

THE
GREEK TESTAMENT,

WITH
ENGLISH NOTES,

CRITICAL, PHILOLOGICAL, AND EXEGETICAL,

PARTLY

SELECTED AND ARRANGED FROM THE BEST COMMENTATORS, ANCIENT AND MODERN,
BUT CHIEFLY ORIGINAL.

THE WHOLE BEING ESPECIALLY ADAPTED TO THE USE OF
ACADEMICAL STUDENTS, CANDIDATES FOR THE SACRED OFFICE, AND MINISTERS:
THOUGH ALSO INTENDED AS A MANUAL EDITION FOR THE USE OF
THEOLOGICAL READERS IN GENERAL.

BY THE

REV. S. T. BLOOMFIELD, D.D. F.S.A.

VICAR OF EISBROOKE, RUTLAND.

FIRST AMERICAN FROM THE SECOND LONDON EDITION.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. I.

BOSTON:

PUBLISHED BY PERKINS AND MARVIN.

NEW-YORK: GOULD AND NEWMAN.

PHILADELPHIA: HENRY PERKINS.

1837.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1836,
By PERKINS AND MARVIN,
in the Clerk's office of the District Court of the District of Massachusetts.

STEREOTYPED BY
FOLSOM, WELLS, AND THURSTON..

PERKINS AND MARVIN, PRINTERS.

P R E F A C E

TO THE

A M E R I C A N E D I T I O N .

THE design of the Publishers in reprinting Dr. Bloomfield's Greek Testament with English Notes, is to furnish the American public with a book, which is well adapted to aid the critical student of the New Testament Scriptures. Dr. Bloomfield is extensively known in England, and to some extent in this country, as an editor of the text of Thucydides, accompanied by a translation and learned notes. The first edition of his Greek Testament was sold off in about three years after its publication; and, a copy of the second edition having by special effort been very early procured, the American publishers have made such unexpected progress in their reprint of it, that it comes before the public many months sooner than was anticipated.

The plan of Dr. Bloomfield's work may be briefly described to the reader. The *text* is formed on the *basis* of the last edition of Robert Stephens, adopted by Mill, and differing slightly from the vulgate text which originated in the Elzevir edition of the New Testament in 1624. In a very few cases, as the editor states, alterations of this text have been admitted, which are supported by the united authority of MSS., ancient versions, and fathers, and also the early printed editions. All *conjectural* emendations have been carefully excluded. Before words where the reading has been altered, an asterisk is uniformly placed, and some notice is taken of the alteration in the Notes. Brackets designate such portions of the text as are suspected of being an interpolation; brackets and a line drawn over the words designate such words or phrases as are probably or certainly spurious. Other marks are used by the editor to indicate suspected words, or such as probably need emendation. The important readings admitted by Wetstein, Matthæi, Griesbach, or Scholz, are noticed when not admitted; as is also any difference between the vulgate text and that of Stephens, adopted by the editor.

Dr. Bloomfield states, that he has bestowed great labour and care upon the division of the text into paragraphs, and also upon its punctuation. The Annotations, he says, are in a very considerable degree original; and where they are not so, they are derived from consulting all the sources of exegetical literature which are at present accessible.

In the second edition, which is here reprinted, the editor states that he has embodied the results of an attentive study of the reformers, Luther, Calvin, and Melancthon; that he has carefully revised the punctuation, and the marginal parallel references; that he has discussed more amply the claims and merits of various readings, and also various Greek and Hellenistic idioms, and introduced a far greater number of illustrations of phraseology from classical writers, and from Philo Judæus and Josephus. He has also given more regular and copious introductions to all the books of the New Testament. Some of the earlier annotations have been entirely rewritten, and many others on the more difficult passages have been greatly enlarged.

The condensation in the mode of printing has made room for all this additional matter, without enlarging the size or the price of the book; and, in this condensed form, the American publishers now proffer the work to the public.

Dr. Bloomfield published, some time since, a work entitled *Recensio Synoptica*, which exhibits the results of ancient and modern criticism on the New Testament in a very abridged form. The labour necessary to perform such a work, was well adapted to prepare him for the present one; to which he must have come, furnished with an extensive knowledge of what had been done by his predecessors in the business of interpretation.

Under these circumstances, and possessed of a sound and sober judgment and a discriminating mind, and having long been conversant with a wide field of classical Greek study, it was to be expected that Dr. B. would exhibit a commentary, which should be a kind of *multum in parvo*; and such is the fact. The reader will find, in most places of the New Testament, at least a hint of the most important opinions that have been maintained in respect to the meaning of them. I have had occasion to follow Dr. B. through two epistles which are among the longest, and I have rarely found an exception to the tenor of the above remark.

As a convenient manual for the study of the New Testament, which furnishes the student with much important information and many useful hints, I can commend this work to our religious public, and have recommended it to the publishers. But in doing this, it is not to be understood, that I pledge myself to all the results of Dr. B.'s exegetical study. He holds the rights of conscience and private judgment too high, not to concede very cheerfully to others the liberty of differing from him; and especially so, as to the sense of difficult and doubtful passages. I cannot subscribe to some of the views in this work, which have a polemic aspect in defence of the hierarchy of the English church, because, after long and patient investigation of the New Testament and of early Christian writers, I do not find any satisfactory evidence of such a modelling of the early church, either in the one or in the

other of these sources. Still less can I hold with Dr. B., that *διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας*, in Tit. iii. 5, expresses the sentiment that regeneration accompanies the external rite of baptism. But cases of such a nature are very unfrequent in his book; and, for the most part, the expression of his opinions is managed with a kind, courteous, and candid spirit. His zeal for the hierarchy and warm attachment to his national church seem to be the strongest temptations that beset him, in the otherwise gentle and even tenor of his way.

The Notes will be found most deficient on the Apocalypse, — a book about the plan and object of which Dr. B. does not appear yet to have wholly satisfied his own mind.

Those who may differ from the author of the Notes in these volumes, in some respects, will be just and generous enough, I would hope, not to reject the good which the work contains on this account. An effort like this, to aid in the study of the New Testament original, and to promote critical and exegetical knowledge among the ministers of the gospel, deserves approbation and patronage, even from those who cannot give to all the sentiments which the work contains, their unqualified approbation.

Dr. B. has expressed great solicitude in his letters to me, that the work should come before the American public in as neat and accurate a manner as possible. To this his request, so natural and reasonable, all possible attention has been paid.

As to the care bestowed on the printing, the work will speak for itself. It has been executed at the University Press, Cambridge; and those who are acquainted with the character of the gentlemen who have the control of this establishment, will be slow to believe that the mother country itself can furnish superintendents and correctors, who are more skilled and accurate than those who conduct this business. So far as I have examined, I think Dr. B. himself will be satisfied with the accuracy which has been attained.

May this, and every attempt to promote the knowledge of the divine word, be blessed of Him who gave that word in order that it should shed light upon the path of our duty and salvation!

M. STUART.

Andover Theol. Seminary, October 1st, 1836.

P R E F A C E.

IN laying before the Public a *fourth* Work, — not less elaborate than any of those in which he has been previously engaged, — the Author feels that the approbation, with which his *former* labours have been received, may well remove from his mind much of that anxiety which he would otherwise have felt as to the reception of the *present*.

It is obviously proper, in sending forth a new Edition of the NEW TESTAMENT, — as it would be in editing *any other* ancient writings, — as well to point out to the reader the principal *deficiencies*, which such Edition is intended to supply, as to state the particular *purposes* which it is intended to answer.

As far as regards the *Text* of the New Testament, the present Editor is not disposed to deny, that amongst the various Editions hitherto published, sufficient evidence is afforded to enable any person competently imbued with Learning and Criticism, to ascertain the true reading. Yet what are called the *Standard Texts* differ considerably; especially that of Griesbach, as compared with the *textus receptus*, and even with that of Matthæi, or of Scholz. And it is not to be supposed that students, — or indeed readers of the New Testament in general, — have at command *all* the chief Standard Texts, or ordinarily possess the ability to decide between their diversities. It, therefore, seemed desirable, that such persons should be supplied with a text so constructed, that the *variations* from the *textus receptus* should be, as far as might be practicable, distinctly marked in the *Text itself*; and, as much as possible, not left to be learned from the Notes: and further, that the *state of the evidence*, in all important cases, should be laid before the reader, — together with the *reasons* which had induced the Editor to adopt any variation from the *textus receptus*; so that the Student might thence learn to judge for himself; for (as Seneca justly observes), “longum iter est per *præcepta*, breve et efficax per *exempla*.” But a *new recension* of the text, formed on such a plan, — however desirable, and even necessary, — was not to be found in this country; nor, indeed, in any other, — based on sound principles of Criticism; the Texts for Academical and general use, on the Continent, being little more than *reprints* of that of Griesbach; of

which the imperfections (as will appear from what is said in these pages, and in the course of the following work) are very considerable.

And if thus great was the want of a *Text* fitted for such uses, how much greater was that of a consistent and suitable *body of Annotation!* The earliest modern Commentaries on the New Testament were little more than unconnected *Scholia* on passages where there seemed a “*dignus vindice nodus.*” And no wonder; since they were formed chiefly on the model of the *Scholiasts* on the Classical writers; whose labours, at the revival of literature, were the only aids to the understanding of those writings. This method was, in many respects, *convenient* to the earlier Commentators on the Scriptures; who, not intending to form what is now called a *perpetual Commentary*, proposed merely to explain or illustrate such points as especially needed it, and such as they felt most able to explain. And, not unfrequently, the passages which they chose to discuss were made rather the means of displaying their own learning or reading, than of explaining the sense of their author. Indeed, even those Theologians who most successfully cultivated this branch of learning, (as Valla, Vatablus, Luther, Calvin, Melancthon, Beza, Erasmus, Strigelius, Lucas Brugensis, Zegerus, Drusius, Castalio, Scaliger, Casaubon, Capellus, Grotius, Cameron, and Pricæus,) and who, in general, interpreted the New Testament in a Grammatical and Critical manner, without introducing doctrinal discussions, fell, in different degrees, into the error of only explaining what it was *convenient* for them to explain, and did not aim at forming a regular *Commentary*.¹ This system,—if system it may be called,—continued to a late period, and may be traced, more or less, in almost all the Commentators of the seventeenth century, even in Grotius himself. There were, indeed, a few exceptions, as in the case of Calvin, Luther, and Crellius; but in those instances the Commentaries were extended to so immoderate a length, as effectually to preclude their being *read*; and to this day they are chiefly used for reference. The very same error was committed, though by a different process, towards the close of the seventeenth century, by Cocceius and others of his school,—as Lampe, Gerdes., Wessel., and other Dutch Theologians; in whose hands the *Analytical* method became as pernicious, and unfavourable to the discovery of truth, as had been the *Logical* and *Grammatical* in the hands of Crellius, Schliting, and others of that School; in whose writings may be discovered the very same *abuse*, from excess, of what is

¹ [Indeed, it was, at that early period, scarcely possible that any *one* man should form a COMMENTARY; which, as Samuel Johnson observes, “must arise from the fortuitous discoveries of many men in many devious walks of literature . . .” and such fortuitous circumstances can only be expected to occur in the lapse of a considerable portion of time.]

N. B. The Notes within brackets have been added in the Second Edition.

good in itself, as that which is justly complained of in the Heterodox class of the Foreign Expositors of the present age. The Commentaries of our own countrymen, during the seventeenth, and part of the eighteenth century (though valuable in themselves, and of perpetual importance) partake of the same fault as those of Grotius and others in the *Critici Sacri*, — in being too prolix and desultory in some parts, and unsatisfactorily brief in others; no approach being made to any thing like a connected COMMENTARY. *This* state of things, both here and on the Continent, also long continued; and the first attempt at any thing like a regular and connected Grammatical Commentary, formed to be *read through*, and not to be used for *reference* only — for Academical and general use, and not for that of the learned only — was made by the erudite and acute KOPPE, who in 1778 commenced an Edition of the New Testament with a corrected text, short Critical Notes, and rather copious philological and exegetical Annotations, serving to establish the literal and grammatical sense; all doctrinal discussions being excluded. The learned Editor only lived to publish two Volumes, containing the Epistles to the Romans, Galatians, Ephesians, and Thessalonians; and after his death the work was continued by Heinrichs and Pott; who, however, so altered the original plan (which was excellent), as to spoil it for the purposes especially had in view by Koppe. Moreover, the principles maintained by those Editors are so heterodox, that — whatever may be the learning and ability occasionally displayed — their interpretations ought to be received with the greatest distrust and caution. Koppe himself, indeed, was not wholly free from that leaven of heterodoxy, which has worked so extensively and perniciously in the greater part of the German Commentators, for the last half century, from Semler downwards. As to the literary merits and *defects* of Koppe's work, the Editor cannot better express his opinion, than in the words of the learned and judicious PELT, Proleg. on Thess. p. 47, “*Jejunam haud raro simplicitatem nimio coëmit pretio, profundioribus scilicet cogitationum rejectis rationibus; in multis tamen præclare sensum attingit, quamquam philologicæ etiam subtilitati non semper, ut decebat, operam dederit.*” To omit such decidedly heterodox works as are better passed over in silence, the Commentaries of ROSENMUELLER and KUINOEL have (especially the latter) much valuable matter. The work of the former, however, (besides that its principles are very objectionable) is almost wholly a *compilation*. Far more valuable is that of the latter; its principles, too, are better; though what are called Neologian views not unfrequently discover themselves; and the work, being too often interlarded with some of the most pestilent dogmas of Semler, Paulus, and others, though accompanied with refutations by the Editor, is very unfit to come into the hands of Students. *Both* the foregoing works are, moreover, some-

what faulty in the Critical and Philological departments; being occasionally deficient in accuracy, and in an acquaintance with the principles of the great Critics of the illustrious School of BENTLEY and HEMSTERHUSIUS, PORSON and HERMANN. In Fritzsche, indeed, we see a disciple worthy of his master, the great HERMANN, and an accomplished Philologist; but besides that the prolixity, and, still more, excursiveness of his Commentary, render it unfit for Academical or general use, we may say of this, as of the foregoing works, and also of Dindorf's and Morus's Annotations, and Iaspis's Version (or rather Paraphrase) with Notes, — *πολλὰ μὲν ἐυθλά μειγμένα, πολλὰ δὲ λυγρά*¹. In the exegetical works of Ernesti, Storr, Carpzov, Staudlin, Knapp, Borger, Tittmann, Winer, Heydenreich, Laurmann, Tholuck, Emmerling, Bornemann, and Pelt, there is, for the most part, little which is really objectionable in *principle*; but they are more or less characterised by prolixity, obscurity, and above all, the want of a clear and well-digested arrangement. In short, as it has been truly observed by the learned Pelt, in the Preface to his Commentary on Thessalonians, — “*Quis neget, omnes fere N. T. libros novâ indigere eâque accuratiore, et ad nostri temporis necessitates accommodatâ expositione; quæ grammaticis, historicis, Criticis, aliisque rationibus quæ in commentario conficiendo in censum venire solent, satisfaciat?*”²”

Hence it is abundantly apparent, that an Edition of the New Testament, with Critical and exegetical apparatus, formed with a due regard to the advanced state of Biblical science at the present day,³ and in other respects

¹ How can we fail to lament, that while we see the learned Critics *acknowledging* the sense, which the immutable laws of Verbal Criticism compel us to assign to Scripture, we should also see *him* caught in the toils of that miserable sophistry, which entangles the ordinary and half-learned sciolists and sceptics of his country!

[I say *half-learned*; for, as Mr. Rose truly observes, “Rationalism is laughed to scorn by the real philologists of Germany, as the emptiness of their religious theories by genuine philosophers. The Rationalists *have* learning on subjects to which they have applied themselves,—the illustration of manners and customs, or the investigation of antiquities; whatever, in fact, relates to the mere exterior in which Scriptural truth is covered.”]

² The same want had been before perceived by the acute and learned Winer, as may be seen in his *Oratio de emendandâ Interpretatione Nov. Test. Lips. 1823, 8vo*, and in his preface to an useful edition of the Epistle to the Galatians, intended to be a specimen of what he thought was proper to be done on the whole of the New Testament.

³ [That Biblical science has greatly advanced within the lifetime of those who have mainly contributed to produce that advance, is undeniable. That such should be the case is not surprising, since (as Dr. Hey has observed) “there is no kind of mental improvement which does not improve *Criticism*.” *Polite arts refine our taste*; and science *ripens our judgment*, and strengthens our understanding. And not only has Biblical science advanced and is advancing, but the safety of the religion itself requires that it should continue to advance. “Let then (to use the words of the great Cudworth) no man, in pursuit of the name of an applied *sobriety*, imagine that we can go too far or be too well read in the book of God's DIVINITY, or in the book of God's works, PHILOSOPHY; but rather let men awaken themselves, and vigorously pursue an endless progress of proficiency in

adapted for Academical and general use as a Manual, is still a *Desideratum*. The older exegetical works of the English School are confessedly insufficient of themselves for the purposes which they were originally intended to serve; and the later and elementary works (besides being for the most part very superficial and unscientific) are so modelled on the older ones, as to be little promotive of their professed object. In fact, in *all* didactic works intended for Academical and for general use, it is now indispensable, that the matter contained in them should not only be as *complete* as possible in *itself*, but should fully attain to the standard of knowledge actually reached in the works of those who have most advanced the science therein treated of.

This acknowledged want it has been the endeavour of the present Editor to supply; with what degree of success, he leaves to the learned and candid reader to determine; and he will now proceed to unfold the *plan* of the present Work, to state the *principles* of Criticism and Interpretation by which he has been guided, and the *purposes* which it is especially intended to answer.

The TEXT has been formed (after long and repeated examinations of the whole of the New Testament for that purpose solely) on the *basis* of the last Edition of R. Stephens, adopted by Mill, whose text differs very slightly from, but is admitted to be preferable to, the *common* Text, which originated in the Elzevir Edition of 1624. From this there has been no deviation, except on the most preponderating evidence; critical conjecture being wholly excluded¹; and such alterations only introduced, as rest on the united authority of MSS., ancient Versions and Fathers, and the early-printed Editions, — but especially upon the *invaluable* EDITIO PRINCEPS; and which had been already adopted in one or more of the *Critical* Editions of Bengel, Wetstein, Griesbach, Matthæi, and Scholz. And here the Editor must avow his total dissent, though not from the *Canons of Criticism* professedly acted upon by Griesbach in his Edition of the New Testament, yet altogether from the *system of Recensions* first promulgated by him, and founded, as the Editor apprehends, upon a misapplication of those

both.” How necessary it is, in times like the present, that the standard of Biblical study should be raised, has been evinced, with his usual ability, by the BISHOP OF LONDON; and also by Mr. Prebendary Raikes, in his instructive little work, entitled “Remarks on Clerical Education.”]

¹ [*Conjectural* emendations, indeed, are at once *unnecessary* (with so many MSS.) and *presumptuous*; nay *foolish*, as often founded on ignorance of the contents and true character of the Book, on which the Conjecturers have chosen to try their ingenuity. To this effect, it is well observed by the learned Editor of the New Testament recently published at Bâle, “Sponte patet, multis in locis Sacri Codicis nec Hemsterhusianas nec Gronovienses emendationes esse ferendas, si isti viri, dum vel maximo acumine et doctrinæ subtilitate pollerent, *Spiritu illo vivifico, quo sacros Scriptores concitatos intelligimus, expertes forent*. Nec enim in Scriptoribus, qui dicuntur, profanis, res critica absque ingenii quodam cum auctore consortio confici poterit.”]

canons. The perpetual, and, for the most part, needless cancellings,¹ and alterations of all kinds, introduced by Griesbach, evince a temerity which would have been highly censurable even in editing a *profane* writer, but, when made in the Sacred Volume, they involve also a charge of *irreverence* for the Book which was intended to make men “wise unto salvation².” In most respects the Editor coincides with the views of Matthæi (whose Edition of the N. T. is pronounced by Bp. Middleton to be by far the best yet seen), and, in a great measure, with those of the learned and independent Scholz.

Further, the present Editor has so constructed his TEXT, that the reader shall possess the advantage of having before him both the Stephanic text and also the corrected text formed on the best MS. ancient Versions and early Editions. To advert to the various kinds of *alterations* of the common text, as they arise from the *omission* or the *insertion* of words, or from a *change of one word into another*,—nothing whatever has been *omitted* which has a place in the Stephanic Text; such words only as are, by the almost universal consent of Editors and Critics, regarded as *interpolations*, being here placed within *brackets*, more or less inclusive, according to the degree of suspicion attached to them. Nothing has been *inserted* but on the same weighty authority; and even *those* words are pointed out as *insertions* by being expressed in a smaller character. All *altered* readings have *asterisks* prefixed, the old ones being invariably indicated in the Notes. And such readings as, though left untouched, are by eminent Critics thought to need alteration, have a † prefixed. [Such words (very few in number) as are, on good grounds, supposed to be corrupt readings, though the MSS. supply not the means of emendation, are designated by an *obelus*.] As to *Various Readings*, the most important are noticed; chiefly those which, though not admitted into the text of the present Edition, have been adopted by one or more of the four great Editors, Wetstein, Matthæi, Griesbach, and Scholz, or are found in the Editio Princeps; or those wherein the

¹ In justification of these, it has generally been urged, that the words, phrases, or clauses, so thrown out are glossematical, and therefore spurious. On this point, however, the present Editor is entirely at issue with the Griesbachian School; and he has much pleasure in referring his readers to a masterly Commentatio by C. C. Tittmann de Glossematis N. T. rectè investigandis, (at p. 501 sqq. of his Opusc. Theolog. Lips. 1803.) ; as also an able and instructive Dissertation of Bornemann de Glossematis N. T. cautè dijudicandis, Lips. 1830, who there completely refutes the rash assertions of Wassenbergh, in a Dissertation de Glossis appended to Valck. Scholia ad N. T., and ably distributes these pretended Glosses under *five Classes*.

² Thus it is well observed by the profoundly learned Valckenaer in his Schol. in N. T. Tom. II. p. 360. “Qui talia in Auctoribus *profanis* periclitari vellet, omnium sibilis exciperetur, nedum talia tentare licet in Sacris, ubi Critica exercenda sobria et modesta, ut a superstitione quidem libera, sic tamen multo magis a temeritate.”

common Text differs from that of Stephens. In such cases, the *reasons* for non-adoption are usually adduced. And this has always been done in the case of *alterations* of the Text, however minute. The CRITICAL NOTES are almost entirely original, and chiefly serve to give *reasons* for the methods pursued in forming the Text. Such Notes would have been brought forward more frequently, had not their introduction been forbidden by the brevity necessary to be preserved in a work of this nature. It also seemed to the Editor more advisable to treat fully and (he trusts) satisfactorily on a comparatively small number of controverted passages, than to introduce frequent, though brief, and therefore unsatisfactory, Critical remarks.

The division of the Text, not into *verses* (though these are expressed in the inner margin), but *paragraphs*, is agreeable to the custom of the most eminent Editors, from Wetst. downwards, and can need no justification. Certain it is that scarcely any thing could have had a more unfavourable effect on the interpretation of the New Testament than H. Stephens's breaking up the whole into verses; thus, occasionally, dissevering clauses which are closely connected in sense.

The *Punctuation* has been throughout most carefully corrected and adjusted, from a comparison of all the best Editions, from the Editio Princeps to that of Scholz. To each verse is subjoined, in the outer margin, a select body of the most apposite *Parallel References*, as adopted by Bp. Lloyd from Curcellæus. The citations from the Old Testament are expressed as such by being *spaced out*; and the words of any speaker are indicated by an appropriate mode of punctuation, and by the use of a Capital letter to designate the commencement of those words.

To advert to the EXEGETICAL NOTES:—These are, for the most part, of the kind found in the best Critical Editions of the Greek *Classical* writers; being intended to comprise whatever respects the *interpretation*, and tends to the establishment of the *Grammatical sense*: and in order thereto, great pains have been taken to trace the *connexion* and *scope* of the passage under discussion¹. And here, together with the greatest *comprehensiveness*, there has been adopted the utmost *compression* consistent with perspicuity; so as to form *an Epitome of exegetical and philological annotation*. The method systematically adopted by the present Annotator, in order to ascer-

¹ In this department of his labours the Editor has availed himself of the valuable assistance (though that not unfrequently failed him) of Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euthymius, and Theodoret; of Calvin, Grotius, Crellius, Carpvov, Koppe, Pott, Heinrichs, Rosenmueller, Kuinoel, and others of the more recent Foreign Commentators; as also, of our own divines, Hammond, Whitby, Locke, Peirce, Benson, Doddridge, Chandler, Newcome, Campbell, Macknight; and finally, Dr. A. Clarke and Mr. Scott, to the various merits and general excellence of whose elaborate Commentary the Editor (widely as he differs from that pious writer on a few points of doctrine, and some matters of doubtful disputation) bears most decided testimony.

tain the sense of passages of very doubtful or disputed meaning, has been this; to seek their illustration. 1. From parallel passages of the N. T., or passages where the same, or a similar phrase, occurs either in the writer himself, or in the other writers of the N. T. or the O. T.; thus making Scripture its own Interpreter. 2. From passages of the Septuagint (including the Apocrypha), Josephus, and Philo. 3. From the Apostolical Fathers. 4. From Apocryphal writings of undoubted antiquity; and which, whatever may be their claims to *inspiration*, are, at least, of considerable utility, as indicating the Theological opinions of the times when they were written, whatever those might be, whether *earlier* or *later* than the N. T.; in the former case, showing the opinions of the Jews previous to the promulgation of the Gospel; in the latter, contributing, in various ways, to the interpretation of the N. T., and often establishing its authenticity and uncorrupted preservation. 5. From Rabbinical writers of unquestionable antiquity. 6. From the Fathers in general, Greek and Latin, of the first four centuries, including the Greek Commentators, Theodoret, Theophylact, Euthymius, and Œcumenius. 7. From the Greek Classical writers, especially those who lived after the formation of the Alexandrian and Hellenistic, Common or popular dialect. The illustrations derived from this last source are generally original; and when not specifically ascribed to any commentator or critic, may, in almost all cases, be so considered.

The Annotations have been partly derived, with due acknowledgment, wherever practicable, from the most eminent Commentators, ancient and modern; but they are *in a very considerable degree* original. In their general character, they are elementary, and introductory to the larger Commentaries; and they especially and systematically indicate and establish what the Editor conceives to be the *true* interpretation of disputed passages.¹

In the present work, the editor has (as in his *Recensio Synoptica*) seen reason continually to search out the fountain-heads of interpretation; as found in Chrysostom, and other eminent Greek Fathers, Commentators, Scholiasts, and Glossographers. And if he be thought by some to have employed

¹ [The Editor has endeavoured, on controverted passages, to ascertain the one true, and therefore *only* sense, namely, that intended by the sacred writer. For, in opposition to the notion of certain Theologians (as Doddridge), that the words of Scripture mean all that they *may* mean, (formed on the Canon of Cocceius, "Verba SS. tantum semper valere quantum valere possunt,") the Editor contends that there is only *one* true sense—that *in the mind of the sacred writer*. In the words of the learned Becher, Præf. ad Tittmann de Synonymis, P. II., "Falsa est quævis interpretatio, quæ in verbis quærit aliam sententiam, quam scriptor ipse in animo habuit, et verbis suis cogitari ab aliis voluit." Indeed, Doddridge, in thus adopting the above Canon, ought to have attended to the words there following, which were meant to limit it, and would make its use comparatively safe: "Et esse in omni eo sensu accipienda, quem significare possunt, juxta emphasin verborum, usitatam rationem phraseos ἀκολουθίαν rerum, et ἀναλογίαν scripturæ."]

unnecessary pains in ascertaining the *antiquity* of interpretations, he would beg them to ponder the weighty observation of Bp. Middleton, who remarks, that "Theologians would do well to notice the *antiquity* of the opinions which they defend, because that antiquity is sometimes no inconsiderable evidence of truth." He has, however, carefully repressed any undue prepossession either in favor of *antiquity*, or of *novelty*¹, and we may say, in the words of Strabo, βούλομαι τὸ ἀληθές, ἂν τε παλαιὸν ἂν τε νέον. He has everywhere endeavoured to combine simple and solid *old* views with ingenious and learned *new* ones; ever bearing in mind (with due restriction) the profound remark of Thucydides, when speaking of the union of youth with age in deliberation and counsel, νομίσατε νεότητα μὲν καὶ γῆρας ἄνευ ἀλλήλων μηδὲν δύνασθαι ὁμοῦ δὲ τὸ τε φαῦλον καὶ τὸ μέσον καὶ τὸ πάνυ ἀκριβές ἂν ξυγκραθῆν μάλιστ' ἂν ἰσχύειν.

It has been the Author's fortune *sometimes* to justify and confirm, by the suffrage of antiquity, what had been unjustly distrusted, and rejected as mere *novelty*; but *far more frequently* to show the solid grounds of interpretations, which it had been too long the fashion to reject, merely *because they were common*; though, from their antiquity and general reception, they might have been *presumed to be true*; for, to use the words of Cicero, "Opinionum commenta delet dies, Naturæ ac veritatis judicium confirmat."

In ascertaining the true interpretation, the Editor has always aimed especially at settling the *Grammatical* and *literal* sense² of any disputed passage; mindful of the pithy dictum of the great SCALIGER, "that all controversies in Theology arose from mistakes in *Grammar*," meaning thereby, in an extended sense, *Philology in general*. Thus the immortal LUTHER (as appears from Tittmann de Synonymis, p. 41.) was accustomed to assert, "optimum Grammaticum, eum etiam optimum Theologum esse³." Indeed, as Bp. Middleton well observes, "when we consider how many there are, who seek to warp the Scriptures to their own views and prepossessions, *Verbal Criticism* seems to be the *only barrier* that can be opposed successfully against heresy and schism."

1 Thus it is profoundly observed by the illustrious BACON, Nov. Org. I. 56, "Reperiuntur ingenia alia in admirationem Antiquitatis, alia in amorem et amplexum Novitatis effusa; pauca vero ejus temperamenti sunt, ut modum tenere possint, quin aut quæ rectè posita sunt ab Antiquis convellant, aut ea contemnunt quæ rectè afferuntur a Novis. Hoc vero magno scientiarum et Philosophiæ detrimento fit, quum studia potius sint Antiquitatis et Novitatis, quam judicia: Veritas autem non a felicitate temporis alicujus, quæ res varia est; sed a lumine Naturæ et Experimentiæ, quod æternum est, petenda est." The folly of an excessive fondness for *either* is ably pointed out by the same great writer De Augm. Scient. L. II.

2 [On this see Becher's Preface (pp. x. & xi.) to P. II. of Tittmann de Synon.]

3 [*Melancthon*, too, used to say, "non posse evadere bonum *Theologum*, qui non antea fuerit bonus *Interpres*; neque posse *Scripturam* intelligi theologicè, nisi antea intellecta sit *grammaticè*."]]

The present Annotator has, moreover, especially kept in view *simplicity* of sense, in opposition to *contort*, however erudite, interpretations¹. On which subject it was well observed by the acute Maldonati, “Verior aliquando Vulgi quam sapientum sententia est, quod dum simplicius veritatem quærit, facilius invenit.” Words and phrases must not be taken in some *recondite* sense, which men of learning and ingenuity, in support of an hypothesis, may devise; but in the ordinary sense of the words, wherein the persons addressed, whether by preaching or writing, would be likely to understand them.

It is an admirable remark of Bp. Middleton, Gr. Ar. p. 539: “It is better to understand phrases according to their obvious import, even though we should be compelled to leave the proof of their fitness to more fortunate inquiry. When once we begin to withhold from words their ordinary and natural signification, we must not complain, if Infidels charge our Religion with mysticism, or its expositors with fraud.”

The editor would further state, that all *pretended* Pleonasm, Hebraisms, &c. are in the present work discountenanced, as well as all other Philological devices to dilute, pare down, or explain away the sense². Above all, care has been taken not to lower the dignity of certain portions of the New Testament by ill judged attempts at explanation, where all explanation must fall short. [However, in such a case, as Dr. Hey well observes, “Men may be said to understand any subject, when they see all that can be seen of it by man.”]

As to the much controverted subject of the *style of the New Testament*, the present editor is opposed to the opinions alike of those who regard the Greek as pure, and even elegant; and, of those who pronounce it barbarous and ungrammatical. To maintain the *former*, after the labours of so many eminent writers from Vorstius downwards, were a vain attempt: and as to the *latter*, it surely does not follow that, because some words are found nowhere else, they were *coined* by the Sacred writers, or were *barbarous*; since there is great reason to suppose, that the Classical authors preserved to us do not contain a tenth part of the Greek language, as it existed at the beginning of the Christian æra. The words or phrases then *may* have

¹ See the excellent Dissertation of Tittmann de Simplicitate in Interpretatione N. T. and another de Causis contortarum Interpret. N. T. p. 239—281. de Synon. N. T.

² See Deyling's Dissertation de Amplitudine Sensus Biblici non Coarctandâ, Op. Sacr. P. v.

[Accordingly, he has carefully noted those *enumerations* of vices which not unfrequently occur in the New Testament (especially in St. Paul's writings), and which the generality of Commentators (especially the recent foreign Expositors) usually consider as merely put *κατὰ συνάθροισιν*, as a *congeries* of all sorts of vice; thus avoiding the trouble of explanation. Whereas the Editor has, he trusts, succeeded, in every such case, in tracing a *plan*, and showing the *distinctive meaning* of the terms. For examples, the reader is referred to Rom. i. 29. sqq. Galat. v. 19—21. 2 Tim. ii. 5.]

been used by the best writers; or they may have formed part of the provincial or popular¹, colloquial and domestic phraseology, not preserved in any of the remains of antiquity. As to the *non-observance of the rules laid down by the Greek Grammarians*, sometimes imputed as a fault to the writers of the N. T., it is an excellent distinction of Tittmann de Syn. p. 231, "Scriptores sacri grammaticas quidem leges servarunt, non autem grammaticorum²."

But to return, it has been the uniform practice of the present Editor fairly to avow, and fully to meet, the innumerable difficulties to be found in the N. T., especially in the Epistles, those best interpreters of the Gospels. But, in order to find space, within the narrow limits of a *manual* Edition, for occasionally dilating on passages of acknowledged difficulty³,— he has systematically excluded all such remarks as seemed trite and obvious, or likely to occur to an attentive reader; and such as might well be derived from *Lexicons* and *Dictionaries* of all kinds; as also from works

¹ [This is a matter of more consequence than it would, at first sight, appear to be; since there can be no doubt that very great mistakes concerning the sense of Scripture (and some even involving *doctrines*) have arisen from not bearing in mind the *popular* cast of the style of the New Testament. Inasmuch that it is the opinion of Dr. Hey (in his Lect. p. 5.) that "the chief difficulty as to expressions in Divinity arises from not considering them as popular." And so Tittmann de Synon. p. 216. "Ea est orationis Scriptorum sacrorum natura, ut ad vite communis loquendi consuetudinem quàm proximè accedat. Sed hujus consuetudinis (quã indocti pariter ac docti utuntur) ea indoles est, ut syntaxeos, quantum legibus illis non necessariis constat, vincula ægerrime patiat. Unde fit, ut sermo vite communis fere omnes loquendi formas habeat, quibus idiomatica constant, et schemata orationis. Non est igitur mirandum, apud sacros scriptores *mixtum* illud dicendi genus reperiri, cujus causas qui optime perspectas habuerit, cum non dubitamus quin optimum illorum interpretem esse dicamus."]

² See the Dissertation of the same writer, "de Scriptorum N. T. Diligentia Grammatica rectè æstimandâ."

[There are not wanting expressions in the New Testament which are *rejected* by some rash Critics, on the score of being formed *contrary to analogy*. But there are few of the most perfect Classical writers which might not furnish some such instances. As an example of which, may be noted, a form of expression occurring in one of the most finished compositions of antiquity—the Phœnissæ of Euripides, v. 405. *καὶ τοῦτο λυπρὸν, ξυνασσοφελὲν τοῖς μὴ σοφοῖς*. Now here *ξυνασ.* is rejected by many Critics, (as Valcknaer and Pierse,) on the ground of *being formed contrary to all analogy*. Porson, however, prudently forbears to make any alteration; "since, (says he,) Euripides may have violated the usual rules for the sake of a stronger antithesis." Thus, in a similar manner, may we usually account for such violations of analogy in the *New Testament*: e. gr. Phil. ii. 30. on the disputed question *παρὰβουλεύεσθαι*; where see Note.

³ The difficulties of Scripture, as they must not be underrated, so neither are they to be magnified beyond due bounds. "From either extreme," says the learned Bp. Van Mildert, in his Bampton Lect. p. 217, "evil consequences may arise: from the one, carelessness or presumption; from the other, blind submission to spiritual guides, or a morbid indisposition to rational inquiry. In either case, encouragement will be given to the dissemination of error; and Romanism, on the one hand, or Fanaticism, on the other, may be favoured; and the privilege of using the Word may be arrogantly monopolized by the Ministers, or irreverently assumed by such as are wholly destitute of the acquirements necessary for the Interpreter."

introductory to the study of the N. T.,—and especially from Mr. Horne's invaluable INTRODUCTION; which the Editor considers quite indispensable to every Student, and reader of this work, who would hope to use it with full advantage.

To some persons the remarkable *diversity of interpretations* may appear unaccountable. Yet this is no proof that the sense of Scripture is too uncertain to be ascertained; but merely that Exegetical science was for a long time, and has been, until a comparatively late period, in a very imperfect state.¹ The same diversities, indeed, occur, though in a less degree, in the Annotations on other ancient writers. And it is well accounted for, both from the great difficulty of the Books of the N. T., and also from the manifest insufficiency, as Critics and Philologists, of by far the greater part of those who have taken upon themselves to determine the sense of Scripture; few of whom have employed that *accurate* and *scientific* mode of interpretation, found in the Annotations of the great Critics and Philologists of the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries on the Greek Classical writers. To *introduce* this into the interpretation of the N. T. has been, in the present work, (as in his *Recensio Synoptica*,) the especial aim of the Editor; in fact, to accomplish that for the *New Testament* which he had already, in his two preceding works, effected for *Thucydides*.

The Editor may be permitted to observe, that one principal motive which first induced him seriously to apply himself to the Critical study of the New Testament, was,—that he might be enabled to prove to infidels that the Sacred Volume is *not*, as they aver, *unintelligible*, but that it can be shown to be everywhere susceptible of a rational and consistent sense; if only the same means be taken to *ascertain* that sense, which have been bestowed on other ancient writings,—nay, even on some modern ones².

¹ Thus it is justly observed by the learned Tittmann, “Tirones hodie discunt ac norunt, quæ doctissimi olim viri vix mente divinarunt.” This is especially the case with respect to the Greek Article, Greek Syntax, Etymology, the nature of language in general, and especially that of the diction of the New Testament writers.

² [This involves an interesting inquiry,—namely, whether the *same* principles must govern the interpretation of the New Testament, as those which are used in explaining other ancient writings. Now, PLANCK, in his Introduction to Sacred Philology, says, that the *very same* principles must be acted on. But PROFESSOR TURNER of New York, in his Translation of that Work, judiciously modifies the rule as follows: “It cannot be denied, that the same principles must govern the interpretation of Scripture as are used in explaining other writings. And yet, the peculiar character of certain portions of Scripture is such as to allow, and very reasonably too, an interpretation, which could not with certainty be elicited, without conceding such a view of their character as cannot be pretended to apply to that of any other writings extant. I refer to whatever portions of the Old Testament are really typical of events connected with the New Dispensation; and also to those portions

Finally, the Editor has made it his particular care to give a new literal version of, or close paraphrase on, all passages of more than ordinary difficulty, and a regular series of glossarial Notes on all words and phrases which required it. In the latter he has endeavoured, in some instances, to combine and arrange what is scattered in the works of various Lexicographers and Philologists, and in others to supply their deficiencies. In all terms of dubious import he has endeavoured not only to *fix* the sense, but (in the words of JOHNSON) “to mark the progress of their meaning, and show by what gradations of intermediate sense, they have passed from their primitive to their remote and accidental signification.”

The Editor cannot conclude without expressing his feelings of devout thankfulness for that Gracious Aid from above, by which, under the pressure of various and formidable difficulties, and with such slender means only, as an inconsiderable benefice in an obscure situation could supply, he has been enabled to complete two such arduous, and, he trusts, not unimportant Theological works as his *Recensio Synoptica* and the present Edition of the New Test. ; works which, as a faithfully attached Son of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND¹, he has the highest satisfaction in reflecting are so strongly confirmatory of her doctrines, discipline, and principles. May she derive that accession of *support* from the contents of the present work, which it is calculated to supply ! *Then* indeed, unsparing as have been the sacri-

of the *prophecies*, which, while they declare truths and facts in immediate connection with that religious system under which the authors lived, do also announce other facts of a subsequent age, and identified with doctrines and realities belonging to the Gospel. This is not the place to discuss the whole subject connected with this remark, but the scriptural fact on which it was founded constitutes a striking difference between some portions of Scripture and ordinary writings. In such cases, therefore, the allowed principles by which writings in general are explained, are not of themselves sufficient. The comment on the New Testament, which can in no case be proved to be incorrect, must be regarded by the Christian expositor in the light of a principle beyond the ordinary principles of interpretation, and must become an additional aid to him in eliciting the true meaning. Compare Ps. viii. with Heb. ii. 6—9.” In confirmation and illustration of the above view, may be added an important remark of Servius, in his *Catena* on Job, thus translated by Bp. Warburton, Works, Vol. v. p. 378: “It is fit we should understand names according to the nature of the subject matter, and not mould and model the truth of things on the abusive signification of *words*.” Now, the rock on which the German Commentators split, is the attending to *words* only, and neglecting *things*. The *usus loquendi* can but show what *may* be the sense. It is the scope of the composition and the intent of the author, the *series orationis* and the nature of the Gospel system, that can elicit what is the sense. Finally, no interpretation that introduces any inconsequence of reasoning into the Divine Word is to be admitted; since it is infinitely more credible that error should be in the exposition of the interpreter, than incoherence in the sacred writer’s discourse.]

¹ [And thus, in effect, the Church of CHRIST. For, to use the words of my old and revered friend the late Dr. Samuel Parr, “the Church of England has not ceased to be the Church of Christ, because, in one sense of the expression, it is the religion of the State. Whatever ideas men may entertain upon the subject of Christian liberty, no clear and satisfactory evidence has been adduced from which it appears that *national* religion is inconsistent either with the express commands or the vital spirit of Christianity.”]

fices of *health, fortune, comfort*, — and *whatever renders life desirable*, — which he has so long made in her service, — he will not, under any circumstances, think that he “has laboured in vain and spent his strength for nought;” but, looking forward to that *final* “recompense of reward,” which he humbly hopes to receive at the great day of Account from the CHIEF SHEPHERD, and LORD OF THE VINEYARD, he will ever say, in the words of the Apostle, *Ἐν τούτῳ χαίρω καὶ χαρήσομαι!*

P R E F A C E

TO THE

S E C O N D E D I T I O N .

It is with feelings of no ordinary satisfaction, that the Author sits down to again address himself to the Public, in a *second Edition*,—after so short a period, as that which has elapsed, since he laid before them the *first*. That a very large impression, of a *newly introduced* work, should have been thus exhausted in little more than three years from the publication,—is a testimony of the public approbation, of which the Writer may justly feel proud. Nevertheless he did not allow the voice of public approbation, testified from a *very early period*, to relax his diligence in future;—but rather found in it the strongest incentive to increased exertions, in order still further to *merit* that approbation. He was, moreover, aware that the work, notwithstanding the labour and pains already employed in its construction, was susceptible of considerable *improvement*: nay, he well knew that it would have been far superior to what it was,—but for certain unfavourable circumstances (*hereafter adverted to*) under which it was formed. Though, at the same time, he was sensible that no *first Edition* of a work, on a plan so new and extensive, had any chance of being what it ought to be, and might afterwards become. Accordingly, not long after the publication of the first Edition, and as soon as there seemed a probability of a second being called for,—he thought it essential for him to ascertain the *points of improvement*, of which the work was susceptible. In doing this, he did not allow himself to be guided solely by his *own* judgment;—but availed himself of the councils of several eminent Biblical Scholars, both in this and in foreign countries. He also occupied a considerable time in searching the great Public Libraries of LONDON and CAMBRIDGE, for the purpose of examining such scarce Exegetical books, on the New Testament, the use of which could not otherwise be obtained; and he diligently sought after, and for the most part procured, such other works of rarity and value, British and Foreign, as had not heretofore formed part of his collection. And as he had before carefully traced the fountain-heads of interpretation,—as found in the early Fathers and the ancient Commen-

tators, Scholiasts, and Glossographers,—so he now thought it expedient to turn his especial attention to a class of writers which had been almost wholly neglected by Expositors,—the great REFORMERS, both of the continent and of this country,—especially Luther, Calvin, and Melancthon; and not in their Expository writings only, but in their Theological works in general: and in respect to *English* Theology, he did not confine himself to the *Reformers*, but extended his examination to those mighty “Masters in Israel,” who succeeded our Reformers, and flourished from the age of Elizabeth down to the middle of the last century. These he carefully went through, in order to bring forward such matter as seemed especially important, at this day, to the interpretation of the New Testament. After a diligent use of all the works above mentioned, the Editor applied himself to an examination of the interpretation of the whole N. T. anew; employing therein the important aids derived from those many valuable works; but, at the same time, freely exercising his own judgment, and again putting in the balance the various interpretations of controverted passages proposed by different Expositors. With what *success* he has *carried into execution* the extensive *plan* of improvement which, after mature deliberation, he had laid down, will appear from an examination of the work itself. And in order that the reader may the better understand the *points of difference* between the former Edition and the present, the following *specification* of the *nature* and *extent* of the various alterations introduced into the latter, may be not unacceptable. These may be distributed into *two* classes,—1. *external*, as regards the *form* and *appearance* of the work; 2. *internal*, as respects its intrinsic merits. As to the *former*, since, in the first Edition, the size of the page of letter-press was so unusually wide in form, as to leave far too small a margin,—the Author directed that in the *present*, the margin should be enlarged by a small diminution of the width of the typographical form, yet so as not to diminish the quantity of matter in a line. As to the *typography*, that of the first Edition could not easily be surpassed; yet, notwithstanding the Editor’s diligence, from various causes, not necessary to be detailed, many more errors of the press remained in the Notes, than he could have wished. In the *present* Edition the greatest exertions have been made by the Editor to secure the utmost possible accuracy: in the furtherance of which important object, he has been much aided by the truly respectable Establishment of Messrs. Gilbert and Rivington, especially the latter, whose sound Classical learning and unwearied vigilance secured such an attention to the Author’s corrections in proof, as to render a *second* Revise (which the shortness of the time forbade) almost unnecessary; and thus materially to lessen the disadvantages of his very great distance from the

Press. Insomuch that, upon the whole, a degree of accuracy, the Author trusts, has been attained in the present work, somewhat unusual, at least in this country.

To pass on to the *internal* alterations, and, it is hoped, amendments,—*first*, the PUNCTUATION of the Text (a matter of no small importance) has been every where most carefully revised, and, the Editor hopes, *very considerably improved*. In adjusting this, it was his aim to steer a due medium between the two *extremes*,—*one* (into which the earlier Editors fell), that of placing *too many* stops; and the other (that of the recent Foreign Scholars) of employing *too few*. Thus (to descend to particulars) the *colon* has been frequently used, where the earlier Editors had employed the *period*; thereby, too often, breaking up the continuity of the discourse; which is above all things to be avoided, especially in the Epistles of St. Paul. It is, indeed, a no small deficiency in the system of Greek Punctuation, that it is unprovided with the *semicolon*. To lessen that want, the Editor has occasionally employed the *period* followed by a *small* (instead of a *capital*) letter, as answering to our *colon*; and the Greek colon, correspondently to our *semicolon*. The period followed by a *capital* he has employed for the purpose of marking the *semi-sections*. In the use of the *comma* he has, (after the example of all the recent foreign Scholars of eminence,) deviated still more from the early and ordinary mode of punctuation,—which, by loading a long sentence with commas, and needlessly breaking it up into minute portions, throws an obscurity over the whole passage, and accordingly tends rather to *impede* than to *aid* the understanding of the sense. The Editor, however, has very rarely introduced any material change of punctuation, except on the authority of one or more of the great Editors, from the time of Wetstein downwards; or sometimes that of Robert Stephens, in the rare and valuable Edition called the “*O mirificam*.” And in all cases he has been careful to adapt the *punctuation* to what, in the Notes, has been, he trusts on good grounds, shown to be the *true interpretation*.

The MARGINAL PARALLELS have been carefully examined, and some errors in figures have been discovered and corrected. Of these so called *Parallels*, derived from Curcellæus, the Editor has ventured to reject a few, which were by no means parallel. In the first three Gospels they have been all of them transferred from the outer Margin to the Notes, where they are printed in Italics, within brackets. The place they formerly occupied has been assigned to what, the Editor is persuaded, the reader will find *singularly useful*; and for which feature of the work he was indebted to the recent Foreign Edition of the New Testament, for Academi cal use, by PROF. VATER. Thus, in each of the first three Gospels, the

reader will find placed before him *at one view*, in *immediate juxtaposition*, references to all the portions of the other two, parallel, in subject and words, to any portion of the one under perusal. And where no such marginal parallels are found opposite to any portion, it may be presumed that that portion is *peculiar* to the Gospel in which it is contained.

To pass on to the TEXT itself, — it will be found, with a few exceptions, the same as in the preceding Edition; and with reason; — since the Editor's opinions, as to the origin and character of the Griesbachian text, are, after much further research, precisely the same as before. He is still firmly persuaded, that the most *ancient* MSS., of the Western and Alexandrian Family, do not present so pure a text, as that of some comparatively modern ones, of the Constantinopolitan Family; and represented, with few exceptions, in the invaluable EDITIO PRINCEPS, for which we are indebted to the munificence of CARDINAL XIMENES. In short, he has no doubt that the texts of the first mentioned MSS. were systematically *altered*, for various reasons, by the early Biblical Critics: thus exemplifying what Lord Bacon says (de Augm. Scient. i. 9.), that “the most corrected copies are commonly the least correct¹.” In deference, however, to the opinions of other scholars, the Editor has, in the present Edition, more frequently introduced the mark † expressive of doubt.

Of the ANNOTATIONS, *Critical and Exegetical*, the former, discussing the *true reading* of passages, will be found, in the present Edition, far more numerous; and several of those contained in the preceding, will in *this* be found enlarged, or in some respects, it is hoped, more or less *improved*, and not a few re-written. The same may be said of *another* class of notes closely connected in their nature with those, — namely, *Critical discussions on the Greek idioms*, especially respecting the Hellenistic dialect found in the Alexandrian and later writers, as compared with the phraseology of the earlier and purer authors. But the most extensive and important additions will be found, — where they were most needed, — in the EXEGETICAL notes. Now these, in the former Edition, were not so much in *continuity* as seemed desirable; there being too often a want of that *connecting thread* which *binds all together*. This, and occasionally the passing over of certain matters, which to some persons required elucidation, — or *others* which seemed too extensive to be treated of in a work

¹ On this important subject the Author refers his readers, for proofs and particulars, to the learned *Prolegomena* of PROF. SCHOLZ, to his Critical Edition of the New Testament with various readings, now in progress, and on the point of being completed, — the result of a quarter of a century's unwearied labours in collating MSS. in every part of Europe. A monument of diligence and erudition rarely surpassed, and by which he has laid the Christian world under greater obligations than any Critical Editor since the time of the illustrious WETSTEIN. See also the able and instructive *Prolegomena* to Bagster's Polyglott, by Professor Lee.

of this nature, — had almost entirely arisen from the Annotator's fear of overrunning the limits prescribed to the work. In the present Edition, these deficiencies have been studiously supplied, and the connexion and course of argument regularly traced; and no topics have been avoided merely from their extensiveness, — except such as respect matters of *Chronology* and the *Harmony* of the Gospels (on which he begs to refer his readers to the elaborate works of Dr. Hales, Mr. Townsend, and Mr. Greswell), or of *Biblical Antiquities*, on which he refers them to Mr. Horne's invaluable Introduction. The *general sense*, too, of a whole passage will in this be found far more frequently laid down than in the former Edition: a procedure agreeable to good taste and propriety. For since, by his Critical examination of the construction of a passage, and the import of words and phrases contained therein, the Commentator has, as it were, to *take it in pieces*, in order to point out the structure and import; so, by a neat *paraphrastic version*, conveying the *full sense*, he is enabled to put it together again, and present it as a *whole*. Moreover, a far greater number of *illustrations* of the phraseology or sense from the *Classical writers*, and likewise from Josephus and Philo Judæus, (for the most part *original*,) are now adduced: as also a still more regular series of *glossarial notes* on words or phrases involving any difficulty.

Another important feature of the present Edition is, that regular INTRODUCTIONS are given to *all* the Books of the New Testament; whereas, in the former Edition, there were only a *few*, (and those somewhat slight,) from about the middle of the second Volume. These Introductions are, indeed, some of them comparatively brief; but they will, in such a case, it is hoped, be found to comprehend the discussion of all points of any material importance. In drawing them up, the Author carefully *thought out* the subjects; and, occasionally, they will be found to contain views which had not occurred to former inquirers; and which may, it is hoped, contribute not a little to the settling of questions which have been long disputed; as, for instance, on the *sources of the first three Gospels*, — and on the *writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews*.

Finally, on the QUOTATIONS FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT a great deal *more* will be found accomplished in this than in the former Edition; though, at the same time, the Author is ready to admit that not a little still *remains* to be done, (and especially various minute *details* requiring a separate work, are necessary to be entered into,) in order to place in a clearer point of view the *amount of discrepancy* between the accounts in the New Testament and those of the Septuagint, or the Hebrew originals respectively; and, as founded thereupon, the best mode of *removing*, or of *accounting* for it.

In order to encounter successfully the difficulties which embarrass this subject, it is indispensably necessary to form correct notions, as to that most delicate perhaps of all points in exegetical science, — the *legitimate use and due extent of the principle of ACCOMMODATION*, so grievously misapplied by German Theologians in general; but on which the Editor can, with confidence, refer his readers, to p. 277, sq. of an excellent little work lately brought out by Prof. Turner, of New York; being a translation of Planck's Introduction to Sacred Philology and Interpretation, with many judicious Notes by the learned Translator. It has been recently reprinted in that very useful publication the *Biblical Cabinet*.

To advert to the *details* of enlargement in the Annotations, considerable additions and alterations will be found, more or less, on *all* the Books of the New Testament, but especially on the Gospel of St. Matthew, (on which the Annotatory matter, — which, from the plan of the work not being, at that early stage, sufficiently developed, was incomplete, — has been two-thirds of it re-written,) and the Epistles to the ROMANS, 1st and 2d CORINTHIANS, GALATIANS, EPHESIANS, and, above all, on the Epistle to the HEBREWS, where, even after the long-continued labours of that distinguished Biblical Critic (the Father of Exegetical science in the new world), PROF. STUART, not a little was still requisite to fully clear the sense of that most difficult composition. On the Gospels of St. *Mark* and St. *Luke* the fewest additions have been introduced, because there they were least requisite; the reader being supposed to regularly refer to the Notes on the parallel passages of St. *Matthew*. On St. *John's Gospel*, and on the *Acts of the Apostles*, they will be found very frequent; as also, more or less, on all the Epistles not before specified. The Editor is, indeed, not aware of *any* one passage of real difficulty, which has not received such an ample discussion, as may, to *most* inquirers, appear sufficient to enable them to ascertain the true sense. On certain portions, indeed, far *more* than ordinary labour has been bestowed; so as to almost entitle the Notes to the name of *Excurses*¹.

¹ As, for instance, at MATT. i. 1 and MARK i. 1, on the sources of the first three Gospels; viii. 28, on the readings Γεργεσηνῶν, Γαδαρηνῶν, and Γερασηνῶν, and the site of the ancient city of *Gergesha*; xii. 31, on the *Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost*; xiii. 1, on *Parables, and the parabolical mode of instruction*; xvi. 18, 19, on the power of the *Keys* delivered to Peter, and the foundation of the Christian Church; xx. 23, δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἕκαστος ἀντὶ πολλῶν; on the *Atonement and Universal Redemption*; xviii. 19, on *Christian Baptism*; MARK vii. 21; classification and distinct sense in enumeration of vices; ix. 44, ὅπου ὁ σκόληξ αὐτῶν οὐ τελευτᾷ, &c.; on the *eternal punishment of the wicked* x. 29, 30, οὐδεὶς ἔστιν ὃς ἀφῆκεν οἰκίαν — ζωὴν αἰώνιον; LUKE vii. 29, ἐδικαιώσαν; JOHN iii. 1 — 21, on our Lord's *Discourse with Nicodemus*; v. 2 — 5, on the *healing at the Pool of Bethesda*; ix. 1 — 11, on the *authenticity of the narration of the woman taken in adultery*; viii. 44, ὅτι ψεύστης ἔστιν καὶ ὁ πατήρ αὐτοῦ; x. 8, πάντες ὅσοι πρὸ ἑμοῦ ἦλθον κλέπται εἰσὶ καὶ ληστές, to show the persons meant, and why called κλ. κ. λ.; xxi. 18 — 23, on the *scope and exact sense, and on the authenticity of vv. 24, 25*; ACTS ii. 30, on the *authenticity of the words τὸ κατὰ σάρκα — Χριστόν*; vii. 1, on the

But, while the Editor has constantly exerted himself to clear up satisfactorily matters of a difficult and recondite nature, — he has been anxious to make himself understood by any attentive and tolerably well-informed reader. He has, accordingly, everywhere *simplified* what seemed unnecessarily recondite, and made perspicuous what had been left obscure; generally, where his aim at brevity had produced, as it often does, obscurity: he moreover sometimes corrected trifling misstatements arising from inadvertence, or too exclusive attention to matters of higher moment; for, as JOHNSON has observed, “he who is searching for rare and remote things, will neglect those which are obvious and familiar. Thus it happens that in things *difficult* there is danger from ignorance; and in things *easy*, from confidence or inadvertence.” Accordingly, while he was anxious to put forth his whole strength, where it was most called for, — on those numerous points, of great intricacy and doubt, “de quibus adhuc sub iudice lis est,” yet he has been, he trusts, never inattentive to minor matters.

The Editor has, also (agreeably to a very generally expressed wish), introduced far more of *original* matter than before; and, in all cases which involved any doubt or difficulty, given his own opinion on the subject in question. At the same time he has, for the most part, stated his *reasons*

nature and scope of the Apologetical Speech of Stephen. In the course of the chapter are considered and accounted for the discrepancies between St. Stephen and the writers of the Old Testament; x. 11, *πέσασαυ ἀρχαῖς δεδεμένον*; xi. 20, on the *reading* (namely, whether “Ἕλληνας or Ἑλλημιστάς) and the *interpretation*; xiii. 18, on the *reading* (namely, whether ἐτροφοφόρησεν or ἐτροποφόρησεν) and *sense*; xiii. 48, ἐπίστευσαυ ὅσα ἴσαν τεταγμένοι εἰς ζωὴν; xv. 20, ἀλισγημάτων καὶ τῆς πορνείας; xvi. 12, πρώτη — τῆς Μακ. πόλις; xvii. 23, on the inscription ἈΓΝΩΣΤΩ ΘΕΩ; xx. 23, τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ [Κυρίου καὶ] Θεοῦ (on the *reading*); xxii. 25, προτίεινευ αὐτὸν τοῖς ἱμασίν; xxvii. on the whole of this chapter much has been done, especially on the nautical terms — and the very difficult and disputed words, (v. 14.) Εὐροκλίδων, (v. 17.) βοηθείαις ἐχρ. ὑποζωννύντες τὸ πλοῖον. χαλ. τὸ σκεῶς and (v. 40.) τὸν ἀρτέμονα; ROMANS i. 17, δικαιοσύνη γὰρ Θεοῦ — πίστιν, *sense*; i. 29, sqq., on the *classification* and *distinct sense* of the various terms in this enumeration of vices; v. 15 — 19, οἱ πολλοὶ — πάντες; vi. 12, 13, on the *reading* and *sense*; viii. 19, ἡ ἀποκ. τῆς κρίσεως, &c. *sense*; ix. 5, δ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, *reading* and *sense*, 1 COR. vi. 2, οἱ ἄγιοι τὸν κόσμον κρινούσι; xi. 4, 5, xi. 10, ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους, *sense*; xii. & xiv., throughout, on the reality, *nature*, and *distinctive import* of the SPIRITUAL GIFTS; xv., throughout, especially on that portion which is read at our *Burial Service*, of which the scope and course of argument are especially examined in an *Introduction* to the chapter; 2 COR. i. 6, on the *reading* and *sense*; Gal. iii. 20, δ δὲ μεστὴς ἐνὸς οὐκ ἐστίν· δ δὲ Θεὸς εἷς ἐστίν, *true sense*; iv. 21, ἀτινά ἐστίν ἀλληγορούμενα; v. 19 — 21, on the *classification* and *distinct sense* in the enumeration of vices there; EPH. v. 16, ἐξαγοραζόμενοι τὸν καιρὸν, *sense*; PHIL. ii. 6, ὅς ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ — ἴσα Θεῷ, *sense* and *doctrine*; iii. 16, *reading* and *interpretation*; 2 THESS. ii. 3, sqq., on the *great Apostasy* and the *Man of Sin*; 1 TIM. iii. 15, 16, ἧτις ἐστίν ἐκκλησία — Θεὸς ἑφανερῶθῃ ἐν σοκί — ἐν δόξῃ, *reading*, *sense* and *doctrine*; 2 TIM. ii. 5, *distinct sense* of the terms in this enumeration of vices; HEB. viii., *Introduction*, in which the *Pauline origin* is evinced; ix. 1, τὸ τε Ἅγιον κοσμηκόν, *nature* and *sense* of κοσμ.; ix. 15 — 18, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο διαθήκης καινῆς μεστὴς ἐστίν, &c. — ὅτε ζῆ δὲ διατιθέμενος; x. 34, *reading* and *sense*; x. 38, δ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται· καὶ ἐὰν ὑποστειλῆται, &c., *true sense* and *doctrine*; 2 PET. i. 5 — 8, incl. ἐπιχορηγήσατε ἐν τῇ πίστει — τὴν ἀγάπην, on the *distinct sense* of the terms in this *series of virtues*, and on the scope of the whole; i. 19 — 21, καὶ ἔχομεν βεβαίωτερον τὸν προφητικὸν — ἰδίας ἐπιλοσεως οὐ γίνεται, *sense* of this dark passage.

for such: not meaning, however, to assume that he has always fixed on the *true* interpretation. Though, in cases where he has missed it, he has, he trusts, placed within the reader's power sufficient means for arriving at the truth. At any rate, he trusts he has materially facilitated the labours of *others*, — and, in the words of a great scholar, “*pontem struxerit aliis transitoris ad veriora* ¹.”

The difficulty, however, was, how to *introduce* this immense quantity of additional matter, without either increasing the number of volumes, or injuring, in some measure, the matter which already occupied them. This required all the advantages derived by the experience of more than ten years in carrying his various works through the press; but at length the object was so effectually attained, that the pages of the present Edition only exceed those of the former (with the exception of the additional prefatory matter, and the Indexes) by about 110 pages. The remainder was provided for, partly by filling the pages even fuller than before, — but chiefly, 1. by the *omission* of various remarks, which seemed sufficiently obvious to occur of themselves to any attentive reader, or concerning things which had been before explained. 2. By the careful *condensation* of all such of the matter retained, as admitted thereof; in doing which, the Author never hesitated to *re-write* an article, if he could thereby effect any very material condensation. This, indeed, was the more necessary, since he sometimes found it advisable to *sacrifice* room, by using *more* words than before; for clearness sake breaking up and separating matter, which had been thrown too much into masses. Of this, he trusts, the reader will find the advantage, in increased perspicuity, and greater ease of finding any exposition of a word or phrase, of which he may be in search. And this leads the Author to observe, that it will be found not the *least useful* feature of this new Edition, that INDEXES (both of Greek *words and phrases* explained, and of *matters* treated of in the Annotations) have been drawn up with the greatest care, so as to make them *practically* serviceable; and to which the reader is earnestly requested to recur, whenever he is in want of any explanation of a word or phrase, and does not find it in the Notes: since, in order to save room for more important purposes, the Editor has, in general, been content to give an explanation *only once*, and afterwards to leave it to

¹ The Author takes this opportunity of saying, that, wherever he has seen reason, on more mature consideration, to change his opinion respecting any matter in dispute (whether of *reading* or of *interpretation*) he has never dissembled such change, nor hesitated to alter what he had before written, or, if necessary, to re-write an article: for he felt (with Prof. Hey, Lect. Vol. i. p. 4.) that “since, from the *progressive* nature of mental acquirements, nothing is more probable than that we should, on repeated examination, discern truth where we had before not discovered it; so no one need be ashamed to retract an opinion, or acknowledge an error.” In short, in the quaint but expressive words of one of our great early Divines, “He that is overcome of the truth parteth victory with him that overcometh, and hath the best share for his part.”

be reverted to by the reader, either with a reference in the Notes, or (as such references would have occupied too much room) *without* it, when it might readily be found by the aid of the Indexes.

Thus much may suffice to point out the *nature* and *extent* of the various additions and alterations in the work now again submitted by the Author to the candour of the Public: and he trusts they will be found such as to render his labours not unworthy of a *continuance* of that approbation, which they have hitherto experienced. One thing he can with truth say, that he has diligently exerted himself to *merit* it. Whatever may be found imperfect, is not so for want of care, but (as SAMUEL JOHNSON says) “because care will not always be successful; and recollection or information come too late for use.” And although he cannot hope, that in a work of such great extent, and so multifarious in its matter, he has entirely avoided mistakes; yet, he can with truth say, that it has been his anxious study to *mislead* no one, but ὀρθοσπομεῖν τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας¹.

Much, it is true, of what has been accomplished in this second Edition, *might* have been effected in the *first*. But that was rendered impracticable, by the very great disadvantages, difficulties, and hindrances (including ill-health), under which it was formed; and the too short space of time allowed (from certain peculiar circumstances, not necessary to be here adverted to) for its completion. Above all, it was the Author's *great misfortune*, that his Biblical labours should, in this work as well as in his RE-CENSIO SYNOPTICA (as also in his Translation and Edition of THUCYDIDES), have been carried on in a situation as unfavourable as can well be imagined; — one of the obscurest nooks in the kingdom², (which his old friend, the late Dr. SAMUEL PARR, used to call the *Ultima Thule*; “quæ a cultu atque humanitate civitatis longissimè abest,”) at 112 miles distance from the Metropolis, and consequently exposed to perpetual delays and disappointments

¹ Accordingly he has endeavoured to keep his mind free from any *party* bias, and has aimed at preserving the *strictest impartiality* in adjusting the interpretation of those passages which involve doctrines, whereon any difference of opinion subsists among the various denominations of professing Christians. At any rate, he has studiously avoided treating on any such passage *polemically*, or *controversially*. So far, indeed, from aggravating the bitterness of the *odium Theologicum*, that *party-spirit* in Religion, which (in the words of the excellent Dr. Hutcheson) “seeks to cantonize men into sects, for trifling causes,” he would rather sound an *Irenicum* to his Ministerial brethren of every denomination, and warn them against *renting the seamless vest of Christ*, their common Lord and Master. Earnestly would he entreat them not to “fall out by the way,” but to “agree to differ;” “in id unum intenti,” (to use the words of the learned and pious Lampe) “ut, junctis manibus et animis, fissuras Zionis, nimum quantum patentēs, compingerent:” ever remembering the maxim of a great ancient Father, “In rebus necessariis *unitas*, in dubiis *libertas*, in omnibus *CARITAS*.” “If any man,” says one of the greatest ornaments of our own Church, “differs from me in opinion, I am not troubled at it; but tell him that truth is in the understanding, and charity is in the will; and is, or ought to be, there before either his or my opinion on those matters can enter; and therefore that we ought to *love* alike, though we do not *understand* alike.” (Jer. Taylor.)

² Tugby, in Leicestershire.

in communicating with the Press, and where only *one* *Revise* was practicable. In this *most ungenial* spot (fit only to be a sort of *ergastulum literarium*), it was impossible for him to hold any communication with learned or enlightened society; or to have access to libraries. And though he had expended, in a manner, a *fortune*, in the formation of a very extensive collection, provided with most of the best works in Classical and Biblical literature, — yet many still remained, which, however requisite, were beyond his power *at once* to procure. These were, — as the Author found opportunity and means, — sought out and procured for the use of the second Edition.

The Editor cannot conclude without expressing his sense of the handsome treatment which his work has received at the hands of the Reviewers in the Critical Journals, both in the Established Church and *out* of it — among professing Christians of various denominations, the most widely separated — especially those very respectable Journals, the *ECLECTIC REVIEW* and the *CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER*. He begs to return his best thanks for the suggestions offered by his learned Reviewers in *general*, for the improvement of the work in a second Edition; and he trusts they will be found *all* of them to have been attended to. He will be happy to receive any *further* suggestions, or remarks, either from them or others, especially Ministers¹: nor will even the strictures of any who may, in the spirit of candour, point out errors, be otherwise than thankfully received. In the words of the illustrious Grotius, “*non illi promptius me monebunt errantem, quam ego monentes sequar.*”

The Author has only to add, that having fairly *done his best*, he commits his work to the candour of the Public, with some confidence, — at least from the consciousness of having *endeavoured well*: and, though he shrinks not from any fair or candid criticism, — yet it might disarm the ruthlessness of even a thorough-paced Critic, if he could know the *extent* of the difficulties, of all sorts, with which the Author had continually to struggle, in his progress through this work. In the prosecution of which he has not only had constantly upon him the charge of two Parishes (and thus was continually obliged to carry forward his labours *ἐν παρόργῳ*²), but has suffered under the continual pressure of those carking cares, that drag down the mind to earth, necessarily involved in scanty, precarious, and continually decreasing resources. The Author is induced (*most unwillingly*) thus to allude to matters of private and personal concern — as feeling it due to the purchasers of the work in its *first* Edition, to give

¹ Who may communicate them to the Author through the medium of Messrs. Rivington.

² And yet in the words of the great Grecian Historian, οὐκ ἐνδέχεται ὅταν τέχνη, ἐκ παρήργου μελετᾶσθαι· ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον μηδὲν ἐκείνῳ πάρεργον ἄλλο γίγνεσθαι. — Thucydides, L. 1.

this explanation of the causes (beyond his control) which occasioned what, under other circumstances, might have seemed strange and difficult to be accounted for. It is true that the same, — nay even *greater* — difficulties impeded the Author in his labours on this *second* Edition: but what may not the *labor improbus* of several years, under Divine blessing, accomplish? And, in fact, when great literary undertakings are to be carried forward, under signal disadvantages, — whatever *is* accomplished cannot be done *at once*; but only *by stages*, just as the labourer may, after some breathing-time, gain fresh vigour to work withal; and as the cares necessary to provide for the passing day, may give him opportunity to *employ* it. In truth, the Author was resolved to put forth his whole strength, while he had yet the *power* to make the performance what it ought to be. He was anxious to “work while it was yet day,” — aware that “the night” could not be far off “when no man can work.” Should he, however, be spared to *complete*, what he has further ventured, in subservience to the Divine will, to mark out as the *extent* of his labours in the service of the Sanctuary, — he shall, he hopes, be ready, under Divine Grace, to deliver up an account of “that which hath been committed to his trust;” content, under *all* circumstances, that “*his cause is with the Lord, and his work with his GOD.*” Nor can he dismiss the present performance, without expressing a deeply thankful sense of the Gracious Aid and support from above, which have been mercifully vouchsafed him during his long and anxious labours thereon. And he desires to offer up his fervent prayers to “the Father of lights,” that it may be blessed to the right understanding of those Holy Scriptures, which are alone “able to make us wise unto salvation,” “through FAITH, which is in CHRIST JESUS.”

EXPLANATION OF CHARACTERS

USED IN THE WORK. (See Preface, p. xii.)

* denotes an altered reading.

‡ a reading thought to need alteration.

[] a reading considered, with *some* probability, as an interpolation.

[] a reading *most probably*, or *certainly*, an interpolation.

† a reading, probably a corruption of the Text, though the MSS. offer no variation of reading, nor the means of emendation.

The small type in the Text is used to denote that the word or words are not found in the *common* Text; but have been *inserted* on competent authority.

ΤΟ ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΤΘΑΙΟΝ

ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ.

- 1 I. ^a ΒΙΒΛΙΟΣ γενέσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, υἱοῦ Δαυὶδ, υἱοῦ Ἀβραάμ. a Luke 3. 23, &c.
 2 ^b Ἀβραάμ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰσαάκ· Ἰσαάκ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰακώβ· Ἰακώβ Acts 13. 23. b Gen. 21. 2. et 25. 24. et 29. 35.

C. I. This is almost universally acknowledged to have been the first written of the Gospels; but the exact time when, is a question which has been long agitated, and not yet determined. It has been assigned to various years, from A. D. 37 or 38, to 63 or 64, but the arguments in favor of an *early* date, I apprehend, greatly preponderate. These are founded, 1. on *external testimony*; 2. on *internal evidence*. As to the former, the *testimony of antiquity* has considerable weight. But that is decidedly in favor of an *early* date. In fact, the passage of Irenæus Adv. Hæres. iii. 1. (cited by Euseb. Eccl. Hist. v. 8.), is the *only* testimony of antiquity in favor of a *late* date; and that is not decisive, since the language is so vague, that the maintainers of the *contrary* hypothesis understand it in a sense by no means unfavorable to their view. And, considering that we have no certain information as to where Peter abode from A. D. 46 to 63, the arguments depending upon *implication* are inconclusive; and probably the good Father did not intend to speak with historical exactness. At all events, whatever weight may be assigned to that passage, it is overbalanced by the testimony of Eusebius, Eccl. v. 24. where it is strongly implied, that Matthew wrote his Gospel *very early*. Which, indeed, is confirmed by Eusebius' own *positive testimony* in his *Chronicum*; where he assigns the 3d year of the reign of Caligula, i. e. A. D. 41. (8 years after Christ's ascension), as the period when Matthew published his Gospel. And this is confirmed by the suffrages of Chrys., Euthym., and Theophylact. *Internal evidence* also preponderates in favor of an *early* date. For while the arguments for a *late* date are rather specious than solid, those for an *early* one are, for the most part, exceedingly cogent. The principal one (probably outweighing *all* on the other side) is, that it is not probable the followers of Christ should have been left, for nearly 30 years after his ascension, without a written history of his ministry.

This question is closely connected with *another*,
 VOL. I.

and more important one,—namely, as to the *language* in which this Gospel was written; some contending that it was in the *Hebrew* of St. Matthew's time (i. e. Syro-Chaldee); others, in *Greek*. Now here, while the *internal evidence* seems to be equal on both sides, the *external*, as resting on the testimony of antiquity, is decidedly in favor of a *Hebrew* original. Besides the passages of Papias and Origen, cited by Eusebius, those of Eusebius and Irenæus, above referred to (as also Euseb. Eccl. Hist. v. 10.), bear the strongest testimony thereto. Yet as they are both of them, I apprehend, in a corrupt state, I will cite them for the purpose of emendation. The first is L. v. 8. where, according to all our copies, the words are: ὁ μὲν δὴ Ματθαῖος ἐν τοῖς Ἑβραίοις τῆ ἰδίᾳ αὐτῶν διαλέκτῳ καὶ γραφῆν ἐξέτεγεν εὐαγγέλιον, τοῦ Πέτρου καὶ τοῦ Παύλου ἐν Ῥώμῃ εὐαγγελιζομένου, καὶ θεμελιούντων τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν. But the use of *καὶ* there is unprecedented, and will by no means bear the sense assigned by Dr. Hales. And *γραφῆν* is not to be endured. For who ever heard of such a phrase as “published a *scripture* of the Gospel”? The passage stands not in need, as Dr. Hales imagined, of “critical translation,” but critical *emendation*. I would cancel the *καὶ*, and read *γραφῆν*, and *εὐαγγέλιον*. The mistake originated thus: The *N* arose from the *E* following; and the *καὶ* arose from this being noted as a var. lect. in the margin; for the *Ϡ* for *γράφεται* and the *Ϡ* are often interchanged. The above emendation is placed beyond doubt by the other passage at iii. 24, where *γραφῆν παραδούς τὸ εὐαγγ.* exactly answers to *γραφῆν ἐξέτεγεν εὐαγγέλιον*. But, in the latter part of the passage, there is evidently a corruption; for the sense assigned by Reading and Dr. Hales, cannot be elicited from the words without exceedingly straining the sense of *παρουσία*. Rather than do which, I would prefer supposing the true reading to be *απουσία* (and render *τῆ αὐτοῦ ἀπ.*, ‘by his departure’). The

c Gen. 38.
27, &c.
1 Chr. 2. 5, 9.

δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰούδαν καὶ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοῦ. ὁ Ἰούδας δὲ ἐγέν- 3
νησε τὸν Φαριῶν καὶ τὸν Ζαυρὸν ἐκ τῆς Θαμίμ' Φαριῶν δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν

words *παρουσία* and *ἀπουσία* are not unfrequently confounded; on which see Wesseling on Diod. Sic. Vol. ii. 274.

But to return, it is not too much to say, that the existence of a Hebrew original was held by the Fathers almost unanimously. And when Dr. Burton affirms that "no ancient writer can be proved to have *seen* the document in question," he demands such a proof of its existence as, from the very nature of the case, it is unreasonable to ask; for as the *Hebrew* original must, after the dispersion of the Jews, and from the universal prevalence of the Greek language, have soon become almost *useless*; so, at an early period it would become obsolete, or be only partially retained, as forming the basis of the very early *fabrications* (adapted to the taste of the judaizing Christians), the *Gospel of the Ebionites*, the *Gospel of the Nazarenes*, and the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, cited by Origen, Epiphanius, and Jerome. It is quite enough to prove the existence of the document *as long as it was in use*, on the testimony of writers who, though they could not have *seen*, what was then *lost*, were well able to weigh the evidence of its *former* actual existence. But while the existence of the Gospel in Hebrew may be considered as resting on such a strong foundation, that it can scarcely be rejected without impairing the credit of all ancient testimony; it must not be denied, that arguments scarcely less cogent are adduced in favor of our present *Greek* Gospel; which has many internal marks of being an *original* writing; for otherwise how can we account for the interpretation of Hebrew names — the citation of the parallel passages of the O. T. not from the *Hebrew*, but from the *Sept.* — and for the versions being all adapted so closely to the *Greek*? Add to this, that Eusebius, and the other Fathers of his time, evidently consider the Greek Gospel as an *original*: not to mention numerous instances of verbal agreement between Matthew and the other Evangelists, which, on the supposition of a *Hebrew* original, are hard to be accounted for. After all, however, the main point (as Dr. Hales observes) is, whether the present Greek Gospel is entitled to the *authority* of an original, or not. This, I apprehend, can be shown beyond all dispute. But that will not at all invalidate the former existence of a *Hebrew* original, which is demanded by the evidence of antiquity, and is in itself very probable; for a *Hebrew* Gospel must, in the first age of Christianity (when almost confined to *Judæa*), have been as requisite as a *Greek* one was afterwards. And there is in the book itself, even in its present state, internal testimony of its being written, at first, especially for the use of the *Jewish* nation; since those circumstances are particularly dwelt on, which were adapted to establish the faith of such as believed, and to sway the minds of those who were disbelievers in the Divine mission of Jesus Christ. And in vain is it to seek to impugn the existence of the Gospel in Hebrew, by urging, as is done, that the Gospel, as we now have it, bears no marks of being a *translation*, but has every appearance of being an *original*. For surely it has far more marks of being a translation, and has far less of the air of an original than *Josephus's History of the Jewish War*, which is confessedly a translation from a *Hebrew* original. Yet the circumstances under

which the Greek both of Josephus and St. Matthew's Gospel were respectively brought out, are such as not to warrant us in regarding either one or the other, as strictly speaking, a *translation*. There is, indeed, reason to think that Josephus made considerable *alterations* in his work, when he brought it out for the use of the *Greeks and Romans*. And there is not less reason to suppose that St. Matthew made *some* alterations; especially in the interpretation of Hebrew names, and in the adaptation of the quotations from the O. T. to the *Sept.* version. And as to the ancient versions being all formed from the *Greek* Gospel, that will not invalidate the existence of a *Hebrew* edition (so to speak), for it is admitted by all, that the *Hebrew* Gospel had become obsolete, before even the earliest of the versions was formed.

In short, all the difficulties which have so long embarrassed this question will vanish; and every thing which seems at first sight strange, be accounted for, by supposing (as Whitby, Benson, and Hales have done), that there were two *originals* (or rather, I should say, two *editions*), one in Hebrew and the other in Greek; but both written by St. Matthew. I cannot, however, agree with those eminent men in fixing the date of the Greek edition to so late a period as they do — 58, 60, or even 64. The true date seems to be that assigned by Eusebius, in his *Chronicum*, — namely, A. D. 41; probably not long after St. Matthew had departed from Judæa to evangelize the Gentile nations. This necessarily carries back the publishing of the *Hebrew* edition to some period not a little anterior to that date. And when we consider how necessary it was that Christians should *not long* be left without any authentic history of our Saviour's ministry, we shall not, I think, err in assigning the date of the *Hebrew* edition to A. D. 37 or 38, four or five years after Christ's ascension.

With respect to the *authenticity* of this Gospel, it is established by the most irrefragable evidence, in a long and unbroken chain of writers citing or alluding to various parts of it, from St. Barnabas downwards, to the time of Theophylact and Photius. And as to the genuineness of the *two first chapters*, which has been recently called in question by the Unitarians, that too has been established most triumphantly; these two chapters being cited or alluded to perhaps *more than the rest*. And, besides the harshness of supposing the Gospel to commence with two words evidently pointing to something that preceded, *ἰν δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐξελθείας* (and which we find at Chap. ii.), and the fact, that there are *other* passages which evidently refer to passages in those chapters; not to say, that the want of a *genealogy* in a work, written at first especially for Jewish Christians, would be a *great deficiency*, we may defy the Unitarians to produce any *unmutilated* MS. or ancient version (though the Peschito Syriac and the Italic Vulgate carry us back to a period nearly coeval with the formation of the canon of the N. T.) which is without those chapters. As to the *separation* of the genealogy, i. 1 — 18. in some Latin MSS., that by no means implies the *spuriousness* of even the portion in question. And although one very modern Greek MS. (the Cod. Ebner.) is without the genealogy, yet that was doubtless owing to the genealogy being, in the

4 Ἐσράμ. Ἐσράμ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἀράμ. ὁ Ἀράμ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἀμινυδάβ. Ἀμινυδάβ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ναυσσών. Ναυσσών δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Σαλιών. ὁ Σαλιών δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Βοῶζ ἐκ τῆς Ραχάβ. Βοῶζ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ὠβήδ ἐκ τῆς Ρούθ. Ὠβήδ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰεσσαί. Ἰεσσαί δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Δαυὶδ τὸν βασιλέα. Δαυὶδ δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐγέννησε τὸν Σολομῶνα ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Οὐρίου. ὁ Σολομών δὲ

d Numb. 7. 12.
1 Chr. 2. 10.
e Ruth. 4. 17.
1 Chr. 2. 10, 11, 12.
f 1 Sam. 16. 1. & 17. 12.
2 Sam. 12. 24.
g 1 Kings 11. 43. & 14. 31. & 15. 3.
1 Chr. 3. 10.
2 Chr. 14. 1.

archetype, separated from the rest, and negligent-ly passed over by the scribe.

Against this mass of *positive evidence* for the genuineness of these chapters, Unitarians, indeed, oppose a show of arguments, partly external and partly internal. But these have been triumphantly refuted by Mosheim, Bishop Horsley, Abps. Magee and Laurence, Dr. Pye Smith, and others.

With respect to the *title* of this Gospel, *Εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Ματθαίου*, the word *εὐαγγέλιον* (from *εὖ* and *ἀγγεῖλιον*) in the *Classical* writers, signifies, in general, *good news*, sometimes the *reicard* given to the bearer of it. In the *Septuagint* and the *New Testament* it almost always has the former signification, corresponding to the Heb. *בשורה*. In the *New Testament* it specially imports the good tidings of the Messiah's Advent, who should deliver man from sin and death, through his merits and intercession; and of the foundation of that spiritual and eternal kingdom predicted in the Prophets, and fulfilled by the incarnation of Jesus Christ. Hence the term at length became merely a name for the *dispensation*; or (as in the Ecclesiastical writers), by metonymy, the *History* of the circumstances which accompanied the promulgation of that dispensation. Our English word *Gospel*, from the Saxon *God* (good), and *spel* (news), well expresses the force of the Greek *εὐαγγέλιον*. The *κατὰ* must not be rendered *secundum*, according to; for (by an idiom found in the later Greek writers), *κατὰ* with the Accusative, has simply the force of a Genitive, i. e. *τοῦ Ματθαίου*.

V. 1. *βιβλος γενέσεως*.] Some suppose an ellipsis of *ἰδ' ἐστὶ*. (See Mark i. 1.) But that is not necessary, *βιβλος*, like the Heb. *ספר*, denotes any sort of writing, whether long or short. See Mark x. 4.

This verse forms a preface to chap. i. and a title to the *genealogy* contained in the first sixteen verses; for *βιβλος* (like the Hebrew *ספר*), denotes a roll or writing, whether long or short. See Taylor's *Calmet v. Book*.

On the following *genealogy* not a few difficulties exist; 1. As to discrepancies from the Old Testament history in names, which might easily arise from errors in *transcription*, especially as some of the names bear a great similarity, and it was not unusual for the same person to have more than one name. 2. As to the *reconciling* this genealogy with that of St. Luke; which is best done by supposing that St. *Matthew* gives the genealogy of *Joseph*; and St. *Luke* that of *Mary*. And therefore the former (who wrote principally for the *Jews*) traces the pedigree from Abraham to David; and so, through Solomon's line, to Joseph, the *legal* father of Jesus. And it must be remembered that, among the *Jews*, legal descent was always reckoned in the *male* line. While St. *Luke*, who wrote for the *Gentiles*, traces the pedigree upwards from Heli, the father of *Mary*, to David and Abraham, and thence to Adam, the

common father of all mankind. Finally, whatever difficulties, even after all the diligence of learned inquirers, shall exist on certain matters connected with this genealogy, we may rest assured, that if these genealogies of Christ, which must be understood to have been derived from the public records in the temple, had not been agreeable thereto, the deception would have been instantly detected. And thus, whether Christ's pedigree be traced through the line of *Joseph* or of *Mary*, it was undeniable that Jesus was descended from David and Abraham; agreeably to the ancient promises and prophecies, that the Messiah should be of their seed.

— *Δαυίδ*.] So Matthæi, Griesb. Knapp. Vater, Fritz, and Scholz edit., here and elsewhere, with the almost universal consent of the MSS. for *Δαβίδ*.

— *νιού* Ἀβραάμ.] *νιού* is for *ἀπογόνου*, after the custom of the Hebrew, in which the correspondent word signifies *any lineal descendant*, however far removed: the idiom, however, is also found in Homer. Thus the general sense is "a descendant of David and Abraham;" which is what the Evangelist now proceeds to prove. That the Jews expected the Messiah to be such, is clear from Matt. xii. 23. xxi. 9. and xxii. 44. David is mentioned first, as being nearer in time to their age.

2. *ἐγέννησε*.] The repetition of this word throughout the genealogy is said to be Hebrew. But it is common to all languages in *genealogies*, which, like law writings, must be very particular and plain, and therefore cannot but deal much in repetition.

— *καὶ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοῦ*.] Why these should be mentioned, though not the Messiah's progenitors, various reasons have been alleged (see Lightfoot, Whitby, and Wetst.), which, however, need not be anxiously debated, since there is every reason to regard the genealogy as no more than a transcript from the public registers.

3. τὸν Φαοῖς καὶ τ. Ζ.] Both are mentioned as being twin brothers, and striving for primogeniture, and also to identify Phares.

5. *Ραχάβ*.] It has been debated, whether this was the harlot of Jericho, mentioned at Josh. ii. 1. and whose faith is so commended at Heb. xi. 31, or some other person of the same name. Theophyl. of the ancient, and many modern commentators, are of the latter opinion. See Lightfoot and Whitby.

6. *Σολομῶνα*.] So almost all the editions from Wets. downwards, on the authority of the best MSS. The common reading, *Σολομῶντα*, is equally agreeable to propriety (as in *Ξενοφῶν*), but it is deficient in MS. authority.

— *ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Οὐρίου*.] The commentators suppose an ellipse of *γυναϊκὸς* and of *ποιέ*. The former may be admitted, but the latter is not, properly speaking, an ellipse at all; but merely an instance of the suppression of something supposed to be well known to the person addressed.

ἐγέννησε τὸν Ῥοβοάμ. Ῥοβοάμ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἀβιά· Ἀβιά δὲ ἐγέν-
 ησε τὸν Ἀσά. ἠ^h Ἀσά δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰωσαφάτ· Ἰωσαφάτ δὲ ἐγέν- 8
 ησε τὸν Ἰωράμ. Ἰωράμ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ὀζίαν· ἰ¹ Ὀζίας δὲ ἐγέννησε 9
 τὸν Ἰωάθαμ. Ἰωάθαμ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἀχαζ· Ἀχαζ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν
 Ἐζεκίαν. κ² Ἐζεκίας δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Μανασσῆ· Μανασσῆ δὲ ἐγέν- 10
 ησε τὸν Ἀμών. Ἀμών δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰωσίαν· ἰ¹ Ἰωσίας δὲ ἐγέννησε 11
 τὸν Ἰερονίαν καὶ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοῦ, ἐπὶ τῆς μετοικεσίας Βαβυλῶνος.
 μ^m Μετὰ δὲ τὴν μετοικεσίαν Βαβυλῶνος, Ἰερονίας ἐγέννησε τὸν Σαλαθιήλ. 12
 Σαλαθιήλ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ζοροβάβελ· Ζοροβάβελ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἀβι- 13
 οὐδ· Ἀβιοὺδ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἐλιακίμ· Ἐλιακίμ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἀζώρ.
 Ἀζώρ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Σαδώκ· Σαδώκ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἀχείμ· Ἀχείμ 14
 δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἐλιοῦδ· Ἐλιοῦδ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἐλεάζαρ· Ἐλεάζαρ 15
 δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ματθάν· Ματθάν δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰακώβ· Ἰακώβ 16
 δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰωσήφ τὸν ἄνδρα Μαρίας, ἐξ ἧς ἐγεννήθη ἸΗΣΟΥΣ
 ὁ λεγόμενος Χριστός.

Πῦσαι οὖν αἱ γενεαὶ ἀπὸ Ἀβραάμ ἕως Δαυὶδ, γενεαὶ δεκατέσσαρες· 17
 καὶ ἀπὸ Δαυὶδ ἕως τῆς μετοικεσίας Βαβυλῶνος, γενεαὶ δεκατέσσαρες·
 καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς μετοικεσίας Βαβυλῶνος ἕως τοῦ Χριστοῦ, γενεαὶ δεκα-
 τέσσαρες.

n Luke 1.
27, 34, 35.

ἢ ΤΟΤ' δὲ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἡ γέννησις οὕτως ἦν. μνηστευθείσης γὰρ 18
 τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ Μαρίας τῷ Ἰωσήφ, πρὶν ἢ συνελθεῖν αὐτοὺς, ἐβρέθη

8. Ἰ. ἐγένν. τὸν Ὀζίαν.] Ἐγένν. must here be taken in an extended sense, founded on the Jewish custom, by which the children of children were reputed the children not only of their immediate parents, but of their ancestors; who are said to have begotten those removed several generations from them (see Is. xxxix. 7); for, by an omission not uncommon in Jewish genealogies, three kings are here omitted—Uzziah being the great-grandson of Joram. The most probable reason for this omission is the curse denounced against the idolatry of the house of Ahab, to which those princes belonged.

11. ἐπὶ τῆς μετοικ.] Ἐπὶ in this use signifies *about*, i. e. a little over or under, an idiom also found in the Latin *circa* and *sub*. Μετοικεσία, *transmigration*, is an Hellenistic word applied, *quasi per meosin*, to denote the removal of the Jews from their own country to Babylonia (see 2 Kings xviii. 32), and correspondent to a Hebrew word which expressed the full force of the thing by *captivity*.

12. μετὰ τὴν μετοικ.] Some (as Kuinoel) render it “at the time of the transmigration.” But the common signification *after* may very well be retained; indeed Fritzsche denies that μετὰ has ever any other. And at Joseph. Ant. I. 12. 2. εἰθύς μετ' ὀγδόην ἡμέραν περιτέμνουσι he translates *exacta die octava*. Although of the ancestors of Jesus in this and the following verses, no mention is made in the O. T., yet this does not derogate from the authority of what is here recorded.

16. ὁ λεγόμενος] “who is known by the name of,” or “is accounted and is Christ.” This idiom is not confined to Hellenistic, but is also found in Classical Greek, at least in the kindred term *πεκλήσθαι*, which is, however, almost confined to the Poets. So Hom. II. B. 260.

—Ἰησοῦς] from the Hebrew יֵשׁוּעַ, a Saviour; a title applied by the Jews, as σωτήρ was by the Greeks, to any public benefactor, and applied to the Messiah *κατ' ἔξοχην*. Χριστός is properly an appellative, derived from the Hebrew: *מָשִׁיחַ* signifying *anointed*, and employed with allusion to the regal, sacerdotal, and prophetic offices; since kings, priests, and prophets, among the Jews, were inaugurated into their respective offices by anointing. But, at length, by frequent application to one individual only, it came to supply the place of a proper name, and thus needed not the article.

17. γενεαί.] This use of *γενεαί*, to denote a succession of persons one after another, is found not only in the Old Testament, but in the best Classical writers.

—δεκατέσσαρες.] The Jews were accustomed to divide their genealogical reckonings into classes, doubtless to aid the memory. Here, however, the classification is important, since in each class a change is denoted.

18. οὕτως] “in the manner following.” Thus the Classical writers perpetually use adjectives and adverbs of a similar sense.

—μνηστευθείσης γὰρ.] Said to be Genit. absol. for Nomin. with verb. But that is unnecessary; and the force of the Gen. absol. notes time more exactly. This use of *γὰρ* in the sense *nampe*, or *scilicet*, at the beginning of a narration, is frequent in the Classical writers, and may be said to be both inchoative and explanatory. See Hoogev. Part. p. 100. 8.

—πρὶν ἢ συνελθεῖν.] On the use of *πρὶν ἢ* with an Infin., for *πρὶν* (said to be middle Attic,) see Viger. p. 442, and Buttman, G. G. p. 265. (Engl. Transl.) It seems to have arisen from *πρὶν* including a sort of indirect *comparison*. Συνελθ. is by some taken to mean removal to the

19 ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα ἐκ Πνεύματος ἁγίου. Ὁ Ἰωσήφ δὲ ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς, ο Deut. 24. 1.
 δίκαιος ὢν, καὶ μὴ θέλων αὐτὴν παραδειγματίσαι, ἐβουλήθη λάθρα
 20 ἀπολύσαι αὐτήν. ταῦτα δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐνθυμηθέντος, ἰδοὺ, ἄγγελος Κυρίου
 κατ' ὄναρ ἐφάνη αὐτῷ λέγων· Ἰωσήφ υἱὸς Δαυὶδ, μὴ φοβηθῆς πα-
 ραλαβεῖν Μαριάμ τὴν γυναικί σου· τὸ γὰρ ἐν αὐτῇ γεννηθὲν ἐκ
 21 Πνεύματος ἑστίν ἁγίου. ῥ τέξεται δὲ υἱόν, καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ
 Ἰησοῦν· αὐτὸς γὰρ σώσει τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν. p Luke 1. 31.
 & 2. 21. Acts 1.
 12. & 10. 43. &
 13. 38, 39.

husband's house; by others, sexual intercourse, by an ellipsis of εἰς εὐνήν, suppressed *verecundie gratiâ*. The latter is perhaps the better founded interpretation, as being more agreeable to the context, and supported by numerous Classical examples adduced by the Philological Commentators. The difference between this and the Classical use is, that in the latter a *Dative* almost always follows.

— ἐπιόθη ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα.] Sub. βοῆφος, or ζυβουον. Examples both of the elliptical and plenary phrase are adduced by the Philological Commentators. Εἰς. ἔχ. is almost universally taken for ἔν γαστρὶ, i. e. εἰχε. And ἐπιόθεσθαι is, indeed, sometimes so used by the Classical writers. Yet so to take it here would enervate the sense. The ancients (as it appears from Euthymius) took the word, in its full force, for ἐγάνη, or ἐμπαγὴς ἐγένετο. Nay, there may be (as Harenberg thinks) a reference to that examination by midwives, which in such a case was usual with the Jews. But there rather seems an allusion to Joseph's discovery of her pregnancy; probably on her return from her visit of three months to Elizabeth.

— ἐκ Πνεύματος ἁγίου.] Bp. Middleton has here an excellent Note, in which he fully exposes Wakefield's mistranslation of the phrase, "by a holy Spirit," and concludes with giving the following admirable summary of the various senses of the important term πνεῦμα. There are six meanings — 1. *Breath*, or wind; in which sense it rarely occurs: Matt. xxvii. 50. John iii. 8. Rev. xiii. 15. — 2. *The intellectual or spiritual part of man*, as distinguished from σῶμα; his carnal part. — 3. *Spirit*, as abstracted from body or matter; whence is deduced the idea of *immaterial agents*. Compare Luke xxiv. 34. John iv. 24. Acts xxiii. 9. The πνεύματα of the demons belong to this head. — 4. *The Spirit*, κατ' ἔσοχόν; i. e. the Third Person in the Trinity; in which acceptance, except in anomalous cases like the present, it is never used without the article. It may be observed, however, that in all the passages where *personal acts* are attributed to the πνεῦμα ἁγίου, and which are, therefore, adduced to prove the personality of the Holy Spirit, the article is invariably prefixed. See Matt. xxviii. 19. Mark i. 10. Luke iii. 22. John i. 31. Acts i. 16. xx. 23. — 5. *The influence*, not the *Person* of the Spirit; in which sense, except in cases of reference, or renewed mention, the article never appears. — 6. *The effects of the Spirit*.

19. δίκαιος.] This is by some ancients and many moderns explained in the sense *merciful, lenient*; as we say a *worthy good man*. And so the Heb. דַּיָּק and the Latin *aquus*, as the Commentators have proved by many examples. It is not, however, necessary to resort to this idiom here; since the usual acceptance is not less apposite, as denoting a *lover of justice*, and a *man of uprightness and integrity*. Being such, he deter-

mined to put her away by law; and yet, with that mercy which ever accompanies true justice, he wished not to make her a *public* example, but to put her away privately; i. e. with only the two witnesses required to attest the delivery of the bill of divorce; which did not necessarily state the *reason* for the divorce.

— παραδειγματίσαι.] This word, found only in the Sept. and the later Greek writers, properly signifies to bring into public notice; but, in use, it is generally employed in *malam partem*, to denote *exposure to public ignominy*.

— ἐβουλήθη.] This denotes, not *will*, or *counsel*, as it is rendered; but inclination of will. See Fritzsche. Ἀπολύσαι, to divorce; as in Matt. v. 31, and 32. Mark x. 4. Luke xvi. 18, and the Heb. הִרְחַץ in Jerem. iii. 3.

— λάθρα, privately; inasmuch as that permitted the suppression of the *cause*.

20. ἐνθυμηθέντος.] The word is here used in its *primitive* signification, which is, to turn any thing in mind, to reflect, meditate.

— ἰδοὺ.] This, like the Heb. הִנֵּה, and Latin *ecce*, is often employed, as here, to prepare the reader or hearer for something unexpected and wonderful. It is rare in the Classical writers; but an example occurs in Eurip. Herc. Fur. 1066.

— ἄγγελος Κυρ.] Camp. and Middlet. observe, that ἄγγελος is used both as an appellative, denoting *office*, (to be rendered *messenger*) and as the title of a particular class of beings; when it becomes almost a proper name, and should be rendered *Angel*.

— κατ' ὄναρ.] In the times of patriarchism, as well as the earlier ages of Judaism, God often revealed his will by *dreams*, not only to his own people, but to the nations at large. And the ancients in general put great faith in them; and rules for their interpretation were formed, both among Jews and Gentiles. There is, however, reason to think, that *prophetic* dreams had, except in the case of Simon the Just, ceased after the time of the last of the prophets, Malachi. Now, however, this channel of communication between God and man, in addition to that of direct revelation, became re-opened in the *prophetic dream of Joseph*.

— παραλαβεῖν.] Scil. εἰς οἶκίαν, supplied in Lucian, Timon 17. The παρα refers to the parents, from whom the bride was received. Τὴν γυν. σου (velut) tuam uxorem.

— τὸ γεινηθὲν.] The neuter is commonly used of the fœtus in utero, since its sex is unknown.

21. τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ.] Commonly explained as put for αὐτόν, and usually accounted a Hebrewism; but the idiom sometimes occurs in the early Greek writers. See Matt. G. G. p. 594. It is not, however, properly put for αὐτόν. See Fritz.

— σώσει — αὐτῶν.] Dr. Maltby (Serm. Vol.

(Τοῦτο δὲ ὅλον γέγονεν, ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου διὰ 22
 q Isai. 7. 14. τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος· Ἰδοὺ, ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἕξει, 23
 καὶ τέξεται υἱόν, καὶ καλέσουσι τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἐμ-
 μανουὴλ. ὃ ἐστὶ μεθερμηνεύομενον, μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ Θεός.)
 Διεγερθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰωσήφ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕπνου, ἐποίησεν ὡς προσέταξεν αὐτῷ 24
 ὁ ἄγγελος Κυρίου· καὶ παρέλαβε τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, καὶ οὐκ ἐγί- 25
 ρωσεν αὐτήν, ἕως οὗ ἔτεκε τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς τὸν πρωτότοκον, καὶ ἐκά-
 λεσε τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἸΗΣΟΥΝ.

a Luke 2. 4, 6, 7. II. a ΤΟΤ' δὲ Ἰησοῦ γεννηθέντος ἐν Βηθλεὲμ τῆς Ἰουδαίας, ἐν ἡμέ- 1
 ραις Ἡρώδου τοῦ βασιλέως, ἰδοὺ, μάγοι ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν παρεγένοντο εἰς

11. 546.) distributes the significations of the important term *σῶζειν* into the four following heads. "1. To preserve generally, from any evil or danger whatsoever. 2. To preserve from sickness, or any bodily disorder; to *heal*. This sense is the most easy to distinguish; yet it has not been duly attended to in every instance by our Translators. 3. To preserve from the temporal anger of the Almighty, such as was manifested in the destruction of Jerusalem. This notion, he remarks, appears to have been originally founded upon expressions in the Jewish Prophets. 4. To give future salvation in Heaven. It might (he continues) have been desirable to have confined the use of the word *σῶζειν* to those passages which come under the fourth class. Those in the third might have been interpreted to *put in the way*, or into a *state of salvation*." The preservation *here* meant, is, I apprehend, a deliverance, both from the punishment of sin, by his atonement, and from the *dominion* of sin (Rom. vi. 14.) by procuring for men the grace of the Holy Spirit, to enable them to resist it successfully.

22. ἵνα πληρωθῇ.] These are not the words of the *angel*, as some have supposed, but an observation of the *Evangelist*; and the *τοῦτο δὲ ὅλον* refers not only to what has been mentioned in the preceding narrative, but also to all other circumstances connected with the transaction there recorded. The *ἵνα* denotes, as Campbell says, no more than that there was as exact a conformity between the event and the passage quoted, as there could have been, if the former had been effected merely for the accomplishment of the latter. "God (continues Campbell) does not bring about an event, because some prophet had foretold it; but the prophet was inspired to foretell it, because God had previously decreed the event." The particles *ἵνα* and *ὅπως* must therefore not be too rigorously interpreted; since they often express not the cause, or design, but the event only, and the phrase *ἵνα πληρωθῇ* should then be translated, "So that thus was fulfilled."

23. ἡ παρθένος.] The earlier Translators seem to have thought the Article pleonastic. But the researches of later Philologists have shown that it is very rarely such, though its sense cannot always be expressed. Here it is used *κατ' ἔσοχην*, and denotes (as Dr. Owen and Bp. Middleton observe) that *particular* virgin, who was prophesied of from the beginning, and whose seed was to bruise the serpent's head.

— καλέσουσι] scil. *ἰσθραῖτοι*, i. e. his name shall be called, or *be*: for the fulfilment of the prophecy depends not upon Christ's *literally* having borne the name Emmanuel, but upon his

being such, which he clearly was as God-man. Thus the Evangelist has interpreted both Emmanuel and Jesus, to show that the prophecy was fulfilled, not in the names, but in their *signification* or *application*.

24. διεγερθεὶς ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕπνου.] Simil. Herodot. i. 34. οὐδ' ἐπέε' ἐξηγήσθη, καταχθονίσις τὸν ὄνειρον, &c.

25. οὐκ ἐγίνωσκεν.] A common euphemism, like that of *recognoscere* in Latin.

— ἕως οὗ ἔτεκε.] "This (says Campbell) does not necessarily imply his knowledge of her afterwards, though it suggests the *affirmative* rather than the *negative*." The quotations produced on the contrary side are, as Whitby has shown, not quite to the point. The suffrage, indeed, of antiquity (which speaks in the negative) is not lightly to be set aside. Yet even that was not constant and without dissent. The term *πρωτότοκος*, it is urged, will not determine the case in the *affirmative*, because it was used, whether there were any more children or not; but the contrary is ably maintained by Fritz, who shows that *ἕως οὗ ἔτεκε* suggests only the *affirmative*. The question, however, is one of mere curiosity; and we may safely say, with St. Basil (cited by Bp. Taylor) that "though it was necessary for the completion of the prophecy, that the mother should continue a virgin until she had brought forth her first-born, yet what she was afterwards, it is idle to discuss, since that is of no manner of concern to the mystery."

II. 1. τοῦ δὲ Ἰησοῦ γεννηθέντος] "(some time) after the birth of Jesus." On the chronology of the visit of the Magi, and the nativity, see Benson's Chronology of the Life of Christ, p. 74; and Dr. Hales; the former of whom refutes the arguments of those who fix the visit of the Magi at a considerable distance of time after the nativity; and he offers good reasons for supposing that it took place between the 39th and 42d day after the birth of Jesus, about February 13th, J. P. 4710. This is confirmed by Justin Dial. c. p. Tryph., (who says, the event was *ἅμα τοῦ γεννηθῆναι αὐτόν*), and is agreeable to the impression naturally suggested by the air of the narrative.

— μάγοι.] The term adopted in our Translation, *wise men*, is not sufficiently definite, since the persons were a particular caste, as distinguished by their peculiarities as any of the Grecian *sects* of philosophers. The word is better left untranslated, as in the Syriac, Arabic, Latin, and Italian versions. It is of Persian origin, (Mogh) and designated throughout the East (and especially Persia, the original seat of this class of persons),

2 Ἱεροσόλυμα, λέγοντες· Ποῦ ἐστὶν ὁ τεχθεὶς βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων; εἶδομεν γὰρ αὐτοῦ τὸν ἀστέρα ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ, καὶ ἤλθομεν προσκυνῆσαι αὐτῷ. Ἀκούσας δὲ Ἡρώδης ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐταράχθη, καὶ πᾶσα Ἱεροσόλυμα μετ' αὐτοῦ· καὶ συναγαγὼν πάντας τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ γραμματεῖς τοῦ λαοῦ, ἐπυνθάνετο πῶς αὐτῶν, πῶς ὁ Χριστὸς γενεῖται. 5 οἱ δὲ εἶπον αὐτῷ· Ἐν Βηθλεὲμ τῆς Ἰουδαίας· οὕτω γὰρ γέγραπται

the priests, philosophers, and men of letters, in general; who devoted themselves to the study of divine and human science, especially medicine and astronomy, or rather astrology. Their doctrines are said to have been derived from Abraham, or at least purified by him from Zabian idolatry. They again became corrupted, and were again purified by Zoroaster, who is supposed to have been a descendant of the Prophet Daniel; deriving from him that intimate knowledge of the Mosaic writings, which his religion evinces. From whence the persons in question derived their information, whether, as some suppose, from a prediction of Zoroaster (whom they believed to have been divinely inspired), or from a prophecy of the Arabian prophet Balaam, is uncertain. Be that as it may, a general expectation then prevailed in the East, that a most extraordinary person was about to be born, who should be Sovereign of the world. Vide Menag. ad Diog. Laert. i. 1. Porphy. de Abst. iv. 16. Perizon. ad Ælian. Var. Hist. ii. 17. Hyde de Relig. Vet. Pers. 31. et Brisson de Princ. Pers. 179. Ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν must not be taken with παρεγένοντο, but with μέγροι. The passages here cited by the recent Commentators are few of them apposite, because the phrase is associated with an Article. The only kindred passage is Matt. xxvii. 57. ἄνωπτος πλοῦσιος ἀπὸ Ἀριμαθαίας. Nor is the sense Magi Orientales. There is rather an ellipse of ἐλδοῖτες, or something equivalent.

2. αὐτοῦ τὸν ἀστέρα.] It would be out of place here to detail the various opinions which have been promulgated concerning this star; especially as the only probable one is, that it was a luminous meteor; exceedingly brilliant, as we learn from Ignat. ad Ephes. xix. called a star from its resemblance thereto, and formed, and its motion regulated, preternaturally. The course the Magi were to take, was probably suggested to them by revelation — or rather they had learned it from some old tradition of the Jews, that a new star would appear at the coming of the Messiah. Numerous Classical citations are adduced by Wets., showing the general belief, that new stars appeared at the birth or death of celebrated personages, and otherwise had some undefined connection with the most important events of their lives.

— προσκυνῆσαι αὐτῷ.] This construction with the Dative, is almost confined to the later writers; the earlier and purer ones using the Accus. With respect to the sense, it is not possible to define the exact nature of this προσκυνῆσαι; because in the East (though never in the West) the prostration of the body to the very earth (which this word imports) was paid alike to monarchs and to gods. Whether, therefore, it was adoration or reverential homage, is doubtful; though, if we consider the Divine revelation vouchsafed to them, the Magi could scarcely but view the new born exalted personage as one far

above any earthly monarch; and, if at all acquainted with the Prophecies of the Old Testament (which we cannot doubt), they might very well expect far more in the Messiah than the human nature. προσκυνεῖν properly signifies to kiss one's hand to any one (equivalent to kissing any one's hands); a form of respectful salutation. This, however, has reference wholly to the Greek and Roman customs. In Scripture the expression has probably never that sense; and to perceive its force there, see Dr. J. P. Smith, Scrip. Testimony to the Messiah, Vol. ii. p. 270.

3. ἐταράχθη.] The perturbation was occasioned by the prevalent persuasion, that the reign, then supposed to be near at hand, would be ushered in by a long train of national calamities. Πᾶσα has reference to ἡ πόλις, understood as Ἱερὸσ.

4. τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ γραμματεῖς.] A formula denoting all the members of the Sanhedrim. By ἀρχ., we are to understand not only the ἀρχιερεῖς, and his deputy (the Sagan), but all those who had passed the office, and still by courtesy enjoyed the title; and who seem to have worn an Archieratical robe: also the heads of the 24 courses. The γραμματεῖς were persons employed either in transcribing, or in explaining the Sacred books, and were distributed into two orders, Civil and Ecclesiastical. Among them were the ρομικοὶ (or lawyers), mentioned in the New Testament, who were, indeed, the only persons occupied in teaching the law and religion to the people.

— γενεῖται.] This is by some taken for γενήσεται, or μέλλει γενεῖσθαι. Others say it is the Fut. mid. contract. (Atticè) with the force of Fut. Pass. But it is very doubtful whether this idiom has place in the New Testament. It is better to regard it as a present, and, with Elsn. and Kuinoel, suppose it put for the Fut.; or rather to take it as used populariter to signify is to be born.

5. διὰ τοῦ προφήτου.] The words following correspond neither to the Heb. nor to the Sept.; and therefore the priests are supposed to have given the sense rather than the words of the Prophet. And, as it is not professed to be a citation, but only a statement of the sense, literal agreement is not to be required. Several recent interpreters, indeed, take the words of the Prophet in the Hebrew and Sept. interrogatively; which will be equivalent to a strong negation. But as this is, with reason, objected to by Fritz, and others, it may be best to allege, that there is only a discrepancy in words, not in reality — the scope of the Prophet and the Evangelist (for I would suppose the passage adduced by Matthew and not by the Sanhedrim) is the same — namely, to state that though Bethlehem be one of the smallest cities of Judah, yet it will not be the smallest (i. e. will be the greatest) in celebrity — since out of it, &c.

b Micah 5. 2.
& John 7. 42.

διὰ τοῦ προφήτου· ^b Καὶ σὺ Βηθλεέμ, γῆ Ἰούδα, οὐδα- 6
μῶς ἐλαχίστη εἶ ἐν τοῖς ἡγεμόσιν Ἰούδα· ἐκ σοῦ γὰρ
ἐξελεύσεται ἡ γούμενος, ὅστις ποιμανεῖ τὸν λαὸν μου
τὸν Ἰσραήλ. Τότε Ἠρώδης λάθρα καλέσας τοὺς μάγον, ἠκρι- 7
βωσε παρ' αὐτῶν τὸν χρόνον τοῦ φαινομένου ἀστέρος· καὶ πέμψας 8
αὐτοὺς εἰς Βηθλεέμ, εἶπε· Πορευθέντες ἀκριβῶς ἐξετάσατε περὶ τοῦ
παιδίου. Ἐπὶ δὲ εὔρητε, ἀπαγγεῖλάτε μοι, ὅπως καγὼ ἐλθὼν προσ-
κινήσω αὐτῷ. Οἱ δὲ ἀκούσαντες τοῦ βασιλέως, ἐπορεύθησαν. καὶ, 9
ἰδοὺ, ὁ ἀστὴρ, ὃν εἶδον ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ, προῆγεν αὐτοὺς, ἕως ἐλθῶν
ἔστη ἐπάνω οὗ ἦν τὸ παιδίον. Ἰδόντες δὲ τὸν ἀστέρα, ἐχάρησαν χαρὰν 10
μεγάλην σφόδρα· ^c καὶ ἐλθόντες εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, *εἶδον τὸ παιδίον 11
μετὰ Μαρίας τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ πεσόντες προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ, καὶ
ἀνοίξαντες τοὺς θησαυροὺς αὐτῶν, προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ δῶρα, χρυσὸν καὶ
λίβανον καὶ σμύρναν. Καὶ χρηματισθέντες κατ' ὄναρ μὴ ἀνακίμψαι 12
πρὸς Ἠρώδη, δι' ἄλλης ὁδοῦ ἀνεχώρησαν εἰς τὴν χώραν αὐτῶν.

c Psal 72. 10.
Isai. 60. 6.

6. γῆ Ἰούδα.] Almost all Commentators regard γῆ as used in the sense πόλις; of which they adduce many examples from the Greek Tragedians. But in them, if γῆ be put for πόλις, it is only by πόλις having the sense a country, or state; for Seidler on Eurip. Troad. 4. and Fritzsche in loc. rightly deny that γῆ is ever so used. There is, however, no reason to resort to the conjecture proposed by Fritzsche, τῆς Ἰουδαίας. It is better to read (as did our English Translators and Lightfoot), γῆ or rather γῆ, taking it for ἐν γῆ. Though indeed the common reading may very well be tolerated, if γῆ be taken in the sense district, canton, as in Hesiod Opp. 161. ἐφ' ἐπιπέδῳ Θήβης, Καρμηίδι γαίῃ, where there is the same opposition, in which the Particip. of the verb subst. is to be understood, equivalent to a relative pronoun and a verb.

— ἐν τοῖς ἡγ.] Sept. χιλιάσιν· Heb. עֲשָׂרָא. For as the Jews divided their tribes into thousands, i. e. companies of 1000 families, so the term was sometimes taken to denote the district where they resided. And here τοῖς ἡγεμόσιν is put figuratively, for ταῖς ἡγεμόσιν, scil. χῶραις, the masculine being used dignitatis gratiā.

— ποιμανεῖ.] This metaphorical use of ποιμ. to denote govern, is found in Homer and the early Greek writers, and seems to be a vestige of ancient simplicity. It is, moreover, very suitable to the pastoral nature of Christ's kingdom, so often dwelt on in the Gospel of St. John.

7. ἠκριβώσατε.] for ἀκριβῶς ἀνέρευθεν, "procured from them exact information."

— φαινομένου.] This is not put for φανέντος, as Kuin. supposes; but the Particip. present is meant either to denote beginning, as Glass maintains, or continuity, as Grot. This construction with the Genit. was probably in popular use, q. d. "the time when the star would begin to shine, or be shining."

8. πορευθέντες ἀ. ἐξετάσατε.] This use of the Particip. is supposed to be pleonastic. But there may be a faint notion of speed intended; or rather it has in general an intensive force, especially with Imperatives. See Matthiæ G. G. § 55.

9. ἀκούσαντες.] The sense is, "so having re-

ceived the King's command." ἐν τῇ ἀναρ. should be rendered "in its rising." See Fritz.

— ἰδόν.] So almost all the MSS. Versions and Fathers, with the Editio Princeps and other ancient editions; which has been received by Mill, Wets., Griesb., and Matth. And as it is sanctioned by the most certain of Critical canons, it may be supposed the true reading. The common one εἶδον was first brought forward by Erasmus in his fifth Edition, and adopted, together with almost the whole of the Text of that Edition, by H. Steph. in his third edition.

10. ἐχάρησαν — σφόδρα.] A stronger expression than this cannot easily be met with. The addition of a cognate substantive to any verb is found also in the Classical writers (See Matth. G. G. p. 597.). The addition, too, of σφόδρα τὸ μέγας, is a relique of early antiquity, when the superlative was formed (as in the Northern languages), not by a termination, but by the addition of particles, usually put after the adjunct.

11. ἔλθόντες εἰς τ. ο.] This is not for εἰσελθ., as some say; but it signifies "having gone to the house which they sought."

— θησαυροῖς.] Campb. rightly renders caskets: though θησαυροὺς (as also the Latin Thesaurus) signifies "any receptacle (as a box or bag) for valuables."

— προσήνεγκαν — δῶρα.] Agreeably to the Oriental custom (even yet retained), of never appearing before a King, or any great personage, without offering him gifts; usually the choicest productions of the country of the giver. Markland ap. Bowyer, p. 50. observes, that this expression occurs seven times more in the New Testament, and is constantly used in a religious sense, of offerings to God. δῶρα, by way of presents. This is put in apposition. χρυσὸν καὶ λίβ. καὶ σμύρναν. From the nature of the presents it has been usually supposed that the Magi came from Arabia. But that is very doubtful. See Fritzsche in loc.

12. χρηματισθέντες.] This word, properly, and in the Classical writers, signifies 1. to despatch business; 2. to debate on it; as in Thucyd. ἐχρημάτισε πρὸς φίλιας ταῖς Ἀθηναίους; 3. to give audience and return answers. Hence the transition is easy to the sense found in the New Testament,

13 Ἀναχωρησάντων δὲ αὐτῶν, ἰδοὺ, ἄγγελος Κυρίου φαίνεται καὶ ὄντα
 τῷ Ἰωσήφ, λέγων· Ἐγερθεὶς παρήλαβε τὸ παιδίον καὶ τὴν μητέρα
 αὐτοῦ, καὶ φεῦγε εἰς Αἴγυπτον, καὶ ἴθι ἐκεῖ, ἕως ἂν εἶπω σοί· μέλλει
 14 γὰρ Ἡρώδης ζητεῖν τὸ παιδίον, τοῦ ἀπολίσσαι αὐτό. Ὁ δὲ ἐγερθεὶς
 παρέλαβε τὸ παιδίον καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ νυκτὸς, καὶ ἀνεχώρησεν
 15 εἰς Αἴγυπτον· ^d καὶ ἦν ἐκεῖ ἕως τῆς τελευτῆς Ἡρώδου· ἵνα πληρωθῇ ^{d Hos. II. 1.}
 τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου διὰ τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος· Ἐξ Αἰγύ-
 16 πτου ἐκάλεσα τὸν υἱόν μου. Τότε Ἡρώδης ἰδὼν ὅτι ἐνεπαύθη

the Sept. and Joseph. Ant. iii. 3, 3, and xi. 3. 4. to impart Divine warnings, and, in the Pass. to receive them; the term being used either absolutely (as Heb. viii. 5, xi. 7, and xii. 25.), or with the addititious ἕκαστος τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου, as Luke ii. 26., or ἐπὶ ἀγγέλου ἁγίου, as Acts x. 22. Thus κατ' ὄναρ in the present passage suggests the notion of Divine admonition, since dreams were believed to be occasionally sent from God. Ἀνακλῆσαι, bend back their course, return. The Classical writers usually subjoin πάλιν.

13. Αἴγυπτον.] A better place of refuge could not be found, from its proximity to Bethlehem, and complete independence on Herod. And as there were many Jews settled there, who enjoyed both civil protection and religious toleration, it would be at once a safe and comfortable place of residence.

— ἴσθι.] “continue, remain.” Ἐως ἂν εἶπω σοί, namely, “What thou must do further.” Μέλλει, &c. “For Herod is about to seek the child, for the purpose of destroying him.” The τοῦ is not, as some say, pleonastic; but the Genit. denotes purpose, as often in the Classical writers. Ἐνεκα is here commonly supplied, though objected to (together with most other ellipses) by our present philologists.

14. νυκτός.] *Ny night*; to conceal his departure, and the *very night* of his receiving the vision, to show his ready obedience.

15. τῆς τελευτῆς.] Scil. τοῦ βίου; like *finis* for *finis vite* in Latin. The *plena locutio* occurs in Homer, Herodotus, and others of the more ancient writers.

— ἵνα πληρωθῇ.] “So that thus was fulfilled.”

— ἐξ Αἰγύπτου — μου.] “These words (from Hos. xi. 1.) are not cited merely by way of accommodation; but, referring primarily to the deliverance of the children of Israel out of Egypt, they were secondarily and figuratively fulfilled in the person of Christ. That Israel was a type of Christ, appears from Exod. iv. 22. where he is called by God *his son*; *his first born*: whence also *Israel* is put for *Christ*, Isa. xlix. 3. Now as a prophetic prediction is then fulfilled, when what was foretold is come to pass, so a type is then fulfilled, when that is done in the *antitype* which was before done in the *type*. It is no objection that the remainder of the prophecy does not belong to Christ, as Matthew only notices the resemblance between the type and antitype, in that both were called out of Egypt.” — *Whitby*. A somewhat different and perhaps juster view is taken by a learned reviewer (of Bp. Wilson's Evidences of Christianity) in the British Critic, for 1832, who regards it as an allusion or adaptation. q. d. “So that the figurative declaration of God in Hosea, ἐξ Αἰγ. — μου, became, in this instance, a literal fact.” Similarly Epiph.,

(cited by Heinsius,) when combating the opposite error of the Antidicomarcionites, or the Collyridians — says, Ὡς κάκεινο τὸ παρά τισι τῶν ἔξωθεν φιλοσόφων ἀδόμιμον, καὶ ἐν αὐτοῖς πληρώσασθαι ἐν τῷ λέγειν, Αἱ ἀκρότητες ἴστανται. “So that the current saying of one of the heathen philosophers, *extremes meet*, was fulfilled in these.”

16. ἐνεπαύθη.] “Was deceived;” literally, was trifled with. A use similar to that of *illudere*, in Latin.

— ἀποστειλας.] The commentators say there is an ellipsis of *τινὰς* or *ἀγγέλους*. It is not, however, necessary to suppose ellipsis at all, any more than in the Latin *mittere*, which is similarly used. When the Accus. is expressed (as sometimes in Herodot. and other early writers), it is of more definite sense than the above. There is no pleonasm in ἀποστειλας, but merely a vestige of primitive verbosity. Τοὺς παῖδας. “the male children;” for though the masculine is sometimes used with nouns of the common gender, in reference to the whole species, both male and female, yet that is chiefly in the Classical writers, and where the context and subject suggest the right application.

— ὁρίσις αὐτῆς, its district, or territory.

— ἀπὸ διετούς καὶ κατωτέρω.] There are few phrases that have been less understood than this. It has been usually regarded as an elliptical expression for ἀπὸ διετούς χρόνου, or, as formed from τὸ διετές, *biennium*. But the latter expression is quite destitute of authority; and the former is very rarely found, and only in *plena locutione*. And neither of the two is suitable in signification. It is rightly observed by Fischer de Vit. Lex. N. T. that a *masculine sense* is required. But when he supposes a *neuter form*, he takes for granted what does not exist. The word has a *masculine form* as well as a *masculine sense*; and no wonder; for it is, in fact, an adjective, with the substantive *παῖδς*, being left to be supplied from the context, and, in the present case, τοὺς παῖδας preceding. The singular is used for the plural, as being taken in a generic sense. Thus it is the same as if there were written ἀπὸ διετῶν. This view of the phrase is confirmed by similar ones in Pollux ii. 2. νῆπιος διετής. ii. Paral. xxxi. 16. ἀπὸ τριετούς καὶ ἐπάνω. i. Paral. xxvii. 23. ἀπὸ εικοσιετούς καὶ κάτω. See also Ezr. iii. 3. Numb. i. 45. As to the opinion of several recent Commentators, that *διετής* may denote a *year* old, it is wholly unsupported by authority. For as to that of *Hesych.* διετής· δι' ὄλον ἔτους, it is nothing to the purpose, for we must there read either, with the editors, δι' ἔτους, or rather *διετήσιος*, from *Suid.* and *Pollux.* the Gloss being borrowed from the *Schol.* on *Thucyd.* ii. 38. ἐγώσι — διετήσιος νομιζόντες, who explains *διετ.* by δι' ὄλον τοῦ ἔτους. But such a sense would be quite inapplicable to the present passage. And that the children were

ὑπὸ τῶν μάγων, ἐθνυμώθη λίαν, καὶ ἀποστείλας ἀνείλε πάντας τοὺς παῖδας τοὺς ἐν Βηθλεὲμ καὶ ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ὄρειοις αὐτῆς, ἀπὸ διετοῦς καὶ κατωτέρω, κατὰ τὸν χρόνον ὃν ἠκρίβωσε παρὰ τῶν μάγων. Τότε ἐπληρώθη 17
 • Jer. 31. 15. τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ Ἰερεμίου τοῦ προφήτου, λέγοντος· Ὁ φωνὴ ἐν Βαμὰ 18
 ἠκούσθη, θρῆνος καὶ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὄδυρμὸς πολὺς· Ῥαχὴλ κλαίονσα τὰ τέκνα αὐτῆς· καὶ οὐκ ἤθιλε παρακληθῆναι, ὅτι οὐκ εἰσί. Τελευτή- 19
 σαντος δὲ τοῦ Ἡρώδου, ἰδοὺ, ἄγγελος Κυρίου κατ' ὄναρ φαίνεται τῷ Ἰωσήφ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, λέγων· Ἐγερθεὶς παρὰ λαβὴ τὸ παιδίον καὶ τὴν 20
 μητέρα αὐτοῦ, καὶ πορεύου εἰς γῆν Ἰσραὴλ· τεθνήκασι γὰρ οἱ ζητούντες τὴν ψυχὴν τοῦ παιδίου. Ὁ δὲ ἐγερθεὶς παρέλαβε τὸ παιδίον 21
 καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς γῆν Ἰσραὴλ. ἀκούσας δὲ, ὅτι 22
 Ἀρχέλαος βασιλεύει ἐπὶ τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἀντὶ Ἡρώδου τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, ἐφοβήθη ἐκτὴ ἀπελθεῖν· χρηματισθεὶς δὲ κατ' ὄναρ, ἀνεχώρησεν εἰς
 1 Judg. 13. 5. τὰ μέρη τῆς Γαλιλαίας. Ἐκὼς ἐλθὼν κατέκησεν εἰς πόλιν λεγομένην 23
 MK. LU. Ναζαρέτ· ὅπως πληρωθῆναι τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν, "Οὐ Ναζω-
 1. 3. ραῖος κληθήσεται.
 3 III. Ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις παραγίνεται Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιστῆς 1

of one year old, is opposed to all Ecclesiastical History.

17. τότε ἐπληρώθη, &c.] The words may be paraphrased, "Then that happened whereby was more fully completed, &c.;" or rather, as the citation is only an accommodation of Jerem. xxxi. 15., "Such another catastrophe took place as that recorded by Jeremiah;" a manner of speaking familiar to the writers of the New Testament. See Matth. xv. 7. & 3., compared with Isaiah xix. 13. and Matth. xiii. 14. compared with Is. vi. 9. Matth. xiii. 34. & 35. compared with Ps. lxxvii. 22. According to this mode any thing may truly be said to be fulfilled, if it admits of being properly applied.

18. θρῆνος — πολὺς.] A most pathetic accumulation of terms, expressing bitter grief, with which Wets. compares a similar one in Plato. ὄδυρμὸς δὲ καὶ στεναγμοὺς καὶ θρήνους καὶ ἀλγηδόνας κ. τ. λ. The words (Kuin. observes,) are to be understood of the *Bethlehemites*.

— κλαίονσα.] Sub. ἦν. A fine figure, whereby Rachel is supposed to be bewailing the slaughter, and weeping for her children, as Ephraim is, in the same chapter, as lamenting himself. "Οὐκ εἰσί, must be taken, not with παρακλή, but with κλαίονσα. In the passage of the Prophet, the words must mean "are gone (into captivity)."

20. οἱ ζητούντες.] A use of plural for singular, common both to the Scriptural and the Classical writers, especially in speaking of Kings and Princes. See I Kings i. 33. 43., compared with Matth. ix. 8. The expression *ζητεῖν τὴν ψυχὴν τινος*, is said by Vorst. and Leusd. to be formed from the Heb. *שׂוֹפֵט נַפְשׁוֹ* in I Sam. xxiii. 15. The use of *ψυχὴν* for *ζωὴν*, though, no doubt, derived by the sacred writers from the Hebrew, is likewise found in Herodot. and the other early Greek writers.

22. βασιλεύει.] Taken improperly for ἄσχει, since Archelaus was not a βασιλεύς, but an ἑθναρχῆς. Ἐκτὴ, for ἐκείσε.

23. κατέκησεν εἰς] "fixed his abode at;" in contradiction to *παρέφησεν*. Εἰς is for ἐν, at; as

2 Chron. xix. 4. *κατέκησεν εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ*. A signification common in the later Classical writers.

— Ναζ. κληθ.] *Κληθήσεται* is by some taken to mean "shall be." But to that sense it is here unnecessary, nay injudicious, to have recourse; for that Jesus was so called, in contempt, is well known from many passages of the Gospels. Bp. Middleton. renders *Ναζ.* "the Nazarene;" "since the Art. could not be inserted, the noun being preceded by the nuncupative verb *κληθήσεται*." Nazareth was proverbially a despised place, as is clear from Nathanael's question, "Can there be any good thing come out of Naz." Thus *Ναζωραῖος* became among the Jews a proverbial term for a despised and rejected character. Thus the meaning is, "that Jesus should be despised and dishonored." *Διὰ τῶν προφητῶν* is said because (as is rightly observed by Jerome) no particular prophet is meant, but the substance of what occurs in all those passages of the Old Testament which were supposed to refer to the contempt with which the Messiah should be treated.

III. 1. ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκ.] This phrase, for ἐν τούτῳ τῷ χρόνῳ, is a customary mode of commencing a narrative, both in the Scriptural and Classical writers. The difference is, that the latter use it *strictly*, when only a *brief* period is interposed between the occurrence to be narrated, and some other event before mentioned; whereas the former use it with greater latitude, when there is a considerable interval; as here of many years: yet always with a reference to some previously mentioned time. And the time adverted to, is that of the residence of Joseph at Nazareth. The transition may, indeed, seem abrupt, but not more so than many things in the Scriptures, or even the *Classics*, as Thucyd. The reason why Matthew passes over the period of Christ's infancy is, that he had little certain information, and it was too, not his purpose to narrate aught but what was connected with the establishment of the Messiah's kingdom. He therefore is silent on the events of Jesus's infancy.

2 κηρύσσω ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τῆς Ἰουδαίας, καὶ λέγων· Μετανοεῖτε! ἤγγικε 1. 3.
 3 γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν. Οὗτος γάρ ἐστιν ὁ ἠηθεὶς ὑπὸ Ἰησοῦ 2 4
 τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος· Φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, ἔτοι- 3
 μάζετε τὴν ὁδὸν Κυρίου! εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρι-
 4 θύους αὐτοῦ! Αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Ἰωάννης εἶχε τὸ ἔνδυμα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ 6
 τριχῶν καμήλου, καὶ ζώην δεγματίνην περὶ τὴν ὄσφυν αὐτοῦ· ἡ δὲ
 τροφή αὐτοῦ ἦν ἀκρίδες καὶ μέλι ἄγριον.

MK. LU.

cy and earlier years, and passes on to the uprising of his great *Forerunner*. The Section is omitted in some MSS. of the Alexandrian recension, later versions and Fathers: but its omission can far better be accounted for (partly from commencing an Ecclesiastical Section, and partly from the difficulty of expressing the same in the Oriental versions) than its insertion. It has a transitive sense, like the Latin *autem*. Παραγγίνεται κηρύσσω, is for παραγγίνεται καὶ κηρύσσει. Παραγγίνεσθαι, like παρίεναί and παρέρχεσθαι in Thucyd. and other writers, has the sense *accedere, prodire*; as said properly of those who come forward to deliver an oration. Now, κηρύσσω properly signifies to proclaim; and 2dly. to publicly teach *viva voce*, to preach. It moreover includes a notion of earnestness and vehemence.

—ὁ βαπτιστής.] A name of office, equivalent to ὁ βαπτίζων, Mark vi. 14., and employed by the sacred writers, to distinguish him from John the Evangelist. Baptism is universally admitted to have been in use with the Jews, as a part of the ceremony for the admission of proselytes; (as indeed it was, with the Persians and other Oriental nations). This appears both from the Talmud, and from allusions which occur in the Classical writers. It was believed that the administration of this rite would form part of the office of the Messiah. Nay, the mode in which the word is here introduced by Matthew, without any explanation, shows that the ceremony alluded to was familiar to them.

—ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ.] Sub. χώρας, by which, however, is to be understood, not an absolutely desert tract; but one comparatively so; as being thinly inhabited, unenclosed by fences, and not in tillage but pasture; like the steppes of Asia, the llanos of S. America, and the extensive commons lately existing in this country. This indeed is adverted to in the Heb. כַּבְרֵךְ, literally, a place to drive cattle upon.

2. μετανοεῖτε.] The word properly signifies to take after thought, as opposed to προνοεῖν. 2dly. to change one's opinion. 3dly. in a religious sense, to so change one's views as to reform one's life. Μετάνοια properly and primarily signifies a change of mind or purpose. But it is so rare in this sense, that no Commentator on the N. T. nor Steph. Thesaurus has adduced an example. The following may therefore be acceptable. Joseph. Bell. I. 4. 4. οἱ δὲ μᾶλλον ἐμίσησαν τὴν μετάνοιαν αὐτοῦ, καὶ τοῦ τρόπου τὸ ἀνάμαλον. In a religious sense, it denotes such a change of mind as to the commission of any previous actions, as shall induce us to forsake the practices, from a conviction that they are opposed to the will of God, and are contrary to our true happiness here and hereafter.

—ἡ βυσ. τῶν οὐρ.] This formula and ἡ βυσ. τοῦ θεοῦ, are synonymous, and frequently occur in the N. T. They denote, 1. the abodes of eter-

nal felicity in heaven, and the state of things there; 2. (with allusion to the prophecies of the O. T.) They represent the spiritual reign of Christ, the Gospel dispensation, as here and at Matt. ii. 7. x. 7. Luke x. 9. xvii. 21., and various other passages. In some others it is doubtful which of these two senses is to be adopted. Nor are there wanting those where both seem to be combined.

3. οἴτος.] Some would take this δεικτικῶς. But though that use is not unfrequently found in the Classical writers; yet it very rarely occurs in the Scriptural ones, and would not here be very suitable. It is more natural to regard the words as the Evangelist's. — Ἰησοῦ τοῦ προφήτου. The words which follow convey the sense, though they do not follow the exact terms either of the Hebrew or Sept. [Comp. Isa. 40. 3. John i. 23.] — φωνή, &c.] "[There is heard] the voice of one preaching in the wilderness, and exclaiming, Ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν, &c." An image borrowed from the practice of Eastern monarchs, who, on taking a journey, or going on a military expedition, used to send forward persons to level the eminences, smoothen the unevennesses, fill up the hollows, &c., so as to form a road. To this purpose Wets. cites Sueton. Calig. 37. Joseph. B. J. iii. 5. 1. and Justin i. 10. Plut. 837. Ovid Amat. ii. 16, 51. See my note on Thucyd. ii. 97 & 100.

4. τὸ ἔνδυμα — καμήλου.] Some take this to mean the camel's pelt, with the hair on, as sheepskins were worn by the Hebrew prophets. See Zechar. xiii. 14. Others, however, more justly, suppose that it was the shaggier camel's hair, spun into coarse cloth, like our druggat. And we find from the Talmud, that camel's hair garments were much worn by the Jews. Joseph. Bell. i. 17. speaks of ἐσθῆς ἐκ τριχῶν πεποιημένη, probably the σάκκος τριχίνος, of Revel. vi. 12. Nor were they unknown to the Heathens. Thus the Schol. on Eurip. Phæn. 329. mentions τὰ τρίχινα ἐνδύματα. Those, however, were probably made of the finer camel's hair, like a manufacture formerly made in this country, and called camlets. Garments similar to the Baptist's are still worn (or rather a manufacture of wool and camel's hair) in the East by the poor, or those who affect austerity. John wore this garment in imitation of the prophets, especially Elijah. See 2 Kings i. 8. whom he also imitated in the austerity of his life. Indeed, it was his prophetic habit and mode of life, that was chiefly instrumental (in connection with the prevailing expectation of the Messiah's advent) to drawing the attention of the Jews to his ministry, in which the spirit of prophecy, which had been lost to Israel for 400 years, was in some measure restored.

—ζώην δεσμ.] So of Elijah, 2 Kings i. 8. ζώην δεγματίνην περιζωσμένος τὴν ὄσφυν αὐτοῦ.

MK. LU.

1. 3. Τότε ἐξεπορεύετο πρὸς αὐτὸν Ἱεροσόλυμα, καὶ πᾶσα ἡ Ἰουδαία, καὶ 5
 5 πᾶσα ἡ περιχώρος τοῦ Ἰορδάνου· καὶ ἐβαπτίζοντο ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῳ ὑπὸ 6
 αὐτοῦ, ἐξομολογούμενοι τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν. Ἴδων δὲ πολλοὺς τῶν 7
 7 Φαρισαίων καὶ Σαδδουκαίων ἐρχομένους ἐπὶ τὸ βάπτισμα αὐτοῦ, εἶπεν
 αὐτοῖς· Γεννήματα ἐχιδῶν! τίς ὑπέδειξεν ὑμῖν φυγεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς
 8 μελλούσης ὀργῆς; Ποίησατε οὖν *καρπὸν *ἄξιον τῆς μετανοίας· Καὶ 8

The austerity consisted in the *materials*; for otherwise these *girdles* formed a regular part of the dress; and were of linen, silk, or even gold and silver, according to the circumstances. See the references in Wets. or Recens. Synop.

— ἡ τροφή — ἀκρίδες.] That locusts (of which Bochart reckons ten species) were permitted to be eaten, appears from Levit. xi. 22.; that they formed a *customary* food in the East is plain from Agatharch. v. 27. Strabo. xvi. p. 1118. Plin. vi. 30. &c. (Wets.) From Aristoph. Ach. 1116. and the Schol., it appears that the *Greeks* also ate of them, but that they were accounted a mean food. That they are at the present day a common diet among the poor, throughout most of the countries of Asia and Africa, which they infest, we learn from the concurrent testimony of modern travellers.

— μέλι ἄγριον.] This is by some taken to denote a sort of *saccharine matter* exuding from palm, date, or olive trees. See Diodor. Sic. xiv. 104., (who calls it by this very name μέλι ἄγριον) Joseph. B. J. iv. 27. Plin. N. H. xxiii. 4. and the Rabbinical writers, who mention *palm honey* and *fig honey*. The more common opinion, however, is, that we are to understand honey procured from hollow trees and clefts of rocks, deposited there by swarms of wild bees. See 1 Sam. xiv. 26. Judg. xiv. 8. and Ps. lxxxii. 16.

5. καὶ πᾶσα.] The *καὶ* is by Fritzsche not ill rendered *nempe*. Πᾶσα, like πάντες in Mark i. 6., is to be taken, in a restricted sense, for *very many*.

6. ἐβαπτίζοντο.] That baptismal ablution or lustrations had been, even among the heathens, thought necessary for admission to religious ceremonies, and for the expiation of offences, the Classical citations here adduced by Wets. and others, fully prove and illustrate. That they were in use, too, among the *Jews*, we find both from the Old Testament, the Rabbinical writers, and Josephus. See B. J. ii. 8. 7. But the baptism here meant is one solemn ablution, never to be repeated, comprehending the wives and children likewise of the proselytes; and founded partly on the ceremony which (as the Jewish theologians inform us) took place immediately previous to the promulgation of the Law, at Mount Sinai, and partly on the Jewish baptism of proselytes; though essentially differing from it. The one involving an obligation to perform the whole law; the other, an obligation to reformation, and faith in the Messiah about to appear — the one founded on a system of justification by works, the other one on faith in Christ. The custom, however, is believed not to have been introduced until after the return from the Babylonish captivity; and that to provide a less revolting mode of initiation into the Jewish church than circumcision. The Jews must have understood the ceremony as significant of a change of religion, and of introduction into a dispensation different from that of Moses. And that

they should have expressed no surprise at this, need not be thought strange; since they were taught by the predictions of the prophets, and the instructions of their most eminent teachers, that at the advent of the Messiah (which was now universally expected), the face of things would be entirely changed, and a new religion be introduced by Baptism. (Wets., Bengel, Kuin., and Rosenm.)

— ἐξομολογούμενοι.] This is not so much put for the simple verb, as it is a *stronger* expression, of which examples (chiefly from Joseph. and Philo.) are adduced by Elsner and Wets. This must be understood not of a particular and individual, but a *general* confession of sins, and renunciation of justification by works.

7. Φαρισαίων καὶ Σαδδουκαίων.] On these Sects see Recensio Synopt., or Horne's Introduction. Ἐρχομένους — αὐτοῦ. The sense is well expressed by the Persic and Syriac versions, "coming for the purpose of being baptized." So Luke iii. 7. ἐκπροσπευμένοις βαπτισθῆναι ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ. Of this signification of ἐπι examples are given by Wets. and Krebs.

— γεννήματα ἐχιδῶν.] "brood of vipers!" So they are likewise called by Christ himself, Mark xii. 34. Infr. 23. 33. Τίς ἐπέδειξεν ὑμῖν, &c. The interrogative here does not, as some suppose, imply a strong negation; but the τίς rather imports exclamation (as in Galat. iii. 1.), namely, from excessive surprise at seeing persons of such dissimilar opinions and characters (Sadducees and Pharisees, men of the world and votaries of pleasure mixed with precise formalists, not to say hypocrites), unite in confessing their sins, in making declarations of repentance, and vows of reformation. The motives of the *generality* in coming thither, must have been corrupt (see Whitby and Mack.), or so severe an expression would not have been employed; and no wonder; for the Jews were then immersed in moral depravity and religious error.

— ὀργῆς.] This is to be taken, by metonymy, for *punishment*, of which use examples are adduced by the Philologists. [Comp. Infr. 12. 34, & 23. 33. Rom. 5. 9. 1 Thess. i. 10.]

8. καρπὸν ἄξιον.] So Ed. Pr. and Steph. 1., with almost all the MSS., which is received by Wets., Matth., Gries., and Scholz. The common reading καρπὸς ἄξιος was introduced by Erasm. on very slight authority, and received, together with all his other alterations, by Steph. in his 3d edition; and thus was introduced into the textus receptus. The phrase ποιεῖν καρπὸν is said to be a Hebraism; but some examples have been adduced from the classical writers, as Plut. ii. 1117. C. οὐ μέντοι τὸ θεράπευμα τοῦτο ἔσχε καρπὸν ἄξιον. Arist. de Plant. i. 4. τῶν φυτῶν τινὰ μὲν ποιοῦσι καρπὸν. Both passages defend the reading adopted in the text. Wets. paraphrases thus: "If ye really repent, show forth not merely the *leaves* of profession, but the *fruits* of performance."

		MK.	LU.
9	μη δόξετε λέγειν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς· Πατέρα ἔχομεν τὸν Ἀβραάμ. λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, ὅτι δύναται ὁ Θεὸς ἐκ τῶν λίθων τούτων ἐργεῖν τέκνα τῶν	1.	3.
10	Ἀβραάμ· ἥδη δὲ καὶ ἡ ἄξινη πρὸς τὴν ῥίζαν τῶν δένδρων κείται· πᾶν οὖν δένδρον μὴ ποιῶν καρπὸν καλὸν ἐκκόπτεται, καὶ εἰς πῦρ		9
11	βάλλεται. Ἐγὼ μὲν βαπτίζω ὑμᾶς ἐν ὕδατι, εἰς μετένοιαν· ὁ δὲ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος ἰσχυρότερός μου ἐστίν· οὗ οὐκ ἐμὶ ἰκανὸς τὰ ὑποδήματα βυστάσαι· αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ	7	16
12	πυρὶ. Οὗ τὸ πτόον ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ· καὶ διακαθαρεῖ τὴν ἄλωα		17

9. μη δόξετε λέγειν.] This is thought to be a pleonasm for μη λέγητε, but it is, in fact, a stronger expression. As to the Greek Classical idiom concerning δοκεῖν, it is here inapplicable. The phrase seems to be rather a popular expression (though it occurs in the Talmud) founded on a blending of two phrases. Λέγειν ἐν ἑαυτῷ is thought to be a Hellenistic phrase, occurring also in Esth. vi. 6., equivalent to *διανοῖν*, *secretly think*, and answering to the Hebr. אָכַר בְּלִבּוֹ. Yet it occurs in a passage of Chrysippus cited by Wets.

— Πατέρα ἔχομεν τὸν Ἀβ.] “We have Abraham for our father, and therefore, as his descendants, cannot but be accepted by God.” Ἐκ τῶν λίθων κ. τ. λ. Here there is either a comparison of the surrounding multitude to stocks and stones, by a common metaphor; g. d. “God can effect that these stones, now lying in Jordan” (compare Joseph. Ant. 4. 3.), i. e. men as unfit for useful purposes as these stones, “shall become children unto Abraham,” and imitate the virtues of Abraham. Or (according to others) the words are meant to strongly show the omnipotence of God, who can raise up instruments to effect his own wise and benevolent purposes from the meanest subjects. [Comp. John viii. 39. Acts xiii. 26.]

10. ἡ ἄξινη.] i. e. the axe of judgment and punishment. ῥίζαν hints at utter destruction; and the ἥδη at what shall shortly happen. In the Scriptures men are often compared to trees; and sometimes (as Eccles. x. 15. and Dan. iv. 20 and 23.) their punishment to the felling of trees. [Comp. Infr. vii. 19. John xv. 16.]

11. ἐν ὕδατι.] The ἐν is thought redundant; and Commentators adduce examples from the Classical writers. It rather, however, denotes the instrument, as Luke xiv. 34. and often.

— εἰς μετένοιαν.] The εἰς denotes purpose. So ἐπὶ supra v. 7. This is a brief phrase, adverting to the solemn engagement entered into by the baptized, to “cease to do evil, and learn to do well.” This, indeed, was so closely associated with baptism, that it is called by Mark i. 4. the baptism of repentance.

— ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος.] Kuin[†] renders it *cessor*. But that conveys a wrong idea. The Present is here used as at ver. 10. We may paraphrase: “There is one coming who will be after me in time, but who will be far greater than I.” There is an allusion to the expression ὁ ἐρχόμενος, [the who is coming,] by which the Messiah was then, from the opinion of his speedy appearance, designated; as in John’s inquiry, σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος. The expression is a brief one, requiring ἄνωθεν, or ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, to be supplied, as elsewhere. Ἰκανός is equivalent to the ἄξιος of St. John, as in Herodotus viii. 36. and elsewhere.

— τὰ ὑποδήματα βαστάσαι.] Ἰπόδημα in Hel-

lenistic phraseology is equivalent to *σανδάλιον*. Βαστάζειν is synonymous with *κομίζειν* in a passage of Plutarch which I have adduced in Rec. Syn. Markland says it signifies to *carry off* or *away*. But that is only implied in the general sense, which is to *have charge of*. From Lucian in Herod. 5. cited by Wets. ὁ δὲ τις μάλα δουλικῶς ἀφαιρεῖ τὸ σανδάλιον ἐκ τοῦ ποδός (to which may be added Hor. Epist. i. 13, 15 : Soleas portat; and Æschyl. Agam. 917.) and other passages adduced by the Commentators, it appears that this was by the ancients (both Orientals and Occidentals) accounted among the most servile of offices. Yet we find from the Rabbinical writers, that it was rendered by the disciple to the master; and from Eusebius, that this descended, with other observances towards the Rabbins, to the first Christian teachers.

— βαπτίσει — πυρὶ.] There has been no little difference of opinion as to the force of βαπτίσει and πυρὶ. The most probable opinion is that of Chrys. and others of the ancients, that βαπτίσειν here, in the sense *obnuere aliquem re*, has reference to the *exuberant abundance* of those extraordinary spiritual gifts soon to be imparted to the first converts. With respect to καὶ πυρὶ, Glass would suppose an Hendiadys, and take it for *ignito*: Esner regards the καὶ as *exegetical*, (in the sense *even*) as representing the Symbol of the Holy Spirit. In either case, there may be an allusion to the miraculous descent of the Holy Ghost in *fiery tongues*; which view is supported by Chrys. Others, however, as Wets., maintain that by the symbol of fire is meant the *severest punishment*, or moral purgation. [Comp. John i. 26. Acts i. 5. ii. 4. xi. 16. xix. 4.]

12. οὗ τὸ πτόον — αὐτοῦ.] The οὗ is not redundant, as Grot., Wets., and others suppose; for, as Fritz. observes, if it were taken away, there would be no connection with the preceding. And he rightly renders, “*cujus (erit) ventilabrum (nempe) in ejus manu.*” Πτόον signifies, not *fun* (which is expressed by *λεμρός* in Amos ix. 9. and was something like our *houling* machine, to raise wind by a sort of fan-like sail; but a *winnowing shovel*, which, from Hesych., seems to have been, in the lower part of it, shaped like a Δ. The word is derived from *πτίειν*, to *toss away*. Διακαθαρεῖ is for *διακαθαροῖσι*, Atticè.

— τὴν ἄλωα.] The word signifies properly the elevated area formed in a field, after harvest, of soil hardened by the use of a cylinder, (See Paulsen ap. Fritz.) where the corn in the sheaf was trodden by oxen, and winnowed; which latter operation was performed by tossing the rough and broken straw away with a fork; and then by stirring up the compound of grain and chaff with the πτόον; when the chaff was delivered to the wind, and the grain left in a heap. After which the rough straw was collected and burnt, no

MK. LU.

1. 3. αὐτοῦ, καὶ συναΐξει τὸν οἶτον αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν ἀποθήκην· τὸ δὲ ἄχρον κατακαΐσει πρὸς ἄσβεστον.

9 21 Τότε παραγίνεται ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰορδάνην πρὸς 13
τὸν Ἰωάννην, τοῦ βαπτισθῆναι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ. Ὁ δὲ Ἰωάννης διεκόλλυν 14
αὐτὸν, λέγων· Ἐγὼ χρεῖαν ἔχω ὑπὸ σοῦ βαπτισθῆναι, καὶ σὺ ἐρχη
πρὸς με; ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπε πρὸς αὐτόν· Ἄφες ἄρτι 15
οὕτω γὰρ πρέπειν ἐστὶν ἡμῖν πληρωῶσαι πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην. τότε
10 ἀφίησιν αὐτόν. Καὶ βαπτισθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνέβη εὐθὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδα- 16
22 τος. καὶ ἰδὼν, ἀνεήχθησαν αὐτῷ οἱ οὐρανοὶ, καὶ εἶδε τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ
11 Θεοῦ καταβαῖνον ὡσεὶ περιστεράν, καὶ ἐρχόμενον ἐπ' αὐτόν. Καὶ ἰδού, 17
φωνὴ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανοῶν, λέγουσα· Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός,
ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα.

doubt, for manure. Here, however, ἄλων seems to signify the above compound of grain and chaff to be winnowed; a sense often occurring in the Sept.

By τὴν ἀποθήκην is meant a repository where any thing, as here corn, ἀποτίθεται; chiefly in the East, subterraneous, or partly so, but covered down and thatched over. By the ἄχρον is denoted, not the chaff, but the rough and broken pieces of straw, separated from the corn by the above process. [Comp. infr. xiii. 30.]

13. τότε.] The particle, the Commentators think, does not mark the exact time when the baptism of Christ took place, but only points to the time when John was baptizing.

— παραγίνεται τοῦ βαπτ.] Christ condescended to be baptized, and it was administered to him by John, upon the very same principles on which the priests were dedicated to their office. See Heb. ii. 17. and Ex. viii. 6. It was necessary to justify the counsels of Divine Wisdom in framing the law of Moses, that the Messiah should recognise its Divine institution, and sanction its ordinances, by observing its rites in his own person. And the selection of John to perform the ceremony would answer many important purposes, and especially tend to the establishment, by a voice from heaven, of the authority both of Christ and his Forerunner. See more in Whitby and Mackn. Τοῦ βαπτισθῆναι is, as Fritzsche says, the Genit. of cause, and the expression is equivalent to εἰς τὸ βαπτισθῆναι.

14. διεκόλλυν] “was hindering, would have hindered.” A not unfrequent sense of the Imperf., on which see my Note on Thucyd. iv. 44, 45.

— ἐγὼ χρεῖαν, &c.] A refined way of saying, “I am very far inferior to thee, and yet dost thou come to me, as to a superior?” For (as Grot. observes) “he who binds another by baptism, seems to be superior to him who is bound.”

15. ἄφες ἄρτι] Rosenm. and Schleus. explain *permitte quæso*; comparing the ἄρτι with ἐν and the Heb. אָרְטִי. But the interpretation “for the present,” is far preferable. Indeed, the former mode would destroy the *emphasis*, which has been with reason supposed to exist in the word. The meaning is, that John must suffer him for the present to be baptized with the baptism of water, for that baptism of his with the Spirit was yet to be exhibited. At ἄφες sub. not με, but τοῦτο εἶναι, which is confirmed by Chrys. Τὴν δικαιοσύνην is for *δικαίωμα*, institution, as often in

the Sept. So, at Deut. vi. 24, πληροῦν τὴν δικαιοσύνην is equivalent to ποιεῖν τὰ δικαίωματα.

16. εὐθὺς.] There is here a transposition (such as that in Mark i. 29. and xi. 2.), found also in the Classical writers, by which εὐθὺς must be taken, not with ἀνέβη, but (as Grot. and others have seen) with ἀνεήχθη. Fritz., indeed, makes objections to εὐθὺς being taken with ἀνεήχθη; and would join it, by a similar transposition, with βαπτισθῆναι. But though that method is less harsh, the sense thence arising is somewhat frigid.

— ἀνεήχθησαν οἱ οὐρανοί.] This is explained by most foreign recent Interpreters of lightning of the most vivid sort, “by which, as it were, the heavens seem cleft asunder.” “So (they add) we find *scindere* and *findere cælum* in the Roman writers. Such language being adapted to the common opinion of the ancients, that the sky was a solid mass, and that fire from thence burst through the vast convex of the firmament.” But this seems to be a mere device to pare down the marvellous, in order to make it more credible. We have good reason to suppose the light to have been *preternatural*, and to have accompanied the Divine Spirit; such a light as accompanied Jesus, on being visibly revealed to St. Paul, at his conversion. Αὐτῷ is by some referred to Jesus, as a Dat. commodi; by others, to John; by which the sense will be, “to his view,” namely, John’s.

— ὡσεὶ περιστεράν.] There is an ambiguity in this circumstance, which has occasioned a variety of interpretation. Some understand by it the descent of a *material dove*, as a symbol of the Spirit, and with allusion to the innocence and meekness of Christ. Others, with more probability, take ὡσεὶ περ. to refer to the *mode* in which the Spirit, in some visible form (probably of a flame of fire), descended; namely, with that peculiar *hovering motion* which distinguishes the descent of a dove, and which is adverted to by Virg. *Æn.* v. 216. cited by Wets. Otherwise it would have been ὡσεὶ *πειρατεῖας*, as ὡσεὶ *περδς*, Acts ii. 3. [Comp. John i. 33.]

17. φωνὴ ἐκ τῶν οὐρ.] Wets., Rosenm., Kuin., and Schleus., take this of *thunder*; which, however, involves absurdity; for (as Mr. Rose on Parkhurst Lex. p. 491. observes), “if articulate words were heard, λέγονσα simply tells us that the very words which follow were used, and the thunder is a gratuitous supposition. If it is meant that *no uttered words were heard*, only a stroke of thunder, which *was to be understood as*

	MK.	LU.
1 IV. Τότε ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνήχθη εἰς τὴν ἔρημον ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος,	1.	4.
2 πειρασθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου. Καὶ νηστεύσας ἡμέρας τεσσαράκοντα	12	1
3 καὶ νύκτας τεσσαράκοντα, ὕστερον ἐπέειπε. Καὶ προσελθὼν αὐτῷ	13	2
ὁ πειράζων, εἶπεν· Εἰ Ἰῶς εἶ τοῦ Θεοῦ, εἶπέ, ἵνα οἱ λίθοι οὗτοι		3
4 ἄρτοι γένωται. Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπε· Γέγραπται· Οὐκ ἐπ' ἄρτω		4
μόνῳ ζήσεται ἄνθρωπος, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ παντὶ ζήματι ἐκπο-		3.
5 ρευομένην διὰ στόματος Θεοῦ. Τότε παραλαμβάνει αὐτὸν ὁ		4

declaring that Jesus, &c., reasoning is idle; for language could hardly have been used less appropriate to convey this idea."

— ἀγαπητός.] For ὁ μονογενής. Applied here, and xii. 8, and Luke ix. 35, xx. 13, to the Messiah. It is taken from the Sept.; as in Gen. xxii. 2; Jer. vi. 26; Amos viii. 10; Zach. xii. 10. — This use occurs in Hom. II. vi. 401, and Hesiod, referred to by Pollux, iii. 2.

— ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα.] The use of the ἐν in this phrase is a Hebraism, occurring also in the Septuagint. The Aorist is not (as some suppose) put for the present, but has the sense of custom, which is frequent in that tense. See Matth. Gr. Gr. § 503. [Comp. infir. xii. 18. xvii. 5; Isa. xlii. 1; Ps. ii. 7; Luke ix. 35; 2 Pet. i. 17; Col. i. 13.]

IV. 1. ἀνήχθη — Διαβόλου.] Ἄνηχ. must not be taken, with some recent Commentators, for ἤχθη, but the ἀνα may refer to the high and mountainous country of which the desert here mentioned (whether what is now called *Quarantania*, a rugged mountain range; or, as others think, the desert of Mount Sinai), consisted, as compared with the low ground about Jordan. The ἀνα may, however, be intensive; and thus ἀν— will be for ἀπ—. By τοῦ πνεύματος is here denoted the influence of the Holy Spirit.

— πειρασθῆναι ὅ. τ. Δ.] We are now advanced to the record of a most awful and mysterious transaction, consequently encompassed with difficulties, defying the human understanding: to avoid which, several eminent persons, both ancient and modern, have thought that a *visionary scene*, not a *real event*, is here narrated. But there is not the slightest intimation in the narrative, that the temptation was such. The air of the narrative produces an impression the contrary; and there are many strong reasons why such a view cannot be admitted. On the other hand, in favor of the common mode, we may safely maintain, that there is nothing in the circumstances, which involves any strong improbability: but rather what is quite agreeable to the analogy of God's methods, in other points, in his dispensations to man. So Bishop Porteus, and Mr. Townson, trace several points of striking similitude to the *temptation of Adam and Eve in Paradise*. And others have compared the character and design thereof with those of the *Crucifixion*, and have recognised in both a vicarious transaction. As to the confident assertion of the *Unitarians*, that the very form of expression, ἀνήχθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πν. shows that it is only a visionary scene, referring for similar expressions to Rev. i. 10. Acts xi. 5, the latter of these has nothing in common with this of St. Matthew; and the former, though it bears some verbal resemblance to the parallel passage of Luke iv. 1, is really of quite another character. Similar expressions do indeed occur at Matth. xii. 28. Lu.

ii. 27. Acts viii. 29. and x. 19. But no one ever imagined the actions there described to be merely *imaginary*.

— τοῦ διαβόλου] Διάβολος, properly a *slanderer*. It is sometimes in the N. T. an *appellative*; but mostly denotes, with the Art., the great enemy of God and man; thus exactly answering to the Heb. שָׂטָן. This arises from the close connection between the senses of *later* and *enemy*. And though it be not often found so used, yet the verb διαβάλλεσθαι occurs in Herodot. and other writers, and is used in the sense to be *hated*; and διαβάλλεσθαι τινι, in Thucyd. iii. 109, iv. 21, viii. 83, signifies, "to be set against any one, to hate him." See my Note there.

3. ὁ πειράζων.] Particip. for substantive verbal; an idiom found both in the Scriptural and the Classical writers.

— Ἰῶς τοῦ Θεοῦ.] Not, "a son of God," as Campb. and Wakef. render. For it has been proved by Br. Middl. that εἶδος τοῦ Θεοῦ, or νίδος Θεοῦ are never taken in a lower sense than ὁ νίδος τοῦ Θεοῦ, which is always to be understood in the *highest* sense. Thus in Mark i. 1. Ἰῶς τοῦ Θεοῦ is spoken by the Evangelist himself of Jesus. In John x. 36. the same phrase is employed by Christ himself of himself; and in Matth. xxvii. 40. it is used by those who well knew Christ's pretensions. Neither is νίδος Θεοῦ, without either of the Articles, to be taken in an inferior sense; for, not to examine all the places in which it occurs, we have Matth. xxvii. 43, where the crime laid to Christ is, that he said, "I am the son of God."

— ἐπιτέ.] "order." This is no Hebraism, but occurs in Thucyd. and the best Classical writers. As *dic* in the Latin.

— ἄρτοι.] *Loaves*. "Ἄρτος, used indefinitely, is rightly translated *bread*; but when joined with εἶς, or any other word limiting the signification in the singular number, ought to be rendered *loaf*; in the plural it ought always to be rendered *loaves*." (Campb.)

4. ἐπ' ἄρτω — ζήσεται.] The quotation agrees with the Heb. and Sept. For, although the Vatican text has τῶν, yet many of the best MSS. and several fathers omit it. Ὁ is placed before ἀνθρώπος in several MSS. of the Alex. recension, and has been introduced into the text by Griesb., Knapp, and Fritz.; but I think without sufficient authority. Vater and Scholz have not admitted it. The Pres. is here put for the Fut., or rather may be taken of what is *customary*. The ἐπι signifies *upon* or *by*.

— ἐπὶ παντί — Θεοῦ.] This explained allegorically, will signify the spiritual life imparted by the Word of God, like the Heb. כָּבֵד, a mode of interpretation confirmed by the authority of the Fathers. Yet as ῥῆμα (to which, however, there is no word corresponding in the Heb.) may be rendered *thing*, as well as *word*; so the best modern Commentators are justified in explaining

MK. LU.

1. 3. Διάβολος εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν πόλιν, καὶ ἵστησιν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸ περὶ ἄγιον τοῦ
 9 ἱεροῦ· καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· Εἰ τίς εἶ τοῦ Θεοῦ, βύλε σεαυτὸν κάτω· 6
 10 γέγραπται γάρ, ὅτι τοῖς ἄγγέλοις αὐτοῦ ἐντελεῖται περὶ
 11 σοῦ· καὶ ἐπὶ χειρῶν ἄροῦσί σε, μήποτε προσκόψῃς
 12 πρὸς λίθον τὸν πόδα σου. Ἐφη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Πάλιν γέ- 7
 12 γραπται· Οὐκ ἐκπειράσεις Κύριον τὸν Θεόν σου. Πά- 8
 5 λιν παραλαμβάνει αὐτὸν ὁ Διάβολος εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλὸν λίαν, καὶ δείκνυ-
 6 σιν αὐτῷ πάσας τὰς βασιλείας τοῦ κόσμου καὶ τὴν δόξαν αὐτῶν, καὶ 9
 λέγει αὐτῷ· Ταῦτα πάντα σοι δώσω, εἰὰν πεσὼν προσκυνήσῃς μοι.
 7 Τότε λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Ἔπαγε ὀπίσω μου, Σατανᾶ· γέγραπται 10
 8 γάρ· Κύριον τὸν Θεόν σου προσκυνήσεις, καὶ αὐτῷ

it, "whatever is ordained by God." "The temptation (observes Campb.) is repelled by a quotation from the O. T. purporting that, when the sons of Israel were in the like perilous situation in a desert, without the ordinary means of subsistence, God supplied them with food, by which their lives were preserved, to teach us that no strait, however pressing, ought to shake our confidence in him." With this sentiment comp. Wisd. xvi. 26. *ὄχι αἱ γεντεῖς τῶν καρπῶν τρέφουσιν ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἥμᾳ σου τοῖς σοι πιστεύοντάς διατηρεῖ.* [Comp. Deut. 8. 3.]

5. As to the difference in the order of the temptations recorded by Matthew, as compared with that in Luke (who transposes the last two) the discrepancy (if, indeed, it can be called such) is not to be removed by any "device for the nonce;" such as supposing the temptation to idolatry to have taken place *twice*; or the order in Luke to have been disturbed by transcribers. Mr. Townsend accounts for the difference in order by ascribing it to *difference of purpose* in the Evangelists. But it is better to attribute it to a difference of purpose in *narrating* the temptation; and to suppose, that while Matthew intended to fix the order of the circumstances, (which is plain by his having employed the definite terms *τότε* and *πάλιν*.) Luke did not mean to be so very exact, but merely to record the transaction in a *general way*; and thus the ordinary conjunction was sufficient for his purpose.

— *παραλαμβάνει*] *Παραλαμβάνει* often signifies, both in the Scriptural and Classical writers, to take any one along with us (*παρα*) as a companion. Neither this term nor *ἵστησιν* gives the least countenance to the vulgar notion, that the Devil transported our Lord through the air. The latter is admitted to have the sense, *prevailed upon him to take his station*. So xviii. 2. and Gen. xliii. 9. *σῆσω αὐτὸν ἐναντίον σου*.

— *ἁγίαν πόλιν*.] So called *κατ' ἔξοχὴν*, as having the holy Temple and its worship. Thus the inscription on their coins was "Jerusalem the holy." Indeed, the Heathens called those cities *holy*, which were accounted the special residence of any of their deities.

— *περὶ ἄγιον*] On the sense of this term Commentators are not agreed. One thing is admitted, that it cannot mean *pinnacle*; for there would have been no Article. And for the sense *pinnacled battlement*, (assigned by Grot., Hammond, and Dodd.) there is no authority. Unluckily we have no other example of *περὶ ἄγιον* used of a *building*. But as the primitive *περὶ* has been proved by Wets. to denote the *roof of a temple*,

so this is supposed by Krebs, Middlet., Schleus., and Fritz., to denote the pointed roof of some part of the temple, and as they are inclined to think, the *great Eastern porch*. The most probable opinion, however, is, that of Wets., Michaelis, Rosenm., and Kuin., that it referred to what was called the *King's Portico*, which overhung the precipice at the S. and E. of the temple (see Joseph. Ant. xv. 11 and 5.); and was perhaps so called from the spire-like figure which the end of the building presented from below. [Comp. Psalm xci. 11.]

6. *γέγραπται γάρ, ὅτι κ. τ. λ.*] The former was a temptation to *presumption* from trust in himself; this, to *distrust* in God's Providence. The Scripture quotation with which the Devil subtly tries to effect his purpose, is perverted; for the promise of protection there given is limited to those only, who endure the evils which *meet them* in the path of duty; not in such as they *bring upon themselves* by rashly presuming on God's protection. The metaphor in *ἐπὶ χειρῶν ἄροῦσί σε*, is, as Kuin. remarks, taken from *parents*, who, in travelling over rough ways, lift up and carry their children over the stones in their path, lest they should trip and stumble upon them.

7. *ὄχι ἐκπειράσεις, &c.*] Ἐκπειράσεις (where the *ἐκ* is intensive) signifies to make trial of any one's power generally; and here, of any one's power to *save*. The Commentators, however, are divided in opinion whether Christ is warning against *presumption* or *distrust*. The former is the more probable. [Comp. Deut. vi. 16.]

8. *δείκνυσιν* — *κόσμον*.] *Δείκνυσιν* sometimes imports not absolutely to *exhibit to the sight*, but merely to *point out*; and here may serve to *indicate* the several kingdoms. Yet there is a difficulty as concerns τὸν κόσμον, in the term of Luke iv. 5. *τῆς οἰκουμένης*. To obviate this, the best modern Commentators are agreed, that the terms must be taken in a restricted sense, to denote *Palestine* only. And indeed undoubted examples of this signification have been adduced, as Rom. iv. 13. Luke ii. 1. Rom. i. 8. From this lofty mountain (supposed to have been Nebo) a prospect would be afforded (as formerly to Moses) of nearly the whole of Palestine; and its provinces might be styled *kingdoms*, just as their tetrarchs or ethnarchs were called kings. See Matt. ii. 22.

9. *προσκυνήσῃς*.] The word here implies, not merely *homage*, but *adoration*, i. e. religious worship. The manner of rendering both was in the East the same, namely, by prostration to the earth.

11 μόνῳ λατρεύσεις. Τότε ἀφίησιν αὐτὸν ὁ Διάβολος· καὶ ἰδοὺ, 1. 3.
 ἄγγελοι προσήλθον καὶ διηκόνουν αὐτῷ. 13
 12 ἈΚΟΥΣΑΣ δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ὅτι Ἰωάννης παρεδόθη, ἀνεχώρησεν εἰς τὴν 14 14
 13 Γαλιλαίαν· καὶ καταλιπὼν τὴν Ναζαρετ, ἐλθὼν κατοικήσεν εἰς Καπερ-
 14 ναοὺμ τὴν παραθαλασσίαν, ἐν ὁρίοις Ζαβουλὼν καὶ Νεφθαλεὶμ· ἵνα 15
 15 πληρωθῇ τὸ ρηθὲν διὰ Ἠσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος· Γῆ Ζα-
 16 τουλὼν καὶ γῆ Νεφθαλεὶμ, ὁ δὸν θαλάσσης, πέραν
 16 τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, Γαλιλαία τῶν ἐθνῶν, ὁ λαὸς ὁ κατή-

10. λατρεύσεις.] *Λατρεύειν* signifies properly to *render service* to any one; but in the Sept. and N. T. it is generally confined to *religious service*. [*Comp.* Deut. vi. 13, and x. 20.]

11. διηκόνουν αὐτῷ.] *Διακονεῖν* properly signifies to be an *attendant* on any one; but here and at Matt. xxvii. 55. and Mark i. 13 and 15 and 41. it signifies (like *ministrare* in Latin) to *wait at table*, and, by implication, to *supply with food*. So Eur. Cycl. 31. Κέκλωπι δειπνῶν δάκονος.

12. παρεδόθη.] Sub. *εἰς φυλακὴν*, which is usually expressed, as in Acts viii. 3. and xxii. 4. and Diodor. Sic. cited by Munthe. Or it may be (with Fritz.) regarded as an *indefinite* form of expression, (left so, in order to avoid mentioning what is unpleasant) signifying “to be delivered up into any one’s power, for harm.” [*Comp.* Luke iii. 19. John iv. 43.]

13. τὴν παραθαλασσίαν] “which is on the coast of the sea,” or lake of Gennesareth. So called to distinguish it from *another* Capernaum. [*Comp.* Luke iv. 16. 30, 31.]

15. Νεφθαλεὶμ.] Drusius would read *Νεφθαλεῖ*, from the Hebrew. But the present reading seems better to correspond to the Syro-Chaldee, which was spoken by the Apostles; and, according to whose peculiarities of termination proper names of the O. T. would be likely to be conformed.

15, 16. The words agree neither with the Sept. nor the Hebrew; yet the discrepancy is by no means so great as would at first sight appear. The Heb., indeed, is in our Common version wrongly translated; and the Sept. is very corrupt. If the mistakes of the one be rectified, and the corruptions of the other be amended, the discrepancy will almost vanish; especially if we consider the *purpose* of the Evangelist; who did not mean to cite the *whole* prophecy contained in Is. ix. 1 and 2, but that *part* of it which sufficed for his purpose. *Why* he did not cite the whole, was, I apprehend, for this reason — that the Sept. was then, as it is now, throughout these verses exceedingly corrupt, and that the Hebrew was very obscure. The Evangelist, however, perceived that the general scope of the *former* of the two verses was the same as that of the *latter*; and that this latter presented only a fuller statement of what was contained in the former. The sense of both being this, that “in the former time he debased (or permitted to be debased) the land of Zebulon, and the land of Naphthali; the maritime district; the country beyond Jordan, called Galilee of the Gentiles; but in the latter time he hath made (or shall make) it glorious.” Such being the case, the Evangelist rightly judged, that the *substance* of the two verses might be blended into one; omitting, in the former verse, the obscure words of the Hebrew, and the corrupt ones of the Greek; and retaining the rest, with VOL. I.

the slight change (adopted from the Sept.) of making γῆ Ζαβ. &c. *nominate* instead of *accusative* cases, followed by ὁ λαὸς ὁ καθήμενος put in apposition with, as explanatory of, the preceding, and pointing out the *nature* of the glory, to which that country was destined. The country here meant by ἰδὼν θαλάσσης is that circumjacent to the sea of Galilee; for that is the θαλ. here intended. Ὅδον θαλ. is elliptically expressed for ἡ χώρα καθ’ ἑδῶν. So Æschyl. Prom. Vinct. 2. init. Χθονὸς μὲν εἰς τηλοφρον ἦκουεν πέδον, Σκίθην ἐς οἶμον. where the Schol. explains οἶμον by ἰδὼν meaning *tract* or *country*. Thus the words will be found a most graphical description of the country afterwards called Galilee, divided into its districts, as it was in the time of the Prophet; in which Γῆ Ζαβ. and γῆ Νεφ. denote the whole of the tribes of Zebulon and Naphthali, except a tract of country bordering on the lake, the same I imagine as that which, in mentioning the divisions of Galilee, the Rabbins call *valley*. The two next clauses, πέραν Ἰορ., Γαλιλ. τῶν ἐθνῶν denote, I apprehend, the *same* district; the latter being only another appellation of the former. The country meant is that district, between Mount Hermon and the river, which skirts the E. side of Jordan, in its course from Mount Libanus to where it enters the sea of Galilee, in which were situated Chorazin and other places frequented by our Lord. As to the discrepancies which seem to subsist between the Sept. and S. Matthew, I apprehend that, in the time of the Evangelists, the text of the Sept. very nearly agreed with that which we now find in his Gospel; and it ran, I conceive, as follows: χώρα Ζαβ., ἡ γῆ Νεφ. ἰδὼν θαλάσσης [καὶ τὴν παραλίαν [οἰκοῦντες] καὶ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορ., Γαλ. τῶν ἐθνῶν, ὁ λαὸς ὁ πορ. ἐν σκότη εἶδε τὸ φῶς μέγα. οἱ καθ. ἐν χ. [καὶ] σκ. θαν. φῶς ἔλαμψε ἐπ’ αὐτοῖς. Most of the deviations from the present text are, more or less, supported by MSS. The words λοιποὶ οἱ in the common text are evidently from the margin, as also οἰκοῦντες, which is found in some MSS. As to τὴν παραλίαν, the true reading, I have no doubt, is τῆς παραλίης. But I suspect that even that came originally from the *margin*; where it was meant to explain ἰδὼν θαλ. In the Alex. and some other MSS. we have both ἰδὼν θαλ. and its gloss; which, as is often the case, by degrees expelled the original reading. Εἶδε τὸ, for the textual ἰδετε, or εἶδετε, is found in several of the best MSS. The error is such as often occurs; and here led to the rash alteration of αὐτοῖς into ἑμᾶς. The reading of the Sept., οἱ οἰκοῦντες, strongly supports that found in the Codex Cant. and several of the best MSS. of the early Italic Version, οἱ καθήμενοι. This is confirmed by the Hebrew, which is well rendered by Rosenm., “et qui Cimmerias regiones colebant, iis sol affulgebit.” However ungrammatical the idiom

MK. LU.

1. 4. μενος ἐν σκότει εἶδε φῶς μέγα· καὶ ἔτοῖς ἔκαθημέ-
 15 νοις ἐν χώρῃ καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου φῶς ἀνέτειλεν αὐτοῖς.
 16 Ἀπὸ τότε ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς κηρῦσσειν καὶ λέγειν· Μετανοεῖτε· 17
 18 ἤγγικε γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν. Περιπατῶν δὲ [ὁ Ἰησοῦς] παρὰ 18
 τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας, εἶδε δύο ἀδελφοῦς, Σίμωνα τὸν λεγόμε-
 17 νον Πέτρον, καὶ Ἀνδρέαν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, βάλλοντας ἀμφίβληστρον
 18 εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν· ἦσαν γὰρ ἀλιεῖς. καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· Δεῦτε ὀπίσω 19
 18 μου, καὶ ποιήσω ὑμᾶς ἀλιεῖς ἀνθρώπων. οἱ δὲ εὐθὺς ἀφέντες τὰ 20
 19 δίκτυα, ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ. Καὶ προβάς ἐκείθεν, εἶδεν ἄλλους δύο 21
 20 ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ μετὰ Ζεβεδαίου τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῶν, καταρτίζοντας τὰ
 δίκτυα αὐτῶν· καὶ ἐκάλεσεν αὐτούς. οἱ δὲ εὐθὺς ἀφέντες τὸ πλοῖον 22
 καὶ τὸν πατέρα αὐτῶν, ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ.
- ^a Καὶ περιῆγεν ὅλην τὴν Γαλιλαίαν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, διδύσκων ἐν ταῖς 23
 συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν, καὶ κηρῦσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας, καὶ
 24 θεραπεύων πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν ἐν τῷ λαῷ. Καὶ ἀπῆλ-
 24 θεν ἡ ἀκοή αὐτοῦ εἰς ὅλην τὴν Συρίαν· καὶ προσήγγεγκαν αὐτῷ πάν-
 24 τας τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας, ποικίλαις νόσοις καὶ βασάνοις συνεχομένους,

a Mark 1. 23.
 Luke 4. 31.
 infr. 9. 35.

may seem, it is very agreeable to the character of the Hellenistic Greek, and is not unfrequently found in the Apocalypse.

16. καθήμενος ἐν σκότει.] Καθῆσθαι sometimes signifies, as here, to *live* or *be*; of which sense the Commentators adduce examples, as Judith v. 3. 1 Macc. ii. 1. and 29. Sir. xxxvii. 18. Herodot. i. 45. ἐν πένθει καθ. and Dionys. Hal. Ant. p. 502. To which may be added Aristoph. Pac. 642. ἡ πόλις γὰρ ὠχρῶσα κἀν φάβῃ καθήμενη. As, however, the word, in this sense, is almost always connected with terms importing *grief* or *calamity*, there may be an *allusion* to *sitting*, as being the posture of mourners. Σκότος and φῶς are, in Scripture, used to denote respectively the ignorance of irreligion, and the light of the Gospel. But here φῶς, (abstract for concrete,) signifies an *enlightener*, or *teacher*; of which sense Wets. adduces numerous examples, as Hom. II. π. 39. φῶς Δαναοῖσι γίνωμαι. Eurip. El. 449. Ἑλλάδι φῶς. — ἐν χώρῃ καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου.] This is to be taken, like the Sept. ἐν χώρῃ σκιᾷ θανάτου for ἐν χώρῃ σκοτεινῇ, similar to which is the *mortis umbra* of Ovid and Virg.

— ἀνέτειλεν.] We have here a continuation of the metaphor. So the Classical writers speak of the coming of some public benefactor as a *light sprung up in the midst of darkness*, (see Æschyl. Pers. 239, and Agam. 505.) and ἀνατλάω properly denotes the rising of the sun. Αὐτοῖς is redundant; not by Hebraism, but according to the *popular* use in almost all languages. [Comp. Isa. xlii. 7.]

17. ἀπὸ τότε.] Sub. χρόνου, i. e. from the time that Jesus settled at Capernaum. ἤρξατο κηρῦξεν for ἐκήρυξε; by a redundancy, say the Commentators, common to both the Heb. and Latin. But it may be doubted whether there is any real pleonasm in the expression. [Comp. supr. iii. 2. et infr. x. 7.]

18. ἀμφίβληστρον.] This is properly an adjective with δίκτυον understood. The word is used by Hesiod, Herodo., and other authors, and appears, from its use, (see Herodo. i. 141.) to have

denoted a *large drag-net*; as δίκτυον, from δίκω, usually a *small casting-net*. [Comp. Luke v. 2, et John i. 42.]

19. δεῦτε ὀπίσω μου.] Δεῦτε is usually considered as a mere particle of exhortation, like ἄγε or ἄγετε and the Heb. הָלֵךְ or יָבֹל. But it is here and at xi. 28. xxii. 4. Mark i. 17. vi. 31. used in its proper sense, to denote *venite*, or *adeste*. Buttin. rightly derives it from δεῦρ' ἔτε. The ὀπίσω μου has reference to the custom for disciples to follow their master, and the expression is equivalent to "Be my disciple." So Diog. Laert. ii. 48. Socrates is said to have thus called Xenophon: ἔπον τῶνιν καὶ μὲνθαι.

— ἀλιεῖς ἀνθρώπων.] i. e. able to draw men over to the Gospel. So Plato in his *Sophista*, compares the teacher of wisdom to a fisher. And in Stob. Scrm. p. 313. (cited by Palairret) Solon says: Ἐγὼ μὴ ἀνασχῶμαι ἵνα ἄνθρωπον ἀλείψω. Indeed, as Kuin. remarks, terms of hunting and fishing are often used by the Classical writers of conciliating friends, or gaining disciples.

21. ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ.] This is wrongly rendered by some "in the boat." Πλοῖον, indeed, is a general term to denote a *vessel* of any size; but it must here denote the *ship*, i. e. their ship.

23. περιῆγεν] *obvit*, *peragravit*. Act. for mid., by the ellip. of *ἐβαίνον*. Αὐτῶν is used with reference to the plural *implied* in the preceding Γαλιλαίαν, by a common idiom, on which see Matt. Gr. Gr. § 435.

— νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλ.] Kuin. regards the terms as synonymous, which they sometimes are, but not here. Νόσος rather denotes a *thoroughly formed disorder*, whether acute or chronic; *μαλακία*, an *incipient indisposition*, or temporary malady. See Euthym. and Markland in Bowyer.

24. αὐτοῦ.] Genit. of object, for *παρὶ αὐτοῦ*; as in Joseph. p. 786. 45. ἀφίκετο ἀγγελία παρὶ αὐτοῦ.

— ἀκοή] *fame*; as in Thucyd. i. 20. So the Latin *auditio* for *fama*.

— βασάνοις συνεχομένους.] Βάσανος signifies 1. a

καὶ δαιμονιζομένους, καὶ σεληνιζομένους, καὶ παραλυτικούς· καὶ
 25 ἔθεράπευσεν αὐτούς. Καὶ ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοὶ ἀπὸ τῆς
 Γαλιλαίας καὶ Δεκαπόλεως, καὶ Ἱεροσολύμων καὶ Ἰουδαίας, καὶ πέραν
 τοῦ Ἰορδάνου.

touchstone; 2. examination, or trial, by torture; 3. torture itself; 4. any tormenting malady; of which signification examples are adduced by Wets. Συνέχεσθαι is often used with a Dative of some disorder; and has reference to such as confine the patients to their bed.

— καὶ δαιμονιζομένους, καὶ σεληνιζομένους.] Notwithstanding the learning and talent which have been so profusely expended in support of the hypothesis of Mede, that these δαιμονιζόμενοι were merely persons afflicted with lunacy, it is, I conceive, utterly untenable. The disorders could not be the same; that of those possessed with demons being precisely distinguished, not only from natural diseases of the worst sort, but from lunacy in particular. It is true, that among both Heathens and Jews, lunacy and epilepsy were ascribed to the agency of demons (the spirits of dead men, or other evil beings); and it must be granted, that there are some passages of Scripture (as Matt. xvii. 11 and 15. John vii. 20. viii. 43 and 52. x. 2.) which prove that the terms σελην., ἐπιληπ., and δαμ. were sometimes used synonymously. But that will not prove that they were not properly distinct from each other. And surely when distinguished, their being sometimes used synonymously ought not to affect their proper acceptation. The great preponderance, too, of the latter over the former seems to evince an intention, on the part of the sacred writers, to prevent the false conclusions which might be drawn from the diseases having many symptoms in common, by marking those cases of possession which Jesus relieved by some circumstances not equivocal, and which could never accompany an imaginary disorder. And when it is urged, that the Evangelists merely adopted the popular phraseology of their countrymen, without any belief in the superstitions connected therewith, (as with us the use of the term bewitched implies no belief in witchcraft,) that is taking for granted the very thing to be proved, and confounds a distinction, that between popular phraseology and doctrine. Mr. Mede was led into the view adopted by him, from having “observed it to be God’s gracious method, in the course of his revealed dispensations, to take advantage of men’s habitual prejudices, to support his truth, and keep his people attached to his ordinances.” But the learned writer should have known how to distinguish between rites and doctrines. They were rites only, of which the Almighty availed himself, for the benefit of his servants: in matters of doctrine, the like compliance could not be indulged them without violating material truths; and therefore Scripture affords us no example of such a condescension. And surely, to support a false and supposititious opinion concerning diabolic possessions would have been contaminating the purity of the Christian faith. Moreover, when it is urged, that no reason can be given why there should have been demoniacal possessions at the time of our Lord, and not at the present day, we reply, that these possessions might then be permitted to be far more frequent than at any other period, in order that the power of Christ over the world of spirits might be more

evidently shown, and that He who came to destroy the works of the Devil might obtain a manifest triumph over him. Mede, Farmer, and others, indeed, insist much on the highly figurative character of Oriental style, and compare those passages of Matt. viii. 26. Mark iv. 39. and Luke viii. 24., where Jesus, it is said, “rebuked the winds,” and another where it is said he “rebuked a fever.” But as to the former expression, it is, in fact, only equivalent to the *motus componere fluctus* of Virgil: and the expression rebuking the fever is but a strongly figurative one, to denote repressing its violence. And when it is urged, that in the demoniacs no symptoms are recorded which do not coincide with those of epilepsy or insanity at the present day, we may ask, if an evil spirit were permitted to disturb men’s vital functions, have we any conception how this could be done without occasioning some or other of the symptoms which accompany natural disease?

It must, moreover, be borne in mind, that these demoniacal possessions have an intimate relation to the doctrine of redemption, and were, therefore, reasonably to be expected at the promulgation of the Gospel. The doctrines of demoniacal possessions and of a future state were equally supported by the acts and preaching of Jesus and his Disciples; and are equally woven into the substance of the Christian faith; the doctrines of the Fall and of the Redemption being the two cardinal hinges on which our holy Religion turns. To form a right judgment of the matter in question, it should be considered what part the Devil bore in the œconomy of grace. Now, in the history of the Fall, Satan is represented as instigating the first man to disobedience; for which his punishment by the second Adam (who restored man to his lost inheritance) is, at the time of the fall, denounced in the terms of “bruising his head by the seed of the woman.” When, therefore, we find this restoration was procured by the death of Christ, we may reasonably expect to find that punishment on the tempter which was predicted in the history of the Fall, recorded in the history of the Restoration. And so, indeed, we find it. See Luke x. 18. Had the first Adam stood in the rectitude of his creation, he had been immortal, and beyond the reach of natural and moral evil. His fall to mortality brought both into the world. The office of the second Adam was to restore us to that happy state. But as the immortality purchased for us by the Son of God was not like that forfeited by Adam, to commence in this world, but is reserved for the reward of the next, both physical and moral evil were to endure for a season. Yet to manifest that they were, indeed, to receive their final doom from the Redeemer, it was but fit that, in the course of his ministry, he should give a specimen of his power over them. One part, therefore, of his God-like labors was taken up in curing all kinds of natural diseases. But had he stopped there, in the midst of his victories over physical evil, the proof of his dominion over both worlds had remained defective. He was, therefore, to display his sover-

V. Ἰδὼν δὲ τοὺς ὄχλους, ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος· καὶ καθίσαντος αὐτοῦ, 1
 προσήλθον αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ, 2
 ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοὺς, λέγων· ^a Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι· ὅτι 3
^b αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν. ^b μακάριοι οἱ πενθοῦντες· ὅτι 4
^c αὐτοὶ παρακληθήσονται. ^c μακάριοι οἱ πραεῖς· ὅτι αὐτοὶ κληρονομή- 5
^d σουσι τὴν γῆν. ^d μακάριοι οἱ πενθῶντες καὶ διψῶντες τὴν δικαιοσύνην· 6

eignty over *moral evil* likewise. And this could not be clearly evinced, as it was over *natural evil*, but by a sensible victory over Satan, through whose temptation *moral evil* was brought into the world, and by whose wiles and malice it was sustained and increased. For evil is represented in Scripture as having been introduced by a Being of this description, who, in some manner, not intelligible to us, influenced the immaterial principle of man. The continuance of evil in the world is often ascribed to the continual agency of the same being. Our ignorance of the manner in which the mind may be controlled by the agency in question ought not to induce us to reject the doctrine itself.

In short, the hypothesis that the demoniacs were merely lunatic persons, with the semblance of *simplicity*, involves far greater *difficulties* than the common view. How otherwise are we to account for the fact, that the *demoniacs* everywhere address Jesus as the Messiah? which was not the case with those who only labored under *bodily disorders*. And when we find mention made of the *number* of demons in particular possessions, *actions* ascribed to them, and actions so expressly *distinguished* from those of the possessed—conversations held by the former in regard to the disposal of them after their expulsion, and accounts given how they *were* actually disposed of—when we find desires and passions ascribed peculiarly to them, and similitudes taken from the conduct which they usually observe, —it is impossible for us to deny their existence. In acquiescing in which, where we cannot *understand*, we may and ought to bow our reason to the Giver of reason. On one side, we have the wonderful doctrine, that it pleased the Almighty to permit invisible and evil beings to possess themselves, in some incomprehensible manner, of the bodies and souls of men; and for purposes which we can partly see, and are partly left to conjecture. On the other, we have Christ, the *revealer of truth*, establishing *falsehood*, sanctioning error and deception, and consequently being answerable for future and gross impositions, such as have been practised in latter ages! We have the Evangelists inconsistent with themselves; and a narrative acknowledged to be inspired, and intended for the unlearned, unintelligible to the learned and even involving falsehood! The hands, too, of Infidels are greatly strengthened by any such concession; and various other awkward consequences arise, which are ably stated by Bp. Warburton, in L. ix. of his Divine Legation, and in a Sermon on this text, to which I have been much indebted in forming the above article.

Ch. V. 1. The subjoined table, from Bishop Marsh's Dissertation on the first three Gospels, represents the parallel passages, as they are scattered throughout the Gospel of St. Luke, on the three following chapters.

MATTHEW.	LUKE.	MATTHEW.	LUKE.
v. 3—6.	vi. 20, 21.	vi. 19—21.	xii. 33, 34.
11, 12.	22, 23.	22, 23.	xi. 34—36.
15.	xi. 33.	24.	xvi. 13.
18.	xvi. 17.	25—33.	xii. 22—31.
25, 26.	xii. 53, 59.	vii. 1—5.	vi. 37—42.
32.	xvi. 18.	7—11.	xi. 9—13.
39—42.	vi. 29, 30.	12.	vi. 31.
44.	27, 28.	13.	xiii. 24.
45.	35.	16—21.	vi. 43—46.
46, 47.	32, 33.	22, 23.	xiii. 25—27.
48.	36.	24—27.	vi. 47—49.
vi. 9—13.	xi. 2—4.		

— Ἰδὼν τοὺς ὄχλους.] “Seeing so great a concourse,” &c.

— τὸ ὄρος.] As the Article does not allude to any before mentioned or definite mountain, it is by many Commentators regarded as indefinite, like the Heb. *הר*, or put for *ר*. The principle, however, is unsound, both as respects the Greek and the Hebrew. See Fritz. We must leave the Art. its definite force, and with Middl. suppose τὸ ὄρος to denote the *mountain district*, as distinguished from the *other two*; as Gen. xix. 17. and Josh. ii. 22. He is of opinion that our Lord would not lead the multitude to Mount *Tabor*, (which has been commonly supposed the scene of the discourse) since part of the ridge lay much nearer to Capernaum.

— καθίσαντος αὐτοῦ] for καθίσταντι αὐτῷ, says Kuin. This, however, is unnecessary. The construction here adopted is found in Herodot. and other writers. *Καθ.* has reference to the *posture* in which the Jewish doctors taught; the master *sitting*, while the disciples stood.

2. ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ.] This is usually esteemed an Hebraism; but Wets. has adduced similar expressions from the Greek Classics; and the expression may rather be considered as a vestige of the redundancy of primitive phraseology; afterwards retained with verbs of speaking, and on occasions of more than usual importance. See Winer's Gr. § 54. 2, a. Sometimes it is used *instead* of a verb of speaking, as in Ps. lxxviii. 12. ἀνοίξω τὸ στόμα μου ἐν παραβολαῖς.

3. μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι.] The sense here partly depends upon the *construction*, on which Commentators are not agreed. Many of the moderns join τῷ πνεύματι with μακ.; while the greater number, and nearly all the ancient, construe it with πτωχοὶ. And this seems preferable; for the former method, though it yields a tolerable sense, is too harsh, and breaks that uniformity of expression, which runs through the several μακαρισμοί. Πτωχοὶ τῷ πν. is well explained by Euthym. οἱ ταπεινοὶ τῇ προαίρεσει those of a humbler disposition. See Is. lxxvi. 2. Here τῷ πνεύματι is added, in order to determine the sense.

4. οἱ πενθοῦντες.] This is by some explained, “those who bear afflictions with resignation.” But it is better, with Chrys. and some moderns.

- 7 ὅτι αὐτοὶ χορτασθήσονται. ^e μακάριοι οἱ ἐλεήμονες ὅτι αὐτοὶ ἐλεηθή- ^e Infra 6. 14. Mark 11. 25. Jam. 2. 13. 1 Pet. 24. 4. Heb. 12. 14. 1 Cor. 13. 12. 1 John 3. 2.
- 8 σονται. ^f μακάριοι οἱ καθαροὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ ὅτι αὐτοὶ τὸν Θεὸν ὄψον- ^f 1 Pet. 3. 14. 2 Tim. 2. 12.
- 9 ται. μακάριοι οἱ εἰρηνοποιοὶ ὅτι αὐτοὶ υἱοὶ Θεοῦ κληθήσονται. ^g h Luke 6. 22. 1 Pet. 4. 14.
- 10 ^g μακάριοι οἱ δεδιωγμένοι ἕνεκεν δικαιοσύνης ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἡ βα- ^g 1 Luke 6. 23. Jam. 1. 2. Acts 7. 52. infr. 23. 34, &c. k Mark 9. 50. Luke 14. 34. & 35.
- 11 σιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν. ^h μακάριοί ἐστε, ὅταν ὀνειδίωσιν ὑμᾶς καὶ ^h 1 Luke 6. 23. Jam. 1. 2. Acts 7. 52. infr. 23. 34, &c. k Mark 9. 50. Luke 14. 34. & 35.
- διώξωσι, καὶ εἰπωσὶ πᾶν πονηρὸν ῥῆμα καθ' ὑμῶν ψευδόμενοι, ἕνεκεν
- 12 ἑμοῦ. ⁱ Χαίrete καὶ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε! ὅτι ὁ μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολὺς ἐν τοῖς ⁱ 1 Luke 6. 23. Jam. 1. 2. Acts 7. 52. infr. 23. 34, &c. k Mark 9. 50. Luke 14. 34. & 35.
- οὐρανοῖς· οὕτω γὰρ ἐδίωξαν τοὺς προφῆτας τοὺς πρὸ ὑμῶν.
- 13 ^k Ὑμεῖς ἐστε τὸ ἅλας τῆς γῆς· ἐὰν δὲ τὸ ἅλας μωρανθῇ, ἐν τίνι

as Kuhn, and others, to interpret, "those who mourn [for their sins.]" See Isa. lvii. 13. and James iv. 9.

— παρακληθήσονται] "they shall be comforted;" namely, with the hope of final acceptance and salvation.

5. οἱ πραεῖς] "the meek and forgiving." It is not *apatheia* which is enjoined, but a regulation of passion. See Ephes. iv. 26. The blessing here promised (taken from Ps. xxxvii. 11.) is primarily an earthly, but terminates in a heavenly one; conferring not a temporal, but an eternal inheritance.

6. οἱ πεινῶντες—δικαιοσύνη] i. e. those who ardently pursue, and, as naturally, seek after it, as men do to satisfy hunger and thirst. By *δικαιοσύνην* is denoted the performance of all the duties which God has enjoined.

—χορτασθήσονται.] The Interpreters variously supply what is here wanting to complete the sense. The best method seems to be that of Chrys. and Euthym. who simply supply *παντὸς ἀγαθοῦ*, i. e. with every good, both in this world, and in the next. *Χορταξ.* is properly used of *animals*, but is, in the later writers, applied to *men*.

7. ἐλεηθήσονται] "shall experience mercy and compassion;" namely, always from God, in pardon and acceptance; and (as seems to be also implied) usually from man. See Chrys. and comp. Prov. xi. 25.

8. οἱ καθαροὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ] i. e. "the pure in heart," as contradistinguished from those who, like the Pharisees, only aimed at an outward and ceremonial purity. So the Heb. כָּרֵן כָּרֵן and כָּרֵן כָּרֵן, as Ps. xxiv. 4. and Gen. xx. 50. Many parallel sentiments are adduced by Wets. from the Classical writers. I add Aristoph. *Ran. γνώμη καθαρεύειν*.

—τὸν Θεὸν ὄψονται.] A phrase occurring also at Heb. xii. 14, which is best explained as indicating the *favour of God* here, and his *final acceptance*, by salvation, hereafter. In the East, where monarchs were seldom seen, and seldom approached by their subjects, it is no wonder that *introduction to them* should have been an image of high honour and happiness.

9. εἰρηνοποιοὶ] i. e. not only those who are peaceably inclined, but also who study to preserve peace among others.

—υἱοὶ Θεοῦ] namely, as imitating and bearing resemblance to God, who is styled the God of peace. See Rom. xv. 20. and 2 Cor. xiii. 11. So Philo de Sacr. οἱ τὸ ἀρετῶν τῇ φύσει καὶ τὸ καλῶν, υἱοὶ εἰσι τοῦ Θεοῦ. Similar expressions, too, occur in the Pagan Philosophers, who are supposed to have borrowed them from the Scriptures. It is here *implied* that they will be loved and blessed with a truly paternal affection.

10. δεδιωγμένοι ἕνεκεν δικαιοσύνης.] Διώκειν signifies, 1. to follow after; 2. to pursue any one for apprehension; 3. in a metaphorical sense, to pursue with acts of enmity, to persecute, as in the present passage, which is similar to 1 Pet. iii. 14. ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ πάσχετε διὰ δικαιοσύνην, μακάριοι. In both the sense of *δικ.* is, "virtue and true religion."

11. ὅταν ὀνειδίωσιν] for εἰ ὀνειδίωσιν. Sub. ἀνθρώποι, by an ellipsis common to most languages. On this use of the subjunct. see Winer's Gr. Some of the best Commentators are of opinion, that, having in the former verse touched on persecution generally, our Lord here descends to particulars; and notices one special act of it, namely, prosecution before human tribunals, on account of religion. Διώκειν is a well known forensic term to denote *prosecute*; and the other expressions in this sentence may have reference to judicial insult and gross abuse, as well as injustice. It may, however, be taken here in the same sense as in the preceding verse, the sense there being only further developed here.

—ψευδόμενοι] Particip. for adv., as in a similar passage of Joseph. Ant. vii. 11. 1. τοῖς πλοναυσιατά-
τους τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἔλεγε, καταψυδόμενος, διδασκάλους εἶναι ἀπὸ τοῦ βουλεμματος γεγονέναι.
—ἕνεκεν ἑμοῦ] "in my cause."

12. χαίrete καὶ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε.] The words are *not*, as Kuhn. supposes, synonymous; but the latter is a stronger term than the former. The sense of *μισθός* need not here be pressed on, since it must signify a reward assigned of mere grace. See Rom. iv. 4.

13. ἐστέ] "are, or are [to be]" "should consider yourselves as." Τῆς γῆς is for τῶν ἀνθρώπων. —τὸ ἅλας τ. γ.] So Livy, cited by Grot. calls Greece the *sal gentium*; salt being a common symbol of wisdom. The meaning is, "What salt is to food, by seasoning and by preserving it, so ought ye to be to the rest of men. Others are to learn from you, and ye are to be examples to others."

—μωρανθῇ] "becomes insipid" ἀναλον γίνεται, as Mark ix. 50. This sense is derived from that signification of *μωρός*, by which (like the Latin *fatuus*, and the Heb. כָּרֵן כָּרֵן, as applied to objects of taste) it denotes *insipid*. The word is properly cognate with *μωρός*, *debilis*. Thus we use *faunt* in the sense *insipid*. It is certain that *rock salt* may lose its savour; but probably not sea salt. And as the allusion is somewhat remote, most recent Commentators have (with Schoettg.) supposed that a *bituminous salt* is here meant, procured from the lake Asphaltites, and which, having a fragrant odour, was strewn over the sacrifices in the temple, to counteract the smell of the burning flesh. Now as large quantities

ἀλισθήσεται; εἰς οὐδὲν ἰσχύει ἔτι, εἰ μὴ βληθῆναι ἔξω, καὶ καταπα-
 τεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων. ^l Τρεῖς ἐστε τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου. οὐ ¹⁴
 δύναται πόλις κρυβῆναι ἐπάνω ὄρους κειμένη. ^m οὐδὲ καίουσιν λῆχρον ¹⁵
 καὶ τιθέουσιν αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον, ὅλλ' ἐπὶ τὴν λαχτίαν· καὶ λάμπει
^{n 1} πᾶσι τοῖς ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ. ⁿ Οὕτω λαμψάτω τὸ φῶς ὑμῶν ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ¹⁶
 ἀνθρώπων, ὅπως ἴδωσιν ὑμῶν τὰ καλὰ ἔργα, καὶ δοξάσωσι τὸν πατέ-
 ρα ὑμῶν τὸν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.
 Μὴ νομίσητε, οἳ ἦλθον καταλῦσαι τὸν νόμον ἢ τοὺς προφῆτας· οὐκ ¹⁷
 ἦλθον καταλῦσαι, ἀλλὰ πληρῶσαι. ^o Ἀμὴν γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν· ἕως ἂν ¹⁸

were laid up in the temple for this use, it would often spoil by exposure to the sun and atmosphere, and was then, we learn, scattered over the pavement, to prevent the priests from slipping, in wet weather. This, then, is thought to be an allusion to the temple service. There is here only a case *supposed*, which does sometimes, though rarely, occur. But this method is not necessary to be adopted, and seems at variance with the parallel passage at Luke xiv. 35.

— ἐὰν δὲ τὸ — ἀλισθήσεται.] “Our Lord has here supported a *particular truth* on a *general principle*. The particular truth is, that the loss of the salt, or genuine spirit of Christianity, cannot be supplied by any expedient whatsoever: and it is supported on this general principle; that every thing has its salt, or essential quality, which makes it to be what it is; and without which it is no longer the same; having degenerated into another thing.” (Warburton).

— εἰ μὴ βληθ. ἔξω] “a sort of rustic proverb, signifying to be good for nothing.” Markl. on Luke xiv. 34.

14. τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου] i. e. the means by which God is pleased to enlighten the minds of men with true religion, as the globe is enlightened by the rays of the sun; which is, in the *proper* sense, τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου. The term was applied by the Jews to their Rabbins, as among the Greeks and Romans celebrated persons were called *lights of the world*.

— οὐ δύναται πόλις κρυβῆναι, &c.] It is commonly supposed that this being connected with ver. 16., which contains the *application* of the similitude, namely, οὕτω λαμψάτω, &c., there is an ellipsis of *καθὼς*; as Is. Iv. 9. and Jer. iii. 20. But it is better to suppose that in these words is *implied* the corresponding clause, “So neither can you remain in secret; the eyes of all being turned upon you.” Then ver. 16. will supply an *admonition* founded on what is said in the two preceding verses.

— πόλις — ἐπάνω ὄρους.] This part of the simile may, as some suppose, have been suggested to Jesus by the city Bethulia, a little N. of Mt. Tabor; and clearly visible from the situation where the discourse was pronounced.

15. καίουσιν] for the more Classical ἄπτουσι, which is used by Lu. viii. 16. xi. 33. Yet examples of it have been adduced, chiefly from the later writers, and in the *passive*. The sentence contains a proverbial saying, to express depriving any thing of its utility, by putting it to a use the farthest from what it was intended for. The words *λήχρον* and *μόδιον* have Articles, because they are *monadic* nouns, as denoting things of which there is usually *one* only in a house. See Middlet. and Campb.

16. τὸ φῶς ὑ.] i. e. the light of your *example* in a holy life.

— ἴδωσιν—καὶ δοξάσωσι.] For ἰδόντες δοξ. Δοξάζειν in the sense *praise, glorify*, is Hellenistic. In Classical Greek it signifies to *suppose*.

17. καταλῦσαι] “to abrogate, to annul.” A sense as applied to laws or institutions of any kind, often occurring in the Classical writers. Our Lord here anticipates an objection; namely, that his doctrines differed, in many respects, from the Mosaic; and that therefore his system could not but *destroy* that promulgated by God to Moses, and borne testimony to by the Prophets. And yet it was not to be imagined, that the all-wise Being would lay down a law, as a *rule* of life, under *one* dispensation, which should be at variance with what he had promulgated under *another*. By τὸν νόμον must be meant in some sense, the law of Moses; that being the invariable sense of the word in the Gospels and Acts. Some, however, understand the *ceremonial*, others the *moral* law. Each, indeed, may be said to be meant. For the *ceremonial* law was completed by our Lord, in answering the types and fulfilling the prophecies, after which it was to cease, the *shadow* being supplied by the *substance*; the *moral*, by his exalting its precepts to a spirituality before unknown, and purifying it from the corruptions of the Jewish teachers: for it is plain from the whole of Scripture, that the *ceremonial* law alone was abrogated, while the *moral* law was left, as of perpetual obligation. And thus, in either case the law was meant to be, as St. Paul terms it, our *παιδαγωγός*, or conductor to, and preparer for, the Gospel, and to cease when it had answered the purpose for which it was originally designed, as a *part* of the great plan of Divine wisdom and mercy, for the salvation of man. This assurance of our Lord was made, to correct the false opinion of the Jews; that the Messiah would raise the Mosaic law to the greatest perfection, and *literally* fulfil the happy predictions of the Prophets.

18. Ἀμὴν.] A word derived from the Heb., and used either at the beginning, or the end of a sentence. In the former case it has the affirmative sense, *verily*, and is equivalent to *ναί*, or *ἀληθῶς*; in the latter, it is put for *γίνωσκο*, “so be it!” “ἕως ἂν παρελθῇ οὐρ.” is a proverbial phrase, often occurring in Scripture, and sometimes in the Classics, to denote that a thing can *never* happen. (So Ps. cxix. 46, Job xi. 9. Luke xvi. 17. Matt. xxiv. 35. Is. v. 10. Jer. xxxiii. 20, 21. Job. xiv. 12.) Dio. Cass. cited by Wets. εἰπόντας Ἰάσσαν ἂν τὸν οὐρανὸν συμπεσεῖν, ἢ Πιλαγίαν τὸν ἐπὶ Σεβήρου παθεῖν. Dionys. Hal. vi. 95. where it is agreed in a treaty, that there shall be peace μέχρις ἂν οὐρανός τε καὶ γῆ τὴν αὐτὴν στάσις ἔχωσι.

παρέλθῃ ὁ οὐρανός καὶ ἡ γῆ, ἵῶτα ἓν ἢ μία κεφαία οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ
 19 ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου, ἕως ἄν πάντα γένηται. ^{p Jam. 2. 10. sup. ver. 3,} ὅς ἐάν οὖν λύσῃ μίαν τῶν
 ἐπιτολῶν τούτων τῶν ἐλαχίστων, καὶ διδάξῃ οὕτω τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, ἐλά-
 χιστος κληθήσεται ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν. ὅς δ' ἂν ποιῆσῃ καὶ
 20 διδάξῃ, οὗτος μέγας κληθήσεται ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν. ^{q Luke 11. 39. infr. 23. 25. 26. 27.} Ἐγὼ
 γὰρ ὑμῖν, ὅτι ἐάν μὴ περισσεύσῃ ἡ δικαιοσύνη ὑμῶν πλεῖον τῶν γραμ-
 ματέων καὶ Φαρισαίων, οὐ μὴ εἰσελθῆτε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρα-
 21 νῶν. ^{r Exod. 20. 13. Deut. 5. 17.} Ἰκούσατε ὅτι ἐρέθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις· “Οὐ φονεύσεις· ὅς δ'
 22 ἂν φονεύσῃ, ἔνοχος ἔσται τῇ κρίσει.” ^{s 1 John 3. 15.} Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι πᾶς
 ὁ ὀργιζόμενος τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ εἰκῆ, ἔνοχος ἔσται τῇ κρίσει· ὅς δ' ἂν

The words *ὁ οὐρανός καὶ ἡ γῆ*, form a periphrasis for *the universe*; which the Jews supposed was never utterly to perish, but would be constantly renewed. See Baruch iii. 32. and i. 11. So Phil. Jud. 656. says, that the laws of Moses may be expected to remain *ἕως ἄν ἡλιος καὶ σελήνη, καὶ ὁ σῆμας οὐρανός τε καὶ κόσμος ᾗ*. Something very similar is cited by Wets. from a Rabbinical writer. — *ἵῶτα — κεφαία*. Ἰῶτα denoted *properly*, the letter *Jod* [י] (as being the smallest of the letters in the Hebrew alphabet,) and *figuratively*, any thing very small: *κεφαία*, the points, or corners, which distinguished similar letters of the Hebrew alphabet, but were used figuratively to denote the minutest parts of any thing. Similar sentiments are cited from the Rabbinical writers. Thus our Lord means to express, in addition to the *eternal obligation*, the *boundless extent* of the moral law, as demanding the utmost purity of *thought*, as well as innocence of action.

— *ἕως ἄν πάντα γένηται*.] “until all shall come to pass,” i. e. be accomplished, namely, by the fulfilment of the legal types and prophecies, and the complete establishment of the moral law.

19. *λύσῃ*.] “Shall neglect, or transgress.” A sense common in the Classical writers, and here required by the antithetical term *ποιεῖν*.

— *μίαν τῶν ἐλαχίστων*.] Render “One of the least of these commandments.” Here there is an allusion to the practice of the Pharisees, who, agreeably to their own lax notions of morality, divided the injunctions of the law into the *weightier* and the *lighter*. Any transgression of the latter they held to be very venial. And, by their own arbitrary classification of the former, they evaded the *spirit*, while they pretended to fulfil the *letter* of the law.

— *ἐλάχιστος κληθήσεται*.] Said *per meiosis* for, “he shall be farthest from attaining heaven,” i. e. “he shall not attain it at all.” By the antithesis *μέγας* must be taken for *μέγιστος*, of which the Commentators adduce examples, to which may be added Plato ap. Matth. G. G. § 266. Here only a high degree of the positive can be meant. *Μέγας κληθήσεται*, “he shall be great,” i. e. in high favour; on which sense see my note on Thueyd. i. 138. By *τῇ βασ. τ. οὐρ.* is meant, the kingdom of Christ on earth, the Gospel dispensation.

20. *περισσεύσῃ, &c.*] “shall excel.” Here our Lord fully declares his meaning; openly *naming* those whom he had before only *hinted* at. The sentence is, as it were, an answer to a question; q. d. “What, will not the righteousness of the law, as exhibited in the lives of such holy per-

sons as the Pharisees, save us?” “No such thing—for I plainly tell you, that unless,” &c. *Δικαιοσύνη* must here denote, like the Heb. *הקרא*, piety and virtue, as evinced in a life spent agreeably to the Divine commands, especially in the cultivation of the moral virtues.

— *οὐ αὖ εἰσελθ.*] “Ye shall by no means enter.” On this syntax see Winer’s Gr. p. 161. m.

21. *τοῖς ἀρχαίοις*.] It is matter of dispute whether this should be rendered “*by*, or *to* them of old time.” The former is maintained by most of the Commentators from Beza downward; the latter, by the Fathers and the ancient translators, and a few modern Commentators, as Doddr. Campb., Bp. Jebb, and Rosenm. So Joseph. Antiq. viii. 2. 4. “God gave to Solomon wisdom, ὥστε τοὺς ἀρχαίους υπερβάλλειν ἀνθρώπους.” Upon the whole, the former interpretation seems to deserve the preference; as being most suitable to the context, and confirmed by the usage of the later writers, especially the Sept. and the N. T. And the words will thus be akin to a Talmudic saying, which may be rendered, *εἰρήκασιν οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἡμῶν*. By *οἱ ἀρχαῖοι* Kuin. understands the *Jewish teachers* not long before the age of the Gospel. And Fritz. observes that the notion of *ἀρχαῖος* is *relative*. Be that as it may, certain it is that in that age the moral law had been utterly perverted; and that our Lord meant to *allude* to that corruption, is plain from what follows.

— *ἔνοχος ἔσται τῇ κρίσει*] “will be liable to the judgment.” So Plato, cited by Wets., *ἔνοχος ἔστω νόμοις ὁ ποῦτο δόξιας*. By *τῇ κρίσει* is meant an inferior Court of Judicature, consisting (as the Rabbin say) of twenty-three, or according to Joseph. Bell. i. 20. 5. and Ant. iv. 8. 14., of *seven judges*.

22. *τῷ ἀδελφῷ*] for *ἑτέρῳ*, *any one*. An idiom arising from the Jews being accustomed to regard all Israelites as brethren.

— *εἰκῆ*] “without sufficient cause;” implying also *above measure*. For such a person, to use the words of Aristot. cited by Wets. is angry, *οἷς οὐ δεῖ, καὶ ἐφ’ οἷς οὐ δεῖ, καὶ μάλλον ἢ δεῖ*. Critics are divided in opinion as to the genuineness of the word, which is rejected by Erasm., Bengel, Mill, and Fritz., but received by Grot., Wets., Griesb., Matthæi, Tittm., Vater, Knapp., and Scholz. The authority of MSS. for its omission is next to nothing; and that of *versions* slender. And although that of the Fathers be considerable, yet far inferior to that *for* the word—Not to say that the *universal consent* of Fathers would not counterbalance such strong external evidence

ἐπὶ τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ· ἡκαὶ, ἔνοχος ἔσται τῷ συνεδρίῳ· ὃς δ' ἂν
 ἐπὶ μωρῆ, ἔνοχος ἔσται εἰς τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρός. Ἐὰν οὖν προσ- 23
 φέρῃς τὸ δῶρόν σου ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον, καὶ εἴ μνησθῆς ὅτι ὁ ἀδελ-
 φός σου ἔχει τι κατὰ σοῦ· ἄφες ἐκεῖ τὸ δῶρόν σου ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ 24
 θυσιαστηρίου, καὶ ὑπάγε, πρῶτον διαλλάγηθι τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου, καὶ
 τότε ἐλθὼν πρόσφερε τὸ δῶρόν σου. Ἴσθι εὐνοῶν τῷ ἀντιδίκῳ σου 25
 ταχὺ, ἕως ὅτου εἴ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ μετ' αὐτοῦ· μήποτε σε παραδῶ ὁ ἀντι-
 δικὸς τῷ κριτῇ, καὶ ὁ κριτὴς σε παραδῶ τῷ ὑπηρέτῃ, καὶ εἰς φυλακὴν
 βληθήσῃ. Ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, οὐ μὴ ἐξέλθῃς ἐκεῖθεν, ἕως ἂν ἀποδοῖς 26
 τὸν ἕχατον κοδράντην. Ὡς ἰσχυροὶ ὅτι ἐξῆλθῃ [τοῖς ἀρχαίοις]. Οὐ 27
 μοιχεύσεις. Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι πᾶς ὁ βλέπων γυναῖκα πρὸς τὸ 28

† Luke 12. 58.

u Exod. 20. 14.
 Deut. 5. 18.
 x Job. 31. 1.

as that for the word. Internal evidence, too, for the word, far preponderates. In short, I quite agree with Matthæi, who pithily remarks, "Asceticæ, non Criticæ, disputatum est contra hoc vocabulum."

—ἔνοχος ἔσται τῷ κρίσει] i. e. is liable to such a punishment in the other world as may be paralleled with that which the Court of seven inflicts. Ἡκαὶ. A term of strong reproach, equivalent to "a vile, worthless fellow."

—μωρῆ.] A term expressive of the greatest abhorrence, equivalent to "thou impious wretch," for, in the language of the Hebrews, *folly* is equivalent to "impiety."

—γέενναν τοῦ πυρός.] Γέεννα is formed from the Hebr. גֵּי הַיְיָ (the valley of Hinnom) a place S. E. of Jerusalem, called *Gatenna* at Josh. xviii. 16. (and probably a deep dell; φάραξ as it is rendered at Josh. xv. 8.) where formerly children had been sacrificed by fire to Moloch; and which long afterwards was held in such abomination, that the carcasses of animals, and dead bodies of malefactors, were thrown into it; which, in so hot a climate, needing to be consumed by fire, which was constantly kept up, it obtained the name γέεννα τῶν πυρός. Both from its former and its present use, it was no unfit emblem of the place of torment reserved for the wicked, and might well supply the term to denote it. Of course, the sense is, that the latter offence would incur as much greater a punishment than the former as burning alive was more dreadful than stoning, &c.

23. As the former verse forbids *ill timed and excessive anger and hatred*, so this and the following enjoin *love to our neighbour, and a placable spirit*. And since the Pharisees reckoned anger, hatred, and reviling among the slighter offences; and thought that they did not incur the wrath of God, if sacrifices and other external rites were accurately observed; so here we are taught, that external worship is not pleasing in the sight of God, unless it is accompanied by a meek and charitable spirit.

—δῶρον.] Whatever was brought to the altar, was so called.

ἔχει τι κατὰ σοῦ.] It is not necessary with most Commentators, to supply ἔγκλημα, cause of complaint; since that is implied by the context. The same expression occurs at Mark xi. 25. and Rev. ii. 4.

24. διαλλάγηθι] "(do thy endeavour to be reconciled with;)" namely either by asking pardon, or by *granting* it. Thus Philo de sacrificiis p. 841. says, that when a man had injured his brother,

and, repenting of his fault, *voluntarily acknowledged it*, he was first to make restitution, and then to come into the temple, presenting his sacrifice, and asking pardon. Thus we are taught that vain is all external worship of the Deity, if the duties towards our fellow creatures be neglected.

25. Here is inculcated the *general maxim* of speedy reconciliation with an adversary. And this is illustrated by an example derived *ex re pecuniaria*. Ἴσθι εὐνοῶν, "be friends with." This is not so much a *periphrasis* for εὐνόησον, as a stronger expression. So Luke xix. 17. ἴσθι ἔξοκταν ἔχων.

—τῷ ἀντιδίκῳ.] The word signifies properly an *opponent in a suit at law*; but here a *creditor*, who is about to become a plaintiff, in Art. by suing his debtor at law.

—ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ] "in the way," namely to the Court, or to the Judge. For from Heinecc. Antiq. Rom. iv. 16. 18. we find that sometimes the plaintiff and defendant used to settle their affair *by the way*; and then the latter, who had been summoned to trial, was dismissed.

—ὑπηρέτῃ] "the person who carried into execution the sentence of the Judge," whether corporal punishment or fine, called by Lu. xii. 58. πρᾶκτωρ, probably the more exact term.

27. τοῖς ἀρχαίοις.] These words have been rightly rejected by all the later Editors, since they are found in few of the MSS., are not in the Ed. Print., and are sanctioned by scarcely any Versions or Fathers; and we can far better account for their insertion than their omission.

28. γυναῖκα] i. e. a *married woman*; which sense is required by the context and almost general use of μοιχεύω and μοιχεία in the Scriptures. Βλέπων is for ἐπιβλέπων, passionately "*gazing upon*." So ἐποφθαλμῶν. Our Lord means to say, that it is not only the act, but the *unchaste desire*, also, (what is called at 2 Pet. ii. 14. the "adulterous eye") which is included in the commandment. Ἐπιθυμία may (with Whitby) be defined "such a desire as gains the full consent of the will, and would certainly terminate in action, did not impediments from other causes arise;" thus making the essence of the vice to be in the *intention*. So also thought many of the sages of Greece and Rome, from whom citations are adduced by Wets., as Juven. Sat. xiii. 203., "Scelus intra se tacitum qui cogitat ullum *Facti crimen habet*;" to which I add Max. Tyr. Diss. 33, 4., who says that, to prevent criminal action, the only safe expedient is *σπίσαι τὰς πηγὰς, καὶ ἀποφράσαι τῶν ἡδονῶν γέεννας*. Indeed, the an-

29 ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτῆς, ἥδη ἐμοίχευσεν αὐτὴν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ. ^γ εἰ ^{y Infr. 18. 8, Mark 9. 43, 45,}
 δεῖ δὲ ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς σου ὁ δεξιὸς σκανδαλίζει σε, ἕξιλε αὐτὸν καὶ βίβλε ἀπὸ
 σου* συμφέρει γάρ σοι ἵνα ἀπόληται ἐν τῶν μελῶν σου, καὶ μὴ ὄλον
 30 τὸ σῶμά σου βληθῆ εἰς γέενναν. Καὶ εἰ ἡ δεξιὰ σου χεὶρ σκανδα-
 λίζει σε, ἔκκοπον αὐτὴν καὶ βίβλε ἀπὸ σου* συμφέρει γάρ σοι ἵνα
 ἀπόληται ἐν τῶν μελῶν σου, καὶ μὴ ὄλον τὸ σῶμά σου βληθῆ εἰς
 γέενναν.
 31 ^{z Deut. 24. 1. Infr. 19. 7. Mark 10. 4. Luke 16. 18. 1 Cor. 7. 10.}
 32 Ἐξόξέθῃ δέ, ὅτι ὅς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, δότω αὐτῇ
 ἀποστάσιον. Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι ὅς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐ-
 τοῦ, παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας, ποιῆ αὐτὴν μοιχῶσθαι* καὶ ὅς ἐάν

tient philosophers maintained, that there was a moral defilement adhering to lascivious thoughts. So Eurip. Hippol. 317. makes Phædra exclaim, χεῖρες μὲν ἀγναί, φρόν δ' ἔχει μίσυμά τι. Similar sentiments, too, but with far less of guarded delicacy, are found in the Rabbinical writers.

29. εἰ δὲ ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς — σκανδαλίζει σε.] “If thy right eye prove a stumbling block to thee,” “occasion thee to stumble,” “lead thee into sin.” Kuin. observes that the Hebrews were accustomed to compare lusts and evil passions with members of the body; for example, an evil eye denoted envy. Thus to pluck out the eye and cut off the hand, is equivalent to *crucify the flesh*, Gal. v. 24., and *mortify your members*, Col. iii. 5. The sense therefore is: “deny thyself what is even the most desirable and alluring, and seems the most necessary, when the sacrifice is demanded by the good of thy soul.” Some think that there is an allusion to the amputation of diseased members of the body, to prevent the spread of any disorder. Why the *right eye* should be mentioned, the Commentators have not told us. The reason must be, as I have observed in Rec. Syn., that the *right eye* was essentially necessary to the purposes of *war*, as it was then carried on. The sentiments contained in this passage are illustrated by Wets. from various passages of the Classical writers; Phil. Jud. Vol. i. 241, 19. Διόπερ ἔλσθαι ἂν μὲν δοκοῦναι οἱ μὴ τελείως εὐπαίδευτοι πεπρωσθαι μᾶλλον ἢ τὰ μὴ προσήκοιθ' ὄρνῃν· κερκωφῶσθαι μᾶλλον ἢ βλαβερῶν ἀκοῦειν λόγων* καὶ ἐκτετμηῶσθαι γλωτταν ὑπὲρ τοῦ μηδὲν τῶν ἀρρήτων ἐκλαθῆσαι. Seneca Ep. 51. “Projice quæcumque cor tuum laniant; que si aliter extrahi nequirent, *cor cum illis evellendum erat.*” In this, and numerous other such like passages, scattered up and down in the Philosophers who lived *after* the promulgation of the Gospel, we may see a higher tone of morals than had been before maintained; and which can be ascribed to nothing but the silent effect of the Gospel, (as is the case in every age,) even on those who refused to receive it.

31. ὅς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ, &c.] We are to bear in mind, that the Jews were permitted to divorce wives without assigning any cause; also that Jesus neither here nor at Matt. xix. 3. meant to give *political* directions; and that he, moreover, did not contradict Moses, who not even himself approved of the arbitrary divorces of his times (See xix. 8.); finally, that the Jewish Doctors in the age of Christ were not agreed on the sense of the passage of Deut. xxiv. 1, which treats of divorce. Those of the school of *Hillel* said that the wife might not only be divorced for some

great offence, but רבך כל לך *κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν*, for any cause however slight, so that a writing of divorcement were given to her. Of which document see the usual form in Lightfoot H. Heb. On the other hand, that of *Shammai* contended that רבך גרוה, the term in Deut. xxiv. 1., which was the subject of the dispute, and which the school of *Hillel* understood of any defect of person, or of disposition, could only mean *something criminal*, as adultery. See Selden de Ux. Heb. iii. 13. Lightf. Hor. Heb. &c. From the words of Christ, xix. 3., compared with Matt. x. 2. seq., it is clear that Moses meant the words to be taken as those of the school of *Hillel* interpreted them; and yet it is plain from Matt. xix. 8. & Gen. ii. 24, that Moses did not approve of arbitrary divorce. The Jewish Doctors, however, changed a *moral precept* into a *civil institution*. [To speak in plainer terms, Many things which Moses had *tolerated* in civil life, in order to avoid a greater evil (See Matt. xix. 8. and note), the Pharisees determined to be *morally right*; as in the case of retaliation. EDIT.] Jesus, therefore, who did not intend to give political directions, here teaches in what case, *salvâ religione et conscientiâ*, a wife might be divorced. (Kuin.) The word ἀποστάσιον (equivalent to βιβλίον ἀποστασίον at xix. 7.) is not found in the Classical writers. But we may compare διαστάσιον.

32. πορνείας.] The Commentators and Jurists are much divided in opinion as to the exact sense of this term. It is generally interpreted *adultery*. That, however, would seem to require *μοιχείας*; and as adultery was a *capital* offence, it would appear unnecessary to denounce *divorce* against such as were found guilty of it. Some understand by it *fornication before marriage*, others *incest*, or vice generally; and Mr. Morgan, in his work on Marriage, Adultery, and Divorce, *religious apostasy*, or *idolatry*. It is strange that so learned and diligent an inquirer should have profited so little by his laborious examination of “all the passages in which the word occurs in the Scriptures, the Sept., and Josephus,” as to assert, that “it is derived from πόρῳ νέειν, and that its primitive signification is *religious apostasy!*” The truth is, πόρῳ is from πτόρῳ, pret. mid. of περῶν, which is derived from περῶν, which signifies primarily to transfer or *give up*. And although πορνεία sometimes signifies idolatry, or religious apostasy, both in the Sept. and the N. T., yet it is only in the Prophets and the Apocalypse. Indeed, to suppose so highly figurative a signification to be employed in a passage intended to give a most important

a Lev. 19, 12.
Exod. 20, 7.
Deut. 5, 11.
& 23, 23.
Num. 30, 3.
b Jas. 5, 12.

c Ps. 45, 2.

d Exod. 21, 24.
Lev. 19, 21.
Lev. 24, 20.

ἀπολελυμένην γαμήσῃ, μοιχῆται. ^a Πάλιν ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη τοῖς 33
ἀρχαίοις· Ὁὐκ ἐπιρκήσεις, ἀποδώσεις δὲ τῷ Κυρίῳ τοὺς ὄρκους σου.
^b Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν μὴ ὁμοῦσαι ὅλως· μήτε ἐν τῷ ὄρκαίῳ, ὅτι θεός 34
ρος ἐστὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ· ^c μήτε ἐν τῇ γῆ, ὅτι ὑποπόδιόν ἐστι τῶν ποδῶν 35
αὐτοῦ· μήτε εἰς Ἱερουσόλυμα, ὅτι πόλις ἐστὶ τοῦ μεγάλου βασιλέως.
μήτε ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ σου ὁμόσης, ὅτι οὐ δύνασαι μίαν τρίχα λευκὴν 36
ἢ μέλαιναν ποιῆσαι. Ἔστω δὲ ὁ λόγος ὑμῶν· καὶ καὶ, οὐ οὐ· τὸ 37
δὲ περισσὸν τούτων ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ἐστίν. ^d Ἰκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη· 38

regulation for all future ages, is like supposing a law to be couched in a riddle. The very same objection lies equally against all the other new interpretations. On such an occasion as the present (and that when the words of Matt. xix. 9. were pronounced), the term *must* be taken in its ordinary signification. Πόρνη (like the corresponding term in our own language, from the A. S. *γῦran* denotes one who yields up the person, whether for hire, or for the purposes of sensuality; and, by implication, *unlawfully*. And consequently, the term *πορνεία*, as applied to females, denotes unlawful commerce with the other sex. But *that*, in a *married* woman, will involve *adultery*; and therefore the term may well be used in that sense. Thus, at Rom. i. 29., *πορνεία* must include adultery; as also at Amos vii. 17., *ἡ γύνῃ σου ἐν τῇ πόλει πορνείσῃ*. The corresponding term in our own language is used in this very sense. See Todd's Johnson. In short, the very use of the word to denote apostasy or idolatry could only have arisen from this sense of *πορν*. And as to the objection, which has seemed so formidable to many as to set them upon devising new interpretations, namely, that adultery was punished by the Jewish law with *death*—that involves no real difficulty at all; for our Lord, in pronouncing on this deeply important matter, was legislating for all future ages, and therefore could have no reference to the Mosaic law, especially as it was now on the point of being abolished. It was sufficient for us to be informed, that adultery may authorize the *divorcement* of the offending party. Whether and *how far* the offence should be punishable by the *Magistrate*, was a question of *policy*, with which our Lord did not interfere, and with which Religion has nothing to do. At *λόγος* there is no such redundancy, *per Hebraismum*, as many Commentators suppose. This use of the word (which is found also in the Classical writers) is taken from *drawing up accounts*. So we say *on the score of*.

33. The Pharisees distributed oaths into the *weightier*, and the *slighter*; and forbade perjury only when the name of God was contained in the oath; but if it was *omitted*, they held it none, or a very slight offence; as also mental prevarication, by swearing with the lips, and disavowing the oath with the heart. A standard of morality even below that of the heathens. See Hom. II. i. 312. Now it is this use of vain oaths, which directly led to *perjury*, that Jesus here means to prohibit. He is, therefore, not to be understood as forbidding *judicial* oaths; but (as appears from the examples he subjoins) such oaths as are introduced in common conversation, and on ordinary occasions.

—ὄρκ ἐπιρκήσεις.] Ἐπιρκεῖν may mean either to swear falsely, and not *ex animo*; or, to violate

one's oath. Both however are here to be understood. The words ἀποδώσεις δὲ ... σου are to be taken (like ἅς δ' ἂν φωνέσῃ, &c. at ver. 19.) as an *interpretation* of the Jewish Doctors. Thus there will be an easier connexion between the doctrine of the Pharisees, expressed in these words, and the opposite one of Christ. (Kuin.)

34. seq.] Here are *instanced* the oaths most frequently used by the Jews. From the examples adduced by Wets. it appears that the heathens used oaths very similar to those of the Hebrews.

—ἐν.] Heb. ג, per, by. The difference between the Classical and the Hellenistic construction of ὄρκος is, that in the former it takes an Accus. or Genit. with *κατά*; the latter a Dat. with *ἐν*, and sometimes, though very rarely, *εἰς* with an Accus., as at ver. 35.

35. τοῦ μεγάλου βασιλέως] i. e. *Dei Optimi Maximi*; as Ps. xlviii. 3. xlviii. 2. & 3. xcv. 3. Job xiii. 9. &c. "The antient Arabs, (says Schulz,) called God simply THE KING."

36. ἐν τῇ κεφ. σου.] This was a practice common to both Greeks and Romans.

—οὐ δύνασαι ποιῆσαι.] There is something here at which many Interpreters have stumbled; and some would *read*, from conjecture, *μίαν τρίχα λευκὴν ποιῆσαι μέλαιναν*. Others attempt to remove the difficulty by *interpretation*, thus: "thou canst not produce, or bring forth, one hair, white or black." This, however, is doing violence to the position of the words, and yields a somewhat jejune sense. I see no reason to abandon the interpretation of the antient, and most of the modern Interpreters, who understand it of *change of colour*. There is an ellipsis of *εἶναι*. The sense is, "thou hast no power even over the colour of thy hair; to make one hair otherwise than what it is; whether white or black." This is seemingly a proverbial expression.

37. καὶ καὶ· οὐ οὐ.] Most Commentators regard this passage as a kindred one to that in James v. 12; and take the first *καὶ* and *οὐ* to signify the *promise*, or assertion, the second *καὶ* and *οὐ* its *fulfilment*; construing: ὁ λόγος ὑμῶν ὁ καὶ, ἔστω καὶ· ὁ λόγος δ' οὐ, ἔστω οὐ. And they compare Rev. i. 7. and 2 Cor. i. 13. & 19. See also Maimonid. cited by Wets. Thus the adverb will be converted into a noun; which is frequent both in the Scriptural and Classical writers. The above method, however, does violence to the construction; and the passages cited are of another kind. It is therefore better (with Chrysostom. Kuin. and Fritz.) to suppose, that the *καὶ* and *οὐ* are repeated, by way of expressing seriousness and gravity; q. d. "be content with a solemn and serious affirmation, or negation."

—τοῦ πονηροῦ.] It is debated whether the sense be, "the evil one." or "evil." The Ar-

- 39 "Ὁφθαλμὸν ἀντὶ ὀφθαλμοῦ, καὶ ὀδόντα ἀντὶ ὀδόντος." ^e Ἐγὼ δὲ ^f Prov. 20. 22. & 24. 29.
- λέγω ὑμῖν μὴ ἀντιστῆναι τῷ πονηρῷ· ἀλλ' ὅστις σε ῥαπίσει ἐπὶ τὴν ^g Luke 6. 29.
- 40 δεξιάν σου σιαγόνα, στρέψον αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν ἄλλην· καὶ τῷ θέλοντί σοι ^h Rom. 12. 17, 19.
- 41 κριθῆναι, καὶ τὸν χιτῶνά σου λαβεῖν, ἄφες αὐτῷ καὶ τὸ ἱμάτιον· καὶ ⁱ 1 Cor. 6. 7.
- ὅστις σε ἀγγαρεύσει μίλιον ἓν, ὑπάγε μετ' αὐτοῦ δύο. ^j Τῷ αἰτοῦντί ^k 1 Thess. 5. 15.
- σε δίδου· καὶ τὸν θέλοντα ἀπὸ σοῦ δανείσασθαι μὴ ἀποστραφῆς. ^l 1 Pet. 3. 9.
- 43 ^m Ἰκούσατε ὅτι ἐρῴξθη· Ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου, καὶ ⁿ Lev. 19. 13.
- 44 μισήσεις τὸν ἐχθρόν σου. ^o Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν· ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθρούς ^p Exod. 34. 12.
- ὑμῶν, εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμᾶς, καλῶς ποιεῖτε * τοῖς * μ- ^q Deut. 7. 2.
- ^r Luke 6. 27. &c.
- ^s Rom. 12. 14, 20.

ticle will here (as Middlet. observes) determine nothing, because the neuter adject. may be used as a substantive; and so τὸ πονηρὸν at Rom. xii. 9. Yet as the former sense is supported by the words of Christ himself at Joh. viii. 44, and in the Lord's Prayer; and as there is every reason to think it was adopted by the antients, it deserves the preference. We may render "springs from the temptation of the Devil."

38. ὀφθαλμὸν—ὀδόντος.] The Commentators here generally suppose an ellipsis of ἰσώσεis. But that is too arbitrary; and εἶναι, with an accommodation of sense, is preferable. There is a reference to the *lex talionis*, which, according to the law and the customs of the Jews, was left, in some measure, with individuals. A similar, and even more severe law, had existed in the very early periods of Greece and Rome, as in all barbarous stages of society; but the right of avengement was afterwards transferred to the magistrate.

39. ἀντιστῆναι τῷ πονηρῷ.] As ἀντίστασθαι, like the Syr. and Arab. *ḥāḥā*, not only signifies to *withstand*, but (from the adjunct) to *retaliate upon*, we may, with Kuin. and Schleus. adopt that sense here. But I prefer it, with others, to explain ἀντιστῆναι, "to set oneself in a posture of hostile opposition," [in order to retaliate.] Τῷ πονηρῷ means the *injurious person*, the *injurer*, as the Sept. render *עוֹרֵר* by *ἀδικῶν* as well as *πονηρός*. Moral maxims similar to the above are adduced from the Heathen Philosophers. That the commands in this and the following verses are not to be taken literally, as enjoining the particular actions here specified, but the *disposition* of forgiveness is apparent, not only from its being usual in the East to put the action for the disposition, but from the manner in which the precepts are introduced. See Horne's *Introd.* II. 452, seq.

—*ῥαπίσει*.] The word corresponds to our *rap* or *slap*; and was chiefly, as here, used of striking on the face; which was regarded as an affront of the worst sort; and was severely punished both by the Jewish and Roman laws. The expression here used was, no doubt, a proverbial one; and like most such, must be understood *cum grano salis*; as a similar expression which occurs in the Latin writers *ora probere contumelias*. It has reference also, in a great measure, to resistance to a superior force.

40. θέλοντί σοι κριθῆναι.] Kuin. and others think that *κριν.* is here taken to be in a figurative sense, of quarrelling, disputing, &c. And they cite Hesych. *κρινόμεθα* ἀντὶ τοῦ μαχώμεθα καὶ διαλεγόμεθα. Read *μαχώμεθα* καὶ διαλυόμεθα. So Thucyd. I. 140. *διαλύεσθαι τὰ ἐγκλήματα*, and I. 145. *δικη ἔσονται εἶναι διαλύεσθαι περὶ τῶν ἐγκλημάτων*. But this amounts to no *proof*. And the

use of *κρίνεσθαι* in the Sept. for *כִּרְי* and *יִרְי* is but a weak one. It is better, with almost all Interpreters, antient and modern, to take *κριθῆναι* in its proper sense, as a *forensic* term signifying "to be impleaded at law;" as in a similar expression of Thucyd. i. 39. *δικη ἐδελέηται κρίνεσθαι*, where see my note. *Θέλοντι* is said by the Commentators to be redundant; but the word is scarcely ever such, and here means "should wish." By *χιτῶνα* is denoted the *under* garment; and by *ἱμάτιον* the *upper*; usually more valuable than the former. *Λαβεῖν* is said to be for *αἶρειν*. But if *κριθῆναι* be taken in a forensic sense, that will be unnecessary.

41. ἀγγαρεύσει, &c.] This verb is taken from the term *ἀγγαρος*, i. e. a *King's Courier*; who had authority to press horses and carriages, either for the post, or for the public service; and, when necessary, (especially in the latter case,) could compel the personal attendance of the owners. See Herodot. viii. 93. Xen. Cyr. viii. 6, 17. Joseph. *Antiq.* xiii. 3. The term was derived from the Persians, who first introduced the use of Couriers, to transmit intelligence, which was employed among the Romans, (who exacted this service from the provincials,) and is yet retained by the Turks.

—*μίλιον*.] On this, and the other Latinisms of the N. T. see Horne's *Introd.* II. 29.

42. δανείσασθαι.] The word signifies to borrow, with or without usury. Here the latter must be meant, because usury was forbidden by the Jewish law. It does not, however, (as Kuin. supposes) imply the non-payment of the sum borrowed; for, in that case, it would have been said, not *lend*, but *give*.

43. τὸν πλησίον.] The term was by the Jews used exclusively to denote their own people. And although in the passage of Scripture here alluded to (Levit. xix. 13.) it is not expressly added "thou shalt hate thine enemy," yet the Jews thought it *deducible* from the words *ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον*, and countenanced by various precepts in Scripture, concerning the idolatrous nations around them; which precepts they extended to all heathens; whom, it seems, they emphatically termed their *enemies*. On the enmity (almost proverbial) borne by the Jews to all other nations see the Classical citations in the *Recens. Synop.*

44. ἀγαπάτε τοὺς ἐχθρούς ὑμῶν] "bear good will towards your enemies;" implying a disposition to do them good; not indeed as *enemies*, but as being *filiius creatures*. See Chrys. and Tittm. de *Syn.* N. T. III. p. 5. The words following are meant to explain and exemplify what is meant by *ἀγαπάτε*.

—*εὐλογεῖτε*.] This is generally interpreted

1 Pet. 3. 9.
Luke 23. 34.
Acts 7. 60.
1 Cor. 4. 13.

σοῦσαν ὑμᾶς, καὶ προσεῖχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐπηρεαζόντων ὑμᾶς, καὶ διω-
κόντων ὑμᾶς· ὅπως γένησθε υἱοὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς· 45
οὐ τὸν ἥλιον αὐτοῦ ἀνατέλλει ἐπὶ πονηροὺς καὶ ἀγαθοὺς, καὶ βρέχει
ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ἀδίκους. ⁱ Ἐὰν γὰρ ἀγαπήσητε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας 46
ὑμᾶς, τίνα μισθὸν ἔχετε; οὐχὶ καὶ οἱ τελῶναι τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσι; Καὶ 47
ἐὰν ἀσπάσησθε τοὺς † ἀδελφούς ὑμῶν μόνον, τί περισσὸν ποιεῖτε;
οὐχὶ καὶ οἱ † τελῶναι οὕτω ποιοῦσιν; ^k Ἔσεσθε οὖν ὑμεῖς τέλειοι, 48
ὥσπερ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς τέλειός ἐστι.

i Luke 6. 32.

k Lev. 11. 44.
& 19. 2. & 20.
7. 26.
1 Pet. 1. 15, 16.

VI. Προσέχετε τὴν † ἐλεημοσύνην ὑμῶν μὴ ποιεῖν ἔμπροσθεν τῶν 1

“wish them all manner of good.” But that sense cannot well be extracted from the word. It is better explained by others “bene precamini iis.” But the simplest interpretation is that of Kuin., “bene iis dicite,” “give them good words.” Καταρῆσθαι may very well be understood of reviling in general. So at 1 Cor. iv. 12. λοιδορεῖν and εὐλογεῖν are similarly opposed. There seems, indeed, to be a climax in the clauses of this verse.

—ταῖς μισοῦσιν.] This all the Editors from Mill downwards are agreed is the true reading. It is found in the Edit. Princ., and almost all the MSS., and has been received into the text by Griesb., Matth., Fritz., Vater, and Scholz., and rightly, for the common reading, τοὺς μισούντας. It is one of the Hellenistic idioms, to use the dative after καλῶς ποιεῖν for the accus., which is the Classical usage. See Winer's Gr. Gr. § 24. i. 6. The same difference subsists with respect to ἐπηρεάζειν.

—ἐπηρεάζωντων.] The Old Commentators tell us, that ἐπηρεάζειν signifies to injure any one either by words or deeds. But *insult* is the leading sense of the term. And when it denotes injury by *deeds*, it is injury accompanied with insult. The recent Commentators are almost universally of opinion, that it denotes injury by *deeds*, as passing from injury by words. Perhaps, however, it is best to take it of insult and abuse, (see my note on Thucyd. i. 26. 6. ἐκέλευον κατ' ἐπιφροῖαν,) and to suppose *injurious action* included in the general term δῖακω.

45. υἱοὶ τοῦ πατρὸς] i. e. “assimilated to him by conformity of disposition,” as children usually are to their parents. See John viii. 44. 1 John iii. 10.

—ἀνατελλεῖ.] The word is here used in a Hiphil sense, for “*causeth to rise*.” An idiom not unfrequent in the Classical writers, on which see Winer's Gr. and Schl. Lex. Many parallel sentiments are adduced by Wets. and others from the Classical writers; some possibly borrowed, directly or indirectly, from the New Testament.

—βρέχει.] It is agreeable to the Classical usage to join ὁ Θεὸς or Ζεὺς to βρέχει, and sometimes other words of similar signification, as those denoting to *thunder* or *lighten*.

46. ἀγαπήσητε τοὺς ἀγ.] Here there is the very frequent ellipsis of μόνον.

—ἔχετε.] This is not put for ἔχετε, as Kuin. and others say; but the sense is, “have ye laid up in the word of God.” See v. 12. & vi. 1. And so Thucyd. i. 129. κείρται σοι εὐεργεσία.

47. ἀσπάσησθε.] This includes (species for genus) the exercise of all the offices of kindness and affection.

—ἀδελφοίς] i. e. your countrymen. Almost

all the MSS., with the Edit. Princ. and other early Editions, together with many ancient Versions and Fathers, have φίλους, which is preferred by Wets., and received into the text by Matth. The common reading was adopted, from the Erasmus Editions, by Steph., on slender MS. authority. Yet it is so strongly supported by Critical probability, that it *requires* little; φίλος being, as Grot. and others have seen, evidently a gloss. However, it is found in many ancient and good MSS., and all the best Versions.

—τί περισσόν.] “what that is superior,” or extraordinary.] Comp. ver 20. Ἔσχι. Socr. Dial. iii. 6. opposes τὰ περιττὰ τοῖς κοινά. Thus also Thucyd. iii. 55. οὐδὲν ἐκπαιστέτερον ὑπὸ ἡμῶν —ἐπάθετε, and ἔξω τοῦ πρόποντος.

For τελῶναι some MSS., Versions, and Fathers have ἔθνηκοι, which is edited by Knapp, Griesb., Fritz., and Tittm. And indeed the *antithesis* favours it; and that this was a maxim among them, appears from Wetstein's citations, to which I have in Rec. Syn. added an interesting passage from Themist. which shows that Socrates *almost* anticipated the doctrine of Christ, on bearing goodwill to our enemies. However *ἔθνηκοι* might arise from a wish to strengthen the antithesis; and probably *did*; as the two or three MSS. which have it are full of such emendations. I have, therefore, with Wets. and Matth., retained the common reading; the MS. evidence for the new one being next to nothing and that of the Fathers slender, for *Chrys.* reads τελῶναι.

48. ἔσεσθε.] Fut. for Imperat., say the Commentators. Nay, Abresch. affirms that ἔσεσθε is equally imperative with ἔστε. But it is more correct to say that it *bears* an affinity to the Imperat., and (as Fritz. has suggested) is a delicate way of signifying what is directed to be done. Nor is this a Hebræism; but it is found both in Greek, Latin, and English. See Matth. Gr. Gr. § 404. The sense is, “you are required to be τέλειοι.” It is obvious that the precept must be taken with limitation; the meaning being, that we are to *aim* at that perfection, especially in acts of benevolence to our fellow creatures, (here especially had in view, as appears from the parallel passage at Luke vi. 36.) which pre-eminently characterizes the Deity. Nor is this limitation arbitrary; but is suggested by ὥσπερ; which, like some other adverbs of comparison, does not denote *equality* in the things compared; (e. g. Matth. xix. 19. ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον ὡς σεαυτὸν.) but *similarity*; q. d. “in the same manner, though not in the same degree.”

VI. 1. προσέχετε.] Sub. τὸν νόον; as we say “*mind that*,” &c. At μὴ ποιεῖν supply ὥστε.

—ἐλεημοσύνην.] All the recent Editors except Matth. are agreed in reading δικαιοσύνην, instead

ἀνθρώπων, πρὸς τὸ θεαθῆναι αὐτοῖς· εἰ δὲ μῆγε, μισθὸν οὐκ ἔχετε
 2 παρὰ τῶ πατρὶ ὑμῶν τῷ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. ^a ὅταν οὖν ποιῆς ἐλεημο- ^a Rom. 12. 8.
 σύνην, μὴ σαλπίσσης ἔμπροσθέν σου, ὡσπερ οἱ ὑποκριταὶ ποιοῦσιν ἐν
 ταῖς συναγωγαῖς καὶ ἐν ταῖς ῥύμαις, ὅπως δοξασθῶσιν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀν-
 3 θρώπων. ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ἀπέχουσι τὸν μισθὸν αὐτῶν. σοῦ δὲ
 ποιοῦντος ἐλεημοσύνην, μὴ γνώτω ἡ ἀριστερά σου τί ποιεῖ ἡ δεξιὰ
 4 σου· ^b ὅπως ἢ σου ἡ ἐλεημοσύνη ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ· καὶ ὁ πατήρ σου ^b Luke 14. 14.
 5 ὁ βλέπων ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ, αὐτὸς ἀποδώσει σοι ἐν τῷ φανερῷ. Καὶ
 ὅταν προσέχη, οὐκ ἔση ὡσπερ αἱ ὑποκριταί· ὅτι φιλοῦσιν ἐν ταῖς

of *ἐλεμ.*, which has indeed the appearance of a gloss. Our Lord, it is urged, first lays down a *general precept*; and then specifies the *particulars*. But strong reasons are urged by Wets. and Matth. why this reading cannot be admitted, especially this; (Qui justè vivit, dicitur δικαιοσύνην ποιεῖν non vero ποιεῖν τὴν δικαιοσύνην,) and it is so very deficient in authority, being found in only three or four MSS. with Wets. Matth. and Scholz. It were strange that a *gloss* should creep into almost every MS. Besides the quarter from whence we receive this reading is one fruitful in corruption under the guise of emendation. May we not, then, suspect that an alteration was made to *introduce* the very regularity above adverted to; though it is little agreeable to the unstudied style which so generally prevails in the N. T.—The phrase *ἐλεημοσύνην ποιεῖν* occurs in Sirach vii. 10. Tob. xii. 10. and Sapient. xxxv. 2.

— *εἰ δὲ μῆγε.*] Scil. προσέχετε μὴ ποιεῖν. See Matth. ix. 17. 2 Cor. xi. 16. Though there can scarcely be said to be an *ellipsis*, since in use, writers seem to have had in mind *otherwise*.—*Ἐχετε* is not put for the Fut., but is to be taken as at v. 46. where see Note.

2. *μὴ σαλπίσσης.*] The common notion, that this has reference to the pharisees having a trumpet sounded before them, when they distributed their alms, is justly exploded by the best Commentators; since there is no vestige of such a custom in the Rabbinical writings. We may, (with Chrys., Euthym., and Theophyl.,) simply take the verb in a metaphorical sense, of *ostentation* in giving; with reference to the custom common to all the ancient nations, of making proclamation, &c., by sound of trumpet. It was probably a proverbial saying. It is well observed by Bp. Warburton, Sermon xxxi. on this text, that, “we are not to understand the precept to be an *exclusive direction* how and in what manner the duty of alms-giving shall be performed: (as that its merit consists in being done *in secret*), but only an *information* given by way of direction, concerning the disposition of mind necessary to make the giver’s alms acceptable before God. q. d. Be not as the *hypocrites*, who, devoid of all benevolence, and actuated either by superstition, self-interest, or vain-glory, seek only the praise of men, and therefore, as it were, sound a trumpet before them, to proclaim their alms-giving.

— *οἱ ὑποκριταί.*] The word properly denotes 1. an actor; and, (as such were masks,) 2. one who acts under a mask, a dissembler.

— *συναγωγαῖς.*] Grot., Wolf, Elsn., Kuin., and others take the word of places of public concourse, to the exclusion of synagogues. But those must surely be *included*, as being the places where alms were especially distributed.

— *ἀπέχουσι.*] It is not for ἀφίξουσι as many Commentators explain; but the Present is used of what is *customary*. It is moreover, for ἀπολαβοῦσι; a use found also at Phil. iv. 18. Luke vi. 24. and often in the later Greek writers, always with an Accus., or at least in an active sense. Some render “fall short of.” But that sense would require the *Genit.* Fritz. thinks there is here an intensive force in ἀπέχουσι; q. d. “they have the *whole* of their reward.” But the sense is, “they receive their reward, all that they seek, or will ever have.” So Luke vi. 24. ἀπέχετε τὴν παράκλησιν ὑρῶν.

3. *μὴ γνώτω — σοῦ.*] A proverbial saying, importing such secrecy, as to escape, if possible, the observation even of ourselves. Several similar sayings are cited from the Rabbinical and Classical writers. Of the latter the most apposite is a passage of Epictet. iii. 2. where the Philosopher, exposing the folly of one who does nothing but out of regard to the public view, adds (possibly, with this passage in his mind): ἀπέχεις πάντα.

4. *ἐν τῷ φανερῷ*] sub. τόπω, for φανερώς, namely in the presence of saints and angels, at the resurrection of the just. The words are not found in a few MSS., Versions, and Fathers, here and at v. 6. And they are cancelled in one or other of the passages by some critics; but defended by others. There is, I conceive, far too little external evidence to authorize *cancelling* them in either of the *first two* passages: and internal evidence is very strong for the *former*. And, as to the latter, it is surely less probable, that they were *inserted* by those who wished to complete the Antithesis, than that they were *cancelled* by those who stumbled at the *repetition*. In removing which, some cancelled the words at v. 4., others at v. 6.; and others, at v. 18.: and as the point was a doubtful one, and the marks of doubt probably left in all the passages, some bold or blundering scribes omitted them in all three; which was better than to cancel, as Griesb. has done, the first and third, and leave the *second*.— However, as external evidence (both in MSS., Versions, and Fathers) is decidedly against the words at v. 18., and as internal evidence is unfavourable to them, I have, for critical consistency, felt bound, while I defend them here and at v. 6. to *bracket* them at v. 18.; though I am far from being certain that they are not genuine even *there*. May the repetition have been *purposely* adopted, (as often) by our Lord, in order that what he had to say might be impressed more deeply on the minds of his hearers? I need only refer to Mark ix. 44., 46., 48., where the words ὅπου ὁ σκώληξ οὐ τελευτᾷ, καὶ τὸ πῦρ οὐ σβέννυται occurring in all three verses, are omitted in

συναγωγαῖς καὶ ἐν ταῖς γωνίαις τῶν πλατειῶν ἐστῶτες προσεύχεσθαι, ὅπως ἂν φανῶσι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι ἀπέχουσι τὸν μισθὸν αὐτῶν. Σὺ δὲ ὅταν προσεύχῃ, εἰσελθε εἰς τὸ ταμιεῖόν σου, 6 καὶ κλεισας τὴν θύραν σου, πρόσευξαι τῷ πατρὶ σου τῷ ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ· καὶ ὁ πατήρ σου, ὁ βλέπων ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ, ἀποδώσει σοι ἐν τῷ φανερῷ. Προσευχόμενοι δὲ μὴ βατιλογήσητε, ὡσπερ οἱ ἔθνηκοί· 7 δοκοῦσι γάρ, ὅτι ἐν τῇ πολυλογίᾳ αὐτῶν εἰσακουσθήσονται. μὴ οὖν 8 ὁμοιωθῆτε αὐτοῖς· οἶδε γὰρ ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν, ὃν χρεῖαν ἔχετε, πρὸ τοῦ ὑμῶν αἰτῆσαι αὐτόν. °Οὕτως οὖν προσεύχεσθε ὑμεῖς· Πάτερ ἡμῶν 9 ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ἡγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομα σου· ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου· 10 γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημα σου, ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. τὸν ἄρτον 11

the first and second by certain MSS., (mostly those which omit the words at v. 4. and 6. here.) And yet no Critic has been bold enough to cancel them *there*.

5. ἐστῶτες.] Most Commentators take this for *δντες*, but it appears from Scripture and the Rabbinical writers, that the Jews used to pray standing. See Horne iii. 327. There is, however, no stress to be laid upon *ἐστῶτες*, and we might render: "they love to stand praying," &c.—Γωνίαις πῶν πλατειῶν, i. e. the place where streets meet at angles; where there is a broader space, and greater concourse of passengers. So the Jerusalem Talmud: "I observed Rabbi Jannai standing and praying in the street of Tripport; and repeating an additional prayer at each of the four corners."

6. ταμιεῖον.] This is explained by Kuin. "an upper chamber," sometimes called *ἐπιρῶνον*, corresponding to Hebr. *תִּיבָה*, appropriated to retirement and prayer. Fritz., however, with reason, thinks the two should not be confounded, and that by *ταμιεῖον* is denoted a yet more retired and secret place. See Vitringa de Synag. Jud. p. 151.

7. βατιλογήσητε.] The word does not occur in the Classical writers; but from what follows, and from the cognate term *βαττολογία*, occurring in Suid., Hesych., Eustath., and explained by them *πολυλογία*, we ascertain it to be the using of prolix useless speech, a dealing in vain repetition. Οἱ ἔθνηκοί, corresponding to *עַמִּיּוֹת*, *strangers*, as opposed to *עַמִּי*, the people of God.

—ἐν τῇ πολυλογίᾳ.] We have very few examples of the Heathen prayers. But if we may judge by their *hymns*, as we find those of Homer, Orpheus (or Pseudo-Orpheus), and Callimachus, they were so stuffed up with synonymes, epithets, and prerogatives of the Deity, as to justify these expressions *βαττολογεῖν* and *πολυλογία*.—Ἐν. for *ἐν* or *ἐνεκα*. *ε*; a use not confined to the Hellenistic, but sometimes occurring in the Classical style.

9. οὕτως] "in this manner, after this model." This being, as Euthym. says, the *fountain* of prayer, whence we may draw precatory thoughts. Surely due reverence for a prayer, which (as Wets. observes) contains all things that can be asked of God, together with an acknowledgment of his Divine majesty and power, and our subjection requires that we should always *include* it in our prayers; especially as the words of Luke xi. 2. "when ye pray, say, Our Father." &c. seem to contain an express command. Comp. also Numb.

vi. 23. (Sept.) and v. 16. There is every reason to think it always formed a part of the devotions of the first Christians. See Acts i. 24. ii. 42. iv. 24. This prayer, as we learn from Luke xi. 2., was uttered at the request of one of Christ's disciples; who entreated that a *form* of prayer might be given them, such as John had delivered to his disciples; which, indeed, was commonly done by the Jewish Masters. It consists of a *preface*, six *petitions*, and a *dorology*. The whole of it, with the exception of the clause "as we forgive our debtors," is, in substance, found in the nineteen prayers of the Jewish Liturgy. On the whole, see Horne's *Introd.* ii. 563.

—πάτερ — οὐρανοῖς.] This address, (frequent in the Jewish form of prayer,) is expressive of the deepest reverence; and the *ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς* implies all the attributes of that glorious Being, who inhabiteth heaven, — but whom the Heaven of Heavens cannot contain; — namely, his omnipresence, omniscience, omnipotence, and infinite holiness. He is styled "our Father," as being such by right of creation and preservation, adoption, and grace.

— ἡγιασθήτω — σου,] for *δοξασθήτω*, as Chrys. explains. Imperat. for Optat. to strengthen the sense. Ὁνομα is here, as often in Scripture, put for the *person* himself. This is accounted a Hebraism; but *some* examples are adduced from the Classical writers.

10. ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου.] Here we pray that the Christian dispensation may be diffused over the whole earth, by the conversion of both Jews and Gentiles; so that all, being members of God's kingdom on earth, may finally be partakers of his kingdom of glory in Heaven. See more in note on Matt. iii. 2.

— γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημα — γῆς] "may the dispensations of thy Providence be acquiesced in by us on earth with the same willing alacrity as they are obeyed in heaven." From this view of the sense, I have, with Fritz. accented the *σου*, since it is emphatic, and cannot therefore be an enclitic; and so also just before. At *ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς* there is thought to be an ellipsis of *οὕτως*, which is frequent both in the Scriptural and Classical writers. Fritz., however, and Winer deny that there is any ellipsis, the *οὕτω* being, they say, suggested by the *καὶ, etiam*.

11. ἄρτον.] This word, like the Hebr. *חֶלֶם*, denotes, by a oriental figure, the necessities of life, including, by implication, clothing; and it is synonymous with τὰ ἐπιτήδεια τοῦ σώματος, at James ii. 16.

12 ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον. καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰ ὀφειλήματα
 13 ἡμῶν, ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφίμεν τοῖς ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν. ^d καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ^d Infr. 13. 19.
 ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμὸν, ἀλλὰ ἴθυσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ. [ὄχι σοῦ
 ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία καὶ ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. ἀμήν.]

— ἐπιούσιον.] On the sense of this term, Commentators are by no means agreed; the difficulty being increased by the word being not found in the Classical writers, and occurring nowhere else in the Scriptural ones, except in the parallel passage of Luke xi. 3. Hence we are compelled to seek its sense, somewhat precariously, from its *etymology*. The only two interpretations that have any semblance of truth are the following: I. That of Salmas., Grot., Kuster, Fischer, Valck., Michaelis, and Fritzsche; who take it for τῆς ἐπιούσης ἡμέρας, and as equivalent to εἰς αὔριον. — And this view is confirmed by the word, which answers to ἐπιούσιος in the Nazarene Gospel, namely, רַקְרַל. The derivation however, on which it is founded, is irregular, and the word contrary to analogy; not to say that it seems at variance with our Lord's command at v. 25 & 34., "to take no thought for the morrow;" and yields a sense somewhat jejune, and even far-fetched. Greatly preferable is that of the ancient Fathers and Commentators in general, and the Syriac Version; and, of the moderns, Beza, Mede, Toup, Kuin., Schleus., Whal., Rosenm., and Matthæi, which, deriving the term from οὐσία, assign as the sense, "sufficient for our support;" the ἐπι denoting *belonging to, fit, or needful for*. This interpretation is ably maintained in two learned Dissertations by Pfeiffer and Stolberg, in the 2d Volume of the Thesaurus Theol. appended to the Dutch Edition of the Critici Sacri, and another by Kirkmaier in Vol. ii. 189. seqq. of the *Novus Thes. Theolog.* a second appendix to the same.

12. τὰ ὀφειλήματα.] Answering to ἀμαρτίας in the parallel passage of Luke. This usage of the word (with which the Commentators compare the Heb. חַוְוָה *to owe*, and to *sin*, as the Greeks say ὀφείλαν ὀκνην, *prænas debere*) arises from this; that obedience being a debt we owe to God, any one who commits sin, thereby contracts a kind of obligation, to be paid by suffering the punishment awarded to it. And ἀφίμεν signifies to remit the penalty, to forgive. Τοῖς ὀφείλ. ἡμῶν signifies those who sin against us. So Luke in the parallel passage, παντὶ ὀφείλουσι ἡμῖν, and Luke xiii. 4., ὀφείλεται παρὸ πάντων ἀνθρώπων.

— ὡς ἀφίμεν.] The best modern Commentators are of opinion that ὡς here signifies *for*, or *since*; a signification frequent in the Classical writers, and confirmed, they think, by the parallel passage in Luke. But that is not decisive; since the prayer is supposed to have been delivered on two occasions, with a slight variation. However, I cannot approve of regarding, with the generality of Interpreters, the ὡς as conditional. It mostly, as Grot. observes, "marks *similitude*." So Tyndale well renders "even as."

13. μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς — πειρασμῶν.] The best Commentators are of opinion, that this expression imports: "Suffer us not to be led into, abandon us not unto, temptation," i. e. (by *implication*) so as to be overcome by it.

— τοῦ πονηροῦ.] It is debated whether the sense here be *evil*, or the *evil one*, SATAN, q. d. "from [the temptation of] Satan." The evidence

for the latter sense preponderates; particularly as it is found in the Jewish formularies, from whence this clause was taken. See, however, Lampe on John, Vol. iii. p. 442.

— ὄχι σοῦ &c.] The genuineness of this doxology has, to most Critics, appeared doubtful: and, with the exception of Matthæi, all the more eminent ones from Erasm. and Grot. down to Scholz, have rejected it. It is, indeed, supported by almost all the MSS., by both the Syriac, and some other Oriental Versions, and by some Greek Fathers. But, on the other hand, it is not found in at least eight MSS., all of very high antiquity, and in others is marked as doubtful; nor has it any place in the Italic, Vulgate, and some other Versions, and many of the Greek and all the Latin Fathers. And as doxologies of this kind were much in use among the Jews and early Christians, there is great reason to suppose that it was interpolated from the ancient liturgies, in which we know it formed the response of the people; the *prayer* alone being pronounced by the priest. It is far more likely to have been *introduced from the Liturgies*, than that it should have been *removed from* the passage because of its not being contained in the parallel one of St. Luke. It is, indeed, argued, that the Greek Church would never have presumed to add from their liturgies, to a form of prayer by Christ himself. But it may be replied, that they never did formally add it; the doxology being introduced gradually, and, no doubt, at first written in a different character, or in red ink, and in the margin, as found in several MSS. And when it is argued, that the Latin Fathers purposely omitted the clauses, to remove a discrepancy between St. Matthew and St. Luke; that is only taking for granted what cannot be proved, and what should not be believed except on the strongest proof, as involving the credit of those venerable persons. Besides, there was a far more serious discrepancy involved in the clause immediately preceding; that not being found in the Vulgate and Italic Versions, nor in the Fathers in question. But they did not attempt to remove that discrepancy. Why then *this*? Moreover, this doxology materially interrupts the connexion between the ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφίμεν and the admonition founded on it at v. 14. And although the omission of the clause does not entirely remove, yet it greatly *lessens* the harshness of the interruption. As to the argument founded on the sublimity, beauty, and appropriateness of the clause in question, it is very inconclusive; for the ancient Liturgies, both Greek and Latin, being chiefly founded on Scripture, abound in passages of great sublimity. And as to the *appropriateness*, that is quite consistent with the clause being *insititious*: for such alone could *cause* it to be introduced here. And a *spurious* passage may be fitted to any context, as well as a genuine one. Its being found, too, in the Peschito-Syriac Version will not absolutely prove its genuineness, unless we could be sure that we have that Version in its original purity. And especially it will not prove that it was not introduced from the liturgies above mentioned; for those liturgies, ascending to the time of St. Bar-

e Mark 11. 25.
Ecclus. 28. 2.
f Infr. 18. 35.

Ἐὰν γὰρ ἀφῆτε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν, ἀφήσει καὶ 14
ὑμῖν ὁ Πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος· Ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἀφῆτε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις 15
τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν, οὐδὲ ὁ Πατὴρ ὑμῶν ἀφήσει τὰ παραπτώματα
ὑμῶν. Ὅταν δὲ νηστεύητε, μὴ γίνεσθε ὡσπερ οἱ ὑποκριταί, σκυθρω- 16
ποί· ἀφανίζουσι γὰρ τὰ πρόσωπα αὐτῶν, ὅπως φανῶσι τοῖς ἀνθρώ-
ποις νηστεύοντες. Ἄμην λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι ἀπέχουσι τὸν μισθὸν αὐτῶν.
Σὺ δὲ νηστεύων ἄλειψαί σου τὴν κεφαλὴν, καὶ τὸ πρόσωπόν σου 17
νύμφα· ὅπως μὴ φανῆς τοῖς ἀνθρώποις νηστεύων, ἀλλὰ τῷ Πατρὶ σου 18
τῷ ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ· καὶ ὁ Πατὴρ σου, ὁ βλέπων ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ, ἀπο-
δώσει σοι [ἐν τῷ φανερῷ].

g Infr. 19. 21.
Luke 12. 33.

Ἐ Μὴ θησαυρίζετε ὑμῖν θησαυροὺς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ὅπου σὴς καὶ βροῦσις 19

nabas and St. Clemens, were far more antient than the highest antiquity ever claimed for the Peschito-Syriac Version. Not to say, that there are passages where that Version is admitted to be interpolated, probably from the later Syriac Versions. And where should we sooner expect it than in a passage like the present, of which the interpolation (if such there be) was confined to the East? for the MSS. which support it are almost wholly of the Constantinopolitan or the Eastern class. And as to what Matthæi says, that "if we reject this clause, then we must receive that at 1 John v. 5. with both hands," since "utriusque loci eadem est crisis," that by no means follows. For although it be true, as he says, that "the external evidence for the latter passage is almost entirely of the Latin Church, and that it is supported chiefly by internal evidence," yet the two cases are by no means the same; internal evidence here being more against the clause than it is there in its favour. And surely it does not follow, that we must receive the passage of 1. Joh. if we reject this; since there may be equal consistency in rejecting both. At all events, if we reject this, we must reject it on the ground, that, as Bp. Marsh observes, (Lect. P. vi. p. 27.) internal evidence may show that a passage is spurious, though external evidence is in its favour. And if we reject that, we must reject it on the ground, that (in the words of the same learned Prelate) "no external evidence can prove a passage to be spurious, when internal evidence is decidedly against it." However, I mean not to say that the state of the evidence is here such as to authorize us to cancel the clause (for nothing but internal evidence of the most conclusive kind, opposed to such strong external evidence as exists, could warrant that): and I have therefore felt justified in merely placing it within single brackets.

14, 15. Ἐὰν γὰρ ἀφῆτε &c.] In order to more impressively recommend the virtue just mentioned, our Lord, in the Hebrew manner, (see Is. iii. 9. xxxviii. 1. Jer. xxix. 11. Deut. ix. 7.) propounds the same sentiment both affirmatively and negatively. (Kuini.) We are not, however, to understand hereby that the practice of this, or of any other single duty, can obtain God's favour, where other Christian virtues are neglected: for, though negative precepts are absolute, yet affirmative promises admit of this limitation, "if no other condition of salvation be wanting."

16. ὅταν δὲ νηστεύητε.] This is meant, not of public and enjoined, but of private and volun-

tary fasting. On both which see Horne's Introd. Vol. iii. p. 324. note, and p. 378.

— μὴ γίνεσθε — σκυθρωποί] "do not put on a morose countenance." Σκυθρωπός properly signifies scowling, as opposed to ἰδαρός. The words ἰποκριταί and σκυθρωποί are conjoined in some passages cited by Wets. and others.

— ἀφανίζουσι] "they disfigure." Ἀφανίζειν signifies 1. to cause to disappear; 2. to change the appearance of, deform. The term has reference, partly, to the squalid appearance which the Pharisees affected, by the sprinkling of ashes or earth on their heads, and letting their beards and hair grow; and partly to the sour countenance into which their faces were screwed up by a semblance of penitence. See Chrys. And so Æschyl. Agam. 766. says of persons affecting "to rejoice with those that rejoice;" Συγχαίροντες ὁμοιοπρεπεῖς ἀγέλαστα πρόσωπα, βίαια ζόμενοι.

— ὅπως φανῶσι — νηστ.] Φανῶσι has the middle force, "that they may appear unto men to fast;" and τοῖς ἀνθρώποις is not, as some say, for ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων. Simil. Aristoph. Ran. 1095., cited by Wets. ἄρακι ἄμπισχόν, ἐν' ἑλευσὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις φανώντων εἶναι. On fasting as a Christian duty, see Whitby and Mackn.

17. ἀλειψαί — νύμφαι] i. e. appear as usual; for the Jews, like the Greeks, regularly washed and anointed, except at times of mourning and public humiliation.

18. ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ.] See note supra, v. 4.

19. Μὴ θησαυρίζετε &c.] Θησαυρός properly signifies a repository for valuables; but sometimes, as here, the treasure itself; i. e. such precious moveables as are usually treasured up; e. g. gold, silver, &c., (either in the mass, or worked up into vessels); and costly apparel, in which the riches of the antients chiefly consisted. So Thucyd. ii. 98. χωρὶς δὲ ὅσα ὑφ' ἀνάγκη τε καὶ λεία καὶ ἡ ἄλλη κατασκευῆ, where see my note. To these two last the words following chiefly allude; for βροῦσις (commonly understood of rust and canker, but by Rosenm. and Kuini. of the curculio or corn-worm, thus making it refer to grain stored up) may be best taken in its most extensive sense, (with Chrys., Euthym., and Fritz.) to denote that corruption to which moveables of every kind are subject. Simil. Jerem. in Epist. v. 9. says of the heathen gods; οἱτοὶ δὲ οὐ διασώζονται ἀπὸ τοῦ καὶ βομμάτων. and Sappho, κείνον, (scil. χρυσόν) οὐ σὴς οὐδὲ κίς δάπτει. With the sentiment I would compare Philostr. Vit. Apoll. v. 36. πλοῦτων ἰγού μὴ τὸν ἀπόθετον· τί γάρ ἂν βελτίον οἴτος τῆς ἀπόθεν συναχθεῖσιν ψάμμου; Vide et seqq. See also

- 20 ἀφανίζει, καὶ ὅπου κλέπτει διορύσσουσι καὶ κλέπτουσι· θησαυρίζετε ^{1 Tim. 6. 9, 18, 19.}
 δὲ ὑμῶν θησαυροὺς ἐν οὐρανῷ, ὅπου οὔτε σὴς οὔτε βρῶσις ἀφανίζει, ^{Heb. 13, 5.}
- 21 καὶ ὅπου κλέπται οὐ διορύσσουσιν οὐδὲ κλέπτουσιν. ὅπου γὰρ ἐστὶν
- 22 ὁ θησαυρὸς ὑμῶν, ἐκεῖ ἔσται καὶ ἡ καρδία ὑμῶν. ^{h Luke 11. 34.} Ὁ λύχνος τοῦ σώματός ἐστιν ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς. εἴν οὖν ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς σου ἀπλοῦς ἦ, ὅλον
- 23 τὸ σῶμά σου φωτεινὸν ἔσται· εἴν δὲ ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς σου ποτηρὸς ἦ, ὅλον τὸ σῶμά σου σκοτεινὸν ἔσται. εἰ οὖν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἐν σοὶ σκότος
- 24 ἐστὶ, τὸ σκότος πόσον! ^{1 Luke 15. 13.} Οὐδέεις δύναται δυοὶ κηρίοις δουλεύειν· ἢ γὰρ τὸν ἓνα μισήσει, καὶ τὸν ἕτερον ἀγαπήσει· ἢ ἐνὸς ἀντίκειται, καὶ τοῦ ἑτέρου καταφρονησει. οὐ δύνασθε Οὐεῖ δουλεύειν καὶ * μιμωνῆ.
- 25 ^{k Luke 12. 22.} Διὰ τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν· μὴ μεριμνᾶτε τῇ ψυχῇ ὑμῶν, τί φάγητε καὶ ^{Phil. 4. 6.} τί πίητε· ^{1 Tim. 6. 8.} μηδὲ τῷ σώματι ὑμῶν, τί ἐνδύσθηθε. ^{1 Pet. 5. 7.} Οὐχὶ ἡ ψυχὴ πλείον ^{Psal. 55. 22.}
 26 ἐστὶ τῆς τροφῆς, καὶ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ ἐνδύματος; ^{1 Job 38. 41.} Ἐμβλέψατε εἰς τὰ ^{Psal. 147. 9.} πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ· ^{Luke 12. 24.} ὅτι οὐ σπεύρουσιν, οὐδὲ θερίζουσιν, οὐδὲ συνάγουσιν εἰς ἀποθήκας· καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος τρέφει αὐτὰ.
- 27 οὐχ ὑμεῖς μᾶλλον διαφέρετε αὐτῶν; Τίς δὲ ἐξ ὑμῶν μεριμνῶν δύνα-

Philo. p. 116. A. cited by me in Rec. Syn.—
 Ἄφανίζει is for διαφθερίζει.

— διορύσσουσι] scil. τὸν τοῖχον, which word, or *cliban*, is generally *supplied*. The walls in the East being chiefly of hardened clay, the houses are very liable to be thus broken into. On the general scope and interpretation of vv. 19 and 20, see Horne's *Introd.* iii. 406. 333. and 452.

22. ὁ λύχνος τοῦ σώματος &c.] It has been usual to interpret ὀφθαλμὸς ἀπλοῦς "a liberal person;" and ὀφθαλμὸς ποτηρὸς, "a covetous eye;" which has been thought to be required by the preceding and following words. And several phrases in the Sept. the N. T., and the Rabbinical writers are adduced, to countenance this mode of interpretation. Yet it involves some confusion; and the words *εἴν οὖν* — φῶς may be better taken, (with Chrysost., Theophyl., Euthym., and others among the antients, and most of the recent Commentators) in their *proper* sense; so that ἀπλοῦς be interpreted *sanus, integer, clear*, and ποτηρὸς, depraved, sickly, dim; of which signification many examples are adduced by Kypke, and Elsner. By τὸ φῶς ἐν σοὶ is meant the light of conscience. — So, among the passages cited by the Commentators, Philo, *περὶ νοῦς ἐν ψυχῇ, τοῦτο ὀφθαλμὸς ἐν σώματι*, borrowed from Aristot. *Topic.* i. 14. — Hence may be defended and illustrated a supposed corrupt, and certainly obscure, expression in Æschyl. *Eumen.* 520. Schutz. *Τίς δὲ μὴδὲν ἐν φάει Καρδίας ἀνατρέφων, Ἡ πόλις βροτὸς θ', βροτὸς ἐρ' ἀν σβεί δίκαν*; so the passage should be pointed. It has been well observed by Olearius, that the whole passage is *adversarial*; of which the first part forms the *advare* itself: "The eye is the light of the body." 2. The *deduction*, by consequence; "If then thine eye be healthy and clear," &c. 3. The *application*: "If therefore the light (or what should be so) in thee be darkness, how great must be that darkness."

24. οὐδέεις — δουλεύειν.] It is *implied* by the context, that the two masters are of contrary dispositions, and give contrary orders. The words *μισεῖν* and *ἀγαπᾶν* may be taken in a qualified sense, as denoting to *love less*, or *love more*; of which there are many examples both in the Sept.

and the N. T. Ἀντίχεσθαι is a stronger term than ἀγαπᾶν, as denoting close connection and strict attachment. The difference here between the Classical and Scriptural use is, that in the former *ἀντίχεσθαι* is used with a Genit. of *thing*, not as here of *person*. The reason assigned by Middleton, for the omission of the Article at ἐνὸς is inadmissible. It seems to have been omitted simply because, having been employed in the other clause of the antithesis, it might be omitted without occasioning mistake. This could not have been done at τοῦ ἑτέρου, for a reason which will apply to the English as well as the Greek.

— μιμωνῆ.] This reading is found in most of the MSS. and many Greek Fathers; the Edit. Prin. and several early Editions; and is confirmed by the parallel passage of Luke, and by its derivation from the Chaldee and Syriac מןןןןן. It has been received by Wets., Griesb., Matthæi, Vater, Fritzi, and Scholz. The word in Chaldee and Syriac signifies *riches*; but, like the Greek *πλοῦτος*, is here *personified*. As to its being a god of the Chaldees, corresponding to the Greek *Plutus*, that has been rather *asserted than proved*.

25. μὴ μεριμνᾶτε.] Not, "take no thought;" but, "take no anxious thought;" "be not anxiously solicitous;" as Phil. iv. 6. *μηδὲν μεριμνᾶτε, "be anxious about nothing."* And so in the parallel passage of Luke *μὴ μετρωρίζεσθε*, "be not tossed with anxious cares." *ψυχῇ* and *σώματι* are datives of *cause*. The argument is: "If God has given us life and bodies, surely he will not deny us the lesser blessings of food and clothing."

26. τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ] עֲוֹנֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם. This is supposed to be a Hebraism; since to the names of animals the Hebrews were accustomed to subjoin the places in which they usually lived. It was not, however, *confined* to the Hebrew, but occurs in the earliest Greek phraseology. So Hom. II. p. 675. *ὑποραγίον πετεινῶν*, and Eurip. *Elect.* 897. *ἢ σκόλον οἰωνοῖσιν αἰθέρος τέκνοις*.

— καὶ, and yet, is called a Hebraism; but is also a Grecism. It may, however, here have the more usual force of *but*. Μᾶλλον is not redundant, but an emphatic addition. So Thucyd. iv. 3. *χωρίον ὑπέροπον (excellent.) μᾶλλον ἕτερον*.

ται προσθεῖναι ἐπὶ τὴν ἡλικίαν αὐτοῦ πῆχυν ἕνα; Καὶ περὶ ἐνδύμα- 28
τος τί μεριμνᾶτε; καταμάθετε τὰ κρίνα τοῦ ἀγροῦ, πῶς αὐξάνει· οὐ
κοπιᾷ, οὐδὲ νήθει· λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐδὲ Σολομῶν ἐν πάσῃ τῇ δόξῃ 29
αὐτοῦ περιεβάλετο ὡς ἐν τούτων. Ἐὶ δὲ τὸν χρόνον τοῦ ἀγροῦ, σήμε- 30
ρον ὄντα καὶ αὔριον εἰς κλίβανον βαλλόμενον, ὁ Θεὸς οὕτως ἀμφιένν-
σιν, οὐ πολλῶ μᾶλλον ὑμᾶς, ὀλιγόπιστοι; Μὴ οὖν μεριμνήσητε, λέ- 31
γοντες· τί φάγωμεν, ἢ τί πίωμεν, ἢ τί περιβαλώμεθα; πάντα γὰρ 32
ταῦτα τὰ ἔθνη ἐπιζητεῖ· οἶδε γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος ὅτι
m Luke 12. 33. ζηρῶτε τούτων ἀπάντων. ^m Ζητεῖτε δὲ πρῶτον τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ 33

καὶ τὴν δικαιοσύνην αὐτοῦ, καὶ ταῦτα πάντα προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν.
Μὴ οὖν μεριμνήσητε εἰς τὴν αὔριον· ἢ γὰρ αὔριον μεριμνήσει τὰ 34
ἑαυτῆς· ἀρκετὸν τῇ ἡμέρῃ ἡ κακία αὐτῆς.

a Luke 6. 37, 38.
Psal. 41. 2.
Rom. 2. 1. &
14. 3, 4, 10, 13.
1 Cor. 4. 3, 4, 5.
James 4. 11, 12.
Mark 4. 24.
b Luke 6. 41.

VII. ^a ΜΗ κρίνετε, ἵνα μὴ κριθῆτε. ἐν ᾧ γὰρ κρίματι κρίνετε, 1
κριθῆσεσθε· καὶ ἐν ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε, * μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν. ^b Τί δὲ 2
βλέπετε τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου, τὴν δὲ ἐν 3

27. ἡλικίαν.] The antient Commentators, and most modern ones, take this to mean *stature*; which sense is ably maintained by Beza, Grot., Elsn., and Fritz. Yet they only prove that it *might* be so taken, if a better sense were not at hand; namely, that of *actatis mensura*. Now this is surely more appropriate; for the admonition is directed against excessive anxiety about food and clothing; which, though necessary to the preservation of life, have nothing in common with *stature*. And *πῆχυς*, like other measures of extent, is not infrequently applied to duration of *time*. Those, however, who support this interpretation are not agreed as to the *nature of the metaphor*. Most think there is an allusion to the allegorical fable of the *Parcæ*; while Wets. supposes it alludes to a *stadium* or race-course, of which, as consisting of several hundred cubits, one cubit might not unaptly be termed *ἐλάχιστον*. 28. καταμάθετε] “attentively survey.” The *κατὰ* is intensive, as in *κατενοήσατε*, Luke xii. 27. *Κοπιᾷ* and *νήθει* refer to the occupations of males and of females respectively.

29. δόξῃ] “splendour.” A sense frequent in the Sept. and New Testament; but scarcely ever occurring in the Classical writers.

30. χρόνον.] The Hebrews divided all vegetables into two sorts, *יָבֵשׁ* and *צֶמַח*, *trees*, and plants or herbs; the former of which were by the Hellenists called *ξύλον*; the latter, *χρότος*; comprehending both grass and corn, and likewise *flowers*, including the lilies just mentioned, supposed to be the plant called the Crown Imperial.—From scarcity of fuel, all the withered stalks, even of the herbage, are in the East employed for that purpose. (Grot. and A. Clarke.)

31. τὰ ἔθνη ἐπιζητεῖ.] A kind of argument often made use of in the O. T., in order, as it were, to *shame* the Israelites into virtue, by showing them that they lived no better than the unenlightened heathens. That *they* should have eagerly sought after such things, was not wonderful; since they had no belief in, or dependence on the Providence of God; and in their labours, or their prayers to the gods, solely regarded *temporal* blessings; as we find from Juvenal, Sat. x.—*οἶδε γὰρ—ἀπάντων.*] Our Lord here argues

from God's *knowledge*, to his *goodness*. Your heavenly Father *knoweth*, and therefore will bestow them; i. e. on the supposition that ye *ask* for them, and are not otherwise *unfit* to receive them. (Markland.)

33. τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ] i. e. the religion promulgated by God, its promises and blessedness. On the full sense of this comprehensive expression, see a Dissertation of Storr, translated into English, and inserted in Vol. I. of the American Biblical Repository.

—τὴν δικαιοσύνην a.] i. e. that mode of justification which he hath revealed, and the righteousness and holiness which it requires; not that righteousness or system of morality which the Jews had devised, consisting chiefly of ceremonies and mere externals.

34. εἰς τὴν αὔριον.] Sub. *ἡμέραν*. Most Commentators take *εἰς τὴν αὔριον* for *τὰ εἰς τὴν αὔριον*. But that is unnecessary. The *εἰς* may very well denote *object*. *Αὔριον* is taken for time to come in general.

—ἀρκετὸν—αὐτῆς.] These, like the words immediately preceding, have the air of an adage, similar to some adduced by Vorst. and Schoettg. The neuter in *ἀρκετὸν* is put, by an idiom common both to the Greek and Latin. And *χρόμα* or *πράγμα* is understood. See Matth. Gr. Gr. § 439.

—τῇ ἡμέρῃ.] Some Commentators supply *ἐκάστη*. But it is better to suppose the Article used with reference to *παροῦσα*, “the (present) day.” *Κακία* is well explained by Chrys. *κώκυσις*, *ταλαπωρία*; a sense found in the Sept., but not in the Classical writers.

VII. I. μὴ κρίνετε—κριθῆτε.] Almost all Commentators take *κρίνετε* for *κατακρίνετε*, chiefly because in the parallel passage of Luke vi. 37. *μὴ καταδικάζετε καὶ οὐ μὴ καταδικασθῆτε* is added. But Fritz. (perhaps with reason) prefers the interpretation of Chrysost., by which *κρίνετε* is taken of sitting in judgment over others acting as severe censors of their faults. And *καταδικάζω* may be understood in the same way, but only in a stronger sense. One thing is certain, that *forensic* judgment cannot here be included.

2. ἐν ᾧ γὰρ κρίματι.] The *ἐν* is thought to be redundant. But it rather answers to the

4 τῷ σὺ ὀφθαλμῷ δοκὸν οὐ κατανοεῖς ; ἼΙ πῶς ἐρεῖς τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου ἄφες, ἐκβάλω τὸ κάρφος ἀπὸ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σου . καὶ ἰδοὺ, ἡ δοκὸς
 5 ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ σου ; Ἐποκρίτά ! ἐκβαλε πρῶτον τὴν δοκὸν ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σου, καὶ τότε διαβλέψεις ἐκβαλεῖν τὸ κάρφος ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου. Μὴ δῶτε τὸ ἄγιον τοῖς κύνι· μὴδὲ βάλητε τοὺς μαργαρίτας ὑμῶν ἐμπροσθεν τῶν χοίρων· μήποτε καταπατήσωσιν αὐτοὺς ἐν τοῖς ποσίν αὐτῶν, καὶ στραφέντες ὀφθήσωσιν ὑμᾶς. ° Αἰτεῖτε, καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν· ζητεῖτε, καὶ εὐρήσετε· κρούετε, καὶ ἀνοιγήσεται ὑμῖν. πῶς γὰρ ὁ αἰτῶν λαμβάνει, καὶ ὁ ζητῶν εὐρίσκει, καὶ τῷ κρούοντι ἀνοιγήσεται. ° ἼΙ τίς ἐστὶν ἐξ ὑμῶν ἄνθρωπος, ὃν ἐὰν αἰτήσῃ ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἄριον, μὴ λίθον ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ ; καὶ ἐὰν λχθὴν αἰτήσῃ, μὴ ὄφιν ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ ; Ἐὶ οὖν ὑμεῖς, πονηροὶ ὄντες, οἴδατε δόματα ἀγαθὰ διδόναι τοῖς τέκνοις ὑμῶν, πόσῳ μᾶλλον ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ ἐν οὐρανοῖς, δώσει ἀγαθὰ τοῖς αἰτοῦσιν αὐτόν ! ° Πάντα οὖν ὅσα

c Infr. 21. 22.
 Mark 11. 24.
 Luke 11. 9.
 John 14. 13.
 & 15. 7. & 16.
 23.
 James 1. 5, 6.
 1 John 3. 22.
 d Luke 11. 11.
 e Luke 6. 31.
 f Job. 4. 16.
 Matt. 22. 40.
 Rom. 13. 8, 10.
 Gal. 5. 14.
 1 Tim. 1. 5.

Heb. כּ, or, as Fritz. thinks, is to be taken in the sense *per*. See Matth. Gr. Gr. p. 812. Instead of ἀντιμετρηθήσεται, μετρηθ. is received by the unanimous consent of all Editors from Mill to Fritz. and Scholz. The other was doubtless derived from the parallel passage of Luke.

3. τί δὲ βλέπεις] I would rather, “how beholdest thou,” “how is it that thou,” &c. See ante supra, v. 25, and a Rabbinical writer cited by Wets. on Luke vi. 19. Nearly the same with πῶς in the next verse. Κάρφος is rightly explained by Grot., Brug., Kuin., and others on (the authority of Hesych. and Suid,) *splinter*. So the Latin *tubera* and *verruca*, as we say *straws*, opposed to *δοκόν*, *beam*. There is reference to a proverb of frequent use with the Jews, against those who, severe upon the slight offences of others, were insensible of their own crimes. Many similar sayings are adduced both from the Rabbinical and Classical writers. See Horat. Sat. i. 3. 25.

4. ἄφες, ἐκβάλω.] The commentators usually supply *iva*. To this, however, Fritz. with reason objects, as unnecessary; and compares the Latin *permitte, extimam*. The Article in ἡ δοκὸς refers to the beam, as just mentioned. See Winer’s Gr. § 53. and compare Æschyl. Eum. 78, and Agam. 243, cited and explained by me on Thucyd. ii. 39. *Transl.*

6. μὴ δῶτε — χοίρων.] Lest any one should suppose *all* liberty taken away of judging even concerning matters the most manifest, Christ subjoins a precept fraught with that prudence, which he elsewhere directs to be joined with simplicity. (Grot.) Here again we have two adagial sayings. Similar ones are adduced from the Rabbinical, and even the Classical writers, to which may be added the following from Aristot. ap. Themist. p. 234. μήτε μίλαι σοφίαν εἰς τοὺς ταύδους. By *dogs* and *swine* are meant those profane and sensual persons, who were so refractory, and devoted to the lusts of the flesh, that so far from receiving the truth, when proposed to them, they resisted and blasphemed it, and impeded the prevalence of it. By τὸ ἄγιον is meant *the doctrine of the Gospel*. From the Rabbinical writers it appears, that the Jews called the precepts of wisdom *pearls*. And our Lord more than once compares the truths (especially the more recon-

dite ones) of the Gospel to the same. See Matt. xiii. 46.

— μήποτε καταπατήσωσιν — ὑμῖς.] Many Commentators take *καταπ.* of the *swine*, and *στραφέντες ὀφθήσωσιν* of the *dogs*, per Chiasmum. This, however, is so harsh, that it is better, with Erasm., Pric., Wets., and Fritz.) to refer *both* to the swine; *στραφέντες* having reference to the *oblique* direction in which hogs make their attack. Ἐν τοῖς ποσίν αὐτῶν is usually rendered *inter pedes, under foot*; but by Fritz., “*suis pedibus*.”

7. αἰτεῖτε — ὑμῖν.] The same thing is expressed in three seemingly proverbial forms. At κρούετε sub. τὴν θύραν, in which term as well as ἀνοίγειν the ellipsis was common.

8. ὁ αἰτῶν.] Namely, *aright*. ὁ ζητῶν, i. e. what is expedient and proper. Τῷ κρούοντι, i. e. who earnestly, and with faith addresses himself in prayer. Ἀνοιγήσεται, “It will be opened.” The sense here nearly that of the *present*, used to denote *custom*.

9. ἡ τίς — ἄνθρωπος.] The ἡ is thought by Fritz. to denote *contrariety*, but it has rather the *illustrative* force; when what follows is meant to illustrate the foregoing by *another* view of the subject As to the τίς, Elsn. and Fritz. rightly suppose an *anacoluthon*, by which two interrogations are blended; thus “an quis est vobis homo, quem, si filius panem poposcerit, num forte lapidem ei porrigat ?” Ἄνθρωπος (the best Commentators, ancient and modern, are agreed) is *emphatical*, “making (as Campb. says) the illustration of the goodness of the celestial Father, from the conduct of even human fathers, with all their imperfections, much more energetic.”

11. πονηροί.] The ancients, and, of the moderns, Grot., Elsn., and Schoettg., explained this *evil, corrupt*; the recent Commentators, *avaricious*. But for the latter sense there is little or no authority, nor indeed propriety. The term is used by way of *comparison* with the celestial Father.

— οὐρα διδόναι.] Almost all the recent Commentators take this as said, *per periphrasin*, for *δίδου*; and they adduce several passages of the Classical writers, which, however, are not quite to the purpose. It seems better to regard it as a Hebraism, and a stronger expression.

12. πάντα οὖν — προφῆται.] A golden precept,

ἂν θέλητε ἵνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς· † οὗτος γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται.

f Luke 13. 24.

Ἔισέλθετε διὰ τῆς στενῆς πύλης· ὅτι πλατεῖα ἡ πύλη, καὶ εὐρύ- 13
χωρος ἡ ὁδὸς ἡ ἀπάγουσα εἰς τὴν ἀπώλειαν· καὶ πολλοὶ εἰσὶν οἱ
εἰσερχόμενοι δι' αὐτῆς. * Τί στενὴ ἡ πύλη, καὶ τεθλιμμένη ἡ ὁδὸς 14
ἡ ἀπάγουσα εἰς τὴν ζωὴν· καὶ ὀλιγοὶ εἰσὶν οἱ εὐρίσκοιτες αὐτήν!

g Micah 3. 5.
h Tim. 3. 5.

Ἐ προσέχετε δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν ψευδοπροφητῶν, οἵτινες ἔρχονται πρὸς ὑμᾶς 15
ἐν ἐνδύμασι προβάτων, ἔσωθεν δὲ εἰσι λύκοι ἄρπαγες. Ἀπὸ τῶν καρ- 16
πῶν αὐτῶν ἐπιγνώσεσθε αὐτούς. μὴ συλλέγουσιν ἀπὸ ἀκανθῶν στα-

h Luke 3. 9. 6.
43, 44. infr.
12. 53.

φυλὴν, ἢ ἀπὸ τριβύλων σῖκα; ἢ οὕτω πᾶν δένδρον ἀγαθὸν καρποῦς 17
καλοῦς ποιεῖ· τὸ δὲ σαπρὸν δένδρον καρποῦς πονηροῦς ποιεῖ. Οὐ 18
δύναται δένδρον ἀγαθὸν καρποῦς πονηροῦς ποιεῖν, οὐδὲ δένδρον σα-
πρὸν καρποῦς καλοῦς ποιεῖν. ἰ (Πᾶν δένδρον μὴ ποιῶν καρπὸν κα- 19
λὸν ἐκκόπτεται, καὶ εἰς πῦρ βάλλεται.) ἄρπαγε ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν αὐτῶν 20
ἐπιγνώσεσθε αὐτούς.

i Supr. 3. 10.
John. 15. 2, 6.

familiar to the Jews, and not unknown to the Gentiles, as the Philological Commentators have shown. The *ὄν* is by some thought *transitive*; by others *resumptive*. Το ὅσα ἂν θέλητε οὕτω Fritz. strongly objects; urging that οὕτω would require ὡς ἂν; and he cancels the οὕτως. Here, however, we have *popular* diction; to alter which were uncritical. More may be said for the οὕτως, which he edits, with Matth., (from the Edit. Princ., and some MSS. and Versions) for οὗτος, just after. Yet the cannon of preferring the more difficult reading must induce us to retain οὗτος. The sense is, "This is the sum and substance of what is contained in the law and the prophets on the relative duties of men."

13. εἰσέλθετε] "strive to enter," (as in the parallel passage at Luke xiii. 24.) namely, εἰς τὴν ζωὴν. The course of human action is often called in Scripture רַחַב דֹּדֹס; and consequently, from the restraints and difficulties of virtue, its road is termed *strait*; as that of vice, *broad*. Here, however, the comparison is to a *gate* opening into a *road* leading up to a citadel. Similar comparisons and parallel sentiments are found in the Heathen writers, as cited by Wets. See also Recens. Synop. The τῆς implies *another* gate, leading to the broad road, which we are not to enter. The sense of the passage is this: "Aim at entering in at the *strait* gate: though there be a gate that is wide, and the way to it broad, and many are travelling along it; yet it leads to perdition; therefore take it not. And though there be a gate that is strait, and the way to it narrow, and few are they that travel thereto; yet take it, for it leads to life and eternal happiness."

14. τί στενή.] It is scarcely possible to imagine stronger evidence than what there is for this reading; which has been received by all the most eminent Editors. The common reading *ὅτι* may, indeed, be tolerated, in the sense *sed*; but Erasmus, from whom Stephens derived it, had little or no authority for it. Whereas τί is supported by the great body of the MSS., all the best Versions, Chrys., Theophyl., and Euthym., and the Ed. Princ. The sense, then, is, "How narrow is the gate!" Ἀπάγουσα. ἄγειν is the regular term; yet ἀπαγ. occurs in a similar passage of Cebes, p. 14.

— οἱ εὐρίσκοιτες.] Schleusn. explains *consequenter*: a frequent use of the word. The expression seems meant to suggest the difficulty and exertion necessary to attain it.

15. προσέχετε δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν ψευδοπροφητῶν.] The full meaning is, "I have exhorted you to enter in by the strait gate. But beware of false guides." (Newcome.) Προσέχειν, when followed by ἀπὸ τινος (with which Kuin. compares the Heb. מִן שַׂרְשָׁר) is equivalent to φοβέσθαι ἀπὸ τινος. It occurs several times in the Sept., but never in the Classical writers. Ἐαυτοῖς seems to be understood, which is expressed at Luke xvii. 3.

— ψευδοπροφ.] This is variously understood; but it is best taken for ψευδοδιδάκαλοι. See 2 Pet. ii. 1. Προφήτης and προφητεῖαν, in the sense *teacher* and *teach*, being common. Some think the ψευδ. in ψευδοπροφ. has reference to their *doctrines*; others, to their *lives*. Both may be supposed.

— ἐν ἐνδύμασι προβάτων.] Ἐν, like the Hebr. בַּ and the Latin *in*, and our *in*, is often used with verbs of clothing, to denote the *material* of which the clothing is formed. Ἐνδύμασι προβάτων has reference to the μιλῶτη (sheep-skin, or sometimes a cloak made of the fleece roughly worked up) with which the false prophets clothed themselves, and, as it seems, the false teachers among the Pharisees.

16. καρπῶν] i. e. "manners and actions." A frequent figure. See Matt. iii. 8. I would compare Thucyd. v. 26. τοῖς γὰρ ἔργοις ἀφορίσει καὶ ἐθέσει. In μὴτε συλλέγουσιν. &c. there is a sort of adagial illustration, found also in Theogn. 537.

17. σαπρῶν.] The word denotes *primarily* what is *decayed* and *rotten*; but 2dly, by metonymy, what is *refuse* and *worthless*, (as old vessels, and small fishes) also, when applied to trees or fruit, what is of a *bad quality*. The passages adduced by Wets. will illustrate all these senses.

19. Some Critics are of opinion that this verse is introduced, by interpolation, from Matt. ii. 10. The objection, however, that it impedes the course of reasoning, will be lessened, if we consider it as an awful admonition incidentally thrown in. See Newcome.

20. ἀρπαγε.] Some Commentators take it for πάντως, *perfecto*. But there is no reason to aban-

21 ^k Οὐ πᾶς ὁ λέγων μοι, Κύριε, Κύριε, εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν ^{k Hos. 8. 2, Luke 6. 46, Rom. 2. 13, James 1. 22,}
 τῶν οὐρανῶν· ἀλλ' ὁ ποιῶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρὸς μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρα-
 22 νοῖς. Πολλοὶ ἐροῦσί μοι ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ· Κύριε, Κύριε, οὐ τῷ
 σῷ ὀνόματι προεφητεύσαμεν, καὶ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι δαιμόνια ἐξεβάλομεν,
 23 καὶ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι δυνάμεις πολλὰς ἐποιήσαμεν; ¹ Καὶ τότε ὁμολο- ^{l Luke 13. 26, 27,}
 γήσω αὐτοῖς· ὅτι οὐδέποτε ἔγνων ὑμᾶς· ἀποχωρεῖτε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ οἱ ἐργα- ^{1 Cor. 13. 2, infir. 25. 12, 41,}
 24 ζόμενοι τὴν ἀνομίαν. ^m Πᾶς οὖν ὅστις ἀκούει μου τοὺς λόγους τού- ^{m Luke 6. 47,}
 τους, καὶ ποιεῖ αὐτοὺς, ὁμοιώσω αὐτὸν ἀνδρὶ φρονίμῳ, ὅστις ὠκοδό-
 25 μησε τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν· καὶ κατέβη ἡ βροχὴ, καὶ
 ἦλθον οἱ ποταμοὶ, καὶ ἔπνευσαν οἱ ἄνεμοι, καὶ προσέπεσον τῇ οἰκίᾳ
 26 ἐκείνῃ, καὶ οὐκ ἔπεσε· τεθεμελίωτο γὰρ ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν. Καὶ πᾶς
 ὁ ἀκούων μου τοὺς λόγους τούτους καὶ μὴ ποιῶν αὐτοὺς, ὁμοιωθήσε-
 27 ται ἀνδρὶ μωρῷ, ὅστις ὠκοδόμησε τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν ἄμμον·
 καὶ κατέβη ἡ βροχὴ, καὶ ἦλθον οἱ ποταμοὶ, καὶ ἔπνευσαν οἱ ἄνεμοι,
 καὶ προσέκοψαν τῇ οἰκίᾳ ἐκείνῃ, καὶ ἔπεσε· καὶ ἦν ἡ πτῶσις αὐτῆς
 28 μεγάλη. ⁿ Καὶ ἐγένετο, ὅτε συντετέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοὺς λόγους τούτους, ^{n Mark. 1. 22, Luke 4. 32,}
 29 ἐξεπλήσιστο οἱ ὄχλοι ἐπὶ τῇ διδασκῇ αὐτοῦ· ἦν γὰρ διδάσκων αὐτοὺς
 ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων, καὶ οὐχ ὡς οἱ Γραμματεῖς.

don the common interpretation, *itaque, ergo*. The Particle is *conclusive*, as in Matt. xvii. 26. xi. 13. The *ἄρα* is *illative*, and the *γε* *limitative*. See Herm. on Viger, p. 321 & 325.

21. οὐ πᾶς.] This is taken by the Commentators to mean *no one*. But though that interpretation is sanctioned by Chrys. and Euthym., there seems no sufficient reason to abandon the usual sense of οὐ πᾶς. We have only to suppose the common ellipsis of *μόνον* with *ὁ ποιῶν*. The sense is, "Not all, who with the lips acknowledge me as their Lord, will be admitted to the blessings which I come to bestow; but those only who likewise perform what my Father enjoins." *Κήριος* is here and often elsewhere used for *διδάσκαλος*, being the name given by the Jews to their Rabbis.

22. ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ] i. e. the day implied in the foregoing words; namely, at the period when there will be a final admission or rejection of all persons. In some other passages, however, as Matt. xi. 24, and Luke x. 12, the pronoun may be understood as referring to some day well known; that expression being, as appears from the Rabbinical writers, used emphatically of the *day of judgment*.

— τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι] "by thy power and authority." See Luke ix. 39.

— προεφητεῦσαμεν] "have taught and preached the Gospel;" not, however, excluding the ordinary sense *prophesied*; for there is reason to think, that miracles were permitted by God to be worked by men whose lives were at variance with the precepts of the Gospel.

23. ὁμολογήσω αὐτοῖς.] "I will tell them openly and plainly." A signification of which examples are adduced from Ælian, Var. Hist. ii. 4. Herod. iii. 6.

— οὐδέποτε ἔγνων ὑμᾶς] i. e. "I never recognised you as my servants, or approved you." This is considered a Hebraism; γινῶν having the sense *approve*. But some examples are adduced by Wets. from Greek writers; not, however,

quite to the point. Far more apposite is the example from Isæus adduced by me in Recens. Synop. Σὺ δὲ τίς εἶ; σοὶ δὲ τί προσέκειε θάπτειν; οὐ γινώσκω σε, (I do not recognise you) οὐ μὴ εἰσῆς τὴν οἰκίαν.

— ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀνομίαν.] The purity of the Greek is established by a passage of Themist. adduced in Recens. Synop. i. e. οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι ἀρετῆν. Ἔργ. is a far stronger term than *ποιεῖν*, and signifies to do any thing studiously and habitually, to *make a trade of it*. The Art. here has an intensive force; q. d. all kinds of iniquity. See Middlet. Gr. A. v. § 2.

24. πᾶς οὖν — αὐτοῖς.] This is regarded as a Hebrew construction for πάντα οὖν ἀκούοντα — ὁμοιώσω ἀνδρὶ. But it may be better called a *popular* construction, and a relique of primitive simplicity of diction. Thus it is found in Herodotus, and all unstudied writers and speakers, in every language. The same may be said of ποιεῖ αὐτοῖς, scil. λόγους, which is a *popular* phrase, to denote "performing my precepts." Ὁμοιώσω is for ὁμοιωθήσεται; or, "I will, may, compare him." *Φρονίμῳ*, prudent, provident; as in Xen. Œcon. xi. 3. cited by Wets.

— ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν.] Upon the force of the Art. here and at ἐπὶ τὴν ἄμμον (which, however, cannot well be expressed in a translation) see Middlet. in loc.

25. ἡ βροχὴ.] This denotes, like the Heb. בַּרְשָׁן, a heavy *gush of rain*, and the Art. is used, as commonly with the great objects of nature, both in Greek and English. Ποταμοὶ, floods or torrents. *Οὗ χεῖμαρῶν ποταμοῖ* in Homer.

26, 27. Many similar sentiments, especially one of Rabbi Elisha, are adduced by Wets. from the Rabbinical writers.

23. καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε.] Like the Hebr. וַיְהִי.

— τῇ διδασκῇ.] The word may denote either the *doctrine taught*, or the *manner of teaching*. But the former seems to be the principal sense intended; the latter being only secondary and implied.

29. ἦν διδάσκων] for ἐδίδασκε, as the Commenta-

VIII. Καταβάντι δὲ αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους, ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ 1
 ὄχλοι πολλοί. ^a καὶ ἰδὼν, λεπρὸς ἐλθὼν προσεκύνη αὐτῷ λέγων· Κύ- 2
 ριε, ἐὰν θέλῃς, δύνασαι με καθαρίσαι. Καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα, ἤψατο 3
 αὐτοῦ ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγων· Θέλω, καθαρίσθῃτι. καὶ εὐθὺς ἐκαθαρίσθη 4
 αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα. ^b Καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Ὅρα μηδεὶ εἶπῃς· 4
 ἀλλ' ἕπαγε, σεαντὸν δεῖξον τῷ ἱερεῖ, καὶ προσέεργε τὸ δῶρον ὃ προσ-
 ἔταξε Μωσῆς, εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς.
 c Luke 7. 1. * Ἐπισελθόντι δὲ αὐτῷ εἰς Καπερναοὺμ προσῆλθεν αὐτῷ ἑκατόνταρχος 5
 παρακαλῶν αὐτὸν καὶ λέγων· Κυριε, ὁ παῖς μου βέβηλται ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ 6
 παραλυτικῶς, δεινῶς βασανιζόμενος. Καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Ἐγὼ 7

tors say. But the sense seems to be: "he had been teaching," or, "he was teaching then," in reference to the customary and general character of his teaching. See Beza.

—ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων] scil. τοῦ διδάσκειν, "as one having authority to teach," i. e. self-derived power; not as the Scribes, who rested only on that of their Doctors; as not the *interpreter*, but the *maker* of the law. Several illustrations of the phrase have been adduced by Wets. and others.

VIII. 1. δέ.] The particle has here the *transitive* sense, and αὐτῷ is redundant, *populariter*.

2. προσεκύνη.] This is not, says Whitby, to be taken as denoting an acknowledgment of the Divinity of our Lord; for the term was one expressive of *civil* adoration, and only paid to him as the Messiah, or a prophet sent from God.

—κύριε.] A form of address used by the Jews to those with whom they were unacquainted, (see Joh. iv. 19. xii. 21. xx. 15.) as *domine* with the Latins, of which see examples in Wets. Yet as it was used by scholars, when addressing their masters, and was doubtless applied to *Rabbis*, so it may here be taken.

—ἐὰν θέλῃς, δύνασαι.] This appears from the examples in Wets. to have been a form of earnest and respectful address, much used by those who sought for relief, especially from physicians.

—καθαρίσαι.] A word used peculiarly of healing leprosy, and which has reference to the *legal impurity* supposed to be incurred by the disease, which could only be removed by the cure of the disorder.

3. ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα.] There is here neither pleonasm nor Hebraism, as is commonly supposed. Nor is the expression devoid of force; though it may be regarded as a relique of the circumstantiality of antient diction.

—ἤψατο αὐτοῦ] i. e. *more Medicorum*, says Wets., who adduces many examples of a similar use of the word. But our Lord seems to have touched the leper, both to inspire him with confidence, (as conceiving that unless with the *power* as well as will to heal him, he would have incurred pollution, and possibly infection) and also to make the bystanders see that the cure was effected by his touch. Our Lord, in most cases, condescended to accompany his words by corresponding actions. As to Jesus's violation of the law, it must be remembered that works performed by Divine virtue were exempted from the ritual precepts.

4. μηδεὶ εἶπῃς.] The best Commentators are agreed that the order was only meant to extend to the period when he had presented himself to the

Priests, for examination. Considering the great multitude of bystanders, it was impossible to prevent the transaction from being made public; so that the object of the injunction must have been, to keep the officiating priest ignorant of the transaction, that he might not maliciously deny the leper to be perfectly clean; which would disappoint the benevolent object of the miracle. It has been supposed (and not without reason) by some (as Lightf. and Newcome) that this transaction is placed here by the Evangelist (for certain reasons) out of its proper chronological order.

—εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς.] It has been debated whether αὐτοῖς has reference to the *priest* (i. e. the priests; *ἱερεῖ* being taken distributively) or to the *people*. Though there is some harshness in the latter mode, (since the antecedent does not exist in the preceding context); yet propriety requires it; for the offering could be no testimony to the *priests*. It may, however, be understood of *both*.

5. προσῆλθεν αὐτῷ ἑκατόνταρχος.] The best Commentators are agreed that, from the striking similarity of circumstances between this transaction and that recorded at Luke vii. 1., they must be the same. The points of difference, they think, are very reconcilable; *παῖς* being both in the Classical and Hellenistic Greek often used for *doctus*, servant; like *puer* in Latin, and used because such kind of services as are performed by our *footmen* or *valets*, was originally rendered by *boys*. Hence the name was afterwards retained, when a change was made in the person. And as to the Centurion here being said to solicit for *himself* what in Luke he entreats through the medium of his *friends*, it may be observed, that the Jews, and in some measure the Greeks and Romans, were accustomed to represent what was done by any one for another, as done by the person himself. See Mark x. 15. compared with Matt. xx. 20. And though Matthew does not tell us that he was a proselyte (as does Luke), yet he says nothing to the contrary. See Grot., Lightf., Kuin., and Fritz.

6. βέβηλται.] A term appropriate to sick persons confined to their couch. Whether it be rendered *decubuit*, with Kuin., or *lecto affixus est*, with Fritz., the sense is the same.

—βασανιζόμενος.] It is debated whether this should be rendered *tortured* or *afflicted*. For palsies, whether attended with contraction, or remission of the nerves, do not, they say, occasion any great pain. Yet it has been proved that, in *one* stage of the disorder, the patient suffers great agony; as also when it passes into apoplexy. The word is rarely found beyond the Scriptural writers, except in Joseph. and Philo.

8 ἔλθὼν θεραπεύσω αὐτόν. ^d Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ ἑκατόνταρχος ἔφη ^{d Luke 15. 10, 21.}
 Κύριε, οὐκ εἰμι ἰκανὸς ἵνα μου ὑπὸ τὴν στέγην εἰσελθῆς· ἀλλὰ μόνον LU.
 9 εἰπέ λόγῳ, καὶ ἰαθήσεται ὁ παῖς μου. καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπός εἰμι 7.
 ὑπὸ ἕξουσίαν, ἔχων ὑπ' ἑμαυτὸν στρατιωτίαν· καὶ λέγω τούτῳ· Πορεύ-
 10 θητι, καὶ πορεύεται· καὶ ἄλλω· Ἔρχου, καὶ ἔρχεται· καὶ τῷ δούλῳ 9
 μου· Ποίησον τοῦτο, καὶ ποιεῖ. Ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐθαύμασε,
 καὶ εἶπε τοῖς ἄκολουθοῦσιν· Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν· οὐδὲ ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ
 11 τοσαύτην πίστιν εἶδον. Λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν, ὅτι πολλοὶ ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν καὶ
 δυσιμῶν ἔξουσιν, καὶ ἀνακλιθήσονται μετὰ Ἀβραάμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ
 12 Ἰακώβ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν· οἱ δὲ υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας ἐκβλη-
 θήσονται εἰς τὸ σκότος τὸ ἑξώτερον· ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ
 13 βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων. Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ * ἑκατοντάρχῳ· Ὕπαγε, 10

8. ἰκανός] for ἄξιος, as in Joh. i. 27. and Matt. iii. 11. The full force of this expression will depend upon whether he was a proselyte, or a heathen. It is not, however, necessary to refine so much as the Commentators have done. We may regard the words as constituting a formula expressive of profound humility.

— λόγῳ.] On this reading and αὐτῶ, all the Editors from Mill downwards are, with reason, agreed. The two readings are found in the best and greater part of the MSS., Versions, Fathers, and the earliest Editions. As to the vulg. τὸν λόγον and τῷ Ἰησοῦ, they were introduced on slender authority by Erasmus. The τῷ Ἰ. is evidently from the margin; and τὸν λόγον arose partly from a confusion of the ν and ι adscript; and partly from an ignorance of the phrase εἰπεῖν λόγῳ, which is like the Latin *verbo dicere*, and our *say at a word*; here, *give order by a word*. Finally εἰπεῖν λόγῳ occurs in the parallel passage of Luke.

9. ἄνθρωπός εἰμι ὑπὸ ἕξουσίαν.] Sub. τασόμενος, which is expressed at Luke vii. 8. and Diod. Sic. cited by Munthe. The sense is *not* what some Commentators maintain, “I am a man holding authority;” (for that would require ἐπ' ἕξουσίας,) but (as the parallel passage of Luke requires) “I am a man placed under authority,” viz. the authority of my superior officer. See Lennep, cited by Scheid. Etymol. 771. This is an argument *a minori ad majus*; q. d. “I who hold but a subordinate office, can order my soldiers and servants, who obey at a word; much more canst thou, who hast supernatural power, cure disorders at thy fiat.” The words following are highly appropriate, and even graphical.

10. ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ] i. e. “the people of Israel;” as often in the Scriptures. But there is not, as some suppose, an *ellipsis* of λαῶ, or οἰκῶ.

— πίστιν.] The word here denotes faith in its general sense; namely, a firm reliance on the power of Jesus to work the miracle in question; a persuasion supposed to have originated in the cure of the nobleman's son, at Cana, only a day's journey distant.

11. πολλοί.] Namely the Gentiles; for they were such, as compared with the υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας, the Jews.

— ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν καὶ δυσιμῶν.] Luke adds ἀπὸ βορρᾶ καὶ νότου. The expression (denoting from all parts of the world) is frequent both in the Scriptural and Classical writers. Grot. thinks that there is a reference to the promise made to Jacob, Gen. xxviii. 14.

— ἀνακλιθήσονται.] A convivial term, like *ἀνακείσθαι, κατακείσθαι, κατακλίνεσθαι*, and others, adapted to the Oriental custom of *reclining*, not *sitting*, at table; on which see Horne's Intr. Both the Scriptural, Rabbinical, and Classical writers (adapting their language to the ordinary conceptions of men) represent the joys of heaven under the image of a *banquet*; and consequently with imagery suited thereto. [Comp. Luke xiii. 28, 29. Mal. i. 11.]

12. υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας.] Scil. τοῦ Θεοῦ, i. e. the Israelites, for whom the happiness of that kingdom was especially destined; and who had arrogated to themselves a place there, to the exclusion of other nations. Kuin. remarks that υἱός like the Heb. בן, is used to denote a person

holding some kind of property in the thing signified by the noun in the Genit., with which it is joined; as Luke x. 6. υἱὸς τῆς εἰρήνης. See also Joh. xvii. 12. and Lu. x. 6.

— σκότος τὸ ἑξώτερον.] Compar. for superl. The expression denotes darkness the most remote from light, and is employed in opposition to the brilliant lights, which are figuratively supposed to be burning in the banqueting room. Some however think that there is an allusion to the dark and squalid subterranean dungeons, into which the worst malefactors were thrust. This I can confirm from Joseph. Bell. iii. 3, 5., where, speaking of suicides, he says, *τοῦτων μὲν ἀδής ἔρχεται τὰς ψυχὰς σκοτεινῶτερος*. See also Dion. Hal. Antiq. viii. p. 522. sub fin., and Horne's Intr. iii. 427. But thus we should have rather had *μυχαιότερον*.

— ἐκεῖ ἔσται — ὀδόντων.] The force of the Art. is expressed by Middlet. thus: “*there shall they weep and gnash their teeth*” the Art. having reference to the persons just mentioned. Ὀδόντων is *not*, as some say, pleonastic; though the word is sometimes omitted in this phrase. Wets. compares Juv. Sat. v. 157. To which I add Soph. Trach. 1074. βέβρυχα κλαίων. [Comp. Infr. xxi. 43. xiii. 42. 50. xxii. 13. xxiv. 51. xxv. 30. Luke xiii. 23.]

13. ἑκατοντάρχῳ.] In this reading, Wets. Matth., Griesb., Vater, and Fritz. agree, for the common ἑκατοντάρχοῳ; and with reason, since it is supported by the greater number of MSS., and is more agreeable to later Grecism. See Poppo's Proleg. on Thucyd. p. 220.

— ἐν τῷ ὧρα ἐκείνῳ] “at that very instant!” for ὧρα sometimes signifies, as the Chaldee and Syr.

MK. LU.

1. 4. καὶ ὡς ἐπίστευσας γενηθήτω σοι. καὶ ἰάθη ὁ παῖς αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ὥρᾳ ἐκείνῃ.
- 29 38 Καὶ ἐλθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Πέτρου, εἶδε τὴν πενθερὰν 14
30 39 αὐτοῦ βεβλημένην καὶ πυρέσσουσαν· καὶ ἤψατο τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς, καὶ 15
31 ἀψῆκεν αὐτὴν ὁ πυρετός· καὶ ἠγέρθη καὶ διηκόνει * αὐτῷ. Ὁπίως δὲ 16
32 40 γενομένης προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ δαιμονιζομένους πολλούς· καὶ ἐξέβαλε τὰ
34 41 πνεύματα λόγῳ, καὶ πάντας τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας ἐθεράπευσεν· ὅπως 17
πληρωθῆ ἡ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἰσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος· Αὐτὸς
τὰς ἀσθενείας ἡμῶν ἔλαβε, καὶ τὰς νόσους ἐβά-
4. 8. στασεν.
- 35 22 Ἰδὼν δὲ Ἰησοῦς πολλοὺς ὄχλους περὶ αὐτόν, ἐκέλευσεν ἀπελθεῖν εἰς 18
9. τὸ πέραν. καὶ προσελθὼν εἰς γραμματεὺς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Διδάσκαλε, 19
57
58 ἀκολουθήσω σοι, ὅπου ἐὰν ἀπέρῃ. Καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Δί 20

רשע and Hebr. עגר, not *hour*, but a point of time, *time*.

14. Πέτρου.] On the several particulars of Peter's life, see Horne's Introd. iv. 438—442.

15. ἤψατο.] *More medicorum*, says Wets., who adduces examples from the Classical writers.—But see note supra. v. 3. Ἀψῆμι is a usual term to denote the departure of a disorder. (See Foesii Œcon. Hippocr.) The miracle here recorded did not consist in the cure of an incurable disorder, but in the *mode* of cure, instantly and by a touch.

—διηκόνει] *waited*, or attended upon him. Camp. “entertained him.” Others, “waited upon him at table.” It seems better, however, to preserve the *general sense*; which is required by the context. This *διακονία* is evidently recorded as a proof of the *completeness* of cure.—See note supra. iv. 11.

αὐτῷ.] On this reading, for the common one *αὐτοῖς*, almost all the Editors are agreed. It has every support from MSS., Versions, and Fathers, is found in the Edit. Princ. and the two first of Stephens, and is received by Scholz. Fritz., indeed, defends *αὐτοῖς*, and it is retained by Griesbach, but upon insufficient grounds.

16. ὥρας.] The Hebrews reckoned two *ὥραι*, the *early*, from the ninth hour to our six o'clock, or sunset, and the *late*, from sunset to nightfall. From Mark i. 32. it appears that the *later* one is here meant; namely, after sunset. (Grot. Kuin., and Fritz.) Thus the sabbath (for we find by Mark i. 21. that it was a sabbath day) had ended when the sick were brought.

—λόγῳ, “at a word.”] Fritz. render “*solâ imperii vi.*” So the Latin *verbo*. See vii. 9. and note.

17. αὐτὸς—ἐβάστασεν.] The words are from Isa. liii. 4., where are described the propitiatory sufferings of Christ for the sins of the world.—And they are supposed, by some Commentators, to be applied by way of *accommodation*. Yet, since the Jews considered dangerous diseases as the temporal punishment of sin, and our Lord often addressed those whom he healed, “*thy sins be forgiven thee*,” it may be granted that the prophecy had a *double fulfilment*; first in the removal of corporeal maladies, and secondly in the remission of our sins, by the sacrifice on the cross. See I Pet. ii. 24. The verbal variation here between St. Matthew and the Sept. is ably

reconciled by Abp. Magee on the Atonement, Vol. i. p. 415. seqq., who refers *ἀσθενείας* and the corresponding Hebrew word to *bodily* maladies (a signification not unfrequent in the Classics, ex. gr. Thucyd. ii. 49.) *νόσους* and its corresponding Hebrew term to diseases of the *mind*; the former clause signifying Christ's removing the sicknesses of men by miraculous cures, the latter, his bearing their sins on the cross. The Unitarian perversion of the passage, whereby it is made to relate to the removal of diseases only, without any reference to a propitiatory sacrifice, is completely refuted by Abp. Magee ubi supra. “It is not surprising (he observes) that so distinguishing a character of the Messiah, as that of his *healing all manner of diseases with a word*, (a character, too, which Isaiah himself has depicted so strongly at ch. xxx. 5. that our Lord (Matt. xi. 4.) quotes the Jews in proof of his Messialship), should be introduced by the Prophet in a passage, where his main object was to represent the plan of our redemption by means of Christ's sufferings; especially as the Jews so connected the ideas of sin and disease, that an allusion to one must suggest the other.”

Αὶ ἔλαβε (ἔστυ) sub. ἐφ' ἐαυτῷ; or take ἔλαβε for ἀνέλαβε. This use of the word is frequent in the Sept. As to ἐβάστα, it cannot, as corresponding to the Heb. כָּרַח, denote *carried*, without great violence. And to this Fritz. (a witness in this respect *omni exceptione major*) bears the strongest testimony. Besides, the interpretation in question passes over the important word *αὐτὸς*, *himself*. I would not, indeed, deny that *βαστάειν* might signify to remove or cure [a disorder] (for a passage of Galen cited by Wets., and another of Diog. Laert. iv. 59., (see also Huet on Origen. Comm. on Matt. xi. 9.) seem to prove this); but I see not how it can, in the passage of the *Prophet*, be so taken; while the language of the *Evangelist* may be taken in the manner above mentioned.

18. ἰδὼν—ἐκέλευσεν κ. τ. λ.] This was not so much because he was not accommoded by the number of applicants for cure, as because Christ systematically avoided keeping a multitude long together, to prevent any suspicion of encouraging sedition. See Le Clerc. On *εἰς τὸ πέραν* see my Note on Thucyd. i. 111.

19. εἰς for τίς.] A use thought by some to be a Hebraism; but it is adduced (as well as *unus* in Latin) from several of the *later* Greek writers.

	MK.	LU.
ἀλώπεκες φωλεοὺς ἔχουσι, καὶ τὰ πτερινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατασκηνώσεις·	4.	9.
21 ὁ δὲ Ἰῶς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἔχει, πού τὴν κεφαλὴν κλίνῃ. Ἐτερος		59
δὲ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Κύριε, ἐπίτρεψόν μοι πρῶτον		
22 ἀπελθεῖν καὶ θάψαι τὸν πατέρα μου. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ·		60
Ἀκολούθει μοι, καὶ ἄφες τοὺς νεκροὺς θάψαι τοὺς ἑαυτῶν νεκροὺς.		8.
23 Καὶ ἐμβάντι αὐτῷ εἰς τὸ πλοῖον ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐ-	36	23
24 τοῦ. Καὶ ἰδοὺ, σεισμὸς μέγας ἐγένετο ἐν τῇ θαλάσῃ, ὥστε τὸ πλοῖον	37	
25 καλύπτεσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν κυμάτων· αὐτὸς δὲ ἐκάθηνδε. Καὶ προσελθόν-	38	24
26 τες οἱ μαθηταὶ [αὐτοῦ] ἤγειραν αὐτὸν, λέγοντες· Κύριε, σῶσον ἡμᾶς·		
ἀπολλύμεθα! Καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· Τί δειλοὶ ἐστε, ὀλιγόπιστοι; Τότε	39	
27 ἐγερθεὶς ἐπέτιμησε τοῖς ἀνέμοις καὶ τῇ θαλάσῃ, καὶ ἐγένετο γαλήνῃ	41	5
27 μεγάλη. οἱ δὲ ἄνθρωποι ἐθαύμασαν λέγοντες· Ποταπὸς ἐστὶν οὗτος!		
ὅτι καὶ οἱ ἄνεμοι καὶ ἡ θάλασσα ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ.		

20. αἱ ἀλώπεκες — κλίνῃ.] This was meant to warn him of the difficulties he would have to encounter in following so destitute a master; and may lead us to suppose that the scribe was desirous of becoming Christ's disciple, from interested motives only. Φωλεὸς denotes dens, or lairs, and κατασκηνώσεις, not nests, (which would be νοσσηταὶ) but places of shelter, such as those where birds settle and perch.

— ὁ Ἰῶς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.] This title, taken from Dan. vii. 13, where everlasting dominion is ascribed to the Messiah under that title, and now first assumed by Christ, occurs 61 times in the Gospels, and is always used by Christ himself, never by any other person. It occurs once in The Acts, (vii. 56.) and is employed by the martyr Stephen. On the origin and nature of the appellation there are various opinions, which see detailed in Recens. Synop. One thing is clear, that from the corresponding term ὁ Ἰῶς τοῦ Θεοῦ, this title belongs to Christ κατ' ἐξοχήν; and that both taken together decidedly prove that Christ, in some manner unknown to us, united in his person both the human and the divine nature, "was very man and very God;" thus negating the opposite tenets of Socinians and of Gnostics. Bp. Middleton observes, that "in a variety of places in which our Saviour calls himself the Son of man, the allusion is either to his present humiliation, or to his future glory." "Now if (continues he) this remark be true, we have, though an indirect, yet a strong and perpetual declaration, that the human nature did not originally belong to him, and was not properly his own." — John v. 27. iii. 13. vi. 62.

— οὐκ ἔχει — κλίνῃ.] A proverbial expression, to denote being destitute of any fixed place of residence, of which sense see two examples adduced in Horne's Introd. p. 409, sqq. See also Wetstein's examples.

21. ἕτερος] for ἄλλος, i. e. either one of the twelve, or of the disciples in general; said by tradition to be Philip. His father was, if not dead, probably at the point of death.

— ἐπίτρεψον κ. τ. λ.] A request (implying that he had been called by our Lord) in itself reasonable. Thus Elijah permitted Elisha to go and bid adieu to his parents; and it was regarded as the bounden duty of children to take care of the funerals of their parents; but which Christ here was pleased to refuse, for reasons unknown to

us, and which doubtless arose from circumstances peculiar to the case. Though we are taught the important lesson, that when we are called to the promotion of religion, either in others or ourselves, we should not allow any temporal business, which may be as well done by men of the world, to prevent us from applying to the work. (See the illustrations in Wets.) Ἀκολούθει μοι. — Equivalent to, "become my disciple."

22. ἄφες — νεκροὺς.] A sententia paradoxa per antanaclastin, (probably proverbial) turning on the double sense of νεκροὺς; which may mean not only the naturally, but the spiritually dead; i. e. insensible to the concerns of the soul or eternity. dead in trespasses and sins. A metaphor familiar to the Jews, not unknown to the Greeks, (as appears from the examples and illustrations adduced by the Commentators) and frequent in the N. T. Τοὺς ἑαυτῶν νεκροὺς is well explained by Euthym. τοὺς προσήκοντας αὐτοῖς νεκροὺς. So Thucyd. ii. 34. καὶ ἐπιφέρει τῷ ἑαυτῷ νεκρῷ (sub. σώματι) ἕκαστος ἦν τι βούλεται.

24. σεισμός.] The word properly denotes terræ motus; but sometimes, as here, stands for maris commotio, λαίλαψ, (a hurricane) which is the term used by Mark and Luke. Καλύπτεσθαι, "was being covered." Ἀπολλύμεθα, "we are perishing."

25. αὐτοῦ.] This is not found in most of the best MSS., some versions and early Edit. and Theophylact, and is cancelled by Mill., Wets., Griesb., Vater, and Scholz. — rightly, for, besides the preponderance of external evidence, internal evidence is against it; since we can far better account, for its addition than omission. It is not needed, because the article carries with it the sense of the pronoun possessive.

26. ὀλιγόπιστοι.] viz. in not confiding in his power to save, as well asleep as awake.

— ἐπέτιμησε — θαλάσῃ.] A highly figurative expression, signifying, he restrained its fury, as Luke iv. 39. ἐπ. τῷ πνεύματι. So Ps. cv. 9. ἐπέτιμησε τῇ ἐρυθρᾷ θαλάσῃ. and lxxviii. 31. xviii. 16. civ. 7. Neh. i. 4. 2 Macc. ix. 8. δὲ ἄρι ὄκων τοῖς τῆς θαλάσσης κύμασιν ἐπιτάσσιν. These nouns ἄνεμος and θάλασσα have the Art., as denoting some of the great objects of nature. See Middlet. Gr. A. iii. 1, 5. The suddenness of the perfect calm is a proof of the reality of the miracle; for after a storm, the sea is never perfectly smooth, until some time has elapsed.

27. ποταπός.] Qualis quantusque sit. The men

MK. LU.

5. 8. Καὶ ἐλθόντι αὐτῷ εἰς τὸ πέραν, εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν * Γαδαρηνῶν, 28
1 26 ὑπήντησαν αὐτῷ δύο δαιμονιζόμενοι, ἐκ τῶν μνημείων ἐξερχόμενοι,

might well regard our Lord as super-human; since to "still the raging of the sea," was always reckoned among the operations of God, inasmuch that in Ps. lxxv. 7, it forms as it were a designation of the Deity.

28. Γαδαρηνῶν.] The reading has here been thought doubtful; the MSS. fluctuating between Γεργασηνῶν, Γαδαρηνῶν, and Γερασηνῶν. The weight of authority, as far as regards number of MSS., is in favour of the first-mentioned, which is the common reading; but those MSS. are chiefly of an inferior kind, and of one class; while Γαδαρηνῶν is supported by a not inconsiderable number of MSS. of great antiquity and different recensions, by the Pesch., Syr., and Persic Versions, and some Fathers; as Euseb., Epiph., and Chrysostom. As to Γερασηνῶν, it is supported almost solely by the Vulg. and a few inferior Versions. Now if external evidence were alone to be considered, we must prefer Γεργ. But internal evidence is to be taken into the account; and that, as we shall see, is strongly in favour of Γαδ. And when some seek to reconcile the discrepancy between St. Matthew and the other Evangelists, who have Γαδαρ., by maintaining that Gergesa was in the immediate vicinity of Gadara, so that the limits belonging to one city were so included within the limits of the other, that one Evangelist might say "the country of the Gadarenes," and another, "the country of the Gergesenes," with equal truth; that is but taking for granted what ought to be proved. Upon the whole, there is great reason to think that the reading Γεργ. originated merely in the conjecture of Origen (as is plain from his own words, T. iv. p. 140.) He rejected the reading Γαδαρ. because, he says, "there were no cliffs nor sea at Gadara." But he forgot that the Evangelists are speaking not of the city, but of the territory, which, as we shall see, extended down to the Sea of Galilee. But the site is not, as the maps place it, at *Oomkeis*; and that for two reasons. 1. Because that is contrary to what Pliny affirms, who says (L. v. 16.) that it was situated "præfluente Hieromace." And 2. Because it runs counter to the testimony of the coins of the city, which bear the representation of a trireme with rowers; which shows, that it must have been in the immediate vicinity of the sea of Galilee, and that its territory must have reached to it. Besides, the hot-baths which Origen and others attest were in the vicinity of Gadara, are found, not on the left, but on the right bank of the Hieromax: for the baths in question undoubtedly correspond to those now called *Hammel el Sheik*, plainly the ancient *Ἰερμαθία*, or *Amathia*. In fact, the true situation of Gadara is very nearly pointed out in a passage of Eusebius, in his *Onomasticum*, v. *Γάδαρι*. His words are: Πόλις ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰορδάνην, ἀντικρὺ Σκυθόπολεως καὶ Τιβεριάδος πρὸς ἀνατολαίς, ἐν τῷ ἄρει. αὐτὸς πρὸς ὑπορυγίαις (I would read ὑπορυγίαις, for the common reading makes nonsense) τὰ τῶν θερμῶν ὑδάτων παράκειται. Now the mountain at whose foot are the hot-baths, is *Hippos*. And as the situation of *Amathia* must correspond to *Hammel el Sheik*, we may approximate to that of Gadara. It was, I conceive, near the termination of *Hippos*, where it runs out into a sort of promontory. The exact situation, however, may pretty exactly be determined from a passage of the Itinerary of Antoninus the Martyr,

cited in Reland's *Palestine*, p. 775, and which I will cite in order to emend.

"Venimus in civitatem quæ vocatur Gaddi, quæ dicitur Gabaon (I conjecture Gaddor, גַּדְדוֹר, the Hebrew name of the city.) In parte ipsius civitatis sunt aquæ calidæ, milliario III. (I conjecture II., the two marks being often interchanged) quæ appellantur Thermæ *Helicæ*, (I conjecture *Haliæ*, from ἕλαι, *salinæ*, salt-springs.) Ibi (i. e. at Thermæ) est etiam fluvius calidus, (I conjecture *gelidus*, a not unfrequent epithet of a river) qui dicitur Gadarra, et descendit torrens, et intrat in Jordanem."

Thus it appears, that the true situation of Gadara is at about two miles from the Hot-baths, from whence to the Lake of Genesaret are three miles; which agrees with what Josephus says of the distance.

But to return, it seems quite clear that the reading Γεργ., either arose from the conjecture of Jerome, or, if he adopted it from others, was derived from those who saw that Γεργασηνῶν was inadmissible, (because Gergasa was situated in quite another part of the country,) and therefore might with no slight probability conjecture Γεργ. For I mean not to deny (as does Fritz.) that there ever was such a city as *Gergesa*; or that it was situated on the E. coast of the lake. There is no proof that Origen speaks from report only (as Fritz. takes for granted); nay, his words seem to show that he speaks from his own knowledge. Yet, though he mentions it as πόλις ἀρχαία, we are not, I think, authorised to conclude that it was then in being; but only to understand by it the ruins of that city. The question, however, is, at what part of the E. coast was Gergesa situated? I apprehend, we may nearly fix its site. Epiphanius adv. Hær. L. i. p. 131, relates, that in the neighbourhood of Gadara there were "caves cut out of the rocks, burying-grounds, and tombs." Now it is plain that these were the reliques of some ancient and very considerable city; and what could it be but *Gergesa*, which I suspect was a little to the N. N. E. of Gadara, and itself situated on the brow of the mountain? Thus, though Gadara and Gergesa were near to each other, yet the cliff over which the swine rushed was, it seems, nearer to the latter than the former. This is plain from the words of Origen, which show that it was probably opposite to Old Gergesa: and from what he says, it appears that the site of the miracle was then pointed out by the people of the country. That, however, was no reason why St. Matthew should have written Γεργ.; for the Gergashites had long ceased to exist. And, therefore, that could not, as some Commentators have imagined, be the general name of the country in which Gadara was situated. In short, the city of Gergesa had been destroyed as long ago as the war of the Israelites with the inhabitants, (so Josephus i. 6, 2, says: "the cities of the Gergashites were destroyed," &c.) who, the Rabbins tell us, went in a body to Africa; permission, by proclamation, being made by Joshua that they should go whither they would. From that time we hear no more of the Gergashites. And, as the inhabitants were removed from the country, it must have soon ceased to bear their name; and at the time of Christ, (as we learn from Josephus in *Vita*, 69,) Gadara, which

	MK.	LU.
χαλεποὶ λίαν, ὥστε μὴ ἰσχύειν τινὰ παρελθεῖν διὰ τῆς ὁδοῦ ἐκεῖνης.	5.	8.
29 Καὶ ἰδοῦ, ἔκραζαν λέγοντες· Τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοὶ, Ἰησοῦ, Πιὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ;	2	27
30 ἤλθες ὧδε πρὸ καιροῦ βασιτεῦσαι ἡμᾶς; ἼIn δὲ μακρὰν ἀπ' αὐ-	3	
31 τῶν ἀγέλη χοίρων πολλῶν βοσκομένη. Οἱ δὲ δαίμονες παρεκάλουν	7	28
αὐτὸν, λέγοντες· Εἰ ἐκβάλλεις ἡμᾶς, ἐπίτρεψον ἡμῖν ἀπελθεῖν εἰς τὴν	11	32
32 ἀγέλην τῶν χοίρων. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Τπάγετε. Οἱ δὲ ἐξεληθόντες	12	33
ἀπ᾿ ἑλθον εἰς τὴν ἀγέλην τῶν χοίρων· καὶ ἰδοῦ, ὤρμησε πᾶσα ἡ ἀγέλη	13	
τῶν χοίρων κατὰ τοῦ κρημουῦ εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, καὶ ἀπέθανον ἐν		
33 τοῖς ὕδασιν. Οἱ δὲ βόσκοντες ἔφυγον, καὶ ἀπελθόντες εἰς τὴν πόλιν,	14	34
34 ἀπήγγειλαν πάντα, καὶ τὰ τῶν δαιμονιζομένων. Καὶ ἰδοῦ, πᾶσα ἡ	15	35
πόλις ἐξῆλθεν εἰς συνάντησιν τῷ Ἰησοῦ. καὶ ἰδόντες αὐτὸν, παρεκάλε-		
σαν ὅπως μεταβῆ ἀπὸ τῶν ὀρίων αὐτῶν.		
1 IX. Καὶ ἐμβὰς εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, διεπέρασε, καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν	2.	5.
2 πόλιν. Καὶ ἰδοῦ, προσέφερον αὐτῷ παραλυτικὸν ἐπὶ κλίνης βεβλημέ-	3	18
ρον. καὶ ἰδὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὴν πίστιν αὐτῶν, εἶπε τῷ παραλυτικῷ·	5	20
3 Θάρσει τέκνον, ἀφέονται σοὶ αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου. Καὶ ἰδοῦ, τινὲς τῶν	6	21
4 γραμματέων εἶπον ἐν ἑαυτοῖς· Οὗτος βλασφημεῖ. Καὶ ἰδὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς	7	22

was the capital of Pærgæ, and, I suspect, had arisen out of the ruins of Gergesa, had a pretty considerable district, including several towns or villages, (doubtless amongst these, the ruined Gergesa and its vicinity); and, consequently, its inhabitants would not be called *Gergesenes*, but *Gadarenes*. I have, therefore, with Fritz. and Scholz, edited *Γαδαρηνοῦν*.

— *μημεῖων*.] Tombs were not only among the Jews, but the Gentiles, very spacious; and usually subterranean. Hence they often served as places of shelter to the houseless wanderer; or such poor wretches as lepers, or demoniacs, who were driven from human habitations; places, indeed, which might seem not unsuitable to the latter, since the ancients supposed that evil demons hovered about sepulchres.

— *χαλεποί*.] The word properly denotes (like *ἄσπρος*) and some other words, see my note on Thucyd. iv. 32. 4.) “what brings one into difficulty and peril;” and is applied both to things inanimate and *animate*; as brutes, or brutal persons; and then signifies *savage*, *fierce*. Of all these uses examples may be seen in Wets.

29. *τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί*.] An idiom frequent both in Hellenistic and Classical Greek, (of which see examples in Wets. and Matth. Gr. Gr. § 335. 10.) in which there is an ellipsis either of *καινόν*, (*expressed* by Ach. Tat. and Leon. Tar. ap. Wets.) or *πράγμα*, supplied in passages of Demosth. and Nichomachus cited in Recens. Syn. The sense of the phrase somewhat varies with the context; but it usually implies *troublesome* or *unauthorised interference*. Here it seems to be, “what authority hast thou over us?” q. d. what have we to do with thee (as subjects)? Ἰησοῦ before *νιὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ* is omitted in some MSS., and cancelled by Griesb., but rashly: for, as Matth. suggests, “*sigla* Ἰησοῦ ante *νιὲ* facile negligebatur.”

— *πρὸ καιροῦ*] “before the appointed time,” i. e. the day of judgment, against which evil spirits “are reserved to be chained in torments in the pit of destruction.” See 2 Pet. ii. 4. Jude 6.

30. *μακράν*.] “a good way off.” So our Comm.

Vers. Better “at some distance,” as Newcome and Campb. render, for *μακρός*, like all such words, is only a *comparative* term. If the above mode of explanation be rejected, we may here and at Luke xviii. 13. *μακρόθεν*, and some other passages (including examples of the Latin *procul*, adduced by Wets., Munthe, &c.), suppose the word to mean *off*, *opposite to*, implying a short distance.

31. *ἐπίτρεψον ἡμῖν*.] Griesb. edits, from four MSS. and some inferior Versions, *ἀπόστειλον ἡμᾶς*. But his reasons are, though specious, not to be balanced against the strong external evidence for the common reading.

32. *κατὰ τοῦ κρημουῦ*] “down the steep.” This sense of *κατὰ* is frequent in the best Classical writers, examples from whom are adduced by Wets., Munthe, &c. The readings, *ἀπόσταλον ἡμᾶς ἀπελθεῖν for ἐπίτρεψον ἡ. ἀπ.* and *τοὺς χοίρους for τὴν ἀγέλην*, are received into the text by Griesb., but wrongly; for *external* evidence is almost entirely against them, and *internal* by no means in their favour. See Fritz.

IX. 1. *τὸ πλοῖον*] i. e. either the vessel which had brought them over, or the ferry boat.

— *ἰδίαν πόλιν*.] So *εἰς τὴν πόλιν αὐτοῦ* in 1 Sam. viii. 22. This expression denoted not only the place of any one’s *birth*, but *residence*; and, according to the Jewish laws, a year’s residence gave citizenship.

2. *ἰδὼν τὴν πίστιν*.] That this was great, appears from the trouble which (as we find by Mark ii. 4. and Luke v. 19) they had taken to bring the man.

— *ἀφένονται*.] The sense is, “thy sins are [hereby] forgiven thee.” It was usual with the Jews, in accordance with the language of the O. T., to regard diseases as the effects of sin. On the phrase *ἀφίεναι τὰς ἁμαρτίας*, see a Dissertation of Vitringa, vol. i. p. 199.

3. *ἔπον ἐν ἑαυτοῖς*.] A popular form of expression, like one in our own language, answering to *διαλογιζόμενοι ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις* in Mark and Luke.

— *βλασφημεῖ*.] Though in the Classical writers the word almost always denotes, in its prop-

MK. LU.

2. 5. τὰς ἐνθνημίσεις αὐτῶν, εἶπεν · Ἰναὶ ὑμεῖς ἐνθνημεῖσθε πονηρὰ ἐν
 9 23 ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν; τί γάρ ἐστιν εὐκοπώτερον, εἰπεῖν · Ἀφέωνταί 5
 10 24 * σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι ἢ εἰπεῖν · Ἐγερταὶ καὶ περιπατεῖς; Ἰνα δὲ εἰδῆτε, 6
 11 25 ὅτι ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀφιέναι ἁμαρ-
 12 26 τίας — Τότε λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ · Ἐγερθεὶς ἄρον σου τὴν κλίνην,
 14 27 καὶ ὑπάγε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου. Καὶ ἐγερθεὶς ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον 7
 28 αὐτοῦ. Ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ ὄχλοι ἐθαύμασαν, καὶ ἐδόξασαν τὸν Θεὸν τὸν 8
 29 δόντα ἐξουσίαν τοιαύτην τοῖς ἀνθρώποις.
 14 27 Καὶ παρὰ γων ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐκείθεν, εἶδεν ἄνθρωπον καθήμενον ἐπὶ 9
 28 τὸ τελῶνιον, Ματθαῖον λεγόμενον, καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ · Ἀκολούθει μοι.
 καὶ ἀναστὰς ἠκολούθησεν αὐτῷ. Καὶ ἐγένετο, αὐτοῦ ἀνακειμένου ἐν 10
 15 29 τῇ οἰκίᾳ, καὶ ἰδοὺ, πολλοὶ τελῶναι καὶ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἐλθόντες συναέ-
 16 30 κειντο τῷ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ. Καὶ ἰδόντες οἱ Φαρισαῖοι 11
 εἶπον τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ · Διατί μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν
 17 31 ἐσθίει ὁ διδάσκαλος ὑμῶν; Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἀκούσας εἶπεν αὐτοῖς · Οὐ 12
 32 χρεῖαν ἔχουσιν οἱ ἰσχύοντες ἑαυτοῦ, ἀλλ' οἱ κακῶς ἔχοντες. Πορευθέν- 13

er sense, to *calumniate*; yet in Scripture it almost invariably has the religious sense, to *speak impiously respecting God*. The persons in question took for granted (and hence are reproached as *εὐθυμολόμενοι πονηρὰ* unjustly) that Jesus was not sent from God; and hence falsely concluded, that by professing to be a Divine Legate, he was blasphemous and injurious towards God.

4. ἰδῶν] for εἰδῶς, which is found in Luke vi. 8. and xi. 17. and some writers, especially Philo and Josephus.

— *ἰναί.*] “The origin of the expression (says Fritz.) is to be explained by *ellipsis*. The complete phrase, after the *present* tense, is *ἵνα τί γίνῃται*, “*ut quid fiat*,” after the *Preterite*, *ἵνα τί γένοιτο*, “*ut quid fieret*?” See *Herm.* on *Vig.* p. 849.

5 & 6. There is in these vv. an irregularity of construction, which has perplexed the Commentators; most of whom are of opinion, that the words *τότε λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ* are parenthetical; and they suppose a transition in the address; *ἵνα εἰδῆτε*, &c. being directed to the *lawyers*, and *ἐγερθεῖς*, &c. to the *paralytic*. But this parenthesis is somewhat harsh; and we should thus expect *ἀφῑένται σοὶ αἱ ἁμαρτίαι* rather than *Ἐγερθεῖς*, &c. Other modes of taking the words are resorted to by Heins., Kuin., and Fritz., all liable to objection. It should seem best not to suppose a parenthesis; but to consider the words *ἵνα εἰδῆτε* — *ἁμαρτίας* as said per *anantapodoton*, vel *aposiopesis*. Thus the sense of the whole passage may be expressed, in paraphrase, as follows. “It was as easy for me to pronounce, Thy sins are forgiven thee, as to say [i. e. with effect] Rise and walk. But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins, [I have done what I have done.] Then, addressing the paralytic, he said, Arise,” &c. Campb. well observes, that “although both, and *with effect*, were equally easy to our Lord, yet in the former case the effect was invisible, and might be questioned by the multitude; whereas the immediate consequence of the latter was an ocular demonstration of the power with which it was accompanied: and to say the one with effect, which effect was *visible*, was a manifest proof that the other was

said also with effect, though the effect was invisible.” Σου for σοι is in most of the best MSS., and the Ed. Princ., and is adopted by almost all the Editors.

3. τοῖς ἀνθρώποις.] This is usually considered as *Plur.* for *Sing.*; but, as Grot. and Fritz. remark, the *Plural* has place *in sententia generali*.

9. παρὰ γων.] Παρὰ γων properly signifies to *pass by*, or *away*; and here, to *go away*, *withdraw*, like the Heb. *נָסַח*.

— τὸ τελῶνιον] “the toll-house;” a sort of hut, in which the collector sat. The word is sometimes written *τελωνεῖον*, and seems to be properly an adjective, with the ellipse of *οἶκον*.

— ἠκολούθησεν αὐτῷ.] He had no hesitation in doing this, as being, doubtless, well acquainted with the character of Jesus. It is generally agreed, from the great similarity of the narrations, that the *Matthew* here and the *Levi* of Mark ii. 14. and Luke v. 29. are names of the same individual, especially as it was usual with the Jews to bear two names. The Evangelist follows the custom of the ancient historians in general; who, on having occasion to speak of themselves, use the third person, to avoid egotism.

10. ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ] “in his house,” i. e. of Matthew, as appears from Mark ii. 15. and Luke v. 29, if indeed the feast was the same; which, however, Greswell denies; without reason, I think. It is better to suppose the mention of the feast *anticipated*; for Newc. has shown, that a period of nearly six months intervened between the call of Matt. and this feast. The *καὶ* before ἰδοὺ seems harsh; but may be best considered with Fritz., as used (like the Heb. *ו* in 1 Sam. xxviii. 1. and 2 Sam. xiii. 1.) in the sense *venempe*.

— ἁμαρτωλοὶ.] The word here, and generally elsewhere in the Gospels, denotes *heathens*, or such Jews as associated with them, and were considered on a footing with them. On which see Lightf. and A. Clarke.

11. ἑατέ — ἰδοὺ.] From the passages cited by Wets. and others, it appears that the *Heathens* as well as the Jews, accounted it a pollution to eat with the impious.

12. οὐ χρεῖαν ἔχοντες.] This appears, from the

	τες δὲ μάθετε τί ἐστίν· Ἔλεον θ' ἔλω, καὶ οὐ θυσίαν· οὐ γὰρ ἤλθον καλέσαι δικαίους, ἀλλ' ἁμαρτωλοὺς, [εἰς μετάνοιαν.]	MK. LU. 2. 5.
14	Τότε προσέρχονται αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου, λέγοντες· Διὰ τί ἡμεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι νηστεύομεν πολλὰ, οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ σου οὐ νηστεύουσι; καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Μὴ δύνανται οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος πενθεῖν, ἐφ' ὅσον μετ' αὐτῶν ἐστίν ὁ νυμφίος; ελεύσονται δὲ ἡμεῖραι, ὅταν ἀπαρθῇ ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὁ νυμφίος, καὶ τότε νηστεύουσιν.	18 33 19 34 20 35
16	Οὐδέεις δὲ ἐπιβάλλει ἐπίβλημα ἄκους ἀγράφου ἐπὶ ἱματίῳ παλαιῷ· αἶρει γὰρ τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱματίου, καὶ χεῖρον σχίσμα γίνεται.	21 36
17	Οὐδὲ βιάλλουσιν οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς παλαιούς· εἰ δὲ μήγε, ῥήγγνται οἱ ἀσκοὶ, καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἐκχεῖται, καὶ οἱ ἀσκοὶ ἀπολοῦνται· ἀλλὰ βιάλλουσιν οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινούς, καὶ ἀμφοτέροι συντηροῦνται.	22 37

Classical citations adduced by Wets., Fritz., and myself, to have been a proverbial expression, employed to rebut such like reproaches as the present.

13. The connection is thus traced by Kuin. "You Pharisees severely censure me for associating with persons such as tax-gatherers, whom you call sinners. I therefore remind you of the word of God, as found in the Prophet, &c."

— *πορευθέντες.*] This is *not*, as the Commentators usually say, redundant; but is put for the verb with *καὶ*; q. d. "Go and apply yourselves to learn." So the phrase cited by Schoettg. *קבלו ונלמדו* *go and learn*, as used by Rabbis when they wished to refer their disciples to the Scriptures. The *indefinite* mode of citation here employed was, as Surenhus. says, usual with the Rabbis, and, in some measure, with all the ancient writers. See Valckn. on Herodo. iv. 131.

— *ἔλεον.*] The word here denotes *φιλανθρωπία*, universal benevolence. The *ל* of the Hebr. and the *καὶ οὐ* here denote, not a simple and absolute, but *comparative* negation, and may be rendered *non tam* — *quam*; an idiom common to both Hebrew and Greek. Passages similar in sentiment are adduced from the Rabbinical writers by Wets. and Scheid, and from the Classical writers by Kypke and Munthe. *Θυσία* is taken, by synecdoche, for the whole of the ceremonial law.

— *οὐ γὰρ ἤλθον, &c.*] These words are, rightly, thus explained by the ancients and most moderns: "Not you who, like the Pharisees, fancy yourselves righteous, but you who acknowledge yourselves sinners, and seek a method of expiation." Dr. Burton, however, thinks "it matters not whether we take *δικαίους* ironically, or *not*." But surely it *does* matter whether we destroy the antithesis, (which requires *both* terms to be understood in a modified sense,) and take away the spirit of this pungent retort, or not. The words *εἰς μετάνοιαν* are not found in several MSS. Versions, and Latin Fathers, (both here and at Mark ii. 17,) are disapproved by Mill, Bengel, Knappe, and Vater, and are cancelled by Griesb. They are, however, defended by Whitby, Wets., Matthei, Fritz., and Scholz; and the MS. authority for them is so strong, that they must be retained. Indeed, as Fritz. observes, they seem quite necessary to the course of argument, and yet cannot well be thought left to be understood. [*Comp. infra*, xii. 7. Hos. vi. 6. 1. Tim. i. 15.]

14. *νηστεύομεν.*] We are not to understand this

of *public* but *private* fasts, upon various extraordinary occasions.

15. *μὴ δύνανται* — *νυμφίος.*] A most delicate form of expressing by *conjecture*, what is meant to be strongly denied. *Δύνανται* is not redundant, (as Kuin. and others say;) but, by the ellipse of some words (such as here, "consistently with the nature of a marriage feast," which Fritz. supplies) may be rendered *debet*, or *decent*.

— *οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος*] i. e. (by a Hebraism whereby *כ* prefixed denotes *distinction* or *participation*) those who were admitted into the bride chamber; namely (the friends of the bride groom, the *παράνυμφοι*, *pronubi*), who formed the marriage procession, and were invited to a participation of the seven days' matrimonial feasting. See Horne's Introd. iii. 410.

— *πενθεῖν.*] Mark and Luke have *νηστεύειν*. Yet *πενθεῖν* may be taken per synecdochen; for fasting was among the signs of grief. In ὁ *νυμφίος* there is a reference to the title given by the ancient Hebrews to Christ. *Νηστεύουσιν*, they will, or may fast.

16. *οὐδὲεις ἐπιβάλλει, &c.*] "no one clappeth a patch of undressed cloth," &c., i. e. rough from the weaver, and which has not yet passed through the hands of the fuller. Thus the expression answers to the *κινδὸν* of Luke. *Ἐπίβλημα* is Hellenistic for *ἐπιπλάσμα*.

— *αἶρει γὰρ* — *γίνεται.*] By this it is meant that the two substances being dissimilar, (one rigid and the other supple) will never wear well together, but the rigid will tear away part of the supple. The comparison is *popular*; and the application suggested by this and the metaphor in the next verse is, the inexpediency of imposing too grievous burthens on them, during their weakness and imperfection, as new converts.

17. *βιάλλουσιν*] Scil. *ἀνθρωποι*. *Βιάλλειν* is used to signify *infundere*, both in the Scriptural and Classical writers.

— *ἀσκοὺς*] flasks made of goat or sheep skins, used in all the ancient nations, and still employed in the Southern parts of Europe. Now these, as they are not so easily distended when they grow old and stiff, so they are liable to burst by the fermentation of the liquor.

— *ἀμφοτέροι.*] On this reading all the Editors are agreed, from Mill to Scholz. It is found in almost all the MSS., the Edit. Princ., and some other early Edd.: as also in the parallel passage of Luke. As to the common reading

MK. LU.

5. 8. Ταῦτα αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος αὐτοῖς, ἰδοὺ, ἄρχων εἰς ἐλθὼν προσεκύνη 18
 22 41 αὐτῷ λέγων· "Οτι ἡ θυγάτηρ μου ἄρτι ἐτελεύτησεν· ἀλλὰ ἐλθὼν
 23 42 ἐπίθες τὴν χεῖρά σου ἐπ' αὐτήν, καὶ ζήσεται. Καὶ ἐγενεθῆς ὁ Ἰησοῦς 19
 24 ἠκολούθησεν αὐτῷ, καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ.
- 25 43 Καὶ ἰδοὺ, γυνὴ αἰμορροῦσα δώδεκα ἔτη, προσελθοῦσα ὀπισθεν, 20
 29 ἤψατο τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ· ἔλεγε γὰρ ἐν ἑαυτῇ· ἂν 21
 34 43 μόνον ἄψωμαι τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ, σωθήσομαι. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἐπιστρα- 22
 φεῖς καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτήν, εἶπε· Θάρσει θυγάτηρ· ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέ σε.
 38 Καὶ ἐσώθη ἡ γυνὴ ἀπὸ τῆς ὥρας ἐκείνης. Καὶ ἐλθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς 23
 εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ ἄρχοντος, καὶ ἰδὼν τοὺς ἀλητάς καὶ τὸν ὄχλον
 39 52 θορυβούμενον, λέγει αὐτοῖς· Ἀναχωρεῖτε· οὐ γὰρ ἀπέθαρτε τὸ κορά- 24
 40 53 σιον, ἀλλὰ καθύδει. καὶ κατεγέλων αὐτοῦ. Ὅτε δὲ ἐξεβλήθη ὁ ὄχλος, 25
 41 54 εἰσελθὼν ἐκράτησε τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς, καὶ ἤγγεσθη τὸ κοράσιον. καὶ 26
 ἐξῆλθεν ἡ φῆμη αὕτη εἰς ὄλην τὴν γῆν ἐκείνην.

ἀμφότερα, it may, indeed, be defended (in the sense "both things"); but it probably either arose from accident, (οἱ and a being perpetually confounded), or from the alteration of those who wished to remove the harshness connected with *ἀμφότεροι*.

18. ἀρχῶν] Scil. τῆς συναγωγῆς, which is expressed in Luke viii. 41. He is by Mark v. 22, called ἀρχισυνάγωγος, and named Jairus. The εἰς after ἀρχων is found in most of the MSS., the Edit. Princ., and the best of the Versions; which is with reason adopted by Wets., Grieb's., Matth., Fritz., and Scholz.

— ἄρτι ἐτελεύτησεν] "is by this time dead," or "as it were dead." This is agreeable to Mark's ἐσχάτως ἔχει and not irreconcilable with Luke's ἀπέθνησκεν, which may be rendered "was dying." And certain it is, that ἀποθνήσκω like the Heb. נָסַח, was used of those at the point of death.

— ἐπίθες τὴν χεῖρά.] "According (says Grot.) to the custom of our Lord, as it had been also of the prophets; who, in praying for the benefit of any person, used to put their hands upon him." See Numb. xxvii. 18. 2 Kings v. 11. Matth. xix. 13. Acts iv. 30.

— ζήσεται.] The interpretation of this word must depend upon the sense assigned to the former ἐτελεύτησεν: but in the popular acception it is susceptible of either the signification *to be restored to life*, or *to continue to live*, which must imply recovery from her sickness.

20. αἰμορροῦσα.] It is not clear whether, by this we are to understand a flux from the *os sacrum*, or the *os matricis*. The former seems the more probable. See Mead cited in Rec. Syn. I would add, that Levit. xv. 33. seems to favour the latter opinion. One thing is certain, that a flux of blood of either kind is the least curable of all distempers.

— τοῦ κρασπέδου.] Not so much the *hem*, as the *tassel*, (i. e. one of the lower tassels) of the garment; which had four corners, called *περόγια*, from each of which was suspended a tassel of threads or strings, called *κράσπεδον*. To touch the lower ones, was regarded as a mark of profound respect. This, however, is not to be regarded as exclusively a Jewish custom; for I have, in Recens. Synop., adduced three examples (from Arrian, Athenaus, and Plutarch) of

heathens touching or kissing the fringe of a great man's robe as a mark of respect, and to gain his good will and favour. It is still retained in the East. The secrecy and delicacy here employed may be attributed to the *nature* of the disorder, which was considered unclean.

21. σωθήσομαι.] "I shall be restored to health." The word is not unfrequent in this sense, as used of recovery from a dangerous disorder.

23. τοὺς ἀλητάς.] The antiquity of the custom of wailing for the dead, and expressing grief by tearing the hair and mangling the flesh, appears from various parts of the O. T.: it was common to both Greeks and Romans, and still continues in some barbarous or half civilized nations. Besides these offices of *relations*, other persons were hired to join in the howling, and to sing dirges, accompanied by various wind instruments.

— θορυβοῦμενον.] This would properly mean *tumultuantem*; but the word must here include the sense of *lamentation*, namely, such tumultuary responses as the *preſicæ* would make in concert.

24. οὐκ ἀπέθαρτε — καθύδει.] We are not to infer from this that the girl was not dead. For that is contrary to the whole tenor of the narration. The best Commentators are agreed that the sense is, "she is not so departed, as not to return to life," (which was the idea associated with death;) and that by *καθύδει* is meant, "is, as it were, asleep." To explain ἀπέθαρτε with Dr. Burton, "she was not dying at the time when her father thought her dying," would be exceedingly harsh and frigid.

25. ἐξεβλήθη] "was dismissed," or, required to withdraw. This and many such terms in both Hellenistic and Classical writers are not to be strained, but to be understood *populariter*. Our Lord excluded the people, in order that those whom he wished to be spectators of the miracles (as the parents, and Peter, James, and John, see Mark v. 37 — 40.) might view what was done without interruption.

— ἐκράτησε τῆς χειρὸς.] Not as a form of raising any one, nor through courtesy, or *more medicorum* as many Commentators say; but, as usual, to accompany the miracle with some *act*, as that of touching.

27 Καὶ παράγοντι ἐκεῖθεν τῷ Ἰησοῦ ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ δύο τυφλοὶ,
 28 κράζοντες καὶ λέγοντες· Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, υἱὲ Δαυὶδ! Ἐλθόντι δὲ εἰς
 τὴν οἰκίαν προσῆλθον αὐτῷ οἱ τυφλοὶ, καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς·
 Πιστεύετε ὅτι δύναμαι τοῦτο ποιῆσαι; λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· Ναὶ, Κύριε.
 29 Τότε ἤψατο τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν, λέγων· Κατὰ τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν
 30 γενηθήτω ὑμῖν. Καὶ ἀνεψύχθησαν αὐτῶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοί. καὶ ἐνεθιμή-
 31 σατο αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγων· Ὁρᾶτε μηδεὶς γινωσκέτω. Οἱ δὲ ἐξελ-
 θόντες διεφήμισαν αὐτὸν ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ γῆ ἐκείνῃ.

32 Αὐτῶν δὲ ἐξερχομένων, ἰδοὺ, προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ ἄνθρωπον κωφόν,
 33 δαιμονιζόμενον. Καὶ ἐκβληθέντος τοῦ δαιμονίου, ἐλάλησεν ὁ κωφός·
 καὶ ἐθαύμασαν οἱ ὄχλοι λέγοντες· [ὅτι] Οὐδέποτε ἐφάνη οὕτως ἐν τῷ
 34 Ἰσραὴλ! Οἱ δὲ Φαρισαῖοι ἔλεγον· Ἐν τῷ ἄρχοντι τῶν δαιμονίων
 ἐκβάλλει τὰ δαιμόνια.

35 ^a Καὶ περιήγεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὰς πόλεις πάσας καὶ τὰς κώμας, διδά- ^a Mark 6. 6.
 σκων ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν, καὶ κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασι- ^b Luke 13. 22.
 λείας, καὶ θεραπεύων πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν [ἐν τῷ λαῷ]. ^c Num. 27. 17.
 36 ^b Ἰδὼν δὲ τοὺς ὄχλους, ἐσπλαγχνίσθη περὶ αὐτῶν, ὅτι ἦσαν ἐσκυλμένοι ^d Zach. 10. 2.

27. *v. l. Δαυὶδ.*] As that was one of the titles then ascribed by the Jews to the Messiah, the use of it was an unequivocal acknowledgment of Jesus's Messiahship. And that use must have been founded on their reliance on the testimony of others who had seen his miracles.

30. *ἀνεψύχθησαν αὐτῶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοί*] "they were restored to sight," or, "received the faculty of sight." This is thought to be a Hebraism; but it is rather a popular form of expression. Thus it is found also in the *Classical* writers. — *ἐνεβουλήσατο*] "strictly enjoined them." The expression, notwithstanding its etymology, only imports earnestness, not passion.

31. *διεφήμισαν αὐτόν.*] The verb is rarely used except of things; when used of persons, it signifies "to make any one known or celebrated."

32. *κωφόν, δαιμονιζόμενον.*] So I point, with Vater and Fritz. For, as Fritz observes, the latter word is explanatory of the former; q. d. "who was such, by demoniacal influence." And this Rosenin. and Kün. admit is the sense intended by St. Matthew and St. Luke. Yet, with a strange perversity, they choose to ascribe the dumbness to disorder. Only, they say, "the Evangelists thought proper to retain the common expression." But this would be inconsistent with the character of honest men, much less messengers from God. See note supra iv. 24. and at variance with the firm belief of demoniacal possession, elsewhere so apparent in their writings. Besides, the truth and dignity of the miracle will not, as is alleged, remain the same. It would not be the same miracle; and the dignity would be far less. For though Dr. Mead expresses his surprise "that divines should contend so eagerly for demoniacal possession, as if something were wanting to demonstrate Christ's power, when exercised only over natural diseases;" yet what has been said supra iv. 24. (and in Bp. Warburton's 27th Sermon.) will abundantly prove that something would have been wanting to demonstrate if not the power, yet the assumed character of Jesus, had it been exercised only over natural diseases. Assured we may be, that,

in proportion as the soul exceeds in dignity the body, so must the suppression of evil from superhuman agents, exceed that of evil produced in the regular course of nature. Besides, the very terms employed shew, that the removal of the dumbness was occasioned by the expulsion of the dæmon. Not to say, that the amazement of the people necessarily supposes the cure of demoniacal possession, not that of disease; for the latter had been very frequently seen in Israel, and evinced by the Prophets; nay, even so far as to raise the dead. [*Comp.* Luke xi. 14.]

33. *οὐδέποτε ἐφάνη οὕτως.*] An elliptical form of expression, in which τούτο, or τοιοῦτό τι, and γενόμενον are usually said to be understood. Fritz., indeed, objects to the uncommonness of the ellipsis; but without reason, for this seems to have been a popular form of expression. Mill, Wets., Griesb., Matth., and Scholz, are agreed that ὅτι before οὐδέποτε which is found in very few MSS., must be cancelled.

34. *ἐν τῷ ἄρχ.*] per Heb. 2. This, however, is not a Hebraism. To the examples adduced by Schless. Lex. may be added another from Thucyd. iii. 42. *Ὅτε ὠφέλειται ἐν τῷ τοιῷδε.* [*Comp.* infr. xii. 24. Mark iii. 23. Luke xi. 15.]

35. *ἐν τῷ λαῷ.*] These words are not found in several MSS., the Edit. Princeps, almost all the ancient Versions, and some Greek Fathers They are therefore rejected by Mill, cancelled by Griesb., Fritz., and Scholz, and bracketed by Knapp. and Vater; though retained by Matthæi. They were probably derived from iv. 23.

36. *ἐσπλαγχνίσθη*] "was moved with compassion." The word occurs neither in the Sept. nor the Classical writers, and seems to have been formed by the New-Testament writers from σπλάγχνα, bowels; for there the Jews placed the seat of sympathy; by a metaphor taken from that yearning which is felt in pity, or the other kindly affections. The verb is construed sometimes with περί, with or without a Genit., others with ἐπὶ and an Accus.

— *ἐσκυλμένοι.*] It is almost impossible to imagine stronger authority, internal and external,

c Luke 10. 2.
John 4. 35.

MK. LU.
6. 9.

7

καὶ ἐρῳιμμένοι, ὡσεὶ πρόβατα μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα. ° Τότε λέγει τοῖς 37
μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ · Ὁ μὲν θειρισμὸς πολὺς, οἱ δὲ ἐργάται ὀλίγοι ·
δεήθητε οὖν τοῦ κυρίου τοῦ θειρισμοῦ, ὅπως ἐκβάλῃ ἐργάτας εἰς τὸν 38
θειρισμὸν αὐτοῦ.

X. Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς δώδεκα μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ, ἔδωκεν αὐ- 1
τοῖς ἐξουσίαν πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων, ὥστε ἐκβάλλειν αὐτὰ, καὶ θειρα-
πεύειν πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν. Τῶν δὲ δώδεκα ἀποστόλων 2
τὰ ὀνόματά ἐστι ταῦτα · πρῶτος Σίμων ὁ λεγόμενος Πέτρος, καὶ Ἄν-
δρέας ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ · Ἰάκωβος ὁ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου, καὶ Ἰωάννης
ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ · Φίλιππος, καὶ Βαρθολομαῖος · Θωμᾶς, καὶ Ματ- 3
θαῖος ὁ τελώνης · Ἰάκωβος ὁ τοῦ Ἀλφαίου, καὶ Λεββαῖος ὁ ἐπικλη-
θεὶς Θαδδαῖος · Σίμων ὁ Κανανίτης, καὶ Ἰούδας [ὁ] Ἰσκαριώτης, 4
ὁ καὶ παραδοὺς αὐτόν.

Τούτους τοὺς δώδεκα ἀπέστειλεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, παραγγέλλας αὐτοῖς, 5
λέγων · Εἰς ὁδὸν ἐθνῶν μὴ ἀπέλθητε, καὶ εἰς πόλιν Σαμαρειτῶν μὴ

than exists for this reading, which has been approved by almost every Commentator, and received by all the Editors from Wets. downwards. As to the common reading, *ἐκλελυμένοι*, it is plainly a gloss. The sense of *ἐσκυλμένοι* is *harassed, vexed, troubled*. It does not denote properly, (as is commonly said) *to tear the hair*, but to *claw*, as applied to dogs and other animals: so Æschyl. Pers. 583. *γναπτόμενοι σκύλλονται*. The words occurs also at Mark v. 35. and Luke viii. 44. 3 Macc. iii. 25. iv. 6.

— *ἐρῳιμμένοι*] i. e. not scattered, as some render, but *tossed aside*, abandoned, unprotected. See Wets. Similar pastoral images occur in I Kings xiii. 17. and Judith xi. 19.

37. *ὁ μὲν θειρισμὸς — ὀλίγοι.*] Probably a proverbial saying, including an agricultural comparison, like many others in Scripture. Indeed, *ἔργον* and its compounds are peculiarly applied to the labours of husbandry. Schoettg. observes, that in the Rabbinical writings teachers are figured as *reapers*, and their work of instruction as the *harvest*.

38. *ἐκβάλῃ*] “would speedily send forth.”

X. 1. *ἐξουσίαν πνευμάτων ἀ.*] Most Commentators here supply *κατὰ*, which, however, though found in several MSS., is only an ancient gloss. The *πνευμ.* is rightly regarded by Kuin. as a *Genit. of object*; as in Eccus. x. 4. *ἐξουσία τῆς γῆς*. John xvii. 2. Rom. ix. 21, and several passages of the Classical writers cited by Raphel and Palairot. [*Comp.* Mark iii. 14.]

2. *ἀποστόλων.*] This important term properly denotes *ἄπεσταλμένοις*, one sent by another, on some important business, as in Herodo. i. 21, where it signifies a *herald*, and I Kings xiv. 6. But (in imitation of the name given to an officer sent by the High-priest and Sanhedrim to the distant and foreign Jews, to collect the tribute levied for the support of the Temple) it is, in the N. T., almost always used to denote “*persons employed to convey the message of salvation from God to man*,” and especially the *twelve Apostles*; who were peculiarly so called, as being at first especially sent out by Christ, and commissioned to preach the Gospel in Judæa; and who afterwards, with Paul and Barnabas, (who were super-

naturally selected for the work) received full and extraordinary authority, not only to promulgate his religion throughout the world, but to found and regulate the Christian Church; and especially to ordain teachers and pastors, who should hereafter govern it by *ordinary* authority.

— *πρῶτος — Πέτρος*] i. e. first in order, as being first called, not in *dignity*; for Christ seems not to have authorised any difference in rank. If he had done so, the Evangelists would have observed it; but they have *not*; for the names are recited by them in different order. Judas, however, is always named last, and Peter first; and John and his brother James third and fourth, or fourth and fifth. Certainly these three were especially esteemed by Christ, perhaps for their docility, attachment, and mental endowments. (Rosenm.) It is a most satisfactory, and, in opposition to the pretensions of the Bishops of Rome, a sufficient explanation of *πρῶτος*, that Peter was *first called* to the ministry. So Theophyl. *Προτίθησι δὲ Πέτρον καὶ Ἀνδρέαν διότι καὶ πρωτόκλητοι*.

4. ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης.] The *ὁ* was brought into the text by the Elzevir Editor, and has been retained by Wets. and all the recent Editors except Matthæi, who cancelled it. Bishop Middleton is of opinion, that the presence or the absence of the Art. depends upon whether *Ἰσκαριώτης* be a *surname*, or an *epithet* significant of *place of birth* or residence. If, as Chrys. and some others say, it is derived from *Carioth*, Judas's birth-place, the Art., he thinks, is required; and if it be a mere surname, it should not have it. Yet as, on other occasions, the Art. is often omitted where in propriety it ought to be inserted, because it is *implied*; (as when a cognomen passes into a simple name) so it may be *here*; and therefore that will determine nothing as to the *reading*. But, since *external* evidence is decidedly in *favour* of the Article, and *internal* equally balanced, it ought not to have been cancelled by Matth. and Valpv. Ὁ καὶ παραδοὺς α. Not, “who also betrayed,” (that would require *προδοῦς*) but “who even delivered him up” [to his enemies.] Vulg. tradidit. See Campb. and Fritz.

