xi. 27.)

The same signification is indicated by the *παρὰ πατρὸς* in our passage, which is to be connected, not with the *δόξαν*, but with *μονογενίδος*. In Paul's language, instead of this, *πρωτότοκος* occurs (Rom. viii. 29; Coloss. i. 15, 18; also Heb. i. 6.), in which expression, however, occasionally (Coloss. i. 18, as Rev. i. 5) the reference to the resurrection of Christ (*πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν*) prevails, and consequently the human nature is indicated. Finally, the quality of the *δόξα* is more exactly defined; it is termed *πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας*. (*Πλήρη* is a reading which resulted from the endeavour to connect the last words of the verse with *δόξαν*; but they refer to the *λόγος*.) Both ideas, that of *χάρις* and that of *ἀλήθεια*,<sup>1</sup> belong to the circle of those peculiar to John. It is remarkable that Seyffarth should overlook the former, since he, nevertheless, has received the kindred one of *ἀγάπη*.<sup>2</sup> With respect to the *ἀγάπη*, he very justly remarks (s. 97, ff.), that it is to be considered as essential in God (1 John iv. 8, 16), as the out-pouring or self-communication of his being; and so Schleiermacher expresses himself. The *χάρις* (= *ἔρως*, *ἡ*) is, according to the idea of John, the expression and activity of the *ἀγάπη* towards the abject,—condescension towards the world of creatures. If they be contemplated at the same time as miserable through sin, then *χάρις* is termed *ἔλεος*. Accordingly, the Father shows towards the Son no *χάρις* but *ἀγάπη*, as it is said, John xvii. 24, *ἡγάπησάς με πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου*. In the Incarnate *Logos*, however, this condescending expression of love,—the *χάρις*,—was the prominent character. As to the *second* term, *ἀλήθεια*, it stands in opposition not only to the *ψεῦδος*, but also to the *ματαιότης*.

According to the profound conception of John, the truth is the same as the *reality* in opposition to shadow, *i. e.*, emptiness, want of the divine essence. This is the character of the sinful world

<sup>1</sup> Both ideas frequently occur in connexion in the Old Testament also, especially in the Psalms (lxxxix. 33, c. 5, cxvii. 2.)

<sup>2</sup> The ancients did not rise above the *Eros*, *i. e.*, love desiring, and therefore arising from want; the *Agape* of Christianity, the love which purely bestows out of absolute fulness, they knew not. Comp. Plato's Symposium, and with it the ingenious remarks of Baur in the Mythol. Bd. ii. abth. ii. s. 242, ff. Concerning the difference between *ἀγαπᾶν* and *φιλεῖν*, comp. Tittman, Syn., Part i. p. 50.

(Rom. viii. 20); ἀλήθεια (= Πῶς), on the contrary, is God himself and his Logos (John xiv. 6.) He does not *have* it as something conceived to exist in connexion with him, and possessed by him; he *is* essentially the thing itself.<sup>1</sup> Hence the communication of the truth through the Logos is not a communication of certain correct notions, but an impartation of the essence, the principle of all truth, the *κοινωνία τοῦ πνεύματος*. Seyffarth, therefore, very justly observes (s. 96), that believers, the *γεννηθέντες ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ*, are called by John *ἡγιασμένοι ἐν τῇ ἀλήθειᾳ* (John xvii. 19.) Accordingly, in the language of John, *ἡ ἀλήθεια* (with the article) is to be distinguished from *ἀλήθεια*. (Comp. John viii. 44.) Even the unholy have some truth in their possession; it is only of the devil that it is said, "truth is not in him." But the Eternal alone is the absolute truth.

Ver. 15. The testimony of John intimated above (ver. 6) is now detailed more precisely, in order that it may be presented (i. 19, ff.) to the readers with its historical occasions. (In the *κράζειν* the energetic character of his *μαρτυρία* is expressed.) The phrase *ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος*, which in Matt. iii. 11 is clear, is in this place somewhat obscure, on account of the *ἐμπροσθέν μου* and *πρώτος μου* (not occurring in Matthew and Mark.) According to the synoptical Evangelists the sentiment is merely this, "who commencing his work later than I, is higher in dignity." Now, *ἐμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν* in our passage can only be understood as relating to the Messianic office of Christ, since *γέγονε* permits no reference to the eternal existence of the Son of God. Meyer, indeed, thinks that the difficulty is relieved, if we refer the expression to the ancient procession of the Logos from God, the *λόγος προφορικὸς*. But this procession itself is to be understood as the eternal action of God, and therefore cannot be designated by *γίνεσθαι*.

The concluding word, however, must be referred to the eternal existence of the Son, since the *ὅτι* founds the previous proposition upon that which follows. (Tholuck, as also Lücke, justly understand *πρώτος* = *πρότερος*, according to John xv. 18, 1 John iv. 19.) The sense will then be this: "He who begins his work

<sup>1</sup> The ancients also used the *ἀλήθεια* in this absolute sense. Comp. Plutarch de Iside et Osir. c. 1, *ὡς οὐδὲν ἀνθρώπῳ λαβεῖν μείζον, οὐ χαρίσασθαι Θεῷ σεμνότερον ἀληθείας*.

later than I, has received a greater dignity, for he was eternally with the Father." This correct knowledge of the Baptist may have been first awakened in him by careful reading of the Old Testament, and by the use of exegetic tradition (both of which Tholuck places prominently in view); but his firm conviction respecting it we can attribute only to the immediate operation of the divine Spirit himself, who inspired him. (Comp. John i. 33.)

Ver. 16. This verse should not be regarded as belonging to the discourse of the Baptist; it is connected with ver. 14, and confirms what is there said respecting the contemplation of the glory of the Lord. Ver. 15 steps in between them parenthetically. The reading *καὶ* of the Text. Recept. is therefore incorrect, and *ὅτι* should be read instead. The change might easily arise from the occurrence of *ὅτι* three times successively appearing strange to the transcribers. The Evangelist now speaks in the name of all believers, and declares how the Redeemer has become to them a fountain of life. The *πλήρωμα* ascribed to him is (as Ephes. i. 23, Coloss. i. 19) the fulness of divine being and essence which dwells in him. In distinction from him, the whole of humanity appears as the party receiving; he alone is the giver, and the giver of the *χάρις*. The meaning *χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος* is easy; the more we receive from the streams of grace, the more we may yet receive; as it is inexhaustible in the giver, the believer may take it without measure. But this use of *ἀντὶ* is without parallel in the New Testament. The passage in Theogn. (sentt. v. 344, *ἀντ' ἀνιῶν ἀνίας*) is analogous, where *ἀντί* may be taken as "for" "over." So also here—"one expression of favour upon another." (Probably the Evangelist had in his mind the Hebrew *יְהוָה עַל יְהוָה*, which exactly corresponds with our formula.) The acceptance of *ἀντί* in the sense of "*instead*," and the reference of the first *χάρις* to the Old Testament, the second to the New Testament, is here quite untenable. The Old Testament, according to its intrinsic character, cannot be called *χάρις*.

This is shown also by the following parallel between Law and Gospel; the abundance of grace in Christ becomes manifest by means of the previous law, in which that severity which demands justice and holiness is exhibited as the prevailing characteristic. It is only remarkable that *ἀλήθεια* also is traced to Christ alone as

its source, when it nevertheless appears that there was truth also in the Old Testament. Here, however, we must understand *the* Truth, in the absolute sense, which—as before observed—is the true Being and Essence itself. The Law induces and elicits the consciousness of sin, and the need of redemption; it only typifies the reality; the Gospel, on the contrary, actually communicates reality and power from above. (Compare Rom. vi. 14, 15, where ὑπὸ νόμον and ὑπὸ χάριν form the antithesis. Hence Paul terms the Old Testament σκία, whilst he calls the New Testament σῶμα (substance), Coloss. ii. 17. De Wette, with subtle criticism, endeavours to determine the difference between ἐδόθη and ἐγένετο, so that the former term would contain the character of the positive, and the latter that of the historical. Ἐδόθη is selected purely on account of the foregoing νόμος, which does not admit of any other verb; but ἐγένετο is here associated with χάρις and ἀλήθεια, because the discourse does not respect the things in themselves, but their becoming manifest to men.

Ver. 18. The concluding verse of the Proœmium, on the one hand, is very beautifully connected with that immediately preceding, since the Son alone could unfold the real knowledge of God, as the Gospel communicates it; while, on the other, this same thought completes the entire Proœmium, the Word which was in the beginning with the Father, and in Christ became man, thus appearing as the Being who supplies all true knowledge of God, and in addition procures eternal life. To represent this work of the Incarnate Logos is the design of the whole Gospel. The expression ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς serves to point out the entity of the Son. Were we to admit an exchange of the prepositions εἰς and ἐν, the term κόλπος might be taken (according to the analogy in Old Testament passages, such as Isaiah xlii. 3, lxvi. 9) as = 𐤀𐤒𐤍, the womb; so that the sense of the expression would be, “The Son was (as λόγος ἐνδιάθετος) from eternity in the essence of the Father.” But Winer (Neut-Gramm., 3te Aufl., s. 350) is justly opposed in the interpretation of this passage to such an exchange; he understands κόλπος in the ordinary signification laid “towards the bosom.” Neither the LXX., however, nor the New Testament ever put κόλπος for 𐤀𐤒𐤍; they always employ

<sup>1</sup> With ἐγένετο, ἀνθρώποις is to be supplied.

κοιλία or μήτρα for it. Consequently, for this passage there remains only the idea (according to the Latin *in sinu, in gremio alicujus esse*) of the most intimate communion.<sup>1</sup> But even if, in accordance with this idea, the words in themselves might agree with Arian and Socinian representations of Christ, still we are necessarily conducted to the more profound conception of the idea,—viz., the reference of the term to the eternal existence of the Son with the Father,—in the first place, by a review of the language *ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν* (ver. 1), and, secondly, by the antithesis between the words in question and *οὐδεὶς ἑώρακε Θεὸν πώποτε*. These words place the only begotten Son in opposition to *all human* and created beings, while they ascribe to him, according to his higher nature, that which rises above the sphere of human existence. The expression *μονογενὴς υἱὸς* cannot refer to the Incarnation of the Word (compare our remarks on i. 14), since in his operation even *before* that (i. 5) he revealed the hidden essence of God to men.

(*Ἐξηγεῖσθαι* = *ἀποκαλύπτειν*. In the Septuagint for *הִגִּיד*, Levit. xiv. 57.<sup>2</sup>) Still, however, some difficulty seems to be occasioned by the circumstance, that even in the Old Testament God appeared to several, *e.g.* to Moses, with whom Christ, as the communicator of the direct knowledge of God, is here contrasted; while Jesus also speaks (Matt. v. 8) of seeing God. But the Old Testament representation itself, when accurately viewed, perfectly confirms the idea here expressed. In the remarkable passage, Exod. xxxiii., God says to Moses (ver. 20), “My countenance thou canst not see, for there shall no man see me and live.” The contrast between the

1 The choice of the expression, *ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς*, which does not again occur in the New Testament, involves something uncommon that has not yet been entirely cleared up. Perhaps there was floating in John's mind a parallel with himself: as he was related to Jesus, so was Jesus to the Father. With this, Hengstenberg's remark (über die Aechtheit des Pentateuch, s. 25) would well agree—viz., that the self-designation of John as the disciple *ὃν ἠγάπα ὁ Ἰησοῦς* is an explanation of his own name, since he takes Jesus as equivalent to Jehovali, so that his name was a prophecy of the relation into which he entered to Jesus. But the language *ἐπισπισῶν ἐπὶ τὸ στήθος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ* (John xiii. 25, xxi. 20) is only a symbolical mode of expressing the idea *ὃν ἠγάπα ὁ Ἰησοῦς*.

2 Lücke strenuously maintains and copiously proves that *ἐξηγεῖσθαι* and *καθηγεῖσθαι*, in the profane writers, were used with special reference to the explanation of sacred things. Yet he himself says that the Evangelist here may have unconsciously used the word which in the best manner points out the reality of the revelation of Christ. As a supplement to *ἐξηγήσατο*, Kuinoel justly adds *τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ*, which certainly, as Lücke remarks, is to be understood as meaning the *χάρις καὶ ἀλήθεια* (ver. 17.)

sinful creature and the eternal God is so immense, that the former is not capable of sustaining the *full* manifestation of the divine light ; it needs a *gradual* disclosure thereof.<sup>1</sup> At the conclusion (ver. 23) it is further said, **וְרֵאִיתָ אֶת-אֲחֵרִי וּפְנֵי לֹא יֵרָאֶה**. Thus in the cases of theophany, men of God under the Old Testament did not see the hidden essence of God, but his *εἰκὼν*. But the image of God is the Son, the Revealer of the hidden Father, and accordingly it was always (even before the Incarnation of Christ) the Son who disclosed to men the inner essence of God by degrees, as they were capable of apprehending it.<sup>2</sup>

Hence, as Deity itself, he stands in opposition to everything human ; *no one* knows the Father except the Son (Matt. xi. 27.) (The readings *μονογενὴς υἱὸς Θεός* or *Θεοῦ* are at any rate to be rejected ; probably they arose from the endeavour to make the antithesis with *οὐδείς* as distinct as possible.)

## § 2. FIRST TESTIMONY OF THE BAPTIST CONCERNING CHRIST. JESUS COLLECTS DISCIPLES.

(John i. 19—52.<sup>3</sup>)

In accordance with the intimation previously given (ver. 6, 7, 15) of John's testimony, a detailed description of the circumstances

1 Although Steudel (in the Tübing. Pfingstprogramm of the year 1830) contends against the distinction between the hidden and the revealed God, yet he seems in reality only to deny the Arian view of a Being standing in the middle between God and man ; and certainly he does so with truth. The contrast doubtless may be understood altogether differently and yet be in harmony with Scripture. John xii. 41 shows that the idea which we have given of the Theophanies is quite the same as that of the Evangelist ; for it is there explained that Isaiah (chap. vi.) saw Christ.

2 In the fragments of Orpheus, terms and sentiments occur which are quite similar to the description of the operation of the divine Logos. In the first fragment from Justin Martyr, it is said :

Εἰς ἔσθ' αὐτογενής, ἐνὸς ἑκγονα πάντα τέτυκται·

'Εν δ' αὐτοῖς αὐτὸς περιλίσσεται· οὐδὲ τις αὐτὸν

Εἰς ὁράσθητῶν· αὐτὸς δὲ γε πάντα ὁρᾷται·

In the second Fragment from Eusebius (praep. Evang. xiii. 12) it is said :

Οὐ γὰρ κέν τις ἴδοι θνητῶν μερόπων κραινοντα,

Εἰ μὴ μονογενὴς τις ἀπορρώξ φύλου ἀνωθεν

Χαλδαίων.

Doubtless, however, Christian influence, or at least Jewish influence assisted in the composition of this and similar Orphesian fragments.

3 In the Greek there are 52 verses, ver. 38 of the English version constituting in the Greek the two verses, 38 and 39.—T'n.



under which it was given, now immediately follows. The fact that the Evangelist opens his work with this ; the very form itself of this narration (comp. especially ver. 20) ; and in like manner the immediately connected representation of the way in which the Lord gathered disciples, while John referred them to him—all these things render it certain that the Evangelist here had something special in view. He doubtless intended to contradict the opinion of the later disciples of John, that the Baptist himself was the Messiah. Moreover, the occasion on which the Baptist delivered the energetic testimony, that he was not the Christ, specially invited more distinct explanation ; *a formal deputation from the Sanhedrim* appeared, whose object was to question him respecting his office, and the legitimacy of his authority. The highest ecclesiastical court possessed a perfect right to send such a deputation. (Compare on this subject the remarks in the Comm. Matt. xxi. 23.)

John therefore answered them and gave them an  $\pi\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ , by which he proved himself to be a genuine prophet, viz., “that the Messiah was already in the midst of them.” From this circumstance we may conclude that our attention is occupied here with an occurrence different from that narrated, Matt. iii. 7, ff. ; for in this latter passage no *deputation* appears, but we merely find, amid the masses of people surrounding John, *individual* Pharisees and Sadducees who wish also to be baptized. The same is clearly shown by the parallel place, Luke iii. 7, ff. Moreover, since it is said, John i. 31, “I knew him (Jesus) not,” whereas in the answer to the deputation Jesus is described as known to John, this occurrence must have taken place after the baptism and temptation of Jesus. (Comp. the particulars ver. 29.)

Ver. 19, 20. By the expression *οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι*, John here designates the members of the Sanhedrim as representatives of the whole nation. All had an idea of something superior in the Baptist, but they were in doubt as to his exact character. The reiteration, *ἠμολόγησε καὶ οὐκ ἠρνήσατο καὶ ἠμολόγησεν* obviously implies great stress. The Evangelist intends to say that the Baptist declared in the strongest terms that he was not the Messiah. The polemical reference in these words to the errors of later disciples of John appears to me obvious beyond mistake.

Ver. 21, 22. The disavowal of the office of Messiah on the part of the Baptist induces the deputies to associate him with other im-

portant persons; they ask whether he may be Elias, who is to precede the Messiah, or Jeremiah,<sup>1</sup> concerning whom a similar opinion was entertained (comp. the Comm. on Matt. xvi. 13.) The Baptist, however, disavows this also. The apparent contradiction, occasioned by the circumstance that Jesus calls John Elias, is reconciled by Luke i. 17, where John is described as working: *ἐν πνεύματι καὶ δυνάμει Ἡλίου* (comp. the Comm. on Matt. xi. 14, and on Matt. xvii. 10).

Ver. 23. After these negative declarations the Baptist at length speaks of himself positively, that he is the *φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ*. He here appeals to the passage, Isaiah xl. 3, which is also applied to the Baptist, Matt. iii. 3; Mark i. 2; Luke iii. 4. (Instead of *ἐτοιμάσατε*, which the three Evangelists have in common with the LXX., John admits *εὐθύνατε*, doubtless only because he quoted from memory.)

Ver. 24, 25. John's additional remark, that these deputies (Priests and Levites) were of the sect of the Pharisees and Sadducees, was very appropriate here, because this was the most likely motive of their subsequent question. The Pharisees adhered rigidly to external rites; they were therefore struck at John's baptizing. They evidently considered baptism as nothing unbecoming to the Messiah or to Elias. (Comp. Lightfoot hor. hebr. ad h. l. Nevertheless the Rabbinical passages there adduced do not treat expressly of a *baptism*, but only in general of a *purification* which Elias was to accomplish. The Jews, however, justly acknowledged the baptism of John as a symbol of purification.) But that any one should baptize *members of the church of God*—consequently declaring them impure and in need of purification, in order to be received into a higher communion—appeared to them inadmissible. For the rest, it cannot be demonstratively shewn from this passage (comp. the Comment. Matt. iii. 1), that the Jews believed the Messiah or his forerunner would baptize. The words only signify that the baptism of Israelites was not inappropriate as administered by these individuals, since they would not merely—like ordinary prophets—strengthen the existing theocratic life, but would found a new, higher constitution. The rite of baptism, however, in its symbolical meaning, was so intelligible, that the Jews, as soon as

<sup>1</sup> Bleek (loc. cit. s. 423, ff.) does not think that Jeremiah is expressly intended, but he is of opinion that in the general sense only, according to Deut. xviii. 15, a prophet was to precede the Messiah, and that to this reference is made here.

they saw John practise it, understood what he intended to indicate thereby. Accordingly, this passage can afford no proof that baptism (in distinction from mere lustration) was known *before* John and Christ. At any rate, it could not have been regarded as a prerogative belonging *only* to the Messiah to baptize the Jews, because in that case John would by no means have adopted it. Moreover, the words before us state nothing to that effect.

Ver. 26, 27. In order to solve this difficulty, John specifies the character of his baptism, which operated only negatively (separating from the impenitent generation), not positively (giving power from above in order to new life), like the baptism of Christ. (Comp. the particulars in the Comm. on Matt. iii. 1.) The synoptical Evangelists have the same words in a more complete form (comp. the remarks on Matt. iii. 11, and the parallels), viz., they expressly add the *βαπτίζω ἐν πνεύματι* which belongs to the Messiah. The words *μέσος ὑμῶν ἔστηκεν, ὃν ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε*, are peculiar to John. They are very important to the connexion of the whole passage. It appears to me that the Evangelist who, as a disciple of John, may have listened to this very conversation with the deputation from the Sanhedrim, reported the words in an abbreviated form. Probably the deputies further proposed an express question to John regarding prophetic legitimation in general. (Comp. the Comm. on Matt. xxi. 23.) To this reference is made in the words *μέσος ὑμῶν ἔστηκεν*. By means of this *σημεῖον* or *תָּיִת*—that he proclaimed to them the Messiah as already amongst them—the Baptist proved himself to be a true prophet of God.<sup>2</sup> On this account also the Lord could ask (Matt. xxi. 25), “Why did ye not believe

1 The importance attributed by the Jews to the rite of baptism is explained, if we take into account the circumstance that no post-Mosaic prophet, seer, judge, or any teacher of divine things under the Old Testament, could introduce a sacred usage, rite, or ceremony to be observed as the Mosaic regulations by the people of God. Subsequently to Moses none but the Messiah could do this, according to the passage Deut. xviii. 15: “A prophet like me (the founder of a new institution of God) will the Lord raise up, him shall ye hear.”

2 In accordance with this also the words *σημεῖον ἐποίησεν οὐδέν*, John x. 41, are to be explained. This statement is intended only to deny actual miracles (*τέρατα*) in the work of John; but the reality of his prophecy concerning Christ is recognised most distinctly in the passage. De Wette himself (on x. 41), acknowledges a testimony to the purity of the tradition, in the fact that no miracle has been ascribed to the Baptist, and Strauss also will not venture to deny this. But then, on what ground was it that the ever ready fabulists, who abounded in apostolic times, did not use the favourable opportunity to adorn the life of the Baptist with wonders?

John?" (With respect to ver. 27, comp. the remarks on ver. 15.)

Ver. 28. This important event, the official legitimation of the Baptist, so impressed John that he further particularizes the *place* where it occurred. The reading *Βηθανία* (בֵּית חֲנָנִיָּה ship-place), is doubtless to be preferred to the reading of the text. rec. *Βηθαβαρᾶ* (בֵּית עֲבָרָה ferry-place.) The latter name has been received only by means of Origen. He found near the Jordan a Bethabara, where according to tradition John baptized; Bethany, however, lay inland midway to Jerusalem. But the spot here meant certainly is not this well-known residence of Lazarus; it was a place bearing the same appellation on the other side of Jordan, which in the time of Origen may have been destroyed.

Ver. 29. In the passage ver. 19—28, the *negative* part of the Baptist's testimony was the chief thing presented, viz., that he was not the Messiah; in the following (ver. 29—34) we have *positive* statements respecting the person of Jesus. Of the *act* itself of the baptism of Jesus, the Evangelist naturally says nothing, because it was of no importance to his design. Indeed, the disciples of John might have inferred from it that the Baptist must have been superior to Jesus. The following words must at all events have been spoken *after* the baptism of Jesus. We need not be embarrassed on account of the *ἐμαύριον*, if we only suppose a quick succession of the occurrences, which there is nothing to contradict. The course of events probably ran thus. In the morning of the *first* day came the deputation; towards evening John baptized Jesus; on the *next* day he spoke the words now following. To take the *ἐμαύριον* (after the analogy of the Hebrew מִחָרָה) in a wider signification, is not suitable, because John here reports so precisely that he even mentions the hour (ver. 40.) The first meeting with his heavenly friend had imprinted itself indelibly upon his memory. But the circumstance noticed above in the remarks on i. 19, that the Baptist speaks of Jesus in such a manner as already to acknowledge his higher dignity, leads me, with Bleek and Tholuck, to think it probable that all of which John informs us took place after the baptism of Christ. Adopting this supposition, one thing only seems strange, viz., that in the synoptical Gospels (Matt. iii. 11, and parallels), the Baptist speaks words *before* the baptism, similar to those which in John he speaks *after* the same. But Tholuck

justly observes, that the Baptist may surely have repeated such figurative expressions as "loosing the shoe latchets;" at first he uttered them before the baptism to the people, not being aware that the Jesus externally known to him was he whose advent he was to proclaim; after the baptism, he addresses similar words to the deputation of the Sanhedrim, with more distinct reference to the person of Jesus. Further, since the four days (John i. 29, 35, 44. ii. 1.) are closely connected, the forty days temptation of Christ requires that all should be placed after the baptism. Tholuck's remark also appears not without foundation, that the words μέσος ὑμῶν ἔσθηκεν (ver. 26), can be suitable only on the supposition that Christ was no longer confined to the narrow circle of private life. The exclamation with which the Baptist points out Jesus to his disciples, ἴδε ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ κ. τ. λ. is very remarkable, especially in the mouth of the Baptist. It shows that at those times at least at which the fulness of the Spirit was specially accessible to him, he had a deep knowledge of the way of salvation. The whole Mosaic institution of sacrifices, combined with various declarations in the Old Testament respecting the suffering and atoning Messiah (*e. g.* Psa. xxii.; Isaiah liii.), had doubtless always kept the truth of this doctrine alive in the minds of *individuals* among the Israelites, although the *mass* entirely mistook it. Just in like manner the Baptist rightly perceived it under the illumination of the Holy Spirit. The term ἀμνός = ἡψ may have been selected in conformity with Isa. liii. 7, where it occurs and even refers to a slaughtered lamb. In the revelation, John very frequently uses ἀρνίον and occasionally with the addition ἐσφαγμένον (Rev. v. 6, xiii. 8; comp. also 1 Pet. i. 19), so that there is no doubt with regard to the meaning of the comparison; Jesus is compared to a sacrificial lamb led to death. The following ἀμαρτία τοῦ κόσμου shews in what sense he is called ἀμνός Θεοῦ, viz., as the abolisher of sin and the sufferer for sin, *sent* by God. (Just as 2 Cor. v. 19, Θεὸς ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλάσσων ἐαυτῷ.) God himself as it were ransomed the sinful world by the sacrifice of his only begotten Son. Those superficial expositions of this profound term, according to which ἀμνός is to be understood merely as an image of meekness, and αἰρεῖν ἀμαρτίαν as referring to the removal of sin by means of instruction (as Dr Paulus think), or, ἀμνός is to be taken as an image of an innocent sufferer, and αἰρεῖν ἀμαρτίαν as

referring to the endurance of persecutions (according to Gabler, in the senso, "this innocent person will be obliged to suffer much"), may be regarded as set aside by the remarks of Lücke, of Tholuck, and especially of Hengstenberg respecting the suffering and atoning Messiah.<sup>1</sup> (Christol. B. i. s. 274, ff. With respect to the circumstance of lambs not being used for trespass and sin-offerings, compare my remarks concerning the paschal lamb, on Matt. xxvi. 17, and 1 Cor. v. 7, by which the difficulty is removed.)

There yet remains for consideration one subject which the most recent investigator has not sufficiently determined. Tholuck thinks that *ἀρχει τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου* merely means "to bear the punishment of sin," he altogether controverts the signification "to take away." He says the phrase *ἀρχει ἁμαρτίαν* is equivalent to *נָשָׂא עוֹן*. In several connections this does mean "to take away sin" like *ἀφαιρεῖν*, but by no means in all. It is often = *קָבַל עוֹן*, as much as *φέρειν, λαμβάνειν*. On this point Tholuck cites Levit. xx. 19, f.; Numb. xviii. 22; Ezekiel xviii. 19, f., xxiii. 35. Now since in the LXX., Isaiah liii. 11, *ἀνοίσει* stands for *קָבַל*, and the Evangelist may be supposed to have had this passage in his mind, it is in the highest degree probable, that the meaning here is, "to bear punishment." To me, however, there appears no real distinction between *נָשָׂא* and *קָבַל*, *ἀρχει* and *ἀφαιρεῖν* in the connexion with *ἁμαρτία*. It is necessary here to combine the two significations "to bear" and "to take away."

The sacrificial lamb which bears the sin, also takes it away; there is no bearing of sin without removing the same. Tholuck was induced to make this distinction merely through observing that opponents attributed so much importance to the signification "to take away." Their error, however, consists not in the application of this meaning, but in their ascribing the removal of sin to the *teaching*, not to the *sacrificial death* of the Lamb of God. Further, the signification "punishment" for *ἁμαρτία* in this passage certainly is not demonstrable. 1 John iii. 5 clearly shows, from the connexion, that *ἀρχει τὰς ἁμαρτίας* in John means to abolish, to remove sin itself. Hence we can only express the sense of

<sup>1</sup> That the idea of a substitutionary endurance of punishment by a righteous person was not unknown to the Jews, is shown not merely by the passages from Josephus and Zohar, quoted by Tholuck on this place, but also by the numerous passages of the Old Testament, in which the reference is to substitution, or a just person presenting himself before the Judge on behalf of the unjust. (Comp. Ezek. xiii. 5, xxii. 30; Isa. lxiv. 7; Isa. cvi. 23; [Exod. xxxii. 11, 7].)

our passage thus, by a periphrasis: "behold this is the sacrificial Lamb, prepared and given by God himself for this purpose, to bear the sin of the world, and by his sufferings and death to annul and remove it." Scripture knows nothing of an endurance of the penalty of sin on the part of the Saviour while men retain the sin itself; sin continuing would continually reproduce the penalty, and thus the remission would be annulled. Sin itself is the true punishment of sin, says Augustine, and sin is truly forgiven only when it is taken away. Meanwhile there is truth also in the remark, that man may have the hope of forgiveness entire and unclouded, although he is also compelled to acknowledge that he does not possess entire freedom from sin; only so far, however, as (according to Rom. vii. 25, in which passage the whole of this difficult doctrine will be further developed) the man, in his inmost essence (the *νοῦς*, the true I), is taken possession of by the new divine life that is in Christ, and can attribute what is in this to the whole, even although his sensuous nature (*σάρξ*) be not yet governed throughout by this new life. Now, it is remarkable not only that the Baptist so decidedly declares the doctrine of the suffering and atoning Messiah, but also that he extends his statement to the Messiah's operation upon the entire *κόσμος*. It might have been supposed that this surpassed the Baptist's point of view, and that he would have contemplated only the people of Israel. (Comp. the Comment. on Matt. iii. 1.) And this consideration might for a moment have disposed one to admit the view that only the words *ἰδε ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ* were the words of the Baptist, as they occur by themselves in ver. 36; the apposition, *ὁ αἴρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου*, being an addition of the Evangelist's. John's custom, also, of making appendices of his own to the speeches of others which he reported, would well agree with this. But, as Lücke observes, it is just as probable that the words of the Baptist<sup>1</sup> were reported in an abbreviated form in ver. 36, while in the term *ἀμνός* the succeeding sentiment is already suffi-

<sup>1</sup> I cannot agree with Tholuck's remarks on the passage, in the fifth edition of his Commentary. He thinks that the Spirit was not really communicated to Christ at his baptism, but, on the contrary, only the consciousness that the moment of his public appearance,—the opportunity for the Spirit already dwelling within him to manifest itself,—was arrived. The account of the baptism plainly produces the impression that the Spirit is for the first time communicated to Christ. This supposition admits of no hesitation, if it be remembered that the human nature of Christ always followed the general process of development, and, consequently, also received the fulness of the Spirit only by degrees. (Comp. Lücke's Excursus on this subject, B. i. s. 373, ff.)

ciently indicated. I have determined in favour of the latter acceptance so much the more, since the Old Testament contains abundant intimations, according to which the work of the Messiah appears extended beyond the boundaries of the people of Israel; and such passages might conduct the Baptist, as well as Simeon, under the illumination of the Holy Spirit, to the comprehensive redemption which should proceed from the Messiah. (Comp. Luke ii. 31, 32, where the passages in the Old Testament pertaining to this subject are quoted.)

Ver. 30, 31. The following words have already been explained, ver. 15. They refer retrospectively to ver. 26, 27, so that *ὁς ἔμ-προσθεν κ. τ. λ.* corresponds with *οὐ ἐγὼ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἄξιος κ. τ. λ.* The final clause, *ὅτι πρῶτός μου ἦν*, confirms the previous sentiments, and has reference to the eternal existence of the Son with the Father. (With respect to the *οὐκ ᾔδειν αὐτόν*, the Comment. on Matt. iii. 17 may be consulted, where it has already been observed that this expression can be understood only as referring to that *inward* knowledge, instead of which an unequivocal sign was given to him by the Spirit, its occurrence enabling him to reveal to the people with certainty the presence of the Messiah.)

Ver. 32—34. With regard to the baptism itself, to which the Baptist refers in no other instance but this, what is needful has already been remarked in the Comment. Matt. iii. 16.

It is peculiar to John's Gospel, that the descent of the Spirit like a dove upon Jesus was given to the Baptist, *as a sign* by which he might recognize the Messiah. Unquestionably this is a proof that the baptism of Christ was not for the multitude, while it also affords ground for the conclusion that the Baptist may have been in doubt as to how he should with certainty discover the Messiah. It was by means of inward revelation (for *ὁ πέμψας με εἶπεν*, ver. 33, is certainly to be understood as referring to this) that such a *σημεῖον* was now given to him. Thus eternal love does not leave weak man, who is so liable to error, without distinct declarations and testimonies, by which, when the heart is sincere, the truth becomes discernible in difficult circumstances.

As the condensed sum of the Baptist's testimony, it is said, ver. 34, *ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ*. This is the first instance in which this name appears in the mouth of the Baptist. We are prevented from taking it merely as the name of Messiah in the subordinate



Jewish sense, synonymously with *Χριστός*, by the *πρώτος μου ἦν*, ver. 30, which plainly refers to the eternal existence with the Father. The knowledge of this was accompanied by that of the higher nature of Jesus generally. (Comp. the particulars on John i. 50.) The *οὐκ ᾔδεν αὐτόν* (ver. 31), does not stand in contrariety to Matt. iii. 14. The Baptist always placed Jesus higher than himself, although without knowing, or being certain of, his Messianic office before the baptism; he may have regarded him as a prophet.

Ver. 35—40. Up to this point the representation of the Evangelist is obviously characterized by the tendency to shew how the Baptist refused all honour for himself, and heaped it upon Jesus, so that the disciples of John might be rendered conscious of having paid false homage to their master. The Evangelist now further describes how, in consequence of this observation of the Baptist's, some of his disciples,—and among them, the Evangelist himself (ver. 40),—allied themselves to Jesus, as if again to intimate what they, the disciples of John, must do, if they participated the sentiments of their teacher.

The great sensitiveness of the Evangelist's mind is touchingly shown in his representation of this first contact with the Lord; the circumstances are present to him in the minutest details; he still remembers the very hour.<sup>1</sup> It is to be regretted that he reports no particulars of those discourses of the Lord by which he was bound to him for the whole of his life; he allows everything personal to retire.

Ver. 41—43. The *one* of these two disciples who is expressly mentioned was Andrew, brother of Peter; the one concerning whom silence is observed was doubtless John himself, who, through delicate reserve, abstains from naming himself in the whole Gospel. Probably the ardent Simon Peter also was hurrying to the Baptist, that he might hear his exhortations to repentance, and prepare himself for the coming Messiah. Andrew, therefore, hastens to inform him that he whom they longed for is found, that their hope and the hope of their fathers is fulfilled. (*Πρώτος* for *πρότερος*, as ver. 15, since probably both sought him. For *Μεσσίαν* many codices read *Μεσίαν*.) Jesus, looking observingly and penetratingly upon Simon

<sup>1</sup> The computation is probably made according to Roman reckoning; so that ten o'clock in the morning is to be understood. Comp. Rettig (in the *Stud.*, 1830, h. i.) and Hug (Frieb. *Zeitschr.* h. v.)

(ἐμβλέψας αὐτῷ is to be taken as emphatic), immediately assigns to him a new name. This term is to be understood only as expressing the inward nature of the apostle, *i. e.*, the new nature, sanctified and purified by the power of grace. Energy and inward firmness were the principal features of his character, which, indeed, in his ingenuousness, were manifested in the form of false self-confidence and assurance, but, after the temptations to these evils had been conquered, fitted him to be one of the pillars of the Church. (Comp. Matt. xvi. 18; Gal. ii. 9. Πέτρος = כִּיפָּא, "Rock," hence "Rock-man.")

Ver. 44, 45. Another young man also, *Philip*, a native of the same town with Peter and Andrew, was called by the Redeemer to follow him, shortly before his departure to Galilee. The circumstance that the call of the apostle, whose name we have mentioned, took place *before* the return of Jesus into Galilee, clearly shews that the account Matt. iv. 18, ff.; Mark i. 16, ff., does not speak of the *first* calling of the disciples, but of their invitation to *permanent* companionship with the Lord. (Comp. the Comm. on Matt. iv. 18.) After this first summons from the Redeemer to follow him, the apostles returned to their earthly vocation; it was not till after the second invitation that they followed Christ permanently.

Ver. 46, 47. The faith but just awakened immediately becomes manifest, like a fire that extends itself, and at the same time kindles everything susceptible of its influence. Philip in his turn proclaims to Nathanael him whom they have found,<sup>1</sup> and who, in the sacred books of the Old Testament, is called Messiah. (Respecting his identity with Bartholomew, comp. the Comm. on Matt. x. 1. Nathanael was probably his proper name.<sup>2</sup>) When Philip calls Jesus υἱὸς τοῦ Ἰωσήφ, he only utters the prevailing popular opinion. Nathanael expresses his doubt as to the truth of Philip's declaration, while he alludes to the contempt generally entertained for Galilee, in which province Nazareth was a small town. (Comp. John vii. 52; Matt. ii. 23.) Philip, however, appeals merely to the striking

<sup>1</sup> Comp. the remarks in the Comm. on Matt. xiii. 44, ff., concerning the different modes of conversion. Peter was of an inquisitive nature, Nathanael was more quiet and contemplative; nevertheless, both were obedient to the light as soon as they beheld it.

<sup>2</sup> The name נַחֲמָאֵל occurs in the Old Testament very frequently. Comp. Numb. i. 8, ii. 5; 1 Chron. ii. 14, and many other instances. It answers to the Greek names Θεόδωρος, Θεόδωτος, Θεοδώρητος.

appearance of Christ himself, by means of which Nathanael also was soon won.

Ver. 48—50. The Lord, who knew the depths of the heart, (John ii. 25),—not merely according to that ordinary knowledge of human nature which is derived from experience, but by means of the divine power that dwelt in him,—as he beheld Nathanael approaching him, expressed the judgment concerning him, that he was “sincere, guileless.” With regard to this particular characteristic of mind (sincerity and uprightness), it may be affirmed, without doubt, that it cannot be distinguished, as in the present case, with perfect certainty by mere experience; to do this requires an insight into the hidden interior.

(*Ἰσραηλῆτης* is here used frequently as a name of honour; “he is truly a member of the nation of believers, the people of God.”) Upon the question of Nathanael, *πόθεν με γινώσκεις*, the Saviour reminds him of a scene which had taken place, probably a short time before, under a fig-tree. This word discloses to the disciple the divine knowledge of Jesus, and he recognizes him as his Lord and King. What passed with Nathanael under the tree is not stated; we may, however, conclude from the connexion that it must have been something *important*, and, indeed, something *internal*; the former because it concerned Nathanael so deeply, the latter because the sight of anything external could never have formed a ground for such an avowal. The disciple must have believed that to discover what Jesus pointed out was possible only to divine power; but how could this with any probability have been believed respecting any external appearance? Accordingly the *look* of Christ can only be understood as an inward look. Nathanael’s soul lay spread open before his spiritual sight, and he read its depths. Doubtless the disciple had, under the fig-tree, uttered in prayer his inmost desires and hopes, and to have been observed in this by the eyes of the All-seeing so subdued his heart, that he also believed in the Nazarene.

Ver. 50 is important on account of the definition of *υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ*. This passage, in fact, appears in favour of the interpretation adopted by Lücke himself, and by Tholuck,—that *ὁ υἱ. τ. θ.* is only another expression for Christ, Messiah. For, according to the point of view occupied by Nathanael, we cannot pre-suppose in him any knowledge of the divine nature of Christ; and,

1 So Bleek justly observes, in his remarks on the passage in the Stud. loc. cit. s. 440, f.

since *ὁ. τ. θ.* precedes *βασιλεὺς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ*, this latter appears to be only an explanation of the previous phrase. Moreover, the proof that *ὁ. τ. θ.* was merely a name of the Messiah cannot be adduced from any other quarter (as we have shown in our remarks on Luke i. 35); nay, John x. 33, ff. expressly shews that the Jews themselves considered it arrogance and blasphemy that the Messiah should call himself *ὁ. τ. θ.*, and therefore no false Messiah appropriated this name. Hence this single passage, which, when viewed alone, appears to favour the above hypothesis, must be otherwise interpreted.<sup>1</sup> The simplest method of solution is to assume that here the Evangelist, anticipating the later knowledge of Nathanael, attributes to him the declaration of faith in the Son of God, immediately upon his avowal of belief. Only, in that case *ὁ. τ. θ.*, as in all similar passages (Matt. xvi. 16; John vi. 69 [text. recept.], xi. 27, xx. 31), must be placed after, whereas here it precedes. Accordingly, it may be better to say that Nathanael had already learned, through Philip, that the Baptist (to whose disciples Nathanael also probably belonged) had called Jesus *ὁ. τ. θ.* (ver. 34); and that he now ascribed this name to Christ, not associating with it a distinctly defined idea, but having a presentiment that it indicated something great and glorious. Meanwhile the Messianic King was the known name by which everything worthy of desire was concentrated in him, and John therefore adds this as the name which he deemed of highest import. The passage would then be understood in the

<sup>1</sup> Lücke (in his Comm. on the passage s. 392, note) will only grant me that "the name Son of God was not exactly in very common use as a designation of the Messiah among the Jews in the time of Christ; the more definite metaphysical idea belonged to the Christian mode of thinking; but that the term was not strange to the Jews as a designation of the Messiah is proved by such passages as John x. 32, ff., xi. 27; Luke xxii. 70." But, in the passage John x. 32, ff., the Jews wish that he would declare himself to be the Messiah, while their purpose was to stone him if he should call himself Son of God; in this they perceive a blasphemous assumption, which they had not found in the name of Messiah. John xi. 27, Martha, the sister of Lazarus, is the person who speaks; with her the name Son of God is an expression of the Christian instruction which she had received; she thus defines the term Messiah. In Luke xxii. 70, Christ is so called by way of derision, in reference to the known fact that he had applied this appellation to himself. Thus none of those passages affords the least proof that the name Son of God was not strange to the Jews as a designation of the Messiah. Our passage, indeed, has the most appearance of it; but the circumstance that no false Messiah ever ventured to call himself the Son of God appears to me a decisive proof that this appellation, as also the name "Son of Man," was unknown to them, that it did not occur in the usage of Jewish language, nay, that it was shuddered at as blasphemy.

following form, "Thou art truly the Son of God, which, as I have heard, thou dost announce thyself to be."

Ver. 51, 52. The Lord now proceeds with augmenting force from the lesser to the greater,<sup>1</sup> and informs Nathanael as well as all the other disciples, that they should behold what was far more sublime than his discovery of hidden things, viz., they should see the whole heavenly world in his service. The reference already made to angelic appearances in general (Comm. on Matt. i. 18) furnishes a guide towards the apprehension of this passage. The ascent and descent of the angels (of which Jacob's ladder of heaven, Gen. xxviii. 12, is a significant type) simply points out the active flow and reflow of divine powers,<sup>2</sup> the opened heaven (comp. the Comm. on Matt. iii. 16) indicates the restoration of the oneness between the higher world of spirit and this lower sphere of things, which had been destroyed by sin; the ascent and descent upon the Son of Man signifies that he is the centre and the leader of all the higher powers of the universe. (Respecting *ὁ. τ. αὐθρ.* comp. the Comm. on Luke i. 35.) The words *ἀπ' ἄρτι* can hardly be referred to the moment of time then present; the opening of heaven and the outpouring of divine powers is to be reckoned from the baptism (Matt. iii. 16) as the public inauguration of Christ, and since that time it had never ceased. At such a spiritual inward conception of the phrase all the more profound expositors of all times have arrived, *e. g.*, Origen and Augustine, Luther and Calvin, Lücke and Tholuck.<sup>3</sup> Every limitation of the words to individual circumstances, whether to angelic appearances strictly, or to the moral operations of Jesus, is to be rejected; the work of the Lord collectively is here to be understood as a constant development of heavenly powers, and as a continuous reintroduction to the world of spirit. It is only in regard to the *idea of angel* that reference need be made to the re-

<sup>1</sup> The formula *ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν* is employed with unusual frequency. Comp. iii. 3, 5, 11; v. 19, 24, 29; vi. 26, 32, 47, 63; viii. 34, 51, 58; x. 1, 7; xii. 24; xiii. 16, 20, 21, 38; xiv. 12; xvi. 20, 23; xxi. 18.

<sup>2</sup> This peculiar expression is explained by the remark of Olshausen, in his Commentary on Matt. iii. 16, 17, that "the flow of his internal life into the everlasting abode of the Spirit, and from thence back upon him, never ceased again."—*Tr.*

<sup>3</sup> When, however, Tholuck (on the passage s. 79, fifth edition) thinks that Matt. xxvi. 64 is to be understood in a similarly figurative manner, I cannot agree with him: on the contrary, the discourse there has respect to the *real* coming of Christ, which, as always in the Old Testament, is only transferred to the closest proximity.

marks above. (Comm. on Matt. i. 18.) It was there mentioned that the *ἄγγελοι* are apprehended at one time as natural powers, at another as personalities.

Here both references may be said to be involved. The spiritual, whether it operate in the internal or in the external world, is viewed in its centralization, and leads back to the Prince of the kingdom of light in his earthly appearance—the Messiah—as its centre. Hence this expression in reference to the ascent and descent of angels designates the purely physical operations that emanated from the Redeemer in wonders, just as much as the purely moral works of regeneration and renovation. It is remarkable, however, that the *ἀναβαίνειν* is placed first, whereas it would appear necessary that the *καταβαίνειν* should precede this; the reason of this arrangement is doubtless no other than the fact that in the Logos, which in Jesus had become man, the collective world of spirit was in effect transferred to the earth, and therefore the active flow of life perpetually issues from him and returns to him.

### § 3. JESUS AT THE MARRIAGE IN CANA.

(John ii. 1—12.)

Ver. 1. The journey to Galilee mentioned (ver. 44) as contemplated, is supposed to be accomplished, and Jesus appears in Cana, the birth-place of Nathanael (John xxi. 2) who probably accompanied the Redeemer with John to Galilee. Cana lay about half a day's journey from the sea of Gennesaret (Joseph. de vita c. 16.)<sup>1</sup> From Jordan, on the shores of which we see Jesus up to this time (i. 28), he might reach Cana in two days; he would thus arrive there *τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ* (reckoned from the last *ἐπαύριον*, i. 44.)

Ver. 2—4. To the marriage, which probably took place in a family related to him (since, according to ii. 12, the relations of Jesus were present), Christ also was invited. (It is unnecessary to take *ἐκλήθη* as pluperfect, since it is not likely that the marriage was his motive for returning to Galilee; it is certain that he had reasons of a spiritual nature.) As there

<sup>1</sup> There was, besides, a second city of this name between Tyre and Sidon (Josh. xix. 28), in the tribe of Asher, which, however, in all probability is not meant here.

was need of wine, Mary requested her divine Son to supply the deficiency; doubtless Jesus designed to display his miraculous power, as his answer shews. It would appear that the Lord had in some way given his mother an intimation to this effect, otherwise it is difficult to explain how it was that Mary hit upon this particular form of the manifestation of miraculous power, and that Jesus displayed it in this very manner. He refers only to *time*, where he says to Mary, οὐπω ἤκει ἡ ὥρα μου. ("Ωρα, like *καίρος*, with the pronoun, relates to the last crisis of the Lord, *e. g.*, John vii. 30, xvii. 1. But in the passage vii. 8, as here, the expression refers to that which is less remote. Passages such as Matt. xiv. 15 do not come under this category, because there the pronoun is absent from ὥρα [comp. the remarks on Matt. xxvi. 18.]) The hour of Jesus was the time for action fixed by the Father, of whose holy will Jesus was undoubtedly every moment sensible. Of such passive submission Mary had no presentiment, and this accounts for her impatient haste. That the accostal γύναι is not unsuitable, has been already frequently remarked; but from the words τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί (corresponding with the Hebrew לִי וְלָךְ, comp. Matt. viii. 29; Mark i. 24), the character of reproof can in no wise be removed, although the rebuke which the expression conveys is indeed but gentle. After the Redeemer was introduced to his sacred office, the relation to his parents (Luke ii. 51), so far as his work was concerned, must be regarded as dissolved. The Son had now become the *Lord* also of the mother, who could secure her own happiness only by believing obedience to him. Because Mary, up to this very time, was conscious of earthly relationship to Christ, it might be difficult for her to understand this higher position, and hence this earnest admonition.

Ver. 5, 6. Upon this Mary, withdrawing, now refers the servants to her divine Son, who, as the ὥρα is come, communicates his command. (Καθαρισμός, purifying of hands and of vessels; comp. on Mark vii. 3, ff. The stone ὑδρίαι [כְּלֵי מַאֲכָל], appear to have been very large, since a metrete, according to Eisenschmidt, contains seventy-two flasks. But, as Semler quite correctly observes, it is not said that water was changed into wine in all the pitchers. The precision of the narrative renders it in the highest degree probable that John was an eye-witness.)

Ver. 7—10. They now drew out of one (or more) of these vessels, and the wine was brought to the president of the entertainment, who knew nothing of what had previously taken place. (This is the only instance in which *Ἀρχιτρίκλινος*, the superintendent of the feast, synonymous with *τρικλινάρχης*, *συμποσιάρχης*, occurs in the New Testament.) This person, astonished at the strength of the wine, tells the bridegroom that, contrary to custom, he is giving the best last. (*Μεθύσκεσθαι* always means, if not exactly to be intoxicated, yet to have drunk copiously. Here, however, the discourse has reference only to what was customary in the world, so that no conclusion can be drawn from the expression as to the marriage itself, at which Jesus was present, or as to the use of the wine that he bestowed.) In regard to this miracle of Jesus we must of course, in the first instance, refuse alike all constructions which, contrary to the meaning of the narrator (comp. ii. 9 with iv. 46), tend to remove the miraculous element from the story. This fact is strictly collateral with the account of the entertainment. Here is a substratum (water) whose substance is changed. The only correct explanation of this occurrence surely is that according to which we understand a real effective influence, manifesting its operation only in an accelerated degree. Hence the Fathers justly observe that here nothing else occurred than what is annually displayed in a more gradual development in the vine.<sup>1</sup> Just so Meyer correctly understands the miracles, and Strauss himself, who at one time knew not how to ridicule it sufficiently, is now compelled in his third number of the controversial works (s. 113) against Bauer, to acknowledge the suitability of supposing an accelerated process of nature. It is self-evident that on this principle the miracle is neither removed nor explained naturally; the essence of the miracle consists in divinely effecting the acceleration of the natural process; and the form in which the miracle is exhibited is employed as an appropriate medium for its contemplation.

Ver. 11, 12. John observes, in conclusion, that this was the first miracle (comp. iv. 54) wrought by the Lord for the *φανέρωσις* of his *δόξα*. (With regard to the *δόξα*, comp. the remarks on i. 14.) Seyf-

<sup>1</sup> Augustine, in *Joan.* tr. viii. says: Ipse fecit vinum in nuptiis, qui omni anno hoc facit in vitibus. Illud autem non miramur, quid omni anno fit; assiduitate amisit admirationem.



farth (s. 82) justly observes that the *δόξα* is an accessory idea to *φῶς*. The Logos, the absolute Light, radiates lustre (*δόξα*) from himself. The *σάρξ* in which the Logos appeared among men is as it were a veiling of the *φῶς*, while in the miracles the brightness breaks through the veil, and thus reveals the divine light that is shut up in an untransparent form. In the transfiguration of Jesus, the *σάρξ* itself appears perfectly illuminated and glorified by the *φῶς*. Now the circumstance that this was the first miracle of Christ serves in some measure to explain the fact that the Evangelist admits into his Gospel this in particular, which probably made a peculiarly deep impression upon him, although in other respects it must appear of comparatively minor importance to him, because no discourses accompanied it. Meanwhile the narration of this occurrence on the part of John is remarkable, especially as its chief contents are not suited to his spiritual character. The miracle involves in itself something very extraordinary, because here Christ appears to have wrought a miracle without a moral end. It is true the disciples believed (*i. e.*, increased in faith) by means of it (ver. 11), but this object would apparently have been still better attained by means of another action in which real utility was united with miracle. Both the difficulties—that John deemed this very occurrence so important, and that Christ wrought the miracle—appear to me to be solved, or at least diminished by one observation. The first disciples of Christ were all originally disciples of the Baptist. His manner of life—rigid, penitential austerity, and solitary abode in the desert—naturally appeared to them the only one that was right. What a contrast for them, when the Messiah, to whom the Baptist himself had pointed them, leads them first of all to a marriage! Whilst John dedicated them to a life of self-denial, Christ conducted them to pleasure,

This contrast needed a reconciliation, which was supplied by means of the miracle. Like the account of the purification of the Temple immediately following, and the miracle wrought upon the fig-tree, this miracle also has predominantly a symbolical aspect, and, when regarded as a significant act, is acknowledged to be

1 The Fathers understand the marriage-feast to which Christ went symbolically, as an image of the inward joy and happiness that Christ imparts to the soul, and in which he bestows the wine of his spirit—an interpretation very conducive to the practical treatment of the passage.

both intelligible and in harmony with the general procedure of Christ. All reprehensive judgments that might obtrude themselves into the hearts of the rigid disciples of John then present were suppressed by the manifestation of the glory of the Lord, which shewed them that in Christ there was more than John, in whom they had never seen anything similar. In relation to this, the fact might appear important also to the Evangelist. Those disciples of John whom he had in his eye, in the composition of his Gospel, were disposed towards a rigid asceticism, and might frequently be scandalized at the more free life of Christians. Hence this occurrence in the life of the Lord was to him, as it were, an apology for the conduct of Christians, and an indirect intimation to the disciples of John not to over-estimate their asceticism.

The Evangelist finally remarks, that Jesus went with his companions<sup>1</sup> from Cana to Capernaum. (*Κατέβη* is said, because Cana was further inland, whereas Capernaum was close to the sea.) The chronological exactness which is observable up to this point here becomes lost in a degree of uncertainty; for, with respect to the stay of the Redeemer and his companions, the Evangelist employs the general phrase: *καὶ ἐκεῖ ἔμειναν οὐ πολλὰς ἡμέρας*; and on this account the comparison of John's narratives with those of the synoptical writers, in reference to the order of their succession, must be very doubtful.

#### § 4. JESUS PURIFIES THE TEMPLE.

(John ii. 13—22.)

John opens this section with the statement, that the Redeemer went from Galilee up to Jerusalem at the *feast of Passover*. From this we may, in some measure, deduce the time of the baptism of Jesus, and the temptation that succeeded it; but still, as it respects the chronology of the evangelic history at large, little is gained from this date, because the synoptical authors (comp. the Comment. on Matt. iv. 12) give no information concerning the

<sup>1</sup> Concerning the brothers of the Lord, comp. the Comment. on Matt. xiii. 55.

first public appearance of Christ. On account, however, of the chronological limitations which follow, this passage is of importance to the history given by John.

Ver. 14—16. Concerning the fact of the purification of the Temple, and the relation of this occurrence to that narrated in Matt. xxi. 12, ff. (comp. the Comment. i. on Matt. xxi. 12), what is needful has already been said. John gives the citation (ver. 16) merely from memory, and this accounts for the variation. The impression conveyed according to him is milder than that given by the synoptical Evangelists, because the general activity employed by the Lord in purifying the Temple is represented, according to John, in a modified degree.

Ver. 17. The Evangelist adds the remark that the disciples hereupon remembered a scriptural phrase, viz. Ps. lxix. 10.<sup>1</sup> It is not said whether this occurred to the disciples immediately at the time of the transaction, or later; but, according to the period given ver. 22, *ὅτε ἡγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν*, the latter is the more probable, especially since the disciples did not, in the first instance, understand the representation of the death of the Messiah. With regard to Ps. lxix. itself, it is so frequently quoted in the New Testament (comp. John xv. 25, xix. 28; Matt. xxvii. 34, 48; Acts i. 20), that it cannot well be denied that the same was interpreted in the time of Christ as Messianic. And, accordingly, a mere accommodation of this passage on account of a similarity of sentiment, or a possible application to the existing circumstances, is not to be supposed. (Comp. the Comm. on Matt. i. 22, concerning *ἵνα πληρωθῇ*, and the review of Hengstenberg's *Christologie* in Tholuck's *liter. Anzeiger Jahrg.* 1831.) That the Rabbins made such use of citations from the Old Testament, can be no proof that the authors of the New Testament did so; on the contrary, the Holy Spirit, who inspired the latter, caused *them* to understand the Scriptures of the Old Testament in their spirituality, and so to treat them. (On this subject comp. the excellent remarks in Billroth's *Erkl. der Briefe an die Korinther*, Lpz., 1833, s. 13, ff.) Until the Old Testament life is apprehended as an organic whole, penetrated by the same Spirit that prevails in the New Testament, by whom the figures fulfilled in the latter

<sup>1</sup> In the English, verse 9.—Ta.

were indited in the former, the use of the Old Testament passages in the New Testament will always remain obscure.<sup>1</sup>

The Psalm describes David as the representative of Divine truth on the earth, and as the individual upon whom fell all the rage of its opponents. The circumstances of the case thus make David a type of the Messiah, and, in accordance with such a typical view, the authors of the New Testament refer passages of the Psalms to the person of Jesus. The meaning of *בִּי-קִינָאת בֵּיתְךָ אֶבְלָתִי* (ver. 10),<sup>2</sup> in reference to the event that has been related, is easy to be understood. It obviously expressed the ardent zeal of the Redeemer for the purification of religion and its sacred institutions, while it intimated also the opposition that malice would raise against him; and from this opposition arose the danger to the person of the Lord. (The reading *κατέφαγε* is plainly derived from the LXX.; in the text of John the reading *καταφάγεται* is doubtless the correct one.)