5. *εἰς ὁδὸν ἐθνῶν.*] for *εἰς ὁδὸν ἢ ἀγα εἰς τὰ ἐθνη*, the Genit. here being a *Genit. of motion*, as in Gen.

	MK.	LU.
6 εἰσέλθῃτε. Πορεύεσθε δὲ μᾶλλον πρὸς τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἀπολωλότα	6.	9.
7 οἴκου Ἰσραὴλ. Πορευόμενοι δὲ κηρύσσετε λέγοντες· Ὅτι ἤγγικεν		2
8 ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν. Ἀσθενούντας θεραπεύετε, λεπροὺς καθυρίζετε, [νεκροὺς ἐγείρετε,] δαιμόνια ἐκβάλλετε· δωρεὰν ἐλάβετε, δωρεὰν		
9 δότε. Μὴ κτήσησθε χρυσόν, μηδὲ ἄργυρον, μηδὲ χαλκόν, εἰς τὰς ζώνας	8 9	3
10 ὑμῶν· μὴ πήραν εἰς ὁδόν, μηδὲ δύο χιτῶνας, μηδὲ ὑποδήματα, μηδὲ		
11 ἄρβαν· ἄξιός γάρ ὁ ἐργάτης τῆς τροφῆς αὐτοῦ ἐστίν. Εἰς ἣν δ' ἂν πόλιν ἢ κώμην εἰσέλθῃτε, ἐξετάσατε τίς ἐν αὐτῇ ἄξιός ἐστι· κἀκεῖ	10	4
12 μείνατε, ἕως ἂν ἐξέλθῃτε. Λιπερχόμενοι δὲ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, ἀπάσαισθε		

iii. 24. the way of the tree of life, and Jer. ii. 13. ἡ δόδος Αὐγύπτου. (Kuin. and Fritz.) Εἰς πόλιν, sub. τινά; for it is *wrongly* taken by Kuin. of "the city of Samaria;" which would require the Art.

6. [Comp. infr. xv. 24. Acts xiii. 46.]

7. [Comp. Luke ix. 2. Supr. iii. 2. iv. 17.]

8. νεκροὺς ἐγείρετε.] Editors are much divided in opinion as to the authenticity of these words; which are rejected by the generality of Critics, but defended by Whitby, Griesb., and Fritz. The internal evidence *for* and *against* is nearly balanced; but the latter somewhat preponderates. (See Grot., Mill, Campb., and Matthæi.) The *external* is most decidedly against them. See Scholz, who has, with Matthæi cancelled the words. If they be retained, we may suppose that, like some few other passages in this discourse respecting events which did not immediately take place, they have reference to the period comprehended under the more extensive commission the Apostles received after Christ's resurrection. See John xx. 21. I have not followed the change of position adopted by Griesb. from some MSS. and Versions, because that would remove one principal cause which may be assigned for the *omission* of the words, namely, the *homœoteleuton*. The *change of position* might well arise from *omission*, afterwards supplied in the margin.

— δωρεὰν — δότε.] This (which is a sort of proverbial saying) must, as appears from Luke x 7, be confined to what went just before; namely, the dispensing of miraculous gifts; and therefore cannot be drawn into an argument against the maintenance of Christian ministers. All that is meant is, that they were not to make a *trade* of their miraculous gifts, as the Jewish exorcists did of their pretended power to cast out devils.

9. μὴ κτήσησθε] "ye must not provide, or furnish yourselves with:" a signification common in the best Classical writers.

— εἰς τὰς ζώνας ὑμῶν.] The words (to which μὴ κτήσησθε χρυσόν, μηδὲ ἄργ. μηδὲ χαλκόν must be all referred) signify, "for your purses," i. e. for your travelling expenses. ζώνας signifies properly *girdles*. But the Oriental nations, (and even the Greeks and Romans) used the belt, with which their flowing garments were confined, as purses — a custom still subsisting in the East, and in Greece. [Comp. Luke xxii. 35.]

10. πήραν.] A sort of wallet, generally of leather, used by shepherds and travellers, for the reception of provisions, mentioned both in the O. T. and in Homer. Yet as εἰς ὁδόν "for the use of the journey," is here associated with it, it may mean, by a common figure, the *provisions themselves*.

— δύο χιτῶνας.] This, (as Fritz. rightly remarks) does not forbid the *wearing* of two coats, (for the ancients generally wore two on a journey) but a *change* of coats.

— ὑποδήματα.] A sort of strong shoes, for *long* journeys. On other occasions *sandals* were worn. These ὑποδήματα they were not to provide, but (as Mark more clearly expresses it) to use sandals only. Ῥάβδους is found in most of the MSS., the Copt., Arm., and later Syriac Versions, Theophyl., Ed. Princ., Steph. Ed. 1 & 2, and is adopted by Grotius, Beza, Whitby, Wets., and Scholz. But it is quite at variance with Mark vi. 8; for, as to its meaning "a change of staves," that is an attempt to remove the discrepancy (as Fritz. says) "a risu quam refutratrone dignior." Besides, we can far better account for the change of Ῥάβδον into Ῥάβδους, than the contrary. The scribes stumbling at a *singular* noun, after several *plural* ones, changed the singular into a plural; which they might more easily do, since the abbreviations for *ον* and *ους* are not very dissimilar. And vain will it be to urge, that in Luke ix. 3. we have Ῥάβδους; for there Ῥάβδον, on very strong evidence, both external and internal, is adopted by all the best Editors. Thus it appears, that the *external* evidence for Ῥάβδον (including several ancient MSS. and the best Versions, as the Pesh. Syr.) is nearly equal to that for Ῥάβδους. And the *internal* evidence is almost wholly on its side. Under these circumstances, I have thought proper (with Mill, Griesb., Matth., Titm., Vater, and Fritz.) to retain Ῥάβδον. The sense will thus be quite reconcilable with Mark vi. 8; the injunction that they should not *provide* themselves with a staff, almost implying that they might *take* one, if they *had* it.

— ἄξιός γάρ &c.] A proverbial expression occurring also in Levit. xix. 13. Deut. xxiv. 14. 15. q. d. "You may cheerfully trust the providence of God to take care of you while engaged in such a cause; and you may reasonably expect to find sustenance among those for whose benefit you labor." The expression τροφή means both food and raiment. "They are forbidden to encumber themselves with any articles of raiment besides what they were wearing, or with money to purchase more, because they would be entitled to a supply from those on whom their labours were bestowed, and money would be but an encumbrance."

11. ἄξιός] scil. παρ' ᾧ μέναιτ' ἂν, "of your company." Some other ellipses which have been supposed are too arbitrary. Nay, the *absolute* use, which is found both in the Scriptural and Classical writers, and supported by the ancient interpreters, may possibly be preferable.

MK. LU.

6. 9. αὐτήν. Καὶ ἐὰν μὲν ἦ ἡ οἰκία ἀξία, ἐλθέτω ἡ εἰρήνη ὑμῶν ἐπ' αὐ-
 11 5 τήν· ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἦ ἀξία, ἡ εἰρήνη ὑμῶν πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐπιστραφήτω. Καὶ 14
 ὅς ἐὰν μὴ δέξηται ὑμᾶς, μηδὲ ἀκούσῃ τοὺς λόγους ὑμῶν, ἐξερχόμενοι
 τῆς οἰκίας ἢ τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης, ἐκτινάξαιτε τὸν κονιορτὸν τῶν ποδῶν
 a Inf. 11. 24. ὑμῶν. ^a Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ἀνεκτότερον ἔσται γῆ Σοδόμων καὶ Γομορρῶν 15
 ἐν ἡμέραις κρίσεως, ἢ τῇ πόλει ἐκείνῃ.
 b Luke 10. 3. ^b Ἰδοὺ, ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω ὑμᾶς ὡς πρόβατα ἐν μέσῳ λύκων· γίνεσθε 16
 Rom. 16. 19. οὗν φρόνιμοι ὡς οἱ ὄφεις, καὶ ἀκέραιοι ὡς αἱ περιστέραί. Προσέχετε 17
 δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων· παραδώσουσι γὰρ ὑμᾶς εἰς συνέδρια, καὶ ἐν
 ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν μαστιγώσουσιν ὑμᾶς. ^c καὶ ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνας δὲ 18
 καὶ βασιλεῖς ἀχθήσεσθε, ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ, εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς καὶ τοῖς
 ἔθνεσιν. ^d Ὅταν δὲ παραδιῶσιν ὑμᾶς, μὴ μεριμνήσητε πῶς ἢ τί λα- 19
 λήσητε· δοθήσεται γὰρ ὑμῖν ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ, τί λαλήσητε· οὐ γὰρ 20
 ὑμεῖς ἐστε οἱ λαλοῦντες, ἀλλὰ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τὸ λαλοῦν
 e Micah 7. 5, 6. ἐν ὑμῖν. ^e Παραδώσει δὲ ἀδελφὸς ἀδελφὸν εἰς θάνατον, καὶ πατήρ 21
 Luke 21. 16. τέκνον· καὶ ἐπαναστήσονται τέκνα ἐπὶ γονεῖς, καὶ θανατώσουσιν αὐ-
 f Mark 13. 13. τούς. ^f Καὶ ἔσεσθε μισούμενοι ὑπὸ πάντων διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου· ὁ δὲ 22
 Luke 21. 17. ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος, οὕτως σωθήσεται. ^g Ὅταν δὲ διώκωσιν ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ 23
 Luke 21. 13. inf. 24. 13.

13. ἐλθέτω.] This, and ἐπιστραφήτω just after, are commonly regarded as examples of Imperat. for Future. But it is better, with Fritz., to take the sense to be "*volo pacem vestram*," &c. Εἰρήνη means the benefit of your peace, &c. or blessing. Πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐπιστραφήτω. This is used in a popular sense, to signify, "become void and ineffectual." So Isaiah lv. 11. οὕτως ἔσται τὸ βῆμα μου, ὃ ἐὰν ἐξέλθῃ ἐκ τοῦ σῆματός μου, οὐ μὴ ἀποσραφῆ, ἕως ἂν τελεσθῇ ὅσα ἂν ἠθέλησα. See also Ps. xxxiv. 6. and vii. 16.

14. καὶ ὅς ἐάν.] This is *not* (as is commonly said) for ἐάν δέ τις; but ἐάν is for ἄν. The construction is *popular*, and involves an *antipodoton* of frequent occurrence; moreover, ἐκείνης is for ἐκείνου, per synesis. The Genit. ποδῶν is governed by the ἐκ in ἐκτινάξαιτε. Shaking off the dust from the feet at persons was a symbolical action, disclaiming all intercourse with them. — [Comp. Acts. xiii. 51. xviii. 6.]

15. ἐν ἡμέραις κρίσεως.] "in the day of judgment." Some Commentators understand this of the *destruction of the Jewish nation*. But that is rather, as Whitby observes, styled the day of *vengeance*; and is otherwise, (as the same Commentator has proved) inapplicable here. The expression, then, must, notwithstanding the omission of the Article (on which see Bp. Middl.), be understood of the day of *final judgment*.

16. γίνεσθε — περιστέραί.] We have here two beautiful and appropriate similes (common in the Classical writers), which hint at the dangers to which they would be exposed, and the best means of avoiding them. Similar sentiments are adduced from the Rabbinical writers.

18. εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς] namely, of the truth of the Gospel, by your endurance of persecution in behalf of it.

19. μὴ μεριμνήσητε] i. e. be not anxiously solicitous. Πῶς ἢ τί λαλήσητε, "how or what you may speak."

20. οὐ γὰρ.] The Commentators regard this as a comparative negation, like *non tam — quam*;

of which there are many examples in the Scriptural and Classical writers. But Winer, in his Gr. N. T. p. 139., seems right in denying this qualified sense to have place in οὐ followed by ἀλλά; and after discussing several passages where the formula is found (as Acts. v. 4. and I Thess. iv. 8. I Cor. i. 17. and the present passage), he shows that the sentiment is enfeebled when the οὐ is translated *non tam*. Here, he observes, the reference is not to the physical act of speaking, but to the sentiment uttered; which was to be really imparted to the Apostles by the Holy Spirit. Newcome very well supplies "in effect and ultimately." Ἐστε is Pres. for Fut.: or it may stand for *are to be*, populariter. — The sense is: "for you are not to be the speakers, but the Spirit of your Father [is to be] that which speaketh [or, the speaker] in you."

21. ἐπαναστήσονται.] Kuin., Rosenm., and others, take this as a forensic *terrus*, to signify they shall rise up as witnesses. And they appeal to Matt. xii. 41. But there ἐν τῇ κρίσει is added. — There seems no reason to abandon the usual interpretation, as referred to *hostility, attack, and persecution*, which is well supported by Wets., Kypke, and Fritz. Here may be compared a very similar passage of Thucyd. iii. 83. καὶ γὰρ πατήρ παῖδα ἀπέκτεινε, "used to put to death." ²² πάντων.] This is commonly taken for *many*; but better by Euthym., for *most, quasi omnibus*.

— εἰς τέλος.] This does not denote the destruction of Jerusalem; nor σωθήσεται just after, a temporary preservation, as Hamm., Wets., and Rosenm. explain; but τέλος is by the ancient and most modern Commentators rightly interpreted, "the end [of their troubles] whether by death or deliverance;" and σωθήσεται, "salvation in heaven."

23. τῇ — τήν.] Bp. Middleton. observes that the Art. is not without meaning; serving to mark the opposition between οὗτος and ἄλλος, "two cities only being supposed."

πόλει ταύτη, φεύγετε εἰς τὴν ἄλλην. Ἀμὴν γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν· οὐ μὴ
 τελέσητε τὰς πόλεις τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ, ἕως ἂν ἔλθῃ ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.
 24^g Οὐκ ἔστι μαθητὴς ὑπὲρ τὸν διδάσκαλον, οὐδὲ δούλος ὑπὲρ τὸν κύ-
 25 ριον αὐτοῦ. ^h Ἀρκέτιον τῷ μαθητῇ, να γένηται ὡς ὁ διδάσκαλος αὐ-
 τοῦ, καὶ ὁ δούλος ὡς ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ. εἰ τὸν οἰκοδεσπότην † Βεελζε-
 26 βούλ † ἐκάλεσαν, πόσω μᾶλλον τοὺς οἰκιακούς αὐτοῦ; ⁱ Μὴ οὖν φο-
 βηθῆτε αὐτούς· οὐδὲν γὰρ ἔστι κεκαλυμμένον, ὃ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται·
 27 καὶ κρυπτόν, ὃ οὐ γνωσθήσεται. Ὁ λέγω ὑμῖν ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ, εἶπατε
 ἐν τῷ φωτί· καὶ ὁ εἰς τὸ σῶς ἀκούετε, κηρύττετε ἐπὶ τῶν δωματίων.
 28 Καὶ μὴ † φοβηθῆτε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποκτεινόντων τὸ σῶμα, τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν
 μὴ δυναμένων ἀποκτεῖναι· φοβήθητε δὲ μᾶλλον τὸν δυνάμενον καὶ
 29 ψυχὴν καὶ σῶμα ἀπολέσαι ἐν γέννη. Οὐχὶ δύο στρουθία ἄσσαρίου
 30 πωλεῖται; καὶ ἐν ἓξ αὐτῶν οὐ πωλεῖται ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἄνευ τοῦ πατρὸς
 31 ὑμῶν. ^k Ἐμῶν δὲ καὶ αἱ τρίχες τῆς κεφαλῆς πᾶσαι ἡριθμημέναι εἰσὶ.

— τελέσητε τὰς πόλεις] for τελ. (τὴν δόδον διὰ) τὰς πόλεις. The ellipsis is frequent in the Classical writers, as Thucyd. iv. 78. ἐς φάραλλον ἐτέλεισε, where see my note.

— ἕως — ἀνθρώπου,] until, or unto, up to the time when, &c. The words are by the best Commentators referred to the destruction of Jerusalem.

24. οὐκ ἔστι — διδάσκαλον] “no disciple is above his master.” Mid. A proverbial saying, which imports, that he cannot expect better treatment than his master.

25. Βεελζεβούλ.] Several Editors and Critics would read Βεελζεβούβ, which Jerome adopted into the Vulg., under the idea that it is the same with the Ekronite idol called at 2 Kings i. 2.

בְּבַיִל הַיָּב, the Lord of flies; and that the change of β into λ was made agreeably to the genius of the Greek language, which admits no word to end in β. But besides that for Βεελζεβούβ, there is scarcely the authority of one MS. (as Grot., Lightf., Wets., and others remark), the title was one of honour; like the Ζεὺς Ἀπορτίος, banisher of flies, given to Hercules. Whereas the name here evidently is one of contempt. Hence the best Commentators, with reason, suppose that the name is indeed the same with that of the above-mentioned; but, (according to a custom among the Jews, of altering the names of idols, to throw contempt on them (changed to Βεελζεβούλ, i. e. Lord of dung, i. e. metaphorically, idolatry, or, according to others, the “Lord of Idols.” Hence it was afterwards given by the Jews to the Prince of dæmons.

— ἐκάλεσαν.] Wets., Griesb., Kuin., Vater, Fritz., and Scholz edit. ἐπεκάλεσαν; which indeed has very strong authority from MSS., Editions, and Fathers. Yet as the MSS. fluctuate between this and three other readings, we may suspect alteration; and then the simplest reading is to be preferred. Thus, in the present case, ἐκάλεσαν might give birth to all the rest. I have, therefore, (with Matthæi) retained the common reading.

26. μὴ οὖν φοβηθῆτε κ. τ. λ.] The sense here is disputed; but it seems to be: “Fear not your persecutors and calumniators, nor be alarmed for the success of the Gospel; for your innocence shall be made as clear as the light, and your doctrine shall enlighten the whole world.” The

words following contain a proverb usual among the Heathens, importing that the truth cannot be extinguished; as in the well-known “Magna est veritas, et prævalebit.”

27. ὃ λέγω — δωματίων.] Of the phrases λέγειν ἐν φωτί and ἀκούειν τι (λεγόμενον) εἰς οὐς, as also of δῶμα in the sense, house-top, see the Classical examples in Wets. and Recens. Synop. They are all metaphorical, and the last adagial.

28. φοβηθῆτε.] Wets., Griesb., Matth., Vat., and Scholz, edit. φοβείσθε, from very many MSS., the Edit. Princ., and some Fathers. But, though external evidence be, perhaps, in favour of φοβείσθε, yet internal is, I apprehend, against it, since it occurs before and after in the context, and φοβηθῆτε was more likely to be changed into φοβείσθε than the contrary, to retain the common reading, which, indeed, is found without var. lect. in the parallel passage at Lu. xii. 4.

— ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποκτεινόντων.] Though there be considerable authority for ἀποκτεινόντων, which is preferred by nearly all the great Editors; yet there seems no sufficient reason for change; since the common reading is more suitable in sense, is found in at least as many MSS., and is confirmed by the parallel passage at Luke xii. 4. See also Matth. xxiii. 37. The construction at φοβ. with ἀπὸ is called a Hebraism. But it may be paralleled with our “feeling apprehension of,” or from.

29. ἐν ἓξ αὐτῶν οὐ] for οὐδὲν, say the Commentators and Winer in his Gr. Gr. § 20. 1. But perhaps there is more emphasis in the present position; the sense being nearly the same as in οὐδὲ ἓν, not even one. In fact, in all the examples adduced by Winer (as Eph. v. 5. and iv. 29. 2 Pet. i. 20.) there is an intensity of sense.

— πωλεῖται ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν.] An idiom common in the Scriptural, and not unexampled in the Classical writers, for ἀπολείται.

— ἄνευ τοῦ πατρὸς ὁ.] “without the counsel and providence of;” as Thucyd. ii. 70. ὅτι ἄνευ αὐτῶν (scil. τῆς γνώμης) ζυγέβησαν. With respect to the sentiment, which inculcates the superintending care of Providence even over the meanest works of the creation, the Commentators adduce many parallels from the Classical, and the Rabbinical writers.

30. καὶ αἱ τρίχες — εἰσὶ.] Another proverbial saying (similar to many in the O. T. and the

^g Luke 6. 40.
John 13. 16.
& 15. 20.
^h Infr. 12. 24.
Mark 3. 22.
Luke 11. 15.
ⁱ Mark 3. 22.
Luke 8. 17.
& 12. 2.
^k Luke 21. 18.
Acts 27. 34.
2 Sam. 14. 11.

- 1 Mark 8. 38. Μὴ οὖν φοβηθῆτε· πολλῶν στρουθίων διαφέρετε ὑμεῖς. ¹ Πᾶς οὖν ὅστις 32
 Luke 9. 26. & 12. 8. ὁμολογήσει ἐν ἐμοὶ ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὁμολογήσω καὶ ἐν
 2 Tim. 2. 12. αὐτῷ ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ πατρὸς μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς. Ὅστις δ' ἂν ἀρνή- 33
 Rev. 3. 5. σῆται με ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἀρνήσομαι αὐτὸν καὶ ἔμπρο-
 m Luke 12. 49, 51. σθεν τοῦ πατρὸς μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς. ^m Μὴ νομίσητε, ὅτι ἦλθον 34
 βαλεῖν εἰρήνην ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν· οὐκ ἦλθον βαλεῖν εἰρήνην, ἀλλὰ μάχισαν.
 n Micah 7. 6. Ἦλθον γὰρ διχάσαι ἄνθρωπον κατὰ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ θυγατέρα κα- 35
 τὰ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτῆς, καὶ νύμφην κατὰ τῆς πενθερᾶς αὐτῆς. ⁿ Καὶ ἐχθροὶ 36
 o Luke 14. 26. τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οἱ οἰκιοκοὶ αὐτοῦ. ^o Ὁ φιλῶν πατέρα ἢ μητέρα ὑπὲρ ἐμέ 37
 οὐκ ἔστι μου ἄξιος· καὶ ὁ φιλῶν υἱὸν ἢ θυγατέρα ὑπὲρ ἐμέ οὐκ ἔστι μου
 p Infr. 16. 24. ἄξιος. ^p Καὶ ὅς οὐ λαμβάνει τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκολουθεῖ ὀπίσω 38
 Luke 9. 23. & 12. 8. ἄξιος. ^p Καὶ ὅς οὐ λαμβάνει τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκολουθεῖ ὀπίσω 38
 q Infr. 16. 25. Mark 8. 35. μου, οὐκ ἔστι μου ἄξιος. ^q Ὁ εὐρὼν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἀπολέσει αὐτήν· καὶ 39
 Luke 9. 24. & 17. 33. ὁ ἀπολέσας τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ, ἐνεκεν ἐμοῦ, εἰρήσει αὐτήν. ^r Ὁ δεχόμενος 40
 John 12. 25. r Infr. 18. 5. ἡμᾶς ἐμὲ δέχεται· καὶ ὁ ἐμὲ δεχόμενος δέχεται τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με. 41
 Luke 10. 16. John 13. 20. Ὁ δεχόμενος προφήτην εἰς ὄνομα προφήτου μισθὸν προφήτου λήψεται·
 καὶ ὁ δεχόμενος δίκαιον εἰς ὄνομα δικαίου μισθὸν δικαίου λήψεται. 42
 s Mark 9. 41. ^s Καὶ ὅς ἐν ποίτῳ ἓνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων ποιήριον ψυχροῦ μόνον, εἰς
 ὄνομα μαθητοῦ, αἰὲν λέγω ὑμῖν· οὐ μὴ ἀπολέσῃ τὸν μισθὸν αὐτοῦ.

Rabbinical writers) importing that the very smallest of our concerns are under the care of God.

32. ὁμολογήσει ἐν ἐμοί.] A Hebrew and Hellenistic construction for ὁμολ. ἐμέ, as at Lu. xii. 8. Rom. x. 9. The sense of the word is literally, "to make profession in conformity to any one." In the other member of the sentence it stands for *agnoscere*, to recognise, approve.

33. ἀρνήσῃται με.] A popular expression denoting to reject a profession by my name. In the clause following it signifies to cast off.

34. μὴ νομίσητε — μάχισαν.] This is (as Wets. and Campbell remark) "a forcible and indeed Oriental mode of expressing the certainty of a foreseen consequence of any measure, by representing it as the purpose for which the measure was adopted." See also Whitby. Dr. Parr, in a Sermon on this text, ably traces the true meaning of this passage; and rescues the words from the misconceptions of ignorance, and the misrepresentations of infidelity, by showing that they were intended only to predict, not to justify, the evils of which Christianity has been eventually productive. By μάχισαν is here meant both war (namely, the Jewish war which soon followed), and civil commotion; which is supported by what follows, and by the parallel passage in Lu. xii. 51.

35. διχάσαι — κατὰ.] Διχάζειν signifies properly to divide into two parts; but here it denotes to separate and set at variance; in which there is a mixture of two constructions. This and the verse following are formed on Micah vii. 6.

36. τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.] Bp. Middlet. considers this equivalent to παντὸς ἀνθρώπου, every man, or, men generally. This is confirmed by the words of Micah; where for ἐχθροὶ πάντες ἀνθρώπου, Bp. Middlet. rightly conjectures παντὸς, which, indeed, is required by the Hebrew. Ἐπὶ ἐμὲ is a Hebraism, as in Gen. xlviii. 2. Judg. ii. 19.

38. λαμβάνει τὸν σταυρὸν.] There is here an allusion to the Roman custom, of compelling a

malefactor going to crucifixion to bear his cross. As crucifixion was not a Jewish punishment, in this mention of it our Lord may seem to have alluded to his own crucifixion; and consequently the passage is, in a certain sense, prophetic.

— ἀκολουθεῖ ὀπίσω μου.] This is not a Hebraism, but is found in Classical writers. See Wets. It is a construction which at first involved an addition of sense, but at length became a pleonasm. See Winer's Gr. Gr. p. 175. and Robinson's note there.

39. ὁ εὐρὼν — ἀπολέσει αὐτήν.] This is supposed to be an acute dictum, or Oxymoron, including a Paronomasia between the two senses of ψυχῆ, namely, life and soul. There is also a *dilogia* in the words ἀπολέσει and εἰρήσει. Life is an Hebrew image of felicity, and in this sense the word ought to be taken in the words ἀπολέσει αὐτήν and εἰρήσει αὐτήν following.

40. ὁ δεχόμενος ἡμᾶς, ἐμὲ δέχεται] "and consequently he that receiveth not you, receiveth not me." The treatment shown to an ambassador is in fact shown to his sovereign.

41. εἰς ὄνομα προφήτου] for ὡς προφ., "for being such." By προφ. seems to be meant a teacher of the Gospel; and by δίκαιον, a pious professor of it.

42. μικρῶν.] Not, "men of mean station;" or "very young persons," as some explain: but, as the antient and the best modern Interpreters take the expression, *disciples*, as opposed to *teachers*; either because μαθητῶν may be understood at μικρῶν, from the context, or be taken substantively, as answering to (what it seems was in the original Hebrew) עֲלֵמִים, and being, as we find from the

Rabbinical writings) the name given to disciples. Ποτίζειν ποτήριον is for ποτίζειν. At ψυχροῦ sub. ὑδατος, an ellipsis, (also found after θερμῶν) which, like *frigida* and *gelida* in Latin, is not unfrequent in the Classical writers. It is supplied in Mark ix. 41. To give a cup of cold water was proverbial for giving the smallest thing.

- 1 XI. Καὶ ἐγένετο, ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς διατάσσωσιν τοῖς δώδεκα μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, μετέβη ἐκεῖθεν, τοῦ διδάσκειν καὶ κηρῦσσειν ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν αὐτῶν.
- 2 Ὁ ΔΕ Ἰωάννης ἀκούσας ἐν τῷ δεσμοτηρίῳ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, 18
- 3 πέμψας δύο τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, ἢ 19
- 4 ἕτερον προσδοκῶμεν; Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Πορευ- 22
- 5 θέντες ἀπαγγέilate Ἰωάννῃ, ἃ ἀκούετε καὶ βλέπετε. τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέ-
πουσι, καὶ χωλοὶ περιπατοῦσι· λεπροὶ καθαρίζονται, καὶ κωφοὶ ἀκού-
ουσι· νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται, καὶ πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται. καὶ μακάριός ἐστιν 23
- 7 ὃς ἐὰν μὴ σκανδαλισθῇ ἐν ἐμοί. Τούτων δὲ πορευομένων, ἤρξατο 24
- ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγειν τοῖς ὄχλοις περὶ Ἰωάννου· Τί ἐξήλθετε εἰς τὴν ἔρημον
8 θεάσασθαι; κάλαμον ὑπὸ ἀνέμου σαλευόμενον; Ἀλλὰ τί ἐξήλθετε 25

LU.
7.

XI. 1. διατάσσω] "giving directions," or injunctions.

—αὐτῶν.] It is not clear to whom this refers. Chrys. and Euthym. understand the *disciples*; other antients, the *Jews*; most modern Commentators, the *Galilæans*; according to the Hebrew idiom of using a pronoun where its antecedent is not expressed, but must be understood from the context. See Winer's Gr. Gr. § 15. 3.

3. σὺ εἶ—προδοκῶμεν.] "Art thou he who should come, or must we look for another?" Few questions have been more debated than the purpose of John's sending this message to Jesus. Some antients and many moderns think that he sent in order to satisfy certain doubts which had occurred to his mind during his confinement. But surely his view of the descent of the Holy Ghost at Christ's baptism, the testimony he then heard from heaven, the divine impulse by which he recognised Jesus as "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world," and his own reiterated testimonies forbid such a supposition: and to imagine that John's *confinement* should have affected the strength of his resolves, or drawn from him the language of fretful remonstrance, or peevish complaint, would do great injustice to so noble a character. In short, the opinion has been shown to be utterly untenable by Chrys., Euthym., Theophyl., and Greg., of the antients; and of the moderns, Hamm., Whitby, Doddr., Bp. Atterbury, and Mr. Benson (Hulsean Lectures, 1820. pp. 60—67.); who maintain, that John sent for the satisfaction of *his disciples*, who, mortified at seeing their master imprisoned for preaching the coming of the Messiah; and disappointed that He whom he testified to be such, should make no such claim; nor make any attempt to deliver his Forerunner: stumbling, too, at the humbleness of Jesus's birth, and the lowliness of his station; and offended at his difference in character from their own ascetic master, had entertained doubts as to his Messiahship. Against *them*, therefore, and not against *John*, the rebuke is levelled. It should seem that for *their* satisfaction John had sent; and as they would not heed his repeated endeavours to remove their doubts, he resolved to refer them to *Christ himself*, for the removal of their scruples: and that our Lord, well aware of his intention, took the surest means of fixing the wavering minds of his disciples, by displaying such supernatural endowments as should completely answer to the pre-

dicted character of the Messiah; and then sent them to their master for the *application*.

With respect to the *reply itself*, both the *man-ner* and the *matter* of it are highly deserving of attention. As to the former, it is, as Bp. Atterbury observes, not direct and positive, but so ordered only, as to give them an occasion of answering the question themselves, which they had proposed to Christ. As to the latter, the learned Prelate, with his usual taste, ably points out the *gradation* to be observed in the particulars, and the appositeness of it in relation to the inquiries. So that the words, "Go show John," &c. may mean, "You come to learn of me whether I am the Messiah. Your master has often told you I am He, but you will not believe *him*. To him you should have gone as my forerunner: to *me* it belongs not so properly to proclaim my own titles, which might excite your suspicion. Behold therefore the testimony of *God!* for the works which I am doing before your eyes bear witness that the Father hath sent me." The description of the works in question is so framed as to be taken from a prophecy of Isaiah lxi. 1. and xxxv. 5, 6. of the Messiah. Thus it is as if our Lord had said, "Ye believe not the *Baptist's* testimony, that I am He who should come. Yet surely Isaiah, whom ye so reverence, and upon whose authority ye have received the Baptist himself, will obtain credence with you; and he has thus prophesied of me."

5. πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται.] A peculiar feature of Christianity, as distinguished from Judaism and Heathenism, whose priests and philosophers courted the rich, and contemned the poor. See John vii. 49.

6. σκανδαλισθῆν ἐν ἐμοί] "stumble in faith, disbelieve and fall from faith in my Messiahship." Σκάνδαλον signifies a *stumbling block*, and, in a spiritual sense, what obstructs us in our Christian course, and causes us to fall away from the faith.

7. κάλαμον ὑπὸ ἀνέμου σαλευόμενον.] The Commentators are not agreed whether the words should be taken in the *natural* sense, meaning, that it was not the sight of any *trifling* thing, such as reeds (with which the wilderness abounded), tossed about by the wind, but, &c., or the *metaphorical*, as figuratively descriptive of levity and inconstancy—a wavering man. The former view is adopted by Grot., Beza, Campb., Wets., Rosenm., Schleus., and Fritz.; the latter by the antients generally, and, of the moderns, by Whitby,

LU.

7. ἰδεῖν; ἄνθρωπον ἐν μαλακοῖς ἱματίοις ἡμφιεσμένον; ἰδοῦ, οἱ τὰ μαλα-
 26 κα φοροῦντες ἐν τοῖς οἴκοις τῶν βασιλέων εἰσίν. Ἀλλὰ τί ἐξήλθετε 9
 27 ἰδεῖν; προφήτην; ναὶ, λέγω ὑμῖν, καὶ περισσότερον προφήτου. Οὗτος 10
 γὰρ ἐστὶ περὶ οὗ γέγραπται· Ἴδοῦ, ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγ-
 γελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου, ὃς κατασκευάσει τὴν
 28 ὁδόν σου ἔμπροσθέν σου. Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν· οὐκ ἐγήγερται 11
 ἐν γεννητοῖς γυναικῶν μείζων Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ· ὁ δὲ μικρότερος
 ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν μείζων αὐτοῦ ἐστίν. Ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν ἡμε- 12
 ρῶν Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ ἕως ἄρτι, ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν βιάζε-
 ται, καὶ βιασταὶ ἀρπάζουσιν αὐτήν. Πάντες γὰρ οἱ προφητῆται καὶ 13
 ὁ νόμος ἕως Ἰωάννου προεφήτευσαν· καὶ, εἰ θέλετε δεῖξασθαι, αὐτός 14

Mackn., and Kuin. The latter, indeed, is more pointed and significant, but the former is more simple, and not less agreeable to the context.

8. ἀλλὰ τί] for ἢ τί, says Kuin. But Fritz. more rightly regards this use of ἀλλὰ after interrogations, as meant to deny anything as corresponding to the objective *at, q. d.* If ye deny that ye went with that view, for what purpose did ye go? Μαλακοῖς, denotes soft, and therefore fine; whether of silk, linen, or other materials.

— βασιλέων.] Very many MSS. have βασιλέων, which is edited by Math. and Scholz, but wrongly, for internal evidence is quite against it, inasmuch as it would produce an idle circumlocution, in the place of an expression whose simplicity and Oriental air attest its truth. The error arose from a mistake of the abbreviation for *ων* and *ειων*.

9. περισσότερον προφήτου.] The full sense is, ‘a prophet, and something more exalted than a prophet,’ namely, as bearing more important commissions. On the points of superiority, see Grot., Lightl., Whitby, and Mackn.

10. Quoted from Mal. iii. 1. The words, however, differ not only from the Heb. but the Sept., in one or both of which Drs. Owen and Randolph suppose a corruption, but without cause. Ἐπιβλέσεται is only a free version of בּוֹנֵן, which scarcely admits of a literal one. Indeed, some MSS. have ἑτοιμάσει, and no doubt others in the time of Christ, ἐπισκενᾶσει, which is a correct version of the Heb. *prō pros. mu* in both Sept. and the Evangelists, are a literal version of the Heb. *בּוֹנֵן*, instead of which the English V. has *me*. Thus the only real difference in the Evangelists, is the supplying (for better illustration of the sense) *one* which is implied in another *expressed*; and in changing, for better application to this present purpose, *mu* into *sou*.

11. οὐκ ἐγήγερται] Ἐγείρεσθαι, like the Hebrew *קָם* is especially applied to the birth of eminent persons. (Grot. and Kuin.) Μικρότερος, for μικρότατος. See Winer’s Gr. Gr. p. 87.

12. ἡ βασιλεία — βιασταί.] Few passages have been more variously interpreted than the present. Whatever may be obscure, one thing is plain — that the two clauses are closely connected with each other; so that whatever can be shown to be the sense of the former, will fix the sense of the latter. And as there is not a little difficulty, it is of the more importance to attend to the *general scope*; which (as in all this portion, v. 9—14.) is, to show the *high dignity* of the Baptist. But to advert to the interpretations in question; most

of them will be found either contrary to the *scope* or to the *connexion* just pointed out. Among these are those which are founded on the attributing an *active* sense to βιάζ. Leaving, therefore, to βιάζονται its natural force, (as a *passive*,) it will be best interpreted (with almost all the ancient and the best modern Commentators) as put for βιάσις κρατεῖται, “impetu quodam et cupidè excipitur Messie regnum.” But if this sense be admitted, it will fix that of οἱ βιασταί, which cannot, as Hamm., Wets., and Br. Middl., imagine, mean “those who had lived by rapine,” as the publicans, soldiers, and the meaner crowd. This is at variance with the connexion, and yields a forced and frigid sense; such indeed as Middl. would never have adopted, had he not been induced to do so, rather than admit that one of his canons on the Article is broken. From the context, βιασταί must denote “persons who engage in any thing impetuously and eagerly.” So in the parallel passage of Luke xvi. 16, (which has been too little attended to.) ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται ἕως Ἰωάννου ἀπὸ τότε ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ εὐαγγελίζονται, καὶ πᾶς εἰς αὐτὴν βιάζεται.

13. πάντες — προεφήτευσαν.] The γὰρ is causal, and has reference to v. 11., for v. 12. is, as it were, parenthetical, and the scope of it is, to point out the dignity of John; from the time of whose appearance the message of the Gospel was received with delight, and its truths were embraced with eagerness by those whose minds were earnestly bent on forcing their way through the strait gate. The sense (which is obscure from brevity) will be made clearer by regarding *προεφ.* as put *emphatically*. We may paraphrase: “For all the prophets, and other sacred writers of the law (i. e. revelation) of God, and its expounders up to the time of John, did but *foreshow* and treat of as *far off*, the dispensation, which should hereafter be promulgated: whereas John announced it as at hand.”

14. εἰ θέλετε δεῖξασθαι.] An impressive formula, like ὁ ἔρχων — ἀκούτω just afterwards, the one soliciting *patient attention*, the other *implicit faith*. This sense of δέχεσθαι, (hearken, believe,) both with the Accus., and used, as here, *absolutely*, is frequent in the Classical writers.

— αὐτός ἐστιν Ἠλίας.] i. e. this is the person meant by Malachi iv. 5. and designated under that name. What is said is not at variance with the *disavowal* of the Baptist himself, John i. 21.; since it is manifest that he was not Elias according to the sense in which Elias was expected by the Jews, i. e. the *same person*. He only bore the name, by figurative adoption, as being the anti-

LU.

15	ἔστιν Ἰλίας ὁ μέλλων ἔρχεσθαι. Ὁ ἔχων ὡτα ἀκούειν, ἀκούετω. Τίνι	7
16	δὲ ὁμοιώσω τὴν γενεὰν ταύτην; Ὁμοία ἐστὶ * παιδιόις ἐν ἀγοραῖς	31
		32
17	καθημένοις, καὶ προσφωνοῦσι τοῖς εἰαίροις αὐτῶν, καὶ λέγουσιν· Ἦν-	
	λήσαμεν ὑμῖν, καὶ οὐκ ὠρχήσασθε· ἐθρηνίσασμεν ὑμῖν, καὶ οὐκ ἐκό-	
18	ψασθε. Ἰαθε γὰρ Ἰωάννης μήτε ἐσθίων μήτε πίνων· καὶ λέγουσι·	33
19	Δαιμόνιον ἔχει. ἦλθεν ὁ Τίος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων· καὶ	34
	λέγουσιν· Ἰδοὺ, ἀνθρώπος γάγος καὶ οἰνοπότης, τελωνῶν φίλος καὶ	35
20	ἁμαρτωλῶν. Καὶ ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς. Τότε	
	ἤρξατο ὀνειδίξειν τὰς πόλεις, ἐν αἷς ἐγένοντο αἱ πλεῖσται δυνάμεις αὐ-	10.
21	τοῦ, ὅτι οὐ μετενόησαν. Οὐαὶ σοι, Χοραζὶν! οὐαὶ σοι, † Βηθσαϊδάν!	13
	ὅτι εἰ ἐν Τύρῳ καὶ Σιδῶνι ἐγένοντο αἱ δυνάμεις αἱ γενόμεναι ἐν ὑμῖν,	
22	πάσαι ἂν ἐν σάκκῳ καὶ σποδιῷ μετενόησαν. Πλὴν λέγω † ὑμῖν· Τύρῳ	14

type to Elias, who was the *type* of what the Baptist would be in after times. So in Sirach 49. 10. he is represented as *δ καταγραφεὶς ἐν ἐλεγμοῖς ἐς καιροῦς*, &c., where for *ελ.* (variously written in MSS.) I conjecture *ἐλεγμῶν*. The *ι* arose from the *ι* adscript, and the *ς* from the *ε* following. That the figurative adoption of a *name* does not imply an *identity*, is admitted by the Rabbins themselves; most of whom acknowledge that the prophecy in question regards the *Messiah*. The *typical* character of Elias is clear from the Gospel; for as the angel (alluding to this prophecy) told Zacharias that his son would be endowed with the *spirit* and *power* of Elias; so these qualifications were communicated to John in the same manner as the spirit of Moses was given to Elijah by the Holy Ghost. The resemblance between the Prophet and the Baptist is conspicuous; not only in mode of life, manners, and dress, but still more in *spirit*, (with which he was exceedingly jealous for the Lord of Hosts, 1 Kings xix. 10.) and in *power*, whereby he "turned many to the Lord their God," Luke i. 16.

15. *δ ἔχων — ἀκούετω.*] A formula (conveying an appeal to the understanding) often used to solicit attention to something of great importance; and chiefly occurring after parabolic or prophetic declarations figuratively expressed.

16. *τίνι δὲ ὁμοιώσω.*] A form of introducing a parable frequent in the Scriptures and the Talmud.

— *παιδιόις.*] In this reading all the Editors from Wets. to Scholz acquiesce, instead of the common one *παιδαρίοις*, which has very little authority. *Ὁμοία ἐστὶ* only denotes that there is a *general* similarity, by which the two things compared may be mutually illustrated. *Ἰαγοραῖς* denotes not only market-places, but those *broad* places in the streets, (especially where they intersect each other) which are places of concourse, *like* market-places. Hence the words *ἀγοραὶ* and *πλατεῖαι* are often in the Sept. used indifferently to express the same Heb. word. *Καθηθεῖται* is said to be, like the Heb. *קָטַב*, used in the sense *versari, esse*. Yet it may allude to the *posture*, so suitable to Eastern manners.

17. *ἠδύλασμεν — ἐκόψασθε*] Seemingly a proverbial expression; in which there is a reference to the *dramatic* sports of children; who, to use their phraseology, "play at" (i. e. represent) some action or character. So the Pharisees are compared to wayward children, who will participate

in no play which their companions propose: since they neither would admit the severe precepts of John, nor approve the mild requisitions of Christ. On the use of musical wind instruments both at funerals and at feasts, in airs adapted, in character, to each respectively, see Grot., Mackn., and Horne's *Introduct.* iii. 430, and 524.

18. *ἦλθε.*] This is *not* redundant, as some Commentators suppose, but signifies, "came forward as a teacher and prophet." *Μήτε ἐσθίων μήτε πίνων*, is an hyperbolic expression, well characterizing the ascetic austerities of John. By the force of the opposition *ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων*, must denote the *contrary*, namely, the living like other men.

19. *καὶ ἐδικαιώθη — αὐτῆς.*] There is scarcely any passage in the N. T. that has been more variously expounded. The most probable interpretations are the following.—1. understanding *σοφία* to apply to the counsels and plans of John and Christ respectively, we may regard the sentence as a reflection of our Lord on the Pharisees, thus; q. d. "But [when the perverseness of men has done its utmost in aspersing the preachers of true religion] *wisdom and virtue* will still vindicate themselves." 2. We may understand by *σοφία* the counsels of God for the conversion of the Jews; and by *τῶν* those who embrace those counsels. And, in this view, the sentence has been thus paraphrased:—"The conduct of John the Baptist and myself, however different, are alike conformable to the Divine wisdom; and those who are enlightened by this wisdom will justify both;" i. e. will vindicate the propriety of both, as the result of different circumstances. The first interpretation seems preferable, as more agreeable to the context. In either case the *καὶ* is for *ἀλλὰ*, as often, and *ἀπὸ* means, "on the part of, or in the case of."

21. *οὐαὶ σοι.*] "Alas for thee!"

— *Βηθσαϊδάν.*] *Βηθσαϊδάν* is found in many MSS., Versions, and Fathers; and is adopted or preferred by every Editor from Mill to Fritz., except Griesb. and Scholz, who retain the common reading; and rightly, for external evidence is against *Βηθσαϊδάν*, and internal by no means in its favour; *Βηθσαϊδάν* being the more *difficult* reading, and therefore more probably genuine. It is not, as some imagine, in the accusative case, but is a nominative of Chaldee form.

— *πάσαι.*] This signifies not so much *diu* as *jamdiu*.

LU.

10. καὶ Σιδῶνι ἀνεκτότερον ἔσται ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως ἢ ὑμῖν. Καὶ σὺ, 23
 15 Καπερναοῦμ, ἡ ἕως τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὑψωθεῖσα, ἕως ἄδου καταβιβασθήσῃ·
 ὅτι εἰ ἐν Σοδόμοις ἐγένοντο αἱ δυνάμεις αἱ γινόμεναι ἐν σοὶ, ἕμειναν
 ἂν μέχρι τῆς σήμερον. Πλὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι γῆ Σοδόμων ἀνεκτότερον 24
 21 ἔσται ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως ἢ σοὶ. Ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ ἀποκριθεὶς 25
 ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· Ἐξομολογοῦμαί σοι, πάτερ, κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς
 γῆς, ὅτι ἀπέκρυψας ταῦτα ἀπὸ σοφῶν καὶ συνετῶν, καὶ ἀπεκάλυψας
 22 αὐτὰ νηπίοις. Ναὶ, ὁ πατήρ, ὅτι οὕτως ἐγένετο εὐδοκία ἔμπροσθεν 26
 σου! Πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός μου· καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐπιγι- 27
 νόσκει τὸν υἱόν, εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ· οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα τὶς ἐπιγινώσκει, εἰ
 μὴ ὁ υἱός, καὶ ᾧ ἔαν βούληται ὁ υἱός ἀποκαλύψαι. Δεῦτε πρὸς με 28
 πάντες οἱ κοπιῶντες καὶ πεφορτισμένοι, κἀγὼ ἀναπαύσω ὑμᾶς. Ἄρατε 29
 τὸν ζυγόν μου ἐφ' ὑμᾶς, καὶ μάθετε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ· ὅτι πρῶτός εἰμι καὶ

—σάκκῳ,] from the Hebrew קש, a coarse cloth, of linen or rough wool, worn for humiliation; as ashes were sprinkled on the head in token of sorrow. See Horne's Introd. vol. iii. p. 523.

23. ἡ ἕως — καταβιβασθήσῃ.] These are hyperbolic expressions, figuratively representing the height of prosperity, and the depth of adversity: ἄδου signifying the lower parts of the earth. Simil. Antholog. i. 80. 15. ad Fortunam. Τοῦς δ' ἀπὸ τῶν νεφελῶν εἰς αἰὲν κατάγει.

24. Comp. Sup. x. 15.

25. ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν.] This expression is here, as sometimes elsewhere, used, where nothing has gone before to which an answer could be supposed; in which most Commentators (as Kuin,) imagine a pleonasm of ἀποκριθεὶς; others a Hebraism, קני being sometimes so used. There must, however, be some reason for the use of either term; and Whitby seems right in supposing, that there is usually a relation to something; i. e. to something which is passing in the mind either of the speaker or hearer, i. e. (as Fritz. says) "either to some supposed question, suppressed from brevity, to which this is an answer; (See Math. xxii. 1. Luke v. 22. vii. 39. sq.) or to some question which might arise from certain actions." See Mark ix. 38. Luke i. 60; xxii. 51.

—ἐξομολογοῦμαί σοι.] This verb properly signifies to acknowledge, with an ellipsis of χάρις (obligation); and, ἐ consequenti, to return thanks, to praise, and glorify. This secondary sense it carries, when followed by a Dative; and often occurs in the Sept., where the same Hebrew word is rendered by ἐξομολογῆσθαι, αἰνεῖν, and ὑμνεῖν.

—ἦτι ἀπέκρυψας — νηπίοις.] The best Commentators, ancient and modern, are agreed that the sense is, "because, having permitted these things to be hidden to the wise and sagacious, thou hast revealed them unto children in knowledge." For God is said in Scripture to do what he is pleased to permit to be done, and what he foresees will be done under the circumstances in which his creatures are placed; though their wills are held under no constraint. With respect to the former idiom, it occurs in Rom. vi. 17. Is. xii. 1. Exod. vii. 4. and 5. 2 Sam. xii. 11. and 12; and often elsewhere; nay, sometimes in the Classical writers. See Fritz. The σοφοὶ and the συνετοὶ are thought to have reference to

the Hebrew חכמים and סנינים, different orders of Jewish teachers of the law. Perhaps, however, that is too fanciful; σοφοί, it should seem, has reference to acquired knowledge, and συνετοὶ to natural talents: while νηπ., by the force of the opposition, denotes persons of plain understanding, with no pretensions to peculiar ability.

26. ὁ πατήρ.] Nomin. for Vocat. An idiom chiefly occurring in Heb. and Hellenistic Greek, but occasionally in the Classical writers, Greek and Latin. The ὅτι is emphatical. We may render: "Yea [I do thank thee], O Father, because it was thy good pleasure that so [it should be]."

27. πάντα.] On the subject of the discourse here, the Commentators are not agreed; some understand it of things, and explain it generally, of all power. Others understand it not of things, but of persons. The former, however, is more probable; but the context requires that we should, with some of the best Commentators, take πάντα to mean all things relating to the counsels of God for the salvation of man.

—παρεδόθη] "were communicated and taught." So John vii. 16. ἡ ἐμὴ διδασχὴ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὴ ἀλλὰ τοῦ πέμψαντός με. And Comp. John xvii. 7. and 8. This doctrine of a certain subordination of the Son to the Father, and the origination of the attributes of Divinity with the Father, comp. infra 28. 13. John iii. 35. xiii. 3. and xvii. 2. when connected with what we elsewhere learn of their equality and majesty co-eternal, (See John i. 18. vi. 46. and x. 15.) and that which follows, of the reciprocal knowledge of the same Persons, involve a mystery which the human understanding cannot penetrate. See Chrys., Grot., and Doddr.

28. οἱ κοπιῶντες καὶ πεφορτισμένοι.] Some understand these words of the Jews, with reference to the burdens of the ceremonial law; and the additional injunctions of the Rabbis, called φορτία βαρῆα, ὑσβάστακτα, Matth. xxiii. 4. Others refer them to the burdens of temptation and sin. Thus, there might be reference both to the Jews and Gentiles. And indeed it seems best to take them, with Chrys., Origen, and Theophyl., of both Jews and Gentiles, and meant to apply as the case might be; to the Jews, in both senses, to the Gentiles in the latter; and ἀναπαύω will be interpreted accordingly.

29. ἄρατε — ἐμοῦ.] These words are exegetical of the preceding; and the sense "become my

	MK.	LU.
30 ταπεινὸς τῆ καρδίᾳ· καὶ εὐφρόσετε ἀνάπαντι ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν. Ὁ	2.	6.
γὰρ ζυγὸς μου χρηστός, καὶ τὸ φορτίον μου ελαφρόν ἐστίν.		
1 XII. Ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ ἐπορεύθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοῖς σάββασιν διὰ τῶν	23	1
σπορίμων· οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπεινάσαν, καὶ ἤρξαντο τίλλειν στά-		
2 χυας καὶ ἐσθίειν. Οἱ δὲ Φαρισαῖοι ἰδόντες εἶπον αὐτῷ· Ἰδοὺ, οἱ	24	2
3 μαθηταὶ σου ποιοῦσιν, ὃ οὐκ ἔξεστι ποιεῖν ἐν σαββάτῳ. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν	25	3
αὐτοῖς· Οὐκ ἀνέγγωτε τί ἐποίησε Δαυὶδ, ὅτε ἐπεινώσεν, [αὐτοῖς] καὶ		
4 οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ; πῶς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ τοὺς ἄρ-	26	4
τους τῆς προθέσεως ἔφαγεν, οὓς οὐκ ἔξόν ἦν αὐτῷ φαγεῖν, οὐδὲ τοῖς		
5 μετ' αὐτοῦ, εἰ μὴ τοῖς ἱερεῦσι μόνοις; Ἦ οὐκ ἀνέγγωτε ἐν τῷ νόμῳ,		
ὅτι τοῖς σάββασιν οἱ ἱερεῖς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τὸ σάββυτον βεβηλοῦσι, καὶ		
6 ἀναίτιοι εἰσι; λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν, ὅτι τοῦ ἱεροῦ * μεῖζόν ἐστιν ὧδε. Εἰ δὲ		
7 ἐγνώκατε τί ἐστίν, “Ἰλλοὺν θέλω καὶ οὐ θυσίαν,” οὐκ ἂν κατεδικάσατε		

disciples," is expressed in metaphors familiar to the Jews, and not unfrequent with the Gentiles; whereby a law or precept is called a *yoke*, by a metaphor taken from oxen which are in harness. See Zach. ix. 9. Jer. vi. 16. Phil. ii. 7. and 8., and Recens. Synop. *πρῶτος* denotes "gentle, unassuming, and descending;" as opposed to the tyranny and haughtiness of the Scribes and Pharisees. The clause *πρῶτος—καρδία* is, in some measure, parenthetical; and meant by our Lord to recommend himself to their choice as a teacher. *Ἀνάπαντι* denotes not only relief from the burdens of the Jewish ceremonial law, but relief from the sense of unforgiven sin; including all the comforts and blessings of the Gospel, both in this world and in the next.

30. *χρηστός.*] As spoken of a *burden*, the word denotes what is convenient, and suitable to the strength of the bearers, *εὐφορον*. [Comp. 1 John v. 3.]

XII. 1. *ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ.*] An indefinite phrase, signifying *about* that time, not necessarily connecting what follows with the preceding. The exact time is indicated by Luke vi. 1.

—*σάββασιν.*] This term (by the usage of both the Sept. and the N. T.) has only the force of a singular. *Τίλλειν* conjoined with *ἐσθίειν*, implies what Luke expresses by *ψάγοντες*. It appears from Deut. xiii. 25. that it was allowed by the law, to pluck ears of corn with the hand in another's field.

2. *ὃ οὐκ ἔξεστι κ. τ. λ.*] That, however, was a disputed point; for though Moses had forbidden all *servile* work on the Sabbath day; it was a controverted point what was, and what was not such. *Reaping* was admitted to fall under the former class; and plucking of ears, being a sort of reaping, was forbidden by the more rigid Rabbis. That, however, especially when the action was done from necessity, was contrary to the *spirit* of the law. See Exod. xii. 16. But our Lord only meets the accusation, by urging, that the thing was not done purposely, but from necessity; on the score of which, or for the performance of a work of charity, he shews that the ceremonial law may be dispensed with.

3. *αὐτοῖς.*] This has no place in any of the MSS., and some Versions; and has been thrown out, or disapproved, by almost all the Editors from Mill to Scholz, but is retained by Matthæi

and Fritz.: rightly, I think, for not only external but internal evidence, is in favor of the word, which, as Fritz. observes, is necessary to the connection: *αὐτοῖς—αὐτῷ* being said, *κατ' ἐναντίωθωσιν*, of which he adduces several examples, as Acts xi. 14. *ὅς λαλήσει ῥήματα πρὸς σε ἐν οἷς σωθῆσθαι σὺ καὶ πᾶς ὁ οἶκός σου.*

4. *οἶκον τοῦ Θεοῦ.*] Not the *Temple*, (which was not then built,) but the court of the *Tabernacle*, which preceded it. See Horne's Introduction. *Εἰ μὴ* is for *ἀλλὰ* when a negative has preceded; which is called a Hebraism, but it is occasionally found in the Classical writers. See Recens. Synop. Homberg and Fritz., however, make *εἰ μὴ* dependent upon *ἔξδν*, assigning an *exceptive*, not an *adversative* force. [Comp. 1 Sam. xxi. 6. Exod. xxv. 30. Levit. xxiv. 6. viii. 31.]

5. *ἐν τῷ νόμῳ.*] See Numb. xviii. 9. —*βεβηλοῦσι.*] Not really so, but *κατὰ τὸ βῆρον*: as those may be said to violate a law, by doing what, unless the worship of God had excused it, it would not have been lawful for them to do. So the Rabbis speak, when they say that the Sabbath is *lawfully violated* by doing such and such sacerdotal works, and that "there it no Sabatism in the Temple."

6. *τοῦ ἱεροῦ—ὧδε.*] Our Lord here anticipates an objection; q. d. "But *you* are no Priest, nor is your work for the benefit of the Temple." To which he does not directly reply, "I am one greater than the Temple;" but, modestly and delicately, "here is something, i. e. one, greater than the Temple." Thus those engaged in his service, may be allowed an equal liberty with the priests, especially as works of necessity, or of mercy, are to be preferred before ritual observances. *Μεῖζον*, which is preferred by nearly all the Editors and Commentators, and edited by Matth., Fritz., and Scholz, is evidently the true reading. being found in the greater part of the MSS., the Edit. Princ., and many of the Greek Fathers. The sense is the same as ver. 41.: *καὶ ἰδοὺ, πλείον Ἰωαὴ ὧδε (ἔστι).* and 42. *πλείον Σολομῶνος,* and Lu. xi. 31.

7. *εἰ δὲ ἐγνώκατε τί ἐστίν.*] A delicate mode, (as supr. ix. 13.,) of asserting the excellency of thing. The passage cited is Hos. vi. 6., before adduced at ix. 13. *Ἐλεον* and *θυσ.* stand, respectively, for the virtues of charity and benevolence, and the works of the ceremonial law.

MK. LU.

2. 6. τοὺς ἀναιτίους. Κύριος γὰρ ἐστὶ [καὶ] τοῦ σαββάτου ὁ Κύριος τοῦ 8
28 5 ἀνθρώπου.

3. Καὶ μεταβῆς ἐκεῖθεν, ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν αὐτῶν. Καὶ ἰδοῦ, 9
2 7 ἄνθρωπος ἦν τὴν χεῖρα ἔχων ξηράν. καὶ ἐπρωήτησαν αὐτὸν, λέγοντες, 10
εἰ ἔξῃσι τοῖς σάββασιν θεραπεύειν; ἵνα κατηγορήσωσιν αὐτοῦ. Ὁ δὲ 11
εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Τίς ἐστὶ ἐξ ὑμῶν ἄνθρωπος, ὃς ἔξει πρόβατον ἓν, καὶ

2. ἐγερεῖ; Πόσῳ οὖν διαφέρει ἄνθρωπος προβάτου! ὥστε ἔξῃσι τοῖς 12
6 10 σάββασιν καλῶς ποιεῖν. Τότε λέγει τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ· Ἐκτεινον τὴν χεῖρά 13
σου. καὶ ἔξῃτενε· καὶ ἀποκατεστάθη ὑγιής ὡς ἡ ἄλλη. Οἱ δὲ Φαρι- 14
σαῖοι συμβούλιον ἔλαβον κατ' αὐτοῦ ἐξελεθόντες, ὅπως αὐτὸν ἀπολέσω- 15
σιν. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς γνοὺς ἀνεχώρησεν ἐκεῖθεν. Καὶ ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ 16
ὄχλοι πολλοὶ, καὶ ἐθιγράπυσεν αὐτοὺς πάντας· καὶ ἐπειρίμωσεν αὐτοῖς, 16
ἵνα μὴ φανερὸν αὐτὸν ποιήσωσιν. Ὅπως πληρωθῆ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ 17
Ἰσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου, λέγοντος· Ἴδὸν, ὁ παῖς μου, ὃν ἤρξει- 18

8. Κύριος — ἀνθρώπου.] Grot. and many other eminent Commentators maintain that ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου here signifies *man* generally; which may seem to be countenanced by the parallel passage of Mark ii. 23. But in all the other 37 passages of the N. T. where it occurs, the expression signifies the Son of man, *the Messiah*; which sense also the *Article* requires: whereas υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου without the Art. as invariably denotes a son of man, a man. Neither does the ὥστε at Mark xi. 23. compel us to take the phrase to denote *man*; since it may be *continuative*, introductory of a new argument, and signify *more-over*; on which sense see examples in Hoogev. Part. See more in Hamm., Whitty, and Doddr. As to the γὰρ of the present passage, it may refer to something not expressed, but merely what is passing in the mind of the speaker; an idiom very frequent in all writers, Scriptural and Classical. And here the suppression is evidently from the same cause that produced the use of *μεῖζον* for *μείζων*. It will clear the construction to consider ver. 7. as parenthetical, and to refer the γὰρ to some clause connected with ver. 6.; q. d. "There is one here greater than the Temple (and his sanction will warrant the breach of any such ceremonial institution as that of the Sabbath); for the Son of man," &c. The *καὶ* before τοῦ σαββάτου, is not found in the great body of the MSS., nor in several of the Greek Fathers; and is cancelled by Matth., Griesb., Knapp, Vater, Fritz., and Scholz; as having probably been introduced from the parallel passages of Mark and Luke. Here it would seem rather to darken and perturb the sense.

9. ἀντῶν] i. e. of the people to whom he had now come.

10. χεῖρα ξηράν.] This is not to be understood of "a partial paralysis," as some suppose; but according to the most accurate inquirers, an *atrophy of the limb*, occasioned by an evaporation of the vital juices, involving an inability to move the nerves and muscles; which must also be the sense at 1 Kings xii. 4.

—εἰ ἔξῃσι, &c.] A modest form of negation. Not so the ruler of the synagogue on a similar occasion, recorded at Luke xiii. 14. See also John ix. 16. From the Rabbinical citations, it ap-

pears that it had been decided unlawful to heal any one on the Sabbath day, unless he were in imminent peril of life. Yet it appears from Luke xiv. 3, that Christ at length made the Pharisees almost ashamed to advance the principle. At *ἐὰν ἐμπέσῃ* there is a Hebrew or Hellenistic construction. Some, too, suppose an *anacoluthon* at *οὐχὶ κρατήσῃ*. But this is rightly rejected by Fritz. "Ἐγερεῖ, "will pull it out." A rare sense of the word, of which, however, the Commentators adduce an example from Philo. This was allowed by the earlier Rabbis, but forbidden by the later ones.

13. ἀποκατεστάθη.] The word properly signifies to bring any thing back to its former situation, or state; and figuratively, to restore to health, as in the Sept. and some later writers.

17. ὅπως πληρωθῆ.] See Note supra i. 22.

18. ἰδοῦ, ὁ παῖς μου, &c.] This prophecy, (from Is. xlii. 1.) differs somewhat from the Hebrew, and yet more from the Sept.; which is supposed to have been corrupted; and the words Ἰακώβ and Ἰσραὴλ (of which there are no traces in the Heb.,) to have been inserted by the Jews, that the passage might not be applied to the Messiah; but without reason. The words, I suspect, were, at first, noted in the *margin* of some very ancient Archetypes; and then were introduced, inadvertently, into the *text* by the scribes; who thought the words were to be *added*. Thus Eusebius testifies that the words were, in his time, *obelized* in the Sept., and were not expressed in the other Greek Versions; that is, not even that of Aquila the Jew, which is certainly very adverse to the above suspicion. In short, in the first two verses (at least as far as οὐ σβίσει), there is very little variation from the Hebrew, certainly none of any importance and where there *is* any at all, it is justified by the Sept. And as to the variation of the Sept. from the *Evangelist*, it is not (up to the above words) any greater diversity than that of a *free* version as compared with a *literal* one — that is, if the words of the Sept. be corrected from MSS., and a *great corruption*, which at present exists, be removed. For such I consider ἀνήσσει, which gives a sense directly the reverse to that which is required by the context. I have no doubt but that the true reading is ἀνασσει, *will*

LU.
11.

σα· ὁ ἀγαπητός μου, εἰς ὃν εὐδόκησεν ἡ ψυχὴ μου.
 Οἴσω τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπ' αὐτόν, καὶ κρίσιν τοῖς ἔθ-
 19 νεσιν ἀπαγγελεῖ. Οὐκ ἐρίσει, οὐδὲ κραυγᾶσει· οὐδὲ
 20 ἀκούσει τις ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ. Κἀ-
 λαμον συντετριμμένον οὐ κατεάζει, καὶ λῆνον τυφό-
 21 μενον οὐ σβέσει· ἕως ἄν ἐκβάλῃ εἰς νῆκος τὴν κρι-
 22 σιν. Καὶ [ἐν] τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ ἔθνη ἐλπιούσι.
 22 Τότε προσηχθή αὐτῷ δαμονιζόμενος, τυφλὸς καὶ κωφός, καὶ 14
 ἐθεράπευσεν αὐτόν· ὥστε τὸν τυφλὸν καὶ κωφὸν καὶ λαλεῖν καὶ βλέ-
 23 πειν. Καὶ ἐξίσταντο πάντες οἱ ὄχλοι, καὶ ἔλεγον· Μῆτι οὗτός ἐστιν

exclaim. The word occurs in Theocritus Id. iv. 37. and elsewhere. The abbreviation for *av* is sometimes confounded with *η*. Bp. Randolph thinks the Evangelist here followed some old translation different from the Sept. But that is too hypothetical: whether there *was* any such version so early as the time of St. Matthew may be doubted. It should rather seem, that the Evangelist, observing the Sept. not to give a faithful representation of the original, corrected it agreeably thereto, and, as I conjecture, conformably to what had appeared in the *Syro-Chaldee* Edition of his Gospel.

The greatest difficulty, however, connected with this passage rests on the words *ἕως ἄν ἐκβάλῃ* — *ἐλπίοισι*. There is here a considerable variation from both the Sept. and the Hebrew; though I think it will be found to involve no real discrepancy. Let us, however, first examine the variation between the *Hebrew* and the *Sept.* The translators by *ἔθνη* thought proper to give the *meaning* intended by the Prophet, rather than the *literal expression*; which would have required *νῆσοι*. The sense is, the “most remote nations, not only the Jews, but the Gentiles.” As to the diversity in *ὀνόματι*, (for the Heb. *דבר* means *law* or *doctrine*), we may either, with Schleus., suppose *ὀνόματι* to be used in the sense *law* or *doctrine*, as in various passages of the N. T., which he so explains in his *Lex. Nov. Test.*; or we may suppose the true reading to be *νόμῳ*. So in Ps. cxx. 4. instead of *δὸς* several MSS. have *νόμον*, which is required by the Hebrew, and was edited by Grabe. However, as both methods seem somewhat precarious, I should prefer supposing that the Sept. here, as before, chose to express the *general sense* in a *very free* version; and that the Evangelist followed the Sept. as far as he thought it sufficiently faithful and to his purpose.

But there yet remains one diversity to be discussed; which is, I apprehend, quite irreconcilable, namely, *ἀναλάμψει*. I have no doubt that the Sept. wrote *ἀνακάμψει*; and also that a negative particle has here (as occasionally in all authors) slipped out. Thus *οὐκ ἀνακ.*, “he will not give way or desist.” (See *Cebes* cited by Steph. Thes. in v.) expresses the true sense of the Heb. *לֹא יָרַח*. Finally, to advert to the difference between the *Hebrew* and the *Evangelist*, this consists, 1. in the omission of several words, and 2. in the *change* of others. But neither, I apprehend, involves any real *discrepancy*; for the sense, as will be seen, is precisely the same. The Evangelist seems to have purposely omitted *part* of the words, because

they were not very apposite to his purpose; and probably were even then very corrupt in the Sept.: and in expressing the sense of the *others*, he chose (as is often done in Scripture) to *blend* together the two clauses *וְיִצְיָא מִן הָאָרֶץ וְיִשְׁמַח בָּהּ* into one, and expresses the *SUBSTANCE* of them. So that the sense of the words *ἕως ἐκβάλῃ* (answering to *ἐξοίσει* in the Sept.) *εἰς νῆκος τὴν κρίσιν* is this: [“And thus will it be] until he send forth [over the whole earth] his Rule of life, [the Gospel] conquering and to conquer:” literally for conquest. On this sense of *κρίσις* see Schleus. and Wahl., and Bp. Lowth on Is. xlii. 4. The article is, as often, put for the pronoun possessive; as the later Syriac translator saw, and also the early interpreters; for to *them* we may attribute the *αὐτοῦ* which is added in several MSS. The Evangelist has shown the true *application* of the prophecy; the chief import of which is centred in the second verse. The whole has reference to the *quiet* and *unostentatious* mode in which Christ promulgated his religion; not resorting to violence or clamour, or offering resistance to oppression; but employing the mildest means: by which, however, it would at length be spread over all the nations of the universe.

— *ἡθέσται*.] The verb denotes properly to *choose*, and from thence, as here, to *love* and *favour*. [*Comp. sup.* 3. 17. infra 17. 5.]

20. *κἀλαμον* — *σβέσει*.] These are lively figures of extreme weakness, importing profound humility and contrition. And here, (as often in the Classical writers,) by the negation of one thing is implied the affirmation of the contrary: q. d. “he will *strengthen* wavering faith, and will *kindle* nearly extinct piety.”

21. *καὶ ἐν* — *ἐλπίοισι*.] “In him (in his Gospel) shall the Gentiles trust (for instruction and salvation.)” The *ἐν* is omitted in various MSS. the Edit. Princ., and some Fathers, is marked for omission by Wets. and Vater, and is cancelled by Matthæi, Griesb., and Scholz. But as both the Heb. and Sept. have a preposition, it should seem probable, that the Evangelist, in adopting this image from the Sept., would take the *preposition* as well as the words; which indeed can scarcely be dispensed with, since its omission destroys the construction.

23. *ἐξίσταντο*.] The word properly signifies, by an ellipsis of *τοῦ νοῦ*, to be stirred out of one’s mind, and secondly, to be *greatly astonished*; by the same metaphor as we say to be frightened out of one’s wits. *Μῆτι* must be rendered *num*, not *nonne*; for, as Campb. remarks, the former implies that *disbelief* preponderates; the latter,

MK. LU.

3. 11. ὁ υἱὸς Δαυὶδ; Οἱ δὲ Φαρισαῖοι ἀκούσαντες, εἶπον· Οὗτος οὐκ ἐκβάλ- 24
 22 15 λει τὰ δαιμόνια, εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ Βεελζεβοὺλ ἄρχοντι τῶν δαιμονίων. Εἰδὼς 25
 23 17 δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὰς ἐνθρημήσεις αὐτῶν, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Πᾶσα βουσιεῖα με-
 24 ρισθῆσα καθ' ἑαυτῆς ἐρημοῦται· καὶ πᾶσα πόλις ἢ οἰκία μερισθῆσα
 26 18 καθ' ἑαυτῆς οὐ σταθῆσεται. Καὶ εἰ ὁ Σαταναῖς τὸν Σατανᾶν ἐκβάλλει, 26
 19 ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν ἐμερίσθη· πῶς οὖν σταθῆσεται ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ; Καὶ εἰ 27
 ἐγὼ ἐν Βεελζεβοὺλ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν ἐν τίνι ἐκβάλλου-
 28 20 σι; Διὰ τοῦτο αὐτοὶ ὑμῶν ἔσονται κριταί. Εἰ δὲ ἐγὼ ἐν πνεύματι 28
 20 Θεοῦ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, ἄρα ἔφθασαν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ.
 27 21 ἼΙ πῶς δύναται τις εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ, καὶ τὰ 29
 σκευῆ αὐτοῦ διαρπάσαι, ἐὰν μὴ προῦτιν δίσῃ τὸν ἰσχυρόν; καὶ τότε
 23 τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ διαρπάσει; Ὁ μὴ ὦν μετ' ἐμοῦ κατ' ἐμοῦ ἐστι· 30
 28 καὶ ὁ μὴ συνάγων μετ' ἐμοῦ σκορπίζει. Διὰ τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν· πᾶσα 31

belief. The multitude seems to have spoken thus modestly, to avoid offending the Pharisees. By υἱὸς Δ. is meant the promised Messiah. See note sup. i. 1.

24. ἄρχοντι τῶν δαιμονίων.] Not only was an hierarchy of good angels held, but a subordination and headship was believed to exist among the evil ones. And this not only by the *Incantatores* and *Exorciste*, &c., but by the Rabbis, and even the Philosophers.

25. πᾶσα βασιλεία—ἐρημοῦται.] A proverbial saying, (similar to many cited from the Classical and Rabbinical writers,) in which there is (as Kuin. observes) an argumentum ab absurdo; q. d. "The safety of a state or a family is promoted by concord, and is destroyed by dissensions. If Satan were to assist me in expelling his demons from the bodies of men, whither he has empowered them to enter, he would be at discord with himself, would act foolishly, and his authority could not continue." The argument then is briefly this: that it were absurd to suppose Satan acting against himself, by casting out his own agents of evil.

26. καὶ εἰ ὁ Σαταναῖς.] The καὶ is taken by Beza for ἀλλά; by Kuin. in the sense quodsi. But it is better to render it [so] also.

27. ἐν Βεελζεβοὺλ.] That there were persons among the Jews who professed to cast out demons by exorcisms, and invocation of the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, we learn both from the Scriptures (see Luke ix. 49. Acts xix. 13. Mark ix. 38.) and from Joseph. Ant. viii. 2, 5. vii. 6, 3, also from the early Fathers, (as Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Origen, Tertullian, and others) and Lucian Trag. p. 171. The argument therefore, is, "If those who cast out demons prove themselves to be leagued with Satan, then must your disciples be also leagued with him; and the censure will apply to them as well as unto me." It affects not the argument whether the demons were really expelled by such exorcism (though it might sometimes happen, by the permission of God); it is sufficient for the argumentum ad hominem, that the Pharisees thought they were expelled, and did not attribute it to the agency of Satan. Υἱοί, by an idiom derived from the customs of the Jews, denotes disciples. See I Kings xx. 35. 2 Tim. i. 2.

28. ἐν πνεύματι Θεοῦ] "by divine co-operation;" as in Luke xi. 20. ἐν δακτύλῳ Θεοῦ. See

Middlet. G. A. p. 163. The reasoning is this: "But if I cast out demons by divine power, I perform miracles by the aid of God: hence it follows, that I am sent from God. But if I be sent from God, you should believe me, when I announce to you the kingdom of God."

—ἐφθασαν.] Schmid and Fritz. take this to be a strong expression, signifying "is come upon you before you are aware." Perhaps it rather means "is already come upon you." The ἦ may be rendered, with Erasmus, *alioqui*; or, with Fritz., "vel, (ut aliter vobis occurram)."

29. The purpose of this verse is to show the folly of supposing that he acts by a power from, and consequently under Satan; since he evinces superiority over him, by overpowering him, and despoiling him of his authority. "And if (as all must confess) he who binds another is stronger than he who is bound by him, you will easily perceive that I must be far more powerful than the Prince of demons."

30. ὁ μὴ ὦν, &c.] Here we have another proverb; in which the converse holds equally true, (and is used by Christ at Luke ix. 50.); as often in adages. (See Prov. xxvi. 4 & 5,) each being applicable, according to circumstances. The scope of the reasoning here seems to be this: that there can be no collusion between Satan and himself—since they are, and must necessarily be, in opposition to each other; agreeably to the proverb, &c. Of the above propositions (both of them true, but in a different view), Br. Taylor, in his Works, xiv. 300, marks out the distinct measures and proper import of each. In συνάγων, &c. there is not, as Kuin. supposes, an allusion to the amassing of money, on the one hand, and its dissipation, on the other; but it is an agricultural, or possibly a pastoral, metaphor, taking from forking together hay or corn, or gathering and folding sheep.

31. διὰ τοῦτο.] There is scarcely any point in the interpretation of the N. T. which has been more debated than the nature of the BLASPHEMY AGAINST THE HOLY SPIRIT, of which it is here said, that "it shall not be forgiven." It would be a waste of time to read, still more to detail and review, the far greater part of the interpretations propounded by Theologians, ancient and modern, of this verse. These may, however, be seen in the Critici Sacri, Pol. Syn. Suicer's Thesaur. i. 69. 8, Wolf, Koecher, Kuinoel, and

ἁμαρτία καὶ βλασφημία ἀφεθήσεται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἡ δὲ τοῦ Πνεύ-
 32 ματος βλασφημία οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. Καὶ ὅς ἂν εἴπῃ 29
 λόγον κατὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ ὅς δ' ἂν

lastly in Bingham's Antiquities of the Christian Church, L. xvi. ch. 7. In order to ascertain the true sense, it is of importance to attend carefully to the *connection*, and to gather what help we can from the parallel passages. Now the *connection* should seem to be decided by the formula διὰ τοῦτο, which introduces what is said; and has reference not so much to what has just preceded, as to the *whole* of the foregoing matter; and especially points at the diabolical calumny which had been uttered by the Scribes, in attributing the undisputed miracles of Christ to the agency of the Devil; as is certain from Mark iii. 23. 30. οὗτι ἐλεγον· πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον ἔχει, of which the full sense is [“this denunciation was uttered” because they said,” &c. Of the almost innumerable interpretations which have been propounded, there are only two which deserve notice. The main question on which the whole hinges is, whether it was the conduct of the Pharisees on this particular occasion, that is meant, or that of the same persons soon afterwards, by similarly calumniating the supernatural gifts of the Spirit, shortly afterwards poured forth, after the resurrection and ascension of Christ. The latter view is strenuously and ably maintained by Whitby, (after Baxter and Hamm.) Dodd., and Mack., whose arguments may be stated in the words of Mr. Holden, as follows: “1. It is declared, that whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him;” and, therefore, the Pharisees, in calumniating his miracles, were not guilty of the unpardonable sin. “2dly. The sin against the Holy Ghost could not be committed during our Saviour’s abode on earth, as the Holy Ghost was not given till after his ascension, John vii. 39. xvi. 7. Acts ii. 1, seq. 3dly. In St. Luke xii. 10, our Saviour makes the same declaration respecting this sin, when no calumny against him was uttered.” These arguments, however, are by no means conclusive. As to the 1st and 3d reasons, they are utterly groundless; for blasphemy could be committed during our Saviour’s lifetime — since, though the Holy Ghost was not given to men until after Christ’s ascension, and even then only occasionally and limitedly, to Christ it was given perpetually, and without measure.

This is plain from John iii. 34. οὐ γὰρ ἐκ μέτρου δίδωσιν ὁ θεὸς τὸ πνεῦμα, where compare the context. The 3d argument has not the least cogency; since in St. Luke the order of the events is very little observed, and the occasions when things were said, is often only hinted, not noted. The only one of any weight that has been urged, is, — that the Pharisees present could not be thought utterly inexcusable, since the crowning evidence of Christ’s Messiahship, by his resurrection and the subsequent effusion of the Holy Spirit, had not yet been afforded. But that argument is more specious than solid; and involves a sitting in judgment on our God’s proceedings: in the words of St. Paul, it is ὑπερφρονεῖν παρ’ ἡ δει φρονεῖν. The crime of the Pharisees was assuredly, all things considered, greater than that committed by those who afterwards spoke evil of the supernatural gifts of the Holy Spirit. It was, as Archbp. Secker observes, “the greatest and most wilful obstinacy in wrong that can be imagined,

when they and all around them saw the most illustrious and beneficial miracles done in confirmation of the most holy and benevolent doctrines, to stand out in opposition to both; to insist that the Devil conspired against himself, rather than own the finger of God, where it was so exceedingly visible; not only to oppose, but to revile, the strongest evidence laid before them in the fullest manner, and that, very probably, against the secret conviction of their own hearts; such behaviour manifests the most hardened and desperate wickedness.” In short, when we consider the extreme harshness of supposing, that what was said in immediate connection with the conduct of the Pharisees, and introduced by a formula confining it to that, was meant not to be understood of that, but of another offence, which bore an affinity to it — we shall see that the interpretation in question is really untenable. There is the more reason to warn Biblical students against adopting it; since it was the adoption of it by the Latin and some Greek Fathers, and the subsequent extension of it to speaking evil of the operations of the Holy Spirit generally, even of his *graces*, which opened a door to the grievous errors into which those Theologians, of the ancient and earlier modern School fell, who almost made the *Sin* (as they inaccurately term it) against the Holy Spirit, to consist in a wilful opposition to the teaching of the Spirit, in respect to what such men persuade themselves is alone the truth, as it is in Jesus. Hence the passage has been quoted by Romanists against Protestants, and Protestants against Romanists; by orthodox Protestants against heterodox Protestants; and might be adduced by the maintainers of the lying miracles of the day against those who reject them. Nay, it has been explained of obstinate resistance to the *graces* of the Holy Spirit by invincible hardness of heart and impenitence; or of apostasy, or of falling into mortal sins after the grace of the Holy Spirit in baptism. Yet those who maintain these various views are constrained to, *virtually* at least, admit the crime to be pardonable; which seems contrary to our Saviour’s words. Besides, it could not be the design of our Lord to utter what should prove, as it were, a trap for the consciences of men; and should operate to fill timid, though sincerely pious persons, with vain alarm; or to furnish arms for Church polemics to wield one against another ad infinitum. I mean not, by what has been said, to aver, that the crime in question was committed *alone* by the Pharisees, who had ascribed the miracles of Christ to the power of the Devil, or that our Lord meant to *confine* the denunciation to that blasphemy. It was, I apprehend, meant to apply also to those who should hereafter ascribe the miracles worked by the Apostles, or by their immediate successors in the government of the Church, to the agency of the evil spirit. At the same time, it must be remembered that most of the offences which have been thought to constitute the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, bear some affinity thereto; being, if not blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, *sin* against the Holy Spirit, “doing despite to the Spirit of Grace, and bringing swift destruction on those who commit them.”

LU.

11. εἶπη κατὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου, οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ οὔτε ἐν
 † τούτῳ † τῷ αἰῶνι οὔτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι. Ἥ ποιήσατε τὸ δένδρον 33
 καλόν, καὶ τὸν καρπὸν αὐτοῦ καλόν· ἢ ποιήσατε τὸ δένδρον σαπρὸν, καὶ
 τὸν καρπὸν αὐτοῦ σαπρὸν· ἐκ γὰρ τοῦ καρποῦ τὸ δένδρον γινώσκειται.
 Γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν! πῶς δύνασθε ἄγαθὰ λαλεῖν, πονηροὶ ὄντες; ἐκ 34
 γὰρ τοῦ περισσεύματος τῆς καρδίας τὸ στόμα λαλεῖ. Ὁ ἄγαθὸς ἄν- 35
 θρωπος ἐκ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ θησανροῦ [τῆς καρδίας] ἐκβάλλει [τὰ] ἀγα-
 θά· καὶ ὁ πονηρὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ θησανροῦ ἐκβάλλει
 πονηρά. Λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν, ὅτι πᾶν ῥήμα ἄργον, ὃ ἐὰν λαλήσωσιν οἱ 36
 ἄνθρωποι, ἀποδώσουσι περὶ αὐτοῦ λόγον ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως. Ἐκ γὰρ 37
 τῶν λόγων σου δικαιοθήσῃ, καὶ ἐκ τῶν λόγων σου καταδικασθήσῃ.
 Τότε ἀπεκρίθησαν τινες τῶν Γραμματέων καὶ Φαρισαίων λέγοντες· 38
 Διδάσκαλε, θέλομεν ἀπὸ σοῦ σημεῖον ἰδεῖν. Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν 39
 29 αὐτοῖς· Γενεὰ πονηρὰ καὶ μοιχαλὶς σημεῖον ἐπιζητεῖ· καὶ σημεῖον

32. οὔτε ἐν τούτῳ — μλλοντι.] According to a common proverb importing *never*. See the Rabbinical citations in Recens. Synop. For *pre-umptuous* sias, like this, no expiation was provided, even under the Jewish law.

— τούτῳ τῷ.] The greater part of the MSS. and many early Editions have τῷ νῦν, which is confirmed by I Tim. vi. 17. 2. Sam. iv. 10. Tit. iv. 10, is preferred by Wets., and edited by Matthæi and Scholz. And this I should have received, had it not been liable to some suspicion of having arisen *ex interpretatione*.

33. ἢ ποιήσατε, &c.] ‘*ponite, suppose, consider.*’ A Latinism for *rihere*. There is here a *return* to the course of argument, interrupted by the solemn warning at vv. 31 & 32. And the words, which have the air of an adage, may, with some Expositors, be applied to the *Pharisees*. And this is supported by the parallel passages at Matt. vii. 17, and Luke vi. 44. But from the context, they seem better referred, (with the best Commentators,) to our *Lord himself*. q. d. Account the tree as good which produces good fruit; or the tree bad, which produces bad fruit. The goodness of my doctrine argues its *divine* origin, as good fruit a good tree. [*Comp. supr. vii. 17. Luke vi. 44.*]

34. πῶς δύνασθε ἄγ. λαλεῖν.] A popular idiom importing that it is scarcely possible. On γενν. ἐχιδ. see Note supra, iii. 7. A yet stronger expression occurs at xxiii. 33.

— ἐκ γὰρ τοῦ περισσεύματος, &c.] A proverbial expression, with which Wets. compares Menand. ἀνδρὸς χαρακτήρ ἐκ λόγων γνωρίζεται. Aristid. οἷος δὲ τρώπος, τοιοῦτος καὶ ὁ λόγος.

35. ἐκβάλλει.] For *προφέρει*. It is not, however, a Hebraism, as some say; for examples are adduced from the best Greek writers. The sense is, “The good man, from the treasure of his kind affections, brings forth candid opinions, and equitable decisions; the wicked man has within him a store of pride, enmity; and malice, which he pours forth in slanderous and unjust language.”

— τῆς καρδίας] is omitted in the greater part of the MSS., the Edit. Princ., and several Versions and Fathers; and is cancelled, or rejected by all the Editors from Mill downwards. It was, no doubt, inserted from the preceding verse, or the parallel passage in Luke vi. 45. The *τὰ* before ἀγαθὰ I have bracketed, as having no place in

very many MSS., the Edit. Princ., Matthæi and Scholz, and liable to the strong objections stated by Middlet. Some, indeed, as Raphael, Wets., and Fritz., seek a peculiar sense arising from the addition of the Art. to ἀγαθὰ, and its rejection after πονηρά. But on the sense itself they widely differ; and the principle on which they go is too fanciful to be admitted.

36. ἄργον.] On the sense of this word there has been no little difference of opinion. Some explain it *rash, vain, unedifying*. And there is something to countenance this in the use of the Heb. חָזָן. But although that sense (which is ably supported by Wets.) may be not inapposite, yet it is not so apt as that of *useless, pernicious*, propounded by others; in which there is a *litotes* common to many words of similar signification. The scope of the passage, however, is most in favour of the interpretation of Chrys., Whitby, and Campb., *false*; though there may probably be a reference to falsehood combined with *calumny*, such as the Pharisees were guilty of. With respect to the construction, there is here what is called a Nom. absolute, occasioned by the abandonment of the construction.

38. θέλομεν — ἰδεῖν.] This was a demand often made. (See *infra* xvi. 1. Mark viii. 11. Luke xi. 16.) and probably founded on the prophecy of Daniel vii. 13, which describes the Son of man as coming in the clouds of heaven. Inasmuch that it was almost a characteristic of the Jews to ask a sign. So St. Paul, I Cor. i. 22, says: οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι σημεῖον αἰτοῦσι. We find from Luke xi. 16, that the sign they asked was one *from heaven*. They had witnessed several *ἐννάμεις* or ordinary miracles, on earth; and they seem to demand the appearance of some *celestial* one, which would be the strongest test of Jesus's pretensions. Our Lord, however, knowing that the demand was made from bad motives, refused to comply with it.

39. μοιχαλὶς.] This is by some understood of *spiritual* adultery; i. e. idolatry. But of *that* there is no reason to think the Jews of that age were guilty. Others would take it to denote *degeneracy* from the piety of their ancestors. But that is harsh and unauthorized. The term may be taken of adultery in the proper sense, which was then exceedingly prevalent. But it rather denotes *spiritual* adultery, — of godlessness and

MK. LU.
3. 11.
30

40 οὐ δοθήσεται αὐτῇ, εἰ μὴ τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωαῦ τοῦ προφήτου. Ὡσπερ
 γὰρ ἦν Ἰωαῦς ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ τοῦ κήτους τρεῖς ἡμέρας καὶ τρεῖς νύκτας·
 οὕτως ἔσται ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ τῆς γῆς τρεῖς ἡμέ-
 41 ρας καὶ τρεῖς νύκτας. Ἄνδρες Νινευῖται ἀναστήσονται ἐν τῇ κρίσει 32
 μετὰ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης, καὶ κατακρινοῦσιν αὐτήν· ὅτι μετενόησαν εἰς
 42 τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰωαῦ· καὶ ἰδοὺ πλεῖον Ἰωαῦ ᾧδε. Βασίλισσα νότου 31
 ἐγεροθήσεται ἐν τῇ κρίσει μετὰ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης, καὶ κατακριεῖ αὐ-
 τήν· ὅτι ἦλθεν ἐκ τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς ἀκοῦσαι τὴν σοφίαν Σολομῶ-
 43 νος· καὶ ἰδοὺ, πλεῖον Σολομῶνος ᾧδε. Ὅταν δὲ τὸ ἀκάθαρτον πνεῦμα 24
 ἐξέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, διέρχεται δι' ἀνύδρων τόπων, ζητοῦν ἀνά-
 44 παυσιν, καὶ οὐχ εὐρίσκει. Τότε λέγει· Ἐπιστρέψω εἰς τὸν οἶκόν μου,
 ὅθεν ἐξῆλθον. καὶ ἐλθὼν εὐρίσκει σχολάζοντα, σεσαρωμένον καὶ κεκο- 25
 45 σμημένον. Τότε πορεύεται καὶ παραλαμβάνει μεθ' ἑαυτοῦ ἑπτὰ ἕτερα 26
 πνεύματα πονηρότερα ἑαυτοῦ, καὶ εἰσελθόντα κατοικεῖ ἐκεῖ· καὶ γίνε-
 ται τὰ ἔσχατα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκείνου χεῖρονα τῶν πρώτων. Οὕτως
 ἔσται καὶ τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ τῇ πονηρῇ. 8.
 46 Ἐν δὲ αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος τοῖς ὄχλοις, ἰδοὺ, ἡ μήτηρ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ 31 19
 47 αὐτοῦ εἰστήκισαν ἔξω, ζητοῦντες αὐτῷ λαλῆσαι. εἶπε δέ τις αὐτῷ· 32 20
 Ἰδοὺ, ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ σου ἔξω ἐστήκασιν, ζητοῦντές σοι
 48 λαλῆσαι. Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπε τῷ εἰπόντι αὐτῷ· Τίς ἐστὶν ἡ μήτηρ 33 21
 49 μου; καὶ τίνες εἰσὶν οἱ ἀδελφοί μου; Καὶ ἐπέειπας τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ 34
 ἐπὶ τοὺς μαθητάς αὐτοῦ, εἶπεν· Ἰδοὺ, ἡ μήτηρ μου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί

practical infidelity. For the marriage covenant, which the Jewish nation was typified as having entered into with God, might be broken by godlessness as much as by idolatry.

— σμ. οὐ ὁθ. εἰ μὴ τὸ σμ. Ἰωαῦ] q. d. the proof of my divine legation shall be an event no other than what happened to Jonah. See Jonah ii. 1, 2.

40. τοῦ κήτους.] This, it is now generally agreed, denotes not the whale, but another large fish called *Lamia*. See Horne's *Interd.* ii. 560. This is, however, denied by Bp. Jebb, *Sacr. Lit.* Ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ τῆς γῆς is said to be a Hebraism for ἐν τῇ γῇ; but a similar expression occurs in our own and most other languages.

41. Ἄνδρες Νινευῖται.] This pleonasm of ἀνδρες is common in the Greek writers, and may be considered a vestige of the wordiness of primitive phraseology. Ἀναστήσονται — κατακρινοῦσιν αὐτήν. There is something refined, and perhaps Oriental, in the turn of this and the next verse, by which the Ninevites and the Queen of the South are supposed to bear testimony against the Jews, as to the transactions here mentioned; and by that testimony, be the means of increasing the condemnation of the Jews by the contrast. On μετεν. εἰς τὸ κήφ. 'I. see Jonah iii. 5.

42. περάτων τῆς γῆς.] A usual phrase to denote a remote country; such as was Sheba: (See 1 Kings x. 1. 2 Chron. ix. 1.) of which examples are adduced by Wets.; and others may be seen in Recens. Synop.

43 — 45. The difficulty of this passage is not in itself, but in its connection, to determine whether it belongs to the verse immediately preceding, viz. vv. 33 — 42, or to the whole narration, v. 22 — 42. If the former, it is meant as a warning to

those who had been demanding a sign. And then the most probable interpretation will be that of Kaufmann, cited by Kuin.; q. d. "Though I were to give you a sign from heaven, yet the effect would be but momentary; the demon of infidelity and obstinacy would return, and, seizing you with greater violence, would but increase your final condemnation." This, however, is somewhat harsh and forced. It is better to suppose (with others) that the application is to the whole of the above portion, and meant, 1. as a retort on his base calumniators; and, 2. as a warning to those who had been seeking a sign; in short, to the Jewish nation in general. In this view the sense is well expressed by Lightf. and Whitby. The parable, however, is susceptible of a general application, suited to all nations and ages; on which see Dr. Hales. With respect to the minor circumstances of the parable, they are merely meant for ornament, and accommodated to the notions of the Jews, as to the haunts and habits of demons, who, they supposed, chiefly abode ἐν τοῖς ἀνείσοις, in the deserts.

44. σχολάζοντα] i. e. ready for his reception. The word is elsewhere almost always used of a person. Τὰ ἔσχατα — πόδρον. A proverbial expression. [Comp. 2 Pet. ii. 20, 21. Heb. vi. 4. x. 26.]

46. οἱ ἀδελφοί] i. e. either brethren, or kinsmen, i. e. cousins; for it is disputed whether these were the sons of Joseph and Mary, or of Joseph by a former wife; or of Mary's sister, the wife of Cleophas. The last is the ancient and more general opinion; and of this use of the term brother the Scriptures furnish many examples. Yet not a few modern Commentators maintain

MK. LU.

3. μου. Ὅστις γὰρ ἂν ποιήσῃ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρὸς μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρα-50
 35 νοῖς, αὐτὸς μου ἀδελφὸς καὶ ἀδελφὴ καὶ μήτηρ ἐστίν.
 4. 8. XIII. Ἐν δὲ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἐξεληθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκίας, 1
 1 4 ἐκάθητο παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν· καὶ συνήχθησαν πρὸς αὐτὸν ὄχλοι 2
 πολλοὶ, ὥστε αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ πλοῖον ἐμβάντα καθῆσθαι· καὶ πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος
 2 5 ἐπὶ τὸν αἰγιαλὸν εἰστήκει. Καὶ ἐλάλησεν αὐτοῖς πολλὰ ἐν παραβολαῖς, 3

that the word must be taken in the usual sense. See Note supra i. 25. *Εἰστήκεισαν* has the termination of a Pluperf. but the sense of a Perf., of which examples are adduced by Wets.

50. μου ἀδελφός, &c.] The Commentators notice the ellipsis of *ὡς, quasi*, and compare a similar one of the Heb. כִּי ; also adducing examples of a similar idiom in the Greek and Latin. But, as Fritz, has rightly remarked, no such ellipsis must here be supposed, which would destroy the force of the address.

XIII. 1. ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ] "at that time." See Lu. v. 17.

2. τὸ πλοῖον.] The Art. may denote either the vessel kept for Jesus, or one belonging to the Apostles; or, indeed, both. See Middlet.

3. παραβολαῖς.] The word *παραβολή*, in its general sense denotes, 1. a *juxta-position* of one thing with another; 2. a *comparison* of one with the other, in point of similarity or dissimilarity; 3. an *illustration* of any thing, resulting from a comparison of it with another thing. In *Rhetoric* it is defined, "that species of the *genus ALLEGORY*, which consists of a continued narration of real or fictitious events, applied, by way of simile, to the illustration of moral truth." In *Scripture*, it may be defined *generally* as a *similitude*, derived from natural things, in order to instruct men in things spiritual. In the O. T. it sometimes denotes merely a *proverb*, or *pithy apophthegm* (Heb. מִשְׁלֵי), and sometimes means a weighty truth, couched under *ænigma* or figure. In the N. T. it generally denotes a *fable* or *apologue*; namely, a narration applied, with more or less of *ænigma*, by way of simile, to the illustration of moral or religious truths. In this use, the parable consists of two parts: 1. the *Protasis*, conveying merely the LITERAL SENSE; 2. the *Apodosis*, which presents the *thing signified* by the similitude, the EXPLANATION, containing the *mystical* sense couched therein. The *second* part may be dispensed with, and was often omitted by our Lord, from the causes adverted to infra v. 13. The Parables of Christ were of two sorts: 1. such as contained illustrations of moral doctrines, and the duties of man to man; 2. what signified, though obscurely and *sub involucri*, the nature of the Gospel, and the future state of the Church. These could not be understood without the previous comprehension of things which required to be cleared by our Lord himself, or by the Holy Spirit, who was promised to guide them to all truth. For the *right explanation* of the Parables (especially when they are without the Apodosis), we must, 1. ascertain their *general scope* or design; which is to be collected from the context, and the occasion on which the parable was spoken; 2. we must first explain the *literal* or external sense, and then the *mystical* or internal; 3. we must avoid a too minute scrupulosity, by *pressing* on single words: nor must we aim at accommo-

dating every part to the general spiritual intent of the parable; since few correspond in every part to the thing compared, many circumstances being introduced which serve only (like drapery) for ornament. They may *suggest*, but they rarely *establish*, some *collateral* truth. They more frequently only serve to illustrate the general meaning, and invigorate the general effect. For this reason, no doctrine of any great moment should ever be extorted from particular passages in parables. Lastly, an attention to *historical* circumstances, as well as an acquaintance with the nature and properties of the things whence the similitudes are taken, the peculiar genius of the composition itself, and the local and national circumstances of the hearers—all these are of great importance to the interpretation of parables.

To advert briefly to the *reasons* why parabolic instruction was resorted to by our Lord, in preference to a more regular mode:—1. As it was the most antient mode of instruction, so it was the *customary* one throughout the East, and was well adapted to the character of the Eastern nations, where it is prevalent to this day. 2. It had many *advantages*, both to the *hearers* and to the *speaker*, because, as Mrs. H. More well observes, "it is naturally adapted to engage the attention, and is level with the capacity of all; and conveys moral or religious truths in a more vivid and impressive manner than the dry didactic mode; and by laying hold of the imagination, insinuates itself into the understanding and affections, and, while it opens the doctrine it professes to conceal, it gives no alarm to men's prejudices." So Maimonid. Port. Mos. p. 84. (cited by Wets.) "Non potest doceri vulgus. nisi per *ænigmata* et parabolas, ut ita communis sit ista docendi ratio mulieribus etiam puerisque et parvulis, quo, cum perfecti evaserint intellectus ipsorum, parabolarum istarum sensus dignoscunt." Nor was it so very *obscure* to attentive and inquiring auditors. And as to such as would neither exercise attention and thought, nor seek elucidation from the speaker,—they must be presumed to be *indisposed* to receive the instruction, and consequently *unworthy* of it. This mode had also the advantage, as far as it was really obscure, of exercising, and consequently invigorating, the understanding. And it was never the intention of God that man should attain *heavenly* knowledge any more than *earthly*, without pains and attention. Parabolical instruction was therefore adopted, among other reasons, in order, (to use the words of Justin Martyr cited by Grot.) ὥστε καὶ πονησαί τοις ζητοῦντας εἶσθαι καὶ μαθεῖν. And it is well remarked by Artemidor. 4. 70. p. 336., cited by me in Rec. Syn., Καὶ γὰρ εἰκός τοις Θεοῦς τὰ πολλὰ δι' αἰνυμάτων λέγειν, ἐπειδὴ, σφώτεροι ὄντες ἡμῶν αὐτῶν, οὐδὲν ἡμᾶς ἀβασιάντως βολδοῖται μανθάνειν. "To the teacher this mode had the advantage of being well adapted to veil unwelcome truths or hard sayings, till the hearers should be able to bear them;" and, in the case of our Lord, to

	MK.	LU.
4 λέγων· Ἰδοὺ ἐξῆλθεν ὁ σπείρων τοῦ σπείρειν. Καὶ ἐν τῷ σπείρειν	4	8.
αὐτὸν, ἃ μὲν ἔπεσε παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν· καὶ ἦλθε τὰ πετεινὰ καὶ κατέφα-	4	
5 γεν αὐτά. Ἄλλα δὲ ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τὰ πετρῶδη, ὅπου οὐκ εἶχε γῆν πολλήν·	5	6
6 καὶ εὐθὺς ἐξανέτειλε, διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν βάθος γῆς· ἡλίου δὲ ἀνατεί-	6	
7 λαντος, ἐκαυματίσθη, καὶ, διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ῥίζαν, ἐξηράνθη. Ἄλλα δὲ	7	7
ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τὰς ἀκάνθας· καὶ ἀνέβησαν αἱ ἄκαιθαι καὶ ἀπέπνιξαν		
8 αὐτά. Ἄλλα δὲ ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν τὴν καλὴν· καὶ ἐδίδου καρπὸν,	8	8
9 ὃ μὲν ἑκατὸν, ὃ δὲ ἐξήκοντα, ὃ δὲ τριάκοντα. Ὁ ἔχων ὅσα ἀκούειν,	9	
10 ἀκουέτω! Καὶ προσελθόντες οἱ μαθηταὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ· Διαιτὴν ἐν παρα-	10	9
11 βολαῖς λαλεῖς αὐτοῖς; Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Ὅτι ὑμῶν δέ-	11	10
δοται γινῶναι τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν, ἐκείνοις δὲ οὐ		
12 δέδοται. Ὅστις γὰρ ἔχει, δοθήσεται αὐτῷ, καὶ περισσευθήσεται· ὅστις		
13 δὲ οὐκ ἔχει, καὶ ὃ ἔχει, ἀρθήσεται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ. Διὰ τοῦτο ἐν παρα-		

shield him from the malice of the Scribes and Pharisees; who would have laid hold on any express declarations which they could turn to his prejudice.

—δ σπείρων.] The Art. (as Middlet. remarks) here gives the participle the nature of a substantive, i. e. *σπορεύς*, which was unknown to the LXX. This is not a Hebraism, but is frequent in the Greek Classical writers. See Matth. Gr. Gr. § 269.

5. τὰ πετρῶδη.] Sub. *χωρία*, (which is expressed in Thuc. iv. 9.), "stony or rocky ground."

6. ἐκαυματίσθη.] In Palestine, during the seed time (which is in November), the sky is generally overspread with clouds. The seed then springs up even in stony places; but when the sun dissipates the clouds, having outgrown its strength, it is quickly dried away. (Rosenm.)

7. ἐπὶ τὰς ἀκάνθας] "among thorns;" or rather, upon thorny ground. So Polyæn. p. 615. *χωρὸν ἀκανθῶδες*. Bp. Middlet. has not said anything on the force of the Art. in this and the following verse. It may be considered an insertion in reference; and that reference should seem to be the thorny ground, and the good ground, as parts of a whole, namely of the field to be sown.

8. ἐδίδου] "gave, yielded." This sense of *δίδομι* is frequent in the Classical writers.

—ἑκατόν.] This immense produce is not unexampled. See Rec Syn. It is not, however, necessary to press on the expression, since a most abundant harvest is all that is required to be supposed.

11. μυστήρια.] This does not mean things entirely beyond the reach of the human understanding. The word (from *μύειν*, to shut up) properly denotes something hidden, withheld, and therefore unknown, either wholly or partly. For all mystery has been well said to be imperfect knowledge. Here, and elsewhere in the N. T., it denotes something disclosed only to certain persons, and not revealed to the multitude; namely, in the present case, the things concerning the plan of salvation, which had not yet been revealed, and were partly opened out in our Lord's explanations of his parables. Thus we are to understand this (as Walch, cited by Koehler, observes) not so much of the doctrines of the Christian religion as "de statu fatisque ecclesiæ sub œconomia Novi Fœderis futuris." So that there may be (as Dr. A. Clarke supposes)

a reference to the prophetic declarations concerning the future state of the Christian Church, expressed in the following and other parables. Of course, the rejection of the Jews, and the calling of the Gentiles, are included in these mysteries; and those were gradually disclosed to the disciples, "as they could bear them," first by our Lord, and then by the Spirit, which was sent to guide them into all truth. These were things not in themselves obscure, nor withheld from any desire to conceal necessary truth; but only because the things in question were, for various reasons, not proper to be then communicated to all; but reserved, in their complete explication, for the οἱ ἰσωτετικοὶ of the disciples.

12. ὅστις γὰρ ἔχει—ἀβυσσῶν.] This adage partaking of the *oxymoron* (which has a twofold application), properly (and as it was, no doubt, commonly used) has reference to worldly riches; for οἱ ἔχοντες and οἱ οὐκ ἔχοντες, (scil. *χορήματα*) is a frequent phrase in the Classical writers to denote the *have-somethings*, and the *have-nothings*, the rich and the poor. And, in this view, the adage can little need explication. Here, however, it is transferred to spiritual riches; and under it is couched the lesson, — that he who hath considerable religious knowledge, and takes that care to improve it, with which men are observed to increase their *wealth*, will find it increase; while those who have but little, and manage it, as the poor are often observed to do, imprudently, will find it come to nought. The little he hath learned will slip out of his memory; he will be deprived of it, and, in that sense, it will be taken from him.

13. διὰ τοῦτο—λαλοῦ.] The Jews, as we have seen, were addressed in parables, because their hardened wickedness and blind obstinacy had *indisposed* them to receive instruction of a more explicit kind. For we are by no means to understand from this and v. 15. μήποτε ἴθωσι τοῖς δευθαλομοῖς &c. that our Lord spake in parables, *in order* to cause the blindness and obstinacy, and therefore occasion the final condemnation of the Jews. The words, when properly interpreted, involve nothing incompatible with the justice and mercy of the All Good and Perfect Being; the true sense being, that the hearts of the men were so hardened by a long course of wilful and presumptuous sin, that, according to the regular operation of moral causes and effects, they,

MK. LU.

4. 8 *βολαῖς* αὐτοῖς λαλῶ· ὅτι βλέποντες οὐ βλέπουσι, καὶ ἀκούοντες οὐκ ἀκούουσιν, οὐδὲ σπιοῦσι. Καὶ ἀναπληροῦνται [ἐπ'] αὐτοῖς ἡ προφη- 14
 12 τεία Ἰσαίου ἡ λέγουσα· Ἀκοῆν ἀκούσετε, καὶ οὐ μὴ συνῆτε· καὶ βλέποντες βλέψετε, καὶ οὐ μὴ ἴδητε. Ἐπαχύνθη 15
 γὰρ ἡ καρδία τοῦ λιοῦ τούτου, καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶ βαρέως ἤκουσαν, καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν ἐκάμυσαν· μήποτε ἴδωσι τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς, καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν ἀκού-
 σωσι, καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ * συνῶσι, καὶ ἐπιστρέψωσι, καὶ ἰάσωμαι αὐτούς. Ἰμῶν δὲ μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοί, ὅτι βλέπουσι· 16
 καὶ τὰ ὅτι ἔμω, ὅτι ἀκούει! Ἀμὴν γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι πολλοὶ 17
 προφητῶν καὶ δικαίων ἐπεθύμησαν ἰδεῖν ἃ βλέπετε, καὶ οὐκ εἶδον· καὶ
 ἀκοῦσαι ἃ ἀκούετε, καὶ οὐκ ἤκουσαν. Ἰμῶν οὖν ἀκούσατε τὴν παρα- 18
 15 12 βολὴν τοῦ σπειρόντος. Παντὸς ἀκούοντος τὸν λόγον τῆς βασιλείας, 19
 16 13 καὶ μὴ συνιέντος, ἔρχεται ὁ ποτηρὸς καὶ ἀρπάζει τὸ ἐσπαρμένον ἐν τῇ
 17 14 καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ· οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν σπαρεῖς. Ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τὰ 20
 πετρῶδη σπαρεῖς, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τὸν λόγον ἀκούων, καὶ εὐθύς μετὰ
 17 15 χαρᾶς λαμβάνων αὐτόν· οὐκ ἔχει δὲ ῥίζαν ἐν ἑαυτῷ, ἀλλὰ πρόσκαιρός 21
 ἐστὶ· γενομένης δὲ θλίψεως ἢ διωγμοῦ διὰ τὸν λόγον, εὐθύς σκανδα-

though *seeing*, in fact, did not see; and though hearing, yet, in fact, did not hear, nor harken, and consequently could not understand. The expression is a proverbial one, common to both the Scriptural and the Classical writers, and used of those who employ not to advantage the faculties of seeing or perceiving, hearing or understanding, and laying to heart. Thus the general sense of the passage of Isaiah now adduced is, that the Jews would hear indeed the doctrines of the Gospel, but not *understand* them; would see the miracles wrought in confirmation of its truth, but not be *convinced* thereby. Not that the evidences themselves were insufficient to establish its truth, but because their hearts were too corrupt to allow them to see the force of those evidences.

14. καὶ ἀναπληροῦνται] i. e. 'is again fulfilled,' by the similar blind obstinacy of the same people. This is by some regarded as what Spanh. calls the secondary and improper use of the formula, by analogy, or example, when a thing happens similar to one that has formerly been done, said, or predicted. There is, however, no reason why it may not be understood of a second fulfilment.

— ἀκοῆν ἀκούετε.] This is called a Hebraism, though examples have been adduced from the Greek Classical writers. The idiom almost always carries emphasis. Ἐπὶ before ἀκ. is marked for omission, or cancelled, by almost all the Editors; and on the strongest grounds, it being omitted in most MSS. and Versions.

15. ἐπαχύνθη] Παχύνω and its derivatives (like *pinguis* in Latin) are often used of *stupidity*, from a notion common to all ages, that fat tends to mental dullness. But as with us *stupidity* is colloquially used in the sense *obstinacy*, so here both senses seem to be meant.

— ἐκάμυσαν.] Καμῦναι is for καταμῦναι, and means, to close the eyelids; literally, to shut down the eyelids, in order to avoid seeing a thing. The word is confined to the later writers, the

earlier ones using the uncontracted form, either with or without ὀφθαλμοῖς. Of course, the eye of the *understanding* is here meant. So Philo p. 589. cited by Loesn. καμν. τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς ὄμμα. The figurative closing of the ears (adverted to in the corresponding words of the following clause) is here *implied*. That would require the term *ἔβυσαν*. So in a very ancient life of St. Luke we have (probably with allusion to this passage) Πρὸς δὲ τὴν ἀληθινὴν διδασκαλίαν τὰ τῆς καρδίας ἔβυσον ὅσα, καὶ τὰ τῆς διανοίας ὄμματα. See also Euthymius. Μήποτε, for ἵνα μὴ; *adeo non*, in the eventual sense, as in John xii. 40. It is implied, in the following words that this blindness would continue till the destruction of the Jewish state: Συνῶσι. This is found in very many MSS., and is edited by Matth., Griesb., Vater, and Fritz.

16. μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοί.] A mode of speaking common to the poetic or the pathetic and spirited style, in every language. See Lu. xi. 27. x. 23. Matt. xvi. 17.

18. ἀκούσατε τὴν παραβολὴν.] "or attend ye, therefore, to the (explanation) parable."

19. μὴ συνιέντος] i. e. and does not lay it to heart so as to understand it; by metonymy of cause for effect. This signification is of frequent occurrence in the Sept. Παντὸς ἀκούοντος may, with Fritz., be rendered "quicumque audit." Perhaps, however, it is a Hebraism.

— δ — σπαρεῖς.] He who is such may metaphorically be called a man sown by the way-side. A man may be termed sown (*σπαρεῖς*) on the same principle that we call a field sown, which receives the seed. We may render, "he who is sown on the way-side." For (as appears from the next verse) the man is compared to the *field*, not to the seed.

20. [Comp. Isai. lviii. 2. John v. 35.]

21. οὐκ ἔχει ῥίζαν.] It is properly the word that hath no root in itself. Comp. Col. ii. 7. Eph. iii. 13. But, per *hypallagen*, it is transferred to the *person*. We may paraphrase, "but he does

		MK.	LU.
22	λίξεται. Ὁ δὲ εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας σπαρεῖς, οὕτως ἐστὶν ὁ τὸν λόγον ἀκού-	4.	8.
	ων· καὶ ἡ μέριμνα τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, καὶ ἡ ἀπίατη τοῦ πλοῦτου	18	14
23	συμπνίγει τὸν λόγον, καὶ ἄκαρπος γίνεται. Ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν τὴν	20	12
	καλὴν σπαρεῖς, οὕτως ἐστὶν ὁ τὸν λόγον ἀκούων καὶ σπυῖων· ὃς δὴ		
	καρποφορεῖ, καὶ ποιεῖ ὁ μὲν ἑκατὸν, ὁ δὲ ἐξήκοντα, ὁ δὲ τριάκοντα.		
24	Ἄλλην παραβολὴν παρέθηκεν αὐτοῖς, λέγων· Ὡμοιώθη ἡ βασιλεία		
	τῶν οὐρανῶν ἀνθρώπῳ σπείροντι καλὸν σπέρμα ἐν τῷ ἄγρῳ αὐτοῦ·		
25	ἐν δὲ τῷ καθεύδειν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, ἦλθεν αὐτοῦ ὁ ἐχθρὸς καὶ		
26	ἔσπειρε ζιζάνια ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ σίτου, καὶ ἀπήλθεν. Ὅτε δὲ ἐβλάστη-		
27	σεν ὁ χόρτος, καὶ καρπὸν ἐποίησε, τότε ἐφάνη καὶ τὰ ζιζάνια. Προσ-		
	ελθόντες δὲ οἱ δούλοι τοῦ οἰκοδεσπότου, εἶπον αὐτῷ· Κύριε, οὐχὶ		
	καλὸν σπέρμα ἔσπειρας ἐν τῷ σῷ ἄγρῳ; πόθεν οὖν ἔχει [τὰ] ζιζάνια;		
28	Ὁ δὲ ἔφη αὐτοῖς· Ἐχθρὸς ἀνθρώπου τοῦτο ἐποίησεν. Οἱ δὲ δούλοι		
29	εἶπον αὐτῷ· Θέλεις οὖν ἀπελθόντες συλλέξωμεν αὐτά; Ὁ δὲ ἔφη·		
	Οὐ· μήποτε συλλέγοντες τὰ ζιζάνια, ἐκριζώσητε ἅμα αὐτοῖς τὸν σίτον.		
30	Ἄφετε συναυξάνεσθαι ἀμφοτέρα μέχρι τοῦ θερισμοῦ· καὶ ἐν [τῷ]		
	καιρῷ τοῦ θερισμοῦ ἐρῶ τοῖς θερισταῖς· Συλλέξτε πρῶτον τὰ ζιζάνια,		
	καὶ δήσατε αὐτά εἰς δέσμας, πρὸς τὸ κατακαῦσαι αὐτά· τὸν δὲ σῖτον		
	συναγάγετε εἰς τὴν ἀποθήκην μου.	13.	
31	Ἄλλην παραβολὴν παρέθηκεν αὐτοῖς, λέγων· Ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασι-	31	19
	λεία τῶν οὐρανῶν κόκκῳ σινάπεως, ὃν λαβὼν ἀνθρώπος ἔσπειρεν ἐν		
32	τῷ ἄγρῳ αὐτοῦ· ὁ μικρότερον μὲν ἐστὶ πάντων τῶν σπερμάτων· ὅταν	32	
	δὲ αὐξηθῆ, μείζον τῶν λαχάνων ἐστὶ, καὶ γίνεται δένδρον, ὥστε ἐλθεῖν		
	τὰ πειρὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ κατασκηνοῦν ἐν τοῖς κλάδοις αὐτοῦ.		
33	Ἄλλην παραβολὴν ἐλάλησεν αὐτοῖς· Ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν	21	
	οὐρανῶν ζύμῃ, ἣν λαβοῦσα γυνὴ ἐνέκρυπεν εἰς ἀλεύρου σάτα τρία, ἕως		
	οὔ ἔξυ ἰώθη ὄλον.		

not suffer it to take deep root in his mind." *Πρόσκαιρος*, scil. *μόνον*, "is but a temporary and unstable disciple." *Σκανδαλίζεται*, "takes offence at, and falls off from the Gospel."

22. ἡ μέριμνα] "anxious care." So called because *μερίζει τὸν νοῦν*, it distracts the mind with worldly cares, and so dissipates the attention, as not to leave us (in the words of Gray) "leisure to be wise," or to attend to the concerns of the soul.

23. ὁ δὲ — σπαρεῖς.] "He who is represented as one that received seed into the good ground." "Ὁς καρποφορεῖ is to be referred, not to the word, but to the person in whose heart the word is sown. Thus is adumbrated the different effect of the Gospel on different hearts.

25. τοὺς ἀνθρώπους.] Euthym., Whitby, Beng., and Wakef. understand this to denote "the men whose duty it was to take care of the field." But that is very harsh; neither was it customary to keep watch in fields, except when the corn was far advanced to maturity. It is, therefore, better to suppose, with Grot., that ἐν τ. καθ. ἁ. is meant for a description of night.

— ζιζάνια.] The Commentators are not agreed what plant is here intended. It is with most probability supposed to be the *darnel*, or *lolium*

temulentum of Linnæus, which grows among corn, and has, in the ear, much resemblance to wheat; but is of a deleterious quality, and therefore deserves the epithet *infelix*, given by Virgil.

27. τὰ ζιζάνια.] The Art. is not found in many MSS. and some Versions and Fathers, and is cancelled by almost all the Editors from Wets. to Scholz.

30. τῷ.] This is not found in many MSS. and early Editions with the Syr. Vers. and Epiphanius, and is cancelled by Wets., Math., Griesb., Knapp., Vater, and Scholz. Middlet. and Fritz., however, disapprove of the omission; though on different grounds, and each resting too much on Grammatical niceties, to which the Sacred writers were little attentive.

32. ὁ μικρότερον.] This, the Commentators say, is for *μικρότατον*; as just after *μείζον* is for *μέγιστον*, by an idiom familiar to the Evangelists, and probably derived from Hebraism. Fritz., however, remarks that this principle has been of late exploded. The phrase was proverbial with the Jews to denote a very small thing.

33. ζύμη] i. e. leaven, or sour dough, which assimilates to its own nature the mass with which it is mixed. Thus is represented the nature of

MK.

4.

33

34

Ταῦτα πάντα ἐλάλησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν παραβολαῖς τοῖς ὄχλοις· καὶ 34
χωρὶς παραβολῆς οὐκ ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς. Ὅπως πληρωθῆι τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ 35
τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος· Ἀνοίξω ἐν παραβολαῖς τὸ στόμα μου· ἐρεῦ-
ξομαι κεκρυμμένα ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου.

Τότε ἀφῆς τοὺς ὄχλους, ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν ὁ Ἰησοῦς· καὶ προσ- 36
ῆλθον αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, λέγοντες· Φηάσων ἡμῖν τὴν παραβολὴν
τῶν ζιζανίων τοῦ ἀγροῦ. Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Ὁ σπείρων 37
τὸ καλὸν σπέρμα ἔστιν ὁ Τίος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου· ὁ δὲ ἀγρὸς ἔστιν ὁ 38
κόσμος· τὸ δὲ καλὸν σπέρμα, οὗτοί εἰσι· οἱ υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας· τὰ δὲ
ζιζάνια, εἰσὶν οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ πονηροῦ. Ὁ δὲ ἐχθρὸς ὁ σπείρας αὐτὰ 39
ἔστιν ὁ Διάβολος· ὁ δὲ θερισμὸς συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος ἔστιν· οἱ δὲ
θεριστὰὶ ἄγγελοι εἰσι. Ὡσπερ οὖν συλλέγεται τὰ ζιζάνια καὶ πυγὰ 40
* καίεται· οὕτως ἔσται ἐν τῇ συντελείᾳ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου. Ἀποστελεῖ 41
ὁ Τίος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τοὺς ἄγγελους αὐτοῦ· καὶ συλλέξουσιν ἐκ τῆς
βασίλειας αὐτοῦ πάντα τὰ σκάνδαλα, καὶ τοὺς ποιοῦντας τὴν ἀνομίαν·
καὶ βαλοῦσιν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν κίμινον τοῦ πυρός. ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλανθ- 42
μὸς καὶ ὁ βρονγμὸς τῶν ὀδοτόων. Τότε οἱ δίκαιοι ἐκλάμπουσιν, ὡς 43
ὁ ἥλιος, ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῶν. Ὁ ἔχων ὅτα ἀκούει,
ἀκουέτω!

Πάλιν ὁμοία ἔστιν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν θησαυροῦ κεκρυμμένῳ 44
ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ. ὃν εὐρῶν ἄνθρωπος ἔκρυψε, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς χαρᾶς αὐτοῦ
ὑπάγει καὶ πάντα ὅσα ἔχει πωλεῖ, καὶ ἀγοράζει τὸν ἀγρὸν ἐκεῖνον.

o Gen. 3. 15.
John. 8. 44.
Acts 13. 10.
1 John 3. 8.

p Rev. 14. 15.
Joel 3. 13.

q Supr. 8. 12.

r Wisd. 3. 7.
Dan. 12. 3.
supr. ver. 9.

the influence of the Gospel on the minds of men, as in the preceding parable is shadowed forth the wide propagation of the Gospel from the very smallest beginnings.

34. χωρὶς παραβολῆς, &c.] This is by some restricted to *that time*, and the auditors *then* with Christ. By others it is, with more probability, regarded as importing, in a general way, that our Lord used parables very frequently.

35. ἀνοίξω — κόσμου.] From Ps. lxxvii. (78) 2., but not exactly agreeing either with the Hebrew or Greek. Though ἐρεῖξομαι might then be in the text of the Sept.; and φθῆγξομαι, the present reading, may be a gloss. The words are admitted to be not quoted by the Evangelist as a prophecy, but to be accommodated to the present purpose. Ἐρεῖγασθαι is properly used of the gushing forth of fluids, but metaphorically, of free and earnest speech.

— ἀπὸ καταβολῆς.] The term is properly used of the founding of buildings, but applied occasionally by the Classical writers to the beginning of any thing. It was especially used of the *world*, because, according to the common notion of ancient times, the world was thought to be an immense *plain surface*, resting on foundations.

36. τὴν οἰκίαν] i. e. the house he had left, at Capernaum.

38. τὸ δὲ καλὸν σπέρμα, &c.] “as to the good seed.” Οἷτοι are accommodated in construction to *υἱοί*, though referring to *σπέρμα*. Perhaps, however, *σπέρμα* is considered as a noun of multitude.

40. καίεται.] Such is the reading of almost all the MSS. and early Editions, and is adopted by almost every Editor from Wets. downwards. The

common reading *κατακαίεται* was probably derived from the Scholiasts.

— ἐν τῇ συντελείᾳ τοῦ αἰῶνος.] This is by some interpreted of the *end of the age*, i. e. the Jewish polity and state. But though that sense of the phrase has place elsewhere, the context must here limit it to the *final consummation of things*. The *other sense* may, however, be *included*.

41. σκάνδαλα.] Σκάνδαλον signifies a stumbling block, either naturally or metaphorically, i. e. whatever occasions any one to err, in his principles or practice. Here, however, as it is joined with *τοὺς ποιοῦντας*, it must denote, not *things*, but *persons*, i. e. false teachers, such as are censured by Peter and Jude; who, under the semblance of Christian liberty, inculcated doctrines repugnant to moral virtue, and held vice to be among the *ἀδιάφορα*, or things indifferent.

42. βαλοῦσιν — πυρός.] An allusion to the Oriental custom of burning alive, mentioned in Dan. iii. 10. The expression is equivalent to *γένερα τοῦ πυρός*, Matth. v. 22.

43. ἐκλάμπουσιν — αὐτῶν.] Our Lord seems to have had in mind Dan. xii. 3. Comp. Wets. iii. 7. Eccles. ix. 11. 1 Mac. ii. 62. 1 Pet. v. 4. (Mackn.)

44. θησαυροῦ κεκρυμμένῳ] i. e. such valuables as, in the insecurity of society in ancient times, men were accustomed to bury in the earth, on the expectation of invasion from an enemy. From the present passage, and one cited by Wets. from the Mishna, it appears that the Jewish law adjudged all treasure found on land to be the right of the then proprietor of the land.

— ἐκρυψε] i. e. either, “covers it up (again),” or, conceals (his good fortune). Bp. Midd.

- 45 *Πάλιν ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ἀνθρώπῳ ἐμπόρῳ ζη-*
 46 *τοῦντι καλοὺς μαργαρίτας· ὃς εὐρὼν ἕνα πολῦτιμον μαργαρίτην, ἀπελ-*
θὼν πέπρακε πάντα ὅσα εἶχε, καὶ ἠγόρασεν αὐτόν.
- 47 *Πάλιν ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν σαγήνῃ βληθείσῃ εἰς*
 48 *τὴν θάλασσαν, καὶ ἐκ παντὸς γένους συναγαγούσῃ· ἣν, ὅτε ἐπληρώθη,*
 49 *ἀναβιβάσαντες ἐπὶ τὸν αἰγιαλόν, καὶ καθίσαντες συνέλεξαν τὰ κατὰ εἰς*
 50 *ἀγγεῖα, τὰ δὲ σαπρὰ ἔξω ἔβαλον. * Οὕτως ἔσται ἐν τῇ συντελείᾳ τοῦ* u Infr. 25. 32.
 51 *αἰῶνος. ἐξελεύσονται οἱ ἄγγελοι, καὶ ἀφοριοῦσι τοὺς πονηροὺς ἐκ μέσου*
 52 *τῶν δικαίων, ἔ καὶ βαλοῦσιν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν κείμενον τοῦ πυρός. ἐκεῖ* t Sup. ver. 42.
 53 *ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων. Λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰη-*
 54 *σοῦς· Συνήκατε ταῦτα πάντα; λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· Ναὶ, κύριε. Ὁ δὲ*
 55 *εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Διὰ τοῦτο πᾶς γραμματεὺς μαθητευθεὶς εἰς τὴν βασι-*
 56 *λείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν ὁμοίός ἐστιν ἀνθρώπῳ οἰκοδεσπότῃ, ὅστις ἐκβάλλει*
 57 *ἐκ τοῦ θησαυροῦ αὐτοῦ καινὰ καὶ παλαιά.*
- 58 *Καὶ ἐγένετο, ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὰς παραβολὰς ταύτας, μετῴρην*
 59 *ἐκεῖθεν·* u καὶ ἐλθὼν εἰς τὴν πατριδα αὐτοῦ, ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ u Mark 6. 1, 2.
 60 *συναγωγῇ αὐτῶν· ὥστε ἐκπλήττεσθαι αὐτοὺς καὶ λέγειν· Πόθεν τοῦ-*
 61 *τοι ἡ σοφία αὕτη καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις;* x Οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τοῦ τέκτονος x John 6. 42.
 62 *υῖος; οὐχὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ λέγεται Μαριάμ, καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ Ἰά-* supr. 12. 46.
 63 *κώβος καὶ Ἰωσήs καὶ Σίμων καὶ Ἰούδας; καὶ αἱ ἀδελφαὶ αὐτοῦ οὐχ* Mark 6. 3.

would, from some MSS., cancel the Art. at τοῦ ἀγορῶ. And indeed it is not easy to see what sense it can have. It must not, however, be cancelled on such slender authority; and idioms, though difficult to be accounted for, are not therefore to be swept away.

45. ἀνθρώπῳ ἐμπόρῳ] “a merchant.” Such as those found in the East, who travel about buying or exchanging jewels, pearls or other valuables; a custom illustrated by the citations in Wets. The ἀνθρώπῳ added is agreeable to an idiom found chiefly in the earliest writers, but not infrequent in Hellenistic Greek, by which the substantive is treated as an adjective. And ἐμπ. was originally an adjective.

—μαργαρίτας.] With respect to the origin of this word, it is justly remarked by Bp. Marsh, that as pearls are the produce of the East, it is more reasonable to suppose that the Greeks borrowed the word from the Orientalists, than the contrary, which is the common opinion. The great value of pearls appears from what is said by Pliny.

47. σαγήνη] verriculum, a drag net, which, when sunk, and dragged to the shore, sweeps as it were the bottom. The word occurs in Ez. xxvi. 5 & 14. for the Heb. סַגְרָה. and in Æschyl., Ælian, Artemid., and other later writers. At ἐκ παντὸς γένους sub. τιῶν or τῶν: not, however, understanding, with Kuin., other things besides fish, but supplying ἰχθυῖδια or ἰχθυῖον.

48. τὰ σαπρὰ] “the refuse.” A vox sol. de h. re. See vii. 17. and Note. *Ἐξω has no reference, as Kuin. and others suppose, to the baskets; but simply denotes away.

49. ἐκ μέσου.] This is thought to be redundant. But see Fritz.

52. διὰ τοῦτο.] The Commentators regard this either as redundant, or, which is much the same thing, as a formula transitionis. But it rather

seems to denote an inference from what has preceded, and may be rendered *Wherefore then, since that is the case;* thus ushering in an admonition to use the knowledge they have.

—γραμματεῖς.] The term properly denotes a doctor of the Jewish law, but here, a teacher of the Gospel; the name being transferred, from similarity of office. See Vitringa de Synag.

—μαθητευθεὶς εἰς τὴν βασιλ. τ. ο.] Griesb., Knapp, and Vater, and Fritz. edit. τῇ βασιλείᾳ; but on too slight authority. The phrase may be rendered, “discipled into the kingdom of heaven, or, “admitted by discipleship into the Christian society.” See xxiii. 34. xxviii. 19. Acts xiv. 21. and an admirable Visitation Sermon of Bp. Blomfield on this text. If however, τῇ βασιλείᾳ be the true reading, the sense will be, “instructed for,” “disciplined to,” i. e. completely acquainted with the nature and purposes of the Gospel. At καινὰ and παλαιὰ we may sub. βρώματα or σκεῆη. It is, however, not necessary to too much scrutinize these words; which simply denote such provisions, or other necessities, as the household may think suitable to the wants of his family; both what he has long laid up, and what he has recently provided. The application, in reference to the Christian teacher, is obvious. See Rec. Synop.

54. πατριδα] scil. πόλιν, i. e. Nazareth, the place where he had been brought up, and which was therefore, in a certain sense, his country.

55. οὗτος.] The use of this pronoun here, as often in the Classical writers, implies contempt, like the Heb. הַזֶּה; and Latin iste.

—τοῦ τέκτονος.] The word τέκτων denotes an artificer, or artisan, as opposed to a laborer; and, according to the term accompanying it, may denote any artificer, whether in wood, stone, or metal. But when it stands alone, it always denotes a carpenter, (as faber and שַׂרְהַר) in the

γ Mark 6. 4.
Luke 4. 24.
John 4. 44.

πᾶσαι πρὸς ἡμᾶς εἰσι; πόθεν οὖν τούτω ταῦτα πάντα; ^γ Καὶ ἔσκαν- 57
δαλίζοντο ἐν αὐτῷ. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Οὐκ ἔστι προφήτης
ἄτιμος, εἰ μὴ ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ. ^δ Καὶ οὐκ 58
ἐποίησεν ἐκεῖ δυνάμεις πολλὰς διὰ τὴν ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν.

z Mark 6. 5.
MK. LU.
6. 9.
14 7

XIV. ἘΝ ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ ἤκουσεν Ἡρώδης ὁ τετραρχῆς τὴν ἀκοὴν 1
Ἰησοῦ, καὶ εἶπε τοῖς παισὶν αὐτοῦ· Οὗτός ἐστιν Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιστής· 2
αὐτὸς ἠγέρθη ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο αἱ δυνάμεις ἐνεργοῦσιν
ἐν αὐτῷ. Ὁ γὰρ Ἡρώδης κρατήσας τὸν Ἰωάννην, ἔδησεν αὐτὸν καὶ 3
ἔθετο ἐν φυλακῇ, διὰ Ἡρωδιάδα τὴν γυναῖκα Φιλίππου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ
αὐτοῦ. ἔλεγε γὰρ αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰωάννης· Οὐκ ἔξεστί σοι ἔχειν αὐτήν. Καὶ 4
θέλων αὐτὸν ἀποκτεῖναι, ἐφοβήθη τὸν ἄγλον, ὅτι ὡς προφήτην αὐτὸν 5
εἶχον. Γενεσίων δὲ ἀγομένων τοῦ Ἡρώδου, ὠρχήσατο ἡ θυγάτηρ τῆς 6
Ἡρωδιάδος ἐν τῷ μέσῳ, καὶ ἤρесе τῷ Ἡρώδῃ· ὅθεν μεθ' ὄρκου ὡμο- 7
λόγησεν αὐτῇ δοῦναι ὃ ἐὰν αἰτήσῃται. Ἡ δὲ προβίβασθεῖσα ὑπὸ τῆς 8
μητρὸς αὐτῆς· Δός μοι, φησὶν, ὅδε ἐπὶ πίνακι τὴν κεφαλὴν Ἰωάννου
26 τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ. Καὶ ἐλπηθή ὁ βασιλεύς· διὰ δὲ τοὺς ὄρκους καὶ 9

Scriptural, and, almost always, in the Classical writers. (Campb.) That such is the sense here intended, cannot reasonably be doubted; especially as it is supported by the concurrent testimony of ancient ecclesiastical writers.

57. οὐκ ἔστι προφήτης—αὐτοῦ.] A proverbial sentiment, importing, that one whose endowments enable him to instruct others, is, no where so little held in honor, as among his townsmen and immediate connexions.

58. οὐκ ἐποίησεν—αὐτῶν.] "Christ did not judge it suitable to obtrude his miracles upon them, and so could not properly perform them."

XIV. 1. τὴν ἀκοὴν Ἰησοῦ, i. e. περὶ τοῦ Ἰ.

2. παισίν.] This, by a use frequent in the Sept., is supposed to denote *friends*. But it rather signifies *ministers, officers* (namely of his Court.)

—αἱ δυνάμεις ἐνεργ. ἐν α.] To account for the Art. here, Bp. Middleton would render "the powers, or spirits, are active in him." But the arguments he adduces are rather specious than solid; and there seems to be no reason to abandon the common interpretation of *δυνάμεις, miracles*. *Ἐνεργ.* may be taken, with most expositors, for *ἐνεργοῦνται*, "miracles are effected by him." But perhaps it is better, with Beza, Wakef., Schleus., and Fritz., to retain the *active* sense, and take *δυνάμεις* of the power of working miracles, as in Acts vi. 8. x. 38., by which the Art. may very well be accounted for.

3—13. In this Episodical digression, recounting the imprisonment and death of John the Baptist, the Aorists must be rendered as Pluperfects. On which see Winck. and Alts. Grammars of the N. T.

4. ἔχειν] for *γαμῆν*. A use frequent in the Classical writers, like that of *habere* in Latin.

6. γενεσίων ἀγομένων.] The Commentators are not agreed, whether this expression should be understood of the *birthday* festival of Herod, or that in *commemoration* of his accession. That the latter was observed as a feast, is certain from Joseph. Ant. xv. 11. 3. (of Herod) and 1 Kings i. 8 & 9. Hos. vii. 5. Since, however, no exam-

ples of this sense of the word *γενεσία* have been adduced, the common interpretation is the safer; and that the antients, both Jews and Gentiles, kept their birthdays as days of great rejoicing, is certain from a variety of passages cited by Wets. At *γενεσίων* some supply *συμποσίων*; others, *ἡμερῶν*. The latter is preferable, as in the phrase *ἀγην ἑορτήν*. Yet no ellipsis is necessary, or indeed proper, since *γενεσία*, and also *ἐγκαίνια* and *γενεθλία*, (which is the term used by the earlier writers,) are in fact *nouns*. At least there is no *plena locutio* hitherto produced, which will determine what was originally the noun employed with them.

—ὠρχήσατο.] Most Commentators (as Grot. and Kuin.) here understand a pantomimic and lascivious dance, recently introduced into Judæa, such as that so severely censured by Juven. Sat. vi. 63. and Hor. Od. iii. 6, 21. Yet that Herod should have permitted, and even been gratified with, a lascivious dance by his *daughter-in-law*, would argue incredible indecorum and depravity. It is therefore better, with Lightf., Mich., and Fritz., to suppose that the dance was a decorous one, expressive of rejoicing, but from the extreme elegance with which it was performed, such as attracted admiration.

8. προβίβασθεῖσα] '*adducta*, urged, instigated.' A signification occurring in the Sept. and also Xen. Mem. i. 2. 17. προβιβ. λόγῳ. Πίνακι, a broad and flat plate or dish, not a *basin*, as Campb. renders; for from its origin (namely *πίνος*, a board) the word commonly denotes what is *flat*, or nearly so. Dr. Walsh, in his Travels in Turkey, informs us, that the head of the celebrated Ali Pacha, after being cut off, and sent to Constantinople, was publicly exposed on a *dish*.

9. ἀνεψύθη.] This is by Kuin. and Wahl. interpreted 'was angry;' of which sense they adduce examples from the Classical and Scriptural writers. But some of them are exceptionable; and here there seems no reason to deviate from the usual signification of the word, to be sorry. Though it *might* be rendered "he was chagrined." The feeling was doubtless a mixed one; *sorrow* (on his own account chiefly) and *chagrin*, not

	MK.	L.U.
10 τοὺς συναρκακισμένους, ἐκέλευσε δοθῆναι. Καὶ πέμψας ἀπεκεφάλισε τὸν	6.	9.
11 Ἰωάννην ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ. Καὶ ἠτέχθη ἡ κεφαλὴ αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ πίνακι, καὶ	27	28
12 ἐδόθη τῷ κορασίῳ· καὶ ἤνεγκε τῇ μητρὶ αὐτῆς. Καὶ προσελθόντες	29	
οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἦσαν τὸ σῶμα, καὶ ἔθραψαν αὐτό· καὶ ἐλθόντες ἀ-	32	
13 ἤγγειλαν τῷ Ἰησοῦ. Καὶ ἀκούσας ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ἀνεχώρησεν ἐκεῖθεν ἐν		
πλοίῳ εἰς ἔρημον τόπον κατ' ἰδίαν· καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ ὄχλοι, ἠκολού-	33	
θησαν αὐτῷ περὶ ἄπο τῶν πόλεων.		
14 Καὶ ἐξελθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶδε πολὺν ὄχλον, καὶ ἐσπλαγχνίσθη ἐπ'	34	11
15 * αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἐθεράπευσε τοὺς ἰσχυρόστους αὐτῶν. Ὁμίς δὲ γενομένης,	35	12
προσῆλθον αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, λέγοντες· Ἔρημός ἐστιν ὁ τόπος,		
καὶ ἡ ὥρα ἤδη παρήλθεν· ἀπόλυσον τοὺς ὄχλους, ἵνα ἀπελθόντες εἰς		
16 τὰς κώμας, ἀγοράσωσιν ἑαυτοῖς βρώματα. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς·	37	13
17 Οὐ χρειάν ἔχουσιν ἀπελθεῖν· δότε αὐτοῖς ὑμεῖς φαγεῖν. Οἱ δὲ λέγου-		
σιν αὐτῷ· Οὐκ ἔχομεν ὧδε, εἰ μὴ πέντε ἄρτους καὶ δύο ἰχθύας. Ὁ	38	
18 δὲ εἶπε· Φέρετέ μοι αὐτοὺς ὧδε. Καὶ κελεύσας τοὺς ὄχλους ἀνακλι-	39	14
θῆναι ἐπὶ τοὺς χόρτους, [καὶ] λαβὼν τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς δύο	41	16
ἰχθύας, ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν, ἐλόγησε· καὶ κλάσας ἔδωκε τοῖς		
20 μαθηταῖς τοὺς ἄρτους, οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ τοῖς ὄχλοις· καὶ ἔφαγον πάντες,	42	17
καὶ ἐχορτάσθησαν· καὶ ἦσαν τὸ περισσεῦον τῶν κλασμάτων δώδεκα	43	
21 κοφίνους πλήρεις. Οἱ δὲ ἐσθιοντες ἦσαν ἄνδρες ὡσεὶ πεντακισχίλιοι, 44		

without anger, at being thus taken advantage of; and even fear; — for he could not but feel apprehensive of the consequences of so unpopular an action. His chagrin may also, as Hammond thinks, have been increased by a superstitious dread of any ill omened occurrence on his birthday. So Martial Epigr. X. 37. "Natalem colimus, tacete lites." In short, great must have been the fluctuation of Herod's mind, occasioned by various contending passions and feelings in his bosom; which is well described by Grotius. *Διὰ τοῦς ἄρκους*, i. e. "out of a scruple to break his oath before his guests;" for at entertainments there was a delicacy in refusing requests.

10. *πέμψας*] scil. *τίνα*. That this is not a Hebraism, (as Rosenm. says) is plain from two Classical examples adduced in Rec. Synop.

13. *ἀκούσας*.] Namely, of John's death, and Herod's opinion of himself. On both which accounts, and also to avoid the imputation of blame for any disturbances which might be expected to follow such an atrocity, and likewise (as we learn from Mark) to refresh himself and his Apostles after their fatigue, our Lord sought retirement. *Περὶ*. Not "on foot," but "by land," as opposed to *ἐν πλοίῳ*. See Campb. This signification is frequent in the Classical writers, and sometimes has place where there is no opposition expressed or even implied.

— *ἀκούσαντες*] i. e. having heard [where he was]. [Comp. Lu. ix. 10.]

14. *αὐτοῖς*.] On this reading all the Editors are agreed. The common one *αὐτοῖς* is proved to have been a mere typographical error of Stephens's third Edition. On this narration *Comp. Jo. vi. 5. seqq.*

15. *ὀψίας γενομένης*] i. e. the first evening, which commenced at three o'clock. Nor, considering the aptitude of the place, and the time of year, a little before the Passover, is this in-

consistent with the expression of Lu. ix. 12. *ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα ἤρξατο κλίνειν*, for the day is there quite on the wane. That mentioned further on at v. 23. is the second evening, which commenced at sun set.

— *ἡ ὥρα ἤδη παρήλθεν*] "the day is far spent." "Ὥρα, like the Latin *hora*, has often this sense. Fritz. understands it of the proper time for healing and instructing the people. But that is harsh.

19. [*καὶ*.] This is rejected or cancelled by almost all Editors, as not found in the greater part of the MSS., early Editions, and Fathers. Rightly, for *internal* evidence is as much against it as external.

— *ἐλόγησε*.] Sub. *τὸν Θεόν*. The word is elsewhere interchanged with *εὐχαριστεῖν*, as synonyms. See Matth. xv. 36. Mark viii. 6. Luke i. 64. ii. 28. xxiv. 53. John vi. 11 & 23. Acts xxvii. 35. Jam. iii. 5. When a noun denoting *food*, or *sacrifice*, is expressed, there is an ellipsis for *εὐλογεῖν τὸν Θεόν ὑπὲρ τὴν θυσίαν*.

— *κλάσας*.] The Jewish loaves were in fact *cakes*; broad, thin, and brittle, like our biscuits; and therefore required to be *broken* rather than cut, and thus would leave very many fragments; which accounts for the great quantity thereof gathered up.

20. *ἦσαν*] scil. *οἱ ἀπόστολοι*. And at *τὸ περισσεῦον sub. μέρος*. *Κλασμάτων*, i. e. not only the fragments, which would arise from *breaking up* loaves for so great a multitude, but (as appears from John vi. 13.) those also which each person would make in eating. The words following *δώδεκα* — *πλήρεις* are in apposition with and exegetical of the preceding; q. d. namely, twelve baskets full.

— *κοφίνους*.] This word has occasioned more discussion among the Commentators than might have been imagined; especially from these co-

MK.

6. χωρὶς γυναικῶν καὶ παιδίων. Καὶ εὐθὺς ἠνάγκασεν [ὁ Ἰησοῦς] 22
 45 τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ ἐμβῆναι εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, καὶ προάγειν αὐτὸν εἰς
 46 τὸ πέραν, ἕως οὗ ἀπολύσῃ τοὺς ὄχλους. Καὶ ἀπολύσας τοὺς ὄχλους, 23
 ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος κατ' ἰδίαν προσεύξασθαι. Ὁψίας δὲ γενομένης,
 47 μόνος ἦν ἐκεῖ. Τὸ δὲ πλοῖον ἤδη μέσον τῆς θαλάσσης ἦν, βασανιζό- 24
 48 μενον ὑπὸ τῶν κυμάτων· ἦν γὰρ ἐναντίος ὁ ἄνεμος. Τετάρτῃ δὲ φρ- 25
 49 λακῇ τῆς νυκτὸς ἀπῆλθε πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, περιπατῶν ἐπὶ τῆς
 49 θαλάσσης. Καὶ ἰδόντες αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ ἐπὶ τῇ θάλασσῃ περιπα- 26
 50 τοῦντα, ἐταράχθησαν, λέγοντες· Ὅτι φάντασμα ἔστι· καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ
 50 φόβου ἔκραξαν. Εὐθὺς δὲ ἐλάλησεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγων· Θαρσείτε· 27
 ἐγὼ εἰμι, μὴ φοβείσθε. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ Πέτρος εἶπε· Κύριε, 28
 εἰ σὺ εἶ, κέλευσόν με πρὸς σε εἰθελὶν ἐπὶ τὰ ὕδατα. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν· 29
 Ἐλθέ. καὶ καταβάς ἀπὸ τοῦ πλοίου ὁ Πέτρος, περιεπάτησεν ἐπὶ τὰ
 ὕδατα, ἐλθελὶν πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν. Βλέπων δὲ τὸν ἄνεμον ἰσχυρὸν, 30
 ἐφοβήθη· καὶ ἀρξάμενος καταποντίζεσθαι, ἔκραξε λέγων· Κύριε, σῶσόν
 με. εὐθὺς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα, ἐπελάβετο αὐτοῦ, καὶ 31
 λέγει αὐτῷ· Ὀλιγόπιστε, εἰς τί ἐδίστασας; Καὶ ἐμβάντων αὐτῶν εἰς 32
 51 τὸ πλοῖον, ἐκόπασεν ὁ ἄνεμος. Οἱ δὲ ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ, ἐλθόντες προσεκύ- 33
 νησαν αὐτῷ, λέγοντες· Ἀληθῶς Θεοῦ Υἱὸς εἶ!

phini being in Juven. Sat. iii. 14. and vi. 512. connected with *hay*, which has been a mote in the eyes of the Commentators. The most rational opinion is, that the *κοφ.* in question were either (as Buxt. thinks) such baskets as had, from the earliest period, been a part of the household utensils of the Jews; (See Deut. xxviii. 5.) or (as Reland, Schleus., and Kuin. suppose) were such portable flag-baskets, as were commonly used by the Jews in travelling through Heathen countries, to convey their provisions, in order to avoid the pollution of unclean food. The hay, it is supposed, they took with them, to make a bed. Yet these baskets could not have held any quantity sufficient for that purpose. It is more probable that the *cofini here* meant carried no hay; and that those mentioned by Juvenal were of a much larger sort, like our *hampers*, used for containing various articles of pedlary, such as the foreign Jews, even then, there is reason to think, used to deal in.

22 *ἠνάγκασεν.*] From this term many have inferred the unwillingness of the disciples to depart; influenced by ambitious views, and thinking that, from the multitude being so desirous to make Jesus a King, now would be the time for him to set up his earthly kingdom. The verb, however, like others in Greek and Latin of similar import, is often used of *moral persuasion*. See Thucyd. viii. 41. and vii. 37. Nay, by an idiom frequent in our own language, it may only mean he *caused* them to enter. &c.

23. *Comp.* John vi. 16. τὸ ὄρος should not be rendered a mountain, but the mountain — namely, that on the back of Bethsaida, a part of that range by which the Lake is encircled on all sides.

24. *μέσον.*] Sub. *κατά*; unless it be, as Fritz. says, a *Nomin.* *Βασανιζόμενον* simply signifies “violently tossed;” as in Polyb. i. 43. 2. a stormy wind is said *πύργους βασανίζειν.*

25. *περιπατῶν ἐπὶ τῆς θαλ.*] Thus our Saviour

evinced his Divine power; for this is in Job. ix. 8. made a property of the Deity; δ *ταῦτας τῶν οὐρανῶν, καὶ περιπατῶν, ὡς ἐπ' ἑδάφους, ἐπὶ θαλάσσης,* and Horapollon Hierogl. i. 58, says, that the Egyptian hieroglyphic for expressing impossibility was “a man’s feet walking on the sea.”

27. *ἐγὼ εἰμι*] “it is I.” Literally, I am the person! A somewhat rare idiom.

28. *κέλευσον, &c.*] Under *bid* is also implied *enable* me to, &c.; for Peter wished a miracle to be worked, to prove that it was really Jesus.

31. *ἐδίστασας*] The word properly signifies to stand in *hīro*, undetermined which way to take; as Eurip. Or. 625. *διπλῆς μερίμνης ἀπείταχτος ἰδὺν δόξας.*

32. *ἐκόπασεν*] “was lulled, or hushed.” Sub. *ἐαυτῶν.* Examples are adduced by the Commentators from Herodot. and Ælian.

33. *Θεοῦ Υἱὸς εἶ.*] Bishop Middleton has proved that the want of the Art. would not authorize us to translate “a son of God,” or “son of a God.” For, as to the former in the sense *prophet*, there is no proof that prophets were so called. And as to the latter, which is thought suitable to the ideas of *Pagans*, there is no proof that these men were such; or, if so, they might adopt the language of the Apostles on this extraordinary occasion: and though it be urged, that the disciples were not yet acquainted with the divinity of our Lord; yet even *that* must be received with some limitation: that the Messiah would be the *son of God*, was a Jewish doctrine; and, therefore, if they acknowledged him as the *Christ*, they must have regarded him as the Son of God; a title which they had repeatedly heard him claim to himself. And what they themselves heard, they would be likely to impart to the mariners; whose exclamation may thus be understood in the highest sense. Ἀληθῶς, too, implies as much as, “Thou art really [the character which thou claimest and art said to be], the Son of God.”

34	Καὶ διαπερεύσαντες, ἦλθον εἰς τὴν γῆν Γεννησαρέτ. καὶ ἐπιγιγόντες	MK.	6.
35	αὐτὸν οἱ ἄνδρες τοῦ τόπου ἐκείνου, ἀπέστειλαν εἰς ὅλην τὴν περιχώρον		53
			54
36	ἐκείνην, καὶ προσήγγεγκαν αὐτῷ πάντας τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας· καὶ πωρε-		55
	κάλουν αὐτὸν, ἵνα μόνον ἄψωνται τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἱματιοῦ αὐτοῦ·		56
	καὶ ὅσοι ἤψαντο, διεσώθησαν.		7.
1	XV. Τότε προσέρχονται τῷ Ἰησοῦ οἱ ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων γραμματεῖς		1
2	καὶ Φαρισαῖοι, λέγοντες· Διὰ τί οἱ μαθηταί σου παραβυῖνοσι τὴν		5
	παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων; οὐ γὰρ ῥίπτιοιαι τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν, ὅταν		
3	ἄρτον ἐσθίωσιν. Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Διὰ τί καὶ ὑμεῖς πα-		9
4	ραβυῖνετε τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ τὴν παράδοσιν ὑμῶν; Ὁ γὰρ Θεὸς		10
	ἐνετείλατο, λέγων· Τίμα τὸν πατέρα [σου] καὶ τὴν μητέρα·		
5	καὶ ὁ κακολογῶν πατέρα ἢ μητέρα, θανάτῳ τελευτά-		
	στω· ὑμεῖς δὲ λέγετε· Ὅς ἂν εἴπῃ τῷ πατρὶ ἢ τῇ μητρὶ· Ἄωρον ὃ ἐάν		11
	ἔξ ἐμοῦ ὠφελῆθῃς καὶ οὐ μὴ τιμήσῃ τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ ἢ τὴν μητέρα		12

XV. 1. οἱ ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων.] "Those of," or belonging to "Jerusalem." An idiom occurring in numerous passages of the Scriptural and Classical writers referred to by the Commentators. — *Those of Jerusalem* were the most learned of the Pharisaical sect, and, as such, were entitled to deliver instruction wherever they went. They were probably sent by the chief of the Pharisees, and as probably came with insidious intentions.

2. τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων.] Παράδ. signifies a precept, or body of precepts, not written, but handed down by tradition. So Joseph. Ant. xiii. 10, 6, says, ἤτι νόμιμα πολλά τινα παρέδοσαν τῷ δήμῳ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ἐκ πατέρων διαδοχῆς, ἅπερ οὐκ ἀναγέγραπται ἐν τοῖς Μωϋσέως νόμοις. These νόμιμα were afterwards digested into one body, and called the *Talmud*; divided into the *Mischna* (or Text) and the *Gemara* (or Commentary), on which see Horne's *Introd.* ii. 417, seqq. By τῶν πρεσβυτέρων are meant, not the members of the Sanhedrim, but the most celebrated doctors.

3. διὰ τί καὶ ὑμεῖς — ὑμῶν.] Our Lord confutes them from their own positions; ably opposing the παράδοσις, &c. to the ἐντολὴ τοῦ Θεοῦ; and before he disputes respecting the tradition to which they referred, he uproots the very foundation on which their whole reasoning was erected, and shows, by a manifest example, how often this was at variance with the Divine Laws.

4. τίμα τὸν πατέρα.] Exod. xx. 12. This was understood to comprehend, under *obedience* and *dutiful respect*, taking care of and supporting. See Numb. xxii. 17. xxiv. i. Judg. xiii. 17. Deut. v. 16. Eph. vi. 2. So Eccles. iii. 8. ἐν ἔργῳ καὶ λόγῳ τίμα πατέρα. Thus also κακολογεῖν, answering to Heb. לָקַךְ, denoted *slighting*, *neglecting* [to support.] Such, too, was the mode of interpretation sanctioned by their own Canonists. See Lightf. and Wets. See Exod. xxi. 17. Comp. Deut. xxi. 18. Σου ἀφ' πατέρα is cancelled or rejected by all the best Editors, as indeed of little or no authority. Θανάτῳ is not a mere pleonasm, but a strong expression, importing a capital punishment of the worst sort. Or θαν. τελέ. may mean, "let him be put to death without mercy;" Hebrew מוֹת יוֹמָת to which our common phrases bear a little affinity.

5. ὄωρον] Scil. ἔστω. From the parallel passage VOL. I.

of Mark, it is evident that ὄωρον is here simply the interpretation of the Heb. כִּרְבֹן denoting any thing devoted — namely, to the service of God. But, as it was often employed in making a vow against using any article, it came, at length, to denote any thing *prohibited*; and, if spoken with reference to any particular person, the phrase imported, that the vower obliged himself *not to give* any thing to the person in question; and thus, if that person were the father of the vower, he was held *prohibited* from relieving his necessities. Such is the view taken of the term by Lightf., Grot., Campb., Kuin., and most recent Commentators. Yet it seems more natural, with the ancient Fathers, and some modern Commentators, to take ὄωρον simply of something *consecrated*, or *supposed* to be consecrated, to pious uses, by a collusion between the sons and the priests, so as to leave the father destitute. For (to use the words of Bp. Jebb, *Sacr. Lit.* p. 246, who has elegantly illustrated v. 3—6.) "when the Jews wished to evade the duty of supporting their parents, they made a *pretended*, or at least an *eventual* dedication of their property to the sacred treasury; or rather a dedication of all that *could* or *might* have been given by them to their parents, saying, Be it *Corban*. From that moment, though at liberty to expend such property on any *selfish* purpose, they were *prohibited* from bestowing it on their parents." To say, therefore, to a parent, *Be it a gift*, was an aggravated breach of the commandment, and was virtually κακολογεῖν πατέρα, ἢ μητέρα.

— καὶ οὐ μὴ τιμήσῃ, &c.] Euthym., not without reason, complains of the difficulty of the construction, in which some suppose an *apodosis* to be wanting, suppressed *per apostrophen*; either ἡλευθέρωται, or ἀντιτίδ' ἐστί, or the like. Others suppose an *ellipsis* of some word, as ὄφειλε. Kuin. and others regard the καὶ as a mere *expletive*, (as often the Hebrew ו) and render "he need not honour." But this removal of a difficulty by *silencing* a word is too violent a procedure. And as to the other methods above-mentioned, there is certainly no *apostrophe*; nor any *ellipsis*, properly so called; nor *inally* is an *apodosis* wanting; for, as Bp. Jebb, *ubi supra*, observes, the context has within itself the full meaning, "Whosoever shall say, *Corban*, &c.

MK.

7. αὐτοῦ. καὶ ἠκροώσατε τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ τὴν παραδόσιν ὑμῶν. 6
 13 ὑποκριταί! καλῶς προσεφώνησε περὶ ὑμῶν Ἰσαΐας, λέγων. Ἐγγίξει 7
 6 μοι ὁ λαὸς οὗτος τῷ στόματι αὐτῶν, καὶ τοῖς χεῖλεσίν 8
 με τιμᾷ· ἡ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω ἀπέχει ἀπ' ἐμοῦ· 9
 μίτην δὲ σέβονται με, διδάσκοντες διδασκαλίας, ἐν-
 14 τάλματα ἀνθρώπων. Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τὸν ὄχλον, εἶπεν 10
 15 αὐτοῖς· Ἀκούετε καὶ συνίετε! Οὐ τὸ εἰσερχόμενον εἰς τὸ στόμα 11
 κοινοῦ τὸν ἄνθρωπον· ἀλλὰ τὸ ἐκπορευόμενον ἐκ τοῦ στόματος, τοῦτο
 17 κοινοῦ τὸν ἄνθρωπον. Τότε προσελθόντες οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ εἶπον 12
 αὐτῷ· Οἶδας, ὅτι οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ἀκούσαντες τὸν λόγον, ἐσκανδαλισθη-
 σαν; Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπε· Πᾶσα φυνεαία, ἣν οὐκ ἐφύτευσεν ὁ 13

must also not honour" [better, must *even* not honour, Edit.] i. e. he is under an obligation *not* to do so. So in the parallel passage of Mark vii. 12. οὐκέτι ἀφίετε αὐτὸν οὐδὲν ποιῆσαι τῷ πατρί.

7. προσεφώνησε]. From the use of this term, the early Commentators in general regarded the passage which follows as a real *prophecy*. Others considered it as a prediction of what would afterwards happen, veiled under a rebuke to the persons addressed. But the employment of the above expression does not necessarily imply that the words are to be considered as a *prophecy*; for *προφητεύειν* may, and, I think, ought, here to be taken in the very frequent sense of speaking or writing under Divine inspiration. And there is a peculiar propriety in the use of the term here; the words purporting to be the words of God himself. That Chrys., Theophyl., and Euthym. did not regard the passage as a *prophecy*, is certain; and that they viewed *προφ.* in this very light, is highly probable from their expositions. As to *περὶ ὑμῶν*, that may very well be taken *populärer*, for (*ὡς* *περὶ ὑμῶν*); the sense being, that Isaiah spoke, under divine inspiration, of the Jews, as if he had been speaking of you. So Euthym.: "Ἀγεὶ τὸν προσφῆτην πάλα κατηγοροῦντα αὐτῶν ἂν οὐτος κατηγοροῖ. Thus the passage may, with the best Commentators, be regarded as an accommodation or application, by way of illustration, of what was said of the Jews of Isaiah's time, to those of the time of Christ. It may, therefore, be classed among *quotations in the way of illustration*, which are allowed not to be, properly speaking, prophecies; though they are sometimes said to be *fulfilled*, i. e. in a *qualified* and peculiar sense of the word, whereby any thing may be said to be *fulfilled*, which can be *pertinently applied*; on which see Note supra ii. 17 & 18. In such cases, the sacred writers did not intend it to be understood, that the passages they were citing from the O. T. were to be considered as real predictions; but only that there was a *con-similarity* of cases and incidents; so that the words of the Prophets in the Old Testament were as applicable to the transactions recorded by the Apostles, as they were suitable to denote the events of their own times.

8. ἐγγίξει μοι, and τῷ στόματι αὐτῶν καί.] These words, omitted in a few MSS., and some Versions and Fathers, are double bracketed by Vater, and cancelled by Griesb. But the evidence in question will scarcely warrant *suspicion*. The words of the quotation in this and the next verse, exactly correspond to the Sept., except that in the

Sept. there is a *καὶ* between *διδασκαλίας* and *ἐν.*, which, however, has nothing corresponding to it in the Heb., and doubtless arose from the mistake either of scribes or sciolists. In v. 9, both the Sept. and St. Matthew differ not a little from the Heb.; and the discrepancy is such as cannot be removed, unless by resorting to so considerable an alteration (without sufficient authority) of the Hebrew text, as sober criticism will not permit. For though there is no doubt, that for *וְהָיָה* the Sept. read *וְהָיָה*, and for *וְהָיָה* read *וְהָיָה*; yet, although these are slight alterations, they ought not to be admitted, on authority far greater than that of *any Version*, or indeed *all* the Versions; because they break up the construction of the whole sentence, the *כִּי יַעַן*, (*inasmuch as*), at the beginning of the 13th verse corresponding to *לְכִן*, (*therefore*), at the beginning of v. 14. The words of the Prophet may be rendered, "Their worship of me is [only] a taught commandment of men;" i. e. the religion rests only on the precepts of men's teaching, i. e. according to the tradition of the elders, and the interpretation of the Scribes. So that, upon the whole, though their be a discrepancy in *words*, their is none in *sense*. [Comp. Isai. xxix. 13.]

9. διδασκαλίας] "as, or by way of, commandments." See Middlet.

— ἐν τάλ. ἀνθρώπων.] "The term (says Campb.) is here and at Mark ix. 7. and Col. ii. 2. contrasted, by implication, with the commands of God, which are in the N. T. called, not ἐν τάλματα, but ἐν τολαί.

11. οὐ τὸ εἰσερχόμενον — ἀνθρώπων.] Our Lord did not hereby intend to abrogate the distinction between clean and unclean things for food. His meaning was only this,—that nothing was naturally and *per se* impure (and therefore such as could defile the mind of man); but was only so *ex instituto*. Or his words may be understood *comparatē*; q. d. forbidden meats do not pollute so much as impure thoughts and intentions. Bp. Middlet. observes, that the Art. at τὸν ἄνθρωπον is necessary, because, as in the case of regimen, the definiteness of a part supposes the definiteness of the whole.

13. φυνεαία.] The word properly signifies "a planting," or plant; but metaphorically denotes the doctrines, or traditions in question, by an allusion to the *mind* as *soil*, and *precepts* as *plants*. Comp. John xv. 2. A comparison familiar both to the Hebrews and Greeks. See Matt. xiii. 29 & 38. John xv. 2. I Cor. iii. 6.

14 πατήρ μου ὁ οὐράνιος, ἐκρίζωθήσεται. Ἄφετε αὐτοῖς· ὁδηγοὶ εἰσι
 τυφλοὶ τυφλῶν· τυφλὸς δὲ τυφλὸν ἐὰν ὀδηγῇ, ἀμφοτέροι εἰς βόθυνον
 15 πεσοῦνται. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Φράσον ἡμῖν τὴν
 16 παραβολὴν ταύτην. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· Ἀκμὴν καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀσύνετοί
 17 ἐστε; Οὐπω νοεῖτε, ὅτι πᾶν τὸ εἰσπορευόμενον εἰς τὸ στόμα εἰς τὴν
 18 κοιλίαν χωρεῖ, καὶ εἰς ἀφθέρωνα ἐκβάλλεται; Τὰ δὲ ἐκπορευόμενα ἐκ
 τοῦ στόματος, ἐκ τῆς καρδίας ἐξέρχεται, κἀκῆνα κοινοῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον.
 19 Ἐκ γὰρ τῆς καρδίας ἐξέρχονται διαλογισμοὶ πονηροὶ, φόνοι, μοιχεῖαι,
 20 πορνεῖαι, κλοπαὶ, ψευδομαρτυρίαι, βλασφημίαι. Ταῦτά ἐστι τὰ κοινοῦν-
 τα τὸν ἄνθρωπον· τὸ δὲ ἀνίπτοις χεροὶ φαγεῖν οὐ κοινοῖ τὸν ἄν-
 θρωπον.
 21 Καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἐκεῖθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ἀνεχώρησεν εἰς τὰ μέρη Τύρου καὶ
 22 Σιδῶνος. Καὶ ἰδοὺ, γυνὴ Χαναναία ἀπὸ τῶν ὀρίων ἐκείνων ἐξελεθού-
 σα ἐκραύγασεν αὐτῷ λέγουσα· Ἐλέησόν με, κύριε, υἱὲ Δαβὶδ! ἡ θυ-
 23 γάτηρ μου κακῶς δαιμονίζεται. Ὁ δὲ οὐκ ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῇ λόγον. καὶ
 προσελθόντες οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἠρώτων αὐτὸν λέγοντες· Ἀπόλυσον
 24 αὐτήν, ὅτι κρᾶζει ὀπισθεν ἡμῶν. Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν· Οὐκ
 25 ἀπεστάλην εἰ μὴ εἰς τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἀπολωλότα οἴκου Ἰσραὴλ. Ἦ δὲ
 26 ἐλθούσα προσέκνυε αὐτῷ, λέγουσα· Κύριε, βοήθει μοι. Ὁ δὲ ἀπο-
 κριθεὶς εἶπεν· Οὐκ ἔστι καλὸν λαβεῖν τὸν ἄρτον τῶν τέκνων, καὶ
 27 βαλεῖν τοῖς κυναρίοις. Ἦ δὲ εἶπε· Ναὶ, κύριε· καὶ γὰρ τὰ κυνάρια

14. *Comp. infra xxiii. 16. Luke vi. 39.*
 — τυφλὸς δὲ τυφλὸν—πεσοῦνται.] A proverbial
 saying, common to both the Hebrews, Greeks,
 and Romans. Βόθυνον signifies, not ditch, but
 pit, such as was dug for the reception of rain
 water.

15. παραβολὴν] i. e. “maxim, or weighty
 apophthegm.” It is not that Peter did not *under-*
stand the maxim; (which was by no means ob-
 scure, insomuch that our Lord says καὶ ὑμεῖς
 ἀσύνετοί ἐστε;) but that his prejudices darkened
 his understanding. Indeed, he could scarcely
 believe his ears that a distinction of meats availed
 not; and therefore asks an explanation.

16. ἀκμὴν] Put adverbially for ἔτι, as not un-
 frequently in the Classical writers. *Comp. infra*
xvi. 9. Mr. Rose on Parkh., p. 26, says the
 meaning is, Yet still after so many miracles, are
 ye without understanding?

17. ἀφείρων.] A word of the Macedonian
 dialect. From its etymon (ἀπὸ καὶ ἐξομαί) it
 signifies a place *apart*, and thence a *privacy*.

18. *Comp. James iii. 6. Gen. vi. 5, and viii. 21.*
 The meaning is, that evil principles, being seated
 in the *heart*, and therefore governing the con-
 versation and conduct, especially defile a man.
 So a great poet well says,
 “Our outward act is prompted from within,
 And from the sinner’s *mind* proceeds the sin.”

21. εἰς τὰ μέρη.] As Christ seems not to have
 actually entered the Gentile territories, we must
 here (with Grot.) interpret *εἰς versus, towards*, and
 so the Syriac, and the Hebrew הַ local, like our
toward in toward. Mark, indeed, has εἰς τὰ μεθάρια
 Τύρου: but μεθάρια is a word of dubious signifi-
 cation; and denoted a strip of land which was
 between two countries, but properly belonging to

neither. So it is explained by the Gloss. Vet.
inter fines.

22. γυνὴ Χαναναία.] Called by Mark Ἑλληνῖς
 Συροφοίνισσα, i. e. a Gentile dwelling on the con-
 fines of Phenicia. She was therefore a Gentile
 by birth, though probably not a proselyte, as some
 have supposed. Yet it does not follow, that she
 was an idolatress; for many Gentiles in those
 parts were believers in one true God, and felt
 much respect for Judaism, though they did not
 profess it. She might easily, therefore, have
 learnt both the doctrine of a Messiah, and the
 appellation, from the Jews. For a particular ex-
 planation of this narration, and a correct view
 thereof, showing the peculiar propriety of our
 Lord’s conduct, in making the manner in which
 he complied with the request of the Greek hea-
 then (ordained by the providence of God to be
 one of the first *Pagan* proselytes), a type of the
 mode in which the Gentiles should be received,
 see two admirable Sermons of Dr. Jortin and Bp.
 Horsley on this text.]

23. ἠρώτων] “asked, besought him.” An usage
 confined to the N. T. and Sept.

— ἀπόλυσον] i. e. “dispatch her business;” i. e.
 as it is implied, “with the grant of the favour she
 asks,” as appears from vv. 24 & 26.

24. *Comp. supr. x. 5 & 6. Acts xiii. 46. Rom.*
xv. 8.

26. κυναρίοις.] The word was adopted after
 the manner of the Jews in speaking of the Gen-
 tiles, though it was also a term of reproach in
 common use with both.

27. καὶ κύριε.] The Commentators are not
 agreed as to the force of this formula. Most
 modern expositors (after Scalig. and Casaub.) as-
 sign to it the sense “obsecro te,” as in Rev. xxii.
 20, and sometimes in the Classical writers. And

MK.

7. ἐσθίει ἀπὸ τῶν ψυχίων τῶν πιπτόντων ἀπὸ τῆς τραπεζῆς τῶν κυρίων
29 αὐτῶν. Τότε ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῇ· Ὡ γύναι, μεγάλη 28
30 σου ἡ πίστις! γενηθήτω σοι ὡς θέλεις. Καὶ ἰάθη ἡ θυγάτηρ αὐτῆς
ἀπὸ τῆς ὥρας ἐκείνης·
- 31 Καὶ μεταβὰς ἐκεῖθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ἦλθε παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλι- 29
λαίας· καὶ ἀναβὰς εἰς τὸ ὄρος, ἐκάθητο ἐκεῖ. Καὶ προσῆλθον αὐτῷ 30
ὄχλοι πολλοὶ ἔχοντες μεθ' ἑαυτῶν χωλοὺς, τυφλοὺς, κωφοὺς, κυλλοὺς,
καὶ ἐτέρους πολλοὺς· καὶ ἔρρόψιαν αὐτοὺς παρὰ τοὺς πόδας τοῦ Ἰησοῦ,
καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν αὐτούς· ὥστε τοὺς ὄχλους θαυμάσαι, βλέποντας κω- 31
32 φούς λαλοῦντας, κυλλοὺς ὑγιεῖς, χωλοὺς περιπατοῦντας, καὶ τυφλοὺς
1 βλέποντας· καὶ ἐδόξασαν τὸν Θεὸν Ἰσραὴλ. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς προσκαλε- 32
2 σάμενος τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ εἶπε· Σπλαγχνίζομαι ἐπὶ τὸν ὄχλον,
ὅτι ἤδη * ἡμέραι τρεῖς προσμένουσί μοι, καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσι τί φάγωσι·
3 καὶ ἀπολῦσαι αὐτοὺς νήσεις οὐ θέλω, μήποτε ἐκλυθῶσιν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ.
Καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ· Πόθεν ἡμῖν ἐν ἐρημίᾳ ἄρτοι 33
5 τοσοῦτοι, ὥστε χορτάσαι ὄχλον τοσοῦτον; Καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· 34
6 Πόσους ἄρτους ἔχετε; οἱ δὲ εἶπον· Ἐπτὰ, καὶ ὀλίγα ἰχθύδια. Καὶ 35
7 ἐκέλευσε τοῖς ὄχλοις ἀναπεσεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν. Καὶ λαβὼν τοὺς ἐπτὰ 36
8 ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς ἰχθύδας, εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασε, καὶ ἔδωκε τοῖς μαθηταῖς
9 αὐτοῦ, οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ τῷ ὄχλῳ. Καὶ ἔφαγον πάντες, καὶ ἐχορτάσθη- 37
10 σαν. καὶ ἦσαν τὸ περισσεῦον τῶν κλασμάτων, ἐπὶ στυγρίας πλήρεις.
Οἱ δὲ ἐσθιόντες ἦσαν τετρακισχίλιοι ἄνδρες, χωρὶς γυναικῶν καὶ 38
11 παιδίων. Καὶ ἀπολύσας τοὺς ὄχλους † ἐνέβη εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς τὰ 39

so the Heb. 83.] The ancients, and some moderns (as Grot., Le Clerc, Elsn., Schleus., and others) take it to import *assent*, which, indeed, is most agreeable to the answer. And though ἀλλὰ does not follow, as it properly should; yet, in such pathetic sentences, regularity is overlooked. Here (as often) γὰρ has reference to a short clause omitted, to be thus supplied: "True, Lord! [but extend a small portion of thy help and mercy towards me]; for even (καὶ) the dogs," &c.

29. εἰς τὸ ὄρος] not "to a mountain," but to the mountain, namely, the mountainous ridge, which skirts the lake on all sides.

30. κυλλοὺς.] It is by no means clear what is meant by this term, and how it differs from χωλοὺς. See Recens. Syn. I have there conjectured, that κυλλός (which Hesych. explains by κέρτυλος) meant "a person with a distorted limb," as a foot; exactly answering to our expressions *bow-leg*, and *bow-legged*. Such persons are not, in a proper sense, *lame*; yet they sometimes labour under more inconveniences than would be occasioned by the loss of a limb. And therefore we need not wonder that such should present themselves as objects of our Lord's mercy; and surely the cure of such a radical *malformation* must give the most exalted idea of our Lord's power.

31. κωφοὺς] i. e. deaf and dumb; since those born deaf are naturally dumb also.

32. ἡμέραι τρεῖς.] The reading here is dubious. Most of the ancient MSS., and some Fathers have ἡμέραι, which has been received by almost

all Editors from Wets. downward; and justly, since the common reading *ἡμέρας* plainly arose from an alteration of the more difficult reading. Yet this leaves a construction of unprecedented harshness; which Fritz. would remove by inserting, from a few MSS., Versions, and Fathers, *εἰσιν, καὶ*. The authority, however, is so slight, and the words so evidently from the margin, that I cannot venture to follow the example. It is strange that none should have seen that the difficulty may better be removed by simply altering the accent of *προσμένουσι* to *προσμενοῦσι*, thus taking it for a particip. Dat. plur. — a kind of error not unexampled. Thus, in Thucyd. iii. 31, I have shown, that for *ἐφορῶσιν*, the true reading is, *ἐφορῶσιν*; and the sentence (similar to the present) is *καὶ ἅμα ἦν ἐφορῶσιν αὐτῷ σφίσι δαπάνη γίγνηται*. Thus the ellipse of *εἰσι* will be very regular, and the construction usual: q. d. "there are three days to them staying with me;" i. e. they have stayed with me three days. The words following, *καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσι*, &c., "signify, "and [now] they have nothing [left] to eat."

39. ἐνέβη.] Almost all the Editors from Wets. to Fritz. adopt or prefer *ἀνέβη*, from several MSS., Versions, and Fathers, with the Edit. Princ. and the two first of Steph. And this may possibly be the true reading. But as I cannot remember any instance of that word being used of *embarking*, (whereas *ἐμβαίνει* is often so used, both in the N. T. and Sept., see viii. 23. ix. 1. xiii. 2. xiv. 22 & 32, and in the parallel passages), I have scrupled to receive it.

1 ὄρα Μαγδαλά. XVI. Καὶ προσελθόντες οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ Σαδ- MK.
 8.
 11
 2 δούκαῖοι, πειράζοντες ἐπρωῶτησαν αὐτὸν σημεῖον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐπι-
 3 λέγετε· Ἐνδία· πυρῶάζει γὰρ ὁ οὐρανός· Καὶ πρῶτ' Σήμερον
 χειμών· πυρῶάζει γὰρ σιγνῶζων ὁ οὐρανός. Ἐποκρῖται! τὸ μὲν
 4 οὐ δύνασθε; Γενὰ ποηρὰ καὶ μοιχαλὶς σημεῖον ἐπιζητεῖ· καὶ σημεῖ- 12
 5 ον οὐ δοθήσεται αὐτῇ, εἰ μὴ τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωῆ τοῦ προφήτου. Καὶ 13
 καταλιπὼν αὐτοὺς ἀπῆλθε.
 6 Καὶ ἐλθόντες οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ πέραν, ἐπελάθοντο ἄρτους 14
 7 λαβεῖν. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Ὁρᾶτε καὶ προσέχετε ἀπὸ τῆς 15
 8 ζύμης τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ Σαδδουκαίων. Οἱ δὲ διελογίζοντο ἐν ἑαυτοῖς 16
 9 λέγοντες· Ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἐλάβομεν. Γινούς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, εἶπεν [αὐ- 17
 10 τοῖς]· Τί διαλογίζεσθε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, ὀλιγόπιστοι, οἱ ἄρτους οὐκ ἐλά- 81
 11 βετε; Οὐπω ροεῖτε, οὐδὲ μνημονεύετε τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους τῶν πεντακισ- 19
 12 χιλίων, καὶ πόσους κοφίνους ἐλάβετε; οὐδὲ τοὺς ἑπτὰ ἄρτους τῶν 20
 13 τετρακισχιλίων, καὶ πόσας σπυρίδας ἐλάβετε; Πῶς οὐ ροεῖτε, οἱ οὐ 21
 14 περὶ * ἄρτων εἶπον ἡμῖν προσέχειν ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ

XVI. 1. ἐπρωῶτησαν.] Here is the same idiom as that by which we say, to ask (i. e. request) any person to do a thing. On the thing itself see supra xii. 33.

2. ἐνδία] Sub. ἔσται. The Jews, and indeed the ancients in general, were attentive observers of all prognostics of weather, fair or foul; and many similar sayings are adduced from both the Rabbinical and Classical writers by the Commentators.

3. σιγνῶζων] for καὶ σιγνῶζαι. The Commentators and Lexicographers say, that σιγνῶζειν signifies properly to *grieve*, and thence to be *gloomy*. The very reverse, however, is the truth. The verb (which is rarely met with, except in the N. T. and Sept.) is derived from σίγος, *thick*, and that from σῦω, to *stuff up*.

— τὸ μὲν πρόσωπον, &c.] “From this reproof it appears, that the refusal of the Jews to acknowledge the Messiahship of Christ, was owing neither to the want of evidence, nor to the want of capacity to judge of that evidence. The accomplishment of the ancient prophecies (Gen. xlix. 10. Is. xi. 1; xxxv. 5. Deut. ix. 24.) and the miracles which he performed, were proof sufficient, and much more easily discernible than the signs of the seasons.” (Mackn.) As to the opinions of the Jews concerning the MESSIAH, they are admirably summed up by Bp. Blomfield (Traditional Knowledge, p. 106), as follows:—“They considered him to be the *Word of God*. (See on Joh. i. 1—3.) They believed that all God’s transactions with mankind were carried on through the medium of his *Word, the Messiah*; who they thought, delivered the Israelites from Egypt, and brought them into Canaan. They believed, that the Spirit of the Lord would be upon him, and manifest itself by the working of miracles. (See Matt. xii. 28.) They supposed that the Messiah would appear, not in a *real* human body, but in the *semblance* of one. They expected that he would not be subject to death. Yet they thought

that he would offer, in his own person, an expiatory sacrifice for their sins. (Joh. i. 49.) He was, they thought, to restore the Jews to freedom; (see Luke i. 68. xxiv. 21. 2 Esdr. xii. 34.) to restore a pure and perfect form of worship; (Luke i. 73. Joh. iv. 25.) to give remission of sins; (Luke i. 76. Matt. i. 21.) to work miracles; (Jo. vii. 31.) to descend into *Hades*, and to bring back to earth the souls of the departed Israelites, united to their glorified bodies. This was to be the first resurrection. (See Ephes. iv. 8, 9. 1 Pet. iii. 18, 19.) After which the Devil was to be cast into hell for a thousand years. Then was to begin the Messiah’s kingdom, which was to last a thousand years. At the end of that time, the Devil was to be released, and to excite great troubles; but he was to be conquered, and again to be imprisoned for ever. Thereupon the second and general resurrection was to take place, followed by the judgment. The world was then to be renewed; and new heavens, a new earth, and a new Jerusalem were to appear. Lastly, the Messiah, having fulfilled his office, was to deliver up the kingdom to God, at whose right hand he was to sit for evermore.” See more in Dr. Pye Smith’s Scripture Testimony to the Messiah, vol. i. p. 464 seqq.

4 & 5. Vide supra xii. 39.

6. ὁρᾶτε καὶ προσέχετε.] An emphatical phrase, signifying mind and *studiously attend to*. It is not so much a Hebraism, as an idiom common to the simple and colloquial style in all languages. Ζύμης, i. e. their doctrines, as δόξαχῆ imports both doctrines and ordinances. See Lightfoot. [Comp. Luke xii. 1.]

7. λέγοντες· ὅτι] Sub. εἶπε or the like. See Grot. and Glass.

9. Comp. supr. xiv. 17. and John vi. 9.

10. Comp. supr. xv. 34.

11. ἄρτων.] So, for ἄρτων, all the most eminent Editors from very many MSS., of various families, and some versions.

MK. LU.

8. 9. Σαδδουκαίων ; Τότε συνῆκαν, ὅτι οὐκ εἶπε προσέχειν ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης 12
τοῦ ἄρτου, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τῆς διδαχῆς τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ Σαδδουκαίων.
- 27 18 Ἐλθὼν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶς τὰ μέρη Καισαρείας τῆς Φιλίππου, ἠρώτα 13
τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ, λέγων· Τίνα [με] λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἶναι
- 28 19 τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ; Οἱ δὲ εἶπον· Οἱ μὲν Ἰωάννην τὸν Βα-14
πτιστὴν· ἄλλοι δὲ Ἠλίαν· ἕτεροι δὲ Ἱερουμίαν, ἢ ἓνα τῶν προφητῶν.
- 29 20 Λέγει αὐτοῖς· Ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνα με λέγετε εἶναι ; Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ Σίμων 15
Πέτρος εἶπε· Σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς, ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος. Καὶ 16
ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Μακάριος εἶ, Σίμων βῆρ Ἰωαῖ, 17
ὅτι σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα οὐκ ἀπεκάλυψέ σοι, ἀλλ' ὁ Πατὴρ μου ὁ ἐν τοῖς
οὐρανοῖς. Καγὼ δὲ σοὶ λέγω, ὅτι σὺ εἶ Πέτρος· καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ 18

13. τίνα με λέγουσι &c.] Bp. Middleton has shown that the interpretation of Beza and others, which supposes a double interrogation [“whom do men say that I am? the Son of man?”] would involve an intolerable harshness, not to say solecism. Yet, as the common reading and construction is liable to no little objection, he thinks the conjecture of Adler probable; that the received reading was made up of two, viz.: τίνα με λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἶναι (which is the reading of Mark and Luke) and of τίνα λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἶναι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, which is the supposed true reading of St. Matthew. The *me* is omitted in the Vatican MS. and several Versions and Fathers.

14. The meaning of this verse will depend upon that assigned to the preceding. If *me* be there removed, the sense here may be, that some thought John the Baptist to be the *Son of man*; others, Elijah, &c. meaning by υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, the person who should be Forerunner to, and usher in the Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ.

16. ὁ Υἱὸς—ζῶντος] Whitby supposes that there was this difference between ὁ Χαριστός, and ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, that the former referred to his *office*, the latter to his Divine *original*; though he admits that neither Nathanael (John i. 49.) nor the other Jews, nor even the Apostles, used it in that *sublime* sense in which Christians always take it. Ζῶντος denotes the (only) living and true [God], as distinguished from εἰδωλα ἄψυχα, (Wisd. xiv. 29), and fictitious deities; and because he alone hath life in himself, and is the Giver of life. [Comp. Joh. vi. 69. Acts viii. 37. ix. 20; 1 John iv. 15; v. 5.]

17. σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα] i. e. according to the sense of the expression in the N. T. and the Rabbinical writers, *Man*, as composed of flesh and blood; by a circumlocution, which (as Fritz. observes) always contains the idea of weakness and frailty. The sense is, Man [in his greatest wisdom], (aluding to the Scribes) hath not taught thee this, but God [by whose Providence thou becamest my disciple]. We are not, however, by this to understand any particular communication, by revelation, to Peter; but only the effect of that *conviction*, which resulted from the evidence afforded by the miracles, and the precepts and doctrines taught by Christ. It is remarkable that this phrase should not occur in the Septuagint.

18, 19. We are now advanced to a passage on which, as the Church of Rome mainly rests its doctrines of the supremacy and infallibility of the Pope, and the power of the Church, we are bound to discuss the sense with especial care. Let us, then, examine the words and clauses in order, as they of-

fer for themselves. First, from the very *form of expression* in Καγὼ δὲ σοὶ λέγω it is plain, that what is here said by Christ is meant to *correspond* to what had been just said by *Peter*. As he had declared to Jesus: Σὺ εἶ—ζῶντος, so Jesus says to him: Καγὼ δὲ σοὶ λέγω, the sense of which is: “Moreover I also say to thee.” In the next clause ὅτι σὺ εἶ Πέτρος, we are to bear in mind that *Peter* was not the *original* name of this disciple; but a *surname*, given to him (as was customary with the Jewish *Rabbis* at the baptism of proselytes) at his *conversion*. And as those names were often given with allusion to some peculiar quality or disposition; so, in the case of Simon, it had reference to that *zeal* and *firmness* which he displayed; as well in first making this confession of faith in Christ, as in afterwards building up the Church and establishing the Religion of Christ. For examples of this kind of *Paronomasia* in giving names, see Gen. xvii. 5. xxxii. 27. and compare Gen. xxvii. 36. Eurip. Phœn. 645. Æschyl. Prom. 472. Theb. 401. Agam. 670. So also Christ in like manner, surmamed James and John *Boanerges*, sons of thunder. Moreover Peter, or rather *Cephas*, (for Πέτρος is only the name Grecized,) means, not *stone*, (as some affirm,) but *Rock*, as Cephas often does, and πέτρος not unfrequently in the Classical writers, as Herodo. ix. 55. Soph. Œd. T. 334. Callim. Hymn in Apoll. 22. So Juvenecus Hist. Ev. iii. 275. must have understood it, who well expresses the sense thus: “Tu nomen *Petri* dignâ virtute tueris. Hac in mole mihi, *Saxique* in robore ponam Semper mansuras æternis mœnibus ædes.” Moreover, σὺ εἶ may be rendered “thy name denotes.” So Mark iii. 17. Βοανεργεὶς ὁ ἴσταν, υἱὸς βροντῆς.

But to proceed. Commentators, both ancient and modern, are not agreed as to what is meant by ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ. Now that depends upon the *reference*; which some suppose to be the *confession of faith* just made by Peter, while others (and indeed almost every modern expositor of any note,) refer it to *Peter himself*: and with reason; for certainly, as is observed by Bp. Marsh (Comp. View, App. p. 27.), “it would be a desperate undertaking to prove that Christ meant any other person than Peter.” In fact, they can indicate no other, consistently with the rules of correct exegesis; for, not to mention that the profession had not been Peter’s only, but in making it, he spoke not for himself alone, but for all the Apostles (and in *that* quality returned answer to a question which had been addressed to *them collectively*: “Whom say ye that I am?” &c.) the *connection* subsisting in the *reason* given for the

πέτρα οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν· καὶ πύλαι ᾄδου οὐ κατισχύ-
19 σουσιν αὐτῆς. Καὶ δώσω σοι τὰς κλεῖς τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν·

surname which had been bestowed on Simon, confines it to that alone; as also does the *paral-
lelism* between Christ's reply to Peter and the answer which he had given. And when the Expositors above alluded to conjecture that, in pronouncing the words, Christ pointed to *himself*, (as the great foundation) they argue upon a wholly gratuitous and very improbable supposition. Moreover, the words following *καὶ σοὶ δώσω* imply that there had been some *previous* gift or distinction. In short, the sense is: "Thou art by name *Rock*; (i. e. thy name means *Rock*) and suitably to that will be thy work and office; for upon *thee* (i. e. upon thy preaching, as upon a rock) shall the foundation of the Church be laid." It may, indeed, seem strange, that so natural and well-founded an interpretation should have been passed over by any. But that may be attributed *partly*, to the causeless fears into which Protestants have been betrayed; lest, by admitting it, they should give a countenance to the Papal claim of supremacy; and *partly*, to an idea, that such a sense would be contrary to what is elsewhere said in Scripture,—namely, that Christ is the *only* foundation. See I Cor. iii. 11. But as to the *first*, the fear is groundless: it being (as Bp. Middleton observes) "difficult to see what *advantage* could be gained; unless we could evade the meaning of *δώσω σοι τὰς κλεῖς*, which follows." And as to the *latter* fear, it is equally without foundation; since the two expressions are employed in two very *different* senses. In St. Peter's case, it was very applicable: for as he was the first Apostle called to the ministry so he was the first who preached the Gospel to the Jews, and also the first who preached it to the Gentiles. So that, to use the words of Bp. Pearson on the Creed, "the promise made here was punctually fulfilled, by Christ's using Peter's ministry in laying the foundation of the Christian Church among both Jews and Gentiles; and in his being the first preacher to them of that faith which he here confesses, and making the first proselytes to it: for St. Peter laid the first foundations of a church among the Jews, by the conversion of 3000 souls, Acts ii. 41., who, when they gladly had embraced St. Peter's doctrine, where all baptized; and then, ver. 47., we first find mention of a Christian Church. St. Peter also laid the first foundation of a Church among the *Gentiles*, by the conversion of Cornelius and his friends, Acts x." "If (says Bp. Taylor) St. Peter was chief of the Apostles, and head of the Church, he might fairly enough be the representative of the whole college of Apostles, and receive this promise in their right, as well as his own;—that promise, I say, which did not pertain to Peter principally and by origination, and to the rest by communication, society, and adherence; but that promise which was made to Peter first; yet not for himself, but for all the college, and for all their successors: and then made a second time to them all, without representation, but in diffusion, and performed to all alike in presence, except St. Thomas." In fact, the *Apostles generally* are in other parts of the N. T. called the *foundation* on which the Church is built, as in Eph. ii. 20. and Rev. xxi. 14., as being the persons employed in erecting the Church by their preaching. And what they all, more or less did, Peter commenced the doing thereof, and might

therefore be said to be the *first* foundation; though in matters of doctrine, the Christian Church rests on the testimony, not of one but of *all*.

But to proceed to the clause *καὶ πύλαι ᾄδου οὐ κατισχύουσιν αὐτῆς*, here there is the same debate as to the reference in *αὐτῆς*; some referring it to *πέτρα*, by which it must mean Peter's confession of faith; and not a few to the rock of the *Gospel*. Both methods are alike harsh and gratuitous, and in violation of the laws of exegesis. Almost all expositors of note are agreed in referring it to *ἐκκλησίαν*, both as it is the *nearer* antecedent, and because there thus arises a better sense. As to what is urged, that "the *grammatical construction* is against it," the persons who make this assertion show that they know as little of *grammar* as of criticism. And when they urge that the sense yielded by *ἐκκλ.* is wholly untenable on the ground of historical fact—this proceeds wholly upon a misconception of the *force* of *ἐκκλ.*, on which see Bp. Pearson on the Creed, Art. ix., where he explains the different modes of using the word. In connection with this promise, the force of *πύλαι ᾄδου* is to be attended to. Now certain plausible senses have been propounded: but, besides that they are far-fetched, the constant import of the phrase, both in the Greek Classical, the Old Testament, and the Rabbinical writers (where it constantly means the grave, or the entrance to it, the state of the dead), must determine it to mean simply *death* (i. e. the entrance into a new state of being). Thus the clause which we are considering contains a promise, *either* of perpetual stability to the Church Catholic, on which see Bp. Horsley, in D'Oyly and Mant, and Vitringa de Synag. p. 36., or, (taking *ἐκκ.*, as the best Commentators direct, to denote the *members* of it *individually*.) that not even death shall prevail over the [faithful] members of it: but that they shall be raised to a happy resurrection. Let us now proceed to examine the true import of the words which contain the *second* privilege conferred on St. Peter; namely, *δώσω οὐρανῶν*. These words appear to be a *continuation* of the image by which the Church was compared to an edifice founded on a rock. And they seem intended to *further explain* what was meant by founding the Church upon Peter, as a foundation; and they *figuratively* denote, that Peter should be the person by whose instrumentality the kingdom of heaven (the Gospel dispensation) should be first opened to both Jews and Gentiles; which was verified by the event. See Acts ii. 41. x. 44. compared with xv. 7. and Joh. xx. 23. seq. It is clear, that this cannot be supposed to give Peter any supremacy over the rest of the Apostles (because the *keys* were, in the same sense, afterwards given to *them* also), much less to the whole Church of Christ in after ages. As to the expression, "the keys," it may also refer to the *power* and *authority* for the said work; especially as a key was antiently an usual symbol of authority (see Is. xxii. 22.); and presenting with a key was a common form of investing with authority; inasmuch that it was afterwards worn as a badge of office.

The words *δὲ ἐὰν λύσῃς οὐρανοῖς* are explanatory of the former. Yet it should seem that the image taken from the *keys* is not continued here; but that they are a *fuller development* of the ideas

MK. LU.

8. 9. καὶ ὁ ἐὰν δέσῃς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ἔσται δεδεμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς· καὶ
 30 21 ὁ ἐὰν λύσῃς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ἔσται λελυμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. Τότε 20
 διεστείλατο τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, ἵνα μηδεὶ εἴπωσιν, ὅτι αὐτός ἐστιν
 [Ἰησοῦς] ὁ Χριστός.
 31 22 Ἀπὸ τότε ἤρξαστο ὁ Ἰησοῦς δεικνύειν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, ὅτι δεῖ 21
 αὐτὸν ἀπελθεῖν εἰς Ἱερουσόλιμα, καὶ πολλὰ παθεῖν ἀπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέ-
 32 ρων καὶ ἀρχιερέων καὶ γραμματέων, καὶ ἀποκτανθῆναι, καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ
 33 ἡμέρᾳ ἐγερθῆναι. Καὶ προσλαβόμενος αὐτὸν ὁ Πέτρος, ἤρξαστο ἐπιτι- 22
 μᾶν αὐτῷ, λέγων· ἡλέως σοι, κύριε! οὐ μὴ ἔσται σοι τοῦτο. Ὁ δὲ 23
 στραφεὶς εἶπε τῷ Πέτρῳ· Γραγε ὀπίσω μου, Σατανᾶ! σκάνδαλον
 μου εἶ· ὅτι οὐ φρονεῖς τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων. Τότε 24
 34 23 ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ· Εἴ τις θέλει ὀπίσω μου ἔλθειν,

of *trust* and *power* of which keys form a symbol; and that the power here meant is of a more extended kind. Not a little diversity, however, of interpretation here exists (see Recens. Synop.); though there is little doubt but that the view taken by Lightfoot, Selden, Hamm., Whitby, Kuin., and most recent Commentators, is the true one; who shew that *δέειν* signifies to *forbid*, not only in the Rabbinical writings, but in Dan. vi. 8. ix. 11, 16., as also in the Chaldee Paraphrase on Numb. xi. 23.; and that *λύειν* Heb. *קָרַר* and *קָרַר* denotes to *pronounce lawful, concede, permit, direct, constitute*, &c. The sense will, then be: "Whatsoever thou shalt forbid to be done, or whatsoever thou shalt *declare lawful*, and constitute in the Church, shall be ratified, and hold good with God; including all the measures necessary for the establishment and government of the Church. (See Vitringa de Synag. p. 754. seq.) That the above powers were exercised by Peter, in conjunction with the other Apostles, is indisputable. We need only advert to the decisions of the Council held at Jerusalem; when nearly the whole of the Mosaic ritual law was *loosed*, given up, and abrogated, while *part* of it was *bound* and still held obligatory. (See also Acts x. 23. & xxi. 24.) The words of our Lord at Joh. xx. 23. confer a similar privilege as to *persons* as that of the keys here imports as to *things*, viz. doctrines and institutions.

It is here observable that this sense of the words *δέειν* and *λύειν* is directly contrary to that which prevails among the Classical writers, in whom *λύειν* (*νόμον*) is synonymous with *καταλύειν* (*νόμον*), to *abrogate*, &c.; but nowhere, I believe, in the sense *concede, permit*, except in Diod. Sic. i. 27. (cited by Selden.) *ἄσα ἐγὼ δέσω οὐδεὶς δύναται λύσαι*. But even that is the *literal Greek* version of an *Oriental inscription*, and therefore is likely to follow the Eastern idiom. In fact, the phrase *δέειν νόμον* has never been produced from any Classical writer. I have, however, met with a passage which *approaches* to it in Soph. Antig. 40. *εἰ τὰδ'—ἐγὼ λύουσα' ἂν ἡ φάπτοσσα προσθείμην πλεον.* where the Schol. explains *τάδε ἐφάπτοσσα* by *βεβαιούσα τὸν νόμον*.

Whatever may be thought of the dignity thus conferred, it will certainly by no means justify the assertion of any peculiar prerogative to the *Roman Pontiff*; nor affect the question at issue between Protestants and Romanists upon the *power of the Church*. Whatever foundation Peter might be to the Church, it is clear that the

very image excludes all notion of a *succession* of persons similarly circumstanced. Nor, if the superiority of *Peter* had been permanent, could it afford a shadow of reason for deducing from it the supremacy of the first Bishop of Rome in the *persons of his successors*. At the same time, it must be observed that the authority of *binding* and *loosing*, first communicated to St. Peter and the other Apostles, was exercised by their immediate successors; and indeed has been continued, as far as altered circumstances would permit, by their *successors*, the Bishops of the Church to the present day.

20. The most eminent Critics are agreed, that *Ἰησοῦς*, found in the common text, is to be cancelled, on the authority of 54 MSS. and several Versions and Fathers.

21. On the connexion of the remaining portion of the Chapter, see Mackn., Porteus, and Townsend.

— *πρεσβυτέρων*] the members of the great Sanhedrim. See xxvi. 3. Acts iv. 8. xxv. 15. At Lu. xxii. 66. they are called *πρεσβυτέρων*.

22. *προσλαβόμενος αὐτόν.*] This controverted expression may mean "taking him aside;" but is best interpreted, "taking him by the hand;" an action naturally accompanying advice, remonstrance, or censure. Schleus, adduces an example of this sense from Plutarch; to which I add another from Aristoph. Lysist. 1123. *λαβούσα δ' ἡμᾶς, λοιπόσθαι βούλομαι.* Ἐπιτιμῶν here only denotes affectionate chiding.

— *ἡλέως σοι.*] Sub. *Θεὸς εἶπ.* Equivalent to our "God forbid;" and common in the Sept., Philo, and Josephus. The words following, *οὐ μὴ ἔσται σοι τοῦτο* are exegetical of *ἡλέως σοι*, and Grot. regards them as equivalent to the Classical *μη γίνωστω*; while Fritz., more properly, makes this distinction between them.— that the former is a formula *malum omen avertentis*; the latter, *precantis et valde sperantis rem aliter eventuram esse*; i. e. Di meliora, domine; non credo hoc tibi accidit. There is an ellipsis of *ὁ Θεὸς εἶπ.* supplied in 1 Chron. xi. 19. Sept. *ἡλέως μοι ὁ Θεός, τοῦ παιῆσαι τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο.*

23. *Σατανᾶ.*] The word here signifies either an adversary, or an evil counsellor. *Σκάνδαλον*, &c. is exegetical of the preceding, and signifies, "thou art an obstacle to the great work of atonement by my death;" namely, by fostering that natural horror of his painful and ignominious death, which occasionally harassed our Saviour. — *οὐ φρονεῖς.*] *Φρονεῖν τι* signifies "to

		MK.	LU.
	ἀπαρνησάσθω ἑαυτὸν, καὶ ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀκολουθείτω	8.	9.
25	μοι. Ὅς γὰρ ἂν θέλῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σῶσαι, ἀπολέσει αὐτήν· ὅς	35	24
26	δ' ἂν ἀπολέσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ, εὕρήσει αὐτήν. (Τί γὰρ	36	25
	ὠφελεῖται ἄνθρωπος, ἐὰν τὸν κόσμον ὅλον κερδήσῃ, τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν		
	αὐτοῦ ζημιωθῇ; ἢ τί δώσει ἄνθρωπος ἀτάλλαγμα τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ;)		
27	Μέλλει γὰρ ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔρχεσθαι ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ Πατρὸς		
	αὐτοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων αὐτοῦ· καὶ τότε ἀποδώσει ἐκάστῳ κατὰ	9.	
28	τὴν προᾶξιν αὐτοῦ. Ἄμην λέγω ὑμῖν, εἰσὶ τινες τῶν ὧδε † ἑσθηκότων,	1	27
	οἵτινες οὐ μὴ γεύσονται θανάτου, ἕως ἂν ἴδωσι τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώ-		
	που ἐρχόμενον ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ.		

1 XVII. ΚΑΙ μεθ' ἡμέρας ἕξ παραλαμβάνει ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὸν Πέτρον καὶ 2 28

be well affected to any one, to take his side." Here it denotes *caring for, being devoted to*, as I Macc. x. 20.

24. ἀπαρνησάσθω ἑαυτὸν] "let him neglect his preservation, not value his life." Comp. Luke xiv. 26., and see note on Matt. x. 38. sq.

26. τί γὰρ ὠφελεῖται—ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ;] This seems to be, like the following *τί δώσει, &c.*, a *proverbial* expression; but transferred by Jesus from temporal to spiritual application; there being an allusion to the two meanings of *ψυχῆ*,—*life* and *soul*. If we think an earthly and temporary life cheaply bought, at whatever price, how much *more* a heavenly and eternal one." At *ζημιωθῇ τὴν ψυχὴν* sub. *eis*, which is sometimes expressed in the Classical writers, though they generally use the *Dative*. *Τί δώσει, &c.* Another proverbial expression, with which Wets. compares several others. I add a saying of Socrates, preserved by Libanius, in which he says, *τιμωτάτων τῶ ἀνθρώπων ψυχὴν εἶναι δέτερον δὲ τὸ σῶμα, τρίτον τὰ χρήματα.* [Comp. John xii. 25.]

27. μέλλει γὰρ &c.] The Commentators are not agreed as to the *reference* in this and the next verse. The antient and the earlier modern ones in general refer the former of them to the *final* advent of Christ at the day of judgment; the latter, to the second advent of Christ at the destruction of Jerusalem, about 40 years afterwards. Most recent Expositors, however, since the time of Whitby, refer the *former* verse also to the second advent of Christ. And indeed they make out, as far as regards the connection with the preceding verses, a tolerably good case. Not so, as regards the words and phrase of the verse itself; which, though they be not wholly unsuitable to the *first* advent, yet are far more naturally to be understood (according to their use elsewhere) of the *final* advent. And as to the *connection*, the *γὰρ* may be referred, not to the verses immediately preceding, but to the injunction at v. 24.; vv. 22. & 23. being parenthetical. Nor is the course of argument injured; which may be preserved by supplying mentally a few words of connection between v. 27 & 28., q. d. [Of his power and determination to judge and punish the impenitent, he will ere long give a specimen on the unbelieving and persecuting Jews]; for "verily I say," &c. And as this second coming ἐν βασιλ. (i. e., as Fritz. rightly explains, in medio regni splendore) is elsewhere described in terms bearing a strong resemblance to those which designate Christ's *final* advent, there was the greater propriety in introducing them as a just ground to expect and prepare for it. And although

it has been urged that it would be harsh to understand the *τινες* of *one* person; and St John alone of the bystanders is known to have lived to see the destruction of Jerusalem, yet that argument is very inconclusive; for it is highly probable that others of the by-standers, as well as St. John, might live forty years. And certainly the air of the words suggests a *distant* event, not one close at hand; as would be the case, if we take this, with Mackn. and others, of the *Transfiguration*, or of Christ's assuming his mediatorial kingdom after his ascension. As to the first of those two interpretations, it has not a shadow of probability; since the words of this verse bear no affinity to those used in describing that awful transaction. As to the *second*, it is not permitted by the connection; since there is no allusion to Christ's coming to judgment. Perhaps, however, as the two events in question formed part of one transaction, the two interpretations may be united. And then the sense will be, that some then present should live to see Christ enter upon and finally establish his mediatorial reign; at the completion of which he will come in the glory of his Father to reward every man according to his works.

28. ἑσθηκότων] Many MSS. and some Fathers have *ἐσθίωνων*, which is edited by Matth., Griesb., Knapp., Vater, and Scholz. Others have *ἐσθῶτες*, which is adopted by Wets., and edited by Fritz., as being the more *difficult* reading. But it seems to have come from the margin, and to have been a conjecture of those who proposed to read *εἰσὶ τινες ὧδε ἐσθῶτες*. As to the first mentioned reading, it *may* be the true one; but the evidence is not so strong as to demand any change in the text; and the common reading is defended by Mark ix. 1. and Luke ix. 27.

—γεύεσθαι θανάτου is a Hebraism (like *θεωρεῖν θαν.*, Joh. viii. 51., *ἰδῆν θαν.*, Luke ii. 26.) by which verbs of sense are used in the metaphorical signification to *experience*, not unfrequent in the *Classical* writers; where it is joined not, indeed, with *θανάτου*, but with nouns denoting *trouble*.

XVII. 1. We are now arrived at the narration of a most awful and mysterious transaction—such as draws back for a moment the veil from the invisible world: on the circumstances, *manner*, and *probable purposes*, of which a brief notice must here suffice. For further particulars, the reader is referred to Bp. Hall's Contemplations, Whitby, Mackn., Porteus, and Townsend; and, above all, to the masterly Dissertation of Witsius,

MK. LU.

9. 9. Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀναφέρει αὐτοὺς εἰς
 29 ὄρος ὑψηλὸν κατ' ἰδίαν. Καὶ μετεμορφώθη ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν, καὶ 2
 ἔλαμψε τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ὡς ὁ ἥλιος, τὰ δὲ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο
 3 30 λευκὰ ὡς τὸ φῶς. Καὶ ἰδοὺ, ὤφθησαν αὐτοῖς Μωσῆς καὶ Ἠλίας, 3
 4 μετ' αὐτοῦ συλλαλοῦντες. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος εἶπε τῷ Ἰησοῦ· 4
 5 33 Κύριε, καλὸν ἐστὶν ἡμῶς ὥδε εἶναι. εἰ θέλεις, ποιήσωμεν ὥδε τρεῖς
 34 σκηνάς· σοὶ μίαν, καὶ Μωσῆι μίαν, καὶ μίαν Ἠλίᾳ. Ἔτι αὐτοῦ λα- 5
 7 35 λῶντος, ἰδοὺ, νεφέλη φωτεινὴ ἐπεσκίασεν αὐτούς· καὶ ἰδοὺ, φωνὴ ἐκ

in the Meletemata Leidensia, or the abstract of it in Townsend. The transaction itself may be considered as a *figurative representation* of Christ's final advent in glory to judgment. To advert to some of the *particulars*,—why three disciples and no more were admitted, seems to have been, because that number was the number of witnesses necessary to establish legal proof of any transaction. The three particular disciples taken were selected as being the most attached and confidential of the disciples. That the presence of Moses and Elias was a bodily, and not, as some say, a *visionary* appearance, there is no reason to doubt; especially as it involves no difficulty, but such as Omnipotence will vanquish at the general Resurrection, though the *nature* of the change in question is incomprehensible to us, with our present faculties. As to supposing, with some sceptical foreign Theologians, the *whole* to have been a vision, that is still *less* defensible; for though the disciples had been asleep (or rather *heavy for sleep*,) the transaction, it seems, taking place in the night (see Luke ix. 32.), they are distinctly said to have been *awake* when they *saw* and *heard* Moses and Elias conversing with Jesus. With respect to the *purposes* of this transaction, it seems to have been intended, 1. to loosen the prejudices of the Apostles as to the performance of the Mosaic Law, by a figurative and symbolical representation of the expiration of the Jewish, and the commencement of the Christian dispensation: 2. to reconcile their minds to the sufferings and death of Christ: 3. to strengthen their faith; affording an *additional* proof, as it were, by a *sign* from heaven, of the Divine mission of *Jesus*. For it is probable that as the Jews supposed the Messiah would, at his coming, be seen literally descending from the heavens, and arrayed in glory; so our Lord was pleased to give his *Apostles* this decisive proof of his Messiahship, by showing himself in his glory, such as that with which he would appear at the final Advent. The representation was, no doubt, *also* intended to comfort and support the Apostles under their present and future trials and tribulations, by a prospect of the *glory* which should be revealed in their Saviour, and, through him, in themselves.

—ὄρος.] This mountain is, from antient tradition, supposed to have been *Tabor*. Lightfoot, however, questions the truth of the tradition: but, as far as respects the distance of the mountain from Cæsarea Philippi, on insufficient grounds; for it is only about 45 miles from that place, a distance easily accomplished in *six days*. But neither, on the other hand, will the words of v. 22, and Mark ix. 30., as is alleged, *prove* what those who maintain that the mountain was Tabor, aver; namely, that a journey was taken through Galilee just before the Transfiguration. As to

the former passage, see the note there; and as to the latter, it only proves that a journey to *Capernaum*, was taken *after* the Transfiguration: and therefore it is highly improbable that there should have been so long a journey taken just *before* it. And although the expressions used by St. Matthew and Mark do not specify any *particular mountain*, yet the context evidently points at some mountain in the neighbourhood of Cæsarea. And this probability is converted into certainty by the words of St. Luke, ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος (as it is found in all the MSS., confirmed by the Pesch. Syr. Version), where the Article limits the sense to *some* mountain, which might be called *the* mountain in respect to Cæsarea; and that cannot well be any other than some part of the ridge of *Hermon*; most probably that part of it which runs out into the plain of the Jordan, within six miles of Cæsarea, called the *Mons Paneum*. The tradition above mentioned seems to have arisen from a confounding of the *two* Mounts Hermon; one very near Tabor, the other near Cæsarea. It should seem that after it had been preserved by antient tradition, that Mount Hermon was the scene of the Transfiguration, those who lived in later ages supposed the Hermon to be that near Tabor, as was natural; since the two were often associated. So Ps. lxxxix. 12. "Tabor and Hermon shall rejoice in Him;" and others afterwards fixed on *Tabor itself*, on account of its very close contiguity, and its being most κατ' ἰδίαν, in their mistaken view of the expression, referring it to the *mountain*; for Mr. Maundrell, in his Travels, remarks that it stands "apart;" and all travellers describe it as being of a conical form, detached from the neighbouring mountain, and terminating in a point.

2. μετεμορφώθη] "was transfigured." The word (which sometimes imports a change of substance) here denotes only a change in external appearance (as in Ælian V. H. i. 1.), agreeably to the sense of its primitive μορφή in the Old and New Testament. Thus, in the plainer words of Luke ix. 29. τὸ εἶδος τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ ἔπεσαν ἐγένετο.

4. σκηνάς] Namely booths composed of branches of trees, such as were hastily raised for temporary purposes by travellers, and such as were reared at the feast of tabernacles. (Comp.)

5. φωτεινῆ] Griesb. and Fritz. edit φωτὸς on account of its being the more difficult reading. But that Critical canon has its exceptions; and *one* is, when the reading involves a violation of the norma loquendi. Now νεφ. φωτὸς, as Knittel and Fritz. remark. "repugnantiam quandam continent, (Comp. Mark ix. 7.) nec facile dici potest," whereas φωτεινῆ is supported by v. 22. See xi. 34 & 36. *Another* is, when the external evidence for reading is exceedingly slight; which is the case here; for it is found only in five or six inferior MSS. The cloud here mentioned,

τῆς νεφέλης, λέγουσα· Οὕτως ἐσὶν ὁ Υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ᾧ ^{MK.} 9. ^{LU.} 9.
 6 εὐδόκησα· αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε. Καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ μαθηταί, ἔπεσον ἐπὶ
 7 πρόσωπον αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν σφόδρα. Καὶ προσελθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς
 8 ἤψατο αὐτῶν, καὶ εἶπεν· Ἐγέσθητε, καὶ μὴ φοβεῖσθε. Ἐπάραντες 8 36
 δὲ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν, οὐδένα εἶδον, εἰ μὴ τὸν Ἰησοῦν μόνον.
 9 Καὶ καταβαινόντων αὐτῶν † ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους, ἐνετείλατο αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰη- 9
 σοῦς, λέγων· Μηδενὶ εἶπητε τὸ ὄραμα, ἕως οὗ ὁ Υἱός τοῦ ἀνθρώπου 11
 10 ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῆ. Καὶ ἐπηρώτησαν αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταί αὐτοῦ, λέγον-
 11 τες· Τί οὖν οἱ Γραμματεῖς λέγουσιν, ὅτι Ἰηλίας δεῖ ἐλθεῖν πρῶτον;
 12 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Ἰηλίας μὲν ἔρχεται πρῶτον, 12
 13 καὶ ἀποκαταστήσει πάντα· λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν, ὅτι Ἰηλίας ἤδη ἦλθε· καὶ 13
 οὐκ ἐπέγνωσαν αὐτόν· ἀλλ' ἐποίησαν ἐν αὐτῷ ὅσα ἠθέλησαν· οὕτω
 14 καὶ ὁ Υἱός τοῦ ἀνθρώπου μέλλει πάσχειν ὑπ' αὐτῶν. Τότε συνήκων
 οἱ μαθηταί, ὅτι περὶ Ἰωάννου τοῦ Βαπτιστοῦ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς.
 14 Καὶ ἐλθόντων αὐτῶν πρὸς τὸν ὄχλον, προσῆλθεν αὐτῷ ἄνθρωπος 14 37
 15 γονυπετῶν αὐτόν, καὶ λέγων· Κύριε, ἐλέησόν μου τὸν υἱόν, ὅτι σελη- 17 38
 νιάζεται, καὶ κακῶς πάσχει· πολλάκις γὰρ πίπτει εἰς τὸ πῦρ, καὶ 13
 16 πολλάκις εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ. Καὶ προσήνεγκα αὐτόν τοῖς μαθηταῖς σου, 40

called at 2 Pet. i. 17. the "excellent glory," is supposed to have been the Shechinah, in which the Divine Majesty often appeared to the Jews.

— ἐπεκρίσεν.] Not, *overshadowed*, but *surrounded*. An Hellenistic use found in the Sept. The αὐτοῖς may be understood of *all present*.

— φωνῆ, &c.] This is one of the three instances in the Gospels, of God's personally interposing and bearing testimony in favour of his Son. Αὐτοῦ is to be taken *emphatically*, "him alone," and no longer Moses and the Prophets. Comp. supra iii. 17. 2 Pet. i. 17. Mark i. 11. John i. 34. Is. xlii. 1.

6. ἔπεσον ἐπὶ πρόσωπον.] A posture generally and naturally assumed by those to whom visions were made; and to be accounted for not merely on a principle of *fear*, (it being the general persuasion that the sight of a supernatural being must destroy life) but of *reverence*. [Comp. Dan. viii. 13, ix. 21. x. 10 & 13.]

9. ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους] i. e. that mentioned, supra xvi. 20. For ἀπὸ Math., Griesb., Fritz., and Scholz edit ἐκ, from very many MSS., early Editions, and Fathers. But there is no sufficient reason for alteration; especially as καταβ. ἀπὸ ὄρους is often used in the N. T.; καταβ. ἐκ τοῦ ὄρους *never*.

— τὸ ὄραμα] "what they had seen," ἢ εἶδον, as Mark phrases it. This term quite excludes the notion that it was a mere vision.

10. τί οὖν οἱ Γραμματεῖς — πρῶτον.] Conf. supra xi. 14. there is here a difficulty, arising from the obscurity of the connection, and the brevity of the enunciation. The sense is most probably as follows: "How can the declaration of the scribes (grounded on the prophecy of Malachi iv. 5.) hold good, — that Elias must precede the Messiah, to announce his coming, and restore all things, &c., when we see the Messiah already come, and no Elias performing any of the offices in question?"

11. Ἰηλίας μὲν — πάντα.] The sense (which has been causelessly disputed) is plainly as follows:

"Elias is indeed first to come, and will restore all things;" i. e. he means of introducing a mighty moral change and reformation. There is thought to be an allusion to the words of Malachi iv. 5, 6. Sept., what is there said *specially*, being here applied *generally*. The *future* tense is used, because Jesus here merely uses the language which was generally applied to the Messiah; q. d. "So then, it seems Elias," &c. Ἀποκαταστήσει is said by some to be taken of *design* rather than effect. But what John was to do, which was only to act an introductory part, was accomplished, and ἀποκατ. must be explained with a reference thereto. If this be not admitted, the way in which the words were said will sufficiently justify the use of the term.

12. οὐκ ἐπέγνωσαν αὐτόν] "knew him not;" "did not recognise him as such;" there being much disagreement as to his real character.

— ἐν αὐτῷ.] This is thought to be a Hebraism; but it is rather a *popular* idiom, similar to one in our own language. Ηοῦν is adapted to denote *treatment* of every kind, whether good or bad. Ὅσα ἠθέλησαν is a *popular* idiom, which usually implies violence. See Luke xxiii. 25. and Mark ix. 13.

14. αὐτόν.] So all the Editors from Wets. downwards read, for αὐτῶν, on the strongest evidence both of MSS. and Fathers, and the usage of Scripture, as Mark i. 40. x. 17.

— γονυπετῶν.] The force of the term is well illustrated in Horne's Introd. iii. 323.

15. σεληνιάζεται] literally, "he is moonstruck." From the symptoms mentioned here and at Mark ix. 13. this disorder is supposed to have been *epilepsy*; under whose paroxysms those afflicted with it are deprived of all sense, bodily and mental, and nearly all articulation. And as we find, in the ancient medical writers, epileptic patients said to be *moonstruck*, agreeably to the common notion, of the influence of the moon in producing the disorder, it is very possible that the disorder in question was epilepsy. Be that, how-

MK. LU.

9. 9. καὶ οὐκ ἠδυνήθησαν αὐτὸν θεραπεῦσαι. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς 17
 19 41 εἶπεν· Ἴδ γενεὰ ἄπιστος καὶ διεστραμμένη! ἕως πότε ἔσομαι μεθ'
 27 42 ὑμῶν; ἕως πότε ἀνέξομαι ὑμῶν; φέρετέ μοι αὐτὸν ὧδε. Καὶ ἐπιτί- 18
 28 43 μησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τὸ δαιμόνιον· καὶ
 ἐθεραπεύθη ὁ παῖς ἀπὸ τῆς ὥρας ἐκείνης. Τότε προσελθόντες οἱ 19
 μαθηταὶ τῷ Ἰησοῦ κατ' ἰδίαν, εἶπον· Διὰ τί ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἠδυνήθημεν
 ἐκβαλεῖν αὐτό; Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Διὰ τὴν ἀπιστίαν ὑμῶν. 20
 ἀμὴν γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν· ἐὰν ἔχητε πίστιν ὡς κόκκον σινάπεως, ἐρεῖτε
 τῷ ὄρει τοῦτο· Μειάθηθι ἐντεῦθεν ἐκεῖ, καὶ μεταθήσεται· καὶ οὐ-
 29 δὲν ἀδυνατήσει ὑμῖν. Τοῦτο δὲ τὸ γένος οὐκ ἐκπορεύεται, εἰ μὴ ἐν 21
 προσευχῇ καὶ νηστείᾳ.

Ἀναστρεφόμενων δὲ αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· 22
 31 44 Μέλλει ὁ Τίος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοσθαι εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων·
 45 καὶ ἀποκτενοῦσιν αὐτὸν, καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγερθήσεται. καὶ ἐλυπή- 23
 ἤσαν σφόδρα.

Ἐλθόντων δὲ αὐτῶν εἰς Καπερναοῦμ, προσῆλθον οἱ τὰ δίδραγμα 24
 λαμβάνοντες τῷ Πέτρῳ, καὶ εἶπον· Ὁ διδάσκαλος ὑμῶν οὐ τελεῖ τὰ
 δίδραγμα; λέγει· Ναί. Καὶ ὅτε εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, προέφθα- 25

ever, as it may, the symptoms are all reconcilable with dæmoniacal influence.

17. ὦ γενεὰ ἄπιστος.] *Who* are the persons here meant, has been much debated. Some understand the *father* and the *relations*. Others, the *Jews*, i. e. the *Scribes* who might be present on the occasion. Others, again, the *disciples*; which seems from the context to be the most probable. But it is better (with Doddr., Kypke, Kuin., &c.) to suppose the reproof meant for *all* present, each as they deserved it. *Γενεὰ ἄπιστος* may be referred to the *disciples*, and perhaps the *father*; *διστρο*, to the *Scribes*; the first *ἑὸν* to the *disciples* and the second to the *scribes*.

— *διστραμμένος* signifies, literally, *crooked, perverse*, and, metaphorically, *bad*; whether in body, or in mind or morals. There is a similar metaphor in our word *wrong*, from the part. *past wrong*, from *wringen*, to twist. In both terms there is a tacit reference to what is *straight*.

— *ἕως πότε* — *ὑμῶν* render, "How long must I be with you," i. e. "how long must my presence be necessary to you?"

18. καὶ ἐπιτίμησεν — *δαίμονιον*.] Some refer the *αὐτῷ* to the sick person; others, far more correctly, to the *dæmon*. In fact, the passage is to be taken as if written *καὶ ἐπιτίμησε τῷ δαίμονι, καὶ ἐξῆλθε*.

20. ὡς κόκκον σινάπεως] i. e. even in the smallest degree; for this was, as we find from the Rabbinical citations in Wets., a proverbial expression to denote any thing exceedingly small, (the *σίναι* being the smallest of all seeds) just as to *remove mountains* was an adagial hyperbole to denote the accomplishment of any thing apparently impossible. [Comp. Mark xi. 23. Luke xvii. 6.]

21. τοῦτο τὸ γένος.] Here almost all Commentators supply *δαμονίων*. But that would suppose *different kinds* of dæmons, which, though a possible fact, yet must not be admitted into revelation *per ellipsis*. The truth is, that (as Chrys., Euthym., and some modern Commentators have seen,) the sense is: "this kind of beings," namely,

dæmons. Similar expressions might be adduced both from the Greek, Latin, and modern languages.

— *ἐν προσευχῇ καὶ νηστείᾳ*.] viz., says Campb., as necessary to the attainment of that faith, without which the dæmons could not be expelled; and, therefore, prayer and fasting might be said to be the *cause*, as being the *cause of the cause*.

22. παραδίδοσθαι.] Not betrayed, but delivered up.

— *ἀναστρεφόμενων ἐν τῇ Γ.*] This should not be rendered, "while they abode in Galilee;" nor, "while they returned to Galilee;" nor, as some interpret, "while they passed through." For though it may seem to be required by Mark ix. 30. *παρεπορεύοντο διὰ τῆς Γαλιλαίας*, yet there is no authority for such a sense; nor do the words of St. Mark require it; for *ἔπορ*, there means, "they passed along through" (as in ii. 23.) i. e. travelled through. And that is the very sense of *ἀναστρέφω* here of which signification Wets. will supply examples. Render, "as they were travelling in Galilee," i. e., as we find from v. 24, on their way to Capernaum; and, as we learn from supra xvi. 21, on their journey to Jerusalem.

24. τὰ δίδραγμα] "the didrachmas." A collective name for the *tax* so called. The plural is used with reference to the many persons from whom it was collected, each paying one. Thus there is no need to read (as Pisc. proposes) *τὸ δ*. And the Art. has reference to the *customary* payment. The noun is declined *τὸ δίδραγμα, τοῦ δίδραχμου*; consequently, *δίδραγμα* is the accus. plural, which I should scarcely have thought worth mentioning, had not some Commentators of eminence, through ignorance of this minute grammatical point, fallen into error. The tax was doubtless the half shekel, the sacred tribute.

25. ὅτε εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν] *Who* is here meant, is not clear. Almost all the Commentators suppose, *Jesus*. We may, however, understand it, with Euthym., L. Brug., and Kuin., (supported by the Syr.) of *Peter*. The sense

σεν αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, λέγων· Τί σοι δοκεῖ, Σίμων; οἱ βασιλεῖς τῆς
 γῆς ἀπὸ τίνων λαμβάνουσι τέλη ἢ κῆρσον; ἀπὸ τῶν υἰῶν αὐτῶν, ἢ
 26 ἀπὸ τῶν ἄλλοτριῶν; Λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Πέτρος· Ἀπὸ τῶν ἄλλοτριῶν.
 27 Ἐφη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Ἄραγε ἐλεύθεροί εἰσιν οἱ υἱοί. Ἴνα δὲ μὴ σκαν-
 δαλίσωμεν αὐτοὺς, πορευθεῖς, εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν βάλε ἄγκιστρον, καὶ
 τὸν ἀναβάτῃα πρῶτον ἰχθῦν ἄρον· καὶ ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ, εὐ-
 ρήσεις στατήρα· ἐκείνον λαβὼν δὲς αὐτοῖς ἀντὶ ἐμοῦ και σοῦ.
 1 XVIII. Ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ προσῆλθον οἱ μαθηταὶ τῷ Ἰησοῦ, λέ- 46
 2 γοντες· Τίς ἄρα μείζων ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν; Καὶ 36 47
 προσκαλεσάμενος ὁ Ἰησοῦς παιδίον, ἔατησεν αὐτὸ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν·
 3 καὶ εἶπεν· Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν· ἐὰν μὴ στραφῆτε καὶ γένηθε ὡς τὰ
 4 παιδία, οὐ μὴ εἰσελθῆτε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν. Ὅστις οὖν
 † ταπεινώσῃ ἑαυτὸν ὡς τὸ παιδίον τοῦτο, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ μείζων ἐν τῇ
 5 βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν. Καὶ ὃς ἐὰν δέξῃται παιδίον τοιοῦτον ἐν ἐπὶ 37 48
 6 τῷ ὀνόματί μου, ἐμὲ δέχεται· Ὅς δ' ἂν σκανδαλίσῃ ἓνα τῶν μικρῶν
 τούτων τῶν πιστευόντων εἰς ἐμὲ, συμφέρει αὐτῷ, ἵνα κρεμασθῇ μύλος

MK. LU.
9. 9.

may be thus expressed: "When Peter had entered into the house, [whither Jesus had already gone, while the tax-gatherers were applying to Peter for the contribution,] and was just about to ask him whether he would not pay the contribution, Jesus was beforehand with his question, by asking him one, namely, *τί σοι, &c.* Υἱῶν, i. e. those of their own family, as opposed to *ἄλλοτ.*, those not of their own family.

26. ἄρα γε ἐλεύθεροί ε. οἱ υἱοί.] Though there has been some question raised as to what is meant by these words, yet, after all, the simplest and truest interpretation is that of Chrysost. and Euthym. (approved by Fritz.), namely, "that this tribute, paid to God for his temple, I ought not to pay, inasmuch as I am his *Son*." There is an argument *à fortiori*. "If such be the case with an earthly king's son, how much more," &c.

27. ἵνα μὴ σκανδαλίσωμεν αὐτοῖς] i. e. that we may not make them suppose, that we undervalue the temple; which might cause them to stumble at, and reject my pretensions.

—τὸν ἀναβάτῃα ἰχθῦν] "that which rises to, or meets the hook." As to the piece of money here mentioned, we need not, with Schmidt, suppose it created on purpose; but that it had fallen into the sea, and been swallowed by the fish. Many instances are on record of jewels, coins, &c. being found in the bellies of fishes.

XVIII. 1. ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ] "at that time" (ὥρα for καιρὸς, as xi. 25.) and probably on the same day with the events just recorded, namely the transfiguration, and the payment of the didrachma by our Lord for himself and Peter. On the discrepancy respecting the mode in which this transaction took place, see Michaelis, as cited by Mr. Townsend, Vol. i. p. 307. Τίς ἄρα μείζων &c. This inquiry, no doubt, arose from a dispute, which had arisen of late from the preference just shown by Jesus to Peter, John, and James; and which had excited some envy in the rest of the disciples, and perhaps some pride in the bosoms of those preferred.

—μείζων] for μέγιστος, say the Commentators. But the disciples seem to have desired to know,

not who should be *the greatest*, but who should be *great*, and fill the *more considerable* posts in the Court of the Messiah. The notion (common to all the Jews) that the Messiah would erect a temporal kingdom, they yet clung to; and never laid aside till fully enlightened at the descent of the Holy Spirit.

2. ἔατησεν αὐτὸ—αὐτῶν] Thus employing a method of instruction always prevalent in the East; namely, that by emblems and symbolical actions. See Joh. xiii. 4. & 14. xx. 22. xxi. 19.

3. ὡς τὰ παιδία] Namely, in respect to unambitiousness, humility, docility, and absence of a worldly-minded spirit, dispositions the very reverse to those which they were then indulging. Comp. infra xix. 14. 1 Cor. xiv. 26. Our Lord proceeds to show that he who evinces the dispositions thus enjoined shall be distinguished in the spiritual kingdom which he comes to establish.

4. ταπεινώσῃ] Lachm. and Scholz edit, from many ancient MSS., *ταπεινώσει*. But there is not sufficient evidence to justify any change. If the propriety of the Greek be objected to, we might answer, with Matthæi, in N. T. non Græcitas sed Codices valent. However, the propriety has been learnedly supported by Fritz.

5. καὶ δε ἐὰν δέξῃται &c.] The preceding verse is evidently directed to the *Apostles*; while this and the following seem not suitable to them; but were probably addressed to some *bystanders*, for to the people at large it would be very suitable.

6. μικρῶν] i. e. disciples generally without reference to age or quality. The words τῶν πιστευόντων are exegetical of the preceding.

—συμφέρει αὐτῷ.] Some supply μάλλον, i. e. rather than he should commit such a crime. But that is not necessary, it being *implied*.

—μύλος ὀνίκος.] Same Commentators understand by this the *upper of the two mill-stones*, called in Heb. גרר, as *riding on the other*: others, a *mill-stone turned by an ass*, and consequently larger than that turned by the hand. Be that as it may, the expression *συμφέρει*—*καταποντισθῆναι* seems to be proverbial. The punishment in question, though not in use among the Jews themselves, was so

MK. LU.

9. 15. οὐκὸς † ἐπὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ, καὶ καταποτισθῆν ἔν τῷ πελάγει τῆς θαλάσσης. Οὐαὶ τῷ κόσμῳ ἀπὸ τῶν σκανδάλων! ἀνάγκη γὰρ ἐστὶν 7 ἔλθειν τὰ σκάνδαλα· πλὴν οὐαὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ, δι' οὗ τὸ σκάν-
 43 δαλον ἔρχεται! Εἰ δὲ ἡ χεὶρ σου ἢ ὁ πούς σου σκανδαλίζει σε, 8 ἔκκοψον αὐτὰ καὶ βύλε ἀπὸ σοῦ· καλόν σοι ἐστὶν εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν ζωὴν ἡλιώτην ἢ κυλλόν, ἢ δύο χεῖρας ἢ δύο πόδας ἔχοντα, βληθῆναι
 47 εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον. Καὶ εἰ ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου σκανδαλίζει σε, ἔξελε· 9 αὐτὸν, καὶ βύλε ἀπὸ σοῦ· καλόν σοι ἐστὶ μονόφθαλμον εἰς τὴν ζωὴν εἰσελθεῖν, ἢ δύο ὀφθαλμούς ἔχοντα, βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυ-
 11 ρός. Ὁρατε μὴ καταφρονήσητε ἐνὸς τῶν μικρῶν τούτων· λέγω γὰρ 10 ὑμῖν, οὗτοι οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτῶν ἐν οὐρανοῖς διὰ παντός βλέπουσι τὸ πρό-
 4 σωπον τοῦ Πατρὸς μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς. Ἦλθε γὰρ ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ ἁ- 11
 4 θρώπου σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός. Τί ὑμῖν δοκεῖ; ἐὰν γένηται τι ἀν- 12
 4 θρώπῳ ἑκατὸν πρόβατα, καὶ πλανηθῆ ἓν ἐξ αὐτῶν· οὐχὶ ἀφείς τὰ

among the surrounding nations: where it was inflicted on criminals of the worst sort.

— πελάγει τῆς θαλάσσης] A somewhat rare phrase, which preserves the primitive sense of *πλάγος*, namely a *depth*. For ἐπὶ before τὸν *πάγ*, very many MSS. have *eis*, which is edited by Wets., Matth., Griesb., Vater, Fritz., and Scholz: perhaps upon just grounds. With this and ver. 7. comp. Luke xvii. 1 & 2.

7. σκανδάλων] Namely, those just adverted to, arising from the calamities and persecutions that awaited the professors of Christianity; and which are supposed to have been present to the mind of our Lord and his Apostles.

— ἀνάγκη γὰρ &c.] The necessity here mentioned is *conditional*; and we may paraphrase this, and the parallel passage of Luke, as follows: "It cannot but happen that offences, (σκάνδαλα) circumstances which obstruct the reception, or occasion the abandonment of the faith, should occur; whether occasioned by persecution, denial of the common offices of humanity, contempt, &c. The argument is, that though, from the corruption of human nature, and the abuse of men's free agency, offences must needs arise, yet so terrible are the consequences of those offences, that it is better to endure the greatest deprivations, or corporeal pain, than occasion them. On this subject see Bp. Taylor's Works, Vol. iii. 221. sq.

8. Compare ch. v. 30. sq. and Notes. With respect to the *connection*, Kuin. denies that there is any. But it should seem that, together with cautions against the σκάνδαλα which draw *others* into sin, our Lord mixes one (intended for his disciples) against throwing any σκάνδαλον in our *own* way, either by giving way to worldly-mindedness, or to sensuality, and inordinate affection. In short, the best commentary on these verses are those of I John ii. 15 & 16., probably written with a view to this admonition of Christ: Μὴ ἀγαπᾶτε τὸν κόσμον &c. οὗτι πᾶν τὸ ἐν κόσμῳ, ἢ ἐπιθυμία τῆς σαρκὸς, καὶ ἐπιθυμία τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν, &c.

10. ὁρατε μὴ καταφρονήσητε &c.] Reverting back to the subject before treated at 6 & 7, our Lord from *persecution* in general proceeds to warn his hearers against *pride* and *contempt* towards the persons in question. And this admonition is urged from two reasons. 1. The care with which God, by his angels, watches over his meanest

servants; 2. the love of Christ shown equally unto *them*, by his laying down his life for their sakes, as well as their more honoured brethren. It is plain that *this* admonition is meant for such as were become disciples. As to the *first* reason, it is an *argumentum ad hominem*, adverting to the general belief of the Jews (retained among the early Christians, and professed by several of the Fathers), that every person, or at least the *good*, had his attendant angel. These are said at Heb. i. 14. to be "ministering spirits to those who shall be heirs of salvation." This angelic attendant they regarded as the representative of the person; and even as bearing a personal resemblance to him: nay, standing in the same favour with God as the person himself.

— βλέπουσι τὸ πρόσωπον &c.] "they enjoy the favour of," &c., in accordance with the Oriental custom, by which none were allowed to see the monarch but those who were in especial favour with him. [Comp. 1 Kings x. 3.]

11. ἦλθε γὰρ — ἀπολωλός.] The connection here is not quite certain; but it seems to be with the *former* part of the preceding verse, q. d. "Despite not any fellow-Christians, however humble; for the Son of Man came to *save ruined men*, without exception or distinction." The verse is rejected by Kuin., and cancelled by Griesb. and Lachm.; but rashly: for *external* evidence is quite in its favour; it being only omitted in 5 MSS. and 3 inferior Versions: and *internal* decidedly so; for it is far easier to account for its omission than its insertion from Luke xix. 10. It is omitted in so few MSS., that we might almost suppose the omission to have been from the negligence of the scribes. But I rather suspect that the slashing Alexandrian Critics (who throughout the whole of the N. T. took such unwarrantable liberties with the text) here threw out the verse for no better reason, than that they could not trace its *connection*. But the very difficulty of tracing that connection is the best of all reasons why we should not suppose the verse to be an insertion; for the kind of persons who used to insert clauses from one Gospel into another would never have thought of making the insertion here.

12. The connection seems to be this: "[You may figure to yourselves the grief and anger which the Almighty feels at *one* of his faithful being se-

13 ἐννενηκονταεπνέα ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη, πορευθεὶς ζητεῖ τὸ πλανώμενον; Καὶ ἐὰν γένηται εὐρεῖν αὐτὸ, ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι χαίρει ἐπ' αὐτῷ μᾶλλον,
 14 ἢ ἐπὶ τοῖς ἐννενηκονταεπνέα τοῖς μὴ πεπλανημένοις. Οὕτως οὐκ ἔστι θέλημα ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ Πατρὸς ὑμῶν τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς, ἵνα ἀπόληται
 15 εἷς τῶν μικρῶν τούτων. Ἐὰν δὲ ἁμαρτήσῃ εἰς σέ ὁ ἀδελφός σου, ὑπάγε, καὶ ἕλεξον αὐτὸν μεταξὺ σοῦ καὶ αὐτοῦ μόνου. Ἐὰν σου
 16 ἀκούσῃ, ἐκέρδησας τὸν ἀδελφόν σου· ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἀκούσῃ, παράλαβε μετὰ σοῦ ἑτὶ ἓνα ἢ δύο· ἵνα ἐπὶ στόματός δύο μαρτύρων ἢ
 17 τριῶν σταθῇ πᾶν ὃ ἔφημα. Ἐὰν δὲ παρακούσῃ αὐτῶν, εἰπέ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ· ἐὰν δὲ καὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας παρακούσῃ, ἔστω σοι ὡσπερ
 18 ὁ ἐθνικός καὶ ὁ τελώνης. Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν· ὅσα ἐὰν δήσητε ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ἔσται δεδεμένα ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ· καὶ ὅσα ἐὰν λύσητε ἐπὶ τῆς
 19 γῆς, ἔσται λελυμένα ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ. Πάλιν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι ἐὰν δύο ὑμῶν συμφωνήσωσιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς περὶ παντός πράγματος, οὗ ἐὰν αἰτήσωνται, γενήσεται αὐτοῖς παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς.
 20 Οὗ γὰρ εἰσι δύο ἢ τρεῖς συνηγμένοι εἰς τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα, ἐκτὶ εἰμὶ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν.
 21 Τότε προσελθὼν αὐτῷ ὁ Πέτρος εἶπε· Κύριε, ποσάκις ἁμαρτήσει
 22 εἰς ἐμέ ὁ ἀδελφός μου, καὶ ἀφήσω αὐτῷ; ἕως ἐπτάκις; Λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Οὐ, λέγω σοι, ἕως ἐπτάκις, ἀλλ' ἕως ἑβδομηκοντάκις ἐπτά.

LU.
15.
6

7

duced away, by the joy which he feels at the recovery of one that had gone astray;] which is like that of the shepherd," who, &c. τί ὑμῖν δοκεῖ (in which words the ὑμῖν is emphatic) is a formula, showing that the thing is illustrated by what takes place with themselves, and in the ordinary occurrences of life. At τὸ πλανώμενον here, as at τὸ ἀπολωλὸς in the verse preceding, sub. πρόβατον.

15. Kuin. thinks there is here no connection with the preceding verses, and that what is now introduced was pronounced at another time. A recent English Commentator imagines that from the *offended*, our Lord proceeds to the *offending* party. But it is directly the *reverse*; and the purpose is not, as he says, how to reclaim a sinner. "but to bring to a better mind one who has wilfully injured us;" a sense of *ἁμαρτ.* frequent in the best writers. Comp. Luke xvii. 3 & 4. There is an allusion to the custom of the Mosaic law, on which the canons of the primitive Church were founded. *Ἐκέρδησας* may be understood, either with Euthym., of gaining him over, and recovering him to *brotherhood*; or, with Grot. and most expositors, of recovering him to a right state of mind, and to the path of duty and the road to salvation.

17. εἰπέ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ] This must mean, "to the particular congregation to which you both respectively belong;" namely, in order that he may be publicly admonished to lay aside his inimical and injurious spirit.

17. ἔστω σοι — τελώνης] i. e. "account him as a person whose intercourse is to be avoided, as that of heathens and publicans." Simil. Rom. xvi. 17. ἐκκλινάτε ἀπ' αὐτῶν. See also 2 Thess. iii. 14.

18. ὅσα ἐὰν δήσητε &c.] On the sense of these words see Note supra xvi. 19. It must not, however, be here taken in the same extent as there; but (as the best Commentators are agreed) be

limited by the connection with the preceding context, and the circumstances of the case in question. We may thus paraphrase: "Whatever ye shall determine and appoint respecting such an offender, whether as to his removal from the Christian society, if obdurate and incorrigible, or his readmission into it on repentance, I will ratify; and whatever guidance ye ask from heaven in forming those determinations, shall be granted you; so that there be two or three who unite in the determination, or in the prayer." Hence it is obvious that, in their primary and strict sense, the words and the promise have reference to the Apostles alone; however they may, in a qualified sense, apply to Christian teachers of every age.

19. περὶ παντὸς πράγματος] *de quacunque re*; a Hebraism. Comp. 1 John iii. 22. v. 14.

20. εἰς τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα] said to be for ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι μου. But the sense is, "on my behalf, in the service of me and my religion."

— δύο ἢ τρεῖς] i. e. very few. A certain for an uncertain, but very small, number. So the Rabbinical writers say that wherever two are sitting conversing on the law, there the Shechinah is among them. Ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν, viz. spiritually by my assistance to speed their petitions.

21. ποσάκις ἁμαρτήσῃ] This comes under Wiener's rule, (Gr. Gr. Nov. Test. § 39. 5.) "Two finite verbs are sometimes so connected, that the first one is to be taken as a *participle*." Matt. xviii. 21. xvii. 20." which is accounted a *Hebraism*; but is, in fact, common to all languages, in the early periods, and in the *popular* style.

— ἐπτάκις.] The number seven was called the complete or full number, and therefore was commonly used to denote *multitude* or *frequency*.

22. ἑβδομηκοντάκις ἐπτά] A high certain, for an uncertain and unlimited number. The meaning is, "as often as he offend, and truly repent."

MK.

10.

Διὰ τοῦτο ὁμοιώθη ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ἀνθρώπῳ βασιλεῖ, ὃς 23 ἤθελσε συνᾶραι λόγον μετὰ τῶν δούλων αὐτοῦ. Ἀρξάμενον δὲ αὐτοῦ 24 συναίρειν, προσηρέχθη αὐτῷ εἰς ὀφειλέτης μυρίων ταλάντων. Μὴ 25 ἔχοντας δὲ αὐτοῦ ἀποδοῦναι, ἐκέλευσεν αὐτὸν ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ παραθῆ-
 ναι, καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰ τέκνα, καὶ πάντα ὅσα εἶχε, καὶ ἀποδοθῆναι. Περὶ οὖν ὁ δούλος προσεκύνει αὐτῷ, λέγων· Κύριε, 26 μακροθύμησον ἐπ' ἐμοὶ, καὶ πάντα σοι ἀποδώσω. Σπλαγχνισθεὶς δὲ 27 ὁ κύριος τοῦ δούλου ἐκείνου, ἀπέλυσεν αὐτὸν, καὶ τὸ δάνειον ἀφήκεν αὐτῷ. Ἐξελθὼν δὲ ὁ δούλος ἐκεῖνος, εἶρεν ἕνα τῶν συνδούλων αὐτοῦ, 28 ὃς ὠφείλειν αὐτῷ ἑκατὸν δηνάρια· καὶ κρατήσας αὐτὸν ἔπιγε, λέγων· Ἀπόδος μοὶ * εἴ τι ὀφείλεις. Περὶ οὖν ὁ σύνδουλος αὐτοῦ εἰς τοὺς 29 πόδας αὐτοῦ, παρεκάλει αὐτὸν, λέγων· Μακροθύμησον ἐπ' ἐμοὶ, καὶ [πάντα] ἀποδώσω σοι. Ὁ δὲ οὐκ ἤθελεν, ἀλλὰ ἀπελθὼν ἔβαλεν αὐ- 30 τὸν εἰς φυλακὴν, ἕως οὗ ἀποθῆ τὸ ὀφειλόμενον. Ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ σύν- 31 δουλοι αὐτοῦ τὰ γενόμενα, ἐλυπήθησαν σφόδρα· καὶ ἐλθόντες διεσά-
 φησαν τῷ κυρίῳ αὐτῶν πάντα τὰ γενόμενα. Τότε προσκαλεσάμενος 32 αὐτὸν ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ λέγει αὐτῷ· Δούλε ποτηρέ! πᾶσαν τὴν ὀφειλὴν ἐκείνην ἀφήκᾰ σοι, ἐπεὶ παρεκάλεισάς με· οὐκ ἔδει καὶ σὲ ἐλεῆσαι 33 τὸν σύνδουλόν σου, ὡς καὶ ἐγὼ σε ἠλέησα; καὶ ὀργισθεὶς ὁ κύριος 34 αὐτοῦ, παρέδωκεν αὐτὸν τοῖς βασανισταῖς, ἕως οὗ ἀποθῆ πᾶν τὸ ὀφειλόμενον αὐτῷ. Οὕτω καὶ ὁ Πατήρ μου ὁ ἐπουράνιος ποιήσει 35 ἡμῖν, ἐὰν μὴ ἀφήτε ἔκμιστος τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν καρδιῶν ἡμῶν τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν.

1

XIX. Καὶ ἔγενετο, ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοὺς λόγους τούτους, 1

23. διὰ τοῦτο] This is *not* (as Kuin. thinks) a mere formula transitionis, but is to be considered as put elliptically; q. d. "Wherefore [because pardon of injuries is to be unlimitedly granted to the repentant] the Gospel Dispensation, and the conduct of God therein, may be compared with that of a King in the following parable. Συνᾶραι λόγον, like *rationes conferre*, in Latin, signifies to bring together and close, or settle accounts. So συλλογίζεσθαι in Levit. xxv. 50.

—δούλων.] Not slaves, but ministers, or officers in the receipt or disbursement of money; of what sort, is not certain.

24. μυρίων ταλάντων] i. e. of silver; for in all numbers occurring in ancient authors, *gold* is never to be supposed, unless mentioned. The Commentators need not have troubled themselves to calculate the amount in English money, since there is no doubt but (as Origen, De Dieu, and Fritz. have seen) μυρ. denotes a very great, but no particular number of talents. The common mode of interpretation destroys the *vraisemblance*.

25. παραθῆναι &c.] According to the custom of all the nations of early antiquity. Among the Jews, however, this bondage only extended to six years.

26. μακροθύμησον ἐπ' ἐμοὶ] This is well rendered in E. V. "have patience with me," as the Latin *indulge, expecta*. So Artemid. Onir. iv. 12. μακροθυμῆν κελεῖει καὶ μὴ κενόσπονδῆν. The word occurs also with ἐπι in Eccles. xxv. 18.

28. κρατήσας ἔπιγε] "he seized him by the

throat." As πύγαιν here, so ἄγχαν often occurs, in the Classical writers, of the seizing of debtors by creditors, to drag them before a magistrate, in order to compel them to pay a debt.

—εἴ τι.) There is the strongest evidence, both external and internal, for this reading; which is preferred by almost every Editor and Commentator of note. The common one, εἴ τι, is doubtless a gloss. The *sense* is the very same, for the *εἰ* is not conditional. Of this phrase there are many examples in the Classical writers, as Diog. Laert. cited by Wets. εἴ τι μοι ὀφείλει ἀφήμι αὐτῷ. See my Note on Thucyd. II. 72.

29. πάντα] There is very strong evidence in MSS., early Editions, Versions, and Fathers, against this word, which is rejected by Mill and Wets., and cancelled by Matth., Griesb., and Scholz. Yet it is found in the old Syriac Version, and its genuineness is well defended by Fritz.

31. ἐλυπήθησαν] The word imports a mixture of grief and indignation.

34. βασανισταῖς.] I have shown in Recens. Synop. that the sense is not *tormentors*, but *jailors*, δεσμοφύλακες, Acts xvi. 23 & 24; for βίανος sometimes signifies a *jail*. Thus it is literally correctors—as we say a *house of correction*.

35. τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν.] These words are cancelled by Griesb. and others, but on slender authority; and, indeed, as Schultz and Fritz. have proved, they are necessary to the sense.

μετῆρην ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς τὰ ὄρια τῆς Ἰουδαίας, πέ-	ΜΚ.
2 ραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου. Καὶ ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοί· καὶ	10.
3 ἐθεράπευσεν αὐτοὺς ἐκεῖ. Καὶ προσῆλθον αὐτῷ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι πειρά-	2
ζοντες αὐτὸν καὶ λέγοντες αὐτῷ, εἰ ἔξοστιν ἄνθρωπῳ ἀπολῦσαι τὴν	
4 γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν. Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς·	
Ὁὐκ ἀνέγνωτε, ὅτι ὁ ποιήσας ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν	6
5 αὐτοὺς, καὶ εἶπεν· Ἐνεκεν τούτου καταλείψει ἄνθρωπος	7
τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα, καὶ προσκολληθήσεται	
τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σῶζα	8

XIX. 1. εἰς τὰ ὄρια — Ἰορδάνου.] There is here a difficulty; for, according to the sense at first offering itself, it would be tantamount to making the country beyond the Jordan a *part* of Judæa; which we know it was not. As to Joseph. Hist. xii. 5. (which passage has been adduced in proof,) it proves rather the *contrary*; for there a comma ought to be placed after Ἰουδαίας. Otherwise the Article τῆς would have been repeated before πέραν. Some attempt to remove this difficulty, by supposing the πέραν to mean, “on this side,” or *alongside* of: both interpretations alike *contra linguam*, and at variance with Mark x. 1. The best mode of removing the difficulty is to take πέραν τοῦ Ἰ. for διὰ τοῦ πέραν, thus: καὶ ἦλθεν πέραν τοῦ Ἰ. εἰς τὰ ὄρια τῆς Ἰ. Fritz., indeed, denies this to be Greek. And he proposes to connect πέραν τοῦ Ἰ with μετῆρην α. τ. Γ. (taking the words as put, *per attractionem*, for “movens a Galilæâ, transit fluvium.”) Thus regarding the words καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς τὰ ὄρια τῆς Ἰ. as parenthetical. But the *violence* thus done to the *construction* is more objectionable than the *liberty* supposed to be taken with the *usus loquendi*, as the words stand: for to say it is *not Greek*, is surely too hypercritical, and is making no distinction between Attic and Hellenistic Greek. The former mode is therefore preferable; which, indeed, is required by the passage of Mark x. 1. κακῶτερον ἀναστῶς, ἔρχεται εἰς τὰ ὄρια τῆς Ἰουδαίας διὰ τοῦ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, i. e. ‘having passed through the country beyond Jordan,’ as Fritz. himself there interprets; where, in like manner, exception *might* be taken to the Greek, though the *sense* is clear. Jesus, it seems, purposely chose the longer course through the country beyond Jordan, to the shorter through Samaria.

3. In λέγοντες αὐτῷ, εἰ, &c. there is a blending of the oratio *directa* and *indirecta*; on which see Winer’s Gr. Gr. p. 182. and other examples in Luke xiii. 23. Acts i. 6. xxi. 37. Genesis xvii. 17.

— εἰ ἔξοστιν, &c.] The insidious motive of this question is apparent by a comparison of this with the parallel passage in Luke xvi. 18. where the judgment of Christ respecting the unlawfulness of divorce is given in illustration of his assurance that the law should endure for ever. The interrogators hoped, by inducing Jesus to again deliver his judgment on this point, to embroil him with the school of Hillel, which taught that divorces were allowable even on trivial grounds. But Christ’s wisdom frustrated their cunning, and thwarted their aims by an appeal to their great Lawgiver.

— κατὰ] “propter.” This is no Hebraism, since examples of this signification are found not only in the Sept., but in the best Greek writers from Homer to Pausanias.

— πᾶσαν] “any whatever.” A use of πᾶς occurring in Rom. iii. 20. Gal. ii. 16. 1 Cor. x. 25. but very rarely in the Classical writers.

— αἰτίαν.] The word here simply means *cause*, (which, indeed, is its primitive signification) not *fault*, as some Commentators explain; a misconception productive of the *gloss* (for such it is) which in some MSS. was introduced in the place of αἰτίαν, namely, ἀμαρτίαν.

4. ὁ ποιήσας.] The Commentators take this as a Participle for Noun, i. e. the Creator; a frequent idiom in Scripture, and not necessary to be supposed here; since (as I observed in Recensio Synoptica, and since that time Fritz. in loc.) ἄνθρωπον in a collective sense (in reference to which we have αὐτοὺς just after) must be supplied from the preceding ἀνθρώπων. However, ἐποίησεν and εἶπεν are to be closely connected; for the inference against divorce is founded on *what God* said (by Adam.) Thus the sense is, “Have ye not read what the Creator, after having at the first made them male and female, said,” &c. To clear the sense, I have, with Schott, transferred the mark of interrogation to the end of the sentence. The argument is strengthened by ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς, and ἀρσέν καὶ θῆλυ (sub. γένος and κατὰ); the latter of which, meaning *man* and *woman*, implying that only two persons, one male and one female, were created, plainly intimates the intention of God, that marriage should be in pairs, and indissoluble except by death or adultery. See more in a passage from Bradford’s Boyle Lectures cited in Recens. Synop.

5. προσκολληθήσεται] “shall be closely connected,” as by glue. A forcible metaphor often occurring in the N. T., and sometimes in the Classics, and also found in the Heb. קָרַב, and the Latin *agglutinare*. The var. lect. κολληθήσεται, (found in many MSS. and Fathers, and edited by Fritz. and Scholz) *may* be the true reading. But there is not sufficient evidence to authorize any change. For both external and internal evidence are in favour of the old reading, which is supported by Ephes. v. 31. and the Septuagint, from which the citation is made.

— εἰς σῶζα μίαν.] A Hebraism for εἰς ἓν, (See Winer’s Gr. Gr. § 22. 3.) i. e. one and the same *person*. So Plato says ὥστε δύο ὄντας ἓνα γυγνόμεναι. It has been thought remarkable, that there is nothing corresponding to εἰς ὄνο in the Hebrew. Inasmuch that Mr. Horne (Introd. ii. 264 & 287.) is persuaded that “it *ought* to be inserted in the Hebrew text.” But nothing could be more uncritical than to insert it. In short, it is quite plain that the Septuagint Translators supplied εἰς ὄνο to strengthen the sense by the aid of antithesis. And, indeed, in the Hebrew something is left to be supplied mentally, such as

MK. LU.

10. 18. *μίαν*; Ὡστε οὐκέτι εἰσὶ δύο, ἀλλὰ σὰςξ μία· ὁ οὖν ὁ Θεὸς συνέ- 6
 9 ζευξεν, ἄνθρωπος μὴ χωριζέτω. Λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· Τί οὖν Μωϋσῆς 7
 4 ἐνετείλατο δοῦναι βιβλίον ἀποστασίου, καὶ ἀπολῦσαι αὐτήν; Λέγει 8
 5 αὐτοῖς· Ὅτι Μωϋσῆς πρὸς τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν ὑμῶν ἐπέτρεψεν ὑμῖν
 11 ἀπολῦσαι τὰς γυναῖκας ὑμῶν· ἀπ' ἀρχῆς δὲ οὐ γέγονεν οὕτω. Λέγω 9
 δὲ ὑμῖν, ὅτι ὅς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, [εἰ] μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ,
 καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην, μοιχᾶται· καὶ ὁ ἀπολελυμένην γαμήσας μοιχᾶται.
 12 Λέγουσιν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ· Εἰ οὕτως ἐστὶν ἡ αἰτία τοῦ ἀν- 10
 11 θρώπου μετὰ τῆς γυναικὸς, οὐ συμφέρει γαμήσαι. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐ-
 13 τοῖς· Οὐ πάντες χωροῦσι τὸν λόγον τοῦτον, ἀλλ' οἷς δέδοται. Εἰσὶ 12
 γὰρ εὐνοῦχοι, οἵτινες ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς ἐγεννήθησαν οὕτω· καὶ εἰσιν
 εὐνοῦχοι, οἵτινες εὐνουχίσθησαν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων· καὶ εἰσιν εὐνοῦ-
 14 χοι, οἵτινες εὐνοίχισαν ἑαυτοὺς διὰ τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν. Ὁ δυ-
 νάμενος χωρεῖν χωρεῖτω.

13 15 Τότε προσηρέχθη αὐτῷ παιδία, ἵνα τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιθῇ αὐτοῖς καὶ 13
 14 16 προσεύξεται· οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ ἐπετίμησαν αὐτοῖς. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· 14

“the man and his wife.” Had it ever been in the Hebrew text, how could we account for its omission?

6. ὁ οὖν.] There seems to be a tacit reference to *γένος* before implied.

— *ἀνέλκετον*.] The sense is “*arctissimè consociavit*,” by a metaphor taken from the yoking of oxen, and common to both the Greek and Latin, nay, perhaps all languages.

7. ἐνετείλατο, &c.] Moses does not command them to divorce their wives; but, when they do divorce them, to give them a writing of divorce-ment. An objection is here proposed: “If the bond of matrimony be perpetual, why did Moses permit divorce, and why did he permit her that was divorced to be married again?” Answ. “But every thing permitted by the law of the land is not just and equitable.” On this and the two following verses see Notes on Matt. v. 31. seq.

8. Μωϋσῆς] i. e. not God; so that it is, as Jerome says, a *consilium hominis*, not *imperium Dei*. “Moses (observes Grotius) is named as the promulgator, not of a common, primæval, and perpetual law, but of one only Jewish, given in reference to the times.” The sum of Christ’s words, Theophylact observes, is this: “Moses wisely restrained by civil regulations your licentiousness, and permitted divorce only under certain conditions, and that because of your brutality, lest you should perpetrate something worse, namely, make away with them by sword or poison.” See Whitby on this and the preceding verse.

— πρὸς τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν] *pertinaciæ vestræ ratione habitâ*, with reference to your unyielding, unforgiving spirit.

— εἰ μὴ.] The *εἰ* is not found in very many ancient MSS. and several early Versions, and is cancelled by Griesb., Vater, Matth., and Fritz.; but retained by Scholz; whose caution I have imitated, although the genuineness of the word may be strongly suspected.

10. ἡ αἰτία — γυναικός] “the case or condition of men with their wives.” Both words have the

Article, as being *Correlatives*. (Middlet.) This use of *αἰτία* is *forensic*, and akin to that of the Latin *causa*.

11. χωροῦσι] *χωρεῖν* properly signifies *capax esse*; but it is sometimes used metaphorically of *capability*, whether of *mind*, or (as here) of *action*. Thus the sense is, “all are not capable of practising this maxim,” or, as the best Commentators render, “this thing.” [Comp. 1 Cor. vii. 2 & 7. ix. 17.]

— οἷς δέδοται.] scil. ἐκ Θεοῦ, as in 1 Cor. vii. 7. Yet not without the co-operation of man, as appears from the words following.

12. εὐνοίχισαν εἰ.] A strongly figurative expression, (akin to that of *ἐκκόπτει τὴν ἐξέλιαν*, v. 29 & 30, xviii. 8. & 9.) found also in the Rabbinical writers, and meant of the suppression of the desire — said with reference to those who, from a desire to further the interests of religion, live in celibacy. The Commentators compare a similar expression from Julian, to which may be added Max. Tyr. Diss. 34. ἀφελε τὴν αἰδοίων ἐπιθυμίαν, καὶ ἐλκόψας τὸ θηρίον.

— χωρεῖτω] “*qui capere, h. e. viribus suis sustinere possit, sustineat*,” Here the Imperative has rather the force of *permission* than *injunction*; or, at any rate, the admonition must, like that of 1 Cor. vii. 26. have reference chiefly to the *circumstances* under which it was delivered.

13. ἵνα τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιθῇ.] Imposition of hands was a rite which from the earliest ages, see Gen. xlviii. 14, had been in use among the Jews on imploring God’s blessing upon any person, and was especially employed by the Prophets, (Numb. xxvii. 18. 2 Kings v. 11.) but sometimes by elders, or men noted for piety. These children, therefore, were brought to Christ for his blessing; and, it should seem, to be admitted into his Church. That they were not brought to be healed of any disorder, but to obtain spiritual blessings, is plain; and that they were not only considered *capable* of receiving them by the people, but also by our Lord himself, is equally clear. By *αὐτοῖς* is meant τοῖς προφῆροις.

Ἄφειτε τὰ παιδία, καὶ μὴ κολύβετε αὐτὰ ἐλθεῖν πρὸς με· τῶν γὰρ τοι- 10. 18.
 15 οὔτων ἐστὶν ἡ βουσιλία τῶν οὐρανῶν. Καὶ ἐπιθεις αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας, 16
 ἐπορεύθη ἐκείθεν.

16 Καὶ ἰδὼν, εἷς προσελθὼν εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Διδάσκαλε ἀγαθὲ, τί ἀγα- 17 18
 17 θὸν ποιήσω, ἵνα ἔχω ζωὴν αἰώνιον; Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Τί με λέγεις 18 19

14. τῶν τοιούτων] namely, such as have these dispositions — i. e. humility, docility, and simplicity. For Christ meant what he said for his disciples — namely, to inculcate the same lesson as he had done a little before (supra xviii. 3.) when in answer to an inquiry of the disciples, which of them should be greatest in the kingdom of heaven, he placed a young child in the midst. See also the note on Luke xviii. 15.

15. ἐκείθεν] i. e. from that part of Peræa, or Judæa, where he had been stopping on his road to Jerusalem. See Mark x. 17. and supra v. 1.

16. εἷς] for τις. This was, as we find from v. 22., a young man; and, as we learn from Luke xviii. 18., a ruler; by which is probably meant a ruler of the Synagogue. His conduct seems to have been dictated by a real desire to be put into the way of salvation, and a sincere intention of following Christ's injunctions; which, however, proved too hard for a disposition in which avarice prevailed over piety.

— τί ἀγαθὸν — αἰώνιον.] This question is thought to have reference to the Pharisaical division of the precepts of the law into the *weighty*, and the *light*. The young man, it seems, was puzzled by the nice distinctions which were made in classing those precepts; and wished to have some clear information as to what was pre-eminently promotive of salvation.

17. τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν; οὐδὲς, &c.] In this and the preceding verse there are some remarkable varr. lectt. In 6 MSS., some later Versions, and some Fathers, the ἀγαθὲ at v. 16. and the ὁ Θεὸς at v. 17. are not found; and for τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν, we have τί με ἐρωτᾷς περὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ; these readings were preferred by Erasm., Grot., Mill, and Bengel, and were received into the text by Griesb. and Lachman; but utterly without reason. The *external* evidence for them is very slender; and the internal, I apprehend, by no means strong. Besides, the answer of our Lord would thus be deprived of all its *simplicity*, and nearly all its *propriety*. It would in fact, be no answer to the inquiry; for the young man did not (as appears from the words following, εἰ δὲ θέλεις — ἐντολὰς) inquire what was *naturally*, or *essentially* good, but what good should be *done* by him. And if the words be, as Griesb. directs, referred to what follows, there is, as Fritz. proves, quite as great an inconsistency. Thus that the readings in question are false, is plain. *How they originated*, is not so obvious. Matthæi thinks that they arose from the conjecture of Origen. But that, as Fritz. has shown, involves a great improbability. At all events, it is more important to inquire *what* induced the persons (whoever they were) to make the alterations in question. Matthæi and Nolan (Gr. Vulg. p. 474.) ascribe it to a groundless fear lest the words should be brought forward against the divinity of Christ. Such charges, however, are not rashly to be made, nor lightly to be credited. If the alterations were all introduced *designedly*, it is more probable that, as Wets. suggests, they arose from those who thought that the answer would be more suitably made to the

QUESTION *itself* ("what good thing shall I do"), than to the *title* "good master." Yet how could any persons who had sufficient influence to materially alter the text, fail to see that the answer to the *question itself* is given in the words *following*? There seems far more reason to suppose, with Fritz., that no original intention existed to alter the passage, from any scruples doctrinal or otherwise; but that the alterations arose at first from accident; namely, in the omission of ἀγαθὲ (propter homœoteleuton.) Whereupon the words of the next verse, τί με λέγεις having become quite unsuitable, would, he says, be altered to τί με ἐρωτᾷς περὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ; I am, however, inclined to think that the alteration was not made *all at once*; but that, at first, a suitable sense was endeavoured to be elicited, by taking λέγεις for ἐρωτᾷς (as in the Sept. and elsewhere in the N. T. See Schl. Lex. in v. § 5.) and then by the slight alteration ἀγαθοῦ, and supposing an ellipsis of περὶ. Comp. Mark i. 30. with Luke iv. 38. And, indeed, ἀγαθοῦ *without* the Article is cited by Origen himself, at p. 664, C. Thus would be generated a gloss, or marginal Scholium, τί με ἐρωτᾷς περὶ ἀγ. or τοῦ ἀγ.; which, it seems, was admitted into the text in six MSS., and possibly those which were used by the framers of the ancient Versions above mentioned. I say *possibly*, since it is extremely doubtful whether the reading was in their MSS.; for their chief aim is to give the *sense*; and, therefore, in passages of great difficulty or obscurity, the ancient Versions afford no certain evidence as to the readings of their MSS. Thus the genuineness of the common reading is, I trust, immovably established. The *propriety* of the answer, according to that reading, is quite as demonstrable. The young man accosts our Lord by a title usually employed by the Jews to their most eminent Rabbis, and of which they were very proud. Hence, before he replies to his inquiry, he takes occasion to indirectly censure the adulation of the persons *addressing*, and the arrogance of those *addressed*. At the same time he *proceeds upon* the notion entertained of him by the young man; who evidently only regarded him in the light of an *eminent teacher*. Moreover, when our Lord adds, οὐδὲς ἀγαθός, εἰ μὴ ὁ Θεός, we are to understand with Bps. Pearson and Bull, the sense to be, that there is no being originally, essentially, and independently good, but God. Thus the Father, being the fountain of the whole *Deity*, must, in some sense, be the fountain of the goodness of the Son. Accordingly, the Ante-Nicene Fathers were generally agreed, that ἀγαθός essentially and strictly applied only to God the Father; and to Christ only by reason of the goodness derived to him as being *very God of very God*. This use of ἀγαθός will establish and illustrate the *ratio significacionis* of the expressive word employed, with slight variations, by all the Northern nations, to denote the Supreme Being, God. Finally, something very similar to the present, both in thought and expression, occurs in a passage of Pseudo-Phocylides, Frag. xiii. 47.

MK. LU.

10. 18. ἀγαθόν; οὐδεὶς ἀγαθός, εἰ μὴ εἰς ὁ Θεός. Ἴδὲ δὲ θέλεις εἰσελθεῖν εἰς
 19 20 τὴν ζωὴν, τήρησον τὰς ἐντολάς. Λέγει αὐτῷ· Ποίῳ; ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπε· 18
 Τό· οὐ φονεύσεις· οὐ μοιχεύσεις· οὐ κλέψεις· οὐ
 ψευδομαρτυρήσεις· τίμα τὸν πατέρα [σου] καὶ τὴν 19
 μητέρα· καὶ ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυ-
 20 21 τόν. Λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ νεανίσκος· Πάντα ταῦτα ἐφυλαξάμην ἐκ νεότη- 20
 21 22 τός μου· τί ἔτι ὑστερῶ; Ἔφη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Εἰ θέλεις τέλειος 21
 εἶναι, ὑπάγε, πώλησόν σου τὰ ὑπάρχοντα καὶ δός πτωχοῖς· καὶ ἔξεις
 22 23 θησαυρὸν ἐν οὐρανῷ· καὶ δεῦρο ἄκολούθει μοι. Ἀκουσάς δὲ ὁ νεα- 22
 νίσκος τὸν λόγον, ἀπῆλθε λυπούμενος· ἦν γὰρ ἔχων κτήματα πολλά.
 23 24 Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ· Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι 23
 25 25 δυσκόλως πλούσιος εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν. Πά- 24
 λιν δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν· εὐκόπωτέρον ἐστὶ κάμηλον διὰ τρυπήματος ὄφρα

Edit. Gaisf. Μὴ γαροῦ σοφῆ, μὴτ' ἀλεῖν, μὴτ' ἐνὶ (I conjecture ἐπὶ) πλούτῳ. Εἰς Θεός ἐστι σοφός, δυνάτος θ' ἄμα, καὶ πολυκόβος.

— τὰς ἐντολάς] namely, of God, as comprehended in the Decalogue; for though our Lord adduces his instances only from the laws of the second table, yet he virtually confirms all of them.

18. ποίῳ] for τίνας, as often in the Sept.

— τὸ· οὐ φονεύσεις.] Though the whole law is meant, yet, as often in the N. T. (see Rom. xiii. 8. and James ii. 8.) the commandments of the second table alone are adduced in exemplification; not that they are of greater importance than those of the first table; but because there is a necessary connection between the duties towards God, and those towards man; and because the latter are not so easily counterfeited as the former. That the terms of salvation here offered are not at all different from those stated in other parts of Scripture, has been evinced by the Commentators. See Lightf., Whitby, and Mackn. On the use of the Article, thus employed with reference to a whole clause, see Matth. Gr. Gr. § 279.

— τί ἔτι ὑστερῶ;] At τί sub. κατὰ, “In what am I yet behindhand, or wanting?” This readiness to undertake more than he had yet done, showed that he was well disposed, and caused Jesus, as we learn from Mark, to be pleased with him. So a Rabbinical writer, cited by Wets.: “There is a Pharisee who says, ‘What ought I to do, and I will do it.’ That is good. But there is also a Pharisee who says, ‘What ought I to do besides, and I will do it.’ That is better.”

21. τελείος.] The term is here used not only in the moral sense, by which God is said to be perfect, but in that comparative sense by which a thing is perfect so far as the constitution of it permits. It therefore denotes a true Christian, and such as will be accepted by God. See note, supra v. 48. and Luke xii. 33. Rom. xii. 2. Phil. iii. 13. Col. i. 28. & iv. 12. James iii. 2. Some, however, think that Christ had referred to the Pharisaical notion of perfection in that respect. See Lightf. There may have been an allusion to it, but no more.

— πώλησόν σου τὰ ὑπάρχοντα] q. d. “show your love to God and obedience to me his Messenger, by selling your goods and following my cause.” Comp. supra vi. The injunction, meant to lower

the pride, and try the sincerity of the convert, was only binding on the individual thus addressed, or on those similarly circumstanced, as in the Apostolic age; and has no relation to Christians of the present or any other period. See Lightf., Whitby, and Mackn.

The use of ὑπάγε just before, is like that at xviii. 15. Mark x. 21. and is said by some Commentators to be pleonastic. But it rather carries an intensive force, and may be rendered “be-gone!”

— δεῦρο.] This is explained by the Commentators as put for ἐλθέ; whereas the truth is, there is an ellipsis of ἐλθέ or the like, which is supplied in Hom. Od. p. Δεῦρο Μοῦσ' ἐλθέ.

22. ἦν ἔχων] “he was in possession.” Or the sense may be, “he chanced to possess.” See Matth. Gr. Gr. 559. 9.

23. δυσκόλως] For χαλεπῶς. He will scarcely be persuaded to become a Christian.

— πλούσιος.] That is, if he place his trust in his riches, and make them his summum bonum; a necessary limitation, as appears from the parallel passage at Mark x. 23. At the same time, considering how many impediments to good, and how many incitements to evil attend riches; how the cares of the world, and the deceitfulness of riches choke the word (see 1 Tim. vi. 9.) this limitation scarcely lessens the difficulty; since it is the very nature and effect of riches to cause men to trust in them, and to seek their happiness in them. Hence both pride is fostered, and selfishness increased. So that although the words of this and the next verse primarily referred to the extreme difficulty (represented by a proverbial mode of expressing what is next to impossible) with which the rich would be converted; yet they are applicable to, and were doubtless intended to supply an awful warning of, the danger of trusting in uncertain riches, and the necessity of a true conversion: without which men do not really belong to the kingdom of Christ on earth, and therefore will not be admitted to his kingdom in heaven.

24. κάμηλον.] Some ancient and modern Commentators would read κάμιλον, a cable rope; or take κάμηλον in that sense. But for the former there is little or no manuscript authority; and for the latter no support from the *usus loquenti*. That the common reading and interpretation must be retained, all the best Commentators are agreed.

	δος † διελεθῆναι, ἢ πλούσιον εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰσελεθῆναι. 10.	MK. 18.	LU. 18.
25	Ἀκούσαντες δὲ οἱ μαθηταὶ [αὐτοῦ,] ἐξεπλήρουντο σφόδρα, λέγοντες· 26	26	26
26	Τίς ἄρα δύναται σωθῆναι; ἐμβλέψας δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· 27	27	27
	Παρὰ ἀνθρώποις τοῦτο ἀδύνατόν ἐστι, παρὰ δὲ Θεοῦ πάντα δυνατὰ [ἐστίν.]		
27	Τότε ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Πέτρος εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Ἰδοὺ, ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν 28	28	28
28	πάντα, καὶ ἠκολουθήσαμεν σοι· τί ἄρα [ἐστίν] ἡμῖν; ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Ἀλλὰ λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι ὑμεῖς οἱ ἀκολουθήσαντές μοι, ἐν τῇ παλιγγενεσίᾳ, ὅταν καθίσῃ ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ θρόνον		

— διελεθῆναι.] For this many MSS., several Versions, and some Fathers, read *εἰσελεθῆναι*, which is preferred by Wets., and edited by Matthæi, Knapp, Griesb., Vater, and Scholz.; though the common reading is retained by Tittm. and Fritz. But though the evidence of MSS. and Versions is somewhat in favour of the new reading, yet internal evidence is rather in favour of the common one, which is found in Mark x. 25. and several MSS., in Luke xviii. 25.

— ῥαφίδος.] Later Greek for *βελόνης* from *ῥάπτω*. The word signifies literally a *sewing tool*.

25. αὐτοῦ.] This is omitted in many MSS. of various Recensions, and some Versions of Fathers, and is cancelled by Griesb., Fritz., and Scholz, perhaps rightly.

— τίς δύναται σ.] This is generally interpreted, “who then can be saved? [since all men are either rich, or desire to be so.]” But that is a harsh mode of interpretation; and therefore it is better, with Euthym. and Markl., to suppose an ellipsis, and interpret, “what [rich man,] then, can be saved?” There is, however, properly speaking, no *ellipsis*; but the *τίς* is supposed to be mentally referred to *πλοῦσιος* which preceded. And the Apostles may have meant to express by inference the *difficulty* with which *men in general*, as well as the rich, would be saved.

26. ἐμβλέψας.] “fixing his eyes upon them.” There is a similar use at Mark x. 21 & 27. xiv. 67. Luke xx. 17. and elsewhere; in which places the word must not, (with many recent Commentators,) be regarded as merely pleonastic, or as having the sense *turning towards*, but must retain its full force; signifying extreme earnestness, as in Mark x. 21. 27. Luke xx. 17. John i. 36, and Xenoph. Cyrop. i. 3. 2. ἐμβλέπων αὐτῷ ἔλεγε. also Acts. xvi. 18. ἐπιστρέψας εἰπε.

— παρὰ ἀνθρώποις.] This use of *παρὰ* is said to be Hebrew, and the Commentators tell us that the Greeks use the simple dative with *δυνατὸν* or *ἀδύνατόν ἐστι*. But the meaning is somewhat different, and we may render, “as far as concerns [the power of.]”

— ἀδύνατον.] Le Clerc ap. Elsley, and most recent Commentators, as Kuin, and Fritz., take the word in the qualified sense, *extremely difficult*, as also at Luke xviii. 27. and Heb. vi. 4. But I agree with Mr. Rose on Parkhurst, p. 16. a., that “the affixing of this sense to passages [like this] containing a doctrine, which is altered by the translation, is improper.” We are therefore to leave the *full sense*; as intimating that, in the work of salvation, human nature is quite insufficient of itself, and stands in great need of the aids of Divine grace.

Ἐστὶ is omitted in very many MSS. of various

recensions, and is cancelled by Griesb., Tittm., Fritz., and Scholz.

27. ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν—ἡμῖν;] This inquiry does not appear to have been suggested by *disappointment*, but simply from the wish of ascertaining the reward, which he and the other Apostles would have for giving up their all in the cause of the Gospel. That all was indeed slender; but it was yielded up unhesitatingly. And hence our Lord, who did not estimate their value from the *amount* of the sacrifices, but from the *mind* and *disposition* with which they had been made, kindly cherished their hopes; pointing to the fruition of them in an immortality of bliss.

— τί ἄρα ἐστίν ἡμῖν;] “what, then, shall be our reward?” namely, in heaven. Said with reference to the preceding *ἐξείς θησαυρὸν ἐν οὐρανῷ*.

28. ἐν τῇ παλιγγενεσίᾳ.] On the sense contained in these words, a wonderful diversity of opinion exists. Now this, it will be observed, depends much upon the *construction*. Some, as the early modern Commentators in general, construe the words with the *preceding* οἱ ἀκολουθοῦ μοι, understanding by *παλ.* the great change of manners and doctrines which arose from the preaching of John the Baptist, or from the moral regeneration consequent upon the *first* preaching of the Gospel. This, however, is harsh and forced; and it is plain that the words following contain a fuller description of this *παλιγγενεσία*, and relate not to time *past*, but to *future*. Indeed, it is now generally admitted, that the words must be referred to what *follows*; though Expositors are not agreed as to the *nature* of the promise, or the *time* of its fulfilment. Whitby fixes the time at the *close of the world*, and after the fall of Antichrist; and he understands, by *παλιγγ.*, not a resurrection of their *persons*, but a revival of their *spirit*, by admitting the Gospel to govern their faith and practice. Adopting this view, others consider the time in question to be the *Millennium*. But the whole of this edifice is built on a sandy foundation, and is utterly untenable. Far better founded is the view adopted by Lightf., Hamm., and others, who understand *παλιγγ.* to refer either to the *renovation*, or *new state of things*, which took place at the promulgation of Christianity, after the ascension and resurrection of Christ; or, to the *regeneration* which was then effected by the Gospel. And they understand “the throne of his glory” to apply to his *mediatorial* kingdom. And the *sitting on thrones*, and judging, &c. they interpret of the *ministerial* authority with which the Apostles had been invested by our Lord. Thus they take the general sense to be, that the Apostles were to rule the Christian Church by the laws of the Gospel, which they were authorized and inspired to

MK. LU.

10. 18. δόξης αὐτοῦ, καθίσεσθε καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐπὶ δώδεκα θρόνους, κρίνοτες τὰς
 29 29 δώδεκα φυλὰς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ. Καὶ πᾶς ὃς ἄρῃκεν οἰκίαν, ἢ ἀδελφούς ἢ 29
 30 30 ἀδελφάς, ἢ πατέρα ἢ μητέρα, ἢ γυναῖκα ἢ τέκνα, ἢ ἀγρούς, ἔκεκεν τοῦ
 31 31 πολλοὶ δὲ ἔσονται πρῶτοι ἔσχατοι, καὶ ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι. XX. Ὁμοῖα 30
 γὰρ ἔστιν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ἀνθρώπῳ οἰκοδεσπότῃ, ὅστις ἐξῆλθεν 1
 ἄμα πρῶτὸ μισθώσασθαι ἐργάτας εἰς τὸν ἀμπελῶνα αὐτοῦ. Συμφω-

preach, and by the infallible decisions respecting faith and practice which he enabled them to give." Yet this interpretation, however specious, will no more bear examination than the foregoing one. For though we may grant that *παλιγγ.* admits of either of these senses, yet the words following cannot, without great violence, be made to yield any sense at all suitable thereto. Not to say that what they assign as the sense would not be sufficiently suitable to the purposes for which the words were pronounced; namely, to hold out to the disciples an ample *compensation* for all their sacrifices and sufferings in the cause of the Gospel. Under these circumstances, I cannot hesitate to adopt, in preference to all others, the sense assigned to the passage by the ancient Expositors in general (and of the modern ones by Kuin. and Fritz.), confirmed by the Syriac, Persic, Arabic, Æthiopic, and Italic Versions; understanding *παλιγγ.* of the *resurrection to judgment*, and a new state of existence. This is very agreeable to, nay, is required by what follows, *ὅταν καθίσῃ ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης αὐτοῦ*, in the only other passage where Christ is so spoken of (Matt. xxv. 31.), the words relate indisputably to the *day of judgment*. And as regards the term itself, it is, from the nature of the context, far more likely to have been used in its physical sense and ordinary acceptation, than in any *figurative* one whatsoever. While, at the same time, it was likely that the *adjunct* to this substantial and definite assurance in the form of *promise* should be denoted by a figurative expression to signify high exaltation and supreme felicity. See 1 Cor. vi. 2. Luke xxii. 30. On the purposes of such *involucra*, see my remarks in Rec. Syn.

Of the truth of this interpretation there cannot be a stronger proof than the fact, that the most powerful supporters of the other are compelled to *engraft* this, and so include both. Nay Campb. grants, that "the *principal* completion of the promise will be at the *general resurrection*." If, however, the other interpretation be at all admitted, it can only be as a kind of subordinate adjunct, by way of allusion, to the principal idea. Compare Acts iii. 21. *ἀρχὴ χρόνων ἀποκαταστάσεως πάντων*.

29. ὅς] Several MSS. have *ὅστις*, which is received by Knapp, Tittm., Vat., and Griesb. in his two first Editions, though it has been rejected in his third. The common reading is retained by Fritz. and Scholz; and rightly, since *ὅστις*, though better Greek, seems to be a *correction* of the Alexandrian critics. It is, moreover, confirmed by Luke xii. 8. & 10. and Acts ii. 21.

— *ἔκατ. λήψ.*] This is by most Commentators understood of a *temporal* recompense, as that suggested in the parallel passage of Mark, namely in the support and comfort they would receive at the hands of their richer brethren. But there is no reason here so to limit the term *ἔκατ.*, which is only a strong mode of expressing that they shall,

on the *whole*, receive back very far *more* in value than they parted with. And although it is not expressly said whether that is to be *temporal* or *spiritual*, yet notwithstanding that what follows in the next verse seems to fix it to *temporal* blessings, still we are justified in *including spiritual* ones; even the inward satisfactions of a good conscience, and the inexpressible consolations of the Gospel (far exceeding in value all that is most precious of earthly goods, however great), which would be their support under all persecutions and troubles. Comp. 2 Cor. vi. 8. seqq., which passage affords both a comment upon our Lord's declaration, and a fulfilment of the prediction contained in it.

30. πολλοὶ δὲ — *πρῶτοι.*] A sort of proverbial mode of expression, often employed by our Lord to check the presumption of the Apostles; the sense of which is, that many of the Jews, to whom the blessings of Christ's kingdom were first offered, would be the last to partake of them; and that many of the Gentiles, to whom they were to be offered after the Jews, would be the first to enjoy them. In illustration of this, our Lord subjoined the parable at the beginning of the next chapter; in which, however, as I have shewn in Rec. Synop., the application is not to be limited to the Jews, but left general; being meant for the instruction of all Christians of all ages.

XX. 1. Ὁμοῖα γὰρ, &c.] The sense is: "The same thing will take place in the Christian Dispensation, which occurred in the management of a certain master of a family." The *γὰρ* may be rendered "thus for example."

The Commentators remark on the *pleonasm* in *ἀνθρώπῳ*, of which there are many similar examples in Scripture, and which they regard as a *Hebraism*. But there are instances of it in the Greek Classical writers, especially Herodotus. It may, therefore, better be regarded as a vestige of the wordiness of primitive diction. It must be remembered, too, that the idiom in question is almost wholly confined to words which were originally *adjectives*.

This Parable is found, though with a widely extended application, in the Jerusalem Talmud. "Here it is meant (as observes Waterland) to represent God's dealings with mankind in respect to their outward call to the means of grace, as well as to the retribution in a state of glory." In this Parable, as in many others, some parts of the simile do not correspond; namely, those which only respect the ornament, and do not affect the *scope* of the parable; as the labourers waiting to be hired, and the murmurings, &c. of the labourers after the distribution of the wages. The main point of similarity is the rejection of those who were first, and the admission of those who seemed last.

— *ἄμα πρῶτ.*] This is regarded by the Commentators as an elliptical expression, for *ἄμα σὺν π.*

νήσας δὲ μετὰ τῶν ἐργατῶν ἐκ δηναρίου τὴν ἡμέραν, ἀπέστειλεν αὐ-
 3 τοὺς εἰς τὸν ἀμπελῶνα αὐτοῦ. Καὶ ἐξελθὼν περὶ [τῆν] τρίτην ὥραν,
 4 εἶδεν ἄλλους ἐστῶτας ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ ἄργοις· κἀκείνοις εἶπεν· Ἐταίγετε
 5 καὶ ὑμεῖς εἰς τὸν ἀμπελῶνα, καὶ ὁ ἐὼν ἡ δίκαιον, δώσω ὑμῖν. Οἱ δὲ
 ἀπήλθον. πάλιν ἐξελθὼν περὶ ἕκτην, καὶ ἐντάτην ὥραν, ἐποίησεν
 6 ὡσαύτως. Περὶ δὲ τὴν ἑνδεκάτην ὥραν ἐξελθὼν, εὔρεν ἄλλους ἐστῶτας
 ἄργοις, καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· Τί ὧδε ἐστήκατε ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν ἄργοι;
 7 λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· Ὅτι οὐδὲς ἡμᾶς ἐμισθώσατο. λέγει αὐτοῖς· Ἐτά-
 8 γετε καὶ ὑμεῖς εἰς τὸν ἀμπελῶνα, καὶ ὁ ἐὼν ἡ δίκαιον, λήψεσθε.
 Ὁ φύσις δὲ γενομένης, λέγει ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος τῷ ἐπιτρόπῳ αὐ-
 9 τοῦ· Κάλυσον τοὺς ἐργάτας, καὶ ἀπόδος αὐτοῖς τὸν μισθόν, ἀρξά-
 10 μενος ἀπὸ τῶν ἐσχάτων ἕως τῶν πρώτων. Καὶ ἐλθόντες οἱ περὶ τὴν
 11 ἑνδεκάτην ὥραν ἔλαβον ἀνὰ δηνᾶριον. Ἐλθόντες δὲ οἱ πρώτοι, ἐνό-
 12 μισαν ὅτι πλεονα λήψονται. καὶ ἔλαβον καὶ αὐτοὶ ἀνὰ δηνᾶριον.
 13 Λαβόντες δὲ ἐγόγγυζον κατὰ τοῦ οἰκοδεσπότου λέγοντες· Ὅτι οὗτοι
 12 οἱ ἔσχατοι μίαν ὥραν ἐποίησαν, καὶ ἴσους ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς ἐποίησας τοῖς
 13 βρωσιάσασιν τὸ βῆρος τῆς ἡμέρας καὶ τὸν κάσωνα. Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς
 εἶπεν ἐνὶ αὐτῶν· Ἐταίγε, οὐκ ἀδικῶ σε· οὐχὶ δηναρίου συνεφώνησάς

But that phrase occurs in the Sept., not in the Greek Classical writers. Whereas *ἀνα* and similar words are of frequent occurrence with nouns of time. I know of no example with *πρωί*, which may be regarded (with Scheid on Lennep), as properly a *Dative* of the old noun *πρωίς*, as the Latin *heri* from *heris*.

2. ἐκ δηναρίου] “at or for a denarius.” This mode of denoting price (which occurs also at Matt. xxvii. 7.) is rarely found in the Classical writers, and only in the later ones. The earlier and best writers use the *Genitive simply*. The *denarius*, which was equivalent to the Greek drachma, was then the usual wages of a labourer, and the pay of a soldier.

3. τῆν] This is omitted in very many of the MSS., including all the most ancient ones, and some Fathers. It is cancelled by Wets., Matth., Griesb., Knapp, Tittm., Fritz., and Scholz; and rightly; for in such common phrases the Article was usually omitted. Indeed ordinals are usually anarthrous.

— ἐστῶτας — ἀργοίς.] The very place where (from its being used for buying and selling, and all public business) the greatest number of persons assembled, especially the idle or unemployed. So Ælian, V. H. xix. 25. (cited by Grot.) μετεπῆρευτο τοὺς ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς ἀποσχολῶντας. The time here mentioned was equivalent to what was called the *πλήθουσα ἀγορά*.

4. ἐὼν] for *ἄν*. In which use with the Subjunctive (rare in the Classical writers) it answers to the Latin *cunq̄ue* and our *soever*.

— δίκαιον,] i. e. not what was legally due, but what was equitable, or *reasonable*.

6. ἀργοίς.] This is cancelled by Griesb. and Vater; but there is very little authority for its omission; and it is well defended by Fritz., as being necessary to the sense.

8. τῷ ἐπιτρόπῳ] A servant nearly answering to the Roman *procurator* and our *bailliff*, and entrusted with the whole domestic economy.

— ἀρξάμενος — πρώτων.] The construction of

this passage has been mistaken by Kypke and Kuin., but is thus rightly laid down by Fritz.: ἀπόδος αὐτοῖς τὸν μισθόν ἕως τῶν πρώτων, ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τῶν ἐσχάτων.

9. ἀνὰ] This is said by the Commentators to be put adverbially; and they refer to a *plena locutio* in Rev. xxii. 21. ἀνὰ εἰς ἕκαστος. There is, in fact, an ellipse of *ἕκαστον*.

12. ἐποίησαν.] Some render it *confecerunt, spent*. But although examples are adduced proving this sense of *ποιεῖν* and the Latin *facere* with nouns of time; yet it is better, with most recent Commentators, to take it for *εργάσαντο*, by an Hebraism formed on *עָרַץ*, as in Ruth ii. 19. Matth. xxi. 23. And so *facere agrum* in Columella.

— ἴσους] for *ἰσομοίρους*, of which Wets. gives examples.

— κείσωνα.] *Κάσων* (which is of the same form with *δόσων, φῶσων, αἰσίων, ἄζων, μέζων, &c.*) literally signifies the *burner*, the burning (wind) *Eurus*; and is often to be found in the Sept. Here it may be explained simply *heat*, as in Genes. xxxi. 40. ἐγενόμην τῆς ἡμέρας συγκαυόμενος τῷ κάσωνι, where in the Heb. it is *צָרַף*, i. e. the *shriveller, the drier*. It is to be remembered that, in the East, though the air be cool in the early part of the day; yet during the remainder of it, the heat of the sun is exceedingly scorching. I would compare Liban. Epist. 245: περὶ ἦν οὗτος πολὺ καῦμα, πολλὴν δὲ καπνὸν ἠνέσχετο.

13. ἐταίγε] An idiom found in the Heb. *עָרַץ*, the Greek *ᾧ ἀγαθῆ, or φίλε*, and the Latin *bône vir*. It was a familiar form of address, and consequently often used to inferiors, and sometimes to strangers or indifferent persons.

— οὐκ ἀδικῶ σε.] Wets. and Waterland task their ingenuity in endeavouring to find a *reason why* all the labourers should have had the same wages. But such *incidental* circumstances as this we are not to *press* in the application, much less to draw doctrinal inferences. It is enough to conclude that, though there be some things in the Gospel dispensation different from what we should

MK. LU.

10. 18. μοι ; ἄρον τὸ σὸν καὶ ὑπάγε. Θέλω τοῦτω τῷ ἐσχάτῳ δοῦναι ὡς 14
καὶ σοί. Ἦ οὐκ ἔξεστί μοι ποιῆσαι ὃ θέλω ἐν τοῖς ἔμοῖς ; ἢ ὁ ὄφθαλ- 15
μός σου πονηρός ἐστιν, ὅτι ἐγὼ ἀγαθός εἰμι ; Οὕτως ἔσονται οἱ 16
ἐσχατοὶ πρῶτοι, καὶ οἱ πρῶτοι ἐσχατοὶ· πολλοὶ γάρ εἰσι κλητοὶ, ὀλίγοι
δὲ ἐκλεκτοί.

32 31 Καὶ ἀναβαίνων ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς Ἱερουσόλυμα, παρέλαβε τοὺς δώδεκα 17
33 μαθητάς κατ' ἰδίαν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Ἰδοὺ, ἀναβαίνομεν 18
εἰς Ἱερουσόλυμα, καὶ ὁ Τίος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδοθήσεται τοῖς ἄρχι-
32 ρεῦσι καὶ γραμματεῦσι· καὶ κατακρονοῦσιν αὐτὸν θανάτῳ, καὶ παρα- 19

expect, yet the whole is agreeable to strict justice.

14. θλω δ.] "It is my pleasure: I choose to give."

15. ἢ ὁ ὄφθαλμός σου πονηρός ἐ.] A figurative expression, importing "art thou envious?" Fritz. well explains the nature of the metaphor thus: "Nam invidentia, ut aliarum animi perturbatiōnum, indices oculi sunt. Hinc factum, ut Hebraici hominem invidum appellarent *יָעַר יָעַר*."

16. οὕτως] i. e. as it was in the case of the labourers last hired by the master.

— πολλοὶ γάρ — ἐκλεκτοί.] On the important terms κλητοὶ and ἐκλεκτοί, it may be proper to offer a few observations. These are supposed to have been originally Jewish forms of expression, applied (like many others) by Christ to similar distinctions in the Gospel Dispensation. In the Sept., κλητοὶ often denotes those *chosen* to receive especial favours, or *called* to execute peculiar trusts. Hence it is, both in the O. and N. T., applied to the *Jews*; who had been *chosen* from the nations, and *called* to peculiar privileges. Thus at Ps. cv. 6. they are called ἐκλεκτοί. In the N. T., κλήσις is often used to denote the *peculiar favour* first vouchsafed to the *Jews*. More frequently, however, both κλητοὶ and κλήσις are used of that shewn to *Christians*. As to ἐκλεκτοί, it may be questioned whether it ever be (as some say) *synonymous* with κλητοί, at least in the N. T. The terms are properly *distinct*, and have reference to two different stages in the Christian course. Thus, in the present passage, and at xxii. 14. they are put in opposition; and in the former, by κλητοὶ are denoted those who have been *invited* into, and have *entered* into, the service of Christ; and by ἐκλ., those who have *approved* themselves therein. In the latter, κλ. means those who are *invited* to the blessings and privileges of the Gospel; and ἐκλ. those who, having *accepted* the invitation, *approve* themselves worthy of their high calling in Christ. It is true that in *both* these parables, by the κλητοὶ are especially designated the *Jews*, who were invited to the marriage feast of the Gospel, but who almost wholly rejected the invitation (see Luke xiv. 18.); by the ἐκλ., those of them who accepted it, and who are termed by St. Paul, Rom. xi. 6, 7. "the remnant κατ' ἐκλογήν." However, the saying admits of, and was doubtless intended for, a *general* application; by which κλ. will denote those who have *accepted* the invitation, and are *professedly* members of the Christian Church; ἐκλ., those who have *approved* themselves not unworthy of the blessing, and have not "received the grace of God in vain." Thus κλ. is often used

in the Epistles of St. Paul and the other Apostles in this general sense; but *sometimes* merely as an appellation of Christianity. There seems to be a reference to this saying of our Lord, in its *general* application, at Rev. xvii. 14. οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ κλητοὶ καὶ ἐκλεκτοὶ καὶ πιστοὶ; where the common punctuation leads to a very objectionable sense, and caused Hammond to suppose that *three different degrees* of Christians were meant: a notion wholly unsupported by Scripture. All will be right if the κλ. be construed with οἱ, and be referred to what preceded, καὶ τῷ Ἀρίῳ νικήσει, and νικήσουσι be supplied from thence; the words *ὅτι Κτίριος — βασιλείῳν* being taken as parenthetical. Thus the words may be rendered: "And the Lamb shall conquer them (for he is King of kings and Lord of lords), and the Saints who are with him, both approved and trusty." Thus κλ. will be, like ἅγιοι, a designation of true Christians, as in Rom. i. 6. and Jude 1. τοῖς ἐν Θεῷ κλητοῖς, and more fully in Rom. i. 7. κλητοὶ ἅγιοι. As to the πιστοί, it is in some measure exegetical of ἐκλ., equivalent to οἱ τετηρημένοι in Jude 1.

17. ἀναβαίνων εἰς Ἱ.] Said with reference to the elevated situation of Jerusalem. Thus similar expressions occur in Homer, as Od. a. 210., and frequently in Joseph. and the Sept. How ancient this custom was, we find from its mention in Ps. cxxii. 3 & 4.

— εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, &c.] By this we are, I think, to understand that Jesus spoke *out*, as we say, and positively; though, from the time when he made a distinct avowal of his Messiahship, at Peter's confession, he had, as we find from supra xvi. 22. *begun* to disclose.

18. κατακρονοῦσιν αὐτὸν θανάτῳ.] This is to be taken improprie (for the Jews had no power of life and death), and is more definitely expressed by Mark xiv. 64. κατίκριναν αὐτὸν εἶναι ἔνοχον θανάτου: which words have reference to the sentence *ἐνοχος θανάτου ἐστί*. Fritz. says that the sense of κατακρίνειν τινα θανάτῳ is, "to devote any one to death." But the expression rather signifies, by a blending of two senses, to condemn any one, *so that* he shall be delivered to death. By ἔθνεσι the *Romans* are plainly meant; for crucifixion was a *Roman* punishment. The minute particularity of this prediction is astonishing; and, as Doddr. observes, is a remarkable proof of the prophetic spirit with which Christ was endued; for, humanly speaking, it was far more probable that he should have been either *assassinated*, in a transport of popular fury, or *stoned*, by the orders of the Sanhedrim; especially as Pilate had given them permission to judge him according to their own law. But "all this was done that the Scripture might be fulfilled."

		MK.	LU.
	δώσουσιν αὐτὸν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν εἰς τὸ ἐμπαῖξαι καὶ μαστιγῶσαι καὶ	10.	18.
	σταυρῶσαι· καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρῃ ἀναστήσεται.	34	33
20	Τότε προσῆλθεν αὐτῷ ἡ μήτηρ τῶν υἱῶν Ζεβεδαίου, μετὰ τῶν υἱῶν	35	
21	αὐτῆς, προσκυνούσα καὶ αἰτοῦσά τι παρ' αὐτοῦ. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῇ·	36	
	Τί θέλεις; Λέγει αὐτῷ. Εἶπέ ἕνα καθίσωσιν οὗτοι οἱ δύο υἱοὶ μου,		
22	εἷς ἐκ δεξιῶν σου καὶ εἷς ἐξ ἐνωπύμων σου, ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου. Ἀπο-	37	33
	κριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· Οὐκ οἴδατε τί αἰτεῖσθε. δύνασθε πιεῖν		
	τὸ ποτήριον, ὃ ἐγὼ μέλλω πίνειν, καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα, ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι,		
23	βαπτισθῆναι; λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· Ἀναμέθεα. Καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· Τὸ	39	
	μὲν ποτήριόν μου πείσθε, καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα, ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι, βαпти-		
	σθήσεσθε· τὸ δὲ καθίσει ἐκ δεξιῶν μου καὶ ἐξ ἐνωπύμων μου, οὐκ ἔστιν	40	
24	ἐμὸν δοῦναι, ἀλλ' οἷς ἠτοίμασται ὑπὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς μου. Καὶ ἀκού-	41	
25	σαντες οἱ δέκα, ἠγανάκτησαν περὶ τῶν δύο ἀδελφῶν. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς	42	

19. εἰς τὸ ἐμπαῖξαι] This, (as Grot. remarks) is to be taken ἐκβατικῶς : q. d. The consequence of which will be, that, &c. *Comp.* Joh. xviii. 33.

20. ἡ μήτηρ, &c.] Namely, Salome, mother of James and John, Mark v. 40. & xvi. 1. She had doubtless followed him from Galilee, with other pious women who attended on our Lord in his journeys. The request she made seems to have originated in the promise just before given to the Apostles of sitting on twelve thrones, &c.

— μετὰ τῶν υἱῶν α.] This shows that they participated in the petition; and, indeed, though they preferred it through the medium of their mother, yet it should seem that they were the principal movers of the affair. Thus Mark is justified in representing them as asking it. And indeed that Jesus regarded them as the principals, is clear from his addressing the answer to them.

— αἰτοῦσά τι παρ' αὐτοῦ] or, as it is more clearly stated by St. Mark, they said, θέλωμεν, ἵνα ὅ ἐγὼ αἰτήσωμεν, ποιήσῃς ἡμῖν.

21. εἷς ἐκ — ἐξ ἐνωπύμων] Said in allusion to the Eastern custom, by which sitting next to the throne denotes the next degree of dignity; and consequently the first situations on the right and left denote the highest dignities. See 1 Kings ii. 19. Ps. xlv. 9. and the Classical Illustrators.

— σου.] This is added in almost all the best MSS., and Versions, and is, with reason, received by Wets., Matth., Griesb., Knapp, Tittm., Vat., Fritz., and Scholz.

22. οὐκ οἴδατε τί αἰτεῖσθε.] i. e. ye do not comprehend the nature of my kingdom; which will rather call you to suffer with me than to enjoy honour or temporal advantage under me. Rochefoucault well observes, “Nous desirerions peu de choses avec ardeur, si nous connoissions parfaitement ce que nous desirons.”

— δύνασθε πιεῖν — πίνειν.] An image frequent with the Hebrews; who thus compared whatever was dealt out to men by the Almighty (whether good or evil) to a cup of wine. See John xviii. 11. Ps. xvi. 5. xxiii. 5. Nor was this confined to the Hebrews; for, as it was customary among the ancients in general to assign to each guest at a feast a particular *cup* as well as dish; and since by the quality and quantity of the liquor contained in it, the respect of the entertainer was expressed; hence *cup* came in general to signify a *portion assigned*, whether of pleasure or sorrow

(as Hom. II. ω. 524, where see Heyne); though, for an obvious reason, the expression was more frequently used of evil than of good.

— καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα — βάπτισθῆναι;] This metaphor, of immersion in water, as expressive of being overwhelmed by affliction, is frequent both in the Scriptural and Classical writers; with this difference, however, that in the latter there is usually added some word expressive of the evil or affliction. The words καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα — βάπτισθῆναι and καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα — βάπτισθήσεσθε are not found in some MSS., Versions, and Fathers; and are rejected by Grot. and Mill, and are cancelled by Griesb. and Fritz. But the external evidence against the words is very slender. And therefore, though the internal be very unfavourable to them (because it is far more probable that they should have been introduced from Mark, than accidentally omitted in the MSS.), yet they ought not to be cancelled.

23. οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν δοῦναι.] Sub. ἔργον, which is sometimes supplied. See Bos Ell. p. 95. So the Latin *non est meum*.

— ἀλλ' οἷς ἠτοίμασται] The early Commentators and Translators (misled by some of the antient Versions) here supposed an ellipsis of *δοθήσεται*, which would afford some colour to the Arian and Socinian doctrines; since, as Whitty and Campb. observe, “in the distribution of future rewards, Christ might seem to acknowledge his inferiority to the Father, inasmuch as there would be some power reserved by the Father to himself, and not committed to the Son.” Others of the ancients supposed an ellipsis of *ἐκείνων ἔστιν*, interpreting the clause *οὐκ ἐμὸν δοῦναι*, not with relation to our Lord's power, but with respect to his justice and equity; or referring the phrase only to his human nature. Others again understand, from the context, *ὑμῶν*, which even crept into the text of the Vulgate. And thus, indeed, all difficulty is removed; but in a manner little warrantable. In fact, all these ellipses are very irregular and inadmissible. It is better to suppose no ellipsis at all; but only to take ἀλλὰ in the somewhat unusual sense of *εἰ μὴ*, as in Mark ix. 8. (where ἀλλὰ corresponds to *εἰ μὴ* in Matt. xvii. 8.) Examples from the Classical writers are by no means rare. (See Rec. Synop.) The *converse*, *εἰ μὴ* for ἀλλὰ, is frequent, and occurs in Rom. xiv. 14. This mode of interpretation is supported by the au-

MK.

10. προσκαλεσόμενος αὐτοὺς εἶπεν· Οἴδατε, ὅτι οἱ ἄρχοντες τῶν ἐθνῶν
 43 κατακυριεύουσιν αὐτῶν, καὶ οἱ μεγάλοι κατεξουσιάζουσιν αὐτῶν. Οὐχ 26
 οὕτως [δὲ] ἔσται ἐν ὑμῖν· ἀλλ' ὅς ἐάν θῆλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν μέγας γενέσθαι,
 44 ἔστω ὑμῶν διάκονος· καὶ ὅς ἐάν θῆλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι πρῶτος, ἔστω ὑμῶν 27
 45 δοῦλος· ὡσπερ ὁ Τίος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἤλθε διακονηθῆναι, ἀλλὰ 28
 διακονῆσαι, καὶ δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν.

thority of the Pesh. Syr., Arabic, Persic, and Æthiopic Versions; and, of Commentators, is adopted by Casaub., Grot., Gatak., Gusset, Hackspan, Koecher, Starck, Raphel, Palairt, Bengel, Rosenm., and Kuin. Indeed, it may be observed, the Sept. sometimes render the Heb. \square \square \square by ἀλλά. Thus our *but*, in this use, has the very same origin, being derived (as Horne Tooke shows) from the Saxon Be-utan, from Beonutan, to be out; as when we say "all but (i. e. except) one." Thus ἀλλά has the two senses of our *but*, indicated in H. Tooke's Div. of P. I. p. 135. 190. 325. seqq. How ἀλλά comes to have this sense, seems to be from its being thus put for ἀλλ' ἢ, otherwise than. Thus all difficulty, both as regards words and things, is entirely removed; for, as observes Whitty, "the expression argues no defect in the power of Christ, but merely a perfect conformity to the will of his Father." "Our Lord (says Bp. Horsley, Sermon. V. v. p. 281.) does not deny his power to give, but only declares who they are who shall receive this honour. His answer, far from intimating any thing of that kind, concludes as strongly against it as a negative argument can be supposed to do. Thus the meaning is, 'I cannot arbitrarily give happiness, but must bestow it on those alone for whom, in reward of holiness and obedience, it is prepared, according to God's just decrees.'"

25. οἱ ἄρχοντες — αὐτῶν.] Erasm., Grot., Wets., Rosenm., and Fritz. take the κατακ. and κατεξ. to denote *tyrannical and arbitrary power*, of course hinting a *censure* thereon; in which sense the words do occur in the Sept. But as it is scarcely to be supposed that the governors in question were always tyrants; and as the *simple* verbs are used in Luke, it is better, with many good Commentators, to suppose the sense to be, "exercise authority over." Thus the κατὰ is not so much *intensive*, as it promotes definiteness. The Commentators thus adverted to, with even *less* reason, suppose the first αὐτῶν to refer to the *people*, the second to the *kings*; which is harsh, and inconsistent with the parallel passage in Luke. There is, in fact, a repetition of the same sentiment in different words (as also at ver. 27.) for greater emphasis. See Bp. Jebb's Sac. Lit. p. 238 seqq.

26. δέ.] This is omitted in many MSS., some Versions, and Theophyl., and was cancelled by Griesb., Knapp, Tittm., Vat., and Scholz; but restored by Fritz.; and rightly; for, it is supported not only by high authority here and in Mark, but is so suitable to the passage, that it can hardly be dispensed with. The cause of the omission (which was accidental) seems to have been this: that after it had been originally written ΟΥΤΩΔΕ in MS., without stops, the Δ was taken with Ω, and mistaken, as not unfrequently, for an N, and then the E would be absorbed by the E following.

— διάκονος — δοῦλος.] There is properly a difference between these terms; the former signi-

fying a *servant* like our *footman*, or *valet*, and usually a free man; the latter, a servant for all work, and also a *slave*. They were, however, sometimes interchanged. So Aristid. Vol. iii. 360. — οὕτω φαῦλος ἦν τοὺς τρῆπους, καὶ αὐτόχρημα εἰκόνομος. The use *here*, and the general sense are plain.

28. δοῦναι — ἀντὶ πολλῶν.] In order to determine the sense of this passage (so important in its connection with the distinguishing doctrine of the Gospel, the ATONEMENT), it is proper carefully to attend to its *scope*, and then to ascertain the force of its principal terms *λύτρον*, *ἀντὶ*, and *πολλῶν*. The scope of the passage evidently is, to point out the *purpose* of Christ's coming into the world. It was *δοῦναι* — *πολλῶν*. On the sense of *ψυχῆ* here there has never been any doubt. — It plainly signifies (as often in the Scriptures, and even the Classical writers) *life*. He came to give up his life as a *λύτρον*. Now *λύτρον* properly denotes the *ransom* paid, in order to deliver any one from *death*, or its equivalent, *captivity*, or *punishment* in general. Thus in Exod. xxi. 30. the word answers to כַּפַּר. More frequently it denotes the *piacular victim*, כַּבֵּב, sometimes expressed by ἐξίλασμα; which Hesych. explains ἀντιλύτρον. It has been abundantly proved that, among both the Jews and the Gentiles, *piacular victims* were accepted as a ransom for the life of an offender, and to atone for his offence. The heathens believed that no atonement was so complete or effectual as that whereby the piacular victim should be a *human* being; whose life was thus given *ἀντὶ* instead of the life of the other. Hence such victims were called ἀντιψυχοὶ, and the atonement made by them an ἀντιλύτρον. And Aristides, Sac. v. has an oracular response, where, with allusion to this, there is demanded ψυχὴ ἀντὶ ψυχῆς. So also Eurip. Phœn. 1012. — ψυχὴν δὲ δῶσω τῆσδ' ὑπερβαίνειν χθονός. Indeed, on the further notion, that the life of one person was, in some cases, to be given and accepted for the life of another, the whole of the Alcestis of Euripides is founded. The *true* notion, indeed, of atonement was unknown to the Heathens; though they felt the necessity for it. See Horne's Introd. Vol. i. 8. & 146, 147. The very term ἀντὶ, it may also be observed, is the strongest that can be imagined; it being derived from the ancient word ἀντ, which signifies change. The ἀντὶ is for ἐν ἀντὶ, *in mutatione*, per mutationem.

The sense, then, of this passage, can be no other than that which has been assigned to it by every Interpreter of any consideration in every age, (including, of the recent foreign Commentators, Kuinoel and Fritz.) namely, that our Lord was to give up his life as a piacular victim, a ransom for mankind, that they might not suffer spiritual death. And thus it harmonizes with the doctrine of Scripture elsewhere. So in Dan. ix. 24. it is predicted, that the Messiah shall make reconciliation for iniquity; whence he is called by the Jewish Rabbins כַּפַּר יִשָּׂא, literally ἀνήρ

	MK.	LU.
29 Καὶ ἐκπορευομένων αὐτῶν ἀπὸ Ἰεριχῶ, ἠκολούθησεν αὐτῷ ὄχλος	10.	18.
30 πολὺς. Καὶ ἰδοὺ, δύο τυφλοὶ καθήμενοι παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν, ἀκούσαντες	46	35
31 ὅτι Ἰησοῦς παράγει, ἔκραζαν λέγοντες· Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, Κύριε, υἱὸς	47	37
Δαυὶδ! Ὁ δὲ ὄχλος ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς, ἵνα σιωπήσωσιν· οἱ δὲ μεῖζον	48	38
32 ἔκραζον, λέγοντες· Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, Κύριε υἱὸς Δαυὶδ. Καὶ στάς	49	40
33 ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐφώνησεν αὐτοὺς καὶ εἶπε· Τί θέλετε ποιήσω ὑμῖν; Αἰ-	51	41
34 γουσι αὐτῷ· Κύριε, ἵνα ἀνοιχθῶσιν ἡμῶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοί. σπλαγ-	52	42
χνισθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἤψατο τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν· καὶ εὐθέως ἀνέ-	43	
βλεψαν αὐτῶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοί, καὶ ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ.		

λύτρον. Comp. Matt. xxvi. 23. John xi. 52. Eph. v. 2. 1 Tim. ii. 6. Heb. ix. 14 & 23. (and the Notes on those passages,) all declaring the same doctrine, that Christ's death was a sacrifice for the sins of mankind; even that true and substantial sacrifice, which those of the law but faintly shadowed forth in types, symbols and figures.

I cannot, however, leave this passage without removing a stumbling-block, which has been found here by serious, but misjudging or timid believers, who have been too ready to conclude that from πολλῶν it may be implied that redemption is not *universal*. But utterly without reason; for the best Expositors, ancient and modern, are agreed, that πολλῶν is here to be taken for πάντων; of which they adduce many examples.— And although not a few of them are inapposite, yet some others fully establish the point; ex. gr. Comp. Dan. xii. 2. with John v. 23. sq. and Rom. v. 12. 15. 18 & 19. with 1 Cor. xv. 22. not to mention *some* examples in the Classical writers. Yet, even in these instances, it may be doubted whether πολλοὶ can ever be said to be, strictly speaking, *put* for πάντες. It should seem that, in such cases, an idiom subsists, which has been, I apprehend, unperceived by Philologists; where there is, by an apposition, either *expressed* or *implied*, a comparison of πολλοὶ with some other very small number (usually *one*), which remains after deducting it from a *total*. In such a case, πολλοὶ may be said to be *equivalent* to πάντες; being, *in a manner*, the whole of the number in question; though it cannot strictly be said to *signify* that; the literal sense being the remainder of a large number, after a very small one has been subtracted. This principle will apply to all the passages alleged in proof that πολλοὶ is used for πάντες. I mean to all that are *justly* alleged; for Matt. xx. 16. has quite another bearing (see the note there); and in places like 1 Cor. x. 33. where the ARTICLE is used, the principle cannot be admitted. There the meaning is, either “the *majority*,” or “the *rest*.” And such is the case in almost all the passages adduced from the Classical writers; where the sense is, “very many,” or “ever so many.” The Commentators might also have cited a passage of Thucyd. i. 133. where τοῖς πολλοῖς, as appears from a comparison with 134. § 5. must mean [all] the rest. So also at i. 33. we have τοῖς πλεοσιν (for πολλοῖς) opposed to τοῖσδε μόνοις. As examples of the *taut* comparison above adverted to, I would specify Rom. viii. 29. εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πρωτότοκον ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς, (where the εἰς is implied in πρωτ.) Matt. xxvi. 23. and Mark xiv. 24. τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστὶ τὸ αἶμά μου, τὸ τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης, τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον εἰς ἄφρονι ἀμαρτιῶν. (where τὸ περὶ πολλῶν is for τὸ ἐνδὸς, περὶ πολλῶν, with

allusion to the μου just before) Heb. ix. 28. οὐτως ὁ Χριστὸς ἅπας προσενεχθεὶς εἰς τὸ πολλῶν ἀνενεγκεῖν ἁμαρτίας, &c. The same principle will also apply to *some* passages where the Article is *found*, namely, where it does not exert its definite force. So Rom. xii. 5. οὕτως οἱ πολλοί, ἐν σώμα ἕσμεν ἐν Χριστῷ. And in Rom. v. 15. 18 & 19. the Article is used both to εἰς and πολλοί, the Articles there coming under the head of “*Insertions in reference*” (See Middl. in loc.), and *renewed mention*,” the reference being to v. 12. where ὡς περὶ δι’ ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου is opposed to εἰς πάντα ἀνθρώπους. Upon the whole, in such a case we may most correctly render “*all the rest*.” And this may be done in the only two Classical passages *not* having the Article that are here apposite, namely, Eurip. Hec. 234. “Ὁδ’ ἀντὶ πολλῶν ἐστὶ μοι παραψυχή,” and Virgil Æn. v. 315. UNUM PRO MULTIS DABITUR CAPUT.

30. δύο τυφλοὶ, &c.] There is a considerable variation in the accounts of this miracle by the three Evangelists. *Mark* and *Luke* notice only one blind man, *Matthew* two; *Luke* represents the miracle as performed “when Jesus was drawing nigh to Jericho,” before he entered it; *Matthew* and *Mark*, after he had left Jericho. The joint testimony, however, of *Matthew* and *Mark*, as to the time, seems to outweigh that of *Luke*, who is not so observant of chronological order; and as all agree, that Christ was then attended by a “*multitude*,” who “*led the way*,” and who “*followed him*” towards *Jerusalem*, it is more probable that the incident took place after he left Jericho, where this multitude seems to have been collected. For He came privately from *Ephraim* to *Jericho*, attended only by the twelve. (Hales.) The minute discrepancies in this narrative, compared with those of *Mark* and *Luke*, involve no contradiction; since, though those Evangelists mention *one* blind man as healed, yet they do not say that *only* one was healed; and *Mark* and *Luke* in mentioning *one*, might mean to point out that one who was the more known. Again, the apparent difference between *Matthew* and *Mark*, as compared with *Luke*, with regard to the *place* where the miracle was performed, may, it is thought, be removed by reading in *Luke* “when, or while, Jesus was near Jericho.” If, however, the trifling discrepancies adverted to were really irreconcilable, still they would not weaken the credit of the Evangelists, being such as are found in the best historians; nay, they may be rather thought to strengthen their authority as independent witnesses.

31. ἐπετίμησεν, *iva*.] *Campb.* translates “charged them, that,” &c. But though that be sometimes the signification of the term at Matt. xii. 16. yet it is here unnecessary to deviate from the import,

MK. LU.

11. 19. XXI. Καὶ ὅτε ἤγγισαν εἰς Ἱερουσόλυμα, καὶ ἤλθον εἰς Βηθφαγή 1
 1 20 πρὸς τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν, τότε ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀπέστειλε δύο μαθητὰς, λέ-
 2 30 γων αὐτοῖς· Πορεύθητε εἰς τὴν κώμην τὴν ἀπέναντι ὑμῶν· καὶ εὐ- 2
 3 31 θέως εὐρήσετε ὄνον δεδεμένον, καὶ πῶλον μετ' αὐτῆς· λύσαντες ἀγά- 3
 χρεῖαν ἔχει· εὐθέως δὲ † ἀποστελεῖ αὐτούς. Τοῦτο δὲ ὅλον γέγονεν, 4
 ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος· Ἐῖπατε τῇ 5
 θυγατρὶ Σιών· Ἰδοὺ, ὁ βασιλεὺς σου ἔρχεται· σοὶ 5
 πρᾶϋς, καὶ ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ ὄνον, καὶ πῶλον υἱὸν

“rebuke,” which is indeed more suitable. The most probable reason assigned for the rebuke is, that they were unwilling that Jesus’s course should be interrupted, or his discourse broken off, or rendered inaudible. Thus it should seem that the people only blamed the importunity, as being unseasonable; as in a kindred passage at xii. 16. ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς, ἵνα μὴ, &c.

XXI. 1. εἰς Βηθφαγή.] Mark xi. 1. and Luke xix. 29. add καὶ Βηθανίαν. We may therefore suppose that the territories of the two villages were contiguous; yet that Bethphage came first in travelling from Jericho to Jerusalem. Hence Calmet and others are wrong in describing Bethphage as being a village between Bethany and Jerusalem. So Eriphan. adv. Hæres. p. 340. cited by Reland Palest. 629. testifies that there was an old road to Jerusalem from Jericho through Bethphage and Bethany, and the Mount of Olives. Nay, Calmet himself describes Bethany as situated at the foot of the Mount of Olives (and so all accounts represent it—see Reland); but from the words πρὸς τὸ ὄρος τ. ἐλ. being here conjoined with Βηθφ., it is probable that Bethphage was situated on some part of the lower ridge, or ἀκρόρεια, of the mountain, and Bethany just below it, at the foot of it: and, consequently, it could not be between Bethany and Jerusalem. This is supported by the testimony of Jerome and Origen, the former of whom describes Bethphage as “sacerdotum viculus, situs in monte Oliveti.” And the latter, in his Annot. on Matt., says it was situated on Mount Olivet.

2. πῶλον] “a colt.” Mark and Luke add, “on which no man had ever sat.” Animals which had never borne the yoke, or been employed for ordinary purposes, were (by a custom common to all the ancients, whether Jews or Gentiles) employed for sacred uses. See Deut. xxi. 3. I Sam. vi. 7. Horat. Epod. 9. 22. Ovid. Met. 3. 11. Virg. Georg. 4. 540. 551. Mark and Luke mention the sending for the colt only, as being that whereon alone our Lord rode; not mentioning the ass, though also brought (agreeable to the prophecy of Zecharias), because they do not mention that prophecy. There is plainly in the latter representation a negation of the former. Whitty notices the minuteness of the matters predicted, and rightly infers from thence Christ’s supernatural prescience.

3. εἶπη τι.] A popular mode of expression equivalent to, “if he shall make objection.”

—ὁ κύριος] i. e. not “the Lord,” which involves great improbability, but “the master,” Rabbi, as at vii. 21. and viii. 25. John xi. 12. xiii. 13 & 14. See Doddr., Campb., and Schleusn.

—ἀποστελεῖ.] Many MSS., Versions, and

Fathers, have ἀποστέλλει, which is preferred by Mill and Wets., and edited by Matth., Griesb., Knapp, Tittm., and Scholz, but without reason. In so minute a variation manuscript authority is of little weight; and yet there is far more of it for the old reading than for the new one; which cannot be admitted without violating the norma loquendi; for the Present cannot (as Kuin. imagines) be here taken for the Future. The common reading is rightly defended by Schulz. (who observes that the new reading arose from an error of pronunciation) and restored to the text by Fritz.

4. ὅλον.] This is suspected not to be genuine by Griesb. and Grotz., and is cancelled by Lachm.; but wholly without cause, for external evidence is almost entirely in favour of the word, and internal nearly as much so, since it is almost necessary to the sense (*tota hæc res*), and was more likely to have been omitted, by accident, in three or four MSS., than have been foisted into the text of nearly as many hundreds. Besides, the word occurs without any var. lect. in passages exactly similar, *supr.* i. 22. xxvi. 56.

5. τῇ θυγατρὶ Σιών] i. e. Jerusalem, by a poetical personification usual in the prophetic writings. Jerusalem might be called the daughter of Sion, being situated at the foot, and, as it were, under the wing of that fortified mount. The quotation is from Zech. ix. 9. (with the exception of the introductory words, which are from Is. lxiii. 11.), and agrees, at least all that is meant to be taken (for a short clause is omitted, as being not to the present purpose), with both the Sept. and the Hebrew. For יְיָ, the true reading, is thought by Dr. Randolph to be יְיָיָ. But there is no occasion for any such change; since יְיָ may mean *lovely*, and is so interpreted by Gesenius in his Lexicon. There is, indeed, a variation in the last words between Matthew and the Sept. But there is some reason to think, that formerly the Sept. was read nearly as in Matthew. At least the Evangelist’s text closely agrees with the Hebrew.

—ὄνον καὶ πῶλον.] Several eminent Commentators would render the καὶ *even*. But this is doing violence to the plain sense expressed, and would really destroy the *coincidence* as to fulfilment of prophecy. Certainly there is no necessity for it in order to reconcile the Evangelists; for St. Matthew does not say that our Lord rode on the ass, but only that it was prepared for him. Neither will it follow from our Lord’s saying, “thus was fulfilled.” For the prophecy was sufficiently fulfilled by the ass and colt being both *got ready*. Not to say, that even the words of the Prophet are not inconsistent with this view; for any one who goes on horseback, accompanied by a *led* horse (to use when he pleases),

	MK.	LU.
6 ὕποζυγίου. Πορευθέντες δὲ οἱ μαθηταί, καὶ ποιήσαντες καθὼς	11.	19.
7 προσέειπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ἤγαγον τὴν ὄνον καὶ τὸν πῶλον, καὶ	4	32
ἐπέθηκαν ἐπάνω αὐτῶν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν, καὶ † ἐπεκάθισεν ἐπάνω	7	35
8 αὐτῶν. Ὁ δὲ πλείστος ὄχλος ἔστρωσαν ἑαυτῶν τὰ ἱμάτια ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ·	8	36
ἄλλοι δὲ ἔκοπτον κλάδους ἀπὸ τῶν δένδρων, καὶ ἐστρώννουν ἐν τῇ		
9 ὁδῷ. Οἱ δὲ ὄχλοι οἱ προάγοντες καὶ οἱ ἀκολουθοῦντες ἔκραζον λέ-	9	37
γοντες· Ὡσαννὰ τῷ υἱῷ Δαυὶδ! εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν	10	38
ὀνόματι Κυρίου! Ὡσαννὰ ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις!		
10 Καὶ εἰσελθόντος αὐτοῦ εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, ἐσείσθη πᾶσα ἡ πόλις,		
11 λέγουσα· Τίς ἐστὶν οὗτος; Οἱ δὲ ὄχλοι ἔλεγον· Οὗτός ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς		
ὁ προφήτης, ὁ ἀπὸ Ναζαρέτ τῆς Γαλιλαίας.		
12 Καὶ εἰσῆλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὸ ἱερόν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἐξέβαλε πάντας τοὺς	15	45
πωλοῦντας καὶ ἀγοράζοντας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, καὶ τὰς τραπέζας τῶν κολλυβιστῶν		

may be, not improperly, described as *ἐπιβεβηκώς*, with respect to *both*, and thus be said to ride both, like the *ἀμφίποιοι*, or *desultores*, mentioned in several ancient writers, a sort of cavalry, where every man had two horses, which he rode in rotation (the *ἀμφί* in this term being for *ἀμφοτερόθεν*); on which subject see my Note on Thucyd. x. 57.

— *ὑποζυγίου*.] Scil. *κτήνηους*. The word properly signifies any *beast of burden*. (See my note on Thucyd. ii. 3.) But as the ass was commonly so used, it came of itself to denote an ass.

7. *ἐπεκάθισεν*.] The reading here is not a little controverted. *Ἐπεκάθισεν* is the reading of all the early Edd.; which was altered by the Elzevir Editor, from several MSS. to *ἐπεκάθισαν*. But *ἐπεκάθισαν* has been restored by Wets., Matth., Knapp, Griesb., Tittm., Fritz., and Scholz. *Ἐπεκάθισαν*, moreover, is supported by St. Luke's *ἐπέβησαν*. It is also preferred by several Commentators, as Beza, Camerar., Pisc., Wakef., and Schleus.; and if we were to follow the *proprietas lingue*, it ought to be adopted. Yet as the verb is often in the Sept. used in the sense “to sit,” or “ride,” so the reading *ἐπεκάθισεν* seems to deserve the preference, especially as it is supported by the parallel passage of Mark. If *ἐπεκάθισαν* be read, *αὐτῶν* will, if understood of the ass and the colt, be unsuitable; and if of the *garments*, it will be very jejune. We might indeed, conjecture *αὐτῶν*, supposing *ἐπάνω* to be taken absolutely for thereon. This will be confirmed by the parallel passage of St. Luke, and not be at variance with that of St. Mark. But the mention of the ass and colt at v. 2. and 7. greatly supports the reading *αὐτῶν*. The people would put the trappings on both the ass and the colt, to do the more honour to Jesus; and as not knowing on which he would ride. On the *ellip.* of *αὐτῶν*, see Winer's Gr. Gr. § 16. 1. Thus, though there is a minute diversity in Matthew and Mark, as compared with Luke, yet it is no real discrepancy, since it does not involve any contradiction. Matthew (as is observed by the British Crit. and Quart. Theol. II. 371) tells us, *all* that happened, because he saw and knew all: Mark and Luke received the facts at second-hand, and mentioned only the material fact. As to the *αὐτῶν*, it must not, with many Commentators, be taken, per enallagen, as plural for singular; or *τινός* be supplied, with others; but, with Euthym., Theophyl., Beza,

Hombergh, Schleus., Wahl., and Fritz., must be referred to the *garments*, not the ass and colt.

8. *ὁ πλείστος ὄχλος*] “the bulk of the people,” consisting of those going to keep the passover, and of those who, after Lazarus's resurrection, had come out of the city to meet Christ. See John xii. 9.

— *ἔστρωσαν ἑαυτῶν τὰ ἱμάτια*.] An Oriental custom employed on the public entry of kings, yet in use among the Greeks also. See examples in Recens. Synop. and Horne's Introd. iii. 397.

— *ἔκοπτον κλάδους*.] Meant as a symbol of joy, employed at the feast of tabernacles and other public rejoicings among the Jews. Yet the custom was in use also among the Greeks and Romans.

9. *Ὡσαννὰ*] Heb. *שָׁן וְשִׁירָה*. *Save us now, or we beseech thee!* from Ps. cxvii. 25.

— *ὁ ἐρχόμενος*.] A title of the Messiah, as also *υἱοῦ Δαυὶδ*.

— *Ὡσαννὰ ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις!*] *Comp.* Psal. cxviii. 24. and see Horne's Introd. iii. 316. Kuhn. thinks there is an ellipse of *ὁ ὢν*; and Grot. takes the *ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις* adverbially, for *summè*. But it is better, with others, to supply *μέρσει*, taking it as a periphrasis for *ἐν οὐρανοῖς*. Thus in Heb. i. 3. and viii. 1. *ἐν ὑψηλοῖς*, is interchanged with *ἐν οὐρανοῖς*. As to the ellipse after *Ὡσαννὰ*, it is rather *ἔστω*; *Ὡσαννὰ* being regarded as a noun. Thus Fritz. well renders, “*eadem lætantium gratulatio in cælo obtineat.*”

10. *ἐσείσθη*] “was in commotion,” agitated with hope, fear, wonder, or disapprobation, according as each person was affected.

11. *ὁ προφήτης*.] The force of the Article is, the [celebrated] prophet.

12. *τὸ ἱερόν*.] A general name for the whole edifice, with all its courts: as distinguished from the *ναός*, or temple properly so called; which comprehended only the vestibule, the sanctuary, and the holy of holies. See Horne's Introd. iii. 236. sqq.

— *ἐξέβαλε* — *ἱερῷ*.] It appears from Mark xi 11. that Jesus did not do this *on the day of his entry* into Jerusalem, (though it is there said that he entered into the temple, and looked round the whole of it,) but the *day after*; spending the night at Bethany, and returning to Jerusalem in the morning; and in the way thither working the miracle of the fig-tree. As Mark is so positive and particular in his account, and as Matth. does

MK. LU.

11. 19. κατέστρεψε, καὶ τὰς καθέδρας τῶν πωλούντων τὰς περιστεράς· καὶ λέγει 13
 17 46 αὐτοῖς· Γέγραπται, Ὁ οἶκός μου οἶκος προσευχῆς κληθή-
 σεταί· ὑμεῖς δὲ αὐτὸν ἐποιήσατε σπήλαιον ληστῶν. Καὶ προσῆλθον αὐ- 14
 τῷ τυφλοὶ καὶ χωλοὶ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ· καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν αὐτούς. Ἰδόντες δὲ 15
 οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς τὰ θαναμίσια ἃ ἐποίησε, καὶ τοὺς παῖδας
 κρούοντας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ καὶ λέγοντας· Ὡσαννά τῷ νιῷ Δαυὶδ! ἤγανάκτη-
 σαν, καὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ· Ἀκούεις τί οὗτοι λέγουσιν; Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς λέγει αὐ- 16
 τοῖς· Ναί. οὐδέποτε ἀνέγνωτε, Ὅτι ἐκ στόματος νηπίων καὶ
 12 θηλαζόντων κατηγορίσω αἱνον; Καὶ καταλιπὼν αὐτούς, 17
 ἐξῆλθεν ἔξω τῆς πόλεως εἰς Βηθανίαν, καὶ ἤλισθη ἐκεῖ.

Πρωΐας δὲ ἐπανάγων εἰς τὴν πόλιν, ἐπέιασε· καὶ ἰδὼν συκῆν 18
 13 μίαν ἐπὶ τῆς ὁδοῦ, ἦλθεν ἐπ' αὐτήν, καὶ οὐδὲν εὔρεν ἐν αὐτῇ, εἰ 19
 14 μὴ φύλλια μόνον· καὶ λέγει αὐτῇ· Μηκέτι ἐκ σοῦ καρπὸς γένηται
 21 εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. καὶ ἐξηράνθη παραχοῖμα ἡ συκῆ. Καὶ ἰδόντες οἱ 20
 22 μαθηταὶ ἐθανύμασαν, λέγοντες· Πῶς παραχοῖμα ἐξηράνθη ἡ συκῆ!
 23 Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν· ἐὰν ἔχητε 21
 πίστιν καὶ μὴ διακριθῆτε, οὐ μόνον τὸ τῆς συκῆς ποιήσετε, ἀλλὰ καὶ

not expressly connect our Lord's driving out the traders with the events of the day, we ought, it should seem, to adopt Mark's account. To do which, there cannot be a greater inducement than the consideration, that those who adopt the other hypothesis are compelled to suppose that the circumstances in question happened twice on two successive days. Nay, thrice; for our Lord had done much the same thing in the first year of his ministry (John ii. 14.) The reason why he did not then do it, is suggested by the words of Mark, *δφίας δὲ γενομένης*, i. e. because, it being evening, the buyers and sellers had most of them retired. That it should then be evening, was likely enough, considering the events of the day, which must have occupied a considerable time.

— *κολληβιστῶν*] from *κόλλυβος*, a petty coin, signifies those who exchanged foreign coin into Jewish, or the larger into the smaller coin, for the convenience of the purchasers of the commodities sold in the temple. See Horne's *Intr.* iii. 184.

13. *γέγραπται*, &c.] This quotation is from Isa. lvi. 7. where it exactly agrees with the Sept. and Hebrew. In the latter clause of the sentence there is not, as the Commentators suppose, a quotation, but only the saying is formed on a similar one at Jerem. vii. 11. *Μὴ σπήλαιον ληστῶν ὁ οἶκός μου*; where there is an allusion to the custom (common to all countries) for robbers to make their abode in caves.

— *ληστῶν*.] Perhaps, not literally thieves, but extortioners and cheats, at least persons devoted to base lucre. An interpretation which seems required by the expression of John *οἶκος ἐμπορίου*. Though our Lord's assertion might be justified in its full sense by what is found in Joseph. B. J. v. 9, 4.

16. *ἐκ στόματος — αἶνον*.] an application to the present case of a passage of Ps. viii. 2. Sept. (which speaks of the existence and providence of God, as so clearly appearing from the works of nature, that even the most simple must see) where the Hebrew is rendered "thou hast ordain-

ed strength;" the Sept. "thou hast perfected praise," i. e. accomplished a grand effect by weak means; for the divine praise is perfected even by the silence of the suckling, and the artless cry of the babe. Thus there is no real discrepancy in sentiment, though there be a diversity in expression, between the Heb. and the Sept. That the whole Psalm has a prophetic reference to the Messiah, is plain by there being three other passages in the N. T. where it is applied to him. 1. Cor. xv. 27. Eph. i. 22. Heb. ii. 6.

17. *ἠλίσθη ἐκεῖ*] "lodged or spent the night there." A sense found in 3 Esdr. ix. 2. Eccl. xxiv. 7. Jesus left the city, and returned to Bethany for the night; not so much, we may suppose, to avoid the snares that might be laid for his life, as to avoid all suspicion of affecting temporal power; the night being a season favourable for popular commotion. See Thucyd. ii. 3. 4. *φυλάξαντες νύκτα*, where see my note.

18. *πρωΐας ἐπὶ ἐπανάγων*, &c.] On the chronology of the Passion Week, the reader is referred to Townson, Hales, Townsend, and Greswell.

19. *μηκέτι — αἰῶνα*.] This was emblematical and figurative; according to the usual custom of the sages of the East to express things by symbolical actions. It was also prophetic. Our Lord intended to prove that his power to punish the disobedient was as great as that to confer benefits. It was, moreover, to prefigure the destruction of the perverse Jews, because in the *time of fruits* they had borne none (see ver. 33—41.); and, likewise, to read a very important lesson to all his disciples of every age,—that if the opportunities God gives for the approving themselves virtuous be neglected, nought will remain but to be withered by the fiat which shall consign them to everlasting destruction.

21. *καὶ μὴ διακριθῆτε*.] Kuin. observes that this negative expression is the very same with the positive one *ἐὰν ἔχητε πίστιν*, the two being united for the sake of emphasis, as at xiii. 34. and elsewhere. In *διακρ.* in this sense (to hesitate) there

		MK. LU.
	τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ εἶπητε· Ἀρθήτι καὶ βλήθητι εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, γε- 11. 20.	
22	νήσεται. Καὶ πάντα ὅσα ἂν αἰτήσητε ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ, πιστεύοντες, 24	
	λήψεσθε.	
23	Καὶ ἐλθόντι αὐτῷ εἰς τὸ ἱερόν, προσήλθον αὐτῷ διδάσκοντι οἱ ἄρ- 27 1	
	χειεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τοῦ λαοῦ, λέγοντες· Ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦ- 28 2	
24	τα ποιεῖς; καὶ τίς σοι ἔδωκε τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην; Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ 29 3	
	ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Ἐρωτήσω ὑμᾶς καὶ γὰρ λόγον ἓνα· ὃν ἐάν 25	
25	εἴπητέ μοι, καὶ γὰρ ὑμῖν ἐρῶ ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιῶ. Τὸ βᾶ- 4	
	πτισμα Ἰωάννου πόθεν ἦν; ἔξ οὐρανοῦ, ἢ ἔξ ἀνθρώπων; Οἱ δὲ διε- 26	
26	λογίζοντο, παρ' ἑαυτοῖς, λέγοντες· Ἴδὼν εἶπωμεν· ἔξ οὐρανοῦ, ἐρεῖ 31	
	ἡμῖν· Διατί οὖν οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε αὐτῷ; ἐάν δὲ εἴπωμεν· ἔξ ἀν- 32 6	
27	θρώπων, — φοβούμεθα τὸν ὄχλον· πάντες γὰρ ἔχουσι τὸν Ἰωάννην 33 7	
	ὡς προφήτην. Καὶ ἀποκριθέντες τῷ Ἰησοῦ εἶπον· Οὐκ οἶδαμεν. 8	
	ἔφη αὐτοῖς καὶ αὐτός· Οὐδὲ ἐγὼ λέγω ὑμῖν ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα 28	
28	ποιῶ. Τί δὲ ὑμῖν δοκεῖ; Ἀνθρώπος εἶχε τέκνα δύο· καὶ προσελ-	

is the same metaphor as in διασῶζω and the Latin *diffrido*.

— τὸ τῆς συκῆς.] An elliptical expression for τὸ περὶ τῆς συκῆς γεγονός ἔργον.

— τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ.] Spoken *δεικτικῶς*, with reference, it is supposed, to the Mount of Olives. For *mountain*, Luke says *sycamore tree*. But there is, in fact, no discrepancy; because Jesus might, and, no doubt, did, make use of *both* examples. On the force of these adagial sayings see Note on Matt. xvii. 20. The construction of the passage is, according to Fritz., as follows: ἀλλὰ καὶ γενήσεται, ἐὰν τῷ ὄρει εἶπητε &c.

22. [Comp. Supr. vii. 7. Luke xi. 9. John xv. 7. 1 John iii. 22. v. 14.]

23. ἐλθόντι αὐτῷ.] These are Datives for Genitives of consequence.

— ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ.] Ἐν, Heb. בְּ, “by virtue of.” This they were privileged to ask, because they had the power of inquiring into the pretensions of a prophet; nay, since the authority of preaching in the temple was derived from them. The interrogators expected, no doubt, that he would answer, “By virtue of my right as Messiah,” and thus enable them to fix upon him the charge of blasphemy. But Jesus forbore to directly answer his malevolent interrogators; not through *fear* (as appears from the boldness evinced in the parables immediately following), but on purpose; and according to a method familiar to Hebrew, nay to Grecian disputants (see the citations of Schoettgen and Wets.), he answers by interrogation, replying to question by question, and that propounded with consummate wisdom; for while the Pharisees were not disposed, nay, were even afraid, to dispute John’s claim to be a prophet, they would thereby, on their own principles, admit the claims of *Jesus*, to whose divine mission John had borne repeated and unequivocal testimony. Schoettg. remarks that, among the Jews, if any proposed a captious question to another, the other had a right to propose one in turn, and not to answer the first till he had received a reply to his.

25. τὸ βάπτισμα — ἦν;] The sense is, “whence had John authority to baptize?” Βάπτισμα is put, by *synecdoche*, for the whole ministry of John

to preach repentance, and the doctrines he taught; because baptism was its most prominent feature, being a symbol of the purity which he enjoined. See Campbell.

— ἐξ οὐρανοῦ.] For ἐκ Θεοῦ, or οὐράνιον, of heavenly origin; a use which sometimes occurs in the LXX., but rarely in the Classical writers.

— διατί οὖν οὐκ ἐπ. α.] “why, then, have ye not believed him?” i. e. in his testimony of me.

26. φοβούμεθα] This is not (as Kuin. and other Philologists suppose,) of the middle voice, signifying *to terrify oneself*, but a deponent formed from what had originally been of the passive voice; just as our neuter or deponent verb, *to be afraid*, was formed from the old passive *to be afraid*, that was struck with fear. Fritz. ably remarks on that *brachylogia* in the present passage, by which a clause is omitted after ἐξ ἀνθρώπων (equivalent to “that will not be for our good”), to which the γὰρ following refers, and which γὰρ is put for two γὰρ’s. I have edited as the sense seems to require, ἐξ ἀνθρώπων, — *per aposiopesis*.

— ὡς προφήτην.] Ὡς is wrongly taken by Kuin. as put for ὄντως; though ὄντως is found in the parallel passage of Mark. It is either elegantly pleonastic (by which the expression will be equivalent to that of Luke) or somewhat diminishes the force of the assertion.

27. οὐκ οἶδαμεν.] Hence (says Wets.) Jesus rightly infers their unfitnes to be judges in this matter, or to claim to have their authority revered.

28. τί δὲ ὑμῖν δοκεῖ.] “What think you? give me your opinion of what I am about to say.”

— ἀνθρώπος — δύο.] By ἀνθρ. is plainly meant *God*; but it is not so clear what is meant by τέκνα δύο, on which there has been some diversity of opinion. The best Commentators, however, are agreed that the words designate two different classes of the Jewish nation; 1. *the profane and irreligious* generally, but who were brought to repentance by John, and to reformation by Christ; 2. *the Scribes and Pharisees*, whether priests or laymen, who, though professedly anxious to do the will of God, were, in reality, the greatest enemies to religion, and especially that of the Gospel.

MK. LU.

12. 20. Θὼν τῷ πρώτῳ, εἶπε· Τέκνον, ὕπαγε σήμερον ἐργάζου ἐν τῷ ἀμπε-
 λῶνί μου. Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν· Οὐ θέλω· ὕστερον δὲ μετα- 29
 μεληθεὶς, ἀπῆλθε. Καὶ προσελθὼν τῷ † δευτέρῳ εἶπεν ὡσαύτως. 30
 Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν· Ἐγὼ, κύριε· καὶ οὐκ ἀπῆλθε. Τίς ἐκ τῶν 31
 δύο ἐποίησε τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρὸς; Λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· Ὁ πρώτος.
 Λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι οἱ τελῶναι καὶ αἱ
 πόρνοι προάγουσιν ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ. Ἦλθε 32
 γὰρ πρὸς ὑμᾶς Ἰωάννης ἐν ὁδοῦ δικαιοσύνης, καὶ οὐκ ἐπιστεῦ-
 σατε αὐτῷ· οἱ δὲ τελῶναι καὶ αἱ πόρνοι ἐπίστευσαν αὐτῷ. ὑμεῖς δὲ
 ἰδόντες οὐ μετεμελήθητε ὕστερον, τοῦ πιστεῦσαι αὐτῷ.
- 1 9 Ἄλλην παραβολὴν ἀκούσατε. Ἀνθρωπὸς [τις] ἦν οἰκοδεσπότης, 33
 ὅστις ἐφύτευσεν ἀμπελῶνα, καὶ φραγμὸν αὐτῷ περιέθηκε, καὶ ὠρυξεν
 ἐν αὐτῷ ληρὸν, καὶ ὠκοδόμησε πύργον· καὶ ἐξέδοτο αὐτὸν γεωργοῖς,
 2 10 καὶ ἀπεδήμησεν. Ὅτε δὲ ἤγγισεν ὁ καιρὸς τῶν καρπῶν, ἀπέστειλε 34
 τοὺς δούλους αὐτοῦ πρὸς τοὺς γεωργοὺς, λαβεῖν τοὺς καρποὺς αὐτοῦ.
- 3 Καὶ λαβόντες οἱ γεωργοὶ τοὺς δούλους αὐτοῦ, ὃν μὲν ἔδειραν, ὃν δὲ 35
 4 11 ἀπέκτειναν, ὃν δὲ ἐλιθοβόλησαν. Πάλιν ἀπέστειλεν ἄλλους δούλους 36

30. *δεντρῶν*] Many MSS. and some Versions and Fathers have *ἐτίρω*, which was approved by Mill and Bengel, and has been adopted by Wets., Griesb., Knapp, Tittm., Vater, and Scholz. But Matth. and Fritz. retain the common reading; and rightly, for it is supported by greater authority, and the other reading is evidently a correction. The two words, however, are often confounded; a remarkable example of which occurs in Thucyd. iii. 49., where see my note.

— *ἐγὼ, κύριε*] The best Commentators are agreed that this phrase, (for which *ἔγωγε* is used in the Classics) answers to the Heb. *אני ה'י*, which is, by ellipse, a phrase of responsive assent, rendered by the LXX. *ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ*, in 1 Sam. iii. 4. Numb. xiv. 14. See also Luke i. 38. and Acts ix. 10. “The Hebrews (observe Vatab., Erasm., and Brug.) answer by pronouns, where the Latins use verbs and adverbs, as *etiam* Domine.” It may be paralleled by our own idiom, “*aye, sir*.” Indeed our *aye* and the *aja, ja, or ya*, of the Northern languages, seem to be cognate with *ἐγὼ*.

31. *οἱ τελῶναι καὶ αἱ πόρνοι*] i. e. even the worst of those profane and dissolute persons.

— *προάγουσι*.] Glass explains this “lead on;” and Schleus. and Wahl assign still less admissible senses. There seems no reason to abandon the common interpretation, “go before,” precede: render, “are preceding you.”

32. *ἐν ὁδοῦ δικ.*] A Hebrew form of expression for “he came to you in the practice of, i. e. practising righteousness;” and, by implication, leading others into the same course.

— *τοῦ πιστεῦσαι*] for *εἰς τὸ πιστ.*, i. e. *ὥστε πιστ.*

33. *τις*] This is not found in many of the best MSS. and some Versions and Fathers, and was cancelled by Griesb., Knapp, Vat., Tittm., Fritz., and Scholz. It was retained by Wets. and Matthæi; but, if we may judge from *supra* ver. 23., without reason. Nay, Fritz. thinks that even the *construction* requires its absence. But that is somewhat hypercritical, and is judging of Hellenistic and popular style by the rules of Classical writing.

— *ὠρυξεν* — *ληρὸν*.] The *ληρὸς* properly denoted the large vat (called the wine-press) into which the grapes were thrown, to be expressed; in which sense it often occurs in the Sept. But as this vessel had connected with it on the side, or under it (to check, by the coolness of the situation, too great fermentation) a *cistern*, into which the expressed juice flowed; and, by synecdoche, *ληρὸς* came to denote (as here) that cistern; which, as it was necessarily subterranean, and sometimes *under the vat*, so it was often called *υπολήμιον*, as in the parallel passages in Mark and Is. xvi. 10. These cisterns (which are even yet in use in the East), bore some resemblance to the *λάκκοι* of the Greeks, which the Scholiast on Aristoph. Eccl. 154. (cited by Wets.) explains *καὶ ὀρυγμῶνα ἐν ῥέχωρα, καὶ στρογγύλα τετράγωνα*, (I conjecture *καὶ στρογγύλα καὶ τετράγωνα*) *καὶ ταῦτα κοινῶντες* (plastering) *οἶνον ἐπιδέχοντο καὶ ἔλαιον εἰς αὐτά*.

— *πύργον*.] This was built partly as a place of abode for the occupier, while the produce was collecting; and partly for security to the servants stationed there as guards over the place. Grot. observes, that in the application of the parable, such circumstances as this are to be considered as only serving for ornament; or, only express generally, that every thing was provided both for pleasure and security.

— *ἐξέδοτο*] for *ἔξερισθῶσε*, as in Polyb. vi. 17. 2. Herodian i. 6. 3. cited by the Commentators; to which I add Thucyd. iii. 68. *τὴν γῆν ἀπερίσθῶσαν ἐπὶ δέκα ἔτη*, the earliest record of letting on *lease* I have ever met with. The word may here be rendered “let it out;” understanding, however, the rent to be not in *money*, but (agreeably to the most ancient usage, yet retained in the East, and even in some parts of the West) in a certain portion of the *produce*. Thus *τοὺς καρποὺς* just after should be rendered “his fruit, or produce, the portion which fell to him.”

34. *καιρὸς τῶν καρπῶν*.] “the time for gathering the fruits.” So Mark xi. 15.

35. *ἔδειραν*.] *Δέριον* signifies properly to *flay* or

	MK.	LU.
37 πλείονας τῶν πρώτων· καὶ ἐποίησαν αὐτοῖς ὡσαύτως. Ὑπερῶν δὲ	12.	20.
ἀπίστευτε πρὸς αὐτοὺς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, λέγων· Ἐντραπήσονται τὸν	6	13
38 υἱὸν μου. Οἱ δὲ γεωργοὶ ἰδόντες τὸν υἱὸν, εἶπον ἐν ἑαυτοῖς· Οὗτός	7	14
ἐστὶν ὁ κληρονόμος· δεῦτε, ἀποκτείνωμεν αὐτὸν, καὶ κατέσχωμεν τὴν		
39 κληρονομίαν αὐτοῦ. Καὶ λαβόντες αὐτὸν, ἐξέβαλον ἔξω τοῦ ἀμπελοῦτος,	8	15
40 καὶ ἀπέκτειναν. Ὅταν οὖν ἔλθῃ ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελοῦτος, τί ποιήσει	9	
41 τοῖς γεωργοῖς ἐκείνοις; Λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· Κακοὺς κακῶς ἀπολέσει	16	
αὐτούς· καὶ τὸν ἀμπελοῦτα ἐκδώσεται ἄλλοις γεωργοῖς, οἵτινες ἀπο-		
42 δώσουσιν αὐτῷ τοὺς καρποὺς ἐν τοῖς καιροῖς αὐτῶν. Λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ		
Ἰησοῦς· Οὐδέποτε ἀνέγνωτε ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς; Λίθον ὃν ἀπεδο-	10	17
κίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες, οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κε-		
φαλὴν γωνίας. παρὰ Κυρίου ἐγένετο αὕτη, καὶ ἔστι	11	
43 θαναμαστὴ ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν. Διὰ τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι		
ἀρθῆσεται ἀφ' ὑμῶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ δοθήσεται ἕθνει		
44 ποιοῦντι τοὺς καρποὺς αὐτῆς. Καὶ ὁ πεσὼν ἐπὶ τὸν λίθον τοῦτον,	18	
45 συνθλασθήσεται· ἐφ' ὃν δ' ἂν πέσῃ, λικμήσει αὐτόν. Καὶ ἀκούσαν-	19	
τες οἱ ἄρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι τὰς παραβολὰς αὐτοῦ, ἔγνωσαν ὅτι		

skin; but as words denoting great violence come at length, through *abuse*, to bear a milder sense, it was at length used to signify *beat severely*.

37. ἐντραπήσονται] “they will treat with reverence.” Ἐντροπέσθαι signifies, 1. to turn upon oneself; 2. *ex adjuncto*, to be afraid; 3. to regard with reverence. The expression is, as Grot. observes, to be understood *θεοπροπῶς*, not to exclude prescience, but to denote that the contingency of an event is viewed in its causes.

38. *Comp.* infr. xxvi. 3. xxvii. 1. John xi. 53.

41. κακοὺς κακῶς ἀπ.] *Camp.* renders, “he will bring these wretches to a wretched death.” This phrase (in which the Paronomasia is remarkable,) occurs very frequently in the Greek writers from Homer downwards. It is worthy of observation that by *Luke* the words are ascribed to Christ himself, and draw from the scribes the exclamation, *μὴ γένοιτο!* Of the many methods proposed for removing this apparent discrepancy, the best seems to be that of *Doddr.*, who supposes that Christ in the *first instance* drew their own condemnation from the Sanhedrim, and then soon afterwards repeated their words, by way of confirmation. There is nothing to stumble at in the Priests pronouncing their own destruction, since they seem not at first to have understood Christ’s drift in the parable.

— ἀποδώσουσιν — αὐτῶν.] This (as I have before observed) was the most ancient mode of paying RENT (which term signifies what is *rendered* for occupancy), namely, by rendering a certain proportion of the produce; of which I have adduced several examples with illustrations in *Recens.* *Synop.* The most apposite is *Plato de Legg.* viii. γεωργαὶ δὲ ἐκδεδόμενοι δούλοισι, ἀπαρχὴν τῶν ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἀποτελοῦσιν. See my note on *Thucyd.* vi. 20. ἀπαρχὴ ἰσφίρεται.

42. λίθον — γωνίας.] Taken from *Ps.* cxvii. 22. Sept., to which there is also a reference in other passages of Scripture; also of which show that the words, though very applicable to David, are, in their highest sense, to be referred to the Messiah; as the Jews themselves acknowledge. *Λίθον ὃν* for *λίθος ὃν* is not (as *Glass.* imagines) a Hebra-

ism; but is a construction frequent both in the Greek and Latin. See *Matth. Gr. Gr.* § 474. c.

— κεφαλὴν γωνίας.] Both the Jewish and Christian dispensations are often designated by the figure of a *building*; and of the latter Christ is represented as the *corner-stone*, and, by its importance in sustaining and defending the building, the *head-stone*. See *1 Cor.* iii. 11. *Eph.* ii. 21. However, the *nature* of the metaphor is not very obvious, nor is it very plain what this *κεφ. γων.* was. *Bp. Middlet.*, with reason, thinks that, from this passage, it appears to have been, 1. something which might be added when the building was complete; 2. that it was so situated, that a passer by might fall against it; and, 3. that it might fall upon him. So that, says he, “it exactly answers to an upright stone or buttress, added for the purpose of protecting the corner of a building, where it is most exposed to external violence.”

— αὕτη — θαναμαστῆ] *Feminines* for *neuters*, *Hebraicè*. An idiom often adopted by the *LXX.* See *Winer’s Gr. Gr.* p. 84. fin. The construction *ἐγενήθη εἰς* is *Hebraic*, as also is *θαναμαστὴ ἐν ὀφθ. ἡμῶν*; for, notwithstanding that the Commentators adduce many examples of the phrase *ἐν ὀφθ.* with a *verb*, yet they produce not one with an *adjective*.

43. ἔθνει] i. c. as *Euthym.* explains, τῶν γένοι τῶν Χριστιανῶν. *Rosenm.* and *Kuin.* very well paraphrase thus: “Because ye have rejected this stone, the benefits of the Messiah’s kingdom and religion shall not be communicated to you; but imparted to a nation, or race of persons (whether Jews or Gentiles), all obedient followers of Jesus, who shall, &c. i. e. the Jewish nation shall no longer be the peculiar people of God; but that nation or race shall be so, which (of whatever country) embraces the plan of salvation now promulgated.”

44. καὶ ὁ πεσὼν — αὐτόν.] Almost all Critics are agreed that this verse should properly follow ver. 42. (as, they think, the connection indicates), and that it has probably no place here, but was introduced from the parallel passage of *Luke*. The *MSS.* and *Versions*, however, give not the slight-

MK.

12.

12

περὶ αὐτῶν λέγει· καὶ ζητοῦντες αὐτὸν κρατῆσαι, ἐφοβήθησαν τοὺς ἄ-
 ὄχλους· ἐπειδὴ ὡς προφήτην αὐτὸν εἶχον.

XXII. ΚΑΙ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς πάλιν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ἐν παραβολαῖς, 1

a Luke 11. 16.
 Rev. 19. 7, 9.

λέγων· ὁ Ωμοιώθη ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ἀνθρώπῳ βασιλεῖ, ὅστις 2
 ἐποίησε γάμους τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἀπέστειλε τοὺς δούλους αὐτοῦ 3
 καλέσαι τοὺς κεκλημένους εἰς τοὺς γάμους· καὶ οὐκ ἤθελον ἔλθειν.

b Prov. 9. 2.

Ἐπίπαιε τοῖς κεκλημένοις· 4
 Ἰδοὺ, τὸ ἄριστόν μου ἠτοίμασα, οἱ ταῦροί μου καὶ τὰ σιτιστὰ τεθυ-
 μένα, καὶ πάντα ἔτοιμα· δεῦτε εἰς τοὺς γάμους. Οἱ δὲ ἀμελήσαντες 5
 ἀπῆλθον, ὁ μὲν εἰς τὸν ἴδιον ἀγρὸν, ὁ δὲ εἰς τὴν ἐμπορίαν αὐτοῦ.

Οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ κρατήσαντες τοὺς δούλους αὐτοῦ, ὕβρισαν καὶ ἀπέκτειναν. 6
 † Καὶ ἀκούσας ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐκείνος, ὠργίσθη· καὶ πέμψας τὰ στρατεύ- 7

est countenance to the first surmise; and the second is very slenderly supported. I cannot but think that all is as it was left by the Evangelist; and I am gratified to find my opinion ably supported by that of Fritz, whom see.

With respect to the nature of the metaphor, there is an allusion to Is. viii. 14 & 15; and the verbs are terms denoting greater or less degrees of injury: the first being to bruise and crush; the second, to beat to pieces, and destroy utterly. Wets. and others think that there is an allusion to the different modes of stoning among the Jews. And they paraphrase thus: "Whosoever shall stumble at and reject me as the Messiah, shall encounter misery; yet they may repent and be healed. But on whomsoever this rock (the Messiah, which might have been their defence) shall fall, it will crush them in utter ruin."

46. ὡς προσφ.] The ὡς is thought to be put for ὄντως, reverd. Comp. Mark xi. 32. and Luke xx. 6. But however this sense may have place in other passages, it would here seem sufficient to render *utpote*.

XXII. 1. ἐν παραβολαῖς.] It is clear that this is put for the more elegant διὰ παραβολῶν, as in Aristoph. Ran. 61. σοὶ δὲ αἰνυμῶν ἔρω. The ἀποκριθεὶς may here simply denote *addressing*; unless there is, as some suppose, an answer to the thoughts of the Pharisees.

2. ἡ βασιλ. τῶν οὐρανῶν] the administration of the heavenly kingdom, or Dispensation. Ὁμοιώθη, i. e. the same thing will take place as that represented in the parable of a King, &c. The primary object of this parable is to represent the invitation given to the Jews to embrace the Gospel; the rejection of that offer, the severe punishment to be inflicted on them for their disobedience, and the admission of the Gentiles, in their stead, to the privileges of Christianity. Such parts of the similitude as are not referrible to these heads, are to be considered as merely introduced for ornament, or to complete the *vraisemblance*. There is, however, a secondary intent to be noticed, which is, to inculcate a truth needful to be kept in mind in every age; namely, that the rewards held out by the Gospel are not to be conferred on mere professors, but upon those only who cultivate the dispositions and habits enjoined by its precepts. There is a peculiar propriety in the comparison itself, since in Scripture the Jewish Covenant, as well as the Christian, is represented under the figure of a marriage contract between

God and his people. See Is. liv. 5. Jerem. iii. 2. and, in the N. T., see Matt. xxv. 5. John iii. 29. 2 Cor. xi. 2. Revel. xix. 7—9.

—γάμους] This is by most Commentators taken to signify a marriage feast; though, as the word (correspondently to the Heb. כַּשְׂתֵּה) often signifies a feast in general, some Commentators assign that sense here; agreeably, as they think, to the moral purport of the parable. Many, however, of the recent Commentators (as Michael., Rosenm., Kuin., and Schleus.) understand an inauguration feast, when the Oriental kings were considered as it were affianced to their country. See Luke xii. 36. xiv. 8. Esth. ii. 18. ix. 22. 1 Kings i. 5—9. There seems no reason, however, to abandon the common interpretation. Whichever be the sense, the plural may be considered as having reference to the continuance of those feasts for several days.

3. καλοῦσι] generally signifies "to invite;" like the Latin *vocare* and the Heb. קָרָא. So Theophr. Char. 12. κεκλημένους εἰς γάμους. Here, however, it rather denotes to *summon*; for Luc., Brug., Grot., and Kuin. have shown that, among the ancients, guests were first invited some time before; and then summoned, within a short time of the feast, that they might be ready.

4. τὸ ἄριστόν] This was, in early times, the name given to breakfast: afterwards it denoted the noonday meal; and, at length, it was applied to the chief meal, taken at the close of the day. Hence it came to signify a banquet in general. See Kypke on John xxi. 12. and Mureti Var. Lect. IV. 12.

—τὰ σιτιστὰ] The term properly denotes animals put up to fatten; and as here we have had mention made just before of ταῦροι, it must denote calves, sheep, &c., with the exception of bullocks.

—τεθύμενα.] Θύω properly signifies *suffio* (whence θύος and θύαμα); and at first signified to make those offerings of incense, fruits, and flowers, for which sacrifices of animals were afterwards substituted. And as θύειν still continued to be used, it then denoted to sacrifice; and at length generally to slaughter for eating; a process found in the Heb. נָכַר (Grot. and Hemsterh.).

5. τὸν ἴδιον] for αὐτοῦ. Ἀγρὸν, properly land; but here farm, or (as the words following require) farming business; for ἐμπορίαν, from the antithesis, must denote other sorts of business, as trade or manufactures.

7. καὶ ἀκούσας—ὠργίσθη.] There are on this

ματα αὐτοῦ, ἀπώλεσε τοὺς φορεῖς ἐκείνους, καὶ τὴν πόλιν αὐτῶν ἐνί-
 8 πρησε. Τότε λέγει τοῖς δούλοις αὐτοῦ· Ὁ μὲν γάμος ἐτοιμὸς ἐστίν,
 9 οἱ δὲ κεκλημένοι οὐκ ἦσαν ἄξιοι. πορευέσθε οὖν ἐπὶ τὰς διεξόδους
 10 τῶν ὁδῶν, καὶ ὅσους ἂν εὗρητε, καλέσατε εἰς τοὺς γάμους. Καὶ
 ἐξελθόντες οἱ δούλοι ἐκείνοι εἰς τὰς ὁδοὺς, συνήγαγον πάντα, ὅσους
 11 εὔρον, πονηροὺς τε καὶ ἀγαθοὺς· καὶ ἐπλήσθη ὁ γάμος ἀνακειμέ-
 12 νων. Ὁ Εἰσελθὼν δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς θεάσασθαι τοὺς ἀνακειμένους, εἶδεν
 13 ἑκάστου ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἐνδεδυμένον ἔνδυμα γάμου· Καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ·
 Ἐταῖρε, πῶς εἰσῆλθες ὧδε μὴ ἔχων ἔνδυμα γάμου; Ὁ δὲ ἐφίμωθη.
 14 Τότε εἶπεν ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῖς διακόνοις· Δῆσαντες αὐτοῦ πόδας καὶ χεῖρας,
 ἄρατε αὐτὸν καὶ ἐκβάλετε εἰς τὸ σκότος τὸ ἑξώτερον· ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ
 15 κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων. Ἐπολλοὶ γὰρ εἰσι κλητοί,
 ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί.
 16 Τότε πορευθέντες οἱ Φαρισαῖοι, συμβούλιον ἔλαβον ὅπως αὐτὸν
 17 παγιδεύσωσιν ἐν λόγῳ. Καὶ ἀποστέλλουσιν αὐτῷ τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτῶν
 μετὰ τῶν Ἰηρῶδιανῶν, λέγοντες· Διδάσκαλε, οἰδαμεν ὅτι ἀληθὴς εἶ,
 18 19 20 21

c 2 Cor. 5. 3.
 Ephes. 4. 24.
 Coloss. 3. 10,
 12.
 Rev. 3. 4. & 16.
 15. & 19. 8.
 d Supr. 8. 12.
 & 13. 42.
 infr. 25. 30.
 e Supr. 20. 16.
 MK. LU.
 12. 20.

clause several varieties of reading. Many MSS., Versions, and Fathers, have ἀκόλας δὲ, and after βασιλεὺς add ἐκείνος. And so Matt., Griesb., and Scholz edit. I cannot venture to imitate their example; because, although there is considerable external evidence for the readings in question, yet internal evidence is, I apprehend, quite against them; and Fritz. has shewn how they originated. In short, all the FIVE varieties of reading here found in the MSS. present no more than so many different ways by which the passage was tampered with by the early critics. And as the common reading is plainly the parent of all the other readings, it ought, according to one of the most certain of critical canons, to be preferred.

9. τὰς διεξόδους τῶν ὁδῶν.] Most Commentators explain this “*compita viarum*,” “places where many streets or roads meet,” and therefore of public concourse. Fisch. and Fritz. explain it “*vias rusticas*.” The former interpretation is preferable; and yet it is difficult to extract such a sense from the word. I would therefore, with Bois ap. Wolf., rather suppose it to mean the great thoroughfares of the city, and outlets into the country — the great trunks, as it were, of communication; and which, in the great ancient cities, were made to terminate at the gates. Such would be places of the greatest concourse. See Thucyd. iii. 93.

10. πονηροὺς τε καὶ ἀγαθοὺς.] By this it is intimated, that the bad as well as the good would form part of the visible Church; though the privileges of the Gospel would belong to the latter, while its threatenings, denounced against the wicked, would fall on the former.

11. θεάσασθαι τοὺς ἀνακειμένους] As was then usual with grandees and others who made great feasts.

— ἐνδυμα γάμου] An appropriate dress, with which those who attended were expected to be clothed. This custom was common alike to the Hebrews, Greeks, and Romans; and something like it yet prevails in the East. In this, therefore, consisted the offence of the delinquent, — that he had neglected to provide himself with the appropriate dress. By this wedding garment some

think that *faith* is represented: but that was implied in the act of attending the supper; and it should rather seem (as Euthym., Grol., Le Clerc, and most recent Commentators take it), to mean adorning our Christian profession by a suitable conduct. See Eph. iv. 1. 2 Pet. i. 10. compared with Rev. xix. 7. The whole, indeed, hinges upon this: whether we are to suppose the garment provided by the *guests*, or by the *king*. If the latter, then, indeed, neither of the above interpretations can well be admitted; and we must rather understand the gifts of the Holy Spirit, — grace, faith, and sanctification; as Irenæus, Hilary, Menochius, and Gerard interpret. This, however, does not agree with the scope of the parable; and it may be observed, that the supposition on which it rests, of the garment being provided by the *king*, is deficient in ancient authority, the examples adduced being almost entirely from modern travellers. It is therefore best to suppose the garment or rather *dress* to have been provided by the *guests*. And such is the opinion of Chrys. and Euthym. Thus in two similar parables cited by Wets. from Rabbinical writers, those who washed themselves, cleansed their garments, and otherwise prepared themselves for the banquet, are contrasted with those who made no preparation; but went on with their occupations, and thus entered the palace “*in turpitudine sua*,” in their mean, ordinary dress.

12. ἐφίμωθη.] “was mute.” *Φιμῶν* signifies properly to muzzle, and metaphorically to silence.

13. σκότος τὸ ἑξώτερον] i. e. darkness the most dense and extreme, as being the furthest removed from the light of the banquet.

14. πολλοὶ — ἐκλεκτοί.] See the long and able annotation of Hammond in Recens. Synop., and a fine observation of Theophyl. cited by Parkhurst, Lex. v. ἐκλεκτός.

15. παγιδέσωσιν] “that they might ensnare him.” The term is properly used of snaring birds; but, like ἀγρεύειν, employed by Mark xii. 12. and the Latin *irretire* and *illaqueare*, is used of plotting any one’s destruction.

16. τῶν Ἰηρῶδιανῶν.] From the slight mention of these persons in the N. T., and the silence of

MK. LU.

12. 20. καὶ τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ διδάσκεις, καὶ οὐ μέλει σοι περὶ
 22 οὐδενός· οὐ γὰρ βλέπεις εἰς πρόσωπον ἀνθρώπων. Εἶπε οὖν ἡμί· 17
15. 23 τί σοι δοκεῖ; ἔξῃσει δοῦναι κήρσον Καίσαρι, ἢ οὐ; Γινὸς δὲ ὁ 18
 Ἰησοῦς τὴν πονηρίαν αὐτῶν, εἶπε· Τί με πειράζετε, ὑποκριταί;
16. 24 Ἐπιδειξατέ μοι τὸ νόμισμα τοῦ κήρσου. οἱ δὲ προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ 19
 δηνάριον. Καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· Τίνος ἢ εἰκὼν αὕτη καὶ ἡ ἐπιγραφή; 20
17. 25 Λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· Καίσαρος. τότε λέγει αὐτοῖς· Ἀπόδοτε οὖν τὰ 21
 26 Καίσαρος Καίσαρι, καὶ τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ τῷ Θεῷ. Καὶ ἀκούσαντες ἐθαύ- 22
 μασαν· καὶ ἀφέντες αὐτὸν ἀπῆλθον.
18. 27 Ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ προσήλθον αὐτῷ Σαδδουκαῖοι, οἱ λέγοντες μὴ 23
 19. 28 εἶναι ἀνάστασιν, καὶ ἐπηρώτησαν αὐτὸν, λέγοντες· Διδάσκαλε, Μωϋσῆς 24

Josephus, nothing certain with respect to them can be determined; but the prevailing and best-founded opinion seems to be, that they did not form any distinct religious sect (though probably Sadducees in doctrine, as was Herod), but were rather a political party, composed of the courtiers, ministers, domestics, and partisans and adherents generally of Herod; who maintained, with Herod, that the dominion of the Romans over the Jews was lawful, and ought to be submitted to; and that under the present circumstances, the Jews might, allowably, resort to Gentile usages and customs. This opinion is confirmed by the termination of the word, *ιστοί*, which was in that age appropriated to denoting political partisans, such as *Cæsariani*, *Pompeiani*, *Ciceroniani*, &c.

— ἀληθῆς] “upright,” neither practising simulation nor dissimulation.

— οὐ μέλει — ἀνθρώπων.] The expressions οὐ μέλει σοι περὶ οὐδενός, and οὐ βλέπεις εἰς πρόσωπον ἀνθ. (of which the former is a Greek phrase, the latter a Hebraism) are generally thought to be of the same sense. But Fritz., with others, denies this, and lays down the connection as follows: “tu per neminem a veritate te abduci sinis; neque enim homines curas, quos si curares, a vera via facile aberrares, sed Deum.” Thus he thinks that πρόσωπον ἀνθ. is put, by an unusual circumlocution, for ἀνθρώπους. To this, however, I cannot assent; for the πρόσ. adverts to the external condition of men, with allusion to its being no more a part of the man than the πρόσωπον, or actor’s mask.

18. πονηρίαν.] This signifies like the Latin malitia, craft. The other Evangelists use the more definite terms πανουργίαν and ὑπόκρισιν.

19. τὸ νόμισμα τοῦ κήρσου.] “nummum ex eo genere quo census exigi solebat.” (Fritz.)

20. τίνος — ἐπιγραφή;] The inscription was ΚΑΙΣΑΡ ΑΥΤΟΥΣΤ: ΙΟΥΔΑΙΑΣ ΕΑΞΩΚΥΙΑΣ. “Our Lord here baffles the malignant proposers of the question, by taking advantage of their own concession, that the denarius bore the emperor’s image and superscription, and also of the determination of their own schools, that wherever any king’s coin was current, it was a proof of that country’s subjection to that government. He significantly warns these turbulent and seditious demagogues, the Pharisees, to render unto Cæsar the dues of Cæsar, which they resisted; and these licentious and irreligious courtiers, the Herodians, to render unto God the dues of God, which they neglected; thus publicly reproofing both, but obliquely, in a way that they could not take any hold of.” (Dr. Hales.)

“Though the right of Cæsar to demand tribute of the Jews may seem to be undecided by the answer, yet the precept at ver. 22 is decisive, and being united with the preceding verses by οὖν, it inculcates that duty of submission to established governments which is a leading feature of the Christian religion.” (Whitby.) [Comp. Rom. xiii. 7.]

23. μὴ εἶναι ἀνάστασιν.] Campb. maintains that the sense is, “no future life;” for ἀνάστασις, he says, when applied to the dead, properly denotes no more than a renewal of life to them, in whatever manner. The Sadducees, he observes, denied not merely the resurrection of the body, but the immortality of the soul, and a future state of retribution. “They had (continues he) no notion of spirit, and were consequently obliged to make use of terms which properly relate to the body, when they spoke of a future state, which therefore came at length to be denoted simply by the word resurrection.” (Comp. Acts xxiii. 8.) Now that the Pharisees, continues he, themselves did not universally mean by this term the re-union of soul and body, is evident both from Josephus’s account of their doctrines, and from passages in the Gospels. To say, therefore, of the Sadducees, that they denied the resurrection, would give a very defective account of their tenets. It is plain from Josephus and other Jewish writers, as also Acts xxiii. 8., that they denied the existence of angels, and all separate bodies. Thus going much further than the Pagans, who did, indeed, deny the resurrection of the body, but believed in a state after death, wherein the souls of the departed exist in a state of happiness or misery, according to their deeds on earth. It is plain, from our Lord’s answer, that the Sadducees denied not merely the resurrection of the body, but the immortality of the soul. They had, it seems, no notion of spirit, and were consequently obliged to make use of terms which properly relate to the body, when they spoke of a future state; which, therefore, came at length to be denoted simply by the word resurrection. Compare Acts xxiii. 8.” The above contains a just representation of the opinions of the Sadducees (on which see Horne’s Introd., Vol. III. 327. and note), but is, I apprehend, no proof that our common version, is as Dr. C. maintains, inaccurate. Nay, on the contrary, his own version is (properly speaking) no version at all, but merely an explanation. The learned Commentator does not sufficiently bear in mind, that of popular phraseology (such as is generally that of the N. T.) must be interpreted as such. There is little doubt but that the phrase ἀνάστασις τῶν νε-

		MK. LU.
	εἶπεν· Ἐάν τις ἀποθάνῃ μὴ ἔχων τέκνα, ἐπιγαμβροεῖ-	12. 20.
	σει ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀναστή-	
25	σει σπέρμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ. Ἴσσαν δὲ παρ' ἡμῶν ἐπὶ 20 29	
	ἀδελφοί· καὶ ὁ πρῶτος γαμήσας ἐτελεύτησε· καὶ μὴ ἔχων σπέρμα,	
26	ἀφῆκε τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ. Ὁμοίως καὶ ὁ δυνέτερος, 21 30	
	καὶ ὁ τρίτος, ἕως τῶν ἐπιτά. Ὅτερον δὲ πάντων ἀπέθανε καὶ ἡ γυνή. 22 31	
27	Ἐν τῇ οὖν ἀναστάσει τίνος τῶν ἐπιτά ἔσται γυνή; πάντες γὰρ ἔσχον 23 33	
28	αὐτήν. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Πλωᾶσθε μὴ εἰδο-	
29	τες τὰς γραφάς, μηδὲ τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ Θεοῦ. Ἐν γὰρ τῇ ἀναστάσει 24 34	
30	οὔτε γαμοῦσιν, οὔτε ἐκγαμίζονται· ἀλλ' ὡς ἄγγελοι τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν 25 35	
31	οὐρανῷ εἰσι. Περὶ δὲ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τῶν νεκρῶν, οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε τὸ 26 37	
32	ῥηθὲν ὑμῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, λέγοντος· Ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ Θεὸς Ἰα- 27 38	
	βράμ, καὶ ὁ Θεὸς Ἰσαὰκ, καὶ ὁ Θεὸς Ἰακώβ; οὐκ ἔστιν	
33	ὁ Θεὸς Θεὸς νεκρῶν, ἀλλὰ ζώντων. Καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ ὄχλοι ἐξεπλήσ-	
	σοντο ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ.	
34	Οἱ δὲ Φαρισαῖοι ἀκούσαντες ὅτι ἐφίμωσε τοὺς Σαδδουκαίους, συνή-	

κρῶν, or ἀνάστασις, denoted, in common parlance, and agreeably to the general doctrines of the Pharisees, the resurrection of the *soul* as well as of the body, and the re-union of both in a future state. Though, at the same time, the ideas of the Pharisees *themselves* (and still more the people at large) as to the *nature* of that future life, were very vague, and occasionally founded on the notions of the heathens. So that our Lord's reply was, in wisdom, so framed as not only to refute the *Sadducean* doctrines, but remove the misconceptions of the *Pharisees*; and thus to benefit not only the *unbelievers* of the doctrine of the resurrection, but the *misbelievers*.