Ver. 18—21. The following words are remarkable, which John connects with the purification of the Temple. The Jews (through their representatives, the Pharisees) asked Jesus for a proof of his authority in a *σημεῖον*. (With respect to this, compare what has been remarked on John i. 19.) Such a question certainly might have been induced by the previous extraordinary proceedings, but it arose from unbelief; Jesus therefore, instead of giving them a sign, answers, "Break down this Temple, and I will build it up again in three days." (*Ἀποκρίνεσθαι* according to the Hebrew *עֲנֶה*. — *Ἐγείρειν* = *יִהְיֶה*.) The Jews referred these words to the Temple in the very vestibule of which they were standing; John, however, explains them as alluding to the Temple of the Lord's body, and refers them to the resurrection of Jesus. The view of the Jews,—that the allusion was to the external Temple,—was rejected by nearly all the ancient expositors, because, in that case, John must have erred in his interpretation of the obscure words of Jesus. But the supposition that Jesus intended merely to refer to his resurrection, was also encumbered by considerable difficulties.

It is true, the circumstance that in this passage it is said : *ἐγερῶ*

<sup>1</sup> Comp. the first supplementary note (which is worthy of perusal) in Tholuck's Comment. on the Epistle to the Romans.

<sup>2</sup> In the English, ver. 9.—TR.

αὐτόν, while in the New Testament the resurrection of Christ is always traced to the Father, was indeed the least of these difficulties ; for, chap. x. 18, Jesus says similarly : ἐξουσίαν ἔχω πάλιν λαβεῖν τὴν ζωήν. But, according to the above supposition, the mistake of the Jews remains inexplicable ; for if the Redeemer wished to be understood in his words, and uttered them δεικτικῶς,—pointing to his body,—it is inconceivable how the Jews could have thought of the Temple. Moreover, a reference to the death of Christ, expressed distinctly and so as to be generally understood, does not appear suitable in his discourses at this very early period, since it is towards the end of the Lord's public ministry that we first perceive in them the intimations of his violent end ; and a reference to the remote future, instead of the present, which the Jews request, does not seem appropriate. Especially, the challenge to the Jews to cause the dissolution of his body, is hardly consistent with the declarations of Christ in other places respecting his death. Meanwhile, the challenge to Judas, chap. xiii. 27, to accomplish his deed, is very similar. If, therefore, the reference of the words to the body ought to be regarded as the first and only one, then it would be necessary at least to say (with Luther, Tittman, &c.) that John has not correctly placed this occurrence in connexion with the discourses which here accompany it, since it belongs, as the synoptical authors assign it, to the end of Christ's ministry. This might appear favoured by the circumstance that, in the impeachment of Christ before the Sanhedrim, mention was made of this declaration ; for it appears more consistent that what he had spoken recently should be referred to, than what he had said years before. Yet the chronological accuracy of John speaks too strongly against this supposition.

These difficulties, associated with the one as with the other acceptance of the words, have induced some very distinguished investigators (Herder, Lücke, Bleek, &c.) to regard the Temple as *a designation of the whole Jewish worship*. The following would then result as the sense : “ Even if the whole order of the Jewish divine worship be discontinued, I will in a short time found a new one.”

But Tholuck, in opposition to this, observes, that the Jews, by whom Christ must have wished to be understood, could not possibly have discovered such a sentiment in the words ; this acceptance

being opposed by the expression *ναὸς οὗτος*, which indicates a reference to the *visible* Temple. Further, the *ἐγερῶ αὐτὸν* affords ground for question, since Jesus, in fact, did *not* rear again the old constitution of the Jewish divine worship. And, finally, according to the above acceptation of the words, the *ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις* can only be taken in the general signification “shortly,” “soon.” We have already said what is necessary concerning this subject in our remarks on Luke xiii. 22; and Tholuck expresses himself in like manner (in his Comment. on that passage), with reference to Hosea vi. 2, which has already been adduced as an argument for the assertion that *ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις* stands equivalent to *εὐθέως*, “shortly.” The phrase “two or three days” is thus substituted for the formula “in three days,” which latter can have no other sense than that which lies on the surface of the words. In Matt. xxvi. 61, Mark xiv. 58, *διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν* stands in a relation somewhat different; *i.e.*, it refers to a continuous activity:—building from this time “three days through without intermission.” In this state of things, the expedient to which resort has been had appears untenable, especially since, if it be adopted, it directly follows that what the Evangelist took to be the meaning must be pronounced incorrect.

Accordingly, it seems to me that the difficulty can only be relieved by the admission of a *double sense* in this passage.<sup>1</sup> In the *first place*, the passage is quite parallel with Matt. xii. 38, xvi. 4, and is a refusal of the request for a sign. Christ knew the insincerity of the heart from which the request proceeded, and therefore refused the miracle. This denial in the answer of Christ consists mainly in the antithesis between *λύσατε* and *ἐγερῶ*, which has been entirely overlooked. Jesus first demands of the Jews something impossible, and with that connects his miracle, which, by means of this connexion, becomes itself an impossibility. “First break *ye* down the Temple, *then* I will rebuild it!” Thus the imperative is doubtless to be taken as making a challenge,<sup>2</sup> and *ναὸς* in this con-

1 After a renewed consideration of all the arguments that favour the other interpretations, I am confirmed in this view. All that has been adduced by Tholuck and Kling (Stud. 1836, h. 1. s. 127, ff.) in support of the justness of the Evangelist's interpretation, and by Lücke and Bleek (loc. cit. s. 442, ff.) in favour of the construction of the passage, according to which it refers to the discontinuance of the national worship, appears to me to possess only relative truth. It is only the blending of the two that exhausts the extraordinarily pregnant declaration of the Lord.

2 Lücke is of opinion that it merely administers rebuke: “Go on profaning the Tem-

nexion is to be understood as referring to the visible Temple. That such a signification is to be received as the primary meaning of the words, appears to me irrefutably deducible from Matt. xxvi. 61, Mark xiv. 58. The witnesses before the High Priest referred to this language of Jesus. Of them, however, in the first place, it is said, that they did not agree in their accusations, although no particulars are given as to how far they differed; and secondly, they are both called *false* witnesses (Matt. xxvi. 60.) This cannot but be involved in their saying that Jesus had declared he would break down the Temple, and in three days would build it again, since he had said, "break *ye* it down, then will I build it up." By means of this apparently unimportant alteration, the sense of the whole phrase was inverted, and Christ appeared as a wanton despiser of the sanctuary, who would like to destroy it; while in his own words, when restored to their proper meaning, his activity is represented as repairing all destruction. But, deducting this distortion, there is nothing false in the words, and if no importance were to be attributed to it, how the witnesses could be called *false* is not to be conceived. (Although Mark [xiv. 58], in his review of this impeachment, does make the antithesis between *ναὸς χειροποιήτος* and *ἀχειροποιήτος*, Tholuck certainly is right when he maintains that this does not indicate a spiritual exposition; but still I cannot with him admit that they thought of a Temple coming down ready from heaven. The expression *διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν* indicates a continuous activity, and [John ii. 20] the antithesis to forty-six years points out a supposed great acceleration of the process of building. Thus they may have thought that Jesus would join the stones together without manual labour, by means of magic power. At any rate, their notions did not go beyond the outward Temple.) *In the second place*, however, the words of the Lord—as is frequently the case with brief, enigmatical expressions—contain, in addition to the allusion intended for the many, an inward meaning, which first occurred to the disciples after the resurrection.<sup>1</sup> According

ple!" which does not correspond with the connexion, and presupposes the correctness of the reference to the divine worship. De Wette quite incongruously takes the imperative as hypothetical. "If ye break down this Temple, then," and so forth. The imperative never thus occurs; in the passage adduced by him (Matt. xii. 33), it is to be understood simply as making a challenge.

<sup>1</sup> The objection of Kling, that this supposition appears incompatible with the divine simplicity of the Lord and of his words, is unfounded. The divine simplicity of Christ

to this, the Temple signified the body of the Lord, which the Jews caused to be nailed to the cross, but in which Jesus rose again on the third day. This σημεῖον also quite corresponded with the sign of Jonah; for, like this latter, it was invisible, it was imparted only to faith, and it corrected the sins of those who then believed, while those Jews who asked for signs, desired only an exciting feast for the eyes. (Comp. the Comm. on Matt. xii. 40.)

As regards the forty-six years mentioned, John ii. 20, in which the Temple was built; the reckoning refers to the rebuilding of the Temple after the exile. Herod began it in the eighteenth year of his reign (Joseph. Arch. xv. 11), but it was not finished till a few years before the destruction of the city. Probably the building was often interrupted, and when these words were spoken, a large principal edifice was just completed, forty-six years after the beginning of the embellishment.

Ver. 22. John's observation is remarkable, that after the resurrection (with regard to ἐγείρεσθαι ἐκ νεκρῶν comp. the Comm. on Matt. xxii. 29) the apostles believed not only this declaration of Jesus (in its deeper sense) but also the *Scripture*. The hypothesis of Dr Paulus, who by γραφή understands some small composition which gave an account of the occurrence just reported, does not deserve a serious refutation. Lücke very justly appeals to John xx. 9, for a proof that the Old Testament is intended. It is true, direct prophecies respecting the resurrection of Christ are not contained in the Old Testament, except in Ps. xvi. 10; but according to Luke xxiv. 26, 27; Acts ii. 24, ff.; 1 Cor. xv. 4, it plainly appears that the apostles found typical prophecies of this fact in the Old Testament. The history of Jonah, and perhaps Hos. vi. 2, were probably the passages which they so understood. Moreover it is manifest that not *only* the prophecies in the Old Testament concerning the resurrection are here meant by the term

co-exists with a copiousness in ideas, which discovers itself in words of manifold reference. Why should we not acknowledge in Christ that which we observe in men of genius? The oneness of the sense in his declarations, I do not deny; I only maintain the multiplicity of their collateral references. Meyer's interpretation of this difficult passage is peculiar. He thinks that Christ said to the Jews, "kill me, and in three days I will rise again!" and said it in the firm belief that if it should come to pass that the Jews should kill him, God would reanimate him. In this case the passage is a prophecy in regard to the resurrection; that which did not then take place, was fulfilled subsequently. The view certainly commends itself; only it then remains unexplained how the Jews, upon the utterance of such words, could think of the stone Temple.



γραφῇ, but the sense of the words is to be taken thus, "through the fulfilment of the *individual* [prophecy], their faith in the divinity of the Scripture as a *whole* was confirmed."

### § 5. THE VISIT OF NICODEMUS.

(John ii. 23—iii. 21.)

There is only one more occurrence related in addition to what has just been considered, as having taken place during the residence of the Redeemer in Jerusalem, at the first feast of Passover, viz., the visit of Nicodemus.<sup>1</sup> That this visit would be of importance to the Evangelist only on account of the discourses which the Lord held upon this occasion is self-evident; these discourses, however, stand in the most intimate connexion with the main design of the Gospel, and form, as it were, a commentary on John i. 17. They exhibit the efficacy of Christ in relation to the law:—whilst the latter only prunes away the impure excrescences of sin, Christ gives a new heart and a new mind, creates a new man born of God. Hence the Evangelist—in the words iii. 16—21, which he connects with the discourse of Christ—gives warning (primarily to the disciples of John) that he who, through unbelief, excludes himself from Jesus, the source of salvation, will assuredly trifle away his salvation.

Ver. 23—25. In these verses, which form the transition to what follows, John briefly informs us that the whole impression which Jesus produced during his presence in Jerusalem, was very favourable. Many believed in him on account of his miracles. But the divine power of the Saviour discerned the inner being of men (τὸ ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ = ὁ ἔσω ἄνθρωπος in the language of Paul, in opposition to the external, visible workings of the interior, which manifest themselves in word and deed), and on this account he did not take them into close connexion with himself. It would certainly be a mistake to believe that Jesus held himself at a distance from these persons, because he discerned *insincerity* in their assumed faith; on the contrary, we are merely to regard them as persons

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Scholl's Treatise on this section, in Klaiber's Stud. B. v. h. 1, and Knapp's interpretation in his scriptis varii argumenti, Halae, 1805.

easily affected by good, while in like manner also they were again easily determined by evil. The spurious open friends of Christ are contrasted, chap. iii. 1, ff., with a secret adherent. The former, therefore, were not so much malicious as superficial, shallow, wavering men; the sensible impression resulting from the *σημεῖα*, combined with the influence exercised upon them by the power of the truth, inclined them towards the Holy One; but so soon as the full energy of evil met them again, it overcame them. Accordingly the idea of the *πίστις* here is the ordinary one, only that in the passage before us the term designates the most general reception of divine influence into the mind, the lowest step of faith, which may be associated with great impurity.

Chap. iii. 1, 2. Nobler and more profound than those who have been described was Nicodemus; the Saviour at once led him more deeply into the truth, and sought to win him entirely for the kingdom of God. As to his name; it has been compared with the Hebrew *נִקְדֵּם*, or *נִקְדִּימֹן*, which must be formed according to the Greek mould. It may, however, be thought that *Νικόδημος* is = *Νικόλαος*, a translation of the Hebrew *בִּלְעָם*. (Comp. Rev. ii. 14, 15.) As to his person; Nicodemus was an *ἄρχων* (i. e. an officer of the Sanhedrim = *שַׂר*). Compare John vii. 50, ff.; xix. 38, ff.

The Talmudists mention a rich Sanhedrist, Nicodemus, who was properly called *Bonar*, and he is said to have lived about the time of Christ; but the identity of the same with the follower of Jesus cannot be ascertained with certainty. To us the importance of the man's *outward* characteristics is surpassed by that of his *inward* disposition of mind; a just apprehension of which is necessary in order truly to understand the circumstances that follow. The visit of Nicodemus at night is doubtless to be regarded as the consequence of the fear of man; that this was his temptation is distinctly shewn by a comparison of John xix. 38 with ver. 39; both Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus were timid followers of Jesus.<sup>1</sup> However, this timidity of his was no positive transgression of law (on which account Jesus does not rebuke it, and still less does John in the

<sup>1</sup> It might indeed be said that because it is stated *only* of Joseph, that he was afraid of the Jews, another cause is to be supposed in the case of Nicodemus. But what is added, chap. xix. 39, has not so much the appearance of being different from the statement in ver. 38, as that of being designed to render the latter more determinate.

words, iii. 19, ff), but only an expression of sinful nature generally, which thus manifested itself in the probably weak and anxious constitution of Nicodemus. Because he was on the whole turned towards the light, the Lord showed him the way in which we may become free, not merely from a single manifestation of sin, but from the entire sinful nature of the old man together with all its manifestations. Susceptible of that which was holy, he had apprehended its existence in the person of Jesus ; and, in like manner, the *σημεῖα* of Jesus indicated to him that Jesus was one sent by God. The miracles thus accomplished for him their own proper end—viz., they proved Jesus to be a messenger of God. Whether he regarded Christ as the Messiah cannot be determined from the words *ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ἐλήλυθας*, since every prophet who had the gift of miracles as the proof of his office, was looked upon as sent from God. If, however, he did see the Messiah in Jesus, he certainly did not perceive in him the divine nature, for with such a perception, the whole general expression *ἐὰν μὴ ᾗ ὁ Θεὸς μετ' αὐτοῦ*—which may also be said respecting the relation of every pious person to God—would not be at all suitable.

We conceive of Nicodemus, therefore, at the best as occupying a point of view purely legal, as being a serious man, and one of sincere mind, who, on account of the miracles, recognised something of the higher kind in Jesus, but did not of himself rightly know what opinion to pronounce respecting him. In order, however, to gain sure information on the subject of his inquiry, he came to Jesus in such a manner as not to expose himself to the Jews, but so that in the stillness of night he might enjoy uninterrupted conversation ; and Jesus now opened to his mind a new spiritual world.

Ver. 3—5. The address of Nicodemus is evidently reported in an abbreviated form, for it wants the very question to which the answer of the Lord refers. It doubtless related to the kingdom of God, which was at that time so ardently longed for by the Jews, and to which he, as an Abrahamite, rightly deemed himself called. The admonition of Jesus, that in order to enter this kingdom, it is necessary *γεννηθῆναι ἄνωθεν*, is then perfectly suitable. This phrase—as will be shewn immediately—could not be in itself entirely unknown, and therefore incomprehensible to the learned Jew ; although, *in reference to his own person*, it must have been obscure to him. Hence the question in ver. 4, which—as Tholuck justly remarks—

is only to be understood thus, "That expression surely cannot be taken in its literal sense, for how shall I, in my circumstances, apply it to myself?"<sup>1</sup> (Used in reference to a Gentile it would have been perfectly intelligible to him.) Now, in the first place, as respects the meaning of the expression βασιλεια τοῦ Θεοῦ in the language of John—it does not essentially differ from what is usual in the other writings of the New Testament;<sup>2</sup> only that in John's Gospel the ideal aspect of the kingdom of God prevails, whilst in the Revelation the external aspect is predominant. Hence, unless circumstances—such, for example, as the adherence in this instance of Nicodemus to Jewish views—led John to decide upon a different course, he used, instead of ἰδεῖν or εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασ. τ. Θ., the more spiritual phrase ἔχειν ζωὴν αἰώνιον (comp. iii. 15, 16.) The reason of this is found (comp. the Introduction, § 2, 3) partly in the general peculiarity of John, but especially in the *design* of his Gospel. The object that he kept in view while writing was a spiritual bias of mind, which dreaded nothing so much as what savoured of materialism; and he aimed at this its partiality for the ideal in order to gain it completely over to the side of the truth of Christianity,—well knowing that the Spirit, when the subjects of this bias yielded themselves to his dominion, would instruct them concerning the true relation of spirit and matter, in the just combination of which the true *realism* consists, this being equally at a distance from idealism and materialism. Where this regard to the spiritual bias was absent—as in the Revelation—there the Evangelist strongly declared the necessity that the inward should emerge from its inwardness and come forth in substantial presence. As therefore it was necessary

<sup>1</sup> De Wette supposes Nicodemus to have understood the words γεννηθῆναι ἄνωθεν as signifying corporeal birth, in order that he may then be able to observe, "Such obdurate ignorance in a Jewish teacher of the law is strange, and, indeed, improbable; and since it corresponds with a prevailing type of dialogues reported by John, it may be placed to the account of the narrator's representation;" (!!) as if the sequel did not speak but too decidedly for the justness of John's description! The obduracy of the Jews induced them altogether to despise Christ and his salvation; and is it improbable that this manifested itself in the life-time of the Redeemer? Or do not the synoptical Evangelists represent them as equally obdurate? Moreover, in relation to Nicodemus, the difficulty that leads de Wette to suppositions so inadmissible, and so destructive of the divine authority of the Evangelist, is one purely self-created.

<sup>2</sup> Compare the development of the idea in the Comm. on Matt. iii. 2; and also Tholuck in his Comm. on the Sermon on the Mount, Matt. v. 3.

that the Word should become flesh, so must the kingdom of Spirit at some time predominate in external manifestation.

The only thing, then, remaining for explanation is the expression *γεννηθῆναι ἄνωθεν*, instead of which we have in ver. 5 the words, *γεννηθῆναι ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος*. (*Ἀνωθεν* is to be taken in the signification of *δεύτερον* [ver. 4], *πάλιν*—as *παλιγγενεσία* [Tit. iii. 5] also shews—and not as meaning “from above.”<sup>1</sup>) The Rabbins use this term in reference to proselytes, whom they call “a new creature,” *בְּרִית חֲדָשָׁה*. But this designation of proselytes, according to the express interpretations of Rabbins, refers only to their altered *external* relations.

Nicodemus might therefore well ask,—how can such a term apply to *me* (and *all* Jews, ver. 7, *δεῖ ὑμᾶς γεννηθῆναι ἄνωθεν*)? We are Abraham’s seed, and to it belongs the promise! This leads the Redeemer to represent the nature of this new birth not as external, but as internal and spiritual.<sup>2</sup>) Some difficulty, however, is occasioned by the circumstance, that the *γέννησις* is traced not only to the *πνεῦμα*, but also to the *ὕδωρ*, whilst immediately afterwards (ver. 6 and 8) *πνεῦμα* only is mentioned. The ordinary interpretations of this difficult passage afford very little satisfaction. Grotius takes it as *ἐν δια δυνoῖν*, “to be born of Spirit, which like water purifies.” But this interpretation is founded upon the false opinion, that here the discourse refers only to a moral purification. This was just the view of Nicodemus, to which, however, Christ opposed the creation of a new, higher being. Teller explains it by *ὕδωρ πνευματικόν*, and understands it as meaning the reception of the doctrine of the Gospel. But the reception of a doctrine is an act of the existing man, which no one can call a new birth without the utmost degree of hyperbole. Nor am I any more prepared to admit, with Tholuck, that the

<sup>1</sup> In *ἀναγεννάω*, 1 Pet. i. 3, 23, the *ἀνά* has only the meaning of repetition.

<sup>2</sup> That the idea of regeneration was unintelligible to Nicodemus is seen, if the expression be taken in its specific, narrower sense—viz. as the communication of a higher life and consciousness, which can only be effected by the Holy Ghost, the requisite condition to the outpouring of which upon mankind was supplied by the glorification of Christ (John vii. 39.) In this narrower sense, no Old Testament saint could speak of regeneration, although, indeed, important transformations (which might be called regeneration in the wider sense, and which, by the impartation of new names, were announced as types of regeneration) did occur in some individuals; as, for example, in the case of Abram and Jacob, who were therefore called Abraham and Israel. (Comp. the remarks Matt. xi. 11.)

mention of water was only intended to assist Nicodemus in understanding the phrase, and to indicate its reference to baptism. The reference of the expression to baptism<sup>1</sup> (especially according to Tit. iii. 5) certainly is clear; the only question is, how this is to be taken; for the view of Knapp,<sup>2</sup> that baptism is to be understood as *καθαρισμός*, is plainly unsatisfactory, although, at the same time, he apprehends the idea of purification more profoundly than Grotius. Lücke follows Knapp in the acceptance of *ῥῥῥῥ*. In my opinion, the true meaning of the passage is best supplied by the following verse.

Ver. 6. Here, in order to demolish the pride of Nicodemus in his corporeal extraction from Abraham, the *σάρξ*, as generating, is placed in contrast with the *πνεῦμα*, as also generating, and the words of the Lord express the simple, easily intelligible sentiment, that what is begotten carries within itself the nature of that which begat it. Still it is plain that here the idea of generation is apprehended profoundly, as the communication of being to another; but no one can impart anything which is not contained in his own nature, and accordingly out of the *σάρξ*, as the antithesis to *πνεῦμα*, nothing *πνευματικόν* can go forth. Further, however (comp. the remarks on John i. 14), *σάρξ* is not to be interchanged with *σῶμα*, or with the dead substance of the *σῶμα*, i. e. the *κρέας*; but it is to be taken in combination with *ψυχή*, in which combination alone procreation is within its power. The contrast to *πνεῦμα* is the natural, sensuous life placed in the power of the perishableness and sin of the *κόσμος*, whilst *πνεῦμα* points out the nature of the higher imperishable life.<sup>3</sup> Hence the expression *ἐκ πνεύματος πνεῦμα* plainly means "that which is imperishable can only have its origin from the fountain itself of imperishable life."

<sup>1</sup> As John vi. is a commentary, or, if it be preferred, a prophetic lesson, on the words of the institution which contain the mystery of the *supper*, so is John iii. upon the baptismal formula which contains the mystery of *baptism*.

<sup>2</sup> See the discussion of this subject in his *Scriptis var. arg.*, p. 199, sqq.

<sup>3</sup> Clemens Alex. says: *ἰσχύς τοῦ λόγου τὸ πνεῦμα, ὡς ἄμα σαρκός*. In other words, the creative element in regeneration is the divine Being itself operating through the Logos (comp. John i. 13, *ἐκ Θεοῦ ἐγεννήθησαν*), so that we may say, the new birth comes to pass *from* God, *through* the Logos, *in* the Spirit. The Letter to Diognetus (cap. 11) describes regeneration as a self-reproduction of the Logos: *ὁ λόγος πάντοτε νῖος ἐν ἀγίῳ καρδίᾳ γεννώμενος*. The Logos reproduces himself in each soul, as the spark elicits the flame in a kindling substance. According to James i. 15, the development in evil is a kind of new birth, the end of which, however, is death.

Thus understood the *ἐκ* has its meaning precisely defined, and because the same preposition is connected, ver. 5, with *ὑδωρ*, this must also have its discoverable relation to the *γέννησις*. The two parallels, Tit. iii. 5; 1 Pet. i. 23, facilitate the interpretation here. In the latter, the *λόγος ζωῶν* (= *πνεῦμα*) is placed as an *ἀφθαρτή*, in opposition to the *σπορά φθαρτή*, and in the sequel, ver. 24, *σάρξ* is described as the *φθαρτόν*.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly the comparison of regeneration with the rise of a new being here stands forth in the most distinct manner. But Tit. iii. 5 is the only passage in the New Testament in which, so closely connected with the operation of the Spirit (*ἀνακαίνωσις πνεύματος*), mention is made of *water* (*λουτρὸν παλιγγενεσίας*), and that with evident reference to baptism; although in Ephes. v. 26, *λουτρὸν τοῦ ὕδατος ἐν ῥήματι*, the *ῥῆμα* also unquestionably signifies the operation of the *πνεῦμα*. (The remarkable passage 1 John v. 6, 8 [comp. John xix. 34], requires a special consideration by itself.) Now if Gen. i. 2 be adduced as a description of the process of creation, where the Spirit is represented as moving upon the water, an interpretation is suggested for the passage as follows. The ideas of birth and of creation are closely related (on which account also the regenerated person is called *καὶνὴ κτίσις*, 2 Cor. v. 17); as in the creation the water appears as the material that is moulded, and the Spirit as he who exerts the plastic power, so also in the *γεννηθῆναι ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος*, the Spirit is the creative principle of the regeneration, while the *ὑδωρ* is the feminine principle of the same,<sup>2</sup> the element of the soul purified in sincere repentance, as it were the mother of the new man. Accordingly without changing the idea, it might have been said: *ἐκ ψυχῆς καὶ πνεύματος*. The *ἐξ ὕδατος* simply indicates that it is not the soul as such, but the *penitent* soul, in which regeneration can be the result.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Also James i. 18, the *λόγος ἀληθείας* appears as the principle, so to speak, impregnating the soul with higher power.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. in Meyer's *Blätt. für höh. Wahrh.* th. ii. s. 76, ff., the treatise on some significations of the word *water* in the Holy Scriptures.

<sup>3</sup> In many passages of Holy Scripture, regeneration is compared to creation, *e. g.* in Rom. iv. 17; 2 Cor. iv. 6; Ephes. ii. 10. Many have derived a just insight into this passage from experience. Thus sings a Christian poet:—

"From nothing, Lord, thou mad'st the world, so let me nothing be,  
And thence a something after thine own image form!  
By nature I am like the waste and gloomy earth—  
Oh that my eyes and heart with tears would overflow;  
And then might thy Good Spirit these sad waters hov'ring o'er,  
Reanimate my lifeless heart with light and strength!"

In the interpretation of this important passage, considerable aid may be derived from the language of Paul, 1 Cor. x. 2 : πάντες εἰς τὸν Μωϋσῆν ἐβαπτίσαντο ἐν τῇ νεφέλῃ καὶ ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ. The *cloud* here—as the column of cloud and fire, the symbol of the divine presence—designates the Spirit, while the *sea* designates the water. The passage through the Red Sea is to the apostle an act of birth, a passage out of a defective condition into one nearer to perfection ; the death of the old, the birth of the new. To every new formation, however, belong two powers, the creative energy, and the substratum on which it operates. The same is involved in the parallel of the deluge with baptism, 1 Pet. iii. 20, 21. (Comp. Rom. vi. 4 ; 1 Cor. xii. 13 ; Col. ii. 12.) Hence the reference to baptism here is just, though it is to be understood as alluding not to the *sacrament*, but to the *idea* of baptism (comp. the remarks on John vi. 51) ; and this is a symbolical mode of expressing the inward occurrence of penitence in the soul,<sup>1</sup> which, in its necessary connexion with faith, forms the negative requisite to regeneration,—susceptibility of the operation of the Spirit. Purification is thus only an effect of regeneration ; the *essence* of the latter is a mysterious union of the powers of the world to come with the soul, which, in its own nature, possesses the capacity of being purified by the divine φῶς, just as much as that of being obscured by the σκότος which rules in the κόσμος, according to the inclination of the free will towards the one or the other element. It is upon the surrender of man to the world of light and its powers that he first arrives at true being and consciousness ; he becomes υἱὸς or ἄνθρωπος Θεοῦ (John i. 13 ; 1 Tim. vi. 11.) God is the absolute πνεῦμα (John iv. 24), and the γεννητοὶ πνεύματος are = γεννητοὶ ἐκ Θεοῦ (Matt. xi. 11 ; John i. 13.) Now the New Testament unfolds this higher degree of life ; whereas in the Old Testament nothing more than the susceptibility is awakened. Accordingly the prophets promise a new heart (Jerem. xxxi. 33 ; Ezek. xviii. 31 ; xxxvi. 26) at the coming of the Messiah, and the pious of the Old Testament may be regarded at the most as persons who, through a

*Tears* are the analogous visible expression of the soul dissolving in the water of baptism, over which the regenerating Spirit of God moves ; and the regeneration is a spiritual process of creation, which is perfected in degrees similar to those in which the Genesis, the outward physical creation, was developed.

1 Comp. in the Old Testament such passages as Ezek. xxxvi. 25 ; Zech. xiii. 1. The baptism of Jesus itself forms a sublime analogy to this.



powerful change in their life, often marked by a new name, *typified* the regeneration. But this regeneration itself remains a pure prerogative of the New Testament. (Comp. the Comm. on Matt. xi. 11.) Yet its essence cannot be regarded as consisting in man's reception of a tendency that opposes his nature, as though by some means John should become a Peter, and Melancthon a Luther; in that case God, who also created the natural man, would contradict himself. On the contrary, regeneration is a *purifying and invigoration of the natural man*, through the impartation of a totally new principle of life, which becomes united to the divinely-related element still subsisting in man after the fall.

Ver. 7, 8. That such a change is possible now awakens the astonishment of Nicodemus. The Redeemer assists him by a simile drawn from nature. We are acquainted with the effects of the wind, but the secret causes of its rise, and of the course that it takes, we know not. (That *πνεῦμα* here is to be referred to the natural phenomenon of wind, and not to the Spirit, is rendered decidedly certain by the comparison, and by the expression *φωνῇ αὐτοῦ*.) In like manner the powers of the invisible world act mysteriously; he who does not experience their effects, believes not their power.

Ver. 9, 10. Up to this point it cannot be said that Nicodemus betrayed in his conversation with Christ either arrogance or unbelief; but that these did lie at the bottom of his heart, is shewn by the following answer and the words in which Jesus replies. The words themselves, *πῶς δύναται ταῦτα γενέσθαι*, *might* proceed from a believing though inquisitive mind (comp. Luke i. 34, where Mary utters the same expression); but the reprimand of Jesus does not permit this supposition. The reference to the function of Nicodemus as a teacher, on the one hand, serves to humble him, and on the other, represents the person of Jesus as the Teacher of teachers, the possessor of the highest knowledge; that of the relations of the spiritual world. It might be asked, how could the Redeemer suppose a knowledge of regeneration even in a Master in Israel? Doubtless on account of the analogy involved in the relation of the heathen to the Old Testament economy, together with the intimations in the Old Testament (Ezek. xxxvi. 25; Zech. xiii. 1), which indicated to the Israelites the necessity of a similar change of heart in order to be able to enter the kingdom of God. But the more appropriate remark is, that the *καὶ ταῦτα οὐ γινώσκεις* is not

to be translated, "And thou knowest not this?" but, "And thou seest not into this?" Thus regeneration remains, even according to the words of Christ, something new, and the sense is, "Thou understandest not the intimations of the Old Testament; the law therefore has not fulfilled its design in thee, no true repentance is awakened in thee; otherwise the need of a totally new birth would declare itself in living utterance within thee." Meanwhile, since our Lord afterwards proclaims redemption to him (ver. 14, ff.), with regard to the condition of Nicodemus, we may judge that he had within him the want of redemption, but, on account of his Jewish prejudices, had not been able to arrive at the clear consciousness of it; this consciousness the discourse of Jesus is intended to awaken.

Ver. 11, 12. This lofty character of Christ is expressed still more distinctly in the following words. In them Jesus ascribes to himself the immediate knowledge of things in the spiritual world. (*Ὁ οἶδαμεν, ὃ ἐώρακαμεν* primarily indicates the experience of the senses, which is here intended to represent the *immediate* knowledge of invisible things in contrast with a knowledge gained by abstraction and reflection.) The guilt of ignorance is attributed merely to the unbelief of men.

(The *οὐ λαμβάνειν* [compare i. 5, 11, 12] is to be understood as meaning the reception of the *reality*, not that of mere conceptions. The powers of the Spirit alone could awaken new life within; it could not be accomplished by altered conceptions or modified ideas.) On account of this unbelief, the Lord refuses to impart any deeper instruction concerning the *πῶς* of regeneration, which was to be sought in the ultimate principles of the spiritual world. He adheres to the *fact*, which is an *ἐπὶ γαίῳ*, so far as it takes place in men who dwell on the earth. (It is indeed no *γῆινον*,<sup>2</sup> since powers from on high produce it.) The remainder of the discourse now turns from Nicodemus to the others present,—probably his companions.

Ver. 13. The connexion of this verse with the preceding is no other than this: "And yet even the Son of Man, who descended

1. The article *ὁ διδάσκαλος* is to be taken thus: the great Teacher whom the people think thee, and whom thou deemest thyself to be.

2. Bengel makes use of the expression: the regeneration is *ex coelo*, non quidem in coelo, est illa in margine coeli.

from heaven, is he from whom alone a disclosure can be derived concerning the ἐπίγεια and ἐπουράνια." The passage is quite parallel with Matt. xi. 27. (Compare the exposition of the latter.) The perfect ἀναβέβηκε is to be taken as the ἑώρακε πώποτε, i. 18. It is the absolute denial of the ἀναβαίνειν εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν :—"neither *has* any one ever gone, nor *can* any one go, into heaven." (According to the connexion, the idea of going to heaven involves the knowledge of the heavenly things which would result therefrom.) The creature cannot, by his own power, penetrate into the eternal world. Such a Titanian enterprise would be either folly or crime. But eternal love itself has indeed *stooped*, and in itself discloses to the humble all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. (Col. ii. 3.) The reference of the words to the ascension, or, indeed, as the Socinians say, to the corporeal transport of Christ into heaven (raptus Christi in coelum), and such like interpretations, are of course to be altogether rejected. In order, however, not to produce by the words καταβὰς ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, the idea of a removal from heaven, ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ is added. (Just in like manner vi. 38 compared with ver. 46.) This appendix, understood as the imperfect, would present an intolerable pleonasm. Lücke and Tholuck justly remark that the coming of the Son does not annul his existence in heaven, as if he were dependant on locality, but that even at his incarnation he ceased not to be with the Father in eternal presence. (Concerning υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, compare the Comm. on Luke i. 35.)

Ver. 14, 15. The connexion of this important verse (ver. 14)<sup>1</sup> with the preceding, is simply this: "Ye accept not my testimony, and yet ye can obtain the truth from no one else; know, however, that not merely the *word* of the Son of Man is presented to faith (not to *preliminary* knowledge), but his whole *appearance*, and especially his deepest humiliation; the Son of Man himself is the object of faith presented to all by God, therefore you must yield faith to me." The words thus contain a strengthened exhortation to faith, since life depends upon it. According to this connexion, it surely must be in the highest degree improbable that—as Lücke and Tholuck think—there is in this verse an application of the term ἐπουράνιον to Christ; for just before this (ver. 12) the Lord had

<sup>1</sup> Compare the Treatise on this passage by Jakobi in the Stud. 1835, b. i. s. 1 ff.; likewise De Wette's remarks, ibid 1834, h. 4.

*altogether refused* to communicate things purely heavenly. And moreover, how could the crucifixion of Christ, which took place on earth, and belonged entirely to earth, be called an *ἐπουράνιον*, when regeneration is called an *ἐπίγειον*? Besides which, the death of the Redeemer, although immediately connected with the forgiveness of sins, was not so closely connected with the new birth. Hence it is more natural to suppose that the reference to the *ἐπουράνιον* is here entirely dropped, so that ver. 14 is connected with that which precedes, simply in the following manner: "the Son of Man alone is come from heaven and is in heaven, therefore he alone must be believed in; to which end he is set up for the contemplation of all, as Moses set up the Serpent." This at any rate appears simpler than to say, with Tholuck, that the crucifixion is called an *ἐπουράνιον*, in so far as it rested upon a decree viewed as made in heaven.

We now proceed to the contents of the passage itself. It belongs to those few discourses of Jesus in which he speaks as it were prophetically of his expiatory death. (Comp. the Comm. on Matt. xx. 28.) Hence it partakes of the general character of these passages, containing intimations rather than details. (See the reasons thereof in the other passages.) The Redeemer takes the occurrence related Numb. xi. 8, 9 typically (a decided testimony, from the mouth of the Redeemer himself, to the allowableness of typical interpretations), and compares the believing gaze of sick people upon the uplifted brazen Serpent and their corporeal recovery, to the gaining of eternal life through the believing look of the sinful world upon the uplifted Son of Man. Hence the suspended Serpent<sup>1</sup> was a *σύμβολον σωτηρίας* (Wisd. Sol. xvi. 4). Lücke thinks that, according to the view of Jesus, it was an *undesigned* symbol of the idea of expiation. But whence this is to be deduced does not appear; the text contains nothing to favour the opinion. On the contrary, in the express divine appointment of this particular remedy, we must presuppose the *decided purpose* that it should be a type of the coming redemption through the Crucified One, even although Moses may not have understood the deeper signification of the Serpent; because otherwise it would be an accidental coincidence, which in the

<sup>1</sup> The Serpent was for a very long time preserved among the people, and divine honour was paid to it under the name of Nechushtan. King Hezekiah on this account caused it to be destroyed (2 Kings xviii. 4.) Comp. Menken über die eberne Schlange. Bremen. 1820. Also Kerne's Treatise in Bengel's Theol. Archiv. Band i.

sublime arrangements of God cannot be supposed. This is confirmed by the *δεῖ*, in which, according to Lücke's more just remark, the higher ethical necessity is intimated. With regard to the point of comparison between Christ and the uplifted Serpent, it is a question whether this consists merely in the *elevation*, or also in the *form* of the Serpent. According to Rom. viii. 3, it appears to me most probable that both are to be combined. It is there said that God sent his Son *ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας*.

The Serpent is thus to be regarded as a symbol of the sinful nature to which the Saviour in his incarnation assumed resemblance. Accordingly, the remedy appeared in the form of that which was to be healed. The *Serpent's bite*—an imitation of the wounding of Adam through the seduction of the old Serpent, *i. e.* the Devil—was healed by a look upon a *serpent-form*, and faith in one who died conquers *death*. The word of divine truth loves such apparent contradictions, in order that, by foolish preaching, the wisdom of the world may be put to shame (1 Cor. i. 20). Now, although John gives in the following verses (iii. 16, ff.) the simplest interpretation of the *ὑψωθῆναι δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τ. ἀ.*,—referring it to the sacrificial death of Jesus,—yet attempts have been made partly to modify this interpretation (Dr Paulus explains *ἔδωκε*, ver. 16, by the words “caused to be born”), and partly to give to the term *ὑψοῦν* itself another meaning, in order to remove the abhorred idea of sacrifice. In the passage Numb. xxi. 8, 9, the word does not occur; there it is said, *וַיִּשָּׂא עַל-יָדָיו*, LXX. *θεὸς ἐπὶ σημείου*, “set up for a sign.” But since that which is set up to be gazed at is usually elevated, the *ὑψωθῆναι* might well be used with respect to it. The Hellenists, however, employ this verb also for *הַשְׁבִּיחַ* in the signification “to exalt, to extol.” (Luke i. 52, x. 15; Matt. xi. 23, xxiii. 12.) Hence Dr Paulus derives the rendering “the Son of Man must be exalted in light and glory, and the recognition of his exaltation is eternally salutary.” But the passages viii. 28, xii. 32, ff., clearly shew that the Jews understood the term *ὑψωθῆναι* otherwise, and referred it to *death*. In the latter passages not only does John again supply the distinct interpretation that *ὑψωθῆναι* means the crucifixion, but the same thing also presents itself in the words of the Jews. Probably therefore the Lord used the Aramaic term *וַהֲרִיף*; Esra vi. 11, or *תָּלָה*, Esth. vii. 9, 10, ix. 13, for

the customary phrase "to hang up a criminal on a post, to crucify," as also the LXX., Esth. vii. 9, apply σταυρώ. Then arises the only consistent sense, that the crucified Messiah would become such a σημεῖον (σημ.) to the whole believing world (πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων.)

Here we find for the first time the expression so common in the language of John, ζῶν αἰώνιος in antithesis with ἀπώλεια.<sup>1</sup> Its meaning appears in connexion with the general explanation of ζῶν given in the remarks on i. 4. We there saw by this that John understands absolute Being, as the source of all that is created. Now, according to a deeply spiritual idea, the Scripture in general ascribes true being to the creature only in connexion with the origin of that being; where sin dissolves that connexion, there θάνατος steps in (Gen. iii. 3), and hence he who lives in a state of sin is called νεκρός. Accordingly ἀπώλεια is to be taken as the antithesis to ζῶν, and equal to θάνατος. By this, an annihilation of substance is not intended; but the idea of true life (that of the Spirit) requires consciousness, and not that of the senses merely, but a spiritual consciousness. This is wanting where there is a deprivation of spiritual life generally, and the ἄνθρωπος ψυχικός or σαρκικός only vegetates; such a condition, therefore, is called absence of ζῶν, or death. Now, the design of the advent of the Logos in flesh is just this: out of the fountain of life to pour life again into dead humanity,—to restore the connexion that has been destroyed. From the αὐτοζῶν a derived πηγὴ τῆς ζωῆς was to be drawn for every soul; and in this fountain the soul has not merely a temporal life, but, because connected with the absolute Being, it has eternal life. It is self-evident that with this, happiness, peace, and joy are given; but still none of these terms can be substituted for ζῶν αἰώνιος itself, any more than in the case of חַיִּים, because they are only *consequences* of life, not the life itself. Accordingly, the intimate union of the divine and the human is not confined to the person of our Lord; that which began in him is gradually extended, and, as the Logos in Christ came

1 It is remarkable how the most profound men of different times, and of various states of cultivation, have agreed with the Holy Scriptures in the choice of many significant expressions for the spiritual life. Thus Plutarch writes: οἶμαι δὲ καὶ τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς, ἢν ὁ Θεὸς ἐληχεν, εὐδαιμον εἶναι τὸ τῇ γνώσει μὴ προαπολιπεῖν τὰ γεγόμενα (de Isid. et Osir. c. i.) And Philo: ζῶν μὲν αἰώνιος ἢ πρὸς τὸ ἐν καταφυγῇ, θάνατος δ' ὁ ἀπὸ τούτου δρασμός (de profugis. edit. Pfeiff. vol. iv. 358.) In the same work, p. 266, we also find the kindred expression ζῶν αἰδίου, which does not occur in the New Testament.

forth a man, so *through* him men appear in the divine nature (2 Peter i. 4.) Without reunion to the fountain of life through faith, man remains in death. Sincere obedience to the law should not and cannot be substituted for it, this being destined merely to awaken the consciousness of estrangement from God, and to lead to the necessity of faith in Jesus (Rom. iii. 20.) Here the conversation of Christ with Nicodemus concludes. If it be further enquired what effect this produced upon Nicodemus, the history does not furnish any additional particulars; but that it did not vanish from him without making some impression is sufficiently shewn by John vii. 50, ff. xix. 39.

Ver. 16. The Evangelist<sup>1</sup> now blends with this discourse of the Lord an explanatory appendix, (such as we often find in the Gospel of John), in which he admonishes his readers not to pass by this gracious sign in unbelief. That the words which now follow are not those of Jesus is demonstrated by the fact, that the reference to Nicodemus is entirely dropped, and the thoughts are carried back to the Proœmium (i. 5, 10.) Moreover, the aorist (*ἡγάπησε*, and especially *ἔδωκε*) represents the expiation as completed; and finally, Jesus never applied to himself the term *μονογενής*. (Comp. also 1 John iv. 9, from which passage we see the genuineness of the verse as John's.) The *ἔδωκε* explains the previous *ὑψωθῆναι δεῖ*, as we have already remarked. John uses *ἔρχεσθαι εἰς τὸν κόσμον* (as chap. i. 9 shews) for the general idea "to be born and to work on earth." *Διδόναι* is equivalent to *παράδιδοναι*. (Comp. Rom. viii. 32 with Gal. i. 4, Luke xxii. 19.) Hence it can only be completed by the words *εἰς τὸν θάνατον*.

It is here remarkable that the work of reconciliation is traced to the divine *ἀγάπη*, which appears heightened by the antithesis to *κόσμος*, this expression involving not merely the idea of universality (as *πᾶς*, ver. 15), but also that of sinfulness, and therefore of unworthiness to be loved. The idea that the divine love is the source of reconciliation so exactly harmonizes with the constant *usus loquendi* of the New Testament, according to which not God but men appear as recon-

1 With respect to this and similar appendices in the Gospel of John, comp. the remarks of Tholuck in his Comm. on John s. 35, f., where it is proved that nothing can be inferred from these appendices derogatory to the historical character of the book. I agree with Kling (loc. cit. s. 138), in considering Lücke's hypothesis, that "in ver. 16 John has reported the words of Jesus in a freer manner, viz, mingling his own words with those of Christ," suspicious.

ciled through Christ (comp. 2 Cor. v. 19), that it must be regarded as intelligible, although it has recently been doubted whether an objective reconciliation of God can be meant in every instance. But the assertion of the doubtfulness of the latter point (with perfect correctness) in the doctrine of the Church, proceeds from the circumstance that in the New Testament, parallel with the above class of statements, another runs, according to which the state of man while unreconciled is the continuance of the wrath of God upon him (comp. the remarks on John iii. 36.) Hence the New Testament speaks of *wrath* as well as *love* in God towards the world;—love towards the divine idea which remains even in the sinful being, wrath towards the sin that is in him which God cannot but hate, as constituting the plague of his creatures, and destroying the harmony of the universe. Accordingly, reconciliation is to the creature the abolition of estrangement; and in like manner, in God it is the adjustment of wrath and favour, which are both to be regarded as in God; and it was necessary that this latter idea of adjustment should be apprehended and represented as the reconciliation of God himself.<sup>1</sup> However, this expression is better abstained from as suited only to the Old Testament point of view; while, instead of this, there remains the New Testament mode of representation, which places reconciliation only in the creature, and describes God as effecting it. (Comp. the excellent remarks by Meyer in the Blätt. f. höh. wahrh. ix. s. 109, ff. on Stier's essay in his Beiträgen zur biblischen Theologie.)

Ver. 17, 18. This mode of apprehending the offering of Christ

<sup>1</sup> Hence this mode of expression occasionally occurs in the Old Testament,—a circumstance which proves that it is to be considered not as positively false, but merely as a subordinate point of view. In the Old Testament, *e. g.*, the phrase יָרַח יְהוָה אֶזְרָאִי occurs, 2 Sam. xxi. 14, xxiv. 25. [The expression in 2 Sam. xxi. 14 is וַיִּרְאֶה יְהוָה אֶת אֶזְרָאִי. In 2 Sam. xxiv. 25 it is וַיִּרְאֶה יְהוָה אֶת אֶזְרָאִי.—Ta.] This literally signifies "God allowed himself to hear," but since it stands in connexion with the presentation of offerings, Luther could correctly translate "God was reconciled." The formula וַיִּרְאֶה יְהוָה אֶת אֶזְרָאִי, Ps. xlix. 8, Sept. ὁδοῦναι τῷ Θεῷ ἐξίλασμα is more definite. Nevertheless, ordinarily even in the Scriptures of the Old Testament the creature is described as the party reconciled, so that the offering is necessary for the sake of the creature. In the New Testament, however, God appears expressly as he who effects the reconciliation itself, which can be said of the Old Testament only so far as the offerings were brought, not according to the impulse of the persons who presented them, but at the command of God, and according to his appointment, he himself therefore in this way bringing about the reconciliation. (Comp. the particulars on this subject in the Comm. on Rom. iii. 25.)



for the world, as the highest proof of divine love, must have commended the Gospel very much to the immediate readers of John, whose bias was thoroughly anti-Jewish, and who, on this account, were scandalized at the notion that the Messiah, as a strict judge, should punish the world. The Evangelist therefore pursues the thought. He denies that the Son came into the world for the purpose of *κρίσις*; he came for the purpose of *σωτηρία*, which is obtained by means of *πίστις*. Faith is here again evidently to be taken in the real signification which, as we have already shewn, pervades the whole language of Scripture. It is the reception of the element of *φῶς* brought into the world by the Messiah. Hence it is also said of the believer, *οὐ κρίνεται*;—he has already accomplished the separation in himself, for, departing out of the *σκοτός* he has turned to the *φῶς*. (Comp. 1 Cor. vi. 2, xi. 31.) From what has already been remarked, we see that although John asserted that Christ did not come (immediately, positively) at his first advent for the purpose of judgment, nevertheless he by no means intended to deny that the *κρίσις* always negatively followed in his train.<sup>1</sup> As it manifests itself in the believer, while henceforth he is not condemned; so also in the unbeliever, since he is condemned already. For the *κρίσις* is the separation and the *φῶς* is the element that distinguishes and separates. On this account it is said in the parallel passage (xii. 47, 48) that the *word* of Christ judges every one who (hears it and) does not believe. The word is to be apprehended as *πνεῦμα* and *ζωή* (vi. 63), and consequently is equivalent to *φῶς*, which either gains the dominion over man and blesses him, or, being rejected, flees from him and condemns him. He who will not suffer its influence, consequently avoids it; but in that very act he shuns the beatifying power of the Light, and is excluded from its kingdom. Accordingly it is evident that faith in the name of the Only-begotten is the act of living in his element, the appropriation of his being. The remark, that here the general judgment of

1 The observation of De Wette (s. 49) on this subject, that "God, as the highest, happiest being, has nothing to do with the discord between good and evil, and consequently does not judge," is entirely void of sense. This height and happiness of his being, on the contrary, goes to prove that God is the Judge of all worlds, in order to which it is requisite that he should not belong to the discord. Although John says (ver. 22), "the Father judgeth no one, but [hath committed all judgment unto] the Son," this only involves the sentiment that while judgment is a manifestive activity of God, the Father always manifests himself in the Son.

the world is not spoken of, affords no aid whatever in ascertaining the sense of the passage; for during the life here below, and in the use of the remedy offered here, the *σωτηρία* or the *κρίσις* is effected, and the separation which will take place at the judgment of the world, will be merely the manifested and final issue of that which has long existed within.

Ver. 19—21. That the *κρίσις* consists in avoiding the element of the Light<sup>1</sup> and in the love of darkness (i. 5—10), John further shews by unveiling the moral causes of this strange phenomenon. The Light in its operation ought to be welcome to every one, but it discloses the secret depths of the soul, and this the hypocritical and impenitent man shuns.<sup>2</sup> In the expressions *ἔρχεσθαι* and *οὐκ ἔρχεσθαι*, activity on the part of man in the work of conversion is very suitably pointed out. The Light (the Spirit) exerts positive efficacy; the negative part, reception or rejection, belongs to man. (With respect to the criminative activity of the Spirit, as the inward light, comp. John xvi. 9. With the accusation of sin, the work of the Spirit *begins*, proceeding gradually to deeper operations.) Some difficulty, however, is occasioned in this passage by the circumstance that two classes of men appear to be distinguished; those of the one class hate the Light because it discloses *φαῦλα* in them, and those of the other class love the Light because it makes manifest good actions. (*Ἀλήθεια* forms the *principle* of the several manifestations; the *ἔργα ἀγαθά* are the *acts* proceeding from it. Compare the remarks on the truly Johannine formula, *ποιεῖν τὴν ἀλήθειαν*, 1 John i. 6.) It might therefore appear as if, according to the opinion of John, just and holy people alone and no sinners could come to the Light; a sentiment which contradicts not merely the doctrine of Scripture as a whole, but also the express declarations of the Evangelist. (Comp. 1 John ii. 1, 2.) On the contrary, the meaning is to be taken thus: Isolated bona opera do not fit men for coming to the Light; these, on the other

1 The interpretation of *φῶς* by means of the words "doctrina Christi," which even Knapp supports, is plainly a dilution of the thought (comp. Knappii, *Scr. var. argum.* p. 250, sqq.)

2 Seneca excellently observes: *Quare vitia sua nemo confitetur? Quia etiam nunc in illis est. Somnium narrare vigilantis est*, (epist. 45.) With this may be compared the words of Augustine (on the passage), *accusat Deus peccata tua, si et tu accusas, coniuugetis Deo. Oportet ut oderis in te opus tuum, et ames in te opus Dei. Cum autem inceperit tibi displicere quod fecisti, ibi incipiunt bona tua opera.*

hand, often have the very effect of withholding from the Light, since man builds upon them an *ιδίαδικαιοσύνη*;—but the fitness consists in the entire inward tone of truth and sincerity, with that which proceeds from it. This disposition is manifested when there is no attempt to exculpate self, but evil is called evil. Accordingly it is true, sincere penitence that leads to the Light, and this must take place just as much in him who, owing to circumstances, has not fallen into gross sins, as in him with whom such is the case.<sup>1</sup> Thus understood, the expression *ποιεῖν ἀλήθειαν* also gains its proper, profound signification, since it indicates the principle of life; and just in like manner, the words *ἐν Θεῷ ἔστιν εἰργασμένα* represent God, the source of truth, as the ground of all truth and sincerity in a creature, so far as they are manifested in him. (Hence *ἐν* retains its proper meaning; and the expression may be explained by *ἐν δυνάμει Θεοῦ*.)

## § 6. SECOND TESTIMONY OF THE BAPTIST CONCERNING JESUS.

(John iii. 22—36.)

The interview of Nicodemus with the Lord took place in Jerusalem, but the Evangelist now brings Jesus to Judæa, in the neighbourhood of the Baptist, where he was at that time teaching in the enjoyment of his liberty. That a second testimony from the Baptist is now adduced, in which no more is said of Christ than in the first, can hardly be maintained as conformable to the object in view, except on the supposition that the Evangelist had persons in his eye, to whom the Baptist's relation to the person of the Redeemer could scarcely be presented with sufficient distinctness. At the same time, ver. 24 renders it certain that the Evangelist presupposed the acquaintance of his readers with the fate of the Bap-

<sup>1</sup> If it be said that *ἔργα ἐν Θεῷ εἰργασμένα* may be even such acts of piety as Cornelius performed (Acts x.), which were accounted in him as means whereby he became pleasing to God; yet it must not be overlooked that this effect was not the result of the actions as such, but of the *disposition* from which they proceeded—a humble, unpretending spirit, sincere, ardent desire after God. So understood, this brings us again to what has already been mentioned; he only who longs to know himself, and who desires in true repentance to become free from sin, comes joyfully to the Light; for in him the Light discloses the inward divine work, that he wishes to be God's, which no man can do of himself.

tist. John, according to his custom, again appended to the words of the Baptist some remarks which relate to the general design of the Gospel.

Ver. 22—24. When Jesus left the city he bent his steps towards the Jordan, where he baptized; remaining, however, in the country of the Jews. (Concerning the baptism of Jesus, comp. the remarks on John iv. 2.) John also was baptizing in the neighbourhood, because the water there, being deep, afforded conveniences for immersion; and the proximity of the two messengers of God occasioned the following *ζητήσεις*. (*Διών* is otherwise not known; probably it is derived from *זַי*, which in the plural is used for fountain.) *Σαλήμ*, or, as some codices write it, *Σαλείμ* = *סֶלֶם*, was a name borne by several cities of Palestine. In the first place, the city of Melchizedek (Gen. xiv. 18), subsequently named Jerusalem, was so called; and, secondly, it is probable that Sichem also anciently had the same designation. But the Salem mentioned here is distinct from both these. (Comp. v. Raumer's *Palaestina*, 2nd edit. s. 159, note.)

Now, here arises the question, how the chronological data of John stand in relation to the statements in the synoptical Gospels. (Comp. the Comm. on Matt. iv. 12.) Luke (iii. 19, 20) introduces the notice concerning the imprisonment of the Baptist quite incidentally, because he had just been speaking of him; so that this is obviously not a date but a remark by way of anticipation. (Comp. the Com. on Matt. iii. 12, and on Matt. xiv. 1.) In Matt. iv. 22, indeed, the visit of Christ to Galilee, which appears to have been occasioned by the report of the Baptist's imprisonment, is annexed to the temptation of Christ, and just so Mark i. 14; but this circumstance does not involve any contradiction to the statements of John, unless this journey to Galilee be taken as parallel with that which is related i. 44, ii. 1. However, there is nothing, throughout the text, that renders it necessary to do this; it may be taken as simultaneous with that mentioned John iv. 3. If this be done, the account of Matthew and Mark only appears very much abbreviated. Both leave out all that occurred between the temptation and the imprisonment, viz., the first journey to Galilee at the marriage in Cana (John ii. 1, ff.), the journey to the Passover (John ii. 13, ff.), and lastly the journey to Jordan (John iii. 22.) Hence we need only suppose that while Jesus was dwelling near Jordan, John the Baptist was arrested, and that this occa-

sioned the journey to Galilee (John iv. 3), and then all exactly harmonizes; for Matt. xiv. 1, ff. is evidently the more precise narration of the particulars of the imprisonment, although introduced at a subsequent period when reference is made to the death of the Baptist; but how long he was in prison we know not. The only thing that can be said in opposition to this arrangement is, that still the omission on the part of Matthew and Mark appears very strange; but we need not consider the period thus passed over to be more than one week. The journey to Cana was merely a subordinate one; in Capernaum Jesus remained (according to ii. 12) but a few days, in Jerusalem only during the feast, and at the Jordan we need suppose only a short stay. Besides, the relation of the Baptist to Jesus implies that he would work with Jesus only a short time. His duty was completed after the baptism of Jesus, and after he had directed his disciples to Jesus; his imprisonment formed only the completion of his personal history. Matthew and Mark therefore might justly connect the imprisonment with the commencement of the ministry of Jesus in Galilee, concerning which Matthew knew nothing by personal observation, as he was called subsequently. Hence I quite agree with the ancient opinion, to which also Eusebius,<sup>1</sup> who relates it, was attached, viz., that Matthew and Mark give no account of what took place *before* the arrest of the Baptist; although indeed that Father is in error when he says that John mentioned *only* the occurrences *before* the same; for, on the contrary, the arrest of the Baptist must be placed shortly before the journey to Galilee, which was occasioned by it. So also in the last editions, Lücke and Tholuck. De Wette, on the other hand, without adducing his reasons, adheres to the opinion that Matt. iv. 12 is parallel with John i. 44, so that the contradiction is not removed; he merely avers that Jesus commenced his ministry John chap. ii., as in Matt. iv. 12, without entering further into the above representation. Yet at the same time he finds himself compelled, in commenting on iv. 1—6, to make the confession (s. 55), “here, if we insert the arrest of the Baptist, Matt. iv. 12 does indeed appear to be parallel,” but he adds peremptorily “it refers to an earlier period.”