24. This is not a regular quotation, nor does it profess to be such — but correctly represents the sense of the injunction of the law. On the *intent* of which see Dr. A. Clarke.

— ἐπιγαμβροεῖσει.] Ἐπιγαμβρεῖω (which occurs also in the Sept.) denotes to marry a widow by right of affinity.

— σπέρμα.] This word, like the Heb. צרר, denotes offspring or progeny, whether one or more children; though in Scripture it is almost confined to the *latter*. On the contrary, in the *Classical* writers it is generally used of the former. So Soph. El. 1510. and Œd. Tyr. 1087. and a Delphic oracle in Thueyd. v. 16. Διὸς νόσφ' ἡμιθέου τὸ σπέρμα — ἀναφῆσαι. There are, however, examples in the *Classical* writers of σπέρμα in a *plural* sense. Thus Soph. Trach. 304. Eurip. Med. 798. ἀλλὰ κτανεῖν τὸ σπέρμα πολήσεις, γβναι.

28. ἐν τῇ ἀν.] “in the future state following the resurrection.”

29. πλανᾶσθε — Θεοῦ] i. e. ye deceive yourselves by assuming a false hypothesis — namely, that if there be a future state it must be like the present, and by your ignorance of the true sense of the Scriptures; not considering the *omnipotence* of God, to whom renewal of existence can require no more exertion of power than original creation; nor reflecting that God is able to raise up the dead without their former passions.

30. οὔτε ἐκγαμίζονται.] On this point there was

much difference of opinion among the Jewish Rabbins. Some maintaining that there is marrying in heaven; others that there is not. The general opinion was, that the dead would be raised either in their former or with other bodies. And it was the common notion, that the offices of the new bodies would be precisely the same with those of the former ones. The wiser few, however, were of quite another opinion. But of these some went into the *other* extreme — and maintained that the raised would have no bodies. (so Maimonides de Pœnit. viii. 3.) in the future state.

— ὡς ἄγγελοι.] Luke says ἰσάγγελοι. Though neither expression imports *equality*, but only *similarity*. This similarity must chiefly by the context be referred to the point in question; i. e. the not being subject to the appetites of the body; although, upon the whole, εἶναι ὡς seems, as Fritz suggests, to denote *condition* generally. At all events, it does not follow, because angels are, as is supposed, composed of spirit only, that the righteous shall, at the resurrection, have *spirits only*. That they will also have bodies of some sort or other, is certain from 1 Cor. xvi. 42. seq.

32. ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ Θεός, &c.] From this passage the doctrine of the resurrection is proved, *more Judaico*, and that inferentially and by legitimate consequence from what has been said. The argument (as stated by Mr. Holden after Mr. Horne) is as follows: “Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob had been long dead when these words were spoken wherein God says, ‘I am,’ not I was, ‘the God of Abraham,’ &c.; and as He is not ‘the God of the dead, but of the living,’ these patriarchs must have been existing in some sense when this declaration was made; for it implies a relationship between God and them, which could not be if they were not existing. The patriarchs, therefore, though dead to us, are alive to God; which proves a future state.” This mode of argumentation, it may be added, was peculiarly *Jewish*. So a Rabbinical writer, cited by Wets., proves the resurrection of the dead from the very same passage, and almost in the very same words.

MK. LU.

12. 20. *χθησαν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ, καὶ ἐπρωτίησεν εἰς ἕξ αὐτῶν, νομικὸς, πειράζων 35*
 29 *αὐτὸν καὶ λέγων· Διδάσκαλε, ποία ἐντολὴ μεγάλη ἐν τῷ νόμῳ; ὁ δὲ 36*
 30 *Ἰησοῦς * ἔφη αὐτῷ· Ἀγαπήσεις Κύριον τὸν Θεόν σου, ἐν 37*
ὄλῃ τῇ καρδίᾳ σου, καὶ ἐν ὄλῃ τῇ ψυχῇ σου, καὶ ἐν
ὄλῃ τῇ διανοίᾳ σου. Αὕτη ἐστὶ πρώτη καὶ μεγάλη ἐντολή. 38
 31 *Δεύτερα δὲ ὁμοία αὐτῇ· Ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς 39*
σεαυτόν. Ἐν ταύταις ταῖς δυοῖν ἐντολαῖς ὅλος ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ 40
προφῆται κρέμνται.
- 35 41 *Συνηγμένων δὲ τῶν Φαρισαίων, ἐπρωτίησεν αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, λέγων· 41*
 42 *Τί ὑμῖν δοκεῖ περὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ; τίνος υἱὸς ἐστι; λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· 42*

35. *νομικὸς.*] Mark xii. 28. calls him *εἰς τῶν γραμματέων*; from which it has been by some thought that *νομικὸς* and *γραμματεὺς* were synonymous terms: while others supposed that a *distinction* existed, as that the *γραμματεῖς* were the public expounders of the law, while the *νομικοὶ* were the private expounders and teachers of it. This, however, rests on mere conjecture. One thing alone seems certain, that the *νομικοὶ* were expounders of the law, whether publicly or privately. So Epict. i. 13. has *νομικὸν, ἐξηγοῦμενον τὰ νόμια*.

— *πειράζων αὐτόν.*] Some modern Interpreters assign to *πειράζων* the *good* sense, *explorans, trying*, viz. his skill in Scripture; which seems to be countenanced by Mark. But most of them adopt the bad one, *tempting*; and there seems no sufficient reason for abandoning the common interpretation. The truth seems to be (as Chrys. and Theophyl. suppose) that the man came with an evil intention, but departed better disposed.

36. *ποία ἐντολὴ μεγάλη.*] Here *ποία* is for *τίς*; and *μεγὰλῃ* for *μεγίστῃ*, by Hebraism; on which account it has the privilege of a superlative, in dispensing with the Article. Superlatives do so, from the affinity which they bear to ordinals. See Middlet. Gr. Art. vi. § 3 & 4. and Winer's Gr. § 29. 1. But to turn from words to *things*, the question involved a matter of no little controversy among the Jewish Doctors; as to the comparative importance of different precepts; some maintaining the pre-eminence of one, some of another. Only while they distinguished the Divine precepts (which they numbered 613) into *great* and *small*, they constantly gave the preference to the *ceremonial* ones. Christ, however, decided in favour of the *moral* law, yet not to the neglect of the *ceremonial*.

37. *ἔφη.*] This reading, which is found in the greater part of the best MSS., is preferred by Mill and Bengel; and is edited by Matth., Griesb., Knapp, Tittm., Vat., and Scholz, instead of the common one *εἶπεν*.

— *ἐν ὄλῃ τῇ καρδίᾳ, &c.*] These are formulas nearly equivalent, and united for intensity of sense (as in a passage of Philo cited by Wets.) importing, not that perfection in degree, or elevation in kind contended for by some, but that we must assign to God the *first* place in our affections, and consecrate to him the united powers and faculties with which he hath endued us.

38. *πρῶτη καὶ μεγ. ἐντ.*] How and in what respect this was such, see Bp. Taylor's Works, vol. iii. p. 7. and Bps. Sherlock and Porteus in

D'Oyly and Mant; also compare Luke x. 27. Rom. xiii. 9. Gal. v. 14. 1 Tim. i. 5. and James ii. 8.

39. *ὁμοία αὐτῇ*] i. e. similar in kind, though not in degree; springing out of it, and closely connected with it.

— *τὸν πλησίον.*] The term here, as often in the N. T., has a very extensive import, including every person with whom we have to do. [Comp. Rom. xiii. 8.]

— *ὡς σεαυτόν.*] We are not here commanded to love; i. e. benefit our fellow creatures *as much* as ourselves (which were inconsistent with the strong principle of *self-love*, which the Almighty has implanted in us, for our preservation); for *ὡς* (like the Heb. כִּי) imports, not equality in *degree*, but *similarity* in *kind*. Thus the precept corresponds to that of our Lord at Matt. vii. 12. And we are commanded not only to avoid injuring him, as we avoid injuring ourselves; but to treat him in the same manner as we might, if exchanging situations with him, fairly claim to be treated.

40. *ἐν ταύταις — κρέμνται.*] This is generally thought to be a metaphor taken from the Jewish custom, of suspending the tables of the laws from a nail or peg. But the metaphor is common to almost all languages, as used of things closely connected, and springing from the same origin. There is, however, a Hebraism in the use of *ἐν* for *ἐκ*. Or the *ἐν* should have been followed by *ἀνακεφαλαιούνται*, or *πληροῦνται*, as in Rom. xiii. 9. On the full sense see Dr. Paley and Archbp. Sharp, in D'Oyly and Mant.

42. *τί ὑμῖν — υἱὸς ἐστι;*] This question was proposed by our Lord to the Pharisees, to show them how little they knew the true nature and dignity of the Messiah. Bp. Bull, in his Jud. Eccl. Cath. i. 12. observes, that "although the Prophets had not obscurely signified that Christ would be God as well as man; and though the wiser few of the Jews saw that, yet that the generality embraced the abject notion that he would be a mighty conqueror, and a glorious monarch (like Cyrus, Alexander, or Cæsar), who would subdue all the nations of the earth, and make Jerusalem the metropolis of the world. And as a *mere man* might, under God's providence, effect all this; where is the wonder that the Jews supposed the Messiah would be *no more*." He adds that, had the Pharisees held the *divinity* of the Messiah, they might easily have solved the proposed enigma, by replying that Christ would indeed be David's Son *quod ad carnem attinet*, but his Lord as regarded his *divine* nature.

πρὸς τὸ θεαθῆναι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. πλατύνουσι δὲ τὰ φυλακτῆρια αὐτῶν, καὶ μεγαλύνουσι τὰ κράσπεδα τῶν ἱματίων αὐτῶν · ° φιλοῦσι ὅτε τὴν πρωτοκλισίαν ἐν τοῖς δείπνοις, καὶ τὰς πρωτοκαθεδρίας ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς, καὶ τοὺς ἀσπασμούς ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς, καὶ καλεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ῥαββί, ῥαββί. ὑμεῖς δὲ μὴ κληθῆτε ῥαββί.

^d εἰς γὰρ ἐστὶν ὑμῶν ὁ ἱερεὺς καθηγητής, [ὁ Χριστός ·] πάντες δὲ ὑμεῖς ὡς ἀδελφοὶ ἐστε. ° Καὶ πατέρα μὴ καλέσητε ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς · εἰς γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ Πατὴρ ὑμῶν, ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. Μηδὲ κληθῆτε καθηγηταί · εἰς γὰρ ὑμῶν ἐστὶν ὁ καθηγητής, ὁ Χριστός. ° Ὁ δὲ μείζων ὑμῶν ἔσται ὑμῶν διάκονος. ° Ὅστις δὲ ὑψώσει ἑαυτὸν, ταπεινωθήσεται · καὶ ὅστις ταπεινώσει ἑαυτὸν, ὑψωθήσεται.

^h Οὐαὶ δὲ ὑμῖν, Γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι, ὑποκριταί! ὅτι κα-

5. πλατύνουσι.] Christ does not censure the wearing of those, or of the fringes, but the doing it ostentatiously, by making them very large. These phylacteries, (of which see a description in Horne's *Introd.*), took their rise from a *literal* instead of a *spiritual* interpretation of Deut. vi. 8. That these were, as the Commentators inform us, also regarded as *amulets*, or charms to preserve from evil, may be very true; but when they would hence deduce the *name itself*, we may hesitate; for the name may quite as well imply that they were thereby *reminded* to keep the law. See a passage of Plutarch cited by Kypke.

6. πρωτοκλισίαν] "the first seat at banquets." That, among the Jews, was probably at the *top* of the table, as with us; though among the Greeks and Romans the *middle* place at a triclinium was the most honourable.

— πρωτοκαθεδρίας.] i. e. on the seats of the seniors and the learned; who sat immediately under, with their backs to the pulpit of the reader; their faces being turned towards the people. See Vitringa de *Synag.* p. 191.

8, 9, 10.] In these three verses there is essentially the same sentiment, but with some variation of terms; resorted to in order to favour the *repetition*, which is meant to give energy to an earnest warning, forbidding the assumption, on the one hand, or the admission, on the other, of such a sort of absolute domination as that assumed by the Scribes over men, without authority from God. It is only meant, therefore, to warn them against that unlimited veneration for the decisions of men, or implicit reliance on any human teacher, which was so common among the Jewish devotees. Such being the purport, this passage cannot be supposed to forbid Christian teachers bearing such accustomed appellations as appertain to superiority of office, of station, or of talent; but only admonishes not to use them as the Scribes did, for the purposes of pride and ostentation, and to exercise a spiritual tyranny over the faith and consciences of their Christian brethren, or pretend to such infallibility and supreme authority as is due to Christ alone. See more in a masterly Sermon of Bp. Warburton, vol. ix. pp. 190 — 206.

The three terms here employed, ῥαββί, πατήρ, and καθηγ. were, as we learn from the Rabbinical writers, appellations such as were ordinarily assumed by and given to their principal Teachers; and not only all three were, we find, sometimes

employed, but each twice; which is alluded to in the preceding verse.

8. μὴ κληθῆτε] "suffer not yourselves to be called."

— καθηγῆτής.] There is some doubt as to the reading here. Many of the best Commentators would read *διδάσκαλος*, which is found in several MSS., Versions, and Fathers, but is received by no Editor except Fritz: doubtless because it would seem a gloss on καθηγ. But *διδάσκ.* is so much preferable, from its being more correspondent to the Heb. מֵרֵךְ, and such an offensive tautology and confusion of terms is thereby removed, that it can scarcely be doubted but that it is the true reading.

— ὁ Χριστός.] This is omitted in several ancient MSS., and some Versions and Fathers; is rejected by Mill and Beng., cancelled by Griesb., and Fritz, and bracketed by most other Editors. It probably crept in from ver. 10.

9. πατέρα — γῆς.] "style no man on earth your Father." There is an ellipsis of *τίνα*.

12. ὅστις δὲ — ὑψωθήσεται] A sentiment very often introduced by our Lord; and indeed a frequent maxim among the Jews, and sometimes occurring in the Classical writers. By Christ, however, it is employed in a *spiritual* sense; i. e. "him God will exalt."

13, 14.] These verses are *transposed* in the *textus vulgatus* and most of the MSS.; but are placed in the present order in the best MSS.; confirmed by several Versions, Fathers, and early Editions, approved, with reason, by all the most eminent Commentators, and restored by Mill, Wets., Matth., Knapp, Fritz., and Scholz. Ver. 13. is omitted in several MSS. of the Alexandrian recension, with some Versions and Latin Fathers. But there is no good ground for rejecting it. It should seem that the text above adopted presents the true reading and order; probably *accidentally* changed by the eyes of the transcribers being carried from the *first οὐαὶ δὲ — υποκριταί!* to the *second*, by which the words *ὅτι κατεσβίετε — κρίμα* were omitted, and afterwards inserted, either by the scribes (perceiving their mistake), or by the correctors, but in the wrong place.

— κατεσβίετε.] Of this use of the word examples occur frequently in the Greek Classical writers; and the same is the case with the correspondent term in Latin, and indeed in the modern languages. *Oikias* means, goods, property, as *οἶκος* is often used in the Classical writers. Both the above

τευθίετε τὰς οἰκίας τῶν χηρῶν, καὶ προσάσει μακρὰ προσεχόμενοι.
 14 διὰ τοῦτο λήψεσθε περισσύτερον κρίμα. ⁱ Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, Γραμματεῖς ⁱ Luke 11. 52.
 καὶ Φαρισαῖοι, ὑποκριταί! ὅτι κλείετε τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν
 ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων. ὑμεῖς γὰρ οὐκ εἰσέρχεσθε, οὐδὲ τοὺς
 15 εἰσερχομένους ἀφίετε εἰσελθεῖν. Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, Γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρι-
 σαῖοι, ὑποκριταί! ὅτι περιάγετε τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ τὴν ξηρὰν, ποιῆ-
 σαι ἓνα προσήλυτον· καὶ ὅταν γένηται, ποιεῖτε αὐτὸν υἱὸν γεέννης
 16 διπλοῦτερον ὑμῶν. ^k Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, ὀδηγοὶ τυφλοὶ! οἱ λέγοντες· Ὅς ἂν ^k Supr. 15. 14.
 ὁμῶσι ἐν τῷ ναῷ, οὐδὲν ἐστίν· ὅς δ' ἂν ὁμῶσι ἐν τῷ χρυσῷ τοῦ
 17 ναοῦ, ὀφείλει. Μωροὶ καὶ τυφλοὶ! τίς γὰρ μείζων ἐστίν, ὁ χρυσοῦς,
 18 ἢ ὁ ναὸς ὁ ἀγιάζων τὸν χρυσοῦν; καὶ· ὅς ἂν ὁμῶσι ἐν τῷ θυσι-
 αστηρίῳ, οὐδὲν ἐστίν· ὅς δ' ἂν ὁμῶσι ἐν τῷ δῶρῳ τῷ ἐπάνω αὐτοῦ,
 19 ὀφείλει. ^l Μωροὶ καὶ τυφλοὶ! τί γὰρ μείζων, τὸ δῶρον, ἢ τὸ θυ- ^l Exod. 29. 37.
 20 σιαστήριον τὸ ἀγιάζων τὸ δῶρον; Ὁ οὖν ὁμῶσας ἐν τῷ θυσιαστη-
 21 ρίῳ ὀμνύει ἐν αὐτῷ, καὶ ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἐπάνω αὐτοῦ. ^m Καὶ ὁ ὁμῶσας ^m 1 Kings 8. 13.
 22 ἐν τῷ ναῷ ὀμνύει ἐν αὐτῷ, καὶ ἐν τῷ κατοικήσασαι αὐτόν. ⁿ Καὶ ⁿ Supr. 5. 34.
 ὁ ὁμῶσας ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ὀμνύει ἐν τῷ θρόνῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἐν τῷ
 καθημένῳ ἐπάνω αὐτοῦ.
 23 Ὁὐαὶ ὑμῖν, Γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι, ὑποκριταί! ὅτι ἀποδεκα- ^o Luke 11. 42.

metaphors are found in Hom. Od. β. 237. *κατῆδουσι βιαίως Οἶκον Ὀδυσσῆος*. This "eating up" was done by various subtle artifices. After making them devotees, they devised various means of laying them under contribution; or caballed with the children to deprive the widow of a portion of her dowry, for some return, either in hand, or in expectation.

— *προσάσει*] Sub. ἐπὶ, "under a pretext," namely, of religion; for it was but a mask to conceal their avarice.

— *μακρὰ*.] Sometimes, it is said, these prayers occupied nine hours a day.

14. *κλείετε ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθ.*] For the more Classical *κλείειν ἀπὸ* or *ἀποκλείειν*. It may be compared with our phrase, *to shut the door in the face of*. In the words of the parallel passage of Luke, *ἤρατε τὴν κλεῖδα τῆς γνώσεως*, there is an allusion to locking a door against any, and preventing them from entering by carrying off the key. The metaphor has reference to the hindering men from embracing Christianity; which they effected by misinterpreting the prophecies, and by other methods.

15. *περιάγετε — ξηρὰν.*] A proverbial expression, frequent both in Greek and Latin, importing the greatest activity and exertion. The zeal, indeed, of the Jews for proselytism was, itself, proverbial among the Heathens (see Hor. Sat. i. 4.) inasmuch that at length it was forbidden by the *Constitutiones Imperatorum*.

— *υἱὸν γεέννης*] i. e. by Hebraism, "deserving of, or doomed to, hell." So 1 Sam. xx. 31. 2 Sam. xii. 5. *υἱὸς θανάτου*, "devoted to death." It is strange that Kypke, Rosenm., and some others, should take *δαλ.* to signify *dolosum*. The grammatical objection to the common interpretation, on the ground that the word never occurs in the *comparative*, has no force, for I have myself in Rec. Syn. adduced two examples. Moreover, *ἀπλότερον*, here and in the other two passages

where it occurs, is not an adjective, but an *adverb*.

16. In this and the seven following verses Christ condemns the subtle distinctions of the Pharisees concerning oaths, and points out the sanctity and obligation of an oath. See Notes on Matt. v. 33, sqq.

— *τῷ χρυσῷ τοῦ ναοῦ*.] By this some understand the *gold which adorned the Temple*; others, the *sacred utensils*; others again, the *money set apart for sacred purposes*. As no particular gold is mentioned, it may be understood of any or all of the above.

17. *ὁ ἀγιάζων*] "makes it sacred and apart from common use." The money was holy, because it was subservient to the uses of the Temple, and other sacred purposes, like the *ἀνάθηματα* among the Greeks, and the *donaria* among the Romans. — (Rosenm.)

21. *κατοικήσασαι*.] This is read, for the common *κατοικοῦντι*, in the greater part of the MSS. and the Ed. Prin.; and it has been, with reason, edited by Matth., Griesb., Tittm., Vat., Fritz., and Scholz.

23. *ἀποδεκατοῦτε — κίμωνον*.] The Pharisees were scrupulously exact in paying tithes, not only of the fruits of the earth, but even of such insignificant herbs as those here specified, as *ἡδύσμονον*, the garden mint, *ἀνηθον*, *dill*; (on which see Dioscor. iii. 461.) and *κίμωνον*, *cummin*, a disagreeable pungent herb, and so little esteemed, that it was proverbially employed to express worthlessness. That the above are only meant as *examples* of insignificant herbs, is plain from Luke having "mint and rue," with the addition of *καὶ πᾶν λάχανον*. *Ἀποδεκατεῖν* is a word not used by the Classical writers, and only found in the Sept.; where it expresses the Heb. *תְּשַׁבֵּת*, which signifies both to *take* tithe and to *pay* tithe. Our Lord, it must be observed, does not censure them for paying tithes of these herbs; but, after performing

τοῦτε τὸ ἡδύοσμον καὶ τὸ ἀνηθον καὶ τὸ κύμινον· καὶ ἀφῆκατε τὰ βαρύτερα τοῦ νόμου, τὴν κρίσιν καὶ τὸν ἔλεον καὶ τὴν πίστιν· ταῦτα ἔδει ποιῆσαι, κἀκεῖνα μὴ ἀφιέναι. Ὁδηγοὶ τυφλοὶ· οἱ διὐλλίζοντες 24 τὸν κώνωπα, τὴν δὲ κἀμηλον καταπίνοντες. Ὁὐαὶ ὑμῶν, Γραμματεῖς 25 καὶ Φαρισαῖοι, ὑποκριταὶ! οὐ καθαρίζετε τὸ ἔσωθεν τοῦ ποτηρίου καὶ τῆς παροψίδος, ἔσωθεν δὲ γέμουσιν ἐξ ἀσπαργῆς καὶ * ἀδικίας. Φιμισαῖε τυφλέ! καθάρισον πρῶτον τὸ ἐντὸς τοῦ ποτηρίου καὶ τῆς 26 παροψίδος, ἵνα γένηται καὶ τὸ ἐκτὸς αὐτῶν καθαρὸν.

p Luke 11. 39.
supr. 15. 20.
Mark 7. 4.

q Luke 11. 44.

Ἐστε ὑποκρίσεως καὶ ἀνομίας. Ὁὐαὶ ὑμῶν, Γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι, ὑποκριταὶ! οὐ παρομοιά- 27 ζετε τάφοις κεκοιταμένοις, οἵτινες ἔσωθεν μὲν φαίνονται ὠραῖοι, ἔσωθεν δὲ γέμουσιν ὀστέων νεκρῶν καὶ πάσης ἀκαθαρσίας. Οὕτω καὶ 28 ὑμεῖς ἔσωθεν μὲν φαίνεσθε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις δίκαιοι, ἔσωθεν δὲ μεστοὶ

r Luke 11. 47.

ἔστε ὑποκρίσεως καὶ ἀνομίας. Ὁὐαὶ ὑμῶν, Γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι, 29 ὑποκριταὶ! οὐ οἰκοδομεῖτε τοὺς τάφοις τῶν προφητῶν, καὶ κοσμεῖτε τὰ μνημεῖα τῶν δικαίων, καὶ λέγετε· Εἰ * ἤμεθα ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις 30

these minute observances, for omitting the weightier matters of the Law. This applies to all the subjects of the woes in this Chapter, as is plain from the words ταῦτα ἔδει ποιῆσαι, κἀκεῖνα μὴ ἀφιέναι.

— ἀφῆκατε] “ye neglect.” The word is often applied to the neglect of Divine precepts.

— κρίσιν, ἔλεον, καὶ τὴν πίστιν.] Render “justice, charity, (or humanity) and faith,” or trust in God, as the proper foundation of our love; not *fidelity*, as some explain; though that sense may be included. Thus it will be agreeable to Luke’s τὴν ἀγάπην τοῦ Θεοῦ. The passage seems to be taken from Micah vi. 8. and may be compared with Pind. Olymp. xiii. 6, 11. and Hor. Od. i. 24, 6.

24. διὐλλίζοντες τὸν κώνωπα.] Not “strain at,” (which was a mere topographical blunder of the first Edition of our common Version) but strain out. There is an allusion to the custom of the Jews (prevalent also among the Greeks and Romans) of passing their wines (which in the southern countries might easily receive gnats, and indeed breed insects) through a strainer. See Amos vi. 6. The Jews did it from religious scruples, (the κώνωψ or *culex vinarius* being unclean,) the Gentiles, from cleanliness. The ratio significationis arises as follows. The term signifies to pass any liquid through a strainer, (δδονίου. See Dioscor. iii. 9. & v. 32.) to separate it from the ἕλη; or mineral particles, (gnats, or aught else) that they may be passed out and off. With respect to κἀμηλον, it signifies, not a *camel*, nor a *beetle*, (as some would take it) but a *camel*. To make the opposition as strong as may be, two things are selected as opposite as possible, the *smallest insect*, and the *largest animal*. This sort of expression was in use both with the Jewish and the Grecian writers. Καταπίνω is used not of liquids only, but also of solids, as here. In the former case it may be rendered to *gulp down*; in the latter, to *bolt down*.

25. καθαρίζετε — παροψίδος.] In the purification of domestic utensils see Horne’s Introd. vol. iii. p. 337. Παροψίς is a word found only in the later writers, and signifies a *platter*, *dish*, or, as some think, *sauce-boat*.

— ἀδικίας.] This, for the common reading

ἀκρασίας, is found in the greater part of the MSS., and many Versions and Fathers; and is edited by Matth., Griesb., Knapp; Tittm., Fritz., and Scholz. The internal evidence for it, too, is as strong as the external; for it suits far better with the character of the Pharisees, who (as Campb. observes) are never accused of *intemperance*, though often of *injustice*.

27. κεκοιταμένοις.] On the exact force of κοιτῶ see my Note in Rec. Synopt. The tombs were annually *whitewashed*, that their situation might be known, and the pollution of touching them avoided. This whitening, we learn, extended as far on the surface of the ground as the vault reached under ground. The sense is, that the Pharisees were so polluted with vice, that they defiled all who had communication with them, and were to be avoided like sepulchres. In the parallel passage of Luke xi. 44. they are likened to μνημεῖα ἀσπλά, (see Note in loc.); but there is, in fact, no discrepancy, but reference is had to the contagion they spread around them.

— ἀκαθαρσίας.] Very apposite to the present purpose is a passage adduced by me in Recens. Synop. from the Schol. on Soph. Phil., who explains the words βράκη βαρείας νοσηλείας πλεῖα by πεπληρωμένα — τῆς ἐκ νόσου ἀκαθαρσίας, i. e. pus and bloody matter.

28. μεστοὶ — ἀνομίας.] Μεστός is almost always used cum genitivo mali.

29. οἰκοδομεῖτε — κοσμεῖτε.] Both the Jews and the Heathens alike showed their respect for the illustrious dead, by repairing and beautifying, and, when necessary, rebuilding their tombs. See the proofs and illustrations in Rec. Syn. “This,” as Kuin. observes, “our Lord did not mean to censure, but to expose the hypocrisy of the Pharisees in pretending a respect for the Prophets which they did not feel.”

30. ἤμεθα.] This reading (for the common one ἤμεν) is found in most of the best MSS., in some Fathers, and in the Ed. Princ.; and was, with reason, edited by Matth., Griesb., and others down to Scholz. Ἦμεν, found also in John xi. 15. Acts x. 20. and elsewhere, was the usual Imperfect in the Alexandrian dialect, though it was by the later Greeks changed into the Attic form ἦν. See Alt’s Gr. N. T. p. 21.

τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, οὐκ ἂν * ἡμεῖθα κοινοὶ αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ αἵματι
 31 τῶν προφητῶν. Ὡστε μαρτυρεῖτε ἑαυτοῖς, ὅτι υἱοὶ ἐστε τῶν φονευ-
 32 σάντων τούς προφήτας. Καὶ ὑμεῖς πληρώσατε τὸ μέτρον τῶν πατέ-
 33 ρων ὑμῶν. "Ὁφεις! γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν! πῶς φύγητε ἀπὸ τῆς ¹Supr. 3. 7.
 34 κρίσεως τῆς γέννης; Ἄλλὰ τοῦτο ἰδοῦ, ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω πρὸς ὑμᾶς ¹Luke 11. 49.
 προφήτας καὶ σοφοὺς καὶ γραμματεῖς· καὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀποκτενεῖτε καὶ ²Acts 5. 40.
 στανρώσατε, καὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν μαστιγώσατε ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς ὑμῶν, καὶ ³& 22. 19.
 35 διώξετε ἀπὸ πόλεως εἰς πόλιν· ὅπως ἔλθῃ ἐφ' ὑμᾶς πᾶν αἷμα ¹Gen. 4. 8.
 δίκαιον ἐκχυνόμενον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ἀπὸ αἵματος Ἀβὲλ τοῦ δικαίου, ἕως ²Heb. 11. 4.
 τοῦ αἵματος Ζαχαρίου, υἱοῦ Βαβαχίου, ὃν ἐφρονέσατε μεταξὺ τοῦ ναοῦ ²2 Chron. 24. 21, 22.

31. Ὡστε μαρτυρεῖτε ἑ., &c.] "ye have the same blood-thirsty disposition (thus they are elsewhere called γενεὰ ἀποκτείνουσα), and ye thus show approbation of your fathers' crimes, by pursuing the same course; as is expressed in the parallel passage of Luke xi. 43. ἅρα μαρτυρεῖτε καὶ συνουδοκτετε τοῖς ἔργοις τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν, where the ὅτι must not be rendered although (as some translate), but has the sense quatenus. See Schleus. Lex. in v. § 5. which, as he observes, "habet vim restringendi et specificandi."

We are now prepared to see the inferential force of ὥστε, which is as follows: So then [by this conduct, so similar to that of your fathers], ye bear testimony respecting yourselves, that ye are true sons of your fathers, who murdered the prophets. On the force of which expression see Notes on Matt. v. 45. and John viii. 44. Most recent Commentators explain μαρτυρ. ἑαυτοῖς, "ye bear testimony against yourselves." But there is no sufficient reason to deviate from the common version unto, i. e. respecting yourselves.

32. πληρώσατε τὸ μέτρον τ. π. ἔ.] This may, with many of the best Commentators, ancient and modern, be accounted an ironical concession, or permission, often occurring in Scripture; such as indignantly leaves the persons addressed to experience the consequences of their wilfulness. For, in the words of Bp. Taylor, "they still continued in the same malice towards those sent from God to reform them; but painted it over with a pretence of piety, and of disavowing their father's sins." On this "measure unfulfilled," see the remarks of Grotius, and the illustrations of Wets., who shew that the language seems to imply that there is a certain height to which the iniquity of nations and individuals is permitted by God to rise, and that when that measure is full, the punishment is inflicted; and that though the vengeance of the Almighty be slow, it is always sure, compensating for long-delayed vengeance by the severity of the stroke. See the fine Tract of Plutarch de Serâ Numinis Vindictâ.

33. ὄφεις — ἐχιδνῶν.] See iii. 7. and on τῆς γέννης, see Note on ver. 15. φύγητε. The best Commentators think that this is put for φείξεσθε; the latter writers imitating the Poetic idiom of using the Subjunctive for the Future, which is generally thought a solecism, though defended by Fritz. in loc.

34. διὰ τοῦτο.] On the force of this formula the Commentators are divided in opinion. Most recent Expositors consider it as merely a form of transition; as ἐν τούτῳ or ἐπὶ τούτῳ in Matt. xiii.

52. xxii. 29. Mark xii. 24. Yet, as that principle is somewhat precarious, we may, with Euthym. and Fritz., refer it to ver. 32. διότι (says Euthym.) μέλλετε πληρῶσαι τὸ μέτρον τῆς κακίας τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν.

—προφήτας — γραμματεῖς.] Our Lord here applies to his Apostles and their successors the titles given by the Jews to their Doctors; signifying that his messengers (so called in Luke xi. 49.), would be as entitled to the appellation προφήτας (in the sense, Divine Legates and inspired interpreters of the will of God) as were the prophets of old; and would likewise be entitled to the appellations σοφῶς, ὀρθῶς, and γραμματεῖς, ὀρθῶς, as being thoroughly conversant in the Scriptures and Divine learning.

—ἐξ αὐτῶν] Sub. τινῶς. Ἀποκτενεῖτε. See Acts vii. 59. & xii. 2.

—στανρώσατε.] Though there is no evidence of the crucifixion of any Christian teacher much before the destruction of Jerusalem; yet the silence of history (so exceedingly brief as it has come down to us) is no proof that there were none such. It is better to rest on this, than to suppose, with some, that Christ here includes himself; or to take στανρ. in sensu improprio for "to put to a cruel death."

—μαστιγώσατε.] See x. 17. and Acts xxii. 19.

35. ὅπως] This should be rendered, not ita ut, but, as Hoogev. suggests, ut, or hoc modo ut. Fritz. well expresses the sense of the passage thus: "Vos omnino ita agētis, ut videamini in id unicè intenti, ut omnis sanguinis iusti atque insontis culpam soli sustineatis." Ἐκχυνόμενον is, as Fritz. remarks, to be taken generally, so as to include both past, present, and future.

—Ζαχαρίου — Βαβαχίου.] There has been much dispute as to the person here meant by our Lord. The various opinions are detailed and reviewed by Kuin. and Fritz. The two alone worthy of remark are, 1. that it was Zechariah, one of the Minor Prophets. But as there is no historical testimony that he was murdered, most of the recent Commentators are of opinion that the person meant is that Zacharias, the High Priest, who, for his having reprov'd the iniquities of the Jewish people, was, by the order of King Joash, slain between the sanctuary and the altar of whole burnt offerings. See 2 Chron. xxiv. 20, 21. And though this Joash be called son of Jehoiada, yet it was not un-frequent among the Jews to bear two names; especially when, as in the present case, the names were of the same meaning.

—θυσιαστηρίου.] "the altar for holocausts, or

καὶ τοῦ θυνσιασθηρίου. Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι ἤξει ταῦτα πάντα ἐπὶ τὴν 36
 γενεὰν ταύτην. Ἰερουσαλήμ, Ἰερουσαλήμ! ἣ ἀποκτείνουσα τοὺς 37
 προφήτας, καὶ λιθοβολοῦσα τοὺς ἀπεσταλμένους πρὸς αὐτήν, ποσάκις
 ἠθέλησα ἐπισυναγαγεῖν τὰ τέκνα σου, ὃν τρόπον ἐπισυνάγει ὄρνις τὰ
 ροσσία ἐαυτῆς ὑπὸ τὰς πτέρυγας, καὶ οὐκ ἠθέλησατε; Ἰδοὺ, ἀφίεται 38
 ὑμῖν ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν ἔρημος. Ἰλέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν· Οὐ μὴ με ἴδῃτε 39
 ἀπ' ἄρτι, ἕως ἄν εἴπητε· Εὐλόγημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι
 MK. LU. 13. 21. Κυρίου.

1 5 XXIV. ΚΑΙ ἐξεθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐπορεύετο ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱεροῦ· καὶ 1
 2 6 προσῆλθον οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπιδείξαι αὐτῷ τὰς οἰκοδομὰς τοῦ ἱεροῦ.
 Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Οὐ βλέπετε πάντα ταῦτα; ἄμὴν λέγω 2
 ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῆ ᾧδε λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον, ὃς οὐ [μὴ] καταλυθήσεται.

burnt sacrifices," which, Grot. shews, was *in subdiali*, in the Court of the Priests.

36. ὅτι] This is found in most of the best MSS. and some Versions and Fathers, with the Ed. Princ., and has been adopted by almost every Editor from Beng. to Scholz.

— ἤξει — ταύτην.] By ταῦτα πάντα are meant "all these crimes;" and ἤκειν, or, as in the former verse, ἐλθεῖν ἐπὶ τὰ here signifies "to come upon any one," "to be visited upon any one," namely, to bring down punishment on his head.

37. ἣ ἀποκτείνουσα] Erasm. well points out the *permanent action* (as referring alike to past, present, and future) denoted by this use of the present tense.

— αὐτήν.] for ἐαυτὴν or σεαυτήν. So I read, instead of the Stephanic αὐτῆν, with the Ed. Princ., Beza, Schmid, Griesb., and Fritz. There is no occasion to bring in the figure by which a transition is made from the second to the third person; which would here be very awkward.

— τέκνα.] The word is often used, both, figuratively, of the *inhabitants* of a city, both in the Scriptural and the Classical writers.

— ἐπισυναγαγεῖν.] The ἐπι is not, as the Commentators imagine, pleonastic, but signifies *to*. Thus the term signifies to draw together to any one.

— ἠθέλησατε.] The plural here has reference to the plural implied in Ἰερουσαλήμ, which means *inhabitants* of Jerusalem, an idiom frequent both in the Scriptural and Classical writers.

38. ἀφίεται] Prophetic present put for future.

— οἶκος.] The Commentators are not agreed whether this is to be taken of the *Temple*, or of the *whole Jewish nation*, especially its *metropolis*; as the Latin writers use *domus* for *patria*. The former sense is, indeed, applicable, but somewhat too *weak*; not to say that *Oseō* would thus require to be added: and therefore the latter is preferable.

39. οὐ μὴ με ἴδῃτε — Κυρίου.] Many are the modes of interpretation offered of this perplexing passage. Some Commentators think that our Lord meant to predict his removal from them, until the destruction of Jerusalem; which is in the next Chapter designated under the name of "the coming of the Lord." And they render the words ἕως ἄν εἴπητε, "until ye might say," "would have reason to say." There is indeed something to countenance this view in the actual state of Judæa at that period, as recorded by the accurate Josephus, Bell. J. vii. 36. But such a sense of

ἕως ἄν εἴπητε is strained; and the interpretation is otherwise liable to some serious objections. Greatly preferable is that of Chrysost. and others, who take the *coming* here spoken of to mean the *second* coming of our Lord to judgment at the end of the world. Thus by *ye* will be meant the *Jewish nation*. That the great bulk of the Jews will, ere that awful catastrophe, be brought to acknowledge that Messiah whom their ancestors rejected, we are taught by the sure word of prophecy. See Grot., Doddr., and Scott. Those who adopt this interpretation maintain that ἀπ' ἄρτι should be rendered "after a while," i. e. after the ascension. But that sense is destitute of proof, and indeed unnecessary, if ἴδῃτε be taken (with Koecher) of *familiar intercourse* as a teacher; for our Lord had with the present address closed his *public* ministry. Εὐλόγημένος, &c. was the form by which the Messiah (usually styled ὁ ἐρχόμενος, &c.) was to be addressed in his coming.

XXIV. I. ἐπιδείξαι αὐτῷ τὰς οἰκοδ.] The disciples were pointing with wonder and pride at their stateliness, and seemed to say, "Is it possible that such a magnificent edifice should be *utterly* destroyed?" Indeed, the destruction of the Temple was, in the minds of the Jews, viewed as coeval only with the *end of the world*; or at least that modification in its constitution, which they supposed would-take place at the coming of the Messiah.

2. οὐ βλέπετε.] Several MSS. and Versions are without the οὐ, which is marked as probably to be omitted by Griesb. and others, and cancelled by Fritz. But the MS. evidence for it is incomparably stronger than that *against* it; and had it not been in the text from the first, who would have thought of inserting it? for, when away, the same sense arises. But why (it may be asked) should the οὐ have been *removed*? I answer, because it is not employed agreeably to the Classical usage, and because it is not found in the parallel passage of Mark.

— οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῆ — λίθον.] A proverbial and hyperbolic expression, denoting utter destruction, but in this instance almost fulfilled to the letter; as we learn from Joseph. B. J. vii. 1, 1. Euseb., and the Rabbinical writers. Simil. Luke xix. 43 & 44. The words ὅς οὐ καταλυθήσεται are added, to strengthen the preceding. See Soph. Antig. 441. and Hom. Il. xxi. 50. referred to by Fritz. The μὴ is omitted in almost all the best MSS., and several Fathers, and the early Editions. It is rejected

	MK.	LU.
3 Καθημένου δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄρους τῶν εἰλαιῶν, προσῆλθον αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ κατ' ἰδίαν, λέγοντες·	13.	21.
Εἰπέ ἡμῖν, πότε ταῦτα ἔσται; καὶ τί	3	7
4 τὸ σημεῖον τῆς σῆς παρουσίας, καὶ τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος; Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς·	5	8
Βλέπετε μὴ τις ὑμᾶς πλανήσῃ.		
5 Πολλοὶ γὰρ ἐλεύσονται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι μου, λέγοντες· Ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ	6	
6 Χριστός· καὶ πολλοὺς πλανήσουσι. Μελλήσετε δὲ ἀκούειν πολέμους		

by Mill, Beng., and Wets., and cancelled by Matth., Griesb., Knapp, Tittm., Fritz., and Scholz; and justly, for scarcely any authority could justify so gross a barbarism. The *μη* arose from the *ου μη* just before. Καταλυθήσεται (Krueg. observes) has reference to the *dissolution of the cogmentatio lapidum*.

3. πότε ταῦτα ἔσται — τοῦ αἰῶνος.] The Commentators are much divided in opinion as to the intent of this inquiry; and not less than four different hypotheses of interpretation have been propounded. The 1st, confines the inquiry to the approaching destruction of Jerusalem. The 2d, extends it to *two* questions, and includes the *second* advent of Christ in the regeneration, according to the Jewish expectation. The 3d, instead of the *second*, substitutes the *last* advent of Christ at the end of the world, and the general judgment. The 4th, (to use the words of Dr. Hales, who adopts it) “unites all the preceding into *three* questions; the 1st, relating to the destruction of Jerusalem; the 2d, to our Lord’s second appearance in glory at the restitution of all things, Acts iii. 21; the 3d, to the general judgment at the end of the world.” “the inquiry (continues he) involves three questions: 1. *When* shall these (things) be? and the *sign* when they shall happen? 2. And what the sign of thy presence? and 3. What the sign when all these things shall be concluded, or of the conclusion of the world?” Mr. Townsend (in common with Chrys., Euthym., and many ancient Interpreters, and also the most eminent modern ones), embraces the first (or rather *second*) hypothesis. “From their question (he says) it appears that the disciples viewed the coming of Christ and the end of the world or age, as events nearly related, and which would indisputably take place together [and used the expression, *συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος* to designate *both*. — Eedit.] they had no idea of the dissolution of the Jewish polity, as really signified by, or included in, either of these events. They imagined, perhaps, a great and awful change in the physical constitution of the universe, which they probably expected would occur within the term of their own lives; but they could have no conception of what was really meant by the expression which they employed, the coming of Christ. The coming of Christ, and the end of the world, being therefore only different expressions to denote the same period as the destruction of Jerusalem, the purport of the disciples’ question plainly is, *When* shall the destruction of Jerusalem be — and what shall be the signs of it? The latter part of the question is the first answered, and our Saviour foretells, in the clearest manner, the *signs* of his coming, and the destruction of Jerusalem. He then passes on to the other part of the question, concerning the *time* of his coming.”

It is no easy matter to decide on the comparative claims of these two views, which are manifestly the soundest of the four. If we were to advert simply to the *intent* of the inquiry of the

Apostles, and trace the remarkable *fulfilment* of the following predictions, even in minute circumstances, we could scarcely, I think, fail to give the preference to the *latter*. But Dr. Hales’s has much to recommend it, in the strong bearing which very many passages have on the *last* advent and the final judgment; while Mr. Townsend’s is too limited, by making our Lord’s words only an answer to the inquiries of the Apostles; indeed scarcely so much; since their *third* question must, by *implication*, be understood to have reference to that regeneration, renovation, or restitution of all things, according to their views. See Note on *παλιγγενεσία* supra xix. 23., and comp. Acts iii. 21. and Rom. viii. 19. Whereas there is no difficulty in supposing that our Lord, finding that the disciples had pointed to the Temple, to draw from him some more explicit declaration respecting the utter destruction, and in their questions had *wished* for more information than they ventured directly to ask, was pleased not only to answer their question, but to give them such further information on an awful topic closely connected with that of their inquiry, as would be most important for them to know, and, through them, his disciples of every age. So that, as the prediction concerning the destruction of the Temple arose naturally out of the train of passing circumstances, so, it should seem, did the awful predictions in this and the next Chapter arise out of the limited interrogatories of the Apostles. It may be observed, that the information as to the *last* advent and general judgment being *super-added* to the information in reply to their question, is, as might be expected, in a great degree, given *last* (xv. 31—46); yet there are many allusions to it in the *preceding* matter, which *chiefly* concerns the event of the second advent to judgment; and in some passages the two predictions are so closely interwoven together, and the expressions and imagery are so applicable to the day of judgment, that we might almost say that a kind of secondary sense must be admitted; which as Mr. Horne has observed, is not unfrequently found in the prophetic writings, where two subjects, a principal and a subordinate one, are carried on together. This principle, will, if I mistake not, afford a sure clue to guide us in our greatest difficulties as to the interpretation of this sublime portion of Scripture.

4. βλέτ. μη τις πλαν.] A form of earnest caution, as in Eph. v. 6. Col. ii. 8. 2 Thes. ii. 3.

5. ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι μου] i. e. assuming the name and character of Messiah. Between these and the false prophets at ver. 11, a distinction must be made. Of the former were Simon Magus and Dositheus, and perhaps those adverted to by Joseph. B. J. i. 2. Of the latter were Theudas, Barchochebas the Egyptian, and many other impostors mentioned by Josephus.

6. πολέμους.] Wets. cites, in illustration, Joseph. Ant. 18, 9, 1, and on ἀκαὶς πολ. Joseph. Ant. 20, 3,

MK. LU.

13. 21. καὶ ἀκούσας πολέμων· ὁρᾶτε, μὴ θροαῖσθε· δεῖ γὰρ πάντα γενέσθαι·
 9 10 ἄλλ' οὐπω ἐστὶ τὸ τέλος. Ἐγερθήσεται γὰρ ἔθνος ἐπὶ ἔθνος, καὶ 7
 βασιλεία ἐπὶ βασιλείαν· καὶ ἔσονται λιμοὶ καὶ λοιμοὶ καὶ σεισμοὶ
 9 11 κατὰ τόπους. Πάντα δὲ ταῦτα ἀρχὴ ὠδίνων. Τότε παραδώσουσιν 8
 ἡμᾶς εἰς θλίψιν, καὶ ἀποκτενοῦσιν ἡμᾶς· καὶ ἔσσεσθε μισούμενοι ὑπὸ 9
 13 17 πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου. Καὶ τότε σκανδαλισθήσονται 10
 πολλοί· καὶ ἀλλήλους παραδώσουσι, καὶ μισήσουσιν ἀλλήλους· καὶ 11
 πολλοὶ ψευδοπροφήται ἐγερθήσονται, καὶ πλανήσουσι πολλούς· καὶ 12
 διὰ τὸ πληθυνθῆναι τὴν ἀνομίαν, ψυγήσεται ἡ ἀγάπη τῶν πολλῶν·

3, & 4, 2; Bell. Jud. 2, 16, & 1, 1, 2. [Comp. Jer. iv. 27; v. 10, 13.]

— ὁρᾶτε, μὴ θροαῖσθε.] So Fritz. rightly points (with Steph.), remarking that ὁρᾶτε μὴ would signify *videte, ne*, and require *θροασθε*.

— δεῖ — γενέσθαι.] This is referred by the earlier modern Commentators to the *counsel* of God, who permits evil, to educe good therefrom. But it is better, with most recent Interpreters, to take the expression as only denoting the *certainty* of the events predicted. Τὸ τέλος is equivalent to *συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος* at ver. 3. Wets. compares Hom. II. β. 122. τέλος δ' οὐπω τι πέφαιται.

7. Ἐγερθήσεται — ἔθνος.] This is referred by Grot., Wets., and Kypke, to those various wars and civil commotions with which most parts of the civilized world were then convulsed.

— λιμοὶ καὶ λοιμοί.] The words are often found joined in a context similar to the present; and no wonder, pestilence usually succeeding famine, (to the citations from Quint. Curt. ix. 10, and Hesiod. Op. 240, adduced by Wets., may be added Thucyd. i. 28,) inasmuch that κατὰ λιμὸν λοιμὸς grew to a proverb. See Thucyd. ii. 54. Λιμὸς is well derived by Hemsterh. from *λεიმὸς* (and that from *λείμναι*.) Yet I suspect that λιμὸς and λοιμὸς are of common origin, having the same general idea of *pining, wasting away*, &c. Wets. adduces ample historical proofs of both these visitations.

— σεισμοί.] This must not be taken, with some, metaphorically, of *civil commotions*, but be understood literally; for it appears from the passages adduced by Wets. and Kuin., that earthquakes were then very prevalent, and were always by the ancients regarded as portents, presaging public calamity and distress. See Joel iii. 3 & 4. Sil. Ital. v. 615.

— κατὰ τόπους.] The earlier Commentators interpret “in divers places;” but the recent ones, after Beza, “every where,” by an ellipsis of *ἐκάστων*. And this method is supported by some of the ancient Versions. Perhaps, however, the true sense is, “in various places.” The words are (with some ancient Commentators, and Wets. and Fritz.) to be referred not to *σεισμοί* only, but also to *λιμοὶ* and *λοιμοί*.

8. πάντα δε — ὠδίνων.] We must here suppose an ellipse of *μόνον* as well as the usual one *ἔσται*; “these are only the prelude of sorrows.” So Eurip. Med. 60, ἐν ἀρχῇ πῆμα, καὶ οὐδέπω μέσοι. ὠδὴν is here (as often in the Sept. and Classical writers) used of severe affliction, whether bodily or mental.

9. τότε.] This may (as Rosenm. suggests) be taken in a lax sense for *circa ista tempora*; since the events which follow happened partly before

the above mentioned calamities, and partly at the same time with them.

— παραδώσουσιν ἑ. εἰς θλίψιν.] θλίψις properly signifies *compression*, and figuratively constraint, oppression, affliction, and persecution. The construction is the same as in a kindred passage of Jerem. xv. 4. παραδ. εἰς ἀνάγκας. [Comp. sup. x. 17.]

— μισούμενοι ὑπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν] i. e. “ye shall be generally objects of hatred.” The feeling of the Gentiles to Christians is plain from various passages of the Classical writers. The true reason for this Bp. Warburton (Div. Leg. Vol. II. L. II. § 6.) has well pointed out, namely, that while the different *Pagan* religions sociably agreed with each other, the Gospel taught Christians not only, like the Jews, to bear their testimony to the falsehood of them all, but also zealously and earnestly to urge on men the renunciation of them as a matter of absolute necessity, and as requiring them under the most tremendous penalties, to embrace the Christian religion.

— τῶν ἐθνῶν.] The τῶν is omitted in the common text; but it has place in very many MSS. and all the Edd. up to the Elzevir (in which Wets. thinks it was omitted by a typographical error), and has been restored by Beng., Wets., Matth., Griesb., Knapp, Tittm., Fritz., and Scholz; rightly, I think: for *internal* as well as *external* evidence is in its favour; since it was more likely to be wrongly omitted than to have been added. Διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου, “for the sake of [their profession of] my religion.” Comp. Jo. xv. 20. xvi. 2. The correspondence of the expressions in this and the following verses up to ver. 13., to facts recorded in History, has been evinced by Wets. and others.

10. Of the expressions in this verse, σκανδ. must be understood of *apostasy*, and παραδ. of the betraying of their former partners in the faith. Μισήσ. ἀλλ. seems to have reference to that *hatred* which would be borne by the apostates to their former companions, even when they did not betray them.

11. ψευδοπροφ.] namely, in the *primary* application, persons pretending to a Divine commission to preach deliverance and freedom from the Roman yoke; in the *secondary*, false teachers. See supra vii. 11.

12. διὰ τὸ πληθυνθῆναι τὴν ἀνομίαν.] I would render. “and because of the prevalence of iniquity and lawlessness of every kind.” It seems better to assign this *general* sense to ἀνομίαν, than any of those *special* ones which are given by one or other of the Commentators. This sense of the word is very frequent both in the N. T. and the Sept. There is something very similar in Ezr. ix. 6. ὅτι αἱ ἀνομίαι ἡμῶν ἐπληρώθησαν.

	MK.	LU.
13 ὁ δὲ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος, οὗτος σωθήσεται. Καὶ κηρυχθήσεται τοῦτο	13.	21.
14 τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ, εἰς μαρτύριον πᾶσι	10	19
15 τοῖς ἔθνεσι· καὶ τότε ἤξει τὸ τέλος. Ὅταν οὖν ἴδητε τὸ βδέλυγμα	14	20
τῆς ἐρημώσεως, τὸ ᾗθ' ἐν δὴ Δαυιὴλ τοῦ προφήτου, ἐστὼς ἐν τόπῳ		
16 ἁγίῳ· (ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοεῖτω·) τότε οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ φεγγέτωσαν	21	
17 ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη· ὁ ἐπὶ τοῦ δώματος μὴ καταβαινέτω, ἄραι * τὰ ἐκ τῆς	15	

— ψυγῆσεται ἡ ἀγ. τ. π.] “the love of the greater part shall grow cold.” By ἀγ. some understand the love of God and zeal for religion; others, mutual love. The latter is generally adopted by the ancient and some eminent modern Commentators, and is certainly more agreeable to the *usus loquendi*; but the former is so strongly supported by the context, that it deserves the preference. That the ardour of many in the cause of Christianity was abated, is plain from Rev. ii. and iii.; and we may infer it from the fact of the defection in several Churches, attested in Gal. iii. 1. seq. 2 Thess. iii. 1. seq. 2 Tim. i. 15. Heb. x. 25. It should seem, however, that the fulfilment of this prediction is chiefly to be sought in the circumstances which shall precede the *second* advent of our Lord to judgment. There can be no doubt that it has been fulfilling for the last century, in the increase of infidelity and heresy. See an excellent Sermon of Bp. Warburton on this text (No. xxxiii.), in which he shews, from considerations drawn, 1. from the nature of things, 2. from the experience of our times, how truly iniquity is assigned as the cause of that general apostasy predicted to be the character of these latter days.

13. ὁ δὲ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος.] This many recent Commentators understand of the destruction of Jerusalem, rendering, “he who endureth unto the destruction, shall be saved,”—namely, from the ruin which shall overwhelm its inhabitants. And indeed Ecclesiastical history informs us, that few or no Christians perished in Jerusalem at that catastrophe, they having timely abandoned the city. But this seems a strained mode of interpretation; and it is better, with the ancient and early modern Commentators, and some eminent recent ones, (as Rosenm., Kuin., and Fritz.) to take ὑπομ. εἰς τέλος of continual perseverance in Christian faith and practice; and σωθ. of salvation in heaven. It should seem, that the *secondary* application alone has place here.

14. ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ.] Most Commentators understand this of the *Roman* world; i. e. the Roman Empire; for which signification of οἰκουμένη there is valid authority. (See Recens. Synop.) But as this is scarcely reconcilable with the words following, πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσι, and since there is reason to think that Christianity had, at the period in question, been promulgated in countries which formed no part of the Roman Empire, (see Whitby and Doddr.) it may be better to retain the ordinary sense of the expression; understanding, by a slight hyperbole, the *greater part of the then known world*. [Comp. Rom. i. 8. & x. 18.]

— εἰς μαρτύριον πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσι.] namely, as some Commentators explain, “that the offer of salvation had been made to the Jews;” by the rejection of which they had drawn down vengeance on their heads: or, according to others, “in order that all nations may know and be able to testify;” that the Jews had filled up the measure of their iniquity and obstinacy by rejecting the proffered

salvation, both spiritual and temporal. These two explanations merge into each other, and may be combined. But as far as the prediction has reference to the *second* advent of Christ, it will require another sense, on which see the Commentaries in Poole’s Syn. Τὸ τέλος, “the end of the Jewish state, and the consummation of God’s judgments against it.”

15. τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως.] Dan. ix. 27; xii. 11. Here βδέλ. has (by Hebraism) the force of an adjective; as in Luke i. 43. ταπεινώσεις τῆς δούλης, for δούλη ταπεινή. The sense is, “the abominable desolation;” i. e. the Roman army; always abominable, as composed of heathens, and carrying idolatrous standards; but then abominably *desolating*, as being invaders and destroyers.

— ἐν τόπῳ ἁγίῳ.] Most Commentators, from Grot. downwards, explain this “on holy ground.” But Bp. Middleton, has shown that this interpretation is ungrounded; for the phrase occurs elsewhere in the N. T. only at Acts vi. 13. xxi. 28, where it can alone be understood of the *Temple*. In the Sept. it is often used, and always of the Temple, sometimes the *Sanctum Sanctorum*. There is therefore no reason to abandon the ancient and common interpretation, “in the Holy place.” [properly so called,] which is required by the parallel passage in Mark xiii. 14, and is confirmed by the history of the completion of the prophecy in Josephus.

— ὁ ἀναγινώσκων ν.] These words are by most supposed to be our *Lord’s*, and meant to fix the attention of his hearers. But the best recent Commentators, with reason, consider them as a parenthetical admonition of the *Evangelist*, and perhaps founded on Daniel ix. 25. καὶ γνώση καὶ διανοηθῆσιν. Νοεῖν signifies properly to *turn in mind*, and, from the adjunct, to *attend*.

16. τότε] “when these things take place.” Οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ, i. e. the inhabitants of Judæa, as opposed to those of Jerusalem.

— τὰ ὄρη.] Not only as being natural strongholds, (often used as such, as we find from Josephus,) but because they abounded in large caverns; wherein the Jews, at times of public danger, took refuge.

17. ἐπὶ τοῦ δώματος, &c.] In this and the two following verses we have some proverbial (and somewhat hyperbolic) forms of expression, denoting the imminency of the danger, and the necessity of the speediest flight. It has ever been customary in the East to build the houses with flat roofs, provided with a staircase both inside and outside. By the latter way (or, as others suppose, over the roofs of the neighbouring houses, and so to the city wall) their flight is recommended to be taken.

— τὰ.] This (instead of the common reading τὶ), is found in all the best MSS. and the ancient Edd. confirmed by the Syr. and Coptic Versions and many Fathers. It has also been approved by almost all the recent Editors, and received from Matth. down to Scholz: with reason, for the

MK. LU.

13. 21. οἰκίας αὐτοῦ· καὶ ὁ ἐν τῷ ἀγροῦ μὴ ἐπιστρεψάτω ὀπίσω, ἄραι τὰ 18
 16 17 23 ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ. Οὐαὶ δὲ ταῖς ἐν γαστρὶ ἐχούσαις καὶ ταῖς θηλαζούσαις 19
 18 ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις. Προσεύχουθε δὲ ἵνα μὴ γένηται ἡ φωνὴ 20
 19 ὑμῶν χειμῶνος, μηδὲ [ἐν] σαββάτῳ. Ἔσται γὰρ τότε θλίψις μεγάλη, 21
 20 οἷα οὐ γέγονεν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κόσμου ἕως τοῦ νῦν, οὐδ' οὐ μὴ γένηται.
 21 Καὶ εἰ μὴ ἐκολοβώθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι ἐκείναι, οὐκ ἂν ἐσώθη πᾶσα 22
 21 σάρξ· διὰ δὲ τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς κολοβωθήσονται αἱ ἡμέραι ἐκείναι.
 22 Τότε ἂν τις ὑμῖν εἴπῃ· Ἰδοὺ, ὧδε ὁ Χριστὸς, ἢ ὧδε· μὴ πιστεύ- 23
 22 σητε. Ἐγερθήσονται γὰρ ψευδοχριστοὶ καὶ ψευδοπροφηταί, καὶ δώ- 24
 23 σουσι σημεῖα μεγάλα καὶ τέρατα, ὥστε πλανῆσαι, εἰ δυνατὸν, καὶ τοὺς
 23 ἐκλεκτοὺς. Ἰδοὺ, προεἶρηκα ὑμῖν. Ἐὰν οὖν εἴπωσιν ὑμῖν· Ἰδοὺ, ἐν 25
 23 τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἐστὶ· μὴ ἐξέλθῃτε· Ἰδοὺ, ἐν τοῖς ταμείοις· μὴ πιστεύ- 26

common reading arose from ignorance of the nature of the more recondite expression τὰ ἐκ τ. ο., which (as Fritz. well remarks), is put for ἄραι τὰ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ. The ἐπὶ ἐπιστρεψάτω has reference to οἰκίας, which may be taken from the preceding οἰκίας. By τὰ ἱμάτια are meant the upper garments; (the cloak and coat) which husbandmen of the Southern countries have ever, when at work, laid aside, or left at home: who are then said to be γυμνοί. So Hesiod. Op. ii. 9. (cited by Elsn.) Γυμνὸν σπείρειν, γυμνὸν δὲ βωστέειν, Γυμνὸν δ' ἀμᾶσθαι. Virg. Georg. i. 299. Nudus ara, sere nudus.

19. οὐαὶ δὲ — ἡμέραις.] It was unnecessary for Grot. and Wolf. to detail the *ius belli* as to women so situated; for our Lord only, while he predicts, deploras (a fine trait of his benevolence) the miserable lot of such persons. This *woe* was (as the records of history testify) amply fulfilled.

20. χειμῶνος.] The Commentators supply *ἄνθος*. But *οὐαὶ* is preferable. No ellipse, however, is necessary to be supposed.

— μηδὲ σαββάτῳ.] Because that would be a material hindrance; since no traveller was permitted by the Jewish Law (which was acted on by the Christians in Judæa long after the time of the destruction of Jerusalem) to proceed further than five furlongs on that day, and the gates of all towns were strictly closed.

The *ἐν* is not found in the greater part of the MSS., the Edit. Princ., and some Fathers; and is cancelled or rejected by almost every Editor from Bengel to Scholz; perhaps rightly, for internal as well as external evidence, is against it. Yet it is defended by xii. 2.

21. οἷα οὐ γέγονεν — νῦν.] The best Commentators agree in considering this as a somewhat hyperbolic, and perhaps proverbial mode of expressing what is *exceedingly great*, as Exod. x. 14; xi. 6. Dan. xii. 1. Joel ii. 2. Yet such were the atrocities and horrors of the siege of Jerusalem (never to this day paralleled) that the words may admit of the most literal acceptance. We may observe the triple negative, as most strongly emphatic. So Heb. xiii. 5. οὐ μή σε ἀνά, οὐ δ' οὐ μή δε ἐγκαταλίπω. See also Rev. xiii. 14. At ἕως τοῦ νῦν sub., not *κόσμου*, with Fritz., but *χρόνου*. *Νῦν* for *τότε* is a rare use; but it is, I apprehend, the primary force of the word; which, being derived from *νῦα* (cognate with *νόσσα*) signifies, 1. a point [of time], 2. time (as *καὶ* ἄνω from *κάω*). So the Heb. נון (whence the Latin *æt-nas*) though it properly denotes *time*, sometimes signifies *now*.

22. εἰ μὴ ἐκολ.] Κολυβοῦν, from *κόλυβος*, a cripple, signifies to amputate, and, as applied to time, to shorten. So Malela, p. 237. (cited by Wets.) τοῦ αὐτοῦ μηνὸς τὰς ἡμέρας ἐκολύβησαν. How they were shortened, we find from Joseph., from whom we learn that many incidental causes combined towards bringing about that event, and the deliverance.

— τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς] meaning, no doubt, the Jewish Christians then in Judæa. See Note supra xx. 16. Grot., Markl., Kuin., and Fritz. observe, that there is here an allusion to the very ancient opinion, that in some cases of national calamity, public destruction is averted by Providence, lest the righteous should suffer with the wicked.

23. Simil. Luke xvii. 23; xxi. 8.

24. ψευδοχριστοὶ καὶ ψευδοπροφ.] Such as Theudas, the son of Judas the Galilean, and others mentioned by Josephus.

— δώσουσι σημεῖα μεγάλα καὶ τέρατα.] An interesting question here arises, whether these *σημεῖα* and *τέρατα* were really performed, or merely *professed*. The ancient and early modern Commentators, together with some recent ones, adopt the former opinion; ascribing the deeds to *dæmoniacal* agency. The latter view is taken by most recent Commentators; who refer to a similar use of *δόδοναι* in Deut. xiii. 2. 1 Kings xiii. 3 & 5. These *σημεῖα* and *τέρατα* (between which terms there need not be any such distinction made as in the Classical writers) are supposed to have been various sleights of pretended magic produced by optical deception, simulated cures of disorders founded in artful collusion, &c.; also, as far as there might be *reality*, wonders performed by *dæmoniacal* agency, such (in the words of 2 Thess. ii. 9.) as were produced κατ' ἐνεργεσίαν τοῦ Σατανᾶ, ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει, καὶ σημείοις καὶ τέρασι ψεύδους.

— εἰ δυνατόν.] This expression does not imply *impossibility*, but only *extreme difficulty* in the performance of what is possible. (So Matt. xvi. 39. Acts xx. 16. Rom. xii. 18.) and therefore this text ought never to have been adduced to prove the doctrine of the perseverance of the elect.

26. ἐστὶ] i. e. αὐτὸς (q. d. you know who) is, namely, the Messiah. There is something *graphic* in this use of the pronoun for the appellative; which, though it had been long generally adopted of that great Personage, who was the object of universal expectation, yet in this case it was employed by the lurking adherents of false Christs.

— ἐν ἐρήμῳ.] The very place where (as we find

27 σητε. Ὡσπερ γὰρ ἡ ἀστραπή ἐξέρχεται ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν, καὶ φαίνεται 13. 21.
 εὼς δυσμῶν, οὕτως ἔσται καὶ ἡ παρουσία τοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.
 28 Ὅπου γὰρ ἐὰν ᾦ τὸ πνεῦμα, ἐκεῖ συναχθήσονται οἱ ἄετοί. Εὐθύως 24 26
 29 δὲ μετὰ τὴν θλίψιν τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐκείνων ὁ ἥλιος σκοτισθήσεται, καὶ ἡ 25
 σελήνη οὐ δώσει τὸ φέγγος αὐτῆς, καὶ οἱ ἀστέρεις πεσοῦνται ἀπὸ τοῦ 26
 30 οὐρανοῦ, καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν σαλευθήσονται. Καὶ τότε 26 27
 φανήσεται τὸ σημεῖον τοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ· καὶ

from Joseph.) these impostors usually appeared and abode.

— ἐν ταῖς ταμεῖσι.] This is not to be taken, with most Commentators, as plural for singular; but, as Schleus. and Fritz. rightly observe, the term is to be considered as denoting a *genus*, q. d. He is in the kind of places called *ταμεῖα* (i. e. secret apartments) namely, in one or other of them.

27. ὥσπερ γὰρ ἡ ἀστραπή — οὕτως, &c.] By this exquisite simile is represented the suddenness, the celerity, and, as some think, the conspicuousness of Christ's advent to take vengeance on the Jews. At ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν (in which expression both Classical and Scriptural writers use the plural) sub. ἡλίου, which is expressed in Soph. Œd. C. 1245. αἱ μὲν, ἀπ' ἡλίου οὐραῶν, αἱ δ' ἀνατέλλοντες.

28. ὅπου γὰρ — ἄετοί.] The connection of this verse with the preceding is variously traced. But the γὰρ must not be too rigorously interpreted; or it may be thought to have reference to a clause omitted. In this figurative language (which seems founded on Job xxxix. 40. οὐ δ' ἂν ὦσι τεθνήκτες παραχρῆμα εἰρᾶσκονται, scil. οἱ ἄετοί, from ver. 27. and was perhaps proverbial) there seems an allusion to the *certainty* as well as suddenness of the destruction. By the *eagles* are meant the *Romans*; and as eagles very rarely feed on dead carcases, so (the best Commentators are agreed) the bird here meant is the *Vultur percnopterus*, or *γυπαετός*, which was by the ancients referred to the eagle genus. By the *πνεῦμα* is meant the *Jewish nation*, as lying, like the fabled Prometheus, a miserable prey to the foes who were tearing out her vitals.

29. εὐθύως δὲ, &c.] On these and the following verses the opinions of Commentators are much divided. The ancients and early moderns understand the expressions, *literally*; and refer the whole to the awful events which shall precede the final catastrophe of our globe, and the day of judgment; especially as in the next Chap., and other parts of Scripture, the same signs are mentioned as ushering in the last great day. But the *connection* here (which is even *stronger* in the parallel places of Mark and Luke) and the assurance contained in them *all*, "this generation shall not pass away till all be fulfilled," has induced the most eminent modern Commentators to refer the passage to the *signs accompanying the destruction of Jerusalem and the Jewish nation*. They consider the language as highly figurative, understanding by the darkening of the sun, &c. the ruin of states and great personages. The appearance of the sign of the Son of man they take to denote the subversion of the Jewish state; and the gathering together of his elect they refer to the gathering of the Christian Church out of all nations. "In ancient Hieroglyphic writings (observes Bp. Warburton) the sun, moon, and stars were used to represent states and empires, kings, queens, and nobility; their eclipse or extinction denoted tem-

porary disasters, or entire overthrow. So, continues he, the Prophets in like manner call kings and empires by the names of the heavenly luminaries. Stars falling from the firmament are employed to denote the destruction of the nobility and other great men; insomuch that, in reality, the prophetic style seems to be a speaking hieroglyphic." See also Whitby and Doddr., who refer to Is. xiii. 10. li. 6. Ez. xxxii. 7. Dan. viii. 10. Esth. viii. 16. Jer. xv. 9. Joel xi. 31. iii. 15. Amos viii. 9. And many examples have been adduced of similar figurative language in the Classical writers. Yet as the expressions admit of explanation according to *each* of the above hypotheses; it may be safer to unite both interpretations; one as the *primary* the other as a *secondary* sense, or by way of allusion.

— οἱ ἀστέρεις πεσοῦνται ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐ.] This admits of two explanations, according to the two views just mentioned. If the *former* be adopted, it must be understood of the falling of the heavenly bodies from the apparent concave sphere in which they are fixed; of course producing "darkness which may be felt." According to the *latter*, it will denote, in conjunction with the foregoing phrases, those great *obscurations* of the light of the heavenly bodies which, Josephus tells us, took place during the siege of Jerusalem, and which, we learn from Humboldt, attend earthquakes. Similar expressions are cited from Herodot. vii. 37. Statius x. and other authors. Αἱ δυνάμεις τοῦ οὐρανοῦ is an expression frequent in the Sept. to denote the heavenly bodies. There is no vain repetition, but a strong emphasis intended by the expression of the same thing in other words; or there may be a *hysteron proteron* q. d. "they will be tossed to and fro, and will then fall." Σαλευσθῆαι is used properly of the tossing to and fro of ships at anchor. See Thucyd. i. 137. where see my note.

30. τὸ σημεῖον τοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθ.] Wolf, Rosenm., and Kuin. think that τὸ σημεῖον is put pleonastically, since it is omitted by Mark and Luke. But though it might be dispensed with, it adds something to the sense. Some supposed an allusion to the *sign from heaven* required. See supra xvi. 1. But it should rather seem that τὸ σημεῖον merely means the *visible appearance*: q. d. "then shall be seen the visible appearance of the Son of Man," i. e. then shall the Son of Man visibly appear agreeably to what the Jews understood from the prophecy in Dan. vii. 13.), and shall give manifest evidences of his power, by taking vengeance on the Jews. The *secondary* application is obvious.

By αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς is meant, as the best modern Commentators, and also Chrysost. are agreed, the inhabitants of Judæa; who would have cause enough to lament. See Luke xxiii. 28. There is a reference to Zech. xii. 12. And St. John in the Apoc. i. 7., certainly had in mind these words of our Lord. In ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν we have

MK. LU.

13. 21. τότε κόψονται πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ ὄψονται τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ μετὰ δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης πολλῆς. Καὶ ἀποστελεῖ τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ μετὰ σάλπιγγος 31 φωνῆς μεγάλης· καὶ ἐπισυναΐξουσιν τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων, ἀπ' ἄκρων οὐρανῶν ἕως ἄκρων αὐτῶν.
- 28 29 Ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς συκῆς μάθεται τὴν παραβολὴν· ὅταν ἦδη ὁ κλάδος 32 30 αὐτῆς γίνηται ἀπαλός, καὶ τὰ φύλλα ἐκφυῖ, γινώσκειτε ὅτι ἐγγὺς τὸ 29 31 θέρους. Οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς, ὅταν ἴδητε πάντα ταῦτα, γινώσκειτε ὅτι 30 32 ἐγγὺς ἐστὶν ἐπὶ θύρας. Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν· οὐ μὴ παρελθῆ ἡ γενεὰ 31 33 αὕτη, ἕως ἂν πάντα ταῦτα γένηται. Ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ παρελεύ- 35 σοῦνται, οἱ δὲ λόγοι μου οὐ μὴ παρελθῶσι. Περὶ δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας 36

splendid imagery, assimilated to the character of *Hebrew poetry*, to designate majesty of approach.

31. καὶ ἀποστελεῖ τοὺς ἀγγέλους, &c.] Here again there is much diversity of interpretation; which, however, might have been avoided, had the Commentators considered the *two-fold* application of the whole of this most interesting portion of Scripture; which even those, who elsewhere recognise it before, seem here to forget. The application of the words to the *final* advent of our Lord is too obvious to need pointing out. (Compare, in this view, the sublime description in I Cor. xv.) But neither ought the advent of our Lord to the *destruction of Jerusalem* to have been unperceived by any; for in that application the words have great propriety; τοὺς ἀγγέλους denoting (as the best Commentators admit) the preachers of the Gospel, announcing the message of salvation, and gathering those who should accept its offer from every quarter of the globe into one society under Christ, their common head. That God's prophets and ministers, both in the O. and the N. T., are often called his ἀγγελοὶ, is certain. The words μετὰ σάλπιγγος φωνῆς (where the construction, unperceived by many, is μετὰ μεγάλης φωνῆς σάλπιγγος) are supposed by most Commentators to have a reference to *preaching*, as compared to the sound of a trumpet, as Is. lviii. 1. Jer. vi. 17. Ez. xxxiii. 3—6. Rom. x. 13. But in both the above applications there seems a reference to the method of convoking solemn assemblies among the Jews and Gentiles, namely, by sound of trumpet. The words are therefore, *not*, as Kuin. imagines, introduced merely *ad ornatum*. In ἐπισυναΐξουσιν, the ἐπι (which has been misunderstood) has reference to the *place* (heaven), or the *society* into which the faithful followers of Christ are gathered. The words ἐκ τῶν τεσσ. ἀνέμων are a Hebrew form, denoting "from all quarters of the globe;" for the Jews not only took the *winds* to denote the *cardinal points* of the heavens; but employed them to mark the *regions* which lay in the direction of any of them. The words ἀπ' ἄκρων — αὐτῶν are also an Hebrew form, serving as an emphatic repetition of the same thing; where ἄκρων denotes those parts of the world where the earth and heaven (according to the vulgar notion) were supposed to border upon each other. [Comp. supra xiii. 41. I Cor. xv. 52. I Thess. iv. 16.]

32. ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς συκῆς — παραβολῆν.] This is a reply to the inquiry at ver. 3., respecting the *time* of this destruction; which, our Lord intimates, will be as plainly indicated by the signs before mentioned, as the approach of Summer is by the early

buds of the fig-tree. I have, with H. Steph., Matth., Fritz., and Lachm., edited ἐκφυῖ instead of the common reading. It is found in several ancient MSS., confirmed by the Syr. Ital. Vulg. and Ethiopic Versions. Fritz. indicates the origin of the error, and remarks, "Subjectum est τὰ φύλλα, ut ante ὁ κλάδος." As to the propriety, Matth. well observes, "Arbor dicitur φτεῖν et ἐκφτεῖν φύλλα, δένους. Homer II. a. 234. Sed τὰ φύλλα dicuntur etiam ἐκφτεῖσθαι, ἐκφυῖσθαι." Br. Middl. well observes, that the article at τὰ φ. shews that it is the Nomin. ἐφ., not the Accus.

— τὸ θερος,] i. e. rather *Spring* than Summer, by an imitation of the Hebrew; in which language there are no terms to denote Spring and Autumn; the former being included under ἡρῶν (the Summer), the latter under ἡρῆν (the Winter). The cause of this idiom is generally sought for in the temperature of the East; but as it occurs in the Western languages also, it is probably a vestige of the simplicity and poverty of the primitive speech. The phrase ἐγγὺς ἐπὶ θεραῖς is formed from two phrases blended together for emphasis, and therefore denotes the closest proximity. Comp. James v. 9. The nominative at ἐστὶ is to be supplied from the preceding context; and therefore can be no other than ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, οὐ ἡ παρουσία τοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

34. ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη.] Notwithstanding the dissent of some, the phrase can only mean "this very generation," "the race of men now living."

36. περὶ δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας, &c.] This verse is by many Commentators referred solely to the *final* advent of Christ, the day of judgment, but without sufficient reason; since there is here no closer allusion to the day of judgment than in the preceding verses; and as the verses following undoubtedly relate to the destruction of Jerusalem, so must this, at least primarily. Ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη is used of the destruction of Jerusalem in various passages. Τῆς is not found in many MSS. of both the Constant and Alexandrian families, and is cancelled by Matth., Griesb., Knapp, Tittm., Vater, and Scholz; but wrongly: for, as Br. Middleton observes, the article is required by ἐκείνης, which is understood from the preceding. It is also confirmed by Matt. xxv. 13. Mark xiii. 32. The Pesch. Syr. Version (though the Editors and Commentators fail to notice it, perhaps because the *Latin Version* does not shew it) renders so that the Translator must not only have had the article, but ἐκείνης repeated; for he uses the emphatic } the word corresponding to ὥρας, but

ἐκείνης καὶ τῆς ὥρας οὐδεὶς οἶδεν, — οὐδὲ οἱ ἄγγελοι τῶν οὐρανῶν — LU.
 17.
 37 εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ μου μόνος. Ὡσπερ δὲ αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ Νῶε, οὕτως 26
 38 ἔσται καὶ ἡ παρουσία τοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. Ὡσπερ γὰρ ἦσαν ἐν 27
 ταῖς ἡμεραῖς ταῖς πρὸ τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ τρώγοντες καὶ πίνοντες, γα-
 μῶντες καὶ ἐγκαμίζοντες, ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας εἰσῆλθε Νῶε εἰς τὴν κιβωτὸν,
 39 καὶ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν, ἕως ἧλθεν ὁ κατακλυσμὸς καὶ ἤρην ἅπαντας· οὕτως
 ἔσται καὶ ἡ παρουσία τοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.
 40 Τότε δύο ἔσονται ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ· ὁ εἷς παραλαμβάνεται, καὶ ὁ εἷς 35
 41 ἀφίεται. δύο ἀλλήθουσai ἐν τῷ μυλῶνι· μία παραλαμβάνεται, καὶ μία
 ἀφίεται.
 42 Γρηγορεῖτε οὖν, ὅτι οὐκ οἴδατε ποία ὥρα ὁ κύριος ὑμῶν ἔρχεται. 12.
 43 Ἐκεῖνο δὲ γινώσκετε, ὅτι εἰ ἴδῃει ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης ποίει φυλακῆ ὁ κλέ- 39
 πτης ἔρχεται, ἐγρηγόρησεν ἂν, καὶ οὐκ ἂν εἴασε διοργῆναι τὴν οἰκίαν
 44 αὐτοῦ. διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ὑμεῖς γίνεσθε ἔτοιμοι· ὅτι, ἢ ὥρα οὐ δοκεῖτε, 40
 45 ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔρχεται. Τίς ἄρα ἐστὶν ὁ πιστὸς δοῦλος καὶ 42

subjoins the demonstr. pronoun **οὗτος** in the fem-
 inine one, answering to the masc. **οὗτος** just be-
 fore adapted to the masc. noun. **ὁ** **οὗτος**. **Μου** is
 omitted in several MSS., and is cancelled by
 Griesb.; but rashly: since it is defended by vii.
 21. x. 32. seq. xi. 27. xii. 50. xv. 13. xvi. 17., and
 others adduced by Schulz. It seems to have been
 omitted for no better reason than *euphony*. It is
 indeed not found in the text of the Pesch. Syr.
 Version; but I suspect that **ὁ** was an error of the
 Scribes, for **μου**, which will express *my*, while the
ὁ, which usually terminates the word, is regularly
 cast off before a pronominal suffix. The *εἰ μὴ* is
 imperfect, and needs to be supplied, namely from
 Mark. That the Son should not know the pre-
 cise time of the destruction of Jerusalem, or of
 the end of the world, ought not to be drawn by
 the Unitarians to prove the mere humanity of
 Christ; for the expression has reference solely
 to his *human* nature; since, though as Son of God,
 he was omniscient, as Son of man he was
 not so.

37. Ὡσπερ δὲ, &c.] The sense is, “the same
 shall happen at the advent of Christ, as did in the
 time of Noah,” namely, the calamity shall be sud-
 den and unexpected. This general sentiment is
 unfolded in ver. 37 — 41. [Comp. Luke xvii. 26.
 seqq. 1 Pet. iii. 20.] (Kuin.)
 38. τρώγοντες — ἐγκαμίζοντες] There is no rea-
 son to put any strong emphasis on the words *τρώ-
 γοντες* and *πίνοντες*; still less to take *γαμ.*
ἐγκαμ. of unlawful lusts; and indeed the best
 Commentators are of opinion, that the words are
 meant to express no more than the *security* and
levity with which they pursued the usual employ-
 ments and amusements of life, when on the brink
 of destruction. Yet considering the solemn warn-
 ing subjoined to ver. 35, at Luke xxi. 34, it is *im-
 plied*, that the antediluvians were guilty of gross
 sensuality.
 39. οὐκ ἔγνωσαν] i. e. by a common Hebraism

in **וְגַ**, They did not attend or consider, did not
 make use of their knowledge. This sense is,
 however, sometimes found in the Classical writ-
 ters. Ἦρον, “swept away.” The Classical writ-
 ters say *αἶρειν ἐκ μέσου* may be rendered. Thus
αἶρειν answers to the Heb. **נָשַׁן** *negare*, in Job
 xxxii. 22. 1 Macc. v. 2.

40. τότε δύο ἔσονται, &c.] The scope of this
 and the following verse is not clear. Some take
 it to denote that the destruction will be as *gene-
 ral* as it will be unexpected; so that no two
 persons employed together shall escape. Others,
 with more reason, suppose it to mean that some
 of both sexes shall escape, while others shall per-
 ish; implying a providential distinction.

41. δύο ἀλλήθουσai.] The *μύλων* was a hand-mill
 with two stones turned by two persons, generally
 females. See my Note on Thucyd. ii. 78.

42. γρηγορεῖτε] Γρηγορεῖν has two senses: 1. to
 be wakeful; 2. to be watchful, as here.

Some of the best Commentators, ancient and
 modern, are agreed that our Lord’s discourse as
 far as regards the destruction of Jerusalem ter-
 minates at ver. 41., and that what follows, (which
 is peculiarly applicable to the *final* advent of our
 Lord) forms, as it were, the *moral* of the prophe-
 cy, and its practical application to his disciples
 of every age. Many of the above Commentators,
 too, think that it was spoken at another time, and
 upon another occasion, since Luke places it (xii.
 39.) in another connection. But as the portion in
 question is applicable in both connections, there
 is no reason why we should not suppose that
 our Lord employed so solemn a warning *twice*.

43. φυλακῆ] for *ᾠρα*, which is read in some
 MSS., but by gloss. The sense is, “at what par-
 ticular time.” The warning to vigilance is *point-
 ed* by the use of a familiar allusion quite adapted
 to the country, and the state of society in Judæa;
 and therefore also employed by St. Paul, St. Pe-
 ter, and St. John. [Comp. 1 Thess. v. 2. 2 Pet.
 iii. 10. Rev. iii. 3. and xvi. 15.]

44. διὰ τοῦτο] i. e. “because ye are in the same
 situation as the householder.”

45. τίς ἀρα ἴστιν.] The Commentators have been
 perplexed with *τίς*, which some take in the sense
qualis or *quantus*; but others regard as put hypo-
 thetically, for *εἰ τίς*, of which usage they adduce

LU.

12. φρόνιμος, ὃν κατέστησεν ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς θεραπείας αὐτοῦ, τοῦ
 43 διδόναι αὐτοῖς τὴν τροφὴν ἐν καιρῷ; Μακάριος ὁ δοῦλος ἐκεῖνος, ὃν 46
 44 ἐλθὼν ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ εὐρήσει ποιοῦντι οὕτως. Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι 47
 45 ἐπὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ὑπάρχουσιν αὐτοῦ καινωθήσεται αὐτόν. Ἐὰν δὲ εἴπῃ 48
 ὁ κακὸς δοῦλος ἐκεῖνος ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ· Χρονίζεῖ ὁ κύριός μου
 ἐλθεῖν· καὶ ἄρξῃται τύπτειν τοὺς συνδούλους αὐτοῦ, * ἐσθίῃ δὲ καὶ 49
 46 * πίνῃ μετὰ τῶν μεθύοντων· ἤξει ὁ κύριος τοῦ δούλου ἔκεινον ἐν 50
 ἡμέρῃ ἣ ἢ οὐ προσδοκᾷ, καὶ ἐν ὧρῃ ἣ οὐ γινώσκει· ἔτι καὶ διχοτομήσει 51
 αὐτόν, καὶ τὸ μέρος αὐτοῦ μετὰ τῶν ὑποκριτῶν θήσει. ἐκεῖ ἔσται
 ὁ κλανθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων.

z Supr. 8, 12.
 & 13, 42.
 infir. 25, 30.

XXV. Τότε ὁμοιωθήσεται ἡ βσιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν δέκα παρθέ- 1
 νοις, αἵτινες λαβοῦσαι τὰς λαμπάδας αὐτῶν, ἐξῆλθον εἰς ἀπάντησιν 2
 τοῦ νυμφίου. Πέντε δὲ ἦσαν ἐξ αὐτῶν φρόνιμοι, καὶ αἱ πέντε μωροί. 2

examples. Those, however, are not applicable, because (as Fritz. remarks, in nearly all of them the interrogation is suitable and applicable: and thus the Article will have no force. I agree with him in regarding this (like some of those in the examples adduced) as an interrogation conjoined with exclamation. The sense may be thus expressed: "Who then is that faithful and attentive servant (i. e. I should much wish to know him) whom, &c. This interpretation is confirmed by the authority of Chrys., who observes that the τίς is meant to express how rare and valuable such servants are. Τῆς θεραπείας, "household," for τῶν θεραπόντων; abstract for concrete; on which idiom see Matth. Gr. Gr. This idiom is almost confined to words signifying service. Ἐν καιρῷ, i. e. as appears from what is said by Casaub. and Le Clerc, monthly.

47. πᾶσι — καταστήσει αὐτόν] i. e. from being dispenser, or οἰκονομος, he will promote him to ἐπίτροπος, treasurer, or steward.

43. ὁ κακὸς ὁ ἐκεῖνος] It is not easy to see what ἐκεῖνος has to do here; the bad servant not having been yet mentioned: and there is plainly no regular opposition between the two. Fritz. has cancelled the word, as having been introduced from ver. 46. But it is almost impossible that it should have found its way into all the MSS.: and yet none countenance the omission. The word must therefore be retained, and explained as it may. And, unless it be a Hellenistic pleonasm, it may serve to strengthen the Article ὁ, which may be thought to require it: for, throughout this parable, the Article is subservient to the purpose of hypothesis. See Middlet. Gr. A. ch. iii. § 2. And as in such cases the Article was considered by the ancient Grammarians to be used indefinitely, so it might seem to need the assistance of ἐκεῖνος, to give it some definiteness.

49. αὐτοῦ] This word is inserted, from several of the best MSS., Versions and Fathers, by Griesb., Knapp, Tittm., Fritz., and Scholz. All the best Editors from Wets. to Scholz are agreed on the emendation ἐσθίῃ καὶ πίνῃ, for ἐσθίειν καὶ πίνειν; which has the strongest evidence of MSS., Versions, and Fathers, and is required by one of the most certain of critical canons.

51. διχοτομήσει αὐτόν] On the interpretation of διχοτ. there has been no little difference of opinion. See Recens. Synop. The versions, "will turn him away," or "will confiscate his goods," are alike unauthorized and frigid; nay, inconsis-

ent with the parallel passage of Luke. Most Commentators explain the word literally, of the ancient punishment of being sawn asunder. But as the sufferer seems, in the words following, represented as surviving the punishment, this cannot well be admitted. Heumann, Dodd., Rosenm., and Kuin. take διχ. in a figurative sense, to denote the infliction of a most severe flagellation; by a figure common to most languages ancient and modern. So Hist. Susanna, v. 55. σχίσει σε μέσον. & 39. πρίσει σε μέσον. When it is said τὸ μέρος αὐτοῦ μετὰ τῶν ὑποκριτῶν θήσει (by which is meant, "will place him in the same situation with hypocrites") we must understand, "when he survives his punishment;" which many would not. There is an allusion to the general treatment of delinquent slaves, whose miseries arc well expressed by κλανθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων.

After all, however, the objection, that the sufferer is afterwards mentioned as alive, may not be fatal to the literal interpretation of διχ.; for I agree with Fritz., that in the words following καὶ τὸ μέρος — θήσει, the similitude is blended with the thing signified. Yet it is not necessary to adopt that interpretation, since the other is equally well founded. Thus, however, is avoided the difficulty which otherwise embarrasses the word ὑποκριτῶν, which the Commentators vainly endeavour to remove by various devices in translation. The sense seems to be, "As he will miserably scourge him, and consign him to the woe-ful abode of incorrigible criminals; so will the Lord consign the wilfully disobedient disciple to the abode of hypocrites," i. e. (as the Jews universally acknowledged) to Hell. In the parallel passage of Luke there is not this blending; the τῶν ἀπίστων being applicable to the servant.

XXV. 1. τότε ὁμοιωθήσεται &c.] The scope of this parable (to which one very similar is adduced from a Rabbinical tract) and the various circumstances are fully illustrated in Recens. Synop. It is meant to intimate the necessity of continued vigilance, constant prayer, and perseverance in every good work; and is especially designed to discourage all trust in a late repentance.

— ἔκα.] Some certain number was likely to be used; and from this parable and a passage of a Rabbinical writer cited by Wets., we may infer that ten was a favourite number with the Jews.

2. φρόνιμοι] "prudent, cautious." Αἱ πέντε,

3 Αἴτινες μωροὶ, λαβοῦσαι τὰς λαμπάδας αὐτῶν, οὐκ ἔλιβον μεθ' ἑαυτῶν
 4 ἔλαιον· αἱ δὲ φρόνιμοι ἔλαβον ἔλαιον ἐν τοῖς ἀγγείοις αὐτῶν μετὰ τῶν
 5 λαμπάδων αὐτῶν. Χρονίζοντος δὲ τοῦ κυρίου, ἐνύσταζαν πᾶσαι, καὶ
 6 ἐκίθηνον. Μῆστις δὲ νυκτὸς κραυγὴ γέγονεν. Ἰδοὺ, ὁ κυριὸς ἔρχε-
 7 ται! ἔξέρχεσθε εἰς ἀπάντησιν αὐτοῦ! Τότε ἠγέρθησαν πᾶσαι αἱ
 8 παρθένοι ἐκίναι, καὶ ἐκόσμησαν τὰς λαμπάδας αὐτῶν. Αἱ δὲ μωροὶ
 9 ταῖς φρονίμοις εἶπον· Δότε ἡμῖν ἐκ τοῦ ἐλαίου ὑμῶν, ὅτι αἱ λαμπά-
 10 δες ἡμῶν σβέννυνται. Ἀπεκρίθησαν δὲ αἱ φρόνιμοι, λέγουσαι· Μή-
 11 ποτε οὐκ ἀρκέσῃ ἡμῖν καὶ ἡμῖν· πορεύεσθε [δέ] μᾶλλον πρὸς τοὺς
 12 πωλοῦντας, καὶ ἀγοράσατε ἑαυταῖς. ^a Ἀπερχομένων δὲ αὐτῶν ἀγοράσαι, ^a Luke 13. 25.
 ἦλθεν ὁ κυριὸς· καὶ αἱ ἔτοιμοι εἰσῆλθον μετ' αὐτοῦ εἰς τοὺς γά-
 11 μους· καὶ ἐκλείσθη ἡ θύρα. Ὑστερον δὲ ἔρχονται καὶ αἱ λοιπαὶ παρ-
 12 θένοι, λέγουσαι· Κύριε, κύριε, ἀνοιξον ἡμῖν. ^b Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς ^b Supr. 7. 23.
 13 εἶπεν· Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς. ^c Γρηγορεῖτε οὖν, ὅτι οὐκ οἶ- ^c Supr. 24. 42.
 14 ^d Ὡσπερ γὰρ ἄνθρωπος ἀποδημῶν ἐκάλεσε τοὺς ἰδίους δούλους, καὶ ^d Mark 13. 33, 35.
 15 παρίδωκεν αὐτοῖς τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῦ· καὶ ᾧ μὲν ἔδωκε πέντε τάλ- ^e Luke 21. 36.
 16 λαντα, ᾧ δὲ δύο, ᾧ δὲ ἓν· ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν δύναμιν· καὶ ἄπε- ^f 1 Cor. 16. 13.
 16 δῆμησεν εὐθέως. Πορευθεὶς δὲ ὁ τὰ πέντε τάλαντα λαβὼν, εἰργάσατο ^g 1 Pet. 5. 8.
^h Rev. 16. 15.
ⁱ d Luke 19. 12.

“the other five.” Such is the force of the Article.

3. αἴτινες μωροὶ] “such as were foolish.” The phraseology is *Hellenistic*, to which Fritz has without reason taken exception. Αὐτῶν. This is edited by Scholz, from many of the best MSS.

5. ἐνύσταζαν, καὶ ἐκίθηνον] “they nodded, and [then] fell asleep.”

7. ἐκόσμησαν] for κατεσκεύασαν, which is used in the Sept.; though the same Hebrew word כִּטְיָהּ is by the Sept. used both for κοσμεῖν and ἐπισκευάζειν. The sense is, “put them in order,” “made them fit for use.” I am not, however, aware that the word is elsewhere used with λαμπάδα, and therefore I suspect that it is one of the phrases of *common life*, not found in the Classical writers.

9. μήποτε οὐκ ἀρκέσῃ, &c.] Here there is plainly something to be supplied. Several Commentators, as Rosenm., and Kuin., would supply οὐτω, and take μήποτε in the sense *perhaps*. But the proof is weak, and the sense somewhat lame. It is better, with Erasm., Wolf, and Elsn., to suppose an ellipsis of σκοπεῖτε, or δεῦρε, or (what Fritz proposes), φοβοῦμεθα or δεδιήμεν. After all, the best founded ellipse may be that of the negative particle, or some negative phrase (as in Gen. xx. 11.), which is adopted in E. V. and preferred by Hoogev., and is also supported by Euthym. The negative, is, I conceive, omitted *verecundiae gratiā*; for the ancients attached some sort of *shame* to denying a request.

— πορεύεσθε — ἑαυταῖς.] This seems to have been a common mode of expression, used to those who asked what could not be spared; and, of course, forms an ornamental circumstance. It is amazing that this passage should have been adduced to support the Romish doctrine of *works of supererogation*; since the circumstance, whether regarded as essential, or ornamental, puts a negative on the doctrine. See Chrys. and Euthym. in Recens. Synop. The δὲ before μᾶλλον

is cancelled by Griesb. and Scholz, from several MSS.; but wrongly, since the current of authority runs the other way, and the *usus loquendi* of Scripture is adverse; for Fritz. truly says “ubique N. T. loca hujusmodi etiam dī habent, non μᾶλλον solum.” See x. 6, 23. Luke x. 20.

10. αἱ ἔτοιμοι] “those who were ready.” This absolute use of ἔτοιμος with *persons* is rare, with *things* not unfrequent.

12. οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς.] The best Commentators are agreed that the sense is, as supr. vii. 23., “I do not recognize you as among those who accompanied me and my spouse;” or, regarding it as a common form of repulsion, “I know nothing about you.”

13. ἐν ᾧ ὁ γῶς — ἔρχεται.] These words are omitted in several good MSS., most of the Versions, and some Fathers, and are cancelled by Griesb., Fritz., and Scholz. They have certainly the air of an addition to fill up the sense, perhaps from supr. xxiv. 42 & 44.

14. ὥσπερ γὰρ ἄνθρωπος, &c.] To this parable (which is not the same with the very similar one in Luke xix. 12.) the apodosis is wanting, i. e. “As that person did, so will the Son of Man do;” or rather there is an *anacoluthon*, arising from inattention to the construction. Ἀποδημῶν, “on taking his departure.” Or it may, with Fritz., be taken for ἀποδημεῖν θέλων.

15. κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν δύναμιν] “according to each one’s particular capacity, and ability to employ the money to advantage.” Thus it seems that masters sometimes (as is still the case in the East, and in Russia) committed to their slaves some capital, to be employed in traffic; for the improvement of which they were to be accountable to them.

16. εἰργάσατο ἐν αὐτοῖς] scil. χρήματα, which is almost always *expressed* in the Classical writers. This use of ἐν is *Hellenistic*. A Classical writer would have used ἐπί. In this use ἐργάσασθαι sig-

ἐν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἐποίησεν ἄλλα πέντε τάλαντα. Ἐοῦτως καὶ ὁ τὰ δύο 17
ἐκέδησε καὶ αὐτὸς ἄλλα δύο. Ὁ δὲ τὸ ἐν λαβὼν, ἀπελθὼν ὠρυξεν 18
ἐν τῇ γῆ, καὶ ἀπέκρυψε τὸ ἀργύριον τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ. Μετὰ δὲ 19
χρόνον πολὺν ἔρχεται ὁ κύριος τῶν δούλων ἐκείνων, καὶ συναίρει μετ'
αὐτῶν λόγον. Καὶ προσελθὼν ὁ τὰ πέντε τάλαντα λαβὼν προσήνεγκεν 20
ἄλλα πέντε τάλαντα, λέγων· Κύριε, πέντε τάλαντά μοι παρέδωκας·
ἴδε, ἄλλα πέντε τάλαντα ἐκέδησα ἐπ' αὐτοῖς. Ἐφη [δὲ] αὐτῷ 21
ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ· Ἐὖ, δοῦλε ἀγαθὲ καὶ πιστέ, ἐπὶ ὀλίγα ἦς πιστὸς,
ἐπὶ πολλῶν σε καταστήσω· εἰσελθε εἰς τὴν χαρὰν τοῦ κυρίου σου.
Προσελθὼν δὲ καὶ ὁ τὰ δύο τάλαντα λαβὼν εἶπε· Κύριε, δύο τάλαντά 22
μοι παρέδωκας· ἴδε, ἄλλα δύο τάλαντα ἐκέδησα ἐπ' αὐτοῖς.
Ἐφη αὐτῷ ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ· Ἐὖ, δοῦλε ἀγαθὲ καὶ πιστέ, ἐπὶ ὀλίγα 23
ἦς πιστὸς, ἐπὶ πολλῶν σε καταστήσω· εἰσελθε εἰς τὴν χαρὰν τοῦ
κυρίου σου. Προσελθὼν δὲ καὶ ὁ τὸ ἐν τάλαντον εἰληφώς εἶπε· 24
Κύριε, ἔγνω σε ὅτι σκληρὸς εἶ ἄνθρωπος, θεριζὼν ὅπου οὐκ ἔσπει-
ρας, καὶ συνάγων ὅθεν οὐ διεσκόρπισας· καὶ φοβηθεῖς, ἀπελθὼν 25
ἐκρυψα τὸ τάλαντόν σου ἐν τῇ γῆ· ἴδε, ἔχεις τὸ σόν. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ 26
ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Ἰοηρὲ δοῦλε καὶ ὀκνηρὲ, ἦδεις ὅτι
θεριζὼ ὅπου οὐκ ἔσπειρα, καὶ συνάγω ὅθεν οὐ διεσκόρπισα; Ἐδεῖ 27

nifies to invest capital, or to *make money*. Ἐποίησεν, "acquired by traffic;" a use chiefly found in the later Greek, the earlier writers employing *κερδήσασθαι*.

18. ὠρυξεν] scil. ὄρυγμα, which is implied. See Herodot. iv. 71.

21. ἔφη δὲ] The δὲ is omitted in many good MSS. and some Versions, and is cancelled by Griesb., Tittm., Fritz., and Scholz. Εἶ for εἶγε, which was used like our *bravo!* and therefore often employed at the public games by the multitude in the expression of applause. At ἐπὶ ὀλίγα, sub. κατασταθείς. The syntax with the *Accus.* (which is rare) occurs also at Heb. ii. 7.

—τὴν χαρὰν.] Some of the best Commentators are of opinion, that in order to keep the *story* apart from the *application*, we should here take *χαρὰ*, by a metonymy of the adjunct, in the sense *banquet*. It is scarcely necessary, however, to abandon the common interpretation, which, as Chrys. and Euthym. observe, denotes τὴν ἄπασαν μακαριότητα. The *Synchysis* in question is not unusual in the ancient writers.

24. ἔγνω σε ὅτι.] On this construction, which depends on *attraction*, see Winer's Gr. Gr. p. 186. —σκληρὸς,] hard-hearted, griping. The expressions following are formulas, probably in common use with agricultural persons, and expressive of the habits of such persons. Though some similar ones are found in the Classical writers, nor are they wanting in our own language. We may render, "reaping where thou hast not sown, and harvesting where thou hast not scattered (namely the seed)." Thus *διασκορπίζειν* signifies to *sow* in Is. xxvii. 29. (Aquila) where the Sept. has *σπείρειν*. So Schleus. and others explain *διασκορπ.* I would, however, prefer to take it of *turning* the corn, to prepare it for *carrying*, which is the meaning of *συνάγων*.

25. φοβηθεῖς] i. e. fearing lest, if I should lose the money, thou wouldst severely exact it of me,

by taking away all my substance. (Kuin.) This was evidently a mere excuse; but, as Euthym. observes, the parable puts a *weak* excuse into the mouth of the slothful servant, in order to show that in such a case *no reasonable* apology can be made.

—ἴδε, ἔχεις τὸ σόν.] Formula nihil ultra debere se profitentis. (Grot.) We have a similar one in English. So also xx. 14. ἤραον τὸ σόν.

26. *πονηρὲ καὶ ὀκνηρὲ*] Campb. has here an able note on the distinction between words nearly, but not quite, synonymous, as exemplified in *κακὸς, πονηρὸς, ἄνομος, ἄδικος*. "Though such words (says he) are sometimes used promiscuously, yet there is a difference. Thus *ἄδικος* properly signifies *unjust*; *ἄνομος*, lawless, criminal; *κακὸς*, vicious; *πονηρὸς*, malicious. Accordingly, *κακὸς* is opposed to *ἐνάρετος, ὁ δίκαιος; πονηρὸς*, to *ἀγαθός*. *Κακία*, is *vice*; *πονηρία*, malice or malignity. This is the use of the words in the Gospel. Thus the negligent, riotous, debauched servant in ch. xxiv. 48. is denominated *κακὸς δούλος*, a vicious servant. Here the bad servant is not debauched, but slothful, and, to defend his sloth, abusive. Thus in xx. 32. the inexorable master is called *πονηρὸς*. A malignant, that is, an envious, eye is *πονηρὸς*, not *κακὸς ὀφθαλμὸς*. The disposition of the Pharisees is termed *κακὸς*, and the devil is termed *ὁ πονηρὸς*, not *ὁ κακὸς*." See more in Tittm. de Syn. N. T.

—ἦδεις, &c.] This is said (as Euthym. and Grot. observe) by the figure *Synchoresis*: "Be it as you say, that I am, &c. then ought you to have taken the more care not to deprive me of what is really my own. Though it were *true*, as you say, that I reap where I sow not, and you durst not risk the money in merchandise; you ought to have put it out to the public money-changers to interest; some exertions should have been made." This, however, will not be necessary, if the words are taken *interrogatively*. I have, therefore, with Griesb. and Fritz., placed the mark of interrogation.

οὖν σε βαλεῖν τὸ ἀργύριόν μου τοῖς τραπεζίταις· καὶ ἔλθῶν ἐγὼ
 28 ἐκομισάμην ἂν τὸ ἐμὸν σὺν τόκῳ. Ἄρατε οὖν ἅπ' αὐτοῦ τὸ τάλαντον,
 29 καὶ δότε τῇ ἔχοντι τὰ δέκα τάλαντα. Ἐγὼ γὰρ ἔχοντι παντὶ δοθή-
 σεται, καὶ περισσευθήσεται· ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ μὴ ἔχοντος καὶ ὃ ἔχει
 30 ἀρθηθήσεται ἅπ' αὐτοῦ. Ἔτι καὶ τὸν ἀρχεῖον δοῦλον ἐκβάλλετε εἰς τὸ
 σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον. ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν
 ὀδόντων.
 31 Ὡς ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ, καὶ πάν-
 τες οἱ [ἄγιοι] ἄγγελοι μετ' αὐτοῦ· τότε καθίσει ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης
 32 αὐτοῦ, καὶ συναρθηθήσεται ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη· καὶ
 ἀφοριεῖ αὐτοὺς ἅπ' ἀλλήλων, ὡςπερ ὁ ποιμὴν ἀφοριεῖ τὰ πρόβατα
 33 ἀπὸ τῶν ἐρίφων· καὶ στήσει τὰ μὲν πρόβατα ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ, τὰ δὲ
 ἐρίφια ἐξ ἐναντίων.
 34 Τότε ἐρεῖ ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῖς ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ· Δεῦτε, οἱ εὐλογημένοι
 τοῦ πατρὸς μου, κληρονομήσατε τὴν ἡτοιμασμένην ὑμῖν βασιλείαν ἀπὸ

f Supr. 13. 12.
 Mark 4. 25.
 Luke 8. 18.
 & 19. 26.
 g Supr. 8. 12.
 & 13. 42. & 22.
 13.
 h Zach. 14. 5.
 supr. 16. 27.
 1 Thess. 4. 16.
 2 Thess. 1. 7.
 Jude ver. 14.
 Rev. 1. 7.
 i Rom. 14. 10.
 2 Cor. 5. 10.
 Ezech. 20. 38.
 & 34. 17. 20.

27. βαλεῖν] for διδοῖναι, as in Luke xix. 23., or the more Classical *θεῖσθαι*.

— τραπεζίταις.] These discharged not only the offices of our *bankers*, in receiving and giving out money, in taking or giving interest upon it; but also in exchanging coins, and distinguishing genuine from forged money.

— τόκῳ.] “interest;” for the word only imports what is *produced* by, as we say, turning money, which, indeed, was *originally* the sense of *usury*, i. e. the profit allowed to the lender for the use of borrowed money. But, indeed, if the *τόκῳ* were taken in the worst sense that was ever ascribed to *usury*, it would not imply Christ's *approbation*, since the whole (as has been before observed) is said *κατὰ συγχώρησιν*. Κομίζεσθαι signifies to *carry off*; and it is generally implied that the thing was before in our possession.

28. ἄρατε οὖν, &c.] These words (says Kuin.) merely serve as a *finish to the picture*.

29. τῷ γὰρ ἔχοντι, &c.] On this proverb see Matth. xiii. 12. and Note. We may here paraphrase with Kuin., “When any one does not properly use gifts bestowed, or benefits received, even *these* are taken from him. But to him who rightly employs them, *more* are given, as rewards of his good management.” On the *ἢ* in *τοῦ μὴ ἔχοντος* it may be observed, that this is used in preference to *οὐκ*, because a *supposition* is implied (see Herman. Vig. p. 805.); as is the case with participles taken generally, and corresponding to *quicumque*, or *quisquis*, as Matt. ix. 36. John v. 23. Rom. xiv. 3. 1 Cor. vii. 30.

30. ἀρχεῖον.] Literally, “good for nothing, bad.” This *meiosis* extends to many other words of similar signification, as *ἀχρηστος*, *ἀξίμφορος*, &c. See Rec. Syn.

— σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον.] Corresponding to the *Tartarus* of the Heathen Mythology. Of the same kind is the expression at 2 Pet. ii. 17. *ζόφος τοῦ σκότους*.

31. ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ, &c.] After pressing the warnings inculcated in the preceding parables, our Lord now proceeds to advert to the *great day of retribution* itself, in a description which (Doddr. observes) is “one of the noblest instances of the true sublime any where to be found.” It represents, 1. the *extent* of the judgment; 2. the *meth-*

ods with which it will be carried on; 3. the *place and circumstances*. The imagery is partly derived from the pompous mode of administering justice in the East (see Ps. ix. 5—9. Zach. xiv. 3. Is. vi. 1. lxvi. 1. Dan. vii. 9. 1 Thess. iv. 16.), and partly it is a pastoral metaphor (frequent in Scripture) adverting to the antient Eastern custom of keeping separate the sheep and the goats. And, besides the respective dispositions of the two animals, as sheep were more valuable than goats, they would, in an allegory wherein the Messiah and those whom he was to guide, are compared to a Shepherd and his sheep, fitly represent the former, the *accepted*, and the latter, the *rejected*.

— ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης αὐτοῦ] “upon his glorious throne.” The *ἄγιοι* before *ἄγγελοι* is omitted in several MSS., and is cancelled by Griesb. and Fritz., as having been introduced from the parallel place of Mark; but is retained by Wets., Matth., and Scholz. The point is doubtful, but the quarter from whence the omission comes is suspicious.

32. πάντα τὰ ἔθνη] i. e. both Jews and Gentiles, both quick and dead.

34. ὁ βασιλεὺς.] So called, the Commentators say, as then exercising the highest act of kingly power. And indeed the kingly and judicial authority were then closely united. But perhaps the term is merely used in accordance with the preceding Regal imagery.

— τοῦ πατρὸς.] Some supply *ὑπὸ*; but the Genit. may of itself note the efficient cause; not to say, with Fritz., that *οἱ εὐλογημένοι* is in some measure a *noun*.

— ἡτοιμασμένην βίην, &c.] Similar is the passage of Tobit vi. 17. *ἔτι σοὶ αὕτη ἡτοιμασμένη ἦν ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος*.

— ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου.] This has been thought to countenance the doctrines of *absolute decrees*. But the expression is merely a Hebraism; and it is clear from the context that the true meaning is, that the kingdom of heaven was *all along* prepared for those, who should approve themselves worthy of acceptance by the performance of those good works (a specimen of which is subjoined) which invariably spring from a true faith. The *κληρονομήσατε* shows the *certainty* of the thing, as *due* by the promise of God.

k Isa. 58. 7.
Ezech. 18. 7.
Eccl. 7. 39.
James 1. 27.

καταβολῆς κόσμου. ^k ἐπέινασα γὰρ, καὶ ἐδώκατέ μοι φαγεῖν· ἐδίψησα, 35
καὶ ἐποτίσατέ με· ξένος ἦμην, καὶ συνηγάγετέ με· γυμνός, καὶ 36
περιεβάλετέ με· ἥσθενῆσα, καὶ ἐπεσκέψασθέ με· ἐν φυλακῇ ἦμην,
καὶ ἦλθετε πρὸς με. Τότε ἀποκριθήσονται αὐτῷ οἱ δίκαιοι, λέγοντες· 37
Κύριε, πότε σὲ εἶδομεν πεινῶντα, καὶ ἐθρέψαμεν; ἢ διψῶντα, καὶ
ἐποτίσαμεν; πότε δὲ σε εἶδομεν ξένον, καὶ συνηγάγομεν; ἢ γυμνόν, 38
καὶ περιεβάλομεν; πότε δὲ σε εἶδομεν ἄσθενῆ, ἢ ἐν φυλακῇ, καὶ 39
ἦλθομεν πρὸς σε; ^l Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐρεῖ αὐτοῖς· Ἀμὴν 40
λέγω ὑμῖν· ἐφ' ὅσον ἐποιήσατε ἐνὶ τούτων τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου τῶν
ἐλαχίστων, ἐμοὶ ἐποιήσατε.

l Prov. 19. 17.
Heb. 6. 10.

m Supr. 7. 23.
Luke 13. 27.
Psalm 6. 8.

^m Τότε ἐρεῖ καὶ τοῖς ἐξ εὐνοῦμων· Πορεύεσθε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, οἱ κατ- 41
ηραμένοι, εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον τὸ ἠτοιμασμένον τῷ Διαβόλῳ καὶ τοῖς
ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ. Ἐπέινασα γὰρ, καὶ οὐκ ἐδώκατέ μοι φαγεῖν· ἐδί- 42
ψησα, καὶ οὐκ ἐποτίσατέ με· ξένος ἦμην, καὶ οὐ συνηγάγετέ με· 43
γυμνός, καὶ οὐ περιεβάλετέ με· ἄσθενής καὶ ἐν φυλακῇ, καὶ οὐκ ἐπε-
σκέψασθέ με. Τότε ἀποκριθήσονται [αὐτῷ] καὶ αὐτοὶ, λέγοντες· 44
Κύριε, πότε σὲ εἶδομεν πεινῶντι, ἢ διψῶντι, ἢ ξένον, ἢ γυμνόν, ἢ
ἄσθενῆ, ἢ ἐν φυλακῇ, καὶ οὐ διηκονήσαμεν σοι; Τότε ἀποκριθήσεται 45
αὐτοῖς, λέγων· Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν· ἐφ' ὅσον οὐκ ἐποιήσατε ἐνὶ τού-
των τῶν ἐλαχίστων, οὐδὲ ἐμοὶ ἐποιήσατε. ⁿ Καὶ ἀπελεύσονται οὗτοι 46
εἰς κόλασιν αἰώνιον· οἱ δὲ δίκαιοι εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

n John 5. 29.
Dan. 12. 2.

MK. LU.
14. 22.
1 1

XXVI. Καὶ ἐγένετο, ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς πάντας τοὺς λόγους 1
τούτους, εἶπε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ· Οἴδατε ὅτι μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας τὸ 2
πάσχα γίνεται· καὶ ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται εἰς τὸ σταν-

35. συνηγάγετε] scil. εἰς τὸν οἶκον. The complete phrase occurs in 2 Sam. ii. 27. and Judg. xix. 18. The difference between the Classical and Hellenistic use is this, that in the latter it is used of one only, in the former of more than one.

36. γυμνός.] The term here (like the corresponding one in most languages, ancient and modern) does not denote absolutely naked, but "with-out some of one's garments," or generally ill clothed.

— ἐπεσκέψασθε.] The word signifies 1st, to look at, survey; 2d, to look after, implying attendance, care, and relief. Thus it is used of both the attendance of a physician, and of a nurse or friend. ἤλθετε πρὸς με, like the Latin *adire*, implies solace and comfort.

38. πότε δὲ.] Raphaelus observes that the δὲ is not adversative, but copulative. It is not, however, simply such, but may be rendered moreover, or again.

40. ἐμοὶ ἐποιήσατε] "ye, as it were, did it unto me, as doing it by my order." Our Lord is pleased to regard what is done to his disciples, whether for good or evil, as done to himself. See Matt. x. 12. and Acts xiv. 4.

41. αἰώνιον.] Considering the opinions of the Jews, and indeed of the ancients in general, our Lord's hearers could not fail to understand this word in the usual sense everlasting, and not (as some ancient and modern Commentators contend) in that of a very long, but limited duration.

And this seems to me one of the strongest arguments against an interpretation which has no solid foundation. The inferences which have been drawn from the use of δεῦτε and πορεύεσθε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, and of ἠτοιμασμένον τῷ Διαβ. καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ, that hell was not originally designed for men, and that they are the authors of their own miseries, are quite unfounded; because δεῦτε could not have been used to the rejected, and among the οἱ ἀγγελοι τοῦ Διαβόλου may be included the incorrigibly bad of every age.

44. αὐτῷ.] This is not found in most of the best MSS. and Versions, and some Fathers; nor has it any place in the Ed. Princ. It was cancelled by Beng., Wets., Matth., and Scholz.

XXVI. 2. γίνεται.] Said to be for ἀγεται, "is to be celebrated," (a frequent sense of the present tense;) which, however, is not only a Hebraism, but (as Raphaelus shows) a Grecism also.

— πάσχα] the paschal feast. The word is derived from the Heb. פסח, a passing by, from פסח, to pass, pass by. And in the Sept. and the N. T. τὸ πάσχα signifies 1. the paschal lamb; 2. the paschal feast.

— καὶ ὁ Υἱός.] The καὶ presents some difficulty, which can only be removed by taking it in sensu chronico, for καὶ τότε. It is often used for ὅτε, which may admit of being resolved into καὶ τότε. That his death was near at hand, our Lord had repeatedly apprised his disciples; but he had not until now told them the exact time.

3 ρωθῆναι. Τότε συνήχθησαν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ 14.
 πρεσβύτεροι τοῦ λαοῦ εἰς τὴν αὐλὴν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως τοῦ λεγομένου 22.
 4 Καϊάφα· καὶ συνεβουλεύσαντο ἵνα τὸν Ἰησοῦν κρατήσωσι δόλῳ καὶ
 5 ἀποκτείνωσιν. Ἔλεγον δὲ· Μὴ ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ, ἵνα μὴ θόρυβος γένηται 2
 ἐν τῷ λαῷ.
 6 Τοῦ δὲ Ἰησοῦ γενομένου ἐν Βηθανίᾳ ἐν οἰκίᾳ Σίμωνος τοῦ λε- 3
 7 προῦ, προσῆλθεν αὐτῷ γυνὴ ἀλάβαστρον μύρου ἔχουσα βαρυτίμου, καὶ
 8 κατέχευεν ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ ἀνακτιμένου. Ἴδόντες δὲ οἱ μαθηταὶ 4
 9 αὐτοῦ, ἠγανάκτησαν, λέγοντες· Εἰς τί ἡ ἀπόλεια αὕτης; ἡδύνατο 5
 γὰρ τοῦτο [τὸ μύρον] πραθῆναι πολλοῦ, καὶ δοθῆναι τοῖς πτωχοῖς.
 10 Ἰννοῦς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Τί κόπους παρέχετε τῇ γυναικί; 6
 11 ἔργον γὰρ καλὸν εἰργάσατο εἰς ἐμέ. Πάντοτε γὰρ τοὺς πτωχοὺς ἔχετε 7
 12 μεθ' ἐπιτηδίων· ἐμὲ δὲ οὐ πάντοτε ἔχετε. Βαλοῦσα γὰρ αὕτη τὸ μύρον 8
 13 τοῦτο ἐπὶ τοῦ σώματός μου, πρὸς τὸ ἐνταφιάσαι με ἐποίησεν. Ἀμὴν 9

3. τότε] i. e. on the second day before the Passover. Οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς—λαοῦ. A periphrasis for τὸ συνέδριον, as that assembly is called in John x. 47, and whose office it was to sit in judgment on false prophets.

—αὐλῆν.] The word signifies, 1. an open enclosure; 2. an area, or court yard, such as was before the vestibule of a large house; 3. an interior court, such as is in the middle of Oriental houses; 4. by synecdoche, an edifice provided with such an αὐλή; and was a name given to the residences of kings or great persons, denoting mansion or palace.

4. δόλῳ.] The Commentators supply ἐν or σὺν. But no ellipsis is necessary, as the Dative form of itself will express the instrument or means.

5. μὴ ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ] scil. γενέσθω τοῦτο. By ἑορτῇ is meant, not the *feast-day*, but the whole paschal festival. The three great festivals, indeed, were periods when notorious malefactors were usually executed, for the sake of more public example. This, however, the Sanhedrim would have waived; but having so fair an offer from Judas, they embraced the opportunity.

6. Σίμωνος τοῦ λεπροῦ.] So called by surname, because he had been a leper, and had probably been cured by Christ. So Matthew was called the *Publican*, as having been such. [Comp. John xi. 2; xii. 3.]

7. προσῆλθεν αὐτῷ γυνή, &c.] There has been no little debate on the question, whether the transaction related here and in Mark xiv. 3—9, be the same with that recorded in John xii. 2, or a different one. The reader is therefore referred, on the latter hypothesis, to Lightfoot and Pilkington; on the former, to Doddr., Michaelis, Recens. Synop., Fritz., and especially Townsend Ch. Ar. i. 387, with whom I entirely agree. There is no great weight in the allegations of discrepancies between the two stories; while their points of agreement are so remarkable, that they cannot well be regarded as two different transactions; but have every appearance of being two statements by two different eye-witnesses of the same transaction. It cannot, indeed, be denied, that one or other of the two narratives must be inserted out of the strict chronological order; which, it should seem, there is greater reason to think is observed by John, than by Matthew and Mark.

—ἀλάβαστρον μύρου.] This simply denotes a

cruise of ointment, which (as we learn from the writers on Antiquities) was much of the form of our oil-flasks, with a long and narrow neck. The utensil was so called, because it had been first, and was always generally made of a sort of marble called *onyx*, from being of the color of a human nail; and also *alabaster*, not from the Arabic *Betstraton*, as some imagine, but I conceive, from the extreme smoothness, and consequently difficulty of handling articles made of it. Thus the utensil came to be called *ἀλάβαστρον*, which it is probable was originally an *adjective* with the ellipsis of *σκεῦος*. Afterwards, however, it came to be manufactured of any materials, as glass, metal, stone, and even wood. In the phrase *ἀλάβαστρον μύρου* (which is found in Herodot. iii. 20, and Athen. 268), there is the same ellipse of *πλῆρον*.

Mark and John call this *μύρον,nard*, which, as appears from Heyn. on Tibull. ii. 27, was rather an oil than an unguent, and therefore (especially as the term *κατέχευεν* just after demands this) we may suppose that such is the sense of *μύρο*, here.

—βαρυτίμου.] A word used by the later Greek writers, equivalent to *πολύτιμος*, which is used by John, or *πολυτελής*, used by Mark.

—κατέχευεν ἐπὶ τὴν κεφ.] The Classical construction is *κατέχ. κατὰ τινος, or κατέχ. τινος*. This was an usual mark of respect from hosts towards their guests, both among Jews and Gentiles.

8. ἀπόλεια.] Σὺ φθόρος ἀργουσίῳ in Theocr. Id. xv. 18, and ἀπώλυμι in Theophr. Ch. Eth. xv. and Plutarch i. 869. At εἰς τὴ sub. ἐστι, or γέγονε, which is expressed in Mark.

9. τὸ μύρον.] The words are wanting in several of the best MSS., besides several Versions and Fathers; and are cancelled by Griesb., Fritz, and Scholz. They seem to have come from the margin, where they were intended to supply a substantive to which τοῦτο might be referred, and were introduced from John xii. 5.

10. τί κόπους παρέχετε.] Παρέχειν is not unfrequently used with an Accus. of a noun, importing labour or exertion; but almost always in the singular, with the exception of *πράγμα*, which always has the plural.

11. πάντοτε γὰρ, &c.] “The good work which was to be done soon or never, was preferable to that of which the opportunities were continual.” [Comp. supra 18, 20, infra 23, 20. John xii. 8.]

12. πρὸς τὸ ἐντ. ἐποίησεν.] Ἐνταφιάζειν signifies

MK. LU.

14. 22. λέγω ὑμῖν ὅπου ἐν κηροχθῆ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦτο ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ, καληθήσεται καὶ ὁ ἐποίησεν αὐτὴ εἰς μνημόσυνον αὐτῆς.
- 10 3 Τότε πορευθεὶς εἰς τῶν δώδεκα, ὁ λεγόμενος Ἰούδας Ἰσκαριώτης, 14
4 πρὸς τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς, εἶπε· Τί θέλετέ μοι δοῦναι, καγὼ ὑμῖν παρα- 15
11 6 δώσω αὐτόν; οἱ δὲ ἔστησαν αὐτῷ τριάκοντα ἀργύρια· καὶ ἀπὸ 16
τότε ἐξήτει ἐγκαίριον ἵνα αὐτὸν παραδῷ.
- 12 7 Τῇ δὲ πρώτῃ τῶν ἁζύμων προσήλθον οἱ μαθηταὶ τῷ Ἰησοῦ, λέγον- 17
9

to make preparation for burying, by such observances (namely, washing, laying out, anointing, and embalming) as were used previously thereto. The best Commentators, from Grot. downward, are agreed that *παρὸς τὸ* has reference not to the intention of the woman, but rather of Providence. There may be, as some think, simply an ellipse of *ὡσπὶ*, (which is confirmed by the Syriac Version,) i. e. she has done it, *as if* for my burial. For (as Grot. remarks) it is not unfrequent in Hebrew for any one to be said to do a thing for this or that end; which, however, is not really intended by him; only his act is consequent upon it *aliunde*: as 1 Kings xvii. 13. Prov. xvii. 19. In either view, the words must be regarded as suggesting the nearness of his death; and (as Grot. says) justifying what had been done by an argument *a pari*: that, had she expended this on his dead body, they who used such ointments could not reasonably object to it; and had, therefore, no ground now to do so, as he was so near death and burial.

13. ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ.] This clause is by some, as Kuin. and Fritz., construed with the following word *καληθήσεται*; but it is usually, and more properly, taken with the preceding ὅπου, and is well rendered by Casaub. "in toto, inquam, mundo." So also the Syr. Version. By *εὐαγγ.* is meant religion. *Εἰς μνημόσυνον αὐτῆς*, "for her [honourable] remembrance," since *μνημόσυνον*, as well as its kindred terms, is almost always meant for praise.

14. τότε.] The sense may be "about that time;" for this particle is of very indefinite signification, and is used with considerable latitude. The particle, however, may have reference to ver. 3, and be resumptive, and the narration of the anointing parenthetical. The *τότε* does not at all events, denote (as Kuin. and others imagine) "when they had resolved to apprehend him," but rather "when they were yet unresolved whether to apprehend him then, or not."

15. ἔστησαν αὐτῷ.] On the interpretation of ἔστησαν Commentators are divided. Some ancient and many modern ones explain it "weighed out," i. e. paid; by a reference to the ancient custom of paying the precious metals by weight; which continued, or at least the mode of expression, even after the introduction of coined money. This signification of *ἔστηναι* is frequent in the Sept., and in the Classical writers from Homer downward. Others, however, induced by a seeming discrepancy from the accounts of Mark and Luke; the former of whom says *ἐπηγγείλαντο αὐτῷ ἀργύριον*; the latter *συνθέντο ἀργύριον δ.*, would take it to mean *promised* to give. But that would be exceedingly harsh; and the testimony of the ancient Versions will afford no confirmation, since they rather give the sense *appointed* than *promised*. Nor is the discrepancy in question so material as to need being got rid of in so violent a manner. For, without resorting to the arbitrary

supposition of Michaelis and Rosenm., that the money in question was only an *earnest* of more; the term used by Mark, (which means *engagéd* to give,) and that used by Luke, (which means *agreed*,) may either of them be said, in such a case, to imply immediate payment at the treasury. That the money was paid, we find from Matt. xxvii. 3—5.

17. τῇ δὲ πρώτῃ τῶν ἁζύμων.] We are here brought to the consideration of a question on which Commentators are much divided in opinion; namely, whether our Lord celebrated the Passover before his crucifixion, and if so, at what time? There are expressions in the Evangelists which seem, at first sight, contradictory. John appears to differ from the rest respecting the time that the Jews partook of the Passover; and supposes that they did not eat it on the same evening as our Saviour; yet all the Evangelists agree, that the night of the day in which he ate what was called the passover, was *Thursday*. He is also said to command his disciples to prepare the passover, and he tells them he had earnestly desired to eat this Passover with them. Yet we find that on the day after that on which he had thus celebrated it, the Jews would not go into the judgment hall, lest they should be defiled, but that they might eat the passover. Now the law required that all should eat it *on the same day*. The principal solutions which have been propounded of this puzzling question are as follows: 1. That our Lord did not eat the Passover at all. Of those who adopt this opinion some contend that it is only a *common* supper that is spoken of; others, that Jesus (like the Jews of the present day) celebrated only a *memorative*, not a *sacrificial* Passover. 2. That he *did* eat the Passover, and on the same day with the Jews. 3. That he ate it, but not on the same day with the Jews; *anticipating* it by one day. Of these solutions, the first, in both its forms, is alike inconsistent with the plain words of Scripture, *φάγειν τὸ πάσχα*, and *θεῖν τὸ πάσχα*. That our Lord did not eat the Passover, rests merely on conjecture; and the place, the preparation, and the careful observance of the Paschal feast, alike forbid the notion of a *common*, or of a *memorative* supper. As to the second solution, it is equally inadmissible, since, on that hypothesis (as Mr. Townsend says), "if our Lord ate it the same hour in which the Jews ate theirs, he certainly could not have died that day, as they ate the passover on Friday, about six o'clock in the evening. If he did not, he must have been crucified on *Saturday*, the Jewish sabbath, and could not have risen again on the first day of the week, as the Evangelists testify, but on Monday." The third solution (which has been adopted by Scaliger, Casaub., Capell., Grot., Borchart, Hamm., Cudw., Carpov, Kidder, Ernesti, Michaelis, Rosenm., Kuin., Bens., A. Clarke, Townsend, and many other eminent Commentators) has the strongest claims to be preferred;

	MK.	LU.
18	14.	22.
19	16	13
20	17	14
21	18	
22	19	23
23	20	

since it is most consistent with the language of the Evangelists, and best reconciles any seeming discrepancies. The Passover was to commence on the first full moon in the month Nisan; but, from the inartificial and imperfect mode of calculation by reckoning from the first appearance of the moon's phasis, a doubt might exist as to the day; and this doubt afforded ground, occasionally, for an observance of different days; which, it is said, the Rabbinical writings recognize. And as the Pharisees and Sadducees, and also the *Karwæi*, (on whom see Horne's Introd.) differed on so many other points, so it is likely that they should on the present. And this disagreement would, it is obvious, make a day's difference in the calculation; which difference would extend throughout the whole month; so that what would to one party be the 14th day, would to the other be the 13th. Of course, the error in this diversity of observance must rest, not with our Lord, but with the Pharisees who differed from the order which he adopted. They might defer, but our Lord would not anticipate the day ἐν ᾗ ἔδεε θύεσθαι τὸ πάσχα. Thus, while Christ celebrated this his last Passover, one day earlier than the Traditionarii, the ruling party among the Jews; yet he might be said equally to observe the ritual command of eating on the 14th of Nisan. See more in Rec. Syn. This is not a mere novel notion, but was adopted by Euthym., and probably Chrysostom.

Thus every real difficulty, as far as the subject admits of it, is solved.

18. τὸν δέινα.] This expression was used both by the Classical and Hellenistic writers (as we say Mr. Such-a-one, and the Spaniards *fullano*) in speaking of a person whose name one does not recollect, or think it worth while to mention, but who is well known to the person addressed. Many reasons have been imagined for Jesus's suppressing the name, which has been variously recorded by Ecclesiastical tradition. It was a person who, our Lord knew, would be ready to accommodate him with a room, and with whom he had, no doubt, previously arranged the matter.

— ὁ καιρὸς μου.] Schmid., Rosenm., Kuin., and some others, take καιρὸς; to denote the time of keeping the passover; and the μου, they think, refers to the different day on which Jesus, with the Karæi and others, kept it, from that of the Pharisees. But though this interpretation may seem countenanced by the words following, yet it presents so frigid a sense, that there is no reason to abandon the usual interpretation, by which καιρὸς; is explained the time of Christ's passion and death. So Ps. xxxi. 15, "my time is in thine hand." Thus the full sense will be, "The time for my departure is near; previous to which it is

necessary that I should celebrate the Passover, which I will do at thy house." This use of ποιῆν, like *facere* in Latin, is found also in the Classical writers.

19. ἠτοίμασαν τὸ πάσχα.] This is usually rendered, "they prepared the paschal lamb." But it rather seems to signify, "they made ready for the paschal meal;" with reference to such preliminaries as examining the lamb, slaying, skinning, and roasting it. On the ceremonies with which the Passover was celebrated, see an admirable summary (from Lightfoot) in Horne's Introd. iii. 310—312.

20. ἀνέκειτο.] Though the Passover was directed to be eaten standing, (Exod. xii. 11.) yet the Doctors had introduced the reclining posture, (which had been usual at meals from ancient times,) accounting it a symbolical action, typifying that rest and freedom to which, at the institution of the rite, they were tending, but had now attained.

22. μήτι ἐγὼ εἶμι] sub. ὁ παραδώσω σε, omitted through delicacy.

23. ὁ ἐμβάψας, &c.] The Commentators are not agreed whether this was meant to designate the betrayer; or whether it was only a prophetic application of a proverbial saying; indicating that one of his familiar companions would betray him, and not meant to be applied particularly, except by the person himself intended. The latter opinion is preferable. Indeed it is plain, from Mark xiv. 20., that Christ did not mean to particularly designate him, since he says εἰς τῶν δώδεκα ὁ ἐμβ., &c. See also Luke xii. 21. Theophyl. and Grot. are of opinion that Judas reclined near Christ; so that, though there were more dishes on the table, of which every one dipped his bread into the one nearest to him, yet he helped himself from the same dish. Thus would Jesus more easily (and without the others hearing) answer the interrogation of Judas by the words "thou hast said;" and thus John would more unobtrusively (on asking who the traitor should be) receive the sign from Jesus. The disciples (except John, see John xiii. 26.), it should seem, did not, until Judas's departure, understand who was meant. They only knew, at the time, that some one of the twelve, who had been helping himself from the same dish with Jesus, would betray him. It should seem, the question, Is it I? was asked by Judas immediately after he had received the sop from Jesus, and that the question asked by John, who it should be? was asked immediately after Jesus had made the public declaration, "One of the twelve, who has been dipping his hand in the same dish, and whose hand is on the same table with me, will betray me."

The custom of several taking food with the

MK. LU.

14. 22. τῷ τριβλίῳ τὴν χεῖρα, οὕτως με παραδώσει. Ὁ μὲν Γίος τοῦ ἀν- 24
 21 ²¹ 22 θρώπου ὑπάγει, καθὼς γέγραπται περὶ αὐτοῦ· οὐαὶ δὲ τῷ ἀνθρώ-
 πῳ ἐκείνῳ, δι' οὗ ὁ Γίος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοιαι· καλὸν ἦν
 αὐτῷ, εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ Ἰούδας 25
 ὁ παραδιδούς αὐτὸν, εἶπε· Μήτι ἐγὼ εἰμι, ῥαββί; λέγει αὐτῷ· Σὺ
 εἶπας.
 22 19 Ἐσθιόντων δὲ αὐτῶν, λαβὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὸν ἄρτον, καὶ * εὐχαριστήσας 26
 ἔκλασε, καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς, καὶ εἶπε· Λάβετε, φάγετε· τοῦτο

hand from the same dish, has ever been in use in the East.

Ὁ ἐμβάψας should be rendered "he who has dipped" (or rather dived): for we need not suppose, with Dr. Shaw, and some of the Commentators, that this was merely dipping the hand into liquid, like soup; but of diving the hand into a deep dish (like a soup-tureen) in order to transfer the *meat*, already torn up into pieces. So Major Taylor, cited by me in Rec. Syn. "The hearty way in which our friend *dived* his hand into a large dish, and transferred its contents to our plates, formed a contrast to the delicacy of European manners." See also an extract from Jackson's Morocco, in Rec. Syn. Hence it appears that ἐμβάψας is for ἐμβαλῶν, which occurs in a fragment of Anacreon, *χεῖρά τ' ἐν τηρόνῳ βαλεῖν*. This idiom is so rare, that no example, I believe, has ever been adduced by any Philologist; and I have myself only met with *one*, namely in Philostr. de Sophist. Vitis, xxi. 3., where, speaking of a party of harvest-men sitting at dinner under an oak-tree, and suddenly killed by lightning, he says, *οἱ θειασταί, ἐφ' οὐπερ ἕκαστος εἴτιχε πράττων, οὕτως ἀπέθανεν* (I conjecture ἀπέθανον). Ὁ μὲν γὰρ κέλικα ἀναϊροήμενος (render, not *sustinens*, but *in manus sustens*: so Hesiod. Theog. 553. *χερσὶν δ' ἀμφοτέρησιν ἀνέλετο λευκὸν ἀλειφαρ*), δὲ δὲ πίνων, δὲ δὲ βάπτων (I conjecture δὲ δ' ἐπιβ.), δὲ δ' ἐσθιόντων, δὲ δὲ τοῖσιν (I conj. δὲ δ' ὅ, τι π.), τὰς ψυχὰς ἀφῆκαν.

24. ἔπάγει] "is going." The present tense is used to denote the nearness of the things predicted. There is, too, an euphemism, "is going (unto death)," such as is common to most languages, in words denoting to *depart*; and of which the Commentators adduce examples both from the Sept. and the Classical writers. In the Anthol. Gr. vii. 169., we have the complete phrase *εἰς αἴθνην ὑπάγει*.

— καθὼς γέγραπται π. α.] Namely, in the Ps. xiii. 1—3. Is. liii. 8. Dan. ix. 26. Zach. xii. 10. & xiii. 7. Καλὸν—ἐγεννήθη is a form of expression employed by the antients to express a condition the most miserable; of which examples are adduced by Lightf., Schoettg., Wets., and Kypke. The most apposite is Schemoth R. § 40. p. 135. "He that knoweth the Law, and doeth it not, it were better for him that he had not come into the world."

25. σὺ εἶπας.] A form of full assent, and serious affirmation, found not only in Hebrew, but sometimes in Greek and Latin.

26. ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν.] Some of the best Commentators render, "when they had eaten;" which sense seems to be required by I Cor. xi. 25. *μετὰ τὸ δεῖνασαι*. But ἐσθιόντων scarcely admits of that sense; and the seeming discrepancy may be removed by a mutual accommodation, rendering the former expression "while they were [yet] eating,"

(i. e., as Rosenm. translates, towards the end of the supper) and the latter, "as they had just finished the paschal feast."

— τὸν ἄρτον.] Bp. Middleton, on the authority of some MSS., would cancel the *τὸν*: an alteration which he thinks called for by the absence of the *τὸν* in the parallel passages of Mark and Luke. But it is more probable that the *τὸν* was cancelled by those who wished to conform the text of Matthew to that of the other Evangelists; which, however, is not necessary; since, though the sense *with* the Article is more definite (i. e. *the* loaf, or rather cake, thin and hard, and fitter to be broken than cut), yet it would be intelligible without it. That *two* cakes of unleavened bread were provided for the Passover, all the accounts testify; though as only *one* was broken by our Lord, it is no wonder that in the new ordinance founded on the Jewish rite, only *one* (and that large or small in proportion to the probable number of communicants) should be provided.

— εὐχαριστήσας.] It is not easy to imagine stronger authority of MSS., Versions, Fathers, and early Editions, than that which exists for this reading (instead of the common one εὐλογῆσας), which has been with reason adopted by Wets., Matth., and Scholz. Nevertheless, the common one is retained and defended by Griesb. and Fritz.; whose reasons, however, seem light, when weighed against such predominant external evidence. From the term εὐχαριστήσας, the rite afterwards took its name; especially as the service was a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving. Indeed it was customary among the Jews never to take food or drink without returning thanks to God the giver, in prayer, by which it became sanctified.

— ἔκλασε.] Namely, as a type of the breaking of the body of our Redeemer on the cross.

— ἐστίν.] All the best Commentators are agreed that the sense of ἐστίν is, *represents*, or *signifies*; an idiom common in the Hebrew, which wanting a more distinctive term, made use of the verb substantive; a simple form of speech, yet subsisting in the common language of most nations. See Gen. xl. 12. xli. 26. Dan. vii. 23. viii. 21. 1 Cor. x. 4. Gal. iv. 24. Thus the Jews answered their children, who asked respecting the Passover, what is this? This is the body of the lamb which our fathers ate in Egypt. See Bp. Marsh's Lectures, p. 332—335. Wets. truly observes, that "while Christ was distributing the bread and wine, the thought could not but arise in the minds of the disciples, What can this mean, and what does it denote? They did not inquire, whether the bread which they saw were *really* bread, or whether another body lay unconspicuously hid in the interstices of the bread, but *what* this action signified? of what it was a *representation* or memorial?"

	MK.	LU.
27	14.	22.
28	23	20
	24	
29	25	18

27 ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμά μου. Καὶ λαβὼν τὸ ποτήριον, καὶ εὐχαριστήσας, ἔδωκεν
 28 αὐτοῖς λέγων· Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες· τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστὶ τὸ αἷμά μου,
 τὸ τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης, τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον εἰς ἄφρασιν ἁμαρ-
 29 τῶν. Λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ πῖω ἄπ' ἄρτι ἐκ τούτου τοῦ γεννή-
 ματος τῆς ἀμπέλου, ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης, ὅταν αὐτὸ πίνω μεθ'
 ὑμῶν καινὸν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς μου.

27. τὸ ποτήριον.] Some few MSS. have not the τὸ. But the evidence, both external and internal, for the Article is so strong, that it must be retained. See Bp. Middlet. Hence it should seem that *one* cup only was used; for (as observes Middlet.) "though four cups of wine were to be emptied at different times during the ceremony, a single cup four times filled was all that the occasion required." Which of the four is here meant, Commentators are not agreed. It is generally supposed to have been the *third*, or the *cup of blessing*; which was regarded as the most important of the four. That the wine was mixed with water, all are agreed; and this custom the Romanists still scrupulously retain; though they boldly violate the next injunction, *πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πᾶντες*, by confining the cup to the Clergy (as if the words were meant for the *Apostles* only), notwithstanding that this view is utterly forbidden by the reason subjoined *why* all are to drink of it; and in spite of the strong authority of Antiquity, in the practice of the Church up to a comparatively recent period.

28. τοῦτο γὰρ — διαθήκης] "For this is my blood, by which the new covenant is ratified." So Luke: τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματι μου, "By the administration of this cup I institute a new Religion, to be ratified by my blood." In the *federal* sacrifices of the ancients it was (as Grot. and Hamm. show) usual to receive the blood in a vessel; which was *itself drunk* by the more barbarous nations; but by the more civilized *wine* was substituted for it; to which the *colour* (the wine of the East being red) would contribute; and indeed wine is by poets called the *blood* of the grape. Hence our Lord is by some thought to have had a reference to this.

— ἐκχυνόμενον εἰς ἄφ. ἁμ.] Here (as Grot. remarks) there is a transition from the idea of *federal* to that of *piacular* sacrifices; in which the *victim* was offered up in the place of the *man*, who had deserved death. Ἐκχυν. is, as Grot. remarks, Present for Proximate future, "now being (i. e. to be) shed." Of this examples are frequent. Περὶ is here put for ἐπέσθ, as in Matt. ix. 36; and the πολλῶν is equivalent to πάντων, as Matt. xv. 23. See the Note there. Comp. Rom. v. 15. Διαθήκης is to be rendered, not *testament*, but *covenant*.

29. οὐ μὴ πῖω — πατρὸς μου.] On the sense of these words there is much diversity of opinion, chiefly occasioned by the various senses assigned to ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς μου, which some think equivalent to ἐν οὐρανῷ, the Gospel dispensation; while others refer the words to Christ's mediatorial kingdom; and others, again, his *Millenian* reign. But for the last-mentioned interpretation, there is as little reason or evidence as can well be imagined; and as to the one before (which supposes that our Lord merely intended to announce the abrogation of the Jewish Passover, and the substitution of the Christian Lord's Supper in its place) it is based on a sandy foundation;

for it does not appear that our Lord here had any reference to the discontinuance of the Passover. The truth, I think, may be found in one or other of the first-mentioned interpretations, of which the former (adopted by many recent Expositors), bears a considerable semblance of truth, being very suitable to the context, and supported by the parallel passage of Luke, where the expression is ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ, which often denotes the Gospel dispensation. Thus καινὸν will be put adverbially for ἐν καινῷ τρόπῳ, "in a new manner," i. e. a spiritual one, namely at the virtual presence of Christ, at the celebration of the Sacrament. Yet specious as this may appear, there is something unsound in principle; for it is *pressing* too much on the καινόν. Besides, when, we may ask, was it fulfilled? At the commencement of Christ's kingdom after his resurrection, when he ate and drank with his disciples, say the above Commentators, who adduce Luke xxiv. 30, 45. John xxi. 13. Acts i. 4. x. 41. But we do not learn that he drank at all, much less that he drank wine. He merely ate a little of some fish and honey-comb, which his disciples set before him (and that merely to convince them that he was really risen from the dead, and no phantom), and then probably presented the rest to his disciples. And so, indeed, several MSS. and Versions (including the two later Syr. and Vulg.) say in words. It appears, therefore, that this interpretation is untenable; and the *fourth* is alone such as can be safely adopted, by which βασι. τοῦ πατρὸς μου is taken for ἐν τῇ βασ. τῶν οὐρανῶν supra viii. 11. Luke xiii. 29. The general sense couched under this strong metaphor is, that his departure from them was nigh at hand, and would prevent his again participating in any future solemnity of the kind, unto the end of the world. The καινόν has a reference to the *spiritual* nature of that kingdom emphatically termed "the kingdom of my Father," even the *new* Jerusalem, that "city not made with hands," "eternal in the heavens." The expression γεννήματος τοῦ ἀμπέλου is a periphrasis for *wine*, occurring not only in the Sept., but (at least with a slight change) in the Classical writers; e. gr. Pind. Nem. ix. 23. ἀμπέλου παῖς. Anacr. Od. I. 7. γένος ἀμπέλου. Instead of γεννήματος, many MSS. have ἐπιγενήματος, which is edited by Matthæi, on the ground of greater propriety, and the general usage of the Scriptural writers; where γέννημα is used of men and animals; ἐπιγένημα, of the fruits of the earth. He acknowledges, however, that there is, even in the Classical writers, some diversity of reading. I have not ventured to follow the learned Editor here, because I feel doubtful whether a minute propriety like this would be observed, or be even known to those, (like the Evangelists,) writing in a foreign language. Besides, the general character of the MSS. which have ἐπιγεν. is such as rather to strengthen a suspicion that it arose, like thousands of other readings of the same MSS., ex emendatione.

MK. LU.

14. 22. Καὶ ὑμνήσαντες, ἐξῆλθον εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν. Τότε λέγει 30
 26 39 αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Πάντες ὑμεῖς σκανδαλισθήσεσθε ἐν ἔμοι ἐν τῇ 31
 27 ταύτῃ. γέγραπται γάρ· Πατάξω τὸν ποιμένα, καὶ δια-
 28 σκορπισθήσεται τὰ πρόβατα τῆς ποιμνῆς. Μετὰ δὲ τὸ 32
 29 ἐγερθῆναί με, προάξω ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ 33
 30 Πέτρος εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Εἰ [καὶ] πάντες σκανδαλισθήσονται ἐν σοί, ἐγὼ
 οὐδέποτε σκανδαλισθήσομαι. Ἔφη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, 34
 οἱ ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ, πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι, τοὺς ἀπαρτίσῃ με.

30. ὑμνήσαντες] "having sung a hymn;" i. e. either, as some think, one adapted to the rite which Christ had just instituted (so the Christian hymn mentioned at Acts iv. 24) or, as most Commentators suppose, the usual Paschal hymn called κατ' ἔξοχὴν, the *Hallel*, which comprised the 113th and four following Psalms. Whether it was sung, or recited, has been doubted; but from the Rabbinical researches of Buxtorf and Lightf., the former is the more probable.

31. σκανδαλισθήσεσθε] i. e. (as Euthym. explains) σαλευθήσεσθε τὴν εἰς ἐμὲ πίστιν, ἠγοῦν φεῖξεσθε, ye shall fall away from, forsake me.

— πατάξω — ποιμνῆς] From Zach. xiii. 7., though with a slight, but very unimportant, variation from the Heb. and Sept. It is indeed there said of an evil shepherd; but, as Whitty remarks, our Lord applies the passage to himself rather as an argument à fortiori than a prediction. Most recent Commentators (from Grot.) think that this is a proverbial expression, of which they adduce examples. But those will only show that there was a similar proverbial expression, not that *this* is such; which is inconsistent with the ὡς γέγραπται, by which is indicated a quotation from the O. T. The true reading in the Sept. is, no doubt, παράξω (found in many of the best MSS.) But as the terminations ω and ον are very similar (especially in MSS.), so probably πατάξω was a frequent, perhaps the common, reading in the time of Christ. This is much better than supposing, with Owen and Randolph, that the *Hebrew* is corrupted; for, although the first person is not inapplicable in the *Evangelist*, yet it is quite unsuitable in the *Prophet*.

32. προάξω ὑμᾶς] Here there is a continuation of the pastoral metaphor of the preceding verse; and the force of the figure is clear by bearing in mind the Oriental custom, of the shepherd not following, but leading the sheep; which is alluded to in John x. 4. Rosenm. and Kuin. think that the sense of προάξω must not be pressed on, since all that is meant is, "I will see you again in Galilee, expect me in Galilee." There is, however, something lax and precarious in this sort of interpretation; and I prefer supposing, that the sense (which is, as in other predictions of our Lord at this period, briefly and obscurely worded) is as expressed by the following paraphrase (founded on Fritz.) "On returning to life, I shall precede you into Galilee;" i. e. I shall first be present in Galilee, where, if you follow me, you will recover your shepherd and leader.

33. εἰ καὶ πάντες] The καὶ is absent from most of the best MSS. and some Versions, and was rejected by Mill and Beng., and cancelled by Wets., Matth., Griesb., Tittm., and Scholz; but restored by Fritz.; whose reasons, however, are more specious than solid. After all, there is more reason to suppose it was introduced from

Mark, in a great part of the MSS., than that it should have been accidentally omitted in so many as form the remainder. For no one would ever designedly omit it, since no Critic would be ignorant of the sense, even. Whereas some might think that they should strengthen the sense by inserting the καὶ, which at all events might make others prefer εἰ καὶ to the καὶ εἰ of Mark; which, however, is more agreeable to propriety. So Hom. II. v. 316. καὶ εἰ μάλα καρτερὸς ἔστιν. Indeed καὶ is occasionally, from various causes, foisted in by scribes or sciolists; inasmuch that I should probably have done right in more decidedly rejecting the καὶ in Thucyd. iii. 27. 3. καὶ εἰ τι ἰβελαστήκει.

34. πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι] The Schol. on Theocrit. says that φωνεῖν is properly used of the voice of birds. Yet it is perhaps never used, in any Classical writer, of cocks; but ᾄδειν, κεκραγῆναι, φθέγγεσθαι. As the Rabbinical writers have told us that cocks were forbidden to be kept in Jerusalem, because of the "holy things," it has been objected that Peter could not hear one crow. But (without cutting the knot by resorting to any unusual sense of ἀλέκτωρ, or disallowing the testimony of the Talmud) we may, with Reland, maintain that the cock might crow outside of the city; and yet, in the stillness of night, be heard by Peter from the house of Caiaphas, which was situated near the city-wall. But perhaps the best mode of removing the difficulty would be to render, "before cock crowing." So Aristoph. Eccl. 391. ὅτε τὸ δεύτερον Ὁ' ἀλεκτροῦν ἰφθέγγετο. Whether cocks were kept, or not, in Jerusalem, they, no doubt, were in the vicinity: and this phrase, like the correspondent one in Latin, depends upon general custom. [Comp. John xiii. 33.]

It has been thought a contradiction, that Mark xiv. 30. says, πρὶν ἢ δὲ εἰς φωνῆσαι. But there will be none, if it be considered that the heathens reckoned two cock crowings; of which the second (about day-break) was the more remarkable, and was that called κατ' ἔξοχὴν the cock-crowing. Thus the sense is, "before that time of night, or early morn, which is called the cock-crowing, (namely, the second time which bears that name) thou shalt deny me thrice." Mark relates the thing more circumstantially; but there is no real discrepancy between the two accounts. In Mark the expression καὶ ἀλέκτωρ ἰφθόνει may be rendered, "and it was cock-crowing-time;" in Luke and John the expression οὐ μὴ ἀλέκτωρ φωνῆσει, "it shall not be cock-crowing time." G. Wakefield here well remarks on the climax in this verse, and the emphatical nature of the expressions. Our Lord assures his presumptuous disciple, that he will not only fall off, and forsake his Master, but will deny having any knowledge of him; and that not once only, but thrice; and on that very night."

	MK.	LU.
35	λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Πέτρος· Κἂν δέη με σὺν σοὶ ἀποθανεῖν, οὐ μὴ σε	14. 22.
	ἀπαρνήσομαι. ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ πάντες οἱ μαθηταὶ εἶπον.	31
36	Τότε ἔρχεται μετ' αὐτῶν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς χωρίον λεγόμενον Γεθσημανῆ,	32
	καὶ λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς· Καθίσαιτε αὐτοῦ, ἕως οὗ ἀπελθῶν προσεύ-	
37	ξωμαι ἐκεῖ. Καὶ παραλαβὼν τὸν Πέτρον καὶ τοὺς δύο υἱοὺς Ζεβεδαιου,	33
38	ῥῆζατοῦ ἠλυεῖσθαι καὶ ἀδμημονεῖν. Τότε λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Περι-	34
	λυτός ἐστιν ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἕως θανάτου· μείνατε ὧδε, καὶ γρηγορεῖτε	
39	μετ' ἐμοῦ. Καὶ † προελθῶν μικρὸν, ἔπευσεν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ,	35 41
	προσευχόμενος καὶ λέγων· Πάτερ μου, εἰ δυνατὸν ἐστί, παρελθέτω	36 42

35. κἂν δέη με σ. σ. ἀποθανεῖν] A strong form of expression, of such frequent occurrence in the Classical writers, that it may be regarded as almost proverbial. On the use of *οὐ μὴ* with the Fut. Indic., see Winer's Gr. Gr. p. 160.

— ὁμοίως δέ.] The *δέ*, which is not found in the textus receptus, is supported by most of the best MSS. and some Versions, Fathers, and early Editions; and it has been restored by Wets., Matth., Griesb., Tittm., Fritz., and Scholz. It is, indeed, required by the *proprietas linguæ*.

36. Γεθσημανῆ.] Heb. גֶּתְשֶׁמָנִי, "place of oil presses." It was situated at the foot of the Mount of Olives. This is improperly, by some Commentators, supposed to have been the *village* in which the produce of the Mount of Olives was prepared for use; for the term *χωρίον* can only mean a *field* or *close*; as, indeed, is plain from the very *ratio significationis* of the word, which is from *χωρίω* cognate with *χωρίζω*, to set apart, take in, or enclose; whence *χωρίς*, *apart*. They were, I imagine, deceived by this *χωρίον* having a name assigned to it. Yet that *fields* had names, we find from 2 Kings xviii. 17. "the fuller's field." 2 Sam. ii. 16. "the field of strong men;" and Acts i. 19. "Aeldama, the field of blood;" and, what is still more to the purpose, Ps. xlix. 11. "call the lands after their own names;" and finally, what is most to the purpose, Thucyd. i. 103. *μάχη ἐν Οἰνοφύτοις*, where the Editors fell into the same error of thinking it to be a *town*. The word *χωρίον* is used in the same sense also at Thucyd. i. 106. and Pausan. i. 29. 2. In fact, we find by Maundrell, that the very close in question *Γεθσημ.* still remains; and the Missionary Herald for 1824, p. 66., attests that there are still several ancient olive-trees in the place.

37. παραλαβὼν τὸν Πέτρον — Ζεβ.] The same whom he had taken as witnesses of his transfiguration. In *ἠλυεῖσθαι καὶ ἀδμημονεῖν* there is a sort of climax; for the latter is a much stronger term than the former, and signifies to be so overwhelmed, as to become insensible. [Comp. sup. iv. 21. John xii. 27.]

38. ὁ Ἰησοῦς.] This is introduced by Wets., Griesb., Matth., Fritz., and Scholz, from the best MSS., Versions, and Fathers. *Περὶλυτός εἰμι*; which is accounted a Hebraism: but it is found in most languages. In *περὶλυτός*, the *περι* is *intensive*, as in the words *περιχαρής*, *περίφοβος*, *περιδής*, and *περιαλγής*. It is well observed by the great Valckn. "Postremum illud *περὶλυτός* apte adhibuerunt Evangelistæ, de Jesu, in horto Gethsemanis, quando, sub forma hominis, DEUM tegens, et peccatorum humanorum ponderè pressus ræne opprimeretur." "Ἔως θανάτου is a not unfrequent addition to the phrase. So

Jonas iv. 9. *λελύθημαι ἕως θανάτου*. See also Ps. cxiv. 3. As to the *nature* of this *agony* of our Lord in the garden of Gethsemane, much has been written, but nothing certainly determined. To so awfully mysterious a subject we cannot approach too reverently. That this *cup* was not simply *death*, (which some of the ancient interpreters understood) we may be very certain. That the agony was occasioned (as some suppose) through the *divine wrath*, by our Redeemer thus bearing the sins of the world, is liable to many objections; as is also the opinion, that our Lord had then a severe spiritual conflict with the great enemy of mankind. The deadly horror was, no doubt, produced by a variety of causes arising from his peculiar situation and circumstances, and which it were presumptuous too minutely to scan. At the same time, however, we may rest assured that our Lord's agony was, in some mysterious way, connected with the offering of himself as a sacrifice for the sins of the world, and the procuring the redemption of mankind.

39. προελθῶν] Many of the best MSS. have *προελθῶν*, which is received into the text by Matth. and Scholz, and strenuously defended by them; but on precarious grounds. The common reading has been justly restored by Griesb. and Fritz.; for it is in vain to urge MS. authority in words perpetually confounded, and none are more so than *προ* and *προς* in composition. But even were that waived, and MSS. were in favour of *προς*, yet the testimony of Versions and Fathers, *all* of them on the side of *προ*, would here turn the scale in favour of the common reading. Besides, *προς* is capable of no tolerable sense, except by a most harsh ellipsis.

— εἰ δυνατὸν ἐ.] "We are here (says Grot.) to distinguish between what is impossible *per se*, and what is impossible *hoc vel illo pacto*. Now *per se* nothing is impossible with God, except such things as are in themselves inconsistent, or else are repugnant to the Divine nature. The sense, therefore, is, 'if it be consistent with the counsels and methods of thy Providence for the salvation of men.'" Thus the words are perfectly reconcilable with those of the parallel passage of Mark iv. 36. *πάντα δυνατὰ σοι*. Similar sentiments are quoted from the Classical writers. In *παρελθέτω — τὸ ποτήριον* there is (as appears from the Classical citations) a figure derived from a cup being carried *past* any one at a feast. So Anacreon, *παρίσχεται; μὴ κάτεχε*. We may remark the bold figure involved in *ποτήριον*, similar to what occurs in Isaiah li. 17., "who hast drunk at the hand of the Lord the cup of his fury; hast drunken the dregs of the cup of trembling:" with which I would compare a very sublime passage of Æschyl. Agam. 1367. *τὰδ' ἂν δίκαιος ἦν,*

MK. LU.

14. 22. ἀπ' ἐμοῦ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο· πλὴν οὐχ ὡς ἐγὼ θέλω, ἀλλ' ὡς σύ.
 37 45 Καὶ ἔρχεται πρὸς τοὺς μαθητάς, καὶ εὗρίσκει αὐτοὺς καθεύδοντας, καὶ 40
 λέγει τῷ Πέτρῳ· Οὕτως οὐκ ἰσχύσατε μίαν ὥραν γρηγορῆσαι μετ'
 38 46 ἐμοῦ; γρηγορεῖτε καὶ προσεύχεσθε, ἵνα μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς πειρασμόν. 41
 39. Τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα πρόθυμον, ἡ δὲ σὰρξ ἀσθενής. Πάλιν ἐκ δευτέρου 42
 ἀπελθὼν προσηύξατο, λέγων· Πατέρι μου, εἰ οὐ δύναται τοῦτο τὸ
 ποτήριον παρελθεῖν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, ἐὰν μὴ αὐτὸ πῖω, γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά
 40 σου. Καὶ ἔλθὼν εὗρίσκει αὐτοὺς πάλιν καθεύδοντας· ἦσαν γὰρ 43
 αὐτῶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ βεβαρημένοι. Καὶ ὑφίς αὐτοὺς, ἀπελθὼν πάλιν 44
 41 προσηύξατο ἐκ τρίτον, τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον εἰπών. Τότε ἔρχεται πρὸς τοὺς 45
 μαθητάς αὐτοῦ, καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· Καθεύδετε τὸ λοιπὸν καὶ ἀναπαύ-
 εσθε·—ἰδοῦ, ἤγγικεν ἡ ὥρα, καὶ ὁ Τίος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδεται
 42 εἰς χεῖρας ἁμαρτωλῶν.—Ἐγείρεσθε! ἄγωμεν! ἰδοῦ, ἤγγικεν ὁ παρα- 46
 δίδούς με.
 43 47 Καὶ ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος, ἰδοῦ, Ἰούδας, εἷς τῶν δώδεκα, ἦλθε, καὶ 47
 μετ' αὐτοῦ ὄχλος πολὺς μετὰ μαχαίρων καὶ ξύλων, ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρχιερέων

ἑπερδικῶς μὲν οὖν Τισσάνε κρατῆρ' ἐν ὁμοίᾳ κακῶν ὅδε Πλήσας ἄραιον, αὐτὸς ἐκπίνει πολλόν.

40. οὕτως] "itane? siccine?" This, like *εἴτα* and some other particles, is so used with interrogations, as to denote wonder mixed with censure. Wets. cites Hom. II. β. 23. & Od. ε. 204. From the natural sense of the term, our Lord now passes to the *metaphorical*, and engrafts upon it an exhortation to *Christian watchfulness*; on which subject see an excellent Sermon on this text by Dr. South, Vol. vi. 353., where, after observing that, in the Christian warfare, the two great defensives against temptation are *watching* and *prayer*, he remarks, I. that *watching* imports, in the first place, a sense of the greatness of the evil we contend against; 2dly, a diligent survey of the power of the enemy, compared with the weakness and treachery of our own hearts; 3dly, a consideration of the ways by which temptation has prevailed on ourselves or others; 4thly, a continual *attention* to the danger, in opposition to *remissness*; 5thly, a constant and severe temperance. II. That *Prayer* is rendered effectual, 1st, by fervency or importunity; 2dly, by constancy or perseverance. III. That *Watching* and *Prayer* must be always *united*; the first without the last being but *presumption*; the last without the first a *mockery*.

41. εἰσέλθητε.] *Εἰσελθεῖν* is here used, like *ἐμπέπειν* in I Tim. vi. 9., to denote *fall under, succumb*. Our Lord does not direct them to pray to God that no temptation might befall them; but that they might not be *overcome* by the temptations in which they must be involved; and to pray for extraordinary spiritual assistance under them.

—τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα —ἀσθενής.] This is meant not as an excuse for their frailty, but as an incentive to greater vigilance, together with prayer.

42. πάλιν ἐκ δευτέρου.] Some would refer πάλιν to ἀπελθὼν, and ἐκ δευτ. (scil. γοήτου) to προσηύξατο. But the Classical examples adduced by the Commentators show that the words must be taken together: in which there is not (as some imagine) a *pleonasm*, but a *stronger expression*.

43. βεβαρημένοι.] Sub. ἕνωρ; though the ellipse

is rarely supplied. Βαρίσθαι is often used of the heaviness of *sleep*.

45. καθεύδετε τὸ λοιπόν.] This seems so inconsistent with the subsequent exhortation *εγείρεσθε! ἄγωμεν!* that many Commentators take the sentence interrogatively; q. d. "do ye yet sleep?" But this is doing violence to the construction, and is contrary to the *usus loquendi* (as Fritz. shows); which will not permit τὸ λοιπὸν to be taken in any other sense than "*in ceterum tempus.*" It is better with Chrysost., Euthym., Erasm., Beza, Grot., and some recent Commentators (as Schmid, and Fritz.), to suppose a kind of slightly *ironical rebuke*; q. d. ["Since you have thus far failed to watch] sleep on the remainder of the time, and take your rest [if you can]." But, if irony be thought unsuitable to the occasion, (though Campb. pronounces it very natural) we may, with Theophyl., Rosenm., and Kuin., take the imperatives *permissively*, "I no longer desire you to watch;" "you can no longer render me service." I have endeavoured by punctuation, to, in some degree, represent the abruptness of the phraseology. I would further observe, that it is in vain to allege that the foregoing punctuation is required by the words of Luke xxii. 46. τί καθεύδετε. Nothing forbids us to suppose, that the address recorded by Luke took place as well as that mentioned by Matth., that of the former *preceding* that of the latter.

—ἡ ὥρα.] Scil. τῆς παραδόσεως, as Euthym. rightly supplies. The καὶ following signifies *when*, or *in which*, by what some call a *Hebraism*; though it is found in Herodot., Thucyd., and others.

—ἁμαρτωλῶν.] i. e. the Romans, as being heathens. Others, less probably, take it of the *Jews*. It may, however, be understood of *both*.

47. ξύλων] "lignorum," clubs and such like *tumultuary* weapons. Such, however, would scarcely have been borne by Roman soldiers; though John xviii. 3. speaks of a Roman *σπίρα*, that expression, however, must be understood in a more general sense of *less* than a cohort. And these might be stationed at some little distance, to aid the civil power, which was *likely* to be accompanied by a considerable mob.

48 καὶ προσβυτιέρων τοῦ λαοῦ. Ὁ δὲ παραδιδούς αὐτὸν ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς 14. 22.
 49 σημεῖον, λέγων· Ὁν ἂν φιλήσω, αὐτός ἐστι· κρατήσατε αὐτόν. Καὶ 44
 εὐθέως προσελθὼν τῷ Ἰησοῦ, εἶπε· Χαῖρε, ἡββί· καὶ κατεφίλησεν
 50 αὐτόν. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Ἐταίρε, ἐφ' ἧ πάρε; Τότε 46
 προσελθόντες ἐπέβαλον τὰς χεῖρας ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰησοῦν, καὶ ἐκρατήσαν αὐτόν.
 51 Καὶ ἰδοῦ, εἰς τῶν μετὰ Ἰησοῦ, ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα, ἀπέσπασε τὴν μά- 47 50
 χαιραν αὐτοῦ, καὶ πατάξας τὸν δοῦλον τοῦ ἀρχιερέως, ἀφείλεν αὐτοῦ
 52 τὸ ὠτίον. Τότε λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Ἀπόστρεφόν σου τὴν μάχαιραν
 εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτῆς· πῖντες γὰρ οἱ λαβόντες μάχαιραν ἐν μαχαίρῃ
 53 ἀπολοῦνται. Ἢ δοκεῖς ὅτι οὐ δύναμαι ἄρτι παρακαλεῖσαι τὸν πατέρα
 54 μου, καὶ παραστήσει μοι πλείους ἢ δώδεκα λεγεῶνας ἄγγέλων; Πῶς
 οὖν πληρωθῶσιν αἱ γραφαί, ὅτι οὕτω δεῖ γενέσθαι;
 55 Ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοῖς ὄχλοις· Ὡς ἐπὶ ληστὴν 48 52
 ἐξήλαθετε μετὰ μαχαίρων καὶ ξύλων, συλλαβεῖν με; Καθ' ἡμέραν πρὸς 49 53
 ὑμῖς ἐκαθεξόμην διδάσκων ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, καὶ οὐκ ἐκρατήσατέ με.

48. φιλήσω.] Agreeably to the customary mode of *salutation* in ancient times, especially in the East; which is still retained in Spain and some parts of Italy and France.

49. κατεφίλησεν.] In the Classical writers the *κατα* is usually *intensive*; but in the Sept. both the simple and compound are used indifferently.

50. ἔταίρε.] This is best regarded as a common form of address, though generally implying some degree of contempt, or, as here, reproach.

— ἐφ' ἧ.] Most of the best MSS., together with some Fathers and early Edd., have ἐφ' ὅ, which is edited by Matthæi, Griesb., Tittm., Fritz., and Scholz. It is scarcely possible to determine the true reading, because the signification of *purpose* is expressed both by the *Dative* and the *Accus.* Yet, if the phrase occurred in a *Classical* writer, I should not hesitate to edit ἐφ' ὅ; for I am not aware of any unimpeachable examples of the simple ὅ; in this sense used in the *Accus.*, but many of the *Dative*. See my Note on Thucyd. i. 134. ἐφ' ἧ ἐχώρει. Πάρε is wrongly rendered by Erasmus, by a very common error in all translators. I shall fully discuss the point in a note on Josephus Bell. i. 12. 4. The case is different with respect to the compounds ὅστις, ὅσπερ, &c. There Classical use employs alone the *Accus.*

51. ἀπέσπασε.] This is Hellenistic Greek for ἔσπασε, or ἐσπάσατο, and occurs elsewhere only in the LXX. Μάχαιρα, or cutlass, such as travellers in Judæa used to carry for security against the robbers, who infested the country. Ἀφείλε is for ἀπέτεμε; an Alexandrian or Hellenistic use; for except the N. T. and LXX., it has only been adduced from Polyænus. It is, however, found in the Latin *auferre*, and in the common dialect of our own language.

— τὸ ὠτίον.] This certainly signifies the whole ear, and not the *tip* of it (as Grot. thinks); for that is inconsistent with the ὄς; in the parallel passage of Luke. Besides, ὠτίον is not unfrequently used in the LXX. for ὄς;. And, (as Lobeck on Phryn. p. 211, observes,) the common dialect calls most parts of the body by diminutives, as τὰ βνία, τὸ ὀμμάτιον. Rosenm. and VOL. I.

Kuin. remark that the sense of ἀφάλε must not be *pressed on*, since from the language of Luke we may infer that the ear hung by the skin. And certainly such kind of hyperbolical idioms are common in every language. [Comp. John xviii. 10.]

52. πάντες γὰρ — ἀπολοῦνται.] Some ancient and several modern Commentators consider these words as a *prediction* of the destruction of the Jews who took up the sword unjustly against Christ and his disciples. But this, though countenanced by Rev. xiii. 10, is a somewhat harsh interpretation; and it seems better to adopt that of Elsn., Campb., Kuin., and Fritz., who consider it as a proverbial saying against repelling force by force, and the exercise of private vengeance; importing that those who shall defend themselves by the sword, will, or may, perish by the sword. Of course, it must be taken with restriction, as it regarded the *disciples*, and be here applied to those who take up the sword against the magistrate. Perhaps, however, a double sense may have been intended, 1st for *caution* (including *admonition*, that swords were not the weapons by which the Messiah's cause was to be defended); and 2dly, by way of *prediction*, which would suggest the best argument for non-resistance. [Comp. Gen. ix. 6. Rev. xiii. 10.]

53. ἡ δοκεῖς, &c.] The connection seems to be this: "Or, [if that argument will not avail, take *this*, that I need not thy assistance, for] thinkest thou," &c. The argument in this and the following verse is, that such conduct implied both distrust in Divine Providence, and ignorance of Scripture. The term ἄρτι is very significant, and denotes *even in this crisis*. Καὶ παραστήσει, "and he would bring to my aid." As to the *number* which follows, it is better, (with some of the best Commentators,) not to dwell upon it, much less deduce any inferences from it, since it only denotes a *very great number*.

54. ἔτι.] Supply αἱ λέγονσαι. Or, as this ellipsis is harsh, with Fritz., take ὅτι in the sense *nam*. Thus there should be a mark of interrogation after γολφαί, and a period after γενέσθαι. [Comp. Isa. liii. 7, 8, 10.]

MK. LU.

14. 22. Τοῦτο δὲ ὄλον γέγονεν, ἵνα πληρωθῶσιν αἱ γραφαὶ τῶν προφητῶν. 56
 50 Τότε οἱ μαθηταὶ πάντες ἀφέντες αὐτὸν ἔφυγον.
 53 54 Οἱ δὲ κρατήσαντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπήγαγον πρὸς Καϊάφαν τὸν ἀρχιε- 57
 54 ρέα, ὅπου οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι συνήχθησαν. Ὁ δὲ Πέ- 58
 55 τρος ἠκολούθει αὐτῷ ἀπὸ μακρόθεν, ἕως τῆς ἀλλῆς τοῦ ἀρχιερέως·
 55 καὶ εἰσελθὼν ἔσω ἐκάθητο μετὰ τῶν ὑψηρευτῶν, ἰδεῖν τὸ τέλος. Οἱ δὲ 59
 56 ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ τὸ συνέδριον ὄλον ἐζήτουν ψευδομαρ-
 τυρίαν κατὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ὅπως θανατώσωσιν αὐτόν· καὶ οὐχ εὔρον· καὶ, 60
 57 πολλῶν ψευδομαρτύρων προσελθόντων, οὐχ εὔρον. Ὅτις δὲ προσελ-
 58 θόντες δύο ψευδομαρτυρεῖς εἶπον· Οὗτος ἔφη· Δύναμι καταλύσαι 61
 60 τὸν ναὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν οἰκοδομηῆσαι αὐτόν. Καὶ 62
 61 καταμαρτυροῦσιν; Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἰσῆπα. καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς 63
 εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Ἐξορκίζω σε κατὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος, ἵνα ἡμῖν εἴπης,

56. τοῦτο δὲ — προφητῶν.] Some (as Erasm.) ascribe this observation to the *Evangelist*; but others, more properly, (as appears from Mark xiv. 49.) attribute it to our Lord. [*Comp.* John xviii. 12 & 24.]

57. ἀπήγαγον πρὸς Κ.] i. e. "after having been first taken to Annas, (as we learn from John xviii. 13,) in order, it should seem, to do him honour, and while the Sanhedrim was collecting. Ἀπάγειν is a term appropriate to leading any one to trial or execution. Kuin. observes, that πρὸς is often joined with Accusative cases of pronouns and persons, to indicate the place in which the person is whose name follows.

58. τῆς αἰλῆς] the inner court of the palace.

59. ἐζήτουν ψευδομαρτυρίαν.] We are not, I think, warranted in supposing, (as has been generally done,) that they suborned false witnesses. Had they done this, (for which, indeed, there was then no *time*, in the hurry with which their determination to take Jesus' life was acted on), they would have tutored their witnesses better than to be rejected even by *themselves*. But the meaning seems to be, that, though they *professed* to seek *true* testimony, yet they readily entertained *any* whether true or false, that might criminate Jesus. Nay, they studiously sought and encouraged the latter; whilst, on the other hand, all testimony in his *favour* was (by the Jewish law) rejected; for, though it was permitted to say any thing true or false *against* false prophets, or persons suspected of idolatry, no man was permitted to appear in their *behalf*. Dr. Hales, indeed, adduces an extract from Buxtorf's Talmudic Lexicon, containing a citation from a Rabbinical writer, admitting, as he thinks, the *subornation* of false witnesses against Christ, describing the *mode*, and justifying it on the ground that idolaters and false prophets are to be proved guilty by whatever means. The passage is certainly curious; but Dr. Hales has mistaken, and consequently mis-stated its purport. It only authorizes their being *entrapped* into a discovery of their guilt, as Pausanias was by the Ephori (see Thucyd. i. 134); not the *subornation* of false witnesses against them. In short the passage is merely curious as showing a tradition prevalent among the Jews of *unfair dealing* in the present instance. But to return to the words in

question, the best view that can be taken of them is, that the *judgment* of the Evangelist is blended with his *narrative*; a sort of *synchysis* not unfrequent in ancient writers. So it is well remarked by L. Brugensis: "*Falsum dicit Matthæus; quamvis simulans se querere verum.*" This is plain, too, from the passage of St. Mark, where, instead of ψεῦδο μαρτυρίαν, we have simply μαρτυρίαν. Thus, just after, at οὐχ εὔρον, we must supply μαρτυρίαν (taken from ψευδομαρτυρίαν), by which is to be understood μαρτυρίαν ἱκανήν, or, as Mark expresses it, ἴσην.

60. οὐχ εὔρον.] These words are wanting in some MSS., Versions, and a few Fathers; are rejected by Campb. and cancelled by Griesb., but retained by Fritz. and Scholz, rightly, since internal as well as external evidence is in their favour. As to the authority of the Versions, it is slender in a point of *this* kind. And we have here not a *mere* repetition, (as the ancient Critics, who cut the words out, supposed,) but a repetition for *emphasis*. The Evangelist here, and at the next verse, calls them false witnesses, as Calvin justly remarks, "*non qui mendacium de nihilo conflatum proferunt, sed qui calumniosè pervertunt rectè dicta, et ad crimen detorquent.*"

61. δύναμι — αὐτόν.] This was, (as appears, from Mark xiv. 58, and John ii. 19), in effect a falsity, by the suppression of *some* words of Christ, with the action which explained them, and adding others. By *this temple* our Lord plainly meant his body. If it *could* have been proved that Jesus had spoken irreverently of the temple, by predicting its destruction, that would have afforded ground for a charge of blasphemy, which was a capital offence. The High-Priest, however, finding that even this testimony could scarcely afford matter for the charge, artfully changed his ground.

63. ἐξορκίζω σε, &c.] This seems to have been the most solemn form of administering an oath. Ὁρκίζειν and ἔθορκ. are used in the LXX. to express the Heb. הִשָּׁבַע, "to make to swear, to swear" *in*, as we say of a witness. The syntax takes an Accus. of the person sworn, (whether witness or criminal,) and a Genit. with κατὰ, or sometimes an Accus., without a preposition, of the Deity sworn by. As this *oath of adjuration* brought an obligation, under the *curse of the Law*,

64 εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς, ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ. λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς. Σὺ 14. 22.
 εἶπας. Πλὴν λέγω ὑμῖν· ἀπ' ἧτι ὄψεσθε τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου 62
 καθήμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τῆς δυνάμεως, καὶ ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ
 65 οὐρανοῦ. Τότε ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς διεῶρῆξε τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ, λέγων, ὅτι 63
 ἐβλασφήμησε· τί ἔτι χρεῖαν ἔχομεν μαρτύρων; ἴδε, νῦν ἠκούσατε τὴν
 66 βλασφημίαν αὐτοῦ. τί ὑμῖν δοκεῖ; Οἱ δὲ ἀποκριθέντες εἶπον· 64
 67 Ἐνοχος θανάτου ἐστί. Τότε ἐπέπυσαν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ, καὶ 65
 68 ἐκολάφισαν αὐτόν· οἱ δὲ ἐξόρῳπισαν, λέγοντες· Προφῆτευσον ἡμῖν,
 Χριστέ, τίς ἐστὶν ὁ παῖσας σε;
 69 Ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ἔξω ἐκάθητο ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ, καὶ προσῆλθεν αὐτῷ μία 66 66
 70 παιδίσκη, λέγουσα· Καὶ σὺ ἦσθα μετὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Γαλιλαίου. Ὁ δὲ 68 67
 71 ἠρνήσατο ἔμπροσθεν πάντων, λέγων· Οὐκ οἶδα τί λέγεις. Ἐξελθόντα 69 68

it imperatively claimed a reply, when the adjuration accompanied an interrogation; and the answer thus returned was regarded as an answer on oath; in which falsity was accounted perjury. Thus our Lord, who had before disdained to reply to an unfounded, and even absurd charge, (especially before judges who had predetermined to find him guilty) now thought himself bound to answer, as an example to others of reverence towards such a solemn form.

— ὁ Χριστὸς, ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ.] Grot. and Whitby remark, that from this and other passages, (as Matt. xvi. 16,) it is clear that the Jews expected their Messiah to be *Son of God*; (interpreting the 2d Psalm as said of him) which title, it is certain, they understood as implying divinity, otherwise the High-Priest could not have declared the assumption of it to be blasphemy. See more in Bp. Blomfield's Dissertation on the knowledge of a Redeemer before the advent of our Lord, p. 115. See Note supra 25.

64. σὺ εἶπας.] Ἄπ' ἧτι is for ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν, (used by Luke), which, by a slight accommodation, may mean *μετὰ μικρόν*, as Euthym. here explains. The words following have reference to the sublime imagery descriptive of the Messiah's advent in Dan. vii. 13 & 14. See Matt. xxiv. 30, and Note.

— τῆς δυνάμεως] for τοῦ Θεοῦ; literally, the Power, abstract for concrete, as we say "the Almighty;" (see Heb. i. 3; viii. 1. 1 Pct. iv. 14,) an idiom founded on the Jewish mode of expressing the Deity, הגבורה, Hagburch, equivalent to ὁ δυνατὸς, i. e. *κατ' ἐξοχὴν*. Thus, in Luke xxii. 69, and sometimes in Philo Jud. τοῦ Θεοῦ is added, as it were, to determine the sense. Hence the expression is not ill rendered in the Peshito. Syr. by ܐܘܢܝܢ; though it is wrongly translated by Schaaf *virtutis*. Rather, *numinis* or *Dei*, as in 2 Thess. ii. 4. The *advent* here meant signifies, *primarily* at least, the coming of Christ to take vengeance on the Jews at the destruction of Jerusalem; and secondarily, but chiefly, his coming to judge the world.

65. διεῶρῆξε τὰ ἱμάτια.] It was a custom among the ancients to express the more violent passions, especially *grief* and *indignation*, by rending the garments, either partly, or from top to bottom, but sometimes from bottom to top.

— ἴδε.] Said by the Commentators to be put for *videte*. But it is better to consider it as an

adverb like *videt*. So John xix. 14. ἴδε, ὁ βασιλεύς.

66. Ἐνοχος θανάτου.] Ἐνοχος (derived from the preterite middle of *ἐνέγω*) is equivalent to *ἐνεχόμενος*, and signifies, 1. "held fast" by, bound to; 2. being subject, or liable to. In this last sense it is used properly with the Dative (as in the LXX., N. T., and the Classical writers. See Matth. Gr. Gr. § 347); but sometimes with the *Genit.*, as in the present passage and Mark iii. 29, and occasionally in the Classical writers; in which syntax there is commonly thought to be an ellipse of *κρίματι*. But it should rather seem that the construction (which occurs also in the Classical writers) is like to that of Plato. *Apolog.* p. 33. *τιμῶνται μοι ὁ ἀνὴρ θανάτου*.

67. ἐπέπυσαν—αὐτοῦ.] A mode of expressing the deepest contempt and abhorrence, common both to ancient and modern times. On this and the other marks of contumely accumulated on the head of our Redeemer, see Horne's *Introd.* iii. 161, sqq.

— ἐκολάφισαν.] Between *κολαφίζω* and *ραπίζω* there is the same difference in signification, as in our *thump* and *slap*. [*Comp.* infra xxvii. 20 Isa. i. 6.]

68. προφῆτευσον ἡμῖν, &c.] To understand this, it is proper to bear in mind, (what we learn from Mark and Luke,) that Christ was blindfolded when these words were pronounced; in which there was a taunt on his arrogating the title of Messiah, and a play on the double sense of *προφητεῖν*, which (as also *μαντεύσθαι*) is often used in a sense corresponding to our *divine*, or guess.

69. ἔξω.] i. e. without the place where Jesus was examined by the council, which was the *vestibule*, called by Matthew *πύλων*, by Mark *περιαλιον*.

— παιδίσκη.) The word properly signifies a *girl*; but, as in our own language, it is often in later Greek, used to denote a *maid servant*. She is by John xviii. 17. styled ἡ θυρωρὸς. And, indeed, the office of porter, though among the Greeks and Romans it was confined to *men*, was among the Jews generally exercised by women. Καὶ σὺ, &c. may be rendered, "Thou too wert one of the party with Jesus;" for *εἶναι μετὰ τινος* often denotes to be on any one's side.

70. οὐκ οἶδα τί λέγεις.] A form expressive of strong denial. So Soph. *Aj.* 270. οὐ *κάποδ' ὅπως λίγεις*. For reconciliations of the minute *seeming*

MK. LU.

14. 22. δὲ αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν πυλῶνα εἶδεν αὐτὸν ἄλλη, καὶ λέγει τοῖς ἐκεῖ· Καὶ
 70 οὗτος ἦν μετὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Ναζωραίου· καὶ πάλιν ἠρώησατο μεθ' 72
 59 ὄρκου, ὅτι οὐκ οἶδα τὸν ἄνθρωπον. Μετὰ μικρὸν δὲ προσελθόντες οἱ 73
 71 60 ἐσωτῆτες εἶπον τῷ Πέτρῳ· Ἀληθῶς, καὶ οὐ ἐξ αὐτῶν εἶ· καὶ γὰρ ἡ 74
 72 61 λαλιά σου δῆλόν σε ποιεῖ. Τότε ἠρώησατο † καταναθεματίζειν καὶ ὀμνύ- 74
 61 ειν, ὅτι οὐκ οἶδα τὸν ἄνθρωπον. καὶ εὐθὺς ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησε. Καὶ 75
 ἐμνήσθη ὁ Πέτρος τοῦ ὀήματος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ εἰρηκότος αὐτῷ, ὅτι πρὶν
 ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι, τοῖς ἀπαρνήσῃ με· καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἔξω ἔκλασε
 πικρῶς.

a Mark 15. 1.
 Luke 22. 66.
 & 23. 1.
 John 18. 28.

XXVII. ^a ΠΡΩΤΙΑΣ δὲ γενομένης, συμβούλιον ἔλαβον πάντες οἱ 1
 ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τοῦ λαοῦ κατὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ὥστε θανατώ- 2
 σαι αὐτόν· καὶ δήσαντες αὐτὸν ἀπήγαγον, καὶ παρέδωκαν αὐτὸν 2
 Ποντίῳ Πιλάτῳ τῷ ἡγεμόνι.

Τότε ἰδὼν Ἰούδας ὁ παραδιδούς αὐτόν, ὅτι κατεκρίθη, μεταμεληθεὶς 3
 ἀπέστρεψε τὰ τριάκοντα ἀργύρια τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσι καὶ τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις,
 λέγων· Ἰμαρτον παραδούς αἷμα ἀθῶον. Οἱ δὲ εἶπον· Τί πρὸς 4

discrepancies in various parts of the narrative, see Recens. Synop., Grot., Mackn., and Kuin.

72. ὅτι οὐκ οἶδα.] "Οτι, like the Hebrew particles כִּי and וְכִי, after verbs of swearing and affirming, denotes *profecto*, ἢ μὴν, ὄντως. Thus 1 Kings i. 30, where the Sept. has ὅτι, and Gen. xxii. 17; xlii. 16, where in the Sept. for וְכִי is ἢ μὴν. But in Gen. xxviii. 16, the Sept. expresses וְכִי by ὅτι; and Sym. by ὄντως. In Gen. xlv. 23, the Hebrew וְכִי is rendered by the Sept. ὅτι. (Kuin.) It should rather seem that there is an ellipsis of λέγων, which is implied in ἠρώησατο.

73. ἡ λαλιά σου δῆλόν σε ποιεῖ.] "thy talk, or dialect, bewrayeth thee." Καταφωρᾶ would have been a more definite term, as in Thucyd. viii. 87. καταφωρᾶ δὲ μάλιστα καὶ ἦν εἶπε πρόφασιν. Different provinces of the same country have usually their distinct idioms, accent, &c., which in the remoter parts are more strongly marked. That this was the case with Galilee, we learn from the Rabbinical writers, who tell us that the speech of the Galilæans was broad and rustic.

74. καταναθεματίζειν.] Nearly all the best, and by far the greater part of the MSS., have καταθεματίζειν, which was preferred by Mill, Beng., and Wets., and has been adopted by Matth., Griesb., Tittm., and Scholz. But it is not easy to see how καταθεματίζειν can be reconciled to analogy, or yield any sense suitable to the context; for it can only mean *depouere*, or possibly be synonymous with καταναθεματίζειν. It is, besides, destitute of any authority beyond the present passage, except that of the Ecclesiastical writers, who plainly took it from their MSS. of the N. T. And as ἀνά might easily slip out, or be lost, by an inattention to a mark of abbreviation, the authority of MSS. has far less weight than the *usus linguae*. I have, therefore, thought proper, with Vater and Fritz., to retain the common reading.

XXVII. 1. πρῶτας δὲ γεν.] The meeting of the Sanhedrim could not be held till the morning, since the courts of the Temple were never opened by night: nor, if they had been then held,

could judgment have been pronounced; for among the Jews justice was required to be administered in the *day time*, and in public.

2. ἠρώησας.] This word is, on account of John xviii. 12. (whence it appears that Christ had been bound *before*) by most Commentators supposed to be put for *ἐδοκίμησεν*. That, however, is too violent a way of removing the discrepancy. It is better, with Elsn. and Fritz., to suppose that our Lord's bonds had been removed during examination, and were now again put on him.

—ἡγεμόνι.] So he is sometimes styled by Josephus also; though, properly speaking, Pilate was only an *ἐπίτροπος*, or procurator, as Joseph. and Philo often call him. He is styled ἡγεμόνι, because he (as was not unusual in the *lesser* provinces) had entrusted to him the *authority* of ἡγεμόνι, as if *President*, (which included the administration of justice, and the power of life and death); in subordination, however, to the *President* of Syria.

3. μεταμεληθεὶς.] On this is chiefly founded the opinion of some of the antient Fathers, as well as many eminent modern Commentators, (as Whitby, Rosenm., Kuin., and A. Clarke), that Judas was partly induced to betray his Master by the expectation that, as Messiah, he could not suffer death; but would no doubt deliver himself from their hands, in some such way as he had done aforetime. But the language of our Lord (see supra xxvi. 24. and John xvii. 12.), and of Peter, Acts i. 25., forbids us to suppose that his repentance was sincere, or ought but the remorse of an upbraiding conscience. Indeed, we have every reason to suppose that, as he was originally actuated solely by *avarice*, so was he now possessed wholly with *despair*. He could not bear the stings of remorse sharpened as they would be by the contempt and abhorrence of all good men, whether Christ's disciples, or not; for it is acutely remarked by Elsn., "apud improbos conscientia vigilare non solet, nisi quum res sit conclamata." —ἀπέστρεψε] returned. An Hellenistic use of the word.

4. αἷμα ἀθῶον] "an innocent person." A signification found in the LXX. and Philo, p. 839. οὐτ' αἵματος ἀθῶον προσήγατο. The word ἀθῶος

- 5 ἡμᾶς; σὺ ὄψει. Καὶ ῥίψας τὰ ἀργύρια ἐν τῷ ναῷ, ἀνεχώρησε· καὶ
 6 ἀπελθὼν ἀπήγξατο. ^b Οἱ δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς λαβόντες τὰ ἀργύρια εἶπον· ^b Acts i. 18.
 Οὐκ ἔξεσι βαλεῖν αὐτὰ εἰς τὸν κορβανᾶν, ἐπεὶ τιμὴ αἱμάτων ἐστὶ.
 7 Συμβούλιον δὲ λαβόντες ἠγόρασαν ἐξ αὐτῶν τὸν ἀγρὸν τοῦ κεραμῆως,
 8 εἰς ταφὴν τοῖς ξένοις. ^c Διὸ ἐκλήθη ὁ ἀγρὸς ἐκείνος Ἀγρὸς αἱμάτων ^c Acts i. 19.
 9 ἕως τῆς σήμερον. ^d Τότε ἐπληρώθη τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἰερεμίου τοῦ προφή- ^d Zach. 11. 12.

properly, and always in the Classical writers, signifies *impunitis*, the not being liable to punishment. Αἷμα δὲ. is in Hellenistic Greek often (as here) taken to denote an innocent person; αἷμα thus exactly corresponding to the expression *σᾶς καὶ αἷμα*. So it occurs in the Sept. and Philo Jud. There is in *ἀθῶων* also a deviation from Classical usage, by which (as Matthæi observes) the word has alone the sense *cui non nocetur, qui non læditur*. Yet the Hellenistic usage is not only defensible, but more agreeable to the primary signification of the word, which has, with reason, been supposed to be *impunitis*, and the not being liable to θωή, or punishment. Τί πρὸς ἡμᾶς; Sub. τοῦτ' ἐστὶ.

— σὺ ὄψει,] 'thou wilt, or ought to see to that; be that thy care.' A Latinism from *tu videris*, for which the Greek Classical writers used σοὶ μελετω, or employed the *Imperative*.

5. ἀπελθὼν ἀπήγξατο.] The plain import of the words would seem to be, "he went and hanged himself;" for many examples of the phrase have been adduced both from the LXX. and the Classical writers. And this sense is supported by the ancient Versions. Since, however, it has been thought inconsistent with the account given by Peter (Acts i. 18.) of the death of Judas, many methods of interpretation have been devised, to reconcile this discrepancy. See Recens. Synop. I am still of opinion that there is nothing to authorize us to desert the common signification of ἀπάγγεσθαι (wherein the reflected sense is to be noticed, on which see Thucyd. iii. 81. and my Note there), nor any reason to suppose but that Judas *hanged* himself. It is very probable that he selected that mode of suicide, since it was frequent; and of the expression itself, ἀπελθὼν ἀπήγξατο, &c. several examples have been adduced. And, as we shall see further on, it involves no real discrepancy with St. Luke's account. Whereas the other interpretations are (as I have shown in Recens. Synop.) open to many objections. Thus even that which assigns the sense "was suffocated," (literally, suffocated himself,) introduces a signification which cannot with certainty be established; for though in Herod. ii. 131. ἡ παῖς ἀπήγξατο ὑπὸ ἄγχεος *may*, with Perizon., be rendered "was suffocated with grief" (an effect of mental agony which is known to sometimes occur), yet it seems far better to render the expression, with the Editors in general, "hanged herself;" a sense occurring also at vii. 232. of the same writer: λυτραί — ἄλλον ἄγγελον — ὡς ἤτιμωτο, ἀπάγγεσθαι. Besides, the context, and the use of the expression ἀπελθὼν, point to an *action*, not to any thing of so *passive* a nature as *dying of grief*. The best mode of reconciling the apparent discrepancy is, to suppose (with Casaub., Raphael., Krebs., Kuinoel., Schleusn., and Fritz,) that after he had suspended himself, the rope breaking, or giving way (from the noose slipping, or otherwise), he fell down headlong, and burst asunder, so that his bowels protruded.

Thus in a Rabbinical writer cited by Wets. on Acts i. 18. quidam de tecto in plateam decidit, et ruptus est venter, et viscera ejus effluerunt. Πρηνῆς in the passage of Acts may be taken, like our *headlong*, simply of falling down from a high place, as in the examples adduced in Recens. Synop. And this view is confirmed by the expression, which *implies* falling from on high. Thus, according to the above Commentators, the narration in the Gospel is completely reconciled with that in the Acts, by supposing that in the former is recorded the *kind of death by which* Judas sought destruction; and in the latter, that by which *he made his final exit*; and which, at least, was the *event* or result of the other.

6. κορβανᾶν,] The word is Syriac, and signifies 1st, something offered, an offering; and, by use, an offering to the sacred treasury: 2dly, the place, or treasury itself, which consisted of chests placed in the Court of the Women.

7. τὸν ἀγρὸν τοῦ κεραμῆως,] The Article τοῦ expresses a particular field known by that name; so called from having been occupied by a potter; no doubt to dig clay for his wares. Thus several villages in England have the prefix, *Potter*: probably from part of the ground having been formerly occupied for potteries; for example, Pottersbury, in Northamptonshire. So the field at Athens, appropriated as a cemetery for those who fell in the service of the country, was called *Ceramicus*, from having been formerly used for brick-making. This, of course, would make a field unfit for tillage; though good enough for a burying ground. And thus the smallness of the price may be accounted for.

— τοῖς ξένοις.] It is debated by the Commentators whether by these we are to understand *foreign Jews*, sojourning at Jerusalem for religious or other purposes, or *Gentile foreigners*. The latter, for the reasons which I have assigned in Recens. Synop., is by far the most probable.

9. τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἰερ.] The following passage is not found in *Jeremiah*; but something very like it, and, as it seems, the very prophecy, occurs in *Zach.* xi. 13; which has induced some to suppose a corruption of the names, arising from MS. abbreviations. Other less probable opinions may be seen in Recens. Synop. The best solution of the difficulty is to suppose, either that Matthew simply wrote διὰ τοῦ προφήτου, omitting, as he often does, the name of the prophet (and indeed Ἰερ. is omitted in a few MS. and several of the antient Versions); or, since Mede and Bp. Kidder have shown it to be highly probable that *Jeremiah* wrote the Chapter from which these words are taken, as well as the two former, to suppose that the Evangelist wrote from that opinion. The mode adopted by Griesb., Paulus, and Fritz., which supposes an *error of memory* on the part of the Evangelist, for *Zachariou*, would remove all difficulty. But it proceeds upon an objectionable principle. To return, however, to the words before us, every grammatical machine has been

MK. LU.

15. 23. του λέγοντος· Καὶ ἔλαβον τὰ τριάκοντα ἀργύρια, τὴν τιμὴν τοῦ τειτιμημένου, ὃν ἐτιμήσαντο ἀπὸ υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ· καὶ ἔδωκαν αὐτὰ εἰς τὸν ἀγρὸν τοῦ κε- 10
ραμείως· καθὰ συνέταξέ μοι Κύριος.
- 2 3 Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἔστη ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ ἡγεμόνος· καὶ ἐπερώτησεν αὐτὸν 11
ὁ ἡγεμὼν, λέγων· Σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων; Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς
3 2 ἔφη αὐτῷ· Σὺ λέγεις. Καὶ ἐν τῷ κατηγοροῦσθαι αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγ- 12
4 χιερέων καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίνατο. Τότε λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ 13
5 Πιλάτος· Οὐκ ἀκούεις πόσα σου καταμαρτυροῦσι; Καὶ οὐκ ἀπε- 14
κρίθη αὐτῷ πρὸς οὐδὲ ἐν ῥῆμα· ὥστε θανατᾶν τὸν ἡγεμόνα λίαν.
- 6 Κατὰ δὲ ἑορτὴν εἰώθει ὁ ἡγεμὼν ἀπολύειν ἓνα τῷ ὄχλῳ δέσμιον, 15
7 ὃν ᾗθελον. εἶχον δὲ τότε δέσμιον ἐπίσημον, λεγόμενον Βαραββᾶν. 16
8 Συναγμένων οὖν αὐτῶν, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, ὁ Πιλάτος· Τίνα θέτετε ἀπολύ- 17
9 σω ὑμῖν; Βαραββᾶν, ἢ Ἰησοῦν τὸν λεγόμενον Χριστόν; Ἰδεῖ γὰρ, 18
10 ὅτι διὰ φθόνον παρέδωκαν αὐτόν. Καθημένου δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοῦ 19
βήματος, ἀπέστειλε πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ, λέγουσα· Μηδὲν σοὶ

put in motion to reconcile them with those of the Hebrew and Sept., but all in vain. Much trouble, however, might have been spared, had it been considered, that we have not a *citation*, but an *application* of the words of the prophecy or vision; which was, no doubt, intended to pre-signify the train of events recorded by the Evangelists. So little *other* application has it, that the Jews themselves have always referred the words to the Messiah.

As to the *mode* in which the words in question are to be taken, there is no reason to abandon the common interpretation, confirmed by Euthym., according to which *τινὸς* must be supplied at *ἀπὸ υἱῶν* Ἰ. It indeed involves a somewhat harsh ellipse, but not so harsh as the method Fritz. has adopted in its place, namely, to take the words of *Judas*. Besides, that makes *ἔν τιμήσαντο* a most offensive pleonasm. Whereas, according to the common interpretation, the words *ἔν τιμήσαντο* — Ἰσρα. arc exegetical of the preceding. It is well observed by Vater, “latet *τινὸς* in v. ἀπὸ, ut alibi in v. *ἰκ*. Conf. Matth. xxiii. 24.” There may seem some difficulty in *καθὰ* — *κύριος*; the best way of removing which is to suppose, that these words (corresponding to אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל of the Hebrew) are left by the Evangelist *unaccommodated*. Campb. and others would take *ἔλαβον* as the *first* person, and read *ἔδωκα*. Thus we might render, “I took the thirty shekels (the price of him that was valued, whom they valued), from the sons of Israel (and they gave them for the potter’s field), as the Lord appointed me.” But this is destitute of manuscript authority, and does such violence to the words, that no dependence can be placed on the sense thus *extorted*. With respect to *τοῦ τειτιμημένου*, the best Commentators regard it as taken, *per metalepsin*, in the sense *purchased*, referring to Thucyd. i. 33. *πρὸ πολλῶν χρημάτων* — *ἐτιμήσαθε*. But perhaps *τιμᾶσθαι* may here be used in the sense to *have a price set on one’s head*. Now when it is said that the Priests agreed with Judas for 30 pieces of silver, it is *implied* that they offered him that sum; which, indeed, might be expected from his inquiry, What will ye give me? — *καθὰ* an adverb formed from *κατ’* [*κέντα*] ᾧ.

11. *σὺ εἶ ὁ βασι. τῶν Ἰ.*] i. e. “dost thou claim to be king of the Jews?” To this the *σὺ λέγεις* following is a form of solemn asseveration. See Note on xxvi. 64. Pricæus compares the *dicti* of Plautus. Hence may be seen the true force of our affirmatives *aye* and *yes*, which are both derived from the old French *ayez*. The sense therefore is, “You say right, (I am a king).” From John xviii. 36. it appears that this declaration was made after our Lord had said that his kingdom was not of this world, i. e. not temporal. On the *order of the events* recorded in this and the following verses, see Euthym. and Kuinoel (cited and translated in Rec. Syn.) who have skillfully adjusted the harmony, and illustrated the connection and mutual bearing of the circumstances. [*Comp.* John xviii. 33. 37. 1 Tim. vi. 13.]

14. *οὐδὲ ἔν.*] A stronger expression than *οὐδὲν*.

15. *κατὰ ἔν ἑορτῆν, &c.*] The Commentators are not agreed whether by *κατ’ ἑορτῆν* we are to understand “at least time,” or, “at the paschal feast.” The latter opinion is thought to be proved by John xviii. 39. And though that passage be not decisive, yet, according to propriety of language, this would seem to be the best founded opinion. See Middlet. There will be little difficulty in supposing, that as *ἑορτῆν* would of itself, without addition, most readily suggest the idea of the paschal feast, so *κατ’ ἑορτῆν* would mean at the paschal feast. Indeed, I find *κατ’ ἑορτῆν* used precisely in this way in Joseph. B. 7. i. 11. 5. and *ἐνατάσης ἑορτῆς* Antiq. xiv. 11. 5. Whether the custom here mentioned was *old*, or *new*, has been debated; but has, with some certainty, been proved to be the *latter*. It was probably derived either from their neighbours the Syrians, or from the Greeks and Romans; the former of whom had such a custom at their Thesmophoriæ, the latter at their Lectisternia.

16. *ἐπίσημος*] Ἐπίσημος signifies, 1. *signatus*, bearing a stamp; 2. *notabilis*, in a good sense; 3. *notabilis*, in a bad sense, as in the Latin *famosus*.

19. *τοῦ βήματος*.] See Recens. Synop. or Horne’s Introd. vol. iii. p. 131. Μηδὲν σοὶ — *ἔκένψ*. Sub.

καὶ τῷ δικαίῳ ἐκείνῳ· πολλὰ γὰρ ἔπαθον σήμερον καὶ ὄναρ δι' 15. 23.
 20 αὐτόν. Οἱ δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ἔπεισαν τοὺς ὄχλους, ἵνα 11
 21 αἰτήσωνται τὸν Βαραββᾶν, τὸν δὲ Ἰησοῦν ἀπολέσωσιν. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ 12 20
 ὁ ἡγεμὼν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Τίνα θίτετε ἀπὸ τῶν δύο ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν ;
 22 οἱ δὲ εἶπον· Βαραββᾶν. Λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Πιλάτος· Τί οὖν ποιήσω
 Ἰησοῦν τὸν λεγόμενον Χριστόν ; λέγουσιν αὐτῷ πάντες· Σιανρωθή-
 23 τω. Ὁ δὲ ἡγεμὼν ἔφη· Τί γὰρ κακὸν ἐποίησεν ; οἱ δὲ περισσῶς
 24 ἔκραζον, λέγοντες· Σιανρωθήτω. Ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ Πιλάτος ὅτι οὐδὲν ὠφε- 14 21
 λει, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον θόρυβος γίνεται, λαβὼν ὕδωρ ἀπενίψατο τὰς χεῖρας
 ἀπέναντι τοῦ ὄχλου, λέγων· Ἀθῶός εἰμι ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ δικαίου
 25 τούτου· ὑμεῖς ὄψεσθε. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς πᾶς ὁ λαὸς εἶπε· Τὸ αἷμα
 26 αὐτοῦ ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα ἡμῶν ! Τότε ἀπέλυσεν αὐτοῖς τὸν 15 25
 Βαραββᾶν· τὸν δὲ Ἰησοῦν φραγελλώσας παρέδωκεν ἵνα σιανρωθῇ.
 27 Τότε οἱ στρατιῶται τοῦ ἡγεμόνος, παγκαλιβόντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν εἰς τὸ 16

γενέσθω. On the nature of the idiom see Note on Matt. viii. 20.

—κατ' ὄναρ.] It has been much debated whether this dream was natural, or supernatural. The latter view is maintained by the Fathers and the earlier Commentators; the former, by most of the recent Interpreters. And, indeed, we may so well account for the thing from natural causes, (especially as History has recorded many similar cases) that we are not required — perhaps scarcely warranted, to call in the supernatural. Πολλὰ, much; as often with verbs signifying to suffer. So Athen. p. 7. Β. πολλὰ κακοπαθήσας. Σήμερον may mean, as Commentators explain, “[early] this morning.” And morning dreams were supposed to be most veracious and ominous.

21. [Comp. Acts iii. 14.]

23. τί γὰρ κακὸν ἐπ.] The γὰρ is not, as some imagine, redundant; but has reference to a clause omitted, expressing, or implying a refusal of the punishment demanded, q. d. “Not so, or why so, for, &c.” See Middleton, Grot., and Krebs. That this is not a Hebraism, (as some have thought) is evident from the Classical examples which have been adduced by Krebs.

24. ὅτι οὐδὲν ὠφελεῖ] “se nihil proficere,” that he is doing no good, effecting nothing.

—ἀπενίψατο τὰς χεῖρας.] A symbolical action, to express being guiltless of the thing; washing the hands being probably a usual mode, among the Jews, of any one's solemnly attesting his innocence of any particular crime; and, doubtless, founded on the precept of Deut. xxi. 6 & 7, where, in case of murder of which the perpetrator is unknown, the elders of the nearest town are commanded to wash their hands, in testimony of their innocence, over the victim which was sacrificed for expiation of the crime. So also Ps. xxvi. 6. “I will wash my hands in [testimony of my] innocence.” It has, indeed, been disputed among Commentators, whether Pilate here followed Jewish or Gentile custom. But, considering the purpose of the action, — namely, to testify his innocence to the people, the former is the more probable. Besides, there has never been any proof adduced that such a custom subsisted among the Gentiles. For the Gentile custom to which Commentators appeal, was only that of washing the hands, not to attest innocence, but to expiate crime, though involuntary; one being for expiation, the

other for attestation. It is not, indeed, impossible that the use of this symbolical action existed among the Gentiles (though it is strange that no allusion to it should have been found); but if so, it was probably rather (according to the import of the phrase with us) to express that “one will have no participation in any thing, nor be answerable for the blame incurred thereby. It is plain, however, from Pilate's words, and the answer made to them by the people, that more than this was meant; namely, to solemnly attest his innocence, and to cast on them the guilt of the crime. And as Pilate had lived long enough in Judæa to become thoroughly acquainted with Jewish customs, and would be more likely to adopt a Jewish form, for the satisfaction of the Jewish people, no doubt can well be entertained but that the action was done according to Jewish, not Gentile custom.

—ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵμα.] The ἀπὸ is added by Hebraism; on which see Fritz.

—δικαίον is here (as supra ver. 19.) taken by Casaub., Le Clerc, Campb., and others, in a forensic sense, i. e. innocent of the crime laid to his charge. But perhaps the forensic and ordinary senses are combined; q. d. this innocent man and just person. To the latter Pilate bore testimony in a despatch sent to the Emperor Tiberius. Ὑμεῖς ὄψεσθε, “you must look to that;” q. d. “you must take the blame.”

25. τὸ αἷμα — ἡμῶς] scil. ἐδόξω, as it is finely rendered by Juvenius, “Nos, nos, crum iste sequatur, Et genus in nostrum scelus hoc, et culpa redundet!” Elsn. and Wets. have proved that it was usual among the Greeks for witnesses, on whose testimony any were put to death, to devote themselves, and even their children, to curses, if they bore false testimony. The antiquity of the custom is plain from 2 Kings ii. 37. Similar forms of imprecation are adduced both from the Rabbinical and the Classical writers.

26. φραγελλώσας.] A word derived from the Latin flagellare. The flagella were so sharp, that they are termed by Horace *Horribilia*. Scourging either with flagella (as in the case of slaves), or, (as in that of free persons) with rods, was among the Romans a prelude to capital punishment; and it was in use by the Greeks in the earliest ages.

27. τὸ πραιτώριον] The word here denotes, not

MK. LU.

15. 23. *πραιτώριον, συνήγαγον ἐπ' αὐτὸν ὄλην τὴν σπεῖραν. Καὶ ἐκδύσαντες* 28
 17 *αὐτὸν, περιέθηκαν αὐτῷ χλαμίδα κοκκίνη. καὶ πλέξαντες στέφανον* 29
 18 *ἐξ ἄκανθῶν, ἐπέθηκαν ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ, καὶ κάλαμον ἐπὶ τὴν*
 19 *δεξιὰν αὐτοῦ· καὶ γονυπετήσαντες ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ ἐνέπαιζον αὐτῷ,*
 20 *λέγοντες· Χαῖρε, ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων! Καὶ ἐμπτύσαντες εἰς* 30
 21 *αὐτὸν, ἔλαβον τὸν κάλαμον, καὶ ἔτυπτον εἰς τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ. Καὶ* 31
 21 26 *ὅτε ἐνέπαιζαν αὐτῷ, ἐξέδυσαν αὐτὸν τὴν χλαμίδα, καὶ ἐνέδυσαν αὐτὸν*
 21 26 *τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἀπήγαγον αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ σταυρῶσαι. Ἐξερχόμενοι* 32
 21 26 *δὲ εὗρον ἄνθρωπον Κυρηναῖον ὀνόματι Σίμων· τοῦτον ἠγγάζευσαν,*
 21 26 *ἵνα ἄρῃ τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ.*
 22 33 *ΚΑΙ ἐλθόντες εἰς τόπον λεγόμενον Γολγοθᾶ, * ὁ ἐστι, [* λεγόμενον,] 33*

that part of the *camp* so called, but a magnificent *edifice* in the upper part of Jerusalem, which had formerly been Herod's Palace, and was afterwards the abode of the Roman Procurators when they sojourned at Jerusalem; for their *residence* was at Cesarea.

23. *χλαμίδα*] This was a kind of round cloak, confined on the right shoulder by a clasp, so as to cover the left side of the body, and worn over the other garments. It was used alike by officers and privates; but, of course, with a difference in texture and dyeing. What is here called *κοκκίνη* is by Mark denominated *πορφύρα*, and by John *πορφυροῦν*. Yet there is no real discrepancy; for though the colours are, properly speaking, different, yet *πορφυροῦς* denoted sometimes a *bright red*; and hence the words *κοκκίνη* and *πορφύρα* were sometimes interchanged. The robe here mentioned was, no doubt, a cast-off *sagum* of some general officer.

29. *στέφανον ἐξ ἄκανθῶν.*] There has been no little debate as to the *nature* and *materials* of this crown; some contending that as this, like all the rest of what was done by the soldiers, was merely in mockery of Jesus' regal pretensions, there could be no motive to *cruelty*: and they propose to take the word *ἄκανθῶν* as the Genit. plural not of *ἄκανθα* but of *ἄκανθος*, i. e. the *bear's foot*, which is rather a smooth than a thorny plant, and would be more convenient to plait. Those, on the other hand, who defend the common version, reply that both *ἄκανθα* and *ἄκάνθινος* often occur in the N. T. and Sept., and always in the sense *thorn* and *thorny*; and that the ancient versions all confirm that version, as well as some ancient Fathers, as Tertullian and Clem. Alexandrinus. It should seem that the latter interpretation is the best founded. Indeed there is (as I observed in Recens. Synop.) the highest probability opposed to mere conjecture. There is, however, great reason to think (with Theophyl. and Budæus) that the crown was not of mere *thorns*, but of some prickly shrub (probably *acacia*), as in a kindred passage cited by Wets.: "In capite corona subito exstitit, ex asperis herbis," especially since those fit to make a fillet are such. So also Pliny Hist. xxi. 10. *villissimam coronam, spineolam*. Finally, Hesych. cited by Wets.: "Ἐφυγον κακὸν, εὖρον ἀμείνον. Νέμος ἦν Ἀθηνησιν ἀμφιβαλῆ παῖδα ἀκάνησι, μετὰ δρυϊνῶν στεφάνων, στέφιστα.

— *χαῖρε, ὁ βασιλ.*] A usual salutation to Emperors, as *Cæsar, ave!* In ὁ *βασιλ.*, the Nominative is put for the vocative, as Mark ix. 25. and Luke viii. 54. See Winer's Gr. Gr. § 22. 2.

30. [*Comp.* Isai. 50. 6. sup. 26. 67.]

31. *ἀπήγαγον.*] A usual term for *leading away* a criminal to execution.

32. *ἐξερχόμενοι*] "as they were going out [of the city];" for executions were, both among the Jews and Gentiles, conducted outside of the cities.

— *ἄνθρωπον κ.*] This use of *ἄνθρωπος* with nouns of *country, business, or office* (see Matth. Gr. Gr. § 430. 7.), is thought to be pleonastic, but is in reality only a vestige of the wordiness of antique phraseology. *Ἠγγάζευσαν*, "compelled;" literally, *impressed*, which implies compulsion (see Note on Matth. v. 41.); though it was customary for the criminal *himself* to carry his cross, which was of the form of a T, and was denominated *σταυρός*, from *στᾶνω*, cognate with *στᾶω* to *fix*, namely in the ground, as our *stake* comes from the past participle of *to stick*. About the middle of it was fixed a piece of wood, on which the crucified person sat, or rather rode; and into which he sometimes, in bravado, leaped. For the height of the cross was (contrary to the common opinion) such as to admit of this, being only such as to raise the feet of the crucified person a yard from the ground. The hands were fastened to the cross-piece with nails, but the feet were only tied to the post with ropes. Crucifixion can be traced back to as early a period as the age of Semiramis; and was a punishment chiefly inflicted on slaves, or free persons convicted of the most heinous crimes. That the corpses were left as a prey to ravenous birds, appears from Artemidorus iv. 49.

33. *Γολγοθᾶ.*] From the Chaldee *gol-goltha*, the second *l* being omitted, for euphony, as in *Babel* for *Babel*. The place in question was a sort of *knoll*, and so called from being strewed with the skulls of executed malefactors, like the *Ceadas* at Sparta, on which see my note on Thucyd. i. 134. [*Comp.* John xix. 17.]

Instead of the common reading *ἔς, ὃ* is found in many of the best MSS., some ancient Versions, and early Edd., and is edited by Beng., Matth., Griesb., Knapp, Tittm., Fritz., and Scholz: with reason; for *ὃ* deserves the preference, as being the more difficult reading. The common reading *λεγόμενος*, just after, can only be defended by the precarious principle of *Hypallage*. Hence, some MSS. change its place, several omit it, and Fritz. cancels it. But it is better to *heal* than to amputate: and I doubt not but that *λεγόμενος* is the true reading; which is found in not a few MSS., and is confirmed by the readings *μετεμνησθέντων*, and *καλούμενον*, and also by the Syriac, Arabic, Persic, and Æthiopic Versions, which must have read

	MK.	L.U.
34 κρανίου τόπος, ἔδωκαν αὐτῷ πιεῖν ὄξος μετὰ χολῆς μεμιγμένον· καὶ	15.	23.
35 γευσάμενος οὐκ ἤθελε πιεῖν. Σταυρῶσαντες δὲ αὐτὸν, διεμερίσαντο τὰ	²³	²⁴
ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ, βάλλοντες κλῆρον· [ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθῆν		34
ὑπὸ τοῦ προφήτου· Διεμερίσαντο τὰ ἱμάτιά μου		
ἑαυτοῖς, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἱματισμὸν μου ἔβαλον κλῆρον.]		
36 καὶ καθήμενοι, ἐτήρουν αὐτὸν ἐκεῖ. Καὶ ἐπέδημαν ἐπάνω τῆς κεφα-		
37 λῆς αὐτοῦ τὴν αἰτίαν αὐτοῦ γεγραμμένην, ΟΥΤΟΣ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΠΙΣΟΣ		
38 Ο ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΤΩΝ ΙΟΥΔΑΙΩΝ. Τότε σταυροῦνται σὺν αὐτῷ δύο		
λησταί, εἷς ἐκ δεξιῶν καὶ εἷς ἐξ εὐωνύμων.		
39 Οἱ δὲ παραπορευόμενοι ἐβλασφήμουν αὐτὸν, κινοῦντες τὴς κεφαλὰς	29	35
40 αὐτῶν καὶ λέγοντες· Ὁ καταλίων τὸν ναὸν καὶ ἐν τριῶν ἡμέραις		
οικοδομῶν, σῶσον σεαυτὸν. εἰ Τίος εἶ τοῦ Θεοῦ, κατέβηθι ἀπὸ τοῦ		
41 σταυροῦ. Ὅμοιως δὲ καὶ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς ἐμπαίζοντες, μετὰ τῶν γραμμα-		
42 τῶν καὶ πρεσβυτέρων, ἔλεγον· Ἄλλους ἔσωσον, ἑαυτὸν οὐ δύναται		
σῶσαι. εἰ βασιλεὺς Ἰσραὴλ ἐστί, καταβάτω νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ, καὶ		
43 πιστεύσομεν ἐπ' αὐτῷ. Πέποιθεν ἐπὶ τὸν Θεόν· ἠυσάσθω νῦν αὐ-		

λεγόμενον, or μεθερμηνεύμενον. Λεγόμενος arose from the vicious reading ὡς preceding. Render "which word is (i. e. signifies) when interpreted, Skull-plate." This sense of λέγεσθαι is found also in John xx. 16. Παββονί· ὃ λέγεται διδάσκαλε. Thus in a kindred passage of Matth. i. 23. ὅ ἐστι, μεθερμηνεύμενον, μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ Θεός. See also Mark v. 41. xv. 22. & 34. John i. 42. Acts iv. 36. In short, the thing is so certain, that I have ventured to edit λεγόμενον.

34. ὄξος — μεμιγμ.] Mark xv. 23. mentions a potion administered to Christ, but he calls it ἑσμερμηνέον οἶνον. Now in order to remove the discrepancy, the best Commentators suppose that it was the same drink under different names; since ὄξος is used to denote wine (especially the poorer kinds); and χολή, though properly signifying wormwood, yet sometimes in the Sept. denotes any bitter infusion. Others are of opinion, that the potions mentioned by the two Evangelists were distinct mixtures; the vinegar mingled with gall being, they think, offered in derision; and the myrrhed wine, the medicated cup usually administered to criminals about to suffer a painful death. The former interpretation, however, seems to be preferable; and it is confirmed by the ancient gloss which has crept into many of the best MSS., and all the best of the ancient Versions, οἶνον. [Comp. Ps. lxi. 22.]

35. ἵνα πληρωθῇ — κλῆρον.] These words are found in comparatively few MSS., have no place in the ancient Versions, and several Fathers, nor the Edit. Princ. They have been cancelled by every Editor of note from Wets. to Scholz. [Comp. Ps. xxii. 19. John xix. 23.]

37. αἰτίαν αὐτοῦ.] Namely, the τίτλον, or ἐπιγραφὴν τῆς αἰτίας, his crimination, the crime laid to his charge. This was engraven on a metal plate, in black characters on a white ground. The trifling discrepancy in the words of this inscription may very well have arisen from the language in which it was written.

38. δύο λησται] i. e. "highway robbers," with which, and banditti of all sorts, Judæa then swarmed; an evil which has been ascribed to various causes — excessive population (arising

from frequency of divorce), misplaced lenity towards offenders, the impatience of the Jews under the Roman yoke, and the crafty policy of the governors in encouraging such offenders. [Comp. Is. liii. 12.]

39. κινοῦντες τὰς κεφαλὰς.] A mark of derision common to all the nations of antiquity, and here a fulfilment of prophecy. See Ps. xxii. 7.

40. ὁ καταλίων, &c.] The ὁ refers to Σὺ understood; and καταλίων and οικοδομῶν signify populariter, "who undertook to destroy." See Glass Phil. [Comp. supra xxvi. 61. John ii. 19.]

41. καὶ φαρσαίων.] Many of the best MSS. add καὶ φαρσαίων, which is adopted by Wets., Matth., Fritz., and Scholz.

42. ἄλλους — σῶσαι.] Beza, Beng., Pearce, and some others, would take the words interrogatively; which makes them, they think, more cuttingly sarcastic. But this does violence to the contour of the passage, and destroys the antithesis, which, as Fritz. remarks, is strengthened by the Asyndeton. In further confirmation, I have in Recens. Syn. adduced the following apt examples. Aristid. iii. 430. B. (of Palamedes) πάσας τὰς ἄλλας εὐόλοσκον μηχανὰς, μίαν οὐχ εἶρεν, ὅπως σωθήσεται. Æschyl. Prom. V. 432 — 5. κακὸς δ' ἰατρὸς ὅς τις, εἰς νόσον Περσῶν ἀθυμεῖς, καὶ σεαυτὸν οὐκ ἔχεις εὐόρεν ὁποῖοις φαρμάκοις λάσιμος. [Comp. Wisd. ii. 18.]

— βασιλεὺς, &c.] We may remark the distinctive taunts of the Jews and the Romans; the former of whom adverted to Jesus's claim to be King of Israel (i. e. Messiah); the latter, to his assuming the title of King of the Jews, which, however, many of the Romans understood as equivalent to Messiah. The ἐπ' is inserted by almost every Editor from Wets. to Scholz, on the authority of nearly all the best MSS., and several Versions and Fathers.

43. πέποιθεν ἐπὶ τὸν Θεόν.] The Commentators are at a loss to know what the railers here allude to; perhaps, they think, to his declaration at Matth. xxvi. 53. But that was delivered aside to his disciples. There is rather a reference to that fearlessness with which Jesus yielded himself to the soldiers sent to apprehend him; and which might

MK. LU.

15. 23. τὸν, εἰ θέλει αὐτόν. εἶπε γάρ· "Οὐ Θεοῦ εἰμι Τίος. Τὸ δ' αὐτὸ 44
 39 καὶ οἱ ληστὰι οἱ συστρωθέντες αὐτῷ ἀνείδιζον * αὐτόν.
 33 44 Ἀπὸ δὲ ἑκτης ὥρας σκότος ἐγένετο ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν ἕως ὥρας 45
 34 ἐννάτης. Περὶ δὲ τὴν ἐννάτην ὥραν ἀνεβόησαν ὁ Ἰησοῦς φωνῇ μεγάλῃ, 46
 λέγων· Ἰλλί, Ἰλλί, λαμὰ σαβαχθανί; τοῦτ' ἔστι· Θεέ μου, Θεέ μου,

very well be thought to imply *confidence* in the Divine aid for deliverance. The railers, however, in this taunt unwittingly fulfilled a remarkable prophecy of the Messiah, Ps. xxiii. 3.

— εἰ θέλει αὐτόν.] Θελεῖν here, after the manner of the Heb. וְצַח, denotes to *delight in*.

44. οἱ ληστὰι — αὐτόν.] Or rather *one* of them, as is stated in the more *exact* account of Luke. This trifling discrepancy may, however, be removed; not, indeed, by supposing an *enallage*, nor by introducing the figure *Amplification*, which cannot here apply, but by supposing that the Evangelist speaks *generally*. See Winer Gr. 21. Αὐτόν (for the common reading αὐτῷ) is found in almost all the best MSS., and is adopted by Wets., Griesb., Matth., Vater, Tittm., Fritze, and Scholz.

45. σκότος — πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν.] There are here two points, which have occasioned no small perplexity to the Commentators; 1. the *darkness* here recorded; and 2. the *distance* to which it extended. On the former subject, they are not agreed as to the *nature* of the darkness, and its *cause*. The recent Commentators in general seek to account for it in the ordinary course of nature; while the antient, and most modern ones regard it as *preternatural*. That it could not be produced by a *total eclipse of the sun* is certain; for that can only happen at a *change of the moon*; whereas it was now *full moon*. Besides, a total eclipse never continues beyond a quarter of an hour. Some ascribe it to a mist arising from sulphureous vapours, such as precede or accompany *earthquakes*. This, the naturalists tell us, may extend to a semi-diameter of ten miles from any spot. Those who adopt this view of the subject appeal to the words of ver. 51. καὶ ἡ γῆ ἐσεισθή, &c. But can such a haze as that be *all* that is here meant? Taking the whole of the circumstances into the account, it should seem that both the darkness and the earthquake may be regarded as *preternatural*; something in the manner of a portentous *natural* meteoric phenomenon described by Ebn Batuta, in his travels, who mentions a certain spot as being "enveloped by a dense black cloud so close to the earth, that it might be almost touched with the hand." The darkness, which, it may be observed, is not said to have been *total* (nor, indeed, from the circumstances which are recorded as accompanying it, *could* it be such), was *probably* (for who shall dare to go beyond conjecture) produced (as Elsner supposes) by a preternatural accumulation of the densest clouds, enveloping the whole atmosphere; such as that mentioned at Exod. x. 21—3., brought preternaturally, at the stretching forth of the hand of Moses, over the whole land of Egypt, except that portion occupied by the children of Israel, and which was meant to portend the calamities that should soon overwhelm the Jewish nation."

But to turn to the *second* question: the *extent* of this darkness. Most of the antient interpreters regard it as extending over the *whole earth*; though *some* of them, as Origen, and the most

eminent modern ones, confine it to *Judæa*; while those who hold the hypothesis of a thick *haze*, such as precedes earthquakes, necessarily to the *vicinity of Jerusalem*. The *second* is, I apprehend, the true view. For, 1st, there is nothing in the words of the original that compels us to suppose *universality*; and it is more natural to take the expression of *Judæa*, the place of the transactions recorded. So, in a kindred passage of Luke iv. 25, ἐγένετο λιμὸς ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν. The Fathers, indeed, and some modern Commentators (especially Grot.) allege, in proof of its universality, passages of Phlegon, Thallus, and Dionys. the Areopagite. But they are not agreed on the nature of *Phlegon's* testimony; indeed, *nothing* which they ascribe to him has any direct bearing on this event. As to the passage adduced from *Thallus*, cited by Jul. Africanus, who mentions a darkness over all the world, and an earthquake which overturned many houses in Judæa and elsewhere; there is no reason to think that Thallus lived *before* Christ; and as the more *ancient* Fathers quote him for *other* matters, but never for *this*, no weight can be attached to the passage in question. As to the story told of Dionys. the Areopagite, it is entitled to still *less* attention, since Dr. Lardner has proved that all the writings attributed to him are spurious. Besides, there was surely (if we may venture to pronounce on the inscrutable purposes of Almighty Providence) a peculiar propriety in the darkness being *confined to Judæa*; — as indicating the wrath of God on that country for the enormity then perpetrating; and presenting an apt emblem of the spiritual darkness in which that benighted region was involved. Finally, by adopting this view, and not needlessly exaggerating the intensity of the obscuration, we are enabled satisfactorily to account for the silence of the Pagan Historians, and even Josephus, without supposing in the latter a wilful suppression of truth. Indeed, that writer has passed by *other* occurrences which we should as little think he would omit as this.

46. Ἰλλί — σαβαχθανί.] This is, with the exception of σαβ. (which is Syro Chaldaic), taken from Ps. xxii. 1. Mark writes Ἐλωί and λαμμᾶ, making it all Syro Chaldaic, which is the dialect then prevalent in Judæa, and, no doubt, used by our Lord. It is of more consequence to consider the *purpose* for which the words were pronounced. They must not be allowed to express (what some have ventured to ascribe to them) *impatience*, *faintheartedness*, and *despair*. We are not, however, to preclude this by giving them, as some do, a very different sense to that which would otherwise be ascribed to them. It is better to suppose that, by citing the verse, and applying it to himself, our Lord meant to turn the attention of his disciples to the *whole* Psalm; and to signify to them that he was now *accomplishing* what is there *predicted* of the Messiah. It has indeed been thought by some, that the words are too expressive of extreme mental suffering to admit of such an explanation. They would regard them as "the natural effusions of

47 ἵναί με ἐγκατέλιπες; Τινές δὲ τῶν ἐκεῖ ἐστῶτων ἀκούσαντες, ἔλεγον· 15. 23.
 48 Ὅτι Ἰλιάν φωνεῖ οὗτος. καὶ εὐθὺς δραμῶν εἰς ἕξ αὐτῶν, καὶ λαβὼν 35
 49 σπόγγον, πλήσας τε ὄξους καὶ περιθειὲς καλάμῳ, ἐπότιζεν αὐτόν. οἱ 36
 δὲ λοιποὶ ἔλεγον· Ἄφες, ἴδωμεν εἰ ἔρχεται Ἰλίας σώσων αὐτόν.
 50 Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς πάλιν κράζας φωνῇ μεγάλῃ, ἀφῆκε τὸ πνεῦμα. 37 46
 51 Καὶ ἰδοὺ, τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ ἐσχίσθη εἰς δύο ἀπὸ ἄνωθεν 38
 52 ἕως κάτω· καὶ ἡ γῆ ἐσεισθη, καὶ αἱ πέτραι ἐσχίσθησαν· καὶ τὰ
 μνημεῖα ἀνεώχθησαν, καὶ πολλὰ σώματα τῶν κεκοιμημένων ἀγίαν
 53 ἠέροθη, καὶ ἐξεληθόντες ἐκ τῶν μνημείων, μετὰ τὴν ἔγερσιν αὐτοῦ,
 εἰσηλθον εἰς τὴν ἀγίαν πόλιν, καὶ ἐνεφανίσθησαν πολλοῖς.

mental torture, scarce conscious of the complaints it uttered." But this is not a sufficiently reverent view. In short, no interpretation must be admitted which implies any expression of querulousness, or distrust in the favour and support of God. Moreover, on a subject so awfully mysterious as this, and that of the agony in the garden, it is better to abstain from all prying speculation, and learn, in the words of the Philosopher, *σωφρονεῖν ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ*.

47. Ἰλιάν φωνεῖ.] These were not, as some imagine, Roman soldiers; for they could know nothing about Elias. The best Commentators are of opinion that they were Hellenistic Jews, who either mistook Christ's words, or intentionally and maliciously perverted them, in derision of his claim to be the Messiah, and with reference to a common opinion, that Elias would return to life at the coming of the Messiah, and prepare the way for his kingdom.

43. καὶ εὐθὺς — ἐπότιζεν αὐτόν.] Namely, in consequence of what Jesus had just before said (as recorded by John xix. 23.) *διψῶ*.

— καλάμῳ.] Some render *reed*; Campb. *stick*. But I prefer, with Markl. "a stalk;" a not unfrequent, and perhaps the primary, sense of the word. Thus Matthew and John will be reconciled; for the *ὑσσώπῳ* of the latter is equivalent to *καλάμῳ ὑσσώπῳ*. The stalk of the hyssop is, in the East, so long, that it might easily reach our Lord on the cross; especially since it was by no means so high as is commonly supposed. *Περθεῖς* may be rendered, "winding, or fastening it round." With *πλήσας ὄξους*, I would compare the Schol. on Aristoph. *σπόγγους πεπληρωμένους μέλιτος*. [*Comp.* Ps. lxix. 22.]

49. ἀφες, ἴδωμεν.] Sub. *ἴνα*. This use of *ἀφες* and *ἴδωμεν* is not pleonastic (as some imagine), but hortatory, like our *come!*

50. κράζας φωνῇ μεγάλῃ.] Gruner (a German Physician, author of a learned Tract to prove the death of Christ real, and not, as some sceptics have pronounced, a mere *syncope*) and Kuin. take this to indicate a loud outcry from pain; as in the case of persons oppressed with an excessive congestion of blood about the heart — the precursor of suffocation. But that does not here apply; for this was not a mere outcry but an exclamation in words, (as is clear from Luke xxiii. 46. and John xix. 30.) namely, *τετέλεισται — πατήρ*. This sense of *κράζειν* is frequent in Scripture, especially as used of exclamations in precatory addresses to God. See Rom. viii. 15. Gal. iv. 6. James v. 4.

— ἀφῆκε τὸ πνεῦμα.] Many ancient and some modern Commentators suppose something preternatural in Christ's death, as being the effect of his volition. But there is nothing in the words of

Scripture to countenance such an opinion; though our Saviour's volition must be supposed to accompany his offering himself for the sins of the world. The term is no other than such as is frequently used, both in the Sept. and the Classical writers, of expiration, either with *πνεῦμα* or *φυχήν*. From the comparative shortness of time during which our Lord survived his crucifixion, some Commentators have supposed an especial interposition of the Deity. But it may very well be accounted for from natural causes, as is shown by Gruner, in the above-mentioned Tract *de morte Christi verâ*, from which copious extracts may be seen in Recens. Synop.

51. *καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ*.] This expression designates the interior of the two veils, which separated the Holy of Holies from the Sanctuary; and which is called by that name in the Sept., Philo, and Josephus. On the form and materials of this veil, see the authors referred to in Recens. Synop. From a most interesting passage of Pausan. v. 12, 12, which I have there adduced, it appears, that exactly such a veil (of woollen, richly embroidered, and in colour purple) was used at the Temple of Diana at Ephesus, and that of Jupiter at Olympia. It reached from the roof to the ground, and was drawn up and down by ropes.

At *εἰς δύο* there is the common ellipse of *μέτρῳ*. This rending of the veil, must, like all the other occurrences of this awful scene, be regarded as preternatural. For, though some recent Interpreters ascribe it to the earthquake just after recorded, certain it is, that no earthquake could rend a veil of 60 feet long, so exceedingly thick as, from its size and purpose, it must have been. Besides, the earthquake is plainly distinguished from the rending of the veil. It was, beyond doubt, supernatural; and on the symbolical intent of it see Recens. Synop.

— καὶ ἡ γῆ ἐσεισθη.] This also must be regarded as preternatural; for though an earthquake be not of itself such, yet when we consider the circumstances which accompanied the one here described, we cannot but regard it as produced by the direct agency of the Author of nature, and, therefore, so far preternatural.

Of this earthquake vestiges still remain, in immense fissures, which attest the violence of the rending, and show the significance and propriety of the words *καὶ αἱ πέτραι ἐσχίσθησαν*. [*Comp.* xxvi. 31; 2 Chron. iii. 14.]

52. καὶ τὰ μνημεῖα ἀνεώχθησαν.] An effect not unfrequently attributed to earthquakes in the ancient writers. See Recens. Synop. In τῶν κεκοιμημένων there is not, as some imagine, an Hebraism, for the idiom occurs in the Classical writers.

53. καὶ ἐξεληθόντες — εἰσηλθον, &c.] In this nar-

MK. LU.

15. 23. Ὁ δὲ ἐκατόνταρχος καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ τῆροῦντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν, ἰδόντες 54
 39 47 τὸν σεισμόν καὶ τὰ γενόμενα, ἐφοβήθησαν σφόδρα, λέγοντες· Ἀληθῶς
 Θεοῦ Τίος ἦν οὗτος.
- 40 49 Ἦσαν δὲ ἐκεῖ γυναικες πολλαὶ ἀπὸ μακρόθεν θεωροῦσαι, αἵτινες 55
 ἠκολούθησαν τῷ Ἰησοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, διακονοῦσαι αὐτῷ· ἐν αἷς 56
 ἦν Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνῆ, καὶ Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωσῆ μήτηρ,
 καὶ ἡ μήτηρ τῶν υἰῶν Ζεβεδαίου.
- 42 50 Ὅφιας δὲ γενομένης, ἦλθεν ἄνθρωπος πλούσιος ἀπὸ Ἀριμαθαίας 57
 43 52 τοῦνομα Ἰωσήφ, ὃς καὶ αὐτὸς ἐμαθήτευσε τῷ Ἰησοῦ. Οὗτος προσελ- 58
 θὼν τῷ Πιλάτῳ, ἤτίμησε τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. τότε ὁ Πιλάτος ἐκέλευ-
 46 53 σεν ἰδοθῆναι τὸ σῶμα. καὶ λαβὼν τὸ σῶμα ὁ Ἰωσήφ, ἐνετύλιξεν 59
 αὐτὸ σινδόνι καθαρῶ, καὶ ἔθηκεν αὐτὸ ἐν τῷ καινῷ αὐτοῦ μνημείῳ, 60
 ὃ ἐλατόμησεν ἐν τῇ πέτρᾳ· καὶ προσκυλίους λίθον μέγαν τῇ θύρᾳ

rative there are *three* points which demand our attention. 1. *Who* were the *οἱ κεκοιμημένοι*. 2. What was the *purpose* of their being raised from the dead. 3. What was the *time* at which it took place. They were *holy persons*, whether Jews, (as old Simcon), or such as had *lately* died in the the faith of Christ. They must have been persons *not long dead*, or they would not have been recognised by their contemporaries. The *purpose* is, with most probability, supposed to have been, to show that the power of the grave was destroyed, by *life* and *immortality* being brought to light by the Gospel; and thus a pledge given of the general resurrection. As to the *time*—that will depend on whether the phrase *μετὰ τὴν ἔγερσιν αὐτοῦ* be taken with the *preceding*, or the *following* words; on which Interpreters, ancient and modern, are divided in opinion. The *former* method seems the best founded. We need not, however, suppose, with some who adopt this view, that the resurrection in question was *gradual*, begun at the rending open of the graves, and *accomplished* after the resurrection of Christ. That would be too hypothetical; nor is it required by the declaration of the Apostle at Col. i. 18, and I Cor. xv. 20, that "Jesus was the first born from the dead, and the first fruits of them that slept." It is better to suppose (with some ancient, and a few modern Commentators), that the words are inserted somewhat out of place, and perhaps belong to *ἡγήρηθῃ*. As to the hypothesis of the sceptical school in Germany, that the verses are spurious, it is destroyed by the *fact*, that the words are found in *all* the MSS. and Versions, and are so alluded to by the early Fathers as to show their existence in *their time*: and interpolation at an *earlier* period was next to impossible.

54. ἀληθῶς—οὗτος.] I have proved at large in Recens. Synop. that Θεὸς ὕδ; cannot mean, as Grot., Markl., Campb. Rosenm., and Kuin. maintain, "an innocent and just man," or a son of a God, (i. e. a demigod); but the Son of God, the Messiah. The soldiers could not but know Jesus's pretensions to be such; and the import of the phrase must have been familiar to them. And seeing the awful and preternatural circumstances which accompanied his death, it was natural that they should exclaim, *some* of them, This was truly an innocent and just person! and *others*, This was truly the personage he affirmed himself to be—the Son of God!

57. ἀπὸ Ἀρ.] scil. ὤν. This sense of ἀπὸ (for which ἐκ is sometimes used) corresponds to the Latin *ex*, the Welsh *ap*, and our *of*. The riches and honourable station of Joseph are mentioned, to show the fulfilment of Isa. liii. 9. The best Commentators are agreed that Joseph was one of the Sanhedrim; for *βουλευτῆς* may be taken *improprie* for *ἄρχων*.

—ἐμαθήτευσε] for μαθητῆς ἦν. Of this intransitive sense examples are adduced by Wets. and Kypke from Plutarch and Jamblichus.

58. ἤτίμησε τὸ σῶμα.] Though the bodies of crucified persons were not *interred* by the Romans, yet they were generally given, on application, to their friends for burial. This would be more especially done in Judæa; because the custom of the country (founded on the Scriptural command, Deut. xxi. 23) required the bodies to be buried before sun-set; and particularly in the present case, on account of the approaching festival.

59. ἐνετύλιξεν—σινδόνι.] Similar language is found in Herodot. ii. 86. in his account of embalmment. The *σινδών* was a *web*, or wrapper of fine linen, which was used for the same purposes as our *sheets*; (see Thucyd. ii. 49, and my Note there), and also employed to roll around a corpse, previously to interment or embalming, being then secured by linen bandages. The word is derived by some from Sidon, where this linen was made. But it was chiefly manufactured in *Egypt*, and is therefore best derived from a similar word in the Coptic. Though I suspect that it *there* had its name (as in the case of our *nanken* and *muslin*, so denominated from Nanking and Masulipatam) from the article being originally brought from *Sind*, (i. e. Hindoostan), by that trade which, from a period anterior to all history, subsisted between Egypt and the East.

60. ἐν τῷ καινῷ αὐτοῦ μν.] These *two* circumstances are mentioned, to show the *honour* paid to our Lord by Joseph (as Dio says Augustus buried Agrippa in his *own tomb*); and to preclude any cavil of the Pharisees; as if the corpse had been resuscitated by touching the bones of some prophet; see 2 Kings xiii. 21. On the general evidence for the reality of the resurrection, see Horne's Introd. [*Comp.* Isa. liii. 9.]

—τῷ πέτρᾳ.] The Article here is very significant, and has reference to the rockiness of the country; on which we have the testimony of

61 τοῦ μνημείου, ἀπῆλθεν. Ἴν δὲ ἐκεῖ Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνῆ, καὶ ἡ ἄλλη Μαρία, καθήμεναι ἀπέναντι τοῦ τάφου.
 62 Τῇ δὲ ἐπαύριον, ἣτις ἐστὶ μετὰ τὴν παρασκευὴν, συνήχθησαν οἱ
 63 ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι πρὸς Πιλάτον, λέγοντες· Κύριε, ἐμνήσθη-
 64 μεν ὅτι ἐκεῖνος ὁ πλάνος εἶπεν ἔτι ζῶν· Μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἐγείρο-
 65 μεν αὐτὸν. Κέλευσον οὖν ἀσφαλισθῆναι τὸν τάφον ἕως τῆς τρίτης ἡμέρας·
 66 μήποτε ἐλθόντες οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ [νυκτὸς] κλέψωσιν αὐτὸν, καὶ
 εἰπωσὶ τῷ λαῷ· Ἠγέρθη ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν· καὶ ἔσται ἡ ἐσχάτη
 65 πλάνη χειρῶν τῆς πρώτης. Ἐφη δὲ αὐτοῖς ὁ Πιλάτος· Ἔχετε κουσιω-
 66 δῖαν· ὑπάγετε, ἀσφαλισασθε ὡς οἴδατε. Οἱ δὲ πορευθέντες ἠσφαλί-
 σαντο τὸν τάφον, σφραγίσαντες τὸν λίθον, μετὰ τῆς κουστωδίας. 16. 24.
 1 XXVIII. ὉΨΕ δὲ σαββάτων, τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτων, 1 1
 ἦλθε Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνῆ, καὶ ἡ ἄλλη Μαρία, θεωρῆσαι τὸν τάφον.

Strabo and Josephus, confirmed by modern travellers.

— προσκυλίσας λ.] The Commentators remark, that it was an Oriental custom thus to guard the entrances of caves, and also of subterraneous sepulchres. This was, however, not confined to the East, but extended to the West; as appears from the Classical passages adduced by Grot. and by myself in Recens. Synoptica; whence it appears that in the early ages stones were generally used in the place of doors to caves or vaults. The stone panelled doors which close many of the Egyptian monuments, were an invention midway between the *block of stone* of the primitive times, and the *wooden door* of after ages.

62. τὴν παρασκευὴν.] Παρασκευὴ denoted the day preceding any sabbath or festival, as being that on which the preparation for its celebration was to be made. See Horne's Introd.

— συνήχθησαν πρὸς Π.] "convenerunt ad Pilatum." There is a *significatio praeagnans* for, they went to and assembled at, i. e. they went in a body to.

63. πλάνος.] This word, like the Latin *planus*, signified properly a *vagabond*, and, from the adjunct, a *cheat*, *impostor*, &c. Μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας, i. e. within three days, equivalent to the third day. See Note on Matt. xvi. 21. That the Jews so understood it, is plain from the next verse. "A most amazing instance of God's providence (observes Markland) to make Jesus' greatest enemies bear witness, that before his death he had foretold his resurrection within three days." To which of the prophecies (whether that at Matt. xii. 40, or at Matt. xxvi. 61,) they alluded, is not clear. Certain it is, however, that our Lord's declaration, that he should rise from the dead, was publicly known.

64. καὶ ἔσται ἡ ἐσχάτη πλάνη, &c.] A proverbial saying, importing that it would be worse if the whole people should acknowledge him as Messiah, and thus rise up in rebellion. Νυκτὸς after αὐτοῦ is wanting in most of the best MSS. Versions, and some Fathers, and is cancelled by Griesb., Frit., and Scholz. Yet it is defended by xxviii. 13.

65. ἔχετε κουστωδῖαν.] The Commentators are not agreed whether ἔχετε should be taken in the Indicative, or in the Imperative. Either method is admissible; but as no example has been adduced of such a sense of ἔχειν as *to take*, though

found in the corresponding term of modern languages; and especially as the sense thus yielded is not so suitable to what follows, the former method (which is confirmed by some ancient and the best modern Commentators) seems preferable. Render, "ye have a guard;" namely, that stationed in the Castle of Antonia, and which was meant to quell any tumult in the city.

— ὡς οὔδατε.] The sense of this expression too is controverted; but the best rendering seems to be that of Grot. Schleus., Rosenm., Kuinoel, Frit., and others, "quantum potestis." In fact, there is an ellipsis of ἀσφαλιστάτα, to be supplied from ἀσφαλισσθε. The literal sense is, "as safely as ye know how," i. e. as ye are able.

66. σφραγίσαντες.] A mode of security in use from the earliest times; (as we find from Daniel vi. 17.), when it supplied the place of locks. See the Classical citations adduced by Wets. and myself in Rec. Synop. In the present case, the sealing material (no doubt with Pilate's seal) is supposed to have been affixed to the two ends of a cord or band brought round the stone. Μετὰ τῆς κουστωδίας may either (by such a transposition that as supra ver. 53,) be referred (with Raphel, Kypke, and Kuin.) to ἠσφαλίσαντο τὸν τάφον; or rather the words may be taken (with Frit.) as a *brachylogia* for μετὰ τοῦ προσθεῖναι τὴν κουστωδῖαν, "together with (a setting of) the guard," i. e. at this same time that they set the guard.

XXVIII. 1. ὉΨΕ δὲ σαββ.] This must, with Krebs, Wahl., Tittm., Kuin., and Frit., be explained, "after the sabbath," i. e. as Mark more clearly expresses it *διαγενομένου τοῦ σαββάτου*, which must determine the sense here. Of this signification the Commentators adduce examples from Philostr., Plut., Ælian, and Xenophon.

— τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ.] An elliptical expression for ἡμα τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐπιφ. The complete one occurs in Herodot. iii. 36, and ix. 44. The word is said by Casaub. to be used properly of the first appearing of the heavenly bodies. It may be paralleled by our verb to *dawn*. Μίαν is for πρώτην; by an idiom often found in the Sept., and derived from the Hebrew; though it exists, more or less, in most languages. On the evidence for our Lord's resurrection the reader is referred, for a general view of the subject and the arguments establishing the credibility thereof, to Horne's

MK. LU.

16. 24. Καὶ ἰδοὺ, σεισμὸς ἐγένετο μέγας· ἄγγελος γὰρ Κυρίου καταβάς ἐξ 2
οὐρανοῦ, προσελθὼν ἀπεκύλισε τὸν λίθον ἀπὸ τῆς θύρας, καὶ ἐκάθητο
ἐπάνω αὐτοῦ. Ἦν δὲ ἡ ἰδέα αὐτοῦ ὡς ἀστραπή, καὶ τὸ ἔνδυμα αὐ- 3
τοῦ λευκὸν ὡσεὶ χιὼν. Ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ φόβου αὐτοῦ ἐσεισθήσαν οἱ τη- 4
6 ροῦντες, καὶ ἐγένοντο ὡσεὶ νεκροί. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ ἄγγελος εἶπε ταῖς 5
7 γυναιξί· Μὴ φοβεῖσθε ὑμεῖς· οἶδα γὰρ ὅτι Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἐσταυρωμέ-
6 ρον ζητεῖτε. Οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε· ἠγγέθη γὰρ, καθὼς εἶπε. δεῦτε ἴδετε τὸν 6
7 τόπον ὅπου ἐκειτο ὁ Κύριος. Καὶ ταχὺ πορευθεῖσαι εἶπατε τοῖς 7
8 μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἠγγέθη ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν· καὶ ἰδοὺ, προάγει
8 ἡμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν· ἐκεῖ αὐτὸν ὄψεσθε. ἰδοὺ, εἶπον ἡμῖν. Καὶ 8
9 ἐξελθούσαι ταχὺ ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου μετὰ φόβου καὶ χαρᾶς μεγάλης,
9 ἔδραμον ἀπαγγεῖλαι τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ. Ὡς δὲ ἐπορεύοντο ἀπαγ- 9
γείλαι τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἰδοὺ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀπήνησεν αὐταῖς,
λέγων· Χαίρετε. Αἱ δὲ προσελθούσαι ἐκράτησαν αὐτοῦ τοὺς πόδας,

Introd. vol. i. p. 239. 260. For a harmony of the various narratives, to Mr. West and Dr. Townsend, and especially to Mr. Townsend (Chron. Arr.), and Mr. Greswell. On the important point of the change of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week, which arose out of our Lord's resurrection on the latter, the reader is referred to Horne's Introd. to a pamphlet of Dr. Millar of Armagh, and especially to an elaborate Sermon with Notes by Professor Lee of Cambridge, 1833. From which works it appears, that there is sufficient warrant in Scripture for the change of the Sabbath, without recurring to the Romish doctrine of *independent tradition*; and also that there is great reason to think the Patriarchal Sabbath coincided with our *Sunday*; also that, as it was thrown back to *Saturday*, in order to commemorate the Jewish Exodus; so that the return to the original Sabbath, when the purpose for which the new one had been appointed was answered, was just as reasonable as its former change. In short, to use the words of Professor Lee, *ubi supra*, "As the original sabbath had been sacred from the beginning, and had lost nothing of its primitive sanctions by having been accommodated to the times of the egress; and, as that system had come to an end, that day would now necessarily recur, by virtue of the precept which at first sanctified and set it apart. There would, consequently, be no necessity for any new commandment, in the New Testament, again to sanction it for the future observance of the Church." Nay, Professor Lee is further of opinion (and gives good reasons for supposing) that the heathens took this day, with its observances, from the Patriarchs; and that, as nothing ever occurred which could have induced the heathens to interrupt the recurrence of this as the seventh day, its observance must have come down to us from times as ancient as those under which the first appointment of a sabbath was kept.

2. καὶ ἰδοὺ σεισμὸς, &c.] I have in Recens. Synop. shown that the interpretation of *σεισμὸς* propounded by some Interpreters (namely, a *tempest* or *whirlwind*) cannot be admitted; still less that of "trembling" or "fear." Not merely absurd, but irreverent, is the interpretation of *ἄγγελος* by the Sceptical School of Theologians in Germany, by which it is made to mean, not a

person, but a *thing*; i. e. lightning or flames, which often accompany earthquakes.

3. ἰδέα] form, figure, or appearance; a signification frequent in the best Classical writers.

—λευκὸν ὡσεὶ χιὼν.] A simile of frequent occurrence in writers of every nation. "Whiteness (says Grot.) having ever been a symbol of purity and sanctity." See Dan. vii. 9. Apoc. iii. 4; vi. 11; vii. 9 and 13. Hence among all the nations of antiquity, it was customary for those who were celebrating divine worship to be clothed in white. But to this whiteness of garment there was, in these *angels*, superadded an undefinable and peculiar splendour, something like what is attributed to Christ in the transfiguration. (xvii. 2.) So Luke says they were *ἐν ἰσθήσασιν ἀστραπτοῦσαι*, a sign of celestial glory, such as Herod presumptuously affected. See Acts xii. 22.

4. ἀπὸ τοῦ φόβου.] *Ἀπὸ* here denotes the *origin* and cause of the fear; an idiom common to both Greek and Latin. *Ἐγέοντο ὡσεὶ νεκροὶ* is an hyperbolic phrase common to all ages and all languages.

6. τόπον.] The word here denotes the cavity, or *cell*, hollowed out in the vault; and in which was deposited the corpse. [*Comp. supra* xii. 40, xvi. 21. xvii. 23.]

8. μνημείου.] The *μνημεῖον*, or *monumentum*, amongst the Greeks and Romans, and perhaps the Jews, consisted of the cave, *κρυεῖν*, *σηλαῖον*, and *βύτην*, τὸ *ὑπαιθρον*, a small inclosure in the same ground around it. This whole *μνημεῖον* was also itself situated in a larger space of ground, outside of the inclosure, called by the Romans *tutela monumenti*; and here corresponding to the cultivated garden.

—μετὰ φόβου καὶ χαρᾶς.] The phraseology (with which Wets. compares several passages from the Classical writers) strongly expresses the mingled sensations of *fear* (or rather *awe*) at the appearance of the angel, and *joy* at the good news he announced.

9. χαίρετε.] This is wrongly rendered by Campb. "rejoice." It is a common form of salutation. So the Syriac renders, "Pax vobis!" Our *Hail!* best represents the sense; since *hail*, in the language of our ancestors, denoted health, prosperity, and good of every kind.

—ἐκράτησαν πόδας] i. e. in the manner of sup-

- 10 καὶ προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ. ^a Τότε λέγει αὐταῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Μὴ φοβεῖ- ^a John 20. 17.
 σθε· ὑπάγετε, ἀπαγγεῖλατε τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μου, ἵνα ἀπέλθωσιν εἰς τὴν Acts 1. 3.
 Γαλιλαίαν· καὶ ἐκεῖ με ὄψονται.
- 11 Πορευομένων δὲ αὐτῶν, ἰδοὺ, τινὲς τῆς κοινοῦ τῆς ἐλθόντες εἰς τὴν
 12 πόλιν, ἀπήγγειλαν τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσιν ἅπαντα τὰ γινόμενα. Καὶ συνα-
 χθέντες μετὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, συμβούλιόν τε λαβόντες, ἀργύρια ἱκανὰ
 13 ἔδωκαν τοῖς στρατιώταις, λέγοντες· Ἐπάτε, ὅτι οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ
 14 νυκτὸς ἐλθόντες ἔκλεψαν αὐτὸν, ἡμῶν κοιμωμένων. Καὶ εἰς ἀκουσθῆ
 τοῦτο ἐπὶ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος, ἡμεῖς πείσομεν αὐτὸν, καὶ ὑμᾶς ἀμεριμνοῦς
 15 ποιήσομεν. Οἱ δὲ λαβόντες τὰ ἀργύρια, ἐποίησαν ὡς ἐδιδάχθησαν.
 Καὶ διεφημίσθη ὁ λόγος οὗτος παρὰ Ἰουδαίους μέχρι τῆς σήμερον.
- 16 ^b Οἱ δὲ ἑνδεκα μαθηταὶ ἐπορεύθησαν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν, [εἰς τὸ ^b Supr. 26. 32.
 17 ὄρος] οὗ ἐτάξαστο αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς. Καὶ ἰδόντες αὐτὸν προσεκύνησαν

pliants; who used to prostrate themselves, and embrace the feet of those from whom they sought protection. Brug., Lightf., and Rosenm., take it to mean "kissed his feet;" a custom also prevalent in the East, from whence it afterwards passed to the West. But the words will not admit such a sense. And, indeed, the deep awe which inspired their adoration (on which see Note on Matt. ii. 2.) seems to have scarcely permitted an action rather importing affection than any more reverential feeling.

10. καὶ ἐκεῖ με ὄψονται] i. e., as Fritz. says, καὶ ἀπαγγ. ὅτι ἐκεῖ με ὄψονται.

12. ἀργύρια ἱκανὰ] i.e. for πολλά; which use is frequent when the word occurs with nouns signifying many. The Commentators regard ἀργ. as plural for singular. In fact, ἀργύριον denotes 1. silver in bullion; 2. silver coined; in which sense it is chiefly used in the singular; 3. silver coins; but chiefly the stater, tetradrachma, or shekel; in which sense it is generally used in the plural, mostly accompanied with numerals, or words that imply number, as many, few, &c. 4. In the plural it denotes money, as here.

13. ἔκλεψαν αὐτὸν] "took him away clandestinely." In this sense κλέπτω occurs in 2 Sam. xix. 41. Several examples from the Classical writers are adduced by the Commentators, but not any quite apposite. One, however, exists in Thucyd. vii. 85.

14. ἐπὶ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος.] Here ἐπὶ is not for ὑπὸ, as some maintain; but is used in the sense apud, coram, as the Syr. takes it, with the approbation of Grot. and Fritz.

— πείσομεν αὐτὸν] "we will appease (his wrath), conciliate his pardon and favour; namely, by entreaties or gifts." There is, however, no ellipse of χρομᾶσι, as some recent English Commentators suppose. The means of persuasion are left to be imagined. Ἀμεριμνοῦς ποιήσομεν is a phrase corresponding to the Latin *indemnem vel securum præstare*, (scil. a malo), to make one safe and sure [from harm].

15. ὁ λόγος οὗτος] i. e. this story, about the stealing of the body, which was put into the mouths of the soldiers. That it was studiously disseminated by the Jews, we learn from a passage of Justin Martyr cited by the Commentators: indeed, traces of it are found in the Rabbinical writings.

16. εἰς τὸ ὄρος οὗ, &c.] Since neither by himself, in his prophetic declaration at Matt. xxvi. 32,

nor in his promise, supra v. 10, nor by the angel, v. 4, is any mountain specified as the place of meeting between Christ and his disciples, it is argued by Whitby, Mackn., and other English Commentators, that the words οὗ ἐτάξαστο must be referred, not to ὄρος, but to Γαλιλαίαν. This, however, would be doing such violence to the construction, that it cannot be admitted. At the same time, there is little doubt that the Apostles did assemble for that purpose on a mountain (for the same reason that our Lord chose mountains for prayer, &c.); and probability and ecclesiastical tradition concur in pointing out Tabor as the place. Are we, then, to suppose that there is, in the passage before us, a reference to a particular spot of meeting, which, nevertheless, has not been mentioned by the Evangelist, where one might have expected it, supra v. 10? Had Kuin. and Fritz. thought so, they would, no doubt, have imputed it to the "hasty negligence with which," they say, "the Evangelist speeds to the conclusion of his Gospel." But far be such irreverence from serious believers! Besides, neither do the other Evangelists, who have supplied what St. Matthew here omits, make mention of this circumstance; which yet would not be likely to be omitted. And it is scarcely probable that our Lord would appoint the place, and not fix the time: since any long continuance in so wild and desert a place as Mount Tabor, must have been very inconvenient to the disciples. I cannot help suspecting, that the words εἰς τὸ ὄρος (which ought to be rendered, not "into a mountain," but "unto the mountain,") are not genuine. They are not found in six MSS., and therefore I have thought proper to place them within brackets. They seem to have arisen from a marginal remark of those who were well aware of the Ecclesiastical tradition, that this transaction took place at Mount Tabor; whence it seems others afterwards introduced them into the text, as thinking them required by the *ov*, and as serving to make the thing more definite. By their removal the difficulty in question will vanish; since the οὗ will thus refer to Γαλιλαίαν just before, and the reference to v. 9 will be more distinct; vv. 11 — 15 being, as Dr. A. Clarke saw, in some measure parenthetical. The οὗ is thus used for οἱ, *whither*, as at Luke x. 1. ἀπέστειλεν αὐτοὺς εἰς πᾶσαν πόλιν — ὅτι ἐμελεῖν αὐτοῖς ἐρχεσθαι, and xxiv. 28. ἤγγισαν εἰς τὴν κώμην, οὗ ἐπορεύοντο. 1 Cor. xvi. 6.

The above Commentators are of opinion, that

c Supr. 11. 27.
John 3. 35.
& 13. 3. & 17. 2.
Heb. 1. 2.
& 2. 8.
d Mark 16. 15.
Luke 24. 47.

αὐτῶ· οἱ δὲ ἐδίδαξαν. ° Καὶ προσελθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐλάλησεν αὐτοῖς, 18
λέγων· Ἐδόθη μοι πᾶσα ἐξουσία ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς. ἂ Πορευ- 19
θέντες [οὖν] μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ

although the Evangelist does not mention more than the *Eleven*, yet that we may suppose there were many more witnesses; namely, the *Seventy* and other recently converted disciples, so that the number may coincide with the 500 mentioned by St. Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 6. But thus what is said v. 19. *πορευθέντες μαθητ. π. τ. ἔ.* would have to be referred to the *whole*; which cannot be meant. Besides, St. Paul there expressly *distinguishes* the appearance to the *Apostles* (the Twelve or Eleven) from that to the 500 (meaning the disciples at large).

[17. *οἱ δὲ ἰδίστασαν.*] There has been some difficulty raised both as to the *construction*, and the *persons* meant by *οἱ δὲ*. As to the former, there can be no doubt but that the *οἱ δὲ* is rightly taken, by some ancient and several of the best modern Commentators, for *ταῖς δὲ*; of which many examples are adduced. But the latter difficulty is not so easily removed. To resort to conjectural alteration, with Beza, is to cut the knot. To take *ἰδίστασαν*, with Grot., Doddr., and Fritz., as a pluperfect, ("had doubted,") is harsh, and too much like a device for the nonce. In Recens. Syn. and the first Edition of this work, I gave the preference to the interpretation of Whitby, West, Owen, and Kuin., who refer the words to the *seventy disciples*, some of whom might have scruples remaining, and who would probably attend together with the Eleven. But I am now persuaded that that view is inadmissible; not so much because it has no countenance from St. Matthew, as because it is contradicted by the express words of St. Paul. Nor are we compelled to take the *οἱ δὲ* of *one only*, Thomas; for we may suppose, that although he alone expressed his doubts, yet there might be at least one more besides, who felt distrust, doubting the *bodily* presence of the Lord. The construction is elliptical, for *καὶ ἰδόντες αὐτὸν, οἱ μὴ προσεκύνησαν αὐτὸν, οἱ δὲ ἰδ.,* or *οἱ δὲ ἴτινες*. So Thucyd. vi. 15. *οἱ μὴ πλείστοι στρατεύειν παρήνουν, οἱ δὲ ἴτινες καὶ ἀντήλεγον.*

Διατάξεν properly signifies to stand *in vivo*, not knowing or determining which road to take. The metaphor may be illustrated from the following elegant passage of Eurip. Orest. 625. *ἁπλῆς μεριμνῆς διπτύχους ἰὼν δόοις.*

[18. *ἔδοθη μοι πᾶσα ἐξ.*] "all power of every kind," the highest authority (*δόξα πραιάντιος*, John xvii. 5. and 24.) These words have been by some so explained as to derogate from the *Divinity* of Christ. But, when properly understood, they will by no means lead to any such conclusion. It is justly argued by Whitby and Mede, that as in his *Divine* nature our Lord doubtless had this power from all eternity, so, if this declaration be supposed to be made with respect to his *Divine nature*, it must be understood of him as being *God of God*, deriving his being and essence by an eternal generation from the Father. But he was also perfect *man*, as well as perfect *God*; and therefore the words may have been spoken in reference to his state of *humiliation*, now about to terminate in glory at the right hand of God; before which time he could not exercise the power, though he had before received it. In short, such unlimited power could neither be received nor exercised by any Being less than *God*. *Christ therefore is God.*

— *πορευθ. οὖν μαθητ., &c.*] The connexion here is ably traced by Bp. Beveridge, thus, — "I have now all power, &c. conferred upon me; by *virtue of which* therefore I empower and commission you to enlarge, settle, and govern the Church which I have founded." Thus we have here that great *commission* granted by Christ to his Apostles and their successors, with respect to all nations (both Jews and Gentiles) embracing three particulars, *μαθητεύειν, βαπτίζειν, and διδάσκειν*, i. e. 1. to disciple them, or convert them to the faith; 2. to initiate them into the Church by baptism; 3. to instruct them when baptized, in the doctrines and duties of a Christian life. From the present passage we may infer three things, 1. the necessity of baptism; 2. the lawfulness of *Infant* baptism; 3. the doctrine of the *Trinity*: since we are baptized in (or unto) the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, without any mention of difference, distinction, or superiority. And with respect to the *second* point, "no argument can," as Dr. Doddridge says, "be drawn from these words to the prejudice of infant baptism," because, though especially adapted to *adults*, as necessarily forming the bulk of the first converts; yet it need not be thought to exclude *infants*, who cannot be expected to have faith in order to be baptized. And this inference would necessarily be drawn by the Jews, since they were accustomed to see infants baptized; and would naturally conclude, that as no alteration was announced, the *mode* of admission into covenant remained the same. The *propriety* of infant baptism may be inferred from the analogy which the rite bears to *circumcision*, and the *baptism of proselytes*, which included their children as well as themselves. There is precisely the same reason why the children of *Christians* should be admitted from their infancy into the Christian covenant, as why the infants of Jewish parents should be admitted into the Mosaic Covenant. Infants being as capable of covenanting in the one case as in the other. And if God did not consider their *age* any objection against even *circumcision*, or the baptism of the children of Jewish proselytes; we have no reason to urge it as an objection against being received to Christian baptism. In short, it may be confidently pronounced, that *Infant Baptism* has subsisted from the times of the Apostles to the present day. Timothy was brought up a Christian ἀπὸ βροίφους, as multitudes of others must, when whole families were baptized. So also Justin Martyr, Apol. i. says that there were then many of both sexes, 60 or 70 years of age, οἱ ἐκ π a ἰδω ν ἱμαθητεῖθησαν τῷ Χριστῷ, ἄφθοροι διαμένοναι. And certain it is, that in Tertullian's day, the practice was general. In fact, had infant baptism not subsisted in the time of the Apostles, what, (as Wets. observes) would have been done with the infants or male children of Christians? Were they to be *circumcised*? certainly not. Were they then to be brought up in neither Judaism nor Christianity, but with their minds a *tabula rasa*? certainly not. "Bring them up," says St. Paul, "in the fear and nurture of the Lord." Otherwise they would have been in a worse condition than if their parents had never been Christians. And though nothing is said in Scripture to *enjoin* infant baptism, it was not ne-

20 ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος, διδάσκοντες αὐτοὺς τηρεῖν πάντα ὅσα ἐνετειλάμην ὑμῖν. Καὶ ἰδοὺ, ἐγὼ μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας, ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος. Ἀμήν.

cessary that it should be expressly enjoined; just as neither the age nor sex of those admitted to the Lord's Supper is mentioned or prescribed. On the other hand, there was a good reason why that should *not* be done; namely, lest superstitious persons should stick at the *bark* only of the doctrines, and give their chief attention to what is *ceremonial*, to the neglect of what is *essential*." See more in Wets., who also well observes, that whatever may be thought of *other* passages, certainly in *this*, which contains the institution of baptism, a *mild and liberal* exposition of *μαθητεῖαν* is to be preferred to a rigid interpretation. Such, indeed, as there is no doubt was adopted by the *Apostles*. On this subject see more in the able Notes of Lightf. and Whitby, and especially an elaborate annotation of Wets. translated and given entire in Rec. Syn. The reader is also referred to an able pamphlet by the learned and candid Professor Stuart (of America), on the Mode of Baptism, who after having at large considered the subject of *sprinkling* as compared with *immersion*, and proved that the former is equally as proper as the latter, as sufficiently expressing the same intention, concludes with the following remark on *Infant Baptism*. "I have only to say

that I believe in both the propriety and expediency of the rite thus administered; and therefore accede to it *ex animo*. Commands, or plain and certain examples, in the New Testament relative to it, I do not find. Nor, with my views of it, do I need them. If the subject had respect to what is *fundamental*, or *essential*, in Christianity, then I must find either the one or the other, in order to justify adopting or practising it. But as the case now is, the *general analogy* of the ancient dispensation; the *enlargement* of privilege under the Gospel; the silence of the New Testament on the subject of receiving children into a special relation to the church, by the baptismal rite, which shows, at least, that there was no dispute in early ages relative to this matter; the certainty that in Tertullian's day the practice was general; all these considerations put together—united with the conviction that baptism is *symbol* and *dedication*, and may be so in the case of infants as well as adults; and that it brings parents and children into a peculiar relation to the church, and under peculiarly recognized obligation—serve to satisfy me fully, that the practice may be, and should be continued."

ΤΟ ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΡΚΟΝ

ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ.

Ι. ἈΡΧΗ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ὡς γέ- 1
γραπτῶν ἐν [Ἡσαΐα] * τῷ * προφήτῃ· Ἴδοὺ, ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω τὸν 2

C. I. The writer of this Gospel is almost universally admitted to have been John, surnamed Mark, who was sister's son to Barnabas, and son of Mary, a pious woman, at whose house the first Christians usually assembled at Jerusalem. This is, indeed, denied by Grotius, and, after him, by Dr. Burton; but the objections of the former have been overruled by Fritz. And as to what is urged by the latter, that "if the Evangelist died, as we are told by Eusebius, in the 8th year of Nero (i. e. A. D. 61 or 62), he could not be mentioned in the 2d Epistle to Timothy, which was not written till, at the earliest, A. D. 64;" we are surely not authorized to reject, on so slender a ground, what is founded in high probability, supported by the earliest Ecclesiastical tradition, on a point where it could scarcely fail to preserve the truth. It is more reasonable to suppose, either that Euseb. was *misinformed* as to the exact date; or rather that there is some mistake of the scribes *in the figure*. Probably for **II** we should read **II** (13).

Mark was not an Apostle, nor probably one of the Seventy disciples, especially as St. Peter (I Pet. v. 13.) calls him his *son* [namely, in the faith], i. e. his convert. For the outlines of the Evangelist's history traced from the N. T. and the early Ecclesiastical writers, the reader is referred to Mr. Horne's Introduction. The time when this Gospel was written is much disputed, and cannot be fixed with certainty; but it is with most probability fixed at A. D. 66 or 67., and a little after the time when St. Luke published his Gospel: certainly not till after the death of St. Peter, and probably St. Paul. This matter is, however, closely connected with another question, of far greater importance, — whether, in writing his Gospel, Mark made use of the Gospel of Matthew? On this the opinions of the learned are at the antipodes; some maintaining that Mark's Gospel is only an abridgement of Matthew's; others, that Mark made no use of that Gospel — nay, was totally unacquainted with it:

indeed, that the Gospels were *all* of them formed without knowledge of, and independently of each other. Now here, if ever, "in medio tutissimus ibis." The instances of verbal coincidence are so striking (nearly the whole of the Gospel being found in Matthew) as to forbid the *latter* supposition. And as to the *former*, it may, with equal confidence, be maintained, that this Gospel is *not* a mere abridgement of St. Matthew's, since it differs from it (as we shall see) in many important respects. The question whether St. Mark made use of St. Luke's Gospel, is of more difficult determination. Dr. Hales thinks that Griesbach has, by an elaborate process, furnished strong internal evidence of the priority of Luke's Gospel to Mark's. In using these Gospels, Dr. Hales thinks that Mark in general rather adopted the *language* of Matthew, but the *order* of Luke; yet neither *implicitly*. Besides, he is more circumstantial and correct than either of them in the relation of joint facts. Now, Dr. Hales argues, had *Luke* followed *Mark* (as is the common opinion), it is not credible that he would have omitted *all* those; since even John has used *some*. And this priority of Luke to Mark is not only maintained by many eminent moderns, but confirmed by the authority of Clemens Alex., who attests that Gospels, with the genealogies, were first written, and by Julian, who mentions them in the order — *Matthew, Luke, Mark, and John*. We can, as Dr. Hales observes, account *thus* for the order in which they at present stand. "From the time that the notion prevailed that Mark's Gospel was an abridgement of St. Matthew's, it was natural to place it *next* to St. Matthew's." This (I would add) might take place even on the opinion that Mark *chiefly* followed Matthew. Thus, also, when Tertullian ranges the Gospels of Matthew, John, Luke, and Mark, he classifies them into *original*, and, in some degree, *compilatory* compositions. To advert to a yet more important subject — it may be thought surprising, that persons of acknowledged ability should have adopted opinions so diametrically

ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου, ὃς κατασκευάσει
 3 τὴν ὁδόν σου [ἔμπροσθέν σου,] Φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν

opposite to each other, as to the *origin*, or sources, and *nature* of the Gospels. But the truth is, that the existence of such striking *verbal coincidences* between Matthew, Mark, and Luke, when coupled with the remarkable *variations*, and almost *discrepancies* in their respective accounts, presents a most perplexing phenomenon. Hence men of talent have set themselves to devise such *hypotheses*, as to the origin of the Gospels, as may satisfactorily *account* for these phenomena; and, as might be expected, they have, to a *certain degree*, met with success. Of the many that have been propounded, *four alone* deserve any attention. 1. That *one or two* of the three Gospels were taken from the *third*. 2. That *all three* were derived from some *original document*, Greek or Hebrew, common to all three. 3. That they were derived from *detached narratives* of parts of the history of Christ, communicated by the Apostles to the first converts. 4. That they were derived from *oral tradition*. Now as to the *traditionary hypothesis*, suffice it to say that, besides proceeding on a wholly gratuitous *assumption* (as to the existence of *verbal Gospels*), and taking for granted other things (as to the *length of time* which elapsed before a Gospel was committed to writing, &c. &c.) it only brings upon us new and *real difficulties* in the place of *alleged ones* (especially as to the *uniformity* of such tradition), and is utterly inconsistent with the striking *verbal coincidences* found in the Gospels. As to the *documentary hypothesis*, even in its most modified and least objectionable form (No. 3.), it is liable to the same objections as No. 2., of *complexity* and *artificialness*; and that fatal one, the *silence of all Ecclesiastical antiquity* as to the existence of any such primary document, or documentary narratives. In short, of all these three hypotheses, (namely 2, 3, 4) we may truly say, that, while they are such as by no means to command our credence, they detract not a little from the *authority* of the first three Gospels as inspired compositions. Whatever may be the *modifications* with which either the *documentary* or the *traditionary hypotheses* be brought forward — whatever may be the *refinements* resorted to — they are insufficient to elude the plain inference, implied in each and all, that the Evangelists are scarcely to be regarded as *regular*, much less as *inspired historians*. There is, indeed, the less excuse for resorting to these hypotheses, since it is wholly *unnecessary* so to do; as will appear from an examination of the first-mentioned hypothesis, which has been held, with various modifications, by many of the most eminent Theologians and Commentators, ancient and modern. Even to *this view*, indeed, objections may, and have been made, which are thus summed up by Mr. Horne, Vol. I. 494 & 496: “1. The Evangelists could have no *motive* for copying from each other. 2. It does not appear that any of the ancient Christian writers had a suspicion that either of the first three Evangelists had seen the other Gospels before he wrote his own. 3. It is not suitable to the character of any of the Evangelists, that they should abridge or transcribe another historian. 4. It is evident, from the nature and design of the first three Gospels, that the Evangelists had not seen any *authentic* written history of Jesus Christ. 5. All the first three Evangelists

have several things peculiar to themselves; which show that they did not borrow from each other, and that they were all well acquainted with the things of which they undertook to write a history.” On a close examination, however, of these objections, some, it is conceived, will be found *groundless*, others to proceed from *misapprehension*, or *taking for granted* what has not, and cannot be *proved*: in short, that all put together have not weight enough to decide even a doubtful case. That there should have been such various *modifications* of the hypothesis now under consideration, is no proof, as the objectors to it allege, that it is wholly unfounded. *Extremes have in all ages produced extremes*. From the strong verbal coincidences between this Gospel and that of St. Matthew, many, from the time of Augustine downwards, have regarded Mark as a mere epitomizer of Matthew. Now this is at variance with the universal testimony of early antiquity, and is forbidden by the *alterations* in the order of time and the arrangement of facts, and the *addition* of much matter not found in Matthew. The strong coincidences may serve to prove that he often *followed* Matthew; but his frequent *deviations* from Matthew show that he was by no means an abridger. But, on the other hand, that the *succeeding Evangelists* did not see each the Gospel of his predecessor, is, as Dr. Hales observes, “a *negative* which cannot be *proved*. Whereas the *affirmative* is highly probable, from the intimate connection and correspondence between them, and appears to be sufficiently established from *internal evidence*.” Upon the whole, there seems no good reason to reject the first-mentioned hypothesis; which will, I apprehend, have only to be *duly modified*, and properly *limited*, to free it from all reasonable objection. The state of the evidence as to the verbal coincidences is, as we have seen, such as to utterly *exclude* the notion (otherwise improbable) that the Evangelists who followed the *first* did not know, much less make use of, their predecessors’ works. The case seems to have been this: 1. That the Gospels of Matthew and Luke were original and independent narratives (except that Luke probably made some use of the Hebrew original of St. Matthew). 2. That Mark’s Gospel appeared after those two; and that the Evangelist freely used the matter contained in one or the other, according as it suited his purpose, and was agreeable to his plan. 3. That such parts as are not found in Matthew or Luke, were either derived from St. Peter (under whose sanction and direction he wrote), or at least from the testimony of “*eye-witnesses*, and ministers of the word.” As to the *discrepancies* (which, however, have been much *exaggerated*) between his Gospel and that of St. Matthew, they will (as Dr. Hales observes) “not prove that he could not have known of it, or used the Gospel; but only that he felt himself authorized to claim the character of an original historian; which, considering his many advantages for arriving at the truth, and the countenance and direction of St. Peter, he might well do.” This view, while it satisfactorily accounts for the verbal coincidences, cannot, when properly understood, be justly thought to derogate from the credit of St. Mark’s Gospel, as a Canonical work, or one written under Divine inspiration. See Dr. Hales’ judicious remarks on the

MT. LU.

3. 3. τῆ ἐρήμῳ, Ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου, εὐθείας ποι-
 3 4 εἶτε τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ· ἐγένετο Ἰωάννης βαπτίζων ἐν τῇ 4

inspiration of the Evangelists. Vol. iii. pp. 26—30. To advert to the *purpose* of this Gospel, "A brief and plain account (to use the words of the same writer) of the grounds of the Christian religion was, even after the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, wanted for plain and unlettered persons. And this Mark, under the sanction and with the occasional assistance of St. Peter, undertook to draw up, at the request (as we learn from early Ecclesiastical writers) of the Christian converts of Rome, who had attended on St. Peter's preaching. In compliance with their request, Mark most judiciously selected, and sometimes *enlarged*, the more important parts of Matthew and Luke, and adapted them to his peculiar purpose; which was to give a *succinct* history of our Lord's ministry, commencing from the preaching of the Baptist to his *Ascension*, and concluding with the preaching of the Apostles every where throughout the world. Hence we are enabled to account for his *omission* of certain portions of their Gospels either entirely or partially; on the same principle that *John* coming after him, omits *considerably more*, so as to form a *distinct* Gospel, which may be considered as a *supplement to the rest* [See, however, *Intr.* to St. John's Gospel. Ed.], with only the insertion of so much matter common to the former, as to connect his Gospel with theirs."

There are indeed not wanting those who, strenuously contending for the Gospels being formed independently of each other, are of opinion that these coincidences in the writings of the Evangelists may be sufficiently accounted for without having recourse to the supposition that the later Gospels were, in some degree, formed on the preceding ones. According to this view, the verbal coincidences are ascribed to the *uncommon attention* with which Christ's sayings were treasured up in the memories of his hearers, and the supernatural aid promised to "bring all things to their remembrance, whatever he had said unto them." (John xiv. 26.) See Bp. Gleig and Archdeacon Nares cited by Mr. Horne. But this, it should seem, is ascribing more to *memory* than, even under the most favourable circumstances, can be safely done. At all events, it is not well judged to bring in the principle of strict *verbal inspiration*, in direct opposition to the strongest internal evidence of one Gospel, at least, being partly formed from the other two. There is nothing, it is apprehended, in the above view derogatory of the true claims of either Evangelist; especially of Luke, as will appear from his own preface to his Gospel; on which see the Notes *in loco*. Inspiration, as far as it was *needed*, was, we may believe, so far granted; and to suppose it to have proceeded *beyond* that, is to run counter to the usual course of God's operations, whether in the *natural* or the *moral* world, in which a beautiful *economy* is observable. The Deity, we may be assured, adapts both the ordinary and the extraordinary dispensations of his Providence to the actual circumstances of the moral world in different places, ages, or countries.

The *authenticity* of this Gospel (which, indeed, has scarcely been disputed) is established on an unbroken chain of testimony, commencing from the time even of St. Clement, in the first century, down to the 4th century. As to the *date* of this

Gospel and St. Luke's, it appears, from Irenæus, that neither was published till after the death of St. Peter and St. Paul. Hence we cannot assign an *earlier* date than 65 to either of the Gospels, nor a *later* one than 68 (both being confessedly written before the destruction of Jerusalem), and probably Luke's Gospel and Acts were published in 66, and Mark's Gospel in 67.

I take this opportunity of offering some further remarks on the state of the evidence, as concerns the date of publication of St. Matthew's Greek Gospel. On a more mature consideration of the various arguments advanced in favour of an *early*, and those of a *later* date, I must confess that the evidence for the *latter* seems to preponderate. That of *antiquity* is stronger for it; and the complete silence of the writers of the Apostolical Epistles as to any *written* Gospels, tends to the same conclusion. A late period, too, was, as Dr. Hales observes, the fittest of all; for whilst the eye-witnesses and ministers of the word were executing their commission of "disciplining all nations, by *preaching* the Gospel every where," they had scarcely *leisure* for *writing*. But when they were "*finishing* their course," in order to supply the place of their *oral* instructions, after their decease, *writing* became necessary. This induced Peter to write his Epistles to the Jewish converts, Paul his Epistles to the Hebrews, James and John their general Epistles, and likewise the Evangelists their Gospels. The marvellous difference of opinion as to the date of Matthew's Gospel, has been chiefly occasioned by the conflicting testimonies of *Irenæus*, as quoted by Eusebius v. 3., and of Eusebius himself, in his *Ecl. Hist.* iii. 24. and his *Chronicon*. Yet the discrepancy may be reconciled, by supposing that the time mentioned by Eusebius, namely the 3d year of the reign of Caligula (i. e. some time in A. D. 40.), is to be understood of the *Hebrew*, not the *Greek* Gospel. This, indeed, is plain from that writer's own words; where he says that, having spread the Gospel *by word of mouth*, the Evangelist, on leaving Judæa to go and preach Christianity to the Gentiles, left his countrymen his Gospel for their information, written *πατριῶ γλώττῃ*, which last circumstance Mr. Horne, iv. 257. (or his authorities) omits to state, in noticing this passage. And as to what is said by *Irenæus*, cited by Euseb. *Ecl. Hist.* v. 3. as quoted in English by Mr. Horne, namely, that Matthew put forth a Gospel among the Hebrews, while Peter and Paul were preaching Christianity at Rome; there would seem to be no difficulty in supposing, as Mr. Horne *does*, in order to reconcile this discrepancy, that the words of Irenæus are to be understood of St. Matthew's *Greek* Gospel; and thereby, its date will pretty nearly be fixed. But then, in the *translation*, literal as it professes to be, which Mr. Horne (or the *authors* by him followed) gives of the passage, there is again (through inadvertence) a passing over of the important words τῆ ὑπὸ αὐτῶν διαλέκτῳ. Now this would seem to put an end to the *reconciliation* of the discrepancy between Irenæus and Eusebius, and oblige us to suppose that Irenæus was *misinformed*; which, considering his opportunities of gaining the necessary information, is by no means probable. It may rather be suspected that the words are *corrupt* (as, indeed, they have long

5 ἐξήμῳ, καὶ κηρύσσων βάπτισμα μετανόιας εἰς ἄρσεν ἀμαρτιῶν. Καὶ 3. 3.
ἐξεπορεύετο πρὸς αὐτὸν πᾶσα ἡ Ἰουδαία χώρα, καὶ οἱ Ἱεροσολυμίται· 5

been acknowledged to be); and the best way, I would suggest, to emend them is simply by reading γραφῆ for γραφῆν, and for εὐαγγέλιον, reading εὐαγγέλιον: point the passage thus: ὁ μὲν δὲ Ματθ. ἐν τοῖς Ἑβραίοις, τῇ ἰδίᾳ αὐτῶν διαλέκτῳ, καὶ γραφῆ, (in their own tongue, and in writing, as opposed to preaching,) ἐξήμεικεν εὐαγγέλιον, τοῦ Πέτρον καὶ τοῦ Παύλου ἐν Ῥώμῃ εὐαγγελιζομένων, καὶ θεμελιούντων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. These emendations are indispensable to make any tolerable sense, and are confirmed by the words of Eusebius, v. 24. in a passage entirely founded on this of Irenæus (of which see a citation in the Introduction to St. Matthew). But if we understand the words, as we must, of St. Matthew's Hebrew Gospel, we are compelled to assign to it a much later period than probability, or the words of Eusebius himself in his Chronicon will justify. For which reason I cannot help suspecting that there yet remains some corruption; for Peter was very little at Rome, and certainly not till A. D. 63, a short time before his martyrdom. Instead of Ῥώμῃ, the true reading, I apprehend, is Ἱέρμῃ, the words being often confounded. See my Note on Thucyd. ii. 81. The sense will then be, "with zeal and ardour." So in Eurip. Rhes. 64. χρῆσθαί τ' ἐντεχεῖ βέβηθη θεοῦ. Thus there will no longer be any discrepancy; for the labours of St. Peter and St. Paul in evangelizing and founding the Christian Church commenced (even in the case of St. Paul) as early as the year 40 or 41. Of course, the passage has no bearing, as it has been supposed, on the date of the publication of the Greek Gospel. Nor do I know of any passage that has, in any writer of sufficient antiquity to deserve credit. It was probably published about A. D. 60, a little before the Epistle of St. James, and meant for the same persons.

In conclusion, to advert to the style of the present Gospel, it is well adapted to the purpose of the writer, being plain, simple, and concise; though not wanting in energy. And however it may occasionally be deficient in the *lingue proprietatis* of exact composition, and contain many Hebraisms, and even Latinisms, yet its authenticity is thereby the more strongly confirmed; it being plainly the work of a Jew, chiefly conversant with the Syro-Chaldee, and who had learnt his Greek chiefly from the Septuagint and the Alexandrian writers. As to the persons for whom this Gospel was intended, the truth here, as often, will be found to lie *in medio*. It should seem to have been written chiefly, though not exclusively, for the Gentile converts, especially of the West.

V. 1. ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου — Οὐδὲ.] In this Gospel we encounter a difficulty at the very threshold; for the Commentators are by no means agreed on the construction of the first four verses, and consequently differ as to their sense. Some (as Euthym., Theophyl., Grot., and others) place a comma after Θεοῦ, and lay down the sense as follows: "The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus the Messiah, thus happened, as it was written in the prophet." But thus (as Fritz. remarks) the Article would be required at ἀρχῆ, a particle (γὰρ, or the like) at ἐγένετο, and ἄνωγας and a verb would have to be supplied. It is better with Le Clerc, Wets., Beza, Campb., Rosemn., and Kuin., to regard verse 1. as a separate sentence, forming

a kind of title to the work. "It was not unusual (says Campb.) with authors to prefix a short sentence, to serve both as a title to the book, and to signify that the beginning immediately followed. So Hosea i. 1." In this view they quote the commencing sentence of the History of Herodotus, to which I have, in Recens. Synop., added the Proems of Thucyd., Procop., Ocell., Luc., Timæus, and some other writers. Thus the ὧς, which may be rendered *sicut*, refers to verse 4, as the completion of the prophecies mentioned. It is, however, not necessary (with Kuin. and others) to supply ἦδε ἐστὶ at ἀρχῆ, since (as Fritz. observes) the pronoun is never required in a title, because the very situation of the title prefixed to a book, shows it to belong to the book to which it is prefixed. For the same reason the Article is not wanted at ἀρχῆ. After all, however, there is something weak in the proofs supporting this mode of interpretation; for not one of the passages cited from the beginnings of the Historians above mentioned and Hosea are quite to the purpose. And as to the customs (to which Campb. appeals), of scribes placing *incipit* at the beginning, and *explicit* at the end of their transcripts, it is nothing to the purpose. I would therefore adopt the mode of taking the passage proposed by Erasm., Zeger, Markland, and Fritz. To this interpretation there is nothing to object on the score of *grammatical propriety*; and though this suspension of the sense is somewhat awkward, yet the style of the Evangelist is occasionally rough and harsh. The sense thus arising is excellent; for that from the preaching of John arose the commencement of the Gospel, is certain from Luke xvi. 16. See also Note on Luke ii. 2.

2. ἐν Ἠσαΐα τ. πρ.] This is the reading of several of the best MSS., and all the most important of the ancient Versions, and it is preferred by some of the most eminent Commentators, and is edited by Griesb., Knapp, Tittm., and Scholz. the superior weight of MS. authority for the common reading ἐν τοῖς προφήταις being overbalanced by critical reasons. Yet even thus the passage may be considered as not quite emended. There is surely as great reason to think that Ἠσαΐα came from the margin, as there is to suppose τοῖς προφήταις to have arisen *ex emendatione*. It is not found in some ancient MSS. and the Syr., Pers., Goth., Vulg., and Ital. Versions; and is cancelled by Fritz.; rightly, I think; for, as Dr. Mill remarked, there is every reason to think, that the original reading was ἐν τῷ προφῆτῃ, from which the other two arose — namely, from those who took upon themselves to supply, in two different ways, what seemed to them a deficiency.

The first passage is taken from Malachi iii. 1, the second from Is. xl. 3. The neglect of the formula citationis, before the second passage, is agreeable to a not unfrequent custom of Jewish writers, on which Fritz. refers to Surehn. βιβλ. καταλλ. p. 45.

— ἔμπεροσθὲν σου] These words are omitted in a few ancient MSS., some Versions, and Origen and Victor, and are cancelled by Griesb., Fritz., and Scholz., who suppose them to have been introduced from Matth. xi. 10. and Luke vii. 27. Fritz. sees no reason why they should have been cancelled, if they had been written by the Evan-

MT. LU.

3. 3. καὶ ἐβαπτίζοντο πάντες ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, ἕξομολογούμενοι τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν. Ἦν δὲ Ἰωάννης ἐνδεδυμένος τρίχας καμήλου, καὶ ζώνην δερματίνην περὶ τὴν ὀσφὺν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐσθίων ἄκριδας καὶ μέλι ἄγριον. Καὶ ἐκήρυσσε λέγων· Ἐρχεται ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου ὀπίσω μου, οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανὸς κύψας λῦσαι τὸν ἱμάτιον τῶν ὑποδημάτων αὐτοῦ. Ἐγὼ μὲν ἐβάπτισα ὑμᾶς ἐν ὕδατι, αὐτὸς δὲ βαπτίσει ὑμᾶς ἐν Πνεύματι ἁγίῳ. Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις, ἦλθεν Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ Ναζαρετ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, καὶ ἐβαπτίσθη ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην. Καὶ εὐθὺς ἀναβαίνων ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος, εἶδε σχιζομένους τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα † ὡσεὶ περιστρεφόμενον καταβαῖνον ἐπ' αὐτόν· καὶ φωνὴ ἐγένετο ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν· Σὺ εἶ ὁ Τεῖός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν † ᾧ εὐδόκησα. Καὶ εὐθὺς τὸ Πνεῦμα αὐτόν ἐκβάλλει εἰς τὴν ἔρημον. Καὶ ἦν ἐκεῖ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἡμέρας τεσσαράκοντα, πειραζόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ Σατανᾶ, καὶ ἦν μετὰ τῶν θηρίων· καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι διηκόνουν αὐτῷ.

gelist. But as the number of MSS. in which they are omitted is very small, we may suppose them to have been omitted *propter homoeoteleuton*. [Comp. John i. 15, 23.]

5. καὶ ὁ ἴ. The *καὶ* is not a mere *copula*, but the sense is, as Fritz remarks, "and (what is remarkable)." Griesbach's alteration *ἕξομολογούμενοι* is alike unnecessary, and devoid of authority; and the changing the place of πάντες, and putting it after Ἰεροσ., is even less defensible. That position is only found in six MSS. and some Versions; which, however, are no great authority on points which respect the order of words. Besides, the reading in question would be (as Fritz has shown) inadmissible, from its yielding a sense not at all satisfactory. The meaning is, that *very many* (of them) were baptized, &c. So Matth. x. 22. *ἔσεσθε μισούμενοι ὑπὸ πάντων.*

7. οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανός. Literally, "I am unfit." — κύψας. This expresses the posture in which the action was done. And, indeed, as the sandals were fastened to the foot by very complicated straps, they could not be loosed without some trouble. This was therefore esteemed a menial office, and was usually committed to slaves. John i. 27. has λῦσαι — τοῦ ὑποδήματος.

8. [Comp. Acts i. 5. ii. 4. xi. 16. xix. 4.] 9. καὶ ἐγένετο — ἦλθεν.] A construction frequent in the Gospels, and derived from the Hebrew. See Genes. xiv. 1. & 2. Most Commentators supply *ἔτι*. But it is justly observed by Fritz., that the construction may be considered as *bimembris*; wherein the first member is explained by the second; which is added *per asyndeton*, and may, in translation, be introduced by *nempe*. The more usual form of the idiom is when the *ἐγένετο* is followed by a *καὶ*.

— ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις.] Namely, when John was preaching in the desert the baptism of repentance. Τῆς Γαλιλαίας is added to Nazareth, to determine its situation, since it was an obscure place. Εἰς is *not* here for ἐν, as most Commentators imagine, who adduce examples which are quite inapposite. The sense of ἐβαπτ. εἰς is, "was dipped," or *plunged into*. Or we may suppose, that, as in the phrase *λούεσθαι εἰς βαλαντιῶν*, there is a *significatio praeognans*, for "to be washed (by being plunged) into a bath;" so the sense

here may be, "He underwent the rite of baptism (by being plunged) into the water." [Comp. John i. 32.]

10. εὐθὺς.] Lightf. and Wets. remarks on the very frequent, and sometimes unnecessary, use of εὐθὺς and εὐθὺς by Mark. But, as Fritz observes, they are never used unnecessarily; though they may seem to be so, by being construed with the wrong word; for they are often, as here, put *per hyperbaton*. Thus here εὐθὺς must be construed with *ἔδωκε*, which must, with the best Commentators, be referred to *Jesus*, not *John*, with others.

— σχιζομένους.] Elsn. and Wets. adduce numerous passages in which mention is made of the heavens being *cleaved* with lightning. But it is truly remarked by Fritz, that they are all dissimilar; for (to use his own words) "hic caelum dehiscit, ut divinus spiritus, relicto domicilio, ad Jesum desuper possit alabi." So Matth. iii. 16. *ἀναψέθησαν οἱ οὐρανοί.*

— ὡσεὶ.] Many MSS., and indeed most of the ancient ones, have *ὡς*, which is edited by Griesb., Fritz, and Scholz, who think that the common reading was derived from the other Gospels. There is not, however, sufficient authority to warrant any change. The expression does not define the *form of appearance* (though it was, as we learn from Luke iii. 22., in a *bodily form*), but the *manner of its descent*, namely, like the *rapid gliding* of a dove.

11. ἐν σοί.] Several ancient MSS., and almost all the Versions have ἐν σοί, which is confirmed by Luke iii. 22., and is edited by Griesb. and Fritz. This may be the true reading; but there is not sufficient authority to warrant any change, especially since *internal* evidence is, I apprehend, against σοί. For *ἐν* was more likely to be changed into the more *definite* σοὶ than the contrary. [Comp. *infr.* ix. 7. Ps. ii. 7. Is. xlii. 1. Matt. iii. 17. xvii. 5. 2 Pet. i. 17.]

12. ἐκβάλλει.] This is not well rendered by Grot. and others, "discedere jubet," or "emissit sine vi." For the word must here be taken of the strong and efficacious (though not overpowering) influence of the Holy Ghost.

13. καὶ ἦν μετὰ τῶν θηρίων.] These words describe the scene of the temptation, which was one of the

- 14 Μετὰ δὲ τὸ παραδοθῆναι τὸν Ἰωάννην, ἦλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν 4. 4.
 15 Γαλιλαίαν, κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ λέ- 12
 γων· "Οὐι πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρὸς, καὶ ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ·
 μετανοεῖτε, καὶ πιστεύετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ. 17
- 16 Περιπατῶν δὲ παρὰ τὴν Θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας, εἶδε Σίμωνα καὶ 18
 Ἀνδρέαν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ † βάλλοντας ἀμφίβληττρον ἐν τῇ θαλάσῃ·
 17 ἦσαν γὰρ ἀλιεῖς. Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Δεῦτε ὀπίσω μου, 19
 18 καὶ ποιήσω ὑμᾶς γενέσθαι ἀλιεῖς ἀνθρώπων. Καὶ εὐθέως ἀφέντες 20
 19 τὰ δίκτυα αὐτῶν, ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ. Καὶ προὐβὰς ἐκεῖθεν ὀλίγον, 21
 εἶδε Ἰάκωβον τὸν τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου, καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ,
 20 καὶ αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ καταριζόντας τὰ δίκτυα. Καὶ εὐθέως ἐκά- 22
 λεσεν αὐτούς· καὶ ἀφέντες τὸν πατέρα αὐτῶν Ζεβεδαῖον ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ
 μετὰ τῶν μισθιωτῶν, ἀπῆλθον ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ. 7.
- 21 Καὶ εἰσπορεύονται εἰς Καπερναούμ· καὶ εὐθέως τοῖς σάββαιον 31
 22 εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν ἐδίδασκε. Καὶ ἐξεπλήρουντο ἐπὶ τῇ δι- 29 32
 δαχῇ αὐτοῦ· ἦν γὰρ διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων, καὶ οὐχ ὡς
 23 οἱ γραμματεῖς. Καὶ ἦν ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ αὐτῶν ἄνθρωπος ἐν πνεύ- 33
 24 ματι ἀκαθάρτω, καὶ ἀνέκραξε, λέγων· "Εα, τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοὶ, Ἰησοῦ
 Ναζαρηεῖ; ἦλθες ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς; οἰδᾶ σε τίς εἶ, ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ

wildest parts of the desert; like that in Virg. *Æn.* iii. 646. (cited by Wets.) *Quam vitam in silvis inter deserta ferarum Lustra domosque traho.*

14. [*Comp.* John iv. 43.]
 15. πεπλήρωται] "adest, מלא." Time is said πληροῦσθαι, partly when it is gone, partly when any definite period approaches. So John vii. 8. Luke xxi. 24. Wets. compares Joseph. Ant. vi. 4. 1. ἐξέδρατο τὸν καιρὸν γενέσθαι πληρωθέντος δὲ αὐτοῦ κ. τ. λ. Acts vi. 23, 30. "The time here spoken of (says Campb.) is that which, according to the predictions of the Prophets, was to intervene between their days, or between any period assigned by them, and the appearance of the Messiah. This had been revealed to Daniel, as consisting of what, in prophetic language, is denominated seventy weeks, that is (every week being seven years), 490 years; reckoning from the order issued to rebuild the Temple at Jerusalem. However much the Jews misunderstood many of the other prophecies relating to the reign of this extraordinary personage, what concerned both the time and the place of his first appearance seems to have been pretty well apprehended by the bulk of the nation. From the N. T., as well as from the other accounts of that period still extant, it is evident that an expectation of this great deliverer was then general among them."

— μετανοεῖτε.] See Note on Matt. iii. 2. πιστεύετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ. The distinction made by some Commentators between πιστεύειν ἐν τῷ εὐαγγ. and πιστ. τῷ εὐαγγ. is unfounded. The only difference is, that the former is the Hellenistic, the latter the Classical form. The sense here is, "be brought to a true faith in the Gospel."

16. βάλλοντας] Most of the antient MSS. have ἀμφιβάλοντας, which is edited by Griesb., Fritz., and Scholz. But as no example has been adduced of the compound in this phrase (where the ἀμφι is rendered by Fritz. *huc illuc*), there seems no sufficient authority to alter the common reading;

and probably the ἀμφι originated in a mere error of the scribes, from the word following.

19. καταριζόντας] Καταρίζω signifies, 1. to restore to its former state what has been disarranged or broken; 2. to repair; and it is used of ships, nets, walls, &c. &c. Καὶ αὐτοῖς. This expression is (as Fritz. thinks) used, because James and John were employed on the same kind of business; namely, what was connected with fishing.

21. τοῖς σάββαιον] This clause, as some imagine, alludes to our Lord's custom of attending the Synagogue every Sabbath day. But it should rather, with some ancient and most modern Commentators, be taken of one particular Sabbath, *the next Sabbath*, as is plain from the εὐθέως, and what follows. On this use of τὰ σάββατα (which Fritz. thinks originated from the Chaldee singular form in emphasis שבתון), see Schleus. Lex.

22. ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων] See Note on Matt. vii. 28.

23. ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ] Some take the ἐν for σὺν; but for this there is no sufficient authority. Others, more properly, render, "in the power of an unclean spirit," or, "occupied by an unclean spirit," "having an unclean spirit," as Luke says. The man must have had lucid intervals, or he would not have been admitted to the Synagogue. His disorder seems to have been epilepsy brought on by Dæmoniacal agency.

24. εἶ] An interjection derived from the Imperative of εἶναι, and signifying, *let us alone!* It expresses indignation, or extreme surprise. Τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοὶ, scil. κοινόν, which is sometimes supplied in the Classical writers. [*Comp.* Matt. 8, 29.]

— ἦλθες ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς] The Commentators are not agreed whether this clause should be taken interrogatively, or declaratively. The recent Editors mostly prefer the latter mode. But there is more point and spirit, and perhaps more propriety, in the former. By ἀπολέσαι is *not* meant (as most of the Commentators imagine) *basiliois*,

MT. LU.
 8. 4. Θεοῦ. Καὶ ἐπειμήσεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, λέγων· Φιμώσθητι, καὶ ἔξειλθε 25
 35 ἐξ αὐτοῦ. Καὶ σπαράξιν αὐτὸν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀκάθαρτον, καὶ κράξιν 26
 36 φωνῆ μεγάλης, ἐξῆλθεν ἐξ αὐτοῦ. Καὶ ἐθαμβήθησαν πάντες, ὥστε 27
 συζητεῖν πρὸς αὐτοὺς, λέγοντες· Τί ἐστὶ τοῦτο; τίς ἡ διδαχὴ ἡ
 καινὴ αὕτη; οἳ κατ' ἐξουσίαν καὶ τοῖς πνεύμασι τοῖς ἀκαθάρτοις
 37 ἐπιτάσσει, καὶ ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ! Ἐξῆλθε δὲ ἡ ἀκοὴ αὐτοῦ εὐθύς 28
 εἰς ὅλην τὴν περιχώρον τῆς Γαλιλαίας.
 14 38 Καὶ εὐθέως ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς ἐξελθόντες, ἦλθον εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν 29
 Σίμωνος καὶ Ἀνδρέου, μετὰ Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωάννου. Ἦ δὲ πενήθερά 30
 Σίμωνος κατέκειτο πυρέσσουσα· καὶ εὐθέως λέγουσιν αὐτῷ περὶ
 39 αὐτῆς. Καὶ προσελθὼν ἤγειρεν αὐτήν, κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς· 31
 15 40 καὶ ἀφῆκεν αὐτήν ὁ πυρετός εὐθέως, καὶ διηκόει αὐτοῖς. Ὀψίας δὲ 32
 16 40 γενομένης, ὅτε ἔδου ὁ ἥλιος, ἔφερον πρὸς αὐτὸν πάντας τοὺς κακῶς
 ἔχοντας, καὶ τοὺς δαιμονιζομένους· καὶ ἡ πόλις ὅλη ἐπισυνηγμένη ἦν 33
 πρὸς τὴν θύραν. Καὶ ἐθεράπευσε πολλοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας ποικίλαις 34
 41 νόσοις, καὶ δαιμόνια πολλὰ ἐξέβαλε· καὶ οὐκ ἤφιε λαλεῖν τὰ δαιμόνια,
 ὅτι ἤδεισαν αὐτόν.
 42 Καὶ πρῶτ', ἔννηχον λίαν, ἀναστὰς ἐξῆλθε, καὶ ἀπῆλθεν εἰς ἔρημον 35
 τόπον, κακεῖ προσήχετο. Καὶ κατεδίωξαν αὐτὸν ὁ Σίμων καὶ οἱ 36
 μετ' αὐτοῦ. καὶ εὐρόντες αὐτόν, λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· Ὅτι πάντες ζητοῦσὶ 37

the term used by Matthew; but rather, as Euthym. explains (in a popular sense), "to destroy our power," by expelling us from earth; so βασιανσαι expresses the final end of them, namely, being consigned to hell torments. By ἡμᾶς, is evidently meant his colleagues. Ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ signifies, by the force of the Article, the Messiah, as being such κατ' ἐξουσίαν.

26. σπαράξιν] *σπαράσσειν* properly signifies to tear, to lacerate; but here and in Luke xix. 39, it signifies to bring on violent convulsions and spasms, such as accompany epilepsy, and which are sometimes called *σπασμοὶ*, though usually *σπασμοὶ* by the Greek Medical writers.

27. πρὸς αὐτοὺς] for πρὸς ἀλλήλους, *inter se*. — τί ἐστὶ — αὕτη] Chrys. and Euthym., of the ancients, and Maldon. and Fritz., of the moderns, have alone seen the true scope of this clause; which expresses not so much *interrogation* as *admiration*. The whole may be rendered thus: "What is this? of what sort is this new (i. e. extraordinary) mode of teaching? for [the teacher] gives his order authoritatively to the unclean spirits, and they obey him!" Of this sense of *ύτος*, examples are found in Acts xvii. 19. and Thncyd. v. 50. Κατ' ἐξουσίαν imports self-derived and independent authority, supposed to be opposed to that of the Jewish *exorcists*.

28. τὴν περιχώρον τῆς Γ.] The Commentators are not agreed whether this denotes "the country round about Galilee," or, "the region of Galilee." If the former method be adopted, the sense must be, as Beza represents it, "not only throughout Galilee itself, but the circumjacent regions." But this is at variance with the parallel passage of Luke iv. 37. εἰς πάντα τόπον τοῦ περιχώρου, and it would require καὶ τὴν περίχ. Thus the latter interpretation is preferable: Render "the surrounding country of Galilee." This signification

is often found in the Sept., and also the N. T., as Matt. xiv. 35. ἀπέστειλαν εἰς ὅλην τὴν περιχώρον ἰκέειν. See also Mark vi. 55. Luke iii. 3. & iv. 37.

30. κατέκειτο] *Katakeisthai*, like the Latin *jacere*, is a term appropriate to one who is confined by sickness. Ἠγειρεν κρατήσας τ. χ. must be considered in the same light as the ἤλατο τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς, namely, as an instance of Christ accompanying his words (Be thou healed, or the like) by a corresponding action; either simply touching the hand, or raising the person from his couch, as symbolical of recovery. Inasmuch that ἐγειρω sometimes denotes to heal. In Matth. viii. 15. καὶ ἠγέρθη, there is a *signif. prægnaans*; the sense being, "she rose up well."

32. ὅτε ἔδου ὁ ἥλιος] They waited till that time (which was the end of the Sabbath) before they would bring their sick: since even to seek medical assistance, in the day, unless in extreme danger, was thought a breach of the Sabbath.

34. πολλοὺς] Matth. says, πάντας. But the one term is not inconsistent with the other. Jesus healed many, even all who were brought to him. [Comp. Acts xvi. 17, 18.]

— οὐκ ἤφιε — αὐτόν] scil. τὸν Χριστὸν εἶναι, as is expressed in many MSS. and in Luke iv. 41. The sense is, "He would not suffer them to speak, because they knew, and would address him as Messiah;" a title to which our Lord as yet made no public claim, lest he should excite tumult among the people. Ἠφιε is a form of later Grecism for ἠφιει.

36. κατεδίωξαν] This word not only signifies *persequi*, but *insequi*. See Hos. ii. 7. It here implies the ardent desire which Simon had of finding and accompanying his Master.

— ζητοῦσὶ σε] The Ed. Pr. and very many MSS. have σε ζητοῦσαι, which was edited by Griesb.,

		MT.	LU.
38	σε. Καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· Ἔρχομεν εἰς τὰς ἐχομένας κομποπόλεις, ἵνα καὶ	8.	4.
39	ἐκεῖ κηρύξω· εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἐξελήλυθα. Καὶ ἦν κηρύσσων ἐν ταῖς		43
	συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν εἰς ὅλην τὴν Γαλιλαίαν, καὶ τὰ δαιμόνια ἐκβάλλον.		44
40	Καὶ ἔρχεται πρὸς αὐτὸν λεπρὸς, παρκαλῶν αὐτὸν καὶ γονυπετῶν	2	12
41	αὐτὸν, καὶ λέγων αὐτῷ· Ὅτι, ἐάν θέλῃς, δύνασαι με καθαρίσαι. Ὁ	3	13
	δὲ Ἰησοῦς σπλαγχνισθεὶς, ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα, ἤψατο αὐτοῦ, καὶ λέγει		
42	αὐτῷ· Θέλω, καθαρῶσθι! Καὶ εἰπόντος αὐτοῦ, εὐθὺς ἀπῆλθεν		
43	ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα, καὶ ἐκαθαρίσθη. Καὶ ἐμβρομησόμενος αὐτῷ,		
44	εὐθὺς ἐξέβαλεν αὐτὸν, καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· Ὅρα μηδεὶ μηδὲν εἶπης·	4	14
	ἀλλ' ὕπαγε, σεαυτὸν δεῖξον τῷ ἱερεῖ, καὶ προσένεγκε περὶ τοῦ καθα-		
45	ρισμοῦ σου ἃ προσέταξε Μωϋσῆς, εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς. Ὁ δὲ ἐξεληθὼν,		15
	ἤρξατο κηρύσσειν πολλὰ καὶ διαφημίζειν τὸν λόγον, ὥστε μηκέτι αὐτὸν		
	δύνασθαι φανερωῖς εἰς πόλιν εἰσελθεῖν· ἀλλ' ἔξω ἐν ἐρήμοις τόποις		
	ἦν, καὶ ἤρχοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν πανταχόθεν.		
1	II. Καὶ * εἰσῆλθε πάλιν εἰς Καπερναοὺμ δι' ἡμερῶν· καὶ ἠκούσθη		
2	ὅτι εἰς οἶκόν ἐστι. Καὶ εὐθὺς συνήχθησαν πολλοὶ, ὥστε μηκέτι	9.	
3	χωρεῖν μηδὲ τὰ πρὸς τὴν θύραν· καὶ ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς τὸν λόγον. Καὶ	2	13
	ἔρχονται πρὸς αὐτὸν παραλυτικὸν φέροντες ἀρβόμενον ὑπὸ τεσσάρων.		
4	Καὶ μὴ δυνάμενοι προσεγγίσει αὐτῷ, διὰ τὸν ὄχλον, ἀπεστέγασαν τὴν		19

Math., Fritz., and Scholz. But there seems no sufficient reason for change. *External* evidence is greatly in favour of the received reading; and internal scarcely less so: for it should seem that the ancient Critics changed the position, in order that the sentence might have a better termination. It is far less likely (considering the *sigmatism* which prevails in even the best writers) that they should have made the alteration for the sake of *euphony*.

38. τὰς ἐχομένας] "neighbouring." This signification of the word thus arises. Ἐχέσθαι τινας signifies properly to hold oneself by any thing; then, to adhere to it; keep close to it; to be close to it, be near it, be neighbouring.

—κομποπόλεις] is a rare word, and occurs elsewhere only in Strabo, Ptolemy, J. Malela, and Isidore; and signifies a place between a city and a village, i. e. a country town, such as Joseph. Bell. i. 3, 2, says there were many in Galilee. These were mostly, though not always, unwall'd, and may be supposed, like those cities of the early ages described by Thucyd. i. 5, as being κατὰ κῆρας οἰκουμένας.

For *κακεῖ* I have edited *καὶ ἐκεῖ*, with Griesb., Fritz., and Scholz, from very many MSS. and many early editions: not merely, however, on account of MS. authority, but because the *καὶ* is *emphatical*; and wherever it is so, no crasis can be admitted. Ἐξελήλυθα is a stronger term than ἐλήλυθα, and signifies, "I am come forth (as a teacher)."

39. ἐν ταῖς συν.] Griesb., Knapp., Tittm., Vat., and Scholz, edit *εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς*, from a few MSS., as being the more *difficult* reading. But the Critical canon preferring such, has its exceptions; one of which is when (as here) it introduces what is *contra linguæ consuetudinem*. For the use of *εἰς* for *ἐν* will not here apply. There is little doubt but that the *εἰς* was a mere error of the scribes (arising from the *εἰς* just after); which

would afterwards cause the noun to be accommodated to it in case. Fritz. sees this matter in the true light, and has restored the common reading, which, indeed, the ancient Versions all support.

43. ἐμβρομησόμενος] "having given him a strict charge." See on Matt. ix. 30. Ἐξέβαλεν α. for ἀπέλυσε, despatched him quickly.

44. See Levit. xiv. 2.

45. κρη. π. καὶ διαφ.] Here the latter term *διαφ.* (which occurs in the Classics) is intended to strengthen the former. The sense is, "to publicly proclaim and divulge the thing." Λόγον is used as at Matt. iv. 8, and elsewhere in Hebraism, since *כַּרְךְ* is so employed.

II. I. δι' ἡμερῶν.] Euthym. and Theoph. rightly take this for *διελθουσῶν ἡμερῶν τινῶν*, "after some days had intervened." This sense of *διὰ* (mostly in *composition*) occurs both in the N. T. and the Sept., and in the best Classical writers. For *πάλιν εἰσῆλθεν* we have *εἰσῆλθε πάλιν* in many MSS., with the Syr. and other ancient Versions, some Fathers, and the Edit. Princ. It is rightly edited by Matth., Fritz., and Scholz.

—εἰς οἶκον] *domi*, at home, namely, in the house in which he sojourn'd. This is regarded as an example of the use of *εἰς* for *ἐν*. But there seems to be rather a blending of two forms of expression, namely, "He has gone to his house and is in it."

2. ὥστε μηκέτι χωρεῖν, &c.] Τὰ πρὸς θύραν for τὸ πρόθυρον, the vestibule. The sense of the passage is, "So that there was no longer place for them in the vestibule [much less the house itself]."

—τὸν λόγον.] Used *κατ' ἐξοχὴν* for τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, or τῆς βασιλείας, the doctrine of the Gospel.

3. ἀρβόμενον ὑπὸ τεσσ.] "carried by four persons;" namely, on a litter." Φέροντες, bringing. The construction is, καὶ ἰαχ. (scil. ἀνθρώποι φέροντες πρὸς αὐτόν; namely, to be healed) παραλυτικὸν ἀρβόμενον ὑπὸ τ.; namely, as we learn from Matt. and Luke, on a litter carried by them.

MT. LU.

9. 5. *στέγην ὅπου ἦν*· καὶ ἐξορῶντες χαλιῶσι τὸν κράββατον, ἐφ' ᾧ ὁ πα-
 20 ραλυτικὸς κατέκειτο. Ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὴν πίστιν αὐτῶν, λέγει τῷ 5
 3 21 παραλυτικῷ· Τέκνον, ἀφέωνταί σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου. Ἦσαν δὲ τινες 6
 τῶν Γραμματέων ἐκεῖ καθήμενοι, καὶ διαλογιζόμενοι ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις
 αὐτῶν· Τί οὗτος οὕτω λαλεῖ βλασφημίας; τίς δύναται ἀφεῖναι 7
 4 22 ἁμαρτίας, εἰ μὴ εἷς ὁ Θεός; Καὶ εὐθὺς ἐπιγνοῦς ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ 8
 πνεύματι αὐτοῦ, ὅτι οὕτως αὐτοὶ διαλογιζόνται ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς·
 5 23 τί ταῦτα διαλογιζέσθε ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν; Τί ἐστιν ἐνκοπώτερον, 9
 εἰπεῖν τῷ παραλυτικῷ· Ἀφέωνταί * σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι, ἢ εἰπεῖν·
 6 24 * Ἐγειρε [καὶ] ἄρῃ σου τὸν κράββατον, καὶ περιπάτει; Ἴνα δὲ 10
 εἰδῆτε, ὅτι ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου * ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀφεῖναι

4. ἀπεστέγασαν τὴν στέγην, &c.] In the interpretation of this passage there are some difficulties; which have appeared to many Commentators so formidable, that they have endeavoured to remove them by resorting to various methods, almost all of them (as I have shown in Recens. Synop.) at variance with the meaning of the terms ἀπεστέγασαν, στέγην, and ἐξορῶντες. The interpretation of Lightf., Whitby, Kuin., and Winer is the least liable to objection; which supposes that the bearers brought the paralytic to the flat roof of the house by the stairs on the outside, or along the top from an adjoining house; and then forced open the trap-door which led downwards, to the ὑπερόχον. But that forcing open the trap-door has nothing to countenance it; nay, (as Fritz. remarks,) the words ἀπεστέγασαν τὴν στέγην ὅπου ἦν can only mean that the bearers tore off the tiles in the very place under which they knew Jesus to be. We may suppose that, not able to approach Jesus in the room where he was, (probably an upper room,) they ascended to the flat roof by the outer stairs, and having uncovered the roofing, (whether tiles or thatching,) and dug through the lath and plaster, about the place where they understood Jesus to be, they let the couch down through the orifice. No other method could have effectually attained the object; namely, of bringing the litter to Jesus without having to pass through the crowd.

Ἐξορ. has here a significatio prægnaus, i. e. digging through and scooping out.

—χαλιῶσι] “let, or lower [down].” So Acts ix. 25. χαλαίαντες αὐτὸν ἐν σπυρίδι. and xxvii. 17. 2 Cor. xi. 33. Jerem. xxxviii. 6. The word does not in this sense occur in the best Classical writers.

5. *sol.*] Griesb., Tittm., and Fritz. edit *σοῦ*, omitting the *σοῦ* following, from some MSS., confirmed as they think, by ver. 9. But those MSS. are too few to have much weight; and ver. 9. can have none; for supposing *σοῦ* there to be the true reading, yet what is so likely as that when a formula, such as ἀφέωνταί σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου, is not employed directly, but put hypothetically, that it should be shortened.

6. *ὄντω.*] This is omitted in some MSS., and is cancelled by Fritz. But it must be retained, as being very significant. The sense is, “Why, or how, does that man [dare to] so speak blasphemies!”

7. *εἰ μὴ εἷς ὁ Θεός.*] Some point *εἰ μὴ εἷς, ὁ Θεός*, in the sense, “but one—that is God.” And they adduce as examples Matt. xix. 17, and Mark x. 18. But in those passages the common punctuation and interpretation adopted in this passage,

by which *εἷς* is taken in the sense *only* (answering to the use of the Heb. **יְהוָה** in Exod. xxxiii. 5. Judg. xxi.) is even more required than in the present; and in all of these it is confirmed by the ancient Versions. Besides, it is here required by the parallel passage of Luke. [Comp. Job xiv. 4. Isa. xliiii. 25.]

8. *τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ.*] Some ancient and early modern Commentators take this to designate Christ's divine nature, which consequently imparted omniscience. Others interpret it, “by the Spirit,” i. e. the Holy Spirit, which, as man, our Lord had received. But of these two interpretations the former is destitute of proof; and the latter is negated by the *αὐτοῦ* added. *Preferable* is a third, supported by the most recent Commentators, as Rosenm., Kuin., and Fritz., “in his mind,” i. e. in *himself*. This, however, seems a curtailment of the sense, which, I think, is, “by his own spirit.” Thus *spirit* will be used emphatically, for the spirit of wisdom, or understanding; and the *αὐτοῦ* is very significant, since, (as Campb. remarks) “the intention of the sacred writer was to signify, that our Lord, in this case, did not, as others do, derive his knowledge from the ordinary and outward methods of discovery which are open to all men, but from peculiar powers he possessed independently of every thing external.” See John ii. 25.

—*αὐτοῖ.*] This word (as also the reading *σοῦ* for *σοῦ* just after) is found in a great majority of the MSS., several Versions, Theophyl., and the Edit. Princ. It has been admitted by Wets., Matth., Griesb., Vat., Fritz., and Scholz.

9. *ἔγειρας.*] So Matth., Griesb., Tittm., Vat., Fritz., and Scholz, edit. with several of the best MSS. and some early Editions, for *ἔγειραι*, which is a very irregular form, and, Fritz. thinks, cannot be defended. Yet it may have been a popular form, like some others used by Mark; and the reading is, in all the passages to which they appeal, doubtful. The *καὶ* following is omitted in several of the best MSS. and some Versions, and is cancelled by almost all Editors from Griesb. to Scholz; but on scarcely sufficient evidence.

10. *ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀφεῖναι.*] This position, instead of the common one *ἀφ. ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς* is found in a very great number of MSS. and Versions, and is adopted by Matth., Griesb., Tittm., Vat., Fritz., and Scholz.

12. *ἐναντίον*] “coram.” This is not a mere Hebraism, but is a use found in the Classical writers. At *ὄντω*s Heupel would supply *τι* and *γενόμενον*. Fritz. maintains that it signifies *hoc modo*, equivalent to *ut hæc res est*.

	MT.	LU.
11 ἁμαρτίας· — λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ· Σοὶ λέγω, ἔγειρε [καὶ] ἄρον τὸν	9.	5.
12 κράββατόν σου, καὶ ἔπαγε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου. Καὶ ἤγερθη εὐθὺς,	7	25
καὶ ἄρας τὸν κράββατον, ἐξῆλθεν ἐναντίον πάντων· ὥστε ἐξίστασθαι	8	26
πάντας, καὶ δοξάζειν τὸν Θεὸν λέγοντας· Ὅτι οὐδέποτε οὕτως εἶ-		
δομεν.		
13 Καὶ ἐξῆλθε πάλιν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν· καὶ πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος ἤρχετο		
14 πρὸς αὐτὸν, καὶ ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς. Καὶ παράγων εἶδε Λευὴν τὸν τοῦ	9	27
Ἀλφαίου καθήμενον ἐπὶ τὸ τελώνιον, καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· Ἀκολούθει μοι.	23	
15 Καὶ ἀναστὰς ἠκολούθησεν αὐτῷ. Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ κατακεῖσθαι	10	29
αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ, καὶ πολλοὶ τελῶναι καὶ ἁμαρτωλοὶ συνανέ-		
κειντο τῷ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ· ἦσαν γὰρ πολλοὶ, καὶ		
16 ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ. Καὶ οἱ Γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι, ἰδόντες	11	30
αὐτὸν ἐσθίοντα μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν, ἔλεγον τοῖς μαθη-		
ταῖς αὐτοῦ· Τί ὅτι μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν ἐσθίει καὶ		
17 πίνει; Καὶ ἀκούσας ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει αὐτοῖς· Οὐ χρεῖαν ἔχουσιν οἱ	12	31
ἰσχύοντες ἰατροῦ, ἀλλ' οἱ κακῶς ἔχοντες. οὐκ ἤλθον καλέσαι δικαίους,	13	32
18 ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτωλοὺς [εἰς μετάνοιαν.] Καὶ ἦσαν οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου	14	
καὶ οἱ τῶν Φαρισαίων νηστεύοντες· καὶ ἔρχονται καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ·		
Διὰ τί οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου καὶ οἱ τῶν Φαρισαίων νηστεύουσιν, οἱ δὲ	33	
19 σοὶ μαθηταὶ οὐ νηστεύουσι; Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Μὴ δύ-	15	34
νανται οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος, ἐν ᾧ ὁ νυμφίος μετ' αὐτῶν ἐστι,		
νηστεύειν; ὅσον χρόνον μεθ' ἐαυτῶν ἔχουσι τὸν νυμφίον οὐ δύνανται		
20 νηστεύειν. Ἐλεύσονται δὲ ἡμέραι ὅταν ἀπαρθῇ ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὁ νυμφίος·	35	
21 καὶ τότε νηστεύουσιν ἐν † ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις. Καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐπίβλη-	16	36

15. ἦσαν γὰρ—αὐτῷ.] These words have been variously rendered, and indeed admit of more than one sense. Most Commentators, (after Grot.) take the *καὶ* for the relative *οἱ*, and render, "for there were many, who had followed Levi, and had sat down to table with him." But this involves a needless repetition, and it should rather seem, that the *αὐτῷ* is to be referred to *Jesus*, and that the sense is, what Fritz. assigns, "for there were many present [in Levi's house] and they had followed Jesus into the house."

16. τί ὄντι.] The sense of this idiom (which occurs both in the Scriptural and Classical writers) is, "What is [the cause] that," "How is it that." In the Classical writers a particle is generally interposed.

17. εἰς μετάνοιαν.] These words are wanting in many of the best MSS., in nearly all the Versions, and in some Fathers; and are cancelled by Griesb., Fritz., and Scholz, being supposed to have been introduced from Luke v. 31. [Comp. 1 Tim. i. 15.]

18. οἱ τῶν Φαρισαίων.] Mill and Beng. would read *οἱ Φαρισαῖοι*, from most of the best MSS. and Versions, which is edited by Griesb., Tittm., Vat., and Scholz. But there is scarcely sufficient authority for the alteration.

—σοὶ μαθηταί.] It is strange that almost all Commentators should take this *σοὶ* as a Dative for Genit. For although the Dative is used for the Genit., both in the Sciptural and Classical writers, yet only under certain circumstances, which here do not exist. Fritz. rightly remarks, that many

such passages are either corrupt, or wrongly understood. And he adds, that unless a Dative can depend on the *notion* of the substantive, or be inserted *by the bye*, or be a *Dativus commodi*, or the like, it cannot be coupled with a substantive. He, very properly, takes the *σοὶ* as the Nominative plural of *σὺς*, *σὺ*, *σὺν*.

19. μὴ δύνανται οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ ν.] Campb. well observes, that "on a subject such as this, relating to the ordinary manners and customs which obtain in a country, it is usual to speak of a thing which *is never done*, as of what *cannot be done*." Whitby remarks, that the term is used on any reasonable hindrance, though far short of improbability. I. If the actions be incongruous or improper, as Luke xi. 7. II. If the thing violates any rule of law or equity, as Deut. xii. 17. Acts x. 47. III. If it be not agreeable to the Divine counsels, as Matt. xxvi. 42. IV. If any inconvenience arises, or other employment impedes it, as Mark iii. 20. V. If there is any defect or fault in the object, as "Christ *could* do no mighty works because of their unbelief," Mark vi. 5. VI. If there is a disposition adverse to it, Gen. xxxvii. 4. John xiv. 17.

20. ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις.] Several ancient MSS. and Versions have *ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ*, which is preferred by Mill and Beng., and edited by Griesb., Vat., and Scholz; but without good reason; for, as Fritz. observes, it can on no account be admitted, since the plural refers to the preceding *ἡμέραι*. I would remark, too, that the testimony of the *Versions* is not of much weight,

MT. LU.

9. 5. μα ἡκούους ἀγνάφου ἐπιθήσεται ἐπὶ ἡματιῶν παλαιῶν· εἰ δὲ μὴ, αἶρε
τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτοῦ τὸ καινὸν τοῦ παλαιοῦ, καὶ χεῖρον σχίσμα γίνεται:
- 17 37 Καὶ οὐδεὶς βύλλει οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς παλαιοῦς· εἰ δὲ μὴ, ῥήσσει 22
ὁ οἶνος ὁ νέος τοὺς ἀσκοὺς, καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἐκχεῖται, καὶ οἱ ἀσκοὶ ἀπο-
12. 6. λούνται· ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινοὺς βλητέον.
- 1 1 Καὶ ἐγένετο παραπορεύεσθαι αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς σάββασιν διὰ τῶν σπο- 23
ρίμων, καὶ ἤρξαντο οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ὁδὸν ποιεῖν τίλλοντες τοὺς
2 2 στάχυας. Καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ἔλεγον αὐτῷ· Ἴδε, τί ποιοῦσιν ἐν τοῖς 24
3 3 σάββασιν, ὃ οὐκ ἔξεστι; Καὶ αὐτὸς ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· Οὐδέποτε ἀνέγνω- 25
4 4 μεῖ' αὐτοῦ; πῶς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπὶ Ἀβιάθαρ 26
τοῦ ἀρχιερέως, καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως ἔφαγεν, οἷς οὐκ ἔξεστι
φαγεῖν, εἰ μὴ τοῖς ἱερεῦσι, καὶ ἔδωκε καὶ τοῖς σὺν αὐτῷ οὔσι; Καὶ 27
ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· Τὸ σάββατον διὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐγένετο, οὐχ ὁ ἄν-

sine in some of them the singular might be taken of *time in general*, and therefore be a free translation of the *plural*. As little reason is there for cancelling the *καὶ* just after, as is done by Griesb., Vat., Tittm., and Scholz, from many of the best MSS.; for the copula (as Fritz observes) cannot be dispensed with. On this and the two next verses see Notes on Matt. ix. 16, 17.

21. αἶρα — παλαιοῦ.] The construction is, τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτοῦ τὸ καινὸν αἶρει (τὴν) τοῦ παλαιοῦ, "its new supplement taketh (something) from the old (garment)." That the ancients supplied ἀπὸ, is plain from its appearing in the MSS. in various positions in the passage, but, no doubt, always from the margin. Πλήρωμα is for ἀναπλήρωμα, the *supplementary portion*, as it is explained by Hesych. On the full sense of these two verses, see Markl. in Recens. Synop.

23. ἐν σάββῳ.] Luke vi. 1, says more definitely, ἐν σαββάτῳ δευτεροπρώτῳ, where see Note.

— παραπορεύεσθαι — σπορίμων.] Παραπ. is not here put (as many imagine) for πορεύεσθαι; nor is the sense of παραπ. διὰ τῶν σπ. what Abr., Pal., and Krebs say, "to pass by *near* the corn-fields." The full sense is, "to pass along (i. e. through) the corn-fields." See Deut. xxiii. 25.

— ἤρξαντο ὁδὸν ποιεῖν τίλλοντες τ. σ.] This is (as Beza and Schleusn. remark) an *interchanged collocation*, (the *primary notion* being seated in the *participle* instead of the verb), for ἤρξαντο ὁδὸν ποιοῦντες τίλλειν, &c., as xi. 5, and Acts xxi. 13. Ὅδον ποιεῖν is Hellenistic Greek (with some tincture of Latinism) for ὁδὸν ποιεῖσθαι; the distinction between the Active and Middle voice being, in the later writers, often neglected.

24. ἴδε, τί — ἔξεστι.] "See! why, or how, are they doing on the Sabbath what is not lawful to be done?"

25. ὅτε χροῶν ἔσχε.] "when he was in great straits," "was pressed by necessity." See 1 Sam. xxi. 6. It is not merely synonymous (as many suppose) with the ἐπέειπας following.

— αὐτοῖς — αὐτοῦς.] This is said κατ' ἐπανόρθωσιν. See note on Matt. xii. 3. I have pointed accordingly.

26. ἐπὶ Ἀβιάθαρ τοῦ ἀρχ.] The sense of this disputed passage *seems* to be, "during the High-priesthood of Abiathar." But from the passage of the O. T. alluded to (1 Sam. xxi. 6.), it appears that, at the period when the circumstance

here adverted to took place, *Ahimelech* was High-Priest; and other passages show that Abiathar was *son* of Ahimelech. To remove this difficulty, many methods have been proposed. Some would cut the passage out altogether; others admit that it was an error of memory in the Evangelist — methods alike inadmissible. Others endeavour to remove the difficulty by *modifying* the usual signification of ἐπὶ, or adopting other senses. But that is too precarious, and indeed *inefficient* a mode to deserve attention. Several recent Commentators suppose that the Evangelist has followed the *Rabbinical* mode of citation; which consists in selecting some principal word out of each section, and applying the name to the section itself. So Rom. xi. 2. ἐν Ἠλῆα. and Mark xii. 26. ἐπὶ τῆς Βάτου. Thus the sense will be, "In that portion of the book of Samuel where the History of Abiathar is related." But this is not permitted by the collocation of the words; nor will ἐπὶ with the Genit. admit of such a signification. Neither is Abiathar called a High-Priest in 1 Sam. xxi. 2. seq. Others, again, think that father and son had two names, and that the father was *also* called Abiathar. But this solution is too manifestly made "for the nonce," and is grounded on no proof whatever. Equally gratuitous is the supposition of some, that Abiathar was the Sagan, or Deputy to his father Ahimelech, and is therefore styled High-Priest. This, indeed, vanishes before the severe historical touchstone applied by Fritz. Finally, Bp. Middlet. thinks that a great deal of learning and ingenuity have been employed to remove a difficulty which *does not exist*. This, he says, has arisen from imagining that the words of St. Mark, explained in the obvious way, would mean, "in the priesthood of Abiathar," a sense which, indeed, they will not admit. *Without* the Article, indeed (continues he), such would have been the meaning, as in 1 Macc. xiii. 42. Luke iii. 2. ἐπ' ἀρχιερωῶν Ἄβια καὶ Καϊάφα. Demosth. i. 250. Thucyd. ii. 2. In fact nothing is more common in the Classical writers. "Now (argues the learned Prelate) in these examples the *Article* would imply, as in the case of Abiathar, that these persons were *afterwards* distinguished by their respective offices from others of the same name. And that the name Abiathar was not an uncommon one among the Jews, is certain. And this might render the addition τοῦ

		MT.	LU.
28	Θρωπος δια τὸ σάββατον. Ὡστε κύριός ἐστιν ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώ- που καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου.	12.	6.
		8	5
1	III. ΚΑΙ εἰσῆλθε πάλιν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν, καὶ ἦν ἐκεῖ ἄνθρω- 9	9	6
2	πος ἐξηραμμένην ἔχων τὴν χεῖρα, καὶ παρετήρουν αὐτὸν, εἰ τοῖς σάβ- 10	10	7
3	βασι θεραπεύσει αὐτὸν, ἵνα κατηγορήσωσιν αὐτοῦ. καὶ λέγει τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ ἐξηραμμένην ἔχοντι τὴν χεῖρα· Ἐγειρε εἰς τὸ μέσον. 8	8	8
4	καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· Ἐξέστι τοῖς σάββασιν ἀγαθοποιῆσαι, ἢ κακο- 9	9	9
5	ποιῆσαι; ψυχὴν σῶσαι, ἢ ἀποκτεῖναι; οἱ δὲ εἰσιώπων. καὶ περιβλε- 12	12	10
	ψάμενος αὐτοὺς μετ' ὀργῆς, συλλυπούμενος ἐπὶ τῇ πωρώσει τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν, λέγει τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ· Ἐτεινον τὴν χεῖρά σου. καὶ 13	13	11
6	ἐξέτεινε, καὶ ἀποκατεστάθη ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ ἕντης [ὡς ἡ ἄλλη.] Καὶ 14	14	1
	ἐξελθόντες οἱ Φαρισαῖοι εὐθέως μετὰ τῶν Ἰερουδιανῶν συμβούλιον ἐποίουν κατ' αὐτοῦ, ὅπως αὐτὸν ἀπολέσωσι.		

λογ. natural, if not absolutely necessary. Thus the sense will be, that this action of David was in the time of Abiathar, the noted person who was afterwards High-Priest. So Luke iv. 27. ἐπὶ Ἐλισσαίου τοῦ προφήτου. This method (which had before occurred to Zegerus and Wets.) seems entitled to the preference; but I must frankly confess that it is not such as to be quite satisfactory to my own mind. [Comp. Exod. xxix. 32. Levit. viii. 31.]

28. ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου] Grot., Campb., Wakef., Kuin., and Fritz., strenuously contend that the sense here is not "the Son of Man," which is the general interpretation, but a son of man. "For (says Campb.) as the last words are introduced as a consequence from what has been advanced, the Son of man here must be equivalent to men in the preceding, otherwise a term is introduced into the conclusion which was not in the premises." But this savours too much of the sophistry of Scotch dialectics; and the interpretation is liable to very serious objections. Suffice it to say, 1. that such a signification of Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθ. is unfounded in the N. T.; and 2. that such a sense of κύριος no where exists in the Sept., the writers of later Greek, or the N. T. In short, the interpretation can by no means be admitted, as introducing, without sufficient ground, a very strong expression; which leads to a laxity of opinion and practice as to the observance of the Sabbath, such as our Lord could not mean to inculcate. Nor is it necessary so to interpret; for (as I have observed on Matt. xii. 8.), the ὥστε here may be not illative, but continuative; of which uses examples may be seen in Steph. Thes. and Hoogev. Partic. Or, with Maldon., it may be considered as *completive*. This view is strongly confirmed by the manner in which St. Luke introduces the words. Besides the new interpretation is negatived by the καὶ (even) of the present passage; which has great force, and implies (as Doddr. justly observes) that "the Sabbath was an institution of high importance, and may perhaps also refer to that signal authority which Christ, by the ministry of his Apostles, should exert over it, in changing it from the seventh to the first day of the week." We may add, that this was a delicate way of claiming to be the MESSIAH, as in the words uttered by our Lord on another occasion, "There is here something greater than the Temple."

In short, the reasoning seems to be this: that

as the Sabbath was an institution meant for the good of man, the relaxation of the strict observance of it might, in some extreme cases, be justified, as in that of David, and in this of his disciples. Besides, if that were not the case, that His countenance and permission were a sufficient authority, for the Messiah is Lord, &c.

III. 2. παρετήρουν] Παρατηρεῖν signifies, 1. to keep one's eyes fixed beside or close to (παρὰ) any person or thing. 2. to watch, whether for a good, or (as generally) for an evil purpose.

4. ἐξέστι — κακοποιῆσαι] Almost all recent English Commentators introduce here a Note of Campb. inculcating that "in Scripture, a negation is often expressed by an affirmation of the contrary." But it does not appear what bearing such a trite remark has on the present passage. Here there is an *interrogation*; which our Lord introduces, as being more spirited than a mere *declarative* sentence. He leaves *themselves* to decide the point. By the expression ἀγαθοποιῆσαι, he adverts to his healing the cripple: and by κακοποιῆσαι, to the designs against his life, which the Pharisees were plotting even on the Sabbath.

5. μετ' ὀργῆς] It is not necessary here to discuss, with Commentators, the question, whether Christ really felt anger, or not; or what is the true definition of anger; for the word ὀργή does not here denote anger, but (as sometimes in the Classical writers) *commotio animi*, indignation; which may be defined, with Whithy, "a displeasure of the mind, arising from an injury done or intended to ourselves or others, with a desire to remove the injury." This view is established by the word following συλλυπούμενος, being grieved in mind, which was, no doubt, meant to qualify and explain ὀργῆς. Πωρώσει (from πῶρος, a hard piece of skin) signifies callousness, perversity.

— ὡς ἡ ἄλλη] These words which are omitted in several MSS., most of the Versions, and some Fathers, are rejected by most Critics, and cancelled by almost all the Editors from Griesb. to Scholz, being supposed to be introduced from Matth. xii. 13., which seems very probable. Ἀποκαθιστάναι signifies to restore any thing to its former place or state, and is, in the Passive, by Hippocr. and the later Greek writers, and also the Sept., used of restoration from sickness to health. So Hippocr. Epidem. p. 1222. ἡ γλῶσσα ἀπεκαθίστατο εἰς τὴν ἐπίστατον.

6. [Comp. Matt. xxii. 16.]

MT. LU.

12. 6. Καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνεχώρησε μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὴν θά- 7
 15 - 17 λασσαν· καὶ πολὺ πλῆθος ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ, καὶ
 ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας, καὶ ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰδουμαίας, καὶ 8
 πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου· καὶ οἱ περὶ Τύρον καὶ Σιδῶνα, πλῆθος πολὺ,
 ἀκούσαντες ὅσα ἐποίει, ἤλθον πρὸς αὐτόν. Καὶ εἶπε τοῖς μαθηταῖς 9
 αὐτοῦ, ἵνα πλοῦριον προσκατεργῆ αὐτῷ, διὰ τὸν ὄχλον, ἵνα μὴ θλι-
 19 θωσιν αὐτόν. Πολλοὺς γὰρ ἐθεράπευσεν· ὥστε ἐπιπίπτειν αὐτῷ, ἵνα 10
 18 αὐτοῦ ἄψωνται, ὅσοι εἶχον μάλιστα. Καὶ τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκάθαρτα, 11
 ὅταν αὐτὸν ἐθεώρει, προσέπιπεν αὐτῷ, καὶ ἔκραζε, λέγοντα· "Οἱ οὐ
 εἶ ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ! Καὶ πολλὰ ἐπειμίμα αὐτοῖς, ἵνα μὴ αὐτὸν φα- 12
 12 νερόν ποιήσωσι. Καὶ ἀναβαίνει εἰς τὸ ὄρος, καὶ προσκαλεῖται οὓς 13
 13 ἦθελεν αὐτός· καὶ ἀπῆλθον πρὸς αὐτόν. Καὶ ἐποίησε δώδεκα, ἵνα 14
 ὡς μετ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἵνα ἀποστέλλῃ αὐτοὺς κηρῶσειν, καὶ ἔχειν ἔξου- 15
 σίαν θεραπεύειν τὰς νόσους, καὶ ἐκβάλλειν τὰ δαιμόνια· [πρῶτον] Σιμῶνα,
 14 (καὶ ἐπέθηκε τῷ Σίμωνι ὄνομα Πέτρον·) καὶ Ἰακώβον τὸν τοῦ Ζε- 16
 βεδαίου, καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ Ἰακώβου· (καὶ ἐπέθηκεν αὐ- 17

7. [Comp. Matt. iv. 25.]

8. οἱ περὶ Τύρον καὶ Σιδῶνα] Grot. rightly observes, that these are not the Tyrians and Sidonians, but those who inhabited the confines of Tyre and Sidon. See vii. 24.

9. εἶπε τοῖς μαθηταῖς] "he directed his disciples." Προσκατεργῆ αὐτῷ, "should attend upon him." Προσκατεργεῖν signifies, 1. to persevere in, and continue intent on any thing. 2. to attend on any person. So Acts viii. 13. βαπτισθεὶς ἦν προσκατεργῶν τῷ Φιλίππῳ, and also in several Classical passages cited by the Commentators. Fritz. thinks it very strange that the phrase should here be used of a thing. But, in fact, the thing is put for a person—the rowers for the boat, as in a kindred passage of Thucyd. iv. 120, where see my Note, also infra iv. 36. ἄλλα δὲ πλοῖα ἦν μετ' αὐτῶν, i. e. with Jesus's vessel, where see Note.

10. ἰθεράπευσεν] Brug., Newc., Kuin., and Fritz. rightly observe, that "this must have a *pluperfect* sense," "had healed." Μάλιστα denotes "grievous disorders." The word properly signifies a *scourge*, but metaphorically any *torturing affection*, especially disease.

11. πνεύματα τὰ ἀκάθαρτα—προσέπιπεν] Camer., Rosenm., and Kuin. take πνεύματα to denote the persons who were troubled with demons. But, as Fritz. justly remarks, there is here ascribed to demons, what the persons possessed by them did, because those persons were not their own masters, but were governed by the demons.

—ὅταν αὐτὸν ἐθεώρει] The sense is, "as often as they saw him," which Fritz. pronounces to be solæcistic, unless we write ἔτ' αὐν ἐθ. But there can be no difficulty in supposing that the Evangelist so wrote, or, at least, so considered the conjunction in his mind. Poppo on Thucyd. perpetually so edits.

14. ἐποίησε] "appointed." So Apoc. i. 6. καὶ ἐποίησεν ἡμᾶς βασιλεῖς καὶ ἱερεῖς τῷ Θεῷ, and sometimes in the later Classical writers. So the Heb. **קָנַע** in 1 Sam. xii. 6. and sometimes the Latin *facere*, as in Cicero pro Plancio, 4.

15. ἔξουσίαν] The word here signifies rather *power* than *authority*.

16. πρῶτον Σιμῶνα] Beza, Schmid, Glass, Schott,

and Fritz., introduced this addition, on the authority of at least *four* MSS., as being necessarily required to complete the sense. And so Newc., Wakef., and Campb. translate. There is, indeed (as Matthæi admits), a manifest *lacuna*. And though that is supplied in various ways, in the MSS., yet in none so satisfactorily as in the above manner. Indeed, De Dieu and Kuin. defend the common reading, and maintain that it is a *concessa hians oratio*, of which the sense is, "And he appointed Simon, whom he (afterwards) called Peter." But let the style of the Evangelist be as unstudied as they please, yet *this* would be an unparalleled negligence. Far better is it to suppose a *lacuna*. To the above addition, however, a strong objection has been made; namely, that it may be supposed to be introduced from Matt. x. 2. But that passage, as Fritz. observes, is very dissimilar. I cannot, however, help suspecting that the *πρῶτον* was derived from that source; and I have little doubt but that the true reading is Σιμῶνα without *πρῶτον*. So in the parallel passage of Luke vi. 14. (which Mark seems to have had in view), ἐκλεξάμενος ἀπ' αὐτῶν δώδεκα, οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασε· Σιμῶνα (ὃν καὶ ὠνόμασε Πέτρον) καὶ Ἀνδρέαν, &c. Besides, it is far more probable that *one* word should have slipped out than two. And *thus* we are enabled to account for the omission, on the principle of *homoteleuton*, or rather *general similarity*; for in Manuscript characters Σιμῶνα is very like Δαυβῶνα. That would cause the omission in some MSS.; though I have no doubt but that, in others, the omission of Σιμῶνα was occasioned by its standing by itself, and seeming to form no part of the construction; though it belongs to the preceding *ἐποίησε δώδεκα*, inserted in the Cod. Vatic. In four other MSS. *πρῶτον* was inserted (though probably not in the Archetypes), because it softens the seeming harshness; which, however, is less, if we consider that the words preceding ἵνα ὡσι—*δαιμόνια* are, in some measure, parenthetical.

The words καὶ ἐπέθηκε—Πέτρον are here added parenthetically; because, in fact, this surname was not given to Simon on the *Mount*, but afterwards. See Matt. xvi. 18.

18 τοῖς ὀνόματα Βουαεργεῖς, ὃ ἐστίν, υἱὸὶ βροτῆς ᾧ) καὶ Ἀνδρέαν, καὶ MT. LU.
6.
15
 Φίλιππον, καὶ Βαρθολομαῖον, καὶ Ματθαῖον, καὶ Θωμᾶν, καὶ Ἰάκω-
 19 βον τὸν τοῦ Ἀλφαίου, καὶ Θαδδαῖον, καὶ Σίμωνα τὸν Κανανίτην, καὶ
 Ἰούδαν Ἰσκαριώτην, ὃς καὶ παρέδωκεν αὐτόν.
 20 Καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς οἶκον· καὶ συνέχεται πάλιν ὄχλος, ὥστε μὴ δύ-
 21 νασθαι αὐτοὺς μήτε ἄρτον φαγεῖν. Καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ, 11.
 22 ἐξήλθον κρατῆσαι αὐτόν· ἔλεγον γὰρ, ὅτι ἐξέστη. Καὶ οἱ Γραμμα- 24
15
 τεῖς οἱ ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων καταβάντες ἔλεγον· Ὅτι Βεελζεβούλ ἔχει, καὶ
 23 ὅτι ἐν τῷ ἄρτονι τῶν δαιμονίων ἐκβάλλει τὰ δαιμόνια. Καὶ προσκα-
 λεσάμενος αὐτοὺς, ἐν παραβολαῖς ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· Πῶς δύναται Σατανᾶς 25
17
 24 Σατανᾶν ἐκβάλλειν; Καὶ ἐὰν βασιλεία ἐφ' ἑαυτὴν μερισθῆ, οὐ δύναται
 25 σταθῆναι ἢ βασιλεία ἐκείνη· καὶ ἐὰν οἰκία ἐφ' ἑαυτὴν μερισθῆ, οὐ
 26 δύναται σταθῆναι ἢ οἰκία ἐκείνη· καὶ εἰ ὁ Σατανᾶς ἀνέστη ἐφ' 26
18
 27 ἑαυτόν καὶ μεμέρισται, οὐ δύναται σταθῆναι, ἀλλὰ τέλος ἔχει. Οὐ 29
21
 δύναται οὐδεὶς τὴν σκευὴν τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ, εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ,
 διαρπάσαι, ἐὰν μὴ πρῶτον τὸν ἰσχυρὸν δῆσῃ· καὶ τότε τὴν οἰκίαν 23
 28 αὐτοῦ διαρπάσει. Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι πάντα ἄφεθήσεται τὰ ἄμαρ- 31
 τήματα τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ αἱ βλασφημίαι, ὅσας ἂν βλα-

17. Βουαεργεῖς] With this word the Commentators are much perplexed. One thing is certain, that it does not correctly represent the Syro-Chaldee term. What that was, the Commentators are not agreed. Most think, with Jerome, that the true word is Βενερεῖμ, from the Heb. בנן רע, for in Hebrew בנן רע continually signifies *thunder*. But this varies too much from the *vestigia literarum*. Others derive it from the Heb. בנן רע. But that deviates further, and only signifies "sons of noise," or sound. The best derivation seems to be that of Caninius, De Dieu, and Fritz., בנן רע; for *Reges*, in Syriac and Arabic signifies *thunder*. Thus the word *Βουαεργεῖς* seems to be a slight corruption for *Βουανεργεῖς*. The reason for this appellation has been variously conjectured. See Horne's *Introd.*

20. μήτε ἄρτον φαγεῖν] i. e. not even to take food (by a common Hebraism); much less to attend to any thing else.

21. καὶ ἀκούσαντες — αὐτόν] There are few passages on which Commentators are more divided in opinion than this. Several questions are involved in the discussion of the sense: 1. who are the οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ? 2. to what report may ἀκούσαντες be thought to have reference? 3. what is the sense of ἐξήλθον and of κρατῆσαι? 4. who those are that are represented as saying ἐξέστη? On these points I see no reason to abandon the opinions which I propounded in *Recens. Synop.* Fritz., after a very long and minute discussion, determines (as I had myself done) that the best interpretation is that of the ancient and many eminent modern Commentators (Grot., Beza, Kypke, Campb., Wets., Valckn., and Kuin.), as follows: "When Jesus' kinsfolk (i. e. his mother and brothers, see ver. 31.) had heard (that he was at Capernaum), they went out from their house, in order that they might lay hands on him; for, said they, he is surely beside himself." Fritz. remarks that the Greeks say εἶναι παρά τινας, in the sense "to be of any one's nation or family;" of which he adduces examples. That from Susan-

na ver. 33. ἔκαλον δὲ οἱ παρ' αὐτῆς, is quite decisive. Ἀκούσαντες signifies "having heard of his being at Capernaum, and what was going on in the house." Κρατῆσαι signifies "to lay hands on and hold fast;" yet it does not necessarily imply *violence*, but sometimes *friendly intentions*, as in 2 Kings iv. 3. and Mark ix. 27. Ἐξέστη, sub. τοῦ νοῦ or γνῶμης, is to be taken in a figurative sense for "he is transported too far." The word is often used in the Classical writers of vehement commotion or perturbation; and we have there both the complete and the elliptical phrase.

22. Βεελζεβούλ ἔχει] i. e. he is possessed of Beelzebub. [*Comp.* John vii. 20. viii. 48. x. 20.]

23—29. In these verses are shown, 1. the *absurdity* of the charge; and 2. the *wickedness* of it; it being of so deep a dye, that it will never be forgiven.

24. ἐφ' ἑαυτὴν μερ.] Μερίζεσθαι signifies properly to be separated into parts, or parties; and, from the adjunct, to be at *variance*, and in *opposition*. In which case it carries with it the regimen of verbs signifying *opposition*.

26. καὶ εἰ ὁ Σ.] The καὶ is said by Kuin. to be for οὕτως. But Fritz. shows that it retains the usual force.

27. οὐ δύναται οὐδεὶς] A great number of MSS., some Versions, and the Edit. Princ., have οὐδεὶς δύναται, which is edited by Griesb., Matth., and Scholz; but injudiciously: for the common reading, as being the more difficult, is to be preferred, and is very properly retained by Tittm., Vat., and Fritz. This idiom of the double negative is frequent in Scripture (as Luke ix. 2. John vi. 63. ix. 33.), though it was generally stumbled at, more or less, by the scribes. Τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ. The force of the Article here is that of *insertion* in Hypothesis. See *Middlet. Gr. Art. C. iii. § 2. 1.*

28. καὶ αἱ] Thus several of the best MSS. read for καὶ. And so Griesb., Tittm., Fritz., and Scholz edit; and very properly: since it is far easier to account for the omission than for the insertion of the αἱ. Besides, the article is here

MT. LU.

12. 8. σφημῆσωσιν· ὅς δ' ἂν βλασφημῆσῃ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, οὐκ ἔχει 29
 ἄφεσιν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ἀλλ' ἔροχος ἐστὶν αἰωνίου κρίσεως. οὕτι ἐλεγον· 30
 46 19 πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον ἔχει. Ἐρχονται οὖν † οἱ ἀδελφοὶ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ † 31
 αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔξω ἐστῶτες ἀπέστειλαν πρὸς αὐτὸν, φωνοῦντες αὐτόν. Καὶ 32
 47 20 ἐκάθητο ὄχλος περὶ αὐτόν· εἶπον δὲ αὐτῷ· Ἰδοὺ, ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ
 48 21 οἱ ἀδελφοὶ σου ἔξω ζητοῦσί σε. Καὶ ἀπεκριθῆ ἀπὸ αὐτοῖς, λέγων· Τίς 33
 49 ἐστὶν ἡ μήτηρ μου, ἢ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ μου; Καὶ περιβλεψάμενος κύκλῳ 34
 τοὺς περὶ αὐτὸν καθημένους, λέγει· Ἴδε, ἡ μήτηρ μου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί
 60 μου. Ὅς γὰρ ἂν ποιήσῃ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ, οὗτος ἀδελφός μου, 35
 καὶ ἀδελφή μου, καὶ μήτηρ ἐστὶ.
13. 2 4 IV. ΚΑΙ πάλιν ἤρξατο διδάσκειν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν· καὶ συνή- 1
 χθη πρὸς αὐτὸν ὄχλος πολὺς, ὥστε αὐτὸν ἐμβάντα εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, καθή-
 σθαι ἐν τῇ θαλάσῃ· καὶ πῶς ὁ ὄχλος πρὸς τὴν θάλασσαν ἐπὶ τῆς
 3 γῆς ἦν. Καὶ ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοὺς ἐν παραβολαῖς πολλὰ, καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐ- 2
 5 τοῖς ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ· Ἀκούετε· ἰδοὺ, ἐξῆλθεν ὁ σπείρων τοῦ 3
 4 σπείρου· καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ σπείρειν, ὃ μὲν ἔπεσε παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν, καὶ 4
 5 ἦλθε τὰ πτερινὰ [τοῦ οὐρανοῦ] καὶ κατέφαγεν αὐτό. Ἄλλο δὲ ἔπεσεν 5
 ἐπὶ τὸ πετρῶδες, ὅπου οὐκ εἶχε γῆν πολλήν· καὶ εὐθέως ἐξαπέτειλε,
 6 διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν βάθος γῆς· ἡλίου δὲ ἀνατείλαντος ἐκαυματίσθη, καὶ, 6
 7 7 διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ῥίζαν, ἐξηράνθη. Καὶ ἄλλο ἔπεσεν εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας· 7
 8 8 καὶ ἀνέβησαν αἱ ἀκάνθαι, καὶ συνέπνιξαν αὐτὸ, καὶ καρπὸν οὐκ ἔδωκε.
 Καὶ ἄλλο ἔπεσεν εἰς τὴν γῆν τὴν καλήν· καὶ ἐδίδου καρπὸν ἀναβαί- 8
 9 ροντα καὶ αὐξάνοντα, καὶ ἔφερον ἕν τριάνοντα, καὶ ἕν ἐξήκοντα, καὶ ἕν
 ἐκατόν. Καὶ ἔλεγεν [αὐτοῖς]· Ὁ ἔχων ὅτα ἀκούειν ἀκουέτω. Ὅτε 9

as much required as at ἀμαρτ. just before. [Comp. I John 5. 16.]

29. βλασφ. εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγ.] See Note on Matt. xii. 31.

— κρίσεως.] The ἁμαρτήματος (or ἁμαρτίας), which Grot., Mill, Griesb., Rosenm., and Kuin. would read, is a mere emendation of the common reading to improve the antithesis; which, however, is unnecessary. See Matt. and Fritz.

30. οὕτι ἐλεγον — ἔχει] These are (as Beza, Casaub., Grot., Kuin., and Fritz. rightly observe) the words of the *Evangelist*, not of our Lord.

31. ἔρχονται οὖν] The οὖν is here, as often (like *ergo* sometimes in Latin), *resumptive*, taking up the thread of the narrative from ver. 21. Instead of οἱ ἀδελφοὶ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ, a few ancient MSS., and most of the Versions, have ἡ μήτηρ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί, which is edited by Griesb., Tittm., Vat., and Scholz. But there is no sufficient authority for the change; which may, with Wets. and Fritz., be accounted for from a wish to do honour to the mother of Christ. By ἔξω is meant, not outside of the house, but outside of the crowd.

32. καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ σου] Many MSS. and the Edit. Princ. add καὶ αἱ ἀδελφαί σου, which words are edited by Matth., Griesb., Tittm., Vat., and Scholz; but are, with more reason, rejected by Kuin. and Fritz.

IV. 1. ἤρξατο διδάσκειν] for ἐδίδαξε, say most Commentators. But, as Fritz. shows, the phrase may have its full force. The sense is, "He be-

gan to teach by the sea;" and then, by the increasing crowd of auditors, he was compelled to embark on board the boat (mentioned supra iii. 9.), and there to teach the people, seated on ship-board at sea.

2. ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ for ἐν τῷ διδάσκειν] a mode of expression peculiar to Mark.

4. τοῦ οὐρανοῦ] Omitted in very many MSS., most of the Versions, and the Edit. Princ.; and rejected by Mill, Beng., Wets., Matth., Griesb., Tittm., Vat., Fritz., and Scholz; as being introduced from the other Gospels.

7. τὰς ἀκάνθας] The Article is here found, as being employed, in a *general* sense, for *thorny ground*.

— καρπὸν οὐκ ἔδωκε] "did not yield fruit." This was not necessary to be said of the former seed sown; but *here* it was with reason expressed, since the first growth justly afforded some hope of a prosperous increase. (Rosenm.)

8. ἀναβαίοντα καὶ αὐξάνοντα] "which sprung up and increased." Αὐξ. is for *αὐξανόμενον*, which is found in some ancient MSS.; but, doubtless, from a gloss. The active is used by the later, and especially the Hellenistic writers; the middle by the earlier. Ἐφερον ἕν. This use of ἕν, serving to *enumeration*, is Hebrew. See I Sam. x. 3. Exod. xviii. 3, 4.

9. αὐτοῖς.] The word is omitted in very many MSS., nearly all the Versions, and the early Editions, and is cancelled by almost every Editor from Wets. to Scholz.

	MT.	LU.
10 δὲ ἐγένετο καταμόνας, ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν σὺν τοῖς δώδεκα	13.	8.
11 τὴν παραβολὴν. καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· Ὑμῖν δέδοται γνῶναι τὸ μυστή-	11	9 10
ριον τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐκείνοις δὲ τοῖς ἔξω ἐν παραβολαῖς τὰ		
12 πάντα γίνεται· ἵνα βλέποντες βλέπωσι, καὶ μὴ ἴδωσι· καὶ ἀκούον-	13	
τες ἀκούωσι, καὶ μὴ συνῶσι· μήποτε ἐπιστρέψωσι, καὶ ἀφεθῆ		
13 αὐτοῖς τὰ ἁμαρτήματα. Καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· Οὐκ οἴδατε τὴν παραβο-		
14 λὴν ταύτην; καὶ πῶς πάσους τὰς παραβολὰς γνῶσεσθε; Ὁ σπείρων	19	12
15 τὸν λόγον σπείρει. Οὗτοι δὲ εἰσιν οἱ παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν, ὅπου σπείρεται		
ὁ λόγος· καὶ ὅταν ἀκούσωσιν, εὐθέως ἐρχεται ὁ Σατανᾶς, καὶ αἶρει		
16 τὸν λόγον τὸν ἐσπαρμένον ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν. Καὶ οὗτοί εἰσιν	20	13
ὁμοίως οἱ ἐπὶ τὰ πετρῶδη σπειρόμενοι, οἱ ὅταν ἀκούωσι τὸν λόγον,		
17 εὐθέως μετὰ χαρᾶς λαμβάνουσιν αὐτόν· καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσι ῥίζαν ἐν	21	
ἑαυτοῖς, ἀλλὰ πρόσκαιροί εἰσιν· εἴτα, γενομένης θλίψεως, ἢ διωγμοῦ		
18 διὰ τὸν λόγον, εὐθέως σκινδαλιζοῦται. Καὶ οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ εἰς τὰς	22	14
19 ἀκάνθας σπειρόμενοι, [οὗτοί εἰσιν] οἱ τὸν λόγον ἀκούοντες· καὶ αἱ		
μερίμναι τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, καὶ ἡ ἀπάτη τοῦ πλοῦτου, καὶ αἱ περὶ		

10. καταμόνας] Sub. *χώρας, apart*, what is in a manner "at [a separate] part." The expression occurs both in the Scriptural and Classical writers. *Οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν* means "those that were about him." By which expression are designated the stated attendants on our Lord's ministry, his regular disciples, probably (as Euthym. thinks) the *Seventy* disciples. So Jamblich. Vit. Pyth. 17. *οἱ περὶ τὸν ἄνδρα* means Pythagoras's disciples. The construction *ἑρωτῶν τινά τι* is remarkable.

11. *δέδοται*] "it is granted" [by Divine grace]; not *obtigit*, as Wets. renders; which is an unjustifiable curtailment of the sense. By *τοῖς ἔξω*, is meant to those who are most removed from intimate connection with me, and acceptance of my religion. This name the Jews used to give to the Heathens, as being removed from covenant with God. Our Lord, therefore, as Whitby remarks, seems to hint to them, that in a short time the kingdom of God would be taken from them, and they themselves be the *οἱ ἔξω*. This mode of speaking is also found in the Rabbinical writers. See Lightf.

12. *ἵνα βλέπ. βλέπωσι*] The Commentators have almost universally taken the *ἵνα* for *ἔτι, qui, or ita ut*. But Fritz. more correctly explains it *eo consilio, ut*. Our Lord means that the prophetic saying of Isaiah will be made good. The sense is, "To the multitude all things are propounded by the intervention of parables; with the intent that (as the prophet says), since they have eyes and ears perfect, and yet see not, not understand, they may not repent and obtain forgiveness of their sins." The expression *βλέπ. καὶ μὴ ἴδωσι* is (as Le Clerc observes) a proverbial one, and relates to those who might see, if they would use their faculties, that which they now overlook, through inattention and folly. So Æschyl. Prom. *Οἱ πρῶτα μὲν βλέποντες ἔβλεπον μάνην, κ λ ὄ ν τ ε ς ὀ κ ἡ κ ο ο υ ν .* [Comp. John xii. 40. Acts xxviii. 26. Rom. xi. 8.]

The words *καὶ ἀφεθῆ αὐτοῖς τὰ ἁμ.* the Commentators consider as an explanation of those of Isaiah *καὶ ἰάσωμαι αὐτούς*; the Hebrews viewing all severe disorders as the punishment of sin. And that those were really such under the Mosaic

dispensation, Abp. Magee (on Atonement, vol. i. p. 433.) thinks we may fairly infer from John v. 14. But the Hebrew is *לֹא נָשְׁלַח*, "ne gens salva evadat." For, as Fritz. observes, the Heb. *נָשְׁלַח*, (as also the Chaldee *נְשַׁלַּח*), to heal, often signifies to forgive, offences being compared with wounds and disorders.

13. *καὶ πῶς.*] "And how then!" Among the other significations of *καὶ* when prefixed to interrogations, is that of *drawing a consequence*, as in Matt. iii. 14, and here. By *πάσους* is meant, not "all [other]," but, "all [such as it behoves you to know]."

14. *ὁ σπείρων — σπείρει.*] A brief and popular form of expression, of which the sense is, "The sower [mentioned in the parable] is to be considered as one sowing the Word [of God]."

15. *οἱ παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν*] scil. *σπειρόμενοι, or σπαρέντες*, or "Ὅπου is for *οἴς, whom*, which is, indeed, found in some MSS. and the Syr., but is doubtless a gloss. So the Latin *ubi* for *in quo*.

16. *ὁμοίως*] "by a similar mode of explanation."

18. *οὗτοί εἰσιν.*] These words are omitted in many MSS., the Ed. Princ. and Beng., several Versions, and some Fathers, and are cancelled by Wets., Matth., Tittm., Vat., and Fritz., which last Editor proves that this is the true way of reading the passage, though others are offered by the MSS.

19. *τούτου.*] Griesb. and Fritz. cancel this word, on the authority of some MSS., as being introduced from the other Gospels. But the sense will scarcely dispense with the word, and the custom of the N. T. requires it. It is, besides, absent from so very few MSS. that the omission may be thought accidental, or introduced elegantiæ gratiâ, for the passage reads better without it. Fritz. adduces Matt. xiii. 39, as an example of the absence of the pronoun; but it may be better dispensed with *there*, since the same expression with the *τούτου* had occurred a little before.

— *ἡ ἀπάτη τοῦ πλοῦτου.*] Some recent Interpreters take *ἀπάτη* for *τροψίς*. But there is no reason to abandon the common interpretation, "the fallaciousness of riches," expressive of those various *deceits*, which accompany riches, pro-

MT. LU.

13. τὰ λοιπὰ ἐπιθυμία, εἰσπορευόμεναι συμπνίγουσι τὸν λόγον, καὶ
 23 ἄκαρπος γίνεται. Καὶ οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν τὴν καλὴν σπα-
 20 ρέντες, οἵτινες ἀκούουσι τὸν λόγον καὶ παραδέχονται· καὶ καρποφο-
 16 ροῦσιν, ἐν τριάκοντα, καὶ ἐν ἐξήκοντα, καὶ ἐν ἑκατόν. Καὶ ἔλεγεν 21
 αὐτοῖς· Μῆτι ὁ λύχνος ἔρχεται, ἵνα ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον τεθῆ ἢ ὑπὸ
 17 τὴν κλίνην; οὐχ ἵνα ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν ἐπιτεθῆ; Οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶ τι 22
 κρυπτόν, ὃ εἰάν μὴ φανερωθῆ· οὐδὲ ἐγένετο ἀπόκρυφον, ἀλλ' ἵνα
 εἰς φανερόν ἔλθῃ. Ἐπις ἔχει ὅσα ἀκούειν, ἀκουέτω. Καὶ ἔλεγεν 23
 18 αὐτοῖς· Βλέπετε, τί ἀκούετε. Ἐν ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε, μετρηθήσεται 24
 ὑμῖν, καὶ προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν τοῖς ἀκούουσιν. ὅς γὰρ ἂν ἔχη, δοθή- 25
 σεται αὐτῷ· καὶ ὅς οὐκ ἔχει, καὶ ὃ ἔχει ἀρθήσεται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.
 Καὶ ἔλεγεν· Οὗτος ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὡς εἰν ἄνθρωπος 26

ducing disappointment, and throwing a veil over the heart, as to *real* happiness here and hereafter. See 1 Tim. vi. 17.

— αὶ περὶ τὰ λ. ἐπιθ.] The sense seems to be, “the desires exercised about the rest of the *gaudes* of life” (to use an old English term). *Λοιπὰ* has reference to τοῦ πλούτου, and alludes to honours and sensual gratifications; what arc called by St. Paul the τῆς σαρκὸς ἐπιθυμίαι, and by Luke viii. 14. ἡδονὰ τοῦ βίου. There may however be (as Grot. suggests) an *euphemism*, since sensuality of every kind is adverted to.

20. παραδέχονται] “receive and entertain it, assent to it.” Ἐν τριάκοντα, &c. There is something harsh in this, instead of which we should expect εἰς. The best way of accounting for it is to suppose, (with Grot. and Fritz.), that the Evangelist suddenly returns back from the *thing*, and the *explication*, to the *parable*.

21. αὐτοῖς] i. e. the *disciples*, not the people at large. Compare vv. 21, 24, 26, and Luke viii. 16—18. And although vv. 21—25 are brought forward in another sense in Matt. v. 15; x. 26; vii. 2 & 13, yet proverbial *sententiæ* like this are (as Grot. observes) applicable in various views. It is (to use the words of Whitby) as if Christ had said: “I give you a clear light by which you may discern the import of this and other parables; but this I do, not that you may keep it to yourselves, and hide it from others, but that it may be beneficial to you, and by you be made beneficial to others; and that having thus learned, you may instruct them how they ought to hear, and to receive the word heard in good and honest hearts, ver. 20. And though I give you the knowledge of these mysteries of the kingdom of God (*καταμύσας*) privately, I do it not that you may keep them so; for there is nothing thus hid, which should not be made manifest, neither was any thing made secret by me, but that it should afterwards come abroad.”

— μῆτι] “num quid.” An adverb sometimes involving affirmation, sometimes negation, (as here,) in which latter case Hoogew. considers it as emphatic. Ἐρχεται, for φέρεται, is “brought.” Neuter for passive, by an idiom common to both Greek and Latin, as spoken of *letters*; though occurring also in other cases, as Thucyd. i. 137. ἦλθε γὰρ (i. e. money) αὐτῷ ὑπέρτερον ἐκ πάντων Ἀθηνῶν.

For ἐπιτεθῆ several MSS. (some of them ancient,) and Theophylact have τεθῆ, which was proposed by Mill, and edited by Griesb., Knapp, and Fritz. But there is not sufficient authority

for the alteration, which seems to be a mere *emendation* of the Alexandrian school. As little ground is there for the omission of the *τι* just afterwards by the same Editors. The *τι* could scarcely be dispensed with in the plain style of the Evangelist, though it might more elegantly be omitted. It was therefore cancelled by the *emendatores*, and *carelessly omitted*, on account of the preceding *τι* in ἐστὶ, by the scribes of the ordinary MSS.

By κλίνην must be understood the *couch* (like our sofa), which, as Grot. observes, had such a cavity as to admit of a *candelabrum* being put under it; nay, it seems, any thing much larger; indeed, from the citations adduced by Wets., it appears to have been used by the ancients as a common hiding-place. [*Comp.* Matt. v. 15. Luke viii. 16. xi. 33.]

22. οὐδὲ ἐγένετο ἀπόκρυφον, ἀλλ' ἵνα, &c.] An elliptical form for οὐδὲ ἐγένετο ἀπόκ. (ἀλλ' ἐγένετο ἀπόκρυφον) ἵνα, &c. Thus there is no reason to adopt any one of the *various readings*, which have sprung from ignorance of the nature of the expression. [*Comp.* Matt. x. 26. Luke viii. 17. xii. 2.]

24. βλέπετε τί—ἀκούουσιν.] There is an obscurity about this verse; which has given rise to several readings, and induced Editors to adopt various expedients to remove it. Griesb. and Tittm. expunge the clause καὶ προστεθήσεται—ἀκούουσιν, with a few MSS.; and Vater, from some MSS., cancels the τοῖς ἀκ. But it has been fully shown by Fritz, that *neither* emendation can be received; and he himself edits βλέπετε, τί ἀκούετε, καὶ προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν τοῖς ἀκούουσιν. Ὡς μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε, μετρηθήσονται ὑμῖν. By this emendation the thought is expressed more logically, and the sense more neatly expressed. But as there is no *direct* authority for the change, and as the Evangelist is by no means characterized by *neatness* and *exact correspondence* of the members of a sentence, it ought not to have been introduced into the text.

The *τι* here answers to the πῶς of Luke. Euthym. well paraphrases thus: Ἐν ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε τὴν προσοχὴν, ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν ἡ γνώσις. [*Comp.* Matt. xiii. 12, & xxii. 29. Luke vii. 18, & xix. 26.]

26. Fritz. well observes, that in ver. 26—32, there is a continuation of our Lord's discourse, which is now addressed to the people at large. The following parable is recorded only by Mark. On its bearing and application Commentators

27 βάλῃ τὸν σπόρον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ καθεύδῃ καὶ ἐγείνηται νύκτι καὶ 13. 13.
 ἤμεραν, καὶ ὁ σπόρος βλαστάνῃ καὶ μηκύνηται, ὡς οὐκ οἶδεν αὐτός.
 28 Αὐτομάτῃ γὰρ ἡ γῆ καρποφορεῖ· πρῶτον χόρτον, εἶτα στάχυν, εἶτα
 29 πλήρη σίτον ἐν τῷ στάχυϊ. Ὅταν δὲ παραθῶ ὁ καρπός, εὐθέως
 ἀποστέλλει τὸ δρέπανον, ὅτι παρεστήκεν ὁ θερισμός.
 30 Καὶ ἔλεγε· Τίνι ὁμοιωσόμεν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ; ἢ ἐν ποίᾳ 31 18
 31 παραβολῇ παραβιάζομεν αὐτήν; Ὡς † κόκκῳ σινάπεως, ὅς, ὅταν 19
 σπαρῇ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, μικρότερος πάντων τῶν σπερματίων ἐστὶ τῶν ἐπὶ 32
 32 τῆς γῆς· καὶ ὅταν σπαρῇ, ἀναββαίνει, καὶ γίνεται πάντων τῶν λαχά-
 νων μεΐζων, καὶ ποιεῖ κλίδους μεγάλους, ὥστε δύνασθαι ὑπὸ τὴν
 33 σκιάν αὐτοῦ τὰ πτερυγία τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατασκηνοῦν. Καὶ τοιαύταις 34

differ; some, as Whitby and Fritz., referring it to the seed which fell on good ground, in the preceding parable of the sower. But others, as Mackn., think the correspondence in many respects fails; and they are of opinion, that it should be taken in connection with the preceding verses, and was intended to prevent the Apostles from being dispirited, when they did not see their labours attended with success.

27. καθεύδῃ καὶ ἐγείνηται, &c.] This expression is like that of Ps. iii. 6. ἐκοιμήθην καὶ ὑπνώσα, ἐγήγερθην, and is an image of security and confidence. 28. αὐτομάτῃ.] The word properly signifies *self-moved*, and is here, as often in the Classical writers, used of that energy of nature, which is independent of human aid. Καρποφορεῖ is generally taken for φέρει; the καρπο being inert, as in Diod. Sic. p. 137. ἄμπελος — καρποφορεῖ τὸν οἶνον. But Beza, Pisc., and Fritz. more properly give it the full sense *fruges fert*, and take φέρει from it in the next clause.

— χόρτον] “blade.” For want of some such definite term, the Greeks and Romans were obliged to use the same word as denoted *grass*. The words χόρτον and στάχυν are put in the singular, because they are used in a general sense, which, however, implies plurality. Στάχυς denotes the ear in its green state, and it is so called from the peculiarly erect form it then has. Πλήρη σίτον, the complete, perfect, and mature *grain*. So Gen. xli. 7. σταχὺς πλήρεις.