<sup>1</sup> Euseb. H. E. iii. 24, edit. Strotli, p. 156. Οὐκοῦν ὁ μὲν Ἰωάννης τῇ τοῦ κατ' αὐτὸν εὐαγγελίου γραφῇ, τὰ μηδέπω τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ εἰς φυλακὴν βεβλημένου πρὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ πρὸς τὴν παραδίδωσιν. Οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ τρεῖς εὐαγγελισταὶ τα μετὰ τὴν εἰς τὸ ἔσσωπτήριον κάθειρξιν τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ μνημονεύουσιν.

Ver. 25, 26. The disciples of John now occasioned a dispute (the *ἐκ* indicates the origin) with a Jew. (The ordinary reading is *Ἰουδαίων*. Bentley conjectures *Ἰησοῦ* without any ground. The singular, however, individualizes more than the plural, and is certainly to be preferred.) The dispute related to baptism (*καθαρισμός* = *βάπτισμα*), which being performed only by John and Jesus upon Jews, must have excited surprise. The precise point of the controversy is not given; but the disciples of John must have felt their vanity wounded by the remarks of the Jew, while he probably spoke of the baptism of Jesus as more effectual than that of John; hence they hasten to their Master, and, as it were, complain to him of Jesus, that all are crowding to him. (The remark, *ὃ σὺ μεμαρτύρηκας*, is justly apprehended by Tholuck as an elevation of John above Jesus.<sup>1</sup>)

Ver. 27, 28. The humble Baptist, however, reminds his vain disciples of the contents of his testimony (comp. i. 15, 30), and refers that which was higher in Christ to the divine appointment, which had ordained to him a more elevated position. There might be a temptation to understand the general phrase in which the Baptist expresses this sentiment—*οὐ δύναται ἄνθρωπος κ. τ. λ.*—as meaning, “Man *may* not take anything to himself which is not given him from above, although he can.” It might then be thought that the Baptist, tempted by vanity, represented himself as the Messiah, and in that case he would have arrogated to himself something which had not been given to him. But the sentiment is undoubtedly to be taken thus: Even if man does assume anything to himself it can yield him no success, unless God wills his prosperity. Be the course of things therefore as it may, all is disposed from above, and without the will of God, *nothing* comes to pass.<sup>2</sup> (In the phrase *ἀλλ’ ὅτι ἀπεσταλμένος εἰμι*, two constructions are blended. The *ἀλλὰ* is to be explained from the antithesis to the

<sup>1</sup> Taking the testimony of John concerning Jesus as that of a superior concerning an inferior, and as it were reminding John of the signal advantage which Jesus had reaped from John's testimony.—Ta.

<sup>2</sup> The idea of the author appears to be this, that if the Baptist had spoken thus, “Man *may* not, *ought* not to assume anything to himself, &c.,” his phraseology would have been open to the construction that he himself was the Messiah, because his hearers might apply his words to Jesus as a kind of animadversion. But taking the *latter* rendering, given by Olshausen, nothing of the kind is indicated in the words of John; they on the contrary testify that as prosperity attended the work of Jesus, it might be presumed that God approved it.—Ta.

foregoing οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐγὼ ὁ Χριστός, and the sentence then runs : ἀλλ' ὁ ἀπεσταλμένος ἔμπροσθεν ἐκείνου. The *ὅτι*, however, is again connected with the *μαρτυρεῖτε*, and supposes the repetition of *ὅτι εἶπον*.)

Ver. 29, 30. The Baptist now represents the different relations of himself and Christ, under the familiar Old Testament figure of marriage. (Comp. the Comm. on Luke xvi. 16.) The Messiah himself is the Desire of humanity, and humanity represented by believers, as its noblest members, is called *νύμφη*. The two are entwined in the most intimate bond of love, which in its highest manifestation,—marriage,—appears in the incarnation and personal ministry of the Son of God on earth. The Baptist further asserts that he is the Bridegroom's man (comp. the remarks on Matt. ix. 15, where the term *ἰσὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος* is employed), who conducts the Bridegroom to the arms of the Bride, but remains without the bridal-chamber, (*i. e.*, enters not into the kingdom of God itself, comp. the remarks on Matt. xi. 11), and listens to the rejoicing of the Bridegroom.

Holy Scripture does not shun the use of such graphic representations, derived from sensual love,<sup>1</sup> in order to illustrate spiritual relations ; because they are intended for readers whose eyes are purified and enlightened, while to the impure, everything, even that which is purest, appears defiled. Such passages of the New Testament support the exposition of the Song of Solomon as referring to spiritual love, without which the book would not belong to the canon. (The formula *χαρὰ πεπλήρωται* occurs also xv. 11, xvi. 24, xvii. 13. The joy of Simeon was completed as he folded the child Jesus in his arms ; the joy of the Baptist was completed when he saw the bride in the arms of the Messiah,—*i. e.*, when he beheld the commencement of Messiah's spiritual work, which endowed humanity with higher spiritual powers.) The humble Baptist now willingly retired with his circle into the shade ; he knew that, according to the appointment of God, the Messiah would increase. This unassuming, child-like feature perfects the character of the Baptist ; a higher power, new life, surpassing the Old Testament, he did not possess ; but with entire humility he acknowledged his position, and attested the subordinate relation in which he stood to the plan of God.

<sup>1</sup> More profoundly apprehended, it must be said that spiritual love is the original, and all sensual love is only a troubled echo of the reality of the former.

Ver. 31, 32. The following words, as far as ver. 36, are evidently not the Baptist's, but those of the Evangelist, who is in the habit of joining his own words immediately to those which he reports;<sup>1</sup> for, in the first place, they are not at all suited to the point of view occupied by the Baptist and his adherents, since these persons evince the happy result of having received the words of Jesus, which had not yet taken place with the Baptist; the sentiments issue from the profound mind of John, and are completely clothed in his garb. In the second place, they also arise out of the connexion; for the latter verses refer not to the relation between Christ and the Baptist, but merely to that between the Redeemer and believers or unbelievers. The first verses (31, 32), however, do contain a further significant reference to the disciples of John, to whom it was intended that their Master should be shewn in his proper position with respect to the Redeemer. The Evangelist now, in the following verses, places the Baptist in contrast with Christ. John, although the greatest born of women (Matt. xi. 11), is nevertheless only an earthly sage, greatly enlightened by the Spirit of God. On the other hand, whilst the Baptist can only speak as his origin permits, Christ is purely from heaven (*ἄνωθεν* is explained by the immediately subsequent words, *ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*),—one who bears witness to mortals of heavenly things seen by him directly. (Comp. the remarks on iii. 11.) (The phrase: *ὁ ὢν ἐκ τῆς γῆς, ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἐστίν*, appears tautological; but Lücke justly observes that the former sentence is the subject, and the latter the predicate,—the former indicating the origin, the latter the occupation,—so that the meaning may be resolved thus: *ὁ ἐκ τῆς γῆς γήϊνος ἐστί*.) The expression *ἐκ τῆς γῆς λαλεῖ*, however, is peculiarly remarkable, and certainly appears too strong in application to a prophet who speaks under the impulse of the Holy Spirit.<sup>2</sup> The term *ἐπίγεια* (iii. 12), may be compared; but while this cannot be interchanged with *γήϊνα*, *ἐκ* and *ἐπί* appear by no means synonymous. The passage is best understood thus: even

1 On this subject comp. the apologetic remarks of Tholuck in his Comment. s. 36.

2 However, its strangeness does not authorize such an unsuitable expression as that of De Wette in his remarks on the passage: "the remarkable undervaluation of all, even of the Baptist, must be regarded as the excess either of *modesty* in the Baptist, or of the *apologetic* element (!) in the Evangelist." The first question is, whether excess can at all be supposed.



that which is divine in the discourse of John, he speaks from earth, —*i. e.*, in an earthly, veiled form,—whilst Christ presents that which is heavenly from heaven, *i. e.*, in heavenly luminousness and purity. John speaks *ῥήματα ἀνθρώπου*, but Christ utters *ῥήματα Θεοῦ*. (Comp. ver. 34.) In John the divine itself is manifested in a human, subordinate form.

Ver. 33, 34. The Evangelist deeply deplores the fact that this heavenly testimony is not received (*i. e.*, only by a very small number in proportion to the mass); but still, taught by inward experience, he is compelled to add that he who has received this testimony has derived from it unspeakable happiness; he has experienced that God is true,—that he fulfils all his promises, and satisfies all desires. (*Σφραγίζω*, to seal, to confirm. Just so vi. 27; Ephes. i. 13, iv. 30. The confirmation here refers to the *λαβών* himself, as well as to the others also.) Now, this confirmation is founded upon the circumstance that he speaks *ῥήματα Θεοῦ*. One expects something entirely different, *e. g.*, that it would be said, “since in him all prophecies are fulfilled.” It is true that words of God need not necessarily be fulfilments; they may be new promises. But he who speaks divine words is the Messiah, of whom it was promised, “I will put *my* words into *his* mouth” (Deut. xviii. 18.) Consequently this sentence means the same thing, for in the Messiah all promises of God are yea and amen (2 Cor. i. 20.) The conclusion: *οὐ γὰρ ἐκ μέτρου δίδωσιν, κ. τ. λ.* explains how he who is sent from God is able to speak *ῥήματα τοῦ Θεοῦ*, for *αὐτῷ* is to be supplied. Even John had the divine spirit in a certain degree (*ἐκ μέτρου* = *μετρίως*, the reading *ἐκ μέρους* is merely explanatory), but the Messiah had the entire fullness of divine life and divine power; the word of the Father dwelt in him, and therefore he spake *ῥήματα τοῦ Θεοῦ*. Meyer has so misunderstood the passage as to consider the words *οὐ γὰρ ἐκ μέτρου δίδωσι* a general phrase, applying to all messengers from God; God, he says, always gives his Spirit without measure; the different degrees in which it is participated depending merely on the different degrees of receptivity in the receivers. The words evidently refer merely to the *ὃν ἀπέστειλεν ὁ Θεός*. (The present *δίδωσι* very aptly points out the permanent communication of the Spirit by the Father to the Son, so that a constant flow

and reflow of living power is to be understood. (Comp. i. 52.)<sup>1</sup>

Ver. 35, 36. Instead of the general expressions that have hitherto been employed respecting the Messiah (*ὁ ἄνωθεν, ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐρχόμενος*), the term *υἱός* now occurs, by which the altogether peculiar relation of God to him, as his *Father*, is designated. (For *ἀγαπᾶν, φιλεῖν* also is used in the same sense. Comp. v. 20.) In consequence of this relation, God has invested the Son, as the *Heir*, with the sovereignty of the world, and, for this reason, on him depends the believer's life and happiness. (Comp. the observations on Matt. xi. 27. To refer the *πάντα* merely to the moral efficacy of the Redeemer through his teaching, is to render the meaning superficial, and thus to contradict the characteristic feature of this Gospel. Comp. the remarks on Matt. xxviii. 18; 1 Cor. xv. 27, 28.) In the concluding verse (as iii. 15), eternal life is associated with faith. Here we need only inquire, how the *ἀπειθῶν* is related to the *μὴ πιστεύων* (ver. 18.) The two expressions are, it is true, different in themselves, but here they are so employed as to be completely synonymous; as Lücke acknowledges in his second edition, although he had previously denied it. Unbelief is itself here regarded as disobedience, and, indeed, as total disobedience proceeding from the entire man; and being such, it is not merely *an ἀπειθεία*, but *the ἀπειθεία*, out of which all others arise. Comp. Rom. xi. 30—32; Ephes. ii. 2, v. 6. In the latter passage, even the *ὀργὴ τοῦ Θεοῦ* is connected with the *ἀπειθεία*.) As parallel to *οὐκ ὄψεται ζωὴν*, it is added: *ἀλλ' ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ Θεοῦ μένει ἐπ' αὐτόν*. (With regard to *ζωή* and *ὀργή*, comp. the remarks on iii. 15, 16.) John, the preacher of God's *love* (1 John iv. 8, 16), knows also the *wrath* of God, which of necessity exists where there are the energy and ardour of love, since in wrath it is only the other pole of love that is exhibited.<sup>2</sup> That which is kindred it draws to itself, whilst that which is discordant it rejects, and, in the same being, it attracts the element of the former, whilst it repels that of the latter. Accordingly, love cannot be without wrath, and, as no property of God operates without the others (for in him all are essentially one), so love does not work without imparting reward (or rather benefit), and wrath does not work without punishing (or inflicting pain), as

<sup>1</sup> In the English, ver. 51.—Tr.

<sup>2</sup> With respect to *ὀργὴ τοῦ Θεοῦ*, comp. the Comment. on Matt. xviii. 34, 35.

the two forms in which righteousness is displayed. So long as man, as a member of sinful humanity, lapsed and estranged from God, has not experienced the redeeming power of Christ (Ephes. ii. 3), the repulsive pole of divine love manifests itself; he altogether rejects redemption; and this state continues till he surrenders himself to its power (*μένει ἐπ' αὐτόν.*) Absolute permanence of wrath is here indicated, only so far as an altogether permanent *ἀπειθεῖν* is presupposed. Hence the intention of wrath and of just wisdom, in rendering sin and evil necessarily connected, is the same as the design of God's love—to awaken in man the consciousness of his sinful condition. And accordingly it is evident that Lücke is in error when he regards the expression: *ὀργὴ Θεοῦ μένει ἐπ' αὐτόν*, as stronger than *κέκριται* (ver. 18.) He who is condemned, *i. e.*, excluded from the kingdom of redemption, is surely under *ὀργή*, and thus in the two expressions one and the same thing only is to be seen (comp. Rom. i. 18; ii. 5; Ephes. v. 6; Coloss. iii. 6.) De Wette here, at the conclusion of the chapter, remarks, "this verse (ver. 36) might be used against the Baptist himself and his disciples." The meaning of this,—*viz.*, that it might be said "the wrath of God remained on the Baptist because he did not believe on the Son,"—is shewn by the sequel, where De Wette observes that John the Baptist appears to have placed himself in opposition to Christ, since he continued to baptize even after Jesus had declared himself to be the Messiah; and that, therefore, even if the whole explanation here given is not to be rejected, at any rate John the Evangelist was induced by apologetic reasons to overstep the limits of historic truth. It is indeed very much to be lamented that the theologian whom we have named has not shrunk from yielding himself so far to the Straussian influence. For, does it follow from John's still baptizing that he intended to place himself in opposition to Jesus? Nay, "is it not the most natural supposition that he baptized for the same purpose afterwards as before, *viz.*, to point the penitent to Christ? Where do we find a word to the contrary? The circumstance that in Acts xix. 3, the disciples of John are still mentioned, only shews—as the existence of the sect of the Zabians, and their doctrines of itself indicates—that many disciples did not follow out John's instruction to join themselves to Jesus. Besides which, some well-meaning persons, like those mentioned Acts xix., may have

become disconnected from the Baptist, before he recognized the dignity of Jesus, which he certainly did at the baptism. At all events the insinuation that ver. 36 may be referred to the Baptist himself is truly calculated to shock the mind.

§ 7. THE CONVERSATION OF CHRIST WITH THE WOMAN OF SAMARIA.

(John iv. 1—42.)

The following pleasing narrative exactly harmonizes with the avowed design (xx. 31) of the Gospel to represent Jesus as the Messiah. Christ here unequivocally declares (ver. 26) that he is the Messiah. Besides which, the spiritual views concerning the true worship of God, propounded in the conversation with the Samaritan woman (ver. 23, 24), are quite calculated for the immediate readers of John; so that the adaptation of this chapter to the general connexion of the Gospel is obvious to every one. However, we cannot but consider Hengstenberg mistaken (*über die Aechtheit des Pentateuchs*, s. 21, ff.), when, following the example of Strauss (*Leben Jesu Th. i. s. 519, ff.*), he supposes that this occurrence involves a symbolical signification which, at the same time, does not destroy the historic truth of Christ's interview with the woman of Samaria. For, in the first place, the supposition that the woman represented the Samaritan people, and her five husbands the five races from which, according to 2 Kings xvii. 24, the Samaritans sprang, is in the highest degree forced; while in the second place, the hypothesis that the Samaritan woman, and with her the inhabitants of Sichem, were employed (and this interpretation would indicate that they were employed purely), as a medium whereby to symbolise a sentiment, which might have been expressed far more simply in words, is altogether inadmissible. For although Hengstenberg does not deny the reality of the external fact, yet he sets aside its signification as such, in order to place the symbolical aspect in the foreground; it being altogether denied, or at least strongly doubted, that the Lord actually intended to produce any result upon the woman and the Sichemites. Now, unconscious objects, such as the fig-tree, the fish with the piece of money, &c., may be appropriately employed

for such symbolical actions, in which the externality of the incident entirely withdraws; but it is not appropriate thus to employ *men*, since they never can be used in the operations of Christ merely as means, but they constantly appear as ends also.

Ver. 1—3. The circumstance that Jesus, upon receiving the intelligence that the Pharisees were aware of the power which he held over the people, left Judæa and went to Galilee,—a place less exposed to Pharisaic influences,—on the one hand indicated the persecutions already prepared for him, and on the other, renders it not improbable that just at this time the Baptist was imprisoned. (Compare the remarks on iii. 22.) Now here it is observed that *Jesus did not himself baptize*, but only the disciples.<sup>1</sup> Just in like manner the apostles did not baptize after the Pentecost, but only their companions, while the apostles laid their hands upon the baptized, who therewith received the Spirit. (Compare Acts viii. 14—17; 1 Cor. i. 14—16.) This plainly indicates a certain subordination of water-baptism (comp. the Comm. on Matt. iii. 1) in relation to the baptism with the Spirit,<sup>2</sup> when the two did not coincide, as doubtless they did in the baptisms performed by the apostles themselves (1 Cor. i. 14, ff.) The baptism of the disciples before the institution of the Sacrament and the outpouring of the Spirit was, at any rate, a mere *βάπτισμα μετανοίας*, because they themselves had not as yet received any other baptism,<sup>3</sup> and the Holy Spirit was not yet given (John vii. 39.)

Ver. 4—6. The direct road from Judæa to Galilee led through Samaria. Only the most carefully scrupulous Jews avoided it, and went through Peræa. The Hebrew name of the town which Jesus touched on his way is *סחף* = *Σιχέμ* or *Συχέμ*. The reading

<sup>1</sup> Jesus himself did not baptize, as Meyer justly remarks, because it appeared unsuitable for him to baptize.

<sup>2</sup> The later ecclesiastical usage, viz., the deacons baptizing, but the bishops imparting the chrism (a custom still retained in the Catholic Church), was derived from this distinction.

<sup>3</sup> I cannot agree with the view of Matthies, when he asserts (de baptismo. Berol. 1831, p. 57, not.) that the baptism practised by the apostles before the outpouring of the Spirit was already performed *ἐν πνεύματι καὶ πυρί*. It was indeed distinguished from that of the Baptist by this, that the apostles did not baptize *εἰς τὸν ἐρχόμενον*, for the apostles acknowledged Christ as the Redeemer already come; but, in the nature of the case, they could not go beyond the *μετάνοια*, because the power of the Holy Spirit was not yet poured out. On this account all who were baptized by the apostles still needed the communication of the Holy Spirit by imposition of hands. (Comp. the remarks on the important passage Acts xix. 1, ff.)

*Σιχάρ*, or more correctly *Συχάρ*, is probably a distortion, become common among the Jews, of the term *שכר*, drunk, or *שקר*, falsehood (Sir. i. 26, the town is called τὰ *Σικίμα*.) But, as it is not likely that the Evangelist would receive a vulgar nickname into his grave composition, it seems to me more probable that the *ρ* stands for *μ* in accordance with a circumstance not unfrequently occurring, viz., the exchange of liquid letters,—as Nebuchadrezzar, Beliar. Hengstenberg's supposition, however, that John himself formed the opprobrious epithet intentionally, in order to point out that which was reprehensible in the Samaritan bias, appears to me inadmissible; because, in the first place, the Sichemites are not the same as the Samaritans generally, but form only a small part of them. The *ὑμεῖς*, in the words *ὑμεῖς προσκυνεῖτε ὃ οὐκ οἴδατε* (ver. 22), does not refer to the Sichemites, but to all Samaritans. In the second place, it is contrary to the usage of the New Testament to disgrace any one by the application of a reproachful name.—With respect to the situation of Sichem and its relation to Neapolis, subsequently so called, comp. v. Raumer's remarks in the second edition of his *Geographie von Palaestina* (s. 168 note), by which the apparent contradictions in the accounts of the ancients are satisfactorily solved. As regards the *χωρὶον* of Joseph comp. Gen. xxxiii. 19, xlviii. 22. Tradition assigns to Jacob a well there, on which Jesus sat in the heat of noon. (The sixth hour = twelve o'clock. The memory of the true disciple often marks such little incidents.) The mention of the fatigue of Jesus is a testimony (although, indeed, it may be an unintentional one) against Gnostic Doceticism.

Ver. 7—9. The Lord, in the simplest and most natural manner, introduces a conversation with a Samaritan woman, who comes to the well to fetch water, and, after thus introducing it, he at once turns it towards divine things. The woman in the first instance expresses her astonishment that a Jew, which she immediately recognized him to be in dress and speech, regardless of national antipathy, should prove so friendly and so disposed to converse. (This is the only instance in which *συνγχεῖσθαι* occurs in the New Testament.) The details respecting the relations and origin of the Samaritans belong to the Jewish History.<sup>1</sup>

Concerning the *time* of the origin of the sect, I refer the reader

<sup>1</sup> Comp. the Comment. on Luke ix. 53, and John iv. 21

to the Programm of Sieffert *de tempore schismatis ecclesiastici Judaeos inter et Samaritanos oborti*. Regiom 1828. He decides for the account of Nehemiah and *against* that of Josephus, who refers the origin of the Samaritans to the time of Alexander the Great, and supposes that the rise of the sect, through the establishment of a peculiar worship on Mount Gerizim in the known manner, took place during the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus, which lasted from 464 to 425 B.C. An entirely different opinion, however, has recently been propounded by Hengstenberg (*über die Aechth. des Pentateuchs* s. 21, ff.) It is the hypothesis, that the Samaritans contained no Israelitish element at all, but that they were merely a mixture of some heathen races. For my own part, I have not been able to convince myself of the correctness of this theory. Even Hengstenberg finds himself compelled to acknowledge, according to the guidance of Acts x. 28, i. 8, that the Samaritans were not placed on a par with the heathen. But on what other ground would they be distinguished from the heathen, than because they contained Israelitish elements? All the declarations of Christ and of the apostles respecting them fully support the opinion that the Samaritans evinced an impure origin, and in like manner also that they had defaced their knowledge of God.

Ver. 10—12. From contending national relations, the Redeemer leads the thoughts of the woman to his own person. In order powerfully to excite her attention, Jesus employs the request that he had made to her for a draught of water, as a means of suggesting to her a similar request for spiritual invigoration. Lücke has justly remarked that the *δωρεὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ* cannot possibly be the person of the Saviour himself, since *καὶ τίς ἐστὶν ὁ λέγων σοι* is added; the expression, on the contrary, indicates the opportunity to hear him, and to learn from him. The woman at first understands the *ἕδωρ ζῶν* as signifying merely fresh spring-water, and supposes that Jesus refers to some mode of obtaining the water more quickly than she does; on this account she points him to the depth of the well. (According to the tradition of travellers, it is 105 feet deep, and contains only five feet depth of water.) Still, conceiving it possible that he may mean another well, she adds, "surely thou hast not yet a better well than this glorious one, out of which father Jacob and his sons drank!" De Wette here presents himself suddenly as the defender of the double sense, and says, that

ὕδωρ ζῶν signifies at the same time fresh water and water of life. Thus the truth attains its practical end, prevailing in spite of opposition, and thrusting into the back ground those circumscribed principles, to establish which unprecedented pains are taken.

Ver. 13, 14. The Lord thereupon unfolds to her the wonderful nature of the water that he means, and which he called ὕδωρ ζῶν (ver. 10.) By this Jesus evidently does not intend his doctrine generally, or anything abstract, communicable in ideas, but the element of his life itself. As he says: ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς, so also he himself is the ὕδωρ τῆς ζωῆς, in which he gives life to the world. (Comp. John vi. 33—35.)<sup>1</sup> Hence the point of comparison is this,—as the φῶς enlightens, imparting the knowledge of reality, so the ὕδωρ invigorates, quickens, quenching thirst and satisfying desire. Moreover, the life of the Redeemer, as the eternal itself, allays all the craving of man's heart in his mortal state, a craving which never can be appeased by the creations of that which is transitory, except for a time, because, in its ultimâ foundation, it constantly relates to that which is eternal,—for ever and ever. This life imparts an abundant sufficiency (περισσόν, John x. 10), assuages all thirst of desire (John vi. 35.) The parallel, Sirach xxiv. 28, 29, is interesting. There the statement is expressed inversely thus, "he who drinks of me (the real Wisdom) thirsts ever after me," i. e., his longings are then drawn away from all transitory objects, and entirely concentrated upon that continued enjoyment of the imperishable which is always accessible to man. The different forms of expression in the two passages might be explained thus: in Sirach the revelation of Wisdom in its entire fulness, is apprehended according to the Old Testament point of view, as *in process*: whereas in John it is regarded rather as that which *has taken place*.<sup>2</sup>

As a second peculiarity of this Water of Life, its creative nature is observed. Having issued from the eternal fountain, it creates

<sup>1</sup> Similarly Philo calls the Logos ποταμὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ. Comp. the passage in Grossmann, loc. cit. p. 59.

<sup>2</sup> Ullmann in the Studien (Erster Jahrg. heft. 4, s. 791, ff.), views the difference in the modes of expression quite correctly. In the Apocryphal Book he finds rather the φιλοσοφία; in the words of Christ, he discovers the expression of the consummate σοφία itself. Only I question whether a distinct citation from the Apocrypha is to be supposed here. On the contrary, I should regard it as a spontaneous coincidence with a form thus nearly corresponding.



in the mind of him who receives it a self-sustaining *πηγή ὕδατος*.<sup>1</sup> (Comp. John vii. 38. Sir. xxiv. 40—44, where the same sentiment is expressed.) Thus, it not only satisfies the need of the individual, but renders this itself a fructifying stream for those around him. Without losing the depth of the meaning, the passage may be taken thus: "The water is in him a spring of salient (*ἀλλομένου* = *ζώντος*) water, for eternal life," or, "which springs up into eternal life." The latter connexion, however, is to be preferred as the simpler. At any rate the sense is this: "the element of life which issues from the parent fountain of *ζωή* must also return to its primitive source." That which is eternal rests not until it has reached the eternal.

Ver. 15—18. The simple woman was unable to apprehend the greatness of such a thought; but still the word of the Lord, spoken with the power of inspiration, sounded in her heart, and thus called her to a nobler life. She longed for such water—water that imparts perfect sufficiency; yet she could not rise entirely above that which appeals to the senses; hence the peculiar form of her request, in which both desire for the higher and desire for the sensuous are mingled. This incitement Christ now employs in order, by a disclosure of her inward self, to awaken repentance deeply in her heart, as the necessary condition for the reception of the powers from above. Every attempt to refer what Jesus here disclosed to the woman of her own life to previous communications received concerning her must be rejected, as contrary to the opinion of the narrator, who presupposes in Christ the ability to discover the depths of the heart. (Comp. John ii. 24, vi. 64.) The effort of those expositors who endeavour to vindicate the woman, is evidently to be regarded as an entire failure; it is upon the very circumstance of her guilt that all the stress lies in this place. After having had five husbands, she lived in illicit connexion with another man.

<sup>1</sup> A better physical illustration of the idea is afforded by the comparison with fire, a spark of which in susceptible matter elicits a new flame. So also the fire of the Spirit which Jesus came to kindle (Luke xii. 49) extends itself from one heart to another through the universe, by means of the kindling spark emitted from his heart of love.

<sup>2</sup> Meyer takes the words *καὶ νῦν οὐ ἔχεις, οὐκ ἔστι σου ἀνὴρ*, as indicating that this last husband had not been faithful to the woman, as she had not been faithful to her former husbands. Of this, however, nothing is contained in the text; the large number of her husbands would only point out her insatiable desire, but not that she had practised adultery.

This disclosure of her secret sins, in which she thought herself unobserved, aroused her slumbering life.

Ver. 19, 20. She recognizes in Christ *a* prophet (not *the* prophet = the Messiah, comp. vi. 14, 15), and immediately consults him respecting the great controversy between Jews and Samaritans. Probably she sought also to divert the conversation, and thus to avoid the pressing effect produced upon her by the view of her sins. (The mountain on which the Temple of the Samaritans stood was called גֶּרִיזִים Gerizim, LXX. Γαριζίν. Moses enjoined that the blessing should be placed upon it, Deut. xi. 29; xxvii. 12, 13; just over against it lay Mount Ebal, where the curse was to be pronounced. After Antiochus Epiphanes destroyed the Temple, the Samaritans rebuilt merely an altar.

Ver. 21, 22. The Lord now introduces the woman to a higher point of view *above* both of the contending opinions. Yet before proceeding to the detail (ver. 23, 24), he unequivocally declares himself *against* the Samaritans. This appears remarkable, considering that the Jews gave themselves up to such a manifestly culpable hatred of the Samaritans. But the thing spoken of here is not the *subjective* position in which certainly the Jews greatly erred, but the real *objective* state of the case. In relation to this, right was on the side of the Jews. The origin of the separate divine worship of the Samaritans was occasioned by sinful anger on account of just punishment.<sup>1</sup> Then the Samaritans adopted merely the Pentateuch, and consequently wanted essential parts of God's word, viz., the Prophets, which contain such important predictions concerning the Messiah. And, lastly, the self-appointed order of their divine service was opposed to the divine will, according to which the sanctuary of God's people was to be on Mount Zion. The Lord could therefore well say: ὑμεῖς προσκυνεῖτε δὲ οὐκ οἴδατε, and the only right thing was, that the Samaritans should relinquish their schism. While they did not do so, they robbed them-

<sup>1</sup> A son of Joiada the High-priest (Josephus in the Archæol. xi. 8, calls him Manasse), married the daughter of Sanballat the Persian Satrap of Samaria. Nehemiah on this account chased him away (Nehem. xiii. 28), and Manasse fled to his father-in-law, where he established the new worship on Mount Gerizim.

<sup>2</sup> The reading  $\phi$  for  $\delta$  in all probability arose from προσκυνεῖν in the New Testament being usually construed with the dative. Still it frequently occurs also with the accusative. The words προσκυνεῖτε δὲ οὐκ οἴδατε are best understood thus, "Ye are without the true knowledge of God." Comp. Matt. xxii. 29.

selves of the opportunity of believing in the Saviour of the world, whom, as the Jewish Messiah, they would not recognize. The consequence is, that they have remained, up to the most recent times, in sectarian combination. (*Σωτηρία* stands, the abstract for the concrete, = *ὁ σωτήρ*. In the divine government of the world, place and time are precisely fixed; as the people from whom the Messiah should come, so in like manner, the family from which he should descend, and the town in which he should be born, were appointed. To these arrangements, man cannot oppose his arbitrary fancies, without bringing upon himself actual injury.) The Samaritans, moreover, believed in a future great Teacher, whom they called *תַּרְבֵּי*, "the Converter." But they appear to have regarded this object of desire merely as a prophet, without attributing to him any higher importance.

Ver. 23, 24. Jesus now returns to the description which he had commenced (ver. 21), of a new, higher form of divine worship, and represents it in prophetic view, precisely as it was subsequently realized,—much as everything at present spoke against it. He does indeed call it a future phenomenon, but still in him, and the small circle of life formed by him, it was already present in the germ. Just in like manner, the kingdom of God is a present as well as a future thing. (Respecting the form *ἔρχεται ὥρα καὶ νῦν ἐστίν* frequently occurring in John, comp. the remarks on John v. 25; 1 John ii. 18.) Now, the true worship which the Lord here describes is placed in opposition, not so much to that which is false (*ψευδώνυμος*), as to that which is imperfect, undeveloped. All Old Testament saints prayed to God under the restrictions of time and place; this did not constitute a false devotion, but was in accordance with the divine will and appointment. Just in like manner, the worship of every infantile, undeveloped mind *must* be limited to season and locality. Hence the *ἀληθινός* is, as we so often find it in John (comp. i. 9), *that which corresponds with the idea in its highest sense*. (The substantive *προσκυνητής* does not occur again either in the New Testament or elsewhere; it is only found in an inscription. Comp. Lücke s. 530, note.) The worship of God, in its highest sense, is that worship which is most homogeneous with the divine nature. Now God is a Spirit, and as such, elevated above space and period; hence that devotion which is *ἐν πνεύματι*, uttering itself independently of time and place, never ceasing, sub-

ject to no external conditions, carried on in the inner sanctuary of man, constitutes the only true worship of God, *i. e.*, the only worship of him which answers to its archetype. Spirit, however, being reality itself, the worship which is *ἐν πνεύματι*, is also called *ἐν ἀληθείᾳ*. (Comp. the remarks on i. 14.) Moreover it was through Christ that the *ἀληθεία* (see i. 17) first came, *i. e.*, appeared in humanity itself; and, therefore, it was only through him and with him that worship in spirit and truth could commence. Then the words *ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ* are to be understood according to the connexion, as in antithesis with *ἐν ὄρει τούτῳ* and *ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις* (ver. 20.) In contrast with that state in relation to God which, being characterised by restriction to time and place, always presupposes the want of spiritual power and reality, another state is presented, viz., that of being filled with spirit and with reality, as the condition of true adherence to God. Thus Augustine, in describing the antithesis between the Old and New Testaments, finely remarks: *Si forte quaeris aliquem locum altum, aliquem locum sanctum, intus exhibe te templum Deo. In templo vis orare, in te ora.* The same sentiment is expressed by an eminent mystic of modern times, Terstegen, thus:

Once I wanted *place* and *time*  
 For prayer and solitude;  
 Now in thought I *always* pray  
 And *always* am alone.<sup>1</sup>

This interesting term, adopted by the Lord, has been interpreted as though *ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ* were equivalent to *πνευματικῶς καὶ ἀληθῶς*, *i. e.*, with a pure sincere spirit; but this interpretation is to be rejected, because it proceeds from the interchange of *πνεῦμα* with *ψυχὴ* or *καρδιά*; besides which, it is evident that long *before* Christ, many Jews and Gentiles had worshipped God *sincerely*. The true idea of *ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ* is gained by a right apprehension of the antithesis. The Redeemer does not here controvert the errors existing among the Gentiles or Samaritans, but places his sublime revelation in contrast with that of the Old Testament, which was not so elevated, and in which the Samaritans participated, although imperfectly. The latter was external

<sup>1</sup> *Alone, i. e.*, freed from all adherence to the creature, and in communion with none but God, the Eternal and the Only. The Mystics term this state of constant inward devotion, life in the divine presence. (Comp. the remarks on Luke xviii. 1, ff.)

(*σάραξ*). whilst an internal (*πνεῦμα*) worship was taught by Christ, which was not, like that of the Old Testament, confined to time and place. That of the Old Testament was not *ψεύδος* but a *σκία*, a mere shadowy form consisting of types, symbols, and presentiments; on the contrary, that of Christ was the reality itself (*ἀλήθεια*), of which the former was but the profile, and which constituted the *fulfilment* of all that the former typified. According to another view of this passage, which we must notice, the *ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ* is apprehended as referring to the justness of those conceptions which the worshipper must have respecting God; such just conceptions being the mere *result* of life in the spirit, and this being possible only through the communication of the Spirit from above. So far, however, as the present shattered condition of man's knowledge and of his nature will allow, many just conceptions concerning God may be adopted without the possession of real divine life, and just so inversely. Hence we can only understand the words as referring to the new, higher element of life which the Lord came to bring down from heaven; and thus to worship God in the spirit and in truth is not to be regarded as a matter dependent only upon inclination and determination; the natural man, without power from above, is held in the fetters of sense; he *cannot* worship God in a godly manner, because he is ungodly until he has in faith received divine power and being.

Ver. 25—27. Although the Samaritan woman may now have formed some idea of the depth of meaning involved in the words which Jesus addressed to her, the essence of that meaning certainly escaped her. All she knew was that something great and exalted was promised; and for the distinct disclosure of this she looked to the coming Messiah, from whom it had been usual to expect the solution of every difficulty, as well as the relief of all need. (The Samaritans entertained substantially the opinions of the Jews concerning the Messiah; but the notions of the Samaritans certainly were not so clear as those of the Israelites, although it is probable that they were less alloyed by political elements.) The Saviour hereupon unequivocally explained to her that *he was* the Messiah. (*Εγώ εἰμι* is a concise expression, like the Hebrew *אני ה' אלהיך*. According to the connexion, *ὁ Χριστός* is to be supplied here.) This open declaration of his Messianic character appears opposed to those numerous instances recorded by the synoptical

Evangelists, in which, when any one recognized him as the Messiah, he prohibited them from making it known. (On this subject comp. the Comm. Matt. viii. 4.) Doubtless the reason of the unreserved expressions employed by Christ concerning his sublime dignity may be found in the simplicity of the woman, and of those in general who inhabited Sichem. They were strangers to those political views which the Jews entertained, and therefore they afforded no such ground for apprehending misconstructions. The disciples, on their return from the city, wonder that Jesus should take the trouble to converse with a woman (the Jews even now regard the female sex as unfit to be instructed in the law),<sup>1</sup> but are restrained by delicate diffidence from venturing to ask him what he has said to her. A difficulty might be felt here respecting the witnesses to the conversation with the woman ; but, on the one hand, it is not said that *all* the disciples went into the city, and it is probable that our Evangelist was present at the interview ; while, on the other hand, either Christ himself or the Sichemites may have communicated the particulars of it during the residence of the disciples in the city (iv. 43.) Suppositions of this kind can be considered strange only by those who do not apprehend the relation between Christ and the disciples in a simple, natural manner. The powerful effects which they beheld as the result of this conversation would certainly direct their attention towards it, and then from one quarter or another they would receive the desired information concerning it.

Ver. 28—30. The declaration of Christ that he is the Messiah is now united in the mind of the woman with the disclosures of Jesus respecting her life (ver. 16, ff.) ; she believes in him, and hastens back into the city to confirm her conviction by the judgment of her fellow-citizens.

Ver. 31—34. The Lord—ever living in the consciousness of his lofty calling—after the withdrawal of the woman, seeks to awaken the deeper life in his disciples. Filled with the thought of corporeal invigoration, they invite their heavenly master to take refreshment with them. But the Redeemer conducts them into the depth of his inner life, which, by means of this happy interview,

<sup>1</sup> *Contempt* of the female sex has been shared by the Jews with the Orientals generally ; in this respect they form the most striking contrast with the German people, amongst whom the honour paid to woman has often been corrupted into *deification*.

with a childlike mind, has become so thoroughly invigorated in the power of the Spirit from above, that the soul strengthens the body.<sup>1</sup> The disciples, still unfamiliar with the spirituality of the words of Jesus, think of corporeal nourishment, and suppose that it must have reached him in some unknown way, until the Lord in further discourse unfolds to them his meaning. (The *ἔργον* is Christ's whole work of redemption, as the *θέλημα* of God to him. *Ποιεῖν* and *τελειοῦν* are to be taken as succinctly expressing the operations of the Spirit in Christ. Activity in promoting the kingdom of God, as it were, opened within the Lord one source of power after another, and it was this that refreshed and strengthened him. I class this passage with those in which *ἵνα* can only be understood as having the force of *τελικῶς*. [Comp. Winer's Gram. 4th edit. s. 312.] The sense here is not "that I may be able to do the will of God," but "the doing itself constitutes the invigoration.")

Ver. 35. The discourse of Christ now takes a somewhat different turn, which, as both ancient and modern expositors agree, is sufficiently accounted for on the supposition that the Lord beheld the inhabitants of Sichem pouring forth from the city towards himself. To this animating scene Jesus directs the eyes of the disciples, pointing to the flock of people in need of salvation, and comparing them to crops ripe for the harvest. Moreover, we are doubtless to think of Jesus as surrounded by sprouting fields, to which the first words, *ἔτι τετράμηνός ἐστι κ. τ. λ.*, have reference. (The textus receptus reads *τετράμηνον* sc. *διάστημα*. But Griesbach, who is followed by Schulz, has adopted, on the authority of several distinguished manuscripts, *τετράμηνος* sc. *χρόνος*.) This expression may relate to the early crops which ripened rapidly, and having been sown in December, might be reaped as soon as April, at Easter. At all events we may conclude that Jesus spoke these words during the seed-time, which varied from October to December according to the variation of climate prevailing in Palestine. Hence it is most clearly evident that the chronology, even according to John, is uncertain. For, ii. 13, Jesus was going to the Passover, and in the accounts which follow, there are so few dates, that so far as the text is concerned, we might as well suppose that these words were uttered in May as in December, but for the incidental expression

<sup>1</sup> On this subject comp. the remarks in the Comm. on 2 Cor. ix. 10, 11.

which here becomes our guide. It remains to be observed, that in the comparison of the earthly with the spiritual seed in this verse, the *ἔτι* and *ἤδη* are to be understood as antitheses. In the former instance the seed is *first* scattered in hope, in the latter case the harvest *is already come*. This is indicated by ver. 38, where the disciples are represented as reapers who have not sown.

Ver. 36—38. The expansion of the metaphor is very simple, and several of the principal ideas, such as *μισθὸν λαμβάνειν*, *συνάγειν καρπὸν* have already been explained in the Comm. on Matt. xx. 1, ff. iii. 12. The only obscure point is the actual meaning of Christ respecting the applicability of the proverb<sup>1</sup> in this case. (*Λόγος* = *παροιμία*, 2 Pet. ii. 12. Griesbach prefers the reading *ὁ ἀληθινός* to that without the article; according to this, the sentiment is more emphatic: "that proverb which is true in relation to such a number of things. How many an individual must engage in undertakings from which he enjoys no fruit!" Here, again, the *ἀληθινός* is but apparently synonymous with *ἀληθής*. The article indicates that the meaning of the words is, "while, in respect to a variety of matters, the well-known adage is true, in this case, with reference to spiritual things, it applies in the highest, the absolute sense." If it be said, as the ancient expositors understood the passage, that the *ἄλλοι* (ver. 38) were Moses and the prophets, while the believing susceptibility which was discovered in the hearts of the Samaritans constituted the harvest resulting from their preaching, then Jesus himself appears as one of the reapers; but it is evident that this is not the meaning of the words, for in that case it must have been said: *ἡμεῖς θερίζομεν*. Hence modern interpreters say that Christ sowed, and that the apostles were, at a *later period*, to see the result of his labour, which Christ himself did not behold on earth. The plural (*ἄλλοι*, ver. 38), it is argued, was employed merely on account of the reference to the proverb, and refers simply to Jesus. But, in that case, the antithesis (ver. 35) which contrasts the spiritual harvest as already matured with the earthly, would not be at all suitable; setting aside the fact that the apostles never did see more than the beginnings of the results produced by the ministry of our Lord. The only way to obtain a lucid view of the pas-

<sup>1</sup> A similar proverb is found among the Greeks: *ἄλλοι αἰὲν σπείρουσ' ἄλλοι δ' αὖ ἀμύσσονται*.



sage is to take it according to Matt. xxiii. 34; Luke xi. 49. Christ represents himself as the Husbandman, who has the direction both of the sowing and of the harvest, who commissions *all* agents,—those of the Old Testament as well as those of the New,—and therefore does not stand at all on a level with either the sowers or the reapers. In relation to the Old Testament, its ministers and their work, the Lord represents the disciples as those who are sent into the harvest; since the great end of the law now displayed itself as realized in that desire after divine things which was manifested by the Sichemites. Thus the reference made is neither to the future harvest of the apostles, nor to the seed just scattered by Christ; but the attention of the disciples is drawn to the gracious character of that calling to which they were appointed, while the prophets had toiled so laboriously before them. In accordance with the copiousness of thought in such passages, it may also be said, as it respects the present in relation to the time of the apostles,<sup>1</sup> that we have come into *their* labour, *they* have borne the heat and burden of the day for us, who are called at the eleventh hour. (Comp. the remarks on Matt. xx. 9.)

Ver. 39—42. The Samaritans were less influenced by the rigid fetters of Pharisaism than the Jews, and hence they easily turned to the Gospel. In Christ they acknowledged the Redeemer of the world, and, filled with longing after substantial knowledge, they entreated him to remain amongst them. The Lord granted them two days for the confirmation of their faith.

This passage is interesting in regard to the signification of the word πιστεύειν.<sup>3</sup> Mere historical credit given to accounts of this or that person (πιστεύειν διὰ τὴν λαλίαν τῆς γυναικὸς—λαλιά = λόγος, ver. 39., comp. John viii. 43) is different from the πιστεύειν arising out of personal experience (ἀκηκόαμεν καὶ οἶδαμεν, ver. 42.) If, indeed, the Redeemer had been like any other man, his λόγος could have had no more weight than that of any other, and in support of his own cause, it would have been still less effective. But

<sup>1</sup> This passage contains abundant encouragement for faithful witnesses to the truth, who see little or no fruit resulting from their labour. There are *preachers who sow* as well as *preachers who reap*, and what the latter reap has often been sown by faithful predecessors.

<sup>2</sup> Respecting this request, Chrysostom very finely says that the real meaning of the petitioners was, διημεκῶς αὐτὸν κατέχειν.

<sup>3</sup> Comp. the Comm. on Matt. viii. 1, ix. 1, xiii. 58, xvii. 20.

as the sun proves its existence and its reality merely by the light and the animating warmth which it imparts ; so Christ, as the Sun of the spiritual world, in all ages past, and even to this day, has had but one witness for himself, viz., his own operation upon souls. By this one means he so entirely takes possession of every unprejudiced mind, that through the reception of his higher vital energies, it becomes to them experimentally certain that the salvation of the world rests in him. Hence conceptions of the truth and doctrinal knowledge are not *principles* in the life of faith, but *effects* resulting from the reception of the spiritual element. (Comp. the remarks on John iv. 24.)

This incident is further remarkable, inasmuch as it forms a rare instance in which the ministry of the Lord produced *an awakening on a large scale*. Ordinarily we find that a few individuals only were aroused by him, and that these—like grains of seed scattered here and there—became the germs of a new and higher order of things among the people at large. That which now germinated in the Samaritans, subsequently,—according to the testimony of Acts viii.,—advanced to pleasing blossom.

#### § 8. THE HEALING OF AN OFFICER'S CHILD.

(John iv. 43—54.)

The adaptation of this narrative to the design of the Gospel is not immediately seen. It quite accords with the history of the cure as reported by the synoptical Evangelists ; as such, however, it could not be of importance to John, especially since it does not include any discourse of Jesus. The account was valuable to him only so far as, like the previous narrative, it represented the advancement of the *πίστις* in the mind of an individual. To him the healing was a means to an end, in so far as it served to conduct the *βασιλικός* more quickly and more radically into the life of faith. Accordingly, the account is to be regarded merely as a *supplement* to that which precedes.

Ver. 43—46. From Sichem Jesus went into Galilee. It is, however, remarkable that ver. 44 is connected with this statement by γὰρ. It would appear as if, before this, the consideration that

a prophet had no honour in his native land must have prevented the Redeemer from going to Galilee. If indeed we could, with Lücke, understand the *πατρίς* as referring to Judæa, because Jesus was born in Bethlehem, the difficulty would be solved ; but this supposition is untenable, because ver. 44 evidently relates to the occurrence mentioned Luke iv. 16, ff. In like manner the acceptance of *γάρ* in the sense of *although* would remove all difficulties, if such an arbitrary permutation of the particles were allowable. Meyer sees in ver. 44 a justification of the circumstance that Jesus had so long been absent from Galilee. But then this circumstance must have been distinctly spoken of in ver. 43. Tholuck resorts to the hypothesis that “ this is the *γάρ* which indicates the reason, and is sometimes placed at the beginning of a sentence in which anything is accounted for. John wished to show the reason why he mentioned that the Galileans received Jesus in a favourable manner, viz., that Jesus had once testified the contrary respecting his native land.” The turn thus given to the passage is not indeed to be altogether rejected ; but still it seems to me probable that if such a course of thought had been passing through the Evangelist’s mind, he would have indicated it by a *μὲν* or a word of the same sort. Hence I prefer to adopt the more precise definition of *εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν* furnished by ver. 46, “ to Galilee, *i. e.*, to Cana and not to Nazareth ;” *πατρίς* is then to be taken as meaning not the province, but the native city. This view is strengthened by the consideration that John here, as in several other instances, supposes the event to which he alludes as already known from the synoptical Evangelists, and from the general evangelical tradition current in the Church. The remark in ver. 45, that the Galileans had witnessed the miracles wrought by the Lord *ἐν τῇ ξορτῇ*, indicates that the Redeemer had as yet attended only this one feast at Jerusalem since he entered upon his ministry, although, according to iv. 35, he certainly might have been present also at the feast of tabernacles (in October), and probably at the feast of dedication (in December.)

In the investigation of the term *βασιλικός* one question in particular has to be solved, viz., whether this account is to be explained as identical with those in Matt. viii. 5, ff. ; Luke vii. 2, ff., as Semler asserts ; for *βασιλικός* may be understood as meaning either a military or a civil officer of a *βασιλεύς* (here of Herod Antipas.) In the first sense, the expression might be parallel with the centurion mentioned

in Matthew and Luke. But Lücke and Tholuck have aptly shewn that a difference between the occurrences is far more probable, and that on this account βασιλικός should be taken as meaning a civil officer; for, on the one hand, there are very many external discrepancies between the two accounts, while, on the other (and this decides the whole question), the character displayed by the captain in Matthew and Luke is altogether different from that which is seen in this βασιλικός. The former appears to be a model of humility and faith, so that he awakens the astonishment of the Son of God himself; the latter, on the contrary, while in the first instance he is anxious only for assistance in temporal need, reaches the attainment of faith by a laborious ascent.

Ver. 47, 48. In the words of Jesus, εἰν μὴ σημεῖα κ. τ. λ. rebuke is evidently implied. It may have referred not *only* to him, but also to the concourse of people who were present; but, at all events, it applied to him. However, this censure of the love of marvels does not in the least derogate from the importance of miracles themselves. (Comp. the Comm. on Matt. viii. 1.) The design of miracles is neither to gratify curiosity and vanity, nor to compel opponents to believe, but to furnish those who have already surrendered to the power of truth, with a proof of the legitimate authority of divine messengers.

• Ver. 49—51. The officer, without being diverted from his object by the rebuke, again appeals to the Lord for help. (Κατάβηθι is employed because Capernaum lay nearer the sea-coast.) The Lord then puts the father's faith to the test, and so increases it, that he trusts in the mere word of Jesus. Without seeing and touching the patient (in which case it appears to those who are guided only by the senses more easy to effect a cure), Christ simply utters the assurance of his restoration. (On the subject of the father's faith and the son's recovery, comp. the remarks on Matt. xvii. 14, ff.)

Ver. 52—54. The afflicted father anxiously enquires of the servants who hasten to him with the news of the child's convalescence, at what hour the recovery commenced; and when he learns that it was *the* hour (the careful John expressly mentions that it was the seventh) in which Jesus spake the word, his faith in the Lord increases. (Κομψάς occurs only here in the New Testament. Its primary meaning is "adorned," "handsome;" here it is em-

ployed as equivalent to *βελτίων*. Arrian. diss. Epict. iii. 10. *κομψῶς ἔχειν* also occurs = the Latin *belle habere*.) John, alluding to his account of the miracle at Cana (ii. 11), mentions that this is the *second σημεῖον*, i. e. in the neighbourhood. This computation cannot apply to the miracles of Jesus in *general*, because he had already performed several in Jerusalem. (Comp. iv. 45.)

## § 9. HEALING OF THE SICK MAN AT BETHESDA.

(John v. 1—47.)

The following account of the cure of a man who had been ill thirty-eight years is evidently inserted, not for its own sake, but only as the historical basis of the Redeemer's great discourse which follows. In this Jesus speaks concerning his relation to the Father, in such a manner that the peculiar dignity of Christ is rendered specially distinct, and thus the entire section sustains the most decided connexion with the whole design of the Evangelist.

Ver. 1. Without giving particulars (according to the best codices, the article itself is absent from *ἐορτή*), John remarks that another feast occurred, and that the Lord went up to Jerusalem to attend it. The question arises, *what* feast is intended? How few data there are for the settlement of this question with certainty, may be seen from the very fact that there is no Jewish feast which one expositor or another has not discovered here. But if an impartial view is taken of the passage in its connexion with what precedes and with what follows, it becomes in the highest degree probable (for in this instance we cannot go beyond *probability*) that the allusion is neither to a Passover nor to a feast falling on the last month of the year. The first supposition is opposed not only by the absence of the article (since the Passover as the principal feast is usually called *ἡ ἐορτή*, John iv. 45, xi. 56, xii. 12), but especially by the passage vi. 4. Here a Passover is distinctly spoken of as approaching, and therefore if the feast in question were a Passover, the expression *μετὰ ταῦτα* (vi. 1) would of necessity include more than a whole year. The altogether untenable interpretation of *ἐγγὺς ἦν τὸ πάσχα* (vi. 4), as meaning that the Passover had just taken

place, has nothing to commend it.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, the theory that it is one of those annual feasts which followed the Passover mentioned ii. 13, viz., the Feast of Pentecost, Tabernacles, or Dedication (in October and December), is opposed by the circumstance that, according to iv. 35, there were only four months to the harvest. Consequently, the simplest supposition is, that here the feast of Purim is meant, which was observed in March.<sup>2</sup> This is equally consistent with what precedes (iv. 35), and with the sequel (vi. 4); since iv. 45, 46, 54, indicate a longer interval, whilst the Passover was kept only a month later than the festival of Purim.

(Concerning the *Μαρδοχαϊκὴ ἡμέρα*, comp. 2 Macc. xv. 36.) The early Fathers also, for the most part, in their interpretations of this passage, did not regard it as referring to a Passover; they supposed that Jesus observed only three Passovers during his ministry,<sup>3</sup> and accordingly reckoned the whole public life of the Lord as limited to between two and three years. It was not till after Theodoret that prophetic statements were discovered in Daniel, intimating that the Messiah would exercise his ministry for three or four years, and since then our passage has been explained as alluding to a Passover. In the most recent times the ancient view has been re-

<sup>1</sup> *Ἐγγύς* always involves the idea of *nearly approaching*; the term is primarily derived from the impression produced upon the senses by having an object *before one*. Then, transferred to inward perception, *ἔγγύς* means "close at hand in the future," not "just past." There is only one case in which *ἔγγύς* may be taken in the latter sense, viz., when the narrator is proceeding backwards into the past. Thus, if we were passing from the present through the time of Reformation up to the middle ages, it might be said "we are now approaching the time of Christ." But such a retrogressive narration has no existence in John.

<sup>2</sup> Some doubt respecting the supposition, that the feast of Purim is intended here, might arise from the circumstance that this festival was of late origin, and the command of the Mosaic law (in which we certainly must look for the reason of the Lord's journeys to the feasts), that all males should appear before the Lord three times a year, at the feasts of Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles (Exod. xxiii. 14, ff.), did not respect this festival. But since we see that the Redeemer attended the Feast of Dedication (John x. 22), to which also the above requirement did not refer, there is no ground for supposing that he was not present at the Feast of Purim. At the same time, we need not ascribe to Christ the extravagant notions of the Jews concerning the importance of this festival. According to Tholuck, it is said in the Gemara, "The Feast of Dedication will be discontinued, but not that of Purim: the Prophets will cease, but not the Book of Esther."

<sup>3</sup> Respecting the views of the Alexandrines, who suppose only a year and some months, comp. the Comm. on Luke iv. 18. Concerning the different opinion of Irenæus, comp. on John viii. 57.

vived. But this passage shows how little the Gospel of John itself is adapted to form a *sure* foundation for a chronology of the life of Jesus.

Ver. 2. On account of the difficulty in determining the locality in Jerusalem, many variations have crept into the codices in this verse. Some read merely ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις κολυμβήθρα; others connect προβατική, sometimes in the nominative, sometimes in the dative, with κολυμβήθρα. But the ordinary reading has the best guarantee, and is therefore adopted by all the best modern critics. Only Gersdorf (in his Beitr. z. Sprachchar. s. 58) reads ἡ προβατική κολυμβήθρα, ἡ λεγομένη, κ. τ. λ. But we know nothing of a sheep-pond, whereas we do know that in Jerusalem there was a sheep-gate (with προβατικῇ, πύλῃ is to be supplied.) (Nehem. iii. 1, 32; xii. 39. Near this lay the pool, containing a therapeutic spring, which was still efficacious in the time of Eusebius.<sup>1</sup> Here a colonnade was erected, with porches for the accommodation of the sick, and to afford protection against bad weather. Probably this was built by the contributions of the benevolent; and hence the name Βηθσεδά = בֵּית־חַסְדָּא, *i. e.*, domus misericordiæ. (The omission of the ה in composition frequently occurs, particularly in names; *e. g.*, Ναασσών for Ναχσών, Μαθουσάλα for Μαθου-σάλαχ. Comp. Kuinoel on the passage.) The name is very variously written in the MSS., because it was not known to the transcribers, who for the most part were not acquainted with Hebrew. Among the different modes of spelling it, the form Βηθξαθά, or Βηξαθά is worthy of remark. This appears to correspond with the Hebrew בֵּית־חַנָּא, *i. e.* new city, and according to Josephus (B. J. v. 4, 2) a part of Jerusalem bore this name.<sup>2</sup> But the critical authorities here decide for the retention of the ordinary reading, although the reading Βηθξαθά appears to have emanated from persons who possessed a local knowledge of Jerusalem.