29. ὅταν δὲ παραθῶ ὁ καρπός.] With this passage the ancient Translators were so perplexed, that they either gave versions which wander from the sense; or else they expressed the sense in a general way by, “when the crop is ripe.” The best mode of removing the difficulty is, (with Beza, Heupel, Wolf, Kuin., and Fritz.) to suppose an ellipsis of *αὐτὸν*, as in the case of many other active verbs to which use imparted a reciprocal sense; κρῖπτειν, κείθειν, ἀποβρίπτειν, ἀναλαμβάνειν, παρέχειν, ἐφίνασι, ἐνδιδόναι, ἐπιδιδόναι, and finally παραδόναι which, though it does not occur in the Classical writers, is found in Hellenistic Greek; e. gr. Josh. xi. 19. οὐκ ἦν πόλις, ἦτις οὐ παρέδωκε (surrender) τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ. 1 Pet. ii. 23. παρείδον δὲ τῷ κρίνοντι δικαίως. The question, however, is, to whom the fruit is to be understood to yield itself up, and deliver its increase? To the reaper, say the Commentators generally. But I prefer, with Fritz., to refer it to τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, taken from the preceding. Thus also ὁ ἄνθρωπος must be understood at ἀποστέλλει. As to ἀποστέλλει τὸ δρέπανον, it is put, by a seemingly popular metonymy, for “he sendeth those who may put

in the sickle;” i. e. the reapers. So, in a very similar passage of Joel iii. 13. ἐξαποστύλατε δρέπανα, ὅτι παρεστήκεν ὁ τρυγητός. See also Rev. xiv. 15. 19.

31. κόκκῳ.] The greater part of the MSS., together with the ancient Editions, and some Versions and Fathers, have κόκκον, which is adopted by Mill and Wets., and edited by Matth., Griesb., and others down to Scholz; except that Fritz. retains the common reading; I think rightly; for (as he shows) it is otherwise scarcely possible to justify the construction. And although κόκκον may seem to be the more difficult reading, yet (as it appears from the Greek Commentators) there is reason to think that κόκκῳ was altered into κόκκον *ex interpretatione*. Besides, it may be added, as the words are so very much alike, (the *ι* adscript and the *υ* being perpetually confounded,) MS. authority will here have but little weight. On the subject of this *Sinapi*, for the purpose of removing what has been thought a great difficulty, (namely, how to reconcile what is here said about the size of the seed and of the plant with the *sinapis nigra*, or common mustard plant,) Mr. Frost has propounded the hypothesis, that the *sinapi* of the N. T. does not designate any species of the genus we call *Sinapis*, but a species of the *Phytolacca* called the *Phytolacca dodecandra*, which is a tree common in North America; and, Mr. Frost says, grows abundantly in Palestine, and has properties exactly corresponding to those here ascribed to the κόκκος. But the learned Botanist has adduced no authentication of these statements from the works of eastern travellers. Indeed, the hypothesis is not only probably devoid of proof, but is unnecessary for the commendable purpose in view. Every enlightened Interpreter will see how uncritical it were to press, so much as Mr. Frost has done, on the expression “least of all seeds.” It is sufficient if the smallest mustard seed be among the very least of seeds known in Palestine; for it is plain that the tobacco could not be here contemplated, since it was unknown till the discovery of America. And the Foxglove was probably not known in Palestine. It is plain, too, that πάντων must not be pressed upon; for the Heb. כּכּ is often similarly pleonastic. Thus it is omitted in the parallel passage of St. Matthew.

Again, γίνεται δένδρον may very well be taken, by a popular hyperbole, for “it becomes, as it were, a tree;” especially as from a comparison of the parallel words of Matthew, ποιεῖ κλάδους μεγάλους, it is plain that the sense must be, “that which branches out widely, LIKE a tree.” Thus, in the

MT. LU.

8. 8. παραβολαῖς πολλαῖς ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς τὸν λόγον, καθὼς ἤδύνατο ἀκοῦναι.
χωρὶς δὲ παραβολῆς οὐκ ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς· καὶ ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς μαθηταῖς 34
αὐτοῦ ἐπέλυε πάντα.
- 18 22 Καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, ὅψιας γενομένης· Διέλθωμεν 35
εἰς τὸ πέραν. Καὶ ἀφέντες τὸν ὄχλον, παραλαμβάνουσι αὐτὸν, ὡς 36
24 23 ἦν, ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ· καὶ ἄλλα δὲ πλοιάρια ἦν μετ' αὐτοῦ. Καὶ γίνεται 37
λαίλαψ ἀνέμου μεγάλης· τὰ δὲ κύματα ἐπέβυλλον εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, ὥστε
αὐτὸ ἤδη γεμίσεσθαι. Καὶ ἦν αὐτὸς ἐπὶ τῇ πρύμνῃ, ἐπὶ τὸ προσκε- 38
25 24 φάλαιον καθεύδων· καὶ διεγείρουσιν αὐτὸν, καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· Δι-
26 δάσκαλε, οὐ μέλει σοι ὅτι ἀπολλύμεθα; Καὶ διεγεροθὲς ἐπιτίμησε τῷ 39
ἀνέμῳ, καὶ εἶπε τῇ Θαλάσῃ· Σιώπα, πεφίμωσο. καὶ ἐκόπωεν ὁ
25 25 ἄνεμος, καὶ ἐγένετο γαλήνη μεγάλη. Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Τί δειλοὶ 40
27 ἐστε οὕτω; πῶς οὐκ ἔχετε πίστιν; Καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν φόβον μέγαν, 41

parallel passage of Luke, for *ἐν ὄχρῳ* some MSS. have *ὡς ἐν ὄχρῳ*, where, though the *ὡς* evidently came from the margin, yet it shows the mode in which the word was taken by the Glossographer. Besides the statements of Lightf., Scheuchzer, and Dr. A. Clarke, make it certain, that this plant sometimes grows to a height which may very well allow it to be a shelter for birds. Thus the above celebrated botanist mentions a species of the plant several feet high, which presents a *tree-like* appearance. As to what Mr. F. calls "the impossibility of an *annual* plant becoming a shrub, much less a *tree*," it is too formal and far-fetched an objection to deserve the least attention. Besides, Mr. Frost's own argument cannot but be fatal to his own hypothesis, since it must be negated by the words *ἔσαν δὲ αὐξηθῆναι, γίνεται πάντων τῶν λαχάνων μείζων*, for surely the term *λαχ.*, *plant*, is not applicable to a *tree*. That some properties are common to the *Sinapi* and to the *phytolacca dodecandra* is clearly insufficient to establish Mr. Frost's position.

33. καθὼς ἤδύνατο ἀκοῦναι] i. e. "as they had the ability and capacity to understand them; and in such a way as they could profit by them."

34. ἐπέλυε πάντα] "gave solutions and explanations of every thing" [that was obscure to them.] Ἐπίλυεν, (as the Heb. פתח and the Latin *solvere*) often has this sense. Its primary signification is to *untie a knot*. The Hebrew term seems to be derived from פתח to *open* or loose what is shut or bound, whence מפתח, a *key*, literally an *opener*.

36. παραλαμβάνουσιν—ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ.] On the interpretation of this passage Commentators are by no means agreed. Most take ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ as put for εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, in this sense: "After he had dismissed the multitude, his disciples took him, just as he was, (i. e. unprepared as he was, and without delay,) on board the ship." An interpretation ably supported by Rosenm. and Kuin. But as this taking of ἐν for εἰς is here somewhat harsh, I should be rather inclined to agree with Euthym. and some other ancients, together with several of the modern Commentators, in joining ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ with ὡς ἦν, which renders any *enallage* unnecessary. Thus the sense will be, that on the dismissal of the multitude, they carried him off, just as he sat in the boat [out of which he had been teaching]. Yet this reference to the boat mentioned supra v. 1. is somewhat harsh, and the

sense rather jejune. Ἦν is too little significant a term to have ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ joined with it; which words are plainly joined in construction with παραλαμβάνουσι. Then ἐν τῷ πλ. is, strictly speaking, not used for εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, but is a *phrasis praevious* (and hence the *Dative* is used for the *Accus.*) denoting, they took him *on board*, and carried him in the bark [namely, that mentioned supra v. 1.] As to ὡς ἦν, there is no need to suppose it to mean *just as he was*, without waiting for refreshment, or accommodations for the passage; a sense somewhat jejune and forced. And surely no great *preparations* would be necessary for a passage of a few miles across a lake. We must here, as in very many places of the best writers, take it simply to mean *ἐνθῆς, quam celerrimè*. (See my note on Thucyd. iii. 30. ὡσπερ ἔχομεν.) This was agreeably to their Lord's *injunction*, and because probably the evening was coming on. See Fritz., who aptly compares Lucian Asin. C. 24. κάτω ἀφῆκαν ὡς ἦν τῷ δέσμῳ.

—μετ' αὐτοῦ] i. e. as Fritz. explains, with Jesus's vessel. And he cites many examples of this figure, by which the vessel is put for the crew, or the crew for the vessel. One, however, still more to the purpose, occurs in Thucyd. iv. 120. 2. ὁ Βρασιδᾶς διέπλευσε γυκτὸς ἐς τὴν Σκιώνην, τοῖσι μὲν φιλία προπλευσῆσθαι, αὐτὸς δὲ ἐν κελητῷ ἄποθεν ἐφεπέμνωτος, ὅπως εἰ μὲν τινι τοῦ κέλητος μείζονι πλοίῳ περιτυγχάνοι, ἢ τοῖσι μὲν αὐτῷ.

37. λαίλαψ.] a whirlwind, hurricane; for the ancient Lexicographers explain it by *συστροφή*, and Aristot. de Mundo, πνεῦμα βλαίων, καὶ εἰλομένον κάτωθεν ἄνω. It seems derived from λαί, *very*, and λάπτειν, to *snatch*, take off, carry away. Ἐπέβυλλον εἰς τὸ πλοῖον is to be taken in an intransitive sense for *se injecerunt, irruerant*. Γεμίσεσθαι, scil. ἐκ τῶν κυμάτων, to be supplied from the preceding.

38. τῇ πρύμνῃ] i. e. the place where the steersman sat, and the most commodious one for a passenger. Τὸ προσκεφ. must be rendered, not a pillow, but the pillow. The Article has a peculiar force, as pointing to a particular part of the furniture of the ship. This seems to have been the *leather-stuffed cushion*, which was used as a pillow.

39. σιώπα, πεφ.] The *asyndeton* here is very suitable to the gravity of the address, and the dignity of the occasion. If Valckn. had had the taste to perceive this, he would have suppressed his conjecture, that σιώπα is a gloss. Besides, the

καὶ ἔλεγον πρὸς ἀλλήλους· Τίς ἄρα οὗτός ἐστιν, ὅτι καὶ ὁ ἄνεμος 8.
καὶ ἡ θάλασσα ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ ;

1 V. ΚΑΙ ἦλθον εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης, εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν 28 26
2 Γαδαρηνῶν. Καὶ ἐξελθόντι αὐτῷ ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου εὐθέως ἀπήρτησεν 27
3 αὐτῷ ἐκ τῶν μνημείων ἄνθρωπος ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτη, ὃς τὴν κα-
τοίκησιν εἶχεν ἐν τοῖς μνήμασι· καὶ οὔτε ἀλύσειν οὐδεὶς ἠδύνατο
4 αὐτὸν δῆσαι, διὰ τὸ αὐτὸν πολλὰκις πέδαις καὶ ἀλύσειι δεδεσθαι,
καὶ διεσπᾶσθαι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τὰς ἀλύσεις, καὶ τὰς πέδας συντριβῆναι·
5 καὶ οὐδεὶς αὐτὸν ἔσχευε δεμάσαι. Καὶ διαπαιτὸς, νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας,
ἐν τοῖς * μνήμασι καὶ ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν ἦν, κριάζων καὶ κυτακόπιων
6 ἑαυτὸν λίθοις. Ἰδὼν δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπὸ μακρόθεν, ἔδραμε καὶ 28
7 προσεκύνησεν αὐτῷ, καὶ κριάζας φωνῇ μεγάλῃ εἶπε· Τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί, 29
Ἰησοῦ Τί ἐ τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου ; ὀρκίζω σε τὸν Θεόν, μὴ με βα-
8 σανίσῃς. ἔλεγε γὰρ αὐτῷ· Ἐξέλθε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀκάθαρτον ἐκ τοῦ
9 ἀνθρώπου. καὶ ἐπηρώτα αὐτόν· Τί σοι ὄνομα ; καὶ † ἀπεκρίθη 30

use of two terms, however seemingly synonymous, strengthens the sense. Thus even in the form with which cryers, or heralds, commenced their addresses, * *Ἀκουε, σίγα*.

41. *ἔλεγον*] Not the disciples only, but the mariners also.

V. 1. *Γαδαρηνῶν.*] See Note on Matt. viii. 28. 2. *ἀνθρώπος ἐν πν. ἀκ.*] Sub. ὦν. So ver 25. *γυνή τις ὄσα ἐν ἴσει αἵματος.* There is no such *hypallage*, as some Commentators suppose; nor do Grot. and Fritz. rightly take the *ἐν* for *σύν*. Indeed ὦν with *ἐν* is equivalent to *ἐνεχόμενος*, "laboring under."

3. *τὴν κατοίκησιν*] The Article refers to *αὐτοῦ* understood; and the force of the Imperfect in *εἶχεν* is that of *use and habit*. *Μνήμασι*, instead of the common reading *μνημείοις*, is read in a great part of the MSS., the Edit. Princ., and Beng. It was with reason preferred by Mill, adopted by Wets., and edited by Matth., Griesb., Tittm., Vat., Fritz., and Scholz. The common reading arose, no doubt, from ver. 2. The sepulchral monuments of the ancients, especially in the East, were tolerably roomy vaults, and would be no indifferent shelter for maniacs. Indeed, from Diog. Laert. ix. 38. *ἐρημάζων ἐνίστε, καὶ τοῖς τάφοις ἐνδιαιρούων*, we find that they formed no contemptible *habitations*, and were sometimes used as such.

5. *ἐν τοῖς — ἦν*] This punctuation I have adopted with the Vulg., Syr., E. V., Doddr., Winer, and Fritz, as being required by propriety. To place the comma after *κράζων*, as is generally done, would yield a false sense. See Winer's Gr. Gr. § 39. The position *ἐν τοῖς μν. καὶ ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν* for the common reading *ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν καὶ ἐν τοῖς μν.*, is found in many of the best MSS., and almost all the Versions, and is edited by Griesb., Tittm., Fritz., and Scholz.

The circumstance of cutting himself with sharp stones, instead of a knife (which, of course, would not be granted him), is quite agreeable to the usual custom of *maniacs*; who tear their flesh, and cut it with whatever they can lay their hands on; of which Wets. adduces examples. Here, however, this was manifestly the result of *dæmoniacal possession*.

7. *Θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου*] The epithet *ὁ ὑψίστος* as applied to God, occurs no where else in the Gospels, and only once out of them; namely, Heb. vii. 1, taken from Genes. xiv. 22. It corresponds to the Heb. *יְיָיְיָ*. The expressions seem to have been at first given with reference to the exalted abode of God, i. e. in Heaven. See Isa. lxvi. 1. The appellations may also refer to the *supreme majesty* of the Deity; and correspondent terms are found in the Theology of all the *Pagan* nations of antiquity. In the O. T., however, *יְיָיְיָ* is almost always used to distinguish the Deity from those who were called Gods.

— *ὀρκίζω σε τὸν Θεόν*] This formula usually denotes to *put any one on his oath*. See Note on Matt. xxvi. 63. But here (as Grot., Rosenm., and Kuin. have shown) it has the force of *oro, obtestor te per Deum*, and thus is equivalent to the *δέομαί σου* of Luke xviii. 28.

— *μὴ με βασανίσῃς*] Namely, as some ancient and modern Commentators explain, "by compelling me to depart from the man." But this interpretation, however agreeable to the context, is somewhat harsh, and is not permitted by the parallel passages of Matthew and Luke; from whence it appears that the word is to be taken of the *modus* of torment, which was supposed to be apportioned to *dæmons* compelled to come out of possessed persons, namely, the being compelled (as Luke expresses it) *εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον ἀπελθεῖν* (see 2 Pet. ii. 4. and Apoc. ix. 1 & 2, xi. 7, &c.), a term applied by the Greeks to their Tartars. The words of ver. 10, *καὶ παρεκάλει — ἔξω τῆς χώρας* may, indeed, seem to favor the first-mentioned interpretation. But they are equally suitable to the other. The *dæmons* entreat that if they *must* depart from the man, they may at least not be compelled to leave the *country*; which was but another form of preferring the first-mentioned request, that he would not send them away to the place of torment.

9. *ἀπεκρίθη λέγων*] Many MSS. (some of them ancient) and most of the Versions read *λέγει αὐτῷ*, which is preferred by Beng., and edited by Griesb., Tittm., Vat., Fritz., and Scholz. But there is no sufficient reason for the alteration.

— *τί σοι ὄνομα*] Spirits, both good and evil, are

MT. LU.

8. 8. † λέγων· Λεγεὼν ὀνομά μοι, ὅτι πολλοὶ ἐσμεν. καὶ παρεκάλει αὐτὸν 10
 30 31 πολλὰ, ἵνα μὴ αὐτοὺς ἀποστελέῃ ἔξω τῆς χώρας. ἦν δὲ ἐκεῖ πρὸς 11
 31 * τῷ ὄρει ἀγέλη χοίρων μεγάλη βοσκομένη· καὶ παρεκάλει αὐτὸν 12
 [πάντες] οἱ δαίμονες λέγοντες· Πέμψον ἡμᾶς εἰς τοὺς χοίρους, ἵνα
 32 εἰς αὐτοὺς εἰσέλθωμεν. Καὶ ἐπέτρεψεν αὐτοῖς εὐθὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς. καὶ 13
 33 ἐξεληθόντα τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκάθαρτα, εἰσῆλθον εἰς τοὺς χοίρους· καὶ
 ὤρμησεν ἡ ἀγέλη κατὰ τοῦ κρημονοῦ εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν (ἦσαν δὲ ὡς
 33 34 δισχιλιοί), καὶ ἐπνίγοντο ἐν τῇ θαλάσῃ. Οἱ δὲ βόσκοιτες τοὺς 14
 χοίρους ἔφυγον, καὶ * ἀπήγγειλαν εἰς τὴν πόλιν καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἀγρούς.
 34 35 καὶ ἐξῆλθον ἰδεῖν τί ἐστὶ τὸ γεγονός. Καὶ ἔρχονται πρὸς τὸν Ἰη- 15
 σοῦν, καὶ θεωροῦσι τὸν δαιμονιζόμενον καθήμενον, καὶ ἱματισμένον
 36 καὶ σωμαροῦντα, τὸν ἐσχηκότα τὸν λεγεῶνα· ἐφοβήθησαν. καὶ διη- 16
 γήσαντο αὐτοῖς οἱ ἰδόντες, πῶς ἐγένετο τῷ δαιμονιζομένῳ, καὶ περὶ
 37 τῶν χοίρων. καὶ ἤρξαντο παρακαλεῖν αὐτὸν ἀπελθεῖν ἀπὸ τῶν ὀρίων 17
 38 αὐτῶν. Καὶ ἐμβάντος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, παρεκάλει αὐτὸν ὁ δαι- 18
 μονισθεὶς ἵνα ἦ μετ' αὐτοῦ. Ὁ δὲ [Ἰησοῦς] οὐκ ἀφῆκεν αὐτὸν, 19

always represented in Scripture, as *having names*: assumed, as Commentators think, in accommodation to human infirmity. Be that as it may, our Lord did not ask the name through ignorance, but (as Euthym. suggests) to thereby elicit an answer; that the bystanders might have the more occasion to admire the stupendous power by which the miracle was wrought.

— Λεγεῶν] This word (from the name of a well-known Roman body of troops) was often used by the Jews to denote a *great number*. That the term has that sense here, and not that of *Chief of the Legion*, is plain from the words following, and those of vv. 10 & 12.

10. αὐτῶς] i. e. himself and his fellows, who called themselves by the name Legion.

11. πρὸς τῷ ὄρει] This reading, for πρὸς τὰ ὄρη is found in the greater part of the MSS., nearly the whole of the Versions (confirmed by Luke viii. 32. ἐν τῷ ὄρει), and is adopted by Wets., Beng., Matth., Griesb., Vat., Tittm., Fritz., and Scholz. Yet the common reading is not, as Fritz. affirms, *inepta*; for the πρὸς might mean *in, at, or by*, as in many passages, which see in Schleusn. or Wahl. Πάντες is omitted in very many MSS., and all the best Versions, and is cancelled by Griesb., Vat., Tittm., Fritz., and Scholz.

13. καὶ ἐπνίγοντο] “were suffocated,” i. e. by drowning. So that it might be rendered “were drowned,” as in a passage of Plutarch cited by Wets. Indeed our *drown* comes from the Saxon *Druncian*, to choke. But that sense is inherent in the added words ἐν τῇ θαλάσῃ. Those who adopt the hypothesis which supposes the demons to have been *lunatics*, are here involved in inextricable difficulties; for the words of Mark (as Fritz. truly observes) can be no otherwise understood than as asserting that the demons ejected from the man really entered into the bodies of such of the swine as they chose.

14. οἱ δὲ βόσκοιτες.] The participle has here the force of a substantive, as Matt. viii. 23. Luke viii. 34. vii. 14. Ἀπήγγειλαν (instead of the common reading ἀνήγγ.) is found in several MSS., and is edited by Griesb., Titt., Vat., Fritz., and Scholz. I long hesitated to receive this reading;

because, though strict propriety requires ἀπήγγ., not ἀνήγγ., yet in such a writer as Mark, that is not decisive; and there are in the N. T. a few instances of ἀναγγ. for ἀπαγγ., a signification which is noticed by Hesych. Yet I know none followed, as here, by εἰς with an Accusative of thing for person; in which case ἀπαγγ. (which is a stronger term) seems requisite.

By τὴν πόλιν is meant the city of Gadara, and by τοὺς ἀγρούς, the country around it.

— ἰδεῖν τί ἐστὶ τὸ γεγ.] This seems to be a popular mode of expression, meaning to examine into the reality of any reported occurrence.

15. θεωροῦσι τὸν—λεγεῶνα] There is no reason to adopt any of the changes here found in MSS. and supported by Critics; not even the cancelling of καὶ before ἱματισμένον, for it tends to strengthen the sense. And although there may seem an unnecessary addition in τὸν ἐσχηκότα τὸν λεγεῶνα after τὸν δαιμονιζόμενον, yet the latter is far more significant; and there is a sort of climax. Render “They see the demoniac seated; both clothed and in his right mind; him (I say) who had been possessed by the demons who called themselves Legion.” The being *seated* is mentioned, as a mark of sanity of mind, since maniacs rarely *sit*. Ἐφοβήθησαν is by most Commentators understood of *fear* lest they might suffer a *greater* calamity; but it rather denotes awe at the stupendous miracle.

17. καὶ ἤρξαντο παρακ.] “whereupon they fell to beseeching him,” &c. This sense of καὶ like that of the Heb. ו is frequent in Scripture, and sometimes occurs in the Classical writers. Τῶν ὀρίων α., “their district.” See Note on Matt. viii. 23. [Comp. Acts xvi. 39.]

18. ἵνα ἦ μετ' αὐτοῦ] “might accompany him.” This was, as many Commentators suppose, from fear lest the demons should again enter into him. But a better motive may be imagined.

19. οὐκ ἀφῆκεν αὐτόν.] The reasons which influenced our Lord's refusal have been variously conjectured; (see Theophyl., Euthym., Grot., Kuin., and Fritz.,) any, or indeed all of which combined, may have had effect. Τοὺς σοῦς, scil. οἰκίους to be taken from οἶκον.

- ἀλλὰ λέγει αὐτῷ· Ἔπαγε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου πρὸς τοὺς σοὺς, καὶ 9. 8.
ἀνάγγειλον αὐτοῖς, ὅσα σοι ὁ Κύριος * πεποίηκε, καὶ ἤλῃσέ σε. 39
- 20 Καὶ ἀπῆλθε καὶ ἤρξατο κηρύνειν ἐν τῇ Δεκαπόλει ὅσα ἐποίησεν
αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· καὶ πάντες ἐθαύμαζον.
- 21 ΚΑΙ διαπερσάσας τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ πάλιν εἰς τὸ πέραν, 1 40
22 συνίχθη ὄχλος πολὺς ἐπ' αὐτόν· καὶ ἦν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν. Καὶ 18 41
ἰδοὺ, ἔρχεται εἰς τῶν ἀρχισυναγῶγων ὀνόματι Ἰάιριος· καὶ ἰδὼν αὐ-
23 τὸν, πίπτει πρὸς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ, καὶ παρεκάλει αὐτὸν πολλὰ, 42
λέγων· Ὅτι τὸ θυγάτριόν μου ἐσχάτως ἔχει· ἵνα ἐλθὼν ἐπιθῆς
24 αὐτῇ τὰς χεῖρας, ὅπως σωθῆ· καὶ ζῆσται. Καὶ ἀπῆλθε μετ' αὐ- 19
τοῦ· καὶ ἠκολούθει αὐτῷ ὄχλος πολὺς, καὶ συνέθλιβον αὐτόν.
- 25 Καὶ γυνή τις οὖσα ἐν ῥύσει αἵματος ἔτη δώδεκα, καὶ πολλὰ 20 43
26 παθοῦσα ὑπὸ πολλῶν ἰατρῶν, καὶ δαπανήσασα τὰ παρ' αὐτῆς πάν-
τα, καὶ μηδὲν ὠφεληθεῖσα, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον εἰς τὸ χεῖρον ἐλθοῦσα,
27 ἀκούσασα περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ἐλθοῦσα ἐν τῷ ὄχλῳ ὕπισθεν, ἤψατο τοῦ 44

— πεποίηκε.] This reading (instead of the common one ἐποίησε) is found in the greater part of the MSS., some Fathers, and the Edit. Princ.; and is, with reason, adopted by Beng., Wets., Matth., Griesb., Tittm., Vat., Fritz., and Scholz. Propriety, indeed, as well as MS. authority, would seem to require the preterite; for (as Fritz. observes) “in the dispossessed person, the effect of the things which the Lord had done remained; but the compassion (denoted by ἤλῃσέ σε) is a thing which would be transient.” Yet ἐποίησε occurs in the parallel place of Luke, from which it was probably introduced here. In καὶ ἤλῃσέ σε there is no occasion to insert *εἶπε*, with Beza. It is better to suppose, with Grot., that these words are suspended on the preceding, so that *ὅσα* may be repeated. Perhaps, however, Fritz. is right in accounting this a *variation of construction*.

21. ἐπ' αὐτόν.] Fritz. observes that the ἐπὶ corresponds to the German *nach*, and that the sense here is, “ut eum indipiceretur.”

22. εἰς τῶν ἀρχισυν. Ἀρχισυναγῶγος properly signifies the president of a synagogue. But there was but one synagogue at Capernaum; and from the expression εἰς τῶν ἀρχισυν., taken in conjunction with Acts xiii. 15. and what we learn from the Rabbinical writers, we may infer, that in a synagogue there was not only *one* who was properly President; but *others*, consisting of the more respectable members, who also *bore the title*; either as having exercised the office of President, or because they occasionally discharged the duties of the office; which were to preserve decorum and the proper forms of worship, and to select and invite those who should read or speak in the congregation.

23. ἐσχάτως ἔχει] “in ultimis est,” “is at the last stage of the disease.” The phrase ἐσχάτως ἔχειν, which occurs only in the latter Greek writers, is equivalent to the more classical ἐσχάτως εἶναι, or *δακτύθου*.

— ἵνα ἐλθὼν ἐπιθῆς, &c.] There is here a difficulty of construction, which some attempt to remove by supposing an *hyperbaton*. This, however, would involve an unprecedented harshness. It is better, with the Syr. and Vulg., Kypke, Kuin., and Fritz., to regard the expression as a *circumlocution*, for the *Imperative*; ἵνα with a Subjunctive

being put for the Imperative, as in Ephes. v. 23. Thus the sense is, “Come, and lay thy hands upon her.” Yet some verb must be supplied at ἵνα; either *ἴδομαι*, as is generally thought, or rather *παρακαλῶ*, taken in the sense of *ἴδομαι*.

25. ὅσα ἐν ῥύσει αἵματος.] This construction is thought by Winer Gr. Gr. p. 134. a Hebraism; by others, a Latinism; but it is common to both Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. Thus the Greeks say εἶναι ἐν νόσῳ, (Soph. Aj. 270.) and the Romans *in morbo esse*.

26. πολλὰ παθούσα.] The expression is a strong one (like the “*diu medicis vexatos*” of Celsus); yet when we consider the ignorance of Jewish physicians, and the various nostrums prescribed in such a case, (on which see Lightf.), many of which would be nauseous and strong, and all of them injurious to a habit of body so languid as in this disease, we may conceive that her sufferings would be great. There *may* be something *sarcastic* in the word πολλῶν, with which the Commentators compare the saying of Menander, πολλῶν ἰατρῶν εἰσοδός μ' ἀπόλεσαν.

— αὐτῆς.] This (for *αὐτῆς*), is read in most of the best MSS. and Theophyl., and rightly edited by Matth., Griesb., Tittm., Fritz., and Scholz; since the common reading arose from an attempt at emendation produced by seeming difficulty. The phrase may (as Fritz. suggests), be best explained, by regarding it as one of those in which the *παρὰ* with a Genit. does not in *sense* differ from a simple Genitive.

— εἰς τὸ χεῖρον ἐλθοῦσα.] Literally, “having come into a worse condition.” This use of *εἰς* or *ἐπὶ* with adjectives of the Comparative degree, importing “for the better” or “for the worse,” is frequent in the best writers.

On the construction in ver. 25—27. (which is somewhat anomalous), Fritz. well remarks, that the Participles ἀκούσασα and ἐλθοῦσα have nothing to do with the preceding ones οὖσα and ἐλθοῦσα, but are put *ἀσυντόμως*. The difficulty may, however, he thinks, be removed by considering the words οὖσα ἐν ῥύσει — εἰς τὸ χεῖρον ἐλθοῦσα as *quasi parathetica*, and showing the nature of the disease. Thus καὶ γυνή τις will connect with ἀκούσασα περὶ τοῦ Ἰ., ἐλθοῦσα, for ἦλθε καὶ, &c. This, how-

MT. LU.

9. 8. ἰματίου αὐτοῦ· ἔλεγε γάρ· Ὅτι κἂν τῶν ἰματίων αὐτοῦ ἄψωμαι, 28
 21 σωθήσομαι. Καὶ εὐθὺς ἐξηράνθη ἡ πηγὴ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτῆς, 29
 45 καὶ ἔγνω τῷ σώματι ὅτι ἔλαται ἀπὸ τῆς μύστιγος. Καὶ εὐθὺς ὁ Ἰη- 30
 σοῦς ἐπιγνοὺς ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὴν ἐξ αὐτοῦ δύναμιν ἐξελοῦσθαι, ἐπιστραφεὶς
 46 ἐν τῷ ὄχλῳ, ἔλεγε· Τίς μου ἤψατο τῶν ἰματίων; καὶ ἔλεγον αὐτῷ 31
 οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ· Βλέπετε τὸν ὄχλον συνθλιβόντά σε, καὶ λέγεις·
 Τίς μου ἤψατο; καὶ περιεβλέπετο ἰδεῖν τὴν τοῦτο ποιήσασαν. ἼΙ δὲ 32
 47 γυνή, φοβηθεῖσα καὶ τρέμουσα, εἰδυῖα ὃ γέγονεν ἐπ' αὐτῇ, ἤλαθε καὶ 33
 22 48 προσέπεσεν αὐτῷ, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν 34
 αὐτῇ· Θύγατερ, ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε· ὕπαγε εἰς εἰρήνην, καὶ
 49 ἴσθι ὑγιής ἀπὸ τῆς μύστιγός σου. Ἐτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος, ἔρχονται 35
 ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρχισυναγῶγου λέγοντες· Ὅτι ἡ θυγάτηρ σου ἀπέθανε· τί

ever, is so like *re-writing* the sentence, that it is perhaps better to consider the whole as one of the many examples of *anacoluthon*, which occur not only in the N. T. but also in the best Classical writers.

28. ἔλεγε γάρ.] Several MSS. and some Latin Versions add ἐν ἑαυτῷ, which Fritz. thinks so indispensable to the sense that he receives the words into the text; utterly disallowing the examples which have been adduced of a similar brevity of expression in λέγειν and the Heb. דָּבַר. But, whatever *propriety* may dictate, and the usage of the best writers confirm; certain it is, that, in the popular and familiar phraseology of most languages, the idiom is found; and though it rarely, if ever, occurs, except when, from the circumstances of the case, no mistake can arise from the omission in question.

29. ἐξηράνθη ἡ πηγὴ τ. a.] Campb. translates "the source of her distemper." But this is neither a correct version, nor a good paraphrase. Πηγὴ must be taken in a physical sense, though not in that proposed by Fritz. Nor is it much to the purpose that the Philological Commentators heap up examples of δακρῶν πηγὴ. Kuin. and Hez. rightly observe, that ἡ πηγὴ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτῆς must be closely kept together, and that πηγὴ τοῦ αἵμ. is for βίσις τοῦ αἵμ., answering to the Heb. דָּמָה דָּמָה in Levit. xii. 7. and xx. 13., a bloody flux. This is placed beyond doubt by the expression of Luke ἐστη ἡ βίσις τοῦ αἵματος αὐτῆς.

— τῷ σώματι] i. e., as Euthym. well explains, διὰ τοῦ σώματος, μηκέτι βαινόμενον τοῖς σταλαγμοῖς. It is plain (as Fritz. observes) that the woman was then suffering under the disorder in its greatest violence. ἴσθαι, "that she had been healed;" for it is the *preterite*, not the *present* (ἴσται). Ἐγνω is a very significant term, and denotes *full conviction from actual experience*. Hence, too, we may see the stupendous nature of the miracle: for, as Grot. observes, "no one can, naturally, all at once recover from an inveterate malady; but vestiges of the disorder, in its gradual retreat, will long remain."

30. ἐπιγνοὺς — ἐξελοῦσθαι.] These words are thought to involve some perplexity. One thing is plain, namely, that from hence, and from Luke vi. 9, it appears that the power of performing miracles was not, with our *Saviour*, as in the case of the Prophets and Apostles, *adventitious*, (in consequence of which they ascribed their miracles

to God,) but *inherent* in him by his Divine nature. This, however, is but an *inference* from the words; in discussing the sense of which, even the best Commentators have much (but vainly) perplexed themselves and their readers. It is needless to advert to the unhallowed speculations of those who refer them to *animal magnetism*: nor can those be commended who ascribe the cure to an *effluvium*, or *emanation*; though Fritz., after a long examination of the force of the words, thinks that they mean, "Jesus knowing *vim salubrem effluxisse ἐ corpore*." It is best to suppose the words not meant to be taken in a *physical* sense; or to teach us the *mode* whereby the miracle was performed. They are rather to be considered as a popular manner of expression, (like διὰ τῶν χειρῶν, often used of the working of miracles) and, therefore, not to be *rigorously* interpreted, or bound down to philosophical precision; but only importing, that Christ was fully aware that a miracle had been worked by his power and efficacy. The sentence is, however, obscured by ellipsis and hyperbaton. The construction is, ἐπιγνοὺς ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὴν δύναμιν ἐξελοῦσθαι ἐξ αὐτοῦ; where at τὴν ἐν. must be supplied ἐν αὐτῷ ὄσσαν from ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἐξελθ., "knowing that the power of working miracles, which was inherent in him, had gone out of him," as it were by the performance of a miracle *through* him. This force of δύναμιν is indicated by the *article*, from inattention to which many of the best Commentators take τὴν δύναμιν to simply signify "a miracle;" which obliges them to interpret ἐξελθ. in the far-fetched sense, "*vim exercuisse*."

32. περιεβλέπετο] for περιέβλεπε, by a use peculiar to the N. T.

33. πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλ.] i. e. as Middlet. explains, "the whole truth respecting the affair in question." In this *absolute* use of the phrase, (with which Fritz. compares Demosth. πάντα γὰρ ελοήσεται τἀληθῆ πρὸς ἐμᾶς), there is an ellipse of τοῦ ἔργου, or the like. But when it is *not* absolute, the ellipse is unnecessary, being supplied in the words following; as in Thucyd. vi. 87. εἰρήκαμεν δ' ἡμῖν πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν περὶ ὧν ὑποπτερόμεθα.

34. ὕπαγε εἰς εἰρήνην.] This and the kindred phrases παύεσθαι, and βαλεῖσθαι εἰς εἰρήνην were founded on the Heb. וָשָׁלֵם, לְשָׁלֵם, and were forms of affectionate or condescending valediction; and mean, as Fritz. explains, "i secundo ordine," "go in God's name."

35. ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρχισ.] literally, "from the President's, i. e. his house, (for he was now with Jesus.)

	MT.	LU.
36 ἔτι σὺλλεις τὸν διδάσκαλον ; Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς, εὐθέως ἀκούσας τὸν λόγον λαλούμενον, λέγει τῷ ἀρχισυναγῶγῳ· Μὴ φόβου, μόνον πίστευε.	9.	8. 50
37 Καὶ οὐκ ἀφῆκεν οὐδένα αὐτῷ συνακολουθεῖν, εἰ μὴ Πέτρον καὶ		
38 Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἰακώβου. Καὶ ἔρχεται εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ ἀρχισυναγῶγου, καὶ θεωρεῖ θόρον, κλαιόντας καὶ ἀλαλάζοντας πολλά. Καὶ εἰσελθὼν λέγει αὐτοῖς· Τί θορυβεῖσθε καὶ κλαίετε ; τὸ παιδίον οὐκ ἀπέθανεν, ἀλλὰ καθεύδει. Καὶ κατεγέλων αὐτοῦ. Ὁ δὲ ἐκβαλὼν * πάντα, παραλαμβάνει τὸν πατέρα τοῦ παιδίου καὶ τὴν μητέρα, καὶ τοὺς μετ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἰσπορεύεται, ὅπου ἦν τὸ παιδίον ἀνακείμενον. Καὶ κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς τοῦ παιδίου λέγει αὐτῇ· Ταλιθὰ κοῦμι· ὃ ἐστὶ μεθερμηνεύμενον, Τὸ κοράσιον, σοὶ λέγω· ἔγειρε. Καὶ εὐθέως ἀνέστη τὸ κοράσιον καὶ περιεπάτει (ἦν γὰρ ἑτῶν δώδεκα), καὶ ἐξέστησαν ἐκστῆσαι μεγάλη.	23	51 52
39 καὶ διεστείλατο αὐτοῖς πολλά, ἵνα μηδεὶς γινῶ τοῦτο· καὶ εἶπε δοθῆναι αὐτῇ φαγεῖν.		
13. 4.	13.	4.
1 VI. ΚΑΙ ἐξῆλθεν ἐκεῖθεν, καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν πατριδα αὐτοῦ·	54	16
2 καὶ ἀκολουθοῦσιν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ. καὶ γενομένου σαββάτου, ἦρξατο ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ διδάσκειν· καὶ πολλοὶ ἀκούοντες ἐξέπλησσαντο, λέγοντες· Πόθεν τούτῳ ταῦτα ; καὶ τίς ἢ σοφία ἢ δόξα αὐτῷ, ὅτι καὶ δυναμεις τοιαῦται διὰ τῶν χειρῶν αὐτοῦ γίνονται ;		
3 Οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τέκτων, ὁ υἱὸς Μαρίας, ἀδελφὸς δὲ Ἰακώβου καὶ		

So John xviii. 28. ἄγουσιν οὖν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ Καϊάφα. The idiom is found both in Greek and Latin, and indeed in modern languages.

33. κλαίωντας καὶ ἀλ.) These words are exegetical of θόρον. Ἀλαλάζειν from ἀλαλα, (whence our *halloo*) seems to be akin to the Heb. חֲחִי, from whence came ἐλελίζειν. Both denoted the shout uttered by the soldiers of all the ancient nations, previous to battle. Ἀλαλάζειν, however, was sometimes used of any shrill vociferation, especially of grief, as in Jerem. xxv. 34 & 47, and Eurip. Elect. 843. ἦσπαιρον, ἠλάλαξε. [Comp. John xi. 1.]

40. ἐκβαλὼν πάντα.] This merely means, "having ordered all to be removed." Jesus retained just so many as were sufficient to prove the reality of the cure. To have permitted the presence of more might have savoured of ostentation. For ἅπαντας, πάντα is found in very many MSS. and the Edit. Princ., and is adopted by Beng., Wets., Mill, Griesb., Tittm., Vat., Fritz., and Scholz. The difference is, that πάντα signifies omnes, ἅπαντας cunctos.

43. ἵνα μηδεὶς γινῶ τοῦτο.] A popular form of expression, importing, "that nothing of this should be made known." The order, however, could not be meant to enjoin perpetual secrecy, but present suppression; in order to avoid drawing together a concourse and raising a tumult. Εἶπε δοθῆναι αὐτῇ φαγεῖν. Εἶπε is for διέταξε. On the syntax see Winer's Gr. Gr. § 33. With respect to the thing itself, it is rightly remarked by Grot. that the order was given that it might be apparent that the maid was not only restored to life, but to health.

VI. 1. πατριδα αὐτοῦ] "the place where he was brought up," namely, Nazareth.

VOL. I.

2. καὶ γενομένου σαββ.] The sense (on which the Commentators are not quite agreed) seems to be, "on the Sabbath day;" γεν, being for ὄντος. This is confirmed by the readings (glosses though they be) of the Cod. Cantab. and some other ancient MSS. Ἀκούοντες, "on hearing him." Fritz. renders it *auditores*. But that would require the Article. Ἐξέπλησσαντο, scil. ἐπὶ τῇ διδασκίᾳ αὐτοῦ, which is added in Matthew. Πόθεν τούτῳ ταῦτα; Sub. εἰσι, in the sense *contigerunt*. A fuller account of this transaction is given by Luke iv. 16. seqq. Τίς ἢ σοφία ἢ δόξα αὐτῷ; scil. ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ. The τίς signifies *quænam*. The ὅτι just after is omitted in the greater part of the MSS. (or ἵνα put in its place), and is cancelled by Matth., Griesb., Tittm., and Scholz. It is, however, retained and ably defended by Fritz.; who remarks, that "all the various readings are only so many corrections of *librarij*, who did not comprehend the argumentation from *miracles* to prove *divine wisdom*; which is well pointed out by Grot." The sense is, "Whence have these talents fallen to the lot of this man; and what is this wisdom given him from above; that [not only he teaches us the way of salvation, but] even such *miracles* [as we have heard related] are performed by him?" Διὰ τῶν χειρῶν, by Hebraism (like $\gamma\iota$) for δι' αὐτοῦ.

3. δ τέκτων.] Some MSS. have δ τοῦ τέκτωνος υἱός. But this is rejected by all the Editors, except Fritz., who are, with reason, agreed that it was introduced from St. Matthew, and sprung from those who wished to consult the dignity of our Lord. That our Lord, however, was a carpenter, is (notwithstanding the denial of Origen) testified by nearly all the MSS., confirmed by general tradition, and the authority of the Fathers; of whom Justin Martyr says that Christ εὐργάζετο

MT. LU.

13. 4. Ἰωσὴ καὶ Ἰούδα καὶ Σίμωνος; καὶ οὐκ εἰσὶν αἱ ἀδελφαὶ αὐτοῦ
 56 ὧδε πρὸς ἡμᾶς; Καὶ ἐσκαιδαλιζοῦτο ἐν αὐτῷ. Ἐλεγε δὲ αὐτοῖς ὁ 4
 57 Ἰησοῦς· Ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι προφήτης ἄμιμος, εἰ μὴ ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ,
 58 καὶ ἐν τοῖς συγγενέσι, καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ. Καὶ οὐκ ἠδύνατο ἐκεῖ 5
 οὐδεμίαν δύναμι πειῆσαι· εἰ μὴ ὀλίγοις ἀξιώστοις ἐπιθεις τὰς χεῖ-
 ρας ἐθεράπευσε. Καὶ ἐθαύμαζε διὰ τὴν ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν· καὶ περιῆ- 6
 10. 9. γε τὰς κόμας κίκλω διδάσκων.
 1 1 ΚΑΙ προσκαλεῖται τοὺς δώδεκα, καὶ ἤρξατο αὐτοὺς ἀποστέλλειν δύο 7
 δύο· καὶ ἐδίδου αὐτοῖς ἕξουσίαν τῶν πνευμάτων τῶν ἀκαθάρτων.
 9 3 Καὶ παρήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς, ἵνα μηδὲν αἴρωσιν εἰς ὄδον, εἰ μὴ ῥάβδον 8
 10 μόνον· μὴ πήραν, μὴ ἄρτον, μὴ εἰς τὴν ζώνην χαλκόν· ἀλλ' ὑπο- 9
 11 4 δεδεμένους σανδάλια, καὶ μὴ † ἐνδύσασθαι δύο χιτῶνας. Καὶ ἔλεγεν 10
 αὐτοῖς· Ὅπου ἐὰν εἰσέλθῃτε εἰς οἰκίαν, ἐκεῖ μένετε ἕως ἂν ἐξέλθῃτε
 14 5 ἐκεῖθεν. Καὶ ὅσοι ἂν μὴ δεξῶνται ὑμᾶς, μηδὲ ἀκούσωσιν ὑμῶν, ἐκ- 11
 πορευόμενοι ἐκεῖθεν, ἐκτινάξτε τὸν χοῦν τὸν ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν

ἄροτρα καὶ ζυγά. That our Lord should have been taught some handicraft occupation the Jewish law required, and the poverty of Joseph would render necessary. And what was so likely, as that he should bring him up to his father's trade; which, though lowly, was not degrading? See more in Bp. Middleton. [*Comp.* John vi. 42.]

— ὧδε πρὸς ἡμᾶς] “hic apud nos.” Fritz observes, that both the Scriptural writers and the Classical ones (at least the poets), so place πρὸς with an Accusative, *adjecto verbo quietis*, which is equivalent to *παρὰ* with a Dative.

4. [*Comp.* John iv. 44.]

5. καὶ οὐκ ἠδύνατο — ποιῆσαι.] These words, in their common acceptation, present a seeming difficulty, which has perplexed the Commentators, and to avoid which, some (as Wolf and Kuin.) suppose a pleonasm, taking οὐκ ἠδύνατο ποιῆσαι for οὐκ ἐποίησε. But (as Fritz. has shown) this pleonasm is *factitious*, and the passages adduced in support of it admit of a better explanation without it. Others take οὐκ ἠδύνατο for *non uult*. This, however, Fritz. shows, is even more destitute of foundation than the former sense. The true interpretation seems to be that of many ancient Commentators as Chrysost., Euthym., and Theophyl.), and, of the moderns, Grot., Whitby, Le Clerc, Bentley, and Fritz. “Our Saviour could not (says Theophyl.), not because he wanted power; but that the subjects of it were unbelieving; and therefore (as Whitby says) wanted the condition on which alone it was fit he should heal them. Christ could not, consistently with the rules on which he invariably acted in performing miracles, (namely, to require faith in his Divine mission) perform them. The Commentators observe, that it is conformable to the Hebrew manner of speaking, to say, that *cannot* be, which *shall* not, or *ought* not to be. But abundance of examples of this have been adduced from both the Greek and Latin Classical writers; and the idiom is found even in modern languages.

6. θαύμαζε.] Schleusn., Kuin., and others, take the word rather of *indignation* than *wonder*; a signification, indeed, not infrequent in the Classical writers, but perhaps not found in the N. T. Far simpler, and more satisfactory is the common interpretation, “he wondered at their want of

faith,” and perverseness, in rejecting his claims on such unreasonable grounds. This construction, however, of θαυμάζειν is very rare, the usual one being θαυμάζειν, ἐπὶ τινι, or περί τινος. Of the examples adduced by Wets., Munnth, and Heupel, the following alone are apposite. Isocr. ὥστε καὶ τοὺς εὐδότας — θαυμάζειν διὰ τὴν καρτοσίαν ταύτην. and John vii. 21. Ἐν ἔργον ἐποίησα, καὶ πάντες θαυμάζετε διὰ τοῦτο. [*Comp.* Luke xiii. 22.]

Κίκλω must (as Fritz. says) be joined περιῆγε, κόμας; and he shows that κίκλω is by the Classical writers often subjoined to verbs compounded with περι-.

7. δύο δύο] “by twos.” An idiom found in the Hebrew, in which distributives are wanting. It is, however, not confined to the Hebrew, but found, though very rarely, in the Classical writers. So in Æsch. Pers. 915. we have μυρία μυρία for κατὰ μυριάδας. [*Comp.* Matt. x. 1. Luke vi. 13.]

9. καὶ μὴ ἐνδύσασθαι.] This is the reading of the common text, and it is supported by the great body of the MSS. But ἐνδύσασθε is found in some of the best, and in the Syr., Vulg., Goth., and Coptic Versions, as also in the Edit. Princ. and Steph. 1. & 2.; and it has been edited by Mill, Beng., Matth., Griesbach, and all other Editors down to Scholz, except Fritz., who has recalled the common reading ἐνδύσασθαι; and, I think, on good grounds. He shows that ἐνδύσασθε would involve an unprecedented anacoluthon, and an extreme harshness; and, after a long and learned discussion, decidedly prefers ἐνδύσασθαι; by which there will be either an *anacoluthon*, or a variation by means of two constructions. Thus, after ἀλλ', from the words ἵνα μηδὲν αἴω. εἰς ὄδον. we must supply ἵνα, or βαδίζειν. This interpretation is also supported by Grot., Heupel, Campb., and Kuin.; and, as being alike satisfactory in sense and construction, it deserves the preference.

11. ἐκτινάξτε τὸν χοῦν, &c.] Besides the parallel passage, comp. Luke x. 10, 11. Acts xiii. 51. The words Ἀμὴν λέγω — ἐκείνη are not found in some ancient MSS., and the Italic, Vulgate, Arabic, Coptic, Persic, and Armenian Versions. They were rejected, as not genuine, by Erasmus, Beza, Zeg., and Mill, were bracketed by Griesb., Knapp, Tittm., and Vater, and cancelled by Lachm. But, as Matth. and Fritz. show, without

- ὑμῶν, εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς. Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν· ἀνεκτίτερον ἔστιαι 14. 9.
- 12 Σοδόμοις ἢ Γομόρροις ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως, ἢ τῇ πόλει ἐκείνῃ. Καὶ 6
- 13 ἐξεληθόντες ἐκήρυσσον ἵνα μετανοήσωσι· καὶ δαιμόνια πολλὰ ἐξέβαλλον· καὶ ἤλειπον ἐλαίῳ πολλοὺς ἀρρώστους καὶ ἐθεράπευον.
- 14 Καὶ ἤκουσεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἡρώδης, φανερὸν γὰρ ἐγένετο, τὸ ὄνομα 1 7
- αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔλεγεν· "Οτι Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτίζων ἐκ νεκρῶν ἠγέρθη, καὶ 2
- 15 διὰ τοῦτο ἐνεργοῦσιν αἱ δυνάμεις ἐν αὐτῷ. Ἄλλοι ἔλεγον, "Οτι Ἰλλίας 8
- ἐστίν· ἄλλοι δὲ ἔλεγον· "Οτι προφήτης ἐστίν, [ἢ] ὡς εἷς τῶν προ- 9
- 16 φητῶν. Ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ Ἡρώδης εἶπεν· "Οτι ὂν ἐγὼ ἀπεκεφάλισα 9
- 17 Ἰωάννην, οὗτός ἐστιν· αὐτὸς ἠγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν. Αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ Ἡρώδης 3
- ἀποστείλας ἐκράτησε τὸν Ἰωάννην, καὶ ἔδησεν αὐτὸν ἐν [τῇ] φυλακῇ, 4
- διὰ Ἡρωδιάδα τὴν γυναῖκα Φιλίππου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ, οὗ αὐτὴν 5
- 18 ἐγάμησεν. Ἐλεγε γὰρ ὁ Ἰωάννης τῷ Ἡρώδῃ· "Οτι οὐκ ἔξεστί σοι 4
- 19 ἔχειν τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου. Ἢ δὲ Ἡρωδίας ἐνείχεν αὐτῷ, καὶ 5

reason. Certainly the authority of about seven MSS. (abounding with all sorts of daring alterations) and some second-rate Versions, generally treading in others' steps, and coinciding with those altered MSS., cannot be considered as authority for the cancelling of any clause, even when internal evidence may be *unfavourable* to it. Which is *not* the case here; for *good reasons* may be given why it should have been omitted. As to the Versions, the clause being found in the three Syriac Versions far more than overbalances the whole authority against it.

13. ἤλειπον ἐλαίῳ.] It appears from various passages of the Medical and Rabbinical writers cited by Wets. and Lightf., that oil (which in the Eastern and Southern countries is of a peculiarly mild quality) was used by the ancients, both Jews and Gentiles, as a medical application. And that it was so employed by the Apostles; and that the sense is, "they anointed many with oil, and thereby cured their diseases," is the opinion of almost all the recent Commentators. But surely this circumstance, that the Apostles had *successfully made use of a well-known medicine*, would ill comport with the gravity and dignity of the preceding words, which, I think, compel us to suppose, with all the ancient and early modern Commentators, that the healing was as much miraculous as the casting out of demons. The anointing was only employed as a *symbolical action*, typical of the oil of gladness and grace to be imparted by Divine assistance. See Euthym. and Theophyl. For the first Christians, being accustomed to represent, in visible signs, the allegorical allusions in Scripture, used oil not only, as the Jews had done, as a *remedy*, which had from high antiquity become *sacred*; but (from that sacredness) as a *religious rite* at baptism, confirmation, and prayers for the sick. Thus it may be regarded as one of those *significant actions* by which both the Prophets of the O. T. and the Apostles (after their Lord's example) with indulgence to human weakness, accompanied their supernatural and miraculous cures. See James v. 14. In all which cases, the *methods* adopted in those actions (which were various) contributed nothing to the cure; that being effected by means of which we can have no conception.

14. ἤκουσεν ὁ βασιλεὺς.] There is here, seemingly, a want of the *Subject* to the verb. With

this the early Critics have, indeed, furnished us, supplying τὴν ἀκοὴν τοῦ Ἡρώδου, which Beza approves, and Fritz., with his usual rashness, inserts in the *text*. And it is surely better to retain a harshness, than to get rid of it by such means. Grot. proposes to put φανερὸν γὰρ ἐγένετο into a parenthesis. But this would involve a very harsh transposition. The best mode is, either to take τὸ ὄνομα αὐ. twice, or to supply the subject αὐτῶν from the context, which is *suggested* in τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῶν.

15. ὅτι προφήτης — προφητῶν.] There has been much discussion on the reading and sense of these words. If the testimony of MSS. and ancient Versions can prove any thing, it is certain that the true reading is ὅτι προφ. ἐστίν ὡς εἷς τῶν προφ., of which the sense can only be, "he is a prophet resembling one of the prophets [of old times.]" The ἢ before ὡς is of little or no authority, being omitted in almost every MS. of consequence, nearly all the Versions, and early Editions; and cancelled by Beng., Wets., Matth., Griesb., Tittm., Vat., and Scholz. The above reading, indeed, involves some harshness; yet the sense of τῶν προφ. is not ill suggested by the *Article*.

16. ὂν ἐγὼ — ἐστίν.) This sort of *attraction* is frequent both in the Scriptural and Classical writers; but it is here adopted to give greater strength to the asseveration. The ἐγὼ also seems to be emphatical.

17. ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ.] The τῇ is omitted in several MSS. and the Ed. Princ.; and is cancelled by Beng., Matth., Griesb., Tittm., and Scholz; but is retained by Fritz.: and with reason; for the number of MSS. is not such as to warrant its being cancelled; and we can more easily account for its omission than its insertion.

19. ἐνείχεν αὐτῷ.] Not, "had a quarrel with," as E. V.; nor "resented this," as Campb.; nor, as Wakef. and some recent Commentators explain, "was enraged against him;" but, "bore a grudge against him." Ἐνείχεν, (equivalent to ἐγκοτεῖν) signifies to harbour (literally, "have in mind") *κόρον*, a grudge or resentment against any one. The complete phrase occurs in Herodot. i. 118. vi. 119. and viii. 27., the elliptical one in Luke xi. 53. Genes. xlix. 23. (answering to \square ψ) and Job xvi. 9. So Hesych. ἐνείχεν μνησικακί, and ἐνείχον· ἐρόλον.

MT.

14. ἤθελεν αὐτὸν ἀποκτεῖναι· καὶ οὐκ ἠδύνατο. Ὁ γὰρ Ἡρώδης ἐφο- 20
 βεῖτο τὸν Ἰωάννην, εἰδὼς αὐτὸν ἄνδρα δίκαιον καὶ ἅγιον, καὶ συνετή-
 ρει αὐτόν· καὶ ἀκούσας αὐτοῦ, πολλὰ ἐποίει, καὶ ἠδέως αὐτοῦ ἤκουε.
- 6 Καὶ, γενομένης ἡμέρας εὐκαίρου, ὅτε Ἡρώδης τοῖς γενεαίοις αὐτοῦ 21
 δέϊπνον ἐποίει τοῖς μεγιστάσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῖς χιλιάρχοις καὶ τοῖς
 πρώτοις τῆς Γαλιλαίας, καὶ εἰσελθούσης τῆς θυγατρὸς αὐτῆς τῆς 22
 Ἡρωδιάδος, καὶ ὀρχηρουμένης, καὶ ἁρυσάσης τῷ Ἡρώδῃ καὶ τοῖς συν-
 7 ανακειμένοις, εἶπεν ὁ βασιλεὺς τῷ κορασίῳ· Αἰτήσόν με ὃ ἐάν θέλῃς,
 καὶ δώσω σοι· καὶ ὄμωσεν αὐτῇ, Ὅτι ὃ ἐάν με αἰτήσῃς, δώσω σοι, 23
 8 ἕως ἡμίους τῆς βασιλείας μου. Ἡ δὲ ἐξελθοῦσα εἶπε τῇ μητρὶ αὐτῆς· 24
 Τί αἰτήσομαι; ἡ δὲ εἶπε· Τὴν κεφαλὴν Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ.
 Καὶ εἰσελθοῦσα εὐθέως μετὰ σπουδῆς πρὸς τὸν βασιλεῖα, ᾔτήσατο 25
 9 του τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ. Καὶ περίλυπος γενόμενος ὁ βασιλεὺς, διὰ τοὺς 26
 10 ὄρκους καὶ τοὺς συνανακειμένους οὐκ ἠθέλησεν αὐτὴν ἀθετῆσαι. Καὶ 27
 εὐθέως ἀποστείλας ὁ βασιλεὺς σπεκουλάτωρα, ἐπέταξεν ἐνεχθῆναι τὴν
 κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ. Ὁ δὲ ἀπελθὼν ἀπεκεφάλισεν αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ, 28
 11 καὶ ἤνεγκε τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ πύνακι, καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτὴν τῷ κο-
 12 ρασίῳ· καὶ τὸ κοράσιον ἔδωκεν αὐτὴν τῇ μητρὶ αὐτῆς. Καὶ ἀκού- 29
 σαντες οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, ἦλθον καὶ ἤρουν τὸ πτώμα αὐτοῦ, καὶ
 ἔθηκαν αὐτὸ ἐν [τῷ] μνημείῳ.

20. ἐφοβεῖτο τὸν Ἰ.] The term here imports a mixture of awe and reverence. There is much difference of opinion as to the sense of *συνετήρει*. The Vulg., L. Brug., Hamm., Le Clerc, Wets., Campb., Kuin., Schleusn., Wahl, and most Commentators, take it in the sense, "preserved him," i. e. from the malice of Herodias. But there is no authority for this signification. Greatly preferable is that assigned by the Syr., Arabic, Italic, and English Versions, and adopted by Frasm., Grot., Lamy, Whit., Wakef., Rosem., and Fritz., "observabat eum," "observantiā prosecutus est," "magni eum faciebat." So Diog. Laert. φέλιος *συνηρεῖν*, paid him respect. This signification seems to arise from that of keeping any one in our mind. Καὶ ἀκούσας αὐτοῦ, "and when he had heard him," i. e. his admonitions. Πολλὰ ἐποίει, "did many things [which were suggested by him.]" [Comp. Matt. xiv. 5; xxi. 26.]

21. ἡμέρας εὐκ.] Here again the Interpreters are divided in opinion; and the ancient and early modern Commentators rendering it, "an opportune season," namely, for working on the mind of Herod, and obtaining his order for the execution of John. But almost all since the time of Glass and Hamm. take it to signify "a festival day." The expression, however, as Fritz. proves, can only mean "a *leisure* day." And thus it exactly answers to our term *holiday*. So εὐκαίρως at xiv. 11. and I Tim. iv. 2.

— τοῖς μεγιστάσιν.] A word only occurring in the later writers, (as Joseph, and the Sept.), and formed from *μέγιστος*, as *νεῶν* from *νέος*. It denotes the *magnates*, or great men of a country, by whose counsel and assistance the monarch is aided.

— τοῖς πρώτοις.] This is by Grot. and Kuin. taken to denote the principal magistrates. But

it should rather be understood (with Fritz.) of the principal persons for wealth or consequence of those in a private station. So Joseph. Ant. vii. 9, 3. οἱ τῆς χάρας πρώτοι.

23. ἕως ἡμίους τῆς βασ.] Many Commentators supply *μέρους*. But there is perhaps no ellipse; for *ἡμῶν* seems to have been as much a substantive as our *half*. The promise involved a sort of hyperbole, and was, as appears from the Classical citations of Wets., a not unusual manner of expression with Kings.

25. μετὰ σπουδῆς] Hcb. **וְזָרְזָהּ** For ἐν σπουδῇ, i. e. *σπουδαίως*, promptly, with alacrity. Ἐξαυτῆς is for *παραυτίκα*, *forthwith*. The earlier authors generally write ἐξ αὐτῆς; scil. *ώρας*. There will be no occasion for the ellipse of *ἀλλὰ*, which Kuin, and others suppose, before τοῖς ὄρκους, if *περίλυπος γενόμενος* be rendered "although he was very sorry."

26. ἀθετῆσαι] "to set her at nought;" namely, by refusing her request. This sense is chiefly confined to the later writers, especially the Sept. and Joseph., who use the word either absolutely, or with an Accusative of *person*, sometimes accompanied with *eis*; more rarely with an Accus. of *thing*.

27. σπεκουλάτωρα.] This term, from the Latin *speculator*, denotes one of the body-guards, who were so called, because their principal duty was that of *sentinels*: for I rather agree with Casaub., Wets., and Fritz., that they had their name from their office *speculari*, and not, quasi *speculatores*, from *speculum*; because the former points to their chief business. They had, however, other confidential duties, and among these, that of acting, like the Turkish soldiers of the present day, as executioners.

29. τῷ μνημείῳ.] The τῷ is rejected by all the

- 30 Καὶ συνάγονται οἱ ἀπόστολοι πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν, καὶ ἀπήγγειλαν 14. 9.
 31 αὐτῷ πάντα, καὶ ὅσα ἐποίησαν καὶ ὅσα ἐδίδασκαν. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· 10
 Δεῦτε ὑμεῖς αὐτοὶ κατ' ἰδίαν εἰς ἔρημον τόπον, καὶ ἀναπαύεσθε
 ὀλίγον. ἦσαν γὰρ οἱ ἐρχόμενοι καὶ οἱ ὑπάγοντες πολλοὶ, καὶ οὐδὲ
 32 φεγεῖν ἠνέκαιρον. Καὶ ἀπῆλθον εἰς ἔρημον τόπον τῷ πλοίῳ κατ'
 33 ἰδίαν. Καὶ εἶδον αὐτοὺς ὑπάγοντας [οἱ ὄχλοι,] καὶ ἐπέγνωσαν αὐτὸν 13
 [πολλοὶ] οἱ ὄχλοι· καὶ περὶ ἀπὸ πασῶν τῶν πόλεων συνέδρομον ἐκεῖ, 11
 34 καὶ προσῆλθον αὐτοὺς, καὶ συνῆλθον πρὸς αὐτόν. Καὶ ἐξελθὼν εἶδεν 14
 ὁ Ἰησοῦς πολὺν ὄχλον, καὶ ἐσπλαγχνίσθη ἐπ' αὐτοῖς, ὅτι ἦσαν ὡς
 πρόβατα μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα· καὶ ἤρξατο διδάσκειν αὐτοὺς πολλά.
 35 Καὶ ἦδη ὥρας πολλῆς γενομένης, προσελθόντες αὐτῷ οἱ μυθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, 15 12
 36 λέγουσιν· Ὅτι ἔρημός ἐστιν ὁ τόπος, καὶ ἦδη ὥρα πολλή· ἀπόλυσον
 αὐτοὺς, ἵνα ἀπελθόντες εἰς τοὺς κύνεω ἀγρούς καὶ κόμας, ἀγοράσωσιν
 37 ἑαυτοῖς ἄρτους· τί γὰρ φέρωσιν οὐκ ἔχουσιν. Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν

Editors from Matth. to Scholz; and with reason; for it is, as Markl. has shown, liable to objection on the score of propriety; it is found in scarcely any MS. but Cod. D., being introduced, perhaps inadvertently, by Stephens, in his 3d Edit.

31. *ὑμεῖς αὐτοί.* This must be rendered not "vos ipsi," or "vos quoque," with most Commentators, but (with Erasm., Schleus., Kuin., and Fritz.) "vos soli," on which use of *αὐτοῖς*; see Schleus., or Wahl. Lex. on *ἠνέκαιρον* comp. supra iii. 20.

32. [*Comp.* John vi. 16.]

33. *καὶ εἶδον — πρὸς αὐτόν.* There are few passages of the N. T. where a greater diversity of readings exist than in the present. Editors and Commentators are alike agreed that it has suffered grievously from transcribers; and the unusual diversity of readings, has here (as in many other cases) led Critics too readily to take *interpolation for granted*: and, in order to relieve the plethora, *pruning* has been employed with considerable effect by the recent Editors. Griesb. edits thus: *καὶ εἶδον αὐτοὺς ὑπάγοντας· καὶ ἐπέγνωσαν πολλοὶ· καὶ περὶ ἀπὸ πασῶν τῶν πόλεων συνέδρομον ἐκεῖ.* But for this, and most of the alterations that have been made, there is little authority. Indeed, I see no good grounds except for the cancelling of *οἱ ὄχλοι*, which is, indeed, found in scarcely any MS. of account, and has no place in the early Editions, except of Erasm., 4. and 5., from which it was introduced into Steph. 3. It has been, with reason, rejected by Mill and Wets., and cancelled by Matth., Griesb., Vat., Tittm., Fritz., and Scholz. Thus *πολλοὶ* becomes the *subject* of the verbs *εἶδον* and *ἐπέγνωσαν*. To this, however, there is great objection. It is frigid as regards *εἶδον*, and as concerns *ἐπέγνωσαν*, for, as Campb. remarks, "the historian would not be likely to say that many knew him, since, after being so long occupied in teaching and healing them, there would be comparatively few who did not know him." I cannot, therefore, but suspect (though it seems not to have occurred to any of the Editors and Commentators) that *πολλοὶ*, though the authorities for its omission are but slender, should not be here. Yet it does not, I suspect, stand here *for nothing*; but, as it is scarcely possible for us to dispense with a *subject*, and as the parallel passages of Matthew

and Luke both have *οἱ ὄχλοι*, I strongly suspect that under this suspicious *πολλοὶ* is concealed that very reading; which I have therefore ventured to introduce in *smaller character*. In this I am supported not only by Critical probability, (for the words *πολλοὶ* and *ὄχλοι* are frequently confounded) but by the authority of the other Evangelists; and, indeed, of all those numerous MSS. which contain *οἱ ὄχλοι*, since they may be considered as *authority* for the reading in question; there being little doubt but that in their *Archetypes* the reading *οἱ ὄχλοι* was written in the margin, and intended as a correction of the textual *πολλοὶ*. I have left the received readings throughout the rest of the verse, because no tolerable case of interpolation, or of corruption, has been established against them. The clause *καὶ προσῆλθον αὐτοῖς* is indeed cancelled by Griesb. and Fritz.; but on very slender authority. The objection on the score of *false construction*, as if *αὐτῶν* were required, is frivolous; for the very same construction is found in almost every good MS. in *Luke* xxii. 47., and is rightly edited by Matth., Griesb., and Scholz. Besides, the circumstance is surely so *natural*, that *internal evidence* is greatly in its favour. One may easily imagine *how* the people who saw our Lord and the Apostles (no doubt, *on board ship*; which removes Campbell's objection), might be so circumstanced in respect of them, as to be enabled to get before them to the place whither they were bound. They would easily see, by the course in which the vessel was directed, the spot where it was meant to land. As to *ἦλθον*, edited by Griesb. and Fritz. for *συνῆλθον*, it has scarcely the support of a single MS., and is, no doubt, a mere *correction*. The common reading must be preferred, as being the more *difficult*. It has a *significatio prægnans*; and the *πὸς* with the Accusative is equivalent to a *Dative*, which latter construction is found in xiv. 53, and Luke xxiii. *Συνίερχεσθαι* is often used in this sense in the N. T.

Ἐκεῖ denotes *εἰς τὸν ἔρημον*, and *περὶ* signifies not *on foot*, but *by land*, which sense occurs elsewhere in the N. T.

34. [*Comp.* Matt. ix. 36. Jerem. xxiii. 1. Ezek. xxxiv. 2.]

35. *ἦδη ὥρας πολλῆς γε.* Almost all Commentators take the sense to be, "it was now late in

MT. LU.

14. 9. αὐτοῖς· Δότε αὐτοῖς ὑμεῖς φαγεῖν. Καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· Ἀπελθόντες
 16 13 ἀγοράσωμεν διακοσίων δηναρίων ἄρτους, καὶ δώμεν αὐτοῖς φαγεῖν;
 17 Ὁ δὲ λέγει αὐτοῖς· Πόσους ἄρτους ἔχετε; ὑπάγετε καὶ ἴδετε. Καὶ 38
 19 14 γρόντες λέγουσι· Πέντε, καὶ δύο ἰχθύνας. Καὶ ἐπέταξεν αὐτοῖς ἀνα- 39
 κλίνει πάντας, συμπόσια συμπόσια, ἐπὶ τῷ χλωρῷ χόρτῳ. Καὶ ἀνέ- 40
 πεσον πρᾶσαι πρᾶσαι, ἀνὰ ἑκατὸν καὶ ἀνὰ πενήκοντα. Καὶ λαβὼν 41
 τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύνας, ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν
 εὐλόγησε· καὶ κατέλασε τοὺς ἄρτους, καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐ-
 20 17 τοῦ, ἵνα παραθῶσιν αὐτοῖς· καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύνας ἐμέρισε πᾶσι. Καὶ 42
 ἔφαγον πάντες, καὶ ἐχορτάσθησαν· καὶ ἦσαν κλασμάτων δώδεκα κο- 43
 21 24 φίνους πλήρεις, καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἰχθύων. Καὶ ἦσαν οἱ φαγόντες τοὺς 44
 22 ἄρτους ὡσεὶ πεντακισχίλιοι ἄνδρες. Καὶ εὐθέως ἠνάγκασε τοὺς μαθη- 45
 τὰς αὐτοῦ ἐμβῆναι εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, καὶ προάγειν εἰς τὸ πέραν πρὸς
 23 Βηθσαϊδὰν, ἕως αὐτὸς ἀπολύσῃ τὸν ὄχλον. Καὶ ἀποταξάμενος αὐτοῖς, 46
 24 ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸ ὕψος προσεύξασθαι. Καὶ ὀψίας γενομένης, ἦν τὸ 47
 πλοῖον ἐν μέσῳ τῆς θαλάσσης, καὶ αὐτὸς μόνος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. Καὶ 48
 εἶδεν αὐτοὺς βασανιζομένους ἐν τῷ ἐλαύνειν· ἦν γὰρ ὁ ἄνεμος
 25 ἐναντίος αὐτοῖς. Καὶ περὶ τετάρτην φυλακὴν τῆς νυκτὸς ἔρχεται πρὸς
 αὐτοὺς, περιπατῶν ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης· καὶ ἤθελε παρελθεῖν αὐτούς.
 26 Οἱ δὲ ἰδόντες αὐτὸν περιπατοῦντα ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης, ἔδοξαν φάντα- 49
 σμα εἶναι, καὶ ἀνέκραζαν· πάντες γὰρ αὐτὸν εἶδον, καὶ ἐταράχθησαν. 50
 27 Καὶ εὐθέως ἐλάλησε μετ' αὐτῶν, καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· Θυροεῖτε· ἐγώ
 32 εἰμι· μὴ φοβεῖσθε. Καὶ ἀνέβη πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, καὶ ἐκό- 51
 πασεν ὁ ἄνεμος· καὶ λίαν ἐκ περιουσίᾳ ἐν ἑνυτοῖς ἐξίσταντο καὶ

the day." Yet they adduce no better proof than examples of the *Latin* phrase *in multam noctem, or diem*. But that sense would require *διαγεν*. Render, "et quum jam tempus multum effluxisset [ex quo docere cæperat]." Unless, therefore, this be a *Latinism*, we may explain the phrase, with Fritz., "when much of the day was now past." [Comp. John vi. 5.]

37. ἀπελθόντες — φαγεῖν.] The best Commentators, ancient and modern, are of opinion this sentence contains an interrogation implying admiration, and perhaps indignation. It may be rendered: "What must we go and buy?" &c. There is reason to think that the sum in question was a proverbial one, for a sum of money exceeding the inconsiderable; as we say, a *good round sum*.

38. [Comp. John vi. 9.]

39. συμπόσια συμπόσια] i. e. κατὰ συμπόσια, in a distributive sense; an idiom common in Hebrew. See Note supra, ver. 7. Συμπόσιον signifies properly a *drinking together*, or a *common entertainment*; and then, by a metonymy common in our own language, it designates the *party* assembled. — χλωρῷ χόρτῳ.] Casaub. and Wets. say that χλωρῷ is added because χόρτος properly signifies *hay*. It simply, however, means *fodder*; and though in the Classical writers it almost always denotes *dry* fodder, yet in the N. T. it as constantly signifies *herbage* of any kind, both of grass and corn.

40. Πρᾶσι properly signifies a *plot* of ground,

such as in gardens are employed for the growth of vegetables. It is strange that the latest Commentators should adopt the derivation of Hesych. from *πῆρας*, "quasi *πρᾶσαι*," when the Etym. Mag. and Zonaras' Lex. offer so much better a one; — namely, from *πρᾶσον*, an old word signifying a leek or onion. Thus the term denotes properly an *onion-bed*, and then any plot of ground of a regular form, as square or parallelogram. See my Note on Thucyd. ii. 56. It here denotes *regular* and equal *companies*, like squadrons of troops. From Luke we find that each was composed of 50 persons. This method was, no doubt, adopted, to let the multitude know their own number.

45. [Comp. John vi. 17.]

46. ἀποταξάμενος αὐτοῖς] "having bid them (i. e. the multitude) farewell." The phrase *ἀποτάσσειν τι*, in this sense, is (as Fritz. observes) not Attic Greek, but that of Philo, Joseph., and the later writers, especially the N. T. ones. [Comp. John vi. 16, 17.]

48. ἐν τῷ ἐλαύνειν] scil. τὴν ναῦν. The ellipsis is sometimes supplied, but at other times *κόπη* is used. Βασανίζομένους, laborantes, distressed.

— ἤθελε παρελθεῖν αὐτοῖς.] The laboured Annotations of Grot., Fritz., and others here are little to the purpose; and much trouble might have been spared by considering the phrase as a *popular* one, for "he would (i. e. he was about to) pass by them;" or, "he made as though he would have passed by them." So of Jesus it is

52 ἐθαύμαζον. Οὐ γὰρ συνῆκαν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἄρτοις· ἦν γὰρ ἡ καρδία αὐτῶν πεπωρωμένη.

MT.
14.

53 ΚΑΙ διαπεράσαντες ἤλθον ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν Γεννησαρέτ, καὶ προσωρμί-

34

54 σθησαν. Καὶ ἐξελεύσονται αὐτῶν ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου, εὐθὺς ἐπιγρόντες

55 αὐτὸν, περιδραμόντες ὅλην τὴν περίχωρον ἐκείνην, ἤρξαντο ἐπὶ τοῖς

35

56 καὶ ὅπου ἂν εἰσεπορεύετο εἰς κώμας ἢ πόλεις ἢ ἀγρούς, ἐν ταῖς

57 ἀγοραῖς εἰθύνον τοὺς ἀσθενούντας, καὶ παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν, ἵνα κὰν τοῦ

36

58 κρασπέδου τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ ἄψωνται· καὶ ὅσοι ἂν ἤπιοντο αὐτοῦ

59 ἐσώζοντο.

15.

1 VII. ΚΑΙ συνάγονται πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι, καὶ τινες τῶν

1

2 Γραμματέων, ἐλεύσονται ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων. Καὶ ἰδόντες τινὰς τῶν

3 μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ κοιναῖς χερσὶ, (τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἀνόπτοις) ἐσθίουσιν ἄρτους,

4 [ἐμίψαντο·] (οἱ γὰρ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ πάντες οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, ἐὰν μὴ

said, Luke xxiv. 23. Καὶ αὐτὸς προσποιεῖτο ποδῶν αὐτοῦ πορεύεσθαι.

52. οὐ γὰρ συνῆκαν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἄρτοις.] By the ἄρτοις is meant, as Krebs observes, τῶ θαλάμῳ τοῖς ἄρτοις γεγομένῳ. That Commentator, however, and Kuin., with some other recent Interpreters, seem wrong in assigning to ἐπὶ the sense *post*. I myself still continue of the same opinion as in Recens. Synop., that the true sense is *per, by*, denoting the efficient cause; as in Matt. iv. 4. And this is confirmed by Fritz. in his Note, who renders: "Non enim per prioris portenti opportunitatem quidquam intellexerant, sed erant callo obductâ mente."

53. προσωρμίσθησαν] scil. ἐκεῖ. Προσωρμίζειν signifies to bring a ship πρὸς ὄρμον, to a port; or, as here, to a station or place fit for landing or drawing a ship ashore.

54. ἐπιγρόντες αὐτὸν] Some MSS. and Versions have added αἱ ἄνδρες τοῦ τόπου ἐκείνου; words, no doubt, derived from Matt. xiv. 13. It may seem harsh that the *subject* of the verb should be suppressed; to soften which, Fritz. would take the words ἐπιγρόντες—ἤρξαντο as put impersonally. But it will be more satisfactory to suppose an ellipsis of the subject; namely, the common one, corresponding to the *man* of the Germans and our *men*, which will here denote the *inhabitants* of that country. This obscurity is perhaps meant to be somewhat cleared up by the ἐκείνην following, which is equivalent to ἐκείνου τόπου.

55. For περιφέρειν some MSS. have φέρειν; others, εἰσφέρειν; and others, again, προσφέρειν, which Fritz. edits; but wrongly; for the *varr. lect.* arose from the librarij stumbling at the use of περιφέρειν here, which has a *significatio præg-nans*, including the senses expressed by the above various readings; q. d. "they carried them about, (i. e. up and down) and brought them to those places where they heard he was."

—ὅπου] This must not be taken for *quoniam* (with Palairet and Schleusn.), but rather (with Beza, Grot., Wets., Kuin., and Winer) the words ὅπου—ἐκεῖ must be closely connected, corresponding to the Heb. וְשָׁם, in the sense *ubi*. Thus ἐκεῖ is said to be redundant. Fritz., however, makes well-founded objections to this combination of the words, and to the supposing the redundancy of them; because the words *ὅτι ἐκεῖ ἐστὶ* are an independent clause. And he, very

properly, limits the above-mentioned idiom to passages where the words occur in the *same clause*. He would therefore render ἔστι *adest*. But it may be better to regard the sentence as an abbreviation of the fuller mode of expression of primitive times; when it would have been phrased "carried them to the place of which they had heard it said, 'he is there?'" Compare I Kings xviii. 10. Thus ἐκεῖ is least of all pleonastic.

56. παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν] It is not clear whether this is to be understood of *those who laid the sick persons down*, or of the *sick persons themselves*. The former method is more suited to the construction; but the latter (which is adopted by Abp. Newcome) is more agreeable to probability.

—ὅσοι ἂν ἤπτ.] The ἂν is not without force, denoting, as Winer thinks (Gr. N. T. p. 117.), the uncertainty of the number. I would render, "as many as might have touched."

VII. 2. κοιναῖς] It was quite in the Jewish idiom to oppose *common* and *holy*, the most usual signification of the latter word in the Old Testament being separated from common, and devoted to sacred use. Their meals were (as the apostle expressed it, I Tim. iv. 5.) *sanctified by the word of God and prayer*. They were, therefore, not to be touched with unhallowed hands. The superficial Pharisee, who was uniform (wherever religion was concerned) in attending to the letter, not to the spirit of the rule, understood this as implying solely that they must wash their hands before they eat. (Campb.) Κοινὸς here (as often in Joseph.) signifies what is ritually impure; thus, as regarded the *hands*, it denoted that they were not washed ritually, i. e. just before the meal; though they might otherwise be clean.

—ἐμίψαντο] This word is omitted in several MSS. and some Versions, is rejected by Mill and Beng., and is cancelled by Griesb., Tittm., and Scholz, but retained and defended by Fritz. strenuously, but not, it should seem, very successfully. No tolerable reason has ever been given why, supposing it to have been originally in the text, it should have been thrown out. On the other hand, it is easy to see how it should have been *added*, namely, by those who were not aware of the true construction of the whole passage, and did not see that vv. 3 & 4 are parenthetical.

MT.

15. πυγμῇ νίφονται τὺς χεῖρας, οὐκ ἐσθίουσι, κρατοῦντες τὴν παράδοσιν
 τῶν πρεσβυτέρων· καὶ ἀπὸ ἀγορᾶς, ἐὰν μὴ βαπτίσωνται, οὐκ ἐσθί- 4
 οῦσι· καὶ ἄλλα πολλὰ ἐστίν, ἃ παρέλαβον κρατεῖν, βαπτισμούς πο-
 τηρίων καὶ ξεστῶν καὶ χαλκίων καὶ κλινῶν·) ἔπειτα ἐπερωτῶσιν αὐτὸν 5
 2 οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ Γραμματεῖς· Διαιτὶ οἱ μαθηταί σου οὐ περιπα-
 τοῦσι κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, ἀλλὰ ἀνίπτοις χερσὶν
 3 ἐσθίουσι τὸν ἄρτον; Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Ὅτι καλῶς 6
 προεφῆτευσεν Ἰσαΐας περὶ ὑμῶν τῶν ὑποκριτῶν, ὡς γέγραπται·
 8 Οὗτος ὁ λαὸς τοῖς χεῖλεσί με τιμᾷ, ἢ δὲ καρδίᾳ αὐ-
 9 τῶν πόρρω ἀπέχει ἀπ' ἐμοῦ. Μάτην δὲ σέβονται 7
 10 με, διδάσκοντες διδασκαλίᾳς, ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων.
 Ἀφέντες γὰρ τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ, κρατεῖτε τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν 8
 ἀνθρώπων, βαπτισμούς ξεστῶν καὶ ποτηρίων· καὶ ἄλλα παρόμοια
 3 τοιαῦτα πολλὰ ποιεῖτε. Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· Καλῶς ἀθετεῖτε τὴν 9
 4 ἐντολὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἵνα τὴν παράδοσιν ὑμῶν τηρήσῃτε. Μωϋσῆς γὰρ 10
 εἶπε· Τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα σου· καὶ
 ὁ κακολογῶν πατέρα ἢ μητέρα, θανάτῳ τελευτάτω·
 5 ὑμεῖς δὲ λέγετε· Ἐὰν εἴπῃ ἄνθρωπος τῷ πατρὶ ἢ τῇ μητρὶ· Κορ- 11

3. πάντες] i. e. all those who observed the traditions; for the Sadducees and a few others (comparatively a small part of the nation) rejected this custom.

—πυγμῇ] There are few expressions on which the Commentators are more divided in opinion than this. The early Versions show that the ancients were as much perplexed with it as the moderns. The Vulg. and some other Versions give the sense *scrape*; whence it has been supposed, that they read *πυκνῇ*, which might be taken for *πυκνὰ*, and that for *πυκνῶς*. But (as Fritz. observes) there is no proof of the existence of any such *adverb* as *πυκνῇ*; and the sense *scrape* would be inapposite. To advert to the interpretations of those who retain the common reading; several Commentators, ancient and modern, take *πυγμῇ* to mean “up to the elbow.” But even though *πυγμῇ* should be proved to have the signification *elbow*; yet such a one as “up to” in the Dative, cannot be tolerated. For the same reason, the interpretation of Lightf., Hamm., Schoettg., and Heupel, “up to the wrist,” must be rejected. Others, as Wets., Pearce, Campb., and Rosenm., endeavor to remove the difficulty by taking *πυγμῇ* to mean “a handful of water,” such as the contracted palm will contain; or rather a *quartarius*, the smallest measure allowed for washing the hands. And this mode of interpretation Campb. supports very ingeniously, but not convincingly; for that sense would require *πυγμῇ ἕκαστος*. In short, *πυγμῇ* can only mean the *doubled* or *closed fist*, in which sense the word is here taken by Scalig., Beza, Grot., and Fritz.; who, however, are not agreed as to the manner of the action. The most probable view is that of Beza and Fritz., who render “unless they have first washed their hands with the fist;” which explanation is confirmed by the customs of the Jews, as preserved in the Rabbinical writers, and even yet in use. Thus the rendering of the Syr. *diligenter* may be admitted as a free translation, as also those of *studiosè*, or *sedulò*, adopted by some moderns:

indeed (as Leigh says) almost all the interpretations imply diligent care in washing.

—κρατοῦντες] “carefully, pertinaciously adhering to, and observing.” Such is the full sense of the word, which is so used in 2 Thess. ii. 15.

4. ἀπὸ ἀγορᾶς] Sub. ἐλθόντες, or γενόμενοι; of which ellipse the Commentators adduce many examples, as also of the complete phrase.

—ἐὰν μὴ βαπτ.] This is best explained, “unless they wash their bodies” (in opposition to the washing of the hands before mentioned); in which, however, is not implied *immersion*; which was never used, except when some actual, and not possible pollution, had been incurred.

—ἃ παρέλαβον κρατεῖν.] The full sense is, “which they had received from their ancestors, that they may firmly keep them.” Ξεστῶν, from *ξίστης*, a liquid measure, of wood, holding a pint and a half. The word is frequent in the later writers, and is from the Latin *Sextus*. Χαλκίων, copper or brazen vessels. Earthen vessels are not mentioned, because those, if supposed to be polluted, were at once broken. See Levit. xv. 12.

7. [Comp. Coloss. ii. 13. seqq. Tit. i. 14.]

9. καλῶς ἀθετεῖτε] The best Commentators (as Euthym., Beza, Casaub., Glass, Cameron, Heupel, Campb., Rosenm., Kuin., Schleusn., Fritz., and Scott) are agreed that this is to be taken as an ironical reproof. Thus the *καλῶς* corresponds to our *finely*; a use frequent in the Classical writers. Some Commentators, who are averse to imputing irony to our Lord, devise other modes of interpretation; all of them, however, either open to strong objections, or closely bordering on irony.

11. ἐὰν εἴπῃ — ὠφελῆθῃς] Something seems wanting in this sentence, to supply which, Pisc., Beza, and Casaub. understand *insens erit*. But it is better to resort to that idiom by which the Greeks leave in a sentence some verb of a contrary signification to be repeated from the preceding sentence: and thus, with Krebs, Kuin., and Fritz., we may here repeat *μὴ θανάτῳ τελευτάτω*, “he shall

12	βῶν (ὃ ἔστι, δῶρον), ὃ ἔαν ἐξ ἐμοῦ ἄφεληθῆς· καὶ οὐκέτι ἀφίετε	MT.
13	αὐτὸν οὐδὲν ποιῆσαι τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ ἢ τῇ μητρὶ αὐτοῦ, ἀκουρῶντες	15.
	τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ τῇ παραδόσει ὑμῶν ἢ παρεδώκατε· καὶ παρόμοια	9
14	τοιαῦτα πολλά ποιεῖτε. Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος πάντα τὸν ὄχλον, ἔλεγεν	10
15	αὐτοῖς· Ἀκούετε μου πάντες καὶ συνίετε. Οὐδὲν ἔστιν ἕξωθεν τοῦ	11
	ἄνθρωπου εἰσπορευόμενον εἰς αὐτὸν, ὃ δύναται αὐτὸν κοινῶσαι· ἀλλὰ	
	τὰ ἐκπορευόμενα ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, ἐκεῖνά ἐστι τὰ κοινῶντα τὸν ἄνθρωπον.	
16	Ἐἴ τις ἔχει ὧτα ἀκούειν, ἀκούετω. Καὶ ὅτε εἰσῆλθεν εἰς οἶκον ἀπὸ	
17	τοῦ ὄχλου, ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ περὶ τῆς παραβολῆς.	15
18	Καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· Οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀσύνετοί ἐστε; οὐ νοεῖτε, ὅτι	16
	πᾶν τὸ ἕξωθεν εἰσπορευόμενον εἰς τὸν ἄνθρωπον, οὐ δύναται αὐτὸν	17
19	κοινῶσαι; ὅτι οὐκ εἰσπορεύεται αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν καρδίαν, ἀλλ' εἰς τὴν	
	κοιλίαν· καὶ εἰς τὸν ἀφροσύνην ἐκπορεύεται, καθαρῶν πάντα τὰ	
20	βρώματα. Ἔλεγε δέ· Ὅτι τὸ ἐκ τοῦ ἄνθρωπου ἐκπορευόμενον, ἐκεῖνο	18
21	κοινῶν τὸν ἄνθρωπον. Ἔσωθεν γὰρ, ἐκ τῆς καρδίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων,	19

not suffer the punishment denounced." Or we may suppose an *Aposiopesis*, of some such words as "It shall be allowed to him so to do."

12. καὶ οὐκέτι ἀφίετε, &c.] The sense is, "and, while thus abrogating the Divine precept, ye permit him not any longer to," &c., namely, out of the money so consecrated; because the devotion of it was made with an imprecation against the devotee, if he employed the money to any other purpose.

13. ἢ παρεδ.] This is not, as some think, pleonastic, but signifies "*quæ propagare soletis*," as Fritz. renders. The ἢ is, by attraction, for ἦν.

15. [Comp. Acts x. 15. Rom. xiv. 17, 20. Tit. i. 15.]

19. καθαρῶν πάντα τὰ β.] In this passage there is much variety of reading, and diversity of interpretation. The varr. lectt. however, are, as Fritz. has shown, of such a nature as to afford no reason to call in question the common reading; they being either *slips of the pen*, or *glosses*. And the conjectures of Critics are entitled to no attention; unless it can be shown that the common reading is incapable of any tolerable explanation; which is not the case. For although most of the many modes of interpretation adopted are quite inadmissible, and some even ludicrously absurd, yet a tolerably good sense may be extracted from the words. Such, I conceive, is that which I have, with some hesitation, propounded in *Recons. Synop.*, where καθαρῶν is taken as a Nominative absolute, and rendered "purifying by removal." This I find confirmed by the authority of Fritz., who, after a minute discussion of the sense, adopts that view. Of course, the Participle with δ and γῆμα understood, must be considered as standing for δ and a verb in the Indicative, i. e. δ καθαρῶν; q. d. "which circumstance (namely, that the meats are cast into the jakes) makes them all alike pure." This use of the Participle, which often takes place in *παρὸν, προσῆκον, δίδαν, &c.*, I have more than once illustrated in *Thucyd.*

21. ἔσωθεν γὰρ, &c.] This passage involves not a few difficulties, and has therefore been variously interpreted. In order to determine its complete sense, it is proper to ascertain its *scope*. Now that undoubtedly is, to illustrate the foregoing principle,—that vice and corruption spring from

within a man. And this is done by first pointing to evil thoughts, as the fountain whence spring evil actions (see *Matt. xii. 34.*); and then *exemplifying* this truth by adverting to the principal and leading vices, *murder, adultery and fornication, theft*, (including rapaciousness in general) *blasphemy*, and *evil speaking*, both in general and in particular. In these enumerations of vices, occasionally occurring in the N. T., the Commentators have, almost universally, recognised mere lists, devoid of all order or arrangement, and only presenting a *congeries* of whatever is bad. I trust that I shall be enabled to prove that, though these may sometimes seem "a maze," it is "not without a plan;" and in most cases to show *what* that *is*; though there may, occasionally, on some details, exist uncertainty, as to the interpretation of terms of very extensive application. We are here, I think, especially bound to suppose *classification*, and thus it is proper to pay attention to the parallel passage of Matthew, where we have only the grand outlines of the picture; here in a great measure filled up. But, to consider more particularly the terms in question, I was long of opinion that there are three classes of vices here intended, namely, 1. *μοιχεῖαι, πορνείαι, φόνοι, κλοπαί*; 2. *πλεονεξία — πονηρός*; 3. *βλασφ., ὑπερ., ἀφο.* And this view I find confirmed by the authority of Fritz. Yet, on mature reflection, I cannot help thinking this is too artificial and arbitrary a mode; and am now of opinion, that there is here little more of *classification* than we find in the passage of St. Matthew; but that we have here filled up what are there only the *outlines* of the picture. This will furnish a clue to ascertaining the sense of more than one controverted term. Thus, I apprehend, *πλεον.* and *δόλος* denote only lesser degrees of theft; namely, rapacity, and artful overreaching in a bargain (see *Thucyd. iii. 45, 6. and 82. 2.*). So *Xenoph. Cyr. i. 6, 28.* not dissimilarly enumerates *κυκνοργαίαι καὶ ἄπται, καὶ δολώσεσι, καὶ πλεονεξίαι*. *Πονηρ.* is by the earlier Commentators, interpreted *vices*, or wickedness; and by the later, *malignity* or malevolence; the latter of which senses is preferable, if we here suppose another *class* of vices intended. But that is discountenanced by the parallel passage; and it would be somewhat out of place. It should

MT.

15. οἱ διαλογισμοὶ οἱ κακοὶ ἐκπορεύονται· μοιχεῖαι, πορνεῖαι, φόνοι, κλο- 22
 παὶ, πλεονεξίαι, πονηρίαι, δόλος, ἀσέλγεια, ὀφθαλμὸς πονηρὸς, βλασφη-
 20 μίαι, ὑπερηφανία, ἀφοροσύνη. Πάντα ταῦτα τὰ πονηρὰ ἔσωθεν ἐκπο- 23
 ρεύεται, καὶ κοινοὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον.
- 21 Καὶ ἐκείθεν ἀναστὰς ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὰ μεθόρια Τύρον καὶ Σιδῶνος. 24
 καὶ εἰσελθὼν εἰς [τῆν] οἰκίαν, οὐδένα ἤθελε γινῶναι· καὶ οὐκ ἠδυνή-
 θη λαθεῖν. Ἀκούσασα γὰρ γυνὴ περὶ αὐτοῦ, ἧς εἶχε τὸ θυγάτριον 25
 αὐτῆς πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον, ἐλθοῦσα προσέειπε πρὸς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ,
 22 (ἦν δὲ ἡ γυνὴ Ἑλληνίς, Συροφοίνισσα τῷ γένει·) καὶ ἠρώτα αὐτὸν 26
 ἵνα τὸ δαιμόνιον ἐκβάλῃ ἐκ τῆς θυγατρὸς αὐτῆς. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν 27
 26 αὐτῇ· Ἄφες πρῶτον χορτασθῆναι τὰ τέκνα· οὐ γὰρ καλὸν ἐστὶ λα-
 27 θεῖν τὸν ἄρτον τῶν τέκνων, καὶ βαλεῖν τοῖς κυναρίοις. Ἢ δὲ ἀπεκρίθη 28
 καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· Ναὶ, Κύριε· καὶ γὰρ τὰ κυνάρια ὑποκάτω τῆς

therefore seem that *πονηρ.* and *δολ.* denote two species of the *genus*, rapacity; of which the former may be supposed to mean *trickery*, something like our *swindling*. This view of the sense of *δόλος* and *πονηρ.* is confirmed by Jerem. ix. 1—6. where the Israelites are described in nearly the colours of the picture here: e. gr. πάντες μοιχῶνται, στυγερὸς ἀθεοτόντων, ἐνέτειναν τὴν γλῶσσαν αὐτῶν ὡς τόξον ψεύδος, καὶ οὐ πίστις ἐνίσχυσιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, πᾶς φίλος δολῶς παρεστέται.—τόκος ἐπὶ τόκῳ, καὶ δόλος ἐπὶ δόλῳ.

To these evil actions and habits are subjoined the cognate evil dispositions, *ἀσέλγεια* and *ὀφθαλμὸς πονηρὸς*; the former of which expressions denotes that spirit of craving which never cries hold! enough! that desire of one's neighbour's goods which leads us to look on his wealth with the eye of desire, grudging him his possessions. So Prov. xxiii. 6. "eat not the bread of him that hath an evil (i. e. grudging) eye." and xxviii. 22. "He that hasteth to be rich hath an evil eye." That *ἀσέλγ.* must here have the sense of excessive desire for wealth (*auri sacra fames*) is plain from its situation in the sentence, which forbids it to be taken in the usual one *lascivia* or *insolentia, injuria*, as Kuin. explains. Indeed *ἀσέλγης* seems primarily to mean *extreme, excessive*. So Ælian ap. Suid. in *ἀσέλγεια* says of a *wind*: πολὺς καὶ ἀσελγῆς τίκεται ἐκείθε, namely, in deep dells through which it is conveyed as through a funnel. Or *ἀσέλγεια* may here denote *profligacy*, the being devoid of principle, snatching at gain in any way. This is confirmed by the derivation of the word, which seems to be from an *intensive* and *αἰλγης*, which I suspect came from the Heb. קלג, to let loose, q. d. *abandoned* to vice, lost to all principle.

To advert to the last three terms, which will, I apprehend, be found to have an affinity to each other. *Βλασφ.*, as appears from the parallel passage, means, not *blasphemy*, but *calumny*. In determining the force of the two other terms, it is proper to consider the *scope*, which I conceive is, to designate the vices which engender calumny. And as Solomon says, (Prov. xiii. 10.), "only by pride cometh contention," so only by pride and vanity cometh evil speaking and slanderous words. So in Prov. viii. 13. "Pride, and arrogance, and the tongue of perversity do I hate;" where by *perversity* is, I apprehend, meant *slander*. So Prov. xvii. 20. "the perverse in his tongue will fall into evil." (i. e. he who perverts the truth) shall fall into evil." Which is the reason why,

at x. 18, it is said, "He that uttereth a slander is a fool." Finally, the remaining term is capable of several senses, and has been variously interpreted. But as it seems to be closely connected with the preceding term *ὕπερφ.*, it may denote (as Fritz. explains) that thoughtless levity and rashness in speaking, which produces evil speaking more frequently than deliberate malice.

24. τὰ μεθόρια Τ. καὶ Σ.] This is by most Commentators taken to mean, that tract of country which *divided* Palestine from Tyre and Sidon. But Fritz. thinks the meaning is, that our Lord entered into the territory of Tyre and Sidon. In fact, the district in question was a strip of anciently debateable *border land*, (like the *Thyreatis* between Argolis and Laconia, and some other tracts in Greece); but afterwards ceded by Solomon to the King of Tyre: though it long afterwards retained its original name of the *border land*. — τῆν.] This is omitted in very many MSS., and nearly all the early Edd. and is cancelled by almost every Editor from Bengel to Scholz. The Article *καὶ* (as Middlet. says) have no place here. Γινῶναι, namely, that he was there. It seems to be a popular form of expression. Καὶ οὐκ ἦδ.] The *καὶ* signifies *but*.

26. Ἑλληνίς] a Gentile, or pagan, (called in Matthew *Χανααῖτα*) for the distinction is one not of country, but religion. The Heathens had, for a long time, been called by the name of *Greeks*, because many of those with whom the Jews held commerce were either such, or at least used the Grecian language.

— Συροφοίνισσα.] A woman of the country called Syria-Phœnicia, which lay between Syria and Phœnicia. Συροφ. too is said because there were *Διβυφοίνικες*, i. e. Carthaginians. Many MSS. here have *Συροφοίνικισσα*, which is received by Matth., Griesb., Vat., Tittm., and Scholz. But the common reading is retained and ably defended by Fritz.

— ἐκβάλλει.] This (for the common reading *ἐκβάλλει*), is found in very many of the best MSS. and the Ed. Princ., and adopted by Wets., Griesb., Tittm., Vat., Fritz., and Scholz. It is (as Fritz. shows) required by the correspondence of tenses found in the Greek idiom.

27. ἄφες πῶταν — κυναρίοις] q. d. "Do not ask me before the time to confer benefits upon you, nor eat like servants: who would be fed before the children are satiated." (Fritz.)

28. ναὶ, Κύριε] Sub. καλὸν ἐστὶ, &c. "True,

29 τραπέζης ἐσθίει ἀπὸ τῶν ψιγίων τῶν παιδίων. Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ·
 Διὰ τοῦτον τὸν λόγον, ὕπαγε· ἐξεήλυθε τὸ δαιμόνιον ἐκ τῆς θυ-
 30 γατρός σου. Καὶ ἀπεθούσα εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτῆς, εὔρε τὸ δαιμόνιον
 ἐξεληλυθὸς, καὶ τὴν θυγατέρα βεβλημένην ἐπὶ τῆς κλίνης.
 31 ΚΑΙ πάλιν ἐξεληθὼν ἐκ τῶν ὁρίων Τύρου καὶ Σιδῶνος, ἦλθε πρὸς
 τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας, ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν ὁρίων Δεκαπόλεως. Καὶ 29
 32 φέρουσιν αὐτῷ κωφὸν μογιάλον, καὶ παρακαλοῦσιν αὐτὸν, ἵνα ἐπιθῆ
 33 αὐτῷ τὴν χεῖρα. Καὶ ἀπολαβόμενος αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου κατ' ἰδίαν,
 ἔβαλε τοὺς δακτύλους αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰ ὄτια αὐτοῦ, καὶ πύσας, ἤψατο τῆς
 34 γλώσσης αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, ἐστέναξε, καὶ λέγει
 35 αὐτῷ· Ἐφαθα, ὃ ἐστι διανοίχθητι. Καὶ εὐθέως διηνοιχθήσαν αὐ-
 τοῦ αἶ ἀκοαί· καὶ ἐλύθη ὁ δεσμός τῆς γλώσσης αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐλάλει
 36 ὀρθῶς. Καὶ διεστειλάτο αὐτοῖς, ἵνα μηδενὶ εἴπωσιν· ὅσον δὲ αὐτὸς

MT.
15.
28

Lord, it is right." Καὶ γὰρ, [But do it] for even, &c.

29. ὕπαγε.] This does not import *begone*, but implies a granting of the request, q. d. "go in God's name." Διὰ τοῦτον τὸν λόγον, "because of this speech [so full of humility and faith]."

30. βεβλημένη ἐπὶ τῆς κλ. i. e. lying tranquil and composed on a bed; not, as before, running up and down, or lying on the ground. Vide supra v. 15.

32. κωφὸν μογιάλον.] There is some difference of opinion on the sense of these words. Some ancient Translators, and early modern Commentators take μογιάλον to denote one *dumb*; which they seek to establish by the use of the word in the Sept. at Isa. xxxv. 5. But that version is *erroneous*, and therefore cannot afford any proof. In vain, too, do they appeal to Matt. ix. 33. and Luke xi. 14, for there is every reason to suppose this miracle a different one from that there recorded. Besides, the words used of the man after his cure (ἐλάλει ὀρθῶς) concur with the proper signification of the term, (namely, *one who speaks with difficulty*;) to show that the person was not *dumb by nature*, nor, probably, *deaf by nature*; otherwise it would have been needless to call him dumb (for such persons always are so); but was one who, having early lost his *hearing*, gradually lost much of his *speech*, and had become a stammerer. Such an impediment is either *natural*, arising from what is called a *bos*, or ulcer, by which any one is, as we say, *tongue-tied*, (of which Wets. adduces some examples from the Classical writers, and I have myself, in Recens. Synop., added others more apposite, from Artemid. and Philostratus,) or brought on, when, from an early loss of hearing, the membrane of the tongue becomes rigid and unable to perform its office. That the former was the case of this poor sufferer, would seem to appear from the expression at ver. 35. ἐλύθη ὁ δεσμός τῆς γλώσσης. But even that may be taken figuratively, (as in some of the passages cited by Wets.,) and the latter view is probably the true one. This sense of μογιάλος is adopted by the Syriac Translator, and also by Beza, Grot., and almost all of the recent Commentators; who answer the argument of their opponents, that at ver. 37 we have καὶ τοὺς ἀλάλους λαλεῖν, by replying that that is either a *general* expression, and not limited to *this* sense; or that ἀλάλος is used by a common *hyperbole*.

33. ἀπολαβόμενος — ἰδίαν] "taking him aside and apart from the multitude," not, away from them, or out of their sight. This was probably done for the same reason as that which influenced our Lord in the miracle recorded supra, v. 40.

— ἔβαλε — τὰ ὄτια αὐτοῦ.] Since this, and the other action mentioned, could contribute nothing to the cure (though we find such used on other occasions, as viii. 23, and John ix. 6.) it has been asked *why* our Lord used them. Such inquiries are often rash, and we are not bound in all cases to give a reason (since our Saviour's *adoption* of an action shows its *fitness*); yet here we can be at no loss. The reason was, no doubt, that assigned by Grot. and Whitby, and adopted by most recent Commentators, as Kuin. and Fritz.; namely, that Christ was pleased, in condescension to human weakness, to use external actions significant of the cure to be performed; and thereby to strengthen the faith and confirm the hopes of the sick persons, and those who brought them; and, moreover, to show that the power he was about to exert resided in *himself*. Our Lord adopted these actions, and also the usual one of laying his hands on the sick, in order to show that he was not confined to any one particular mode. [Comp. John ix. 6. Infra viii. 23.]

34. καὶ ἀναβλ., &c.] [Comp. John xi. 41; xvii. 1.]

— ἐστέναξε] "he groaned;" in sympathy with human calamity. [Comp. Heb. iv. 15.]

— ἐφαθα.] Syro Chaldee, and the Imperative of the passive conjugation Ethrael. Διανοίχθητι, i. e. Have the use of thine ears. Ἀλεσθαί would seem a more proper term as applied to the tongue; but διανοίγεσθαι is adopted as being applicable to the removal of *both* obstructions. For in Hebrew phraseology *to open any one's eyes or ears* denotes imparting to him the faculty of sight or speech. Grot. observes, that such words are usually interchanged, "*per abusivem*." But the reason rather is, that in words indicative of the deprivation of any natural faculty there is *one common idea*. Thus our words *dumb, blind, and deaf*, are all derived from past participles of verbs signifying to *stop up*. And the same might be shown in almost all the correspondent words of other languages.

36. ὅσον] for καθ' ὅσον, say most Commentators; who also at μάλλον supply τοσοῦτη. But

MT.

15. αὐτοῖς διετέλλετο, μᾶλλον περισσότερον ἐκήρυσσον. Καὶ ὑπερπερισσῶς 37
ἐξεπλήσσοντο, λέγοντες· Καλῶς πάντα πεποίηκε· καὶ τοὺς κωφούς
ποιεῖ ἀκούειν, καὶ τοὺς ἀλάλους λαλεῖν.

VIII. ἘΝ ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις, παμπόλλου ὄχλου ὄντος, καὶ μὴ 1
32 ἐχόντων τί φάγωσι, προσκαλεσάμενος [ὁ Ἰησοῦς] τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ, 2
λέγει αὐτοῖς· Σπλαγχνίζομαι ἐπὶ τὸν ὄχλον· ὅτι ἤδη * ἡμέραι τρεῖς
προσμένουσί μοι, καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσι τί φάγωσι. Καὶ ἔαν ἀπολύσω ἀν- 3
33 τῶν μακρόθεν ἦκουσι. Καὶ ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ· 4
34 Πόθεν τούτους δυνησεται τις ὧδε χορτάσαι ἄρτων ἐπ' ἑρημίας; Καὶ 5
35 ἐπηρώτα αὐτούς· Πόσους ἔχετε ἄρτους; οἱ δὲ εἶπον· Ἐπτία. Καὶ 6
36 παρήγγειλε τῷ ὄχλῳ ἀναπεσεῖν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς· καὶ λαβὼν τοὺς ἐπτὰ
ἄρτους, εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασε, καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, ἵνα
37 παραθῶσι· καὶ παρέθηκαν τῷ ὄχλῳ. Καὶ εἶχον ἰχθύδια ὀλίγα· καὶ 7
37 εὐλόγησας, εἶπε παραθεῖναι καὶ αὐτά. Ἔφαγον δὲ, καὶ ἐχορτάσθησαν· 8
38 καὶ ἦσαν περισσεύματα κλασμάτων, ἐπὶ τὰ σπυρίδας. Ἦσαν δὲ οἱ φαγόν- 9
τες ὡς τετρακισχίλιοι· καὶ ἀπέλυσεν αὐτούς.

Καὶ εὐθὺς ἐμβὰς εἰς τὸ πλοῖον μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, ἦλθεν 10
16. εἰς τὰ μέρη Δαλμανουθά. Καὶ ἐξῆλθον οἱ Φαρισαῖοι, καὶ ἦρξαντο 11
1 εὐζητεῖν αὐτῷ, ζητοῦντες παρ' αὐτοῦ σημεῖον ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, πει-
4 ράζοντες αὐτόν. Καὶ ἀναστενάξας τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ, λέγει· Τί ἡ 12
γενεὰ αὕτη σημεῖον ἐπιζητεῖ; Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν· εἰ δοθήσεται τῇ
γενεῇ ταύτῃ σημεῖον! Καὶ ἀφείδ αὐτούς, ἐμβὰς πάλιν εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, 13
ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸ πέραν.

5 Καὶ ἐπέλαθοντο λαβεῖν ἄρτους. καὶ εἰ μὴ ἓνα ἄρτον οὐκ εἶχον 14
6 μεθ' ἑαυτῶν ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ. καὶ διετέλλετο αὐτοῖς λέγων· Ὁρατε, 15

Fritz., with reason, rejects both ellipses, and simply renders the words *quantum* — and *magis*. There is not (as some suppose) any pleonasm in *μᾶλλον περ.*; but as Fritz. observes, the *μᾶλλον* adds weight and intensity to the following comparative *περισσότερον*. He compares Aristoph. Eccl. 1131. *μᾶλλον ὀβριώτερος*.

VIII. 2. *ἡμέραι*.] This (for the common reading *ἡμέρας*) is found in very many MSS., most of them ancient, and is preferred by Mill, Beng., and Wets., and edited by Matth., Griesb., Tittm., Vat., Fritz., and Scholz. See Note on Matt. xv. 32. Fritz., indeed, points *ἡμέραι*, *ἢ ἡμέραι τρεῖς*, *προσμ.* μ. remarking, “*temporum notationes illo pacto haud raro a veteribus reliquæ orationi interponi;*” adducing, as an example, Lucian. Dial. Mer. i. 4. *οὐ γὰρ ἐώρακα, πολὺς ἦδη χρόνος, ἀντόν*. But of that idiom not a single example, I believe, can be adduced from the *Scriptures*, with whose style it totally disagrees.

3. *νήστεις*.] Sub. *κατὰ*, “fasting;” from *νήστις*, literally, “at fasting;” or, in our ancient phraseology, a “fasting.” So a “cold,” &c. &c. Thus it came at length to have the force of an adjective. And the number (sing. or plur.) is accommodated to that of the *subject* of the assertion. Such seems to be the true nature of the idiom, neglected by Commentators and Philologists. For

ἦκουσι some would read, from several MSS., *ἦκασι*. But Fritz. shows that the use of the preterite *ἦκα*, however it may be found in the Sept., Joseph., and Liban., cannot be proved to have been adopted by the writers of the N. T. Besides, there is no need of the change, since the Present of *ἦκω* has often the sense of the Preterite. Thus we may render “are come,” or “had come.”

11. *σζητεῖν αὐτῷ*] “to enter into argument with him.” The word properly signifies “to use mutual inquiry and discussion.” The construction of this verse (which is somewhat rough) is thus adjusted by Fritz. “*Ζητοῦντες — ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ* has regard to *ἦρξαντο σοῦ αὐτῷ*, but *πειράζοντες αὐτόν* to the whole sentence *ἦρξαντο — ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*.” [Comp. John vi. 30.]

12. *ἀναστενάξας τῷ πν.*] The *ἀνα* is intensive, and signifies what is deep; (for the notions of *height* and *depth* concur,) i. e. “having fetched a deep groan or sigh from the very heart.”

— *εἰ δοθήσεται*, &c.] The *εἰ* is not (as some imagine) put for *οὐ*; but (as the best Commentators are agreed) this is a form of solemn asseveration (common in the O. T., but rarely, if ever, found in the Classical writers), in which there is implied an imprecation; which, however, is omitted *per aposiopesis* et *gravitatis ergo*. The nature of the imprecation (“may I not live!” or the like) will depend upon the subject, and the speak-

- 16 βλέπετε ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης τῶν Φαρισαίων, καὶ τῆς ζύμης Ἡρώδου. Καὶ
 17 διελογίζοντο πρὸς ἀλλήλους, λέγοντες· Ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχομεν. Καὶ
 γνούς ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει αὐτοῖς· Τί διαλογίζεσθε· ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ
 ἔχετε; Οὐπω ροεῖτε, οὐδὲ συνίετε; ἔτι πεπωρωμένην ἔχετε τὴν
 18 καρδίαν ὑμῶν; Ὁφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντες οὐ βλέπετε; καὶ ὅσα ἔχοντες
 19 οὐκ ἀκούετε καὶ οὐ μνημονεύετε; Ὅτι τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους ἔκλασα εἰς
 τοὺς πεντακισχιλίους, πόσους κοφίνους πλήρεις κλασμάτων ἤρατε; λέ-
 20 γουσιν αὐτῷ· Δώδεκα. Ὅτι δὲ τοὺς ἐπὶ εἰς τοὺς τετρακισχιλίους, 10
 πόσων σπυρίδων πληρώματα κλασμάτων ἤρατε; οἱ δὲ εἶπον· Ἐπὶ.
 21 Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· Πῶς οὐ συνίετε;
 22 ΚΑΙ ἔρχεται εἰς Βηθσαϊδάν· καὶ φέρουσιν αὐτῷ τυφλόν, καὶ
 23 παρακαλοῦσιν αὐτὸν, ἵνα αὐτοῦ ἄψηται. Καὶ ἐπιλαβόμενος τῆς χειρὸς
 τοῦ τυφλοῦ, ἐξήγαγεν αὐτὸν ἔξω τῆς κώμης. Καὶ πύσας εἰς τὰ
 ὄμματα αὐτοῦ, ἐπιθείς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῷ, ἐηρώατα αὐτὸν εἶ τι βλέπει;
 24 Καὶ ἀναβλέψας ἔλεγε· Βλέπω τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, ὡς δένδρα, περιπα-
 25 τοῦντας. Εἴτα πάλιν ἐπέθηκε τὴν χεῖρα ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ,
 καὶ ἐποίησεν αὐτὸν ἀναβλέπειν· καὶ ἀποκατεστάθη, καὶ ἐνέβλεπε
 26 τηλαυγῶς ἅπαντας. Καὶ ἀπέστειλεν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ, λέγων·
 Μηδὲ εἰς τὴν κώμην εἰσελθῆς, μηδὲ εἴπῃς τι ἐν τῇ κώμῃ.

er. This is supplied at Ezek. xiv. 16. Sept. The Classical writers use the complete form, but only, I think, with *el μή*.

15. βλέπετε ἀπό.] Equivalent to the *προσέχετε* of Matthew and the *φύλασσεσθε* of Luke. This use is Hellenistic. Καὶ τῆς ζύμης Ἡ. Matthew joins the *Sadducees* with the Pharisees, and makes no mention of Herod. But there is no real discrepancy, since Herod and the Herodians (i. e. his adherents and courtiers) were, no doubt, Sadducees, and there is every reason to think that their doctrines and morals were such as to justify the caution of our Lord. Ζύμη, by a striking metaphor, denotes the *infection of false doctrines*, (so Matt. xvi. 12,) as well as of corrupt morals.

19. πέντε ἄρτους ἔκλασα εἰς τοὺς π.] It is well observed by Fritz. that there is here a *prægnans constructio*, in which is included the two senses, to *break the loaves*, and to *distribute* them to the multitude. This idiom is indeed frequent both in the Scriptural and Classical writers.

22—26. This miracle is recorded only by Mark; though it has several circumstances which render it worthy of particular attention. [*Comp. vii. 32.*]

23. ἐξήγαγεν — κώμης] i. e., as most Commentators say, because he thought those who had seen so many miracles in vain, were not worthy to see more. The reason, however, seems rather to have been, that our Lord never chose to perform a miracle with a crowd pressing about him. See supra iii. 10. & v. 29.

— πύσας εἰς τὰ ὄμματα] Our Lord was here again pleased to vary the mode of the external action: and that the one adopted on this occasion was not unusual with those who pretended to cure blindness, or dimness of sight, we may suppose from the same thing occurring in an account of a pretended miracle narrated in Suet. Vesp. 7. Our Lord was also pleased to vary the operation, and cause that it should not be instantaneous, but gradual.

24. καὶ ἀναβλέψας] *Ἀναβλέπειν* signifies not only to *look up*, but “to recover the sight,” which latter signification many Commentators (after Erasmus.) here adopt. That, however (as Campb. observes), only has place where a *complete* recovery is denoted; which was not the case here, the *perfection* of it being marked by the words *ἀποκατεστάθη, καὶ ἐνέβλεψε τηλαυγῶς ἅπαντας*. The best Commentators, ancient and modern, are agreed on the former signification to *look up*. He looked up in order to ascertain whether he had recovered his sight.

— βλέπω τοὺς ἀνθρώπους — περιπατοῦντας] These words have occasioned somewhat of perplexity. There is, as might be expected, great variety of readings; for several MSS. and early Edd. read *βλέπω τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ὅτι ὡς δένδρα ὁρῶ περιπ.* And this was edited by Schmid, Mill, Beng., and Matth. But Fritz. has shown that this reading yields no tolerable sense; and he (in common with Griesb., Tittm., Vat., and Scholz) edits the words without the *ὅτι* and *ὡς*, as in the *textus receptus*. This, too, is found in the Edit. Pr. and the great body of MSS., confirmed by almost every one of the ancient Versions: and it is doubtless to be preferred. The other seems to have arisen, as Fritz. remarks, ἐ *διτρογαφία*, i. e. *βλέπω* and *ὁρῶ*; and *ὅτι* and *ὡς*. The words *ὡς δένδρα* are to be referred to the *τοὺς ἀνθ.*, not *περιπ.*; and the sense is, “I see men, as trees, walking;” i. e. I can distinguish men from trees only by their walking; a result of imperfect vision; since a *confusion of vision* in the objects is, as Plato observes, the first sign of returning sight, which, as he says, *τῆς αἰσθήσεως σημεῖα παραλλάττει*. This view of the sense is confirmed by Victor, who, no doubt, derived it from the Fathers. From the above it is plain that the person was not born blind, but had lost his sight from disease.

26. μηδὲ εἰς τὴν — κώμην] On these words there has been a needless scruple raised, the best way

MT. LU.

16. 9. Καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς κώμας Καί- 27
 13 18 σαρείας τῆς Φιλιππου· καὶ ἐν τῇ ὁδοῖ ἐπιηρώτα τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ,
 14 19 λέγων αὐτοῖς· Τίνα με λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἶναι; Οἱ δὲ ἀπεκρίθη- 28
 15 20 σαν· Ἰωάννην τὸν βαπτιστὴν· καὶ ἄλλοι Ἰλίαν· ἄλλοι δὲ ἓνα τῶν
 20 21 προφητῶν. καὶ αὐτὸς λέγει αὐτοῖς· Ὅτι οἱ τίνα με λέγετε εἶναι; 29
 20 21 ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος λέγει αὐτῷ· Σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστός. Καὶ ἐπετί- 30
 21 22 ΚΑΙ ἤρξατο διδάσκειν αὐτοὺς, ὅτι δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πολ- 31
 21 22 λὰ παθεῖν, καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι ἀπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ ἀρχιερέων
 22 22 καὶ γραμματέων, καὶ ἀποκτανθῆναι· καὶ μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀναστῆναι.
 22 22 καὶ παρῆρσιαι τὸν λόγον ἐλάλει. Καὶ προσλαβόμενος αὐτὸν ὁ Πέτρος, 32
 23 22 ἤρξατο ἐπιτιμᾶν αὐτῷ. Ὁ δὲ ἐπιστραφεὶς καὶ ἰδὼν τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐ- 33
 23 22 τοῦ, ἐπετίμησε τῷ Πέτρῳ, λέγων· Ὑπαγε ὀπίσω μου, σατανᾶ· οὗ οὐ
 24 22 φρονεῖς τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων.
 24 22 Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τὸν ὄχλον σὺν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ εἶπεν 34
 23 22 αὐτοῖς· Ὅστις θέλει ὀπίσω μου ἐλθεῖν ἀπαρνησάσθω ἑαυτὸν, καὶ
 25 24 ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀκολουθήτω μοι. Ὅς γὰρ ἂν θέλῃ 35
 25 24 τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σῶσαι, ἀπολέσει αὐτήν· ὅς δ' ἂν ἀπολέσῃ τὴν
 26 25 ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ, ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, οὗτος σώσει αὐτήν. Τί 36
 26 25 γὰρ ὠφελήσει ἄνθρωπον, ἐὰν κερδήσῃ τὸν κόσμον ὅλον, καὶ ζημιωθῇ
 26 25 τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ; ἢ τί δώσει ἄνθρωπος ἀνάλλαγμα τῆς ψυχῆς 37
 26 25 αὐτοῦ; Ὅς γὰρ ἂν ἐπαισχυθῇ με καὶ τοὺς ἐμούς λόγους ἐν τῇ 38
 26 25 γενεᾷ ταύτῃ τῇ μοιχαλίδι καὶ ἁμαρτωλῷ, καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
 26 25 ἐπαισχυθήσεται αὐτὸν, ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ μετὰ
 28 27 τῶν ἀγγέλων τῶν ἁγίων. IX. Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· Ἀμὴν λέγω 1
 28 27 ὑμῖν, ὅτι εἰὰ τινὲς τῶν ὧδε ἐστηκότων, οἵτινες οὐ μὴ γεύσονται θανά-
 28 27 του, ἕως ἂν ἴδωσι τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐληλυθῆναι ἐν δυνάμει.
 17. 1 28 Καὶ μεθ' ἡμέρας ἕξ παραλαμβάνει ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὸν Πέτρον καὶ τὸν 2
 17 1 28 Ἰάκωβον καὶ τὸν Ἰωάννην, καὶ ἀναφέρει αὐτοὺς εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλὸν καὶ
 2 29 ἰδίῳν μόνους· καὶ μετεμορφώθη ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν· καὶ τὰ ἱμάτια 3
 2 29 αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο στίλβοντα, λευκὰ λίαν ὡς χιών, οἷα γραφεὺς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς
 3 30 οὐ δύναται λευκᾶναι. Καὶ ὠφθῆ αὐτοῖς Ἰησοῦς σὺν Μωϋσῆϊ· καὶ 4
 4 33 ἦσαν συλλαλοῦντες τῷ Ἰησοῦ. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Πέτρος λέγει τῷ 5
 4 33 Ἰησοῦ· Ραββὶ, καλὸν ἐστὶν ἡμᾶς ὧδε εἶναι· καὶ ποιήσωμεν σκηνὰς
 5 34 τρεῖς· σοὶ μίαν, καὶ Μωϋσῆϊ μίαν, καὶ Ἰησοῦ μίαν. Οὐ γὰρ ᾔδει τί 6
 5 34 λαλήσῃ· ἦσαν γὰρ ἔκφοβοι. Καὶ ἐγένετο νεφέλη ἐπισκιάζουσα αὐτοῖς· 7

of avoiding which is to consider them as expressing this sense: "Do not go into the village and tell them what has happened."

31. ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι] An allusion to Ps. cxviii. 22. And the word implies *contumely* with rejection.

32. παρῆρσιαι] i. e. "plainly." So Euthym. φανερώς καὶ ἀπαοκαλιπτως, i. e. without any figure of speech, as John expresses it.

35. [Comp. John xii. 25.]

38. [Comp. Rom. i. 16. 2 Tim. ii. 12. 1 John ii. 23.]

IX. 3. γραφεὺς from γράφος, a tool with which the ancients used to raise the nap of worn cloth. This was one of the employments of an artisan called γραφεύς; and with it were united that of cleansing soiled garments, and restoring them to their original state; either by dyeing them, or, by the use of fullers' earth and alkali, restoring their whiteness.

7. ἐπισκιάζουσα αὐτοῖς.] This construction with the *Dative* is rare; (that with the *Accusative* being the usual one) but it is found also in Acts v. 15, and Ps. xc. 3, Sept., and ἐπισκιάζουσα τινὶ may there

καὶ ἦλθε φωνὴ ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης· [λέγουσα.] Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ
 8 μου ὁ ἀγαπητός· αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε! Καὶ ἐξάπινα περιβλεψάμενοι, 8 36
 9 οὐκέτι οὐδένα εἶδον, ἀλλὰ τὸν Ἰησοῦν μόνον μεθ' ἑαυτῶν. Καταβαινόν- 9
 των δὲ αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους, διεστείλατο αὐτοῖς, ἵνα μηδεὶ διηγή-
 σονται, ἃ εἶδον, εἰ μὴ ὅταν ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῇ.
 10 Καὶ τὸν λόγον ἐκράτησαν, πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς συζητοῦντες, τί ἐστὶ τό· ἐκ
 11 νεκρῶν ἀναστῆναι. Καὶ ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν λέγοντες· *Ὁ τι λέγουσιν 10
 12 οἱ γραμματεῖς, ὅτι Ἰλίας δεῖ ἐλθεῖν πρῶτον; ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν
 αὐτοῖς· Ἰλίας μὲν ἐλθὼν πρῶτον, ἀποκαθιστῆ πάντα· [καὶ] * κα- 11
 ὄως γέγραπται ἐπὶ τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἵνα πολλὰ πείθῃ καὶ

MT. LU.
 17. 9.

be rendered, "to be a shade to," or over "any one"; the Dative (which is *ποι*, as Fritz. imagines, a Dativus commodi) being suspended on the *ἐπι*.

— λέγουσα.] This is omitted in many MSS., some Versions, and Theophyl.; and is cancelled by Matth., Griesb., and Fritz., as having been introduced from the other Gospels. [Comp. Matt. iii. 17. Luke iii. 22. 2 Pet. i. 17.]

8. ἐξάπινα.] This rather rare form is a neuter plural, taken adverbially, of the old epic adjective ἐξάπινος; whence the Ionic ἐξαπίνης, contracted by the Attics to ἐξαίφνης. Yet the old adverb had been retained by the Macedonians, occurs sometimes in the later Writers, and is frequent in the LXX. Ἄλλα τὸν Ἰ. This is generally taken as put for *εἰ μὴ*. Fritz., however, supposes the ἀλλὰ as put with reference to the negative in οὐκέτι, and supplies a *verb* of seeing; namely, ἰδῶσιν, from the preceding participle. Yet the former mode is defended and illustrated by our *but*, which has often the sense *except*. The fact is, that in this case, ἀλλὰ is for ἀλλ' ἢ, otherwise than.

10. τὸν λόγον ἐκράτησαν, &c.] The sense (much disputed) of these words, will chiefly depend upon the construction. Some construe them with the words following, πρὸς ἑαυτούς; others take them with the preceding, συζητοῦντες. The former method is preferred by some of the ancient, and the earlier modern Commentators; but the latter is adopted by almost all the later Expositors; and with reason; for such a construction as the former would be unprecedented. They are, however, not agreed on the sense of ἐκράτησαν; some rendering it "reticuerunt," others, "animo exceperunt;" others, again, "animo retinuerunt." To all of these interpretations, however, objections are made by Fritz.; who himself renders "sermonem (Jesu) firmiter tenuerunt." This version perhaps deserves the preference; but the *reticuerunt* of Schleus. and others may be the true sense. Τί ἐστὶ — νεκρῶν, quidnam esset ἐ mortuis redire,— "what Jesus meant by speaking of rising from the dead." They did not question the general resurrection, which all but the Sadducees believed; but they could not reconcile this language with what they had learnt in the law,—that Christ should live for ever, and hold an everlasting kingdom. Hence their slowness in comprehending the assurances, so often reiterated to them, by Christ, of his death and resurrection. Inasmuch that when the Lord was dead, their hopes died with him, and only revived at his resurrection.

11. ὁ τι λέγουσιν.] Almost all Commentators take ὅτι in the sense *why*. Fritz., with reason, rejects, as unfounded, this signification. He

would read *τί ὄν* from some Latin Versions. But this reading is of slender authority, and the *ὄν* was doubtless derived from Matt. xvii. 10. If the common reading be correct, the best mode of interpretation will be, to supply *τί ἐστι τοῦτο* here and infra ver. 23, which is confirmed by the Armenian Version. But as this is a very harsh ellipsis, we may suspect some corruption in the text. Perhaps the true reading is that of one or two MSS. *τί for διὰ τί*. This is confirmed even by those MSS. which are quoted in favor of *τί ὄν*; and perhaps by the Versions which are adduced in support of *πῶς ὄν*. The *ο* might easily arise from the *ς* preceding. The authority, however, is too weak; and the reading is probably no more than a *conjecture* to remove the difficulty; which may more effectually and quite as allowably, be done by reading *ὅ τι*, which I have ventured to edit here and infra v. 23. This signification is not frequent; yet instances do occur. Steph. Thes. furnishes *three*; Hom. II. κ. 142. Odys. τ. 463, where Eustath. rightly explains it by *τι* or *διὰ τί*, both in interrogation; of which Stephens gives one example from Isocrates, to which I am enabled to add the following. Thucyd. i. 90, fin. καὶ ὅποτε τις αὐτὸν ἐροῦτο τῶν ἐν τείλει ὄντων ὅ τι οὐκ ἐπὶ ἔρχεται, &c. (So Bekker and Poppon rightly edited, instead of the common reading *ὄτι*.) Xenoph. Ephes. iv. 2, fin. ἐκέλευσε ἐπιμελείαν ἔχειν πᾶσαν, ζωῆς, ἔφη. μάθωμεν ὅστις ὁ ἀνθρώπος ἐστίν, καὶ ὅ τι ὄντως αὐτοῦ μέλει θεοῖς. where *ὅ τι* was rightly emended instead of the common reading *ὄτι*. In such a case *ὅ τι* is for *διότι*. It is no wonder that the Scribes or Critics should have altered *ὅ τι* into *τί*, from ignorance of its meaning. The same has happened elsewhere. Thus in Lucian Contempl. § 18. πρὸς ἑμαυτὸν ἐνοῶ τί τὸ ἦδὺ αὐτοῖς παρὰ βίον. some MSS. have *ὄτι*; but the true reading, as Hemsterhus. saw, is *ὅ τι*, which, he observes, is often used for *τι*. Here the *ο* was absorbed by the *ω* preceding.

12. Ἡλίας μὲν — πάντα.] Here there is *not* any irony, (as some imagine,) but rather a Synchore-sis. Render, "Elias is, indeed, first to come, and is to restore things to their former state."

— καὶ καθὼς γέγραπται, &c.] There are few passages which have more perplexed the Commentators than this. Various are the attempts which have been made to assign a satisfactory sense to the words of the common text καὶ πῶς. But all have failed; being more or less defective, either in sense or construction, or both. This being the case, the most eminent Commentators have been long agreed, that the passage is corrupt; and various modes of emendation have been proposed. Mere *conjectures* merit little attention. As to the various readings of MSS., not one is deserv-

MT. LU.

17. 9. ἐξουδενωθῆν — ἀλλὰ λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι καὶ Ἡλίας ἐλήλυθε, καὶ 13
 12 ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ ὅσα ἠθέλησαν. [καθὼς γέγραπται ἐπ' αὐτόν.]
 37 Καὶ ἐλθὼν πρὸς τοὺς μαθητάς, εἶδεν ὄχλον πολὺν περὶ αὐτοὺς, καὶ 14
 Γραμματεῖς συζητοῦντας αὐτοῖς. Καὶ εὐθίως πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος ἰδὼν αὐτὸν 15
 14 38 ἔξεθαμβήθη, καὶ προστρέχοντες ἠσπάζοντο αὐτόν. Καὶ ἐπηρώτησε τοὺς 16
 15 39 Γραμματεῖς· Τί συζητεῖτε πρὸς αὐτούς; Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς εἰς ἐκ τοῦ 17
 16 40 ὄχλου εἶπε· Διδάσκαλε, ἤνεγκα τὸν υἱόν μου πρὸς σε, ἔχοντα πνεῦμα
 17 41 θηταῖς σου, ἵνα αὐτὸ ἐκβάλωσι, καὶ οὐκ ἴσχυσαν. Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς 19
 [* αὐτοῖς] λέγει· Ὡ γενεὴ ἀπίστος! ἕως πότε πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἔσομαι;

ing of notice, except that for the vulg. καὶ πῶς, several ancient MSS., with the latter Syr. Version and Euthym. and Victor, read καθὼς. But even this will not render much service. Some, therefore, (as Beza, Campb., and Bp. Marsh,) have resorted to the mild conjecture καὶ καθὼς. The sense assigned by Bp. Marsh is, "And that, as it is written of the Son of man, he (John the Baptist) may suffer many things and be set at nought." But this is too mild a medicine to be effectual. Hence some recent Commentators, Grot., Schulz., and Fritz., have attempted to restore the corruption by stronger methods. And as it appears that in this passage (as in the parallel one of Matt. vii. 12 & 13.) the fate of John Baptist and of Christ are meant to be paralleled, so they conceive that the substance of the two verses have been, by some accident, transposed; and propose that the clause καθὼς γέγραπται — ἐξουδενωθῆν should be transposed, and placed after ὅσα ἠθέλησαν; the words καθὼς γέγραπται ἐπ' αὐτόν being cancelled, as a double reading of the former. Thus the passage will stand as follows: Ἡλίας μὲν ἐλθὼν πρῶτον ἀποκαθιστῆ πάντα ἀλλὰ λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι καὶ Ἡλίας ἐλήλυθε καὶ ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ ὅσα ἐθέλησαν, καθὼς γέγραπται ἐπὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἵνα πολλὰ πάθῃ καὶ ἐξουδενωθῆ. This yields an excellent sense, and the transposition is countenanced by the parallel passage of Matt. xvii. 12 & 13. But as there is not the slightest authority for it, either in MSS. or Versions, it cannot be adopted in the text, nor ought it to be introduced into any Version. Indeed it may, after all, be unnecessary; for, adopting as I have ventured to do, the reading, καὶ καθὼς, &c., we may supply after ἐξουδενωθῆ the short corresponding clause (which is often, in such cases, left to be understood from the context) οὕτω πάσχει, "thus he (i. e. John Baptist) is to suffer." This is strongly confirmed by the οὕτω καὶ of Matthew. The words καθὼς — αὐτόν, at the end of the verse, are merely a διττογραφία of the former, and therefore stand for nothing. Yet they strongly confirm the reading καθὼς, which is so indispensable to the emendation of the passage, especially as they are found in every one of the MSS. The omission of καὶ before καθ. is very frequent in the MSS. of all writers. The Dative at ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ is a Dativus commodi, as in Isocr. Nic. 613. ἃ πάσχοντες ἡφ' ἐτέρων ἀργίζεσθε τοῖς ἄλλοις μὴ ποιεῖτε. [Comp. Luke i. 17.]

15. ἐξεθαμβήθη.] The word implies a mixture of admiration, veneration, and awe.

17. ἤνεγκα — πρὸς σε.] The state of the case was, that the man had brought his son to Jesus to

be healed by him. But our Lord not being immediately at hand, or the man not being willing to trouble Him, he presented his son to the Apostles for cure; since it was known that they had healed many such poor wretches.

— ἔχοντα — ἄλαλον.] Notwithstanding what some recent Commentators urge, who adopt Mede's hypothesis on the Demoniacs, this can only signify, as Fritz. acknowledges, "whose body was in the power of a dæmon who made him dumb." So in Luke xi. 14. a deaf dæmon (i. e. one who causes deafness) is mentioned. Here Wets. compares Plut. T. ii. p. 438. (speaking of the Pythian priestess) ἀλάλον καὶ κακοῦ πνεύματος οὕσα πλήρης.

18. ὅπου — καταλάβῃ.] Wets. and others render, "and wherever, or whenever, it may attack him;" for the verb καταλαμβάνειν, they say, is often used of the attack of any disorder, especially of epilepsy. But the context demands that we should take καταλάβῃ of the dæmon; and the sense is, "wherever, or whenever, it lights on him;" a signification often found in Thucyd.

— ῥίσει αὐτόν.] Beza and others, with E. V., render it "tears him." But the true sense is that of the ancient Versions and Commentators, and most modern ones, "dashes him on the ground;" of which signification many examples from the Classical writers and the Sept. are adduced by the Commentators.

— τριζει τοὺς ὀδ. α.] "grinds his teeth." So Theophyl. Sim. p. 91. C. χαλεπαίων καὶ τετριγῶς τοὺς ὀδόντας. Aristoph. Ran. 926. μὴ πρὶς τοὺς ὀδόντας. These and the other particulars in this verse and ver. 22, are, indeed, all symptoms of epilepsy. But if we even should suppose that the man was an epileptic; it would not follow that the disorder was not induced by demoniacal influence.

— ξηραίνεται.] Some antient and several modern Commentators explain, "faints away," "falls into a swoon." But however this may be a symptom of epilepsy, the word will not bear that sense, and can only mean "pines away." I agree with Fritz. that the word denotes, not so much what happens during the dæmon's attack, as it is a general consequence from thence. Thus Celsus says of epilepsy, "hominem consumit!"

19. αὐτοῖς.] For Vulg. αὐτῷ many MSS. and Versions have αὐτοῖς, which is edited by Griesb., Tittm., and Scholz rightly, as far as regards suitability to the context. But as the MSS. in general fluctuate between αὐτῷ and αὐτοῖς, while some others have neither one nor the other,

- 20 ἕως ποῦ ἀνέξομαι ὑμῶν; φέρετε αὐτὸν πρὸς με. Καὶ ἤνεγκαν αὐ- 17. 9.
τὸν πρὸς αὐτόν. καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτόν, εὐθὺς τὸ πνεῦμα ἐσπάραξεν αὐτόν. 42
- 21 καὶ περὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐκλυίετο ἀφρίζων. Καὶ ἐπρωτόησε τὸν πατέρα
αὐτοῦ· Πόσος χρόνος ἐστὶν, ὡς τοῦτο γέγονεν αὐτῷ; Ὁ δὲ εἶπε·
- 22 Παιδιόθεν. καὶ πολλάκις αὐτὸν καὶ εἰς τὸ πῦρ ἔβαλε καὶ εἰς ὕδατα,
ἵνα ἀπολίσῃ αὐτόν. ἀλλ', εἴ τι δύνασαι, βοήθησον ἡμῖν σπλαγχνισθεὶς
- 23 ἐφ' ἡμᾶς. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ τό· εἰ δύνασαι πιστεῦσαι—
- 24 πάντα δυνατὰ τῷ πιστεύοντι. Καὶ εὐθὺς κράζας ὁ πατήρ τοῦ παι-
δίου, μετὰ δακρῶν ἔλεγε· Πιστεύω, κύριε· βοήθει μου τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ!

I cannot help suspecting that *both* are from the margin.

20. ἰδὼν αὐτόν—ἐσπάραξεν.] Most Commentators take ἰδὼν for ἰδόντα. But that is a false view of the construction, which Fritz. rightly regards as an *anacoluthon*. The Evangelist meant to say καὶ ἰδὼν (ὁ παῖς) αὐτόν, εὐθὺς ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐσπαράσσετο, but then changed the construction; of which see another example in Acts xx. 3. Wets. and Vater take ἰδὼν as a Nominative absolute, supplying αὐτός.

21. ὡς] for ἐξ οὗ, or ἀφ' οὗ, ("since the time) when."

—παιδιόθεν.] This form, and the kindred, but more elegant one παιδόθεν, are of later Grecism. The earlier purer writers employed ἐκ παιδός, or ἐκ παιδίου.

22. τὸ πῦρ.] The Article (absent from Vulg.) is found in many ancient MSS., and is adopted by Matth., Griesb., Fritz., and Scholz, and confirmed by Matt. xvii. 15. John xv. 6. Acts xviii. 5, and other passages. Propriety, indeed, would seem to require this, since it falls under that canon of Middlet. by which all those utensils or substances in a house, of which there is ordinarily but *one*, take the Article. Thus when πῦρ signifies the fire in any house, it requires the Article; when it signifies any other, or fire in general, it rejects it. But whether, even in the former case, the Article was not occasionally, in the common dialect, omitted in phrases of frequent occurrence, is more than I would venture to affirm. Besides, the word may here be taken in a general sense; and if so, it *needs* no Article. Fritz. inserts the Article even before ὕδατα; but purely from conjecture; and very wrongly: for the word is used in a generic sense. So we speak of accidents "by fire and flood."

—ἀλλ', εἴ τι δύνασαι.] This use of ἀλλ' is said to be *supplicatory*; but it is rather hortatory; and the idiom results, as Fritz. observes, from the *Imperative*, with which the particle is, in such a case, united. As to the εἴ τι δύνασαι, some Commentators there recognise a doubt; while others deny that there is any; neither of which views seems well founded. Fritz. rightly regards it as a *formula obtestationis*, entreating help. He cites Soph. Aj. 326. More apposite, however, is the passage Dio Chrysost. p. 81, adduced by me in Recens. Synop.: ἐκείνης δεομένης τοῦ πατρὸς, εἴ τι δύναται, βοηθεῖν. See also Thucyd. vi. 25. and Herodot. viii. 57. Of course, the very nature of this formula implies *some* doubt of the power of the person whose help is implored.

23. εἰ δύνασαι—πιστεύοντι.] With this sentence Commentators have been somewhat perplexed; partly from the brevity and indefiniteness of the phraseology, and partly from the pe-

culiar use of the τό. The conjectures that have been hazarded are very inefficient, and indeed unnecessary. Some would remove the difficulty as regards the τὸ by taking it for τοῦτο. But that is a long exploded principle; and to supply κατὰ, as they do, is absurd. The best recent Commentators are, with reason, agreed that the τὸ is here meant to be applied to the sentence following, by a use common in the Classical writers: where it is often applied to a *whole sentence*. See Winer's Gr. Gr. p. 54. Krebs, Rosemnn., and Kuin. would extend the force of the τὸ to πιστεύοντι. But to produce the sense which they extract, they are obliged to insert an εἶνα after πάντα, and supply at the end of the sentence βοηθήσω σοι, or εὐ ἔχει. But *thus εἶνα* could not *but* have been expressed; and the other ellipsis is harsh. The only satisfactory solution of the difficulty is that propounded in Recens. Synop. (and which has been since adopted by Fritz.) namely, to suppose that after πιστεύοντι is to be supplied (what our Lord, from modesty, suppressed) βοηθήσω σοι, or εὐ ἔχει. From the same feeling, ἐμὸς is omitted after δύνασαι. The δύνασαι, at which so many Critics stumble, is used with reference to the δύνασαι of the question, to which this is an answer. And the best way of accounting for the use of the τὸ is, to suppose, either that this mode of speaking was not unusual to our Lord, in cases where his help was entreated with any sort of doubt; or that the answer returned was well known. Thus the sense will be, "the (well known answer.*)" All the best Commentators are agreed that τὸ πιστεύοντι is a Dativus commodi. Render, "All things are possible [to be done] for him who believeth." [Comp. Luke xvii. 6.]

24. πιστεύω, κύριε.] Κύριε is not found in about seven MSS. and some Versions, and is cancelled by Griesb., Vater, and Scholz; but with singular rashness. For, as Fritz. observes, "Nihil hæc voce, in humili et supplicis patris observatione, fingi potest apertus."

But how came it, some may ask, that a word so proper and suitable should have been omitted? I answer, it may, as the MSS. are so few, have been omitted inadvertently by those scribes who did not see its force; yet not, as Fritz. supposes, "ob ἔλεγε quod præcedit." I rather suspect it to have been omitted from *design*. The Alexandrian critic who first struck it out, no doubt thought there was more *gravity* in making the clause terminate with the most important word; which itself conveyed the answer. So thought our English Translators, who render, "Lord, I believe." And the Greek critic would probably have emended κύριε, π., had it not been forbidden by the *linguæ proprietates* to commence an ad-

MT. LU.

17. 9. Ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι ἐπισυντρέχει ὄχλος, ἐπέτιμήσεν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ 25
ἀκαθάρτη, λέγων αὐτῷ· Τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄλλαιον καὶ κωφόν, ἐγὼ σοὶ
18 42 ἐπιτάσσω· ἔξελεθε ἐξ αὐτοῦ, καὶ μηκέτι εἰσέλθῃς εἰς αὐτόν. Καὶ 26
κράζαν καὶ πολλὰ σπαράζαν αὐτόν, ἔξηλθε. καὶ ἐγένετο ὡσεὶ νεκρός·
ὥστε πολλοὺς λέγειν ὅτι ἀπέθανεν. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς κρατήσας αὐτόν τῆς 27
χειρὸς, ἤγειρεν αὐτόν· καὶ ἀνέστη.
- 19 Καὶ εἰσελθόντα αὐτόν εἰς οἶκον οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπηρώτων αὐτόν 28
21 κατ' ἰδίαν, † Ὁ τι ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἠδυνήθημεν ἐκβαλεῖν αὐτό; Καὶ εἶπεν 29
αὐτοῖς· Τοῦτο τὸ γένος ἐν οὐδενὶ δύναται ἐξελεθῆναι, εἰ μὴ ἐν προσευχῇ
καὶ νηστείᾳ.
- 22 ΚΑΙ ἐκῆθεν ἔξελεθόντες παρεπορεύοντο διὰ τῆς Γαλιλαίας· καὶ οὐκ 30
ἤθελεν ἵνα τις γινῶ. Ἰδίδυσακε γὰρ τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔλεγεν 31
23 44 αὐτοῖς· Ὅτι ὁ Τίσις τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων,
καὶ ἀποκτενοῦσιν αὐτόν· καὶ ἀποκτανθεὶς, τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀνα-
45 στησεται. Οἱ δὲ ἠγρόουν τὸ ἥημα, καὶ ἐφοβοῦντο αὐτόν ἐπερωτῆσαι. 32
18. Καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς Καπερναοὺμ· καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ γενόμενος, ἐπηρώτα 33
46 αὐτούς· Τί ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς διελογίζεσθε; Οἱ δὲ εἰσώπων· 34
1 πρὸς ἀλλήλους γὰρ διελέχθησαν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, τίς μείζων. Καὶ καθίσας 35
ἐφώνησε τοὺς δώδεκα, καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· Ἐῖ τις θέλει πρῶτος εἶναι,
2 47 ἔσται πάντων ἔσχατος καὶ πάντων δούλος. Καὶ λαβὼν παιδίον, 36
ἔστησεν αὐτὸ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν· καὶ ἐναγκαλισάμενος αὐτὸ, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς·
4 48 Ὅς ἐὰν ἐν τῶν τοιοῦτων παιδίων δέξηται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου, ἐμὲ 37
δέχεται· καὶ ὅς ἐὰν ἐμὲ δέξηται, οὐκ ἐμὲ δέχεται, ἀλλὰ τὸν ἀποστεί-
λαντά με.
- 49 Ἀπεκρίθη δὲ αὐτῷ [ὁ] Ἰωάννης λέγων· Διδύοκαλε, εἰδομέν τινα 38
[ἐν] τῷ ὀνόματί σου ἐκβάλλοντα διαμόνια, ὡς οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ ἡμῖν·
50 καὶ ἐκωλύσαμεν αὐτόν, ὅτι οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ ἡμῖν. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπε· 39
Μὴ κωλύετε αὐτόν. οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἐστὶν ὃς ποιήσῃ δύναμιν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνό-
ματί μου, καὶ δυνήσεται ταχὺ κακολογῆσαί με. Ὅς γὰρ οὐκ ἔστι καθ' 40

dress with a vocative case. And it seems they had not the good taste to feel the propriety of making the profession of faith be accompanied by an address so adapted to entreaty.

—βοῆθαι μου τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ.] By ἀπιστία, as Grot. rightly observes, is here meant, not a total want of faith, but a deficient or wavering faith. The sense is, "I have a faith, but it is infirm; supply its deficiency, regard it as complete, and heal my son accordingly."

25. ἐπισυντρέχει.] "were running together towards him." The τὸ at τῷ πνεύματι, &c. is authoritatively emphatical.

23. ὁ τι.] I have, at the Note supra, v. 14, sufficiently justified this deviation from all the editors, instead of the vulg. ὅτι. The various readings of the MSS., namely, διὰ τί, or τί ὅτι, are manifestly glosses.

30. παρεπορεύοντο] "passed along;" namely, the Lake and the Jordan. See Note on Mark ii. 23. Οὐκ ἠθέλειν — γινῶ. A popular mode of speaking, like that at vii. 23. οὐδένα ἠθέλει γινῶναι, signifying like that he wished to travel in a private character.

31. παραδίδοται] "is being delivered; i. e. is shortly to be delivered."

36. ἐναγκαλισάμενος.] Kypke, Elsn., and Wets. observe, that as the child was of somewhat advanced years, the signification here is not strictly "to take up into the arms," but to embrace.

37. [Comp. John xiii. 20.]

38. ἐν τῷ ὀν.] The ἐν of the text. receipt. is absent from several MSS., and is cancelled by Mill, Wets., Matth., Griesb., Vater, and Scholz. But I think, wrongly. It is defended by xi. 9. x. 16.; and 7. Jam. v. 10. The early Critics, it seems, stumbled at the Hebraistic idiom; and hence either cancelled the ἐν, or changed it into ἐπι, which last reading (slenderly supported by MS. authority) ought not to have been edited by Fritz.

39. οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἐστὶν, &c.] The sense is, "nemo enim meâ auctoritate miraculum edet, et poterit illico mihi conviciari." This construction (similar to that at I Cor. vi. 5.) is quite agreeable to Classical usage. So Plato Menex. p. 71. A. οὐδεὶς ὅστις οὐ γέλασται καὶ ἔρει. Thucyd. ii. 51.

41 † ἡμῶν, ὑπὲρ † ἡμῶν ἔστιν. Ὅς γὰρ ἂν ποτίσῃ ἡμᾶς ποτήριον ὕδα-
 42 τος ἐν [τῷ] ὀνόματι [μου,] ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἐστέ, ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ
 τῶν πιστευόντων εἰς ἐμέ, καλόν ἐστιν αὐτῷ μᾶλλον, εἰ περικίεται λίθος
 43 καὶ ἐὰν σκανδαλιζῆσθαι σε ἢ χεῖρ σου, ἀπόκοπον αὐτήν· καλόν σοι ἐστὶ
 44 κυλλόν εἰς τὴν ζώην εἰσελθεῖν, ἢ τὰς δύο χεῖρας ἔχοντα ἀπελθεῖν εἰς
 45 τὴν γέενναν, εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἄσβεστον· ὅπου ὁ σκώληξ ἀνθρώπων
 οὐ τελευτᾷ, καὶ τὸ πῦρ οὐ σβέννυται. Καὶ ἐὰν ὁ πούς

MT.
18.
6
8

ἀπορία τοῦ θεραπεύοντος Δυνήσεται ταχὺ signifies, "will readily bring himself to," &c. (Fritz.)

40. Instead of the text. recept. ἡμῶν—ἡμῶν, many MSS. and Versions have ὑμῶν—ὑμῶν, which is found in most of the early editions; and edited by Mill, Matth., Griesb., Vater, and Scholz. But, I think, without reason: for in external evidence the reading is not superior to the received one, (and if it were, *Manuscript* authority is of little weight in respect to words perpetually confounded in the MSS.) and in *internal*, greatly inferior; for, as Fritz. truly remarks, both here and at Luke ix. 50. "de Jesu agitur, non de Apostolis. Et potuit Jesus includere simul discipulos, se excludere non potuit." He also observes that this verse contains a *fresh* reason why no molestation should be given to the person in question. [*Comp.* also Matt. xii. 30.]

41. ἐν [τῷ] ὄν.—ἐστὶ.] The words in brackets are not found in very many MSS. Versions and Early editions, and were thrown out of the text by Griesb., Vater, Fritz., and Scholz, rightly, I think; for we may more easily account for the *insertion* than the *omission* of the words: especially as the force of the somewhat rare phrase ἐν ὀνόματι ὅτι hoc nomine vel titulo, "on account of," was likely to be unknown to the scribes. See Thucyd. iv. 60. 1. At the same time, it is not impossible, that the common reading may be the true one. At least the reasons alleged *against* it by Fritz. (that it is pleonastic; that the epegesis in ὅτι τοῦ Χρ. ἐ. is languid; and that for ἐν τῷ ὄν. ought to have been written ἐπὶ for consistency's sake. *Comp.* v. 33.) are not of any great weight; they might rather lead us to suspect *alterations*, to get rid of what was offensive,—did we not remember that the Critics in question were not persons likely to have devised so neat an emendation.

—ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἔστέ.] It has been debated whether Χριστός in the N. T. be a *proper name*, or an *appellative*. That it was originally an appellative descriptive of office and dignity (like ὁ βαπτιστής, seems certain; and so frequent is this use in the N. T., that some contend that it is never employed otherwise. But in Rom. v. 6. 1 Cor. i. 12. and 23. 2 Cor. iii. 3. Col. iii. 24. 1 Pet. i. 11. to render "the anointed," or even "the Messiah," would be harsh. Hence Middlet. maintains that in all those passages Χριστός is merely a proper name; and he contends that even during our Saviour's life, it had become such. Compare Matt. xxvii. 17. and 20. with Matt. x. 2. Campb., however, is of opinion that this use of the word was not introduced until after the resurrection. With the present passage Middlet. aptly compares a kindred one at 1 Cor. iii. 23. ὑμεῖς δὲ Χριστοῦ, Χριστός δὲ Θεοῦ. The same phrase εἶναι τινος, to be devoted to any one, oc-

curs elsewhere in the N. T., and sometimes in the Classical writers.

43. τὰς δύο χεῖρας] "both of your hands." The article has here the force of the possessive pronoun.

44. ὅπου—σβέννυται.] The words are derived from Is. lxvi. 24., where the punishment to be inflicted, in this life, on those who are rebellious towards God, are vividly depicted, by the representation of their carcases being subject to the continual gnawing of worms, and the devouring of an unextinguishable fire, so as to be objects of detestation to all future generations. The words are here applied to represent the *eternal misery* of another world, by images derived from Γέεννα in this world; on which, as a frequent emblem of torment, see Note at Matt. v. 22. The true rendering seems to be, "where the worm is never to die, nor the fire to be quenched." So the Sept. well renders, ὁ γλοσκώληξ αὐτῶν οὐ τελευτήσει, καὶ τὸ πῦρ αὐτῶν οὐ σβισθήσεται. Similar figures are found in Eccus. vii. 17. ἐκλίκεται ἀσεβοῦς πῦρ καὶ σκώληξ. and Judith xvi. 17. Κέριος παντοκράτωρ ἐκδέκσει αὐτοὺς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως, δοῦναι πῦρ καὶ σκώληκας εἰς σάρκας αὐτῶν, καὶ κλάουσεναι ἐν αἰσθήσει ἕως αἰῶνος. Some difference of opinion, however, exists as to the *nature* of the punishments here designated by ὁ σκώληξ αὐτῶν καὶ τὸ πῦρ (scil. αὐτῶν, i. e. of the wicked) namely, whether they are to be regarded as *actual* and *positive* inflictions, or as *figuratively* representing the gnawing of remorse and self-condemnation, and the torture of unavailing reproach, for having brought on themselves their own destruction. Many have been inclined to think that, though the *fire* be taken in a physical sense, the *worm* is *figurative*. On which interpretation it is truly observed by Fritz. that "what holds good of one clause of the sentence, must of the other; for a confusion of the physical with the metaphorical in the same sentence is not to be tolerated." And he would have *both* taken in the literal sense. But there seems no reason why both terms should not be regarded as *figurative*, yet designating, under these figures, *real inflictions* as dreadful to the then frame, as the gnawing of worms, or the burning of fire, to our present. See a recent Tract by the learned and excellent Professor Stuart, entitled "Exegetical Essays," on some words of Scripture relative to future punishment, namely, αἰὼν, and αἰώνιος, ἕρως, ἄδης, and γέεννα, and especially Sect. 3., which treats on the nature and manner of using figurative language in respect to the objects of a future world. The able writer there shows how it happens (namely, by the weakness of our nature, and the poverty and inadequateness of human language) that we are compelled, in speaking of the Deity, or of the things of *another* world,

MT.

18.

σου σκανδαλίῃ σε, ἀπόκοπον αὐτόν· καλὸν ἐστὶ σοι εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν ζωὴν χολὸν, ἢ τοὺς δύο πόδας ἔχοντα βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν, εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἄβεστον, ὅπου ὁ σκώληξ αὐτῶν οὐ τελευτᾷ, καὶ τὸ πῦρ 46 οὐ σβέννυται. Καὶ ἐὰν ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς σου σκανδαλίῃ σε, ἔκβαλε αὐτόν· 47 καλὸν σοι ἐστὶ μορόφθαλμον εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βουσιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἢ δύο ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντα βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρός, ὅπου ὁ 48 σκώληξ αὐτῶν οὐ τελευτᾷ, καὶ τὸ πῦρ οὐ σβέννυται. Πᾶς γὰρ πυρὶ 49 ἄλισθῆσεται, καὶ πᾶσα θυσία ἀλλ' ἄλισθῆσεται. Καλὸν τὸ ἄλας· ἐὰν 50 δὲ τὸ ἄλας ἄναλον γένηται, ἐν τίνι αὐτὸ ἀρτύσετε; Ἔχετε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἄλας, καὶ εἰρηνεύετε ἐν ἀλλήλοις.

to make use of terms which have a reference to this world. "Thus," continues he, "Heaven is represented as a *paradise*, i. e. a *pleasure garden*; as a city with magnificent walls and structures; as a place of perpetual feasting and delight; as a land of rest and overflowing plenty; as a magnificent palace, in which the guests appear adorned with princely robes and splendid crowns, and are admitted to the immediate presence of the great King of kings. *Hell* is represented as an *abyss*; a *bottomless pit*; a *lake* that burneth with fire and brimstone, the smoke of which ascendeth up for ever and ever; a *Gehenna*, where the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched; as a place of outer darkness; as a loathsome dungeon; as a place of torture and anguish unspeakable; a place of banishment from God, on which all the vials of his wrath are poured out; and by other such tremendous images all drawn from natural objects of terror and distress. That none of these descriptions are to be *literally understood*, seems to be exceedingly obvious; for if any one is to be *literally understood*, which is the one? Who will determine this question? If then, there are no particular grounds for making any such determination, we must either construe all of them *figuratively*, or all of them *literally*. Not the latter, because then the Bible must be made to contradict itself, beyond all possibility of reconciliation. It must also be made to contradict the nature of the *spiritual* and invisible world. The former, therefore is the only principle which can be admitted.

Not only does the language under our consideration express torment, the acutest in kind, but *eternal in duration*. So in the parallel passage of Matthew, are the expressions *εἰς γέενναν τοῦ πύρου*; and *εἰς πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον*, the latter qualifying and completing the idea in the former. And therefore the notions of those who from the time of Origen have dared to *limit* this duration, are both groundless and presumptuous. So Prof. Stuart, at § 17. of the before-mentioned work, after considering at large the bearing which the use of the terms *αἰὼν* and *αἰώνιος* in Scripture, have on the subject of future punishment, comes to this conclusion (awful, indeed, but not to be suppressed) that it does most plainly and indubitably follow, that if the *Scriptures have not asserted* the ENDLESS punishment of the wicked, neither have they asserted the ENDLESS happiness of the righteous, nor the ENDLESS glory and existence of the Godhead. The one is equally certain with the other. Both are laid in the same balance. They must be tried by the same tests. And if we give up the one, we must, in order to be consistent, give up the other also." When it can be shown, that there is *deliverance* from "the lake of fire,"

which is "the second death," then something will be done to affect the question under consideration. Until then, I see not how we can avoid the conclusion, that the smoke of future torment will ascend up for ever and ever! So Bp. Jer. Taylor, in his matchless Discourse, entitled "The Foolish Exchange," after showing the distinction to be made between the language of the Prophet, which represents the utter and everlasting destruction of the Jewish nation, and observing that the worm stuck close to the Jewish nation, and the fire of God's wrath flamed out till it produced its perdition; adds, that this, being transferred to signify the state of accursed souls, whose dying is a continual perishing, who cannot cease to be, must mean an eternity of duration, in a proper and natural signification. So that as the worm, when it signifies a temporal infliction, means a worm that never ceases giving torment till the body is consumed; so when it is transferred to an immortal state, it must signify as much in that proportion. That "eternal," that "everlasting," hath no end at all; because the soul cannot be killed in the natural sense, but is made miserable and perishing for ever; that is, "the worm shall not die" so long as the soul shall be unconsumed, or "the fire shall not be quenched" till the period of an immortal nature comes. And that this shall be absolutely for ever, without any restriction, appears unanswerable in this, because the same "for ever" that is for the blessed souls, the same "for ever" is for the accursed souls. So that this undying worm, this unquenchable fire of Hell have no period at all; but shall last as long as God lasts, or the measure of a proper eternity." That this was the universal sentiment of the Fathers (with the exception of Origen), is shown by Whithy, on Heb. vi. 2. That the doctrine is consonant to *reason*, as well as Scripture, appears from its having been held by Greeks, Romans, and Jews, and indeed the ancients universally.

49. πᾶς γὰρ — ἀλισθῆσεται.] There is perhaps no passage in the N. T. which has so perplexed the Commentators, or so defied all efforts to assign to it any certain interpretation, as this. It is impossible here to *detail*, much less *review*, even a *tenth* of the interpretations which have been proposed. It must suffice (omitting all mere conjectures, or interpretations proceeding on a strained sense of the words) to notice those expositions only which have any semblance of truth. It is a material previous question, whether the words are to be considered with reference to what *went before*, or taken as a *separate dictum*. The latter is the view taken by some, especially Kuhn; who maintains, that this and the next verse are out of place, and belong to some other

	MT.
1	19.
	1
2	3
3	
4	7
5	
6	8
7	4

part of the Gospel. This, however, is a gratuitous supposition ; which has, moreover, the disadvantage of depriving us of all benefit of a context, to shed some glimmer of light on this deep obscurity. Yet those who admit that the passage has a connexion with and reference to what precedes, are not agreed as to the precise nature of that connexion. Many refer it to the words immediately preceding ; so that either a reason may be supposed given why the wicked in Hell will be tormented unto eternal life, or that ver. 49. may be considered as a further explication, or illustration, of what was said in ver. 43.; for γάρ has often the sense of *nempe*. But the great objection to this mode of interpretation is, that it compels them to assign such a sense to πᾶς as cannot be justified on any principle of correct exegesis, namely, "every wicked man," or, "every one (of those condemned to Hell)." Quite as objectionable is the sense of πᾶσα θυσία, assigned by some of these Commentators, "every one consecrated to God ;" by which the salt is taken to mean the salt of grace. Many other interpretations are grounded upon this hypothesis, that the words have reference to those which immediately precede ; every one of which, however, (as Fritz. has proved) is liable to very strong objections.

Let us now examine the other class of interpretations, namely, those which proceed on the principle, that the words have reference to ver. 47. Thus πᾶς will denote "every one of you," "every Christian." But what is the meaning of πρὸς ἀλιθθῆσθαι ? Here, as in the former class, we have a multitude of precarious and even absurd interpretations. Indeed, only two can be adduced, which deserve any attention. 1. That of those who take πρὸς ἀλιθθ. to mean "shall be purified by the Holy Ghost." See Matt. iii. 11. Acts iii. 3. They render : "For every Christian will be seasoned with the fire [of the Holy Ghost]," as (in the old Law) the precept was, every sacrifice shall be seasoned with salt ; q. d. "As (καὶ for ὡς, as often) every sacrifice, under the Old Law, was to be seasoned with salt, so in the New, every Christian shall have a portion of the Holy Spirit." But to assign such a sense to πρὸς is harsh, and we can scarcely suppose the Evangelist would word the sentence so enigmatically. In fact, the difficulty is chiefly centred in the interpretation of πρὸς ; which is best taken by the ancients generally, and some moderns (as Beza, Rosenm., Kuin., and Fritz.), to mean "the fiery trials of life." They are not, however, agreed on the sense of ἀλιθθῆσθαι. Beza and others take the meaning to be, "Every Christian is purified by the fiery trials of life, as every sacrifice is salted with salt." But as ἀλιθθ. will not admit of such a sense, I prefer the interpre-

tation of ἀλ. proposed by Bos, Muzel, and Fritz. ; especially as it is confirmed by the ancient glass δοκιμασθήσεται, namely, "shall be put to the proof." They well remark, that the reference of this verse is not to ver. 47 only, but likewise to ver. 43—7. For, as Fritz. truly observes, "since Jesus has there thrice expressed the sentiment, that a loss even of the members of the body, nay, of those most useful, is to be encountered, rather than to yield to the seductions of vice ; that so being tried and approved, we may attain the prize of our high calling ;" nothing can be expected but that we should show that such sort of trials (like those of athletes) are either very useful, or absolutely necessary." By πᾶς must be understood all persons, all Christians, since to them ver. 43—48. belong. Πῖρρ designates those fiery trials, in encountering which the self-denial and fortitude is compared to that of suffering the loss of a limb. Πρὸς ἀλ. may be interpreted, "will be tried and prepared by such fiery trials [for the enjoyment of eternal felicity]." There is here a metaphor taken from victims, which were prepared for sacrifice by the imposition of the mola salsa. The words of the next clause καὶ πᾶσα θυσία ἀλὶ ἀλιθθῆσται are founded on Levit. ii. 13. καὶ πᾶν ἄσπον θυσίας (i. e. every sacrifice) ὑμῶν ἀλὶ ἀλιθθῆσται. And the καὶ is to be rendered *sicuti*, as, like the Heb. γ.

Here is a paronomasia on the double sense of salt ; for the word is first used, at ver. 49, in its proper sense ; then, at ver. 50, in its figurative one ; where it denotes, as some say, the salt of friendship ; but rather, we may suppose, with others, the salt of wisdom. See Coloss. iv. 6. Comp. Matt. v. 13. Luke xiv. 84. Rom. xii. 18. Heb. xii. 14. After recommending the study of wisdom, our Lord enjoins the cultivation of peace one with another.

X. 2. οἱ Φαρ.] There are many MSS. here that have not the Article ; which is cancelled by Griesb., Vater, and Scholz. But, I apprehend, without any good reason. The Article (found in the parallel passage) can scarcely be dispensed with ; and the sense is, "the persons who were of the sect of the Pharisees in the surrounding country." It will, perhaps, be said, that the sense is, "some Pharisees," &c. But that would require Φαρ. τινες. Besides, it is easier to account for the omission than for the addition of the οἱ, which Fritz., with more than his usual discretion, retains and defends. It is true, that some MSS. are without the οἱ in the parallel passage. But they are very few in number, and *al* most all of them such as omit it here.

6. ἀπὸ δὲ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως.] In this rare phrase κτίσις signifies "the things created," the world or

MT. LU.

19. 18. καταλείψει ἄνθρωπος τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν μη-
 5 τέρα· καὶ προσκολληθήσεται πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐ-
 6 τοῦ, καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν. Ὡστε οὐκεία 8
 7 εἰσὶ δύο, ἀλλὰ μία σὰρξ. Ὁ οὖν ὁ Θεὸς συνέζευξεν ἄνθρωπος μὴ 9
 8 χωρίζετω. Καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ πάλιν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ περὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ 10
 9 ἐπηρώτησαν αὐτόν. Καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· Ὁς ἐὰν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα 11
 10 αὐτοῦ καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην, μοιχῶται ἐπ' αὐτήν· καὶ ἐὰν γυνὴ ἀπολύσῃ 12
 11 τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς καὶ γαμηθῇ ἄλλω, μοιχῶται.
 13 15 Καὶ προσέφερον αὐτῷ παιδία, ἵνα ἄψῃται αὐτῶν· οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ 13
 14 ἐπειμῶν τοῖς προσφέρουσιν. Ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἠγανάκτησε, καὶ εἶπεν 14
 15 αὐτοῖς. Ἄφετε τὰ παιδία ἔρχεσθαι πρὸς με, [καὶ] μὴ κωλύετε αὐτὰ·
 16 τῶν γὰρ τοιούτων ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ. Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν· ὅς 15
 17 ἐὰν μὴ δέξῃται τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ ὡς παιδίον, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθῃ
 18 εἰς αὐτήν. Καὶ ἐναγκαλισάμενος αὐτὰ, τιθεὶς τὰς χεῖρας ἐπ' αὐτὰ, 16
 17 ἠνλόγει αὐτά.
 18 16 Καὶ ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ εἰς ὁδὸν, προσδραμῶν εἰς καὶ γονυπετήσας 17
 19 αὐτόν, ἐπηρώτα αὐτόν· Διδάσκαλε ἀγαθὲ, τί ποιήσω, ἵνα ζωῶν αἰώνιον
 20 κληρονομήσω; Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν; οὐ- 18
 21 δεις ἀγαθός, εἰ μὴ εἰς ὁ Θεός. Τὴς ἐντολῆς οἶδας· Μὴ μοιχεύ- 19
 22 σῃς· μὴ φονεύσῃς· μὴ κλέψῃς· μὴ ψευδομαρτυρήσῃς·
 23 μὴ ἄποστερήσῃς· τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέ-

universe, as xiii. 19. 2 Pet. iii. 4. Sap. v. 18, & xvi. 24. The argument meant to be urged in this and the verse following is, that God at the beginning of the world created man and woman that they should live together in the greatest union; and that hence married persons are to be regarded not as two, but one, and therefore, by the Divine law, no divorce can be permitted.

10. ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ.] This seems to designate some private lodging, which they occupied on the road; and the expression is here used in contradistinction to the *public place* where our Lord had been arguing with the Pharisees.

11, 12. In these two vv. there is a marvellous diversity of readings, none of which, however, authorise any change in the text. There may be some want of neatness in the phraseology, nay, of precision in the use of one of the terms employed — namely, ἀπολύσῃ in ver. 12. But if the whole be taken as expressed *populariter*, there will be nothing to stumble at. It is true that, strictly speaking, a Jewish wife could not divorce her husband; for as to the examples of Salome and others, *their* actions were done in defiance of all law, and in imitation of Roman licentiousness. Ἀπολύσῃ, therefore, at ver. 12, may, with many of the best Commentators, be considered as used with some license, on account of the antithesis, for ἐξελθῆν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνδρός; which, indeed, is found in some MSS. and Versions, and is *edited* by Fritz; but is plainly a gloss. There is the same catachresis at 1 Cor. vii. 12 & 13, (where the Apostle may be supposed to have had this passage in mind) in the use of μὴ ἀφίετω αὐτήν, and μὴ ἀφίετω αὐτόν. Perhaps, too, this term is used with reference to the customs of the *Gentiles* rather than the Jews, and seems to be meant to give a rule to the Apostles for *general applica-*

tion, and which should put both sexes on the same footing.

The αὐτήν is by some referred to the *repudiated wife*; by others, to the *newly married one*. Either may be admitted; but in the former case the sense of ἐπὶ will be, “to the injury of;” in the latter, “in respect of;” i. e. in his connection with. [Comp. Matt. v. 32. Luke xvi. 18. 1 Cor. vii. 10. seq.]

14. [Comp. Matt. xviii. 3. 1 Cor. xiv. 20. 1 Pet. ii. 2.]

— καὶ μὴ κωλύ. The καὶ is not found in many MSS., and is rejected by Mill, and cancelled by Griesb., Matth., and Scholz; while Fritz, objects that such an *Asyndeton* is unknown in *Scripture*. Perhaps, however, that is being *hypercritical*. And when he says that the καὶ is necessary to the sense, he writes inconsiderately; for in admitting the *Asyndeton any where*, he admits that it may be left to be implied. In the parallel passage of Matthew, indeed, the καὶ is found in perhaps all the MSS. But there the order of the words is different, and it could scarcely be dispensed with.

— τῶν τοιούτων, &c.] Render, “for to them belongeth,” &c.

15. [Comp. supra ix. 36.]

17. ἐκπορευομένου — ὁδόν] “as he was departing (from thence) on his way.”

18. [Comp. Exod. xx. 13. xxi. 12. Deut. v. 17. Rom. xiii. 9.]

19. μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς.] Many Commentators are of opinion that ἀποστερεῖν is used in *Scripture* in a very extensive sense, so as to denote committing injustice of any kind; and to be nearly synonymous with ἀδικεῖν. But ἀποστερεῖν has properly a more *special* signification, denoting to deprive any one of his property, whether by actual

	MT.	LU.
20 ρα. Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτῷ. Διδάσκαλε, ταῦτα πάντα ἐφυλα-	19.	18.
21 ξάμην ἐκ νεότητός μου. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἐμβλέψας αὐτῷ ἤγάπησεν αὐτόν,	19	21
καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Ἐν σοὶ ὕστερεῖ ὕπαγε, ὅσα ἔχεις πώλησον, καὶ δός	21	22
[τοῖς] πτωχοῖς, καὶ ἔξεις θησαυρὸν ἐν οὐρανῷ· καὶ δεῦρο ἀκολούθει		
22 μοι ἄρας τὸν σταυρὸν. Ὁ δὲ στυγνάζων ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ, ἀπῆλθε λυπού-	22	23
23 μενος· ἦν γὰρ ἔχων κτήματα πολλά. Καὶ περιβλεψάμενος ὁ Ἰησοῦς,	23	24
λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ· Πῶς δυσκόλως οἱ τὰ χρήματα ἔχοντες εἰς		
24 τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰσελεύσονται. Οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ ἐθαμβοῦντο		
ἐπὶ τοῖς λόγοις αὐτοῦ. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς πάλιν ἀποκριθεὶς λέγει αὐτοῖς·		
Τέκνα, πῶς δύσκολόν ἐστι τοὺς πεποιθότας ἐπὶ τοῖς χρήμασιν εἰς τὴν		
25 βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν! Ἐυκοπιώτερόν ἐστι κήμηλον διὰ τῆς	24	25
τρυμαλιῆς [τῆς] φαβίδος † διελθεῖν, ἢ πλούσιον εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ		
26 Θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν! Οἱ δὲ περισσῶς ἐξεπλήσσοντο, λέγοντες πρὸς ἑαυ-	25	26
27 τούς· Καὶ τίς δύναται σωθῆναι; Ἐμβλέψας δὲ αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέ-	26	27
γει· Παρὰ ἀνθρώποις ἀδύνατον, ἀλλ' οὐ παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ· πάν-		
28 τα γὰρ δυνατὰ ἐστί παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ. Καὶ ἤρξατο ὁ Πέτρος λέγειν αὐτῷ·	27	28

and open robbery, or by secret fraud, as denying a debt, cheating in the quality of goods sold, or overreaching in the bargain. Be that as it may, the words have not (as Wets. and others imagine) reference to the *ninth* and *tenth* Commandments, but, as Heupel observes, to the *seventh*, *μη κλέψης*, on which this is a sort of paraphrase, to show the extent of the injunction. Indeed, the Jews were accustomed, in ordinary discourse, and even in writing, to recite the precepts of the Decalogue not in the very words in which they are expressed, but in other equivalent terms.

21. *ἠγάπησεν αὐτόν.*] On the sense of *ἠγάπ.* there is much difference of opinion; which has been occasioned by the fact, that the young man did not follow our Lord's admonition. Some would adopt a sense of *ἀγαπήν* by which it denotes to be content with. But the svntax is then very different. And it is used of *things*, not *persons*, and is construed either with a Dative of object, or with a Participle, or an Infinitive. The other interpretations are divided into such as respect good will generally, "he was kindly disposed towards him," or (as that has been by many supposed not sufficient) such as imply good will by some outward gesture or action. H. Steph. and Lightf. interpret, "he kissed him;" while Casaub., Grot., Wets., Heum., Kuin., and Fritz. interpret "he accosted him kindly;" both significations alike destitute of authority. The interpretation, "he felt kindly disposed towards him." (which is supported by the ancient Commentators.) is the most natural and probable.

21. *τοῖς πτωχοῖς.*] The Article is not found in very many MSS. and the Edit. Princ., and is cancelled by Beng., Matth., Fritz., and Scholz. The chief reason, it should seem, why these Editors have cancelled the *τοῖς*, is because it is not found in the parallel passages of Matthew and Luke. But *granting*, as Fritz. alleges, that "such expressions admit of the Article, and also may dispense with it;" yet is not a writer to be allowed to choose which he will? And as Mark uses the Article in precisely the same case at ch. xiv. 5 & 7, it is surely proper to leave it to him here. And certainly we may far better account for the omission than the insertion of it here; namely,

from a wish to make the phrase tally with Matthew and Luke. On this verse compare Matt. vi. 19. Luke xii. 33. xvi. 9.

22. *στυγνάζων.*] This may be referred either to the *countenance* or to the *mind*. In the former case it will denote that *contraction of the countenance*, which is produced by hearing any thing which displeases one: in the latter, it will signify *perturbation*. Thus, however, the term would be nearly the same with *λυπούμενος* just after. The former interpretation, therefore, is preferable; especially as it is confirmed by a passage of Nicetas ap. Schleus. Lex. *οἱ δὲ κατηφώντες καὶ στυγνάζοντες ἐβίωσκον.*

24. [*Comp.* Job xxxi. 24. Ps. lxii. 10. I Tim. vi. 17.]

25. *τῆς τρυμαλιῆς τῆς φαβίδος.*] The Articles are omitted in several MSS. most of them ancient. Middlet. thinks them spurious; and Fritz. cancels them. Certainly, propriety requires that *φαβίς*, as it denotes a needle in general, should not have the Article. And then propriety alike requires that if that be omitted, the *other* too shall be left out. Since, however, the latter propriety is of too refined a kind to be likely to have been known to the Evangelist; and as the idiom is found in our own language, it may be safer to retain the Article in question. *Τρυμαλιὰ* is from *τρυβί, tero*, and is of the same form with *ἀμαλιά*.

— *διελθεῖν.*] Very many MSS., and some Fathers, have *εἰσελθεῖν*, which is adopted by Wets. and Matth. But it would require much *stronger* evidence to establish so glaring a violation of propriety; for which Schulz. in vain alleges Matt. vii. 13, because (as Fritz. truly observes) at *εἰσελθετε διὰ τῆς στενῆς πύλης* should be supplied *εἰς τὴν ζωὴν*.

26. *καὶ τίς δύναται σωθῆ.*] As Matt. xix. 25. has *τίς ἄρα*, this has by many been regarded as a Hebraism. But *καὶ* thus prefixed to *τίς* is frequent in the Classical writers, as appears from the examples adduced by Bos, Elsn., and Wets. The *καὶ* in this use may be rendered "aye (but)." There is perhaps an ellipse of *ἄρα*. By the *τίς* must be understood *πλοῖσιος*.

27. [*Comp.* Job xlii. 2. Jer. xxxii. 17. Luke i. 37.]

28. *καὶ ἤρξατο.*] The *καὶ* is not found in very

MT. LU.

19. 18. ἰδοῦ, ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν πάντα, καὶ ἠκολουθήσαμεν σοι. † Ἀποκριθεὶς 29
 28
 29 29 δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν· οὐδεὶς ἐστίν, ὃς ἀφήκεν οἰκίαν,
 ἢ ἀδελφούς, ἢ ἀδελφάς, ἢ πατέρα, ἢ μητέρα, ἢ γυναῖκα, ἢ τέκνα, ἢ ἀγροῦς,
 30 ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, εἰ μὴ λάβῃ ἑκατονταπλασίονα νῦν ἐν τῷ 30
 καιρῷ τούτῳ, (οἰκίας καὶ ἀδελφούς καὶ ἀδελφάς καὶ μητέρας καὶ τέκνα

many MSS., and is cancelled by Griesb., Vat., and Scholz. But I think, wholly without reason. For it is obvious, and acknowledged by Fritz., that some particle is necessary; and he edits ἤρξατο δὲ. But for that reading there is not sufficient authority; and besides, there would thus appear no reason for the omission of the particle. Whereas the καὶ would be likely to be omitted, as being used in a manner never found in the Classical writers. At ver. 29, the true reading, I suspect, is καὶ ἄπ. δ I., as found in many MSS. and early Editions, and edited by Fritz. and Scholz. Those many MSS. which have neither particle nor the other, are in favour of this reading. For the Critics, it seems, were content with expelling the καὶ, and introduced nothing in its stead.

29. ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ καὶ τ. εὐαγγ.] Very many MSS. have ἕνεκα also before τοῦ εὐαγγ., which is edited by Griesb., Matth., and Scholz. I have not ventured to follow their example: yet not because I think (as does Fritz.) that the word is better away; but because it appears to me. (especially considering the reading of the parallel passage) that it was more likely to have been inserted than omitted. Besides, the very same expression occurs supra viii. 35, with only one ἕνεκα.

29, 30. There are marvellous diversities of reading in these verses (especially the latter), and no slight difficulties have been started as to the interpretation of the words as they now stand. Two scruples have been raised, one as to the promise itself; the other as to its limitation, μετὰ διωγμῶν. With respect to the former, Campb. objects that in ver. 30. the words οἰκίας — ἀγροῦς seem to signify that the compensation shall be in kind, in this life; which, he says, could only mislead instead of enlightening. Besides, that some things are mentioned at ver. 29. of which a man can have but one, as father and mother. And yet at ver. 30. we have the plural — mothers. Wife is mentioned at ver. 29. but not wives at ver. 30. According to rule (he adds) if one was repeated, all should have been repeated. And the construction required the plural number in all. In short, it is plain that he regarded the passage (with Pearce, Owen, and others) as an interpolation. But the consent of all the MSS. and early Versions utterly discountenances such a notion. And as to the objections of Campb., though they have been adopted and strenuously urged by Fritz., they have, in reality, little or no force. We may safely maintain (with several Commentators, ancient and modern) that the promise even as regarded this world was (considering that ἑκατονταπλασίονα must be taken for πολλαπλασίονα, which indeed is read in the parallel passage of Luke, and in some MSS. of that of Matthew) fulfilled literally in the Apostolic age. For the disciples, as they travelled about, or were driven by persecutions, experienced every where the most unbounded hospitality from their brethren; inasmuch that the advantages they had lost might be said to be amply made up to them. There is even less force in the other objections. The

strict regularity, which Campb. and Fritz. desiderate, is by no means a characteristic of the Scriptural writers, (indeed of few ancient ones) and least of all of St. Mark. The irregularities they complain of are indeed, all of them, removed in one or other of the MSS., and those alterations are all received into the text by Fritz., though in defiance of every principle of true Criticism. As to the plural number being required throughout ver. 30, it surely makes no great difference whether the plural or the singular be adopted. We might, indeed, say that the singular in things of which men have but one should have been used. Hence I have sometimes thought that μητέρα should be read, from several MSS. The plural, however, may be tolerated, as referring to Christians at large. For though the declaration is commenced with οὐδεὶς, yet that is evidently intended of *many*. And though grammatical propriety confined the Evangelist to the use of the singular as to the things just adverted to in the first verse, yet in the second and more minute enumeration he abandons it. Then again, though three particulars are omitted in ver. 30, which have place in ver. 29, (i. e. πατέρας, μητέρας and γυναῖκας), yet μητέρας might, in some measure, include the other; or, as there is very good authority for it in MSS. and Versions, and strong support in a well known critical principle, we might be justified in introducing καὶ πατέρας into the text after καὶ μητέρας. As to the omission of γυναῖκας, it is not difficult to account for that; for not only delicacy forbade the introduction of this particular, but, in reality, it was a kind of loss which, in the nature of things, did not admit of being made up.

As to the spiritual recompense in this life, mentioned by Campb. (and anxiously sought for by many pious Commentators), "the joy and peace in believing," which would more than counterbalance their losses, that, it should seem, was not here adverted to by our Lord. And though it may seem but little that temporal remuneration should be mentioned to the Apostles, yet that might be especially meant for the disciples at large. Thus Chrysostom in his Homily on Matt. xix. 27, & seqq. p. 405. 40. acutely and truly observes: "ἵνα γὰρ μὴ τινες, ἀκούσαντες τὸ, ἕμεῖς [ὡς] ἐξέλεστον τῶν μαθητῶν εἶναι τούτο νομισοῦσι, (λέγω δὲ τὸ τῶν μεγίστων καὶ πρωτίων ἐν τοῖς μέλλουσιν ἀπολαύειν) ἐξέτινε τὸν λόγον, καὶ ἠπλώσε τὴν ὑπόθεσιν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἅπασαν· καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν παρόντων καὶ τὰ μέλλοντα πιστοῦται. In the words ἐξέτινε — τὴν γῆν ἅπασαν there is a reference to ver. 31, πολλοὶ — πρώτοι, which Chrys. rightly said, are here applied by Christ, with reference to worldly condition, as at ix. 35.; the sense being, that many of those who are accounted first in this world, will be found last in the world to come. The αἰ before is absent from many MSS., and is cancelled by Griesb., Matth., and Fritz., perhaps rightly. See Bp. Middleton on Matt. xix. 30.

Proceed we to consider the other difficulty viz. that found in the qualifying words, μετὰ διωγμῶν; which, taken in conjunction with a promise of

καὶ ἀγρούς, μετὰ διωγμῶν) καὶ ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τῷ ἐρχομένῳ ζῶν αἰώνιον. MT. LU. 19. 18.
 31 Πολλοὶ δὲ ἔσονται πρόωτοι, ἔσχατοι * καὶ [οἱ] ἔσχατοι, πρόωτοι. 30
 32 Ἦσαν δὲ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, ἀναβαίνοντες εἰς Ἱερουσόλυμα καὶ ἦν προά- 20.
 γων αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς * καὶ ἐθαμβοῦντο, καὶ ἀκολουθοῦντες ἐφοβοῦντο. 17
 Καὶ παραλαβὼν πάλιν τοὺς δώδεκα, ἤρξατο αὐτοῖς λέγειν τὰ μέλλοντα 31
 33 αὐτῷ συμβαίνειν * Ὅτι, ἰδοὺ ἀναβαίνομεν εἰς Ἱερουσόλυμα, καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ 34
 ἀνθρώπου παραδοθήσεται τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσι καὶ [τοῖς] γραμματεῦσι * 32
 καὶ κατακρινούσιν αὐτὸν θανάτῳ, καὶ παραδώσουσιν αὐτὸν τοῖς ἔθνεσι, 19
 34 καὶ ἐμπαΐξουσιν αὐτῷ, καὶ μαστιγώσουσιν αὐτὸν, καὶ ἐμπτύσουσιν αὐ- 33
 τῷ, καὶ ἀποκτενοῦσιν αὐτόν * καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστήσεται.
 35 Καὶ προσπορεύονται αὐτῷ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάννης οἱ υἱοὶ Ζεβεδαίου 20
 λέγοντες * Διδάσκαλε, θέλομεν ἵνα ὁ ἐν αἰτήσωμεν, ποιήσης ἡμῖν.
 36 Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς * Τί θέλετε ποιῆσαι με ὑμῖν ; Οἱ δὲ εἶπον αὐτῷ * 21
 37 Δὸς ἡμῖν, ἵνα εἷς ἐκ δεξιῶν σου καὶ εἷς ἐξ ἐνωτέρων σου καθίσωμεν 22
 38 ἐν τῇ δόξῃ σου. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς * Οὐκ οἴδατε τί αἰτεῖσθε * 22
 δύνασθε πιεῖν τὸ ποτήριον ὃ ἐγὼ πίνω, καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα ὃ ἐγὼ βα- 23
 39 πτίζομαι, βαπτισθῆναι ; Οἱ δὲ εἶπον αὐτῷ * Δυνάμεθα. ὁ δὲ Ἰη- 23
 σοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς * Τὸ μὲν ποτήριον, ὃ ἐγὼ πίνω, πῖεσθε * καὶ τὸ 23
 40 βάπτισμα, ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι, βαπτισθήσεσθε * τὸ δὲ καθίσαι ἐκ δε- 24
 41 ξιῶν μου καὶ ἐξ ἐνωτέρων μου οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν δοῦναι, ἀλλ' οἷς ἤτοι- 24
 42 καὶ Ἰωάννου. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς προσκαλεσάμενος αὐτοὺς, λέγει αὐτοῖς * 25
 Οἴδατε ὅτι οἱ δοκοῦντες ἄρχειν τῶν ἐθνῶν, κατακρυεύουσιν αὐτῶν *

things merely temporal, has been thought by many to have been *illusory*; inasmuch that they have sought either to alter the reading *διωγμῶν* into *διωγμῶν*, or to take *μετὰ* in the sense *after*. But there is no authority for either change. The ancient Commentators, and several modern ones (as Beza, Zeger, Heupel, Wolf, Winer, and Fritz.), rightly explain the sense to be "under persecutions," i. e. "even amidst persecutions;" for where tribulation abounded, consolation should much more abound. Upon the whole, this remarkable passage may be regarded as one of those sayings of our Lord which were at once *declarations* and *prophecies*. And the fulfilment of it in the latter view is strikingly manifest, both from Scripture and from the Ecclesiastical History of the first Century.

31. [*Comp. Matt. xx. 16. Luke xiii. 30.*] 32. *ἐθαμβοῦντο*, &c.] On the *origin* and *nature* of these feelings of the Apostles, the Commentators are divided in opinion. Some, as Heum., Rosenm., and Kuin., attribute them to the prediction, which Christ now delivers of his death and passion. So Euthym., Beza, and others, suppose that the cause of their *fear* was our Lord's going to Jerusalem, notwithstanding the Sanhedrim were seeking to apprehend him; and dread of the evils which he had said at ver. 31. & ix. 31. impended over him. Since, however, they did not understand their Lord on that occasion, and were probably not then aware of the designs of the Sanhedrim, this view cannot well be admitted. Fritz. thinks it was a sort of involuntary presentiment of evil. This is, I conceive, the *truth*; but not the *whole truth*; because it accounts for *ἀκο-*

λουθῶντες ἐφοβοῦντο, but not for *ἐθαμβοῦντο*. That must be referred (as I suggested in Recens. Synop.) to a certain *undefinable awe*, with which the Apostles, since the Transfiguration, had begun more and more to contemplate their Lord; and which, besides his many miracles, the increasing air of majesty and authority which he more and more assumed, as his hour drew so near, was well calculated to inspire.

On the remaining part of this verse, compare supra viii. 31. *Matt. xvi. 21.*

38. [*Comp. Luke xii. 50.*]

40. *ἐξ ἐνωτέρων μου*.] *Μου* is omitted in many MSS. and Versions, and is cancelled by Matth., Griesb., Vat., and Scholz; but is retained by Tittm. and Fritz.: rightly, I think; for not only external, but *internal* evidence is quite in favour of the word, which, it is more probable, was cancelled by the fastidious Alexandrian critics, to remove tautology, than added by the *librarii* of later times. It may, indeed, be thought to have been introduced from Matthew. But let us remember *why* the *σοῦ* was thrown out at *Matt. xx. 22.*, and *by whom restored*; by those very Editors who here cancel the *μου*, merely on *surmise*. On this verse *comp. Matt. xxv. 34.*

42. *οἱ δοκοῦντες ἄρχειν*] The old Commentators regard the participle as *redundant*. And to this opinion the most recent English Expositors cling, adducing from them a cloud of examples, most of them not to the purpose. I have myself always objected to the unnecessary introduction of the above figure, whether in the Scriptural or the Classical writers; which view I find supported by the authority of Fritz., who pronounces that

MT. LU.

20. 18. καὶ οἱ μεγάλοι αὐτῶν κατεξουσιάζουσιν αὐτῶν. Οὐχ οὕτω δὲ ἔσται ἐν 43
 26 ὑμῖν· ἀλλ' ὅς ἐὰν θέλῃ γενέσθαι μέγας ἐν ὑμῖν, ἔσται διάκονος ὑμῶν·
 27 καὶ ὅς ἐὰν θέλῃ ὑμῶν γενέσθαι πρῶτος, ἔσται πάντων δούλος. Καὶ 44
 28 γὰρ ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἤλθε διακορηθῆναι, ἀλλὰ διακορῆσαι, 45
 καὶ δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀπὸ πολλῶν.
 29 35 Καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς Ἱεριχὼ· καὶ ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ Ἱεριχῶ, καὶ 46
 30 τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὄχλου ἱκανοῦ, υἱὸς Τιμαίου, Βαρτίμαιος ὁ
 36 τυφλός, ἐκάθητο παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν προσαιτῶν. Καὶ ἀκούσας ὅτι Ἰησοῦς 47
 37 ὁ Ναζωραῖός ἐστιν, ἤρξατο κράζειν καὶ λέγειν· Ὁ υἱὸς Δαυὶδ Ἰησοῦ,
 38
 31 39 ἐλέησόν με! Καὶ ἐπειτῶν αὐτῷ πολλοὶ, ἵνα σιωπήσῃ· ὁ δὲ πολλῶ 48
 μᾶλλον ἔκραζεν· Τίε Δαυὶδ, ἐλέησόν με! Καὶ στῆς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν 49
 32 40 αὐτὸν φωνηθῆναι· καὶ φωνοῦσι τὸν τυφλόν, λέγοντες αὐτῷ· Θάρσει,
 ἔγειραι· φωνεῖ σε. Ὁ δὲ ἀποβαλὼν τὸ ἱμάτιον αὐτοῦ, ἀναστὰς ἦλθε 50
 41 πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Τί θέλεις 51
 33 ποιήσω σοι; ὁ δὲ τυφλός εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Ῥαββουνι, ἵνα ἀναβλέψω.
 34 42 Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Ῥαγε· ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέ σε. καὶ 52
 43 εὐθέως ἀνέβλεψε, καὶ ἠκολούθει τῷ Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ.
 21. 19. XI. ΚΑΙ ὅτε ἐγγίζουσιν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, εἰς Βηθθαγῆ καὶ Βηθα- 1
 1 29 ρίαν πρὸς τὸ ὄρος τῶν Ἐλαιῶν, ἀποστέλλει δύο τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ,
 2 30 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· Ἐπάγετε εἰς τὴν κώμην τὴν κατέναντι ὑμῶν· καὶ 2
 εὐθέως εἰσπορευόμενοι εἰς αὐτὴν εἰρήσετε πῶλον δεδεμένον, ἐφ' ὃν
 3 31 οὐδέις ἀνθρώπων κειάθηκε· λύσαντες αὐτὸν ἀγάγετε. Καὶ εἴαν τις 3
 ὑμῖν εἴπῃ· Τί ποιεῖτε τοῦτο; εἶπατε, ὅτι ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ χρειᾶν ἔχει·

the word is *no where* pleonastic. That it is not so *here*, will appear from the numerous examples which I have adduced from the Classical writers in Recens. Syn., which will confirm the rendering of Grot., “qui imperare censentur;” or that of Fritz., “qui sibi imperare videntur.” [Comp. Luke xxii. 25.]

—οἱ μεγάλοι αὐτῶν] The sense is, “the great ones (magnates) among them.” Fritz. calls this a *mira dictio*. He might better have termed it *dictio popularis*. Κατεξουσιάζουσιν, i. e. as Casaub. renders, *imperium in eorum nomine exercent*.

44. [Comp. supra ix. 35. 1 Pet. v. 3.]

45. [Comp. John xiii. 14. Phil. ii. 7. Eph. i. 7. Col. i. 14. 1 Tim. ii. 6.]

46. Βαρτίμαιος] Some take this for a *patronymic*, or *explication* of ὁ υἱὸς Τιμαίου. Others, with more reason, consider it as a *real name*, and think the person was called Βαρτίμαιος and was the son of Timæus. So Βαρθολομαῖος and Βαρησοῦς, and Thucyd. i. 29, Ἰσαρχίδας ὁ Ἰσάροχος. In such cases the *patronymic* has been converted into a regular appellative. There is some resemblance to those names which have the *form* only, without the *signification*; on which see my Note on Thucyd. i. 1.

—προσαιτῶν] The *προς* is not (as some imagine) without force; but it cannot signify, as some suppose, *besides*, but rather denotes to or for, render “asking for himself.” So in πρόσσδος and προσκαλεῖσθαι. Supply τὸ χρῆμα.

48. πολλοί] Not “the multitude,” for that sense would require οἱ πολλοί; but *many*, namely, of those who accompanied Jesus.

49. φωνηθῆναι] “to be called or summoned.”

50. ἀποβαλὼν τὸ ἱμάτιον] Namely, through joy, and in order to reach Jesus the sooner. A *graphic trait*, evidently proceeding from an eye-witness, like that in John vi. 10. “Now there was much grass in the place.”

51. Ῥαββουνι] “great master.” The reading *ουνι* for *ου* is found in most of the best MSS., and is edited by Matth., Griesb., Vat., Tittm., Fritz., and Scholz; with reason. The *ι* is, as Fritz. says, *paragogic*, and the whole termination is, the Talmudists tell us, *augmentative*. See John xx. 16. and Lampe in loc.

XI. 1. καὶ ὅτε ἐγγίζουσιν—Ἐλαιῶν] There is here much diversity of reading, owing to the ancient Critics stumbling at the close brevity and roughness of the phraseology, and, as usual, taking the liberty to expand and polish. The *sense*, indeed, is what those MSS. represent: namely, “and when they had approached to Jerusalem, and were come to the [vicinity of] Bethphage and Bethany [even] to the Mount of Olives.” But we are not warranted in *receiving* those readings, as Fritz. has done.

2. κειάθηκε] “has sate.” Dodd. and others have well remarked here on our Lord’s prescience even as the most minute and fortuitous particulars, viz. 1. Ye shall find a colt; 2. on which no man ever sat; 3. bound with his mother; 4. where two ways meet; 5. as ye enter into the village; 6. the owners of which will at first seem unwilling that you should unbind him; 7. but when they hear that I have need of him, they will let him go. “Many such things (adds Dodd.) occurred a little before his death. Com-

	MT.	LU.
4 καὶ εὐθὺς αὐτὸν ἀποστελεῖ ὧδε. Ἀπῆλθον δέ, καὶ εὗρον [τὸν] πῶ- λον δεδεμένον πρὸς τὴν θύραν ἔξω ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀμφόδου· καὶ λύουσιν	21.	19.
5 αὐτόν. Καί τινες τῶν ἐκεῖ ἐστηκότων ἔλεγον αὐτοῖς· Τί ποιεῖτε λύ- 6 οντες τὸν πῶλον; Οἱ δὲ εἶπον αὐτοῖς καθὼς ἐνετείλατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς·	6	32
7 καὶ ἀφῆκαν αὐτούς. Καὶ ἤγαγον τὸν πῶλον πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν, καὶ	7	35
8 ἐπέβαλον αὐτῷ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν· καὶ ἐκάθισεν ἐπ' αὐτῷ. Πολλοὶ	9	36
9 δὲ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν ἴσθρυσαν εἰς τὴν ὁδόν· ἄλλοι δὲ στοιβάδας ἔκο- 10 πτοῦν ἐκ τῶν δένδρων, καὶ ἐστράννουν εἰς τὴν ὁδόν. Καὶ οἱ προάγοντες καὶ οἱ ἀκολουθοῦντες ἔκραζον, λέγοντες· Ῥουανὰ! εὐλογημένος ὁ	9	37
11 ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου! εὐλογημένη ἡ ἐρχομένη βασιλεία [ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου,] τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Δαυὶδ· Ῥουανὰ ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις!	9	38
12 Καὶ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς Ἱερουσόλυμα ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ εἰς τὸ ἱερόν· καὶ περιβλε- ψάμενος πάντα, ὀφίας ἤδη οὔσης τῆς ὥρας, ἔξηλθεν εἰς Βηθανίαν	17	
μετὰ τῶν δώδεκα.		
13 Καὶ τῇ ἐπαύριον, ἐξεληθόντων αὐτῶν ἀπὸ Βηθανίας, ἐπεινάσε. Καὶ	18	
14 ἰδὼν συκῆν μακρόθεν ἔχουσαν φύλλα, ἦλθεν, εἰ ἄρα εὐρήσει τι ἐν	19	
αὐτῇ· καὶ ἐλθὼν ἐπ' αὐτήν, οὐδὲν εὗρεν εἰ μὴ φύλλα. οὐ γὰρ ἦν		
14 καιρὸς σύκων. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς [ὁ Ἰησοῦς] εἶπεν αὐτῇ· Μηκέτι ἐκ		

pare Matth. xxvi. 31—35. Mark xiv. 15 & 16. Luke xxii. 11—13."

3. ἀποστελεῖ] Very many MSS., several Versions, and the Edit. Princ. have ἀποστέλλει, which is adopted by Wets., Matth., Griesb., Vat., Tittm., and Scholz. But Fritz., more judiciously, retains the common reading; and gives good reasons for so doing. As for the authority of MSS., it is of little avail in such minutiae as λ and λλ.

4. ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀμφόδου] This is wrongly rendered by some "in bivio." The word properly denotes a passage, but in the Sept. and N. T. signifies a street, Heb. יָרֵךְ as here.

7. [Comp. John xii. 14. 2 Kings ix. 13.]

8. στοιβάδας] The word (which is in the Classical authors written στιβᾶς) denotes properly something strewed on the ground; whether straw, hay, stubble, rushes, reeds, leaves, or the twigs of trees; of all which examples may be seen in Wets. Here, however, from a comparison with Matth. xxi. 8., it appears to denote *frondes*, the leafy twigs of trees, such as were used for low couches.

9. [Comp. Ps. cxviii. 25, 26. Matt. xxiii. 39.]

10. The words ἐν ὀν. Κυρ. are omitted in some MSS., and cancelled by Griesb., Vater, Fritz., and Scholz, but without any sufficient reason.

11. [Comp. John ii. 14.]

13. οὐ γὰρ ἦν καιρὸς σύκων] There are few passages that have occasioned greater perplexity than the present. The difficulty of reconciling the words with our Lord's *expectation* of finding figs on the tree, or with his subsequent cursing of it, is obvious. Some have given up the solution in despair; others have suspected the passage to be corrupt, and propounded various conjectures; all of them inadmissible, since the MSS. discountenance any alteration, still more any cancelling of words. The present reading must be retained, and the difficulty be removed by *interpretation*.

Almost all the methods, however, which have been propounded, are either founded on unauthorized senses of *καιρὸς*, or are inapposite. One thing seems clear,—that we must (with Kidder, Markl., Pearce, Campb., Wolf, Doddr., Wets., Wakef., Rosenm., Kuin., Schleusn., and Wahl) take *καιρὸς σύκων* as corresponding to the *καιρὸς τῶν καρπῶν* at Matt. xxi. 34., and the *καιρὸς τοῦ θερισμοῦ* at Matt. xiii. 30., as also the *ὁ τῶν σύκων καιρὸς* at Athenæus, p. 65. And this sense is very rational; for what (as Pearce and Campb. say) can the *time* of any fruit be, but the time of its maturity and *gathering*? But the declaration contained in *οὐ γὰρ ἦν καιρὸς σύκων* cannot (as the order of the words would induce us to suppose) be meant to offer the *reason why* there was nothing but leaves on the tree; for the fig is of that class of trees wherein the fruit is developed *before* the leaves appear. Now some would place the words *καὶ ἐλθὼν—φύλλα* in a parenthesis; for which, however, there seems no place. Others suppose a *trajectio per synchysin* (as at xvi. 3 & 4. *Τίς ἀποκλιθεὶς ἡμῖν τὸν λίθον ἐκ τῆς θύρας τοῦ μνημείου; καὶ ἀναβλέψασαι θεωροῦσαι ὅτι ἀποκεκλισται ὁ λίθος· ἦν γὰρ μέγας σφόδρα.*) by which the words *οὐ γὰρ, &c.* though coming immediately after *καὶ ἐλθὼν, &c.* are to be referred to the more remote *ἦλθεν εἰ ἄρα εὐρήσει τι ἐν αὐτῇ*, thus: seeing a fig-tree afar off having leaves, he came, to see if haply he might find any fruit thereon; for fig-gathering was not yet come: and therefore, if the tree had produced any figs, some, however unripe, might be expected to be growing on it. But when he came to it, he found nothing but leaves; and thus, his disappointment could only have proceeded from the barrenness of the tree. Unripe figs, it has been observed, may be eaten for allaying hunger. And though this might seem early for figs, yet, in Judæa, the fig-tree bears twice in the year; the first crop being at the beginning of the summer. Not to say that a few forward and vigorous trees will ripen their fruit several weeks before the generality.

MT. LU.

21. 19. σοῦ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα † μηδεὶς καρπὸν φάγοι! καὶ ἤκουον οἱ μαθηταὶ
 12 45 αὐτοῦ. Καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα· καὶ εἰσελθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὸ 15
 ἱερόν, ἤρξατο ἐκβάλλειν τοὺς πωλοῦντας καὶ ἀγοράζοντας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ·
 καὶ τὰς τραπέζας τῶν κολλυβιστῶν καὶ τὰς καθέδρας τῶν πωλούντων
 τὰς περιστερὰς κατέστρεψε· καὶ οὐκ ἤφειεν ἵνα τις διενέγκῃ σκεῦος 16
 13 46 διὰ τοῦ ἱεροῦ. Καὶ ἐδίδασκε, λέγων αὐτοῖς· Οὐ γέγραπται, ὅτι ὁ 17
 οἶκος μου οἶκος προσευχῆς κληθήσεται πᾶσι τοῖς
 ἔθνεσιν; ὑμεῖς δὲ ἐποιήσατε αὐτὸν σπήλαιον ληστῶν. Καὶ ἤκουσαν 18
 47 οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ ἄρχιερεῖς, καὶ ἐζήτουν πῶς αὐτὸν ἀπολέσουσιν·
 48 ἐφοβοῦντο γὰρ αὐτὸν, ὅτι πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος ἐξεπλήσσετο ἐπὶ τῇ διδασκίῃ
 αὐτοῦ.

Καὶ ὅτε ὀψέ ἐγένετο, ἐξεπορεύετο ἔσω τῆς πόλεως. Καὶ πρῶτὸν παρα- 19
 πορευόμενοι, εἶδον τὴν συκῆν ἐξηραμμένην ἐκ ὀψίων. Καὶ ἀναμνη- 20
 σθεὶς ὁ Πέτρος λέγει αὐτῷ· Ῥαββί, ἴδε, ἡ συκῆ, ἣν κατηράσω, 21
 21 ἐξήρανται. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει αὐτοῖς· Ἔχετε πίστιν 22
 Θεοῦ. ἄμην γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι ὅς ἂν εἴπῃ τῷ ὄρει τοῦτο· Ἄρθητι, 23
 καὶ βλήθητι εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν· καὶ μὴ διακριθῆ ἔν τῃ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ,
 22 ἀλλὰ πιστεύσῃ, ὅτι ἃ λέγει γίνεται· ἔσται αὐτῷ ὃ ἐὰν εἴπῃ. Διὰ 24
 τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν· Πάντα ὅσα ἂν προσευχόμενοι αἰτεῖσθε, πιστεύετε
 ὅτι λαμβάνετε· καὶ ἔσται ὑμῖν. Καὶ ὅταν στήκητε προσευχόμενοι, 25
 ἀφίετε εἴ τι ἔχετε κατὰ τινος· ἵνα καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐ-
 ρανοῖς ἀφῆ ὑμῖν τὰ παραπτώματα ὑμῶν· εἰ δὲ ὑμεῖς οὐκ ἀφίετε, 26
 20. οὐδὲ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς ἀφήσει τὰ παραπτώματα ὑμῶν.

23 1 ΚΑΙ ἔρχονται πάλιν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα· καὶ, ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ περιπατοῦν- 27
 τος αὐτοῦ, ἔρχονται πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ ἄρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ
 2 οἱ προσδύτριοι, καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· Ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιεῖς; 28
 24 3 καὶ τίς σοι τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην ἔδωκεν, ἵνα ταῦτα ποιῆς; Ὁ δὲ 29

14. μηδὲς] This reading (for vulg. οὐδεὶς) is found in very many MSS., some Fathers, and several of the early Editions; and is received by Wets., Griesb., Matth., Fritz., Tittm., and Scholz. Strict grammatical propriety requires it, but that Mark so wrote is by no means certain.

15. ἤρξατο ἐκβάλλειν] This is not, as most Commentators imagine, for ἐξέβαλε; but the sense is, "he proceeded to cast out." [Comp. John ii. 14.]

16. διενέγκῃ σκεῦος] This is usually understood to mean any vessel, namely, devoted to profane uses, and by which any gain was made. But the word σκεῦος, which in the Sept. corresponds to the Heb. כֵּל, has, like that word, a considerable latitude of signification, and denotes, like the Latin *vas*, or *instrumentum*, a *utensil* (whether for sacred or profane use), or *piece of furniture*, or *dress*, and, in a general sense, an *article*, whether for use or traffic.

In doing this our Lord upheld the Jewish Canons (founded on Levit. xix. 30. and Deut. xii. 5.), which, as we find from the Rabbinical writers, define the reverence of the Temple (i. e. the outer Court) to mean, that none should go into it with his staff, shoes, or purse, or with dust upon his feet; and that none should make it a thoroughfare. The irregularities which our Lord

rebukes, had, it is supposed, originated in, or been increased by the proximity of the Castle of Antonia; to which there would be a constant resort of various persons, (so Joseph. B. J. i. 3. 5. *παρίοντα οὐὰ τοῦ ἱεροῦ*.) and that the Priests, having an interest in, connived at them.

17. [Comp. 1 Kings viii. 29. Is. lvi. 7. Jer. vii. 11.]

18. [Comp. John vii. 19.]
 22. ἔχετε πίστιν Θεοῦ] Some take this to mean, "have a strong faith;" by a common Hebraism, whereby the genitive of "God" subjoined to substantives, denotes greatness or excellence. But there is no reason to abandon the common interpretation, by which Θεοῦ is a Genitive of *object* or *end*, as in Rom. iii. 22. Gal. ii. 20. iii. 22., where it is also found with *πίστις*. Of course it is implied, that the faith which is reposed in God shall be firm and undoubting, as the words following suggest and illustrate.

23. [Comp. Matt. xvii. 20. Luke xvii. 6.]

24. ἔσται ὑμῖν] This, like *ἔσται αὐτῷ* just before, is a Dative of *possession*, "shall be yours." [Comp. Matt. vii. 7. Luke xi. 9. John xiv. 13. James i. 5. 6. 1 John iii. 22. v. 14.]

25. [Comp. Matt. vi. 14. Eph. iv. 32. Col. iii. 13. Eccl. xxviii. 2.]

28. [Comp. Exod. ii. 14. Acts iv. 7. vii. 27.]

	MT.	L.U.
Ἰησοῦς ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Ὑπερωτήσω ὑμᾶς καὶ γὰρ ἓνα λόγον,	21.	20.
30 καὶ ἀποκριθῆτέ μοι· καὶ ἐρῶ ὑμῖν ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιῶ. Τὸ	25	4
βάπτισμα Ἰωάννου ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἢ, ἢ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων; ἀποκριθῆτέ μοι.		
31 Καὶ ἐλογίζοντο πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς, λέγοντες· Ἐὰν εἴπωμεν· Ἐξ οὐρανοῦ,	5	
32 ἐρεῖ· Διὰ τί οὖν οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε αὐτῷ; ἀλλ' ἐὰν εἴπωμεν· Ἐξ ἀν-	26	6
θρώπων, ἐφοβοῦντο τὸν λαόν· ἅπαντες γὰρ εἶχον τὸν Ἰωάννην ὅτι		
33 ὄντως προφήτης ἦν. Καὶ ἀποκριθέντες λέγουσι τῷ Ἰησοῦ· Οὐκ οἶ-	27	7
δαμεν. Καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀποκριθεὶς λέγει αὐτοῖς· Οὐδὲ ἐγὼ λέγω ὑμῖν	8	
ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιῶ.		
1 XII. ΚΑΙ ἤρξατο αὐτοῖς ἐν παραβολαῖς λέγειν· Ἀμπελῶνα ἐφύ-	33	9
τευσεν ἄνθρωπος, καὶ περιέθηκε σφαγμὸν, καὶ ὄρυξεν ὑπολήμιον, καὶ		
2 ὠκοδόμησε πύργον, καὶ ἐξέδοτο αὐτὸν γεωργοῖς, καὶ ἀπεδήμησε. Καὶ	34	10
ἀπέστειλε πρὸς τοὺς γεωργοὺς τῷ καιρῷ δοῦλον, ἵνα παρὰ τῶν γεωργῶν		
3 λάβῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ καρποῦ τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος. Οἱ δὲ λαβόντες αὐτὸν ἔδειραν,	35	
4 καὶ ἀπέστειλαν κενόν. Καὶ πάλιν ἀπέστειλε πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἄλλον δοῦ-	36	11
λον· κακῆϊνον λιθοβολήσαντες ἐκεφαλαίωσαν, καὶ ἀπέστειλαν ἡτιμωμέ-		
5 νον. Καὶ πάλιν ἄλλον ἀπέστειλε· κακῆϊνον ἀπέκτειναν. καὶ πολλοὺς		12
6 ἄλλους, τοὺς μὲν δέροντες, τοὺς δὲ ἀποκτείνοντες. Ἔτι οὖν ἓνα υἱὸν	37	13
ἔχων ἀγαπητὸν αὐτοῦ, ἀπέστειλε καὶ αὐτὸν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἔσχατον, λέ-		
7 γων· Ὅτι ἐντραπήσονται τὸν υἱόν μου. Ἐκείνοι δὲ οἱ γεωργοὶ εἶπον	38	14
πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς· Ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ κληρονόμος· δεῦτε ἀποκτείνωμεν		
8 αὐτὸν, καὶ ἡμῶν ἔσται ἡ κληρονομία. Καὶ λαβόντες αὐτὸν ἀπέκτειναν,	39	15
9 καὶ ἐξέβαλον ἔξω τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος. Τί οὖν ποιήσει ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπε-	40	
λῶνος; ἐλεύσεται καὶ ἀπολέσει τοὺς γεωργοὺς, καὶ δώσει τὸν ἀμπε-	41	16
10 λῶνα ἄλλοις. Οὐδὲ τὴν γραφὴν ταύτην ἀνέγνωτε; Αἶθρον ὃν	42	17
ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες, οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς		
11 κεφαλὴν γωνίας. παρὰ Κυρίου ἐγένετο αὕτη· καὶ		
12 ἔστι θυμαμιστὴ ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ημῶν. Καὶ ἐξήτουν αὐ-	46	19

32. ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἐφοβοῦντο τὸν λαόν.] The Scribes and the Commentators alike stumble at this construction, and endeavour to remove the irregularity by various methods, all of them fruitless and indeed unnecessary. For there is no need to supply, with some, τί γενήσεται ἡμῖν, or κακῶς ἔξει· There is, as Kypke and Fritz, say, an *anacoluthon*, (frequent in the best writers,) by which the Evangelist passes from the *very words* of the persons spoken of, to a *narration of what was said*; a sort of idiom similar to that by which there is a transition from the *oratio directa* to the *obliqua*. Thus ἐφοβοῦντο τὸν λαόν is for φοβοῦμεθα τὸν λαόν, which is found in Matt. xxi. 25. [Comp. supra v. 20; and Matt. xiv. 5.]

XII. 1. ἐν παραβολαῖς.] Beza rightly regards this as denoting the *genus* orationis, and as equivalent to παραβλήδην; for our Lord probably spoke several, though the Evangelist has recorded only one.

— ἀμπελῶνα ἐφύτ.] Comp. Ps. lxxx. 8. Is. v. 1. Jer. ii. 21. xii. 10.

4. λιθοβολήσαντες ἐκεφαλ.] On the sense of ἐκεφαλ. the Commentators are divided in opinion. But

almost all the interpretations proposed are objectionable; either as straining the sense by arbitrary ellipses, or as assigning significations which either are not inherent in the word, or are frigid and unsuitable. The true sense seems to be that expressed by the Syr., Vulg., and other Versions, and some modern Translations, (as E. V.,) and adopted by Beza, Pisc., Casaub., Heupel, Rossem., Schleus., Kuin., and Fritz.. “wounded him in the head.” Thus λιθοβολ. will denote the *manner* and *means*; i. e. “by pelting him with stones.” This interpretation is moreover confirmed by the *τραυματίζειν* of Luke. And although this signification of the verb is perhaps without example, yet it is strongly supported by the analogy of the language, as in the verbs *γναθόν*, *γνισόν*, *γαστρίζειν*, *μηρίζειν*. Ἡτιμωμένον, “ignominiously treated.” This form (*ἀτιμῶ* for *ἀτιμάζω*) is of very rare occurrence. But the Evangelist has many such peculiarities, derived, probably, from the language of common life.

7. [Comp. Ps. ii. 8. Matt. xxvi. 3. John xi. 53. Gen. xxxvii. 18.]

10. [Comp. Ps. cxviii. 22. Isaiah xxviii. 15. Acts iv. 11. Rom. ix. 33. 1 Pet. ii. 7.]

MT. LU.

22. 20. τὸν κρατῆσαι, καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν τὸν ὄχλον· ἔγνωσαν γὰρ ὅτι πρὸς αὐτούς τὴν παραβολὴν εἶπε· καὶ ἀφέντες αὐτὸν, ἀπῆλθον.
- 16 20 Καὶ ἀποστέλλουσι πρὸς αὐτὸν τινὰς τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ τῶν Ἰερο- 13
διανῶν, ἵνα αὐτὸν ἀγρεύσωσι λόγῳ. Οἱ δὲ ἐλθόντες λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· 14
21 Διδάσκαλε, οὐδαμὲν ὅτι ἀληθῆς εἶ, καὶ οὐ μέλει σοι περὶ οὐδενός· οὐ
γὰρ βλέπεις εἰς πρόσωπον ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλ' ἐπ' ἀληθείας τὴν ὁδὸν
17 22 τοῦ Θεοῦ διδάσκεις. ἔξεστι κῆρσον Καίσαρι δοῦναι ἢ οὐ; δῶμεν, ἢ
18 23 μὴ δῶμεν; Ὁ δὲ εἰδὼς αὐτῶν τὴν ὑπόκρισιν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Τί με 15
19 24 πειράζετε; φέρετέ μοι δηνῆριον, ἵνα ἴδω. Οἱ δὲ ἤνεγκαν. Καὶ λέγει 16
20 αὐτοῖς· Τίνος ἢ εἰκὼν αὕτη καὶ ἡ ἐπιγραφή; οἱ δὲ εἶπον αὐτῷ·
21 25 Καίσαρος. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Ἀπόδοτε τὰ Καί- 17
22 26 σαρος Καίσαρι, καὶ τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ τῷ Θεῷ. καὶ ἐθαύμασαν ἐπ' αὐτῷ.
23 27 Καὶ ἔρχονται Σαδδουκαῖοι πρὸς αὐτὸν, οἵτινες λέγουσιν ἀνάστασιν 18
24 28 μὴ εἶναι· καὶ ἐπηρώτησαν αὐτὸν, λέγοντες· Διδάσκαλε, Μωϋσῆς 19
ἔγραψεν ἡμῖν, ὅτι ἐάν τις ἀδελφὸς ἀποθάνῃ, καὶ καταλιπῇ γυναῖκα,
καὶ τέκνα μὴ ἄρῃ, ἵνα λίβῃ ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, καὶ
25 29 ἔξαναστήσῃ σπέρμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ. Ἐπίτῃ ἀδελφοὶ ἦσαν· καὶ ὁ 20
26 30 πρῶτος ἔλαβε γυναῖκα, καὶ ἀποθνήσκων οὐκ ἄφηκε σπέρμα· καὶ ὁ 21
δεύτερος ἔλαβεν αὐτήν, καὶ ἀπέθανε, καὶ οὐδὲ αὐτὸς ἄφηκε σπέρμα·
31 καὶ ὁ τρίτος ὡσαύτως. Καὶ ἔλαβον αὐτήν οἱ ἐπίτῃ, καὶ οὐκ ἄφηκαν 22
27 32 σπέρμα. Ἐσχάτη πάντων ἀπέθανε καὶ ἡ γυνή. Ἐν τῇ οὖν ἀναστασει, 23
28 33 ὅτιαν ἀναστῶσι, τίνος αὐτῶν ἔσται γυνή. οἱ γὰρ ἐπίτῃ ἔσχον αὐτήν
29 34 γυναῖκα. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Οὐ διὰ τοῦτο 24
30 35 πλανᾶσθε, μὴ εἰδότες τὰς γραφὰς μηδὲ τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ Θεοῦ; ὅτιαν 25
γὰρ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῶσιν, οὔτε γαμοῦσιν, οὔτε γαμίσκονται, ἀλλ' εἰδὼν
31 37 ὡς ἄγγελοι [οἱ] ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. Περὶ δὲ τῶν νεκρῶν, ὅτι ἐγείρονται, 26
32 ὁ Θεὸς λέγων· Ἐγὼ ὁ Θεὸς Ἀβραάμ, καὶ ὁ Θεὸς Ἰσαάκ,
38 καὶ ὁ Θεὸς Ἰακώβ; οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ Θεὸς νεκρῶν, ἀλλὰ Θεὸς ζών- 27
των· ὑμεῖς οὖν πολὺ πλανᾶσθε.

13. ἀγρεύσωσι.] This verb, like the Heb. **קָח**, properly signifies to *make spoil of, catch, take*, as said of beasts, birds, and fishes; but as that implies circumvention, so it metaphorically denotes to *lay snares for any one*, either by words or deeds, and may then be rendered to *ensnare*. **Matth.** uses the more special expression *παγιδέσωσι*.

17. [Comp. **Matth.** xvii. 25. **Rom.** xiii. 7.]

18. [Comp. **Acts** xxiii. 8.]

19. [Comp. **Deut.** xxv. 5, 6.]

—ἔγραψεν ἡμῖν.] **Γράφειν** is, both in the Classical and Scriptural writers, used as applied to *legislation*, and then denotes to *prescribe, enact*.

24. οὐ διὰ — Θεοῦ.] The interrogation here implies a strong affirmation.

26. ἐπὶ τῆς Βάτου.] This is usually taken as if there were a *transposition* for ὡς εἶπεν ἀντῷ ὁ Θεὸς ἐπὶ τῆς Βάτου. But **Wolf**, **Mich.**, **Rosenm.**, and **Kuin.**, more properly, adopt the view taken by **Bezua** and **Jablonski**; who regard this as a *form of citing Scripture* usual, in that age, with the

Jewish Doctors; namely, of referring to any particular part of Scripture by naming some remarkable circumstance therein narrated. Thus the sense will be, “in the section which treats of the burning bush.” So in **Rom.** xi. 2. *ἢ οὐκ οὐδαρὲ ἐν Ἠλίᾳ τί λέγει ἡ γραφή.* And, I would add, the ancient Critics cite various parts of **Homer** in the same manner; e. g. *ἐν Καταλόγῳ—ἐν Τύφῳ Πατρόκλου, ἐν Νεκρομαντείᾳ.* **Nay**, **Thucydides** i. 9. himself refers to **Homer** ἐν τοῦ σκῆπτρου τῇ Παραδόσει.

On the present verse compare **Exod.** iii. 6. **Acts** vii. 32. **Heb.** xi. 16.

With respect to the *Article*, it is not certain whether τῆς be the true reading, or τοῦ. But although τοῦ is found in very many of the best MSS., and is received by **Matth.**, **Griesb.**, and **Scholz**; yet, as the masculine is found only in the earlier Classical writers, not in the later ones, who use the feminine, I have, with **Fritz.**, retained the common reading.

27. Θεὸς ζώντων.] Many MSS., some Versions,

28 Καὶ προσελθὼν εἰς τῶν γραμματέων, ἀκούσας αὐτῶν συζητούντων, MT. LU. 22. 20.
 εἰδὼς ὅτι καλῶς αὐτοῖς ἀπεκρίθη, ἐπρωτότησεν αὐτόν· Ποία ἐστὶ 34
 29 πρώτη † πασῶν ἐντολῆ; ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ· Ὅτι πρώτη 35
 πασῶν τῶν ἐντολῶν· Ἄκουε, Ἰσραήλ· Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς 37
 30 ἡμῶν Κύριος εἰς ἐστὶ· καὶ ἀγαπήσεις Κύριον τὸν
 Θεόν σου ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου, καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς
 ψυχῆς σου, καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς διανοίας σου, καὶ ἐξ ὅλης 38
 31 τῆς ἰσχύος σου. Αὕτη πρώτη ἐντολή. Καὶ δευτέρα ὁμοία, † αὐ- 39
 τη· Ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν· μείζων 40
 32 τούτων ἄλλη ἐντολὴ οὐκ ἐστὶ. Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ γραμματεὺς· Κα-
 λῶς, διδάσκαλε, ἐπ' ἀληθείας εἶπας, ὅτι εἰς ἐστὶ· [Θεός,] καὶ οὐκ
 33 ἔστιν ἄλλος πλὴν αὐτοῦ. Καὶ τὸ ἀγαπῆν αὐτὸν ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας,
 καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς συνέσεως, καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς, καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς
 34 ἰσχύος, καὶ τὸ ἀγαπῆν τὸν πλησίον ὡς ἑαυτόν, πλεῖον ἐστὶ πάντων τῶν
 ἐλοκαυτωμάτων καὶ [τῶν] Θυσιῶν. Καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἰδὼν αὐτὸν ὅτι νου-
 νεχῶς ἀπεκρίθη, εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Οὐ μακρὰν εἶ ἀπὸ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ
 Θεοῦ. Καὶ οὐδεὶς οὐκέτι ἐτόλμα αὐτὸν ἐπερωτῆσαι.
 35 Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἔλεγε, διδάσκων ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ· Πῶς λέ- 42 41
 36 γουσιν οἱ γραμματεῖς, ὅτι ὁ Χριστὸς υἱὸς ἐστὶ Δαυὶδ; αὐτὸς γὰρ 43 42
 Δαυὶδ λέγει ἐν [τῷ] πνεύματι [τῷ] ἁγίῳ· Εἶπεν ὁ Κύριος τῷ 44

with Euthym. and Theophyl., omit Θεός; which is cancelled, perhaps without good reason, by Griesb., Fritz., and Scholz.

23. [Comp. Luke x. 25.]
 —πασῶν.] Very many MSS. have here, and just after, πάντων; which is preferred by Mill and Beng., and edited by Matth., Griesb., Tittm., Fritz., and Scholz. But with the idiom by which, in certain formulas, πάντων (in the neuter) is put in the sense all things (as Thucyd. iv. 52.) rare even in the Classical writers, it is unlikely that the Evangelist should have been acquainted; and I have seen no example where πάντων is thus brought into immediate concurrence with the Genit. feminine. That, indeed, is generally omitted. Perhaps, as the authority for the former πάντων is greatly superior to that for the latter, Mark may have written in this verse πρώτη πάντων ἐντολή; and in the next, πρώτη πασῶν τῶν ἐντολῶν, which the scribes would be likely to alter into πάντων, in order to adapt it to the former passage. Certainly πάντων cannot (as some imagine) be a masculine, and have reference to νόμων.

29. Κύριος — ἐστὶ.] See Deut. vi. 4. x. 12. Luke x. 27. Vitranga and Campb. take the words as forming two sentences. "The Lord (i. e. Jehovah) is our God: the Lord is one." But, though the verb substantive be admitted in the Hebrew, yet the idiom of that language will not permit the separation of the words יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ and יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵים; and the construction in Greek will as little permit of it.

31. ὁμοία αὐτῇ.] See Levit. xix. 13. Luke x. 27. Rom. xiii. 9. Gal. v. 14. James ii. 3. There is here a variation in reading; some MSS. and Versions, with Euthym. and Victor, having ὁμοία αὐτῇ; others, ὁμοία αὐτῆς; others, again, ὁμοία ταύτῃ. The first seems preferable, was approved by Mill and Heupel, and is edited by Fritz. But as the evidence for it is very slight, (for that of the Versions is scarcely to be admitted,) and as all

the varr. lectt. seem to be so many ways of removing the difficulty of the common reading, it ought not to have been received into the text; it was probably derived from St. Matthew. The sense is, "The second is like [unto it; i. e. in importance]; namely, this." Fritz., indeed, scruples at this absolute use of ὁμοίως; but it is found in the Classical writers; and though it may not occur elsewhere in the Scriptural ones, that might be by accident, especially as it does not often occur *any where*.

32. καλῶς — εἶπας.] Render, "Of a truth, Master, thou hast spoken well." Θεός before εἰς ἐστὶ is not found in a considerable portion of the best MSS., several Versions, and the Ed. Princ. It seems to be from the margin; and is rightly cancelled by Wets., Matth., Griesb., Tittm., Vat., Fritz., and Scholz. Πλὴν αὐτοῦ is omitted in some MSS., but is defended by many Classical passages cited by the Commentators; to which may be added one more apposite than any of them, from Aristoph. Plut. 106. οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν ἄλλος, πλὴν ἐγώ. See my Note on Thucyd. ii. 9. No. 5.

33. συνέσεως.] This is not, as Schleus. and Wahl imagine, for ψυχῆς, but for διανοίας.

34. ἰδὼν — ἀπεκρίθη.] Put by attraction for ἰδὼν ὅτι, &c., "perceiving that he had answered wisely." Νουνεχῶς is later Greek for the earlier νονεχόντως.

36. τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ.] See Ps. cx. 1. Acts ii. 34. 1 Cor. xv. 25. Heb. i. 13. The Articles are omitted in many of the best MSS., and several early Editions; and cancelled by Griesb., Matth., Tittm., Vat., Fritz., and Scholz; rightly, I think, because the omission is not only confirmed by the Var. lect. in Matt. xxii. 43, but by the context, which, says Middleton, requires the influence of the Holy Spirit.

I have, just before, with Fritz., edited λέγει, for εἶπεν; for though the direct evidence for it be but

MT. LU.

22. 20. κυριῶ μου· Κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, ἕως ἄν θῶ τοὺς
 45 44 ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου. Αὐτὸς οὖν Δαυὶδ 37
 λέγει αὐτὸν κύριον καὶ πόθεν υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἔστι; Καὶ ὁ πολὺς ὄχλος
 ἤκουεν αὐτοῦ ἡδέως.

46 Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ· Βλέπετε ἀπὸ τῶν γραμ- 38
 23. ματιῶν, τῶν θελότων ἐν στολαῖς περιπατεῖν, καὶ ἀσπασμούς ἐν ταῖς
 6 ἀγοραῖς, καὶ πρωτοκαθεδρίας ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς, καὶ πρωτοκλισίας ἐν 39
 7 τοῖς δαίνοις. Οἱ καιτεσθίοντες τὰς οἰκίας τῶν χρησῶν, καὶ προφάσει 40
 14 47

24. 21. μακρὰ προσεχόμενοι· οὗτοι λήψονται περισσώτερον κρίμα.

1 Καὶ καθίσας ὁ Ἰησοῦς κατέναντι τοῦ γαζοφυλακίου, ἐθρόρει πῶς ὁ 41
 ὄχλος βάλλει χαλκὸν εἰς τὸ γαζοφυλάκιον· καὶ πολλοὶ πλούσιοι ἔβαλλον
 2 πολλὰ. καὶ ἐλθούσα μία χήρα πτωχὴ ἔβαλε λεπτὰ δύο, ὃ ἔστι κοδράν- 42
 3 τής. Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ, λέγει αὐτοῖς· Ἀμὴν 43
 λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι ἡ χήρα αὕτη ἢ πτωχὴ πλείον πάντων βέβληκε τῶν βυ-
 4 λότων εἰς τὸ γαζοφυλάκιον. Πάντες γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ περισεύοντος αὐτοῖς 44
 ἔβαλον· αὕτη δέ, ἐκ τῆς ὑστερήσεως αὐτῆς, πάντα ὅσα εἶχεν ἔβαλεν,
 ὅλον τὸν βίον αὐτῆς.

1 5 XIII. ΚΑΙ ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ, λέγει αὐτῷ εἰς τῶν 1
 μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ· Διδάσκαλε, ἴδε, ποταποὶ λίθοι, καὶ ποταπαὶ οἰκο-
 2 6 δομαί! Καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Βλέπεις ταύτας τὰς 2

slight, yet the *indirect* is very strong; since (as Fritz. observes) it is found in the parallel passages of Mark and Luke, and is confirmed by the *λέγει*, at ver. 37. I would add, that the *λέγει* of very numerous MSS. and Editions for *εἶπεν*, in the next clause (which, therefore, Matth., Griesb., and Scholz receive into the text, though at variance with the Sept. and the parallel passages of Matthew and Luke) is, I doubt not, meant for *this*; a sort of mistake frequent in all authors. Indeed, propriety would seem to require that *λέγειν* should be used of a *man* (as David), and *εἰπῆν* of *God*, the latter being a more significant and authoritative term.

33. στολαῖς.] The *στολή* was an Oriental garment, descending to the ancles, and worn by persons of distinction, as Kings (1 Chron. xv. 27. John iii. 6), Priests (3 Esdr. i. 1. v. 81), and honourable persons; (see Xen. Cyr. i. 4. 26. ii. 4, 1. Luke xv. 22.) and were affected by the Jurists of the Pharisaical sect.

40. οἱ καιτεσθίοντες, &c.] This is by most Commentators esteemed a *solecism*; but similar constructions are found in the Classical writers. It is better regarded by some recent Commentators as an example of *anacoluthon*. Fritz., however, objects to that principle, as unsuitable to the simplicity of construction in the passage; and he would take the whole sentence as *exclamatory*, "these devourers!" &c., these shall receive, &c. I prefer, however, with Grot., to suppose an *Asyndeton*, and render, "those who devour," &c., "those shall receive." &c.; which method involves the least difficulty. [Comp. 2 Tim. iii. 6. Tit. i. 11.]

41. [See 2 Kings xii. 9.]

42. λεπτά.] The *λεπτὸν* was a very minute coin, the half of a *quadrans* or farthing. It is in our common translation rendered *mite*; which word

comes from *minute*, as *farthing* from *fourthing*, formed in imitation of *quadrans*.

43. πλείον] i. e. more in proportion to her substance. [Comp. 2 Cor. viii. 12.]

44. ἐκ τοῦ περισεύοντος αὐτοῖς] [for ἐκ τοῦ περισεύματος, which is found in some MSS. here and at Matthew and Luke, but is doubtless a correction. Τὸν βίον αὐτῆς, "her means of living;" a signification of *βίος* common both in the Classical writers and the Sept.]

XIII. 1. ποταποὶ λίθοι.] These were indeed stupendous; in proof of which the Commentators adduce Joseph. Ant. xv. 11, 3. Bell. v. 5, 6, (from which passages it is said that the stones of the temple were some of them 45 cubits in length, 5 in depth, and 6 in breadth. It is strange, however, they did not see that the latter account, as far as it regards the dimensions of the stones, makes the former one seem almost incredible. For it represents them as only about 25 cubits long, 3 in height, and about 12 in depth. It is not so much the excessive *length* spoken of (for in Bell. i. 21, 6. Josephus speaks of the stones of Strato tower as some of them 50 feet long, 9 high, and 10 broad) as the *disproportion in breadth*, which affords room for suspicion. And as this account differs so materially from the other in Josephus, I cannot but suspect that for *μ'* we should read *κ'*, which will make the number *twenty-five*. Thus both accounts will exactly tally. I cannot omit to add, that though I have carefully examined almost all the accounts which the ancients have left us as to the dimensions of stones used for building, I have never found any to exceed 35 feet. The exclamation of the Apostles here is illustrated by what Josephus says at Bell. v. 5, 6. namely, that the whole of the exterior of the Temple, both as regarded stones and workmanship, was calculated to excite astonishment (ἐκπληξέων) [Comp. 1 Kings ix. 7.]

μεγάλαις οἰκοδομαῖς; Οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῆ ἕλιθος ἐπὶ λίθῳ, ὃς οὐ μὴ κατα-
 3 λυθῆ. Καὶ, καθήμενον αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν Ἐλαιῶν κατέναντι τοῦ 3
 ἱεροῦ, ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν κατ' ἰδίαν Πέτρος καὶ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάννης 7
 4 καὶ Ἀνδρέας· Εἶπε ἡμῖν, πότε ταῦτα ἔσται; καὶ τί τὸ σημεῖον ὅταν
 5 μέλλῃ πάντα ταῦτα συντελεῖσθαι; Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτοῖς 4
 6 ἤρξατο λέγειν· Βλέπετε μὴ τις ὑμῶς πλανήσῃ. Πολλοὶ γὰρ ἐλεύσον- 5
 7 ται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου, λέγοντες· Ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι· καὶ πολλοὺς πλανή-
 8 σουσιν. Ὅταν δὲ ἀκούσητε πολέμους καὶ ἀκούσας πολέμων, μὴ θροεῖσθε· 9
 9 δεῖ γὰρ γενέσθαι· ἀλλ' οὐπω τὸ τέλος. Ἐγερθήσεται γὰρ ἔθνος ἐπὶ 7 10
 ἔθνος, καὶ βασιλεία ἐπὶ βασιλείαν· καὶ ἔσονται σεισμοὶ κατὰ τόπους, 11
 9 καὶ ἔσονται λιμοὶ καὶ ταραχαί. Ἄρχαὶ ὀδίνων ταῦτα. Βλέπετε δὲ 8
 ὑμεῖς ἑαυτοὺς· παραδώσοσι γὰρ ὑμᾶς εἰς συνέδρια, καὶ εἰς συνα- 9 12
 10 γωγὰς δαρήσεσθε, καὶ ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνων καὶ βασιλέων σταθήσεσθε ἕνεκεν
 11 ἐμοῦ, εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς. Καὶ εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη δεῖ πρώτον κη- 14 13
 11 ρυθῆναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. Ὅταν δὲ ἀγάγωσιν ὑμᾶς παραδιδόντες, μὴ
 14 προμεριμνᾶτε τί λαλήσητε, μηδὲ μελετᾶτε· ἀλλ', ὃ ἐὰν δοθῆ ὑμῖν ἐν
 15 ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ, τοῦτο λαλεῖτε· οὐ γὰρ ἐστε ὑμεῖς οἱ λαλοῦντες, ἀλλὰ
 12 τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον. Παραδώσει δὲ ἀδελφὸς ἀδελφὸν εἰς θάνατον, 16
 καὶ πατὴρ τέκνον· καὶ ἐπαναστήσονται τέκνα ἐπὶ γονεῖς, καὶ θανατώ-
 13 σουσιν αὐτούς. Καὶ ἔσεσθε μισούμενοι ὑπὸ πάντων διὰ τὸ ὄνομά 9
 μου· ὃ δὲ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος οὗτος σωθήσεται. 13 19
 14 Ὅταν δὲ ἴδητε τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως, τὸ ἦρθέν ὑπὸ Λαυηλ 15 20
 τοῦ προφήτου, ἐστὼς ὅπου οὐ δεῖ, [ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοεῖτω·] τότε οἱ 21
 15 ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ φεγγέτωσαν εἰς τὰ ἔρη· ὃ δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ δώματος μὴ 17
 καταβάτω εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, μηδὲ εἰσελθῆτω ἄραι τι ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ·
 16 καὶ ὃ εἰς τὸν ἀγρὸν ὧν μὴ ἐπιστρεψάτω εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω ἄραι τὸ ἱμάτιον 18
 17 αὐτοῦ. Οὐαὶ δὲ ταῖς ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσαις καὶ ταῖς θηλαζούσαις ἐν 19 22
 18 ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις! προσερχεσθε δὲ, ἵνα μὴ γένηται ἡ φυγὴ ὑμῶν 20
 19 χειμῶνος. Ἔσονται γὰρ αἱ ἡμέραι ἐκείναι θλίψις, οἷα οὐ γέγονε 22
 τοιαύτη ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως, ἧς ἔκτισεν ὁ Θεὸς, ἕως τοῦ νῦν, καὶ οὐ
 20 μὴ γένηται. Καὶ εἰ μὴ Κύριος ἐκολόβωσε τὰς ἡμέρας, οὐκ ἂν ἐσώθη 22
 πᾶσα σὰρξ, ἀλλὰ διὰ τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς, οὓς ἐξελέξατο, ἐκολόβωσε τὰς
 21 ἡμέρας. Καὶ τότε ἐὰν τις ὑμῖν εἴπῃ· Ἴδου, ὧδε ὁ Χριστὸς, ἢ 23
 22 ἴδου, ἐκεῖ· μὴ πιστεύσητε. Ἐγερθήσονται γὰρ ψευδοχριστοὶ καὶ ψευ- 24
 δοπροφήται· καὶ δώσοσι σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα, πρὸς τὸ ἀποπλανῆναι, εἰ
 23 δυνατὸν, καὶ τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς. Ὅτι οὐδεὶς δὲ βλέπετε· ἴδου, προειρηκα 25
 24 ὑμῖν πάντα. Ἄλλ' ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις, μετὰ τὴν θλίψιν ἐκείνην, 29 25
 25 ὃ ἥλιος σκοτισθήσεται, καὶ ἡ σελήνη οὐ δώσει τὸ φέγγος αὐτῆς· καὶ
 οἱ ἀστέρες τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἔσονται ἐκπίπτοντες, καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις αἱ ἐν

11. μελετᾶτε.] Μελετᾶν, in the Classical writers, is used of the *fore-thought*, *study*, and *elaboration* of Orations, in opposition to *extemporary* oratory. Thus the declamations of the Rhetoricians were called μελεται. [Comp. Matt. x. 19. Luke xii. 11.]

13. [Comp. Matt. x. 22. Rev. ii. 7. 10.]

14. [Comp. Dan. ix. 27. xii. 11.]

21. [Comp. Luke xvii. 23.]

22. [Comp. Deut. xiii. 1. 2 Thess. ii. 11.]

24. [Comp. Is. xiii. 10. Ezek. xxxii. 7. Joel ii. 10, 31. Rev. vi. 12.]

25. οἱ ἀστέρες τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἔσ. ἐκπ.] This passage is inadequately represented by all Translators. The sense is, "the stars of heaven shall be wan-

MT. LU.

24. 21. τοῖς οὐρανοῖς σαλευθήσονται. Καὶ τότε ὄψονται τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώ- 26
 30 26 που ἐρχόμενον ἐν νεφέλαις μετὰ δυνάμεως πολλῆς καὶ δόξης. Καὶ 27
 31 27 τότε ἀποστελεῖ τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐπισημάνει τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς
 αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων, ἀπ' ἄκρου γῆς ἕως ἄκρου οὐρανοῦ.
 32 29 Ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς συκῆς μάθετε τὴν παραβολὴν· ὅταν αὐτῆς ἦδη ὁ 28
 30 κλάδος ἀπαλὸς γένηται, καὶ ἐκφυῖ τὰ φύλλα, γινώσχετε ὅτι ἐγγὺς τὸ
 33 31 θῆρος ἐστίν· οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς, ὅταν ταῦτα ἴδητε γινόμενα, γινώσχετε 29
 34 32 ὅτι ἐγγὺς ἐστὶν ἐπὶ θύραις. Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐ μὴ παρελθῆ ἢ 30
 35 33 γενεὰ αὕτη, μέχρις οὗ πάντα ταῦτα γένηται. Ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ 31
 παρελεύσονται· οἱ δὲ λόγοι μου οὐ μὴ παρελθῶσι.

36 Περὶ δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ἢ τῆς ὥρας, οὐδεὶς οἶδεν· οὐδὲ οἱ 32
 ἀγγελοι οἱ ἐν οὐρανῷ, οὐδὲ ὁ Υἱός· εἰ μὴ ὁ Πατήρ.

Βλέπετε, ἀγροπνεῖτε καὶ προσεύνχεσθε· οὐκ οἴδατε γὰρ πότε ὁ καιρὸς 33
 ἐστίν. Ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἀπόδημος ἀφείς τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ, καὶ δούς τοῖς 34
 δούλοις αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐξουσίαν καὶ ἐκάστῳ τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ, καὶ τῷ θυρω-
 ρῷ ἐνετείλατο ἵνα γρηγορῇ. Γρηγορεῖτε οὖν· οὐκ οἴδατε γὰρ πότε ὁ 35
 κύριος τῆς οἰκίας ἔρχεται· ὁψέ, ἢ μεσουκτιου, ἢ ἀλεκτοροφωνίας, ἢ
 προῦ· μὴ ἐλθῶν ἐξαίφνης, εὖρη ὑμᾶς καθυδόντας. Ἄ δὲ ὑμῖν λέγω, 36

26. 22. πᾶσι λέγω· Γρηγορεῖτε. 37

2 1 XIV. ἮΝ δὲ τὸ πάσχα καὶ τὰ ἄζυμα μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας· καὶ 1
 3 2 ἐξήτουν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς, πῶς αὐτὸν ἐν δόλῳ κρατήσου-
 4 2 τες ἀποκτείνωσιν. Ἐλεγον δὲ· Μὴ ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ, μήποτε θόρυβος 2
 5 2 ἔσται τοῦ λαοῦ. Καὶ ὄντος αὐτοῦ ἐν Βηθανίᾳ, ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ Σίμωνος 3
 6 7 τοῦ λεπροῦ κατακειμένου αὐτοῦ, ἦλθε γυνὴ ἔχουσα ἀλάβαστρον μύρου

ing;” i. e. shall gradually lose their light. On the use of *ἀμι* and the participle, for some verb, see Winer's Gr. Gr. § 39. 2. All the difference here between the Evangelists is, that Mark is more graphically minute than Matthew and Luke.

26. [Comp. Dan. vii. 13. Rev. i. 7. 1 Thess. iv. 16. 2 Thess. i. 10.]

23. [ἐκφυῖ] See Note on Matt. xxiv. 32.

31. [Comp. Ps. cii. 27. Is. xl. 8. Heb. i. 11.]

32. ἦ] This (for the common reading *καὶ*) is found in most of the ancient MSS., Versions, and Fathers, and is received by almost every Editor from Wets. to Scholz. Here comp. Acts i. 7.

33. [Comp. Luke xii. 40. 1 Thess. v. 6.]

XIV. [Comp. John xi. 55. xiii. 1.]

3. [Comp. Luke vii. 37. John xi. 2.]

—πιστικῆς] With this word the Commentators have been not a little perplexed; and hence their opinions are very various. Besides conjectural alterations, and derivations from some name of place, which are alike inadmissible, there are three interpretations worthy of notice. 1. That of Camer., Beza, Grot., Wets., and Rosenm., who think that *πιστικῆς* is put, per metathesin, for *σπικῆτος*, as supra vii. 4. *ξέστη* for *sextario*. And this is somewhat confirmed by the Vulgate *Spicati*. But there is little other authority for it, or indeed, *probability*; for why (as Fritz. remarks) should not St. Mark have at once used *σπικῆτος*, as Galen often does? 2. Others, as Erasm.,

Luther, Vatabl., Suic., Capell., Casaub., Salmas., Scalig., Le Clerc, Beng., Kypke, Heun., Kuin., Tittm., and Wahl, derive the word from *πίσις* (as from *μάντις*, *μαντικός*; from *πράξις*, *πρακτικός*; from *κρίσις*, *κριτικός*), and take it to signify *pure*, *genuine*, *unadulterated*. For that word was often *adulterated*, appears from Pliny and Diosc., the former of whom mentions a *pseudo-nardus*. Fritz., however, objects, that then *πιστικός* would be *qui fidem vel facere vel habere potest*, a signification plainly unsuitable to *nard*. And to derive the term from *πιστός*, would lead to a like result. 3. Pisc., P. Steph., Schmid, Schwartz, Heupel, Fischer, Schneider, Schleusn., and Fritz. derive it from *πίαν* or *πιῖν* (or, as Fritz. maintains, *πισσκεῖν*: thus *πισκω*, *πίσω*, *ἐπίσω*, *πέπισμαι*, *πιστός*, *πιστικός*: for adjectives in *-ικός* are often derived from verbals in *-ός*.), and they take it to mean *liquid*. Fritz., however, explains *potable*; and he shews, from some passages of Athenæus, that unguents were sometimes *drunk* by the ancients. Upon the whole, however, he has better succeeded in proving that the interpretation *liquid* or *potable* is *probably true*, than that the sense, *genuine*, is *certainly false*. The trifling *abuse* he complains of will not be fatal to that interpretation; for it may very well be, that Mark here (as occasionally elsewhere) uses a term of the common Greek dialect; and as the interpretation is strongly supported by the ancient Versions and Fathers, I see no reason to abandon it. So Eusebius Apod. i. 9. (cited by Fritz.) calls the Gospel τὸ πιστικὸν τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης κρῆμα.

	MT.	LU.
νάροδου πιστικῆς πολυτελεῶς· καὶ συντριψίμα αὐτὸ ἀλάβαστρον, κατέχευεν	8	22.
4 αὐτοῦ κατὰ τῆς κεφαλῆς. Ἰσαν δὲ τινες ἀγανακτοῦντες πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς,	8	
5 καὶ λέγοντες· Εἰς τί ἢ ἀπόκλιμα αὕτη τοῦ μύθου γέγονεν; Ἰδύνατο	9	
γὰρ τοῦτο πραθῆναι ἐπάνω τριμικοσίων δηναρίων, καὶ δοθῆναι τοῖς		
6 πτωχοῖς· καὶ ἐνεβριμῶντο αὐτῇ· Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· Ἄφετε αὐτὴν·	10	
7 τί αὐτῇ κόπους παρῆχετε; καλὸν ἔργον εἰργάσατο ἐν * ἐμοί. πάν-	11	
τοτε γὰρ τοὺς πτωχοὺς ἔχετε μεθ' ἑαυτῶν, καὶ, ὅταν θέλῃτε, δύνασθε		
8 αὐτοὺς εὖ ποιῆσαι· ἐμὲ δὲ οὐ πάντοτε ἔχετε. Ὁ ἔσχεν αὕτη, ἐποίησε.	12	
9 Προέλαβε μυρία μου τὸ σῶμα εἰς τὸν ἐνταφιασμόν. Ἀμὴν λέγω	13	
ὑμῖν· ὅπου ἂν κηρυχθῇ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦτο εἰς ὅλον τὸν κόσμον,		
10 καὶ ὃ ἐποίησεν αὕτη λαληθήσεται εἰς μνημόσυνον αὐτῆς. Καὶ ὁ Ἰου-	14	8
δας ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης, εἰς τῶν δώδεκα, ἀπῆλθε πρὸς τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς, ἵνα		
11 παραδῷ αὐτὸν αὐτοῖς. Οἱ δὲ ἀκούσαντες ἐχάρησαν καὶ ἐπηγγείλαντο	4	
αὐτῷ ἄργύριον δοῦναι· καὶ ἐξῆτει πῶς εὐκαίρως αὐτὸν παραδῷ.	5	6
12 ΚΑΙ τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἀζύμων, ὅτε τὸ πάσχα ἔθνον, λέγουσιν	17	7
αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ· Ποῦ θέλεις ἀπελθόντες εἰτοιμάσωμεν ἵνα	9	
13 φάγῃς τὸ πάσχα; Καὶ ἀποστέλλει δύο τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, καὶ	8	10
λέγει αὐτοῖς· Ῥάγαγε εἰς τὴν πόλιν· καὶ ἀπαντήσει ὑμῖν ἄνθρωπος	18	10
14 κεράμιον ὕδατος βιασίζων· ἀκολουθήσατε αὐτῷ, καὶ ὅπου ἐὰν εἰσέλ-		
θῃ, εἶπατε τῷ οἰκοδεσπότη, ὅτι ὁ διδάσκαλος λέγει· Ποῦ ἐστι τὸ	11	
15 κατάλυμα, ὅπου τὸ πάσχα μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν μου φάγω; Καὶ αὐ-	12	
τὸς ὑμῖν δεῖξει † ἀνώγειον μέγα ἐστρωμένον ἑτοιμον· ἐκεῖ εἰτοιμάσατε		
16 ἡμῖν. Καὶ ἐξῆλθον οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἦλθον εἰς τὴν πόλιν, καὶ	19	
εἶθρον καθὼς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· καὶ ἠτοίμασαν τὸ πάσχα.	13	
17 Καὶ ὀψίας γενομένης, ἔρχεται μετὰ τῶν δώδεκα· καὶ ἀνακειμένων	20	14
18 αὐτῶν καὶ ἐσθιόντων, εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι εἷς ἐξ	21	

— καὶ συντριψίμα] Here, again, the Commentators are at issue on the sense of *συντριψίμα*. Some take it to mean “having broken it in pieces;” others, “having shaken it up.” But the former would be unnecessary, and unsuitable to the purpose in view; and the latter interpretation proceeds too much upon hypothesis, and is utterly repugnant to the sense of the word; as is that of others, “rubbing it in.” The true interpretation, no doubt, that of Drus., De Dieu, Krebs, Rosenm., Kuin., Schleusn., Wahl, Bretschn., and Fritz., who take it to mean “*diffRACTO orificio, alabastrum aperuit.*” The term was, it seems, used of the opening of flasks of oil or liquid ointment; which was, by knocking off the tip end of the narrow neck, where the orifice was sealed up, to preserve the contents. Now this, plainly, might be done without wasting the contents. The above view of the sense is confirmed by the ancient Versions, which express the general signification “*aperuerunt.*”

6. ἐν ἐμοί.] This (for εἰς ἐμὲ) is found in almost all the best MSS. and early Editions; is adopted by Wets. and edited by Beng., Matth., Vat., Tittm., Fritz., and Scholz; no doubt, rightly; for its Hebrew character and greater difficulty attest its genuineness. [Comp. Deut. xv. 11.]

8. ἔσχεν] i. e. ἰδύνατο; a sense of ἔχειν, like

that of *habere* in Latin, common in the Classical writers. Προέλαβε, i. e. προέφθασε, “anticipated,” pre-occupied.

12. See Exod. xii. 17. Deut. xvi. 5.

13. ἄνθρωπος] From the word being opposed to *οἰκοδεσπότης* in the following verse, and from the servile nature of the occupation, it may be inferred that this was a domestic.

— κεράμιον] The Commentators concur in recognizing here an ellipse of *σκεῦος*, or *ἀγγεῖον*; and they produce examples both of the elliptical and the complete phrase. But the examples of the latter have *κεραμίον*, which is, beyond doubt, an adjective, whereas *κεράμιον*, as Fritz. shows, was always considered as a substantive.

14. κατάλυμα] See note on Luke ii. 15. 7.

15. ἀνώγειον] An upper room, used by the Jews for the same purposes as those to which our dining-rooms and parlours are applied. Griesb., Fritz., and Scholz edit, from the best MSS., *ἀνώγειον*. But the thing is not so certain as to warrant a change. Ἐστρωμένον has a reference to the preparation of beds, couches, or sofas, carpets, pillows, stools, &c., such as among the Oriental nations, supply the place of chairs, tables, and indeed almost all the other furniture of a room.

17. See John xiii. 21.

18. [Comp. Ps. xli. 9. Acts i. 16.]

MT. LU.

22. 22. ἑμῶν παραδώσει με ὁ ἐσθίων μετ' ἐμοῦ. Οἱ δὲ ἤρξαντο λυπεῖσθαι, 19
 26 23. καὶ λέγειν αὐτῷ, εἷς καθ' εἷς· Μήτι ἐγώ; καὶ ἄλλος· Μήτι
 23 ἐγώ; Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Εἷς ἐκ τῶν δώδεκα, ὁ ἐμβα- 20
 24 21. πτόμενος μετ' ἐμοῦ εἰς τὸ τρυβλίον. ὁ μὲν Τίος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὑπίγει, 21
 καθὼς γέγραπται περὶ αὐτοῦ· οὐαὶ δὲ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ, δι' οὗ
 ὁ Τίος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδεται. καλὸν ἦν αὐτῷ, εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη
 ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος.
- 26 Καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν, λαβὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἄρτον, εὐλογῆσας ἔκλασε, καὶ 22
 ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ εἶπε· Λάβετε φάγετε. τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου.
 27 Καὶ λαβὼν τὸ ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς· καὶ ἔπιον ἐξ 23
 28 αὐτοῦ πάντες. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ αἷμά μου, τὸ τῆς 24
 29 καινῆς διαθήκης, τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυρόμενον. Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι 25
 οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ πίνω ἐκ τοῦ γεννήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου, ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας
 ἐκείνης, ὅταν αὐτὸ πίνω καιρὸν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ.
- 30 39. Καὶ ὑμνήσαντες, ἐξῆλθον εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν Ἐλαιῶν. καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς 26
 31 ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Ὅτι πάντες σκανδαλισθήσεσθε ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ· 27
 ὅτι γέγραπται· Πατάξω τὸν ποιμένα, καὶ διασκορπισθήσεται τὰ πρό-
 32 δατα. ἀλλὰ μετὰ τὸ ἐγερθῆναί με, προύξω ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν 28
 33 Ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ἔφη αὐτῷ· Καὶ εἰ πάντες σκανδαλισθήσονται, ἀλλ' οὐκ 29
 34 ἐγώ. Καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, ὅτι σὺ σήμερον ἐν 30
 35 τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ, πρὶν ἢ δις ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι, τρίς ἀπαρνήσῃ με. ὁ δὲ 31
 ἐκ περισσοῦ ἔλεγε μᾶλλον· Ἰάν με δὲρ συναποθανεῖν σοι, οὐ μὴ σε
 ἀπαρνήσομαι. ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ πάντες ἔλεγον.
- 36 40. ΚΑΙ ἔρχονται εἰς χωρίον, οὗ τὸ ὄνομα Γεθσημανῆ· καὶ λέγει τοῖς 32
 37 μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ· Καθίσατε ὧδε ἕως προσεύξωμαι. Καὶ παραλιμβά- 33
 νει τὸν Πέτρον καὶ τὸν Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην μεθ' ἑαυτοῦ. καὶ ἤρξα-
 38 το ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι καὶ ἀδημονεῖν. Καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· Περίλυπός ἐστιν 34
 ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἕως θανάτου· μείνατε ὧδε καὶ γρηγορεῖτε. Καὶ προσελ- 35
 39 41. θὼν μικρὸν, ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ προσηύχετο, ἵνα εἰ δυνατόν ἐστι,
 42 παρέλθῃ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἡ ὥρα· καὶ ἔλεγεν· Ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ, πάντα 36
 δυνατά σοι. παρένεγκε τὸ ποτήριον ἀπ' ἐμοῦ τοῦτο· ἀλλ' οὐ τί ἐγὼ
 40 45. θέλω, ἀλλὰ τί σὺ. καὶ ἔρχεται καὶ εἰσίσκει αὐτοὺς καθεύδοντας, καὶ 37
 46 λέγει τῷ Πέτρῳ· Σίμων, καθεύδεις; οὐκ ἴσχυσας μίαν ὥραν γρηγορεῖ-

19. εἷς καθ' εἷς] A Hebrew idiom for καθ' ἕνα, as the Commentators say; but it is found also in other writers, though, indeed, almost wholly those who formed their style on the N. T. Fritz has proved that the κατὰ cannot be taken, as some suppose, for καὶ εἷσα.

22. [Comp. 1 Cor. xi. 24.]

27. Πατάξω, &c.] See Zach. xiii. 7.

28. [See infra xvi. 7.]

29. [See John xiii. 37.]

30. σὺ.] This is found in almost all the ancient MSS. and the early Edd., confirmed by most of the ancient Versions, and has been, with reason, received by Wets., Matth., Griesb., Knapp, Vater, Tittm., Fritz., and Scholz. It was, no doubt, absorbed by the σὴ following. The word is emphatical.

32. [Comp. John xviii. 1.]

34. [Comp. Luke xxii. 44. John xii. 27.]

36. [Comp. John vi. 33.]

— Ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ.] There has been no little difference of opinion as to the reason for this seeming pleonasm, and the exact force of the idiom. The ancient Greek Interpreters, several early modern ones (as Beza, Lightf., and Leigh), and most of the later Commentators (as Newcome, Campb., Wakef., Fisch., Schleus., Rosenm., and Kuin.), think that ὁ πατήρ is added, agreeably to a custom by which the Jews used to call a person or thing by two names, one Hebrew and the other Greek. But I rather agree with others (as Fritz.), that the latter is an interpretation or explication of the former, as in Rom. viii. 15. Gal. iv. 6. As to Ἀββᾶ, it is (as Fritz. observes) used agreeably to the custom (found even in the

38 *σαι ; Ἰηηγορεῖτε καὶ προσεύχεσθε, ἵνα μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς πειρασμόν.* 26. 22.
 39 *τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα πρόθυμον, ἡ δὲ σὰρξ ἀσθενής. Καὶ πάλιν ἀπελθὼν* 41
 40 *προσηύξατο, τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον εἰπὼν. Καὶ ὑποστρέψας εὔρεν αὐτοὺς* 43
πάλιν καθυδόντας· ἦσαν γὰρ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτῶν βεβαρημένοι, καὶ
οὐκ ᾔδεισαν τί αὐτῷ ἀποκριθῶσι.
 41 *Καὶ ἔρχεται τὸ τρίτον, καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· Καθυδέτε τὸ λοιπὸν καὶ* 45
ἀναπαύεσθε. ἀπέχει! ἦλθεν ἡ ὥρα· ἰδοὺ, παραδίδοται ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ
 42 *ἀνθρώπου εἰς τὰς χεῖρας τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν.— Ἐγείρεσθε! ἄγωμεν!* 46
ἰδοὺ, ὃ παραδιδούς με ἤγγικε.
 43 *Καὶ εὐθέως, ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος, παραγίνεται Ἰούδας, εἷς ὢν τῶν* 47 47
δώδεκα, καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ ὄχλος πολὺς μετὰ μαχαιρῶν καὶ ξύλων, παρὰ
 44 *τῶν ἀρχιερέων καὶ τῶν γραμματέων καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων. Δεδώκει δὲ* 48
ὁ παραδιδούς αὐτὸν σύσημον αὐτοῖς, λέγων· Ὅν ἂν φιλήσω, αὐτός
 45 *ἐστί· κρατήσατε αὐτὸν, καὶ ἀπαγάγετε ἀσφαλῶς· Καὶ ἐλθὼν, εὐθέως* 49 47
 46 *προσελθὼν αὐτῷ λέγει· Ῥαββί, ῥαββί· καὶ κατεφίλησεν αὐτόν. Οἱ* 50
δὲ ἐπέβαλον ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐκράτησαν αὐτόν.
 47 *Εἷς δε τις τῶν παρεστηκότων σπασάμενος τὴν μάχαιραν, ἔπαισε τὸν* 51 50
 48 *δοῦλον τοῦ ἀρχιερέως, καὶ ἀφείλεν αὐτοῦ τὸ ὠτίον. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς* 55 52
ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Ὡς ἐπὶ ληστὴν ἐξήλθετε μετὰ μαχαιρῶν καὶ
 49 *ξύλων, συλλαβεῖν με; Καθ' ἡμέραν ἤμην πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ* 53
διδάσκων, καὶ οὐκ ἐκράτησατέ με· ἀλλ' ἵνα πληρωθῶσιν αἱ γραφαί.
 50 *Καὶ ἀφέντες αὐτὸν πάντες ἔφυγον. Καὶ εἷς τις νεανίσκος ἠκολούθει*
 51 *αὐτῷ, περιβεβλημένος σινδῶνα ἐπὶ γυμνοῦ· καὶ κρατοῦσιν αὐτὸν*

Lord's prayer) of commencing with the word *Father*.

33. [*Comp. Gal. v. 17.*]
 41. [*ἀπέχει*] The Commentators are not agreed on the force of this expression. Of the various interpretations propounded, there are only two which have any claim to attention. 1. That of most of the recent Commentators, *abest*, scil. *transiit animi mei angor*. But this is liable to insuperable objections, both Grammatical and others. 2. That of Luther, Beza, H. Steph., Hamm., Gatak., Raph., Heup., and Fritz., "*sufficit*," it is enough; "I no longer need your vigils." This is strongly confirmed by the ancient Versions, and the Glosses of the Scholiasts, and yet more by the *ἱκανὸν ἴσθι* of Luke. And although the sense be rare, yet there have been *two* other examples adduced; one from Anacreon xxviii. 33. *ἀπέχει βλέπω γὰρ ἀδύην*, and another from Cyril. Thus *ἀπέχει* is an impersonal, and to be taken, as the simple *ἔχειν* and many of its compounds frequently are, in a *neuter* sense.
 43. [*Comp. John xviii. 3.*]
 44. [*σύσημον.*] An Alexandrian term for the Attic *σημῖον*. *Αὐτὸς* is for *οὗτος*, by an Hellenistic use often found in the N. T.
 — [*ἀσφαλῶς.*] This is not (as some Commentators imagine) to be taken with *κρατήσατε*, and rendered *sine periculo*; but with *ἀπαγάγετε*, and rendered "*caute ac diligenter*." So in Acts xvi. 23. the jailer is ordered *ἀσφαλῶς τηρεῖν*. and in ver. 24. *ἀσφαλίσθητι* is used of securely keeping the prisoners.
 45. [*Comp. 2 Sam. xx. 9.*]
 47. [*εἷς δὲ τις.*] Almost all the Commentators

account this a *pleonasm*, of which they adduce examples both from Scriptural and Classical writers. But it is, in fact, no pleonasm, and Fritz. truly observes, that *εἷς τις* signifies *unus aliquis, some one*. The expression is generally used of one whose name we know not, or do not care to mention. The reason for suppressing the name *here* is obvious. That for using the same indefinite expression further on at ver. 51., seems to have been from the Evangelist not *knowing* the person's name. For though many conjectures thereupon have been hazarded, yet not one of them has even probability to recommend it, except this, that he was a young man of the Roman soldiery; especially as again, in this very verse, the Article points to a particular part of the company; which could only have been the soldiery.
 49. [*Comp. Ps. xxii. 7. lxx. 10. Is. liiii. 12.*]
 50. [*Comp. Job xix. 13. Ps. lxxviii. 8.*]
 51. [*σινδῶνα.*] See Note on Matt. xxvii. 59. The sense, however, *here* is somewhat different. For as the word primarily denoted a web of cloth, so it came to mean a *wrapper*, such as was often used for a night-vest; of which Wets. adduces examples from Herodot. and Galen, and Schleusn. another from D. Kimchi. This is doubtless the sense *here*, though the word sometimes denoted those webs of cloth which, as we find from Oriental travellers, are still used as a *day* dress, like our Highland plaids, and called *Hyks*.
 — [*ἐπὶ γυμνοῦ.*] Almost all Commentators suppose an ellipse of *σώματος*. But Fritz. would take it as a Genitive of the *neuter noun*, τὸ γυμνόν, the naked body. That, however, would require

MT. LU.

26. 22. οἱ νεανίσκοι. Ὁ δὲ καταλιπὼν τὴν σινδῶνα, γυμνὸς ἔφυγεν ἀπ' 52
αὐτῶν.

57 54 Καὶ ἀπήγαγον τὸν Ἰησοῦν πρὸς τὸν ἀρχιερέα· καὶ συνέρχονται 53
58 αὐτῷ πάντες οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς. Καὶ 54
ὁ Πέτρος ἀπὸ μακρόθεν ἠκολούθησεν αὐτῷ ἕως ἔσω εἰς τὴν αὐλὴν
55 τοῦ ἀρχιερέως· καὶ ἦν συγκαθήμενος μετὰ τῶν ὑπηρέτων, καὶ θερ-
59 μαινόμενος πρὸς τὸ φῶς. Οἱ δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ ὅλον τὸ συνέδριον 55
ἔξήτουν κατὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ μαρτυρίαν, εἰς τὸ θανατώσαι αὐτόν· καὶ
60 οὐκ εὗρισκον. Πολλοὶ γὰρ ἐψευδομαρτύρουν κατ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἴσαι αἱ 56
μαρτυρίαι οὐκ ἦσαν. Καὶ τινες ἀνασιάντες ἐψευδομαρτύρουν κατ' αὐ- 57
61 τοῦ, λέγοντες· "Οτι ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν αὐτοῦ λέγοντος· "Οτι ἐγὼ κα- 58
ταλύσω τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον τὸν χειροποίητον, καὶ διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν ἄλλον
ἀχειροποίητον οἰκοδομήσω. Καὶ οὐδὲ οὕτως ἴση ἦν ἡ μαρτυρία αὐτῶν. 59
62 Καὶ ἀναστὺς ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς εἰς τὸ μέσον, ἐπρωτίησε τὸν Ἰησοῦν, λέγων· 60
63 Οὐκ ἀποκρίνη οὐδέν; Τί οὗτοι σου καταμαρτυροῦσιν; Ὁ δὲ ἐσιώ- 61
πα, καὶ οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίνατο. Πάλιν ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς ἐπρωτία αὐτόν, καὶ
64 λέγει αὐτῷ· Σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ ἐνλογητοῦ; ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς 62
εἶπεν· Ἰγὼ εἰμι. καὶ ὅψεσθε τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καθήμενον
ἐκ δεξιῶν τῆς δυνάμεως, καὶ ἐρχόμενον μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.
65 Ὁ δὲ ἀρχιερεὺς, διαρρήξας τοὺς χιτῶνας αὐτοῦ, λέγει· Τί ἔτι χρεῖαν 63
66 ἔχομεν μαρτύρων; ἠκούσατε τῆς βλασφημίας· τί ὑμῖν φαίνεται; Οἱ 64
67 δὲ πάντες κατέκριναν αὐτόν εἶναι ἔνοχον θανάτου. Καὶ ἤρξαντο τινες 65
ἐμπιύειν αὐτῷ, καὶ περικυλύπτειν τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ καὶ κολαφίζειν
68 αὐτόν, καὶ λέγειν αὐτῷ· Προφήτευσον· καὶ οἱ ὑπηρεταὶ ἑπίστυμιν
αὐτὸν ἐβύλλον.

the Article, and the existence of the word must not be admitted without some authority more valid than the use of τὰ γυμνά, "the unprotected parts of the body;" for in that expression there is an ellipse of μέρος as well as of τοῦ σώματος. The phrase is plainly for ἐπὶ τοῦ γυμνοῦ τοῦ σώματος, and the very elliptical form it assumes, shows that it was much in use; probably in the phraseology of common life. It was probably a provincial idiom.

— οἱ νεανίσκοι.] This, by the force of the Article, must denote the Roman soldiers just mentioned. Examples are adduced by Rosenm., and Kuin. of this sense in Greek, and also of *juventutes* and *adolescentes* in Latin. Nay, it even extends to the Hebrew.

53. [Comp. John xviii. 13, 24.]

54. πρὸς τὸ φῶς] for πρὸς τὸ πῦρ. So Luke xxii. 56. καθήμενον πρὸς τὸ φῶς. This has been proved to be a Hebraism, such as often occurs in the Sept., and corresponds to נִשָּׂא. For though the purity of the Greek has been maintained by many Commentators, yet they only adduce passages where the word signifies *fulgor*, rather than *ignis*; or, in one or two instances, a *blaze*, such as arises from kindled wood. Thus, by a metonymy of effect for cause, φῶς is transferred to all objects which emit *light*, though it may be accompanied with *heat* likewise.

55. [Comp. Acts vi. 13.]

56. ἴσαι.] The Commentators are not agreed on the sense. By the ancient Versions and most early modern Commentators, it is taken to mean *convenientes*, 'such as tally.' So E. V. "agreed not together." Erasm., Grot., Hamm., Whitby, Heup., and Campb., render it, "non idonea erant," "were insufficient to establish the charges against him." But, as Beza and Fritz. observe, the *usus loquendi* will not permit this sense; and the difficulty which drove the above Commentators to adopt so forced an interpretation is really by no means formidable: see Recens. Synop. Lightf. observes, that the Jewish Canons divided testimonies into three kinds, 1. a *vain* or discordant testimony; 2. a *standing* or presumptive testimony; 3. an *even* consistent testimony.

53. χειροποίητοι] i. e. "the work of man." This was added (says Grot.) lest Christ should seem to have spoken parabolically. Of the word *χειροπ.* examples are adduced by Wets., to which may be added a passage of Thucyd. ii. 77. yet more apposite, where φλᾶξ *χειροποιήτη* is opposed to ἀπὸ ταντομάτου πῦρ. Our Lord alluded to Is. xvi. 12. See Note on Acts vii. 48. and compare infra xv. 29. John ii. 19.

61. [Comp. Is. liii. 7. Acts viii. 32.]

62. καὶ ὄψεσθε, &c.] Comp. Dan. vii. 10. John vi. 62. Acts i. 11. 1 Thess. iv. 16. 2 Thess. i. 10. Rev. i. 7.

65. [Comp. John xvi. 10, 11. Is. i. 6. John xix. 3. xviii. 16, 17.]

	MT.	LU.
66	Καὶ ὄντος τοῦ Πέτρου ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ κἀτω, ἔρχεται μία τῶν παιδισκῶν	26. 22.
67	τοῦ ἀρχιερέως, καὶ ἰδοῦσα τὸν Πέτρον θερμαινόμενον, ἐμβλέψουσα αὐτῷ	69 56
68	λέγει· Καὶ σὺ μετὰ τοῦ Ναζαρηνοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἦσθα. Ὁ δὲ ἠρώησατο,	70 57
	λέγων· Οὐκ οἶδα οὐδὲ ἐπίσταμαι τί σὺ λέγεις. καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἕως εἰς	
69	τὸ προαύλιον· καὶ ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησε. Καὶ ἡ παιδίσκη ἰδοῦσα αὐτὸν	71 58
	πάλιν, ἤρξατο λέγειν τοῖς παρεστηκόσιν· Ὅτι οὗτος ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐστιν.	
70	Ὁ δὲ πάλιν ἠρώητο. Καὶ μετὰ μικρὸν πάλιν οἱ παρεστώτες ἔλεγον τῷ	72 59
	Πέτρῳ· Ἀληθῶς ἐξ αὐτῶν εἶ· καὶ γὰρ Γαλιλαῖος εἶ, καὶ ἡ λαλιά	73
71	σου ὁμοιάζει. Ὁ δὲ ἤρξατο ἀναθεματίζειν καὶ ὀμνύειν· Ὅτι οὐκ	74 60
72	οἶδα τὸν ἄνθρωπον τοῦτον ὃν λέγετε. Καὶ ἐκ δευτέρου ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώ-	
	νησε. καὶ ἀνεμνήσθη ὁ Πέτρος τοῦ ἡμήματος οὗ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς·	75
	Ὅτι πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι δις, ἀπαρνήσῃ με τρίς. καὶ † ἐπιβαλὼν	
	ἔκλαιε.	27. 23.

1	XV. ΚΑΙ εὐθὺς ἐπὶ τὸ πρῶτὸν συμβούλιον ποιήσαντες οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς	1
	μετὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ γραμματέων, καὶ ὅλον τὸ συνέδριον, δῆσαν-	1
2	τες τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπήνεγκαν καὶ παρέδωκαν τῷ Πιλάτῳ. καὶ ἐπρωτόησεν	11 3
	αὐτὸν ὁ Πιλάτος· Σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων; Ὁ δὲ ἀποκρι-	
3	θεις εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Σὺ λέγεις. Καὶ κατηγοροῦν αὐτοῦ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς	12
4	πολλά. Ὁ δὲ Πιλάτος πάλιν ἐπρωτόησεν αὐτὸν, λέγων· Οὐκ ἀπο-	
5	κρίῃ οὐδέν; Ἴδε, πόσα σου καταμαρτυροῦσιν· Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς οὐκέτι	14
	οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίθη· ὥστε θαυμάζειν τὸν Πιλάτον.	

68. οὐκ—λέγεις.] This is rightly regarded by Wets. as an idiomatical form of negation. In οὐκ οἶδα οὐδὲ ἐπίσταμαι there seems a stress laid upon ἐπιστ.; and hence the student may attend to the observation of Math. Gr. Gr. § 233, who rightly observes, that it is properly the mid. voice of ἐπίστανμι, with the subordination of τὸν νοῦν, in which the Ionic form is retained. It therefore signifies, "to set one's mind to any thing," as we say, enter into it, comprehend it. Wets. subjoins many examples, both from the Classical and Rabbinical writers. On the seeming discrepancy with the accounts of the other Evangelists, see Horne's *Introd.* iv. 235.

69. [Comp. John xviii. 25.]
72. καὶ ἐκ δευτέρου, &c.] Comp. John xiii. 33. xviii. 27.

—ἐπιβαλὼν.] With this word the Commentators have been exceedingly perplexed; and hence their interpretations are marvellously discordant. To omit conjectural alterations, and manifestly false interpretations, many Commentators, ancient and modern, take ἐπιβάλλειν in the sense *begin*, and regard ἐπιβαλὼν ἐκλαιε as standing for κλάτειν ἐπέβαλε, either in the sense "began to weep," or "proceeded to weep," as in Acts xi. 4. ἀρξάμενος—ἔξετίθετο for ἤρξατο—ἐκτίθεσθαι. That passage, however, has quite another sense. Besides, though the above signification of ἐπιβάλλειν does exist in the later writers, yet of the *hyper-lige* in these words no example has been adduced. Besides, the sense is so feeble, and even frigid, that, although it is supported by most of the ancient Versions, it cannot, I think, be admitted. In fact, there should seem rather to be an *ellipsis*, though to determine with certainty what was originally the *plena locutio*, is perhaps impossible; some would take ἐπιβαλὼν to mean "having rushed

out of doors;" a sense not unsuitable, and supported by the parallel passages. Yet such a signification of ἐπιβάλλειν has never been established, the passages cited being not to the purpose. There seems little doubt but that the truth lies with one or other of the two following interpretations. 1. That of Casaub., Bois, Heupel, Kyrke, Wets., Koecher, Campb., and others, "having reflected thereon;" which is a very suitable sense. And abundant examples are adduced, both of the complete phrase ἐπιβάλλειν τὸν νοῦν, and even of the elliptical ones. Yet, as Fritz, remarks, the latter is only found where the *context suggests* the notion of *attention*; which is not the case here. He, therefore, after a minute discussion of the merits of all the interpretations, decides in favour of that of Chrysost., Theophyl., and other Greek Fathers, and to which several eminent modern Commentators have inclined, (as Salmas., Suic., Elns., Heum., Krebs, and Fischer), by which ἐπιβαλὼν is taken as equivalent to ἐκκαλυψάμενος, "having covered his head (with his vest)." But here, again, decisive authority is wanting; for though the complete phrase ἐπιβάλλειν ἑαυτὸν is very frequent, yet not one example has been adduced of the elliptical one, *τινι*, not even if ἐπιβάλλειν ἑαυτὸν τῇ κεφαλῇ. To this, indeed, Fritz, answers that, from the great frequency of the phrase, no additional word was *necessary* to decide the sense; which is (he remarks) the case with other terms, as *ὑποσησάμενος* and *περιβήξάμενος*. That the action is suitable to extreme grief, none can doubt; and that it was in use among the ancients, is proved by a cloud of examples.

XV. 1. [Comp. Ps. ii. 2. John xviii. 23. Acts iii. 13.]
2. [Comp. John xviii. 33.]
4. [Comp. John xix. 10.]

MT. LU.

27. 23. Κατὰ δὲ ἑορτὴν ἀπέλυνεν αὐτοῖς ἓνα δέσμιον, ὄνπερ ἦτοῦντιο· Ἦν δὲ 6
 15 17 ὁ λεγόμενος Βαραββᾶς μετὰ τῶν συστασιαστῶν δεδεμένος, οἴτινες ἐν 7
 16 19 τῇ σιάσει φόνον πεποιήκεισαν. Καὶ ἀναβοήσας ὁ ὄχλος ἤρξατο αἰτεῖ- 8
 17 σθαι, καθὼς ἀεὶ ἐποίει αὐτοῖς. Ὁ δὲ Πιλάτος ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς, λέ- 9
 γων· Θέλετε ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν τὸν βασιλέα τῶν Ἰουδαίων; ἐγίνωσκε γὰρ 10
 20 18 ὅτι διὰ φθόνον παραδεδώκεισαν αὐτὸν οἱ ἄρχιερεῖς. Οἱ δὲ ἄρχιερεῖς 11
 21 20 ἀνέσεισαν τὸν ὄχλον, ἵνα μᾶλλον τὸν βαραββᾶν ἀπολύσῃ αὐτοῖς. Ὁ δὲ 12
 22 Πιλάτος ἀποκριθεὶς πάλιν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Τὴν ὄν θέλετε ποιήσω, ὃν λέ-
 21 γετε βασιλέα τῶν Ἰουδαίων; οἱ δὲ πάλιν ἔκραζαν· Σταύρωσον αὐτόν. 13
 23 22 ὁ δὲ Πιλάτος ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· Τί γὰρ κακὸν ἐποίησεν; Οἱ δὲ περισ- 14
 26 23 24 25 σστέρωσ ἔκραζαν· Σταύρωσον αὐτόν. Ὁ δὲ Πιλάτος βουλόμενος τῷ 15
 ὄχλῳ τὸ ἱκανὸν ποιῆσαι, ἀπέλυσεν αὐτοῖς τὸν Βαραββᾶν· καὶ παρέ-
 δωκε τὸν Ἰησοῦν, φοραγελλώσας, ἵνα σταυρωθῇ.
 27 Οἱ δὲ στρατιῶται ἀπήγαγον αὐτὸν ἕσω τῆς αὐλῆς, (ὅ ἐστι πραιτώ- 16
 28 ριον,) καὶ συγκυλοῦσιν ὅλην τὴν σπεῖραν· καὶ ἐνδύουσιν αὐτὸν πορ- 17
 29 φύραν, καὶ περιτιθέουσιν αὐτῷ πλέξαντες ἀκάνθινον στέφανον, καὶ 18
 30 ἤρξατο ἀσπάσασθαι αὐτόν· Χαῖρες, βασιλεῦ τῶν Ἰουδαίων. Καὶ ἔτυ- 19
 πον αὐτοῦ τὴν κεφαλὴν καλύμφη, καὶ ἐνέπτυον αὐτῷ, καὶ τιθέντες τὰ
 31 γόνατα προσεκύνουν αὐτῷ. Καὶ ὅτε ἐνέπαιζαν αὐτῷ, ἐξέδυσαν αὐτὸν 20
 τὴν πορφύραν, καὶ ἐνέδυσαν αὐτὸν τὰ ἱμάτια τὰ ἴδια· καὶ ἐξάγουσιν
 32 26 αὐτόν, ἵνα σταυρώσωσιν αὐτόν. Καὶ ἀγγαρεύουσι παρόγοντά τινα 21
 Σίμωνα Κυθηραῖον, ἐρχόμενον ἀπ' ἀγροῦ (τὸν πατέρα Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ
 Ρούφου), ἵνα ἄρῃ τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ.
 33 33 Καὶ φέρουσιν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ Γολγοθᾶ τόπον, ὃ ἐστι, μεθερμηνεύμενον, 22
 34 Κρανίου τόπος. Καὶ ἐδίδουν αὐτῷ πιεῖν ἐσμυρτισμένον οἶνον· ὁ δὲ 23
 35 οὐκ ἔλαβε. Καὶ σταυρώσαντες αὐτόν, * διαμερίζονται τὰ ἱμάτια αὐ- 24
 34 τοῦ, βάλλοντες κλήρον ἐπ' αὐτὰ, τίς τί ἄρῃ. Ἦν δὲ ὥρα τρίτη, καὶ 25

6. ἀπελυνε] "used to release;" as in Matt. ἐλώθει ἀπολυνε. [Comp. John xviii. 39.]

8. At αἰτεῖσθαι supply ποιεῖν αὐτόν. [Comp. John xviii. 40. Acts iii. 14.]

11. ἀνέσεισαν] "instigated." Some MSS. have ἀνέπαισαν, and others ἐσεισαν. The one is a gloss, and the other derived from the parallel passage of Matthew. The textual reading, which is a stronger term, is confirmed by Luke xxiii. 5. and, this use of the word, by the examples produced from Diod. Sic. by Elsner and Munthe, to which may be added Eurip. Orest. 612. and Dionys. Hal. viii. 81.

14. τί γὰρ κακόν.] The γὰρ refers to a clause suppressed, "Why should I crucify him, for," &c.

15. τῷ ὄχλῳ τὸ ἱκανὸν ποιῆσαι] "to satisfy the wishes of the people," or, as Grot. explains it, agreeably to the usage of *satis facere* in Latin writers, to remove all cause of complaint on their part. [Comp. John. xix. 1.]

16. [Comp. John xix. 1.]

19. τιθέντες τὰ γόνατα] for γονυπετήσαντες, which is used by Matth. The phrase signifies to place the knees (i. e. on the ground).

21. Ἀλεξ. καὶ Ρ.] Persons probably well known, and then living at Rome; since Paul, Rom. xvi. 13. salutes Rufus there.

22. [Comp. John xix. 17.]

24. διαμερίζονται.] This (for διμερίζου) is found in nearly all the best MSS., and is adopted by every Editor from Wets. to Scholz. It is indeed not only required by the *lingua proprietatis*, but, what is more, is confirmed by the parallel passages of Matt. and Luke. The error seems to have arisen from the *τα* being absorbed by the *τα* following. [Comp. Ps. xxii. 18. John xix. 23.]

25. ἦν δὲ ὥρα τρίτη καὶ ἑσταύρωσαν α.] Comp. John xix. 14. A difficulty is here started by some Commentators, namely, that the crucifixion is twice described by Mark as taking place. To avoid which, some would take the *καὶ* for *ἐξ ὅ*. But that signification is quite unauthorized. Others endeavour to remove the difficulty by a change of punctuation. But that involves a most harsh construction. It is better, with others (among whom is Fritz.) to take *ἑσταύρωσαν* as an Aorist with a Pluperfect sense (on which use see Winer's Gr. Gr. p. 106.), thus: "It was the third hour when they had crucified him." Even this, however, is unnecessary, if *σταυρώσαντες* in the preceding verse be taken, as it may, in a present tense (and indeed the Cod. Vatic. has the present tense), thus: "and on proceeding to crucify him, they divided his garments." Now *this* indicates the commencement of action, namely, the *stripping of our Lord*. The next verse denotes the *com-*

26 ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτόν. Καὶ ἦν ἡ ἐπιγραφή τῆς αἰτίας αὐτοῦ ἐπιγεγραμ-^{MT. LU.}
 27 μένη, Ὁ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΤΩΝ ἸΟΥΔΑΙΩΝ. Καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ σταυροῦσι ²⁷ 23.
 28 δύο ληστὰς, ἓνα ἐκ δεξιῶν καὶ ἓνα ἐξ εὐωνύμων αὐτοῦ. Καὶ ἐπληρώθη
 29 ἡ γραφή ἣ λέγουσα· Καὶ μετὰ ἀνόμων ἐλογίσθη. Καὶ ³⁹ 35
 οἱ παραπορευόμενοι ἐβλασφήμουν αὐτόν, κινοῦντες τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν
 καὶ λέγοντες· Οὐδᾶ! ὁ κατακλῶν τὸν γαὸν καὶ ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις
 30 οἰκοδομῶν, σῶσον σεαυτὸν, καὶ καταβίη ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ. Ὁμοίως ⁴¹
 31 [δὲ] καὶ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς ἐμπαίζοντες πρὸς ἀλλήλους, μετὰ τῶν γραμματέων,
 32 ἔλεγον· Ἄλλους ἔσωσεν, ἑαυτὸν οὐ δύναται σῶσαι. Ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ ⁴⁹
 βασιλεὺς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ καταβίη νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ, ἵνα ἴδωμεν καὶ
 33 πιστεύσωμεν. καὶ οἱ συνεσταυρωμένοι αὐτῷ ἀνείδιζον αὐτόν. Γενομέ- ⁴⁴ 39
 νης δὲ ὥρας ἑκτης, σκότος ἐγένετο ἐφ' ὅλην τὴν γῆν, ἕως ὥρας ἐννιάτης· ⁴⁵ 44
 34 καὶ τῇ ὥρᾳ τῇ ἐννάτῃ ἐβόησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς φωνῇ μεγάλῃ, λέγων· Ἐλωὶ ⁴⁶
 Ἐλωὶ, λαμμᾶ σαβαχθανί; ὃ ἔστι, μεθερμηνεζόμενον, Ὁ Θεός ⁴⁶
 35 μου ὁ Θεός μου, εἰς τί με ἐγκατέλιπες; Καὶ τινὲς τῶν παρεστηκότων ⁴⁷
 36 ἀκούσαντες, ἔλεγον· Ἰδοὺ, Ἰλίαν φωνεῖ. Δραμῶν δὲ εἷς, καὶ γεμίσας ⁴⁸
 σπύγγον ὄξους, περιθείς τε καλίμῳ, ἐπότιζεν αὐτόν, λέγων· Ἄφerte,
 ἴδωμεν εἰ ἔρχεται Ἰλλίος καθελεῖν αὐτόν.
 37 Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἀφείς φωνῇ μεγάλῃ, ἐξέπνευσε. Καὶ τὸ καταπέτα- ⁵⁰ 46
 38 σμα τοῦ ναοῦ ἐσχίσθη εἰς δύο, ἀπὸ ἄνωθεν ἕως κάτω. Ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ ⁵¹ 45
 39 κεντυρίων ὁ παρεστηκώς ἐξ ἐναντίας αὐτοῦ, ὅτι οὕτω κράζας ἐξέπνευ- ⁵⁴ 47
 40 σεν, εἶπεν· Ἀληθῶς ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος Υἱὸς ἦν Θεοῦ! ἦσαν δὲ καὶ ⁵⁵ 49
 γυναῖκες ἀπὸ μακρόθεν θεωροῦσαι, ἐν αἷς ἦν καὶ Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαλη- ⁵⁶
 νῆ, καὶ Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Ἰακώβου τοῦ μικροῦ καὶ Ἰωσὴ μήτηρ, καὶ Σα-

pletion of action, and therefore fixes the time when it took place. In short, σταυρώσαντες αὐτόν, simply means, 'and, on crucifying him.'

With respect to the seeming discrepancy between Mark and John, as to the hour of the crucifixion, various methods have been proposed for its removal. See Recens. Synop. Now although such discrepancies "are (as Fritz. observes) rather to be patiently borne, than removed by rash measures," yet here we are, it should seem, not reduced to any great straits. For though the mode of reconciling the two accounts by a sort of management is not to be commended; yet surely, when we have the testimony of several of the ancient Fathers, that an early corruption of number in one of these two passages had taken place by a confusion of the *ς* and *ς*, we cannot hesitate to adopt so simple and natural a mode of removing the discrepancy. See more in Note on John xix. 14.

26. [Comp. John xix. 19.]

23. [Comp. Is. liii. 12.] This ver. is marked for omission by Griesb. and cancelled by Fritz.; but injudiciously; for there is no reason why so remarkable a fulfilment of prophecy, mentioned by the other Evangelists, should not also be recorded by Mark. Besides, the number of MSS. in which it is omitted is so comparatively small, that it is very probable it was inadvertently passed over by the scribes; which might arise from this and the next ver. both beginning with a καί.

29. οὐδᾶ.] An interjection of derision and VOL. I.

sult, like the Latin *vah*, and our *ho!* *oh!* *ah-ah!* which, however, are used, like all interjections, with much latitude of signification, and are adapted to express most of the violent emotions. [Comp. Ps. xxiii. 8. lxi. 20. Supra xiv. 53. John ii. 19.]

31. ἐλ.] This is absent from many good MSS., and is cancelled by Matth., Griesb., Tittm., Vat., Fritz., and Scholz.

36. καθελεῖν.] A vox solennis de hac re, — like the Latin *refigere*. [See my Note on Thucyd. ii. 14.] [Comp. Ps. lxi. 22. John xix. 29.]

37. ἀφείς φωνῇ μεγ.] Φωνῇ ἀφιέναι signifies to send forth a voice, whether articulate or inarticulate. [See Note on Matt. xxvii. 50. John xix. 30.]

39. ὅτι οὕτω κράζας.] This does not mean (as many explain) that he had cried with such a loud voice; nor that the Centurion felt admiration at his being so soon released from his torments, but that, on hearing such words as those at ver. 34. pronounced, as it were from the bottom of the heart, by the crucified person; and that he should so immediately after be released from his torments, — the Centurion thence felt assured, that he was not only a righteous person, but had the character which he claimed; namely, that of being ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ: on the force of which expression see Note on Matt. xxvii. 54.

40. [Comp. Ps. xxxviii. 12.]

41. [Comp. Luke viii. 2. 3.]

42. προσάββατον.] A very rare word, only occurring elsewhere in Judith viii. 6., and by which,

MT. LU.

27. 23. *λώμη, αὐ καὶ, ὅτε ἦν ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ, ἠκολούθουν αὐτῷ, καὶ διηκόνουν 41*
αὐτῷ· καὶ ἄλλαι πολλαὶ αἰ σνναναβῆσαι αὐτῷ εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα.
- 57 54 *Καὶ ἦδη ὀφίας γενομένης, (ἐπεὶ ἦν παρασκευῆ, ὃ ἐστὶ προσάββατον,) 42*
 51 * *ἐλθὼν Ἰησοῦς ὁ ἀπὸ Ἀρμαθαίας, εὐσχήμων βουλευτῆς, ὃς καὶ αὐτὸς 43*
 58 52 *ἦν προσδεχόμενος τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ· τολμήσας εἰσῆλθε πρὸς*
Πιλάτον, καὶ ᾔτήσατο τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. Ὁ δὲ Πιλάτος ἐθαύμασεν 44
εἰ ἦδη τέθνηκε· καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τὸν κεντυρίωνα, ἐπηρώτησεν
αὐτὸν εἰ πάλοι ἀπέθανε· καὶ γρονθὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ κεντυρίωνος, ἐδωρήσατο 45
 59 53 *τὸ σῶμα τῷ Ἰωσήφ. Καὶ ἀγοράσας σινδῶνα, καὶ καθελὼν αὐτὸν, 46*
 60 *ἐνέλιψε τῇ σινδῶνι, καὶ κατέθηκεν αὐτὸν ἐν μνημείῳ, ὃ ἦν λελατομη-*
μένον ἐκ πέτρας· καὶ προσεκύλισε λίθον ἐπὶ τὴν θύραν τοῦ μνημείου.
- 61 55 *Ἡ δὲ Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ καὶ Μαρίᾱ Ἰωσῆ ἐθνεύρουν πῶν τίθεται. 47*
28. 24. XVI. *ΚΑΙ διαγενομένου τοῦ σαββάτου, Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ καὶ 1*
 1 *Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Ἰακώβου καὶ Σαλώμη ἠγόρασαν ἀρώματα, ἵνα ἐλθούσαι*
 1 *ἀλείψωιν αὐτόν. Καὶ λιὰν πρῶτῃ τῆς μιᾶς σαββάτων ἔρχονται ἐπὶ τὸ 2*
 1 *μνημεῖον, ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου. Καὶ ἔλεγον πρὸς ἑαυτάς· Τίς 3*

as he was writing for Gentiles, Mark explains the Jewish sense of *παρασκευῆ*; meaning by *προσ.* the time which preceded the commencement of the Sabbath, which began at the sunset of Friday. [Comp. John xix. 88.]

43. *εὐσχήμων*] “respectable, honourable.” The word properly signifies of *good presence*, then *decorous, dignified*, &c. It is never used in this sense by the Classical writers; but is so employed in Joseph. de Vita 9. *ἀνδρῶν εὐσχημόνων*. By *βουλευτῆς* is meant, if not *one of the Sanhedrim*, at least *one of the council of the High Priest*. See Note on Matth.

—*ἐλθὼν*.] For the common reading *ἦλθεν* is found in many of the best MSS. and some Versions and Fathers; and was edited by Matth., Fritz., and Lachm., rightly, I think; for the common reading, as Fritz. observes, involves an intolerable *Asyndeton*: and for the addition of *καὶ* before *τολμήσας*, which would make all right, there is very little authority; and it was only an *emendation* of the Critics. Fritz. thinks that *ἦλθεν* partly arose from Matt. xxvii. 57, and partly from the Greek Interpreters (as we find from Euthym.) terminating the sentence at Θεοῦ; and having changed *ἐλθὼν* into *ἦλθεν*, and added *καὶ* before *τολμ.* So much trouble was occasioned by the awkward insertion (at least *here*) of *εὐσχημόνων*—Θεοῦ. Thus *τολμήσας* will be taken for the adverb *τολμηρῶς*; a frequent construction in the N. T., as Fritz. testifies. I would observe, that *ἐλθὼν* and *ἦλθεν* are so much alike in MSS., that one might *inadvertently* be confounded with the other. However, I would not venture to deny that it is *possible* *ἐλθὼν* may be the *emendation*, and *ἦλθεν* the original reading. But then the *καὶ* before *τολμ.* is indispensable. And as we must, in either case, take what *may* have proceeded from emendation, it seems prudent to give the preference to *number and excellence of MSS.*

44. *ἐθαύμασεν εἰ*.] Beza and others wrongly render the *εἰ* by *an*, as if there were a *doubt*; whereas *εἰ* is used with *θαυμάζειν*, as the Latin *si* with *mirari* (indeed with all verbs of *wonder*) to express what is not *doubted*, but *wondered* at: Thus we may here render, “that he were already dead!” The *πάλοι* is wrongly rendered in E. V.

“long.” Much mistake in the interpretation of the word might have been avoided by adverting to its primary sense. The word (as Valckn. and Lennep. show) comes from *πάλω* (or *πάλλω*), to violently shake any thing, and so turn it over. It is a Dative case of the old noun *πάλα*; and thus when used of *time* (to which it was early appropriated) denotes *δ χρόνος ὃ ἐπὶ πάλοι*, *tempus, quod retro est*, time which has been thrown back, got rid of, *past*; whether recently elapsed, or long gone by, in both which significations it occurs in the Classical writers. Thus the Latin *olim* is from *δλις* (and that from *δλω, volvo*), and properly denotes *χρόνος ὃ (κατ') δλιν*: (so *πάλιν* for *κατὰ πάλιν*) time which has rolled past and gone. Thus in the words of Pilate there is a repetition of the foregoing question, with the adoption of a more precise term.

46. *μνημεῖον ὃ ἦν, &c.*] Comp. Matt. xii. 40. xxvi. 12. John xix. 41. Wolf, Salmas., Krebs., Schleus., and others are mistaken in taking these words to denote a monument constructed of hewn and polished stone, as appears from Matt. xxvii. 60. *ὃ ἐλατόμησεν ἐν τῇ πέτρῳ*. It was, no doubt, a *cave hewn out in the rock*; that being the custom of the country, and of most of the Eastern nations. Many thousands of such *μνημεῖα* still remain, and are noticed by travellers.

—*θύραν*] Not “door,” but “entrance.”

XVI. I. *διαγενομένου*] “being elapsed,” or past: a sense of the word frequent in the Classical as well as Scriptural writers.

—*ἠγόρασαν*] Not “had bought,” but “bought.” So the Vulg. “*emerunt*,” a translation supposed to have been adopted to reconcile this passage with Luke xxiii. 56, where it is said that the spices were prepared upon the evening of the Sabbath. But, as Mr. Townsend observes, “it is only by a scrupulous adherence to the plain sense of Scripture that all difficulties are ever removed.” And the researches of recent Harmonists and Interpreters have established the fact, which had escaped the earlier Commentators, namely, that there were *two* parties of women, to whom the two Evangelists refer respectively. Thus also we are enabled satisfactorily to remove

	MT.	LU.
4 ἀποκλίσει ἡμῖν τὸν λίθον ἐκ τῆς θύρας τοῦ μνημείου; καὶ ἀνα- 27.	24.	
βλέψασαι θεωροῦσιν ὅτι ἀποκεκλύσται ὁ λίθος· ἦν γὰρ μέγας σφόν- 2		
5 δρα. Καὶ εἰσελθούσαι εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον, εἶδον νεανίσκον καθήμενον ἐν 3 3		
6 τοῖς δεξιotoῖς περιβεβλημένον στολὴν λευκὴν· καὶ ἐξεθαμβήθησαν. Ὁ 4		
δὲ λέγει αὐταῖς· Μὴ ἐθαμβεῖσθε. Ἰησοῦν ζητεῖτε τὸν Ναζαρηθὸν 5 5		
τὸν ἐσταυρωμένον· ἠγέρθη, οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε· ἶδε, ὁ τόπος ὅπου ἔθη- 6		
7 καν αὐτόν. Ἀλλ' ὑπάγετε, εἰπάτε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ Πέτρῳ, 7 6		
ὅτι προάγει ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν· ἐκεῖ αὐτὸν ὄψεσθε, καθὼς εἶπεν 16		
8 ὑμῖν. Καὶ ἐξελθούσαι [ταχὺ] ἔφυγον ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου. ἔιχε δὲ 8 9		
αὐτὰς τρόμος καὶ ἔκστασις· καὶ οὐδενὶ οὐδὲν εἶπον, ἐφοβούντο γάρ.		
9 Ἀναστὰς δὲ πρῶτὴ πρῶτῃ σαββάτου, ἐγένη πρῶτον Μιχαῖα τῇ Μαγ- 10		
δαληνῇ, ἀφ' ἧς ἐκβεβλήκει ἐπὶ δαιμόνια. Ἐκείνη πορευθεῖσα ἀπήγ- 11		
γαιλε τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ γενομένοις, πενθοῦσι καὶ κλαίουσι. Κάκεινοι, 12		
ἀκούσαντες ὅτι ζῆ καὶ ἐθείθη ὑπ' αὐτῆς, ἠπίστησαν. Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα 13		
δυσὶν ἐξ αὐτῶν, περιπατοῦσιν, ἐφανερῶθη ἐν ἐτέρῳ μορῇ, πορευομένοις 13		
εἰς ἀγρόν. Κάκεινοι ἀπελθόντες ἀπήγγειλαν τοῖς λοιποῖς· οὐδὲ ἐκέ-		

a difficulty which had embarrassed the old Commentators; namely, to reconcile ἀνατελειαντος τοῦ ἡλίου at ver. 2. with the πρῶτὴ σκοτίας ἐτι οὔσης at John xx. 1.

4. Ἦν γὰρ μέγας σφόνδρα.] The Commentators have been not a little perplexed with this clause, because it cannot be referred to what immediately precedes. To remove this difficulty, some would take γὰρ in the sense of δὲ. But it is better, with others, to suppose that the words have reference, not to the clause which immediately preceded, but to the one before that, τίς — μνημείου; the intermediate words being regarded as parenthetical. Yet the construction at καὶ ἀναβλέψασαι will not admit of the parenthesis; and thus the difficulty remains in its full force; and it would seem impossible to remove it, except by transposing the words, as is done by Newcome and Wakef. But for that there is little authority: and what may be allowable in forming translations, is not so in editing the words of an original. I cannot but think that the γὰρ has reference to some clause omitted; not, indeed, that which Whitby, Grot., and Rosenm. ad libitum suppose, “and this happened luckily for them;” but to something which may be supplied from both the preceding sentences, thus: “[And well might they say, Who will roll, &c., and behold, doubtless with surprise, its removal;] for it was very great.” Thus the words at ver. 7. καθὼς εἶπεν ὁ. are, with Fritz., to be referred, not to the clause which immediately precedes, but to the one before that.

5. [Comp. John xx. 12.]

7. τοῖς μαθηταῖς a.] Many recent Commentators understand, by this expression, Christ's followers in general. But the older ones (and lately Fritz.) seem right in taking it to denote the Apostles, by a frequent figure of speech, whereby a part is put for the whole; and of which examples are adduced by Grot.

The καὶ just after is best rendered, “et (praesertim),” as put for καὶ μάλιστα; a signification often occurring in the Classical writers from Homer downwards. On the reason why Peter is here named, the Commentators differ in opinion; though they are in general agreed that it

was not from any pre-eminence which he had over the rest of the Apostles. The several reasons they assign may perhaps be conjoined. Peter was, it seems, named both for his consolation and assurance, and also from the permanent regard which his singular affection towards his Master had created. See supra xiv. 23. Matt. xxvi. 32. Acts i. 3. xiii. 31. 1 Cor. xv. 5.

8. ταχύ.] This is omitted in most of the best MSS., and is cancelled by almost every Editor from Wets. to Scholz. It was, no doubt, introduced from Matt. xviii. 8. The words οὐδενὶ οὐδὲν εἶπον must (as appears from the ἐφοβούντο just after) be understood of the time during their return, or shortly after; and of the persons whom they might then meet with. [Comp. John xx. 13.]

9. The authenticity of the remainder of this Gospel has been impugned by several Critics, but defended by more. See a statement of the arguments on both sides in Recens. Synop. To what is there said it may be added, that Scholz, after all his researches (extended to MSS. nearly half as numerous again as Griesbach's), has never been able to find this portion omitted in more than one MS. (and that one in which great liberties have been taken) and a single Version.

9. ἐπὶ δαιμόνια.] Many of the recent Foreign Commentators stumble at the ἐπὶ. But it has no difficulty, except to those who adopt Mede's hypothesis with respect to the Demoniacs. Why should not this poor wretch have been possessed with seven devils as well as another was with a legion? i. e. very many. [Comp. John xx. 14. 16. Luke viii. 2.]

12. ἐν ἐτέρῳ μορῇ.] Some interpret μορῇ of dress; but the authority for that signification is very slender. Others, more properly, understand by it, visage and general appearance. Whatever the alteration in appearance might be, it was such as also to prevent our Lord's being immediately recognised by the two disciples who were going into the country. See Luke xxiv. 13.

13. οὐδὲ ἐκείνοις ἐπίστευσαν.] This seems to be at variance with Luke xxiv. 34., who says, that before they approached, Jesus had appeared to Simon, and that he had related it to the assembly.

a John 20. 19.
1 Cor. 15. 5, 7.

νοὺς ἐπίστευσαν. ^a Ὑστερον ἀνακειμένοις αὐτοῖς τοῖς ἕνδεκα ἐφανερῶ- 14
θη· καὶ ᾤνειδισε τὴν ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν καὶ σκληροκαρδίαν, ὅτι τοῖς

b John 15. 16.

θεασαμένοις αὐτὸν ἐγγηγερόμενον οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν. ^b Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· 15
Πορευθέντες εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἅπαντα, κηρύξατε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον πάσῃ
τῇ κτίσει. Ὁ πιστεύσας καὶ βαπτισθῆς σωθήσεται· ὁ δὲ ἀπιστήσας 16

c Luke 10. 17.
Acts 5. 16.
& 8. 7.
& 16. 18.

κατακριθήσεται. ^c Σημεῖα δὲ τοῖς πιστεύουσι ταῦτα παρακολουθήσει· 17
ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου δαιμόνια ἐκβαλοῦσι· γλώσσαις λαλήσουσι καιναῖς·

& 2. 4.
& 10. 46.
1 Cor. 12. 10,
28.

^d ὄφεις ἄρουσι· κἄν θανάσιμόν τι πῶσιν, οὐ μὴ αὐτοὺς βλάψει· ἐπὶ 18
ἄρρώστους χεῖρας ἐπιθήσουσι, καὶ καλῶς ἔξουσιν.

d Luke 10. 19.
Acts 28. 3, 8.

Ὁ μὲν οὖν Κύριος, μετὰ τὸ λαλῆσαι αὐτοῖς, ἀνελήφθη εἰς τὸν οὐρα- 19
νόν, καὶ ἐκάθισεν ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ. Ἐκείνοι δὲ ἐξεληθόντες ἐκήρυξαν 20
πανταχοῦ, τοῦ κυρίου συνεργοῦντος, καὶ τὸν λόγον βεβαιοῦντος διὰ τῶν
ἐπακολουθούντων σημεῖων.

For even *this* they had not fully credited, nay, even when Jesus had come up, Luke adds, *ἐτι ἀπιστοῦντων αὐτῶν*. All this, however, tends to make us repose a firmer confidence in the testimony of those who themselves so slowly and cautiously admitted belief. (Grot.) In the passage of Luke, the Apostles and Disciples are indeed spoken of, but *λαλοῦντες* does not denote *all* the Apostles and Disciples gathered together, but only some of them. Passages of this sort, in which what seems spoken of *all* is to be understood only of some, are not unfrequent in the N. T. There is therefore *no discrepancy* between Mark and Luke. *Some* of the assembly (as Luke tells us) believed that Jesus had returned to life; *all the rest* denied implicit credit to the narrations concerning that event. Hence even when Jesus appeared to them, they fancied they saw a *phantasm*; from all which we may conclude that they were by no means *credulous*. (Kuini.)

15. *πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει*] i. e. to all human creatures, both Jews and Gentiles, to *all nations*, as Matthew expresses it.

16. *ὁ πιστεύσας — κατακριθήσεται*.] By comparing this with the commission given the Apostles, Matt. xxviii. 20, and Luke xxiv. 47, it is plain that not only *faith*, but *repentance* and *obedience* were to be preached in the name of Christ, the sense being, that he who by true and lively faith embraces Christianity, and engages, in baptism, to obey its injunctions, and faithfully fulfil his engagements, shall obtain everlasting salvation. With respect to *κατακριθήσεται* whether it be rendered "damned," or "condemned," matters but little as to the ultimate sense; since, upon the *lowest* meaning that has been affixed to *σωθήσεται* (namely, the being put into a state of salvation), the contrary cannot but imply a state of *present reprobation*; which, if continued in, must assuredly terminate in *perdition*: and the *condemnation*, to take place at the day of Judgment, cannot but imply the being consigned to the curse, and the eternal woe consequent upon it. By "not believing," is meant either obstinately refusing assent to the evidence of the truth of the Gospel, however satisfactory; or not so believing the

Gospel as to *obey* it, and thus holding the truth in unrighteousness. In the former case, he who believeth not must be condemned to eternal misery, because he rejects the only means whereby he can be saved. That reason requires us to limit the denunciation here to *wilful* disbelief, and not extend it to *involuntary*, is shown by Dr. Campb. and Dr. Maltby, cited by me in Recens. Synop. And that it is confirmed by the word of God, is plain from John iii. 18. compared with v. 36.

17. *σημεῖα δὲ, &c.*] [*Comp.* Luke x. 17. Acts v. 16. & viii. 7. xvi. 18. ii. 4. x. 46. 1 Cor. xii. 10, 28.] On the several particulars of our Lord's promise, so as to show their full force and exact fulfilment, much valuable matter may be found in Recens. Synop. The exercise of the *first* gift, namely, the casting out of devils, is proved by the early Fathers, Justin Martyr, Clemens Alex., Origen, Irenæus, Tertullian, &c. Of the *second*, namely, *speaking with new tongues*, which must be understood, in its *full* sense, of the miraculous communication of the faculty of speaking with tongues never previously learned, (on which I have copiously treated in the Note at Acts ii. 4.), we have abundant proof, both from Scripture, and the testimonies of the earliest Fathers. The same may be said of the next two particulars, the "*taking up of serpents*," and the "*drinking of poison without injury*." The former was in that age regarded as a decisive test of supernatural protection; though we find that this power was sometimes pretended to by impostors. As to the *latter*, that faculty (as Doddr. observes) would be especially necessary in an age when the art of poisoning was brought to such cursed refinement. As to the *fifth* particular, *healing the sick* supernaturally, the Scriptures and early Ecclesiastical writers are full of examples. Upon the whole, there is abundant evidence for the fulfilment of all the promises which the above expressions, in their plain and full sense, imply; and for their chief purposes, namely, of miraculous attestation to their Divine mission, and supernatural protection under all the evils which they should have to encounter in the exercise of their ministry.

ΤΟ ΚΑΤΑ ΛΟΥΚΑΝ

ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ.

1 Ἰ. ἘΠΕΙΔΗΠΕΡ πολλοὶ ἐπεχείρησαν ἀνατάξασθαι διήγησιν περὶ
2 τῶν πεπληροφορημένων ἐν ἡμῖν πραγμάτων, ^a καθὼς παρῶσαν ἡμῖν ^{a Heb. 2. 3.}
^{1 John 1. 1.}

Of this Evangelist (as of St. Mark) little is known with certainty, except what is learned from the N. T. The traditions of the early Fathers are few and slight; and those of the later ones merit little attention. They, and the older Commentators in general, are of opinion that he was a *Jew*; but their proofs are by no means strong. It is *more probable* that (as many recent Expositors suppose) he was descended from Gentile parents, but had in his youth embraced Judaism, from which he had been converted to Christianity. Yet whether even this be true, may be doubted; for there is great reason to think that Luke was but a very young man when converted to *Christianity*; and it is not likely that he had, before that time, passed over from Paganism to Judaism. It may rather be supposed that he was born of *Jewish* parents; or at least (as in the case of Timothy) of parents, the father a gentile, and the mother a Jewess. The Hebrew-Greek style of his writings and the accurate knowledge shewn in them of the Jewish religion, make it probable that the writer was not a *Jewish Proselyte*, but a *Jew*, on the *mother's* side, though a Greek on the father's. Thus also we are enabled to account for the power of Greek style which he occasionally evinces. For it was likely that he would by his *father* be competently instructed in Greek literature. That he should be *so far* a Jew, is not at all inconsistent with his bearing a *Greek* name, which he would derive from his father. There is, I apprehend, nothing in the N. T. which militates against this hypothesis (by which all seeming discrepancies are reconciled), but much to confirm it; for surely he was more likely to be reckoned among *Jews* (see Acts xxi. 27. compared with xxi. 15 & 17.), if he were *Jew-born* by the mother's side, and brought up a Jew, than if he had been merely a *Proselyte* from Gentilism. As to the argument founded on Col. iv. 11 & 14, it is by no means cogent; since the *opposition* there alleged between Arist., Marcus, and Justus, and Luke and Demas, cannot be shown to exist.

The first mention of Luke in the N. T. is at Acts xvi. 10 & 11, where he is said to have been with Paul at Troas; from whence he attended him to Jerusalem, and having continued with him in his troubles, accompanied him on his voyage from Casarea to Rome, and stayed with him during his two years' confinement there. The time of Luke's death we cannot ascertain from any precise information. We only know that it was after that of St. Peter and of St. Paul. With this is closely connected *another* question,—as to the *date* of the publication of his Gospel; which I have considered at large in the *Introd.* to Mark's Gospel, when treating on the sources of the first three Gospels. Of the *genuineness* and *authenticity* of this Gospel, there has never been any doubt entertained. It is quoted or alluded to by writers, in an unbroken chain, from the Apostolical Fathers down to the time of Chrysostom. To its *Canonical authority*, indeed (as well as that of St. Mark's Gospel), objections have been made by *Michaelis*. These, however, have been satisfactorily answered, especially by Professor Alexander (of America) on the Canon of the N. T. p. 202—210, whose remarks may be seen in Mr. Horne's Introduction. As to the authenticity of the first two Chapters, which has been recently called in question by those who impugn the miraculous conception of Christ,—suffice it to say, that those Chapters are found in *all the MSS.* of the Gospel, of which we have any knowledge, and in *all the Versions*. And to this complete *external evidence* may be added *internal evidence* of the strongest kind: for while there is no Critical reason imaginable *against* the Chapters, there is the strongest reason to suppose them *genuine*, since the 1st is connected with the 2d, and the 2d with the 3d, in exactly the same manner as the 1st and 2d Chapters of Matthew are connected with the 3d. In fact, the only argument even *specious*, that has been urged against their authenticity is, that they were not found in the copies used by *Marcion* in the second century. But Dr. Lardner has shewn, that if he used

οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρεταὶ γερόμενοι τοῦ λόγου· ^b ἔδοξε

^b Acts 1. 1.

καί μοι, παρηκολουθηκοῖ ἄνωθεν πᾶσιν ἀκριβοῦς, καθέξις σοὶ γράψαι, 3

St. Luke's Gospel at all, he so mutilated and altered it, that even he did not allow it to be called *Luke's Gospel*. Indeed, several of the most distinguished Critics of the last half century (as Semler, Eichhorn, Griesb., Loeffler, Bp. Marsh, and Dr. Pye Smith) have shown that there is no good reason for supposing that he used St. Luke's Gospel at all. That this Gospel was written for the benefit of *Gentile converts*, is quite plain from the contents, and is confirmed by the unanimous voice of antiquity. On which see Dr. Townson's Works, Vol. I. pp. 181—196, or Horne's Introduction, Vol. IV. 296. sq. On the difficulty which has been found (or rather made) in the Proem, and what was the general purpose of the Evangelist in drawing up this Gospel, the reader is referred to the Notes on the Proem. St. Luke's Gospel is, both in plan and character, different from those of St. Matthew and St. Mark; having many peculiarities, and especially this, that, while Matthew and Mark generally relate the facts they record *chronologically*, Luke has mostly not done so, but narrated them according to a *classification* of events; a plan pursued by writers of the greatest eminence, as Livy, Suetonius, Florus, and, to a certain degree, Plutarch in his Lives.

With respect to the *style* of this Gospel, it is purer and more fluent than that of the others; as might be expected from one who, as a Physician, must have had a tolerably good education, and have been, in some degree, a man of letters. There is one peculiarity which deserves attention, namely, that (as Dr. Campb. has remarked) "while each of the Evangelists has a number of words used by none but himself, in St. Luke's Gospel the number of such words is greater than that of all the others put together; and in the *Acts* very far more." For further information on this subject, the reader is referred to Schleiermacher's Critical Essay on the Gospel of St. Luke; and especially to a valuable Critique on it by Dr. Burton in the British Critic for 1827, also Bp. Cleaver's Discourse on the style of St. Luke's Gospel. Suffice it to say that, as there is more of the finish of composition in this Gospel, there is less of nature and simplicity than in the other three. The writer also approaches nearer to the regular historian, by giving, as it were, his *own opinion and judgment* combined with his narrative. See vi. 11. vi. 16. xvi. 4. xi. 53. iii. 20. In recording the moral instructions given by our Lord, especially in the *Parables*, he is surpassed by no other writer for simplicity and pathos.

I. 1. ἐπειδήπερ—διήγησεν.] There is a similar commencement to Justin's History; "Cum multi ex Romanis—res Romanas Græco peregrinoque sermone contulissent, &c.;" and to Isocrat. ad Demon., p. 2. "Ὅσοι μενὸν τοὺς προτρεπτικοῦς λόγους συγγράφουσι, καλὸν ἔργον ἐπιχειροῦσι, &c." See also the commencement to Josephus's Jewish Antiq. *Who* are meant by these "*many*" has been much discussed; but it is now agreed that the *Gospels of Matthew and Mark* could not be intended to be included in those writings; St. Matthew being one τῶν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπτων, and the Gospel of Mark not yet written. The narratives in question were probably the compositions of pious and well-meaning persons; but, as we may infer, without the necessary information, or qualifications for writing a Gospel History. They

were not intentionally false, but necessarily erroneous and defective. It is certain that we are not to understand what are called the *Apocryphal Gospels* (as they have been collected by Fabricius), since very few, if any, of those can be proved to have been then in being. It is, however, probable that a portion of them would be incorporated into those Apocryphal Gospels, and thus have been preserved. "It is (as Wets. observes) not surprising that the minds of men, strongly excited as they were by the mighty *moral revolution* which had taken place, should have been deeply interested about the origin and nature of a Religion so novel in its character, and promulgated in a manner so widely different from all that had preceded it." And that several should have applied themselves to satisfy this rational curiosity; professing, indeed, to derive their relations from credible, but all of them, more or less, erroneous and defective testimonies. That they were in some degree defective or erroneous, is implied in the very act of St. Luke's undertaking to supply Theophilus with more certain information. For the use of the term ἐπιχειροῦν will not, as the ancient and some modern Commentators have supposed, supply any such inference; since the word merely means to *undertake* any thing, whether the attempt be accomplished, or *fail*: and therefore, as the Evangelist certainly means not to speak invidiously of the compositions in question; we may, with the most eminent modern Commentators, suppose that there is here no reference to either *success* or *failure*.

Ἀνατάσσεισθαι has been wrongly supposed by some to signify *re-arranging what is already written*. For the sense of *repetition* in the word, though frequent, is not perpetual. Nor need we, with some, suppose that the preposition here loses its proper force. It is better to take it to denote, not indeed, *repetition*, but *succession*, as of one thing after another, which implies *setting in order*. Thus ἀνατάσσεισθαι will be equivalent to *συντάσσεισθαι*, and that, in a figurative sense, may very well denote *contexere, componere*.

—πεπληροφορημένω] Πληροφόρος signifies, 1st, to carry a *full measure*, to be full, or make full. 2dly, to render *fully certain*, either as spoken, 1. of persons, or, 2. (as here and in 2 Tim. iv. 17.) of things, which are thus said to be fully confirmed and established, and are therefore received as *certain truths*, with full assurance of faith.

2. καθὼς παρέθεσται] Some difficulty attaches to these words (though English Commentators almost universally fail to notice it); for if they be referred, with most Interpreters, to the *narratives before mentioned*, there would seem to be no *reason* why St. Luke should undertake a work which would appear to be superfluous; the information in those being supplied by the persons best qualified to give it. But though that reference may, according to the construction, be made, it is certain that such could not be St. Luke's meaning, otherwise he would have said, not *ἡμῖν*, but *αὐτοῖς*. What, then, is the reference? Shall we suppose it to be the present Gospel? thus understanding an *hyperbaton*, and making the clause καθὼς, &c. come in after ἀκριβοῦς? A method pursued by the learned Capellus. This, however, I have not ventured to adopt, since it is at once too violent and arbitrary. Neither, indeed, is it necessary;

4 κράτιστε Θεόφιλε, ἵνα ἐπιγνῶς περὶ ὧν κατηχήθης λόγων τὴν ἀσφάλειαν.

5 Ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἡρώδου τοῦ βασιλέως τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἱερεὺς ^{c Matt. 2. 1. I Chron. 24. 10, Neh. 12. 4, 17.} τῆς ὀνόματι Ζαχαρίας ἐξ ἐφημερίας Ἀβιά· καὶ ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῶν

6 θυγατέρων Ἀαρῶν, καὶ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς Ἐλισάβετ. Ἰσταν δὲ δίκαιοι

for if, with Koecher, Rosenm., and Kuin. (and I think Grot.), the καθὼς, &c. be referred to τῶν πεπληροφορημένων ἐν ἡμῖν πραγμάτων; (these words being understood to assign the ground of that firm conviction) thus καθὼς will have (as not unfrequently in the N. T.) the sense *inasmuch as, quatenus*. By ἡμῖν will be meant "us Christians," i. e. all Christians.

— ἀπ' ἀρχῆς] This is by some supposed to refer to the period at which St. Luke commences his narration; by others, to the commencement of Christ's ministry. The former view is manifestly erroneous; and the latter far from well founded, since the expression must (like that at Matt. xix. 10.) refer to the *primordia* of the thing in question; namely, the *Christian dispensation*, which had its origin in the birth of Christ. So I John i. 1. ὃ ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ὃ ἀκηκάμεν, ὃ ἐσοκάμεν — ἀπαγγέλλομεν ὑμῖν (a passage admirably illustrative of the present). Comp. also Heb. ii. 3. And so often in St. John's Gospel and Epistles. See Benson's examples on the above passage. It is probable, however, that by ἀρχῆ St. Luke means the *remote origin* of the Christian dispensation in the birth of the Forerunner of its Author, namely, John the Baptist; which the Evangelist commences with narrating. Thus also St. Mark i. 1. says that the Gospel had its origin in the preaching of John the Baptist, as prophesied of by Isaiah.

— τοῦ λόγου.] Many of the best Commentators take this to mean "the thing in question, i. e. the Gospel." And ὑπάρχει they interpret "associates in the matter," namely, Christ's relatives, disciples, and friends. Of this sense of λόγος, examples are adduced from Acts xiii. 5, 15, 26. 1 Cor. iv. 1. Wisd. vi. 4. and several from the Classical writers. There is, however, no good reason to abandon the common interpretation, by which τοῦ λόγου is taken to mean τοῦ λόγου τοῦ Θεοῦ, the Gospel; a signification frequent in this Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles, and derived from that frequent idiom, by which the Jews applied the phrase, "the word of God;" or, elliptically, "the word," to whatever is revealed by God to men for their instruction. Thus, too, we obtain a more significant expression, and one more agreeable to facts; since Luke received his information, both from those who had attended on the ministry of Christ while on earth, and from those who, after his ascension, were preëminently ministers for the propagation of his Gospel throughout the world; especially Saint Paul.

3. παρακολουθεῖν — ἀκριβῶς.] Render: "having accurately investigated every thing from the very first." Παρακολουθεῖν signifies properly to follow up, trace, &c. Many examples have been adduced from the Classical writers, both of the natural and the figurative sense. Ἐνωθεν cannot mean (as some imagine) "by inspiration;" since the context requires the usual sense "from the very first." Thus it is equivalent to ἀπ' ἀρχῆς just before, and has reference to the period at which the Gospel commences (namely, from the conception of John the Baptist), a period earlier than that of Matthew and Mark.

— καθεζῆς.] This denotes, not so much order of time, as of events, with reference to the regular disposition, and orderly classification which especially distinguish this Gospel. See the Introd.

— Ομόφιλε.] The notion of some of the older Commentators, that this is only a feigned name, expressive of any Christian, and not that of a real person, is now generally exploded. It would indeed be the only instance in the N. T. of a feigned name. Κράτιστε may be (as it is regarded by the best Commentators) a title of respect and civility addressed to persons of rank and consequence. So Acts xiii. 26. τὸ κράτιστον Φίλιππε. and xxiv. 3. κράτιστε Φίλιξε. But reference to title would be out of place here, and not agreeable to the manner of Scripture. The sense therefore seems to be that of our word excellent, defined by Johnson as "said of a person of great virtue and worth." So Ps. xviii. 3. 2 Macc. iv. 12. Thucyd. ii. 40. κράτιστοι δ' ἂν τὴν ψυχὴν δικαίως καθεῖεν. To suppose it (with some) used like the Roman "vir præstantissime, vir optime," i. e. as a civil compliment, is forbidden by the character of an Evangelist to his convert. In fact, the above sense assigned to κράτιστε proceeds upon the supposition, purely gratuitous, that Theophilus was a person of high rank and elevated station; a circumstance, to say the least, doubtful. It is probable that he had been converted by Luke, and that he lived out of Palestine.

4. ἵνα ἐπιγνῶς] The ἐπι is here intensive, and the sense of the verb is to ascertain and be thoroughly informed of any thing. Κατηχήθης does not import what is now meant by Catechetical instruction, but merely denotes that instruction (elementary and chiefly *vivâ voce*), which preceded and followed up admission by baptism into the Christian Church. By λόγων are, I conceive, meant, as the subject of the κατηχ., both the statements made of the facts which had taken place respecting the origin of the new religion, and the doctrines which it revealed. It is remarked by Kuin., that τὴν ἀσφάλειαν glances at the opposite qualities in the narrations just adverted to; as do also the preceding terms ἄνωθεν, ἀκριβῶς, and καθεζῆς.

5. ἐφημερίας.] This word (from ἐπι and ἡμέριος, a poetic form for ἡμεριδός) signifies properly a daily service, as was that of the Jewish priests in the temple; and since that was performed by the priests, in turn, for a week alternately, it came to denote (as here), by metonymy, the class (and there were 24 classes) that took that weekly service in rotation. This is mentioned, to show that John was of honourable birth. Zacharias was not, however (as has been supposed), the High Priest; since τις is added, and the High Priest was of no class at all. The offering of incense was, no doubt, only the daily offering, which would fall to his lot as an ordinary priest in his course.

6. δίκαιοι] "persons of uprightness and integrity." Ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ is an Hebraic adjunct importing reality; for whatever is what it is, in the sight of an omniscient God, must be really so. The words following are exegetical and illustra-

ἀμφοτέροι ἐνόπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ, πορευόμενοι ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐντολαῖς καὶ δικαιοῦμασι τοῦ Κυρίου ἄμεμπτοι. Καὶ οὐκ ἦν αὐτοῖς τέκνον, καθότι 7 ἡ Ἐλισάβετ ἦν στείρα, καὶ ἀμφοτέροι προβεβηκότες ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις αὐτῶν ἦσαν. Ἐγένετο δὲ, ἐν τῷ ἱερατεύειν αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ τάξει τῆς 8 ἐφημερίας αὐτοῦ ἔναντι τοῦ Θεοῦ, ^d κατὰ τὸ ἔθος τῆς ἱερατείας, 9 ἔλαχε τοῦ θυμαίωσαι, εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὸν ναὸν τοῦ Κυρίου· καὶ πᾶν τὸ 10 πλῆθος τοῦ λαοῦ ἦν προσευχόμενον ἕξω τῇ ὥρᾳ τοῦ θυμιάματος. 11 Ὁ ἄγγελος Κυρίου ἐστῶς ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ θυμισατηρίου 12 τοῦ θυμιάματος. καὶ ἐταράχθη Ζαχαρίας ἰδὼν, καὶ φόβος ἐπέπεσεν 13 ἐπ' αὐτόν. Ἐἶπε δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ ἄγγελος· Μὴ φοβοῦ, Ζαχαρία· 14 διότι εἰσηκούσθη ἡ δέησις σου, καὶ ἡ γυνή σου Ἐλισάβετ γεννήσει υἱόν σοι, καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰωάννην. ^e Καὶ ἔσται χαρὰ 14 σοι καὶ ἀγαλλίασις, καὶ πολλοὶ ἐπὶ τῇ † γεννήσει αὐτοῦ χαρήσονται.

^d Exod. 30. 7. Lev. 16. 17. Heb. 9. 6.

^e Exod. 30. 1.

^f Infr. ver. 60.

^g Infr. ver. 58.

tive; and πορευόμενοι is figuratively used of *habitual action*. Δικαιοῦμασι and ἐντολαῖς, denoting the ordinances and commandments, are nearly synonymous; but the former may (as some suppose) denote the moral, the latter the ceremonial law. ἄμεμπτοι (irreproachable) expresses their good repute with men, as δικ. their piety towards God. So Ovid (cited by Wets.) says similarly of Deucalion and Pyrrha, "innocuos ambos, cultores numinis ambos.

7. καθότι] "inasmuch as," "seeing that."

—προβεβηκότες ἐν ταῖς ἡμ. This is said to be a Hebraism: but it is only such by the use of ἡμεραῖς for ἡλικία, and in the use of ἐν; the Classical writers (as is shown by the examples in Recens. Synop.) using the phrase προβαίνειν τῇ ἡλικίᾳ, or κατὰ τὴν ἡλικίαν. The expression exactly corresponds to our *elderly*, and the Greek ὠρογέρων. So Suid. explains προβεβηκότι by παλαιωτέρους. This, in the present case, could not exceed 50, since after that time a priest was superannuated.

8. ἱερατεύειν.] The word is only found in the later writers; the earlier ones using ἱεραθεῖν.

9. ἔλαχε τοῦ θυμιάωσαι.] Sub. κληρὸν, scil. μέρος, which is expressed in Acts i. 17; though perhaps the Accus. may be the λάχος included in the verb. Among the various offices thus distributed by lot, the most honourable was this,—of burning incense. So much so, indeed, that no priest was allowed to perform it more than *once*. Τὸν ναὸν τοῦ Κ. ; i. e., the *Sanctuary*, in which was the altar of incense, as distinguished from the temple at large, in which the people were praying, v. 10.

10. For τοῦ λαοῦ ἦν several MSS. have ἦν τοῦ λαοῦ, which is adopted by almost every Editor from Matth. to Scholz; but wrongly. I conceive; for the authority is too weak to establish the existence of so great a harshness as the separation of a Genit. so closely connected with its Nomin. as τοῦ λαοῦ with πλῆθος. This harshness, and the small number of MSS. in favour of the new reading, induce me to suspect that it arose from a mere error of the scribes; who first omitting τοῦ λαοῦ (which, indeed, would not seem very necessary) and then, observing the error, inserted the ἦν after τοῦ λαοῦ. The same kind of mistake has occasioned many thousands of corruptions in the Classical writers. For a description of the sacred rite then performing see Lightf. in Rec. Syn. and compare Eccles. i. 15, and seqq.

11. ἐκ δεξιῶν] scil. μερῶν. This was considered as a good omen by the ancients. And such an-

gelic appearances are occasionally mentioned in *Scripture*, as Judg. xiii. 22, and Dan. x. 8.

13. On the circumstances connected with the births of John the Baptist and of Christ, see Lightf., Whitby, and Mackn., and especially Dr. Bell on the mission of John the Baptist; who ably evinces the genuineness of this part of the sacred history, and shows, that "the whole train of events here said to have taken place, are of a nature so entirely beyond the power of man to produce, that, if they really happened as they are said to have happened, the authority of any fact founded on them becomes unquestionable." He further shows, that "whatever circumstance one may select with the endeavour to fix *imposture*, it can be evinced that any such supposition involves absurdities of the grossest sort; in fact, that in general, the supposed imposture is not only *morally*, but almost *physically* impossible. And, in short, that whether the character, circumstances, and condition of the persons concerned, or the nature of the supposed *plot* and its chances of success be considered, the whole affair is completely immersed in absurdity, and runs counter to the ordinary principles of human action."

—εἰσηκούσθη.] A Hellenistic use of the word, in which the εἰς signifies *leaning towards*, which implies *favour*, &c.

—ἡ δέησις σου.] Some think the prayer adverted to was a prayer for offspring; addressed either then or formerly. Many specious arguments have been urged for, and not a few weighty reasons against this supposition. Besides that the apparent impossibility of the thing may be supposed to have produced acquiescence in the will of God; the pious priest would be unlikely to mingle private concerns with public devotions; and it is, therefore, more probable that he was praying for the advent of Him whose coming many signs announced to be near at hand, even the Messiah.

14. ἔσται χαρὰ σοι.] Literally, "he shall be joy to thee," i. e. occasion of joy; said in allusion to the name Ἰωάννης, which signifies "the grace and mercy of God." Ἀγαλλίασις is a stronger term, and denotes *exultation*. Instead of γεννήσει, Griesb. and many others down to Scholz edit, from very many MSS., γενέσθαι, which is, indeed, agreeable to the *proprietas lingue*; but of such minutiae the sacred writers are little observant, and the former was more likely to be changed into the latter than the contrary.

- 15^h Ἔσται γὰρ μέγας ἐνώπιον τοῦ Κυρίου· καὶ οἶνον καὶ σίκερα οὐ μὴ h Num. 6. 3.
Jud. 13. 4.
Jer. 1. 5.
Gal. 1. 15.
πίη· καὶ Πνεύματος ἁγίου πλησθήσεται ἔτι ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς αὐτοῦ.
- 16ⁱ Καὶ πολλοὺς τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ ἐπιστρέψει ἐπὶ Κύριον τὸν Θεὸν αὐτῶν. i Mal. 4. 5.
Matt. 11. 14.
- 17^k Καὶ αὐτὸς προελεύσεται ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ ἐν πνεύματι καὶ δυνάμει k Mal. 4. 6.
Matt. 3. 1.
Mark 9. 12.
Ἰλίου· ἐπιστρέψαι καρδίας πατέρων ἐπὶ τέκνα καὶ ἀπειθεῖς ἐν φρο- 1 Gen. 17. 17.
- 18 νήσει δικαίων, ἐτοιμάσαι Κύριῳ λαὸν κατεσκευασμένον. ¹ Καὶ εἶπε 1 Gen. 17. 17.
Ζαχαρίας πρὸς τὸν ἄγγελον· Κατὰ τί γνώσομαι τοῦτο; ἐγὼ γὰρ
εἰμι πρεσβύτης, καὶ ἡ γυνή μου προβεβηκυῖα ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις αὐτῆς.
- 19^m Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ ἄγγελος εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Ἐγὼ εἰμι Γαβριὴλ ὁ παρ- m Dan. 8. 16.
& 9. 21.
Matt. 18. 10.
εστηκὸς ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ· καὶ ἀπεστάλην λαλῆσαι πρὸς σε, καὶ
- 20 εὐαγγελίσασθαί σοι ταῦτα. Καὶ ἰδοὺ, ἔση σιωπῶν καὶ μὴ δυνάμενος
λαλῆσαι ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας γένηται ταῦτα, ἀνθ' ὧν οὐκ ἐπίστευσας τοῖς
- 21 λόγοις μου, οἷτινες πληρωθήσονται εἰς τὸν καιρὸν αὐτῶν. Καὶ ἦν ὁ
λαὸς προσδοκῶν τὸν Ζαχαριάν· καὶ ἐθαύμαζον ἐν τῷ χροιάζειν αὐτὸν

15. μέγας ἐνώπιον τοῦ Κυρίου] i. e. μέγας παρὰ Θεῶν, in the sight of the Lord or Jehovah. Though some take Κυρίουν of Christ, yet Middlet. has shown that the use of the Article with Κυρ. requires us to understand it of Jehovah.

—οἶνον —πίη.] A Nazaritic injunction. So Numb. vi. 3, it is said of him who has vowed a vow of Nazareth: ἀπὸ οἴνου καὶ σίκερα ἀγνισθήσεται. Σίκερα is derived from the Heb. שכר, to inebriate, and denotes generally any intoxicating drink; but was chiefly applied to what we call made wines; or fermented drink, such as ale, or spirit of aniseed, &c. The words ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς αὐτοῦ contain a Hebrew hyperbole, denoting "from the earliest period." See Is. xlvi. 8; xlix. 1 & 5. Ps. lxxi. 6. Yet something very similar occurs in the Anthol. Græc. v. 25. The Classical writers use the phrases ἐκ παιδός, or βρέφους, or νηπιῶν. The ἔτι is for ἤδη.

16. ἐπιστρέψει ἐπὶ Κύρ.] "will convert to the true worship of God," as Acts xi. 21; xiv. 15. 2 Cor. iii. 16.

17. αὐτοῦ.] A difference of opinion exists as to what this is to be referred. Some, as Kuin., regard it as put *emphatically* for Christ, and compare Luke v. 17. 1 John ii. 6 & 12. But there the reference is not, as here, clear and determinate, the αὐτοῦ being closely connected with Κύριον τὸν Θεόν, i. e. Jehovah. The allusion in προελεύσεται ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ is clear from Matt. iii. 3. where see Note. Πνεύματι signifies disposition, and δυνάμει zeal, energy, or mighty endowments. On Elias, as a type of the Baptist, see Note on Matt. xi. 14. In ἐπιστρέψαι, &c. there is plainly an allusion to Mal. iv. 6, (compare also Eccles. xlvi. 10,) but on the exact import of the words Commentators are not agreed. The most natural mode of interpretation, and that most suitable to the words of the Prophet, is to regard them as denoting that reconciliation of discordant sects and political feuds, by a common repentance and reformation, and general cultivation of philanthropy, which it was the purpose of the Gospel to promulgate and enjoin on men.

—καὶ ἀπειθεῖς ἐν φρονήσει δικ.] There is some difference of opinion as to the sense of these words. Many Commentators construe them with the words following, and render: "And by the wisdom of the righteous (or of righteousness) to render the disobedient a people well-disposed for

the Lord, i. e. furnished for the Lord, or formed for him." This, however, does violence to the construction of the sentence; and therefore it is better, with most Commentators, (supported by the authority of Valckn.,) to take the words as a separate and independent clause. Thus ἐν φρονήσει will be for εἰς φρόνησιν, and the sense will be, "to reform the disobedient and unrighteous to the comprehension and embracing of righteousness." The true construction seems to be this: καὶ ἐπιστρέψαι ἀπειθεῖς (ὥστε εἶναι) ἐν φ. δ., "so that they may be of the disposition of the righteous."

The sense of ἐτοιμάζειν Κυρῷ λαὸν κατεσκευασμένον is, "to make ready a people prepared or fitted for [the service of] the Lord." Thus all is plain. The two first clauses state the particular purposes of the Baptist's mission; namely, to introduce concord, philanthropy, and reformation of mind and practice. The third states the general purpose, or perhaps the result of the former.

18. κατὰ τί.] Sub. σημεῖον, which is expressed in a similar passage of Gen. xv. 8. So also ἐν τινί at Judg. vi. 15, and 1 Sam. xxix. 4. Grot. here remarks on the difference in the cases of Abraham and Zechariah, as to the same action. The former did not ask for a sign, from distrust in the promise of God, but for confirmation of his faith; whereas the latter had no faith at all. Hence, though a sign was given to him, it was a punishment likewise, though wisely ordained to be such, as should fix the attention of the Jews on the promised child. See more in Rec. Syn.

19. παρστηκὸς ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ.] An image borrowed from Oriental custom in courts. See Rec. Syn. and Note on 1 Thess. iii. 6.

20. ἔση — λαλῆσαι.] This is not a mere pleonasm; but the latter phrase is meant to explain and strengthen the force of the former. Thus in Acts: ἔση τυφλός, μὴ βλέπων τὸν ἥλιον. The Commentators who refer this to the idiom by which the affirmation of a thing is joined with a denial of its contrary, confound two distinct idioms.

21. The people might well wonder that Zech. should stay so long; for it appears to have been customary for the priest not to tarry long, on account of the people waiting in the outer court; who would fear lest some harm had befallen him, from negligence in the duty, or otherwise; which might be ominous of evil to the people at large.

ἐν τῷ ραῖ. Ἐξεληθὼν δὲ οὐκ ἠδύνατο λαλῆσαι αὐτοῖς· καὶ ἐπέγνω- 22
σαν οἱ ὀπτασίαν εἰσάρακν ἐν τῷ ραῖ· καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν διανεύων αὐτοῖς,
καὶ διέμενε κωφός. Καὶ ἐγένετο, ὡς ἐπλήσθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι τῆς λει- 23
τουργίας αὐτοῦ, ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ. Μετὰ δὲ ταύτας τὰς 24
ἡμέρας συνέλαβεν Ἐλισάβετ ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ, καὶ περιέκρυβεν ἑαυτὴν
μῆνας πέντε, λέγουσα· ⁿ "Οὐ οὕτω μοι πεποιήκειν ὁ Κύριος ἐν ἡμέραις 25
αἷς ἐπιῖδεν, ἀφελῖν τὸ ὄνειδος μου ἐν ἀνθρώποις.

n Gen. 30. 23.
Isa. 4. 1.

o Matt. 1. 18.

ἘΝ δὲ τῷ μηνὶ τῷ ἕκτῳ ἀπεστάλη ὁ ἄγγελος Γαβριὴλ ὑπὸ τοῦ 26
Θεοῦ εἰς πόλιν τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἣ ὄνομα Ναζαρέτ, ὁ πρὸς παρθένον 27
μεμνηστευμένην ἀνδρὶ ᾧ ὄνομα Ἰωσήφ, ἐξ οἴκου Δαβὶδ· καὶ τὸ ὄνομα
τῆς παρθένου Μαριάμ. Καὶ εἰσελθὼν ὁ ἄγγελος πρὸς αὐτήν, εἶπε· 28
Χαῖρε, κεχαριτωμένη· ὁ Κύριος μετὰ σοῦ· εὐλογημένη σὺ ἐν γυ-
ραιζίν! Ἡ δὲ ἰδοῦσα διεταράχθη ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ αὐτοῦ, καὶ διελογίζετο 29
ποταπὸς εἶη ὁ ἀσπασμὸς οὗτος. Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ ἄγγελος αὐτῇ· Μὴ 30

When Zechariah at length appeared, and was evidently deprived of the faculty of utterance, the people would be likely to conjecture that something extraordinary had happened to him, and naturally asked, whether he had seen *ὀπτασίαν*, as we say, *apparition*.

22. λαλῆσαι αὐτοῖς.] i. e. to give them the accustomed benediction, as most Commentators explain; though the thing is not certain. Ἦν διανεύων αὐτοῖς, scil. τοῦτο, i. e. nodding assent to the inquiry, whether he had seen a vision. Διανέειν signifies to express one's meaning by nods, or becks. See Recens. Synop. κωφός here signifies both deaf and dumb, as may be imagined from what has been observed on a former occasion.

23. λειτουργίας.] Λειτουργία is derived from the old word *λήϊτος*, *publicus*; and signifies properly any public service, whether civil or military. But in the Scriptures it is applied to the public offices of religion; 1. that of the Priests and Levites, under the Mosaic Law; 2. that of Christian Ministers of every sort, under the Gospel Dispensation.

24. συνέλαβεν.] Sub. ἔμβρονον.
— περιέκρυβεν ἑ.] The import of this expression has been much disputed. Some Commentators, ancient and modern, take it to mean, she concealed her situation. To which it has been justly objected, that there could be no reason for such concealment. Indeed, the word cannot signify any such thing; and it is not necessarily implied in the context: not to say that that sense would be scarcely of sufficient moment. It should, therefore, seem best to take *περικέκρυβεν* in the sense, "she kept herself retired." This she would be induced to do, throughout her whole pregnancy, not only through motives of delicacy, (considering her advanced years,) but still more from an anxiety to preserve herself from such accidents, as might either endanger the safety of the precious embryo, or impart any defilement to it; (See Lightf., and comp. Judg. xiii. 14.) and lastly, she would feel herself bound, considering the signal favour she had received at the hands of the Almighty, (by which was removed from her the reproach that barrenness was thought to convey) to employ the period of her pregnancy for the purposes of more than ordinary devotion. It is frivolous to debate which five months are here meant; for the last five are not permitted by the

context, which manifestly points to the first five. But the words ἐν τῷ μηνὶ τῷ ἕκτῳ ἀπεστάλη will not, (as it has been thought,) oblige us to suppose that she kept retired only the first five. There was more reason, on every account, for the next four; and, therefore, we are warranted in extending that privacy (with Lightf.) to the whole period of Elizabeth's gestation.

25. ἐπιῖδεν] "looked upon me," i. e. (by implication) with favour. A signification found in the Heb. פָּקַד, the Gr. Class. *εἰσδέειν*, and the Latin *respicere*. Ονειδος is one of those words which, though in the later Grecism having a bad sense, yet in the earlier one were of middle signification; as Eurip. Bacch. 640. κάλλιστον ὄνειδος. So ὄβρα, and the Latin *fama*, &c. This is only the case with words which from their origin admit of a middle signification: not so with those which, from their derivation, must have a bad one. So ψόγος, from ψέω, cogn. with ψάω, rado, to rub, and, in a metaphorical sense, to be rough upon, rub hard upon, reprove.

26—30. On the miraculous conception here treated of, see Townsend's Chron. Arr. of N. T., p. 32, sqq.

27. μεμνηστευμένην] "betrothed, contracted;" without which no woman was ever married, among the Jews, and probably the Gentiles also, from the earliest ages. See Hom. Il. Z. 245.

28. κεχαριτωμένη.] This is not well rendered "beloved," or "favourite of heaven," as in Campbell's version. Better (as in the Vulg.) "gratiâ plena," "highly favoured." For (as Valckn. observes) all verbs of this form, as *αἰματώω*, *θαυματώω*, &c. have a sense of *hearing up*, or *rendering full*. Χαριτώω is rare, and only found, in the Classical writers, once in Liban. It occurs, however, in Ecclus. ix. 8; xviii. 17, and Ps. xviii. 26. Symm. Ὁ Κύριος μετὰ σοῦ. Sub. ἔστω. A frequent form of salutation. See Ruth ii. 4. Judg. vi. 12.

— εὐλογημένη ἐν γυναιζίν.] This is said to be a Hebrew form of expressing the superlative; but it is found also in both the Greek and the Latin Classical writers. Suffice it to refer to the Horatian "Micat *inter omnes Julium sidus, velut inter ignes Luna minores*."

29. ποταπὸς εἶη ὁ ἀσπ. οὗτος.] A popular form of expression, equivalent to "what these remarkable addresses might mean."

τοῦ Κυρίου μου πρὸς με; ἰδοὺ γὰρ, ὡς ἐγένετο ἡ φωνὴ τοῦ ἄσπα- 44
 σμοῦ σου εἰς τὰ ὠτά μου, ἐσκίρτησεν ἐν ἀγαλλίασει τὸ βρέφος ἐν τῇ
 κοιλίᾳ μου. Ἐκείνη ἡ πιστεύουσα ὅτι ἔσται τελείωσις τοῖς 45
 λελαλημένοις αὐτῇ παρὰ Κυρίου.

t Infr. 11. 28.

u 1 Sam. 1. 11.
 Gen. 30. 13.
 x Gen. 17. 7.
 Exod. 20. 6.
 Psal. 103. 17.
 y Isa. 29. 15.
 & 51. 9.
 & 52. 10.
 Ps. 33. 10.
 1 Pet. 5. 5.
 z 1 Sam. 2. 7.
 8.
 Ps. 113. 7.
 Job 5. 11.
 & 12. 18, 19, 21.

Καὶ εἶπε Μαριάμ· Μεγαλύνει ἡ ψυχὴ μου τὸν Κύριον, καὶ ἡγαλ- 46
 λιάσε τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπὶ τῷ Θεῷ τῷ σωτῆρί μου· ὅτι ἐπέβλεψεν 47
 ἐπὶ τὴν ταπείνωσιν τῆς δούλης αὐτοῦ. Ἰδοὺ γὰρ, ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν μακα- 48
 ριοῦσί με πᾶσαι αἱ γενεαί· ὅτι ἐποίησέ μοι μεγαλεῖα ὁ Δυνατὸς, καὶ 49
 ἄγιον τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ· Ἐκείνη ἡ πιστεύουσα ὅτι ἔσται τελείωσις τοῖς 50
 φεβουμένοις αὐτῶν. Ἐποίησε κράτος ἐν βραχίονι αὐτοῦ· διεσκόρπισεν 51
 ὑπερηγάνους διανοίᾳ καρδίας αὐτῶν. Καθῆκε δυνάστας ἀπὸ θρόνων, 52

This manner of speaking is a form expressive of admiration at any unexpected honour done, and is not unfrequent in the Classical writers.

44. ἐσκίρτησεν ἐν ἀγαλλ.] i. e. by a popular manner of speaking, as it were leaped for joy; for the fœtus was incapable of any sensation. Her knowledge that Mary was to be the mother of the Messiah, as well as her immediate belief in the promise of the angel, was doubtless imparted by a Divine revelation. Instead of ἐσκίρτησεν ἐν ἀγαλλ. τὸ βρέφος very many MSS. have ἐσκίρτησε τὸ βρέφος ἐν ἀγαλλ., which is edited by Matth., Griesb., and Scholz; but wrongly; for the reading seems to have arisen merely from an accidental omission of ἐν ἀγαλλ. (which is awkwardly interposed between the Nominat. and the verb), and then to have been inserted, but in the wrong place. Besides, the reading in question involves, in ἐν ἀγαλλ. ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ, a greater irregularity than can be found any where else in St. Luke's writings.

45. ἡ πιστεύουσα ὅτι, &c.] Some join ὅτι closely with πιστ. But this construction, though sanctioned by the usage of Scripture, pares down the sense, while that proposed by Kuin. is unnecessarily tortuous.

46. It is observable, that most of the phrases in this noble effusion are borrowed from the O. T.; especially from the song of Hannah, to which it bears a strong resemblance, and in which there were so many phrases remarkably suited to Mary's own case.

—μεγαλύνει ἡ ψυχὴ μου.] This use of ψυχὴ is not a mere Hebraism, but is very emphatic, and implies the greatest earnestness and intensity of feeling. Μεγαλύνειν, in this precatory use, (of which there are instances in the Classical writers) signifies *extol*. Ταπείνωσιν signifies not *humility*, but *lowly condition*, as in Gen. xxix. 32, and elsewhere; though the former may be included as a secondary sense.

48. μακαριοῦσί] “shall esteem me happy;” namely, in giving birth to the Saviour of the world. In this absolute use the word occurs in James v. 11; but in the Classical writers it is usually accompanied with a Genitive of thing, stating the *cause*, or *origin*.

49. μεγαλεῖα.] The Commentators supply ἔργα. But it is better to say that, in such a case as this, the adjective is used substantively. Nor is *μεγ.* to be rendered, with some, “*miracles*;” but ἐποίησε μοι *μεγ.* may be translated, “hath conferred upon me very great benefits;” for *μεγαλειος* signifies more than *μέγας*. The expression is founded on Ps. lxx. 19. (Sept.) ἃ ἐποίησας μοι μεγαλεῖα. See Deut. x. 21. 1 Sam. xii. 16. Tobit xi.

15. There seems to be an antithesis between *μεγαλεῖα* here, and *μεγαλύνει* at ver. 46. The expression ὁ Δυνατὸς, formed on the Heb. רַב־נַחַשׁ, designates *κατ' ἐξοχὴν* (as in Ps. xxiv. 8. Sept.) *the Almighty*. At ἄγιον — αὐτοῦ supply *ἵστι*, render “*holy and to be revered is his name.*” This is formed on Ps. cxi. 3.

50. τοῖς φεβ.]] for πρὸς τοὺς φεβουμένους; a syntax frequent in the LXX. See Exod. xx. 6. Ps. lxxxviii. 2. Sept.

51. Here we have a celebration of God's power; and the general declaration ἐποίησε κράτος ἐν βραχίονι αὐτοῦ (where the Aorist denotes *custom*) is then illustrated by *examples*. Βραχ. denotes, by an usual Hebrew figure, the mighty power of God, as shown most signally; for (as a Commentator remarks), “*the great power of God is represented by his finger; his greater by his hand; and his greatest by his arm.*” By ἔλωσ is meant, as often in the Sept., the *benignity* of God. Instead of εἰς γενεάς γενεῶν several MSS. have εἰς γενεὰν καὶ γενεάν; which reading is edited by Matthæi. But wrongly; for that and the other three various readings, are no more than so many various modes of explaining, or simplifying a rather unusual expression, yet founded on the Hebrew idiom. The use, too, of ποιεῖν throughout the passage is Hebraic.

—διεσκόρπισεν] “*he utterly discomfits.*” A metaphor derived from putting to flight a defeated enemy. The word not unfrequently occurs in the LXX. (and in this very sense, in Ps. lviii. 11.), but very rarely in the Classical writers, though one example is adduced by Kuin., from Ælian, Var. Hist. xiii. 46. τοὺς μὲν διεσκόρπισεν, οὓς (read τοὺς) ἐδὲ ἀπέκτεινε.

Διανοίᾳ is given by ἐπὶ understood, and may be understood to denote their inmost thoughts and devices. The full sense of the passage is well expressed by Mr. Norris, in the following paraphrase: “*He scatters the imaginations of the proud, perplexes their schemes, disturbs their politics, breaks their measures, sets those things far asunder which they had united in one system, and so disperses the broken pieces of it, that they can never put them together again. And by this he turns their wisdom into folly, their imaginary greatness into contempt, and their glory into shame; so overruling their counsels, in his wise government of the world, as to make all turn to his, not their, praise.*”

52. καθῆκε δυνάστας.] Καθῆκω signifies properly to *pull down*, as applied to *things*; but it is not unfrequently used of *persons*. The passage is formed on Ecclus. x. 14. See my Note on

- 53 καὶ ὑψωσε ταπεινούς. ^a Πεινῶντας ἐνέπλησεν ἀγαθῶν, καὶ πλουτοῦντας a Paal. 34. 10.
1 Sam. 2. 5.
b 1 Sam. 30. 18.
& 41. 8.
& 54. 5.
c Jer. 31. 3, 20.
& Gen. 17. 19.
& 22. 13.
Pa. 132. 11.
- 54 ἐξαπέστειλε κενούς. ^b Ἀντελάβετο Ἰσραὴλ παιδὸς αὐτοῦ, μνησθῆναι
- 55 ἐλέους (καθὼς ἐλάλησε πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν) τῷ Ἀβραάμ καὶ τῷ
- 56 σπέρματι αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. Ἔμεινε δὲ Μαριάμ σὺν αὐτῇ ὡστὶ d Supr. v. 14.
μῆνας τρεῖς καὶ ὑπέστρεψεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτῆς.
- 57 Τῇ δὲ Ἐλισάβετ ἐπλήσθη ὁ χρόνος τοῦ τεκεῖν αὐτήν, καὶ ἐγέννησεν d Supr. v. 14.
- 58 υἱόν. ^d Καὶ ἤκουσαν οἱ περὶοικοὶ καὶ οἱ συγγενεῖς αὐτῆς, οὗ ἐμεγά- d Supr. v. 14.
- 59 λυνε Κύριος τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ μετ' αὐτῆς καὶ συνέχαιρον αὐτῇ. ^e Καὶ e Gen. 17. 12.
Lev. 12. 8.
- ἐγένετο, ἐν τῇ ὀγδόῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἦλθον περιτεμεῖν τὸ παιδίον καὶ ἐκάλουν
- 60 αὐτὸ, ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, Ζαχαρίαν ^f Καὶ ἀποκριθεῖ- f Supr. v. 13.
- 61 σα ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ εἶπεν. Οὐχί, ἀλλὰ κληθήσεται Ἰωάννης. Καὶ
- εἶπον πρὸς αὐτήν. Ὅτι οὐδεὶς ἐστιν ἐν τῇ συγγενείᾳ σου, ὃς καλεῖται
- 62 τῷ ὀνόματι τούτῳ. Ἐνένευον δὲ τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ, τὸ τί ἂν θέλοι
- 63 καλεῖσθαι αὐτόν. ^g Καὶ αἰτήσας πινακίδιον, ἔγραψε λέγων. Ἰωάννης g Supr. v. 13.
- 64 ἐστὶ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ. καὶ ἐθαύμασαν πάντες. Ἀνεώχθη δὲ τὸ στόμα
- αὐτοῦ παραχρῆμα καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐλάλει ὑλογῶν τὸν Θεόν.
- 65 Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐπὶ πάντας φόβος τοὺς περιοικοῦντας αὐτούς καὶ ἐν ὄλῃ
- 66 τῇ ὀρειῇ τῆς Ἰουδαίας διελαλεῖτο πάντα τὰ δῆμματα ταῦτα. Καὶ ἔθνετο

Thucyd. vi. 83. Δυνάστας (potentates) denotes, not kings only, but all who are invested with political power, in Recens. Synop. Wets. aptly compares Hesiod *Ἔργ.* i. 5. *Ῥεῖα μὲν γὰρ βριάσει, βεῖα δὲ βριάοντα χαλέπτει. Ῥεῖα δ' ἀρίζηλον μύθει, καὶ ἄδηλον ἄξει.*

53. Ἀγαθῶν is a term savouring of the simplicity of common life and Oriental plainness, denoting the *subsidia vite*.

54. ἀντελάβετο [I.] Ἀντιλαμβάνειν denotes properly *to lay hold of any thing*, or person, by the hand, in order to support it when it is likely to fall; but it is here, as often in the Classical writers, used metaphorically, for *“to protect,” “support.”*

—μνησθῆναι.] Sub. ὡστε or εἰς τὸ, as v. 72. and frequently elsewhere. The construction will be plain from the punctuation which I have adopted, and it is confirmed by Ps. xvii. 3. LXX. With respect to the full sense of *μνησθῆναι*, God (as I explained in Rec. Synop.) is said to be *mindful* of his people, when he exerts his power for their support, and confers on them the benefits he promised.

56. ὡσεὶ μήνας τρεῖς] i. e., as Theophyl., Euthym., and Grot. show, till very near the time of Elizabeth's delivery. That she left her at so critical a time was probably from motives of delicacy; since such were periods of great bustle, by the extraordinary resort of company to congratulate the mother.

59. ἐκάλουν] “they were calling,” “were going to call it.” A frequent sense of the Imperfect.

60. οὐχί.] This paragogic form of οὐ is intensive, signifying *nay, by no means*. So Luke xii. 51. xiii. 3. 5.

62. ἐνένευον] “they intimated by becks and signs.” See Note supra v. 22. At τὸ τί sub. κατὰ, as *to*. It is not necessary, however, to take the τὸ for τοῦτο. It belongs to the whole of the clause following; nor is there any pleonasm in the word, as some imagine.

63. πινακίδιον.] This is supposed to mean the

small square writing board, whitened over, which is even yet in use in the East. Λέγων, “expressing.” A sense occurring also in the Classical writers, and derived from the unexact phraseology of common life.

64. ἀνεώχθη — γλῶσσα α.] This is, by the best Commentators, rightly referred to one of those idioms, by which a verb is joined with *two* nouns of cognate sense; to *one* only of which it is *properly* applicable. So Hom. *σίτον καὶ οἶνον ἔχοντες*. and I Cor. iii. 2. *Γάλα ὑμᾶς ἐπέπιασα καὶ οὐ βρώμα*. So also Æschyl. *Prom.* 21. *οὔτε φωνῆν, οὔτε μορφήν βροτῶν ὄψαι*. Besides, the term *ἀνοίγεται* may not unaptly be applied to *setting free the tongue*. Thus (as De Rhoer observes) Sophocles and Themistius speak of the tongue being *shut*, and of the *door* of the tongue. Now surely there is no more impropriety in speaking of the tongue being *opened*. Moreover, the Heb. *התפת*, to which *ἀνοίγει* answers, signifies not only *to open*, but *to loose*, as in Gen. xxiv. 32. Is. v. 27. See Note on Mark vii. 34. Thus there will be no occasion to supply (with most Commentators) *ἐλάθη, or ἐμπεροσώθη*, which is *supplied* in some few copies, no doubt from the margin.

I have in Recens. Synop. shewn that the hypothesis by which the loss and the recovery of Zacharias' speech is attributed to *natural* causes cannot be admitted, because we learn from the Evangelist that it was a *judicial* infliction. The presumption as well as folly of making this, in common with many similar narrations of the N. T., a mere *myth*, cannot be too severely reprobated.

65. φάσας.] This imports here a mixed feeling of *wonder and awe*.

66. ἔθνετο ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ] scil. ταῦτα, namely, (says Euthym.) ὡς ἀξιόλογα. This phrase is rare in the Classical writers. We may compare the Homeric *μῦθον ἐντίθεσθαι θυμῷ*. and the Latin *reponere, or condere mente*. The τί, which is for τίς, expresses *admiration*; and the ἀρα is *ratiocinative*. Ren-

πάντες οἱ ἀκούσαντες ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῶν, λέγοντες· Τί ἄρα τὸ παιδίον τοῦτο ἔσται; καὶ χεῖρ Κυρίου ἦν μετ' αὐτοῦ. Καὶ Ζαχαρίας ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ ἐπλήσθη Πνεύματος ἁγίου, καὶ προεφίητεσε, λέγων· ἠ Εὐλογητὸς Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ, ὅτι ἐπεσκέψατο, καὶ 68 ἐποίησε λύτρωσιν τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ· ἠ καὶ ἤγειρε κέρας σωτηρίας ἡμῖν, 69 ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ Δαυὶδ τοῦ παιδὸς αὐτοῦ· (καθὼς ἐλάλησε διὰ στόματος τῶν ἁγίων τῶν ἀπ' αἰῶνος προφητῶν αὐτοῦ,) σωτηρίαν ἐξ ἐχθρῶν 71 ἡμῶν, καὶ ἐκ χειρὸς πάντων τῶν μισούντων ἡμᾶς· ποιῆσαι ἔλεος μετὰ 72 τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, καὶ μνησθῆναι διαθήκης ἁγίας αὐτοῦ· ἠ ὄρχον 73 ὃν ὤμοσε πρὸς Ἀβραάμ τὸν πατέρα ἡμῶν, τοῦ δοῦναι ἡμῖν, ἠ ἀφό- 74

h Infr. 2. 30.
Matt. 1. 21.
i Ps. 132. 17, 18.
k Psal. 72. 12.
Jer. 23. 6.
& 30. 10.
Dan. 9. 27.

l Gen. 22. 16.
Ps. 105. 9.
Jer. 31. 33.
Heb. 6. 13.
m Heb. 9. 11.

der, "What sort of man, now, will this child become?"

— καὶ χεῖρ Κυρίου ἦν μετ' αὐτοῦ.] These words are by some supposed to be a part of the speech; by others, more rightly, an observation of the Evangelist; and part of the narrative. The καὶ is not for γὰρ, as some suppose; but signifies *et sane, and indeed*.

67. προσφίητεσε.] Many learned Commentators think that the term here, and occasionally elsewhere, merely denotes to praise God in fervent and exalted strains, *like those of a prophet*. And indeed such a sense in *προφήτης* is found in the Classical writers; but not in the Scriptural ones; much less in *προφήτειν*. It may indeed be with truth affirmed, that in the N. T., at least, there are but two significations of *προφήτειν*; 1. to *prophesy, predict future events*; the other to *speak under the impulse of divine inspiration*. Now the hymn of Zacharias was both inspired and prophetic.

68. ἐπεσκέψατο] scil. τὸν λαόν, "hath visited with his mercy and favour." The metaphor (which occurs also in ver. 73. and vii. 16. Acts xv. 14. Heb. ii. 6.) is derived either, as is commonly supposed, from the custom of princes, to visit the provinces of their kingdom, in order to redress grievances, and confer benefits; or rather from the visiting of the distressed by the benevolent. Zacharias' language was permitted by the Holy Spirit to be accommodated to the opinion of the speaker, and, indeed, at that time, of all Jews; who supposed the Messiah was to be manifested for the deliverance and benefit of the Jews only, not to be a blessing to the whole human race.

69. κέρας σωτηρίας.] On the exact nature of the metaphor, Commentators are not agreed. Noesself supposes an allusion to the *iron horns* which were sometimes fastened to the helmets of the ancients. Fischer and others to the *four horns of the altar*, which were among the Hebrews (as the *arae* and *foci* among the Greeks and Romans) places of refuge for suppliants. Thus Christ will be regarded as a new refuge of safety to those who embrace his religion. This, however, seems rather ingenious than solid. Far more natural is the common interpretation (adopted by the ancients and most moderns, and ably supported by Kuin.) which derives the metaphor from *horned animals*, whose strength is in their horns. Hence *horn* is a term perpetually used to denote *strength*, and is thus a symbol of power and principality. Thus κέρας σωτηρίας is put for βασιλεὺς καὶ σωτήρας λαοῦ, a royal and powerful deliverer and helper.

70. τῶν ἁγίων — προσφ.] The second τῶν is not found in some ancient MSS., and is suspected

not to be genuine by Gersdorf and Vater, "because," say they, "the Article is no where else so used *precedente adjective*." Yet on that very account they ought to have been less ready to cancel the Article, than to inquire whether the preceding word is *really* an adjective. Now Br. Jebb and Rosenm. think it is not an adjective, but a *substantive*, as very often elsewhere. So Deut. xxxiii. 2. 3. 1 Sam. ii. 9. 2 Chron. vi. 41. Job xv. 15. Ps. xxx. 4. xxxiii. 29. That the Patriarchs, from Adam downwards, were God's *saints*, though not all of them his *prophets*, is certain: and why they might be so called, appears from Levit. xx. 7. So xix. 2. and xxi. 3. This view I should have adopted, but for the very similar passage of St. Luke himself, Acts iii. 25. ἀγῶν χρόνων ἀποκαταστάσεως πάντων, ὡν ἐλάλησεν ὁ Θεὸς διὰ στόματος [πάντων] ἁγίων αὐτοῦ προφητῶν ἀπ' αἰῶνος, where Griesb. and others insert τῶν before ἁγίων; which, however, Br. Middlet. thinks unnecessary. Yet here it is found in all the MSS. and if the Article be used with the *adjective*, it cannot be dispensed with in the *substantive*. And that the writer meant it so to be taken in the passage of Acts is clear; because ἁγίων αὐτοῦ προσφ. can only mean, "of his holy prophets;" and τῶν ἁγ. πρ. could mean *no more*. This indeed is confirmed by 2 Pet. iii. 2. μνησθῆναι τῶν περ. ἡμετέρων ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων προσφ. τῶν. and Rev. xxii. 6. ὁ Θεὸς τῶν πνευμάτων τῶν ἁγίων προσφ. τῶν.

— ἀπ' αἰῶνος.] This phrase, which often occurs in the Hellenistic writers, and sometimes in the Classical, (who, however, prefer ἀπ' ἀρχῆς), means, "from the most ancient times."

71. σωτηρίαν] i. e. a means of salvation, for σωτήρας; a frequent idiom in the Scriptures.

72. ποιῆσαι ἔλεος μετὰ τῶν π. ἡ.] Sub. ὥστε. The sense is: "in order to show his mercy and kindness to;" &c.; for the phrase does not imply any *promise*; but ποιῆσαι τὸ ἔλεος μετὰ τίνος corresponds to the Heb. כָּרַם חַסְדִּים in Genes. xxi. 23. and signifies "to deal mercifully and kindly with, to exercise kindness to," as Acts xv.

73. ὄρχον ὃν ὤμοσε.] The difficulty here in syntax cannot be removed by resorting to the principle of *apposition*; nor even by supposing the antecedent as put in the same case with the relative, because that does violence to the construction; but rather by supplying κατὰ, with Camer. and others. Thus the sense will be, "by (i. e. confirmed by the oath)," &c.

— τοῦ δοῦναι.] Sub. περὶ, or take τ. δ. for ἐν τῷ δοῦναι, Hellenistic. This and the next ver. contain the *substance* of the oath unto Abraham, on which see Recens. Synop. The Prophets of the O. T., in describing the times of the Messiah, and the spiritual worship which was to succeed

75 ὥς ἐκ χειρὸς τῶν ἐχθρῶν ἡμῶν ἠυσθέντας λατρεύειν αὐτῶ ⁿ ἐν ⁿ¹ Pet. 1. 15.
 ὀσιότητι καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας [τῆς ζωῆς]
 76 ἡμῶν. ° Καὶ σὺ, παιδίον, προφήτης ὑψίστου κληθήσῃ· προπορεύσῃ ^o Mal. 3. 1.
 77 γὰρ πρὸ προσώπου Κυρίου, εἰομαίωμαι ὁδοῦς αὐτοῦ, ^p τοῦ δοῦναι ^o Mal. 4. 2.
 78 γνώσιν σωτηρίας τῇ λαῷ αὐτοῦ, ἐν ἀφέσει ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν, ^q διὰ ^q Mal. 4. 2.
 σπλάγχνα ἐλέους Θεοῦ ἡμῶν, ἐν οἷς ἐπεσκέψατο ἡμᾶς ἀνατολῇ ἐξ ^{Zach. 3. 8.}
 79 ὑψους, ^r ἐπιφῆναι τοῖς ἐν σκότει καὶ σκιῇ θανάτου καθημένοις, τοῦ ^r Isa. 9. 1.
 80 κατενθῆναι τοὺς πόδας ἡμῶν εἰς ὁδὸν ἐρήνης. ° Τὸ δὲ παιδίον ἠΰσανε ^{& 42. 7.}
 καὶ ἐκραταιοῦτο πνεύματι· καὶ ἦν ἐν ταῖς ἐρήμοις, ἕως ἡμέρας ἀνα- ^{& 43. 5.}
 δείξεως αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὸν Ἰσραὴλ. ^{& 49. 9.}
^{& 60. 1.}
^{Matt. 4. 15.}
^{s Infr. 2. 40.}

1 II. ἘΓΕΝΕΤΟ δὲ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις, ἐξῆλθε δόγμα παρὰ
 2 Καίσαρος Αἰγυπτίου, ἀπογράφεσθαι πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην. (αὕτη ἡ

to the ceremonial observances of the Law, use the very same language as this Divine Hymn; though neither the Jews, nor even the prophets themselves, understood those prophecies as we, (informed by history, and enlightened by the Gospel), are enabled to do. Ἀφάβως must be taken not with *βυσθέντας*, but with *λατρεύειν*, which is required by the construction, and yields a sense most in unison with the nature of the Gospel, as alluding to the absence of the "spirit of bondage," mentioned Rom. viii. 15. Ὀσιότητι denotes the observances rendered to God; δικαιοσύνη, the duties to men. Compare Eph. iv. 24. Τῆς ζωῆς is omitted in many of the best MSS., all the most important Versions, and some Fathers, and is cancelled by Griesb., Vat., Tittm., and Scholz; and rightly, for we can far better account for its insertion than its omission.

77. At τοῦ δ. sub. διά. Γνώσιν σωτηρίας. This under the Law, was by *legal righteousness*; under the Gospel, by *remission of sins*.

78. Ἡ σπλάγχνα ἐλέους.] With this Comp. σπλ. οἰκτιρῶν at Col. iii. 12 Each is a stronger expression than either noun would be, taken simply. See Tittm. de Syn. p. 63., who observes that as σπλ. properly denotes the *viscera nobiliora*, the heart, lungs, &c., hence the term is used of all the more vehement affections of the mind, as we say of those destitute of them, that they are *heartless*. EA. is, he observes, a stronger term than οἰκτ.; the latter signifying only the *pain we feel at the misery of others*; the former, the *desire of relieving that misery*, with an adjunct notion of *benevolence*.

— ἀνατολῇ ἐξ ὑψους.] On the interpretation of this phrase there has been some diversity of opinion. Many eminent Commentators take ἀνατολῇ to signify a budding branch, and figuratively a *son*, like the Heb. בְּרִיךְ. But the metaphor is so harsh, and leads to such a confusion, (taken in conjunction with the words following), that I see no reason to abandon the common interpretation, "the dawn from on high," with allusion to those passages of the O. T. which describe the Messiah under the metaphor of the *light*, and the *sun*. See Mal. iv. 2. To this interpretation, indeed, it is objected by Wets. and others, that thus ἐξ ὑψους will not be proper — because the sun *when he ascends* is always in the *horizon*, and not *over head*. This, however, is hypercritical criticism, and proceeds on the *error* of tying popular language down to the rules of strict philosophical propriety. The expression may very well denote

that *moderate elevation* which the sun soon attains after its rise. However, ἐξ ὑψους may be taken, with Kuin., Titta., and Wahl, for *ἀνωθεν*, i. e. from heaven. So Virgil, Ecl. iv. 7., from the Sibylline oracles, "Jan nova progenies cælo demittitur alto." The terms which follow indeed seem to require this interpretation. The whole passage represents the Messiah as coming, like the rising sun, to dispel the darkness which covered the world, bringing life and immortality to light through the Gospel.

79. The same metaphor is continued. Compare Ps. xliii. 3. cxix. 105. and on εἰς ὁδὸν βεβ., Eurip. Med. 740. and Æsch. Ag. 170.

80. πνεύματι] "in mind," and wisdom, as opposed to bodily growth.

— ἐν ταῖς ἐρήμοις.] Whether by this is meant the *Hill country* where he was born, or the *Desert* properly so called, the Commentators are not agreed. The latter may be considered pretty certain. The *period* of his retirement is with probability supposed to have been at the age of puberty, when he would have strength of body and mind to bear that solitude, which for him was so necessary and so beneficial. For thus he would not be warped by the prejudices of the Jewish teachers, and would, in that seclusion, approach near unto God, and seek that guidance of the Holy Spirit which was necessary to enable him to be the Herald of the Gospel. Sweet, too, are the uses of *solitude* (as well as *adversity*), as the greatest of men have experienced. So Josephus spent some years of his early youth in the desert; and Chrysostom many of those of his mature age in a *cave*, (as it is said), diligently studying the Scriptures; and framing his immortal *Homilies*.

— ἀναδείξεω.] The word is often used of admission to any office unto which a person has been appointed; and here denotes "entrance on his ministry;" as x. 1. and Acts i. 24.

II. 1. ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις.] This does not refer to the last verse, but to ver. 36. seqq. of the preceding Chapter. Ἐξῆλθε δόγμα, "an edict or decree was issued," or promulgated, neuter for passive. This sense of ἐξελχεσθαι occurs in the LXX. at Dan. ii. 13. ix. 25. and Esth. i. 19., where it answers to the Heb. נָצַח. Δόγμα in this forensic sense occurs both in Hellenistic and Classical Greek.