Ver. 3—5. In these porches lay crowds of sufferers desiring to avail themselves of the virtue of the water; among these was the man who had been ill for thirty-eight years (probably a paralytic, a cripple) whose cure is here narrated.

<sup>1</sup> That the phrase ἔστι ἐν τοῖς Ἱεροσολύμοις affords no evidence that the city was still standing when this Gospel was composed, has already been remarked in the Introduction, § 4.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. Raumer's Palaestina s. 263, ff. Just. Olshausen zu Topographie des alten Jerusalem (Hamburg, 1833) s. 9, ff.

Here an appendage is added to the account (from ἐκδεχομένων to νοσήματι) which, according to the evidence derived from criticism, is to be regarded as spurious. Not only is it wanting in Cod. B.C., but the concluding words of ver. 3 are not found in Cod. A., and ver. 4 is absent from Cod. D. In many cursive MSS., the passage is marked with an asterisk or obelisk. For the omission of this section, however, there is no conceivable ground; although the suspicion against its *authenticity* is strengthened by the fact, that it is characterized by a great number of different readings (some of which retain, while others omit one or other portion),—a circumstance usually regarded as betraying subsequent interpolation. The supplementary paragraph must be very old, since Tertullian, Chrysostom, and other Fathers, acknowledge it. It is in the highest degree probable that it was introduced into the text from those MSS., in the margin of which their owners had supplied the remark from personal observation. Doubtless, therefore, it was a fact that the water, from time to time (κατὰ καιρόν), fitfully bubbled up, and in such seasons the greatest efficacy was ascribed to it. Now, since the sick man refers to this fact (ver. 7), it was evidently very natural to annex the above information, by way of explaining his words. Such is the opinion of the best modern interpreters and critics upon this critically suspicious passage. De Wette, however, does not decidedly agree in this, without at the same time asserting the authenticity of the words. He lays stress upon the arguments, that, in the first place, the omission of the paragraph is supported only by Alexandrine evidence; and, secondly, that John could hardly have concluded ver. 3 with ξηρῶν, and then have proceeded with ἦν δέ τις ἄνθρωπος, ver. 5. Still, the difficulties on the other side are far greater, especially since, in a few lines, several expressions occur that are found nowhere else in John, as κίνησις, παραχή, δήποτε, νόσημα. This, at any rate, affords ground for calling the spuriousness of the passage very probable.

Special notice is due to the circumstance, that, in this appendix, the movement of the water is ascribed to an *angel*. Even the best modern expositors, Lücke and Tholuck, regard this as a legend, and do not think it worth the trouble of a minute examination, because it is not a genuine production of John's. But I am quite convinced that although the passage did not emanate from John, it



does not contain anything incompatible with the circle of his ideas. It is necessary only to guard against the prevailing view, according to which the production of the phenomenon in the fountain, as a natural effect brought about by natural means, is absolutely opposed to that which is supernatural, accomplished through an angel. By the reference of the phenomenon to an angel, the existence and co-operation of natural forces are not denied; only these natural forces themselves are conceived of in their higher cause. That such an idea of angels was not foreign to the Evangelist is clearly shewn by the passage i. 52, where no one can suppose the ascent and descent of winged beings, as angels sometimes *appear*, but rather the copiousness of spiritual powers which rested upon the Son of Man as their centre. In every physical miracle wrought by the Lord, it may be said that an angel, a manifestation of divine power, descended upon him; and just in like manner here, a striking natural phenomenon is not confined to inanimate, mechanical forces of nature, but is traced up to the creative<sup>1</sup> living spirits of a higher world. (Comp. the remarks in the Comm. on Matt. i. 18, and Luke v. 8, 9.)

Ver. 6—9. Jesus looked upon the poor sufferer, (*ὅτι ἔχει* scil. *ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ*, comp. ver. 5) and sought by the question: *θέλεις ὑγιῆς γενέσθαι*; to awaken in him the hope of aid. The view of Dr Paulus, that "this sick man was an impostor, and did not *wish* to appear in health, although he was so," condemns itself; since the evident object of the narrator is to recount a miraculous cure performed by the Redeemer. The expression *θέλεις* is indeed somewhat remarkable; it would appear obvious that one who had suffered so long, *wished* to be healed. But the strangeness vanishes when it is considered that this unhappy man had almost abandoned all hope of recovery; his paralysis prevented him from reaching the water at the right time, when it was in motion, and therefore restoration appeared to him on every hand excluded. Hence, the question was intended to awaken the desire which slumbered within him, and thus to prepare him for the reception of those heavenly energies which were poured upon him from the Redeemer.

Ver. 10—13. The circumstance that the cure was performed on

<sup>1</sup> The term "creative" is employed here merely in application to *instrumentality* or *agency*.—TA.

the Sabbath now excited the opposition of the people who were bound in the rigid fetters of Pharisaism. (Comp. the remarks on Matt. xii. 10, ff.) The spectators specially censure the carrying of the bed as a violation of the Sabbath. The restored man exonerates himself by reference to the command of his Deliverer, whose name indeed he knew not, but who had now convinced him that he was endowed with the powers of a higher world. The command of Jesus to carry away the bed certainly appears as an invasion of existing manners, of which we find no trace elsewhere in the work of the Lord. But the superstitious mode in which the Jews apprehended the law of the Sabbath may have rendered such positive aggression upon prevailing custom quite necessary. That Jesus by no means sanctioned a tumultuous abolition of the Sabbatic law, is shewn by Matt. xxiv. 20. (*Ἐκνεύω* or *ἐκνέω*, ver. 13, occurs only here in the New Testament. Its primary signification is "to avoid by turning the head aside;" and then, in the general sense, "to turn away," "to withdraw.")

Ver. 14—16. Soon afterwards the Lord met the restored man in the Temple, and sought to apply the coporeal recovery that he had experienced to his spiritual restitution. Probably, according to the words, *μηκέτι ἁμάρτανε*, the illness of the man was connected with sinful indulgences. The Redeemer, therefore, expressly warns him to avoid sin, seeing that this would perpetually bring injury upon him, which would be the more serious as his guilt became greater; and that his guilt would necessarily increase through special experiences of grace and mercy rendered fruitless. The *χείρον*, however, does not allow of application so much to severe illness, as on the contrary to punishment in the world to come; for the full measure of earthly chastisement had been undergone in the sickness of thirty-eight years. The healed man now learns *who* his Benefactor is, and tells it unequivocally to the Jews. In doing this he certainly had no evil design; at all events no hint of it can be traced in the representation of John. Perhaps he hoped that the renowned name of Jesus would stop their blasphemy. But the Pharisaic Sanhedrists (ver. 33) now assail the Holy One of God with violent persecution; the darkness received not the light which was pouring its rays upon it (John i. 5, 11<sup>1</sup>).

<sup>1</sup> The reading, *καὶ ἐξήτουν αὐτὸν ἀποκτείνειν*, ver. 16, is certainly spurious; it was most probably derived from ver. 18.

Ver. 17. The Jews, on calling the Saviour to account respecting his healing on the Sabbath, had probably appealed to Gen. ii. 2, 3; Exod. xx. 10, 11. He then replied by maintaining his peculiar relation to the Father. Jesus did not thus by any means deny the obligation attached to the Sabbatic law, he merely explained the constitution of the Sabbath. The solemnities of the Sabbath were intended to restore the human spirit, distracted by the diversity of earthly affairs, to the oneness of the divine Being;<sup>1</sup> but he who, according to his nature, ever reposes in this unity, observes a perpetual Sabbath, and no activity can distract him. This rest in all activity belongs to God and to the only begotten Son of the Father. Lücke refers ἐργάζεσθαι merely to the *sustaining* activity of God; but in the spiritual world, the *creative* activity of God constantly continues, and it therefore cannot be excluded; indeed, preservation itself is in reality a continuous creation. Spirit is power itself, and activity is but its necessary manifestation; but in the perfect spirit this takes place without the *disquietude* that attends the activity of the created spirit when drawn hither and thither by the variety of things below. Hence in God, and just in like manner in Christ, as his perfect reflection, absolute activity and absolute rest are united.

Ver. 18—20. This comparison, which the Lord institutes between his Heavenly Father and himself, leads the opponents to a still graver accusation (οὐ μόνον—ἀλλὰ καὶ), viz., that he makes himself equal with God. Now this passage (in connexion with the parallel John x. 25—39) is very important in determining the import of the expression *Son of God*,<sup>2</sup> according to the views of the Jews and the meaning of Jesus himself.

The Jews by no means recognized in this term an ordinary appellation of the Messiah, but thought that, in using it, he ascribed to himself a dignity equal to that of God (ἴσον ἑαυτὸν ποιεῖς τῷ Θεῷ. x. 33, ποιεῖς σεαυτὸν Θεόν), which they (according to their mistaken views) did not acknowledge in the Messiah, deeming him only an extraordinary man. The Lord, so far from declaring these conclusions from his words to be erroneous, now

<sup>1</sup> As Luther finely remarks: "Thou shouldest cease from thine own work, that God may carry on his work in thee."

<sup>2</sup> For although, ver. 17, the term υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ does not occur, yet it is implied in πατήρ, and accordingly, in ver. 19 and 20, it is actually employed.

fully confirms them; so that we thus have a genuine declaration of the Lord concerning his consubstantiality and equality with the Father. With the most emphatic protestation (*ἀμήν, ἀμήν λέγω ὑμῖν*), Christ asserts the complete *unity of operation* between the Father and himself; this he states *negatively*, denying all action of his own will in detachment from God (*οὐ δύναται ὁ υἱὸς ποιεῖν ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ οὐδέν*), as well as *positively*, the act of the Son being the act of God. Still, in the terms adopted, the difference of personalities appears carefully confirmed, since it is not said, *ὁ πατὴρ ποιεῖ ἐν τῷ υἱῷ*, but *ἃ ἐκεῖνος ποιεῖ, ταῦτα καὶ ὁ υἱὸς ὁμοίως ποιεῖ*. The reduction of this unity of operation between Father and Son to a mere so-called moral unity, although supported even by virtuous minds, through their yielding to the guidance of *inclination*, is evidently altogether opposed to the sense of our passage, in which the characteristic *οὐ δύναται* indicates unity of *being* as the *ground* of unity in action. This ground is disclosed in ver. 20, where *love* is declared to be the bond between Father and Son, and consequently, the reason of the oneness in their action (comp. iii. 35.) The love of the Father to the Son is here represented as perfect *self-communication*; to the Father belongs the *δεικνύειν*, to the Son the *βλέπειν* of all that God is and does. Both operations (the former rather as the active, the latter as the receptive) are to be apprehended as real; it is not merely in figure that God shews to the Son, and the Son beholds, but this mysterious unity is carried on with real spiritual communication by the ascent and descent of divine powers, and, as if in gradual advancement, it is manifested in effects ever greater and more amazing.

Ver. 21. As *one* of such great works, in the first place, the awakening of the dead is now mentioned. (*Ἐγείρειν* is here distinguished from *ζωοποιεῖν*—the former refers to the startling away of death, the latter to the impartation of new life.) As the Father has given all into the hand of the Son (iii. 35), so he has given to him the awakening of the dead. “Whom he *will* (*οὓς θέλει*), he quickeneth.”<sup>1</sup> This will of the Son, however, is not to be regarded as arbitrary and exclusive (even in the operations of the Son there is nothing *arbitrary*), but as all-comprehensive, and as beatifying

<sup>1</sup> Lücke justly remarks that the expression *οὓς θέλει* refers primarily to the Israelites, who imagined that, as descendants of Abraham, they had a necessitating *right* to eternal life: to this right is opposed the *will* of God.

the whole world of conscious creatures ; although, indeed, it does not compel to happiness, but awaits free choice. The difficult question whether the spiritual or the physical awakening of the dead is here referred to can be decided only by ver. 25, ff., where the idea is pursued. Ver. 21, it is presented simply as a sublime *ἔργον*, belonging alone to the Father and the Son, as the independent sources of the *ζωή* (ver. 26.) Meanwhile, the awakening of the dead by the Father appears different from that which is the work of the Son. The former is the Old Testament awakening, which we recognize, for example, in the life of a David ; while the latter is that of the New Testament. The former is the act of the Father in attracting to the Son, the latter the production of Christ in the soul.

Ver. 22. As *another* *ἔργον*, which the Father has committed to the Son, the Evangelist now speaks of the *κρίσις* (comp. ver. 27), which also, according to its nature,—like the resuscitation of the dead, whether corporeal or spiritual,—pre-supposes divine properties. (The *γάρ* appears to refer to *οὐς θέλει* ; that Jesus quickens whom he will [not all], is an exercise of jurisdiction, as it is described iii. 18.) The contradiction between this passage and the words iii. 17, *οὐκ απέστειλεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν ἵνα κρίνῃ τὸν κόσμον*, is merely apparent. (Compare the interpretation of the passage.) For, in iii. 17, it is only denied that the primary *purpose* of sending Christ was the *κρίσις*, while the *consequence* of that mission to those who did not believe was the judgment, precisely according to ver. 18. The exact meaning either of the resuscitation or of the *κρίσις* is not defined. As in the former, so in the latter case, the expression may designate the internal, spiritual, as well as the general judgment of the world.

Ver. 23. The design of this surrender by the Father of all his glory to the Son is, that all may pay the same honour to the Son as is due to the Father ; and the consequence is, that those who do *not* honour the Son, do not honour the Father, because he will be honoured only in the Son. The Father has, as it were, withdrawn ; he will be acknowledged, loved, adored only in the Son. It is not till the end of the world that the Son will deliver up the kingdom to God and the Father (1 Cor. xv. 24.) Here the connexion with ver. 18 completely finishes. The Jews censured Jesus because *he* had made himself equal with God ; the Saviour,

on the contrary, shews that *God* has constituted him equal with him self, and that he who does not acknowledge him in this exaltation, opposes the will of God himself, whom he pretends to honour. Now this passage in the mouth of him who was lowly in heart (Matt. xi. 29) is a stronger argument for the divine nature of Christ than all those passages in which he is called *God*. The words *τιμᾶν τὸν υἱόν, ὡς τιμῶσι τὸν πατέρα* can only refer to the honour of *worship*; this, however, according to Exod. xx. 3, belongs only to the true God, and *may* not be addressed to any but him. To suppose an arbitrary transference of the honour of worship to this or that person by God, is not consistent with worthy conceptions of him; for God *cannot*, in accordance with his veracity, will that this honour shall be paid to any one to whom it does not belong. Hence it only remains that the Son, Light out of Light, Life out of Life, on account of his essential equality and oneness, *may* and *must* be adored as the Father. Moreover, he who knows the Son and does not adore him, does not worship the Father (the living God), but rather pays homage to the gods of his own understanding, or to idols still more perishable; for the eternal light of the hidden God has been manifested in no other than in the Son, who is the revealed God himself. Nay he who knows not the Son, yet unconsciously worships him, so far as he possesses the *true* knowledge of God or the presentiment of it; for he beholds rays of that light which is displayed in the Son.

Ver. 24. Here we must suppose a return to the discussion of the awakening of the dead, which in ver. 21 was merely touched upon. Up to this point the connexion is clear and simple. We might take *ἀνάστασις* like *κρίσις* in the widest sense, spiritually as well as physically, since both are mentioned merely as works of God which the Father has delivered to the Son. But now the connexion seems to cease, and especially the idea of the resurrection appears so differently employed, that the interpretation is very difficult. The allusion is explained most simply by the impression which the previous words produced upon the hearers. According to their subordinate Jewish views, they were accustomed not to ascribe the resurrection of the dead to the Messiah, but to refer it to God. The discourse of Christ must therefore have produced astonishment, which was doubtless vividly portrayed in their countenances. On this account Jesus recurs to the sentiment of ver. 21, and enlarges

upon it, showing that, according to the more profound mode of apprehending the subject (the view presented in the Old Testament itself when rightly understood), everything, and therefore the *awakening of the dead*, is delivered by the Father to the Son, for that he, like the Father, containing life independently in himself (ver. 26), is able to reanimate. The ancient opinion,<sup>1</sup> that the awakening of the dead is to be taken either in the *physical* sense *merely* (as is thought by several of the Fathers, and among the modern theologians by Storr, Schott, Kuinoel, &c.), or in the *spiritual* sense *exclusively* (as Eckermann, Ammon, &c., maintain), may be considered perfectly obsolete; Augustine, and more recently Luther, Calvin, Lücke, Tholuck, acknowledge that the discourse embraces *both*. The scholars last named interpret ver. 28, 29, as relating to corporeal resuscitation; while they refer the other verses to the spiritual awakening of the dead world. But even this view does not quite suffice for the solution of the difficulties in our passage: the relation between ver. 24 and ver. 25 still remaining obscure, because, according to this view, the same subject is pursued in both verses, which is inconsistent with the difference in the modes of representation.

It appears to me that Lücke approaches most nearly to the correct exposition of this difficult passage. He refers to the Jewish doctrine of a double corporeal resurrection, which the New Testament also recognizes and confirms (comp. my Comm. on Luke xiv. 14), and he thinks that the Saviour here alluded to this. He adds, however, that the Lord cannot have admitted this Jewish view of a twofold resurrection in its literal sense, but that he *apprehended it spiritually*, and merely retained the mode of expression, that believers or the pious only would be raised first. Now this remark in reality conducts us back to the ancient opinion respecting the passage. But if we grant physical resurrection universally, it does not appear why this should not be regarded as proceeding at certain intervals, so that the truly pious, *i. e.* the regenerate, should be raised first, and then the rest. At all events, strict exegesis is not required to do anything beyond bringing out the ideas contained in the text, simply according to the meaning of the author; and, in pursuing this object, we are led by the *progression* in our passage to this result, *viz.*, that the

<sup>1</sup> Respecting the history of the exposition of this passage, compare the excellent Excursus I. of Lücke in the 2d vol. of his Commentar.

Saviour, proceeding from the purely spiritual resuscitation of men, passes on to the resurrection of the just, and thence to the awakening of the dead universally. Accordingly the simple meaning of the words that follow is this: "Truly I say unto you, the Son of God is in *every sense* the reanimator of the dead; he awakens them spiritually, and he will effect the corporeal resurrection of the saints, who are to be raised first, as well as that of all mankind." In ver. 24, *λόγον ἀκούειν* evidently means to receive the preaching of Christ; this, as of divine origin, as the efflux of *ζωή*, produces eternal life, and removes from men the *κρίσις*, the separative element being received in the light itself. (Comp. the remarks on iii. 15, 17, 18.) The condition of merely natural life is that of *θάνατος*, the absence of divine *ζωή*; the regenerated man is transferred from this spiritual death to true life. The *ζωή αἰώνιος* is not to be regarded merely as *ulterior*; in him who is awakened out of the death of the natural man, it begins *already*, so that heaven appears brought down to earth, being placed in the heart of the believer. The element of life, however, must gradually penetrate from within through the whole man, even through his corporeal nature.

Ver. 25. As in the individual the process of animation advances by degrees from within to the exterior, so it is in the mass. *Some* of the dead rise first, and at last *all* that rest in the grave (ver. 28.) The former are those who in this life hear the Word of God (*οἱ ἀκούσαντες*, sc. *τὸν λόγον*, ver. 24), and receive him so as to be regenerated. They are thus prepared to recognize the call (*φωνή*) of the Son of God, and to be corporeally transformed. It is evident that *φωνή* is essentially distinct from *λόγος*, and, as ver. 29 shews, is nothing else than the creative call of God, which vivifies the dead, or the awakening summons (*φωνὴ σάλπιγγος*), 1 Cor. xv. 52; hence the passage cannot be understood as referring to spiritual resuscitation. The words *ἔρχεται ὥρα καὶ νῦν ἐστίν* also prohibit the latter acception, for they could not be employed in relation to spiritual resuscitation, this being already accomplished and present.<sup>1</sup> The formula *ἔρχεται ὥρα καὶ νῦν ἐστίν* is adopted

<sup>1</sup> In opposition to this Lücke remarks (B. ii. s. 44), that as yet the apostles themselves had scarcely begun to awake out of the death of error, and thus it might well be said: "the hour of spiritual awakening cometh." But that the words *οἱ νεκροὶ ἀκούσονται* are to be understood as referring to the apostles, is in the highest degree improbable. I allow, indeed, that my interpretation of the passage may fail to carry conviction, so long as it is doubted that Christ admitted the Jewish distinction between a resuscitation of



when some phenomenon is spoken of which, although indeed future, may be regarded as present in the germ. As with the kingdom of God, so with the *ἀνάστασις*. This, like the erection of the kingdom of God, was viewed as coincident with the *ἐπιφάνεια* of the Messiah, and although, like the latter, as it respects the completion, it was delayed, yet it was heralded by analogous instances<sup>1</sup> in the present (Matt. xxvii. 52, 53.)

Ver. 26, 67. Now, the possibility of the accomplishment of such a work is founded on the fact, that the Father has given to the Son *ζωή* as a possession, as an independent fountain of life, and with it *κρίσις*. (Comp. the remarks on John i. 4, iii. 19.) In connexion with this, however, the final clause, *ὅτι υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστὶ*, is remarkable. It is evidently intended to furnish the reason why the *κρίσις* could be given to him. It is therefore obvious that *ὁ ἀ.* cannot here be equivalent to *ἄνθρωπος*, in order to maintain which it would be necessary to connect the words with the following verse, as several of the Fathers, and, among the moderns, Dr Paulus, propose; but this is utterly inadmissible. The sense itself, as well as the circumstance that *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου* has not the article, are explained in the simplest manner by supposing a reference to the passage, Dan. vii. 13. There, in like manner, the article is wanting, and a Son of man appears before the throne of the Ancient, in order to be formally invested with all might and dominion. With allusion to this, it is now said, that because he is such a *בן אדם*, he is also the Judge, for *all* is delivered into his hands.<sup>2</sup> (John iii. 35; Matt. xi. 27, xxviii. 18; 1 Cor. xv. 27.)

the righteous and the universal awakening of the dead; but, on the other hand, it cannot be denied that if Christ acknowledged this doctrine, our acception gains from the reference to the resurrection of the just that strength of evidence in which every other is more or less deficient.

<sup>1</sup> Some of the Fathers, *e. g.*, Chrysostom, Cyril, &c., referred *καὶ νῦν ἐστὶν* only to the reanimation of Lazarus and similar cases, which is evidently too narrow a limitation of the words.

<sup>2</sup> Upon a comparison of this passage with Heb. ii. 17, 18, it might appear that *υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* here designates the man in his humility and lowliness; so that the sense would be: "Because he has humbled himself in lowliness, he is well adapted to be a merciful Judge." In that case, it would be necessary to lay all the stress upon the absence of the article, for *ὁ υἱὸς τ. ἀ.* is *never* employed in reference to the humiliation. But, since the absence of the article is easily explained by the circumstance that *υἱὸς τ. ἀ.* possesses the nature of an adopted nomen proprium, it is indisputably most suitable to retain the ordinary meaning of the expression.

Ver. 28, 29. The less is now surpassed by the greater :—yea, even the *universal* resuscitation at the end of time is the work of the Son of God! That the Lord here refers to *physical* resurrection, is shewn by the expression *ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις*, as also by *ἐκπορεύεσθαι*, and by the remark that the wicked will rise as well as the good. The *ἀγαθὰ ποιήσαντες* are here, of course, righteous persons, as they are described Matt. xxv. 34, ff., but distinguished from the *ἀκούσαντες* (ver. 25, those who are regenerated through the Logos). Just in like manner in the Apocalypse, the priests of God and of Christ who have part in the first resurrection (xx. 5, 6) are distinguished from the dead, who are judged *according to their works*, among whom are righteous and unrighteous (xx. 12.) To the one class of those who are judged the *ἀνάστασις* is the true *ζωή*, while to the other it is only *θάνατος δεύτερος* (Apoc. xx. 14), *i. e.*, the entire loss of all higher life and being, and abandonment to perfect alienation from God. In the case of the latter, therefore, *κρίσις* appears as the absolute *κατάκρισις*. This passage is further remarkable as the only one in the New Testament,—besides Acts xxiv. 15, where the *ἀνάστασις δικαίων τε καὶ ἀδίκων* is spoken of,—containing an express mention of the resurrection of the wicked. 1 Cor. xv. the resurrection appears only as a favour bestowed upon believers, and Matt. xxv., Rev. xx., although the universal judgment of the world is the subject of discourse, nothing is said respecting the corporeal resurrection of the wicked. In the passage Matt. x. 28, indeed, the corporeal resurrection of the wicked is presupposed, and in the Old Testament, Dan. xii. 2, the doctrine that the ungodly will rise again is most distinctly taught.

Ver. 30. The Redeemer in conclusion describes his judgment as unalterable, because it is just. The Father himself judges in the Son. The words *οὐ δύναμαι ἐγὼ κ. τ. λ.* proceed from the general relation of the Son (comp. the remarks on ver. 19), and upon this is founded the special relation of the *κρίσις*. The judgment of the Son cannot but be *δικαία*, because it emanates from God, the absolute *δικαιοσύνη* (comp. viii. 16), and in the Son it is not a detached will of his own (*θέλημα ἐμόν*), but simply the will of the Father. (The interpretation, “I judge concerning my contemporaries according to that which I have [through men] learned respecting them,” would reduce all the depth of meaning in this passage to mere superficiality, and sufficiently refutes itself.)

Ver. 31, 32. These declarations of Jesus regarding his sublime dignity, very naturally lead him to speak of the witnesses thereto. Doubtless he read in the astonished looks of his hearers the question: "How dost thou prove this?" Now, it is remarkable that the Redeemer here appears to say the very contrary to that which he uttered in another passage (viii. 14) in reply to a similar query. There he says that his witness concerning himself is true, here, that it is not true. It has, however, already frequently been remarked that this difference is solved in a simple manner thus: Christ in this passage places himself in the human point of view which belonged to his auditors, to whom a testimony from himself in his own cause could be of no value, because everywhere in the *κόσμος* the possibility of imposture or deceit must be supposed. But in the passage viii. 14 the Lord speaks concerning his divine dignity, the truth of which nothing can more strongly confirm than his own word, this being one with the divine word itself. Now, here (ver. 32) Jesus speaks of the divine testimony to him as that of *another*. Some, *e. g.* Chrysostom and Grotius, have understood by *ἄλλος*, not God, but John the Baptist; a view sufficiently refuted by the sequel (ver. 37, 38.) Here, however, arises the difficult question,—how many testimonies are to be distinguished in the words that follow? That of the Baptist (ver. 33—35) and that of Holy Scripture (ver. 39) stand clearly out; but whether, ver. 36, the testimony by means of the *ἔργα* is to be discriminated from the testimony of God it is difficult to say. The distinction depends upon the acceptance of ver. 36, 37, where we shall recur to the question; here I only remark, in a cursory way, that I believe the two witnesses must be united,—that of the *ἔργα*, and, so to speak, the personal testimony of God. Ver. 32, however, may be so taken as to comprehend all the subsequent forms of testimony, for those of the Baptist and of the Sacred Scriptures are in reality the testimonies of God to Jesus.

Ver. 33, 34. The Saviour reminds his hearers, in the first place, that they had already received a witness on his behalf in John, whom they honoured as a prophet; and, in the next place, that they had sufficient grounds for believing him. Yet Jesus expressly remarks, that he does not need recommendation from a *human* being; he refers to such evidence only to assist them in believing, and thus to promote their salvation (*ταῦτα λέγω, ἵνα ὑμεῖς σωθῆτε.*)

(The *ἀλήθεια* which the Baptist attested, is, that Jesus is the Messiah.) This declaration is somewhat extraordinary; it appears as though Christ here declined the testimony of the Baptist, which nevertheless was appointed for him by God himself, and on which such great stress was laid, John i. 19, ff. Lücke endeavours to solve the difficulty by taking *λαμβάνω* here actively, as meaning "to seek, to strive after." But the statement: "I desire no human witness" is still extraordinary, since Jesus himself, ver. 35, ascribes importance to the testimony of the Baptist. Doubtless the sentence is, on the contrary, to be taken thus: "I do not receive the witness from a man; the testimony of the Baptist was not a human testimony; God testified through him." To those who regarded it merely as a human attestation it was of no value.

Ver. 35. The following words, therefore, while they represent John as subordinate to Jesus who was the *φῶς*, still point him out as filled with divine energy, by means of which he aroused hearts and consciences (*καιόμενος*), while he illuminated understandings (*φαίνων*.) Comp. as parallel Sirach xlviii. 1. The Jews had indeed acknowledged the prophetic endowments of the Baptist, but had not made use of them; instead of being moved by his ardour to genuine contrition, and going as penitents to Christ, they played like children in his light for awhile, and then forsook him. The Redeemer characterizes the conduct of the Jews in a similar manner Matt. xi. 16, ff. (*Ἐθέλειν* indicates the inclination of the Jews for such trifling pleasures. Comp. ver. 40. It is, as Lücke justly remarks, neither adverbial nor pleonastic.—*Πρὸς ὥραν*, comp. Gal. ii. 5; Phil. ii. 15.)

Ver. 36. In addition to John's testimony, the *ἔργα* of Christ are now mentioned. As regards the idea that John attached to the term *ἔργα*;<sup>1</sup>—some have understood by it the course of action which Jesus pursued, or his Messianic ministry in general; some have applied it to his doctrine or to his miracles alone; and others have taken it as involving the latter in connexion with his Messianic ministry. That the term does not indicate either the doctrine<sup>2</sup> or the Messianic ministry of Jesus *without* his miracles is so clear,

<sup>1</sup> There are but few instances besides those in John, where the expression occurs with this signification, as Matt. xi. 2; Heb. iii. 9; Ps. cvii. 24; in the Hebrew, מַעֲשֵׂה.

<sup>2</sup> In the passage xiv. 10 this is very apparent. Compare, however, the exposition in loco.

and now so acknowledged, that it needs no further proof. Still the question remains, whether we are to understand the miracles of Christ *alone*, or *in connexion with his ministry generally*. Lücke, with whom Tholuck accords, decidedly maintains the latter opinion. I think, with Storr, Flatt, and Kuinoel, that ἔργα = σημεῖα indicates *only* the miracles of Jesus. Lücke is led to the adoption of the other view by the comparison of John xvii. 4, τὸ ἔργον ἐτελείωσα. This passage does indeed *appear* parallel, since in our's also τελειώσω αὐτά occurs; but a closer consideration of it shows the contrary. The *singular*, with the article John xvii. 4, leaves no choice; there *the* work of Jesus is not to be understood as designating his miracles collectively, but, on the contrary, his entire Messianic vocation, with all its individual manifestations. But where the expression occurs in the *plural*, this signification is by no means so suited to the context as that which is restricted to the miracles. In addition to the present passage, John-x. 25, 32, 38, xiv. 11, ff. decidedly favour this view. In these verses the ἔργα are always employed as *proofs* of the divine mission of Christ, just as the σημεῖα, iii. 2. Miracles, however, are the *only* manifestations of the Messianic ministry of Jesus which could prove his mission to be divine, and consequently these alone could be meant. The *entire* Messianic work of Jesus could not form a *proof*, for the very reason that it was not yet completed, and could not be surveyed. Lücke, indeed, thinks that τελειώσω cannot at all be said of miracles, because they are completed immediately that they take place. But this expression does not refer to the completion of a single miracle, it relates to the entire sum of his miracles which was present to the mind of Christ. Accordingly, this comprehensive term is resolved into its particulars by the words αὐτὰ τὰ ἔργα, ἃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ which follow, and this supplementary sentence is quite incompatible with the interpretation of Lücke. The miracles of Jesus are, in their nature, the only arguments that can prove the divine authority of Christ's ministry.

Ver. 37, 38. These verses appear to contain merely a more definite explanation of ver. 36, as Lücke thinks, and as at an earlier period it seemed to me probable. But the perfect μεμαρτύρηκε with the subsequent ἀκηκόατε and ἐώρακατε, as also the emphatic αὐτός, and the circumstance that εἶδος and φωνή are not suited to ἔργα, indicate with more than probability an advance to some-

thing fresh. We are not indeed to suppose an allusion either to the fact of the Baptism or to the prophets and their testimony, but a reference to the immediate operation of the Spirit of God in the souls of men (comp. vi. 45); the Lord represents this as constituting spiritual theophania, which, however, presuppose susceptibility, "being in the truth," in order to be perceived. They might have seen the form of God, and might have heard his voice, but they had been prevented by their sins, which had blunted their powers of perception. Jesus, in exhibiting the proof of this want of susceptibility in his contemporaries, refers to the various modes in which God is revealed; he manifests himself, as in nature and in history, so also in the soul. But the Jews had *in no case* acknowledged him. Of course we are not to understand literal theophania, for these the Jews could not have seen; but the form of the expression is borrowed from these. *Φωνή* and *εἶδος*, as modes of divine revelation which the ear and eye of the opened mind can perceive, correspond with *ἀκούειν* and *βλέπειν*, whereby Jesus designates his own perceptions of the operations of the Father. To understand the passage as stating the spirituality of God, is, as may easily be seen, quite a mistake; for the Lord does not deny, but asserts the *φωνή* and *εἶδος* of God, while he says that the Jews have not acknowledged them.

As regards the language: *καὶ τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔχετε μένοντα ἐν ὑμῖν*;—I cannot with Lücke refer it to the word of Scripture, but only to the inward revelation of God in the mind. (Comp. 1 John i. 10.) According to John's idea, the word of the eternal God speaks or sounds in the mind of every individual by whom anything external kindred to that word is encountered. Sin has indeed diminished man's susceptibility of its awakening power, but still it displays itself as efficacious. The *λόγον ἔχειν μένοντα*, however, according to our passage, precedes faith, and is essential to it. It is equivalent to being "of the truth," or to the law of God within men. (Rom. i. 18, 19, ii. 14, 15.) Without something analogous in the mind, man cannot perceive the things of God.

It is the same as that which Jesus, in the synoptical Gospels (Matt. vi. 23), calls "the light in thee." This acceptance does not involve a denial of proneness to sin, although it certainly does deny the entire extinction of all power to perceive that which is divine. (The idea of *μένειν, εἶναι ἐν τινί*, in John, is profoundly spiritual; he

understands by it *real* existence and abode within, for the divine nature is conceived of as actually imparting itself to men through love [ver. 42.] Comp. Rom. x. 8.) In regard to the correctness of this interpretation of ver. 37, 38 ;—some mistake might be occasioned by the comparison of i. 18 and vi. 46, where it is said that no one except the Son can see God. But even in these passages the reference is not to an immediate contemplation of God, effected without the intervention of the Son ; on the contrary, the meaning, when divested of the metaphorical allusion to theophania, is no other than that expressed Matt. xi. 27, “ No one knoweth the Father except the Son, and he to him the Son will reveal him.” Christ was willing to reveal the Father, but the unbelieving Jews closed their eyes against the light which sought to penetrate.

Ver. 39, 40. As a proof of the complete blindness and deadness of the Jews, Jesus adduces the fact that they perpetually searched in the Scriptures and thought to possess eternal life therein, while nevertheless they perceived not that the Scriptures themselves testified concerning Christ. But (*καὶ* is to be taken as adversative) they *would* not come to Christ ; the insincerity of their disposition forms the foundation of their incapacity for the knowledge of God and of his messengers. Thus apprehended the passage takes its place in the connexion with less ambiguity than when *ἐρευνᾶτε* is understood as an imperative. It is true, however, that the absence of *ὑμεῖς* appears to favour the acceptance of the imperative ; and Lücke adduces John vii. 24, xiv. 28 ; 1 Thess. ii. 9, as instances in which *ὑμεῖς* is omitted before the imperative.

Ver. 41—44. As the ground of this unwillingness (*οὐ θέλετε εἰσελθεῖν*, ver. 40), the Lord now mentions their love of self, and the deficiency of love to God connected therewith. (The words *οὐκ ἔχειν ἀγάπην τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν ἑαυτῷ* are evidently to be taken as *λόγος ἔχειν ἐν ἑαυτῷ*, ver. 28 ; viz., not as referring to the determination of the will, but to that higher element of life which God imparts to man ; for no one can love God, until God has first loved him, *i. e.*, has communicated himself to him, 1 John iv. 10.) The love of God rebukes all sin and self-complacency, but the sin that is in men flatters them ; hence man seeks the transitory *δόξα* of men which pleases the flesh, rather than eternal *δόξα* with God. On this account the Jews welcomed false christs and prophets, but fastened the true Saviour to the cross. (Comp.

the Comm. on Matt. xxiv. 4, 5. Lücke on the passage remarks, according to Bengel, that the Jews numbered not less than sixty-four false messiahs *after* Christ.)

Ver. 45—47. Jesus now addresses his final rebuke to those who were present, in which he states his relation to Moses, the representative of the law. The Pharisaic Jews, on account of their legality, thought that in Moses they had a substitute with God; if they did see in Christ anything divine or pleasing to God, yet he appeared to them as their opponent, because he reproved their sins. This view proceeded from a total derangement of the point of sight. The gentle Son of Man, full of grace and truth (i. 17), brought forgiveness, although indeed only to the penitent and believing;<sup>1</sup> Moses, on the contrary, with his law formed the accusatory element against the disobedient. To this latter class the Jews plainly shewed that they belonged, for not to mention any gross transgressions of law, they did not observe the command of Moses to honour the promised Prophet. (Deut. xviii. 18.) The Lord may have alluded specially to this passage; but he also regarded all the other predictions in the Mosaic writings (thus acknowledging prophecies in the Pentateuch, comp. Luke xxiv. 27), in connexion with the typically symbolic character of the law, as means calculated to awaken his contemporaries, and draw them speedily to himself. But they accumulated to themselves teachers according to the itching of their ears (2 Tim. iv. 3), rather than they would receive the salutary doctrine of the Son of God. The concluding words (ver. 47) are remarkable, since the *ῥήματα* of Christ appear far more efficacious than the *γράμματα* of the Old Testament. But submission to the authority of Holy Scripture tended to assist these individuals in perceiving the truth that it contained, whilst they were full of prejudice against the person of the Lord.

<sup>1</sup> De Wette's view of this passage, according to which Jesus merely said, "that he would not accuse them, this not being necessary, since Moses did it," is erroneous. As if Moses here did some thing which properly Christ should have done. The judicial activity of the Redeemer, on the contrary, entirely withdraws here, and the sense of our passage is equivalent to the words, "I judge no one."



§ 10. THE FEEDING OF THE FIVE THOUSAND—JESUS WALKING  
ON THE SEA—DISCOURSES ON PARTAKING HIS FLESH  
AND BLOOD.

(John vi. 1—71.)

Ver. 1—13. With respect to the fact of the entertainment itself, such remarks as are needful have already been made in the Comm. on Matt. xiv. 13, ff. compared with xv. 32, ff. The fact itself, like the walking of Jesus on the sea, is here only of secondary importance; both form merely the bases of the following great discourses by Jesus, which were important to the Evangelist on account of his immediate design. For it is evident that the narration of the feeding, according to the meaning of John, stands in close connexion with the following discourse respecting the eating and drinking of his flesh and blood, and hence may furnish an illustration of the doctrine of the Holy Supper. The *εὐχαριστία* of Christ, which vi. 23 appears as the effective circumstance in the feeding, is to be understood similarly also in connexion with the Supper. (Concerning the *μετὰ ταῦτα*, ver. 1, compared with *ἦν δὲ ἐγγὺς τὸ πάσχα*, ver. 4, we have already spoken, v. 1. The Feast there mentioned was probably that of Purim, which was only about a month distant from the Passover. If a Passover were to be understood there, then either no account would be given of a whole year, or else it would be necessary, as Dr Paulus proposes, to take *ἐγγύς* in the sense of “just after,” “shortly thereupon.” This, however, as we have already observed in our remarks on v. 1, is utterly incongruous, since the term is constantly employed in reference to time “nearly approaching,”<sup>1</sup> and accordingly we cannot receive the view that the Feast mentioned v. 1 is a Passover.)

Ver. 14, 15. John relates more expressly than the synoptical Evangelists, that the assembled multitude, astonished at the amazing miracle, endeavoured to claim Jesus on the side of their political views concerning the Messiah. This induced him to return alone to the mountain (ver. 3) where he had previously been with his

<sup>1</sup> Comp. only John xi. 55, where the same words occur: *ἦν δὲ ἐγγὺς τὸ πάσχα ὡπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων*.

disciples. ('Ο προφήτης here stands, κατ' ἐξοχήν, for the Messiah, according to Deut. xviii. 18, in the signification : " The One known great Prophet promised by Moses."

16—24. The event immediately subsequent, the walking of Jesus on the sea, has also been considered, Matt. xiv. 22, ff. Our Evangelist only speaks more particularly regarding the conduct of the people after the Lord had withdrawn (ver. 22—24.) The assembly, he says, observed that, when the disciples in the evening went away, Jesus remained behind, and that no other ship was there besides that in which they embarked. (For the sake of pointing out the one ship more exactly, some codices have, in ver. 22, the additional sentence : ἐκεῖνο, εἰς ᾧ ἐνέβησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, which, however, plainly betrays itself as a mere interpretation.) They therefore conjectured that the Lord must have chosen the route by land, and they hastened to cross the intervening sea that they might arrive before him. (Since it had been said before that there was no other ship there; it was needful to observe in addition, ver. 23, that others had arrived from Tiberias. This, however, forms a parenthesis, for ὅτε εἶδεν, ver. 24, resumes the thread of the discourse, ἰδών, ver. 22. The reading εἶδον or εἶδεν for ἰδών has arisen from a mistake of the parenthetical sentence.)

Ver. 25—26. Surprised to find Jesus already on the other side of the sea, they ask : πότε ὥδε γέγονας ; the πότε here evidently involves the πῶς, as they thought to deduce from the time of arrival the mode in which he had come. The Redeemer enters into no particulars about external matters, but conducts them at once to a knowledge of their own hearts, from the motives which induced them to follow him. Tholuck remarks, in connexion with this, that if the miracle had been requested merely for the sake of gratifying the eye, this would have been a proof of great externality ; but, if the object was to satisfy animal appetite, it was still more censurable. He appears, therefore, to have taken the passage, so that ὅτι ἐφάγετε ἐκ τῶν ἄρτων καὶ ἐχορτάσθητε refers merely to physical satisfaction, which, indeed, the words primarily indicate. But in that case it is difficult to conceive how Christ could have been induced to address such a spiritual discourse to men so grossly sensual. For, granting that the Redeemer in his discourses frequently went beyond the point of view which belonged

to his hearers, because his words were intended also for after ages (John xiv. 26), still it must be admitted that Jesus did not act inconsiderately, addressing what was most profound to the very persons who had least ability to understand it. The concluding observations, vi. 60—71, further appear unsuited to such a character of inferiority, and such childlike expressions as ver. 34, κύριε, πάντοτε δὸς ἡμῖν τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον, also appear to indicate a different bent of mind. It might, indeed, be said that the μαθηταί (ver. 60, ff.) are to be distinguished from the grossly sensual men, and that the profound discourses are intended properly for the former. But ver. 27, ff., shew the contrary. Here, at the very beginning of the discourse, the sentiments peculiar to it are addressed to the persons who appear described, ver. 26, in such strong language. Hence the best mode of apprehending the words, is to take them similarly to the manner in which we have understood the expressions of the Samaritan woman at Jacob's well. Although her attention was directed primarily to the well-water in the external sense, she was not of the nature which characterized the common mass, but was in the highest degree susceptible; thus these men also, although they certainly rejoiced in the distribution of the bread, yet, at any rate, they did not do so from vulgar sensuality, but partly on account of that destitution which excited pity, and partly from the mere desire of edification. The Lord, therefore, could venture such profound revelations in their hearing, since he might hope, by disclosing the truth, to awaken within them the slumbering germ of higher attainments; or if they remained immoveable and became contentious, he must have wished them to withdraw.

Ver. 27, 28. Jesus here introduces the discourse just in the same way as he introduced the conversation with the woman of Samaria. From corporeal bread he proceeds to speak of spiritual, and here designates himself ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς, in like manner as he there described himself to be the water of life. The expression βρωσις μένουσα εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον also intimates the effect of spiritual nutriment.

Food itself, of course, ministers to enjoyment, but heavenly food imparts its nature to those who partake it, whilst, on the contrary, the system changes physical nutriment into its own nature. The υἱὸς τ. ἀ. now dispenses this food, but man must seek it from him.

(*Ἐργάζεσθαι* corresponds with the foregoing *ζητεῖν*. It is here employed in the sense "to obtain by labour," *i. e.*, to acquire, to procure. Thus *פָּעַל* is used in Hebrew, *e. g.*, Prov. xxi. 6, *פֹּעֵל אֲצִירֹת בְּלִשׁוֹן שָׁקֶר*, *i. e.*, one who acquires treasures with a lying tongue. The LXX., it is true, here translated it by *ἐνεργεῖν*, but Theodotion has *ἐργάζεσθαι*. Similarly *ποιεῖν* is employed. Comp. Matt. xxv. 16.) The Father (by means of the signs which he performs through the Son [ver. 36]) has sealed him,<sup>1</sup> as the dispenser of heavenly vital energy. (Concerning *σφραγίζω*, comp. the remarks on iii. 33.<sup>2</sup>) The answer of the Jews to these words plainly indicates a certain spiritual understanding; it is not indeed altogether suitable, but still it is not entirely beside the mark. They refer the *βρῶσις*, in accordance with their legal point of view, to such works of the law as God requires (*ἔργα τ. Θ.*), and from Christ they only desire instruction as to the right legal works. Lücke here observes that this answer may have been given by the *more cultivated* among the assembly, and it certainly is probable that they led the conversation; but even the most *uncultivated* might have answered thus, if only susceptible of the higher element.

Ver. 29—31. From the *many* works to which the Jews, in accordance with their legal bias, referred, Jesus points them to the *one* thing needful, whereby alone all the works of man are hallowed, *viz.*, faith in the Son of God. With a fine allusion to the *\*ἔργα* he terms it *ἔργον τ. Θ.*, faith being not only pleasing to God, but also performed by means of his grace, and thus being a work of God in the soul of man. To this work the Jews did not attain, through their inward restlessness, and their efforts to perform works of many kinds. Even now when this invitation was addressed to them, instead of manifesting a docile mind, and making room in their hearts for the power of Jesus, first of all they require signs. Dr Paulus makes use of these words to shew that they cannot have regarded the previous entertainment as a miracle. But in that case the subsequent mention of manna, ver. 31, is obscure, because this necessarily referred directly to the miracle of the feeding. We must

<sup>1</sup> Here (ver. 27) *πατήρ* is used in connexion with *ὁ τ. ἀνθρώπου*, a circumstance that seldom occurs. Comp. the remarks on Mark xiii. 32, in the Comm.

<sup>2</sup> The view of Hilary is quite erroneous. He refers the *σφραγίζειν* not to the *ἔργα* but to the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father, as if he were an impression of the Father (*χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως*, Heb. i. 3.)

therefore suppose the circumstances to have been as follows. The assembly here surrounding Jesus, consisted partly of those who had beheld that miracle, and partly of others who had only heard it related; some of the latter placed no confidence in the account, and wishing to see something of the kind with their own eyes, endeavoured, by mentioning the manna, to induce Jesus to repeat the miracle. 'Εχορτάσθητε, ver. 26, evidently points to the same persons. They now plainly intimate to the Redeemer what kind of miracle they mean, viz., a truly splendid one (ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, Matt. xvi. 1) like that of Moses with the manna. This appears to involve a depreciation of that which Jesus had done, viz., the feeding with *ordinary* bread; so that we get the sense, "Behold Moses performed a still greater miracle, he gave us bread *from heaven*!" Such a miracle the Jews probably thought they might expect from the Messiah, because they regarded Moses as a type of the Messiah, in relation also to this miracle.<sup>1</sup> The citation is from Ps. lxxviii. 24, where, however, the LXX. read ἄρτον οὐρανοῦ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς. (Comp. Rev. ii. 17.)

Ver. 32, 33. With this manna that nourishes the body, Christ now contrasts his nutriment for the soul. The Redeemer by no means denies that the manna came from heaven; he only says that it was not the ἄρτος ἀληθινὸς ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ (respecting ἀληθινὸς comp. the remarks on John i. 9) *i. e.*, it could not be so termed in the *proper* and highest sense, because it served for physical purposes, and therefore, although prepared by God in a miraculous way, could not have been derived from the world of spirit.

With respect to the manna still found in Arabia, and its relation to the miraculous manna of holy Scripture, Von Raumer's remarks may be compared, in his Zuge der Israeliten durch die Wüste (Leipzig, 1837) s. 24, ff. As the ἄρτος ἀληθινὸς Christ designates himself the καταβαίνων ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. Lücke justly defines the difference between καταβαίνων and καταβάς (ver. 41); the latter indicates a fact, the former rather a property. But I cannot agree with Lücke in understanding the words ὁ καταβαίνων ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ζῶν διδοὺς τῷ κόσμῳ as an epithet of the ἄρτος. This would occasion

<sup>1</sup> Lightfoot hor. hebr. p. 1018, quotes from Midras Cobelet h. f. 86, 4, this passage: redemptor prior (*i. e.*, Moses) descendere fecit pro iis Manna, sic et redemptor posterior מַנָּה יָרַד מִן הַשָּׁמַיִם, *i. e.*, descendere faciet Manna sicut scriptum est Ps. lxxviii. 24.

<sup>2</sup> The Hebrew text has כֶּסֶם בֶּן הַשָּׁמַיִם, *i. e.*, corn of Heaven. -

an obvious tautology with what precedes. On the contrary, it is a predicate, or, inverting the sentence, a subject in this sense: "He who comes from heaven, the dispenser of life to the world, is himself the bread of God." That the bread of God comes from heaven is self-evident, since God dwells in heaven. Moreover, it is only thus that the language *ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς* (ver. 35) is suitable. The world is contemplated as carrying within itself *θάνατος*, and the Incarnate Logos is the first who brings into it the true *ζωή* (i. 4.) If the words had been intended to refer to *ἄρτος*, it would doubtless have been said, *ὁ γὰρ ἄρτος Θεοῦ καταβαίνει ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*. I cannot admit that if the participle had been used in application to Christ, the expression *ὁ καταβάς* must have been employed, because the coming of Christ from heaven was not concluded once for all with the birth, but is a continuous act, on which account it was said of Christ during his life on earth: "he is in heaven;" consequently, both participles may be used with respect to Christ, according as his descent is represented as finished, or as continuous. So also justly Meyer.

Ver. 34, 35. Just like the Samaritan woman (iv. 15), the assembly of Jews cried out *πάντοτε δὸς ἡμῖν τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον*, and thus we see that these men entertained a certain desire after heavenly things. Hereupon the Redeemer expressly represents himself to them as *ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς*, and as appeasing all hunger.

Here the remark applies which we made in commenting on iv. 14, viz., it is not the Lord's *doctrine* that imparts satisfaction, and allays desire (this may be possessed in the memory without assuaging the longings of the heart); but it is his *Spirit*, which necessarily teaches right doctrine. He communicates his spiritual life and being itself to his own, and consequently makes them like himself, first spiritually, then corporeally (Rom. viii. 11.) Respecting *ἐρχεσθαι* = *πιστεύειν*, consult the remarks on John iii. 20, 21, compared with ver. 18, and also John vi. 36, compared with ver. 37.

Ver. 36—38. This true faith was the very thing that was not yielded to the Redeemer (ver. 26.) They regarded Jesus as the Messiah (ver. 14, 15), and yet did not exercise faith in him, because they did not receive the divine power that issued from Christ, and allow it to operate effectually within them. This was the more censurable as they enjoyed his immediate ministry. (In *ὅτι καὶ*

ἐωράκατέ με, the καὶ is to be taken in the signification of etiam si.) Yet the Lord, as if consoling himself, limits the general expression οὐ πιστεύετε, so as to except some from the statement, just as he did i. 11, 12. (In πᾶν ὁ the absolute is employed for the concrete; Christ views those who come to him as one organic whole.) All whom the Father giveth to him certainly will come to him. Διδόναι (x. 29, xvii. 6, 9, 12, 24) evidently traces faith itself to a divine activity, which is designated, ver. 44, ἐλκύειν. Faith, therefore, is God's work in the believer (Phil. ii. 13); but it by no means follows that the unbelief of the unbeliever is founded in God's decree. For it is the sad prerogative of the creature that he can sin, and by sin can render himself unsusceptible of God's gracious attractions. The Son, full of kindness, comes to meet every heart that yields to these attractions of the Father (οὐ μὴ ἐκβάλω ἔξω is to be taken as Litotes, "I not only do not cast him out, but I embrace him with all the energy of love.") The operations of the Father and of the Son do not oppose each other, but work harmoniously together. (The formula ἐκβάλλειν ἔξω indicates an enclosed, bounded community of life, which the Redeemer came to establish. Comp. Matt. xxv. 10.

Ver. 39, 40. As the sublime will of the Father, that was to be carried into effect in the mission of the Son, it is now specified that he, the source of ζωή, should impart life to the νεκροί. (Comp. i. 4, iii. 15, 16.) As the point of consummation, however, in the ζωοποιεῖσθαι, the ἀνάστασις ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ is immediately mentioned, and this presupposes the awakening of the spirit, and the quickening of the soul. That this can denote *only* the corporeal resurrection, is, according to the idea indicated by ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, certain. (Comp. the Comm. on Matt. xxiv. 3.) Any reference of the expression to the merely spiritual ministry of Christ would occasion tautology with ἔχειν ζωὴν αἰώνιον. If, however, we understand the ζωοποίησις τοῦ σώματος as that which is alluded to here, we then have in these words a significant hint at the turn afterwards given to the course of the conversation. In the interview with the woman of Samaria, Jesus did not proceed beyond the representation of himself as spiritual, living water, which refreshes and sustains the soul; here he already intimates that he is about to go further, and to describe himself as the Restorer and Transformer of the *entire* man, even of the body. Thus the conversa-

tion, as it proceeds, advances further into spiritual things,—the Redeemer penetrates more and more deeply into the sublime idea of the *ζωοποίησις* of the world; and as its consummation, he sets forth the glorification even of that which is corporeal. Hand in hand with this advance, the disclosure of the gifts that he bestows progresses. He gives not merely his *πνεῦμα*, but his *ψυχὴ* itself, and even his *σὰρξ*. (The construction of *πάν* with the following *ἐξ αὐτοῦ* is a known Hebraism. Comp. Gesenius, *Lehrgeb.* s. 723, ff. on the use of the absolute nominative. Lücke, it is true, justly remarks, that kindred constructions occur even in the writings of profane Greek authors. [Comp. Viger, Hermann's edition, s. 54, note, where *e. g.* the passage : *ἡ δὲ δεξιὰ, ὀρθοὶ τῆς χειρὸς ἐκείνης οἱ δάκτυλοι* is adduced from Philostrat. *vita Apoll. Tyan.* iv. 28.] But this simply shews the admissibility of the expression, whilst in the Hebrew it is the ordinary construction. The reading *πατρός*, ver. 39, is to be regarded as a mere gloss to *πέμψαντος*.)

Ver. 41, 42. The Jews, prejudiced in their ordinary views of the Messiah, according to which they looked upon him merely as an *ἄνθρωπος κατ' ἐκλογήν*, make objections because Jesus ascribes to himself a direct heavenly origin.

Lücke thinks that, according to vii. 27, they supposed the Messiah's origin to be unknown (comp. the analogy Heb. vii. 3); and considering that they knew the father and mother of Jesus (the prevailing opinion being that Joseph was his father), they deduced from this the conclusion that he was not the Messiah. But this evidently disagrees with vi. 14, 15, where it is said they wished to make him king. It was not against the Messiahship of Jesus that *these* Jews directed their objections, but against the circumstance that he, as Messiah, ascribed to himself a purely heavenly origin. (Com. Matt. x. 32, ff.)

Ver. 43, 44. This fresh proof of their unbelief induces Jesus to refer again (ver. 37) to the circumstance that faith is a gracious gift of God. The Redeemer does not operate upon the minds of men by external facts, historically (so to speak),—*e. g.* by the information that he is not the son of Joseph, but begotten by the Holy Spirit; on the contrary, his operations are purely internal and spiritual, effected by means of the indwelling power of truth. He continually pours the rays of his heavenly light into the darkness of the heart, certain that it will be effectual where the Father's gracious



attractions are displayed. At the same time, where this is not the case, the defect is not occasioned by any purpose or decree (*οὐδεὶς δύναται ἐλθεῖν*) ;—the hour of gracious attraction is to be awaited. Here, however, *ἐλκύειν* needs a close consideration. (The expression is selected in accordance with the Old Testament form. *קָנָה* which is employed in the same signification, Jerem. xxxi. 3, Song of Solomon i. 4. The LXX. translate it in both instances by *ἐλκύειν*.) For since the activity of the Son is certainly divine, there here appears a twofold divine activity,—that of the Father and that of the Son. The question is, how these are related.<sup>1</sup> Although, in the Father's attracting to the Son, even external circumstances favourable to the development of spiritual life may be taken into account, still that which is *essential* in such attractions always consists in spiritual animation produced by means of the Spirit. However, since the Father *draws* to the Son, and the Son again leads to the Father (John xiv. 6), and it is also said in reference to the Son, "without *me*, ye can do nothing" (John xv. 5), a relation altogether peculiar is here to be presupposed. The hints already given on Matt. xii. 32, concerning the relation of the Trinity, furnish the key to this difficulty. All knowledge of God proceeds from the Father, inasmuch as in him *power*,—of which man first conceives,—is primarily manifested. Hence, when first the soul traces in itself living divine operations, these are, in every case, the attractions of the Father ; it feels itself dependent, and learns to recognize God as the absolute power, as the Author and Sovereign of all things. But genuine knowledge of God necessarily involves the condition of development ; if the soul knows something of him, it is drawn on to seek a more profound acquaintance with him. Now, he who made himself known as Power, reveals himself in the Son as absolute and merciful *Love*. Thus the Father continually draws to the Son, in the knowledge of whom fear (the beginning of wisdom) first becomes changed to reciprocal love. Again, however, the soul sincerely seeking God is referred to the eternal Author of all being, for every creature is *from* God, *through* God, and *to* God. Accordingly the Son conducts to the Father, as the Father drew to the Son.

It remains to be observed, in the first place, that here obviously

<sup>1</sup> In the language of Paul, *καλεῖν* is parallel with *ἐλκύειν* ; the Father calls to the Son. Comp. 1 Cor. i. 9, *πιστός ὁ Θεὸς δι' οὗ ἐκλήθητε εἰς κοινωνίαν τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*.

there is no reference to a *drawing* in opposition to the will of man (*that* would be *compulsion*), but rather to an internal awakening of the inclination of the will towards God and his service); and secondly, that in this instance, as before, we are not to understand a knowledge of God consisting of mere *notions* (this may be possessed with logical correctness by those who are estranged from God), but a *real* knowledge of God received in regeneration. Here the discourse relates to real conditions which are developed successively as described in 1 John ii. 13, ff.

Ver. 45. The connexion of this verse with the foregoing is not easily seen. All connective particles are wanting. Some codices, it is true, supply *οὖν* after *πᾶς*, but B.C.D.L.S.T., 37, 69, 124, 235 omit it, and the addition of the particle is easily accounted for, since the subject seems to require it, whilst the omission, on the contrary, is not thus to be explained; on this account Griesbach and Schulz have not placed *οὖν* in the text. The context, however, plainly indicates that the citation is intended to prove the previous sentiment. Accordingly *γάρ* is to be supplied, and this being connected, an antithesis between *οὐδεὶς* (ver. 44) and *πάντες*, which is not at all designed here, cannot be urged; on the contrary, the emphasis here is only on the expression *διδασκτοὶ Θεοῦ*, to which the following *ἀκούσας* and *μαθὼν* refer. That expression indicates an internal operation of God upon men (comp. the remarks on v. 37, 38), denoted by *ἐλκύειν*. Hence the Lord may have employed this passage for the purpose of proving the necessity of an internal operation of grace in order to produce faith in himself. (The phrase : *γεγραμμένον ἔστι ἐν τοῖς προφήταις* is remarkable; as if the words as they stand, Isaiah liv. 13, occurred in several prophets. Moreover, the text even in Isaiah does not quite correspond with the words of the Evangelist. The best conclusion therefore is, that Jesus alluded to all the prophetic passages in which reference is made to the effectuation of true divine knowledge through the Spirit of God. [Respecting such collective quotations, comp. the remarks on Matt. ii. 23.] Others, less suitably, take the plural as a designation of the collection of writings *נְבִיאִים אֲחֵרִים*, in which Isaiah stands.)

Ver. 46—50. The following words restrict the idea of the knowledge of God just expressed, somewhat more closely. The

1 Luther on this subject quaintly observes, "The drawing is not like that of the executioner, who draws a thief up the ladder to the gallows; it is a kind allurements."

oneness and community of the Son with the Father (see i. 18, iii. 13) cannot be compared ; it stands alone and without analogy. (Concerning *παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ*, comp. the remarks on John i. 1, 2. It is neither equal to *πρὸς τὸν Θεόν*, nor even to *παρὰ σοί*, John xvii. 5. On the contrary it designates the origin.) On account of this peculiar position, the Son alone participates the life,—the world receives it from him. While the manna only sustains physical life, he is the *ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς* who nourishes to eternal life. (Comp. ver. 31, 58.) That according to the meaning of Christ, the words *καὶ μὴ ἀπόθανῃ* (ver. 50) do not refer merely to the vanquishment of spiritual death, but also to corporeal, physical life, is indicated by the mention already frequently made of the *ἀνάστασις ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ* (ver. 39, 40, 44); but the sentiment attains perfect distinctness only in the sequel (ver. 51—59) where the conversation reaches its proper point.

Ver. 51—53.<sup>1</sup> The Redeemer at length more precisely explains the peculiar relation in which he calls himself *ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς*, or *ἄρτος ζῶν*; the bread that I will give you (he says) *ἡ σὰρξ μου ἐστίν, ἣν ἐγὼ δώσω ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς*. Here, however, we arrive at the point where we must once more look at the connexion, in order to answer the query, *whether the Holy Supper is here referred to or not?* The circumstance that, even to this day, it has been impossible to harmonize the opinions on this point, would be inexplicable, but that the views entertained concerning the nature of the Supper have so easily operated upon the minds of expositors in the examination of this passage, and in the end *must* exert their influence. For the mode of apprehending this doctrine stands in vital connexion with many others, *e. g.*, with the doctrine of the glorification of Christ's body, and of bodies generally, as also ultimately with the doctrine of the relation of spirit to matter; and, therefore, as no one will introduce into his exposition sentiments at variance with his own principles, the general circle of ideas prevailing in the mind of the expositor must exercise great influence in the interpretation of a passage like the present. He who does not find in Scripture the transformation of bodies generally, and of the corporeity of Christ in particular, of

<sup>1</sup> Concerning John vi. 51—56, comp. the Treatise respecting Schulz's Lehre vom Abendmahl, by Pfarrer Stendel, in Kläiber's Stud. B. ii. h. 2, s. 167, ff., and the remarks of Kling in the Stud. von Ullmann und Umbreit Jahrg. 1836, h. 1, s. 140, ff.

course cannot well allow that Christ here uttered sentiments which presuppose such views. On the other hand, he who acknowledges these doctrines as biblical, can hardly suppose that the Lord employed the expression, "to eat his flesh and drink his blood" without *any* reference to the Holy Supper, since, in this sacrament, the communication of the glorified body must be to him the specific point. Besides the general difficulty, various subordinate matters present themselves in our passage, by means of which the views concerning it have been modified. In order, therefore, to a clear comprehension of the various expositions, a *short history* of its interpretation is needful.<sup>1</sup> In the ancient Church there were two principal explanations. One was maintained by Origen, and after him by Basil the Great. According to this, all reference to the sacrament of the Supper was denied, and to eat and drink Christ's flesh and blood was understood as meaning to partake the spiritual power of the Redeemer. But as Origen discovered in the Supper itself only a spiritual operation, he found no *necessity* to exclude entirely the reference of our passage to the Supper; he did so merely because it appeared to him unsuitable to suppose that the Lord spake of the Supper *before* its institution.

The other explanation was offered by Chrysostom, who was followed by Cyrill, Theophylact, and subsequently by the Scholastics and the whole Catholic Church. According to this, the following words in the sixth chapter of John relate primarily to the Sacrament of the Supper, so that this mention of it *before* its institution was, as it were, a prediction of it by Christ. Up to the time of the Reformation, this view generally prevailed. With the doctrine of transubstantiation, however, it had no necessary connexion at all. On the contrary, those who maintained this doctrine may have been induced to oppose the reference of our passage to the Sacrament of the Supper, just as well by a different application of the circumstances. But close adherence to exegetic tradition allowed no other interpretation to stand its ground. When, however, this adherence was abolished by the free inquiry of the Reformers, Origen's mode of interpretation was revived among the Swiss. Zwingli understood the passage superficially, taking the *σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα* merely as metaphorical, while Calvin apprehended it more

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Lücke's second Excursus in the 2d vol. of the Comm., s. 727, ff.

profoundly, discovering therein a designation of humanity completely penetrated by divine life. Still both found here merely a description of the reception of Christ in faith,—the appropriation of his reconciling and redeeming efficacy; and thus they excluded a reference to the Sacrament of the Supper. Nevertheless they employed our passage (especially John vi. 63) as a hermeneutic canon (thus Lücke expresses himself) for the doctrine of the Supper; and since they did this, they might just as well have said that it treats literally of the Sacrament, and shews how the Supper and its efficacy were viewed;<sup>1</sup> but as *they* did not at all allow the reference to the Sacrament, one would suppose that Luther maintained it. However he by no means did so. Although he defended the more rigid idea of the Supper, which approached more nearly to the Catholic view, yet he abandoned the old exegetic tradition, and denied even any reference of the passage to the Sacrament.<sup>2</sup> The occasion of this doubtless was his fear lest the hypothesis, that the Supper was treated of in the sixth chapter of John, should commend the spiritual acceptance of the Swiss expositor (in favour of which the relation of ver. 51—59 to the previous passage on the *ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς* appeared to speak) rather than his own. Still Luther in his exposition differed considerably from the interpretation of the Protestants. In his view of this passage he followed Augustine, with the exception that this eminent Father, very properly, did not so utterly exclude all reference to the Supper as Luther did.<sup>3</sup> Both

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Zwingli's writings in the *Auszuge von Usteri und Vögelin*: Zurich, 1830, Bd. ii. s. 77. "The sum of this matter may easily be derived from the sixth chapter of John. And here no attention is to be paid to those who immediately cry out, 'Christ did not there treat at all of the Supper!' For although I also am of this opinion, yet through what is said there, all the incorrect notions which we form respecting the Supper are in the surest manner refuted. It was from this chapter I proceeded when, after long previous deliberation, I resolved to venture on this difficult and dangerous subject." These words indicate Zwingli's doctrinal obscurity; for if John vi. does not at all refer to the Supper, it is unintelligible how this chapter can furnish a refutation of the errors concerning the said doctrine.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. Luther's *Werke*, Walch's edit., Th. vii. s. 2071: "Faith is the eater which eats and believes in Christ;" s. 2072, "Here the expressions are figurative; to eat, here means to participate spiritually;" s. 2075, "Jesus here speaks of true Christian faith as the main thing, and therefore it is said that thou must believe in his flesh and blood. This is comprehended in the article: 'If thou wilt be a Christian, thou must believe in the flesh and blood of Christ.'"

<sup>3</sup> Lücke (l. c. s. 572) declares the view of Augustine to be inconsistent, and says, "his exegesis was often different from his theology." Although I quite concur in this criti-

agreed in denying that διδόναι σάρκα (ver. 51) relates to the death of Jesus, and accordingly understood τρώγειν καὶ πίνειν σάρκα καὶ αἷμα as meaning the full enjoyment of the blessings resulting from the death of the Lord. Consequently Luther, although he denied the allusion of the passage to the Sacrament, yet allowed to the expression σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα the full real signification, and did not, like Zwingle, refer it to a mere metaphor.

The views of the Reformers still prevail in their ecclesiastical communities up to the most recent times, in which the fetters of symbolism are thrown off, and at least the preparatory step,—that of *being able* to consider the passage freely and without prejudice,—is attained. The result is, that the reference (so prominent in ver. 51) to the death of Christ, which Augustine and Luther very justly pointed out, has become *generally* acknowledged. Lücke also and Tholuck declare themselves in favour of this view. These scholars, however, feel compelled to exclude the reference to the Supper just as earnestly as Dr Paulus and Schulz,<sup>1</sup> who do not acknowledge a reference to the sacrificial death, but think, as Origen and Zwingle thought, that the whole passage is to be understood figuratively. According to this view the subject of discourse in our passage would be “the entire phenomenon of Christ’s life and ministry on earth as the Messiah and the Son of God.” Such an interpretation, however, with all its freedom from symbolic constraint, evidently betrays the fixedness of an unscriptural circle of ideas, which alone explains the circumstance that here the sacrificial death of Jesus is so entirely overlooked. (Comp. the particulars in the exposition of the single verses.) Lücke and Tholuck would have been perfectly right, had they admitted, *at the same time with* the reference to the death of the Lord, a reference also to the Supper, which is maintained among the modern interpreters, by Scheibel (das Abendmahl des Herrn. Bresl. 1823, s. 179, ff.), Knapp (in his Divinity), and Bretschneider (probab. de evang. Jo. p. 86.) The admission of such a reference was the more suitable on account of the circumstance that the ceremony of the Supper itself involves an evident allusion (in the breaking of bread and the distribution

cism in relation to another point, still I think that here Lücke has not done the renowned Father justice. Augustine appears to me, in the view he takes of this difficult passage, just to have hit upon the true *media via*.

<sup>1</sup> Schulz Christl. Lehre vom heil. Abendmahl. Leipz. 1824, s. 155, ff. 162, ff.

of wine)<sup>1</sup> to the expiatory death of Jesus. The eminent expositors named above were restrained from the impartial apprehension of this difficult passage, probably on the one hand by doctrinal influence, viz., by opposition to the scriptural doctrine of the glorification of the body, which, especially in Lücke, more than once betrays itself; and on the other by an exchange of the *sacrament* of the Holy Supper with the *idea* from which it proceeded,—an exchange that has always contributed in the greatest degree to decide many distinguished expositors against a reference to the Supper in our passage. It must indeed have appeared unsuitable that the Saviour should speak of a *rite* before its institution, so that no one could understand what he alluded to; but, at the same time, it is probable that Christ would previously moot the *idea* from which the rite afterwards arose. The idea, however, is no other than this, that Jesus is the principle of life and nourishment to the new, regenerated man, not merely for his soul and his spirit, but also for his glorified body. As this principle of life he offers himself, and gives himself especially in his death; hence the mention here (ver. 51) (as in the institution of the Supper), of his death, although this is by no means to be deemed the main point of the whole passage. As the remarks above have shewn, in John iii. 5, a distinction is to be made between the *sacrament* and the *idea* of Baptism, the reference there being certainly to the latter, and by no means to the former; and here the idea of the Supper might be spoken of before the institution of the sacrament. For if a full comprehension of the words was not to be expected, yet the vividness of the discourse may have rendered their essential contents distinctly cognizable to the disciples, as with the institution of the Supper itself, which was not followed by any explanatory statements, and the nature of which was only gradually unfolded.

Now, if we take a closer view of particular points,<sup>2</sup> it becomes evident that ver. 51 is in the highest degree favourable to the interpretation of our passage as referring to the death of Christ; for *δώσω σάρκα ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς* cannot with propriety be apprehended otherwise than as meaning to devote himself in

<sup>1</sup> Compare in the *Leidensgeschichte* the Exposition of Matt. xxvi. 26 and parallels.

<sup>2</sup> The words *ἢ ἡ ἐγὼ δώσω* in ver. 51 are probably spurious, and Lachmann has expelled them from the text. This, however, has no influence on the sentiments contained in the passage, since in the interpretation these must be supplied from the whole course of thought.

death, (*διδόναι* = *παραδιδόναι*).<sup>1</sup> Also the comparison of ver. 35 shows that *φαγεῖν* may be taken = *πιστεῦεν*. In the formula: *καὶ ὁ ἄρτος δέ*, however, if there is not exactly a transition to something altogether different, yet an advance in the subject of discourse is plainly indicated. And certain as it is that this must be acknowledged, it is of equal importance not to overlook the circumstance that this mention of the Lord's sacrificial death does not exclude the reference to the idea of the Supper. Indeed, as it has been remarked, the institutive words of the Supper contain the same mention of the death of Jesus, and the form of the rite presents a symbol of it. (Comp. Luke xxii. 19: *τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον*. According to 1 Cor. xi. 26, the death of the Redeemer is to be proclaimed in the celebration of the Supper until he comes, his *θάνατος* being the source of *ζωή* to the dead world; while the Supper illustrates the *ζωοποίησις* of the world at its highest point, shewing that even the corporeal nature, through the participation of the tree of life, again receives that eternal life which was lost in Paradise by tasting the tree of knowledge. The sacrificial death of the Lord, however, cannot be regarded as the predominant idea in our passage, because *διδόναι* is not at all repeated in the sequel, whilst eating and drinking the flesh and blood of the Lord is continually spoken of with the greatest emphasis. This emphasis is the more remarkable, since the Jews objected (ver. 52) to the words of Christ. Had he acted the part of policy as a teacher, these objections would have induced him to modify the force of his words, as if the Jews had entirely misunderstood them, or he had intended to say something quite different from what they supposed. But so far from this, the Saviour only increases the pungency of his language<sup>2</sup> (the reason will be seen in the remarks on ver 60), and maintains the sentiment unchanged, that his flesh and his blood are the source

<sup>1</sup> The altogether superficial view according to which *σάρξ* would mean the *doctrine* of Jesus, needs no refutation. Dr Phulus, however, whom Shulz follows, understands the formula: *διδόναι σάρκα*, of the *operation* of the Logos upon the physical life for the welfare of mankind. But John's *usus loquendi* by no means permits the expression to be so understood. (Comp. Lücke in the Comm. Th. ii. s. 99, f.)

<sup>2</sup> The expression *τρώγειν* itself is stronger than the previous terms *ἐσθίειν* and *φαγεῖν*. It literally signifies to gnaw, to break off in little bits, then to triturate, to eat up. Lücke apprehends the question of the Jews: *πῶς δύναται κ. τ. λ.* as derision, and says that Jesus may have repeated the same sentiment with emphasis, merely in order to subdue this. But this supposition is not consistent with ver. 60, ff., according to which the audience raised a *serious* opposition to the hardness of the saying.



of the true *ζωή*, and the participation of them is the condition of the resurrection. Hence the passage can only be understood thus, that Jesus represents himself as the *ζωοποιῶν* to the whole man, the spiritual *ζωοποιήσις* prevailing up to ver. 50, and from ver. 51 the idea which lies at the foundation of the Holy Supper,—that the glorified corporeity of Christ sanctifies and glorifies ours also,—being presented with augmenting force; and the formula *καὶ ὁ ἄρτος δέ* extends to this highest idea.

Ver. 54—59. In these verses, with the eating and drinking of the flesh and blood of the Son of Man, are connected *ζωὴ αἰώνιος* (ver. 54), *μένειν ἐν Χριστῷ* (ver. 56), and *ζῆν ἐἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* (ver. 58), these being the sublimest effects which the Redeemer purposed in general to call forth. With regard, in the first place, to the meaning of *μένειν ἐν Χριστῷ*, or inversely Christ's remaining in us, which expression again occurs here, it is to be observed—as already remarked on John v. 38—that this belongs to John's peculiar phraseology. (Comp. xiv. 10, 16, 17, xv. 4; 1 John ii. 6; iii. 15, 17, iv. 12, 13, 15.) In the interpretation of this, the spirituality of John's views must be borne in mind, in accordance with which he adopted the idea of a spiritual immanence, a real penetration of spirits into each other, and life in one another.<sup>1</sup> Hence the *μένειν ἐν Χριστῷ* is not to be reduced to the general notion of a close connexion, but is to be understood as meaning a real being in each other. The life and being of Christ is an all-penetrating, sanctifying, and glorifying power; the union of man according to the three potencies of his being, is internal, real, essential. That "Christ remaineth in us, and we in him," therefore, conveys the same signification as the language of Paul, *ἐνδύσασθαι Χριστόν* (Gal. iii. 27; Rom. xiii. 14.) (Comp. the description given of the Word of God or Wisdom, as the all-penetrating power, Heb. iv. 12, and Wisd. Sol. vii. 22, 24.) The effects mentioned as resulting from the participation of Christ's flesh and blood might speak in favour of the opinion, that the formulæ *τρώγειν σάρκα*, *πίνειν αἷμα* are to be understood as indicating merely the spiritual efficacy of Christ. But *two* things in our passage oppose this. First the phrase, *ἀναστήσω αὐτὸν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ*. With respect to this it has already been re-

<sup>1</sup> The reader scarcely needs to be reminded that I distinguish the *essential*, *real*, from the *material*. The penetration and transformation of matter by spirit is expressed in the doctrine of the Holy Supper.

marked (on ver. 40), that it can only be explained as referring to corporeal resurrection. Now the fact that this is here so expressly referred to the participation of Christ's flesh and blood, leads to an idea familiar to the early Fathers,<sup>1</sup> and acknowledged by Luther,<sup>2</sup> in their signification, but which the idealism prevailing in the views of the modern world does not know how to appropriate, viz., that the participation of the Lord's glorified body causes the germ of resurrection to sink into the bodies of believers, and, so to speak, begets the new body within the old one as the mother, so that the day of resurrection is the moment of its birth. On the one hand, this view allows the resurrection of the body to be recognized only in connexion with the general development of humanity; for, according to this, it does not stand in isolation as a magical fact, but presents itself in union with the general, gradually advancing process whereby the fallen creature is transformed. On the other hand, it is the only one suited to the context of our passage, because, without this fundamental view, the mention of the resurrection either is altogether irrelevant here, or else must be regarded in the light of doceticism, *i.e.*, altogether denied as a literal fact, in conformity with the prevailing bias of modern theology. Secondly, our opinion is decidedly supported by ver. 55, where it is said, ἡ σὰρξ μου (*i.e.*, the flesh which the Logos has adopted and glorified) ἀληθῶς ἐστι βρώσις. With respect to the reading;—important authorities (B.C.K.L.T. and several others) have, instead of ἀληθῶς, the adjective ἀληθής. In relation to the sense, this reading does not produce any essential alteration, and therefore external reasons only can favour the retention of ἀληθῶς in the text. But the change of sense would be very important, if ὁ ἀληθινός were read;<sup>3</sup> for while ἀληθής is opposed to the false, ἀληθινός

1 Ignatius (ep. ad Ephes. c. 20), in reference to this, calls the Holy Supper the *φάρμακον τῆς ἀθανασίας*. This idea is further developed by Iren. adv. haer. iv. 28, 5, v. 2, 2. Clem. Al. Paedag. ii. 2. (Comp. Münscher's Dogmengesch. Th. ii s. 348, ff)

2 Luther's Werke, Walch's edit. Th. xx. s. 1076, ff., 1094, ff. At the latter place he says, "Is he eaten *spiritually*, through the word, he remains in us *spiritually* in the soul; is he eaten *corporeally*, he remains in us *corporeally* also; as he is eaten, so he remains in us, and we in him. For he is not digested and changed, but without fail he changes us, the soul into righteousness, the *body into immortality*." In these remarkable words, the profoundness of the doctrine of the Supper is finely expressed. As with Adam death came through *food*, so with Christ, through *food*, comes eternal life.

3 Tholuck contests this, and I certainly did not formerly express myself with sufficient distinctness, inasmuch as I did not give prominence to the article. But that βρώσις

forms the antithesis to that which is true, but which does not perfectly correspond with the idea. The Logos is called (i. 9) the *φῶς ἀληθινόν*, because all other (even true) light does not reach his splendour. Accordingly, if *ἀληθινός* occurred here, or if we might exchange the term with *ἀληθής*, an exchange which the language of John by no means allows, this would be very favourable to the spiritual interpretation, and this passage might then be placed in connexion with ver. 32, where Christ terms himself *ἄρτος ἀληθινός*. But this passage is just as much opposed to that interpretation, if *ἀληθώς* remains, for then the sense is as follows: "My flesh is, *in truth*, food, and my blood is, *in truth*, drink; they may be partaken, received by believers into themselves;" i. e., "what I say is no mere unsubstantial comparison; it is no empty metaphor; it is in truth so to be understood." The Jews evidently understood it thus, and on this account they so staggered at this discourse that they ceased to follow Jesus. Moreover, the Lord permitted it to be so; he allowed them to go, without saying, "I mean a merely spiritual communication," which would have presented no difficulty to the mind of any one present. Hence a true exposition,—one that gives the sentiments of the writing under consideration,—must, even if the views of the expositor are entirely different, confess that here the discourse relates to a participation of the corporeality of Christ. The contradiction to this which may apparently be derived from ver. 63 will hereafter be considered. It is only remarkable that Lücke, an expositor generally so impartial, could persuade himself that special support for his interpretation respecting the spiritual enjoyment of Christ, rendered perfectly possible by his death, is contained in the words *ὁ τρώγων με* (ver. 57.) In reference to them he remarks "hence it results that the expression *σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα* is synonymous with *ἐγώ*.<sup>1</sup> But *ἐγώ* designates the entire personality of the Lord; and, therefore, if in the participation of the Lord the corporeality is *excluded* or apprehended as relating merely to the death, and not to the participation itself,

*ἀληθής* is something different from *ἡ βρῶσις ἡ ἀληθινή* cannot be denied. The true food stands in opposition merely to the deceptive, but the real to all relative means of nourishment.

<sup>1</sup> Even Kling (l. c.) has justly declared himself, in the most decided manner, opposed to this.

then *σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα* cannot possibly stand for *ἐγώ*. Here it is synonymous only because the corporeality is to be *included*. (As regards the use of *διὰ*, ver. 57, in the phrases *διὰ τὸν πατέρα*, *δι' ἐμέ*, it is not necessary to suppose that the preposition is here arbitrarily connected with the accusative instead of with the genitive; on the contrary the various relations expressed by the use of the same preposition with different cases coincide *in the idea*, and so far they may be exchanged. Comp. Winer's Gram. s. 339.)

Ver. 60—62. The whole of the following passage contains almost as many *external* difficulties as those involved in the foregoing discourse of the Lord respecting the *ideas*. For, in the first place, it is in the highest degree remarkable that the Lord should thus suffer persons who had allied themselves to him to leave him, without endeavouring to remove the cause of their separation, by explaining the subject to them more clearly; and, in the second place, it is no less singular that the Saviour even asks the twelve whether they too will leave him, and then mentions the betrayer. Obscure, however, as this mode of proceeding on the part of Christ appears at first sight, yet it is this very thing, when rightly apprehended, that furnishes the key to the *form* of the foregoing discourse of the Redeemer. Doubtless the Lord thus forcibly set forth such profound sentiments on purpose to bring about that which, as we see, was the result, viz., a *sifting* of his disciples. It could not promote his design to have any more disciples in companionship with him than those who adhered entirely—heart and mind—to him as the Being in whom the Father dwelt; while, at the sametime, none but these could reap any real advantage from following him. That man surely must be trusting too much to his own understanding, and placing too little reliance on Christ, who, by means of a discourse which might be to him unintelligible or apparently absurd, could be frightened away from the Lord, whose heart-attracting influence he had felt, and whose miracles he had beheld; and although he might even carry within him many germs of good, he was not fit to labour for the kingdom of God. But to *labour* for the kingdom of God was the very calling of the first disciples. Hence it was needful that persons who could not endure the test should be separated, for the sake of their own welfare, and that of the growing Church. Probably the Lord designed also to operate upon the mind of Judas Iscariot. It would have been a victory of

truth if he had had the candour to withdraw ; for his *remaining* with the Lord was certainly falsehood. Assuredly he could not have applied the words of Jesus to himself, as probably the other disciples did not (ver. 67, 68) ; and yet he was not restrained by that which bound the others, the flame of love in their hearts ; for had he possessed this, he could not have betrayed the Saviour ;—he remained out of *hypocrisy*. Accordingly, we here see Jesus, as it were, sitting in judgment on his disciples, and selecting afresh for his work only those who stood the trial.

The second part of the exclamation uttered by the disciples about to withdraw from Christ,—*τίς δύναται ἀκούειν* (= *γρηῖ* in the signification intelligere),—explains the term *σκληρός* in the first part. The predominating idea in this expression is that of being *difficult to understand*. The predominance of this one idea, however, does not exclude the other, of *offensiveness* ; for that which is difficult to understand, may, so far as it is understood, be offensive. It was just so here, and on this account the Redeemer at once emphatically employs the term *σκανδαλίζειν*. In the discourse of Christ, there is an evident aposiopesis which must be supplied by means of the idea, “ ye will yet see what is greater, *i. e.*, more difficult to comprehend !” The antithesis is then first between the *less* and the *greater*, and, secondly, between *hearing* and *seeing*. Were they already offended by a word, what would they say to actual occurrences ? The greater phenomenon, the actual event, is the *ἀναβαίνειν τοῦ υἱοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ὅπου ἦν τὸ πρότερον*.

Now this passage is in the highest degree remarkable. In the *first* place, it is the *only* instance in which the ascension is mentioned by the Lord himself.<sup>1</sup> It is true, Christ often speaks of his return to his

<sup>1</sup> De Wette rejects the reference to the ascension, because it is not related in John. But in this very place it is mentioned, and the circumstance that it is not expressly narrated afterwards is sufficiently explained by the fact that it was merely a natural consequence of the resurrection. The same scholar further remarks, that “ the ascent of Jesus to the place where he was before does not relate to his flesh, which he certainly had not before his descent.” But these words are altogether without meaning ; for it is not said that he returned to the place where he was in the flesh, before the descent ; but that as a perfect man, and therefore with the glorified humanity, he returned to the place where he was before, viz., without the same. Lücke and Tholuck think that if the ascension had been referred to, instead of *ὁ. τ. ἀ.* the expression *σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα* must have been employed. By no means ; for it was not merely the corporeality that ascended to heaven, but the entire Christ *with* the corporeality. This unity is expressed by the name *ὁ. τ. ἀ.* With respect to the question whether there is a heaven anywhere to which an ascent can be made, the treatise in the *Evangel. Kirchenzeit. Jahrg. 1837*, “ Das Land der Herrlich-

Father, but without express reference to his return with his glorified body. This, however, must be supposed here on account of the connexion, while the term *υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* also indicates the corporeality of Christ. To suppose a spiritual return would not have occasioned the least difficulty to any of the hearers, but here the Redeemer speaks of something still more difficult and still more offensive than the eating and drinking of his flesh and blood; and well might the exaltation of the Messiah's humanity in the heavenly world be so to his audience, since even now this idea is seldom acknowledged. In the *second* place, this passage renders it necessary to reason *a posteriori*; as here the discourse cannot have reference to a merely spiritual return,—which presents nothing that would be unintelligible even to the weakest,—so also in the former portion, the participation of his flesh and blood must designate *more than merely spiritual operations of Christ* upon believers. The entire discourse relates to his *glorified corporeality*, the reality of which John, according to his main design, was compelled to defend against gnosticising doceticism, just as now it has become needful to maintain it in opposition to idealistic Gnosis.

Ver. 63. This verse, however, appears to favour the *spiritual* interpretation of the formula “to eat flesh and blood,” and in fact all the supporters of that interpretation have at all times laid special stress on this passage. It is at the same time quite undeniable that in this verse the words of the Logos, who is the *ζωή*, are themselves represented as *ζωή* (carrying life in themselves as well as producing life, *ζωοποιοῦν*); and consequently they must also be received in spirit and in life. In these words, therefore, we certainly may discover a polemic opposition to the *carnal* apprehension of his discourse. But hence it follows only that the Lord intended to exclude the gross views entertained by the men of Capernaum respecting the participation of his flesh, and by no means that he denied all participation of *his* flesh, asserting only a spiritual impartation of himself. The only possible way of rendering this pas-

seit,” may be consulted. At any rate, the glorified corporeality must be considered as somewhere (if not according to the idea of localitas, yet according to that of alicubitas.) A ubiquitas personalis entirely destroys the idea of corporeality; it can only be conceived of as operativa. The decisive evidence, however, with regard to the whole passage is furnished by the connexion which necessarily indicates that something more difficult than what preceded is adduced. Lücke, it is true, pronounces this view dubious, but nevertheless he cannot remove it from the connexion.

sage subservient to the spiritual interpretation has been to take ἡ σὰρξ οὐκ ὠφέλει οὐδέν as synonymous with ἡ σὰρξ μου.<sup>1</sup> But the flesh of Christ, as begotten by the Holy Ghost, is itself a πνευματικόν; his flesh, therefore, is eaten, not with the *mouth of the body*, but with the *mouth of faith*.<sup>2</sup> It is not till a new man is born through the inward baptism of the Spirit that there is an organ for the reception of the Lord's sacred body. Hence the misapprehension consists in conceiving of the flesh without the Spirit (*i. e.*, as not glorified by the Spirit), and thus mistaking the nature of Christ's corporeality. If the statement of Scripture were admitted, that the Lord is exalted on the throne of his glory at the right hand of the Father *with* his holy humanity, and *in* it he will return to judge the living and the dead (comp. Acts i. 11, οὕτως ἐλεύσεται, ὃν τρόπον ἐθεάσασθε αὐτόν πορευόμενον εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, *i. e.*, in his corporeality), then the true meaning of our passage would never be mistaken; doctrinal prejudices alone obscure the view. (Concerning the opinion of Schulz, that a σῶμα πνευματικόν may be spoken of, but not a σὰρξ πνευματική, comp. the remarks on Matt. xxvi. 26. The latter term certainly does not occur in 1 Cor. xv., σῶμα being always used, and the unquestionable reason is that σὰρξ = רֶשֶׁת is prevalently employed as the *antithesis* to πνεῦμα. But that it *could* not be used is decidedly incorrect. It does not appear what pneumatic element pertains to a σῶμα that does not to the σὰρξ; for there is no σῶμα but one consisting of σὰρξ [or in an inanimate state of κρεάς], since in the nature of the case the idea of an *organic whole* can be applied only to that which is material. In this passage, ver. 63, σῶμα of course could not be employed, but in ver. 54 the expression σῶμα φαγεῖν would have been equally appropriate, as is shewn by Matt. xxvi. 26.)

Ver. 64, 65. The fact that several of the disciples were induced by the discourse of Jesus entirely to withdraw from him, is now traced by the Lord to an evil principle in their hearts, *viz.*, *unbelief*. The Evangelist, in connexion with this, remarks that Christ possessed the gift of perceiving the condition of men as it regarded faith, con-

<sup>1</sup> Comp. the excellent remarks of Kling on this passage (loc. cit. s. 150, ff.), who apprehends it as supporting Christian realism, and opposing spiritualism just as much as false materialism.

<sup>2</sup> As regards my view of the Supper generally, compare the remarks on Matt. xxvi. 26, ff.

cerning which subject the remarks on ii. 24 may be compared. Here again unbelief is of course to be apprehended only relatively, otherwise it would destroy the idea of *μαθητής*. Doubtless those persons possessed a certain faith; not, however, that living real faith which springs from pure love to that which is divine, but a faith attained by means of the intellect. They probably found that certain external signs predicted by the prophets, in order to the recognition of the Messiah, were fulfilled in Jesus; and for this reason they allied themselves to him. But his heavenly nature had not reached their hearts; and, accordingly, as soon as their narrow understanding thought itself violated by his discourse, they withdrew. Jesus therefore added, ver. 65, that on this account he had said, "Without the attraction of the Father, without the inmost awakening of the heart by the power of the Spirit, no one can really seek the Son." (Concerning this subject, comp. the remarks on ver. 37 and 44.)

Ver. 66—69. From that time many not merely forsook the Lord externally, but turned from him in their heart. (*Ἀπέρχεσθαι εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω* occurs again John xviii. 6, and in John xx. 14, we find the expression *στρέφεισθαι εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω*. In the Hebrew *בָּרַח* *רָחַק*, Ps xxxv. 4.) The declaration which Peter in the name of all the apostles returns to the question of the Lord, *μὴ καὶ ὑμεῖς θέλετε ὑπάγειν*, is striking. It expresses the true attachment produced by the power of the Spirit, and that inmost affection which is not to be loosened by any intellectual scruples, because it awakens the consciousness of personal weakness and poverty as well as of the glory of the Lord. What they found in him they could expect no where else, for it was the eternal itself, that which would present itself in humanity in *one* sublime personage *alone*.<sup>1</sup> According to the ordinary reading, *ὅτι σὺ εἶ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ ζῶντος*, this passage would be quite parallel with Matt. xvi. 16. However, it is but too probable that ours has been corrected from the latter.

<sup>1</sup> On this subject Schubert justly writes in the *Symbolik des Traums*, s. 168, as follows. "The strong is overcome only by a stronger; the weakest of our sensual propensities is stronger than the strongest intellectual reasoning which operates merely upon the inward ear, not upon the heart; and man is improved only when a higher and nobler love takes possession of his propensities, and diminishes the lower and less noble,—when the light of a higher sun extinguishes the glimmer of the inferior spark." Such was the effect which the apostles had experienced in their hearts; their hearts burned with light and fire which the Lord had kindled within them, and this drew them to its source.



According to the authority of the MSS., the only reading here is *οτι ου̐ ει̐ ο̐ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ*. This appellation is rare in the New Testament. It occurs in Luke iv. 34, and, according to ver. 41, it appears synonymous with *υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ*. Rev. iii. 7, merely *ἅγιος* occurs, and Acts iv. 17, *ἅγιος παῖς Θεοῦ*. The only instance in the Old Testament where the appellation is applied to the Messiah is Dan. ix. 24. Perhaps the reason for selecting the expression here was, that to many of the disciples the previous obscure discourse of Christ appeared of a profane kind, so that the expression was understood thus, "Notwithstanding the obscure discourses to which we have listened, and which sounded to us as though they were profane, yet we know that in Thee the holiness of the Father is manifested to us."

One more remark is needful, as to the significant position of the *πιστεύειν* and *γινώσκειν* (ver. 69.) Here, as xvii. 8, the two expressions are so placed that the *γνώσις* appears as the consequence of the *πίστις*, but John x. 38 and 1 John iv. 16, they stand just inversely. Lücke therefore justly observes that the position is not to be pressed. True faith never exists without the germ of knowledge, and yet perfected<sup>1</sup> knowledge here below never exists without faith; the two ideas are necessarily correlates.<sup>2</sup>

Ver. 70, 71. The following words are evidently intended to invite the disciples to a more thorough self-examination. Jesus therefore directs their attention to the favour conferred upon them in the call that he had given them, and at the same time points out the ingratitude of one among them, whom, however, he does not name. Had uprightness now triumphed in the heart of Judas, he would have been compelled either to withdraw, or confess openly to Christ; but he persisted in his insincerity, and filled up the measure of his sins. As to the expression *διάβολος*, it cannot be translated "devil." For if this translation be adopted, it is necessary either to apprehend the passage as meaning "he is *the* Devil," i. e., the Devil has taken possession of his heart (as it is said John

1 The term "*perfected knowledge*," as employed here, does not indicate the *degree* of knowledge itself, but rather the *consummation* of knowledge in faith.—TR.

2 It is interesting here to notice the distinction of Alexander of Hales between *intellectus vocis vel signi*, and *intellectus rei*; the former, he says, precedes faith, the latter follows it, for nothing can be believed that is not in a certain sense already perceived. In the New Testament, however, *γινώσκειν* and *γνώσις* are prevalently employed in the latter, more profound sense of the terms, so that they presuppose faith.

xiii. 27), in which case the article must have been employed; or else to render the words "one is *a* devil." In the latter signification, however, as equal to δαιμόνιον, neither διάβολος, nor σατάν occurs; both expressions constantly designate, in the New Testament, the prince of this world. Here, therefore, it would appear that the term should be understood in the general signification of *opponent*. (Matt. xvi. 23 is not to be paralleled with this passage;—comp. my Comm. in loco.) But Tholuck justly remarks in opposition to this, that if Christ had said, "One among you is an opponent," the mode of expression would have been flat, and moreover, some *addition* might have been expected, such as διάβολός μου or Θεοῦ. Hence I am now inclined to understand the expression as meaning, one among you is (not *a* but) *the* devil; *i. e.*, what the devil is among the children of God, that is this individual among you. Jesus probably contemplated his circle as a type of the heavenly sphere: as he himself represented the Father and the disciples the angels, so Judas represented the Devil. Διάβολος then stands here as a familiar nomen proprium without the article.

## PART THE SECOND.

FROM THE JOURNEY OF CHRIST TO THE FEAST OF TABERNACLES  
TILL THE JOURNEY TO THE LAST PASSOVER.

(John vii. 1—xi. 57.)

---

§ 1. CHRIST'S JOURNEY TO THE FEAST OF TABERNACLES.

(John vii. 1—36.)

Ver. 1, 2. The fact mentioned, John v. 18, has already shewn that a powerful hatred against the Lord has been developed in the minds of the Jews, and our Evangelist exhibits its gradual ripening, especially in this second part of his work. So long, however, as his hour was not yet come, Jesus avoided their snares, and on this account refrained for a long time from going into Judæa. Nevertheless the Feast of Tabernacles induced the Redeemer to visit Jerusalem, probably because, being faithfully obedient to the law of the Old Testament, he carefully fulfilled the command Exod. xxiii. 17, without being disturbed about the possible consequences. The journey to the Feast of Tabernacles is parallel with Luke ix. 51 (comp. the Comm. on Luke ix. 51.) For, according to the following representation in John, the Lord after this feast-journey did not return to Galilee (comp. John vii. 37, with ix. 14, x. 22, 40, xi. 54), but remained in Judæa, whence he made short journeys into the neighbourhood.

The Feast of Tabernacles (חג הסוכות or הַאֶסִּיף, *i. e.*, Feast of booths, or harvest-feast), belonged, with the Passover and Pentecost, to the three principal Feasts of the Jews. It was celebrated on the fifteenth day of the seventh month, or September. It referred primarily to the sojourn of the Jews in the desert, in commemo-

moration of which booths were constructed of boughs; and the great providential favours bestowed by God were called to mind with joy and delight. Connected with this was the celebration of the vintage, but it was only a subordinate festival (comp. Levit. xxiii., Deut. xvi.)

Ver. 3—5. The relatives of the Lord (respecting the ἀδελφοί, comp. the remarks on Matt. xiii. 55) seek to induce him to attend with them the Feast in Jerusalem, by making the remark that he will there have a suitable opportunity for manifesting himself to the world. Although these words may not have been spoken without some feelings of derision, yet it must not be supposed that they proceeded from absolute hostility. The state of mind that existed in the individuals above-mentioned was probably one of vacillation. On the one hand, their susceptibility of that which was divine would be excited by the words and discourses of Jesus, while, on the other, they could not persuade themselves that he whom they had seen taking his part in the trifling occurrences of life was so entirely superior. They may, therefore, have looked around after decisive circumstances, for the very purpose of being able to believe.—This passage is further very important for the definition of the ἀδελφοί, for, since they did not believe, they of course cannot have been among the disciples, and it has therefore been thought necessary to suppose that Jesus had two kinds of brothers, believing and unbelieving (actual brothers, and cousins), for which supposition, however, no ground at all exists.<sup>1</sup> (Lücke justly observes that, ver. 4, αὐτός is to be taken as the Latin *idem* in the signification, “and at the same time,” “and yet.” Tholuck and Kling [loc. cit. s. 154] keep αὐτός to the signification “himself,” in order to render the personal reference emphatic. “And yet he himself seeks to become celebrated by means of the mode of operation which he adopts.” Ἐν παρήρσιζ is precisely defined by the antithesis

<sup>1</sup> Olshausen's view (expressed in his Comm. on Luke iv. 21, 22) is, that our Lord had no real brothers, but only cousins. He supports his opinion chiefly by the following arguments—first, that if the mother of Jesus had had other sons, it is not likely that they would have had the same names as the sons of Mary, the wife of Cleopas, one of whom was called James, and another Joses (Matt. xxvii. 56); secondly, that if the mother of Jesus had had sons of her own, it is not likely that Jesus would have committed her to the care of John, who did not belong to the family; thirdly, that since, according to the O. T. prophecies, we cannot look upon the family of David as continued in the line from which the Messiah sprang, it is more suitable to regard it as concluded in Jesus, the eternal Ruler of the House of David.—Tr.

ἐν κρυπτῷ; the idea of celebrity is here confined to publicity. *Εἰ* in ver. 4 is evidently to be taken hypothetically: "if thou canst do such things, which we do not believe;" for the words [ver. 5] which express the unbelief of the brothers, refer to this very doubt.)

Ver. 6—8. Jesus now refuses to go with his brethren to the Feast, and, for the purpose of awakening their minds, directs their attention to the different positions in which he and they stood with respect to a higher will. They, free and separate from God, followed the guidance of their own inclination; he, on the contrary, never acted arbitrarily, but according to the will of God, in obedience only to his intimations. This is called, in other instances, in the language of John, "hearing what the Father speaks, seeing what he does;" it presupposes an intimate union through the power of the Spirit, a constant internal connexion with God, and observation of his operations. A true analogy to this is presented only in him who is regenerated. The natural man,—even he who is legally faithful,—goes, comes, labours, rests, according to his own fancies, and cannot do otherwise, because he has not this link of union with God, viz., the Spirit of God to guide all his steps. (Concerning *καὶρὸς ἑμὸς*, comp. the remarks on John ii. 2; Matt. xxvi. 18. Here, as also ver. 30, we are not to understand by it the termination of the earthly life of Christ, but a time more closely at hand, which is, nevertheless, to be apprehended as of divine appointment.)

Ver. 7 expressly indicates the enmity of men as the reason that deterred Christ. In this respect, also, a similar difference appears between Christ and the brethren. The latter belong, according to the very principle of life by which they are animated, to the *κόσμος*; the Lord, on the contrary, dispenses that Spirit which opposes everything worldly. Hence the world must contend against him, and, as the Destroyer of its life, must hate him as it hates all those also in whom the Spirit of Christ operates (John xvii. 14.)

The open declaration in ver. 8, *οὐκ ἀναβαίνω*, is remarkable, since in ver. 9 it is said, *τότε καὶ αὐτὸς ἀνέβη εἰς τὴν ἑορτήν*. Through fear lest the Lord should appear to have spoken falsely,<sup>1</sup> some transcribers have put *οὐπω* instead of *οὐκ*, and Knapp and

<sup>1</sup> Where this anxiety has not been felt, the passage has actually been employed to maintain the necessity of lying. An apparent instance of the kind occurs also in the O. T., in the passage, 2 Kings viii. 10, 14.

Lachmann have even received it into the text. But, in addition to some MSS. in Matthæi's class and versions, only the codices D. and K. contain this reading. Moreover, it is evident that a doctrinal motive may easily have occasioned the correction. If, however, the passage be viewed with an unprejudiced mind, it cannot be said that there is any difficulty in it. For since οὐπω immediately follows, it is self-evident that οὐκ is to be understood with the addition of νῦν. Οὐκ ἀναβαίνω is not a negative with respect to the entire future (nay, the future is not employed), but merely in reference to the present time. Tholuck, indeed, thinks the words εἰς τὴν ἑορτὴν ταύτην would shew that the Redeemer did not at all intend to go, and on this account conjectures an inaccurate report of the language of Christ. But I do not think this hypothesis is at all capable of being established.

Ver. 9—13. After the expiration of a few days, the Lord also proceeded to Jerusalem, and, in order that he might not excite observation, he went in perfect silence. (I understand the words ὡς ἐν κρυπτῷ, ver. 10, like the expression i. 14, as the so-called *ἡ veritatis*, “quite in secret.” Lücke, who is followed by Tholuck and De Wette, translates, “as it were.” But since the open declaration οὐ φανερώς precedes, the stress must lie on the words ἀλλ’ ὡς ἐν κρυπτῷ; and with this, the above acceptance is evidently not quite consistent.—Verses 11—13 describe the excitement of the people respecting the person of Jesus; no one was indifferent, but the opinions concerning him were very various, and the people only shrank from publicly expressing them on account of the Sanhedrists. (Ἀγαθός, ver. 12, according to the common *usus loquendi*, is to be understood only in a subordinate sense, as meaning one who does not cherish actually evil designs.)

Ver. 14, 15. It was not till the middle of the Feast that Jesus made his appearance publicly and taught in the Temple. (The Feast lasted, as all great Feasts of the Jews, seven days, and hence the middle was the fourth day.) From the following remarks of the Jews, it is probable that the Redeemer did not merely teach in the open air in the front court, but delivered a formal discourse, perhaps in the synagogue, which was placed in the court of the women. (Comp. Tholuck on the passage.) The auditors were surprised at his erudition, as they knew that he had not enjoyed the usual rabbinical education. (As the Jews knew of no learning

apart from religion, the *γράμματα* are nothing else than the sacred Scriptures, in the exposition of which the entire education of Jews was concentrated.) According to the Jewish custom, with respect to which, however, it is a question whether it was so completely established in the time of Christ, no one could teach unless he had been the regular pupil of a Rabbi (רַבִּי) and a Rabbi's assistant (חֵבֵר). No one but a Rabbi might deliver his own sentiments; the pupils and assistants were only at liberty to repeat what they had learned. (Comp. Tholuck on the passage.)

Ver. 16—18. The Saviour, proceeding from this remark, points out the difference between his doctrine and that of the Rabbies. The object, to which the doctrine of the Rabbies pointed, was indeed substantially the right one (Matt. xxiii. 2, 3), but their relation to the true doctrine was false. They taught without a true divine commission, and without a divine call (*ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν*), and in so doing sought honour from men; hence they were characterized by inward falseness and injustice. (*Ἀδικία*, ver. 18, designates the unjust relation generally,<sup>1</sup> in which their moral life stood to God. Comp. the remarks on Rom. iii. 21.) On the contrary, the Lord says of himself, that he does not regard his doctrine as his property (*οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμή*), he does not speak of and from himself (*ἀπ' ἑμᾶυτοῦ*), but in the name and by the commission of God (*τοῦ πεμφαντός με*), whose honour alone he seeks. (Comp. with respect to the same sentiment, v. 44, viii. 50.) Accordingly the aim to advance personal interests and freedom from every thing selfish here form the antithesis;—the former rendering the individual unprepared for the reception of divine grace, even although the words of the Old Testament are possessed and taught, as in the case of the Pharisees. This obscuration of the inner man through impurity is especially pointed out ver. 17, and further dwelt upon ver. 19, ff. In this the Redeemer discovered the reason of the strange phenomenon, that men would not perceive the bright lustre of the divine nature in Christ. Jesus describes the *γνώσις* of the divinity of his doctrine as dependent upon the *θέλειν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ ποιεῖν*.

It is evident that the will of God is not the injunction of Christ

<sup>1</sup> According to Lücke and Tholuck, *ἀδικία* is = רִמְיָה or רִמְיָה in the signification of falsehood. But in that case we should here have only an inversion of the sentence *οὗτος ἀλήθης ἐστι*. *Ἀδικία* certainly never exists without internal falsehood, but *ἀδικία* and *ψεῦδος* are not on this account synonymous.

alone, but also that of the Old Testament (comp. ver. 19, ff.), and even of conscience itself (Rom. ii. 14.) The divine command is in its nature one and the same in all the forms of its manifestation, only it is represented in different degrees of development. Sincerity in regard to the known law of God is always required; this determines the real position of the mind towards God, and prepares it for deeper and deeper penetration into that knowledge. On the contrary, he who is insincere, and does not practise what he knows, but evades the practice by sophisms (the very conduct which characterized Pharisaism), blinds himself, until at length he cannot see the brightest light. This passage is practical, and of the highest importance to biblical psychology; for its fundamental idea is, that the faculty of knowing does not act in isolation, but that man's *capacity* for knowledge is constantly conditional upon his *inclination*.<sup>1</sup> If the inclination follows that which is not pleasing to God, it beclouds the capacity for knowledge, the mirror of the soul becomes obscured, and lusts destroy in error (Ephes. iv. 22); but if the desire be directed towards that which is divine, the ability to know it increases. Hence in our passage the *γνώσις* is intentionally described as dependent, not upon the *ποιεῖν*, but upon the *θέλειν ποιεῖν*. The perfect accomplishment of the will of God, on the one hand, is often prevented by circumstances, while on the other, because of sinfulness it is not possible to any one. Even the sinful man, however, may, under all circumstances, evolve the *θέλειν* (*i. e.*, not the positive, practically efficacious will [*βούλεσθαι*], but the negative desire and longing) in the depth of his soul—and in this consists the true nature of the fear of God, and of love to the truth. Hence Pascal very truly says, “in order to love human objects it is necessary to know them; in order to know those which are divine it is necessary to love them.”

Ver. 19, 20. The Redeemer now discloses the fact that they themselves were making no effort whatever to fulfil the law of God

<sup>1</sup> Lücke, it is true, is correct in his opinion that the older exposition of this passage, according to which, doing the will of God here means faith in Jesus, and the fulfilment of his commands, is not the most suitable; for ver. 19 clearly shows that the discourse has reference also to the fulfilment of the Mosaic law. But this does not interfere with the use of our passage as an argument for Christianity from internal experience, since it involves the idea that the faithful application of what is known concerning God is the only means by which we can continually attain a more profound and essential knowledge of him and of his will.



as delivered to them by Moses, in such a manner, that he brings to light their hostile feelings towards himself. Jesus, as it were, says "Ye disobedient persons do not so much as keep the most essential commands of the law." No doubt his reason for extending the statement thus universally to all (ver. 19, οὐδεὶς ἐξ ὑμῶν) was that those hearers who surrounded him most closely were his most thorough and zealous opponents,—they sought to catch him in his words. For ver. 25 there appear τινές, who are decidedly distinguished from such as seek to kill. Hence I cannot agree with the opinion of Tholuck, who observes that the exclamation of the ὄχλος: "Thou hast a demon," proceeded from the lips of persons in the court who, having come from other countries, were not acquainted with the evil designs of the leading men. The character of these impenitent individuals is far more correctly denoted when we suppose that even the most furious opponents of Christ represented themselves to him as innocent. (The formula δαιμόνιον ἔχεις is here to be taken merely as a prevailing mode of expression, synonymous with μαίνεσθαι. The most striking proof of this is furnished by John x. 20, where the latter term is employed as an explanation of the former. The former expression certainly was founded in the notion that μανία originated in being possessed by evil spirits; but when this language was employed, the speaker of course did not possess a distinct consciousness of this connexion. In such a case, it would by no means have been said that Christ spoke by the power of the Devil. The expression had a different meaning in Matt. xii. 24; comp. the Comm. on the passage.)

Ver. 21—24. The Redeemer drops the question respecting their desire to kill him, probably because this desire, being purely internal, would not be demonstrated. He confines himself to the disclosure of their want of right principle, shewn by the fact that, while they represent him as a violator of the Sabbath on account of beneficent acts of healing which he performed, they themselves no less break the Sabbath by circumcising on that day. (Concerning this question comp. the remarks on Matt. xii. 3, ff.)

It is, however, a matter of distinct inquiry to what ἐν ἔργον (ver. 21) refers. It is said that the subject of reference was the healing on the Sabbath, recorded John v. 1, ff. But this took place during a former visit of Christ to Jerusalem, and it would have been a strange thing if the very same Pharisees who then censured him

on account of that act, had also rebuked him for it now. It is far more natural to say that a similar circumstance had taken place, and this gave rise to the whole conversation. Moreover, that Jesus had again wrought miracles is clearly shewn by ver. 31. He contrasts his single deed with the continual occurrence of circumcision, which in the cases of all children born on the Sabbath was performed on the eighth day after, *i. e.*, on the following Sabbath. (*Θαύμάζειν* here evidently involves the additional idea of *censuring*, just as it may express also the additional idea of *praising*, according to the connexion in which it occurs. It ordinarily takes the genitive, and occasionally the accusative. The construction with *διὰ* is rare; but compare Mark vi. 6, and also Aelian, V. H. xii. 6, where it is said of Marius: *θαυμάζομεν αὐτὸν διὰ τὰ ἔργα*. Schulz, however, thinks it necessary to differ from Griesbach and Knapp, and refers *διὰ τοῦτο* to the sequel. He observes that John frequently begins sentences with *διὰ τοῦτο*, *e. g.* v. 16—18, vi. 65, viii. 47, &c., as also 1 John iii. 1, iv. 5. Meanwhile, in the case now before us, this connexion with the sequel does not appear altogether suitable, because it does not afford any sense more congruous with *διὰ τοῦτο*. Lücke is of just the same opinion.) The parenthetical remark that circumcision originated from the Patriarchs (*πατέρες* = *אבות* comp. Rom. ix. 5, Exod. iii. 15) deserves our notice. (*Θύχ' ὅτι* relates to the preceding clause, *Μωσῆς δέδωκεν ὑμῶν τὴν περιτομήν*, thus: "I do not mean to say that it literally originated from Moses, on the contrary, its origin was more ancient.") The object of this remark is certainly no other than to augment the importance of circumcision by adducing its higher antiquity. Then, since this involved as it were a justification of their conduct in practising circumcision on the Sabbath, it also increased the force of the argument that Jesus employed; for if they themselves infringed the Sabbath, why might not the Redeemer also do so, and especially for a still more worthy purpose? Circumcision, like everything belonging to the Old Testament, related only to the *σάρξ*, while on the contrary the healing performed by Christ related to the *whole* man (comp. the Comm. on Matt. viii. 2); with him the cure of the body was merely a stepping-stone to the restoration of the spiritual life.

(The observation that the *ὅλος ἄνθρωπος* stands in contrast with the *ἐν μέλος* effected by circumcision, appears to me quite unsuit-

able.<sup>1</sup> The *inner* life necessarily belongs to the *entire* man, and therefore the expression cannot denote merely the *body*. "*ἵνα μὴ λυθῇ ὁ νόμος Μωσέως*" is to be understood thus: "in order that the law should not be broken." It is true I cannot admit with Lücke that ὁ νόμος here means merely the command to circumcise, for, in my opinion, if this alone had been referred to, ἡ ἐντολή would have been employed,—the term that designates the individual declarations of the νόμος. But ὁ νόμος here is the Mosaic law *in relation to* circumcision; he who transgresses one of its precepts transgresses the whole law. Accordingly, the design in practising circumcision on the Sabbath was to avoid the neglect of a higher law for the sake of a lower. Thus Christ says: I do not neglect the strict observance of the Sabbath arbitrarily, but in order to fulfil the higher command of *love*.) By such a representation of the reasons of his conduct, the Lord now hoped to turn the judgment of his opponents from that which was external (κατ' ὄψιν = κατὰ τὴν σάρκα, viii. 15) to that which was real,—the inward motive of the act.

Ver. 25—27. Some well-meaning citizens of Jerusalem (different from the inimical persons alluded to in ver. 19) wonder at the muteness of Christ's enemies, and think the latter may have taken him for the Messiah himself, which *they* were inclined to do, since their susceptible minds felt the power of the truth uttered in the words of Christ, and the manner in which he acted. But externality held them in fetters, and prevented them from entirely opening their hearts to Christ; they thought that the origin of Christ the Messiah would be entirely unknown, whereas that of Jesus was known. Concerning this opinion of the Jews (which Scripture directly contradicts, since it names even the birth-place of the Messiah), we have, in the rabbinical writings, no valid evidence.<sup>2</sup> The idea of the person from whom this notion originated

<sup>1</sup> Kling (loc. cit. s. 156), with whom Tholuck agrees, thinks that the wounding of one member in circumcision is contrasted with the corporeal healing of the whole man by Christ. But according to this, circumcision is represented as inflicting injury upon man,—a view quite contrary to that of the O. T.; it was a means of salvation, its saving tendency, however, being, like everything belonging to the O. T., merely external and by way of metaphor, whilst Christ saves internally. This view is quite consistent with the following κατ' ὄψιν, which here is equal to κατὰ σάρκα.