— ἀπογράφεσθαι πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκ.] Winer, Gr. Gr. § 33. 3., takes ἀπογρ. to be in apposition with the preceding. But it is better to suppose an ellipsis

ἀπογραφῇ πρώτη ἐγένετο ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Συρίας Κυρηίου.) καὶ 3
 ἐπορεύοντο πάντες ἀπογράφεσθαι, ἕκαστος εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν πόλιν. Ἐνέβη 4
 δὲ καὶ Ἰωσήφ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἐκ πόλεως Ναζαρέτ, εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν,
 εἰς πόλιν Δαυὶδ, ἣτις καλεῖται Βηθλεὲμ, διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν ἐξ οἴκου
 καὶ πατριᾶς Δαυὶδ, ἀπογράψασθαι σὺν Μαρίας τῇ μεμνηστευμένῃ 5
 αὐτῷ γυναικί, ὄσῃ ἐγκύῳ. Ἐγένετο δὲ, ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτοὺς ἐκεῖ, ἐπλή- 6
 σθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ τεκεῖν αὐτήν. καὶ ἔτεκε τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς 7
 τὸν πρωτότοκον καὶ ἐσπαργάνωσεν αὐτὸν καὶ ἀνέκλιεν αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ
 φάτνῃ. διότι οὐκ ἦν αὐτοῖς τόπος ἐν τῷ καταλύματι.

of *ῶσε*, (i. e. εἰς τὰ) in the sense of *purpose*, of which examples are frequent. By τὴν οἰκ., scil. γῆν, it is now generally admitted, cannot be meant, *the whole world*. Most of the Commentators take it to mean the *Roman world*, i. e. empire; this expression (like *orbis terrarum* in Latin) being then in general use. See Acts xxiv. 5. Apoc. iii. 10. xvi. 14. Since, however, no historian notices such a general census of the whole empire; and since it is improbable that *had there been* one, it would have been mentioned in connection with the Propætor of Syria, we may rather suppose (with Keuchen, Bynæus, Wolf, Lardner, Pearce, Fischer, Rosenm., and Kuin., and others), that *Judea only* is meant, as in Acts xi. 23. and Luke iv. 3. and perhaps xxi. 20. Indeed the Jews called *Judea the earth* of all the earth. See Ruth i. 1. 2 Sam. xxiv. 3. and Mr. Rose's Parkh. in v.

As to the sense of ἀπογράφεσθαι, which is rendered in E. V. "*taxed*," we have the testimony of Josephus that no tax was levied from *Judea* till many years after this period, and the use of the word rather requires us to adopt the interpretation of almost all modern Commentators, "*registered*;" understanding the ἀπογραφὴ as a *census of the population*. Of this many examples are adduced by Wets., and others are added in Recens. Synop.; to which I must beg to refer for information on the next verse, as concerns αὐτῆς ἢ ἀπογραφῆς πρώτη — Κυρηίου, into the discussion of which the nature of this work will not permit me to enter. The reader is likewise referred to Townsend, Chr. Arr. i. 51.

4. Ἐξ οἴκου καὶ πατριᾶς Δ.] Grot., Kypke, and others, have rightly observed, that the πατριὰ was a part of the οἶκος; the latter comprehending the collateral branches, and even servants (οἰκογενεῖς), the former being confined to the direct line of descent; very similar to the distinction, among the Romans, of *gentes* and *familie*. After the many separations which had taken place of the Jews, any such census as the above would have been impossible, unless each went to the place which had formerly been the lot of his clan or family. The only reason which the Commentators can imagine for Mary's attendance is, that she was an *heïress*; for otherwise *women* were not registered. But it does not follow, from the words of the Evangelist, that Mary went to be registered; for σὺν may very well mean, "*accompanied by*."

5. μεμνηστευμένη] "who had been betrothed (and was then married)." That such must be the sense, appears from Matt. i. 25.

6. ἐπλήσθησαν αἱ ἡμέρ.] Simil. Gen. xxv. 24. (Sept.) καὶ ἐπληρώθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ τεκεῖν αὐτήν. Ἡμ. is here put for *time*; which use is frequent in Scripture, and is here called a Hebraism; but

it occurs in Thucyd. vi. 65. αἱ ἡμέραι ἐν αἷς ξυνθένετο ἤξεν ἐγγὺς ἦσαν.

7. ἐσπαργάνωσεν.] Σπαργάνωσεν scarcely ever occurs in the Classical writers, though σπάργανον often does. We find it, however, in Ezra xvi. 4. These σπάργανα were not only in use *then*, but even until very late in modern times, as a preventive to distortion.

— ἀνέκλιεν α. ἐν τῇ φάτνῃ.] Ἀνακλίω is often used absolutely; the *place* of laying being left to be supplied from the context, or the subject. Here it is a *vox signata de h. re*, and may be rendered "*cradled*." It is not so easy to fix the sense of φάτνη. It is commonly taken to denote "*a manger*." But, although such would seem no unfit receptacle for a new born child, yet, as *mangers* are not *now* in use in the East, but *hair cloth bags* instead, this interpretation has been thought groundless. Yet it has never been established that *mangers* were *not* used by the ancients; nay, there has been tolerable proof adduced, from Homer and Herodotus, that they *were*; namely, of the form of our *cribs*. See Is. xxxix. 9. and Job xxxix. 9. The common interpretation, however, seems to be untenable on another and more serious ground. For if the φάτνη (as Wets. observes) was a part of the stable, and the stable a part of the inn; it follows that he who had a place in the stable, had one in the inn. Yet the Evangelist says "*there was no room for them in the inn.*" It is (as Bp. Middleton observes) plain from the whole context, that φάτνη was not merely the place in which the babe was laid, but the place also in which he was born and swaddled. The words ἐν τῇ φάτνῃ surely belong as much to ἔτεκεν as to ἀνέκλιεν, for else where should the delivery take place? Not in the *κατάλυμα*, for *there* there was no room, not merely for the *child*, but for "*them*." It is plain, therefore, that we must adopt the interpretation of Wets., Rosen., Middlet., Kuin., and many others; who by φάτνη understand some *place of lodging*, though less convenient than the *κατάλυμα*. Many think it was an enclosed space, either in front of or behind the house, paved in like our *farm yards*; which is, indeed, very agreeable to the primary sense of the word. Such, however, would seem but indifferent shelter for one in Mary's situation, and therefore others adopt the signification "*stable*," which latter sense is thought to be confirmed by the authority of many of the early Fathers, who call the place of Christ's nativity a *cave*. Those writers, however, expressly distinguish between the cave and the φάτνη. It is, I think, plain that they took φάτνη to mean a *crib*, and equally so that they read ἐν φάτνῃ, which is found in some ancient MSS. But the authority is insufficient to establish that reading; which seems to have originated from the

8 Καὶ ποιμένες ἦσαν ἐν τῇ χώρα τῇ αὐτῇ ἀγραυλοῦντες, καὶ φυλάσ-
 9 σοντες φυλακὰς τῆς νυκτὸς ἐπὶ τὴν ποίμνην αὐτῶν. Καὶ ἰδοὺ, ἄγγελος
 Κυρίου ἐπέστη αὐτοῖς, καὶ δόξα Κυρίου περιέλειμψεν αὐτούς· καὶ ἐφο-
 10 βήθησαν φόβον μέγαν. Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ ἄγγελος· Μὴ φοβεῖσθε·
 ἰδοὺ γὰρ, εὐαγγελίζομαι ὑμῖν χαρὰν μεγάλην, ἣτις ἔσται παντὶ τῷ λαῷ·
 11 ὅτι ἐτέχθη ὑμῖν σήμερον σωτήρ, ὃς ἐστι Χριστὸς Κύριος, ἐν πόλει
 12 Δαυὶδ. Καὶ τοῦτο ὑμῖν τὸ σημεῖον· εὐρήσετε βρέφος ἐσπαργατω-
 13 μένον κείμενον ἐν [τῇ] φάτῃ. ^x Καὶ ἐξαίφνης ἐγένετο σὺν τῷ ἄγγε-
 λῳ πλήθος στρατιᾶς οὐρανόθεν, αἰνούντων τὸν Θεὸν, καὶ λεγόντων·
 14 ^y Δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις Θεῷ, καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς εἰρήμη· ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκία!

^x Dan. 7. 10.
 Rev. 5. 11.
^y Infr. 19. 33.
 Isa. 57. 19.
 Eph. 2. 17.
 Rom. 5. 1.

alteration of Critics, who took φάτ. in the sense manger or crib; a sense, however, for which there is no good authority in Scripture, where the word invariably signifies a stall [for cattle] or a stable [for horses]. See infra xiii. 15. As to the choice between the above two interpretations, neither seems to be correct. The φάτνη appears to have been neither a mere inclosure, nor a regular building, like our stable. It was indeed exactly like the hovels and sheds, covered over head, but open on one side, which are found round our farm yards, or home stalls. And this would be, in a climate like that of Judæa, no bad shelter for the houseless. Sheds like this were so easily constructed, and so convenient, that it is not probable a cave should have been used; which would have been in many respects less comfortable. On the Jewish κατάλυμα, see Rec. Syn.

8. ἀγραυλοῦντες.] The word properly signifies to abide in the fields *sub dio*, whether by night or day, but usually the former. It is not certain, however, that these shepherds abode in the open air. They might be in huts; for Kypke cites from Diod. Sic. ἀγυαλία, to denote a military encampment. And Busbequius, Epist. i. 53. speaks of "wandering flocks" (like the Spanish Merinos) tended day and night by the shepherds, who carry their wives and children with them in waggons, and for themselves, he adds, "exigua tabernacula tendunt," no doubt, such as the bird-boy's hut of *sods and boughs* so graphically described by Robert Bloomfield in his Farmer's Boy. Yet these shepherds were probably not Nomades, but Bethlehmites, whose "watch over their flocks by night" may be best expressed by the modern term *bivouac*, which comes from the A. Saxon *bepacian*, *vigilare*. Τῆς νυκτὸς is for νυκτερινάς; and φυλάσσει. φυλ. τ. ν. may be rendered, "keeping the night watches;" the plural having reference to the various turns, or reliefs, by which the watch was kept.

9. ἐπέστη αὐτοῖς.] Ἐπιφάναι denotes to come upon the sight suddenly, and, as appears from the examples in Wets., is especially used of supernatural appearances. Δόξα Κυρίου is explained by many recent Commentators "a bright glory or splendour," by a well known idiom alluding to the name of the Deity. But it is better, with Euthym., Whitby, Schoettg., and Wahl, to take it here, and at Acts vii. 55, (as also in Exod. xxiv. 16. xl. 34. 1 Kings vii. 11. 2 Chr. vii. 1. Heb. כבוד יהוה) of that Θεῶν φῶς, or extreme splendour, in which the Deity is represented as appearing to men; and sometimes called the Shechinah, an appearance frequently attended, as in this case, by a company of angels.

10. χαρᾶν.] By metonymy, for "cause of joy,"

as James i. 2. and Aristoph. Plut. 637. λέγεις μοι χαρᾶν.

11. σωτήρ.] Wets. has here and on i. 79. incontestably proved (after Br. Pearson), by a vast assemblage of citations, that the terms σωτήρ, Κύριος, Θεός, and ἐπιφάνης, so often applied in Scripture to Jesus Christ, prove him to have been of an origin far more august than the human; the terms being only applicable to a *Deus præsens*, *The Son of God*, and *God*.

12. τῇ φάτῃ.] The τῇ is not found in very many of the best MSS., and early Edd.; and has been, with reason, cancelled by the Editors from Wets. to Scholz.

14. ἐν ὑψίστοις.] Sub. either τόποις scil. οὐρανοῖς, (the plural being used with reference to the Heb. שָׁמַיִם, which only occurs in the plural), or rather οὐρανοῖς, required by that dogma of Jewish Theology, which reckoned three heavens, the aerial, the starry, and the highest, or the seat of God and the angels. The phrase occurs also in Matt. xxi. 9. Mark xi. 10. Luke xiii. 33. Job xvi. 19.

— δόξα — εὐδοκία.] There are few sentences so short, with which Commentators have been more perplexed than this. Hence some read εὐδοκίας, and others conjecture εὐδοκία. But the former seems to be merely an ancient conjecture, and is as little to be attended to as the latter, which is professedly such. No greater notice is due to those who change the *doxology* into a kind of proverb, by taking εὐδοκία ἐν ἀνθρώποις as the predicate, and the rest of the words as the subject of the sentence. Various methods of interpretation have been propounded by Commentators of the last half century; all liable more or less to objection. In this strait, a recent English Commentator comes to our aid, and proposes to extricate us from the embarrassment by a simple expedient. "The whole difficulty (says he) seems to have arisen from dividing the verse into three clauses. That it consists only of two is evident to demonstration, from the apposition of ἐν ὑψίστοις and Θεῷ in the one, to ἐπὶ γῆς and ἐν ἀνθρώποις in the other. Hence also the following order: Θεῷ ἐν ὑψίστοις δόξα (ἔστι), καὶ ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἐπὶ γῆς εἰρήμη, εὐδοκία." But so far from this being "evident to demonstration," the sentence, even after it has been put on the bed of Procrustes, still remains (*mirabile dictu*) the same — i. e. *trimembris*; for at εὐδοκία must necessarily be repeated ἔστι; and ἐν ἀνθρώποις must also be repeated, otherwise there will be no sense. Besides, the order here proposed does violence to the plain structure of the sentence; and that by the above mentioned unnatural procedure. The "apposition" supposed

Καὶ ἐγένετο, ὡς ἀπῆλθον ἀπὸ αὐτῶν εἰς τὸν οὔρανόν οἱ ἄγγελοι, καὶ 15 οἱ ἄνθρωποι, οἱ ποιμένες, εἶπον πρὸς ἀλλήλους· Ἀέλιθωμεν δὴ ἕως Βηθλεὲμ, καὶ ἴδωμεν τὸ ἥμα τούτο τὸ γεγονός, ὃ ὁ Κύριος ἐγνώ- 16 ρισεν ἡμῖν. Καὶ ἦλθον σπεύσαντες, καὶ ἀνεύθρον τὴν τε Μαριὰμ καὶ τὸν Ἰωσήφ, καὶ τὸ βρέφος κείμενον ἐν τῇ φάτιγῃ. Ἰδόντες δὲ διεγνώ- 17 ρισαν περὶ τοῦ ἡμήματος τοῦ λαληθέντος αὐτοῖς περὶ τοῦ παιδίου τού- 18 του. Καὶ πάντες οἱ ἀκούσαντες ἐθαύμασαν περὶ τῶν λαληθέντων ὑπὸ 19 τῶν ποιμένων πρὸς αὐτούς. Ἦ δὲ Μαριὰμ πάντα συνετίθει τὰ ῥήματα 20 ταῦτα, συμβάλλουσα ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῆς. καὶ * ὑπέστρεψαν οἱ ποιμέ- 21 νες, δοξάζοντες καὶ αἰνοῦντες τὸν Θεὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσιν οἷς ἤκουσαν καὶ εἶδον, καθὼς ἐλάληθη πρὸς αὐτούς.

z Gen. 17. 12.
Lev. 12. 3.
supr. 1. 31.
Matt. 1. 21.
John 7. 22.

^z ΚΑΙ ὅτι ἐπλήσθησαν ἡμέραι ὅκτῳ τοῦ περιτεμεῖν * αὐτὸν, καὶ 21 ἐκλήθη τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦς, τὸ κληθῆν ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀγγέλου πρὸ τοῦ συλληφθῆναι αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ.

a Lev. 12. 2.
et seq.

^a ΚΑΙ ὅτι ἐπλήσθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ αὐτῶν, κατὰ τὸν 22 νόμον Μωϋσέως, ἀνήγαγον αὐτὸν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, παραστήσαι τῷ Κυ- 23 ρίῳ, (^b καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν νόμῳ Κυρίου· "Ὅτι πᾶν ἄρσεν 24 διανοῖγον μήτραν ἄγιον τῷ Κυρίῳ κληθήσεται.") ^c καὶ 24 τοῦ δοῦναι θυσίαν, κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον ἐν νόμῳ Κυρίου, ζευγος 25 τρυγόνων ἢ δύο νεοσσούς περιστερῶν.

b Ezod. 13. 2.
& 22. 29.
& 34. 19.
Num. 3. 13.
& 8. 15, 17.
c Lev. 12. 6, 8.

is not such, but an antithetical apodosis. The sentence, I repeat, is grammatically *trimembris*. For though some eminent Commentators recognize only two members and a corollary, that is conceding the very point in dispute, the corollary clause constituting a *third*. That third indeed is in some measure exegetical of the preceding; ἐν ἀνθρώποις corresponding to ἐπὶ γῆς (which corresponds to ἐν ὑψητοῖς of the first member), and εὐ-δόκια to εἰρήνη. At the second member, Θεῷ must be supplied from the first, and be taken for πρὸς τὸν Θεόν. It must also be supplied in the third from the second. Εὐδοκία signifies a state of acceptance. The omission of the copula before the clause ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδ. may be accounted for on the principle suggested by Doddr.; namely, that "such exclamatory sentences are usually broken up into short elliptical clauses." It should seem, however, that εὐδοκία is in apposition with, and explanatory of ἐπὶ γῆς εἰρήνη. Thus the sentence is grammatically *trimembris*, but in sense *membris*. In such cases of apposition ὃ ἐστι is understood, and thus no copula is necessary. It is plain that we must supply in the two last clauses not ἴστω, as many do; but ἐστι. The 2d and 3d clauses assign the cause and ground of the δόξα.

15. καὶ οἱ ἄνθρωποι, οἱ ποιμένες, &c.] The καὶ is, as often, redundant, after the manner of the Heb. ו. As to the next words, there is not, as the Commentators suppose, any pleonasm; for the use of the Article before each word forbids us to take it as the common idiom ἀνθρώπος πάντες; but the latter term is in apposition with, and exegetical of the former; q. d. the men, i. e. the shepherds.

—τὸ ῥῆμα.] The Commentators here take ῥῆμα for πράγμα, as in several other passages. As to the Heb. רַבָּר, and the Greek Classical ἔπος and λόγος. There is, however, generally a sort of significatio *prægnans*, the word denoting a thing

spoken of. Here τὸ γεγονός is added by way of explanation.

16. ἐν τῇ φ.] Render "in the home-stall." 19. συμβάλλουσα.] Some explain this "endeavouring to comprehend." But the proof is imperfect. Others, with Elsn., "forming conjectures respecting," i. e. by comparing past with present events. But far more natural and agreeable to the context is the common interpretation, "pondering, revolving," as in many passages of the Classical writers. So διαλογίζεσθαι ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις in Mark ii. 6. and Luke v. 22. Ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ belongs both to συνετίθει and συμβάλλουσα. So Dan. vii. 23. καὶ τὸ ῥῆμα ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ μου συνετίθησαν.

20. ὑπέστρεψαν.] This reading, for the Vulg. ἐπέστρ., is found in almost all the MSS. and early Edd., confirmed by numerous passages from this Gospel and the Acts. And it is adopted by every Critical Editor from Wets. to Scholz.

21. αὐτόν.] This (for the Vulg. τὸ παιδίον) is found in almost all the best MSS. and Versions. and early Edd.; and is adopted by Matt., Griesb., Tittm., Vat., and Scholz; rightly, for the common reading is plainly a correction.

22. παραστήσαι.] The term is used κατ' ἐξοχὴν, of victims brought to the altar, and of offerings consecrated to God. So the Latin *admovere* and *sistere*. There is here no little variety of reading. Some copies have αὐτοῦ, others αὐτῆς, but the great majority αὐτῶν. For the first two readings there is little or no authority. Αὐτῆς is justly suspected to be a παραδόξωσις, and to have proceeded (as did the omission of αὐτῶν) from the superstition of those who were scandalized at the idea of impurity being ascribed to Jesus. But they should have considered that the impurity was only external and ceremonial, not moral, it being merely an obligation and restraint laid on

25 Καὶ ἰδοὺ, ἦν ἄνθρωπος ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ, ᾧ ὄνομα Στυμεών· καὶ ὁ
 ἄνθρωπος οὗτος δίκαιος καὶ εὐλαβὴς, προσδεχόμενος παράκλησιν τοῦ
 26 Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ Πνεῦμα † ἅγιον ἦν ἐπ' αὐτόν· καὶ ἦν αὐτῷ κεχηρημα-
 τισμένον ὑπὸ τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου, μὴ ἰδεῖν θάνατον, πρὶν ἢ ἰδῆν
 27 τὸν Χριστὸν Κυρίου. Καὶ ἦλθεν ἐν τῷ Πνεύματι εἰς τὸ ἱερόν· καὶ
 ἐν τῷ εἰσαγαγεῖν τοὺς γονεῖς τὸ παιδίον Ἰησοῦν, τοῦ ποιῆσαι αὐτοὺς
 28 κατὰ τὸ εἰθισμένον τοῦ νόμου περὶ αὐτοῦ· καὶ αὐτὸς ἐδέξατο αὐτὸ εἰς
 29 τὰς ἀγκάλιας αὐτοῦ, καὶ εὐλόγησε τὸν Θεὸν καὶ εἶπε· ^d Νῦν ἀπολύεις
 30 τὸν δουλόν σου, δέσποια, κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμά σου, ἐν εἰρήνῃ, ^e ὅτι εἶδον
 31 οἱ ὀφθαλμοί μου τὸ σωτήριόν σου, ὃ ἠτοίμασας κατὰ πρόσωπον πάν-
 32 των τῶν λαῶν· ^f φῶς εἰς ἀποκάλυψιν ἐθνῶν, καὶ δόξαν λαοῦ σου Ἰσ-

^d Gen. 49. 30.
 Phil. 1. 23.
^e Ps. 68. 2.
 Isa. 52. 10.
 infr. 3. 6.
^f Ian. 42. 6.
 & 49. 6.
 Acts 13. 47.
 & 28. 28.
 supr. 1. 68.

women newly brought to bed, till after the performance of certain rites.

25. δίκαιος καὶ εὐλαβής.] Of these terms the former is explained by the Commentators to denote one who observes the outward ceremonies of the Law; the latter one who cultivates the inward devotion. But this view appears too much squared by Jewish notions. There is no reason why *δικ.* should not mean (in the usual sense) a person of integrity and uprightness, discharging faithfully his duties towards men; and *εὐλ.*, one pious and devout, circumspectly and scrupulously performing his duties towards God; thus denoting rather more than *εὐσεβής*. See Acts x. 22. Nor is this sense without examples in the Classical writers from Plato downwards. See Wets. or Recens. Syn.

— παράκλησιν τ. ἴ. i. e. by metonymy of abstract for concrete. παράκλητον, the Consoler, a name, by the Jews of that age and long afterwards, used to designate the expected Messiah, with reference to the language of the Prophets, which would then be brought peculiarly to mind by the oppression under which they were groaning from the Gentiles. Πνεῦμα ἅγ., i. e. “the influence of the Holy Spirit.” See Middlet. For ἅγιον ἦν very many MSS. have ἦν ἅγιον which is edited by Matth., Griesb., Vat., and Scholz.

26. ἦν αὐτῷ κεχο.] The more usual construction would be κεχηρηματισμένος ὑπὸ τοῦ Πν., as in Matt. ii. 12. Acts x. 22. and elsewhere. Χηρητίζειν signifies to give a χροῖμα (anciently synonymous with χροσμός), or oracular and Divine admonition. In what manner this was in the present case conveyed; whether by oral communication, dream, or otherwise, cannot with certainty be determined. Ἰδεῖν θάνατον is a Hebraism answering to כוּת רִצּוֹת. It never occurs in the Classical writers; though ἄ δ ἦν ἰδεῖν and εἰσῆδεῖν are cited from the Poets.

27. ἐν τῷ Πν.] “under the influence of the Spirit.” Ἐν, like the Heb. ב, *by*, is often synonymous with διὰ, denoting the moving cause. Τὸ εἰθισμένον, for τὸν ἔθιστον, or τὸ ἔθος, which, like δικαίωμα, denoted the rites of the Law. Thus the Hebrew מִשְׁפַּח is rendered *ἔθισμός* 1 Kings xviii. 28.

29. ἀπολύεις.] Ἀπολύνειν signifies properly “to loose, let go from any place (or figuratively from any state, which implies coercion) to any other place,” as home, &c.; and it is used either with εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν or absolutely; and sometimes, as here, it is employed figuratively, and by euphemism, of death, with the addition of τοῦ σώματος, or

of τοῦ ζῆν, as is usual in the Classical writers, though in the Scriptural ones without it, as here and in Num. xx. 29. and Gen. xv. 2. See more in Recens. Synop. The result of the diligent researches of the Philological Illustrators is, that the term was by the Classical writers used partly of deliverance from confinement to liberty; partly of deliverance from labours and anxieties of various kinds, not only by the being eased of laborious duties, but by removal from them by death; thus attesting “a hope full of immortality;” inasmuch as, amidst various metaphors, the body is supposed to enchain the soul, and detain it from its native home. The sense of the passage is, “Now, Lord, thou dost (by this sight) dismiss me to the grave, as thou promisedst, in peace and tranquillity, because mine eyes have seen my salvation,” i. e. the author of it. There is no occasion to suppose, with many, that ἀπολύεις is for ἀπολύσεις. The aged saint, by a beautiful figure, takes this sight of his Redeemer, as a dismissal from the burden of life, a sort of *Go in peace*. So Statius in his Theb. vii. 366. cited by Wetstein. Et fessum vitā dimitte, Parca! I add Æschyl. Agam. 520, where the herald, out of joy, on again seeing his native country, exclaims, τεθνᾶναι δ' οὐκ ἀντεροῦ Θεοῖς. It is strange that so many Commentators should have failed to see that ἔτι after ἐν εἰρήνῃ is to be closely connected therewith, and rendered not “for” but “because.” Now this construction is common when a verb or adjective precedes; why, then, should it not be allowed after an adjectival phrase? The other signification requires much unauthorized subaudition to make out any construction, as may be seen by consulting the Paraphrasts. Δεσπότης is in Scripture used of the supreme Lord, i. e. God; but in the Classical writers the highest sense it has, is when used of Sovereigns.

30. εἶδον οἱ ὀφθ.] In οἱ ὀφθ. there is an *emphaticis*, as in Gen. xlv. 11. Job xix. 27. xlii. 5. 1 John i. 1. Τὸ σωτήριον, Neut. adjective for substantive, as in Luke ii. 30. Eph. iii. 6. Psal. xcvi. 2. See Matth. Gr. Gr. § 627.

32. φῶς—ἰθύνων.] This is an apposition with τὸ σωτήριον οὐν at ver. 30. Grot. observes, that the passage has reference to Is. xlii. 6. and Psal. xcvi. 2. from which it should seem that there is here a transposition, for φῶς ἰθύνων, εἰς ἀποκάλυψιν. But εἰς ἀποκ. does not, I conceive, mean (as Grot. and others suppose) “for a revelation of the righteousness of God;” but is better explained by Euthym. εἰς ἀνάβλεψιν τῶν ἐθνῶν scil. τετυφλωμένων τῇ πλάνῃ.

ραήλ. Καὶ ἦν Ἰωσήφ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ θαυμάζοντες ἐπὶ τοῖς λαλον- 33
 μένοις περὶ αὐτοῦ. Ἐ καὶ εὐλόγησεν αὐτοὺς Συμεὼν, καὶ εἶπε πρὸς 34
 Μαριάμ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ· Ἴδού, οὗτος κείται εἰς πτώσιν καὶ ἀνά-
 στασιν πολλῶν ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ εἰς σημεῖον ἀντιλεγόμενον· (ἡ καὶ 35
 σοῦ δὲ αὐτῆς τὴν ψυχὴν διελεύσεται ὄμοφαία·) ὅπως ἂν ἀποκαλυ-
 φθῶσιν ἐκ πολλῶν καρδιῶν διαλογισμοί.

Καὶ ἦν Ἄννα προφῆτις, θυγάτηρ Φανουὴλ, ἐκ φυλῆς Ἀσήρ· αὕτη 36
 προβεβηκυῖα ἐν ἡμέραις πολλαῖς, ζήσασα ἕτη μετὰ ἀνδρὸς ἐπὶ τὰ ἀπὸ
 τῆς παρθενίας αὐτῆς. Ἴ καὶ αὕτη χήρα ὡς ἐτῶν ὄγδοηκοντατεσσάρων, 37
 ἣ οὐκ ἀφίστατο ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱεροῦ, νηστεύσασα καὶ δεήσασα λατρεύουσα νύ-
 κτια καὶ ἡμέραν· καὶ αὕτη αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρῃ ἐπιστάσα ἀνθρωπολογεῖτο τῷ 38
 Κυρίῳ, καὶ ἐλάλει περὶ αὐτοῦ πᾶσι τοῖς προσεχομένοις λύτρωσιν ἐν
 Ἱερουσαλήμ. Καὶ ὡς ἐτέλεσαν ἅπαντα τὰ κατὰ τὸν νόμον Κυρίου, 39
 ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν εἰς τὴν πόλιν αὐτῶν Ναζαρετ. ἑ Τὸ δὲ 40

g Isa. 8. 14.
 Matt. 21. 44.
 Rom. 9. 32, 33.
 1 Pet. 2. 8.
 1 Cor. 1. 23, 24.
 & 2 Cor. 2. 16.
 Acts 23. 22.
 h John 19. 35.

i 1 Sam. 1. 22.
 1 Tim. 5. 5.

k Supr. 1. 80.
 infr. ver. 52.

33. ἦν] “*per syncopen, for ἦσαν, Doricē,*” say the Commentators. It was not, however, peculiar to the *Doric*. It was rather an *ancient* usage, but could not well arise from *Syncopē*; though it was caught up, (together with many other syncopated words,) by the Poets, to suit their convenience. I suspect it to have been a *very* old form, as old as the time when, in the simplicity of early diction (which yet lingers in the popular dialect), a distinction of number in the *verb* was unattended to; and that it afterwards continued in use in the *common* dialect.

34. οὗτος κείται, &c.] The imagery is supposed to be taken from Is. viii. 14. & xxviii. 16, which passages are applied to the Messiah in Rom. ix. 33. See Grot., Wolf, Le Clerc, and Wets.; who remark, that under the figure of a stone lying in a path, on which heedless persons may trip, Christ is designated as a *rock of stumbling* to those who reject him, but a *rock of support* to those who avail themselves of his aid. *Κεῖσθαι εἰς* is not, however, to be regarded as implying *fatality*; but to be taken in a popular acceptance, for *to be ordained or appointed* for any thing, as in Phil. i. 17. and 1 Thess. iii. 3. *Ἰπῶσαν* and *ἀνάστασιν* are to be taken figuratively, of sin and misery,—and of reformation and happiness; namely, that he should be the occasion of sin to many, who would reject him; and be the occasion of many being raised, from the bondage of sin, to repentance, faith, and salvation through him.

—εἰς σημεῖον, scil. εἶναι.] On the sense of *σημεῖον* Commentators are not agreed. Beza, L. Brug., Mald., Mackn., and Doddr., think it is a figure intimating the deliberate malice of Christ's persecutors. And though no example of *σημεῖον* so used has been adduced, yet several have been noted of the corresponding Latin term *signum*. The sense, however, thus arising is somewhat *jejunum*; and since this whole passage is founded (though the Commentators have failed to notice it) on Isaiah viii. 14—18, it is certain that the sense must be (as Grot. and most of the best Expositors since his time have seen), that “He should be a signal example of virtue calumniated, and beneficence basely requited.” Ἀντιλεγόμενον is to be taken nearly as equivalent to ἀντιλεχθόμενον. The Pesch. Syr. Tr. freely, but not unfaithfully, renders, “a mark for contradiction or calumny.” The best comment is supplied by the

words of Heb. xii. 3. written, as also ii. 13, with this passage of the prophet in mind: Ἀναλογισασθε τὸν καιρὸν ὑπομενεῖν κῆτα ὑπὸ τῶν ἀμαρτωλῶν εἰς αὐτὸν ἀντιλογίαν, ἵνα μὴ κάμητε, ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν ἐκλυόμενοι.

35. καὶ — ἐ] “*quia — imo.*” Σοῦ αὐτῆς, for *σσαντῆς*; perhaps by a popular idiom. In τὴν ψυχ. δ. *φορητὰ* is figurative language, similar to what we find in the Poetic parts of the O. T., and indeed in the *Classical* Poets, by which men's minds are said to be wounded, as the body is transfixed with arrows, swords, &c. See Prov. xii. 18, and Rec. Syn. We can be at no loss to imagine the many ways in which this prophecy was fulfilled, (since the calumnies shot at her *Son* must have pierced her to the heart, without supposing, with some, that Mary should *suffer martyrdom*.)

— ὅπως ἂν — διαλογ.] Διαλογισμὸς is a *vox mediæ significationis*, denoting the *course* of thought and reflection, whether good or evil. The sense is, “in order that the real disposition of every one as [to truth and virtue] may be disclosed.”

36. προφῆτις.] Of the various senses which have been here assigned to this term, the best founded is that of the ancients and Grot., adopted by Schleus., “one endowed with the χάρισμα, or Spiritual grace, of uttering Divine revelations.” Προβεβηκυῖα ἐν ἡμέραις πολλαῖς is, *per hyperallagen*, for πολὺ προβ. Ἐπὶ ἐπὶ τὰ, scil. μόνα. At χήρα sub. γένη, which is sometimes expressed, especially in the earlier writers. The very long widowhood of Anna is particularly mentioned, since virtuous widowhood was held in great honour among the Jews, and even Gentiles. See Joseph. Ant. xviii. 6, 6, and Val. Max. ii. 1. 3.

37. οὐκ ἀφίστατο — νύκτια καὶ ἡμέραν.] An hyperbolical expression, importing that she *assiduously attended* at all the stated periods of public worship, both day and night, (for there were occasionally night-services of sacred music); and perhaps that she spent most of her time in the temple, engaged in prayer and holy meditation.

38. ἐπιστάσα] “*coming up.*” Ἀὐτῇ τῇ ὥρῃ, i. e. at the time that Simeon uttered the above words. Ἀνθρωπολογεῖτο τῷ Κ. This is by some rendered, “*returned thanks.*” That sense, however, is confined to the *Classical* writers; and even in them has χάριν added, and is accompanied by no *Dative*. It is better to adopt the sense which

παιδίων ἠΐξανε, καὶ ἐκραταιοῦτο πνεύματι, πληρούμενον σοφίας· καὶ χάρις Θεοῦ ἦν ἐπ' αὐτό.

41 ¹ ΚΑΙ ἐπορεύοντο οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ κατ' ἔτος εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ τῇ ἑορ-^{1 Deut. 16. 1.}
 42 τῇ τοῦ πάσχα. Καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο ἐτῶν δώδεκα, ἀναβάντων αὐτῶν εἰς ^{Exod. 23. 15,}
 43 Ἱεροσόλυμα κατὰ τὸ ἔθος τῆς ἑορτῆς, καὶ τελειωσάντων τὰς ἡμέρας, ἐν ^{17. & 24. 23.}
 τῷ ὑποστρέφειν αὐτοὺς, ὑπέμεινεν Ἰησοῦς ὁ παῖς ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ· καὶ ^{Lev. 23. 5.}
 44 οὐκ ἔγνω Ἰωσήφ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ. Νομίσαντες δὲ αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ
 45 συνουδίᾳ εἶναι, ἤλθον ἡμέρας ὁδόν, καὶ ἀνεζήτησαν αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς συγ-
 46 γενέσι καὶ ἐν τοῖς γνωστοῖς· καὶ μὴ εὐρόντες αὐτὸν, ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς
 46 Ἱερουσαλήμ ζητοῦντες αὐτόν. Καὶ ἐγένετο, μεθ' ἡμέρας τρεῖς εἴδον
 αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, καθεζόμενον ἐν μέσῳ τῶν διδασκάλων, καὶ ἀκούοντα
 47 αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπερωτῶντα αὐτοῦς. ^{m Matt. 7. 28} Ἐξίσταντο δὲ πάντες οἱ ἀκούοντες ^{Mark 1. 22.}
 48 αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῇ συνέσει καὶ ταῖς ἀποκρίσεσιν αὐτοῦ. Καὶ ἰδόντες αὐτόν ^{infr. 4. 22. 32.}
 ἐξεπλάγησαν· καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ εἶπε· Τέκνον, τί ἐποίησας ^{John 7. 15, 46}
 49 ἡμῖν οὕτως; ἰδοὺ, ὁ πατήρ σου κἀγὼ ὀδυνώμενοι ἐζητοῦμέν σε. Καὶ
 εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς· Τί ὅτι ἐζητεῖτέ με; οὐκ ᾔδειτε ὅτι ἐν τοῖς τοῦ

the word bears in some kindred passages of the LXX. (as Ps. lxxix. 13.) and render, "returned praises to the Lord." The two significations, however, merge into each other. Διῴωσαν here seems to include the notions of *deliverance* and *redemption*. Most of the Jews thought only of the temporal, the wiser few took it in the *spiritual* sense.

40. χάρις Θεοῦ, &c.] Raphael, Wets., Campb., and Wakef., take these words, by an idiom connected with the oblique cases of Θεός, to denote *greatness* or *excellence*, and by a common signification of χάρις (*grace*) to denote that he was of extraordinary comeliness. But there is no example of χάρις in the N. T. in any *nearer* sense than *gracefulness of speech*; which cannot here apply. Besides, χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ is of such frequent occurrence in the N. T., (especially in St. Luke's works,) that the Evangelist would never have ventured on introducing such an idiom of Θεός as that just adverted to, in *this* case, since misapprehension would be sure to arise. In fact, χάρις Θεοῦ, except in a few passages where it has reference to the *miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit*, always denotes in the N. T. the *favour of God to men*. And that it is so taken here is placed beyond doubt by a kindred passage, *infra* ver. 52.

41. ἐπορεύοντο.] All the males were required to attend at the three festivals at Jerusalem; and females, though not commanded, yet used often to attend, especially at the Passover.

42. ἀναβάντων αὐτῶν.] The αὐτῶν includes *Jesus*; and which, indeed, is implied in the preceding words ὅτε ἐγένετο ἔ. δ.; for the age of 12 years (which was considered the age of puberty, and was that when the children were put to learn some trade) was, as appears from the Rabbinical writers, that at which the above obligation was thought binding; when too they were solemnly introduced into the Church, and initiated in its doctrines and ceremonies.

44. ἐν συνουδίᾳ.] The word properly denotes "a journeying together," and then, by metonymy, a *company* of fellow travellers. The Orientals express this by *Caravan*.

—ἀνεζήτησαν] "sought him out," i. e. diligently;

for the ἀνα is intensive. So Thucyd. ii. 8. πάντα ἀνεζητήτο.

—ταῖς γνωστοῖς] "acquaintance." The word very rarely occurs as a substantive, (being properly a participle or adjective) though it is found in Ps. lxxviii. 9.

46. μεθ' ἡμ. τρεῖς] i. e. on the 3d day. The 1st. was spent in their journey; the 2d. in their return to Jerusalem; and on the 3d. they found him.

—ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ.] By this is meant a *court* in which (as we learn from the Rabbinical writers) the doctors sat, for the purpose of public instruction. It is not necessary to press on the sense of ἐν μέσῳ, which may be taken to mean "among them;" viz. in the centre of an area round which the benches of the doctors were raised semicircularly. Nor are we from ἐπερωτῶντα αὐτοῦς to suppose any thing like *disputation*, but modest interrogation.—See Doddr. Indeed, it is plain from the Rabbinical citations in Lightf., that the Jewish doctors used such a plan of instruction as dealt much in interrogation, both on the part of the teachers and the taught. Something very similar I have noted in the following account given by Josephus of his boyhood, *Life*, § 2:—Ἐγὼ δὲ συμπαιδευόμενος, εἰς μεγάλην παιδείας προκόπτων ἐπίδοσιν, μνήμη τε καὶ συνέσει δοκῶν διαφέρειν. Ἐτι δ' ἄρα παῖς ὢν, περὶ τεσσαρακαίδεκατον ἔτος, διὰ τὸ φιλογοῦμαι ὑπὸ πάντων ἐπινοήμην, συνίστην ἅει τῶν ἀρχιερέων καὶ τῶν τῆς πόλεως πρώτων, ὑπὲρ τοῦ παρ' ἐμοῦ περὶ τῶν νομίμων ἀκριβέστερόν τι γινώσκαι.

47. τῇ συνέσει] "intelligence," "natural sagacity." So Thucyd. i. 138. φθίσως ἰσχυρὸν δηλόσασα· οἰκία γὰρ ζυνέσει, &c. In τῇ συνέσει καὶ ταῖς ἀποκ. there is no Hendiadys (as Kuin. imagines) but ἐν ταῖς ἀποκ. is added, to show in what that *σύνεσις* especially consisted.

49. ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου.] Commentators are perplexed with this elliptical expression; in which there was perhaps a *studied* ambiguity. Some supply πράγμασι, others οἰκίμασι. The former is well supported by Classical examples, and if this were a Classical author, it might deserve the preference; but in an Hellenistic one it cannot be admitted. Besides, the answer, according to

n Infr. 9. 45.
& 13. 34.

πατρός μου δεῖ εἶναι με ; ⁿ Καὶ αὐτοὶ οὐ συνήκαν τὸ ῥῆμα, ὃ ἐλάλη- 50
σεν αὐτοῖς. Καὶ κατέθη μετ' αὐτῶν, καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς Ναζαρέτ· καὶ ἦν 51
ὑποτασσόμενος αὐτοῖς. Καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ διετήρει πάντα τὰ ῥήματα
ταῦτα ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῆς. ^o Καὶ Ἰησοῦς προέκοπτε σοφίᾳ καὶ ἡλι- 52
κίᾳ, καὶ χάριτι παρὰ Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώποις.

o 1 Sam. 2. 26.
supr. 1. 80.
& 2. 40.

MT. MK.

3. 1. ³ ραίας καὶ Τραχωνίτιδος χώρας, καὶ Λουσανίου τῆς Ἀβιληνῆς τετραρχοῦντος, 2
1 ἐπ' ἀρχιερέων Ἄννα καὶ Καϊάφα, ἐγένετο ῥῆμα Θεοῦ ἐπὶ Ἰουάνην τὸν
2 [τοῦ] Ζαχαρίου υἱὸν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ· καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν περιχώρον 3
3 2 τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, κηρύσσων βίβησι μετανοίας εἰς ἄφειον ἁματιῶν· ὡς 4
γέγραπται ἐν βίβλῳ λόγων Ἰσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου, λέγοντος· Φωνὴ
βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ· ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν Κυρίου,
εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ. πᾶσα γῆ 5
πληρωθήσεται, καὶ πᾶν ὄρος καὶ βουνὸς τυπεινωθή-
σεται· καὶ ἔσται τὰ σκολιὰ εἰς εὐθεΐαν, καὶ αἱ τρα- 6
χεῖαι εἰς ὁδοὺς λείας. καὶ ὄψεται πᾶσα σὰρξ τὸ σω- 6
7 τήριον τοῦ Θεοῦ. Ἔλεγεν οὖν τοῖς ἐκπορομενοῖς ὄχλοις βι- 7
πιοθῆναι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ· Γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν! τί ὑπέδειξεν ἡμῖν φρυγῆν
8 ἀπὸ τῆς μελλούσης ὀργῆς; Ποιήσατε οὖν καρποὺς ἀξίους τῆς μετα- 8
9 νοίας· καὶ μὴ ἄρξῃσθε λέγειν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς· Πατέρα ἔχομεν τὸν
Ἀβραάμ· λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, ὅτι δύναται ὁ Θεὸς ἐκ τῶν λίθων τούτων

that sense, would scarcely be suitable to the question. It is therefore better, with the ancient, and a great majority of the modern Commentators, to supply *οὐκ ἔστιν*, of which ellipsis Wets. has adduced abundance of examples, both from the Classical and Scriptural writers. So Gen. xli. 51. Eccles. xlii. 10.

51. ἦν ὑποτασσόμενος αὐτοῖς.] Ἰποτάσσεσθαι is used not only of forcible and compulsory, but voluntary, subjection, as that of wives and of children. ῥήματα may here mean both sayings and doings.

52. προέκοπτε] "advanced." In this sense there is (as I observed in Recens. Synop.) a metaphor taken from the felling of trees, or clearing of thickets, to effect a passage. Ἠλικία is by some interpreted "stature;" by others, "age." The latter is possibly true; but it would rather have required a double καὶ before σοφία; and the former is more suitable to the context. Both may have been in the mind of the Evangelist.

III. 1. On the chronological questions connected with this passage, the reader is referred to Dr. Hales, Mr. Benson, and Mr. Townsend.

2. ἐπ' ἀρχ. "A. καὶ K."] [Comp. Acts iv. 6.] There has been much perplexity occasioned by the use, in the Gospels and also in Joseph., of phraseology expressing or implying plurality, where the Law recognised but *one*. In strict propriety there could be but *one* high priest at a time, who held the office for life. But, after the reduction of Judæa to the Roman yoke, great changes were made; and the occupants of an office, which had enjoyed almost regal authority,

were changed at the will of the conquerors. Hence some have supposed that the office had been made annual; and that Annas and Caiaphas occupying it *by turns*, each, or both, might be said to be the High Priest. This, however, is a wholly gratuitous supposition, and overturned by what is said in Joseph. Ant. xviii. 2, 2. Others think that Caiaphas was the High Priest, and Annas his Sagan, or Deputy; a title given to him by Joseph. Ant. xviii. 6, 24. And great was the dignity of the Sagan; who was allowed, upon occasion, to perform the most sacred functions of the High Priest. Others, again, imagine that the *title* is given to Annas, as being the chief of Aaron's family then alive, and being regarded as the rightful High Priest by the Jews, though Caiaphas held the *office* by appointment of the Roman Governor. These last two methods *also* proceed upon supposition, and although there is nothing which *contradicts* either, there is no reason for giving a preference to either.

—ἐγένετο ῥῆμα Θ. ἐν Ἰ.] "the command of the Lord was issued to John." A formula implying Divine authority, which occurs also in Jer. i. 2.

3. καὶ ἦλθεν.] "And he (accordingly) went."

4. See Is. xl. 3. John i. 23.

5. The Evangelist, it may be observed, cites this passage of the Prophet further on than Matthew and Mark, because he was writing especially for Gentile converts; and the latter part of the question was necessary to assure them, that the "salvation of God," and the participation in the privileges of the Gospel, extended to *them* as well as the Jews.

6. See Ps. xcvi. 3.

9 ἐγείραι τέκνα τῶ Ἀβραάμ. Ἰδὴ δὲ καὶ ἡ ἀξίτη πρὸς τὴν ὄψιν τῶν
 δένδρων κείται· πᾶν οὖν δένδρον μὴ ποιοῦν καρπὸν καλὸν ἐκκόπτε-
 ται καὶ εἰς πῦρ βάλλεται.
 10 Καὶ ἐπρωτίων αὐτῶν οἱ ὄχλοι, λέγοντες· Τί οὖν ποιήσομεν; Ἀπο-
 11 κριθεὶς δὲ λέγει αὐτοῖς· Ὁ ἔχων δύο χιτῶνας μεταδώτω τῷ μὴ ἔχοντι·
 12 καὶ ὁ ἔχων βρώματα ὁμοίως ποιείτω. Ἰησοῦν δὲ καὶ τελῶναι βαπτί-
 13 σθῆναι, καὶ εἶπον πρὸς αὐτόν· Διδάσκαλε, τί ποιήσομεν; Ὁ δὲ εἶπε
 πρὸς αὐτούς· Μηδὲν πλέον παρὰ τὸ διατεταγμένον ὑμῖν πράσσετε.
 14 Ἐπρωτίων δὲ αὐτῶν καὶ στρατευόμενοι, λέγοντες· Καὶ ἡμεῖς τί ποιή-
 15 σομεν; Καὶ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς· Μηδένα διασεΐσητε, μηδὲ συκοφαν-
 τήσητε· καὶ ἀρκεῖσθε τοῖς ὀφωτοῖς ὑμῶν.
 15 Προδοκῶντος δὲ τοῦ λαοῦ, καὶ διαλογιζομένων πάντων ἐν ταῖς καρ-
 16 δίας αὐτῶν περὶ τοῦ Ἰωάννου, μήποτε αὐτὸς εἴη ὁ Χριστὸς, ἀπεκρίνατο 11 7
 ὁ Ἰωάννης ἅπασιν, λέγων· Ἐγὼ μὲν ὕδατι βαπτίζω ὑμᾶς· ἔρχεται
 δὲ ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου, οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἰκανὸς λῦσαι τὸν ἱμάντια τῶν ὑπο- 8
 17 δημάτων αὐτοῦ· αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν Πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρὶ.
 18 οὗ τὸ πύρον ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ διακαθαριεῖ τὴν ἄλωνα αὐτοῦ· 12
 καὶ συναΐξει τὸν σίτον εἰς τὴν ἀποθήκην αὐτοῦ, τὸ δὲ ἄχρον κατα-
 19 κούσει πυρὶ ἀσθέστω. Πολλὰ μὲν οὖν καὶ ἕτερα παρακαλῶν εὐηγγε-
 19 λίζετο τὸν λαόν. Ὁ δὲ Ἡρώδης ὁ τετραρχῆς, ἐλεγχόμενος ὑπ' αὐτοῦ
 περὶ Ἡρωδιάδος τῆς γυναικὸς [Φιλίππου] τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ, καὶ

10. [Comp. Acts ii. 37.]

11. αὐτοῖς.] And to the Pharisees more especially, as we learn from Matt. iii. 7. *Charity* is here enjoined, as a prominent part of that moral virtue in which *they* were so notoriously deficient. [Comp. 1 John iii. 17. iv. 20.]

12. The Future in *ποιήσομεν* here and just before is to be rendered by *must* rather than *shall*; a Hebraism. The *ποιήσομεν* of many ancient MSS., edited by Scholz, is only a gloss. It is well observed by Bornemann: 'Neutrum est falsum, sed exquisitius futurum, quod in subsequentibus mutare librarii desiderunt. Eadem est scribendi diversitas,' John vi. 5. *πῶθεν ἀγοράσομεν ἄροτους*;

13. *μηδὲν πλέον — πράσσετε.*] This use of *πράσσειν*, as said of *taxes*, (like *perficere* in Latin), is frequent in the Classical writers. The sense was either to *exact*, or to *collect*; the former was the idea of the payer, the latter of the receiver. The *original* sense intended seems to have been "to manage." The difference between the active and middle forms is this: the active signifies to collect for *another's* use, the middle to collect for one's *own*. Διατάσσειν is a *vox signata*, used of legal enactments, especially such as relate to laying on taxes. See Duker on Thucyd. iii. 70. The *παρὰ* after a comparative, or a word which implies comparison (especially *μείζων* or *κρείττων*), is used for *ἄν*, both in the Scriptural and Classical writers. The literal sense of *παρὰ* in this use is "alongside of;" and juxtaposition almost implies comparison. Our Lord does not, we see, condemn their profession, but only the *abuse* of the power it gave them.

14. *στρατευόμενοι.*] Michaelis thinks that this denotes the "men under arms, or going to battle;" for he imagines that Herod's war with Aretas had

already commenced; and that there is here reference to the troops engaged in that service. A *chronological* reason, however, may be opposed to overturn this supposition; and, moreover, the *Article* would thus be indispensable.

— *μηδένα διασεΐσητε.*] This is by many Commentators taken to mean, "do not harass;" a signification found in the Classical writers. But some more *special* sense seems to be intended. It is therefore best explained as equivalent to, and indeed formed from, the Latin *concitere*, which has been proved to have the signification "to extort money by dint of threats." Διασεΐειν imports extortion by threats of *violence*; *συκοφαντεῖν* that by threats of unjust accusation, false information, &c.

— *ἀρκεῖσθε τοῖς διψωνίοις.*] In the early ages a soldier's pay consisted chiefly in a *supply of food*: and was called *διψώνιον*, from *διψων*, *meat*. In process of time an equivalent in money was substituted for the supply of food; and then *διψώνιον*, which had originally meant *support*, came to denote *pay*; though still *some* allowances *in kind* were left the soldier; which probably opened a way to the extortion alluded to.

15. *προδοκῶντος τοῦ λαοῦ.*] i. e. as the people were waiting and in suspense; so Acts xviii. 6.

16. *ἅπασιν*] i. e. both those there, and those at Jerusalem, who (we learn from John ii. 13.) had sent a message of inquiry. On this verse comp. John i. 26. Acts i. 5. xi. 16. xiii. 25. Is. xlv. 3. Joel ii. 23. Acts ii. 4.

18. *εὐηγγ.* ἰδὸν λαόν.] "he evangelized the people," proclaimed to them the Gospel; as Acts viii. 25. Gal. i. 9.

19. *Φιλίππου.*] This is omitted in very many MSS., and almost all the early Editions, and has been with reason cancelled by almost every Ed-

MT. MK.

3. 1. περὶ πάντων ὧν ἐποίησε ποιηρῶν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, προσέθηκε καὶ τοῦτο 20
ἐπὶ πᾶσι, καὶ κατέκλεισε τὸν Ἰωάννην ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ.
- 16 10 Ἐγένετο δὲ, ἐν τῷ βαπτισθῆναι ἅπαντα τὸν λαὸν, καὶ Ἰησοῦ βα- 21
πτισθέντος καὶ προσευχομένου, ἀνερχθῆναι τὸν οὐρανόν, καὶ καταβῆναι 22
17 11 τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον σωματικῶς εἶδει, ὡσεὶ περιστερῶν, ἐπ' αὐτόν, καὶ
φωνὴν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ γενέσθαι, λέγουσαν· Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπη-
τός, ἐν σοὶ ἠδόκησα. Καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὡσεὶ ἐτῶν τριάκοντα 23
ἀρχόμενος· ὧν, ὡς ἐνομίζετο, υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ, τοῦ Ἥλ, τοῦ Ματθαῖ, τοῦ 24
Λευὶ, τοῦ Μελχὶ, τοῦ Ἰαννά, τοῦ Ἰωσήφ, τοῦ Ματταθίου, τοῦ Ἀμώς, 25
τοῦ Ναοῦμ, τοῦ Ἐσλὶ, τοῦ Ναγγαῖ, τοῦ Μιὰθ, τοῦ Ματταθίου, τοῦ 26
Σεμεὶ, τοῦ Ἰωσήφ, τοῦ Ἰούδα, τοῦ Ἰωανῆ, τοῦ Ῥησᾶ, τοῦ Ζοροβάβελ, 27
τοῦ Σαλαθιήλ, τοῦ Νηρι, τοῦ Μελχὶ, τοῦ Ἀδδὶ, τοῦ Κωσᾶμ, τοῦ Ἐλ- 28
μωδάμ, τοῦ Ἰθρ, τοῦ Ἰωσή, τοῦ Ἐλιέζερ, τοῦ Ἰωρεὶμ, τοῦ Ματθαῖ, τοῦ 29
Λευὶ, τοῦ Συμεῶν, τοῦ Ἰούδα, τοῦ Ἰωσήφ, τοῦ Ἰωρᾶν, τοῦ Ἐλιακίμ, τοῦ 30
Μελεῖ, τοῦ Μαιρᾶν, τοῦ Ματταθᾶ, τοῦ Ναθῶν, τοῦ Λαβὶδ, τοῦ Ἰεσ- 32
σαι, τοῦ Ὠβήδ, τοῦ Βοὸζ, τοῦ Σαλωμών, τοῦ Ναασσών, τοῦ Ἀμιναδάβ, 33
τοῦ Ἀράμ, τοῦ Ἐσρῶμ, τοῦ Φαριζ, τοῦ Ἰούδα, τοῦ Ἰακώβ, τοῦ 34
Ἰσαὰκ, τοῦ Ἀβραάμ, τοῦ Θάρα, τοῦ Ναχὼρ, τοῦ Σερούχ, τοῦ Ῥαγαῦ, 35
τοῦ Φάλεκ, τοῦ Ἐβέρ, τοῦ Σαλά, τοῦ Κάινᾶν, τοῦ Ἀφραζᾶδ, τοῦ Σῆμ, 36
τοῦ Νῶε, τοῦ Λάμεχ, τοῦ Μαθουσάλα, τοῦ Ἐνὼχ, τοῦ Ἰυριδ, τοῦ 37
4. Μαλελεήλ, τοῦ Κάινᾶν, τοῦ Ἐνὼς, τοῦ Σῆθ, τοῦ Ἀδάμ, τοῦ Θεοῦ. 38

- 1 IV. ἸΗΣΟΥΣ δὲ Πνεύματος ἁγίου πλήρης, ἐπέστρεφεν ἀπὸ τοῦ 1
12 Ἰορδάνου· καὶ ἦγετο ἐν τῷ Πνεύματι εἰς τὴν ἔρημον ἡμέρας τεσσαρά- 2
13

itor from Wets. to Scholz. [Comp. Matt. xiv. 3. Mark vi. 17.]

21. βαπτ. καὶ προσ.] [Comp. John i. 32.] The words καὶ προσ., which are added by St. Luke, merit attention. Our Lord, who was content to be obedient unto the Law for man, underwent the rites and performed the ceremonies of the Mosaic Law; and on the same principle underwent this baptism, because, as we find from St. Matthew, he wished to set an example to others of fulfilling all righteousness. With respect to the use of prayer, it was doubtless to set an example to others of the indispensable necessity of prayer, to make any external rites effectual. See Bp. Taylor, vol. ii. 190.

22. [Comp. Is. xlii. 1. Mark ix. 7. 2 Pet. i. 17.]

23. αὐτὸς ἦν ὁ Ἰησοῦς — ἀρχόμενος.] These words have occasioned much perplexity, not only to modern Commentators, but, (as appears from the Varr. Lectt.) to the ancient Interpreters. The phraseology is rugged; yet the harshness must not be removed by cancelling any word (for the consent of MSS. will not permit that); nor even by silencing it. Some seek to remove the difficulty by connecting ὧν with ἀρχ. But this is doing violence to the construction, and yields a feeble and frigid sense. Upon the whole, no interpretation involves so little difficulty as that of the ancient and the best modern Commentators, by which ἦν is construed with ἀρχ., and εἶναι understood after ἀρχ. The sense, then, is, "Jesus was beginning to be of about 30 years," i. e. he had nearly completed his 30th year. I grant that this is somewhat anomalous phraseology; but it is not more so than some other modes of expres-

sion to be found in Scripture; and was probably formed on the popular mode of speaking. There must not be an ἀπὸ supplied before εἶναι, (with some recent Commentators), for in this sense εἶναι carries the Genit. alone. See Matth., Gr. Gr. p. 519. Obs. 2.

— ὡς ἐνομίζετο.] This evidently alludes to his Divine origin.

— τοῦ Ἥλ.] This must mean the son-in-law of Heli, for Jacob was the father of Joseph. So Matt. i. 16. Thus this genealogy must be considered as the lineage of Mary, the daughter of Heli. On the mode of reconciling the seeming discrepancy in the genealogies, see Dr. Hales.

35. Σερούχ.] This (for Σαρούχ) is found in almost all the best MSS., Versions, and early Editions, and is received by almost every Editor from Wets. to Scholz.

IV. 2. ἡμέρας τεσσαράκοντα.] These words would seem to connect with the πειραζόμενος following, as some Editors take them. But St. Matthew describes the temptation as taking place at the close of that period. Most recent Commentators attempt to remove the discrepancy by supposing the meaning to be, not that Jesus was tempted 40 days in succession, but that, at various times during those days, he was exposed to temptations, besides those which the Evangelist now proceeds to enumerate. This method, however, cannot well be admitted. At least it is better, with some ancient and modern Commentators, to connect the words with the preceding. [Comp. Exod. xxxiv. 28. 1 Kings xix. 8.] Πειραζόμενος, however, is not, I conceive, put for πειρασθῆναι,

κοντα πειραζόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ Διαβόλου. Καὶ οὐκ ἔφαγεν οὐδὲν ἐν ταῖς 4. 1.
 3 ἡμέραις ἐκείναις· καὶ, συντελεσθεισῶν αὐτῶν, ὕστερον ἐπέινασε. Καὶ 2
 εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Διάβολος· Εἰ Τίος εἶ τοῦ Θεοῦ, εἰπέ τῷ λίθῳ τούτῳ, 3
 4 ἵνα γένηται ἄρτος. καὶ ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς πρὸς αὐτόν, λέγων· Γέ- 4
 γραπται, ὅτι οὐκ ἐπ' ἄρτῳ μόνῳ ζήσεται [ὁ] ἄνθρω- 5
 5 πος, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ παντὶ ῥήματι Θεοῦ. Καὶ ἀναγαγὼν αὐτόν 8
 ὁ Διάβολος εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλόν, ἔδειξεν αὐτῷ πάσας τὰς βασιλείας τῆς 9
 6 οἰκουμένης ἐν σιγῇ χρόνον· καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Διάβολος· Σοὶ δώσω 9
 τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην ἅπασαν, καὶ τὴν δόξαν αὐτῶν· ὅτι ἐμοὶ παραδέ- 7
 7 δοται, καὶ ᾧ ἐὰν θέλω, δίδωμι αὐτήν. Σὺ οὖν ἐὰν προσκυνήσης 8
 8 ἐνώπιόν μου, ἔσται σου * πᾶσα. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτῷ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰη- 10
 9 σοῦς· Ἔπαγε ὀπίσω μου, Σατανᾶ· γέγραπται [γάρ]· Προσκυ- 11
 νήσεις Κύριον τὸν Θεόν σου, καὶ αὐτῷ μόνῳ λα- 6
 9 τρεύσεις. Καὶ ἤγαγεν αὐτόν εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ, καὶ ἔστησεν αὐτόν ἐπὶ 6
 τὸ πτερυγίον τοῦ ἱεροῦ, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Εἰ [ὁ] Τίος εἶ τοῦ Θεοῦ, 6
 10 βάλε σεαυτὸν ἐντεῦθεν κάτω· γέγραπται γάρ· Ὅτι τοῖς ἀγγέ- 11
 11 λοις αὐτοῦ ἐντελεῖται περὶ σου, τοῦ διαφυλάξαι σε· 12
 12 καὶ [ὅτι] ἐπὶ χειρῶν ἄροῦσί σε, μή ποτε προσκό- 13
 12 ψης πρὸς λίθον τὸν πόδα σου. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν 7
 αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Ὅτι εἴρηται· Οὐκ ἐκπειράσεις Κύριον 7
 13 τὸν Θεόν σου. Καὶ συντελέσας πάντα πειρασμὸν ὁ Διάβολος, 11
 ἀπέστη ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἄχρι καιροῦ.
 14 ΚΑΙ ὑπέστρεψεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ Πνεύματος εἰς τὴν 12 14
 Γαλιλαίαν· καὶ φήμῃ ἐξῆλθε καθ' ὅλης τῆς περιχώρου περὶ αὐτοῦ.
 15 Καὶ αὐτὸς ἐδίδασκεν ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν δοξαζόμενος ὑπὸ πάν-
 16 των. ^a Καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν Ναζαρέτ, οὗ ἦν τεθραμμένος· καὶ εἰσῆλ- ^{a Matt. 2. 23.}
 θε, κατὰ τὸ εἰωθὸς αὐτοῦ, ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαββάτων εἰς τὴν συνα- ^{& 13. 54.}
 17 γωγὴν, καὶ ἀνέστη ἀνυμνοῦσαι. Καὶ ἐπεδόθη αὐτῷ βιβλίον Ἰσαΐου ^{Mark 6. 1.}
^{John 4. 43.}
^{Neh. 8. 5, 6.}

but is a *nominativus pendens*, for Genit. absolute. This mode of taking the passage is confirmed by Mark i. 12. who here follows Luke: καὶ ἦν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἡμέρας τεσσαράκοντα, πειραζόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ Σατανᾶ. Moreover, as πειραζόμενος is implied τότε from the context. That, however, will not, as in the case of διὰ ἡμ. τεσσ., involve any contradiction; since what takes place at the close of any period of time is understood, *populariter*, to fall within that term. I must further observe, that in ἡγουσ just before, there seems to be included (per significationem prænantem) καὶ ἦν scil. ἐκά, which is expressed by Mark.

4. ὁ ἀνθρ.] The ὁ is omitted in very many of the best MSS., and cancelled by Matth., Griesb., and Scholz. But there is not sufficient authority to cancel it. [Comp. Deut. viii. 3.]

6. καὶ τὴν δόξαν αὐτῶν] scil. βασιλείων. We may paraphrase, "and the glory which will proceed from the government of them."

7. πᾶσα.] This (for the common reading πάντα) is found in almost all the best MSS., with several Versions, Fathers, and early Edd. It has also been received by Wets., Matth., Griesb., and others, down to Scholz, to whose authority I have yielded. Indeed, as being the more difficult reading,

it seems to deserve the preference. Yet πάντα may be defended, as being more natural, and agreeable to the popular style; though propriety requires πᾶσα as referred to ἕξουσίαν.

8. γάρ.] See Deut. vi. 13. 1 Sam. vii. 3. This and the ὁ in the next verse are omitted in the best MSS., and cancelled by almost all the recent Editors.

10. See Ps. xci. 11.

11. The ὅτι is not found in very many MSS., early Edd., and Versions, and is cancelled by Matthæi. It seems to have come from the margin, and to have originated from those Critics who read γέγραπται γὰρ ὅτι—ἐντελεῖται; thus regarding the words as not strictly speaking a quotation, but only a report of the sense. And thus the ὅτι would require to be repeated. But it should seem that there is an actual quotation, and therefore the ὅτι is pleonastic; on which see Wahl's Clavis by Robinson.

12. See Deut. vi. 16.

14. ἐν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ Πν.] "under the influence of the Spirit." Καθ' ὅλης, throughout, over all. This sense occurs also in Acts ix. 31, and is sometimes found in the later Classical writers.

15. δοξαζόμενος] for ἐν δόξῃ ὦν.

τοῦ προφήτου* καὶ ἀναπύξας τὸ βιβλίον εἶρε τὸν τόπον οὗ ἦν
 γεγραμμένον.^b Πνεῦμα Κυρίου ἐπ' ἐμέ· οὗ ἔννεκεν 18
 ἔχρισέ με * εὐαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοῖς, ἀπέσταλκέ
 με ἰάσασθαι τοὺς συντετριμμένους τῆν καρδίαν·
 κηρῦσαι αἰχμαλώτοις ἄφεις, καὶ τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλε-
 ψιν· ἀποστεῖλαι τεθασμένους ἐν ἀφέσει·^c κηρύ- 19
 ξαι ἐνιαυτὸν Κυρίου δεκτόν. Καὶ πύξας τὸ βιβλίον, 20
 ἀποδοὺς τῷ ὑπηρέτῃ ἐκάθισε· καὶ πάντων ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ οἱ ὄφθαλ-
 μοὶ ἦσαν ἀτενίζοντες αὐτῷ. Ἦρξατο δὲ λέγειν πρὸς αὐτούς·^d Οὐ 21
 σήμερον πεπλήρωται ἡ γραφὴ αὕτη ἐν τοῖς ὠσίν ἡμῶν.^d Καὶ πάντες 22
 ἐμαρτύρουν αὐτῷ, καὶ θαυμάζον ἐπὶ τοῖς λόγοις τῆς χάριτος τοῖς
 ἐκπορευομένοις ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔλεγον· Οὐχ οὕτός ἐστιν

b Isa. 61. 1, 2.
 Matt. 11. 5.
 Isa. 42. 7.

c Lev. 25. 10.

d Isa. 50. 4.
 Matt. 13. 54.
 Mark 6. 2. 3.
 sup. 2. 47.
 John 6. 42.

17. βιβλίον.] The βιβλία of the Hebrews, and indeed of the ancients in general, were *rolls* fastened to two laths with handles; by holding which in his hand, the reader could roll, or unroll the book at his pleasure.

18. ἔχρισέ με εὐαγγ.] This portion, taken from Is. lxi. 1. was selected by Jesus, in order to draw the attention of the people, and to show its fulfilment in himself: as also with allusion to the *reason* why he was called Christ, and his Religion termed the Gospel. Its application to the Messiah is acknowledged by the best Jewish Expositors. Indeed, the prophecy throughout admits of a *spiritual* interpretation, and an application to all times and all people.

— ἔχρισαι.] This term signifies, not so much being *anointed*, as *inaugurated*, introduced into an office; which, in the case of eminent persons (as kings, prophets, priests, &c.) was always conferred by *unction*.

— εὐαγγελίσασθαι.] Very many MSS. and early Edd. have the common reading εὐαγγελίζεσθαι. But the other is preferred by almost all Editors from Math. to Scholz.

— ἰάσασθαι — καρδίαν.] These words are omitted in a few MSS., Versions, and Fathers, and have been rejected by Grot. and Mill, and cancelled by Griesb. and others; but most rashly, since they are found both in the Heb. and LXX., and, as they are only omitted in *six* MSS., we may impute the omission merely to the carelessness of the Scribes. The words probably formed *one line* of the Archetype; and on that account might be the more easily omitted; especially as the line before began with a word of the same ending as that which commenced this; namely, εὐαγγελίσασθαι. From the same cause have arisen thousands of *lacunæ* in the Classical writers. Moreover, the words are required by the *parallelism*; in which πτωχοῖς and συντετρα. τὴν καρδίαν correspond to each other, the latter signifying the afflicted, or *contrite*, the former the distressed or *poor in spirit*; according as the *literal* or the *spiritual* sense be adopted. ΣΥΝΤ. is occasionally found even in the Classical writers, in a metaphorical sense, of mental sorrow.

The correspondent terms which follow, αἰχμαλώτοις, τυφλοῖς, and τεθασμένους, have likewise a double sense. Ἀφεις, in the sense of *deliverance from captivity*, is found also in the Classical writers. With respect to τυφλοῖς, the sense of the *Hebrew*, “those who are bound,” is greatly preferable, though the other may be justified, by

taking the term to denote those who are as it were blind with long confinement in dark dungeons. In the spiritual sense, αἶχμ. will denote those who are bound with the chain of sin; and τυφλοῖς those who are blinded by sin and Satan; namely, the “blind people that have eyes,” (Is. xliii. 8.) or those that “seeing, see not.” (Matt. xiii. 13.) The next clause ἀποστεῖλαι — ἀφείσει is not found in either the Heb. or LXX. in this passage, though it is at C. 53. It was, no doubt, inserted, in reading, from that passage, as illustrative. As to the conjecture of Owen, that the words are a gloss, it is unfounded; and as to that of Randolph, that the Hebrew formerly contained a clause to this effect, is too hypothetical. Ἐν ἀφέσει is not, as most Commentators imagine, for εἰς ἀφειαν; but may be rendered “in freedom,” a phrase for the adjective free.

19. κηρύξαι — δεκτόν.] This sums up the whole of the above, in words which contain an allusion to the *year of Jubilee*; when, by sound of trumpet, was proclaimed deliverance, and restoration of every kind. Thus it is meant, that the *Gospel* is to the *Law* what the Jubilee year was as compared to all others. In the application, ἐνιαυτός will denote *time* generally. Δεκτόν is for ἀρεστόν, as 2 Cor. vi. 2. καίως δεκτός. The word is not found in the Classical writers.

20. ἐκάθισε.] As those did, who proceeded to address some instruction to the people, after having read the portion of Scripture. See Vitringa de Syn. Jud., p. 899.

21. ἐν τοῖς ὠσίν ἡμῶν.] E. V. “in your hearing.” And so most Commentators take it. But that involves a very harsh *catachresis*, and it is better (with the Syr., Beng., De Dieu, and Campb.) to render, “which ye have heard;” literally, “which is now in your ears.” Thus we must suppose an ellipsis of the relative. But this, however frequent in *Hebrew*, is very rare in *Greek*; and would here be so harsh, that I would rather suppose an ἡ had slipped out after αὐτῷ. The ἡ twice occurring just before would make this the more easily absorbed. The Syriac Translator certainly had it in his copy.

22. ἤμαρτόν α.] Μαροτρῆν with a Dative signifies “to bear testimony to, or for,” and almost always implies *in favor of*. The word here expresses *commendation* on the grounds afterwards mentioned. Ἐδοκίμαζον ἐπὶ, &c. is exegetical of the preceding. This syntax of δοκίμαζειν with ἐπὶ, (*at*) occurs also in Mark xii. 17, and sometimes in the Classical writers. Διὰ or ἐν is more usual.

23 ὁ υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ ; ° Καὶ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς · Πάντως ἐρεῖτέ μοι τὴν ^c παραβολὴν ταύτην · Ἰατρὲ θεράπευσον σεαυτὸν · ὅσα ἠκούσαμεν γε- ^e νόμιστα ἐν τῇ Καπερναούμ, ποιήσον καὶ ὧδε ἐν τῇ πατριδί σου. ^{13.}
 24 Ἐἶπε δέ · Ἀλλὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐδεὶς προφήτης δεκτός ἐστιν ἐν τῇ ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^{aa} ^{ab} ^{ac} ^{ad} ^{ae} ^{af} ^{ag} ^{ah} ^{ai} ^{aj} ^{ak} ^{al} ^{am} ^{an} ^{ao} ^{ap} ^{aq} ^{ar} ^{as} ^{at} ^{au} ^{av} ^{aw} ^{ax} ^{ay} ^{az} ^{ba} ^{bb} ^{bc} ^{bd} ^{be} ^{bf} ^{bg} ^{bh} ^{bi} ^{bj} ^{bk} ^{bl} ^{bm} ^{bn} ^{bo} ^{bp} ^{bq} ^{br} ^{bs} ^{bt} ^{bu} ^{bv} ^{bw} ^{bx} ^{by} ^{bz} ^{ca} ^{cb} ^{cc} ^{cd} ^{ce} ^{cf} ^{cg} ^{ch} ^{ci} ^{cj} ^{ck} ^{cl} ^{cm} ^{cn} ^{co} ^{cp} ^{cq} ^{cr} ^{cs} ^{ct} ^{cu} ^{cv} ^{cw} ^{cx} ^{cy} ^{cz} ^{da} ^{db} ^{dc} ^{dd} ^{de} ^{df} ^{dg} ^{dh} ^{di} ^{dj} ^{dk} ^{dl} ^{dm} ^{dn} ^{do} ^{dp} ^{dq} ^{dr} ^{ds} ^{dt} ^{du} ^{dv} ^{dw} ^{dx} ^{dy} ^{dz} ^{ea} ^{eb} ^{ec} ^{ed} ^{ee} ^{ef} ^{eg} ^{eh} ^{ei} ^{ej} ^{ek} ^{el} ^{em} ^{en} ^{eo} ^{ep} ^{eq} ^{er} ^{es} ^{et} ^{eu} ^{ev} ^{ew} ^{ex} ^{ey} ^{ez} ^{fa} ^{fb} ^{fc} ^{fd} ^{fe} ^{ff} ^{fg} ^{fh} ^{fi} ^{fj} ^{fk} ^{fl} ^{fm} ^{fn} ^{fo} ^{fp} ^{fq} ^{fr} ^{fs} ^{ft} ^{fu} ^{fv} ^{fw} ^{fx} ^{fy} ^{fz} ^{ga} ^{gb} ^{gc} ^{gd} ^{ge} ^{gf} ^{gg} ^{gh} ^{gi} ^{gj} ^{gk} ^{gl} ^{gm} ^{gn} ^{go} ^{gp} ^{gq} ^{gr} ^{gs} ^{gt} ^{gu} ^{gv} ^{gw} ^{gx} ^{gy} ^{gz} ^{ha} ^{hb} ^{hc} ^{hd} ^{he} ^{hf} ^{hg} ^{hh} ^{hi} ^{hj} ^{hk} ^{hl} ^{hm} ^{hn} ^{ho} ^{hp} ^{hq} ^{hr} ^{hs} ^{ht} ^{hu} ^{hv} ^{hw} ^{hx} ^{hy} ^{hz} ^{ia} ^{ib} ^{ic} ^{id} ^{ie} ^{if} ^{ig} ^{ih} ⁱⁱ ^{ij} ^{ik} ^{il} ^{im} ⁱⁿ ^{io} ^{ip} ^{iq} ^{ir} ^{is} ^{it} ^{iu} ^{iv} ^{iw} ^{ix} ^{iy} ^{iz} ^{ja} ^{jb} ^{jc} ^{jd} ^{je} ^{jf} ^{fg} ^{fh} ^{fi} ^{fj} ^{fk} ^{gl} ^{gm} ^{gn} ^{go} ^{gp} ^{gq} ^{gr} ^{gs} ^{gt} ^{gu} ^{gv} ^{gw} ^{gx} ^{gy} ^{gz} ^{ha} ^{hb} ^{hc} ^{hd} ^{he} ^{hf} ^{hg} ^{hh} ^{hi} ^{hj} ^{hk} ^{hl} ^{hm} ^{hn} ^{ho} ^{hp} ^{hq} ^{hr} ^{hs} ^{ht} ^{hu} ^{hv} ^{hw} ^{hx} ^{hy} ^{hz} ^{ia} ^{ib} ^{ic} ^{id} ^{ie} ^{if} ^{ig} ^{ih} ⁱⁱ ^{ij} ^{ik} ^{il} ^{im} ⁱⁿ ^{io} ^{ip} ^{iq} ^{ir} ^{is} ^{it} ^{iu} ^{iv} ^{iw} ^{ix} ^{iy} ^{iz} ^{ja} ^{jb} ^{jc} ^{jd} ^{je} ^{jf} ^{fg} ^{fh} ^{fi} ^{fj} ^{fk} ^{gl} ^{gm} ^{gn} ^{go} ^{gp} ^{gq} ^{gr} ^{gs} ^{gt} ^{gu} ^{gv} ^{gw} ^{gx} ^{gy} ^{gz} ^{ha} ^{hb} ^{hc} ^{hd} ^{he} ^{hf} ^{hg} ^{hh} ^{hi} ^{hj} ^{hk} ^{hl} ^{hm} ^{hn} ^{ho} ^{hp} ^{hq} ^{hr} ^{hs} ^{ht} ^{hu} ^{hv} ^{hw} ^{hx} ^{hy} ^{hz} ^{ia} ^{ib} ^{ic} ^{id} ^{ie} ^{if} ^{ig} ^{ih} ⁱⁱ ^{ij} ^{ik} ^{il} ^{im} ⁱⁿ ^{io} ^{ip} ^{iq} ^{ir} ^{is} ^{it} ^{iu} ^{iv} ^{iw} ^{ix} ^{iy} ^{iz} ^{ja} ^{jb} ^{jc} ^{jd} ^{je} ^{jf} ^{fg} ^{fh} ^{fi} ^{fj} ^{fk} ^{gl} ^{gm} ^{gn} ^{go} ^{gp} ^{gq} ^{gr} ^{gs} ^{gt} ^{gu} ^{gv} ^{gw} ^{gx} ^{gy} ^{gz} ^{ha} ^{hb} ^{hc} ^{hd} ^{he} ^{hf} ^{hg} ^{hh} ^{hi} ^{hj} ^{hk} ^{hl} ^{hm} ^{hn} ^{ho} ^{hp} ^{hq} ^{hr} ^{hs} ^{ht} ^{hu} ^{hv} ^{hw} ^{hx} ^{hy} ^{hz} ^{ia} ^{ib} ^{ic} ^{id} ^{ie} ^{if} ^{ig} ^{ih} ⁱⁱ ^{ij} ^{ik} ^{il} ^{im} ⁱⁿ ^{io} ^{ip} ^{iq} ^{ir} ^{is} ^{it} ^{iu} ^{iv} ^{iw} ^{ix} ^{iy} ^{iz} ^{ja} ^{jb} ^{jc} ^{jd} ^{je} ^{jf} ^{fg} ^{fh} ^{fi} ^{fj} ^{fk} ^{gl} ^{gm} ^{gn} ^{go} ^{gp} ^{gq} ^{gr} ^{gs} ^{gt} ^{gu} ^{gv} ^{gw} ^{gx} ^{gy} ^{gz} ^{ha} ^{hb} ^{hc} ^{hd} ^{he} ^{hf} ^{hg} ^{hh} ^{hi} ^{hj} ^{hk} ^{hl} ^{hm} ^{hn} ^{ho} ^{hp} ^{hq} ^{hr} ^{hs} ^{ht} ^{hu} ^{hv} ^{hw} ^{hx} ^{hy} ^{hz} ^{ia} ^{ib} ^{ic} ^{id} ^{ie} ^{if} ^{ig} ^{ih} ⁱⁱ ^{ij} ^{ik} ^{il} ^{im} ⁱⁿ ^{io} ^{ip} ^{iq} ^{ir} ^{is} ^{it} ^{iu} ^{iv} ^{iw} ^{ix} ^{iy} ^{iz} ^{ja} ^{jb} ^{jc} ^{jd} ^{je} ^{jf} ^{fg} ^{fh} ^{fi} ^{fj} ^{fk} ^{gl} ^{gm} ^{gn} ^{go} ^{gp} ^{gq} ^{gr} ^{gs} ^{gt} ^{gu} ^{gv} ^{gw} ^{gx} ^{gy} ^{gz} ^{ha} ^{hb} ^{hc} ^{hd} ^{he} ^{hf} ^{hg} ^{hh} ^{hi} ^{hj} ^{hk} ^{hl} ^{hm} ^{hn} ^{ho} ^{hp} ^{hq} ^{hr} ^{hs} ^{ht} ^{hu} ^{hv} ^{hw} ^{hx} ^{hy} ^{hz} ^{ia} ^{ib} ^{ic} ^{id} ^{ie} ^{if} ^{ig} ^{ih} ⁱⁱ ^{ij} ^{ik} ^{il} ^{im} ⁱⁿ ^{io} ^{ip} ^{iq} ^{ir} ^{is} ^{it} ^{iu} ^{iv} ^{iw} ^{ix} ^{iy} ^{iz} ^{ja} ^{jb} ^{jc} ^{jd} ^{je} ^{jf} ^{fg} ^{fh} ^{fi} ^{fj} ^{fk} ^{gl} ^{gm} ^{gn} ^{go} ^{gp} ^{gq} ^{gr} ^{gs} ^{gt} ^{gu} ^{gv} ^{gw} ^{gx} ^{gy} ^{gz} ^{ha} ^{hb} ^{hc} ^{hd} ^{he} ^{hf} ^{hg} ^{hh} ^{hi} ^{hj} ^{hk} ^{hl} ^{hm} ^{hn} ^{ho} ^{hp} ^{hq} ^{hr} ^{hs} ^{ht} ^{hu} ^{hv} ^{hw} ^{hx} ^{hy} ^{hz} ^{ia} ^{ib} ^{ic} ^{id} ^{ie} ^{if} ^{ig} ^{ih} ⁱⁱ ^{ij} ^{ik} ^{il} ^{im} ⁱⁿ ^{io} ^{ip} ^{iq} ^{ir} ^{is} ^{it} ^{iu} ^{iv} ^{iw} ^{ix} ^{iy} ^{iz} ^{ja} ^{jb} ^{jc} ^{jd} ^{je} ^{jf} ^{fg} ^{fh} ^{fi} ^{fj} ^{fk} ^{gl} ^{gm} ^{gn} ^{go} ^{gp} ^{gq} ^{gr} ^{gs} ^{gt} ^{gu} ^{gv} ^{gw} ^{gx} ^{gy} ^{gz} ^{ha} ^{hb} ^{hc} ^{hd} ^{he} ^{hf} ^{hg} ^{hh} ^{hi} ^{hj} ^{hk} ^{hl} ^{hm} ^{hn} ^{ho} ^{hp} ^{hq} ^{hr} ^{hs} ^{ht} ^{hu} ^{hv} ^{hw} ^{hx} ^{hy} ^{hz} ^{ia} ^{ib} ^{ic} ^{id} ^{ie} ^{if} ^{ig} ^{ih} ⁱⁱ ^{ij} ^{ik} ^{il} ^{im} ⁱⁿ ^{io} ^{ip} ^{iq} ^{ir} ^{is} ^{it} ^{iu} ^{iv} ^{iw} ^{ix} ^{iy} ^{iz} ^{ja} ^{jb} ^{jc} ^{jd} ^{je} ^{jf} ^{fg} ^{fh} ^{fi} ^{fj} ^{fk} ^{gl} ^{gm} ^{gn} ^{go} ^{gp} ^{gq} ^{gr} ^{gs} ^{gt} ^{gu} ^{gv} ^{gw} ^{gx} ^{gy} ^{gz} ^{ha} ^{hb} ^{hc} ^{hd} ^{he} ^{hf} ^{hg} ^{hh} ^{hi} ^{hj} ^{hk} ^{hl} ^{hm} ^{hn} ^{ho} ^{hp} ^{hq} ^{hr} ^{hs} ^{ht} ^{hu} ^{hv} ^{hw} ^{hx} ^{hy} ^{hz} ^{ia} ^{ib} ^{ic} ^{id} ^{ie} ^{if} ^{ig} ^{ih} ⁱⁱ ^{ij} ^{ik} ^{il} ^{im} ⁱⁿ ^{io} ^{ip} ^{iq} ^{ir} ^{is} ^{it} ^{iu} ^{iv} ^{iw} ^{ix} ^{iy} ^{iz} ^{ja} ^{jb} ^{jc} ^{jd} ^{je} ^{jf} ^{fg} ^{fh} ^{fi} ^{fj} ^{fk} ^{gl} ^{gm} ^{gn} ^{go} ^{gp} ^{gq} ^{gr} ^{gs} ^{gt} ^{gu} ^{gv} ^{gw} ^{gx} ^{gy} ^{gz} ^{ha} ^{hb} ^{hc} ^{hd} ^{he} ^{hf} ^{hg} ^{hh} ^{hi} ^{hj} ^{hk} ^{hl} ^{hm} ^{hn} ^{ho} ^{hp} ^{hq} ^{hr} ^{hs} ^{ht} ^{hu} ^{hv} ^{hw} ^{hx} ^{hy} ^{hz} ^{ia} ^{ib} ^{ic} ^{id} ^{ie} ^{if} ^{ig} ^{ih} ⁱⁱ ^{ij} ^{ik} ^{il} ^{im} ⁱⁿ ^{io} ^{ip} ^{iq} ^{ir} ^{is} ^{it} ^{iu} ^{iv} ^{iw} ^{ix} ^{iy} ^{iz} ^{ja} ^{jb} ^{jc} ^{jd} ^{je} ^{jf} ^{fg} ^{fh} ^{fi} ^{fj} ^{fk} ^{gl} ^{gm} ^{gn} ^{go} ^{gp} ^{gq} ^{gr} ^{gs} ^{gt} ^{gu} ^{gv} ^{gw} ^{gx} ^{gy} ^{gz} ^{ha} ^{hb} ^{hc} ^{hd} ^{he} ^{hf} ^{hg} ^{hh} ^{hi} ^{hj} ^{hk} ^{hl} ^{hm} ^{hn} ^{ho} ^{hp} ^{hq} ^{hr} ^{hs} ^{ht} ^{hu} ^{hv} ^{hw} ^{hx} ^{hy} ^{hz} ^{ia} ^{ib} ^{ic} ^{id} ^{ie} ^{if} ^{ig} ^{ih} ⁱⁱ ^{ij} ^{ik} ^{il} ^{im} ⁱⁿ ^{io} ^{ip} ^{iq} ^{ir} ^{is} ^{it} ^{iu} ^{iv} ^{iw} ^{ix} ^{iy} ^{iz} ^{ja} ^{jb} ^{jc} ^{jd} ^{je} ^{jf} ^{fg} ^{fh} ^{fi} ^{fj} ^{fk} ^{gl} ^{gm} ^{gn} ^{go} ^{gp} ^{gq} ^{gr} ^{gs} ^{gt} ^{gu} ^{gv} ^{gw} ^{gx} ^{gy} ^{gz} ^{ha} ^{hb} ^{hc} ^{hd} ^{he} ^{hf} ^{hg} ^{hh} ^{hi} ^{hj} ^{hk} ^{hl} ^{hm} ^{hn} ^{ho} ^{hp} ^{hq} ^{hr} ^{hs} ^{ht} ^{hu} ^{hv} ^{hw} ^{hx} ^{hy} ^{hz} ^{ia} ^{ib} ^{ic} ^{id} ^{ie} ^{if} ^{ig} ^{ih} ⁱⁱ ^{ij} ^{ik} ^{il} ^{im} ⁱⁿ ^{io} ^{ip} ^{iq} ^{ir} ^{is} ^{it} ^{iu} ^{iv} ^{iw} ^{ix} ^{iy} ^{iz} ^{ja} ^{jb} ^{jc} ^{jd} ^{je} ^{jf} ^{fg} ^{fh} ^{fi} ^{fj} ^{fk} ^{gl} ^{gm} ^{gn} ^{go} ^{gp} ^{gq} ^{gr} ^{gs} ^{gt} ^{gu} ^{gv} ^{gw} ^{gx} ^{gy} ^{gz} ^{ha} ^{hb} ^{hc} ^{hd} ^{he} ^{hf} ^{hg} ^{hh} ^{hi} ^{hj} ^{hk} ^{hl} ^{hm} ^{hn} ^{ho} ^{hp} ^{hq} ^{hr} ^{hs} ^{ht} ^{hu} ^{hv} ^{hw} ^{hx} ^{hy} ^{hz} ^{ia} ^{ib} ^{ic} ^{id} ^{ie} ^{if} ^{ig} ^{ih} ⁱⁱ ^{ij} ^{ik} ^{il} ^{im} ⁱⁿ ^{io} ^{ip} ^{iq} ^{ir} ^{is} ^{it} ^{iu} ^{iv} ^{iw} ^{ix} ^{iy} ^{iz} ^{ja} ^{jb} ^{jc} ^{jd} ^{je} ^{jf} ^{fg} ^{fh} ^{fi} ^{fj} ^{fk} ^{gl} ^{gm} ^{gn} ^{go} ^{gp} ^{gq} ^{gr} ^{gs} ^{gt} ^{gu} ^{gv} ^{gw} ^{gx} ^{gy} ^{gz} ^{ha} ^{hb} ^{hc} ^{hd} ^{he} ^{hf} ^{hg} ^{hh} ^{hi} ^{hj} ^{hk} ^{hl} ^{hm} ^{hn} ^{ho} ^{hp} ^{hq} ^{hr} ^{hs} ^{ht} ^{hu} ^{hv} ^{hw} ^{hx} ^{hy} ^{hz} ^{ia} ^{ib} ^{ic} ^{id} ^{ie} ^{if} ^{ig} ^{ih} ⁱⁱ ^{ij} ^{ik} ^{il} ^{im} ⁱⁿ ^{io} ^{ip} ^{iq} ^{ir} ^{is} ^{it} ^{iu} ^{iv} ^{iw} ^{ix} ^{iy} ^{iz} ^{ja} ^{jb} ^{jc} ^{jd} ^{je} ^{jf} ^{fg} ^{fh} ^{fi} ^{fj} ^{fk} ^{gl} ^{gm} ^{gn} ^{go} ^{gp} ^{gq} ^{gr} ^{gs} ^{gt} ^{gu} ^{gv} ^{gw} ^{gx} ^{gy} ^{gz} ^{ha} ^{hb} ^{hc} ^{hd} ^{he} ^{hf} ^{hg} ^{hh} ^{hi} ^{hj} ^{hk} ^{hl} ^{hm} ^{hn} ^{ho} ^{hp} ^{hq} ^{hr} ^{hs} ^{ht} ^{hu} ^{hv} ^{hw} ^{hx} ^{hy} ^{hz} ^{ia} ^{ib} ^{ic} ^{id} ^{ie} ^{if} ^{ig} ^{ih} ⁱⁱ ^{ij} ^{ik} ^{il} ^{im} ⁱⁿ ^{io} ^{ip} ^{iq} ^{ir} ^{is} ^{it} ^{iu} ^{iv} ^{iw} ^{ix} ^{iy} ^{iz} ^{ja} ^{jb} ^{jc} ^{jd} ^{je} ^{jf} ^{fg} ^{fh} ^{fi} ^{fj} ^{fk} ^{gl} ^{gm} ^{gn} ^{go} ^{gp} ^{gq} ^{gr} ^{gs} ^{gt} ^{gu} ^{gv} ^{gw} ^{gx} ^{gy} ^{gz} ^{ha} ^{hb} ^{hc} ^{hd} ^{he} ^{hf} ^{hg} ^{hh} ^{hi} ^{hj} ^{hk} ^{hl} ^{hm} ^{hn} ^{ho} ^{hp} ^{hq} ^{hr} ^{hs} ^{ht} ^{hu} ^{hv} ^{hw} ^{hx} ^{hy} ^{hz} ^{ia} ^{ib} ^{ic} ^{id} ^{ie} ^{if} ^{ig} ^{ih} ⁱⁱ ^{ij} ^{ik} ^{il} ^{im} ⁱⁿ ^{io} ^{ip} ^{iq} ^{ir} ^{is} ^{it} ^{iu} ^{iv} ^{iw} ^{ix} ^{iy} ^{iz} ^{ja} ^{jb} ^{jc} ^{jd} ^{je} ^{jf} ^{fg} ^{fh} ^{fi} ^{fj} ^{fk} ^{gl} ^{gm} ^{gn} ^{go} ^{gp} ^{gq} ^{gr} ^{gs} ^{gt} ^{gu} ^{gv} ^{gw} ^{gx} ^{gy} ^{gz} ^{ha} ^{hb} ^{hc} ^{hd} ^{he} ^{hf} ^{hg} ^{hh} ^{hi} ^{hj} ^{hk} ^{hl} ^{hm} ^{hn} ^{ho} ^{hp} ^{hq} ^{hr} ^{hs} ^{ht} ^{hu} ^{hv} ^{hw} ^{hx} ^{hy} ^{hz} ^{ia} ^{ib} ^{ic} ^{id} ^{ie} ^{if} ^{ig} ^{ih} ⁱⁱ ^{ij} ^{ik} ^{il} ^{im} ⁱⁿ ^{io} ^{ip} ^{iq} ^{ir} ^{is} ^{it} ^{iu} ^{iv} ^{iw} ^{ix} ^{iy} ^{iz} ^{ja} ^{jb} ^{jc} ^{jd} ^{je} ^{jf} ^{fg} ^{fh} ^{fi} ^{fj} ^{fk} ^{gl} ^{gm} ^{gn} ^{go} ^{gp} ^{gq} ^{gr} ^{gs} ^{gt} ^{gu} ^{gv} ^{gw} ^{gx} ^{gy} ^{gz} ^{ha} ^{hb} ^{hc} ^{hd} ^{he} ^{hf} ^{hg} ^{hh} ^{hi} ^{hj} ^{hk} ^{hl} ^{hm} ^{hn} ^{ho} ^{hp} ^{hq} ^{hr} ^{hs} ^{ht} ^{hu} ^{hv} ^{hw} ^{hx} ^{hy} ^{hz} ^{ia} ^{ib} ^{ic} ^{id} ^{ie} ^{if} ^{ig} ^{ih} ⁱⁱ ^{ij} ^{ik} ^{il} ^{im} ⁱⁿ ^{io} ^{ip} ^{iq} ^{ir} ^{is} ^{it} ^{iu} ^{iv} ^{iw} ^{ix} ^{iy} ^{iz} ^{ja} ^{jb} ^{jc} ^{jd} ^{je} ^{jf} ^{fg} ^{fh} ^{fi} ^{fj} ^{fk} ^{gl} ^{gm} ^{gn} ^{go} ^{gp} ^{gq} ^{gr} ^{gs} ^{gt} ^{gu} ^{gv} ^{gw} ^{gx} ^{gy} ^{gz} ^{ha} ^{hb} ^{hc} ^{hd} ^{he} ^{hf} ^{hg} ^{hh} ^{hi} ^{hj} ^{hk} ^{hl} ^{hm} ^{hn} ^{ho} ^{hp} ^{hq} ^{hr} ^{hs} ^{ht} ^{hu} ^{hv} ^{hw} ^{hx} ^{hy} ^{hz} ^{ia} ^{ib} ^{ic} ^{id} ^{ie} ^{if} ^{ig} ^{ih} ⁱⁱ ^{ij} ^{ik} ^{il} ^{im} ⁱⁿ ^{io} ^{ip} ^{iq} ^{ir} ^{is} ^{it} ^{iu} ^{iv} ^{iw} ^{ix} ^{iy} ^{iz} ^{ja} ^{jb} ^{jc} ^{jd} ^{je} ^{jf} ^{fg} ^{fh} ^{fi} ^{fj} ^{fk} ^{gl} ^{gm} ^{gn} ^{go} ^{gp} ^{gq} ^{gr} ^{gs} ^{gt} ^{gu} ^{gv} ^{gw} ^{gx} ^{gy} ^{gz} ^{ha} ^{hb} ^{hc} ^{hd} ^{he} ^{hf} ^{hg} ^{hh} ^{hi} ^{hj} ^{hk} ^{hl} ^{hm} ^{hn} ^{ho} ^{hp} ^{hq} ^{hr} ^{hs} ^{ht} ^{hu} ^{hv} ^{hw} ^{hx} ^{hy} ^{hz} ^{ia} ^{ib} ^{ic} ^{id} ^{ie} ^{if} ^{ig} ^{ih} ⁱⁱ

MT. MK.

8. 1. ἐπιτάσσει τοῖς ἀκαθάρτοις πνεύμασι, καὶ ἐξέρχονται. Καὶ ἐξεπορεύετο 37
28 ἦχος περὶ αὐτοῦ εἰς πάντα τόπον τῆς περιχώρου.
- 14 29 Ἄναστὰς δὲ ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς, εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Σίμωνος. 38
30 [ἦ] πενθερὰ δὲ τοῦ Σίμωνος ἦν συνεχομένη πυρετῷ μεγάλῳ. Καὶ
31 ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν περὶ αὐτῆς. Καὶ ἐπιστὰς ἐπάνω αὐτῆς, ἐπειτίμησε τῷ 39
15 πυρετῷ, καὶ ἀφῆκεν αὐτήν. παροχρόσημα δὲ ἀναστᾶσα διηκόνει αὐτοῖς.
- 16 32 Δύοντος δὲ τοῦ ἡλίου, πάντες ὅσοι εἶχον ἀσθενοῦντας νόσοις ποικί- 40
34 λαις, ἤγαγον αὐτοὺς πρὸς αὐτόν· ὁ δὲ ἐνὶ ἐκάστῳ αὐτῶν τὰς χεῖρας
ἐπιθεῖς, ἐθεράπευσεν αὐτοῖς. Ἐξήρχετο δὲ καὶ δαιμόνια ἀπὸ πολλῶν, 41
κράζοντα καὶ λέγοντα· Ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ Πῖος τοῦ Θεοῦ. καὶ
ἐπιτιμῶν οὐκ εἶα αὐτὰ λαλεῖν, οἳ ἤδειςαν τὸν Χριστὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι.
- 35 Γενομένης δὲ ἡμέρας ἐξεληθὼν ἐπορεύθη εἰς ἔρημον τόπον, καὶ οἱ 42
36 ὄχλοι ἐπεζήτουν αὐτόν, καὶ ἦλθον ἕως αὐτοῦ· καὶ κατεῖχον αὐτόν,
37 τοῦ μὴ πορεύεσθαι ἀπ' αὐτῶν. Ὁ δὲ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς· Ὅτι καὶ 43
38 ταῖς ἐτέραις πόλεσιν εὐαγγελίσασθαι με δεῖ τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ·
39 οἳ εἰς τοῦτο ἀπέσταλμαι. Καὶ ἦν κηρῦσσαν ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς τῆς 44
Γαλιλαίας.

a Matt. 13. 22.
Mark 4. 1.

V. ^a ἘΓΕΝΕΤΟ δὲ ἐν τῷ τὸν ὄχλον ἐπιχειῖσθαι αὐτῷ τοῦ αζουεῖν 1
τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν ἐστὼς παρὰ τὴν λίμνην Γεννησαρέτ.

b Matt. 4. 18.
Mark 1. 16.

^b Καὶ εἶδε δύο πλοῖα ἐστῶτα παρὰ τὴν λίμνην· οἱ δὲ ἄλιεῖς ἀποβίβ- 2
τες ἀπ' αὐτῶν, ἀπέπλυναν τὰ δίκτυα. Ἐμβὰς δὲ εἰς ἓν τῶν πλοίων, 3
ὃ ἦν τοῦ Σίμωνος, ἠρώτησεν αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἐπαναγαγεῖν ὀλίγον·
c John 21. 6. καὶ καθίσας ἐδίδασκεν ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου τοὺς ὄχλους. Ὡς δὲ ἐπ' αὐτὸν 4
λαλῶν, εἶπε πρὸς τὸν Σίμονα· Ἐπανάγαγε εἰς τὸ βῆθος, καὶ χαλί-
σατε τὰ δίκτυα ἡμῶν εἰς ἄγρην. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Σίμων εἶπεν 5
αὐτῷ· Ἐπιστάτα, δι' ὅλης τῆς νυκτὸς κοπιῶσάντες, οὐδὲν ἐλάβομεν·

38. ἦ πενθ.] The ἦ is not found in most of the ancient MSS. and in the Ed. Princ., and other early Edd., and is cancelled by Wets., Matth., Griesb., Tittm., Vat., and Scholz.

39. ἐπειτίμ. τῷ πυρετῷ.] A highly figurative expression, signifying he put a stop to the violence of the fever.

41. σὺ εἶ.] Comp. Mark iii. 11. Why the demons here confess the power of their Conqueror, and proclaim him to be the promised MESSIAH, was in order to impede his ministry. On which account Jesus checks them, and commands them to be silent. See Bp. Warburton Sermon. Vol. X. p. 145.

V. What is related in the 11 first vv. of this Ch. agrees with what is narrated at Matt. v. 18. 22. (where see Note) and Mark i. 16—20. On which Dr. Townson observes, that the Evangelists vary only in the number, or choice of circumstances; and wrote from the same idea of the fact which they lay before us.

2. ἐστῶτα] i. e. as opposed to being in motion. Compare viii. 38. The Greeks used σῆναι, and the Latins stare, to express the situation of ships, whether at anchor or fastened on shore. See Recens. Synop. Ἀπέπλυναν, “had washed,” i. e. had been washing. The ἀπ in ἀπέπλ. signifies off, with respect to the filth of the fish, &c. Δίκτυον,

Valckn. remarks, is from δέδικται, preterite of δέικω, jacio, q. d. a casting net.

3. ἐπαναγαγεῖν.] Sub. ναῦν. I have in Recens. Synop. compared Herodot. vii. 100. τὰς δὲ νέας οἱ ναύαρχοι ἀναγαγόντες ὅσον τε (I conjecture γε) τέσσερα πλέθρα ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰγιαλοῦ. The ἐπι is equivalent to our ward in composition. On this term, and on ἀγαγεῖν and κατάγειν, which signify to bring to land, see my Note on Thucyd. Vol. I. p. 52. Transl.

4. ἐπανάγαγε — καὶ χαλίσατε.] This change from the singular to the plural, Bornemann accounts for thus: “In altum enim navigat, qui eo gubernaculum dirigit, h. l. Simon, sed ad retia projicienda pluribus hominibus opus erat, qui in navi versabantur.” Χαλᾶν is a vox sol. de hac re, though καθίνας and βῆθρον are also used. Ἄγρην signifies the prey taken or caught, like captiva in Pliny, cited by Kuin. So also Lucian Pisc. § 47. Ἀλιεύειν διέγνωνας; σῶπῃσον, καὶ τὴν ἄγρην περιβίμεν.

5. ἐπιστάτα.] Ἐπιστάτης properly denotes one who is set over any persons or business, as here that of instruction; and is thus equivalent to master or teacher, ἐδύτακτος, used by the other Evangelist. The latter sense is rather rare in the Classical writers; when it does occur, it denotes a professor of any art, as opposed to a novice. Ῥήματι, command. So the Heb. רִצְצָה. This is

- 6 ἐπὶ δὲ τῷ ῥήματι σου χαλάσω τὸ δίκτυον. Καὶ τοῦτο ποιήσαντες, συνέκλεισαν πλήθος ἰχθύων πολὺ· διεῖρήγγυτο δὲ τὸ δίκτυον αὐτῶν,
- 7 καὶ κατένευσαν τοῖς μειτόχοις τοῖς ἐν τῷ εἰέρῳ πλοίῳ, τοῦ ἐλθόντας συλλαβεῖσθαι αὐτοῖς· καὶ ἦλθον, καὶ ἔπλησαν ἀμφοτέρα τὰ πλοῖα,
- 8 ὥστε βυθίζεσθαι αὐτά. Ἰδὼν δὲ Σίμων Πέτρος, προσέπεσε τοῖς γόνασιν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, λέγων· Ἐξέλθε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ ὅτι ἀνὴρ ἁμαρτωλὸς εἰμι,
- 9 Κύριε. Θάμβος γὰρ περιέσχεν αὐτὸν καὶ πάντας τοὺς σὺν αὐτῷ ἐπὶ τῇ ἄγρῳ τῶν ἰχθύων ἢ συνέλαβον. ^d Ομοίως δὲ καὶ Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην υἱοὺς Ζεβεδαίου, οἳ ἦσαν κωωνοὶ τῷ Σίμωνι. Καὶ ἔϊπε πρὸς τὸν Σίμωνα ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Μὴ φοβοῦ· ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀνθρώπους ἔσῃ ζωγρῶν. ^e Καὶ καταγαγόντες τὰ πλοῖα ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, ἀφέντες ἅπαντα ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ. ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^{aa} ^{ab} ^{ac} ^{ad} ^{ae} ^{af} ^{ag} ^{ah} ^{ai} ^{aj} ^{ak} ^{al} ^{am} ^{an} ^{ao} ^{ap} ^{aq} ^{ar} ^{as} ^{at} ^{au} ^{av} ^{aw} ^{ax} ^{ay} ^{az} ^{ba} ^{bb} ^{bc} ^{bd} ^{be} ^{bf} ^{bg} ^{bh} ^{bi} ^{bj} ^{bk} ^{bl} ^{bm} ^{bn} ^{bo} ^{bp} ^{bq} ^{br} ^{bs} ^{bt} ^{bu} ^{bv} ^{bw} ^{bx} ^{by} ^{bz} ^{ca} ^{cb} ^{cc} ^{cd} ^{ce} ^{cf} ^{cg} ^{ch} ^{ci} ^{cj} ^{ck} ^{cl} ^{cm} ^{cn} ^{co} ^{cp} ^{cq} ^{cr} ^{cs} ^{ct} ^{cu} ^{cv} ^{cw} ^{cx} ^{cy} ^{cz} ^{da} ^{db} ^{dc} ^{dd} ^{de} ^{df} ^{dg} ^{dh} ^{di} ^{dj} ^{dk} ^{dl} ^{dm} ^{dn} ^{do} ^{dp} ^{dq} ^{dr} ^{ds} ^{dt} ^{du} ^{dv} ^{dw} ^{dx} ^{dy} ^{dz} ^{ea} ^{eb} ^{ec} ^{ed} ^{ee} ^{ef} ^{eg} ^{eh} ^{ei} ^{ej} ^{ek} ^{el} ^{em} ^{en} ^{eo} ^{ep} ^{eq} ^{er} ^{es} ^{et} ^{eu} ^{ev} ^{ew} ^{ex} ^{ey} ^{ez} ^{fa} ^{fb} ^{fc} ^{fd} ^{fe} ^{ff} ^{fg} ^{fh} ^{fi} ^{fj} ^{fk} ^{fl} ^{fm} ^{fn} ^{fo} ^{fp} ^{fq} ^{fr} ^{fs} ^{ft} ^{fu} ^{fv} ^{fw} ^{fx} ^{fy} ^{fz} ^{ga} ^{gb} ^{gc} ^{gd} ^{ge} ^{gf} ^{gg} ^{gh} ^{gi} ^{gj} ^{gk} ^{gl} ^{gm} ^{gn} ^{go} ^{gp} ^{gq} ^{gr} ^{gs} ^{gt} ^{gu} ^{gv} ^{gw} ^{gx} ^{gy} ^{gz} ^{ha} ^{hb} ^{hc} ^{hd} ^{he} ^{hf} ^{hg} ^{hh} ^{hi} ^{hj} ^{hk} ^{hl} ^{hm} ^{hn} ^{ho} ^{hp} ^{hq} ^{hr} ^{hs} ^{ht} ^{hu} ^{hv} ^{hw} ^{hx} ^{hy} ^{hz} ^{ia} ^{ib} ^{ic} ^{id} ^{ie} ^{if} ^{ig} ^{ih} ⁱⁱ ^{ij} ^{ik} ^{il} ^{im} ⁱⁿ ^{io} ^{ip} ^{iq} ^{ir} ^{is} ^{it} ^{iu} ^{iv} ^{iw} ^{ix} ^{iy} ^{iz} ^{ja} ^{jb} ^{jc} ^{jd} ^{je} ^{jf} ^{fg} ^{fh} ^{fi} ^{fj} ^{fk} ^{fl} ^{fm} ^{fn} ^{fo} ^{fp} ^{fq} ^{fr} ^{fs} ^{ft} ^{fu} ^{fv} ^{fw} ^{fx} ^{fy} ^{fz} ^{ga} ^{gb} ^{gc} ^{gd} ^{ge} ^{gf} ^{gg} ^{gh} ^{gi} ^{gj} ^{gk} ^{gl} ^{gm} ^{gn} ^{go} ^{gp} ^{gq} ^{gr} ^{gs} ^{gt} ^{gu} ^{gv} ^{gw} ^{gx} ^{gy} ^{gz} ^{ha} ^{hb} ^{hc} ^{hd} ^{he} ^{hf} ^{hg} ^{hh} ^{hi} ^{hj} ^{hk} ^{hl} ^{hm} ^{hn} ^{ho} ^{hp} ^{hq} ^{hr} ^{hs} ^{ht} ^{hu} ^{hv} ^{hw} ^{hx} ^{hy} ^{hz} ^{ia} ^{ib} ^{ic} ^{id} ^{ie} ^{if} ^{ig} ^{ih} ⁱⁱ ^{ij} ^{ik} ^{il} ^{im} ⁱⁿ ^{io} ^{ip} ^{iq} ^{ir} ^{is} ^{it} ^{iu} ^{iv} ^{iw} ^{ix} ^{iy} ^{iz} ^{ja} ^{jb} ^{jc} ^{jd} ^{je} ^{jf} ^{fg} ^{fh} ^{fi} ^{fj} ^{fk} ^{fl} ^{fm} ^{fn} ^{fo} ^{fp} ^{fq} ^{fr} ^{fs} ^{ft} ^{fu} ^{fv} ^{fw} ^{fx} ^{fy} ^{fz} ^{ga} ^{gb} ^{gc} ^{gd} ^{ge} ^{gf} ^{gg} ^{gh} ^{gi} ^{gj} ^{gk} ^{gl} ^{gm} ^{gn} ^{go} ^{gp} ^{gq} ^{gr} ^{gs} ^{gt} ^{gu} ^{gv} ^{gw} ^{gx} ^{gy} ^{gz} ^{ha} ^{hb} ^{hc} ^{hd} ^{he} ^{hf} ^{hg} ^{hh} ^{hi} ^{hj} ^{hk} ^{hl} ^{hm} ^{hn} ^{ho} ^{hp} ^{hq} ^{hr} ^{hs} ^{ht} ^{hu} ^{hv} ^{hw} ^{hx} ^{hy} ^{hz} ^{ia} ^{ib} ^{ic} ^{id} ^{ie} ^{if} ^{ig} ^{ih} ⁱⁱ ^{ij} ^{ik} ^{il} ^{im} ⁱⁿ ^{io} ^{ip} ^{iq} ^{ir} ^{is} ^{it} ^{iu} ^{iv} ^{iw} ^{ix} ^{iy} ^{iz} ^{ja} ^{jb} ^{jc} ^{jd} ^{je} ^{jf} ^{fg} ^{fh} ^{fi} ^{fj} ^{fk} ^{fl} ^{fm} ^{fn} ^{fo} ^{fp} ^{fq} ^{fr} ^{fs} ^{ft} ^{fu} ^{fv} ^{fw} ^{fx} ^{fy} ^{fz} ^{ga} ^{gb} ^{gc} ^{gd} ^{ge} ^{gf} ^{gg} ^{gh} ^{gi} ^{gj} ^{gk} ^{gl} ^{gm} ^{gn} ^{go} ^{gp} ^{gq} ^{gr} ^{gs} ^{gt} ^{gu} ^{gv} ^{gw} ^{gx} ^{gy} ^{gz} ^{ha} ^{hb} ^{hc} ^{hd} ^{he} ^{hf} ^{hg} ^{hh} ^{hi} ^{hj} ^{hk} ^{hl} ^{hm} ^{hn} ^{ho} ^{hp} ^{hq} ^{hr} ^{hs} ^{ht} ^{hu} ^{hv} ^{hw} ^{hx} ^{hy} ^{hz} ^{ia} ^{ib} ^{ic} ^{id} ^{ie} ^{if} ^{ig} ^{ih} ⁱⁱ ^{ij} ^{ik} ^{il} ^{im} ⁱⁿ ^{io} ^{ip} ^{iq} ^{ir} ^{is} ^{it} ^{iu} ^{iv} ^{iw} ^{ix} ^{iy} ^{iz} ^{ja} ^{jb} ^{jc} ^{jd} ^{je} ^{jf} ^{fg} ^{fh} ^{fi} ^{fj} ^{fk} ^{fl} ^{fm} ^{fn} ^{fo} ^{fp} ^{fq} ^{fr} ^{fs} ^{ft} ^{fu} ^{fv} ^{fw} ^{fx} ^{fy} ^{fz} ^{ga} ^{gb} ^{gc} ^{gd} ^{ge} ^{gf} ^{gg} ^{gh} ^{gi} ^{gj} ^{gk} ^{gl} ^{gm} ^{gn} ^{go} ^{gp} ^{gq} ^{gr} ^{gs} ^{gt} ^{gu} ^{gv} ^{gw} ^{gx} ^{gy} ^{gz} ^{ha} ^{hb} ^{hc} ^{hd} ^{he} ^{hf} ^{hg} ^{hh} ^{hi} ^{hj} ^{hk} ^{hl} ^{hm} ^{hn} ^{ho} ^{hp} ^{hq} ^{hr} ^{hs} ^{ht} ^{hu} ^{hv} ^{hw} ^{hx} ^{hy} ^{hz} ^{ia} ^{ib} ^{ic} ^{id} ^{ie} ^{if} ^{ig} ^{ih} ⁱⁱ ^{ij} ^{ik} ^{il} ^{im} ⁱⁿ ^{io} ^{ip} ^{iq} ^{ir} ^{is} ^{it} ^{iu} ^{iv} ^{iw} ^{ix} ^{iy} ^{iz} ^{ja} ^{jb} ^{jc} ^{jd} ^{je} ^{jf} ^{fg} ^{fh} ^{fi} ^{fj} ^{fk} ^{fl} ^{fm} ^{fn} ^{fo} ^{fp} ^{fq} ^{fr} ^{fs} ^{ft} ^{fu} ^{fv} ^{fw} ^{fx} ^{fy} ^{fz} ^{ga} ^{gb} ^{gc} ^{gd} ^{ge} ^{gf} ^{gg} ^{gh} ^{gi} ^{gj} ^{gk} ^{gl} ^{gm} ^{gn} ^{go} ^{gp} ^{gq} ^{gr} ^{gs} ^{gt} ^{gu} ^{gv} ^{gw} ^{gx} ^{gy} ^{gz} ^{ha} ^{hb} ^{hc} ^{hd} ^{he} ^{hf} ^{hg} ^{hh} ^{hi} ^{hj} ^{hk} ^{hl} ^{hm} ^{hn} ^{ho} ^{hp} ^{hq} ^{hr} ^{hs} ^{ht} ^{hu} ^{hv} ^{hw} ^{hx} ^{hy} ^{hz} ^{ia} ^{ib} ^{ic} ^{id} ^{ie} ^{if} ^{ig} ^{ih} ⁱⁱ ^{ij} ^{ik} ^{il} ^{im} ⁱⁿ ^{io} ^{ip} ^{iq} ^{ir} ^{is} ^{it} ^{iu} ^{iv} ^{iw} ^{ix} ^{iy} ^{iz} ^{ja} ^{jb} ^{jc} ^{jd} ^{je} ^{jf} ^{fg} ^{fh} ^{fi} ^{fj} ^{fk} ^{fl} ^{fm} ^{fn} ^{fo} ^{fp} ^{fq} ^{fr} ^{fs} ^{ft} ^{fu} ^{fv} ^{fw} ^{fx} ^{fy} ^{fz} ^{ga} ^{gb} ^{gc} ^{gd} ^{ge} ^{gf} ^{gg} ^{gh} ^{gi} ^{gj} ^{gk} ^{gl} ^{gm} ^{gn} ^{go} ^{gp} ^{gq} ^{gr} ^{gs} ^{gt} ^{gu} ^{gv} ^{gw} ^{gx} ^{gy} ^{gz} ^{ha} ^{hb} ^{hc} ^{hd} ^{he} ^{hf} ^{hg} ^{hh} ^{hi} ^{hj} ^{hk} ^{hl} ^{hm} ^{hn} ^{ho} ^{hp} ^{hq} ^{hr} ^{hs} ^{ht} ^{hu} ^{hv} ^{hw} ^{hx} ^{hy} ^{hz} ^{ia} ^{ib} ^{ic} ^{id} ^{ie} ^{if} ^{ig} ^{ih} ⁱⁱ ^{ij} ^{ik} ^{il} ^{im} ⁱⁿ ^{io} ^{ip} ^{iq} ^{ir} ^{is} ^{it} ^{iu} ^{iv} ^{iw} ^{ix} ^{iy} ^{iz} ^{ja} ^{jb} ^{jc} ^{jd} ^{je} ^{jf} ^{fg} ^{fh} ^{fi} ^{fj} ^{fk} ^{fl} ^{fm} ^{fn} ^{fo} ^{fp} ^{fq} ^{fr} ^{fs} ^{ft} ^{fu} ^{fv} ^{fw} ^{fx} ^{fy} ^{fz} ^{ga} ^{gb} ^{gc} ^{gd} ^{ge} ^{gf} ^{gg} ^{gh} ^{gi} ^{gj} ^{gk} ^{gl} ^{gm} ^{gn} ^{go} ^{gp} ^{gq} ^{gr} ^{gs} ^{gt} ^{gu} ^{gv} ^{gw} ^{gx} ^{gy} ^{gz} ^{ha} ^{hb} ^{hc} ^{hd} ^{he} ^{hf} ^{hg} ^{hh} ^{hi} ^{hj} ^{hk} ^{hl} ^{hm} ^{hn} ^{ho} ^{hp} ^{hq} ^{hr} ^{hs} ^{ht} ^{hu} ^{hv} ^{hw} ^{hx} ^{hy} ^{hz} ^{ia} ^{ib} ^{ic} ^{id} ^{ie} ^{if} ^{ig} ^{ih} ⁱⁱ ^{ij} ^{ik} ^{il} ^{im} ⁱⁿ ^{io} ^{ip} ^{iq} ^{ir} ^{is} ^{it} ^{iu} ^{iv} ^{iw} ^{ix} ^{iy} ^{iz} ^{ja} ^{jb} ^{jc} ^{jd} ^{je} ^{jf} ^{fg} ^{fh} ^{fi} ^{fj} ^{fk} ^{fl} ^{fm} ^{fn} ^{fo} ^{fp} ^{fq} ^{fr} ^{fs} ^{ft} ^{fu} ^{fv} ^{fw} ^{fx} ^{fy} ^{fz} ^{ga} ^{gb} ^{gc} ^{gd} ^{ge} ^{gf} ^{gg} ^{gh} ^{gi} ^{gj} ^{gk} ^{gl} ^{gm} ^{gn} ^{go} ^{gp} ^{gq} ^{gr} ^{gs} ^{gt} ^{gu} ^{gv} ^{gw} ^{gx} ^{gy} ^{gz} ^{ha} ^{hb} ^{hc} ^{hd} ^{he} ^{hf} ^{hg} ^{hh} ^{hi} ^{hj} ^{hk} ^{hl} ^{hm} ^{hn} ^{ho} ^{hp} ^{hq} ^{hr} ^{hs} ^{ht} ^{hu} ^{hv} ^{hw} ^{hx} ^{hy} ^{hz} ^{ia} ^{ib} ^{ic} ^{id} ^{ie} ^{if} ^{ig} ^{ih} ⁱⁱ ^{ij} ^{ik} ^{il} ^{im} ⁱⁿ ^{io} ^{ip} ^{iq} ^{ir} ^{is} ^{it} ^{iu} ^{iv} ^{iw} ^{ix} ^{iy} ^{iz} ^{ja} ^{jb} ^{jc} ^{jd} ^{je} ^{jf} ^{fg} ^{fh} ^{fi} ^{fj} ^{fk} ^{fl} ^{fm} ^{fn} ^{fo} ^{fp} ^{fq} ^{fr} ^{fs} ^{ft} ^{fu} ^{fv} ^{fw} ^{fx} ^{fy} ^{fz} ^{ga} ^{gb} ^{gc} ^{gd} ^{ge} ^{gf} ^{gg} ^{gh} ^{gi} ^{gj} ^{gk} ^{gl} ^{gm} ^{gn} ^{go} ^{gp} ^{gq} ^{gr} ^{gs} ^{gt} ^{gu} ^{gv} ^{gw} ^{gx} ^{gy} ^{gz} ^{ha} ^{hb} ^{hc} ^{hd} ^{he} ^{hf} ^{hg} ^{hh} ^{hi} ^{hj} ^{hk} ^{hl} ^{hm} ^{hn} ^{ho} ^{hp} ^{hq} ^{hr} ^{hs} ^{ht} ^{hu} ^{hv} ^{hw} ^{hx} ^{hy} ^{hz} ^{ia} ^{ib} ^{ic} ^{id} ^{ie} ^{if} ^{ig} ^{ih} ⁱⁱ ^{ij} ^{ik} ^{il} ^{im} ⁱⁿ ^{io} ^{ip} ^{iq} ^{ir} ^{is} ^{it} ^{iu} ^{iv} ^{iw} ^{ix} ^{iy} ^{iz} ^{ja} ^{jb} ^{jc} ^{jd} ^{je} ^{jf} ^{fg} ^{fh} ^{fi} ^{fj} ^{fk} ^{fl} ^{fm} ^{fn} ^{fo} ^{fp} ^{fq} ^{fr} ^{fs} ^{ft} ^{fu} ^{fv} ^{fw} ^{fx} ^{fy} ^{fz} ^{ga} ^{gb} ^{gc} ^{gd} ^{ge} ^{gf} ^{gg} ^{gh} ^{gi} ^{gj} ^{gk} ^{gl} ^{gm} ^{gn} ^{go} ^{gp} ^{gq} ^{gr} ^{gs} ^{gt} ^{gu} ^{gv} ^{gw} ^{gx} ^{gy} ^{gz} ^{ha} ^{hb} ^{hc} ^{hd} ^{he} ^{hf} ^{hg} ^{hh} ^{hi} ^{hj} ^{hk} ^{hl} ^{hm} ^{hn} ^{ho} ^{hp} ^{hq} ^{hr} ^{hs} ^{ht} ^{hu} ^{hv} ^{hw} ^{hx} ^{hy} ^{hz} ^{ia} ^{ib} ^{ic} ^{id} ^{ie} ^{if} ^{ig} ^{ih} ⁱⁱ ^{ij} ^{ik} ^{il} ^{im} ⁱⁿ ^{io} ^{ip} ^{iq} ^{ir} ^{is} ^{it} ^{iu} ^{iv} ^{iw} ^{ix} ^{iy} ^{iz} ^{ja} ^{jb} ^{jc} ^{jd} ^{je} ^{jf} ^{fg} ^{fh} ^{fi} ^{fj} ^{fk} ^{fl} ^{fm} ^{fn} ^{fo} ^{fp} ^{fq} ^{fr} ^{fs} ^{ft} ^{fu} ^{fv} ^{fw} ^{fx} ^{fy} ^{fz} ^{ga} ^{gb} ^{gc} ^{gd} ^{ge} ^{gf} ^{gg} ^{gh} ^{gi} ^{gj} ^{gk} ^{gl} ^{gm} ^{gn} ^{go} ^{gp} ^{gq} ^{gr} ^{gs} ^{gt} ^{gu} ^{gv} ^{gw} ^{gx} ^{gy} ^{gz} ^{ha} ^{hb} ^{hc} ^{hd} ^{he} ^{hf} ^{hg} ^{hh} ^{hi} ^{hj} ^{hk} ^{hl} ^{hm} ^{hn} ^{ho} ^{hp} ^{hq} ^{hr} ^{hs} ^{ht} ^{hu} ^{hv} ^{hw} ^{hx} ^{hy} ^{hz} ^{ia} ^{ib} ^{ic} ^{id} ^{ie} ^{if} ^{ig} ^{ih} ⁱⁱ ^{ij} ^{ik} ^{il} ^{im} ⁱⁿ ^{io} ^{ip} ^{iq} ^{ir} ^{is} ^{it} ^{iu} ^{iv} ^{iw} ^{ix} ^{iy} ^{iz} ^{ja} ^{jb} ^{jc} ^{jd} ^{je} ^{jf} ^{fg} ^{fh} ^{fi} ^{fj} ^{fk} ^{fl} ^{fm} ^{fn} ^{fo} ^{fp} ^{fq} ^{fr} ^{fs} ^{ft} ^{fu} ^{fv} ^{fw} ^{fx} ^{fy} ^{fz} ^{ga} ^{gb} ^{gc} ^{gd} ^{ge} ^{gf} ^{gg} ^{gh} ^{gi} ^{gj} ^{gk} ^{gl} ^{gm} ^{gn} ^{go} ^{gp} ^{gq} ^{gr} ^{gs} ^{gt} ^{gu} ^{gv} ^{gw} ^{gx} ^{gy} ^{gz} ^{ha} ^{hb} ^{hc} ^{hd} ^{he} ^{hf} ^{hg} ^{hh} ^{hi} ^{hj} ^{hk} ^{hl} ^{hm} ^{hn} ^{ho} ^{hp} ^{hq} ^{hr} ^{hs} ^{ht} ^{hu} ^{hv} ^{hw} ^{hx} ^{hy} ^{hz} ^{ia} ^{ib} ^{ic} ^{id} ^{ie} ^{if} ^{ig} ^{ih} ⁱⁱ ^{ij} ^{ik} ^{il} ^{im} ⁱⁿ ^{io} ^{ip} ^{iq} ^{ir} ^{is} ^{it} ^{iu} ^{iv} ^{iw} ^{ix} ^{iy} ^{iz} ^{ja} ^{jb} ^{jc} ^{jd} ^{je} ^{jf} ^{fg} ^{fh} ^{fi} ^{fj} ^{fk} ^{fl} ^{fm} ^{fn} ^{fo} ^{fp} ^{fq} ^{fr} ^{fs} ^{ft} ^{fu} ^{fv} ^{fw} ^{fx} ^{fy} ^{fz} ^{ga} ^{gb} ^{gc} ^{gd} ^{ge} ^{gf} ^{gg} ^{gh} ^{gi} ^{gj} ^{gk} ^{gl} ^{gm} ^{gn} ^{go} ^{gp} ^{gq} ^{gr} ^{gs} ^{gt} ^{gu} ^{gv} ^{gw} ^{gx} ^{gy} ^{gz} ^{ha} ^{hb} ^{hc} ^{hd} ^{he} ^{hf} ^{hg} ^{hh} ^{hi} ^{hj} ^{hk} ^{hl} ^{hm} ^{hn} ^{ho} ^{hp} ^{hq} ^{hr} ^{hs} ^{ht} ^{hu} ^{hv} ^{hw} ^{hx} ^{hy} ^{hz} ^{ia} ^{ib} ^{ic} ^{id} ^{ie} ^{if} ^{ig} ^{ih} ⁱⁱ ^{ij} ^{ik} ^{il} ^{im} ⁱⁿ ^{io} ^{ip} ^{iq} ^{ir} ^{is} ^{it} ^{iu} ^{iv} ^{iw} ^{ix} ^{iy} ^{iz} ^{ja} ^{jb} ^{jc} ^{jd} ^{je} ^{jf} ^{fg} ^{fh} ^{fi} ^{fj} ^{fk} ^{fl} ^{fm} ^{fn} ^{fo} ^{fp} ^{fq} ^{fr} ^{fs} ^{ft} ^{fu} ^{fv} ^{fw} ^{fx} ^{fy} ^{fz} ^{ga} ^{gb} ^{gc} ^{gd} ^{ge} ^{gf} ^{gg} ^{gh} ^{gi} ^{gj} ^{gk} ^{gl} ^{gm} ^{gn} ^{go} ^{gp} ^{gq} ^{gr} ^{gs} ^{gt} ^{gu} ^{gv} ^{gw} ^{gx} ^{gy} ^{gz} ^{ha} ^{hb} ^{hc} ^{hd}

MT. MK.

9. 2. κώμης τῆς Γαλιλαίας καὶ Ἰουδαίας καὶ Ἱερουσαλήμ· καὶ δύναις
 2 3 Κυρίου ἦν εἰς τὸ ἰᾶσθαι αὐτούς. Καὶ ἰδοὺ, ἄνδρες φέροντες ἐπὶ 18
 κλίνης ἄνθρωπον, ὃς ἦν παραλελυμένος· καὶ ἐξήτουν αὐτὸν εἰσενεγκῆν
 4 καὶ θεῖναι ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ· καὶ μὴ εὐρόντες [διὰ] † ποίας εἰσενέγκω- 19
 σιν αὐτὸν, διὰ τὸν ὄχλον, ἀναβάτες ἐπὶ τὸ δῶμα, διὰ τῶν κεράμων
 καθῆκαν αὐτὸν σὺν τῷ κλινιδίῳ εἰς τὸ μέσον ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ.
 5 Καὶ ἰδὼν τὴν πίστιν αὐτῶν, εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Ἄνθρωπε, ἀφέωνταί σοι αἱ 20
 3 6 ἁμαρτίαι σου. Καὶ ἤρξαντο διαλογίζεσθαι οἱ Γουρματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φα- 21
 7 ρισαῖοι, λέγοντες· Τίς ἐστὶν οὗτος, ὃς λαλεῖ βλασφημίας; τίς δύναται
 4 8 ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας, εἰ μὴ ὁ μόνος ὁ Θεός; Ἐπιγρούς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοὺς 22
 διαλογισμοὺς αὐτῶν, ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς· Τί διαλογίζεσθε
 5 9 ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν; τί ἐστὶν ἐνκοπώτερον, εἰπεῖν· Ἀφέωνταί σοι 23
 6 10 αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου· ἢ εἰπεῖν· Ἐγειρε καὶ περιπάτει; Ἴνα δὲ εἰδῆτε ὅτι 24
 ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας,
 11 (εἶπε τῷ παραλελυμένῳ·) Σοὶ λέγω· ἔγειρε, καὶ ἄρξαι τὸ κλινιδίον
 7 12 σου, πορεύου εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου. Καὶ παρεχορήμη ἀναστὰς ἐνώπιον 25
 αὐτῶν, ἄρας ἐφ' ᾧ κατέκειτο, ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ δοξάζων
 8 τὸν Θεόν. Καὶ ἔκστασις ἔλαβεν ἅπαντας, καὶ ἐδόξαζον τὸν Θεόν, καὶ 26
 ἐπλήσθησαν φόβου, λέγοντες· Ὅτι εἶδομεν παράδοξον σήμερον.
 9 13 Καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐξῆλθε, καὶ ἐθεάσατο τελώνην ὀνόματι Λευῖν καθή- 27
 14 μενον ἐπὶ τὸ τελώνιον, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Ἀκολούθει μοι. Καὶ κατα- 28
 10 15 λιπὼν ἅπαντα, ἀναστὰς ἠκολούθησεν αὐτῷ. Καὶ ἐποίησε δοχλὴν μεγάλην 29
 [ὁ] Λευῖς αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἦν ὄχλος τελωνῶν πολὺς καὶ
 ἄλλων, οἳ ἦσαν μετ' αὐτῶν κατακείμενοι. Καὶ ἐγόγγυζον οἱ Γουρμα- 30
 11 16 τεῖς αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ, λέγοντες·
 12 17 Διὰ τί μετὰ τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν ἐσθίετε καὶ πίνετε; Καὶ ἀποκρι- 31
 θεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς· Οὐ χρεῖαν ἔχουσιν οἱ ἱγιαίνοντες

cal writers. It may be regarded as a relic of the inartificial simplicity of primitive diction. [*Comp.* Levit. xiii. 2. xiv. 2, 21, 22.]

17. καὶ δύναις — αὐτούς.] Render, "and the power of the Lord was (exerted) to heal them." By Κυρίου some understand *God*. But that would require μετ' αὐτοῦ (i. e. Christ) to be supplied; an ellipse which can by no means be admitted. By αὐτούς must, (as the recent Commentators have seen) be understood, not the Pharisees, but the sick. Thus (Kuin. observes) the Hebrews use the pronoun relative when there is no antecedent noun, though it may be easily be understood from the context. This is very true, and the idiom is by no means confined to the *Hebrew* writers; but it is here not applicable, for αὐτούς plainly has reference to the αὐτῶν (i. e. ἀσθενῶν) at ver. 15.

19. εἰά.] This is omitted in very many MSS. and early Edd., and is cancelled by Matth., Griesb., Vat., Tittm., Scholz; and with reason; for it is plainly an addition of the Scholiasts, as *infra* xix. 4. Since, however, the ellipse of εἰά is harsh, I am inclined to suspect that ποίας is not the true reading, but ποία, sub. δὲ, which, though not noted from any of the MSS., seems to have been read by the Italic and Vulgate Translators, who render "quā parte." The ε might easily have arisen from the ε following. My conjecture

is confirmed by the opinion of Bornem., who cites Schaefer on Apoll. Rhod. i. 934. in proof that ποία (sub. μέρος vel δὲ) may mean, "quānam parte?" And there is little doubt but that, in the common dialect, the word was also used *extra* interrogationem, for quā parte.

26. ἔκστασις ἔλαβεν ἅπ.] So Hom. II. λ. 402. φόβος ἔλλαβεν πάντας. Mangey conjectures that one of the two words φόβος and ἔκστασις is a gloss on the other. But the ideas are (as Grot., observes) very different. They were struck with wonder at the thing done, and full of reverence at the Divine power. ἔκστασις signifies, exceeding great wonder. So Menander in Stobæi Serm. cxi. p. 556. 25. πάντα ἐν Τᾷ μὴ προσδοκῶμεν ἔκστασιν φέροι. Παράδοξα. This denotes what is παρὰ ὄξαν, beyond one's expectation, and, from the adjunct, unusual, wonderful.

29. δοχλή.] "an entertainment;" from δέχεσθαι, to receive or entertain guests. Ὁ Λευῖς. The δ is omitted in many MSS. and early Edd., and is cancelled by Wets., Matth., Griesb., Tittm., and Scholz. Yet its insertion is agreeable to the strictest propriety of the language.

30. αὐτῶν.] i. e. the persons present, the Capernaumites. Some MSS. and the Edit. Princ. have τῶν before τελωνῶν, which is received by Matth., Griesb., and Scholz.

	MT.	MK.
32	ἰατροῦ, ἀλλ' οἱ κακῶς ἔχοντες. οὐκ ἐλήλυθα καλεῖσαι δικαίους, ἀλλὰ	9. 2
33	ἁμαρτωλοὺς εἰς μετάνοιαν. Οἱ δὲ εἶπον πρὸς αὐτόν· Διὰ τί οἱ μαθηταὶ	14 18
	Ἰωάννου νηστεύουσι πυκνὰ καὶ δεήσεις ποιοῦνται, ὁμοίως καὶ οἱ τῶν	
34	Φαρισαίων· οἱ δὲ σοὶ ἐσθίουσι καὶ πίνουσιν; Ὁ δὲ εἶπε πρὸς	
	αὐτούς· Μὴ δύνασθε τοὺς υἱοὺς τοῦ νυμφῶνος, ἐν ᾧ ὁ νυμφίος μετ'	15 19
35	αὐτῶν ἐστί, ποιῆσαι νηστεύειν; Ἐλεύσονται δὲ ἡμέρῃ [καὶ] ὅταν	20
	ἁμαρθῇ ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὁ νυμφίος, τότε νηστεύσουσιν ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς	
36	ἡμέραις. Ἐλεγε δὲ καὶ παραβολὴν πρὸς αὐτούς· Ὅτι οὐδεὶς ἐπίβλημα	16 21
	ἱματίου καινοῦ ἐπιβάλλει ἐπὶ ἱμάτιον παλαιόν· εἰ δὲ μήγε, καὶ τὸ	
	καινὸν σχίζει, καὶ τῷ παλαιῷ οὐ συμφωνεῖ τὸ ἐπίβλημα τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ	
37	καινοῦ. Καὶ οὐδεὶς βιάλλει οἶνον νέον εἰς ἄσκοὺς παλαιούς· εἰ δὲ	17 23
	μήγε, ῥήξει ὁ νέος οἶνος τοὺς ἄσκοὺς, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐκχυθήσεται, καὶ οἱ	
38	ἄσκοι ἀπολοῦνται· ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἄσκοὺς καινοὺς βλητέον, καὶ	
39	ἁμφότεροι συντηροῦνται. Καὶ οὐδεὶς πῶν παλαιὸν εὐθέως θέλει νέον·	
	λέγει γάρ· Ὁ παλαιὸς χρηστότερός ἐστιν.	12.
1	VI. Εἶπενετο δὲ, ἐν σαββάτῳ δευτεροπρωτῷ διαπορευέσθαι αὐ-	1 23
	τὸν διὰ τῶν στοριζμῶν· καὶ ἔπιλλον οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ τοὺς στάχνας,	
2	καὶ ἦσθιον, ψόχοντες ταῖς χερσὶ. τινὲς δὲ τῶν Φαρισαίων εἶπον αὐ-	2 24
3	τοῖς· Τί ποιεῖτε ὃ οὐκ ἔξεστι ποιεῖν ἐν τοῖς σάββατοις; Καὶ ἀπο-	3 25
	κριθεὶς πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Οὐδὲ τοῦτο ἀνέργωτε, ὃ ἐποίησε	

31. οὐ χρεῖαν ἔχουσιν. &c.] See Note on Matt. ix. 12. To the parallel sentiments adduced by the Commentators, I add a very apposite one (applied to Diogenes) from Dio Chrys. Orat. viii. p. 131. Morell. 'Εώρα γὰρ ὅτι πλείστοι ἄνθρωποι ἐκεῖ (i. e. Corinth) συνίασι διὰ τοῦς λιμένας καὶ τὰς ἐταίρας· δεῖν οὖν φρόνιμον ἄνδρα, ἥπερ τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἱατρῶν, ὅπου πολλοὶ νοσοῦσιν, ἐκείσε ἰεῖναι βοηθήσοντα, οὕτως ὅπου πλείστοι εἰσὶν ἀφρονέστεροι, ἐκεῖ μάλιστα ἀποδημεῖν, ἐξελέγχοντα καὶ καλῶσαντα τὴν ἀνομίαν αὐτῶν.

34. See Is. lxiii. 5. 2 Cor. xi. 2.

35. καὶ ὅταν ἄπ.] The καὶ is omitted in several MSS. and the greater part of the Versions; and in most of those it is inserted before τότε, exactly as in the parallel passages of Matthew and Mark, and as, I conceive, the Evangelist wrote; for it is difficult to account for a καὶ here. To call it a *Hebrew pleonasm* is but to shuffle over the difficulty. And yet it cannot well be rendered *nempe*, with some, or *et quidem* with others. To construe it with τότε (as do Homberg and Abresch.) is doing utter violence to the construction. It should seem that the καὶ was first omitted by accident, then written in the margin as to be inserted, and finally brought in at a wrong place.

— τότε — ἐν ἐκ. τ. ἡμέραις.] Bornem. compares a similar pleonasm from Demosth. de Cor. p. 233. τότε τοῖσιν κατ' ἐκείνον τὸν καιρὸν. However, such are not properly called *pleonasm*s, since the *verbosity*, as he calls it, is *intensive*.

36. ἐπίβλημα.] This is omitted in many MSS. and is cancelled by Wets., Mill, Markl., Matth., and Tittm., but retained by Scholz and Gratz, though with a mark of probable expunction. Certainly to cancel it is very objectionable. It would be harsh, and inconsistent with the plain style of Scripture to supply a noun from such a distance. Besides, the word is found in all the Versions, except two later ones of little authority, and more

than 3-4ths of the MSS., including some of the most ancient. I cannot therefore but suspect that the omission was accidental. The cause of it will immediately appear, if we consider that many MSS. and Edd. have τὸ ἐπίβλημα; for it is obvious how easily the word ἐπίβλημα might be lost by means of the two τῶ's. Thus those very MSS. in which this word is omitted bear testimony of the existence of the first τὸ in their Archetype. I have therefore admitted it into the text.

39. Of this illustration, (which is confined to Luke,) the scope, as the best ancient and modern Commentators agree, is of a piece with the preceding doctrine; namely, that all things should be suited to *circumstances*, and that as use forms the taste, so men's long accustomed modes are not speedily to be changed, nor can they be suddenly initiated into austerities.

VI. I. ἐν σαββάτῳ δευτ.] It is impossible for me to notice, much less review, the very numerous interpretations which have been propounded of this obscure expression; nor is it *necessary*; since the only one that has any semblance of truth is that of Theophyl. and Euthym., among the ancients, and Scaliger, Lightf., Casaub., Whitby, Schleus., Kuin., &c. of the moderns, namely, that the sense is the *first Sabbath after the second day of unleavened bread*; namely, that on which the *wave sheaf* was commanded to be offered up, and from which, and not the *first day of the Passover*, the fifty days were reckoned to the Pentecost. Hence it is no wonder that all the Sabbaths from the Passover to the Pentecost, should have taken their appellation ἀπὸ τῆς δευτέρας τοῦ πάσχατος.

— ψόχοντες.] This word is of rare occurrence, Yet it is adduced from Nicand. Ther. 590 and 629, and καταψ. from Herodot. iv. 75

MT. MK.

12. 2. Δαυὶδ, ὅποτε ἐπεινάσεν αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ ὄντες; ὡς εἰσῆλθεν 4
 4 26 εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως ἔλαβε καὶ
 8 28 ἔφαγε, καὶ ἔδωκε καὶ τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ· οὓς οὐκ ἔξεστι φαγεῖν εἰ μὴ
 3. ἀνθρώπου καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου.
 9 1 ἘΓΕΝΕΤΟ δέ, καὶ ἐν ἐτέρῳ σαββάτῳ εἰσελθεῖν αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν συ- 6
 2 ραγωγὴν καὶ διδάσκειν· καὶ ἦν ἐκεῖ ἄνθρωπος, καὶ ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ ἡ 7
 3 δεξιὰ ἦν ξηρά. Παρατήρουν δέ [αὐτὸν] οἱ Γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρι-
 4 σαῖοι, εἰ ἐν τῷ σαββάτῳ θεραπεύσει· ἵνα εὕρωσι κατηγορίαν αὐτοῦ.
 5 Αὐτὸς δὲ ᾗδει τοὺς διωλογισμοὺς αὐτῶν, καὶ εἶπε τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ ξη- 8
 6 ρὰν ἔχοντι τὴν χεῖρα· Ἐγεραι καὶ στήθι εἰς τὸ μέσον. ὁ δὲ ἀναστὰς
 7 ἔστη. Εἶπεν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς πρὸς αὐτούς· Ἐπερωτήσω ὑμᾶς τι· ἔξεστι 9
 8 τοῖς σάββασιν ἀγαθοποιῆσαι, ἢ κακοποιῆσαι; ψυχὴν σῶσαι, ἢ ἄπο-
 9 λέσαι; Καὶ περιβλεψάμενος πάντας αὐτοὺς, εἶπεν * αὐτῶ· Ἐκτείνον 10
 13 6 τὴν χεῖρά σου· ὁ δὲ ἐποίησεν οὕτω. καὶ ἀποκατεστάθη ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ
 14 [ὑγιής] ὡς ἡ ἄλλη. Αὐτοὶ δὲ ἐπλήσθησαν ἀνοίας· καὶ διελάλουν 11
 πρὸς ἀλλήλους, τί ἂν ποιήσειαν τῷ Ἰησοῦ.
 13 Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις, ἔξηλθεν εἰς τὸ ὄρος προσεύξα- 12
 σθαι· καὶ ἦν διανυκτερεύων ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Καὶ ὅτε 13

4. μόνους τοὺς [.] Several MSS. have *μόνοις τοῖς [.]* as in Matt. and Mark. But that reading is *ex emendatione*. The syntax with the Dative is most usual, but that with the Accus. sometimes occurs. In which case there is an ellipse of *ὅσπερ* with the foregoing infinitive repeated. [*Comp.* Exod. xxix. 32, 33. Levit. viii. 31.]

7. αὐτῶν.] This is omitted in very many MSS. and early Edd., and also in some Versions; and is cancelled by Wets., Matth., Griesb., Tittm., Vat., and Scholz. But it is found in the parallel passage of Mark, and is so agreeable to the style of the N. T., that we may rather suspect the word to have been cancelled by some over-nice ancient critics. The testimony of *Versions* is, in a case of this kind, of little weight.

— *κατηγορίαν* a.] “an accusation against him.” This is an example of what Grammarians call the *Genitive of object*, — as Acts iv. 9. *ἐνελογεῖσά ἀνθρώπων*. See Alt’s Gram. N. T. § 26. p. 45.

9. ἐπερωτήσω ὑ.

“I will ask you a question.” For ἀποκτεῖναι very many MSS. and early Edd. have ἀποκτείναι; which is received by Matth., Griesb., Tittm., Vat., and Scholz; but without sufficient reason; for the new reading has every appearance of being a *gloss*.

— *ἐπερ. ὑ. τι.*] There are two ways in which the *τι* may be taken; 1. declaratively for *πότερον*, *ecquid*, either with the preceding or following (as Matt. xxi. 31.) And so the Syr. and many Commentators. 2. Interrogatively, for *Quid*, What? as Theophyl. and Gratz interpret. Each of these modes has much to recommend it; and the latter is thought to communicate peculiar *spirit* to the address. Yet this sort of *δαϊμόνης*, however common in the Classical writers, is little suitable to the style of *Scripture*. The usual punctuation, therefore, is preferable, by which the *τι* is construed with the *preceding*; and that on account of its greater simplicity, and because it is confirmed by a similar mode of expression at Matt. xxi. 24. Luke xx. 3.

10. αὐτῶ.] This (for the common reading τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ) is found in a very great number of MSS., the Ed. Princ., and the principal Versions; and has been edited by Wets., Griesb., Matth., Tittm., Vat., and Scholz. The common reading is probably from the margin.

— ἐποίησεν οὕτω.] The οὕτω is omitted in very many MSS., and is cancelled by Matth., Griesb., Tittm., and others; but injudiciously: for a great part of those MSS. have *ἐξέτεινον* for *ἐποίησεν*, and with that the οὕτω is inconsistent. To ἐποίησεν the οὕτω is almost indispensable, and it is confirmed by a similar use in ix. 15. xii. 45. Acts xii. 8. Luke ii. 43. iii. 11. vi. 31. x. 37. Ὑγιής is omitted in very many MSS., and is cancelled by most Editors. See, however, the Note on Matt. xii. 13. and Mark iii. 5. and compare Acts xiv. 10. Bornem. remarks on this *usus prolepticus*, in *ὑγιής*.

11. ἀνοίας] “fury, rage;” a signification found in Thucyd. iii. 43, and elsewhere. A similar idiom occurs in our own language.

12. ἦν διανυκτερεύων ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ τ. θ.] On the interpretation of τῇ προσευχῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ there has been some difference of opinion. The ancients, and most moderns, take it to mean, “*prayer to God*;” while some of the early modern Commentators and others of the more recent ones, as Markl., Wets., Dodd., and Campb., maintain that it signifies a *proseucha*, or *oratory*. And that there were Jewish places of worship so called is undoubted. But whether that sense is *here* to be assigned is another question. Those Commentators adduce, indeed, several reasons why the *common* interpretation cannot be admitted. They urge that *προσευχῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ*, in the sense, *prayer to God*, is abhorrent from the simplicity of Scriptural expression, and subversive of analogy; and that *διανυκτερεύειν* properly respects some *place where* the night is spent. But *διανυκτερεύειν* is not only used of *places where* but of *things*, (i. e. *business*) in which the night is occupied, as in

ἀγένετο ἡμέρα, προσεφώνησε τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἐκλεξάμενος
 14 ἀπ' αὐτῶν δώδεκα, οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασε· Σίμωνα, ὃν καὶ
 ὠνόμασε Πέτρον, καὶ Ἀνδρέαν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάν-
 15 νην, Φίλιππον καὶ Βαρθολομαῖον, Ματθαῖον καὶ Θωμᾶν, Ἰάκωβον τὸν
 16 τοῦ Ἀλφαίου καὶ Σίμωνα τὸν καλούμενον Ζηλωτὴν, Ἰούδαν Ἰακώβου
 17 καὶ Ἰούδαν Ἰσακαριώτην, ὃς καὶ ἐγένετο προδοτής. ^a Καὶ καταβίβας μετ'
 αὐτῶν, ἔστη ἐπὶ τόπου πεδινοῦ· καὶ ὄχλος μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, καὶ πλῆ-
 θος πολὺ τοῦ λαοῦ ἀπὸ πάσης τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ Ἱερουσαλὴμ, καὶ τῆς
 παραλίου Τύρου καὶ Σιδῶνος, οἱ ἦλθον ἀκοῦσαι αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἰαθῆναι
 18 ἀπὸ τῶν νόσων αὐτῶν· καὶ οἱ ὀχλούμενοι † ὑπὸ πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρ-
 19 των· καὶ ἐθεραπεύοντο. ^b Καὶ πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος ἐξήτει ἄψευθαι αὐτοῦ· ^c ὅτι δύναμις παρ'
 αὐτοῦ ἐξήρχετο, καὶ ἴατο πάντας. ^d Καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπάρας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ εἰς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐ-
 20 τοῦ, ἔλεγε· Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοὶ· ὅτι ὑμετέρα ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ
 21 Θεοῦ. ^e Μακάριοι οἱ πεινῶντες νῦν· ὅτι χορτασθήσεσθε. μακάριοι ^f
 22 οἱ κλαίοντες νῦν· ὅτι γελάσετε. ^g Μακάριοί ἐστε, ὅταν μισήσωσιν
 ὑμᾶς οἱ ἄνθρωποι, καὶ ὅταν ἀφορίσωσιν ὑμᾶς, καὶ ὀνειδίσωσι, καὶ
 ἐκβάλωσι τὸ ὄνομα ὑμῶν ὡς πονηρὸν, ἕνεκα τοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

MK.

3.

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

the examples cited in Recens. Synop. And as to
simplicity of expression, it is no more violated
 here than in numerous other cases, where the
 use of the Genitive falls under that Rule of
 Winer's Gr. N. T. § 23. I. p. 71. "The Geni-
 tive after nouns which indicate feeling, speech,
 or action in respect to any thing, is sometimes to
 be understood as indicating the *relation* which
 that feeling, speech, or action has toward that
 thing;" e. gr. Matt. xiii. 13. Luke vi. 7. Acts
 iv. 9. See also Matthiæ Gr. Gr. § 313. In such
 cases the Genit. has the force of an Accus. with
 πρός.

Wholly unfounded are the other objections of
 Campb. As to *subversion of analogy*, analogy
 must not be sought by placing on the bed of Pro-
 crustes whatever deviates from it; and *variety* is
 quite the characteristic of ancient writings. The
 rest of his objections proceed on a confusion of
 ancient with modern modes of expression. See
 Recens. Synop. As to that which respects the
 employment of the *Article* here, it has been fully
 answered by Bp. Middlet.; who has shown that
 it is not uncommon with προσενχῆ in the sense of
prayer. See Matt. xxi. 22 Acts i. 14. 1 Cor. vii.
 5. and comp. Matt. xiv. 23.

By *prayer* we are here to understand not prayer
 alone; but holy meditation, and devout thought-
 fulness, which ought to precede and follow prayer.
 Even a heathen (Artemidorus Onir. iii. 53.) testifies
 of heathens. Οὐδέεις ἄπεισαν εἰς προσευχὴν, μὴ
 οὐχὶ φρονιζῶν σφόδρα.

15. I have pointed as I have in this and the
 next verse, with Schulz., Scholz, and Gratz, be-
 cause the Apostles are here evidently meant to
 be distributed into pairs. That they were so sent
 forth to evangelize, is certain, from Mark vi. 7.

17. πόσων πεδινῶν.] To reconcile this with the
 description in Matthew (for the discourse here
 recorded is substantially the same with that), we
 may suppose that it was a sort of high, but level,
 table-land.

18. ὀχλούμενοι ὑπὸ πν. ἀκ.] Ὀχλεῖσθαι and ἐνοχλ.
 VOL. 1.

signify "to be troubled or vexed, whether by irk-
 some business, or by such sickness as hinders any
 one from pursuing his occupation;" of which
 senses abundant examples, both with νόσον ex-
 pressed, and understood, are adduced by Wets
 and others. In the N. T. and LXX., however,
 the latter is never found, but only that of *being*
vexed, or troubled, as said of *demoniacal possession*.
 So Acts v. 16. ὀχλουμένους ὑπὸ πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων.
 and Tob. vi. 7. ἰάν τινα ὀχλῆ δαιμόνιον, καὶ πνεῦμα
 πονηρὸν, &c. And such is plainly the sense here,
 and not that assigned by those who advocate the
 hypothesis of Mede. For the *sick and the demoni-
 cians* are here plainly distinguished.

For ὑπὸ many MSS. have ἀπὸ, which is edited
 by Matth., Griesb., Tittm., Vat., and Scholz.
 But it does not appear that ἀπὸ in this sense is
 ever used in the N. T. after a verb passive; while
 ὑπὸ frequently is, both in the N. T. and the Clas-
 sical writers; and, indeed, this sense (of *origin*
 or cause) is not strong enough to suit the Passive.
 So in this very phrase we have ὑπὸ, at Acts v. 16.
 Compare, also, Acts x. 38. and xiii. 4. As to MS.
 authority, it is of little weight in words so per-
 petually confounded as ἀπὸ and ὑπὸ.

19. δύναμις παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐξήρχετο.] This will not,
 any more than Mark v. 30., prove the notion that
 the power by which the sick were healed was
 exerted by a sort of efflux, or effluvia from his
 body. See Note on Mark v. 30. The best Com-
 mentators, ancient and modern, are agreed that
 ἐξήρχεσθαι here, like the Heb. יָצָא in Ruth i. 13.,
 simply means *se exerted*.

22. ἀφορίσωσιν.] This was the *first* degree of
 excommunication among the Jews. On which
 see Vitrina de Synag. and other authorities re-
 ferred to in Recens. Synop.

— ἐκβάλωσι — πονηρῶν.] On the sense of this
 expression Commentators are not agreed. Now
 ἐκβάλλειν signifies generally to *cast out*, both in a
 civil and in a military sense; i. e. either "to ban-
 ish," or "to cashier." It also signifies "to dis-
 place officers," or "reject actors." Hence many

f Acts 5. 41.
& 7. 51.

* Ἐχάρητε ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, καὶ σκιρτήσατε! ἰδοὺ γὰρ, ὁ μισθὸς 23
ὑμῶν πολὺς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ· κατὰ ταῦτα γὰρ ἐποίησαν τοῖς προφήταις
οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν. Ἐ Πλὴν οὐαὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς πλουσίοις· ὅτι ἀπέχετε τὴν 24
παράκλησιν ὑμῶν. ἠ οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, οἱ ἐμπεπλησμένοι· οἱ πεινάσετε. 25
οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, οἱ γελῶντες νῦν· οἱ πενθήσετε καὶ κλαύσετε. Οὐαὶ 26
[ὑμῖν], ὅταν καλῶς ὑμᾶς εἴπωσι [πάντες] οἱ ἄνθρωποι· κατὰ ταῦτα
γὰρ ἐποίησαν τοῖς ψευδοπροφήταις οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν.

i Exod. 23. 4.
Prov. 25. 21.
Matt. 5. 41.
Rom. 12. 14, 20.
1 Cor. 4. 12.
k Infr. 23. 34.
Acts 7. 60.
l Matt. 5. 39.
1 Cor. 6. 7.

Ἰ Ἀλλ' ὑμῖν λέγω τοῖς ἀκούουσιν· Ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν· 27
καλῶς ποιεῖτε τοῖς μισοῦσιν ὑμᾶς· ἡ εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμῖν· 28
[καὶ] προσεχέσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐπηρεαζόντων ὑμᾶς. ἰ Τῷ τύπτοντί σε 29
ἐπὶ τὴν σιαγόνα πάρεχε καὶ τὴν ἄλλην· καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰροντός σου τὸ
ἱμάτιον καὶ τὸν χιτῶνα μὴ κωλύσης. ἢ Παντὶ δὲ τῷ αἰτοῦντί σε δι- 30
δου· καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰροντος τὰ σὰ μὴ ἀπαίτει. ἔ Καὶ καθὼς θέλετε 31
ἵνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς ὁμοίως. ἞ Καὶ 32
εἰ ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, ποία ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστὶ; καὶ γὰρ οἱ
ἁμαρτωλοὶ τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας αὐτοὺς ἀγαπῶσι. Καὶ ἐὰν ἀγαθοποιῆτε 33
τοὺς ἀγαθοποιούντας ὑμᾶς, ποία ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστὶ; καὶ γὰρ οἱ ἁμαρ-
τωλοὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσι. ἞ Καὶ ἐὰν δανεῖζητε πτωχῷ ὧν ἐλπίζετε ἀπολα- 34
βεῖν, ποία ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστὶ; καὶ γὰρ οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἁμαρτωλοῖς δανεῖ-
ζουσιν, ἵνα ἀπολάβωσι τὴν ἴσασιν. ἞ Πλὴν ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν 35
καὶ ἀγαθοποιεῖτε, καὶ δανεῖζετε μηδὲν ἀπελπίζοντες· καὶ ἔσται ὁ μ-

m Deut. 15. 7.
Matt. 5. 42.
n Matt. 7. 12.
Tob. 4. 16.
o Matt. 5. 46.

p Matt. 5. 42.
Deut. 15. 8.

q Matt. 5. 44.

here assign the sense "to reject with scorn and ignominy;" which is preferable to the sense "to banish," adopted by Kuinoel, or "to defame," supported by Campbell: though the signification is wholly unauthorized. Wolf regards it as a fuller expression of the sense contained in ἀφορίσωσι. But it seems rather to advert to the treatment which they would experience at the hands of the heathens, as ἀφορίσωσι to that from the Jews. How covered with obloquy and contempt were the primitive Christians by the Heathens, we have abundant evidence, both in Scripture and in the writings of the first Christian Apologists.

23. χάρητε.] This (for χαίρειτε) is found in almost all the best MSS., and is adopted by Wets., Griesb., Matth., Tittm., Vat., and Scholz. On which use of the Subjunctive in an Imperative or hortatory sense, see Butt., Matth., and Herm. on Vig.

25. οὐαὶ ὑμῖν.] Campb., in a long and able Note (which see in Recens. Synop.), shows, as Euthym. had long ago done, that οὐαὶ here is not imprecative, but declarative: "Woe is unto you! alas for you!"

26. οὐαὶ, ὅταν καλῶς, &c.] This was meant primarily for the Apostles and first teachers of the Gospel, but mutatis mutandis for their successors. Grot. has appositely cited a narration respecting Phocion, recorded by Plut. T. ii. 137. F., where we are told, that when, in his orations, he had particularly pleased the multitude, he used to ask his friends whether any thing wrong had escaped him in his address. Ὑμῖν and πάντες are omitted in almost all the best MSS. and several Versions and Fathers, and are cancelled by nearly all Editors from Griesb. to Scholz. The same may be said of the καὶ at ver. 23, where the Asyndeton much increases the gravity of the injunction.

30. The expressions in this and the foregoing verse are not to be too rigorously interpreted; being merely intended to inculcate a spirit of forbearance and meekness under injuries or deprivations. At τὰ σὰ subaud. χροίματα; and at κωλύσης sub. ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰρεῖν.

32. χάρις] put for εὐεργεσία and its consequent μισθός. So Dionys. Hal. A. vi. 36. τίς ἐστιν ἡ σὴ χάρις ἡμῖν καὶ ὠφέλεια. In this and the following verses, μόνον is to be supplied after ἡμᾶς.

35. καὶ δανεῖζετε μηδὲν ἀπελπ.] On the sense of μηδὲν ἀπελπ. the Commentators are not agreed. Some take it to mean "nothing despairing." But though ἀπελπίζω often signifies to despair, yet that it cannot have that sense here is plain from the words of the preceding verse, παρ' ὧν ἐλπίζετε ἀπολαβεῖν. Others take ἀπελπ. in an active sense of causing despair. But that sense of the word is unauthorized, and here unsuitable. The true interpretation seems to be the one generally assigned by ancient and modern Commentators, "hoping for nothing again;" a sense which, however deficient in Classical authority, is very agreeable to analogy; for as ἀπολαβεῖν is used for λαβεῖν ἀπὸ τινος, so ἀπελπίζω may be for ἐλπίζειν ἀπὸ τινος. So Athen. p. 649. ἀπελπίω for ἐσπίω ἀπὸ τιμος. The sense, therefore, is: "Lend to those from whom there is little hope of receiving back your money." From numerous passages of the Classical writers which I have added in Recens. Synop., it appears that the heathens sometimes used to lend money to respectable persons brought to unmerited distress. Inasmuch that the words might seem to have reference to that kind of beneficial collection in aid of distress, which the Greeks called ἐρασιμῶς. If any one, for instance, had lost a considerable part of his property by shipwreck, fire, or any other calamity,

σθὸς ὑμῶν πολὺς, καὶ ἔσσεσθε υἱοὶ [τοῦ] ὑψίστου. ὅτι αὐτὸς χρηστός
 36 ἔστιν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀγαπίστους καὶ πονηροὺς. Ἔγινεσθε οὖν οἰκτιρόμενοι, r Matt. 5. 48.
 37 καθὼς καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν οἰκτιρῶν ἐστί. Ἐ καὶ μὴ κρίνετε, καὶ οὐ ἔ
 μὴ κριθῆτε ἢ μὴ καταδικάζετε, καὶ οὐ μὴ καταδικασθῆτε ἢ ἀπολύετε,
 38 καὶ ἀπολυθῆσεσθε. Ἰδίδοτε, καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν ἢ μέτρον καλὸν, πε- t Prov. 10. 22.
 πεισμένον καὶ σεσαλευμένον καὶ ὑπερεκχυνόμενον δώσουσιν εἰς τὸν κόλ- t Matt. 17. 2.
 πον ὑμῶν. τῷ γὰρ αὐτῷ μέτρῳ ἢ μειρεῖτε, ἀντιμετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν. Mark. 4. 24.
 39 ἢ Ἐἴπε δὲ παραβολὴν αὐτοῖς ἢ Μήτι δύναιται τυφλὸς τυφλὸν ὀδη- u Isa. 42:19.
 40 γεῖν; οὐχὶ ἀμφοτέροι εἰς βόθρον πεσοῦνται; ἢ Οὐκ ἔστι μαθητῆς Matt. 10. 24.
 ὑπὲρ τὸν διδάσκαλον αὐτοῦ ἢ κατηγορισμένος δὲ πᾶς ἔσται ὡς ὁ διδά- John 13. 16.
 41 σκαλος αὐτοῦ. ἢ Τί δὲ βλέπεις τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦ γ Matt. 7. 3.
 ἀδελφοῦ σου, τὴν δὲ δοκὸν τὴν ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ ὀφθαλμῷ οὐ κατανοεῖς;
 42 ἢ ἢ Πῶς δύνασαι λέγειν τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου ἢ Ἀδελφε, ἄφες ἐκβάλω τὸ ἢ Prov. 18. 17.
 κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ σου, αὐτὸς τὴν ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ σου δοκὸν
 οὐ βλέπων; ἢ Ἐποκριτὰ, ἔκβαλε πρῶτον τὴν δοκὸν ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ
 σου, καὶ τότε διαβλέψεις ἐκβαλεῖν τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦ

it was not unuseful for his friends to supply him with money, not to be paid back by any certain day, but when convenient. This, however, they scarcely ever did, except to those who, they had some hope might, (by a more prosperous turn of fortune), some time or other, not only repay the money, but return the favour, which they termed ἀνταρραπίζειν. Whereas our Lord enjoins his hearers to do this good (in the words of Thucyd. ii. 40.) "not with the narrow calculations of self-interest, but in the confidence of liberality;" a confidence reposed in Him who is the poor man's surety.

— υἱοὶ τ. ὑψ.] i. e. either "beloved of God," (as in Eccles. iv. 10. γίνου ὀφθαλμοῦ πατρὸς — καὶ ἔσθι ὡς υἱὸς ὑψίστου) or, "you will be like unto God, as being animated with a spirit of benevolence similar to that of the Deity." The Art. is omitted in many MSS. and the Ed. Princ., and is cancelled by Math., Griesb., Pittm., Vat., and Scholz; agreeably to the usage of Luke. See 1. 32. 35. 76.

— ὅτι αὐτὸς — πονηρός.] This is not, as Kuin. asserts, "the same sentiment, in other words, as that at Matth. v. 45." For there the injunction is only to shew kindness even to our enemies; here we are also enjoined to shew beneficence to our fellow-creatures. And when we are commanded to imitate God, who is beneficent even to the ungrateful; — this is said to anticipate an objection, — that the persons whom we may benefit are almost sure to prove ungrateful. To which the answer is, But yet benefit them, for God, &c. In the next verse, οἰκτ. should be rendered, not "merciful," but compassionate; pitying and relieving, according to your power, the distresses of others.

37. κατ' οἰκτιρίζετε.] This word and κρίν. and ἀπολ. are properly forensic terms; the former signifying to condemn, the other to acquit. They are, however (as Grot. and other good Commentators have seen) to be accommodated to private use. The three clauses advert, the 1st to sitting in judgment on the faults of others; the 2d to passing condemnation on them. The 3d enjoins a contrary spirit, that of judging for the best, acquitting our neighbour of such charges as are not manifestly well founded.

38. ἰδίδοτε, &c.] With candour in judging is united liberality in giving, as being a kindred virtue. Inasmuch that, at the end of the verse, the words τῷ γὰρ αὐτῷ — ὑμῖν are employed to enjoin the exercise of the virtue mentioned in the preceding ver., by a metaphor derived from the imagery in this; in which the καλὸν (fair and full) is further illustrated by the terms πεπεισμένον, σεσαλευμένον, and ὑπερεκχυνόμενον; which have reference to the three principal modes of giving abundant measure among the Jews; for, as Buxt. observes, there were many: such as the supernatans, the abrasa, the accumulata, pressa, agitata, operta. Of these the abrasa corresponds to our mode of measuring corn, by upheaping the measure, and cutting off the cumulus with a lath. The cumulata and operta were still larger than the abrasa; but the pressa, agitata, and supernatans, corresponding to the three here mentioned, were the amplest. Ἐποκριτὰ is not to be taken (with almost all Commentators) of a measure of liquids (for that is inconsistent with its being "poured into the lap;" as just after), but (with Euthym. and Beza) of a measure of solids, by an idiom common to all languages. Thus there is a elimax; for the ὑπερεκχ. supposes that the measure has been already pressed down and shaken together. In δώσουσιν εἰς τὸν κόλπον ὑμῶν there is an allusion to the Oriental custom, of receiving a measure of corn or other dry articles in the bosom or the lap of their flowing vests, the former of which they made use of like our pockets. See 2 Kings iv. 39. Prov. xv. 33. And so also among the Greeks and Romans, e. gr. Herodot. vi. 125. τὸν κόλπον πάντα πλησάμενος χρυσοῦ. Hor. Sat. ii. 3. 71. necesse ferre sinu lato. The expression is proverbial, and expressive of what generally takes place. Similar ones are cited by the Commentators from the Rabbinical and the Classical writings.

40. The purport of the words in their present application (for it is sometimes different) is this: "The disciple is not usually above his teacher; but every one who is, or would be, a thoroughly instructed person, a finished scholar, must be, i. e. must aim at being, as perfect as his teacher."

a Matt. 7. 17.
& 12. 33.

b Matt. 7. 16.

c Matt. 12. 34,
35.

d Mal. 1. 6.
Matt. 7. 21.
& 25. 11.
infr. 13. 23.
Rom. 2. 13.
James 1. 22.
e Matt. 7. 21.

ἀδελφοῦ σου. ^a Οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶ δένδρον καλόν, ποιοῦν καρπὸν σαπρὸν· 43
οὐδὲ δένδρον σαπρὸν, ποιοῦν καρπὸν καλόν. ^b Ἐκαστον γὰρ δένδρον 44
ἐκ τοῦ ἰδίου καρποῦ γινώσκειται· οὐ γὰρ ἐξ ἀκανθῶν συλλέγουσι σῦκα,
οὐδὲ ἐκ βιάτου τρυγῶσι σταφυλήν. ^c Ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τοῦ ἀγα- 45
θοῦ θησαυροῦ τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ προφέρει τὸ ἀγαθόν· καὶ ὁ πονηρὸς
ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ θησαυροῦ τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ προφέρει τὸ
πονηρὸν· ἐκ γὰρ τοῦ περισσεύματος τῆς καρδίας λαλεῖ τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ.

^d Τί δέ με καλεῖτε Κύριε, Κύριε· καὶ οὐ ποιεῖτε ἃ λέγω; ^e Πᾶς 46
ὁ ἐρχόμενος πρὸς με καὶ ἀκούων μου τῶν λόγων καὶ ποιῶν αὐτοῦ, 47
ὑποδείξω ὑμῖν τί ἐστὶν ὅμοιος. Ὅμοιός ἐστιν ἄνθρωπῳ οἰκοδομοῦντι 48
οἰκίαν, ὃς ἔσκαψε καὶ ἐβύθηνε, καὶ ἔθηκε θεμέλιον ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν.
πλημύρας δὲ γενομένης, προσεβόησεν ὁ ποταμὸς τῇ οἰκίᾳ ἐκείνῃ, καὶ
οὐκ ἔσχυσε σαλευθῆναι αὐτήν· τεθεμελίωτο γὰρ ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν. Ὁ δὲ 49
ἀκούσας, καὶ μὴ ποιήσας, ὅμοιός ἐστιν ἄνθρωπῳ οἰκοδομήσαντι οἰκίαν
ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν χωρὶς θεμελίου· ἣ προσεβόησεν ὁ ποταμὸς, καὶ εὐθέως
ἔπεσε, καὶ ἐγένετο τὸ ῥῆγμα τῆς οἰκίας ἐκείνης μέγα.

MT.

8.

VII. ἘΠΕΙ δὲ ἐπλήρωσε πάντα τὰ ῥήματα αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς ἀκοὰς 1
1 τοῦ λαοῦ, εἰσῆλθεν εἰς Κυπεραναίμ. Ἐκαιοτηζήχου δὲ τινος δούλος 2
κακῶς ἔχων ἡμελλε τελευτῆν, ὃς ἦν αὐτῷ ἔντιμος. Ἀκούσας δὲ περὶ 3
τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ἀπέστειλε πρὸς αὐτὸν πρεσβυτέρους τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ἐρωτῶν
αὐτὸν ὅπως ἐλθῶν διωσώσῃ τὸν δούλον αὐτοῦ. Οἱ δὲ, παραγενόμενοι 4
πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν, παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν σπουδαίως, λέγοντες· Ὅτι ἀξίος 5
ἐστὶν ᾧ παρῆξει τοῦτο· ἀγαπᾷ γὰρ τὸ ἔθνος ἡμῶν, καὶ τὴν συναγω- 6
γὴν αὐτὸς ἀκοδόμησεν ἡμῖν. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἐπορεύετο σὺν αὐτοῖς. Ἦδη 6
δὲ αὐτοῦ οὐ μακρὰν ἀπέχοντος ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκίας, ἔπεμψε πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ 8
8 εκατόνταχος φίλους, λέγων αὐτῷ· Κύριε, μὴ σκύλλου· οὐ γὰρ εἰμι
ικανὸς ἵνα ὑπὸ τὴν στέγην μου εἰσέλθῃς· διὸ οὐδὲ ἐμαυτὸν ἠξίωσα 7
9 πρὸς σε ἐλθεῖν· ἀλλὰ εἰπέ λόγῳ, καὶ ἰαθήσεται ὁ παῖς μου. Καὶ 8
γὰρ ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπός εἰμι ὑπὸ ἔξουσίαν τασσόμενος, ἔχων ὑπ' ἐμαυτὸν
στρατιώτας, καὶ λέγω τούτῳ· Πορεύθητι, καὶ πορεύεται· καὶ ἄλλῳ·
Ἔρχου, καὶ ἔρχεται· καὶ τῷ δούλῳ μου, Ποίησον τοῦτο, καὶ ποιῆ.
10 ἀκούσας δὲ ταῦτα ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐθαύμασεν αὐτόν. Καὶ στραφεὶς τῷ ἀκο- 9

Thus, as the disciple generally follows his master's example, so if you neglect your duty to God, neither will your hearers observe theirs. The connection of the verses following is obvious.

43. οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶ, &c.] Render "for that is not a good tree which brings forth bad fruit."

46. καλεῖτε.] The word has here a sensus prægnans, and signifies, "Why do you address me, saying Lord?"

48. ἔσκαψε καὶ ἐβύθηνε] by Hendiadys, for βαθέως ἔσκαψε; a kind of expression found both in the Classical and the Hellenistical writers. So Judg. xiii. 10. ἐτάχυνε καὶ ἔδοσμε, for ταχέως ἔδοραμε. See Winer's Gr. Gr. § 47. 3. The moral (as Grot. observes) is, that the study of piety should not be superficial, but a principle well grounded and deeply rooted in the heart, so as to resist the assaults of passion, temptation, &c.

—πλημύρας.] The word denotes a *swell* or inundation of any kind.

VII. 2. ὃς ἦν αὐτῷ ἔντιμος] "who was much esteemed by him." Of this signification examples are adduced by Wets.

3. πρεσβυτέρους τῶν Ἰ.] Perhaps the elders of the synagogue which he had built.

4. ἀξίος ἐστὶν ᾧ παρῆξει.] If the phrase be not a Latinism, ἀξίος must be taken in the *absolute* sense, of which I have adduced numerous examples in Recens. Synop. Παρῆξει is Attic for παρῆξει (on which see Math. Gr. Gr. § 197. and 496. and Winer's Gr. Gr. § 7. 2.) one of the many Atticisms in this Gospel: "Οτι, as often, introduces the exact words of the speaker.

5. τὴν συναγωγὴν — ἡμῖν.] Render: "And he it is who hath built for us the synagogue." This

λουθοῦντι αὐτῷ ὄχλῳ εἶπε· Λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐδὲ ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ τοσαύτην
 10 πίστιν, εἶρον. Καὶ ὑποστρέψαντες οἱ πεμφθέντες εἰς τὸν οἶκον, εὐ-
 ρον τὸν ἀσθενοῦντα δοῦλον ὑγαίονοντα.
 11 ΚΑΙ ἐγένετο ἐν τῇ ἐξῆς, ἐπορεύετο εἰς πόλιν καλουμένην Ναὴν· καὶ
 12 συνεπορεύοντο αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἱκανοὶ, καὶ ὄχλος πολὺς. Ὡς
 δὲ ἤγγισε τῇ πόλει τῆς πόλεως, καὶ ἰδὼν ἐξεκομίζετο τεθνηκῶς υἱὸς
 13 μονογενῆς τῇ μητρὶ αὐτοῦ· καὶ αὐτὴ χήρα. καὶ ὄχλος τῆς πόλεως
 14 αὐτῆς, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ· Μὴ κλαῖε. ἵ καὶ προσελθὼν ἤψατο τῆς σο- ^{f Acts 9. 40.}
 ροῦ· οἱ δὲ βασιάζοντες ἔστησαν· καὶ εἶπε· Νεανίσκα, σοὶ λέγω,
 15 ἐγέρθητι. καὶ ἀνεκάθισεν ὁ νεκρὸς, καὶ ἤρξατο λαλεῖν· καὶ ἔδωκεν
 16 αὐτὸν τῇ μητρὶ αὐτοῦ. Ἐλαβε δὲ φόβος ἅπαντας, καὶ ἐδόξαζον τὸν ^{g Mark 7. 37.}
 Θεόν, λέγοντες· Ὅτι προφήτης μέγας ἐγήγεραι ἐν ἡμῖν· καὶ ὅτι ^{infr. 24. 19.}
 17 ἐπεσκέπαστο ὁ Θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ. καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ὁ λόγος οὗτος ἐν ^{John 4. 19.}
 ὅλῃ τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν πάσῃ τῇ περιχώρῳ. ^{& 6. 14.} ^{& 9. 17.} ^{supr. 1. 68.}
 18 ΚΑΙ ἀπήγγειλαν Ἰωάννη οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ περὶ πάντων τούτων. MT. 11.
 19 Καὶ προσκαλεσόμενος δύο τινὰς τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ὁ Ἰωάννης ἔπεμψε 2
 πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν, λέγων· Σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, ἢ ἄλλον προσδοκῶμεν;
 20 Παραγεγόμενοι δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ ἄνδρες εἶπον· Ἰωάννης ὁ βυπτιστῆς
 ἀπέσταλκεν ἡμᾶς πρὸς σε, λέγων· Σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, ἢ ἄλλον προ-
 21 δοκῶμεν; (ἐν αὐτῇ δὲ τῇ ὥρᾳ ἐθεράπευσε πολλοὺς ἀπὸ νόσων καὶ

was not unusual in an individual. The person was, no doubt, a proselyte.

7. εἰπέ λόγῳ] "give thy fiat at a word," or by word of mouth.

9. θαύμασεν] held him in admiration. A use of θαυμάζειν somewhat rare.

12. ἐξεκομίζετο.] Ἐκκομίζειν is a funeral term like the Latin *efferre*; for the custom of interring the dead outside of cities or towns, was common to all the ancients; to the *Jews*, because dead bodies were among them unclean; and to the *Gentiles*, in order to prevent infection. (Grot.)

—τῇ μητρὶ.] Dative of possession for the Genit., as Matt. ii. 13. and not unfrequently in the Scriptural, and also Classical writers. See Matth. Gr. Gr. § 392. 3. and Winer's Gr. Gr. § 25. 6. Note 3. One cannot but remark the simple pathos of the story, with which I have in Recens. Synop. compared Eurip. Alc. 305. *μόνος γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἡσθα*, and 925. *κάρως ἀξιοθρήνων ὄψατο ἔν δόμοισι μόβταται*.

At αὐτῇ χήρα there is something like an Antipodoton. Some MSS., indeed, have αὐτῇ χήρα. But that is a mere *emendation*, and moreover unnecessary; for we have only to supply ἦν, agreeably to the tense of the preceding verb, especially as it would be in some measure *anticipated* from the following ἦν; for a repetition of ἦν within so short a space would have been offensive. The ἦν just after is, indeed, omitted in many MSS., early Edd., and Versions. And it is cancelled by almost all the Editors. Yet it cannot well be dispensed with. I suspect that its omission partly arose from a mistake originating in a confounding of this ἦν with the one just before. The MSS. in which it is not found are comparatively few; and the Versions can have no weight, since those which here omit the ἦν insert

it just before, and they could not well express it in both places.

14. ἤψατο τῆς σοροῦ.] Meaning thereby to stop the bearers. *Σορός* generally denotes a *coffin*, of marble or other materials. But as such were not in use among the *Jews*, the word must here denote the *bier*, or *funeral couch* on which the dead of the higher classes were carried forth. See the references in Recens. Synop. and my Note on Thucyd. ii. 34.

17. ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Ἰ.] Here and at Matt. ix. 31. the Commentators take ἐν for *διὰ*. But that is so harsh that it is better to suppose ἐν used for εἰς, (as often) in the sense *unto*, which implies *over* and *throughout*.

18. δύο τινὰς.] The *τις* indefinite is simply used with a numeral at Acts xxiii. 23. & xix. 14. And the Philologists think that the addition of the *τις* renders the number indefinite; which is frequently the case in the Classical writers; and the *τις* may be there expressed by our *some*; but whether it has that force in the N. T., I doubt. It is unsuitable to the sacred writers, and can hardly have place in numbers so small as *two*. Besides, Matthew mentions positively *two*. It rather seems to have the usual sense *certain*: q. d. *certain persons*, two in number.

21. θεοόπικασε.] This is not well rendered "cured," or "was curing." It should rather seem that the Aorist is put for the Pluperfect, as often in narration; as Mark iii. 10.

—νόσων καὶ μαστ. καὶ πν. π.] Here we see *demontiacal possession* studiously distinguished from *disorders*, and that by a Physician. The disorders are also distinguished into the ordinary and milder ones, (*νόσοι*), or the more grievous and painful *μάστιγες*; (as Mark iii. 10. and v. 29. and Ps. xxxii. 10.) so called, because such were regarded

MT.

11. μασιγῶν καὶ πνευμάτων πονηρῶν, καὶ τυφλοῖς πολλοῖς ἐχαρίσατο τὸ
 4 βλέπειν.) Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Πορευθέντες 22
 5 ἀπαγγείλατε Ἰωάννῃ, ἃ εἶδετε καὶ ἤκουσατε· ὅτι τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέπουσι,
 6 χωλοὶ περιπατοῦσι, λεπροὶ καθαρίζονται, κωφοὶ ἀκούουσι, νεκροὶ ἐγεί- 23
 7 ρονται, πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται. καὶ μακάριός ἐστιν, ὃς ἐὰν μὴ σκαν- 24
 8 δαλισθῆ ἔν μοι. Ἀπελθόντων δὲ τῶν ἀγγέλων Ἰωάννου, ἤρξατο λέγειν 24
 9 πρὸς τοὺς ὄχλους περὶ Ἰωάννου· Τί ἐξεληλύθατε εἰς τὴν ἔρημον θεά-
 10 σασθαι; κάλαμον ὑπὸ ἀνέμου σαλευόμενον; Ἄλλὰ τί ἐξεληλύθατε 25
 11 ἰδεῖν; ἄνθρωπον ἐν μαλακοῖς ἱματίοις ἡμφιεσμένον; ἰδοὺ, οἱ ἐν
 12 ἱματισμῷ ἐνδόξῳ καὶ τρυφῇ ὑπάρχοντες ἐν τοῖς βουδαίοις εἰσίν. Ἄλλὰ 26
 13 τί ἐξεληλύθατε ἰδεῖν; προφήτην; καὶ λέγω ὑμῖν, καὶ περισσότερον
 14 προφήτου. Οὗτός ἐστι περὶ οὗ γέγραπται· Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω 27
 15 τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου, ὃς κατα-
 16 σκευάσει τὴν ὁδόν σου ἔμπροσθέν σου. Λέγω γάρ ὑμῖν· 28
 17 μεῖζων ἐν γεννητοῖς γυναικῶν προφήτης Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ οὐ-
 18 δεις ἐστίν. ὁ δὲ μικρότερος ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ μεῖζων αὐτοῦ
 19 ἐστί. Καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἀκούσας καὶ οἱ τελῶναι ἐδικαίωσαν τὸν Θεόν, 29

as peculiar scourges from God. Ἐθεράπευσε is used *proprie* of the νόσοι καὶ μάστιγες, and *improprie* of the dispossessions. However, in that case there was almost always a disorder cured at the same time that a demon was ejected. Ἐχαρίσατο τ. β., "he bestowed sight." The τὸ, which is omitted in several MSS., and which some Editors are inclined to cancel, is very necessary to the sense. Τὸ βλ. signifies the faculty of sight.

22. See Is. xxix. 18. xxxv. 5.

25. Τρυφῇ is by most recent Commentators, supposed to mean sumptuous dress; to which it is sometimes applied in the Classical writers, as in Eurip. Phœn. 1505. σκολία κροκοῖσαν ἀνείσα τρυφᾶς. Thus it would stand for τρυφασῶν. That, however, would be too poetic for plain prose; and there is no reason to abandon the interpretation luxury, i. e. a luxurious life. Thus in a kindred passage of Artemid. iii. 60. τοῖς ἐν τρυφῇ διάγονοι. Ἡ ὑπόχ. must be accommodated in sense to each of the nouns with which it is connected. See also 2 Pet. ii. 13. Besides, both circumstances are necessary to designate the luxurious. See Luke xvi. 19.

27. See Malachi iii. 1. Mark i. 2.

29. ἐδικαίωσαν.] On the signification of this word the Commentators are not agreed. The versions "honoured," "obeyed," and others, are but paraphrases. It is best to suppose a significatio prægnans, and to adopt the primary sense, and that espoused by many of the best Commentators, acknowledged and commended the justice of God (i. e. of his purpose in calling them to repentance by John) and were accordingly baptized. This interpretation is required by the antithetical formula in the next verse, τὴν βουλήν (counsel) τοῦ Θεοῦ ἠθέλησαν, &c. A disputed point, however, still remains, — namely, whether this and the verse following are to be considered as the words of our Lord, (which is the common opinion) or whether (as some eminent Interpreters maintain) the words of the Evangelist, containing a remark, that in consequence of what our Lord then said concerning John, the people immediately resorted to his baptism. And it must be granted that

such remarks do occasionally occur in the N. T. But, (as is justly urged by Campb.), such cannot be the sense; because John was then in prison, where he remained till his death. An objection so serious, that Bornem., who strenuously maintains the words to be the Evangelist's, is compelled, in stating their sense, to pass over all mention of the people being baptized by John. And then, as if distrusting his own view, "he sees no reason why the Aorists ἐδικαίωσαν and ἠθέλησαν should not be taken as Pluperfects." But, pace viri doctissimi, there is a reason; namely, that it may be doubted, whether the Aorist ever is, strictly speaking, put for the Pluperfect; most of the passages adduced by Philologists being not at all to the purpose. And Winer and Alt have shown under what circumstances alone this can be said to be the case. Here, however, no such circumstances exist. Prof. Robinson, indeed, on Winer, p. 106, thinks the Aorist is simply put for the Pluperfect at John iv. 1. ὡς οὐκ ἔγνω ὁ Κέριος ὅτι ἤκουσαν οἱ Φαο. ὅτι, &c. But there, it may be observed, the Aorist is used suitably to the use of the Present instead of the Imperfect, in the verbs following in this clause, ποιεῖ and βαπτίζει. Our authorized version, indeed, renders ἤκ. in the Pluperfect; but only because it renders the other verbs in the past tense. In short, had the writer meant to express a Pluperfect sense, why should he not have used the Pluperfect tense? As to what is urged by Bornem. that the words, regarded as those of Christ, are languid and frigid; that is a mere question of taste. But if we allow these to be frigid, it would not be difficult to prove the words which follow this same verse, in Matt. xi. 12., to be so also. And yet even Bornem. must acknowledge those to be Christ's. Finally, the words under consideration can be no other than Christ's, because they are evidently of the very same nature with that verse, and related to the same conversation of our Lord. For as πᾶς ὁ λαὸς means the people at large, the populace, (called at John vii. 49. ὁ ὄχλος ὁ μὴ γενόμενος τὸν νόμον.) as opposed to the Rulers and Pharisees, so also the best Commentators interpret the ex-

30 βαπτισθέντες τὸ βάπτισμα Ἰωάννου· οἱ δὲ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ νομικοὶ
τὴν βουλήν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἠθέτησαν εἰς ἑαυτοὺς, μὴ βαπτισθέντες ὑπ' αὐ-
31 τοῦ. [εἶπε δὲ ὁ Κύριος·] Τίτι οὖν ὁμοιώσω τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τῆς 16
32 γενεᾶς ταύτης; καὶ τίτι εἶδιν ὅμοιοι; Ὅμοιοὶ εἰσι παιδίσι τοῖς ἐν
ἀγορᾷ καθημένοις, καὶ προσφωνοῦσιν ἀλλήλοις καὶ λέγουσιν. Πύλῃ- 17
σαμεν ὑμῖν, καὶ οὐκ ὠρχήσασθε· ἐθρηνησάμεν ὑμῖν, καὶ οὐκ ἐκλαύ-
33 σατε. Ἐλήλυθε γὰρ Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιστὴς μῆτε ἄστρον ἐσθίων μῆτε 18
34 οἶνον πίνων· καὶ λέγετε· Δαιμόνιον ἔχει. Ἐλήλυθεν ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀν- 19
θρώπου ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων· καὶ λέγετε· Ἰδοὺ, ἄνθρωπος φάγος καὶ
35 οἰνοπότης, τελωνῶν φίλος καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν. Καὶ ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία
ἀπὸ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς πάντων.
36 Ἡρώτα δὲ τις αὐτὸν τῶν Φαρισαίων, ἕνα φάγγ μετ' αὐτοῦ· καὶ ^{h Matt. 26. 6.}
37 εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ Φαρισαίου, ἀνεκλίθη. Καὶ ἰδοὺ, γυνὴ ἐν ^{Mark 14. 3.}
τῇ πόλει, ἣτις ἦν ἁμαρτωλὸς, ἐπιγνοῦσα ὅτι ἀνέκειται ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ τοῦ ^{John 11. 2.}
^{& 12. 3.}

pression *βιασται* at Matt. xi. 12. of the meaner crowd.

To advert to what may be considered as principally leading to the opinion of these verses being from the *Evangelist*—namely, the words which introduce the verse following, *εἶπε δὲ ὁ Κύριος*; these are now universally admitted to be not genuine. And vain is it that Bornem. seeks to build even upon this an argument for the preceding being those of the *Evangelist*. Nothing, surely, is more improbable than that the words should have originated in any such desire to prevent mistake in the words following; for no one could fail to see that they were *Christ's*. In short, it is plain that the words originated from the *Lectonaries*, since the verse commences an *ἀνάγνωσις* or Reading, and which required to be introduced by some such words. Thus Scholz attests that they are found, not only in the *Lectonaries*, but in the margin of those MSS. *textus perpetui*, which always mark the commencement of the Readings in the margin. It may, moreover, be urged, that the *οὖν* at v. 3., which is found in all the MSS., evidently has reference to what was said at v. 29, 30.

Lastly, there is another reason why the verses under consideration cannot but be from our *Lord*—namely, that they are evidently adverted to by Him at v. 35. *καὶ ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς πάντων*. And thus we are there supplied with an *authentic interpretation* of one of the most variously expounded passages in all the N. T. By *σοφία* is meant the wise counsel of God for bringing men to the Gospel, by what was a preparation thereto, namely, thoroughly repenting of their former sins, and being baptized by John. By the *children* of wisdom are meant, those who recognized that wisdom, and approved it by acting conformably thereto, and who were therefore (by the same metaphor) children of God.

The passage may be rendered thus: “And now the great body of the people who have heard him,—and even the publicans,—have acknowledged and fulfilled the purpose of God, by being baptized by John: but the Pharisees and Lawyers have set at nought the purpose of God respecting themselves, having not been baptized by John.” *Εἰς ἑαυτοὺς* is by some interpreted “against themselves,” “to their own injury.” But although this sense of *εἰς* is supported alike by Classical

and Scriptural authority, and would here give a good sense, it is better (with Camer., Grot., Hamm., Wolf, Whitby, Wets., Campb., Rosenm., and Kuin.) to suppose a slight transposition, and connect *εἰς ἑαυτοὺς* with *βουλήν τοῦ Θεοῦ*, in the sense “in regard to themselves.” This use of *εἰς* is very frequent. See the Lexicons.

33. [*Comp.* Matt. iii. 4. Mark i. 6.]

37. *καὶ ἰδοὺ, γυνή, &c.*] It has been a much disputed question whether this story be the same with that narrated at Matt. xxvi. 6. Mark xiv. 3. John xii. 3., or not. The former is maintained by some ancient and most early modern Commentators, especially Lightf. and Grot. The latter by Theophyl. and Euthym. (from Chrysost.), and by many of the best modern Commentators, as Buxt., Hamm., Whitby, Wolf, Markl., Michaelis, Rosenm., Kuin., Deyling, and Lampe, (the substance of whose arguments may be found stated in Recens. Synop.) The points of *dissimilarity* between the two narrations, and between the Mary here mentioned, and Mary Magdalene, are striking. As to the *similarity*,—the *action* (anointing) was not unusual, the name of the vessel common, and the name of the Pharisee one of those most frequently met with. This is quite independent of the sense to be assigned to *ἁμαρτωλὸς*, whether *sinner* or *Gentile*. Of the latter sense there is perhaps not one undoubted example in the *singular*: and even with the *plural* it requires the Article, unless united with *τελῶνας*. Though, therefore, that interpretation may have been adopted by several good Commentators, the former, which is espoused by most Commentators, is greatly preferable. But when they assign to the word the sense *harlot*, or *adulteress*, they adduce no proof of that signification from the Classical writers. Nor is it necessary to suppose any such *particularity*. There is no reason why it may not be taken in the *general* sense of a *vicious person*; in which signification the singular is frequent, e. gr. Luke v. 3. *ὅτι ἁμαρτωλὸς εἶμι*. Thus we are enabled to get rid of the harshness of taking *ἦν* in a *pluperfect* tense, (very rarely met with) which all the Commentators do who assign to *ἁμαρτωλὸς* the signification *harlot*. The woman, it secus, was then a sinner: however, a sinner under conviction of sin, and having the sincere desire of amendment.

Φαρισαίου, κομίσασα ἀλάβαστρον μύρου. Καὶ στήσασα παρὰ τοὺς πόδας 38
αὐτοῦ ὀπίσω κλαίονσα, ἤρξατο βρέχειν τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ τοῖς δάκρυσι,
καὶ ταῖς θριξὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτῆς ἐξέμασσε· καὶ κατεγίλει τοὺς πόδας
αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἤλειψε τῷ μύρῳ. Ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ Φαρισαῖος ὁ καλέσας αὐτὸν, 39
εἶπεν ἐν ἑαυτῷ, λέγων· Οὗτος εἰ ἦν προφήτης, ἐγίνωσκεν ἂν τίς καὶ
ποταπὴ ἢ γυνὴ, ἣτις ἀπτεται αὐτοῦ· ὅτι ἁμαρτωλὸς ἐστι.

Infr. 15. 2.

Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπε πρὸς αὐτόν· Σίμων, ἔχω σοί τι 40
εἰπεῖν· ὁ δὲ φησὶ· Διδάσκαλε, εἰπέ. Δύο χρωφειλῆται ἦσαν 41
ρευιστῆ τινι· ὁ εἰς ἄφιλε δηνάγια πεντακόσια, ὁ δὲ ἕτερος πενήκοντα.
Μὴ ἐχόντων δὲ αὐτῶν ἀποδοῦναι, ἀμοιτέροις ἐχαρίσατο. Τίς οὖν 42
τῶν, εἰπέ, πλεῖον αὐτὸν ἀγαπήσει; Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Σίμων εἶπεν· 43
Ἐπολαμβάνω ὅτι ᾧ τὸ πλεῖον ἐχαρίσατο. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Ὁρθῶς
ἔκρινας. Καὶ στραφεὶς πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα, τῷ Σίμωνι ἔφη· Βλέπεις 44
ταύτην τὴν γυναῖκα; Εἰσῆλθὼν σου εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν· ὕδωρ ἐπὶ τοὺς
πόδας μου οὐκ ἔδωκας· αὕτη δὲ τοῖς δάκρυσιν ἔβρεξέ μου τοὺς πό-
δας, καὶ ταῖς θριξὶ [τῆς κεφαλῆς] αὐτῆς ἐξέμαξε. Φίλημαί μοι οὐκ 45
ἔδωκας· αὕτη δὲ ἀφ' ἧς † εἰσῆλθον, οὐ διέλιπε καταφιλοῦσά μου
τοὺς πόδας. Ἐλαίῳ τὴν κεφαλὴν μου οὐκ ἤλειψας· αὕτη δὲ μύρῳ 46
ἤλειψε μου τοὺς πόδας. Οὐ χάριν, λέγω σοι, ἀφένονται αἱ ἁμαρτίαι 47
αὐτῆς αἱ πολλαὶ, ὅ τι ἠγάπησε πολὺ. ᾧ δὲ ὀλίγον ἀφίεται, ὀλίγον

38. *στήσασα ὀπίσω.*] Jesus, it seems, was reclining at table on a couch, leaning on his left elbow, his head and countenance turned towards the table; and his naked feet (the sandals being taken off before the meal) turned the contrary way, towards that which the servants bearing the dishes were waiting on the triclinium or table. (Malton. & Kuing.)

— *κατεφίλει.*] The *κατα* is intensive; and this action implied the deepest reverence and most profound humility; as the bathing his feet with her tears did earnest supplication. The anointing of the feet was a mark of profound respect, retained even in modern times.

39. *προφήτης.*] i. e. a Divine legate, and consequently endowed with supernatural knowledge. Yet, as Grot. observes, not even the *Prophets* knew all things, but only such things as God was pleased to reveal to them.

41. *ὁ εἰς — ὁ δὲ ἕτερος.*] Ὁ μὲν — ὁ δὲ is the more elegant mode of expression; but the other is more pointed.

44. This and the following verses advert to the customs in use among the Jews to guests who were made very welcome. 1. Their sandals were unloosed, and their feet washed and carefully wiped, and, if the person were of high rank, anointed. 2. A kiss was the usual salutation on entrance, or as soon as the person was made comfortable. 3. The head was usually anointed with aromatic oils or unguents. The words *τῆς κεφαλῆς* are omitted in many MSS. and Versions, and have been cancelled by Griesb., Vat., Scholz, and others; but on insufficient grounds. The MSS. are comparatively few; Versions are, in a case like the present, no sure testimony; and better reasons may be given for the *omission* than for the *insertion* of the words.

45. *εἰσῆλθον.*] The chief Editors and Commentators agree in preferring *εἰσῆλθεν*, which is the

reading of some MSS. and Versions. The evidence, however, for it is so slender, that, small as the difference is, an Editor is scarcely warranted in receiving it; especially as it cannot be proved that the common reading is positively wrong; for we have only to regard the language as partaking of the same hyperbolical cast, which is so characteristic of Oriental phraseology. Besides, it is probable that the woman came in very soon after our Lord was seated, and thus supplied those observances which Simon had neglected. Indeed, there is something *feeble* in the sense of *εἰσῆλθεν*. That *εἰσῆλθον* is as proper in *grammar* as *εἰσῆλθεν*, is plain from a kindred passage of Liban. which I have cited in Recens. Synop.: *ὁ δὲ ἀνθρωπος ἐκείνος, ἀφ' οὗπερ ἤκον, οὐ διέλιπε βάλλων· εἰ δὲ οὐκ ἐπήγγυτο τὰ βέλη.*

— *οὐ διέλιπε καταφιλοῦσα.*] On the Participle for Infinitive after verbs signifying *repeated action*, see Winer's Gr. Gr. § 39. 1.

47. *αἱ πολλαί.*] Sub. ὄσσαι, which is expressed in a similar passage of Philostratus Vit. Ap. i. 13. *μετῆρῆθαι τὸν ἁμαρτημάτων πολλῶν ὄστων.*

— *ὅ τι ἠγάπησε πολὺ.*] On the sense of the *ὅτι* here Commentators are not agreed. The ancient and early modern ones interpret *ὅτι* (according to its usual acceptance) *for* or *because*. But all the most eminent of the recent Expositors, regarding this sense as repugnant to the scope of the parable; which, say they, represents the gratuitous forgiveness of sins as the *cause of the love*, not the *love, the cause of the forgiveness*; an effect, they remark, at v. 50. ascribed to faith) and they render the *ὅτι therefore*. Since, however, this signification is deficient in authority, others (as Parkhurst) suppose that the love of the woman is adduced as the *sign*, not the *cause* of her pardon, and that *οὐ χάριν* expresses an inference from the antecedent to the consequent; “Wherefore [since she has shown so great a regard for me] I

48 ἀγαπᾷ. ^k Ἔειπε δὲ αὐτῇ· Ἀφείωνταί σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι. ^l Καὶ ἤρξαντο ^k Matt. 9. 2. ^l Matt. 9. 3.
 49 οἱ συνακαίειμοι λέγειν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς· Τίς οὗτός ἐστιν ὃς καὶ ἁμαρτίας ^{Mark 2. 7. m} Matt. 9. 22. ^{Mark 5. 34. & 10. 52. inf.} 8. 48. & 19. 42.
 50 ἀφίησιν; ^m Ἔειπε δὲ πρὸς τὴν γυναικα· Ἢ πίστις σου σέσωκέ σε πορεύου εἰς εἰρήνην.

1 VIII. Καὶ ἐγένετο, ἐν τῷ καθεξῆς, καὶ αὐτὸς δίδωδενε κατὰ πόλιν καὶ κόμην κηρύσσων καὶ εὐαγγελιζόμενος τὴν βυσιλειαν τοῦ Θεοῦ· καὶ
 2 οἱ δώδεκα σὺν αὐτῷ, ⁿ καὶ γυναικίς τινες, αἱ ἦσαν τετραπευμέναι ⁿ Matt. 27. 55, 56. ^{Mark 16. 9. John 19. 25.}
 ἀπὸ πνευμάτων πονηρῶν καὶ ἀσθενειῶν, Μαρίη ἡ καλουμένη Μαγδα-
 3 ληνή, ἀφ' ἧς δαιμόνια ἐπτά ἐξεληλύθει, καὶ Ἰωάννα γυνὴ Χουζᾶ ἐπι-
 τρώπου Ἰερῶδου, καὶ Σουσάννα, καὶ ἕτεροι πολλοὶ, αἵτινες διηκόνουν [†] ^{MT. MK.}
 αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐταῖς. ^{13. 4.}
 4 Ὁ Συριόντος δὲ ὄχλου πολλοῦ, καὶ τῶν κατὰ πόλιν ἐπιπορευομένων ² ¹
 5 πρὸς αὐτὸν, εἶπε διὰ παρεμβολῆς· Ἐξῆλθεν ὁ σπεῖρων τοῦ σπεῖραι τὸν ³ ³
 σπόρον αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἐν τῷ σπεῖρειν αὐτὸν, ὃ μὲν ἔπεισε παρὰ τὴν ⁴ ⁴
 ὁδόν· καὶ κατεπιτήθη, καὶ τὰ πτερινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατέφυγεν αὐτό.
 6 Καὶ ἕτερον ἔπεισεν ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν· καὶ φυνὲν ἐξηρίνθη, διὰ τὸ μὴ ⁵ ⁵
 7 ἔχειν ἱμάδα. Καὶ ἕτερον ἔπεισεν ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ἄκανθῶν· καὶ συμ- ⁶ ⁶
 8 φρεῖσαι αἱ ἄκανθαὶ ἀπέπριξαν αὐτό. Καὶ ἕτερον ἔπεισεν εἰς τὴν γῆν ⁷ ⁷
 τὴν ἀγαθὴν· καὶ φυνὲν ἐποίησε καρπὸν ἑκατονταπλασιοῦνα. ταῦτα ⁸ ⁸
 9 λέγων ἐφαίνει· Ὁ ἔχων ὠτα ἀκούειν, ἀκουέτω. Ἐπιρρώτων δὲ αὐτὸν ⁹ ⁹
 10 10

say unto you, [it is plain that] her many sins are forgiven, for, or because, she loved much." Yet even this method is open to no little objection: and the ancient interpretation, being the most simple and involving the least difficulty, deserves the preference. And as to what has been alleged, that it represents love as the meritorious cause of the remission of sins, that is by no means the case. Although faith is afterwards said to have saved her, yet as it was faith working by love, and veneration, the latter might be said, in a popular sense, to be the cause of her salvation. The meaning of ὅτι ἠγάπησε πολὺ may be expressed by "inasmuch as she hath given full evidence of her love and attachment." Now that implied faith in the Messiah-ship of Jesus, and may be presumed to have sprung from true repentance. "Wherefore (saith our Lord) [since she hath so great a regard for me] her sins, her many sins, are forgiven; as she hath loved much, i. e. as her sins have been great, so is the forgiveness she shall have, great in proportion. Read ὁ τι, standing for καθ' ὅτι, as ὁ τι is often used for διότι, or διὰ τι. See Note on Mark ix. 11.

The words which follow, ὃ δὲ ὄλιγον — ἀγαπᾷ are not to be too much pressed. They were meant to glance at Simon, for his comparatively little attention.

43. ἀφείωνταί σου αἱ ἁμ.] "thy sins are (hereby) forgiven thee." Many Commentators say that this is doubtless a repetition of the consolatory assurance which Christ had on some previous occasion given to the woman. But this may be considered utterly unfounded. We have merely a formal pronunciation of that forgiveness which the foregoing words implied. So Euthym.: εἶπε αὐτῇ, ἵνα πληροῦσθαι φερεθῇ.

VIII. 1. κατὰ πόλιν.] Wets. rightly distinguishes between this expression and κατὰ τὴν πόλιν, VOL. I.

the latter being said of one, the former of more than one. In fact, the κατὰ has the distributive sense, which takes place not only in numerals, but also in words which are not so, by an ellipsis, as the Grammarians think, of ἕκαστος. The sense is, "city by city."

2. Μαγδαληνή.] The best Commentators are agreed that there is no authority in Scripture for supposing this Mary to have been a harlot; nay, it should seem that she was a person of some consequence. Ἐξελήλυθα, "had been expelled." Neut. for passive, as often in the Gospels and Acts. Many recent Commentators take the ἐπὶ as signifying "many," definite for indefinite, as in Matt. xii. 45. and xii. 26. But that idiom is not to be introduced unnecessarily; and here it is not very suitable.

3. ἐπιρρώτων.] The Commentators are not agreed on the exact office designated by ἐπιρρώπων; which, as it denotes generally one who has an office committed to his charge, is of very extensive signification, and may denote Guardian, or Lieutenant of a province, or Treasurer, or house or land Steward, agent and manager. So Xen. Econ. xii. 2. ἔχω ἐπιρρώπων ἐν τοῖς ἀγροῖς.

3. διηκόνους] "supplied with the necessaries of life;" as Matth. iv. 11. xxvii. 35. Mark i. 13. xv. 41. This signification occurs also in Theophr. Char. ii. 4. For αὐτῷ a great number of MSS. and many Versions have αὐτοῖς, which is edited by Matth. and Scholz. But both external and internal evidence are rather in favour of the common reading.

3. εἰ.] This reading (for ἐπι) is found in many MSS. and Versions, and is adopted by almost every Editor from Wets. to Scholz, being the more difficult reading; whereas the other seems to be derived from Matth. and Mark. εἰς occurs again in this sense infra xiv. 9.

MT. MK.

13. 4. οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, λέγοντες· τίς εἴη ἡ παραβολὴ αὕτη. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν· 10
 11 11 Ἐγὼ δέδοται γινῶναι τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βουλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ· τοῖς δὲ
 13 12 λοιποῖς ἐν παραβολαῖς· ἵνα βλέποντες μὴ βλέπωσι, καὶ ἀκούοντες μὴ
 18 13 συνιῶσιν. Ἔστι δὲ αὕτη ἡ παραβολή· ὁ σπόρος ἐστὶν ὁ λόγος τοῦ 11
 19 15 Θεοῦ· οἱ δὲ παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν εἰσὶν οἱ ἀκούοντες· εἴτα ἔρχεται ὁ Διά- 12
 20 16 βολος καὶ αἶρει τὸν λόγον ἀπὸ τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν, ἵνα μὴ πιστεύσαν-
 22 16 τες σωθῶσιν. Οἱ δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς πέτρας, οἱ, ὅταν ἀκούσωσι, μετὰ χαρᾶς 13
 17 δέχονται τὸν λόγον· καὶ οὗτοι ἄρξιν οὐκ ἔχουσιν, οἱ πρὸς καιρὸν
 22 18 πιστεύουσι, καὶ ἐν καιρῷ πειρασμοῦ ἀφίστανται. Τὸ δὲ εἰς τὰς ἀκάν- 14
 19 19 θας πεσόν, οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀκούσαντες, καὶ ὑπὸ μεριμνῶν καὶ πλοῦτου
 23 20 καὶ ἡδονῶν τοῦ βίου πορευόμενοι συμπνίγονται, καὶ οὐ τελεσφοροῦσι.
 21 20 Τὸ δὲ ἐν τῇ καλῇ γῆ, οὗτοί εἰσιν, οἵτινες ἐν καρδίᾳ καλῇ καὶ ἀγρυπνίᾳ 15
 21 21 ἀκούσαντες τὸν λόγον κατέχουσι, καὶ καρποφοροῦσιν ἐν ὑπομονῇ.
 22 21 Οὐδέις δὲ λήθρον ἕψας, καλύπτει αὐτὸν σκεῦει, ἢ ὑποκάτω κλίνης 16
 22 22 τίθειν. ἀλλ' ἐπὶ λιχνίας ἐπιτίθησι, ἵνα οἱ εἰσπορευόμενοι βλέπωσι
 24 22 τὸ φῶς. Οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶ κρυπτόν, ὃ οὐ φανερόν γενήσεται· οὐδὲ ἀπό- 17
 24 24 κρυφον ὃ οὐ γνωσθήσεται, καὶ εἰς φανερόν ἔλθῃ. Βλέπετε οὖν πῶς 18
 12 25 ἀκούετε· ὡς γὰρ ἂν ἔχη, δοθήσεται αὐτῷ· καὶ ὡς ἂν μὴ ἔχη, καὶ
 12. 3. ὃ δοκεῖ ἔχειν, ἀρθήσεται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.
 46 31 Παρεγένοντο δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡ μήτηρ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ οὐκ 19
 47 32 ἠδύνατο συνιπεῖν αὐτῷ διὰ τὸν ὄχλον. Καὶ ἀπηγγέλη αὐτῷ, λεγόντων· 20
 48 33 Ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ σου ἐστήκασιν ἔξω, ἰδεῖν σε θέλοντες.
 50 35 Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς· Μήτηρ μου καὶ ἀδελφοί μου 21
 50 35 οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀκούοντες καὶ ποιῶντες αὐτόν.
 8. 4. Καὶ ἐγένετο, ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐνέβη εἰς πλοῖον καὶ οἱ 22
 18 35 μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς· Διέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς
 24 37 λίμνης· καὶ ἀνήχθησαν. Πλεόντων δὲ αὐτῶν ἀφύπνωσε. καὶ κατέβη 23

9. τίς εἴη ἡ παραβολὴ α.] i. e. what might be the meaning of this parable. See Winer's Gr. Gr. § 35. 3. So Ceber's Tab. διήγησαι ἡμῖν—τί ποτε ἔστιν ὁ μῦθος;

10. [Comp. Matt. xi. 25, 26. 2 Cor. iii. 5. 14. Is. vi. 9. Ezek. xii. 2. Rom. xi. 8.]

14. πορευόμενοι συμπνίγονται.] Πορ. is best explained "in their progress through life," "as they proceed in life." So Euthym. πολιτευόμενοι. See Luke i. 6. In ὑπὸ μεριμνῶν καὶ πλοῦτου the sense (which is imperfectly developed) seems to be, "by the cares of poverty and the anxieties of riches." These are illustrated by passages of Theocrit. Idyl. xxi. and Eurip. Med. 599. adduced in Recens. Synop.

—οὐ τελεσφοροῦσι.] The word is used of trees or plants bringing fruit to maturity, and almost always with an Accus.

15. καλῇ καὶ ἀγρυπνίᾳ.] Beza and Grot. regard this as an expression *ex adytis Philosophiæ*; and they compare the expression of the Classical writers καλὸς κάγαθος as said of one who is endowed with all the advantages of body, mind, fortune, &c. But the expression here simply designates a "thoroughly good heart," the καλῇ being used merely with reference to the thing compared, namely, the ground just before. So Xenophon often used the word of land or soil naturally fer-

tile. 'Εν ὑπομονῇ is by some rendered "with patience;" by others, "with perseverance." Both senses may have place.

13. ὃ δοκεῖ ἔχειν.] Δοκεῖ is not (as many Commentators imagine) redundant here, and perhaps in very few of the many passages which they adduce. Luke has expressed something *more* than Matthew and Mark; namely, that what such a person yet retains is likely to be soon lost, that he can hardly be said to have it. [Comp. infra xix. 26.]

20. ἀπηγγέλη—λεγόντων.] Most Commentators supply τινῶν, or αὐτῶν. But the construction of Genitive absolute is here harsh, and it should rather seem that ἀπὸ is to be fetched from the verb, or ἐπὶ supplied, together with αὐτῶν referring to ὄχλον, which is a noun of multitude. Ἰδεῖν is for συνιπεῖν, i. e. καλεῖσθαι, as in Matth. (antecedent for consequent). So in Thucyd. iv. 125. and Xen. Cyr. iv. 6, 2.

21. [Comp. John xv. 14. 2 Cor. v. 16.]

23. ἀφύπνωσε] obdormivit. A rare sense, ἀφύπνω and ἀφρηπνίζω signifying in the Classical writers to raise oneself from sleep, to awake. The other occurs, however, in the LXX. (Judg. v. 27.) in Ignat. Martyr. § 7., and is noticed in the Glossaria Gr. Lat. Markl. thinks it was an Antioch-

	MT.	MK.
λαίλαψ ἀνέμου εἰς τὴν λίμνην, καὶ συνεπληροῦντο, καὶ ἐκινδύνευον.	8.	4.
24 Προσελθόντες δὲ διήγειραν αὐτὸν, λέγοντες· Ἐπιστάτια, ἐπιστάτια,	25	38
ἀπολλύμεθα. Ὁ δὲ ἐγεροθεὶς ἐπέτιμωσε τῷ ἀνέμῳ καὶ τῷ κλύδωνι τοῦ	26	39
25 ὕδατος· καὶ ἐπάυσαντο, καὶ ἐγένετο γαλήνη. Εἶπε δὲ αὐτοῖς· Ποῦ	40	40
ἔστιν ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν; Φοβηθέντες δὲ ἐθαύμασαν, λέγοντες πρὸς	27	41
ἀλλήλους· Τίς ἄρα οὗτός ἐστιν, ὅτι καὶ τοῖς ἀνέμοις ἐπιτάσσει καὶ		
τῷ ὕδατι, καὶ ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ;	5.	
26 Καὶ κατέπλευσαν εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Γυδασηνῶν, ἣτις ἐστὶν ἀντιπέ-	28	1
27 ραν τῆς Γαλιλαίας. Ἐξελθόντι δὲ αὐτῷ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ὑπήντησεν αὐτῷ	2	
ἀνὴρ τις ἐκ τῆς πόλεως, ὃς εἶχε δαιμόνια ἐκ χρόνων ἱκανῶν, καὶ		
ἱμάτιον οὐκ ἐνεδιδύσκετο, καὶ ἐν οἰκίᾳ οὐκ ἔμενεν, ἀλλ' ἐν τοῖς μνή-		
28 μασιν. Ἰδὼν δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν, καὶ ἀνακράζας, προσέπεσεν αὐτῷ, καὶ	3	6
φωνῇ μεγάλῃ εἶπε· Τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοὶ, Ἰησοῦ, γίε τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψί-	29	7
29 στου; δέομαί σου, μὴ με βασανίσῃς. Παρήγγειλε γὰρ τῇ πνεύματι	8	
τῷ ακαθάρτῳ ἐξελθεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου· πολλοὺς γὰρ χρόνους σννηρ-		
πάκει αὐτὸν, καὶ ἐδεσμεῖτο ἀλύσει καὶ πέδαις φυλασσόμενος, καὶ		
διαφόρησων τὰ δεσμὰ, ἡλαύνετο ὑπὸ τοῦ δαίμονος εἰς τὰς ἐρήμους.		
30 Ἐπρηόηθη δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, λέγων· Τί σοι ἐστὶν ὄνομα; ὁ δὲ	9	
31 εἶπε· Λεγεών· ὅτι δαιμόνια πολλὰ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς αὐτόν. Καὶ παρε-	10	
32 κάλει αὐτὸν ἵνα μὴ ἐπιτάξῃ αὐτοῖς εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον ἀπελθεῖν. Ἴδὼν δὲ		
ἐκεῖ ἀγγέλι χοίρων ἱκανῶν βοσκομένων ἐν τῷ ὄρει· καὶ παρεκάλουν	30	11
αὐτὸν ἵνα ἐπιτρέψῃ αὐτοῖς εἰς ἐκείνους εἰσελθεῖν. καὶ ἐπέτρεψεν αὐ-	31	12
33 τοῖς. Ἐξελθόντα δὲ τὰ δαιμόνια ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τοὺς	32	13
χοίρους· καὶ ὤρμησεν ἡ ἀγγέλι κατὰ τοῦ κρημνοῦ εἰς τὴν λίμνην, καὶ		
34 ἀπεπνίγη. Ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ βόσκοντες τὸ † γεγενημένον ἔφυγον, καὶ	33	14

ism. But it rather seems to have been a popular use of the word.

25. κατέβη.] Stormy gusts are often said καταβαίνειν, or κατείναι. So Thucyd. ii. 25. ἀνέμου κατείντος, et sæpe. Plut. ap. Steph. Thes. Pausan. xi. 34. 3. κατείντος ἐπι τοῦ πνεύματος. Pollux i. 103. κατείντος τοῦ ἀνέμου.

— συνεπληροῦντο.] A popular catachresis, by which what happens to the ship is ascribed to the sailors. Examples are found in the best writers.

29. πολλοὺς χρόνους.] Grot. and Rosenm. take this for πολλάκις. But as in ver. 27. we find ἐκ χρόνων ἱκανῶν, so Loesn. and Kuin. here take χρόνοις for inde a pluribus annis. And indeed that sense is frequent in the Classical writers, and sometimes occurs in the Sept. Loesn. cites Diod. Sic. xlv. A. and Wets. Plut. de Educ. xiv. 26. ἐν δεσμοτηρίῳ πολλοὺς κατεσπῆ χρόνους. I add Thucyd. i. 96. τότεων — τοῖς χρόνοις οὐκ ἀκριβῶς ἐπεμνήσθη.

31. τὴν ἄβυσσον] scil. χώραν, i. e. Tartarus, that part of Hades in which the souls of the wicked were supposed to be confined. See 2 Pet. i. 14. Apoc. xx. 1. So also Eurip. Phœn. 1632. Ταρτάρου ἀβύσσου χάσματα. See Professor Stuart's instructive Essays on the words relating to Future Punishment, especially on ἡλύω, ἄδης, and τάρταρος. "Sheol (says he), was considered as a vast and wide domain or region, of which the grave seems to have been as it were only a part, or a kind of entrance way. It appears to have been

regarded as extending deep down into the earth, even to its lowest abysses. It may also be remarked, that, as in the O. T. Sheol is a place to which the righteous go, as well as the wicked; and as our Saviour, subsequently to his death, is represented as being in Hades, Ps. xvi. 10. Acts ii. 27, 31; so it is not improbable that the general conception of Hades, as meaning the region of the dead, comprised both an Elysium and a Tartarus (to speak in Classical language), or a state of happiness and a state of misery." It is plain that by ἄβυσσος is meant this Tartarus. So 2 Pet. ii. 4, we have the expression ταρταρώσας. I would further observe that the etymology of the Heb. ἡλύω need not have so perplexed Philologists. Notwithstanding the doubts of Gesenius, it is certainly derived (as Parkh. and others supposed) from ἡλύω; yet not from the signification, to seek; nor has it any sense in common with ἄδης. I suspect that the primitive physical signification of ἡλύω was to dig deep, to scoop out, to hollow; and as men dig deep only in search of something, so the verb came to mean, figuratively, search or seek for. So Job iii. 21. "and dig for (i. e. anxiously seek) death more than for hidden treasures." Thus the word was originally merely the past participle of ἡλύω, and denoted a pit thus dug. Indeed, the words hell and the grave (called in German Hölle) were originally only past participles of verbs meaning to dig out, to hollow.

34. τὸ γεγενημένον.] Many MSS. have τὸ γεγο-

MT. MK.

8. 5. [~~ἀπελθόντες~~] ἀπήγγειλαν εἰς τὴν πόλιν καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἀγρούς. Ἐξῆλθον 35
 34 15 δὲ ἰδεῖν τὸ γεγονός· καὶ ἦλθον πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν, καὶ εὗρον καθήμε-
 16 ρον τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ἀφ' οὗ τὰ δαιμόνια ἐξεληλύθει, ἱματισμένον καὶ
 17 σωφρονοῦντα παρὰ τοὺς πόδας τοῦ Ἰησοῦ· καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν. Ἀπ- 36
 17 ἠγγειλαν δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ οἱ ἰδόντες, πῶς ἐσώθη ὁ δαιμονισθεὶς. Καὶ 37
 17 ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν ἕπειν τὸ πλῆθος τῆς περιχώρου τῶν Γαδαρηνῶν ἀπελ-
 18 θεῖν ἀπ' αὐτῶν· ὅτι φόβη μεγάλη συνέιχοντο. αὐτὸς δὲ ἐμβὰς εἰς
 18 τὸ πλοῖον ὑπέστρεψεν. Ἐδέετο δὲ αὐτοῦ ὁ ἀνήρ, ἀφ' οὗ ἐξεληλύθει 38
 19 τὰ δαιμόνια, εἶναι σὺν αὐτῷ. Ἀπέλυσε δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, λέγων·
 19 Ἐπίστρεψε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου, καὶ διηγοῦ ὅσα ἐποίησέ σοι ὁ Θεός. 39
 20 καὶ ἀπῆλθε, καθ' ὅλην τὴν πόλιν κηρύσσωσιν ὅσα ἐποίησεν αὐτῷ ὁ
 9. Ἰησοῦς.

1 21 ἘΙΠΕΝΕΤΟ δὲ, ἐν τῷ ὑποτρέψαι τὸν Ἰησοῦν, ἀπεδέξατο αὐτὸν ὁ 40
 ὄχλος· ἦσαν γὰρ πάντες προδοκῶντες αὐτόν.
 13 22 Καὶ ἰδοὺ, ἦλθεν ἀνὴρ ὃ ὄνομα Ἰάιρος, καὶ αὐτὸς ἄρχων τῆς συνα- 41
 22 γωγῆς ὑπῆρχε, καὶ πεσὼν παρὰ τοὺς πόδας τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, παρεκάλε 42
 23 αὐτὸν εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ· ὅτι θυγάτηρ μονογενῆς ἦν αὐτῷ 42
 24 ὡς ἐτῶν δώδεκα, καὶ αὕτη ἀπέθνησκεν. ἐν δὲ τῷ ὑπάγειν αὐτὸν οἱ
 20 25 ὄχλοι συνέπιγον αὐτόν. Καὶ γυνὴ οὖσα ἐν ἥσει αἵματος ἀπὸ ἐτῶν 43
 26 δώδεκα, ἣτις * ἰατροῖς προσαναλώσασα ὅλον τὸν βίον, οὐκ ἔχυσεν ὑπ'
 27 οὐδενὸς θεραπευθῆναι, προσελθοῦσα ὑπισθεν, ἤψατο τοῦ κρασπέδου 44
 27 τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ· καὶ παραχρῆμα ἔστη ἡ ἥσις τοῦ αἵματος αὐτῆς.
 29 Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Τίς ὁ ἀψάμενός μου; ἄρνούμενων δὲ πάντων, 45
 30 εἶπεν ὁ Πέτρος καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ· Ἐπιστάτα, οἱ ὄχλοι συνέχουσί σε
 31 καὶ ἀποθλίβουσι, καὶ λέγεις· Τίς ὁ ἀψάμενός μου; ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς 46
 31 εἶπεν· Ἰψατό μου τίς· ἐγὼ γὰρ ἔγνω δύναμιν ἐξελθοῦσαν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ.
 33 Ἰδοῦσα δὲ ἡ γυνὴ ὅτι οὐκ ἔλαθε, τρέμουσα ἦλθε, καὶ προσεπεσοῦσα 47
 33 αὐτῷ, δι' ἣν αἰτίαν ἤψατο αὐτοῦ ἀπήγγειλεν αὐτῷ ἐνώπιον παντὸς
 22 34 τοῦ λαοῦ, καὶ ὡς ἰάθη παραχρῆμα. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῇ· Θάρσει θύ- 48
 35 γατερ, ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέ σε· πορεύου εἰς εἰρήνην. Ἐτι αὐτοῦ 49
 35 λαλοῦντος, ἔρχεται τις παρὰ τοῦ ἀρχισυναγώγου λέγων αὐτῷ· Ὅτι
 36 τέθνηκεν ἡ θυγάτηρ σου· μὴ σκύλλε τὸν διδάσκαλον. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς 50
 36 ἀκούσας, ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ, λέγων· Μὴ φοβοῦ· μόνον πίστευε, καὶ
 23 37 σωθήσεται. [Ἐἶσ]ελθὼν δὲ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, οὐκ ἀφῆκεν εἰσελθεῖν οὐ- 51
 37 δέναι, εἰ μὴ Πέτρον καὶ * Ἰωάννην καὶ Ἰάκωβον, καὶ τὸν πατέρα τῆς

ids, which is received by Griesb. and Scholz; but without any reason. Ἀπελθόντες before ἀπήγγ. is rightly cancelled by all Editors, being absent from almost all MSS., and, no doubt, introduced from Matt. viii. 33.

37. [Comp. Acts xvi. 39.]

40. ἀπεδέξατο "joyfully received him." A sense inherent in the ἀπδ, and found in the Classical as well as the Scriptural writers.

42. ἀπέθνηκεν "was (as it were) dying," "was near unto death." Συνέπιγον, for συνέλιβον, which is used by Mark.

43. οὖσα ἐν ἥσει. This use of εἶναι with ἐν, de-

noting to labour under a disorder, occurs elsewhere in Scripture. We may compare ἄνθρωπος ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ in Mark v. 2. In either case the ἐν is for σὺν. For εἰς ἰατροῖς is written ἰατροῖς in almost all the best MSS., which is adopted by all Editors from Wets. to Scholz.

51. εἰσελθὼν. Many MSS. have ἔλθων, which is received by Wets., Griesb., and Scholz. Καὶ Ἰωάννην καὶ Ἰάκωβον (for Ἰάκ. καὶ Ἰωάνν.) is found in all the best MSS. and Versions, and Theophyl., and is edited by Wets., Matth., Griesb., Tittm., and Scholz, who are probably right in so doing, as the mistake might easily arise from the καὶ—καί. Yet the common reading might be defended.

		MT.	MK.
52	παιδὸς καὶ τὴν μητέρα. ἔκλαιον δὲ πάντες, καὶ ἐκόπτοντο αὐτήν.	Ο 9.	5.
53	δὲ εἶπε· Μὴ κλαίετε· οὐκ ἀπέθανεν, ἀλλὰ καθύπδει·	34	38
54	λων αὐτοῦ, εἰδότες ὅτι ἀπέθανεν. Αὐτὸς δὲ ἐκβαλὼν ἔξω πάντας, καὶ	25	40
55	κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς, ἐφώνησε, λέγων· ἼΙ παῖς, ἐγείρου. Καὶ		41
	ἐπέστρεψε τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτῆς, καὶ ἀνέστη παραχρῆμα· καὶ διέταξεν		42
56	αὐτῇ δοθῆναι φαγεῖν. Καὶ ἐξίστησαν οἱ γονεῖς αὐτῆς· ὁ δὲ παρήγγ-		43
	ηλιεν αὐτοῖς μηδεὶ εἰπεῖν τὸ γεγονός.	10.	6.

1	IX. ΣΤΙΚΑΛΕΣΑΜΕΝΟΣ δὲ τοὺς δώδεκα [μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ,]	1	7
	ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς δύναμιν καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ δαιμόνια, καὶ νό-		
2	σους θεραπεύειν· καὶ ἀπέστειλεν αὐτοὺς κηρῦσσειν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ	7	
3	Θεοῦ, καὶ ἰῶσθαι τοὺς ἄσθενούντας. Καὶ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς· Μηδὲν	9	8
	αἰρετε εἰς τὴν ὁδόν· μήτε † ῥάβδους, μήτε πήγαν, μήτε ἄρτον, μήτε	10	
4	ἀργύριον· μήτε ἀνὰ δύο χιτῶνας ἔχειν. Καὶ εἰς ἣν ἂν οἰκίαν εἰσέλ-	11	10
5	θῆτε, ἐκεῖ μένετε, καὶ ἐκεῖθεν ἐξέρχεσθε. Καὶ ὅσοι ἂν μὴ δέξωνται	14	11

52. ἐκόπτοντο αὐτήν] “bewailed her.” Κόπτει properly signifies to beat or strike oneself; and then, because that is the usual accompaniment of extreme grief, to bewail, grieve for any one. It answers to the Heb. נָכַח, which is followed by לְ, for, or ἵπ, over, and has sometimes in the Sept. (as here) simply an Accusative, thus becoming a Dependent.

54. ἡ παῖς.] Nomin. for Vocat., which occurs also at vi. 25. x. 21. xii. 32. xviii. 11. and Mark v. 41., and sometimes in the Classical writers, especially the Attic ones. The words ἐκβαλὼν ἔξω πάντας καὶ are not found in some very ancient MSS. and Versions, are rejected by Schulz. and Bornem., and cancelled by Lachm. They certainly may have been introduced from the parallel passage of Mark. But as the MSS. are so very few (only about 8), may we not rather suspect an accidental omission?

IX. 1. μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ.] These words are omitted in very many of the best MSS., several Versions, and some Fathers; and are cancelled by almost every Editor from Wets. to Scholz. Some MSS. and those Versions which have not μαθ. αὐτοῦ have ἀποστόλους αὐτοῦ. Nothing, therefore, can be plainer than that both are from the margin. It may be said, indeed, that these words are confirmed by Matth. x. 1. But it is more probable that they have been introduced from thence. Better reasons may be imagined for their insertion than for their omission. The elliptical expression οἱ δώδεκα, for the Twelve Apostles, is frequent in the N. T., though, as might be expected, there are generally some MSS. which have ἀπόστολοι added. I cannot but here animadvert on the bad criticism and disingenuous spirit evinced by the supporters of the system which considers the Demoniacs as merely lunatics. For though dæmoniacs and lunatics would in this verse seem to be as plainly distinguished as words can make them, yet the persons in question seek to neutralize this by foisting an alios in their versions, as if ἄλλους were found in the text.

—καὶ νόσους θεραπεύειν.] This is, as Bornem. remarks, an elliptical form of expression for καὶ ἐξουσίαν θεοῦ νόσους, of which he adduces an apposite example from Xen. Anab. i. 2. 27. Σ. ἔδωκε Κίρῳ χρομάτα πολλά, Κίρῳ δ' ἐκέλευε δῶρα — καὶ τ ἦν

χώραν μηκέτι ἀφορπάζεσθαι, τὰ δὲ ἥρασματὰ ἀνθρώποδα ἀπολαμβάνειν. See Matth. Gr. Gr. § 532. a.

2. ἀπσταλεν, &c.] Comp. Matth. x. 7. In the foregoing verse it is said, that he gave them power to cast out dæmons and to heal disorders. In this the sense is, that they had a commission to go forth and exercise that power, in conjunction with the preaching of the Gospel-Dispensation.

3. ῥάβδους.] Many MSS. have ῥάβδον, which is preferred by almost all the recent Editors. See Note on Matth. x. 10. Ἄνὰ, a-piece. So Matth. xx. 9. Ἐλαβον ἀνὰ ὄνῳρον, and John ii. 6. ἀνὰ μετρητὰς δύο ἢ τρεῖς. On this distributive sense, see Bornem. and Matth. Gr. Gr. § 579. 3. The Commentators and Grammarians, however, seem wrong in supposing that in this idiom the numeral and noun belong to the ἀνα. They are rather to be referred to the verb; and the preposition is to be taken as put absolutely (thus becoming, as it were, an adverb) by an ellipsis of ἕκαστον, which is sometimes expressed, though generally left to be understood. Our word a-piece well expresses the force of the idiom; being for at-piece (as it was formerly written) where piece coming from the Ital. pezzo (which is from the Germ. beissen, to bite; for piece and bit have the same origin), exactly answers to ἕκαστον, as well it may; since the idea of separation is quite as inherent in ἕκαστος as in pezzo, both, in fact, being originally passive verbals, signifying broken off, separated.

—ἔχειν.] This is usually explained as Infin. for Imperat. ἔχετε: a not unfrequent idiom, to lessen the harshness of which Philologists generally suppose an ellipse of an Imperative of wish, or of δεῖ. But it is better, with Herm. on Vig. p. 591, to suppose the idiom to be a relique of ancient simplicity of language, when a wish was expressed simply by a verb in the Infinitive. Of this there is a confirmation in the use of the Hebrew verb. The principle, however, cannot apply to the phraseology of later Greek writers, especially prose writers. It will usually be found that the Infinitive has a reference to some verb which has preceded, and to which the writer, inadvertently, accommodates the construction. Thus the idiom falls under the head of Anantipodoton; e. gr. here ἔχειν is used as if αἴων (referred to εἶπε, bade) had preceded, and not αἴρετε.

MT. MK.

10. 6. ἡμᾶς, ἐξερχόμενοι ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης· καὶ τὸν κοινορτὸν ἀπὸ τῶν
 12 ποδῶν ἡμῶν ἀποτινάξατε, εἰς μαρτύριον ἐπ' αὐτούς. Ἐξερχόμενοι 6
 13 δὲ διήρχοντο κατὰ τὰς κόμιας, εὐαγγελιζόμενοι καὶ θεραπεύοντες παν-
 14 ταχοῦ.
- 1 14 Ἦκουσε δὲ Ἡρώδης ὁ τετραράρχης τὰ γινόμενα ὑπ' αὐτοῦ πάντα· 7
 2 καὶ διηπόρει, διὰ τὸ λέγεσθαι ὑπὸ τινῶν, ὅτι Ἰωάννης ἐγήγερται ἐκ
 15 νεκρῶν· ὑπὸ τινῶν δὲ, ὅτι Ἠλίας ἐφάνη· ἄλλων δὲ, ὅτι προφήτης 8
 16 εἷς τῶν ἀρχαίων ἀνέστη. καὶ εἶπεν [ὁ] Ἡρώδης· Ἰωάννην ἐγὼ ἀπε- 9
 κεφάλισα· τίς δὲ ἐστίν οὗτος, περὶ οὗ ἐγὼ ἀκούω τοιαῦτα; καὶ ἐξή-
 17 τει ἰδεῖν αὐτόν.
- 30 Καὶ ὑποστρέψαντες οἱ ἀπόστολοι διηγῆσαντο αὐτῷ ὅσα ἐποίησαν. 10
 31 Καὶ παραλαβὼν αὐτούς, ὑπεχώρησε κατ' ἰδίαν εἰς τόπον ἔρημον πόλεως
 32 καλουμένης βηθσαιῶν. Οἱ δὲ ὄχλοι γνόντες, ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ· καὶ 11
 14 33 34 δεξιόμενος αὐτούς, ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ τοὺς
 15 35 χοεῖαν ἔχοντας θεραπείας ἰάτο. Ἦ δὲ ἡμέρα ἤρξατο κλίνειν· προσελ- 12
 36 θόντες δὲ οἱ δώδεκα εἶπον αὐτῷ· Ἀπόλυσον τὸν ὄχλον, ἵνα ἀπελθόν-
 16 37 τες εἰς τὰς κύκλις κόμιας καὶ τοὺς ἀγρούς καταλύσουσι, καὶ εἴρωσιν
 17 ἐπιτισιμῶν· ὅτι ὧδε ἐν ἐρήμῳ τόπῳ ἐσμέν. Εἶπε δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς· 13
 17 Δότε αὐτοῖς ὑμεῖς φαγεῖν. οἱ δὲ εἶπον· Οὐκ εἰσὶν ἡμῖν πλέον ἢ
 18 πέντε ἄρτοι καὶ * ἰχθύες δύο· εἰ μὴ τι πορευθέντες ἡμεῖς ἀγοράσωμεν
 19 εἰς πάντα τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον βρώματα· ἦσαν γὰρ ὡσεὶ ἄνδρες πεντα- 14
 19 39 κισχίλιοι. Εἶπε δὲ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ· Κατακλίνατε αὐτούς
 40 κλισίας, ἀνὰ πενήκοντα· καὶ ἐποίησαν οὕτω, καὶ ἀνέκλιναν ἅπαντας. 15
 41 Λαβὼν δὲ τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύες, ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν
 20 42 παρατιθέμεναι τῷ ὄχλῳ. Καὶ ἔψαγον καὶ ἐχορτάσθησαν πάντες· καὶ 17
 16. 8. ἦρθη τὸ περισσεῦσαν αὐτοῖς κλισμμάτων κόφινος δώδεκα.
- 13 27 ΚΑΙ ἐγένετο, ἐν τῇ εἶναι αὐτὸν προσευχόμενον καταμόνας, συνῆσαν 18
 αὐτῷ σὺ μαθηταί, καὶ ἐπρωτήθησαν αὐτούς, λέγων· Τίνα με λέγουσιν

5. καὶ τὸν κοιν.] Bornem. well renders the *καὶ οδοῦ*, even; and he and Scholz have rightly removed the comma after *ἐκείνης*, as the construction of the sentence required; with which Bornem. compares Aristoph. Av. 1735. *εἰὰ σὲ τὰ πάντα κρατήσας καὶ (even) παρέφρον βασιλείαν ἔχει Διός.*

7. διηπόρει] "he was in doubt and perplexity," namely, what to think.

10. ποδῶν.] "of the city," or the district of Bethsaida.

12. ἡμέρα ἤρξατο κλίνειν.] *Κλίνειν* and its compounds are often used with *ἥλιος* of the declination of the sun to the horizon. Sometimes, as here, *ἡμέρα* is used instead of *ἡλιος*. On the present transaction, comp. John vi. 5. At τὰς κύκλις sub. *ἐν*, and *οἰσας*, or *κειμένως*. The ellipsis is frequent in the Classical writers.

—*ἵνα καταλύσουσι*] "that they may seek καταλύματα, or lodgings;" as xix. 7. and Gen. xxiv. 23. (Sept.) The figure is derived (like that in our *stage* for *stayage*) from travellers unloading their beasts and unguarding themselves.

13. ἰχθύες δύο.] This, instead of *δέο ἰχθύες*, is found in a very great number of MSS., and is re-

ceived by Wets., Matth., Griesb., Tittm., Knapp, and Scholz.

—*εἰ μὴ τι.*] There is here some obscurity, the sense being not fully developed. Hence Beza, Grot., Pisc., and Wolf suppose an ellipsis of *οὐ δυνατόν ἐστι, or οὐ δυνατόν εἶναι*. But this is so harsh, that Kypke, Kuin., and others seek to remove the difficulty by taking *εἰ μὴ τι* for *nunc quid*, and making the sentence interrogative. For that signification, however, they adduce no sufficient authority. It is better, therefore, to adhere to the usual signification of *εἰ μὴ*, i. e. *unless*; and suppose (with the Syriac Translator, Casaub., Valckn., Schleus., and Wahl) that the *τι* has what Hoogev. calls the *vis stoχαστικῆ*, and signifies *fortasse*, or perhaps *forsooth*. It should seem that the apostles, through delicacy, do not fully express their meaning, which was probably this: "We have no more than, &c. unless, forsooth, we should go and purchase [sufficient food] for all this multitude."

14. κλισίας.] Sub. *κατά*. The word is very rare in the Classical writers, but is found in Josephus.

	MT.	MK.
19 οἱ ὄχλοι εἶναι ; Οἱ δὲ ἀποκριθέντες εἶπον ᾽ Ιωάννην τὸν βαπτιστὴν ᾽	16.	8.
ἄλλοι δὲ ᾽ Ηλίαν ᾽ ἄλλοι δὲ, οὗτοι προφήτης τις τῶν ἀρχαίων ἀνέστη.	14	28
20 Εἶπε δὲ αὐτοῖς ᾽ Τρεῖς δὲ τίνα με λέγετε εἶναι ; ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ [ὁ]	15	29
21 Πέτρος εἶπε ᾽ Τὸν Χριστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ. Ὁ δὲ ἐπιτιμήσας αὐτοῖς,	20	30
22 παρήγγειλε μηδενὲ εἰπεῖν τοῦτο ᾽ εἰπὼν, οὗτοι δεῖ τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πολλὰ παθεῖν, καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι ἀπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ ἀρχιερέων καὶ γραμματέων, καὶ ἀποκτανθῆναι, καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγερθῆναι.	21	31
23 Ἐλεγε δὲ πρὸς πάντας. Εἴ τις θέλει ὀπίσω μου ἔλθειν, ἀπαρνη- 24 34		
σάσθω ἑαυτὸν, καὶ ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ [καθ' ἡμέραν,] καὶ		
24 ἀκολουθήτω μοι. Ὅς γὰρ ἂν θέλῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σῶσαι, ἀπολέσει 25 35		
αὐτήν ᾽ ὅς δ' ἂν ἀπολέσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ, οὗτος σώσει		
25 αὐτήν. Τί γὰρ ὧφελῆται ἄνθρωπος κερδήσας τὸν κόσμον ὅλον, ἐάν- 26 36		
26 τὸν δὲ ἀπολέσας ἢ ζημιωθῆις ; Ὅς γὰρ ἂν ἐπαισχυνθῇ με καὶ τοῦς 38		
ἐμοῦς λόγους, τοῦτον ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπαισχυνθήσεται, ὅταν		
ἔλθῃ ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τῶν ἁγίων ἀγγέλων. 9.		
27 Λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ἀληθῶς ᾽ εἰσὶ τινες τῶν ὧδε ἐστηκότων, οἳ οὐ μὴ γεύ- 28 1		
σονται θανάτου, ἕως ἂν ἴδωσι τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ. 17.		
28 Ἐγένετο δὲ μετὰ τοῦς λόγους τούτους ὡσεὶ ἡμέραι ὀκτώ, καὶ παρα- 1 2		
λαβὼν [τὸν] Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάννην καὶ Ἰάκωβον, ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος		
29 προσεύξασθαι. Καὶ ἐγένετο, ἐν τῷ προσεύχεσθαι αὐτὸν, τὸ εἶδος τοῦ 2 3		
προσώπου αὐτοῦ ἕτερον, καὶ ὁ ἱματισμὸς αὐτοῦ λευκὸς ἕξαστράπτων.		

20. ὁ Π.] The ὁ is omitted in many good MSS., and is cancelled by Matth. and Scholz.

22. The alteration in punctuation which I have adopted in τούτο· εἰπὼν, ὅτι seems called for by propriety, and is confirmed by the parallel passages of Matthew and Mark. This narrative sense of εἰπεῖν is very frequent.

23. καθ' ἡμέραν.] The Editors and Critics are in doubt as to the genuineness of this expression. It is rejected by Wets., Matth., and Scholz, but retained by Griesb., Knapp., Tittm., and Vat. External evidence is pretty equally balanced; the Alexandrian recension and almost all the Versions having it, and the Constant., with the other Versions, and several Fathers, being without it. Griesb. thinks it was removed by the *librarii*, as not being in the other Gospels. But he adduces no example of a similar curtailment from the same cause. Matthæi, on the contrary, thinks it was introduced from the Fathers and Interpreters; who had perhaps in view 1 Cor. xv. 31. And of this he adduces some strong proofs. I entirely agree with him; and would add that the same asceticism, which induced several of the Fathers to throw out the *εἰσὶ* at Matt. v. 22, may have induced them to introduce καθ' ἡμέραν here. But I rather think that they only brought it forward to complete the sense, not the text; and that having been taken from them by the *Scholiasts*, it was occasionally marked in the margin of copies, and then was introduced into the text of the transcripts. It was not, however, I conceive, introduced directly from the Fathers, or the Interpreters. It was, no doubt, at first borrowed by the *Scholiasts*; and from them was marked in the

margin of copies, from whence careless scribes introduced it into the text.

24. [Comp. Matthew x. 39. xvi. 25. John xii. 25.]

25. Ζημιωθῆις.] Repeat *ἑαυτὸν* in the sense *ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν*. Herodot. vii. 39. has *τὴν ψυχὴν ζημώσεται*.

26. [Comp. infra xii. 9. Matt. x. 33.]

28. ἐγένετο — ὀκτώ.] There is here something seemingly anomalous in the construction; to remove which, some recur to the idiom whereby in Hebrew and Hellenistical phraseology verbs singular are united with nouns plural. But that principle is inapplicable here. And as to *ἐγίνοντο*, which some would read, it is a mere conjecture. The truth is, that *ἐγένετο* is not the true verb to *ἡμέραι*, but, together with *δέ*, constitutes (by an ellipse of *τοῦτο*) a formula, frequent in St. Luke, which merely serves to introduce some new narration. Thus *ἐγένετο δὲ*, &c. will be connected with *καὶ παραλαβὼν*; and consequently *ὡσεὶ ἡμέραι ὀκτώ* will be a parenthetical epianorthosis of the preceding *μετὰ τ. λ. τ.* As to those nouns denoting time, when put in the Nominative, (among which we may reckon *ἡμέραι* for *ἡμέραι*, which occurs in the common text of Thucyd. viii. 64.) there is manifestly an ellipsis of a verb in the plural, either *εἰσι* or *ἦσαν*, according to the context. See Hom. Od. ξ. 93. However, the expression sometimes (as in the case of *ἡμέραι*) becomes an adverbial phrase, and afterwards an adverb. *τὸν* is omitted in very many MSS. and early Editions, and is cancelled by Matth., Griesb., and Scholz, perhaps without sufficient reason.

29. λευκὸς ἕξ.] "very dazzling white." The *ἕξ* is intensive.

MT. MK.

17. 9. Καὶ ἰδοὺ, ἄνδρες δύο συνελάλουν αὐτῶ, οἵτινες ἦσαν Μωϋσῆς καὶ 30
 3 4 Ἰλλίας· οἱ, ὀφθέντες ἐν δόξῃ, ἔλεγον τὴν ἔξοδον αὐτοῦ, ἣν ἔμελλε πλη- 31
 ροῦν ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ. Ὁ δὲ Πέτρος καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ ἦσαν βεβαρημένοι 32
 ὑπνῷ· διαγρηγορήσαντες δὲ εἶδον τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, καὶ τοὺς δύο ἄν-
 4 5 δρας τοὺς συνεσιῶτας αὐτῶ. Καὶ ἐγένετο, ἐν τῷ διαχωρίζεσθαι αὐ- 33
 5 6 * μίαν Μωϋσεῖ, καὶ μίαν Ἰλίμ· μὴ εἰδῶς ὃ λέγει. Ταῦτα δὲ αὐτοῦ 34
 7 λέγοντος, ἐγένετο νεφέλη καὶ ἐπέσκιασεν αὐτούς· ἐφοβήθησαν δὲ ἐν τῷ
 ἐκείνους εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν νεφέλην· καὶ φωνὴ ἐγένετο ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης, 35
 λέγουσα· Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός· αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε. καὶ, 36
 ἐν τῷ γενέσθαι τὴν φωνήν, εὐρέθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς μόνος. καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐσίγησαν,
 καὶ οὐδεὶς ἀπήγγειλαν ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις οὐδὲν ὧν ἐώρακασιν.

Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῇ ἐξῆς ἡμέρᾳ, κατελθόντων αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους, 37
 συνήνησεν αὐτῷ ὄχλος πολὺς. Καὶ ἰδοὺ, ἀνὴρ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου ἀνεβό- 38
 ησε, λέγων· Διδάσκαλε, δέομαί σου * ἐπιβλέψαι ἐπὶ τὸν υἱόν μου, ὅτι
 μορογενής ἐστί μοι· καὶ ἰδοὺ, πνεῦμα λαμβάνει αὐτόν, καὶ ἐξαίφνης 39
 κολάζει, καὶ σπαράσσει αὐτόν μετὰ ἄφρονος, καὶ μόγις ἀποχωρεῖ ἀπ’
 αὐτοῦ, συνηρίβον αὐτόν. Καὶ ἐδεήθη τῶν μαθητῶν σου, ἵνα ἐκβά- 40
 λωσιν αὐτό, καὶ οὐκ ἠδυνήθησαν. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· 41
 Ὡ γενεὰ ἄπιστος καὶ διεστραμμένη! ἕως πότε ἔσομαι πρὸς ὑμῖς,
 καὶ ἀνεξομαί ὑμῶν; προσάγμε τὸν υἱόν σου ὧδε. Ἔτι δὲ προσε- 42
 χομένου αὐτοῦ, ἔρῳξεν αὐτόν τὸ δαιμόνιον καὶ συνεσπάρμαξεν· ἐπε-
 τίμησε δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ, καὶ ἴασατο τὸν παῖδα·
 καὶ ἀπέδωκεν αὐτόν τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ. ἔξεπλήσοντο δὲ πῶντες ἐπὶ τῇ 43
 μεγαλειότητι τοῦ Θεοῦ. Πάντων δὲ θιναμαζώτων ἐπὶ πᾶσιν, οἷς ἐποί-

30. ὀφθέντες ἐν δ.] “appearing with a resplendent light.” See supra ii. 9.

31. τὴν ἔξοδον.] This word often signifies a *military expedition*, both in the Scriptural and Classical writers. Hence some have imagined that it here figuratively represents the *contest* our Lord was afterwards to maintain against the rebellious Jews, on his advent at the destruction of Jerusalem. But this is neither warranted by the words, nor permitted by the context. The best Commentators since the time of Grot. are agreed, that *ἔξοδος* is here used to denote *death*; by a euphemism common both in the Scriptural and Classical writers, and indeed found in every language; and which is justly considered among the allusions that have preserved that most ancient of traditions, the immortality of the soul.

32. [Comp. Dan. viii. 13, x. 9.]

33. μίαν Μωϋσεῖ.] This, instead of Μωϋσεῖ μίαν, is found in almost all the best MSS. and Versions, with the Edit. Princ.; and has been rightly edited by Matth., Griesb., Vat., and Scholz.

35. [Comp. Matt. iii. 17. Mark i. 11. 2 Pet. i. 17.]

38. ἐπιβλέψαι.] The *textus receptus* has ἐπιβλεψόν. But almost all the best MSS. have ἐπιβλέψαι, which has been accordingly edited by Matth., Griesb., Vater, Tittm., and Scholz. Bornem., however, makes well founded objections

to that reading, as being in opposition to the *usus loquendi* of St. Luke, and he would read ἐπιβλέψαι, from some MSS., confirmed by a similar idiom in Acts xxv. 3. I have received this, because the Scribes of the other MSS. might easily mistake in so small a matter.

40. ἐκβάλωσιν.] This, for ἐκβάλλ., is edited by Matth., Griesb., and Scholz.

41. πρὸς ὑμῶν.] *apud vos*. Equivalent to the μεθ’ ὑμῶν of Matthew. The same signification is found in John i. 1. Ἀιτέζομαι ὑμῶν, “shall I bear with you.” This sense is frequent in the N. T., and sometimes occurs in the Classical writers, though with the *Accusative*.

— τὸν — ὧδε.] This (instead of ὧδε τὸν υἱόν σου) is found in almost all the best MSS., and the Ed. Pr., and is received by Matth., Griesb., Vat., and Scholz.

43. ἐπὶ τῇ μεγ. τοῦ Θεοῦ] “at the mightiness of God as manifested in Christ.” Μεγαλειότης is a word which, in Scripture, is almost appropriated to designating *Divine* power. So it is used in Acts xix. 27. of Diana; and in 2 Pet. i. 16. of Christ, thus showing Peter’s belief in the divinity of our Lord.

44. θέσθε — ὧτα ὑμῶν.] Equivalent to θέσθε εἰς τὰς καρτίας, which occurs in Luke xxi. 14. “Let these sayings sink into your ears,” i. e. attend to and lay them to heart.

- 44 ησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, εἶπε πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ· ^a Θέσθε ὑμεῖς εἰς τὰ ὧτα ὑμῶν τοὺς λόγους τούτους· ὁ γὰρ ἦχος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου μέλλει
 45 παραδίδοσθαι εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων· ^b Οἱ δὲ ἠγνόουν τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο, καὶ ἦν παρακαλυμμένον ἀπ' αὐτῶν, ἵνα μὴ αἰσθῶνται αὐτὸ· καὶ ἐφοβοῦντο ἐρωτῆσαι αὐτὸν περὶ τοῦ ῥήματος τούτου.
- 46 Ἐἰσῆλθε δὲ διαλογισμὸς ἐν αὐτοῖς, τὸ, τίς ἂν εἶη μείζων αὐτῶν.
- 47 Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἰδὼν τὸν διαλογισμὸν τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν, ἐπιλαβόμενος παιδίου, ἔστησεν αὐτὸ παρ' ἑαυτῶ, ^d καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Ὅς ἂν δέξηται τοῦτο τὸ παιδίον ἐπὶ τῶ ὀνοματί μου, ἐμὲ δέχεται· καὶ ὅς ἂν ἐμὲ δέξηται, δέχεται τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με. Ὁ γὰρ μικρότερος ἐν πᾶσιν ὑμῶν ὑπάρχων, οὗτος ἔσται μέγας.
- 49 Ἐποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰωάννης εἶπεν· Ἐπιστάτα, εἰδομέν τινα ἐπὶ τῶ ὀνοματί σου ἐκβάλλοντα [τὰ] δαιμόνια· καὶ ἐκολύσαμεν αὐτὸν, οὗ
 50 οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ μεθ' ἡμῶν. ^e Καὶ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Μὴ κωλύετε· ὅς γὰρ οὐκ ἔστι καθ' ἡμῶν, ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἔστιν.
- 51 ἘΓΕΝΕΤΟ δὲ ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ἀναλήψεως αὐτοῦ, καὶ αὐτὸς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἐστήριξε τοῦ πορευέσθαι εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ. Καὶ ἀπέστειλεν ἀγγέλους πρὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ· καὶ πορευθέντες εἰσῆλθον εἰς κώμην Σαμαρειτῶν, ὥστε ἐτοιμάσαι αὐτῶ.

a Matt. 16. 21. & 17. 22.
 Mark 9. 31.
 infr. 18. 32.
 Acts 1. 23.
 b Supr. 2. 50.
 infr. 18. 34.
 Mark 9. 32.

c Matt. 18. 1.
 Mark 9. 33.
 infr. 22. 24.

d Matt. 18. 5.
 Mark 9. 37.
 infr. 10. 16.
 John. 1. 25.
 Matt. 23. 11.
 infr. 14. 11.
 & 18. 14.

e Mark 9. 38.

f Matt. 12. 30.
 Mark. 9. 40.
 infr. 11. 23.

g Mark 16. 15.
 Acts 1. 2.

45. [ἵνα μὴ αἰσθ.] The best Commentators are agreed, that *ἵνα* is for *ὥστε*, *adeo ut*, *insomuch that*, a very frequent sense. The sense is: "And it was hidden (i. e. obscure) to them, so that they did not understand it." "They understood (says Kuin.) the words of Christ, but were at a loss how to reconcile them with their preconceived opinion, (founded on their own traditions) that the Messiah should *live for ever*, or with the great things they expected from him." These prejudices, in after ages, led to the *distinction* made by the Rabbins between *Messiah Ben Joseph*, who was to die, and *Messiah Ben David*, who was to triumph and live for ever. See Whitby. Some recent Commentators have endeavoured (after Campb.) to revive the interpretation of the early Translators; who take *ἵνα* in the ordinary sense to the end that, as expressing something *intentional*. And it is not to be denied, that predictions were sometimes intentionally expressed darkly, that they might not be thoroughly understood. But that principle must not be unnecessarily called in. Campb. justly admits, that "if the Evangelists had employed an *adjective* (as *κρυπτὰ*) for the past participle, *ἵνα* might better have been interpreted *so that*." If, however, no *better* reason can be given for the other interpretation than *that*, it cannot stand; for what is so common as the use of a past participle for an adjective? Are there not hundreds of past participles in both the ancient and modern languages used as adjectives, and a still greater number of adjectives which were once past participles, but have ceased to be such, and have become purely adjectives?

46. τὰ, τίς, &c.] This use of τὰ, in reference not to a *noun*, but to a *sentence*, or part of a sentence, is almost peculiar to St. Luke, though it occurs also in Matt. xix. 19, and Mark ix. 23. (Campb.) In fact, the neuter Article (to use the words of Winer, Gr. Gr. p. 54.) "stands before all propositions which are cited as pro-

verbs, or maxims, or which on account of their importance require to be made distinctly prominent."

49. τὰ.] This is omitted in very many MSS., and is cancelled by Matth., Griesb., and Scholz. But the case is doubtful; for Critical reasons may be adduced both ways.

—οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ μεθ' ἡμῶν.] The sense is, "does not belong to our company of disciples," "is not our fellow disciple." The phrase is supposed to have been formed from the custom of the Jewish Doctors (like that of the Greek Philosophers), of being accompanied by their disciples wherever they went. But it is found also in the Classical writers. See Lobbeck on Phrynicus, p. 353, sq.

50. ὅς γὰρ — ἡμῶν.] See Note on Mark ix. 40.

51. συμπλ. τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ἀναλ. α.] Συμπληροῦσθαι, when used of *time*, denotes such a completion of a period between two given periods as that the latter is *fully come*. Here it is, as often, taken *populariter*; an event being thus spoken of as *come*, when it is *very near at hand*. On the sense of ἀναλήψεως the Commentators are not agreed. Some take it to signify a *removal*, others a *lifting up*, i. e. on the cross: interpretations alike inadmissible. The true one is, no doubt, that of the Syr. and Arab., Euthym., Beza, De Dieu, Grot., and others down to Rosenm., Kuin., Schleus., and Wahl, who understand it of our Lord's *ascension into heaven*. The *noun*, indeed, does not elsewhere occur either in the N. T. or the LXX. except in 2 Kings ii. 11. of the translation of Enoch; but the *verb ἀναλαμβάνειν* is often used to denote Christ's ascension, ex. g. Acts i. 2; ii. 23. 1 Tim. iii. 16. An ἀνάληψις occurs in Test. xii. Patr. in Fabric. Cod. Pseud. i. p. 585, and in the name of a Treatise, called ἀνάληψις Μωϋσέως.

—τὸ πρόσωπον α. ἐστήριξε.] This is best explained as a Hebraism formed from פָּנָי פָּנָי, which often in the Sept. denotes to firmly determine and resolve. So the Pers. Vers. renders "positum

h John 4. 4, 9. ^h Καὶ οὐκ ἐδέξαντο αὐτὸν, ὅτι τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἦν πορευόμενον εἰς 53
 2 Kings 1. 10, 12. ^h Ἱερουσαλήμ. ⁱ Ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ Ἰακώβος καὶ Ἰωάννης 54
 εἶπρον· Κύριε, θέλεις εἰπωμεν πῦρ καταβῆναι ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ
 ἀναλῶσαι αὐτούς, ὡς καὶ Ἥλιος ἐποίησε; στραφεὶς δὲ ἐπειτίμησεν αὐ- 55
 k John 3. 17. & 12. 47. τοῖς, καὶ εἶπεν· Οὐκ οἰδατε οἶον πνεύματός ἐστε ἡμεῖς; [^k ὁ γὰρ 56
 τὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἦλθε ψυχὰς ἀνθρώπων ἀπολέσαι, ἀλλὰ σῶσαι.]
 MT. καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν εἰς ἐτέραν κώμην.
 S. 19 Ἐγένετο δὲ, πορευομένων αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, εἶπέ τις πρὸς αὐτόν· 57
 20 Ἀκολουθήσω σοι ὅπου ἂν ἀπέρχῃ, κύριε. Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· 58
 Αἱ ἀλώπεκες φωλεοὺς ἔχουσι, καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταικηνώ-
 21 σεις· ὁ δὲ Τὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἔχει πού τὴν κεφαλὴν κλίην.
 22 Εἶπε δὲ πρὸς ἕτερον· Ἀκολουθεῖ μοι. ὁ δὲ εἶπε· Κύριε, ἐπίτρεψόν μοι
 μοι ἀπελθόντι πρῶτον θάψαι τὸν πατέρα μου. Εἶπε δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰη- 60
 σοῦς· Ἄφες τοὺς νεκροὺς θάψαι τοὺς ἑαυτῶν νεκροὺς· σὺ δὲ ἀπελ-
 11 Kings 19. 20. θὼν διᾶγγελλε τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ. ¹ Εἶπε δὲ καὶ ἕτερος· Ἀκο- 61
 λουθήσω σοι, κύριε· πρῶτον δὲ ἐπίτρεψόν μοι ἀποτάξασθαι τοῖς εἰς
 τὸν οἶκόν μου. Εἶπε δὲ πρὸς αὐτόν ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Οὐδεὶς ἐπιβαλὼν τὴν 62
 χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἐπ' ἄροτρον, καὶ βλέπων εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω, εὐθετός ἐστιν εἰς
 τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ.

X. *META* δὲ ταῦτα ἀνέδειξεν ὁ Κύριος καὶ ἑτέρους ἑβδομήκοντα, 1
 καὶ ἀπέστειλεν αὐτοὺς ἀνὰ δύο πρὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ, εἰς πᾶσαν πόλιν

firmum fecit;” and Valckn., “firmiter animo destinavit.”

53. ὅτι τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἦν πορευόμενον, &c.] This phrase is Hebraic (so in 2 Sam. xvii. 11. ךרבר הלכתי בדרך), which is rendered by the LXX. καὶ τὸ πρόσωπόν σου πορευόμενον ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν), and the sense is, “when they knew that he was travelling to Jerusalem.”

54. ἀναλῶσαι] “to destroy.” This signification is common both in the Scriptural and Classical writers, and is applied to destruction by fire, in Gen. xli. 30. Ez. v. 12. On the wide difference between the case adverted to by the Apostles and their own, see Grot. and Whitby.

55. οὐκ οἰδατε — ἐστε.] Most recent Commentators take this sentence *interrogatively*, rendering, “know ye not with what spirit and disposition ye ought to be actuated [as my disciples]?” The ancient and the earlier modern ones take it *declaratively*, “Ye know not with what disposition ye are actuated [and whither it would hurry you];” ye do not consider the unsuitableness of what ye propose. The latter interpretation is preferable; for the former certainly does some violence to the words by making ἐστε mean “ye ought to be.” The whole clause, and the introductory words καὶ εἶπεν are omitted in many MSS., Versions, and Fathers, and are suspected by some Editors not to be genuine; but without cause. There is no more reason to suspect the genuineness of this clause than of the preceding. The MSS. in which the latter is not found, are, with very few exceptions, the same as omit the former. And there is little doubt but that in these MSS. the words were omitted by the carelessness of the Scribes; whose blunder, I suspect, was occasioned by the two καὶ’s, each of which probably com-

menced a line in the very ancient originals of the Uncial MSS.

61. ἀποτάξασθαι τοῖς, &c.] Heins. and Doddr. apply the words to the man’s possessions, supposing an ellipse of κρίμασι; and they take the sense to be, “to arrange and settle my affairs.” But this is very harsh. The common interpretation, by which τοῖς εἰς τὸν οἶκόν μου is taken for τοῖς οἰκείοις, yields a sense so simple and natural, that we cannot doubt its truth. And of the sense to bid farewell in ἀπορ. abundant examples have been adduced by Kypke.

62. οὐδεὶς ἐπιβαλὼν — Θεοῦ.] We have here an admonition couched under a figure derived from the ploughman; who must keep his eyes intent on his work, and not permit them to be turned away to any other object, otherwise his labour will be fruitless. See Hesiod. Op. D. ii. 61. and Theocr. Id. 10. init. Ἐπιβάλλαν χεῖρά τιναῖς is often used of undertaking any work. The ἀπόδοσις (as Grot. remarks) is here (as often) mingled with the comparison. Turning back implies inattention, or preference to some other employment than that we are engaged in. So Lucian. Catapl. cited by Wets. ἐπιστρέφονται γοῶν εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω, ὡσπερ οἱ ἄστροντες. Similar is the Pythagorean maxim in Simplic. on Epict. 332. cited by Grot. εἰς τὸ ἑρὸν ἀπερχόμενος μὴ ἐπιστρέφου.

X. 1. ἀνέδειξεν — καὶ ἑτέρους] “appointed seventy others also.” i. e. besides the Apostles. Some few MSS., Versions, and Fathers, read ἐβλ. ἑβδο. But their authority is weak; and I suspect that the B was derived from the K following. Those two letters are in MSS. written in the uncial character, frequently confounded. Some, however, are of opinion that 70 is a round number for 72, the number, they say, of the Elders

2 καὶ τόπον οὗ ἔμελλεν αὐτὸς ἔρχεσθαι. ^m ἤλεγεν οὖν πρὸς αὐτούς· ^m Matt. 9. 37.
 Ὁ μὲν θειρισμὸς πολλὸς, οἱ δὲ ἐργάται ὀλίγοι· δεήθητε οὖν τοῦ κυ-
 ρίου τοῦ θειρισμοῦ, ὅπως ἐκβάλῃ ἐργάτας εἰς τὸν θειρισμὸν αὐτοῦ. ^{John 4. 35.}
 3 ⁿ Ὑπάγετε· ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω ὑμᾶς ὡς ἄγρας ἐν μέσῳ λύκων. ^{2 Thess. 3. 1.}
 4 ^o Μὴ βαστάζετε βυλάντιον, μὴ πήραν, μηδὲ ὑποδήματα· καὶ μηδένα ^o Matt. 10. 9,
 5 κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ἀσπάσθητε. ^p Εἰς ἣν δ' ἂν οἰκίαν εἰσέρχησθε, πρῶ-
 6 τον λέγετε· Εἰρήνη τῷ οἴκῳ τούτῳ. καὶ ἐὰν [μὲν] ἢ ἐκεῖ [ὄ] ^o Matt. 10. 9,
 υἱὸς εἰρήνης, ἐπαναπαύσεται ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἢ εἰρήνη ὑμῶν· εἰ δὲ μήγε, ^{supr. 9. 3.}
 7 ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἀνακάμψει. ^q Ἐν αὐτῇ δὲ τῇ οἰκίᾳ μένετε, ἐσθίοντες καὶ ^{& 22. 35.}
 πίνοντες τὰ παρ' αὐτῶν· ἄξιός γάρ ὁ ἐργάτης τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐστί. ^{Mark 6. 8.}
 8 μὴ μετιβαίνετε ἐξ οἰκίας εἰς οἰκίαν. Καὶ εἰς ἣν δ' ἂν πόλιν εἰσέρ- ^{2 Kings 4. 29.}
 9 χησθε, καὶ δέξονται ὑμᾶς, ἐσθίετε τὰ παρατιθέμενα ὑμῖν, ^p καὶ θερα- ^p Matt. 10. 12.
 πεύετε τοὺς ἐν αὐτῇ ἀσθενεῖς, καὶ λέγετε αὐτοῖς· Ἦγγικεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς, ^{Mark 6. 10.}
 10 ἢ βουσιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ. ^s Εἰς ἣν δ' ἂν πόλιν εἰσέρχησθε, καὶ μὴ δέ- ^q Lev. 19. 13.
 11 χωνται ὑμᾶς, ἐξελθόντες εἰς τὰς πλατείας αὐτῆς, εἶπατε· Καὶ τὸν ^{Deut. 24. 14.}
 κοινοσητὸν τὸν κολληθέντα ἡμῖν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ὑμῶν ἀπομασσομέθα ^{& 25. 4.}
 ὑμῖν. Πλὴν τοῦτο γνώσκετε, ὅτι ἤγγικεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βουσιλεία τοῦ ^{Matt. 10. 10.}
 12 Θεοῦ. Λέγω [δέ] ὑμῖν, ὅτι Σοδόμοις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἀνεκτότερον ^{1 Cor. 9. 4.}
 13 ἔσται, ἢ τῇ πόλει ἐκείνῃ. Οὐαὶ σοι, Χοραζῖν! οὐαὶ σοι, Βηθσαῦδά! ^{et seqq.}
 ὅτι εἰ ἐν Τύρῳ καὶ Σιδῶνι ἐγένοντο αἱ δυνάμεις αἱ γενόμεναι ἐν ὑμῖν, ^{1 Tim. 5. 18.}
MT. 11. 21

selected by Moses as his colleagues in the government of the people, and of the Jewish Sanhedrim, as also the Translators of the Sept. But in the first case *seventy* was the number; and of the rest there is reason to think that not 72, but 70, was the real number.

2. οὖν.] Some ancient MSS. read *εἰ*, which is thought to be confirmed by most of the Versions, and it is placed in the inner margin by Griesb., and received into the text by Lachmann. But rashly—for it is a mere alteration of the Alexandrian school. The Critics stumbled, it seems, at this rather unusual sense of *οὖν*, by which it has a *resumptive*, or *continuative* force, and may be rendered *porro*, as in 1 Cor. viii. 4. See Schleus. Lex. in v. § 3.

—ἐκβάλλει.] This, for ἐκβάλλει, is found in very many MSS. and early Edd., and is received by almost all Editors from Matth. to Scholz. On the sense see Note on Matt. ix. 38.

4. μὴ — ἀσπάσθητε.] i. e. do not indulge in merely complimentary or courteous addresses, to the neglect of the weightier concerns of your sacred office.

6. μὲν.] This is omitted in most of the ancient MSS., and in several Versions, Fathers, and early Edd., and is cancelled by Wets., Matth., Griesb., Tittm., Vat., and Scholz. It was probably inserted to complete the apodosis. The Article *ὁ* is omitted in almost all the best MSS., some Fathers, and nearly all the early Edd. I suspect that it crept, by an error of the press, into the 5th edition of Erasmus, and consequently was introduced into the 3d of Stephens, where it is found. Therefore, it could not, as some imagine, be a mere conjecture of Beza. It is true he considered the Article as indispensable: in which he was so far mistaken, that the Article can by no means be tolerated; the regimen (as Middl. ob-

serves) not permitting it, this being one of those numerous cases, in which *υἱὸς* (by Hebraism) is put before a Genitive to indicate the relation of *possession*, or *resemblance*, *participation*, &c., as in Luke xvi. 8. *υἱὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου*. Matt. xxiii. 15. *υἱὸς τῆς γενεῆς*. 1 Thess. v. 5. *υἱὸς τοῦ πατρὸς*, &c. The sense is, “one deserving of your blessing.”

7. τὰ παρ' αὐτῶν] scil. παρατιθέμενα. See Bos Ell. “*Ἄξιός γάρ ἐστι*.” The full sense is, “[And this ye may freely do.] for the labourer is worthy of his hire;” as much as to say, “ye will earn your support by your labour for the spiritual good of your hosts.” *Μὴ μεταβαίνετε — οἰκίαν*, literally, “do not change your lodgings, by going from house to house.”

11. ἀπομασσομέθα ὑμῖν.] Render, “we wipe off unto you,” i. e. we return it back to you; a form of giving up all intercourse. “*Ἐφ' ὑμᾶς* is by almost all Commentators supposed to mean, “against you,” “to your harm.” But that sense cannot be admitted. All that is meant seems to be this, that the same solemn message is to be delivered unto them, whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear. Render, “But (or however) know ye this, (i. e. receive this our testimony) that the kingdom,” &c. Griesb. indeed cancels *ἐφ' ὑμᾶς*, from some MSS. But they are so few in number, as to have little weight. Nay, we might suspect the words to be omitted by accident; but that it seems more probable that they were cancelled by the Critics, from mere fastidiousness, in order to remove what they thought a tautological repetition.

12. δέ.] This is omitted in very many MSS., most of them ancient, and several Versions, and early Edd., and is cancelled by Matth., Griesb., Tittm., and Scholz. But the formula is almost always accompanied with some conjunction. And *perspicuity* here would require one.

MT.

11.

22
23

πάλαι ἂν ἐν σάκκῳ καὶ σποδῷ καθήμεναι μετενόησαν. Πλὴν Τύρω 14
καὶ Σιδῶνι ἀνεκτότερον ἔσται ἐν τῇ κρίσει, ἢ ὑμῖν. Καὶ σὺ, Καπερ- 15
ναοῦμ, ἢ ἕως τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὑψωθείσα, ἕως ἕδου καταβιβασθήσῃ. Ὁ 16
ἀκούων ὑμῶν ἐμοῦ ἀκούει, καὶ ὁ ἀθετῶν ὑμᾶς ἐμὲ ἀθετεῖ· ὁ δὲ ἐμὲ
ἀθετῶν ἀθετεῖ τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με. Ἐπίστρεψαν δὲ οἱ ἐβδομήκοντα 17
μετὰ χαρᾶς, λέγοντες· Κύριε, καὶ τὰ δαιμόνια ὑποτάσσεται ἡμῖν ἐν
τῷ ὀνόματί σου. Ἐῖπε δὲ αὐτοῖς· Ἐθεώρουν τὸν Σατανᾶν ὡς ἄστρα- 18

† Rev. 12. 8, 9.

u Mark 16. 18.

Acts 23. 5.

z Exod. 32. 32.

Isa. 4. 3.

Dan. 12. 1.

Phil. 4. 3.

Rev. 13. 8.

MT.

11.

25

πὴν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πεσόντα. Ἰδοὺ, δίδωμι ὑμῖν τὴν ἐξουσίαν τοῦ 19
πατιῶν ἐπάνω ὄφρων καὶ σκορπίων, καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ
ἐχθροῦ· καὶ οὐδὲν ὑμᾶς οὐ μὴ ἀδικήσῃ. Ἐπὶ πλὴν ἐν τούτῳ μὴ χαί- 20
ρετε, ὅτι τὰ πνεύματα ὑμῖν ὑποτάσσεται· χαίρετε δὲ [μᾶλλον], ὅτι
τὰ ὀνόματα ὑμῶν ἐγράφη ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. Ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ ἡγαλλι- 21
άσατο τῷ πνεύματι ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν· Ἐξομολογοῦμαι σοι, Πάτερ,
Κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς, ὅτι ἀπέκρυψας ταῦτα ἀπὸ σοφῶν 22
καὶ συνετῶν, καὶ ἀπεκάλυψας αὐτὰ νηπίοις. καὶ, ὁ Πατὴρ, ὅτι οὕτως
ἐγένετο εὐδοκία ἐμπροσθέν σου. Ἐπὶ πάντα παρεδόθη μοι ὑπὸ τοῦ 22

26

27

y Paul. 8. 7.

Heb. 2. 8.

Matt. 11. 27.

z Ps. 18.

John 3. 35.

z 17. 2.

1 Cor. 15. 27.

Eph. 1. 21, 22.

Phil. 2. 9.

John 1. 18.

z 6. 46.

z 14. 8, 9.

r Matt. 13. 16.

1 Pet. 1. 10.

a Matt. 22. 35.

Mark 12. 25.

b Deut. 5. 5.

z 10. 12.

z 30. 6.

Lev. 19. 18.

Rom. 13. 9.

Gal. 5. 14.

James 2. 8.

Πατρός μου· καὶ οὐδεὶς γινώσκει τίς ἐστίν ὁ Υἱός, εἰ μὴ ὁ Πατὴρ,
καὶ τίς ἐστίν ὁ Πατὴρ, εἰ μὴ ὁ Υἱός, καὶ ὃ ἐὰν βούληται ὁ Υἱός
ἀποκαλύψαι. Ἐπὶ σιγαφείς πρὸς τοὺς μαθητάς κατ' ἰδίαν εἶπε· 23
Μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ οἱ βλέποντες ἃ βλέπετε. λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, ὅτι 24
πολλοὶ προφητῶν καὶ βασιλεῖς ἠθέλησαν ἰδεῖν ἃ ὑμεῖς βλέπετε, καὶ οὐκ
εἶδον· καὶ ἀκοῦσαι ἃ ἀκούετε, καὶ οὐκ ἤκουσαν.

Ἐπὶ ἰδοὺ, νομικός τις ἀνέστη, ἐκπειροῦζων αὐτὸν, καὶ λέγων· Δι- 25
δάσκαλε, τί ποιήσας ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω; Ὁ δὲ εἶπε πρὸς 26
αὐτόν· Ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τί γέγραπται; πῶς ἀγαγινώσκεις; Ὁ δὲ 27
ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν· Ἀγαπήσεις Κύριον τὸν Θεόν σου ἐξ

13. ἐν σάκκῳ — καθήμεναι.] This posture of mourning and repentance was in use not only among the Eastern. but the Western nations of antiquity. See Kypke in Recens. Syn.

18. Ἐθεώρουν τὸν Σ., &c.] The best Commentators are agreed that this is a bold and figurative mode of expression, anticipating the future triumph of the Gospel over the powers of darkness. So Bp. Warburton, Sermon. xxvii. says "it is a lively picture of the sudden precipitation of the Prince of the air, where he had so long held his empire; and hung, like a pestilential meteor, over the sons of men;" and that, as being exalted to heaven imports widely spread dominion, so falling from heaven denotes a fall from eminence and power. A kindred expression occurs in Is. xiv. 12. See also John xii. 31. Ephes. vi. 12. Nor is it without example in the Classical writers. Thus Cicero Epist. Att. ii. says of Pompey, "ex astris decidisse."

19. I would not, with many recent Commentators, regard this as merely a figurative mode of expression, importing that they should be delivered, by Divine assistance, from the greatest perils; but take it in the literal acceptation. See Note on Mark xvi. 17. Some Commentators here recognise another figure expressive of safety from men as deadly in their hostility as serpents and scorpions. See more in Recens. Synop. In Kat

οὐδὲν — ἀδικήσῃ there is an intensive accumulation of negatives. See Matt. xxiv. 21. and Note. Something similar occurs in Lucian Pisc. § 19. οὐδὲν οὐ μὴ γίνεσθαι ἄδικον, Δικαιοσύνης συμπαροσῆς.

20. πλὴν] *attamen*. Ὅτι τὰ ὀνόματα, &c. The best Commentators are agreed that there is here an allusion to the methods of human polity; future life being represented under the image of a temporal πολιτεύμα; in which the names of citizens were inscribed in a book, from which were occasionally expunged the names of those persons who were thought unworthy, and who thereby lost the *jus civitatis*. The same image is frequent in the O. T., and sometimes occurs in the N. T.; nor is it rare in the Classical writers.

Μᾶλλον is omitted in very many MSS., Versions, Fathers, and early Edd., and is cancelled by almost all Editors, rightly, I think.

21. ἡγαλλιάσατο τῷ πν.] Here we have the same rapturous expressions of praise and thanksgiving, as on the return of the twelve Apostles from executing the same commission. See Note on Matt. xi. 25, 27. and xiii. 16. and comp. Is. xxxix. 14. 1 Cor. i. 19. 26.

25. et seqq. See Grot., Whitby, and Doddr., and the notes on a kindred narration in Matt. xxii. 36.

27. ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας — διανοίας.] Vorst. considers these as Hellenistic phrases: while Valckn.

ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου, καὶ
 ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ἰσχύος σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς διανοίας σου.
 28 καὶ τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτὸν. Ἐἶπε δὲ αὐτῷ Ὁρθῶς c Lev. 18. 5. Ezek. 20. 11, 13.
 29 ἀπεκρίθη· τοῦτο ποιεῖ, καὶ ζήσῃ. Ὁ δὲ θέλων δικαιοῦν ἑαυτὸν, εἶπε
 30 πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν· Καὶ τίς ἐστὶ μου πλησίον; Ὑπολαβὼν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς
 εἶπεν· Ἄνθρωπός τις κατέβαιεν ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ εἰς Ἱεριχὼν, καὶ
 λησταῖς περιέπεσαν· οἱ καὶ ἐκδύσαντες αὐτὸν καὶ πληγὰς ἐπιθέντες
 31 ἀπῆλθον, ἀφέντες ἡμίθανῃ τυγχάνοντα. Κατὰ συγκυρίαν δὲ ἱερεὺς τις
 32 κατέβαιεν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἐκείνῃ· καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτὸν, ἀντιπαρῆλθεν. Ὁμοίως
 δὲ καὶ Λευίτης, γενόμενος κατὰ τὸν τόπον, ἐλθὼν καὶ ἰδὼν ἀντιπαρ-

and Bornem. endeavour to prove that they are Classical, by adducing examples from Arrian Dissert. on Epictetus. The truth seems to be that they were expressions of late Grecism, such as are not unfrequently found in the writers of the N. T., in common with Arrian in his Philosophical writings.

29. θέλων δικ.] i. e. wishing to excuse himself from the imputation of not having attended to the Law he taught. For the Pharisee wished to show that he had not proposed a slight, or easily solvable question; but one of importance, and difficult determination. And since πλησίον is a term of extensive application, he takes occasion, from that ambiguity, to put the question καὶ τίς ἐστὶ μου πλησίον; Jesus, however, returns an answer quite contrary to the expectation of the lawyer; and by teaching that (after the example of the Samaritan who had deserved so well of the Jew) even to strangers, foreigners, and enemies, were to be extended the offices of humanity and kindness, he left the Pharisee nothing to answer." (Kuin.)

— τίς ἐστὶ μου πλησίον;] literally, who is near to me, i. e. neighbour. Bp. Middl. has shown how it is, that the Article can here be dispensed with; namely, from the vicinity of the same word with the Article, and in the sense neighbour. This use of δ πλησίον has before been illustrated in the Notes on Matt. and Mark. And the expression may, in this sense, be defined, any one of our fellow-creatures, with whom we are in any way connected, whether in respect of country, religion, or political institutions.

“ Homo sum: nihil humani a me alienum puto.”

30. ὑπολαβὼν] Sub. τὸν λόγον, which ellipse is supplied in Herodot. iii. 146. Render, “taking him up,” i. e. “answering;” a signification common both to the Scriptural and Hellenistic, and also to the Classical writers. So the Latin *excipere* and *suscipere*. It is well observed by Kuin., that in the best Classical writers ὑπολαβὼν is joined to εἶπεν, when any one interrupts the speaker, and so answers him as to take exception at, reprehend, or at least circumscribe, or correct, any position laid down by the other; in which case the word is not redundant. Thus it here seems to convey, by implication, an intimation that he had not, as he thought, thoroughly kept the moral law. It was, indeed, (as Gilpin says), the impossibility of doing this, which made a Saviour necessary. Wakef. and Campb. connect ἄνθρωπος closely with ἀπὸ Ἱερ., remarking, that the whole energy of the story depends on the opposition between the Jew and the Samaritan. But such a transposition would be very harsh, and indeed

unnecessary; since, considering how very little Judæa was frequented by foreigners, it might very well be implied, that a person travelling from Jerusalem to Jericho would be a Jew. He could not be a Samaritan, because Samaritans were never allowed to go to Jerusalem. Κατέβαιεν has reference to the situation of Jericho as compared with Jerusalem, the latter being on a hill, and the former on low ground. Περιπίπτειν signifies 1. to fall on. 2. to happen upon, fall in with, generally of things, but sometimes of persons; and almost always implying evil.

The phrase πληγὰς ἐπιθέναι is found also in Acts xvi. 23., and occasionally in the Fathers; but never in the Classical writers; so that it is supposed to be a Latinism formed from the phrase *imponere plagas*. Yet we find in 2 Maccab. iii. 26. πολλὰς ἐπιθήπτουτες αὐτῷ πληγὰς. Ἡμιθανῆ; is the ordinary Greek form for the Attic ἡμιθνής. Yet I suspect that it was the more ancient form, and the other an Attic contraction.

31. κατὰ συγκυρίαν.] The Classical writers not unfrequently use κατὰ συντυχίαν; but never κατὰ συγκυρίαν; and indeed they rarely use συγκυρία. Inasmuch that we might suppose it to be entirely Hellenistic, did it not occur several times in Hippocrates. Hence it appears to have been a very ancient word; and the phrase κατὰ συγκυρίαν was probably early in use, but afterwards supplanted by κατὰ συντυχίαν. Yet it maintained, it seems, a place in the popular diction even to the time of Eustathius.

31. ἀντιπαρῆλθεν.] The exact sense of this term is not clear. It cannot well be that commonly assigned to it, “passed by on the other or farther side;” i. e. by getting out of the road. Most recent Commentators consider the ἀντι as pleonastic. But that is declining the difficulty. I should be inclined to think with Grot., that it might mean, “passed by going the contrary way;” i. e. from Jerusalem to Jericho. But that is forbidden by the κατέβαιεν; neither would that circumstance be to the purpose. It should seem that ἀντι here means over against, which, indeed, I believe to be its original sense; it being, no doubt, for [ἐν] ἀντι, from the old word ἀντις, whence the common term ἐναντι. Thus the sense is, “He passed by right over against him;” and not at some distance off, as travellers might do, for in such a desert as that whole tract was, it is not likely that there should be any regular inclosed road. The term ἀντιπαρέχουμαι occurs also in the LXX. once.

32. ἐλθὼν καὶ ἰδὼν.] The ἐλθὼν is not redundant, but shows that the Levite did more than the

ἤλθε. Σαμαρείτης δὲ τις, ὀδεύων, ἤλθε καὶ αὐτὸν, καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτὸν 33
 ἐσπλαγχνίσθη. καὶ προσελθὼν κατέδησε τὰ τραύματα αὐτοῦ, ἐπιχέων 34
 ἔλαιον καὶ οἶνον, ἐπιβιδάσας δὲ αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸ ἴδιον κτῆνος, ἤγαγεν
 αὐτὸν εἰς πανδοχεῖον, καὶ ἐπεμελήθη αὐτοῦ. Καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν αὐτίον ἐξ- 35
 ελθὼν, ἐκβαλὼν δύο δηνάρια ἔδωκε τῷ πανδοχεῖ, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Ἐπιμε-
 λήθητι αὐτοῦ· καὶ ὅτι ἂν προσδαπανήσης, ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ ἐπανέρχεσθαί με
 ἀποδώσω σοι. Τίς οὖν τούτων τῶν τριῶν δοκεῖ σοι πλησίον γεγενῆσθαι 36
 τοῦ ἐμπεσόντος εἰς τοὺς ληστής; Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν· Ὁ ποιήσας τὸ ἔλεος 37
 μετ' αὐτοῦ. Εἶπεν οὖν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Πορεύου καὶ σὺ ποιεῖ ὁμοίως.

d John 11. 1.
 & 12. 2, 3.

e Acts 22. 3.

^d ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ δὲ, ἐν τῷ πορεύεσθαι αὐτοῦ, καὶ αὐτὸς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς 38
 κώμην τινά· γυνή δὲ τις ὀνόματι Μάρθα ὑπέδειξεν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν
 οἶκον αὐτῆς. * Καὶ τῆδε ἦν ἀδελφή καλομένη Μαρία, ἣ καὶ παρα- 39
 καθίσασα παρὰ τοὺς πόδας τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἤκουε τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ. Ἡ 40
 δὲ Μάρθα περιεσπᾶτο περὶ πολλὴν διακονίαν· ἐπιστάσα δὲ εἶπε·
 Κύριε, οὐ μέλει σοι ὅτι ἡ ἀδελφή μου μόνην με κατέλιπε διακονεῖν;
 εἰπέ οὖν αὐτῇ ἵνα μοι συναντιλάβηται. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῇ 41
 ὁ Ἰησοῦς· * Μάρθα Μάρθα, μεριμνᾷς καὶ τρῶβάζῃ περὶ πολλά· ἐνὸς 42

Priest. The latter only cast a passing glance; the former also went towards him.

34. κατέδησε.] A surgical term, occurring also in Xen. Cyr. v. and Ecclus. xvii. 31., and signifying to apply bandages to hold down the lips of a wound. The use of oil and wine, both separately, and as a mixture called *οἰνέλαιον*, is established by the citations of Wets. from the ancient Medical writers. Here, however, they may be best understood as used *separately*; the *wine* to wash the wound and staunch the blood, and the *oil* to allay the pain. The oil (which in that country is very generous) was, no doubt, intended for *anointing*; and the antiquity of the custom of carrying oil on a journey is (as Schoettg. observes) shown by the case of Jacob in the O. T.

— κτῆνος.] This corresponds to our general term *beast*, whether horse, mule, or ass. It was probably an ass. Πανδοχεῖον denotes a *public hostelry*, such as are still known in the East by the name *khan*. The word is said to occur only in the later writers; yet I find something very much like it in Æschyl. Choeph. 649. Σκοτεινόν· ὦρα δ' ἐμπόρους μεθίεναι ἀγκυρᾶν ἐν δόμοισι πανδοχείοις ξένων.

35. ἐκβαλὼν] “having cast down, put down, or disbursed.” The *two denaria* were (as I have observed in Recens. Synop.) equivalent to two days' wages of a labourer. See Matt. xx. 9. Ἐπιμελεῖσθαι was a term appropriated to the *nursing* and *care* of the sick and wounded, as distinct from medical or surgical attendance.

37. ὁ ποιήσας — αὐτοῦ] “he who exercised benevolence towards him.” A Hebraism. See Notes on Luke i. 53 & 72.

38. κώμην τ.] namely, Bethany. See John xii. 1. In the phrase ὑπέδειξεν αὐτὸν εἰς οἶκον is implied hospitable entertainment. The words εἰς τὸν οἶκον are very rarely added in the Classical writers; yet in Hom. Od. xvi. 70. we have the equivalent phrase ὑπέδειχμαι οἶκον.

39. καὶ] also, i. e. as well as the disciples. Παρακάθισσα, “having seated herself.” That the phrase itself, and the custom of *sitting* as a posture of instruction, was not unknown to the

Greeks and Romans, as well as the Jews, is clear from the citations adduced by Wets.

40. περιεσπᾶτο.] Περιεσπᾶν signifies properly to *draw around, draw aside, draw out of course*. Thus those are, by an elegant metaphor, said *περιεσπᾶσθαι*, who are distracted; and whose minds are drawn aside in various directions by anxious cares. So Diod. Sic. p. 82. Α. ἀπῆλθε περιεσπασθεῖς, ὑπὸ βιωτικῆς χρείας. Hor. Sat. viii. 6, 7. *Omni sollicitudine districtum.*

Διακονεῖν here denotes the preparation of the meal, and other services required by hospitality. Συναντιλάβεσθαι signifies to lend a hand with one, to help in any work.

41. τρῶβάζῃ] “thou art troubled,” (or, “thou distractest thyself with”) a multiplicity of cares. Τρῶβάζειν is said by some Commentators to properly signify to *raise the mud*. But it comes from *τρῶβη*, which does not signify *mud*; but is equivalent to our old English Substantive a *stir*. Ang. Sax. *stour*, which is probably cognate with *τρῶβη*, *turba*; and that comes from *τρεῖν* (cognate with *τάσειν* and *ταράσσειν*), to *stir*, which is the *same word*, for *σ* is often prefixed to words, as *τέγος*, *στῆγος*. Though, indeed, the true nature of such *inceptive* letters seems to be this — that they were originally part of the word, and were, in process of time, dropped, *euphonia gratiâ*.

42. ἐνός.] On the reference in this word, Commentators are not agreed. Several ancient and some modern Interpreters suppose an ellipsis of *βρώματος* here, and of *βρωμάτων* at πολλά, thus conveying a moral *gnome*, that *one dish* is sufficient for any reasonable person. But surely such a commendation of temperance and frugality were worthy rather of a second-rate Heathen Philosopher, than the lips of Him who “spake as never man spake.” Indeed, the ellipsis in question is most irregular. Others are of opinion that we have here a kind of *adage*, spiritually applied, *knowledge* being often compared to *food*. But that sense is very frigid. There can be no doubt that by ἐνός (in which there is in reality *no ellip-*

MT.

6.

δέ ἐστι χρεία. Μαρία δὲ τὴν ἀγαθὴν μερίδα ἐξελέξατο, ἣτις οὐκ ἀφαιρεθήσεται ἀπ' αὐτῆς.

- 1 XI. ΚΑΙ ἐγένετο, ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτὸν ἐν τόπῳ τινὶ προσευχόμενον, ὡς ἐπάναστο, εἶπε τις τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ πρὸς αὐτόν· Κύριε, διδάσον ἡμᾶς προσεύχεσθαι, καθὼς καὶ Ἰωάννης ἐδίδασκε τοὺς μαθητὰς 9
2 αὐτοῦ. Εἶπε δὲ αὐτοῖς· Ὅτιαν προσεύχησθε λέγετε· Πάτερ ἡμῶν ὃ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου· ἔλθέτω ἡ βουσιλεία σου· 10
3 γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. Τὸν ἄρτον 4 ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δίδου ἡμῖν τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν· καὶ ἄφεσις ἡμῖν τὰς 11
ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν, καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ ἄφίμενοι παντὶ ὀφείλουσι ἡμῖν· καὶ μὴ 12
εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμῖς εἰς πειρασμὸν, ἀλλὰ ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ. 13
5 Καὶ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς· Τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν ἔξει φίλον, καὶ πορεύσεται πρὸς 1 Infr. 18.1, &c.
αὐτὸν μεσονυκτίου, καὶ εἴπῃ αὐτῷ· Φίλε, χοῦσον μοι τρεῖς ἄρτους· 6 ἐπειδὴ φίλος μου παρεγένετο ἐξ ὁδοῦ πρὸς με, καὶ οὐκ ἔχω ὃ παρα-

sis) is meant (as is commonly understood) the care of the soul, contrasted with that of the body.

— μερίδα.] Grot., Elsn., Kypke, Kuin., and almost all recent Commentators, are of opinion that *μερίς* here signifies *business, or occupation*; as in Xen. Cyr. iii. 3. 5. Anab. vii. 6. 25. So the Latin *pars* in Cic. Quint. Frat. So Julian, p. 253. (cited by Elsn.) *ὀν μικρῆς μερίδος ὁ φιλόσοφος προσέστηκεν, i. e. non exiguo muneri præfectus est* Philostrophus. This, however, I cannot but consider a stiff and frigid view of the sense. It should rather seem that the term *μερίδα* is chosen with allusion to any one's taking his part of any thing left him to choose from. Our Lord appears to have had in mind Ps. xvii. 14. and perhaps Ps. xvi. 5.

XI. 1. *δίδαξον ἡμᾶς προσ.*] We are not to suppose but that our Lord had given them instructions on prayer, both as to the manner and matter. But it was the custom of the Rabbis to give their disciples some brief *forms* of prayer.

2. seqq. On the interpretation here see Notes on Matt. vi. 9. seqq. I cannot but advert to the marvellous *omissions* which are found in some few MSS., and Fathers, and which are almost invariably adopted by Griesb. and some other Editors. The words *ἡμῶν ὃ ἐν τοῖς οὐρ.* are not found in about 8 MSS., with the Vulg. and Pers. Versions. But that authority is too slender to claim any attention. The reason for the omission may readily be *conceived*; though it were vain to imagine reasons for *all* the innumerable alterations which were introduced by the *Alexandrian biblical Aristarchs*.

The words *γενηθῆτω — γῆς* are omitted in nearly the same MSS. and Versions as the preceding *ἡμῶν — οὐρανοῖς*, and, of course, there is no greater attention due in this than in the former case. But the omission *here* cannot well be considered as otherwise than *unintentional*. And not only the very small number of MSS. (about six) warrants us to suppose this; but there is a *palæographical* principle which increases the probability thereof; namely, that as *this* clause begins with 4 words, 2 of them the same, and the other 2 of the same *termination* with the former clause *ἁγιασθήτω τὸ θελήμα σου*; so it is likely that these each formed a *line* in the very ancient Archetype or Archetypes; and thus (as in a thousand other cases) the

scribes' eyes might be deceived, and they inadvertently omit the second of those clauses.

Again, the words *ἀλλὰ ῥῦσαι — πονηροῦ* are omitted in about the same number of MSS. and Versions as the before-mentioned clauses; with the addition of three or four others, and *Origen*; and are cancelled even by Scholz. *Here* the omission cannot be accounted for on the same principle as at *γενηθῆτω — σου*; yet the testimony is too weak, and the quarter whence it comes so suspicious, as to destroy all confidence. And far more probable is it, that the words were omitted by the above-mentioned critics for some speculative doctrinal reasons than that in *all* the MSS. except about ten, the clause should have been introduced from Matthew. This last reason will also apply to the *other* omissions; especially as the *doxology*, which is found in almost all the MSS. of *Matthew*, is here found in *not one*. Is it likely that those who introduced *three* interpolations, should *all* of them omit to introduce the *fourth*.

4. *καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ, &c.*] These words may seem to confirm the interpretation of those who render the *ὡς* in Matthew vi. 10. by *for, forasmuch as*. But it is not *necessary* to resort to that sense; and there is no real discrepancy; since in *Luke* that duty is *taken for granted* as indispensable, which in *Matthew* is made the *condition, or measure* of the forgiveness that we implore. Thus there is surely no discrepancy between "Give us *this day*," and "Give us *day by day*."

5. *τίς,]* The best Commentators are of opinion that *τίς* is for *εἰ τίς*, as in 1 Cor. vii. 13. and James v. 13. Thus the sense would be, "Should any one of you," &c. But this seems a wrong view, and I agree with Fritz. on Matt. p. 726. and Bornemann in loco, that the true sense in such cases is *quisnam?* where the interrogation, as Fritz. says, expresses "*animi commotionem*;" though (as Bornemann remarks) in some passages referred to this idiom, we must call in the principle of a blending of two constructions. At *εἴπῃ* the proper construction is abandoned for another which is not unsuitable.

6. *ἐξ ὁδοῦ.]* Valckn. and Campb. construe this with *παρεύγινετο*, and render, "is come out of his road." This sense, however, is forced, and the construction harsh; and it is better, with others, to connect *παρεύγινετο* with *πρὸς με*; a very fe-

MT.

7. Θήσω αὐτῷ· κακῆϊνος ἔσωθεν ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπη· Μὴ μοι κόπους 7
 πάρεχε· ἤδη ἡ θύρα κέκλειται, καὶ τὰ παιδία μου μετ' ἐμοῦ εἰς
 τὴν κοίτην εἰσίν· οὐ δύναμαι ἀναστῆς δοῦναί σοι. Λέγω ὑμῖν· εἰ 8
 7 καὶ οὐ δώσει αὐτῷ ἀναστῆς διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτοῦ φίλον· διὰ γε τὴν
 ἀναίδειαν αὐτοῦ, ἐγερθεὶς δώσει αὐτῷ ὅσων ᾔρξῃ. Καθὼ ὑμῖν λέγω· 9
 8 Αἰτεῖτε, καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν· ζητεῖτε, καὶ εὐρήσετε· κρούετε, καὶ
 ἀνοιγήσεται ὑμῖν. Πᾶς γὰρ ὁ αἰτῶν λαμβάνει· καὶ ὁ ζητῶν εὐρί- 10
 9 σκει· καὶ τῷ κρούοντι ἀνοιγήσεται. Τίνα δὲ ὑμῶν τὸν πατέρα αἰτήσει 11
 ὁ υἱὸς ἄρτον, μὴ λίθον ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ; * ἢ καὶ ἰχθῦν, μὴ ἀντὶ
 10 ἰχθύος ὄφιν ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ; ἢ καὶ εἰν αἰτήσῃ ὄν, μὴ ἐπιδώσει 12
 11 αὐτῷ σκορπίον; Εἰ οὖν ὑμεῖς, πονηροὶ ὑπάρχοντες, οὐδατέ ἀγαθὰ 13
 δόματα δίδοναί τοῖς τέκνοις ὑμῶν, πόσῳ μᾶλλον ὁ Πατήρ ὁ ἐξ οὐρα-
 12 νοῦ, δώσει πνεῦμα ἅγιον τοῖς αἰτοῦσιν αὐτόν;
- 22 Καὶ ἦν ἐκβάλλων δαιμόνιον, καὶ αὐτὸ ἦν κωφόν· ἐγένετο δὲ, τοῦ 14
 23 δαιμονίου ἐξεληθόντος, ἐλάλησεν ὁ κωφός· καὶ ἐθαύμασαν οἱ ὄχλοι.
 24 Τινὲς δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν εἶπον· Ἐν Βεελζεβούλ ἄρχοντι τῶν δαιμονίων ἐκ- 15
 38 βύλλει τὰ δαιμόνια. Ἐτεροι δὲ πειράζοντες σημεῖον παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐζήτουν 16
 25 ἐξ οὐρανοῦ. Αὐτὸς δὲ, εἰδὼς αὐτῶν τὰ διανοήματα, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· 17
 Πᾶσα βασιλεία ἐφ' ἑαυτὴν διαμερισθεῖσα ἐρημοῦται, καὶ οἶκος ἐπὶ
 26 οἶκον πίπτει. Εἰ δὲ καὶ ὁ Σατανᾶς ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν διμερισθῆ, πῶς στα- 18
 27 θήσεται ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ; ὅτι λέγετε ἐν Βεελζεβούλ ἐκβάλλειν με τὰ
 28 δαιμόνια. Εἰ δὲ ἐγὼ ἐν Βεελζεβούλ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, οἱ υἱοὶ 19
 28 ὑμῶν ἐν τίνι ἐκβάλλουσι; διὰ τοῦτο κριταὶ ὑμῶν αὐτοὶ ἔσονται. Εἰ 20
 29 δὲ ἐν δακτύλῳ Θεοῦ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, ἄρα ἔφθασεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ
 29 βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ. Ὅταν ὁ ἰσχυρὸς καθωπλισμένος φυλάσῃ τὴν 21

quent construction, especially in Luke. The *ἐξ οὐρανοῦ* depends on ὧν understood, and the sense is, "who is just come off a journey." On *κόπους πάρο*, see Note at Matt. xxvi. 10.

7. *εἰς τὴν κοίτην*.] Newcome and Middl. would take *κοίτην* to mean *bed-chamber*. But for that signification there is no authority. The interpretation was probably adopted to avoid the difficulty of supposing that all were in the same bed, since *κοίτην* has the Article. But that does not necessarily involve such a sense; for the Article may here have the force of the pronoun possessive, and *μετ' ἐμοῦ* may mean (as Pearce and Campb. render) "as well as myself." *Εἰς τὴν κοίτην* is best rendered by our old adverb *a-bed* (for *at bed*).

8. *ἀναίδειαν*] "impertunity which will not be repressed." See *ἀναίδης* in Homer II. Δ. 521.

11. *καθὼ ὑμῖν*.] The comparison is not *à simili*, but *à majori*, q. d. "If the impertunate *teaser* obtains so much from men, what will not he that offers up fervent and assiduous prayers obtain from his Father in heaven?" [Comp. Mark xi. 24. John xiv. 13. xv. 7. xvi. 23. James i. 5. 1 John iii. 22.]

11. *ἰχθῶν*.] Many MSS., Versions, and Fathers prefix *ἐξ*, which is adopted by Griesb., and Scholz, but it seems to come from the margin. See *infra* xiv. 5. "H. instead of *ἐξ* is found in a great number of the best MSS., in most of the Versions, several Fathers, and the Ed. Princ.; and is adopted by Wets., Matth., Griesb., Tittm., Vat., and

Scholz. The words are perpetually confounded in the MSS., but *ἦ* seems to be required by the context.

13. *ἐξ οὐρανοῦ*] for *οὐρανοῖς*, as often. By *πνεῦμα ἅγιον* are meant the ordinary aids of the Holy Spirit. So Euthym. *ἅγιον πνευματικόν*.

14. *κωφόν*.] This is said to be put by metonymy, for what *causes* deafness, as Mark ix. 25. But it may mean *dumb*, as often elsewhere.

15. [Comp. Matt. xii. 24.]

16. [Comp. Matt. xvi. 1.]

— *ἐξήτουν*.] Bornem. would read *ἐξήτουν*, which would indeed be more Classical; but the common reading is *Hellenistic* Greek.

17. *καὶ οἶκος — πίπτει*.] Campbell's version, "one family is falling after another," yields an unsatisfactory sense, and is irreconcilable with the parallel passages of Matth. and Mark. The common version well expresses the sense, while it preserves the construction. The sentence contains a *parallelism*; and (as Valckn. saw) *διαμερ.* in the former member is to be repeated, with an adaptation of gender, in the latter. This mode of taking the passage is confirmed by the parallel ones in Matthew and Mark, and is adopted by almost all the ancient and the best modern Commentators, who illustrate the *sentiment* both from the Classical and Rabbinical writers. [Comp. John ii. 25. Mark iii. 24.]

21. *ὁ ἰσχυρός*.] The Article here falls under Middleton's canon, of *insertions in Hypothesis*.

- 22 ξαντοῦ αὐλήν, ἐν εἰρήνῃ ἐστὶ τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῦ. Ἐπὶ δὲ ὁ ἰσχυ- MT.
 12. ρότερος αὐτοῦ ἐπελθὼν νικήσῃ αὐτὸν, τὴν πανοπλίαν αὐτοῦ αἴρει, ἐφ'
 23 ἧ ἔπεποιθει, καὶ τὰ σκύλα αὐτοῦ διαδίδωσιν. Ὁ μὴ ὦν μετ' ἐμοῦ 30
 24 κατ' ἐμοῦ ἐστὶ· καὶ ὁ μὴ συνάγων μετ' ἐμοῦ σκορητίζεῖ. Ὅταν τὸ 43
 ἀκάθαρτον πνεῦμα ἐξέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, διέρχεται δι' ἀνύδρων
 τόπων ζητοῦν ἀνάπαυσιν· καὶ μὴ εὐρίσκον, λέγει· Ἐποστρέψω εἰς
 25 τὸν οἶκόν μου, ὅθεν ἐξῆλθον. Καὶ ἐλθὼν εὐρίσκει σεσαρωμένον καὶ 44
 26 κεκοσμημένον. Τότε πορεύεται καὶ παραλαμβάνει ἐπὶ ἕτερα πνεύματα
 πονηρότερα ἑαυτοῦ, καὶ εἰσελθόντα κατοικεῖ ἐκεῖ· καὶ γίνεται τὰ
 ἔσχατα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκείνου χείρονα τῶν πρώτων.
 27 Ἐγένετο δὲ, ἐν τῷ λέγειν αὐτὸν ταῦτα, ἐπάρασά τις γυνὴ φωνὴν ἐκ
 τοῦ ὄχλου, εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Μακαρία ἡ κοιλία ἡ βυστάσιός σε, καὶ μα-
 28 στοὶ οὓς ἐθήλυσας! Αὐτὸς δὲ εἶπε· Μενοῦνγε μακάριοι οἱ ἀκούοντες
 29 τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ φυλάσσοντες αὐτόν. Τῶν δὲ ὄχλων ἐπαθροί- 39
 ζομένων, ἤρξατο λέγειν· Ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη πονηρὰ ἐστὶ· σημεῖον ἐπιζητεῖ,
 καὶ σημεῖον οὐ δοθήσεται αὐτῇ, εἰ μὴ τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωνᾶ τοῦ προφήτου.
 30 Καθὼς γὰρ ἐγένετο Ἰωνᾶς σημεῖον τοῖς Νινευίταις, οὕτως ἔσται καὶ ὁ 40
 31 Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ. Βασίλισσα νότου ἐγεροθήσεται ἐν
 τῇ κρίσει μετὰ τῶν ἀνδρῶν τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης, καὶ κατακρινεῖ αὐτούς·
 32 ὅτι ἦλθεν ἐκ τῶν περσίων τῆς γῆς ἀκοῦσαι τὴν σοφίαν Σολομῶνος· 41
 καὶ ἰδοῦ, πλεῖον Σολομῶνος ᾤδε. Ἄνδρες Νινευῆ ἀναστήσονται ἐν τῇ
 κρίσει μετὰ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης, καὶ κατακρινοῦσιν αὐτήν· ὅτι μετενό-
 33 σαν εἰς τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰωνᾶ· καὶ ἰδοῦ, πλεῖον Ἰωνᾶ ᾤδε. MT.
 5.
 33 Οὐδεὶς δὲ λύχνον ἄψυς εἰς κρύπτῃν τίθεισιν, οὐδὲ ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον,
 ἀλλὰ ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν, ἵνα οἱ εἰσπορευόμενοι τὸ φέγγος βλέπωσιν.
 34 Ὁ λύχνος τοῦ σώματός ἐστιν ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς· ὅταν οὖν ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς σου 22
 ἀπλοῦς ᾗ, καὶ ὅλον τὸ σῶμά σου φωτεινὸν ἐστίν· ἐπὶ δὲ πονηρὸς ᾗ, 23
 35 καὶ τὸ σῶμά σου σκοτεινόν. Σκόπει οὖν μὴ τὸ φῶς τὸ ἐν σοὶ σκότος

The force of it is "he who [is]." Thus also ὁ ἰσχυρότερος is "he who (is) stronger." The reasoning at ver. 22, is, that when another attacks, conquers, and spoils any one's property, it is plain that the other is more powerful than he.

22. τὰ σκύλα.] Many eminent modern Commentators take σκ. to signify "effects," corresponding to the σκελή of Matthew. This they confirm from the Heb. חָזַק, which, though it properly signifies *spoil*, often denotes *goods*, as in Esth. iii. 13. That sense, however, is not established on any Classical authority; nor, indeed, is it necessary to resort to it, since the common version *spoils*, denoting the *goods made a spoil of*, includes the other sense. [Comp. Is. liii. 12. Col. ii. 15.]

26. [Comp. John v. 14. 2 Pet. ii. 20. Heb. vi. 4. x. 26.]

27. μακαρία, &c.] With this exclamation the Commentators compare several from the Classical and the Rabbinical writers. Κοιλία and μαστοὶ are put for *μάτηρ*.

28. μενοῦνγε] "imo vero, yea indeed," as Rom. ix. 20. x. 13. Phil. iii. 8. So Enthym. explains it ἀληθῶς. Μενοῦνγε is a stronger expression than μενοῦν, and is used at the beginning of a sentence;

VOL. I.

which the other is *not*. The γε is used as in *καίτοι γε, μήτις, &c.*

32. πλεῖον Σολ.] See Note on Matt. xii. 6.

33. εἰς κρύπτῃν.] Here we may supply *χώραν*, or take *εἰς κρύπτῃν* as put for *εἰς κρυπτόν* (which, is, indeed, found in a few MSS. and Editions, even to that of Mill, but is evidently from the margin). Bornem. denies that there is any ellipsis at all, and compares the expressions *εἰς μακρὰν, εἰς μίαν, and τὴν ταχίστην*. Probably, however, those are of a different nature from the present: and to suppose *κρυπτ.* to stand for *εἰς κρυπτόν, or ἐν κρυπτῷ*, is objectionable, inasmuch as a *Substantive* is required, to suit the parallelism. It is better, therefore, to suppose, with Schleusn., that *κρυπτήν* is a *substantive*, especially as examples of this use, though rare, are occasionally found; one being adduced from Athen. p. 205. A., another from Heraclides de Civit. p. 73. Indeed, in the sense *vault* the word occurs not unfrequently in the writers of late Grecism, and gave birth to the Latin *cripta* and our *Croft*. That, however, is, I apprehend, not the sense here, but rather such as is found in the passage of Heraclides. What is here meant seems to be, a *dark hole or corner*, in which articles are stowed out of the way. The

ἐστίν. Ἐὶ οὖν τὸ σῶμά σου ὅλον φωτεινόν, μὴ ἔχον τι μέρος σκοτεινόν, 36
 ἔσται φωτεινόν ὅλον, ὡς ὅταν ὁ λύχνος τῆ ἀστραπῆ φωτίζῃ σε.

MT.

23.

25

26

26

23

Ἐν δὲ τῷ λαλῆσαι, ἤρῳτα αὐτὸν Φαρισαῖός τις, ὅπως ἀριστήσῃ παρ' 37
 αὐτῷ· εἰσελθὼν δὲ ἀπέπεσεν. Ὁ δὲ Φαρισαῖος ἰδὼν ἔθαύμασεν, ὅτι 38
 οὐ πρῶτον ἐβαπτίσθη πρὸ τοῦ ἀρίστου. εἶπε δὲ ὁ Κύριος πρὸς αὐτόν· 39
 Νῦν ὑμεῖς οἱ Φαρισαῖοι τὸ ἔσωθεν τοῦ ποτηρίου καὶ τοῦ πίνακος
 καθαρίζετε, τὸ δὲ ἔσωθεν ὑμῶν γέμει ἀρπαγῆς καὶ ποτηρίας. Ἄφρο- 40
 νες! οὐχ ὁ ποιήσας τὸ ἔσωθεν καὶ τὸ ἔσωθεν ἐποίησε; Πλὴν τὰ 41
 ἐνόντα δοτε ἐλεημοσύνην· καὶ ἰδοὺ, πάντα καθαρά ὑμῖν ἐστίν. Ἄλλ' 42

above appears so certain, that I have ventured, with Schleus., to accent κρέπην.

36. In order to remove what they call an *irregularity* and *tautology*, several Commentators devise various *conjectures*, all of them unauthorized, and indeed unnecessary. There is, properly speaking, no tautology at all; nor any greater irregularity, than is often elsewhere found in Scripture, and sometimes in the Classical writers. This section, vv. 33—36, forms one of the many independent and separate sayings of our Lord, which St. Luke has put together, in a miscellaneous form, without attention to time or place, from ch. xi. to xviii. 14. And therefore it is uncertain whether there be any connection between this section and the preceding one, vv. 27—32. What is here said by Christ does, indeed, appear in another connection at Matt. v. 15. Mark iv. 21. supra iii. 6. But our Lord might choose to introduce it *twice*, under different circumstances; meaning to caution his hearers against that *prejudice*, which blinded the eyes of their understanding to the evidence of his Messiahship, and demanded a *sign*. Accordingly, he exhorts them to profit by the light of reason and conscience, illuminated by the truths of the Gospel. He means to say (v. 33,) that as he who lights a lamp does it that it may give light to all around, so the faculty of reason and the gift of conscience should not be allowed to lie hid and be useless. And that (v. 34,) as the eye, when the vision is sound, directs a man's steps aright; so the *mental* eye of reason and conscience, is a valuable guide, when *not perverted*. Therefore, they are warned (v. 35,) to take heed that this internal and spiritual light be not obscured [for otherwise, it is said in St. Matthew, great indeed will be that darkness.] Then at v. 36. is a *further illustration* of the great importance of preserving and cultivating this light; and that introduced in a *familiar* and *popular* manner with the not unusual intermixture of the *comparison* and the *thing compared*. "Though (observes Bp. Middl.) nothing more than the body has been mentioned, yet the soul is evidently the object which our Saviour has in view: and to this, probably, by a tacit inference, the application is to be made. In v. 35. the analogy between external and internal light had been established: in the present, the complete illumination described in the concluding clause, though intended of the mind, is affirmed only of the body, the application, after what had been said, being supposed to be obvious." Οὖν has here the *continuative* sense *inquam, quippe, certum, porro*, (as was perceived by the Pesch. Syr. Translator) on which use see Schleus. Lex. in v. §3. Finally, there is, in reality, no tautology at all; for the clause μὴ ἔχον τι μέρος σκοτεινόν is intended to *strengthen* what

was said in the preceding; and the clause ἔσται φωτεινόν ὅλον is meant to *illustrate* what was just before said, by a reference to the figure employed at v. 33. of the lamp; and the ὅλον (which is here to be taken adverbially for καθ' ὅλον) is put after φωτ., the better to connect with the comparison ὡς ὅταν, &c. The word ἀστραπή almost always elsewhere denotes the *lightning*, but here, as sometimes in the Sept., it signifies, in a general sense, a *bright flame* or *lustre*.

37. ἀπέπεσεν] This simply means "he seated himself at table;" the word only having reference to that *reclining* posture adopted at meals. Ἐλθὼν signifies "on entering," i. e. immediately on entering; which is required by what follows; where the sense is meant to be *strongly marked* by πρῶτον and πρὸς. Of ἐβαπτίσθη, Pass. for Middl., the sense is the same as at Mark vii. 4, where see Note.

38. [Comp. Mark vii. 3.]

39. νῦν.] In the interpretation of this particle, the Commentators generally run into the extremes, either of regarding it as *expletive*, or of *pressing on* the sense. It is best, with Schleus. and Wahl, to consider it as an affirmative particle, signifying, 'sane, profecto,' as in Acts xxii. 16. So we sometimes use Now! or aye, now! Kuhn. and others think there is a *transposition* of ὑμῶν, which they construe with ἀρπαγῆς. But that is at variance with the context; and the passages adduced in proof are not to the purpose. We have only to suppose (with Bornem.) a *brevity* of construction, for τὸ δὲ ἔσωθεν ὑμῶν οὐ καθαρίζετε· γέμει γὰρ ἀρπαγῆς, &c. The interpretation of Elsn. and Kuhn., however learned and ingenious, is too far-fetched, and depends too much on an insufficiently established sense of ποιεῖν, to be received. The common interpretation by which τὸ ἔσωθεν (scil. μέρος) is taken to denote *the body*, and τὸ ἔσωθεν *the mind*, bears, in its simplicity, the stamp of truth. [Comp. Tit. i. 15.]

41. τὰ ἐνόντα.] The ancient and most modern Commentators consider this as an elliptical phrase, and supply κατὰ and χρήματα, in the sense "according to your ability," or your substance; as Tobit iv. 7. ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων σοι ποιεῖ ἐλεημοσύνην. Of each signification examples have been adduced, and the ellip. is not unfrequent in τὰ ἐνόντα. Other Commentators, however, (as Raphel Heum., Kypke, and Wets.) think that the sense would require ἐκ τῶν ἐνόντων. And they take τὰ ἐνόντα to signify "what is within the cup," or dish, i. e. its contents, q. d. "Be not anxious about the outward part; [or its brightness] but [rather] attend to its contents, and do but give alms therefrom, and then food and every thing else shall be pure to you." Thus ἐλεημοσύνη will be in apposition with and exgetical of τὰ ἐνόντα. Upon the

οὐαὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς Φαρισαίοις, οἳ ἀποδεκατοῦτε τὸ ἡδύσυμον καὶ τὸ
 πῆγανον καὶ πᾶν λάχανον, καὶ παρέρχεσθε τὴν κρίσιν καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην
 43 τοῦ Θεοῦ. Ταῦτα ἔδει ποιῆσαι, καὶ κείνα μὴ ἀφιέναι. Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς 6
 Φαρισαίοις, οἳ ἀγαπᾶτε τὴν πρωτοκαθεδρίαν ἐν ταῖς συνκλιμαῖς, καὶ
 44 τοὺς ἄσπασμους ἐν ταῖς ἄγοραῖς. Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, Γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρι- 7
 σαῖτοι, ὑποκριταί! οἳ ἐστὲ ὡς τὰ μνημεῖα τὰ ἄδηλα· καὶ οἱ ἄνθρω- 27
 45 ποι οἱ περιπατοῦντες ἐπάνω οὐκ οἴδασιν. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ τις τῶν
 46 νομικῶν λέγει αὐτῷ· Διδάσκαλε, ταῦτα λέγων καὶ ἡμῶν ἔβροχίζεις. ὁ 4
 δὲ εἶπε· Καὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς νομικοῖς οὐαὶ! οἳ φορτίζετε τοὺς ἀνθρώ-
 47 πους φορτία δυσβάστακτα, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν τῶν δικτύων ὑμῶν οὐ προσ- 29
 48 προφητῶν, οἳ δὲ πατέρες ὑμῶν ἀπέκτειναν αὐτούς. Ἄρα μαρτυρεῖτε 31
 καὶ συνευδοκεῖτε τοῖς ἔργοις τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν· οἳ αὐτοὶ μὲν ἀπέ-
 49 κτειναν αὐτούς, ὑμεῖς δὲ οἰκοδομεῖτε αὐτῶν τὰ μνημεῖα. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ 34
 ἡ σοφία τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶπεν· Ἀποστελῶ εἰς αὐτούς προφητίαν καὶ ἀπο-
 50 στόλους, καὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀποκτενοῦσι καὶ ἐκδιώξουσιν· ἵνα ἐκζητηθῇ τὸ 35
 51 αἷμα πάντων τῶν προφητῶν, τὸ ἐκχυνόμενον ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου,
 52 ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης, ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος Ἀβελ ἕως τοῦ αἵματος Ζαχα-
 ρίου τοῦ ἀπολομένου μεταξὺ τοῦ θουσιασθηρίου καὶ τοῦ οἴκου. καὶ
 53 λέγω ὑμῖν· ἐκζητηθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης. Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς 36
 νομικοῖς, οἳ ἤρατε τὴν κλεῖδα τῆς γνώσεως· αὐτοὶ οὐκ εἰσήλθετε, καὶ 13
 53 τοὺς εἰσερχομένους ἐκωλύσατε. Λέγοντος δὲ αὐτοῦ ταῦτα πρὸς αὐτούς,
 ἤρξαντο οἱ Γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι δεινῶς ἐνέχειν, καὶ ἀποστο-

MT.
23.

whole, this interpretation is so strongly confirmed by Matt. xxiii. 26. that it probably deserves the preference. [Comp. Is. lviii. 7. Dan. iv. 27. infra xii. 33.]

42. [Comp. 1 Sam. xv. 22. Hos. vi. 6. Mich. vi. 8. Matt. ix. 13.]

44. οἴδασιν.] At this word the preceding περιπατοῦντες is to be repeated. The sense is, "The men who walk over know not [that they are walking over them.]"

46. καὶ ὑμῖν τ. ν.] Some recent Commentators (as Rosenin. and Kuin.) take the καὶ in the sense *præsertim*. And indeed the νομικοὶ were, in dignity, superior to the Scribes and Pharisees, as being their teachers. But it seems harsh to suppose a sense of καὶ so very rare,—nay, which Bornem. asserts is found only with adjectives or adverbs in the superlative. There is no reason to abandon the common interpretation, which assigns to καὶ a sense at once usual and equally agreeable to the context; for since the Scribes and Pharisees, and the νομικοὶ, or Jurists, were closely connected as instructors and instructed, he who spoke to the prejudice of the one, spoke so of the other also. [Comp. Is. x. 1.]

47. οἳ οἰκοδομεῖτε.] On the omission of μὲν, see Matthæi's Gr. § 284. 4. Winer's Gr. § 13. 2.

48. οἳ — μνημεῖα.] Bornem. rightly renders, *quod, dum majores vestri prophetas necarunt, vos horum monumenta instaurastis*. And remarks that the Greeks often put a *primary* sentiment in the second place, and a *secondary* one in the first place in the sentence. See note on Matt. xxiii. 29, 30, sq.

49. ἡ σοφία τοῦ Θεοῦ.] Several ancient Commentators (as Euthym.), and some modern ones, as Brug. and Wolf, take this to mean the *Δόλος*, or Son of God, i. e. Christ himself, who is called in 1 Cor. i. 24. the Wisdom of God. And this interpretation is strongly confirmed by the ἐγὼ of Matthew in the parallel passage. And Dr. Burton in his Bampton Lectures, p. 364. observes that there seems reason to conclude, that the Jews were in the habit of using the term *wisdom* in a personal sense. However, there is more reason to think, with the generality of modern Commentators, that ἡ σοφία τοῦ Θεοῦ is abstract for concrete for ὁ Θεὸς ὁ σοφός. [Comp. Acts viii. 10. Matt. x. 16. xxiii. 34. supra x. 3. John xvi. 2. Acts vii. 51. Heb. xi. 35.]

51. [See Gen. iv. 8. 2 Chron. xxiv. 21.]

52. ἤρατε τὴν κλεῖδα τῆς γ.] The Christian doctrine is here compared to an edifice; which, when the key is taken away, becomes inaccessible. The sense is the same as Matt. xxiii. 13, i. e. ye both reject the Gospel dispensation yourselves, and hinder others from embracing it. Matt. xvi. 19.

53. δεινῶς ἐνέχειν] i. e. ἐγκοπεῖν, on which sense see Note on Mark vi. 19. Ἀποστοματίζειν is properly a Rhetorical term, and signifies to repeat *memoriter*, to bring forward any thing from memory, or *ex tempore*. See Tim. Lex. Plat., and especially Suid. and Hesych. So λέγειν ἀπὸ στόματος καὶ ἀποστοματίζειν; of which numerous examples are given by Wets. Sometimes, however, it is used in an active or transitive sense, "to make any one speak *memoriter*," of which examples are produced from Plato 216. C. & 217. A. This is

MT.

16. ματιζειν αὐτὸν περὶ πλείονων, ἐνεδρεύοντες αὐτὸν· [καὶ] ζητοῦντες 54
θηρεῦσαί τι ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ, ἵνα κατηγορήσωσιν αὐτοῦ.

XII. ἘΝ οἷς ἐπισυναχθεισῶν τῶν μυριάδων τοῦ ὄχλου, ὥστε κατα- 1
πατεῖν ἀλλήλους, ἤρξατο λέγειν πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ· πρῶτον
6 προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς ἀπὸ τῆς ζήμης τῶν Φαρισαίων, ἣτις ἐστὶν ὑπόκρισις.
10. Οὐδὲν δὲ συγκαλυμμένον ἐστὶν, ὃ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθῆσεται· καὶ κρυ- 2
27 πτόν, ὃ οὐ γνωσθήσεται. Ἄνθ' ἃν ὅσα ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ εἶπατε, ἐν τῷ 3
φωτὶ ἀκουσθήσεται· καὶ ὃ πρὸς τὸ οὐς ἐλαλήσατε ἐν τοῖς ταμείοις,
28 κηρυχθήσεται ἐπὶ τῶν δωματίων. Λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν τοῖς φίλοις μου· Μὴ 4
φοβηθῆτε ἀπὸ τῶν † ἀποκτεινόντων τὸ σῶμα, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα μὴ ἐχόν- 5
των περισσώτερόν τι ποιῆσαι. Ἐποδείξω δὲ ὑμῖν τίνα φοβηθῆτε. φο-
βήθητε τὸν μετὰ τὸ ἀποκτεῖναι ἐξουσίαν ἔχοντα ἐμβάλειν εἰς τὴν γέενναν·
29 τοὺς, λέγω ὑμῖν, τοῦτον φοβήθητε. Οὐχὶ πέντε στρούθια πωλεῖται ἀσ- 6
σαριῶν δύο; καὶ ἐν ἐξ αὐτῶν οὐκ ἔστιν ἐπιλεησμένον ἐνώπιον τοῦ
30 Θεοῦ· ἀλλὰ καὶ αἱ τρίχες τῆς κεφαλῆς ὑμῶν πᾶσαι ἠριθμηταί. μὴ 7
31 οὐκ φοβεῖσθε· πολλῶν στρούθιων διαφέρετε. Λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν· Πᾶς ὃς 8
32 ἂν ὁμολογήσῃ ἐν ἐμοὶ ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ ὁ Κύριος τοῦ ἀνθρώ-
33 που ὁμολογήσῃ ἐν αὐτῷ ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀγγέλων τοῦ Θεοῦ. Ὁ δὲ 9
12. ἀρνησάμενός με ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἀπαρνηθήσεται ἐνώπιον τῶν
32 ἀγγέλων τοῦ Θεοῦ. Καὶ πᾶς ὃς ἐρεῖ λόγον εἰς τὸν Κύριον τοῦ ἀνθρώ- 10
31 που, ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ· τῷ δὲ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα βλασφημήσαντι
10. οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται. Ὅταν δὲ προσφέρωσιν ὑμᾶς ἐπὶ τὰς συναγωγὰς καὶ 11
19 τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας, μὴ μεριμνῆτε πῶς ἢ τί ἀπολογησῆσθε, ἢ
20 τί εἴπητε· τὸ γὰρ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα διδάξει ὑμᾶς ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ, ἃ 12
δεῖ εἰπεῖν.

Εἶπε δὲ τις αὐτῷ ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου· Διδάσκαλε, εἰπέ τῷ ἀδελφῷ μου 13
μερίσασθαι μετ' ἐμοῦ τὴν κληρονομίαν. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Ἄνθρωπε, 14

plainly the sense of the word in the present passage. The Pharisees strove to draw from Jesus unpremeditated effusions, in order that they might catch up something hastily and inconsiderately uttered, whence they might elicit matter for public accusation.

54. καί.] This is omitted in almost all the ancient MSS., several of the Versions, and almost all the early Edd., and is cancelled by Wets., Matth., Griesb., Tittm., Vat., and Scholz. It came, no doubt, from the margin.

XII. 1. ἐν οἷς.] Most Commentators interpret "*interea*." Thus there will be an ellip. of *χρόνοις*. But the true ellip., I conceive, is *πράγματι*, "during which proceedings." Μυριάδων (as Kuin. observes) stands for an *exceedingly great number*, as often the Heb. מֵרַבָּבִּים. The idiom, however, is common to all languages.

— πρῶτον.] This may be taken either with the preceding ἤρξατο λέγειν, or the following προσέχετε. The former construction is adopted by the earlier, and the latter by the recent Translators and Commentators. The Editors, almost without exception, point according to the former. Yet the latter seems by far the better founded: and thus *πρῶτον* signifies *in primis*, as in Matt. vi. 33. Rom.

i. 8; iii. 2, and in Joseph. Ant. x. 10. 5. πρῶτον αὐτοῖς προστάξας. [Comp. Mark viii. 15.]

2. [Comp. Job xii. 22. Mark iv. 22.]

4. ἀποκτεινόντων.] Several MSS. and early Edd. have ἀποκτεινόντων, which is edited by Wets., Matth., Griesb., Vat., and Scholz. But there is no sufficient reason for the change. If any were made, I should prefer, with Bornem., ἀποκτεινόντων, or ἀποκτενόντων, or ἀποκτεινόντων. But as so many readings may be true, while it is difficult to prove which of them is the true one, it is better to adhere to the common text. The various readings seem to be only so many ways of removing the harshness of having two participles on one verb.

7. [Comp. 1 Sam. xiv. 45. 2 Sam. xiv. 11. 1 Kings, i. 52. Infra xxi. 18. Acts xxvii. 34.]

10. [Comp. Mark iii. 28. Heb. x. 26. 1 John v. 16.]

11. τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας.] Of these words conjoined, examples are cited by Wets., to which may be added Onosand. p. 104. The latter denotes *magistrates*, the former *rulers and governors*. In this sense ἀρχή is almost always found in the plural. I have, however, in Recens. Synop., adduced examples of the singular from Thucyd. iv. 53. Theogn. 1941. Liban. Orat. p. 369. [Compare Matt. x. 19. Mark xiii. 11. Infra xxi. 14.]

13. μερίσασθαι μετ' ἐμοῦ.] This use of μετὰ im-

15 τίς με κατέστησε δικαστὴν ἢ μεριστὴν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς; Ἐἶπε δὲ πρὸς αὐ-
 16 τοὺς· Ὅρατε καὶ φυλάσσετε ἀπὸ τῆς πλεονεξίας· ὅτι οὐκ ἐν τῷ
 17 περισσεύειν τινὶ ἢ ζωῇ αὐτοῦ ἐστὶν ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐτοῦ. Ἐἶπε
 18 δὲ παραβολὴν πρὸς αὐτοὺς, λέγων· Ἀνθρώπου τινοῦ πλουσίου εὐφό-
 19 ρησεν ἡ χώρα· καὶ διελογίζετο ἐν ἑαυτῷ, λέγων· Τί ποιήσω; ὅτι
 20 οὐκ ἔχω ποῦ συνάξω τοὺς καρπούς μου; Καὶ εἶπε· Τοῦτο ποιήσω·
 21 καθελῶ μου τὴν ἀποθήκην, καὶ μείζονας οἰκοδομήσω, καὶ συνάξω
 22 ἐκεῖ πάντα τὰ γεννήματά μου καὶ τὰ ἀγαθὰ μου· καὶ ἐρῶ τῇ ψυχῇ
 23 μου· Ψυχὴ, ἔχεις πολλὰ ἀγαθὰ κείμενα εἰς ἔτη πολλά· ἀναπαύου,
 24 φάγε, πίε, εὐφραίνου. Ἐἶπε δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ Θεός· Ἄφρον, ταύτῃ τῇ
 25 νουκίᾳ τὴν ψυχὴν σου ἀπαιτοῦσιν ἀπὸ σοῦ· ἃ δὲ ἠτοίμασας, τίμη ἔσται;
 26 Οὕτως ὁ Θεσσαρίζων ἑαυτῷ, καὶ μὴ εἰς Θεὸν πλουτῶν.

ports participation. The sense is, so "to divide as to admit me to my share." On the thing itself see Grot., Whity, and Recens. Syn.

14. τίς με — ἐφ' ὑμᾶς.] In allusion to Exod. ii. 14. The difference between δικαστὴς and μεριστὴς, I had myself thought to be this; that the former signifies an arbitrator, or referee in general; the latter such a one as has power to adjust conflicting claims, by apportioning to all parties their proper share. Thus ἡ κερὰ may be said to be exegetical of δίκ., as in a kindred passage of Appian. T. i. 64. 96. μήτε ἠγεῖσθαι Ῥωμαῖοι δικαστὴν ἢ διατὴν. And Menander, Εἰ τις δικαστὴς ἢ διατὴς θεῶν. VALCKENAEER, however, has pronounced an opinion, which, though it somewhat differs from the above, and from that of all other Commentators, may probably serve to decide the question. He maintains, that by δίκ. is meant a judge publicly appointed; and by μεριστὴς, a privately appointed judge, an arbitrator, one authorized to determine conflicting claims, and apportion what is right to all, usually called a διατὴς. And what Luke calls μεριστὰς, Plato de Legg. p. 915, first calls αἰρετοὺς δικαστὰς, and then διατὴρὰς.

15. αὐτοῦς] i. e. "the bystanders, his hearers in general."

— ὄρατε καὶ φυλά.] "Mind and carefully guard against." So Heliod. cited by Wets. ὄρα δὲ οὖν, φυλάτρου. The construction φυλά. ἀπὸ often occurs in the LXX., and sometimes in the Classical writers. Πλεονεξία here denotes an excessive desire of increasing one's substance; and it is the scope of the subsequent parable to show how little such a spirit avails, whether to produce happiness, or procure longevity. See a masterly discourse on this subject, from this text, by Dr. South, vol. iv. 415. seqq. With this admonition the Commentators compare many moral lessons of the Heathen Philosophers, to which I have in Recens. Synop. added others, the most apposite of which is an answer of the Pythian oracle, preserved by Liban. Orat. φυλάττεσθαι τὴν φιλοχρημάτων ὡς δέλερον ἔχουσαν, where I would emend the manifest corruption by reading τὸ φιλά. and ἔχου, or φιλοχρημάτων, retaining ἔχουσαν. Dr. South pithily remarks, that "there are many more whom riches have made covetous, than covetousness made rich."

— οὐκ ἐν τῷ περισσεύειν, &c.] On the sense, and still more the construction, of this passage, Commentators are not agreed. Kuin. maintains that ἐν τῷ περισσεύειν τινὶ signifies, "when there is abundance to any one," i. e. "when he has abundance." Οὐκ, he says, is to be referred to ἔστι,

which is to be joined with ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχ. αὐτοῦ. Schleus., Wahl, and Bornem., rightly take ζωῇ for "the comfort of life (happiness, "our being's end and aim"), as in Acts ii. 28. Rom. viii. 6, and 1 Pet. iii. 10. Thus the sense will be: "In whatever affluence a man may be, his happiness depends not on his possessions. Bornem., however, takes well founded exception to the above construction; and gives the following version and paraphrase: "Non in abundantia cuiquam felicitas versatur [parta] ex opibus ejus; i. e. nemini, propterea quod abunde habet, felicitas paratur ex opibus quas possidet." And he adduces an example of ἐκ in this sense from Xenoph. Conv. iv. 57.

16. εὐφώρησεν ἢ χώρα.] I have, in Recens. Synop., shown that χώρα here denotes farm; a signification found in the LXX., Joseph., and the Classical writers. Εὐφώρησεν, "bore well," yielded abundant produce. The word is rare, but it occurs in Joseph. Bell. i. 2. 43.

18. π. τ. γεννήματα] all the produce of my lands]: a sense occurring also infra xxii. 18, and in the later Greek writers, and the LXX. Τὰ ἀγαθὰ may mean goods generally, as just after; or such produce as might not fall under the name of γεννήματα, as wool, &c.

19. τῇ ψυχῇ μου.] Euthym., Brug., and Kuin. seem right in taking this to mean "to myself," as in Matt. x. 39. [Comp. Eccles. xi. 9. Eccles. xi. 19. 1 Cor. xv. 32. James v. 5.]

— εὐφραίνου.] This denotes, in a general way, the sensual delight resulting from the animal gratifications just mentioned: not the least of which in the East, and in all hot countries, is the ἀναπαύσθαι, the "far niente," of the Italians. Simil. Tobit vii. 9. φάγε, πίε, καὶ ἡδέως γίνου.

20. εἶπε.] Not in direct words addressed to the man, but by a silent decree. See Prov. i. 26. [Comp. Job xx. 22. Ps. lii. 7. Jer. xvii. 11.]

— ἀπαιτοῦσι.] The Commentators are not agreed as to what is the Nominat. here. Most think it alludes to those angels, who, as the Jews thought, accompanied the angel of death to require the debt of life, which is inherent in ἀπαιτεῖν. But it seems better to suppose (with the best modern Commentators) that by an idiom common to both Hebrew and Greek, the noun is suppressed, and to be supplied from the context. Or, ἀπαιτοῦσι may be regarded as an impersonal form, "it shall be required;" of which idiom there are many examples. See Winer's Gr.

21. οὕτως] i. e. "such is the case with," such the folly of. Ἐαυτῷ, "for himself (only)." On

MT.

6. *Ἐίπε δὲ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ· Διὰ τοῦτο ὑμῖν λέγω· μὴ* 22
 25 *μεριμνᾶτε τῇ ψυχῇ ὑμῶν, τί φάγητε· μηδὲ τῷ σώματι, τί ἐνδύσθητε.*
 26 *Ἡ ψυχὴ πλείον ἐστι τῆς τροφῆς, καὶ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ ἐνδύματος. Κατα-* 23
νοήσατε τοὺς κόρακας, ὅτι οὐ σπείρουσιν, οὐδὲ θερίζουσιν· οἷς οὐκ 24
ἔστι ταμείον οὐδὲ ἀποθήκη· καὶ ὁ Θεὸς τρέφει αὐτούς. πόσω μᾶλ-
 27 *λον ὑμεῖς διαφέρετε τῶν πετεινῶν; Τίς δὲ ἐξ ὑμῶν μεριμνῶν δύναται* 25
προσθεῖναι ἐπὶ τὴν ἡλικίαν αὐτοῦ πῆχυν ἓνα; Ἐὶ οὖν οὔτε ἐλάχιστον 26
 28 *δύνασθε, τί περὶ τῶν λοιπῶν μεριμνᾶτε; Κατανοήσατε τὰ κρίνα πῶς* 27
 29 *αὐξάνει· οὐ κοπιᾷ, οὐδὲ νήθει· λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν· οὐδὲ Σολομῶν ἐν*
 30 *πάσῃ τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ περιεβάλετο ὡς ἐν τούτων. Ἐὶ δὲ τὸν χρότον ἐν* 28
τῷ ἄγρῳ σήμερον ὄντα καὶ αὔριον εἰς κλίβανον βαλλόμενον ὁ Θεὸς
 31 *οὕτως ἀμφιένυσσι· πόσω μᾶλλον ὑμᾶς, ὀλιγόπιστοι; Καὶ ὑμεῖς μὴ* 29
 32 *ζητεῖτε τί φάγητε ἢ τί πίητε· καὶ μὴ μετεωρίζεσθε. ταῦτα γὰρ πάν-* 30
τα τὰ ἔθνη τοῦ κόσμου ἐπιζητεῖ· ὑμῶν δὲ ὁ πατὴρ οἶδεν ὅτι ζηήσετε
 33 *τούτων. Πλὴν ζητεῖτε τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ· καὶ ταῦτα πάντα* 31
προσθεθήσεται ὑμῖν. Μὴ φοβοῦ, τὸ μικρὸν ποίμνιον· ὅτι εὐδόκησεν 32
ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν δοῦναι ὑμῖν τὴν βασιλείαν. Πωλήσατε τὰ ὑπάρχοντα 33
 20 *ὑμῶν, καὶ δότε ἐλεημοσύνην. ποιήσατε ἑαυτοῖς βαλάντια μὴ παλαιού-*

the sense of *εἰς Θεὸν πλουτῶν* there is some difference of opinion. Certain Expositors take the meaning to be, "he who is rich for the honour and glory of God," which is the benefit of man. Thus Kypke compares Lucian Epist. Saturn. 24. *εἰς τὸ κοινὸν πλουτεῖν*. and Philo. Byzant. *πλουτεῖν εἰς θεῶν κόσμον*. More simple, and perhaps nearer the truth, is the interpretation of the ancient and many modern Commentators (as Grot., Beza, Elsn., Wolf, Rosenm., and Kuin.) who take *πλουτεῖν εἰς τὸν Θεὸν* for *θησαυρίζειν παρὰ Θεοῦ*, in the sense, "to lay up riches with God;" namely, by works of charity, benevolence, and virtue in general.

22. *διὰ τοῦτο* i. e. as I am treating on this subject.

23. *πλείον* "a greater gift;" and consequently authorizing and enjoining you to depend upon God for the supply of the lesser.

24. *τοὺς κόρακας*.] "The Divine Providence (remark Grot. and Bochart) is especially shown in the case of the ravens; [the corvus corax of the Zoologists] for though (as we learn from Aristotle and Ælian) the old ones very soon expel their young from the nests, and Philo says that they often abandon both nest and young; yet, by a wise Providence, they instinctively heap up in their nests whatever creates worms, whereby their abandoned young are preserved." See Ps. cxlvii. 9, and Job xxxviii. 41.

—*ταμείον*.] Campb. wrongly renders this "*cellar*." The word scarcely differs in sense from *ἀποθήκη*. The difference, if any, seems to be this; that *ταμείον* denoted a regularly built *barn*, and *ἀποθ.* merely one of those temporary subterranean *depositories* for grain which are common in the East. Or if *ἀγαθὰ* be had in view, *ταμ.* may denote one of those large *storehouses*, in which whatever was necessary for domestic use was laid up, and thence dispensed.

29. *μὴ μετεωρίζεσθε*.] The full sense (missed by most Commentators) is, "Be not anxiously fluctuating between hope and fear [of a livelihood.]"

Μετεωρίζεσθαι signifies properly to be lifted on high; and, among other things, it is used of vessels tossed aloft at sea; which are in time depressed to the depths of the sea (as the Psalmist finely describes); an apt figure of *anxiety*, whence the signification in question is derived. That *μετεωρίζεσθαι* should have this sense is no wonder, since *μετέωρος* not unfrequently has the signification *dubious, fluctuating*. (See my Note in Recens. Synop. and on Thucydides ii. 8.)

30. *ἔθνη τοῦ κόσμου*.] This is a *plena locutio* for the more frequent *ἔθνη*, Heb. עַמִּים, denoting "the [other] nations of the world, (besides the Jewish)."]

32. *τὸ μικρὸν ποίμνιον*.] The Article supplies the place of the Vocative, *Hellenistic*: This double diminutive has great emphasis; and Commentators compare the expressions *μικρὸν ἀργυρίδιον, μικρὰ πολίχνια, μικρὸν γῆδιον*. But there is this difference, that here the double dimin. (like the diminutive forms in Italian, and indeed in most languages), is expressive of tenderness and affection.

—*εὐδόκησεν*] "hath thought good." This verse is connected with the preceding, and also with the following, and that connection is well expressed by Dr. Burton in the following paraphrase. "I told you to seek the kingdom of God; and I now say, that God *intends* to GIVE you this kingdom. Do not, therefore, value your worldly possessions, but prepare for the world to come."

33. To the followers of Christ in those times of persecution and peril, the possession of riches would prove but an incumbrance. Better, therefore, were it to resign them at once, as mariners battling with a dangerous sea, lighten the vessel of all superfluous burdens. [*Comp.* Matt. xix. 21. Acts ii. 45. *Infra* xvi. 9.]

—*βαλάντια*.] This is said, by metonymy, for the money contained in the purse. The word signifies the same as *θησαυρός*; in the other member of the sentence, except that by *θησαυρός* is meant a greater, and by *βαλ.* a lesser portion of wealth.

34 *μενα, θησαυρόν ἀρέκλειπτον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ὅπου κλέπτεις, οὐκ ἐγ-
 35 γίζει, οὐδὲ σὺ διαφθείρεις. Ὅπου γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ θησαυρὸς ὑμῶν, ἐκεῖ καὶ
 36 ἡ καρδία ὑμῶν ἔσται. Ἔστωσαν ὑμῶν αἱ οὐσφύες περιζωσμένοι, καὶ
 37 οἱ λύχνοι καιόμενοι· καὶ ὑμεῖς ὅμοιοι ἀνθρώποις προσδεχομένοις τὸν
 38 κύριον ἑαυτῶν, πότε ἀναλύσει ἐκ τῶν γάμων· ἵνα, ἐλθόντος καὶ κροῦ-
 39 σαντος, εὐθέως ἀνοιξώσιν αὐτοῖ. Μακάριοι οἱ δοῦλοι ἐκεῖνοι, οὓς ἐλθὼν
 40 ὁ κύριος εὐρήσει γρηγοροῦντας. Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οἱ περιζώσεται καὶ
 41 ἀνακλιεῖ αὐτούς, καὶ παρελθὼν διακοπήσει αὐτοῖς. Καὶ ἐὰν ἔλθῃ ἐν
 42 τῇ δευτέρᾳ φυλακῇ, καὶ ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ φυλακῇ ἔλθῃ, καὶ εὐρη οὕτω, μακά-
 43 ριοὶ εἰσιν οἱ δοῦλοι ἐκεῖνοι. Τοῦτο δὲ γινώσκετε, ὅτι εἰ ἴδῃ οἰκοδε-
 44 σπότης ποιεῖ ὥρα ὁ κλέπτεις ἔρχεται, ἐργηζόρησεν ἄν, καὶ οὐκ ἂν ἀφῆκε
 45 διοργῆναι τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ. Καὶ ὑμεῖς οὖν γίνεσθε ἔτοιμοι· ὅτι ἡ ὥρα
 46 οὐ δοκεῖτε, ὁ Κύριος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔρχεται. Ἐἶπε δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ Πέτρος·
 47 Κύριε, πρὸς ἡμᾶς τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην λέγεις, ἢ καὶ πρὸς πάτας;
 48 Ἐἶπε δὲ ὁ Κύριος· Τίς ἄρα ἐστὶν ὁ πιστὸς οἰκονόμος καὶ φρόνιμος, ὃν
 49 καταστήσει ὁ κύριος ἐπὶ τῆς θεραπείας αὐτοῦ, τοῦ διδοῦναι ἐν καιρῷ τὸ
 50 σιτομέτριον; Μακάριος ὁ δοῦλος ἐκεῖνος, ὃν ἐλθὼν ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ εὐρή-
 51 σει ποιοῦντα οὕτως. Ἀληθῶς λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι ἐπὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ὑπάρχουσιν
 52 αὐτοῦ καταστήσει αὐτόν. Ἐὰν δὲ εἶπῃ ὁ δοῦλος ἐκεῖνος ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ·
 53 Χρονίζει ὁ κύριός μου ἔρχεσθαι· καὶ ἄρξῃται τύπειν τοὺς παῖδας καὶ
 54 τὰς παιδίσκας, ἐσθίειν τε καὶ πίνειν καὶ μεθύσκεσθαι· ἤξει ὁ κύριος τοῦ
 55 δούλου ἐκείνου ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἧ οὐ προσδοκᾷ, καὶ ἐν ὥρᾳ ἧ οὐ γινώσκει·
 56 καὶ διχοτομήσει αὐτόν, καὶ τὸ μέρος αὐτοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἀπίστων θήσει.
 57 Ἐκεῖνος δὲ ὁ δοῦλος ὁ γνοὺς τὸ θέλημα τοῦ κυρίου ἑαυτοῦ, καὶ μὴ
 58 ἔτοιμάσας μηδὲ ποιήσας πρὸς τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ, διηρήσεται πολλὰς· ὁ*

(Rosenm.) Ἀνέκλ. is a rare word, but it occurs in the LXX., and occasionally in Diod. Sic. and other later writers.

35. αἱ οὐσφύες περιεζ.] There is here an allusion to what must be done before the long-robed inhabitants of the East can engage in any active employment, civil or military. The custom, however, extended to the West, as appears from many passages of the Classical writers. [Comp. Eph. vi. 14. 1 Pet. i. 3.]

36. ἀνθρώποις] "men (servants)." An idiom common to the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, and even modern languages, especially when any word corresponding to *master* is in the context.

— ἀνακλιεῖ shall return. A sense derived from a natural metaphor, and used both in the LXX. and Classical writers. Γάμος in the plural is here, as often, used to denote a feast generally.

37. περιζ. καὶ ἀνακλ.] Many Commentators compare this with what took place at the Roman *Saturnalia*, and the Cretan *Hermæa*. But, as Kuin. remarks, such was common to all servants, good and bad. Here the subject is the reward assigned to *diligent* and *faithful* servants. The image (as he observes) only imports, that as the master will treat such servants with unusual condescension and kindness, so will your heavenly Master, of his free bounty, reward your diligence and fidelity with rewards as disproportionate.

39. [Comp. 1 Thess. v. 2. 2 Pet. iii. 10. Rev. iii. 3. xvi. 15.]

42. τίς ἄρα, &c.] Jesus does not answer to the question proposed by Peter *directly*, but by *implication*. For, from the following parable, it is manifest that what is said, though applicable to all, is meant especially for the *Apostles*; who are compared to *house-stewards*, such as in large families used to dispense the allotted portion of food to the servants. Τῆς θεραπείας, for τῶν θεραπευόντων, abstract for concrete, as frequently, both in the Scriptural and Classical writers. See my Note on Thucyd. v. 23.

43. καὶ μὴ ἔτοιμάσας — αὐτοῦ.] This is, per Synchysin, for μὴ ἔτοιμ. [ἑαυτὸν πρὸς] [τὸ ποιεῖν] μηδὲ ποιῆσαι, &c. [Compare James iv. 17.]

48. ἐαρήσεται δόλιγας.] Here and just before there is said to be an ellipse of *κατά*. But as the complete phrase has never been produced, while the elliptical one is common, this may be reckoned among those *false ellipses* which have been swept away, by the enlightened researches of Hermann, Schaefer, and others.

To inflict any stripes upon a man for not performing his Lord's will, when he had no *knowledge* of it, would be manifestly unjust. So Thucyd. iii. 10. puts even in the mouth of the stony-hearted Cleon the sentiment *ξίγγυμον δ' ἐστὶ τὸ ἀκοῦσιν* (where see my Note), and Eurip. Hippol. 1331. *τὴν δὲ σὴν ἀμαρτίαν τὸ μὴ εἰδέναι ἔκλυε κήκας* (guilt). Hence some would restrict the words to the knowing the Lord's will by *special revelation*, and the not knowing it by that means. But it is

MT.

6.

21

24.

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MT.

10. δὲ μὴ γνοῦς, ποιήσας δὲ ἄξια πληγῶν, δαρήσεται ὀλίγας. Παντὶ δὲ ᾧ ἐδόθη πολὺ, πολὺ ζητηθήσεται παρ' αὐτοῦ· καὶ ᾧ παρέθεντο πολὺ, περισσότερον αἰτήσουσιν αὐτόν. Πῦρ ἦλθον βαλεῖν εἰς τὴν γῆν· καὶ 49
τί θείλω, εἰ ἤδη ἀνήφθη; βάπτισμα δὲ ἔχω βαπτισθῆναι· καὶ πῶς 50
34 συνέχομαι ἕως οὗ τελεσθῆ. Δοκεῖτε οὐ εἰρήνην παρεγενόμενν δούναι 51
ἐν τῇ γῆ; οὐχὶ, λέγω ὑμῖν, ἀλλ' ἢ διαμερισμόν. Ἔσονται γὰρ ἀπὸ 52
τοῦ νῦν πέντε ἐν οἴκῳ ἐνὶ διαμεμερισμένοι, τρεῖς ἐπὶ δυὸ καὶ δύο ἐπὶ
35 τρισί. Διαμερισθήσεται πατὴρ ἐφ' υἱῶν καὶ υἱὸς ἐπὶ πατρί· μήτηρ 53
ἐπὶ θυγατρὶ καὶ θυγάτηρ ἐπὶ μητρὶ· πενθερὰ ἐπὶ τὴν νύμφην αὐτῆς
καὶ νύμφη ἐπὶ τὴν πενθέραν αὐτῆς.
Ἔλεγε δὲ καὶ τοῖς ὄχλοις· Ὅταν ἴδῃτε τὴν νεφέλην ἀνατέλλουσαν 54
ἀπὸ δυσμῶν, εὐθέως λέγετε· Ὅμβρος ἔρχεται· καὶ γίνεται οὕτω.
16. Καὶ ὅταν νότον πνεόντα, λέγετε· Ὅτι καύσων ἔσται· καὶ γίνεται. 55
3 Ἐποικριαί! τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γῆς καὶ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ οἴδατε δοκιμάζειν, 56
τὸν δὲ καιρὸν τοῦτον πῶς οὐ δοκιμάζετε; Τί δὲ καὶ ἄρ' ἑαυτῶν οὐ 57

better to understand them *comparatively*, of one who knew it more perfectly, as compared with one who knew it less perfectly. And this view has the advantage of *including* the other. The full sense of the passage is ably pointed out by Br. Jebb, *Sacr. Lit.* p. 201.

—παντί.] This is not, as Winer imagines, a Dative absolute, but is put for παντός, being accommodated, by attraction, to ᾧ.

—παντὶ δὲ ᾧ ἐδόθη—παρ' αὐτοῦ.] Bishop Sanderson, *Serm. ad Pop.* iv. p. 191, observes, the very *distribution* of God's gifts lays on us the necessity of *using* them. Where God *bestoweth*, he *bindeth*; and to whom any thing is *given*, of him something shall be *required*.

49. πῦρ ἦλθον βαλ.] "From the necessity of Christian vigilance, our Lord is led to consider those times of persecution, when it would be especially needed; and the *fire* of which would be kindled soon after his death and passion; which are represented under the figure of baptism." (Grot.) Fire is an image of discord and violence.

—τί θείλω—ἀνήφθη.] This clause partakes of that obscurity which is generally inherent in what is uttered amidst extreme mental agitation. And hence Commentators are at issue on its meaning. Grot., Whitty, and others assign to the *εἰ* the sense "*O that*," and render, "And what do I wish? O that it were already kindled!" But though *εἰ* be sometimes used for *εἴθε*, as in Luke xix. 42. & xxii. 42., it is in a very different construction from the present. Rosenm. and Kuin. take the *τί* for πῶς, and the *εἰ* for *ut*, like the Heb. *אֵיךְ*, rendering, "And how much I wish that it were already accomplished?" But both significations, in such a context as the present, are precarious. It is *better*, with Le Clerc and Campb. to render the *Vulgate*, "Quid volo, nisi ut accendatur." But to take *εἰ* for *εἰ μὴ* is unauthorized. We must retain the usual signification of *εἰ*, and we may take *θείλω* for *θελομαι*, with the Syr. Version, q. d. "And what should I (have to) wish, if it were but already kindled?" the very sense expressed by the *Vulg.*, but thus elicited without any violence. There is, however, scarcely a shade of difference between this and the first-mentioned interpretation.

50. βάπτισμα δὲ ἔχω βαπτισθῆναι] i. e. I have to

suffer many things. See Note on Matt. xx. 22. and comp. Mark x. 38.

—καὶ πῶς—τελεσθῆ.] "And how am I distressed till it be accomplished!" Συνίχεσθαι signifies properly "to be *hemmed in*," and is used with a Dative, denoting disease, or calamity, either expressed or implied. The term here merely denotes an *anxious longing*. The general sense of this pathetic exclamation is well expressed by Mr. Holden thus: "I am come to deliver a doctrine which, through the wickedness of man, will be the cause of persecutions and sufferings, with which I must be overwhelmed; yet what do I wish, except that they already took place, since they will be abundantly repaid by the propagation of the Gospel."

51. ἀλλ' ἦ.] The best Commentators render this *imo potius*. But of such a sense no proof has been adduced. There will be no occasion to deviate from the usual signification of ἦ, if the ἀλλ' be taken, not for ἀλλὰ, but ἄλλο, and an ellipsis be supposed, or rather a repetition from the context after ὑμῖν, of οἱ[εἶν] παρεγενόμενν δούναι ἐν τῇ γῆ. Buttman, in his *Larger Gr. Gr.* p. 405. (Engl. Transl.) after illustrating this use of οἱεῖν ἄλλο and οὐδὲν ἄλλ', shews how the expression, by the progress of ellipse, came at length to be considered equivalent to *εἰ μὴ*· as Aristoph. *Ran.* II05. Οὐκ ἠπίσταν' ἀλλ' ἦ μόζαν καλέσαι. Though he acknowledges that in most cases there is an abbreviation of the thought before this ἀλλ' ἦ, which it is impossible to supply in words. Here, however, it is, as we have seen, very possible. On the present passage comp. Micah vii. 6.

54. τὴν ἐφ' ἔλην] i. e. "the cloud;" alluding to a well-known phenomenon regarded as a certain prognostic of rainy weather. We learn both from the Scriptures (see I Kings xviii. 4.) and from the travellers in the East, that a small cloud like a man's hand is often the forerunner of violent storms of wind and rain. See Horne's *Introduct.* vol. iii. 32.

57. τί εἶ—ἐκαιο.] On the connection of these words some difference of opinion exists. The older Commentators almost universally refer them to what *precedes*; most recent Interpreters, as Pott and Kuin., to what *follows*. Both may be said to be, in a certain sense, right. The *gram-*

MT.
5.
25

58 κρίνετε τὸ δίκαιον; Ὡς γὰρ ὑπάγεις μετὰ τοῦ ἀντιδίκου σου ἐπ' ἄρ-
χοντα, ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ δὲς ἐργασίαν ἀπῆλλάθαι ἀπ' αὐτοῦ· μήποτε κατα-
σύρη σε πρὸς τὸν κριτὴν, καὶ ὁ κριτὴς σε παραδῶ τῷ πράκτορι, καὶ
59 ὁ πρᾶκτωρ σε βάλῃ εἰς φυλακὴν. Λέγω σοι· οὐ μὴ ἐξέλθῃς ἐκεῖθεν,
ἕως οὗ καὶ τὸ ἕσχατον λεπτὸν ἀποδοῖς.

26

1 XIII. ΠΑΡΗΣΑΝ δὲ τινες ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ καιρῷ ἀπαγγέλλοντες αὐτῷ
περὶ τῶν Γαλιλαίων, ὧν τὸ αἷμα Πιλάτος ἔμιξε μετὰ τῶν θουσιῶν αὐ-
2 τῶν. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Δοκεῖτε ὅτι οἱ Γαλιλαῖοι

matical connection is with the following, as appears from the *ὡς γὰρ*: but there is a connection of thought with the preceding; these words, in fact, forming the *vinculum* between two sentiments. At the end of the next verse the conclusion of the argument is, as often, left to be supplied by the attentive hearer or reader, and the sense is well expressed by Dr. Burton.

58. *δὲς ἐργασίαν.*] A Latinism for “*da operam.*” Ἀπαλλάττεσθαι ἀπὸ τινος signifies either “to be rid of any thing,” or “to be dismissed, or let go by any person,” and “is used (says Schleusn.) in a forensic sense, either of a criminal who is set at liberty when an adversary does not follow up an accusation; or of a debtor, who receives an acquittance from his creditor, by paying the money due, or making a composition.” [Comp. Prov. xxv. 3.]

— *πράκτορι.*] Πράττειν and εἰσπράττειν signify “to exact the payment of a mulct, or of its equivalent in corporal punishment;” and accordingly πρᾶκτωρ denotes the *exactor pœnæ* (as in Æschyl. Eum. iii. 13. *πράκτορες αἵματος*), and, in a general sense, the executioner of a magistrate’s sentence.

XIII. 1. *παρήσαν*] “came up,” as in Matt. xxvi. 50. This signification is found in the *Classical* writers; though, in the earlier and purer ones, followed by *εἰς* and a proper name. In the *later*, the word is, as here, used absolutely. So Diod. Sic. xvii. 8. *παρήσαν τινες ἀπαγγέλλοντες*, &c.

— *περὶ τῶν Γαλ. ὧν, &c.*] To what circumstance in the history of that time this incident is to be referred, Commentators are not agreed. Those which they mention (as the *sedition of the Samaritans* on Mount Gerizim, or the *rebellion set on foot by the followers of Judas of Galilee*) are liable to insuperable objections. The affair is doubtless one (like the murder of the babes at Bethlehem) passed over by Josephus. Though nothing is more probable than that something of this sort should have happened; for the Galilæans were the most seditious people in Judæa, and Pilate not the most merciful of Governors: Josephus has not, indeed, mentioned any Galilæans slain in the Temple by Pilate; but we learn from various parts of his history (see Ant. xv. 4. & 7. xvii. 9. 3. & vi. 17. 10.) that tumults often arose at the festivals, and sometimes battles took place even in the Temple. For which reason Herod erected the fortress of Antonia, in the immediate vicinity, and garrisoned it with a strong military force. So Joseph. Ant. xvii. 11. 6. *μάλιστα δὲ τὴν σφαγὴν τῶν περὶ τὸ ἱερὸν ἰδεῖν—ὡς ἐορτῆς τε ἀνεστηκίας, καὶ ἱερῶν ἐν τράπῳ σφαχθῶσιν.* Josephus relates that Archelaus put to death 300 Galilæans in the Temple in the act of sacrificing. It is therefore likely that a similar insurrection of Galilæans, also at a festival, happened in the government of Pilate, and was repressed in the same manner.

VOL. 1.

With respect to the phraseology, there is in τῶν θουσιῶν an ellipse of *αἵματος*, to be supplied from *αἶμα*; an idiom found both in the Greek and Latin writers. The complete expression occurs in Philo. ii. 315, (cited by Wets.,) where, giving a reason why God commanded that a homicide who had fled for refuge to an altar should be delivered up to justice; for otherwise, says he, *ἀίματι ἀνδροφόνων αἶμα θουσιῶν ἀνακραθήσεται.* I add Theophyl. Simoc. p. 127. *Οἱ μὲν οὖν ἔκκενθήσαντες τὸν Β. ἀνείλον' ἀναμετριμένον τοῖνον τοῦ δέικνου καὶ αἵμασιν.* It is a boldly figurative way of saying, that they were slain while attending the sacrifice. How atrocious it was thought to slay any one at an altar is well known. The circumstance in question was, it seems, mentioned as being the effect of a Divine judgment on the sufferers. And our Lord’s answer is meant to remove the erroneous notion of considering *that, or such like calamities*, as marks of Divine vengeance; and moreover to predict a similar fate to those who would not repent; a prediction which ere long attained its full completion,—when, in the very Temple, innumerable multitudes of Jews were slain, and their blood was literally mingled with the blood of the victims.

This passage, as Bp. Warburton observes, has been usually regarded as a reproof of the opinion which ascribes the general calamities effected by natural or civil causes to God’s displeasure against sin; but incorrectly: that opinion being founded in the very essence of religion. What the text condemns is the superstitious *abuse* of it, which uncharitably concludes that the *sufferers* in a calamity are greater sinners than other men. This view the learned Prelate ably maintains, 1. from the character of the speaker; 2. from the state and circumstances of the hearers; and, 3. from the words of the text itself. For, “1. He who attempts to instruct others in the knowledge of God, must needs conceive that the Moral Governor of the universe, who leaves himself not without witness, doth frequently employ the physical and civil operations of our world to reform the moral. In man’s state here, natural and civil events are the proper instruments of moral government. The teacher, therefore, of religion will be naturally led to inculcate this truth, that general calamities, though events merely physical or civil, were ordained for the scourge of moral disorders. 2. This is clear from the condition of the hearers; for the Jews, of all people on earth, were best justified in ascribing national calamities to the anger of offended Heaven. They had been accustomed to receive rewards and punishments through the instrumentality of nature, and of a religion which more exactly dispensed them. 3. The very words of the reproof [‘except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish’] imply that, among the many ends effected in the administra-

οἱ αἰματωτοὶ παρὰ πάντας τοὺς Γαλιλαίους ἐγένοντο, ὅτι τοιαῦτα
 πεπόνθειαν; οὐχὶ, λέγω ὑμῖν· ἀλλ', ἐὰν μὴ μετανοήτε, πάντες ὡσαύ- 3
 τως ἀπολεισθήτε. Ἦ ἐκεῖνοι οἱ δέκα καὶ ὀκτώ, ἐφ' οὓς ἔπεσεν ὁ πύργος 4
 ἐν τῷ Σιλωὰμ καὶ ἀπέκτεινεν αὐτοὺς, δοκεῖτε ὅτι οὗτοι ὀφειλέται ἐγέν-
 οντο παρὰ πάντας ἀνθρώπους τοὺς κατοικοῦντας ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ; 5
 οὐχὶ, λέγω ὑμῖν· ἀλλ', ἐὰν μὴ μετανοήτε, πάντες ὁμοίως ἀπολεισθήτε. 6
 Ἔλεγε δὲ ταύτην τὴν παραβολὴν· Συκῆν εἶχέ τις ἐν τῷ ἀμπελῶνι 6
 αὐτοῦ πεφυτευμένην· καὶ ἦλθε ζητῶν καρπὸν ἐν αὐτῇ, καὶ οὐκ εὔρεν.
 Εἶπε δὲ πρὸς τὸν ἀμπελοργόν· Ἰδοὺ, τρία ἔτη ἔρχομαι ζητῶν καρπὸν 7
 ἐν τῇ συκῇ ταύτῃ, καὶ οὐκ εὗρίσκω· ἔκκοψον αὐτήν, ἵνατί καὶ τὴν γῆν
 καταργεῖ; Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς λέγει αὐτῷ· κύριε, ἄφερ αὐτήν καὶ τοῦτο 8
 τὸ ἔτος, ἕως ὅτου σκάψω περὶ αὐτήν, καὶ βάλω * κόπριαν· κὰν μὲν 9
 ποιήσῃ καρπὸν, — εἰ δὲ μήγε, εἰς τὸ μέλλον ἐκκόψεις αὐτήν.
 Ἦν δὲ διδάσκων ἐν μιᾷ τῶν συναγωγῶν ἐν τοῖς σάββασι· καὶ ἰδοὺ, 10
 γυνὴ ἣν πνεῦμα ἔχουσα ἀσθενεῖς ἔτη δέκα καὶ ὀκτώ, καὶ ἦν συγκύ- 11
 πτουσα καὶ μὴ δυναμένη ἀνακύψαι εἰς τὸ παντελές. Ἰδὼν δὲ αὐτήν ὁ 12

a Isa. 5. 2.
 Matt. 21. 19.

tion of Nature, this was one, — to express God's displeasure at human iniquities, in order to bring men to *repentance*. But if the belief of a moral end in these calamities be a principle of religion proper to be inculcated, what was it, you will ask, that deserved so severe a reproof as this? It was that *superstition* which so often accompanies, and so fatally infects this principle of religion — that of ascribing public calamities, not to God's displeasure against sin in general, but to his vengeance on the persons of the sufferers, whom this superstition concludes to be greater sinners than other men." The learned Prelate then proceeds to shew, that this superstitious notion *deserved* the severity of our Lord's censure, "1. because it implied *gross ignorance* in the nature of the punishment, and betrayed *malignity of heart*; 2. from its extreme *uncharitableness*; and 3. because it has a direct tendency to defeat the very end of the chastisement, whereby exemplary warnings become lost, and every fresh gleam of Divine mercy only serves to ripen them into the speedy objects of God's justice; as was probably the case with the Jews then, whose day of grace was past, their doom pronounced, and the Imperial Eagle, scenting the carcass from afar, came down to the extermination of this devoted people." Next the admirable writer fully evinces that the doctrine which ascribes the *general* calamities arising from natural causes to God's displeasure against sin, is agreeable both to reason and religion, displaying God's glory in the fairest colours, and establishing man's peace and happiness on the most solid foundation. The very same view is taken by Dr. Waterland (Works, vol. iv.)

2. *παρὰ*] "beyond," as Luke iii. 13. and elsewhere. The origin of which sign is shewn by Winer, Gr. Gr. p. 149.

4. *ἐν τῷ Σιλ.*] The sense is, "at," i. e. *by* "Siloam." This tower was probably one of the towers of the city walls, and was, I imagine, the one at the S. E. angle of the walls. Thus the fountain is correctly noted by Milton as being "*fast by the Oracle of God.*" Ὀφθαλμα, sinners. A Chaldee idiom, by which debts and sins, and debtors and sinners, are interchanged.

7. *τρία ἔτη.*] At which time from planting, the Naturalists tell us, those that bear at all will produce fruit. *Καταργεῖ* is for *ἀργὸν ποιεῖ*, "makes it unproductive," as in Ezra iv. 21. The term is mostly figuratively employed to denote *abrogating a law*.

— *ἵνατί καὶ τ. γ. κ.*] The *καὶ* here is so far from being, as some say, redundant, that it is almost emphatic, denoting that the tree not only bore no fruit itself, but hindered the growth of it in others.

9. *κόπριαν.*] This, instead of *κοπρίαν*, is found in a great number of MSS. and early Edd., and is adopted by Wets., Matth., Griesb., Vat., Tittm., and Scholz.

11. *πνεῦμα ἔχουσα ἀσθ.*] "laboured under weakness." The recent Commentators mostly regard *πν. ἀσθ.* as a periphrasis, for *ἀσθενεῖαν*, as denoting simply a *disease*. But the passages of the Classical writers which they adduce are of a different nature. The words of our Lord at ver. 16. *ἦν ἔδρασε ὁ Σατανᾶς* show that *πνεῦμα* is very significant; and, considering the very frequent use of the word in the sense *δαίμονιον*, it cannot be doubted but that the sense is (as the ancient and most modern Commentators suppose) "having a demon which inflicts disease and infirmity." So Acts xvi. 16. *πνεῦμα Πέδωνος*, where see Note. It was, indeed, the Jewish notion, and indeed that of the Gentiles, that diseases, especially the severely acute and tediously chronic ones, were inflicted by demons. But the peculiarity of the present expression, and the words of our Lord himself, oblige us to suppose a real demoniacal possession. Euthym. well explains *πν. ἀσθ.* by *δαίμονιον ἀρρώστιας, μὴ ἰδὼν αὐτὴν ὑγιαίνει*.

— *καὶ ἦν συγκύ.*] "she was bowed together." This, however, is not simply an *active* in a *passive* sense; for the word may be taken in a *neuter* sense for *συγκυφὸς εἶναι*; from which the transition to a *passive* one is easy. The disorder called *κίφωσις* is seated in the whole of the spine, and extends to the loins; inducing a total inactivity of the vertebrae: so that the patient is necessarily *loved together*, from utter weakness of the parts. And therefore the disease might very well be

Ἰησοῦς προσεφώνησε καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ· Γύναι, ἀπολέλωσαι τῆς ἀσθενείας σου. Καὶ ἐπέθηκεν αὐτῇ τὰς χεῖρας· καὶ παραχρῆμα ἠνωρθώθη, καὶ ἐδόξαζε τὸν Θεόν. ὁ ἄρχισυνάγωγος, ἀγαρικτῶν ὅτι τῷ σαββάτῳ ἐθεράπευσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ἔλεγε τῷ ὄχλῳ· Ἐξ ἡμέραι εἰσὶν ἐν αἷς δεῖ ἐργάζεσθαι· ἐν ταύταις οὖν ἐρχόμενοι θεραπεύεσθε, καὶ μὴ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ σαββάτου. ὁ Ἀπεκρίθη οὖν αὐτῷ ὁ Κύριος, καὶ εἶπεν· Τροκιδιὰ, ἕκαστος ὑμῶν τῷ σαββάτῳ οὐ λύει τὸν βῶν αὐτοῦ ἢ τὸν ὄνον ἀπὸ τῆς φάττης, καὶ ἀπαγαγὼν ποτίζει; ταύτην δὲ, θυγατέρα Ἀβραάμ οὐδαι, ἣν ἔδωκεν ὁ Σατανᾶς ἰδοὺ δέκα καὶ ὀκτὼ ἔτη, οὐκ ἔδει λυθῆναι ἀπὸ τοῦ δεσμοῦ τούτου τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ σαββάτου; Καὶ ταῦτα λέγοντος αὐτοῦ, κατησχύνοντο πάντες οἱ ἀντικείμενοι αὐτῷ· καὶ πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος ἔχαιρεν ἐπὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ἐνδόξοις τοῖς γινομένοις ὑπ' αὐτοῦ.

18 Ἔλεγε δὲ· Τίνι ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ; καὶ τίνι ὁμοίωσω αὐτήν; Ὅμοία ἐστὶ κόκκῳ σινάπεως, ὃν λαβὼν ἄνθρωπος ἐβυλεν εἰς κῆπον ἑαυτοῦ· καὶ ἠῤῥησε καὶ ἐγένετο εἰς δένδρον μέγα, καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατεσκήνωσεν ἐν τοῖς κλάδοις αὐτοῦ. [Καὶ] πάλιν εἶπε· Τίνι ὁμοιώσω τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ; Ὅμοία ἐστὶ ζύμῃ, ἣν λαβοῦσα γυνὴ ἐνέκρυπεν εἰς ἀλεύρου σάτα τρία, ἕως οὗ ἔξυμώθη ὅλον.

22 ΚΑΙ διεπορεύετο κατὰ πόλεις καὶ κώμας διδάσκων, καὶ πορεύων ποιούμενος εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ. Εἶπε δὲ τις αὐτῷ· Κύριε, εἰ ὀλίγοι οἱ σωζόμενοι; Ὁ δὲ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς· Ἀγωνίεσθε εἰσελθεῖν διὰ τῆς στενῆς πύλης· ὅτι πολλοὶ, λέγω ὑμῖν, ζητήσουσιν εἰσελθεῖν, καὶ οὐκ ἰσχύσουσιν, ἀπ' οὗ ἂν ἐγερθῇ ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης, καὶ ἀποκλείσῃ τὴν

b Exod. 20. 9.
Deut. 5. 13.
Ezek. 20. 12.

c Exod. 23. 5.
Deut. 22. 4.
Matt. 12. 1, 11.
Mark 3. 2.
supra 6. 7.
infra 14. 3.
John 7. 23.

MT.
13.

31

32

33

7.

13

called *ἀσθένεια*. The words *εἰς τὸ παντέλες* are a phrase for the adverb *παντέλεως*, as Heb. vii. 25. and sometimes in the later Classical writers.

12. ἀπολύσαι.] Both the Hebrew and Greek writers used to compare disorders to *chains* and *ropes*, by which men are, as it were, held bound. Of this Kypke and Wets. produce examples.

15. οὐ λέει, &c.] Christ refutes their cavil by a reference to their *own practice*: for that it was considered allowable to attend to the *necessary care of animals* on the Sabbath, is clear from many passages of the Rabbinical writers, cited by Schoettg. Nay, even *Pagan* superstition permitted various employments of husbandry even on the solemn festivals.

18. [Comp. Mark iv. 30.]

22. [Comp. Matt. ix. 35. Mark vi. 6.]

23. εἰ ὀλίγοι οἱ σωζ.] It has been a disputed point, what is the exact *import* of this inquiry, and the *spirit* which dictated it. Some understand *σωζ.* of temporal deliverance, namely, being preserved from the approaching destruction of the Jewish state. But that is surely supposing a kind of *enigma* little suitable to a simple *inquiry*. More probable is the opinion of many eminent Interpreters, from Hamm. to Kuin., that *σωζ.* is to be understood of preservation from the general unbelief of Christ and his religion; of which sense they adduce examples from the N. T. and Ignatius' Epistles to Polycarp. Those, however, are rather proofs of the *sense* "being put into the

way of salvation." It is far more natural to understand the word (with most Interpreters, ancient and modern,) of *salvation* — properly so called: q. d. Are there few who will attain salvation? A sense which seems *required* by the terms of our Lord's *reply*. Whether the question was a *captious* one or not (though the latter is the more probable opinion), certain it is (as appears from Lightf. and Schoettg.) that the point was a disputed one in the Jewish schools; some maintaining *universal salvation*, others limiting it to a few *elect*. Now to a question of such minor importance as this, (for it rather concerns us, as Grot. observes, to know *what sort* of persons will be saved, than *how few*) our Lord (agreeably to his custom of never answering questions of *mere curiosity*) was pleased to return no answer; but makes his words an answer to the question which *ought rather* to have been asked, — namely, "*how* salvation is to be attained." Ἀγωνίεσθαι is a very significant term, founded on an agonistic allusion. The sense is, "strain every nerve." This use of *εἰ* for *πότερον* in *direct* address is rare; in *indirect* address it is not unfrequent either in the Scriptural or Classical writers. The best mode of viewing the former idiom is to consider it as a blending of the *oratio directa* with the *indirecta*.

25. ἀπ' οὗ.] Sub. χρόνον, "from the time," "when once." I have preferred the punctuation adopted by the Bâle Editor, and approved by Bornemann, because it seems most agreeable to

MT.

7. *Θύραν, καὶ ἄρξῃσθε ἔξω ἐστάναι καὶ κρούειν τὴν θύραν, λέγοντες·*
 22 *Κύριε, Κύριε, ἀνοιξον ἡμῖν· καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ἐρεῖ ἡμῖν· Οὐκ οἶδα*
 23 *ὑμᾶς πόθεν ἐστέ. Τότε ἄρξῃσθε λέγειν· Ἐπαγόμεν ἐνώπιόν σου καὶ 26*
ἐπίομεν, καὶ ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις ἡμῶν ἐδίδαξας. Καὶ ἐρεῖ· Λέγω ὑμῖν, 27
 8. *οὐκ οἶδμ ὑμᾶς πόθεν ἐστέ· ἀπόστητε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, πάντες οἱ ἐργάται*
 12 *τῆς ἀδικίας. Ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρογμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων, 28*
ὅταν ὄψῃσθε Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ καὶ πάντας τοὺς προ-
 11 *φήτας ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὑμᾶς δὲ ἐκβαλλομένους ἔξω. Καὶ 29*
 19. *ἤξουσιν ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν καὶ δυσμῶν, καὶ ἀπὸ βορρῆᾶ καὶ νότου· καὶ*
 30 *ἀνακληθήσονται ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Καὶ ἰδοὺ, εἰσὶν ἔσχατοι, 30*
οἱ ἔσονται πρῶτοι· καὶ εἰσι πρῶτοι, οἱ ἔσονται ἔσχατοι.
Ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ προσῆλθόν τινες Φαρισαῖοι, λέγοντες αὐτῷ· 31
Ἐξέλθε καὶ πορεύου ἐντεῦθεν, ὅτι Ἰησοῦς θέλει σε ἀποκτεῖναι. Καὶ 32
εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Πορευθέντες εἴπατε τῇ ἀλώπεκι ταύτῃ· Ἰδοὺ, ἐκβάλλω
 23. *δαιμόνια καὶ ἰάσεις ἐπιτελοῦ σήμερον καὶ αὔριον, καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ τελειού-*
 37 *μαι. Πλὴν δεῖ με σήμερον καὶ αὔριον καὶ τῇ ἐρχομένῃ πορεύεσθαι· 33*
— ὅτι οὐκ ἐδέχεται προφήτην ἀπολέσθαι ἔξω Ἱερουσαλήμ. Ἱερουσα-
λήμ! Ἱερουσαλήμ! ἣ ἀποκτείνουσα τοὺς προφήτας, καὶ λιθοβολοῦσα
τοὺς ἀπεσταλμένους πρὸς αὐτήν, ποσάκις ἠθέλησεν ἐπισυναΐσαι τὰ τέκνα
σου, ὃν τρόπον ὄρεῖς τὴν ἑαυτῆς ρουσιάν ἐπὶ τὰς πέτρωντας; καὶ οὐκ

the context to connect this ver. (as the Syr. Transl. and Beza did) with the *preceding* rather than the *following*, according to which we may best suppose the *apodosis* to be at *τότε* ver. 26. Ἐγερθῆ is not (as some imagine) redundant, but is a part of the imagery of the story, and signifies, "has risen from his seat."

26. ἐνώπιόν σου] "in thy presence and company." This mode of address is a form of *rousing any one's recollection* of a person; as denoting familiar intercourse.

27. οὐκ οἶδα ἔ. π. ἔ.] This seems to be a familiar mode of expressing that we desire to have nothing to do with the person as Matt. vii. 23. xxv. 12. So Lucian, Pisc. 50. i. 617, makes Aristotle, when brought back to life, say of one who pretends to be a true follower of Aristotle, and is not such, ἀγνοῶ γὰρ ὅστις ἐστίν.

— ἐργάται τῆς ἀδικίας.] Grot. well explains the *εργ.* as denoting *habit* and devotedness to. So Bp. Sanderson, Sermon, ad Aulam, p. 216, observes, that the wicked are so termed in Scripture because they do, *hoc agere*, make it their work, business, or trade. Schleus. compares Xen. Mem. ii. 1. 27. *καλῶν καὶ σεμνῶν ἐργάτης*. To which I would add 2 Macc. iii. 6. *οἱ ἐργάται τῆς ἀδικίας*. Menand. Hist. i. 145. A. *χαλεπῶν ἐργῶν καὶ ἀνοσιῶν ἐργάται*. 29. [Comp. Is. ii. 2, 3. Mal. i. 11.]

32. τῇ ἀλώπεκι τ.] Our Lord did not use this appellation by way of contumely, but to show his intimate knowledge of his disposition and secret policy. (Wets.) However the use of it confirms the opinions of those who think that these persons had been sent to intimate to Jesus, a *pretended* design of the Tetrarch to kill him, and that to get rid of him out of his dominions:—for the same reason, probably, that the Gadarenes at Matt. viii. 34. desire Jesus to depart from their coasts.

— ἐκβάλλω δαιμόνια, &c.] The course of reasoning in this verse seems to be this: "I am employed innocently, and even highly meritoriously, nor shall I long weary him with my presence, but soon take my departure; why then should he seek my life?" *Σήμερον καὶ αὔριον* is a sort of proverbial form, denoting any short interval of time, as in a kindred passage of Arrian Epict. iv. 10. and Hos. vi. 2. cited by Wets. On the import of *τελειοῦμαι* the Commentators are not agreed. Some recent ones take it to mean, "I shall be sacrificed;" but of this sense they adduce no valid proof. It is better, with the ancient and most modern Interpreters, to explain it, "I shall be brought to the end of my course, and then shall die." So Phil. iii. 12. *οὐχ ὅτι ἤδη τετελείωμαι*. Almost all Commentators consider the word as an *Attic contract form* for *τελειώσομαι*, and that as put for *τελειώθησομαι*. But Bornem., with reason, objects that the penult of this verb is *long*; and notices similar errors in the forms of other verbs in the Classics. Here certainly the Present may be tolerated; nay, is *required*, by the correspondent verbs foregoing, *ἐκβάλλω* and *ἐπιτελοῦ*; though the *sense* be, "I am being brought to my end;" which involves a notion of what is scarcely *future*, as very shortly to take place.

33. πλὴν — πορεύεσθαι.] The sense seems (as Kuin. suggests) to be, "However, I must for this short time go on in my usual course or ministry; for *πορεύεσθαι*, (like the Heb. *הלך*) denotes habitual action or regular business. *πορεύεσθαι* cannot, as Hammond thinks, have reference to the counsel of the Pharisees, v. 31. for then some words denoting, "after working my miracles," will have to be supplied — and the ellipsis which he lays down is both harsh, and the reasoning inconsequent. There is, in fact, not so much an *ellipsis*, as an *aposiopesis*, to be supplied from

MT.

23.

38

39

35 ἤθελήσατε. Ἰδοὺ, ἀφίεται ὑμῖν ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν ἔρημος. ἀμὴν δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ με ἴδητε, ἕως ἂν ἴξῃ ὅτε εἴπητε· Εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου.

1 XIV. ΚΑΙ ἐγένετο, ἐν τῷ ἐλθεῖν αὐτὸν εἰς οἶκόν τινος τῶν ἀρχόντων τῶν Φαρισαίων σαββάτω φαγεῖν ἄρτον, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἦσαν παρατηρούμενοι αὐτόν. Καὶ ἰδοὺ, ἀνθρώπος τις ἦν ὑδρωπικός ἐμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ· ^a καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπε πρὸς τοὺς νομικοὺς καὶ Φαρισαίους, λέγων· Ἐὶ ἔξῃσι τῷ σαββάτῳ θεραπεύειν; οἱ δὲ ἠσύχασαν. 2 Καὶ ἐπιλαβόμενος ἴωσατο αὐτὸν καὶ ἀπέλυσε. ^b καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἶπε· Τίνος ὑμῶν ὄνος ἢ βοῦς εἰς φρέαθ ἐμπεσῆται, καὶ οὐκ εὐθὺς ἀνασπάσει αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ σαββάτου; Καὶ οὐκ ἔσχυσαν ἀνταποκριθῆναι αὐτῷ πρὸς ταῦτα. 3 Ἔλεγε δὲ πρὸς τοὺς κεκλημένους παραβολὴν, ἐπέχων πῶς τὰς πρωτοκλισίας ἐξελέγοντο, λέγων πρὸς αὐτούς· Ὅτιαν κληθῆς ὑπὸ τινος εἰς γάμους, μὴ κατακληθῆς εἰς τὴν πρωτοκλισίαν· μήποτε ἐντιμότερός σου ἢ κεκλημένος ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐλθὼν ὁ σὲ καὶ αὐτὸν καλέσας ἐρεῖ σοι· Δὸς τούτῳ τόπον· καὶ τότε ἄρξῃ μετ' αἰσχύνῃς τὸν ἔσχατον τόπον κατέχειν. Ἄλλ' ὅτιαν κληθῆς, πορευθεὶς ἀνάπεσον εἰς τὸν ἔσχατον τόπον· ἵνα ὅτιαν ἐλθῇ ὁ κεκληκὼς σε, εἴπῃ σοι· Φίλε, προσανάβηθι ἀνώτερον· τότε ἔσται σοι δόξα ἐνώπιον τῶν συνανακειμένων σοί.

what went before — as follows “[I shall, I say, finish this course in spite of Herod, and shall not be killed in Galilee] for it cannot be,” &c.

— οὐκ ἐνδέχεται — Ἱερουσαλήμ.] These words contain one of the most cutting reproaches imaginable. Of course, οὐκ ἐνδέχεται must be understood with the usual limitation in such sort of *acute dicta*; i. e. “it can scarcely be;” for John the Baptist and others had been put to death out of Jerusalem.

35. ἀφίεται ἔρημος.] I cannot agree with Griesbach and Scholz in cancelling ἔρημος; because it is indispensably necessary to the sense; and ὑμῖν would thus be worse than useless. There is an allusion to land or territory which is *thrown up*, as no longer worth cultivating.

XIV. 1. φαγεῖν ἄρτον.] This phrase, the Commentators say, is formed from the Hebrew לֶחֶם דָּרַח; which though it properly signifies no more than “to take food,” yet often denotes to feast, to make good cheer. But that sense, I apprehend, is never found, except when the meal is one to which guests are invited; and then it may be supposed that the cheer is better than that of an ordinary domestic meal. But then this is never the *signification* of the phrase, and is only implied in the context. Such a meal, no doubt, was the present. Indeed, it appears from what Lightf., Wets., and others, have copiously adduced from the Rabbinical writers, that it was usual with the Jews to provide better cheer on the Sabbath than on other days. Also that they used to make feasts and give entertainments especially on that day.

By τινος τῶν ἀρχ. τῶν Φαρ. is meant (as Grot., Hamm., Whitby, Pearce, and Campb., have shown) one of the rulers [of a synagogue] who was a Pharisee. Comp. John iii. 1. That all

such rulers were not Pharisees, appears from John viii. 43.

2. ἐμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ] “in his view;” having probably so placed himself, though he did not dare to ask for cure, it being the Sabbath day.

5. τίνος ὑμῶν — καὶ οὐκ, &c.] Bornemann rightly renders, “*Cujusnam vestrum asinus aut bos in puteum incidit, et quis non statim eum extrahet?*”

— ὄνος.] Many good MSS., Versions, and some Fathers and early Edd. have *ὄνος*, which is adopted by Wets., Matth., and Scholz; but without sufficient reason; for the canon of preferring the more difficult reading does not apply in cases where that would involve an exceeding harshness, and violate the usage of the language, or where the words are *very similar*. Such is the case here. In these sort of sayings an *ass* and an *ox* are put for *any domestic animal*, as being in the most common use.

7. παραβολὴν.] The word here seems to bear the sense of an *important* moral precept, on which see Note on Matt. xiii. 2.

— ἐπέχων.] Some imagine here an ellipse of τοὺς δόξαλαβούς. But as they adduce examples only of the *complete* phrase ἐπέχων δόξα τινι, not of the elliptical one, this cannot be admitted. Others, more properly, supply τὸν νόον, both here and at Acts iii. 5. But even that is so seldom found supplied, that it is better to suppose no ellipse at all, as in 1 Tim. iv. 16. ἐπεχε σεαυτῷ. Thus ἐπέχων will simply denote “*observing*.”

9. δὸς τόπον] “give place, seat, situation.” The phrase often occurs in the later Greek Classical writers, and was probably founded on the Latin *locum dare*. From Schoettg. it appears that this was the phrase used on such occasions by the Jews, who (as well as the Greeks and Romans) had frequent disputes about the chief seats at feasts.

d Job 22. 29.
Prov. 23. 23.
Matt. 23. 12.
supra. 1. 51.
infra 18. 14.
James 4. 6, 10.
1 Pet. 5. 5.
e Neh. 8. 12.
Tob. 4. 7.
Prov. 3. 9, 28.

δ' "Οτι πᾶς ὁ ὑψῶν ἑαυτὸν, ταπεινωθήσεται· καὶ ὁ ταπεινῶν ἑαυτὸν ἠψωθήσεται.

e "Ελεγε δὲ καὶ τῷ κεκληρότι αὐτόν· "Οταν ποιῆς ἄριστον ἢ δέϊπνον, 12 μὴ φῶνει τοὺς φίλους σου, μηδὲ τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου, μηδὲ τοὺς συγγενεῖς σου, μηδὲ γείτονας πλουσίους· μήποτε καὶ αὐτοὶ σε ἀντικαλέσῃσι, καὶ γένηταί σοι ἀνταπόδομα. Ἄλλ' ὅταν ποιῆς δοχῆν, κἀλεῖ 13 πτωχοὺς, ἀνυπόδητους, χωλοὺς, τυφλοὺς· καὶ μακάριος ἔσῃ· ὅτι οὐκ 14 ἔχουσιν ἀνταποδοῦναί σοι· ἀνταποδοθήσεται γὰρ σοι ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει τῶν δικαίων.

Ἀκούσας δὲ τις τῶν συνανακειμένων ταῦτα, εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Μακάριος 15 ὁς φάγεται ἄρτον ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ. 16 Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· 16 "Ἀνθρώπος τις ἐποίησε δεῖπνον μέγα, καὶ ἐκάλεσε πολλοὺς. 17 Καὶ 17 ἀπέστειλε τὸν δούλον αὐτοῦ τῇ ὥρᾳ τοῦ δεῖπνου εἰπεῖν τοῖς κεκλημένοις· "Ἐρχεσθε, ὅτι ἤδη ἔτοιμά ἐστι πάντα. Καὶ ἤρξαντο ἀπὸ μιᾶς 18 παραιεῖσθαι πάντες. Ὁ πρῶτος εἶπεν αὐτῷ· "Ἀγρὸν ἠγόρασα, καὶ 19 ἔχω ἀνάγκην ἐξελθεῖν καὶ ἰδεῖν αὐτόν· ἐρωτῶ σε, ἔχε με παρητημένον. Καὶ ἕτερος εἶπε· Ζεύγη βοῶν ἠγόρασα πέντε, καὶ πορεύομαι 19 δοκιμάσαι αὐτά· ἐρωτῶ σε, ἔχε με παρητημένον. Καὶ ἕτερος εἶπε· 20 Γυναικί ἐγῆμα, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο οὐ δύναμαι ἐλθεῖν. Καὶ παραγε- 21 νόμενος ὁ δούλος ἐκεῖνος ἀπήγγειλε τῷ κυρίῳ αὐτοῦ ταῦτα. Τότε ὀργισθεὶς ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης εἶπε τῷ δούλῳ αὐτοῦ· Ἔξελθε ταχέως

f Isa. 25. 6.
Matt. 22. 2.
Rev. 19. 9.
g Prov. 9. 2, 5.

11. πᾶς ὁ ὑψῶν — ὑψωθήσεται.] Probably an adage. Similar sentiments occur in the Rabbinical writers.

12. μὴ φῶνει τοὺς φίλους, &c.] The best Commentators are of opinion, that the negative particle must here be taken with limitation, and rendered *non tam, quam potius*, as in many passages of the O. and N. T. This idiom, however, Winer and Bornem. say, is properly confined to cases where the two particles are employed in the same sentence; not, as here, in two different ones, and they lay down the sense as follows: "Noli beneficia in alios conferre eo consilio, ut acceptam tibi gratiam referant, sed ut comproberis Deo." But this is an unjustifiable refinement. The plain intent of what is said, being to inculcate, that charity is a duty far more obligatory than hospitality.

This sense of φῶνειν is very rare, and is founded on that more frequent one by which the word denotes to *hail* any one; and, from the adjunct, to summon or call him to us.

14. ὅτι οὐκ — ἀντ. γὰρ, &c.] The full sense is, "because, though they can make thee no return, a return will be made thee," &c.

— ἀναστᾶσει τῶν δικαίων.] So ἀναστ. τῆς ζωῆς in John v. 29, where it is opposed to ἀναστ. κρείστος. The Pharisee believed in a resurrection of the just, but imagined that there would be two resurrections; the first to take place at the coming of the Messiah, who would thus establish an earthly kingdom, to which the Pharisee here evidently alludes. (See Grot. and Pearce.)

13. ἀπὸ μιᾶς.] some supply ὥρας; others γνώμης; others, again, φωνῆς, which is expressed in Joseph. ii. 509. and Diod. Sic. 515. D. But the true ellipse seems to be γνώμης (on which see Bos.):

from one and the same [excuse] principle. Παραιεῖσθαι here signifies to *excuse themselves*, as is clear from the following ἔχε με παρητημένον, which is a Latinism formed on the *excusatum me habeo* *rogo*, which occurs in Martial.

— ἀγρὸν ἠγόρασα.] Since we cannot suppose that a man would buy land without seeing it; or that having bought it, the going to see it should be a matter of such urgency; most recent Commentators take the sense of ἠγόρασα to be, *I intend to buy*. But this can by no means be admitted. Others suppose that the purchase was *conditional*. But of such a mode of purchasing land, (i. e. on *warrant*), there is no proof, and thus the interpretation is altogether *hypothetical*. The best method of interpretation seems to be that proposed in Recens. Synop., namely, to take the Aorist in the sense (on which idiom see Matth. Gr. Gr. § 506. and Win. Gr. Gr. § 34. Note 3.) "I have been purchasing," i. e. "been in treaty for;" which well accounts for the *going and seeing* the land, agreeably to the *going and proving* the oxen just after mentioned.

19. ζεύγη βοῶν ἠγόρασα.] Here again I would render ἠγόρασα, "I am, or have been, in treaty for," because though, in a passage of a Rabbinical writer, mention is made of some oxen being sold on warranty, and subject to subsequent proof, yet we may readily imagine that such cases were rare.

20. γυναίκα — οὐ δύναμαι ἐλθεῖν.] This was the most specious excuse; for, by the laws and customs of most nations, any omission in the *duties*, much less the *etiquette* of life, was thought excusable in newly married persons; hence even soldiers had usually a furlough for a year.

MT.
10.

22 εἰς τὰς πλατείας καὶ ὄμματα τῆς πόλεως, καὶ τοὺς πτωχοὺς καὶ ἀναπη-
 23 ρους καὶ χωλοὺς καὶ τυφλοὺς εἰσάγαγε ὧδε. Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ δοῦλος·
 24 κύριε, γέγονεν ὡς ἐπέταξας· καὶ ἔτι τόπος ἐστί. Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ κύριος
 25 πρὸς τὸν δοῦλον· Ἐξέλθε εἰς τὰς ὁδοὺς καὶ φραγμαῖς, καὶ ἀνά-
 26 κασον εἰσελθεῖν, ἵνα γεμισθῇ ὁ οἶκος μου. Λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, ὅτι
 27 οὐδεὶς τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐκείνων τῶν κεκλημένων γένυται μου τοῦ δείπνου.
 28 Συνεπορεύοντο δὲ αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοί· καὶ στραφεὶς εἶπε πρὸς αὐ- 37
 29 τοὺς· Ἐπίτι ἔρχεται πρὸς με, καὶ οὐ μισεῖ τὸν πατέρα ἑαυτοῦ καὶ
 30 τὴν μητέρα, καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα καὶ τὰ τέκνα, καὶ τοὺς ἀδελφούς καὶ τὰς
 31 ἀδελφάς, ἔτι δὲ καὶ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν, οὐ δύναται μου μαθητὴς εἶναι.
 32 Καὶ ὅστις οὐ βραδίξει τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔρχεται ὀπίσω μου, οὐ 38
 33 δύναται μου εἶναι μαθητὴς. Τίς γὰρ ἐξ ὑμῶν θέλων πύργον οἰκοδο-
 34 μῆσαι, οὐχὶ πρῶτον καθίσας ψηφίζει τὴν δαπάνην, εἰ ἔχει [τὰ] † πρὸς
 35 ἀπυρισμόν; ἵνα μήποτε, θέντος αὐτοῦ θεμέλιον καὶ μὴ ἰσχύοντος
 36 ἐκτελέσαι, πάντες οἱ θεωροῦντες ἄρξωνται ἐμπαιξέειν αὐτῷ· λέγοντες·
 37 Ὅτι οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἤρξατο οἰκοδομεῖν, καὶ οὐκ ἰσχυσεν ἐκτελέσαι.
 38 Ἴη αἰς βασιλεὺς πορευόμενος συμβαλεῖν ἐτέρῳ βασιλεῖ εἰς πόλεμον, οὐχὶ
 39 καθίσας πρῶτον βουλευέται εἰ δυνατός ἐστιν ἐν δέκα χιλιάσιν ἀπαιτη-
 40 σαι τῷ μετὰ εἴκοσι χιλιάδων ἐρχομένῳ ἐπ' αὐτόν; εἰ δὲ μήγε, ἔτι
 41 πόρῳ αὐτοῦ ὄντος, πρεσβεῖαν ἀποστείλας ἐρωτᾷ τὰ πρὸς εἰρήνην.
 42 Οὕτως οὖν πᾶς ἐξ ὑμῶν, ὅς οὐκ ἀποτίσσεται πῶσι τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ ὑπάρ- 5.
 43 χουσι, οὐ δύναται μου εἶναι μαθητὴς. Καλὸν τὸ ἄλλας· ἐὰν δὲ τὸ 13
 44 ἄλλας μωρανθῇ, ἐν τίνι ἄρτυθήσεται; Οὐτε εἰς γῆν, οὔτε εἰς κο-
 45 πρίαν εὐθετόν ἐστιν· ἔξω βάλλουσιν αὐτό. ὁ ἔχων ὡτι ἀκούειν ἀκούειτω.

21. ἄμιας] “lanes;” a signification only found in the later writers, and, as appears from Lobeck on Phryn., first employed as a comic appellation. Τοὺς πτωχοὺς — τυφλοὺς, i. e. the most wretched and miserable objects.

23. φραγμαῖς.] The Commentators all take this to mean, “places fenced off.” But that sense is quite unsatisfactory. From the connexion of the term with ὁδοίς, it is plain that some *kind of road* is meant; and as φραγμὸς signifies what we call in the country a *dead fence* (i. e. one made with faggots) so the sense here must be, “a fenced path,” such as would be necessary across vineyards, orchards, &c.

— ἀνάγκασον.] All the best Commentators have been long agreed, that this can only denote the *moral compulsion of earnest persuasion*.

25. [Comp. Deut. xiii. 6. xxxiii. 9.]

26. μισεῖ] i. e. comparatively, namely, “minus amat,” as appears from Matt. vi. 24. x. 37.

28. By these parabolical comparisons, Christ counsels them, (and all of us of future ages) before we enter on the Christian life, to seriously weigh the *difficulties* of the duties required of us, the *sacrifices* to be made, and the *temptations* to be resisted: so that we may not afterwards be moved by them to abandon our Christian course.

— πύργον] Doddr. supposes this to be such a tower as was built in the vineyards of the East, for the temporary accommodation of those who guarded the produce. But the *costliness* implied in calculating its expense indicates a *permanent mansion* of the higher class; such, it seems, as

was called *πύργος*, by a similar figure to the Latin *turris*, as denoting a turreted house; and, by implication, a considerable edifice. We are however, to understand a *country house, or seat*, in which sense *turris* occurs in Livy xxxiii. 48., where Duker gives other examples. I find from Arundel's Travels in Asia Minor, vol. ii. 335, that *πύργος* even yet designates a country house, usually surrounded by gardens and groves.

— τὰ πρὸς ἰπ.] Several MSS. have τὰ εἰς, and some εἰς without the τὰ, which is cancelled by Griesb. and Scholz; rightly, if the construction be what Bornem. affirms, εἰ ἔχει τὴν δαπάνην εἰς ἄπ.

— καθίσας.] This is used *graphical*, and is merely *ad ornatum*. ψηφίζειν signifies, 1. to count by dropping pebbles; a primitive mode of calculation still preserved among barbarous nations; 2. to calculate, reckon.

31. συμβαλεῖν] The construction *συμβάλλειν εἰς πόλεμον*, or μάχην τινί, is frequent in the Classical writers. Such adjuncts are *exegetical*. Καθίσειν and the Latin *sedere* are often used in expressions denoting *to take counsel*.

32. ἐρωτᾷ τὰ πρὸς εἰρ.] By τὰ πρὸς εἰρήνην is meant what *tends to peace*, i. e. proposals for peace, conditions of peace. So Wets. appositely cites τὰ πρὸς τὰς διαλύσεις from Polyb.

33. ἀποτίσσεται] “renounces, forsakes.” Ἀποτίσσειν signifies, 1. to range into parts. 2. (in the middle voice) *to take part with one*, which implies a *renouncing the other*. This last sense of the word is Alexandrian Greek, and only found in Joseph. and other later writers.

a Matt. 9. 10.
Supra 5. 29.

XV. ἤΙΗΣΑΝ δὲ ἐγγίζοντες αὐτῷ πάντες οἱ τελῶναι καὶ οἱ ἄμαρ- 1
τωλοὶ, ἀκούειν αὐτοῦ. Καὶ διεγόγγυζον οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ Ἰθαμ- 2
ματεῖς, λέγοντες· Ὅτι οὗτος ἄμαρτωλοὺς προσδέχεται, καὶ συνεισθίει 3
αὐτοῖς. Εἶπε δὲ πρὸς αὐτοὺς τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην, λέγων· ὁ ἄνθρωπος 4
ἐξ ὑμῶν ἔχων ἑκατὸν πρόβατα, καὶ ἀπολέσας ἓν ἐξ αὐτῶν, 5
οὐ καταλείπει τὰ ἑννενηκονταενέα ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, καὶ πορεύεται ἐπὶ τὸ
ἀπολωλὸς, ἕως εὑρῆ αὐτό; Καὶ εὑρὼν ἐπιτίθεισιν ἐπὶ τοὺς ὄμους 6
ἑαυτοῦ χαίρων· ὁ καὶ ἐλθὼν εἰς τὸν οἶκον συγκαλεῖ τοὺς φίλους καὶ 7
τοὺς γείτονας, λέγων αὐτοῖς· Συγχάρητέ μοι, ὅτι εὑρον τὸ πρόβατόν 8
μου τὸ ἀπολωλός. Ἄλέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὕτω χαρὰ ἔσται ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ 9
ἐπὶ ἐνὶ ἄμαρτωλῷ μετανοοῦντι, ἢ ἐπὶ ἑννενηκονταενέα δικαίοις, οἵτινες 10
οὐ χρειάν ἔχουσι μετανοίας. ἢ τίς γυνὴ δραχμῆς ἔχουσα δέκα, ἐὰν 11
ἀπολέσῃ δραχμὴν μίαν, οὐχὶ ἄπει λύχνον, καὶ σαροῖ τὴν οἰκίαν, καὶ 12
ζητεῖ ἐπιμελῶς, ἕως ὅτου εὑρῆ; καὶ εὑροῦσα συγκαλεῖται τὰς φίλας 13
καὶ τὰς γείτονας, λέγουσα· Συγχάρητέ μοι, ὅτι εὑρον τὴν δραχμὴν ἣν 14
ἀπόλεσα. Οὕτω, λέγω ὑμῖν, χαρὰ γίνεται ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀγγέλων τοῦ 15
Θεοῦ ἐπὶ ἐνὶ ἄμαρτωλῷ μετανοοῦντι.

c 1 Pet. 2. 25.

d Supra. 5. 32.

Εἶπε δὲ· Ἄνθρωπός τις εἶχε δύο υἱούς· καὶ εἶπεν ὁ νεώτερος αὐ- 11
τῶν τῷ πατρὶ· Πατέρ, δός μοι τὸ ἐπιβάλλον μέρος τῆς οὐσίας. καὶ 12
διέδωκεν αὐτοῖς τὸν βίον. Καὶ μετ' οὐ πολλὰς ἡμέρας συναγαγὼν 13
ἅπαντα ὁ νεώτερος υἱός, ἀπεδήμησεν εἰς χώραν μακρὰν, καὶ ἐκεῖ διε-

34. The connection here is obscure, and disputed. It is, with most probability, laid down as follows: "Ye see, then, the necessity of counting the cost and hazard of becoming my disciples. For if ye engage inconsiderately, ye may either apostatize altogether, or become mere professors, hearers of the word, and not doers."

XV. 1. The Pharisees regarded heathens and gross sinners as equally unworthy of being conversed with; even though with the intention of converting them. They therefore calumniated Christ for too much familiarity with these persons; not considering, that he conversed with them not as their companion, but their physician of the soul. Hence our Lord employs the following parables to show them how *inhuman*, and how different from God's merciful disposition to them was such conduct. See Note on Matt. xviii. 12—14.

2. προσδέχεται.] Προσδέχσθαι implies admission to any one's acquaintance; and συνεισθίειν, to his intimacy. See I Cor. v. 11. Gal. ii. 12. and Ps. ci. 5.

4. ἐπὶ joined with verbs of motion indicates the purpose of the action. Kypke compares Diog. Laert. i. 10. 2. πεμφθεῖς—ἐπὶ πρόβατον. I add Thucyd. iv. 13. ἐπὶ ξύλα—παραπέμπειν.

5. ἐπιτίθεισιν—ὄμους.] It may have been, as some say, a custom with the Jewish shepherds to carry their sheep on their shoulders. But this passage will not prove it; for a lost sheep far from home must by shepherds of all countries be carried, since a single sheep cannot be driven.

7. ἢ] for μάλλον ἢ, as in the best writers. See Winer's Gr. § 28. who traces the idiom to Hebraism. Bornem. refers it to the construction being moulded as if πρότερον εἰ had preceded: citing Eccclus. 22. 15. But that is refining too much, more

Hermannii. There can be no doubt that the Scriptural use originated in Hebraism. See Schulz. By μετάνοια is not meant that sorrow for sin which is continually required even of the best men, but that thorough reformation, which is indispensably necessary to the true conversion of the habitual sinner.

8. τίς γυνή.] With this parable the Commentators compare a very similar one in the Rabbinical writings. And Wets. cites from Theophrast. Char. 10. τῆς γυναικὸς ἀποβαλοῦσης τράχαλκον, οἷος μεταφέρειν τὰ σκεύη, καὶ τὰς κλίνας, καὶ τὰς κιβωτοὺς, καὶ οἰφᾶν τὰ καλύμματα.

— ἄπει λύχνον.] There would be this need; since (as we find from the remains of Hercules and Pompeii) the houses of the lower classes, in ancient times, either had no windows, or what were rather like the loop-holes of our barns. 12. τὸ ἐπιβάλλον μέρος.] Sub. μοι from the preceding, "the portion which falleth to me." This use of ἐπιβάλλειν is found in the best writers from Herodot. downwards. The Jewish law did not, any more than the Roman, permit to a father the arbitrary disposal of his whole property. It was entailed on the children, after his death, in equal portions; except that the first-born had a double share. Such distribution, however, was, as I have shewn in Recens. Synop., sometimes made by an indulgent parent to his children during his lifetime, with a reservation of what was necessary to the support of himself and his wife, if alive.

13. συναγαγὼν ἅπαντα.] The sense is, "having converted the whole into money," as is clear from two passages cited by Wets. from Plutarch, p. 772. and Quintill. Dial. v. There is, however, no ellipsis of εἰς ἀργεῖον; but only that circumstance is implied in συναγ., which seems to have been a form of expression used in common life.

14 σκόρπισε τὴν οὐσίαν αὐτοῦ ζῶν ἰσότητος. Διαπηνήσαντος δὲ αὐτοῦ πίν-
 15 τα, ἐγένετο λιμὸς ἰσχυρὸς κατὰ τὴν χώραν ἐκείνην, καὶ αὐτὸς ἤρξατο
 16 ὑστερεῖσθαι. Καὶ πορευθεὶς ἐκολλήθη ἐνὶ τῶν πολιτῶν τῆς χώρας
 17 ἐκείνης· καὶ ἔπεμψεν αὐτὸν εἰς τοὺς ἀγρούς αὐτοῦ βόσκειν χοίρους.
 18 Καὶ ἐπεθύμει γεμίσει τὴν κοιλίαν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν κεραιῶν, ὧν ἦσθιον
 19 οἱ χοῖροι· καὶ οὐδεὶς εἰδίδου αὐτῷ. Εἰς ἑαυτὸν δὲ ἐλθὼν εἶπε·
 20 Ἦσομαι μίσθιοι τοῦ πατρὸς μου περισσεύουσιν ἄρτων, ἐγὼ δὲ λιμῷ
 21 ἀπόλλυμαι! Ἀναστὰς πορεύσομαι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα μου, καὶ ἐσῶ αὐ-
 22 τῷ· Πάτερ, ἡμαρτον εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ ἐνώπιόν σου· [καὶ] οὐκέτι
 εἰμὶ ἄξιος κληθῆναι υἱὸς σου· ποιήσόν με ὡς ἓνα τῶν μισθίων σου.
 23 Καὶ ἀναστὰς ἦλθε πρὸς τὸν πατέρα ἑαυτοῦ. Ἦτι δὲ αὐτοῦ μακρὰν
 ἀπέχοντος, εἶδεν αὐτὸν ὁ πατήρ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐσπλαγχνίσθη· καὶ δρα-
 24 μῶν ἐπέπεσεν ἐπὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ καὶ κατεφίλησεν αὐτόν. Εἶπε δὲ
 αὐτῷ ὁ υἱός· Πάτερ, ἡμαρτον εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ ἐνώπιόν σου, καὶ οὐ-
 25 κέτι εἰμὶ ἄξιος κληθῆναι υἱὸς σου. Εἶπε δὲ ὁ πατήρ πρὸς τοὺς δούλους
 αὐτοῦ· Ἐξενέγκατε τὴν στολὴν τὴν πρώτην καὶ ἐνδύσατε αὐτόν, καὶ
 δότε δακτύλιον εἰς τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ καὶ ὑποδήματα εἰς τοὺς πόδας·

c Acts 2, 39.
Eph. 2, 12, 17.

— διασκορπίσῃ] “dissipated.” A metaphor taken from winnowing.

— ἀσότης] i. e. τρώψω ἀσώτου. Ἄσωτος originally denoted one who cannot be saved; but was afterwards used, in an active sense, to denote “one who cannot save [himself].” a prodigal, a dissolute person, whom (as I think Alexis ap. Athenæum says) “the Goddess of Salvation herself could not save.” Some Commentators, however, maintain a passive sense, referring to Aristot. Eth. iv. 1. But that passage supplies no certain proof. And it is plain that Aristotle considered the word as having an active sense, since he just after explains it by ἀκατῶς καὶ εἰς ἀκαλασταν διαπηνήσαντος; the most accurate definition that has ever yet been given of the word.

15. ἐκολλήθη] “connected himself with,” i. e. bound or engaged himself to. The verb has properly a passive sense, but is always used in a reflected or reciprocal one. Βόσκειν χοίρους. An employment considered by all the ancient nations, even where no religious prejudices subsisted, as among the vilest. How degrading, then, to a Jew.

16. καὶ ἐπεθύμει γεμίσει αὐτῷ.] The sense which several Translators and Commentators assign to ἐπεθύμει, desired, is far from satisfactory. Campb. strenuously maintains that the expression cannot denote desire ungratified (“for the young man,” says he, “had surely the power, and would scarcely scruple to satisfy his hunger on the hucks”); and that it is in vain to support this view by taking for granted circumstances which do not appear from the story.” This is true, but little to the purpose. It will only hold good against supplying κεραιῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ. And why, it may be asked, should οὐδεὶς be here said? for surely none could give him, even of the κεραῖα, but his master. In vain does Campb. urge that ἐπεθ. “cannot signify desire ungratified.” It certainly does signify it. The poor wretch desired to satisfy his hunger with the food of men, if he could; but of that he could buy very little, and no man gave him aught. And as to the swine’s hucks,

he could not satisfy his hunger with so small a quantity as his stomach would bear. Consequently ἐπεθ. does denote desire ungratified. Campb., indeed, takes ἐπιθυμῆν here for ἀγαπᾶν, to be fain, i. e. content. But that sense has never been established on any certain proof, either in the Scriptural or Classical writers. Now the difference between I was fain, and I would fain, is worthy of remark. The former signifies “I was glad” (fain coming from the Ang. Sax. feagen, glad), which implies a sort of παθητικῆς, or compulsion for fear of worse; the latter (in which fain is an adverb) signifies “I would gladly do,” or have done, a thing, if permitted. And though the former sense would certainly be apt, both here and at Luke xvi. 21, yet, considering how deficient it is in authority, it cannot with propriety be adopted. It is better, therefore, to retain the common version, “he would fain have filled his belly, &c. And no one gave him aught, namely, such food as is eaten by human beings;” (at αὐτῷ supplying τῆ scil. φαιγίῳ.) This latter clause, we may observe, contains a pathetic representation of extreme distress.

By the κεραι., Commentators are now agreed, is meant (as Sir Th. Brown first proved) the fruit of the *ceratonia siliquosa*, or *carob-tree*, common in the Southern and Eastern countries, and still used for feeding swine, nay, occasionally eaten by the poorer class of people, as were the *silique* among the Romans.

19. καὶ.] This is omitted in very many of the best MSS. and Versions, and is rightly cancelled by almost all Editors. The *Asyndeton* is intensive.

21. πάτερ, &c.] The prodigal commences the confession he had meditated, notwithstanding he had the embrace of forgiveness; yet he does not finish his intended speech; being, we may suppose, interrupted in uttering the last words ποιήσον—σου by the words of his father.

22. Ἐξενέγκατε, &c.] The articles called for are such whose use denoted freedom and dignity; nay, the robe is to be the best. This use of πρώτος

καὶ ἐνέγκαντες τὸν μόσχον τὸν σιτευτὸν θύσατε, καὶ φραγόντες εὐφραν- 23
 θώμεν· ὅτι οὗτος ὁ υἱὸς μου νεκρὸς ἦν, καὶ ἀνέζησε· καὶ ἀπολω- 24
 λὼς ἦν, καὶ εὐρέθη. καὶ ἤρξατο εὐφραίνεσθαι. Ἦν δὲ ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ 25
 ὁ πρεσβύτερος ἐν ἀγῶνι· καὶ ὡς ἐρχόμενος ἤγγισε τῇ οἰκίᾳ, ἤκουσε
 συμφωνίας καὶ χορῶν· καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος ἕνα τῶν παιδῶν, ἐπνυ- 26
 θάετο τί εἶη ταῦτα; Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ὅτι ὁ ἀδελφός σου ἦκει· 27
 καὶ ἔθυσεν ὁ πατήρ σου τὸν μόσχον τὸν σιτευτὸν, ὅτι ὑγαίοντα αὐ-
 τὸν ἀπέλαβεν. Ὁργίσθη δὲ, καὶ οὐκ ἔθελεν εἰσελθεῖν. Ὁ οὖν πατήρ 28
 αὐτοῦ ἐξελθὼν παρεκάλει αὐτόν. Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπε τῷ πατρί· 29
 Ἴδού, τοσαῦτα ἔτη δουλεύω σοι, καὶ οὐδέποτε ἐντολήν σου παρῆλθον·
 καὶ ἐμοὶ οὐδέποτε ἔδωκας ἔριφον, ἵνα μετὰ τῶν φίλων μου εὐφρανθῶ.
 Ὅτι δὲ ὁ υἱὸς σου οὗτος, ὁ καταφαγὼν σου τὸν βίον μετὰ πορνῶν, 30
 ἦλθεν, ἔθυσας αὐτῷ τὸν μόσχον τὸν σιτευτόν. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· 31
 Τέκνον, σὺ πάντοτε μετ' ἐμοῦ εἶ, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐμὰ σὰ ἐστίν. Ἐν- 32
 φρανθήναι δὲ καὶ χορῆσαι ἔδει· ὅτι ὁ ἀδελφός σου οὗτος νεκρὸς ἦν
 καὶ ἀνέζησε· καὶ ἀπολωλὸς ἦν καὶ εὐρέθη.

XVI. ἜΛΕΓΕ δὲ καὶ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ· Ἄνθρωπός τις 1
 ἦν πλοῦσιος, ὃς εἶχεν οἰκονόμον· καὶ οὗτος διεβλήθη αὐτῷ ὡς δια-
 σκορπίζων τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῦ. Καὶ φωνήσας αὐτὸν εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Τί 2
 τοῦτο ἀκούω περὶ σοῦ; ἀπόδος τὸν λόγον τῆς οἰκονομίας σου· οὐ
 γὰρ δυναθήσῃ ἔτι οἰκονομεῖν. Εἶπε δὲ ἐν ἑαυτῷ ὁ οἰκονόμος· Τί ποιή- 3
 σω, ὅτι ὁ κύριός μου ἀφαιρεῖται τὴν οἰκονομίαν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ; σκάπτειν

is rarely found except in the Scriptures. The only apposite examples adduced from the Classics are Athen. V. p. 197. Ταῦται δ' ἀμφίτατοι ἀλουργεῖς ὑπέστρωτο τῆς πρώτης ἐφοίας. Joseph. Ant. xiii. 5. 4. τὰ πρῶτα μέρα χροῦμενοι.

23. τὸν μόσχον τὸν σιτ.] such as we may suppose most opulent rustic families would be usually provided with, for any extraordinary call on their hospitality; as with us *poultry*. Moreover *veal* was by the ancients reckoned a delicacy. Θύσατε, butcher, see Note on Matt. xxii. 4.

24. νεκρὸς ἦν καὶ ἀνέζησε.] This must, notwithstanding the dissent of Herman and Rosenm., be taken in a metaphorical sense, of *spiritual* death and coming to life again by repentance; a sense often occurring in Scripture, and not unfrequent in the Classical writers. See Rec. Syn.

25. ἤκουσε συμφωνίας καὶ χορῶν.] It was a very ancient and *Oriental* custom to have concerts of music at entertainments. See Hom. Od. xvii. 358.

27. ὑγαίοντα] “safe and sound.” So the Greeks say *σῶν καὶ ὑγιῶν*, as Herodot. iii. 124. Thucyd. iii. 34. Yet the *figurative* sense *inculcated* at ver. 24. may be here *united* with the physical one. So Plutarch, cited by Kypke, *ἵνα μὴ ταῦ ὑγαίοντος καὶ τεταγμένον* (orderly) βίου καταφρονήσωσι.

29. δουλεύω.] The present tense here denotes *continuity*, “I have been and am serving thee.”

30. ὁ καταφαγὼν—βίον.] This metaphor, to denote prodigality, is common in the Classical writers from Homer downwards. See Rec. Syn.

31. πάντα τὰ ἐμὰ σὰ ἐστίν] i. e. “is to be thine as **MY** **HEIR**,” κείνος πάντων (for his brother had for-

feited all title to *inheritance*). Such a person the Romans called *Herus minor*.

XVI. 1. ἄνθρωπος τις ἦν πλ.] On the scope of this Parable the Commentators widely differ. (See Recens. Synop.) It is, however, generally admitted to have an affinity to the foregoing one; and, like that, to have been meant for the instruction of Christ's followers in general; for *μαθηταὶ* is often taken in this extended sense. And as that represents the consequences of living without God in the world, so this seems to have been meant to teach men the true use of riches; and how they may be employed, so that being in this world rich towards God, they may attain eternal happiness in the world to come. A Parable very similar to this is cited by Lightf. and A. Clarke from D. Kimchi on Isaiah xl. 21.

—οἰκονόμος.] The *οἰκονόμος* was a domestic, generally a freedman, who discharged duties corresponding with those of our *house-stewards* and of our *house-keepers*. Διεβλήθη, “was accused.” This use of the word, of a *true* and not of a *calumnious* charge, is chiefly found in the Sept. and the later Greek writers.

2. τί] for *δαρτί*, how! or what! importing *expostulation* and anger. τὸν λόγον, “the account,” viz. which you are bound to give. So Plato Phæd. § 8. ἵμῖν δὲ τοῖς ἐκασταῖς βόλομαι τὸν λόγον ἀποδοῦναι. Δυνήσῃ is *not* redundant, but signifies *must*; i. e. “unless thou give a *satisfactory* account.” The not attending to this point has occasioned some misconceptions in the interpretation of the Parable.

3. σκάπτειν οἶκ ἰσχύω.] The sense is, “I have

4 οὐκ ἰσχύω, ἐπιπαιεῖν ἀισχύνομαι. Ἔργων τί ποιήσω· ἵνα ὅταν μετα-
 5 σταθῶ τῆς οἰκονομίας, δέξωμαι με εἰς τοὺς οἴκους αὐτῶν. Καὶ
 προσκαλεσάμενος ἓνα ἕκαστον τῶν χρεωφειλετῶν τοῦ κυρίου ἐαυτοῦ,
 6 ἔλεγε τῷ πρώτῳ· Πόσον ὀφείλεις τῷ κυρίῳ μου; ὁ δὲ εἶπεν· Ἐκα-
 τὸν βάτους ἐλαίου· καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Δέξαι σου τὸ γράμμα, καὶ
 7 καθίσας ταχέως γράψον πενήτηντα. Ἐπειτα ἑτέρῳ εἶπε· Σὺ δὲ
 πόσον ὀφείλεις; ὁ δὲ εἶπεν· Ἐκατὸν κόρους οἴτου. καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ·
 8 Δέξαι σου τὸ γράμμα καὶ γράψον ὀγδοήκοντα. ^a Καὶ ἐπήνεσεν ὁ κύ-
 ριος τὸν οἰκονόμον τῆς ἀδικίας, ὅτι φρονίμως ἐποίησεν. ὅτι οἱ υἱοὶ
 τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου φρονιμώτεροι ὑλὲρ τοὺς υἱοὺς τοῦ φωτός εἰς τὴν

^a Eph. 5. 8.
 1 Thess. 5. 5.

not strength to work as a day labourer;” of which occupation *digging*, as being the most laborious and servile, is put, a *part* for the *whole*. So Phocyl. εἰ δὲ τις οὐ δέδρακε τέχνην, σκάπτει τὸ οὐκ ἐλλῆγ. and Aristoph. Av. 1432. τί γὰρ πάθω, σκάπτειν γὰρ οὐκ ἐπίσταμαι.

4. ἔγνω.] Kuin. and others explain, “I understand or see, although occurs to me.” But this is destitute of authority, and limits the sense, which seems to include this, and the common version “I am (or have) resolved.” So Bishop Sanderson, (in an admirable Sermon on ver. 8, p. 209.) “He casteth about this way and that way and every way; and, at last, bethinketh himself of a course, and resolveth upon it.”

— μετασταθῶ.] Μεθίστημι is often used of removal from office. In δέξωμαι we have antecedent for consequent (*support*), as in John xix. 27. Δέξ. may (as Kuin. directs) be taken *impersonally*; but, on account of the αὐτῶν following, it is better to suppose an ellipse of ἀνθρώποι; or rather there seems to be a reference to *certain persons* in the mind of the steward; namely, his master’s debtors.

5. τῷ πρώτῳ.] One or two cases are mentioned as *examples* of what was said to all.

6. δέξαι τὸ γράμμα, &c.] There is some doubt as to the sense of γράμμα. The almost invariable opinion of Commentators, ancient and modern, is that it signifies a *bond*, or *engagement*; of which sense Kypke adduces four examples from Josephus and Libanius. And Grot. has proved that γράμμα, like the Latin *literæ*, had the signification of *syngrapha*, or *chirographa* (so we say a note of *hand*) and *cautio*. These *bonds*, he shews, were kept in the hands of the steward. Dr. A. Clarke thinks that “this γράμμα was a writing in which the debt was specified, together with the obligation to pay so much, at such and such times. This,” continues he, “appears to have been in the *hand-writing* of the debtor, and probably signed by the steward; and this precluded imposition on each part. To prevent all appearance of forgery in this case, he is desired to write it over again, and cancel the whole engagement.” That it was in the *hand-writing* of the debtor, is very probable. Yet such a *note of hand* could not require the *steward’s signature*. It is more probable that (according to the explanation given by Dr. Mackn.) the γράμμα denotes a *contract* (probably on lease) for *rent*. However, the common interpretation *may* be, and I think ought to be, *written*, to represent the true sense. These γράμματα were, it should seem, both *bonds* and *contracts*. Those who took land were, we may suppose, required, previously to occupancy, to execute and

sign an *engagement*, binding them to pay as rent a certain portion of the produce to the proprietor. This was, no doubt, countersigned by the proprietor or his steward, with an *acceptance* of the rent, (thus ratifying the contract,) of which a *copy*, also signed by the steward, was given to the occupier for his security. Thus the writing in question being both an *engagement* and a *contract*, was rightly styled a γράμμα, in whichever sense that word may be taken. Now this alteration of *contract* would be a more *lasting* advantage to the tenants, and, of course, would entitle the steward to a proportionably greater degree of their gratitude.

8. κύριος.] This denotes the “master (of the steward),” not, as it is commonly interpreted, “the Lord,” i. e. Christ.

— ἐπήνεσεν] “commended him,” not for his *fraud*; but, besides his *prudence* in securing his future subsistence, for the *dexterity* with which he had effected it (as, in Terent. Heanton. iii. 2, 26, Chremes praises a knavish servant: “Syrus. Eho! laudas, quæso, qui heros fallerent? Chremes. In loco ego verò laudo.”); for a *blundering* fraud would merit both censure and contempt. Τὸν οἶκ. τῆς ἀδικίας is for τὸν οἶκ. τῶν ἀδικῶν, (Hebraicè) the fraudulent steward. (So v. 9. μαμωνᾶ τῆς ἀδικίας for τοῦ μ. ἀδικῶν.)

— οἱ υἱοὶ— εἰσι.] The best Commentators are agreed that these are the words, not of the *master*, but of *Christ*, suggesting an important admonition. The force of the expression υἱοὶ τοῦ α. τ. and υἱοὶ τοῦ φωτός is fully and ably discussed by Bp. Sanderson in a Sermon on this text. Both phrases are found in the Rabbinical writers.

The words εἰς τὴν γενεὰν τὴν ἐαυτῶν admit of various explanations, and have been variously interpreted. The older Commentators take it for ἐν τῇ γενεᾷ, and assign to γεν. various metaphorical senses alike unauthorized. But a *literal* acceptance is to be preferred; namely, that of their own race, people like-minded with themselves. Nor is there any occasion to take the εἰς for ἐν. It may be rendered *quod attinet ad*, as far as respects the judgments and ideas of persons of their own kind. Bp. Sanderson, in his Sermon on this text, enumerates the various respects in which they are wiser. “1. As being more sagacious and provident to forethink what they ought to do, and forecast how it ought to be done; to weigh all probable and possible obstructions to their designs, and endeavour to remove them. 2. More industrious and diligent in pursuing what they have designed. 3. More cunning and close. 4. More united, holding all together.” He then

b Matt. 6. 19. γενεάν τὴν ἑαυτῶν εἰσι. ὁ Κἀγὼ ὑμῖν λέγω ποιήσατε ἑαυτοῖς φίλους 9
& 19. 21.
1 Tim. 6. 19. ἐκ τοῦ μαμωνᾶ τῆς ἀδικίας, ἵνα ὅταν ἐκλίπητε, δέξωνται ὑμᾶς εἰς τὰς
c Infr. 19. 17. αἰωνίους σκηνάς. ὁ πιστὸς ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ καὶ ἐν πολλῷ πιστὸς ἐστὶ 10
καὶ ὁ ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ ἄδικος καὶ ἐν πολλῷ ἄδικος ἐστίν. Ἐὶ οὖν ἐν τῷ 11
ἀδικῷ μαμωνᾷ πιστοὶ οὐκ ἐγένεσθε, τὸ ἀληθινὸν τίς ὑμῖν πιστεύσει;
καὶ εἰ ἐν τῷ ἄλλοτρίῳ πιστοὶ οὐκ ἐγένεσθε, τὸ ὑμέτερον τίς ὑμῖν δώσει; 12

shows how Christians should emulate the worldling's wisdom in all those particulars, so as to be wise in their *own* way, and in the sight of God. He moreover considers the *limitation* implied in *εἰς τὴν γεν.*, rendering it "in *genere suo*," in their kind of wisdom, namely, in worldly things, for worldly ends. "Simply and absolutely considered (continues he) the child of light is the wiser man, since true wisdom can be learned only from the word of God. That godliness is the only wisdom, and that there is no fool but the sinner, will appear as follows:—1. He is all for the present, and never considers what *mischiefs* or *inconveniences* will follow thereupon afterwards. 2. When *both* are permitted to *his choice*, he hath not the wit to prefer that which is eminently *better*, but chooseth that which is *extremely worse*. 3. He proposes to himself base and *unworthy ends*. 4. For the attaining even of those *poor ends*, he makes choice of such *means* as are neither *proper* nor *probable* thereunto. 5. He goes on in *bold enterprise* with great confidence of success, upon very *slender grounds* of assurance. And lastly, where his own wit will not serve him, *refuseth to be advised* by those that are *wiser* than himself, what he wanteth in *wit*, making up in *will*. No wise man, I think, can take a person of this character for any other than a *fool*. And every worldly or *ungodly man* is all this, and more; and every *godly man* the contrary."

9. ποιήσατε — σκηνάς.] On the whole of this verse there is no little diversity of interpretation. With respect to *μαμωνᾶ τῆς ἀδικίας*, it is plainly put for *μαμωνᾶ ἀδίκου*, by a common Hebraism. But the force of the epithet here is not so clear. Some take *μαμωνᾶ τῆς ἀδ.* to denote *riches acquired by injustice*. But this cannot here be admitted, because it would lead to a sense which would inculcate a doctrine unworthy of the Gospel; as if the wrath of God for ill-gotten gain could be appeased by giving alms to the poor. It is *better* to suppose, with the best modern Commentators, that *ἀδικία* is here to be taken in the sense *deceitful, unstable*, as opposed to *ἀληθινός*, as at ver. 11. Of this sense they adduce many examples from the LXX. and the Classical writers, and a few from the N. T. But these last are not to the purpose; and the others are *doubtful* as taken from *poetic phraseology*. I therefore prefer, with some ancient and several modern Commentators, to suppose that the epithet has reference, in a general sense, to the *means* whereby riches are often acquired. And I would suggest, that *ἀδικία* sometimes is used of *harsh and gripping conduct*, and taking unfair advantages, without which *great riches*, it is to be feared, are rarely amassed. See Matth. xxv. 24. At *ἐκλίπητε* there is an ellipse of *τὸν βίον*, which is generally expressed in the Classical writers, though in the LXX. always omitted.

As to the *persons* meant in *δέξωνται*, many ancient and modern Commentators understand the *angels appointed to receive departed spirits*. And for this there is some countenance in Matth. xxiv.

31. Luke vi. 38. and especially xii. 20. τὴν ψυχὴν σου ἀπαιτοῦσιν ἀπὸ σοῦ. But there the *ἀπαιτ.* may be taken as an *impersonal*: so indeed almost all recent Commentators take the *δέξωνται* in the present passage, q. d. "that ye may be received." However, it would seem most natural to refer *δέξωνται* to the *φίλους* before; and this is strongly confirmed by the foregoing parable, of which this is an application. And thus the sense *may be*, as Scott and Le Bas suppose, "Make to yourselves friends, by relieving the poor and destitute, that those whom you have thus befriended may, by their prayers and intercessions, be a means of your being received into heaven," i. e. may contribute to your reception. And in *αἰωνίους σκηνάς* there is meant to be an *opposition*, namely of solid and lasting houses ["not made with hands"] to the temporary and frail *tents* of this world. The above view is supported by Bp. Sanderson, who after remarking that these words contain the *application* of the Parable, says, "it has two parts. 1. More *general* respecting the *end*; that as he was careful to provide *maintenance* for the preservation of his *natural life*, so we should be careful to make provision for *our souls*, that we may attain to *everlasting life*. 2. More *special*, respecting the *means*; that as he provided for himself out of his *master's goods*, by disposing the same into *other hands*, and upon *several persons*; so we should *lay up for ourselves a good foundation* towards the attainment of everlasting life out of the *unrighteous mammon* wherewith God hath intrusted us, by being *rich in good works*, communicating and distributing some of that in our hands towards the *necessities* of others."

10. ὁ πιστὸς — ἐστίν.] This is an adagial saying, to be understood only of what *generally* happens; and adverting to the principle on which masters act; who, after proving the fidelity of servants in *small matters*, at length confide more important business to their care. Our Lord, however, proceeds to give it an application as respects the comparative importance of the riches of this world and those of heaven; q. d. As he who is faithful in *small matters*, &c., so he who has misapplied the riches committed to his stewardship. &c.

11. τίς.] By implication, *no one*, q. d. God will not. Τὸ ἀληθινόν, "the true riches," i. e. the favour of God and admission to the mansions of eternal bliss. So said in opposition to the riches of the world, which are but a vain show, and promise what they never perform.

12. εἰ ἐν τῷ ἄλλοτρίῳ — δώσει.] This is only another mode of expressing the same thing viewed in another light. By τὸ ἄλλοτρίον are meant the goods of this life only; which are so called, because they are, strictly speaking, not our own, but only committed to us as stewards. So Clem. Rom. ii. 5. cited by Wets., enjoins us τὰ κοσμικὰ πάντα ὡς ἄλλοτρία ἡγεῖσθαι, καὶ μὴ ἐπιθεμεῖν αὐτῶν. By τὸ ὑμέτερον are meant the riches of an eternal inheritance in heaven, called *our own*, because,

MT.

6.

24

13 Οὐδέεις οἰκέτης δύναται δυοὶ κυρίοι δουλεύειν· ἢ γὰρ τὸν ἓνα μισή-
σει, καὶ τὸν ἕτερον ἀγαπήσει· ἢ ἐνὸς ἀνθέξεται, καὶ τοῦ ἑτέρου κατα-
φρονήσει. οὐ δύνασθε Θεῷ δουλέειν καὶ μαμωνᾷ.

14 Ἦκουον δὲ ταῦτα πάντα καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι, φιλάργυροι ὑπάρχοντες,

15 καὶ ἐξεμυκτήριζον αὐτόν. Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Ὑμεῖς ἐστε οἱ δικαιοῦ-
τες ἑαυτοὺς ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων· ὁ δὲ Θεὸς γινώσκει τὰς καρδίας
16 ὑμῶν· οἷ το ἐν ἀνθρώποις ὑψηλὸν βδέλυγμα ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ

16 [ἐστίν]. Ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται ἕως Ἰωάννου· ἀπὸ τότε ἡ βι-
17 σιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ εὐαγγελίζεται, καὶ πᾶς εἰς αὐτὴν βιάζεται. Ἐνδοπιώτε-
ρον δὲ ἐστὶ τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν παρελθεῖν, ἢ τοῦ νόμου μίαν

17 σιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ εὐαγγελίζεται, καὶ πᾶς εἰς αὐτὴν βιάζεται. Ἐνδοπιώτε-
ρον δὲ ἐστὶ τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν παρελθεῖν, ἢ τοῦ νόμου μίαν

18 κεραίαν πεσεῖν. Πῶς ὁ ἀπολύων τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ γαμῶν ἑτέραν

18 κεραίαν πεσεῖν. Πῶς ὁ ἀπολύων τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ γαμῶν ἑτέραν
μοιχεύει· καὶ πᾶς ὁ ἀπολελυμένην ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς γαμῶν μοιχεύει.

19 Ἀνθρώπος δὲ τις ἦν πλούσιος, καὶ ἐκεδιδύσκετο πορφύραν καὶ βύσσον,

20 εὐφραίνόμενος καθ' ἡμέραν λαμπρῶς. πτωχὸς δὲ τις ἦν ὀνόματι Λά-
21 ζαρος, ὃς ἐβέβλητο πρὸς τὸν πυλῶνα αὐτοῦ, ἠλκωμένος καὶ ἐπιθυμῶν

21 ζαρος, ὃς ἐβέβλητο πρὸς τὸν πυλῶνα αὐτοῦ, ἠλκωμένος καὶ ἐπιθυμῶν
χορτασθῆναι ἀπὸ τῶν ψιχίων τῶν πιπτόντων ἀπὸ τῆς τραπέζης τοῦ

11.

13

12

5.

18

32

1st, the possession of it is secured to us on certain conditions; 2dly, it will be wholly our own, and not to be shared with others.

14. *Ἐξεμυκτήριζον αὐτόν.* ["sneered at him."] *Μυκτηρίζειν* (from *μυκτήρ*, the nose) properly signifies to *turn up the nose*; a metaphor used in most languages to designate *derision*. [*Comp.* Matt. xxiii. 14.]

15. *δικαιοῦντες ἑ.*] This expression (which is variously interpreted) most probably designates their arrogating to themselves a virtue and sanctity not really theirs. Thus *δικαίως* is taken, like the Hiphil conjugation in Hebrew, for "to *make [one seem] just.*" *Βδελύγμα* is for *βδελυκτὸν*, *abstract for concrete*. Of course, this enunciation must be restricted to what went before, and denote the pomp of ceremonious observances, which served as a cloak to vice. [*Comp.* Ps. vii. 9. 1 Sam. xvi. 7.]

16—18. On these verses, see Note on Matt. xi. 12 & 13. v. 18 & 32. and on the connection with the preceding, see Whitby, Doddr., Kuin., and Vat.

17. [*Comp.* Ps. cii. 26. Is. xl. 8. 2 Pet. iii. 7.]

19. *ἀνθρώπος δὲ τις, &c.*] It has been disputed, both among ancient and modern Commentators, whether the following narration be a real history, or merely a story, or something composed of both, i. e. founded on fact, but adorned with colouring and imagery. The best Commentators, both ancient and modern, with reason consider it as *a parable*; since all the circumstances seem parabolic, and a story very similar to it is found in the Babylonian Gemara. Its scope is too obvious to need explanation.

— *πορφύραν.*] The use of purple vestments was originally confined to *Kings*, but had gradually extended itself to the noble and rich. On this, and the nature and species of Byssus among the ancients, see Recens. Synop.

20. *πτωχός.*] Not so much a *beggar*, as a *poor destitute person*. *Ἐβέβλητο*, "was stretched out at." See Note on Matt. viii. 6. The portal of a rich man was, for many reasons, a frequent resort of the needy. In which view Wets. cites Hom. Od. ρ. 336. and Il. κ. 25. This still continues to

be the case in Italy and elsewhere. It would seem to have been the *usual* place where Lazarus was laid. See Note on Acts iii. 2.

21. *ἐπιθυμῶν χορτ.*] It has been much debated among the Commentators whether *ἐπιθυμῶν* signifies *desiring*, (*who desired*), or *who was glad*, or *vain*. The former interpretation has been generally maintained by ancient and modern Commentators; but the latter has been adopted by Elsn., Parkh., Campb., and others, whose reasons, however, are insufficient. For *ἀγαπᾶν*, though used in this sense by the *Classical* writers, is never found in the Scriptural ones; and *ἐπιθυμεῖν* nowhere occurs in that sense in the *Classical*, nor, I believe, in the *Scriptural* writers; for as to Luke xv. 16, see the Note there. Our common Translators have, I think, done right in adopting the sense "he would fain" in that passage; and have as rightly retained the ordinary signification in the present. *Here* it is simply *desire*, or *wish* that is expressed. His desire, in being laid there, was to be fed, &c. The taking his post there was a sort of *begging by action*. That this his desire was, as some represent, *not fulfilled*, is not only not implied in the term itself, but is, as Campb. shows, inconsistent with the circumstances of the narrative.

— *τῶν ψιχίων, &c.*] Not, the crumbs which fell from, &c. but the "*scraps which chanced to be sent from the table.*" By the same metaphor, Pythagoras (cited by D'Outrin) enjoined *τὰ πύπρωτα ἀπὸ τῆς τραπέζης μὴ ἀναρσεῖσθαι*, i. e. not to gather up the scraps or leavings, but let them alone for the poor. This whole context is well illustrated by Homer *Odys. ρ. 220.* (omitted by all the Commentators), *Πτωχῶν ἀνηρώδων, δαιετῶν ἀπολυμαντῆρα, ὅς πολλῆσι φλίσει παραστᾶς φλίφεται ὄμων, Αἰγίζων ἀκόλους.* where *ἀπολυμ.* is explained by the Schol. *τὸν καθάρματα ἀποφωρῶμενον.* The 2d line illustrates the custom of mendicants taking their station at a rich man's portal; and the expression denoting *continuance* there, though homely, is strong. The 3d and 1st lines are illustrated by a kindred passage in the Hymn in Cer. 115. *Αἰγίζων ἀκόλους τε καὶ ἐκβόλα λίματα δαίτος.*

πλοσίον· ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ κύνες ἐρχόμενοι ἀπέλειχον τὰ ἔλκη αὐτοῦ.
 Ἐγένετο δὲ ἀποθαιεῖν τὸν πτωχὸν, καὶ ἀπενεχθῆναι αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τῶν 22
 ἀγγέλων εἰς τὸν κόλπον [τοῦ] Ἀβραάμ. ἀπέθαιε δὲ καὶ ὁ πλούσιος
 καὶ ἐτάφη. Καὶ ἐν τῷ ἄδῃ ἐπάρας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ, ὑπάρχων 23
 ἐν βυσάνοις, ὄρῃ τὸν Ἀβραάμ ἀπὸ μακροῦθεν, καὶ λέξασθαι ἐν τοῖς κόλ-
 ποις αὐτοῦ. ^d Καὶ αὐτὸς φωνήσας εἶπε· Πάτερ Ἀβραάμ, ἐλέησόν με, 24
 καὶ πέμψον Λάζαρον, ἵνα βύβῃ τὸ ἄγκρον τοῦ δακτύλου αὐτοῦ ὕδατος,
 καὶ καταψύξῃ τὴν γλῶσσάν μου· ὅτι ὀδυνῶμαι ἐν τῇ φλογὶ ταύτῃ.
 e Ἰὼβ. 21. 13. Ἐἶπε δὲ Ἀβραάμ· Τέκνον, μὴ θῆσθι ὅτι ἀπέλαβες [σὺ] τὰ ἀγαθὰ 25
 σου ἐν τῇ ζωῇ σου, καὶ Λάζαρος ὁμοίως τὰ κακά· νῦν δὲ † ὅδε παρα-

^d Ios. 66. 24.
 Zach. 14. 12.
 Mark 9. 44.

e Job. 21. 13.

—ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ κύνες, &c.] This must not, with some, be considered as meant to note an *alleviation* of Lazarus' sufferings; though the tongue of a dog is known to be healing; but only (as Euthym. and Doddr. remark), to represent his helpless and miserable condition (with his ulcers neither bound up, nor mollified with ointment); and consequently the *uncharitable neglect* of the rich man.

22. ἀπενεχθῆναι αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγγ., &c.] The elder Commentators take these words literally; the more recent ones think that the simple idea of Lazarus being removed to supreme felicity in heaven, is adorned with imagery agreeable to the opinions of the Jews; which are stated and illustrated by Wets., Schoettg., and others, cited or referred to in Recens. Synop., from which it appears that the same notions prevailed among the Greeks and Romans. Now if there had been only the circumstance of his being carried by the angels to the place of eternal bliss, — that, however agreeable to the notions of the Jews, would have had some countenance for it in our Lord's words; especially, "as this office (Doddr. remarks) would be suitable to their benevolent natures, and to the circumstances of a departed spirit." But when we consider the many *other* circumstances connected with it; as the ἀπενεχθῆναι αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ Ἀβ. (which has reference to the Oriental custom of *reclining* at table, by which the head of a person sitting next him who was at the top of the triclinium was brought almost in his lap (See Note on John vi. 11.); and that, according to the Jewish opinions, angels were employed to convey the bad to hell, as well as the good to heaven, it should seem that the former view is the most correct. Yet it is to be borne in mind, that no *responsibility* on our Lord's part is involved in this case, as in that of the *Dæmoniacs*; for our best Commentators and Theologians are agreed, that in *paraboli- cal* narrations, provided the doctrines inculcated be strictly true, the terms in which they are expressed may be adapted to the prevailing notions of those to whom they are addressed. See Grot., Doddr., and Mackn.

23. ἐν ἄδῃ.] So Note on Matt. xi. 23. Here, indeed, it is commonly supposed that the word denotes *Hell*, the *place of torment*. And even Professor Stuart, in his Exegetical Essays on Words denoting future punishment, assigns this sense; though he admits that this is the only passage where the word carries that import. Wets., Rosenm., and Campb., however, take it in the usual signification to denote the place of departed souls, *Sheol*, or Hades, which the Jews as well as

the Greeks supposed to be divided into two parts, *Paradise* and *Gehenna*, contiguous to each other, but separated by an impassable chasm [thus Hor. Carm. ii. 13. 23. "sedesque discretas piorum"], so narrow, however, that there was a *prospect* of one from the other; nay, such that their respective inmates could converse with each other. Thus both the rich man and Lazarus would be equally in Hades, though in different parts. This view seems preferable, because it is better to avoid supposing any such unusual signification as the above. Indeed, if ἐν τοῖς βυσάνοις be meant as Kuin. (who retains the common signification) says, to qualify ἐν τῷ ἄδῃ, that of itself decidedly proves that ἄδης must be taken in the usual sense, — otherwise, according to the signification *Hell*, no such qualification could have been necessary. In fact, ἐν τοῖς βυσάνοις ὑπάρχων is equivalent to ἐν τῷ ταστάρῳ ὕ. as St. Peter speaks more definitely, 2 Pet. ii. 4. σείσῃς ζόφου ταστάρῳσας, and Joseph. cont. Ap. ii. 33. ἐν ταστάρῳ δεδεμένους. The *paraboli- cal* representation is, indeed, accommodated to Jewish ideas, and the invisible state is described by images derived from the *senses*. But it is going too far to say, with Dr. Jortin (in D'Oyly and Mant) that "we are only to infer the doctrine of a future state of rewards and punishments." For unless we suppose the great source of all truth to sanction *error*, we cannot but infer that there is an *intermediate* state before the general resurrection; since that is too prominent a feature of the representation to be numbered with circumstances merely *ornamental*.

25. ὄδε.] Very many MSS., Versions, Fathers, and early Edd., have ὄδε, which is edited by Matth. and Scholz. But, though this may seem agreeable to a well-known canon; yet that does not apply to words exceedingly similar and often confounded; in which case manuscript authority is small. *Propriety* must, then, decide; and that here requires ὄδε.

—σὺ.] This is omitted in several MSS., Versions, and Fathers, and is cancelled by Griesb., Titm., and Scholz; but without reason; for besides that the antithesis requires the σὺ, and the insufficiency of the evidence for cancelling it, (that of *Versions* being in a case like this but slender), we can account for its *omission* in two ways; for its insertion, in *one* only, and that not a very probable one.

—μὴ θῆσθι ὅτι — ὀδυνῶσαι.] The words are excellently paraphrased by Bp. Sanderson. Sermon ad Populum, p. 151. "If thou hadst any thing good in thee, remember thou hast had thy reward in earth already; and now there remaineth for thee nothing but the *full punishment* of thine ungodli-

26 καλεῖται, σὺ δὲ ὀδυνᾷσαι. Καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσι τούτοις, μεταξύ ἡμῶν καὶ ὑμῶν χάσμα μέγα ἐστήρικται· ὅπως οἱ θέλοντες διαβῆναι ἔνθεν πρὸς 27 ἡμᾶς μὴ δύνωνται, μηδὲ οἱ ἐκεῖθεν πρὸς ἡμᾶς διαπερῶσιν. Εἶπε δέ· Ἐρωτῶ οὖν σε, πάτερ, ἵνα πέμψῃς αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ πατρὸς 28 μου· ἔχω γὰρ πέντε ἀδελφούς· ὅπως διαμαρτυρηθῶνται αὐτοῖς, ἵνα μὴ 29 καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔλθωσιν εἰς τὸν τόπον τούτων τῆς βυσάνου. [Λέγει αὐτῷ Ἀβραάμ· Ἐχουσι Μωϋσεία καὶ τοὺς προφήτας· ἀκούσάτωσαν αὐτῶν. 30 Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν· Οὐχί, πάτερ Ἀβραάμ· ἀλλ' ἐάν τις ἀπὸ νεκρῶν πο- 31 ρευθῆ] πρὸς αὐτοὺς, μετανοήσουσιν. Εἶπε δὲ αὐτῷ· Λὶ Μωϋσείως καὶ τῶν προφητῶν οἶκ ἀκούουσιν, οὐδὲ, ἐάν τις ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῆ, περ- σθήσονται.

[Isa. 8. 20. & 34. 16. John 5. 39. 45. Acts 15. 21. & 17. 11.]

MT. 18.

1 XVII. ΕΠΙΕ δὲ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητάς· Ἀνένδεκτόν ἐστι τοῦ μὴ ἐλ- 7 2 θεῖν τὰ σκάνδαλα· οὐαὶ δὲ δι' οὗ ἔρχεται. Αὐσιτελεῖ αὐτῷ, εἰ μύλος 6 3 λασσαν, ἢ ἵνα σκανδαλίῃ ἓνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων. προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς. 15 Ἐάν δὲ ἀμάρτη εἰς σέ ὁ ἀδελφός σου, ἐπιτίμησον αὐτῷ· καὶ ἐάν μετα- 4 νοήσῃ, ἄφες αὐτῷ. Καὶ ἐάν ἐπιτάκις τῆς ἡμέρας ἀμάρτη εἰς σέ, καὶ ἐπιτάκις τῆς ἡμέρας ἐπιστρέψῃ [ἐπὶ σέ,] λέγων· Μετανοῶ· ἄφησεις αὐτῷ.

ness there in *Hell*. But as for Lazarus, he hath had the chastisement of his infirmities on earth already; and now remaineth for him nothing but the full reward of his godliness here in *Heaven*."

26. ἐνθεν.] This (for the common reading ἐν- τῶθεν) is found in many MSS. and the Ed. Princ. and was rightly adopted by Wets., Matth., Griesb., and Scholz; the common reading plainly having arisen from a marginal gloss. In the later Grecism (see the Critics cited by Bornem.) ἐνθεν was used for ἐντῶθεν. However, this was no innovation; since it is found in Hom. II. xiii. 13. It had probably always been retained in the common dialect, though, in the more refined diction, ἐν- τῶθεν was early substituted. Yet ἐνθεν is found in Thucyd. and Xenophon. What is more, ἐνθεν καὶ ἐνθεν occurs frequently in the Sept.; ἐντῶθεν very rarely, as Numb. xxii. 24. φραγμὸς ἐντῶθεν καὶ φραγμὸς ἐντῶθεν. And Thucyd., in a similar pas- sage, has ἐνθεν, vii. 81. δὸς δὲ ἐνθεν τε καὶ ἐνθεν.

28. διαμαρτυρηθῶνται.] Render, warn, or seriously admonish, by bearing witness of these truths.

29. Μωϋσεία καὶ τοῦς προφ.] meaning the sacred books of the Jews (as in Matt. xvii. 5); all re- vealing, more or less clearly, the doctrine of a future life, and a state of rewards and punish- ments.

30. οὐχί.] The construction is elliptical. We must supply ἀκούσουσιν, "they will not attend to them, they will slight them," as I did.

31. εἰ Μωϋσείως — πειθήσονται.] The Jews themselves confessed that the Law was delivered to them by God, and confirmed by manifest and signal miracles; the report of which, as handed down to them from their ancestors, they had re- ceived. Yet they led a life contrary to the plain injunctions of the law. Nothing, therefore, hin- dered their reformation but a perverse mind, un- willing to embrace, as true, what they could not prove to be false. (Rosenm.) The passage may be thus paraphrased: "Occasions of repentance and reformation are not wanting to them. If, therefore, they will not embrace these; not even

miracles could move their perverse and stubborn wills." For, as it is well expressed by Dr. South (Serm. vol. i.), "where a strong inveterate love of sin has made any doctrine or proposition wholly unsuitable to the heart, no argument or demon- stration, no nor miracle, whatsoever, will be able to bring the heart cordially to close with or re- ceive it. See more in Doddr. and Campb., and also a Discourse by Bp. Atterbury, vol. ii. Serm. 2, and Bp. Sherlock, vol. ii. Serm. 15.

XVII. 1. ἀνένδεκτόν ἐστι] for οὐκ ἐνδέχεται, which occurs in Luke xiii. 33, and denotes what neces- sarily must happen, from the condition of man. See Matt. xviii. 7. and Note. The τοῦ inserted before μὴ ἐλθεῖν from many MSS., Fathers, and early Edd., and adopted by Matth., Griesb., Vater, and Scholz, is probably genuine, being certainly agreeable to the usage of St. Luke. And thus we may render literally, "it is impossible for of- fences not to come."

In the following portions there is no occasion to perplex ourselves about the connection; since, as the best Commentators have observed, the dis- course is formed of detached admonitions, and consequently no connection is *interced*.

2. λυσαιτε.] Here there is the frequent el- lipse of μάλλον.

3. προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς.] These words may be re- ferred either to what precedes, or to what follows. And here Expositors are divided in opinion. The former view seems preferable, since this solemn formula of warning is certainly most suitable to what has just preceded. The δὲ, too, just after, which here (as very often) marks the transition to a new subject, rather shews that the words belong to the preceding. However, it may be meant for both. See Whitby and Gilpin. On what follows, comp. Levit. xix. 17. Prov. xvii. 9. Eccles. xix. 13.

4. [Comp. Matt. xviii. 21.] — ἐπιτάκις] for πολλάκις; a frequent Hebrew idiom. The ἐπὶ σέ after ἐπιστρέψῃ is omitted in

MT.

17.

20

Καὶ εἶπον οἱ ἀπόστολοι τῷ Κυρίῳ· Πρόσθες ἡμῖν πίστιν. Ἐἶπε 5
δὲ ὁ Κύριος· Ἐἰ εἴχετε πίστιν ὡς κόκκον σιγάπικας, ἐλέγετε ἂν τῇ 6
συκαμίνῳ ταύτῃ· Ἐκριζώσθῃ, καὶ φτενύσθῃ ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ· καὶ 7
ὑπήκουσεν ἂν ἡμῖν. Τίς δὲ ἐξ ὑμῶν δούλον ἔχων ἀροτριῶντα ἢ ποι- 7
μαίνοντι, ὃς εἰσελεύθῃ ἐκ τοῦ ἀγροῦ ἐρεῖ· Ἐυθίως παρελεύθῃ ἀνά- 8
πυλαι· ἄλλ' οὐχὶ ἐρεῖ αὐτῷ· Ἐτοιμίμωσον τί δευτηρήσω, καὶ περιζύσω— 8
μενος διακόνει μοι, ἕως φάγω καὶ πίω· καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα φάγῃ καὶ 9
πίῃσιν σύ; Μὴ χάριν ἔχει τῷ δούλῳ ἐκείνῳ, ὅτι ἐποίησε τὰ διατα- 9
χθέντα [αὐτῷ]; οὐ, δοκῶ. Οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς, ὅταν ποιήσῃτε πάντα 10
τὰ διαταχθέντα ὑμῖν, λέγετε· Ὅτι δούλοι ἀρχεῖοι ἐσμεν· ὅτι ὁ 11
ὠφείλομεν ποιῆσαι πεποιθήκαμεν.

ΚΑΙ ἔγένετο, ἐν τῷ πορεύεσθαι αὐτὸν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, καὶ αὐτὸς 11
διήρχετο διὰ μέσου Σαμαρείας καὶ Γαλιλαίας. Καὶ εἰσερχομένου αὐ- 12
τοῦ εἰς τινα κώμην, ἀπήντησαν αὐτῷ δέκα λεπροὶ ἄνδρες, οἳ ἔστησαν 13
πόσῳθεν· καὶ αὐτοὶ ἤραν φωνήν, λέγοντες· Ἰησοῦ ἐπιστάτα, ἐλήσῃσον 13
ἡμᾶς! ^a Καὶ ἰδὼν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Πορευθέντες ἐπιδειξάτε ἐαυτοὺς τοῖς 14
ἱερεῦσι. Καὶ ἔγένετο, ἐν τῷ ὑπάγειν αὐτοὺς, ἐκαθαρίσθησαν. Εἷς δὲ 15
ἐξ αὐτῶν, ἰδὼν ὅτι ἰάθη, ὑπέστρεψε μετὰ φωνῆς μεγάλης δοξάζων τὸν 16
Θεόν· καὶ ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον παρὰ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ, εὐχαριστῶν 16

a Lev. 13. 2.
& 14. 2.
Matt. 8. 4.
supr. 5. 14.

very many MSS., Versions, and Fathers, and is cancelled by Wets., Matth., Griesb., Tittm., Vat., and Scholz. But the evidence for it is so strong, that it is more probable the words were omitted by some over nice Critics, to remove what seemed an offensive repetition, than that it should have been brought in to complete the sense. Such sort of tautology as this *strengthens* the sense, and is found in the best writers. The Editors have chiefly been induced to cancel the words, because they thought the existence of two readings, ἐπὶ σὲ and πρὸς σὲ, showed that *both were from the margin*. But there are exceptions to that, as well as most other Critical Canons. And one is, where a phrase or clausula is such as the Critics, from over fastidiousness, would be likely to object to and alter. For, in such a case, there may be several ways by which the alleged imperfection might be removed; which may all be resorted to by the Critics. And yet that will not prove that the readings are all alike not genuine. Certainly the existence of the words in the Pesch. Syr. Versions attests their high antiquity.

6. *συκαμίνῳ*] i. e. the *ficus sycamorus* of Linnæus; a tree whose leaves resemble those of the mulberry, and its fruit that of the fig-tree. It is found in Egypt and Palestine, and is so called as resembling the *fig-tree* in its fruit, and the *mulberry* in its leaf.

8. *φάγῃ καὶ πίῃσιν*.] These are, as Wets. observes, 2 pers. Fut. Mid. for *φάγη* and *πίη*, according to the early usage (which, it seems, continued in the common dialect to a late period), whereby *φάγομαι* and *πίομαι* were used for *φαγῶμαι* and *πιῶμαι*. See Matth. Gr. Gr. § 197. 1. and Butt. Gr. Gr. p. 244. ἀλλὰ οὐχὶ ἐρεῖ with most for *καὶ ο*. The doctrine contained in ver. 7—10 is plainly this, that the rewards held out to Christian obedience are not of merit, but purely of grace. On which I would refer the reader to a powerful Sermon of Dr. South on Job xxii. 20,

entitled "The Doctrine of merit stated, and the impossibility of Man's meriting of God."

9. *μὴ χάριν ἔχει*.] Kuin. renders, "num gratiam habere debet," which is approved by Bornem., who gives several examples of this sense, and refers to various Critics.

—αὐτῷ.] This is not found in nearly all the best MSS., and in several Fathers and early Edd., and is with reason cancelled by almost every Editor from Beng. to Scholz.

11. *διήρχετο διὰ μέσου Σ.*] On the exact force of this expression the Commentators are in doubt, since Samaria and Galilee seem to be mentioned in a manner the reverse of their geographical position. But it should rather seem that no notice is meant of that position; and that Grot., De Dieu, Wets., Campb., and others, have rightly supposed that our Lord did not proceed by the *direct* way (namely, through Samaria) to Jerusalem; but that, upon coming to the confines of Samaria and Galilee, he diverged to the east; so as to have Samaria on the right, and Galilee on the left. Thus he seems to have passed the Jordan at Scythopolis (where there was a bridge), and to have descended along the bank on the Peræan side, until he again crossed the river, when he came opposite to Jericho. The reason which induced our Lord to take this circuitous route, was probably both to avoid any molestation from the Samaritans, and at the same time to impart to a greater number of Jews the benefits of his Gospel.

12. *εἰσερχομένου αὐτοῦ*] "as he was entering," i. e. about to enter. *Πρόσωθεν*. No doubt, within the distance, whatever it was (for on that the Rabbins are not agreed), at which lepers were obliged to stand apart from others.

14. *τοῖς ἱερεῦσι*.] This is either meant (as Grot. and others think) to be taken in a *collective* sense; or, with Wets., we may suppose the priests of

17 αὐτῶ. καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν Σαμαρείτης. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν·
 18 Οὐχὶ οἱ δέκα ἐκαθαρίσθησαν; οἱ δὲ ἐννέα ποῦ; Οὐχ εὐρέθησαν
 19 ὑποστρέψαντες δοῦναι δόξαν τῷ Θεῷ, εἰ μὴ ὁ ἄλλογενὴς οὗτος. ^b Καὶ ^b Matt. 9. 22.
 εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Ἀναστάς πορεύου· ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέ σε. ^b Mark 5. 34.
 20 Ἐπερωτηθεὶς δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν Φαρισαίων, πότε ἔρχεται ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ ^b & 10. 52.
 Θεοῦ, ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς καὶ εἶπεν· Οὐκ ἔρχεται ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ ^b supra 7. 50.
 21 μετὰ παρατηρήσεως· οὐδὲ ἐροῦσιν· Ἴδου ὧδε, ἢ ἰδου ἐκεῖ· ἰδου γὰρ ^b infra 13. 42.
 22 ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἐστιν. Εἶπε δὲ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς·
 23 Ἐλεύσονται ἡμέραι, ὅτε ἐπιθυμήσετε μίαν τῶν ἡμερῶν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ MT.
 24 ἀνθρώπου ἰδεῖν, καὶ οὐκ ὄψεσθε. Καὶ ἐροῦσιν ὑμῖν· Ἴδου ὧδε, ἢ 24.
 24 ἰδου ἐκεῖ· μὴ ἀπέλθῃτε, μηδὲ διώξητε. ὥσπερ γὰρ ἡ ἀστραπή ἢ 23
 25 ἀστράπτουσα ἐκ τῆς ὑπ' οὐρανὸν εἰς τὴν ὑπ' οὐρανὸν λάμπει· οὕτως 27
 25 ἔσται [καὶ] ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ αὐτοῦ. Πρῶτον δὲ
 26 δεῖ αὐτὸν πολλὰ παθεῖν, καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι ἀπὸ τῆς γενεῆς ταύτης.
 26 Καὶ καθὼς ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις [τοῦ] Νῶε, οὕτως ἔσται καὶ ἐν 37
 27 ταῖς ἡμέραις τοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. Ἦσθιον, ἔπινον, ἐγάμου, ἐξε- 38
 28 γαμίζοντο, ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας εἰσῆλθε Νῶε εἰς τὴν κιβωτὸν, καὶ ἦλθεν
 28 ὁ κατακλυσμὸς καὶ ἀπώλεσεν ἅπαντας. Ὅμοιος καὶ ὡς ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς
 29 ἡμέραις Λὸτ· ἦσθιον, ἔπινον, ἠγόραζον, ἐπώλουν, ἐφύτευον, ἠκοδό-
 29 μουν· ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα ἐξῆλθε Λὸτ ἀπὸ Σοδόμων, ἔβραξε πῦρ καὶ θεῖον
 30 ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἀπώλεσεν ἅπαντας. κατὰ ταῦτα ἔσται ἡ ἡμέρα ὁ 17
 31 Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀποκαλύπτεται. Ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, ὃς ἔσται ἐπὶ
 32 καὶ ὁ ἐν τῷ ἄγρῳ ὁμοίως μὴ ἐπιστρέψάτω εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω. Μνημονεύετε

both Jews and Samaritans. But the former is far more probable.

17. See a masterly Sermon on this text by Dr. Parr, entitled, *On the sin of ingratitude.*

18. ἀλλογενής.] Such the Samaritans were esteemed by the Jews; and Josephus calls them ἄλλοθενεῖς. Whether they were to be regarded as *Gentiles*, was a disputed question among the Rabbins. That they were not *heathens*, was certain; but the Jews took advantage of some approach to idolatry, in the worship at Mount Gerizim, to regard them as such.

20. μετὰ παρατηρήσεως.] On the sense of this expression Commentators are not agreed. The word *parat.* is indeed rare; but four examples are adduced from the later writers, in which the sense is, *attention, observation.* But as that signification does not seem suitable here, many recent Commentators render it *splendour, pomp, parade*; which, however, is rather an *interpretation* than a *version.* It may be best taken, by metonymy, to denote *what attracts observation.*

21. ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἔ.] for ἐν ὑμῖν, "as among you." q. d. the kingdom of the Messiah has even *commenced* among you (i. e. in your own country, and among your own people), though ye do not see it. So xi. 20. ἔφθασεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. On this interpretation the best Commentators are agreed, and adduce examples of this use of *ἐντὸς.* The common interpretation, which takes it of the *internal* and *spiritual* principle, yields a good sense (see Rom. xiv. 17.), but is forbidden by the *context.*

25. [Comp. Matt. xvi. 21. xvii. 22. xx. 18. Mark viii. 31. supra ix. 22. 26.]

26. [Comp. 1 Pet. iii. 20. Gen. vi. 2.]

28. ὁμοίως καὶ ὡς ἐν.] A somewhat unusual mode of expression, which is learnedly discussed by Bornem., who, however, is wrong in referring these words of that *precedes.* It should seem to be a *stronger* expression than either *ὁμοίως ἐγένετο* or *ὁμοίως ἐγένε.* would have been. And we may suppose an *ellipsis*, thus to be supplied: "the circumstances of that age, and the consequent catastrophe, took place also in a similar manner as they did in the days of Lot." [Comp. Gen. xix. 14.]

29. ἐβραξε.] Sub. *θεός*; a frequent ellipsis, but supplied in Gen. xix. 24. Πῦρ denotes lightning; and such is the *proper* signification of *θεῖον*, i. e. *divine fire.* Thus places struck with lightning were said to be *θεῖα*, and were separated from human use. Since, however, in such places there are (to use the words of Lucret. vi. 219.) *inusta vapore Signa notæque, graves halantes sulphuris auras*; and since lightning has a sulphurous smell, hence it is often used for *sulphur*, as here and in Apoc. xiv. 10. xix. 20. Therefore, by *πῦρ καὶ θεῖον* is denoted a sulphurous fire, meaning that of lightning.

32. μνημ. τῆς γων. Λῶτ.] See Gen. 19. 26. Whatever may be the view taken of the occurrence in question, — whether Lot's wife was *literally* turned to a pillar of salt, or *figuratively* so, by being suffocated, and the corpse indurated by the *salsiginous vapour*, — the warning is equally

MT.

16. τῆς γυναικὸς Λώτ. Ὁς ἐὰν ζητήσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σώσει, ἀπολέσει 33
 25 αὐτήν· καὶ ὃς ἐὰν ἀπολέσῃ αὐτήν, ξωογονήσει αὐτήν. Λέγω ὑμῖν· 34
 24. ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ ἔσονται δύο ἐπὶ κλίνης μᾶς· ὁ εἰς παραληφθήσεται,
 41 καὶ ὁ ἕτερος ἀφεθήσεται. δύο ἔσονται ἀλλήθουσαι ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό· ἡ 35
 40 μία παραληφθήσεται, καὶ ἡ ἕτερα ἀφεθήσεται. [δύο ἔσονται ἐν τῷ 36
 ἀγρῷ· ὁ εἰς παραληφθήσεται, καὶ ὁ ἕτερος ἀφεθήσεται.] Καὶ ἀπο- 37
 28 τὸ σώμα, ἐκεῖ συναχθήσονται οἱ αἰετοί.

a Eocl. 18. 22.
 Rom. 12. 12.
 Eph. 6. 18.
 Col. 4. 2.
 1 Thess. 5. 17.
 supra 11. 5.
 & 21. 36.

- XVIII. ἌΛΙΕΓΕ δὲ καὶ παραβολὴν αὐτοῖς πρὸς τὸ δεῖν πάντοτε 1
 προσεῖχεσθαι, καὶ μὴ ἐκκακεῖν, λέγων· Κριτὴς τις ἦν ἐν τινι πόλει τὸν 2
 Θεὸν μὴ φοβούμενος, καὶ ἄνθρωπον μὴ ἐντρέπομενος. Χήρα δὲ [τις] 3
 ἦν ἐν τῇ πόλει ἐκείνῃ, καὶ ἤρχετο πρὸς αὐτὸν, λέγουσα· Ἐκδικήσον 4
 με ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνιδίου μου. Καὶ οὐκ ἠθέλησεν ἐπὶ χρόνον· μετὰ δὲ 4
 ταῦτα εἶπεν ἐν ἑαυτῷ· Ἐὶ καὶ τὸν Θεὸν οὐ φοβοῦμαι, καὶ ἄνθρωπον 5
 οὐκ ἐντρέπομαι· διὰ γε τὸ παρέχειν μοι κόπον τὴν χήραν ταύτην ἐδικήσω 5
 αὐτήν, ἵνα μὴ εἰς τέλος ἐρχομένη ὑπωπιάξῃ με. Εἶπε δὲ ὁ Κύριος· 6
 b Rev. 6. 10. Ἀκούσατε τί ὁ κριτὴς τῆς ἀδικίας λέγει. Ὁ δὲ Θεὸς οὐ μὴ ποιήσει τὴν 7

forcible against the sin of disbelieving these awful predictions, and against a love of the world, or other carnal dispositions.

33. ἡς ἐὰν, &c.] Comp. supra ix. 24. Mark viii. 25. John xii. 25. and Matt. x. 39., where see note. Here the application is somewhat different, referring to what precedes. This sense of ζωογονεῖν (namely to preserve) is never found in the Classical writers; but it is not unfrequent in the LXX.

36. This verse is omitted in a great number of the best MSS., some Versions, and several early Edd.; and is cancelled by almost all recent Editors, as an interpolation from Matthew. But as it is found in some MSS. and almost every Version of antiquity and credit, it should rather seem to be genuine, and only omitted accidentally, propter homocoteleuton.

37. ποῦ, Κύριε] scil. ταῦτα ἔσται vel γενήσεται; i. e. where shall these things come to pass? Not, as Kuin. explains, by what means shall, &c. For thus the words of our Lord in reply would be no answer to the question. And thus, even granting (what perhaps could not be proved) that ποῦ is ever used for πῶς, it could not be shewn to have that sense here. Our Lord, indeed, we may well suppose, was not, neither intended to be, understood then; but he was afterwards; and therefore this partakes of the nature of a prophecy, to be understood completely only by the event, and when fulfilled.

XVIII. 1. πρὸς τὸ δεῖν] “on the subject of the duty of,” &c. See supra ix. 18. and note. Of this sense of πρὸς with verbs of speaking and writing, Kypke adduces an example from Plutarch. Πάντοτε signifies constantly, perseveringly, in opposition to that intermission of regular duty, which arises from weariness or despondency. “This (observes Dr. Barrow, Serm. i. 75.) imports, as the ensuing discourse shews, restless importunity in prayer, so often enjoined by the phrases μὴ ἐκκακεῖν, μὴ παύεσθαι, προσκαρτερεῖν, ἀγωνιάεσθαι, προσμνεῖν, ἀγρυπνεῖν ἐν προσκαρτερίῳ.” See the

whole of his Sermons, vi. and vii., on 1 Thes. v. 17. Ἐκκακεῖν signifies properly “to abandon any thing from cowardice, laziness, or despondency.” The commencement of this chapter is plainly connected in subject with the close of the preceding. For an attention to the duties of prayer, patience, and perseverance would be their best support in the hour of tribulation and distress, under the evils which would precede the destruction of Jerusalem.

2. τὸν Θεὸν — ἐντρέπομενος.] A proverbial form, denoting the most daring and unblushing wickedness; of which many examples are given by Elsn. and Wets.; to which I have added many others in Rec. Syn. All may have originated from Hom. Od. x. 39.

3. ἐκδικήσον] almost all English Commentators agree in censuring the *avenge* of our Common version, and render “do me justice upon.” But the change is unnecessary, since *avenge* in our early writers has this very sense; namely, “to take satisfaction for an injury from or upon the injurer.” So far from *revenge* forming any part of the idea, in the minds of the Translators, even the word itself is frequently used by our old writers in the sense of taking retribution, justice by law.

4. ἐπὶ χρόνον] scil. τινα, as Acts xxviii. 6. 1 Cor. vii. 39. and Hom. II. β. 299.

5. εἰς τέλος.] An Hellenistic phrase (formed on the Hebr. עַד עַד) for the Classical one διὰ τέλους, and signifying perpetually, constantly. So *dei* is used in a kindred passage of Herodot. iii. 119. which I have adduced in Recens. Synop. Δεῖ δλον, Euthym. Ὑπωπιάζειν is properly a pugilistic term. It signifies 1. to bruise under the eyes; 2. to bruise generally. 3. It figuratively denotes to stun any one by dinning in his ears, and consequently to weary him. So Euthym. δσωσπῆ. See Joseph. Bell. i. 1, 2. No certain example of this sense has been adduced from the Classical writers; but it is frequent in the correspondent Latin term *obtundere*; so that this is probably a Latinism.

ἐκδίκησιν τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν αὐτοῦ τῶν βωόντων πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡμέρας καὶ
8 νυκτὸς, καὶ μακροθυμῶν ἐπ' αὐτοῖς; λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ποιήσει τὴν ἐκ-
δίκησιν αὐτῶν ἐν τάχει. Πλὴν ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐλθὼν ἄρα εὐ-
ρήσει τὴν πίστιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς;

9 Ἐἶπε δὲ καὶ πρὸς τινὰς τοὺς πεποιθότας ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς ὅτι εἰς δι-
10 καιοί, καὶ ἔξουθενούντας τοὺς λοιποὺς, τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην. Ἀν-
θρώποι δύο ἀνέβησαν εἰς τὸ ἱερόν προσευξασθαι· ὁ εἰς Φαρισαῖος,
11 καὶ ὁ ἕτερος τελώνης. ὁ Φαρισαῖος σιθεις πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ταῦτα
προσηύχετο· Ὁ Θεὸς, εὐχαριστῶ σοι, ὅτι οὐκ εἰμι ὡσπερ οἱ λοιποὶ
τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἄρπαγες, ἄδικοι, μοιχοί· ἢ καὶ ὡς οὗτος ὁ τελώνης.

12 Νηστεύω δις τοῦ σαββάτου, ἀποδεκατῶ πάντι ὅσα κτώμμαι. Καὶ ὁ
13 τελώνης μακρόθεν ἑστὼς οὐκ ἤθελεν οὐδὲ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς εἰς τὸν οὐ-
ρανὸν ἐπάραι· ἀλλ' ἔκτυπεν εἰς τὸ στήθος αὐτοῦ, λέγων· Ὁ Θεός,

c Isa. 1. 15.
& 63. 2.
Rev. 3. 17.

7. ἐκδίκησιν ποιήσει is for ἐκδίκησιν.

— τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν] “his choice and approved servants.” Βωόντων is to be understood of loud and earnest entreaty. The figure is often found in the Classical writers, but always of reproach or expostulation. There is a difficulty attendant on οὐ μὴ, which most Commentators do not face. Bornem. offers an able solution, by taking the passage as if written thus: ἀλλ' οὐ φοβητέον, μὴ καὶ μακροθυμῶν ὁ Θεὸς ποιήσει τῶν ἐκλ. α. &c. This method is strongly confirmed by the context.

— καὶ μακροθυμῶν ἐ. α.] If, with most Expositors, μακροθυμῶν, according to its general sense in the N. T., be taken of God's long suffering, consequently αὐτοῖς must be referred to those who *aggrieve the righteous*. That, however, would involve an unprecedented harshness, since such a sense cannot be elicited even from the context, much less any word of the text. Αὐτοῖς cannot, without violence, be referred to any other word than to ἐκλεκτοῖς. We must therefore suppose some other sense of μακροθυμῶν. And as the word signifies properly to be slow-minded, it may very well denote to be slow in avenging or affording assistance. And in this sense the word occurs in a kindred sentiment at Eccles. xxxii. 13. Sept. καὶ ὁ Κύριος οὐ μὴ βραδύνει, οὐδὲ μὴ μακροθυμῶν ἐπ' αὐτοῖς. This interpretation (which alone suits the scope of the parable) is adopted by almost all recent Commentators, and is confirmed by Euthym.

8. πλὴν ὁ Υἱὸς — τῆς γῆς.] The Commentators are not agreed whether this coming of our Lord adverts to his final advent, or to his advent at the destruction of Jerusalem. But may not both views be admitted? as in chap. xxv. & xxvi. of St. Matthew. The former may be maintained; but the latter is so confirmed by the account which we have of the time in question, in the Epistles of James, Peter, and Paul, that it can scarcely be doubted but it is the true interpretation. Of course, τῆς γῆς must be taken, as often, of the land of Judæa. See the notes of Wets., Doddr., Campb., Rosenm., and Kuin., or the abstract in Rec. Syn. The interrogation implies a strong negation.

It is strange that Markl. and Campb. should suppose τὴν πίστιν to mean “the belief of this truth,” namely, that God will avenge his elect; for that would require τὴν πίστιν ταύτην. The true force of the Article is well pointed out by Bornem.

9. εἶπε δὲ πρὸς πεπ.] The best Commentators are agreed that πρὸς here and at v. 1. means *concerning*, as supra xii. 41. infra xix. 9., and sometimes in the Classical writers. This the Commentators exemplify from Plutarchi Op. p. 394. πρὸς ὃν δὲ Πίνδαρος εἶρηκε. I add Thucyd. iii. 42. πρὸς τὰ μέγιστα λέγειν.

11. πρὸς ἑαυτὸν.] There has been some doubt as to the construction of these words; which some Expositors connect with σταθεῖς, in the sense “*apart, by himself*;” others with προσήχετο. The latter mode is preferable; for the former proceeds on a confusion of πρὸς; ἑαυτὸν with καθ' ἑαυτὸν. Πρὸς ἑαυτὸν can only denote “with himself;” and is not unfrequently joined with verbs of speaking or thinking; of which the Commentators adduce examples both from the N. T. and the later Classical writers. Wets. renders it *secum tacitus*, and compares the Horatian “*labra movet metuens audiri.*” The illustration is better than the Version, for it is not, as some have thought (for instance, Bulkeley and Dr. Maltby) *mental prayer* that is meant; but *secret prayer*, when the words are pronounced by the lips, but not so as to be heard by a bystander. Σταθεῖς is by some rendered *consistens*; by others is considered as added for ornament. But (as I suggested in Recens. Synop.) it has reference to the posture of prayer among the Jews — namely, *standing*: inasmuch that it was not permitted to pray in any other posture.

— ἄρπαγες.] Ἀρπαξ denotes one who *injures another by force*; ἄδικος, one who *over-reaches him by fraud*, or under a semblance of justice.

12. δις τοῦ σαββάτου.] viz. on the 2d and 5th days, as appears from Epiphanius and the Rabbinis, cited by Wets. By these are meant not *public*, but *private* and voluntary fasts. On ἀποδεκ. see Note on Matt. xxiii. 23.

13. μακρόθεν ἑστὼς.] Namely, in the court of the Gentiles, if he was a Pagan; or, if a Jew, placed far apart from the Pharisees.

— οὐκ ἤθελεν — ἐπάραι.] Schoettz. remarks that it was a maxim of the Rabbinis, that he who prays should cast down his eyes, but raise his heart to God; contrary to the custom of the Greeks and Romans, which was to lift up the eyes and hands in prayer. Yet in this picture of real contrition and genuine humility we must suppose every thing *unstudied*.

— ἔκτυπεν εἰς τὸ στήθος.] An action suited to

d Job. 22. 29. Prov. 29. 23. supra 14. 11. Matt. 23. 12. James 4. 6, 10. 1 Pet. 5. 5. MT. MK.	14. 10.	ἐλάσθητί μοι τῷ ἁμαρτωλῷ. ἄ	λέγω ὑμῖν, κατέβη οὗτος δεδικαιωμένος 14
	13 13	εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ, † ἢ ἐκεῖνος. ὅτι πᾶς ὁ ὑψῶν ἑαυτὸν ταπεινωθή-	
	14 14	σεται ὁ δὲ ταπεινῶν ἑαυτὸν ὑψωθήσεται.	
	19. 10.	Προσέφερον δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ τὰ βρέφη, ἵνα αὐτῶν ἄπτηται· ἰδόντες 15	
	13 13	δὲ οἱ μαθηταὶ ἐπετίμησαν αὐτοῖς. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς προσκαλεσάμενος αὐτὰ, 16	
	14 14	εἶπεν· Ἄφετε τὰ παιδιά ἔρχεσθαι πρὸς με, καὶ μὴ κωλύετε αὐτά· τῶν	
	15 15	γὰρ τοιούτων ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ. Ἄμην λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅς ἐάν 17	
	16 16	μὴ δέξηται τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ ὡς παιδίον, οὐ μὴ εἰσελθῆ εἰς	
	17 17	αὐτήν.	
	18 17	Καὶ ἐπηρώτησέ τις αὐτὸν ἄρχων, λέγων· Δικασκαὶ ἀγαθὲ, τί ποι-	
	18 18	ήσας ζῶν ἁίωιον κληρονομήσω; Ἐἶπε δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Τί με 19	
	19 19	λέγεις ἀγαθόν; οὐδεὶς ἀγαθός, εἰ μὴ εἷς, ὁ Θεός. Τὸς ἐντολάς οἱ-	
	19 20	δας· Μὴ μοιχεύσης· μὴ φονεύσης· μὴ κλέψης· μὴ	
	19 20	ψευδομαρτυρήσης· τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μη-	
	19 20	τέρα σου. Ὁ δὲ εἶπε· Ταῦτα πάντα ἐφυλαζύμην ἐκ νεότητός μου. 21	

grief, remorse, &c., and common to all nations; as appears from the many passages adduced by Wets. and others: among which, however, I find none sufficiently similar in the construction; which appears Hellenistical, and consists in the omission of the pronoun; though the phrase, even with a personal pronoun, is rare.

—μοι τῷ ἁμ.] Wets. and others think that the Article is emphatical, and used κατ' ἔξοχόν. But its force is better indicated by Bp. Middlet. thus: "Whenever an attributive noun is placed in opposition with a personal pronoun, such attributive has the Article prefixed. Thus in Luke vi. 24. ὑμῖν τοῖς πλουσίοις. xi. 46. ὑμῖν τοῖς νομικοῖς. We have the same form of speech also in Herodot. ix. p. 342. με τὴν ἰκέτιν. Plut. Conv. vii. Sap. p. 95. ἐμὲ τὸν ὀύστηνον. See also Soph. Elect. 282. Eurip. Ion. 348. Aristoph. Av. 5. Acharn. 1154. Eccles. 619. Of the usage in question the ground is sufficiently obvious. The Article here, as elsewhere, marks the assumption of its predicate; and the strict meaning of the publican's prayer is, "Have mercy on me, who am confessedly a sinner; or," "seeing that I am a sinner, have mercy on me."

14. κατέβη εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ.] Said with reference to the lower situation of the city with respect to the Temple. So ver. 10. ἀνέβησαν. But in fact the expression is nearly equivalent to "went back," ἀπεχώρει, as in Thucyd. iii. 42. ἀξυνειπώτερος ἀν' ὀδῆς εἶναι ἀπεχώρει. Βῦ δεδικαιωμένος is meant accepted, approved, considered as just. See Schoettg.

—ἢ ἐκεῖνος.] There is thought to be here the common ellipse of μάλλον. But it is better (with Euthym., Rosenm., and Kuin.) to suppose that, as the Hebrews often express a simple negation by a comparative, (as in Gen. xxxviii. 26. and 1 Sam. xxiv. 17.) so here the sense is, that the Publican went away justified; but not the Pharisee.

For ἢ most of the MSS. and almost all the early Edd. have ἢ γὰρ, which is approved by Mill, and adopted by almost every Editor from Wets. to Scholz. But though the more difficult is usually to be considered the preferable reading, yet that principle does not extend to manifest violations

of the propriety of the language. And, notwithstanding what those Editors say, this use of γὰρ cannot be defended; as appears from the vain attempts made to explain it. For to render it *sane*, or *nimirum*, or to consider it as having reference to a clause omitted, is alike inadmissible. And as ἢ γὰρ differs so slightly from another reading, namely ἢπερ, found in some MSS. and Basil, we may suspect the ἢ γὰρ to be an error of the scribes, who had ἢπερ in their originals. Whether, indeed, that be the true reading, I doubt. It seems to have been a very early correction of Luke's Greek. For elegance of style would require ἢπερ, rather than ἢ. It may be added, too, that every ancient Version of credit represents ἢ or ἢπερ, not ἢ γὰρ. How περ might be confounded with γὰρ (especially by those who did not consider the construction) is obvious from the strong similarity between π and ς and a and ε. I suspect, however, that of those who wrote γὰρ many had in their originals παρ' ἐκεῖνον, which is found in several very ancient MSS. and the Pesch. Syr. Version; and that παρ' had arisen from περ. Then ἐκεῖνος would easily be altered to ἐκείνῳ. Thus it appears that the original reading was ἢ, from which arose ἢπερ, and ἢ γὰρ. Now it is one of the most certain of Critical Canons, that, among several readings of a word or passage, that from which all the rest might easily have originated is to be preferred. Moreover, that ἢ, rather than ἢπερ, is the true reading, is probable from the former occurring in a similar construction, supra xv. 7. *sine var. lect.*

15—17. This section is introduced here in a very different connection than it is by Matthew and Mark. By them it is brought forward after the narration of the inquiry made by the Pharisees as to the lawfulness of divorce; and that simply because it took place immediately after. St. Luke, however, introduces it here, as intending to classify things according to their subjects; and indeed the connection here is very suitable.

15. τὰ βρέφη] i. e. the children of the persons who resorted to him. Render, "their children." On the rest of the Chap. see the Notes on the parallel passages.

16. [Comp. Matt. xviii. 3. 1 Cor. xiv. 20. 1 Pet. ii. 2.]

	MT.	MK.
22 Ἀκούσας δὲ ταῦτα ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Ὅτι ἐν σοὶ λείπει πάντα	19.	10.
ὅσα ἔχει πώλησον, καὶ διάδος πτωχοῖς, καὶ ἕξεις θησαυρὸν ἐν οὐρανῷ·	20	21
23 καὶ δεῦρο ἀκολούθει μοι. Ὁ δὲ ἀκούσας ταῦτα περιλύπτος ἐγένετο ἦν	22	22
24 γὰρ πλούσιος σφόδρα. Ἴδὼν δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰησοῦς περιλύπον γενόμενος,	23	23
εἶπε· Πῶς δυσκόλως οἱ τὰ χρήματα ἔχοντες εἰσελεύσονται εἰς τὴν βα-		
25 σιλίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ. Εὐκοπώτερον γὰρ ἐστὶ κήμηλον διὰ τρυμματίας φαμί-	25	25
26 δος εἰσελθεῖν, ἢ πλούσιον εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν. Εἶπον	26	26
27 δὲ οἱ ἀκούσαντες· καὶ τίς δύναται σωθῆναι; Ὁ δὲ εἶπε· Τὰ ἀδύ-	26	27
28 νατα παρὰ ἀνθρώποις δυνατὰ ἐστὶ παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ. Εἶπε δὲ [ὁ] Πέτρος·	27	29
29 Ἴδού, ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν πάντα καὶ ἠκολούθησάμεν σοι. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν	28	29
αὐτοῖς· Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐδεὶς ἐστὶν ὃς ἀφῆκεν οἰκίαν, ἢ γονεῖς,		
30 ἢ ἀδελφοὺς, ἢ γυναῖκα, ἢ τέκνα, ἕνεκεν τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὃς	30	30
οὐ μὴ ἀπολάβῃ πολλαπλασίονα ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ, καὶ ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι		
τῷ ἐρχομένῳ ζῶν αἰώνιον.	20.	
31 ΠΑΡΑΛΑΒΩΝ δὲ τοὺς δώδεκα, εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς· Ἴδού, ἀναβαί-	17	32
32 νομεν εἰς Ἱερουσόλυμα, καὶ τελεσθήσεται πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα διὰ τῶν	19	33
33 προφητιῶν τῷ Γίῳ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. Παραδοθήσεται γὰρ τοῖς ἔθνεσι,	19	34
34 καὶ ἐμπαυχθήσεται καὶ ὑβρισθήσεται καὶ ἐμπτυσθήσεται· καὶ μαστιγώ-		
35 σαντες ἀποκτενοῦσιν αὐτόν· καὶ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ ἀναστήσεται. Καὶ		
αὐτοὶ οὐδὲν τούτων συνήκων, καὶ ἦν τὸ ἕνμα τοῦτο κεκρυμμένον ἀπ'		
αὐτῶν, καὶ οὐκ ἐγίνωσκον τὰ λεγόμενα.		
35 Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ ἐγγίξειν αὐτὸν εἰς Ἱεριχά, τυφλὸς τις ἐκάθητο παρὰ	29	46
36 τὴν ὁδὸν προσαιτῶν· ἀκούσας δὲ ὄχλου διαπορευομένου, ἐπυνθάνετο	30	30
37 τί εἶη τοῦτο. Ἀπήγγελλαν δὲ αὐτῷ, ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος παρέρ-		
38 χεται. καὶ ἐβόησε λέγων· Ἰησοῦ Γιδέ Δαυὶδ, ἐλέησόν με! Καὶ οἱ		47
39 προάγοντες ἐπετίμων αὐτῷ ἵνα σιωπήσῃ· αὐτὸς δὲ πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἔκρα-	31	48
40 ζεν· Γιδέ Δαυὶδ, ἐλέησόν με. Σταθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐκέλευσεν αὐτόν	32	49
41 ἀχθῆναι πρὸς αὐτόν· ἐγγίσαντος δὲ αὐτοῦ, ἐπρωτότησεν αὐτόν, λέγων·	33	51
42 Τί σοὶ θέλεις ποιήσω; ὁ δὲ εἶπε· Κύριε, ἵνα ἀναβλέψω. καὶ ὁ	34	52
43 Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Ἀνάβλεψον· ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε. Καὶ παρα-		
χρῆμα ἀνέβλεψε, καὶ ἠκολούθει αὐτῷ δοξάζων τὸν Θεόν· καὶ πᾶς ὁ		
λαὸς ἰδὼν, ἔδωκεν αἶνον τῷ Θεῷ.		

22. [Comp. Matt. vi. 19. 1 Tim. vi. 19.]

23. ἀφήκαμεν πάντα.] MSS. A. & B. have ἀφέν-
τες τὰ ἴδια, and D. τὰ ἴδια ἀφήκ. The former of
which, Bornem. thinks, is the true reading: 1.
because of the weight of testimony in its favour; 2.
from the expression being "exquisitor;" 3.
because the common reading might have been
formed after the model of Matt. xix. 27. Mark x.
28. Luke v. 11; whereas the other has nothing
similar to it in Scripture. But the learned Critic
is, I apprehend, quite wrong. The external tes-
timony for the common reading is almost as strong
as can be expected for any reading. All the MSS.
(300 in number) except three, have it. And the
internal evidence is, when properly considered,
strongly in favour of the common reading. It is
surely far more likely that in MSS. so notorious
for being dressed up by Alexandrian Critics, a
reading somewhat plain and homely, should have

been altered into one *exquisitoris* Græcismi, than
that a somewhat elegant reading should have been
altered all but universally into a plain one. Not,
indeed, that it is absolutely homely; for the term
is such as Xenophon himself might have used.
But fastidiousness is the characteristic of all
Critics of a certain calibre in every age. And
as to what Bornem. urges, as *gravissimum argu-
mentum*, that the common reading might be form-
ed from other passages, while the new one has
nothing like it in the Gospels — it is hardly pos-
sible to imagine any argument more futile. If
the learned Critic had examined the varr. lect.
more carefully, he would have found another
reading; which, though it has no claims to be
thought the true one, might have prevented him
from thus rashly adopting one so little authorized
as the above-mentioned, namely, ἀφήκαμεν πάντα
τὰ ἴδια. Now nothing can be more evident than

XIX. ΚΑΙ εἰσελθὼν διέρχεται τὴν Ἱεριχώ· καὶ ἰδοὺ, ἀνὴρ ὀνό- 1
 ματι καλούμενος Ζακχαῖος, καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν ἀρχιτελώνης· καὶ οὗτος ἦν 2
 πλούσιος· καὶ ἐξήτει ἰδεῖν τὸν Ἰησοῦν τίς ἐστι, καὶ οὐκ ἠδύνατο ἀπὸ 3
 τοῦ ὄχλου, ὅτι τῇ ἡλικίᾳ μικρὸς ἦν. καὶ προδρομῶν ἔμπροσθεν, ἀνέ- 4
 βη ἐπὶ συκομορέαν, ἵνα ἴδῃ αὐτόν· ὅτι [δι']^a † ἐκείνης ἡμέλλε διέρχε- 5
 σθαι. Καὶ ὡς ἦλθεν ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον, ἀναβλέψας ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶδεν αὐτόν, 6
 καὶ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτόν· Ζακχαῖε, σπένσας κατίβηθι· σήμερον γὰρ ἐν 7
 τῷ οἴκῳ σου δεῖ με μῆναι. Καὶ σπένσας κατίβη, καὶ ὑπεδέξατο αὐτόν 8
 α Supra. 3. 14. τῶν ἄνδρ' εἰσηλθε καταλῦσαι. ^a Σταθεὶς δὲ Ζακχαῖος εἶπε πρὸς τὸν 8
 Κύριον· Ἰδοὺ, τὰ ἡμίση τῶν ὑπαρχόντων μου, Κύριε, δίδωμι τοῖς 9
 β Supra 13. 16. πτωχοῖς. καὶ εἴ τινός τι ἐσυκοφάνησα, ἀποδίδωμι τετραπλοῦν. ^b Εἶπε 9
 δὲ πρὸς αὐτόν ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Ὅτι σήμερον σωτηρία τῷ οἴκῳ τούτῳ ἐγέν- 10
 ετο· καθότι καὶ αὐτὸς υἱὸς Ἀβραάμ ἐστιν. ^c ἦλθε γὰρ ὁ Χρῆστος τοῦ 10
 ἀνθρώπου ζητῆσαι καὶ σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός.

ἌΚΟΤΟΝΤΩΝ δὲ αὐτῶν ταῦτα, προσθεὶς εἶπε παραβολὴν, διὰ τὸ 11
 ἐγγὺς αὐτὸν εἶναι Ἱερουσαλήμ, καὶ δοκεῖν αὐτοὺς ὅτι παραχοῖμα μέλλει 12
 ἢ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀναφαίνεσθαι. Εἶπεν οὖν· Ἄνθρωπός τις 12
 ἐυγενῆς ἐπορεύθη εἰς χώραν μακρὰν, λαβεῖν ἑαυτῷ βασιλείαν καὶ ὑπο-

that τὰ ἴδια came from the Scholiasts and the *Margūn*, and that ἀφέντες was but something framed by the *Alexandrian Aristarchs*.

XIX. 1. *διέρχεται*] “was passing through.” So *Campb.* and *Waker.*, confirmed by the *Syr.*

2. *ἀρχιτελώνης.*] This signifies a sort of *receiver-general* of the taxes of a district, in which several inferior collectors were employed. That *Zacchæus* was a Jew, and not, as some imagine, a Gentile, is pretty certain from ver. 9. The occurrence of *οὗτος* after *αὐτός* may seem harsh, but examples from the Classics are adduced by *Bornem.* Indeed it will appear less so, if we consider the words *καὶ οὗτος ἦν πλούσιος* as in some measure a parenthetical clause. It may be rendered “and the man was rich.”

3. *ἔζητει — τίς ἐστι.*] On this idiom see *Viger* and *Matth. Gr. Gr.* § 295. 3. *Τίς* signifies *qualis*, what sort of person. The use of *ἀπὸ* before *τοῦ ὄχλου* is Hellenistic, and formed on the *Heb. כּ, on account of.*

4. *προδρομῶν ἔμπ.*] The Commentators adduce similar pleonasm from the Classical writers. Yet it may be doubted whether there is ever, strictly speaking, a pleonasm at all. There is almost always a *strengthening of the sense.*

— *ἐκείνης.*] Sub. *δεοῦ*, and indeed *διὰ*, which, though it is found in the common text, and in very many MSS., yet is omitted in most of the *ancient MSS.*, and cancelled by almost every recent Editor. The ellip., however, is harsh; and not to be defended by a similar one at v. 19, for, as *Bornem.* remarks, and I had myself long conjectured, there can be little doubt that the true reading there is *ποία*, and here *ἐκείνη*.

5. *εἶδεν αὐτόν, &c.*] The ancient, and the most judicious modern Commentators rightly refer our Lord's knowledge of the name and circumstances of *Zacchæus* to his Divine omniscience.

— *μῆναι*] “to sojourn.” See Note on *Matt. x.*

7. *καταλῦσαι.*] See Note on *Luke ix. 12.*

8. *σταθεὶς — εἶπε.*] Construe: *σταθεὶς δὲ πρὸς τὸν Κῆριον εἶπε* (πρὸς αὐτόν) namely after *Zacchæus* had been introduced into the presence of *Jesus* (and had thereby an opportunity of addressing him), he said, &c. So *Acts v. 20. σταθέντες λαλεῖτε*, and *xxvii. 22.*

— *εἰδόμεν.*] *Grot.*, *Wets.*, *Campb.*, *Whitby*, and others take this as *Present for Future*, to denote *firmness of purpose*. But it is better to suppose (with *Euthym.*, *Theophyl.*, and *Vater*) the sense to be, “I do [hereby] give;” agreeably to which *Christ* says, *This day is salvation come unto thee and thy family, &c.* [*Comp. John iv. 53. Acts x. 2. and the Note on Matt. xxviii. 19.*]

9. *εἶπε δὲ πρὸς α.*] The *πρὸς* is by some rendered *concerning*. But though that signification does occur, yet never after the phrase *εἶπε δὲ*. And although *Zacchæus* is just after spoken of in the third person, yet we have only to suppose that the latter clause was addressed to the *by-standers*, and the former to *Zacchæus*, whose declaration required some reply. I have pointed accordingly.

— *καθότι.*] The Particle thus denotes *cause*, and, as is often the case with *γὰρ*, the use here is elliptical; q. d. [Yes I do this] because, or inasmuch as, &c.

11. *δοκεῖν αὐτοῦς, &c.*] Our Lord's words just before declared his Messiahship, and the Apostles no doubt supposed them to imply his speedy entrance upon his reign, and assumption of the character of liberator of the Jewish nation. This erroneous opinion our Lord corrects in the following parable, on which see *Notes on Matt. xxv. 14. seqq.* and *Dr. Hales.*

12. *λαβεῖν ἑαυτῷ βασ.*] *Whitby*, *Campb.*, and *Schleus.* have shown, that the phrase signifies “to receive institution to a kingdom, procure for him-

13 σιγήν. Καλέσας δὲ δέκα δούλους ἑαυτοῦ, ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς δέκα μνᾶς,
 14 καὶ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς· Πραγματεύσασθε ἕως ἔρχομαι. Οἱ δὲ πόλιται
 αὐτοῦ ἐμίσησαν αὐτὸν, καὶ ἀπέστειλαν πρεσβείαν ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ, λέγοντες·
 15 Οὐ θέλομεν τοῦτον βασιλεῦσαι ἐφ' ἡμᾶς. Καὶ ἐγένετο, ἐν τῷ ἐπαν-
 ελθεῖν αὐτὸν λαβόντα τὴν βασιλείαν, καὶ εἶπε φωνηθῆναι αὐτῷ τοὺς
 δούλους τούτους, οἷς ἔδωκε τὸ ἀργύριον, ἵνα γινῶ τις τί διεπραγμα-
 16 τεύσατο. Παρεγένετο δὲ ὁ πρῶτος, λέγων· κύριε, ἡ μνᾶ σου προσεoir- 20
 17 γύσατο δέκα μνᾶς. Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Εὖ, ἀγαθὲ δοῦλε· ὅτι ἐν ἑλα-
 18 χίστῳ πιστὸς ἐγένου, ἵσθι ἔξουσίαν ἔχων ἐπάνω δέκα πόλεων. Καὶ
 19 ἦλθεν ὁ δεῦτερος, λέγων· κύριε, ἡ μνᾶ σου ἐποίησε πέντε μνᾶς. Εἶπε
 20 δὲ καὶ τούτῳ· Καὶ σὺ γίνου ἐπάνω πέντε πόλεων. Καὶ ἕτερος ἦλθε,
 λέγων· κύριε, ἰδοὺ ἡ μνᾶ σου, ἣν εἶχον, ἀποκειμένην ἐν σουδαρίῳ.
 21 ἐφοβούμην γάρ σε, ὅτι ἄνθρωπος ἀσπιηρός εἶ· αἶρεις ὁ οὐκ ἔθικας, 24
 22 καὶ θεροῖεις ὁ οὐκ ἔσπειρας. Λέγει δὲ αὐτῷ· Ἐκ τοῦ στόματός σου
 κρινῶ σε, πονηρὲ δοῦλε· Ἴδιεις ὅτι ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπος ἀσπιηρός εἰμι,
 23 αἶρων ὁ οὐκ ἔθικα, καὶ θεροῖζων ὁ οὐκ ἔσπειρα· καὶ διατί οὐκ ἔδω- 27
 24 ἔπραξα αὐτό; Καὶ τοῖς παρεσιῶσιν εἶπεν· Ἄρατε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τὴν
 25 μνᾶν, καὶ δότε τῷ τὰς δέκα μνᾶς ἔχοντι. Καὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ· κύριε,
 26 ἔχει δέκα μνᾶς. Λέγω γάρ ὑμῖν, ὅτι παντὶ τῷ ἔχοντι δοθήσεται ἀπὸ 29

self royalty," as was the case with Archelaus and Herod. [*Comp.* Mark xiii. 34.]

13. δέκα δ. ἑ.] "ten of his servants." This is merely (as Euthym. remarks) a round number. Πραγματεύσασθε. The word signifies literally and in the Classical writers, "to be engaged in business; but here it is used as a deponent, in the sense "to do business with by investment in trade." Thus *πραγματευτής* is used both in the Classical writers and the LXX. to denote a *mercant*. The term in Matthew is ἐργάζεσθαι.

14. οὐ θέλομεν, &c.] The earlier Commentators are of opinion that this adverts to the case of Archelaus. But that view is liable to objections; and therefore it is better, with most recent Commentators, to regard the circumstance as introduced *ad ornatum*; though undoubtedly it forms an interesting feature of the story.

16. προσεoirάσατο.] In this use of ἐργάζεσθαι there is the same metaphor as that by which we say "to make money," viz. by investment in trade. Money so employed was said to be ἐνεργον; on the contrary, what was allowed to lie dormant was said to be ἀργόν.

17. ἵσθι ἑξ. ἔχων.] This idiom is found in the Classical writers as well as the Scriptural ones.

— ἐπάνω.] This sense, as denoting *authority over*, is rare in the Classical writers, and only occurs in the later ones. There is here (as I remarked in Recens. Synop.) an allusion to the ancient Oriental custom of assigning the government and revenues of a certain number of cities to a meritorious officer. See the examples in proof of this in Recens. Synop. and especially in my Note on Thucyd. i. 138. [*Comp.* supra xvi. 10.]

20. σουδαρίῳ.] The word is of Latin origin, and denotes such a cloth as was among the ancients generally used as a *kerchief*, but sometimes as a *napkin*. And from the Rabbinical writers it ap-

pears that such were sometimes used to wrap money in and lay it by.

21. ἀσπιηρός.] The word primarily (as applied to *feeling*) signifies *dry, harsh*; and, as applied to the *taste, sour and crabbed*. In a metaphorical sense it signifies *severe and cynical*; or, in another view, *severe and gripping*, which is the sense here, and Dio Chrys. *Orat.* 12. p. 207. *ἄνδρα ἀσπιηρόν*. So Hor. Ep. i. 7. 91. *Durus nimis attentusque videtur esse mihi*.

— αἶρεις ὁ οὐκ ἔθικας.] A proverbial expression, like Matt. xxv. 24. Kypke observes, that *αἶρειν* is used of taking up and carrying off any thing which has been found; and mentions a law of Solon ἄ μὴ ἔθων, μὴ ἀνέλῃ· εἰ δὲ μὴ, θάνατος ἢ ζημία. From other passages cited by him and Wets. it is clear that the pure Greek idiom requires ἀναίρεισθαι. And as no example is adduced of *αἶρειν* in the sense of carrying off and appropriating, it may be regarded as Hellenistic, though an idiom exactly corresponding to it is found in the Ang. Sax. and old English *Hlifstan*, to *lift* i. e. to carry off, appropriate by theft.

22. [*Comp.* Matt. xii. 37. 2 Sam. i. 16.]

23. τράπεζαν.] The word denotes, 1. a table; 2. a money-table or counter, on which the money-changers did their business. But as those counters were, no doubt, provided with *desks or tillers*, for the deposit of money, so *τράπεζα* came to mean, 3. a place for the investment of money, just as our *bank*, derived from *αββα*, originally only denoted a counter.

Many MSS. and Edd. here omit the Article. But there is no proof that the phrase had become so common, that the Article, which is properly *requisite*, could be dispensed with.

— ἐπραξα.] This sense of *πράσσειν* for *exigere* is found also in the Classical writers, but generally in the middle voice.

26. The Commentators are not agreed whether

MT. MK.

21. 11. δὲ τοῦ μὴ ἔχοντος, καὶ ὁ ἔχει ἀρθῆσεται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ. Πλὴν τοὺς 27
 ἐχθρούς μου ἐκείνους, τοὺς μὴ θελήσωτάς με βασιλεῦσαι ἐπ' αὐτοὺς,
 ἀγάγετε ὧδε καὶ κατασφάζετε ἔμπροσθέν μου. Καὶ εἰπὼν ταῦτα 28
 ἐπορεύετο ἔμπροσθεν, ἀναβαίνων εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα.

ΚΑΙ ἐγένετο, ὡς ἤγγισεν εἰς Βηθφαγή καὶ Βηθανίαν, πρὸς τὸ ὄρος 29
 2 2 τὸ καλούμενον Ἐλαιῶν, ἀπέστειλε δύο τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ εἰπὼν· 30
 Ἔπάγετε εἰς τὴν κατέναντι κώμην· ἐν ἧ εἰσπορευόμενοι εὑρήσετε πῶλον
 δεδεμένον, ἐφ' ὃν οὐδεὶς πώποτε ἀνθρώπων ἐκάθισε· λύσαντες αὐτὸν
 3 3 ἀγάγετε. Καὶ εἰάν τις ὑμᾶς ἐρωτᾷ· Διατί λύετε; οὕτως ἐρεῖτε αὐτῷ· 31
 6 4 Ὅτι ὁ Κύριος αὐτοῦ χρεῖαν ἔχει. Ἀπελθόντες δὲ οἱ ἀπεσταλμένοι εὔ- 32
 6 6 ρον, καθὼς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς. Ἀνότων δὲ αὐτῶν τὸν πῶλον, εἶπον οἱ κύ- 33
 6 6 ριοι αὐτοῦ πρὸς αὐτούς· Τί λύετε τὸν πῶλον; οἱ δὲ εἶπον· Ὁ Κύ- 34
 7 7 ριος αὐτοῦ χρεῖαν ἔχει. Καὶ ἤγαγον αὐτὸν πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν· καὶ 35
 ἐπιῴψαντες ἑαυτῶν τὰ ἱμάτια ἐπὶ τὸν πῶλον, ἐπεβίβασαν τὸν Ἰησοῦν.
 8 8 Πορευομένου δὲ αὐτοῦ, ὑπεστράγγνον τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ. 36
 9 9 Ἐγγίζοντος δὲ αὐτοῦ ἤδη πρὸς τῇ καταβάσει τοῦ ὄρους τῶν Ἐλαιῶν, 37
 ἤρξαντο ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος τῶν μαθητῶν χαίροντες αἰνεῖν τὸν Θεὸν φωνῇ
 10 10 μεγάλῃ περὶ πασῶν ὧν εἶδον δυνάμεων, λέγοντες· Ἐὐλογημένος ὁ 38
 ἐρχόμενος βασιλεὺς ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου· εὐλόγηται ἐν οὐρανοῖς, καὶ δόξα
 ἐν ὑψίστοις! Καὶ τινες τῶν Φαρισαίων ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου εἶπον πρὸς 39
 αὐτόν· Διδάσκαλε, ἐπιτίμησον τοῖς μαθηταῖς σου. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς 40
 εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Λέγω ὑμῖν, εἰ ἐὰν οὗτοι σιωπήσωσιν, οἱ λίθοι κεκρα-
 ξοῦνται. Καὶ ὡς ἤγγισεν, ἰδὼν τὴν πόλιν, ἔκλαυσεν ἐπ' αὐτῇ, λέγων· 41
 Ὅτι εἰ ἔγνωσ καὶ σὺ, καὶ γε ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ σου ταύτῃ, τὰ πρὸς εὐαγγελίαν 42

these are the words of our Lord, or of the King. According to the former interpretation, they may be supposed to be a *parenthetical admonition* to the disciples. This, however, would be harsh, and make the next verse exceedingly so. The latter interpretation is therefore preferable; especially since it is required by the parallel passage in Matth. Yet even this is not unattended with difficulty; which is not diminished by placing (as many Editors do) ver. 25 in a parenthesis. Besides, the words are plainly *not* parenthetical. To remove this difficulty, many Commentators suppose an ellip. of *ὁ δὲ κύριος εἶπε· ὅτε*. But that is too arbitrary. Nor indeed can *ellipsis* apply to this case; which is one of those numerous instances in which *γὰρ* is used in answers, and where it has, indeed, a *causative* force, but with reference to something which has preceded, or *might* have preceded, as belonging to the subject. See Acts ii. 15. & xvi. 37. Here *ὅτε* may be supposed to be referred to, and to be repeated from the context. [Give, I say,] *for*, &c. [Comp. supra viii. 18. Matt. xiii. 12. Mark iv. 25.]

27. ἀγάγετε — μου.] A custom derived, no doubt, from the barbarous ages, but (as appears from the Classical citations in Wets.) long retained by the most civilized nations of antiquity. It even yet continues in the East; which has ever been the seat of peculiar atrocity in the punishment of criminals, and the treatment of captured enemies.

28. [Comp. Mark x. 32.]

33. οἱ κίριοι αὐτοῦ.] I have shown in Recens.

Synop. that the sense is, "those who had a power over it," including the *servants* of the owner.

35. [Comp. John xii. 14. 2 Kings ix. 13.]

38. [Comp. Ps. cxviii. 26. Supra ii. 14.]

40. οἱ λίθοι κεκραξοῦνται] Grot. and Wets. have shown that this is a proverbial form of expression, denoting that *it is a moral impossibility for a thing to be otherwise than it is*; the meaning being *here*, that if those should be checked, God would, even by a miracle, animate the very *stones* to celebrate his triumph. In addition to the examples from Greek and Latin writers, adduced by those Commentators, I would compare Æschyl. Agam. 36. οἶκος δ' αὐτὸς, εἰ φθογγῆν λάβοι, Σαφύτταρ' ἄν λήξειεν. Joseph. Bell. i. 10. 2. περὶ τῆς ἐνοίας — οὐκ ἔφη δεῖν αὐτῷ· κεκραγέλαι γὰρ τὸ σῶμα (his body) σιωπῶντος scil. αὐτοῦ, "if he should be silent." Our Lord had probably in view Habakkuk ii. 11, where see the examples adduced by Jerome in his Comm.

42. εἰ ἔγνωσ.] On the force of the phraseology, Commentators are divided in opinion. Some take *εἰ εἶθε*, "would that thou hadst considered;" a use sometimes found both in the Scriptural and Classical writers. Others, with more reason, suppose an ellipsis, *per aposiopesis*, of *εἰ ἂν ἔχοι* or the like. Both the above methods come to the same thing. The *εἰ* may popularly be rendered *utinam*; but there is, in fact, an ellipsis, *per aposiopesis*, which will vary with the subject. The *aposiopesis* is frequent in language dictated by grief, or any of the violent passions. Grot. has here shown that our Lord's weeping, while

- 43 σου· νῦν δὲ ἐκρύβη ἀπὸ ὀφθαλμῶν σου· οἱ ἤξουσιν ἡμέραι ἐπὶ σέ, 21. 11.
καὶ περιβαλοῦσιν οἱ ἐχθροὶ σου χιμάκῃ σοι, καὶ περικυκλώσουσί σε,
44 καὶ συνέξουσί σε ἀντόθεν, καὶ ἐδαφιοῦσί σε καὶ τὰ τέκνα σου ἐν σοί,
καὶ οὐκ ἀφήσουσιν ἐν σοὶ λίθον ἐπὶ λίθῳ· ἀνθ' ὧν οὐκ ἔγνως τὸν
καιρὸν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς σου.
- 45 Καὶ εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὸ ἱερόν, ἤρξατο ἐκβάλλειν τοὺς πωλοῦντας ἐν αὐτῷ 12 15
46 καὶ ἀγοράζοντας, λέγων αὐτοῖς· Ἰεραπταί· Ὁ οἶκός μου οἶκος 13 17
προσευχῆς ἐστίν· ὑμεῖς δὲ αὐτὸν ἐποιήσατε σπήλαιον
λυστῶν.
- 47 Καὶ ἦν διδάσκων τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ· οἱ δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ 18
48 οἱ γραμματεῖς ἐξήτουν αὐτὸν ὑπολέσαι, καὶ οἱ προῖτοι τοῦ λαοῦ· καὶ
οὐκ εὗρισκον τὸ τί ποιήσωσιν, ὁ λαὸς γὰρ ἤπιος ἐξεκρέματο αὐτοῦ
ἀκούων.
- 1 XX. ΚΑΙ ἐγένετο ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐκείνων, διδάσκοντος αὐτοῦ 23 27
τὸν λαὸν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, καὶ εὐαγγελιζομένου, ἐπέστησαν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ
2 οἱ γραμματεῖς σὺν τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις, καὶ εἶπον πρὸς αὐτὸν, λέγοντες· 23 28
Εἶπε ἡμῖν ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιεῖς, ἢ τίς ἐστίν ὁ δούς σοι τῆν
3 ἐξουσίαν ταύτην; Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς· Ἐρωτήσω ὑμᾶς 24 29
4 ἀγῶ ἓνα λόγον, καὶ εἰπατέ μοι· Τὸ βάπτισμα Ἰωάννου ἐξ οὐρανοῦ 25 30
5 ἦν, ἢ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων; Οἱ δὲ συνελογίσαντο πρὸς ἑαυτούς, λέγοντες· 31
Ὅτι εἰν εἰπόμεν· Ἐξ οὐρανοῦ· ἐρεῖ· Διὰ τί οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε αὐτῷ;
6 εἰν δὲ εἰπόμεν· Ἐξ ἀνθρώπων· πᾶς ὁ λαὸς καταλιθώσει ἡμᾶς· πε- 26 32
7 πεισμένος γὰρ ἐστίν Ἰωάννην προφήτην εἶναι. Καὶ ἀπεκρίθησαν μὴ
8 εἰδέναι πόθεν. Καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Οὐδὲ ἐγὼ λέγω ὑμῖν ἐν 27
ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιῶ.

it evinces his extreme sensibility and benevolence, does not derogate from, but enhances, his dignity.

— νῦν δὲ ἐκρύβη, &c.] The words may be paraphrased thus: “But now, by an inexcusable ignorance, thou rejectest light offered and pressed upon thee: and therefore perish thou must.”

— ἐν τῷ ἡμέρα σου ταύτῃ] “at this thy time, so opportune for thy repentance and salvation.” Wetstein appositely cites Polyb. 17, 18. βασιλεῦ, φείγουσιν οἱ πολέμιοι· μὴ παρῆς τὸν καιρὸν· οὐ μιν οὐσιν ἡμᾶς οἱ βάρβαροι· ὡς νῦν ἐστίν ἡμέρα, σὺς ὁ καιρὸς.

— καὶ ἐβ.] “was then the metropolis of the country to which I was especially sent.”

43. χιμάκα] “a rampart.” So called from the χάρακες, or strong pales, which were driven down to preserve the *agger*, or mound of earth, in due form. There is here a manifest prediction, and indeed lively description of the siege of Jerusalem; and the accumulation of terms, περικυκλώσουσι and συνέξουσιν, designate the closeness of the blockade, to which Josephus attests.

44. ἐδαφιοῦσι—σοί.] The best Commentators are agreed that there is here a *synlepsis*, of demolishing the building, and of dashing the inhabitants against the stones. Both senses are found in use, and both here seem to be meant. On this passage *comp.* 1 Kings ix. 7, 8. Micah iii. 12. Matt. xxiv. 1, 2. Mark xiii. 2.

— τὸν καιρὸν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς σου.] There has been some difference of opinion on the sense of ἐπισκο-
VOL. I.

πῆ here, which, as being a word of *middle* signification, admits both of a good and a bad sense. Some Commentators take it here in the *latter*; which may be defended, and that sense is elsewhere found. But the *former* seems more apposite; and is adopted both by Theophyl. and Euthym., and the best modern Commentators; and this sense occurs in Job x. 12. [*Comp.* 2 Cor. vi. 2.]

46. [See 1 Kings viii. 29. Is. lvi. 7. Jer. vii. 11.]

47. [*Comp.* John vii. 19; viii. 37.]

48. ἐξεκρέματο] “hung on his words,” i. e. heard him with deep interest. Of this sense of *ἐκκρεμᾶσθαι*, and the Latin *pendere*, examples are adduced by the Commentators, to which I add Thucyd. vii. 75. Virg. *Æn.* iv. 79.

XX. 6. καταλιθώσει ἡμᾶς.] The Priests had themselves accustomed the people to that violence. When they could not legally convict their enemies, they incited the populace to stone them, by what was called the *judicium zeli*. See John x. 31. Acts xiv. 19. (Grot.) Stoning was indeed enjoined in the Law of Moses as a punishment for idolatry, blasphemy, incest, and other heinous offences; and its execution was committed to the people at large. Yet it appears from Exod. viii. 23. that such sort of irregular and tumultuary vengeance was in use *before* the Law. Nor was this confined to the Jews; for we find

MT. MK.

21. 12. Ἦρξατο δὲ πρὸς τὸν λαὸν λέγειν τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην· Ἄνθρωπός 9
 [τις] ἐφύτευσεν ἀμπελῶνα, καὶ ἐξέδοτο αὐτὸν γεωργοῖς, καὶ ἀπεδήμησε
 34 2 χρόνους ἱκανούς. Καὶ ἐν καιρῷ ἀπέστειλε πρὸς τοὺς γεωργούς δούλον, 10
 35 3 ἵνα ἀπὸ τοῦ καρποῦ τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος δώσιν αὐτῷ. Οἱ δὲ γεωργοὶ δε-
 36 4 ραντες αὐτὸν ἐξαπέστειλεν κενόν. Καὶ προσέθετο πέμπαι ἕτερον δοῦ- 11
 λον· οἱ δὲ κακέεινον, δείραντες καὶ ἀτιμάσαντες, ἐξαπέστειλαν κενόν.
 5 Καὶ προσέθετο πέμπαι τρίτον· οἱ δὲ καὶ τοῦτον τρισμαίωσαντες ἐξέ- 12
 37 6 βαλον. Εἶπε δὲ ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος· Τί ποιήσω; πέμπω τὸν 13
 38 7 υἱὸν μου τὸν ἀγαπητόν· ἴσως τοῦτον ἰδόντες ἐπιτραπήσονται. Ἰδόντες 14
 δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ γεωργοὶ, διελογίζοντο πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς, λέγοντες· Οὗτός ἐστιν
 ὁ κληρονόμος· δεῦτε ἀποκτείνωμεν αὐτὸν, ἵνα ἡμῶν γένηται ἡ κλη-
 39 8 ρονομία. Καὶ ἐκβαλόντες αὐτὸν ἔσω τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος ἀπέκτειναν. Τί 15
 40 9 οὖν ποιήσει αὐτοῖς ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος; ἐλεύσεται καὶ ἀπολέσει 16
 41 τοὺς γεωργοὺς τούτους, καὶ δώσει τὸν ἀμπελῶνα ἄλλοις. Ἀκούσας
 42 10 δὲ εἶπον· Μὴ γένοιτο! Ὁ δὲ ἐμβλέψας αὐτοῖς εἶπε· Τί οὖν ἐστι 17
 τὸ γεγραμμένον τοῦτο· Λίθον ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκο-
 44 δομοῦντες, οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας; πᾶς 18
 ὁ πεσὼν ἐπ' ἐκείνον τὸν λίθον, συνθλασθήσεται· ἐφ' ὃν δ' ἂν πέσῃ,
 45 12 λικμήσει αὐτόν. Καὶ ἐζήτησαν οἱ ἄρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς ἐπιβα- 19
 λειν ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὰς χεῖρας ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ, καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν τὸν λαόν·
 46 ἔγνωσαν γὰρ ὅτι πρὸς αὐτοὺς τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην εἶπε.
 22. Καὶ παρατηρήσαντες ἀπέστειλαν ἐγκαθήμετους, ὑποκρινομένους ἑαυτοὺς 20
 15 13 δικαίους εἶναι· ἵνα ἐπιλάβωνται αὐτοῦ λόγου, εἰς τὸ παραδοῦναι αὐτὸν
 16 14 τῇ ἀρχῇ καὶ τῇ ἔξουσίᾳ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος. Καὶ ἐπηρώτησαν αὐτὸν, λέγον- 21
 17 15 τες· Ἀδίασκαλε, οἴδαμεν ὅτι ὀρθῶς λέγεις καὶ διδάσκεις· καὶ οὐ λαμ-
 18 βάνεις πρόσωπον, ἀλλ' ἐπ' ἀληθείας τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ διδάσκεις. Ἔξε- 22
 19 16 στιν ἡμῖν Καίσαρι φόρον δοῦναι, ἢ οὐ; Κατανοήσας δὲ αὐτῶν τὴν 23
 20 16 νῆριον, εἶπε πρὸς αὐτοὺς· Τί με πειράζετε; ἐπιδείξατέ μοι δη- 24
 21 17 Καίσαρος. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Ἀπόδοτε τοίνυν τὰ Καίσαρος Καίσαρι, 25
 καὶ τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ τῷ Θεῷ. Καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἐπιλαβέσθαι αὐτοῦ ὅτι 26

allusions to it in Hom. II. γ. 56. and Thucyd. v. 60.

9. [Comp. Is. v. 1. Jer. ii. 21. xii. 10.]

11. προσέθετο πέμφαι.] This expression (as also that at xix. 11. προσθεῖς εἶπε) is an Hellenistic idiom formed on the Hebrew, and found in Gen. viii. 21; xviii. 29, & Job xix. 1.

13. ἴσως.] This is commonly rendered "it may be, or perhaps." But Pearce, Campb., and Schleus. object, that that sense can have no place in the Scriptures, since the Spirit of truth could be under no doubt. Hence they would render it surely, adducing examples of that sense from the LXX. and the Classical writers, and referring to several Notes of Critics. But the difficulty started is perhaps imaginary; for the term occurs in a *parable*; and may be supposed to be used per anthropotheism, and to keep up the *verisimilitude* of the story. If this be not admitted, we must, with Bornem., take the ἴσως for οἶμαι *sane*; which

he proves by references to Schaefer and Hermann.

14. [Comp. Ps. ii. 1. 8. Gen. xxxvii. 18. Matt. xxvi. 3. John xi. 53. Heb. i. 2.]

17. [See Ps. cxviii. 22. Is. viii. 14; xxviii. 16. 1 Pet. ii. 4. 7.]

18. [See Is. viii. 15. Zech. xii. 3.]

20. ἐγκαθήμετους.] The word properly denotes one who is stationed in a lurking place, to watch another's motions; either for attacking him, or otherwise; and, in a metaphorical sense, denotes one set as a spy, whether of words or actions.

21. λαμβάνεις πρόσωπον.] A phrase formed on the Heb. לַבֵּן פָּנַי, and denoting "to show partiality to any one." It occurs frequently in the LXX.

23. κατανοήσας τὴν πανουργίαν.] Two MSS. have ἐπιγνοὺς τὴν πανουργίαν; plainly from emendation. But though the first expression is the more elegant, the second is less proper. The following

	MT.	MK.
ματος ἐναντίον τοῦ λαοῦ· καὶ θανατώσαυτες ἐπὶ τῇ ἀποκρίσει αὐτοῦ εἰσίγησαν.	22.	12.
27 Προσελθόντες δὲ τινες τῶν Σαδδουκαίων, οἱ ἀντιλέγοντες ἀνάστασιν	23	18
28 μὴ εἶναι, ἐπηρώτησαν αὐτὸν, λέγοντες· Διδάσκαλε, Μουϋσῆς ἔγραψεν	24	19
ἡμῖν· ἐάν τις ἀδελφὸς ἀποθάνῃ ἔχων γυναῖκα, καὶ οὗτος ἄτεκος		
ἀποθάνῃ, ἵνα λάβῃ ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ τὴν γυναῖκα, καὶ ἐξαιστήσῃ		
29 σπέρμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ. Ἐπὶ οὖν ἀδελφοὶ ἦσαν· καὶ ὁ πρῶτος	25	20
30 λαβὼν γυναῖκα, ἀπέθανεν ἄτεκος· καὶ ἔλαβεν ὁ δεύτερος τὴν γυναῖκα,	26	21
31 καὶ οὗτος ἀπέθανεν ἄτεκος· καὶ ὁ τρίτος ἔλαβεν αὐτὴν, ὡσαύτως		
32 δὲ καὶ οἱ ἐπὶ· [καὶ] οὐ κατέλιπον τέκνα, καὶ ἀπέθανον· ὕστερον	22	22
33 δὲ πάντων ἀπέθανε καὶ ἡ γυνή. Ἐν τῇ οὖν ἀναστάσει, τίος αὐτῶν	23	23
34 γίνεται γυνή; οἱ γὰρ ἐπὶ ἔσχον αὐτὴν γυναῖκα. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς	29	24
εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου γαμοῦσι καὶ ἐγαμί-		
35 σκονται· οἱ δὲ καταξιοθέντες τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐκείνου τυχεῖν, καὶ τῆς ἀνα-	30	25
36 στάσεως τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν, οὔτε γαμοῦσιν οὔτε ἐγαμιόσκονται· οὔτε γὰρ		
ἀποθανεῖν ἔτι δύναται· ἰσάγγελοι γὰρ εἰσι, καὶ υἱοὶ εἰσι τοῦ Θεοῦ,		
37 τῆς ἀναστάσεως υἱοὶ ὄντες. Ὅτι δὲ ἐγείρονται οἱ νεκροὶ καὶ Μουϋσῆς	31	26
ἐμήνυσεν ἐπὶ τῆς Βάτου, ὡς λέγει Κύριον, τὸν Θεὸν Ἀβραάμ καὶ τὸν	32	27
38 Θεὸν Ἰσαὰκ καὶ τὸν Θεὸν Ἰακώβ. Θεὸς δὲ οὐκ ἔστι νεκρῶν, ἀλλὰ	27	
39 ζώντων· πάντες γὰρ αὐτῷ ζῶσιν. Ἀποκριθέντες δὲ τινες τῶν γραμ-		
40 ματιῶν εἶπον· Διδάσκαλε, καλῶς εἶπες. οὐκ ἔτι δὲ ἐτόλμων ἐπερωτῆν		
αὐτὸν οὐδὲν.		
41 Εἶπε δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς· Πῶς λέγουσι τὸν Χριστὸν υἱὸν Δαυὶδ εἶναι;	42	35
42 καὶ αὐτὸς Δαυὶδ λέγει ἐν βίβλῳ Ψαλμῶν· Εἶπεν ὁ Κύριος τῷ	43	36

examples may suffice. Xenoph. Anab. vii. 5. 11. δὲ ἐ γνοῖς τοῦ Ἡ. τὴν πανουργίαν. Joseph. Ant. x. 12. 6. συνιδῶν τὴν κακουρίαν αὐτῶν.

27. οἱ ἀντιλέγοντες ἀνάστ. μὴ εἶναι.] On this idiom, by which verbs containing *denial* add *μη* to the Infinitive, see Matth. Gr. Gr. § 533. Obs. 3. To the examples adduced may be added another from Thucyd. iii. 41. ἀντέλεγε μὴ ἀποκτεῖναι.

28. [See Deut. xxv. 5.]

31. οὐ κατέλιπον — ἀπέθανον.] Ne mireris prothysteron; “Primaria enim sententia secundariae praemissa est,” ut v. 28. et Joan xv. 6. (Bornemann.) Many MSS. and some Edd. have not the *καὶ* before *οὐ*, which is cancelled by almost all the recent Editors — rashly, I think: for it seems to have been thrown out by the early Critics, to avoid the too frequent repetition of the word.

35. οἱ καταξιοθέντες — τυχεῖν.] Of this turn of expression examples are adduced by Wets., to which I would add a very apposite one from Æschyl. Prom. 239. θνητοῦς δ' ἐν οἴκτῳ προθέμενος, ταῦτον τυχεῖν οὐκ ἠξιώθη αὐτός. where *ἀξίω* is for *καταξίω*, as in Pind. Nem. x. 73. where the Schol. explains *ἀξιωθεῖν* by *καταξιοθεῖν*.

36. οὔτε γὰρ — δύναται.] By this our Lord meant to impugn the Pharisaical notion of a *metempsychosis*. I would compare Artemid. iii. 13. ἀθάνατοι οἱ ἀποθανόντες, ἐπὶ μηκέτι τεθνήσκοντες. See I John iii. 2.

— ἰσάγγελοι.] The Commentators are agreed

that since *ισάγγελος* is formed after the model of *ἰσῆθος*, it should be rendered, not *equal to the angels*, but *like unto the angels*; (viz. in respect of immortality and the nature of their bodies), as in Matt. xxiii. 30. ὡς ἄγγελοι. The word *ισάγγελος* is rare; but one example is adduced by Bulkley from Hierocles: *σέβειν ὁ λόγος πασαιεὶ τοὺς ἰσοδαίμονας καὶ ἰσαγγέλους*. See also Ecumen. on Acts, p. 74. The angels are called *sons of God* on account of their participation in Divine felicity and glory, as *υἱοὶ τῆς ἀναστ.* denotes those who are partakers in the resurrection and the future life. On which sense of *υἱός*, see Note on Matt. viii. 12; xi. 19, and an example of the phrase from a Rabbinical writer in Schoettg. on I Cor. xv. 42.

37. [See Exod. iii. 6. Acts vii. 32. Heb. xi. 16.]

38. πάντες γὰρ αὐτῷ ζῶσιν.] On the sense of these words Commentators are divided in opinion. Some (as Beza, Wets., and Dodd.) regard them as giving the consequence of our Lord's argument; in the sense, that “all, however dead to us, are still living, as regards God, to whom things future are as present.” Others, as Kypke and Campb., consider the *γὰρ* as not *causal* but *illative*, and confirmatory of the proposition; q. d. “He is not a God of the dead, but of the living, for all (who are alive) live unto him; since death does not terminate our connection with Him, inasmuch as He can recall us to life, and make that life immortal.” See some interesting passages, illustrative of this sentiment, cited and referred to in Recens. Synop.

MT. MK.

22. 12. Κυριῶ μου, Κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, ἕως ἄν θῶ τοὺς 43
 44 37 ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου. Δαυὶδ οὖν 44
 45 38 Κύριον αὐτὸν καλεῖ· καὶ πῶς υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἐστιν; Ἀκούοντος δὲ 45
 παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ, εἶπε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ· Προσέχετε ἀπὸ τῶν 46
 23. γραμματέων τῶν θελότων περιπατεῖν ἐν στολαῖς, καὶ φιλοῦντων ἄσπα-
 6 39 σμοὺς ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς, καὶ πρωτοκαθεδρίας ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς, καὶ
 14 40 πρωτοκλισίας ἐν τοῖς δείπνοις· οἱ κατεσθίουσι τὰς οἰκίας τῶν χηρῶν, 47
 καὶ προφάσει μακρὰ προσέχονται. οὗτοι λήψονται περισσότερον
 κρίμα.

41 XXI. ἈΝΑΒΛΑΨΑΣ δὲ εἶδε τοὺς βάλλοντας τὰ δῶρα αὐτῶν 1
 42 εἰς τὸ γαζοφυλάκιον πλουσίου· εἶδε δὲ καὶ τινα χήραν πενυχρὰν 2
 43 βάλλουσαν ἐκεῖ δύο λεπτά, καὶ εἶπεν· Ἀληθῶς λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι ἡ χήρα 3
 44 ἢ πτωχὴ αὕτη πλεῖον πάντων ἔβαλεν· ἅπαντες γὰρ οὗτοι ἐκ τοῦ 4
 περισεύοντος αὐτοῖς ἔβαλον εἰς τὰ δῶρα τοῦ Θεοῦ, αὕτη δὲ ἐκ τοῦ
 24. 13. ὑστερήματος αὐτῆς ἅπαντι τὸν βίον ὃν εἶχεν ἔβαλε.
 1 1 ΚΑΙ τινων λέγοντων περὶ τοῦ ἱεροῦ, ὅτι λίθοις καλοῖς καὶ ἀναθή- 5
 2 2 μασι κεκόσμηται, εἶπε· Ταῦτα [ἡ] θεωρεῖτε, ἐλεύσονται ἡμέραι ἐν αἷς 6
 3 οὐκ ἀφειθήσεται λίθος ἐπὶ λίθῳ, ὃς οὐ καταλυθήσεται. Ἐπηρώτησαν 7
 4 δὲ αὐτὸν, λέγοντες· Διδάσκυλε, πότε οὖν ταῦτα ἔσται; καὶ τί τὸ
 σημεῖον ὅταν μέλλῃ ταῦτα γίνεσθαι;
 4 5 Ὁ δὲ εἶπε· Βλέπετε μὴ πλανηθῆτε· πολλοὶ γὰρ ἐλεύσονται ἐπὶ 8
 5 6 τῷ ὀνόματί μου, λέγοντες· Ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι· καὶ ὁ καιρὸς ἤγγικε. μὴ
 6 7 οὖν πορευθῆτε ὀπίσω αὐτῶν. Ὅτι οὐκ ἀκούετε πολέμους καὶ ἀκατα- 9
 στασίας, μὴ πτοηθῆτε· δεῖ γὰρ ταῦτα γενέσθαι πρῶτον, ἀλλ' οὐκ
 7 8 εὐθὺς τὸ τέλος. Τότε ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· Ἐγερθήσεται ἔθνος ἐπὶ ἔθνος, 10
 καὶ βυσιλεῖα ἐπὶ βυσιλεῖαν· σεισμοὶ τε μεγάλοι κατὰ τόπους καὶ λιμοὶ 11
 καὶ λοιμοὶ ἔσονται, φόβητό τε καὶ σημεῖα ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ μέγала ἔσται.

43. [See Ps. cx. 1. Acts ii. 34. 1 Cor. xv. 25. Heb. i. 13. x. 13.]

46. [See supra xi. 43.]

47. [Comp. 2 Tim. iii. 6. Tit. i. 11.]

XXI. 5. ἀναθήμασι.] Ἀνάθημα signifies, 1. any thing laid up or apart; 2. any thing separated, dedicated, consecrated to God. These ἀναθήματα were usually displayed conspicuously in the temple either by being hung up, or otherwise serving to adorn it. These the devotees used to bring thither, not only in the hope of future blessings from heaven, but from their gratitude for past benefits. The offerings varied according to the taste, intention, or the ability of the giver; consisting of crowns, golden or silver vases, pictures, arms, &c.

6. ταῦτα.] Sub. κατὰ, "as for these things;" or suppose, with Bornem., an accusative absolute; though the parallel passages strongly countenance the opinion of Rinek. Lucubr. Crit. p. 334, that τὰ is to be cancelled on the authority of several MSS. and Versions, and a mark of interrogation placed after θεωρεῖτε.

—ἐλεύσονται ἡμέραι, &c.] See supra xix. 44. 1 Kings ix. 7, 8. Micah iii. 12. Wets. appositely compares Hom. II. δ. 164. ἔσεται ἡμᾶρ, ὅταν ποτ' ἄλλω ἦλιος ἰσθῇ.

9. ἀκαταστασίας.] Ἀκαταστασία denotes that unsettled state, which arises from sedition and faction; wherein the laws cease to have any force, and things are carried on by force and violence. The word is only found in the later Greek writers and in the LXX.

—μὴ πτοηθῆτε.] Bornem. compares a passage of Plutarch. Moral. π. 451, where πτοῖα and φόβοι are combined. He also adduces a learned remark of Wyttenb., that πτοῖα properly denotes percussione animi subitani, et tantum perturbationum; and then comes to mean, "permanentem a subita percussione profectam perturbationem, sive cum cupiditate sive timore conjunctam." A very accurate representation. Yet how, it may be asked, comes the word to mean percussione. I answer, πτοῖω must not, with Lennep, be supposed derived from πίπτω and πτώω. But πτοῖω comes from πτόω, which is cognate with πτώω; and both are onomatop. simply signifying, and the same word with, our verb to puff. Now a puff of wind implies a percussione of the air; and πτοῖα came, by a usual figure, to denote percussione simply; and, by use, percussione of the mind.

10. φόβητρα] objects of terror, terrific prodigies. The meaning is plain from what follows, σημεῖα ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ, where by σημ. are denoted aerial phenomena.

12 *Πρὸ δὲ τούτων * πάντων ἐπιβαλοῦσιν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν καὶ* 13. 13
διώξουσιν, παραδιδόντες εἰς συναγωγὰς καὶ φυλακὰς, ἀγομένους ἐπὶ βα- 9 9
13 σιλῆς καὶ ἡγεμόνας, ἔνεκεν τοῦ ὀνόματός μου· ἀποβήσεται δὲ ὑμῖν εἰς
14 μαρτύριον. Θέσθε οὖν εἰς τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν μὴ προμελεῖν ἀπολο- 11
15 γηθῆναι. ἐγὼ γὰρ δώσω ὑμῖν στόμα καὶ σοφίαν, ἣ οὐ δυνήσονται
16 ἀντελεῖν οὐδὲ ἀντιστῆναι πάντες οἱ ἀντικείμενοι ὑμῖν. Παραδοθῆ- 12
σεσθε δὲ καὶ ὑπὸ γονέων καὶ ἀδελφῶν καὶ συγγενῶν καὶ φίλων· καὶ
17 θανατώσουσιν ἕξ ὑμῶν· καὶ ἔσεσθε μισούμενοι ὑπὸ πάντων διὰ τὸ
18 ὄνομά μου· καὶ θριξὶ ἐκ τῆς κεφαλῆς ὑμῶν οὐ μὴ ἀπόληται. Ἐν τῇ
19 ὑπομονῇ ὑμῶν † κτήσασθε τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν. Ὅταν δὲ ἴδῃτε κυκλο- 13 14
20 μένην ὑπὸ στρατοπέδων τὴν Ἱερουσαλὴμ, τότε γινώτε ὅτι ἤγγικεν ἡ 15
21 ἐρήμωσις αὐτῆς. Τότε οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ φευνγέτωσαν εἰς τὰ ὄρη, καὶ 16
οἱ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῆς ἐκχωρεῖτωσαν· καὶ οἱ ἐν ταῖς χώραις μὴ εἰσερχέσθωσαν 18 18
22 εἰς αὐτήν. ὅτι ἡμέραι ἐκδικήσεως αὐταῖ εἰσι, τοῦ † πληρωθῆναι πάν-
23 τα τὰ γεγραμμένα. Οὐαὶ δὲ ταῖς ἐν γαστρὶ ἐχούσαις καὶ ταῖς θηλα- 19 17
ζούσαις ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις· ἔσται γὰρ ἀνάγκη μεγάλη ἐπὶ τῆς
24 γῆς, καὶ ὄργῃ [ἐν] τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ. Καὶ πεσοῦνται στόματι μαχαί-
ρας, καὶ αἰχμαλωτισθήσονται εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη· καὶ Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἔσται
25 πατουμένη ὑπὸ ἐθνῶν, ἄχρι πληρωθῶσι καιροὶ ἐθνῶν. Καὶ ἔσται 29 24

12. *πάντων.*] This, for the common reading *ἀπάντων*, is received, from very many MSS. by almost all Editors. On the present passage compare John xvi. 2. Rev. ii. 10. Acts iv. 3. v. 18. xii. 4.

13. *εἰς μαρτύριον.*] Sub. *αὐτοῖς*, (which is expressed in the parallel passage of Mark,) the sense being "that they shall not be able to say at the judgment. We never heard of these things."

14. [*Comp. Matt. x. 19. supra xii. 12.*]

15. [*Comp. Exod. iv. 12. Is. liv. 17. Acts vi. 10.*]

— *στόμα καὶ σοφίαν.*] This, by a mixture of metonymy and hendiadys, is used for the faculty of speaking wisely and ably. It is not a mere Hebraism, since *στόμα* is sometimes, though rarely, used in the Greek Classical writers, as *os* in the Latin. See Dr. South's Serm. on this text vol. v. 433.

18. [*See Matt. x. 30. 1 Sam. xiv. 45. 2 Sam. i. 11. 1 Kings i. 5.*]

19. *ἐν τῇ ὑπομονῇ—ὑμῶν.*] The sense is, "by your persevering endurance ye will preserve your lives." For the Imperative, say the Commentators, has the force of a Future. See Glass. Phil. Sac. p. 236, who adduces several examples of this idiom, proceeding, he thinks, from the Prophets. But the passages cited are of a different nature: so that we may rather suppose the true reading here is *κτήσασθε*; which is found in several of the best MSS., and no doubt will be found in more, if carefully examined. For the difference is so small as to often escape the eye. Hence the terminations are perpetually confounded. As all the best ancient Versions, too, use the *future*, there is little doubt, considering how *literal* those Versions are, that the Translators had *κτήσασθε* in their copies, which is also in several of the early Fathers.

22. *πληρωθῆναι.*] Very many MSS. have *πλη-*

σθῆναι, which is received by several Editors. On this passage compare Dan. ix. 26, 27. Zech. xi. 1.

23. *ἀνάγκη.*] This, like the Hebr. *צָרָה*, is put for *θλίψις*, which is found in the parallel passage of Matth. This sense of the word occurs not only in the Sept., but also in the best Classical writers.

— *ἐν τῷ λαῷ τ.*] The *ἐν* is omitted in most MSS. and is cancelled by the recent Editors. But the common reading admits of a good sense; which is well expressed by Lord Bacon, Essays, vol. i. p. 347.

24. *στόματι μαχ.*] *Στόμα μαχ.* is thought to be a Hebraism for *צָרָה פִּי*, as in Deut. xv. 13. Yet Wets. and Elsn. adduce some examples from the Classical writers, to which may be added Theophyl. Simoc. p. 129. A. [*Comp. Rom. xi. 25.*]

— *πατουμένη.*] Some take this to mean "occupied," and (consequently) *profaned*. So Apoc. xi. 2. 1 Macc. iii. 52. *τὰ ἅγια σου καταπεπάρηται καὶ βεβήλωται*. And sometimes in the Classical writers. Others explain, "shall be ignominiously treated." So Cic. ad Attic. viii. 11. cited by Wets. *Conculcari miseram Italiam videbis proxima æstate, et quati utriusque vi*. To which I add Æschyl. Eum. 110. *καὶ πάντα τὰντα λὰξ δροῶ πατούμενα*, and Choeph. 639. The significations merge into each other.

— *ἄχρι πληρωθῶσι καιροὶ ἐθνῶν.*] Commentators are not agreed on the sense of these words. Some take it to be, "the times when the Gentiles shall be visited for their sins." See Jer. xxvii. 7. Ezek. xxi. 25; xxii. 3 & 4; xxx. 3. But that would be supposing the words to be quite ænigmatical. It is *better*, with the ancient and earlier modern Commentators, to interpret, "the time when the number of Gentiles to be called to God shall be complete." That, however, may be thought to be negated by Rom. xi. 12, seqq. So that some of the best Commentators, from

MT. MK.

24. 13. σημεῖα ἐν ἡλίῳ καὶ σελήνῃ καὶ ἄστροις, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς συνοχή ἐθνῶν
 ἐν ἀπορίᾳ, ἠχούσης θαλάσσης καὶ σάλου ἄποφυγόντων ἀνθρώπων ἀπὸ 26
 25 φόβου καὶ προσδοκίας τῶν ἐπερχομένων τῇ οἰκουμένῃ· αἱ γὰρ δυνάμεις
 30 26 τῶν οὐρανῶν σαλευθήσονται. καὶ τότε ὄψονται τὸν γῶν τοῦ ἀνθρώ- 27
 που ἐρχόμενον ἐν νεφέλῃ μετὰ δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης πολλῆς.

Ἄρχομένων δὲ τούτων γίνεσθαι, ἀνακύψατε καὶ ἐπάρατε τὰς κεφαλὰς 28
 ὑμῶν· διότι ἐγγίξει ἡ ἀπολύτρωσις ὑμῶν.

Lightf., Whitby, and Newton downwards, are, with reason, of opinion, that the words refer to a period when the Jews shall be restored; i. e. when the times of the four great kingdoms, predicted by Daniel, shall have expired, and the fifth, or kingdom of Christ, shall be set up in their place; when the scattered sheep of Israel shall be again collected, and become one fold under one shepherd, as citizens of the New Jerusalem. However, after all, the simplest and best representation of the sense may be that offered by Bp. Pearce, who paraphrases it, "until those Gentiles have done all which God has decreed that they should do." Thus the words will have reference to the primary import of our Lord's prophecy, and probably were meant to be confined to that. See Note on Matt. xxiv. 29.

25. On this verse compare 2 Pet. iii. 10, 12. Is. xiii. 10. Ezek. xxxii. 7. Joel ii. 10. Rev. vi. 12. — ἐν ἀπορίᾳ.] Not "with perplexity," but "amidst perplexity." Συνοχή, like the Latin *angustia*, denotes such anxiety, as holds the mind, as it were, enchained. See Gray's Ode to Adversity, sub. init. So 2 Cor. ii. 4. Ὀλίφης καὶ σ. καρδίας. Hence it is often associated with nouns denoting distress. So Job xxx. 3. συνοχήν καὶ παλαιπωρίαν. And see Artemid. in Rec. Syn. Ἄπορία denotes *inopia consilii*, the not knowing what to do. Σάλος denotes the tossing of the sea, and figuratively *civil commotion*. See Soph. Œd. Tyr. v. 22, seqq. The reading ἠχους θαλάσσης, received by Griesb., 3d Edit., is a mere emendation of the ancient Critics, proceeding on a misunderstanding of the passage. See Matthæi and Scholz.

— ἠχούσης θαλάσσης καὶ σάλου.] These words are, in the present context, not without their difficulty; which has occasioned both variety of reading and diversity of interpretation. To advert first to the former, several ancient MSS., and the Syr., Pers., Arab., Vulg., Italic, and Slav. Versions have ἠχους θαλ., which is approved by Bengel and Kuin., and edited by Griesb. (in his third Edition) and Lachm. But without any good reason; for the sense thus arising is very harsh and frigid, and would ill comport with the other imagery of this sublime description. The reading in question seems to have arisen from the ancient Critics, who stumbled at the intermixture of circumstances denoting *physical* with those of *moral* agitation. Such, however, is frequent in the O. T., and by no means rare in the N. T., especially in the Apocalypse; nay, it is found in the Classical writers, for example, Æschylus. Yet it is not necessary, nor will it be proper here, to take the words in *sensu physico*. They may, and ought to be taken in a metaphorical sense, as belonging to the same description as that at Matt. xxiv. 29. and Mark xiii. 24, 25. At σάλου supply ἠχούσης, taken from ἠχούσης preceding; or there may be a sort of Hendiadys. It is well remarked by Grot.,

that in the Prophetical books "*Mare significat statum mundi variis casibus turbidum; Sonus, excitatus inde tumultus.*" By the σάλου ἠχ. or κινουμένου are, as Kypke rightly notices, designated ἀκαταστασίαι et turbulentatæ harum commotiones et tumultus. There seems, too, an allusion to Psalm lxxv. 7., where it is given as an attribute of God, that he "stilleth the raging of the sea, and the noise of its waves, and the tumult of the people;" in which passage Aquila well renders, καταστέλλων ἤχον θαλάσσης, θόρυβον κινμάτων αὐτῆς. For (as Pisc. rightly observes) what is there meant by *strepitus maris* is explained by the following *frenitus nationum*. Nor is this without example in the Classical writers. Thus Soph. Œd. Tyr. 23. πόλις γάρ ἠὲν σαλεθεῖ· κἀνακουφίσαι κόρα βυθῶν ἐν ὄνχ' οἴα τε φοινῶσ' ὄσλου. And Plut. Fab. Max. 37. ἠγγμονίαν πολλῶν σάλω σεισθεῖσαν ὤρθωσε πάλιν. Also Romul. 24. Theophyl. Simoc. p. 72 & 749. and comp. Pind. Pyth. iv. 484.

The words at v. 26. αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν σαλευθήσονται have the same sense as at Matt. xxiv. 29. (where see Note). In fact, the present passage, Matt. xxiv. 29. and Mark xiii. 24, 25. are of the very same nature, and relate to the very same events; i. e. primarily, to the destruction of Jerusalem and the Jewish state; but secondarily, to the destruction of the world. Moreover, the imagery (though the Commentators have omitted to notice it) is evidently formed upon Is. xiii. 10 & 13. (which treats of the destruction of Babylon) where Bp. Lowth remarks, "that, when the Hebrews intend to express *happiness, prosperity, the instauration and advancement of states, kingdoms, and potentates, they make use of images taken from the most striking parts of nature, from the heavenly bodies, from the sun, moon, and stars; which they describe as shining with increased splendour, and never setting; the moon becomes like the meridian sun, and the sun's light is augmented seven-fold (see Is. xxx. 26.); new heavens and a new earth are created, and a brighter age commences. On the contrary, the overthrow and destruction of kingdoms is represented by opposite images: the stars are obscured, the moon withdraws her light, and the sun shines no more; the earth quakes, and the heavens tremble; and all things seem tending to their original chaos. See Joel ii. 10. iii. 15, 16. Amos viii. 9." See also Sir Isaac Newton on Is. xiii. 13. (in D'Oyly and Mant) and compare Ps. lix. 2. Sept.*

26. φόβου καὶ προσδοκίας.] There is a Hendiadys, for "a fearful expectation;" or καὶ may be exegetical, for *even*. Ἀποφυγόντων is by many Commentators explained of *death*; but it seems only to mean (like ἐκθνήσκων) to die away with fear. Προσδοκία is often used of such an expectation as is associated with fear. So Thucyd. says, ἐλπίς τοῦ φόβου.

28. ἀνακύψατε.] Ἀνακύπτειν is intransitive, and

	MT.	MK.
29	24.	13.
30	32	28
31	33	29
32	34	30
33	35	31

Καὶ εἶπε παραβολὴν αὐτοῖς· Ἴδετε τὴν συκῆν καὶ πάντα τὰ δένδρα.
 ὅταν προβάλωσιν ἡδὴ, βλέποντες ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν γινώσκειτε ὅτι ἡδὴ ἐγγύς
 τὸ θέρος ἐστίν. οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς ὅταν ἴδητε ταῦτα γινόμενα, γινώσκειτε
 ὅτι ἐγγύς ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ. Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐ μὴ
 παρέλθῃ ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη, ἕως ἂν πάντα γένηται. ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ
 παρελεύσονται, οἱ δὲ λόγοι μου οὐ μὴ παρέλθωσι. Προσεχετε δε ἑαν-
 τοῖς, μὴ ποτε † βαρυνθῶσιν ὑμῶν αἱ καρδίαι ἐν ρομπύλῃ καὶ μέθῃ
 καὶ μερίμναις βιωτικαῖς· καὶ αἰφρίδιος ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἐπιστῇ ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκεί-
 νη. ὡς παγὶς γὰρ ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς καθεμένους ἐπὶ προ-
 σωπον πάσης τῆς γῆς. Ἀγρυπνεῖτε οὖν ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ, δεόμενοι ἵνα
 καταξιώθῃτε ἐκφυγεῖν ταῦτα πάντα τὰ μέλλοντα γίνεσθαι, καὶ σταθῆται
 ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.
 Ἴν δὲ τὴς ἡμέρας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ διδάσκων· τὴς δὲ νύκτας ἐξερχόμενος
 ἠϋλίζετο εἰς τὸ ὄρος τὸ καλούμενον Ἐλαιῶν. Καὶ πῶς ὁ λαὸς ὠρθηριζε
 πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἀκούειν αὐτοῦ.
 1 XXII. ἸΠΤΙΖΕ δὲ ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν ἄζύμων, ἡ λεγομένη πάσχα· καὶ 2 1
 2 ἐζήτουν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς, τὸ, πῶς ἀνέλωσιν αὐτόν· ἐφο- 4
 βούντο γὰρ τὸν λαόν.
 3 Εἰσῆλθε δὲ [ὁ] Σατανᾶς εἰς Ἰούδαν τὸν ἐπικαλούμενον Ἰσκαριώτην,
 4 ὄντα ἐκ τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ τῶν δώδεκα· καὶ ἀπελθὼν συνελάλησε τοῖς ἀρ- 14 10
 5 χιερεῦσι καὶ τοῖς στρατηγοῖς, τὸ, πῶς αὐτόν παραδῶ αὐτοῖς. Καὶ 15 11

denotes to raise up the body, as opposed to συγκύπτειν in Luke xiii. 11. Wets. compares Joseph. Bell. Jud. vi. 8. 5. διῆγον ἐκκύψαντες ἐκ τοῦ δόους. See Rom. viii. 23.

30. ἔταν προβ.] Supply καρπὸν, or φύλλα. Grot. cites from Dioscorid. προβάλλειν ἄνθος. So the Hebr. קָרַח is used of the budding and shooting forth of trees.

33. [Comp. Ps. cii. 26, 27. Is. li. 6. Heb. i. 11. 2 Pet. iii. 7. 10.]

34. [Comp. Rom. xiii. 13. 1 Thess. v. 6. 1 Pet. iv. 7.]

34. κραπάλη καὶ μέθη.] The latter term denotes the drunkenness itself, and the former the headache and stupid feeling which supervenes, and indisposes the mind for all serious reflection. Βαρυνθῶσιν. Very many MSS. and early Edd. have βαρηθῶσιν, which is adopted by Wets., Matth., and others down to Scholz. But I suspect that the η arose from a confusion with υν, the abbreviations being very similar. It is a great confirmation of the common reading, that the Sept. translators very often used βαρύνεσθαι; never, I believe, βαρῆσθαι. They have indeed the very phrase ἐβαρύνθη ἡ καρδία at Exod. viii. 15. ix. 7 & 31. x. 1, and at Sapient. Sol. ix. 15, what is here to the purpose, φθορὰν γὰρ σῶμα βαρύνει ψυχῆν. So Horace Sat. II. ii. 79. Quin corpus onustum Hesternis vitis animum quoque pręgravat una, Atque affigat humo divinę particulam aurę.

35. ὡς παγίς γὰρ ἐπελ.] i. e. shall come on unexpectedly. Παγίς and σκάνδαλον are frequent images expressive of calamity (as the Heb. קָרַח in Ps. lvi. 6. and 1 Macc. i. 35. v. 4.) especially such as is sudden and unexpected (as here and in Rom. xi. 9.), by which men are taken (like a beast in a trap) before they are aware. Καθεμένους. The word here denotes merely existing. There

is a reference to Jer. xxv. 29. [Comp. 1 Thess. v. 2. 2 Pet. iii. 10. Rev. iii. 3. & xvi. 15.]

36. σταθῆται.] This may be used, as in Luke xix. 8., of being introduced to, as a mark of honour and acceptance; or, as it is a judicial term, it may denote to be absolved or acquitted. [Comp. supra xii. 40. xviii. 1. 1 Thess. v. 6.]

37. [Comp. John viii. 1, 2.]

38. ὠρθηριζε πρὸς α.] Ὁρθηριζειν denotes properly to rise early; 2ndly, to go about any business early; 3dly, and when followed by a preposition denoting motion towards, it denotes to go or resort to any place or person. In which sense it occurs here, and occasionally in the Sept.

XXII. 2. [Comp. Ps. ii. 2. John xi. 47. Acts iv. 27.]

3. εἰσῆλθε δὲ ὁ δ Σ.] The best Commentators are agreed that this does not imply a physical entry of Satan into Judas; but it is to be understood of mental influence and instigation. As those who obey the divine motions are said to receive the Spirit as a divine guest; so Satan is said to enter into those who consent unto criminal suggestions. See John xiii. 2. Acts v. 3. Ephes. ii. 2. Consult the Notes on Matth. iii. 16. iv. 1. Luke ii. 27. This view does not at all negative the personality of Satan; since that is implied.

The Article before Σαρ. is omitted in many MSS. and early Edd., and is cancelled by Griesb., Vat., Tittm. and Scholz; but perhaps without reason; for though the word, as partaking of the nature both of a proper name, and an appellative, may either admit, or reject it; yet as here three-fourths of the MSS. have it, and as it is almost always found in the N. T. with Σαρ., except in the vocative case, it is best to retain it here.

4. στρατηγοῖς.] scil. τοῦ ἱεροῦ. On the meaning

MT. MK.

26. 14. ἐχάρησαν, καὶ συνέθεντο αὐτῷ ἄργύριον δοῦναι. Καὶ ἐξωμολόγησε· 6
 16 καὶ ἐξήτει εὐκαιρίαν τοῦ παραδοῦναι αὐτὸν αὐτοῖς ἄτερο ὄχλου.
- 17 12 Ἦλθε δὲ ἡ ἡμέρα τῶν ἀζύμων, ἐν ἧ ἔδει θύεσθαι τὸ πάσχα· καὶ 7
 18 13 ἀπέστειλε Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάννην, εἰπὼν· Πορευθέντες ἐτοιμάσατε ἡμῖν 8
 τὸ πάσχα, ἵνα φάγωμεν. Οἱ δὲ εἶπον αὐτῷ· Ποῦ θέλεις ἐτοιμάσω- 9
 μεν; Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Ἴδου, εἰσελθόντων ὑμῶν εἰς τὴν πόλιν, 10
 συναντήσεται ὑμῖν ἄνθρωπος κεράμιον ὕδατος βαστάζων· ἀκολουθήσατε 14
 αὐτῷ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, οὗ εἰσπορεύεται· καὶ ἐροῖτε τῷ οἰκοδεσπότῃ τῆς 11
 οἰκίας· Λέγει σοι ὁ διδάσκαλος· Ποῦ ἐστι τὸ κατάλυμα, ὅπου τὸ 15
 πάσχα μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν μου φάγω; Κακέινος ὑμῖν δείξει † ἀνώγειν 12
 19 μέγα ἐστρωμένον· ἐκεῖ ἐτοιμάσατε. Ἀπελθόντες δὲ εὔρον, καθὼς εἶρη- 13
 κεν αὐτοῖς· καὶ ἠτοίμασαν τὸ πάσχα.

Καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο ἡ ὥρα, ἀνέπεσε, καὶ οἱ δώδεκα ἀπόστολοι σὺν αὐ- 14
 τῷ, καὶ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς· Ἐπιθυμία ἐπεθύμησα τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα 15
 φαγεῖν μεθ' ὑμῶν πρὸ τοῦ με παθεῖν· Λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐδέτι 16
 οὐ μὴ φάγω ἐξ αὐτοῦ, ἕως ὅτου πληρωθῇ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ.
 Καὶ δεξιόμενος ποτήριον, εὐχαριστήσας εἶπε· Λάβετε τοῦτο καὶ δια- 17
 29 25 μερίσατε ἑαυτοῖς· Λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐ μὴ πῖω ἀπὸ τοῦ γεννήματος 18
 26 22 τῆς ἀμπέλου, ἕως ὅτου ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἔλθῃ. Καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον 19
 εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασε, καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς, λέγων· Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά
 μου, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον· τοῦτο ποιῶτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνη- 27
 23 σιν. Ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον μετὰ τὸ δειπῆσαι, λέγων· Τοῦτο τὸ 28
 24 ποτήριον, ἡ καιρὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμε-
 23 20 ρον. Πλὴν ἰδοὺ, ἡ χεὶρ τοῦ παραδιδόντος με μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς τρα- 21
 24 21 πέζης. Καὶ ὁ μὲν Ἰῶς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πορεύεται, κατὰ τὸ ὄρισμένον· 22

of this expression Commentators vary in opinion. But I agree with Bp. Middlet. on Acts iv. 1. that the most probable view is that of Lightf., who has shewn from the Jewish writers, that in various parts of the Temple, bodies of Levites constantly mounted guard: and that the persons commanding these several parties were called *στρατηγοί*; but that, besides these, there was an officer, who had the supreme authority over all of them; and that this is he whom we may suppose is called, by way of eminence, *ὁ στρατηγὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ* at Acts iv. 1.

6. ἐξωμολόγησε.] The word properly signifies to say the same thing with any one; and 2dly, as here, to agree with, assent to, what he proposes; a signification found also in the best writers.

— ἄτερο ὄχλου.] From the use of ἄτερο and such terms, certainly not employed in the common speech, and only found in the best writers, especially the Poets, Valcknaer thinks we may reasonably infer that Luke was conversant with the Classical authors.

11. οἰκοδεσπότη τῆς οἰκίας.] Bornem. compares *οικοφύλαξ ὁδῶν, αἰπόλια αἰγῶν, συβόσια σῶν, τὰ βοσκόμενα τῶν βοῶν* and other similar pleonasms.

15. ἐπιθυμία ἐπεθύμησα.] A Hebrew idiom, as in Gen. xxxi. 30. *ἐπιθυμία γὰρ ἐπεθύμησας ἐπελθεῖν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ πατρὸς*. Blackwall, Winer, and Bornem., produce what they call similar phrases from the Greek writers; but which are not quite

similar. For in Hebrew this idiom has a strongly *intensive* force; but scarcely ever so in the Greek Classics. As to *ἐρόμην εἶναι*, cited from Xenoph. by Bornem., it does not fall under this class.

16. ἕως ὅτου — τοῦ Θεοῦ.] The expression (which seems a Hebraism) imports, that our Lord would have no further society with them on earth. The thing to be completed was the work of human redemption by the sacrifice of Christ. Examples of a similar association of negatives are adduced by Bornem.

19. τοῦτο ποιῶτε, &c.] Do this; namely, which I have done — break bread, &c. See Bornem., who also gives examples of passages where, as here, the pronoun dem. is to be referred *ad remotiora*, and where *ἕως* is used for *ἕως*. Schoettg. cites various Rabbinical passages, which prove that the ancient Jewish Church in celebrating the Paschal feast, always had in view the sufferings of the Messiah. [Comp. I Cor. xi. 23, 24.]

24. τοῦτο τὸ — ἐκχυνόμενον.] Bornem., after a minute discussion of the sense, lays it down as follows: "*Hoc poculum, quod vestram in salutem effunditur, signum est novi fœderis per sanguinem meum sancienti.*"

21. ἡ χεὶρ — τραπέζης.] An Oriental mode of saying "the person is at the table with me." [Comp. John xiii. 21.]

22. [Comp. John xiii. 18. Psal. xli. 9. Acts i. 16.]

	MT.	MK.
23 πλὴν οὐαὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ δι' οὗ παραδίδοται. Καὶ αὐτοὶ ἤρξαν- 26		14.
το συζητεῖν πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς, τὸ, τίς ἄρα εἶη ἐξ αὐτῶν ὁ τοῦτο μέλλων 23		19
24 πρᾶσσειν. Ἐγένετο δὲ καὶ φιλονεικία ἐν αὐτοῖς, τὸ, τίς αὐτῶν δοκεῖ 20.		10.
25 εἶναι μείζων. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Οἱ βασιλεῖς τῶν ἐθνῶν κυριεύου- 25		42
26 σιν αὐτῶν, καὶ οἱ ἐξουσιάζοντες αὐτῶν εὐεργέτιαι καλοῦνται. ἤμεῖς δὲ 26		43
οὐχ οὕτως· ἀλλ' ὁ μείζων ἐν ὑμῖν γενέσθω ὡς ὁ νεώτερος· καὶ ὁ		
27 ἡγούμενος, ὡς ὁ διακονῶν. Τίς γὰρ μείζων, ὁ ἀνακείμενος ἢ ὁ διακο- 27		
28 νῶν. ἤμεῖς δὲ ἐστε οἱ διαμεμετηγότες μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐν τοῖς πειρασμοῖς 19.		14.
29 μου· καὶ γὰρ διατίθειμαι ὑμῖν καθὼς διέθετό μοι ὁ πατήρ μου βασιλεῖ- 28		
30 αν, ἵνα ἐσθίητε καὶ πίνητε ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης μου ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ μου·		
καὶ * καθίσσθε ἐπὶ θρόνων, κθίνοντες τίς δώδεκα φυλάς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.		
31 Εἶπε δὲ ὁ Κύριος· Σήμερον, Σήμερον, ἰδοὺ, ὁ Σατανᾶς ἐξητήσατο ὑμᾶς,		
32 τοῦ σιναῖσαι ὡς τὸν σῖτον· ἐγὼ δὲ ἐδεήθην περὶ σου, ἵνα μὴ ἐκλείπῃ		
ἡ πίστις σου· καὶ σύ ποτε ἐπιστρέψῃς στήριξον τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου. 26.		
33 Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Κύριε, μετὰ σοῦ εἶτομός ἐμι καὶ εἰς φυλακὴν καὶ 33		29
34 εἰς θάνατον πορεύεσθαι. Ὁ δὲ εἶπε· Λέγω σοι, Πέτρε, οὐ μὴ φω- 34		30
35 νήσει σήμερον ἀλέκτωρ, πρὶν ἢ τρεῖς ἀπαρνήσῃ μὴ εἶδέναι με. Καὶ		
εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Ὅτε ἀπέστειλα ὑμᾶς ἄτερ βελαντίου καὶ πήρις καὶ		
36 ὑποδημάτων, μὴ τινὸς ὑστερήσατε; οἱ δὲ εἶπον· Οὐδενός. Εἶπεν		
οὖν αὐτοῖς· Ἀλλὰ νῦν ὁ ἔχων βελάντιον ἀράτω, ὁμοίως καὶ πήραν·		

24. ἐγένετο δὲ καὶ φιλονεικία, &c.] From the difference of circumstances, notwithstanding the identity of the thing itself, some Commentators maintain, that this represents an occurrence distinct from that recorded at Matt. xx. 20. and Mark x. 35. But (as Dodd. remarks) "we cannot suppose such a contention for superiority should have occurred immediately after so affecting a lesson of humility;" accordingly he and some other eminent Commentators are of opinion that this is the same circumstance with that mentioned by Matthew and Mark; but here brought in out of the regular order; of which Luke is less observant than the other Evangelists. However, as Matthew and Mark tell us that the contention took place in the way, before they came to Jerusalem, or even Jericho, ἐγένετο must be taken in a *pluperfect* sense, "there had been," viz. on the road to Jericho.

25. εὐεργέται καλοῦνται.] *Εὐεργέτης* was among the Greeks a title of honour, assigned to all who had deserved well of the monarch or state, defended its liberties, or increased its honour. See my note on Thucyd. i. 129. *κείται σοι εὐεργ.*

26. οὐχ οὕτως.] Sub. *ποιεῖτε*, or with Bornem. *ἔσεθε*, or *ἐστέ*. [Comp. supra ix. 48. 1 Pet. v. 3.]

— ὁ μείζων.] From the antithetical word *νεώτ.* this has been by some supposed to denote "one who is elder," like the Latin *major*. But from the parallel passage of Matthew it is plain that *νεώτ.* is rather to be accommodated to *μείζων* than vice versâ; and Kypke has adduced many Classical authorities for *νεώτερος* in the sense of an *inferior*. He shows that the expressions employed throughout have reference to *office*, or *station* in the kingdom of Christ.

27. τίς γὰρ, &c. [Comp. John xiii. 14. Phil. ii. 7.]

28. πειρασμοῖς] "trials, afflictions."

VOL. I.

29. διατίθειμαι ἴ.]—The best Interpreters, ancient and modern, are of opinion that the sense of *διατίθ.* here is *engage for*, or *promise*; but that just after it must have the further removed sense of *grant* or *bestow*. The former is found in the Sept., the latter sprang from the usual sense of *corenauting*, which implies something *granted*. [Comp. supra xii. 32. Matt. xxiv. 47.]

30. καθίσσθε.] So for *καθίσσθε*, many of the best MSS., and some early Edd.; which is received by Wets., Matth., Griesb., and others; and rightly, for, as Born. observes, the Future was more likely to be changed into the Subj. than the contrary. And that it is *meant* to be construed with *ἵνα* is probable from a similar construction at John xv. 8.

31. ἐξητήσατο ὑμᾶς.] Ἐξαίτησθαι signifies to require any one to be delivered up to us, whether for *good* or for *evil*. See examples in Recens. Synop. The sense here is simply, "Satan desires to get you into his power;" a strongly figurative form of expression, used with allusion to the narrative of Job's temptation, recorded in Job. ii. 6.

— τὸν σιναῖσαι.] *Σιναῖσαι*, from *σινλον*, *a sieve*, signifies to *sift*, or *winnow*; and as that implies agitation, commotion, and separation, so most Commentators think it denotes to *perturb*, *loosen*, *undermine*, and *overthrow* your fidelity. But the sense suggested by our common version is more apt,—namely, *sift* you, *scrutinize*, or try your fidelity, and *constancy*. [Comp. 1 Pet. v. 8.]

32. ἐπιστρέψας] neuter for reciprocal. The sense is, "Having recovered thyself [namely from that lapse, which will happen to thee] by a sincere repentance."

35. [Comp. Matt. x. 9. Mark vi. 8. supra ix. 3. x. 4.]

MT. MK.

26. 14. καὶ ὁ μὴ ἔχων πωλησάτω τὸ ἱμάτιον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀγορασάτω μάχαιραν.
 λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, οἳ ἐπι τοῦτο τὸ γεγραμμένον δεῖ τελεσθῆναι ἐν ἐμοί, 37
 τό· Καὶ μετὰ ἀνόμων ἐλογίσθη· καὶ γὰρ τὰ περὶ ἐμοῦ
 τέλος ἔχει. Οἱ δὲ εἶπον· Κύριε, ἰδοὺ μάχαιρα ὡδε δύο. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν 38
 αὐτοῖς· Ἰκανόν ἐστι.
- 36 32 ΚΑΙ ἐξελθὼν ἐπορεύθη, κατὰ τὸ ἔθος, εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν Ἐλαιῶν· 39
 ἠκολούθησαν δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ. Γενόμενος δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ 40
 39 35 τόπου, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Προσεύχεσθε μὴ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς πειρασμόν. Καὶ 41
 αὐτὸς ἀπεσπάσθη ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὡσεὶ λίθου βολήν· καὶ θείξ τὰ γόνατα
 36 προσηύχετο, λέγων· Πάτερ, εἰ βούλει παρενεγκεῖν τὸ πότηριον τοῦτο 42
 ἀπ' ἐμοῦ· — πλὴν μὴ τὸ θέλημά μου, ἀλλὰ τὸ σὸν γενέσθω. ὠφθη 43
 δὲ αὐτῷ ἄγγελος ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἐνισχύων αὐτόν. Καὶ γενόμενος ἐν 44
 ἀγωνίᾳ ἐκτενέστερον προσηύχετο. ἐγένετο δὲ ὁ ἰδρῶς αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ

36. πωλησάτω — μάχαιραν.] Some Commentators stumble at these words; not being able to reconcile them with our Lord's pacific admonitions elsewhere, and his own non-resistance when apprehended by the soldiers. Hence they resort either to novel conjectures, or new interpretations; alike unnecessary, — since (as Grot., Wets., and other eminent modern Commentators have seen) this and the preceding phrases contain nothing more than a prediction of *impending perils*; which are opposed to the *quiet and security* of former times. The Prophets (they observe) are accustomed to metaphorically signify perilous times by representing what men then commonly do, in order to guard against danger. So also Euthym. observes, that our Lord signifies that the time for combat is at hand — merely meaning that their enemies are close upon them.

The expression πωλησάτω τὸ ἱμ. is a proverbial form, by which a thing is counselled to be done *at any rate*. It is strange the Commentators should have adduced no examples of this mode of speaking. I have noted some from the purest Attic writers; e. gr. Thucyd. viii. 81. οὐδ' ἦν εἴη, τελευτῶντα τὴν ἑαυτοῦ στρατιὴν ἕξαγυρῶσαι. Xen. Anab. vii. 5, 5. καὶ προσδανεισάμενος, εἰ μὴγ' ἄλλως εἶδένω, καὶ ἀποδόμενος τὰ σκευῶν ἱμάτια.

37. [Comp. Is. liii. 12. Mark xv. 28.] Grot. paraphrases the verse thus: "After the many other evils endured by me, the last now remains, namely, that I should be brought to an ignominious death. And my lot will extend to you also; for the ignominy and hatred encountered by the master, will be visited on you his disciples." Τέλος ἔχει is synonymous with τελεσθῆναι, and is used by the best Classical writers of the completion of predictions. Wets. and Kypke cite many examples, as Dionys. Ital. Ant. ix. 12. τέλος εἶχε τοῖς Τ. τὰ μαντεῖα ματα.

38. ἰδοὺ μάχαιρα ὡδε δύο.] Render, "See here are two swords." How it happened that they had the swords, and for what purpose, has been variously accounted for. Euthym. thinks that they had taken them to sacrifice the Paschal lamb. Grot., more rationally, supposes that as the road from Galilee to Jerusalem was infested with robbers, many (and especially the Galilæans) took swords. This is very probable; since Schoett. has shown that at that time, in Judæa, even the Priests were armed when on a journey.

— ἰκανόν ἔστι.] On the sense of this expres-

sion there is a difference of opinion. Some take ἰκανόν to mean, "sufficient for a symbol of hostility." But that would suppose the words almost enigmatical. Others think there is an *irony*; which, however, would be suitable neither to the period nor the season. The best Commentators, ancient and modern, are generally agreed, that ἰκανόν ἔστι is here used in a sense not unfrequent in that and similar expressions in all languages; and which is employed on occasions when we do not care to rectify a stupid misapprehension; but dismiss both the person and the thing with "It is very well:" "that will do." Of this idiom they adduce many examples, both from the Classical and the Rabbinical writers.

41. ἀπεσπάσθη.] Many Commentators render *proripuit se*. But the more eminent, both ancient and modern, are of opinion that no impetuosity is implied; observing, that both the Hebrews, Greeks, and Romans used many words which properly have a notion of violence with a considerable diminution, and sometimes an entire abandonment thereof. They render "he withdrew himself from them;" adducing several examples, the most apposite of which is 2 Mace. xii. 10. To which I add Thucyd. vii. 80. ἀπεσπάσθη, "separated, parted from." See Hemsterh. on Lucian i. 256. and Wakefield's Silv. Cr. v. 70.

— λίθου βολήν.] A rough mode of estimating distance, which originated in the simplicity of primitive times, and was afterwards retained in the common dialect, and even found its way into the best writers. Wets. adduces examples of the phrase, but not one to the purpose. The following may therefore be not unacceptable. Propoc. p. 236, 17. διεστίκει γὰρ αὐτοῦ ὅσον λίθου βολήν.

42. εἰ βούλει — ἀπ' ἐμοῦ.] There is thought by the Commentators to be here an ellipsis; and the most probable one is *παρένεγκε*, on which Bornem. refers to Matth. Gr. § 617. p. 124, 8. But it should seem that this is rather an example of *Aposiopesis*. Such is a modest way of making a request. By *σαρ.* is here meant, as Bornem. shews, *præterire sinere*. [Comp. John vi. 38.]

43, 44. These verses are rejected by some Critics. But as the external evidence for their omission is next to nothing, and the *internal* very slender and precarious; and as their omission is far easier to account for than their insertion, they may justly be regarded as genuine. [Comp. John xii. 27. Heb. v. 7.]

	MT.	MK.
45 θρόμβοι αἵματος καταβαίνοντες ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν. Καὶ ἀναστίας ἀπὸ τῆς 26	14.	
προσευχῆς, ἔλθὼν πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ, εὗρεν αὐτοὺς κοιμωμένους 40	37	
46 ἀπὸ τῆς λύπης, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Τί καθεύθετε; ἀναστάντες προσ- 41	39	
εύχεσθε, ἵνα μὴ εἰσέλθῃτε εἰς πειρασμόν.		
47 Ἐν δὲ αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος, ἰδοὺ ἄγγελος, καὶ ὁ λεγόμενος Ἰούδας (εἷς 47	43	
τῶν δώδεκα) προήρχετο αὐτοὺς, καὶ ἤγγισε τῷ Ἰησοῦ φιλήσασαι αὐτόν. 48	45	
48 Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Ἰούδα, φιλήματι τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου 49	45	
49 παραδίδως; Ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ περὶ αὐτόν τὸ ἐσόμενον, εἶπον αὐτῷ· Κύ- 50	50	
50 ριε, εἰ πατάξομεν ἐν μαχαίρᾳ; Καὶ ἐπάτιξεν εἰς τις ἐξ αὐτῶν τὸν 51	47	
51 δοῦλον τοῦ ἀρχιερέως, καὶ ἀφῆκεν αὐτοῦ τὸ οὖς τὸ δεξιόν. Ἀποκρι- 49	49	
θεις δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· Ἴατε ἕως τούτου! καὶ ἀμίμητος τοῦ ὠίδου 55	48	
52 αὐτοῦ ἴασατο αὐτόν. Ἴλεπε δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς πρὸς τοὺς παρεγνομένους ἐπ’ 48	48	
αὐτόν ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ στρατηγούς τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ πρεσβυτέρους· Ὡς ἐπὶ 53	48	
53 ληστὴν ἐξεληλύθατε μετὰ μαχιωρῶν καὶ ξύλων; καθ’ ἡμέραν ὄντος 48	48	
μου μεθ’ ὑμῶν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, οὐκ ἐξετείνετε τὰς χεῖρας ἐπ’ ἐμέ. ἀλλ’ 48	48	
αὕτη ὑμῶν ἐστὶν ἡ ὥρα· καὶ ἔξουσία τοῦ σκότους!	48	

—ὡσαύθι θρόμβοι αἵματος.] It has been by many supposed that our Lord's sweat was actually blood, or at least bloody; and examples of this phenomenon have been adduced. But the best Expositors, ancient and modern, are agreed that the sense is, "his sweat became like drops of blood." This, they think, the words themselves demand. Comp. Acts ix. 19. Theophylact and Photius Epist. 133. consider it as merely a proverbial mode of expression, by which it is said of those who labour, that they sweat drops of blood. But that view can by no means be admitted. Surely the very existence of the saying in the Greek, as well as in our own and other languages, at least attests the existence of bloody sweats, under excessive perturbation of mind or distress of body. See Lucan. Phars. ix. 309—14. cited in Rec. Syn., where, among other expressions, we have *sudor rubet*. So that, after all, those who understand it of a *sanguineous appearance in the sweat*, may be right; for the numerous authorities adduced or referred to in Rec. Syn., prove that sanguineous sweats sometimes have been known to attend extreme agony of mind. And this view is strongly supported by the following citation from a medical writer, *Blainville*, for which I am indebted to the British Critic for 1831. P. i. "On l'a trouvée (la sueur) colorée en rouge dans une affection qui a reçu le nom de *Diapédèse*, maladie dans laquelle il n'y a pas une véritable transpiration, mais qui constitue bien plutôt une *hemorragie* par exhalation, comme celle que l'on observe à la surface de membrane pituitaire. Cette *transudation* a lieu dans les cas, où par suite d'une frayeur subite, ou d'une *vice émotion*, il se fait congestion." Other examples of this phenomenon may be seen in *Sagittarii Hist. Passionis*, Bartholin de Cruce, and other writers cited by *Gruner* in his elaborate *Commentatio de J. Christi morte*.

45. κοιμωμένους ἀπὸ τῆς λύπης.] The force of the expression may best be understood by considering, that extreme grief has a stupefying tendency, and tends to induce a sort of heavy, though unrefreshing sleep; an effect which is alluded to in

various passages of the Classical writers cited by Wets.

43. [Comp. John xviii. 3.]

49. εἰ πατάξομεν.] *Ei* has the sense *num*, as in Mark viii. 23. where see Note. *Ἐν* is said by the Commentators to be here put for *σὺν*. But no good writers use *σὺν* in the sense of the *instrumental cause*; whereas *ἐν* is sometimes found in that sense, though in the writers of the N. T. it, no doubt, proceeded from Hebraism.

50. [Comp. John xviii. 10.]

51. ἴατε ἕως τούτου.] The Commentators are not agreed on the sense of these words; which are, from brevity, obscure, and admit of two different interpretations, according as they are supposed to be addressed to the *multitude* or to the *disciples*. Agreeably to the former view, the sense is, "leave me free till I shall have healed the wounded man." That, however, requires many harsh ellipses, and yields a sense liable to much objection. According to the latter, the sense is (by an ellipse of *αὐτοῦς* after *ἴατε*), "let them do what they please—desist." Others interpret otherwise. But the ellipse of *αὐτοῦς* is harsh, as is also that at *ἕως τούτου*. The true ellipse after *ἴατε* is *τὸ πᾶνγμα*. So Matt. xxvii. 49. *ἰφέις*, "let alone." There is also a constructio *pragnans*, as in Thucyd. i. 71. *μέχοι τοῦτε ὠρίσθη ἡμῖν ἢ βραδύτης*. The sense, then (as Wets., Ros., Kuin., and Schleus. explain) is: "let the matter alone [after its having proceeded] thus far! Enough of this."

52. ὡς ἐπὶ ληστῆν.] The construction is: *ἐξελ. μετὰ μαχιαρῶν καὶ ξύλων ἐπ' ἐμέ, ὡς ἐπὶ ληστῆν*; The *ἐπὶ* signifies *against*, for *apprehension*; as in Joseph. Antiq. xiv. 11, 6. *ἐξελθεῖν ἐπὶ Μάλιχον πείθει μετὰ ξιφιδίων*. At the parallel passages of Matt. xxvi. 55. and Mark xiv. 48. there is added, to determine the sense, *σὺλλαβεῖν με*, which is indeed here found, in some MSS. But, as the above passage of Josephus proves, they are not absolutely necessary to the sense.

53. ἀλλ' αὕτη—σκότους.] There is here again a certain obscurity, arising from the sense being, from intensity of feeling, but imperfectly developed. Some take the words to mean, "This is

MT. MK.

26. 14. ΣΤΑΛΛΟΝΤΕΣ δὲ αὐτὸν ἤγαγον, καὶ εἰσῆγαγον αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν 54
 57 53 οἶκον τοῦ ἀρχιερέως· ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ἠκολούθει μακρόθεν. Ἀψάντων 55
 58 51 δὲ πῦρ ἐν μέσῳ τῆς ἀνλῆς, καὶ συγκαθίσαντων αὐτῶν, ἐκάθητο ὁ Πέ-
 69 66 τρος ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν. Ἰδοῦσα δὲ αὐτὸν παιδίσκη τις καθήμενον πρὸς 56
 70 67 τὸ φῶς, καὶ ἀτεινίσασα αὐτῷ, εἶπε· Καὶ οὗτος σὺν αὐτῷ ἦν. Ὁ δὲ 57
 71 63 ἤρῆσατο αὐτὸν, λέγων· Γύναι, οὐκ οἶδα αὐτόν. Καὶ μετὰ βραχὺ 58
 72 60 ἕτερος ἰδὼν αὐτὸν ἔφη· Καὶ σὺ ἐξ αὐτῶν εἶ. Ὁ δὲ Πέτρος εἶπεν·
 73 70 Ἄνθρωπε, οὐκ εἰμί. Καὶ διαστάσης ὡσεὶ ὥρας μῦς, ἄλλος τις διύσχυ- 59
 74 71 Γαλιλαῖός ἐστιν. Εἶπε δὲ ὁ Πέτρος· Ἄνθρωπε, οὐκ οἶδα ὃ λέγεις. 60
 72 Καὶ παραζηῖμα, ἔτι λαλοῦντος αὐτοῦ, ἐφώνησεν [ὁ] ἀλέκτωρ. Καὶ 61
 75 στραφαῖς ὁ Κύριος ἐπέβλεψε τῷ Πέτρῳ· καὶ ὑπεμνήσθη ὁ Πέτρος τοῦ
 λόγον τοῦ Κυρίου, ὡς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Ὅτι πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι,
 ἀπαρνήσῃ με τρίς. Καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἔξω ὁ Πέτρος ἔκλυσε πικρῶς. 62
 67 56 Καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες οἱ συνέχοντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐνέπαιζον αὐτῷ, δέροντες· 63
 καὶ περικαλύψαντες αὐτόν, ἔτυπιον αὐτοῦ τὸ πρόσωπον, καὶ ἐπηρώτων 64
 68 αὐτόν, λέγοντες· Προφήτευσον, τίς ἐστιν ὁ παῖσας σε; καὶ ἕτερα 65
 27. 15. πολλὰ βλασφημοῦντες ἔλεγον εἰς αὐτόν.

1 1 Καὶ ὡς ἐγένετο ἡμέρα, συνήχθη τὸ πρεσβυτέριον τοῦ λαοῦ, ἀρχιερεῖς 66
 τε καὶ γραμματεῖς, καὶ ἀνήγαγον αὐτόν εἰς τὸ συνέδριον αὐτῶν, λέγον- 67
 τες· Εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς, εἰπέ ἡμῖν. Εἶπε δὲ αὐτοῖς· Ἐὰν ὑμῖν
 εἶπω, οὐ μὴ πιστεύσητε· ἐὰν δὲ καὶ ἐρωτήσω, οὐ μὴ ἀποκριθῆτέ μοι, 68

the time most opportune for your purpose; this is the hour fit for deeds of darkness." An interpretation confirmed by several passages adduced from the Latin Classics. Others explain, "This is the time destined and permitted by God, and this is the power of iniquity," i. e. iniquity has obtained this power; *αὐτὴ ἐστὶ* being supplied before *ἐξουσία*. The latter is greatly preferable; and the interpretation, as far as concerns the first clause, is confirmed and illustrated by Matt. xxvi. 45 and 56. The sense of the second clause, however, has not been well discerned. It should seem that *ἐξουσία τοῦ σκότους* is, as it were, a personification of the Prince of darkness, the Devil (Eph. ii. 2.) And so Ephes. vi. 12. *πρὸς τὰς ἀρχὰς, πρὸς τὰς ἐξουσίας, πρὸς τοὺς κοσμοκράτορας τοῦ σκότους*. See also Col. i. 13. Indeed *ἐξουσία* is often used for *ἄρχων*, as supra xii. 11. Rom. xiii. 1. 1 Cor. xv. 24. Eph. i. 21. iii. 10. Col. i. 16, ii. 10. Thus the complete sense is, "This is the time when the power to destroy me is granted you by the Providence of God; and in which the Power, or Prince, of darkness is permitted to exercise his rage against me." There is an ellipsis of *αὐτὴ ἐστὶ*, to be supplied from the preceding clause.

54. [Comp. John xviii. 12, 21.]

56. *ἀτεινίσασα αὐτῷ*. Ἀτεινίσαι signifies "to fix oneself intently;" and, with *ὄμμασι* or *ὀφθαλμοῖς*, to fix one's view intently. But the words *ὄμμασι*, or *ὀφθαλμοῖς*, are almost always left to be understood; and the object of view is expressed either by an Accus. with *εἰς* (as in Acts i. 10. iii. 4.), or with a Dat. without a preposition, as here and in Luke iv. 20.

58. ἕτερος. Matthew says ἄλλη, another maid-servant. But this discrepancy may be removed

on the principle suggested by Wets., who observes, that *ἕτερος* may be used with reference to *ἄνθρωπος* being understood, which is sometimes applied to a woman. Examples of this ellipsis are frequent. Thus Pausan. ii. 21. speaking of two women, *τοῖτους δὲ φαειν*; and Soph. Elect. 990. *τῶδε τῷ κασιγνήτῳ*.

— *ἄνθρωπε*.] This, like the Latin *homo*, and our *man*, is a term of expostulation.

59. *διύσχυρέτεο* "strongly affirmed," as Acts xii. 5, and in passages of Lysias, Ælian, Lucian, and Joseph. cited by the Commentators.

61. [Comp. John xiii. 33. xviii. 27.]

66. *τὸ πᾶσβ. τοῦ λαοῦ*. Luke alone in this passage and Acts xxii. 5. gives this name to the Sanhedrim. At Acts v. 21. he calls it *ἡ γερουσία*.

67. *εἰ σὺ — εἰπέ ἡμῖν*.] These words admit of being rendered in three different ways. 1. "Art thou the Christ? tell us." So our Common Version. 2. "If thou be the Christ, tell us [so]." This is adopted by the Pesch. Syr. and Campb. 3. "Tell us whether thou be the Christ [or not]." The 1st mode has far less to recommend it than the 2d and 3d, of which the latter seems, on account of its greater suitability to the occasion and the context (especially the words of the answer) to be entitled to the preference.

68. *ἐὰν δὲ καὶ ἐρωτήσω*.] The Translators and Expositors are here much at fault. So little satisfactory is the ordinary sense of *ἐρωτ.*, that Heinsius would here assign that of *supplicate*. But that signification is ill founded, and the sense arising would here be very objectionable; being, indeed, at variance with the words following *οὐ μὴ ἀποκριθῆτε μοι*, by which *interrogation* of some kind is certainly adverted to. As to what Heins. urges,

69 ἢ ἀπολύσῃτε. Ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἔστι ὁ Τίος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καθήμενος 27. 15.
 70 ἐκ δεξιῶν τῆς δυνάμεως τοῦ Θεοῦ. Εἶπον δὲ πάντες· Σὺ οὖν εἶ ὁ
 Τίος τοῦ Θεοῦ; ὁ δὲ πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἔφη· Ῥεῖς λέγετε ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι.
 71 Οἱ δὲ εἶπον· Τί ἔτι χρεῖαν ἔχομεν μαρτυρίας; αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἠκούσαμεν
 ἀπὸ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ.

1 XXIII. ΚΑΙ ἀναστὰν ἦσαν τὸ πλῆθος αὐτῶν, * ἡγαγον αὐτὸν 2
 2 ἐπὶ τὸν Πιλάτον. Ἠρξάντο δὲ κατηγορεῖν αὐτοῦ, λέγοντες· Τοῦτον
 εὗρομεν διαστρέφοντα τὸ ἔθνος, καὶ κωλύοντα Κεῖσαι φόρους διδοῖναι,
 3 λέγοντα ἑαυτὸν Χριστὸν βασιλεῖα εἶναι. Ὁ δὲ Πιλάτος ἐπηρώτησεν 11 2
 αὐτὸν, λέγων· Σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων; ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς
 4 αὐτῷ ἔφη· Σὺ λέγεις. ὁ δὲ Πιλάτος εἶπε πρὸς τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ
 τοὺς ὄχλους· Οὐδὲν εὗρισκω αἴτιον ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τούτῳ.
 5 Οἱ δὲ ἐπίσχον, λέγοντες· Ὅτι ἀνασείει τὸν λαόν, διδάσκων καθ’
 6 ὅλης τῆς Ἰουδαίας, ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἕως ὧδε. Πιλάτος
 δὲ ἀκούσας Γαλιλαίαν, ἐπηρώτησεν εἰ ὁ ἀνθρώπος Γαλιλαῖός ἐστι·
 7 καὶ ἐπιγινούσας ὅτι ἐκ τῆς ἐξουσίας Ἡρώδου ἐστίν, ἀπέπεμψεν αὐτὸν
 πρὸς Ἡρώδη, ὄντα καὶ αὐτὸν ἐν Ἱερουσολύμοις ἐν ταύταις ταῖς ἡμέραις.
 8 Ὁ δὲ Ἡρώδης ἰδὼν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐχάρη μίαν· ἦν γὰρ θέλων ἐξ ἱκανοῦ
 ἰδεῖν αὐτὸν, διὰ τὸ ἀκούειν πολλὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἠλπίζε τι σημεῖον
 9 ἰδεῖν ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ γινόμενον. Ἐπηρώτα δὲ αὐτὸν ἐν λόγοις ἱκανοῖς· ἀν-
 10 τὸς δὲ οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίνατο αὐτῷ. Εἰστήκεισαν δὲ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ
 11 γραμματεῖς εὐτόμως κατηγοροῦντες αὐτοῦ. Ἐξουθενήσας δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ
 Ἡρώδης, σὺν τοῖς στρατεύμασιν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐμπαΐζας, περιβαλὼν αὐτὸν

that Christ had not the power to ask questions of his judges, that is quite supposititious and unauthorized. It is evident, then, that *interrogation* is here meant;—of *what* kind is the question. Certainly not what Bp. Pearce understands *concerning the Christ*: still less what Doddr., “inquiring wherefore they persist in their infidelity.” To ask questions, in order to convince, is incongruous. The true force of the expression was alone, I think, seen by *Grotius*, who observes, that “it bears a sense which, united with that of *interrogation*, yet has another, namely that of *argumentari*.” “The Hebrews (says he) as well as the Greeks used to carry on argument by *interrogation*.” And he adduces an example from Aristotle. He might have added, that this use of the word to signify *questionem proponere*, is, as H. Steph. Thes. in v. attests, frequent in the Dialecticians, especially *Sextus Empiricus*; as also *interrogare* in Latin. The sense, then, may be thus expressed; “If I simply tell you that I am the Christ, ye will not believe me: and if I propose questions in argument, to support my claim, ye will not answer me, nor, though convinced, will you release me. [However] henceforward shall the Son of Man (meaning himself,) be [seen] sitting,” &c. That such is the meaning, is plain from the parallel passages of *Matth.* and *Mark*; for there is, in reality, no discrepancy. The *πλῆθος* of *Matthew* may seem more definite; but there is great force in the *Asyndeton* here. See *Note* on *Matth.* xxvi. 64.

69. [*Comp.* Dan. vii. 9. *Matt.* xvi. 27. xxiv. 30. Acts i. 11.]

XXIII. 1. τὸ πλῆθος αὐτῶν] i. e. the chief priests, elders, and Scribes. Πλῆθος *congregatio*, as the *Pesch. Syr.* renders. The *multitude* of our common Version suggests a wrong meaning, and has misled some Commentators. Ros. and Schl. very well render *cœtum*. However, the truth is, that *πλῆθος* has here simply the sense *number*, without reference to great or small. So *Thucyd.* i. 47. τῶν εἴκοσι νεῶν, ἀπὸ ἑλθασσίνος πλῆθους, οὐ παρουσῶν, and elsewhere. Ἠγαγον (instead of ἡγαγεν) which is found in almost all the best MSS. and supported by the *Ed. Pr.*, is adopted by most Editors. [*Comp.* John xviii. 23.]

2. τ. εὗρομεν δ.] Εὗρισκω is here a forensic term, denoting *conviction* on legal examination. [See *Matt.* xvii. 25. xxii. 21. *Mark* xii. 17. supra xx. 25. *Rom.* xiii. 7. *Acts* xvii. 7.]

4. οὐδὲν εὗρισκω αἴτιον.] Αἴτιον is properly an adjective neuter, from *αἴτιος*, denoting *worthy of*, or *the cause of*; and, when used in a judicial sense, signifies *worthy of blame*, and consequently of *punishment*.

7. ἐκ τῆς ἐξουσίας] “*ex ditione*,” the region over which he had held power. Ἀπέπεμψε, “*remisit*,” to use the corresponding term in the Roman law. “It was (observes *Grot.*) the regular practice of the Roman law to remove the prisoner to the governor of the province or district to which he belonged; though Governors had the right of trying all offences within their own province.”

8. [*Comp.* supra ix. 7. *Matt.* xiv. 1.]

9. οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίνατο.] Why he returned no answer, see *Euthym.* and *Kuin.* in *Rec. Syn.*

MT. MK.

27. 15. ἐσθῆτα λαμπράν, ἀπέπεμψεν αὐτὸν τῷ Πιλάτῳ. Ἐγένοντο δὲ φίλοι ὁ 12
 τε Πιλάτος καὶ ὁ Ἡρώδης ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ μετ' ἀλλήλων· προϋπή-
 ζον γὰρ ἐν ἔχθρᾳ ὄντες πρὸς ἑαυτούς. Πιλάτος δὲ συγκαλεσάμενος 13
 τοὺς ἄρχιερεῖς καὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας καὶ τὸν λαόν, εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς· 14
 Προσηγάκατέ μοι τὸν ἄνθρωπον τοῦτον, ὡς ἀποστρέφοντα τὸν λαόν.
 καὶ ἰδοὺ, ἐγὼ ἐνώπιον ὑμῶν ἀνακρίνας, οὐδὲν εὔρον ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ
 τούτῳ αἴτιον, ὧν κατηγορεῖτε κατ' αὐτοῦ. Ἄλλ' οὐδὲ Ἡρώδης· 15
 ἀνέπεμψα γὰρ ὑμᾶς πρὸς αὐτὸν, καὶ ἰδοὺ οὐδὲν ἄξιον θανάτου ἐστὶ
 15 6 πεπραγμένον αὐτῷ. Παιδεύσας οὖν αὐτὸν ἀπολύσω. Ἀνάγκην δὲ εἶχεν 16
 8 ἀπολύειν αὐτοῖς κατὰ ἐορτὴν ἓνα. Ἀνέκραζαν δὲ παμπληθεῖ, λέγοντες· 17
 16 7 Λίβε τοῦτον, ἀπόλυσον δὲ ἡμῖν τὸν Βαραβῆάν· ὅστις ἦν, διὰ στάσιν 18
 22 τινὰ γενομένην ἐν τῇ πόλει καὶ φόνον, βεβλημένος εἰς φυλακὴν. 19
 Πάλιν οὖν ὁ Πιλάτος προσεφώνησε, θέλων ἀπολύσαι τὸν Ἰησοῦν. Οἱ 20
 25 δὲ ἐπεφώνουν, λέγοντες· Σταύρωσον, σταύρωσον αὐτόν! Ὁ δὲ τρίτον 21
 εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς· Τί γὰρ κακὸν ἐποίησεν οὗτος; οὐδὲν αἴτιον 22
 θανάτου εὔρον ἐν αὐτῷ· παιδεύσας οὖν αὐτὸν ἀπολύσω. Οἱ δὲ ἐπέ- 23
 15 αῖ φωναὶ αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν ἄρχιερέων. Ὁ δὲ Πιλάτος ἐπέκρινε γενέσθαι 24
 26 τὸ αἴτημα αὐτῶν. Ἀπέλυσε δὲ [αὐτοῖς] τὸν διὰ στάσιν καὶ φόνον 25
 βεβλημένον εἰς τὴν φυλακὴν, ὃν ἤτοιοντο· τὸν δὲ Ἰησοῦν παρέδωκε τῷ
 θελήματι αὐτῶν.
 32 21 Καὶ ὡς ἀπήγαγον αὐτὸν, ἐπιλαβόμενοι Σιμωνός τινος Κυρηναίου 26
 [τοῦ] ἐρχομένου ἀπ' ἀγροῦ, ἐπέθηκαν αὐτῷ τὸν σταυρὸν φέρειν
 ὀπισθεν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. Ἰκολούθει δὲ αὐτῷ πολὺ πλῆθος τοῦ λαοῦ, καὶ 27
 γυναικῶν, αἵ καὶ ἐκόπιοντο καὶ ἐθρήνον αὐτόν. Στραφεῖς δὲ πρὸς 28
 αὐτὰς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπε· Θυγατέρες Ἰερουσαλὴμ, μὴ κλαίετε ἐπ' ἐμὲ,

11. στρατεύμασιν] satellites, i. e. his body-guards, as in Acts xxiii. 10. More than those Pilate would not have allowed him to bring.

12. ἐγένοντο φίλοι] "were made friends" See Acts iv. 27. M. Saurin observes that the reconciliation of Herod and Pilate was more wonderful than their enmity. The ænigma, however, is solved by the profound remark of the Stagirite: that "it contributes much to the formation of friendship, or to the recovery of it, to either love or hate the same person; to be engaged, no matter how, as colleagues in the same business." Compare Æschyl. Agam. 659, and see Bp. Sanderson's Sermons ad Aulam, p. 217 in ed.

— ἐν ἔχθρᾳ.] Classical usage would require ἐπ' ἔχθρᾳ, as in Thucyd. i. 69. Schleus. and Kuin. say that προὔπρ. has the force of an adverb here and at Acts viii. 9. But, in fact, ἐπάρχ. here follows the construction of τυγχάνειν, and ὄντες could not be dispensed with. For though we may say εἶναι ἐν ἔχθρᾳ, yet not ἐπάρχειν ἐν ἔχθρᾳ.

14. ἀποστρέφοντα τὸν λαόν.] Scil. ἀπὸ τοῦ Καίσαρος, "from their allegiance to Caesar." So Eclus. xlv. 13. Καὶ ὅσοι οὐκ ἀπεστράφησαν ἀπὸ Κυρίου.

15. πεπραγμένον αὐτῷ] for πεπ. ὑπ' αὐτοῦ; of which idiom many examples are adduced by Raphael and Wets. from the best writers.

16. παιδεύσας] "having chastized." Παιδεύειν properly signifies to educate a child; and then,

by an easy transition, to correct, either generally, or in some particular manner, expressed or understood. Here correction by flagellation is meant. [Comp. John xix. 1.]

17. ἀνάγκην εἶχε.] A phrase very much like the Latin *opus habere*, yet occasionally found in the later Classical writers. The kind of necessity will depend upon the context. Here that of custom is meant. See Acts iii. 14.

21. ἐπεφώνουν.] Ἐπιφωνεῖν imports responsive shouting, and παμπληθεῖ, "in full chorus." The word is found in Xen., Demosth., and other authors.

23. ἐπικέντρο] "were very pressing and urgent with him." See examples of this sense in Kypke.

24. ἐπέκρινε.] The word denotes the final adjudication or decree of a judge.

25. αὐτοῖς.] This is omitted in many MSS. &c. and is cancelled by Griesb., Knapp, and Scholz; but rashly—for more causes may be imagined for the omission than the insertion of the word. See Rinck. Lucub. Crit. p. 336.

26. τοῦ ἐρχ.] The τοῦ is omitted in most MSS. and early Edd., and is cancelled by almost all Editors. Propriety of language will not admit it, and it seems to have arisen from the *ιον* preceding.

27. καὶ γυναῖκων] "even of women."

28. μὴ κλαίετε] "weep not so much for me as," &c. For ἐπ' ἐμὲ some MSS. have ἐπ' ἐμοί, which

29 πλὴν ἐφ' ἑαυτοὺς κλαίετε καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν! ὅτι ἰδοὺ, ἔρχονται 27. 15.

ἡμέραι ἐν αἷς ἐροῦσι· Μικαρίαί μὲν στείροι, καὶ κοιλίαὶ αἱ οὐκ ἐγέν-

30 νησαν, καὶ μαστοὶ οἱ οὐκ ἐθήλασαν! Τότε ἄρξονται λέγειν τοῖς ὄρεσι·

31 Πέσετε ἐφ' ἡμᾶς! καὶ τοῖς βουνοῖς· Καλύψατε ἡμᾶς! Ὅτι εἰ ἐν

32 τῷ ὑγρῷ ξύλῳ ταῦτα ποιοῦσιν, ἐν τῷ ξηρῷ τί γένηται; Ἰγνοτο δὲ

καὶ ἕτεροι δύο κακοῦργοι σὺν αὐτῷ ἀναιρεθῆναι.

33 Καὶ ὅτε ἀπῆλθον ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον τὸν καλούμενον Κρατίον, ἐκεῖ 33 22

ἕσταίρωσαν αὐτὸν, καὶ τοὺς κακοῦργους, ὃν μὲν ἐκ δεξιῶν, ὃν δὲ ἐξ

34 ἄριστερῶν. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἔλεγε· Πατέρ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς· οὐ γὰρ οἶδισι

is supported by Luke xix. 41. and by general Classical usage. But the other is confirmed by that of the LXX.

29, 30. How awfully the predictions contained in these verses were fulfilled at the destruction of Jerusalem, the affecting narrative of the great Jewish Historian abundantly attests. The 1st of these verses alludes to a pathetic circumstance, to which numerous parallels from the ancient writers are adduced by Pricæus, Grot., and Wets. The 2d contains a yet more touching feature of this graphic sketch; with which may be compared similar passages in Is. ii. 19. Hos. x. 8. Rev. vi. 16. ix. 6. and some from the ancient Greek writers. In the present passage, however, I cannot, with Kuin, and some recent Commentators, see that "per montes et colles intelliguntur cavernæ et speluncæ." See Matth. xxiv. 16. Indeed, to suppose any *allusion* to the caves as *places of refuge*, would be to mar the magnificent beauty of the thought; which simply expresses, that they would wish for speedy death (caves being used in the East as burial-places) to be rid of their troubles. So M. Laveau, in his Sketch of the ancient history of Moscow, says "that so dreadful were the ravages of the Tartars in the year 1238, that the living envied the dead the repose of the tomb." If there be any *allusion* united with the image in *mountains* or *hills*, it should rather seem to be, to those immense *barrows* of the early ages, under which sometimes great numbers were buried, and to which the little mount, or tumulus, formed a *monument*.

31. ἐν τῷ ὑγρῷ — γένηται.] A proverbial form of expression; for (as we find from Ps. i. 3. Ez. xx. 47. Eccl. vi. 3. and especially the Rabbinical writers) the Hebrews were accustomed to figuratively call the righteous *green trees*, and the wicked *dry ones*. Hence the sense here is: "If the *innocent* and *righteous* be thus cut off, what may not be expected to befall the *wicked* and disobedient at the day of visitation, which impends over you." Of ξύλον in the sense *tree* there are many examples, both in Classical and Hellenistic Greek.

32. It is the opinion of Commentators in general, that Christ is here reckoned among malefactors, agreeable to what was said supra xxii. 37. καὶ μετὰ ἀνόμων ἐλογίσθη, and because he was so considered by the Jews. Since, however, this involves a considerable harshness, it is better avoided; which it easily may, by regarding κακοῦργοι, with many of the best recent Commentators, as not in *concord*, but in *apposition* with ἕτεροι; so that it will be the same as if written οἱ ἦσαν κακοῦργοι. It will not, however, be necessary to *point off* κακοῦργοι, as those Commentators have done. As examples of this idiom I have

noted Aristoph. Ran. 782. & 514. καὶ γὰρ ἀλλήτρεις γέ σοι Μὲ ἔδον ἐσθ' ὠρασιότατη, κίωρχιστρίδες ἕτεροι δὲ ἢ τοῖσι. Thucyd. iv. 67. οἱ δὲ μετὰ τοῦ Δημ. Πλαταιῆς τε φίλοι καὶ ἕτεροι περίπολοι (for οἱ ἦσαν π. See my Note there) ἐνήδρευσαν, &c.

By the expression κακοῦργοι are not meant, strictly speaking, thieves or robbers, but rebels or insurgents, brigands. It is true that these are called by Matthew and Mark *λῃσταί*. But the terms *λῃσταί* and *κακοῦργοι* were, as Kypke and Wets. have shown, convertible; and from the examples they have adduced, it is clear that both terms were applied not only to robbers, but to *plunderers* and *ravagers* in war. On the word *κακοῦργος* see Thucyd. ii. 67. vii. 4. & 10. ii. 22. iii. 1. vi. 6.; and on *λῃστ.*, iv. 2. viii. 40. and my Notes. The persons in question were, no doubt (as Grot., Kuin, and Bp. Maltby suppose), men who had taken up arms on a principle of resistance to the Roman oppression, and especially to the payment of the tribute-money; but, though professedly opposed to the Romans only, — yet, when engaged in their unlawful courses, made less difference between Romans and Jews than they at first set out with doing.

34. Πατέρ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς, &c.] Grot. remarks, that much may be pleaded in extenuation of the crime of the *people at large*; especially as regards their ignorance of the real nature of the person whom they so injuriously treated. The Philosophers, he shows, considered ignorance, if not an excuse for crime, an extenuation of the guilt. Thus Aristotle distributes offences into three sorts; ἀνυχήματα, ἀμαρτήματα, and ἀδικήματα; of which the 1st merits rather *pity*, the 2d requires *reproof* and *correction*, to the 3d alone belongs *severe punishment*. Now (continues he) as the offence of the Jews was not a mere ἀνυχημα, nay exceeded the ordinary sort of ἀμαρτήματα, yet it carried with it something of the ἀνυχημα, from the ignorance joined with it. To his citations from the Classical writers may be added many others, which I have adduced on the same subject in a Note on Thucyd. iii. 40. (Transl.) For the chief priests and scribes there could indeed be little or no excuse: but then the more magnanimous must our Lord's conduct be considered, who here rose superior in *practice* to what even the most enlightened sages had reached in *theory*; though Menander says, οὔτος κράτιστος ἔστ' ἀνὴρ, ὃ Γοργὸν, ὅστις δίκαιεσθαι πλείστ' ἐπίσταται βροτῶν. There can be no doubt but that the *Jews*, as well as the Roman soldiers, were included in this prayer; which must be supposed to import an intercession, that opportunity for repentance might be granted to the guilty, and that pardon might be extended to such as should lay hold on the forbearance of God. That not a few *did* so,

MT. MK.

27. 15. τί ποιῶσι! Διαμεριζόμενοι δὲ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ, ἔβαλον κλῆρον. καὶ 35
 39 29 εἰσήκει ὁ λαὸς θεωρῶν. Ἐξεμνητήριζον δὲ καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες σὺν αὐτοῖς,
 42 31 λέγοντες· Ἄλλους ἕσωσε, σωσάτω ἑαυτὸν, εἰ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ
 τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκλεκτός. Ἐπέπαιζον δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ στρατιῶται, προσερχό- 36
 μνοι καὶ ὄσος προσφέροντες αὐτῷ, καὶ λέγοντες· Εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς 37
 37 26 τῶν Ἰουδαίων, σῶσον σεαυτὸν. Ἴν δὲ καὶ ἐπιγραφὴ γεγραμμένη ἐπ' 38
 αὐτῷ γραμμασιν Ἑλληνικοῖς καὶ Ῥωμαϊκοῖς καὶ Ἑβραϊκοῖς, ΟΥΤΟΣ
 ΕΣΤΙΝ Ο ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΤΩΝ ΙΟΥΔΑΙΩΝ.
 44 32 Εἰς δὲ τῶν κρεμισθέντων κακούργων ἐβλασφήμει αὐτὸν, λέγων· Εἰ 39
 σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς, σῶσον σεαυτὸν καὶ ἡμᾶς. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ ἕτερος 40
 ἐπετίμα αὐτῷ λέγων· Οὐδὲ φοβῆ ἄν τὸν Θεόν, ὅτι ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ κρι- 41
 ματι εἶ; Καὶ ἡμεῖς μὲν δικαίως· ἄξια γὰρ ὧν ἐποράξαμεν ἀπολαμ- 42
 βάνομεν· σὺτος δὲ οὐδὲν ἄτοπον ἔπραξε. Καὶ ἔλεγε τῷ Ἰησοῦ· Μνή- 43
 σθητί μου, Κύριε, ὅταν ἔλθῃς ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου. Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ 43
 ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, σήμερον μετ' ἐμοῦ ἔσῃ ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ.
 45 33 Ἴν δὲ ὡσεὶ ὥρα ἕκτη, καὶ σκότος ἐγένετο ἐφ' ὅλην τὴν γῆν ἕως 44
 ὥρας ἐνάτης. Καὶ ἐσκοτίσθη ὁ ἥλιος, καὶ ἐσχίσθη τὸ καταπέτασμα 45
 46 34 τοῦ ναοῦ μέσον· καὶ φωνήσας φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπε· Πάτερ, 46
 50 37 εἰς χεῖράς σου παραθήσομαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου. καὶ ταῦτα εἰπὼν ἐξέπνευ-
 54 39 σεν. Ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ ἐκατόνταρχος τὸ γενόμενον, ἐδόξασε τὸν Θεόν, λέγων· 47
 Ὅπως ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος δίκαιος ἦν. Καὶ πάντες οἱ συμπαραγενό- 48

is clear from the Evangelical history contained in the Acts of the Apostles.

40. οὐδὲ φοβῆ ἄν τὸν Θεόν, ὅτι, &c.] The best Commentators are agreed that the οὐδὲ must be joined with σὺ. Bornem. well expresses the sense as follows: "Ne te quidem vereri Deum, co magis miror, quod pari es in supplicio."

41. ἄτοπον.] The word denotes *what has no place, is naught*; and therefore may well signify *what is naughty* or evil.

42. ὅταν ἔλθῃς ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου.] Markl. on Lysias i. 572., Reiske, and Kuin, think the sense is, *quando redieris in regno tuo, i. e. Rex, regia potestate præditus*. But though that sense of ἐρχεσθαι and ἔκειν be found in the Classics, it does not obtain in the Scriptures; and, upon the whole, the interpretation is a *strained* one; so that there is no reason to abandon the common opinion, that ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ is for *eis τὴν βασιλείαν*; especially since this idiom is common in the later Greek writers.

43. σήμερον — παραδ.] There has been much discussion, both among ancient and modern Commentators, as to what Christ intended the penitent malefactor to understand by the "*paradise*" promised. Chrys., Euthym., Grot., Wets., and many of the best recent Commentators, are agreed that he could not mean to countenance Jewish fables, or the notions of the Essenes, still less the Phari-saical ones (like the Mahometan) of a *paradise of sensual delights*. Nor must we suppose that by *Paradise* is meant *heaven*. The word is commonly supposed to be derived from the Persian پارادیس , a garden — but, in fact, as Schroeder (Præf. Thes. Ling. Armen. p. 36., referred to by Bornem.) has shown, is derived from the Armenian. Now as great pains were bestowed by the Orientals on

their *gardens*, the word easily came to mean a *pleasure-garden*, a place of luxury and enjoyment. In this sense *παράδεισος* often occurs in Xenophon. Hence it is no wonder that the term came to denote, among the later Jews, that *pleasant abode* in Hades appointed for the reception of the pious dead, until they should, after the day of judgment, be again united to their bodies in a future state. See Joseph. Bell. Jud. iii. 8. 4. ii. 8. 11. This, Chrysost. has shown, was the idea entertained of *Paradise* by all the *Orthodox* believers of his time. The sense, therefore, meant to be expressed was, that the penitent malefactor might hope from the mercy of God for blessings far beyond the imagination of the Jewish doctors; even a secure and quiet retreat for the time which should intervene between death and the resurrection: and also (which was *implied* in the other) an admittance into the regions of that eternal felicity, of which the other was but a foretaste and earnest.

46. [Comp. John xix. 33.]

47. ὄντως — δίκαιος ἦν.] See Note on Matt. xxvii. 54. by which a method of removing the minute discrepancy between the accounts of the Evangelists will suggest itself. One may observe, how peculiarly suitable *ὄντως* is to this passage of Luke, as ἀληθῶς is to those of Matthew and Mark: in the first of which the sense is, "This was truly [what he appeared to be] a just person;" in the 2d and 3d, "This was really the personage he claimed to be — *the Son of God*." On the distinction between *ὄντως* and ἀληθῶς see Tittm. de Synon. p. 162.

— δίκαιος.] On the distinction between ἀγαθός and δίκαιος see Tittm. de Synon. p. 19. sqq. In popular use, however, they are synonymous; especially when as in Æschin. cited by Kuin. they

μενοι ὄχλοι ἐπὶ τὴν θεωρίαν ταύτην, θεωροῦντες τὰ γενόμενα, τῷ 27. 15.
 49 πτοντες ἐναντῶν τὰ στήθη ὑπέστρενον. Ἐίστηγέουσιν δὲ πάντες οἱ γρω- 55 40
 στοὶ αὐτοῦ μακρόθεν, καὶ γυναῖκες αἱ συνακολουθήσασαι αὐτῷ ἀπὸ
 τῆς Γαλιλαίας, ὁρῶσαι ταῦτα.
 50 ΚΑΙ ἰδοὺ, ἀγὴρ ὀνόματι Ἰωσήφ, βουλευτῆς ὑπάρχων, ἀγὴρ ἀγαθὸς 57 43
 51 καὶ δίκαιος, (οὗτος οὐκ ἦν συγκατατεθειμένος τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῇ πράξει
 αὐτῶν) ἀπὸ Ἀριμαθαίας πόλεως τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ὃς καὶ προσεδέχετο καὶ
 52 αὐτὸς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ· οὗτος προσελθὼν τῷ Πιλάτῳ ᾗτήσατο
 53 τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. Καὶ καθελὼν αὐτὸ ἐνετύλιξεν αὐτὸ σινδόνι, καὶ 58
 59 ἔθρηκεν αὐτὸ ἐν μνήματι λαξευτῷ, οὗ οὐκ ἦν οὐδέπω οὐδεὶς κείμενος.
 54 Καὶ ἡμέρα ἦν παρασκευῆ, καὶ σάββατον ἐπέφωσκε.
 55 Κατακολουθήσασαι δὲ καὶ γυναῖκες, αἵτινες ἦσαν συνελλυθῦναι 61 47
 αὐτῷ ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, ἐθείσαντο τὸ μνημεῖον, καὶ ὡς ἐτέθη τὸ σῶμα
 56 αὐτοῦ. Ἐποστρέψασαι δὲ ἠτοίμισαν ἀρώματα καὶ μύρα· καὶ τὸ μὲν 28. 16.
 1 σάββατον ἠσύχασαν κατὰ τὴν ἐντολήν· XXIV. τῇ δὲ μιᾷ τῶν σαβ- 1 1
 βάτων, ὄρθρον βαθέος, ἦλθον ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον, φέρουσαι ἅ ἠτοίμισαν
 ἀρώματα· καὶ τινες σὺν αὐταῖς.
 2 Ἐῤῥον δὲ τὸν λίθον ἀποκεκλισμένον ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου, καὶ εἰσελ- 4
 3 θῦσαι οὐκ εῤῥον τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ. Καὶ ἐγένετο, ἐν τῷ 5
 4 διαπορεῖσθαι αὐτὰς περὶ τούτου, καὶ ἰδοὺ, δύο ἄνδρες ἐπέστησαν αὐ- 2
 5 ταῖς ἐν ἐσθήσεσιν ἀσπραπτούσαις. Ἐμφόβων δὲ γενομένων αὐτῶν καὶ
 κλινοῦσάν τὸ πρόσωπον εἰς τὴν γῆν, εἶπον πρὸς αὐτάς· Τί ζητεῖτε τὸν 5 6
 6 ζῶντα μετὰ τῶν νεκρῶν; Οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε, ἀλλ' ἠγέρθη. Μνήσθητε 6
 7 ὡς ἐλάλησεν ὑμῖν, ἔτι ὢν ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ, λέγων· Ὅτι δεῖ τὸν Υἱὸν
 τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδοθῆναι εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων ἀμαρτωλῶν, καὶ
 8 σταυρωθῆναι, καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστῆναι. Καὶ ἐμνήσθησαν τῶν
 9 ῥημάτων αὐτοῦ· καὶ ὑποστρέψασαι ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου ἀπίγγειλαν 8 8
 10 ταῦτα πάντα τοῖς ἑνδεκα, καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς λοιποῖς. Ἦσαν δὲ ἡ Μαγ-
 δαληνῆ Μαρία καὶ Ἰωάννα καὶ Μαρία Ἰακώβου, καὶ αἱ λοιπαὶ σὺν

are conjoined, and opposed to *κακοί*. And there are cases when *ἀγαθός* imports not only *δίκαιος*, but all other virtues. So Aristotle de Republ. iii. 4. says τὸν ἀγαθὸν ἄνδρα φάμεν εἶναι κατ' ἀρετὴν τελείαν, in like manner as Pope's line — "An honest man's the noblest work of God."

51. *συγκατ. τῇ βουλῇ*.] *Συγκατατιθέναι* signifies properly to lay down together, and, in the middle voice, to range oneself with any others, to act with them. So that we need not, with most philologists, suppose an ellip. of *ψῆφον*. The term is used in this sense both in the LXX. and the Classical writers. [See supra ii. 25.]

— *προσδέχετο* — τὴν *βασ.* τοῦ Θεοῦ] "who also himself looked forward to the kingdom which God should establish by the Messiah." [Comp. Luke ii. 25.]

54. *ἐπέφωσκε*] "was just dawning," just drawing on, commencing. As the Sabbath commenced in the evening of the preceding day, the expression *ἐπέφωσκε* requires to be taken by a metaphor which may seem strange. Kuin., however, (after Wets.) justly observes, that however incongruous it might sound to Greek and Roman ears, when they heard

of the evening, or approach of night, expressed by *επιφώσκω*, yet to Jewish ones it was familiar, and by no means harsh. Camb. rightly accounts for this idiom by attributing it to the confusion of Oriental with Classical ideas and phrases, so likewise to occur in a Jew by no means slightly tingured with Classical erudition. †

XXIV. 1. *ὄρθρον βαθέος*.] *Βαθὺς* is often used with words denoting *time*, especially evening, night, or the dawn of day. On the true sense of *ὄρθρος* see my Note on Thucyd. iii. 112. On the order of events connected with the resurrection, see Notes on Matt. xviii. and Towns. i. 596. sqq. [Comp. John xx. 1.]

5. *κλινοῦσάν τὸ πρόσωπον*.] By way of reverence, not adoration. See Doddr. and Wets.

6. See Matt. xvi. 21. xvii. 23.

10. *αἱ λοιπαί*.] Render the other women, by whom are probably meant, as Prof. Scholef. suggests, "that company of women, who along with the two Mariés and Joanna are mentioned so frequently and so honorably in this history." See supra viii. 3.

αὐταῖς, αἱ ἔλεγον πρὸς τοὺς ἀποστόλους ταῦτα. Καὶ ἐφάνησαν ἐνώπιον 11
 αὐτῶν ὡσεὶ λῆρος τὰ ἔμφατα αὐτῶν, καὶ ἠπίστον αὐταῖς. Ὁ δὲ 12
 Πέτρος ἀναστάς ἔδραμεν ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον, καὶ παρακύψας βλέπει τὰ
 ὀθόνια κείμενα μόνα· καὶ ἀπῆλθε πρὸς ἑαυτὸν θαυμάζων τὸ γεγονός.
 b Mark 16. 12. ὁ ΚΑΙ ἰδοὺ, δύο ἐξ αὐτῶν ἦσαν πορευόμενοι ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ εἰς 13
 κόμην ἀπέχουσαν σταδίους ἐξήκοιτα ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ, ἣ ὄνομα Ἐμμαούς·
 καὶ αὐτοὶ ὁμίλουσαν πρὸς ἀλλήλους περὶ πάντων τῶν συμβεβηκότων τού- 14
 των. Ὁ Καὶ ἐγένετο, ἐν τῷ ὁμιλεῖν αὐτοὺς καὶ συζητεῖν, καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ 15
 Ἰησοῦς ἐγγίσας συνεπορεύετο αὐτοῖς· οἱ δὲ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτῶν ἐκρατοῦντο 16
 τοῦ μὴ ἐπιγινῶναι αὐτόν. Ἰῆπε δὲ πρὸς αὐτοὺς· Τίνες οἱ λόγοι οὗτοι, 17
 οὓς ἀντιβάλλετε πρὸς ἀλλήλους περιπατοῦντες, καὶ ἔστε σκυθρωποὶ;
 Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ εἷς, ὃ ὄνομα Κλεόπας, εἶπε πρὸς αὐτόν· Σὺ μόνος 18

11. ἐφάνησαν—βήματα a.] So Lucian Tim. 1. (cited by Wets.) ἀπαντα ταῦτα λῆρος ἦν ἀναπέφρη. I have in Recens. Synop. shown that λῆρος is derived from the Anglo Saxon Leepen, as tale from Tellen, and that both mean “ [something] told ; ” and 2dly, a mere tale, or old saw.

—ἠπίστον αὐταῖς.] Not because they thought they had fabricated the account, but that they considered them as foolish women, since, as Thucydides truly observes, vi. 33. οἱ τὰ μὴ πιστὰ δοκοῦντα εἶναι ἀπαγγέλλοντες οὐ μόνον οὐ πέθουσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀφρονεῖς δοκοῦσιν εἶναι.

12. παρακύψας.] Παρακύπτειν properly signifies to stoop to any thing, and especially to stoop, look down, to look at any thing; and is usually of those who peep, peer at, or survey any thing attentively. This last is the sense in the present passage; of which I have found an example in Theoc. Id. iii. 7. ταῦτο κατ’ ἄντρον παρακύπτουσα.

—ἀπῆλθε πρὸς ἑ. θ.] There has been some doubt here raised as to the sense; which will depend upon the construction. Πρὸς ἑαυτὸν may be construed either with the preceding, ἀπῆλθε, or the following, θαυμάζων. Several eminent Commentators, ancient and modern, adopt the former mode, adducing several passages from Classical writers, and some from the N. T. But of the latter only one is to the purpose, John xx. 10. ἀπῆλθον οὖν πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς οἱ μαθηταὶ and, at all events, this will only show, that such may be the sense, if the context will permit it. Yet this it scarcely does; for as to the sense which they assign, “ he went home to his inn or lodging,” it is truly observed by Camb., that “ it seems more probable from infra v. 24. and John xx. that Peter did not go directly home from the sepulchre, but returned to the place where the Apostles and disciples were assembled.” Hence it is better to construe the words with θαυμάζων, as is done by most Expositors, ancient and modern (supported by the authority of all the best ancient Versions and Theophyl.); especially as, from the occurrence of the similar expression δελογίζοντο πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς at xx. 14., it appears to be very suitable to the style of the Evangelist.

13. δύο ἐξ αὐτῶν.] These words must be referred to verse 9., where we read ἀπήγγειλαν ταῦτα πάντα τοῖς ἑνδεκά, καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς λοιποῖς. The two persons here mentioned are, with reason, supposed to have been of the number of the Apostles, or at least Seventy disciples. The name of one of these persons the Evangelist has recorded; that of the other he has omitted to mention; and has

thereby exercised the ingenuity of the Commentators in guessing it; some of whom conjecture Nathanael, others, Bartholomew, or Luke himself.

—Ἐμμαούς.] There were two places of this name; one a town, 160 stadia from Jerusalem; and often mentioned in Josephus, the Books of Maccabees, and the Rabbinical writings; the other (the one here meant) a village distant only 70 stadia. These persons probably lived at Emmaus, and were returning thither from the feast of the Passover.

14. ὁμίλουσαν πρὸς ἀλλήλ.] This signification of ὁμ. is rare in the Classical writers, but not unfrequent in the Hellenistic ones.

16. οἱ δὲ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτῶν ἐκρ.] It is not agreed among the Commentators, whether this being prevented proceeded from natural causes, or supernatural ones. The ancients and early moderns take the latter view, and attempt to trace the mode in which this was effected; adducing several passages of the Classical writers, where a similar effect is ascribed to the influence of some Deity, ex. gr. Soph. Aj. 85. ἐγὼ σκυθρωπὸν βλέφαρα καὶ ἑδωρόκτα. The more recent Commentators ascribe it to natural causes, taking the word metaphorically; and refer the hindrance to the inattention of the observers, or to our Lord’s being so situated as not to be distinctly seen, as also to the change of apparel mentioned at Mark xvi. 12. In this view it is considered as an Oriental and popular mode of expression, importing that they were prevented from recognising, i. e. failed to recognise him. But ἐκρατοῦντο, when coupled with ἐπιολέχθησαν just after, seems to be too strong a term to permit us to suppose aught less than Divine agency, on either the body or the mind, or both. Though as there is a marked economy in all the preternatural operations of the Deity, it is not for us to pronounce how far that agency might be exerted, and how far the natural causes might contribute to the effect in question. Be that as it may, the words ought to be rendered—“ their eyes were hindered, that they did not see him.”

17. ἀντιβάλλετε.] The word properly signifies “ to toss backwards and forwards,” as a ball; but is here used of the reciprocation or interchange of remark in conversing or arguing. So 2 Macc. xi. 3. πρὸς ἑαυτὸν, ἄ., reason with himself. At καὶ ἔστε σκυθρωποὶ, Kuin. and Bornem. supply τὶ, why, taken from the preceding τίνες.

18. σὺ μόνος περιαιρέεις, &c.] There has been some difference of opinion as to the exact import of these words. The ancient and earlier modern

παροικίς [ἐν] Ἱερουσαλήμ, καὶ οὐκ ἔγνωσ τὰ γενόμενα ἐν αὐτῇ ἐν ταῖς
 19 ἡμέραις ταύταις; ^d Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Ποῖα; Οἱ δὲ εἶπον αὐτῷ· <sup>d Matt. 21. 11.
supra 7. 16.
John 4. 19.
& 6. 14.</sup> Τὰ περὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Ναζωραίου, ὃς ἐγένετο ἀνὴρ προφήτης, δυνατὸς ἐν
 20 ἔργῳ καὶ λόγῳ ἐναντίον τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ πικρὸς τοῦ λαοῦ· ὅπως τε
 παρέδωκαν αὐτὸν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ ἀρχοντες ἡμῶν εἰς κρίμα θανάτου,
 21 καὶ ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτόν. ^e Ἡμεῖς δὲ ἠλπίζομεν ὅτι αὐτὸς ἐστὶν ὁ μέλλων ^{e Acts 1. 6.}
 λυτροῦσθαι τὸν Ἰσραὴλ· ἀλλὰ γε σὺν πᾶσι τούτοις τρίτην ταύτην ἡμέ-
 22 ραν ἄγει σήμερον ἀπ' οὗ ταῦτα ἐγένετο. ^f Ἀλλὰ καὶ γυναῖκες τινες <sup>f Matt. 28. 8.
Mark 16. 10.
John 20. 18.</sup>
 23 ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐξέστησαν ἡμᾶς, γενόμεναι ὀρθοῦσαι ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον· καὶ
 μὴ εὑροῦσαι τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ, ἦλθον λέγουσαι καὶ ὀπτασίαν ἀγγέλου
 24 ἑωρακέναι, οἱ λέγουσιν αὐτὸν ζῆν. Καὶ ἀπήλθον τινὲς τῶν σὺν ἡμῖν
 ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον, καὶ εὔρον οὕτω, καθὼς καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες εἶπον·
 25 αὐτὸν δὲ οὐκ εἶδον. Καὶ αὐτὸς εἶπε πρὸς αὐτοῖς· Ὡ ἀνόητοι καὶ
 βραδεῖς τῆ καρδίᾳ τοῦ πιστεῦν ἐπὶ πᾶσιν, οἷς ἐλάλησαν οἱ προ- ^g
 26 φῆται! ^g Οὐχὶ ταῦτα ἔδει παθεῖν τὸν Χριστὸν, καὶ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν <sup>g Isa. 50. 6.
& 53. toto.
Phil. 2. 7, &c.
Heb. 12. 2.
1 Pet. 1. 11.</sup>

Commentators take the sense to be; "Art thou the only sojourner (or, as others render, 'the only resident') in Jerusalem, who art ignorant of these things?" But the best Commentators from Whitby and Wolf downwards, take παροικίς in the sense of *being a stranger*, and regard the words as a form of speech applied to those who are ignorant of what is doing around them. Thus the sense will be, "Art thou alone such a stranger in Jerusalem as to be unacquainted with these circumstances? For illustration, Wets. and Kypke adduce several passages of the Classical writers; as Dio Chrys. Or. iii. p. 42. σὺ ἄρα μόνος ἀνήκοος εἰ τοῖτων, ἢ πάντες ἴσασι. But I would rather choose to take μόνος for μόνον, and take παροικίς for πάροις εἰς, rendering, "of these things?" i. e. "Art thou [though] but a stranger in Jerusalem, ignorant," &c. The ἐν is omitted in most of the ancient MSS. and the early Edd.; and is cancelled by almost every Editor from Bengel and Wets. to Scholz; but perhaps without good cause; for as there is no example of this signification in the N. T. or the LXX., but many in the best Classical writers, the ἐν would seem to have been suppressed by those ancient Critics, who made it their business everywhere to polish the style of the N. T.

19. ἀνὴρ προφήτης.] The ἀνὴρ is not, as some imagine, redundant; nor is it, as others suppose, emphatic, and intended as a title of honour; but is merely a vestige of the *verbosity* of primitive times, (thus the idiom is found most in the earliest writers,) when what are now *verbal nouns*, were only *adjectives*, and consequently required ἀνὴρ or some other noun to make them serve for substantives.

— δυνατὸς ἐν ἔργῳ καὶ λόγῳ.] Δυνατὸς properly signifies "having power;" but sometimes, *efficacy* or *authority* and influence; and here (as also at Acts vii. 22.) both power and *skill*, or *excellence*. So Thueyd. i. 139. λέγειν τε καὶ πράττειν δυνατώτατος. Here ἔργῳ relates to the *miracles*; and λόγῳ to the *Divine wisdom* of our Lord.

20. ὅπως τε.] Bornem. well remarks that ὅπως τε refers to the οὐκ ἔγνωσ at v. 18.

21. σὺν πᾶσι.] The σὺν is said to be for ἐπὶ, as often in the Scriptural and Classical writers, like \square for \square in Hebrew. But the idiom may better

be compared with our adverb *withal*; which was once a *phrase*, i. e. "with all this," or these things. Indeed *συνπασι* occurs, in this very sense in Dionys. Hal. i. 59. Ἄλλὰ γε, just before, is noted by Bornem. as a very rare formula, and to be rendered, at *mirum*, or at *sane*.

— τρίτην— ἄγει σήμερον] There is something anomalous in this phraseology, which has perplexed the Commentators. Some think that there is a Nominative (as Θεός, οὐρανός, or ἡλιος) understood. Others suppose ἄγει put for ἀγεται, taken impersonally. Others, again, take σήμερον as a *Nomin.* But all these methods are more or less objectionable. There is more to approve in the method pursued by Beza, Kypke, Middl., and others; who supply Ἰησοῦς, by an idiom, frequent in the best writers; whereby, when it is intended to show that a thing has been done on a certain day, they ascribe what denotes the *day* to the *person*. Examples are, indeed, said by Kuin. to be wanting. But examples of the phrase ἀγειν ἡμέραν (like the Latin *agere diem*) are adduced by Wets., and of the idiom in question by the other Commentators; and it would be unreasonable to demand examples of the *two conjoined*.

22. ἐξέστησαν] "have thrown us into amazement." This *active* sense is also found in Acts viii. 9. There is an ellipsis of τοῦ νοῦ. Ὀρθοῖαι is *adject.* for *adverb.* as often, especially in *adjectives of time*, both in Greek and Latin.

25. ἀνόητοι.] Doddr. and Camb. object to the Comm. Vers. "fools," and render "thoughtless." And indeed that ἀνόητος and similar terms (as μωρός and μάταιος) are often in Greek and in all languages used in a milder sense is certain. If *foolish* be thought too harsh, we may render *misjudging*. The word, indeed, denotes either one who *has not*, or who *uses not* the faculty of reason, (the νοῦν) or *uses it not aright*. See Tittm. de Synon. p. 59.

— καὶ βραδεῖς τῆ καρδίᾳ.] Βραδὴς is often opposed to ἀγγίvous, *ready willed*, and is preserved in the Latin *barulus*, from the Æolic βραδός. But as here τῆ καρδίᾳ is added, it cannot denote *stupid*, but rather *sluggishly disposed, indisposed*; and τὸν πιστεύειν is for εἰς τὸ πιστεῖν. So James i. 19. βραδὴς εἰς τὸ λαλῆσαι, β. εἰς τὴν ἀκοήν.

h Gen. 3. 15.
& 22. 18.
& 26. 4.
& 49. 10.
Ps. 16. 8, 9, 10.
& 22. toto.
& 132. 11.
Dan. 9. 24, &c.
i Gen. 19. 3.
Acts 16. 15.
Heb. 13. 2.

δόξαν αὐτοῦ; ^b Καὶ ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ Μωϋσέως καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν 27
προφητῶν, διηρομήνευεν αὐτοῖς ἐν πάσαις ταῖς γραφαῖς τὰ περὶ ἐαν-
τοῦ. Καὶ ἤγγισαν εἰς τὴν κώμην οὗ ἐπορεύοντο· καὶ αὐτὸς προσε- 28
ποιεῖτο ποθρότερον πορεύεσθαι. ⁱ Καὶ παρεβιάσαντο αὐτὸν, λέγοντες· 29
Μεῖνον μεθ' ἡμῶν, ὅτι πρὸς ἐσπέραν ἐστὶ, καὶ κέλικεν ἡ ἡμέρα. καὶ
εἰσῆλθε τοῦ μείναι σὺν αὐτοῖς. Καὶ ἐγένετο, ἐν τῷ κατακλιθῆναι αὐ- 30
τὸν μετ' αὐτῶν, λαβὼν τὸν ἄρτον ἐβλόγησε, καὶ κλάσας ἐπέδιδον αὐτοῖς.
Αὐτῶν δὲ διηροίχθησαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοί, καὶ ἐπέγνωσαν αὐτὸν· καὶ αὐτὸς 31
ἄφαντος ἐγένετο ἀπ' αὐτῶν. Καὶ εἶπον πρὸς ἀλλήλους· Οὐχὶ ἡ καρδία 32
ἡμῶν καιομένη ἦν ἐν ἡμῖν, ὡς ἐλάλει ἡμῖν ἐν τῇ ὁδοῦ, καὶ ὡς διήροιγεν
ἡμῖν τὰς γραφάς; Καὶ ἀναστάντες αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ, ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἰε- 33
ρουσαλὴμ, καὶ εὔρον συναθηροισμένους τοὺς ἑνδεκα καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς,
k ^k λέγοντας· Ὅτι ἠγέρθη ὁ κύριος ὁὕτως, καὶ ὤφθη Σίμωνι· καὶ 34
αὐτοὶ ἐξηγοῦντο τὰ ἐν τῇ ὁδοῦ, καὶ ὡς ἐγνώσθη αὐτοῖς ἐν τῇ κλάσει 35
τοῦ ἄρτου.

l Mark 16. 14.
John. 20. 19.

^l Ταῦτα δὲ αὐτῶν λαλούντων, αὐτὸς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἔστη ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν, 36
καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· Εὐρήνη ὑμῖν! πτοηθέντες δὲ καὶ ἔμφοβοι γενόμενοι 37

27. ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ M.] Even in the Books of Moses there are *prophecies*, as, for instance, those respecting Esau and Dan, &c. There are also *types* and *symbols*, as of the serpent erected by Moses; and also some connected with the affairs of David, the explanation of which Christ communicated to the Apostles, and the Apostles to us. It seems probable, too, that a similar mystical explication of other prophecies was delivered by Christ, or by the Holy Spirit, and handed down by tradition in the Church. — (Grot.)

28. προσποιεῖτο ποθρότερον π.] Προσποιεῖσθαι signifies, "properly to take to oneself, make one's own;" and, in a metaphorical sense, to "make as though," a sense occurring both in the Scriptural (as I Sam. xxi. 13. 2 Sam. xliii. 5.) and the Classical writers. See Note on Mark vi. 48. Euthym. well explains it *ἐσχηματίζετο*, "he made a motion as though." However, there is no ground for founding any charge of *dissimulation* against our Lord; for he would really have gone on, had he not been detained by their *friendly importunity*; which is all that *παρεβιάσαντο* imports. On which idiom see Note on Matt. xiv. 22. and Mark xiv. 23.

29. πρὸς ἐσπέραν.] Πρὸς with nouns of time denotes the proximity of it, (answering to our *towards*.) Thucyd. iv. 135. πρὸς ἑαρ ἡῆρ. (Wets.)

30. κλάσας a.] This was contrary to the custom of guests; that office belonging to the *host* (as we find from Xenoph., Hom., and Apuleius), except when the host, out of respect, chose to resign it to the guest. (Grot. and Pric.)

31. διηροίχθησαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοί.] On the hindrance before adverted to being removed, and on a nearer approach, they recognised Christ. See Note supra ver. 16.

— ἄφαντος ἐγένετο ἄ. a.] There has been some difference of opinion as to the exact sense of these words. The best Commentators are, however, agreed that *ἄφαντος ἐγένετο ἄ. a.* must be equivalent to *ἠφανίσθη ἀπ' αὐτῶν*; and that we are not to suppose that our Lord vanished as a *spectre* might be imagined to do. Grot., who discusses the *mode* of our Lord's disappearance, confesses that of the *three* ways in which it may have hap-

pened, *two* are easier of comprehension, but the third not *impossible*. And he thinks it better, with Basil, not to scrutinize the *how*. A prudence certainly much to be commended, but which here may be thought unnecessary; since, from the passages of the Classical writers adduced by Abresch and Wets. (see also Recens. Synop.) none can doubt but that the sense simply is, "he suddenly or abruptly withdrew from their company." See more in my Note on Thucyd. viii. 33. ἀποπλέων — ἀφανίζεται. In the whole of the passages adduced there and in Recens. Synop. all that is implied by this use of ἀφανίζεται, or the synonymous expressions ἄφαντος γίνεσθαι, &c. is a notion of *suddenness* or *abruptness* in the action of the verb.

32. καρδία ἡμῶν καιομένη.] Kypke observes that *καίεσθαι* is often used of the more violent emotions, especially joy; and truly remarks, that the affection here meant was a compound feeling; made up partly of *respectful affection* towards one who had so ably expounded the oracles of the Prophets; of *desire* to longer enjoy his society and instruction; of *joy*—since they anxiously longed that what he had taught them of the resurrection of the Messiah might prove true, and (though with some fluctuation of mind) they rejoiced in the anticipation of that truth.

36. Ἰησοῦς ἔστη ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν.] John adds *ὀφίαις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ, καὶ θυρῶν κεκλεισμένων*, from which words many have inferred that Jesus entered the closed doors without stirring them on their hinges. But thus the words ought to have been *διὰ τῶν θυρῶν κεκλεισμένων*. Indeed, the last words have solely a reference to the preceding *διὰ φόβου τῶν Ἰουδαίων*. But (say some) has not John noted that the doors were opened? True: but to such minutiae as this (namely, whether Jesus himself opened the door, or ordered it to be opened) the Evangelists are not accustomed to descend. Besides, had the disciples from Emmaus also entered by the closed doors? The word *ἔστη* [which is for *ἐπέστη*] indicates that Jesus appeared suddenly and unexpectedly. (Kuini.)

37. πτοηθέντες.] This term and *ἔμφοβος* are sy-

- 38 ἐδόκουν πνεῦμα θεωρεῖν. Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Τί τεταραγμένοι ἐστέ;
- 39 καὶ διακί διαλογισμοὶ ἀναβαίνουσιν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν; ^m ἴδετε ^m John 20. 20, 27.
- τὰς χεῖράς μου καὶ τοὺς πόδας μου, ὅτι αὐτὸς ἐγὼ εἰμι· ψηλαφήσατέ με καὶ ἴδετε· ὅτι πνεῦμα σάρκα καὶ ὀστέα οὐκ ἔχει, καθὼς
- 40 ἐμὲ θεωρεῖτε ἔχοντα. Καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν ἐπέδειξεν αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας καὶ
- 41 τοὺς πόδας. ⁿ Ἐτι δὲ ἀπιστούντων αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τῆς καρῆς, καὶ θαν- ⁿ John 21. 10.
- 42 μαζόντων, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Ἐχετε τι βρώσιμον ἐνθάδε; Οἱ δὲ ἐπέ-
43 δωκαν αὐτῷ ἰχθύος ὀπτοῦ μέρους, καὶ ἀπὸ μελισσίου κηρίου· καὶ
- 44 λαβὼν ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν ἔφαγεν. ^o Εἶπε δὲ αὐτοῖς· Οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι οὗς ^o Matt. 16. 21. & 17. 22. & 20. 18. & 9. 31. & 10. 33. supra. 9. 22. & 18. 31. & 24. 6. p. supra v. 26.
- ἔειπα πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἔτι ἂν σὺν ὑμῖν, ὅτι δεῖ πληρωθῆναι πάντα τὰ ^q Acts 13. 38. 1 John 2. 12.
- γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ νόμῳ Μωϋσέως καὶ Προφῆταις καὶ Ψαλμοῖς περὶ
- 45 ἐμοῦ. Τότε διήνοιξεν αὐτῶν τὸν νοῦν, τοῦ συνίεναι τὰς γραφάς· ^p καὶ
- 46 εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Ὅτι οὕτως γέγραπται, καὶ οὕτως ἔδει παθεῖν τὸν Χρισ-
47 τὸν, καὶ ἀναστῆναι ἐκ νεκρῶν τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, ^q καὶ κηρυχθῆναι ἐπὶ
- τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ μετάνοιαν καὶ ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη,
- 48 ἀρξάμενον ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλήμ. ^r Ὑμεῖς δὲ ἐστε μάρτυρες τούτων. ^s Καὶ ^r Joh. 15. 27.
- 49 ἰδὼν, ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρὸς μου ἐφ' ὑμᾶς· ὑμεῖς ^s John 14. 26. & 15. 26. & 16. 7. & Acts 1. 4. & 2. toto.
- δὲ καθίσατε ἐν τῇ πόλει Ἱερουσαλήμ, ἕως οὗ ἐνδύσησθε δύναμιν ἐξ
- ὑψους.
- 50 Ἐξήγαγε δὲ αὐτοὺς ἕξω ἕως εἰς Βηθανίαν· καὶ ἐπάρας τὰς χεῖρας ^t Acts 1. 12.

nonymous, but joined for emphasis. On the Jewish notions of spirits, see Rec. Syn. It may be added that our Lord meant not to countenance those notions, but to show his hearers that, according to their own notions of spirits, he could not be one.

38. διαλογισμοὶ ἀναβαίνουσι.] Of this use of ἀναβαίνειν and the Latin *surgere* examples are adduced by Wets., which show that it is not a Hebraism. It is found in all languages.

39. πνεῦμα—οὐκ ἔχει.] This was probably spoken agreeably to the general opinion of all nations. See the Note of Grot. and the numerous Classical citations adduced by Wets., many of which (together with others of my own) may be seen in Recens. Synop.

41. ἀπιστούντων αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τῆς καρῆς.] This is founded in nature. The disciples yet doubted; as is sometimes the case on the occurrence of events very felicitous, which happen suddenly and unexpectedly. We think the news too good to be believed, and fancy we are dreaming. So Ovid. *Tarda solet magnis rebus inesse fides.*

42. ἀπὸ μελισσίου κηρίου.] A frequent food with the ancients, especially those who studied abstemiousness of diet.

44. οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι (scil. εἰσὶ) οὗς ἔλ. &c.] The sense is, "The words uttered by me, when I was with you, imported that all things written of me (my death, burial, and resurrection) should be fulfilled." The *Psalms* are put for the *Hagiographia*, as being the chief book of that division of the O. T. *Τὰ γεγραπ.* "which are written."

45. διήνοιξεν α. τὸν ν.] This is very distinct in sense from the explanation of the *Scriptures* mentioned supra ver. 27., and imports an enlightening of the mind by assisting the natural powers; and it may include *inclining* and *disposing* the mind to attend to the knowledge in question. So Acts xvi. 14. ὁ Κύριος διήνοιξε τὴν

καρδίαν προσέχων τοῖς λαλούνεσις ὑπὸ Π. Plut., cited by Wets., says of the reading of the Poets; *προσανοίγει καὶ προσκλίνει τὴν τοῦ νέου ψυχὴν φιλοσοφίας λόγους.*

47. καὶ κηρυχθῆναι, &c.] Supply *δεῖ* from the *ἔδει foregoing.*

—ἀρξάμενον ἀπὸ ἱ.] Participles, passive or neuter, are sometimes (as here) put impersonally in the neuter gender. The Accus. is used instead of a Genit. of consequence. Thus the sense is "the beginning being made." So Philostr. *Epist. Apoll.* 3. Ἐπῆλθες ἔθνη—ἀπὸ Συρίας ἀρξάμενος. That the commencement should be made from Jerusalem was according to a sort of ancient prerogative of the Holy city.

43. τοῦτων] Namely (says Whitby) of the events of the life, death, and especially *resurrection* of Christ, as an unequivocal proof of his Divine mission.

49. ἐπαγγελίαν] i. e. the thing promised, namely, the gift of the Holy Spirit. Ἐξ ὑψους, i. e. ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, which sense confirms Horne *Tooke's* derivation of *heaven*, as participle past of *heapan* to *heave*, *raise*. So the Greek οὐρανοῦς comes from ὄρω, to raise.

—ἐνδύσασθε.] Ἐνδύσασθαι answers to the Heb. *בש* and the Latin *induire*; but, like them, is, both in the Classical and Scriptural writers, used in the sense to be *endued*; i. e. completely furnished with any power; for though *περιβάλλεσθαι* and *ἐνδύεσθαι* be used promiscuously in the N. T., yet properly, the former signifies to cast a robe about one, the latter to be involved in a coat or some article of dress; which implies a fully clothing the part, or whole of the body. On this omission of *ἂν* with the Conjunctive, and on the force in general when expressed, see the masterly Dissertation by Hermann. subjoined to the new edition of Steph. Thes.

50. ἐξήγαγε—ἕξω.] That there is here no *ple-*

u Mark 16. 19.
Acts 1. 9.

αὐτοῦ εὐλόγησεν αὐτούς. Ἔγένετο, ἐν τῷ εὐλογεῖν αὐτὸν αὐτοῦς, 51
διέστη ἀπ' αὐτῶν, καὶ ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν. Καὶ αὐτοὶ προσ- 52
κυνήσαντες αὐτὸν, ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ μετὰ χαρᾶς μεγάλης·
καὶ ἦσαν διαπαντός ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, αἰνοῦντες καὶ εὐλογοῦντες τὸν Θεόν. 53
ἀμήν.

opasm (as Kuin. fancied), has been shown by Bornemann, who adduces several examples from the Classics. On the seeming discrepancy, see Towns.

52. προσκυνήσαντες αὐτόν.] The term here must

denote the performance of religious worship, now first rendered to Christ by the Apostles, and paid to him even though absent and invisible; a decisive proof of the opinion they entertained of his Divinity.

ΤΟ ΚΑΤΑ ΙΩΑΝΝΗΝ

ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ.

1 I. ἘΝ ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ Λόγος, καὶ ὁ Λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, καὶ 1 John 1. 1, 2.
 2 Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος. Οὗτος ἦν ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν. Ἐπάντα δι' Rev. 19. 13.
 infra 10. 33, 36.
 z Eph. 3. 9.

Of all the Gospels, this may be considered the most important, both as regards the subjects there treated of, and the doctrines thence to be deduced. In no other have we the real person of the Redeemer so fully exhibited. Inasmuch that it was called by the Fathers the *Spiritual Volume*, the *Pectus Christi*. While the other Evangelists chiefly occupy themselves in narrating the events which marked our Lord's earthly course, St. John applies himself, almost exclusively, to record the discourses of Christ; and whatever, either of words or deeds, was calculated to show forth His Divine majesty and glory, His Divine origin, the nature of the office committed to him by the Father, and the efficacy of his death as an atonement for the sins of the world. The other Evangelists have, indeed, inculcated this fundamental doctrine; but only occasionally and incidentally; John professedly and systematically. In fact, the purpose of St. John in writing this Gospel differed materially from that of the other Evangelists. It was not to write a *history of the life of Christ*, but to select some of the most remarkable parts of his personal history, in order thereby to introduce some of the most important of his discourses, in which he spoke of himself, his person, and his office: intending thereby to demonstrate his *divine nature*; to shew the excellency of his office, and to vindicate the truth against the Jews and Judaizing Christians of those times, and sceptical persons of every age,—who, whether from the influence of error or deep-rooted prejudice, should entertain notions derogatory to the honour of the Saviour. This the Evangelist has done; not by resorting to *subtlety of argument*, but by stating the *evidence of facts*, and urging the authority of our Lord himself. As, then, St. John did not intend to write the *life of Christ*, he commences, not with his birth by the Virgin Mary, but goes back beyond even the creation of the universe, and teaches that our Saviour existed before that period. He commences with a PROEM (justly called the *Golden Proeme*), the sum and substance of which, as that is of the whole

Gospel, is; that the promised Messiah *existed before the beginning of the world with God*, and WAS GOD; that He was Creator of the universe, but was made man, and lived among men, and by words and works manifested himself to be the *Son of God*—the Saviour of mankind. After adverting to the weighty testimony of John the Baptist, and recording the commencing miracles wrought in Cana of Galilee and the Temple of Jerusalem, it seems to have been the intent of the Evangelist to furnish his readers with some specimens of the *Discourses of Christ*, in order thence to establish and illustrate the positions laid down in the Preface. For in each year of Christ's ministry he has narrated certain actions and miracles, and recorded certain discourses in which our Saviour spoke of his person and office. These actions he seems to have related solely with a view to the discourses which gave rise to them. As to the miracles, it was not (see xx. 31.) his intention to accumulate as many instances as possible of the miraculous powers exerted by Christ; but only those which were best adapted to the purpose of his Gospel. The later discourses of our Lord, and the history of his passion, death, and resurrection, St. John has more fully detailed, both that Christians might be assured of the reality of his death (so great being the efficacy thereof) and that they might be convinced of his resurrection and the glory into which, after death, he was received.

To advert to the personal history of the Evangelist himself, suffice it to say that, as being the son of a respectable Master Fisherman, he must have had a tolerable education; and although without pretensions to learning properly so called, could not be termed *illiterate*. He and his brother James had probably received a careful religious education; had been well grounded in the Scriptures, if not in the original, yet in the Syro-Chaldee Version, or Paraphrase, and in the Sept.; and were probably not wholly unversed in the Rabbinical learning of the day. From the time that they received their immediate call from Christ,

Col. 1. 17.
 Heb. 1. 2.
 infra 5. 25.
 & 8. 12.
 & 9. 5.
 & 12. 46.
 1 John 5. 11.
 a Iufra. 3. 11.

αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν ὃ γέγονεν. Ἐν αὐτῷ 4
 ζωῇ ἦν, καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἦν τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων. ἃ καὶ τὸ φῶς ἐν τῇ 5
 σκοτίᾳ φαίνει, καὶ ἡ σκοτία αὐτὸ οὐ κατέλαβεν.

they became first his *disciples*, then his *constant attendants*, and lastly were appointed with others as *Apostles*. With respect to the *character* and *disposition* of the Evangelist, we have every reason to think that it was at once frank and amiable, uniting suavity with firmness. Hence he became the object of our Lord's peculiar regard and confidence, which he repaid by the most sincere attachment to his Master.

The *genuineness* of the present Gospel is unquestionable; not only as attested by the strongest internal evidence (namely, in the style and manner, the circumstantiality of its details, and the evident marks of the writer's having been an eye-witness of much that he relates), but the strongest *external* evidence, in an unbroken chain of testimonies from writers in the Apostolic age down to that of Epiphanius, Chrys., and Jerome. It was, indeed, never disputed, until lately, by *Bretschneider*; whose doubts, however, have been, as he confesses, entirely removed by the very able writers who came forward to maintain the authenticity of the Gospel. On the genuineness of a particular part of it, namely, the narrative of the woman taken in adultery, ch. viii. 1—11. and also of ch. xxi., see the Notes in loc.

To advert to the *contents* of this Gospel, the Evangelist has a style and manner peculiar to himself, uniting plainness of diction with sublimity of character—not such as results from art, but is engendered by magnitude of conception united with a natural simplicity of expression, and which, coming from the heart, speaks to the heart. This Gospel is, however, by no means without its difficulties, which may be ascribed, 1. to the abstruseness of the subjects there treated on; 2dly, to the dark cast and manner of the writer; 3dly, to the strongly Hebraic character of the style; and that not only in the acceptance of words, (some of which are peculiar to himself) but in the structure of his sentences, and especially in the use of the Tenses, where *Enallage* of Past, Present, and Future, is not unfrequent. Hence, after all the labor which has been so profusely bestowed upon it by learned and pious Expositors (of whom the most distinguished are Calvin, Beza, Grot., Lampe, Tittm., Kuin., and Tholuck), yet there is not any Book of the N. T. of which the interpretation has been so uncertain and debateable. Accordingly, the Editor of the present work has found it necessary to use every exertion in his power to vanquish the difficulties, and place the interpretation, in some measure, on the same footing of certainty, or something approaching to it, as in the other Gospels.

But to consider the remaining circumstances connected with this Gospel, namely, as to the *place where*, and *time when* it was written: the unanimous voice of antiquity testifies that the *place* was *Ephesus*. And to this all the moderns readily assent. On the *time*, however, considerable difference of opinion exists. It has been the general sentiment, both of ancient and modern inquirers, that it was published about the *close of the first century*. While some of those who are best able to judge of such matters (as Lampe, Lardner, Owen, Tittm., and Kuin.), suppose it to have been written before the destruction of Jeru-

salem; though they differ as to the exact date. The *former* opinion indeed, is alleged to be most agreeable to ancient authority. Yet the testimonies adduced are almost entirely from writers (such as Epiphanius, Theodoret, and Jerome) of a period too far remote from the Apostolic age to have much weight. In fact, the only ancient authority alleged is Irenæus ap. Euseb. Eccl. Hist. v. 8. (where, however, it is merely said that John wrote *after* the other Evangelists) and another passage cited from him by Lardner vi. 187, from which it has been inferred, but *very precariously*, that this Gospel was written long after the destruction of Jerusalem. Certainly the evidence is not such as to establish the point in question. And the opinion itself seems to have originated in the notion, prevalent both in ancient and modern times (but destroyed by Tittman, in a masterly Dissertation, *de Vestigiis Gnost. in Evang. Joan. frustra quesitis*), that this Gospel was written for the purpose of confuting the Heresies of the Gnostics and others as to the person of Christ. Indeed, if we inquire what evidence is alleged for that opinion, several expressions in the *Proeme* are pointed out, and a few others occurring up and down in the Gospel. Yet these cannot, without the aid of strong imagination, be thought to give any great evidence: and Expositors best acquainted with the contents of this Gospel (as Calvin, Lampe, Tittman, Kuin., Tholuck, and Bp. Blomfield in his Lectures) are decidedly of opinion that the notion is unfounded, and that (in the words of Bp. Blomfield) "the design of St. John in writing this Gospel was of a *general nature*, namely to convey to the Christian world just notions of the real nature, character, and office of that great Teacher who came to instruct and to redeem mankind." So long, however, as the opinion prevailed, that the Gospel was a *polemical one*, and written to confute heresies, men were obliged to suppose *as late* a date as the life of the Evangelist would permit, for the publication of the Gospel; since the heresies in question were not prevalent before the latter end of the first century.

To advert to another opinion almost universal, that St. John wrote to supply the deficiencies and omissions of the former Evangelists—for this there is, I apprehend, no foundation in the *Gospel itself*. And when it is attempted to unite this notion with the *late date*, the inconsistency is surely great; for if the date were what those writers allege, and if St. John wrote to supply certain deficiencies in the former Gospels, why are so many things unaccountably omitted? as, for instance, the remarkable fulfilment of our Lord's prophecies respecting the destruction of Jerusalem; which would have tended in the highest degree to confirm whatever the Evangelist intends to prove. Moreover, if St. John meant, as they say, to supply the omissions and confirm the authority of the preceding, is it likely, that he would have suffered 30 or 40 years to elapse without doing either one or the other. Those, indeed, who contend for a late date, ground them not only on *external* testimony, but *internal evidence*, namely in the *contents* of the Gospel. The Evangelist, they allege, considers those whom he is addressing as little

6 ^b Ἐγένετο ἄνθρωπος ἀπεσταλμένος παρὰ Θεοῦ ὄνομα αὐτῷ Ἰωάν-
 7 νης. οὗτος ἦλθεν εἰς μαρτυρίαν, ἵνα μαρτυρήσῃ περὶ τοῦ φωτός, ἵνα

^b Matt. 3. 1.
 Mar. 1. 2, &c.
 Luke 3. 3.
 & 7. 27.
 Acts 13. 24.

acquainted with Jewish customs and names; since he gives various explanations even more frequently than St. Mark and St. Luke. The reason of which, they think, was, that, at the time when St. John wrote, many more Gentiles had been converted; and thus it became necessary to explain several circumstances which required no explanation while the Jewish Polity was in existence. These arguments, however, are rather specious than solid. For the very same reasons, in nearly the same degree, might exist 23 or 29 years earlier. Upon the whole, it should seem that there is no conclusive evidence adduced for the *late* date in question. On the other hand, many arguments are urged too far in favour of a date before the destruction of Jerusalem. Suffice it to say, that the arguments in general, though not all of equal weight, yet overbalance those on the contrary side. To advert to a few of both — Lampe, Tittm., and others appeal to ch. v. 2. "there is at Jerusalem by the sheep market, a pool," &c. as a proof that this gospel must have been written before the destruction of Jerusalem; since it recognises the city as *in being* when the words were written. This others attempt to set aside, by remarking, that writers "do not weigh their words so exactly;" and that "the Present there may be put for the Past tense." But the former is a frivolous excuse; and as to the latter, such a confusion of tenses cannot be admitted in a *narrative*. And when it is suggested that Jerusalem *might*, during a period of 26 or 27 years, have risen from its ruins — yet that there is no sort of historical evidence; while to its *utter* and total destruction Josephus bears testimony in his Bell. vii. 1. where he says that the whole city was so completely destroyed and dug up, ὥστε μηδὲ πόποι* οἰκισθῆναι πιστὴν ἂν ἔτι παρασχέιν τοῖς προσελθούσι. And if, in the course of those, a few houses might have been erected, yet surely not so as to be called a city, and have its streets designated by names. Nor are there wanting, in addition to the above strong *internal* arguments adduced by the Commentators, who maintain the publication *before* the destruction of Jerusalem; which are, however, closely connected with the question as to the *main purpose* of the Evangelist, which, if it was, as it should seem, *general*, evidently points to a date far earlier than the close of the first century. With respect to the above two points, the *date* and the *design* of the Gospel, it appears *most* probable, that it was published not very long after St. John had gone to reside at Ephesus, and only a short period before the destruction of Jerusalem — say A. D. 69. John had probably left Judæa four or five years before, when the troubles were beginning, which ended in the destruction of the Jewish state. Had, indeed, St. John written so late as the close of the first century, he would surely have done *more* towards repressing the heresies of the Gnostics, Cerinthians, Nicolaitans, and others, than barely employ a few expressions intended to repress their dogmas; since in the Apocalypse he has censured them *pointedly, openly, and by name*. If, however, the expressions in question should appear to be such as to imply a *settled purpose* in the writer, we have only to suppose that, *together with* the above-mentioned *general* design, there was united a *particular* one, — namely, to encounter those heretical no-

tions, which probably were even then starting up like weeds in the rising corn. And although it cannot be proved that St. John wrote for the *purpose* of supplying the omissions of his predecessors, yet, as he *has*, in some measure, done so, by the insertion of certain particulars, not required by his principal design — we may say that he intended his Gospel to be, in *some* degree, supplementary to, and consequently confirmatory of, theirs.

J. I. et seqq. On this noble Proeme (which Augustin de Civ. D. x. 29. tells us a Platonic Philosopher said ought to be written in letters of gold, and hung up in all the churches) see an erudite Dissertation of C. Vitringa T. ii. p. 122 — 156.

— ἐν ἀρχῇ] scil. τοῦ κόσμου. The expression answers to the Heb. בְּרֵאשִׁית, in Gen. i. 1. which the Evangelist seems to have had in mind. On account of the ἐν many Commentators explain the phrase to mean *before* the creation of the world; referring for examples of this sense of ἐν ἀρχῇ to John xvii. 5. Eph. i. 4. and Prov. viii. 23, where it is more exactly defined by the preceding πρὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος, and the following πρὸ τοῦ τὴν γῆν ποιῆσαι. But neither in those passages, nor in the one before us, has ἐν *properly* this sense; nor can it ever have it. It is only *implied* from the context. For what was existing at the creation of the world must have existed *before* it. By ἀρχῇ is here meant the origin of all things; and ἐν ἀρχῇ is for ἐπ' ἀρχῆς, and the expression is evidently meant to designate *eternity*. Thus it is by Nonnus expressed by ἀχρονος, *unconnected with time*.

— ἦν ὁ Λόγος.] It is impossible, within the limits of a work of this nature, to do any sort of justice to the important, but most intricate subject of the Logos. I must therefore content myself with referring the reader to my Dissertation in Recens. Synop., also to Tittman, p. 27 — 29. and Townsend N. T. Chron. p. 7. seqq. also Dr. Burton's Bampton Lectures, p. 212 — 24. Whatever may be the source from whence St. John borrowed this term, all the best informed inquirers are agreed (contrary to the Unitarians) that it designates a real subsisting *Being*, and not an *attribute*. — as Wisdom or Reason. Indeed, the personality of the Logos is manifest from the whole of the Proeme.

The reader may consult the summary by Vitringa or Townsend on the substance of the sense contained in this Proem, and the Gnostical heresies which each clause has been *supposed* to encounter.

— πρὸς τὸν Θεόν.] The phrase εἶναι πρὸς τὸν Θεόν denotes close union and intimate society, and, in the present context, compared with 17. 5. and I John i. 1, cannot be thought to mean less than *communion of the Divine nature*, and participation of the Divine glory and majesty, implying a community also of *actions and counsels*. This assertion is repeated in the next verse; yet, as Tittm. observes, "not by a Hebrew pleonasm, but in order to more fully explain what is meant by this εἶναι πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, and to shew *how* the Lord used and evinced his majesty, and the Divine power which he had with the Father; and thus to declare his Divine dignity by a new argument."

— καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος.] The sense is clearly

e Infra. 3. 19.
& 8. 12.
& 9. 5.
& 12. 46.

πάντες πιστεύουσι δι' αὐτοῦ. Ὡς ἦν ἐκείνος τὸ φῶς, ἀλλ' ἵνα μαρ-
τυρήσῃ περὶ τοῦ φωτός. Ὁ ἦν

Ὡς ἦν ἐκείνος τὸ φῶς, ἀλλ' ἵνα μαρ- 8
τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν, ὃ φωτίζει πάντα 9

"and the Logos was God." Ὁ Λόγος being the *subject*, and Θεὸς the *predicate*, as in John iv. 24. Πνεῦμα ὁ Θεός. and iv. 8. ὁ Θεὸς ἀγάπη ἴστιν. The temerity of Crellius, who, to destroy this irrefragable testimony to the Godhead of Jesus Christ, would alter Θεὸς to Θεοῦ, met with well merited chastisement from Beng. and Wets. Some later Socinians have attempted to compass the same end, by maintaining that as Θεὸς has not the Article, it should be taken in a lower sense, to denote a God. But that sophism has been completely refuted by Beng., Campb., Middlet., and Kuin.; the last of whom has proved that, in the present construction, the Article *could* not have been used without producing a position as little accordant with the *Socinian* as with the *Trinitarian* hypothesis. This criticism is confirmed by the learned Professor Bournoff in his excellent Greek Grammar (in French). His Canon of the Article in question is thus: "En Grec, comme en Français, c'est le nom précédé de l'article qui est le sujet; l'autre est l'attribut. Ex. gr. ἡ ἀρετὴ πλουτός ἐστι."

3. πάντα — ἐγένετο.] By πάντα is meant *all things in the world* — the *universe*. Ἐγένετο is for ἐκτίζετο, as the *usus loquendi* permits, and the context requires. See Ps. cxlviii. 33. Many Commentators take διὰ as denoting the *instrumental cause*, as in Hebr. i. 2. But there is no reason to abandon the opinion of almost all the ancient, and the most eminent modern Interpreters, that it denotes the *efficient* and *principal cause*, as in Rom. xi. 36. 1 Cor. i. 9. Gal. i. 1. and often elsewhere. As to the passage of Hebrews, it is of quite a different nature to this of St. John; since in the latter only *one* agent is spoken of, but in the other *two* agents are adverted to. Thus the Logos is described as being "very God" and Creator of the universe; who, on account of his communion with the Divine nature, hath an equal power with the Father; and by his co-operation with the Father, created the world.

The next words, καὶ χωρὶς — γέγονεν, are usually explained as yielding the same sentiment with the foregoing clause; the same thing being expressed both by affirmation and by negation, of which we see many examples in Recens. Synop. But here we have not the *same thing* expressed; but a much stronger sentiment. Even the *dialysis* οὐδὲ ἔν has an intensive force. Indeed Tittm. would understand the words of the *preservation* and *governance* of what had been created.

Here 4 MSS., 3 inferior Versions, and many of the Fathers (chiefly Latin) connect the words ὃ γέγονεν with the sentence following; and this has been adopted by Dr. Burton. But I have not thought proper to follow his example, 1. because *all* the other MSS., all the Versions of any account, and the most judicious of the Fathers (as Chrys., Epiph., Theophyl., Euthym., Cyprian, Arnob., and Jerome) adhere to the received construction; and, 2. because if, with the ancient Interpreters, we explain, "omne quod creatum est per eum vitam accepit," we have a sense which involves a considerable tautology, and moreover cannot be extracted from the words without violence. And if, with Wets. and Dr. Burton, we suppose the sense to be "the thing which was made (i. e. the benefit which was gained for man) in or through him was life;" we gain, indeed, a good

sense, but one which cannot be proved to exist in the words; and which, indeed, would suppose the words of a passage otherwise plain to be expressed with an almost ænigmatical obscurity. By the common construction, the same sentiment is obtained, without resorting to any such violence.

4. Lightf. observes, that "to the *physical* creation by the Logos is here subjoined a new and *moral* one by the same." Strictly speaking, however, there is here (as Chrys. and Tittm. remark) a *reason* given for what has just been affirmed.

— ἐν αὐτῷ (ζωὴ ἦν — φῶς.) It has been not a little disputed, what is meant here by ζωὴ and φῶς. And no wonder, since these are terms of very extensive signification, and there are several senses in which it is equally true, that our Saviour was life and light. And Wets. has adduced numerous passages of ancient writers in which Gods and Heroes are called the life and light of men. By ζωὴ most Expositors think is here meant *author of life and salvation*; and by φῶς, *teacher* and promulgator of its doctrine, the Gospel. But though that sense is very agreeable to the *usus loquendi*, yet it seems to be not permitted by the context; which is elaborately discussed, together with the force of the expressions ζωὴ and φῶς, by Lampe and Tittm.; the latter of whom has shown that, though the senses of ζωὴ and φῶς are often interchangeable, yet that here ζωὴ denotes the *cause*, φῶς the *effect*; the former indicating *vim creatricem et facultatem*, and belonging to *all creatures*; the latter, *salutem ipsam*, and pertaining to *man*. "Thus (he observes) the sense is, 'In eo est vis vivifica,' seu, 'pollet vi, vitam et salutem tribuendi rebus omnibus, eaque vi utitur in primis ad salutem hominum.'" It is well observed by Wets., that the ἐν denotes, that the power was *centred* in himself, i. e. *self-derived*, not as was the case with the *Prophets*; and that his power was exerted by a *proper* and *natural*, not an *adventitious*, *acquired*, or *delegated* force. Thus he is elsewhere said ζῶν ἔχειν ἐν ἑαυτῷ.

5. καὶ τὸ φῶς — οὐ καταβεν.] Σκορία is a perpetual image of ignorance, and also the *wisery* consequent upon it. See Is. ix. 2. Matth. iv. 16. Acts xxvi. 18., and also the Classical citations in Recens. Synop. Here the word is put (abstract for concrete) in the place of τοῖς ἐσκοπισμένοις τῆ διαβολῆ (Eph. iv. 18.), namely, persons immersed in ignorance, idolatry, and vice, and consequently far removed from light and virtue, holiness and happiness. Thus the sense is, "And this salvation was offered to wretched, corrupt, and miserable men: but the plan of salvation they did not *comprehend*, much less did they accept and embrace it."

6—8. The scope of these verses (which are in some measure parenthetical) is to prevent misapprehension, and to show the *purpose* of God in *sending John*; and to prove, even on the evidence of John himself, the infinite superiority of Christ to John *q. d.* To bear witness to this light, and further its reception, was John sent from God; not as being himself that light, namely the Messiah, but to bear witness to the Divine mission of Him who was so. Ἀδῶν is for ᾧ, by an idiom not confined to the Hebrew, but extending to the popular dialect of every language.

7. εἰς μαρτυρίαν, ἵνα μαρτ.] Here there is not so much a repetition of the same thing in plainer

10 ἄνθρωπον ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον. ^d Ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἦν, καὶ ὁ κόσμ^d Heb. 1. 2.
 11 ος δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ ὁ κόσμος αὐτὸν οὐκ ἔγνω. εἰς τὰ ἴδια
 12 ἦλθε, καὶ οἱ ἴδιοι αὐτὸν οὐ παρέλαβον. ^e Ὅσοι δὲ ἔλαβον αὐτὸν, ^e Rom. 8. 15.
 ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τέκνα Θεοῦ γενέσθαι, τοῖς πιστεύουσιν εἰς τὸ ^f Gal. 3. 26.
 13 ὄνομα αὐτοῦ. ^f οἱ οὐκ ἐξ αἱμάτων, οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος σαρκὸς, οὐδὲ ^g 1 Pet. 1. 4.
 ἐκ θελήματος ἀνδρῶς, ἀλλ' ἐκ Θεοῦ ἐγεννήθησαν. ^g John 3. 1.
 14 ^h Καὶ ὁ Λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν· καὶ ἐθεασά ^h Matt. 1. 18.
 μεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ Πατρὸς, πλήρης ⁱ 17. 2.
 χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας. ⁱ Luke 1. 31.
^j 2. 7.
^k 2 Pet. 1. 17.
^l Col. 1. 19.
^m & 2. 3, 9.

terms, as that *ἴνα μαρτ.* &c. is an *epanorthosis* upon *εἰς μαρτυρίαν τοῦ φωτός.* In fact, the *tautologies, repetitions, pleonasm,* and positions expressed both negatively and affirmatively, in which this Gospel is said by the Commentators to abound, may almost all of them be accounted for on that principle; which itself arose from anxiety on the part of the Evangelist to impress the important truths he had to communicate as forcibly as possible on the minds of his readers.

8. *ἐκεῖνος.]* The full sense is, "he himself."
 9. *ἦν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν]* [*that was the true light;*"] i. e. he was the true light. Of this use of *ἀληθ.* with *φῶς,* examples are adduced by Wets. In the sense of *reality* there is implied *excellence,* as in John vi. 32. xvi. 1. and elsewhere. *φωτίζει* is generally taken as put for the Future *φωτίσει,* or to be taken to mean "who was to enlighten." But it may rather be said to have the sense of the Aorist, by which it denotes what is done at all times; or it may be rendered, "who is to enlighten." By *πάντα ἄνθρωπων* is meant men of all nations;" and not the Jews only; which is intended to oppose the Jewish notion, that the Messiah was to come for the salvation of the *Jews* only.

The next words *ἐρχ. εἰς τὸν κόσμον* are commonly taken (as indeed would seem more naturally) with *πάντα ἄνθρωπων.* But the best Commentators are agreed that they should be construed with *τὸ φῶς;* for in the former case, say they, the words would seem unnecessary, and never occur in that sense; whereas in the latter, the phrase is very significant, and applicable to Christ. (*Comp.* xii. 46, and iii. 19.) Besides, *ὁ ἐρχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον* was a usual phrase to designate the Messiah. See vi. 14; xviii. 37. And finally that sense would require the Article. As to the exact force of the declaration, it seems to repeat, somewhat more emphatically, what was said at v. 4. *ἡ ζωὴ ἦν τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων.*

10. *ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἦν.]* These words designate the appearance and existence of the Logos on earth in a human form. It is well observed by Tittm., that in this and the following verse *ascendit oratio:* q. d. The only and true Saviour came to, and abode in the world,—a world created by him; but which, nevertheless, knew him not, acknowledged him not as such. Nay, though he came to his own people especially, yet even they received him not as the Saviour. Some take *τὰ ἴδια* to mean *the world at large.* But though it be true, that the whole earth is the Lord's, yet Christ could not be said to be rejected by those to whom he did not reveal himself as Saviour, viz. the Gentiles. Indeed, he professes (Matt. xv. 24.) that "he was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel." The best Commentators are therefore, with reason, agreed that *τὰ ἴδια,* sub.

οἰκήματα can only mean his *own country,* or people; a sense of which numerous examples are adduced by Krebs, Wets., and Kypke. The Jews were the peculiar people of God, and consequently of Christ as united in the Godhead. Besides, the Jews might be called Christ's own people, as having been born and having lived among them.

12. *ὅσοι εἰ ἐλαβον α.]* The reasoning may be completed thus. "His countrymen, as a body, rejected him. Yet his coming was not utterly without effect. Some few did acknowledge him as Messiah. And to such as did, (or hereafter should,) he gave, &c." *Ἐξουσία* here denotes *privilege;* a signification sometimes occurring in the later Classical writers and the LXX. By *τέκνα Θεοῦ* is meant *obedient and true worshippers of God,* and, from the adjunct, those who are acknowledged by God as such, and admitted to the privilege of Sonship: to be as happy in this world and the next, as infinite Goodness, under the guidance of infinite Wisdom, can make them. The phrase often occurs in the discourses of our Lord, and in the Epistles of St. Paul and St. John, and is referred by Tittman, as the *fundus locutionis,* to Deut. xiv. 1, 2.

13. *οἱ οὐκ — ἐγεννήθησαν.]* The sense, as laid down by the best Commentators, is: "Who obtained that Sonship, (*υιοθεσία,*) not by virtue of ancestry, nor by any affinity, or connection of human descent, but by a free grant from God." The *plural* is used by adaptation to *ἔδωκεν* before; but, of course, what is here applied to those who received Jesus as Messiah during his abode on earth, is equally applicable to those who *should,* after his ascension, at any future period receive him as Messiah and embrace his religion. The *plural αἱμάτων* has reference to the *several* ancestors from whom the children of Israel boasted their descent; as Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. See 2 Cor. xi. 22. sq. I have, in Recens. Synop., compared Eurip. Ion, 693. *ἄλλων τραπεῖς ἀφ' αἱμάτων.* The plural also occurs in Lycophr. v. 304 & 1249. The two phrases, *ἐκ θελ. σαρκ.* and *ἐκ. θ. ἀνδρῶς,* by Hendiadys, designate, *per euphemismum,* the *natural* mode of descent, as opposed to the *spiritual* one proceeding from the adoption of God.

14. *καὶ ὁ Λόγος σὰρξ ἐγ.]* This is closely connected with ver. 10. *ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἦν,* and is a resumption of what was there said; q. d. "And [accordingly] the Logos was clothed with a human body, and sojourned among us [men]." *Σάρκινος ἐ.* would have been more Classical Greek. So Artemid. ii. 35. *ἐάν τε γὰρ σάρκινος οἱ Θεοὶ φαινύνται,* &c. This addition of the human nature to the Divine, *implies* that conjunction, by which the same person is both Son of God and Son of man. — *ἐσκήνωσε.]* There is no necessity to suppose

h Matt. 3. 11.
Mark 1. 7.
Luke 3. 16.
Infra. ver. 26,
et seqq.
& 3. 31.
i Col. 1. 19.
& 2. 9.
k Exod. 20.
1, &c.
Deut. 5. 6, &c.

^h Ἰωάννης μυστυεῖ περὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ κέκραγε λέγων· Οὗτος ἦν ὃν 15
εἶπον· Ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος ἔμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν· ὅτι πρῶτός
μου ἦν. {ⁱ Καὶ ἐκ τοῦ πληρώματος αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς πάντες ἐλάβομεν, καὶ 16
χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος·^k ὅτι ὁ νόμος διὰ Μωϋσέως ἐδόθη, ἡ χάρις καὶ 17

(with Lampe and Schoettg.) any reference to the *Schechinah*. The sense is what Wets. lays down: "He who had dwelt in heaven descended from thence, that he might sojourn with men." For, as I have shown by many examples in Recens. Synop., *σκηνοῦν* signifies, "to take up one's quarters, or sojourn." And it is here used in preference to *ζῆν*, with allusion to the life of man as a sojourn; and because it better designates that *familiariter vivere* which seems here meant; and suggests such an intercommunity of all the functions of human life, as showed that he was really and truly a man.

The next words, καὶ ἰθεασάμεθα, &c. seem meant to intimate, that though he was real man, yet he was also something far more; namely, *Son of God*; implying a community of the *Divine* nature. The terms are such as merit attention. Ἰθεασάμεθα, is very significant, and even emphatic; q. d. "We distinctly saw his glory." Now there were many ways in which they saw the *glory* of Christ; namely, in his *miracles*, (see ii. 11,) and not only in acts which evinced *power*, but *wisdom* and *goodness* also, in his ineffable love to men, such as to induce him to suffer death, even the death of the cross, for their salvation. The Apostles themselves, too, (at least St. John and two others) had seen his glory in his *transfiguration* on Mount Tabor. Though these and the other evidences of Christ's glory in his Mediatorial capacity John did not intend to *specify*, content with affirming it to have been ὄξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ Πατρὸς, such a glory as might be expected in a Being the only begotten Son of the Father; who accordingly is, as St. Paul says, the ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτῆρὸς τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ. It is to be noted, that the ὡς (as Chrys. and Tittm. remark,) does not express *similitude*, but *identity* and *truth*; i. e. truly such. On the full sense of *μονογενῆς* see Lampe and Tittm. It is proper to remark the use here of the verbal for the verb, *μονογενῆς* for *μόνος γεννηθείς*, which will account for the use of the Genitive with *παρὰ* instead of the simple Genitive. And it is truly observed by Bp. Bull, *Judic. Eccl.* p. 56. "that *μονογενῆς παρὰ* seems more significantly to express the *Divine* generation of the Son from the Father, than the simple genitive; the *παρὰ* intimating that the *Logos* *ita Dei Patris unicum filium esse*, ut *solus vera ab atque ex ipso Patre genitus fuerit*."

As to the *construction* of the passage, many regard the words καὶ ἰθεασάμεθα — παρὸς as parenthetical, referring *πλήρης* to *ἐσκήνωσεν*. But though this makes the syntax regular, it does violence to the structure of the sentence, and deteriorates the sense. It is better, with others, to suppose an enallage, (frequent in St. John,) and regard *πλήρης* as put for *πλήρους*. This is confirmed by an imitation of the passage in Theophyl. Simoc. p. 115. καὶ ἰθεασάμεθα τὴν ὄξαν αὐτῆς πλήρη χάριτος. Χάριτος καὶ ἀλ. is thought to be put, *per Hebraicam*, for *χάριτος ἀληθινῆς*; and the sense of *πλήρης χάριτος* ἀλ. to be "most gracious and benignant."

15. Having appealed, in a general way, to the testimony the Baptist bore to Jesus, John now proceeds to mention *what* that testimony was;

and by *κέκραγε* he means it was uttered openly, *ex animo*, and *decisively*.

— δ ὀπίσω — μου ἦν.] The sense of δ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος seems to be, "He who enters (i. e. is to enter) upon his office after me;" in which sense ἐρχεσθαι frequently occurs in the N. T., and sometimes in the LXX. The interpretation of ἔμπροσθέν μου γέγ., is doubtful, and may be taken either of *time* or of *dignity*. If the former be adopted (as it has been by the later commentators in general, supported by the Latin Versions), the clause ὅτι πρῶτός μ. ἦν. must be considered as expressing the same sense as the preceding. And the words may be thus rendered from Tittm.: *Hic est ille, quem indigitavi, cum dicerem, me sequitur, qui ante extitit, neque prior est.*" If the latter, (which is the mode adopted by the ancient and early modern Expositors, and also Lampe,) the words will express this sense: "This is he of whom I said, He who cometh into the world [or entereth on his office] after me, is become of greater dignity than myself; inasmuch as, by his own Divine nature, he was always before me, more honourable than I." This interpretation seems to deserve the preference, as yielding a sense equally suitable to the context, and more worthy of the Baptist than the other. Of this sense of *ἔμπροσθεν*, somewhat rare in the Scriptural writers, an example occurs in Gen. xlviii. 20.

16 — 13.] It has been disputed whether these verses are from the *Baptist*, or from the *Evangelist*. The former opinion has been adopted by many Interpreters; but (as Tittm. observes) it lies open to the objection, that what is contained in these verses could hardly have been said by John the Baptist of himself, *his own* times, and of his disciples. Lampe and Tittm. are agreed that they are the words of the *Evangelist*; who, in using the term *πληρώματος* (answering to *πλήρης*, which denotes the *sum* of any thing, and also *plenty*) seems to have referred to the expression *πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας* in ver. 14, and meant by it to express the *abundance* of benefits and blessings. Thus ἐκ τοῦ πλήρ. a. may be rendered, "from his rich store-house of benefits and blessings." How these are in Christ, appears from the context, and is fully shown by Tittm. in Recens. Synop. Χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος is a periphrasis of the superlative, like the Hebr. *יח לי יח*, an idiom not unknown to the Greek, ex. gr. Theogn. Admon. 344. *δοῖς ἀντ' ἀνῶν ἀνίας*. Thus the sense is, "benefits upon benefits," abundance of benefits. So Philo i. 354. (cited by Wets.) says the Deity, after giving τὰς πρώτας χάριτας, εἰσαῖθις, ἐτέρας ἀντὶ ἐκείνων, καὶ τρίτας ἀντὶ τῶν δευτέρων, καὶ αἰ νέας ἀντὶ παλαιότερων ἐπιδίδωσιν. This passage was perhaps in the mind of Proclus. Institut. C. p. 131, where he says, that the supreme Deity imparts to the inferior ones, and to men, what he possesses κατὰ τὸ ὑπερπλήθους ἑαυτοῦ. By πάντες are meant all Christians of all times and places. Christ, as Tittm. observes, being the perennial fountain of felicity to the whole human race, of every age.

17. ὅτι ὁ νόμος — ἐγένετο.] In these words

18 ἡ ἀλήθεια διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐγένετο. ¹ Θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακε πώποτε. ¹ Ex. 33. 20. Deut. 4. 12. ὁ μονογενὴς Τίος, ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκείνος ἐξηγήσατο. ¹ infra. 6. 46. I John 4. 12. I Tim. 6. 16. 19 ^m Καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία τοῦ Ἰωάννου, ὅτε ἀπίστειλαν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἐξ Ἱερουσαλὺμων ἱερεῖς καὶ Λευίτας, ἵνα ἐρωτήσωσιν αὐτόν· ¹ Matt. 11. 27. Luke 10. 22. ² Σὺ δαῖτι οἱ ἐξ Ἱερουσαλὺμων ἱερεῖς καὶ Λευίτας, ἵνα ἐρωτήσωσιν αὐτόν· ² infra 3. 29. Acts 13. 25. 20 τίς εἶ; ² Καὶ ὠμολόγησε, καὶ οὐκ ἠρώησατο· καὶ ὠμολόγησεν· ² Oti οὐκ εἰμι ἐγὼ ὁ Χριστός. ³ Καὶ ἠρώητησαν αὐτόν· Τί οὖν; ³ Ἠλίας εἶ σύ; καὶ λέγει· Οὐκ εἰμι. ⁴ Ὁ προφήτης εἶ σύ; καὶ ἀπεκρίθη· 22 Οὐ. ⁵ Ἐἶπον οὖν αὐτῷ· Τίς εἶ; ἵνα ἀποκρισὶν δῶμεν τοῖς πέμψασιν ἡμᾶς· τί λέγεις περὶ σεαυτοῦ; ⁶ Ἐφη· Ἐγὼ φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, εὐθύνατε τὴν ὁδὸν Κυρίου! καθὼς εἶπερ

(which were meant for the Jews at large) are exemplified and illustrated the benefits received from Christ by his disciples; and the grace of the Gospel is opposed to the rigour of the Law. The Law was given as a benefit to the Israelites; yet it was harsh and burdensome; its blessings scanty, and those confined to one nation: whereas the Gospel imparts its blessings, through Christ, copiously to the whole human race. (Kuin.) Ἡ χάρις καὶ ἡ ἀλ. denotes, per hendiadym, ἡ χάρις ἀληθινή, “the true and most excellent grace.” See the contrast in *graciousness* between the Law and the Gospel stated more at large by Wets. Both the above Commentators, however, have omitted to notice what is especially adverted to, — the grace of the *Holy Spirit*, in which the Gospel was so superior to the Law. This χάρις Christians receive from the πλήρωμα of Christ; since to him (as is said at iii. 34.) οὐκ ἐκ μέτρου δίδωσιν ὁ θεὸς τὸ Πνεῦμα. On which subject the reader may profitably consult the 9th, 10th, and 11th chapters of the Dissert. Poster. Harmon. Apost. of Bp. Bull.

18. Θεὸν οὐδεὶς εἶ. π.] This is an illustration of the preceding verse by *example*; and that deduced from the clear knowledge of God communicated by Christ. q. d. [No wonder that the Gospel of Christ should be so superior to the Law of Moses]; for no man hath seen (i. e. perfectly known, learned) God; nor even Moses and the Prophets. So Eccles. xliiii. 31. τίς ἑώρακεν αὐτόν, καὶ ἐκδηγήσαται; This sense of δρᾶν, corresponding to the Hebr. רָאָה is found also in the Classical writers. Thus the passage is by no means in contradiction to Exod. xxxiii. 11, “the Lord spake to Moses face to face.” Besides, there is reason to think that it was Christ, the Logos, who appeared as the JEHOVAH ANGEL on that and other occasions. On this important point see Bp. Bull. p. 274. sqq. of his matchless Defensio Fidei Nicænæ.

— ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τ. Π.] Lampe, in a dissertation on these words, has proved that more is denoted, than what the expression means in the Classical writers, namely, participation in any one’s counsels, — and he lays down the sense as follows: “He who is most intimately connected with the Father, and the dearest to Him.” The expression arose from the custom, common to all the ancient nations, of reclining at meals; according to which he who sat next the host (who was at the top of the table) seemed, as it were, to lie in his bosom or lap.

— ἐξηγήσατο] Sub. Θεόν; has distinctly disclosed his nature, attributes, and will. There may be — Wets. thinks there is — reference to the ἐξηγηταί,

or interpreters of the portents, and directors of religious ceremonies among the Greeks.

19. καὶ αὕτη ἡ μαρτ.] q. d. and this testimony which I have just adduced was borne on the occasion following.

— οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἐξ Ἱερ.] “the Jews of Jerusalem;” meaning those who are elsewhere called οἱ ἀρχοντες τῶν Ἰουδαίων, had the authority of making inquiry into the pretensions of prophets; namely, the Sanhedrim. There is no reason to suppose, with some, that the Evangelist has not given the whole address; for the τίς in the question evidently refers to the kind of prophetic character claimed by John; which implied an inquiry, 1. whether he was the Christ; 2. whether he was Elias. The form σὺ τίς εἶ was (it appears from Wetstein’s citations) not unusual, as addressed by those who demanded to know any one’s authority to act in any business. Though the Sanhedrim knew that John’s ancestry did not accord with that which had been predicted of Christ; yet, when they bore in mind what had happened to Zacharias in the temple, and that his mother was of the lineage of David, they might think it possible that he was the Messiah; especially as it was not absolutely determined among the doctors whether Christ was to be born at Bethlehem or not.

— ὠμολόγησε — καὶ ὠμολόγησεν] These words contain the strongest *assereration* possible; since the two methods, assertion by affirmation and by negation of the contrary, together with a repetition of the affirmation, are here united.

21. τί οὖν] A popular form of expression, for τίς οὖν, yet sometimes found in the best writers. Ἠλίας εἶ σύ; the Jews supposed, from Malachi iv. 5, that Elijah would return from heaven, whither he had been caught up, and would usher in and anoint the Messiah.

— οὐκ εἰμι.] i. e. not in the sense in which the question was asked; though in another sense he might be called Elias, as he came in the spirit and power of Elias. See Matt. xi. 14.

— ὁ προφήτης εἶ σύ;] It is plain that this cannot mean Elijah, since that would involve a vain repetition. The Article shows that it must denote some particular prophet. The best Commentators, ancient and modern, are of opinion that *Jeremioh* is meant, thus the sense will be, “the prophet promised,” namely, in Deut. xviii. 15 — 19. See Acts iii. 22.

22. τίς εἶ;] i. e. what sort of person art thou, whether a prophet or not?

23. ἐγὼ φωνή, &c.] i. e. as the older Commentators interpret, “I am the person there spoken of;” or, as the later ones, “What the Prophet (namely, Isaiah iv. 3.) there says, holds good of

Ἰσαΐας ὁ προφήτης. Καὶ οἱ ἀπεσταλμένοι ἦσαν ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων· 24
 q Deut. 18. 15. q καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν, καὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ· Τί οὖν βαπτίζεις, εἰ σὺ οὐκ 25
 r Matt. 3. 11. Mark 1. 7. Luke 3. 16. Acts 1. 5. & 11. 16. & 19. 4. εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς, οὔτε Ἰλλίας, οὔτε ὁ προφήτης; Ἰ ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς ὁ 26
 Ἰωάννης, λέγων· Ἐγὼ βαπτίζω ἐν ὕδατι· μέσος δὲ ὑμῶν ἕστηκεν, ὃν
 ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε. Αὐτὸς ἐστὶν ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος, ὃς ἔμπροσθέν 27
 μου γέγονεν· οὗ ἔγὼ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἄξιος ἵνα λύσω αὐτοῦ τὸν ἱμάντα τοῦ
 ὑποδήματος. Ταῦτα ἐν * Βηθανίᾳ ἐγένετο πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, ὅπου 28
 ἦν Ἰωάννης βαπτίζων.
 * Τῇ ἐπιούριον βλέπει ὁ Ἰωάννης, τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐρχόμενον πρὸς αὐτὸν, 29
 καὶ λέγει· Ἴδε ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ ὁ αἴρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου.

me; you will find there, what will be a sufficient description of my person and office."

25. τὶ οὖν βαπτίζεις, &c.] The Pharisees (such as these persons were) thought that the power of baptizing Jews, and thereby forming a new Religion, was confined to the Messiah and his precursors the Prophets; who, they supposed, would return to life for that purpose. The subject of the nature and lawfulness of John's baptism is elaborately treated on in a Dissertation of Danzius on the baptism of Proselytes, inserted in Meuschen's Nov. Test. ex Talm. ill. From which the most important passages are translated and introduced in Mr. Townsend's Chron. Arr. N. T., Vol. i. 107. seqq.

26. ἐγὼ βαπτίζω, &c.] The sense of the answer is: "I only baptize with water, and collect followers for the Messiah, from whom a very different and much more powerful baptism may be expected; even a far more effective means of purifying the people. Moreover, He whom you require (i. e. the Messiah), and by whose authority I do this, is among you."

28. Βηθανία] This reading (instead of the common reading Βηθαβάρη) is found in almost all the best MSS., every Version of credit, many Fathers and ancient Commentators, and almost all the early Editions; and was restored to the text by Wets., Matth., Griesb., Knapp, Vater, Tittm., and Scholz, who are of opinion, that the common reading proceeded from a mere conjecture of Origen; who, because the situation here does not correspond with that of Bethany, where Lazarus and his sisters lived, made the change in question, forgetting that there are in all countries many places of the same name. So in Judæa, Bethsaida, Bethlehem, and Emmaus: and Bethany, from its signification (namely, a ferry-place or passage), was very likely to be one. Besides, this seems meant to be distinguished from the other Bethany by the addition πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, which, I apprehend, denotes on the opposite bank of the Jordan: for we may be sure it was on the river-side. The meaning of the name Bethabara is almost exactly the same with that of Bethany. Inasmuch that many learned men (as Schleus.) are of opinion that Bethabara and Bethany were only two different names for the same place; which is very probable. We need not, however, suppose, with Schleus., that the place, in the age of Christ, was called Bethany, and in a later one, Bethabara. It should rather seem that Bethabara is the more ancient name. And if, as there is great reason to think, Bethabara here is the same with the Bethabara of Judges vii. 24, what Schl. says could not be the case. The difficulty, however,

may be removed by supposing that Bethabara was the original name of the place; but that in the time of Christ it was usually called Bethania, as better designating its situation; the original crossing being by ford, having now been changed to that by ferry; yet that, notwithstanding this, the old name (of which many examples might be adduced) still continued in use, probably among the common people, who are always averse to such changes of names. Inasmuch that in the time of Origen, it seems to have been commonly called Bethabara. For he says: Δείκνυσθαι δὲ λέγοναι παρὰ τῇ ὄχθῃ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου τὰ Βηθαβάρη, ἐνθα ἱστοροῦσι τὸν Ἰωάννην βεβαπτικέναι. Hence he changed the reading; which others also approved.

29. τῇ ἐπιούριον] This was after the baptism of Jesus: but the expression refers not to the baptism, but to the mission of the priests and Levites.

— Ἴδε ὁ ἀμνὸς — κόσμου] In order to rightly understand these words, we must observe, that as often as in Scripture the name Lamb is applied to Christ, so often the subject of what is spoken is his death and passion; inasmuch as he underwent it for men. And in this view John the Baptist considered Jesus, when he called him lamb, namely, as suffering and dying like a victim. It is clear that he meant to represent our Lord as one dying, and that in the place of others. For he has subjoined the words ὁ αἴρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου, by way of explication. Now the phrase αἴρειν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν answers to the Hebr. וְיָרֶם אֶת חַטָּאתוֹ, which never signifies to remove sins, i. e. extirpate iniquity from the earth (as some recent Interpreters suppose), but to forgive sins (as in Gen. 1. 17. Exod. xxxiv. 7. Num. xiv. 19. Ps. xxxii. 1, 5. 1 Sam. xv. 25. xxv. 28.), or to pay the penalties of sin, either one's own, or others; as in Exod. xxviii. 38. Lev. v. 1. x. 17, where are conjoined, as synonymous, the formulas to bear the sin of the people, and expiate and to atone the people with God. Therefore the formula to bear sins signifies to be punished because of sins, to undergo punishment of sins. Furthermore, as to bear one's own sins denotes to be punished for one's own sins, so to bear the sins of others, must mean to be punished for the sins of others, to undergo the punishment which the sins of others have deserved.

Moreover, Christ is said to bear the sin of the whole world; and therefore the interpretation above mentioned can have no place. / It must be observed, too, that there is in these formulas a manifest allusion to, and comparison with a placular victim. For such a victim was solemnly

- 30 Ὁὐτός ἐστι περὶ οὗ ἐγὼ εἶπον· Ὅπισθ' μου ἔρχεται ἄνθρωπος, ὃς ἔμφο-^{t Supra ver. 15.}
- 31 σθέν μου γέγονεν, οὗ πρωτός μου ἦν. καὶ γὰρ οὐκ ᾔδειν αὐτόν· ἀλλ' ἵνα φανερωθῇ τῷ Ἰσραὴλ, διὰ τοῦτο ἦλθον ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ ὕδατι βαπτίζων.
- 32 Ἔκαι μαρτύρησεν Ἰωάννης, λέγων· Ὅτι τεθέαμαι τὸ Πνεῦμα κατα-^{n Matt. 3. 16. Mark 1. 10. Luke 3. 21. x Matt. 3. 11. Acts 1. 5.}
- 33 βαῖνον ὡσεὶ περιστεράν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ ἔμεινεν ἐπ' αὐτόν. Ἐγὼ οὐκ ᾔδειν αὐτόν· ἀλλ' ὃ πέμψας με βαπτίζειν ἐν ὕδατι, ἐκείνος μοι εἶπεν· Ἐφ' ὃν ἂν ἴδῃς τὸ Πνεῦμα καταβαῖνον καὶ μένον ἐπ' αὐτόν,
- 34 οὗτός ἐστιν ὃ βαπτίζων ἐν Πνεύματι ἁγίῳ. Καὶ γὰρ ἰώρακα, καὶ μαρτύρηκα ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ.
- 35 Τῇ ἐπιούριον πάλιν εἰστήκει [ὁ Ἰωάννης,] καὶ ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν ἀν-^{y Supra ver. 29.}
- 36 τοῦ δύο. καὶ ἐμβλέψας τῷ Ἰησοῦ περιπατοῦντι, λέγει· Ἴδε ὁ ἄμνος τοῦ Θεοῦ. Καὶ ἤκουσαν αὐτοῦ οἱ δύο μαθηταὶ λαλοῦντος, καὶ ἤκολούθησαν τῷ Ἰησοῦ. Στραφεῖς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ θαυμάσιμος αὐτοῦς ἀκούσας, λέγει αὐτοῖς· Τί ζητεῖτε; οἱ δὲ εἶπον αὐτῷ· Ῥαββί, (ὃ λέγεται ἐρηρηνόμενον διδάσκαλε) ποῦ μένεις; λέγει αὐτοῖς· Ἐρχεσθε καὶ ἴδετε. Ἦλθον καὶ εἶδον ποῦ μένει· καὶ παρ' αὐτῷ

brought to the altar, and then the Priest put his hands over the head; which was a *symbolical action*, signifying that the sins committed by the persons expiated were *laid upon the victim*; and, when it was slaughtered, it was then said to *bear* the sins of the expiated; by which it was denoted that the victim paid the penalty of the sins committed, was punished with death in their place, and for the purpose of freeing them from the penalty of sin. Therefore when Christ is called *the lamb bearing* the sins of the world, it is manifest that we must understand one who should take upon himself the sins of men, so as to pay the penalties of their sins, and in their stead, for the purpose of freeing them from those penalties. (Tittm.) On this passage see Recens. Synop., the admirable work of Abp. Magee on the Atonement, and the authors by him referred to. Examine also the Marginal References in Scott's Bible. On the deeply important subject here treated of, I cannot express my sentiments better than in the words of Mr. Townsend, Chron. Arr. i. 103. "In support of the doctrine of the Atonement there is more authority than for any other revealed in the Jewish or Christian Scriptures. It was taught in the beginning of the patriarchal dispensation, the first after the fall, in the words of the promise, and in the institution of sacrifices. It is enforced by the uniform concurrent testimony of the types, prophecies, opinions, customs, and traditions of the Jewish Church. It is the peculiar foundation and principal doctrine of the Christian Church in all ages, which has never deviated from the opinion that the death of Christ on the cross was the full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world."

30—34. John now mentions *how* he obtained this knowledge, that Jesus was the Messiah; namely, by an express revelation from God. Up to the period of his baptism our Lord (such was his humility of deportment) had passed for a mere man. He was first made known as *Messiah* by John at his baptism, and through him to the multitude. Whether John had before any knowledge of Jesus by face, is variously disputed. Certain

it is that he did not know him to be *the Messiah*. That knowledge he obtained by a Divine revelation, which had given him the *sign* whereby he should recognise the Messiah; namely, the descent of the Holy Spirit, in symbolic figure, upon him. That sign he saw in Jesus, and was therefore sure he was that personage.

Moreover, when it is said, I knew him not [as Messiah], this is not contradictory to the passage of Matt. iii. 14.; for, as Mr. Holden observes, John might have declined the office of baptizing Jesus in consequence of knowing his superior wisdom and sanctity, and perhaps from his believing him a prophet; and yet might not have known him to be the Messiah. All that is here affirmed being, that John was ignorant of the *true* character of Jesus till the time of his baptism. The words ἀλλ' ἵνα φανερωθῇ &c. should be rendered: "But to the end that he should be made manifest to Israel, am I come baptizing with water." It is not said that this was the *sole*, but only that it was the *chief* end.

34. μαρτύρηκα.] This is thought to be Preter. for Pres. but the sense is, "have borne, and do bear witness."

35. τῇ ἐπιούριον.] Namely, two days after the mission of the Priests and Levites. See v. 29.

— εἰστήκει] "was standing," i. e. was there. Ὁ Ἰωάννης is omitted in many MSS., Versions, and Fathers, and is cancelled by Matth., Vat., Tittm., Griesb., and Scholz.

39. τί ζητεῖτε;] A popular form of expression, signifying, "What is your business with me?"

— ποῦ μένεις] "where dwellest thou?" *Μένειν* is used either of a *fixed habitation*, or a *lodging*, as here, and in Luke xix. 5. xxiv. 29. Acts xviii. 3 and 20., and often in the Sept., and sometimes in the Classical writers. So also *manere*, in the Latin. By calling Jesus διδάσκαλε they showed that they sought *instruction*; and by addressing to him the question ποῦ μένεις, they requested *private conversation*; no doubt, on the great doctrine which then occupied the minds of all reflecting Jews.

40. ἔρχεσθε καὶ ἴδε.] The most correct view of

- z Matt. 4. 18. ἔμειναν τὴν ἡμέραν ἐκείνην· ὥρα [δὲ] ἦν ὡς δεκάτη. ^z Ἦν Ἀνδρέας, 41 ὁ ἀδελφὸς Σίμωνος Πέτρου, εἰς ἐκ τῶν δύο τῶν ἀκουσάντων παρὰ Ἰωάννου καὶ ἀκολουθησάντων αὐτῷ. Εὐρίσκει οὗτος πρῶτος τὸν ἀδελφὸν τὸν ἴδιον Σίμωνα, καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· Εὐρήκαμεν τὸν Μεσσίαν, (ὁ
- a Matt. 16. 18. ἐστὶ μεθερμηνεύμενον [ὁ] Χριστός.) ^a καὶ ἤγαγεν αὐτὸν πρὸς τὸν 43 Ἰησοῦν. ἐμβλέψας δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπε· Σὺ εἶ Σίμων ὁ υἱὸς Ἰωνᾶ· σὺ κληθήσῃ Κηφᾶς· (ὁ ἐρμηνεύεται Πέτρος.)
- Τῇ ἐπαύριον ἠθέλησεν [ὁ Ἰησοῦς] ἐξελεῖθαι εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν· καὶ 44 εὐρίσκει Φίλιππον, καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· Ἀκολούθει μοι. ^b ἦν δὲ ὁ Φίλιππος 45 πρὸς ἀπὸ Βηθσαϊδά, ἐκ τῆς πόλεως Ἀνδρείου καὶ Πέτρου. ^c Εὐρίσκει 46 Φίλιππος τὸν Ναθαναήλ, καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· Ὅν ἐγραψε Μωϋσῆς ἐν τῷ νόμῳ καὶ οἱ προφηταί, εὐρήκαμεν, Ἰησοῦν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Ἰωσήφ τὸν ἀπὸ Ναζαρέτ. ^d Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ναθαναήλ· Ἐκ Ναζαρέτ δύναται 47 τι ἀγαθὸν εἶναι; Λέγει αὐτῷ Φίλιππος· Ἐρχου καὶ ἴδε. ^e Εἶδεν ὁ 48 Ἰησοῦς τὸν Ναθαναήλ ἐρχόμενον πρὸς αὐτὸν, καὶ λέγει περὶ αὐτοῦ· Ἴδε, ἀληθῶς Ἰσραηλίτης, ἐν ᾧ δόλος οὐκ ἔστι. Λέγει αὐτῷ Ναθαναήλ· 49 Ἰπόθεν με γινώσκεις; ἀπεκρίθη [ὁ] Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Πρὸ τοῦ σε Φίλιππον φωνῆσαι, ὅγτα ὑπὸ τὴν συκῆν εἶδόν σε. Ἀπεκρίθη 50 Ναθαναήλ καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· Ραββί, σὺ εἶ ὁ Πῖος τοῦ Θεοῦ, σὺ εἶ ὁ
- b John 12. 21.
- c Infra. 21. 2. Gen. 3. 15. & 22. 18. & 49. 10. Deut. 18. 15. 2 Sam. 7. 12. Isa. 7. 14. & 40. 10, 11. & 53. 1, &c. Jer. 23. 5. & 33. 14. Ezek. 34. 23. & 37. 24. Dan. 9. 24. Mich. 5. 2. Zach. 6. 12. & 9. 9. d Matt. 2. 23. Luke 2. 4. infra 7. 41, 42. e Psal. 32. 2.

the scope of this reply, seems to be that taken by Euthym.; who says that our Lord did not tell them where he abode; but bade them follow him, to inspire them with confidence. Of these disciples one, we learn, was Andrew. The other is generally supposed to have been the Evangelist himself, who usually suppresses his own name: (See xiii. 23. xviii. 15. xix. 26.) but Epiphanius says John or James.

— ὥρα δὲ ἦν.] The *ὁ* is omitted in most of the ancient MSS. and the early Edd., and is cancelled by almost every Editor from Beng. and Wets. to Scholz.

41 — 43. On the seeming discrepancy here between the Evangelists, see Recens. Syn.

42. ἀδελφὸν τὸν ἴδιον] for ἀδ. αὐτοῦ (like the Heb.) "his brother." An idiom frequent both in the N. T. and LXX.

— Μεσσίαν, &c.] When a significant name (such as Peter, Thomas, or Tabitha) was given to any one, it was usual to translate it, when the person was spoken of in a different language. The Evangelist here follows this custom, both to explain the import of the names *Messiah* and *Cephas* (which the Gentile converts of Asia Minor were not likely to understand) and to prevent his readers from mistaking the persons spoken of for some other persons.

44. ὁ Ἰησοῦς.] Very many MSS., Versions, and Fathers omit the *ὁ* 'I. here, but insert it after λέγει; and so Griesb., Matth., and Scholz edit, perhaps rightly.

— ἀκολουθεῖ μοι.] A form of speaking equivalent to "become my disciples," and sometimes used by the Grecian Philosophers.

46. Ναθαναήλ.] This is supposed to have been the same with the *Bartholomew* mentioned by Matthew; that being a *surname*, as is plain by the occurrence of the name *Θοδομαῖος* twice in Josephus, namely, Antiq. xiv. 8. 1. and Bell. i. 9. 3. It therefore means *Son of Θεοῦ*. or *μητηρ*. Various

reasons are there for the above supposition. And 1. that all the rest of John's followers mentioned in the chapter were received into the number of the Apostles; 2. since John nowhere makes mention of Bartholomew, nor the rest of the Evangelists of Nathanael; 3. since Luke vi. 14, in his list of the Apostles, puts Bartholomew after Philip, with whom Nathanael was converted.

47. ἐκ Ναζαρέτ — ἀγαθὸν εἶναι] i. e. τίνα ἀγαθόν; it seemed little probable to Nathanael that a *good man*, much less a *prophet*, and least of all the *Messiah*, could come out of *Galilee*, still less from Nazareth, which was but a mean country town, whose inhabitants, as indeed all the Galilæans, were held in contempt by the Jews; the cause for which has been attributed to their being a mixed race, partly of Gentile origin, very corrupt in their morals, and reckoned boorish and stupid, even to a proverb.

— ἔρχου καὶ ἴδε.] A formula equivalent to *Judge for yourself*; *Seeing is believing*.

48. ἀληθῶς.] for ἀληθῆς. A common permutation. The appellation *true Israelite* (denoting one who imitates the virtues of the Patriarch Israel, see Rom. ix. 6.) was given among the Jews to persons remarkable for probity. In the words ἐν ᾧ δόλος οὐκ ἔστι there is thought to be a reference to what is said of Jacob in Gen. xxv. 27. But it seems rather to have been a phrase borrowed from Ps. xxxii. 2. xiv. 3. (compare 1 Pet. ii. 22.) to designate one who is *integer viua scelerisque purus*, a man of thorough integrity, whose profession of religion is not leavened with hypocrisy, one of undoubted integrity towards men, and unfeigned piety towards God; in short, the character of whom a great poet has said—

"An honest man's the noblest work of God."

50. Nathanael, in his answer, seems to hint that Jesus had been *informed* of his character by his friends. In order, therefore, to remove this

51 βασιλεὺς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ. Ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Ὅτι εἶπόν σοι· Εἰδὼν σε ὑποκάτω τῆς συκῆς, πιστεύεις; μεῖζω τούτων ὄφει.

52 Καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἅπ' ἄρτι, ὄψεσθε τὸν υἱὸν ἀνεμφοῦτα, καὶ τοὺς ἀγγέλους τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀναβαίνοντας καὶ καταβαίνοντας ἐπὶ τὸν Πῶν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

f Gen. 28. 12.
Matt. 4. 11.
Luke 22. 43.
& 24. 4.
Acts 1. 10.

1 II. ΚΑΙ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ γάμος ἐγένετο ἐν Κανῆ τῆς Γαλιλαίας· καὶ ἦν ἡ μήτηρ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐκεῖ. ἐκλήθη δὲ καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν γάμον. Καὶ ὑστερήσαντος οἴνου, λέγει ἡ μήτηρ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ πρὸς αὐτόν· Οἶνον οὐκ ἔχουσι. Λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰη-

supposition, and show Nathanael that he knew him not from the information of Philip, or any other person, but from his own knowledge, our Lord mentions what none could know but Philip and Nathanael: *Ἰδὼν τοῦ σε Φίλιππον φωνῆσαι, ὄντα ὑπὸ τὴν συκῆν, εἰδὼν σε.* Now this circumstance of *sitting under the fig-tree*, Chrysost. and Theophyl., with the best modern Commentators, well illustrate by supposing that Philip had found Nathanael under a certain fig-tree; and had then, as often before, conversed with him about Christ; and that now our Lord mentions this in order to evince his divine power. And no wonder: for there had been a conversation of only two, nor was there any one present who could tell what had passed at it. Thus a conversation was alluded to, held at some time previous, and in a particular place, identifying it, and distinguishing it from any other. A proof this of supernatural knowledge, and consequently of a Divine commission. Hence Nathanael, from this display of superhuman knowledge, even of the secrets of the heart, could not but recognise a divine virtue in Jesus. (Tittm.) That conversation, meditation, and even prayer, was carried on under fig-trees, is proved by the Rabbinical citations of Lightf. and Schoettg.

— ὁ Ἰδὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ.] By this it is plain Nathanael meant the *Messiah*. And from the term just after, “King of Israel,” it is as plain that he thought only of an *earthly* kingdom. Our Lord, however, encourages his faith, imperfect as it was, in the words following, “Dost thou believe,” &c.

51, 52. πιστεύεις — Ἰδὼν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.] On the scope of this assurance the Commentators differ; some recognising *reproof*; others, *praise*; which latter view seems best founded. “Our Lord (says Tittm.) at once *commends* and *exhorts*.” With respect to the words ἀπ’ ἄρτι — Ἰδὼν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, the Commentators are not agreed whether they should be taken *literally*, to signify such angelic manifestations as those recorded at Matt. iv. 11. xviii. 2. Lu. ii. 9, 13, 22, and 43. Acts i. 10.; or *figuratively*, in the sense, henceforth “you will see me enjoy the especial providence and signal defence of the Almighty; you will see far *greater* works than this, even mighty *miracles* wrought by me; so as to leave no doubt of my *Messiahship*.” The former view is adopted by the ancient and the earlier modern Commentators: the latter, by those of after times, and especially the recent Interpreters; and it seems, upon the whole, to deserve the preference. Yet the literal sense need not be *excluded*; nor is it without reason that most of the older Commentators suppose an allusion to Jacob’s vision, Gen. xviii. 12. Thus the meaning seems to be, that they should henceforward see such a series of *miracles* wrought by Christ, in the course of his

ministry, that it should seem as if heaven were opened, and the angels of God were continually (as they appeared in vision to Jacob) ascending and descending upon the Son of Man; hinting that in the Gospel dispensation now commenced, should be fulfilled the blessings which had been *figuratively* represented by that vision.

II. 1. τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ] i. e. on the third day after Christ’s arrival in Galilee from Bethany. Γάμος here denotes a *marriage-feast*.

2. ἐκλήθη.] On what ground, whether of *relationship*, or of *acquaintance*, Jesus was invited, is variously conjectured. It is most probable that the bride or bridegroom, or both, were related to his mother, Mary, who, it is supposed, had been *προμνηστρα*, or *νυμφαγωγὸς*, and had been already there making arrangements for the feast, since it is plain that she had the chief direction therein. The house is conjectured to have been that of Alphens or Clopas, who married the sister of Jesus’ mother.

3. οἶνον οὐκ ἔχουσι] equivalent to *υστερεῖ ὀίνος*; the wine is “falling short.” Comp. Gen. xliii. 2. This might very well happen without supposing any excess on the part of the guests; since these festivities lasted a considerable, though not any certain number of days. Besides, Jesus and his disciples were probably not calculated on when the wine was provided; and more than were expected might be attracted to the company by the fame of our Lord. With what intent Mary addressed our Lord, the commentators are not agreed. Some suppose she meant to hint that it was time to depart: and our Lord’s answer, they think, imports that it was not yet time to go. That, however, yields a very frigid sense, and supposes something enigmatical in the words: which were no doubt meant to intimate the inability of the host to provide a further supply of wine. And, from the *poverty* of our Lord, it is not probable (as some imagine) that this could be a *hint* to him to provide a supply. It seems best to suppose, (with Chrysost., and almost all the earlier modern Commentators,) that Mary had a view to the removal of the want by *miracle*. Indeed, considering the wonderful circumstances of her son’s birth and childhood, and the recent testimony to his Divine mission by John the Baptist, she was warranted in that expectation. Thus the words may be considered as a hint that it would be proper to commence his Ministry, and prove his Divine mission by a miracle, which should unite a benefit to her friend, together with a manifestation of his own Divine power. Her directions to the servants plainly evince the above expectation. Though that our Lord had been accustomed to work miracles in private, for the

12094
 5 οὐκ ἔμοι καὶ σοὶ, γίναι; οὐπω ἦκει ἡ ὥρα μου. λέγει ἡ μή- 5
 g Mark 7. 3. 7η αὐτοῦ τοῖς διακόνοις· Ὁ τι ἂν λέγῃ ὑμῖν, ποιήσατε. Ἐἶπον δὲ 6
 ἐκεῖ ὑδρίαὶ λίθιναι ἕξ κείμεναι, κατὰ τὸν καθαρισμόν τῶν Ἰουδαίων,
 7 χωροῦσαι ἀνά μετρητάς δύο ἢ τρεῖς. λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Γεμί- 7
 8 σατε τὰς ὑδρίας ὕδατος· καὶ ἐγέμισαν αὐτὰς ἕως ἄνω. Καὶ λέγει 8
 αὐτοῖς· Ἀντλήσατε νῦν καὶ φέρετε τῷ ἀρχιτρικλίνῳ· καὶ ἤνεγκαν.
 Ὡς δὲ ἐγένεσθαι ὁ ἀρχιτρικλίνος τὸ ὕδωρ οἶνον γεγεννημένον, (καὶ οὐκ 9
 ἦδει πόθεν ἐστίν· οἱ δὲ διάκονοι ἤδεισαν οἱ ἠντιληκότες τὸ ὕδωρ)
 φωνεῖ τὸν νυμφίον ὁ ἀρχιτρικλίνος, καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· Πῶς ἄνθρωπος 10
 πρῶτον τὸν καλὸν οἶνον τίθησι, καὶ ὅταν μεθυσθῶσι, τότε τὸν ἐλάσσω·

support or comfort of his mother (as some imagine), is inconsistent with ver. 11., unless the words there be taken somewhat violently, of public miracles.

4. *τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοὶ, γίναι;*] These words cannot import (as some Commentators suppose) *strong reprehension*. For that would seem unmerited by the address preceding. As far as the opinion rests on the *γίναι*, it is utterly unfounded; since this was a form of address used even to the most dignified persons; and employed by Jesus to his mother on the most affecting of all occasions. As to the other words, *τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοὶ*, they are a formula taken from the language of common life; and must be interpreted according to the occasion and the circumstances of the case. It usually denotes impatience of interference, signifying, "What hast thou to do with me?" as appears from numerous passages, both of the Scriptural and Classical writers, adduced by Wets. and others. This would seem to be the sense here; though it was probably modified by the tone of voice, and softened into a mild rebuke for interfering with him in a matter where her parental claim to respect could have no authority over him.

The words following *οὐπω — μου* evidently mean, "The right time for my doing what you suggest, is not yet come;" which implied that *he* alone was the proper judge of that season, and would seize it when it arrived; thus mixing comfort with mild reproof. The time seems to have been when the wine was quite exhausted, and thus the reality of the miracle would be undoubted.

6. *ὑδρίαὶ*] i. e. water vats, or butts for domestic purposes, and the various washings prescribed by the Jewish Law. See Luke xi. 39.

— *κατὰ τὸν καθ.*] *Κατὰ* here signifies *propter*, for the purpose of; a very rare sense, for which the Classical writers use *πρός*. Thus, in a kindred passage of Plutarch, which I have adduced in *Recens. Synop.* *Κατὰ τὴν πολλοὶ παρήσαν ἀγυαί, πρὸς τὸ λουτρὸν ὕδατος, ἐπὶ χειρῶν ἔχοντες.*

— *ἀνά μετρ.*] On the exact quantity designated by the *μετρητῆς* Commentators and Antiquaries are not agreed. For the term may designate the Heb. *בַּר*, to which it answers in the LXX., i. e. a measure containing $7\frac{1}{2}$ gallons; or the *Attic measure Metretes*, consisting of 9 gallons. See *Eisenschmid* de pond. et mens. iv. 2. The latter is the more probable; though, even according to the former, the quantity of liquor has been evailed at by sceptics. But the largeness of the quantity would be *requisite* in order to place the miracle beyond dispute. Nor can the quantity be thought enormous for many days' consumption

of such a number of guests as had assembled; to which *more* would now be added by the fame of the miracle, and from curiosity to see the worker of it. Not to say that we need not suppose *all* the wine to be consumed. The surplus, if any, would be acceptable to the newly married couple.

7. *γεμίσατε — ἕως ἄνω.*] These circumstances are *not*, as some fancy, too *minute* to be worthy of introduction. They are mentioned to evince the *truth* and *magnitude* of the miracle; as in that worked by Elijah, 1 Kings xviii. 33—35., the Prophet in like manner exclaims, "Fill four barrels with water, and pour it," &c. "Do it the second time—Do it the third time." The words were, no doubt, pronounced, and the thing done, *publicly*. The order to fill them, which was fully obeyed, rendered all collusion, by procuring and introducing of the wine, impossible. That what the guests saw as water was become wine, was likewise evinced in the plainest manner.

8. *ἀρχιτρικλίνῳ*] "the director of the feast," i. e. a person (not one of the guests) who was appointed to superintend the preparations for, and management of, a feast; examining the provisions and liquor brought forward, and passing among the guests to see that they were in want of nothing, and giving the necessary orders to the servants. (See *Ecclus.* xxxii. 1.) This *ἀρχιτρικλίνος* is to be distinguished from the *συμποσιαρχῆς*, *βασιλεύς*, or *στρατηγός*, of the Greeks, and the *moderator*, *arbiter*, *rex convivii*, of the Romans. This latter was one of the *guests*, chosen sometimes by lot, who presided at the table, and prescribed rules in regard to drinking, &c. (*Wahl*) *Walch*, *Lampe*, and *Kuin*, say, that the *Architriclinus* was a *domestic*. Indeed, if he was the same with the *Triclinarches* of the Romans, *he was* such. A decisive proof, however, is that *Juvenus*, in his *Hist. Evang.*, terms the *Architriclinus* a *summus minister*. The wine was, as usual, handed to the *Architriclinus*, in order that he might taste, and see if it were worthy of being set before the company.

10. *πᾶς ἄνθρωπος — τίθησι.*] This denotes what *it was customary* to do: which is illustrated by the Classical citations in *Wets.* *Μεθεῖν* is from *μεθεῖν*, (probably derived from the Northern word *Med* or *Meth*) and signifies to moisten, or be moistened with liquor, and in a figurative sense (like the Latin *madere vino*) to be saturated with drink. In *Classical* use it generally, but not always implies intoxication. *One* exception I have myself adduced in *Recens. Synop.* from *Aristot.* ap. *Stob. Phys.* ii. 312. where the wise man is permitted *μεθυσθῆσθαι κατὰ συμπεριφορῆς*. So also *Plutarch Alex.* 69. (a passage very similar to *Gen*

11 οὐ τετήρηκας τὸν καλὸν οἶνον ἕως ἄρτι. Ταύτην ἐποίησε τὴν ἀρχὴν τῶν σημείων ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν Κανᾷ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, καὶ ἐφανέρωσε τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ.

12 Μετὰ τοῦτο κατέβη εἰς Καπερναοῦμ, αὐτὸς καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ, καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἐκεῖ ἔμειναν οὐ πολλὰς

13 ἡμέρας. Καὶ ἐγγὺς ἦν τὸ πάσχα τῶν Ἰουδαίων, καὶ ἀνέβη εἰς Ἱεροσό-

14 λυμα ὁ Ἰησοῦς. ^{h Matt. 21. 12. Mark 11. 15. Luke 19. 45.} καὶ εὔρεν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τοὺς πωλοῦντας βόας καὶ

15 πρόβατα καὶ περιστερεῖς, καὶ τοὺς κερμαιστὰς καθήμενους. Καὶ ποιήσας φραγέλλιον ἐκ σχοινίων, πάντας ἐξέβαλεν ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ, τὰ τε πρό-

xliii. 34.) and Menander ap. Athen. p. 364. In the Hellenistic writers, however, as Joseph., Philo, and the LXX., it (like the Heb. רָצַח) very often only denotes drinking freely, and the hilarity consequent. So in Gen. xliii. 34. it is used of Joseph's brethren. Of the Commentators some adopt the former, some the latter sense. It should seem not very necessary to confine ourselves to either; since the Architrictinus is not speaking of the guests present, but only makes a general observation as to what was usual. Τὸν ἐλάσσω, literally, minus nobile, less [good.]

— οὐ τετήρηκας τὸν καλὸν ο. ἕ. ἄ.] To preclude the suspicion that their taste was vitiated, through excessive drinking, so as not to know water from wine, Jesus orders it first to be carried to the governor of the feast, who must have been sober; for those who were entrusted with this office were obliged to observe the strictest sobriety, that they might be able properly to direct the whole business of the entertainment.

11. τῶν σημείων.] Σμῆτιον properly denotes 1. a mark, seal, or token, by which any thing is known to be what it is, and distinguished from something else; 2. a pledge or assurance, taken in evidence; 3. a miraculous sign, A MIRACLE, either 1. in confirmation of the Divine power or legation of the worker of it; or 2. a miracle simply; in which case it is either joined with τέρας, or stands by itself. A miracle may be defined, with Farmer and Dr. Maltby, "Every sensible deviation from, and every seeming contradiction to, the laws of nature, so far as they are known to us. By thus expressing myself (says Dr. Maltby), I would guard against an objection which has been made to the language employed by some advocates, as well as enemies, of Christianity, when they represent miracles as violations of the laws of nature." Dr. Brown, a profound metaphysician, and the successor of the celebrated Dugald Stewart, contends that miracles à priori, are possible; that they are not violations of the laws of nature, and are capable, under certain circumstances, of being made credible by testimony. "The possibility (says Dr. Brown), of the occasional direct operation of the power which formed the world, in varying the usual course of its events, it would be in the highest degree unphilosophical to deny; nor can we presume to estimate the degree of its probability. The laws of nature, surely, are not violated when a new antecedent is followed by a new consequent; they are violated only when the antecedent, being exactly the same, a different consequent is the result. A miracle is not a violation of any law of nature. It involves, therefore, primarily, no contradiction, nor physical absurdity. It has nothing in it which is inconsistent

with our belief of the most undeviating uniformity of nature; for it is not the sequence of a different event, when the preceding circumstances have been the same: it is an effect that is new to our observation, because it is the result of new and peculiar circumstances. The antecedent has been by supposition different; and it is not wonderful, therefore, that the consequent also should be different. While every miracle is to be considered as the result of an extraordinary antecedent; since it flows directly from a higher power than is accustomed to operate in the common train of events which come beneath our view, the sequence which it displays may be regarded, indeed, as out of the common course of nature, but not as contrary to that course." On this whole subject see Horne's Introduction, vol. i. 205—271.

— καὶ ἐπίστευσαν.] The καὶ may be rendered and so, as in Matt. xii. 45. xiii. 22. Luke ix. 39. John x. 11. Acts vii. 10. and sometimes in the Sept.

13. τὸ πάσχα.] The best Commentators, ancient and modern, are generally agreed that St. John mentions four Passovers as occurring during Christ's ministry, of which they reckon this as the 1st; that mentioned at v. 1. the 2d; that at vi. 4. the 3d; and that at which Christ suffered as the 4th. Thus his ministry will extend to three years and a half.

14. εὔρεν — πωλοῦντας.] The best Commentators, ancient and modern, are generally agreed that this circumstance was prior to, and consequently different from the similar one recorded at Matt. xxi. 12. sq. There seems a great propriety in this symbolical action (which denoted the purification of the Jewish Religion) being used both at the beginning and the close of Christ's ministry.

— βόας.] The number of victims of all sorts, (as we learn from Josephus,) sometimes amounted to 2,500,000; and it is certain from the Rabbinical writers, that immense traffic was carried on in cattle, &c. for victims, and much extortion practised; a great part of the profits of which accrued to the Priests. Even at the best, very great indecorum was involved. The κερμ. here are the same with the κολλυβισται at Matt. xxi. 12, changers of small coin.

15. φραγέλλιον ἐκ σχ.]" "a scourge of ropes," or bands made of rushes, &c., such as were used for tying up the cattle. We need not, however, suppose much, if any, use made of the φραγέλλιον, except to serve for a symbolical action. Besides, there was no need of stripes. The traffickers, conscious of the unlawfulness of their proceedings, and struck by the Divine energy of our Lord, would not hesitate to obey his injunctions,

βατα καὶ τοὺς βόους. Καὶ τῶν κολληθιστῶν ἐξέχεε τὸ κέρμα, καὶ τὰς
 τραπέζας ἀνέστρεψε· καὶ τοῖς τὰς περισσεύσας πωλοῦσιν εἶπεν· Ἄρατε 16
 ταῦτα ἐντεῦθεν· μὴ ποιεῖτε τὸν οἶκον τοῦ πατρὸς μου οἶκον ἐμπο-
 ρίου. ἰ Ἐμνήσθησαν δὲ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι γεγραμμένον ἐστίν· 17
 Ὁ ζῆλος τοῦ οἴκου σου † κατέφαγε με. κ Ἀπεκρίθησαν οὖν 18
 οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ· Τί σημεῖον δεικνύεις ἡμῖν, ὅτι ταῦτα
 ποιεῖς; ἠ Ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Ἀύσατε τὸν ναὸν 19
 τοῦτον, καὶ ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις ἐγερῶ αὐτόν. Λῖπον οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι· 20
 Τεσσαράκοντα καὶ ἕξ ἔτισιν ἠκοδομήθη ὁ ναὸς οὗτος· καὶ σὺ ἐν τρι-
 σὶν ἡμέραις ἐγερεῖς αὐτόν; Ἐκεῖνος δὲ ἔλεγε περὶ τοῦ ναοῦ τοῦ σώματος 21
 αὐτοῦ. μ Ὅτε οὖν ἠγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν, ἐμνήσθησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ 22
 ὅτι τοῦτο ἔλεγεν [αὐτοῖς]· καὶ ἐπίστευσαν τῇ γραφῇ καὶ τῷ λόγῳ ᾧ
 εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς. Ὡς δὲ ἦν ἐν Ἱερουσαλὺμοις ἐν τῷ πάσχα ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ, 23
 πολλοὶ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, θεωροῦντες αὐτοῦ τὰ σημεῖα ἃ
 ἐποίει. Αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἐπίστευεν ἑαυτὸν αὐτοῖς, διὰ τὸ αὐτὸν 24
 γινώσκειν πάντως· ἠ καὶ ὅτι οὐ χρεῖαν εἶχεν ἵνα τὶς μαρτυρήσῃ περὶ 25
 τοῦ ἀνθρώπου· αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐγίνωσκε τί ἦν ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ.

i Psal. 69. 9.

k Matt. 12. 38.
& 16. 1.
Mark 8. 11.
Luke 11. 29.
infra. 6. 30.
1 Matt. 26. 61.
& 27. 40.
Mark 14. 58.
& 15. 29.

m Luke 24. 8.

n Intra 6. 64.
Acts 1. 24.
Rev. 2. 23.

especially as the crowd of approving and admiring bystanders would be ready to enforce that obedience.

— κέρμα.] This signifies *small coin*, from κέρω. For the most ancient coins (especially the Oriental) being (like Spanish reals) of a square form, admitted of being *cut*, so as to form the lesser kind of money. Ἐξέχεε is especially suitable to *minute coin*.

— ἀνέστρεψε.] Some would read ἀπέστρεψε, from certain MSS. But though that is more accordant with *Classical usage*, it is, probably, *ex interpretatione*. Ἀναστρέφειν was, it should seem, used in the common dialect for ἀνατρέφειν

17. ὁ ζῆλος — με.] This brought to our Lord's mind the words of Ps. lxxix. 9. Κατέφαγε involves an Oriental and emphatical metaphor, appropriate not only to grief or indignation, (as here,) but to other of the more violent passions, which (in the words of Gray) "inly gnaw the heart." See Job xix. 22, and the *Classical passages* adduced by Lampe and myself in *Recens. Synop.* Ζῆλος τοῦ οἴκου signifies, not zeal of, but zeal for; and the Aorist κατέφαγε signifies *excedere solet*.

For κατέφαγε, καταφάγεται is found in very many ancient MSS. and early Edd., and is adopted by almost all the recent Editors.

19. Ἄρατε τὸν ναὸν τ.] An *acutè dictum*, so uttered to draw the attention of the by-standers; the understanding of which, however, might be aided by *action*; our Lord pointing to his own body, the temple of the Logos. Thus the Hebrews used to call the body *היהוה, סכניו*. See *Note on 2 Cor. v. 1.* Nay, Philo calls it *ναὸς*, or *ἱερόν*, with reference to the dignity of the soul which tenants it. Indeed, *δέμας* and *δομή* (found in the sense of *body* in *Lycophr. Cass. 783.*) both denote a *building*; and St. Paul often speaks of the body of a Christian as being a *temple* of the Holy Spirit. The Imper. has here, as often, a *permissive* sense; q. d. *you may destroy*; which differs little from the *hypothetical* sense, "Be it that you destroy." Our Lord means to say, that

his resurrection from the dead will be the especial sign by which his Divine mission shall be declared.

20. τεσσαράκοντα — οἶκος.] The sense is: "For ty and six years hath this Temple been a building." The use of the Aorist will *permit*, and facts *require* this rendering. For it was then the 46th year since the time when Herod commenced the building. He formed it on a dilapidated one originally erected by *Zorobabel*; using the old materials, and sometimes the old foundations. In consequence of which, and especially as it was raised by parts, the old buildings being gradually pulled down, and new ones erected in their place, so the edifice was still called *Zorobabel's*, and the *second Temple*, nay even *Josephus* so terms it.

22. ἐπίστευσαν τῇ γραφῇ] i. e. by a comparison of those parts of the O. T., which predict the Messiah's rising from the dead, both with *Jesus' words*, and with the *fact* of his resurrection, they thoroughly believed in the inspiration of the Scriptures and the divine mission of Jesus.

23. σημεῖα.] What these were we know not. But from this passage and from *iv. 45.* and *vi. 2.* it is certain that Christ worked many miracles not recorded by the sacred writers.

— ἐπίστευσαν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα α.] Their faith, however, it appears from what follows, was only an external and historical, not an internal and vital one. The understanding was convinced, but the will was not subdued to obedience.

24. οὐκ ἐπίστευεν ἑαυτὸν αὐτοῖς.] Some Commentators take this to mean, "he did not trust his person (i. e. his life and safety) to them." But this is *frigid*; and it is better, with the most eminent Commentators, ancient and modern, to interpret the phrase *figuratively*: "he did not place any implicit confidence in, by imparting his true character as Messiah, — carried himself cautiously and circumspectly towards them." The *complete knowledge* of the hearts of men which is thus ascribed to Christ, is among the other irrefragable proofs of his Divinity; for omniscience is the attribute of *God* alone.

- 1 III. ὁ ἸHN δὲ ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων, Νικόδημος ὄνομα ^{o Infr. 7. 50. & 19. 39.}
- 2 αὐτοῦ, ἄρχων τῶν Ἰουδαίων. Ὁ οὗτος ἦλθε πρὸς * αὐτὸν νυκτὸς, καὶ ^{p infr. 9. 16, 33. Acts 10. 33.}
- εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Ῥαββί, οὐδὲν ὅτι ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ἐλήλυθας διδάσκαλος·
- οὐδὲς γὰρ ταῦτα τὰ σημεῖα δύναται ποιεῖν ἢ σὺ ποιεῖς, ἐάν μὴ ᾗ ὁ
- 3 Θεὸς μετ' αὐτοῦ. ἠ' Ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν ^{q Tit. 3. 5.}

III. We are now advanced to a most important narrative, — in which, as it has a bearing on one of the most important doctrines of the Gospel, more than usual care should be taken to trace the true scope and intent of the Evangelist in recording this conversation, and to ascertain the real import of the phraseology there employed. Now the *intent* of the sacred historian was here, as in all other parts of his Gospel, to set forth the glory of the Lord; and in the present instance particularly it should seem meant to illustrate his *omniscience*. This is a key to the general import of what is narrated. Another important point is the *true character* and *real motives* of Nicodemus, in seeking this interview. That, however, is a subject involved in much obscurity; since we have there no *direct* information from the Evangelist, but are left to collect both one and the other from the narrative itself; which, while it doubtless contains the *substance*, of what was said *by our Lord*, yet probably records but a *part* of what was said, at least, by *Nicodemus*. Hence no little diversity of opinion exists as to the character and motives of this ruler. Some ascribe to him *integrity, candour, and diffidence*; united, however, with *timidity*; and they suppose his motives in seeking this interview to have been of the most honourable kind. Others paint his character in very different colours; ascribing his coming to *pride* cloaked under pretended humility, *craftiness*, and *dissimulation*, subservient to a purpose of treachery. Between these opposite views a middle course will probably conduct us nearest to the truth. We may suppose him to have been a proud, timid, and, in a great degree, worldly-minded man: though, at the same time, it should seem that in his character the good preponderated above the evil; and his motives appear, upon the whole, to have been good. If this Nicodemus was, (as is generally thought,) the Nicodemus of whom so much is said in the Rabbinical writers, we may gather some information that will prove important towards ascertaining his real character and views. He is there described as a man of unbounded wealth, even to a proverb, — of magnificent liberality — of piety the most ardent, — inasmuch that they ascribe to him the working of miracles. His splendid fortune was, however, they say, attended by a reverse almost as great as that of *Job*. If to this we add what we learn from the Evangelist, — his official character, as a Ruler, and his high renown for learning, as the teacher of Israel, — we have the picture complete. Now it is obvious, that a person so circumstanced, — with so much to *lose*, and nothing, in a worldly point of view, to *gain* by any change of religion in the Jewish nation, would be naturally disposed to favour the *present state of things*; and to be tardy in embracing a new religion, and especially one so persecuted and evil spoken of as the Christian. None of his rank in life had hitherto embraced it; and, accordingly, he might think that great caution was necessary on his part. Uneasy doubts had probably long weighed on his mind. His *reason* was,

on due inquiry, convinced that the evidence for the Messialship of Jesus was of the strongest kind: and he could not but consider with alarm what would be his punishment if he neglected so great salvation! But to *yield* to these convictions, and *openly* embrace the Gospel, involved sacrifices of the severest kind, — all that was considered valuable in life, nay, probably life itself. Now Nicodemus was not one of those who are ready to give up *all* for religion's sake. In short, with many prejudices of the mind, was doubtless united a latent unsoundness of *heart*. His convictions of the reality of our Lord's pretensions had probably been gradual, but were now *decided*. Yet he was not prepared to make those unsparring sacrifices which the circumstances of his case demanded. Not venturing openly to avow, what he secretly believed, he resolves, like most timid and selfish men, to steer a *middle* course; and, with the usual expedient of cowardice, seeks to do that *privately* which he was afraid to do *publicly*; and, accordingly, seeks an interview *by night*, in order to be *privately* admitted to his discipleship. From the manner in which that interview was conducted, it is plain that our Lord fully penetrated into his real character. And if we bear in mind the various prejudices and infirmities of the man, in conjunction with his recent and sincere, but not deeply rooted faith in Christ, we shall be enabled to ascertain the real scope of what our Lord addressed to him. It seems to have been the especial intent of our Lord *first* to *humble* his pride of rank, wealth, and talents. That pride had, it seems, induced Nicodemus to think that Jesus would receive *him* as his convert on easier and less humiliating terms than those which he required from the *people* at large; namely, that of submitting to public baptism, and thus owning his need of repentance, and a total change of character. We cannot, of course, ascertain precisely the nature of the *information* for which Nicodemus meant to have applied, had he been allowed to propound all his inquiries. But they were probably on *the nature and properties of true religion*; and *the way* in which those imperfections which he could not fail to discern in the Jewish, might be remedied. He commences the conversation with a sort of half proud, half flattering compliment, expressive of the conviction of himself and all who weighed the evidence of miracles to prove a divine mission, that Jesus was at least a *teacher sent from God*. Whether Jesus were the MESSIAH or not, Nicodemus was probably *uncertain*; and perhaps *one* chief purpose of his visit was to ascertain that point, in a close and confidential interview. Fluctuating between hope and fear, doubt and conviction, he was resolved to know how far the doctrines of Jesus, when stated in private and confidential communication, did or did not coincide with the notion which he had formed of the Messiah. See a Discourse of Bp. Heber on the character of Nicodemus.

2. ἀπόδ.] So many MSS. and some Versions and Fathers, which is adopted by almost all the recent Editors.

λέγω σοι· εἰν μὴ τις γεννηθῆ ἄνωθεν, οὐ δύναται ἰδεῖν τὴν βασι-
 λείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ. Λέγει πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ Νικόδημος· Πῶς δύναται ἄ- 4
 θρωπος γεννηθῆναι γέρον ὢν; μὴ δύναται εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν τῆς
 μητρὸς αὐτοῦ δευτερον εἰσελθεῖν καὶ γεννηθῆναι; Ἀπεκρίθη ὁ 5
 Ἰησοῦς· Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω σοι· εἰν μὴ τις γεννηθῆ ἔξ ὕδατος καὶ
 πνεύματος, οὐ δύναται εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ. Τὸ 6
 γεγεννημένον ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς σὰρξ ἐστὶ· καὶ τὸ γεγεννημένον ἐκ τοῦ
 πνεύματος πνεῦμά ἐστι. Μὴ θαναμάσης ὅτι εἶπόν σοι· Δεῖ ὑμᾶς γεν- 7
 νηθῆναι ἄνωθεν. Ἐκ τῶ πνεύμα ὅπου θέλει πνεῖ, καὶ τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ 8
 ἀκούεις, ἀλλ' οὐκ οἶδας πόθεν ἔρχεται καὶ ποῦ ὑπάγει· οὕτως ἐστὶ

r Eccl. 11. 5.
 1 Cor. 2. 11.

3. ἀπεκρίθη—εἰν μὴ, &c.] It is with great probability supposed by Beza, Calvin, Lampe, Tittm., and Kuin., that this reply of our Lord interrupted Nicodemus in his address; and that, in order to increase his faith, by evincing his perfect knowledge of what was passing in the mind of the Jewish teacher, our Lord, without waiting till he should have propounded his inquiries, anticipated him by replying to them *in thought*. What those inquiries were, however, has been much disputed. The earlier Commentators suppose them to have been on the *mode of attaining eternal salvation*: most recent Commentators, on the *person of the Messiah*, and the *nature of the salvation* to be expected. But there is no reason why both these views may not be united. The question, however, hinges on the force of the expression *γεννηθῆ ἄνωθεν*. Many recent Expositors (as Rosenm. and Kuin.) maintain that it here denotes a total change of *sentiment* and *opinion* as to the Messiah, the nature of his kingdom, and the benefits thereof. But no *proof* has been made out that the expression in question was ever used *merely* of a change of *sentiments* and *views*. Besides, it is plain, from a comparison of these words with those at vv. 5 & 7, that such cannot be the sense here intended. It should seem that our Lord did not intend to advert to any *particular* heads of inquiry meant to be propounded by Nicodemus, but cuts off all such discussions at once, by laying the axe at the root of the prejudices and errors which struggled with his faith, and made him only *half* a believer; declaring that there must be an entire change of heart, disposition, &c., as implied in the sincere embracing of a new and spiritual religion, before he could hope for salvation through the Messiah. The expression *ἄνωθεν γενν.* is plainly equivalent to *ἀναγεννηθῆναι* or *παλιγγενεῖα*, which denote properly a *new birth*, but figuratively a *complete alteration* and *reformation*. Our Lord, however, evidently intended *more* than even *that*; as appears v. 5. (where see Note.) That Nicodemus understood his words in the manner above explained, there can be no doubt; for the expression was a common one among the Jews, to signify an *entire change of heart and life*, though it was almost always connected with *baptism* as the *symbol* or *pledge* of it. The expressions, therefore, of Nicodemus, in his answer v. 4, *γεννηθῆναι* and *δευτερον γεννηθῆναι*, must not be taken, with many Expositors, in a *physical*, but in a *moral* and *metaphorical* sense, q. d.; “As it involves not only a physical impossibility, but a moral unfitness, for an aged man to be born again; so it involves as great a moral unfitness for such a person to be

figuratively born again, by a total change of mind and heart. He meant, doubtless, to hint that there would be a far greater moral unfitness in *his* case, a man of his great consequence in all respects, such as ought to *exempt him* from ordinary probations and empty ceremonies. To this our Lord replies by simply *repeating* his former assertion; and though he retains the same figure, he varies its form, to set forth the *full extent* of what was required of him. Now the expression *δευτερον γεννηθῆναι* was one commonly used by the Jews to denote the total change of religion, from heathenism to the worship of the one true God; but it was also applied to the entire change of heart and purification of mind *typified* by the ceremony of *baptism*. That the term *ὑδατος* must be understood of *baptism*, is quite plain from Titus iii. 5, and other passages.

The purpose of the next verse (6.) seems to be, to set forth the indispensable *necessity* of this regeneration by water and the Spirit, in order to the attainment of everlasting salvation; for that, as the mere natural or animal life depends on flesh and blood, so does the *spiritual* life depend on the baptism by water and by the Spirit.

3. The argument here is, that however *strange* this two-fold regeneration may seem, it is not to be thought *impossible*,—any more than many wonderful phenomena in the *natural* world; which are obvious to the *senses*, though their *causes* defy all explanation. And in order to illustrate a spiritual truth by something familiar to the senses, our Lord subjoins an example from the *wind*, on the *causes* of which see an interesting extract from Vogler in Recens. Synop. The expressions, however, are not to be interpreted with philosophical subtilty, but according to *popular* ideas; for the investigations of Wolf, Wets., and others, have proved, that both the Hebrews and the ancients in general were accustomed (by a sort of proverb) to signify any thing unknown or obscure by comparing it with *the wind*. The *application* of the figure is, that a man knows that his heart is more interested in religion, that he has a deeper insight and greater relish for spiritual truths: and though he does not perceive the immediate *influence* from which this change proceeded, yet the *effects* he knows by communing with his own heart. And they are of a kind which he must ascribe to the Author of all good, though he cannot trace the *exact process* by which that heavenly agency was employed for that effect; yet he does not the less believe its reality. Here, too, there may be an allusion to the *freedom* of that Divine grace, which, not

9 πᾶς ὁ γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος. ἠπεκρίθη Νικόδημος καὶ ^{Infra. 6. 52, 60.}
 10 εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Πῶς δύναται ταῦτα γενέσθαι; Ἄπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ
 εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Σὺ εἶ ὁ διδάσκαλος τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ ταῦτα οὐ γινώσκεις;
 11 Ἄμην ἄμην λέγω σοι, ὅτι ὁ οὐδαμὲν λαλοῦμεν, καὶ ὁ ἑωράκαμεν μαρ- ^{Infra. ver. 32.}
 12 τυροῦμεν· καὶ τὴν μαρτυρίαν ἧμῶν οὐ λαμβάνετε. Εἰ τὰ ἐπίγεια & 7. 16.
 εἶπον ἡμῖν, καὶ οὐ πιστεύετε· πῶς, ἐὰν εἶπω ὑμῖν τὰ ἐπουράνια, πι- & 8. 28.
 13 στεύσετε; ἠ καὶ οὐδεὶς ἀναβέβηκεν εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, εἰ μὴ ὁ ἐκ τοῦ ^{& 12. 49.}
^{& 14. 24.} ^{Infra. 6. 62.}
^{Eph. 4. 9.}

confining the blessings of salvation to the *Jews*, extended them to the *whole human race*.

9. On hearing this, Nicodemus, partly perplexed with what seemed obscure, and partly confounded with what, though he *understood*, he was not prepared to *receive*, exclaims, with unfeigned surprise, πῶς δύναται ταῦτα γενέσθαι!—a mode of expression which involves a modest request for further information. Our Lord, however, before he communicated this, was pleased to humble his pride, by adverting to his ignorance of what, as “a teacher of Israel,” he might have known, because the Prophets of the O. T. had, though obscurely, intimated these truths. See Isaiah xlix. 21. lvi. 3. Ezek. xxxvi. 26, 27. xxxvii. 9, 10. His humiliation must have been great indeed if the expression ὁ διδάσκαλος mean, as Bp. Middl., with some reason, supposes it to do, “the teacher of Israel;” a title which he aptly compares with those given, in the middle ages, to the great schoolmen; one of whom was called the *Angelic Doctor*; another, the *Admirable*; and a third, the *Irrefragable*.

11. ὁ οὐδαμὲν—μαρτυροῦμεν.] The best Commentators are agreed that the plural is here used agreeably to the usage of persons in authority. (See Mark iv. 30.) The next clause ὁ ἑωρ. μαρτ. is still more significant than that which preceded. Both are expressive of that *complete knowledge* which our Lord, as united with God the Father, could not but possess. There is also implied knowledge *by a virtue of his own*, and not by revelation.

12. Having at v. 11. asserted the *authority* with which he was invested, as a teacher come from God; and made his claim to complete truth in every *statement*, and unerring wisdom in every *doctrine*; our Lord here points out the improbability of producing conviction in *greater matters*, when his endeavours to convince upon the less had been thus unsuccessful. “If I have told you earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe, if I tell you of heavenly things?” as much as to say: The same absence of impartial inquiry and fixed attention—the same disposition to measure every tenet offered to your consideration, by your own confined views, or crooked prepossessions—the same unwillingness to examine the *grounds* upon which, as Teacher of Israel, you have erected your pretensions to superior sagacity and sanctity—these very same causes which prevent you from believing what is more familiar to your memory, and more obvious to your understanding, will have betrayed you into *more criminal incredulity*, when your Teacher expatiates upon a subject of far *greater difficulty* and moment. By τὰ ἐπίγεια are denoted earthly doctrines, such as that of regeneration by water and the Spirit, so called because they are things *done* upon earth, and therefore to be comprehended. By ἐπουράνια is meant the purposes

of God for the salvation of man, involving the doctrines mentioned in the subsequent part of this discourse; and also other doctrines, which, though not adverted to in this conversation, were afterwards revealed by the Holy Spirit; namely, the mysterious union of Christ with God, and His being subject unto death not only for the Jews, but for the *Gentiles*; such as are by St. Paul termed *μυστήρια*. The sense of the whole passage is most learnedly discussed, and the full force of ἐπουράνια ably pointed out, by B. L. Raphelius, in the erudite Preface to his father’s Notes on the N. T. He confirms the above explanation of ἐπίγεια by two apposite quotations from Origen and Ammonius, and also the explanation of οὐδεὶς ἀναβέβηκεν, &c. in the next verse.