<sup>2</sup> Passages such as Justin: M. dial. c. Tryph. p. 226, 336, edit. Sylburg, to which appeal has been made, are not relevant to this question. The *former* only says, that the Messiah, until his anointing with the Spirit by Elias, would not be known either

may have been perfectly correct, viz., that no one would know the eternal heavenly origin of the Messiah as the Son of God. (This is intimated in the Old Testament, Is. liii. 8, Micah v. 2 ; in the New Testament, Heb. vii. 3.) The untutored multitude, however, misunderstood the idea, and referred the ignorance respecting the origin of the Messiah to his external advent. They may have thought, as the Marcionites did, that he would descend suddenly from heaven, although this would have formed a contradiction (not to be wondered at in connexion with such crude views) to the prevailing opinion that the Messiah would be a mere man. At all events, the entire notion was one merely partial, and not entertained by the whole nation. (Comp. Matt. ii. 4, ff.)

Ver. 28—30. Lücke is certainly correct in maintaining that the following answer of the Saviour presents a fine stroke of irony ; Jesus grants them that they are acquainted with his earthly origin, but he so much the more decidedly denies that they know his heavenly origin, for he says, “ Ye do not so much as know him who sent me ; how then can ye know my relation to him ? ” This expression appears too strong, since the Jews still constantly worshipped the true God ; but their conception of God did not answer to the living nature of the Eternal ; they had not the Θεὸς ἀληθινός, but an inferior notion of him, in various ways obscured.

Here again, therefore, the signification of ἀληθινός is the strict one in which the term is employed by John ; it is not (like ἀληθής) opposed to the absolutely false, but to the relative, the imperfect. The idea of the Jews respecting God was not absolutely false, while at the same time it was not complete. Jesus here contrasts the *essential* knowledge of God with a merely *notional* knowledge ; the former alone prepares us to recognize that which is divine wherever it may be presented to our notice. These pointed accusations now excited all the acrimony of the Jews ; but so long as the hour fixed by the Father was not arrived, their rage against him led to no result.

Ver. 31, 32. Now as sin became more glaringly manifest, so the better characteristics were increasingly displayed ; many were

to others or to himself. Accordingly, that passage has no reference at all to his earthly origin. The second passage says that the Messiah would at first be *mistaken*, and would not be recognized till after his manifestation in glory ; this, therefore, like the other, has no connexion with the popular notion that John here mentions.

seized by the power of the words and actions of Jesus and believed. So much the more zealously, however, did those among the Jews who were influenced by Pharisaic prejudices endeavour to arrest the effects which he was producing.

Ver. 33, 34. This induced the Redeemer to hint at his departure, which would take place soon enough. Jesus makes use of very similar expressions viii. 21, ff. and refers to them xiii. 33. From the latter passage it is obvious that the words were directed to the Jews, and not at all to the believing disciples. That εἰμί here, as ver. 36, is the correct reading, does not admit of a doubt, for εἶμι occurs nowhere in the New Testament, and it is evident that here the term is employed only as parallel with ὑπάγω; nor is there any ground at all for understanding εἰμί here in the sense of venire; on the contrary the present tense is simply to be taken in the future signification. Most important, however, for the interpretation of this passage is the question, how may ζητεῖν be interpreted? Grotius maintains the view that it designates *hostile* seeking, in the sense: "ye will then form plots against me in vain, I shall then be entirely rescued from your power." But this is not consistent with the words: ἔτι μικρὸν χρόνον μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμί; for had the Lord intended to convey the meaning: "ye cannot abridge the short time that I shall yet spend here," this must have been otherwise expressed. Moreover the parallel passages (viii. 21, ff., xiii. 33) plainly indicate another sense as that of the passage.

The words xiii. 33 leave no doubt at all that ζητεῖν is to be understood in the *good* sense, as meaning to seek and long after through ardent desire. Hence arises the following elevated sense of the words,—one truly worthy of the Redeemer: "Unwise men! ye know not what ye do, in rejecting me, your Deliverer. Soon enough will your foolish desire to see me removed from you be fulfilled. I shall remain with you only a short time, and then return to my heavenly Father. Then ye will perceive your perfidy, and seek me with sorrow; but ye will not find me, or be able to reach me." The objection urged against this interpretation, that the Jews did not wish to fly to heaven, is very easily removed, if the pith of the sentiment be apprehended. To be able to come to Christ cannot mean merely to be corporeally near him, but signifies to experience his power and his life spiritually. The Redeemer here represents this as that which they will one day desire in vain. It cannot be

said in opposition to this, that if this desire were *true*, Christ would satisfy it even in the case of the Jews, and that they might thus come to him even after his departure to the Father. For, according to the universal doctrine of the Bible, the hour of grace may be lost. To these persons whom Jesus addressed, the hour of gracious visitation was the present; if they did not avail themselves of this, they could by no means recover that which was lost at any time they pleased; but it would be with them as with Esau, who found no place for repentance, though he sought it with tears, and therefore certainly exemplified the *ζητεῖν*. (Heb. xii. 17.)

Ver. 35, 36. The bystanders do not apprehend the pregnant meaning of Christ's prophetic words. In accordance with the external bias of their minds, they conjecture something external, and this not without a mixture of derision (comp. viii. 22.) They suppose that he intends to turn from the Jews, amongst whom his labours were so ineffectual, to the Gentiles, for the purpose of converting them. ("*Ἕλληνες* are not Jews among the Gentiles [Hellenists), but *pars pro toto* Gentiles in general; it is only by understanding the term thus, that due force is given to the antithesis between this and the supposed departure from Jerusalem. The signification of *διασπορά* is sufficiently determined by the words *διδάσκειν τοὺς Ἕλληνας*; it here designates, not the *διασπαρέντες* themselves, but the *place* of their residence, comp. 1 Pet. i. 1; James i. 1.)

## § 2. DISCOURSES AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE FEAST OF TABERNACLES.

(John vii. 37—viii. 59.)

Ver. 37. In what has preceded (vii. 1—36), no important discourses standing in immediate connexion with the main purpose of the Evangelist have occurred. The paragraph has been occupied with historic preparations (so to speak) for that which follows and completes the picture of the scene in which the Redeemer moved during this residence in Jerusalem. The verses vii. 40—52 also are to be viewed just in the same light. But the passage vii. 37—39, with which viii. 12—59 is immediately connected, forms the com-

menement of a great number of discourses, all of which appear to have been on one day,—the concluding day of the Feast of Tabernacles. These are most intimately associated with the chief design of the Gospel, since they throw increased light upon the person of the Redeemer himself and upon his ministry. The history of the adulteress (vii. 53—viii. 11) evidently interrupts the unity of the discourses, and therefore our special consideration of it, critically as well as exegetically, is postponed to the conclusion of chap. viii. Of the Lord's first discourse, in which he represents himself (similarly to the description in John iv.) as the water of life that satisfies all desire, John gives only a brief notice, adding an explanation (ver. 39) of his own. Doubtless Jesus pursued these thoughts further; but this the Evangelist did not need to do, because the conversation with the Samaritan woman involved all that appertained to the subject. Probably, however, the mention of *ὕδωρ* here was occasioned by an external cause, as was the case at Jacob's well. The last day of the Feast of Tabernacles, as the last feast-day of the year, was commenced with ceremonies of a character altogether special, on which account it was called *ἡ μεγάλη*. The generally joyous character of the Feast on this day broke out into loud jubilation, particularly at the solemn moment when the priest, as was done on every day of this festival, brought forth in golden vessels water drawn from the stream of Siloah which flowed under the Temple-mountain, and solemnly poured it upon the altar.<sup>1</sup> Then the words, Isa. xii. 3, "With joy shall ye draw water out of the fountains of salvation" were sung, and thus the symbolical

<sup>1</sup> Plutarch, Sympos. lib. iv. Opp. t. ii. p. 671, describes this custom, and calls it *bacchic*, because it was connected with the vintage and wore a very joyous character. He says: *Τῆς μεγίστης καὶ τελειοτάτης ἑορτῆς παρ' αὐτοῖς ὁ καιρὸς ἐστὶ καὶ ὁ τρόπος Διονυσίῳ προσήκων· τὴν γὰρ λεγομένην ὑψητεῖαν ἀκμάζοντι τρυγητῷ τραπίῃς τε προτίθενται πανιοδαπῆς ὀπώρας, ὑπὸ σκιναῖς τε καθίσαι, ἐκ κλημάτων μάλιστα καὶ κιττοῦ διασπλεγμέναις, καὶ τὴν προτίραν τῆς ἑορτῆς σκηνὴν ἀνομάζουσιν. Ὅλγαις δὲ ὕστερον ἡμέραις ἄλλην ἑορτὴν οὐκ ἂν δι' αἰνιγμάτων, ἀλλὰ ἀντικρυς Βάκχου καλουμένην τελοῦσιν. Ἔστι δὲ καὶ κραττοφορία τὴν ἑορτὴν καὶ θυρσοφορία παρ' αὐτοῖς, ἐν ᾗ θύρσους ἔχοντες εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν εἰσίσαι, εἰσελθόντες δὲ ὅ, τι δρῶσιν οὐκ ἴσμεν. Εἰκοσι δὲ Βακχίαν εἶναι τὰ ποιούμενα, καὶ γὰρ σάλπιγξι μικραῖς, ὥσπερ Ἀργεῖοι τοῖς Διονυσίοις, ἀρακαλοῦμενοι τὸ Θεὸν χρῶνται, καὶ καθαρίζοντες ἑτέροι προσίσαι οὓς, αὐτοῖς Λεῦϊτας προσονομάζουσιν, εἴτε παρὰ τὴν Λύσιον, εἴτε μᾶλλον παρὰ τὸν Ἐϋιον τῆς ἐπικλήσεως γεγενημένης. Comp. Joseph. Arch. xiii. 16. Lake-macher, observ. sacr. Lib. i. p. 18—78, treats at large upon this usage, only he is mistaken in thinking that the Jews derived it from the bacchic rites of the Greeks: the hostile opposition between Jews and Pagans would not have permitted this (comp. Lundius jud. heiligh. s. 1053, ff.).*

reference of this act, intimated ver. 39, was expressed. (Comp. Winer's Reallex. s. 403.) It was probably upon the occasion of this ceremony that the Saviour uttered these words, in which he represents his Spirit as water for eternal life.

Ver. 38. The Saviour now extols the virtue of the water: it not only allays thirst and invigorates, but renders the individual who partakes it himself a living fountain (πιστεύειν here equals πί-ναι, comp. vi. 35. We have already enlarged upon the idea, iv. 14.) We are not to suppose that Jesus here alludes to all those passages in which the knowledge of God is represented as water covering the land (as some expositors think is indicated by passages like Is. xi. 9, xlv. 3, lviii. 11), but rather that the allusion is only to those (such as Joel iii. 18; Zech. xiv. 8; Ezek. xlvii. 1—12) in which a reference is made to a stream issuing from the Temple-hill.

The metaphor is evidently as follows: the Redeemer compares himself with the Temple, and represents himself and every believer as a living Temple; as the fountain of Siloah poured forth its waters from the Temple-mountain, so also a stream of heavenly life issues from the Redeemer and from all those who have become like him. Gieseler (in a remark in Ullmann's Studien, Th. ii. h. i. s. 138) lays stress on the expression ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας, and thinks this indicates a reference to the circumstance that the water poured upon the altar by the priests flowed by means of canals from the recesses of the mountain into the brook Cedron. Although this may be too far-fetched, κοιλία stands like קוֹלָא (Prov. xx. 27), for the interior generally. Hence the expression, taken in its highest metaphorical sense, may imply a reference to the corporeity of the individual by whom this water is received, and the sense would then be: "the entire man, spirit, soul, and body, by means of the water which I give him, is purified, and becomes himself a living fountain of happiness." The circumstance that the water *overflows* and is *poured forth to others*, necessarily presupposes abundance in him from whom it issues, and presents this abundance in its highest and most extensive sense. The Lord, who is full of grace, gives to the children of men a full *overflowing* measure. (Luke vi. 38.) Lücke's remarks, in opposition to the idea of the overflowing and pouring forth, are of no importance whatever; for the circumstance that John does not explain this reference



in ver. 39 only proves that it was not his purpose to make *every* allusion in the words of the Lord prominent.

Ver. 39. According to his own custom, the Evangelist accompanies this saying of the Lord by an interpretation. The living water is, in his view, the *πνεῦμα*, which believers were about to receive, and which, in the following words, he designates more precisely as the *ἅγιον*. Simple as this thought is,<sup>1</sup> the conclusion of the verse is, on the other hand, pregnant with meaning, for, according to it, this Spirit was not yet there (*οὐπω ἦν*), and that *because* Christ was not yet glorified. These ideas are, in a doctrinal point of view, of the highest importance. (Compare the hints on Luke i. 15, 35.) In the first place, that *οὐπω ἦν* has no reference to *existence*, is self-evident; for the Holy Spirit is to be conceived of as eternal, just as much as the Father and the Son. In order to obviate such a mistake, in many manuscripts additions are made, as *ἐπ' αὐτοῖς, δεδομένον, δοθέν* (Lachmann has, without sufficient reasons, merely on the authority of the Codex B., received the reading *δεδομένον* into the text),—expressions intended to designate the relation of the Holy Spirit to the disciples. This same thing is also plainly indicated by the concluding words, in which the *δοξασθῆναι* of the Son is mentioned, not merely as a period, but as a mediative and conditional circumstance to the communication of the Spirit. The glorification of Christ (comp. the particulars on xiii. 31), of course, respects his humanity, which, through the power of the indwelling Deity, was spiritualized and deified. This process does not appear to have been completed till the ascension; hence it was not till after this that the fulness of

<sup>1</sup> The objections urged by Lücke (in loco) against John's interpretation appear to me of no consequence. He thinks that the ὕδωρ ζῶν, with which the Lord compares himself, means ζωή αἰώνιος, not the πνεῦμα, since John was not made acquainted with this till after the outpouring of the Holy Ghost. But ζωή αἰώνιος is only a consequence of the πνεῦμα; the principle imparted by Christ is always the Spirit, even where merely its *effect* is mentioned. The use of the simile of *outpouring* (Acts x. 45; Rom. v. 5; Tit. iii. 6), which is not suited to fire, satisfactorily shews that in the N. T. πνεῦμα is frequently compared with water, which Lücke denies. Moreover, according to the declaration of John, it is not needful to take *ρεύσουσι* as an absolute future, for Jesus, even before the Pentecost, imparted his Spirit to those who believed in him (John xx. 22); the outpouring of the Spirit is mentioned only as the highest point of his manifestation. It is also to be remarked that the idea of an outpouring of the Spirit, according to passages such as Joel iii. 1 (in the English ii. 28—Tr.); Isaiah xxxii. 15, xlv. 3; Ezek. xxxvi. 25, xxxix. 29, was very familiar to all Jews. (On this subject comp. Kling's remarks in opposition to Lücke, loc. cit. s. 132, f.)

the Spirit was poured out upon the apostles and the first believers.<sup>1</sup> In perfect harmony with this is the declaration also of the Lord, *xvi. 7, εὰν μὴ ἀπέλθω, ὁ παράκλητος οὐκ ἐλεύσεται πρὸς ὑμᾶς*, since death and the glorification connected with it were the *conditions* of the impartation of the Spirit. Hence these words evidently involve the idea that the manifestation of the Deity in men takes place by degrees, and is conditional upon the gradual perfection of those in whom the manifestation is made. The Spirit of God built within Mary the holy Temple of the Lord's body, that he might dwell in it as a pure immaculate medium; and it was by the power of this indwelling divine Spirit that the Lord's body gradually became so glorified that the highest manifestation of Deity—the Holy Spirit—could be poured forth from him upon mankind, like an all-quickening and sanctifying stream. In constant union with this influence of the Holy Spirit, the power of the Lord's glorified humanity was so displayed, that he communicated to his followers not merely his Spirit, but also his flesh and blood, rendering them in all respects conformed to himself,—bone of his bone, and flesh of his flesh (Ephes. v. 30; Phil. iii. 21.)

In accordance with this we may now determine the manner in which we are to regard the operations of the Holy Spirit before the glorification of the Lord, with respect to those who lived under the New Testament. According to 2 Pet. i. 21, we find the Holy Spirit acting in the ministry of the Old Testament prophets, and the New Testament speaks of the activity of the same spirit in John the Baptist, as well as in the physical creation of Jesus (comp. the remarks on Luke i. 15, 35.)<sup>2</sup> The express mention, however, of the Holy Spirit in the Old Testament occurs only in Psalm li. 13; Isaiah lxiii. 10; and the whole of the Old Testament shews that the

<sup>1</sup> As the *Son* operated in mankind long before his *incarnation*, so also the *Spirit* was manifested long before the *outpouring*. But as the fulness of the life belonging to the Son was not revealed until his incarnation, so also the Spirit was not displayed in his full power till the outpouring at Pentecost. The outpouring of the Spirit, therefore, is the same circumstance in his development as the incarnation is in the development of the Son. Concerning the *incarnation of the Spirit* in a distinct personality, traces of which doctrine occur in several sects, Holy Scripture knows nothing. (Comp. the observations on Acts xix. 2.)

<sup>2</sup> The idea expressed by Olebausen, in his Commentary on these passages, is that the term *πνεῦμα ἁγίου*, as employed there, designates the divine essence in general, which according to its nature is holy. He thinks it is not there to be taken as meaning literally the third Person in the Godhead.—T<sub>2</sub>.

idea of it in the minds of enlightened men under that dispensation was but very obscure. (In the Apocrypha the term *πνεῦμα ἅγιον* occurs Wisd. Sol. i. 5, ix. 17.) It may indeed be said that the whole difference in the operations of the Holy Spirit under the Old and under the New Testaments, consisted in this,—that under the latter economy it was manifested in greater copiousness, that it was displayed in more extraordinary gifts, and more various forms of operation (1 Cor. xii. 7, ff.), and it acted more *permanently*, while under the Old Testament its operations appears changing and transitory. In that case, however, it was not so much something really new that was given in the New Testament, as merely the Old Testament advanced; and hence the instances to which we have referred, although they cannot be overlooked, were not altogether fair specimens, but on the contrary essentially defective. For in so far as the Deity, as such, is spirit and is holy, it cannot be denied that the Holy Spirit also wrought in the Old Testament as is indicated also by the formulæ, “God spake” and “the Spirit came upon the prophets,” which occur in instances almost innumerable; and further, according to the necessary unity of the Father, Son, and Spirit, in consequence of which neither acts without the others, the activity of the Holy Spirit must always be connected with the operations of God in the Old Testament. Nevertheless the *usus loquendi* of Scripture and the internal relation of the Persons of the Trinity itself justify us in distinguishing between the operations of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, as different Persons in the divine Being; and in relation to this distinction we must say that the ministry of the Holy Spirit commenced with the glorification of Jesus, and the outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost. Hence the view which has often presented itself in the church respecting particular economies of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, contains some truth. The operations of the Deity under the Old Testament were those of the Son; those of the Holy Spirit commence with the Pentecost. This is indicated especially by the last great discourses of the Lord concerning the Holy Spirit (comp. the remarks on John xvi. 7), in which also the departure of Jesus is represented as the necessary condition of the Spirit’s manifestation. It might be said that until the glorification of Jesus the *πνεῦμα ἅγιον* operated as *ἐνδιάθετον*, and after this as *προφύρικον*. The proper work of the Holy Spirit is regeneration, and the entire creative operation of God

in the souls of men; accordingly the new birth essentially belongs to the New Testament, the specific effects of the Holy Spirit being played first under that economy. (Comp. the Comm. on Matt. xi. 11.)<sup>1</sup>

Ver. 40—43. The demeanour of Jesus, the ardour of his speech, and the power of the Spirit which proceeds from him, powerfully affect many of his hearers; they perceive something great in him (concerning *ὁ προφήτης*, comp. the observations on John i. 21), only they stumble at the circumstance that (according to their erroneous opinion) he was not born in Bethlehem. Without making thorough inquiry, they allow themselves, through this external circumstance, to err in relation to the impression of their hearts, and thus they betray their shallowness and indolence.

Ver. 44—49. In those who were less susceptible of impressions from the truth, the counterpart of this is now presented: they desire to lay hands on the Holy One of God, but are held in fetters by an invisible power. Meanwhile this feeling amongst a portion of the people encourages the Sanhedrim to make an experiment for the purpose of arresting him officially; officers from the Temple (*ὑπηρέται*) are sent to bring him before this tribunal. But, although these men are untutored, their minds, being simple, accessible to the power of the truth, and not entangled in error through self-interest and sophistry, are too powerfully wrought upon by the word of the Lord; and they return from the errand on which they were sent without executing their commission. Doubtless these individuals were incapable of apprehending the thoughts of Jesus, but the impression made by his demeanour overcame them.<sup>2</sup> To this powerful, although, at the same time, purely subjective conviction, the arrogant Sanhedrists oppose a merely external circumstance. "No man of rank or learning believed in Jesus, therefore they might conclude, that there was nothing superior in him." The peculiarity of Pharisaism which has been transferred to the more recent Rabbinism, is discovered in the over-valuation

<sup>1</sup> De Wette here as usual resorts to dogmatism. He calls my exposition subtle and erroneous. Instead of proving this, he makes the monstrous assertion that "the idea of the Holy Spirit as a Person is implied in the O. T. more plainly than that of the Son as such." (!?)

<sup>2</sup> Here we may well apply the fine saying: *cujus vita fulgur est, ejus verba sunt tonitrus.*

of that which is outward,—the inculcated form of the knowledge of the law, which too often presents itself without that true love and desire for divine things whereby the law itself is most justly apprehended. With this haughty, excessive estimation of self, is associated a shocking contempt of others; the people who are not formed in the rabbinical mould are called ἐπικατάρατοι, as those who, being without the knowledge of God, are delivered over to destruction. (The Rabbins abuse the uneducated with the appellation עַם הָאֲרָץ, and even אֲשֶׁר, *i. e.* abomination, while, on the contrary, they call themselves עַם קֹדֶשׁ. Comp. Lightfoot on the passage.)

Ver. 50—52. Probably the rebuke was administered to the officers of the Temple during a sitting of the Sanhedrim, in which it was intended immediately to condemn Jesus. On this account Nicodemus, whose heart was bound indissolubly to the person of the Lord by the conversation held with him at night, ventures to speak openly in his favour. He reminds the assembly of the law of Moses that no one was to be condemned unheard (comp. passages such as Exod. xxiii. 1; Deut. i. 16, 17, xix. 15. With ἀκούσῃ, κρίτης is to be supplied.) According to ver. 51, however, we are not to suppose a decree on the part of the Sanhedrim to arrest Jesus; in this case they could not have been thus censured, and Jesus would not have withdrawn himself, as was shewn by his conduct at the end of his life. The affair is rather to be regarded as a private enterprise of some Pharisees who wished, not to apprehend him, but to have him put to death without a hearing. These men endeavoured to avert the disagreeable truth by a derisive jest; they reproach Nicodemus himself as a Galilean, and tell him that no prophet comes out of this half Pagan land. This assertion was false, for both Jonah and Elias<sup>1</sup> were from Galilee. But when Bretschneider<sup>2</sup> deduces from it the spuriousness of the Gospel, thinking it inconceivable that the true John should attribute such an error to the Sanhedrists, who were so accurately acquainted with the Scripture, he evidently goes much too far, for in the heat of the debate it may easily have happened that such a minute historical circumstance was overlooked.

<sup>1</sup> Whether Nahum also was from Galilee is not to be determined, on account of the uncertain situation of his birth place, Elkosh.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. probab. de evang. Johannis indole et origine pag. 99. sqq.

Here the following history of the adulteress obviously interrupts the connexion. The passage viii. 12 (comp. with this viii. 21, 30—59) proves that the discourse commenced vii. 37 was pursued further; its unity also is clearly indicated by the connexion of the ideas, while viii. 20, 59 shews that the whole took place in the Temple. The paragraph vii. 40—52, as we have remarked above, is merely an intervening description of the circumstances occurring at the time when the discourse was delivered. In the passage vii. 53, on the contrary, we find the altogether dissimilar statement: ἐπορεύθη ἕκαστος εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ, Ἰησοῦς δὲ ἐπορεύθε εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν, with which viii. 59 is utterly incompatible, for, according to the latter, as vii. 37, Jesus again teaches in the Temple. Being convinced upon other grounds also that the history of the adulteress is spurious, I have preferred postponing the close consideration of this till after the interpretation of the entire section, in which it is unsuitably inserted. (Comp. the particulars after viii. 59.)

Chap. viii. 12. The words wherein the Redeemer represents himself as the φῶς τοῦ κόσμου (comp. i. 4), which guides all who follow it into the right path of life, are evidently parallel with the passage vii. 37, where Christ describes himself as the ὕδωρ τῆς ζωῆς. He obviously endeavours to draw the attention of the people to himself and win them for the great end of his mission. For this reason he presents himself to them as the possessor of all the powers of the higher life, who can satisfy every want and every desire. Lücke, mistaking this common bond between the discourses, thinks they must be regarded as separated by a greater interval. He says that πάλιν may be understood as indicating also a later discourse detached from the previous one by the space of several days, and that Jesus appears to have been dealing at one time (vii. 40) with the people, at another (viii. 13) with the Pharisees, at another (viii. 22) with the Jews, at another (viii. 30) partly with believers and partly with unbelievers. But this variety of relations is very simply explained on the hypothesis that the Lord spoke first with this and then with that party in the mixed concourse; while the supposition that the Saviour uttered these words also on the concluding day of the Feast of Tabernacles is pre-eminently favoured by the fact, that reference is made to an external circumstance in the ritual of the feast which explains why Jesus compares himself with light as he

formerly did with water. In the court of the women there stood two colossal candlesticks decorated with a multitude of lamps; towards evening, these were lighted up, and the people danced around them with great rejoicing.<sup>1</sup> Even this usage had a symbolical signification (comp. Zech. xiv. 7—16); Jerusalem was thus to be represented as the city that enlightened the world, and the light symbolized the element of joy and pleasure. Now nothing is more appropriate than that the Lord, in allusion to this chandelier which was then about to be lighted up (for *after* the lighting, the jubilation of the multitude would not have permitted him to discourse), should say: “*I am the true Light of the world—all that is symbolically represented in the sacred rites of the Temple, is actually fulfilled in me!*” Lücke also thinks it likely that Jesus connected his discourse with something external, but he is of opinion, with Kuinoel and Dr Paulus, that the chandelier was illuminated only on the first day. On the one hand, however, it certainly is probable that as the drawing of the water took place every day during the feast, the illumination also was repeated; while on the other, it is sufficient to admit that the colossal candlesticks remained there, and that Jesus in his address alluded to them.

Ver. 13, 14. In reply to the declaration of Jesus concerning himself, the Pharisees say that his evidence is not *true*, because he testifies of himself. Had they said that, being a testimony respecting himself, it was not *valid* to them, the remark would have been more tolerable; but even in this form it would have contained an evident falsehood. On this account the Lord thinks proper first to maintain against these daring sinners the sublime elevation of his position, and not to condescend to them as he did, ver. 31, till afterwards. He declares that his witness is *true*, for it results from the most absolute knowledge, in which they are altogether wanting. If *ὑμεῖς* be taken in the wider signification, as referring, not only to the individuals who had spoken, but to man in general, the words *ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐκ οἴδατε, κ. τ. λ.*, at the same time contain the reasons why no man whatever bore testimony to him; for his origin *in* God (*πόθεν ἦλθον*), and his return *to* God (*πρὸς ὑπάρχω*), as divine actions, surpass everything human; they can

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Lundius jüd: heiligh, s. 1055, ff.

be perceived only through the reception of divine powers into the mind.<sup>1</sup>

Ver. 15, 16. In perfect harmony with this is the observation that the Pharisees judge according to that which is external (*κατὰ τὴν σάρκα*, comp. vii. 24), because they are not capable of discerning the interior. But the words following, *ἐγὼ οὐ κρῖνω οὐδένα*, appear to depart from the connexion. The best mode of understanding them is to take them as forming a remark by the way, intended to show the aggravated character of their sin, in this sense: "I teach peacefully, and misconstrue no one, but ye assail me with your sentences of condemnation; if, however, *ye* are obliged to judge *me* in this manner, I pass a *true* sentence, for I judge in the strength of God." (Comp. the Comm. on John iii. 17.)

Ver. 17—20. This mention of the Saviour's consubstantiality with the Father leads him, just as in v. 32, to represent the Father as the witness to himself, and (which is remarkable), in this instance, he refers to the law of the Old Testament, Deut. xvii. 6, xix. 15. (The words are quoted only in their general sense, and from memory; in the Hebrew, as also in the LXX., they run quite differently.) Now in the first place, it is singular that he should say: *δῖο ἀνθρώποι*, though the expression *ἀνθρωπος* is here to be taken only in the signification of "personality." In the second place, it nevertheless appears that there is only one witness, viz. the Father, the testimony being certainly *in favour of* Christ. But the Redeemer evidently views his divine nature in its distinction from his human existence; the Father and the Son are the heavenly witnesses, and, if we will, the Holy Spirit also, as the third witness, testifies to the human form which they saw before them. (Thus the passage is parallel with the celebrated verse, 1 John v. 7, where, indeed, the reading is erroneous, but nevertheless three heavenly witnesses are to be conceived of, as standing in contrast with the three earthly.) The materialistic Jews do not understand the words of Christ, but think of a cor-

<sup>1</sup> The comparison with *φῶς* corresponds very well with these words, for as nothing can manifest light, because light is itself the all-manifesting element, so that which is divine is itself its only witness. On this point Augustine finely remarks: *lumen et alia demonstrat, et se ipsum, testimonium sibi perhibet lux, aperit sanos oculos, et sibi ipsa testis est.*



poral father, and are therefore repelled by the Lord with the disclosure of their entire ignorance concerning divine things. They possessed merely *notions* respecting God and divine things, and made these notions the objects of their worship; but the ability to discern the *divine nature* was in them altogether extinct.

At the conclusion it is added, by way of information as to the locality, that all this was spoken in the Temple (vii. 37), near the *γαζοφυλάκιον*. Here, doubtless, reference is made to the chests in which contributions for the Temple were collected. There were thirteen of them; on account of their shape they were called trumpets (*τήρηψ*); they stood in the court of the women, in the very place where the great candlesticks were situated, from which, as we have seen, Jesus took occasion to represent himself as the *φῶς τοῦ κόσμου*. The circumstance that Jesus taught publicly in the Temple, and yet no one could lay hands on him, forms a fine contrast with the rage of his enemies. The hand of God protected the Beloved until the hour of the great sacrifice.

Ver. 21, 22. Since all is closely connected up to ver. 59, we have sufficient reason for understanding *πάλιν* here also as relating to the same day, thus: "after a while Jesus began again, &c." *Ἔπαγω* obviously relates to the same thing as the Redeemer spoke of viii. 14. Concerning the sentiments themselves expressed in these verses, we have already made such remarks as are requisite, in the exposition of vii. 34, ff.; the only thing peculiar to our passage is presented by the words: *καὶ ἐν τῇ ἁμαρτία ὑμῶν ἀποθανεῖσθε*. They evidently indicate that *ζητεῖν* is to be understood as meaning to seek through desire; while the observations on vii. 34 clearly shew that the Saviour might well say: "at a future time ye will implore my aid, but nevertheless ye will die in your sin," because they had *known* the time of their visitation, and yet had not *heeded* it.<sup>1</sup> Here again, as vii. 35, the Jews make a perverted interpretation of the words of Jesus, which, in addition to the perversion, involves a bitter reproach, because the Jews regarded suicide as a crime that inevitably led to hell. Origen thought this view of the matter supposed too much malice, and hence it was his opinion that the Jews alluded to a tradition, according to which it

<sup>1</sup> We are not to suppose a permutation of *ἐν* and *δια* in the sentence *ἐν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ὑμῶν ἀποθανεῖσθε*; the sense is just this, that they would die without being delivered from their sins,—in a state of bondage to them.

was expected that the Messiah would die in a manner more god-like (*θεώτερον*) than the ordinary one, viz., that he would as it were put himself to death. But of such a tradition there is nowhere any trace. (Comp. the details on this subject in Lücke's Comm. on the passage.)

Faber conjectures *ἀποξενοι* instead of *ἀποκτενεῖ*, so that the answer would be parallel with that given vii. 36; but this conjecture is not confirmed by manuscripts. It is true that if the words be understood as a jest, the meaning is certainly impudent and malicious, but still we can easily suppose how a jester might be induced to utter it.

Ver. 23, 24. With calm perspicuity, Christ, in opposition to their scorn, unfolds the entire disparity between his position and that of his hearers. The passage iii. 31 is similar, where, instead of *ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου*,<sup>1</sup> we find *ἐκ τῆς γῆς*. In our's, however, as is not the case in iii. 31, the expression designates, not merely the origin, but also the degraded carnal disposition. This prevented the Jews from believing in Jesus, because his holy nature was exactly contrary to their unholy. (*Εγὼ εἰμι* scil. *ὁ Χριστός*, the one, great, desired Prophet = the Heb. *אני הנביא*.)

Ver. 25, 26. Here the meaning is obscure. In the first place, as regards the words *σὺ τίς εἶ*;—they contain a question full of insolence, as Tholuck expresses himself, and of malevolent ridicule—"Who dost thou suppose thyself to be? Dost thou fancy thyself the Messiah?" Luther takes the expression as ingenuous. "Oh yes, what thou sayest is indeed true; who art thou, good Master, Jesus?" Lücke, like Luther, in the oldest edition, translates: "Who art thou then? and Jesus said: Just that which I have already told you." But the question, thus understood, appears as if it arose from actual want of instruction; and this is not at all consistent with ver. 26.

In the second place, greater difficulty is presented by the answer of Christ. As to the text itself, it is a question whether *ὅ, τι* or *ὅτι* is to be read, and whether after *λαλῶ ὑμῖν* a full stop or a comma should be placed. The reading *ὅ, τι* is according to all critical authorities to be preferred. The other reading arose from ignorance, and perhaps also from the explanation of the passage propounded by Augustine, according to which, *τῇν*

<sup>1</sup> Concerning *κόσμος οὗτος*, comp. the remarks on John xii. 31.

*ἀρχήν* is taken as an accusative in the signification of principium, so that the sense is this: "regard me as the Origin, *i. e.*, the Author of all things, because I speak with you, *i. e.*, I have condescended to you."

But the incorrectness of this view is beyond all doubt; *τὴν ἀρχήν* is certainly to be taken adverbially, and hence also the reading *ὅτι* is inapplicable. As regards the connexion with ver. 26, all modern expositors agree in opposing it; they differ from one another merely in the view taken of *τὴν ἀρχήν*. The interpretation "from the beginning," equal to *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς*, maintained by Tholuck, is indeed supported, so far as the terms are concerned, by passages in the version of the Seventy, such as Gen. xliii. 18, 20 (where in the Hebrew the expression is *הַרְחֵק*); but if the sense of the words be "that which I said even at the beginning" ("of my ministry" is the best addition that can be made), then their order must be altered, and the sentence must run: *ὁ, τι καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν ὑμῖν λαλῶ*. Besides which, no instance is recorded in which the Lord said this at the beginning of his ministry. Lücke therefore, with Erasmus, Wolf, Kuinoel, and Tittmann, takes *τὴν ἀρχήν* in the signification of *ὅλως*, omnino, profecto, like *ἀμήν*, so that the meaning of the words is this: "truly I am no other (*ἐγὼ εἰμι* supplied) than I also tell you." But it is felt that thus the *καὶ* (which Lücke translates "without reserve") does not suit; and moreover, if this rendering be adopted, we must read *ἐλάλησα* instead of *λαλῶ*. In the interpretation of this difficult passage, I decidedly agree with Dr Paulus in preferring the signification "first."<sup>1</sup> This view involves no grammatical difficulty whatever; the accusative absolute here presents the expression in its original sense, from which the other signification "truly" is derived. *Τὴν ἀρχήν* can have this meaning only in so far as that which is first is also frequently most important; on the contrary, "first, in the first place," is the most natural sense. Dr Paulus, however, takes ver. 25 in entire separation from ver. 26, and thus injures the

<sup>1</sup> The result of the investigation into this passage instituted by De Wette (comp. Stud. und Kritiken, 1834, h. 4) is that the words mean "from the beginning I am that which I tell you." In an extraordinary manner, however, he takes "from the beginning" as equivalent to "before all things" or "certainly," although it refers only to the beginning, and cannot mean anything else. The separation of ver. 25 and 26, which De Wette also maintains, is quite erroneous.

interpretation of the passage. He translates : " in the first place, I am that which I even now tell you, *i. e.*, your admonisher. In the second place, I have also yet much to say to you, &c." In this way a difficult ellipsis arises, and the discourse is extremely obscure. On the other hand, the connexion of the whole is simple, if ver. 25 and 26 are united, and then the sense is this: " first I have, as I plainly tell you, much to say to you in the way of rebuke and censure ; and thus I am your serious admonisher." It is only according to this view of the passage, which in several Codices is indicated by the blending of the two verses, that *καὶ* attains its proper signification. The circumstance that no "*secondly*" follows "*first*," is founded in the sentiment which runs through the whole argumentation ; for the answer is intended to be one of rebuke, and the expression " first" awakens the idea that Jesus, if he had thought proper, could have said much more to them. Hence he adds, by way of example, the statement that his judgment is perfectly true, because it is that of Deity itself, though effected through the Son. (Concerning the ἀκούειν of the Father's voice, compare the parallel βλέπειν, v. 19 ; and respecting the κρίνειν of the Son, the remarks on iii. 17 may be consulted.)

Ver. 27—29. In accordance with the remark of the Evangelist that the Jews again did not apprehend the meaning of the words of Christ, this paragraph of the Lord's discourse is wound up with his declaration, that they would recognize him in his peculiar elevation, when they had lifted him up. The passages iii. 14, and xii. 32, 33, according to the authentic interpretation of their author, leave no doubt concerning the import of the Saviour's words. The elevation of Jesus on the cross, the deepest circumstance of his humiliation, was at the same time the very point at which the most copious display of the fulness of the Spirit in him would commence, and at which he would be recognized by many even among the Jews ; and moreover many of those who had already received strong impressions from the truth, but were not in a position to set themselves free from many prejudices, after the perfection of the Lord, would be overcome by the power of the Holy Spirit. The Redeemer again connects the necessity of recognizing him with the truth that in him nothing of his own, in detachment from the Deity, was presented, but rather the pure expression of the divine will itself, against which nothing could stand. (Concerning the

words οὐκ ἀφήκε με μόνον ὁ πατήρ, which occur also John xvi. 32, comp. the remarks on Matt. xxvii. 46.)

In regard, however, to the words ὅτι ἐγὼ τὰ ἀρεστὰ αὐτῷ ποιῶ πάντοτε, it is certainly to be observed that they do not furnish the *reason* of the intimate union of nature between Father and Son, as if the Father never left the Son *because* the Son always did his will; this would argue merely a *moral* union, which would depend upon the fidelity of the Son. On the contrary, the fidelity of the Son was the *consequence* of the oneness of nature; in Christ the impossibility of being unfaithful was according to his higher nature. Hence ὅτι ἐγὼ κ. τ. λ. is to be understood as implying the visible expression of the internal invisible consubstantiality between Father and Son; so that the passage must be taken thus: "the Father has never left me yet, *for* ye see I constantly do that which is pleasing to him, and no one among you can convict me of a sin."

Ver. 30—32.<sup>1</sup> By means of the words ταῦτα αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος, the sequel is immediately connected with that which precedes. Among the hearers many believed in him, and to these in particular Jesus addressed himself. The following verses express new and exalted ideas concerning bondage and freedom, the children of God and those of the Devil. *In the first place*, however, it is remarkable that, although this discourse was held with persons who believed, yet Jesus reproaches them with the desire to kill him (ver. 37 and 40), and even calls them (ver. 44) children of the Devil. But the term πιστεύοντες, here applied to the hearers of Christ, is to be understood as in John ii. 23—25, vii. 40, viz., as designating a certain credit given to that which the Redeemer might be in accordance with their own views. At the same time it was *possible* for this to be associated (as in the case of Judas) with great insincerity of heart, and the words of the Lord indicate that such *was the fact* in the case before us. Still, strong as are the accusations of Christ against them, it is by no means necessary to suppose that they had formed a definite and determined *plan* to kill Jesus; it is sufficient to understand that the general sinful element predominated in them. This very thing, indeed, may have led them to acknowledge the Messiah in the person of Christ, since they hoped that through him their vain projects would be fulfilled. But as soon as Jesus shewed himself to them as one who would by

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Kling in the Studien, 1836, h. 3 s. 661, ff., on the section John viii. 30—46.

no means flatter their vanity, but would rebuke it, the apparent goodwill degenerated into hatred; that diabolic element (the parent of murder) forced itself into prominence, and at once brought forth its fruit in actual deeds (viii. 59.)

*In the second place*, in this discourse again (as chap. vi.) it appears objectionable that the Lord should, as it were, irritate his hearers by the pungency of his remarks, in which he represents them as slaves and children of the Devil. But, in the present case, just as in the others, this conduct on the part of Jesus properly belongs to his wise mode of instruction. It was by no means compatible with the character of the Saviour to keep the people in good humour, and partially attract them to himself by means of compliances; on the contrary, he wished to dart into their minds the word of God, which penetrates through joint and marrow (Heb. iv. 12), in order that he might disclose to them the concealed heinousness of sin, and truly deliver them from it. In the case of the sincere, this succeeded, and he thus bound them eternally to himself; but those who were not sincere, as soon as they experienced his rigour, turned away from him, and, instead of their apparent affection, cherished hatred more bitter than ever. The insincerity of the persons whom Jesus here addressed is at once indicated by the words (ver. 31): ἀληθῶς μαθηταί μου ἐστέ. For according to the *usus loquendi* of John (comp. i. 9) these words cannot mean, “ye are not perfected disciples,” but their sense must rather be, “ye are not sincere upright disciples; if, however, ye remain in my word ye may *become* so; since it will lead you to the consciousness of your insincerity.” (Accordingly ἀληθῶς is not to be interchanged with ἀληθινῶς.) The only difficulty, in this case, is that μένειν ἐν τῷ λόγῳ presupposes the εἶναι, and how can this be predicated of the insincere? The word of Christ, who is the *original word* (the Logos, i. 1), completely partakes his nature; his word *is* divine, and *operates* in a divine manner; as living power it penetrates into the depth of the heart, and that, not merely in the sincere, but also in those who are not sincere. In the former it produces consolation and invigoration, to the latter it administers rebuke. It may therefore be said that the words εἶναι ἐν τῷ λόγῳ ἐμῷ, or inversely, λόγος ἐμός ἐστι ἐν τινί, are applicable even to the most insincere person,<sup>1</sup> when he experiences the power of God

<sup>1</sup> To be entirely free from the word of God, would be a predicate of the Devil. Even

even *against* his will ; but his gaining salvation from the word of God depends entirely on the *μένειν*. The insincere man seeks to get rid of his troublesome admonisher as soon as possible, and drives the Spirit of God away from himself, but he who is sincere endures the correction in penitence and humility, and thus his soul is restored. Accordingly it becomes evident that the association of *μένειν* in the word with *γνώσις τῆς ἀληθείας* is quite psychologically correct ; for the power of the word is received only in *πίστις*, and every man as a sinful being, according to the degree of impurity that is in him, is the subject of a variety of feelings which contend against grace ;—the result of which is that with him first this, and then that, is not right as it respects God ; but if he *persevere*, the entire work of God gradually becomes unfolded in his soul with perfect distinctness, and in this little world he beholds, as in a mirror, the universe in its most essential relations, so that *πίστις* produces *γνώσις*. The *ἀλήθεια* itself, however (comp. the remarks on i. 14), which the true *γνωστικός* possesses not merely as a system of ideas,<sup>1</sup> but in its full reality, calls forth another new condition, that of *ἐλευθερία*, to the development of which we are conducted by the sequel. But the Son of God himself is the truth in its reality, and hence also ver. 36, the liberation is ascribed to the Son, who is the truth itself, as he is the life itself.

Ver. 33, 34. The sad political state of the Jews, in connexion with that lively consciousness of their elevated vocation which obtained among the people, had awakened a fanatic strife after freedom, and this was displayed, during the contests with the Romans, in horrible scenes. Instead of taking their oppressed condition humbly from the hand of God as the punishment of their sins, they daringly endeavoured, in opposition to God, to acquire an external freedom by conquest. Nothing, therefore, was more intolerable to them than to be considered the slaves of men. In their longing after the Messiah, they were beguiled especially by the hope that this Desired-One would make them the lords of the world. Hence it must have surprised them very much, that Jesus, whom they were disposed

in the most degraded man, the voice of the Lord still speaks by the reproaches of conscience.

1 A logically correct system of ideas may be possessed by man in union with internal falsehood. Hence the sacred Scriptures attribute no value to correct ideas *alone* ; they require internal truth, from which correct ideas naturally proceed.

to regard as the Messiah, should treat them as δούλοι. They at once supposed that he referred to an external bondage, and adduced their noble origin from Abraham. The Lord therefore conducts them more deeply into the idea of freedom, and to this end describes its opposite, viz. *slavery*. Ἀμαρτία is the predominating element in spiritual slavery, and ποιεῖν τὴν ἀμαρτίαν is at once its *consequence* and the *sign by which it is betrayed*. Accordingly, he who is ὄντως ἐλεύθερος appears entirely freed from the control of ἀμαρτία. The reading τῆς ἀμαρτίας is not quite certified, but there is by no means sufficient critical authority to justify its rejection. At all events, the only expression that can be supplied after δούλος is τῆς ἀμαρτίας. Tholuck thinks it gives to the sentence a perfectly different meaning, because, if it is retained, δούλος, ver. 35, must be taken in the sense "servant in a family," while in ver. 34 it means "servant of sin" in the metaphorical sense. But the difficult comparison in ver. 35, 36, is only to be taken generally, and as a new illustration derived from the general idea of δούλος; this, therefore, cannot exert any important influence upon the view of ver. 34. But Tholuck understands the passage, without the addition of τῆς ἀμαρτίας, thus: "He who yields himself to sin, loses more and more of the control over himself, and becomes its slave." This interpretation appears to me mistaken; the discourse here certainly is not on the subject of gradually *becoming* governed, but on that of *being* entirely under the dominion of sin. All men in their natural condition commit sin, and, on this very account, all are servants of sin, and do not cease to be so until the Son makes them free. Hence the idea of δούλος involves an acknowledgment of the germ of good in man; for that which is evil itself, cannot be enslaved,—this can only be the case with that which is good.<sup>1</sup> That which is entirely evil is as destitute of God as that which is good is free from evil; between these two stands the ἄνθρωπος ψυχικός, with a germ of good—this germ, however, being held in the power of evil. To this condition the Redeemer directs the attention of his hearers, in order to awaken the idea of a perfect freedom, arising from the perception of bondage and the effort to obtain help which this would induce.

<sup>1</sup> In the fifth edition, Tholuck, although he expels τῆς ἀμαρτίας from the text, at the same time justly observes that the sense is not by this means altered. Sinfulness is something foreign to man, and the inmost man does not consent to sin.



Ver. 35, 36. The connexion of the following statement with this is simple. In order to excite a lively desire of freedom, the Redeemer describes the difference between a δούλος and a υἱός;—the former is a stranger in the house, the latter is the lord and heir, and always remains in it (Gal. iv. 1, ff.; Heb. iii. 1, ff.) The illustration, however, drawn from the δούλος seems to create some difficulty. For, not merely does ἀμαρτία appear as the lord of the δούλος, although it cannot be the Father of the Son, but moreover, if God be regarded as the Parent, the metaphor is not clear, since the servant remains constantly in the house,<sup>1</sup> although indeed *as* a servant, whilst the grown-up Son becomes lord. For the solution of this difficulty, which in fact is not unimportant, various methods have been devised. As regards the reference to the custom of selling or liberating servants (which, according to Exod. xxi., was obligatory every Sabbatic year), Lücke, following the example of Lampe, justly remarks that it is not relevant, since the subject of discourse here is something bad. It is true that being sold may at that time have been regarded as an evil, because the servant thus became subject to a stranger; but, if this circumstance be placed prominently in view, it gives rise to the idea of a severity in the lord which is not consistent with the connexion, since we must regard God as the Lord of the house in which the Son remains for ever. Hence Lücke, as also Chrysostom and Theophylact, take μένειν ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ synonymously with ἔχειν ἐξουσίαν χαρίζεσθαι, to have the right of liberating the servant. But, in the first place, it is unnatural to put upon that expression a sense which it does not at all convey; and, secondly, it would follow that οὐ μένειν must be understood in the signification “*not* to possess the right of liberating,” as Lücke also thinks; and thus an entirely strange sense is given to the passage. On the other hand, the reference to the expulsion of Ishmael (Gen. xxi.), admitted by Lücke, in harmony with Calvin, Cocceius, and Lampe, is perfectly appropriate, and is expressly indicated by the distinction between σπέρμα and τέκνα Ἀβραάμ (comp. viii. 37—39) that follows; though this has no necessary connexion with the interpretation maintained by Lücke. According to my conviction, the only way of solving the difficulty

<sup>1</sup> It might be said that the words “if he be unfaithful” are to be supplied, for he may be expelled. But this is untenable, because something similar might be said of the Son. The discourse here embraces merely the *pure* ideas of *servant* and *son*.

is to view the passage as follows. The Jews, as children of the promise, were literally *children* in the great house of God, but, through sin and their protracted perseverance in it, they surrendered themselves *as slaves* to a *strange* master, viz., the world or its representative, the Prince of this world. Although *externally* they lived in the house of the Father, *i. e.*, they stood in connexion with the Temple and its divine institutions, yet *internally* they belonged to the strange master, and it was certain that he would at length put in force his full right to them. This right consisted in the fact that he had snatched them from the house of the Father, and had appropriated them to himself as his property. The only means of averting this horrible doom was that these blinded men—who thought themselves true children, while they were in reality the slaves of a stranger—should rightly perceive their condition, and, as they could not set themselves free from the bond, should look around for a Deliverer. The only individual, however, in whom they could find such a deliverer was the true Son of God, who remained free from sin, and being, as the Son of God, the Heir of the Father's power, is able to rescue the prey from the strange master; hence it was *his* help that they needed to seek. Thus the sense is complete, and the *ὄντως ἐλεύθερος* stands in opposition to the imaginary freedom which the Jews thought they possessed as descendants of Abraham. It remains to be observed, that the condition of *ἐλευθερία* cannot be regarded as absolutely realized on earth, because this would presuppose the transformation of the body, and hence Paul (Rom. viii. 21) describes the *ἐλευθερία τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ Θεοῦ* as something future. But where the redeeming power of Christ displays its effect, there the state of freedom is relatively attained, and perfection is approximately reached. In this relative degree, it exists immediately upon the exercise of living faith, which involves *freedom from the law*, although this does not constitute *freedom from sin*.

Ver. 37, 38. To this the Redeemer adds the remark in which he acknowledges that the Jews are physically connected with Abraham (*σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ* in antithesis with *τέκνα Ἀβραάμ*, ver. 39), but denies that they are so morally. Christ discloses to them the contents of their hearts, which up to that time may have been concealed even from themselves, but which were soon made known to them in the deeds that followed (ver. 59.) Their inmost life, as

one of self-complacence and self-seeking, strove against the Lord's spirit of love, which tended to destroy the disposition indulged by them. This very opposition between the Lord and them necessarily involved their hatred to him, and their hatred implied the spirit of murder (1 John iii. 15.) Hence the Lord did not go too far, when—although, it may be, they had not shaped the definite *design* to kill him—he accused them of the spirit of murder; on the contrary, by such a disclosure of the abominable wickedness of the heart, he assisted those who were sincere in coming to a knowledge of themselves. As a sign of the inward state described, Jesus adduces the fact: *ὅτι οὐ χωρεῖ ὁ λόγος ὁ ἐμὸς ἐν ὑμῖν*. These words result from the most vivid spiritual view, which, however, becomes obscured if we translate *λόγος* "*doctrine*;" it is rather to be rendered "*word*;" the word of the Logos is itself spirit and life as he himself is (vi. 63.)

So far as the intellect was concerned, they received his doctrine very well, but their *hearts* remained shut against his beneficent influences, and he felt that the stream of life which issued from him could not penetrate, but returned to him (comp. are the parallel passage, Matt. x. 13.) The fact that they were thus closed against the holy operations of Christ presupposed that a mighty power was exerted upon them by darkness. This Jesus openly declares ver. 44, and the consequence is that their hatred at length breaks out (ver. 59) in an actual attempt to commit murder. Here again we are not to suppose an interchange of *ἐν* and *εἰς*; on the contrary, we must add to the foregoing idea of motion the subsequent one of rest; and this is expressed in the *ἐν*.<sup>2</sup> The Saviour, in conclusion (ver. 38), points out the total disparity between his position and theirs. He traces the deepest movements of the vital principle in himself and in them (*λαλεῖν* and *ποιεῖν*) to sources (*πατέρες*) en-

<sup>1</sup> Kling (loc. cit. s. 668, note), in opposition to Lücke, acknowledges with me the distinction between *σπέρμα* and *τέκνα* in our passage. It is self-evident that this is not to be sought in the terms themselves as such, but is founded in the connexion of the whole argument. In Rom. ix. 7, however, the very same distinction is made.

<sup>2</sup> Kling (loc. cit. s. 666, f. note) thinks there is a twofold reference in the fundamental signification of *χωρεῖν*. First, it means to have room for something,—i. e., to contain; or, secondly, to have room in connexion with something, or in something,—i. e., to succeed, to find a place, to meet with acceptance. The latter meaning, in combination with *rest*, is the one here applied. It is unsuitable to translate *ἐν ὑμῖν*, "my word has no continuance among you."

tirely different. *Who* it is that he regards as *their* father he plainly avows, ver. 44. (Ver. 38, the pronouns *μου* and *ὑμῶν* are, upon internal as well as external grounds, to be rejected from the text.)

Ver. 39, 40. The Jews again appeal to Abraham, and the Redeemer on the contrary denies that they are τέκνα τοῦ Ἀβραάμ, because they did not act as he did. (Τέκνα here forms the antithesis to σπέρμα, ver. 33, and designates the inward derivation of the nature, which must be manifested by similarity in the tendency of life, and the external expression of which is constituted by the ἔργα.) As a proof of this Jesus again adduces the ζητεῖν ἀποκτείνει, and adds to the pungency of his accusation by the λαλεῖν τὴν ἀλήθειαν which he predicates of himself.

Ver. 41—43. The Jews, probably without rightly knowing what Christ means, nevertheless take his words, as conveying a meaning derogatory to them; they therefore leave the subject of physical descent, and call God in a spiritual sense their Father. (According to passages such as Isaiah lxiii. 16, lxiv. 8.) Hence the πορνεία which they deny in reference to themselves is to be understood as signifying spiritual fornication, so that the meaning is, “we are not the offspring of idolatry, we are true children of God.” (Comp. Ezek. xvi. 15, xx. 30.) This, however, the Lord disputes (ver. 19), and deduces from their incapacity to perceive that which was divine in him their own estrangement from God. The sight of a kindred object awakens responses; in Christ the pure revelation of Deity was given, and therefore he who knew God would certainly recognize him as the Holy one of God. (Ver. 42, ἐξῆλθον refers rather to the origin of Christ, and ἦκω to his existence on earth, as Lücke justly remarks.) But they could not receive his word (ἀκούειν = ὑπαῖ), and therefore they did not derive their origin from the truth. (John xviii. 37.) Lücke distinguishes between λαλία and λόγος thus:—he regards the latter as denoting the contents or the sentiments, and the other as meaning the form, the λόγος λαλούμενος. This is certainly quite correct in itself; but it is evident that in our passage the two expressions are employed synonymously, since λαλία in connexion with γινώσκειν must necessarily have reference to the sentiments.

Ver. 44. In this verse the discourse of the Lord reaches its climax; he calls the Jews, in so many words, children of the Devil, and imputes to them the inclination (θέλετε) to follow out his

wicked suggestions, in a course of conduct which, according to ver. 37—40, is traced to the desire to kill Christ.

As regards this expression of the Lord, we may remark, in the first place, that it is to be taken just in the same manner as *γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν* (Matt. iii. 7), or as the epithet “plants which the heavenly Father has not planted.” (Matt. xv. 13.) The words of Jesus do not imply an absolutely abandoned condition, for in that case his conversation with these men would have been to no purpose; his design must have been to awaken repentance, and this would have followed, had they themselves yielded to the accusation of the Redeemer.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly the sense of the expression is nothing more than this: sin is represented in your hearts in all its heinousness, hence the kingdom of darkness has access to you, ye allow it a place within you, and thus ye are children of the Prince of Darkness, the offspring of the Devil, who have need to be born again, begotten anew by God. In the second place, this passage is very important as a proof of the doctrine in general concerning the Devil. The Lord here utters it entirely of his own accord, and even to the offence of his hearers. Schleiermacher (Dogm. i. s. 227, f.), endeavours to set aside this passage, by stating that it belongs to the usage of proverbs, though he does not say in what this consisted. And as to the opinion that, according to this passage, if taken as doctrinal, it is necessary either to adopt the views of the Manichæans, who represent the Devil as the opposite to God, or to regard the relation of Christ to the Father as neoteric<sup>2</sup>,—it is quite unfounded, for not merely is Christ as the *υἱὸς τ. Θ.* contrasted with the children of the Devil, but on the other hand, it is admitted respecting men in general that they might be children of God. Now as John frequently speaks of the *ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου*, it is not needful here to point out the idea, this being so obvious; and the opposition raised by Schleiermacher

<sup>1</sup> Still we cannot admit the statement of Lücke (B. ii. s. 298), that “every one can, at any moment, *if he will*, become a child of God or of the Devil.” At all events, the one part,—becoming a child of God,—is a work of electing grace, not of man’s will: grace has its seasons, which are to be watched for. The strongest Pelagianism has not ventured to assert that man at any moment, if he will, can become a child of God!

<sup>2</sup> The Manichæans believed that there were two original principles absolutely opposed to each other, which had their opposite creations. The one was God, the primal light from whom nothing but good can proceed; the other was original evil. They regarded Christ as an entirely new being generated by an *Æon* which God caused to emanate from himself. See Neander’s Gen. Ch. Hist., translated by Terrey, vol. ii. p. 288, ff. Clark’s Foreign Library.—Ta.

must, in this instance again, have proceeded from his doctrinal prejudices. The Saviour does not deem it sufficient to make the general statement respecting their spiritual relationship to the Prince of Darkness; on the contrary, he gives a precise description of his real character, intending this description to furnish them with a mirror in which they might see their own internal state. Comp. Krabbe, s. 134. He first calls the *διάβολος* an *ἀνθρωποκτόνος ἀπ' ἀρχῆς*. If we compare this with 1 John iii. 15, where the Evangelist expresses his profound view as to the nature of the spirit of murder—which he regards as identical with hatred,—it cannot be doubted that the term *ἀνθρωποκτόνος* used in respect to the author of evil himself, cannot refer to an isolated fact, an external murder,—such as that committed by Cain,—but to the radical principle which produced this as well as all other murders.

It is the seduction of the first man, and the infusion of the spirit of murder into him and his entire race, that is here viewed as the spiritual murder of a vast collection of life. In this sense, it may be said literally to have taken place *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς*, and it forms a fine antithesis to the intended murder of the Redeemer as the second Adam, whose death was the source of life and happiness for all, whilst the death of the first Adam brought destruction upon the whole human race. Tholuck thus justly explains the passage, after the example of Augustine, Luther, and Calvin. In the most recent times, Lücke, De Wette, and Nitzsch<sup>1</sup> have maintained a reference to the murder of Cain; this, however, evidently takes away from the depth of the meaning, as also Kling (loc. cit. s. 669, note) acknowledges. The view in question certainly appears favoured by the parallel, 1 John iii. 12 (where the murder of Cain is the express subject of discourse), as well as by the connexion of the words in the passage before us, the primary reference in the context being to the designed destruction of Christ. But the murder of Abel was too isolated a fact to justify the use of the term *ἀνθρωποκτόνος*, if the reference to spiritual death is to be excluded. The blood-thirstiness of the Jews was merely an expression of their inward spiritual death. Tholuck adduces, as an argument for the reference of the term to the spiritual death of man

<sup>1</sup> Nitzsch, in his treatise on John viii. 44, which, in other respects, contains very much that is valuable (comp. Schleiermacher's u. s. w. Zeitschrift heft iii.)

by means of Satan's seduction, a suitable parallel from the supplement to Zohar, in which the old Serpent is called **שֶׁרֶפְטָן**, **שֶׁרֶפְטָן** *i. e.* "which killed Adam," viz., in his higher spiritual life.<sup>1</sup>

We must not overlook the **ἦν** in our passage; it implies that the Devil constantly maintains the character which he manifested from the beginning of the history of man. It would add to the significance of the second statement which Christ makes respecting the Devil: **ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ οὐχ ἔστηκεν**, if **ἔστηκεν** might be translated "he *continued* not in the truth," because this would presuppose a previous existence in it, and would accordingly indicate the fall of the Devil from that original state of purity. But it has often been remarked, and, so far as the terms are concerned, it is perfectly indubitable (comp. Buttman's large griech. Gramm. ii. s. 157, f.; Winer's Gramm., 3d edit. s. 206, ff.), that **ἔστηκα** and **ἑστήκειν** have the significations "I stand" and "I was standing." Hence it appears that here the Saviour describes only the actual state of the Prince of Darkness. According to this, however, the words **ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἀλήθεια ἐν αὐτῷ** present an aspect of pure tautology; for, in the first place, it seems self-evident that in him who does not *stand* in the truth there *is* no truth; and, secondly, it does not at all appear how, according to the above view of **ἔστηκεν**,

<sup>1</sup> Lücke here warns us against false depth, and that justly. But it is a question whether the fear of this has not in the present instance, as in others, led to the contrary superficiality. His main argument against my opinion is this: "the view of the murder of man, in a spiritual sense, destroys the connexion, because here the discourse can have no reference whatever to spiritual murder as respects Christ." And why not? Lücke has not specified the reason. Probably he thinks that, on account of ver. 59, where it is said the Jews "took up stones," we cannot suppose murder in a spiritual sense. But was this act of taking up stones a literal murder? Did not the Jews really believe that Jesus blasphemed God, and that consequently they ought to inflict the punishment which the law appointed for that crime? Besides, it must necessarily be admitted that they were not cherishing this design during the conversation; the whole discourse, from ver. 31, is addressed to the Jews *who believed in him*. Thus the matter is completely reversed, and, as Lücke maintains, *we cannot here suppose physical, but only spiritual murder*. These persons, who believed in him as Messiah, had an apparent faith. They entertained worldly hopes in reference to the Messiah, and thought that Christ would bring them to pass. But their hearts were set against the real object which engaged the mind of Christ, viz., the establishment of a spiritual kingdom, and, being lovers of the world, they hated him as the pure son of God. It was *in this spiritual hatred* that their *murderous disposition* consisted, and not in any positive purpose to commit corporeal murder upon Christ; they would have shuddered at such a thought, for they regarded him as the Messiah. It was not till he ascribed to himself divine properties that they desired to inflict on him the legal punishment. Then let us not have superficiality at the cost of exegetic truth!

the second statement could form the ground of the first, although this connexion between the two is indicated by *ὅτι*. Lücke (s. 238), it is true, takes the connexion thus: "The Devil does not continue in the truth, however often he may be placed in it, because the truth does not belong to his nature." But, in the first place, the supposition that the Devil has often been replaced in the truth, after having fallen from it, is without any foundation; and, moreover, according to this view, the circumstance that there is no truth in him would be the *reason* of his not continuing in the truth, whereas it is evident that the meaning is to be apprehended inversely thus: "because he does not continue in the truth, there is no truth in him." Hence some expositors have taken *ὅτι* as the mark of an inference in the sense of *διὰ τοῦτο*; but Lücke justly observes that, on account of the following *ὅτι ψεύστης ἐστί*, this hypothesis cannot well be admitted. If, however, the casual connexion be retained, we are driven to a view of the words very similar to the old interpretation respecting the fall, and which may also be maintained in harmony with the true meaning of the terms; for the perfect tense *ἔστηκα* certainly may be translated "I stand," because it literally signifies "I have placed myself." This original signification being adhered to, the expression obtains the meaning of *continuance*, which Lücke and Tholuck also acknowledge. This, however, necessarily involves the idea of previous existence in the truth. Hence we must say, that although the proposition "he continues not in the truth" certainly does not explicitly affirm the fall, yet it implies it; only the fall is regarded, not so much as an isolated fact, but rather as a *continuous* act. This is what Lücke appears to have had in his eye when he employed the terms "however often he may be, so to speak, placed in the truth;" only the expression is not suitable. Accordingly, the sense of these remarkable words is this: "he continues not in the (element of the) truth, for there is no truth at all in him."

In considering the sentiment embodied in this language, we must not overlook, first, the distinction between *ἀλήθεια* and *ἡ ἀλήθεια*, and secondly, the difference in the significations of the phrases "he is in the truth" and "truth is in him." *The* truth is the absolute truth,—eternal, pure Being itself. In this element nothing moves but that which is in itself holy; the Devil was *in* it, but he fell, and ever since has continued *out of it*. An unholy



being, however, may have truth in himself; if, for example, he in penitence acknowledge his want of holiness, there is truth in him. But where there is not even *this* truth, there that which is devilish begins; and this not merely is averse from what is divine, but endeavours to abolish it, and to put that which is not divine in its place. Now the divine activity against the Devil is nothing else than a protracted effort to reawaken the truth in him; but since he perseveringly resists this activity of the divine light, he perfects himself in his own character.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly as all is conceived of in its development, so is the character of the Devil. It originated in defection, *i.e.*, an act isolated in itself, but involving every stage of the development; the unceasing energy of the Light bringing upon him the curse that results from shutting himself more and more against it. In this persevering activity of opposition, the *ψεύδος* becomes perfected as the property (*ἰδία*) of the Devil; for perfected falsehood (*τὸ ψεύδος*) is not merely that which is sinful in itself—which (as before remarked) in man, if acknowledged and repented of, may appear in association with what is good—but includes, besides departure from God, the exertion of positive activity with a view to make the fallen existence equal to the eternal Being himself.

It may, however, be said that the representation, viewed thus, borders upon Manichæism; for if *the true be that which is* (i. 14), then in the Devil his existence is a truth, so that the expression *οὐκ ἔστιν ἀλήθεια ἐν αὐτῷ* appears too strong. Were it desirable to return a subtle answer, it might here be said that a distinction is to be made between *ἔστιν ἀλήθεια ἐν αὐτῷ* and *αὐτός ἐστιν ἀλήθεια*. For, if his existence were not a truth, he would certainly be either a chimera, or else an absolute being; but here the only thing intended to be asserted is that the free activity *in* him is not truth. Meanwhile, we prefer saying that here we are to retain merely the practical character of holy Scripture, which is quite at a distance from metaphysical interest; and hence the words are to be judged of only according to practical necessity. In conformity with this, Christ aimed to describe the Devil in such a manner as was needful, in order to shew the Jews that the character of their inward disposition was devilish. The supposition of De Wette, that John teaches

<sup>1</sup> Compare the remarkable observations of Dschelaledin on the relation of the Devil to God; in Tholuck's *Blüthensamml.* s. 138, ff.

an eternal fall of the Devil—as John v. 17, an eternal creation (? !)—is without any authority ; it is to be reckoned among the numerous instances of arbitrariness, in which this expositor attributes his own ideas to the author whom he proposes to interpret.

Ver. 45—47. These verses contain the application of that which precedes to the hearers. They did not receive (true) faith, just *because* the Redeemer spoke the truth, and this as a strange element did not suit them. In the passage xviii. 37, the words *ὁ ὢν ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας, ἀκούει μου τῆς φωνῆς* are quite parallel with *ὁ ὢν ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ*, ver. 47. The sense is this : “ In order to the reception of that which is divine, a mind kindred to it is necessary ; the want of this prevents it from being perceived.” According to what has preceded, this train of thought is clear ; but some obscurity still presents itself in ver. 46. The question : *τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν ἐλέγχει με περὶ ἁμαρτίας*, is evidently intended to awaken in the listeners the acknowledgment of the holiness and sinlessness of Christ, for which the words *εἰ τὴν ἀλήθειαν λέγω* do not appear suitable. Lücke therefore takes *ἁμαρτία* merely in the signification of “error.” But if we apprehend the term *ἀλήθεια* only in the profound sense in which John employs it, the connexion is of the closest kind. The truth, as such, can proceed only from him who is sinless ; hence the elevated moral character of Christ, —in which no one, not even the bitterest enemy, could find anything to censure,—ought to have rendered the Jews more attentive to what he said, and more susceptible of impression from it.

Ver. 48—51. After this pungent address, hatred broke forth into its virulent fruits ; they charge him with heresy and madness. (Concerning *δαιμόνιον ἔχειν* comp. the remarks on vii. 20, x. 20.) (The term *Σαμαρείτης* involves not only the idea of being held in contempt, but that of being in error respecting matters of faith, and thus is employed as the designation of a heretic.) The Lord repels even this bold calumny in a gentle manner, adducing first his humble self-forgetting ministry (comp. the observations on vii. 18), in order then expressly to describe the eternal blessing which results from the reception of his word. (The phrase *θάνατον οὐ θεωρεῖν*—or, with a modification of the form, *οὐ γεύσασθαι θανάτου εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* [ver. 52]—is perfectly synonymous with *ζωὴν αἰώνιον ἔχειν*. The words *τηρεῖν λόγον ἐμὸν*, as in the similar case, ver. 32, are not to be apprehended as meaning merely to retain instruction in the

memory, or merely to carry it out in external actions, but they are to be understood in accordance with the profound view of the word of the Logos, to which John always adheres, [comp. the remarks on viii. 37]—that the word of Christ is a living spiritual power, which is poured into the soul as a creative element, and when kept—*i. e.*, faithfully retained—calls forth therein a new higher life, so to speak, a heavenly *σπέρμα*. [Comp. the remarks on 1 John iii. 9.])

Ver. 52—55. In such terms the Jews think they have a decisive proof that the language of Christ is irrational, their thoughts turning on physical death, the vanquishment of which is here referred to only as the extreme point in the redeeming power of Christ. (Comp. the Comm. on John vi. 40.<sup>1</sup>) Hence they discover in his words a profession that he surpasses Abraham and the Prophets. Upon which Christ by no means denies his superior *δόξα*, but simply gives prominence to the fact that it is not arrogated, it is conferred upon him by his Father. They, however, do not know this heavenly Father, and therefore they are incapable of perceiving his will; but he himself so knows him, that if he were to say he knew him not, he would participate their element of falsehood.

It is remarkable that here (ver. 55) the Saviour says of himself (as above [ver. 51], he had recommended *them* to keep *his* word); *τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ τηρῶ*. This language seems to favour the Socinian view of Christ; for *τηρεῖν* always implies the receptive activity of the creature towards that which is conferred, but it does not appear how Christ could ascribe this to himself, since he not merely *preserves* or retains the *λόγος* of the Father, but *is* this Logos itself. Certainly the difficulty is obviated with ease, if it be said that *λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ τηρεῖν* means “to put into execution the commands of God;” and our passage is in that case similar to ver. 46, *τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν ἐλέγχει με περὶ ἁμαρτίας*. But this superficial interpretation, *in the first place*, stands in conflict with the profound view taken by John, according to which the practical observance of commands appears only as the necessary consequence resulting from the inward preservation or retention of the higher vital power; and, *secondly*, it leads back to the legal point of view, where *ἔργα* and not *πίστις* are the objects of contem-

<sup>1</sup> The author alludes to the final resuscitation of the body, which he regards as the consummation of redemption.—Ta.

plation. I therefore prefer to explain the passage in harmony with the more profound view of the phrase, so that Christ here places himself, as a human being, in proximity to his hearers; as he evidently presupposes in them the *possibility* of knowing God and keeping his word, so he proclaims to them the *actual existence* of the same in himself. It is not till we come to the verses which follow, that the language of the Saviour amounts to a representation of his absolutely superhuman nature.

Ver. 56. In allusion to ver. 53, Abraham is here called *ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν*, and thus the corporeal relationship of the hearers to Abraham is implied, just as much as their spiritual difference from him. That in which Abraham rejoiced as a future good, was to these men a matter of no concern, although they had it before their eyes. But for the obscurity of the following *εἶδε καὶ ἐχάρη*, the meaning of the first clause—which is so simple—certainly would never have been mistaken. At all events the better class of expositors, such as Tittmann, would have abandoned the interpretation of the sentence as hypothetical,—an interpretation first proposed by the Socinians, who treat all grammar with contempt:—*exaltaturus fuisset, si vidisset diem meum, &c.* (comp. Lücke in loco.) The signification of *ἡμέρα ἐμή* cannot be at all doubtful; according to the *usus loquendi* which pervades the Old as well as the New Testament, it is the time of Christ's appearance and ministry upon earth. An apparent difference of signification is suggested merely by the fact that in the Old Testament the expression *יהוה יום* comprehends the *entire* Messianic appearance in humiliation and in exaltation viewed collectively, whilst in the New Testament the *ἡμέρα Χριστοῦ* appears only as the future circumstance of Christ's return. (Comp. the details in the Comm. Matt. xxiv. 1.) As regards *ἀγαλλιάσθαι* with *ἵνα* following, it is by no means necessary to ascribe to the verb the idea of wishing, longing; it is sufficient to give *ἵνα ἴδῃ* its right meaning, "that he should see," and every difficulty is removed. (Comp. Winer's Gram.\* 4th edit. s. 314.)

The concluding words, however, *εἶδε καὶ ἐχάρη*, are obscure. The reason why they are added is clear: they are intended to represent the eternal existence of the Son, as ver. 58 plainly shews. But how are they meant? Lücke and Tholuck, influenced by the example of Maldonatus, Lampe, and Kuinoel, here suppose a view of the coming of Christ upon earth in Abraham's heavenly exist-

ence. They say that Abraham, in harmony with the promises which he had received concerning the Messiah (Gen. xviii. 18, xxii. 18), rejoiced at the time of Christ's appearing, and according to the general connexion of the beatified with the living, he felt the influence of the event, and his joy was completed. Certainly no one would object to such an interest taken by the departed in earthly occurrences, although the passages Matt. viii. 11, xxii. 32; Luke xvi. 19 (to which Lücke here refers) cannot prove it; Matt. xvii. 3, to which Tholuck appeals, indicates it more plainly. However, this view of the passage, on other accounts, does not suit the connexion. It is true, it seems favoured by the fact that *ἰδεῖν* must be something else than *ἀγαλλιᾶσθαι*, whilst on the other hand, if the act of seeing be conceived of as internal and spiritual, the two appear identical; for the exultation certainly presupposes that the object is beheld by faith. But this apparent advantage, upon closer consideration, is seen to be of no importance; not to mention that it is opposed by a very essential circumstance in the connexion. For, if the sight of the day of Christ by Abraham referred to the time of the Redeemer's ministry on earth, in the first place, it would have been necessary to employ the present tense, and to say "Abraham sees my day and rejoices," because the ministry of Christ on earth was still continuing; and secondly, ver. 58 would be quite unconnected with the subject. There the Redeemer declares that he was before Abraham; but how could he say so in allusion to ver. 56, if in this verse nothing more were affirmed than that Abraham rejoiced in the future Messiah, and rejoiced as soon as he came? If, however, the connexion between ver. 58 and ver. 56 be entirely denied, and it be said that the declaration ver. 58 was occasioned merely through the remark of the Jews ver. 57, then it remains inexplicable why Christ uttered the statement of ver. 56 at all; these words can have no meaning unless they are regarded as intended to represent the superior dignity and the eternity of Christ.

Hence we must agree with Origen, Augustine, the Reformers, Bengel, Semler, &c., who here acknowledge a view of the Messiah on the part of Abraham while he was on earth. Then ver. 56 and ver. 58 are in precise harmony,—the latter asserting that at that remote period it was *possible* for Abraham to behold him, since he *was before* Abraham. If we do but correctly apprehend this vision of Christ by Abraham, we are easily released from the above-men-

tioned difficulty ; for it is to be distinguished from the *promises* that were given to Abraham,<sup>1</sup> and from the *types* that he saw.<sup>2</sup> It is true, we cannot with certainty adduce a definite fact from history<sup>3</sup> as the thing referred to in the mention of this vision ; but, as it does not follow from this that we must adopt the other hypothesis and suppose it to have taken place in heaven, let us receive it upon the word of Jesus as having occurred in Abraham's life on earth. It is sufficient that it was a sacred circumstance in his life, in which—like John who (according to the Apocalypse) saw the last time—he beheld the glory of the revelation of God realized in Christ, and this sight filled him with happiness and joy.<sup>4</sup> This view being taken, the sequel unites with the statements of ver. 56 in a strict and complete connexion.

Ver. 57—59. The Jews understood Christ quite correctly in so far as they perceived that he represented himself as existing in the

1 The interesting parallel Heb. xi. 13, *κατὰ πίστιν ἀπέθανον οὗτοι πάντες, μὴ λαβόντες τὰς ἐπαγγελίας, ἀλλὰ πόρρωθεν αὐτὰς ἰδόντες καὶ ἀσπασάμενοι*, is to be explained as referring merely to seeing in faith.

2 Those types which relate to the suffering Christ, such as the offering of Isaac, are by no means to be regarded as pertaining to this subject ; for *here* it is only the glorious part of the Messiah's appearance that is viewed. It would be more appropriate to think of such as the meeting of Abraham with Melchizedek, and the entertainment with bread and wine (Heb. vii.)

3 Lücke adduces this circumstance, that nothing is said of such a fact in the Old Testament, in opposition to that view of the passage which we have propounded ; but then Abraham's sympathy in the heavenly world with the occurrences of the Messianic period must also be proved. The same scholar further thinks that the connexion with ver. 58 may be wanting, because ver. 58 was elicited by the exclamation of the Jews ver. 57. But if the Jews did not interpret the words of Jesus incorrectly, it follows that the relation of ver. 58 necessarily requires a reference to ver. 56 ; and if their view of his language had been false, the Saviour would not have agreed with it, but would have corrected it. Finally, Lücke, in opposition to my interpretation, makes the superficial remark that although profound, it is not true, for Abraham might certainly have beheld Christ, but he could not have seen his *day*, because this was not come ; as if the future were not in all prophetic visions represented as present ! If Lücke's exposition were correct, the passage must necessarily have run : " Your father Abraham rejoiced that he should see my day, and now he *sees* it and *rejoices*." But had this been the form of the words, the Jews could not have replied : " Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham ?" Accordingly, this remark of the Jews renders it necessary to regard the fact, that Abraham saw the day of Christ, as belonging to the past.

4 Also, passages in the writings of the Rabbins affirm, according to Gen. xviii. 17, that God shewed to Abraham all the future. (Comp. Lücke in loco. s. 310, note.) A remarkable parallel to the phrase " Abraham saw my day" is formed in the speech of Balaam, Numb. xxiv. 17, by the words : " I shall see him, but not now, I shall see him, but not nigh ; there shall come a Star out of Jacob, and a Sceptre shall rise out of Israel." The only difference is that there the future is employed and here the aorist.

time of Abraham ; only they referred this statement to his corporeal existence instead of to his divine life. (There can be no doubt that they named fifty years merely as a round number ; Irenæus, therefore, is mistaken in deducing from this passage the conclusion that Christ must have been more than forty years old, Iren. adv. haer. ii. 39, iii. 22.) The Lord emphatically explains it as indicating his higher being : “ Before Abraham *was born* I *existed*.” In these words we must not only retain the antithesis between *γίνεσθαι* and *εἶναι* (comp. the remarks on i. 1), according to which Christ ascribes to himself absolute and eternal being ; but, moreover, the signification of the present tense (*εἰμί*) must not be overlooked. It bears the same signification as the imperfect is in other instances employed to convey, viz., that of enduring, competent being. (Comp. the observations on i. 1. Winer’s Gramm. 4th edit. s. 244. He adduces from the Old Testament the parallel Jer. i. 5 : *πρὸ τοῦ με πλάσσει σε ἐν κοιλίᾳ, ἐπίσταμαί σε*.) In my opinion, however, Tholuck is not correct when, referring to iv. 26, he ascribes to *ἐγώ εἰμι*, according to the Hebrew *אני הנה*, the meaning “ I am who I am.” For here the subject of discourse is not *who* Christ is, but the *fact that according to his divine being he is eternal*.

The attempt has been made to remove this meaning, which is of so much doctrinal importance, by saying that here *εἶναι* denotes not real, personal existence, but the divine knowledge and will respecting the future existence, so that the sense would be, “ before Abraham was born, God had decreed that I should exist.” Such is the explanation given by Dr Paulus, and at an earlier period by Grotius. But where this idea occurs, as, for example, Ephes. i. 4, the divine will is the express subject of consideration ; here, however, it is merely existence that is spoken of, and upon a comparison of i. 1, *ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν* no doubt remains that the words of the Saviour are intended to teach a personal existence.

This open declaration of Jesus concerning himself causes the inward rage of these supposed believers against the object of their selfish belief to break loose and display itself externally in the attempt to murder ; but as the hour of the Lord was not yet come, no hand could touch him, the shield of God rendered him invulnerable. Jesus, however, left the Temple. (Concerning *ἐκρύβη καὶ ἐξῆλθεν*, comp. Winer’s remarks, Gramm. s. 439. The additional sentence, *διελθὼν διὰ μέσου αὐτῶν καὶ παρήγγεν οὕτως*, in

which, according to another reading, ἐπορεύετο is further interpolated, is undoubtedly spurious, and on this account it is rejected by Griesbach and Schulz. Probably it was first inserted in the margin, from Luke iv. 30, and then gradually admitted into the text.)

### § 3. HISTORY OF THE ADULTERESS.

(John vii. 53—viii. 11.)

In considering this remarkable account, which we here treat as supplementary, we have a twofold investigation to conduct; *in the first place*, we must examine the subject of its authenticity in the Gospel of John; and *secondly*, the credibility of the history as such must be tested. As to the *first* question, most of the modern inquirers are so unanimous in their opinion, that we may regard it as settled. On this account, and considering also that it belongs rather to the department of preliminaries, we shall only treat it briefly. The *second* inquiry, on the contrary, seems to me so far from decided, that I deem a careful consideration of it indispensable, and to this I hope I may be able to furnish at least a contribution.

1. The spuriousness of the history of the adulteress in John is indicated by *the manuscripts*. Not merely is it wanting in distinguished Codices (as A.B.C.),<sup>1</sup> but, in many of those which contain it, it is marked with the sign of suspicion; not to mention that a great and striking variety of readings occurs in the account, by which interpolations are generally betrayed. 2. The *Fathers* and the *Versions* perfectly harmonize with the manuscripts in their testimony against its authenticity. For, anterior to Augustine and Jerome,<sup>2</sup> we find only slight traces of it, and at a far later period, Euthymius<sup>3</sup> declares himself doubtful as to its genuineness. More-

<sup>1</sup> In regard to Cod. A., however, the omission is only concluded from the circumstance that the pages wanting would not have been sufficient to contain the section. There is a break also in Cod. C. The most important MS. in which the piece is found is D.; but this Codex gives an entirely different text.

<sup>2</sup> Jerome, who devoted himself so much to inquiry, investigated this section. Comp. advers. Pelag. ii. 17. He remarks that although it is found in many Greek and Latin Codices, yet he has serious doubts as to its authenticity.

<sup>3</sup> Euthymius was a learned monk who flourished about A.D. 1116. He was celebrated



over, the oldest versions, *e. g.*, the Syriac, Gothic, and Armenian, know nothing of the account of the adulteress in John. 3. Evidence to the same effect is derived from the *language*, which in many instances is not that of John. The expressions *πᾶς ὁ λαός, καθίσας ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς* (viii. 2), and *οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ φαρισαῖοι* (viii. 3), are more in conformity with the *usus loquendi* of the synoptical writers than with that of John; while the entire complexion of the language, *e. g.*, the incessant *δέ*, is quite contrary to the style of our Evangelist. 4. Finally, the *context* also shews that the history does not belong to the Gospel; for it interrupts the course of the conversation of Christ with the Jews in the Temple (comp. the remarks already made viii. 12), and it has no connexion at all either with that which precedes it, with that which follows it, or with the main design of John. The phrase in which the transition is expressed, *καὶ ἐπορεύθη ἕκαστος εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ* (vii. 53), is particularly obscure. It does not appear whether we are to understand by *ἕκαστος* the Sanhedrists, who have just been spoken of, or the strangers who had come to the feast. The remark in reference to the former,—that after their sitting was concluded they went to their homes,—would be perfectly idle; and the application of it to the latter is forbidden by the context, for not a word has been previously said about persons who had been journeying to the feast. Moreover, the following words (viii. 1, 2.) *Ἰησοῦς δὲ ἐπορεύθη εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν ὄρθρου δὲ πάλιν παρεγένετο εἰς τὸ ἱερόν*, sound quite as if they related to the last days of the life of Jesus, the nights of which we know he spent out of the city; that he did this before that period is not probable.

In addition to all these grounds, we have the *internal* argument derived from the account itself; but as this is not needed in order to establish the conclusion that the narrative is spurious,<sup>1</sup> we shall view it under the *second question*, viz., the *credibility of the history in itself*.

As I cannot agree with the prevailing opinion (entertained also

for his *Panoplia dogmatica orthodoxæ fidei adversus omnes Haereses*, which was designed to defend the doctrines of the Greek Church against all its opponents. He also wrote Commentaries on the Psalms and the four Gospels. Mosheim ranks him among the principal writers of the age. See Soames' Mosheim, vol. ii. p. 434, note 2.—TRA.

<sup>1</sup> The most successful attempts to maintain the authenticity of the account in John have been made in recent times by Storr, Stäudlin, and Kuinoel. Still the scale preponderates against its genuineness; Lücke, De Wette, and Tholuck are opposed to it.

by Lücke and Tholuck) that nothing can be urged against the credibility of the account itself, I feel bound to give a full statement of the difficulties which present themselves to me in the history of the adulteress, in order that the objections which I myself shall endeavour to set forth may, if possible, be satisfactorily removed.<sup>1</sup>

1 Tholuck finds, in the history of the adulteress, no difficulty of importance. He thinks the Pharisees, in arresting the woman, did not perform any judicial act, but designed to propose to Christ a mere question of law; and hence they could consistently withdraw. He is of opinion that the temptation intended for the Lord by the question of the Pharisees was this: they, knowing his gentleness, hoped he would speak freely to the woman, in which case they could have charged him with the open violation of the law. By the treatise of Dieck, however (*Studien*, Jahrg. 1832, h. 4, s. 791, ff.), I confess that I am only confirmed in my doubt, and cannot see the propriety of the course which he takes. This scholar, to whom we *Theologians* must acknowledge an obligation for having, as a *Lawyer*, entered upon the close consideration of this narrative, says (*loc. cit.* s. 796) it appears to him that all depends upon the answer to the question, *whether, according to Christian principles, the punishment of adultery with death is tenable*; and, in order to answer this question satisfactorily, Dieck thinks it necessary to enter into the Christian system of divorce in general. This mode of proceeding seems to me entirely mistaken. Since both the woman and the Pharisees were Jews, how could the Christian rule be applied to the case? We always find that the Redeemer treats every one according to the principles which apply to his point of view; a confused transference of higher principles to persons occupying an inferior point of view never occurs in his ministry. From what follows (*loc. cit.* s. 808, ff.) it is also clear that Dieck thinks, if the Lord had decided for the fulfilment of the law, the Pharisees would forthwith have stoned the woman. But I confess I find that this supposition encumbers the account with insurmountable difficulties; for, according to this, the conduct of Christ would have been a complete interference with the course of justice—an act which Jesus never allowed himself to commit. Hence the legal view put upon the history of the adulteress, in the treatise by Dieck, clearly shews how important the perplexities are which the account contains. With the whole question is associated the difficult inquiry concerning the relation of the invisible Church, and that which obtains in it, to the external constitution of Church and State, and here primarily to that of the Old Testament. The words of Luther, “the preaching of Christ did away with sword, judge, and all the rest,” may, in this connexion, be very incorrectly apprehended; in relation to the spiritual world they certainly are perfectly true, but in relation to this alone. In the external world, the Lord allows justice to take its solemn course. Although the thief on the cross sincerely repented, Jesus did not take him from the cross by miracle, but suffered him to bear his punishment. In like manner here, it cannot be said that the Saviour rescued a guilty but penitent woman from the arm of the law which had seized her; although, it may well be supposed, that, according to divine permission, *no one* being found who would make a charge against her, the Lord did not consider himself called upon to become her *accuser*. It must, therefore, be presumed that the Pharisees in question did not act officially, but merely as private persons; the narrative otherwise viewed becomes involved in difficulties. The great satisfaction with which this account is regarded by worldly men, who are destitute of spiritual life, rests mainly upon the misapprehension so easily arising from a false view of the history; they think of the Lord as doing away with the *just* punishment of sin—a mode of proceeding quite suited to their moral indifference. But of such a Saviour the Bible knows nothing! The living Christ is as *just* as he is gracious, and

The question arises,—were the Pharisees and Scribes, who brought the woman to the Saviour, acting officially as agents of the authorities, or as private individuals? In the *former* case a difficulty springs from the circumstance that they came to Christ at all, and then that they afterwards let the woman go; it would have been their *duty* to hand her over to the magistrate. In the *latter* case, however, it becomes a question to what law they refer when they say: *Μωσῆς ἡμῖν ἐνετείλατο τὰς τοιαύτας λιθοβολεῖσθαι σὺ οὖν τί λέγεις*; (viii. 5.) Moses had not appointed every one to be judge, but only the magistrate. It is true that appeal has here been made to the so-called law of zealots, but the opinion to be formed of this has already been indicated in the Comm. on Matt. xxi. 12.<sup>1</sup>

(2.) Another difficulty is involved in the circumstance that stoning for adultery is not commanded by Moses. (Comp. Levit. xx. 10; Deut. xxii. 22.) According to Talmudic statements, strangling and not stoning was customary; it was only when the adulteress had been betrothed, or was a priest's daughter, that the latter mode of punishment was adopted. Meanwhile, upon the perusal of the disquisition concerning this point by J. D. Michaelis (Mos. Recht. Th. v. s. 261, ff.), it is soon seen that little stress is to be laid on this circumstance; for the Talmudists take their data from mere conjectures, and the ancient practice in respect to this is unknown.

(3.) A far more important difficulty is started by the inquiry,—

because sin cannot but be punished, he takes its necessary consequences upon himself, bestowing the blessing of forgiveness upon those who, *in true repentance, pronounce the sentence upon themselves*, and believe in him who justifies. Thus the thief on the cross rightly judged, in the conversation with his companion: "we receive the due reward of our deeds;" and it was only on account of such repentance arising from a true sense of justice, that he could believe in forgiveness. In like manner, it must be presumed respecting the adulteress that she deemed herself deserving of death. It was only in this case that the words of the Lord could have been applied to her: "Neither do I condemn thee,"—a declaration which is to be understood not merely as negative, but as positive also: "I forgive thee thy sins!" Only in this case could the words "sin no more," addressed to her after she had received forgiveness, convey their proper force. Hence, as I have already remarked, I can only consider Dieck's view of the whole matter, according to which the Redeemer was even *bound* to act as is related, in order to *save the life* of the adulteress (loc. cit. s. 814), as entirely mistaken. So far from the preservation of physical life being the subject of discourse here, the entire ministry of the Redeemer relates to that which is spiritual, and corporeal preservation may be regarded merely as the *consequence* of the salvation of the soul.

<sup>1</sup> Olshausen's remark on this subject, in the Commentary on the passage here referred to, is, that the so-called law of zealots has been completely exploded by Lücke.—T.A.

how could this question involve a temptation for Jesus (viii. 6) ? Had he, according to the law, advised severe measures, or had he recommended leniency, it does not at all appear in what way this could have injured him, since at any rate he would have expressed merely a private opinion. All that has been adduced, in proof that such an expression of his sentiments would have exposed him to danger, has the evident appearance of being forced ; for example, that if Jesus had decided in favour of punishment by death, it would have seemed that he vindicated the right of the Jews to administer capital punishment, and thus he might have been rendered an object of suspicion to the Romans (so Grotius) ; or, that if he had pronounced a lenient judgment, he would have been accused by the Jews as a despiser of the law (so J. D. Michaelis.) The only means of solving the difficulty is to take *πειράζειν* in the milder sense, as denoting, not a malicious attempt to embarrass, but rather a well-meaning desire to gain information. (It is employed similarly Matt. xxii. 35, at which passage compare the Commentary.) It is true the words added, *ἵνα ἔχωσι κατηγορεῖν αὐτοῦ*, appear opposed to this view of the term ; perhaps, however, they may be explained in such a manner as not to shew that these individuals intended to derive from the answer of Jesus materials for an accusation before the Romans or the Sanhedrim, but that they only designed, by means of the information obtained from him, to get into favour with the leaders of their sect. In this case the act might be regarded as one of inconsiderateness, but not of malevolence. Still this is not quite satisfactory, and the circumstance contains a serious difficulty yet to be removed.

(4.) The answer of Christ (viii. 7) seems like an interference with the official administration of justice ; for the expression *οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ φαρισαῖοι*, ver. 3, appears to designate the members of the Sanhedrim, who were the lawful judges. The judicial punishment of crimes is independent of the guilt that may attach to the judge ; it is the *duty* even of the most wicked judge to punish the guilty (unless he intends to augment the number of his sins), because he is to be regarded not as an individual, but merely as the organ of divine justice. Here, however, Jesus appears to connect the punishment of gross, open transgression with the innocence of those who punish. But if this connexion were just, no punishment could be admitted in any case, especially consider-

ing that ἀναμάρτητος (viii. 7) cannot be understood as referring merely to similar crimes of incontinence, in the sense “he who is conscious of being free from guilt in *this* point,” but must be taken as implying sinlessness in general; for that every one of these Pharisees was an adulterer, neither is involved in the words, nor is in itself to be supposed; and hence, as no one is sinless, no sin could be punished. Lücke, indeed, on this point observes (s. 190) that here the Redeemer spoke merely in reference to the βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ, and he quotes the words of Luther: “Such is the doctrine of the kingdom of Christ; and when this prevails, it does away with the sword, the judge, and all the rest.” But in all the four Gospels we find no instance in which the Redeemer shielded an action evidently constituting a gross violation of the Mosaic law from the severity which that law enjoined, as it would appear that he shielded this. In Luke xv. the prodigality and harlotry of the son is not to be viewed as crime coming under the cognisance of the magistrate. Moreover, συκοφαντεῖν, Luke xix. 8—10, does not denote evident and actionable fraud, but the less palpable practice of overreaching, which is to be tried only before the tribunal of conscience. Adultery, however, (*i. e.* illicit union with a married woman, who was regarded as the property of the husband) is a positive transgression of the law, which, according to the code of Moses, was a capital offence; how, then, could the Lord connect the punishment of such a crime with the guiltlessness of any one? Even viewing the matter in reference to the kingdom of God, we never see Jesus so invade the existing order of things as to abolish it. This,—as it appears to me,—very weighty objection to the history has not until now been set forth in its full importance, any more than it has been appropriately answered. In addition to these considerations, we may also notice, in the first place, the extraordinary tenderness of conscience manifested, according to viii. 9, by the Pharisees; secondly, the circumstance that, as the same verse implies, the people (ver. 2) appear to have withdrawn with the Pharisees, for which there does not seem to have been any reason at all; and, lastly, the fact that Jesus, according to viii. 11, uttered the words πορεύου καὶ μηκέτι ἁμάρτανε, without anything being said about penitence and faith on the part of the woman. If it be said that Jesus perceived penitence and faith in her, it must be confessed that, in that case, either John or one of the other

expected to mention it, because, by this means alone, all misapprehension of the passage might have been removed.

Whether it be possible to set aside all the scruples arising from the considerations which I have now enumerated I know not; but, notwithstanding my full sense of their weight, I am restrained from positively denying the credibility of the history, because there are important circumstances *in favour* of it. 1. As one of these we may mention the peculiarity of the history, which makes a subsequent fiction improbable. Christ's stooping down and writing in the sand is such a singular act, that the narrative surely would not have been invented; it must have arisen from some historical occasion. 2. The account, even if it be not John's, is ancient; for, according to Eusebius H. E. iii. 39, it is found among the additions to the original Matthew, which occur in the *εὐαγγέλιον καθ' Ἑβραίους*. 3. No design can be ascribed to the invention of this history. All traditional legendary compositions wear the impression of a certain party, for the interests of which they are constructed; here, however, not a trace of design is betrayed. Why it was inserted in this passage of John's Gospel cannot indeed be stated with certainty; but the words, viii. 15, *ἐγὼ κρίνω οὐδένα* might easily induce some one to write this anecdote in the margin of his Codex as a proof to the point.

These circumstances, which exclude the supposition of a purposed fiction, conduct us to the following remarks in reference to the difficulties specified. In the first place, these Pharisees, although to be regarded as natural men, must by no means be considered malicious; on the contrary, they appear to have been susceptible of the operations of the Spirit, and only to have desired information from Jesus as to his opinion on such a case. It is true that this view of them does not suit the context in John; but the account, looked upon as an isolated history, contains nothing opposed to it, if we except the words *ἵνα ἔχωσι κατηγορεῖν αὐτοῦ* (viii. 6), which certainly present a contradictory appearance. These persons must be regarded as acting altogether in a private capacity; they apprehended the adulteress in order to bring her before the tribunal; but, as they happened to meet with Jesus, they laid the matter before him. Accordingly the requirement of the Mosaic law to which they refer (viii. 5), is to be understood as relating merely to the sentence that might be expected

from the court of justice, and not to an arbitrary execution, on their part, of what the law demanded. They were not compelled by any law to present themselves as *accusers* in this affair, (they were not at liberty to be *judges*); they might have quietly left the husband to complain and to call them as *witnesses*. Doubtless their indignation did not proceed from pure moral emotion, but contained an admixture of that secret malignant gratification, which so often creeps into the heart of man, when he sees his neighbour led into sin and misery. Perhaps they hoped that as a Prophet, and as the supposed Messiah, he would deliver an extraordinarily severe opinion respecting the unhappy woman. But Jesus first (by the symbolic action of stooping down and occupying himself with something else) shewed them that such matters did not belong to him, (just as in Luke xii. 14); and afterwards, when they pressed him more urgently, he pronounced no sentence concerning her, but indirectly rebuked the accusers themselves. He awoke within them the consciousness of personal guilt, which was the most powerful means of suppressing their malignant joy; and as they had now lost the motive for interfering in an affair that did not pertain to them, while on the other hand they were under no necessity to meddle with the woman, far from committing any daring mischief, they, with a proper feeling, withdrew. Jesus, however, did not thus relax the rigour of the law, and still less did he take upon himself the judicial office; he only pointed out to these accusers, who had taken pleasure in the unhappy circumstances of another, that, before they set themselves up as public protectors of morality, it was necessary for them to begin with their own faults, leaving the affair of the woman to the husband, who alone, in this case, was *called* to speak. Now, regarding himself merely as a private person, and perceiving the woman's sincere penitence, Jesus could say to her: οὐδὲ ἐγὼ σε κατακρίνω,—while this declaration being purely spiritual and individual, and not a sentence which it devolved on the Judge to pass, neither was intended to make, nor could make, any invasion of the rights belonging to the husband and to justice, if the former chose to prosecute his cause. Thus the conduct of Jesus was in the highest degree beneficial in its effects, without involving any injury whatever. According to this view, the principal considerations against the credibility of the account disappear; and if at the

same time we admit that it was not composed by an apostle, but was produced at a somewhat later period, the circumstance that no explicit mention is made of repentance and faith (viii. 11), which otherwise would be strange in the highest degree, becomes explained; while, in like manner, the inaccuracy of the representation, an instance of which occurs viii. 9, where *μόνος* relates merely to the Pharisees who had withdrawn, and not to the people (ver. 2), is accounted for.

The most dubious point, however, in the narrative, is the description of the Pharisees as *πειράζοντες, ἵνα ἔχωσι κατηγορεῖν αὐτοῦ* (viii. 6), which, on the one hand, is not consistent with the by no means unsusceptible disposition ascribed to them in the subsequent statement; while, on the other, it does not appear apposite, because no temptation was involved in the question. Hence a certain suspicion respecting the credibility of the history of the adulteress continues in my mind, and none of the interpretations which have been offered to this day has sufficed to remove it. May some one, by unfolding the subject with greater acuteness, succeed in dispelling all my doubt!

The individual points of the section remain to be noticed. The expression *ἐπαντοφώρω* (viii. 4), in the New Testament, is a *ἄπαξ λεγόμενον*. Hesychius explains it: *ὁ ἐπ' αὐτῷ τῷ κλέμματι εὔρεθεις, ἔτι κατέχων αὐτό*. In the wider sense it signifies "taken in the act itself." The action of Christ in stooping down and writing on the ground is altogether peculiar. The transcribers were perplexed as to the manner in which this fact was to be understood; hence some added *καὶ προσποιούμενος*, i. e., "appearing as if he wrote," while others, adopting a sense precisely opposite, appended the words *μὴ προσποιούμενος*, meaning that he wrote in reality. Many even sought to find out what the Saviour had written; some entertained the idea that Jesus wrote hints concerning the sins of the Pharisees, and that when they perceived his knowledge of their hearts, they slipped out. But this interpretation proceeded from the feeling that the withdrawal of the Pharisees required a motive, because in consequence of viii. 6 they were regarded as malevolent tempters of Christ—according to which view, however, the history is perfectly unintelligible.

Modern expositors are one in the opinion that the stooping down



and marking in the sand is merely an expression of refusal, indifference, or unwillingness to reply.<sup>1</sup> Instances of the same custom frequently occur among the ancients. Thus, for example, in the beginning of the *Acharnians* of Aristophanes, ver. 30, ff. it is said :

κἄτ' ἐπειδὴν ὦ μόνος,  
στένω, κίχνην, σκορδινῶμαι, πέρδομαι,  
ἀπορώ, γράφω, παρατίλλομαι, λογιζομαι κ. τ. λ.

where the expressions *γράφω* and *παρατίλλομαι*, “ I write, and I pluck out a hair here and there,” indicate actions implying embarrassment, absence of mind, or occupation with something else. Comp. also Aelian, Var. hist. xiv. 19,<sup>2</sup> and from the Talmud Tract. Gittin, fol. vii. 1. (Consult Tholuck in loco.)

The words viii. 7, *πρῶτος τὸν λίθον ἐπ' αὐτῇ βαλέτω*, are not to be regarded as containing an invitation to put the sentence in execution (this belonged to the judicial authorities); on the contrary, the phrase is only similar to the following *κατακρίνειν*, ver. 10. Any one may in his own thoughts condemn as well as acquit a criminal, without assuming the prerogative of the magistrate, supposing that he passes his opinion merely as an act of individual judgment. It is thus that we are to take the language of Jesus : *οὐδὲ ἐγὼ σε κατακρίνω*, i. e., in reference to the external fact; while, on the other hand, as it respects the relation to God, it is of eternal moment. It may be supposed that after this acquittal of the woman by the Lord, if the husband had prosecuted her, she would have been condemned by the court and stoned; but this would not have annulled the pardon granted by Christ, which was of eternal force in regard to her *soul*. Hence Augustine very justly remarks : *ergo et dominus damnavit, sed peccatum, non hominem*. (Concerning *εἰς καθ' εἰς* or *καθεὶς* [Mark xiv. 19; Rom. xii. 5] comp. Winer's Gramm., 4th edit., s. 227. It is a solecism occurring also in pro-

<sup>1</sup> Jer. xvii. 13, the phrase “ to write the name of some one in the earth ” is a form for “ leaving to destruction.” But, if this signification be applied here, it follows that Christ judged the Pharisees, which, according to viii. 15, does not appear to be the tendency of the account. Besides which, in that case the words *ἔγραψεν εἰς τὴν γῆν* would not have stood alone, but *ὀνόματα αὐτῶν* or *αὐτοὺς* must have been added.

<sup>2</sup> In Aelian it is said of Archytas, that being asked an impudent question, he was silent, *ἐπέγραφε δὲ κατὰ τοῦ τοίχου, δείξας μὲν, δ' εἰπεῖν ἐβιάζετο, οὐ μὴν βιασθεὶς εἰπεῖν*. But we must not overlook the circumstance that Aelian mentions this fact as an *unusual* one.

fane writers. On the formation of this expression comp. Döderlein de brachylogia [Erl. 1831] p. 10.)

### § HEALING OF THE MAN BORN BLIND.

(John ix. 1—34.)

The eighth chapter, which winds up with the conclusion of a large number of discourses, is followed by the history of a cure. As to the chronological connexion of the latter with what precedes, no express dates are given, but *παράγων* (ix. 1) in association with ver. 14, according to which the healing took place on the Sabbath, allows us regard to the event as having occurred on the same day during which the above discourses were delivered. This was the last day of the feast (vii. 37), and, as such, a Sabbath. If a subsequent Sabbath had been meant, it is probable that *μετὰ ταῦτα*, or a similar formula, would have been added. As regards the form taken by the history of this cure, we are struck by the great degree of amplification, which brings to mind the accounts of cures given by the synoptical Evangelists. But, *in the first place*, it is to be observed that this narrative does not stand by itself; it is in union with the discourses in chap. x., to which it forms the historical foundation. And *secondly*, the greater part of this paragraph is not the history of the healing, but a representation of the insidious proceedings of the Pharisees. The Evangelist, however, in strict keeping with the design of his work, has reserved the description of the increasing hatred cherished against Jesus by his enemies for the later period of his life.

Ver. 1, 2. In the neighbourhood of the Temple a number of sufferers lived (Acts iii. 2), amongst whom was a man born blind. The severity and rareness of this affliction induced the disciples to inquire into its cause. They traced this, as all evil, to sin, but they were in doubt whether the sins of the man, or those of his parents, had been the cause of *such* a calamity. The former view was very natural and is also intimated ix. 34. According to Exod. xx. 5, evil is visited on the third and fourth generations, while good is transmitted to the thousandth; or, if the statement be inverted, God by his grace so soon arrests the naturally progressive operations of

sin, that they are not displayed beyond the fourth generation. Thus instead of severity being involved in this, as is often believed, it implies transcendent grace. At the same time, this transmission itself of happiness or suffering from parents to children presents nothing inconsistent, except when men are regarded as individuals standing in perfect isolation from the mass; while, according to every view that penetrates beneath the surface, humanity appears as a living whole of which individuals are the members, and as members, they naturally share the condition of the body at large. Participation, however, in the suffering of the parents is no more a sign of *personal guilt*, than participation in their happiness is a matter of *personal merit*.<sup>1</sup> (Comp. the details in the Comm. on Rom. v. 12, ff.) But the most remarkable part of our passage is the alternative presented in the words: *ἢ οὗτος ἥμαρτεν, ἢ οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ*. The hypothesis of the pre-existence and transmigration of souls, which it was at one time attempted to found upon this passage, may now be regarded as obsolete. The Jews do not appear at any time to have entertained these notions; at all events, the people in general never did.<sup>2</sup> It is also to be observed that, had they done so, they must have supposed not merely pre-existence, but (as Origen observes) also a fall among souls in the spiritual world. Hence Tholuck is of opinion that the passage is to be understood as referring to anticipatory punishment for future sins, which God, according to his omniscience, foresaw in the

1 The book of Job is a commentary on the truth that personal suffering is not always to be looked upon as the punishment of corresponding personal guilt. Job's friends, in consequence of his suffering, supposed that he had contracted proportionate guilt, and urged him to confess it; but he declared his innocence, and God recognised it. The passage Deut. xxiv 16, refers to personal guilt, which every one bears for himself.

2 That the Jews believed the doctrine of metempsychosis has been inferred from Josephus, B. J. ii. 12, who remarks: the Pharisees thought that souls passed into other bodies. But this, when rightly apprehended, has reference only to the *μετεσσωμάτωσις*, i. e., the transition of the soul into a glorified body at the resurrection. The pre-existence of the soul does indeed appear to be asserted in some rabbinical writings. (See the passages in Lightfoot, hor. heb. p. 1049.) They speak of a place where souls are assembled, which they call Goph or Guph (גופ), and from which souls gradually descend into bodies. But the question is, whether this idea had been distinctly arrived at in the time of Christ? The later Rabbins have taken a great deal from the Gnostics and other sects that was not known by the Jews of earlier times. Thus Eisenmenger (entd. Judenth. ii. s. 85) adduces passages from the writings of later Rabbins, in which, under the name of *Ibbur*, a regular transmigration of souls is taught.

blind man, but that this view may have been entertained without any analogy in the Holy Scriptures.<sup>1</sup> Lücke, on the contrary, agrees with Lightfoot, and supposes sins which the blind man may have committed in the womb of his mother. The Rabbins certainly admitted the possibility of such sins, and, in speaking of it, they appeal to the contest between Esau and Jacob in the womb of Rebekah, Gen. xxv. 22. It is, indeed, doubtful whether, in the time of Christ, this had become a familiar national idea; but this view of the obscure passage commends itself to me more than the others which it has been attempted to found upon it.

I class the phrase, *ἵνα τυφλὸς γεννηθῇ* with those in which *ἵνα* is used as indicating consequence and not design. Winer, indeed (Gramm. 3d edit., s. 383), says that it is to be explained from the Jewish teleology, which the disciples, participating the national propensity to exaggerate, had believed. But if this statement were forced, it would imply that the disciples supposed either the blind man or his parents to have sinned *for the purpose*, or *with the design*, that he might be born blind. According to the Jewish teleology such a design might certainly be ascribed to God, but not to sinners themselves. If therefore it is incorrect constantly to say that *ἵνα* is employed *ἐκβατικῶς*, in order to remove a difficulty in the meaning,—it appears to me equally certain that Fritzsche and Winer have gone too far in asserting that in the New Testament *ἵνα* is used only *τελικῶς*. (Comp. the Comm. Matt. i. 22.)

Ver. 3. The words of Jesus are by no means intended to convey a general denial of the sinfulness of the blind man and his parents; they merely deny the connexion of this affliction with distinct *personal* guilt, although, apart from the *collective* guilt of the race, we cannot suppose any suffering in any instance. On this account, *ἵνα φανερωθῇ κ. τ. λ.* cannot denote the only reason of the man's being born blind, but simply the activity of divine grace, which in the phenomena of suffering again opens fountains of happiness. Evil

<sup>1</sup> It is true that these words were spoken only by disciples whom we may regard as still unenlightened; so that we may admit this interpretation without supporting the untenable distinction, in reference to the doctrine of predestination, between *praevisio* and *prædestinatio*. But still I hesitate to receive this view of the passage, since it appears to me improbable that, at the time of Christ, opinions of this kind were prevalent among the Jews; at all events, I know not of any certain proof that they were so.

still remains evil, even though God employs it to manifest his marvellous works. (Respecting the idea of *ἔργα*, comp. the remarks on John v. 36.)

Ver. 4, 5. According to the ordinary interpretation,—which gives to *ἡμέρα* the sense of *tempus opportunum*, and to *νύξ* that of *tempus importunum* (the latter being intended to designate the departure of the Lord),—this passage is by no means clearly intelligible. Dr Paulus justly observes that, taking this view of the passage, we cannot understand the words *οὐδεὶς δύναται ἐργάζεσθαι*, since it was after the departure of Christ that the apostles strictly began to work. On this ground he explains *ἡμέρα* as meaning daylight, and takes the passage as indicating the impossibility of effecting the cure without the necessary light of day. This view of the passage needs no refutation, as it obviously proceeds merely from the objection of its author to miracles; but the remark against the ordinary exposition is certainly correct. In addition to this difficulty—occasioned by the occurrence of the term *οὐδεὶς*, whereas the Lord at first spake only of himself,—as well as the uncertainty of the antithesis between *ἡμέρα* and *νύξ*, a question arises concerning the true relation between ver. 5 and ver. 6. While in the latter verse Jesus represents himself as working by day, in ver. 5 he describes himself as the light that brings the day, by which means the metaphor is completely changed. According to this we should expect *ὕμᾱς δεῖ ἐργάζεσθαι κ. τ. λ.*, which would have been exactly suited to both verses. Now, although this reading does not occur, *ἡμᾶς* does, and this may have proceeded from a sense of the difficulties in the passage, notwithstanding the fact that it does not entirely remove them.

The passage does not become clear until we look further into the meaning of *ἡμέρα* and *νύξ*. After the comparison of places such as Luke xxii. 53 (where the hour in which darkness has dominion is the subject of discourse), it cannot well be doubted that the two expressions denote the predominance of the elements of grace or of darkness (*i. e.* evil). The period of grace was then specially conditional on the presence of Christ as the light of the world; when he withdrew darkness broke in, although it did not prevent the dawn of a new and more glorious day in the invisible ministry of Christ through the power of the Spirit; a day that will not attain its perfect splendour until Christ returns. Thus Christ

is conceived of in a twofold manner, first as the illuminating sun of the spiritual world, and secondly, as himself co-operating with it.<sup>1</sup>

In the latter view he appears as the model of the human race, and in connexion with this the reading *ἡμᾶς* has its truth. Hence the language is applicable to all times of favour, to particular seasons as well as to the entire period, seasons of favour being constantly followed by circumstances of a darker kind, which become a medium of blessing only when the others have been improved. According to the interpretation thus given, the sense of the words is to be understood as follows: "I must work the works of God while good predominates; too soon the time will come when darkness will gain dominion and (for a space) interrupt all my operations (in spiritual things.) So long as I am in the world, I am the Light of the world, and I promote the prosperity of all that is good; but, as soon as the darkness breaks in and hides me from view (which came to pass at the death of Christ), that prosperity will be arrested." The physical exchange of day and night, by means of which all the processes of nature are assisted, thus forms a striking figure of the exchanges between the powers of the unseen world. (Comp. the Comm. on xi. 9, 10; xii. 35, 36.) The words, however, were specially intended to draw the thoughts of the disciples,—who had been standing with their attention fixed merely on the sick man,—to the fact that the Father had prepared all things, and, amongst others, this blind man, for the grand ministry of the Son; hence it was his duty to glorify God in him.

This view of the passage has been opposed by Lücke and Kling, although upon grounds evidently unsatisfactory. But the interpretation proposed by them needs a close consideration, as at first sight it appears to commend itself. According to this, the formula *οὐδεὶς δύναται ἐργάζεσθαι* is merely a proverbial mode of expressing the thought: "One cannot work at night;" while ver. 4 and ver. 5 are so connected that in the latter the operations of Christ are more precisely defined. In this case the sense is: "There comes for me also a time when it is not possible to work: while I am in the world, I am the Light of the world, it is my vocation to enlighten." But, in the first place, it is quite beyond proof that a proverbial mode

<sup>1</sup> Compare Meyer's Blatt. f. Löh. Wahrh. Bd. iii. s. 361, ff.

of expression such as οὐδεὶς δύναται ἐργάζεσθαι has anywhere existed. It is only the first part of the Saviour's language that is proverbial, viz., "It is necessary to work, while the day lasts;" the other part, "a night cometh when no man can work," is a prophetic announcement by Christ respecting the future. In the second place it is quite incorrect to translate ὅταν ὦ "since I am;" ὅταν signifies quando, si quando, quamdiu, but never "since." (Cf. Wahl. clav. N. T. s. v.). Kling acknowledges that Lücke is mistaken here, and thinks ὅταν is to be understood as quamdiu; but he has overlooked the fact that then the entire meaning is unsuitable. According to Lücke's interpretation, ὅταν must here signify "since." Kling thus removes the foundation from the exposition which he on the whole approves. For, according to Kling, what would be the meaning of the words, "so long as I am in the world I am the Light of the world?" Here, "to be in the world" means "to live," "to dwell on earth;" and did Christ cease to be the light of the world when he ceased to dwell on the earth? Hence we are only afresh convinced that our interpretation is correct, the twofold aspect in which, according to this, Christ contemplates himself, not being at all prejudicial, since a similar view frequently occurs in his discourses. In regard, however, to what we have said respecting the commencement of a new, brighter day, after the night had gathered over the Lord, this has not (as Kling seems to suppose) been laid down as involved in the text, but merely remarked in order to shew the reader more plainly in what manner, according to the case in question, we are to regard the relation of subsequent times to the life of Christ on earth.