13. καὶ οὐδεὶς ἀναβέβηκεν—οὐρανῷ.] *Literally* to ascend to heaven could not apply to our Saviour; for his *ascension* had not yet taken place: *figuratively*, it means the investigation of hidden things; and for such investigation Christ, who came down from heaven, was peculiarly qualified. The phrase ἀναβ. εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν (as Schoettgen and others notice) is used agreeably to the language commonly employed of one who *announced any revelation*,—that he had ascended to heaven and fetched his knowledge from thence. The ὄν is, I conceive, of the Present Indefinite; and ὁ ὄν ἐν οὐρ. means, “whose proper dwelling-place is in heaven.” The sense, then, is: “And no one has ever ascended to heaven, to bring down this information from heaven, nor can any one except the *Son of man*, (i. e. the Messiah) reveal the counsels of God for the salvation of man, i. e. “No one knoweth the counsels of God but I who came down from God.” Now in Deut. xxx. 11. we read: “This commandment which I command thee this day, it is not hidden from thee, neither is it far off. It is not *in heaven*, that thou shouldst cry, Who shall go over the sea for us, and bring it unto us, that we may hear it, and do it?” Alluding to which passage St. Paul, at Rom. x. 6. says: “The righteousness which is of faith speaketh on this wise, Say not in thine heart, Who shall ascend into heaven? (that is, to bring Christ down from above). But what saith it? The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth, and in thy heart: that is, the word of faith, which we preach.” Meaning, that the Gospel Dispensation is not so hidden, that we must draw it from heaven, or raise it from the abyss; for this were literally the same as if a man were to endeavour to bring down Christ from heaven; it would imply, that having come down from heaven before, he had not in his Gospel sufficiently explained to us the principle of justification and other heavenly things necessary to our salvation. See also Prov. xxx. 4. A similar form of expression occurs in Job xii. 32. and Luke v. 10. (where see Note.) Christ, then, who literally had been in heaven, is metaphorically said to have ascended thither,

x Num. 21. 9.
2 Kings 18. 4.
Infra 8. 22.
& 12. 32.

y Infra ver. 36.
Luke 19. 10.
1 John 5. 10.
z Rom. 5. 8.
& 8. 32.
1 John 4. 9.
a Infra 9. 29.
& 12. 47.
Luke 9. 55.
1 John 4. 14.

b Infra 5. 24.
& 6. 40, 47.
& 20. 31.

οὐρανοῦ καταβάς, ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ. ^x Καὶ 14
καθὼς Μωϋσῆς ὑψωσε τὸν ὄφιν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, οὕτως ὑψοθήναι δεῖ τὸν
Υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. ^y ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν μὴ ἀπόληται, 15
ἀλλ' ἔχη ζωὴν αἰώνιον. ^z Οὕτω γὰρ ἠγάπησεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν κόσμον, 16
ἵνα ὅσπερ τὸν Υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ ἔδωκεν, ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων εἰς
αὐτὸν μὴ ἀπόληται, ἀλλ' ἔχη ζωὴν αἰώνιον. ^a οὐ γὰρ ἀπέστειλεν ὁ 17
Θεὸς τὸν Υἱὸν αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ἵνα κρίνῃ τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλ' ἵνα
σωθῆῃ ὁ κόσμος δι' αὐτοῦ. ^b Ὁ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν οὐ κρίνεται· ὁ 18
δὲ μὴ πιστεύων ἤδη κέκριται, ὅτι μὴ πεπίστευκεν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ

because, being in the bosom of his Father, he had the fulness of knowledge in heavenly things.

14. Let us now trace the *connection* between what is said on heavenly things, and the ascension of Christ into heaven, and the lifting up of the Son of man. Our Lord does not content himself with stating that Nicodemus would not believe, if he told him of heavenly things: he points out his *own peculiar* knowledge of these things, showing that no *mere man* hath so understood these heavenly things as the Son of Man, who came down from heaven to reveal them. Thus there is evidently, though it has been denied, a connection between the declaration about heavenly things, v. 12. and the assertion at v. 13. that they were known to Christ. Indeed, v. 14., which Schmid calls independent even of v. 13., is, in reality, connected with both that and the preceding one. Having asserted that the Jews would not believe him, when he spoke of heavenly things; and declared, that He who was in heaven had therefore contemplated and known them, he selects a particular and most striking *instance* of that which the Jews would not admit, and which he himself knew and came to reveal. He simply lays before Nicodemus two of the purposes of Divine wisdom for the salvation of men, which unassisted reason never could have pointed out — purposes which, till revealed, might well be called *mysteries* — purposes which *having been* revealed, instead of being any longer mysterious to the human mind, became at once level to our apprehensions, credible to our reason, and such as powerfully to interest our affections. They were as follows: — Nicodemus had, in common with other Pharisees, looked for the temporal advantages of the Messiah's kingdom; and his imagination arraved him in all the pomp of earthly majesty. But what says Christ? "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up." Was not, then, the doctrine of a crucified Redeemer one of those "heavenly things" which Nicodemus and his countrymen were most unlikely to receive. Was it not a doctrine, the knowledge and communication of which was reserved for that exalted Being who came down from heaven. See more in a Sermon of Dr. Samuel Parr, on the Conversation of Christ with Nicodemus.

The doctrine, however, of a *suffering and dying Messiah*, our Lord as yet, from caution, revealed, even to Nicodemus, veiled under figure and *enigma*; and though meant to stimulate his attention, it probably was very imperfectly comprehended by him *then*, though he would afterwards bring it to mind, and both see the full truth and recognise a solemn prediction fulfilled. The figurative way of expressing it was this: The

Messiah must (it is destined that he should) be suspended on high, as was the brazen serpent in the wilderness. Comp. viii. 23. xii. 22. 32. This is plain from v. 16. It is not, however, agreed on among the Commentators whether this brazen serpent was meant to be a *type* of Christ crucified. Almost all the ancient, and nearly all the modern Commentators up to the middle of the last Century, maintained the affirmative. But the negative has (after Greg. Naz.) been supported by nearly all Commentators since the time of Vitringa, especially by Kuin., A. Clarke, and Tittm., whom see in Recens. Synop. There is, they show, only a *comparison*, namely, as to the *kind* of death, and its *cause*; which consists 1. in Christ's being suspended on the cross as the brazen serpent was suspended aloft by Moses; 2. that *as* all who looked with faith upon the serpent were cured of the bite of the fiery serpents, *so* will all who have faith in a crucified Saviour not perish, but have everlasting life.

15. *ἵνα πᾶς — αἰώνιον.*] Our Lord here adverts to the *causes* and the *effects* of this being lifted up. The *causes* were, 1. to save the human race from that utter perdition, which would have overwhelmed them, from sin, original and actual; 2. to acquire for them eternal salvation. The *effects* were, 1. deliverance from perdition; and 2. restoration to that favour of God, which is "better than life."

16—21. Most of the recent Commentators (as did Erasmus formerly) regard these verses as the words not of Jesus, but of the Evangelist. This they argue from certain *repetitions*, the *style*, and other matters of doubtful disputation. But there is no reason to abandon the common opinion, that they are a continuation of our Lord's discourse. Τὸν κόσμον is, as Grot., Lightf., and Tittm. remark, meant to show that the salvation to be obtained by the Saviour was to be extended to all the nations of the earth, and held out to every individual of the human race, in contradiction to the notion of the Jews, that he would come to bless and save them alone. Comp. 1 John ii. 2. Ἐδωκεν is here equivalent to *παρέδωκεν*, and signifies "hath delivered him to death;" which implies that he was a *ransom* for a sinful world. Comp. Luke xxii. 19. Rom. viii. 32. Gal. i. 4.

17. Tittm. observes, that what is said from v. 17. to 21. is levelled against the Jewish notion, that the Messiah would come for the benefit of the Jews only, would rather destroy the Gentiles. Κρίνῃ is said to be for *κατακρίνῃ*, and to have the sense *punish and destroy*. We may render: "God sent his Son into the world not to exercise severe *judgment* and inflict *punishment* on any nation of the world, but that every one of

- 19 μονογενοῦς Ἰοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ. ^c Ἀυτὴ δὲ ἐστὶν ἡ κρίσις· ὅτι τὸ φῶς ^c Supra 1. 5, 19, 11.
- ἐλήλυθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, καὶ ἠγάπησαν οἱ ἄνθρωποι μᾶλλον τὸ σκότος,
- 20 ἢ τὸ φῶς· ἦν γὰρ πονηρὰ αὐτῶν τὰ ἔργα. ^d Πᾶς γὰρ ὁ φαῦλα ^d Joh 2. 13, et seqq.
- πραΐσων μισεῖ τὸ φῶς, καὶ οὐκ ἔρχεται πρὸς τὸ φῶς, ἵνα μὴ ἐλεγχθῇ
- 21 τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ· ^e ὁ δὲ ποιῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἔρχεται πρὸς τὸ φῶς, ἵνα ^e Ep 5. 8.
- φανερωθῇ αὐτοῦ τὰ ἔργα, ὅτι ἐν Θεῷ ἐστὶν εἰργασμένα.
- 22 ^f Μετὰ ταῦτα ἦλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν Ἰου- ^f Infra 4. 1.
- 23 δαίαν γῆν· καὶ ἐκεῖ διέτριβε μετ' αὐτῶν καὶ ἐβάπτισεν. ^g Ἦν δὲ καὶ ^g Matt. 3. 6, 16, Mark. 1. 5, Luke 3. 7, 1 Sam. 9. 4.
- Ἰωάννης βαπτίζων ἐν Αἰνῶν ἐγγὺς τοῦ Σαλεῖμ, ὅτι ὕδατι πολλὰ ἦν
- 24 ἐκεῖ· καὶ παρεγίνοντο καὶ ἐβαπτίζοντο. ^h οὐπω γὰρ ἦν βεβλημένος ^h Matt. 14. 3.
- 25 εἰς τὴν φυλακὴν ὁ Ἰωάννης. Ἐγένετο οὖν ζήτησις ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν

them, through his atonement, might be put into the way of salvation." This truth is repeated at v. 18., but so as to show, that there will be no distinction between Jew and Gentile, since *every one*, of whatever nation, will have part in this salvation. Our Lord, however, engrafs upon it *another* sentiment in *ἡ ἡ κρίσις*; i. e. he is not only doomed to perdition for refusing the offers of salvation, but he is already *as good as punished*, so certain is his condemnation; or, he is already miserable by the slavery of sin, nay, he is self-condemned and past all hope of salvation.

19. *αὐτὴ δὲ ἐστὶν ἡ κρίσις*, &c.] The best Commentators are agreed that by *κρίσις* is meant not the *punishment itself*, but the ground of the condemnation, as the cause of the punishment. The meaning is, that Christ is not the cause of any evil such men suffer by not listening to his doctrine, but the blame rests solely with *themselves*, who, blinded by passion and prejudice, were indisposed to receive the truth, though coming with the fullest evidence, and spurned the gracious offer of salvation; *ἐν οἷς*, to use the words of St. Paul, 2 Cor. iv. 4. *ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου ἐτόλμωσε τὰ νοήματα τῶν ἀπίστων, εἰς τὸ μὴ αἰγῶσαι τὸν φωτισμὸν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τῆς δόξης τοῦ Χριστοῦ.*

20, 21. The sentiment at the last clause of v. 19. is here illustrated; and the discourse concludes with the *prognome generalis*, showing the pernicious effect of immorality on all inquiries after truth.

— *φαῦλα*] The word properly signifies *little*, *paltry*; and, 2. *worthless and vicious*. Ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν. The idea of truth here and in some other passages of the N. T. is that of *rectitude and goodness*, as opposed to what is base and vicious. So in 1 Cor. xiii. 6. *ἀλήθεια* is opposed to *ἀδικία*. The expression *to do the truth*, is often found in the Rabbinical writings. In *ἐν Θεῷ* the *ἐν* corresponds to the Heb. *בְּ*, and signifies *agreeably to*; and Θεῷ, "God's will." Ὁ ἐλεγχθῆν just before, see Note on Ephes. v. 13. and my Note on Thucyd. vi. 38. No. 15.

22. *εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν γῆν*.] Not "into Judæa," since any one in *Jerusalem* must necessarily be in *Judæa*; but, as Wolf, Lampe, and Kuin. interpret, "the territory of Judæa," as distinguished from its metropolis. So Luke v. 17. vi. 17. and not infrequently in the Sept., as Josh. viii. 1. I have given into thy power the King of Ai, καὶ τὴν πόλιν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν γῆν αὐτοῦ. So Jerusalem and its *χωρὰ* (which is the more usual term) are distinguished *infra* xi. 55. And we say "go into the country," as distinguished from the *metropolis*, without reference to any particular part of the

country. It is not said to what *place* our Lord went to hold his baptism. We may, I think, not improbably conjecture it to have been Bethany or Bethabara, where *John* had been baptizing; on which see Note *supra* i. 28. The true situation of the place seems to be on the Jordan, about 5 miles from its embouchure into the Dead Sea. This might very well be called the *Ford or Ferry town*, since (being situated at the nearest point of the Jordan from Jerusalem), it formed the regular passage from Jerusalem to Peræa and Arabia. It should seem that *John* had removed from Bethabara to *Ænon*, in order that the *Samaritans* also might the more conveniently come to his Baptism.

— *ἐβάπτισεν*] i. e. through the medium of his disciples; for Christ did not himself baptize. See *iv. 2*. Thus what a King's servants do is ascribed to himself. Our Lord declined himself baptizing, probably from a dignified modesty; because baptism bound the persons to religious obedience to *himself*, and might therefore with less ostentation be administered by another. Why St. *Paul* baptized few or none, was because of his being always engaged in more important avocations; and that solemn initiatory rite could as well be performed by any other person.

23. *ὑδατι πολλὰ*] "many streams," i. e. from the adjunct, much water. A sense (perhaps proceeding from Hebraism) often occurring in the Apocalypse. At *παρεγίνοντο* and *ἐβαπτ.* sub. *ἄνθρωποι*.

25. *ζήτησις*] for *συζήτησις*, disputation, as in Acts xv. 2. At *ἐκ τῶν μαθ.* Beza, Grot., Middleton, and Kuin. supply *ταῖς*; an ellip. not unfrequent after a Genitive; but here not necessary to be resorted to, since *ἐκ*, like the Heb. *מִן*, may mean "on the part of," and thus the same sense will arise as if *ταῖς* had been written; with the additional intimation that the dispute originated with *John's* disciples. For the common reading *Ἰουδαίων*, very many Versions and Fathers have *Ἰουδαίων*, which is preferred by most of the Commentators, and adopted by almost all the Editors from Wets. to Scholz; and with reason; for the ellip. of *τινῶν* is frequent, whereas that of *τινῶν* would be anomalous. Besides, the change of *Ἰουδαίων* into *Ἰουδαίων* was likely to take place from the plural just before. This Jew may be supposed to have been one of those who had been baptized by Christ's disciples.

— *περὶ καθαρισμοῦ*.] The meaning is not quite clear. Some take it of the comparative merit or efficacy of *John's* baptism and that of *Jesus*. But that is a sense which cannot well be elicited from

i Supra 1. 7, 15, 26, 34.
 Matt. 3. 11.
 Luke 3. 16.

Ἰωάννην καὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ· Ῥαββί, ὃς ἦν μετὰ σοῦ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, ᾧ σὺ μεμαρτύρηκας, ἴδε οὗτος βαπτίζει, καὶ πάντες ἔρχονται πρὸς αὐτόν. ^k Ἀπεκρίθη Ἰωάννης καὶ εἶπεν· Οὐ δύναται ἄνθρωπος λαμ- 27
 βάειν οὐδέν, ἐὰν μὴ ᾗ δεδομένος αὐτῷ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. ^l Αὐτοὶ ὑμεῖς 28
 μοι μαρτυρεῖτε ὅτι εἶπον· Οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐγὼ ὁ Χριστός, ἀλλ' ὅτι ἀπε-
 σταλμένος εἰμὶ ἔμπροσθεν ἐκείνου. Ὁ ἔχων τὴν νύμφην νυμφίος ἐστίν· 29
 ὁ δὲ φίλος τοῦ νυμφίου, ὁ ἐστηκὼς καὶ ἀκούων αὐτοῦ, χαρῆ χαίρει διὰ
 τὴν φωνὴν τοῦ νυμφίου. Αὕτη οὖν ἡ χαρὰ ἣ ἐμὴ πεπλήρωται. Ἐκεῖ- 30
 νον δεῖ αὐξάνειν, ἐμὲ δὲ ἔλαττοῦσθαι. ^m Ὁ ἄνωθεν ἐρχόμενος ἐπάνω 31
 πάντων ἐστίν· ὁ ὢν ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἐστὶ, καὶ ἐκ τῆς γῆς λαλεῖ·
 ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐρχόμενος ἐπάνω πάντων ἐστὶ, ⁿ καὶ ὁ ἑώρακε καὶ 32
 ἦκουσε, τοῦτο μαρτυρεῖ· καὶ τὴν μαρτυρίαν αὐτοῦ οὐδεὶς λαμβάνει.

m Infra 8. 23.
 1 Cor. 15. 47.

n Infra 5. 20.
 & 8. 26.
 & 12. 49.
 & 14. 10.

the words. It should seem that the discussion was on the nature and efficacy of *baptismal purification* (as *καθαρο*, signifies in 2 Pet. 1. 9.); which, however, was closely connected with another and the comparative efficacy of the baptism of John and that of Jesus. If the nature of *Christ's* baptism were considered, it might well be thought that that of John was unnecessary. On this, therefore, John's disciples went to consult him.

26. ἦν μετὰ σοῦ.] This expression only denotes Jesus' attendance on John to be baptized. The words ᾧ σὺ μεμαρτ. perhaps have reference, not so much to the testimony borne by John to Jesus, as to the increase of Jesus's celebrity, and credit consequent on it. They thought that John, through excess of modesty, had exaggerated the dignity of Jesus; whom, it is plain, they did not consider as the *Messiah*. However, the *οὗτος* does not (as Wets. imagines) imply *contempt*, but rather *ill-will*. Πάντες, for οἱ πολλοί, *very many*, by an hyperbole usual to those who speak under the influence of passion and prejudice.

27 — 30. Here the Baptist checks their excessive attachment to himself, and envy at Jesus; first by showing the real nature of Jesus' person, and that couched in a *gnome generalis*, "A man can receive nothing except it be given him from above." By this he means, that he himself can take nothing to himself that God has not given him; nor can Jesus do so: therefore whatever is done by him happens by the providence of God. Then he proceeds to disavow that superior dignity which his disciples ascribed to him; reminding them of his public and private avowal, that he was *not* the *Messiah*, but only his herald, to prepare for his coming. (Tittm.)

29. ὁ ἔχων τὴν νύμφην, &c.] The subject is here illustrated by a similitude derived from common life, in tracing the nature of which some Commentators obscure rather than illustrate the subject by references to Jewish Antiquities. Lampe, Kuin., and Tittm. are rightly agreed that there is merely an illustration by similitude (as in Matt. ix. 15. and Mark ii. 19.), in which John compares Christ to the *bridegroom* at a marriage feast, and himself to the *παρόνμφος*, or *bridegroom*; who was a friend that had been employed to negotiate the marriage, and had acted as his agent throughout the whole affair. There were, indeed, *two* paronyms; one on the part of the bridegroom, the other on that of the bride; who after-

wards acted as mediators, to preserve peace and harmony between the new-married pair. The allusion at ἐστηκὼς — χαίρει διὰ τὴν φωνὴν τοῦ νυμφίου is variously explained. The words are most probably supposed to allude to the ceremony of the formal interview, previous to marriage, of the betrothed pair, who were brought together by the paronyms to a private apartment; at the door of which they were themselves stationed, so as to be able to distinguish any elevation of voice on the part of the sponsus addressing the sponsa; from which, and from the *tone* of it, they would easily infer his satisfaction at the choice made for him by them, and feel corresponding joy. The sense, then, may be thus expressed. "As, in the ceremonies pertaining to marriage, the sponsus is the principal person, and his paronymus willingly cedes to him the preference, and, rejoicing in his acceptance, is content to play an under part; so do I willingly sustain the part of a humble forerunner to Christ." Πεπλήρωται, is complete, consummate.

31. To cut off all future occasion for comparison, John shows that there will be less and less room for it; since the celebrity of the one must increase, that of the other decrease; and so resplendent will be the glory of the former, as to cast that of the latter into the shade, and cause it to fade away like the morning star, or the waning moon at sun-rise. (Tittm. and Euthym.)

31 — 36. The Commentators are not agreed whether these are to be considered as the words of the *Evangelist*, or of *John the Baptist*. The former is the opinion of most recent Commentators, and is grounded on the style and manner being that of the Evangelist. That, however, is a very precarious argument. It is better to adopt (with almost all ancient and most modern Commentators) the latter view. For, as Tittm. remarks, "there is a complete connection of these words with the preceding; without the interposition of any expression, from which it could be inferred that what follows is from the Evangelist. Nor is there any reason *why* he should have added these words, and chosen to confirm by his own judgment the testimony of John the Baptist, which must have been to his readers alike remarkable and deserving of credit. On the other hand, there are obvious reasons *why* this passage should be from *John the Baptist*; for in it he seems to have intended to advert to the reasons confirming

33^o Ὁ λαβὼν αὐτοῦ τὴν μαρτυρίαν ἐσφράγισεν ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς ἀληθὴς ἐστιν. o 1 John 5, 10. Rom. 3, 4.
 34^p Ὁν γὰρ ἀπίστευεν ὁ Θεὸς, τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ Θεοῦ λαλεῖ· οὐ γὰρ ἐκ p Supr. 1, 16. Eph. 4, 7.
 35 μέτρου δίδωσιν ὁ Θεὸς τὸ Πνεῦμα. ⁴ Ὁ Πατὴρ ἀγαπᾷ τὸν Υἱόν, καὶ q Matt. 11, 27. & 28, 15. Luke 10, 22. infra 5, 22. & 17, 2.
 36 πάντα δέδωκεν ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ. ⁵ Ὁ πιστεύων εἰς τὸν Υἱόν ἔχει Heb. 2, 9. r Supra 3, 15, 16. & 6, 47. 1 John 5, 11. s Supra 3, 22, 26.
 ζωὴν αἰώνιον· ὁ δὲ ἀπειθῶν τῷ Υἱῷ οὐκ ὄψεται ζωὴν, ἀλλ' ἡ ὀργὴ
 τοῦ Θεοῦ μένει ἐπ' αὐτόν.

1 IV. Ὡς οὖν ἔγνω ὁ Κύριος, ὅτι ἤκουσαν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ὅτι Ἰησοῦς
 2 πλείονας μαθητὰς ποιεῖ καὶ βαπτίζει ἢ Ἰωάννης· (καίτοιγε Ἰησοῦς
 3 αὐτὸς οὐκ ἐβάπτισεν, ἀλλ' οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ) ἀρῆκε τὴν Ἰουδαίαν, καὶ

what he had said, namely, that the precedence is due, not to *him*, but to *Jesus*. It is, he means to say, only *just* that *his* fame should be spread, and the number of *his* disciples be increased, inasmuch as he was sent from heaven, endowed with gifts immeasurably great; nay, was the beloved Son of God, the Lord and promised Saviour of the human race." Indeed the words *cannot* be the *Evangelist's*; for allowing all that can be claimed for the force of the not unfrequent hyperbole in οὐδείς (as meaning so few as to be next to none), it would be by no means a correct representation of the state of Christian converts upwards of 60 years after the death of Christ. The first two verses of this portion are very similar in sentiment to supra vv. 11, 12, & 13; and the antithesis between δ ἐκ τῆς γῆς and δ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ necessarily involves the divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ.

We must supply καὶ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ λαλεῖ, to correspond to ἐκ τῆς γῆς λαλεῖ. The sense is: "A mere man is not endued with knowledge of divine things, has not that intimate acquaintance with the secret counsels of God, which He possesses who is of celestial origin (to whom God giveth not the Spirit by measure, v. 34.); he, therefore, teacheth, and can teach, only what is earthly, incomplete, and imperfect. But he who is endued by God with a complete knowledge of heavenly things, being thoroughly conversant with the counsels of God, speaketh the words of God: and he is, from his origin, superior to all men in dignity, and far exceeds even the *Prophets* in spiritual knowledge."

With δ ὦν — λαλεῖ I would compare Æschyl. ap. Stobæi Serm. Eth. p. 98. τὸ γὰρ βρότειον σπέρμ' ἐφημέρια φρονεῖ. At ὃ ἔώρακε καὶ ἤκουσε we may supply ἐξ αὐτοῦ, i. e. ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ. The καὶ signifies "and [yet]."

33. The Baptist here corrects the grievous error of undervaluing Jesus, by showing (of course, with an admission of Jesus' Messiahship) that he who believeth or hath faith in Christ, hath it in God. (Tittm.) Ἐσφράγισεν is (as Chrys. says) for ἰδεῖν, and signifies *attests, confirms, professes* his belief; a metaphor taken from deeds *signed and sealed*. For as testimonies of contracts, or other engagements, were confirmed by the addition of a seal, any confirmation of truth was called *σφραγίς*; and as by the imposition of a seal, any thing is rendered *unsuspected of fraud*, sure and certain, therefore, *σφραγίζειν* came to mean to *confirm*, as here and in Eph. i. 13. 2 Cor. i. 22. Sap. ii. 5.

34. οὐ γὰρ ἐκ μέτρου — Πνεῦμα.] The phrase ἐκ μέτρου with verbs of giving, denotes, by implication, *sparingly, restrictedly*, like provisions in a besieged city. And so the Latin *ad demensum*,

tribuere. Οὐκ ἐκ μέτρου, denotes completely. The best Commentators are agreed that there is an allusion to the *Prophets*, the very greatest of them being allowed by the Jewish Rabbis to have only had the gifts of the Holy Spirit *ἐκ μέτρου*, and that the law itself is only given *ad mensuram*. On the *particulars* of this unbounded power, see Tittm. in Recens. Synop. Δίδωσιν is for εἰδῶκεν, which occurs just after.

35. πάντα] i. e. whatever is necessary to procure the salvation of man.

36. Here are declared the *consequences* of faith, and also want of faith, in Christ. In the former clause ἔχει is not (as most Commentators imagine) simply for ἔξει, but the Present is used, to show the *certainty* of the thing; "it is laid up for him." By δ ἀπειθῶν is meant he who refuseth this faith; though there *maybe*, as Doddr. thinks, an allusion to that principle of unreserved obedience to Christ, which can alone make faith available. Οὐκ ὄψεται ζωὴν is a Hebrew phrase denoting, "he shall never possess eternal life." The words following suggest the *reason*: and the descending series (as observes Bp. Jebb) "is magnificently awful: he who, with his heart, *believeth in the Son*, is *already* in possession of eternal life: he, whatever may be his outward profession, whatever his theoretic or historical belief, who *obeyeth not the Son*, not only does not possess *eternal* life, he does not possess any thing worthy to be called life at all; but this is not the whole, for as eternal life is the present possession of the faithful, so the wrath of God is the *present* and *permanent* lot of the disobedient; it *abideth on him*, not being removed by the atoning merits of the Redeemer."

IV. In this Chapter is recorded an important discourse of Christ with a Samaritan woman; for illustrating the *purpose* and *scope* of which, the Evangelist prefaces the narration with some particulars respecting the *occasion* which led to that discourse. Dr. A. Clarke has well pointed out the numerous *internal evidences of truth*, which strike the mind of the attentive reader, in this narrative, which concentrates so much information, that a *Volume* might be filled with its illustrations of the history of the Jews, and the geography of their country. Our Lord, it should seem, left Judæa (perhaps suddenly) in order to avoid every thing that could needlessly excite the indignation of the Ecclesiastical Rulers, and probably for *other* reasons, adverted to by Doddr.

1. μαθητὰς ποιεῖ καὶ βαπτίζει ἢ Ἰ.] "is making more disciples than John, and is [even] baptizing them." So Grot. or is making more disciples by baptism.

4. ἔδει δὲ αὐτὸν δ.] It was *so far* necessary, as being a much shorter route than through Peræa.

ἀπῆλθε πάλιν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν. Ἔδει δὲ αὐτὸν διέρχεσθαι διὰ τῆς 4
 Σαμαρείας. ἔρχεται οὖν εἰς πόλιν τῆς Σαμαρείας λεγομένην * Συχάρ, 5
 πλησίον τοῦ χωρίου, ὃ ἔδωκεν Ἰακώβ Ἰωσήφ τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ. Ἦν δὲ 6
 ἐκεῖ πηγὴ τοῦ Ἰακώβ. Ὁ οὖν Ἰησοῦς κεκοπιτικῶς ἐκ τῆς ὀδοποιρίας,
 ἐκαθίστατο οὕτως ἐπὶ τῇ πηγῇ· ὥγα ἦν ὡσεὶ ἕκτη. Ἔρχεται γυνὴ ἐκ 7
 τῆς Σαμαρείας ἀντλησάσα ὕδωρ. Λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Δός μοι πιεῖν 8
 (οἱ γὰρ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἀπεληλύθεισαν εἰς τὴν πόλιν, ἵνα τροφάς 8
 ἀγοράσωσι.) Ἄγει οὖν αὐτῷ ἡ γυνὴ ἡ Σαμαρεῖτις· Πῶς σὺ, Ἰου- 9
 δαῖος ὢν, πιεῖς ἐμοῦ πιεῖν αἰτεῖς, οὐσης γυναικὸς Σαμαρεῖτιδος; (οὐ
 γὰρ συγχρῶνται Ἰουδαῖοι Σαμαρεῖταις.) Ἄπεκριθὴ Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν 10
 αὐτῇ· Εἰ ᾔδεις τὴν δωρεάν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ τίς ἐστὶν ὁ λέγων σοι·
 Δός μοι πιεῖν· σὺ ἂν ᾔηθης αὐτὸν, καὶ ἔδωκεν ἄν σοι ὕδωρ ζῶν.
 Ἄγει αὐτῷ ἡ γυνὴ· Κύριε, οὐτε ἀντλημα ἔχεις, καὶ τὸ φρέατος ἐστὶ 11
 βαθύ· πόθεν οὖν ἔχεις τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ ζῶν; Μὴ σὺ μεῖζων εἶ τοῦ 12

t Gen. 33. 19.
 & 48. 22.
 Jos. 24. 32.

u Luke 9. 52,
 53.
 infra 8. 48.
 Acts 10. 28.
 2 Kings 17. 21.
 x Isa. 12. 3.
 infra 6. 35.
 & 7. 88, 89.

y Jer. 2. 13.

So Joseph. Vit. 52. says πάντως εἶδε τοὺς ταχὺ βου-
 λόμενος ἀπελθεῖν (namely, from Jerusalem to Gal-
 ilaea) ἐπὶ ἑκατέρας (Samararia) πορείεσθαι. He calls it
 a three days' journey.

5. ἔρχεται εἰς] "comes, came unto, as far as;"
 for from v. 6. it appears that he took up his quar-
 ters *outside* of the city; though his disciples en-
 tered it, to procure provisions, and on returning
 from thence found Jesus talking with a Samaritan
 woman. Συχάρ. So very many MSS. It is for
 Vulg. Συχημ and received by all the best Editors.
 Originally called Συχημ, from the name of the
 person of whose family Jacob bought the land,
 and built an altar. See Gen. xxxiii. 13. The
 name is supposed to have been altered by the
 Jews to Συχάρ, to denote the drunkenness or the
 idolatry of the inhabitants. But probably it was
 merely a dialectical change.

6. κεκοπιτικῶς.] Neut. in a passive sense. On
 the force of οὕτως the Commentators differ. Some
 render it *therefore*, others *afterwards*; for neither
 of which significations is there any authority.
 The true interpretation seems to be that of the
 ancients, and several eminent moderns, who take
 οὕτως for οὕτως ὡς ἦν. or ὡς ἔτυχεν, "just as he was,
 just where it happened, without any pitching of a
 tent." So Acts xvii. 17. οὕτως ἐξέφροντο, just as it
 happened, at the mercy of the winds. See also
 Hor. Od. ii. 11, 13. If this be not approved by
 the reader, he may (as I suggested in Recens.
 Synop.) take ἐκαθ. οὕτως as if οὕτως ἐκαθ. had been
 written; and thus understand οὕτως in the sense
accordingly, which is better than regarding it,
 with most recent Commentators, as pleonastic.
 Lampe thinks, that Jesus stopped there, not only
 for the sake of rest, but as being a very conven-
 ient dining place. So Philostr. V. Ap. ἀριστο-
 ποιουμένων δὲ αὐτῶν πρὸς πηγῇ ὕδατος.

7. γυνὴ ἐκ τῆς Σαμ.] This means not a woman
 from, but *of*, Samaria; and is, by an ellip. of οὐσα,
 equivalent to γυνὴ Σαμαρεῖτις in the next verse.
 She had, no doubt, come from Sychar. Δός μοι
 πιεῖν. The verb is employed as a noun; of which
 the Greek Classics abound in examples.

9. πῶς σὺ, &c.] She expresses wonder at any
 favour, however small, being asked by a Jew from
 a Samaritan. So Raschi, in his Gloss. on the
 Gemara, says, "it is an abomination to eat the
 bread or drink the wine of a Samaritan." On the
 origin and causes of this reciprocal hatred, I have

treated at large in Rec. Syn. The reason for this
 the Evangelist subjoins, for the information of
 his Greek readers, in the words οὐ γὰρ, &c.,
 where συγχ. must be understood of *familiar in-
 tercourse and society*; (So Euthym. explains by
 οὐ κοινωνοῦσι.) for the intercourse of *buying and
 selling* was still kept up. Συγγασθαι signifies,
 properly, "to use any one's co-operation in any
 thing." The word, however, in this sense occurs
 only in the later writers, as Polyb. and Arrian;
 the earlier ones using ἐναλλάσσεισθαι. So Thucyd.
 i. 120. ἡμῶν δὲ ὅσοι Ἀθηναίους ἦδε ἐνηλλάγησαν.

10. τὴν δωρεάν τ. θ.] i. e. the favour which God
 graciously vouchsafes to thee, in this opportunity
 of knowing the Messiah, and receiving the offer
 of free salvation from himself. Ὑδωρ ζῶν
 properly means *running water* (as that of fountains
 and rivers) in opposition to the dead, i. e. stag-
 nant, water of pools or cisterns. It occurs in
 Gen. xxvi. 19. and Levit. xiv. 5. The Classical
 writers for ζῶν used the epithets ἀεὶφύροντον, ἀν-
 ναον; nay Plato has ἐμψυχρον ὕδωρ. In this
physical sense the woman understood the term.
 But our Lord employed it *figuratively*, for ζωο-
 ποιῶν. "It being his custom (observes Kuin.)
 from things corporeal to excite the minds of his
 hearers to the study and knowledge of things
 spiritual." It is common in the Scriptures and
 the Rabbinical writers to liken unto water that
 which refreshes and blesses the souls of men.
 See vii. 38. Prov. x. 11. Ecclus. xv. 3. xxiv. 21.
 And no wonder; since in the hot countries of
 the East, pure water is the most refreshing of
 beverages, and is even reckoned among the *bles-
 sings* of life.

11. ἀντλημα] "a bucket," such as travellers in
 the East are accustomed to take with them, and
 which, by the aid of the rope and wheel provided
 as *fixtures* at public wells, is sufficient to procure
 water from the deepest wells.

12. μεῖζων] "a person of more consequence."
 This has reference to what Jesus had before said,
 "If thou hadst known *who it is* that speaketh
 to thee." The words following are meant to say:
 It was good enough for our ancestor Jacob, who
 himself drank of it, &c.; which he would not
 have done, if he had known a better. If thou
 canst show us a better, thou wilt, in that respect,
 be greater than Jacob. Οἱ υἱοί, i. e. the family
 in general, including the servants, as in Gen. xiv.

πατὴρ ἡμῶν Ἰακώβ, ὃς ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν τὸ φρέαρ, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐξ αὐτοῦ
 13 ἔπιε, καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὰ θρόσματα αὐτοῦ; Ἐπεκρίθη [δ] ^{z Infr. 6. 59.}
 Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ· Ἰὼς ὁ πίνων ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος τούτου διψήσει
 14 πάλιν· ὃς δ' ἂν πίη ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος, οὗ ἐγὼ δώσω αὐτῷ, οὐ μὴ <sup>a Infr. 6. 27, 35.
 & 7. 38, 39.</sup>
 διψήσῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα· ἀλλὰ τὸ ὕδωρ, ὃ δώσω αὐτῷ, γενήσεται ἐν
 15 αὐτῷ πηγὴ ὕδατος ἀλλομένου εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον. Λέγει πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡ
 γυνή· Κύριε, δός μοι τοῦτο τὸ ὕδωρ, ἵνα μὴ διψῶ, μηδὲ ἔρχωμαι
 16 ἐνθάδε ἀνελεῖν. Λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Ἔπαγε φώνησον τὸν ἄνδρα
 17 σου, καὶ ἐλθὲ ἐνθάδε. Ἀπεκρίθη ἡ γυνή καὶ εἶπεν· Οὐκ ἔχω ἄνδρα.
 18 Λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Καλῶς εἶπας· Ὅτι ἄνδρα οὐκ ἔχω· πέπτε
 γὰρ ἄνδρας ἕσχες· καὶ νῦν ὃν ἔχεις, οὐκ ἔστι σου ἀγής· τοῦτο ἀλη- <sup>b Infr. 6. 14.
 Luke 7. 16.
 & 24. 19.</sup>
 19 θές εἶρηκας. ^b Λέγει αὐτῇ ἡ γυνή· Κύριε, θεωρῶ ὅτι προσφίτης εἶ <sup>c Deut. 12. 5,
 11.</sup>
 20 σύ. ^c Οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν † ἐν τούτῳ τῷ ὄρει προσεκύνησαν· καὶ ὑμεῖς <sup>1 Kings 9. 3.
 2 Chron. 7. 12.</sup>

11. This, and the mention of the cattle enjoined, is agreeable to the simplicity of early times, and which has, more or less, always prevailed in the East.

13, 14. Our Lord here shows that he does not depreciate Jacob or his well; but intimates that however great was the benefit bestowed by the Patriarch, he can bestow a far greater, and thus is superior to Jacob.

—ὃ μὴ ἐψήσῃ εἰς τὸν αἰ. i. e. shall have nothing more ever to desire. See Rev. vii. 16. The general meaning of the words, when divested of the figure, is, that such shall be the vivifying effect of the Gospel, as to satisfy the most ardent desires of the soul; which, placing its happiness in God and his worship, no other desire will be thought of. Also, that such is the nature of that doctrine, that it purifies a man from vicious inclinations, and is, as it were, an ever-springing fountain of holy affections, producing comfort here, and everlasting happiness hereafter;” like that good spoken of by an ancient Philosopher, “quod non fiat in dies deterius, quo non melius possit optari.” (Seneca Ep.) To drink, Lampe observes, signifies to fully imbibe Christ’s doctrine; and πηγὴ and ἀλλεσθαι involve the idea of perennial abundance.

15. δός μοι, &c.] The Commentators are not agreed whether this was spoken in simplicity, or ironically. Both may, in some measure, be admitted. Comp. vi. 34. Κρίει, πάντοτε ὃς ἡμῖν τὸν ἄρονον τ.

16. Perceiving that the woman did not yet comprehend him, or perhaps began to trifle with him, our Lord was pleased at once to check her rising freedom, by reminding her of her immoralities; taking care withal so to effect this as to prove himself a Divinely commissioned Monitor and Teacher.

—φώνησον τὸν ἄνδρα σου.] Our Lord, indeed, knew already, that she had no husband: but he bid her do this, knowing that the answer that would thus be returned, would afford him occasion of showing her his omniscience, and admonish her of her immorality.

17. καλῶς] is not put ironically, but is simply for ἀληθῶς, as is plain from the words following τούτο ἀληθές εἶρηκας.

18. οὐκ ἔστι σ. ἀ.] “is not [really] thy husband.” It appears that the woman had been five times married; but whether those marriages had been

dissolved by death or by divorce, does not appear. Both might be the case; and as divorce was then shamefully prevalent, this implies no certainty of infidelity on the part of the woman; to represent whom as a harlot (as some Commentators do) is unjustifiable, though this is better than the other extreme into which some run (even Tittm.) of representing the woman as free from all blame, by supposing that, though not actually married to this person, she was espoused to him. That would require the οὐ to be taken for οὐτω; which is a straining of the sense, and is refuted by the words οὐκ ἔχω ἄνδρα; and as ὃν ἔχεις implies cohabitation, she cannot be acquitted of living in concubinage; which, however common in the East, and though neither there, nor in the West, then accounted very disgraceful by the multitude, yet was held by persons of any pretensions to virtue as sinful and impure, because transgressing the primeval and sacred institution of matrimony.

19. θεωρῶ ὅτι προσφίτης εἶ σύ.] The woman is justly amazed that a stranger and a Jew should be acquainted with the whole tenour of her life; for πάντα may be taken populariter, to denote the leading events of her life. Such knowledge she knew could not be acquired but by Divine revelation; and therefore she justly inferred that Jesus must be at least a prophet; and, as such, be a proper authority to appeal to for the solution of the controverted question as to the comparative holiness of the Jewish and the Samaritan places of common national worship. To this question our Lord so answers as to give her to understand, that it is not necessary to discuss it at all; since there was at hand such a total change of religious institutions as to render it nugatory.

20. ἐν τούτῳ τῷ ὄρει] i. e. Mount Gerizim, on which the Samaritans maintained that Abraham and Jacob had erected an altar, and offered sacrifices to Jehovah; and, therefore, that the Deity had willed blessing to be pronounced from thence, and an altar to be erected, alleging in proof Deut. xxvii. 2. 12.; and, in order to “make surety doubly sure,” interpolating the text at v. 4. and changing ἔβα, into ἔβη, Gerizim. Hence they called it “the blessed mount,” “the holy place.” For ἐν τούτῳ τῷ ὄρει very many MSS. and most of the early Editions, have ἐν τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ, which is received by almost every Editor from Wets. to Scholz. I cannot, however, ven-

λέγετε ὅτι ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐστὶν ὁ τόπος ὅπου δεῖ προσκυνεῖν. Λέγει 21
 αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Γίνααι, πιστευσόν μοι, ὅτι ἔρχεται ὥρα, ὅτε οὔτε ἐν
 τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ οὔτε ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις προσκυνήσετε τῷ Πατρὶ. ^dΤμῆς 22
 προσκυνεῖτε, ὃ οὐκ οἴδατε· ἡμεῖς προσκυνοῦμεν, ὃ οἶδαμεν· ὅτι ἡ
 σωτηρία ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐστίν. Ἀλλ' ἔρχεται ὥρα, καὶ νῦν ἐστίν, ὅτε 23
 οἱ ἀληθινοὶ προσκυνῆται προσκυνήσουσι τῷ Πατρὶ ἐν πνεύματι καὶ
 ἀληθείᾳ· καὶ γὰρ ὁ Πατὴρ τοιοῦτους ζητεῖ τοὺς προσκυνοῦντας αὐτόν.
 e 2 Cor. 3. 17. Ὁ Πνεῦμα ὁ Θεός· καὶ τοὺς προσκυνοῦντας αὐτόν ἐν πνεύματι καὶ 24
 ἀληθείᾳ δεῖ προσκυνεῖν. Λέγει αὐτῷ ἡ γυνή· Οἶδα ὅτι Μεσσίας ἔρ- 25
 χεται· (ὁ λεγόμενος Χριστός·) ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἐκείνος, ἀναγγελεῖ ἡμῖν

ture to admit it, the old reading being superior in *external*, authority; and I think in *internal*, for the new reading seems to be (as the character of several of the MSS. which support it would lead us to suppose) *ex emendatione*; though ungrounded; for ἐν τούτῳ τῷ ὄρει conveys, I conceive, a stronger sense (namely, "in this very mountain") than ἐν τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ, which latter is very suitable at v. 21., since *there* we have no emphasis. Grot. and Lampe notice and illustrate the custom (probably ante-diluvial) of worshipping the deity on *mountains*, perhaps as being thought nearer to heaven: or rather, I conceive, from high mountains being more suited to devotion, by their being removed from the din of men. So Milton's Paradise Lost, i. "Sing, heavenly Muse, that on the secret top of Horeb or of Sinai," &c.

21. πιστευσόν μοι.] Our Lord here claims, at least, the belief due to a *Prophet*, such as the woman acknowledged him to be. Ἐρχεται, "is coming;" namely, at the destruction of Jerusalem. Προσκυνήσετε ἑαυτοῖς ἑαυτοῖς by *Hebraism*, as some Commentators imagine; but is a more pointed expression, meaning ye and others. Wets. has shown the exact fulfilment of the prediction, in the overthrow both of the Jewish and Samaritan holy places, by numerous citations from Josephus and the early Fathers.

22. ἡμεῖς — οἴδατε.] There is here somewhat of obscurity; which has occasioned diversity of interpretation. Most Commentators (especially the ancient ones) refer the ὃ to the *Deity*, by the ellipsis of Θεῶν; meaning that the Samaritans knew not God properly, by confining him to *place*. But this charge, as well as that of idolatry, (which others suppose here alluded to) has been disproved by the researches of Reland, Lampe, and Gesenius; of whom Lampe rightly supposes our Lord to charge them not with *corruption*, but with *ignorance*. See Recens. Synop. But he unjustifiably confines it to ignorance of the *manner* of worship. The more recent Commentators from Beng. and Markl. to Kuin. and Tittm. are of opinion that ὃ denotes not the *object* of the worship, but the *form* of it; and they take ὃ for καθ' ὃ, with reference chiefly to the *manner* and *form* of worship, but also, by implication, including *place*; q. d. Ye worship according to your ignorance, *we* according to our knowledge; and consequently in the manner and place appointed by Divine command.

In ὅτι ἡ σωτηρία — Ἰουδαίων there is a reason suggested why the Jews should best know the mode and the place of the National worship; namely, since from *them* the Messiah (σωτηρία being for σωτηρ) was confessedly to spring.

23. ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ.] I can neither agree with those Commentators who take πν. to denote the *Holy Spirit*; nor with those who take it of the *human mind*. It should seem that these are adverbial phrases, for πνευματικῶς καὶ ἀληθῶς; of which the former involves a tacit contrast of the *letter of the Law*, with the *Spirit of the Gospel*. See 2 Cor. iii. 6. Rom. ii. 29. Phil. iii. 3., where γράμματι and πνεύματι are opposed, as the λατρεία λογικὴ in Rom. xiii. 1. is opposed to the σαρκική. The ἐν ἀληθείᾳ has reference to the *Law*, as being only (what St. Paul says, Col. ii. 17. and Heb. viii. 5. x. 1.) a *shadow* of good things to come, not the σῶμα.

— καὶ γὰρ ὁ Πατὴρ, &c.] Our Lord now shows by *two reasons* why God is to be so worshipped. 1. From the sovereign *will* of the Deity, to whom spiritual and internal worship is alone acceptable. 2. From the *nature* of the Deity, who is of a *spiritual* nature, far removed from any thing corporeal; and therefore must be worshipped in a spiritual manner, and also *in truth*, since such he requires; and indeed aught else would be a solemn mockery of the GOD OF TRUTH.

24. Πνεῦμα ὁ Θεός.] By πνεῦμα is meant (as the best Expositors, ancient and modern, are agreed) an immaterial, unconfined, and invisible nature, without parts or passions, and not circumscribed by space or limits, as every thing corporeal must be. The expression, however, also involves the *attributes* and *perfections* of the Deity, His omniscience, omnipotence, infinite benevolence, &c. That the wiser Jews had tolerably correct ideas of the spirituality of God, is evinced by Schoettg. from various passages of Rabbinical writers.

— καὶ τοὺς προσκυνοῦντας αὐτόν.] In the compass of 3 verses we have 3 variations in the government of the verb προσκύνειν. In the N. T. it is used with the *Dative*, except here and at Matt. iv. 10. Luke iv. 8. The *Dative* is also used by most of the later Greek writers. The earlier ones invariably have the *Accusative*. This being, as Matthiæ observes, (Gr. Gr. § 407.) one of those many verbs that have an *Accusative* which does not mark the *passive* object of the action, but that to which an action has only generally an immediate reference. It should, however, seem that the *Dative* is used with reference to the *pros*, since verbs which govern an *Accus. out* of composition, when *in* composition, only direct the *Subst.* to the *Dative*.

25. The woman here refers the decision of the question to the times of the Messiah, of whose speedy appearance she had probably heard. (Tittm.) The Jews of that age were accustomed to refer the decision of controverted questions to

26 πάντα. Ἰ λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Ἐγὼ εἰμι, ὁ λαλῶν σοι. Καὶ ἐπὶ ^fInfra. 9. 37.
 27 τούτῳ ἦλθον οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐθαύμασαν ὅτι μετὰ γυναικὸς
 ἐλάλει· οὐδεὶς μὲντοι εἶπε· Τί ζητεῖς; ἢ τί λαλεῖς μετ' αὐτῆς;
 28 Ἀπήκην οὖν τὴν ὕδριαν αὐτῆς ἢ γυνή, καὶ ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὴν πόλιν,
 29 καὶ λέγει τοῖς ἀνθρώποις· Λεῦτε, ἴδετε ἀνθρώπον, ὃς εἶπε μοι πάντα
 30 ὅσα ἐποίησα· μήτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός; Ἐξῆλθον οὖν ἐκ τῆς πό-
 λεως, καὶ ἤρχοντο πρὸς αὐτόν.
 31 Ἐν δὲ τῷ μεταξύ ἠρώτων αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ, λέγοντες· Ῥαββί,
 32 φάγε. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Ἐγὼ βρωῶν ἔχω φαγεῖν, ἢν ὑμεῖς οὐκ
 33 οἴδατε. Ἐλεγον [οὖν] οἱ μαθηταὶ πρὸς ἀλλήλους· Μή τις ἤνεγκεν
 34 αὐτῷ φαγεῖν; λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Ἐμὸν βρωμά ἐστιν, ἵνα ποιῶ
 35 τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμφαντός με, καὶ τελειώσω αὐτοῦ τὸ ἔργον. Ἔ ^gMatt. 9. 37.
 Luke 10. 2.

the coming of future prophets, and especially of the Messiah. And from what has been discovered of the opinions of the Samaritans of that age, (see Gesenius' Comment. de Samaritanis), it should seem that they expected in the Messiah chiefly a great *spiritual* Ruler, and teacher of religion.

The most eminent Critics are agreed that the clause *ὁ λεγόμενος Χριστὸς* came from the *Evangelist*, not the woman. *Ἀναγγ.* denoting properly the delivering of a message from one person to another, here involves the idea of what we mean by a *Revelation* from God. See Note infra xvi. 14.

26. *ἐγὼ εἰμι, ὁ λαλῶν σοι.*] The reasons why our Lord revealed himself so much more unreservedly to this woman and the Samaritans than to the Jews, were probably, 1. because the Samaritans were better affected, more sincere, and of greater integrity and moral virtue, and therefore more worthy of unreserved confidence. 2. Because of the reason which induced our Lord to use caution in that respect with the Jews; namely, to avoid giving needless offence to the Rulers, and thereby *anticipating* what he should eventually suffer from them. 3. Because the Samaritans seem to have had more correct ideas of the nature of the Messiah's kingdom, founding their views on Deut. xviii. 15., and therefore would not be likely to abuse what he said to purposes of sedition; besides that they were orderly and quiet in their habits.

27. *ἐπὶ τούτῳ.*] Subj. *ῥήματι.* Or it may simply mean "*hereupon.*" Ὅτι μετὰ γυν., "with the woman," as being a Samaritan, and in so public a place. See Bp. Middl. and Rec. Syn.
 — *τί ζητεῖς;*] A popular expression, meaning, "what is your purpose or business?"

29. *πάντα*] i. e. (by an hyperbole natural to her situation, inasmuch that she had forgotten to take back her bucket) the *main* events of her life, on which the rest hinged.

— *μήτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Χ.*] The Commentators are not agreed whether this means, "is this the Christ?" or, "is not this the Christ?" I have in Recens. Synop. shown at large that the latter version cannot be admitted, 1. because there is little or no authority for *μήτι* in the sense *annon*; 2. because it is less suitable to the case in question. For the woman appears (as Theophyl. notices) to have meant courteously to propose this rather as a question for their *consideration* than to *affirm* it, at least by implication. So also at Matt. xii. 23. *μήτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς Δαυὶδ,*

should be rendered, "is this the son of David?" a sense supported by the authority of the best ancient Versions, and adopted by the most eminent Expositors. Prof. Scholefield observes, that the *μή* thus joined to the Indicative implies a mixture of *belief, doubt, and wonder.* Comp. vii. 41. and Acts x. 47.

32. *βρωῶν ἔχω, &c.]* Here we trace our Lord's usual endeavour from things corporeal to things spiritual. In the Scriptural and Rabbinical phraseology, *that* is said to be any one's *meat and drink*, by which one is supported, refreshed, or delighted. Of this Schoettgen subjoins several examples from the Rabbinical writers, and others are adduced by Lampe and Wets. from the Classical writers. The most apposite of which may be seen in Rec. Syn., where I have shown that *ἐγὼ* is here, as often, emphatic, q. d. Whatever may be the case with *you, I* have spiritual enjoyments which ye know not. See two able Discourses of Dr. Parr on this text; in which is well pointed out the force of this figurative language.

33. *οὖν.*] This is omitted in very many of the best MSS. and some Versions, and is cancelled by almost all the recent Editors.

34. *βρωμά]* scil. *πνευματικόν.* By τὸ ἔργον is meant, not merely that doctrine, but every other part of the work of salvation enjoined by the Father. Comp. xviii. 4.

35. As to the exact force of our Lord's address, Expositors are not agreed whether it is to be taken *figuratively, or literally.* The most eminent ones (as Grot., De Dieu, Wolf, Whitby, Rosenm., Tittm., and Kuin.) take *λέγετε* for *λέγουσα*, "it is commonly said," and explain the next words to mean: "Is it not a saying among you, that when your seed is sowing, you expect a harvest in four months hence; and thus the husbandman is supported by the distant hope, though yet in the *bud*, of reaping a harvest. Therefore heed not labour, when reward is at hand." This view of the sense *may* be admitted; but it is open to the objections stated by Doddr. and others, that no example of such a proverb has been adduced, and that the period in question is not *four*, but *six* months. Yet the former objection is by no means fatal; and the latter is of no great weight; for it has been proved, that in the East, scarcely more than four months intervene between the *end* of seed-time and the *beginning* of harvest. Not to mention that it is of the nature of *hope* to lessen what lies

ὑμεῖς λέγετε, ὅτι ἔτι * τετραμήνός ἐστι, καὶ ὁ θερισμὸς ἔρχεται; ἰδοὺ, λέγω ὑμῖν· ἐπάρατε τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ὑμῶν, καὶ θεάσασθε τὰς χώρας, ὅτι λευκαὶ εἰσι πρὸς θερισμὸν ἤδη. Καὶ ὁ θερίζων μισθὸν λαμβάνει, 36 καὶ συναίει καρπὸν εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον ἵνα καὶ ὁ σπείρων ὁμοῦ χαίρῃ καὶ ὁ θερίζων. Ἐν γὰρ τούτῳ ὁ λόγος ἐστὶν ὁ ἀληθινός, ὅτι ἄλλος 37 ἐστὶν ὁ σπείρων, καὶ ἄλλος ὁ θερίζων. Ἐγὼ ἀπίστευκα ὑμᾶς θερίζειν, 38 ὃ οὐχ ὑμεῖς κεκοπιύκατε· ἄλλοι κεκοπιύκασι, καὶ ὑμεῖς εἰς τὸν κόπον αὐτῶν εἰσεληλύθατε. Ἐκ δὲ τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης πολλοὶ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς 39 αὐτὸν τῶν Σαμαρειτῶν, διὰ τὸν λόγον τῆς γυναικὸς μαρτυρούσης· Ὅτι εἶπέ μοι πάντα ὅσα ἐποίησα. Ὡς οὖν ἦλθον πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ Σα- 40 μαρεῖται, ἠρώτων αὐτὸν μείναι παρ' αὐτοῖς· καὶ ἔμεινεν ἐκεῖ δύο ἡμέρας. Καὶ πολλῶν πλείους ἐπίστευσαν διὰ τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ, ἢ τῆ 41 γυναικὶ ἔλεγον· Ὅτι οὐκέτι διὰ τὴν σὴν λαλίαν πιστεύομεν· αὐτοὶ 42 γὰρ ἀκηκόαμεν, καὶ οἶδαμεν ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου, ὁ Χριστός.

h Infra 17. 8.

i Matt. 13. 57.
Mark 6. 4.
Luke 4. 24.

Μετὰ δὲ τὰς δύο ἡμέρας ἐξῆλθεν ἐκεῖθεν, καὶ ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὴν 43 Γαλιλαίαν. Ἁὐτὸς γὰρ [ὁ] Ἰησοῦς ἐμαρτύρησεν, ὅτι προφήτης ἐν τῇ 44

in the way to the attainment of its object. However, the *literal* sense may be the true one; and thus the meaning will be, "Ye are now [perhaps] saying, or may say, it is four months to harvest time; but the *spiritual* harvest of souls is already come (though the natural one may not be ready these four months), and therefore ought to commence immediately. See [pointing to the Samaritans coming up] what an Evangelical harvest is approaching?"

— ὑμεῖς λέγετε.] A popular idiom, for λέγετε or λέγουσι scil. ἀνθρώποι, as Matth. xvi. 2. In this address (meant to prepare his disciples for what was about to take place, and to induce them to imitate his example in performing the work of his Father) our Lord uses three arguments to excite their diligence. 1. That the harvest is near. 2. That the fruits to be collected are abundant. 3. That the accomplishment of the whole has been facilitated by others. On the force of τετραμήνους the Commentators are not agreed. Wets. supposes the metaphor to be derived from corn in the blade, of which nothing certain can be pronounced; and this is meant to express hope as yet in the bud. As to the particular time mentioned, though there may sometimes be six months between seed time and harvest, yet a Jewish proverb mentions but *four*; and as seed-time and harvest occupy a considerable period, so from the end of seed time to the beginning of harvest, there may be four months. Others, as Grot., Rosenm., and Tittm., think it is unnecessary to press on the import of τετρα., which is used with popular inexactness; and the general sense, they conceive, is: Never heed labour, when the reward is at hand; q. d. As hope calls forth the harvest-man to his work, so be ye also prompt in the accomplishment of the work I commit to you, for the promotion of your own spiritual good and that of others, nay, of the whole human race.

Instead of the common reading τετραμήνον almost all the best MSS. several Fathers, and all the early Editions, except the Erasmian, have τετραμήνος; which is adopted by every ancient

Editor from Wets. to Scholz, to whose authority and that of MSS., I have deferred; though, after all, the common reading may be the true one; for τριμήνον is found in Hebrews xi. 23., and other forms in — from derivations of μῆν occur in the later writers.

By λευκαὶ is meant a white approaching to yellow, such as accompanies maturity. By χώρας are denoted *cultivated fields*; a signification somewhat rare, but occurring in Luke, and occasionally in the Classical writers.

36. καὶ ὁ θερίζων.] Θερίζειν here denotes all sorts of *harvest work*. Here we have (as Rosenm. observes) a blending of the apodosis with the comparison. The sense is: "As the agricultural labourer receives his wages, whether for ploughing and sowing, or for reaping and gathering the corn; so shall ye receive your reward for gathering men unto the kingdom of God; and whether your labour be only preparatory, or such as consummates the spiritual harvest, ye shall alike be blessed with an ample reward."

37. ἐν τούτῳ.] Sub. πράγματι, in this case or instance. Ὁ λόγος, "saying, proverb." The application is, that as Moses and the Prophets, and finally John the Baptist, prepared the minds of men for receiving the Gospel from Christ; so will the Apostles reap the harvest of converts, for which He had prepared.

38. κεκοπιύκατε] "laboured for, worked out." Κοπιῶν is used of severe toil, such as is required in all the agricultural occupations which precede harvest. Κόπον, i. e. the *fruit* of labour.

41. ἐπίστευσαν] i. e. professed faith in his Messiahship.

42. σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου] i. e. not of the Jews only. So much more enlightened, because better disposed, were the Samaritans than the Jews.

44. αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ 'Ι.] This cannot be meant to offer a *reason* why our Lord went to Galilee. Some have attempted to remove the difficulty by supposing an omission of certain words to which the γὰρ might be suitable, as "Passing by Nazareth," or "but not to Nazareth;" thus distin-

45 ἰδίᾳ παιρίδι τιμὴν οὐκ ἔχει. Ὅτι οὖν ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν, ἐδέ-
 ξαντο αὐτὸν οἱ Γαλιλαῖοι, πάντα ἐωρακότες, ἃ ἐποίησεν ἐν Ἱεροσολύ-
 46 μοις ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ· καὶ αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἦλθον εἰς τὴν ἑορτήν. ^k Ἦλθεν οὖν ^k Supra 2. 1,
11.
 [ὁ Ἰησοῦς] πάλιν εἰς τὴν Κανᾶ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, ὅπου ἐποίησε τὸ ὕδωρ
 οἶνον. Καὶ ἦν τις βασιλικὸς, οὗ ὁ υἱὸς ἠσθένει ἐν Καπερναούμ.
 47 Οὗτος ἀκούσας ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἦκει ἐκ τῆς Ἰουδαίας εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν,
 ἀπῆλθε πρὸς αὐτὸν, καὶ ἠρώτα αὐτὸν ἵνα καταβῆ καὶ ἰάσῃται αὐτοῦ
 48 τὸν υἱόν· ἡμέλλε γὰρ ἀποθνήσκειν. ¹ Εἶπεν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς πρὸς αὐτόν· ¹¹ Cor. 1. 22.
 49 Ἐὰν μὴ σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα ἴδῃτε, οὐ μὴ πιστεύσητε. Λέγει πρὸς
 αὐτὸν ὁ βασιλικός· Κύριε, κατάβηθι πρὶν ὑποθανεῖν τὸ παιδίον μου.
 50 Λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Πορεύου· ὁ υἱὸς σου ζῆ. Καὶ ἐπίστευσεν ὁ
 51 ἀνθρώπος τῷ λόγῳ ᾧ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ ἐπορεύετο. Ἰδὼν δὲ
 αὐτοῦ καταβαίνοντος, οἱ δοῦλοι αὐτοῦ ἀπήνησαν αὐτῷ, καὶ ἀπήγγειλαν
 52 λέγοντες, Ὅτι ὁ παῖς σου ζῆ. Ἐπύθετο οὖν παρ' αὐτῶν τὴν ὄραν,
 ἐν ᾗ κομψότερον ἔσχε· καὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ· Ὅτι χθὲς ὄραν ἐβδόμην
 53 ἀφῆκεν αὐτὸν ὁ πυρετός. Ἐγνώ οὖν ὁ πατήρ ὅτι ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρῃ,
 ἐν ᾗ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς σου ζῆ· καὶ ἐπίστευσεν αὐτός
 54 καὶ ἡ οἰκία αὐτοῦ ὅλη. Τοῦτο πάλιν δευτέρον σημεῖον ἐποίησεν ὁ Ἰη-
 σοῦς, ἐλθὼν ἐκ τῆς Ἰουδαίας εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν.

1 V. ^m *META* ταῦτα ἦν ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, καὶ ἀνέβη ὁ Ἰησοῦς ^m Lev. 23, 2,
Deut. 16, 1.
 2 εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα. Ἔστι δὲ ἐν τοῖς Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐπὶ τῇ προβατικῇ κο-

guishing Nazareth from the rest of Galilee. This method, however, is too arbitrary; and may rather be called *cutting* than *untying* the knot. It is far better (with Alting, Schleusn., Tittm., and Kuin.) to take the γὰρ in the somewhat unusual sense *although*, as in Rom. ix. 15 & 17. Thus the meaning will be, that he returned to Galilee, *though* he had himself borne testimony to the truth of the saying, that a prophet, &c.

45. ἐδέξαντο] gave him a favorable reception.

46. βασιλικός.] On the exact sense of this term Commentators are not agreed. It must denote a *courtier*; but whether holding any office or not, or whether a Jew or a foreigner, is uncertain.

48. ἐὰν μὴ — πιστεύσητε.] This reproof is supposed by Euthym., Doddr., Kuin., and Tittm. to have been meant for the bystanders rather than the nobleman, or rather was directed against the Jews in general. But I am inclined to think that by *ye* is meant *ye Nazarenes*; for we have reason to think the people would not believe without seeing a sign, and consequently our Lord did not vouchsafe a sign, because of their obstinate unbelief. See Matt. xiii. 53. As, however, miracles form the proper evidence of a divine mission, some Commentators think our Lord could not mean the words as a *reproof*. The sense, they say, is: "Except ye see miracles, it cannot be *expected* that ye will believe; therefore I will heal the courtier's son." But that is surely *straining* the sense, and very unnecessarily; for why may we not suppose ἴδῃτε to be put *emphatically*, and the words be meant as a reproof of those who, like the Nazarenes, refused belief in the authority of numerous miracles established on the most credible evidence; but demanded to see them with their *own* eyes. That surely *was* unreasonable. The proof by miracles could not

fairly be demanded to be brought to *every city*, or *individual*.

50. To show that he could do even *more* than the father hoped for, and could heal the sick absent as well as present (and in order thereby to effectually remove any want of faith in the bystanders) Jesus says πορεύου, i. e. "Go in peace: thy business is done." Ζῆ is by the best Commentators interpreted, "is convalescent." So the Heb. גָּיַי in Josh. v. 8. and often in the Rabbinical writers. Comp. the well-known "non vivere, sed valere vita!"

52. κομψότερον ἔσχε.] A popular idiom for βελτιώτερον, or ῥαβύτερον, &c. So the Latin *bellè habere*. Ἄφῃκεν implies the *suddenness* of the cure. See Hippocrates, cited by Triller, ἀφῃκεν αὐτὸν ὁ πυρετός.

54. ἐλθὼν] "after he had returned," &c., πάλιν being construed with ἐλθὼν.

V. 1. ἑορτῇ] *Which* of the Feasts this was the Commentators are not agreed. Some think it was that of *Purim*, in our March, about a month before the Passover. Others suppose it the *Encenia*, or feast of eight days, about the middle of December. Others, again, the *Feast of Tabernacles*. The most eminent Expositors, however, are of opinion that the *Passover* is meant; which, indeed, seems the most probable. And Bp. Middleton, has shewn that, notwithstanding the absence of the Article, the Passover *may* be, and, on other accounts, probably *is* meant. As an example of a similar omission, he adduces xix. 14. ἦν δὲ παρασκευὴ τοῦ Πάσχα, than which, notwithstanding the omission of the *article*, nothing can be more definite.

2. ἐπὶ τῇ προβ. 1.] There is here an ellipsis, which is supplied by ἀγορά, or χῶρα, or (which is adopt-

λυμβήθρα, ἡ ἐπιλεγομένη Ἐβραϊστὶ Βηθεσδά, πέντε στοῶς ἔχουσα.
 Ἐν ταύταις κατέκειτο πλῆθος πολλὸν τῶν ἀσθενούντων, τυφλῶν, χωλῶν, 3

ed by the most eminent Commentators, as Wolf, Lampe, Campb., Kuin., and Tittm.) πύλη. This last is preferable, as being a very frequent ellip. in the best writers from Homer downwards, and is placed beyond doubt by Nehem. iii. 32. xii. 39, who mentions τὴν πύλην τὴν προβατικὴν; whereas there is no evidence of there being any such place as the Sheep-market. This is confirmed by the testimony of Sandys, who tells us that "the gate in question (no doubt the gate of St. Stephen) was called in times past the Gate of the Valley, and of the Flock; for that the cattle came in at this gate which were to be sacrificed in the Temple."

Κολυμβήθρα signifies properly a *bathing-pool*; but here it is supposed by the best Commentators to denote not the pool only, but the buildings which had been erected around it, for the accommodation of the bathers. By Ἐβρ. is meant the Syro-Chaldee, then the vernacular tongue in Judæa.

— Βηθεσδά.] The MSS. vary; but there is not the least reason to doubt the accuracy of the common reading, especially as it is confirmed by the derivation from the Hebr. בֵּית and חַסְדָּה, "house of mercy," or "charity-hospital." That the bath had medicinal properties, is plain; but whence it derived them, is not so certain. The older Commentators refer them to *supernatural agency*; the more recent ones in general to *natural causes*, for which there may be thought some confirmation in the fact, ascertained from Theophyl., that such was the common notion. But as to the causes to which he says the people ascribed it, namely, the effect produced by the washing at this pool of the entrails of the sheep sacrificed at the Temple, or from the blood and washings from the victims being conveyed hither by pipes (which several learned Physiologists think might impart a medicinal property to the water); there is decided evidence *against the former notion*; and the latter rests on no proof. Hence the most eminent of the later Commentators prefer to account for the effects by supposing that the water was of itself a medicinal one, deriving its sanative properties from some mineral with which it was impregnated. "This would (says Mead), from the water being perturbed from the bottom by some natural cause (perhaps subterranean heat, or storms) rise upwards and be mingled with it, and so impart a sanative property to those who bathed in it *before the metallic particles had subsided to the bottom*. That it should have done so, κατὰ καθῶν, is not strange; since Bartholin has, by many examples, shown that it is usual with many medical baths to exert a singular force and sanative power at *stated times*, and at periodical, but *uncertain intervals*." The learned Physician does not deign to notice the difficulty presented by the words ἀγγελοῦς κατέβησαν ἐν κολ. καὶ ἐτέραςαε τὸ ὕδωρ; though he doubtless, with most recent Commentators, referred to the *opinion entertained by the Jews*, who, ignorant of natural philosophy, referred such phenomena to a peculiar Divine operation, to whose agency they, as usual, called in the intervention of angels. The Commentators in question, however, distrusting their own solution, with reference to *natural causes*, propose to cancel part of this narration. But all, or the greater part of the words ἐκδεχομένων — τὸ ὕδωρ must be cancelled.

And for *that* there is only the authority of 2 MSS., 2 very inferior Versions, and Nonnus. But Nonnus can *here* be no authority, since he frequently passes over clauses, and such Versions *very slight*. Besides the MSS. are such as abound with all sorts of liberties taken with the text. Insomuch that Rinck. (Lucub. Crit. in loco) though a rash Critic, and too apt to innovate on the authority of a few MSS., frankly admits, "Sed suspectæ fidei in equis modi ommissionibus censores Alexandrini, qui, veterum exemplorum auctoritate neglectâ, iudicio suo nimium indulgentes, quiddid in profanis et Sacris Scriptoribus minus aptè vel sapienter dictum videbatur, obelis notare cœperunt." And even the innovating Lachmann *removes* the brackets, in which Griesb. had included the passage. As to the other varr. lect., they all plainly originated in a desire to *get rid of the difficulty*. In short, the words seem to have been cancelled by them for the *same reason* that some Critics of the present day (who bear a strong resemblance to the Alexandrian Censores), wish to *get rid of them*. But that is impracticable; since they are plainly *alluded* to at ver. 7. in the words ὕσαν ἢ παραχθῆ τὸ ὕδωρ, which cannot be explained without them. The words must therefore be retained, and interpreted in the best manner we are able. Kuinoel's mode of explanation *creates* more difficulty than it solves. The plain and obvious meaning (and that recognised by the ancient and all earlier modern Commentators) is, that God had endued the Pool with a preternatural healing quality, and in the communication of it employed one of his ministering spirits; not, however, as we have any reason to think, *visibly*. Certainly the *circumstances* of the narration (as that only the *first* who entered after the commotion of the water was healed; and that *all* disorders — not those only which medicinal waters heal — were cured, and that *instantaneously* and *invariably*) utterly exclude the notion of any thing short of miraculous agency. And if the circumstance of the angel's going down be thought (as it is by Doddridge) to "involve the greatest of all difficulties in the Evangelists" (which, however, is far from being the case), we may (with that Commentator and Bps. Pearce and Mann) suppose, that the sanative property was supernatural, and communicated, during a short period, as typical of the "fountain opened for the purifying of sin, by the atonement of the Messiah (the prophecy of Zechariah being thus realized into a type), and that the Evangelist, in thus mentioning the descent of the angel, speaks according to the opinion of the Jews; who ascribed all the operations of God's Providence to the ministry of angels." Yet even Doddr. admits that they and St. John "had reason so to do, since it was the *Scripture scheme* that these benevolent spirits had been, and frequently are, the invisible instruments of good to men." Surely, then, what was right in *them* cannot but be right in *us*; and the common view is the more to be adhered to, as giving no countenance to a most unsound and dangerous principle, on which I have treated in my Annotation on the *Demoniacs*.

— στοῶς.] The best Commentators take these to have been *porticoes* fronting the bath; and roofed, but open on the sides, and supported with pillars placed at regular intervals, from which ran side-

- 4 ξηρῶν, ἐκδεχομένων τὴν τοῦ ὕδατος κίνησιν. Ἄγγελος γὰρ κατὰ καιρὸν κατέβαινεν ἐν τῇ κολυμβήθρῳ, καὶ † ἐτάρασσε τὸ ὕδωρ· ὁ οὖν πρῶτος ἐμβύς μετὰ τὴν ταραχὴν τοῦ ὕδατος ὑγιὴς ἐγένετο, ᾧ δὴποτε κατείχeto 5 νοσήματι. Ἴν δέ τις ἀνθρώπος ἐκεῖ τριάκοντα καὶ ὀκτὼ ἔτη ἔχων ἐν 6 τῇ ἀσθενείᾳ. Τοῦτον ἰδὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς κατικείμενον, καὶ γνοὺς ὅτι πολλὴν 7 ἤδη χρόνον ἔχει, λέγει αὐτῷ· Θέλεις ὑγιὴς γενέσθαι; Ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ ὁ ἀσθενῶν· Κύριε, ἀνθρώπον οὐκ ἔχω, ἵνα, ὅταν ταραχθῇ τὸ ὕδωρ, * βιάη με εἰς τὴν κολυμβήθραν· ἐν ᾧ δὲ ἔρχομαι ἐγὼ, ἄλλος πρὸ 8 ἐμοῦ καταβυβαίνει. ἂ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Ἐγείραι, ἄρον τὸν κράβ-^{n Matt. 9. 6.}
^{Mark 2. 11.}
^{o Luke 5. 24.}
^{o Infra 9. 14.} 9 βατόν σου, καὶ περιπάτει. Ὁ Καὶ εὐθέως ἐγένετο ὑγιὴς ὁ ἀνθρώπος· καὶ ἦρε τὸν κράββατον αὐτοῦ, καὶ περιεπάτει. Ἴν δὲ σάββατον ἐν 10 ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ. Ἐλεγον οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι τῇ τεθεραπευμένῳ· Σάβ-^{p Exod. 20. 10.}
^{Deut. 5. 13.}
^{Neh. 13. 19.}
^{Jer. 17. 21, &c.}
^{Matt. 12. 2.}
^{Mark 2. 24.}
^{Luke 6. 2.} 11 βατόν ἐστιν· οὐκ ἔξεστι σοι ἄραι τὸν κράββατον. Ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς· Ὁ ποιήσας με ὑγιῆ, ἐκείνός μοι εἶπεν· Ἄρον τὸν κράββατόν σου, καὶ 12 περιπάτει. Ἠρώτησαν οὖν αὐτόν· Τίς ἐστιν ὁ ἀνθρώπος ὁ εἰπὼν 13 σοι· Ἄρον τὸν κράββατόν σου, καὶ περιπάτει; Ὁ δὲ ἰαδὴς οὐκ ἤδει τίς ἐστιν· ὁ γὰρ Ἰησοῦς ἐξένευσεν, ὄχλου ὄντος ἐν τῷ τόπῳ. 14 Ἐπειὶ ταῦτα εὗρίσκει αὐτόν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ·^{q Matt. 12. 45.}
^{infra 8. 11.}

walls, separating them from each other; the whole forming a pentagon. This, in so genial a climate as that of Judæa, would be a sufficient shelter by day; and at night the patients were probably removed.

3. Ἀσθενεῖν is applicable to any formed disease; and κατεῖσθαι, to such chronic ones as confine any one to his bed or room. Ξηρῶν seems to denote those labouring under "pining sickness," such as atrophy or consumption.

4. κατὰ καιρὸν.] This only means "at certain unknown intervals of time;" and therefore those who refer it to any stated times, are wrong. Κατείχeto is a stronger term than εἶχeto, and is applied to thoroughly formed, and usually chronic disorders. Instead of ἐτάρασσε τὸ ὕδωρ, very many MSS. and several Versions and early Edd. have ἐταράσσeto τὸ ὕδωρ, which was adopted by Bengel and Matthæi, the latter of whom remarks, "facile excidit τὸ ob proximum τό." But it was almost as easy for the τὸ to have been inadvertently joined with ἐτάρασσε, especially in MSS. written in Uncials, and without any space between the words. Besides, the common reading is more appropriate, and suitable to the context.

5. ἔχων.] This must be construed with ἦν, not (as is done by many) with τριάκ. as appears from v. 6. Comp. Luke xiii. 11. viii. 43. John xi. 39. Ἐχων ἐν τῇ ἀσθ. is for ἀσθενὴς ἦν or ἡσθένει. Render, "There was a man there who had been 33 years labouring under sickness." With respect to the disorder, it was probably paralysis; for not only was such the constant tradition of the primitive ages; but no less than six medical reasons for it are given by Bartholin.

6. ἔχει.] Sub. οὕτως ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ from the preceding.

—θέλεις ἴν. γ.] "Is it your purpose? are you here with the view of being healed?"

7. βιάη.] This, for βιάλλη, is found in the greater part of the best MSS., and has been received by Wets., Griesb., Matth., Vater, and Scholz.

8. κράββατον.] This was a small mean seat,

something like those portable seats used by us on ship-board, or elsewhere; and had, it appears, only a skin, rug, or the like, for a covering. See Mark ii. 4, 11. Περιπάτει has reference to the man's former inability to walk, being bedridden: and the order was no doubt given, to evince the completeness of the cure.

9. εὐθέως ἐγένετο ὑγιὴς.] Thus from an obstinate and incurable disorder he was immediately restored to health, without that languor which is always observable in those cured by human art.

10. οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι.] Not the bystanders, but (as Lampe has shown) some who met the healed person on his way home carrying his bed.

—οὐκ ἔξεστι, &c.] This was supposed to be forbidden in Jer. xvii. 21; which passage, however, has reference only to what involves great labour; though the lawyers interpreted it as forbidding to carry even the lightest weight. Yet the Rabbinical writers recognize some cases, when it was permitted to carry burdens on the Sabbath. If, then, it was lawful for the Lawyers, in certain cases, to dispense with the observance of the Sabbath; how much more for Christ, the LORD OF THE SABBATH!

11. ὁ ποιήσας, &c.] As the Jews admitted, that by the command of a prophet, the Sabbath might be broken, so the man seems to have alluded thereto; and accounting (as he justly might) the worker of such a miracle to be a Prophet.

13. οὐκ ἤδω τίς ἐστιν.] In ἤδω there seems to be a significatio prægenans, for "he knew not [and had not ascertained] who it was, for Jesus ἐξένευσε," "had glided away." Ἐκνέω signifies properly to swim away; and then, like the Latin enatare, and emergere, signifies evadere, to slip away unobserved. He had probably done this, partly to avoid the admiration of the well-disposed, and partly to cut off the envy of the malicious.

14. ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ.] A frequent place of resort to the Jews, and whither the healed man had probably gone, to return God thanks for his recovery.

Ἴδε, ὑγιῆς γέγονας· μηκέτι ἀμάστανε, ἵνα μὴ χεῖρόν τι σοι γένηται.
 Ἀπῆλθεν ὁ ἄνθρωπος, καὶ ἀγγέειλε τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις, οἳ Ἰησοῦς ἐστὶν ἰσ
 ὁ ποιήσας αὐτὸν ὑγιῆ. Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐδίδωκαν τὸν Ἰησοῦν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, 16
 r *Infra* 14. 10. [καὶ ἐξήτουν αὐτὸν ἀποκτείνειν,] ὅτι ταῦτα ἐποίει ἐν σαββάτῳ. Ὁ δὲ 17
 Ἰησοῦς ἀπεκρίνατο αὐτοῖς· Ὁ Πατὴρ μου ἕως ἄρτι ἐργάζεται, καὶ γὼ
 s *Infra* 7. 19. ἐργάζομαι. Διὰ τοῦτο οὐκ μᾶλλον ἐξήτουν αὐτὸν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἀπο- 18
 & 8. 38. κτείνειν, ὅτι οὐ μόνον ἔλκε τὸ σάββατον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πατέρα ἰδίου ἔλεγε
 & 9. 4. τὸν Θεόν, ἵσον ἑαυτὸν ποιῶν τῷ Θεῷ. Ἀπεκρίνατο οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ 19
 & 10. 32. εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν· οὐ δύναται ὁ Τίος ποιεῖν ἄφ'
 Phil. 2. 6. ἑαυτοῦ οὐδὲν, ἐὰν μὴ τι βλέπῃ τὸν Πατέρα ποιοῦντα· ἢ γὰρ ἂν ἐκί-

—μηκέτι ἀμάστανε, &c.] It is not necessary to refer this, with many Commentators, to the Jewish notion, that all violent disorders were the punishment of sin; but we may (with Brug., Grot., and Doddr.) suppose, that the man's disorder had really been brought on by intemperance and vice; and that our Lord meant to give him a proof of his omniscience, by showing his knowledge of that fact.

15. ἀπῆλθεν, &c.] There is no reason to suppose (with some Commentators) that his intention in going was a bad one: it was rather from a wish to justify himself for breaking the Sabbath by the command of an undoubted prophet; as also from gratitude to his benefactor, and benevolence to others, by making known the fountain of health. By τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις may be meant the influential persons among the Jews, i. e. the Sanhedrim and leading Doctors and Jurists, or (as Tittm. supposes) those Jews whom he met with, as ver. 10.

17. ἀπεκρίνατο.] As an answer implies a question, Grot., Lampe, and others regard the following as a justification of his conduct, pronounced by Jesus before the Rulers, either at public or private examination. No previous questions, however, are necessary to be supposed; but we may simply take ἀπεκρίνατο, either in the sense addressed, or for ἀπελογήσατο; on which see Steph. Thes. Our Lord, it seems, intended to refute their calumny by thus addressing them, while standing by at the Temple. The words of his apology are obscure from brevity; and from this, and their abruptness, the best Commentators infer that the Evangelist has not recorded the whole of what was then said. But there is something so precarious in that principle, that it ought never to be resorted to in a case of necessity; which does not exist here. It should seem that our Lord comprehended all that was necessary in one brief, but pithy, dictum, in order to make the more impression on those whom he addressed; especially as it was customary with the Jews to express things, as much as possible, with *apophthegmatical* brevity. Besides, it was not so obscure, but that the Jews readily comprehended the most material part, i. e. his claiming to be Son of God, and consequently equal with God; from which his right to dispense with the Sabbath would, on the authority even of the Jewish traditions, be undoubted. By ἐργάζεσθαι is meant the operation of God, as displayed in the preservation and governance of all created beings, which are therefore the works of his omnipotence; and by ἕως ἄρτι is expressed the perpetuity of that preservation and governance, unremittingly ex-

erted for the safety and welfare of his creatures. Something similar occurs in Philo. i. 44. 29. cited by Wets. παθεῖται γὰρ οὐδέποτε ποιῶν ὁ Θεός· ἀλλ' ὥσπερ ἴδιον τὸ καίεν πνός, καὶ χρίνος τὸ ψέχειν. οὕτω καὶ Θεοῦ τὸ ποιεῖν. and i. 46. 49. ποιῶν ὁ Θεός οὐ πάύεται· ἀλλ' ἐτέρων γενέσεως ἄρχεται. By this example of God, our Lord intends to rebut their crimination, and to teach them that he imitates God, who hath no Sabbath, but doth His work perpetually. "As my Father doth not cease to benefit men on the Sabbath, neither am I impeded by any such observance." In short, the argument is, that as his Father governed and preserved the world as well on the Sabbath as on other days, so he, as Son, had an equal right so to do. But this involved equality with his Father, and consequently essential DIVINITY. But what is more, our Lord professes to do the same works which the Father doth; and these not only of benevolence, but of omnipotence. He therefore equals himself with the Father. And when the Jews, as was natural, understood his words of claiming equality with God, Jesus did not attempt to remove that notion, but confirmed and more expressly asserted it. See Tittman.

18. πατέρα ἴδιον &c.] By this is meant calling God peculiarly his Father; thus making himself equal to God. See Campb. For they interpreted his words to mean, that being the Son of God and the Messiah, he could, by his own proper authority, dispense with the observance of the Sabbath. Now this was contrary to their opinion of the power of the Messiah, which they maintained to be only delegated, and in all things subservient, and inferior to that of the Father. Hence they understood him as not claiming to be Messiah in the common sense, but in a peculiar and sublime one, by which he arrogated an authority independent of God; and therefore, in a certain sense, was equal to Him.

19. οὐ δύναται, &c.] To this charge of the Jews, that he claimed equality with God, by professing to have power, by his own authority, to dispense with the observance of the Sabbath, Jesus replies by a fuller explanation of what he had before said. The justification which follows was (as appears from v. 18.) pronounced some little time after the preceding. Here our Lord professes, that he doth nothing of his own will only, but in conformity and conjunction with that of the Father, and that therefore his works are contemporaneous to those of the Father; nay, that there is the same will both of Father and Son, with also the same power. That he doth all things after the example of the Father, and therefore can do nothing contrary to His will; in

- 20 ρος ποιῆ, ταῦτα καὶ ὁ Πῶς ὁμοίως ποιεῖ. "Ὁ γὰρ Πατὴρ φιλεῖ τὸν ^{u Supra 3. 35.}
 Πῶν, καὶ πάντα δείκνυσιν αὐτῷ, ἃ αὐτὸς ποιεῖ· καὶ μεζονα τούτων
 21 δείξει αὐτῷ ἔργου, ἵνα ὑμεῖς θαναμάζητε. Ὡσπερ γὰρ ὁ Πατὴρ ἐγείρει
 τοὺς νεκροὺς καὶ ζωοποιεῖ, οὕτω καὶ ὁ Πῶς οὓς θέλει ζωοποιεῖ.
 22 * Οὐδέ γὰρ ὁ Πατὴρ κρίνει οὐδένα, ἀλλὰ τὴν κρίσιν πῶσον δέδωκε ^{x Matt. 11. 27.}
 τῷ Πῶ. * ἵνα πάντες τιμῶσι τὸν Πῶν, καθὼς τιμῶσι τὸν Πατέρα. ^{& 25. 19.}
 Ὁ μὴ τιμῶν τὸν Πῶν, οὐ τιμᾷ τὸν Πατέρα τὸν πέμψαντα αὐτόν. ^{supra 3. 35.}
 23 τῷ Πῶ. * ἵνα πάντες τιμῶσι τὸν Πῶν, καθὼς τιμῶσι τὸν Πατέρα. ^{infra 17. 2.}
 Ὁ μὴ τιμῶν τὸν Πῶν, οὐ τιμᾷ τὸν Πατέρα τὸν πέμψαντα αὐτόν. ^{Acts 17. 31.}
 24 * Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν· ὅτι ὁ τὸν λόγον μου ἀκούων καὶ πιστεύων ^{z Supra 3. 18.}
 τῷ πέμψαντί με ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον· καὶ εἰς κρίσιν οὐκ ἔρχεται, ἀλλὰ ^{infra 6. 40, 47.}
 25 μεταβέβηκεν ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου εἰς τὴν ζωὴν. * Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν· ὅτι ^{& 8. 51.}
 ἔρχεται ὥρα, καὶ νῦν ἐστίν, ὅτε οἱ νεκροὶ ἀκούσονται τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ Πῶ ^{Rom. 8. 24.}
 26 τοῦ Θεοῦ· καὶ οἱ ἀκούσαντες ζήσουσι. Ὡσπερ γὰρ ὁ Πατὴρ ἔχει ζωὴν ^{Eph. 2. 8.}
 27 ἐν ἑαυτῷ, οὕτως ἔδωκε καὶ τῷ Πῶ ζωὴν ἔχειν ἐν ἑαυτῷ. Καὶ ἐξουσίου ^{1 John 3. 2.}
^{Luke 23. 43.}
^{1 Eph. 2. 1, 5.}
^{1 Tim. 5. 6.}
^{Rev. 3. 1.}
^{Rom. 6. 4.}
^{Gal. 2. 20.}

short, that he cannot depart from the example of the Father, either in doing, or not doing, any thing. Thus there is a comparison of the works of the Father with those of the Son, in universality, identity, and conjunction of will and plan. Hence we are taught the *economical* subordination of the Son to the Father, and yet the co-equality of both: on which see Bp. Bull's *Defensio Fidei Nicænæ*, Sect. iv. *ὁ δὲναται*, as in John iii. 9. 12 & 39, imports not a *physical*, but a *moral* impossibility, q. d. *alienissimum fuerit ab illo*. Ἐάν μὴ is for ἀλλὰ or ἀλλ' ἦν, as in Gal. ii. 16. on which I have before treated.

20. In this verse is expressed in a *popular* and general way (but *οικονομικῶς*) that the Father, out of love to the Son, communicates to him the power of doing *whatever he doth*; nay, will enable him to achieve greater works. ἵνα is put for ὥστε, denoting simply the *event*. Δείκνυσι literally signifies to show any one how to do a thing; and, by implication, to enable him to do it. It here, as Doddr. observes, "has reference to the complete knowledge the Son hath of the whole of the Father's counsels, in every part of their mutual relations; and expresses the communication of the power to work such wonderful works as God worketh, and even greater, namely, miracles of the most illustrious kind."

21. The portion from ver. 21 to 31. has been variously explained. The question in dispute is, what our Lord meant to be understood by the *resurrection of the dead*, and *judgment*, here mentioned; whether, in a figurative sense, the awakening the men of that generation to a spiritual life; or, in a natural one, the resurrection of all men to eternal life: and whether, by *judgment*, he meant the *retribution* to succeed this. The best Expositors are in general agreed in adopting the *second* interpretation, which is, indeed, more agreeable to what *precedes*, and is probably what was *principally* intended. But may it not be here (as in the prophetic declarations of our Lord at Matt. xxiv.) that a two-fold sense was intended: so that under the natural is couched also a mystical one. Such a sense, even Tittm. admits, is allowed by the context and the usus loquendi; nay, sometimes seems to be the prominent one, exactly as in the above passage of Matt.

24. εἰς κρίσιν οὐκ ἔρχεται.] Ἔρχεται is for ἐλεύ-

σεται, to shew the certainty of the event; and κρ. is for κατόκρισιν or κόλασιν.

— μεταβέβηκεν — ζωὴν.] These words yield a good sense on either of the above mentioned interpretations, according to the latter of which they will signify, "he hath as it were passed, or he is to pass (on both of which see Win. Gr.) from death to a state of everlasting life and happiness," the Preterite being used to express the *certainty* of the thing; or, according to the former, "he hath passed from a state of death and condemnation unto a state which will terminate in life eternal." The two senses, however, merge into each other.

25, 26. These verses admit of a good sense on either of the foregoing interpretations: and Expositors adopt some one, some the other; not considering that *both* were probably intended. However, the *tropical* and *mystical* should seem to be more prominent than the *literal*. Thus by νεκροὶ will be meant those who are dead in trespasses and sins (Eph. v. 14.), and by ζήσουσι, that "they shall be put into the way of obtaining eternal life," namely, by hearkening to the preaching of Christ's Gospel. The full sense of ver. 26. may be thus expressed in paraphrase: "For as the Father hath in himself, as the Fountain of life, the power of giving [the] life or salvation [which had been forfeited by the fall of man in Adam], so hath he communicated to the Son, in like manner, the power to give this eternal life." At ver. 27. there is a transition to the *literal* sense; κρίσιν ποιῶν meaning to hold judgment. "Ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου has already occurred 70 times, and now for the first time without either of the Articles, from which Beza and others contend that the sense is 'son of a man.' They attempt to defend this on a *Syriasm*, which is rather *against* their conclusion. The omission of the Articles must be explained from *Greek* usage. Now the Articles in the phrase ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου were employed because Christ assumed to himself this appellation, and the very *assumption* forbade him to use the phrase otherwise than as ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. And the first Article requires the second, for ὁ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου would offend against *regimen*. Hence the Article is not *materially* and *essentially* necessary, but only *accidentally*; and consequently it will not be admitted; but when *regimen* requires it, i. e. when ὁ υἱὸς pre-

b Dan. 12. 2.
1 Cor. 15. 52.
1 Thess. 4. 16.

ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ καὶ κρίσιν ποιεῖν, ὅτι υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστὶ. ^b Μὴ θαυμά- 28

ζετε τοῦτο· ὅτι ἔρχεται ὥρα, ἐν ἣ ἅ πάντες οἱ ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις ἀκού-

c Matt. 25. 46.

σονται τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ, ^c καὶ ἐκπορεύσονται· οἱ τὰ ἀγαθὰ ποιή- 29

σαντες εἰς ἀνάστασιν ζωῆς, οἱ δὲ τὰ φαῦλα πράξαντες εἰς ἀνάστασιν

d Supra ver. 19.
infra 6. 38.

κρίσεως. ^d Οὐ δύναμαι ἐγὼ ποιεῖν ἅπ' ἑμαυτοῦ οὐδέν. καθὼς ἀκούω, 30

e Infra 8. 14.

κρίνω· καὶ ἡ κρίσις ἣ ἐμὴ δικαία ἐστίν· ὅτι οὐ ζητῶ τὸ θέλημα τὸ

f Isa. 42. 1.
Matt. 3. 17.
& 17. 5.

ἐμὸν, ἀλλὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με [Πατρὸς]. ^e Ἐὰν ἐγὼ μαρ- 31

τυῶ περὶ ἑμαυτοῦ, ἡ μαρτυρία μου οὐκ ἔστιν ἀληθής. ^f Ἄλλος ἐστὶν 32

g Supra 1. 19.

ὁ μαρτυρῶν περὶ ἐμοῦ· καὶ οἶδα ὅτι ἀληθής ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία, ἣν

μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ. ^g Ὑμεῖς ἀπεστάλατε πρὸς Ἰωάννην· καὶ μεμαρ- 33

τύρηκε τῇ ἀληθείᾳ. Ἐγὼ δὲ οὐ παρὰ ἀνθρώπου τὴν μαρτυρίαν λαμ- 34

βάνω· ἀλλὰ ταῦτα λέγω ἵνα ὑμεῖς σωθῆτε. Ἐκεῖνος ἦν ὁ λύχνος ὁ 35

cedes. Now here not *ὁ υἱὸς*, but *υἱὸς* follows *ἐστὶ*, and the phrase could not be otherwise than *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου*. Moreover, the sense for which these Commentators contend is equally deducible from the common interpretation; for the title Son of man has everywhere reference to the *incarnation* of Christ, and therefore implies His acquaintance with human infirmity." (Bp. Middl.) In this view of the sense all the ancient Expositors agree, and some of the most eminent modern ones, as Grot., Lampe, Morus, Rosenn., Kuin., and Tittm., who compare a similar use of *Υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου* at Matt. xiv. 33. and elsewhere. Thus the meaning is, that Christ hath committed to him likewise authority to *hold judgment* at the last day; for his Mediatorial office will not be complete till he hath *judged* the world. There is here a reference to the *incarnation* of Christ, which implies his acquaintance with human infirmity, and consequently his fitness to be our Judge. This is strongly confirmed by Hebr. iv. 15. where the Apostle exhorts his converts *καταεῖν τῆς δολογίας*, inasmuch as they have a great High-priest in the heavens, who is at once *ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ* and *Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*; the words *πεπρασμένον τῶν ἀσθενειῶν*, &c., being only a fuller expression of the idea Son of man. Lampe has here an able note, in which he goes far to prove that there is here an especial reference to Christ's Mediatorial office and acquirement of the gift of salvation by his perfect obedience; and that exercise of judgment pertains to the reward of this obedience. See Is. liii. 12.

28, 29. We have here a *transition* from the *moral* to the *physical* resurrection, and the judgment connected with it. *Μὴ θαυμάζετε* has reference to what was said at vv. 21. & 25.; yet not in the *literal* acceptance of those words, as Kuin. and Tittm. imagine, (for that would yield a very frigid sense, as if it were greater to raise the *buried* than the *dead*) but the *allegorical* and mystical; q. d. "Wonder not at what I have said of this moral revivification; for," &c. This physical resurrection, though not a work greater in itself, yet was, by the consequences it drew with it, more august and worthy of admiration.

30. *οὐ δύναμαι* — *οὐδέν*.] *Δύναμαι* and *ἅπ' ἑμαυτοῦ* are to be taken as at v. 19.; only what is here said of *any* action, is here applicable to *judging*. (Enthym.) Our Lord here, as Scott observes, repeats his declaration of the entire coincidence of design and operation between the Father and the Son. It was impossible he should do any

thing in his work as Mediator, or as Judge, from any motive, to any end, or by any power, different from those of the Father. Thus what is done by Christ is understood to be done with the full concurrence of the Father, and therefore cannot but be just.

— The words *ὅτι οὐ ζητῶ*, &c., suggests another reason why his judgment is just;—because he is not biased by any private interest or passion, as human judges sometimes are, but regards alone his Father's will.

31. *ἰὰν ἐγὼ μαρτυρῶ*, &c.] Jesus proceeds to show that, from his actions, miracles, and the character of his doctrines, he is proved to be the Messiah; and first anticipates the objection (couched in a proverbial saying) that no one is a fit witness in his own case. Render: "If I were to bear witness of myself, [only], my witness would not be valid;" *ἀληθής* being for *πιστός*. Thus there will be no discrepancy between what is said here and at viii. 14. Compare viii. 17. There is an ellip. of *μόνος*; and *ἀληθής* is for *πιστός*.

32. *ἄλλος*.] Who is here meant, the Commentators are not agreed. The ancient and early modern ones suppose *John the Baptist*; but some more recent ones, as Kuin. and Lampe, the *Father*. But although they make out a tolerable case, yet the former interpretation is so strongly confirmed by what follows, that I can scarcely doubt but that it is the true one.

33. *ὕμεῖς* — *ἀληθείᾳ*] i. e. You yourselves have heard the witness appealed to by a public mission, and he bore testimony concerning us. You have therefore *human* testimony. See i. 8. 15. & 26. 3 John 3. 6.

34. *ἐγὼ δὲ οὐ*, &c.] The sense is: "I say not this through a desire for the honour which human fame can bestow. I want—I *accept* not the testimony of any man. I only appeal to the testimony of John, in order that, believing in me through that testimony, ye may be saved."

35. *ὁ λύχνος ὁ καίμενος*.] Render the "*burning and shining light*." "John's ministry (says Campb.) was of a peculiar character; he was the single prophet in whom the old Dispensation had its completion, and by whom the new was introduced; therefore, until our Lord's ministry took place, John may justly be said to have been the *light* of that generation." Bp. Middlet. thinks there is an allusion to some phrase then current to signify an enlightened teacher: which is confirmed not only by what Lightf. says, that "a per-

- καίόμενος καὶ φαίνων· ὑμεῖς δὲ ἠθελήσατε ἀγαλλισθῆναι πρὸς ὄραν
 36 ἐν τῷ φωτὶ αὐτοῦ. ^h Ἐγὼ δὲ ἔχω τὴν μαρτυρίαν μεζῶ τοῦ Ἰωάννου·
 τὰ γὰρ ἔργα ἃ ἔδωκέ μοι ὁ Πατήρ ἵνα τελειώσω αὐτὰ, αὐτὰ τὰ ἔργα
 37 ἃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ, μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ, ὅτι ὁ Πατήρ με ἀπέσταλκε. ⁱ καὶ ὁ
 πέμψας με Πατήρ αὐτὸς μεμαρτύρηκε περὶ ἐμοῦ. Οὐτε φωνὴν αὐτοῦ
 38 ἀκηκόατε πώποτε, οὔτε εἶδος αὐτοῦ ἐωράκατε. καὶ τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ
 οὐκ ἔχετε μένοντα ἐν ὑμῖν· ὅτι ὃν ἀπέστειλεν ἐκεῖνος, τούτῳ ὑμεῖς οὐ
 39 πιστεύετε. ^k Ἐρευνᾶτε τὰς γραφάς, ὅτι ὑμεῖς δοκεῖτε ἐν αὐταῖς ζῶν
 40 αἰώνιον ἔχειν. (καὶ ἐκεῖναί εἰσιν αἱ μαρτυροῦσαι περὶ ἐμοῦ)· καὶ οὐ
 41 θέλετε ἐλθεῖν πρὸς με, ἵνα ζῶν ἔχητε. Δόξαν παρὰ ἀνθρώπων οὐ
 42 λαμβάνω· ἀλλ' ἔγνωκα ὑμᾶς, ὅτι τὴν ἀγάπην τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐκ ἔχετε ἐν

^h Matt. 3. 17.
 & 17. 5.
 Mark 1. 11.
 & 9. 7.
 Luke 3. 22.
 & 24. 35.
 supra 1. 33.
 infra 6. 27.
 & 8. 18.
 & 10. 25.
 & 12. 28.
 2 Pet. 1. 17.
 3 Exod. 33. 20.
 Deut. 4. 12.
 1 Tim. 6. 16.
 1 John 4. 12.
 k Isa. 8. 20.
 & 34. 16.
 Luke 16. 29,
 & 24. 27.
 & Acta 17. 11.
 Deut. 18. 15.
 supra 1. 45.

son famous for light or knowledge was called a candle, the candle of the Law, the lamp of light; but by a passage of Salomon Jarchi cited by Lampe; and, what is more, by Ecclus. xlviii. 1. Nor is the metaphor unknown in the Classical writers.

—[ὁ θελ. ἀγαλλ.] The sense is, “Ye were disposed to rejoice greatly in his light, but only temporarily, until he reproved their vices, when they said he had a Devil.” Luke vii. 30. 33.

36. Our Lord now suggests the reason why he needs not the testimony of John; and that by adducing the infinitely weightier one of the FATHER; appealing to the works the Father hath commissioned him to accomplish, and adverting to the testimony of the Prophets of the O. T. By ἔργα are meant especially miracles, but not to the exclusion of other works suitable to the Messiah. (See xiv. 11, 12.) On the force of the Article (τῆν) here see Middlet. G. A. i. 8. I.

36, 37. The sense is here somewhat obscure, and consequently controverted. See Rec. Syn. If, however, the declaration and testimony here spoken of may be (as the context requires) limited to bearing witness of Christ; and if the words be supposed closely connected with the preceding, a sense will arise very suitable; as follows: “Nay, the Father himself, who hath sent me, hath borne testimony of me; although ye have not heard him audibly, nor seen him in visible form declaring this testimony of me.” Such Lampe, Kuin., and Tittm., agree is the sense of the passage. The question, however, is, how the word *although* can be proved to have any place here. The only way to remove this difficulty is to suppose an ellipsis of *καίπερ*, as in Heb. iv. 1. οὐδὲν διαφέρει δούλου, κίριος πάντων ὢν. It is true we have here not a participle, but a verb. Yet this may be regarded as one among the many anomalies to be met with in St. John's writings. The testimony of God here meant, is that of the Scriptures of the O. T., spoken of in the next verse, (namely, in his declarations, promises, and prophecies of a Messiah, all fulfilled in Jesus); and that adverted to in the preceding verse, the power of working miracles communicated to Christ. Compare vi. 27. Thus it is meant (as Gilpin suggests) that “though the witness is invisible, the testimony is evident.”

The next words (verse 37.) may be rendered, “Yea, ye have not his Word [i. e. the Scriptures] abiding in you,” i. e. ye suffer them not to sink into your minds, so as to understand their true

import; or perceive their fulfilment in me; as is declared plainly in the next verse.

39. *ἰρευνᾶτε τὰς γραφάς.*] It has been debated whether *ἰρευνᾶτε*, ought to be taken as an *Imperative*, or as an *Indicative*. The former method is adopted by almost all the ancient, and a great majority of the modern Commentators; the latter, by the most eminent modern ones (besides whom, see Vitringa de Synag. Jud. p. 671., who illustrates what is meant by *ἰρευνᾶτε*, and Bp. Bull's Harm. Apost. x. 17.); and with reason; for the Indic. is, as we have seen, far more agreeable to the context, and (as Lampe and Campb. show) is required by the scope of the passage and the course of argument. Nor are the objections which have been advanced against it of any weight: while, on the other hand, the *Imperative* involves a great harshness in reference to the *δοκεῖτε* just after. That the Jews did use a diligent investigation and study of the Scriptures, is certain from the ancient Rabbinical writings. So Pirke Aboth: “Versa eam [Scripturam] et versa eam.” Our Lord grants this; and by implication commends them for it; but complains that this has not its due effect in bringing them to acknowledge him as their Saviour, and thus to obtain salvation by Him. Thus the very admission that they search the Scriptures involves also a tacit reproof, no less than that (as the Prophet says) “seeing, they see not,” being gross-minded, and “slow of heart to believe all that the Prophets foretold of him.” The sense may be thus expressed, “Ye indeed search diligently the Scriptures, supposing that in them ye have [revealed] the way of attaining eternal life [but, *atqui*, those are they which bear testimony of me]; and [yet] ye will not come unto me [and become my disciples] that ye may attain this life.” The general sense is admirably expressed by Bp. Bull. ubi supra, and Lampe.

40. Here is intimated the cause of this failure, namely, the want of a disposition to impartially weigh the evidence.

—*ἔλθειν πρὸς* X. is a phrase occurring also at vi. 35. 37. 44. 45. vii. 37. x. 41. xiv. 6., which signifies to resort to Jesus and accept him as a Teacher and Saviour.

41, 42. Our Lord means to say, that he does not so speak as if he needed their testimony or sanction, but solely to warn them of the awful error in which they were. On this He (at v. 42.) engrafs another sentence, containing the reason why they would not receive him as the Messiah; namely, because they had not the love of God (the first and great principle of religion) in their hearts.

ἐαυτοῖς. Ἐγὼ ἐλήλυθα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Πατρὸς μου, καὶ οὐ λαμ- 43
βάνετε με· ἐὰν ἄλλος ἔλθῃ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τῷ ἰδίῳ, ἐκείνον λήψετε.

¹ Infr. 12. 43.
Rom. 2. 29.

¹ Πῶς δύνασθε ὑμεῖς πιστεῦσαι, δόξαν παρὰ ἀλλήλων λαμβάνοντες, καὶ 44
τὴν δόξαν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ μόνου Θεοῦ οὐ ζητεῖτε; Μὴ δοκεῖτε ὅτι ἐγὼ 45
κατηγορήσω ὑμῶν πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα· ἔστιν ὁ κατηγορῶν ὑμῶν, Μωϋ-
σῆς, εἰς ὃν ὑμεῖς ἠλπίζατε. ^m Εἰ γὰρ ἐπιστεύετε Μωϋσῆ, ἐπιστεύετε 46
ἂν ἐμοί· περὶ γὰρ ἐμοῦ ἐκείνος ἔγραψεν. Εἰ δὲ τοῖς ἐκείνου γράμ- 47
μασι οὐ πιστεύετε, πῶς τοῖς ἐμοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς πιστεύετε;

^m Gen. 3. 15.
& 22. 13.
& 49. 10.
Deut. 18. 15.

VI. ΜΕΤΑ ταῦτα ἀπῆλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης τῆς 1

Γαλιλαίας τῆς Τιβεριάδος· καὶ ἠκολούθει αὐτῷ ὄχλος πολὺς, ὅτι ἐόρων 2
αὐτοῦ τὰ σημεῖα, ἃ ἐποίει ἐπὶ τῶν ὑσθενοῦντων. Ἀπῆλθε δὲ εἰς τὸ 3

ⁿ Exod. 12. 18.
Lev. 23. 5.
Num. 28. 16.
Deut. 16. 1.
^o Matt. 14. 15.
^{Mark} 6. 35.
^{Luke} 9. 12.

ὄρος ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ ἐκεῖ ἐκάθητο μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ. ⁿ ἦν δὲ 4

ἐγγὺς τὸ πύσχα ἢ εορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων. ^o Ἐπάρας οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοὺς 5
ὄφθαλμοὺς, καὶ θεασάμενος ὅτι πολὺς ὄχλος ἔρχεται πρὸς αὐτὸν, λέγει
πρὸς τὸν Φίλιππον· Πόθεν ἀγοράσομεν ἄρτους, ἵνα φάγωσιν οὗτοι;

(Τοῦτο δὲ ἔλεγε πειράζων αὐτόν· αὐτὸς γὰρ ᾔδει τί ἔμελλε ποιῆν.) 6
Ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ Φίλιππος· Διακοσίων δηναρίων ἄρτοι οὐκ ἀρκοῦσιν 7

^p 2 Kings 4. 43.

αὐτοῖς, ἵνα ἕκαστος αὐτῶν βραχὺ τι λάβῃ. Λέγει αὐτῷ εἷς ἐκ τῶν 8

μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, Ἀνδρέας ὁ ἀδελφὸς Σίμωνος Πέτρου· ^p Ἔστι παιδά- 9
ριον ἐν ᾧδε, ὃ ἔχει πέντε ἄρτους κριθίνους καὶ δύο ὄψαρια· ἀλλὰ

^q 1 Sam. 9. 13.

ταῦτα τί ἔστιν εἰς τοσοῦτους; Ἐῖπε δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Ποιήσατε τοὺς 10
ἀνθρώπους ἀναπεσεῖν. ἦν δὲ χόρτος πολὺς ἐν τῷ τόπῳ. ἀνέπεσον οὖν

οἱ ἄνδρες τὸν ἄριθμὸν ὡσεὶ πεντακισχίλιοι. ^q Ἐλιβε δὲ τοὺς ἄρτους 11
ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ εὐχαριστήσας διέδωκε τοῖς μαθηταῖς, οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ τοῖς

ἀνακειμένοις· ὁμοίως καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὄψαριων ὅσον ἤθελον. Ὡς δὲ ἐνε- 12
πλήσθησαν, λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ· Συναγάγετε τὰ περισσεύσαντα

κλάσματα, ἵνα μὴ τι ἀπόληται. Συνήγαγον οὖν, καὶ ἐγένισαν δώδεκα 13
κοφίνους κλασμάτων ἐκ τῶν πέντε ἄρτων τῶν κριθίνων, ἃ ἐπερίσσευσ

43. This verse is, I conceive, a further unfolding of the sentiment at verse 41. and the sense is: "I need not human glory, because I came unto you with Divine authority. Yet, so perverse are ye, that if another should come with only his *own* (i. e. human) authority, him ye will admit."

44. Here is suggested the *reason* for this preference, namely, the influence of ambition, vain-glory, and worldly-mindedness. The *πῶς δύνασθε*, (which is to be understood comparatē, q. d. How can it be expected but that), as Lampe remarks, implies that the origin of this inability was perversity of will, and such hardness of heart that they *would* not come to Christ.

45. *μὴ δοκεῖτε*, &c.] i. e. Think not that I will accuse you to the Father. This I *need* not do, since Moses and his writings will be sufficient accusers; i. e. ye will be condemned for not believing his writings which testify of me, both by express predictions, and by typical representations. See Vitringa de Synag. J. p. 999.

46. Their pretences for not believing in Christ were these two, their love to God and their reverence for the law of Moses: Christ shows at v. 42. they could have no true *love to God*; and in this verse, that they had no real *faith in Moses*;

for if they had, they would have believed on Him. (Drs. Whitby and Hammond.)

— *περὶ ἐμοῦ ἔγραψεν*] i. e. not only showed by what marks a Divine legate might be distinguished from a false prophet, (see Deut. xviii. 15. seqq.) but predicted the coming of the author of a better religion.

47. *πῶς — πιστ.*] how can ye be expected to give credence? See Winer's Gr. § 33. 3. and Comp. John xv. 17.

VI. On v. 1—14. see Matt. xiv. 13—21, and Notes. At v. 6. *πειράζων* is for *δοκιμάζων*.

9. *παιδάριον*] a youth, *ἡν* between boyhood and manhood. This was probably a baker's servant, who had been sent to dispose of bread in a place where, from the multitude collected, it was likely to obtain a ready sale.

10. *ἦν δὲ χόρτος — τόπος*.] And thus it would be very suitable for the purpose. On these incidental and parenthetical circumstances, which, as Dr. Paley observes, mark an eye-witness; with which I would compare Joseph. Ant. iv. 3. 1. *φανικόφυτον δὲ ἐστὶ τὸ χῶριον*. Xenoph. Anab. i. 4. 9. *ἐξελάνει ἐπὶ τὸν Χάλον ποταμῶν, πλήρη ἰχθύων καὶ πραιῶν*. Æschyl. Pers. 510. Thucyd. iv. 13.

- 14 τοῖς βεβρωκόσιν. Ὁ οὖν ἄνθρωποι ἰδόντες ὃ ἐποίησε σημεῖον ὁ
 Ἰησοῦς, ἔλεγον· Ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ προφήτης ὁ ἐρχόμενος εἰς
 15 τὸν κόσμον. Ἰησοῦς οὖν γινούς ὅτι μέλλουσιν ἔρξασθαι καὶ ὑπάξειν
 αὐτὸν, ἵνα ποιήσωσιν αὐτὸν βασιλεία, ἀνεχώρησε πάλιν εἰς τὸ ὄρος αὐτὸς
 16 μόνος. Ὡς δὲ ὄψα ἐγένετο, κατέβησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν
 17 θάλασσαν· καὶ ἐμβάντες εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, ἤρχοντο πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης
 εἰς Καπερναοῦμ. Καὶ σκοτία ἤδη ἐγεγόνει, καὶ οὐκ ἐληλύθει πρὸς
 18 αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἢ τε θάλασσα, ἀνέμου μεγάλου πνέοντος, διηγείρετο.
 19 Ἐλληκότες οὖν ὡς σταδίους εἰκοσιπέντε ἢ τριάκοντα, θεωροῦσι τὸν
 Ἰησοῦν περιπατοῦντα ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης, καὶ ἐγγὺς τοῦ πλοίου γινόμε-
 20 νον· καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν. Ὁ δὲ λέγει αὐτοῖς· Ἰγὼ εἰμὶ· μὴ φοβεῖσθε.
 21 Ἦθελον οὖν λαβεῖν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, καὶ εὐθέως τὸ πλοῖον ἐγένετο
 ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς εἰς ἣν ὑπῆγον.
 22 Τῇ ἐπαύριον ὁ ὄχλος ὁ ἐσθηκῶς πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης, ἰδὼν ὅτι
 πλοιάριον ἄλλο οὐκ ἦν ἐκεῖ εἰ μὴ ἐν ἐκείνῳ εἰς ὃ ἐνέβησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ
 αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὅτι οὐ συνεισῆλθε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὸ
 23 πλοιάριον, ἀλλὰ μόνοι οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἀπῆλθον· (ἄλλα δὲ ἦλθε
 πλοίαρια ἐκ Τιβεριάδος ἐγγὺς τοῦ τόπου ὅπου ἔφαγον τὸν ἄρτον, ἐν-
 24 χαριστήσαντος τοῦ Κυρίου·) ὅτε οὖν εἶδεν ὁ ὄχλος ὅτι Ἰησοῦς οὐκ
 ἔστιν ἐκεῖ, οὐδὲ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, ἐνέβησαν [καὶ] αὐτοὶ εἰς τὰ πλοῖα,
 25 καὶ ἦλθον εἰς Καπερναοῦμ ζητοῦντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν. Καὶ εὐρόντες αὐτὸν
 26 πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης, εἶπον αὐτῷ· Ῥαββί, πότε ὧδε γέγονας; Ἀπε-
 κριθῆ αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν· Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν· ζητεῖτέ
 27 μὲ οὐχ ὅτι εἰδετε σημεῖα, ἀλλ' ὅτι ἐφάγετε ἐκ τῶν ἄρτων καὶ ἐχο-
 ρήσατε. Ἐργάζεσθε μὴ τὴν βρωσὴν τὴν ἀπολλυμένην, ἀλλὰ τὴν

r Deut. 18. 15.
 Luke 7. 16.
 & 24. 19.
 supra 1. 21.
 & 4. 19.
 infra 7. 40.

s Matt. 14. 22.
 Mark 6. 47.

t Supra 1.
 32. & 4. 11.
 & 5. 37.
 infr. ver. 40,
 54, & 18. 8.
 Matt. 3. 17.
 & 17. 5.
 Mark 1. 11.
 & 9. 7.
 Luke 3. 22.
 & 9. 35.
 2 Pet. 1. 17.

14. On the difference between this miracle and those of Moses see Grot., Lampe, and Rosenm., in Recens. Synop.

16—19.] See Notes on Matt. xiv. 22, sq. and Mark vi. 46, seqq.

18. ἀνηγέρετο.] Lampe adduces Pollux i. 9. κῆμα ἐγαιώμενον, ὑποκινούμενον.

21. ἦθελον λαβεῖν αὐτόν.] To remove a trifling discrepancy with the other Evangelists, the best modern Commentators take the sense to be, "they willingly received," which I have in Recens. Syn. confirmed from several passages of the Classical writers.

22. ὁ ἐσθηκῶς] i. e. who had remained there for the purpose, it seems, of deliberating, whether they should proclaim Jesus as Messiah.

26. Our Lord, observing that the multitude which flocked to him were influenced not by a desire for spiritual improvement, but for worldly advantage, takes occasion from the natural and earthly bread with which he had supplied them, to advert to spiritual and celestial nutriment; showing how much more anxious they ought to be for the acquisition of spiritual than of corporeal nourishment. This portion, from v. 26. to 65. has been the subject of much discussion among Commentators, some of whom (as Kuin.) suppose the obscurity which pervades it to have been occasioned by the Evangelist's omitting part of what was then said. This view, however, lies open to serious objection, being hypothetical and

unauthorized, and proceeding upon an unsound principle. Much of the difficulty, I apprehend, is to be attributed to the highly figurative cast of the expressions, and the brevity of the phraseology; but most of all by the persons addressed being different in different parts of the discourse. Our Lord sometimes addresses the *higher classes*, who were, more or less, ill-affected to him; at other times, the *lower classes*, who were upon the whole *well-disposed*, but exceedingly dull of comprehension, and quite ignorant of His true character as *Son of God*. Thus we find at vii. 12. these *two classes* at Jerusalem, of which one said of Jesus, "he is a good man;" others, "nay, but he deceiveth the people." Now this will satisfactorily account for the frequent repetitions of the same sentiment, which might otherwise be thought unnecessary. In such cases, either our Lord replies to the objections, or removes the scriptures of, the two classes in *separate addresses*: or, in compassion to the ignorance and dulness of the multitude, condescends to repeat the same thing more than once, in order to impress it more strongly on their minds.

27. ἐργάζεσθε μὴ, &c.] Ἐργάζεσθαι here, as often in the Classical writers, denotes, together with labour, its *effect* in gain or acquirement. The full sense, then, is: "labour to acquire." Ἀπολλ. denotes what terminates merely in animal life. The metaphor in βρωσὴν μένουσαν is such as is common in all languages. The ἀλλά is

βρωσῶν τὴν μένουσαν εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, ἣν ὁ Πῶς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὑμῖν
 δώσει· τοῦτον γὰρ ὁ Πατήρ ἐσφράγισεν ὁ Θεός. Εἶπον οὖν πρὸς 28
 αὐτόν· *u* 1 John 3. 23. Τί ποιούμεν, ἵνα ἐργαζώμεθα τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Θεοῦ; *u* Ἀπεκρίθη 29
 ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ ἔργον τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἵνα πι-
 x Matt. 12. 38. & 16. 1. στεύσῃτε εἰς ὃν ἀπίστευεν ἐκείνος. *x* Εἶπον οὖν αὐτῷ· Τί οὖν ποιεῖς 30
 Mark 8. 11. σὺ σημεῖον, ἵνα ἴδωμεν καὶ πιστευσώμεν σοι; τί ἐργάζῃ; *y* Οἱ πατέ- 31
 Luke 11. 29. ρες ἡμῶν τὸ μάννα ἔφαγον ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, καθὼς ἐστι γεγραμμένον·
 y Exod. 16. 4, 14. Ἄρτον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς φαιγεῖν. Εἶπεν οὖν 32
 Num. 11. 7. αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν· Οὐ Μωϋσῆς δέδωκεν ὑμῖν
 Psal. 78. 24. τὸν ἄρτον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ· ἀλλ' ὁ Πατήρ μου δίδωσιν ὑμῖν τὸν ἄρτον
 Wisd. 16. 20, 1 Cor. 10. 3. ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τὸν ἀληθινόν. ὁ γὰρ ἄρτος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστὶν ὁ κατα- 33
 βαινὼν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ ζωὴν διδὼς τῷ κόσμῳ. Εἶπον οὖν πρὸς 34
 αὐτόν· Κύριε, πάντοτε δὸς ἡμῖν τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον. *z* εἶπε δὲ αὐτοῖς 35
 z Eccl. 24. 29. ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς· ὁ ἐρχόμενος πρὸς με οὐ μὴ
 Isa. 55. 1. supra 4. 14. infra 7. 37. πευνάσῃ· καὶ ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ οὐ μὴ διψήσῃ πώποτε. Ἄλλ' εἶπον 36

by most recent Commentators rendered *non tam* — *quum*. But that principle in *οὐκ* — *ἀλλὰ* and *μὴ* — *ἀλλὰ* has been recently disputed by De Wette, Schulthess, and Winer, Gr. p. 159; and indeed with some reason, especially as concerns *αὐ* — *ἀλλὰ*.

— *ἐσφράγισεν*] “confirmed, authorized, commissioned, as it were with a seal, with which contracts and orders were sealed.”

28. Here they ask *how* they may obtain these benefits, or gain the approbation of God. By τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Θεοῦ are meant the actions which are enjoined by God, as Ps. li. 19. the sacrifices of God.

29. On the full import of the expression *πιστεύειν εἰς Ἰησοῦν* see the elaborate discussion of Tittm., who well explains it *Jesum agnoscere ac suscipere tanquam salutis humanæ auctorem verissimum et perfectissimum, Servatorem mundi unicum, adeoque ab eo salutem omnem hujus et futuræ vitæ expetere et expectare*. The learned Commentator justly remarks, “how important is this passage to evince the necessity of this faith to Christians; also, that it is a thing not *human* but *divine*, as being what God requires from every one, and by which alone he can be acceptable to God.” The persons here addressing Jesus were probably of the *higher classes*. Some of them probably had not themselves witnessed the late miracle our Lord had worked, and may have wished to see one worked. However, by advertising to Moses' calling down manna *from heaven*, they seem to have desired, what was by the Jews of that time regarded as the only unequivocal proof of Divine mission, a sign from heaven (such as the calling down manna), something not private, simple, and unostentatious, but public, conspicuous, and striking the senses.

31. τὸ μάννα.] Render the manna. On the derivation of the word the Commentators are not agreed; whether from the Heb. מָנָה, *what is this?* or from מָנָה, *to measure, or prepare*. The recent Commentators enlarge much in describing the common manna which, in the East, still bedews the ground by night, and is collected in the morning, and made into a kind of cake. The identity, however, of this with the manna of the Israelites, is rather *taken for granted* than proved. There are indeed so many important diversities

between the two (pointed out by Deyling in his Obs. S. iii. 7.) as completely to establish the miraculous nature of the transaction, with those who admit the credibility of Moses. It was called “bread from heaven,” *bread* — because made up into cakes like the natural manna; and *from heaven*, as being the gift of God.

32. οὐ Μωϋσῆς — οὐρανοῦ, &c.] Τὸν ἄρτον scil. ἀληθινόν. “Our Lord's declaration imports that it is in a subordinate sense only that what dropped from the clouds, and was sent for the nourishment of the body, still mortal, could be called the bread of heaven, being but a type of that which hath descended from the heaven of heavens, for nourishing the immortal soul unto eternal life, and which is therefore, in the most sublime sense, the *bread of heaven*.” (Campb.) “Our Lord means that there is as much difference between the food supplied by Moses, and that which his Father would bestow, as between the body and the soul, between temporal and eternal life, earth and heaven.” (Tittm.)

33. ὁ γὰρ ἄρτος, &c.] Here our Lord, in explanation, shows *what sort* of bread he means, even HIMSELF, as the author of that *Gospel* which nourishes the soul, and leads unto salvation; adverted to in the words *ζωὴν δίδους τῷ κόσμῳ*, which allude to the great doctrine of the *Atonement*, by which salvation was given to a world dead in trespasses and sins.

34. εἶπον.] The persons who now speak seem to be not the same who had demanded a sign, but the *common people*; who ignorantly supposed that he was speaking of corporeal bread, such as Moses had procured from heaven for their forefathers. In like manner the Samaritan woman, at iv. 15. says, *κύριε, δός μοι τούτου τὸ ὕδωρ*.

35. ἐγὼ εἰμι, &c.] Our Lord now proceeds to the *second* point to be explained in this discourse. q. d. “It is I who am that bread of life, as being the procurer and bestower of salvation; for who-soever becomes my disciple and embraces my doctrine, shall have no desire for any thing further, having all that is necessary to happiness and salvation.” See iv. 14. and Note, and here Dr. A. Clarke. Ὁ ἐρχόμενος πρὸς με is equivalent to ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ which follows.

36. ἀλλ' εἶπον — πιστεύετε.] There is here some

37 ὑμῖν ὅτι καὶ ἐωράκατέ με, καὶ οὐ πιστεύετε. Πᾶν ὃ δίδωσι μοι ὁ Πατήρ,
 38 πρὸς ἐμὲ ἤξει· καὶ τὸν ἐρχόμενον πρὸς με οὐ μὴ ἐκβάλω ἔξω· ὅτι κατα-
 βέβηκα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, οὐχ ἵνα ποιῶ τὸ θέλημα τὸ ἐμὸν, ἀλλὰ τὸ θέλημα
 39 τοῦ πέμψαντός με. Ὁ τοῦτο δὲ ἐστὶ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με Πατρός,
 ἵνα πᾶν ὃ δέδωκέ μοι μὴ ἀπολέσω ἐξ αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ ἀναστήσω αὐτὸ ἐν
 40 τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ. Ὁ τοῦτο ἴδὲ ἐστὶ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με,
 ἵνα πᾶς ὃ θεωρῶν τὸν Υἱὸν καὶ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν, ἔχη ζωὴν αἰώνιον,

a Matt. 26, 39.
 Mark 14, 36.
 Luke 22, 42.
 supra 4, 34.
 & 5, 30.
 b Infrā 10, 23.
 & 17, 12.
 & 18, 9.
 c 3, 15, 16.

obscurity, occasioned by brevity. The best Commentators assign this sense: "But, as I have told you before, ye see and know me, yet ye believe not on me." The full meaning, may, however, be better expressed as follows: "But, as I have already told you [and now tell you again], ye have seen me [and my works (including miracles) and known my doctrines] and yet ye believe not on me."

37. πᾶν ὃ δίδωσι — ἔξω.] The connection seems to be: [Yet I shall not labour in vain, there will not be wanting those who shall receive my doctrine.] The neuter is here usually considered as put for the masculine, πᾶν ὃ for πᾶς ὄν. Yet perhaps that is, strictly speaking, not the case. It should seem that our Lord first speaks of the number of those given to him *collectively*, and then *individually*. And when taken in conjunction with πᾶν, there is probably (as some eminent Commentators suppose) an obscure allusion to the *calling of the Gentiles*; for they, according to the ancient promise, Ps. ii., were to be *given* to Christ. This is confirmed by what is added at the parallel passage, ver. 45, 46, where it is said that the prophecy is καὶ ἔσονται πάντες διδασκὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, synonymous with the πᾶν here is the πᾶσις σαρκός at xviii. 2.; πᾶν ὃ may be meant of the Gentiles *as a body*. And so Tittm. explains it to mean omnes homines, sine discrimine gentium.

But to consider the most important term of this sentence, δίδωσι, as to the sense in which the Father is said to *give* men to Christ, Expositors differ in opinion. The Calvinistic ones, as may be imagined, understand it of being chosen of the Father to eternal salvation by an absolute decree. But to this view see the unanswerable objections of Grot., Hammond, and Whitby, as also of Chrys., who ascribes the dogma to the *Mauicheans*. The term therefore (here and at ver. 39 and 65) must signify something compatible with the free agency of man. And there is no difficulty in ascertaining its sense here, because our Lord has himself determined its meaning by the expression which is *substituted for it* in the parallel passage at ver. 41, which is *explanatory* of the present. To *give* men to Christ is evidently equivalent to *draw* them to Christ; and how irreconcilable that is with the *compulsion* implied in the Calvinistic interpretation of *giving*, is obvious. For ἔλκεῖν (as has been proved by Tittm.) like the Heb. גָּרַב, denotes a power not compulsory, but *strongly suasive*, meaning to *draw* (not *drag*) any one; i. e. to sway the understanding, or incline the will by all moral means and fit motives, as propounded in the Revelation of his will in the Holy Scriptures. See John xii. 32. and Phil. ii. 13. & 14. and the note; as also a Sermon by Dr. Balguy on that text, and one by Dr. Clarke on the present. However, the above is by no means the *whole* of what is meant in these words (though

the German Commentators almost universally stop there) but both terms undoubtedly point to a most important doctrine — that of the *preventing grace of God by his Holy Spirit*, indispensably necessary to any one's being given to Christ by God; also the necessity for the *co-operating grace* of that Spirit, after we have been brought to Christ by his preventing grace — proving the truth of what is said in our Article, that "we have no power to do works pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God preventing us, that we may have a good-will, and working with us when we have that good-will." So Phil. ii. 12, 13. μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου τὴν εὐαγγελίαν καταργήσατε· ὁ Θεὸς γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ ἐνεργῶν ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ τὸ θέλειν καὶ τὸ ἐνεργεῖν. (where see Note). Thus δίδωσι adverts to the *thing itself*; and ἔκ. suggests the *means* by which it is accomplished. At the same time, we know from other parts of Scripture, that these means are not *irresistible*: man *may* receive this grace of God in vain. The truth is that (in the words of Mr. Holden) though God *wills* all men to be saved, he does not *force* them; and though he *wills* all men to be saved, those only will be saved who have complied with the conditions. Every thing necessary is freely supplied; but men are free agents, and may reject the gracious offer. There is no limitation in the *will* and *mercy* of God, he *wills* that all whom he has *given* to Christ, or *drawn* to him by the influence of his Spirit, should be saved; yet they may receive this grace of God in vain, and when they are lost, it is not for want of *will* in God, but for want of their own *co-operation* with divine grace: ch xviii. 9.

38. ὅτι καταβέβηκα, &c.] The connection is: "[And] *for* I came down, &c., i. e. for the very purpose of my coming down on earth was, &c. How *should* I repel any who thus come unto me, since I came for the very purpose of saving them."

39. ἔξ αὐτοῦ] scil. πατρὸς. Sub. τι, as at xvi. 17. Apoc. xi. 9. and elsewhere. Μὴ ἀπολέσω, "that I should, as far as depends on me, *suffer* no one to perish." The verb is taken *permissively*. By ἀναστήσω (at which repeat ἵνα, and take ἀναστ. in the Subjunctive) is meant (as almost always in Scripture as well as the Rabbinical writers) the resurrection of the blessed to eternal happiness.

40. This ver. is a plainer expression of the preceding sentiment, importing that every one who discerns him as Messiah, and recognises him as such, shall be both raised to life again, and blessed with everlasting happiness. Instead of *δέ*, many MSS., Versions, and Fathers have γὰρ, which is edited by Griesb., Titt., Vater, and Scholz. I suspect, however, that it arose *ex emendatione*, or rather a marginal explanation. The testimony of the Versions, full as it is, only strengthens this suspicion.

καὶ ἀναστήσω αὐτὸν ἐγὼ τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ. Ἐγγύζουσιν οὖν οἱ Ἰου- 41
δαῖοι περὶ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι εἶπεν· Ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος ὁ καταβάς ἐκ τοῦ
οὐρανοῦ. ^d καὶ ἔλεγον· Οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς ὁ υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ, οὗ ⁴²
ἡμεῖς οἶδαμεν τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα; πῶς οὖν λέγει οὗτος·
“Οὐ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβέβηκα; Ἀπεκρίθη [οὖν] ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ⁴³
εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Μὴ γογγύσετε μετ’ ἀλλήλων. Οὐδεὶς δύναται ἐλθεῖν ⁴⁴
πρὸς με, ἐὰν μὴ ὁ Πατὴρ ὁ πέμψας με ἐκύση αὐτόν, καὶ ἐγὼ ἀνα-
στήσω αὐτὸν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ. ^e Ἔστι γεγραμμένον ἐν τοῖς προ- ⁴⁵
φήταις· Καὶ ἔσονται πάντες διδασκατοὶ [τοῦ] Θεοῦ. Πᾶς
[οὖν] ὁ * ἀκούων παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ μαθὼν ἔρχεται πρὸς με.
^f οὐχ ὅτι τὸν Πατέρα τὶς ἐώρακεν· εἰ μὴ ὁ ὢν παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, οὗτος ⁴⁶
ἐώρακε τὸν Πατέρα. ^g Αἴμην αἴμην λέγω ὑμῖν· ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ ⁴⁷
ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον. Ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς. ^h Οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν ⁴⁸
ἔφαγον τὸ μάννα ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, καὶ ἀπέθανον· οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ⁴⁹
ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβαίνων, ἵνα τὶς ἐξ αὐτοῦ φάγη καὶ μὴ ἀποθάνῃ. ⁵⁰
ⁱ Ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ζῶν ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς· ἐάν τις φάγη ⁵¹
ἐκ τούτου τοῦ ἄρτου, ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. Καὶ ὁ ἄρτος δέ, ὃν ἐγὼ
δώσω, ἡ σὰρξ μου ἐστίν, ἣν ἐγὼ δώσω ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς.

41. ἐγγύζουσιν.] This word (an onomatop. similar to γγγύζειν) imports not only secret discontent, but indignant complaint, though faintly expressed.

44. ἐκύση αὐτόν.] See Note supra ver. 37. Before τῇ ἐσχ. many MSS. insert ἐν, which is received by Matth., Griesb., Tittm., Vat., and Scholz. But I suspect that it arose from the *ov* preceding, or came from the margin.

45. καὶ ἔσονται, &c.] Meaning that these words (taken from Is. liv. 13.) shall be made good. By τοῖς προφήταις is meant (by an idiom common in Jewish citation) in that part of the Sacred Volume called the *Prophets*. Διδασκατοὶ is for διδασκαμένοι, and there is an ellip. of ὑπὸ. See Win. Gr. Gr. § 23. 3. 6. Τοῦ before Θεοῦ is omitted in many ancient MSS. and Fathers, and is cancelled by Matth., Griesb., Vat., Tittm., and Scholz, who also edit ἀκούων for ἀκούσας on good grounds.

46. οὐχ ὅτι — τὸν Πατέρα.] Kuin. well expresses the sense thus: “What I have said of the teaching of the Father is not to be understood of complete and immediate instruction; *this* hath fallen to the lot of Him only who came down from Heaven, who was sent from the Father, or who hath been with him, and who hath obtained a full knowledge of God and of his will, as being most intimately conjoined with the Father.”

47, 48. Here our Lord (to make himself thoroughly understood) repeats what he had before said, that he is, (i. e. imparts) the food of life, and that whosoever hath faith in him shall receive everlasting life.

49, 50. The scope of these vv. is to illustrate what has been said, by showing, in reply to what was said supra v. 31. on comparison, the superiority of the spiritual bread which Christ bestows, to the corporeal bread procured by Moses. The full sense is: “Your forefathers ate the manna in the wilderness, and [yet] died: that is the bread [of life] which descended from heaven, in order that if any eat thereof, he may not die, but live.” The phrase φαγεῖν ἐξ ἄρτου denotes to

avail themselves of that doctrine, by coming to Jesus, in faith.

51. Here our Lord declares, in literal expressions, what he had in the preceding verse couched in figurative ones. By ζῶν is meant, ζωοποιῶν, denoting (as Tittm. remarks) that he is the author of life, having obtained the power of bestowing it by his death. This is illustrated by the words following, which may be rendered: “And this bread, moreover, which I shall give, is my flesh (i. e. body), which I shall give for the salvation of the world;” where there is plainly a reference to the sacrifice of the death of Christ, and the atonement through his blood. Christ had before called himself the bread, as being the *author* and *bestower* of that spiritual nourishment which preserves the soul unto eternal life, even as corporeal food does the body. Comp. xi. 25. xv. 1. So here he calls himself the *life-giving* bread, as giving his flesh for the life of the world, i. e. to obtain for it eternal life.

It is a disputed point whether in what is said at v. 50. about eating, &c., there is a reference to the *Eucharist*, or not. The *affirmative* was maintained by most ancients and is by most moderns, especially the Romanist Interpreters: while the *negative* has been adopted by many of the most eminent Expositors, of the ancient ones by Tertull., Clem. Alex., Origen, Cyril, Chrys., and Augustine; and of the moderns, by Grot., Whitby, Wolf, Lampe, Tittm., and Kuin., who show that the *context* will not permit us to take the words of the *Eucharist*. See Recens. Synop. and Tittm. But though they successfully prove that by eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ, must here be meant securing to ourselves the benefits of the sacrifices of Christ by a true and lively faith; yet that will not prove that there is no reference by *allusion* to the *Eucharist*. Hence I would (with Dr. Hey and Mr. Holden) steer a middle course, and take the passage *primarily* of the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ, and the benefits thence derived by faith; and *secondarily*, as a

- 52 ^k Ἐμάχοντο οὖν πρὸς ἀλλήλους οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, λέγοντες· Πῶς δύναται ^{k 3. 9.}
- 53 οὗτος ἡμῖν δοῦναι τὴν σάρκα φαγεῖν; ¹ Εἶπεν οὖν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ¹ Matt. 26. 26.
¹ Cor. 11.
²³, &c.
- Ἄμην ἀμην λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐὰν μὴ φάγητε τὴν σάρκα τοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀν-
 54 θρώπου, καὶ πίητε αὐτοῦ τὸ αἷμα, οὐκ ἔχετε ζωὴν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς· ^m Ο ^{m 4. 14.}
- τρώγων μου τὴν σάρκα καὶ πίνων μου τὸ αἷμα ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον·
 55 καὶ ἐγὼ ἀναστήσω αὐτὸν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ. ἢ γὰρ σὰρξ μου ἀληθῶς
 56 ἐστὶ βρωσίς, καὶ τὸ αἷμά μου ἀληθῶς ἐστὶ πόσις. Ὁ τρώγων μου
 τὴν σάρκα καὶ πίνων μου τὸ αἷμα ἐν ἐμοὶ μένει, καὶ ἐγὼ ἐν αὐτῷ.
 57 Καθὼς ἀπέστειλέ με ὁ ζῶν Πατήρ, καὶ ἐγὼ ζῶ διὰ τὸν Πατέρα· καὶ ὁ
 58 τρώγων με, καὶ κεῖνος ζήσεται δι' ἐμέ. ⁿ Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ἐκ ^{n 3. 13.}
- τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς· οὗ καθὼς ἔφαγον οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν τὸ μάννα,
 καὶ ἀπέθανον. Ὁ τρώγων τοῦτον τὸν ἄρτον ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.
 59 Ταῦτα εἶπεν ἐν συναγωγῇ διδασκῶν ἐν Καπερναούμ.
- 60 Πολλοὶ οὖν ἀκούσαντες ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ εἶπον· Σκληρός ἐστιν
 61 οὗτος ὁ λόγος· τίς δύναται αὐτοῦ ἀκούειν; Εἰδὼς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν
 ἑαυτῷ, ὅτι γογγύζουσι περὶ τούτου οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς·
 62 Τοῦτο ὑμᾶς σκανδαλίζει; ^o Ἐὰν οὖν θεωρῆτε τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώ- ^{o 3. 13.}
- 63 που ἀναβαίνοντα ὅπου ἦν τὸ πρότερον.— ^p Τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστι τὸ ζωο- ^{Mark 16. 19.}
¹ Luke 24. 51.
^{Acts 1. 9.}
^{Eph. 4. 8.}
^{p 2 Cor. 3. 6.}
- ποιῶν, ἢ σὰρξ οὐκ ὦφελεῖ οὐδὲν· τὰ ὅρηματά, ἃ ἐγὼ † λαλῶ ὑμῖν,

prophetic intimation of the advantages to be derived from a worthy participation of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper; since the two have so close a relation one to the other, that the mention of the one must suggest the other. Thus in speaking of the offspring of his body, our Lord may be supposed to have had reference, by anticipation, to that Sacrament, soon to be instituted, in which, to the end of time, that sacrifice would be typified and its benefits applied.

52. *ἐμάχοντο*] "altercabant," namely, the two classes before mentioned, the higher class and the one ill affected to Christ, and the multitude, who were well disposed to him; some of whom are here introduced speaking as follows.

53. *ἐὰν μὴ φάγητε, &c.*] Our Lord, seeing that those whom he addressed, by taking his words in a literal sense, either mistook or misrepresented his meaning, here repeats, with stronger asseveration, what he had before said. At the same time, he expresses himself so particularly, as to show that by eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ, he means eating and drinking in a *figurative* and *spiritual* manner; where the expressions signify applying to ourselves the sacrifice of his death, by coming unto Him in faith, and thus participating by faith in the benefits procured by that sacrifice.

56. *ἐν ἐμοὶ — ἀντὶ.*] These words describe the mystical union by which the faithful are made partakers of the Divine nature. Christ *remains in* any one by loving, aiding, defending, and blessing him, both here and hereafter. The disciple *remains in Christ* by receiving him, and ever accounting him as the author of his salvation, &c. (Tittm.)

57. *καθὼς ἀπέστειλε.*] The best Commentators here suppose an enallage, and take the sense to be: "As the Father liveth, who sent me." No doubt, the force of the antithesis is in ζῶν, not ἀπέστειλε. By *liveth*, is meant, *hath life in himself*.

The full sense of the passage may be thus expressed, with Dr. Burton. "I have life in myself, and have power to give life, because the Father (who dwelleth in me, and I in Him) hath life in himself, and hath power to give life."

58. To prevent all *further* ignorant misapprehension of his meaning, our Lord concludes with inculcating the same truth that he had before done at v. 35. and 43—51., and subjoins the same solemn assurance as at vv. 47. and 51.

60. *μαθητῶν.*] By these are (as appears from the next verse) meant, not the stated disciples, but the general followers of Christ.

— *σκληρός.*] Some explain this, "*hard to be understood*;" others, "*ungrateful, offensive.*" Either interpretation may be admitted, and indeed both will be true, as understood of the two classes of persons respectively adverted to in the above.

61. In this and the following verses (spoken, not in the Synagogue, but elsewhere, and, no doubt, in private) our Lord condescends to remove the two great stumblingblocks, which even the well disposed, notwithstanding his explanations and assurances, still found; namely, 1. that he had said he had come down from heaven, ver. 42.; and 2. that he was the bread of life, and should give his flesh for the life of the world. In removing the *first* of these, our Lord employs a most energetic form of expression, involving a kind of ellipsis, or rather aposiopesis, suitable to deep emotion. At the end of the verse supply *τί ἐρεῖτε*. Yet as this would seem harsh in a Version, most Translators supply *Quid (what)* at the beginning of the verse, and place a mark of interrogation at the end. I have, however, pointed in the text according to the true nature of its construction. In *τί ἐρεῖτε* we have an energetic form of appeal, of very extensive meaning; the force of which is well expressed by Mr. Holden.

63. In this verse is removed the *second* stumblingblock above adverted to; though on the ex-

q 2. 25.
infra. 13. 11.

πνεῦμά ἐστι καὶ ζωὴ ἐστιν. ἢ Ἄλλ' εἰσὶν ἐξ ὑμῶν τινὲς οἳ οὐ πιστεύ- 64
ουσιν. ἦδει γὰρ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, τινὲς εἰσὶν οἳ μὴ πιστεύοντες,

r v. 44.

καὶ τίς ἐστιν ὁ παραδῶσων αὐτόν. Καὶ ἔλεγε· Διὰ τοῦτο εἶρακα 65
ὑμῖν· ὅτι οὐδεὶς δύναται ἐλθεῖν πρὸς με, ἐὰν μὴ ἦ δεδομένον αὐτῷ
ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς μου. Ἐκ τούτου πολλοὶ ἀπῆλθον τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ 66

s Acts 5. 20.

εἰς τὰ ὄπισω, καὶ οὐκέτι μετ' αὐτοῦ περιεπάτου. Ἐἶπεν οὖν ὁ Ἰη- 67
σοῦς τοῖς δώδεκα· Μὴ καὶ ὑμεῖς θέλετε ὑπάγειν; Ἀπεκρίθη [οὖν] 68

t Matt. 16. 16.
Mark 8. 29.
Luke 9. 20.
inf. 11. 27.
u Luke 6. 13.
inf. 9. 44.

αὐτῷ Σίμων Πέτρος· Κύριε, πρὸς τίνα ἀπελευσόμεθα; ῥήματα ζωῆς
αἰωνίου ἔχεις· καὶ ἡμεῖς πεπιστεύκαμεν καὶ ἐγκώκαμεν, ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ 69
Χριστὸς, ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος. Ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς [ὁ Ἰησοῦς] 70

Οὐκ ἐγὼ ὑμᾶς τοὺς δώδεκα ἐξελεξάμην; καὶ ἐξ ὑμῶν εἰς διάβολός
ἐστιν. Ἐλεγε δὲ τὸν Ἰουδαν Σίμωνος Ἰσκαριώτην· οὗτος γὰρ ἡμέλλεν 71
αὐτὸν παραδιδόναι, εἰς ὃν ἐκ τῶν δώδεκα.

act import and bearing of the words Commentators are not agreed. Πνεῦμα, the disputed term of this passage, many take of the *Holy Spirit*, others, of *spiritual views*, in contradistinction to the *carnal* ones of the Jews; or, as Bp. Middlet. interprets, the *spiritual* sense, as opposed to the *literal* one, as πνεῦμα is opposed to γράμμα at 2 Cor. iii. 6. The *first* mentioned interpretation, however, seems excluded by the context and the scope of the passage; the *second* has been ably maintained by Bp. Middl., who assigns the following sense: "But it is the *spiritual* part of Religion, which is of avail in opening the understanding; the mere *letter* is nothing: my words, however, are the spirit and the life of all, which ye have hitherto known only in the *literal* and *carnal* sense." Thus the present passage will agree very well with what precedes, meaning that they ought not to stumble at these his sayings, since they were not to be understood in a gross and carnal, but spiritual sense. And, in this view, with *ἀρβὸς οὐκ ὠφέλιμ' οὐδὲν* may be compared I Tim. iv. 8.

Instead of λαλῶ several ancient MSS., Versions, and Fathers, have λελάληκα, which is adopted by Scholz; but wrongly; for it evidently arose *ex emendatione*.

65. Our Lord in these words refers to what was said at v. 37. and 44.: and from a comparison of those verses with this, it is as certain as any thing can well be, that by the Father's *giving* men, is meant His *drawing* them to Him by the strong *moral motives* propounded in His word, and by the sanctifying *influences of the Holy Spirit*. See the Notes on those verses.

66. ἐκ τούτου.] Sub. χρόνου. Ἀπῆλθον ὄπισω is explained by οὐκέτι μετ' αὐτοῦ περιεπάτου. Comp. Matt. xvi. 23. Luke iv. 8. Heb. x. 39. Περιεπατεῖν is a Hebrew phrase to denote *discipleship*; as Prov. xiii. 20.

67. μὴ καὶ ὑμεῖς.] From the passages of the Classical writers adduced in Recens. Synop. (from Wets. and others), it appears that this mode of address was not unfrequently resorted to by monarchs, generals, and philosophers, when about to be abandoned by their adherents.

68. ῥήματα] i. e. "which teach it, and are the medium by which it is conferred." What the ῥήματα are, is plain from v. 63. τὰ ῥήματα—ζωὴ ἐστιν. Comp. iii. 34. Moses' words, received from the Jehovah. Angels are only called λόγια

ζῶντα (see Acts viii. 38.), but Christ's words are called ῥήματα ζωῆς and ζωῆ, from the infinite superiority, He being himself the Jehovah Angel.

69. The words τοῦ ζῶντος are not found in seven or eight very ancient MSS., nor in the Cop., Sahid., Armenian, Pers., Vulg., and Italic Versions, some Fathers, and Nonnus and Cyrill, and are cancelled by Griesb. and Scholz: but without any good reason; for the common reading is not only supported by *external* evidence of the most decisive kind, but is also equally strong in *internal*, being far more *appropriate* (as better suited to the ardent temperament of Peter) and coinciding with his unequivocal confession of faith, Matt. xvi. 16. Griesb. also, instead of ὁ Υἱὸς, edits ὁ ἅγιος, from a few MSS. and Versions. But that reading is, very properly, rejected by Scholz; since the *external authority* for it is far less, and *internal evidence* is altogether on the side of the common reading; the appellation ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ, as used of our Lord, only occurring once, in the confession of the demoniacs, Mark i. 24. Luke iv. 54. He is, indeed, called ἅγιος παῖς, Acts iv. 27. but not ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ. Whereas the appellation Χριστὸς, ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, frequently occurs in the N. T., and especially in this Gospel, i. 50; xi. 27. See more in Tittm., who proves that the appellations ὁ Χριστὸς and ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ were not synonymous; but that the latter has reference to the *Divine* nature of Christ. Hence we may easily conjecture from what quarter came the reading ἅγιος. Moreover, when Scholz rejected that reading, he ought, in consistency, to have rejected the *other*; since the *principal* MSS. are precisely the same for both. And there can be no doubt that the alterations in question came from the *same* quarter, namely, from the *Alexandrian Critics*.

70. οὐκ ἐγὼ—ἐξελεξάμην.] The interrogation (as some of the best Commentators and Editors have seen) terminates at ἐξελ., not at ἐστιν; for the καὶ is, as Euthym. observes, put for καὶ ἑμῶς. The sense is: Have I not chosen and appointed twelve of you as my legates [and confidants], and one of you is an enemy, and a betrayer or accuser. See Acts xiii. 17. Διάβολός ἐ. The sense is, an *adversary*, one *disaffected* to me. So διαβεβλησθαι πρὸς τινα in the sense of being hostile to, is, used in the best Classical writers.

71. ἔλεγε] "he meant:" a sense frequent both in the Classical writers and the N. T.

Ὡς δὲ ἀνέβησαν οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ, τότε καὶ αὐτὸς ἀνέβη εἰς τὴν 10
 c *Infra* 11. 56. ἑορτήν, οὐ φανερώς, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐν κρυπτῷ. ° Οἱ οὖν Ἰουδαῖοι ἐζήτουν 11
 d *ver.* 40. αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ, καὶ ἔλεγον· Πού ἐστιν ἐκεῖνος; ° καὶ γογγυσμὸς 12
 & 6. 14. & 9. 16. & 10. 19. πολὺς περὶ αὐτοῦ ἦν ἐν τοῖς ὄχλοις. Οἱ μὲν ἔλεγον· "Οὐ ἀγαθὸς
 Matt. 21. 46. ἐστίν· ἄλλοι [δὲ] ἔλεγον· Οὐ· ἀλλὰ πλανᾷ τὸν ὄχλον. ° Οὐδεὶς 13
 Luke 7. 16. e 9. 22. & 12. 42. μῆντοι παρόρησάι ἐλάλει περὶ αὐτοῦ διὰ τὸν φόβον τῶν Ἰουδαίων.
 & 19. 33.

Ἰδιῇ δὲ τῆς ἑορτῆς μεσουσῆς, ἀνέβη ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὸ ἱερόν καὶ 14
 ἐδίδασκε. Καὶ ἐθαύμαζον οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, λέγοντες· Πῶς οὗτος γράμμα- 15
 f 8. 28. & 12. 49. τα οἶδε, μὴ μεμαθηκώς; ° Ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν· Ἰ 16
 & 14. 10, 24. ἐμὴ διδασχὴ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὴ, ἀλλὰ τοῦ πέμψαντός με. Ἐάν τις θέλῃ τὸ 17

sense of οὐπω ἀναβαίνω is: "It is not at present my intention to go up," &c. The next words signify: "My time [for going] is not fully come," or at hand, he being then prevented by some hindrance.

The reason why our Lord did not go at first was, we may suppose, because the roads would then be thronged with travellers. And therefore, as privacy was his aim, (as is indicated by the words following, ἀλλὰ ὡς ἐν κρυπτῷ, meaning, as privately as was possible in so public a character,) he chose to go at a time when there would be fewest persons on the road; and, therefore, it is probable, he set off on the first day of the Feast, since he did not arrive till the middle of the Feast, which lasted eight days.

11. οἱ Ἰ ἐζήτουν.] Some of the best Commentators take the sense to be, "the principal persons among the Jews (the chief Priests, &c.) sought him, to put him to death." This is countenanced by v. 1, 19 and 25; but the words following demand the sense "Judæi (scil. vulgus) desiderabant eum;" a signification frequent in the N. T., especially St. John's writings. See Calvin, Grot., and Tittm.

12. γογγυσμός.] The term has here the sense in which θροῦς is often used in Thucyd. and other writers; namely, a *muttering* or *whispering*, denoting *private discourse*. Δὲ is not found in many MSS., early Editions, and Fathers, and is cancelled by Matthæi, Griesb., and Scholz, perhaps rightly; internal evidence being strongly against it.

13. οὐδεὶς] i. e. [of those who thought favourable of him].

—διὰ τὸν φόβον τῶν Ἰ.] "through their fear of the Jews;" as xix. 33, and Jer. xxxv. 11. The *Dative* with a preposition would be more Classical Greek. So Thucyd. i. 26. ἔλει τῶν Κερκυραίων.

14. ἑορτῆς μεσουσῆς] i. e. on one of the days between the 1st and the 7th; which were the most solemn days; namely, the 3d or 4th day.

—ἀνέβη — ἐδίδασκε.] See Luke ii. 46, and Note. The Gentile philosophers too were accustomed to deliver their instructions in the *temples*, on account of the sanctity of the place, and the number of persons continually resorting thither. So Philostr. Vit. Ap. v. 26 & 27. καὶ παρελθὼν εἰς τὸ ἱερόν ποι, ἔφη · &c.

15. γράμματα] *litteras*, learning; no doubt, meaning that kind of learning which was alone cultivated in Judæa; namely, the interpretation of the Scriptures, and an acquaintance with Theology in general. Thus the dispute carried on by the Commentators, whether γράμματα means *Divine* or *human* learning, is nugatory. Μὴ here

seems to be for οὐ; though this may perhaps be ranged under that usage of the particle pointed out by Hermann and Wahl, by which is indicated a *softened negation*. Compare 2 Cor. xii. 21.

16. ἡ ἐμὴ διδασχὴ — με.] The general import of these words is evident; while the exact sense and application is not so clear but that Expositors differ in opinion. To determine that, we must consider the context, the scope, and the literal sense of the terms; especially those on which the sentiment hinges, διδασχὴ and οὐκ — ἀλλά. To advert to the *scope*, the words were intended to refute the notion of those who, regarding Jesus merely as ἀνομαθῆς and ἀνοδιδάκτος, accounted him (as, we learn from the Rabbinical writers, was customary with the Jews) utterly undeserving of attention — a mere pretender, and no prophet. To which our Lord replies, that his teaching is *not* his own; i. e. that he is not ἀπ' ἑαυτοῦ διδ., but θεοοδιδάκτος. This should seem to be the *primary* sense. Yet under it *another* and *secondary* one is also contained, serving to introduce the arguments which follow. Thus διδασχὴ is to be taken in the sense *doctrine*; i. e. system of religious instruction. In this sense, too, our Lord asserts that his doctrine, though not derived from their schools, is not therefore false, since it was not devised by himself, but came from the Source of all Truth, *God himself*. Thus the argument here is the same as that hinted at by St. Paul, Gal. i. 1. Παῦλος ἀπόστολος οὐκ ἀνθρώπ. οὐδέ ἐξ ἑ' ἀνθρ., ἀλλὰ διὰ Ἰ. Χ. καὶ Θεοῦ. Thus it pleased Divine wisdom that the Apostles should be unlearned, in order that the work might not be ascribed to human learning or eloquence. The above view of the sense is supported by the ancient Commentators in general; and, of the modern ones, by Brug., Pisc., Mald., Grot., Calvin, Lampe, and Kuin. In saying this (they remark) our Lord speaks "ex hypothesi Judæorum, secundum captum auditorium," who regarded him as a *mere man*. Some Commentators, however (as Wolf, Pearce, Kypke, and Tittm.), seek to avoid this by supposing that οὐκ — ἀλλά here involves, not an *absolute*, but a *comparative* negation, to be rendered *non tam — quam*. This is certainly better than, with others, to suppose an ellipsis of μόνον. But it is wholly unnecessary, and indeed inadmissible, as being contrary to the *scope* and *context*. See vv. 15 & 17, and compare xiv. 10. Indeed, Winer (Gr. N. T.) denies that the formula οὐκ — ἀλλά ever denotes a *comparative* negation: yet wrongly. — for although that principle has been carried too far, still it cannot be denied that it *sometimes* has place, as in Matt. x. 20. οὐ γὰρ βρεῖς ἐστε οἱ λαλοῦντες, ἀλλὰ τὸ Πνεῦμα.

Θέλημα αὐτοῦ ποιεῖν, γνώσεται περὶ τῆς διδαχῆς, πότερον ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ
 18 ἔστιν, ἢ ἐγὼ ἀπ' ἐμαντοῦ λαλῶ. ^εὉ ἀπ' ἐμαντοῦ λαλῶν τὴν δό- ^g 5. 41.
 ξαν τὴν ἰδίαν ζητεῖ ὁ δὲ ζητῶν τὴν δόξαν τοῦ πέμψαντος αὐτὸν, οὐ-
 19 τος ἀληθῆς ἐστι, καὶ ἀδικία ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔστιν. ^h Οὐ Μωϋσῆς δέδω- ^h Exod. 20.
 κεν ἡμῖν τὸν νόμον; καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐξ ἡμῶν ποιεῖ τὸν νόμον· τί με ⁱ & 24, 3.
 20 ζητεῖτε ἀποκτεῖναι; ⁱ Ἀπεκριθῆ ὁ ὄχλος καὶ εἶπε· Διμῶνιον ἔχεις· ^{Acts} 7. 53.
 21 τίς σε ζητεῖ ἀποκτεῖναι; Ἀπεκριθῆ ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Ἐν ^{Matt.} 12. 14.
 22 ἔργον ἐποίησα, καὶ πάντες θαυμάζετε ^k διὰ τοῦτο. Μωϋσῆς δέδωκεν ^{sup.} 5. 16, 18.
^{sup.} 10. 39.
[&] 11. 53.
^{inf.} 10. 39.
[&] 10. 20.
^k Gen. 17. 10.
^{Lev.} 12. 3.

17. *ἴαν τις θέλη, &c.*] We have in this and the next ver. two arguments in proof of the preceding position (namely, that his doctrine is from God); 1. *internal*, and deduced from the nature, qualities, and effects of the doctrine itself (v. 17.); the other *external*; namely, that in what he is doing he has in view, not his own honour, but that of God. (Kuin.) Render, "He who is disposed to obey the will of God when revealed, however contrary it may be to his prejudices or carnal affections," shall know, &c. See the Classical citations cited in Rec. Syn. from Lampe; to which I have subjoined one from Hermes ap. Stob. Phys. I. 2. 698. ὁ δὲ ἐσεβῶν εἰσεται καὶ τοῦ ἔστιν ἡ ἀλήθεια, καὶ τίς ἐκείνη. By θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ is meant what he would have us do, both as to belief and practice; and to *do his will* is to embrace that belief, and adopt that course of action. Now the will of God, says St. Paul, is our *sanctification*. This *conforming* of our will implies the abandonment of all the *prejudices and passions*, which obscure the judgment and enslave the will (as the eye cannot rightly distinguish colours, when suffused with morbid humours); otherwise what we *wish* to be false, we shall not readily believe to be true: and thus unbelief is more the fault of the *heart* than the understanding. "The Gospel (observes Dr. South) has then only a free admission to the assent of the understanding, when it brings a passport from a rightly disposed will. If the heart be but well disposed, the natural goodness of any doctrine will be enough to vouch for the truth: for the suitability of it will endear it to the will; and thus it will slide into the assent also." See more on this subject in a masterly Sermon of Dr. South on the present text, vol. i. p. 239, in which he discusses very ably the design and purpose of the words, and points out what truths may be supposed to flow from thence, Γνώσεται, "he shall know from experience;" namely, by finding that this *doing* the will of God will conduce to his happiness here and *hereafter*, when (as Dr. South says) "persuasion shall pass into knowledge, and knowledge into assurance; and all be at length completed in the beatific vision and full fruition of those joys which are at God's right hand for ever and ever."

18. ὁ ἀπ' ἐμαντοῦ — ζητεῖ.] Here our Lord supplies *another* criterion from which to judge whether this doctrine be of God. The false teacher seeks the praise of *men*; but the true legate of *God* seeks the glory of God in the salvation of *men*.

— ἀδικία] "pravum, fucatum." (Calvin.)

19. οὐ Μωϋσῆς — νόμον.] There is here thought to be a change of subject; and the recent Commentators (as formerly Calvin) are mostly of opinion that the words have reference to certain remarks (not recorded by the Evangelist) on the part of the rulers present, charging Christ with

violating the Sabbath, by healing on that day. But we may well suppose the reference, *if such there be*, made, not to any accusation then advanced, but to what had been and still was occasionally brought forward by them. By τὸν νόμον many of the best Commentators understand that part of the Law which enjoins the observance of the Sabbath. But it is better, with Euthym., Beza, Lampe, Calvin, and Tittm., to take it of the *Law generally*, of which the most important injunctions were violated, either in letter or spirit, by the Pharisees. Of this a signal example is then adduced by our Lord, namely, that they are plotting his death; q. d. "You do not even keep the Law of *Moses*, or why plot against my life, in violation of the 6th commandment?"

20. διμῶνιον ἔχεις.] Put for the more Classical term *κακοδαμονίης*; and to be taken, in a popular sense, for "You are out of your senses." The words τίς σε ζητεῖ ἀποκτεῖναι are rightly ascribed to the *multitude*; for they had no designs on the life of Jesus, and were unconscious of those of the Rulers; therefore they might well feel indignant at what they conceived a false accusation. Jesus, however, notices not their unmerited reproach, nor removes their mistake; but proceeds to trace the malevolence and murderous plots of the principal persons to their true origin, namely, his healing the paralytic on the Sabbath day. He shows that they had no reason to censure him on that account, and justifies his actions from their own practice, and on their own principles.

21. In reply, our Lord practically refutes this charge of madness, by speaking on the matter in question with the words of truth and soberness. He confirms his foregoing assertion by shewing *why* they sought his death, and upon what irrational and unjust grounds they condemned him.

— ἐν ἔργον ἐποίησα.] "One [illustrious] work I have done." Θαυμάζετε is here not to be taken, (with most Commentators,) in its ordinary sense, but (with the most eminent Commentators, ancient and modern), as at Mark vi. 6. and Gal. i. 6., of that kind of *wonder* which borders on a feeling of disapprobation. This idiom is also found in the Classical writers (on which see my Note on Thucyd. vi. 36.), nor is it unknown in our *own* language.

— διὰ τοῦτο.] These words are by most Translators construed with the words *following*. But thus they admit of no suitable sense, and therefore the best Expositors, both ancient and modern, take them with the *preceding*, and render *thereat*; rightly, I think: for θαυμάζειν in the above sense is rarely, if ever, put absolutely; but is followed by some *case*, with or without a preposition. So Mark vi. 6. ἠθαύραζε διὰ τὴν ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν. Revel. xvii. 7.

22. δέδωκεν ὑ. τὴν περιτ.] i. e. gave you the com-

ὑμῶν τὴν περιτομὴν, (οὐχ ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ Μωϋσῆως ἐστὶν, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῶν πατέρων) καὶ ἐν σαββάτῳ περιτέμνετε ἄνθρωπον. Ἐν περιτομῇ λαμβάνει ἄνθρωπος ἐν σαββάτῳ, ἵνα μὴ λυθῇ ὁ νόμος Μωϋσῆως, ἐμοὶ χοῦτε ὅτι ὅλον ἄνθρωπον ὑγιᾶ ἐποίησα ἐν σαββάτῳ; ¹ Μὴ κρίνετε καὶ ὄψιν, ἀλλὰ τὴν δικαίαν κρίσιν κρίνατε. Ἐλεγον οὖν τινὲς ἐκ τῶν Ἱερουσαλιμιτῶν· Οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν, ὃν ζητοῦσιν ἀποκτεῖναι; καὶ ἶδε, 26 παρόρσηε λαλεῖ, καὶ οὐδὲν αὐτῷ λέγουσι. Μήποτε ἀληθῶς ἔγνωσαν

1 Deut. 1. 16,
17.
Prov. 24. 23.
James 2. 1.

mand to circumcise, enjoined the rite of circumcision.

— οὐχ ὅτι, &c.] Subaud. λέγω. See Bos. Ellip. The sense is: "Not that it was from Moses, but had been established by [Abraham]." It is observed by the Fathers, and also Euthym., and Beng., that thus the dignity of circumcision, as compared with the Sabbath, is meant to be exalted, on the ground of its more ancient institution. On the contrary, Dr. Burton thinks this is meant to prove that the Sabbath was an earlier institution than Circumcision, otherwise the argument would not be valid. Both, however, seem mistaken. There is no comparison between the Sabbath and circumcision; but, in the parenthetical clause is merely implied the high antiquity and consequent *dignity* of circumcision. Nor is the argument invalid; since the full sense of καὶ ἐν σαββάτῳ περιτ. ἀνθ. is, "and accordingly ye circumcise a man-child, though on the Sabbath." The reason given by the Jews for this was, that cir- cision was an affirmative precept, the Sabbath a negative one, and therefore the former vacated the latter.

23. εἰ περιτομῇ, &c.] An argumentum a minori ad majus. Thus traced by Lampe, "Illic erat minister Moses, hic Dominus ipse Christus. Illic Lex positiva cedebat positivæ; quanto majus naturali." Χολᾶτε; "are ye [justly] angry?" Χολᾶν properly signifies to vent one's bile (χολῆν); and in the later writers it is used either with a Dative, or an Accus. with πῶς, in the sense to vent one's bile at, i. e. to be very angry with. "Ὅλον is by most Commentators and Translators taken as if it belonged to ὑγιᾶ, and were put adverbially for καθόλου. But the best ancient and modern Expositors are agreed that it should be taken with ἄνθρωπον, "the whole man," as opposed to the part which was circumcised. Thus arises a stronger sense, and yet one quite justified by facts; for in a violent paralysis the whole body is affected. So Hippocr. (cited by Lampe) says, "Ὅλος ἄνθρωπος νοσᾶς ἐστὶ. And Aretæus says of a virulent chronic disorder, ὅλω τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐνοικεῖ. There may, too (as many of those Commentators think) be an opposition meant, by allusion to circumcision being confined to a particular part, but the healing in question extending to the whole. So a Rabbinical writer cited by Wets. says, "Circumcision, which is performed on one of the 248 members of the body, vacates the Sabbath; how much more the whole body [i. e. the healing of the whole body] of a man [vacates it.]" To fully understand which, and the force of our Lord's reasoning, we must suppose that under *circumcision* is involved the *medical cure* of the wound; and that that, and even medical or surgical aid in all cases of imminent peril, were permitted by the Jurists. So the same writer elsewhere says, fol. v. 1. Periculum vitæ pellit sabbatum; item circumcisio ejusque sanatio. Our Lord therefore means to argue that what he had done

was justifiable on even stronger ground, inasmuch as circumcision and its medical healing only affected a very small part of the body; his cure, the whole body.

24. κατ' ὄψιν.] There is some doubt as to the sense of this term. The ancient and most early modern Commentators, also Wolf and Lampe, think it is equivalent to προσωποληπτικῶς, i. e. by partiality or preference; an apt sense, but destitute of proof. It is therefore better (with Erasm., Beza, Wets., Kypke, Kuin., Rosenm., Schleus., and Tittm.) to take it to signify a judging by the outward appearance only, and consequently superficially and precipitately, which, indeed, implies partiality and injustice. Thus in Is. xi. 3 & 4, to judge κατὰ ὄψιν is opposed to judging according to truth and equity. Wets. adduces a similar use of ἀπ' ὄψεως, from a kindred passage of Lysias. The force of the argument is, (as it is stated by De Dieu,) "do not condemn in me what you approve of in Moses; if you allow a man to be circumcised on the Sabbath, because Moses ordered it, but do not allow him to be healed, when I do it, you judge κατ' ὄψιν, according to the person, and not according to justice."

26. μήποτε ἀληθῶς — Χριστός.] The scope of the words is, to suggest a probable reason for their non-molestation of Jesus; namely, that they have really ascertained that he is truly the Christ. The second ἀληθῶς is omitted in many ancient MSS. and Versions, and the Ed. Princ., is rejected by most Critics, and cancelled by Griesb., Val., and Scholz; but on insufficient grounds: since the external evidence is far inferior to that for the common reading; and the internal is by no means so strong; for it was more probable that the ancient Critics should stumble at the repetition of ἀληθῶς, and cancel one of the two (thus in some MSS. and Versions the first ἀληθῶς is omitted), than that any should foist in what might scarcely seem necessary. And yet, St. John is so fond of the word, that he uses it exactly as many times as all the other writers of the N. T. put together, and yet never once pleonastically. As to the double use of it here, the latter ἀληθῶς is confirmed by John vi. 14. vii. 40. ἀληθῶς ὁ Προφήτης, and Matt. xiv. 33. xxvii. 54; the former by John xvii. 8. ἔγνωσαν ἀληθῶς. Acts xii. 11. οἶδα ἀληθῶς. Hence we see how feeble is the criticism of Bp. Pearce and Dr. Campb. (adopted by Dr. A. Clarke) that the second ἀληθῶς is unnecessary, unsuitable to the usual style of the writer, if not inaccurate. The last mentioned charge is manifestly unfounded, and the second is negated by positive testimony. The first, too, is groundless; for how can the word be unnecessary, if it strengthens the sense? and that it does so, is manifest. Besides, the two are meant of two different classes. "In primo (to use the words of the learned Mästricht) veram Sacerdotum cognitionem, in posteriori veritatem Messie indicare voluit Evangelista; quæ diversæ

- 27 οἱ ἄρχοντες, οἳ οὗτός ἐστιν [ἀληθῶς] ὁ Χριστός; ^m ἀλλὰ τοῦτον ^m οἶδαμεν πόθεν ἐστίν· ὁ δὲ Χριστός ὅταν ἔρχηται, οὐδεὶς γινώσκει ^m Matt. 13. 55. Mark 6. 3. Luke 4. 22.
- 28 πόθεν ἐστίν. ⁿ Ἐκράξεν οὖν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ διδάσκων ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ λέ- ⁿ 8. 26, 42, 55. Rom. 3. 4.
- γων· Καρὲ οἴδατε, καὶ οἴδατε πόθεν εἰμί. καὶ ἀπ' ἐμαντοῦ οὐκ
- 29 ἐλήλυθα, ἀλλ' ἔστιν ἀληθινὸς ὁ πέμψας με, ὃν ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε. ^o Ἐγὼ ^o Matt. 11. 27. inf. 10. 15.
- 30 [δέ] οἶδα αὐτόν, οἳ παρ' αὐτοῦ εἰμι, καὶ κενός με ἀπέστειλεν. ^p Ἐξή- ^p 8. 20, 37. Mark 11. 18. Luke 19. 47. & 20. 19. ver. 19.
- τον οὖν αὐτόν πιάσαι· καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐπέβαλεν ἐπ' αὐτόν τὴν χεῖρα, οἳ ^q 8. 30.
- 31 οὐπω ἐληλύθει ἢ ὥρα αὐτοῦ. ^a Πολλοὶ δὲ ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου ἐπίστευσαν ^a
- εἰς αὐτόν, καὶ ἔλεγον· Ὅτι ὁ Χριστός ὅταν ἔλθῃ, μῆτι πλείονα ση-
- 32 μεῖα τούτων ποιήσει, ὧν οὗτος ἐποίησεν; Ἰκόνσαν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι τοῦ
- ὄχλου γογγύζοντος περὶ αὐτοῦ ταῦτα· καὶ ἀπέστειλαν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι

sunt veritates." That some MSS. and Versions omit *both*, ought only to *strengthen* our persuasion that both were originally written by the Evangelist. The truth seems to be, that the Alexandrian Critics, having decided, *pro sapientiâ suâ*, that, to prevent tautology, *one* should be omitted, could not agree *which* to remove; and the indications of this doubt were probably expressed in the originals of those MSS. where we find both omitted. Thus the scribes were puzzled which to take, and which to leave; and, as might be expected, omitted *both*.

27. ἀλλὰ τοῦτον, &c.] Tittm. regards these words as not coming from the same persons as the preceding, but from *others*, in reply to those who were inclined to suppose Jesus to be the Messiah. And to this opinion I acceded in the first Edition of this work. But, on further consideration, I have seen reason to abandon that view; since, to suppose so sudden a change of persons in the speakers, without necessity, is surely what cannot well be defended. And unnecessary it certainly is; for there is no reason why we should not suppose the *same* persons still speaking; but, as it were, *correcting* their former impression that he might be the Messiah, and seeking an excuse for not believing on him. See the able annotation of Calvin. The ἀλλὰ is better rendered in our common Version *howbeit*, than in any of the others; q. d. However, be that as it may, yet, &c. Of which elliptical use of ἀλλὰ, see Schleus. Lex. & Wahl's Clavis.

But to advert to the *nature* of the excuse which they made to themselves for not acknowledging Jesus as the Messiah; in the words τοῦτον οἶδαμεν, &c. there is (as we find from the Rabbinical writers) reference to a notion then prevalent, that the parentage, and consequently birth-place, of the Messiah would be unknown — that he would be ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ, ἀγενεαλόγητος. So that, when he should appear, no one would be able to say whence he had come; for he would appear *suddenly* and *adult*. How these vain notions had arisen, is not clear. See, however, Lampe and Calvin. Be that as it may, they were opposed to Scripture, and were therefore only harboured by *Traditionarii*, the Pharisees and others, not by the *Scriptuarii*. The best Commentators, with reason, interpret the πόθεν not so much of *place*, as (like the Latin *unde*) of *origin*. "The Jews (says Tittm.) thought that the origin of the Messiah would be unknown, and that he would be ἀπάτωρ and ἀμήτωρ, or at least born of a virgin." Perhaps, however, we may, with Markl. and Kuin.,

take the πόθεν of both place and person. Indeed, this seems required by what follows.

28. ἔκράξεν] palam dixit, professus est. So I John i. 15. Rom. ix. 27. Hesych. κέκραγε· φανερώς διαμαρτύρησαι.

— καρὲ οἴδατε — εἰμί.] There is a difference of opinion as to the exact sense of these words. Many Commentators, ancient and modern, take them *interrogatively*. But that is negated by καρὲ and the καὶ of the following sentence; and to suppose any clause to be *supplied by ellip.*, would be harsh and arbitrary. They must be taken *declaratively*, in this sense: "Ye do indeed know me and my origin! And yet that will not prove my claim to be false; for I came not of myself, falsely assuming a Divine commission, nor found my claims on self-testimony, but on the testimony of the *God of truth* — but whom ye know not, otherwise ye would have believed his testimony concerning me." Grot. thinks that the words are meant to suggest that the *genuine father* of Jesus was He who sent him; the other, whom they knew, was only "*supposed to be his father*." On ὃν ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε compare viii. 19. 53.

29. Here Jesus asserts his claim to a Divine original (at least by implication), and to a Divine commission. Δὲ is omitted in very many MSS., Versions, and early Editions, and is cancelled by Matth., Griesb., Tittm., Vat., and Scholz. Internal evidence is certainly against it, and the asyndeton has great force.

30. ἔξήρουν.] The persons here meant, are not those who had been just speaking, but those mentioned at v. 27 & 29, the ἀρχοντες. By ἔξ is meant they *sought occasion to lay hold on him*, but, for the present, found none. Πιάζειν was an old Doric form for πιέζειν, and signifies properly to *set foot upon*. But in the vulgar dialect it was, by a metaphor taken from beasts, (similar to one in our own language), employed to mean to *lay hands on*, or hold of. Thus it is used both of *apprehending men*, as here and at v. 32 & 44., viii. 20. x. 39. xi. 57. 2 Cor. xi. 32. Ecclus. xxiii. 21., and of *catching fish*, as John xxi. 3 & 10. Rev. xix. 20. It occurs only in the Sept. and the later Greek writers.

— ὥρα] The "full time" appointed for his end.

31. ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτόν.] It was not, however, a firm belief; much less a sound and true faith; for it rested on *miracles* without reference to doctrine, and its very profession was made by implication only, and expressed in a whisper.

32. οἱ Φαρισαῖοι.] i. e. those rulers of the Sanhedrim who were of the Pharisaical party.

r 13. 33.
& 16. 16.

καὶ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς ὑπηρέτας, ἵνα πιάσωσιν αὐτόν. Ἔλεπον οὖν [αὐτοῖς] 33
ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Ἐτι μικρὸν χρόνον μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι, καὶ ὑπάγω πρὸς τὸν
πέμψαντά με. Ἰζητήσετέ με, καὶ οὐχ εὐρήσετε· καὶ ὅπου εἰμι ἐγὼ, 34
ὑμεῖς οὐ δύνασθε εἰλθεῖν. Ἐλεπον οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι πρὸς ἑαυτούς· Πού 35
οὗτος μέλλει πορευέσθαι, ὅτι ἡμεῖς οὐχ εὐρήσομεν αὐτόν; μὴ εἰς τὴν
διασπορὰν τῶν Ἑλλήνων μέλλει πορευέσθαι, καὶ διδάσκειν τοὺς Ἕλληνας;
Τίς ἐστὶν οὗτος ὁ λόγος ὃν εἶπε· Ζητήσετέ με, καὶ οὐχ εὐρήσετε· καὶ 36
ὅπου εἰμι ἐγὼ, ὑμεῖς οὐ δύνασθε εἰλθεῖν;

t 4. 14.
& 6. 35.
Lev. 23. 36.
Isa. 55. 1.
Rev. 22. 17.
u Isa. 12. 3.
& 41. 3.

Ἐν δὲ τῇ ἑξακτῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ μεγάλῃ τῆς ἑορτῆς εἰστίκει ὁ Ἰησοῦς, 37
καὶ ἔκραξε λέγων· Ἐάν τις διψῆ, ἐρχέσθω πρὸς με καὶ πινέτω. Ὁ 38
πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ, καθὼς εἶπεν ἡ γραφή, ποταμοὶ ἐκ τῆς κοιτίας

33. αὐτοῖς.] The word is omitted in very many MSS., Versions, and early Editions, and is rightly cancelled by almost all the Critical Editors; for internal evidence is as much against it as external.

34. Some obscurity here exists, which has occasioned not a little diversity of opinion. See *Recens. Synop.* But from a comparison of the parallel passages at viii. 21. and xiii. 33., Lampe thinks it clear that this seeking of the Lord is not as if the Jews would seek Jesus as their *helper* at or after the destruction of Jerusalem (according to Chrysost., Theophyl., and Euthym.), or as if they would in vain endeavour to seek Jesus for the purpose of destroying him, after his resurrection, (according to Rupertus), but because they would *seek* the *Messiah* in their own way, according to their own conceptions; which was by implication the same as to seek *Jesus*; since besides *him* no other *Messiah* was to be expected. They would *seek* him by a scrutiny of the times, by a vain expectation. But by all these attempts they would not *find* him: not in *word*, because the veil of Moses was upon their hearts; not by *rain confidence*, since they *could* not escape the destined destruction; not by seeking after *false Christs*, since they would be miserably deceived by them. I would suggest, that much of the discrepancy in question may be removed by supposing that as our Lord is admitted to have spoken somewhat ænigmatically, so he seems here, as on some other occasions, to have intended a *double* sense, according to the class of persons to whom the words might be referred. So Calvin well remarks: "Christus in ambiguitate verbi significationis ludit." This is especially the case in the second clause. (See *Tittm.*) And as to the first, though Lampe's view may be admitted, yet neither must that of Chrys. and others, including Calvin, be rejected. "They would seek him then (says Calvin) in another manner, nempe ut miseris suis ac perditis in rebus aliquid opis vel solati invenirent." This is confirmed by viii. 21. In xiii. 33. the application is different.

35. πού οὗτος, &c.] It has been a matter of no little dispute what is meant by τὴν διασπ. τῶν Ἑλλ., by which some understand the *dispersed Jews*, i. e. the Jews dispersed among the Gentiles; as James i. 1. and I Pet. i. 1. The first interpretation has no foundation in evidence. And to the *second* it has been objected, that the foreign Jews are nowhere called Ἕλληνας, but Ἑλληνισταί. Hence Salmas., Loesn., Krebs, and *Tittm.*, would take διασπ. for the *place* of dispersion, i. e. where the dispersed Jews inhabit; re-

ferring to James i. 1. and I Pet. i. 1. But διασπ. there cannot denote the *place*, but only the *persons* dispersed; and the argument above mentioned has no force; for the foreign Jews are not *here* called Ἕλληνας; that word refers only to the *Gentiles*, according to its usual sense in the N. T. And the passages of James and Peter tend to confirm the opinion of Grot., Wets., Rosenm., and Kuin., that by διασπ. τῶν Ἑλλήνων we are here to understand, "the Jews dispersed among the Gentiles," abstract for concrete, as in 2 Macc. i. 27. ἐπισυνάγαγε τὴν διασπορὰν ἡμῶν, ἐλευθέρωσαν τοὺς δουλεύοντας ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι. Psalm cxlvi. 2. Sept. τὰς διασπορὰς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ἐπισυνάξει. So also Paralip. Jerem. (cited by Wets.) εἶπατε τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ — ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς ἀπέστειλεν εἰς τὴν διασπορὰν τῶν ἐθνῶν.

37. The last and *great day* of the festival now drew near; of which the Jews used to say that he who had not seen that day, had seen no rejoicing. It was very solemn, on account of the libations of water then, in great pomp, fetched from Siloam in golden vessels, and brought, amidst the sounds of musical instruments, to the Temple; where the Priest received it at the high altar, mixed it with wine, and poured it on the altar and the victim. This solemnity was not of Divine institution, but had been established by their ancestors in memory of the water so bountifully bestowed on the Israelites in the desert; and, as the Rabbins testify, was meant to be a symbol of the benefits to be sometime poured out and dispensed by the Holy Spirit. This solemn festival our Lord was pleased to consecrate by a most remarkable discourse; the subject of which was suggested to him by the very solemnity itself. He was in the Temple, he stood in a place where he could be seen by every one; and he spake not only openly, but with a loud voice, as if declaring what it was of the utmost consequence should be known by all. (*Tittm.*) See a full account of all the solemnities of this feast in *Rec. Syn.*, formed from the Notes of Lightf., Vitinga, Surenh., Iken., Lampe, Calmet, and others.

— ἔάν τις διψῆ] i. e. "if any one ardently desire." Lampe and *Tittm.* observe, that all such metaphors as this from words denoting *hunger* and *thirst*, imply *need of* as well as *desire for* the things in question. Thus the sense of the passage, after withdrawing the imagery, is: "If any one be desirous of learning, let him commit himself to my instruction, and use aright my doctrine."

38. ὁ πιστεύων, &c.] On the construction of these words some recent Commentators needless-

- 39 αὐτοῦ ῥεύσουσιν ὕδατος ζῶντος. ^x Τοῦτο δὲ εἶπε περὶ ^{x Joel 2. 28.}
 τοῦ Πνεύματος, οὗ ἔμελλον λαμβάνειν οἱ πιστεύοντες εἰς αὐτόν. οὐπω ^{Acts 2. 17.}
 40 γὰρ ἦν Πνεῦμα ἅγιον, οὗ ὁ Ἰησοῦς οὐδέπω ἐδοξάσθη. ^{y 1. 21. & 4. 42.} Πολλοὶ οὖν ^{& 6. 14.}
 ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου ἀκούσαντες τὸν λόγον ἔλεγον· Οὗτός ἐστιν ἄληθῶς ὁ ^{Deut. 18. 15.}
 41 προφήτης. ^{z 1. 46.} ἄλλοι ἔλεγον· Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός. ^{ver. 52.} ἄλλοι δὲ ἔλεγον· ^{a Pa. 132. 11.}
 42 Μὴ γὰρ ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ὁ Χριστὸς ἔρχεται; ^{Matt. 21. 46.} οὐχὶ ἡ γραφὴ εἶπεν,
 43 οὗ ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ, καὶ ὑπὸ Βηθλεὲμ τῆς κώμης, ὅπου ἦν ^{Luke 7. 16.}
 44 Δαυὶδ, ὁ Χριστὸς ἔρχεται; ^{b 9. 46.} οὐχὶ ἡ γραφὴ εἶπεν,
 45 ἐκ τῆς κώμης Βηθλεὲμ ἐκτεθήσεται ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν. ^{1 Sam. 16. 1. 4.}
 46 Ἀπεκρίθησαν οὖν ἐκ τῶν ἀκούσαντων· Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός. ^{b 9. 16.} ἄλλοι δὲ ἔλεγον· ^{& 10. 19.}
 47 οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός. ^{c 12. 42.} ἄλλοι δὲ ἔλεγον· Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός. ^{1 Cor. 1. 20.}
 48 ἄλλοι δὲ ἔλεγον· Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός. ^{& 2. 8.} ἄλλοι δὲ ἔλεγον· Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός. ^{Acts 6. 7.}
 49 τῶν Φαρισαίων; ἄλλ' ὁ ὄχλος οὗτος ὁ μὴ γινώσκων τὸν νόμον ἐπι-

ly deviate from the common mode, either by connecting *δ πιστεύων* with *πᾶσι* in the preceding sentence, or by taking *εἶπε* in the sense "ordered." The common construction is well defended by Kuin; who shows that it is required by the explanation of these words at v. 39., and from a kindred sentiment at xiv. 2. There is nothing to stumble at in the Nominative *δ πιστεύων*, which involves an *anacoluthon*, common both in the Scriptural and Classical writers, which may be resolved by *quod attinet ad*, "As to him who," &c. Nor is there any reason to suppose the words after *γραφὴ* to be the words of *Christ*, not of *Scripture*, because they are not found *totidem verbis* in Scripture. The best Commentators are, indeed, of opinion that no *particular* text of Scripture is meant, but that the substance is given of several passages of Scripture, which refer to the effusion of the Holy Spirit. Surenh. and Schoettg. have, however, shown that there are only two passages referred to, namely, Is. lv. I. lviii. 11.

— *ποταμοὶ* — *ρέουσαι*.] *Ποτ.* is a symbol of abundance; and *ρέουσαι* alludes to the free communication of the abundant benefits. The metaphor is frequent in the Jewish writings. So Sohar (ap. Recens. Synop.), "When a man turns to the Lord, he is like a fountain filled with living water, and rivers flow from him to men of all nations and tribes." Nor is it unknown in the Classical writers. So Philo p. 1140. (cited by Lampe;) *λόγον δὲ συμβολικῶς ποταμὸν εἶναι φημὲν*, &c. I would add Philostr. Vit. Soph. i. 22, 4. p. 525. *ὡσεὶ κέκαστον δοκεῖ τὸ σῶμα*. Philostr. Vit. Ap. (of the Temple of the Muses at Helicon) *λόγων τε κρατῆρες ἴσταντο, καὶ ἠρόντρο αὐτῶν οἱ διψῶντες. Κοιλία*, like the Heb. כֶּבֶד or כֶּרֶב often, as here, denotes the *heart*, i. e. the *mind*. Thus the sense of the passage is: "Whosoever seeks truth, or desires salvation, must not seek them from Moses or the Jewish Teachers, but have recourse to me, and drink at the fountain of both, which I have opened."

39. *τοῦτο δὲ εἶπε* — *αὐτόν*.] Here we have an authentic explanation of the allegorical language of the preceding verse. There is not a shadow of reason (with some Critics) to omit *ἅγιον* and insert *δέδομνον*; since the latter is plainly from the

margin; and the former, if not expressed, would be understood; for there is no ground to suppose (with some recent Commentators) that *πνεῦμα* merely denotes the doctrine of Christ, and the *knowledge* imparted by him. It is clear that we must understand it, not indeed in the *Personal* sense (which the Unitarians catch up, merely from thence to deduce that the Holy Ghost is not God), but as denoting His *operation* and *influence*, (see Lampe and Tittm.) and, from the adjunct, the *gifts* of the Holy Spirit, by which must be meant (as the occasion and context require) those *extraordinary* and supernatural gifts which were conferred on the Apostles and first converts, for the founding of Christianity; (see Bp. Middlet.) though there may be included those *ordinary* gifts which were then and are still given to every man to profit withal. (See Bp. Warburton's *Divine Legation*, vol. vi. 317.) By *ἐδοξάσθη* is meant the resurrection, ascension, and reception to the right hand of God. See xii. 16 — 29. xiii. 31. xiv. 3. and *Comp. Acts* ii. 33.

40. *δ προφήτης*.] to be understood as i. 21.
 41. *μὴ γὰρ*, &c.] "What then, does Christ," &c. This use of *γὰρ* is found in *Matt. xxvii. 23*. On this force of *μὴ*, see Note supra vi. 66.

42. *ἡ γραφὴ εἶπεν*.] There is a reference (by a mode of citation familiar to the Jews) to several passages of Scripture which they explained of the Messiah and his birth, as Is. xi. 1. Jerem. xxiii. 5. Micah v. 2. Ps. lxxxix. 36.

— *ὅπου ἦν Δ.*] "where David dwelt." It has been proved by Lampe, that the earlier Jews acknowledged that Christ was of the family of David; and that the Talmudists admitted the Messiah was to be born in Bethleem.

43. *σχίσμα*.] The word properly signifies a *rent*; and metaphorically a dissent in opinion, usually attended with angry debate.

46. *οὐδέποτε* — *δ ἄνθρωπος*.] See Doddr.

43. *μὴ τις ἐκ τῶν ἀρχ.* ἐπ.] i. e. the Sanhedrim, whose duty it was to take care that no false doctrines should be promulgated; and to hold inquiry concerning those who were making innovations in the Church. (Kuin.) Thus they argue from the example of the *two-fold* authorities, both judicial and magistral.

49. *ἀλλ' ὁ ὄχλος* — *εἰται*.] On the exact force of,

d 3. 2.

e Ex. 23. 1.
 Lev. 19. 15.
 Deut. 1. 17.
 & 17. 4. 8.
 & 19. 15.
 f Isa. 51. 1. 2
 Matt. 4. 15.
 supra 1. 46.

κατάρατοι εἰσι. ^d Λέγει Νικόδημος πρὸς αὐτοὺς, (ὁ ἐλθὼν νυκτὸς 50
 πρὸς αὐτὸν) εἰς ὧν ἐξ αὐτῶν. ^e Μὴ ὁ νόμος ἡμῶν κρίνει τὸν ἄνθρω- 51
 πον, ἐὰν μὴ ἀκούσῃ παρ' αὐτοῦ πρότερον, καὶ γινῶ τί ποιεῖ; ^f Ἀπε- 52
 κριθῆσαν καὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ. Μὴ καὶ σὺ ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας εἶ; ἐρεῖ-
 νησον καὶ ἴδε, οὔτι προφήτης ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας οὐκ ἐγήγγηται. Καὶ 53
 ἐπορεύθη ἕκαστος εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ.

VIII. Ἰησοῦς δὲ ἐπορεύθη εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν Ἐλαιῶν. Ὁρθρον δὲ 1

ἐπικατάρατοι the Commentators are not agreed. Lampe thinks that as the word is used in the LXX. to denote those who by transgression of the Law are doomed to punishment temporal and eternal, it means *execrable*. Kuin. takes it to mean *excommunicated*; but without reason. It is, I think, better interpreted by Schleus. "nullius sunt pretii," as in Plutarch. de Educ. : ἀνθρώπους ἀσίμους καὶ καταράτους. So our *wretched* means 1. cursed and abominable; 2. *vile and refuse*. But *ἐπικατ.* is a stronger term than *καταρ.*, and the sense seems to be: "As to this rabble, who are ignorant of the Law, they are a parcel of poor wretches!" The Scribes and Pharisees, it may be observed, entertained the same profound contempt for the multitude which the Heathen Philosophers so liberally indulged in. So Sappho ap. Athen. ix. ὁ δῆμος οὐδὲν οὐτ' ἀκούων οὐθ' ὄρων. and Horace, "Odi profanum vulgus et arceo."

50. εἰς ὧν ἐξ αὐτῶν.] Being one of the Sanhedrim, he was authorized to speak; and he speaks as one neither justifying nor condemning Jesus, but only objecting to his being condemned unheard.

51. τὸν ἄνθρωπον.] The Translators render *quempiam, a man*. But this does not represent the force of the Article, which involves an ellipsis of *κρινόμενον* ["the accused] person," to be taken out of *κρίνει*.

52. ἐκ τῆς Γαλ.] i. e. of the Galilæan party.

—ὅτι προφήτης, &c.] The *ὅτι* here, I think, marks not the *cause* but the *proof*. The Commentators are perplexed to reconcile this with the *fact*,—that Galilee had produced, it is said, four great Prophets. And most of them resort to the expedient of ascribing this to the ignorance and forgetfulness of the Priests, or the exaggeration of anger. See Doddr. and Campb. But ignorance of the common details of Scripture, or the birth-place of its writers, cannot, with any probability, be imputed to the Sanhedrim; and the other method is not quite satisfactory. Perhaps the difficulty may be best removed by availing ourselves of that latitude, in which the Preterite admits of being taken; and which not unfrequently refers to what is *customary* during a period not very long past. The Prophets of the O. T. in question had all lived upwards of 500 years before. Now the Pharisees, we may suppose, merely advert to what had been *usually* the case at a comparatively *recent* date; namely, since the country had borne the name of Galilee. This sense is well expressed by the gloss (for such it is) *ἐγγίγεται*, found in many MSS. and Nonnus.

VIII. 1—11. For a full discussion of the perplexed question as to the *authenticity* of this paragraph, the reader is referred to the Recens. Syn., where he will find a full statement of all the *objections* to its genuineness, together with their *answers*, placed in juxta-position; the evidence

being carefully stated, and the decision to be made therefrom suggested. The following is a brief *summary* of the evidence, *external* and *internal*—(the former founded on the ample data recently presented by Scholz); subjoined to which are some remarks on the *nature* of that evidence, and an *ἐπίκρισις* on the whole question.

I. EXTERNAL EVIDENCE AGAINST THE PARAGRAPH.—It is not found in 56 MSS., (in some of which, however, a space is left for it,) in 33 Evangelisteria, and several MSS. of the Syr., Copt., Sahidic, Armenian, and Italic Versions; nor is it treated on by Origen, Apollinar., Theod., Mops., Chrys., Bas., Cosmas., Theophyl., Catena, Tertull., Cypr. and Juvenc.; nor is it expressed by Nonnus.

External evidence for the Paragraph.—It is found in 284 MSS., and 6 Evangelisteria. In 40 others it is found, but *obelized*. In 15 others it is found with an asterisk: and again in 8 others is placed at the end of the Gospel. Of the remainder of the MSS., not ranged under *either* head, 13 MSS. have not been *examined* on purpose for this Paragraph: and 75 (including 13 Uncial ones) are found *mutilated* in this part by the abstraction of a leaf, or otherwise. And as to its not being contained in Nonnus's Version, that proves nothing; for many other omissions are there found equally remarkable. Thus we have a large chasm at vi. 40, and at xi. 55.

Internal evidence against the Paragraph.—This is any thing but decisive; for though the *variety* of readings in those MSS. which have it is great, yet it is scarcely greater than that which exists on some other passages, where there was any thing particularly to stumble at in the matter; as, for instance, part of the 2d, 3d, and 4th verses of the 5th chapter of this Gospel, where some Critics cut out the *whole*, some a *part*, and others contented themselves with endeavouring to alter the *words* on which the objection chiefly rests. This, to a certain degree, is the case *here*. Thus, instead of *κατακρίνω* at v. 11. some MSS. have *κρίνω*. In short, the arguments *against* the Paragraph from *internal* evidence resolve themselves into a series of objections, or surmises, founded on misconception; many of them such as might be advanced against *any* passage whose authenticity is undisputed. These may be found, together with, I trust, satisfactory answers, in Rec. Syn. Suffice it here to notice *two* objections which seem very specious; one that the paragraph is but little noticed by the Fathers and ancient Commentators. But this, we may imagine, arose *partly* because there was no *occasion* to advert to it; or because it could not *strengthen* their arguments or dissuatives against adultery— and partly because many persons, however causelessly, *did* stumble at one circumstance of the narration;—wondering why our Lord did not pass a more decided and severe condemnation. Thus the Fathers were apprehensive lest any persons, induced by the seeming im-

2 πάλιν παρεγένετο εἰς τὸ ἱερόν, καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἤρχετο πρὸς αὐτόν·
 3 καὶ καθίσας ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς. Ἄγρουσι δὲ οἱ Γερουμαεῖς καὶ οἱ Φα-
 ρισαῖοι πρὸς αὐτόν γυνῆν ἐν μοιχαίᾳ κατελιγμένην, καὶ στήσαντες
 4 αὐτήν ἐν μέσῳ, λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· Διδάσκαλε, αὕτη ἡ γυνὴ κατελήφθη
 5 ἑπαντοφώρῳ μοιχευομένῃ. Ἐν δὲ τῷ νόμῳ Μωϋσῆς ἡμῖν ἐνετείλατο ^{g Lev. 20, 10.}
 6 τὰς τοιαύτας λιθοβολεῖσθαι· σὺ οὖν τί λέγεις; Τοῦτο δὲ ἔλεγον ^{Deut. 22, 22.}
 πειράζοντες αὐτόν, ἵνα ἔχῃσι κατηγορεῖν αὐτοῦ. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς κίτω
 7 κύψας, τῷ διακίτῳ ἔγραψεν εἰς τὴν γῆν. Ἡς δὲ ἐπέμεινον ἐρωτῶντες ^{h Deut. 7, 7.}
 αὐτόν, ἀνακύψας εἶπε [πρὸς] † αὐτούς· Ὁ ἀναμάρτητος ὑμῶν προῖτος

punity of the offence, should be encouraged to the commission of this crime. So Augustin de Conjug. Adult. ii. 7. says, "that many, from a mistaken notion that the passage gave countenance to immorality, or an ill-judged fear lest its tendency should be misunderstood by the ignorant and ill-inclined, removed it from their copies." Hence it was generally passed over in the Homilies and Theological Treatises, and omitted in the Lectonaries. That it should have been passed over by Nonnus, may be imputed to much the same reason; though, indeed, that Paraphrast has omitted several other portions, some as long as this, without any apparent reason. And yet there is nothing in the Paragraph, when properly understood, that militates against the character of Christ, or can give the least encouragement to crime. On the contrary, the whole is perfectly consistent with the gentleness and benevolence of our Lord; while, at the same time, the censure itself is sufficient for the purpose. And if it be objected, that he suffered a guilty woman to go unpunished, it should be remembered: 1. that (according to our Lord's own declarations, John iii. 17; x. 11, 17.) he came not to exercise the office of a judge: and 2. that any such exercise of judicial authority would have been at variance with that deference which he ever inculcated, both by precept and example, to the civil magistrate. As a sinner he morally condemned her, when he bid her "go and sin no more."

In short, all the arguments put together, founded on internal evidence, against the authenticity of this Paragraph, will not counterbalance one which may be adduced for it,—namely, that, while we can easily imagine why it should have been omitted, no tolerable reason can be assigned why the story should have been fabricated at all, or if so, why fabricated with the present circumstances: and how it could, amidst so many objections, have found its way into five-sixths of the MSS. The fabricated stories found in the apocryphal Gospels are quite of a different character, and almost always founded on the most severe and ascetic views. And had this Paragraph been of that character, it would, I will venture to say, never have been omitted, or removed by any. To advert to a powerful argument from internal evidence in favour of its authenticity, the Paragraph is not denied by any competent judges to have upon it the stamp and impress of truth, in the profound wisdom of the answer, "Let him that is without sin cast a stone at her." Inasmuch that the most eminent of the Critics who dispute its authenticity (namely, whether it was recorded by St. John) are constrained to admit the truth of the narrative itself, which they think was introduced into the Gospel by Papias, or the

disciples of St. John; or else was, at a later period, expressed in the margin of some ancient MSS., and from thence found its way into the rest. But nothing can be imagined more improbable than the latter supposition. For there were surely many reasons why such a story should not have been introduced into the Text, and thus propagated into other MSS.; but not one reason why it should. And as to the former, it is very difficult to imagine how even Papias himself could have been enabled, had he wished it, to foist in an interpolation, especially of this nature: and if he had wished to interpolate, why he should have chosen this alone of all the many narrations which must then have been preserved by tradition,—namely, those πολλὰ ἄλλα, which St. John speaks of at xx. 30, and which he had chosen not to record, on the principle that those he had recorded were sufficient for the purpose of showing that Jesus was the Messiah. Such being the case, how would Papias dare to introduce any more?

4. κατελήφθη ἑπαντοφώρῳ μοιχευομένῃ.] Καταλαμβάνεσθαι ἑπαντοφώρῳ is a phrase properly used of thieves caught in the act of theft, or with the property upon them; but more frequently of those detected in the commission of any crime, especially such as is committed furtively. Other verbs of detection, as εἰρήσκω, ἀίσκω, κρητέω, were sometimes used. Ἐπαντ. may be construed either with κατελ. or with μοιχ.; but the former method is preferable, as being confirmed by the Classical passages cited by the Commentators.

5. λιθοβολεῖσθαι.] On the mode of stoning see Note in Recens. Synop.

6. τῷ διακίτῳ ἔγραψεν εἰς τὴν γῆν.] Some strange notions have been here broached by many ancient and modern Commentators, which may be seen in Lampe. The only correct view seems to be that taken by Euthym., Luther, L. Brug., Grot., Hamm., Lampe, Kypke, Schoettg., and others, that our Lord here employed an action frequent with those who do not choose to answer an improper question, and meant to intimate that they are otherwise engaged. Thus our Lord's action was only a symbolical one, though pregnant with meaning, signifying that he cared not to show any attention to what they were saying, or to answer their insidious question. Or it may have implied contempt, or censure,—as if they did not deserve that he should take the trouble to repeat, what he had so often inculcated, that with Judicial questions he had nothing to do; and that they merited no other answer than what they had themselves suggested by appealing to the Mosaic precept.

7. πρὸς αὐτούς.] Many Fathers and MSS. read αὐτοῖς.

—ὁ ἀναμάρτητος ὑμῶν.] The Commentators

τὸν λίθον ἐπ' αὐτῇ βαλέτω. Καὶ πάλιν κάτω κύψας ἔγραψεν εἰς τὴν 8
 γῆν. Οἱ δὲ ἀκούσαντες, [καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς συνειδήσεως ἐλεγχόμενοι] ἐξήρ- 9
 χοιτο εἰς καθ' εἰς, ἀρξάμενοι ἀπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἕως τῶν ἐσχάτων·
 καὶ κατελείφθη μόνος ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἐν μέσῳ * οὔσα. Ἀνακύψας 10
 δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ μηδένα θεασάμενος πλὴν τῆς γυναικὸς, εἶπεν αὐτῇ·
 Ἦ γυνή, ποῦ εἰσιν ἐκεῖνοι οἱ κατήγοροί σου; οὐδεὶς σε κατέκρινεν;
 Ἦ δὲ εἶπεν· Οὐδεὶς, κύριε. Ἐἶπε δὲ αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Οὐδὲ ἐγὼ σε 11
 κατακρίνω· πορεύου καὶ μηκέτι ἁμάρτανε.

i 1, 5, 9, 9, 5.
 & 12, 46.

ἰ Πάλιν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς αὐτοῖς ἐλάλησε, λέγων· Ἐγὼ εἰμι τὸ φῶς 12
 τοῦ κόσμου· ὁ ἀκολουθῶν ἐμοὶ οὐ μὴ περιπατήσει ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ, ἀλλ'

are not agreed on what is here meant by ἀναμόρ-
 τητος. Some take it to denote freedom from
 adultery; others, freedom from any notorious sin,
 like adultery; others, again, freedom from sin in
 general. But this last interpretation cannot be
 admitted, since it would be too favourable to the
 adulteress, and be inconsistent with our Lord's
 emphatic censure of her crime. Of the other
 senses, the former, which is adopted by the best
 Commentators, seems alone the true one. It
 may, however, very well include fornication, con-
 cubinage, and lasciviousness of every kind. To
 the extreme corruption of morals in his country-
 men Josephus bears ample testimony; and that
 the priests and scribes deeply participated in this
 corruption there is no reason to doubt; for the
 Rabbinical writers supply abundant proofs of the
 lasciviousness of even the most eminent Rabbis.
 That ἁμαρτάνειν and ἁμαρτία are in the Classical
 writers often used of adultery and fornication, is
 well known. If the word be taken in the above
 extensive sense (which is fully warranted by Scrip-
 ture) there will be no reason to doubt but that
 every one of the persons present was, more or
 less, guilty. As to the objection of Le Clerc and
 others, that no law demands perfect innocence in
 its judges, &c., it may be observed, that our Lord
 is here not speaking *juridically*, but *popularly*
 and considers the thing in *foro conscientie*; as in
 the passages of Cicero and Synesius compared
 by Grot. Thus our Lord did by no means absolve
 the accused, but smote the consciences of the
 accusers. He neither acquits nor condemns the
 woman; but tempers his answer with such pru-
 dence, that it should neither be contrary to jus-
 tice, nor inconsistent with mercy; and while it
 by no means absolved the accused, might smite
 the consciences of the accusers.

— πρῶτος — βαλέτω.] Render: "let him first
 cast the stone at her." By the stone is meant
 the fatal stone, which was first cast in form by one
 of the accusers or witnesses, and served as a sig-
 nal to the bystanders to commence the stoning.

8. καὶ πάλιν — τὴν γῆν.] The best reason that
 has been alleged for the repetition of this sym-
 bolical action, is that it was meant to give the
 priests and scribes an opportunity of withdrawing
 with less confusion. But, in fact, this was a
 counterpart to the former action.

9. τῆς συνειδήσεως.] This term (like *conscientia*)
 is employed properly, 1. generally to denote the
 innate light of reason, by which any one possess-
 ing in himself the seeds and the rule of truth
 and falsehood, is *conscious* of his own existence,
 essence, relation, &c. But it is used more *spe-*
cially by the Philosophers, and by the sacred

writers, to denote the faculty *consequent* upon it,
 by which a man exercises right judgment on the
 goodness or badness of his actions. Hence the
 office of reproof and conviction is well attributed
 to it; for, according to the expressive saying of
 Juven. Sat. xiii. 2. Prima est hæc ultio, quod, se
Judice, nemo nocens absolvitur. (Lampe.) I add
 Eurip. Orest. 390. ΜΕΝ. Τί χροῖμα πάσχεις; τίς σ'
 ἀπόλλυται νόσος; ΟἸ. Ἐξύβρισις ὅτι σίνουδά δέν'
 εἰργασμένος. The words καὶ — ἐλεγχ. are absent
 from many MSS. and early Editions, and may have
 been, as Matthæi suspects, from the margin, though
 it is more probable that they came from the
 Evangelist, because, as Matth. admits, they are
 much in his manner, — such ἐπικρίσεις being fre-
 quent with him. Instead of the common reading
 ἐστῶσα very many MSS. Versions and Edd. have
 οὔσα, which is edited by Matth. and Scholz, and
 rightly, for *internal* as well as *external* evidence,
 is in its favour.

On εἰς καθ' εἰς see Note on Mark xiv. 19. By
 πρεσβυτέρων (as Keuchen remarks) is here meant
 the *more honourable*, as by ἐσχάτων the lowest in
 degree or station. See Mark ix. 35. It is not
 meant, that they went out, each in seniority, but
 that they all went out, one after another, of every
 station and age, from first to last.

10. κατέκρινεν] "pronounced sentence on thee."

11. οὐδὲ ἐγὼ σε κατακρίνω] "neither do, or will
 I pass sentence on thee." Πορεύου, &c. We are
 not to take this as a *remission* of her sins; (which,
 as supreme Lord, he *might* have pronounced) but
 simply a declaration that, since his kingdom was
 not of this world, so he would not assume the
 office of temporal magistracy. False, therefore,
 is the conclusion of some, who hence infer that
 our Lord did not approve of adultery being pun-
 ished with death. For, upon the same principle
 they might argue that, when our Lord declined
 to act as judge between the brothers disputing
 about an inheritance (see Luke xii. 15.) he did
 not approve of inheritances being divided: and
 did not care that the disputes thence arising should
 be amicably settled. (Lampe.) To prevent any
 mistake of his meaning, our Lord added μηκέτι
 ἁμάρτανε.

12. Now follow to the end of the Chapter cer-
 tain discourses pronounced by our Lord in the
 Temple, on some other occasion, though *what*
 that was, is uncertain. The Commentators vari-
 ously speculate. Tittm. thinks vv. 12—19 are a
 continuation of the discourse at vii. 33. seqq.
 The scope of the address he thinks the same; but only
 that another metaphor is adopted, that of the
Sun. Thus our Lord is represented as the great
moral Teacher, and especially the only *Saviour*

- 13 ἔξει τὸ φῶς τῆς ζωῆς. Ἐῖπον οὖν αὐτῷ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι· Σὺ περὶ σεαυ-
 14 τοῦ μαρτυρεῖς ἢ μαρτυρία σου οὐκ ἔστιν ἀληθής. ^k Ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς ^{k5} 31.
 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Καὶ ἐγὼ μαρτυρῶ περὶ ἐμαυτοῦ, ἀληθής ἐστιν ἡ
 μαρτυρία μου· ὅτι οἶδα πόθεν ἦλθον, καὶ ποῦ ὑπάγω· ὑμεῖς δὲ
 15 οὐκ οἴδατε πόθεν ἔρχομαι, καὶ ποῦ ὑπάγω. Ἔτις κατὰ τὴν σάρκα
 16 κρίνετε· ἐγὼ οὐ κρίνω οὐδένα. Καὶ ἐὰν κρίνω δὲ ἐγὼ, ἡ κρίσις ἡ
 ἐμὴ ἀληθής ἐστιν· οὐ μόνος οὐκ εἰμι, ἀλλ' ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πέμψας με
 17 Πατήρ. ^l Καὶ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ δὲ τῷ ὑμετέροι γέγραπται, ὅτι δύο ἄνθρω- ^l Deut. 17. 6.
 18 πων ἡ μαρτυρία ἀληθής ἐστιν. Ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ μαρτυρῶν περὶ ἐμαυτοῦ, ^l Matt. 18. 16.
 19 καὶ μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ ὁ πέμψας με Πατήρ. Ἐλεγον οὖν αὐτῷ· Ποῦ ^l 2 Cor. 13. 1.
 ἐστιν ὁ πατήρ σου; Ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Οὔτε ἐμὲ οἴδατε οὔτε τὸν ^l Heb. 10. 23.
 20 Πατέρα μου· εἰ ἐμὲ ᾔδειτε, καὶ τὸν Πατέρα μου ᾔδειτε ἄν. ^m Ταῦτα ^m Supra 7.
 τὰ ῥήματα ἐλάλησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῷ γαζοφυλακίῳ, διδάσκων ἐν τῷ ^{8,30.}
 ἱερῷ· καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐπίσταν αὐτὸν, ὅτι οὐπω ἐληλύθει ἡ ἡμέρα αὐτοῦ.
 21 ⁿ Ἐῖπεν οὖν πάλιν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Ἐγὼ ὑπάγω, καὶ ζητήσετέ με, ⁿ Supra 7. 34.
 καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ ὑμῶν ἀποθανέσθε· ὅπου ἐγὼ ὑπάγω, ὑμεῖς οὐ ^{infra} 13. 33.

of the world. Indeed the former as well as the latter is an attribute of *Deity*; for the Rabbinical writers speak of *God* as the *light of the world*, and say that the light dwelleth alone with Him. And as *darkness* is often, in this Gospel, used to denote *vice* and *iniquity*, and *life* to signify *virtue* and its concomitant happiness, so *φῶς τοῦ κόσμου* may very well denote the *Messiah*, who shall enlighten, bless, and save the human race. Indeed this is required by the words following *ἔξει τὸ φῶς τῆς ζωῆς*.

13. *σὺ περὶ σεαυτοῦ μαρτ., &c.*] The foregoing lofty claim the Pharisees do not openly reject, but *put aside* by such a sort of argument, as they thought Jesus could not rebut; namely, that self-commendation has no force, and that no one can bear witness in his own case. This our Lord had before admitted, supra v. 31. But he removes the objection by arguing, that though in *common life* the rule holds good, yet an exception to it must be admitted in his own person; who had come down from heaven endued with the fullest Divine knowledge, (see vi. 46.) for the purpose of imparting it to men ignorant of celestial things, or what was the true nature of His office. Therefore the words "I know whence I came and whither I go," contain a *periphrasis of Divine legation*. The sense may be thus expressed: "My testimony is perfectly true; for I know with what authority I act, and what commands have been given to me: *you cannot know*, except you learn of me."

15. *ὑμεῖς κατὰ τὴν σάρκα κρίνετε.*] The sense is; "Ye are used to judge according to the external appearance, warped by passion and prejudice, q. d. *τὰ κατὰ πρόσωπον βλέπετε*, as St. Paul says, 2 Cor. x. 7.; and thus ye account me a *mere man*, not the *MESSIAH*."

—*οὐ κρίνω οὐδένα.*] The sense is not certain: Lampe contends that it is, "I as yet judge no man, being now only a Teacher," while Kuin. and Tittm. supply *οὐτως*, i. e. as you do, or *κατὰ σάρκα*.

16—18. Here follows another argument: "I do not alone bear testimony of myself; *God* bears testimony to me by the miracles which I work." (Kuin.) The passage is thus paraphrased by

Tittm.: "But even were I to bear the most honourable testimony of myself, yet it would be true, and worthy of credence; for neither am I alone, nor is my testimony solitary, but my Father also who sent me, hath testified of me," namely, by the Prophets. "Our Lord (says Tittm.) employs the same kind of argument here, as at v. 37. seqq. Nay (continues he), it is ordained by your law, that the testimony of two witnesses is worthy of credit." Therefore ought also *my* testimony of myself to be thought worthy of credit; since it is not of myself only, but likewise of my Father, who hath sent me.

19. *ποῦ ἔστιν ὁ πατήρ σου.*] On the scope of these words the Commentators are not agreed. The best founded opinion seems to be that of Lampe, Kuin., and Tittm., that they were said not from ignorance but by way of insult, q. d. Where is this Father of yours, that we may interrogate him? we do not see this other witness. To which our Lord indignantly replies, "Your very question betrays the malignity of your hearts; and shows that you neither truly know, nor care to know, either me or my Father. If you knew me as a Teacher sent from heaven, you would know that it is God who beareth witness of me, though not in a visible way, yet by miracles."

21. *πάλιν.*] The particle shows that the following discourse was pronounced at another time, and that it has no connexion with the preceding. The sense is: "I am about to depart, and ye shall seek the help of the Messiah, (and therefore of me, who am the Messiah;) but in vain; for having rejected my claims, there remaineth no other salvation." *Ἐν τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ ὑμῶν ἀποθ.* is a mode of expression taken from Ezek. iii. 19. xviii. 26. xxxiii. 9. 18. Some Commentators render *ἐν τῇ ἁμ. ὁ.* "in this your sin" i. e. obstinate incredulity and putting Christ to death. But the expression seems *general*, and may therefore be rendered in the *plural*. So Enthym. well paraphrases: "I came to deliver you from all your sins; but ye would not; therefore I depart, and ye shall afterwards die in all your sins; inasmuch as ye would not be delivered from them." By *ἀποθ.* is denoted not so much *temporal* death,

δύνασθε ἔλθειν. Ἔλεγον οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι· Μῆτι ἀποκτενεῖ ἑαυτὸν 22
 ὅτι λέγει· Ὅπου ἐγὼ ὑπάγω, ὑμεῖς οὐ δύνασθε ἔλθειν; καὶ εἶπεν 23
 αὐτοῖς· Ὅτι ἐκ τῶν κάτω ἐστὲ, ἐγὼ ἐκ τῶν ἄνω εἰμί· ὑμεῖς ἐκ
 τοῦ κόσμου τούτου ἐστὲ, ἐγὼ οὐκ εἰμί ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου. Εἶπον 24
 οὖν ἡμῖν, ὅτι ἀποθανεῖσθε ἐν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ὑμῶν· ἐὰν γὰρ μὴ
 πιστεῦσθε ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι, ἀποθανεῖσθε ἐν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ὑμῶν. Ἔλεγον 25
 οὖν αὐτῷ· Σὺ τίς εἶ; Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Τὴν ἀρχὴν ὁ τι
 καὶ λαλῶ ὑμῖν. Ὁ Πολλὰ ἔχω περὶ ὑμῶν λαλεῖν καὶ κρῖνειν· ἀλλ' ὁ 26
 πέμψας με ἀληθὴς ἐστὶ, καὶ γὰρ ἃ ἤκουσα παρὰ αὐτοῦ, ταῦτα λέγω εἰς
 τὸν κόσμον. Οὐκ ἔγνωσαν ὅτι τὸν Πατέρα αὐτοῖς ἔλεγεν. Εἶπεν οὖν 27
 αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Ὅταν ὑψώσθε τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, τότε γνώ- 28
 σεσθε ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι, καὶ ἀπ' ἐμαντοῦ ποιῶ οὐδέν· ἀλλὰ, καθὼς ἐδίδαξέ
 με ὁ Πατήρ μου, ταῦτα λαλῶ. Καὶ ὁ πέμψας με μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐστίν· 29
 οὐκ ἀφῆκέ με μόνον ὁ Πατήρ, ὅτι ἐγὼ τὰ ἀρεστὰ αὐτῷ ποιῶ πάν-
 τоте.

Ταῦτα αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος, πολλοὶ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτόν. Ἔλεγεν οὖν 30
 ὁ Ἰησοῦς πρὸς τοὺς πεπιστευκότας αὐτῷ Ἰουδαίους· Ἐὰν ὑμεῖς μείνητε 31

(namely, at the destruction of Jerusalem) as eternal death, a state of everlasting woe.

22. *μήτι ἀποκτενεῖ ἑαυτὸν, &c.*] This was a wilful perversion of our Lord's meaning, and a scornful repartee; q. d. What! will he make away with himself, to get away from this our pretended persecution? See vii. 20. This imputation of intended suicide involved, even according to the opinions of the Jews, great criminality; for we find from Josephus, that the Pharisees thought the lowest pit of Hell was reserved for self-murderers.

23. *ὑμεῖς ἐκ τῶν, &c.*] Our Lord does not deign to notice the above absurd and malignant imputation; but points at the cause of it, by adverting to their difference in disposition as well as origin, from himself; they being of earthly origin and grovelling minds, he of celestial origin and heavenly minded. Compare John iii. 31. He means to intimate, that it is their earthly and corrupt dispositions that hindered them from believing, and would consequently cut them off from salvation.

24. *ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι.*] Scil. *ἐκείνος*, namely, that personage expected and predicted of by the Patriarchs and Prophets. An ellip. found also in a kindred passage at Mark xiii. 6. See also Deut. xxxi. 29. and Acts xiii. 25.

25. *σὺ τίς εἶ;*] The best Commentators are agreed that the question is not one of simple ignorance, seeking information but involving scornful rebuke, q. d. Who art thou who speakest so loftily of thyself, and rebukingly to us? Our Lord, however, was pleased to answer, as if it had been the former.

— *τὴν ἀρχὴν — ὑμῖν.*] The sense of these words hinges upon *τὴν ἀρχὴν*; where the ancient and older Commentators suppose an ellip. of *κατά*; and take the phrase for *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς*. The *ἀρχὴν* some suppose denotes the *beginning of office*; others, the *beginning of the present address*; which latter opinion is preferable. Thus the expression may simply mean, *didum, or etiam nunc*, as in Gen. xliii. 18. Thus *λαλῶ* will be for *ἐλάλησα*, "I have been telling you."

26. *πολλὰ ἔχω, &c.*] These words are, from brevity, somewhat obscure; but the sense seems to be: ["I could say much more in reference to you, and in reproof of your unbelief;] but I shall content myself with declaring, that as I am sent from the great Father of truth, so what I publicly aver is from Him, and therefore must be true." (See a similar ellip. of *ἀλλὰ* at vii. 26.) *κρῖνειν* is here meant to further define *λαλεῖν*.

27. *οὐκ ἔγνωσαν — ἔλεγεν.*] The sense is: "They did not, or cared not to know that he spake unto them of (i. e. that he meant) his Father," viz. in heaven, *God*.

28. *ὅταν ὑψώσθε, &c.*] These words could not have been understood by his hearers; but they were purposely expressed obscurely, partly from the reserve which prudence induced our Lord then to maintain; and partly because when what was now enigmatical, should be explained by the event, there might arise that confirmation of faith which results from the fulfilment of prophecy. The same remark applies to the words of our Lord addressed to Peter, respecting John, xxi. 22. *ἐὰν αὐτὸν θέλω μένειν ἕως ἐγὼ ἐρχομαι.* See also iii. 14. xii. 42. Indeed, what is spoken respecting future events, and not intended to be understood until the events themselves have taken place, can be expressed no otherwise than obscurely. Here there is an obscure allusion, but plain from the event, to the wonderful circumstances attending the crucifixion, and to the events subsequent to it; namely, the resurrection and ascension, the coming of the Holy Spirit, and the working of miracles in the name of Christ, which would so demonstrate Jesus to be the Messiah, that they would all have abundant evidence to see, and many would believe that he was the Christ. At *εἰμι* sub. *ἐκείνος*.

It is well remarked by Chrysost., that in *καθὼς — λαλῶ*, our Lord speaks *more humano*. V. 29. is closely connected with the preceding, and the sense is, "who having sent me, leaves me no alone, but aids and supports me, because I thus perform his will in all things."

31. *ἐὰν ὑμεῖς μείνητε, &c.*] "If ye adhere with

32 ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῷ ἐμῷ, ἀληθῶς μαθηταὶ μου ἐστέ· καὶ γινώσθε τὴν
 33 ἀλήθειαν, καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια ἐλευθερώσει ὑμᾶς. Ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ·
 Σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ ἐσμεν, καὶ οὐδενὶ δεδουλεύκαμεν πώποτε· πῶς σὺ
 34 λέγεις· Ὅτι ἐλεύθεροι γενήσεσθε; Ἡ ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· p Rom. 6. 16.
 & Pet. 2. 19.
 Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι πᾶς ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, δοῦλος ἐστι
 35 τῆς ἁμαρτίας. Ὁ δὲ δοῦλος οὐ μένει ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα· ὁ
 36 υἱὸς μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. Ἐάν οὖν ὁ υἱὸς ὑμᾶς ἐλευθερώσῃ, ὄντως
 37 ἐλεύθεροι ἔσεσθε. Οἶδα ὅτι σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ ἐστε· ἀλλὰ ζητεῖτέ με
 38 ἀποκτεῖναι, ὅτι ὁ λόγος ὁ ἐμὸς οὐ χωρεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν. Ἐγὼ, ὁ ἐώρακα
 παρὰ τῷ Πατρὶ μου, λαλῶ· καὶ ὑμεῖς οὖν, ὁ ἐωράκατε παρὰ τῷ πατρὶ
 39 ὑμῶν, ποιεῖτε. Ἀπεκρίθησαν καὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ· Ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν Ἀβραάμ

constancy to my doctrine, and act upon it, in a holy obedience by your lives."

32. γινώσθε τὴν ἀλήθειαν.] The sense is: "ye shall experimentally find the true and beneficial effects of my doctrine, as well as the reality of the Divine origin and legation which I claim." Comp. v. 28. vii. 17. Christ adds yet more, καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια ἐλευθερώσει ὑμᾶς; where ἀλ. must mean the true doctrine promulgated by him, *Gospel truth*. Ἐλευθ. signifies "will liberate you from the bondage to sin and Satan, and place you in the glorious liberty of the children of God." (See Rom. viii. 2. 15.) *Servitude* being, by a metaphor common both in the Scriptural and Classical writers, a perpetual symbol of *vice*.

33. ἀπεκρίθησαν.] Not the οἱ πεπιστευκότες just mentioned, but some bystanders, who here per- versely misrepresent Christ's meaning.

— οὐδενὶ δεδουλεύκαμεν π.] As the Hebrews had been in slavery not only under the Egyptians and Babylonians, but were subject to the Romans, many Commentators regard this as an impudent *falsehood* uttered in the heat of disputation. But the manner of the speakers indicates not *anger*, but *craftiness*. It is better, with others, to take δεδουλ. in such a restricted sense as the truth of history will justify. Yet I am inclined, with most recent Interpreters, to regard the words as spoken of *themselves* only and their *own age*. And assuredly the Jews, even after they became subject to the Roman Empire, were left in the enjoyment of no inconsiderable liberty, *political* as well as religious. See Notes on Matt. xvii. 24, 27. xv. 26. 60. Our Lord now shows that he meant not political, but *moral* and *spiritual* liberty. Comp. vi. 17. See v. 32.

34. ποιῶν ἁμ.] practises it habitually.

35. ὁ δὲ δοῦλος — αἰῶνα.] Here we have a *gnome generalis*, and an illustration drawn from what is usual in common life; q. d. "The *Slave* has no claim to remain continually in the same family; but may, at the pleasure of his owner, be sold unto another. Not so the *son*; he cannot be alienated from the family. Thus it is with the *servants of sin*, who may, at any time, be excluded from God's house and favour, into outer darkness. Whereas those who have the liberty of the *sons* of God will abide in it for ever." V. 36. contains another view, engrafted on the former, the comparison being the same but with another application. And as, in the foregoing verse there is a comparison between the state of a slave, and that of the son and heir; so in this there is, I conceive, one between the freedom communicated by the lord, and that by his son, with the *concur-*

rence of his Father. For as there may have been cases in which a Proprietor could not manumit without the consent of the son and heir, (or at least a manumission in which the son concurred with the father, might be regarded as being doubly effectual); so the freedom and salvation produced by the conjoint manumission of both Father and Son is most truly effectual. *ἄνωγος ἐλεύθεροι* has reference, not *merely*, as Wets., Rosenm., and Kuin. suppose, to the freedom from the tyranny of evil passions, but freedom from "the dominion of sin," mentioned by St. Paul. Rom. vi. implying an introduction into "the glorious liberty of the children of God." Rom. viii. 21. "the adoption, to wit, the redemption, of our bodies." Rom. viii. 23. ix. 4.

37. οἶδα ὅτι σπέρμα — ἀποκτεῖναι.] Our Lord grants their assertion; but makes use of it to shew the inconsistency between their boasted claims of ancestry and their present conduct. How degenerate must those descendants of Abraham be who pursue a conduct the reverse of his pure and blameless spirit, by plotting the death of Him to whom both the Patriarchs and Prophets bear witness. Then is suggested the *reason* for that rejection of his doctrine, which made them plot against his person; namely, ὅτι ὁ λόγος — ὑμῖν, where the Commentators are not agreed on the exact sense of χωρεῖ. The sense "has place," adopted by many eminent ancient and modern Expositors, is destitute of authority, and not definite or significant enough. The best interpretation seems to be that of Nonnus, Grot., De Dieu, Camer., Lampe, Rosenm., Kuin., and Wahl, "does not go into," or penetrate "your hearts," by being received and carried into effect. Ἐν is for εἰς, which is the proper construction, as Matt. xv. 17. The *hypallage* may be accounted for by supposing that there is here a blending of two phrases of different constructions.

38. The scope of this verse (which is variously traced by the Commentators) seems to be simply that of drawing a parallel between *His* actions and *theirs*, to account for their rejection of Him, God. *He* faithfully delivers the *doctrine* which he has learnt from and with *His father*; they do the *works* which they have learnt from *their father*, even the Devil; as is more clearly signified further on. The account given by Josephus of the Jews of his age fully vindicates our Lord's words from any charge of exaggeration.

— ἐώρακα.] Ὁραῖν has here (as often) not the physical sense to see, but the moral sense to perceive, i. e. understand, know, learn.

39. ὁ πατὴρ — ἐστι.] The scope of the passage

ἔστι. Λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Εἰ τέκνα τοῦ Ἀβραάμ ἦτε, τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Ἀβραάμ ἐποιεῖτε [ἄν]. Νῦν δὲ ζητεῖτέ με ἀποκτεῖναι, ἄνθρωπον 40 ὃς τὴν ἀλήθειαν ὑμῖν κηρύττει, ἣν ἤκουσα παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ· τοῦτο Ἀβραάμ οὐκ ἐποίησεν. Ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε τὰ ἔργα τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν. Εἰ- 41 πον οὖν αὐτῷ· Ἰμεῖς ἐκ πορνείας οὐ γεγεννήμεθα· ἓνα πατέρα ἔχομεν, τὸν Θεόν. Ἐπεὶ οὖν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· *Εἰ ὁ Θεὸς πατὴρ ὑμῶν 42 ἦν ἡγαπάτε ἄν ἐμὲ· ἐγὼ γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐξῆλθον καὶ ἤκω· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ ἐβλήθη, ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνός με ἀπέστειλε. Διὰ τὴν λαλίαν 43 τὴν ἐμὴν οὐ γινώσκει; ὅτι οὐ δύνασθε ἀκούειν τὸν λόγον τὸν ἐμόν.

q 1 John 3. 8.
Jude ver. 6.

q Ὑμεῖς ἐκ πατρὸς τοῦ Διαβόλου ἐστέ, καὶ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τοῦ πατρὸς 44

is not well traced by the Commentators. It should seem that the Jews, not knowing that by *their father* Jesus had meant the Devil; and not quite understanding what was meant by their "seeing things with [apud] their father," and regarding it as disrespectful to *Abraham*, take refuge in their former allegation; and simply repeat that *Abraham* is their father, in whom they trust. To this our Lord objects, that they are not *Abraham's* sons in the spiritual and real sense; namely, those who closely copy his example, and do his works. This, he shows in the next verse, they are the farthest from doing, by their plotting the murder of one who had told them the whole truth from God.

From the Rabbinical citations adduced by Lightf. and others, it is clear that this figurative sense of *son* was well known to the Jews. Wets. contrasts the belief and practice of *Abraham* (who received every revelation of the will of God and discovery of the truth with unreserved faith), with that of the Jews, who rejected both.

The *ἄν* after ἐποιεῖτε is omitted in many good MSS. and some Versions and Fathers, together with the early Edd., and is cancelled by Griesb., Pittm., Vater, and Scholz. Internal evidence is indeed against it, yet it is confirmed by *ἄν* being used in a kindred passage, infra ver. 42.

40. *νῦν*.] This is, Lampe observes, used *assumptively*, as ix. 41. xviii. 36. Acts xv. 10. And so, I add, it is often taken in Thueyd.

41. *πορνείας*.] The best Commentators are agreed that the word here, as often, signifies *idolatry*; which was considered by the Jews as a sort of *spiritual* adultery, since so close was the connection of the people of Israel with God, that it was compared to the conjugal union. Compare Judg. ii. 17. 1 Chron. v. 25. Is. i. 21. Hos. i. 2. iv. 12. Their meaning, therefore, is: "If thou art now speaking of our *natural* Father, know that we recognise no other Father than God. To Him we are dear and beloved, like children: Him only do we worship." This argument our Lord rebuts, by again adverting to the *spiritual* sense of Father.

42. ἐξῆλθον καὶ ἤκω.] The sense is: "I proceeded forth from God, and come hither [as his Legate]." The former term has reference to the character of Jesus as the *eternal son of God*; the latter, as *Legate*, *Mediator*, and *Redeemer*. Compare vi. 46. vii. 29. xiii. 3. xvi. 27, 28. xvii. 7. and 25.

43. λαλίαν] for λόγον or λόγους; namely, those which he had just delivered, and such like, — indeed his *doctrine in general*. Γινώσκετε has reference to that *full comprehension* of our Lord's words, which the Jews certainly had not; and

the reason of which is suggested in the next words οὐ δύνασθε, &c., where *δύν.* must be understood of the *moral inability* arising from perversity and indisposition to receive what is said. Compare John vii. 7. and Jerem. vi. 16. Ἀκούειν here, as often, signifies to *hearken*, to *give heed* to what is said.

44. ὑμεῖς — διαβόλου.] Our Lord now speaks more plainly, pointing out their *true* Father, and indicating *two* of the principal characteristics in which their similarity to their Diabolical father consists; namely, *man-slaying* and *lying*. Θέλτε, ye will, i. e. ye are resolved. Ἀπ' ἀρχῆς denotes here, as often, "from the beginning of the world." Compare i. 1. and 1 John iii. 8. The expression, however, includes a notion of *continuance* and *perseverance in*. In ἀνθρωποκτονίας there is not, I conceive, a reference (as some imagine) to the murder of *Abel*, committed at the instigation of Satan; neither, however, must the sense of the word (with others) be *explained away*. It must be taken in its *proper* sense, and be referred to the seduction of our first parents, called ἀνθρωποκτονία, as "bringing death into the world, and all our woe;" the thing being brought about by Satan's machinations. Thus a Rabbinical writer cited by Schoettg. speaks of "children of the old Serpent, who killed Adam and all his posterity." The slaying is also ascribed to the Devil in Wisd. ii. 24.

The words καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ οὐχ ἔστ. contain a strong affirmation, by a negation of the contrary. And as to *stand in* any action is to steadfastly practise it, so the sense here is, "He has perpetually fallen away from the truth." This is repeated in another mode of expression (occurring also in 1 John i. 3. 2 Macc. vii. 13, and often in the Rabbinical writers), denoting that there is no principle of truth in him. Ἔστηκε has (as almost always) a sense of *present* time, or rather is used indefinitely of *all* times. The idea is further illustrated in the words following, the sense of which will much depend upon the manner in which *αὐτοῦ* in the next clause is explained; which some ancient and a few modern Translators render, according to the more usual signification of the word, *ipsius*, *his*. Yet this produces so odd a sense, — "for he is a liar, and so is his father," — that almost all Expositors of any eminence, from Erasmus to Pittm., take *αὐτοῦ* as a *neuter*, rendering *ejus*, *it*; and refer it either to the remote antecedent ψέδος, or consider that word as *inherent* in the verbal ψέστης. As, however, this would seem to involve a *pleonasm* in the article, Ep. Middleton. (after affirming that the article is never pleonastic) ventures to pronounce that all the great scholars who have espoused the com-

ὑμῶν θέλετε ποιεῖν. ἐκείνος ἀνθρωποκτόνος ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀλήθειᾳ οὐκ ἔστηκεν· ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἀλήθεια ἐν αὐτῷ. Ὅτιαν λαλή τὸ ψεῦδος, ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων λαλεῖ· ὅτι ψεύστης ἐστὶ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ.
 45 ἐγὼ δὲ οἶτι τὴν ἀλήθειαν λέγω οὐ πιστενετέ μοι. Τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν ἐλέγχει
 46 με περὶ ἁμαρτίας; εἰ δὲ ἀλήθειαν λέγω, διατί ὑμεῖς οὐ πιστενετέ
 47 μοι; Ἦ ὁ ὢν ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀκούει· διὰ τοῦτο· 1 John 4. 6.

mon version, were in error. And, as might be expected, he adopts the *masculine* sense of αὐτοῦ. But, in order to avoid the insuperable objection arising from the sense thus produced, he endeavours to free his criticism from the difficulty in question by changing the *subject* in αὐτοῦ, and rendering, not "the Devil," but his son, the Liar. This he does by supposing the person at λαλεῖ to be not Διάβολος, but τις understood. And he renders, "when any of you speak that which is false, he speaks after the manner of his kindred (such he takes to be the sense of ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων); for he is a liar, and so also is his father." But to this it is, with reason, objected by Prof. Scholefield, that after describing the man as a liar, it was superfluous to add, "for he is a liar." This difficulty the learned Professor attempts to remove by cancelling the comma, and rendering, "for his father also is a liar;" a sense which he thinks its strange should not have occurred to Bp. Middl. But it probably did occur, and was rejected, as it might with reason; since it does violence to the construction, and introduces a sense not a little jejune, — such as would never suggest *itself*, but would have to be devised for the purpose of removing an objection. But there is a still more formidable objection: for (not to mention that such a sense as "after the manner of his kindred" is very harsh and improbable) this changing the subject *ad libitum*, and supplying a nominative, τις at λαλεῖ, is surely too arbitrary a method to be justified. The ellipsis in question is, indeed, frequent in the Classical writers; but it is almost confined to the *Attic* ones, being very rarely found in the Alexandrian writers or those of later times, and never in the N. T. or the Sept. For Prof. Scholf. admits that it is unnecessarily supplied at Acts x. 28. And he himself allows that this is a "questionable part of the criticism." So questionable, I must think, that it ought to be *rejected*. There is, indeed, no reason to deviate from our common version; for though there may seem something *uncouth* in the *it*, and such as is at first little intelligible, yet the same is observable in many other parts of Scripture. The sentiment too, thus arising is both apposite and natural, and suggests matter for serious reflection. And in a writer like St. John, not tied down to strict rules, when we have arrived at this, we must not be deterred by petty grammatical objections. Thus Markland (who may surely be considered as good a Grecian as Bp. Middl.) observes, *supra* ver. 33. that "in this Evangelist the sense is more to be regarded than the construction." Now here there is little that can be called irregular. This use of αὐτοῦ in the neuter is indeed not very frequent; yet it is found at Gal. iii. 11. iv. 17. Eph. i. 7. Nor is the use of the article to be called anomalous. The article might indeed be dispensed with. And thus it is used, as is often the Hebr. 7. But, in fact, it is not *without* its force; the sense being "and the originator of it, by the deception of

our first parents," Gen. iii. 5. (So Soph. Œd. Tyr. 868. calls Jupiter the πατὴρ νόμων.) Again, instances are abundant of nouns being left to be supplied from a verb preceding (see Glass. Phil. Sac. 111. 2. 10. and Casaubon); thus there is surely no great harshness in a noun being left to be supplied from a *verbal*, if we consider its true nature, and especially as the very word itself has just preceded. So Koecher says *latet* in ψεύστης.

The above method of exposition is also supported by the suffrage of the earliest antiquity, being adopted by the Pesch. Syriac Translator in the middle of the second century; who renders by

σας with the *feminine* affn., which therefore cannot be referred to the Devil, and must belong to the preceding *feminine* noun Ἰζαζα, a lie? Finally, though I know of no example of ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων in the sense ἰδιώματος, we may suppose it to be a form of expression in the common dialect for ἐκ τοῦ ἰδίου. And so the Pesch. Syr. Translator must have taken it; since he renders in the *singular* Ἰζαζα, *de suo*. And as there

is something peculiar in St. John's use of τὰ ἴδια at i. 11. & xix. 27; so there is less to scruple at here. ἴδ. is for οἰκτίων. So Hesych.: ἴδιον· οἰκτίων. And Lampe adduces Porphyry as saying of demons, τὸ ψεῦδος τοῖσι οἰκτίων.

46. τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν — ἁμαρτίας.] The scope of this address is to convince them of his credibility by another and a popular kind of argument. The best Commentators take ἁμαρτία to denote, not *sin*, according to the common acceptance, but *error*, or falsehood in doctrine, as opposed to the truth mentioned in the next clause. Of this signification many examples are adduced; to which I have in Recens. Synop. added others more apposite; as Æschyl. Agam. 480. φρεῶν ἁμαρτία. Thucyd. i. 32. δόξης ἁμαρτία. & 78. ἐν ἁμαρτία ὄντες. But it may be better to keep to the general sense, as including both words and actions. Ἐλέγχει must be rendered, not *convinceth*, but *convicteth*. Thus in a kindred passage of Aristoph. Plut. 574. (cited by Eckhard) καὶ σίγῃ ἐλέγξει μ' οὐπω δόνασαι περὶ τοῦτου.

Jesus appeals to his auditors, whether they can make out any such charge against him, of vice in *action*, or falsehood in *words*, as to warrant his claims to be disregarded; see a similar appeal of Moses to the Israelites, Numb. xvi. Such an interrogatory appeal involves the force of a strong negation. Thus, in the words following, the hearers are *supposed* to have answered, *No one!* The *inference* is manifest. In v. 47. the argument is followed up. "If ye were really, as ye boast, sons of God, ye would hearken to and yield credence to the words of God [from me, His legate]. The very reason why ye hearken not to them is, that ye are not of God;" i. e. sons of God. Ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ is for υἱὸς Θεοῦ.

47. 20. 10. 20. ὑμεῖς οὐκ ἀκούετε, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐκ ἐστέ. *Ἀπεκρίθησαν οὖν 48
 οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ· Οὐ καλῶς λέγομεν ἡμεῖς, ὅτι Σαμαρείτης
 εἶ σὺ, καὶ δαιμόνιον ἔχεις; Ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς· Ἐγὼ δαιμόνιον οὐκ 49
 ἔχω, ἀλλὰ τιμῶ τὸν Πατέρα μου, καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀτιμάζετε με. Ἐγὼ δὲ οὐ 50
 ζητῶ τὴν δόξαν μου· ἔστιν ὁ ζητῶν καὶ κρίνων. Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω 51
 ὑμῖν· ἐάν τις τὸν λόγον τὸν ἐμὸν τηρήσῃ, θάνατον οὐ μὴ θεωρήσῃ
 εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. Εἶπον οὖν αὐτῷ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι· Νῦν ἐγνώκαμεν ὅτι 52
 δαιμόνιον ἔχεις. Ἀβραάμ ἀπέθανε καὶ οἱ προφῆται· καὶ σὺ λέγεις·
 Ἐάν τις τὸν λόγον μου τηρήσῃ, οὐ μὴ γεύσεται θανάτου εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.
 Μὴ σὺ μεῖζων εἶ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἀβραάμ, ὅστις ἀπέθανε; καὶ οἱ 53
 προφῆται ἀπέθανον· τίνα σεαυτὸν οὐ ποιεῖς; Ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς· 54
 Ἐάν ἐγὼ δοξάζω ἑμαυτὸν, ἢ δόξα μου οὐδὲν ἐστιν· ἔστιν ὁ Πατήρ
 μου ὁ δοξάζων με, ὃν ὑμεῖς λέγετε, ὅτι Θεὸς ὑμῶν ἐστι. Καὶ οὐκ 55
 ἐγνώκατε αὐτόν· ἐγὼ δὲ οἶδα αὐτόν· καὶ ἐν εἴπω ὅτι οὐκ οἶδα
 αὐτόν, ἔσομαι ὅμοιος ὑμῶν, ψεύστης· ἀλλ' οἶδα αὐτόν, καὶ τὸν λό-
 γον αὐτοῦ τηρῶ. Ἀβραάμ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ἠγαλλιάσατο ἵνα ἴδῃ τὴν 56
 ἡμέραν τὴν ἐμὴν· καὶ εἶδε καὶ ἐχάρη. Εἶπον οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι πρὸς 57

48. Not being able to answer these arguments, the Jews are fain to have recourse to reviling.

— Σαμαρείτης—ἔχεις.] Of these two expressions the latter has been explained at vii. 20. The former appears from the Rabbinical writers, to have been a term of reproach, equivalent to calling in any one a *heathen*, or a *heretic*; for the Samaritans were accounted *both*, as well in doctrine as in practice.

49. Here our Lord, with mild dignity, rebuts the insulting charge. *Τιμῶ τὸν Πατέρα* here signifies *cum effectu*, the executing his Father's injunctions, by delivering his message and doctrine. Compare xvii. 4. This honour to God, he argues, would not be rendered by a *dæmoniac*.

50. *Ἐγὼ δὲ οὐ ζητῶ*, &c.] The full sense is: "However, it is not my part to vindicate my honour; [nor need I;] there is a Being who will vindicate it, and hold judgment on men as to their reception of me."

51. *Ἐάν τις τὸν λόγον*, &c.] Here our Lord especially adverts to the happy lot of those who accept his covenant of grace, and observe its requisitions. That they shall never *θεωρεῖν θάνατον*, which, like *ἰδεῖν θάνατον* at Luke ii. 26, signifies, "to experience death;" i. e. death spiritual, and eternal. Yet, though it has been proved that the phrase as well as the doctrine was not unknown to the Jews, the hearers misunderstand or pervert our Lord's words, and endeavour thereby to fasten on him the charge of being possessed with a *dæmon*. Moreover, as this claim to confer immortality implied the possession of it himself, the Jews justly interpreted this as virtually an arrogation of superiority over Abraham and the Prophets.

53. *καὶ οἱ προφῆται ἀπέθανον*.] An abandonment of the construction, for *καὶ τῶν προφήτων οἱ ἀπέθανον*. Wets. compares Homer, II. φ. 107. *κάρθανε καὶ Πάτροκος, ὅσπερ στο πολλὰν ἀμείνων*. See Lucret. iii. 1055. The Jews only stumbled at these claims because they would not acknowledge his Messiahship: for they did not deny that the *Messiah* was to be far superior to all the Patriarchs, Prophets, and even Angels.

54. Here our Lord rebuts the charge of arrogance, by showing that this glory is not sought by him, but freely given him by the Father.

— *δοξάζω ἐμ.*] take glory or honour to myself; equivalent to *ζητῶ τὴν δόξαν μου*, supra 50.

— *ὅτι Θεὸς ἔ. ἔ.*] is put for *Θεὸν ὑμῶν εἶναι*; i. e. whose worshippers ye profess to be.

55. *καὶ οὐκ ἐγν.*] "And [yet] ye do not truly know Him, because ye refuse to admit me;" for, as Euthym. observes, the keeping of God's commandments is the only sure proof that we know Him.

56. Ἀβραάμ—ἐχάρη.] Our Lord here contrasts their feelings towards Him with that of Abraham, of whom they so boast; and that in order to hint at his Messiahship, and consequently infinite superiority to Abraham.

— *ἠγαλλιάσατο ἵνα ἴδῃ*.] Render (with Bp. Pearce) "earnestly desired to see;" which sense is confirmed by the Pesch. Syr. Version; "He earnestly wished to see, or know the time when the promise made to him (Gen. xii. 3.) should be fulfilled." He anticipated the period, and exulted as if it were present to him.

ἵνα seems to be the Accusative (with the ellip. of *κατὰ*) of ἵς, a shoot, or fibre, whatever issues from a root; and generally, *issue*. Thus it may well denote the *issue*, or *end*, of *action*. When it denotes *where*, it signifies the issue or end of *motion*, the place where it ceases. From the word ἵς came the Latin *vis*: for as ἵς signifies a fibre, so it might well denote a *nerve* (an animal fibre), and therefore *strength*, (namely, what *stringeth* the nerves, for that is the origin of the word, and the nature of the metaphor.) From this same ἵς (or *ivis*) *ivis* may be deduced the Ang. Sax. and Old English *imp*, *imp*, a shoot, and metaphorically a son.

— *τὴν ἡμέραν τ. ἔ.*] "my time;" i. e. when I the promised Saviour (See Joel ii. 1.) should come into the world." Ἰδεῖν ἡμέραν signifies to live to any time; of which examples are adduced by Elsn., Wets., and Kypke.

— *καὶ εἶδε καὶ ἐχάρη*] "and he saw it with delight;" i. e. as most recent Commentators ex-

58 αὐτόν· Πεντήκοντα ἔτη οὐπω ἔχεις, καὶ Ἀβραάμ ἰούρακας; εἶπεν αὐ-
 τοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν· πρὶν Ἀβραάμ γενέσθαι, ἐγὼ
 59 εἶμι. Ἦσαν οὖν λίθους, ἵνα βιάωσιν ἐπ' αὐτόν· Ἰησοῦς δὲ ἐκρούβη,^{t infra. 10. 31.}
 καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ, διελθὼν διὰ μέσου αὐτῶν· καὶ παρήγγεν
 οὕτως.

1 IX. Καὶ παρήγγων εἶδεν ἄνθρωπον τυφλὸν ἐκ γενετῆς. καὶ ἠρώ-

plain, in *Orcus*, or the seat of the righteous dead (see Luke xvi. 23. and Notes). In proof of which they adduce much specious evidence. But, after all, the meaning probably is (as the older Commentators interpret), "he saw it partly by the eye of faith, so strong as to be compared to sight, (see Heb. xi. 13. 1 Pet. i. 10—12,) and partly by a revelation supposed to be made to him on being commanded to offer up Isaac." At least, Schoettg thinks there is good reason to suppose that he was favoured by the Jehovah Angel with some faint representations of what would take place at the time of the Messiah.

57. πενήκοντα ἔτη, &c.] The Commentators have been needlessly perplexed with these words; which are best treated on by Beza, Rosenm., and Kuin., who account for this mode of speaking on the principle, that opponents in argument sometimes grant *more* than their antagonists ask, in order to vanquish them in the end more effectually. The number *fifty* is used not (as Grot. supposes) as being a round number, (though that might be admitted, if it could be proved that our Lord was then, as Irenæus and some other of the Fathers suppose, about forty years of age,) but because among the ancients fifty was considered as the age when any one was past his vigour, and was discharged from severe service, civil or religious. So Philo, p. 24. ἀνὴρ δ' ἄχρους ἐνδὸς δέοντος πενήκοντα. Thus the sense is: "Thou art not yet even *πρεσβύτης*, much less *γέρων*."

58. πρὶν Ἀβραάμ — ἐγὼ εἶμι.] This passage is of the highest importance, as illustrating the *supreme majesty* of Christ, by showing his pre-existence long before his birth in this world; and also, by what appears an assumption of the name of Jehovah, of his *Divinity*. There has, however, been some difference of opinion among Commentators on the sense of the words. As to the Unitarian interpretation, which explains the existence not of *nature*, but of *destination*, in this sense: "Before Abraham was [Abraham, the father of many nations, in a mystical sense] I already was destined to be the Messiah;"—it is perhaps the most far-fetched and frigid ever broached even in that School. It is utterly inconsistent with the context, and is quite inadmissible, since it introduces an *unauthorized addition* into the sentence. See the unanswerable refutations of Whitby, Lampe, Kuin., and Tittm. Having seen what is *not*, let us examine what *is* the sense. The ancient and most earlier modern Commentators took *εἶμι* to denote the *eternal existence* and consequently *Divinity* of Christ, as bearing the appellation of Deity, "I AM that I am." And this interpretation has been ably supported by Euthym., Glass, Whitby, and especially Lampe. Yet Grot., Drus., Heins., Simon, Le Clerc, Wolf, and Wets., and almost all those of the last century, (including Rosenm., Kuin., and Tittm.,) take the *Present* as put for the *Imperfect*, of which a multitude of examples are adduced from the Scriptures. Thus the sense will be: "before Abraham existed, I was in existence;"

a doctrine quite agreeable to many other passages of the N. T., especially this Gospel. See i. 1 & 2; iii. 13; vi. 46 & 62; vii. 29; xvii. 5. That idiom, however, (like evagation of every kind) has its limits; and, among other cases, it cannot be admitted where the *sense entirely turns* on the tense; for thus an *uncertainty* would be produced, at variance with the very purpose of language. The fact is, that this peculiar use of *εἶμι*, if it does not amount to conferring on Christ the appellation of DEITY, still may reasonably be thought to intimate, together with *existence prior to a given period*, (which is sufficiently pointed out by the *γενεθαι* preceding) *uninterrupted existence since that time*, and, by implication, *existence unconnected with ANY time*:—i. e. *eternal duration*, an attribute of the GODHEAD alone. So Ps. xc. 2. πρὶν τὰ ὄρη γεννηθῆναι, σὺ εἶ. Thus the same sense will arise as in the first mentioned interpretation; an attribute of Deity being employed for an *appellative*. In this way, it should seem, the Jews must have understood Jesus; otherwise they would not, in exasperation, have attempted to stone him for blasphemy.

59. ἐκρούβη, &c.] In *ἐκρ.* we have an example of Passive for Middle, on which see Winer's Gr. Gr. p. 101. Most recent Commentators suppose an Hendiadys, in ἐκρούβη καὶ ἐξῆλθεν; or (as Winer, Gr. Gr. § 47. 3.) refer it to the rule by which of two verbs in connection one is to be rendered as an adverb. It is not, however, necessary to resort to that principle here. Jesus, it should seem, hid himself *for the moment*, and soon afterwards went out of the temple. We need not, with the older Commentators, suppose this concealment *miraculously* effected, by vanishing from the sight of the multitude. Not only is nothing *said* to that effect, but the words following rather *discountenance* such a view. See Note on Luke iv. 30. Indeed, the words ἐτελθὼν — οὕτως have been rejected by many of the best Commentators, and are cancelled by Griesb. But there is scarcely evidence sufficient to warrant even any strong *suspicion*; for they are only omitted in *one MS.*, (and that one of the most altered,) two or three very recent and inferior Versions, and two or three Fathers. And as the words are not at all essential to the *sense* of the passage, the testimony of Versions, and Fathers cannot here have much weight. All the *most ancient Versions* have it; and the Fathers adduced have it in *other* citations. Finally, it is confirmed by the metrical version of Nonnus. I cannot help suspecting that the Critics who formed the text of the MSS. before mentioned threw out the words for no better reason than to remove *two tautologies*.

IX. This Chapter records other refutations by our Lord, of the objections brought forward by the Pharisees.

1. παρήγγων] "as he was passing by," or along [the streets]. See Matt. xx. 30. Mark ii. 14. xv. 21. — τυφλὸν ἐκ γενετῆς.] And consequently incurable by any human art.

τησαν αὐτὸν οἱ μιθηταὶ αὐταῦ, λέγοντες· Ῥαββί, τίς ἡμαρτεν, οὗτος 2
 ἢ οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ, ἵνα τυφλὸς γεννηθῆ; Ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Οὔτε 3
 οὗτος ἡμαρτεν οὔτε οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ· ἀλλ' ἵνα φανερωθῆ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ 4
 Θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ. Ἐμε δεῖ ἐργάζεσθαι τὰ ἔργα τοῦ πέμψαντός με ἕως 4
 ἡμέρα ἐστίν· ἔρχεται νῦν, ὅτε οὐδεὶς δύναται ἐργάζεσθαι. ὅταν 5
 ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ᾧ, φῶς εἰμι τοῦ κόσμου. Ταῦτα εἰπὼν ἔπινσε χαμαὶ 6
 καὶ ἐποίησε πηλὸν ἐκ τοῦ πύσματος, καὶ ἐπέροσε τὸν πηλὸν ἐπὶ τοῖς 7
 ὀφθαλμοῖς τοῦ τυφλοῦ, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Ὑπαγε νίψαι εἰς τὴν κολυμ-

u 1. 5, 9.
 & 8. 12.
 infra 12. 35, 46.

2. τίς ἡμ. οὗτος ἢ οἱ γον.] Some of the best Commentators think that there is here a reference to the doctrine of the προῦπαρξις, pre-existence of souls; or of the μετεσσωμιάσις, or μετεμψύχωσις, transmigration of souls into other bodies, by which what a soul had sinned in one body might be punished in another. Others, however, as Lightf., Lampe, and Tittm., deny this; maintaining that it cannot be proved that the Jews in the age of Christ held any such doctrine. But granting that the affirmative cannot be fully proved; yet neither can the negative; and considering that the doctrine was held in the surrounding nations (especially Egypt), it seems next to impossible, that the disciples of Jesus should not have heard of the doctrine, and felt some interest about it. Indeed Joseph. Ant. xviii. 1. 3. ad Bell. ii. 8. 14. iii. 3. 3. positively affirms, that the Pharisees (whose tenets were generally received by the people, and well known, at least, if not favored regarded by the Apostles), did hold the Pythagorean doctrine of the *metempsychosis*. Besides, the language is not of *positive belief* seeking for confirmation, but of *doubt* seeking for information. Their question, as to what caused this natural blindness, rested on the common notion (prevalent also among the Heathen), that all dangerous diseases, or grievous calamities, must have been produced by the interment of some heinous sin, which they were meant to punish. A notion likely to be held by those, who lived under a dispensation, which dwelt much in temporal and corporeal punishment. Now, in applying this to the case of any disease which befel a person in the course of his life, there was reason for perplexity; since it might be referred either to his own sin, or the sin of his parents; for the Jews likewise held, that the sin of parents, when not suffered for by themselves, was visited upon their children in the form of disease or calamity. See Ecclus. xi. 23. But how to apply this to the case of any disease *born with* a person, occasioned no little perplexity. Now for a solution of this difficulty the disciples apply—whether with the dogma of metempsychosis in their minds, or not, cannot be certainly determined. The former, however, is the more probable.

3. οὔτε οὗτος — αὐτοῦ.] Repeat ἵνα τυφλὸς γεννηθῆ, “This blindness is from no sin, either in his parents or in himself.”

— ἀλλ' ἵνα φανερωθῆ, &c.] At ἀλλὰ supply πρὸ φλδς ἐγεννήθη from ἵνα τυφλὸς γεννηθῆ. Our Lord did not vouchsafe to give any answer to the inquiry, which seems to have been concealed under this interrogatory; but (as when asked, Luke xiii. 23. “Are there few that be saved?”) fixes attention on a matter of far greater moment; namely, the truth, that God permits diseases to afflict men for His own wise purposes; here for the manifestation of His own glory in the miracle

worked by His Messiah; one of whose characteristic miracles (see Is. xxxv. 5.) it was prophesied, should be giving sight to the blind.

4. ἐμὶ δεῖ ἐργάζεσθαι, &c.] The connection is best traced by Lampe as follows: “By me [I say] it is necessary that these works should be [now] performed [notwithstanding the objections on the score of prudence]; now [I repeat] while there is yet time and opportunity, for the night is coming. In ἔρχεται νῦν, &c. there is probably an adage, q. d. The day is the τὸ ἐνεργόν, the time for business; the night is the *tempus inopportunitatem negotio*. So the German adage, “Die nacht ist niemand's freund.” Our Lord meant thereby to intimate, that his continuance with men would be short, and that he should not long either convince them by his miracles, or enlighten them by his doctrines.

5. ὅταν — ᾧ] “as long as I am,” &c. When ὅταν has the sense of duration of time, it requires the Subjunctive. Φῶς τοῦ κόσμου denotes both the enlightener and the blesser of the world; light being a metaphor both of knowledge and happiness. See Esth. viii. 16. Ps. xcvi. 11. cxii. 4. John i. 5. This sentiment was doubtless suggested by the case of the blind man.

6. ἔπινσε — τοῦ τυφλοῦ.] The reason why this action (by which was meant to be suggested an idea of the *collyrium*, or eye-salve) was employed (though it could in itself contribute nothing to the cure) will appear from the Notes on Mark vii. 33. and viii. 23.

7. νίψαι] “wash thyself,” probably the eyes only: for νίπασθαι denotes to wash a part only of the body, while λούειν is to wash or bathe the whole body. This distinction is expressly marked infra xiii. 10., where λελουμένος is used of him whose whole body is washed, and the verb νίψασθαι is joined with τοὺς πόδας. (Mark. and Campb.) Cötovicius Itiner. Hieros. p. 292. attests, that this fountain is much revered by both Christians and Turks, who use the water to wash the eyes with in certain disorders of that organ. On κολυβήθρα see Note supra v. 2. This order was given to try his faith.

The words ὁ ἑρμηνεύεται, ἀπασαμένους are by Wassenburgh and Kuin. considered as a gloss; but without reason; since they are omitted only in two Oriental Versions. Now Versions are at best but slender evidence for the omission of clauses little necessary to the sense; and the omission of the present by those who were writing for the use of Oriental readers may be easily accounted for. There can be no doubt but that it is genuine; for such etymological interpretations of names were then very usual; as might be shown by many examples both from the Scriptural and the Classical writers, especially Thucydides; though such passages have usually proved traps into which ignorant or unwary Critics have

βήθραν τοῦ Σιλωάμ (ὃ ἐρμηνεύεται, ἀπεσταλμένος). ἀπῆλθεν οὖν καὶ ἐνίψατο, καὶ ἤλθε βλέπων.

- 8 Οἱ οὖν γείτονες καὶ οἱ θεωροῦντες αὐτὸν τὸ πρότερον ὅτι † τυφλὸς
9 ἦν, ἔλεγον· Οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ καθήμενος καὶ προσαιτῶν; Ἄλλοι
10 ἔλεγον· Ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν· ἄλλοι δέ· Ὅτι ὁμοιος αὐτῷ ἐστιν. ἐκείνος
11 ἔλεγον· Ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι. Ἐλεγον οὖν αὐτῷ· Πῶς ἀνεώχθησάν σου οἱ
12 ὀφθαλμοί; ἀπεκρίθη ἐκείνος καὶ εἶπεν· Ἄνθρωπος λεγόμενος Ἰησοῦς
13 πλητὸν ἐποίησε, καὶ ἐπέχρυσέ μου τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς, καὶ εἶπέ μοι· Ἔπαγε
14 εἰς τὴν κολυμβήθραν τοῦ Σιλωάμ καὶ νίψαι. ἀπελθὼν δὲ καὶ νιψά-
15 μενος, ἀνέβλεψα. Εἶπον οὖν αὐτῷ· Πού ἐστιν ἐκείνος; λέγει· Οὐκ
οἶδα.
16 Ἄκουσι αὐτὸν πρὸς τοὺς Φαρισαίους τὸν ποτὲ τυφλόν. ἼΗν δὲ
17 σάββατον, οἱτε τὸν πλητὸν ἐποίησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ ἀνέωξεν αὐτοῦ τοὺς
ὀφθαλμούς. Πάλιν οὖν ἠρώτων αὐτὸν καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι, πῶς ἀνέβλεψεν.
Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Πηλὸν ἐπέθηκέ μου ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς, καὶ
ἐνιψάμην, καὶ βλέπω. Ἐλεγον οὖν ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων τινές· Οὗτος ὁ
ἄνθρωπος οὐκ ἔστι παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὅτι τὸ σάββατον οὐ τηρεῖ. ἄλλοι
ἔλεγον· Πῶς δύναται ἄνθρωπος ἁμαρτωλὸς τοιαῦτα σημεῖα ποιεῖν;
καὶ σχίσμα ἦν ἐν αὐτοῖς. Λέγουσι τῷ τυφλῷ πάλιν· Σὺ τί λέγεις
περὶ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἠροῖξέ σου τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς; Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν· Ὅτι προ-

fallen. See Bornem. Dissertat. de Gloss. New Test.

— ἤλθε] for ἀνῆλθε; a frequent signification.

8. τυφλός.] The reading is here uncertain; several ancient MSS., Versions, and some Fathers, having *προσαίτης*, which is preferred by most Critics, and received by almost every Editor, from Griesb. to Scholz; but, I conceive, on insufficient grounds. Whichever be the true reading, *one* must be an *intentional alteration*; for neither could be a gloss on the other. Now it seems more probable that *τυφλ.* should be altered into *προσαίτης*, than *προσ.* into *τυφλ.* And I suspect that the former alteration was made by those who took the *ὅτι* for a *causative conjunction*. Thus it is in the Versions rendered *quia*, or *quod*. And if that were the right interpretation, the sense would rather require *προσαίτης* than *τυφλός*. But *thus* οἱ θεωρ. α. τ. πρ. would yield a feeble sense; and *δρῶντες* would be required, not *θεωροῦντες*. In short, there can be little doubt but that ignorance, or inattention to the *Hellenism* in οἱ θεωροῦντες *αὐτῶν* ὅτι ἦν for οἱ θεωρ. ὅτι αὐτὸς ἦν, led to the mistake and alteration in question. And surely *τυφλ.* is far more suitable in sense than *προσαίτης*. We may render: "And those who had seen, ascertained, and known him to be blind," &c. This is mentioned in order to place the evidence for the miracle in a strong point of view, and show that imposture or collusion was impossible. The Evangelist might, indeed, have written *τυφλός καὶ προσαίτης*, as found in a few MSS. and Latin Versions; but he is not accustomed to be so exact; nor was it *necessary*, for the latter circumstance *comes out* in the subsequent narration. The Critics who formed the text of those MSS., it should seem, were induced to concoct the reading *τυφλός καὶ προσαίτης* because there is reason to think that *παῦχος τυφλός* was as common a

VOL. I.

phrase in Greek, as *cæcus rogator* in Latin; for the blind were almost always beggars.

9. *βουίος αὐτῷ ἐ.]* For the restoration of sight, and the joy consequent upon it would give a different air to his whole countenance.

11. ἀνέβλεψα.] "I received sight."

13. τοὺς Φαρ.] i. e. the Sanhedrim, the far greater part of whom were Pharisees. That these were the *rulers*, is plain from v. 22 & 34.

15. *μου.]* This position of *μου* instead of that after *ὀφθ.* is found in most of the best MSS. and early Edd., and is, with reason, received by almost all Editors from Wets. to Scholz.

16. *παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ]* scil. ἀπεσταλμένος, commissioned from God.

— τὸ σάββ. οὐ τηρεῖ.] They still advance the *same* charge that Jesus had before refuted (ch. v. & vii.) since they had no other handle of accusation. But here especially does their *malice* shine through the flimsy gauze of hypocrisy with which they seek to veil it under the guise of *religion*. (Lampe.)

— πῶς δύναται ἄνθρ. ἁμαρτ.] By *ἄνθρ.* is here simply meant an impostor. The argument is, that an impostor would not be endued by God with the power of working miracles; and that if so endued, he was plainly commissioned from on high, and could therefore dispense with any ritual observances.

17. *σὺ τί λέγεις — ὅτι ἠροῖξε, &c.]* There is no occasion (with Lampe and others) to break up the sentence into two interrogations, "What sayest thou of him? that he hath opened thine eyes?" For though specious reasons may be adduced in favour of that mode, yet *thus* the *second* question would be futile, because it had *before* been put, and the man had manifestly recovered his sight. It is better, with all the ancient and most modern Commentators, to assign the sense:

φῆτης ἐστίν· Οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι περὶ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι τυφλὸς 18
 ἦν καὶ ἀνέβλεψεν, ἕως οὔτου ἐφώνησαν τοὺς γονεῖς αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἀναβλέ-
 ψαντος· καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτούς, λέγοντες· Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς ἡμῶν, 19
 ὃν ἡμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι τυφλὸς ἐγεννήθη; πῶς οὖν ἄρτι βλέπει; Ἀπε- 20
 κρήθησαν αὐτοῖς οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ εἶπον· Οὐδαμεν ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν
 ὁ υἱὸς ἡμῶν, καὶ ὅτι τυφλὸς ἐγεννήθη· πῶς δὲ νῦν βλέπει οὐκ οὔδα- 21
 μεν· ἢ τίς ἠροῖξεν αὐτοῦ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς, ἡμεῖς οὐκ οὔδαμεν· αὐτὸς 22
 ἠλικίαν ἔχει, αὐτὸν ἐρωτήσατε· αὐτὸς περὶ αὐτοῦ λαλήσει. ^z Ταῦτα 22
 εἶπον οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἐφοβοῦντο τοὺς Ἰουδαίους· ἤδη γὰρ συνειέ-
 θειντο οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, ἵνα ἐάν τις αὐτὸν ὁμολογήσῃ Χριστὸν, ἀποσυνάγωγος
 γένηται. Διὰ τοῦτο οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ εἶπον· Ὅτι ἠλικίαν ἔχει, αὐτὸν 23
 ἐρωτήσατε. Ἐφώνησαν οὖν ἐκ δευτέρου τὸν ἄνθρωπον ὃς ἦν τυφλός, 24
 καὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ· Δὸς δόξαν τῷ Θεῷ· ἡμεῖς οὔδαμεν ὅτι ὁ ἄνθρω-
 πος οὗτος ἁμαρτωλὸς ἐστίν. Ἀπεκρίθη οὖν ἐκείνος καὶ εἶπεν· ^{Li} 25
 ἁμαρτωλὸς ἐστίν, οὐκ οὔδα· Ἐν οἴδῃ, ὅτι τυφλὸς ὢν, ἄρτι βλέπω.
 Εἶπον δὲ αὐτῷ πάλιν· Τί ἐποίησέ σοι; πῶς ἠροῖξέ σου τοὺς ὀφθαλ- 26

“What sayest thou (i. e.) what opinion hast thou of him, in that he hath opened thine eyes, or as to his opening thine eyes?”

—*προφήτης.*] Not “the Prophet foretold by Moses” (as some Commentators suppose), for that (as Bp. Middlet. has observed) would require the *Article*; but a prophet, *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος*, as Euthym. explains. It is plain from vv. 31 & 36, that the man considered Jesus only as such: certainly not the Son of God.

18. οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι] i. e. the *Φαρισαῖοι* before mentioned. Ἐφώνησαν, “had summoned.”

19. οὗτος ἐστίν — ἐγεννήθη.] Lampe, Markl., Kuin., and Tittm. think that two questions are here blended into one, i. e. “Is this your son? Do ye say he was born blind?” such would, indeed, be the more *regular* manner of expression? but the present is the more simple, natural, and *characteristic* of the persons; for in their haste to proceed from *interrogation* to *imputation of fraud*, they blunt out the latter (which is implied in *λέγετε*) together with the former. In their answer, the parents *pass over* the imputation, and consider the words as comprehending *two* questions, to which they reply.

21. ἠλικίαν ἔχει.] The sense is, “He is of an age sufficient to enable him to give testimony.”

22. συνετέλειντο.] Here we have a *significatio prægenæ*. Render, “de communi consilio decreverant,” as in Acts xxiii. 20. On this use of the Pluperf. Pass. in the Middle or Deponent sense, see Butt. Gr. p. 234. and Win. Gr. Gr. Ὁμολογήσῃ Χριστόν. Sub. Ἰησοῦν εἶναι.

—ἀποσυνάγωγος γένηται] “should be excommunicated.” There were three sorts of excommunication (see Rec. Syn.), the second of which is supposed to be here meant.

24. δὸς δόξαν τῷ Θεῷ.] This does not signify, what it might seem to import, “Give the praise of thy cure to God [and not to this man.]” For the absence of the *Article* will not permit that sense; and the words are a *form* of expression often employed in the O. T. in order to seriously admonish any one to speak the truth (see Josh. vii. 18 & 19. 1 Sam. vi. 5. Jer. xiii. 16). “For a lie (as Lampe observes) is a denial of the om-

niscience, holiness, truth, and justice of God: and he who wilfully conceals the truth, or declares a falsehood, insults all those attributes of the Deity.” Thus the form was used when a confession of crime was to be wrung from any one. The sense, then, meant to be expressed is, “Confess the truth, dissemble nothing: hast thou been really blind from thy birth, and been healed by this man?” They hoped thus to detect some fraud or collusion; but being disappointed, they resolved to excommunicate the man immediately.

25. εἰ ἁμαρτωλός — οὔδα.] The Commentators are divided in opinion as to the scope and character of these words, in which some recognize *dissimulation*, others *sarcasm*: neither of which views seem well founded. It is *better* (with Brug., Camer., Grot., and Whitty) to take the words to import, that he has no knowledge of what they allege; q. d. “That Jesus is a sinner I know not;” εἰ being put for *ὅτι*. But the authority for this signification of *εἰ* is precarious; and I would therefore retain the usual sense *whether*, and take *οὐκ οὔδα* in a *popular* sense to denote, I give no opinion: I have nothing to do with that. This view is confirmed by the words following, *ἐν οὔδᾳ*, which do not imply knowledge of nothing besides, but of one thing *especially*. Here Wets. aptly compares a similar passage in Aristoph. Av. 1176. τίς τῶν θεῶν; Ag. οὐκ ἴσμεν ὅτι δ' εἶχε περὶ τῶν ἴσμεν. And I have myself noticed the following. Arist. Pac. 227. οὐκ οὔδα· πλὴν ἐν, ὅτι (these words being also an answer to a question). Eurip. El. 752. οὐκ οὔδα, πλὴν ἐν — φένοισι οἰμωγῶν κλέω. Soph. Œd. Col. 1161. τί προσχρῶζοντα τῷ βακχεῖ; Οὐκ οὔδα, πλὴν ἐν, σοῦ γὰρ κ. τ. λ. Eurip. Iph. Taur. πύθοισι; Ἐλλήνες, ἐν τούτῳ οὔδα, κοῦ παρατέρω. Herc. Fur. 1115. οὐκ οὔδα, πλὴν ἐν — πάντα δυστυχῆ τὰ σά. Thus the man *really gave glory to God*, since he remained constant in bearing testimony to the truth; and would by no threats be induced to dissemble the benefit which he had received.

26. 27. The Sanhedrim now repeat the same question before proposed. A crafty device, by which they hoped to detect some discrepancy in his testimony, which might stamp falsehood on

27 μούς; Ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς· Εἶπον ὑμῖν ἤδη, καὶ οὐκ ἠκούσατε· τί
 πάλιν θέλετε ἀκούειν; μὴ καὶ ὑμεῖς θέλετε αὐτοῦ μαθηταὶ γενέσθαι;
 28 Ἐλοιδόγησαν οὖν αὐτὸν καὶ εἶπον· Σὺ εἶ μαθητῆς ἐκεῖνου· ἡμεῖς
 29 δὲ τοῦ Μωϋσῆως ἐσμὲν μαθηταί. ὧ Ἡμεῖς οἴδαμεν ὅτι Μωϋσῆ λέλάληκεν ὧ ^{Supra 8. 14.}
 30 ὁ Θεός· τοῦτον δὲ οὐκ οἴδαμεν πόθεν ἐστίν. Ἀπεκρίθη ὁ ἄνθρωπος
 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Ἐν γὰρ τούτῳ θανασιόν ἐστιν, ὅτι ὑμεῖς οὐκ
 31 οἴδατε πόθεν ἐστὶ, καὶ ἀνέψξέ μου τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς. ὧ Οἴδαμεν δὲ ὅτι <sup>z Prov. 15. 29.
& 23. 9.
Isa. 1. 15.</sup>
 ἀμαρτωλῶν ὁ Θεὸς οὐκ ἀκούει· ἀλλ' ἐάν τις θεοσεβῆς ἦ καὶ τὸ θέλημα
 32 αὐτοῦ ποιῇ, τούτου ἀκούει. Ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος οὐκ ἠκούσθη, ὅτι ἤνοιξέ
 33 τις ὀφθαλμοὺς τυφλοῦ γεγεννημένου. Εἰ μὴ ἦν οὗτος παρὰ Θεοῦ,
 34 οὐκ ἠδύνατο ποιεῖν οὐδέν. Ἀπεκρίθησαν καὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ· Ἐν ἀμαρ-
 τίας σὺ ἐγεννήθης ὄλος! καὶ σὺ διδάσκεις ἡμᾶς; καὶ ἐξέβαλον αὐτὸν
 35 ἔξω. Ἰκκουσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ὅτι ἐξέβαλον αὐτὸν ἔξω· καὶ εὐφρῶν αὐτὸν
 36 εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Σὺ πιστεύεις εἰς τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ; Ἀπεκρίθη ἐκεῖνος
 37 καὶ εἶπε· καὶ τίς ἐστι, κύριε, ἵνα πιστεύσω εἰς αὐτόν; εἶπε δὲ αὐτῷ
 ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Καὶ ἰώρακας αὐτόν, καὶ ὁ λαλῶν μετὰ σοῦ ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν.
 38 Ὁ δὲ ἔφη· Πιστεύω, Κύριε· καὶ προσεκύνησεν αὐτῷ. <sup>a Supra 3. 10.
infra 12. 47.</sup> Καὶ εἶπεν

the whole; or they hoped that some additional circumstances would transpire, from which they might plausibly reason that the blindness was not real, or, at least, not from his birth. The man, however, distinctly perceives their aim; and, no longer able to suppress his indignation, impatiently exclaims, εἶπον, &c.

27. τί] for κατὰ τί, why. Οὐκ ἠκούσατε, attended not to what I said. The next words are ironical; to which the Sanhedrim reply by gross abuse.

— ἐλοιδόγησαν καὶ εἶπον] put for ἐλοιδ. εἰπόντες; for they thought it abuse enough to call him the disciple of an impostor. And, in fact, as Basil, cited by Heinsius, well remarks: Πάν ῥήμα ἐκ διαβόλων τοῦ ἀπεμῶσι λεγόμενον λοιδόρια ἐστὶ· κἄν μὴ τὸ ῥήμα δόξη εἶναι ἕθροιστικόν.

29. οὐκ οἶδ.— ἐστίν.] A popular expression, importing, “We know not his Divine mission, whether his doctrine and miracles proceed from Divine impulse, or dæmoniacal agency.” (See viii. 27. Note.)

30. ἐν τούτῳ] scil. μέρι, in this circumstance. Γὰρ has here, like the Heb. ׀, the sense sané. Ὑμεῖς is emphatical. Καὶ, “and yet.” The sense is: “This truly is strange, that you, who pretend to distinguish true from false prophets, should not be able to discern with whose power he comes who gives sight to those born blind.”

31. οἴδαμεν] “it is well known.” The following is a sentiment frequent in Scripture (as Ps. lvi. 13. Is. i. 13.), and found in Hom. II. a. 218. And this and that in the next clause are intended to be especially applied to the case of false prophets asking countenance from God.

32. ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος] “from the beginning of the world.” See Note on Luke i. 70. Τίς, scil. ἄνθρωπος, any mere man. Though communication of sight, in some cases, to those born blind, has of late been effected by the improvements of modern surgical art, yet that does not affect the present case; for the operation in question demands the intervention of the most consummate skill and labour; and it would be equally a mira-

cle to restore such persons to sight without those means.

34. ἐν ἀμαρτίας σὺ ἐγεννήθης ὄλος.] We need not suppose, with the older Commentators, that there is here any reference to the doctrine of original sin. It may, as some think, be said on the same principle which prompted the question of the disciples, v. 2. Though the best Commentators, ancient and modern, regard it as an hyperbolic phrase, equivalent to *scates peccatis*. Perhaps it is a blending of two phrases, ὄλος ἀμαρτωλὸς εἶς, and ἐν ἀμαρτίας ἐγεννήθης, formed on Ps. li. 5. which would form the most opprobrious speech that can easily be imagined.

— ἐξέβαλον αὐτόν ἔξω.] The Commentators are not agreed whether this means, “trust him out of the council chamber;” or excommunicated him.” The expression must signify the former; but the latter is suggested.

35. πιστεύεις — Θεοῦ.] Almost all Commentators regard these words as only importing, “Dost thou believe in the coming of the Messiah?” as all pious Jews did. But the mode of address seems to be directed to the state of the man's mind; who, though at the time the miracle was worked upon him, and even when brought before the Sanhedrim, he seems to have regarded Jesus as only a prophet; yet, on reflection, and consideration of the wonderful works Jesus had done, began to think that he must be more than a prophet; and to wish to be his disciple. His answer seems to comprehend two things; 1st, “Yea, Sir, I have that belief;” and 2dly, “Canst thou tell me where, or who that personage is, that I may believe in him, and commit myself to his teaching.” The words seem to express a sort of expectation that the extraordinary person whom he was addressing, could tell him who and where the Messiah was; or perhaps might himself be that personage. In this view, the words of his answer may be regarded as a refined way of saying, “Art thou that personage? dost thou sustain that character? Tittm. here remarks, that Ἰδὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ is, in the discourses of our

ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Εἰς κρίμα ἐγὼ εἰς τὸν κόσμον τοῦτον ἦλθον· ἵνα οἱ μὴ 39
 βλέποντες βλέπωσι, καὶ οἱ βλέποντες τυφλοὶ γένωνται. Καὶ ἤκουσαν 40
 ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων ταῦτα οἱ ὄντες μετ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ· Μὴ
 καὶ ἡμεῖς τυφλοὶ ἐσμεν; ^b Εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Ἐὶ τυφλοὶ ἦτε, 41
 οὐκ ἂν εἶχετε ἁμαρτίαν· νῦν δὲ λέγετε· "Οτι βλέπομεν· ἢ οὖν ἁμαρ-
 τία ὑμῶν μένει.

b Infra 15. 22.

X. Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν· ὁ μὴ εἰσερχόμενος διὰ τῆς θύρας εἰς 1
 τὴν αὐλὴν τῶν προβάτων, ἀλλὰ ἀναβυβαίνων ἀλλαχόθεν, ἐκεῖνος κλέπτῃς ἐστί

Lord and of his Apostles, never a name of office, but of *Divine nature*; yet he thinks that by Ἰῶς τοῦ Θεοῦ the man only understood a divine person, and not the Messiah. I have, with almost all Editors from Wets. to Scholz, inserted *καὶ* from very many of the best MSS., Versions, Fathers, and early Edd. This omission (of which other examples occur at xiv. 22.) arose from the verse just below.

39. εἰς κρίμα, &c.] These words were (as Doddr. has seen) spoken for the sake of the bystanders. For the very act of worshipping would be likely to draw a crowd of persons about them. On the sense of *εἰς κρίμα* Commentators are not agreed. Some take it of the *last judgement*. But that is not permitted by the words following; and thus, too, the *Article* would be required. Others think the sense is, "for the purpose of judging [concerning men], showing their condition and pointing out their duties." But that signification is not well established; and the sense yielded would not only be too feeble for the occasion, but deprive the words of that *sting*, which what follows shows they were meant to convey. The true sense seems to be that assigned by Chrysost. and Euthym., and adopted by some eminent modern Commentators, *εἰς διάκρισιν καὶ διαχωρισμὸν*, "for distinction and separation," that men's dispositions may be put to the proof. This is quite agreeable to the primitive signification of *κρίνειν*, which is to *winnow*, and, in a general way, to *separate*, *divide*, as an army into ranks. See Hom. II. β. 362. So also Xenoph. Mem. iii. 1, 9. has *κρίνειν τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς καὶ τοὺς κακοὺς*.

In the next words the *ἴνα* is not *causal*, but *eventual*, or rather *consequential*. The general meaning, then, is: "so that the *effect* or consequence of my coming in the world will be, that a discrimination will be made between the true and the false worshippers of God (see iv. 23); so that those who are blind through simple ignorance may see, — i. e. receive sight (by the light of the Gospel, and the illumination of the Holy Spirit), and that those who have the use of sight, and have knowledge, but are blinded by passion and prejudice, — may not see what is before their eyes, but be left judicially to their own blindness." *Κρίμα* is here used in preference to *διαχωρισμὸν*, in order to suggest the *result* of that self-discrimination of this world, namely, the final and eternal separation of the two classes at the last award, the *κρίμα*. See Matt. xxv. 32. compared with Acts xxiv. 25. Heb. vi. 2. By the οἱ βλέποντες are meant the οἱ δοκοῦντες βλέπειν or ἀνδρακίς, those who were thought to have, and thought they had knowledge of Scripture.

41. εὶ τυφλοὶ ἦτε.] Our Lord hints that they labour under a more incurable blindness than that of the common people whom they despised. The full sense is, "If ye were [simply]

ignorant, your unbelief might be excusable; but, since ye fancy ye are wise, your unbelief remains [inexcusable]." They had every advantage of coming at the truth, and recognising Jesus as the Messiah; but they resisted conviction, were wilfully blind, and therefore their sin of unbelief could not but rest upon them unexpiated, and sink them in perdition. Ἀμαρτίαν ἔχειν is a phrase signifying to be guilty of any crime, and be liable to punishment for it. It is not a mere Hellenistic idiom; since I find it in Plato iv. p. 70. Bip. δ μὴ ἔχων κακίαν καὶ ἔχων ἀδικίαν.

X. 1 seqq.] Some Commentators think that the discourse in vv. 1—22. was delivered at another time. But the introductory ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν is never used at the *beginning* of a discourse, but is employed to introduce some further remark or admonition. See John v. 24, 25. vi. 26, 32. viii. 34, &c. And the Evangelist seldom commences any new narrative without some kind of preface, however brief. Besides, v. 21. may be supposed to have reference to the blind man. And, moreover, the imputation lately cast upon our Lord, ix. 24. of being an impostor, would induce him to take the first opportunity of *retorting* the charge on his calumniators, and showing that he sought nothing but the benefit of the people. That he was the true Shepherd, the Messiah; and that they who called themselves the shepherds of the people, and excommunicated those who acknowledged the Messiah, were the false teachers and impostors: that he himself, so far from seeking, as an impostor would, his own interest, sought nothing but the benefit of the people, and would lay down his life for them. In illustration, our Lord borrows an image from *pastoral* life. He shows, that those teachers alone were worthy of the name of *shepherds*, who, having learnt of Him, should preach his doctrine. In this, and other of his discourses recorded by St. John, our Lord was pleased to employ expressions not direct, but highly figurative, in order to show the nature of his person and office. Why he was pleased to do this, will appear from what is said in the Note on *Parabolic instruction* at Matt. xiii. 3. Here it is proper to be more than usually attentive to the caution there suggested as to the *application* of Parables; namely, not to press too much on some of the *circumstances*, since they are but ornamental, and form, as it were, the *drapery* to the figure in the pictures. But to advert to the *scope* of the present paragraph, 1—21. Most of the ancient and earlier modern Commentators supposed the *subject* of it to be the *entering upon Ecclesiastical offices*, without being authorized by a commission from those who have such commission regularly transmitted down from the Apostles, and derived consequently from Christ himself. But that such

2 καὶ ληστής· ὁ δὲ εἰσερχόμενος διὰ τῆς θύρας ποιμὴν ἐστί τῶν προ-
 3 βιάτων. Τούτου ὁ θυρωρὸς ἀνοίγει· καὶ τὰ πρόβατα τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ
 ἀκούει· καὶ τὰ ἴδια πρόβατα καλεῖ κατ' ὄνομα, καὶ ἐξάγει αὐτὰ.
 4 Καὶ ὅταν τὰ ἴδια πρόβατα ἐκβιάλῃ, ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν πορεύεται· καὶ
 5 τὰ πρόβατα αὐτῷ ἀκολουθεῖ, ὅτι οἶδαι τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ. Ἀλλοιοί
 6 δὲ οὐ μὴ ἀκολουθήσωσιν, ἀλλὰ φεύξονται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ· ὅτι οὐκ οἶδαι
 7 τῶν ἄλλοτριῶν τὴν φωνήν. Ταύτην τὴν παροιμίαν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰη-
 8 σοῦς· ἐκεῖνοι δὲ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν τίνα ἦν, ἢ ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς.

7 Εἶπεν οὖν πάλιν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγοι ὑμῖν, ὅτι ἐγώ
 8 εἰμι ἡ θύρα τῶν προβάτων. Πάντως ὅσοι [πρὸ ἐμοῦ] ἤλθον κλέπτει

can be deduced from the present passage, neither the nature of the context, nor the import of the words will, I think, permit us to suppose. The purpose here in view is certainly (according to the opinion of the most eminent of the more recent Commentators) that which has been above detailed. It therefore has reference not to *teachers*, but to *Christians in general*.

1. αὐλῆν.] The word means an open hovel, formed by hurdles and wickerwork. By ἀλλή τῶν προβάτων (Church of the N. T., the kingdom of Christ), is here designated the *Jewish people*, who needed the food of spiritual instruction. See Ezek. xxiv. 11. Jerem. xxiii. 4. sq. 'To enter in by the door, was probably a proverbial expression, to denote making a regular ingress. So Arrian in Epict. finely remarks, Ἀρχὴ φιλοσοφίας παρά γε τοῖς ὡς οἰεῖ, καὶ κατὰ τὴν θύραν, ἀπομένους αὐτῆς, συναίσθησις τῆς αὐτοῦ ἀσθενείας. Christ is called the door, as giving an opportunity of entering into heaven. Κλέπτης and ληστής properly differ, as our thief (or pilferer) and robber, (or highwayman), the one referring to private stealing, the other to public and violent robbery. Here, however, they have little or no difference, but being united, have a force greater than either would bear separately.

3. ὁ θυρωρὸς] i. e. the under-shepherd, in attendance at the door of the αὐλή.

— τῆς φωνῆς α. ἀκούει] i. e. attend to, obey his orders. Φωνῆς denotes those *inarticulate sounds*, as whistling, &c., or certain words, such as were addressed to the animals, on which see Recens. Synop. The calling them by their names is illustrated by what Wolf and others adduce; who prove that anciently names were given not only to horses, oxen, dogs, and cats, but also to *sheep*.

4. ἐκβιάλῃ] "putteth forth;" for there is no notion of force. So ἐξάγειν and ἐκβάλλειν are indifferently used by the LXX. to express the same Hebrew word.

— ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν πορεύεται.] Contrary to the custom which prevails in the West, the Eastern shepherds precede their flocks, and lead them by peculiar sounds of the voice. See Ps. xxiii. 2. lxxvii. 20. lxxx. 1. The custom (no doubt introduced by the Moors) still continues in Spain. Yet how ancient was the practice, at least in the West, for the sheep to go before, and the shepherd follow, may be inferred from the idea suggested by the Greek word προβατον. Probably that custom might have prevailed in the great plains of central Asia, from whence came those early colonists of Greece who introduced the Greek language.

6. παροιμίαν] for παραβολήν; for though the words are distinguished in the Classical writers,

(the former there signifying a *common saying*, from ὄλιμος, *via trita*. So our *by-word*) yet they were confounded by the Hellenists.

7. On this and the following passage we may remark that it is entirely *allegorical*. Now all allegory is similitude: but similitude may be considered in various views; and therefore, in one and the same allegory, a person may be considered in many ways. (Rosenm.) There is here not a mere repetition, but an explanation or application of the foregoing example. (Kuin. and Tittm.)

Θύρα, like the Heb. פתח, denotes not only door, but approach; also, as here, he who gives it. Taken in conjunction with what precedes, the primary import of the words must be, that Christ is the only way through which mankind can obtain salvation (see ver. 9.); though it may include, in an under sense, that (as Doddr. observes) as a man must observe and pass through the door, in order to his making a regular and unsuspected entrance into a sheep-fold; so he must maintain a proper regard to Christ, in order to his being a true teacher in the Church, and must pass, as it were, through him, or by his authority, into his office. So at xiv. 6, he is called the way.

8. πρὸ ἐμοῦ.] These words have perplexed Interpreters of every age. They are omitted in very many MSS., Versions, Fathers, and early Edd., and are rejected by Grot. and Campb., and cancelled by Matth.; but on precarious grounds. It is one of the most certain of Critical canons, that an omission of words, which have occasioned perplexity to the Commentators, is always to be regarded as suspicious. And there are reasons which make the validity of this Canon stronger in the *Scriptures* than in the Classical writers. The omission might here be officiously made, to save the honour of Moses and the Prophets, especially as the Manichæans denied their Divine legation. *Internal* evidence, therefore, is so strong in favour of these words, as to balance even a superiority of external; which, however, does not exist. Besides, the words are almost necessary to make any tolerable sense. They must, then, be regarded as genuine. And the only question is, what is their true import? Many ancient and modern Commentators take πρὸ for ἀντι, and suppose an ellip. of ἐν τῷ ὄνοματι τοῦ Πατρὸς μου; understanding it of *false Christs*, as Theudas and Judas of Galilee. This is also maintained by others, who take πρὸ in the usual sense before. But the former interpretation is unfounded, and the latter involves an inadmissible ellipsis, and, indeed, an *anachronism*; for, as the best Commentators are agreed, it cannot be proved that there were any false Christs previous

εἰσὶ καὶ λησταί· ἀλλ' οὐκ ἤκουσαν αὐτῶν τὰ πρόβητα. Ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ 9
 θύρα. δι' ἐμοῦ ἐάν τις εἰσέλθῃ, σωθήσεται· καὶ εἰσελεύσεται καὶ
 ἐξελεύσεται, καὶ νομὴν εὐρήσει. Ὁ κλέπτης οὐκ ἔρχεται, εἰ μὴ ἵνα 10
 κλέψῃ καὶ θύσῃ καὶ ἀπολέσῃ· ἐγὼ ἤλθον, ἵνα ζῶν ἔχωσι, καὶ περισσόν

to that time. And if even *one* such could be found, it would not justify the πάντες ὅσοι. One thing is plain, that our Lord could not have meant to include Moses and the Prophets; of whom he every where speaks in terms of the highest reverence. The best solution of this difficulty is supposed to be that of Beng., Rosenm., Campb., and Kuin.; who think that ἤλθον is to be taken of time *recently* past, and up to the present; i. e. "have come;" and that by the term is meant "have lately come in the character of teachers of God's people." Now our Lord (say they) throughout this discourse considers himself, viz. as the *supreme* spiritual Shepherd, through whose instruction and grace the under-shepherds must be admitted into his fold, the Church. "In this view (says Campb.) the words are directed chiefly against the Scribes and Pharisees, considered as teachers: whose doctrine was far from breathing the same spirit with his, and whose chief object was not, like that of the good Shepherd, to feed and protect the flock, but like that of the robber, or of the wolf, to devour them." Yet in this there is something not a little harsh: 1. in arbitrarily taking ἤλθον as a kind of Preterite-present; 2. in understanding ἤλθον in the sense "have come, as teachers;" for (not to mention that this is inconsistent with the πρὸ ἐμοῦ) our Lord is here not representing himself as a teacher, but as the *good Shepherd*; which, as is shewn at ver. 11, must principally involve the idea of *governing*. But how, then, will the parallel hold good between the *Messiah* and the Scribes and Pharisees. In order to remove this difficulty, many have understood οἱ πρὸ ἐμοῦ of *false Christs*. This, however (as we have seen) is at variance with facts. After full and repeated consideration of the words, I am persuaded that the only way to arrive at the truth is to suppose the parallel to be *perfect*, and to keep in view the leading idea in ποιῶν δ καλῶς. In short, by οἱ πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἤλθον are, I conceive, meant those who before Christ had come in the character of *supreme Shepherd of the people*, and promising access to salvation, as Mediator of the Mosaic covenant. So Gal. iii. 19. the Law is said to have been διαταγῆς δι' ἀγγέλων ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου. And at Hebr. viii. 6. ix. 15. xii. 24. the mediator of the new and better covenant is tacitly compared with that of the old and imperfect one. Now that this Mediator under the old Covenant could be no other than the *High Priest* is plain; and is proved by the parallel drawn by St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Hebrews, between Christ and the Mediator of the first covenant, the *High Priest*; first, between Moses, the original Mediator, and Christ, ch. iii.; and then between the successive Mediators, the High Priests for the time being, ch. iv. 15. οὐ γὰρ ἔχομεν ἀρχιερεῖα μὴ δυνάμενον, &c. ἀλλὰ, &c. Again, ch. v. 1. it is said, πᾶς γὰρ ἀρχιερεὺς ἐξ ἀνθρώπων λαμβανόμενος; which is exemplified by Aaron, the first High Priest. So also at ch. vii. he continues the parallel between these mediators, the High Priests who die, and he who is a High Priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec, ἀπῶρον, ἀμήτωρ, ἀγενεαλόγητος: who οὐ κατὰ νόμον ἰστολῆς σαρκικῆς γέγονεν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ ἔνταυρον

ζῶνς ἀκατάλτρον, ver. 16. So also at ver. 23. he contrasts the *High Priests* and the *Messiah* thus: καὶ οἱ μὲν π λ ε ι ο ν ε σ ε ι α γ γ ο ν ὄν τ ε ς ἱ ε ρ ε ῖ ς διὰ τὸ θ α ν ἄ τ ω ς κ ω λ ῆ σ θ α ι πα ρ α μ ῖ ν ε ι ν· ὁ δὲ, &c. and ver. 26. τοιοῦτος γὰρ ἡμῖν ἔπρεπεν εἶναι ἀρχιερεὺς, ὅσιος, ἀκακος, ἀμίαντος, &c. See also ver. 27 and 28. At ch. viii. & ix. he proceeds in the parallel, instituting a minute comparison. Thus it is evident that the expression in question, οἱ πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἤλθον may very well mean those who before Christ had sustained the office of *temporary mediators between God and man*, but who were now disannulled by the disannulling of the old covenant, and the coming of a new and better Mediator, the *Lord of the Temple* himself. But how, it may be asked, does this character of κλέπται καὶ ληστὰι correspond to the High Priests? I answer, 1. it has been admitted by almost every Commentator that πάντες may very well be taken to denote πολλοί. 2. It is almost universally agreed, that by κλέπται καὶ ληστὰι we are only to understand rapacious persons, chiefly intent on gain. And that most of those under the second Temple at least were such, the History of Josephus will abundantly testify: nay, it is clear that almost all of them for the last 60 or 70 years had been such; persons who bought their office, and then made as much of it as they could, for the short time they were allowed to hold it. The traits of their characters, as delineated by Josephus, exactly correspond to those adverted to in the present comparison, vv. 10, 12, & 13, namely, avarice and the most cruel extortion, united with the utmost timidity and neglect of protecting those under their governance. That our Lord meant chiefly the High Priests of a recent period, is plain from the use of the present tense *clot*. Now that the sheep should not listen to their spiritual admonitions, might be expected; and that they did not, is attested by the horrid picture presented by Josephus of the state of society at the time in question, which was even worse than that of Greece just before the Peloponnesian war, so inimitably depicted by Thucydides.

9. ἐάν τις—εἰσέλθῃ.] Commentators are not agreed whether these words are to be referred to *shepherds* (i. e. spiritual pastors) or *sheep*, i. e. their flock. Some take one, and some the other, and Tittm. both. But if the view taken of the foregoing verse be (as I doubt not it is) correct, they can refer only to the people: indeed they could not be referred to *pastors* without great harshness. Ἡ θύρα, i. e. the [only] Mediator, through whom is an access to the Father. See Rom. v. 2. Eph. ii. 18. comp. with Heb. ix. 15. Σωθ. may thus be interpreted: "shall be placed in a state of salvation." And the words εἰσελεύσεται—εἰσέλθῃ form a *pastoral image* expressive of undisturbed enjoyment of the blessings in question.

10. ὁ κλέπτης.] "The false teacher," i. e. "the false teachers;" for this is (as appears from ver. 1.) a singular, being taken for a *genus*; on which see Middlet. Gr. Art. The terms θύρα and ἀπολέσῃ are *graphic* (signifying respectively "butcher and destroy"), and describe what was often done by the roving bands of marauders, who then infested Judæa, and who used to destroy what they

11 ἔχωσιν. Ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός. ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς τὴν ψυχὴν
 12 αὐτοῦ τίθησιν ὑπὲρ τῶν προβάτων· ὁ μισθωτὸς δὲ καὶ οὐκ ὢν ποι-
 μὴν, οὗ οὐκ εἰδὶ τὰ πρόβατα ἴδια, θεωρεῖ τὸν λύκον ἐρχόμενον, καὶ
 ἀφίησι τὰ πρόβατα καὶ φεύγει· καὶ ὁ λύκος ἀρπάζει αὐτὰ, καὶ σκορ-
 13 πίζει τὰ πρόβατα. Ὁ δὲ μισθωτὸς φεύγει, οἱ μισθωτὸς ἐστὶ, καὶ
 14 οὐ μέλει αὐτῷ περὶ τῶν προβάτων. Ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός·
 15 καὶ γινώσκω τὰ ἐμὰ καὶ γινώσκονται ὑπὸ τῶν ἐμῶν, καθὼς γινώσκει
 με ὁ Πατὴρ καὶ γινώσκω τὸν Πατέρα· καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν μου τίθημι

c Isa. 40. 11.
Ezek. 34. 23.
& 37. 21.

could not carry off. See Note on Acts xx. 29. The words περισπῶν ἔχωσιν serve to strengthen the sense of the preceding clause.

11. ἔγω — καλός.] The image is here changed, and another confirmation of what was said is introduced, in which our Lord represents himself under the emblem of the *good shepherd*. By ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός many Commentators think is simply meant “an enlightened teacher.” But this is passing over the article; and to this interpretation it is justly objected by Tittm., that ποιμὴν has no where else the sense *teacher*, but usually involves the idea of *governing, protecting, taking care of*. Thus in the O. T. *kings* are often called *shepherds*, as also in Homer and Eschylus. So in the N. T. ποιμένες is the name given to the *Curators Ecclesiae*, otherwise called ἐπίσκοποι, as Eph. iv. 11; and in 1 Pet. ii. 25. our Lord is called ποιμὴν καὶ ἐπίσκοπος τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν. And as in Heb. xiii. 20. Paul calls our Lord τὸν ποιμένα τῶν προβάτων τὸν μέγαν, so was he foretold under that character in the prophecies of the O. T. See Is. xl. 11. Ez. xxiv. 12—33. Zech. xiii. 7. Mic. v. 4.

— ὁ ποιμὴν — προβάτων.] The phrase ψυχὴν τιθέναι answers to the Heb. שָׂדֵךְ אֶתְּנֶה, which literally denote *profundere vitam*: but, in use, generally denote only to *hazard one's life*. And this sense is here adopted by many of the most eminent Commentators. By the ancient and most modern Commentators, however, the *former* is assigned; and rightly: for though the *restricted* sense of the phrase is agreeable to the *natural* import of the words, yet the *full* sense is demanded by the *figurative* one as applied to the Redeemer. Our Lord, indeed, here only *hints* at what, at ver. 17, he plainly expresses. The sense, then, is: “As the good shepherd hazards his life for his flock, so does the Messiah, represented by the Prophets under that character, lay down his life for his spiritual flock, the human race.”

12. ὁ μισθωτὸς δὲ, &c.] This is said in order to illustrate the character of the good shepherd by contrast with the *bad*; who is called a *hireling*, not because *all* hirelings are unfaithful, but that they are *generally*, more or less, such. Ὁ μισθωτὸς must, like ὁ κλέπτης and ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός before, denote a whole class of persons. And Lampe, Kuin., and Tittm. rightly suppose that the Ecclesiastical rulers of that time are meant, as at ver. 8. This sudden transition from one metaphor to another is Hebraic. See Kuin. By the term μισθωτὸς is perhaps *also* denoted their *avarice*, and preference of the honours and emoluments of their office to discharging its duties.

— οὗ οὐκ εἰδὶ τὰ πρόβατα.] This shows, that the shepherd is supposed to be also the *owner* of the sheep; such as in Hom. Odys. iv. 37, is called indifferently ἀναξ (master) and ποιμὴν.

14. γινώσκω — ἐμῶν.] These words figuratively designate the mutual love and attachment of the great Shepherd and his spiritual flock. Comp. v. 15 with 17. So Heb. נָרַךְ. See Amos iii. 2.

15. καθὼς γινώσκει — Πατέρα.] These words are closely connected with the preceding (from which they are unnaturally disjoined by the division of verses), being an illustration by similitude of what was there said, q. d. I both know my sheep, and am known of them, even as the Father knoweth me, and I know the Father. Dr. Burton thinks that the members of this sentence, if properly disposed, would be as follows: Γινώσκω τὰ ἐμὰ, καθὼς γινώσκω τὸν Πατέρα· καὶ γινώσκονται ὑπὸ τῶν ἐμῶν, καθὼς γινώσκει με ὁ Πατήρ.

— τὴν ψυχὴν — προβάτων.] Our Lord here *applies* what he had already said of a good shepherd, to *himself*; and openly declares that he shall *offer up his life* for men, and for their salvation. By *what means* and *how* that death is available to the salvation of men, we are not clearly informed. We may, however, suppose it to be as follows. Our Lord describes the sheep for whom he lays down his life as being in extreme peril (see vv. 10 & 12); and St. Paul calls those for whom Christ died *weak, sinful, &c.*, but to be preserved from wrath. Thus in Matth. xx. 28, where our Lord is said δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντι πολλῶν. Now λύτρον denotes the *price* of redemption, i. e. the money given, or the sacrifice offered, by which any one shall be redeemed from peril and punishment, — and what is given, 1. *for* another, in *his place* and in *his stead*: 2. that the other should be liberated from punishment; 3. that it should be sufficient, and not require any *other* price. See Is. liiii. 10. Hence it is plain what was the *purpose* of the death of Christ, and for what *causes* he laid down his life. He died, 1. in the place and stead of men: 2. to obtain their liberation from the punishment of sin, or to obtain pardon of their sin; 3. that his death should be sufficient to obtain the pardon of sin. Those therefore are in grievous error, who maintain that Christ died only to confirm the truth of his doctrines, or the certainty of the promises respecting the grace of God, and the pardon of sin; since for neither of these purposes would the death of Christ have been necessary. Nay, the truth and certainty of both are sufficiently established from other proofs; neither does our Lord say that he lays down his life for his *doctrine*, but for his *sheep*. Hence it is clear that our Lord called himself ποιμὴν, not inasmuch as he was an enlightened and holy *teacher of religion*; but in a far sublimer sense, namely, inasmuch as by his death he obtained the *pardon of sins*, and the salvation of men. (Tittm.) The lax dogmas of some recent heresiarchs are strongly contrasted with the uncontaminated orthodoxy of an Apostolic Father, as

d Ezek. 37. 22. ὑπὲρ τῶν προβάτων. ^d Καὶ ἄλλα πρόβατα ἔχω, ἃ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τῆς 16 αὐτῆς ταύτης· κἀκεῖνά με δεῖ ἀγαγεῖν, καὶ τῆς φωνῆς μου ἀκούσουσι· καὶ γενήσεται μία ποίμνη, εἰς ποιμήν. Διὰ τοῦτο ὁ Πατήρ με ἀγαπᾷ, ὅτι 17 ἐγὼ τίθημι τὴν ψυχὴν μου, ἵνα πάλιν λάβω αὐτήν. Οὐδεὶς αἴρει αὐτήν 18 ἀπ' ἐμοῦ· ἀλλ' ἐγὼ τίθημι αὐτὴν ἀπ' ἐμναυτοῦ. ἔξουσίαν ἔχω θεῖναι αὐτήν, καὶ ἔξουσίαν ἔχω πάλιν λαβεῖν αὐτήν. Ταύτην τὴν ἐντολὴν ἔλαβον παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς μου. Σχίσμα οὖν πάλιν ἐγένετο ἐν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις διὰ 19 τοὺς λόγους τούτους. ^e Ἐλεγον δὲ πολλοὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν· Δαιμόνιον ἔχει καὶ 20 μαίνεται· τί αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε; Ἄλλοι ἔλεγον· Ταῦτα τὰ ῥήματα οὐκ ἔστι 21 δαιμονιζόμενον· μὴ δαιμόνιον δύναται τυφλῶν ὀφθαλμοὺς ἀνοίγειν;

f 1 Macc. 4. 59. ^f ἘΓΕΝΕΤΟ δὲ τὰ ἐγκαίρια ἐν [τοῖς] Ἱεροσολύμοις, καὶ χειμῶν ἦν· 22 καὶ περιεπάτει ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἐν τῇ στοᾷ [τοῦ] Σολομῶνος. 23

follows: Ἐν ἀγάπῃ προσελάβετο ἡμᾶς ὁ δεσπότης, διὰ τὴν ἀγάπην, ἣν εἶχεν πρὸς ἡμᾶς, τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἔδωκεν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ὁ Χριστὸς δὲ κέρως ἡμῶν, ἐν θελήματι Θεοῦ, καὶ τὴν σάρκα ὑπὲρ τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν, καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν. Clemens Rom. 1 Epist. ad Corinth. § 49.

16. ἄλλα πρόβατα — ταύτης.] The Jews and Gentiles are here represented under the image of two different flocks, inclosed in separate folds. By the ἄλλα πρόβατα are designated the Gentiles; and ὅγ τῆς αὐτῆς ταύτης, the Jews. Ἄγαγειν is for *προσαγαγεῖν*, bring to [this fold]. Ἄγειν and its derivatives are frequently employed as pastoral terms. Our Lord calls the Gentiles *his sheep*, by *prolepsis*, because he had marked them as his own, was about to lay down his life for their salvation, and foresaw that many would shortly embrace his religion, which he expresses in the words τῆς φωνῆς μου ἀκούσουσι. "Thus (says Tittm.) our Lord predicts the future admission of the Gentiles to the Christian flock, and the joint participation of them and the Jews in the blessings obtained by him, under one and the same Lord, so that he might be the author of salvation not to *one only*, but to *all* the nations of the universe." *Mia, one only, one and the same*, i. e. in having (whatever may be their diversities) the same common Saviour.

17. ἵνα πάλιν λάβω αὐτήν.] The best Commentators are agreed that the *ἵνα* is not *causal*, or denoting *end* and *purpose*, but declarative of the future, or the *event*, and is to be rendered *ita tamen ut*.

18. οὐδεὶς αἴρει αὐτήν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ] "no one taketh it from me" [by force]. We may paraphrase the passage thus: "No one [not even the Father] compelleth me to die for my flock. I have, of my own will undertaken to lay down my life for it. By the same will I shall return again to life." On the voluntary death of Christ see Note on Matt. xvi. 21.

— ταύτην — Πατρός μου] "This charge received I from my Father." In this whole passage our Lord affirms that he is about to undertake death spontaneously; that the malice of those who may plot against his life could avail nothing, even were it *not* decreed that he should undergo death for the salvation of his people; that no force could take away his life, if he were unwilling to part with it; that he freely lays down that life for the salvation of his flock; and that if they shall kill him, it will not be without his own consent. He asserts, moreover, that he

lays down his life, so, however, as to receive it back; and therefore that his death is not to be considered as coming under the common law of mortality, by which all that go down to the tomb return to the dust; but that it is altogether peculiar to itself; since, after a few days, he will rise from the sepulchre and return to life. He then affirms that his death happens not by any *fate* or *necessity*, but by the eternal *counsels* of his Father. (Tittm.) Ἐντολὴν is to be understood *οικονομικῶς*, in reference to the mediatorial capacity in which Christ stood.

20. δαιμόνιον — μαίνεται.] See Note on vii. 20.

22. τὰ ἐγκαίρια.] The word answers in the Sept. to the Hebr. *הקדש*, *handselling* or *initiation*; and in the N. T. denotes the *encenium*, or festival of eight days, occurring in the month Kisleu, instituted by Judas Maccabæus in commemoration of the purification of the Temple from Heathen pollution. Unlike all other festivals, which were kept only at *Jerusalem*, this was celebrated throughout the whole of Judæa. And as lights were kept burning in every house throughout each night of the festival, it is called by Josephus, Ant. xii. 7. 7. *φῶτα*.

— καὶ χειμῶν ἦν.] The best Commentators in general take *χειμῶν* to denote rainy or wintry weather, as in Matt. xvi. 3. Acts xxvii. 20. Ezra x. 9. But there the sense is, *a storm*, or *tempest*. And the signification *wintry weather*, though it is not unfrequent in the Classical writers, as Thucyd. iv. 6, and vi. 2, yet does not occur in the Scriptures; nor is there any good reason to abandon the common interpretation. "It was winter;" for this circumstance might, as Beng. suggests, be added for the information of those readers who knew not the *time* of the feast.

23. τοῦ Σολ.] Τοῦ is omitted in some MSS. and early Edd., and is cancelled by almost all Editors from Matthæi to Scholz. But the authority is insufficient to warrant that; especially as its absence violates the propriety of language, by which the Article is either prefixed to both the governing and governed nouns, or else is omitted before both. As little reason is there to cancel the *τοῖς* before Ἱεροσολ. just before, as many Editors have done.

This portico was called *Solomon's*, as having been built by Solomon; being the part of Solomon's temple which had been left undestroyed by the Babylonians, and was therefore allowed to remain, though in a dilapidated state. There were porticos erected all round the temple; but

- 24 Ἐκύκλωσαν οὖν αὐτὸν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, καὶ ἔλεγον αὐτῷ· “Ὡς ποτε τῆν
 25 ψυχὴν ἡμῶν αἴρεις; εἰ οὐ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς, εἰπέ ἡμῖν πηδῶρήσῃα. ^ε Ἀπε- ^f Supra 5. 39.
 κέθη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Εἶπον ὑμῖν, καὶ οὐ πιστεύετε. τὰ ἔργα ἃ ^{infra ver. 39.}
 ἐγὼ ποιῶ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Πατρὸς μου, ταῦτα μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ.
 26 Ἄλλ' ὑμεῖς οὐ πιστεύετε· οὐ γὰρ ἐστε ἐκ τῶν προβάτων τῶν ἐμῶν· ^h Supra 8. 19.
 27 καθὼς εἶπον ὑμῖν, τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἐμὰ τῆς φωνῆς μου ἀκούει, καὶ γὰρ
 28 γινώσκω αὐτά· καὶ ἀκολουθοῦσί μοι, καὶ γὰρ ζῶν αἰώνιον δίδωμι
 αὐτοῖς· καὶ οὐ μὴ ἀπώλωνται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, καὶ οὐχ ἀρπάσει τις αὐτά
 29 ἐκ τῆς χειρὸς μου. ¹ Ὁ Πατήρ μου, ὃς δίδωκέ μοι, μείζων πάντων· ⁱ Infra 14. 28.
 ἔστι· καὶ οὐδεὶς δύναται ἀρπάξαι ἐκ τῆς χειρὸς τοῦ Πατρὸς μου. ^k Infra 17. 11,
 30 ^k Ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ Πατήρ ἐν ἑσμεν. ¹ Ἐβάστασαν οὖν πάλιν λίθους ὡς ^{22.}
^l Supra 8. 59.

this fronted the East. Porticos were common in the Heathen temples likewise, and were erected for the accommodation of the priests and worshippers in general; both for walking in inclement weather, (So Cebes, cited by Wets.; ἐτυγχάνομεν περιπατούντες ἐν τῇ τοῦ Κρόνου ἱερῷ) and for the purpose of Teachers communicating oral instruction sometimes in walking, to their followers, from which circumstance two principal Sects of Philosophers, namely, the Stoics and the Peripatetics, derived their names.

24. αἴρεις.] Euthym. well explains: αἰωρεῖς, ἀναρτάς μεταδὲ πίστει καὶ ἀπιστίας. The full sense is: “keep us in suspense between hope and fear, belief and disbelief.” So Philostr. cited by Blackwall; καὶ μετὰ πᾶν αἴρει ὁ λόγος ὃν εἶρηκε, and εἰπαίρειν frequently occurs in the sense to *buoy up with hope*.

25. εἶπον ἔ.] “I have told you [who I am].” — τὰ ἔργα — ἐμοῦ.] The sense is: “[Nay] the works (i. e. the miracles) which I do by the authority of my Father, these bear witness of me [that I am sent by Him].” Of this figurative use of *μαρτυρεῖν*, Wets. adduces an example from Heraclid. de Deo: “Ἔργα δὲ μαρτυρεῖν, οἷα ἡλίου· νῆξ αὐτῷ καὶ ἡμέρα μαρτυροῦσιν, ἀδρα αὐτῷ μαρτυροῦν, γῆ δὲ ἅλη καρποφοροῦσα μάρτυς — οὐρανὸς μαρτυροῖα. Simil. 19th Psalm. “The Heavens declare the glory of God,” &c. This authority from God, however, our Lord had, not as a mere legate, but as being partaker of the Divine attributes. See v. 17, sq.

26. οὐ γὰρ ἐστε, &c.] This suggests the *cause* of their unbelief; namely, that they are not of his flock, will not suffer themselves to be brought into it, nor are willing to acquire the proper dispositions for it. With the words καθὼς εἶπον ὑμῖν Commentators are somewhat perplexed, since Christ had no where before told them that they were not his sheep. To remove this difficulty, it seems, some ancient Critics cancelled the clause; for to no other cause can we well ascribe the omission of it in several ancient, but altered, MSS. and some Versions. Nor is it easy to believe (what some modern Critics aver) that the words were foisted in by the Scribes; nay it is incredible that *such* a clause, by no means necessary to the sense, should have crept into nearly all the MSS. As to Versions, they are not good authority for omissions, and especially of what is perplexing. There can be no doubt that the clause is genuine; and though we find nothing of this kind said in our Lord's preceding discourses, yet may it not have reference to something said, but not recorded by St. John? This is preferable to

supposing, with some, that it was *indirectly* expressed; i. e. *implied*, in our Lord's words. However, as there can be no doubt that there is a reference to the preceding discourse of the good shepherd, (for our Lord now proceeds to resume the allegory,) and since, though our Lord does not there use these words, but *does*, in fact, say (v. 3.) that “his sheep hear his voice;” so it is probable, that καθὼς, &c. belong to those words, and should therefore be joined with the following verse, as in some MSS., Versions, and Euthym., with the approbation of Pearce, Campb., Vat., Tittm.

27. τῆς φωνῆς μου ἀκ.] i. e. give heed to, obey my commands. By τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἐμὰ are meant such of the sheep as acknowledge their shepherd. Γινώσκω, I acknowledge them as mine, provide for their welfare. See v. 14. Ἀκολουθοῦσί μοι, i. e. in faith and obedience.

28. οὐ μὴ ἀπώλωνται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.] Tittm. thus paraphrases: “At no time, neither in this life, nor in death, nor after death, to all eternity, shall any thing happen to them that shall deprive them of salvation.” See John viii. 51. The words following καὶ οὐχ ἀρπάσει — μου are *confirmatory* of the above promise; and in the next verse is suggested the *reason why* no one can snatch these faithful disciples from him; namely, that the Father hath delivered them to him, in order to be preserved and redeemed; that omnipotent Being in whom are the issues of life and death, both temporal and spiritual. The whole passage bears strong attestation to the Divinity of Christ; but gives, when properly understood, no countenance to the doctrine, that the elect can never fall away and perish; having, in truth, no relation to *personal election*, or *final perseverance*.

30. ἐγὼ — ἐσμεν.] On the exact sense of ἐν ἑσμεν Commentators are not agreed. Some ancient, and most modern ones, understand them of *unity of will, purpose, counsels, and works*. This they support from John xvii. 21 — 23., and especially from the verse preceding. But so sudden are the transitions, and so excursive the thoughts in our Lord's discourses, as recorded in this Gospel, that the argument drawn from thence is precarious. By far the greater part of the ancient and earlier modern Commentators understand the words of *physical unity of essence*, including *moral unity*. This Lampe has shown, was the opinion of almost every one of the Orthodox Fathers. Tittm., however, while he rejects the first mentioned interpretation, declines embracing the latter; and takes the words of *unity of energy and power*. And indeed this is sup-

Ἰουδαῖοι, ἵνα λιθάσωσιν αὐτόν. Ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Πολλὰ 31
καλὰ ἔργα ἔδειξα ὑμῖν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς μου· διὰ ποῖον αὐτῶν ἔργον 32
λιθάσετε με; Ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, λέγοντες· Περὶ καλοῦ 33
ἔργου οὐ λιθάσομέν σε, ἀλλὰ περὶ βλασφημίας, καὶ ὅτι σὺ ἄνθρωπος
ᾧ ποιεῖς σεαυτὸν Θεόν. ἠ Psal. 82. 6. Ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Οὐκ ἔστι 34
γεγραμμένον ἐν τῷ νόμῳ ὑμῶν, Ἐγὼ εἶπα, Θεοὶ ἐστε; εἰ ἐκείνους εἶπε 35
Θεοὺς, πρὸς οὓς ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐγένετο, (καὶ οὐ δύναται λυθῆναι
ἢ γραφῆ,) ὃν ὁ Πατὴρ ἡγίασε καὶ ἀπέστειλεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ὑμεῖς 36
λέγετε· Ὅτι βλασφημεῖς, ὅτι εἶπον· Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰμι; Ἐὶ οὐ 37
ποιῶ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Πατρὸς μου, μὴ πιστεύετε μοι· ἢ εἰ δὲ ποιῶ, κἄν 38
ἐμοὶ μὴ πιστεύητε, τοῖς ἔργοις πιστεύσατε· ἵνα γνῶτε καὶ πιστεύσῃτε,
ὅτι ἐν ἐμοὶ ὁ Πατὴρ κἀγὼ ἐν αὐτῷ. Ἐξήτουν οὖν πάλιν αὐτὸν πιάσαι· 39
καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἐκ τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῶν.

n Infr 14. 10.
11.
& 17. 21, 22.

ported by the preceding context. For (as Tittm. argues) 1. our Lord at v. 28. attributes the same to himself as to his Father. 2. He shows the reason why nothing can be taken from the Father; namely, *because He is All-mighty*. 3. A reason is added why nothing can be taken from *Him* any more than from his Father, *because they are one*, viz. in the work of *power*, &c. This, Tittm. argues, implies union of *attributes*; and where there is one and the same divine power and attributes, there must be one and the same *Divine nature*. Whichever interpretation be adopted, the words can import no less than a claim to equality with the Father (and consequently prove the *DEITY* of our Lord), just as the passage at viii. 53. which, and the present, the Jews must have so understood; or otherwise they would not have attempted to stone him for blasphemy, exclaiming, *Σὺ ἄνθρωπος ᾧ ποιεῖς σεαυτὸν Θεόν*. Indeed had he been aught but God, one with the Father, common honour and ingenuousness would have required him to disavow the interpretation they had put upon his words.

31. *ἔβαστασαν*] “took up.” This signification is thought to be Hellenistic; but I have, in Recens. Synop., adduced two examples from Antiphans and Josephus.

32. *πολλὰ καλὰ ἔργα ἔδειξα ὑμῖν*] The sense is: “Many benefits have I conferred upon you.” The *ἔργα* relates not only to the wonderful and salutary *miracles* exhibited by Jesus, but also to his *whole course of action* in promulgating the Gospel of grace. Ἐδειξα may, indeed, seem to have reference most to *miracles*, but it often in the Classical writers simply means, *edere, prastare*, to perform. Of this Wetstein cites examples, to which I have in Recens. Synop. added others. Ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς μ. signifies “in virtue of the powers vested in me by my Father.”

34. *οὐκ ἔστι γεγραμμένον*, &c.] In repelling the charge of blasphemy, our Lord, for reasons which it were irreverent too nicely to scan, was pleased not to *fully* disclose his intimate conjunction with the Father; and why he called God his Father, and himself the Son of God. He contents himself with using a sort of argument quite in the Jewish style; (and therefore adapted to make an impression on his hearers) arguing with them on the ground of what they themselves admitted; namely, that He was a *Prophet* sent from God; and showing that, even on *that* supposition, he had a right to the title which they

refused him. Our Lord alludes to Ps. lxxxii. 6. where judges and magistrates are called *Elohim*, sons of the most high God.

35. *πρὸς οὓς ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἔγ.*] These words are well explained by Tittm. thus: “to whom was delivered the command mentioned just before, namely, to plead the cause of the destitute, &c. The words *καὶ οὐ δύναται λυθῆναι ἢ γραφῆ* are to be taken in a restricted sense, to signify, ‘and the Scriptures cannot be taken exception to,’ cannot be thought wrong.”

36. *ἔγλασε*] “has set apart,” as the τὸν ἅγιον τοῦ Θεοῦ; for ἀγιάζειν, like the Heb. *שׂקק*, signifies to set apart from common use to a sacred purpose. It is justly remarked by Tittm. that our Lord did *not* (as the Socinians say) argue thus, to signify that he was to be called God, and Son of God, in no other sense than that in which those judges were so styled; namely, with respect to *office*; much less to decline the application of the word in the same sense as of the Father; as is evident from what precedes. He merely uses an argument *ab exemplo* (what the Philosophers call an *instance*) and argues *ab concessis*, q. d. *Magistrates* are called divine, and sons of God, without injury to the Deity: nay, God himself hath so called them. May not *I*, then, by a similar right, be so called, whom God hath sent into the world, and to whom he hath committed a charge so salutary to the human race.

37, 38. The sense of the passage (which is expressed *more Judaico*) is simply this: “That I am Son of God, the Messiah, and am most closely united with the Deity, my *works* show; q. d. If I had not done the same *works* which my Father doth, ye might refuse credit to my *words*: but since they bear the same stamp, you should at least believe *them*, if you will not believe my *words*; and then you would understand that the Father is in me, and I in the Father.” By these words our Lord manifestly declares himself to be Son of God, not in that sense in which the Jewish Rulers were so called, but in a more sublime one; not in respect to the *office* he sustains, but the *nature* which he bears, since he does the same works as the Father. (Tittm.)

The words *ἐν ἐμοὶ ὁ Πατὴρ* — αὐτῷ plainly (as Tittm. remarks) indicate generally *intimate connexion*, and here, by the force of the context, *conjunction* of one and the same energy. The Father was *in* the Son, the Son *in* the Father;

40 Καὶ ἀπῆλθε πάλιν πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, εἰς τὸν τόπον ὅπου ἦν
41 Ἰωάννης τὸ πρῶτον βαπτίζων· καὶ ἔμεινεν ἐκεῖ. Καὶ πολλοὶ ἤλθον
πρὸς αὐτὸν, καὶ ἔλεγον· Ὅτι Ἰωάννης μὲν σημεῖον ἐποίησεν οὐδέν·
42 πάντα δὲ ὅσα εἶπεν Ἰωάννης περὶ τούτου ἀληθῆ ἦν. καὶ ἐπίστευσαν
πολλοὶ ἐκεῖ εἰς αὐτόν.

1 XI. ἮΝ δὲ τις ἀσθενῶν Ἀΐζαρος ἀπὸ Βηθθαίου, ἐκ τῆς κώμης
2 Μαρίας καὶ Μιρθας τῆς ἀδελφῆς αὐτῆς. Ὁ Ἦν δὲ Μαρία ἡ ἀλείψασα o Infra 12. 3.
Matt. 26. 7.
Mark 14. 3.
τὸν Κύριον μύρω, καὶ ἐκμάκισα τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ ταῖς θριξίν αὐτῆς,
3 ἧς ὁ ἀδελφὸς Ἀΐζαρος ἠσθένει. Ἀπέστειλαν οὖν αἱ ἀδελφαὶ πρὸς
4 αὐτὸν, λέγουσαι· Κύριε, ἴδε, ὃν φιλεῖς, ἀσθενεῖ. Ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς
εἶπεν· Αὕτη ἡ ἀσθένεια οὐκ ἔστι πρὸς θάνατον, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ τῆς δόξης
5 τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἵνα δοξασθῇ ὁ Παῖς τοῦ Θεοῦ δι' αὐτῆς. Ἠγάπα δὲ ὁ
6 Ἰησοῦς τὴν Μιρθάν καὶ τὴν ἀδελφὴν αὐτῆς, καὶ τὸν Ἀΐζαρον. Ὡς
οὖν ἤκουσεν ὅτι ἀσθενεῖ, τότε μὲν ἔμεινεν ἐν ᾧ ἦν τόπω δύο ἡμέρας.
7 Ἐπειτα μετὰ τοῦτο λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς· Ἀγωμεν εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν
8 πάλιν. Λέγουσιν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταί· Ῥαββί, νῦν ἐξήτουν σε λιθάσαι
9 οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, καὶ πάλιν ὑπάγεις ἐκεῖ; Ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Οὐχὶ δώ-
δεκά εἰσιν ὥραι τῆς ἡμέρας; Ἐάν τις περιπατῇ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, οὐ

inasmuch as the Son hath the same as the Father, and can do, and doth the same with the Father; Comp. v. 17. See Bulli Opera, p. 39, 40.

39. ἐξῆλθεν] “subdixit se.” It is not necessary to press so much, as some Commentators do, on this expression, which simply means, “he escaped out of their hands.” See Note on viii. 59.

40. πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδ.] i. e. Bethany, or Bethabara, on the other side of the Jordan. See Note on i. 28.

—ἔμεινεν ἐκεῖ] “abode there;” which, however, does not preclude the supposition of Lampe and Pittm. that he took, during the four months of his sojourn there, some journeys into Peræa.

41. ἔλεγον, &c.] They reasoned thus: “John worked no miracle, yet we believed in his divine mission. And now we see it amply proved by the miracles worked by Him to whom John professed to be but a forerunner.”

XI. The Evangelist now proceeds to narrate the closing scenes of our Lord's life, what is related in this Chapter having taken place only a few days before the Passover on which he suffered death. The raising of Lazarus being a work of all that Christ had hitherto done the most stupendous, was studiously recorded by the Evangelist, as illustrating the majesty of our Lord. No wonder, therefore, that infidels and sceptics should have used every exertion to destroy its credibility. Their cavils, however, have been triumphantly refuted by Lardner and others, and the quibbling objections of the Rationalists of our own times have been satisfactorily answered by the best Theologians, both British and Foreign.

1. ἀσθενῶν.] The word is used not only of indisposition, but also of dangerous illness, whether acute or chronic; as Xen. Anab. i. 1. Matt. x. 3. Luke iv. 40. vii. 10. The earnest representation sent by the two sisters shows that Lazarus was in imminent danger. Ἀπὸ Βηθ., [an inhabitant] of Bethany. The ἐκ just after is used in a similar

way; and the use of both where one would have sufficed, is characteristic of St. John.

2. ἡ ἀλείψασα.] Said, by anticipation, for who [afterwards] anointed. The figure is not unusual where the action (as here) speedily followed, and is well known. See Matt. xxvi. 13. On this circumstance see Note on Matt. xxvi. 7.

4. οὐκ ἔστι πρὸς θάνατον.] “is not to be fatal,” “will not finally terminate in death.” Such is the best interpretation of this dubious expression, which it is better to consider as a popular form, than to understand by death the decretory death by which all must return to earth. The Classical writers use in this sense ἐπὶ θανάτῳ. Ἄλλ' ὑπὲρ, &c. “but is meant to illustrate the glory of God,” namely, by the Son being thereby glorified. See ix. 3.

The best Commentators are agreed in considering this verse as the answer sent by our Lord to the sisters. “Our Lord (observes Euthym.) sent this predictive answer in order to comfort them. But he himself stayed some time longer, waiting till Lazarus should actually expire and be buried; that no one might say that he had raised him when not yet dead, but only in a fainting fit, or trance.”

6. ἔμεινεν—δύο ἡμέρας.] i. e. he did not come to Bethany till Lazarus had been dead four days.

7. ἔπειτα μετὰ τοῦτο.] A sort of pleonasm, but of which many examples from the best writers are adduced by Wets. and Kypke. However, we have only εἶτα μετὰ τοῦτο, or ταῦτα, never ἔπειτα, which was probably confined to the popular phraseology.

8. καὶ πάλιν ὑπάγεις ἐκεῖ;] The words are (by the expression of wonder) strongly dissuasive, and were suggested by some fear for Jesus, notwithstanding their conviction of his divine power to save himself, and also by some apprehension for their own safety.

9. οὐχὶ δώδεκα—ἡμέρας.] The Jews (by a reckoning adopted from the Greeks) divided their day, or the time from sun-rise to sun-set, into

προσκόπει, ὅτι τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου τούτου βλέπει· ἐν δὲ τις περι- 10
 παιῆ ἐν τῇ νυκτι, προσκόπει, ὅτι τὸ φῶς οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν αὐτῷ. Ταῦτα 11
 εἶπε, καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο λέγει αὐτοῖς· Λάζαρος ὁ φίλος ἡμῶν κεκοίμηται·
 ἀλλὰ πορεύομαι ἵνα ἐξυπνίσω αὐτόν. Εἶπον οὖν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ· 12
 Κύριε, εἰ κεκοίμηται, σωθήσεται. Εἰρήγει δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς περὶ τοῦ 13
 θανάτου αὐτοῦ· ἐκείνοι δὲ ἔδοξαν ὅτι περὶ τῆς κοιμήσεως τοῦ ὕπνου
 λέγει. Τότε οὖν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς παρόρησι· Λάζαρος ἀπέθανε· 14
 καὶ χαίρω δι' ὑμῶν, ἵνα πιστεύσητε, ὅτι οὐκ ἦμην ἐκεῖ. ἀλλ' ἄγωμεν 15
 πρὸς αὐτόν. Εἶπεν οὖν Θωμᾶς, ὁ λεγόμενος Δίδυμος, τοῖς συμμαθη- 16
 ταῖς· Ἄγωμεν καὶ ἡμεῖς, ἵνα ἀποθάνωμεν μετ' αὐτοῦ.

Ἐλθῶν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, εὗρεν αὐτὸν τέσσαρας ἡμέρας ἤδη ἔχοντα ἐν 17
 τῷ μνημείῳ. Ἦν δὲ ἡ Βηθανία ἐγγὺς τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων, ὡς ἀπὸ στα- 18
 δίων δεκαπέντε· καὶ πολλοὶ ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐληλύθεισαν πρὸς τὰς 19

twelve hours, of course varying a little according to the season of the year. The words were a sort of adagial maxim, like that at ix. 4, where see Note. On the sense meant to be conveyed by the next words, *ἐν τις — αὐτῷ*, the Commentators are not agreed. The best view seems to be that taken by Camer., Pearce, and Dodd., and further unfolded by Mor., Rosenm., Kuin., and Tittm.; namely, that the words are a *parabolical aenigma*, in the Eastern manner, but obscurely expressed; the *application* being left to be supplied by the hearers, as in Virg. Ecl. ii. 13. *Alba ligustra cadunt, vaccinia nigra leguntur*. The sense is: "There is a certain and stated time for work; the *day* is that time. Now is *my day*: now my business must be done, while alone it can be done at all."

With respect to the phraseology itself, at *προσκόπει* sub. *πόδα* (which is expressed in Matt. iv. 6.), and also *ταὶ* or some other *Dative*, which is supplied in some passages of Xenoph. and Aristoph. cited in Recens. Synop. *Τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου* is regarded by the Commentators as a periphrasis for *τὸν ἥλιον*. But the expression rather signifies the light which is shed abroad in the world, for *τὸ φῶς τὸ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ*. "Ὅτι φῶς οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν αὐτῷ seems to be a popular expression, for *φῶς οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτῷ*, "he is destitute of light;" as xii. 35.

11. *κεκοίμηται — ἐξυπνίσω αὐτόν*.] In assigning the *reason* why he must go, Jesus expressed himself first figuratively, and then in plain terms. In *κεκοίμη*, there is a euphemism denoting *death*, common to all languages; but the sacred writers especially used it to adumbrate the death of the righteous. The disciples, however (partly misled by their wishes), misunderstood our Lord.

12. *εἰ κεκοίμηται, σωθ.*] q. d. "if he has gone to sleep, he will recover." Perhaps a sort of adage founded on experience. Thus the Rabbins mention sleep among the six good symptoms in sickness; and many passages are adduced by Wets. from the Classical writers, lauding its beneficial effects in sickness. The disciples seem to have intended to hint, that as Lazarus was likely to recover, there was no occasion for their Lord to hazard himself in Judæa.

14. *Λάζαρος ἀπέθανε*.] Our Lord now declares in plain terms, "Lazarus is dead." The knowledge of which circumstance can be ascribed to nothing but omniscience. In the words following, Jesus *hints* at what he had already plainly

said, ver. 11; namely, that he was going to raise Lazarus from the dead.

15. *χαίρω δι' ὑμῶν — ἐκεῖ*.] The words *ἵνα πιστεύσητε* are *not*, as many Commentators suppose, parenthetical; but there is a *transposition* in the construction, for *καὶ χαίρω, ὅτι οὐκ ἦμην ἐκεῖ, δι' ὑμῶν ἵνα πιστεύσητε*. "Ἦμην for *ἦν* is a form found only in the later writers. See Lobeck on Phryn. p. 152. Πιστ. is here used of that completeness of faith in Christ which, it seems, the disciples had not yet all attained.

16. *ὁ λεγόμενος Δ.*] The best Commentators take this as an *interpretation* of Θωμᾶς, i. e. ΠΙΣΤΗ. But some, as Tittm., think it expresses a *cognomen*, as Σίμων ὁ λεγόμενος Πέτρος. And this view is confirmed by Nonnus and Sedulius.

— *ἄγωμεν — αὐτοῦ*.] On the sense of these words the Commentators are not agreed. Some would take them *interrogatively*. But that is doing violence to the construction. The only doubt is whether *αὐτοῦ* is to be referred to *Lazarus*, or to *Jesus*. Now many eminent modern Commentators adopt the *former* method; though it does not yield so natural a sense as the *latter*, which is supported by the ancient and many modern Interpreters, as Calvin, Maldon., Lampe, Dodd., Tittm., and Kuin. Thomas, keenly alive to the danger both Jesus and themselves would incur by going into Judæa, exclaims, with characteristic, but well-meant bluntness: "Since our Master will expose himself to such peril, let us accompany him, if it be only to share his fate!"

17. *ἔλθων*.] "having arrived;" not, however, at Bethany itself, but at the *vicinity*; whither Martha, hearing of his approach, had gone to meet him; and had met with him, it seems, not far from the burying-ground, which was always outside of a city or town. Ἐρχεσθαι, when used, as here, of *time*, signifies *agere, transigere*; an idiom frequent in the Classical writers. The *four days* (observes Lampe) seem to be reckoned from the *burial* of Lazarus; though at ver. 39. the reckoning is made from his *death*. The interval, however, between death and burial among the Jews was very short, generally only a few hours. The 4th day was probably only *begun*, not completed.

18. *ἀπὸ σταδίων δ.*] Sub. *γενόμενη*, "it being at about 15 stadia off." The ellip. is expressed in Appian, p. 793. Of this absolute use of *ἀπὸ* (which may be compared with our *off*) Kypke adduces examples from several of the later writers.

περὶ Μάρθαν καὶ Μαρίαν, ἵνα παραμυθῆσονται αὐτὰς περὶ τοῦ ἀδελ-
 20 φοῦ αὐτῶν. Ἡ οὖν Μάρθα, ὡς ἤκουσεν ὅτι ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἔρχεται, ὑπὴρ-
 21 τησεν αὐτῷ· Μαρία δὲ ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ ἐκμηδίζετο. Εἶπεν οὖν ἡ Μάρθα
 πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν· Κύριε, εἰ ἦς ὧδε, ὁ ἀδελφός μου οὐκ ἂν ἐτεθνήκει.
 22 Ἀλλὰ καὶ νῦν, οἶδα ὅτι ὅσα ἂν αἰτήσῃ τὸν Θεόν, δώσει σοι ὁ Θεός.
 23 Λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Ἀναστήσεται ὁ ἀδελφός σου. Ἦ λέγει αὐτῷ p. supra 5. 29.
 24 Μάρθα· Οἶδα ὅτι ἀναστήσεται ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ.
 25 Εἶπεν αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ ἀνάστασις καὶ ἡ ζωή. Ὁ πι-
 26 στεύων εἰς ἐμὲ, καὶ ἂν ἀποθάνῃ, ζήσεται· ἢ καὶ πᾶς ὁ ζῶν καὶ πιστεύων q. supra 6. 35.
 27 εἰς ἐμὲ οὐ μὴ ἀποθάνῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. πιστεύεις τοῦτο; Ἦ λέγει
 αὐτῷ· Ναί, Κύριε· ἐγὼ πεπίστευκα, ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστός, ὁ υἱὸς
 28 τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὁ εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἐρχόμενος. Καὶ ταῦτα εἰπούσα, ἀπῆλθε
 καὶ ἐφώνησε Μαρίαν τὴν ἀδελφὴν αὐτῆς λάθρᾳ, εἰπούσα· Ὁ διδά-
 29 σκαλος πάρεστι, καὶ φωνεῖ σε. Ἐκείνη, ὡς ἤκουσεν, ἐγείρεται ταχὺ καὶ
 30 ἔρχεται πρὸς αὐτόν. Οὐπω δὲ ἐληλύθει ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν κόμην, ἀλλ'
 31 ἦν ἐν τῷ τόπῳ, ὅπου ὑπῆρτησεν αὐτῷ ἡ Μάρθα. Οἱ οὖν Ἰουδαῖοι
 οἱ ὄντες μετ' αὐτῆς ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ καὶ παραμυθούμενοι αὐτὴν, ἰδόντες
 32 τὴν Μαρίαν ὅτι ταχέως ἀνέστη καὶ ἐξῆλθεν, ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῇ, λέγον-
 τες· Ὅτι ὑπάγει εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον, ἵνα κλάσῃ ἐκεῖ. Ἡ οὖν Μαρία ὡς
 ἦλθεν ὅπου ἦν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ἰδοῦσα αὐτόν, ἔπεσεν εἰς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ,
 λέγουσα αὐτῷ· Κύριε, εἰ ἦς ὧδε, οὐκ ἂν ἀπέθανέ μου ὁ ἀδελφός.

19. *Ἰουδαίων.*] Chiefly, we may suppose, the *Jerusalemites* from the vicinity. The best Commentators, ancient and modern, are of opinion that *πρὸς τὰς περὶ Μ. καὶ Μ.* is simply for *πρὸς Μάρθαν καὶ Μ.* The idiom is common in the Classical writers; but it does not always mean the *person* only, but sometimes includes his relations or near friends. And as at Acts xiii. 13. *οἱ περὶ τὸν Παῦλον* denotes "Paul and his companions," so here it may mean "Martha and Mary with their relations." These visits of condolence were usual among the Jews, and continued to seven days after the funeral. The number of persons going thither became the means of making the miracle generally known, and thereby establishing its reality.

20. *ὡς ἤκουσεν*] "as soon as she had heard;" probably from some travellers on horseback, who had passed Jesus on the road. *Ἐν τῷ οἴ. ἐκαθ.*, "sate at home." Campb. renders, "remained at home." But see ver. 30. the posture was suitable to grief.

22—24. Hence it should seem that Martha had a persuasion that Jesus *could*, and an expectation, though faint, that he *would* raise her brother from the dead.

— *ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει.*] "at the general resurrection."

25. *ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ ἀνάστασις, &c.*] Here our Lord (by a common figure of the effect for the efficient) professes that He is the *author* of the resurrection of the dead; and that as he shall sometime raise *all* the dead, so he can and will now raise Lazarus to life. "We have here (says Dr. Jortin), in a few words, the summary of the Gospel; and the sublimity of the language is not less remarkable than the great truths conveyed in the words. Jesus is the *resurrection* to those believers who

are departed hence in the Lord; and he is the life to those who are still upon earth; and he will finally be the resurrection and the life to them *both*."

— *ζήσεται*] "shall be raised to a life of felicity and glory." *Καὶ ἀποθάνῃ*, "though he must die."

26. *πᾶς ὁ ζῶν — τὸν αἰῶνα.*] This seems meant to engraft on the foregoing assurance another, expressed in yet stronger terms, and denoting something *more*, — namely, that the gift shall be not only of life in a figurative, but in a physical sense, and that *never ending*. Ὁ ζῶν may signify "while alive;" intimating that the chance for obtaining eternal life is suspended on the issue of the life on earth. But perhaps the best Commentators are right in considering it as a Hebraism; and thus the sense will be, "every person living who believeth," &c.

27. *σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστός — Θεοῦ.*] Martha, it should seem, mentions, in the ardour of her devotion, *both* the titles designating the expected Messiah in Scripture. Tittm. thinks that she understood by the latter something more exalted than the former, — namely, one united in the Godhead, and in whom are centred all the essential attributes of God. Be that as it may, Martha certainly understood by it a term of *nature*, not of *office*.

— *ὁ ἐρχόμενος*] "who is to come into the world," i. e. who, the Scriptures say, is to come.

28. *λάθρᾳ.*] In thus calling her apart, it appears she had Jesus's directions; though the Evangelist has not recorded it.

29. *ἐγείρεται ταχέως.*] Not only out of reverence to Jesus, but from her faith being invigorated by the alacrity of her sister.

31. *ἡ ἀνάστασις ἐκεῖ.*] According to the custom of both Jews and Gentiles, to repair to the cemeteries to weep at the tombs of their relations

Ἰησοῦς οὖν ὡς εἶδεν αὐτὴν κλαίουσαν, καὶ τοὺς συνελθόντας αὐτῇ Ἰου- 33
 δαίους κλαίοντες, ἐνεβριμήσατο τῷ πνεύματι καὶ ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτὸν, καὶ 34
 εἶπε· Ποῦ τεθείκατε αὐτόν; Λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· Κύριε, ἔρχου καὶ ἴδε.
 Ἐδάκρυσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς. Ἔλθον οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι· Ἴδε, πὸς ἐφίλει αὐτόν! 35
 Ἐπίκειτο δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν εἶπον· Οὐκ ἠδύνατο οὗτος ὁ ἀνοήσις τοὺς ὀφθαλ- 36
 μούς τοῦ τυφλοῦ ποιῆσαι, ἵνα καὶ οὗτος μὴ ἀποθάνῃ; Ἰησοῦς οὖν 37
 πάλιν ἐμβριμώμενος ἐν ἑαυτῷ, ἔρχεται εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον. Ἦν δὲ σπήλαιον, 38
 καὶ λίθος ἐπέκειτο ἐπ' αὐτῷ. λέγει ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Ἀρατε τὸν λίθον. Λέ- 39
 γει αὐτῷ ἡ ἀδελφὴ τοῦ τεθνηκότος Μάρθα· Κύριε, ἤδη ὄζει· τεταρ- 40
 ταῖος γὰρ ἐστὶ. λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Οὐκ εἶπόν σοι, ὅτι ἐάν πι- 41
 στεύσῃς, ὅφει τὴν δόξαν τοῦ Θεοῦ; ἤραν οὖν τὸν λίθον, οὗ ἦν ὁ 41
 τεθνηκὸς κείμενος. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἤρε τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἄνω καὶ εἶπε·
 Πάτερ, ἐνχαριστῶ σοι ὅτι ἤκουσάς μου. Ἐγὼ δὲ ᾔδειν ὅτι πάντοτε 42
 μου ἀκούεις· ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὄχλον τὸν περιεστώτα εἶπον, ἵνα πιστεύ- 43
 σωσιν ὅτι σὺ με ἀπίστευκός εἶ. Καὶ ταῦτα εἰπὼν, φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ἐκράνυσε· 43
 Ἀύρασε, δεῦρο ἔξω! καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ὁ τεθνηκὸς, δεδεμένος τοὺς πόδας 44
 καὶ τὰς χεῖρας κειρίαις· καὶ ἡ ὄψις αὐτοῦ σουδαρίῳ περιεδέδετο.
 λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Ἀύσατε αὐτόν καὶ ἄφετε ὑπάγειν.

Πολλοὶ οὖν ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων οἱ ἐλθόντες πρὸς τὴν Μαρίαν, καὶ 45
 Θεασάμενοι ἃ ἐποίησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτόν. Τινὲς δὲ ἐξ 46
 αὐτῶν ἀπῆλθον πρὸς τοὺς Φαρισαίους, καὶ εἶπον αὐτοῖς ἃ ἐποίησεν ὁ

33. ἐνεβριμήσατο.] On the sense of this word Commentators are not agreed. The term would, according to its usual acceptation both in the Scriptural and the Classical writers, signify *indignatus est*. And so many eminent Commentators explain it. But (as Tittm. observes) there seems to have been no ground for *censure*. It is better to take the word (with Campb., Rosenm., Schl., and Tittm.) of *violent internal perturbation excited by sorrow*, as the Heb. הָרַחֵם is used in Gen. xl. 6. and I Sam. xv. 11. Indeed *βρίμω* (from which the word is derived) like its cognate *fremo* simply denotes only the *commotion* of any one of the violent passions, anger, sorrow, &c. The sense assigned by Euthym. and Maldon., “he repressed his spirit or emotion,” would deserve attention, were it not for *πάλιν ἐμβριμώμενος ἐν ἑαυτῷ* at ver. 38, which admits of no other interpretation than the one which I have here adopted, and which is much confirmed by the words following *καὶ ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτὸν*, which are exegetical of the foregoing, and in which we have an example of reciprocal for passive, as 2 Pet. ii. 8. Thus *ἐν τῷ πνεύματι* will signify “in his spirit,” as it is explained by Middlel. Gr. Art.

38. Ἐπέκειτο does not import, as strict propriety of language would suggest, that the entrance was *from above*, since the researches of Antiquaries show that it was, in the case of the Jewish tombs, *from the side*. Hence we may see the suitability of the Hebrew term to denote the stone which closed up the entrance, namely, לְרֹלֵל , “the roller.” The same is to be taken of ἀράτε .

39. ὄζει.] Ὄζειν signifies properly to emit an odour, whether *good* (as in Aristoph. ap. Suid.), or *bad*, as here and in other passages in the LXX. and Classical writers adduced by Wets.

— *τεταρταῖος γὰρ ἐστὶ*.] Of this Greek idiom (by which what properly belongs to the *person* is applied to the *thing*), many examples are adduced by Raphel. and Wets. It seems by these words that Martha thought Jesus meant no more, by ordering the stone to be removed, than to take a last look at the countenance of his friend.

41. εἶπε· Πάτερ, &c.] The words of this prayer are, from high-wrought pathos, very brief, and consequently obscure. Hence their full sense is only to be expressed in a paraphrase. I would propose the following: “Father, I thank thee that thou usest to hear my prayers. I know that thou dost continually hearken to my wishes, [whether expressed, or only mental]; but I have [now] spoken [them] because of the multitude present, that [by their seeing the granting of my desire] they may know that thou hast sent me.” The best Commentators are agreed, that in *ἤκουσας* the Aorist expresses, as often, what is *customary*. Ἦδειν in a Present sense is common. The elipsis after *ἀλλά* is very frequent.

44. δεδεμένος — κειρίαις.] It is not necessary to suppose, with most Commentators, that the whole body was involved in the bandages, (for thus a *second* miracle would be requisite); but, as miracles are not to be supposed without sufficient reason, we may imagine that the sheet, (*σινδῶν*), in which the body was wrapped, was not so tightly brought together by the bandages whereby the armlets were kept in their places, but that Lazarus was enabled to *creep* forth.

— *σουδαρίῳ kerchief*.] This did not cover the face, but was brought under the chin.

— *λύσατε*] i. e. “loosen the bandages.” On the credibility of this stupendous miracle, see the able remarks of Tittm. in Rec. Syn.

47 Ἰησοῦς. Ἰ Συνήγαγον οὖν οἱ Ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι συνέδριον, καὶ ἔλεγον· Τί ποιοῦμεν; ὅτι οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος πολλὰ σημεῖα ποιεῖ. 1. Matt. 26. 3. Mark 14. 1. Luke 22. 2.

48 Ἐὰν ἀφῶμεν αὐτὸν οὕτω, πάντες πιστεύουσιν εἰς αὐτόν· καὶ ἐλεύσονται οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι καὶ ἀρῶσιν ἡμῶν καὶ τὸν τόπον καὶ τὸ ἔθνος. Εἰς δὲ τις ἐξ αὐτῶν, Καϊάφας, ἀρχιερεὺς ὢν τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐκείνου, εἶπεν

49 ἀδοῦς· Ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε οὐδέν· ἢ οὐδὲ διαλογίζεσθε, ὅτι συμφέρεῖ ἡμῖν, ἵνα εἰς ἄνθρωπος ἀποθάνῃ ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ, καὶ μὴ ὅλον τὸ ἔθνος ἀπόληται. τοῦτο δὲ ἀφ' ἐαυτοῦ οὐκ εἶπεν· ἀλλὰ, ἀρχιερεὺς ὢν τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐκείνου, προεφήτευσεν, ὅτι ἔμελλεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀποθνήσκειν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἔθνους· καὶ οὐχ ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἔθνους μόνον, ἀλλ' ἵνα καὶ τὰ τέκνα τοῦ Θεοῦ τὰ διεσκορπισμένα συναγάγῃ εἰς ἓν. Ἀπ' ἐκείνης οὖν τῆς

U Infra 16. 14.

47. τί ποιοῦμεν.] “What are we doing?” A popular phrase fitted to deliberation, and implying also “What are we to do?”

— σημεῖα.] They admitted, it seems, the miracles of Jesus, but yet refused faith, on some such groundless pretence as, that they were effected by Diabolical agency.

48. τόπον.] Not the Temple, as some explain; for that would require τοῦτον τὸν τόπον; but the city of Jerusalem. Though Kuin. takes it of the country. Αἰρεῖν, like the Hebr. נשף, is used of destroying either a city or country.

49. ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε οὐδέν.] These words, and the counsel afterwards given, correspond so little to the foregoing ones, that almost all the best Commentators are of opinion, that something which immediately preceded them in the deliberations has been omitted by the Evangelist. This, however, is a principle always precarious, and is here (as usual) unnecessary. May we not consider the words of the Evangelist, τί ποιοῦμεν — ἔθνος as containing two opinions pronounced by two different parties of the Sanhedrim; τί ποιοῦμεν — ποιεῖ by those who were inclined to think well of Jesus; and ἐν ἀφῶμεν — ἔθνος by those who troubled not themselves about the truth or the falsehood of Jesus's pretensions, but viewing the thing solely in a political point of view, were alive to the danger of letting him go on; and thought he must be put down, but scrupled at the means. Against these the rebuke of Caiaphas seems to be directed: q. d. “Ye are foolish and raw! namely, in state craft, by seeing what is expedient to be done, and yet scrupling at the means to bring it about.” “He seems (observes Campb.) to concede to those who appeared to have scruples, that, though their putting Jesus to death could not be vindicated by strict law or justice, it might be vindicated from expediency and reason of state, or rather from the great law of necessity, the danger being no less than the destruction of their country, and so imminent, that even the murder of an innocent man, admitting Jesus to be innocent, was not to be considered as an evil, but rather as a sacrifice every way proper for the safety of the nation.”

50. συμφέροι — ἀπόληται] i. e. “It is a frequent maxim of state policy, that the safety of the whole nation is to be preferred to one individual.” On the nature of the reasoning, and the cause of the apprehension felt by the Sanhedrim, see Towns. Chron. Arr. i. 331. As to the phraseology, we have here a Positive with καὶ μὴ instead of a Comparative with ἤ.

51. προεφήτευσεν.] The sense “prophesied,”

generally assigned to the word, has been by most recent Commentators rejected, because the words of Caiaphas were, they say, no prediction at all, but only a political counsel, like the Virgillian “Unum pro cunctis dabitur caput.” Accordingly, they take προεφ. for quasi vaticinatus est, ita locutus ut vatic. videatur. But C. F. Fritzsche, (not the Editor of St. Matthew and Mark) in his learned Tract de Revelationis notione Biblica, p. 63, shrewdly remarks, that he can no more understand the meaning of a quasi oraculum in the Gospel, than Cotta (in Cicero de Nat. D. i. 26.) could understand “in DEO quid sit quasi corpus, vel quasi sanguis.” He contends strongly for retaining the usual sense prophesied, which he thinks required by the opposition between ἀφ' ἐαυτοῦ εἶπεν and προεφήτευσεν. The meaning, therefore, is, that in saying what he did, (namely, that one should die for the people,) he unwittingly uttered a prediction, afterwards fulfilled, that one, even Jesus, should die for the people. That Caiaphas, though a bad man, should have been inspired, is not strange, (as will appear by the example of Balaam,) since his office rather than his person is to be considered; especially as we have some reason to think that the gift of prophecy was occasionally granted to the High Priest. So Philo says expressly: ὁ δὲ πρὸς ἀλήθειαν ἱερεὺς εὐθύς ἐστι προφήτης. Thus Diodoti, in his Annotations, well remarks: “God guided the tongue of the High Priest: so that, thinking to utter a speech according to his own wicked meaning, he pronounced an oracle according to God's meaning: as the High Priest had oftentimes inspirations from God.” If this view be thought inadmissible, we may, (and must at least,) with Lampe, Kypke, and Tittm., take προεφ. in the sense, “spoke from the impulse of divine inspiration,” which comes to the same thing.

52. καὶ οὐχ ὑπὲρ — εἰς ἓν.] These words are meant to explain and show the extent of the seeming prediction. And here there is an ellipsis of some words, to be supplied from the preceding clause; q. d. [It was, indeed, decreed that he should die for the nation] and not for the nation only, &c. This is better than (with Kuin. and Tittm.) assigning to ὅτι the sense quoniam, which is an unusual signification, and here forbidden by the words following ἔμελλεν ἀποθν., which plainly mean, that “he should die.” Συναγάγῃ εἰς ἓν, as it were into one Catholic Church, united in one holy communion, under one common Head. — Τέκνα τοῦ Θεοῦ. So called by anticipation, in order to show God's gracious designs that they should be so.

ἡμέρας συνεβουλεύσαντο, ἵνα ἀποκτείνωσιν αὐτόν. Ἰησοῦς οὖν οὐκ ἔτι 54 παρήγορα περιεπάτει ἐν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις· ἀλλὰ ἀπῆλθεν ἐκεῖθεν εἰς τὴν χόραν ἐγγὺς τῆς ἐρήμου, εἰς Ἐφραῖμ λεγομένην πόλιν, κακεῖ διέτριβε μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ. Ἦν δὲ ἐγγὺς τὸ πάσχα τῶν Ἰουδαίων· καὶ 55 ἀνέβησαν πολλοὶ εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα ἐκ τῆς χώρας πρὸ τοῦ πάσχα, ἵνα ἀγνώσωσιν ἑαυτοὺς. Ἐξήτουν οὖν τὸν Ἰησοῦν, καὶ ἔλεγον μετ' ἀλλήλων 56 ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἐσθηκότες· Τί δοκεῖ ὑμῖν; ὅτι οὐ μὴ ἔλθῃ εἰς τὴν ἑορτήν; Λεδώκεισαν δὲ καὶ οἱ Ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ἐντολήν, ἵνα 57 εἴαν τις γυνὴ ποῦ ἐστὶ, μνηστῆρ, ὅπως πιάσωσιν αὐτόν.

x Matt. 26. 6.
Mark 14. 3.

y Supra 11. 2.

z Infra. 13. 29.

XII. *Ο ΟΡΝ Ἰησοῦς πρὸ ἑξ ἡμερῶν τοῦ πάσχα ἦλθεν εἰς Βηθα- 1 ρίαν, ὅπου ἦν Λάζαρος ὁ τεθνηκώς, ὃν ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν. Ἐποίησαν 2 οὖν αὐτῷ δεῖπνον ἐκεῖ, καὶ ἡ Μάρθα διηκόνει· ὁ δὲ Λάζαρος εἰς ἦν τῶν * ἀνακιμένων σὺν αὐτῷ. * Ἡ οὖν Μαρία λαβοῦσα λίτρον μέρου 3 νέφθου πιστικῆς πολυτίμου, ἤλειψε τοὺς πόδας τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ ἐξέμαξε ταῖς θριξίν αὐτῆς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ· ἡ δὲ οἰκία ἐπληρώθη ἐκ τῆς ὀσμῆς τοῦ μέρου. Λέγει οὖν εἰς ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, Ἰούδας Σκ- 4 μωνος Ἰσκαριώτης, ὁ μέλλων αὐτὸν παραδιδόναι· Διὰ τοῦτο τὸ μέρον 5 οὐκ ἐπρίσθη τρικκοσίων δηναρίων, καὶ ἐδόθη πτωχοῖς; * Εἶπε δὲ 6 τοῦτο, οὐχ ὅτι πρὸς τῶν πτωχῶν ζήλεν αὐτῷ· ἀλλ' ὅτι κλέπτης ἦν,

55. ἵνα ἀγνώσωσιν ἑαυτοὺς.] Namely, from such ceremonial defilements as they might have contracted; in order to participation in the Paschal feast. This purification was effected by sacrifices, sprinkling of water, fasting, prayer, and other observances, which lasted from one to six days. This, and the other prescribed rites, brought a great concourse of people together at Jerusalem, before the Festival.

56. τί δοκεῖ — ἑορτήν.] These words are by most Expositors supposed to mean, "What think ye, that he should not have come to the Feast." But the Feast was not yet arrived; and therefore that he should not have come, was not surprising. Indeed, from what is said in the next verses, they had little reason to expect him at all. Moreover, the words τί δοκεῖ ὑμῖν rather indicate a mutual discussion of what was doubtful and uncertain, whether it would or would not be. I have, therefore, followed the Pesch. Syr., Chrys., Euthym., Lampe, Pearce, Kuin., Tittm., and Campb., in placing a mark of interrogation after ὑμῖν; of course taking ἔλθῃ in a future sense, for ἐλεύσεται. The phraseology is, indeed, unusual; but this use of the interrogation with a double negation is intended to represent some one as proposing a question, and himself answering it in the negative. Thus it may be regarded as equivalent to, "Is it your opinion [as it certainly is mine] that he will by no means come?" They were warranted in supposing so, since (as we find from the next verse) strict inquiries were made after Jesus, and orders given for his apprehension.

XII. 1. πρὸ ἑξ ἡμερῶν τοῦ πάσχα.] A transposition, for ἑξ ἡμερῶν πρὸ τ. π., as in Joseph. Ant. xv. 4. πρὸ ἡμέρας μίας τῆς ἑορτῆς, and elsewhere in the later writers. "Ὅπου ἦν Α. ὁ τεθ. is rightly rendered by Markland, "where Lazarus was; he who had been dead and raised to life."

2. ἰποίησαν δ.] For the Impersonal, "a supper was made." Διηκόνει denotes attendance at table, to carve and serve the provisions. The entertainment, however, was, as we find from Matt. xxvi. 6, not in honour of Martha, but a person of the name of Simon, surnamed the Leper, probably a near relative of Mary, who acted as *hostess* on the occasion.

— ἀνακειμ.] instead of *συνανακ.*, is found in almost all the best MSS. and the early Edd., and is received by almost every Editor from Wets. to Scholz. Lazarus's presence is mentioned, to show that since his resurrection he had possessed the usual functions of life.

3. καὶ ἐξέμαξε ταῖς θριξίν.] This has been thought by Lightf. and Bynæns to denote that Mary had washed Jesus' feet before anointing them. If so, there is a remarkable *transposition* in the construction. But as the unguent used was liquid, the wiping would be as suitable to that as to washing. See more in Rec. Syn., in the Notes on Matt. xxvi. 6—11. On πιστικῆς see Note on Mark xiv. 3.

— ἡ δὲ οἰκία — μέρου.] This is, as Bp. Midd. observes, a figurative mode of expressing the extreme fragrance of the unguent. So Plutarch i. 676. cited by Wets. ὡδῶν δὲ θεσπέσιον ὄσον ἀπὸ ἀρωμάτων καὶ μέρων ὁ οἶκος.

6. τὸ γλωσσόκομον.] This word originally denoted the box in which pipers deposited the mouth pieces of their instruments. Thence it came to denote any box or casket, for holding money, or other valuables. And such is the sense here and in 2 Chron. xxiv. 8. and Plut. p. 1060. cited by Wets. Βαλλόμενα is for εἰσβαλλόμενα, "what was put therein," as contributions towards a common fund for the support of Christ and his Apostles. According to the common rendering of the passage, the sense proceeds very awkwardly; nor is this to be remedied by that θεὸς ἀπὸ μηχανῆς, a *transposition*, which the Critics call to their aid.

- 7 καὶ τὸ γλωσσόκομον εἶχε καὶ τὰ βαλλόμενα ἐβάσταζεν. Εἶπεν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Ἄφες αὐτήν· εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ ἐνταφιασμοῦ μου τετήρηκεν αὐτό. ^a Τούς πτωχοὺς γὰρ πάντοτε ἔχετε μεθ' ἑαυτῶν, ἐμὲ δὲ οὐ πάντοτε ἔχετε. ^a Deut. 15. 11. Matt. 25. 11. Mark 14. 7.
- 9 Ἐγνώ οὖν ὄχλος πολὺς ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ὅτι ἐκεῖ ἐστι· καὶ ἤλθον οὐ διὰ τὸν Ἰησοῦν μόνον, ἀλλ' ἵνα καὶ τὸν Λάζαρον ἴδωσιν, ὃν ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν. Ἐβουλεύσαντο δὲ οἱ Ἀρχιερεῖς, ἵνα καὶ τὸν Λάζαρον ἀποκτείνωσιν· ὅτι πολλοὶ δι' αὐτὸν ὑπῆγον τῶν Ἰουδαίων, καὶ ἐπίστευον εἰς τὸν Ἰησοῦν.
- 12 ^b Τῇ ἐπαύριον ὄχλος πολὺς ὁ ἐλθὼν εἰς τὴν ἑορτήν, ἀκούσαντες ὅτι ἔρχεται ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, ἔλαβον τὰ βάρια τῶν φοινίκων, καὶ ἐξῆλθον εἰς ὑπάντησιν αὐτῷ, καὶ ἔκραζον· Ὡσαννά· εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ! Εὐθρόν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὀνόμαζεν ἐπ' αὐτό, καθὼς ἐστι γεγραμμένον· ^d Μὴ φοβοῦ, θύγατερ Σιών· ἰδοὺ, ὁ βασιλεὺς σου ἔρχεται κλινομένης ἐπὶ πῶλον ὄνου. Ταῦτα δὲ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ τὸ πρῶτον· ἀλλ' ὅτε ἐδοξάσθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς, τότε ἐμνήσθησαν ὅτι ταῦτα ἦν ἐπ' αὐτῷ γεγραμμένα, καὶ ταῦτα ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ. ^b Matt. 21. 8. Mark 11. 7. Luke 19. 35. c Psal. 118. 25, 26.
- 17 Ἐμφοτύρει οὖν ὁ ὄχλος ὁ ὢν μετ' αὐτοῦ, ὅτι τὸν Λάζαρον ἐφώνησεν ἐκ τοῦ μνημείου καὶ ἤγειρεν αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ὑπήνησεν αὐτῷ ὁ ὄχλος, ὅτι * ἤκουσαν τοῦτο αὐτὸν πεποιηκέναι τὸ σημεῖον.
- 19 Οἱ οὖν Φαρισαῖοι εἶπον πρὸς ἑαυτούς· Θεωρεῖτε ὅτι οὐκ ὠφελεῖτε οὐδέν; Ἴδε, ὁ κόσμος ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ ἀπήλθεν. ^d Zach. 9. 9.

It is plain that the sense commonly assigned to *ἐβάσταζεν* cannot be tolerated; and that of *managed*, proposed by some, is destitute of proof or even probability. Almost all the best Commentators, ancient and modern, are agreed that it must signify *surrumpit, intervertit*, (like *ferre* for *aufferre* in Latin) of which sense they adduce examples from the later writers, to which I would add the following very apposite one from Joseph. p. 402. 39. Huds. ὠρμήσαντες εἰς μίαν σκηνὴν, ὡς οὐδένα ἐώρων ἐν μέσῳ, φαγόντες καὶ πίνοντες ἐβάστασαν ἐσθῆτα, καὶ πολλὴν χρυσῶν κομισάντες ἕξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς, ἔκρουσαν. Indeed as at xx. 15. the word denotes to *carry off* by stealth, so it may here very well mean simply to *steal*: a sense required by the *κλέπτῃς* just before; for thus we learn *why* Judas took exception at the ointment being so employed, and why he is called thief.

7, 8. See on Matt. xxvi. 12.

11. ὑπῆγον.] Literally, “drew off,” namely, abandoned that attachment to the teaching of the Scribes, which they had formerly had. Not, “withdrew from the Temple service,” as some Commentators explain. For (as Campb. observes) no sect of the Jews withdrew from the synagogue. Both Jesus and his Apostles and disciples punctually attending at the Temple service, until they were expelled from the synagogues. The sense of *ἵτοδ*, for the Scribes and Pharisees occurs often in this Gospel.

13. βάρια.] This is by many Commentators said to be a Coptic word, signifying a branch of a palm tree. But it rather comes from *βαῖος, slender*, and thus denotes the *tapering twigs* of the palm-tree. Indeed the Coptic may be derived

from this, just as there are numerous words in the Rabbinical writers derived from the Greek and Latin. Indeed the Coptic language is filled with words of foreign origin and late introduction.

15. μὴ φοβοῦ, θύγ. Σ.] On this prediction of Zech. ix. 9. see Townsend Chron. Arr. i. 395.

16. The first *αὐτῷ* is emphatical, and the words *καὶ* (repeat *ἔτι*) *ταῦτα ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ* mean—and that [the people] had done unto him [in fulfilment of prophecy]. Which last words are suggested by the preceding words.

17. *ἔτι*.] Many MSS., Versions, and early Edd. have *ἔτι*, which was edited by Math., who remarks that *ἔτι* was introduced into the text by Beza. Be it so—but it is supported by perhaps *stronger* MSS. authority, than *ἔτι*; as *internal* evidence is quite in favour of *ἔτι*; for thus *ἐφώνει*, not *ἐφώνησεν*, would be required. Moreover, the context requires this sense. By *ὁ ὢν μετ' αὐτοῦ* must be meant, “who had been with him,” [on the occasion in question.] Thus there is a blending of two clauses into one. The sentence *fully* expressed would run—“The people who had been with him when he raised Lazarus from the dead, attested that he,” &c.

18. ἤκουσαν.] This, for *ἤκουσε*, is found in most of the best MSS., and early Edd., and is received by almost all Editors from Wets. to Scholz. There is a transposition of *τοῦτο*.

19. θεωρεῖτε—οὐδέν;] The best Commentators, ancient and modern, are agreed that these words must be taken interrogatively. See *ye, &c.?* And thus they have certainly more spirit. The words *ὁ κόσμος—ἀπήλθεν* are a *popular* form of

Ἦσαν δὲ τινες Ἕλληνες ἐκ τῶν ἀναβαινόντων ἵνα προσκυνήσωσιν ἐν 20
τῇ ἑορτῇ· οὗτοι οὖν προσῆλθον Φιλίππῳ τῷ ἀπὸ Βηθσαϊδᾶ τῆς 21
Γαλιλαίας, καὶ ἠρώτων αὐτὸν λέγοντες· Κύριε, θέλομεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν
ἰδεῖν. Ἐρχεται Φίλιππος καὶ λέγει τῷ Ἀνδρέᾳ· καὶ πάλιν Ἀνδρέας 22
καὶ Φίλιππος λέγουσι τῷ Ἰησοῦ. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἀπεκρίνατο αὐτοῖς, λέ- 23
γων· Ἐλήλυθεν ἡ ὥρα ἵνα δοξασθῇ ὁ Τίος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. Ἀμὴν 24
ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν· ἐὰν μὴ ὁ κόκκος τοῦ σίτου πεσὼν εἰς τὴν γῆν
ἀποθάνῃ, αὐτὸς μόνος μένει· ἐὰν δὲ ἀποθάνῃ, πολὺν καρπὸν φέρει.

e Matt. 10. 39. & 16. 25.
Mark 8. 35.
Luke 9. 24.
& 17. 33.
f Infra. 14. 3.
& 17. 24.
I Thess. 4. 17.
Ἐὰν οὖν φιλῶν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἀπολέσει αὐτήν· καὶ ὁ μισθὸς τῆν 25
αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ τούτῳ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον φυλάξει αὐτήν. Ἐὰν 26
ἐμοὶ διακοῖῃ τις, ἐμοὶ ἀκολουθεῖτω· καὶ ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ, ἐκεῖ καὶ ὁ
δίακονος ὁ ἐμὸς ἔσται· καὶ ἐάν τις ἐμοὶ διακοῖῃ, τιμήσει αὐτὸν ὁ

Πατήρ.

speaking, denoting that a teacher has very numerous followers. The hyperbole in κόσμος is frequent in the N. T. and the Rabbinical writers.

20. Ἕλληνες.] It is a much debated question *who* are here to be understood. Some suppose foreign Jews living out of Palestine, and speaking the Greek language. And certainly there were Jews dispersed all over Egypt, Asia Minor, &c., where Greek was the vernacular tongue, and spoken by the sojourning Jews. But that is no reason why they should be called *Greeks*; nor can it, I think, be proved from any passage of the N. T. that they were so called. It is therefore better to suppose (with others) that by Ἕλληνες are to be understood *Gentiles*; for 1. wherever in the N. T. Ἰουδαῖοι and Ἕλληνες are mentioned, by the latter are meant *Gentiles*; 2. because the thing recorded is agreeable to the custom of those times; since the Gentiles worshipped not only the gods of their own country, but of any foreign nation into which they might come, nay they made journeys for the purpose of worship, to the most celebrated foreign temples, especially that of Jerusalem. See the passages of Joseph., Philo. and Sueton., adduced (from Light., Wets., and Schoettg.) in Recens. Synop. Nay, many Gentiles were in that age diligent in their search after true religion, and in order thereto, frequented the Jewish Synagogues, though they made no external profession of the Jewish religion, nor were circumcised. Such are in Acts xvii. 4. called οἱ Ἕλληνες σεβόμενοι. Thus though σεβόμενοι be not here added, yet it might be understood, and these may be regarded as a sort of Proselytes. And as it cannot be proved that the Gentiles ever attended at Jerusalem, at the celebration of the *Passover*, these may with most probability be supposed Proselytes of the gate, who, however, afterwards made profession of the Mosaic religion. See Lampe and Tittm.

21. ἰδεῖν.] “to have an interview with.” An idiom common to most languages. There were many reasons why such persons should desire an introduction to so celebrated a person. Their motives, however, in seeking it can only be conjectured. And the effect of the application, not being recorded, is also a matter of uncertainty. But it is most probable that they were admitted.

23. ἐλήλυθεν — ἀνθρώπου.] Our Lord may be thought to take occasion from this circumstance to presignify to the two disciples the future progress of the Gospel, when it should be manifested

not merely to a few religiously inclined foreigners, but to all the nations of the earth in their own countries. At least, such is the view taken by Noesselt, Kuin., and others, whom see in Recens. Synop. But, notwithstanding that it may seem confirmed by the context, I am inclined to agree with Lampe and Tittm., that the *glory of Christ* here mentioned rather consisted in the resurrection from death, ascension to heaven, and sitting at the right hand of the Father, nay even in the death itself which he suffered for the salvation of the human race, of his own free will, and from the abundant love which he bore towards the Father and towards men. This glory, they add, would be eminently displayed, when it became generally known on earth that he died to save men, — had, moreover, returned from death to life, had ascended to heaven, and was constituted head of the human race, Lord in heaven and earth; and finally, when he should be acknowledged by Jews and Gentiles as the supreme Saviour of all men.

24. ἐὰν μὴ ὁ κόκκος — φέρει.] This is an illustration of what was said in the preceding verse; though the comparison is unaccompanied with application. The sense is: “As a grain of corn cast into the earth, unless it die (i. e. putrify), remains alone, i. e. has no increase; so it must be with me; for as it must die to yield increase, so must I undergo temporal death, in order to be glorified, and produce a great spiritual increase.”

25. ὁ φιλῶν τὴν ψυχὴν — αὐτήν.] See Note on Matt. x. 39. Our Lord here teaches, that those of his disciples who desire communion in his glory, must not decline participation in his tribulations. q. d. “He who so loveth his life, as to prefer to the loss of it the loss of the advantages of my kingdom, shall not enjoy the felicity destined for those faithful followers, who encounter all perils for mine and the Gospel’s sake.” Φιλεῖν τὴν ψυχὴν is for φιλοψυχεῖν. The words have indeed immediate reference only to the then state of things and the first Christians; but may, by accommodation, be applied to all times, and Christians of every age.

26. ἐὰν ἐμοὶ διακοῖῃ τις, ἐμοὶ ἀκολ.] The words may be thus paraphrased: “If any one would dedicate himself to my service, let him imitate my example, submitting cheerfully to all afflictions, nay even death itself, for the advancement of my religion: and (for his encouragement) let him be assured, that where I am, there will he

27 *Νῦν ἡ ψυχὴ μου τετάρακται· καὶ τί εἶπω; Πάτερ, σῶσόν με ἐκ*
 28 *τῆς ὥρας ταύτης; ἀλλὰ διὰ τοῦτο ἦλθον εἰς τὴν ὥραν ταύτην. Πά-*
τερ, δοξάσόν σου τὸ ὄνομα. Ἦλθεν οὖν φωνὴ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ· Καὶ
 29 *ἰδοῦσα, καὶ πάλιν δοξάσω! ὁ οὖν ὄχλος ὁ ἐστὼς καὶ ἀκούσας, ἔλεγε*
 30 *βροντὴν γερονεία. ἄλλοι ἔλεγον· Ἄγγελος αὐτῷ λελάληκεν. Ἀπεκρίθη*
ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν· Οὐδὲ ἐμὲ αὕτη ἡ φωνὴ γέγονεν, ἀλλὰ δι' ὑμᾶς.
 31 *Ἔτι· Νῦν κρίσις ἐστὶ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου· νῦν ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τοῦ-* ε Intra 16. 11.

be, as partaker of my glory. Moreover, whoever shall serve me faithfully, him will my Father reward with a crown of glory.

27. *νῦν ἡ ψυχὴ, &c.*] If the common punctuation and interpretation be here adopted, we must suppose that, through perturbation, our Lord first utters, and then retracts a prayer. That, however, is both objectionable and unnecessary; for many of the best ancient and modern Commentators and Editors place a mark of interrogation after *ταύτης*, thus making *two* interrogations, as follows: What shall I say? [Shall I say] Father, deliver me from this hour? But for this cause came I, for this hour, i. e. to meet this hour. It is well observed by Campb., that "it suited the distress of our Lord's soul to suggest at first a petition for deliverance. But in this he is instantly checked by the reflection on the end of his coming. This determines him to cry out, Father, glorify thy name! which was not put as a question, it is what his mind finally and fully acquiesced in. After a short, but severe, struggle, the natural emotions of fear soon subside into acquiescence in the will of his Father, whose glory he desires may be promoted by his death."

Ἦσα to denote a time of distress, occurs also on the same subject, in Mark xiv. 35.

28. Π. *δοξασόν σ. τ. ὄ.*] These (as Dr. Burton observes) are words of *resignation*. q. d. "Cause thy name to be glorified in any manner that seemeth good to thee."