Ver. 6, 7. As regards the cure of the blind man by means of spittle, we have already treated of that subject in the remarks on Mark vii. 32, where the same method was adopted in the case of one who was deaf and dumb. The only thing that remains to be observed is that, in diseases of the sight, the ancients often recommended saliva, and even saliva jejuna. Comp. Pliny H. N. xxviii. 7. It is a peculiarity in our history, that the Redeemer further

1 Suet. vit. Vespas. 7, it is said of this emperor (Vespasian) : e plebe quidam luminibus orbatus, item alius debili crure, sedentem pro tribunali pariter adierunt, orantes opem valetudinis, demonstratam a Serapide per quietem (in a dream) restitutum oculis si inspississet; confirmaturum crus, si dignaretur calce contingere. Cum vix fides esset, rem ullo modo successurum, ideoque ne experiri, quidem auderet, extremo hortantibus amicis, palam pro concione utrumque tentavit, nec eventus defuit. In the history of the

recommended a washing in the pool of Siloam. To me, however, it appears altogether unlikely that this washing accomplished any part in the cure; it was probably intended merely to remove the *πηλός* laid upon the eyes, and special mention is made of it because, at the moment when the *πηλός* was taken away, the disengaged eye was enabled to perform its function. The only instrument by which the cure was effected was the *πηλός* (formed from the *πτύσμα*), which acted as a conductor of the healing energies of Christ. (*Σιλωάμ* = *הַלֵּוֹאִם* or *הַלֵּוֹאִם*, Nehemiah iii. 15; Isaiah viii. 6.<sup>1</sup> According to tradition, it sprang at the foot of Moriah, and hence it was a type of the spiritual stream which issues from the Temple of God. (Isaiah viii. 6; Ezekiel xlvii. 1.)

Tholuck thinks that the appended remark: *ὁ ἐρμηνεύεται ἀπὸ σιλωάμ*, by which John explains the name Siloam to his Greek readers, is intended to convey a typical reference to Christ, and on this account he is inclined to expunge it from the text, as a gloss by an allegorizing Greek of a later period. With the latter part of Tholuck's view Lücke also agrees. But this opinion is not supported by critical authorities. The words are inserted by all of them except the Syriac version, in which case its omission is a matter of course. It is also to be borne in mind that John is fond of such supplementary observations, and often adopts them. There is nothing prejudicial in tracing this remark to John himself, if it be regarded merely as an etymological interpretation. How he can have intended it to suggest a type of Christ it is difficult to conceive, since the *man* was the individual *sent*, and Christ was the person *by whom* he was sent. To me it appears certain that, if John had designed to use a figure at all, he would have compared the rivulet that sprang from under the Temple-hill (the symbol of God's heavenly dwelling) to the spiritual stream which issues from God. (As to the forms *הַלֵּוֹאִם* and *הַלֵּוֹאִם*, they may also have a passive signification. Comp. Tholuck, Beiträge zur Sprachenerklär. des N. T. s. 123, ff.)

same man by Tacitus (hist. iv. 81) it is said: *ut genas et oculorum orbes dignaretur respergere oris excremento*. An analogy to this is furnished in modern times by the custom of the French kings in healing scrofulous affections.

<sup>1</sup> Lightfoot (hor. heb. 1052) distinguishes between the two names, and refers them to the two ponds which formed the stream. Probably, however, the two forms were employed interchangeably. The stream ran at the foot of Mount Zion, at the southern end of the city. Comp. Just. Olshausen zur Topographie des alten Jerusalem, s. 56.



Ver. 8—12. The first persons who make remarks upon the miraculous cure are the neighbours,—well-meaning men, but completely under the influence of the Pharisees. They are amazed, and desire to see Jesus, but for the sake of safety they immediately bring the matter before their spiritual leaders. (*Προσαίτης*, mendicant, occurs only here; and even, in this instance, does not rest upon certain evidence; many distinguished Codices have *τυφλός* instead. But the latter reading too plainly betrays itself as a correction from the context; the distinctive feature in the man's case was his being blind, not his begging. The verb *προσαιτέω*, however, occurs Mark x. 46; Luke xviii. 35.

13—16. The report of the cure to the Pharisees now leads to further transactions respecting the miracle. The enemies of the Saviour, in order to rob it of its importance, say that it was performed on the Sabbath. But the cure of a man born blind appears to some among them too difficult to have proceeded from any other than divine power. The formality of the investigation renders it likely that the whole affair took place before a tribunal, which probably was the so-called petty Sanhedrim. (The term was applied to inferior courts of justice, which existed in all cities. Respecting the Jewish tribunals, comp. the Comm. on Matt. xxvi. 57.) Before this assembly, a difference of opinion concerning the matter might arise, because the Pharisees, with all their minute casuistry, had not attained so far as to decide upon every case in which a disease might or might not be healed.<sup>1</sup>

Ver. 17—23. Perhaps they hoped to be able to bring the blind man himself as a witness against Christ, since they asked him about his benefactor; but the simple man spoke in his favour. He regarded Jesus as an individual endowed with superior powers, a *נָבִיא*. (As to the degree of faith manifested by the restored man, comp. the Comm. on ver. 30, ff.) The Pharisees now inquire of the parents whether it was not incorrect that their son had been blind from his youth, and whether some deceit was not being practised in jest. They, however, for fear of the tyrannical Rabbins, declined

<sup>1</sup> The folly of the Rabbins in settling these matters surpasses all description. Comp. Lightfoot hor. p. 1051, where he quotes from Schabb. fol. 108, 2: *vinum in medium oculi injici (sabbato) prohibitum, poni super palpebras licitum. Alter dicit, sputum etiam super palpebras poni prohibitum.*

any discussion of the matter, and referred to the man himself, who had attained his full age (*ἡλικία*, ver. 23.)

The Evangelist incidentally remarks (ver. 22), that the Jews had already resolved (*συντίθεσθαι*, to pass a decree, to come to an agreement; compare Luke xxii. 5; Acts xxiii. 20) that those who would declare Jesus to be the Messiah should be separated from connexion with the synagogue. (Compare John xii. 42.) (The expression *ἀποσυνάγωγος γίνεσθαι*, indeed, does not apply to the two highest degrees of excommunication, *חָרֵם* and *שְׁמִתָּה*, but only to the lowest punishment, which was called *נִדְּבָה*, and consisted in being excluded from the synagogue for a month. It is evident that the penalty was intended merely as a means of intimidation to prevent the people from allying themselves to Jesus.

Ver. 24—27. Once again the Pharisees turn to the healed man himself, and seek, by means of their spiritual authority, to lead him into error. They tell him that they know “he (Jesus) is a *ἁμαρτωλός*.” The honest and sincere man, however, does not allow himself to be drawn aside by falsehood, but retains the impression which he at first received from the person of the Lord, viz., that he was an absolute friend and benefactor. With the power of simplicity he unveils to the Pharisees the secrets of their own hearts, and shews them the insincerity from which their question proceeded, in the words: *μὴ καὶ ὑμεῖς θέλετε αὐτοῦ μαθηταὶ γενέσθαι. (Διδόναι δόξαν τῷ Θεῷ* here signifies, to tell the truth: “do not attempt to conceal that which is known to us, and of which we have been informed by God.” The *ἁμαρτωλός* here, as ver. 16, according to the main idea implied by the term, is a person who displeases God, and to whom, on this very account, God does not impart or intrust any higher powers. Compare the remarks on ver. 30, 31.)

Ver. 28—34. The boldness of the man's faith now kindles their rage to a flame; they place themselves, as genuine disciples of Moses, in contrast with him, as an apostate and a follower of Jesus. This leads the man born blind to become the teacher of those who, as the guides of the people in spiritual matters, ought to have been able to perceive the truth clearly. The words *πόθεν ἐστὶ* might cause the expectation that the blind man, in stating his opinion as to the person of the Redeemer, would say more than he did ver. 17, where he called him *προφήτης*; for the expression (*πόθεν ἐστὶ*)

might be applied to a higher, heavenly existence, to the divine nature of Christ. But, upon a closer view, it is easily seen that the language is not employed in this sense. The Pharisees compared Christ with Moses, and then said, in reference to the former, *τοῦτον δὲ οὐκ οἶδαμεν πόθεν ἐσπίν*. Moses is spoken of as one *ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*, not as possessing a superior heavenly nature, but as a Prophet, as one sent from God. The words of the healed man respecting Jesus convey just the same meaning, while the higher conviction of the divine origin of Christ might easily be developed from this faith, as the bud from the root. This faith in the man rested upon *one proof alone*, viz., subjective experience. It is evident, however, that his experience did not relate merely to the external cure, but on the contrary, in connexion with this, light beamed into the depth of his soul. But for such an operation of grace, his faith being as yet only in the bud, he would not have been able to meet the malignant temptations of the Pharisees with such a vigorous resistance. (Ver. 30 various readings occur in the words *ἐν τούτῳ γάρ*. On the one hand *γάρ* has been objected to and corrected by *οὖν*, while on the other, instead of *ἐν τούτῳ* [scil. *πράγματι*], *ἐν τούτῳ* has been adopted as more suitable. But the critical authorities are decidedly in favour of the ordinary reading, and there is no reason whatever to doubt its correctness, if we only view the *γάρ* as occasioned by an ellipsis, or rather an aposiopesis. The language of the man is to be regarded as full of emotion, and we may supply what is wanting thus: "Speak not so, for herein is a marvellous thing, &c." Comp. Winer's Gramm. s. 521, f.) The conversation at length concludes (ver. 34) with calumnies against the man who faithfully confessed his belief, and with the punishment of excommunication.

(The word *ἐκβάλλειν* by no means signifies merely the removal of the man from the council-room; it implies excommunication. It is only in the latter sense that the fact appears so important as it is represented according to ver. 35. The expression *ὅλος ἐγενήθη ἐν ἁμαρτίαις* relates to the whole person, so that the sense is: "We see that thou art not merely branded by God in thy body, but perverse in thy soul." Some have proposed to take *ὅλος* = *ὅλως*, "Thou art *throughout* born in sins," which in the end amounts to much the same thing.)

## § 5. DISCOURSES OF JESUS AGAINST THE PHARISEES.

(John ix. 35—x. 21.)

The fresh chapter should have begun at ver. 35, since x. 1 ff. is connected in the closest manner with what immediately precedes. For the transition (35—38) is followed by the great discourse on account of which especially the above narrative was introduced. This discourse contains, in addition to the polemic element that opposes the Pharisees, a doctrinal one, by which it stands in the most intimate association with the main design of the Evangelist. Here the Redeemer describes himself by reference to his peculiar work in relation to men, and thus the sublime portrait of the Saviour which John aims to sketch is completed.

Ver. 35—38. In these verses of transition, the first thing we see is the solicitude of the Lord to lead on the healed man, who had so faithfully employed the feeble knowledge which he possessed, to further attainments. He exhorts him to exercise faith in the Son of God, whom he plainly declares himself to be; whereupon the man adores him as his Redeemer and Benefactor.

Here, however, the inquiry arises: what is the meaning of  $\phi\upsilon\omicron\varsigma\ \tau.\ \Theta.$  in this passage? This passage is one of those employed to prove that the meaning of the term in question is "Messiah," and we cannot deny that here, as i. 50, this assertion has some appearance of truth. For since, according to ix. 17—30, the blind man at first considered Christ to be a prophet, it seems consistent that he should be led on to the conviction that Christ was more than this, viz., that he was the expected Messiah himself. It is true, it might be said that, since no further doctrinal explanation is added, it can by no means be supposed that the healed man can have attached to the expression  $\phi\upsilon\omicron\varsigma\ \tau.\ \Theta.$  the more profound signification of being born from the essence of God.<sup>1</sup> He does not ask *what* is the Son of God? but simply "*who* is he?" (Ver. 36.) But plausible as this mode of argument is when the words are viewed *alone*, it loses all its force as soon as we compare the passage immediately following, viz. x. 30—36. From this, which

1 That is,—since the Saviour did not give the man any explanation of the term, it is not likely that the man would himself attach to it this profound signification.—Tr.

is more definite and more copious, we must explain the one under consideration, which is brief and general. The verses to which we refer show, beyond the possibility of dispute, that the Jews were not acquainted with the expression *υἱὸς τ. Θ.* as a common designation of the Messiah, but that on the contrary they regarded it as blasphemy, if anyone applied the term to himself, and thus made himself equal with God. Hence the question *τίς ἐστι* may be taken (because it is a person that is spoken of) as meaning: "What am I to understand by the term *υἱὸς τ. Θ.*?" Now, whether John has withheld from us any of the particulars, or it did not appear to the Lord appropriate to give the simple-minded man a number of doctrinal explanations, it was sufficient that he should represent himself as the Son of God in association with the beneficent power, the influence of which the man had already experienced, and his faith at once embraced the Lord as his benefactor. In conclusion, here again we see that the specific nature of faith does not consist in clear and precise ideas so much as in susceptibility of heart to the influence of heavenly powers. The *γνώσις* advances as the *πίστις* is developed.

Ver. 39—41. Jesus now passes on to the discourse, which was intended partly for the Pharisees, some of whom probably hastened to the spot when they saw Jesus talking with the healed man. The relation of the blind man (whose spiritual eye in addition to that of his body had been opened) to the spiritually blind Pharisees is the first thing set forth by the Redeemer. Concerning the words *ἐγὼ εἰς κρίμα εἰς τὸν κόσμον τοῦτον ἦλθον* comp. the remarks on iii. 17, and viii. 15. The advent of the Redeemer is a source of curse as well as of blessing; he bestows the latter upon those who are humble and believing; he visits the former upon those who are rebellious and unbelieving. According to circumstances, first the one aspect of his ministry is presented, and then the other.

In the words *ἵνα οἱ μὴ βλέποντες κ. τ. λ.* corporeal blindness is mentioned in connexion with spiritual blindness. This mode of expression was occasioned by the cure of the man corporeally blind; blindness of the eye is viewed as a symbol of blindness of soul.

It is customary, for the purpose of removing that which is considered objectionable in the severe language *ἵνα οἱ βλέποντες τυφλεῖ γέωνονται*, to interpret *ἵνα* as employed *ἐκβατικῶς* and denoting merely consequence. But it has already been shewn, in the remarks on Matt. xiii. 14 (compared with John xii. 40) that this

is contrary to the meaning of the Lord. The infliction of blindness upon those who see is viewed as an intended punishment. Greater difficulties are presented in the subsequent question of the Pharisees ; *μη καὶ ἡμεῖς τυφλοί ἐσμεν* : Tholuck, as some of the Fathers, *e. g.* Chrysostom, here understands corporeal blindness. The words taken thus would not convey a tolerable sense unless regarded as ironical, thus, "surely you do not mean to say that we are corporeally blind !" But, even thus understood, they are less suitable than when considered as relating to spiritual blindness. The only difficulty associated with this view arises from the circumstance that the Pharisees ask whether they are *τωφλοί*, whereas Jesus just above called them *βλέποντες*, and ver. 41 again describes them similarly. If the expression be interpreted in the sense of "made blind," then the following language of Jesus, in which he addresses them as persons who see, is not consistent. Hence it seems necessary to say that the vain Pharisees, proud of their knowledge, did not rightly understand the words of Christ, but only caught the general impression "he speaks against us," and having misconstrued his language, concluded that he called them blind, at which they were greatly offended. The answer of Christ then appears intended to correct their mistake, but, at the same time, to shew them that their supposed superiority is conducing to their destruction. The first part of this answer is perfectly clear ; the meaning is : "If you in reality possessed no capacity for the knowledge of God, it would be better for you ; in that case your condition could not be charged upon you as sin." The expression : *ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἔχειν* must not be rendered "to be sinless ;" it means only "to be without blame as regards your present position." Had they been blind, they would not have been absolutely sinless, they would only have been less blameable in their sinful state. Being in a kind of unconscious condition, they would not have perceived the spirit of Christ moving upon their hearts. But, as they saw, their unbelief deepened their guilt. Consequently the passage must be taken thus : "were ye blind, ye might, according to the nature of my ministry (which changes the *μή βλέποντες* into *βλέποντες*), obtain assistance from me ; but now, since ye think that yee see, ye remain as ye are."

The formula *νῦν δελεγετε ὅτι βλέπομεν* is very appropriately selected to point out the peculiarity of their state, which consisted in

the fact that they actually had a *certain* capacity for the knowledge of God, but obscured it by their conceit, and were in reality blind (Matt. xxiii. 24.) Accordingly it may be accounted that, with all their guilt, they did not commit the sin against the Holy Ghost, when they opposed Christ; they knew not what they did.

Chap. x. 1—6. The portion of our Lord's discourse on which we have just commented is immediately followed, as x. 21 clearly shews,<sup>1</sup> by the comparison of the good and bad shepherds. Here the connexion of the ideas is so close, that the unity of the discourse does not admit of any doubt; it is usual merely to suppose a pause in the conversation, or to supply a form of transition. It is also to be observed that the conduct of the Pharisees, whose calling was that of pastors, had furnished sufficient occasion for the Saviour to exhibit to them the picture of a true Shepherd.

This passage is not to be regarded as a complete *parable* (comp. the remarks on Matt. xiii. 1); it wants one thing belonging to the nature of parables, viz., the narration of an occurrence as a fact. Hence the term *παροιμία* (ver. 6) is to be taken only in the signification of "comparison." (John never uses the word *παραβολή*.) This also may be employed in the general sense. Comp. the Comm. on Matt. xiii. 1.)

In order to explain the *choice* of this particular comparison, some expositors have supposed that Christ uttered the words in the open air, within sight of a flock of sheep. This appears to me too far-fetched; the comparison of teachers with shepherds was already so common in the Old Testament,<sup>2</sup> that no special occasion for its selection was needed. Besides which, I do not see how it can be supposed that what is related ver. 23 ff. took place outside the city. As to the interpretation of the comparison (ver. 1—5), Jesus (ver. 7, 9, 10, 11, 14—18) very copiously expounds those features of the similitude which refer to himself; verses 8, 10, 12, 13, on the contrary, he explains as those that serve to depict the character of false pastors. The individual members of these two parts perfectly correspond. 1. Ver. 7, 9, Jesus shews what was meant by the entrance through the *right* door, representing himself as being the door; ver. 8, 10, he describes the parallel choice of the *false* way.

1 Comp. the Treatise by Voretzsch on this section (x. 1—18). Altenburg 1838.

2 Comp. the passages Numb. xxvii. 16, 17; Ezek. xxxiv. 1, ff., which contain the elements of our comparison.

the climbing over, by which the false shepherds are characterized, who rob both the sheep of their salvation, and the true Shepherd of his sheep. 2. Ver. 11, 14, the Lord describes himself as the *true Shepherd*, whom the sheep know; ver. 12, 13, on the contrary, he portrays the *hirelings*, whose voice the sheep know not. Accordingly, it would be thought that the whole similitude is so clear as to prevent the possibility of any difference of opinion concerning it; but such is not exactly the case. *In the first place*, Christ has not explained all the features of the comparison;—for example, respecting the *θυρωρός*, ver. 3, nothing farther is said; hence the question arises, whether this point has a particular signification or not. If the expression be retained, according to the interpretation of the comparison given by the Redeemer himself, the only hypothesis which presents itself is, that the *θυρωρός* means the Holy Spirit, who prepares the way, and brings about the entrance of Christ into the hearts of believers. Still I do not venture here to advance anything decisively, since the Lord himself, on this point, is silent. *In the second place*, it is remarkable that Jesus gives prominence to a double reference in the similitude; he represents himself first as the *door*, and then as the *shepherd* who enters through the door. This circumstance seems encumbered with so much difficulty that it might be thought necessary to suppose that, in the first instance, the Saviour had only *one* point of comparison in his eye, viz., the parallel between himself and a shepherd; and it is not until he enters upon the explanation, that the figurative import of the door is exhibited. But this supposition appears to me by no means tenable; what Jesus says in the interpretation doubtless was in his mind when he drew the comparison. The strangeness of this double reference at once disappears, if we only keep in view the twofold relation involved in the person of Jesus. Christ might, on the one hand, represent himself, according to his humanity, as one teacher amongst others; and, on the other hand, he might prominently display that part of his nature which admitted of no comparison, and according to which he is the Mediator between God and men, the only way of salvation to teachers themselves. Hence this twofold application of the similitude to Jesus was *necessary* for the very purpose of shewing that in every way it related to him. A mere representation of himself as a good shepherd would have led the hearers to think of him simply as they did of all other



teachers, or at the utmost to look upon him as distinguished from them in degree, but not as specifically different.

With respect to the *individual* points, it is scarcely needful to remark that, in the East, as elsewhere, there were robbers and wolves, and that there the shepherds were accustomed, in the known manner, to drive the sheep to the pasture; nor is the circumstance of a watch keeping guard over the flock to be considered as peculiar to oriental usage. One observation only is requisite, viz., that by *αὐλή* we are not to understand a regular building, but merely an open space enclosed by a low wall. This explains the term *ἀναβαίνειν*, which, if the term *αὐλή* were viewed according to our western customs, would be somewhat obscure. However, we shall connect the elucidation of particular points immediately with the interpretation which Jesus himself gave to those Jews who did not rightly apprehend the meaning of the similitude.

Ver. 7—9. The Redeemer begins his explanations with the most emphatic assurance (*ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν*) that he himself is the *θύρα τῶν προβάτων*. As we have already remarked, it would seem that this metaphorical allusion was not originally implied in the similitude, but is to be regarded as a subsequent turn given to the comparison in the course of conversation. *Θύρα*, considered as it stands in the comparison itself, might be supposed to mean nothing more than those genuine-self-renouncing sentiments which result from divine influence in the mind. But if we only examine the meaning of *θύρα* more closely, no such distinction is presented, and even viewed in itself it would be utterly untenable. The expression does not indicate a doctrine, or a communicable circle of ideas necessary in order to enter the kingdom of heaven; for in that case the application of the term *θύρα* to Christ would have been altogether unsuitable, and he ought to have been called *θυρωρός* or *ὁδηγός*. If, however, it is remembered that what Christ imparts is actually his own nature, we see that he bears the name (as xiv. 6, *ἡ ὁδός*) in its deepest and most fundamental sense. He who does not participate the nature of Christ, cannot enter the true *αὐλή* either as a teacher or as a scholar. This *αὐλή* certainly signifies the *βασίλεια τ. Θ.*, the true community of believers;<sup>1</sup> but

<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless comp. ver. 16, whence it appears that, as far as this passage, the kingdom of God is conceived of in the *external* form of a theocratic institution, although in accordance with its true idea, i. e., as the genuine Israel not only corporeally but spiritually.

all teachers must first enter this community as believers through the reception of the divine being and nature. It is only after this entrance, and by ampler endowments than those generally conferred, as well as by a special call, that they become teachers. The antithesis between sheep and shepherds, which presents itself so distinctly in the similitude, of course disappears in the explanation; for although every sheep is not a shepherd, yet every shepherd is, in a certain sense, a sheep in the general flock of Christ, and for him no other way of entrance avails than that which is appointed for all. The mistake of this circumstance has occasioned much perplexity, especially respecting verses 9 and 10. It has appeared unintelligible how Christ, in a comparison supposed to treat merely of teachers, could speak of the general blessings resulting from faith in the Redeemer;<sup>1</sup> a difficulty which by our view is completely set aside.

The *first* thing regarded as a *consequence* of entering through the Lord (ver. 9) is *σωτηρία*, since he who enters leaves the *κόσμος τῆς ἀπωλείας*. The *next* result is the *εἰσερχεσθαι* and *ἐξέρχεσθαι*. These terms denote the complete and intimate communion thus instituted between Christ and believers; receiving his life into themselves, they enter into fellowship with God. (The mode of expression is formed according to the Hebrew *בָּוִי* and *וַיֵּצֵא*, comp. Numb. xxvii. 17.) The *last* thing mentioned as the fruit of this entrance through the Redeemer is *νομὴν εὗρίσκειν*. This phrase, strictly speaking, belongs to the similitude, and the proper interpretation of it is not given till ver. 10, in the words *ζωὴν καὶ περισσὸν ἔχειν*. Here (as chapters iv. and vi.) Christ is represented as he who satisfies all the longings of the soul (hunger and thirst), imparting to man that which is eternal itself, the possession of which is in reality the object of all the cravings in the human heart. Lücke explains *νομὴν εὗρίσκειν* as referring to a blessing upon the ministry; an interpretation evidently in the highest degree forced, and proceeding merely from his excessive

<sup>1</sup> The difficulty to which Olshausen thus refers may be stated more clearly as follows. According to verses 1 and 2, it appears that in verses 9 and 10 the Saviour is speaking of *shepherds* or *teachers*, and of the blessings which they obtain from him. Hence it would seem strange that in describing these blessings he should mention only such as are enjoyed by all his flock. This difficulty is entirely obviated by Olshausen's remark, that in the fold of Christ all the shepherds are sheep.—Tn.

solicitude to preserve the distinction between the shepherds and the sheep.

Ver. 8, 10. Alternately with this description of Christ, as the door, and of those who enter by it, proceeds the delineation of the thieves, who, according to ver. 1, climb over the wall of the *αὐλή*, without passing through the door. Looking at the picture closely, we should expect to find these thieves represented as bringing destruction upon *themselves*, as it is said that those who enter through the right door obtain salvation. This, however, is presupposed, although the description itself only exhibits their destructive influence upon *others*; from such a ruinous effect on others their own perdition necessarily follows. The view given in the words before us shews that the robbers are contrasted with Christ. While he blesses and brings salvation, they destroy the sheep and seek their own aggrandizement. Had the other view—that they prepare ruin for themselves—been presented, in that case the contrast would have been between them and the sheep who enter the fold. Thus it may be seen that, in the nature of the subject, the antithesis between shepherds and sheep cannot be retained; and this conclusion perfectly dissipates much of the obscurity in the similitude and its interpretation. A very great difficulty, however, is involved in the language of ver. 8: πάντες ὅσοι πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἦλθον, κλέπται εἰσὶ καὶ λησταί. Many expositors have already remarked that the reading πρὸ ἐμοῦ is to be preferred just because of its difficulty. The omission of the words may have arisen merely from the circumstance that the passage was employed by the Gnostics in support of their views respecting the objectionableness of the Old Testament. They explained πάντες ὅσοι πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἦλθον as referring to the prophets of the Old Testament, and thus, as they presumed, they had in the language of Christ himself a testimony against the Old Testament. But if the words be genuine, the question is,—how are they to be interpreted? The forced explanations (which, by the way, are quite contradictory),—that πρὸ stands for χωρίς (and in this case false prophets would be meant); that it is instead of ἀντι or ὑπέρ (according to which false Messiahs must have been intended, who, however, did not make their appearance *before* Christ); or finally, that πρὸ ἐμοῦ is equivalent to πρὸ τῆς θύρας (in the sense “all who pass by me and do not enter through me as the door), may be

regarded as sufficiently refuted.<sup>1</sup> At the same time the interpretation supported by the most modern expositors contains doubtful points. Appeal is made to the present tense (*εἰσὶ*) and thence it is concluded that the words refer to teachers who acted in the time of Christ, and who, before his entrance upon his ministry, undertook to shew the Jews the way to heaven. But in the *first place*, it would then be necessary to restrict the term *πάντες* and apply it only to the majority; for that *no one* amongst the Jewish teachers acted faithfully and uprightly, according to his knowledge, appears scarcely conceivable, while it is to be remembered that, *before* Christ's ministry, the higher knowledge which he came to impart could not be attained by them. In the *second place*, the words *ὅσοι ἦλθον πρὸ ἐμοῦ* are not at all compatible with the idea—"they taught before my entrance upon my ministry." For, the circumstance of their coming before him would certainly have decreased their guilt; and, if the terms were pressed, it might be asked,—are we then to regard those bad teachers who did not begin their operations till *after* the commencement of the Redeemer's ministry as excluded from the charge? This interpretation, therefore, is by no means satisfactory; it results from difficulty, and is forced rather than derived from the words.

For my part, I incline towards the view already mentioned, that here false prophets, *i.e.* teachers of error, are denoted. It is perfectly true that *πρὸ* is never synonymous with *χωρὶς*, but still, by a natural aposiopesis, the *sentence* to which *πρὸ* belongs may involve the *idea* of *χωρὶς*. Now, in our passage, the main idea expressed by the phrase *ἦλθον πρὸ ἐμοῦ* is that of "*working without me*;" and if we understand the coming of Christ as meaning neither his entrance upon his ministry nor his birth, but his spiritual advent

<sup>1</sup> Voretzsch (in the Treatise already referred to, s. 9 ff.) proposes to solve the difficulty by taking *πρὸ ἐμοῦ* as relating, not to the birth of Christ, but to his entrance upon his ministry. He observes that, before this, persons made their appearance who assumed authority; and, as instances, he adduces from Josephus (Arch. xvii. 10, 5, 6, B. J. ii. 4, 2) three individuals, Judas, Simon, and Athronges. But this solution is opposed by the circumstance that these personages did not lay any claim to a spiritual character; they did not profess to be either Prophets or Messiahs; their tendency was merely external. Indeed, too much honour is put upon them if they are looked upon as pretenders to the throne. They appear, on the contrary, to have been common outlaws. From such men Jesus would in no case have first expressly distinguished himself. It is self-evident that in his lips the expression *κλείπται καὶ λήσται* has a spiritual reference.

and operations in the mind, the words may properly be taken as conveying the sense "false teachers, not called and not inspired by God, having no connexion with the Logos." This signification alone suffices for the entire discourse. Accordingly there is no reason for remaining, as Lücke and Tholuck appear to do, altogether in doubt as to the interpretation of this certainly difficult passage.

Ver. 11—13. As the second point of comparison, Christ himself is further represented as the Good Shepherd, and contrasted with the *μισθωτός*. The specific feature in the character of the true Shepherd is the sacrifice of his life for the sheep, whilst the hireling, who is not connected with the flock by any real bond (*οὐδ' οὐκ εἰσὶ τὰ πρόβατα ἴδια*), has merely his own interest in view, and, when danger approaches, he flees. (The *λύκος* is evidently a symbol of the Prince of this world, who pursues all the children of God, and strives to wrest them from their Lord.) This passage is important, inasmuch as, at any rate, it must be classed with those in which Christ himself *points to* his sacrificial death. (Comp. especially ver. 17, 18.) It may not indeed have been understood by those who heard the discourse, as a distinct declaration on the subject, but, after the death of the Lord, it must have gained the form of a prophecy. The contents of these verses appear, in fact, as an expansion of the similitude, since that does not contain any definite intimations of the sentiments here developed.

Ver. 14—16. The idea that between the false shepherds and the sheep there is merely an external connexion, and that they are not blended into spiritual unity, is again expressed, ver. 13, in order to place the contrary—the intimate union of Christ with his people—in a still stronger light. This relation and its antithesis were set forth with special fulness in the similitude itself (ver. 3, 4, 5), and it was because the apprehension of it depended, for the most part, upon Christ, that he exhibited it so minutely in the interpretation as well. The close relation between Christ and his people is here designated by *γινώσκω*. That this expression is not to be understood as denoting a merely external knowledge is indicated by the general usus loquendi of Scripture, according to which *γινώσκειν* = *γιν*, employed in reference to Deity, always signifies a knowledge of the reality.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, in our passage the parallel

<sup>1</sup> Respecting the knowledge of believers by the Lord, comp. the remarkable language of

which the Redeemer draws between this *γινώσκειν*, and the most profound knowledge subsisting between the Father and the Son, shews the same thing. (For a more detailed consideration of this subject, comp. the remarks on Matt. xi. 27.)

Further, the reciprocal action intimated in the words *γινώσκω* and *γινώσκομαι* is not to be overlooked. Whilst the knowledge of the Redeemer is the active element,—that which penetrates with his power and life,—the knowledge of believers is the passive principle, the reception of his life and light. In this reception, however, an assimilation of the soul to the sublime object of its knowledge and love takes place; and thus an activity (although only a derived one) is developed, which shews itself in obedience to his commands. At the sametime, the reception of that which is divine into the mind necessarily presupposes therein a principle kindred to God, which, when a homogeneous element is presented, spontaneously receives it, and, when approached by what is heterogeneous, rejects it. On this account it is said, ver. 5 : *ἄλλοτρίῳ οὐ μὴ ἀκολουθήσωσιν, ὅτι οὐκ οἶδασιν τῶν ἄλλοτρίων τὴν φωνήν*. Thus the blind man was indissolubly bound to Christ by his gentle, enchainng power, while the opposing element which animated the Pharisees could not retain its power over him.

Here, however, the question arises,—are we then to consider the *ἐμὰ πρόβατα* and the *ἄλλότριοι* so entirely different as this? Were the comparison urged, it might be supposed to shew that Christ divided men into two parts,—the one containing the principle kindred to God, which, when God exerts and manifests his power in Christ, is put in action,—the other containing the sinful principle, which does not allow itself to be attracted by what is divine, but follows only that which is evil. But we have already frequently pointed out the fact that such an *absolute* difference in men is not harmonious with the doctrine of Scripture. (Comm. on the parables Matt. xiii.) It is true that in the one class of men a preponderance of that which is sinful is displayed, while in the other we see a preponderance of what is good; but on both sides a transition to the opposite, by faithfulness or unfaithfulness, is possible. It is specially important to bear this in mind, when interpreting ver. 16. In this verse the Lord, after again mentioning his love to his people—which

Paul (2 Tim. ii. 16), in which he calls the knowledge of believers, on the part of the Redeemer, the seal (*σφραγίς*) of being and living in God.

he declares will be faithful unto death—proceeds to describe the ample extension of the effects produced by his operations. His *φωνή* causes every fibre of humanity to vibrate, and, where any thing kindred is slumbering, there it awakens the germ of the higher life. Here the Redeemer certainly had in his eye the Jewish nation (the visible form of the *βασιλεία τ. θ.*) as the first *ἀνλή*, and the entire Gentile world as the more distant circle on which he would act. As, however, all Jews were not his sheep, so neither would all Gentiles be; but he would gather susceptible minds and faithful followers from among the Gentiles as well as the Jews. These together (after the wall of partition, raised by the external law, had been broken down, Ephes. ii. 14, ff.) would form a new living unity, the true spiritual Israel (*μία ποίμνη*) in which Christ himself is the head (the *εἰς ποιμήν*); whilst the others who did not hear the voice of Christ would remain excluded. Here, therefore, not a word is said about a general union of *all* men, good and evil. The passage John xi. 52 perfectly confirms our interpretation. There, those of all nations who are attracted by the living power of God are called *τέκνα τοῦ Θεοῦ*, and Christ is represented as the person who unites them all, the *συναγαγὼν εἰς ἑν.* This abolition of all barriers between Jews and Gentiles had already been beheld, with the prophetic eye, by the seers of the Old Testament.

In relation to this subject, Psal. lxxxvii. is worthy of special remark. There Rahab (Egypt), Babylon, Philistia, and Tyre—the very nations who stood in the most hostile position towards Israel—are described as those who should be born in Zion, the centre of the theocracy. Nor must we overlook the circumstance that in xi. 52 this extension of the effects wrought by the Redeemer is connected with his death; and thus the passage (comp. also Eph. ii. 14, ff.) is parallel with John xii. 32, where Christ, before his crucifixion, says that he will draw all (those who hear his voice) unto him. Accordingly his death appears as the act of emptying or pouring forth his power and his life, which, coming in contact with susceptible minds, would draw them into the new living community. That which is to be imparted to a mass must be resigned in its individuality, in order to be found again in the greater unity.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> In Christianity this sacrifice of the individual to the universal, appears in its necessary restriction (viz., so that individuality is not annihilated, but regained in higher energy) by means of the resurrection of the body, as the *permanent limitation of the per-*

Ver. 17, 18. On account of the profound connexion of this thought with the whole discourse, it is brought forward again with special stress in the concluding verses. Three equally remarkable ideas now present themselves. The *first* is that of the voluntary sacrifice, already implied in the terms *τιθέναι τὴν ψυχὴν* (ψῆψ ἰψῆ), but expressed with particular emphasis in the words: *οὐδεὶς αἶρει αὐτὴν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, ἀλλ' ἐγὼ τίθημι αὐτὴν ἀπ' ἑμαυτοῦ*. (Ver. 18.) This idea is very important in relation to the scriptural doctrine of redemption. It shews that neither a compulsory decree of the Father, nor the power of the Evil One, occasioned the death of the Son, but that it resulted only from the inward impulse of the love of Christ. The Father, who is love itself, permitted that death of love to which the Son consented, because it would have been contrary to his nature to prevent the highest display of love. But in the will of the Father there was nothing which submitted the Son to necessity. This view of the sacrificial death of the Lord sets aside many objections against it which have commonly been derived from the argument that God, as love, could not deliver the Son to death. The death of Christ is the pure effluence of boundless love, which thus displays its very essence in the sublimest form. The *second* idea is, that the dying Saviour of the world himself resumes his life. He ascribes to himself the *ἐξουσία* to take it again,

*sonality*. In the oriental religions, especially in Buddhism, and even according to the views of the most eminent Mohammedan mystics, the offering up of self is nothing but pantheistic annihilation. Such is the very doctrine of Dschelaleddin Rumi, when he sings :—

God is the universal sea of being !  
 All beings, e'en the countless hosts of heaven,  
 Move towards him as the streamlets to the ocean.  
 Is the great sea of Deity in tempest ?  
 Then all his streamlets toss with agitation.  
 Will he, the Parent-deep, dry up these waters ?  
 He casts them from him to the shore's dry heights.  
 Or, will he merge them in his own abysses,  
 Then must they yield as stubble to the burning !

Hence, to be sacrificed to the universal appears to the oriental mystics associated with delightful happiness, and accordingly the same poet says :

Because to die is even sweet (believe me),  
 The Koran therefore suicide prohibits.  
 To me, death pours out life with pearly brightness,  
 And takes me from diversity to unity !

Comp. Tholuck's *Blüthensammlung aus der morgenländischen Mystik*, Berlin, 1825, s. 110 f. and 128.



and represents this resumption of it as the *purpose* for which it was laid down (*ἵνα πάλιν λάβω αὐτήν*), his death being designed to destroy death by life (Heb. ii. 14.) Although in other instances the resurrection of Christ is referred to the Father, whilst here it is ascribed to the Son himself, this is only an apparent discrepancy; for Father and Son are one (ver. 30), and hence the nature of the Father lives also in the Son. So far, however, as we recognize in the Father the cause, and in the Son that which is caused, everything in the Son may be traced to the prescription (*ἐντολή*) of the Father. As the Father is life, so the Son also carries it within him (v. 26), and the life that overcomes the power of death,—the new light which dissipates the inundating darkness,—is the *ἀνάστασις*. Accordingly, the sentiment conveyed, when Christ calls himself the *ἀνάστασις* (xi. 25), is identical with the meaning here, although it is the power of the Father that produces the effect in him.

The *last* thing to be observed is, that the Redeemer, in the words *διὰ τοῦτο ὁ πατήρ με ἀγαπᾷ, ὅτι κ. τ. λ.*, appears to found the bond of love between Father and Son upon the sacrifice of the latter. Lücke (in the first edition) endeavours to avoid this idea, by connecting *ἵνα* with the preceding words, and translating thus: "The Father loves me, because I lay down my life, *so much, that* I have power to take it again." But Tholuck has already shewn that this interpretation is forced, since it is not at all consistent with the position of the words; and moreover, it would require that *ἵνα* should be taken *ἐκβατικῶς*, for which there is no ground, the resurrection being here viewed strictly as the design of the death of Jesus. And further, according to Lücke's interpretation of our passage, the essential difficulty remains; for the love of the Father is founded upon the sacrifice of the Son, and this appears to favour the Socinarian notion of Christ, as a being intimately connected with God by a moral bond,—viz., that of faithful and willing obedience,—but not by unity of nature. This passage, however, is to be classed with those in which the Lord, in speaking of his relation to the Father, places himself, as a man, on a parallel with his fellow-men. Jesus does not mean to say that his self-sacrificing love and fidelity is anything self-subsistent and unconnected with God (such a statement would have represented the Father's love as acquired by merit); on the contrary, the Son's spotless nature itself is the *consequence* of God's eternal love to him, and the communication of God's

own nature to him. But in order to shew the Pharisees their estrangement from God in their love of self, Christ exhibits that part of his nature which must have been the most intelligible to them.

Ver. 19—21. The result of this address delivered by the Redeemer was, as in former cases, on the one hand, increased hatred poured forth in blasphemous sayings (concerning *δαιμόνιον ἔχειν*, comp. the Comm. on viii. 49, vii. 20), while, on the other, the minds of some were effectually wrought upon by the Spirit, and the power displayed in the words of the Lord. It is the purpose of John to describe the gradual advance of these two opposite effects, as he constantly indicates the impression produced by the discourses of Christ which he reports.

#### § 6. FEAST OF DEDICATION.

(John x. 22—39.)

The Evangelist, without making any remark whatever on the further journey of the Redeemer, transports us at once to a new feast at Jerusalem, that of the Dedication. The simplest way of explaining this connexion with what precedes, is to suppose that Christ remained either *in Jerusalem or in its neighbourhood*. Certainly the chronological character of John here sustains an injury as to its exactness; for, if he had intended to maintain chronological precision, he must here have added at least a date. The conjecture, that Jesus had not left Jerusalem at all, is especially favoured by the circumstance that ver. 26, ff., the words of the Lord evidently have reference to the foregoing similitude of the Good Shepherd, which renders it probable that what follows was uttered in the presence of the same persons who listened to the preceding discourse.

This section does not contain any fresh sentiments, but is in the highest degree important in relation to the development of the idea conveyed by *υἱός τ. Θ.* We have already taken opportunity, in commenting on the passage v. 18, ff., which is parallel to this, to shew that the term never occurs merely as name of the Messiah. In favour of this position the following conversation speaks far

more decidedly than any of the arguments yet adduced, the proof contained in it being of such a nature that its force can scarcely be avoided.

Ver. 22, 23. The feast which John here calls τὰ ἐγκαίνια was held to commemorate the purification of the Temple desecrated by Antiochus Epiphanes. In the Hebrew it is termed קִדְּוֶה, *i. e.* consecration, ἐγκαίνισμός τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου (1 Macc. iv. 56), or καθαρισμός τοῦ ἱεροῦ (2 Macc. i. 18), or τοῦ ναοῦ (2 Macc. x. 5.) Josephus (Archæol. xii. 7) calls it τὰ φῶτα, on account of the brilliant illumination kept up during the eight days of the festival. The feast fell in the month Chislew (December), to which circumstance allusion is made in the words καὶ χειμῶν ἦν.<sup>1</sup> The rough, cold weather induced Jesus to choose a Stoa in order to converse with the Jews. This Stoa, named after Solomon, was situated on the east side of the Temple, and on this account was called στοὰ ἀνατολική. In the destruction of Solomon's Temple it was preserved, and in the time of Zerubbabel's it was used as a venerable ruin.

Ver. 24—28. In this porch Christ was surrounded by Jews of active mind, who were attracted by the wonderful appearance which the Redeemer presented to them, and were earnestly desirous to comprehend it. Their minds being full of the images which the generally prevailing belief associated with the idea of the Messiah, they thought that probably this might be realised in him. Still they remained in uncertainty, because so many things in Christ were not consistent with their notions, and they did not find that he supported them in their carnal hopes. From this tormenting suspense they wished to be relieved, and hence the question: ἕως πότε τὴν ψυχὴν ἡμῶν αἶρεις; (profane writers also use αἶρειν [only without ψυχὴν] for μετεωρίζειν to leave in uncertainty, to strain by hope or fear. [Comp. Lücke's remarks, Stud. 1834, h. 3.] Markland conjectures αἰωρεῖς, which gives the same sense; but he has no support from critical authorities.) Christ tells them with sufficient plainness that he is the Messiah, but at the same

<sup>1</sup> De Wette is quite mistaken in his observation on this passage, that the words χειμῶν ἦν have no reference to the weather, and that, if such a reference had been intended, χειμῶν ἐγένετο must have been said (!) Certainly χειμῶν ἦν means "it was winter time;" but because in the winter rough weather prevails, the terms assuredly imply an allusion to the weather.

time rebukes their unbelief, which, notwithstanding the most evident testimonies from God on his behalf (comp. the remarks on v. 36), would not allow them to decide in his favour. Jesus shews that they do not belong to his sheep, from the fact that his voice,—his pure heavenly ministry,—could not attract them, and found no earnest echo in their hearts.

The reference in this language to the above similitude is obvious; hence it appears to me that the words *καθὼς εἶπον ὑμῖν* (ver. 27), which are wanting in the Manuscripts B.K.L.M. and other critical authorities, are a gloss. De Wette thinks the omission proceeds merely from the circumstance that these words were not found in the foregoing comparison, and accordingly he says that we must here acknowledge an instance of inaccuracy in John's report. But, although the following language does not occur word for word in the previous portion of the Redeemer's discourse, yet it does in its essential contents. This hypothesis, therefore, is to be rejected as unsound.

Ver. 29, 30. The idea, that all who are given to the Redeemer by the Father (respecting *διδόναι*, comp. the Comm. on John vi. 37—44) belong to him in such a manner that he never can lose them, is here enlarged upon by Christ, evidently with the melancholy feeling that these persons to whom he spoke, and who, in the widest sense of his ministry, were objects of redemption, would notwithstanding be lost, because they had given themselves to another power than that of the Good Shepherd. (Comp. the remarks on John viii. 44.) The impossibility, however, of true believers being lost, in the midst of all the temptations which they may encounter, does not consist in their fidelity and decision, but is founded upon the *power of God*. Here the doctrine of predestination is presented in its sublime and sacred aspect; there is a *predestination of the holy*, which is taught from one end of the Scriptures to the other; not indeed of such a nature that a *gratia irresistibilis* compels the opposing will of man, but so that that will of man which receives and loves the commands of God is *produced* only by God's grace. Hence no holy person has believed himself to be sanctified by anything (especially not by anything resting on himself) except the power of grace. Accordingly in our passage God is spoken of as the Preserver, and it is not said "My true friends keep themselves in unalterable union with me." for no man would be happy if left to self-preservation. The

designation of the Father as the absolute Power (*μείζων πάντων ἐστὶ*) evidently has a reference to the Evil One and his agents, whose hostile activity (*ἀρπάζειν*) appears impotent in contrast with the victorious might of the Good One.

The Lord, for the sake of throwing further light upon his relation to the Father, adds the declaration *ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατήρ ἐν ἐσμέν*, which forms the centre point of this entire discourse. The idea of *υἱὸς* being necessarily connected with that of *πατήρ*, these words express just as much as *ὁ υἱὸς καὶ ὁ πατήρ ἐν εἰσιν*, on which account the Redeemer could justly say (without the need of a supposition, on our part, that the conversation is abridged) *ὅτι εἶπον, υἱὸς τ. Θ. εἰμί* (ver. 36.) The primary idea suggested by the connexion of the passage is that of *power*, so that the phrase *μείζων πάντων ἐστὶ* (ver. 29) applies also to the Son. But, since we cannot conceive of *one* divine property without *another*, it follows that *ἐν εἶναι* must denote the *consubstantiality* of the Son with the Father. Meanwhile, there are entirely unprejudiced expositors, such as Lücke and Tholuck, who have thought that our passage could not relate to consubstantiality, because in other passages John employs the expression *ἐν εἶναι* respecting the relation of the disciples to himself. (Comp. xvii. 11, 21, 22.) But in these places we find the addition of the significant language : *καθὼς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατήρ ἐν ἐσμέν*. This surely must indicate that here the sense of the expression cannot be essentially different from that which we attach to it in the verse under consideration, and a closer view of the subject clearly shews that it is not so. For, if the Arian-Socinian-Rationalistic hypothesis,—that *ἐν εἶναι* refers only to unity of *will*, not of *nature*,—be entertained, let it not be forgotten that *true* unity of will without unity of nature is something inconceivable. Hence, if Christ speaks of unity of *will* between himself and his people, this can subsist only so far as such unity of will has been rendered possible to them by a previous communication of his *nature*.<sup>1</sup> The profound idea, that believers are assimilated to the Lord by the communication of his nature to them (which

<sup>1</sup> This is acknowledged by Tholuck, in the fourth edition (s. 195), where he remarks that *ἐν εἶναι*, even when used in application to the disciples, denotes not merely an *external* harmony of will, but *internal* fellowship of life, as the source of that harmony. That the expression must be used thus is obvious; for the *ἐν εἶναι* of believers with Christ depends upon the participation of the divine nature through the communication of his Spirit. (Comp. 2 Peter i. 4.)

we find, John vi., in the participation of his flesh and blood) here appears to have escaped the above-named expositors; but, this being kept in view, it is clear that in this instance, as in the other, the language *cannot but* relate to consubstantiality.<sup>1</sup>

In conclusion, it should not be overlooked that *ἐν*, and not *ἐκ*, is employed. The choice of the former expression indicates the manner in which we are to apprehend the relation of triality to unity in the Trinity. Triality of *persons* forms a unity of *being* but not of *person*; the latter mode of speech would not be *super-natural*, but *contrary to nature*. The most ancient Fathers, as is known, were strangers to the view which has obtained since the time of Augustine, and is common in the so-called Athanasian creed, according to which a *numerical* unity is asserted of the triality of persons.

Ver. 31—33. The Jews quite correctly understood the expression as denoting *consubstantiality* (De Wette discovers in this a mistake of the Jews [!], as if Christ did not in other instances ascribe to himself divine dignity and properties—and, moreover, here had they made such a mistake, he certainly would have removed it with a word); believing, however, that God had not made Christ equal to himself, but that *Christ* had *arrogated* that equality (ver. 33), they regarded his words as involving blasphemy against God. Here it will be well to refer to ver. 25, and to determine the precise meaning of *υἱὸς τ. Θ.* The Jews regarded Jesus as an ordinary man (*ἄνθρωπος ὃν ποιεῖς σεαυτὸν Θεόν*), but nevertheless thought it possible that he was the Messiah, and saw no blasphemy in his open declaration that he was so (ver. 25.) However, when he called himself the Son of God, they took up stones and cried out "He blasphemeth God!" According to this, it is quite inconceivable that the term "Son of God," among the Jews in the time of Christ, was synonymous with "Messiah;" on the contrary, it signified something higher and superhuman. As, according to earthly laws, the son bears the dignity of the father, so the expression "Son of God" denotes the equality of dignity, and the common popular opinion did not ascribe this even to the Messiah, who was believed to be only an *ἄνθρωπος κατ' ἐκλογήν*. Hence, when the term

<sup>1</sup> The same idea, also, is indicated in the subsequent language of Jesus, John x. 35, ff.

ὁ. τ. Θ. is connected with the name Christ (as John i. 50,<sup>1</sup> vi. 69, ix. 17—35), the former is a more precise definition of the latter, and the combination is to be understood thus : “ The Messiah, who (according to the more profound view) is a manifestation of the Son of God or Logos.” If the term had been a common designation of the Messiah, the defence of Jesus would have taken quite a different form ; it would not have been requisite for him to say anything more than this : “ I only answered your question (ver. 24), and how can blasphemy be involved in my saying that I am the Messiah, whom ye yourselves have a certain inclination to believe me to be ?” Instead of this, the Redeemer, in the first place, again reminds them of his καλὰ ἔργα, and, when the Jews reply that they appreciate these, Christ adduces an argument from the Old Testament, which sufficiently shews that he himself intended this expression to be apprehended in the more profound manner.

Ver. 34—36. The Lord cites the remarkable passage, Ps. lxxxii. 6. In the first place, as regards the form of the quotation, νόμος is used in the wider sense of the Old Testament generally. (By way of synecdoche for the chief part, the whole is called the Thorah.) The expression occurs just in like manner, John xii. 34, xv. 25. Secondly, as to the passage itself, the words run : אֲמַרְתִּי אֱלֹהִים אֲתָם וּבְנֵי עֲלִיּוֹן כָּלְכֶם ; LXX. ἐγὼ εἶπα, Θεοὶ ἐστέ, καὶ υἱοὶ ὑψίστου πάντες. This juxtaposition of Θεός and υἱὸς ὑψίστου explains the synonymous use of the terms “ God” and “ Son of God” by Christ in the sequel (ver. 35, 36.) The Son partakes the nature of the Father, and therefore the Son of God is himself God. Thus the Jews concluded, and the correctness of their conclusion is acknowledged by Jesus himself. The only question is as to the *applicability* of the name of God in certain cases, and *this* the Redeemer intends to point out by the citation. The customary mode of interpreting the use of the quotation in our passage (the mode adopted by Lücke and Tholuck) is as follows : It is said that the Psalm relates to judges or kings ; that these are called, in the Old Testament, Elohim, *because they ought to discharge their duty in the name of God* ; and that hence the Redeemer draws the conclusion : if ordinary kings are called gods, surely the highest king, Messiah, may wear this name. It cannot

<sup>1</sup> In the English ver. 49.—Tr.

be said that this view is characterized by anything actually false. At the same time it is open to objection, inasmuch as the rigidity of the Mosaic Monotheism is incompatible with the unscrupulousness which appears to be betrayed in the application of the sacred name of God to human individuals, if the custom of calling kings Elohim had no other foundation than the circumstance, that it behoved them to fulfil their office in the name of God. Who gives to an ambassador the title of *majesty*, because he acts in the name of his monarch? The custom itself, however, is indubitable; only let Exod. xxi. 6, xxii. 8, 28, be compared with Exod. xviii. 15, Deut. i. 17, xix. 17. Accordingly, the only question is,—whence did this extraordinary application of the name Elohim arise? The best assistance in answering this inquiry is gained from Exod. xviii. 15, where it is said: כִּי-יָבֹא אֵלֵי הָעָם לִדְרוֹשׁ אֶל־הוֹיָהוּ. These words are to be understood as referring to the regal and judicial ministry of Moses; and hence it is seen that, according to the genuine theocratic view, God himself is conceived of strictly as the true King and Judge of Israel, who only has his organ through whom he manifests himself. The name Elohim, applied to those who are in authority, presupposes a *real union* of the person with God; if this does not exist, the name has no truth.<sup>1</sup> That the Redeemer intended Ps. lxxxi. 6 to be understood thus, is clearly shewn by the language: πρὸς οὗτος ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐγένετο. This form of speech is parallel with the known phrase יְהוָה דִּבֶּר יְהוָה עַל פִּלְגִי, which, as is known, denotes the circumstance of superior communication, such as the prophets received. Consequently we are to understand here, not merely authorities purely political, but *prophets* and divinely-enlightened men in general, who, according to the theocratic view, might also judge, because God, the only true Judge, spoke through them. All these were termed *children of God*, because the power and nature of God wrought in them and were manifested by means of them.

<sup>1</sup> In opposition to this, de Wette remarks that a real union between these persons and God cannot be supposed, because God rebukes them (where?) as unrighteous. But here the language does not relate to concrete individuals, in so far as they express the idea imperfectly; it relates to the idea as such. This idea is, that these authorities are called gods, not because an office is entrusted to them externally by God, but because it is their duty to be organs of the divine will, which, in the other case, they would necessarily be, although their own hearts were insincere. (Compare the remarks on John xi. 49—52.)



Thus a real parallel subsists between them and Christ himself; only that in him the absolute and perfect manifestation of God was represented, on which account he is called *the* Son of God absolutely, *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ*, whilst the others (to avail myself of a Philonean distinction) were rather called *υἱοὶ τοῦ λόγου*. In this eminent sense, the Lord here designates himself *ὃν ὁ πατὴρ ἡγάσσε*. The expression *ἀγιάζειν* = *שְׁדַדָּה* is here to be retained in the literal and primary signification<sup>1</sup> in which it is used = *ἀφορίζειν*, “to set apart from a number,” especially for sacred use. For whilst all prophets, and those to whom the word of God came, may be called *ἡγιασμένοι* in relation to the world, the Messiah is the distinguished One among these *ἡγιασμένοι* themselves, and thus the *ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ κατ’ ἐξοχήν*. (Comp. John vi. 69.) In order to strengthen the argument, and fasten it upon the hearers, Jesus adds: *καὶ οὐ δύναται λυθῆναι ἡ γραφή*. The meaning of *λυθῆναι* is, in this instance, to be understood just as in Matt. v. 17, Gal. ii. 18; the Scripture, as the expressed will of the unchangeable God, is itself immutable and indissoluble.

Ver. 37—39. This language of Jesus (comp. the explanation of v. 36) is not unimportant, as the means of ascertaining, from his own lips, the relation of miracles to the proof which lies in the internal and divine power of his words. It is evident that here two kinds of *πιστεύειν* are distinguished: the *πιστεύειν τοῖς ἔργοις* and the *πιστεύειν ἐμοί*. Now, since the latter is represented as to be produced by the former, the *πιστεύειν ἐμοί* appears the higher. It presupposes full susceptibility to the divine influence which proceeded from Jesus, and where such susceptibility existed, miracles certainly were rather an addition to the proof than the proof itself. But where this was wanting, and the impressions of divine things had to contend with the manifold workings of sin—which operated partly from within and partly from without—there it was requisite to give such a sign of his heavenly mission as should set aside every doubt; and this was the purpose answered by miracles. Now, where these passed over the mind without effect, the eradication of all good had reached its highest degree, and sin had gained the victory.

Respecting *γινώσκειν καὶ πιστεύειν*, comp. the remarks on John

<sup>1</sup> Respecting *ἀγιάζειν*, comp. the particulars on John xiii. 31.

vi. 69. Some manuscripts here omit one and some the other idea, the arrangement having appeared to many transcribers unsuitable. The form : *ἐν ἐμοὶ ὁ πατὴρ καὶ γὰρ ἐν αὐτῷ*, which expresses the reciprocal action of the love between Father and Son, is elucidated in the remarks on xiv. 10. Concerning ver. 39, comp. the Comm. on vii. 30.

END OF VOL. III