— *ἦλθεν οὖν φωνὴ ἑ. τ. ο.*] Many recent Commentators understand by *φωνὴ* here and at Matt. iii. 3. 17. simply *thunder*. They maintain that *no words* were uttered at all; and that the Evangelist did not suppose that there *were* any; but that he only meant to use the words which God, *if he had* expressed His will and intention by human voice, *would have used*. But this is justly accounted by Tittm. an unjustifiable license of interpretation. He observes, that it is inconsistent with the words of v. 30. *οὐδὲ ἐμὲ αὕτη ἡ φωνὴ γέγονεν, ἀλλὰ δι' ὑμᾶς*. "That a voice *was* (says he) heard in *plain words*, from heaven, we are not permitted to doubt, because of the exactly similar circumstances which took place not only in the case of Moses and the children of Israel, (Exod. xix. 19.) and also in that of Samuel, (see 1 Sam. iii. 5. seqq.) but likewise in that of our Lord himself at his baptism, and in his transfiguration on Mount Tabor, which places the thing beyond dispute. For 1. the *words themselves*, which were heard, are expressly mentioned. 2. In the following passage not only are some said to have thought that an angel spoke with Jesus, but our Lord himself says, *οὐδὲ ἐμὲ αὕτη ἡ φωνὴ γέγονεν, ἀλλὰ δι' ὑμᾶς*. So also St. Peter relates, that he and the rest who were with our Lord on Mount Tabor, heard a *voice* from heaven which said, 'This is my beloved Son. It is true that the by-standers differed in opinion. Some, who perhaps had not been very attentive, and had them-

selves not heard the words distinctly, said *it thundered*; for the voice had proceeded from the clouds, [and indeed that thunder sometimes accompanied (probably preceded or followed) this voice from heaven, is certain from Exod. xix. 16. 19. Revel. iv. 5. vi. i. x. 3. Edit.] Others, however, had heard them, and immediately supposed that God had spoken by an angel, conformably to the opinion of the Jews, who thought that God never spoke except by the ministry of angels; and therefore they did not doubt whether the words were uttered, but *in what manner*." See Note on Matt. iii. 17. As to the words themselves, the full sense intended, though not then expressed, but meant to be understood from the event, may be what Dr. Burton expresses in his paraphrase: "I have caused my Name to be glorified by my former dispensations, and now I shall do so again by thy death." On the whole of this important subject, the *Bath Col*, or voice from heaven, see Mr. Townsend's remarks, Chr. Arr. i. 406.

30. *δι' ὑμᾶς*] for your sakes, for the confirmation of your faith.

31. *νῦν κρίσις—ἔξω.*] There has been much difference of sentiment on the interpretation of these words, which admit of more than one sense. Tittm. after an elaborate discussion of the import, is of opinion that by *ἀρχων τοῦ κόσμου* is denoted the *genius seculi*, a spirit of unbelief and wickedness, (see Eph. ii. 2. and compare Acts xxvi. 18. with Col. i. 13.) and that by *ἀρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου* we may understand generally the *influence* which unbelief and iniquity exerted over the minds of men, impeding the progress of true religion and happiness. This interpretation, however, is more *ingenious than solid*; and I see no reason to abandon the common one, by which *ὁ ἀρχων* is taken to mean *Satan*. The full sense of the passage may be expressed thus: "Now is [at hand] the judgment or condemnation of the world," (i. e. now will sentence be passed on this world "which lieth in sin"); "now will the Prince of this world be deposed from his rule." This sense of *ἐκβάλλειν* is found in the best writers, who use both *ἐκβάλλαν βασιλεῖα ἐκ τῆς ἀρχῆς* and simply *ἐκβάλλαν*. The not discerning the *ratio metaphorice* has led the Commentators astray. The meaning is, that now is the Prince of this world about to be deposed, and his subjects condemned for sin and unbelief. That the two clauses are very closely connected in sense, is certain from a kindred passage at xvi. 11. compared with v. 6.; where our Lord says that the *Paraclete*, at his coming, *ἐλέγξει τὸν κόσμον περὶ κρίσεως*, i. e. as it is then explained, *ὅτι ὁ ἀρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου κέκρηται*, "is to be condemned," and consequently deposed. See the Note there.

Thus here, by the Ruler of the world being deposed is meant, that his authority is to be abolished, and his empire over the minds of men destroyed; namely, by the abolition of idolatry and

h Supr. 3. 14.

του ἐκβληθήσεται ἔξω· ^h καὶ ὡς, ἐὰν ὑψωθῶ ἐκ τῆς γῆς, πάντας ἐλύσω 32
 πρὸς ἑμαυτόν. Τοῦτο δὲ ἔλεγε, σημαίνων ποίῳ θανάτῳ ἤμελλεν ἀπο- 33
 θνήσκειν. ⁱ Ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ ὁ ὄχλος· Ἥμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν ἐκ τοῦ νόμου, 34
 ὅτι ὁ Χριστὸς μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα· καὶ πῶς σὺ λέγεις· [“Οὐ”] δεῖ
 ὑψωθῆναι τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου; τίς ἐστιν οὗτος ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀν-
 θρώπου; ^k Εἶπεν οὖν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Ἔτι μικρὸν χρόνον τὸ φῶς 35
 μεθ’ ὑμῶν ἐστί. περιπατεῖτε ἕως τὸ φῶς ἔχετε, ἵνα μὴ σκοτία ὑμᾶς
 καταλάβῃ· καὶ ὁ περιπατῶν ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ οὐκ οἶδε ποῦ ὑπάγει.
 Ἔως τὸ φῶς ἔχετε, πιστεῦτε εἰς τὸ φῶς, ἵνα υἱοὶ φωτὸς γένησθε. 36
 Ταῦτα ἐλάλησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς· καὶ ἀπελθὼν ἐκρύβη ἀπ’ αὐτῶν.

i 2 Sam. 7. 13.
 Psal. 89. 29, 36.
 & 110. 4.
 Isa. 9. 6, 7.
 Ezek. 37. 25.
 Dan. 2. 44.
 & 7. 14, 27.
 k Supra 1. 9.

Τοσαῦτα δὲ αὐτοῦ σημεῖα πεποιηκότος ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν, οὐκ ἐπί- 37
 στενον εἰς αὐτόν· ^l ἵνα ὁ λόγος Ἰσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου πληρωθῇ, ὃν 38

l Isa. 53. 1.
 Rom. 10. 16.

superstition, and the introduction of true and vital religion.

32. καὶ ὡς—ἑμαυτόν.] Here our Lord, I conceive, points out, though obscurely, the means by which the great consummation just adverted to would be accomplished, namely, by his *crucifixion, resurrection, ascension, exaltation* to glory, and the commencement of his office as Advocate with the Father, the first work of which would be the sending of the Holy Spirit, and then the mission of those who in every age should preach the Gospel. By these, and by his revealed Word in the N. T., our Lord means to say, he would draw all men to him; would offer such moral inducements and spiritual aids to men as should be sufficient to sway the intellect to assent to the truths of his religion, and the will to obey its moral requisitions. By πάντας may be intimated the *universality* intended in the blessings of redemption; though it may also (as Tittm. thinks) mean, that these benefits shall be extended to men of every nation, both Jews and Gentiles. Πρὸς ἑμαυτόν suggests the place whither he is going, *Heaven*. Thus at xiv. 2, 3. our Lord says he is going to prepare a place for them; and having prepared it, he will return and receive them to himself. Ἔτιν ἐστί is here and at John vi. 62. xiv. 3. 1 John iii. 2. and elsewhere, and sometimes in the Sept., put for ὅταν, i. e. ὅτ’ ἂν, by an ellipsis of ὅτε.

33. σημαίνων.] The word is often used (as here) of things future and obscurely signified, as in oracles, &c. So Plutarch cited by Wets. οὐτε λέγει, οὐτε κρύπτει, ἀλλὰ σημαίνει.

34. τοῦ νόμου] i. e. the Scriptures. See x. 34. Μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, “is to remain on earth for ever.” There are numerous passages of the Prophets, referred to by the Commentators, importing that Christ’s kingdom would be everlasting. But by that was meant his *Spiritual* kingdom.

—ὑψωθῆναι τὸν Υἱὸν τ. ἀ.] It is plain from hence that the terms Χριστὸς and ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου were regarded as synonymous. The speakers take for granted that Jesus is, what he claims to be, the *Messiah*. The Commentators, however, are wrong in supposing that by ὑψωθῆναι the people understood him to speak of *crucifixion*. It should seem that not even the Apostles comprehended the import of what was said, which was only meant as a *dark prediction* to be understood after the event, for the confirmation of their faith. The multitude, as appears from what follows, un-

derstood the expression ὑψωθῆναι ἐκ τῆς γῆς only of removal from earth to heaven, whether by death, or otherwise, as in the case of Elijah.

—τίς ἐστιν—ἀνθρώπου.] This is wrongly rendered by our English Translators, “Who is that Son of man?” Τίς is for ποῖος (like quis for qualis in Latin), as in Mark i. 27. & vi. 2. Luke i. 66. John vii. 36. and often. Render: “What sort of Son of Man is that to be?” To this question our Lord (ver. 35.) only replies *indirectly*, and by allegory, hinting at their erroneous opinions concerning the Messiah, by adverting to that opportunity for obtaining light to dissipate the clouds of error which they must use while they have it, lest they should be overtaken by that spiritual darkness which would disable them from directing their course. Καταλαμβάνειν is often used of the coming on of night. At περιπατεῖτε σεν. ἐν τῷ φωτί, which is explained at ver. 36. by πιστεῦτε εἰς τὸ φῶς, “believe in Him who is the great Teacher.” By υἱοὶ τοῦ φωτὸς are meant those who should follow the instructions and example of that Teacher. See Luke xvi. 8. Ὁ περιπατῶν ἐν—ὑπάγει must be viewed in the same light as the passage at xi. 10. where see Note, οὐκ οἶδε ποῦ ὑπάγει being a popular expression, signifying, “he knows not how to direct his course.”

36. ἐκρύβη ἀπ’ αὐτῶν] “withdrew himself from them, and kept himself in seclusion, no longer teaching in public.”

37—50.] This portion is called by Grot. and Beng. the *Epiphonema*, or *Epicrisis historice totius*, containing the remarks of the Evangelist on the event (so little successful) of Christ’s teaching. In this he treats, 1. of the *miracles* (vv. 37—43.), and 2. of the *doctrine* of Jesus; and shows that neither were such as to induce the Jews to believe in him.

38. ἵνα.] The best Commentators, ancient and modern, are agreed that ἵνα here denotes (as often) the *event*, and not the *cause*; “for (as Mr. Holden expresses it) their unbelief did not happen because it was foretold; but it was foretold because it was foreseen that it would happen.” For a complete understanding of this abstruse subject, the reader is referred to the able Note of Whitby; and for a learned and able discussion of the phraseology (especially as to its difference from the Hebrew and Sept.), to Tittm. in Recens. Synop. It is shown that the difference is only in words, the sense being precisely the same. q. d. “So that the saying of Isaiah was fulfilled.”

εἶπε· Κύριε, τίς ἐπίστευσε τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν; καὶ ὁ
 39 βραχίων Κυρίου τίνι ἀπεκαλύφθη; Διὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ἠδύνα-
 40 το πιστεῦν, ὅτι πάλιν εἶπεν Ἰησοῦς· ^m Τετύφλωκεν αὐτῶν τοὺς ^m Isa. 6. 9.
 ὀφθαλμοὺς, καὶ πεπόρωκεν αὐτῶν τὴν καρδίαν· ἵνα ^{Matt. 13. 14.}
 μὴ ἴδωσι τοὺς ὀφθαλμοῖς, καὶ νοήσωσι τῇ καρδίᾳ, καὶ ^{Luke 8. 10.}
 41 ἐπιστραφῶσι, καὶ ἰάσωμαι αὐτούς. Ταῦτα εἶπεν Ἰησοῦς, ὅτε ^{Acts 28. 26.}
 42 εἶδε τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐλάλησε περὶ αὐτοῦ· ὅμως μέντοι καὶ ἐκ τῶν ^{Rom. 11. 8.}
 ἀρχόντων πολλοὶ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτόν· ἀλλὰ, διὰ τοὺς Φαρισαίους,
 43 οὐκ ὁμολογοῦν, ἵνα μὴ ἀποσυνάγωγοι γένωνται. ⁿ ἤγάπησαν γὰρ τὴν ⁿ Supra 5. 41.
 δόξαν τῶν ἀνθρώπων μᾶλλον ἢπερ τὴν δόξαν τοῦ Θεοῦ.
 44 Ὁ Ἰησοῦς δὲ ἔκραξε καὶ εἶπεν· Ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ, οὐ πιστεύει εἰς ^o 1 Pet. 1. 21.
 45 ἐμέ, ἀλλ' εἰς τὸν πέμψαντά με· καὶ ὁ θεωρῶν ἐμέ θεωρεῖ τὸν πέμ-
 46 ψαντά με. ^p Ἐγὼ φῶς εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἐλήλυθα, ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων ^p Supra 1. 5, 9-
 47 εἰς ἐμέ ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ μὴ μείνη. ^q Καὶ ἐάν τις μοῦ ἀκούσῃ τῶν ῥημά- ^q 3. 19.
 τῶν καὶ μὴ πιστεύσῃ, ἐγὼ οὐ κρίνω αὐτόν· οὐ γὰρ ἦλθον ἵνα κρίνω ^{& 8. 12.}
 48 τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλ' ἵνα σώσω τὸν κόσμον. Ὁ ἀθετῶν ἐμέ καὶ μὴ λιμ- ^{& 9. 5.}
 49 βάνων τὰ ῥήματά μου ἔχει τὸν κρίνοντα αὐτόν· ὁ λόγος ὃν ἐλάλησα ^q Supra 3. 17.
 49 ἐκείνος κρίνει αὐτόν ἐν τῇ ἑσχατῇ ἡμέρᾳ. ^r Ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐξ ἐμαντοῦ οὐκ ^r Infra 14. 10.
 ἐλάλησα· ἀλλ' ὁ πέμψας με Πατὴρ, αὐτός μοι ἐντολὴν ἔδωκε, τί εἶπω
 50 καὶ τί λαλήσω· καὶ οἶδα ὅτι ἡ ἐντολὴ αὐτοῦ ζωὴ αἰώνιος ἐστίν. Ἄ
 οὐν λαλῶ ἐγὼ, καθὼς εἶρηξέ μοι ὁ Πατὴρ, οὕτω λαλῶ.

—τῇ ἀκοῇ] “our speech,” or testimony. A sense of the word derived from the Heb. *אָמַר*, and occurring at Rom. x. 16. Gal. iii. 2. and Jerem. x. 22. *βραχίων* signifies *power*; a common metaphor; or rather *power exerted in action*. Lampe thinks this has reference to the custom of the warriors of antiquity, to uncover their arms, whether for actual battle, or for giving orders. But there can be no more than an *allusion*, and perhaps not *that*. The interrogation implies a strong negation, q. d. *nemo fere, very few*. And although the words might be applicable enough to the times of Isaiah, nay, to almost *all* times, yet (as Tittm. observes) there can be no doubt but that the Prophet had in view our Lord and his age.

39. *διὰ τοῦτο*] i. e. since they would not hearken to Christ's instructions. *ὄκ ἠδύνατο πιστεῦν*. This must, of course, not be understood of physical inability; but we must, with the best Commentators, ancient and modern, take it of *moral* inability, to mean, they *would* not, i. e. literally, *they could not bring themselves to*, &c. See Note on Matt. xiii. 14.

42. *ὅμως μέντοι*.] An accumulation of synonymous words, to strengthen the sense, as in Herodot. i. 189. On *ἀποσυνάγ. γένωνται*, see note on ix. 22.

44—50. This forms the *second* part of St. John's discourse above mentioned, namely, on the *doctrines* of Jesus, being a brief summary of them, and in our Lord's own words. See supra i. 15. and Note. The Aorists *ἔκραξε* (which denotes *public* teaching) and *εἶπε* must be taken as Pluperfects.

—ὁ—ἀλλ'] Here, as often, this denotes *non tam—quam*, “not [so much] in me as in Him.” &c. Or there may be, as Kuin. thinks, an ellip.

of *μόνον*, on which see my Note on Thucyd. iii. 45. and compare Mark ix. 37.

45. *ὁ θεωρῶν—με*.] This denotes the intimate union of nature, will, counsel, &c. between the Father and the Son. See xiv. 9. and Note.

46. *φῶς—ἐλήλυθα*.] St. John often styles our Lord *φῶς*. So i. 9. viii. 12. See Notes.

47. *ὁ κρίνω αὐτόν*.] The words are commonly taken to mean, “I do not *here* on earth act as judge over him, since I came to be a Saviour, not a Judge.” See iii. 17. v. 45. viii. 15. and Notes. Kuin. and Tittm., however, take *κρίνω* here in the sense *condemn* and *punish*, q. d. I am not the cause of his condemnation, or that of men, having come not for the ruin, but the salvation, of men. On this verse see iii. 16—19. compared with 2 Pet. iii. 9.

48. *ὁ ἀθετῶν—κα. αὐτόν*.] There seems here to be an *ἀλλὰ* omitted per *Asyndeton*. q. d. [Nevertheless, he will not go unpunished]. He that, &c.

—ὁ λόγος.] By this and the *τὰ ῥήματα* are meant that part of Christ's teaching which respected his person and office. See iii. 17. and Note. The *εἶπω* refers to commands; and *λαλήσω* to oral instruction. It is meant that the unbeliever's inattention and wilful neglect of both will bring down on him condemnation and destruction.

50. Christ here made three declarations: 1. That he had not invented the doctrine himself, but received it from the Father, and that therefore it did not owe its origin to human invention, but was altogether divine. 2. He testified his thorough persuasion, that those things which were committed to him to be delivered, had all no other end but the eternal salvation of men: and that his doctrine points out the way which

e Matt. 26. 1.
Mark 14. 1.
Luke 22. 1.

t Matt. 23. 18.
supra 3. 35.
infra 17. 2.

XIII. ἡ ΠΡΟ δὲ τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ πάσχα, εἰδὼς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι ἐλήλυ- 1
θεν αὐτοῦ ἡ ὥρα, ἵνα μεταβῇ ἐκ τοῦ κόμου τούτου πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα, 2
ἀγαπήσας τοὺς ἰδίους τοὺς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, εἰς τέλος ἠγάπησεν αὐτούς.
Καὶ δείπνου γενομένου, (τοῦ Διαβόλου ἡδὴ βεβληκότες εἰς τὴν καρδίαν 2
Ἰούδα Σίμωνος Ἰσκαριώτου, ἵνα αὐτὸν παραδοῖ,) εἰδὼς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ὅτι 3
πάντα δέδωκεν αὐτῷ ὁ Πατὴρ εἰς τὰς χεῖρας, καὶ ὅτι ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ἐξῆλθε 4
καὶ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ὑπάγει· ἐγείρεται ἐκ τοῦ δείπνου, καὶ τίθησι τὰ 4
ἱμάτια, καὶ λαβὼν λέπτιον, διέξωσεν εαυτὸν· εἶτα βάλλει ὕδωρ εἰς τὸν 5
πιπῆρα, καὶ ἤρξατο νίπτειν τοὺς πόδας τῶν μαθητῶν, καὶ ἐκμύσειν

leads to eternal happiness. 3. He affirmed that, in teaching, he had confined himself to the will of his Father; that he had neither added nor suppressed ought, and that therefore his doctrine was pure, complete, and altogether Divine. (Tittm.)

XIII. Having finished the work of *public* instruction, our Lord now devoted the short remainder of his life to the private instruction of his disciples. These he in, chap. xiii., xiv., xv., apprises of his approaching trials, and endeavours to console them by kind assurances, evincing his love both to them and to the whole human race.

1. πρὸ τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ πάσχα.] See Note on Matt. xxvi. 2.

—εἰδὼς — ὥρα.] Of this he was well aware — having frequently conversed with his disciples upon it, and predicted its most minute circumstances.

—ἵνα μεταβῇ — Πατέρα.] Christ called his departure *μετάβασις*, as signifying that he had not come on earth as a *mere man*, but as the *Son of God*, who had proceeded from, and would return to God.

—ἀγαπήσας τοὺς ἰδίους.] By τοὺς ἰδ. almost all Commentators understand his *disciples*. But as the words τοὺς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ are subjoined, Tittm. maintains that the sense must be, “the whole human race.” See xvii. 24.

—ἠγάπησεν.] Tittm. rightly observes, that this is to be taken, like many other verbs, *declaratively*. By the *tokens* of love evinced by Jesus to his disciples are meant the *symbolical actions* mentioned just afterwards. At εἰς τέλος sub. βλῶν; or take εἰς τέλος ἡγ. for *διετέλει ἀγαπῶν*, with Grot. and Tittm.

2. δείπνου γεν.] Many Commentators render this *cenā peractā*. But, as at vv. 4 & 12, Christ is said to have risen from supper, and again sat down, others (as Tittm.) with reason take it to mean “*cenā instructā*,” “it being supper time,” such washing being performed *before*, not *after* a meal. Accordingly, Tittm. thinks that our Lord had sat down to table; but that before he began supper, he arose, to wash his disciples’ feet. Then, having sat down again, he held the discourse here recorded. Kuin., on the other hand, takes *γενομένου* for *δντος*, and thinks the sense is, “while supper was taking.” And he parries the objection, that washing *preceded* the meal, by observing, that this was an *extraordinary* washing, meant as a symbolical action. Yet there were, as we learn from the Rabbinical writers, *two* washings at the Paschal supper. Be that as it may, the symbolical action was meant to inculcate a lesson of humility and affectionate atten-

tion to each other’s comfort, so much the more seasonable, as the disciples had been disputing *who* were to fill the *chief posts* in the Messiah’s temporal kingdom.

—βεβληκότες εἰς τὴν καρδίαν Ἰ. Σ.] This and other kindred phrases, with more or less variety, are used in Scripture of suggesting any thought to the mind. Many recent Commentators, indeed, regard this as a popular form of expression, meant only to denote the enormity of the crime meditated. This, however, is founded on a dangerous principle, and the words evidently convey the notion of a *real Being* possessed of an *actual power* over the minds of men. The circumstances of Judas’s temptation to betray his Master, and the condescension of that Master, are mentioned together, in order to represent more strongly the baseness of the betrayer.

3. εἰδὼς ὁ Ἰησοῦς — χεῖρας.] Tittm. has shown that ὅτι ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ἐξῆλθε, taken in conjunction with πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ὑπάγει, can import no less than that Jesus was of celestial origin, and dwelt in heaven before he came upon earth. (See iii. 13; vi. 62; xvii. 5; also i. 1; ii. 18.); also “that πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ὑπάγει must mean, that our Lord would return to the Father, again to reign with Him by equal right.” In short, the verse plainly declares the dignity of Christ’s person and office — that as he had “*come from*” God (by origination from the Father), and had had the governance of the universe committed to him, so he was going [back] to God, to resume the glory he had had with the Father from all eternity. See viii. 42. and Note.

4. τίθησι] “lays aside.” So *ponere* in Latin. By ἱμάτια is meant either the upper garment, the *pallium* (plural for singular, as in the corresponding Hebrew terms), or the *pallium* and *stola*. See Recens. Syn. and Note on Matth. xxiv. 18. Δέντιον is a Hellenistic word, from the Latin *linteum*, nearly synonymous with *σινδῶν*, and properly called *σάβανον*, a *towel*. To be thus girded was considered by the ancients in the same light as a person’s wearing an *apron* is with us, namely, as indicating the exercise of some servile occupation.

5. βάλλει — νιπῆρα.] Βάλλει is for *ἐμβάλλει*. (or more properly *ἐγγεί*) and occurs in this sense in Exod. xxiv. 6. Τὸν νιπ. Bp. Middt. observes that the *Article* implies that there was *but one* ewer employed for the occasion. This washing which, in the times of primitive simplicity, had been performed by the host or hostess to the guest, was in after ages committed to the servants, and was therefore accounted a servile employment. Thus it is rarely mentioned. At no time had it been done by a *superior* to an *inferior*.

6 τῷ λεντίῳ ᾧ ἦν διεξωσμένος. Ἐρχεται οὖν πρὸς Σίμωνα Πέτρον· καὶ
 7 λέγει αὐτῷ ἐκεῖνος· Κύριε, σύ μου νίπτεις τοὺς πόδας; Ἀπεκριθῆ
 Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Ὁ ἐγὼ ποιῶ σὺ οὐκ οἶδας ἄρτι, γνώση δέ
 8 μετὰ ταῦτα. Λέγει αὐτῷ Πέτρος· Οὐ μὴ νίψῃς τοὺς πόδας μου εἰς
 τὸν αἰῶνα. Ἀπεκριθῆ αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Ἐὰν μὴ νίψω σε, οὐκ ἔχεις
 9 μέρος μετ' ἐμοῦ. Λέγει αὐτῷ Σίμων Πέτρος· Κύριε, μὴ τοὺς πόδας
 10 μου μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν. Ἄγει αὐτῷ ὁ ^u Infra 15. 3.
 Ἰησοῦς· Ὁ λελουμένος οὐ χρεῖαν ἔχει ἢ τοὺς πόδας νίμωσθαι, ἀλλ'
 11 ἔστι καθαρός ὅλος. Καὶ ὑμεῖς καθαροὶ ἐστε· ἀλλ' οὐχὶ πάντες. ἤδει
 γὰρ τὸν παραδιδόντι αὐτόν· διὰ τοῦτο εἶπεν· Οὐχὶ πάντες καθαροὶ
 ἐστε.
 12 Ὅτε οὖν ἔνιψε τοὺς πόδας αὐτῶν, καὶ ἔλαβε τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ, ἀνα-
 13 πεσὼν πάλιν, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Γινώσκειτε τί πεποίηκα ὑμῖν; ^x Ἔμεῖς ^x Matt. 23. 8,
 φωνεῖτέ με· Ὁ διδάσκαλος, καὶ ὁ Κύριος· καὶ καλῶς λέγετε· εἰμὶ ¹ Cor. 8. 6.
 14 γὰρ. Ἐὶ οὖν ἐγὼ ἔνιψα ὑμῶν τοὺς πόδας, ὁ Κύριος καὶ ὁ διδάσκα-
 15 λος, καὶ ὑμεῖς ὀφείλετε ἀλλήλων νίπτειν τοὺς πόδας. Ἐπόδειγμα γὰρ
 16 ἔδωκα ὑμῖν, ἵνα καθὼς ἐγὼ ἐποίησα ὑμῖν, καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιῆτε. ^y Ἀμήν ^y Infra 15. 20,
 ἀμήν λέγω ὑμῖν· οὐκ ἔστι δούλος μετῴνων τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ, οὐδὲ ἀπό- ¹ Matt. 10. 24,
¹ Luke 6. 40.

6. σύ μου—πόδας.] This sort of interrogation involves a strong negation, and the σὺ and νίπτ. are emphatic.

7. ὃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ, &c.] A popular mode of expression for, "The meaning of what I am doing," &c. Μετὰ ταῦτα is often used, as here, of a very short period hence; and then is better rendered afterwards: here it means, "after I have done what I am doing." Our Lord shows the reason at v. 12—17; namely, to set them an example of humility, condescension, and Christian forbearance.

8. εἰάν μὴ νίψω σε need not be supposed (with Kuhn. and others) to mean, "unless thou sufferest me to wash thee." The phrase seems to be so worded, to make the thing appear a *privilege* to be conferred by Christ. There is an allusion to the *spiritual* washing away of sin by the blood of Christ. Ἐχειν μέρος μετὰ τινος is a common phrase denoting conjunction, friendship, and (from the adjunct) communion of benefits.

10. ὁ λελουμένος—ὅλος.] The best Commentators are agreed, that λελ. denotes the washing of the whole body in a bath, as opposed to *νίπτεσθαι*, which is used of *washing* part of the body. See Acts ix. 37. compared with Homer, *Iliad* ω. 532. A guest who had gone through the *former*, needed only, on arrival at the house of his host, to have his *feet* washed; which, as the Jews wore no sandals, might be soiled by the way; or, in a hot climate, would need washing after the perspiration occasioned by walking. To offer this was a mark of civility and attention. Thus the sense is: "As he who has bathed has no need of washing himself, except his feet, but is then quite pure, [so] ye need no other washing." H is for ἀλλ' ἢ, which is of rare occurrence.

—καὶ ὑμεῖς—πάντες.] From the mention of external and ceremonial cleansing, Christ takes occasion to advert to *internal* and *moral* purity; i. e. from evil thoughts and actions; both by way of admonition to the disciples, and to smite the

conscience of Judas. The καὶ, as at ver. 14, may be rendered "and [thus]."

12—17. Here our Lord shows the *intent* of the action he had been performing, admonishing them of the duty it was meant to suggest.

12. τί πεποίηκα ὑμῖν] "the intent of what I have done to you."

13. φωνεῖτέ με· ὁ δὲ δ. ὁ δ.δ. is not (as Campb. supposes) the *nominal*. for the accus., but rather for the *vocative*, as at Mark v. 41. and elsewhere. See Winer's *Gr.* § 22, 3. Indeed, here it forms part of the form of address, there being an ellipsis of *λέγοντες*. How frequent, nay perpetual was this mode of address, is proved by the citations adduced from the Rabbinical writers by Schoettgen; which indeed shew that the *proper* name of the Rabbins was almost dropped. Thus in *Sanhedrim*, fol. 100, l. we read, "It is Epicureism (or impiety) if any one shall call a Rabbi by his proper name."

14. ὑμεῖς—πόδας.] These words are not to be taken, nor were understood, in the *literal* sense; for neither the Apostles nor the primitive Christians had any such customs. Our Lord here intended an admonition (as Tittm. has shewn at large, see *Rec. Syn.*) most seasonable to the disciples (in whose bosoms ambition, pride, and other worldly passions had begun to manifest themselves), and, in order to impress it still more on their minds, was pleased to employ a *symbolical* action; a mode of teaching often resorted to by the prophets of the O. T. and by our Lord. By "washing one another's feet," however, he did not mean that they should do this *actually* and according to the *letter*, but that they should behave towards each other with the same *spirit* as that characterized by this symbol of humility and condescension, having a mind weaned from pride, ambition, vain-glory, and ever ready to shew mutual forbearance, condescension, and kindness.

16. ἀπόστολος] for ὁ ἀποσταλμένος, like the Heb.

στολος μείζων τοῦ πέμφαντος αὐτόν. Ἐὶ ταῦτα οἴδατε, μακάριοι ἐστε 17
 ἐὰν ποιῆτε αὐτά. Οὐ περὶ πάντων ὑμῶν λέγω· ἐγὼ οἶδα οὓς ἐξελε- 18
 z Psal. 41. 9. ξάμην· ἀλλ' ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῆ, "Ὁ τρώγων μετ' ἐμοῦ
 τὸν ἄρτον ἐπήρην ἐπ' ἐμέ τὴν πτέρυναν αὐτοῦ. Ἀπ' ἄρτι 19
 λέγω ὑμῖν πρὸ τοῦ γενέσθαι, ἵνα ὅταν γένηται, πιστεύσητε ὅτι ἐγὼ
 a Matt. 10. 40. εἰμι. "ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν· Ὁ λαμβάνων ἐὰν τινα πέμφω ἐμὲ 20
 λαμβάνει· ὁ δὲ ἐμὲ λαμβάνων λαμβάνει τὸν πέμφαντά με.
 b Matt. 26. 21.
 Mark 14. 18.
 Luke 22. 21. "Ταῦτα εἰπὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐταράχθη τῷ πνεύματι, καὶ ἐμαρτύρησε καὶ 21
 εἶπεν· Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι εἷς ἐξ ὑμῶν παραδώσει με. Ἔβλε- 22
 c Infrn. 21. 20. πον οὖν εἰς ἀλλήλους οἱ μαθηταί, ἀπορούμενοι περὶ τίνας λέγει. "Ἦν 23
 δὲ ἀνακείμενος εἷς τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ὃν
 ἠγάπα ὁ Ἰησοῦς. Νέει οὖν τούτῳ Σίμων Πέτρος πυθέσθαι τίς ἂν 24
 εἴη περὶ οὗ λέγει. Ἐπιτεσῶν δὲ ἐκείνος ἐπὶ τὸ στήθος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, 25
 λέγει αὐτῷ· Κύριε, τίς ἐστιν; Ἀποκρίνεται ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Ἐκεῖνός 26
 ἐστιν ὃς ἐγὼ βίβιας τὸ ψωμίον ἐτιδώσω. καὶ ἐμβάψας τὸ ψωμίον, δι-

γῆψ. A similar maxim is cited from the Rabbinical writers.

17. *ei taũta — autá.* The *ei may*, with Kuin. and others, be rendered *siquidem, since*, as at ver. 14. *ei — ἕνεκα*, &c. Acts xi. 17. xvi. 15. xviii. 15. Rom. viii. 31. and elsewhere. See Herm. on Vig. § 312. Matth. Gr. § 508. Buttm. Gr. p. 240. 2. But it may be doubted whether they did really know the truths they had been told; and an *opinion* of knowledge is a frequent cause of ignorance: *οἴησις προκοπῆς ἔγκοπῆ*, said the Philosopher. Moreover, as that signification is not to be resorted to unnecessarily, and where it materially alters the sense, so here it is better to retain the ordinary one; and suppose that our Lord here slightly alludes to that self-opinion. q. d. Ye may say that ye know all this very well. If, then, ye do know these things, happy are ye if ye *put them in practice*; for, as Lampe remarks, "knowledge must precede holiness; but it is not of itself sufficient. The *practice* must be added. These two things are inseparably connected: knowledge is the rule of practice, and practice the scope and purpose of knowledge."

18. *οὐ περὶ — λέγω*] meaning "Of all of you I cannot affirm that ye will be happy in the practice of this precept."

— *οἶδα οὓς ἐξελέξαμην.*] The sense is, "I know the [dispositions of the] persons whom I have chosen [as Apostles]." So xv. 16. *ὅς ἐξελέξαμην ἡρᾶς καὶ ἔσηκα ὑμᾶς.* At *ἀλλ' ἵνα*, &c. sub. *τοῦτο γίνεται*, or the like. The *ἵνα* has the *eventual* force. Render, "But [such is the case with you] that the words of Scripture are fulfilled:" what was literally meant for Abithophel being typically intended for, and fulfilled in, Judas.

— *ὁ τρώγων — αὐτοῦ.*] Ὁ τρ. denotes a familiar friend; the communion of domestic hospitality having in every age been accounted an inviolable pledge of friendship. See Eurip. Hec. 793. Quint. Curt. vii. 4. Ἐπήρην, &c. The general sense is, "a has turned against me, to overthrow me." A metaphor taken, according to some, from *wrestling*; according to others, from *kick- ing* animals, which suddenly and treacherously kick at and injure their feeders. This is confirmed by a similar passage at Jerem. ix. 4. πᾶς ἀδελ-

φὸς πτέρην πτερειεῖ (scil. ἀδελφὸν) καὶ πᾶς φίλος δολίως πορεύεται.

19. *ἀπ' ἄρτι λέγω — πιστεύητε*, &c.] "I tell you this now before it has happened, that when it has taken place, ye may be confirmed in your faith that I am He [whom I professed to be, the Messiah]." There is the same omission at viii. 24. and elsewhere; in which, and many other similar cases, we recognize what we should call *genuine modesty* in a distinguished *human being*; though, in speaking of our Lord, the language even of commendation should be checked by reverential awe. Πιστ. is taken as at ii. 11. and elsewhere; in which an *intension* of the sense denoted by the verb seems meant. Our Lord's purpose was not only to confirm their faith, but calm their perturbation at the perfidy soon to be disclosed, since his words allude to only *one* traitor, as indeed he soon afterwards intimates in express terms.

20. So Matt. x. 40. where see Note. The connexion here is variously traced. The scope of the words seems to be, to fortify them under the tribulations they should endure in the course of their Apostolic office, by the remembrance, that as they sustained the character of *representatives* of their Lord, they should not be troubled at having to suffer, as He had, from the treachery, cowardice, stupidity, and perverseness of those whom they taught.

21. *ἐμαρτύρησε καὶ εἶπεν.*] For *ἐμαρτ. εἰπὼν*. *Μαρτυρεῖν* denotes open declaration, in contradistinction to the indirect allusion at v. 20.

22. *ἔβλεπον εἰς ἀλλ.*] This well depicts their *anxiety*, as *ἀπορούμενοι* their *perplexity* what to think or whom to suspect. See Gen. xlii. 1. and Hom. II. ω. 430.

24. *νέει.*] See Note on Luke i. 22.

25. *ἐπιτεσῶν*] "leaning upon." Enthym., however, thinks John did not alter his posture, but merely turned his head. That the question was put in a low voice, and answered in the same tone, is plain from vv. 28, 29.

26. *ψωμίον.*] This is ill rendered *sop*; and not well translated *morsel*, though that signification is sometimes found. As derived from *ψάω*, it signifies, (like the Heb. פָּרַק from פָּרַק to *break*) a

27 δωσιν Ἰούδα Σίμωνος Ἰσακαριώτη. Καὶ μετὰ τὸ ψομίον τότε εἰσηλ-
 28 θεν εἰς ἐκείνον ὁ Σατανᾶς. λέγει οὖν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Ὁ ποιεῖς,
 29 ποιήσον τάχιον. Τοῦτο δὲ οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τῶν ἀνακειμένων πρὸς τί ἔπιν
 30 αὐτῷ. ^d τινὲς γὰρ ἐδόκουν, ἐπεὶ τὸ γλωσσόκομον εἶχεν ὁ Ἰούδας, ὅτι ^d Supra 12. 6.
 λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Ἀγόρασον ὧν χρεῖαν ἔχομεν εἰς τὴν ἐορτήν· ἢ
 31 τοῖς πτωχοῖς ἵνα τί δῶ. Λαβὼν οὖν τὸ ψομίον ἐκείνος, εὐθὺς ἐξῆλ-
 32 θεν· ἦν δὲ νύξ. Ὅτε [οὖν] ἐξῆλθε, λέγει ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Νῦν ἐδοξάσθη
 33 ὁ Πῶς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, καὶ ὁ Θεὸς ἐδοξάσθη ἐν αὐτῷ. ^e Supra 7. 34.
 Ἐδὸξάσθη ἐν αὐτῷ, καὶ ὁ Θεὸς δοξάσει αὐτὸν ἐν ἑαυτῷ, καὶ εὐθὺς ^e 8. 21.
 34 δοξάσει αὐτόν. ^f Infra 15. 12.
 Τεκνία, ἔτι μικρὸν μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι. ζητήσετέ με, καὶ ^f Lev. 19. 18.
 καθὼς εἶπον τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις· Ὅτι ὅπου ὑπάγω ἐγὼ, ὑμεῖς οὐ δύνασθε ^g Matt. 22. 39.
 34 εἶλθῆν· καὶ ὑμῖν λέγω ἄρτι. ^g Gal. 6. 2.
 Ἐντολήν καινὴν δίδομι ὑμῖν, ἵνα ἀγα- ^h James 2. 8.
ⁱ 1 Pet. 1. 22.
^j 1 John 3. 11.
^k & 4. 15, 21.

bit or piece of anything. And here probably it denotes a piece of the paschal lamb dipped in the sauce. Such portions were usually distributed by the master. There is no real discrepancy in the statements of the Evangelists. Jesus, it seems, was thus engaged, when John, putting the above question to him, he either helped Judas first, or, in serving out the portions, had come to him in his turn. Judas, then, (perhaps sitting near Jesus, and having heard John's interrogation, or, with the suspicion natural to guilt, supposing that they were speaking of *him*), after receiving the portion, asks in a low voice, Is it I, master? To whom Jesus answers, *σὺ εἶπας, it is thou.* (See Matt. xxvi. 25.) Then in a loud voice he adds *ἃ ποιεῖς ποιήσον τάχιον*, "what thou art to do, do very quickly." Where the Present *ποιεῖς* is for the Future sense, the Imperative is, as Chrys. remarks, *permissive*.

31. ὅτε [οὖν] ἐξῆλθε.] The MSS., Versions, and Edd., vary as to the reading, and still more the position of these words; which are in some copies connected with what precedes, in others with what follows. The Ed. Princ. and Stephen, 1, 2, join them with the following, placing a period after *νύξ*: the Erasmusian and Stephen's 3d Ed. connect them with the preceding. But the old position was recalled by Beza and the Elzevir Editor; and was thus introduced into the *textus receptus*. Of later Editors, Wets., Matthæi, Knapp, and Vat., join them with the preceding; Griesb., Tittm., and Scholz, with the following. The determination of this question much depends upon its being decided whether the *οὖν* should be adopted or rejected. It is found in most of the MSS. (many of them very ancient) in several of the later Versions, and some Fathers; but is not found in very many MSS., (some equally ancient), and the earlier and principal Versions; and is rejected by Wets., Matth., Griesb., and Scholz. The point admits not of any certain determination. It might have been thrown out by those who, joining the words with the preceding, thought the *οὖν* worse than useless: or it might have been inserted by those who, connecting the words with what follows, thought that a particle of *continuation* was wanting. And this seems more probable, and better accounts for the variation of opinion as to the construction of the words. Whether *ὅτε* — *ἐξῆλθε* should be taken with the preceding, or the following, is a matter on which we cannot positively pronounce. I agree, however, rather with those who adopt the latter course; by

which we gain a better sense; for it surely could not be the intention of the Evangelist to make an insignificant circumstance so very prominent. And if the other mode of position be adopted, there is a great harshness in the next verse beginning so abruptly. This, too, is directly opposed to the great body of the MSS., which have *οὖν*; for thus the *οὖν* could not be retained. At *ἦν νύξ* the words *ὅτε ἐξῆλθε* may very well be supplied from the preceding context; and it is expressed in Cyril; and we have something equivalent to it in Nonnus.

On the departure of Judas our Lord delivered those most interesting *last discourses* with his disciples, by which he intended to infix in their minds truths, which, ignorant as they were, and labouring under heavy affliction, they could not, indeed, at that time, fully comprehend, but which they would afterwards understand; and by which, even now, they would be fortified against their impending trials and afflictions. (Tittm.) In *ἐδοξάσθη* we have the *Prophetic Preterite*, used of what is shortly to happen, to express certainty. See John xi. 23. xv. 6. xvi. 33. and Notes. On this *glory*, both as it regarded our Lord and the Father, see Wets. and Tittm. in Recens. Synop.

32. δοξάσει αὐτόν ἐν ἑαυτῷ.] It is not easy to say whether ἐν ἑαυτῷ should be referred to God or to Christ. Rosenm. and others avoid the difficulty in their explanation; while Kun. and others attempt to get rid of it by supposing the words *redundant*! The question is ably discussed by Lampe as follows: "If it be referred to God, God glorifies Christ in himself because *by himself*, by his own divine glory. (see Rom. vi. 4.), his perfections all shining in the Son — because he will himself be glorified by the glorification of the Son — because he glorifies his Son with himself, giving him a communion and equality of glory, &c. If to the Son, he is glorified in himself, because the glory, though given by the Father, is his own, and because by the glorification, he possesses an eternal fount, from which the glory of all the elect to the end of the world will be derived."

33. τεκνία.] This appellation was employed in ancient times by masters to their servants; and generally by superiors to inferiors; especially by teachers to their pupils. It is expressive of affection, and may, in several passages of I John be rendered, Dear children.

— οὐ δύνασθε εἶλθῆν] i. e. not now, but, as is added further on at xiv. 3., hereafter.

πάντε ἀλλήλους· καθὼς ἠγάπησα ὑμᾶς, ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους. Ἐν τούτῳ γνώσονται πάντες ὅτι ἐμοὶ μαθηταὶ ἐστέ, ἐὰν ἀγά- 36
 ἰν ^g *Infra* 21. 19. πην ἔχητε ἐν ἀλλήλοις. Ἐλέγει αὐτῷ Σίμων Πέτρος· Κύριε, ποῦ 36
 ὑπάγεις; Ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Ὅπου ὑπάγω, οὐ δύνασαι μοι
 νῦν ἀκολουθῆσαι· ὕστερον δὲ ἀκολουθήσεις μοι. Λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Πέ- 37
 τρος· Κύριε, διὰ τί οὐ δύναμαι σοι ἀκολουθῆσαι ἄρτι; τὴν ψυχὴν 38
 μου ὑπὲρ σοῦ θήσω. Ἐπεκρίθη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Τὴν ψυχὴν σου 38
 ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ θήσεις; ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, οὐ μὴ ἀλέκτωρ φωνήσει
 ἕως οὗ ἀπαρνήσῃ με τρίς.

^b Matt. 26. 31.
^c Mark 14. 30.
^d Luke 22. 34.

XIV. Μὴ ταρασσέσθω ὑμῶν ἡ καρδιά· πιστεύετε εἰς τὸν Θεόν, 1
 καὶ εἰς ἐμὲ πιστεύετε. Ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ τοῦ Πατρὸς μου μοναὶ πολλαὶ 2
 εἰσιν· εἰ δὲ μὴ, εἶπον ἂν ὑμῖν· πορεύομαι ἑτοιμάσοι τόπον ὑμῖν.

34. ἐντολὴν—ἀλλήλους.] There have been some needless difficulties raised on the sense of these words, and that by pressing too much on the sense of *καὶ*. In removing these, some of the best Commentators (as Lampe, Kuin., and Knapp) make some rather sophistical distinctions, and especially by laying an undue stress on *καθὼς*. It must, I think, be granted that these words are not to be regarded as a *general precept* of mutual love, though such precepts abound in the N. T. See Eph. v. 2. 1 Thess. iv. 9. James ii. 8. 1 John ii. 8—11. iii. 23. It was very necessary to be then enjoined to the Apostles, as the best alleviation of the trials and tribulations they would have to undergo. Nay, the very Mosaic rule itself (Lev. xix. 18.) was not *universal*, but *particular*, and confined to their countrymen. The injunction here given to the Apostles was, though not absolutely new, yet new to *them*, if we consider the sentiments, opinions, and practice of the age. In their contests for pre-eminence, and selfish preference for themselves, in their worldly, proud and envious spirit, they had forgotten the precept of mutual love. Hence our Lord had before enjoined on them the opposite virtues by an affecting *symbolical action*; and now he enforces one of the most important of these duties by the *present injunction*, which might, Tittm. observes, be called new, if we consider the *standard* to which the duty was raised, *καθὼς ἠγάπησα ὑμᾶς*. “They were (Tittm. remarks) to show as sincere and unfeigned an affection to each other, as fellow labourers in the Gospel, as he had done to them; and by no means to suffer this holy society to be torn asunder by hatred, variance, envy, strife, &c.; but rather to preserve it by mutual concord, and being united in the bonds of sincere affection.” It was also so far *new*, as being enforced by new motives, to be performed in a new manner, and made a peculiar characteristic of the Christian Religion, as is suggested in the words *ἐν τούτῳ γνώσονται*, &c., and which was so observed by the first Christians, that the Heathens used to say, “See how these Christians love one another!”

XIV. Now follow two discourses of Christ: one held at the Eucharistical table, the other on going out of the city. The former is contained in ch. xiv., the latter in ch. xv., xvi.; and may be distributed into three heads:—I. *Consolation* for the impending affliction, vv. 1—5. II. *Exhortation* to faith in Christ, vv. 5—15. III. A *promise* of the Holy Spirit, vv. 16—fin. (Schottg.) The

whole relates primarily to the Apostles only. But it was, no doubt, meant to apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to their successors, all future Teachers of the Gospel.

1. μὴ ταρασσέσθω ὑμῶν ἡ κ., &c.] “Be not troubled in mind at what I have said of my *departure*: only trust in God and in me.” The first *πιστεύετε* admits of being taken either in the *Indicative* or in the *Imperative*. See Note supra, ver. 39. The former is adopted in the Vulg. and by the earlier modern Commentators; the latter, by many ancient Fathers, the Pesch. Syr. Version, and almost all the modern Commentators from Whitty to Tittm. From the connection of the words, we can scarcely suppose the same word used first in the Indicative, and then in the Imperative, *in the same sentence*. Nothing but a necessity, resulting from the impossibility of otherwise attaining a good sense, could authorize this. We are therefore bound to suppose the Imper. to be meant in the first as well as the second *πιστ.*; especially as it yields a sense not only good in itself, but apposite, and agreeable to the analogy of Scripture.

2. ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ—εἰσιν.] This seems meant to wean them from ambition, and console them under present affliction, by a representation of the ample felicity he is going to prepare for them. By *ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ τοῦ Πατρὸς μου* is expressed *κατ’ ἀθροιστάειαν, Heaven*. In the *μοναὶ* πολλαὶ some suppose an allusion to the numerous chambers in the House of his Father on earth, the *Temple*; and others to the custom of Eastern monarchs, of assigning to their courtiers habitations within the precincts of their vast palaces, while others think we may hence infer that there are various degrees of reward in heaven proportioned to men’s progress in faith and holiness. But this is very precarious. All that we can with certainty pronounce meant by our Lord is, to console them under affliction, by a view of the glory and boundless felicity in reserve for the faithful servants of God and Christ. The words imply a *participation* in those mansions of bliss which our Lord was going to occupy, and to which he would lead the way to all his disciples. Tittm., too, thinks that by *πολλαὶ* our Lord also meant to intimate that heaven is a *most ample space*, sufficient for the reception of vast numbers, nay, as far as concerns the will of the Father, *all men*. And so also Dr. Burton understands.

—εἰ δὲ μὴ, εἶπον ἂν ὑμῖν.] “If it had not been

3ⁱ Καὶ ἐὰν πορευθῶ καὶ ἐτοιμάσω ὑμῖν τόπον, πάλιν ἔρχομαι καὶ παρα-ⁱλήψομαι ὑμᾶς πρὸς ἐμαυτὸν· ἵνα ὅπου ἐγὼ καὶ ὑμεῖς ἦτε. ⁱ Infra ver. 13. supra 12. 25.

4 Καὶ ὅπου ἐγὼ ὑπάγω οἴδατε, καὶ τὴν ὁδὸν οἴδατε. Λέγει αὐτῷ

5 Θωμᾶς· Κύριε, οὐκ οἶδαμεν ποῦ ὑπάγεις· καὶ πῶς δυνάμεθα τὴν

6 ὁδὸν εἶδέναι; Λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Ὑγὼ εἰμι ἡ ὁδὸς, καὶ ἡ ἀλη-
θεια, καὶ ἡ ζωὴ· οὐδεὶς ἔρχεται πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα, εἰ μὴ δι' ἐμοῦ.

7 Εἰ ἐγνώκετέ με, καὶ τὸν Πατέρα μου ἐγνώκετε ἄν· καὶ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ

8 γινώσκετε αὐτὸν, καὶ ἐώρακατε αὐτόν. Λέγει αὐτῷ Φίλιππος· Κύριε,

9 δεῖξον ἡμῖν τὸν Πατέρα, καὶ ἀρκεῖ ἡμῖν. ^k Λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ^k Supra 12. 45. infra ver. 30. & 17. 21. & 17. 21, 23.

Τοσοῦτον χρόνον μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι, καὶ οὐκ ἔγνωκάς με, Φίλιππε; ὁ
ἐώρακώς ἐμὲ ἐώρακε τὸν Πατέρα· καὶ πῶς σὺ λέγεις· Δεῖξον ἡμῖν

so, I would have told you so, and not deceived you with vain hopes."

—*παρέσομαι*, &c.] These words contain (as Tittm. observes) a sentence of particular application, in confirmation of the foregoing general one. "Nay, I go to prepare a place for you there;" namely, by virtue of his sacrifice and intercession; a similitude taken from one who goes before another to some unknown country, to prepare for his reception.

3. ἐὶν πορευθῶ καὶ ἐτοιμάσω.] The best Commentators are agreed that the sense is, "When I shall have gone, and shall have prepared a place;" and that πάλιν ἔρχομαι (I am to come back) is for πάλιν ἐλεύσομαι. They differ, however, on whether this coming of our Lord is to be understood of the day of judgment (see vv. 13, 23. xii. 26. Acts i. 11. 1 Thess. iv. 17.), or of the day of each man's death. The former interpretation is maintained by most ancient and earlier moderns; the latter by the generality of the recent Commentators. The words are, indeed, a continuation of the foregoing similitude, and derived from the custom of persons, who have gone forward to prepare a residence for their friends, returning to fetch and accompany them thither. But if the latter interpretation be adopted, the words would seem a mere accommodation, with little meaning. And even were we to grant (what has never yet been proved) that at death the righteous are immediately received up into heaven, yet the maintainers of that doctrine do not assert that Christ comes to fetch them. The common interpretation, then, is greatly preferable; and it is placed beyond doubt by 1 Thess. iv. 16, where the language of the Apostle is the best comment on that of his Lord: ὅτι αὐτὸς ὁ Κύριος ἐν κελύφατι, ἐν φωνῇ ἀρχαγγέλου, καὶ ἐν σάλπιγγι Θεοῦ καταβήσεται ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ, καὶ οἱ νεκροὶ ἐν Χριστῷ ἀναστήσονται πρῶτον· εἴπειτα ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες, οἱ περιλειπόμενοι, ἅμα σὺν αὐτοῖς ἀπαγαγόμεθα ἐν νεφέλαις εἰς ἀπάντησιν τοῦ Κυρίου εἰς αἼερα· καὶ οὕτω πάντοτε σὺν Κυρίῳ ἔσμεθα. The purpose of both passages is the same, namely, the consolation of the persons addressed.

4. The general purport of the ver. may be thus expressed (with Dr. Burton): "Thus ye know that heaven is the place whither I am going; and all my former teaching was suited to shew you the way thither."

—τὴν ὁδὸν] i. e. the means whereby ye may arrive thither, namely, by faith in Christ. Since, however, the disciples did not thoroughly comprehend his meaning (confounding the terms with notions of an earthly kingdom, and never of the death of the Messiah), he makes it clearer at

ver. 6; at the same time using a certain boldness of metaphor, in order to impress it in a more lively manner.

6. Ἑγὼ εἰμι ἡ ὁδὸς, &c.] Ὀδὸς is for ὁδοποιός, or δὸηγός. The other terms ἡ ἀλήθεια and ἡ ζωὴ, are by the best Commentators supposed to be put, by Hebraism, for the adjectives ἀληθινή and ζωοποιός. See x. 7. compared with ver. 9. xi. 25. But it is rather a more energetic mode of expression, q. d. I am the way, the true way [to life], the author of life and happiness; the third term being exegetical of the two former. The words following are exegetical of the preceding clause, and by the coming of the Father is denoted introduction to the heavenly mansions just before mentioned, alone to be obtained by faith and obedience, through the one true Guide to life and happiness, and by his propitiation.

7—10. In these vv. it is affirmed that he who has seen and heard Christ has, in some way and some sense, seen and heard the Father; which implies an essential union of Father and Son. So intimate is this union, that Christ says, εἰ ἐγνώκετε, &c. Now by the knowing Christ is denoted the knowledge of his attributes, his infinite wisdom, benevolence, mercy, &c. which, if they be fully known, will be found the same as those of the Father. This implies that mysterious union of the Father and the Son, which makes the will of the latter essentially the will of the former.

—καὶ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ—αὐτόν.] The best Commentators are agreed that the Present is here (as often) used of what is very shortly to be; and that in order to suggest its speedy occurrence. We may therefore render: "Ye will a short time hence know, and, as it were, see him," meaning after Christ's death, and at the sending of the Holy Spirit, to guide them into all truth; or, retaining the usual force of the tenses, the sense may be, "Yea, a short time hence [ye may say that] ye know Him, nay have seen Him;" namely, because ye have known and seen me, who am one with Him. This I find confirmed by the learned C. G. G. Thiele in his Notitia Comm. in N. T. p. 7, where, after Luick, he assigns as the full sense (though imperfectly developed) "Nondum intellexistis, verum] abhinc intelligitis atque vidistis jam;" i. e. intelligetis, quippe jam auspiciati; [atque ita intelligendi facultatem nacti.]

8. δεῖξον ἡμῖν τὸν Πατέρα.] This inquiry seems founded on Philip's erroneously taking ἐώρακατε in the literal sense.

9. οὐκ ἔγνωκάς με] i. e. known who I am, and my true character.

—ὁ ἐώρακώς—Πατέρα] "He who hath seen me

τὸν Πατέρα; Οὐ πιστεύεις ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ, καὶ ὁ Πατὴρ ἐν 10
 ἐμοὶ [ἔστι]; Τὰ ῥήματα ἃ ἐγὼ λαλῶ ὑμῖν ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ οὐ λαλῶ.
 ὁ δὲ Πατὴρ ὁ ἐν ἐμοὶ μένων, αὐτὸς ποιεῖ τὰ ἔργα. Πιστεύετε μοι 11
 ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ, καὶ ὁ Πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί· εἰ δὲ μὴ, διὰ τὰ ἔργα
 αὐτὰ πιστεύετε μοι. Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν· ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ, τὰ 12
 ἔργα ἃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ κάκεινος ποιήσει, καὶ μεῖζονα τούτων ποιήσει· ὅτι
 ἐγὼ πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα μου πορεύομαι·¹ καὶ ὁ τι ἂν αἰτήσητε ἐν τῷ 13
 ὀνόματι μου, τοῦτο ποιήσω· ἵνα δοξασθῇ ὁ Πατὴρ ἐν τῷ Υἱῷ. Ἐάν 14
 τι αἰτήσητε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι μου, ἐγὼ ποιήσω.

Ἐάν ἀγαπήτε με, τὰς ἐντολὰς τὰς ἐμὰς τηρήσατε. καὶ ἐγὼ ἐρωτήσω 15
 τὸν Πατέρα, καὶ ἄλλον Παράκλητον δώσει ὑμῖν, ἵνα μένη μεθ' ὑμῶν 16

1 Infra 15. 16.
 & 16. 23, 24.
 Matt. 7. 7.
 Mark 11. 24.

bath [in effect] seen the Father." The Apostles had seen the sanctity of his life, his contempt of earthly riches and honours, his submission to the lowest state of poverty and misery, his sole desire to promote the salvation of souls. They had, moreover, seen his *majesty*, "the majesty of the only begotten of the Father" (see i. 14.) nay, were shortly to see him *die for the human race*. But in all this, they had, in fact, heard and seen the *Father*, i. e. the image, decrees, counsels, and works of the Father respecting the salvation of men. He who saw Jesus living, acting, and dying, saw, in fact, the *Father*, i. e. the image of the Father, and the *effigies* of the Divine nature. There was, therefore, no need that our Lord should then show them the Father, and more fully expound his counsels and decrees. They might *already* have sufficiently known them from the words and actions of their Lord, and would shortly know and comprehend them *more fully* by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. (Tittm.)

10. ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ] scil. *εἰμι*. The phrase *εἶναι ἐν τινι* imports *intimate connection and conjunction with*, the nature of which must vary with the subject and the context. Tittm. shows that here (as also at x. 33.) *community of work and power* is meant, including also *parity of feelings and counsels*.

—τὰ ῥήματα—οὐ λαλῶ.] These words, and the following, ὁ δὲ Πατὴρ—τὰ ἔργα, are an *illustration* of the *community* just mentioned, as applied both to *words* and to *works*. In the latter clause all will be regular, if we supply, as corresponding to τὰ ῥήματα—λαλῶ, the words τὰ ἔργα ἃ ποιῶ ἐν ὑμῖν ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ οὐ ποιῶ. There is a plain *reference* to this omitted clause in the introductory *δέ*. Here Tittm. draws the following inference: "But since a conjunction not only in respect of *counsel and will*, but in respect of one and the same *energy and power*, subsists between the Father and the Son, it may hence, with certainty, be inferred that there is also between them a *communion of one and the same nature*; and when our Lord affirms, that 'the Father abideth in him,' he has indicated a *perpetuity of mutual conjunction*, and testifies that it is impossible he should ever do any thing contrary to the mind, counsel, and wishes of the Father."

11. πιστεύετε, &c.] Here Christ not only repeats the foregoing assertion, but enjoins them to repose faith in it; telling them (as a *popular* proof of His conjunction with the Father) that His works (i. e. miracles) argue *community of mind, energy, and power*.

12. ὁ πιστεύων—ποιήσει.] It is evident that this promise appertained solely to the *Apostles*. By τὰ ἔργα ἃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ, Tittm. observes, is meant that *part* of Christ's work which he at xvii. 4. calls the *work committed to him by the Father*, namely, in promulgating the Father's plan of salvation though the Son, in confirming it by miracles, in collecting a community of those who should embrace the plan of salvation, &c. &c. By the *greater* works here mentioned we are to understand not greater *per se*; for, as far as regards the miracles worked by the Apostles, none were *more illustrious* than those performed by our Lord, but only in a *certain degree*, partly as regarded their *office* and *ministry* (which is alone the subject of these words), and partly in respect to the *effects* of those miracles. See more in Tittm. and Whitby.

—ὅτι ἐγὼ—πορεύομαι.] In these words the difficulty is to determine the reference. They seem to have so little bearing on the preceding words, that many Commentators connect them with the following καὶ ὅτι ἐν αἰρ.; and they render, "because I go to my Father, whatsoever," &c. This, however, is overlooking the *καὶ*; and in *because* we have a not very apposite sense. I would render, "For I am going to my Father, and [accordingly] whatsoever ye ask," &c. This is confirmed by *facts*; for after our Lord's death, resurrection, and ascension, he sent the Holy Spirit both to guide them into all truth, and to enable them to work all miracles necessary to its confirmation.

13. ὅτι] i. e. whatsoever, in the furtherance of the work committed to you, which indeed is implied in ἐν τῷ ὄν. Compare this verse with xv. 16. xvi. 23., whence it follows, (as Whitby shows), that "as both Father and Son equally hear and grant the petitions offered up in the name of Christ, both equally possess omniscience and omnipotence." Ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι, "in my cause," "for the furtherance of my cause." Ἐν τῷ ὄντι, "by and through the Son."

16. ἄλλον Παράκλητον, δώσει ὑμῖν.] For their further encouragement, Christ subjoins a *promise*; on the nature of which there has been much difference of opinion. Many of the earlier Commentators assign to παράκλητος the sense of *comforter*; others *teacher*; others, again, *helper*; and not a few, *advocate*, or *intercessor*. On due examination, it will, I apprehend, appear, that those of *comforter, teacher*, and some others which have been proposed, are *too limited* to reach the *extent* of signification evidently meant by the term, or denote the variety of the gifts imparted by the

17 εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα· τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, ὃ ὁ κόσμος οὐ δύναται λα-
 βεῖν, ὅτι οὐ θεωρεῖ αὐτὸ, οὐδὲ γινώσκει αὐτό· ὑμεῖς δὲ γινώσκετε
 18 αὐτό, ὅτι παρ' ἡμῶν μένει, καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσται. Οὐκ ἀφήσω ὑμᾶς ὄρ-
 19 φανούς· ἔρχομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς. Ἦτι μικρόν, καὶ ὁ κόσμος με οὐκ ἔτι
 20 θεωρεῖ· ὑμεῖς δὲ θεωρεῖτέ με· ὅτι ἐγὼ ζῶ, καὶ ὑμεῖς ζήσεσθε. Ἐν
 ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ γνώσεσθε ὑμεῖς ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ μου, καὶ ὑμεῖς
 21 ἐν ἐμοί, καὶ γὰρ ἐν ὑμῖν. Ὁ ἔχων τὰς ἐπιτολάς μου καὶ τηρῶν αὐτάς,
 ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν ὁ ἀγαπῶν με· ὁ δὲ ἀγαπῶν με ἀγαπηθήσεται ὑπὸ τοῦ
 Πατρὸς μου· καὶ ἐγὼ ἀγαπήσω αὐτὸν, καὶ ἐμφανίσω αὐτῷ ἐμάντον.
 22 Λέγει αὐτῷ Ἰούδας (οὐχ ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης)· Κύριε, καὶ τί γέγονεν ὅτι
 23 ἡμῖν μέλλεις ἐμφανίζεῖν σεαυτὸν, καὶ οὐχὶ τῷ κόσμῳ; Ἀπεκρίθη ὁ
 Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Ἰάν τις ἀγαπᾷ με, τὸν λόγον μου τηρήσει·

Holy Spirit. One of the two senses, *Helper* and *Intercessor*, is, I doubt not, the true one; the former of which is adopted by TITM., KUIN., and almost all recent Commentators; the latter by Bp. Pearson, Lampe, Ernesti, Pearce, Wets., and others. And this (confirmed by most of the ancient Fathers and Commentators) seems to be preferable, especially as it has the peculiar advantage of *including the former*; since, as appears from the passages of the Classical writers, adduced by Lampe, Wets., and TITM., *παράκλητος* was used not only of a person called *in to plead any one's cause*, but of *one who is a helper in any matter*, or generally a *patron*. And as both these offices are centred in the PARACLETE, so there can be little doubt that both are intended. Nay, even the sense *Comforter* may be included.

— εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.] The best Commentators are agreed, that the context here so limits the sense, that the phrase is synonymous with εἰς τέλος, “to the end of life.”

17. τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας.] This may, as the best Commentators explain, denote the *author of all truth, the very truth itself* (and the *imparter of it*), *Gospel truth*. There is, however, a reference to the *Holy Spirit as being this Paraclete*. See v. 17. 26. From this passage, compared with the following one, and xv. 26. xvi. 13. Matt. x. 20. Acts ii. 13. 33. Rom. viii. 9. Gal. iv. 6. Phil. i. 19. 1 Pet. i. 11., the *Personality and Divinity* of the Holy Ghost is manifest, as well as His *procession from the Father and the Son*.

— ὁ κόσμος.] i. e. the sensual, corrupt, and worldly-minded part of it. Οὐ δύναται λαβεῖν. i. e. cannot bring themselves to receive it; since, from exclusive attention to worldly things, they neither understand, nor care about spiritual gifts. And thus it happens, as is just afterwards said, that they have neither any perception nor any knowledge of the thing. Μένει, “is [soon] to abide.”

18. οὐκ ἀφήσω ὑμᾶς ὄρφ., &c.] These words are variously interpreted. Some refer them solely to Christ's reappearance, and society with them, after his resurrection. Others take them, in a *figurative* sense, of Christ's invisible and spiritual presence. But it is best, with TITM., to unite both interpretations. And this is supported by *facts*. “For (as TITM. observes) Christ did return *literally* to his disciples, after his resurrection, in a visible manner; and, *metaphorically*, unseen, after his ascension to heaven; when also,

as he promised, in departing to heaven (see Matt. xxviii. 20.), he was perpetually *present with them*, by the gracious aid of his omnipotent power, in the discharge of their Evangelical functions. He was always *with them*, and, in fact, gave them, when absent, greater aid than he had done when present.

19. καὶ] “and [then].” Θεωρεῖ, “is to see, will see.” Θεωρεῖτε, “ye will see me.” Ζῶ may be for ἀναζῶ, and ζήσεσθε for ἀναζή. The two terms may be taken, either in a metaphorical sense, of the *spiritual life*, or in the ordinary one of the natural. Nay, both the natural and metaphorical senses may have been intended.

20. ἐν ἐκ. τῇ ἡμέρᾳ.] i. e. when the promise of the sending of the Paraclete shall be fulfilled. Ἐγὼν ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ, &c. On this indissoluble union, see v. 7. and Note.

21. ὁ ἔχων — ἀγαπῶν με.] This is a repetition of the sentiment at v. 15. and is meant to limit the declaration in the foregoing verses to those only who evince their *love of God*, by keeping his commandments; since to such alone will he manifest himself. See also vv. 23, 24. xv. 14. 1 John ii. 5. iii. 13 — 24. Ἐγχεῖν here, and often elsewhere, denotes to *have in mind*, be *acquainted with*.

— ἐμφανίσω αὐτῷ ἐμ.] This is by some understood *literally*, of Christ's personal appearance after his resurrection. But that interpretation (as KUIN. observes) is at variance with the *explanation* of the words at v. 23. It must, therefore, be taken, with others, *metaphorically*, of an invisible and spiritual manifestation. Though as far as regards the *disciples*, both senses may be conjoined, as at v. 13.

22. Κύριε — κόσμῳ.] This question, (which, as Lampe observes, displays “*ignorance proceeding from prejudice, and conjoined with alarm*”), originated in misapprehension of our Lord's words, arising from the false notions the Apostles entertained of the Messiah's kingdom. “To this, our Lord (observes TITM.) answered *not directly*, (because they would not have comprehended him) but merely assigns a *reason* for the distinction which he would make between his disciples and the world; or turns their attention to what it *especially* behoved them to know and believe; — namely, that not *He* only, but the FATHER would be perpetually with them by His Holy Spirit, and that *then* they would understand all things necessary for them to know.”

Before τί γέγονεν I have inserted καὶ, from many

καὶ ὁ Πατήρ μου ἀγαπήσει αὐτὸν, καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐλευσόμεθα καὶ
μοιρῆν παρ' αὐτῷ ποιήσομεν. ὁ μὴ ἀγαπῶν με τοὺς λόγους μου οὐδὲ
τηρεῖ. Καὶ ὁ λόγος ὃν ἀκούετε οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸς, ἀλλὰ τοῦ πέμψαντός
με Πατρὸς.

m Luke 24, 49.
infra 15, 26.
& 16, 7.

Ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν παρ' ὑμῖν μένων. ὁ δὲ παράκλητος, τὸ 25
Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ὃ πέμψει ὁ Πατήρ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου, ἐκεῖνος 26
ὑμᾶς διδάξει πάντα, καὶ ὑπομνήσει ὑμᾶς πάντα ἃ εἶπον ὑμῖν. εἰρήνην 27
ἀφίημι ὑμῖν, εἰρήνην τὴν ἐμὴν διδωμι ὑμῖν· οὐ καθὼς ὁ κόσμος δι-
δωσιν, ἐγὼ διδωμι ὑμῖν. μὴ ταρασσέσθω ὑμῶν ἡ καρδιά, μηδὲ δειλιά-
τω. ἡκούσατε ὅτι ἐγὼ εἶπον ὑμῖν· Ὑπάγω καὶ ἔρχομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς. 28
Ἐγὼ ἡγαπαῖτέ με, ἐχάρητε ἂν ὅτι εἶπον· πορεύομαι πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα·

of the best MSS., some Versions and Fathers, and the Ed. Princ. It has been received by almost every Editor from Wets. to Scholz. There is a kindred construction at ix. 36. καὶ τίς ἐστι, Κίριε, &c., where many inferior MSS. (with the received Text) omit the καὶ. Add 2 Cor. ii. 2. καὶ τίς ἐστι, &c. This forms one branch of that *generic construction*, by which καὶ is used with particles of interrogation; when it has always an intensive force.

23. ἐλευσόμεθα καὶ μοιρῆν π. α. π.] The Commentators adduce examples of the phrase μοιρῆν ποιεῖν, which they regard as synonymous with μένειν. But it is, in fact, a more significant expression, denoting a *continued abiding*. Of course, it is to be taken in a metaphorical sense, of an invisible and spiritual presence, and (as Kuin. observes) is meant to illustrate the ἐμφανίσω αὐτῷ ἐμᾶντων at v. 21. In the O. T. God is said to *come* to men, when he promises or bestows peculiar benefits on them; also to *dwell* or remain with those whom he especially favours; as also to *leave* and *depart* from those whom he ceases to benefit.

Besides, God and Christ may be said to come by the *Holy Spirit*, whose temple (to use the words of Whitby) is the body of the Saints, (1 Cor. iii. 16; vi. 13.) and by whose indwelling they are made a habitation of God. Eph. ii. 22. *By* this Spirit the Father and Son dwell in all true Christians.

24. ὁ μὴ ἀγαπῶν—οὐ τηρεῖ.] This is, I conceive, a *resuming* of what Christ was going to say, when he was interrupted by Judas's question. It is meant to affirm the same truth *negatively*; and consequently there is *implied* the *negative* of the proposition at v. 21; i. e. he will *not* have the love of myself and the Father, the ἐμφάνεια and the other benefits resulting from thence. In the words following there must again be something supplied to *complete* the sense; which is rather *intimated* than fully expressed,—namely, “he therefore who rejects me, rejects the Father.” Οὐκ ἀλλὰ may here (as often) signify *non tam—quam*, implying no more than community of participation in commanding.

25. ταῦτα λελάληκα, &c.] The full sense is: “These instructions and consolations have I given you while present with you. At my departure the Holy Spirit will be your Teacher and Helper.”

26. ἐν τῷ ὀνόμ. μου] i. e. in my behalf, and in my place. Πάντα, i. e. all things important for you to know, respecting the counsels of God, and the work of Christ for the salvation of men. Ὑπομνήσει, i. e. will bring to mind whatever either hav-

ing been said had been forgotten, or when said, imperfectly understood and misconceived. Thus the two clauses import the communication of all necessary knowledge, and a rectification of all misconception.

27. εἰρήνην ἀφίημι—ὑμῖν.] This is *not*, I conceive (as some Commentators suppose), a *mere form of farewell*, but a solemn and affecting *re-lection* and *benediction*, as of a man about to leave his friends for ever. Τὴν ἐμὴν εἰρ. seems added in further explanation and confirmation of the εἰρήνην just before. Ἀφίημι is employed suitably to the *imagery*, and alludes to a dying man as *bequeathing*. The ἐμὴν, taken in reference to the subsequent clause, is *emphatical*; and suggests that this peace is given by Christ alone. The words of that clause are exegetical of the preceding, and suggest a comparison not between the *mode* of giving (for καθὼς has often a very lax sense) but between the *kind of gifts*; the *world* (as Gerhard observes) conferring external, empty, and transitory peace; *Christ* bestowing internal and spiritual, stable and solid peace. On the superiority of internal peace to all external advantages the ancient Philosophers often dilate.

28. Our Lord concludes with the same exhortation as that with which he had commenced this affecting address; after which, adverting to what he had said of his departure from them, he urges that their love of Him should make them rather rejoice than grieve thereat. He tells them that he is going, not to some distant region of the world (as some of the disciples fancied, xiii. 36.) but to the *Father*, to resume the majesty and glory he had before the creation of the world; and that from Him he would send to the disciples his Holy Spirit, and be their present and omnipotent aider and helper.

28. ὅτι ὁ Πατήρ—ἐστι.] On the true import of these words (which have staggered many orthodox Commentators, and have been abused by the Unitarians to impugn the doctrine of Christ's divinity) I must content myself with *referring* my readers to the invaluable annotatory matter introduced from Lampe, Zanchius, and Tittm. in Rec. Syn.; in which it is shown *in what respects*, and *in what sense*, Christ might be said to be inferior to the Father. The reader will also do well to consult sect. iv. of Bp. Bull's Defensio Fidei Nicæne; entitled, “De Subordinatione Filii ad Patrem, ut ad sui originem ac principium.” Suffice it to remark, that the very mention of the comparison *implies* the fallacy of supposing Christ to have been a *mere man*

29 οὗτοι ὁ Πατήρ μου μερίζων μου ἐστί. ° Καὶ νῦν εἶρηκα ὑμῖν πρὸν γε-^oSupra 13. 19.
νέσθαι· ἵνα ὅταν γένηται, πιστεύσητε.

30 P Οὐκ ἔτι πολλὰ λαλήσω μεθ' ὑμῶν· ἔρχεται γὰρ ὁ τοῦ κόσμου P Supra 12. 31.
infra 16. 11.

31 [τούτου] ἄρχων, καὶ ἐν ἐμοὶ οὐκ ἔχει οὐδέν. ° Ἄλλ' ἵνα γνῶ ὁ κόσμος, q Supra 10. 13.
ὅτι ἀγαπῶ τὸν Πατέρα, καὶ καθὼς ἐνετείλατό μοι ὁ Πατήρ, οὕτω ποιῶ.
ἐγήρασαδε, ἄγωμεν ἐντεῦθεν.

1 XV. ἘΓΩ εἰμι ἡ ἄμπελος ἡ ἀληθινή, καὶ ὁ Πατήρ μου ὁ γεωργός
2 ἐστί. Πᾶν κλήμι ἐν ἐμοὶ μὴ φέρον καρπὸν, αἶρει αὐτό· καὶ πᾶν τὸ
3 καρπὸν φέρον, καθαίρει αὐτό, ἵνα πλείονα καρπὸν φέρῃ. ° Ἴδὴ ὑμεῖς, r Supra 13. 10.
καθαροὶ ἐστε διὰ τὸν λόγον ὃν κηλεύηκα ὑμῖν. Μείνατε ἐν ἐμοί, καὶ γὰρ
ἐν ὑμῖν. Καθὼς τὸ κλήμι οὐ δύναται καρπὸν φέρειν ἄφ' ἑαυτοῦ, ἐὰν

29. εἶρηκα] scil. τούτο; i. e. "his departure and the sending to them of the Paraclete."

30. οὐκ ἔτι π. λαλ.] As this is suspended on the words ἔρχεται γὰρ, &c., it is plain that the sense requires not *will*, but *shall*; i. e. I shall not *have opportunity* to discourse much with you. On the ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου see Note on xii. 31. Ἐρχεται is coming upon me. The words ἐν ἐμοὶ οὐκ ἔχει οὐδέν are by the best Commentators admitted to mean, "hath no power;" "will have no effect against me," viz. in frustrating the plan of salvation. Ἐν ἐμοὶ may literally be rendered "in respect of me." These words were made good by the event.

Τούτου after κόσμου is omitted in very many of the best MSS., Versions, and earlier Fathers, and is cancelled by almost every Editor from Wets. to Scholz, being supposed to have been introduced from xii. 3.

31. ἀλλ' ἵνα γνῶ, &c.] Here (as often after ἀλλὰ, before ἵνα and such particles) something is left to be understood, and may be variously supplied. The full sense seems to be, "But [the Prince of the world is permitted to attack me] that the world may know," &c. This sense of ἀγαπῶ is required by the words καθὼς ἐνετείλατο, &c.

XV. Commentators are not agreed as to the place where the remaining portion (Ch. xv., xvi., xvii.) of Christ's discourse was delivered. Many think it was pronounced somewhere on the way from Jerusalem to Gethsemane. But of this there is no proof; — and, from the nature of the discourse, little probability. Nay, the words of Ch. xviii. 1. ταῦτα εἰπὼν ἐξῆλθε — ἦν κήπος plainly show that the words cannot have been delivered on the road to Gethsemane; nor, as some, at Gethsemane; but (as Glass, Pearce, Lampe, Dodd., Kuin., Knapp, and Tittm. maintain) in the *guest chamber*, after having risen from table, and previous to his departure. In this *resumption* of the foregoing discourse, our Lord, loath to part with his faithful followers, enlarges on, and further illustrates the same topics.

1. ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ ἄμπε. ἡ ἀληθ.] This similitude (probably suggested by the wine on the table, called by Christ, Matt. xxvi. 29. γέννημα τοῦ ἀμπέλου) was one not uncommon. It is often used in the O. T. of the Jewish people and Church; and, as appears from the Rabbinical writers, was sometimes taken to designate the *Messiah*. It here represents the vital union between Christ and the *faithful* people in his Church. On the exact import of ἡ ἀληθ. Commentators are not agreed.

It is best explained by Euthym. ἡ τὴν ἀλήθειαν καρποφοροῦσα. The force of the Article here is the same as in ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς, x. 14. where see Note. In calling God the γεωργός (i. e. ἀμπελονογός, genus for species) Christ follows the usage of the O. T. See Is. v. 1—7. Jer. ii. 21. Ps. lxxx. 8—11. Christ is here represented as the *Vine* (i. e. the trunk of the vine) of religious truth, — the Gospel; and his faithful disciples as the *branches* from that vine, — all deriving nourishment, and even life itself, from the trunk.

2. ἐν ἐμοί] "belonging to me;" i. e. considered as the trunk. Sub. ὃν for ὃ ἐστί, like φέρον for ὃ φέροι. Αἶρει, "cuts it away." Opposed to which, by paronomasia, is καθαίρει, — purified the tree; i. e. by ridding it of those useless shoots, which most abound in the best trees. How this *spiritual* purification is carried on by the Almighty Vine-dresser, amidst the various dispensations of his Providence, see Lampe in Rec. Syn.

— πλείονα καρπὸν] not only *more*, but *better in quality*; for the difference between the works done under the Gospel, and those of mere nature, is like that which exists between the fruit of *wild* trees, and that of *cultivated* ones. So Plutarch. Vit. Arat. similarly speaking of the irregularity of virtue produced independently of philosophy, says, Τὴν δὲ τοιαύτην ἀνωμαλίαν ἐνδεία λόγου φιλοσόφου περὶ τὰς εἰφήνεις ἀπεργάζεται· τὴν ἀρετὴν, ὡπερ καρπὸν ἀποφυῆ καὶ ἀγεώργητον, ἐμφέρουσα δίχα τῆς ἐπιστήμης.

3. ἴδὴ — ὑμῖν.] From vv. 3—17, Christ now gives the *application* of the comparison; showing to what kind of vine branches they were to be referred, and the duties suitable to that state. (Lampe.) By καθαρός is here meant freed from ignorance, error, and prejudice; and therefore capable of bearing spiritual fruit. They were *then*, in a great measure, purified; though they were shortly afterwards to be *quite so* by the efficacy of the Holy Spirit soon to be manifested. Hence in the next ver. Christ exhorts them not to break the mutual conjunction between them and himself; but constantly cultivate it, as *He* should on his part preserve it for ever.

4. μένατε ἐν ἐμοί — ὑμῖν.] Our Lord here addresses them not so much as *disciples*, as his *future ministers*; and in this capacity exhorts them to zealously *adhere* to him, not only in faith and obedience, but in their Apostolic duties. Μένειν ἐν τῷ is used, as here, of union of thought, feeling, purpose, and action at 1 John ii. 6, 24, 27, 28. See more in Note supra vi. 56. The next words, καὶ γὰρ (sub. μενῶ) ἐν ὑμῖν, contain a *promise*, as the following ones do a precept. And the *kai* is to

μη μείνη ἐν τῇ ἀμπέλῳ· οὕτως οὐδὲ ὑμεῖς, εἴν μη ἐν ἐμοὶ μείνητε. Ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ ἀμπελος, ὑμεῖς τὰ κλήματα. ὁ μένων ἐν ἐμοί, κἀγὼ ἐν 5 αὐτῷ, οὗτος φέρει καρπὸν πολὺν· ὅτι χωρὶς ἐμοῦ οὐ δύνασθε ποιεῖν οὐδέν. Ἐὰν μὴ τις μείνη ἐν ἐμοί, ἐβλήθη ἔξω ὡς τὸ κλῆμα, καὶ 6 ἐξηράνθη· καὶ συνάγουσιν αὐτὰ καὶ εἰς τὸ πῦρ βάλλουσι, καὶ καίεται. Ἐὰν μείνητε ἐν ἐμοί, καὶ τὰ ῥήματά μου ἐν ὑμῖν μείνη, ὃ ἐὰν θή- 7 λητε αἰτήσεσθε, καὶ γενήσεται ὑμῖν. Ἐν τούτῳ ἐδοξάσθη ὁ Πατήρ μου, 8 ἵνα καρπὸν πολὺν φέριτε· καὶ γενήσεσθε ἐμοὶ μαθηταί. Καθὼς 9 ἠγάπησέ με ὁ Πατήρ, κἀγὼ ἠγάπησα ὑμᾶς· μείνατε ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ τῇ ἐμῇ. Ἐὰν τὰς ἐντολάς μου τηρήσητε, μενεῖτε ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ μου· κα- 10 θὼς ἐγὼ τὰς ἐντολάς τοῦ Πατρός μου τηρήρηκα, καὶ μένω αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ. Ταῦτι λελάληκα ὑμῖν, ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ ἡ ἐμῇ ἐν ὑμῖν μείνη, 11 καὶ ἡ χαρὰ ὑμῶν πληρωθῇ. Ἄυτι ἐστὶν ἡ ἐντολὴ ἡ ἐμῇ, ἵνα ἀγαπᾶτε 12 ἀλλήλους, καθὼς ἠγάπησα ὑμᾶς. Μείζονα ταύτης ἀγάπῃ οὐδεὶς ἔχει, 13

s Matt. 3. 10.
& 7. 19.
t Infra 16. 23.
1 John 3. 22.
u Supra 13. 34.
Eph. 5. 2.
1 John 3. 11, 16.
& 4. 21.
1 Thess. 4. 9.

be taken for *καὶ οὕτω*, the *οὕτω* being implied in the *apodosis*. The substance of the promise is, that Christ will abide in them, importing communion with them by his Holy Spirit, and support and protection to them by the influence of the Paraclete, whom he should send to them from Heaven. See Rom. viii. 9. 1 John iii. 24. iv. 13. The words *καθὼς τὸ κλῆμα—μείνητε* suggest another argument to union, deduced from the highly beneficial effects of it. As the branches receive all their life and vigour from the trunk, so must they adhere to Christ and his injunctions, if they would produce spiritual fruit. Ἄφ' ἑαυτοῦ, "by its own virtue."

5. *χωρὶς ἐμοῦ*] "apart, separate from me." Οὐδὲν ποιεῖν οὐδέν, i. e. can do nothing effectual. See 2 Cor. iii. 5. Comp. ver. 4.

6. *ἐβλήθη ἔξω*.] The Aorist is here for the Future, or rather the Present, as being used of what is customary, or perhaps to represent the thing to be done, as already done. By τὸ κλῆμα is meant the branch which has been separated from the trunk. The *καὶ* before *ἐξηράνθη* is not put (as some imagine) for the relative, but *αὐτὸ* is understood. *Αὐτὰ* is for *αὐτὸ*, *populariter*.

The *τὸ* before *πῦρ* is found in many MSS. and some early Edd., and is admitted by Matth., Griesb., Knapp, Tittm., Vat., and Scholz. The same phrase, however, occurs *without* the Article at Matt. iii. 10. vii. 19. Luke iii. 9.

7. *ἐὰν μείνητε—γενήσεται ὑμῖν*.] Here is another argument for the preservation of this communion; in stating which the foregoing general enunciation (*μένειν ἐν ἐμοί*) is further evolved by *καὶ τὰ ῥήματα—μείνη*; and as the former denotes continuance in, communion in general, so this denotes, *specially*, steadfastness in assenting to and receiving the doctrines and instructions of Christ; especially in the present discourses, wherein he taught them the nature of his person and office. The benefit promised in *ὃ ἐὰν—ὑμῖν* is nearly allied to that at Matt. xxi. 21. The *whatever* must, of course, be limited to whatever is necessary for the purpose adverted to in the preceding and following verses, —namely, their bringing forth much fruit, and the promotion thereby of the glory of God.

8. *ἐδοξάσθη*.] The Aorist is here taken as at ver. 6., where see Note. ἵνα is used as *ὅτι*, *quod*, at iii. 23. iv. 17. The *καὶ* is *not*, as most Com-

mentators suppose, for *οὕτω* or *ὅτε*, but we must repeat *ἐν τούτῳ* from the preceding clause. So xiii. 35. *ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκονται πάντες ὅτι ἐμοὶ μαθηταὶ ἐστε*. By *γενήσεσθε* is meant, will *really be*. How, and in what respects the Father is glorified by the disciples of his Son bringing forth the fruits of holiness and virtue, &c. See Tittm. in Recens. Synop.

9—11. *καθὼς ἠγάπησέ με, &c.*] Christ here proceeds to remind them of his own singular love to them, and holds out for their imitation his own example in doing the work of the Father. *Καθὼς* and *καὶ* may be rendered *quantopere—tantopere*. (Tittm.) Others, however, as Lampe, take the sense to be *as—so*. Others, again, take the *καθὼς* to signify *since*; and the *καὶ* they regard as a simple copula; which would require a *comma* after *ὑμᾶς*. But the first-mentioned interpretation is preferable. The words *μείνατε—ἐμῇ* are explained by most Commentators, "continue in the love of me," or "to love me." But that sense can only be tolerated by the change of punctuation just mentioned. *Both* methods, however, are liable to much objection. And it is better, with Campb., to suppose the sense to be, "Continue to be beloved by me," "keep your place in my affections."

Then are mentioned the *means* by which they may continue to possess his love, —namely, by keeping *His* commandments, after the example which he had set them by keeping his Father's.

11. *ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ—πληρωθῇ*] i. e. (as the best Commentators explain) "that my joy in you [at your love, faith, and obedience] may be enduring; and that your joy [in continuing in my love] may be complete and perfect." See xvi. 24 & 33. xvii. 13. 1 John i. 4. 2 John 12. *Χαρὰ ἐν ὑμῖν* denotes "joy felt on your account."

12. *αὐτὴ ἐστὶν—ὑμᾶς*.] These words are meant to show what *sort* of love is evinced by Him to them, and consequently expected in return. A similar argument is used at xiv. 21. See also Matt. xx. 28. Rom. v. 7 & 8. 1 John iii. 16. As instances of this degree of attachment from a friend, Grot. adduces the cases of Pylades and Orestes, and Damon and Pythias. I would add the yet more apposite one of Alcestis, so finely represented in the inimitable drama of Euripides. So ver. 155. *πῶς δ' ἂν μάλλον ἐνδέξατο τις Πίστιν προτιμᾶσ', ἢ θεῶν οὐσ' ὑπερβαίνει*.

- 14 ἵνα τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ θῆ ὑπὲρ τῶν φίλων αὐτοῦ. Ἐμεῖς φίλοι μου
 15 ἐστέ, ἐὰν ποιῆτε ὅσα ἐγὼ ἐντέλλομαι ὑμῖν. Οὐκέτι ὑμᾶς λέγω δούλους·
 ὅτι ὁ δούλος οὐκ οἶδε τί ποιῆ αὐτοῦ ὁ κύριος· ὑμᾶς δὲ εἶρηκα φί-
 λους, ὅτι πάντα ἃ ἤκουσα παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς μου, ἐγνώρισα ὑμῖν.
 16 Ὁὐχ ὑμεῖς με ἐξελεξάσθε, ἀλλ' ἐγὼ ἐξελεξάμην ὑμᾶς, καὶ ἔθικα ὑμᾶς, ^{x Matt. 23. 19.}
 ἵνα ὑμεῖς ὑπάγητε καὶ καρπὸν φέρητε, καὶ ὁ καρπὸς ὑμῶν μένη· ἵνα
 17 ὅτι ἂν αἰτήσητε τὸν Πατέρα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου, δῶ ὑμῖν. Ταῦτα
 ἐντέλλομαι ὑμῖν, ἵνα ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους.
 18 Εἰ ὁ κόσμος ὑμᾶς μισεῖ, γνώσκετε ὅτι ἐμὲ πρῶτον ὑμῶν μείσηκεν.
 19 Ἐἰ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου ἦτε, ὁ κόσμος ἂν τὸ ἴδιον ἐφίλει· ὅτι δὲ ἐκ τοῦ ^{y 1 John 4. 5.}
 κόσμου οὐκ ἐστέ, ἀλλ' ἐγὼ ἐξελεξάμην ὑμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου, διὰ τοῦτο
 20 μισεῖ ὑμᾶς ὁ κόσμος. ^{z Supra 13. 16.} Ἐνημονεύετε τοῦ λόγου οὗ ἐγὼ εἶπον ὑμῖν·
 Οὐκ ἔστι δούλος μείζων τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ. Εἰ ἐμὲ ἐδίωξαν, καὶ ὑμᾶς
 διώξουσιν· εἰ τὸν λόγον μου ἐτήρησαν, καὶ τὸν ὑμέτερον τηρήσουσιν.
^{Matt. 10. 24.}
^{Luke 6. 40.}

14. Here Christ shows *how* that friendship may be evinced; namely, as in the love before mentioned, by keeping his commandments.

15. οὐκέτι ὑμᾶς — ἐγνώρισα.] The sense here is not very clearly developed, and may best be expressed by the following paraphrastic version: “[I say *friends* ;] for I no longer style you *servants*, since the servant [differeth from the friend, inasmuch as he] knoweth not what his master doeth” (i. e. his plans of action). But you I call *friends* [and as such I have treated you] since whatsoever I have learned from my Father I have made known to you [thus treating you with the most unreserved confidence]. Some exceptions have indeed been made to the words taken in their ordinary and full acceptance by several recent Commentators; who, because our Lord had before (Luke xii. 4.) called them his *friends*, and had always treated his disciples with affability and kindness, would here take οὐκέτι for οὐκ, and λέγω in the sense of a Preterite, *per Enallagen!* But that is a figure not to be resorted to *ad libitum*, and the use of οὐκέτι for οὐκ is precarious. Lampe’s arguments in defence of the common interpretation are sufficient to establish it. Our Lord had, up to this time, (agreeably to the custom of the Jewish Rabbies) called them servants; though he had not *treated* them as such. And the term is susceptible of a milder interpretation, considering the connection of disciple with master; and thus it is interchanged with δαδούτος at John xii. 26. The words of Luke will only prove that Christ addressed them as friends. And certain it is that he had never before expressly styled them his friends.

From xvi. 12. it is clear that the πάντα must (as the best Commentators are agreed) be understood *restrictively*, i. e. of all things proper for them then to know. The disciples here present were (as Tittm. observes) the *esoteric*, those *interioris admissionis*, as opposed to the *exoteric*, the οἱ ἔξω. (Compare Matt. xiii. 11. Luke viii. 10.) and therefore favoured with his peculiar confidence.

16. οὐχ ὑμεῖς — ὑμᾶς.] This is meant to excite them to gratitude and obedience, as showing them that the obligation was all on *their* side. Ἐκλέγεσθαι may here (as often) be taken, not so much of *choice*, as of the *love* which it implies; antecedent being put for consequent; as Mark xiii.

20. Acts xiii. 17. 1 Cor. i. 27 & 28. Eph. i. 4. James ii. 5. τῶθέναι, like the Heb. וַיִּשָּׂא, and the corresponding terms in most languages, has often the sense *appoint*. Ὑπάγητε is regarded by most Commentators as pleonastic. It is not, however, quite so, but conveys a notion of activity in the discharge of their functions as Apostles or Teachers. For that is what is meant by the καρπὸν φέρ. The words καὶ ὁ καρπὸς ὑμῶν μένη point at the *ulterior effects* of these labours to succeeding ages; and which, judging by events, we *now know* must endure unto the end of the world. In the words following ἵνα denotes *event, result, or consequence*. The sense is: “Thus it shall happen, that whatever ye shall ask the Father,” &c.

17. In this verse, our Lord, I conceive, means to say, that he has given them the injunctions he has, with the hope and trust that they will so fulfil them as to love each other; concord being essential to their spiritual success.

18. From the above injunction of *mutual love*, our Lord passes to a kindred subject, — the *hatred of the world* towards them; forewarning them of the evils they would have to endure in his cause, exhorting them to patient endurance, and consoling them by reminding them of the treatment *He* had experienced in his own case: q. d. “If *my* blameless and most beneficial life could not shield me from the hatred and mortal persecution of the world, (i. e. of the unbelieving and wicked part of it) so neither will yours protect you.” Many Commentators take γνώσκετε as an *Imperative*, in the sense *reflect, consider*. But the common view, by which it is considered as an *Indicative*, is most natural. Πρῶτον is manifestly an *adverb* for πρῶτερον, as Campb. has convincingly shown.

19. εἰ ἐκ τοῦ, &c.] Ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου εἶναι signifies “to be conformed to the world.” So ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, or διαβάλλον, &c. For (as Grot. observes) the ἐκ, as it denotes *descent from*, so it may very well import *affinity to*.

20. οὐκ ἔστι δούλος, &c.] Compare Matt. x. 24. John xiii. 16.

— εἰ τὸν λόγον — τηρήσουσιν.] The sense of these words *seems* to be directly contrary to that which the context requires. To remove this difficulty, some would take τηρεῖν for παρατη-

a Infra 16. 3.

Matt. 24. 9.

b Supra 9. 41.

c Ps. 35. 19.
& 69. 5.d Supra 14. 26.
infra 16. 7.
Luke 24. 49.e Acts 1. 21.
& 5. 32.

^a Ἀλλὰ ταῦτα πάντα ποιήσουσιν ὑμῖν διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου, ὅτι οὐκ οἶδασι 21
τὸν πέμψαντά με. ^b Εἰ μὴ ἦλθον καὶ ἐλάλησα αὐτοῖς, ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ 22
εἶχον· νῦν δὲ πρόφασιν οὐκ ἔχουσι περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν. Ὁ ἐμὲ 23
μισῶν καὶ τὸν Πατέρα μου μισεῖ. Εἰ τὰ ἔργα μὴ ἐποίησα ἐν αὐτοῖς, 24
ἂ οὐδεὶς ἄλλος πεποιήκεν, ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ εἶχον· νῦν δὲ καὶ ἐωράκασι,
καὶ μεμισήκασι καὶ ἐμὲ καὶ τὸν Πατέρα μου. ^c Ἄλλ' ἵνα πληρωθῇ 25
ὁ λόγος ὁ γεγραμμένος ἐν τῷ τόμῳ αὐτῶν, Ὅτι ἐμίσησάν με
δωρεάν. ^d Ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ὁ Παράκλητος, ὃν ἐγὼ πέμψω ὑμῖν παρὰ 26
τοῦ Πατρὸς, τὸ Πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, ὃ παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευέ-
ται, ἐκείνος μαρτυρήσει περὶ ἐμοῦ· ^e καὶ ὑμεῖς δὲ μαρτυρεῖτε, ὅτι ἀπ' 27
ἀρχῆς μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐστέ.

οῦν. But for that sense of the word with *τὸν λόγον* there is no authority. The same remarks will apply to that method of interpretation (objectionable on other grounds) which is founded on the use of *εἰ* to signify *as*. The best mode of removing the difficulty that has been hitherto propounded is that of Tittm., who assigns the following sense. "If they had admitted and observed my doctrine, they would admit and observe yours. Yet it involves such an anomaly of language as I must hesitate to ascribe to the Evangelist; because, though inattentive to the nicer idioms of the language, yet he nowhere so openly sets all rules at defiance. Not to say that the use of the tenses in the *antithetical* clause forbids this sense. In short, if we would arrive at the truth, on any difficult passage, we must not tamper with the sense of any word, nor strain the force of the tenses; but seek some mode of explanation which may not involve any anomaly. In the present instance, this may be done by considering the *affirmative* enunciation as dependent on the *hypothetical* *εἰ* as meant to imply also its *negative*, i. e. "If they have not observed my words, neither will they observe yours." On examination, I find that Euthym. and some of the early modern Commentators took the words as *equivalent* to a negative sentence; but *how* this arose, they seem not to have been aware.

21. διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου] "on my account," "for your attachment to me." And, therefore, what they do to you I regard as done to myself. Οὐκ οἶδασι. This imports not involuntary ignorance, but self-produced blindness as to the true nature of the evidence of a Divine legation.

22. εἰ μὴ ἦλθον, &c.] This verse is exegetical of the preceding, and our Lord (as Lampe observes) "therein encounters a tacit argument, which might be pleaded in excuse of the persons in question, that they sinned from ignorance. This he overturns, by showing that their ignorance and perverseness were inexcusable, because sufficient means for the attainment of a knowledge of the truth had been provided, both by internal and external evidence, in doctrines and in miracles." Ἅμαρτ. must not be taken (with many) of *sin in general*, but of the sin in question, that of rejecting the Messiah. From the antithetical clause *νῦν δὲ οὐκ ἔχουσι*, &c., it appears that the sense *here* is, "they would have been, comparatively, innocent of the sin." "there would have been some excuse for them."

23. ὁ ἐμὲ μισῶν — μισεῖ.] This is meant to mark, under a *general* assertion, the sinfulness of *their* conduct, in particular: namely, that their

hatred and rejection of Him and his mission, and injurious treatment of *Him*, was, in fact, done to his *Father*. v. 24. Here the assertion of v. 22. is resumed, (the words of v. 23. being in some measure parenthetical) and the *proof* of Divine mission from *miracles* is adverted to. Then a conclusion is drawn. Or, as Lampe observes, "we have a *conditional proposition* so assumed, that, from a refutation of the *antecedent*, there results a refutation of the consequent." (See Bp. Warburton's Works, v. 326.) The sense may be thus expressed: "But now, although these miracles have been wrought before their eyes, yet they have only produced hatred and injurious conduct towards me, a conduct (agreeable to the foregoing assurance) directed against my Father likewise." In this is implied the *consequence* above expressed at v. 22. πρόφασιν οὐκ ἔχουσι περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν.

25. ἀλλ' ἵνα πληρωθῇ.] The older Commentators maintain that the sense is, "But this is come to pass, that the Scripture might be fulfilled;" while the later ones are of opinion that the *iva* is here, as often, *eventual*, and that the sense is: "Now by this having come to pass the words written in the Law have been made good." Those words were *properly* spoken of the enemies of David: but as David was a type of Christ, so they are *accommodated* to Him.

26. ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ὁ Παράκ.] The scope of the words *here* is uncertain; but seem to have been spoken with the view of softening an ungrateful communication, by a promise of Divine assistance, and the aid of the Holy Spirit; q. d. "Though rejected by the multitude, I am acknowledged as Messiah by the Father, who, in proof of this, will shortly send you the aids of the Holy Spirit."

— μαρτυρῆσαι περὶ ἐμοῦ.] This is explained by almost all recent Commentators, of confirming by arguments what has been taught. q. d. "The Holy Spirit will cause that my person, counsels, deeds, and works, shall be more and more known," or, as it is said in xvi. 14. ἐκεῖνος ἐμὲ δοξάσει. The words, however, cannot admit of that sense; and that the usual signification of *μαρτυρεῖν* is here to be retained, is plain from the next verse; for we can hardly suppose the word used in two such different senses within so short a space. The true interpretation seems to be that of the ancients and earlier moderns, i. e. "the Holy Spirit will bear witness to my Messiahship by the miraculous spiritual gifts with which he will endow believers in me."

27. To the testimony of the *Holy Spirit* Christ

1 XVI. Ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν, ἵνα μὴ σκανδαλισθῆτε. Ἀπουναγώ-
 2 γους ποιήσουσιν ὑμᾶς· ἀλλ' ἔρχεται ὥρα, ἵνα πᾶς ὁ ἀποκτείνων ὑμᾶς
 3 δόξῃ λατρείαν προσφέρειν τῷ Θεῷ. [Καὶ ταῦτα ποιήσουσιν [ὑμῖν,] f Supra 15. 21.
 4 ὅτι οὐκ ἔγνωσαν τὸν Πατέρα οὐδὲ ἐμέ. Ἐ⁵ Ἀλλὰ ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν, g Matt. 9. 15.
 ἵνα, ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἡ ὥρα, μνημονεύητε αὐτῶν, ὅτι ἐγὼ εἶπον ὑμῖν. Ταῦτα δὲ Mark 2. 19.
 5 ὑμῖν ἐξ ἀρχῆς οὐκ εἶπον, ὅτι μεθ' ὑμῶν ἤμην. Νῦν δὲ ὑπάγω πρὸς τὸν Luke 5. 34.
 6 πέμψαντά με· — καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐξ ὑμῶν ἐρωτᾷ με· Ἥοῦ ὑπάγεις; ἀλλ'
 7 ὅτι ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν, ἡ λύπη πεπλήρωκεν ὑμῶν τὴν καρδίαν. Ἀλλ'
 ἐγὼ τὴν ἀλήθειαν λέγω ὑμῖν· συμφέροι ὑμῖν ἵνα ἐγὼ ἀπέλθω. ἐάν

adds that of the apostles and disciples themselves; who were, in all respects, qualified to bear unimpeachable testimony to the person, character, and actions of Christ, as having been with him from the beginning of his ministry; a testimony so much the more weighty, since it was, in the case of some, confirmed by personal miracles, and in others brought forward in writing, by the Gospels.

XVI. 1. ἵνα μὴ σκανδ.] Those were said σκανδαλισθῆναι, who, either stumbling at the external poverty and lowliness of our Lord, formed a wrong judgment of him, and at least doubted of his Divine mission; or who, though convinced of it, suffered themselves to be so influenced by the apprehension of evil, as to abandon their Christian profession. (Tittm.)

2. ἀπουναγώγους π.] See Note on ix. 22. ἵνα for ὅτε, as often.

—λατρείαν προσφέρειν.] Λατρεῖαν properly signifies to serve any one as a slave. But in the N. T. and LXX. it is always used to denote the offering of sacrifice, or rendering worship and service of any kind. The sense is: "he will think he is rendering an acceptable service to God." So a Rabbinical writer, cited by Lampe: "Omnis effundens sanguinem improborum æqualis est illi qui sacrificium offert." Doddr. thinks there is here an allusion to such sort of deeds as the assassination of Paul planned by the forty conspirators, (see Acts xxiii. 14. sq.) and in which they gloried: and certain it is that the greatest enormities recorded in Josephus were perpetrated by the Zelotæ, who originally were religious zealots.

3. καὶ ταῦτα — ἐμέ.] This is meant to trace such conduct to its original source (namely, ignorance of God and the Son of God, otherwise they would have known how abhorrent from the nature of both is persecution), and to suggest consolation to themselves, as suffering in the cause of God and Christ. See xv. 21. Ἵμῶν ἢ παύσ. is not found in very many MSS., Versions, Fathers, and early Edd., and is, with some reason, cancelled by Matth., Griesb., Tittm., Vat., and Scholz.

4. ἡ ὥρα] i. e. the time for suffering such calamities.

— ταῦτα — οὐκ εἶπον.] By ἐξ ἀρχῆς is meant the beginning of Christ's ministry. And in using the expression ὅτι μεθ' ὑμῶν ἤμην, our Lord speaks of himself as already departed, since he is on the point of leaving them. Of this there are several examples in the Classical writers; e. gr. Eurip. Alcest. 281. οὐκ ἔτι δὴ μήτηρ σφῶν ἔστιν. 399. ὡς οὐκ ἔτ' οὐσαν οὐδὲν ἂν λέγοις ἐμέ. Heraclid. 9. πλείστον μετέσχον, εἰς ἀνήρ, Ἡρακλεῖ, ὅτ' ἦ μεθ' ἡμῶν, νῦν δ' ἐπέα κατ' οὐρανὸν Ναιεῖ, κ. τ. λ. Since,

however, our Lord had apprized his disciples of the persecutions they would have to undergo on account of their Christian profession, many take the οὐκ εἶπον restrictively; q. d. I did not fully apprise you of, &c. But as ταῦτα may very well mean the things which should befall them after their Lord's departure, and as Christ had nowhere directly adverted on those evils, so that should seem to be the sense here. This, indeed, is placed beyond doubt by the words following, which suggest the reason why Christ did not do it; namely, either because he was then *willing* them, to comfort and support them, and himself to bear the brunt of those trials; or, because he was then going to stay with them for some time, and did not wish to pain them *before* the time.

5. νῦν δὲ ὑπάγω, &c.] The Commentators are not agreed on the scope of these words. They are generally considered as introducing a *new subject*, namely, — that of his departure, (see Lampe) and the following sense is assigned: "But now that I am going to Him who sent me, none of you asketh," &c. But thus the *καὶ* is silenced; and the sentiment in the preceding words ταῦτα δὲ — εἶπον is left very deficient. And though δὲ has sometimes a transitive force, yet the context must decide *where* that is to be ascribed. It is better (with Grot., Wakef., Kuin., Tittm., and Vat.) to suppose the words to be connected with the preceding clause. Thus the δὲ will be, as often, *adversative*. There is, however, something left, *per aposiopesis*, to be supplied, q. d. "And therefore I have thought it necessary to tell you," or something similar. The *καὶ* in the words following signifies "And [yet], i. e. though I am going;" a signification frequent in St. John's writings. By ἔρωτᾷ is meant νῦν ἐρωτᾷ; for they had asked *before*. The disciples are, however, I conceive, reproved, not so much for *not then* asking, as for the feeling which occasioned it, namely, *sorrow*; for that profound grief produces silence is undoubted. So Shakspeare:—

"Light sorrows speak; great grief is dumb,"— imitated from Seneca, *Curæ leves loquuntur, ingentes stupent*. Their sorrow, however, was blameable, as proceeding from *want of reflection* on the causes of his departure, the place whither he was going, and the *purpose* of it, though these had been before suggested to them. However, our Lord in vv. 7—11. again adverts thereto, and in plainer terms.

7. συμφέροι — ἀπέλθω.] On the highly beneficial effects to the Apostles of Christ's departure, Tittm. remarks thus: "The Holy Spirit effected much more in them than Christ *himself* had done, (see v. 12, 14, & 16.) imparting to them a more complete knowledge of the Saviour, than what He himself could communicate, and also many

γὰρ ἐγὼ μὴ ἀπέλθω, ὁ Παράκλητος οὐκ ἐλεύσεται πρὸς ὑμᾶς· ἐὰν δὲ πορευθῶ, πέμψω αὐτὸν πρὸς ὑμᾶς. Καὶ ἐλθὼν ἐκείνος ἐλέγξει τὸν 8 κόσμον περὶ ἁμαρτίας καὶ περὶ δικαιοσύνης καὶ περὶ κρίσεως. περὶ 9 ἁμαρτίας μὲν, οἳ οὐ πιστεύουσιν εἰς ἐμέ· περὶ δικαιοσύνης δὲ, ὅτι 10

^h Supra 12. 31.

πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα μου ὑπάγω, καὶ οὐκ ἔτι θεωρεῖτέ με· ^h περὶ δὲ 11 κρίσεως, ὅτι ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου κέκριται.

ⁱ Supra 14, 26. & 15. 25.

Ἔτι πολλὰ ἔχω λέγειν ὑμῖν, ἀλλ' οὐ δύνασθε βαστάζειν ἄρτι· ὅταν 12 δὲ ἔλθῃ ἐκείνος, τὸ Πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, ὀδηγήσει ὑμᾶς εἰς πᾶσαν 13

other excellent gifts, necessary for their Apostolic function; supplying to them eloquence irresistible, the power of working the most illustrious miracles, for the confirmation of their testimony concerning Jesus, and rendering their timid minds invincible to all the terrors of their adversaries."

"It was (says Euthym.) the pleasure of the Holy Trinity that the Father should draw them to the Son, that the Son should teach them, and the Holy Spirit perfect them. Now the two first things were already completed: but still it was necessary for the third to be accomplished, namely, the being perfected by the Holy Spirit."

8. *ἔλεγει* — κρίσεως.] This is a passage of considerable difficulty, and therefore it is no wonder that the Commentators should not be agreed on its sense. Some take τὸν κόσμον to mean the world at large; others, the Jewish world,—the Jews only. And according as they adopt one or the other view, they assign to the passage either a general, or a particular sense. The former is supported by Lampe: and the latter by most recent Commentators, especially Kuin. and Tittm., who assign the following as the import: "He will show clearly, 1. the great sin of the Jews in rejecting me, by the conversion of many thousands of Jews through the effusion of the Spirit; 2. that I was really an innocent and just person, by teaching, through the Apostles, that God hath received me into heaven; 3. that the opposition made to me by the rulers of this world is in vain, since my religion will prevail; and that their policy will be judged and condemned." This seems, from the following vv., to be the most correct view: though exception may be taken to some points of the exposition, and others may be doubtful. Thus the sense of *ἔλεγει* seems to be mistaken. For since (as Mr. Rose ap. Parkh. in v. observes) "whether the world be taken in its unlimited, or in its restricted sense, it is to be its own judge, the sense of *ἔλεγει* must be convince, not convict; those two terms, when applied to a fault, only differing in this, that the individual may be himself convinced of his fault, but is convicted of it in the judgment of others." How this conviction was effected, and to what extent, is taught us in the subsequent book of Scripture, and in the early Ecclesiastical writers. See Acts ii. 4. By ἁμαρτία is meant not only the sin of unbelief, but of persecuting and crucifying the Lord of life, and endeavouring to suppress the religion sent from God.

With respect to the meaning of *περὶ δικαιοσύνης*, the best Commentators are agreed that it must belong to Christ; *περὶ* denoting *quod attinet ad*: and that, taken in conjunction with the words following, *δικαιοσύνη* can denote no other than the innocence and holiness of Jesus, the Author of justification by his blood. The proof of this (adverted to in the words following) was his going

to his Father in heaven, evinced by his resurrection, and also by his sending the Holy Spirit with miraculous gifts. See Acts ii. 2. sq. xvii. 31. Rom. i. 4. 1 Cor. xv. 14. sq. In *πρὸς κρίσεως* the *περὶ* must be taken in the same sense, and the import of the phrase be determined by the words following; which show it to be the *Divine judgment* and condemnation, i. e. the condemnation of the unbelieving part of the world, whether Jews or Heathens. The certainty of this is hinted at v. 11., by the mention of the condemnation of ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου, which expression, however, does not (as most recent Commentators imagine) denote the body of the Jewish rulers, chief Priests, &c. &c.; but (as the old Commentators thought, and as I have shown is also the sense at xii. 31.) Satan. For by the manifestation of the Holy Spirit, in all His miraculous gifts and wonderful effects, the Author of sin was condemned, and his power subverted. And if he was condemned, so would his followers, whether Jews or Gentiles; and punishment be executed on them, both in this world and in the next. Such seems to be the sense of this obscure passage; which is adopted and ably supported by Mr. Scott. If τοῦ κόσμου be taken in its unrestricted sense, of the world at large, the meaning will be what is expressed by Mr. Holden, as follows: "The Comforter will convince the world of the heinous nature and penalty of sin, concerning righteousness or justification through the death of Christ, as proved by his resurrection and ascension to the Father; and concerning a future judgment, in which a final sentence will be passed upon all men."

12. πολλὰ] "many other doctrines," namely, as the Commentators say, the abrogation of the Ceremonial law, the removal of the distinction between Jews and Gentiles. But there seems reference also to those more mysterious and spiritual doctrines, such as justification by faith, which the Spirit of truth afterwards revealed by St. Paul. *βαστάζειν*, like the Latin *ferre*, often signifies (as here) to comprehend; and the same metaphor is found in our *understand*.

13. ἐκείνος.] Spoken emphatically, to denote the *Paraclete* before mentioned, v. 7. In τὸ Πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθ. there is (as Grot. observes) the figure πρὸς τὸ σημανόμενον. It is, however, of more importance to remark on this among so many other proofs in this Gospel, of the personality of the Holy Spirit, namely, from personal actions being ascribed to him.

— ὀδηγ. ὑμᾶς εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλ.] In Recens. Synop., I preferred to the common version that of Campb., Wets., and Newc., "into all the truth." This, I have since found, is adopted by Br. Middlet., who remarks that ἀλήθεια here denotes not truth universally, but only in reference to the particular subject. He does not seem,

τὴν ἀλήθειαν· οὐ γὰρ κληθήσει ἀπ' ἐαυτοῦ, ἀλλ' ὅσα ἂν ἀκούσῃ κληθή-
 14 σει, καὶ τὰ ἐρχόμενα ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν. Ἐκείνος ἐμὲ δοξάσει, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ
 15 ἐμοῦ λήψεται, καὶ ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν. ^k Μάντα ὅσα ἔχει ὁ Πατήρ, ἐμά ^k *Infra 17. 10.*
 ἔστι· διὰ τοῦτο εἶπον, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήψεται, καὶ ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν.
 16 Μικρὸν, καὶ οὐ θεωρεῖτέ με· καὶ πάλιν μικρὸν, καὶ ὄψεσθέ με· ὅτι
 17 ἐγὼ ὑπάγω πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα. Εἶπον οὖν ἐκ τῶν μιμητῶν αὐτοῦ πρὸς
 ἀλλήλους· Τί ἐστι τοῦτο ὃ λέγει ἡμῖν· Μικρὸν, καὶ οὐ θεωρεῖτέ με·
 καὶ πάλιν μικρὸν, καὶ ὄψεσθέ με· καὶ ὅτι ἐγὼ ὑπάγω πρὸς τὸν
 18 Πατέρα; ἔλεγον οὖν· Τοῦτο τί ἐστιν, ὃ λέγει, τὸ μικρὸν; οὐκ οἶ-
 19 δαμεν τί λαλεῖ. Ἔγνω οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ὅτι ἤθελον αὐτὸν ἐρωτᾶν· καὶ
 εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Περὶ τούτου ζητεῖτε μετ' ἀλλήλων, ὅτι εἶπον· Μικρὸν
 20 καὶ οὐ θεωρεῖτέ με, καὶ πάλιν μικρὸν καὶ ὄψεσθέ με. Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν

however, to have been aware that the force of τὴν ἀλ. had been long ago pointed out by Le Clerc, in his *Arts Crit.* ii. 1. 2., where he adduces other examples from Joseph. Bell. viii. and Plato *Apolog.* in which Socrates thus addresses his judges: Ὑμεῖς δέ μου ἀκούσασθε πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν. I would render, "the whole truth," i. e. without any thing being kept back, as at present, from circumstances. Our Lord seems to have had in view Ps. xxiv. 5. δόξησάν με ἐπὶ τὴν ἀλήθειάν σου.

— οὐ γὰρ κληθήσει ἀπ' ἐαυτοῦ, &c.] Christ here speaks of the Holy Spirit *after the manner of men*, as of a *Legate*, who ought to say nothing but what he has been instructed by his principal; q. d. "The instruction delivered by the Holy Spirit will not be ἀπ' ἐαυτοῦ, *suo arbitrio*, but agreeably to the injunctions and the will of the Father; and therefore absolutely true and divine. Nay, moreover, he will not only open out to you the whole truth of things *past*, but also, as often as need shall require, "he will tell you things *future*, and of which I have said nothing to you:" (Tittm.) namely, what shall happen either to the world at large, or to the Jewish people, or to the Church. See Acts xi. 23. xx. 23. xxi. 11. 1 Tim. iv. 1. 2 Tim. iij. 1. 2 Pet. i. 14. (Grot.)

14. ἐκείνος ἐμὲ δοξ. &c.] *The scope* of the word seems to be, to shew that in all the Holy Spirit shall reveal and teach, he will have in view the glory of Christ; or, that all which he teaches will tend thereto.

15. πάντα ὅσα ἔχει — ἐστι.] These words denote that there is the most intimate connection and perfect community of counsel, will, feeling, energy, and operation between the Father and the Son, and consequently that the cause of the latter is that of God. (Tittm.) This whole passage is excellently adapted to establish the doctrine of the Trinity against the Socinians. "For here are *three persons* expressly distinguished from each other, and yet among them the *closest connection* is said to subsist. The *glory ascribed to them is equal*; and yet this by no means precludes the supposition that the Son is the Heir of the Father, and the Holy Spirit the Legate of both." (Lampe.)

— οὐα τοῦτο εἶπον] i. e. it was in this sense that I said.

16. μικρὸν.] Sub. διάστημα χρόνον ἐστὶ ὃ ἔσται, as in Hos. i. 4. Καὶ, for ὅτε, "and [then]." Οὐ θεωρεῖτε. Pres. for Fut. This is a strong, but delicate form of expression to denote *absence by death*. ὄψεσθέ με is for πάλιν ὄψ., spoken of his

visible advent after the resurrection. The next words ὅτι ἐγὼ — Πατέρα are not satisfactorily explained by any Commentator. It should seem to be an elliptical mode of expression, of which the sense is: "[I use this language] because I am going to the Father." Indeed, though speaking of *going away*, and then *coming* shortly, would suggest the idea of only a temporary stay, yet it would not do that clearly enough to be understood until after the event: which is all that our Lord intended. Then it would serve to confirm their faith, as it now cheered their sorrow.

17. τί ἐστι τοῦτο, &c.] It has been thought surprising that the Apostles should have failed to comprehend the words of our Lord. But the thing is easily accounted for, when we consider their conciseness, and remember that they were *predictive*, perhaps *intentionally* obscure, and only to be understood after their fulfilment. Besides, the Apostles' perceptions were clouded by deep-rooted prejudices, as to the temporal nature of Christ's kingdom, and dulled by their excess of sorrow on learning that, whatever might be the full sense of the words, they were, at least, to be deprived of their Lord. Their greatest perplexity, no doubt, was with the words ὅτι ὑπάγω πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα, which they were not likely to understand in the true sense. They might, indeed, comprehend that they were first to be deprived of, and then to receive back their Lord; but as they firmly believed that the Messiah was to come and establish an earthly kingdom, they could make nothing out of the last words. At ver. 18, the sense of τοῦτο — τὸ μικρὸν has been ill represented in most translations, from inattention to the *Article*, which is correctly expressed in the Syriac Version. The construction is: Τί ἐστι τοῦτο ὃ λέγει, τὸ μικρὸν; Render, "What meaneth this *little while* which he speaketh of?" Οὐκ οἶδμεν, &c. "We know not what he is speaking of."

These words of the Apostles to each other are, with reason, supposed by Heumann to have been pronounced *aside*.

19. περὶ τούτου ζητεῖτε, &c.] This sentence is generally regarded as *interrogative*; but by the best Expositors as *declarative*, which is more suitable to our Lord, as knowing all hearts, and being well acquainted both with what they had been saying, and their desire for information, which they dared not ask for. Compare ver. 30. Thus the sense will be, "So then you are debating," &c. However, after all, the interrogative mode (which is supported by the Pesch. Syr. Ver-

λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι κλυύσετε καὶ θρηνήσετε ὑμεῖς, ὁ δὲ κόσμος χαρήσεται ὑμεῖς δὲ λυπηθήσεσθε, ἀλλ' ἡ λύπη ὑμῶν εἰς χαρὰν γενήσεται. Ἡ 21 γυνὴ ὅταν τι κτη λύπην ἔχει, ὅτι ἤλθεν ἡ ὥρα αὐτῆς· ὅταν δὲ γεννήσῃ τὸ παιδίον, οὐκ ἔτι μνημονεύει τῆς θλίψεως, διὰ τὴν χαρὰν, ὅτι ἐγεννήθη ἄνθρωπος εἰς τὸν κόσμον. Καὶ ὑμεῖς οὖν λύπην μὲν νῦν ἔχετε· πάλιν δὲ 22 ὄψομαι ὑμᾶς, καὶ χαρήσεται ὑμῶν ἡ καρδία, καὶ τὴν χαρὰν ὑμῶν οὐδεὶς αἰρεῖ ἀφ' ὑμῶν. ¹ Καὶ ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐμὲ οὐκ ἐρωτήσετε οὐδέν. Ἀμήν 23 ἀμήν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι ὅσα ἂν αἰτήσητε τὸν Πατέρα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου, δώσει ὑμῖν. Ἔως ἄρτι οὐκ ἠτήσατε οὐδέν ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου· αἰτεῖτε, 24 καὶ λήψεσθε, ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ ὑμῶν ᾗ πεπληρωμένη. Ταῦτα ἐν παροιμίαις 25 λεκάλημι ὑμῖν· ἀλλ' ἔρχεται ὥρα ὅτε οὐκ ἔτι ἐν παροιμίαις λαλήσω ὑμῖν, ἀλλὰ παρῴσιά περὶ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἀναγγεῖλω ὑμῖν. Ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ 26 ἡμέρᾳ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου αἰτήσεσθε· καὶ οὐ λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐρω- ^m τήσω τὸν Πατέρα περὶ ὑμῶν· ^m αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ Πατὴρ φιλεῖ ὑμᾶς, ὅτι 27 ὑμεῖς ἐμὲ πεφιλήκατε, καὶ πεπιστεύκατε ὅτι ἐγὼ παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐξῆλ- ^m θον. Ἐξῆλθον παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ ἐλήλυθα εἰς τὸν κόσμον· πάλιν 28 ἀφίημι τὸν κόσμον, καὶ πορεύομαι πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα.

1 Supra 14. 13. & 15. 16.
Matt. 7. 7. & 21. 22.
Mark 11. 24.
Luke 11. 9.
James 1. 5.

m Infra 17. 8. 25.

sion) has more of nature and spirit. q. d. "What, then, are you debating?" &c.

20. ἀμήν ἀμήν λέγω ὑμῖν, &c.] Our Lord did not, for the reason above mentioned, give any explanation. And thus his silence may be supposed to mean: "Yet it is so. What I have said you will find true." However, in order to more deeply impress their minds, he points to the circumstances which should accompany the events in question; namely, at first the sorrow of his disciples, and the triumphant exultation of the world; then the grief of the disciples soon afterwards turned into joy: "*quasi post nubila Phœbus.*"

21. Our Lord here illustrates what he has just said by a simile familiar to the Hebrew writers (as Isa. xxi. 3. xxvi. 17. xxxvii. 3. Jer. iv. 31. xxii. 23. xxx. 6.), and not unknown to the Classical ones. See Hom. Iliad. α. 269. Τίττειν in the Classical writers signifies to bear children; but in the Hellenistic ones mostly (as here) to be in travail. It is, however, sometimes in Hippocrates interchanged with κτείν. Δύπνην ἔχει must, from the context, denote "is in pangs," is suffering pangs. Ὥρα should be rendered, not hour, but time. Ἀνθρώπος signifies here a human being, without reference to sex. She rejoices (as Grot. expresses it) quod genus humanum novâ prole auxerit. And not only from the thing itself, but its results to herself; for as barrenness was thought a reproach, so child-bearing was considered the reverse; not to mention the pleasure anticipated from the duty and affection of the child. So Aristotle observes: οὐ παντ' εὐδαιμονικὸς ὁ ἀτεκνος.

22. ἔχετε and αἰρεῖ are Presents for Futures. Χαρήσεται ὑμῶν ἢ. κ. A strong expression signifying, "ye shall feel heartfelt joy." By τὴν χαρὰν ὑμῶν οὐδεὶς αἰρεῖ ἀφ' ὑμῶν it is meant that their joy should be uninterrupted and permanent; not liable to be taken away, as all joy founded on human affairs must be.

23. Christ here subjoins, what would tend to repress their anxiety for the explanation, which he had thought fit not to give them, by intimating that in that day of joy they would have no occu-

sion to put questions on the subject; q. d. "Ye will have nothing to ask me;" for that such is the sense of ἐμὲ οὐκ ἐρωτ. ο. the best Commentators are agreed. On the subject of putting questions, Christ engrafs that of preferring requests; and shows that whatever else they might have to ask for, in His cause, whether Spiritual illumination, or courage in action, the Father would deny them nothing.

24. ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου] i. e. "on my account, for my cause," as many eminent Commentators explain; or, as Hamm. and Lampe, "by my mediation," through me, as Mediator between God and man. But this, which can scarcely be the direct sense, is implied in the former interpretation.

— αἰτεῖτε — πενήθη.] i. e. ye have only to ask and receive, that your joy may be complete; meaning their spiritual joy, especially that adverted to supra ver. 22.

25. Christ here gives a reason why he had spoken ἐν παροιμίαις, darkly and figuratively. See Note on Matt. xiii. 3. To this is opposed ἀναγγεῖλιν παρῴσιά, to speak without the involvements of figurative allusion. I would here compare the words of Æschyl. Agam. 1154. φρενώσω δ' (scil. ἡμᾶς) οὐκ ἔτ' ἐξ ἀνιγμάτων. By ταῦτα is meant all that Christ had said in the preceding discourses. The fulfilment of this promise is alluded to at Luke xxiv. 26 — 44. and Acts i. 3.

26 — 28. Here are indicated the advantages resulting from this fuller knowledge: "At that time (i. e. when I shall have more fully taught you concerning my Father, his counsels, and decrees) ye shall address your prayers in my name, and shall receive benefits the most precious." (Tittm.)

— καὶ οὐ λέγω — ὑμῶν.] Since Christ has at xiv. 16. promised that he will ask the Father on their behalf; and as we have just after, xvii. 9. seqq. an actual intercession for them, and as Christ is at Rom. viii. 34. Heb. vii. 25. & 1 John ii. 1. I. said to be continually interceding for his disciples, the sense of the words must be, not what they would at first seem to express, but what has been assigned by the most eminent Interpreters

29 *Λέγουσιν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ· Ἴδε νῦν παρόρησά λαλεῖς, καὶ*
 30 *παροιμίαν οὐδεμίαν λέγεις.* ⁿ *νῦν οἶδαμεν ὅτι οἶδας πάντα, καὶ οὐ* ⁿ *Infrā 17. 8.*
χρειάν ἔχεις ἵνα τίς σε ἐρωτῇ. ἐν τούτῳ πιστεύομεν ὅτι ἀπὸ Θεοῦ
 31 *ἐξῆλθες.* *Ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Ἄσπι πιστεύετε;* ^o *ἰδοὺ, ἔρχεται* ^o *Matt. 25. 31.*
 32 *ὥρα, καὶ νῦν ἐλήλυθεν, ἵνα σκοπισθῆτε ἕκαστος εἰς τὰ ἴδια, καὶ ἐμὲ* ^{Mark 14. 27.}
 33 *μόνον ἀφῆτε· καὶ οὐκ εἰμὶ μόνος, ὅτι ὁ Πατήρ μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐστι. ταῦτα*
λελάληκα ὑμῖν, ἵνα ἐν ἐμοὶ εἰρήνην ἔχητε. ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ θλίψιν ἔξετε·
ἀλλὰ θαρσεῖτε, ἐγὼ νενίκηκα τὸν κόσμον.

1 XVII. ^p *ΤΑΡΤΑ* ἐλάλησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ ἐπῆρε τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ^p *Supra 12. 23.*

for the last century, namely, "I need not say that I shall pray the Father for you, since you know I will do *that*; [nay, there is no *need*, in *another* respect] for the Father Himself loveth you." This idiom has the technical name *præteritio*, and is to be found even in the Classical writers. The omission of a clause suspended on γάρ is common in the N. T. *Ἄσπι* is for *ἀσπίματος*. *Πεφίληκατε* and *πιστεύκατε* are to be taken as Presents. On the full sense of *ἐξῆλθον παρὰ τοῦ Πατρ.* (as denoting not *mission* from, but *procession* from God, implying the being *with God*, and *VERY GOD*.) Compare iii. 13. 31. vi. 62. viii. 41. and see the Notes of Lampe and Tittm. in Recens. Synop.

30. *νῦν οἶδαμεν, &c.*] We may paraphrase: "Now we experimentally know that to thee all the thoughts, wishes, and desires of men are open, and therefore cannot doubt of thy divine mission." To the Messiah, the Jews always ascribed supernatural knowledge of the thoughts of men.

31. *ἄσπι πιστεύετε;*] Christ here checks their excessive confidence, and inculcates diffidence in their own strength. The interrogation here, as often, involves a strong negation.

32. *καὶ νῦν ἐλήλυθεν*] "nay, is now come." At *ἴδια* sub. *οἰκίματα*. So I Macc. vi. 54. *ἕκαστος εἰς τὸν τόπον ἑαυτοῦ*. Comp. Hom. Odys. a. 274. *Μηστῆριος μὲν ἐπὶ σφέτερα σκιδνάσθαι ἀναχθεῖ*. — *καὶ οὐκ εἰμὶ, &c.*] The *καὶ* has here, as often, the sense *and yet*; and in *μετ' ἐμοῦ* there is an allusion to the double meaning of the phrase. See Note on viii. 29.

33. *ταῦτα*.] The recent Commentators too much limit the force of the word, as if referring only to what was *just said*. Whereas it must, with the ancient, and some eminent modern Commentators, be taken of the whole of what had been said in the preceding discourse; which, it seems, our Lord delivered for the purpose of suggesting grounds of consolation under the evils which they would speedily encounter, and perpetually have to grapple with. See Lampe and Doddr.

— *ἐν ἐμοὶ*] i. e. by faith in me, and reliance on my protection. *Εἰρήνην*, that tranquillity of mind, consolation, and comfort, which he had so solemnly bequeathed them at xiv. 27, and alone to be attained through Him "who is our Peace." See Eph. ii. 14.

— *νενίκηκα τὸν κόσμον*.] This is, as Kuin. and Tittm. observe, the *prophetic* Præterite, for the Future, namely, when the future event is just about to take place. *Νικ.* signifies "to foil, and frustrate." *Κόσμος* here denotes the unbelieving and persecuting part of the world, combined under their leader the *ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου*, to destroy the cause of the Gospel. By saying that

He hath overcome the world (for the *ἐγὼ* is emphatic) our Lord intimates that by the same all powerful aid (that of the Father, (see v. 32.) and His own, and the Holy Spirit's), *they* might also come off more than conquerors in the day of tribulation and persecution. See Rom. viii. 37. 1 Cor. xv. 57. 2 Cor. ii. 14. 1 John iv. 4.

XVII. After concluding the above impressive discourse, Christ addresses himself in *prayer* to God. The prayer is (as Tittm. observes) such, that, "had we no other knowledge of Christ than what was furnished thence, it would be sufficient to show us the supreme dignity of his person, his exalted magnanimity, his ardent love to man, and the momentous consequences of the work He was effecting." The following brief analysis thereof is given by Dr. Hales, vol. iii. 190: "As the Jewish High Priest, on the day of *atonement*, was required to make *annual intercession* for himself, for his household, the *Priests* and *Levites*, and for the *whole nation*, Levit. xvi. 17.; so our *all-sufficient* High Priest, *once for all*, Heb. ix. 26. Rom. vi. 10., on this his great day of *atonement*, solemnly *interceded* with God His Father for himself, that he might be received into *glory*, his original *glory* in heaven, xvii. 1—5., for his *household*, the *Apostles* and *Disciples*, that God would preserve them in his *name*, or in the true religion; give them a spirit of *unity* and *concord*, and protect them in and from the *wicked world*, v. 6—19.; and that, finally, they might partake of his *glory* in heaven, and also be supported by his *love* and *presence* on earth, v. 24—26.; and also for all *future believers*, through their preaching, that they might be endued with the same spirit of unity and concord, and for the *conversion* of the whole world, v. 20—23."

Lampe thinks, that the primary intent of this prayer was, to console the disciples. But it was equally so to *instruct* them, (since, as Dr. Hales observes, it unfolds the grand mystery of the Gospel—the instituted means of salvation by the Father and the Son conjointly, from their love to the world), to set them an example of fortitude and resignation, as well as prayer to God under circumstances of peril, affliction, and distress; finally, to teach Christians of all ages to commit themselves and all their concerns to the Providence of that God who "watcheth over them." This may very well serve to account for the *variation of manner* in different parts of the prayer; for though, throughout the whole, Christ speaks as the *Incarnate Son of God*, yet he sometimes supplicates as *Man*; at others he speaks as the *Mediator of his people*, but not unfrequently expresses himself with *Divine* majesty and authority.

1. *ἔπηρε τοὺς ὀφθαλ.* a. e. τ. o.] On this attitude

αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ εἶπε· Πάτερ, ἐλήλυθεν ἡ ὥρα· δόξασον
 σου τὸν γίόν· ἵνα καὶ ὁ γίός σου δοξάσῃ σε· ¹ καθὼς ἔδωκας αὐτῷ 2
 ἐξουσίαν πάσης σαρκὸς ἵνα πᾶν ὃ δέδωκας αὐτῷ, δώσῃ αὐτοῖς ζωὴν
 αἰώνιον. Αὕτη δὲ ἐστὶν ἡ αἰώνιος ζωὴ, ἵνα γινώσκωσι σὲ τὸν μόνον 3

q Matt. 28. 18.
 supra 5. 27.

of reverent devotion, as well as that of lifting up the hands, see Elsn. and Lampe.

— Πάτερ.] On the peculiar sense in which the word is here to be taken, see Lampe in Recens. Synop. Christ is here to be considered as praying according to his *human* nature: for as Schoettg. observes, “in his state of *exinanition*, having emptied himself of his glory, Christ is considered as a *subject* fulfilling the orders of his *Monarch*, namely, God. Therefore to the Triune God, as his Lord and Master, Christ might direct his prayers.” Ἐλήλυθεν ἡ ὥρα, i. e. the decisive and appointed time, the time in which the glory both of the Father and the Son should be manifested. ἡ ὥρα is elsewhere so employed in the N. T., and almost always used of a period ushering in calamity.

— δόξασον — δοξάσῃ σε] i. e. “receive Him into the glory He originally had in Heaven.” On the nature of that glory, *how* it was manifested in Heaven, developed on earth, and revealed to men; how the Father was glorified by the Son, in all His attributes, and in the whole work of salvation, see Lampe and Tittm. in Recens. Synop.

2. καθὼς ἔδωκας — σαρκὸς, &c.] This suggests the *reason* and *cause* of the prayer here offered; our Lord refers both his own glory and that of his Father to the work of salvation committed to him. καθὼς, “inasmuch as, since.”

— ἐξουσίαν πάσης σαρκὸς] “a power over all men.” A Hellenistic use of the Genit. Πᾶσα σὰρξ is a frequent Hebraism. Πᾶν is Neut. for masc., by a usage frequent in the Classical writers. It is considered by Kypke and Kuin. as a nom. absol., or an accus. for dat., and αὐτοῖς as redundant, the plural being referred to the sing. πᾶν, by the figure πρὸς τὸ σημαίνον. But Lampe, with reason, objects to this pleonasm, and enalage of number. The pleonasm, indeed, is *energetic*, and therefore *no* pleonasm. And the enalage *may* be, as he says, emphatic. It should, however, seem best not too *anxiously* to press on such constructions, nor too minutely to discuss them on the principles of Classical construction; but to consider them as *anacolutha*, such as are found in the *popular* phraseology of almost all languages. But, to turn from words to things; on the full extent of this *august* power claimed by our Lord, Tittm. shows that it involves the governance of all human affairs, the regulation of the vicissitudes of times, and places, &c. &c.: all in order to accomplish the work of human salvation. A work committed to Him, as the Saviour of men, in order that he who *obtained* that salvation, might be the *giver* of it. Christ might, indeed, be said to give eternal life, by giving and promulgating that Gospel which reveals it. But he emphatically gives it, by the sacrifice of himself to atone for the sins of the whole world.

3. αὕτη δὲ ἐστὶν — Χριστόν.] In the interpretation of this verse the utmost caution is requisite, since from it senses the *very opposite* have been sought. It has ever been regarded by the Heterodox as one of their strong-holds, and from this they have adventured to impugn the doctrine of the DEITY OF CHRIST. In order to effectually frustrate their attempt, many Orthodox Commen-

tators, ancient and modern, lay down such a construction of the sentence, as that the words τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν Θεὸν may belong not *only* to the Father, but also to the Son. This they seek to effect in two ways, — 1. by inverting the natural order of the words, thus: “Ut te, et quem misisti Jesum Christum, solum verum Deum agnoscant.” 2. by supposing an ellipsis of εἶναι, and after καὶ supplying ἅμα σοι. But the best Commentators have long been agreed, that this arbitrary *transposition* and *supplying of words* involves so much violence, that the interpretation founded thereon is inadmissible. Indeed, as Bp. Middlet. observes, “it could only have originated in a wish to evade the consequences which this text has been supposed to establish.” We must not, then, seek here an *assertion of the Deity of Christ*, but content ourselves with proving that Christ is *not* here represented as a *mere Legate*, much less a *mere MAN*. That our Lord did not, *could* not, mean to make such an assertion, is plain both from the passage itself, and from what precedes and follows it.

In the first place, it is proper to ascertain the exact sense of the terms μόνον, ἀληθινὸν, and γινώσκειν. Now this will mainly depend upon the *construction*; about which no little difference of opinion exists. There are *two* classes of Interpreters, who each suppose an ellipsis of εἶναι. But, as Bp. Middlet. has proved, the exposition of the one class is negated by the presence of the Art. τὸν; and that of the other, both by that, and by its involving an unprecedented harshness of construction. It is evident that τὸν μόνον ἀλ. Θε. is in *apposition* with σε; and we may, with Lampe, suppose the τὸν to mean, “who art thou,” &c.; or, with Bp. Middlet. render, “as being.” Of *most* consequence, however, is it to ascertain the *true import* of μόνον ἀληθ. Now many ancient Expositors (as Athanasius, and most of the early Fathers), and, of the moderns, Calvin, Bp. Bull, Wets., Tittm., Hales, and others, suppose the words to recognize in God the Father a superiority, as being such, *principaliter*, and κατ’ ἐξοχὴν; the Fountain of all Deity; namely, as it is expressed by Athanasius (cited by Bp. Bull) Def. Fid. Nic. p. 264. ὅτι μόνος ἀγέννητος, καὶ μόνος πηγὴ Θεότητος. Yet, however true may be the doctrine itself, (which has been established, as on a Rock, by Zanchius and Bp. Bull. in Section iv. of his immortal DEFENSIO Fidei Nicænæ), yet here it should seem to be out of place. Indeed, it may be observed, that one of the arguments which most effectually keep out the *Socinian* interpretation, will go far to exclude *this*. And to those by whom it has been supported, we may, to a certain degree, apply what Bp. Middlet. has said of the Socinian interpreters, who, he observes, “argue as if in *our Saviour’s days* there had been the same controversy about the *nature* and *essence* of the One True God, which arose afterwards; whereas the dispute then was, whether there were a *plurality* of Gods, or only One; of which the Jews held the latter, and the whole Pagan world, the former opinion.” This very circumstance, I would remark, is strongly in favor of an interpretation which has every appearance of be-

4 ἀληθινὸν Θεὸν, καὶ ὃν ἀπέστειλας Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν. Ἐγὼ σε ἐδόξασα
 5 ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς· τὸ ἔργον ἐτελείωσα ὃ δέδωκάς μοι ἵνα ποιήσω· καὶ νῦν
 δόξασόν με σὺ, Πάτερ, παρὰ σεαυτῶ, τῇ δόξῃ ἣ εἶχον πρὸ τοῦ τὸν
 6 κόσμον εἶναι παρὰ σοί. Ἐφανέρωσά σου τὸ ὄνομα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις,
 οὓς δέδωκάς μοι ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου. Σοὶ ᾗσαν, καὶ ἐμοὶ αὐτοὺς δέδωκάς·
 7 καὶ τὸν λόγον σου τετηρήκασι. Νῦν ἔργωναν ὅτι πάντα ὅσα δέδωκάς

ing the true one, and has been adopted by some ancient and many eminent modern Expositors, as Lucas, Brugensis, Maldon, Grot., Whitty, Pearce, Schleus., Bp. Middl., Bp. Burgess, and Archdeacon Pott: according to which, *μόνον ἀληθ.* is supposed to be meant in opposition to the *false gods* of the Heathens, who have no real entity. Comp. 1 Thess. i. 9. 1 John ii. 8. Thus the Apostles would be taught that (to use the words of Bp. Middl.) “eternal life is only to be obtained by a knowledge of the *one true God*, and of Jesus Christ; thus directing the mind to the truths both of natural and revealed religion.” This is supported and confirmed by two passages of Josephus, namely, *Antiq.* viii. 13. 6. *προσκύνουν ἕνα Θεὸν, καὶ μέγιστον καὶ ἀληθῆ μόνον ἀποκαλοῦντες· τοὺς δ’ ἄλλους ὀνόματα ὑπὸ φάβου καὶ ἀνοήτου δόξης πεποιημένα.* and *Ant.* x. 11. 7. where Nebuchadnezzar calls the God of Daniel (Jehovah) *τὸν μόνον ἀληθῆ.* καὶ τὸ πᾶν κράτος ἔχοντα. i. e. (as Bp. Burgess, in his excellent Tract addressed to Mrs. J. Baillie, p. 77, explains the *τὸν μόνον ἀλ.*) “greater than all the gods of the heathens.” The learned Prelate there well remarks, that “the term *only* does not possess so *exclusive* a sense in Greek, Latin, or English, as is insisted on by Socinians and others, to the exclusion of the Deity of Christ, and that Servius’s Note on a passage of Virgil’s *Georgics*, may serve as an illustration: ‘*Sola, magna, præcipua, id est, supra alios deos marinos.*’ The restricted sense of this term, (continues the Bishop), in our own language, may be exemplified from a memorable passage in the Liturgy of our Church: ‘*Thou only art holy.*’ is said of Christ, but not exclusively of the Holy Spirit; and ‘*Thou only art the Lord,*’ yet not exclusively of the Father.” Thus it is plain that there is no opposition intended between the Father and the Son; and that the Father is no more said to be the *true God*, to the *exclusion* of the Son, than at *Is.* xlv. 6. xlv. 22. In short (as Bp. Middl. says), “it is perfectly frivolous to introduce this passage into the Trinitarian dispute.”

To advert to the import of *γινώσκωσι*, the term must, in its full force, (which is fully discussed by Lampe and Tittm.) denote such *knowing* and *recognizing* the Father and the Son to be what they have revealed themselves, *cum effectu*, and not in mere speculative knowledge, as shall influence us to worship, serve, and obey them; and to seek salvation from them alone. Thus the general sense may be expressed in paraphrase as follows: “This is the way by which they may attain to eternal salvation, namely, to acknowledge Thee as the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent [as the only true Messiah].” See Note on 1 John v. 20.

4. *σε ἐδόξασα.*] Jesus glorified the Father by causing him and his attributes to be known and acknowledged on earth. See Lampe and Tittm. — *τὸ ἔργον — ποιήσω.*] Not the work of teaching only as some recent Commentators suppose, but also (as Grot., Lampe, and Storr have proved)

that of *atonement by his death and passion*, which was then commencing. For as they were so very near, this anticipation is very admissible. The words breathe a holy triumph at so goodly a work being nearly completed.

5. *δόξασόν με σὺ, &c.*] Here again our Lord has predicated of himself things most august, and evincing his Divine majesty. 1. He professes that he had *δόξαν*, (Heb. *כְּבוֹד*) i. e. the divine Majesty, embracing the whole compass of the Divine nature, attributes, counsels, and works. (See the Note on i. 14.) 2. He makes the asseveration. “I had this glory *παρὰ σοί*, i. e. with God in Heaven.” Therefore he *was in Heaven* before he came into the world, or *was in the bosom of the Father*. (John i. 18.) 3. He professes that he had glory with the Father, *before he came to the earth*; nay, *πρὸ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον εἶναι*, or (as the Apostles say) *πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου*, and (as St. John expresses it) *ἐν ἀρχῇ*, i. e. *from eternity*. For by phrases of that sort the Hebrews were accustomed to designate *eternity*. (See the Note on i. 1.) 4. He prays that the glory and majesty which, as *Son of God*, he enjoyed from all eternity, the Father would now invest him with, as *Son of man*, and *Saviour of the human race*. Now, how could he have said this, and thus prayed for it from the Father, unless he had been the true and eternal Son of God, such as he is described in this Gospel? (Tittm.) The same learned Commentator and Lampe have completely refuted the Socinian perversion of *ἔχων*, by which it is understood only of *destination*.

6 — 14. Christ here speaks of his *disciples*, and commends them to the especial favour and protection of the Father, since they had been his docile followers, and were to be the first planters of his Gospel.

As *ὄνομα τοῦ Θεοῦ* is often used for *θεός*, so *σὺν τὸ ὄνομα* may denote *Thee*, i. e. thy nature, attributes, and counsels for the salvation of men. See v. 14.

6. *οὓς δέδωκάς μοι.*] The best Commentators are agreed, that the sense is: “whom, by Thy Providence, thou hast delivered to me, to be taught, and brought unto salvation.” By *τοῦ κόσμου* is meant the world at large, which, as we are elsewhere told, lieth in sin.

— *σοὶ ᾗσαν*] namely, 1. by right of creation and preservation; and 2. by sincere attachment to thee. *Δέδωκας*, hast given me them as Disciples. *Τὸν λόγον σου τερ.* means the *doctrine of the Gospel* delivered to them through Christ by God the Father. *τερ.* is a very strong term, and imports entire acquiescence in, and adherence to, as a principle of action.

7. *ἔγνωσαν*] “they assuredly know.” By *πάντα* may be understood both the *words* and *works* enjoined by the Father; but chiefly the former, as appears from the next verse, which is, in some measure, exegetical of the preceding.

8. *ὅτι παρὰ σοῦ ἐξήλθον.*] Tittm. observes, that we must be careful to distinguish the *proceeding*

r Supra 16. 27,
30,
infra ver. 25.

μοι παρὰ σοῦ ἐστίν· ὅτι τὰ ζήματα ἃ δέδωκάς μοι, δέδωκα αὐτοῖς· 8
καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔλαβον, καὶ ἔγνωσαν ἀληθῶς, ὅτι παρὰ σοῦ ἐξῆλθον· καὶ
ἐπίστευσαν ὅτι σὺ με ἀπέστειλας. Ἐγὼ περὶ αὐτῶν ἐρωτῶ· οὐ περὶ 9
τοῦ κόσμου ἐρωτῶ, ἀλλὰ περὶ ὧν δέδωκάς μοι, ὅτι σοὶ εἰσι. * Καὶ τὰ 10

s Supra 16. 15.

t Supra 10. 30,
infra ver. 21.

ἐμὰ πάντα σὰ ἐστί, καὶ τὰ σὰ ἐμὰ· καὶ δεδύξασμαι ἐν αὐτοῖς. † Καὶ 11
οὐκ ἔτι ἐμὴ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, καὶ οὗτοι ἐν τῇ κόσμῳ εἰσὶ, καὶ ἐγὼ πρός
σε ἔρχομαι. Πάτερ ἄγιε, τήρησον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου, ‡ οὓς

of Jesus from God, xvi. 28., and coming to the earth, v. 3., from his being sent by God, as the Messiah. It should seem that ἐξῆλθον here includes both these particulars: one referring to his Divine nature, as Son of God, the other to his office as commissioned from the Father, and sent to redeem mankind. The best comment on this passage is viii. 42. ἐγὼ γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ Ουοῦ ἐξῆλθον καὶ ἦκα (scil. εἰς τὸν κόσμον) οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀπ' ἐμαντοῦ ἐξῆλθον, ἀλλ' ἐκείνός με ἀπέστειλε.

9. οὐ περὶ τοῦ κόσμου ἐρωτῶ.] Since Christ did elsewhere pray for the world, (see v. 20, 22. Luke xxiii. 34.) nay for his very enemies, Kuin. supposes the sense to be: "I pray especially for thy faithful worshippers; they are worthy of this favour." Others take οὐ—ἀλλὰ for *non tam—quam*, importing that the prayer for His disciples is not to the exclusion of the world from his prayers. But this is *extorting* a sense which is not inherent in the words. The difficulty will, I think, be removed by rendering ἐρωτῶ "I am praying," meaning, I am *now* praying. The nature of the thing did not (as the best Commentators have seen) admit of Christ's *then* praying for the world, i. e. the unbelieving part of it, those who had not embraced the Gospel. See v. 20.

—ὅτι σοὶ εἰσι] i. e. *now* by adoption (see 1 John iii. 2.) as heretofore by creation, &c. See note sup. v. 6.

10. καὶ τὰ ἐμὰ—ἐμὰ.] These words seem meant to illustrate the preceding: since from the close communion of will, counsel, and works, of Father and Son, whatever is the one's is also the other's. See xvi. 15. Hence the disciples are sometimes called the *Father's*, and sometimes the *Son's*. The πάντα may be taken (as the recent Commentators direct) for the masc. πάντες; but in a *gnoine generatis* like this, the neuter may denote both *persons* and *things*.

—καὶ δεδύξασμαι ἐν αὐτοῖς.] These words seem meant to express something *beyond* the preceding, q. d. "they are not only mine, but I am glorified in and through them; therefore they are *effectively* mine." Rosenm. and Tittm. take δεδέξ. in a Future sense, as a *preterite prophetic*. But the glorification in question, namely, by the propagation of his religion, had already taken place, and was taking place. Hence Grot. and Doddr. would take it for a Pres. or Aor. But strict philosophical propriety will not warrant that. The case seems to be this: The Perf. is often put for the Pres., when an action or state is designated, which has commenced in time past, but extends also to the present. See Matth. Gr. Gr. § 503. and Win. Gr. Gr. § 34. 3. a. But the Present, in an action of *continued progression*, like the spreading of the Gospel, is so *intermingled* with the Future, that the Future may also be included. Thus the full sense is: "I have been, am being, and am to be glorified."

11. καὶ οὐκ ἔτι—ἔρχομαι.] These words offer the *reason* why Jesus commends them to the

protection of God. See xiv. 13. Render: "I am [as it were] no longer in the world, but they are in the world [alone]; while I am going to thee." Yet something is wanting to complete the sense. It should seem that in this verse the words ἐγὼ περὶ αὐτῶν are supposed to be repeated, q. d. "Yea, I do pray for them, as being myself no longer in the world." &c.

—Πάτερ ἄγιε, &c.] Now follows, to the end of the Chapter, the prayer of our Lord for the disciples. With Πάτερ ἄγιε the Commentators compare the precatory use of *Sancte Pater!* in the Latin Classical writers.

—τήρησον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀν. σ.] On the sense of ἐν τῷ ὀνόμ. σου the Commentators differ. It seems to be best explained by Grot., De Dieu, Kuin., Hales, and Campb., who take it to mean "in the profession of thy doctrine and worship, in the faith and practice of thy religion." "By making known (says Campb.) the name of God to those who enjoyed the old dispensation, is plainly suggested that additional light was conveyed to them, which they could not have derived from it. By manifesting God's name to them, therefore, we must understand the communication of those truths which peculiarly characterize the new dispensation; and as every revelation which God gives tends further to illustrate the divine character, the instructions which our Lord gave to his disciples, relating to life and immortality, and the recovery of sinners through his mediation, may well be called revealing God, or (which, in the Hebrew idiom, is the same) the *name of God* to them."

There is here a remarkable var. lect. Instead of οὓς, very many MSS. (mostly ancient) and several Greek Commentators and early Edd. have ᾧ; which has been received by almost every Editor, except Matthæi. from Beng. and Wets. to Scholz. And this is very agreeable to the Critical Canon, which directs the more difficult reading to be preferred. But that Canon has several limitations and exceptions; and, amongst the rest, where the readings are exceedingly similar in appearance, and where the propriety of the language rejects the more difficult one, or where the context will not permit it. Now *all* these circumstances here concur. For the ᾧ involves an unprecedented harshness; since thus we must take ἐν τῷ ὀνόμ. in the sense "by thy power;" a use of ὄνομα nowhere else found in Scripture, or any other writings; and which would be unsuitable to the words following. Besides, the idiom of ᾧ for ὁ is not agreeable to the character of St. John's style, and nowhere occurs in his Gospel or his Epistles. Whereas the above use occurs at ver. 6, 9, and 12, of this prayer. Indeed the common reading is not only greatly superior in external evidence (being supported by a decided majority of MSS., some exceedingly ancient, and the earliest Versions and Fathers), but seems to be placed beyond doubt by the *repetition* of

12 δέδωκάς μοι ἵνα ὣσιν ἐν καθὼς ἡμεῖς. "Ὅτε ἤμην μετ' αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ ^{Infra 18. 9.} κόσμῳ, ἐγὼ ἐτήρουν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι σου· οὗς δέδωκάς μοι ἐφύλαξα, ^{Ps. 109. 8.} καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀπόλειτο, εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας, ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ
13 πληρωθῇ. Νῦν δὲ πρὸς σε ἔρχομαι, καὶ ταῦτα λαλῶ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ,
14 ἵνα ἔχῃσι τὴν χαρὰν τὴν ἐμὴν πεπληρωμένην ἐν αὐτοῖς. Ἐγὼ δέδωκα
αὐτοῖς τὸν λόγον σου· καὶ ὁ κόσμος ἐμίσησεν αὐτοὺς, ὅτι οὐκ εἰσὶν ἐκ τοῦ
15 κόσμου, καθὼς ἐγὼ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου. Οὐκ ἐρωτῶ ἵνα ἄρῃς αὐτοὺς
16 ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου, ἀλλ' ἵνα τηρήσῃς αὐτοὺς ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ. Ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου
17 οὐκ εἰσὶ, καθὼς ἐγὼ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου οὐκ εἰμί. Ἁγιάσον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ ἄλλῃ-
18 θείῃ σου. ὁ λόγος ὁ σὸς ἀληθινός ἐστι. Καθὼς ἐμὲ ἀπέστειλας εἰς τὸν

the words in the next verse, ἐγὼ ἐτήρουν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι σου, οὗς δέδωκάς μοι. I cannot help suspecting that the false interpretation of *ὄνομα* and the alteration of *οὗς* to *ᾧ* or *ᾗ* (which last is found in several MSS. and Versions), arose chiefly from an inattention to the *transposition*; which, however, is frequent in St. John's writings. Certainly, if the librarii *did* stumble at *ὄνοματι*, (and what was so probable?) they would be likely to alter the reading *οὗς* to *ᾧ* or *ᾗ*. Whereas, if we were to suppose *ᾧ* or *ᾗ* to have been the *original* reading, it would not be easy to account for the alteration into *οὗς*.

— ἵνα ὣσιν ἐν καθὼς ἡμεῖς.] This is a blending of two phrases, ἵνα ὦσι (καθ') and ἵνα ὦσι καθὼς ἡμεῖς ἔσμεν; the latter explaining the former: the sense being, "that they may be united in sentiment, affection, and zeal for the dissemination of the Gospel, even as we are united in will and purpose."

12. ἀπόλειτο.] There seems here to be, as in Ps. ii. 12., an allusion to the case of a traveller, who has, from abandoning his guide, lost the right path, and come to destruction. In the words of the above Psalm, *ἀράσασθε παιδείας, μήποτε ἀπολείσθε ἐξ ὁδοῦ δικαίας*, there is a use of the antecedent for the consequent, as in the present passage.

— ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας.] The sense is not merely, as Rosenm., Kuin., Schleusn., and Tittm. render, *homo nequam, nullius fragis*; but the expression must mean one who is deserving of, and devoted to, perdition. This use of *υἱὸς* with a noun in the Genit. is a Hebraism.

— ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ.] The best Expositors are agreed that the sense is: "So that the Scripture is thus fulfilled;" or, as Bp. Pearce explains, may be *applied* in this case. On the passage here had in view the Commentators are not agreed. Most think there is only a *general reference* to the prophecies concerning the passion of our Saviour. See, however, Ps. 41. 9. and 109, S. compared with Acts i. 20.

13. ἵνα ἔχῃσι — αὐτοῖς.] Render: "that they may [by these words] have their joy in me (i. e. of which I am the object) complete and perfect." Now that would shortly be the case at his resurrection, and the sending to them the Holy Spirit.

15. οὐκ ἐρωτῶ — κόσμου.] The sense seems to be, "I pray not that thou shouldst remove them from this life." To more fully comprehend the purport of the expression, it is proper to bear in mind a remark of Euthym. and Grot. that "these words are said in *explication* of the preceding, and for the sake of the disciples then present, and within hearing." Our Lord, therefore, meant *indirectly* to warn his disciples, under the bitter persecutions they would be called upon to endure, not to wish or pray for death, since he had

important purposes for them to answer, during many years: at the same time suggesting to them motives for constancy and fortitude, in their being *defended* and *preserved* under the sorrows which should surround them.

By *τοῦ πονηροῦ* many eminent Commentators understand the *Evil one*; referring to Matth. vi. 13. & 1 John v. 19. But though that interpretation be there suitable, it does not follow that it should *here* be admitted, since the circumstances are different. It is better, with Est., Grotius, Lampe, Campb., Noesselt, Rosenm., and Tittm., to take *τοῦ πονηροῦ* in the *neuter* gender of *evil*, as Rom. xii. 9, and often elsewhere. The sense, too, thence arising is more extensive, and more suitable to the context.

17. ἁγιάσον — ἀληθινός ἐστι.] From their *preservation under trials* and calamity, our Lord proceeds to pray for their *preservation in the Evangelical office*. Ἀγιάζειν, like the Heb. *שָׂרַף*, signifies properly to separate, set apart to some office, whether civil or Ecclesiastical, i. e. to consecrate to the worship of God, or the concerns of religion. Ἅγιος properly denotes a person so set apart, or consecrated, and is used especially of *Prophets* or *Priests*; both being said *ἀγιάζεσθαι*. It is also used of the appointment by the Father of the Son to the work of human salvation by his incarnation (see x. 36.) and to which our Lord is said to have devoted himself. But how, it may be asked, are we to understand the term, as applied to the *Apostles*? On this Expositors are not agreed. Some assign the sense "Set them apart unto the promulgation of thy truth," i. e. the Word of the Gospel, which is then added, by way of explanation, as the *Truth*. Others take it to mean, "Sanctify them (namely, by cleansing them from sin, and releasing them from the power of sin, through the operation of the Holy Spirit, unto the promulgation of thy Faith." This latter interpretation seems preferable, as being called for by the *fact*, that the Apostles required far *more* than to be set apart to the ministry: not to say that in the term itself there seems an allusion to the Πνεῦμα ἅγιον. And this use of the word to denote *purify* is of frequent occurrence both in the Sept. and the N. T. as 1 Thess. v. 23. Since, however, the word is sometimes so used in the Sept. (as Gen. ii. 3. *ἡγίασεν ἡμέραν*. and supra x. 36. (of our Lord Jesus Christ) *ἐν ὁ Πατὴρ ἡγίασε*, i. e. ἀφύωσε) it may *here* also be admitted; yet only in *conjunction* with the other. And indeed this setting apart and consecrating would be the result of that *cleansing and purifying* of which the Apostles then stood much in need.

18. εἰς τὸν κόσμον.] Namely, for the purpose of *promulgating thy Truth*. See ver. 17.

κόσμον, καὶ γὰρ ἀπέστειλα αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸν κόσμον· καὶ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἐγὼ ἀγιάζω ἐμαυτὸν, ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ὧσιν ἡγιασμένοι ἐν ἀληθείᾳ. Οὐ περὶ τούτων 20 δὲ ἐρωτῶ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τῶν *πιστευόντων διὰ τοῦ λόγου αὐτῶν εἰς ἐμὲ·^x ἵνα πάντες ἐν ᾧσιν· καθὼς σὺ, Πάτερ, ἐν ἐμοὶ καὶ γὰρ ἐν σοὶ, ἵνα καὶ 21 αὐτοὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ἐν ᾧσιν· ἵνα ὁ κόσμος πιστεύῃ ὅτι σὺ με ἀπέστειλας. Καὶ 22 ἐγὼ τὴν δόξαν ἣν δέδωκάς μοι δέδωκα αὐτοῖς, ἵνα ᾧσιν ἐν καθὼς ἡμεῖς ἐν ἐσμέν· ἐγὼ ἐν αὐτοῖς, καὶ σὺ ἐν ἐμοί· ἵνα ᾧσι τετελειωμένοι εἰς 23 ἐν, καὶ ἵνα γινώσκῃ ὁ κόσμος ὅτι σὺ με ἀπέστειλας, καὶ ἡγάπησας αὐτούς, καθὼς ἐμὲ ἡγάπησας.^y Πάτερ, οὓς δέδωκάς μοι, θέλω ἵνα 24 ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ, κατέκινῃ ᾧσι μετ' ἐμοῦ· ἵνα θεωρῶσι τὴν δόξαν τὴν ἐμὴν, ἣν ἔδωκάς μοι, ὅτι ἡγάπησάς με πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου· Πάτερ 25 δίκαιε, καὶ ὁ κόσμος σε οὐκ ἔγνω, ἐγὼ δὲ σε ἔγνω, καὶ οὗτοι ἔγνωσαν ὅτι σὺ με ἀπέστειλας· καὶ ἐγνώρισα αὐτοῖς τὸ ὄνομά σου, καὶ γνω- 26 ρίσαι· ἵνα ἡ ἀγάπη ἣν ἡγάπησάς με ἐν αὐτοῖς ἦ, καὶ γὰρ ἐν αὐτοῖς.

XVIII. ^z ΤΑΡΤΑ εἰπὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐξῆλθε σὺν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐ-

x Supra 10. 38. & 14. 10.
1 John 1. 3.
& 3. 24.

y Supra 12. 26. & 14. 3.
1 Thess. 4. 17. supra ver. 5.

z Matt. 26. 36. Mark 14. 32.
Luke 22. 39.
2 Sam. 15. 23.

19. ἐγὼ ἀγιάζω ἐμαυτὸν.] Here, again, some difference of opinion exists as to the sense of the term ἀγιάζω; though it is generally agreed that it must be explained suitably to the sense adopted at ver. 17. This is, however, by no means necessary, considering the sudden transitions and changes of sense observable in this Gospel. It should seem that the word is here to be taken in the *secondary* sense pointed out at ver. 17; and thus we may render: "I set myself apart, devote myself to my ministry." The ἡγιασμένοι following must be explained in the same manner: "That they also may be devoted to the discharge of their sacred office."

20—26. Now commences the *concluding* portion of this sublime prayer, on the scope of which Expositors considerably differ in opinion; not only as to the *persons* who may be supposed to be objects of this prayer, but still more whether what is here said should be referred to Christians of that age, or of *all ages*: according as either of which views be adopted, so the leading terms, δόξαν, &c. are interpreted. One thing is certain — that our Lord here makes some change in the persons the objects of his prayers; namely, from the *Apostles* (then present). And it should seem that by τῶν πιστευόντων (which all the best Editors are agreed is to be read, instead of πιστευόντων) are meant the *believers in general* of that age, as distinguished from the *Apostles*. For these our Lord prays (ver. 21.) that they may be united to each other and to God, by a union as close as that which subsists between the Father and the Son (see x. 30. and Note), i. e. in being of *one mind, sentiment, will, and purpose*, being united to the Father and the Son by the Holy Spirit working in them. And for this, among other reasons: "that the unbelieving part of the world may, by seeing that union and concord, be more led to believe my doctrine to be from God."

At ver. 22, a difference of opinion exists as to *who* are the persons prayed for. Some say, *Christians in general*; others, the *Apostles*. And each class of Expositors interpret the δόξαν there according to their respective views; the former understanding it of the reward laid up in heaven for the righteous. But thus the expression δέδωκα will have to be taken for δώσω; which is the more

harsh, as δέδωκας, the next word but one, must thus be taken in a *preterite* sense. Others, therefore, suppose by δόξαν to be meant such a part of Christ's mediatorial glory, imparted to them by the Holy Spirit, as was suitable to the purposes they were to accomplish; including, of course, the *working of miracles* in establishment of the truth of the Gospel. Thus the next words ἵνα ᾧσι τετελειωμένοι, &c. advert to the *mode of exercising* such high gifts, namely, with that perfect union with themselves and with the Father and the Son, as exists between the Father and the Son. Then is represented the *purpose*, — namely, that, by being thus τετελειωμένοι (i. e. perfectly united), the world may be brought to believe in the Divine origin of the religion they teach and profess, and in the love and favour of God towards its faithful professors. Ver. 24 seems to have reference, not to the *same persons* only, but to true *believers in general*. The words denote admission to heavenly felicity, and participation in the joy of their Lord. At ver. 25 there is manifestly a transition to the *Apostles*; the οὗτοι being said δεικτικῶς. Our Lord finally commends them to the care and protection of the Father. Οὐκ ἔγνω. See viii. 27 & 28.

25. δίκαιε] most gracious. *Ἐγνώσαν, are assured. *Ὄνομα, thy counsels, &c. Γνωρίσω, i. e. both in person after my resurrection, and by the Comforter, after my ascension.

26. ἵνα ἡ ἀγάπη — αὐτοῖς] that the love with which thou hast loved me may be in them (i. e. enjoyed by them, that they may be the objects of thy love and Fatherly care, and attain happiness both in this world and in the next), and that I may be in them, namely, by my spiritual presence, that they may remain united with me in the same holy cause, of promoting the salvation of men.

XVIII. 1. The Evangelist now proceeds to record the *Passion* of our Lord, so however as only to touch lightly on what had been recorded by preceding writers; at the same time adding certain circumstances omitted by them; thus strongly confirming the truth of what had been before written, and, in the circumstances which he himself records, plainly taking that truth for granted. (Lampe.)

τοῦ πέραν τοῦ χειμάζοντος * τοῦ Κέδρων, ὅπου ἦν κήπος, εἰς ὃν εἰσῆλ-
 2 θεν αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ. Ἰηδεὶ δὲ καὶ Ἰούδας ὁ παραδιδούς
 αὐτὸν τὸν τόπον· ὅτι πολλάκις συνήχθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐκεῖ μετὰ τῶν μαθη-
 3 τῶν αὐτοῦ. ^a Ὁ οὖν Ἰούδας λαβὼν τὴν σπέῤῥαν, καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἀρχιερέων
 καὶ Φαρισαίων ὑπηρέτας, ἔρχεται ἐκεῖ μετὰ φανῶν καὶ λαμπάδων καὶ
 4 ὄπλων. Ἰησοῦς οὖν εἰδὼς πάντα τὰ ἐρχόμενα ἐπ’ αὐτὸν, ἐξελθὼν εἰ-
 5 πεν αὐτοῖς· Τίνα ζητεῖτε; Ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ· Ἰησοῦν τὸν Ναζω-
 ραῖον. λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Ἐγὼ εἰμι. εἰστίχκει δὲ καὶ Ἰούδας ὁ
 6 παραδιδούς αὐτὸν μετ’ αὐτῶν. Ὡς οὖν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι,
 7 ἀπῆλθον εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω, καὶ ἔπεσον χαμαί. Πῦλιν οὖν αὐτὸς ἐπηρεά-

a Matt. 26. 47.
 Mark 14. 43.
 Luke 22. 47.
 Acts 1. 16.

I. τοῦ Κέδρων.] The reading is here uncertain. Instead of the common reading τῶν Κέδρων, four of the most ancient MSS. and several of the most ancient Versions, with some Fathers, have τοῦ Κεδρῶν, which was preferred by Beza, Casaub., Campb., Cast., Drus., Lightf., Bois, Bynæus, Reland, and others of the best Commentators down to Middleton, Kuinöel, and Tittm.; and has been received by Beng., Griesb., Knapp, Vat., and Scholz. The common reading, however, is strenuously, but not satisfactorily, defended by Lampe and Matthæi. The external evidence for τοῦ may, indeed, seem slender; but it is, in fact, of the most weighty kind (confirmed also by Josephus), the MSS. being some of the most ancient in existence, and the Versions the most estimable. And internal evidence is quite in favor of τοῦ, since it is far more likely that τοῦ should have been altered by the scribes into τῶν, than τῶν into τοῦ, especially in uncial MSS. Matthæi indeed adduces the authority of Chrys., Cyrill, Theophyl., and Euthym., for the common reading. But the authority of Commentators and Homily-writers, in proper names, which they do not particularly treat on, is but small; especially where the common reading is retained. That τῶν Κέδρων occurs twice in the LXX. may seem a strong confirmation of the Vulg. But that would not be decisive. Not to say that the very same mistake may there exist. The common reading might, as Bp. Middlet. observes, originate in a mistake of the Copyists (thousands of similar mutations occurring in the Classical writers); or even design, since the Greeks were accustomed to Grecize barbarous names. And it would seem probable that the name meant “the brook of Cedars.” Though Lightf. and Reland have shewn that it is derived from the Heb. קדר; and hence קדרק will denote the black torrent. Bp. Middlet. instances a similar corruption in Suid. of Χειμαρῶντος τοῦ Χισῶ into Χειμ. τῶν Κισῶν. “the torrent of ivy-trees.”

— κήπος.] This seems to have been a plot of garden ground provided with a sort of cottage.

3. τὴν σπέῤῥαν.] This word should, I think be derived from σπῆω cognate with σπῶω, to draw or twist, and literally signifies a band. Hence it would designate any military corps; but the best founded opinion, and that supported by all the most eminent Commentators, is that it here denotes either the Roman cohort, which garrisoned the castle of Antonia, or the detachment of it, which, by order of the Procurator, attended on the Sanhedrim at the great festivals, and kept the peace. Hence the propriety of the Article, to denote the detachment then on duty.

— μετὰ φανῶν καὶ λαμπ.] It is not easy to determine the precise force of these two terms. Bynæus thinks the former means torches; the latter, lamps. Lampe is of opinion that the latter commonly denoted torches (appealing to the λαμπαδοφορία described by Meursius in his Græc. Fer. L. v.), and maintains (from a reference to Athenæus, L. xv. 18.) that the φανοὶ were a more ancient and ruder kind of torches, formed of split laths bound into a bundle; but that afterwards torches of other materials, and of a more convenient form (namely, tapers and lanterns) came into use; though the others still continued to be employed by the meaner sort of people. That both lanterns and torches were in use among soldiers, appears from Dionys. Hal. ix. (cited by Lampe and Wets.) ἐξέτραχον ἅπαντες ἐκ τῶν σκηνῶν ἄθροοι, φανόσ τε ἔχοντες καὶ λαμπάδας. It was, indeed (I would add) usual for such corps to carry both arms and lanterns. So Thucyd. iii. 23, speaking of the picket-guard of the Peloponnesians, says, καὶ ἐν τούτῳ οἱ τριακῶσιοι αὐτοῖς ἐπέφεροντο λαμπάδας ἔχοντες.

4. ἐρχόμενα ἐπ’ αὐτόν.] This phrase is by some accounted a Hebraism. But, as Kypke and Wets. have shown, it is also found in the Classical writers, in whom ἔρχεσθαι signifies to befall, and is almost always used of what is evil. Ἐξελθὼν. This is rightly taken by Euthym., Mold., and Pearce for προσελθὼν, namely, from that part of the garden whither Christ had retired for prayer.

6. ἀπῆλθον—ἔπεσον χαμαί.] The earlier and the recent modern Commentators here adopt different views. The former suppose a miracle; the latter, with the exception of Titt., recognize none, attributing the circumstance to the awe of the soldiers at the sight of so august a person; of this they adduce what they call parallel instances from the Classical writers. The cases, however, are quite of another kind, and the mode in which those Commentators account for the thing, proceeds almost wholly upon supposition. If we confine ourselves simply to the plain words and the actual circumstances, we shall see that something far surpassing the ordinary, and rising to the preternatural, is suggested. See the able Notes of Wolf, Lampe, and Tittm. There seems to be no reason to doubt but that some undefinable, but supernatural, power was exercised; as in many similar instances recorded in Holy writ; ex. gr. that of Paul (Acts ix. 3), where he is described as being “struck to the earth” as well as struck with blindness. Whether all fell to the ground (even Judas), as the old Commentators maintain, is uncertain, and will by no means alter the case. But we cannot understand less than very many.

της· τίνα ζητεῖτε; οἱ δὲ εἶπον· Ἰησοῦν τὸν Ναζωραῖον. ἀπεκριθῆ 8
 [ὁ] Ἰησοῦς· εἶπον ὑμῖν, ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι· εἰ οὖν ἐμὲ ζητεῖτε, ἀφετε 9
 τούτους ὑπάγειν. ^bἵνα πληρωθῇ ὁ λόγος ὃν εἶπεν· Ὅτι οὓς δέδωκάς 9
 μοι, οὐκ ἀπόλεσα ἐξ αὐτῶν οὐδένα. Σίμων οὖν Πέτρος ἔχων μάχαιραν, 10
 ἐίλκυσεν αὐτήν, καὶ ἔπαισε τὸν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως δούλον, καὶ ἀπέκοπεν 11
 αὐτοῦ τὸ ὠτίον τὸ δεξιόν. ἦν δὲ ὄνομα τῷ δούλῳ Μάλχος. εἶπεν οὖν 11
 ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ Πέτρῳ· Βάλε τὴν μάχαιράν [σου] εἰς τὴν θήκην. τὸ 12
 ποτήριον ὃ δέδωκέ μοι ὁ Πατήρ, οὐ μὴ πῖω αὐτό;

c Matt. 26. 57.
 Mark 14. 53.
 Luke 22. 54.
 d Luke 3. 2.

^cἩ οὖν σπεῖρα καὶ ὁ χιλιερχος καὶ οἱ ὑπηρέται τῶν Ἰουδαίων συνέ- 12
 λαβον τὸν Ἰησοῦν, καὶ ᾔδησαν αὐτὸν, ^dκαὶ ἀπήγαγον αὐτὸν πρὸς Ἄνναν 13
 πρῶτον· ἦν γὰρ πενθερὸς τοῦ Καϊάφα, ὃς ἦν ἀρχιερεὺς τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ 14
 ἐκείνου. ^eἦν δὲ Καϊάφας ὁ συμβουλευσας τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις, ὅτι συμφέρει 14
 ἓνα ἄνθρωπον ἀπολέσθαι ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ. ^fἨκολούθει δὲ τῷ Ἰησοῦ 15
 Σίμων Πέτρος, καὶ ὁ ἄλλος μαθητῆς. ὁ δὲ μαθητῆς ἐκεῖνος ἦν γνωστὸς 15
 τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ, καὶ συνεισηλθε τῷ Ἰησοῦ εἰς τὴν αὐλήν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως·

e Supra 11. 50.
 f Matt. 26. 58.
 Mark 14. 54.
 Luke 22. 54.

3. εἰ οὖν ἐμὲ—ὑπάγειν.] A brief manner of speaking, of which the full sense is: "If, then, ye seek to apprehend me [take me; but] let those [my companions] depart."

9. ἵνα πληρωθῇ, &c.] The best Commentators are agreed that the sense is, "Thus was made good, or verified, the words," &c. namely, xvii. 2. By this all difficulty vanishes.

11. σου.] This is omitted in very many of the best MSS. and Versions, and is cancelled by almost every Editor from Beng. and Wets. to Scholz; and with reason: for internal evidence is as much against it as external.

—τὸ ποτήριον—αὐτό.] See xxvi. 39 & 54. The interrogation, accompanied with a double negation, involves a strong affirmative (so Euthym. well explains πάνω μὲν οὐκ), and the whole is expressive of perfect acquiescence in the will of his Father.

12, 13. On the discrepancy which has been supposed to exist in this statement, as compared with the other Evangelists, see the able remarks of Tittm. in Recens. Synop. On the dissimilarity of matter in St. John as compared with the other Evangelists, yet coupled with a *similitude of manner*, Dr. Paley has well treated, and especially with reference to the present passage.

15. καὶ ὁ ἄλλος μαθητῆς.] There is no little difficulty here to account for the Article. Many eminent Commentators are inclined to think it *redundant*. But Bp. Middl. justly accounts such a device "the refuge of learned ignorance." He admits the difficulty; but rightly maintains that, "though we should not be able to ascertain it, it is better to impute the obscurity to our own want of knowledge, than to attempt to subvert the analogy of language." To cancel it with Erasm., Beng., and Vat., is rash, because the evidence for its omission is so very slight, only that of four MSS., and that of Versions but slender. And, as Bp. Middl. observes, it is far easier to account for the omission of the article in a few of the MSS., supposing it to be authentic, than for its insertion in almost all of them, supposing it to be spurious: for the apparent difficulty which might operate as an inducement in the one case, would be a powerful discouragement in the other.

We must therefore explain as we may. Now almost all Commentators, ancient and modern, are agreed that by the *other disciple* the Evangelist means *himself*; and with reason? for though Grot., Lampe, Heum., and Pearce deny this, they are as unsuccessful in proving it *not* to have been St. John, as they are fixing on *any other* disciple. The Evangelist never mentions *himself* by name, and yet (as Michaelis shows) he has described the whole of what took place in the hall of Annas, &c. so circumstantially, that we cannot but conclude that he was present, as Ecclesiastical tradition attests. "Supposing, then, (remarks Bp. Middl.) that St. John himself is meant by ὁ ἄλλος μαθητῆς, it may not be impossible to assign something like a plausible reason why he should call himself *the other disciple*." "This phrase (continues the learned Prelate) obviously implies the remaining *one of two persons*, who not only were, in common with many others, disciples of Christ, but between whom some still closer relation might be recognized to exist: and if it could be shown that Peter and John stood towards each other in any such relation, the term *the other disciple*, might not unfailly be used, immediately after the mention of Peter, to designate John; especially if, from any cause whatever, John was not to be spoken of by name. Now it does appear that a particular, and even exclusive friendship existed between Peter and John. The same expression, ὁ ἄλλος μαθ., occurs in John xx. 2, 3, 4, 8; from which it may be inferred, that this phrase, when accompanied with the mention of Peter, was readily, in the earliest period of Christianity, understood to signify *John*." Prof. Scholefield, in his Hints, further remarks, that in ch. xx. 2. the words "the other disciple whom Jesus loved" are not to be taken in close connection, so as to imply that Peter and John were *the two* disciples whom he loved; but there must be a kind of break, as if the Evangelist had said, "the other disciple—him, I mean, whom Jesus loved."

—ὁ ἄλλος μαθητῆς—ἀρχιερεῖ.] These words are meant to show *how* it happened that persons of such inferior rank as he and St. Peter should have obtained access to the Hall of the High Priest.

- 16 ὁ δὲ Πέτρος εἰστίθει πρὸς τῇ θύρᾳ ἕξω. Ἐξῆλθεν οὖν ὁ μαθητῆς ὁ ἄλλος, ὃς ἦν γνωστός τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ, καὶ εἶπε τῷ θυρωρῷ, καὶ εἰσῆγαγε
 17 τὸν Πέτρον. Λέγει οὖν ἡ παιδίσκη ἡ θυρωρὸς τῷ Πέτρῳ· Μὴ καὶ σὺ ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν εἶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τούτου; λέγει ἐκεῖνος· Οὐκ
 18 εἰμί. Εἰστίθεισαν δὲ οἱ δούλοι καὶ οἱ ὑπηρέται ἀνθρακίαν πεποιηκότες, ὅτι ψύχος ἦν, καὶ ἐθερμαίνοντο· ἦν δὲ μετ' αὐτῶν ὁ Πέτρος ἐστὼς
 19 καὶ θερμαινόμενος. Ὁ οὖν ἀρχιερεὺς ἠρώτησε τὸν Ἰησοῦν περὶ τῶν
 20 μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, καὶ περὶ τῆς διδαχῆς αὐτοῦ. Ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰη-
 21 σοῦς· Ἐγὼ παρόξισμά ἐλάλησα τῷ κόσμῳ· ἐγὼ πάντοτε ἐδίδαξα ἐν
 [τῇ] συναγωγῇ καὶ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, ὅπου * πάντοτε οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι συνέχρον-
 22 ται, καὶ ἐν κρυπτῷ ἐλάλησα οὐδέν. Τί με ἐπερωτᾷς; ἐπερωτήσον τοὺς
 23 ἀκηκοῦτας, τί ἐλάλησα αὐτοῖς· ἴδε οὗτοι οἴδασιν ἃ εἶπον ἐγώ. Ταῦτα
 24 δὲ αὐτοῦ εἰπόντος, εἰς τῶν ὑπηρέτων παρεστηκὸς ἔδωκε ῥάπισμα τῷ
 25 Ἰησοῦ, εἰπών· Οὕτως ἀποκρίθη τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ· Ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰη-
 26 σοῦς· Εἰ κακῶς ἐλάλησα, μαρτύρησον περὶ τοῦ κακοῦ· εἰ δὲ καλῶς,
 27 τί με δέρεις; Ἐπέστειλεν οὖν αὐτὸν ὁ Ἄννας δεδεμένον πρὸς Κυϊάφαι
 τὸν ἀρχιερέα.
- 25 ^h Ἦν δὲ Σίμων Πέτρος ἐστὼς καὶ θερμαινόμενος· εἶπον οὖν αὐτῷ
 Μὴ καὶ σὺ ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ εἶ; ἠρώτησάτο ἐκεῖνος, καὶ εἶπεν·
 26 Οὐκ εἰμί. Λέγει εἰς ἐκ τῶν δούλων τοῦ ἀρχιερέως, συγγενῆς ὢν οὗ
 ἀπέκοψε Πέτρος τὸ ὄπιον· Οὐκ ἐγὼ σε εἶδον ἐν τῷ κήπῳ μετ' αὐτοῦ;
 27 Πάλιν οὖν ἠρώτησάτο ὁ Πέτρος, καὶ εὐθέως ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν.

z Matt. 26. 57.
 Mark 14. 53.
 Luke 22. 54.

h Matt. 26. 69.
 Mark 14. 66.
 Luke 22. 55.

18. ἀνθρακίαν.] The word denotes a mass of live charcoal, from ἀνθραξ, a live coal; and that from ἀνθράσσω, all which come from ἀνθος, whence ἀνθρός, florid, red, burning. So Hom. II. γ. 213. ἀνθρακίην στορέσας. Its difference from τέφρα is plain from an adage of Suidas: μὴ τὴν τέφραν φεῖγαν εἰς ἀνθρακίαν πέσας.

20. πάντοτε.] Instead of the common reading πάντοθεν before οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, almost all the MSS., with all the Edd. up to Beza's have πάντοτε, which is received by almost every Editor from Wets. to Scholz; and rightly: since the external evidence for πάντοθεν is but slender, and its internal far inferior to the other reading. It was, in truth, as Wets. shews, a mere emulation of Beza. Both he and the ancient Critics stumbled at the tautology occasioned by the repetition of πάντοτε; the latter, by reading πάντες. At the same time, it cannot be denied that πάντοθεν would have been more suitable. So Joseph. Bell. vi. 4. 3. μὴ γὰρ ἂν ποτε Ἰουδαίους παύσασθαι γεωπερίζοντας τοῦ ἰασθῆναι μένοντος, ἐφ' ὃν οἱ πάντα χόθιν συλλέγονται. The τῇ in ἐν τῇ συναγ. is omitted in a great number of the best MSS., and is cancelled by almost all Editors from Beng. and Matthæi to Scholz; and rightly, I conceive: for internal evidence is strong against it; since it would be more likely to be wrongly inserted, on account of the ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, than wrongly omitted. And, moreover, when the singular is, as here, used in a generic sense for the plural at large, it rejects the Article.

—ἐν κρυπτῷ ἐλάλησα οὐδέν.] This, as the best Commentators are agreed, must be taken comparatē, and with restriction, i. e. nothing post sindonem (like the Heathen mysteries, or the Jewish Cabbala), at variance with any public

doctrines, and consequently nothing savouring of sedition.

25—27. Peter, it seems, was exceedingly terrified on beholding such a scene, and especially hearing Jesus examined respecting his disciples; from whence he might infer that the Sanhedrim had thoughts of ordering them also to be seized. He did not, it appears, return to himself before the cock crew, of which our Lord had spoken; when (as we learn from Luke xxii. 61.) Jesus turned his eyes towards him, and looked him full in the face. Our Lord, by the common decree of the Sanhedrim, had been pronounced worthy of death, since he had professed himself to be the Messiah and the Son of God. In order to carry this sentence into effect, they brought the affair before Pontius Pilate. The council, therefore, rose, and just as the day was dawning, led him bound, as one pronounced worthy of death, to the Prætorium. Matt. xxvii. 2., adds, καὶ παρέδωκεν αὐτὸν Ποντίῳ Πιλάτῳ; and when it is evident that it was their counsel and plan that Pilate should order him to execution. Thus do the infatuated wretches hurry away the Messial sent to them, and deliver him up to the Gentiles! But, it may be asked, why should the Jewish Rulers have delivered Jesus to the Roman Procurator for punishment, and not themselves have executed it; and by what right could Pilate condemn him to death? On this question the most learned are divided in opinion; some contending that the right of inflicting punishment had been taken away from the Jews; others, that they still retained that right. At least they seem to have exercised it. See Acts vii. 57. xii. 2. xxiii. 27. The discrepancy seems to be best settled by

i Matt. 27. 1.
Mark 15. 1.
Luke 23. 1.
Acts 10. 25.
& 11. 3.

¹ ΑΓΟΤΣΙΝ οὖν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ Καϊάφα εἰς τὸ πραιτώριον. ἦν 28
δὲ πρῶτα· καὶ αὐτοὶ οὐκ εἰσῆλθον εἰς τὸ πραιτώριον, ἵνα μὴ μιαν-
θῶσιν, ἀλλ' ἵνα φάγωσι τὸ πάσχα. Ἐξῆλθεν οὖν ὁ Πιλάτος πρὸς 29
αὐτούς, καὶ εἶπε· Τίνα κατηγορίαν φέρετε κατὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τούτου;
Ἀπεκρίθησαν καὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ· Εἰ μὴ ἦν οὗτος κακοποιός, οὐκ ἂν σοι 30
παρεδώκαμεν αὐτόν. Εἶπεν οὖν αὐτοῖς ὁ Πιλάτος· Λάβετε αὐτὸν ὑμεῖς, 31
καὶ κατὰ τὸν νόμον ὑμῶν κρίνατε αὐτόν. Εἶπον οὖν αὐτῷ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι·
Ἡμῖν οὐκ ἔξεστιν ἀποκτεῖναι οὐδένα. ^κ Ἰνα ὁ λόγος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ πλη- 32
ρωθῆ, ὃν εἶπε σημαίνων ποίῳ θανάτῳ ἤμελλον ἀποθνήσκειν. ¹ Εἰσῆλ- 33
θεν οὖν εἰς τὸ πραιτώριον πάλιν ὁ Πιλάτος, καὶ ἐφώνησε τὸν Ἰησοῦν,
καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων; Ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ 34
ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ σὺ τοῦτο λέγεις, ἢ ἄλλοι σοι εἶπον περὶ ἐμοῦ;
Ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Πιλάτος· Μῆτι ἐγὼ Ἰουδαῖός εἰμι; τὸ ἔθνος τὸ σὸν καὶ 35
οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς παρέδωκάν σε ἐμοί· τί ἐποίησας; Ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς· 36
Ἡ βασιλεία ἣ ἐμὴ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου· εἰ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου
τούτου ἦν ἡ βασιλεία ἣ ἐμὴ, οἱ ὑπηρέται ἂν οἱ ἐμοὶ ἠγωνίζοντο, ἵνα
μὴ παραδοθῶ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις· νῦν δὲ ἡ βασιλεία ἣ ἐμὴ οὐκ ἔστιν
ἐντεῦθεν. Εἶπεν οὖν αὐτῷ ὁ Πιλάτος, Οὐκοῦν βασιλεὺς εἶ σύ; Ἀπε- 37

k Matt. 20. 19.
Mark 10. 33.
Luke 18. 32.
i Matt. 27. 11.
Mark 15. 2.
Luke 23. 3.

those who maintain that a *distinction* must be made between *sacred* and *civil* causes; and that in those pertaining to *religion*, the Jews had yet the power of inflicting capital punishment, [subject, however, to the confirmation of the Procurator. — Edit.] but that in *civil* causes, and such criminal ones as appertained to the *crimen læsæ majestatis* or treason, (as did sedition) that was not conceded to them, the cognizance of all such matters resting solely with the President or Procurator. [On this question see the elaborate discussion in Townsend Chron. Arr. i. 511 — 13., who decides that the power of life and death had not been formally abrogated by the Romans; but that the grant which secured to the Jews their own rights and privileges, had been gradually *set aside* by the influence of the Roman authority, which had, in some measure, superseded the Jewish magistracy. — Edit.] Now our Lord's cause, at the beginning, did not *seem* to be *civil*; at least the Jewish Rulers had pronounced him worthy of death because he had *professed himself the Messiah, or Son of God*; and yet they led him to Pontius Pilate in order that they might cast on *him* the blame of shedding innocent blood. Afterwards, however, when Pilate had declared that he found no fault in him, and seemed to wish to remove from himself the cognizance of the cause, they ventured (as we learn from Luke xiii. 2.) to bring forward a *two-fold political charge*, namely, that of exciting the populace to rebellion, and of discountenancing the payment of tribute; offences both of them falling within Pilate's jurisdiction, as being *ἡγεμῶν* of Judæa. (Tittm.)

31. λάβετε αὐτὸν ὑμεῖς. Take ye him and punish him. q. d., I cannot do a thing so unheard of in the Roman law as to condemn a person unheard. On ἡμῖν οὐκ ἔξεστιν, &c., see Note on v. 25 — 27.

32. Ἰνα ὁ λόγος — πληρωθῆ. &c.] The best Commentators are of opinion that the sense is:

“Thus was made good the words,” &c. But it is not necessary to deviate from the usual import of this formula; for as our Lord had predicted the manner of his death (Matt. xx. 19. xxvi. 2. John xii. 32. sq.) so, as Biscoe remarks, the meaning of what is here said seems to be, that the Jews fulfilled this prophecy, when they declined passing sentence on him by their own law; crucifixion being not a *Jewish*, but a Roman punishment.

34. ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ] “*proprio motu*,” from thy own knowledge or suspicion of my having been concerned in seditious practices.

35. μῆτι ἐγὼ Ἰουδαῖός, &c.] The full sense is well expressed by Kuin. in the following paraphrase: “No, I have not asked thee of my own thought: I have found nothing hitherto in thee which would afford any colour to such a charge as thine enemies advance: but it does not hence follow that thou art innocent. Of thee and thy case I know nothing. I am not a Jew, to know or care about such things. It is on the representations of thy countrymen and the chief Priests that I examine thee. What hast thou done to afford ground for this accusation?”

36. ἡ βασιλεία, &c.] The sense is: [“I am a King, it is true, but] my kingdom is not a temporal one, but entirely spiritual. If my kingdom had been of this world, I should have collected about me vast numbers of my countrymen. These would have defended me against the attacks of my Jewish adversaries. But as I have done nothing of this sort, it is plain that my kingdom is not of such a nature as at all interferes with earthly governments, or affords any colour for this charge of sedition.” (Tittm.)

37. οὐκοῦν βασιλεὺς εἶ σύ;] Some Commentators would have the interrogation removed, — in the sense, So then, thou art a king! This may seem to be more agreeable to what follows; but there is no good authority, for οὐκοῦν is a declarative sentence.

κρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Σὺ λέγεις ὅτι βασιλεὺς εἰμι ἐγώ. ἐγὼ εἰς τοῦτο
γεγέννημαι, καὶ εἰς τοῦτο ἐλήλυθα εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ἵνα μαρτυρήσω τῇ
38 ἀληθείᾳ. πᾶς ὁ ὢν ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας, ἀκούει μου τῆς φωνῆς. Λέγει
αὐτῷ ὁ Πιλάτος· Τί ἐστὶν ἀλήθεια; καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν, πάλιν ἐξῆλθε
πρὸς τοὺς Ἰουδαίους, καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· Ἐγὼ οὐδεμίαν αἰτίαν εὗρισκω
39 ἐν αὐτῷ. ^mἜστι δὲ συνήθεια ὑμῖν, ἵνα ἕνα ὑμῖν ἀπολύσω ἐν τῷ ^m Matt. 27. 15.
πάσχα· βούλεσθε οὖν ὑμῖν ἀπολύσω τὸν βασιλέα τῶν Ἰουδαίων; ^{Mark 15. 6.}
40 ⁿἘκραύγασαν οὖν πάλιν πάντες, λέγοντες· Μὴ τοῦτον, ἀλλὰ τὸν ⁿ Acts 3. 14.
1 Βαραββᾶν· ἣν δὲ ὁ Βαραββᾶς ληστής. XIX. Ὁ τότε οὖν ἔλαβεν ὁ
2 Πιλάτος τὸν Ἰησοῦν, καὶ ἔμαστιγώσασε. Καὶ οἱ στρατιῶται πλέξαντες
στέφανον ἐξ ἁκανθῶν, ἐπέθηκαν αὐτοῦ τῇ κεφαλῇ, καὶ ἱμάτιον πορ-
3 φουροῦν περιέβαλον αὐτὸν, καὶ ἔλεγον· Χαῖρε, ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων·
4 καὶ ἐδίδουν αὐτῷ ῥαπίσματα. Ἐξῆλθεν οὖν πάλιν ἔξω ὁ Πιλάτος, καὶ
λέγει αὐτοῖς· Ἴδε, ἄγω ὑμῖν αὐτὸν ἔξω, ἵνα γινῶτε ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ οὐδε-
5 μίαν αἰτίαν εὗρισκω. Ἐξῆλθεν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἔξω φορῶν τὸν ἁκάνθινον
στέφανον καὶ τὸ πορφουροῦν ἱμάτιον. καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· Ἴδε, ὁ ἄνθρω-
6 πος. Ὅτε οὖν εἶδον αὐτὸν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ ὑπηρέται ἐκραύγασαν,
λέγοντες· Σταύρωσον, σταύρωσον. Λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Πιλάτος· Λάβετε
αὐτὸν ὑμεῖς καὶ σταυρώσατε· ἐγὼ γὰρ οὐκ εὗρισκω ἐν αὐτῷ αἰτίαν.
7 Ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι· Ἡμεῖς νόμον ἔχομεν, καὶ κατὰ τὸν
νόμον ἡμῶν ὀφείλει ἀποθανεῖν, ὅτι ἑαυτὸν Υἱὸν [τοῦ] Θεοῦ ἐποίησεν.

—σὺ λέγεις, &c.] i. e. thou truly sayest that I am a King; it is very true; I am a King. Σὺ λέγεις signifies *it is so*; a phrase of modest assent and affirmation. Our Lord now proceeds to show the nature of his kingdom, and in what sense he is a King. He is come not to *reign* but to bear witness to the truth, to promote, confirm, and establish it.

—ὁ ὢν ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας] “he who is studious of the truth.” i. e. the truth of the Gospel, true religion. So Rom. ii. 8 ὁ ἐκ τῆς ἐριθείας.

38 τί ἐστὶν ἀλήθεια;] On the exact force of this question Commentators are not agreed. Some take the meaning to be: “What is truth to me? what care I about truth?” But this sense cannot be fairly elicited from the words: nor is it likely that a man in high dignity would speak with such levity. The other interpretations are, as I have shown in Rec. Syn. each in some respects more objectionable. It should seem that Pilate put the question with no design of *insulting* our Lord; but that, knowing the endless disputations of the Philosophers on this subject, and how difficult it was to arrive at any clear notions on the subject, he asked, “What is truth? define it;” as much as to say, “aye, what is truth? that is the great question—but such as you are not likely to settle.” But our Lord, knowing that the question was put with levity and insincerity, vouchsafed no answer. Nor did Pilate think it worth his while to wait long for the solution of so debated a question from a Jewish peasant. And perceiving that the kingdom claimed by him was purely figurative, (something similar to what the Heathen Philosophers spoke of), and considering him a harmless sort of person, he only thought how he might set him at liberty.

VOL. I.

XIX. 4, 5. On the motives and intent with which Pilate brought out Jesus, see Recens. Synop.

6. σταύρωσον, σταύρωσον.] In very many MSS., Versions, Fathers, and early Edd., is added *αὐτὸν*, which is received by almost every Editor from Wets. to Scholz. But it is so difficult to account for its *omission* in far more than half of the MSS., many of them very ancient, and so easy to account for its *insertion*, that I dare not follow their example. Such kind of exclamations are usually very elliptical, and the pronoun is often omitted. Out of very many examples which I could adduce, one must suffice. Pseudo-Eurip. Rhcs. 685. Παῖτε, παῖτε.

—λάβετε αὐτὸν ὑμεῖς, &c. Many understand these words as a *permission*. But Pilate neither said, nor could say this *seriously*; for he well knew that crucifixion was not in use among the Jews; and the Priests had already declared that they could not put him to death, on account of the festival. The words (as Chrysost. long ago saw, and in which light they have been viewed by some modern Commentators, as Lampe) are those of *irritation* and *disgust*; neither does it appear that the Jews regarded them as a *permission*, since they immediately resort to a new charge—that of blasphemy. (Kuīn.)

7. ἡμεῖς νόμον ἔχομεν, &c.] The sense is: “By our law he has been found guilty of blasphemy, and condemned; but on account of the feast, we could not inflict the punishment; and therefore we had recourse to thee.” By *the law*, they meant some passages of the O. T., as Levit. xxiv. 16 Deut. xiii. 1. sq. v. 13 & 20, which denounce death on *pretenders* to Divine mission: for ἐποίησεν here means *pretended to be*. On the full purport of the Jewish Law on this head, on the cri-

“Ὅτε οὖν ἤκουσεν ὁ Πιλάτος τοῦτον τὸν λόγον, μᾶλλον ἐφοβήθη, 8 καὶ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸ πραιτώριον πάλιν, καὶ λέγει τῷ Ἰησοῦ· Πόθεν 9 εἶ σὺ; Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἀπόκρισιν οὐκ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ. Λέγει οὖν αὐτῷ 10 ὁ Πιλάτος· Ἐμοὶ οὐ λαλεῖς; οὐκ οἶδας ὅτι ἔξουσίαν ἔχω σταυρῶσαι σε, καὶ ἔξουσίαν ἔχω ἀπολύσαι σε; Ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Οὐκ εἶχες 11 ἔξουσίαν οὐδεμίαν κατ’ ἐμοῦ, εἰ μὴ ἦν σοι δεδομένον ἄνωθεν· διὰ τοῦτο ὁ παραδιδούς μέ σοι μείζονα ἁμαρτίαν ἔχει. Ἐκ τούτου ἐζητεῖ 12 ὁ Πιλάτος ἀπολύσαι αὐτόν. Οἱ δὲ Ἰουδαῖοι ἔκραζον, λέγοντες· Ἐὰν τοῦτον ἀπολύσῃς, οὐκ εἶ φίλος τοῦ Καίσαρος. πᾶς ὁ βασιλεὺς αὐτὸν ποιῶν ἀντιλέγει τῷ Καίσαρι. Ὁ οὖν Πιλάτος ἀκούσας τοῦτον τὸν 13 λόγον, ἤγαγεν ἔξω τὸν Ἰησοῦν, καὶ ἐκάθισεν ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος, εἰς τόπον

terion of false prophets, and on the kind of death inflicted on such, see the Note of Lampe in Recens. Synop.

The τοῦ before Θεοῦ is omitted in many MSS. and early Edd., and is cancelled by almost every Editor from Wets. to Scholz; a decision approved of by Bp. Midd., who shews that Ἰῶς Θεοῦ may mean the Son of God, as well as ὁ Ἰῶς τοῦ Θεοῦ, and proves that Christ, in affirming that he was the Son of God, did, in fact, affirm his Messiahship. See Note on Matt. xiv. 33. and comp. Lu. xxii. 66. with v. 70. Tittm., however (whose Note see in Recens. Synop.) is of opinion that the names *Messiah* and *Son of God* were by no means synonymous, but of very different meaning; the former expressing *office*, the latter *Divine nature*. See i. 14. And that Pilate so understood the appellation, he thinks is clear from what follows. Be that as it may, the two appellations by which the Saviour of Israel was called, namely, *Messiah* (which implied, they thought, *Kingship*), and *Son of God* (which expressed His *Divine nature* and union with God), afforded the chief Priests an opportunity of shifting the charge as they found politic, pressing either that of *sedition*, or of *blasphemy*.

8. μᾶλλον ἐφοβήθη] Namely, to condemn him to be crucified. Pilate’s apprehension arose probably from an impression, such as he could not suppress, that Jesus was at least a very extraordinary person, if not the character he claimed to be. Whether this idea was at all mixed up with the notion of a Heathen Demigod (though the most celebrated Commentators ascribe it chiefly to that) is very doubtful. The stories of Demigods, &c. were probably by the higher classes regarded in nearly the same light in which we view them; namely, as mere *Mythological* fictions, only deserving of attention from their antiquity and poetic elegance.

9. πόθεν εἶ σὺ;] This cannot mean, as some Commentators imagine, “of what country art thou?” for Pilate knew him to be a Galilæan; but, as others interpret, “What is your origin and parentage?” So 2 Sam. i. 13. πόθεν εἶ σὺ; Josh. ix. 8. πόθεν ἔστε. For Pilate now knew that Jesus claimed to be of celestial origin (ὠδὸς Θεοῦ). To this question our Lord was pleased to make no answer; partly because Pilate’s conduct did not entitle him to any, and partly because an answer to the interrogation, in the usual acceptation of the words, Pilate could scarcely need; and in any other sense it would have been little intelligible, and have led to further questions, all superfluous,

since Jesus knew he had resolved to deliver him to the fury of the Jews.

11. οὐκ εἶχες—ἄνωθεν.] The best Commentators, ancient and modern, are agreed that ἄνωθεν signifies “from on high,” “from Heaven,” i. e. “by Divine Providence,” as in iii. 31. James i. 17. and Ælian and Dio Chrys. cited by the Commentators. Instead of ἔξουσίαν ἔχω, the more Classical phrase is κέρως εἶναι. So in a kindred passage of Dio Cass. p. 393. 1. κέρως καὶ σώσαι καὶ ἀπολύσαι τινας. By δεδομένον, Gröt. rightly understands, not that *common permission*, which leaves many things to the natural course of events, but something decreed in the Divine counsels.

—διὰ τοῦτο.] With these words the Commentators are perplexed. To suppose it, with Kuin., a mere formula of transition, is very unsatisfactory. The methods proposed by Markl. and Bp. Pearce are too violent and arbitrary. It may, perhaps, be best regarded as a highly *elliptical* expression, and the διὰ τοῦτο need not be too rigorously interpreted. The sense seems to be, “Wherefore [in thus giving me up to the fury of the people] he who put me into thy hands is more in fault than thou.”

12. This divining of his thoughts, and this candid judgment of his conduct, seems to have much affected Pilate for the moment; hence he made another effort to save Jesus. The Jews, however, perceiving that Pilate was studying every method of releasing Jesus, and that he paid little attention to their second charge, — of blasphemy, as not falling under his cognizance, — now return to their first alleged crime, which especially belonged to the Procurator, namely, that of *sedition*, and *treason against Cæsar*.

—οὐκ εἶ φίλος τ. κ.] A popular *meiosis*. Ἄντιλέγει is, by a Hellenistic use, put for ἀπαθεῖ or ἀνταρτεῖ. The threat was not to be despised; since, as we learn from Suetonius and Tacitus, Cæsar was most suspicious, and punished with death any offence that bordered on the *crimen læsæ majestatis*.

13. ἐκάθισεν.] A juridical expression signifying *sit for judgment*. Λιθάριον denoted a pavement formed of pieces of marble or stone of various colours: such as were called *vermiculata*, and *tesselata*. A sort of luxury which had arisen in the time of Sylla, and had extended even to the most remote provinces. Julius Cæsar, as we learn from Sueton. Vit. 46, carried about with him in his expeditions such pieces of sawn marble and variegated stone with which to adorn his prætorium. The fashion, as we should call it, seems

- 14 λεγόμενον Λιθόστρωτον, Ἑβραϊστὶ δὲ Γαββαθᾶ, (ἦν δὲ παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα, ὧρα δὲ ὡσεὶ † ἔκτη,) καὶ λέγει τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις· Ἴδε, ὁ
 15 βασιλεὺς ὑμῶν. Οἱ δὲ ἐκραύγασαν· Ἄρον, ἄρον· στανῶσωσιν αὐτόν.
 λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Πιλάτος· Τὸν βασιλεὺς ὑμῶν στανῶσω; ἀπεκρίθησαν
 16 οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς· Οὐκ ἔχομεν βασιλεία, εἰ μὴ Καίσαρα. ^{p Matt. 27. 32.} ^{Mark 15. 22.} ^{Luke 23. 33.} Τότε οὖν παρέ-
 δωκεν αὐτὸν αὐτοῖς, ἵνα στανῶθῃ.
 17 Παρέλαβον δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ † ἀπήγαγον· καὶ βασιάζων τὸν σταν-
 ρὸν αὐτοῦ ἐξῆλθεν εἰς τὸν λεγόμενον Κρανίου τόπον, ὃς λέγεται Ἑβραϊ-
 18 στὶ Γολγοθᾶ· ὅπου αὐτὸν ἐσταύρωσαν, καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ ἄλλους δύο
 19 ἐντεῦθεν καὶ ἐντεῦθεν, μέσον δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν. ^{q Matt. 27. 37.} ^{Mark 15. 26.} ^{Luke 38. 38.} Ἐγραψε δὲ καὶ τίτλον
 ὁ Πιλάτος, καὶ ἔθηκεν ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ· ἦν δὲ γεγραμμένος, ἸΗ-
 20 ΣΟΥΣ Ὁ ΝΑΖΩΡΑΙΟΣ Ὁ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΤΩΝ ἸΟΥΔΑΙΩΝ. Τοῦ-
 τον οὖν τὸν τίτλον πολλοὶ ἀνέγνωσαν τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ὅτι ἐγγὺς ἦν τῆς
 πόλεως ὁ τόπος, ὅπου ἐσταυρώθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς· καὶ ἦν γεγραμμένος
 21 Ἑβραϊστὶ, Ἑλληνιστὶ, Ῥωμαῖστί. Ἐλεγον οὖν τῷ Πιλάτῳ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς
 τῶν Ἰουδαίων· Μὴ γράφῃ· Ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων· ἀλλ' ὅτι
 22 ἐκεῖνος εἶπε· Βασιλεὺς εἰμι τῶν Ἰουδαίων. Ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Πιλάτος·
 23 Ὁ γέγραφα, γέγραφα. ^{r Matt. 27. 35.} ^{Mark 15. 24.} ^{Luke 23. 34.} Οἱ οὖν στρατιῶται, ὅτε ἐσταύρωσαν τὸν
 Ἰησοῦν, ἔλαβον τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐποίησαν τέσσαρα μέρη, ἐκάστῳ
 στρατιῶτῃ μέρος, καὶ τὸν χιτῶνα. ἦν δὲ ὁ χιτῶν ἄρόφατος ἐκ τῶν ἀνω-
 24 θεν ὑφαντὸς δι' ὄλου. ^{s Psal. 22. 18.} εἶπον οὖν πρὸς ἀλλήλους· Μὴ σχίσωμεν
 αὐτόν, ἀλλὰ λάχωμεν περὶ αὐτοῦ, τίνος ἔσται· ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ
 ἡ λέγουσα· Διεμερίσαντο τὰ ἱμάτιά μου ξαυτοῖς, καὶ
 ἐπὶ τὸν ἱματισμόν μου ἔβαλον κληῖρον.
 25 Οἱ μὲν οὖν στρατιῶται ταῦτα ἐποίησαν· εἰσήκισαν δὲ παρὰ τῷ

to have been brought from the East at the Roman conquests in Asia. It had probably long been in use there. So Aristeas ap. Euseb. Præp. Evang. p. 453, says of the Temple at Jerusalem. Τὸ δὲ πᾶν ἕδαφος λιθόστρωτον καθέστηκε. The passage of Suet. throws the strongest light on the passage before us, and shows that by λιθ. is here meant the *Prætorium* of Pilate, paved with variegated marble slabs.

14. παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα.] See Campb.
 — ὧρα δὲ ὡσεὶ ἔκτη.] On the seeming discrepancy between this account and that of the other Evangelists, see Recens. Synop. Townsend's Chr. Arr. i. 5. 24. and the Note on Mark xv. 25. There can be no doubt that an error of number has crept in (the 7 being confounded with the 5), and that the true reading is 7, i. e. τῆτη. Indeed, this reading is found in seven of the best MSS., some Fathers, as Euseb. (who says it was so written in the autograph), Jerome, Severus, Ammonius, and Theophyl., and some Scholiasts, with Nonnus. In this opinion the best recent Commentators acquiesce. That this clause is not, as Wassenbergh imagined, a gloss, is established satisfactorily by Bornm. de Glossis, p. 44.

15. οὐκ ἔχομεν, &c.] A mere pretence, since the Jews always maintained that they owed no allegiance to any earthly monarch, but were subjects of God only.

16. καὶ ἀπήγαγον.] Many MSS. and early Edd., and some Fathers and Commentators have ἡγαγον,

which is received by almost every Editor from Wets. to Scholz. But ἀπάγειν (not ἄγειν) is a vox sol. de hac re. The error, I suspect, arose from the contraction *καπήγαγον*, which might easily be mistaken for *καὶ ἡγαγον*.

19. τίτλον.] On this superscription, see the ingenious dissertation of Dr. Townson in Mr. Towns. Chr. Arr. i. 534.

22. ὃ γέγραφα, γέγραφα] q. d. "as it is written, it shall stand." A popular form of expressing a refusal to have it altered.

24. ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ.] The best Commentators are of opinion that the sense is: "Thus was fulfilled the Scripture (i. e. Ps. xxii. 19.) which saith." But they are not agreed whether the verse of the Psalm was meant to refer to Christ, or not. Most recent Interpreters think it was not; and take the words to relate solely to David, and to have reference to the rebellion of Absalom. They are here only, they think, introduced by application and accommodation to the present purpose. But though it be true that the form *ἵνα πληρωθῇ ἡ γραφὴ* sometimes means, that such a thing so happened that this or that passage would appear quite suitable to it; yet as this and other passages of the Psalms cannot be proved to have been fulfilled in the case of David, whereas this and other parts of the same Psalm were minutely fulfilled in that of Christ; and, what is more, as the Evangelist plainly regarded the Psalm as

σταυροῦ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἡ ἀδελφὴ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ, Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ, καὶ Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνῆ. Ἰησοῦς οὖν ἰδὼν 26 τὴν μητέρα, καὶ τὸν μαθητὴν παρεστῶτα, ὃν ἠγάπα, λέγει τῇ μητρὶ αὐτοῦ· Γυναί, ἰδοὺ, ὁ υἱός σου. Ἔπειτα λέγει τῷ μαθητῇ· Ἰδοὺ, ἡ 27 μήτηρ σου. καὶ ἀπ' ἐκείνης τῆς ὥρας ἔλαβεν αὐτὴν ὁ μαθητὴς ἐκεῖνος εἰς τὰ ἴδια. Ἰ Μετὰ τοῦτο εἰδὼς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ὅτι πάντα ἤδη τετέ- 28 λεισται, ἵνα τελειωθῇ ἡ γραφὴ, λέγει· Διψῶ. Ἰ Σκεῦος οὖν ἔκειτο 29 ὄξους μεστόν· οἱ δὲ πλήσαντες σπόγγον ὄξους, καὶ ὑσώπιω περιθέν- 30 τες, προσήνεγκαν αὐτοῦ τῷ στόματι. Ὅτι οὖν ἔλαβε τὸ ὄξος ὁ Ἰησοῦς, 31 εἶπε· Τετέλεσται· καὶ κλίνας τὴν κεφαλὴν παρέδωκε τὸ πνεῦμα.

Οἱ οὖν Ἰουδαῖοι, ἵνα μὴ μείνη ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ τὰ σώματα ἐν τῷ 31 σαββάτῳ, ἐπεὶ παρασκευὴ ἦν· ἦν γὰρ μεγάλη ἡ ἡμέρα * ἐκείνη τοῦ σαββάτου· ἠρώτησαν τὸν Πιλάτον, ἵνα κατεαγῶσιν αὐτῶν τὰ σκέλη, καὶ ἀρθῶσιν. Ἰ Πλθον οὖν οἱ στρατιῶται, καὶ τοῦ μὲν πρώτου κατέα- 32 ξαν τὰ σκέλη καὶ τοῦ ἄλλου τοῦ συσταυρωθέντος αὐτῷ· ἐπὶ δὲ τὸν 33 Ἰησοῦν ἐλθόντες, ὡς εἶδον αὐτὸν ἤδη τεθνηκότα, οὐ κατέαξαν αὐτοῦ τὰ σκέλη· ἀλλ' εἰς τῶν στρατιωτῶν λόγῳ αὐτοῦ τὴν πλευρὰν ἔνυξε, 34

prophetic, and the words as fulfilled in Christ, the former view is decidedly preferable.

25—27. The incident narrated in these verses is recorded by St. John only. On Clopas, see Recens. Synop.

26. ἰδοὺ, ὁ υἱός σου] i. e. regard him as thy son, and just after, ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ σου, “regard her as thy mother.” Thus commending the two persons whom he most dearly loved to the care and affection of each other.

28. εἰδὼς—ὅτι πάντα ἤδη τετ.] On the exact import of ἤδη τετ. and τετέλεσται at ver. 30, Commentators are not agreed. Many eminent modern ones take the expression to be a popular one for “It is all over with me.” “I am about to breathe my last.” And they cite from Homer τὰ δὲ νῦν πάντα τελείται, and other passages less to the purpose. That, however, is a sense too feeble to be admitted. The true sense is doubtless that of the ancients and early moderns, “knowing that all things [namely, what he had to do and to suffer] were now accomplished.”

—ἵνα τελειωθῇ—διψῶ.] Most recent Commentators are of opinion that the passage of the Psalm here alluded to, lxi. 22, was not meant of the Messiah, and consequently not prophetic; but that St. John only applies it to Christ by accommodation. But that tool of accommodation is not very safe in the hands of some who maintain this view, and here it must by no means be employed. It is plain that the Evangelist did not mean merely to accommodate the passage; but to shew that it was prophetic of Christ, and was now fulfilled, at least in its principal scope. As to the argument that the imprecations at ver. 23 show the Psalm not to be prophetic, it is very weak. For it is not necessary to suppose the whole Psalm prophetic of Christ. See Note supra ver. 24.

29. ὑσώπιω περιθέντες.] On the difficulty connected with ὑσώπιω, see Note on Matth. xxvii. 50. Suffice it here to say, that there are several species of the hyssop; one of which (and no doubt the one here meant) has a woody, red-like

stalk, of two feet or more in length, and which is mentioned by the Rabbinical writers as bound up in bundles for firing. Ὑσώπιω, then, is here put for καλάμῳ ὑσώπιου (hence called by Matthew and Mark καλάμῳ); and this, if of the length above mentioned, might easily enable a person to reach the mouth of Jesus on the cross, which, as was shown on Matth. xxvii. 32, was so low that the feet of the crucified person were not more than a yard from the ground. Περιθέντες signifies “having wound or fastened it around,” or, “having stuck it on.” Thus the word is used in the LXX. to express the Hebr. $\psi\psi$, to tie to, in Prov. vii. 3. And Aristoph. Thesm. 337. uses περιῖθον for ἐπιθον.

30. παρέδωκε τὸ πνεῦμα.] This and the ἀφῆκε τὸ πνεῦμα of Matthew suggest the idea of a placid, peaceful, and resigned dissolution, and were therefore used by the pious among the Hebrews to denote that the soul is rendered back unto God its original author, to dispose of according to his good pleasure. (Grot. and Kuin.)

31. μεγ. ἡ ἡμέρα] “A very solemn festival,” namely, as being not only an ordinary Sabbath, but the extraordinary one on the 15th of Nisan. For ἐκείνη, very many MSS., Versions, and early Edd. have ἐκείνου, which is received by most Editors from Wets. to Scholz, with the approbation of Bp. Middl.

—ἵνα κατεαγῶσιν αὐτῶν τὰ σκέλη.] Not, as some imagine, to increase their torment, but to accelerate death; as is plain from the passages of the Classical writers cited by Wets. The legs, we learn, were broken, just above the ankle, by an iron mallet.

34. Some difference of opinion exists, 1. as to the intent of the Evangelist in this attestation. It has been generally supposed that he meant to establish the fact of Christ's actual death; while some (as Dr. Burton) think it was his intent to refute the Docetae, who held that Jesus had not a real body, but was only a phantom. 2. As to the phenomenon itself, the earlier Commenta-

- 35 καὶ εὐθύς ἐξῆλθεν αἷμα καὶ ὕδωρ. Καὶ ὁ ἰωρακῶς μεμαρτύρηκε, καὶ ἀληθινῆ αὐτοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία· κἀκεῖνος οἶδεν ὅτι ἀληθῆ λέγει, ἵνα
 36 ὑμεῖς πιστεύητε. * Ἐγένετο γὰρ ταῦτα· ἵνα ἡ γομφὴ πληρωθῇ.^{x Exod. 12. 46. Num. 9. 12.}
 37 Ὅστούνη οὐ συντριβήσεται αὐτοῦ. † Καὶ πάλιν ἕτερον γομφὴ^{y Zach. 12. 10.} λέγει· Ὁψονται εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν.
 38 ^{z Matt. 27. 57. Mark 15. 42. Luke 23. 50. supra 12. 42.} **ΜΕΤΑ** δὲ ταῦτα ἠρώτησε τὸν Πιλάτον [ὁ] Ἰωσήφ ὁ ἀπὸ Ἀρμαθαίας, ὃν μαθητὴς τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, (κεκρυμμένος δὲ διὰ τὸν φόβον τῶν Ἰουδαίων,) ἵνα ἄρῃ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ· καὶ ἐπέτρεψεν ὁ Πιλάτος.
 39 Ἦλθεν οὖν καὶ ἤρε τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ·^{a Supra 3. 1.} ἠῆλθε δὲ καὶ Νικόδημος, ὁ ἐλθὼν πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν νεκτὸς τὸ πρῶτον, φέρων μίγμα σμύρνης καὶ
 40 ἀλόης * ὡς λίτρας ἑκατόν. Ἐλαβον οὖν τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ ἔδη-

tors in general regard it as *miraculous*; but the researches of modern Surgery have established the *fact*, that the effusion would have taken place in *any case*, being the *natural* consequence of such a wound; and is, under all circumstances, decisive evidence of the actual death of Christ. Medical writers are, indeed, not quite agreed whether by *αἷμα καὶ ὕδωρ* be meant the small portion of water found in the pericardium, called *lymph*, or (which is more probable) the sanguineous and aqueous liquor found in the cavities of the pleura after a mortal wound, or that follows a stab in the pleura, when the *pericardium* has been pierced, *which is always mortal*; consequently a proof that if Christ had not been already dead, this wound would certainly have extinguished the last remains of life; which was doubtless the intent of the soldier. See the learned and convincing Treatise of C. F. F. Gruner (a celebrated German Physician), *de morte Christi verâ, non simulatâ*, Halæ, 1805. The purpose, then, of the Evangelist, in recording this circumstance, was probably both to afford additional evidence of our Lord's actual death, and to refute the notion of the Docete, and thus put to silence both infidels and heretics.

35. καὶ ὁ ἰωρακῶς — ἡ μαρτυρία.] I would render: "And one who was an eye-witness [to the circumstance] (namely, *John* himself) testifieth to the truth of this, and his testimony is true: yea he is conscious that he speaks the truth, so that ye may rely on his testimony."

36. ἐγένετο γὰρ ταῦτα.] The γὰρ refers to a clause omitted, q. d. "And believe ye well may — for all these things were really done," &c.

— ὁστούνη οὐ, &c.]. Many recent Commentators are of opinion that the passages of the O. T. (Exod. xii. 46. Numb. ix. 12.) in which it is enjoined, that "not a bone of the lamb shall be broken," are not *prophetical*, and had no reference to Christ. "There are (say they) no vestiges in the O. T. of the Paschal lamb being considered as a type of Christ; nor did the Evangelist mean to so represent it. He only *applies* the passage to our Lord, and *compares* Christ with the Paschal lamb; intending to denote, that in the institution of the Paschal lamb, something had been enjoined similar to what would, by Divine interposition, take place in the case of Christ; by which Providence, therefore, it happened that his bones were not broken." But that the Evangelist *did* mean to represent the Paschal lamb as a *type* of Christ, and consequently that such must be the only true view, no person who fairly considers the words can doubt. What can offer

so probable a reason for the otherwise unaccountable injunction, that not a bone of the Paschal lamb should be broken, as that it might point to the sacrifice of that lamb as a type of the sacrifice of Christ?

There is evidently a correspondence between the *type* and *antitype*. And as the passage noted in the first verse (also alluded to at Rev. i. 7.) is (as Lampe and Tittm. prove) plainly prophetic of the piercing of the Redeemer's side; so we have here both a correspondence of type and antitype, and a fulfilment of prophecy, viz. of the *piercing*. With respect to the circumstance *ὄψονται εἰς*, it was partly fulfilled at the *first* advent of our Lord, at the destruction of Jerusalem and the Jewish state; and will be finally and more signally fulfilled at the last advent, the *day of judgment*, which seems especially alluded to at Rev. i. 7. As to the seeming *discrepancies* in the above two passages, (namely, Exod. xii. 46. Zech. xii. 10.) suffice it to say, that the former is, properly speaking, no citation at all, but only a statement of the *sense*. The other is a quotation; and although it differs considerably from the Sept., it agrees with the Versions of Aquila, Theodotian, and Symmachus; and, indeed, with the Hebrew, if, with 36 MSS. and many Critics, we read וַיִּשְׁקֹט instead of וַיִּשְׁקַט . And so indeed Abp. Newcome translates. Thus there will be no reason to suppose a *change of person*, for accommodation's sake; which is forbidden by the text of the *Jewish* Translator.

39. σμύρνης καὶ ἀλόης.] The *σμέρνα* here mentioned is (as we learn from Dioscorides and Pliny) the juice of a certain tree in Arabia, from which, on the trunk being bored, exudes a kind of gummy liquid, which is caught on mats, &c. The *ἀλόη* is supposed by many Commentators not to be the *herb aloe*, from which a bitter juice is expressed, but an *aromatic tree*, which is also called *agolloctum*, and the *hyaloe*, whose wood was likewise employed by the Egyptians for embalming corpses. The best Commentators are of opinion, that we are not to suppose the myrrh and aloe to have been in a *liquid* state, (namely, the distillation from the trees) but to have been the *wood* of those trees *dried* and pulverized. This, indeed, appears by the great *weight* of the spices (100 lb. troy weight.) The body could not have been regularly embalmed, since there was not time sufficient for that; but spices and unguents were brought to wash and anoint the body.

— ὡς λίτρας ἑκατόν.] Instead of *ὥσπερ* not a few MSS. and early Edd. have *ὡς*, which is received by Griesb. and others down to Scholz. I have

σαν αὐτὸ ὀθονίοις μετὰ τῶν ἀρωμάτων, καθὼς ἔθος ἐστὶ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ἐνταφιάζειν. Ἦν δὲ ἐν τῷ τόπῳ, ὅπου ἐστιαυρώθη, κήπος, καὶ ἐν 41 τῷ κήπῳ μνημεῖον καινόν, ἐν ᾧ οὐδέπω οὐδεὶς ἐτέθη. Ἐκεῖ οὖν, διὰ 42 τὴν παρασκευὴν τῶν Ἰουδαίων, οἱ ἐγγύς ἦν τὸ μνημεῖον, ἔθηκαν τὸν Ἰησοῦν.

b Matt. 28. 1.
Mark 16. 1.
Luke 24. 1.

XX. ^b Τῆ δὲ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ ἔρχεται 1 πρῶτῃ, σκοτίας ἔτι οὔσης, εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον· καὶ βλέπει τὸν λίθον ἠρμένον ἐκ τοῦ μνημεῖου. Τρέχει οὖν καὶ ἔρχεται πρὸς Σίμωνα Πέτρον 2 καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἄλλον μαθητὴν ὃν ἐφίλει ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· Ἦραν τὸν Κύριον ἐκ τοῦ μνημεῖου, καὶ οὐκ οἶδαμεν ποῦ ἔθηκαν αὐ- 3 τόν. ^c Ἐσῆλθεν οὖν ὁ Πέτρος, καὶ ὁ ἄλλος μαθητής, καὶ ἤρχοντο εἰς 3 τὸ μνημεῖον. Ἐτρεχον δὲ οἱ δύο ὁμοῦ· καὶ ὁ ἄλλος μαθητής προέ- 4 δραμε τάχιον τοῦ Πέτρου, καὶ ἦλθε πρῶτος εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον· καὶ 5 παρακύψας βλέπει κείμενα τὰ ὀθόνια· οὐ μένοι εἰσῆλθεν. Ἐρχεται 6 οὖν Σίμων Πέτρος ἀκολουθῶν αὐτῷ, καὶ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον, καὶ θεωρεῖ τὰ ὀθόνια κείμενα, καὶ τὸ σουδάριον, ὃ ἦν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς 7 αὐτοῦ, οὐ μετὰ τῶν ὀθονίων κείμενον, ἀλλὰ χωρὶς ἐντετυλιγμένον εἰς ἓνα τόπον. Τότε οὖν εἰσῆλθε καὶ ὁ ἄλλος μαθητής ὁ ἔλθων πρῶτος 8 εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον, καὶ εἶδε καὶ ἐπίστευσεν· οὐδέπω γὰρ ᾔδεισαν τὴν 9 γραφὴν, οἱ δὲ αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστήναι. Ἀπῆλθον οὖν πάλιν 10 πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς οἱ μαθηταί. ^d Μαρία δὲ εἰστήκει πρὸς τὸ μνημεῖον κλαί- 11 ουσα ἔξω. Ὡς οὖν ἔκλαιε, παρέκυψεν εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον· καὶ θεωρεῖ 12 δύο ἀγγέλους ἐν λευκοῖς καθεζομένους, ἓνα πρὸς τῇ κεφαλῇ καὶ ἓνα πρὸς τοῖς ποσίν, ὅπου ἔκειτο τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. Καὶ λέγουσιν αὐ- 13 τῇ ἐκεῖνοι· Γύναι, τί κλαίεις; λέγει αὐτοῖς· Ὅτι ἦραν τὸν κύριον

c Luke 24. 12.

d Mark 16. 5.

followed their example; though the reading is uncertain, since St. John uses both *ὡς* and *ὡσαύ* in this sense. However, *ὡσαύ* is more likely to have been a marginal gloss than *ὡς*. The Critics could have no reason to alter *ὡσαύ* to *ὡς*, since one is as good Greek as the other. The quantity of spices here mentioned has been thought by some incredibly great; and they propose some other signification of *λίτρα*. But there is no reason to abandon the common interpretation; for the chamber in which our Lord's body was deposited would, according to the common custom, have to be completely perfumed; and no inconsiderable part would probably be reserved for the *funeral*; since, on such occasions, immense quantities of spices were burnt, especially when great respect was meant to be shown to the dead.

40. *ἐνταφ.*] The term signifies to *prepare for burial*, whether by embalming or otherwise.

42. *διὰ τὴν παρασκευὴν, &c.*] Since the day (Friday) was verging to a close, and the Sabbath was at hand, they (for greater despatch) laid Jesus, for the present, in the sepulchre, which was near at hand, that they might observe the Sabbath rest.

XX. On the harmony of the Resurrection see Notes on Matt. xxviii. 1—10. and Townsend.

2 τὸν ἄλλον μαθ.] See Note on xviii. 15.

4. *πρόδρομα τάχιον.*] Here is a blending of two forms of expression, to strengthen the sense.

5. *οὐ μένοι εἰσῆλθεν.*] This was either through fear of the pollution supposed to be imparted by a dead body; or through timidity.

7. *χωρὶς ἐντετυλιγμένον ε. ε. τ.*] The particip. has a signif. *prægn.*, “rolled up and put.” The construction is: *ἐντετ. εἰς ἓνα τόπον χωρὶς*. It is excellently remarked by Racine (in his observations on particular passages of Scripture), that the linen clothes thus placed and disposed apart from one another, plainly showed that the body had not been carried away by thieves. Those who steal are not observed to do things in such a quiet orderly manner.

8. *ἐπίστευσεν.*] Not, the truth of the *resurrection*, (as some eminent Commentators explain, (for, as the words following suggest, they did not yet know or fully comprehend the prophecies which predicted Christ's resurrection) but (as most of the best Commentators are agreed) the fact related by Mary, that the body had been removed from the sepulchre.

10. *πρὸς ἑαυτοῦς.*] The sense is: “to themselves,” i. e. their companions, who then, jointly with them, occupied the same house. So that it comes to mean “to their homes;” of which sense many examples are adduced by the Commentators.

12. *ἐν λευκοῖς.*] Sub. *ἱματίος*, of which ellipsis the Commentators cite several examples. The

- 14 μου, καὶ οὐκ οἶδα ποῦ ἔθηκαν αὐτόν. ^c Καὶ ταῦτα εἰποῦσα ἐστράφη ^e Matt. 28. 9.
εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω, καὶ θεωρεῖ τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐστῶτα· καὶ οὐκ ᾔδει ὅτι ὁ
15 Ἰησοῦς ἐστι. Λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Γύναι, τί κλαίεις; τίνα ζητεῖς;
Ἐκείνη δοκοῦσα ὅτι ὁ κηπουρός ἐστι, λέγει αὐτῷ· Κύριε, εἰ σὺ ἐβά-
16 στασας αὐτόν, εἰπέ μοι ποῦ αὐτὸν ἔθηκας· καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸν ἀρῶ. Λέγει
αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Μαρία! στραφεῖσα ἐκείνη λέγει αὐτῷ· Ραββουνί!
17 (ὃ λέγεται, διδάσκαλε). ^f Λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Μή μου ἄπτου· οὐπω
γὰρ ἀναβέβηκα πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα μου· πορεύου δὲ πρὸς τοὺς ἀδελ-
φούς μου, καὶ εἰπέ αὐτοῖς· Ἀναβαίνω πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα μου καὶ Πα-
18 τέρα ὑμῶν, καὶ Θεὸν μου καὶ Θεὸν ὑμῶν. Ἐρχεται Μαρία ἡ Μαγδα-
ληνὴ ἀπαγγέλλουσα τοῖς μαθηταῖς, ὅτι εἶώρακε τὸν Κύριον, καὶ ταῦτα
εἶπεν αὐτῇ.
19 ^g Οὐσης οὖν ὀψιας, τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων, καὶ τῶν ^g Mark 16. 14.
θυρῶν κεκλεισμένων, ὅπου ἦσαν οἱ μαθηταὶ συνηγμένοι, διὰ τὸν φό- ^h Luke 24. 36.
βον τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ἦλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἔστη εἰς τὸ μέσον, καὶ λέγει ⁱ 1 Cor. 15. 5.

same occurs in other words denoting colour, as κόκκινα, ἄνθινα, λαμπρά, &c. "White (observes Lampe) has ever been a symbol, 1. of excellence, whether of person or office; 2. of holiness and innocence."

15. ὁ κηπουρός.] This is explained by the best Commentators "the bailiff." But there is no reason why it may not denote the occupier of the plot of garden. Κῆρι. The term is here, as often, merely an appellation of common civility to a person of respectable appearance.

—εἰ σὺ ἐβάστασας α.] i. e. "if thou hast been concerned in its removal." The word βαστάζειν properly signifies to bear; 2dly, to bear away, remove; the nature of the removal being determined by the context. It is, however, (as also ἀναθεῖν) especially applied to the removal of a corpse for burial. Examples of removal simply, and also for burial, may be seen in Wets. and Kypke. Mary, it seems, thought the corpse had been removed by some friend, with the knowledge and connivance, if not assistance, of the gardener; and she would be anxious to know where.

17. μή μου ἄπτου, &c.] On the purpose of this address, and consequently on the exact sense of ἄπτου, Commentators differ; yet the most eminent ones are agreed that the purport of the passage is: "Embrace me not; Let me go; do not waste the time in any demonstrations of affection and respect: you will have an opportunity of showing this afterwards; for I am not immediately going to take my departure from earth: but proceed directly to my brethren with this comforting message,—that in a little time I shall ascend to heaven, to God my Father, who is also your Father, and your God." This sense of ἄπτεισθαι (neglected by the Commentators) I have in Recens. Synop. illustrated from Eurip. Phœn. 910. μὴ ἐπιλαβάνου. where the Schol. explains μή μου ἄπτου.

What was the action of Mary, interrupted by Christ's words, has been matter of debate among Commentators. It was probably embracing the knees or feet, as expressing deep veneration and perhaps adoration. Some Commentators think that Mary's motive in wishing to embrace our Lord was to ascertain whether it was He corpo-

really, or only a spirit. That may have been one of the motives.

In the words following, ἀναβέβηκα is regarded by the best Commentators as a kind of Preterite-Present, q. d. I am not now ascending, i. e. going to ascend. The words of the message, ἀναβαίνω πρὸς—ἐμῶν, would inform them that He should stay a short time longer with them upon earth, and then ascend—He does not say to heaven, but, in order to remind them of the relation in which He stands to God, and they to Him, He says, "to my Father," which would give them to understand, that, for their comfort, He who was from the beginning with God is going to act as their Mediator with God; who would now become their Father and their God, not by creation only, but by the spiritual paternity implied in the Gospel covenant.

19. τῶν θυρῶν κεκλ.] On this passage the ancient, and the recent modern Commentators are at the antipodes of opinion; the former maintaining that Jesus penetrated, by a miracle, through the closed doors; the latter, that he entered in the ordinary way, after knocking and being admitted. The former view cannot be admitted, 1. because it involves an insuperable Philosophical difficulty, well stated by Whitty and Lampe; 2. because such a sense cannot be shown to exist in the words. Still less, however, is the latter opinion defensible; for no dispassionate person can attentively peruse this passage and the similar one at v. 26. without feeling that something far more than an entry in the ordinary way is meant. In the latter passage there would have been no need of the τῶν θυρῶν κεκλ., unless something more had been intended; something supernatural. (See also v. 30.) But what, it may be asked, is that? Not the first-mentioned circumstance, for the reasons above adduced; but (as there is a beautiful œconomy, like that observable in nature, perceptible in our Lord's working of miracles, by which no more power is employed than is necessary to accomplish the purpose in view) we may suppose (with the best Commentators, from Calvin, Grot. and Whitty, down to Tittm.) that our Lord caused the doors to preternaturally open of themselves; as the angel did at

αὐτοῖς· Εἰρήνη ὑμῖν! Καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν ἴδειεν αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας καὶ 20
τὴν πλευρὰν αὐτοῦ. Ἐχάρησαν οὖν οἱ μαθηταὶ ἰδόντες τὸν Κύριον.
Εἶπεν οὖν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς πάλιν· Εἰρήνη ὑμῖν! καθὼς ἀπέσταλκέ 21
με ὁ Πατήρ, καὶ γὰρ πέμπω ὑμᾶς. Καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν ἐνεφύσησε καὶ 22
λέγει αὐτοῖς· Λάβετε Πνεῦμα ἅγιον. ἢ ἂν τινων ἀφῆτε τὰς ἁμαρτίας, 23
ἀφίεται αὐτοῖς· ἂν τινων κρατήτε, κεκρατήνται. Θωμᾶς δὲ, εἰς ἐκ 24
τῶν δώδεκα (ὁ λεγόμενος Δίδυμος) οὐκ ἦν μετ' αὐτῶν, ὅτε ἦλθεν ὁ
Ἰησοῦς. Ἔλεγον οὖν αὐτῷ οἱ ἄλλοι μαθηταί· Ἐωράκαμεν τὸν Κύ- 25
ριον. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Ἐὰν μὴ ἴδω ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν αὐτοῦ τὸν τύπον
τῶν ἡλων, καὶ βάλω τὸν δάκτυλόν μου εἰς τὸν τύπον τῶν ἡλων, καὶ
θάλω τὴν χεῖρά μου εἰς τὴν πλευρὰν αὐτοῦ, οὐ μὴ πιστεύσω. Καὶ 26
μεθ' ἡμέρας ὀκτὼ πάλιν ἦσαν ἔσω οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ Θωμᾶς μετ'
αὐτῶν. Ἐρχεται ὁ Ἰησοῦς, τῶν θυρῶν κεκλεισμένων, καὶ ἕστη εἰς τὸ
μέσον καὶ εἶπεν· Εἰρήνη ὑμῖν! εἶτα λέγει τῷ Θωμᾶ· Φέρε τὸν 27
δάκτυλόν σου ὧδε καὶ ἴδε τὰς χεῖράς μου· καὶ φέρε τὴν χεῖρά σου καὶ
βύλε εἰς τὴν πλευρὰν μου· καὶ μὴ γίνου ἄπιστος, ἀλλὰ πιστός. Καὶ 28
ἀπεκριθὴ ὁ Θωμᾶς, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Ὁ Κύριός μου καὶ ὁ Θεός μου!

h Matt. 16. 19.
& 18. 18.

Acts v. 19. compared with 23. See also Acts xii. 4. 6. 7. 10. I must not omit to observe, that those who adopt the second interpretation are compelled to make the words τῶν θυρῶν κεκλ. a mere *notatio temporis*, q. d. "at door-shutting time." But for that there is no *authority*; nor could it be so taken *here*, since it is closely connected with the following ὅπου ἦσαν, &c.

21. καθὼς ἀπέσταλκε—ὑμᾶς.] As Christ was sent for many most important purposes which could have no parallel with the sending of the Apostles, the καθὼς—καὶ must solely refer to those points which were similar; i. e. the being delegated and commissioned by the Father, as His ambassadors, to carry the message of salvation to the world. Just as the Apostles were empowered to hand down their authority to their successors. Thus the Christian Ministry is of Divine ordinance.

22. ἐνεφύσησε.] This we are (with the best Commentators) to regard as a *symbolical action*, by which our Lord was pleased to confirm and illustrate (by a significant sign, comp. sup. iii. 3.) the promise before made: for λάβετε ἅγιον can only be understood as a *present promise* of a *future benefit*, which should very shortly be communicated; namely, on the day of Pentecost, when it was formally and substantially communicated.

23. ἂν τινων, &c.] These words were doubtless meant primarily for the *Apostles*; but they contain a promise which, with due limitation, may be extended to their *successors*. For the privilege given was one of *office*; and as the office was handed down, there is no reason why the *privilege* should not remain. The best Commentators are agreed that ἀφῆτε and κρατήτε must be taken *declaratively*, i. e. to pronounce the remission or retention of sins; which is the general and safest view of the sense: though the more eminent of the recent Commentators (even Tittm.) are of opinion that the sense is, "that they were authorized to declare that pardon of sins and salvation in general will be granted to all

who seek it by the appointed means." But see Matt. xvi. 13, 19, and Notes.

25. ἂν μὴ ἴδω, &c.] He means to say, that "unless he have the testimony of both sight and touch as to the identity and real bodily presence of Jesus," &c. For Thomas did not so much call in question the *veracity* of the disciples, as he supposed they had been *deceived* by some spirit.

27. ἄπιστος] "unbelieving." This *active* sense is rare in the Classical writers; yet I can myself adduce the following examples in Thucyd. i. 68. 1. Æsehyl. Theb. 873. Prov. xxviii. 25. The use of πιστός for πιστεύων is still more rare; yet one or two examples are adduced by the Commentators.

28. ὁ Κύριός μου.] On the sense of these remarkable words there has never been any real doubt, except such as has been raised by Arians and Socinians; who, to avoid this plain recognition of the Divinity of our Lord, have been compelled to resort to the *miserable shift* of taking the words as a mere formula of admiration, as we say *good Lord!* &c., an idiom found also in *other* modern languages, but of which not a vestige is found in the *ancient* ones. Besides, that sense is not permitted by the words following; in which Christ commends the faith of Thomas, though he gently reproves the tardiness with which it was rendered. And, what is more, the words being introduced by an εἶπεν αὐτῷ shows that they cannot be a mere *exclamation of surprise*, but an *address*, which, (to use the words of Bp. Middlet.) "though in the form of an exclamation, amounts to a confession of faith, and was equivalent to a direct assertion of our Saviour's Divinity." See Towns. Chron. Arr. i. 604.

And in vain is it attempted to evade the force of this recognition by assigning a *lower* sense to Θεός; for a refutation of which, and an illustration of the sense in which the Apostles understood it, see Note in Recens. Synop. and Middl. in loc. The testimony is clear, and the authority irrefragable; for by not censuring the Apostles

29ⁱ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· “Οὐ εἰσρακάς με, [Θωμᾶ,] πεπίστευκας· μα-^{i 1 Pet. 1. 8.}
κάριοι οἱ μὴ ἰδόντες, καὶ πιστεύοντες.

30^k Πολλὰ μὲν οὖν καὶ ἄλλα σημεῖα ἐποίησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐνώπιον τῶν^{k Infra 21. 28.}

31 μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, ἃ οὐκ ἔστι γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τούτῳ. Ταῦτα δὲ γέγραπται, ἵνα πιστεύσητε ὅτι ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ· καὶ ἵνα πιστεύοντες ζωὴν ἔχητε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ.

1 XXI. META ταῦτα ἐφάνησεν ἑαυτὸν πάλιν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοῖς μα-
2 θηταῖς ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης τῆς Τιβεριάδος. ἐφάνησεν δὲ οὕτως. Ἰσαν
δομοῦ Σίμων Πέτρος, καὶ Θωμᾶς ὁ λεγόμενος Αἰδύμος, καὶ Νυθανανὴλ ὁ
ἀπὸ Κανᾶ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, καὶ οἱ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου, καὶ ἄλλοι ἐκ τῶν
3 μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ δύο. λέγει αὐτοῖς Σίμων Πέτρος· Ἐπάγω ἀλιεύειν.
λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· Ἐρχόμεθα καὶ ἡμεῖς σὺν σοί. Ἐξῆλθον καὶ * ἐνέβη-

for now first applying the name *God* to Him, our Lord takes it to himself, thinking it (in the words of the Apostle) “not robbery to be equal with God.”

A question, however, still remains as to the construction. Many eminent Commentators (as Grot., Wets., Rosenm., Kuin., Tittm., and Middleton.) think that the *Κύριος* and *Θεός* are *vocatives*, and that the Article stands for the Classical ὁ. Others (as the ancient Syriac and Persic Translators, and some modern Commentators, from Bp. Pearson downwards) take them as *Nominatives*, with the ellipsis of *σὺ εἶ*. The former method seems to involve the least difficulty.

29. Θωμᾶ.] This is omitted in very many MSS. and early Edd., and is cancelled by almost every Editor from Wets. to Scholz.

30. σημεῖα.] By *σημεῖα* the earlier Commentators understand the *miracles* worked by Christ; while the recent ones in general, take it of the *evidences and proofs* of his resurrection; a sense of the word perhaps found at ii. 18. The former interpretation is manifestly untenable, for the reasons assigned by Kuin. and Tittm. Greatly preferable is the latter, which was adopted by Chrys. and Euthym., and is confirmed and illustrated by a passage of Acts i. 3. *παρίστησεν ἑαυτὸν ζῶντα ἐν πολλοῖς τεκμηρίοις*. Yet there is some harshness in understanding *ταῦτα* in the next verse, (which, however, can denote no other than what is denoted by *σημεῖα*, as is plain from the *μὲν* corresponding to *δέ*;) and hence Kuin. and Tittm. suppose by *ταῦτα* to be meant the *whole of what the Evangelist has recorded of the actions and words of Christ*. But that cannot, from the above connection, be admitted. *Ταῦτα* may better be taken of the *above evidences of the resurrection*; and assuredly (notwithstanding what Kuin. says) Christ's resurrection being proved, *also* proved him to be the Messiah, since that was the attestation of God. See Acts ii. 24. xiii. 23. Rom. iv. 24. viii. 11. 1 Pet. i. 21. Still there is a harshness in taking *σημεῖα* to mean *proofs of his resurrection*, because *τῆς ἀναστάσεως αὐτοῦ* ought thus to have been added. I am therefore persuaded that *μὲν οὖν* is (as the early Commentators considered it) a *conclusion* from all that has been said: and I would take the *σημεῖα* to denote evidences of the Messiahship. Nor is there any harshness involved in this *brief* mode of expression: since *τῶν Χριστῶν εἶναι* may very well be supplied from the context following.

VOL. I.

XXI. Respecting the authenticity of this Chapter, some doubt has been raised by Grot., Le Clerc, and Heumann. But it will clearly appear, from the important matter introduced in Recens. Synop. from Lampe, Kuin., and Tittm., that the opinion is as destitute of all *internal proof* as it is of *external authority*. Granting the Chapter to be (as they say) an *Appendix* to the foregoing accounts, “might not (as Tittm. suggests) the Evangelist have had good reason to add something to his own work, as St. Paul did to certain of his Epistles; especially that to the Romans?” As to the objection, that the circumstances recorded are not of sufficient consequence,—that has little or no force; indeed, it were presumptuous to sit in judgment on the words of inspiration: and such they must be supposed to be, since not the slightest external evidence has ever been adduced to invalidate their authority. As to some *peculiarities* in this portion of Scripture, we are (as Tittm. suggests) to bear in mind (what is evident from the other Gospels as well as St. John's) that our Lord, after his resurrection, no longer held intercourse with his Disciples in the way he had done before his death, nor treated them with the same familiarity; nay, that he bore himself as one already withdrawn from human society, and soon to depart, to enter upon his majesty and glory, at the right hand of the Father; which was done, in order, perhaps, that they might be gradually weaned from his *visible presence*, which they had hitherto enjoyed, and become accustomed to his *invisible presence*.

2. ἴσαν δομοῦ] i. e. temporarily, at the period in question. Ἄλλοι ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν δύο. Whether these were *Apostles*, or of the number of the *Seventy Disciples*, or of *Christ's followers in general*, cannot be determined. It does not, however, follow that because the Evangelist does not mention their names, they were *not* of the number of the *Apostles*.

3. ἐπάγω ἀλιεύειν.] This use of the Present found here in *ἴπ*. and just after in *ἐρχόμεθα*, followed by an *Infin.* of action, denoting *intention* of presently doing a thing, seems to be derived from the *popular phraseology*; though something like it is found in the later Classical writers.

—ἐνέβησαν.] This (for the common reading *ἀνέβη*.) is found in the best MSS. and earliest Edd., and has been received by almost every Editor from Wets. to Scholz; rightly; for *ἀναβαίνειν*, in a context like the present, cannot be

σαν εἰς τὸ πλοῖον εὐθύς, καὶ ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ νυκτὶ ἐπιάσαν οὐδέν. Πρω- 4
 τὰς δὲ ἤδη γενομένης, ἔστη ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὸν αἰγιαλόν· οὐ μένοι
 ἤδεισαν οἱ μαθηταὶ ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστι. Λέγει οὖν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· 5
 Παιδιά, μὴ τι προσφάγιον ἔχετε; ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ· Οὐ. Ὁ δὲ 6
 εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Βιάτε εἰς τὰ δεξιὰ μέρη τοῦ πλοίου τοῦ δίκτυον, καὶ
 εὐρήσετε. Ἐβαλον οὖν, καὶ οὐκ ἔτι αὐτὸ ἐλκῦσα ἴσχυσαν ἀπὸ τοῦ
 1 Supra 13. 23. πλῆθους τῶν ἰχθύων. Ἰλέγει οὖν ὁ μαθητῆς ἐκεῖνος, ὃν ἠγάπα ὁ 7
 Ἰησοῦς, τῷ Πέτρῳ· Ὁ Κύριός ἐστι. Σίμων οὖν Πέτρος, ἀκούσας ὅτι
 ὁ Κύριός ἐστι, τὸν ἐπενδύτην διεξώσατο (ἦν γὰρ γυμνός), καὶ ἔβαλεν
 ἑαυτὸν εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν. Οἱ δὲ ἄλλοι μαθηταὶ τῷ πλοιαρίῳ ἦλθον, 8
 (οὐ γὰρ ἦσαν μακριὰν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς, ἀλλ' ὡς ἀπὸ πηχῶν διακασίων)
 σύροντες τὸ δίκτυον τῶν ἰχθύων. Ὡς οὖν ἀπέβησαν εἰς τὴν γῆν, βλέ- 9
 πουσιν ἀνθρακίαν κειμένην, καὶ ὄψαριον ἐπικείμενον, καὶ ἄρτον· Λέ- 10
 γει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Ἐνέγκατε ἀπὸ τῶν ὄψαριῶν ὧν ἐπιάσατε νῦν.
 Ἀνέβη Σίμων Πέτρος, καὶ εἴλκυσε τὸ δίκτυον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, μεστὸν 11
 ἰχθύων μεγάλων ἑκατὸν πεντηκοτατριῶν· καὶ τοσοῦτων ὄντων, οὐκ
 ἐσχίσθη τὸ δίκτυον.

tolerated. The words of Mark vi. 51. may be thought to defend it; but that passage is of a different kind.

5. *παῖδια.*] *Παῖδιον* and *τεκνίον* were terms of kindness or affability used by elderly persons or superiors. *Προσφάγιον* properly denotes *what is eaten with bread*; as we say *meal*, though (like *ὄψαριον*) it is generally used of *fish*. The word is only found in the later writers. From Chrys. and Wets. it appears that *τι ἔχετε*; was a phrase employed by those who inquired of fishers or hunters *what they had taken*.

6. *βιάτε εἰς τὰ δεξιὰ μέρη.*] An Imperative of *counsel*; proceeding, as they imagined, from one who had some knowledge of their art. (Euthym. and Lampe.) *Ἐβόησατε* is employed with an ellipsis common to hunters and fishers in all languages. Ἀπὸ, for *ὑπὸ, prae*; a sense usually considered Hebraic, but found also in the Classical writers, especially Thucyd.

7. Ὁ Κύριός ἐστι.] They inferred this from the prodigious draught, and the remembrance of the similar one mentioned at Luke v. 1.

— *ἐπενδύτην.*] From the researches of Salmas., Lampe, and Fischer, this somewhat obscure word is proved to mean that *upper linen tunic* worn by Greeks, Romans, and Jews, and called by the Romans *superaria*, corresponding to our *coat*, and worn between the inner tunic (the *interula* or *subnucula* of the Romans and the *χιτωνίσκος* or *ἐποδότης* of the Greeks) and the *surtout*, upper garment, or cloak. The best description is that of Euthym. in Recens. Synop., from which it seems to have been a common fisherman's coat, consisting of a sort of *full frock without sleeves, reaching only to the knees, and bound round the middle by a belt*. The Article has here the force of the pronoun possessive; and *διεξώσατο* has a *significatio pregnans*, for *put on and girded*. *Γυμνός*. Not absolutely so; but, as we should say, stripped to his shirt and waistcoat. Peter, we may suppose, did not plunge into the sea, in order to swim ashore. (for he could not swim) but only in order to *wade* on shore. In his haste he would

not stay to go as the other disciples did, who proceeded more leisurely by the cock-boat belonging to the skiff; at the same time drawing with them to the shore the net of fishes.

8. τὸ δίκτυον τῶν ἰχθύων.] Sub. *μεστὸν*, which is expressed at v. 11. This idiom, in nouns of *capacity*, is found in all languages, chiefly, however, in the popular phraseology.

9. βλέπουσιν ἀνθρακίαν κειμένην.] Notwithstanding the sophistry of some recent Commentators, who seek to account for this in the *natural* way, there is no doubt, from the air of the passage, but that the fire and food were not only *provided by Christ*, but *miraculously*, as he had just before caused the miraculous draught of fishes. Both miracles may have been intended to teach, by symbolical actions, the lesson, that Jesus had both the will and the power to abundantly provide for the comfortable subsistence of his disciples.

— *ὄψαριον.*] Almost all our Translators render this *fish*, as if there were *many*. But that sense is not well established, and the usage both of the Scriptural and Classical writers shows that it rather denotes *a fish*. And as all the company seem to have made a meal of it, it was, no doubt, *large*, like the fish in the net, which being first called *ὄψαριον*, are then said to have been of *great size*. In this sense, indeed, the word often occurs in the Classical writers, as Athen. and Ælian. Hence there is no excusing Wakefield and A. Clarke for rendering “*a small fish*.” Even had not the context shown that a *large* fish is meant, Mr. Wakefield at least could not have to learn that in Greek (as in other languages) diminutive forms often lose their diminutive sense (so *βιβλίον*, &c.) as patronymics their patronymic sense. See my Note on Thucyd. i. 1. We may observe that the fish being not only numerous, but *all large*, made the miracle the more conspicuous.

11. ἐσχίσθη.] Not broken, as in E. V.; still less *torn*, as Wakef. renders, for that is *exaggerating* the sense (a fault, however, of which that

- 12 λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Δεῦτε ἁγισθήσατε. οὐδεὶς δὲ ἐτόλμα τῶν μαθητῶν ἐξετάσαι αὐτόν· Σὺ τίς εἶ; εἰδότες ὅτι ὁ Κύριός ἐστιν.
- 13 Ἐρχεται οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ λαμβάνει τὸν ἄρτον καὶ διδωσιν αὐτοῖς, καὶ
- 14 τὸ ὄψάριον ὁμοίως. Τοῦτο ἤδη τρίτον ἐφανερώθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, ἐγερθεὶς ἐκ νεκρῶν.
- 15 Ὅτι οὖν ἡγίστησαν, λέγει τῷ Σίμων Πέτρῳ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Σίμων Ἰωνᾶ, ἀγαπᾷς με πλεῖον τούτων; λέγει αὐτῷ· Ναὶ, Κύριε· σὺ
- 16 οἶδας ὅτι φιλῶ σε. λέγει αὐτῷ· Βόσκει τὰ ἄρτια μου. λέγει αὐτῷ πάλιν δεύτερον· Σίμων Ἰωνᾶ, ἀγαπᾷς με; λέγει αὐτῷ· Ναὶ, Κύριε· σὺ οἶδας ὅτι φιλῶ σε. λέγει αὐτῷ· Ποιῶμαινε τὰ πρόβατά μου.
- 17 λέγει αὐτῷ τὸ τρίτον· Σίμων Ἰωνᾶ, φιλεῖς με; Ἰλνπήθη ὁ Πέτρος, ὅτι εἶπεν αὐτῷ τὸ τρίτον· Φιλεῖς με; καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Κύριε, σὺ πάντα οἶδας· σὺ γινώσκεις ὅτι φιλῶ σε. λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Βό-
- 18 σκε τὰ πρόβατά μου. ἠμὴν ἠμὴν λέγω σοι· ὅτι ἦς νεώτερος, ἔξῶν—^{m 2 Pet. 1. 14.} νυς σεαυτὸν, καὶ περιεπάτιεις ὅπου ἤθελες· ὅταν δὲ γηράσῃς, ἐκτενεῖς

Critic is rarely guilty): but, as Campb. translates, *rent*.

12. ἁγισθήσατε.] The Commentators and Critics are not agreed whether this should be understood of *dinner*, or of *breakfast*. Most recent Commentators adopt the latter interpretation; but Campb. at large maintains the former. If we could be sure that the ancients used (as he asserts) but *two* meals for our *three* (breakfast, dinner, and supper), and that the latter corresponded to our *supper*, he would be right. But I have, on Thucyd. iv. 91, proved that, though, in the early times, but *two* meals were taken, ἄριστον and δεῖπνον, yet that afterwards, even in the time of Thucyd., there were *three*: the ἀκράτισμα, answering to our *breakfast*; the ἄριστον, to our *lunch*, or *early dinner*; and the δεῖπνον to our *later dinner*, or *supper*. If the same custom prevailed in Judæa, then ἄριστον will denote the *second* meal, call it by what name we may. If, however, the Jews (as is not improbable) retained the *primitive* custom of *two* meals a day, then ἄριστον will here mean, as it did in the time of Homer, *breakfast*; and denote (as its *etymon* would suggest) a far more substantial meal than the ἀκράτισμα; which seems to have meant merely a *snack*, caught up by those who could not wait till the ἄριστον, which was taken about an hour before noon.

14. τρίτον] i. e. the third time recorded in *this Gospel*; for it appears from Matth. xviii. 16 sq. that he had appeared to them *five* times before; or the third time of showing himself to his disciples collectively.

15. πλεῖον τούτων.] By τούτων, Whitby, Pearce, Middl., and others understand "these things;" i. e. the nets, boats, and other implements of his trade: q. d. "dost thou prefer my service to thy temporal occupation?" But there is something frigid in this sense. Besides, as Jortin observes, Peter might love Jesus *more than these*, and yet not love him *much*. The true interpretation seems to be that of the ancient and many of the most eminent modern Commentators, as Lampe, Campb., Kuin. and Tittm., who assign the following sense: "Dost thou love me more than those do?" The Question has (as Campb. remarks) a reference to the declaration of Peter,

Matth. xxvi. 33, when he seemed to arrogate a superiority above the rest, in zeal for his Master and steadiness in his service. It is proper to observe, that though our Lord asks the question thrice, yet the admonition, which each time follows it up, is not quite the same; for βόσκειν signifies simply to *feed*, provide with pasture; ποιῶμαινε both to *feed* and to *tend*; the former being especially applicable to ἀρνία (meaning young raw professors); and the latter to πρόβατα, or the more advanced and mature professors. As Christ was the ἀρχιποιμὴν (1 Pet. v. 4.), so Peter and the other Apostles were to be ποιμένες. And the notion of *tending* necessarily carries with it that of *guiding* and *governing*. The admonition was *thrice* repeated, either, as Beza supposes, with reference to Peter's *three denials*, the disgrace of which it was just he should wipe away by a triple confession; or, in order that the importance of the injunction might thus be more strongly impressed on the mind of Peter and the other Apostles. So it is said in an ancient writer (Aristoph. Ran. 368.) Τούτοις ἀπὸ καθῶς ἀπαυδῶ, καθῶς τὸ τρίτον μάλ' ἀπαυδῶ.

17. σὺ πάντα οἶδας.] A recognition of omniscience, and consequently Divinity.

18—23. There is some difficulty connected with these verses, and consequently a difference of opinion, 1. as to the *precise import* of the prediction contained therein. By these words (probably suggested by Peter's girding himself, after having changed his clothes, as he would be likely to do after having come on shore thoroughly wet) our Lord meant, it should seem, to adopt the most impressive mode of signifying to Peter what he would have to undergo in his cause, introductory to the final and solemn *injunction* to follow *his example*. In like manner, at Acts xxi. 10. it is said Agabus, a prophet, took Paul's girdle, and bound his own hands and feet, and said, "Thus saith the Holy Ghost, So shall the Jews at Jerusalem bind the man that owneth this girdle, and shall deliver him into the hands of the Gentiles." To advert to the particular import of the prediction, the words ἐξῶννευς σεαυτὸν καὶ περιεπάτιεις ὅπου ἤθελες are evidently a figurative mode of expressing youthful vigour and perfect freedom of action. The next words ὅταν δὲ γηράσῃς — θέλεις are

τὰς χεῖράς σου, καὶ ἄλλος σε ζώσει, καὶ οἴσει ὅπου οὐ θέλεις. Τοῦτο 19
 δὲ εἶπε, σημαίνων ποῖω θανάτῳ δοξάσει τὸν Θεόν. καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν
 λέγει αὐτῷ· Ἀκολούθει μοι. ⁿ Ἐπιστραφεῖς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος βλέπει τὸν 20
 μαθητῆν, ὃν ἠγάπα ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀκολουθοῦντα, ὅς καὶ ἀπέπεσεν ἐν τῷ
 δαίτην ἐπὶ τὸ στήθος αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἶπε· Κύριε, τίς ἐστὶν ὁ παραδιδούς
 σε; Τοῦτον ἰδὼν ὁ Πέτρος λέγει τῷ Ἰησοῦ· Κύριε, οὗτος δὲ τί; 21
 λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Ἐάν αὐτὸν θέλω μένειν ἕως ἔρχομαι, τί πρὸς 22
 σέ; σὺ ἀκολουθεῖ μοι. ἔξηλθεν οὖν ὁ λόγος οὗτος εἰς τοὺς ἀδελ- 23
 φούς· Ὅτι ὁ μαθητῆς ἐκεῖνος οὐκ ἀποθνήσκει. καὶ οὐκ εἶπεν αὐτῷ

n Supra 13. 23.
 & l. c.
 ver. 7.

by most Expositors ancient and modern, supposed to allude to *crucifixion*; while several recent Commentators recognize a reference solely to the *helplessness* of age. But that view is surely forbidden by the *οὐ θέλεις*; besides that yields a sense very frigid, and by no means suitable to the occasion. Yet whether the words can fairly be thought to refer to the *crucifixion itself*, may be doubted: for though the expressions *ἐκτενείς τὰς χεῖράς σου καὶ ἄλλος σε ζώσει* be correspondent thereto, since the person would have to stretch out his arms to be nailed to the cross bars; yet that is supposing him to be *already* there, and not have to be *taken* (as the words following express) "where he would not wish to go," namely, to the place of execution. Hence Kuin. and Tittm. maintain that the words only predict that Peter should die a *violent death*. And indeed the words following *τοῦτο δὲ—Θεὸν* cannot be *proved* to have reference to more than *martyrdom* by whatever death. Yet they, and especially the subsequent admonition *ἀκολουθεῖ μοι*, rather suggest death by *crucifixion*; and as the universal testimony of antiquity concurs in shewing that Peter suffered martyrdom by *crucifixion*, I am therefore inclined to think, with Casaubon, Scaliger, Amelinus, Lampe, Wets., and Ernesti, that there is a reference, not to actual crucifixion, but to the *preparation* for it, by which (as they prove from various examples) the criminal was compelled to put his neck into a *furea* (of the form Π, called *patibulum*); his hands being extended and bound to the *transverse horns* (to represent, by a *significant action*, the punishment he was about to suffer); and after being carried, as it were in procession, to the place of execution, he was then *actually* crucified. As to the *obscurity* which this interpretation supposes to exist in the words, that is by no means greater than might be expected in a *prediction*, not intended to be fully understood but by the *event*; when it would prove as great a *support* to the Apostle as it would *before* that time have been a source of alarm and dismay.

Instead of *οἴσει*, a Classical writer would have said *ἀπάξει*. And indeed some MSS. have *ἀπάξουσι*, or *ἄξουσι*; both evidently *glosses*. From the question put by Peter at ver. 21, it is manifest that he understood his Lord's expressions of a violent death by the executioner; but *what kind* of death he did not understand; and in his 2d Epistle i. 14, though he speaks with uncertainty, yet he plainly alludes to a *violent death*.

19. *δοξάσει τὸν Θεόν.*] An expression designating martyrdom, on which see Grotius and Tittman.

20. *ἐπιστραφεῖς.*] It seems that Peter, though he was aware of the figurative sense intended in *ἀκολ.*, yet thought it safer to observe the direc-

tion in the *literal* one, and therefore follows his master. Then, turning about and seeing John also following, and thereby showing his comprehension of the meaning of Jesus, he feels a curiosity to know whether John, his friend and companion, would *also accompany* him in death, and therefore asks *οὗτος δὲ τί*, where must be supplied *ποιήσει*, which may mean, "What shall he do, i. e. suffer? (for *ποιῶ* has often the sense of *πάσχω*) i. e. what shall be his fate?"

22. *ἐάν αὐτὸν θέλω, &c.*] Here, again, the sense is obscure, for the very same reason as before, and consequently has led to a great variety of interpretations; all of them, I conceive, more or less erroneous. To ascertain the true sense, the scope of the words, and their natural import, considered separately and conjointly, must first be ascertained. Now it is evident that our Lord intended a *gentle rebuke* to Peter for his curiosity on a subject which did not concern himself, and into which it was not proper for him to pry. Now *τί πρὸς σέ* was (as appears from the Classical illustrations of Wets. and Kypke) a frequent form of repressing vain curiosity. The *chief* sense, therefore, to be expressed, seems to be that assigned by Euthym., "Do thou mind thine own concerns: mind thy *own* death. and do not too curiously pry into the manner of that of thy companion." As, however, *τί πρὸς σέ* is followed by *ἐάν αὐτὸν θέλω* μ. ἔ. ἔ., something *more* is intended, which, though phrased (for the same reason as the foregoing intimations) somewhat obscurely, yet, when we consider that the force of this kind of phrase is to *put a negative* on any question asked, and that the scope of Peter's inquiry was to know whether John *too* would suffer martyrdom, the words may reasonably be thought to contain, together with a *mild reproof* for the liberty taken, an *obscure intimation* that he would *not* suffer martyrdom, but continue alive up to — what period? — TILL I COME. Now here was an *enigma*, but such as the Disciples might, with due attention and consideration, understand; and which, therefore, it is strange that so many of the Commentators should have failed to see. They take this coming of Christ to denote his *final advent* to judge the world; as if this were only a *popular* way of expressing, "If I should choose for him not to *die at all*, what would that be to thee?" But that, I apprehend, would be making the expression *more* enigmatical than its wording will justify. The coming of Christ must rather denote (as many eminent Expositors suppose) the *coming of Christ in power to execute vengeance on the Jewish nation*. That John lived up to, and far beyond, the entire completion of Christ's judgments on the Jewish nation, is well known. As, however, the disciples did not *then* know of

ὁ Ἰησοῦς, οἱ οὐκ ἀποθνήσκει· ἀλλ'· Ἐὶν αὐτὸν θέλω μένειν ἕως
ἕρχομαι, τί πρὸς σέ;

24 ΟΥΤΟΣ ἐστὶν ὁ μαθητὴς ὁ μαρτυρῶν περὶ τούτων, καὶ γράψας
25 ταῦτα· καὶ οἶδαμεν ὅτι ἀληθὴς ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία αὐτοῦ. ὅστι δὲ καὶ ^oSupra 20. 30.
ἄλλα πολλὰ ὅσα ἐποίησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς αὐτὰ ἐν γράφῃται καθ' ἕν, οὐδὲ
αὐτὸν οἶμαι τὸν κόσμον χωρῆσαι τὰ γραφόμενα βιβλία. Ἀμήν.

this advent of our Lord, but only of the *final* one, it is no wonder that they should have *then* understood it of the *other*, and consequently supposed that he would not die at all.

24, 25. Several eminent Critics and Commentators, even those who receive all the rest of the Chapter, regard these verses as not from the Evangelist, but an addition from another hand, — probably John the Presbyter. This they are induced to suppose, partly from the change of persons in οἶδαμεν, and partly by a fancied dissimilarity to the style in the preceding verse. The latter, however, is but a weak argument, and the former has not much force; though it has been but faintly rebutted by the defenders of the authenticity of the verses; who so distrust their own arguments, as to propose no less than *four conjectures*, all of them without any countenance from the MSS., and two of which introduce bad Greek! It is strange that the impugnors of these verses should not have seen, that, if the rest of the Chapter be (as it *certainly is*) from the Evangelist, so *must*, at least, the clause οὗτος — γράψας ταῦτα; for this would be *requisite* to form any *conclusion* (and that these verses, which Kuin. calls a *corollarium*, were meant to do so is pretty clear), and would be a very proper one. But if *that* clause be from St. John, so probably must the *next*, since it is strongly confirmed by an altogether kindred passage at xix. 35. Nor is there any such difficulty in οἶδαμεν as to be fatal to the authority of the clause; since it may be taken, not *per enallagen*, as many contend, for it would rather be οἶδε; but, as some eminent Critics maintain, *communicative*, i. e. to include the disciples and first Christians in general: q. d. “*It is known.*” Indeed, from *whom* can this clause and the next verse have proceeded, if *not* from St. John? The *Bishops of the Churches of Asia*, say the first-mentioned Critics. But St. John’s assertion could not *need* the support of *their* testimony. Besides, the singular οἶμαι, in the next verse (which cannot be taken for *sanè*, because it is nowhere so used in the Scriptures), forbids this notion. Are we, then, to consider the last verse as an addition by some hand different from

that of the preceding clause? That involves a great improbability; for surely there would *seem* to be no need of any addition, at least not to the *reader*; though the *author* might see the thing in a different view. Upon the whole, there is not the slightest reason for supposing that the verse came from any other than the *Evangelist*, who seems to have intended it as a *supplement* to what was said at xx. 30.

The words οὐδὲ αὐτὸν οἶμαι — βιβλία are (as the best Critics and Commentators have been long agreed) an Oriental and hyperbolical mode of expression, to represent that the miracles, the remarkable actions and discourses of Jesus, were exceedingly numerous. Of this kind of speaking many examples are adduced by Bp. Pearce from the Scriptural and the Classical writers. And two are cited by Wets. from the Rabbinical writers, so similar, that one might almost suppose this to have been a common Jewish phrase. To the above I have, in Recens. Synop., added others from Eurip. Hipp. 1248. Æschyl. Pers. 435. and Eurip. Menalipp. frag. 3. οὐδ’ ἅπας ἂν σβρανδῆ, Διὸς γοῶφέντος τὰς βροτῶν ἁμαρτίας, ἕκαστος αἰεὶ. I would now subjoin Philo Jud. p. 123. D.

It must be observed, that at ver. 24. the τούτων has reference to the events of this Chapter; and the ταῦτα, to those of the rest of the Gospel. At ἄλλα πολλὰ is plainly to be supplied ἃ οὐκ ἔστι γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τούτῳ. To these allusions are occasionally found. Compare Matt. xi. Acts xx. 35; and see a learned tract of Zornius de *ἀγοφῶσι Christi dictis*. We have, however, reason to acquiesce in the providence of Him who “doeth all things well.” Every important purpose, in a work meant for the *people at large* rather than the *learned*, is accomplished by the Gospels in their present state. Had they recorded all the words and actions of Christ, or even any considerable part, they would have been, as the Evangelist perhaps means to intimate, too voluminous for a *manual* adapted to ordinary use. Enough is recorded to direct our faith, and regulate our practice: *more* would have been superfluous, and in some respects, have defeated the purpose in view.

ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΤΩΝ ΑΓΙΩΝ

ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ.

Ι. ΤΟΝ μὲν πρῶτον λόγον ἐποιήσαμην περὶ πάντων, ᾧ Θεόφιλε, 1
ᾧν ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς ποιεῖν τε καὶ διδάσκειν, ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας ἐντελεύ- 2

This important book forms the grand connecting link of the Gospels with the Epistles, being a sort of *appendix* to the former, and *introduction* to the latter, and is therefore indispensably necessary to a right understanding of *both*. That St. Luke was the author, is plain both from what is said at the commencement, and from the similarity of the style with that of the Gospel; besides the unanimous testimony of early Fathers. Inasmuch that some have conjectured that the Gospels and the Acts formed only *two parts* in *one* general work. Of the *genuineness* of the present production we have the amplest proof in the testimonies of the earliest Christian Fathers; inasmuch that this has never been disputed. The *time* when it was published we are better enabled to ascertain than that of any other book in the N. T. Considering that the history therein contained is brought down to the second year of St. Paul's imprisonment, it could not have been written before A. D. 63; and as it makes no mention of St. Paul's death, it is most likely to have been written before that event. And learned men in general assign A. D. 63 as the time of its publication. Though, indeed, from the date of the present book depending upon the date of St. Luke's Gospel (on which see the Introduction), and that of St. Paul's death, which is not thoroughly ascertained, — the point admits not of certain determination. It is probable that the latter end of A. D. 65, or the beginning of A. D. 66, is the true date, i. e. if St. Paul perished, not in the persecution which arose immediately after the great fire at Rome, in Oct. A. D. 64, but (as some think, on the testimony of Clemens Rom.) about two years after. If, however, St. Paul perished in the persecution of the autumn of A. D. 64, that will throw back the period; though probably not further than the earlier part of 64. Dr. Burton, indeed, thinks the Acts were written at Rome, during St. Paul's first imprisonment at Rome, between 56 and 53, and published in 53; for otherwise Luke would have said more of St. Paul's history. That, however, will depend upon whether Luke intended

to give a history of the evangelical labours of the Apostle.

The *Canonical authority* of this book is connected with that of the *Gospel*, on which see the Introduction, and that to St. Mark. To turn to the *contents*, which will be best appreciated by adverting to the *purpose* of the work; it is plain that St. Luke did not intend to write a regular history of the rise and progress of the Christian Church, for thirty years after the Ascension, but only what the French call *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire*. The design of the writer seems to have been *two-fold*; 1st, to give an authentic account of the communication of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, and of the miraculous powers and supernatural gifts bestowed by the Spirit on the first preachers of the word and professors of the Gospel. Also, 2dly, to present such an authentic narrative of the early progress of the Gospel, as should establish the full claim of the Gentiles to be admitted into the Church of Christ — a claim even yet disputed by the Jews. And, in a general way, to afford matter of confirmation to the accounts in the Gospel, and supply irrefragable evidence of the Divine origin of the Christian religion. To advert to the Book itself — there is a manifest attention paid to chronological order; and some epochs being *fixed* by their combination with certain political events, there is little difficulty in determining the dates of almost all the events recorded in this book, with the exception, however, of those which took place between the years 33 and 34, and between 44 and 60, on which, and the chronology of the Book in general, see Bp. Marsh's *Michaelis*, vol. iii. P. 1. p. 336 — 338, and especially Hug's *Introd.* to the N. T. vol. ii. p. 312 — 334.

The *style* of this book is neat, and differs not materially from that of the later Greek writers in the Alexandrian and the *κατὰ εὐαγγέλιον*. On the *phraseology*, and the *peculiar terms*, &c., see Schleiermacher's *Essay on the Gospel of Luke*, and the review of it in *Brit. Crit.*, said to be by Dr. Burton. Of the *place* where the work was

μενος τοῖς ἀποστόλοις διὰ Πνεύματος ἁγίου, οὓς ἐξελέξατο, ἀνελήφθη.

3 Οἷς καὶ παρέστησεν ἑαυτὸν ζῶντα, μετὰ τὸ παθεῖν αὐτὸν, ἐν πολλοῖς τεκμηρίοις, δι' ἡμερῶν τεσσαράκοντα ὀπιτανόμενος αὐτοῖς καὶ λέγων τὰ

4 περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ. ^p Καὶ συναλιζόμενος παρήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς ^p ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων μὴ χωρίζεσθαι, ἀλλὰ περιμένειν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ ^p Luke 24. 49. John 14. 26. & 15. 26.

5 Πατρὸς, ἣν ἠκούσατέ μου. ^q ὅτι Ἰωάννης μὲν ἐβάπτισεν ὕδατι, ὑμεῖς ^q Matt. 3. 11. Mark 1. 8. Luke 3. 16. John 1. 26. infra 2. 4. & 11. 16. & 19. 4.

δὲ βαπτισθήσεσθε ἐν Πνεύματι ἁγίῳ οὐ μετὰ πολλὰς ταύτας ἡμέρας.

6 Οἱ μὲν οὖν συνελθόντες ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν, λέγοντες· Κύριε, εἰ ἐν τῷ

written we have no certain information. It was probably *Achaea*, where, I conjecture, St. Luke chiefly resided after the year 56, and where Ecclesiastical tradition tells us that he died.

C. I. 1. Πρῶτων is for *πρότερον*; a use (as also that of the Latin *primus* for *prior*) frequent in the best writers. *Λόγος*, in the sense narrative of words or actions, *history*, occurs frequently in the Classical writers, and in the N. T. at Acts v. 21. John iv. 39. Hence historians were anciently called *λογοποιοί*; and *λόγον ποιῆσθαι* signified to compose a history. This use of *μὲν* not followed by *ἐπὶ* often occurs in the Classics, especially at the beginning of a work. By *πάντων* must be understood all things necessary to be revealed. See John xx. 30. sq.; xxi. 25. Ὡν for ὤν by a common idiom, usually referred to the principal *Attraction*, on which see Alt's Gram. N. T. p. 89. The *ἡμέρας* is supposed by the Commentators to be pleonastic, as in Mark vi. 7. Matt. xii. 1. and often elsewhere. But it is, properly speaking, never pleonastic. In several of those passages it signifies, "took in hand;" and in others, including the present, it has an *intensive* force, intimating the great labour, difficulty, or importance of the work in question.

2. ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας — ἐξελέξατο.] Most of the later Commentators construe διὰ Πν. ἁγ. with ἐξελέξατο; the ancient and earlier moderns take them with ἐντελέμενος; and rightly; for according to the former mode, there is some violence done to the construction. Διὰ πν. ἁγ. signifies "by means of the Holy Spirit." Here, as in some other passages, what our Lord taught and did is, with reference to his human nature, attributed to the Holy Spirit. Ἐντελέμενος need not be confined to *any one direction*; but may be extended to *all* the injunctions given to them for the right discharge of their Apostolic office. See Matt. xxviii. 19. Mark xvi. 15 — 19.

3. παρέστησεν ἐ. ζ.] "proved or evidenced himself to be alive." This use of *παρίσταναι*, which occurs also at xxiv. 15, is frequent in the Classical writers, and arises from that *physical* sense by which the word signifies to *place any thing down by another*. Τεκμηρίοις, "clear and evident proofs." Δ' ἡμερῶν τεσσ., i. e. at intervals during that period, and on no less than *eight* different occasions; 1. to Mary Magdalene and the other Mary; (Matt. xxviii. 1 — 9.) 2. to the two disciples on their way to Emmaus; (Luke xxiv. 15.) 3. to Peter; (Luke xxiv. 35.) 4. to ten of the Apostles; (Thomas being absent) (Luke xxiv. 36. John xx. 19.) 5. to the Eleven Apostles; (John xx. 26.) 6. to seven of the Apostles in Galilee, at the sea of Tiberias; (John xxi. 4.) 7. to James; (1 Cor. xv. 7.) 8. when the Apostles and Disciples were assembled together, and when he led them out as far as Bethany, (Luke xxiv. 50.) from whence he ascended to heaven in the presence of above 500

brethren at once, 1 Cor. xv. 6. On the present passage see Bp. Atterbury's Sermon, vol. i. p. 173, entitled, "Some Reasons assigned for our Saviour's appearing chiefly to his Apostles after his resurrection, and his manner of conversing with them represented."

"Our Lord (says Schoettg.) employed these 40 days in conversing with his disciples on all matters relating to the Constitution of the Christian Church to be planted and established among the Gentiles: 1. concerning *doctrines*, inculcating anew the instruction hitherto delivered to them, which, that it might be the more impressed on their memories, was afterwards *confirmed* at the effusion of the Holy Spirit. (See John xiv. 26.) 2. He gave them injunctions concerning the *rites* and *ceremonies* to be observed in the Church; as, for instance, in what manner the Sacraments were to be celebrated, the mode and time of assembling together," &c.

4. συναλιζόμενος.] Some MSS. have *συναυλ.*, which is preferred by several Critics, but without reason; for its authority is very slender, and it is evidently a *gloss* on the received reading, which is rather difficult, and therefore variously interpreted. The ancients, and earlier moderns, in general explain it "convescens," by a derivation from *ἄλς* or *ἄλας*; the later Commentators, *convalescens* cum illis, deriving it from *ἄλς confertim*; taking it in a neuter sense. The former signification is of slender authority, and here unsuitable. The latter is greatly preferable, and is confirmed by many passages of the Classical writers adduced by the Commentators; c. gr. Herodot. i. 62. οἱ μὲν δὲ *συνελίζοντο*. and v. 15. The construction is; *ἀλιζόμενος σὺν αὐτοῖς, παρήγγειλεν* (αὐτοῖς). Wakef. well renders: "During these communications with them." In *χωρίζεσθαι* we have another example of passive in a neuter sense.

— ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ Πατρὸς] i. e. the promised gift of the Father, the Holy Spirit. See ii. 13. It was promised in the prophecies of the O. T. See Joel ii. 28. "Ἦν ἠκούσατε," which ye have lately heard of from me." Sub. ἐκ οὐρα. See John xiv. 26. xv. 26. xvi. 7. Luke xxiv. 49. Here is a transition from the *oratio indirecta* to the *directa*; an idiom peculiar to the popular style in modern languages, though occasionally found in the best ancient writers.

5. Πνεύματι ἁγίῳ.] This must mean (especially as there is no Art.) the *influence* of the Holy Spirit. Βαπτισθ. suggests the *abundance* of the thing, q. d. "ye shall be plenteously imbued with the influences of the Holy Spirit."

6. εἰ.] Some of the Commentators explain *εἰ νυν*; others, *annon*. The former is the more accurate version, and is supported by the Pesch. Syr. Version. This peculiar use of the particle seems to have arisen from a blending of the ora-

χρόνῳ τοῦτῳ ἀποκαθιστάνεις τὴν βασιλείαν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ; Εἶπε δὲ πρὸς 7
 αὐτούς· Οὐχ ὑμῶν ἐστὶ γινῶναι χρόνους ἢ καιροὺς, οὓς ὁ Πατὴρ ἔθετο
 r Infr 2. 2. ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ· ἀλλὰ λήψασθε δύναμιν, ἐπελθόντος τοῦ ἁγίου 8
 Πνεύματος ἐφ' ὑμᾶς· καὶ ἔσεσθέ μοι μάρτυρες ἐν τῇ Ἰερουσαλὴμ καὶ
 s Mark 16. 19. Luke 24. 51. [ἐν] πάσῃ τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ καὶ Σαμαρείᾳ, καὶ ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς. * Καὶ 9
 ταῦτα εἰπὼν, βλεπόντων αὐτῶν ἐπήρθη, καὶ νεφέλῃ ὑπέλαβεν αὐτὸν
 ἀπὸ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν. Καὶ ὡς ἀτεινίζοντες ἦσαν εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, 10
 παρενομένου αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἰδοὺ, ἄνδρες δύο παρειστήκεισαν αὐτοῖς ἐν
 ἐσθῆτι λευκῇ, οἳ καὶ εἶπον· Ἄνδρες Γαλιλαῖοι, τί ἐστήκατε ἐμβλέποντες 11
 εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν; οὗτος ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὁ ἀναληφθεὶς ἀφ' ὑμῶν εἰς τὸν
 οὐρανόν οὕτως ἐλεύσεται ὁν τρόπον ἐθέψασθε αὐτὸν παρενόμενον εἰς
 τὸν οὐρανόν. Τότε ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἰερουσαλὴμ ἀπὸ ὄρους τοῦ καλου- 12
 μένου Ἐλαιῶνος, ὃ ἐστὶν ἐγγὺς Ἰερουσαλὴμ, σαββᾶτου ἔχον ὁδόν.

tio *directa* with the *indirecta*. According to the rules of regular composition, it would have been written *ἐπρωτων εἰ ἀποκαθιστάνει, ἢ ἀποκαθιστάνοι*. So Mark viii. 25. *ἐπρωτα αὐτὸν, εἰ βλέπει τι*, and Acts xvii. 11. *ἀνακρίνοντες, εἰ ἔχει ταῦτα*. There is another example of this idiom at vii. 1. *εἶπε δὲ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς· εἰ ἄρα ταῦτα ὄντως ἔχει;* and xxii. 27. *λέγε μοι, εἰ σὺ Ῥωμαῖος εἶ*.

Most Commentators either consider ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ τ. as pleonastic, or as serving to express anxiety or disapprobation. But the meaning intended seems to be simply this: "is the time now come for thy restoring," &c. Ἀποκαθιστάναι signifies properly to restore any thing, which has suffered change, to its former state; and it is not unfrequently used (as here and in Matt. xvii. 11. and Mark ix. 12.) of restoring a ruined kingdom or government to its ancient form, and there is usually implied some *improvement* upon that. Indeed, the Apostles seem to have thought that Christ would then restore the kingdom of Judæa to its former consequence, and would conjoin with it a spiritual kingdom, spoken of by the Prophets; (see Is. i. 26. ix. 7. Jer. xxiii. 6. xxxiii. 15 — 17. Dan. vii. 13. sq. Hos. iii. 4. sq. Am. ix. 11. Zach. ix. 9. sq.) and accordingly, that the Gentiles who expected salvation must first embrace Judaism. The answer to this question, though not direct, yet has reference to the words ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ τ. which shows that they ought by no means to have been regarded as *pleonastic*.

7. οὐχ ὑμῶν ἐστὶ γινῶναι, &c.] "it is not your business, it is not permitted you to know." Of the terms χρόνους and καιροῖς, the former denotes *tempus*; the latter, *tempus opportunum*. But with H. Steph., Valckn., and Wakef., they may be taken as put, per hendiadyn, for *opportunos temporum articulos*. But, strictly speaking, the latter term is put by an *epanorthosis* of the former. The whole has the air of a popular mode of speaking, properly used of soldiers, who as they know not the τοῖς καιροῖς τῆς μάχης. (of which their general alone can judge), ought not to pry into or criticize his plans.

— ἔθετο ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ.] Most Commentators, since the time of Kypke, have assigned as the sense, "hath appointed [i. e. determined] by his own power." But this mode of interpretation is somewhat harsh; and there is no good ground to abandon the old one, "hath put in his own power," which seems to be a *popular* form of ex-

pression for "placed at," or "reserved in," "his own disposal;" which, however, cannot imply that Christ was ignorant of them, but that they were *secrets* reposed with the Father, which the Son was not authorized to disclose.

8. δύναμιν] here denotes the miraculous gifts of the Spirit; for (as Whitby truly observes) δύναμις in the N. T., when it relates to God the Father, Christ, or the Holy Ghost, imports some miraculous, or extraordinary power. Compare Luke xxiv. 50. Many Commentators, take ἐπελθ. τοῦ ἁγ. Πν. with δύναμιν, as in regimen with it. But I doubt whether the proprietaries linguæ will permit this: and it is forbidden by ἁγ. Πν. being here plainly taken in the *personal* sense. Comp. Luke i. 35. The phrase ἕως ἐσχάτου (scil. μέρους) τῆς γῆς was probably understood by the Disciples that part of the East only — as Syria. But Christ, no doubt, meant it of the *whole world*, (as Ps. xix. 5. Is. xlix. 6.) agreeably to his Father's promise, Ps. ii. 8., of "giving Him the heathen for His inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession."

9. καὶ νεφέλῃ ὑπέλ.] "And [then] a cloud received him." Ὑπέλαβε is not, as some imagine, for ἀνελ.; but there is a signif. prægn. for ἐπήλαβε καὶ ἀπέλαβε, *susceptum abstulit*.

10. ἀτεινίζοντες ἦσαν] "were fixedly gazing." See Note on Luke xxii. 54. Ἀτεινίξ. must be construed, not as Kuin. says, with παρενομένου, but with εἰς τὸν οὐρ., as is plain from the other passages of the N. T. where the word occurs.

— παρειστήκεισαν] "came and stood by." They seem to have appeared suddenly and preternaturally (see Note on John xxi. 4.), and were, no doubt, angels in the form of men.

11. ἐστήκατε ἐμβλέπ.] as in amazement and awe. This sense is in some measure inherent in ἐστηκέναι; but is generally expressed by added words, as in a kindred passage of Aristoph. cited by Valckn. τί πάσχετ', ἄνδρες; ἔστατ' ἐκτεπληγμένοι. — οὗτος — ἔλεσθ.] Namely, visibly and in the clouds. See Dan. vii. 13. Matt. xxiv. 30.

12. Ἐλαιῶνος.] These forms in — ὦν Bp. Blomfield (on Æschyl. Prom. 667.) thinks are derived from the Genit. plural of the primitive noun; and Valck. regards the form as having a *collective* force, and importing *plenty*.

— σαββᾶτου ἔχον ὁδόν.] Mr. Valpy pronounces that ἔχον is *not* for ἀνέχον; but that it signifies *being, consisting of*. That, however, yields a

- 13 Καὶ ὅτε εἰσῆλθον, ἀνέβησαν εἰς τὸ ὑπερῶον οὗ ἦσαν καταμένοντες, ὃ τε Πέτρος καὶ Ἰάκωβος, καὶ Ἰωάννης καὶ Ἀνδρέας, Φίλιππος καὶ Θωμᾶς, Βαρθολομαῖος καὶ Ματθαῖος, Ἰάκωβος Ἀλφαίου καὶ Σίμων ὁ
- 14 Ζηλωτῆς, καὶ Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου. Οὗτοι πάντες ἦσαν προσκατεροῦντες ὁμοθυμαδὸν τῇ προσευχῇ καὶ τῇ δεήσει, σὺν γυναιξὶ καὶ Μαρίᾳ τῇ μητρὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ σὺν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς αὐτοῦ.
- 15 ΚΑΙ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις ἀναστὰς Πέτρος ἐν μέσῳ τῶν μαθητῶν
- 16 εἶπεν· (ἦν τε ὄχλος ὀνομάτων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ὡς ἑκατὸν εἴκοσιν·) Ἔν-^{1 Paul. 41. 10.} ^{John 13. 13.} ^{& 13. 3.} ^{18.} ^{19.} ^{20.} ^{21.} ^{22.} ^{23.} ^{24.} ^{25.} ^{26.} ^{27.} ^{28.} ^{29.} ^{30.} ^{31.} ^{32.} ^{33.} ^{34.} ^{35.} ^{36.} ^{37.} ^{38.} ^{39.} ^{40.} ^{41.} ^{42.} ^{43.} ^{44.} ^{45.} ^{46.} ^{47.} ^{48.} ^{49.} ^{50.} ^{51.} ^{52.} ^{53.} ^{54.} ^{55.} ^{56.} ^{57.} ^{58.} ^{59.} ^{60.} ^{61.} ^{62.} ^{63.} ^{64.} ^{65.} ^{66.} ^{67.} ^{68.} ^{69.} ^{70.} ^{71.} ^{72.} ^{73.} ^{74.} ^{75.} ^{76.} ^{77.} ^{78.} ^{79.} ^{80.} ^{81.} ^{82.} ^{83.} ^{84.} ^{85.} ^{86.} ^{87.} ^{88.} ^{89.} ^{90.} ^{91.} ^{92.} ^{93.} ^{94.} ^{95.} ^{96.} ^{97.} ^{98.} ^{99.} ^{100.} ^{101.} ^{102.} ^{103.} ^{104.} ^{105.} ^{106.} ^{107.} ^{108.} ^{109.} ^{110.} ^{111.} ^{112.} ^{113.} ^{114.} ^{115.} ^{116.} ^{117.} ^{118.} ^{119.} ^{120.} ^{121.} ^{122.} ^{123.} ^{124.} ^{125.} ^{126.} ^{127.} ^{128.} ^{129.} ^{130.} ^{131.} ^{132.} ^{133.} ^{134.} ^{135.} ^{136.} ^{137.} ^{138.} ^{139.} ^{140.} ^{141.} ^{142.} ^{143.} ^{144.} ^{145.} ^{146.} ^{147.} ^{148.} ^{149.} ^{150.} ^{151.} ^{152.} ^{153.} ^{154.} ^{155.} ^{156.} ^{157.} ^{158.} ^{159.} ^{160.} ^{161.} ^{162.} ^{163.} ^{164.} ^{165.} ^{166.} ^{167.} ^{168.} ^{169.} ^{170.} ^{171.} ^{172.} ^{173.} ^{174.} ^{175.} ^{176.} ^{177.} ^{178.} ^{179.} ^{180.} ^{181.} ^{182.} ^{183.} ^{184.} ^{185.} ^{186.} ^{187.} ^{188.} ^{189.} ^{190.} ^{191.} ^{192.} ^{193.} ^{194.} ^{195.} ^{196.} ^{197.} ^{198.} ^{199.} ^{200.} ^{201.} ^{202.} ^{203.} ^{204.} ^{205.} ^{206.} ^{207.} ^{208.} ^{209.} ^{210.} ^{211.} ^{212.} ^{213.} ^{214.} ^{215.} ^{216.} ^{217.} ^{218.} ^{219.} ^{220.} ^{221.} ^{222.} ^{223.} ^{224.} ^{225.} ^{226.} ^{227.} ^{228.} ^{229.} ^{230.} ^{231.} ^{232.} ^{233.} ^{234.} ^{235.} ^{236.} ^{237.} ^{238.} ^{239.} ^{240.} ^{241.} ^{242.} ^{243.} ^{244.} ^{245.} ^{246.} ^{247.} ^{248.} ^{249.} ^{250.} ^{251.} ^{252.} ^{253.} ^{254.} ^{255.} ^{256.} ^{257.} ^{258.} ^{259.} ^{260.} ^{261.} ^{262.} ^{263.} ^{264.} ^{265.} ^{266.} ^{267.} ^{268.} ^{269.} ^{270.} ^{271.} ^{272.} ^{273.} ^{274.} ^{275.} ^{276.} ^{277.} ^{278.} ^{279.} ^{280.} ^{281.} ^{282.} ^{283.} ^{284.} ^{285.} ^{286.} ^{287.} ^{288.} ^{289.} ^{290.} ^{291.} ^{292.} ^{293.} ^{294.} ^{295.} ^{296.} ^{297.} ^{298.} ^{299.} ^{300.} ^{301.} ^{302.} ^{303.} ^{304.} ^{305.} ^{306.} ^{307.} ^{308.} ^{309.} ^{310.} ^{311.} ^{312.} ^{313.} ^{314.} ^{315.} ^{316.} ^{317.} ^{318.} ^{319.} ^{320.} ^{321.} ^{322.} ^{323.} ^{324.} ^{325.} ^{326.} ^{327.} ^{328.} ^{329.} ^{330.} ^{331.} ^{332.} ^{333.} ^{334.} ^{335.} ^{336.} ^{337.} ^{338.} ^{339.} ^{340.} ^{341.} ^{342.} ^{343.} ^{344.} ^{345.} ^{346.} ^{347.} ^{348.} ^{349.} ^{350.} ^{351.} ^{352.} ^{353.} ^{354.} ^{355.} ^{356.} ^{357.} ^{358.} ^{359.} ^{360.} ^{361.} ^{362.} ^{363.} ^{364.} ^{365.} ^{366.} ^{367.} ^{368.} ^{369.} ^{370.} ^{371.} ^{372.} ^{373.} ^{374.} ^{375.} ^{376.} ^{377.} ^{378.} ^{379.} ^{380.} ^{381.} ^{382.} ^{383.} ^{384.} ^{385.} ^{386.} ^{387.} ^{388.} ^{389.} ^{390.} ^{391.} ^{392.} ^{393.} ^{394.} ^{395.} ^{396.} ^{397.} ^{398.} ^{399.} ^{400.} ^{401.} ^{402.} ^{403.} ^{404.} ^{405.} ^{406.} ^{407.} ^{408.} ^{409.} ^{410.} ^{411.} ^{412.} ^{413.} ^{414.} ^{415.} ^{416.} ^{417.} ^{418.} ^{419.} ^{420.} ^{421.} ^{422.} ^{423.} ^{424.} ^{425.} ^{426.} ^{427.} ^{428.} ^{429.} ^{430.} ^{431.} ^{432.} ^{433.} ^{434.} ^{435.} ^{436.} ^{437.} ^{438.} ^{439.} ^{440.} ^{441.} ^{442.} ^{443.} ^{444.} ^{445.} ^{446.} ^{447.} ^{448.} ^{449.} ^{450.} ^{451.} ^{452.} ^{453.} ^{454.} ^{455.} ^{456.} ^{457.} ^{458.} ^{459.} ^{460.} ^{461.} ^{462.} ^{463.} ^{464.} ^{465.} ^{466.} ^{467.} ^{468.} ^{469.} ^{470.} ^{471.} ^{472.} ^{473.} ^{474.} ^{475.} ^{476.} ^{477.} ^{478.} ^{479.} ^{480.} ^{481.} ^{482.} ^{483.} ^{484.} ^{485.} ^{486.} ^{487.} ^{488.} ^{489.} ^{490.} ^{491.} ^{492.} ^{493.} ^{494.} ^{495.} ^{496.} ^{497.} ^{498.} ^{499.} ^{500.} ^{501.} ^{502.} ^{503.} ^{504.} ^{505.} ^{506.} ^{507.} ^{508.} ^{509.} ^{510.} ^{511.} ^{512.} ^{513.} ^{514.} ^{515.} ^{516.} ^{517.} ^{518.} ^{519.} ^{520.} ^{521.} ^{522.} ^{523.} ^{524.} ^{525.} ^{526.} ^{527.} ^{528.} ^{529.} ^{530.} ^{531.} ^{532.} ^{533.} ^{534.} ^{535.} ^{536.} ^{537.} ^{538.} ^{539.} ^{540.} ^{541.} ^{542.} ^{543.} ^{544.} ^{545.} ^{546.} ^{547.} ^{548.} ^{549.} ^{550.} ^{551.} ^{552.} ^{553.} ^{554.} ^{555.} ^{556.} ^{557.} ^{558.} ^{559.} ^{560.} ^{561.} ^{562.} ^{563.} ^{564.} ^{565.} ^{566.} ^{567.} ^{568.} ^{569.} ^{570.} ^{571.} ^{572.} ^{573.} ^{574.} ^{575.} ^{576.} ^{577.} ^{578.} ^{579.} ^{580.} ^{581.} ^{582.} ^{583.} ^{584.} ^{585.} ^{586.} ^{587.} ^{588.} ^{589.} ^{590.} ^{591.} ^{592.} ^{593.} ^{594.} ^{595.} ^{596.} ^{597.} ^{598.} ^{599.} ^{600.} ^{601.} ^{602.} ^{603.} ^{604.} ^{605.} ^{606.} ^{607.} ^{608.} ^{609.} ^{610.} ^{611.} ^{612.} ^{613.} ^{614.} ^{615.} ^{616.} ^{617.} ^{618.} ^{619.} ^{620.} ^{621.} ^{622.} ^{623.} ^{624.} ^{625.} ^{626.} ^{627.} ^{628.} ^{629.} ^{630.} ^{631.} ^{632.} ^{633.} ^{634.} ^{635.} ^{636.} ^{637.} ^{638.} ^{639.} ^{640.} ^{641.} ^{642.} ^{643.} ^{644.} ^{645.} ^{646.} ^{647.} ^{648.} ^{649.} ^{650.} ^{651.} ^{652.} ^{653.} ^{654.} ^{655.} ^{656.} ^{657.} ^{658.} ^{659.} ^{660.} ^{661.} ^{662.} ^{663.} ^{664.} ^{665.} ^{666.} ^{667.} ^{668.} ^{669.} ^{670.} ^{671.} ^{672.} ^{673.} ^{674.} ^{675.} ^{676.} ^{677.} ^{678.} ^{679.} ^{680.} ^{681.} ^{682.} ^{683.} ^{684.} ^{685.} ^{686.} ^{687.} ^{688.} ^{689.} ^{690.} ^{691.} ^{692.} ^{693.} ^{694.} ^{695.} ^{696.} ^{697.} ^{698.} ^{699.} ^{700.} ^{701.} ^{702.} ^{703.} ^{704.} ^{705.} ^{706.} ^{707.} ^{708.} ^{709.} ^{710.} ^{711.} ^{712.} ^{713.} ^{714.} ^{715.} ^{716.} ^{717.} ^{718.} ^{719.} ^{720.} ^{721.} ^{722.} ^{723.} ^{724.} ^{725.} ^{726.} ^{727.} ^{728.} ^{729.} ^{730.} ^{731.} ^{732.} ^{733.} ^{734.} ^{735.} ^{736.} ^{737.} ^{738.} ^{739.} ^{740.} ^{741.} ^{742.} ^{743.} ^{744.} ^{745.} ^{746.} ^{747.} ^{748.} ^{749.} ^{750.} ^{751.} ^{752.} ^{753.} ^{754.} ^{755.} ^{756.} ^{757.} ^{758.} ^{759.} ^{760.} ^{761.} ^{762.} ^{763.} ^{764.} ^{765.} ^{766.} ^{767.} ^{768.} ^{769.} ^{770.} ^{771.} ^{772.} ^{773.} ^{774.} ^{775.} ^{776.} ^{777.} ^{778.} ^{779.} ^{780.} ^{781.} ^{782.} ^{783.} ^{784.} ^{785.} ^{786.} ^{787.} ^{788.} ^{789.} ^{790.} ^{791.} ^{792.} ^{793.} ^{794.} ^{795.} ^{796.} ^{797.} ^{798.} ^{799.} ^{800.} ^{801.} ^{802.} ^{803.} ^{804.} ^{805.} ^{806.} ^{807.} ^{808.} ^{809.} ^{810.} ^{811.} ^{812.} ^{813.} ^{814.} ^{815.} ^{816.} ^{817.} ^{818.} ^{819.} ^{820.} ^{821.} ^{822.} ^{823.} ^{824.} ^{825.} ^{826.} ^{827.} ^{828.} ^{829.} ^{830.} ^{831.} ^{832.} ^{833.} ^{834.} ^{835.} ^{836.} ^{837.} ^{838.} ^{839.} ^{840.} ^{841.} ^{842.} ^{843.} ^{844.} ^{845.} ^{846.} ^{847.} ^{848.} ^{849.} ^{850.} ^{851.} ^{852.} ^{853.} ^{854.} ^{855.} ^{856.} ^{857.} ^{858.} ^{859.} ^{860.} ^{861.} ^{862.} ^{863.} ^{864.} ^{865.} ^{866.} ^{867.} ^{868.} ^{869.} ^{870.} ^{871.} ^{872.} ^{873.} ^{874.} ^{875.} ^{876.} ^{877.} ^{878.} ^{879.} ^{880.} ^{881.} ^{882.} ^{883.} ^{884.} ^{885.} ^{886.} ^{887.} ^{888.} ^{889.} ^{890.} ^{891.} ^{892.} ^{893.} ^{894.} ^{895.} ^{896.} ^{897.} ^{898.} ^{899.} ^{900.} ^{901.} ^{902.} ^{903.} ^{904.} ^{905.} ^{906.} ^{907.} ^{908.} ^{909.} ^{910.} ^{911.} ^{912.} ^{913.} ^{914.} ^{915.} ^{916.} ^{917.} ^{918.} ^{919.} ^{920.} ^{921.} ^{922.} ^{923.} ^{924.} ^{925.} ^{926.} ^{927.} ^{928.} ^{929.} ^{930.} ^{931.} ^{932.} ^{933.} ^{934.} ^{935.} ^{936.} ^{937.} ^{938.} ^{939.} ^{940.} ^{941.} ^{942.} ^{943.} ^{944.} ^{945.} ^{946.} ^{947.} ^{948.} ^{949.} ^{950.} ^{951.} ^{952.} ^{953.} ^{954.} ^{955.} ^{956.} ^{957.} ^{958.} ^{959.} ^{960.} ^{961.} ^{962.} ^{963.} ^{964.} ^{965.} ^{966.} ^{967.} ^{968.} ^{969.} ^{970.} ^{971.} ^{972.} ^{973.} ^{974.} ^{975.} ^{976.} ^{977.} ^{978.} ^{979.} ^{980.} ^{981.} ^{982.} ^{983.} ^{984.} ^{985.} ^{986.} ^{987.} ^{988.} ^{989.} ^{990.} ^{991.} ^{992.} ^{993.} ^{994.} ^{995.} ^{996.} ^{997.} ^{998.} ^{999.} ^{1000.} ^{1001.} ^{1002.} ^{1003.} ^{1004.} ^{1005.} ^{1006.} ^{1007.} ^{1008.} ^{1009.} ^{1010.} ^{1011.} ^{1012.} ^{1013.} ^{1014.} ^{1015.} ^{1016.} ^{1017.} ^{1018.} ^{1019.} ^{1020.} ^{1021.} ^{1022.} ^{1023.} ^{1024.} ^{1025.} ^{1026.} ^{1027.} ^{1028.} ^{1029.} ^{1030.} ^{1031.} ^{1032.} ^{1033.} ^{1034.} ^{1035.} ^{1036.} ^{1037.} ^{1038.} ^{1039.} ^{1040.} ^{1041.} ^{1042.} ^{1043.} ^{1044.} ^{1045.} ^{1046.} ^{1047.} ^{1048.} ^{1049.} ^{1050.} ^{1051.} ^{1052.} ^{1053.} ^{1054.} ^{1055.} ^{1056.} ^{1057.} ^{1058.} ^{1059.} ^{1060.} ^{1061.} ^{1062.} ^{1063.} ^{1064.} ^{1065.} ^{1066.} ^{1067.} ^{1068.} ^{1069.} ^{1070.} ^{1071.} ^{1072.} ^{1073.} ^{1074.} ^{1075.} ^{1076.} ^{1077.} ^{1078.} ^{1079.} ^{1080.} ^{1081.} ^{1082.} ^{1083.} ^{1084.} ^{1085.} ^{1086.} ^{1087.} ^{1088.} ^{1089.} ^{1090.} ^{1091.} ^{1092.} ^{1093.} ^{1094.} ^{1095.} ^{1096.} ^{1097.} ^{1098.} ^{1099.} ^{1100.} ^{1101.} ^{1102.} ^{1103.} ^{1104.} ^{1105.} ^{1106.} ^{1107.} ^{1108.} ^{1109.} ^{1110.} ^{1111.} ^{1112.} ^{1113.} ^{1114.} ^{1115.} ^{1116.} ^{1117.} ^{1118.} ^{1119.} ^{1120.} ^{1121.} ^{1122.} ^{1123.} ^{1124.} ^{1125.} ^{1126.} ^{1127.} ^{1128.} ^{1129.} ^{1130.} ^{1131.} ^{1132.} ^{1133.} ^{1134.} ^{1135.} ^{1136.} ^{1137.} ^{1138.} ^{1139.} ^{1140.} ^{1141.} ^{1142.} ^{1143.} ^{1144.} ^{1145.} ^{1146.} ^{1147.} ^{1148.} ^{1149.} ^{1150.} ^{1151.} ^{1152.} ^{1153.} ^{1154.} ^{1155.} ^{1156.} ^{1157.} ^{1158.} ^{1159.} ^{1160.} ^{1161.} ^{1162.} ^{1163.} ^{1164.} ^{1165.} ^{1166.} ^{1167.} ^{1168.} ^{1169.} ^{1170.} ^{1171.} ^{1172.} ^{1173.} ^{1174.} ^{1175.} ^{1176.} ^{1177.} ^{1178.} ^{1179.} ^{1180.} ^{1181.} ^{1182.} ^{1183.} ^{1184.} ^{1185.} ^{1186.} ^{1187.} ^{1188.} ^{1189.} ^{1190.} ^{1191.} ^{1192.} ^{1193.} ^{1194.} ^{1195.} ^{1196.} ^{1197.} ^{1198.} ^{1199.} ^{1200.} ^{1201.} ^{1202.} ^{1203.} ^{1204.} ^{1205.} ^{1206.} ^{1207.} ^{1208.} ^{1209.} ^{1210.} ^{1211.} ^{1212.} ^{1213.} ^{1214.} ^{1215.} ^{1216.} ^{1217.} ^{1218.} ^{1219.} ^{1220.} ^{1221.} ^{1222.} ^{1223.} ^{1224.} ^{1225.} ^{1226.} ^{1227.} ^{1228.} ^{1229.} ^{1230.} ^{1231.} ^{1232.} ^{1233.} ^{1234.} ^{1235.} ^{1236.} ^{1237.} ^{1238.} ^{1239.} ^{1240.} ^{1241.} ^{1242.} ^{1243.} ^{1244.} ^{1245.} ^{1246.} ^{1247.} ^{1248.} ^{1249.} ^{1250.} ^{1251.} ^{1252.} ^{1253.} ^{1254.} ^{1255.} ^{1256.} ^{1257.} ^{1258.} ^{1259.} ^{1260.} ^{1261.} ^{1262.} ^{1263.} ^{1264.} ^{1265.} ^{1266.} ^{1267.} ^{1268.} ^{1269.} ^{1270.} ^{1271.} ^{1272.} ^{1273.} ^{1274.} ^{1275.} ^{1276.} ^{1277.} ^{1278.} ^{1279.} ^{1280.} ^{1281.} ^{1282.} ^{1283.} ^{1284.} ^{1285.} ^{1286.} ^{1287.} ^{1288.} ^{1289.} ^{1290.} ^{1291.} ^{1292.} ^{1293.} ^{1294.} ^{1295.} ^{1296.} ^{1297.} ^{1298.} ^{1299.} ^{1300.} ^{1301.} ^{1302.} ^{1303.} ¹³⁰⁴

γοῦ τοῖς συλλαβοῦσι τὸν Ἰησοῦν· ὅτι κατηριθιμημένος ἦν σὺν ἡμῖν, 17
 u Matt. 27. 5. καὶ ἔλαξε τὸν κλῆρον τῆς δικαιοσύνης ταύτης. ("Οὗτος μὲν οὖν ἐκτήσατο 18
 χωρίον ἐκ [τοῦ] μισθοῦ τῆς ἀδικίας, καὶ πρηγῆς γενόμενος ἐλάκησε
 μέσος, καὶ ἐξεχύθη πάντα τὰ σπλάγγνα αὐτοῦ· καὶ γνωστὸν ἐγένετο 19
 πᾶσι τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν Ἱερουσαλὴμ, ὥστε κληθῆναι τὸ χωρίον ἐκεῖνο
 x Psal. 69. 26. τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ αὐτῶν Ἀκeldαμὰ, τουτέστι, χωρίον αἵματος.) * γέ- 20
 & 109. 8. γραπται γὰρ ἐν βίβλῳ Ψαλμῶν· Γενηθήτω ἡ ἔπαυλις αὐτοῦ
 ἔρημος, καὶ μὴ ἔστω ὁ κατοικῶν ἐν αὐτῇ. καὶ Τὴν
 ἐπισκοπὴν αὐτοῦ λάβοι ἕτερος. Δεῖ οὖν τῶν συνελθόντων 21
 ἡμῖν ἀνδρῶν ἐν παρτὶ χρόνῳ ἐν ᾧ εἰσῆλθε καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ὁ
 Κύριος Ἰησοῦς, ἀφ' ἡμῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ βαπτίσματος Ἰωάννου ἕως τῆς 22
 ἡμέρας ἧς ἀνελήφθη ἀφ' ἡμῶν, μάρτυρα τῆς ἀναστάσεως αὐτοῦ γενέσθαι
 σὺν ἡμῖν ἓνα τούτων. Καὶ ἔστησαν δύο, Ἰωσήφ τὸν καλούμενον Βαρ- 23
 σαβᾶν, ὃς ἐπεκλήθη Ἰούστος, καὶ Μαθθίαν. Καὶ προσευξάμενοι εἶπον· 24
 Σὺ, Κύριε, καρδιογνώστη πάντων, ἀνάδειξον * ὃν ἐξελέξω ἐκ τούτων

they were then assembled. The terms πληρωθ. and προεῖπε περί will not permit us to suppose, with most recent Commentators, that what is said by David of his treacherous companion, is here, on account of the coincidence of the cases, applied, by accommodation, to Judas: but we must suppose, that what was prophesied by the Holy Spirit was meant primarily of David's enemies and treacherous companions; but, secondarily and typically, of Christ's enemies and treacherous friends. See Dodd. The citations in question substantially agree with the Hebrew and Sept., except that the plural is changed to the singular, because it is applied to Judas only. The above principle of accommodation might, indeed, be admitted, if we could, with some recent Commentators, construe πληρωθῆναι with περί Ἰούδα. But that is forbidden by the construction; since περί ἰ. plainly belongs to προεῖπε, not to πληρ.: and the term πληρ. is never used with περί to mean "in the case of," but with ἐν. The first of the two passages presents a lively figure of utter destruction.

17. Λαγχάνειν signifies properly to receive by lot, have allotted to one. The κλῆρον is not, as Kuin. imagines, redundant, but signifies appointment. The meaning is, the appointment belonging to this ministry, or office.

18. The best Expositors are agreed that this and the next verse are parenthetical, and to be regarded as the words not of Peter but of Luke; who thus introduces some circumstances respecting this treachery; namely, what use he made of the wages of iniquity, and what was his fate. The obscurity of which the Commentators complain, has been chiefly occasioned by the sense at v. 17. being not sufficiently developed. For to assign (with Kuin.) the sense although to ὅτι is quite unauthorised. If the Apostle had subjoined the words ἃς παρέβη πορευθῆναι εἰς τὸν ἴδιον τόπον, which he does afterwards at v. 25. all would have been plain. It is evident that he had them in his mind.

— ἐκτήσατο] i. e. was the means of its being purchased, — namely, by the chief priests. For the best Commentators are agreed, that this is to be referred to that idiom of Scripture by which an action is sometimes said to be done by a person who was the occasion of its being done. See ex-

amples in Recens. Synop. If that be thought harsh, it may be considered as a figurative catachresis, by which Judas might be said to have bought the field with the wages of iniquity, by receiving such wages as would have bought the field. So 2 Kings v. 26, "Was this a time to receive money and garments: and olive-yards and vineyards, and sheep and oxen, and men-servants and maid-servants?" On the seeming discrepancy between the account of Judas's manner of death here, and that at Matt. xvii. 5. ἀπεθῶν ἀπήγατο, see the Note there. To advert to the phraseology here, πρηγῆς signifies tumbling headlong, — and ἐλάκησε is for διεββῆθη or ἐσχίσθη. So Suidas: ἐλάκησε· εἰεββῆθη, and Schul. on Aristoph. Nub. 409. διαλακίσασα· διαββῆσθαι. Thus λακτώ is synonymous with ψοφῆω, crack, So in a kindred passage of Joseph. Bell. vi. 1. 6. καὶ πταίους πρὸς τινα πέτρων πρηγῆς ἐπ' αὐτῆς (read αὐτῶν with the best MSS.) μετὰ μεγίστου φόβου κατέπεσον. With ἐλάκησε μέσος comp. Plautus Curc. ii. 1. 7. Hoc metuo, ne medius disruppar. On the difficulty in πρηγῆς — σπλάγγνα αὐτοῦ, see Note on Matt. xxvii. 5.

20. Ἐπισκοπῆ here signifies any office committed to one's charge.

21. τῶν συνελθ. Sub. ἐκ. The sense is, "who have associated with us," formed part of the same society. In εἰσῆλθε καὶ ἐξῆλθε there is an idiom formed on the Heb. נָשָׂא וְנָשָׂא, equivalent to versatus est. (See Acts ix. 23.) It has reference to conduct, manner of life, and administration of office, public and private.

23. ἔστησαν.] See Note infra vii. 59 & 6.

24. καρδιогνώστη πάντων.] It is not agreed among Commentators whether this appellation be meant of God, or of Christ. That it is used of God in the O. T., Joseph., and Philo. is granted. But that it is equally applicable to Christ, appears from John xvi. 30, where see Note. See also John i. 43 — 50. ii. 24. vi. 69. xxi. 17. Apoc. ii. 23. Κύριος, too, was a common appellation of Christ, and, besides that the connection with ver. 21 seems to determine it to be meant of Christ, there would be peculiar propriety in addressing this prayer to Him, as the Head of the Church, and who originally appointed the other Apostles.

— ἀνάδειξον.] The term is often used of ap-

25 τῶν δύο ἕνα, λαβεῖν τὸν κληρὸν τῆς διακονίας αὐτῆς καὶ ἀποστολῆς,
26 ἐξ ἧς παρέβη Ἰούδας, πορευθῆναι εἰς τὸν τόπον τὸν ἴδιον. Καὶ
ἔδωκαν κλήρους αὐτῶν, καὶ ἔπεσεν ὁ κληρὸς ἐπὶ Ματθίαν, καὶ συγκατε-
ψηφίσθη μετὰ τῶν ἑνδεκα ἀποστόλων.

1 II. *ΚΑΙ* ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς Πεντηκοστῆς, ἦσαν
2 ἅπαντες ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό. Καὶ ἐγένετο ἄρρω ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ
3 ἦχος, ὡσπερ φερομένης πνοῆς βιαίας, καὶ ἐπλήρωσεν ὅλον τὸν οἶκον
4 οὗ ἦσαν καθήμενοι. Καὶ ὠφθῆσαν αὐτοῖς διαιμεριζόμεναι γλώσσαι
4 ὡσεὶ πυρὸς, ἐκάθισέ τε ἐφ' ἕνα ἕκαστον αὐτῶν. ^{Supra} Καὶ ἐπλήσθησαν ^{Supra} 1. 5.
ἅπαντες Πνεύματος ἁγίου, καὶ ἤρξαντο λαλεῖν ἐτέρας γλώσσαις, καθὼς

pointment to office. The reading ὃν ἐξελέξω — ἕνα, for the common one ἐκ τούτων τῶν δύο ἕνα ὃν ἐξελέξω, is found in nearly all the MSS., Versions, and the Edd. up to Stephens, and is received by every Editor from Beng. to Scholz.

25. καὶ ἀποστολῆς.] This is exegetical of τῆς διακονίας just before. Παρέβη, abandoned, deserted; by a metaphor taken from a traveller who deserts the right road. Comp. 2. Pet. ii. 15. A very rare use, but of which I can adduce one example, namely, Joseph. Antiq. xiv. 9. 2. οὐδὲν πρὸς Ὑ. ἐνόησας καὶ πίστειος παρῖβη.

— πορευθῆναι — ἴδιον.] On the sense of these words there have been many different opinions, which see detailed and reviewed in Recens. Syn. I still think the common interpretation (by which τὸν τόπον τὸν ἴδιον is taken to mean the place suited to him, — namely, the place of destruction) is alone the true one, as being recommended by its simplicity and suitableness to the usage of the Jewish writers, and confirmed by several passages of the Apostolic Fathers.

26. ἔδωκαν κλήρους.] The exact mode in which they cast the lots cannot be determined; various being the methods by which the ancients were wont to do it. They used to cast slips of parchment, or pieces of the *tabulae scriptoriae*, with the names inscribed, into an urn. And this kind of *sortitio* most Commentators here understand. Now the lots are said to be *theirs* on whom the lots are cast, and *fall* upon him who comes off successful in the *sortitio*. Συγκαταψηφίσαι properly denotes “to choose by common suffrages,” and then “to number with or unto,” συγκαταψηφίσαι. This deciding of a thing by casting lots was understood to be a mode of showing the will of the Almighty; and was, therefore, from the earliest times, resorted to in the creation of kings or the appointment of priests. See the numerous Classical citations in Recens. Synop., and compare Levit. xvi. 8. Numb. xxvi. 51. Josh. xiii. 6. On the appointment of Matthias, see a dissertation of Mr. Towns. Chr. Arr. ii. p. 9. sqq.

II. 1. συμπληροῦσθαι.] See Note on Luke ix. 51. At πεντηκοστῆς the Commentators suppose an ellip. of ἡμέρας, or ἑορτῆς. But there is perhaps no ellip. at all; πεντηκ. being a substantive and an appellative. This will afford a solution to several difficulties which perplexed Kuin.

— ἦσαν ἅπαντες.] The Commentators are not agreed who are here meant. Some say the Apostles only; others, the disciples at large, mentioned at i. 15. The latter is undoubtedly the true opinion. For (as Kuin. observes) the subject at i. 15. is the assembly of the 120 disciples whom Peter

addressed, and from whom Matthias was taken into the Apostolic body; while the eleven Apostles are only mentioned *en passant*. Now with the *predicate*, which is destitute of a subject, the subject immediately antecedent, and not that of which mention was made *en passant*, but *professionally*, ought to be taken. This, too, is clear from ἅπαντες, not οἱ, being used. Besides, the absence of the rest of the disciples on so solemn a festival cannot be supposed.

2. ὡσπερ φερομ. πνοῆς β.] Comp. the *luctantes venti tempestatesque sonore* of Virgil. This use of φέρεσθαι and its compounds, of the rushing of winds, and associated with πολλὰς, βίαιος, and other adjectives of similar signification, is frequent in the Classical writers.

— τὸν οἶκον] doubtless the ἑπερωῶν supra i. 13., where see note.

3. διαιμεριζόμεναι.] Not cloven (which sense would have required διασχιζόμεναι), but distributed, Vulg. *dispertite, divided*. As to the exact mode in which this took place there has been much said, but to little purpose. To refer it to lightning, or electricity, or to resolve all into Oriental metaphor, and Jewish notions, were alike unwarrantable.

— γλώσσαι πυρὸς] i. e. pointed flames; the top of a flame of fire being called a *tongue*. So fire is sometimes in Hebrew said to *lick up* what it consumes. At ἐκάθισαι some would supply πνεῦμα taken from πνεύματος. Kuin., however, with reason, objects that the phrase πνεῦμα ἁγ. ἐκάθισαι is unexampled. He might have added, that πνεῦμα cannot be taken from πνεύματος afterwards, because that is not in the same sentence; for, notwithstanding what some think, a new one commences at καὶ ἐπλήσθη. Besides, *there πν. ἁγ.* signifies only the influence of the Spirit, not the Spirit personally. As to the true ellip. Valekn. alone has seen that ἐκάθισαι does not belong to γλώσσαι, or to πυρὸς; but that we are to supply ἐκάστη, quod evolvendum ex ἕκαστον, as follows: ἐκάθισαι (scil. ἐκάστη τῶν γλωσσῶν) ἐφ' ἕνα ἕκαστον αὐτῶν. Thus the sense is: “And there were seen as it were tongues of fire, distributing themselves, and settling upon them, one on each.” This symbol was meant to typify the gift of tongues, the first fruits of the Spirit.

4. Various are the hypotheses propounded by recent Commentators on the words ἤρξαντο — ἀποφθ. All, however, more or less liable to insuperable objections, being contort and far fetched, and such as no person of sober understanding and competent learning, who had no knowledge except of the passage before him would ever have thought of. Nor is there any phraseology in Pin-

τὸ Πνεῦμα ἐδίδου αὐτοῖς ἀποφθέγγεσθαι. Ἦσαν δὲ ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ 5
κατοικοῦντες Ἰουδαῖοι ἄνδρες εὐλαβεῖς ἀπὸ παντὸς ἔθνους τῶν ὑπὸ
τὸν οὐρανόν. Γενομένης δὲ τῆς φωνῆς ταύτης, συνῆλθε τὸ πλῆθος, 6
καὶ συνεχύθη· οὐ ἤκουον εἰς ἕκαστος τῆ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ λαλοῦντων
αὐτῶν. Ἐξίσταντο δὲ πάντες καὶ ἐθαύμαζον, λέγοντες πρὸς ἀλλήλους· 7
Ὅν ἰδοὺ πάντες οὗτοί εἰσι οἱ λαλοῦντες Γαλιλαῖοι; καὶ πῶς ἡμεῖς 8
ἀκούομεν ἕκαστος τῆ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ ἡμῶν ἐν ᾗ ἐγεννήθημεν, — Παρθοὶ 9
καὶ Μηδοὶ καὶ Ἑλαμίται, καὶ οἱ κατοικοῦντες τὴν Μεσοποταμίαν,
† Ἰουδαίαν τε καὶ Καππαδοκίαν, Πόντον καὶ τὴν Ἀσίαν, Φρυγίαν τε 10
καὶ Παμφυλίαν, Αἴγυπτον καὶ τὰ μέρη τῆς Αἰβύτης τῆς κατὰ Κυρήνην,

dar himself more lyrical than the high-wrought figure thus ascribed to a plain prose narration. Surely so magnificent and august a preparation as the preternatural appearance of the tongues of fire, and the ὠφθησαν αὐτοῖς διαμερίζεσθαι γλώσσαι ὡσεὶ πορὸς, suggests the idea of something miraculous, and not that they only prayed and preached with unusual flow of language and fervour. And indeed the conversion of the 3000 supposes something miraculous to have taken place.

The ancient and common interpretation, then, can alone be the true one, which assigns to ἑτέρας γλώσσαις the sense "languages other than those which they were acquainted with," i. e. "such as they were ignorant of." This is confirmed by the words following καθὼς, &c., where the supporters of the hypotheses above mentioned are compelled to assign to καθὼς the unauthorised sense *postquam, quoniam, or nam*. Ἀποφθέγγεσθαι (as the best Commentators have shown) is used of profound and sententious, and also of divinely inspired and prophetic, language.

5. κατοικοῦντες.] These were not, (as some imagine) *proselytes*, but *foreign Jews*; pious men, who had taken up their sojourn, or residence at Jerusalem, for the purpose of those greater facilities for religious duties which the place afforded, and because the advent of the Messiah was then expected. On this distinction between ἐσσιβῆς and εὐλαβῆς, see Tittm. de Synon. p. 147. seq. The words ἀπὸ παντὸς, &c., are admitted to be hyperbolic; this being (as Mr. Scott observes) a general, not an universal proposition.

6. τῆς φωνῆς ταύτης.] The Commentators are not agreed to what to refer this φωνή. Some think it has reference to the ἦχος at v. 2. But that is too remote, and the sense yielded is very unsuitable. It is better, with others, to suppose φωνῆς put for φήμης; a sense often occurring in the LXX. Thus ταύτης will be for περὶ τούτου. As, however, this is somewhat harsh, I prefer to take φωνῆς (with the ancient Versions, and Pisc., Menoch., Wakef., and Kuin.) of the noise produced by the multitude praying or conversing together, and, no doubt, in great commotion. This is confirmed by the words following.

— συνεχύθη] "was thrown into great perplexity." This was their first feeling. Their second was extreme amazement and astonishment. In ἐξίσταντο and ἐθαύμαζον the latter term is rather ex-aggerated of the former.

7. Γαλιλαῖοι.] The sense is: "They were amazed at seeing persons nearly all of one country, (Galilee, as understood) and that a rustic and illiterate one, all speaking foreign languages, and addressing each of them in his own tongue."

8. ἐν ᾗ ἐγεννήθημεν.] This seems to be a popular phrase, for the adjective ἰγγενεῖ, indigenous, or native. The perplexity of construction in the words following, is best removed by the mode of punctuation which I have, with Knapp and Tittm., adopted. Sub, ὄντες. Render, "We, I say, who are Parthians." At ἀκούομεν there is a repetition, in order to clear the sense, long suspended by the interposed portion at vv. 9. and 10.

9. Ἰουδαίαν.] At this word Commentators and Critics, with reason, stumble; for what Judæa can here have to do, it is not easy to see. As to the defence set up for it by some Commentators, it proceeds on the supposition that the language of Judæa was a different one from the Galilæan; whereas there is great reason to think that the latter differed from the former only as the English of Middlesex differs from that of Somersetshire or Cornwall.

Besides, the air of the whole list is that of a list of foreign nations. Upon the whole, it is plain that Ἰουδαίαν cannot be accounted for in any satisfactory way; and must (as it is done by the most eminent Critics) be regarded as corrupt. Are we, then, to cancel it? In the first edition of this work I expressed it as my opinion that the word came from the margin. Yet, as it is difficult to account for it as a gloss; and as such a gloss was little likely to have crept into all the MSS., I must abandon that position; and am now fully persuaded, that the reading is simply corrupt, and probably to be emended from some hitherto uncollated MSS. In the mean time, I have little doubt but that the true reading is (according to the conjecture of Barthius, which also occurred to myself), Ἰδουμαίαν, which word bears a striking resemblance to the common reading: for Δ and Μ are perpetually confounded; and it is plain that part of the Μ being faded off, would leave a Λ; and the abbreviation for δον [δν] is very similar to ου. In fact, that the words Ἰουδαίαν and Ἰδουμαίαν are often confounded, I have already shown; and many instances could I adduce from Josephus. By *Idumæa* we may understand that tract of country situated on the other side of Jordan, and south-east of Judæa, which was sometimes called Arabia Petrea: and so the word is sometimes used in Josephus. And we know that Damascus was now in possession of Aretas, king of Arabia P. There is indeed the greatest reason to think, that the territory subject to him also extended to that part of Arabia which was N. E. from Judæa, and would thus be almost conterminous with Mesopotamia. And it is plain that the countries are mentioned in geographical order, from East to West.

10. κατὰ Κυρήνην] i. e. belonging to Cyrene.

- 11 καὶ οἱ ἐπιδημοῦντες Ῥωμαῖοι, (Ἰουδαῖοι τε καὶ προσήλυτοι), Κηρῆες
καὶ Ἀραβες, — ἀκούομεν λαλούντων αὐτῶν ταῖς ἡμετέροις γλώσσαις τὰ
12 μεγαλεῖα τοῦ Θεοῦ; Ἐξίσταντο δὲ πάντες καὶ διηπόρουν, ἄλλος πρὸς
13 ἄλλον λέγοντες· Τί ἂν θέλοι τοῦτο εἶναι; ἔτεροι δὲ † χλευάζοντες
ἔλεγον· Ὅτι γλεύκους μεμεστωμένοι εἰσὶ.
14 Σταθεῖς δὲ Πέτρος σὺν τοῖς ἑνδεκα, ἐλίχθη τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ, καὶ
ἀπεφθέγγετο αὐτοῖς· Ἄνδρες Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ οἱ κατοικοῦντες Ἑρουσαλήμ
ἡπαντες, τοῦτο ὑμῖν γνωστὸν ἔστω, καὶ ἐνωτίσασθε τὰ ῥήματά μου.
15 Οὐ γὰρ, ὡς ὑμεῖς ὑπολαμβάνετε, οὔτοι μεθύουσιν· ἔστι γὰρ ὥρα
16 τρίτη τῆς ἡμέρας. ² ἀλλὰ τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ εἰρημένον διὰ τοῦ προσήγιου ² Joel 2. 28.
17 Ἰωήλ· Καὶ ἔσται ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις [[λέγει ὁ
Θεὸς,]] ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου ἐπὶ πᾶσαν σάρ-

The Classical writers use the phrase, but with *πρός*; of which I have adduced examples in *Reverens. Synop.*; as also one from Malchus with *κατά*. By οἱ ἐπιδημοῦντες Ῥ. are denoted those Jews who were settlers at Rome; which is rendered plain by the added words Ἰουδαῖοι, &c., indicating that they were Jews by descent, or by adoption and religious conversion. So Ἄντιοχεῖς occurs in *Josephus for Antiochian Jews*.

11. τὰ μεγαλεῖα.] See Note on Luke i. 49.

12. διηπόρουν.] Διαπορεῖν is a stronger term than *δορεῖν*, and signifies "to be utterly at a loss what to do." By πάντες are meant the persons just mentioned, namely, the foreign Jews; to whom are, in the next verse, opposed the ἔτεροι, meaning those of Judæa. Τί ἂν θέλοι τοῦτο εἶναι, is a popular idiom (of which examples are adduced by Wets.) denoting, "what may this mean?" how has it arisen?

13. χλευάζοντες.] The word is best derived from *χέλος*, synonymous with *χέλος*, the lip; and signifies to thrust out the lip, as in Ps. xxii. 7.

For χλευάζ, a few ancient MSS. and some Fathers have *διαχλ.*, which is received by almost every Editor from Griesb., downwards, but without reason; for the external evidence for the new reading is very weak, and the internal evidence not strong. Simple verbs are not unfrequently changed into compounds, to communicate a stronger sense, or for greater elegance. Or the *δια* may have arisen from the *δέ* preceding. Besides, *χλευάζω* occurs more than once elsewhere in this Book, and often in the LXX.; *διαχλ.*, neither in the N. T. nor the LXX.

— γλεύκους.] Not, new-made wine, which is the proper signification of the word (for that is forbidden by the time of year); but new, i. e. sweet wine, which is very intoxicating. This was, as Markl. observes, a sneer on the meanness of their condition, since no person of respectability tapped the last year's γλεύκος so early as June, unless compelled by necessity.

14. σὺν τοῖς ἐνδ.] Namely, to show their consent and concurrence in what Peter should say, who was to be spokesman. The force of the Article will be expressed by rendering: "the other eleven."

— ἄνδρες Ἰουδαῖοι.] Some recent Commentators maintain, that only the substance of the address is recorded, and that many things are omitted which were said by the Apostle. The former position may be true; but the latter is more than can safely be affirmed. At least an inspired writer cannot

be supposed to omit any thing necessary to be recorded. Ἐνωτίσασθε, "receive into your ears," "hearken attentively to." An Hellenistic and Alexandrian word often occurring in the LXX. and the later Greek writers.

15. ὥρα τρίτη.] Before that time none but debauchees took strong drink, and few took food or drink of any kind.

16. τοῦτό ἐστι.] The complete sense is: "this [state of things] is [a fulfilment of] what was predicted," &c.

17—21. A citation from Joel ii. 28—32., (in the Hebrew, iii. 1—5.) but with some slight difference. The chief difference is in *ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις* being used for *μετὰ ταῦτα*, on which see further on. The words *λέγει ὁ Θεός* are not a part of the quotation; but are an insertion by Luke, to indicate the person who says this. I have expressed this by double brackets, thus distinguishing such insertions from words or clauses whose authenticity is doubtful. The two last clauses of v. 17. are transposed, — probably by citing from memory. At v. 18. *γε* is inserted, which strengthens the sense; for *καὶ γε* (which sometimes occurs in the Classical writers) signifies *quinetiam*. The words *καὶ προφητεύσουσι* are added (from the preceding context) by way of explanation. Finally, at v. 19. the words *ἄνω* and *κάτω* are added to strengthen the sense; and accordingly, they are often found joined to *ἐν οὐρανῷ* and *ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*, in the O. T. See Exod. xx. 4. Josh. ii. 11. The passage contains (as the Jewish Interpreters themselves admit) a highly figurative description of the state of things, which shall precede and accompany the coming of the Messiah; namely, by an extraordinary outpouring of the Spirit. But Peter himself did not then understand the full sense of the prophecy as regarded "all flesh," i. e. men of all nations, both Jews and Gentiles, יְרֵיִךְ rendered by the LXX. *μετὰ ταῦτα*, is ad-

mitted by Kinchi to be equivalent to the Hebrew words corresponding to *ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις* in other passages of the LXX.; and that is universally granted by the Jewish Commentators to denote the times of the Messiah. Ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος is said to be for *πνεῦμα*, as in the Hebrew. But it rather seems to be a slight alteration agreeably to the sense rather than the words, i. e. a portion of my Spirit. What kind of spiritual effects are meant, is clear from the following verses. Ἐκχεῶ is, like the correspondent terms in Greek and Latin, used to suggest the *erubescence* of the gifts

κα' καὶ προφητεύουσιν οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν καὶ αἱ θυγα-
τέρες ὑμῶν· καὶ οἱ νεανίσκοι ὑμῶν ὀράσεις ὄψονται,
καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ὑμῶν ἐνύπνια ἐνυπνιασθήσονται.
Καὶ γε ἐπὶ τοὺς δούλους μου καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς δούλας μου, 18
ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις, ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός
μου, καὶ προφητεύουσι. Καὶ δώσω τέρατα ἐν τῷ 19
οὐρανῷ ἄνω, καὶ σημεῖα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κάτω, αἶμα καὶ
πῦρ καὶ ἀτμίδα καπνοῦ. Ὁ ἥλιος μεταστραφήσεται 20
εἰς σκότος, καὶ ἡ σελήνη εἰς αἶμα, πρὶν ἢ ἔλθειν τὴν
ἡμέραν Κυρίου τὴν μεγάλην καὶ ἐπιφανῆ. ^a Καὶ ἔσται, 21
πᾶς, ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσεται τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου, σωθήσεται.
^b Ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλίται, ἀκούσατε τοὺς λόγους τούτους· Ἰησοῦν τὸν 22
Ναζωραῖον, ἄνδρα ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑποδειγμένον εἰς ὑμᾶς δυνάμει
καὶ τέρασι καὶ σημείοις, (οἷς ἐποίησε δι' αὐτοῦ ὁ Θεὸς ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν,
καθὼς καὶ αὐτοὶ οἴδατε,) τοῦτον τῇ ὤρισμένῃ βουλῇ καὶ προγνώσει 23

imparted. Πᾶσαν σάρκα seems to mean some of all orders and ranks, and (in a secondary sense) of all nations. See Whitby.

— προφητ.] This must, in the full sense, denote speaking under Divine inspiration, whether by prophesying, (the strict sense), or otherwise. See xxi. 9. and Matt. vii. 22. This, of course, includes all the lower degrees of the προφητεία, (as in Rom. xii. 6. I Cor. xii. 10. xiii. 2.) to denote speaking and teaching the truths of the Gospel, exhorting, &c.; though even there *inspiration* is implied. The next clause denotes in general, that God would also reveal his will to both old and young, in a manner which partook of the *προφ.* just before mentioned, namely, by *visions* and *dreams*.

The terms προφητεία and ὄρασις are sometimes synonymous; but here ὄρασις is equivalent to *ὄρασις*; in either of which an appearance is presented to the person, whether waking or by trance; whereas, ἐνύπνιον is always a dream, in which something is preternaturally suggested to the mind. Thus at I Sam. iii. 1. ὄρασις διαστῆλλουσα denotes a *distinct revelation* by supernatural appearance, in opposition to the *less direct* revelation by dreams or otherwise. With respect to the present passage, the ὄρασις was fulfilled in the case of St. Paul; the ἐνύπνια in that of St. Peter. What is said at v. 19. was signally fulfilled by the communication of the Spiritual Gifts, mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles and Epistles.

19, 20. From these verses we are only to infer that the events here predicted will take place at the times of the Messiah. But whether they are to be referred to the first advent of our Lord at the destruction of Jerusalem, or his second at the day of judgment, Commentators are not agreed. They are exactly parallel to, and admit of, nay perhaps require, the same mode of explication as Matt. xxiv. 29. Luke xxi. 25., where see Notes. Αἶμα καὶ πῦρ are a formula exactly parallel to our fire and sword. The ἀτμίδα καπνοῦ is graphic, and completes the picture of devastation. Ἡμέραν ἐπιφανῆ denotes a day notable for the visitation of God's punishment on the guilty, and therefore terrible, as the Hebrew is rendered; though the former sense is assigned to the word נִרְאָה in other passages.

21. πᾶς ὃς — σωθήσεται.] The best Commentators are agreed, that ἐπικ. τὸ ὄνομα here denotes religious invocation, as a disciple of Christ, by embracing his religion. Σωθ. denotes not temporal deliverance, (to which many recent Commentators confine it), but spiritual deliverance, by being received into the Gospel covenant, and thereby put into the way of salvation.

22. The Apostle, after having shown that a Saviour had been promised, who should save to the uttermost his faithful worshippers, proceeds to turn their attention to the grand subject of his discourse; showing that JESUS OF NAZARETH, whom they have crucified, is that personage, — that he was proved to be such by his resurrection to life; and pointing out the purposes for which he was raised from the dead. On this is engrafted a notice of the validity of the general evidence in favour of Jesus's Messiahship, and the nature of that evidence. Then is subjoined that this Jesus it is, thus raised and invested with supreme dignity, who hath procured this plentiful effusion of the Holy Spirit, as attested by the effects which they now see and hear. Of Him, too, the words of Ps. cx. I. are meant; which their own Rabbis referred to the Messiah. Hence (the Apostle concludes) they may be assured that this Jesus, whom they have crucified, is the Lord and Christ appointed of God.

But to consider the passage in detail, the Apostle addresses them by the appellation *Israelites*, as the most conciliatory he could select. Ναζωραῖον is subjoined to Ἰησοῦν, because in mentioning his name thus formally, it was proper to add, what had indeed become a usual *appellative*. See Mark xvi. 6. Acts iii. 6. x. 33. and Note on John i. 45. xix. 19.

— ἄνδρα ἀπὸ — δυνάμει.] The construction is: ἄνδρα ἀπὸ. εἰς ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ Θεοῦ. “a man approved to you on the part of God [to be a Divine Legate] by signs,” &c. Of this sense of ἀπόδ., by which it means to *demonstrate* or *evince*, examples are adduced from the Classical writers, by Kypke. Δυνάμει, τέρασι, and σημείοις, are nearly synonymous, but combined to *strengthen* the sense; as including every sort of *supernatural* work.

23. τῇ ὤρισμένῃ βουλῇ καὶ προγνώσει.] The best Commentators are agreed, that ὤρισμ. βουλῇ means

- τοῦ Θεοῦ ἔκδοτον λαβόντες, διὰ χειρῶν ἀνόμων προσπῆξαντες ἀνέλλετε·
- 24 ὃν ὁ Θεὸς ἀνέστησε, λύσας τὴς ὀδύνας τοῦ θανάτου, καθότι οὐκ ἦν c Infra v. 32. & 3. 15. & 4. 10. & 13. 39, 34. & 17. 31. Rom. 4. 24. & 8. 11. 1 Cor. 6. 14. & 15. 15. 2 Cor. 4. 14. Gal. 1. 1. Eph. 1. 20. Col. 2. 12. 1 Thess. 1. 10. Heb. 13. 20. d Psal. 16. 8.
- 25 δυνατὸν κρατεῖσθαι αὐτὸν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ. ^d Δαυὶδ γὰρ λέγει εἰς αὐτόν·
- Ἡροωρώμην τὸν Κύριον ἐνώπιόν μου διὰ παντός, ὅτι
- 26 ἐκ δεξιῶν μου ἐστίν, ἵνα μὴ σαλευθῶ· διὰ τοῦτο εὐφράνθη ἡ καρδία μου, καὶ ἠγαλλιῆσατο ἡ γλῶσσά μου· ἔτι δὲ καὶ ἡ σὰρξ μου κατασκηρῶσει ἐπ' ἐλπίδι.
- 27 Ὅτι οὐκ ἐγκαταλείψεις τὴν ψυχὴν μου εἰς ἄδου, οὐδέ
- 28 δώσεις τὸν ὄσιόν σου ἰδεῖν διαφθοράν. Ἐγνώρισάς μοι ὁδοὺς ζωῆς· πληρώσεις με εὐφροσύνης μετὰ τοῦ
- 29 προσώπου σου. ^e Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, ἐξὸν εἰπεῖν μετὰ παρόρησίας πρὸς ὑμᾶς περὶ τοῦ πατριάρχου Δαυὶδ, ὅτι καὶ ἐτελεύτησε καὶ εἰάφη, καὶ τὸ e 1 Kings 2. 10. infra 13. 26.

the determinate, and consequently, immutable counsel of God; and that *προσπῆσαι* signifies *decease*; a signification common both to Hellenistic and Classical Greek. Ἐκδοτον δόναται or λαβεῖν denotes to *give up*, or *receive*, at discretion, to *treat at one's pleasure*. The expression διὰ χειρῶν ἀνόμων as conjoined with τῇ ὀρίσμ. βουλή—Θεοῦ, is meant to suggest, that God's counsels and decrees did not absolve the Jews of guilt in putting Jesus to death, since they were still free agents. Some render "the hands of the sinners," i. e. the Gentiles. But that sense would require τῶν ἀνόμων. Προσπῆξαντες scil. σταυρωθῆναι is added to show that the putting to death was by the most cruel and ignominious mode.

24. λύσας τὰς ὀδύνας τοῦ θαν.] The best Commentators, ancient and modern, are of opinion that ὀδύνας denotes not *pains*, but *bonds*; a signification, indeed, scarcely known in the Classical writers, but occurring in the LXX. This interpretation, they say, is supported by the following λύσας, and especially by κρατεῖσθαι, and is confirmed by certain passages cited by Wets. But that λύσας may only mean *removed*, without any allusion to a *bond*, is clear from what I have annotated on the words λαῖν τῶν δεμάτων in Thucyd. ii. 101. Engl. Transl. It is best, therefore, to retain the common version *pains*, and merely suppose that in κρατεῖσθαι there is an allusion to the notion of *tight bands*, as in Ælian, H. A. 12. 5. τοῦς τῶν ὀδύνων λύσαι δεματός. The common version is, I find, retained and well defended by Tittm. de Syn. p. 196.

— οὐκ ἦν δυνατὸν.] Inasmuch as He had life in Himself, John v. 26., and was the "Prince of life." For the δυν. is taken in a popular sense, to denote, as Scott explains, "impossible, consistently with the dignity of His Person, the nature of His undertaking, the perfecting of His work, the purpose of God, and the predictions of Scripture."

25. εἰς ἄδην] "concerning," or "with reference to" him. Whether this reference be *primary* or *secondary*, Commentators are not agreed. The most eminent Interpreters have long been of opinion, that this 16th Psalm has in many of its parts a *double* sense, one *Historical*, of David, the other *mystical* and *allegorical*, of Christ. Be that as it may, the latter, if *secondary* in *order*, is *primary* in *importance*. It should seem that David spoke in the person of the Messiah.

— προωρώμην.] Προωράσθαι here signifies "to

be so mindful of as to set always before us." The Aorist is expressive of what is perpetually and habitually done. By *the Lord* is meant his power to save. The words ὅτι ἐκ δεξιῶν μου ἐστίν are intended to show in what light the Lord is considered, — namely, as a *helper*. Of these some think an allusion to those παράκλητοι, who stood as any one's supporters when he was brought to trial, we may compare the παρακληυστοὶ καθήμενοι mentioned in Thucyd. vi. 13. "ἵνα μὴ σαλ., " that I should not succumb or fall under calamity."

26. εὐφράνθη ἡ καρδία μου.] This and ἠγαλλ. ἡ γλῶσσά μου are meant to denote *extreme joy*, both heartfelt and expressed. Ἐπ' ἔλπ., namely, of being raised. See Rom. viii. 21.

27. εἰς ἄδου] scil. δόμον, or ὄκον. See Notes on Matt. xvi. 18. Luke xviii. 23. v. 31. Οὐδέ δώσεις, "nor wilt thou suffer." For εἰδοῦναι, like the Heb. יָדַע, denotes sometimes not a *physical*, but a *moral* giving. τὸν ὄσιόν σου. This, by permission, is usually rendered "Thy pious worshipper;" a sense which may very well suit *David*, but not *Christ*, with reference to whom the sense must be, "me who am pre-eminently the *Holy one*; and *thine*, as united to Thee in the Godhead." Ἰεῖν διαφθοράν, "to experience putrefaction," i. e. to lie so long as to be exposed thereto.

28. ἐγνώρισάς — ζωῆς.] Render, "thou hast made known (i. e. opened for us) paths of life," i. e. the means of avoiding permanent death, and attaining unto life. The next clause adverts to the state of glory, and the fulness of joy which should succeed to that "earthly race which was set before him;" after which he should sit down at the right hand of God, and be blessed with his immediate presence.

29. The Apostle now proceeds to establish an argument (resting on the position that the *Messiah* is meant in the Psalm in question); and this he does by tacitly encountering an objection which might be made — q. d. 'These are the words of *David*, and are to be understood of *him*. In answering which the Apostle introduces the mention of *David* in very respectful language, calling him *Patriarch*. "I may be permitted (says he) freely to tell you concerning the *Patriarch David*, that he both died and was buried, and his sepulchre remains unto this day." And as *David* died, was buried, and his body experienced corruption, so it followed that, in the passage adverted to, he could not have spoken of *himself*.

f 2 Sam. 7. 12.
1 Chron. 22. 10.
Ps. 132. 11.
infra 13. 34.

μνημια αὐτοῦ ἔστιν ἐν ἡμῖν ἄχρι τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης. Ἱεροφάντης οὖν 30
ὑπάρχων, καὶ εἰδὼς ὅτι ὄρκω ἄμωσεν αὐτῷ ὁ Θεός, ἐκ καρποῦ τῆς
δοξοῦς αὐτοῦ [τὸ κατὰ σάρκα ἀναστήσειν τὸν Χριστὸν,] καθίσει ἐπὶ
g Psal. 16. 10.
infra 13. 35.
τοῦ θρόνου αὐτοῦ, Ἐ προϋδὼν ἐλάλησε περὶ τῆς ἀνυστάσεως τοῦ Χριστοῦ, 31
ὅτι οὐ κατελείφθη ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ εἰς ἴδου, οὐδὲ ἡ σὰρξ αὐτοῦ εἶδε
διαφθοράν. Τοῦτον τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀνέστησεν ὁ Θεός, οὗ πάντες ἡμεῖς 32
ἔσμεν μάρτυρες. Τῇ δεξιᾷ οὖν τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑψωθεὶς, τὴν τε ἐπαγγελίαν 33
h Psal. 110. 1.
τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος λαβὼν παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς, ἐξέχευ τοῦτο ὃ ἦν
ἡμεῖς βλέπετε καὶ ἀκούετε. Ὁ γὰρ Δαυὶδ ἀνέβη εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, 34

30. In this and the next two verses the Apostle draws tight the argument. The sense may be thus expressed: "Now he being a Prophet (i. e. one endowed with a supernatural knowledge of future events), and, in that quality, knowing that God had sworn a solemn oath to him, that from the fruit of his loins (i. e. from his posterity) Christ should, as to his human nature, descend, in order to sit on his throne; he, foreseeing this event, spoke (in the passage in question) of the resurrection of Christ, when he said that his soul," &c. On this promise see 2 Sam. vii. 11—16, and the other passages adduced in the references. The expression ὄρκω ἄμωσεν, as applied to God, denotes only "His fixed and immutable purpose," *sanctissimè pronisit*.

The words τὸ κατὰ σάρκα — Χριστὸν were rejected by Mill and Beng., and cancelled by Griesb. and Knapp. But the authority for this omission is exceedingly small — only that of three MSS.; for the reading of the Cod. Cantab. is *ex emendatione*. And that the words were formerly in that MS. is plain, from their being found in the venerable *Latin Version* which accompanies the MS. Of the three MSS. which are said not to have the words, the Barb. 1. is of no authority. The other two (the Cod. Alex. and the Cod. Ephr.) are very ancient MSS., but bear perpetual marks of the liberties taken with them by some Biblical Critics of an early period. The words are found in *all the other MSS.* (not very far short of 200) including the most ancient of MSS., the *Cod. Vaticanus*, and (as we have seen) the *Cod. Cantab.* Thus the *external* evidence for the omission in question is exceedingly slight. As to the *internal*, it is far more probable that the words should have been omitted in two or three MSS. by accident, or perhaps removed designedly by Pelagians, than that they should have been foisted into *all the other MSS.* The evidence, indeed, of the *Versions* may seem more in favour of the omission. But let us examine. Those Versions are the printed Syriac (Peshito), the Vulg., Copt., Æthiop., Arm., and Arab. of Erpenius. Now though the *printed* Syriac has them not, yet the MSS., I am told, *have*. And, at all events, the authority of the Syriac in the *Acts* and *Epistles* is far inferior to that in the Gospels; it being supposed to be of a more modern date, and to have been sometimes altered from the Vulg. The authority of the *Vulg.* may seem weighty; but it is, in fact, not so in cases like the present, where it is unsupported by the ancient *Italic*. And that the words were in *that Version*, is plain from what is brought forward by Sabatier. See *Matthæi* and *Nolan*, p. 390. The authority of the *other Versions* is but slender. As to the *Fathers*, some of them, indeed, adduce the verse without the words

in question. But others (as Theophyl., Theodoret, and especially Chrysost.) cite the verse *with* those words. And in the *Fathers* the evidence for *insertion* is much stronger than for *omission*; since citing, as they perpetually do, *from memory*, they often omit words, especially such as are not to their purpose. Heinrichs and Kuin., indeed, seek an argument for their omission, from the words being variously placed in the MSS. But the truth is, that in only some two or three MSS. is there a transposition, evidently from the carelessness of scribes; which, of course, *proves nothing*. As to their argument, that the omission of the words produces a *more difficult* reading, and therefore the more likely to be genuine, it is of greater weight, but by no means conclusive; for even that Critical Canon has its exceptions. It cannot, for instance, well apply to cases like the present, where the more difficult reading is found only in *two or three MSS.* out of a very great number; for then it is more probable that the reading in question arose from *alteration*, than that a false reading should have crept into all the other MSS. And if those *few MSS.* be such as abound in unauthorized and rash alterations of all sorts, the suspicion of alteration in such a case is greatly increased. However, I mean not to say that the words can *positively* be asserted to be genuine. We must be slow to impute *bad faith*, unless on the strongest evidence: and as the words, if removed by the Alexandrian Critics, must have been removed in order to suppress an evidence to the Divinity of Christ (a stigma which we are not enabled to fix on these persons), so I am induced to hesitate; and have therefore placed the words within *single brackets*. The *insertion* of the words may be accounted for without supposing any bad faith on the part of those who introduced them; since they might be brought in *gradually*, first Χριστὸν, then ἀναστήσειν, and lastly τὸ κατὰ σάρκα from the margin, where it had perhaps been noted from Rom. ix. 5. ὧν οἱ πατέρες καὶ ἐξ ὧν ὁ Χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα. And indeed there is something to countenance this in the MSS.

32. τὸν οὖν τὸν Ἰ. &c. The evidence for this resurrection is now touched on, by adverting not only to the positive testimony of the Apostles, disciples, and other eye-witnesses (as contrasted with a *want* of evidence for the assertion of the Jews, that he *did see* corruption, and *did not rise*), but to that testimony of his resurrection (and consequent Messiahship) afforded by his exaltation to the right hand of God; by his having obtained (agreeably to the promise) the sending of the Holy Spirit and the copious effusion of his gifts; producing effects such as they now see and hear, and which, by their miraculous nature, attest the Messiahship of Him who procured them.

λέγει δὲ αὐτός· Εἶπεν ὁ Κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου, Κάθου
35 ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπό-
36 διον τῶν ποδῶν σου. Ἀσφαλῶς οὖν γνωσκέτω πᾶς οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ,
οἷ Κύριον καὶ Χριστὸν αὐτὸν ὁ Θεὸς ἐποίησε τοῦτον τὸν Ἰησοῦν, ὃν
ὑμεῖς ἐσταυρώσατε.

37 Ἀκούσαντες δὲ κατενύγησαν τῇ καρδίᾳ, εἰπόν τε πρὸς τὸν Πέτρον
38 καὶ τοὺς λοιποὺς ἀποστόλους· Τί ποιήσομεν, ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί; Πέτρος
δὲ ἔφη πρὸς αὐτούς· Μετανοήσατε, καὶ βαπτισθήτω ἕκαστος ὑμῶν
ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν· καὶ λήψεσθε
39 τὴν δωρεάν τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος. Ἑμῖν γὰρ ἔστιν ἡ ἐπαγγελία καὶ
τοῖς τέκνοις ὑμῶν, καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς εἰς μακρὰν, ὅσους ἂν προσκαλέσηται
40 Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν. Ἐτέροις τε λόγοις πλείοσι διεμαρτύρητο καὶ
41 παρεκάλει, λέγων· Σώθητε ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς τῆς σκολιᾶς ταύτης. Οἱ
μενοῦν ἀσμένως ἀποδεξάμενοι τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ ἐβαπτισθησαν· καὶ
προσεετίθησαν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ψυχὰι ὡσεὶ τριαχίλια.

34. οὐ γὰρ Δαυὶδ, &c.] Δαυὶδ is emphatical; and (as Mr. Holden observes) the Apostle's argument is this: That David speaketh concerning the *Messiah* (as cited ver. 25 et seq.) is clear from Ps. cx. 1, where he speaks of a LORD who was to be at God's right hand till all his enemies were subdued. For that patriarch is not raised from the dead, and "ascended into the heavens" to God's right hand, therefore he must have spoken this of some *other* person, namely, of Jesus Christ, "who hath shed forth this which ye now see and hear." The concluding words suggest the certainty of their own ruin, if they continued to reject Jesus Christ.

36. Here we have the *conclusion*,—that this same Jesus whom they had crucified was the divinely constituted Lord and Christ.

37. κατενύγησαν τῇ καρδίᾳ] "were pierced at the heart." Κατανύσσειν signifies to be *pricked through*, and is used of the emotions of violent grief or remorse, whether expressed in words, or *silent*. See Ecclus. xii. 12. xx. 21. xlvi. 21. Susan. 11. Ps. iv. 5. Wets. and Kypke adduce several Classical examples; of which, however, two only are quite apposite,—namely, Simplicius on Epict. ὡς τοὺς μὴ πάντως νεκρωμένους νύττεσθαι ἐκ τῶν λόγων. Plutarch. de Animi tranq. p. 476, where he says that the conscience of evil doers τῇ ψυχῇ μεταμίλειαν αἰμάσσουσιν αἰὲ καὶ νύττεσθαι ἐναπολείπει. I would add from Liban. τοῖς κεντοῦμαι τῇ ψυχῇ.

38. μετανοήσατε.] This repentance is supposed to include *reformation*, by an abandonment of their Jewish prejudices, and by acknowledging Jesus as the Messiah, and embracing his religion in baptism, and thereby engaging to observe all his injunctions, both of belief and practice. Comp. infra iii. 19. and Bp. Bull's Harm. Apost. p. 9.

—τὴν δωρεάν τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος.] By this seems to be here chiefly meant, not the *miraculous gifts* before adverted to, but, as appears from what follows, the ordinary aids and influences of the Spirit given to every man to profit withal.

39. ἑμῖν—ἡ ἐπαγγ.] "to you belongs the promise," namely, of sending the Spirit. Πᾶσι τοῖς εἰς μακ. must, notwithstanding the dissent of some, mean the *Gentiles*, as aliens from the commonwealth of Israel. See x. 45. xi. 15—18. xiv. 27.

VOL. I.

xv. 3. Eph. ii. 12. seq. These the Apostles *then* thought would be received into the Messiah's kingdom by becoming proselytes to the Jewish religion. See iii. 25. Προσκαλ., "shall or may call," namely, by the preaching of the Gospel.

40. διεμαρτύρητο καὶ παρ.] "did he earnestly charge and exhort." See 1 Tim. v. 21.

—σώθητε] "save yourselves," suffer yourselves to be saved, or put into the way of salvation. Σκολιᾶς signifies *perverse* and generally *wicked*, by a metaphor taken from what is *crooked* as opposed to *straight*. The phrase is borrowed from Deut. xxxii. 5. γενεὰ σκολιὰ καὶ διστραμμένη.

41. ἀσμένως.] This is omitted in a few ancient MSS. and Fathers, and is supposed spurious by some Biblical Critics; but without reason: for it was evidently either omitted by the scribes through inadvertence, or cancelled by the ancient Critics, because it *seems* not very necessary. That, however, is only by regarding the *οἱ* as a *relative*; which yet is not necessary, for *οἱ* is here the article, and is used with *μὲν* as the Classical writers use it with *δέ*. We *may*, then, render: "And they thereupon gladly receiving his word (or exhortation) were baptized;" which is confirmed by the Syriac and Arabic translators. After all, however, it may be best (with our authorized Version), to consider *οἱ* as closely connected with *ἀποδ.*, "those who accepted the offer were baptized." Yet this is passing over the *μὲν ὄν*, which may be rendered *whereupon*; it having a *transitive* and slightly *illative* sense; as ix. 31. xvi. 30. xvii. 30. In which case, and where it signifies *immo*, it should be written *μενοῦν*, to distinguish it from that use where the *μὲν* has *δέ* corresponding to it. Ἀποδέχσθαι, as used of *things*, signifies to approve, &c., and is often accompanied with *ἀσμένως*.

—ἐβαπτισθησαν.] In the first age of Christianity, those who acknowledged Jesus to be the Messiah were received, by this solemn rite, into the Christian Church; so that a fuller instruction did not *precede*, but *follow* baptism. We need not, however, suppose that *all* were baptized; though 3000 must have formed a very considerable part of the multitude. Προσεετίθησαν, "were adjunctioned?" Pass. for Middle, as often in this word. The use of *ψυχὰι* for *persons* is common to the

Ἦσαν δὲ προσκαρτεροῦντες τῇ διδαχῇ τῶν ἀποστόλων, καὶ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ καὶ τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου, καὶ ταῖς προσευχαῖς. Ἐγένετο δὲ πάση 43 ψυχῇ φόβος, πολλὰ τε τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα διὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐγένετο.

i Infra 4. 32.

Ἰ Πάντες δὲ οἱ πιστεύοντες ἦσαν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ, καὶ εἶχον ἅπαντα κοινὰ 44 καὶ τὰ κτήματα καὶ τὰς ὑπάξεις ἐπίπρασμον, καὶ διεμέριζον αὐτὰ πᾶσι, 45

Classical as well as Scriptural writers (see examples in Recens. Synop.) as the Heb. $\Psi\Delta\text{I}$ ΨN . Indeed the idiom is found in all languages.

42. Having recorded the amazing increase to the members of the visible Church, the Apostle takes occasion to notice their manner of living; and by προσκαρτ. τῇ διδαχῇ he intimates that they continued steadfastly to adhere to that profession which they so suddenly had taken up; though the words chiefly mean, “they were intently engaged on the Apostles’ doctrine.”

— Ἦσαν προσκαρτ. τῇ διδαχῇ.] So προσκαρτ. τῇ προσευχῇ in Acts i. 14. vi. 4. Rom. xii. 12. Col. iv. 2. On the exact sense of the words following τῇ κοινωνίᾳ — προσευχαῖς considerable difference of opinion exists. Many eminent Expositors, ancient and modern, take κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου of the Eucharist; which opinion may seem confirmed by the preceding τῇ κοινωνίᾳ; that term being frequently used of the Lord’s Supper. Thus they in general take τῇ κοινωνίᾳ καὶ τῇ κλάσει, by a Hendiadys, for “the common participation of the Eucharistic bread broken and distributed.” And so the Vulgate. Some, however (as the Pesch. Syriac Translator) understand κοιν. of association for religious purposes: while most of the recent Commentators understand by κοιν. social intercourse; and by τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου, the exercise of mutual hospitality; which, they think, is supported by the expression κλῶν ἄρτον at ver. 46. But that sense is little agreeable to the context, which certainly requires something more. Nor is there any authority for such a sense of κοινωνία in Scripture; nor perhaps of τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου; for ver. 46 (to which they appeal) may very well bear another sense. Some, again, join κοινωνίᾳ with the words preceding, namely, τῶν ἀποστόλων, q. d. “in intimate society with the Apostles.” A construction most harsh, and a signification unauthorized. It must undoubtedly be taken with what follows; and τῇ κοιν. καὶ τῇ κλάσει seems put, by a hysteron proteron, for τῇ κλάσει καὶ κοιν.; or, by hendiadys, for “a common participation of bread broken.” Now this may be understood of the Eucharist: yet as ver. 46, undoubtedly has reference to the same subject, but certainly cannot be so understood, as appears from the words following; so it should seem that in both that passage and this we are to understand the common participation of meals, taken in charitable communion and religious thankfulness, and followed by prayer. This view is confirmed by what is said at ver. 46. κλῶντες τε κατ’ οἶκον ἄρτον, μετέλαβον τροφῆς ἐν ἀγαλλίσει καὶ ἀφελότητι καρδίας, αἰνοῦντες τὸν Θεόν. So St. Paul, 1 Tim. iv. 4, 5, says, (with reference, it may be supposed, to these religious meals), that every kind of food is good, if it be taken μετὰ εὐχαριστίας: for (he adds) ἀγιάζεται διὰ τοῦ λόγου καὶ ἐν τῷ ἐξέειναι. By these religious meals I would not, however, with some, understand the *Agape*, or *Love-feasts*, which used to precede the Eucharist. For those, I apprehend, were not yet in being, having, it should seem, originated at a somewhat later period, when the custom of having all things in common, prac-

ticable only in a small society, was afterwards discontinued; and in the place of it was substituted a formal communion, at certain stated religious meals, which preceded the celebration of the Lord’s Supper. See Rom. xiii. 6.

43. πάση ψυχῇ] “every person;” namely, of the multitude at large, the εὐὸν τὸν λαὸν mentioned at ver. 46. φόβος, “reverential awe.”

44. ἦσαν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό.] This is generally taken by both ancient and modern Expositors of being collected together for divine worship. And although the great number (3120) of the disciples has been urged as an objection to that view; yet we need not suppose all to have been assembled at the same time, nor perhaps all at the same place. Still a certain degree of harshness attaches to that interpretation; and therefore it seems better (with Theophyl., Beza, Calvin, Pearce, Heumann, and Kuin.) to understand the expression of perfect unanimity and concord (as Ps. xxxiv. 4. and elsewhere in the Sept.); a view confirmed by iv. 34. and a passage of Thucyd. i. 79. What, however, is chiefly meant seems to be that the believers all kept together as a distinct society; which is supported by the words following.

— εἶχον ἅπαντα κοινὰ.] The earlier Commentators in general understand by this a perfect community of goods; while many recent ones think that the words are to be taken only in a popular sense, nearly as the adage πάντα κοινὰ, as indicating great charity and beneficence. The next verse, however, excludes this latter view; yet it does not necessarily imply an absolute community by distribution. Some of the rich sold their property in part, in order to have more to give immediately to their poorer brethren; but the money accruing from thence did not cease to be by their own disposal. This is plain from iv. 32, v. 4. xii. 12. That all did not sell their property is evident from the fact that there were soon afterwards rich and poor among the Christians. See ix. 36. xi. 29. xx. 35. 1 Cor. xvi. 1. Eph. iv. 28. This intercommunity of goods was probably very limited; any sale of property for distribution being far from general, and the distribution itself varying; though the rich, we must suppose, for the most part (influenced by the admonitions of our Lord, as enforced by the Apostles) regarded their wealth as held in trust for the advantage of their fellow Christians. It is plain that this intercommunity of goods was voluntary, limited in operation, and produced by the peculiar circumstances of the infant Church at Jerusalem; composed as it was, in a great measure, of foreign Jews sojourning there, and detained by the natural wish of acquiring a thorough knowledge of the religion which they had adopted; and yet whose funds might, by their detention so much longer than they had expected, have fallen short, and thrown them on the charitable assistance of their richer brethren. As to the native Jews, the poorer converts were peculiarly objects of consideration to their richer brethren; since all charity from those who adhered to the Jewish religion would be denied them; and they would have

46 καθότι ἄν τις χρεῖαν εἶχε· ^k καθ' ἡμέραν τε προσκυροῦντες ὁμο- ^k Infra 20. 7.

θυμαδὸν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, κλιῶντες τε κατ' οἶκον ἄρτον, μετελάμβανον τροφῆς
47 ἐν ἀγαλλίσει καὶ ἀρελότητι καρδίας, αἰνοῦντες τὸν Θεὸν, καὶ ἔχοντες
χάρον πρὸς ὅλον τὸν λαόν. Ὁ δὲ Κύριος προσετίθει τοὺς σωζομένους
καθ' ἡμέραν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ.

1 III. Ἐπι τὸ αὐτὸ δὲ Πέτρος καὶ Ἰωάννης ἀνέβαινον εἰς τὸ ἱερόν

scrupled to partake of the relics from the *Temple sacrifices* (which were distributed to the poor.) Nay, their means of supporting themselves might occasionally be taken from them by bigoted employers or customers. Under these circumstances, no relief or support could be expected, except from their Christian brethren; who therefore, it seems, were induced not only to contribute much of their *ready-money*, but, occasionally and in part, to sell their *possessions*. By which, however, we are not to suppose but that they had still a *property* both in the price of what was sold, and in the possessions yet unsold.

45. κτήματα.] This properly denotes possessions or property in general; but here it must be understood of the *bona immobilia* (lands and houses), as *ἐτάξεις* of the *mobilia*.

46. προσκαοῦ.] Προσκ. is put for προσκ. ταῖς προσευχαῖς, which occurred a little before. Render: "They persevered in attending the Temple service every day," i. e. (as is implied) at the stated hours of prayer.

— κλιῶντες τε κατ' οἶκον ἄρτον.] This is by many understood of the Eucharist, or at least of the *agapæ* which preceded the Eucharist; while others understand it of *common meals* taken by companies in certain houses in rotation. And certainly there is much to countenance this in what follows. Yet, if we consider the *preceding* words, it will seem more probable that the meals in question were the charitable and religious common meals treated of supra ver. 42. At κατ' οἶκον supply ἕκαστον; an ellipsis frequent in adverbial phrases formed of a noun with κατά. The expressions ἐν ἀγαλλίσει — καρδίας denote, I conceive, the *disposition of mind* in the partakers, rich and poor respectively. Thus ἀγαλλίσει seems meant *chiefly*, though not entirely, of the poor; ἀφελότητι, principally, though not exclusively, of the rich. What is meant is, that the rich cordially rejoiced in the exercise of this liberality to the poor; and the poor were sincerely thankful for their liberality. Thus the rich were devoid of grudging or ostentation; the poor, of envy and ill-will.

47. αἰνοῦντες — λαόν.] This may signify, in a general way, "They were [in their mode of life] much occupied in prayer, and were in favour with the people." As, however, αἰνοῦντες is grammatically connected with μετελάμβανον, it seems better to suppose the sense to be: "And these common meals (namely those mentioned supra ver. 42.) they held with prayer to God; and by the use of these, and by their general conduct, they were in favour with the people at large," i. e. all except the Rulers, the Priests, and their party.

— προσετίθει τοὺς σωζομένους.] On the exact sense of these words considerable difference of opinion exists. Our authorized Version has "those that should be saved;" which rendering has been inadverted on as if it were *singular*; whereas

the same sense is found, I believe, in all the early Versions which preceded it, supported by some Latin ones. But be that as it may, it is now almost universally agreed that this mode of rendering cannot be admitted, since it would require, not σωζομένους, but σωθσομένους. Thus even Calvin renders "qui salvi fuerunt," which yields a very different sense. The version in question must therefore be rejected, *not because it introduces a Calvinistic doctrine* (see Wets.), but because such a sense cannot be shown to be inherent in the words. The sense "had been saved," which some Anti-Calvinistic Commentators propose, is equally inadmissible. Others, as Grot., and Bp. Maltby, render "those who were being saved," namely, by being put into a state of salvation: an interpretation adopted by me in the first Edition of this work. But, on further consideration, I am induced to reject it; not that σώζεσθαι might not signify to be put into the way of salvation, if the context permitted or required it, but because such a sense would here be factitious. If we keep close to the *proprietas linguæ* (which, where a *doctrine* is concerned, must be considered the only right course), we cannot translate otherwise than "the saved," "those who were saved," as the expression is rendered by Doddr. and Mr. Wesley (see Horne's Introd. ii. 632.); which is also supported by the authority of the Pesch. Syr. Version. And if the sense be even yet thought *uncertain*, it is determined by the word σωθῆτε supra ver. 40; for the expression must denote those who *hearkened* to the earnest injunction, "Save yourselves from this perverse generation," namely, by abandoning their prejudices, renouncing Judaism, seeking admission into the Christian Church, and thus being saved from their sins by the washing of regeneration, and put into a *state* of salvation; whence, by the grace imparted under the Gospel, they might be *actually* saved both from the guilt and the power of sin. See Dr. A. Clarke, Dr. Hales, and Mr. Gilpin. Thus at 1 Cor. i. 18, and 2 Cor. xi. 15. τοῖς σωζομένοις, those who had received the Christian faith, are opposed, τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις, to the Jews, who rejected it. Thus it comes to the same thing as their being put into a *state* of salvation. So at Luke xii. 9, our Lord says to Zacchæus: "This day is salvation come to this house." And at 1 Cor. xv. 2, we have δι' οὗ (scil. τοῦ εὐαγγελίου) σώζεσθαι. Tit. iii. 5. ἔσωσεν ἡμᾶς διὰ λουτροῦ παραγενεσίας, καὶ ἀνακαινώσεως Πνεύματος ἁγίου, also Revel. xxi. 24. καὶ τὰ ἔθνη τῶν σωζομένων ἐν τῷ φωτὶ αὐτῆς περιπατοῦσι.

III. 1. Ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ must here mean *together, in company*, and be taken after ἀνέβαινον, "were going up." Sim. Joseph. cited by Krebs, μεχρὸ Ἀντιοχείας ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ παρήλθον. The use of ἐπὶ with an Accus. in the sense *to*, is found also in the Classical writers, and especially with nouns of *time*. Τῆν ἐνν. is in apposition with, and exegetical of ὥρον.

ἐπὶ τὴν ὥραν τῆς προσευχῆς, τὴν ἐννάτην. Καὶ τις ἀνὴρ χωλὸς ἐκ 2
κοιλίας μητρὸς αὐτοῦ ὑπάρχων ἐβασιάζετο· ὃν εἰτίθουν καθ' ἡμέραν
πρὸς τὴν θύραν τοῦ ἱεροῦ τὴν λεγομένην Ὠραίαν, τοῦ αἰτεῖν ἐλεημο-
σύνην παρὰ τῶν εἰσπορευομένων εἰς τὸ ἱερόν. Ὅς ἰδὼν Πέτρον καὶ 3
Ἰωάννην μέλλοντας εἰσεῖναι εἰς τὸ ἱερόν, ἤρώτα ἐλεημοσύνην λαβεῖν.
Ἀτενίσας δὲ Πέτρος εἰς αὐτὸν σὺν τῷ Ἰωάννῃ, εἶπε· Βλέψον εἰς ἡμᾶς. 4
Ὁ δὲ ἐπέιχεν αὐτοῖς, προσδοκῶν τι παρ' αὐτῶν λαβεῖν. Εἶπε δὲ Πέ- 5
τρος· Ἀργύριον καὶ χρυσίον οὐχ ὑπάρχει μοι· ὃ δὲ ἔχω, τοῦτό σοι 6
δίδωμι. ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Ναζωραίου ἔγεραι καὶ
περιπάτει. καὶ πιάσας αὐτὸν τῆς δεξιᾶς χειρὸς ἤγειρε. παραχρῆμα δὲ 7
ἐστερεώθησαν αὐτοῦ αἱ βῆσεις καὶ τὰ σφυρά· καὶ ἐξαλλόμενος ἔστη, 8
καὶ περιεπάτει· καὶ εἰσῆλθε σὺν αὐτοῖς εἰς τὸ ἱερόν, περιπατῶν καὶ
ἀλλόμενος καὶ αἰνῶν τὸν Θεόν. Καὶ εἶδεν αὐτὸν πᾶς ὁ λαὸς περιπα- 9
τοῦντα καὶ αἰνοῦντα τὸν Θεόν· ἐπεγίνωσκόν τε αὐτὸν ὅτι οὗτος ἦν ὁ 10
πρὸς τὴν ἐλεημοσύνην καθήμενος ἐπὶ τῇ Ὠραίᾳ πύλῃ τοῦ ἱεροῦ· καὶ
ἐπλήσθησαν θαμβοὺς καὶ ἐκστάσεως ἐπὶ τῷ συμβεβηκότι αὐτῷ.

Κρατοῦντος δὲ τοῦ ἰαθέντος χωλοῦ τὸν Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάννην, συνέ- 11
δραμε πρὸς αὐτοὺς πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἐπὶ τῇ στοᾷ, τῇ καλουμένῃ Σολομῶνος
ἔκθαμβοι. Ἰδὼν δὲ Πέτρος ἀπεκρίνατο πρὸς τὸν λαόν· Ἄνδρες Ἰσ- 12
ραηλίται, τί θαυμάζετε ἐπὶ τούτῳ, ἢ ἡμῖν τί ἀτενίζετε, ὡς ἰδίᾳ δυνάμει
ἢ εὐσεβείᾳ πεποιηκῶσι τοῦ περιπατεῖν αὐτόν; 13 Ὁ Θεὸς Ἀβραάμ καὶ 13

1 Infra 5. 30.

2. ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς] for ἐκ γενετῆς. See John ix. 1. Ἐκ γαστρὸς occurs in the Pseudo-Theogn. v. 307. Ἐβασιάζετο, "was being carried." Ἐτίθουν. The sick and poor were, both among Jews and Gentiles, usually laid, or placed themselves at the portals of the Temples, to ask charity of the worshippers; though sometimes at the gates or doors of rich men. See Luke xvi. 20. and Note.

— Ὠραίαν.] So I write with almost every Editor up to Wets. Those after him write ὦραλαν; but wrongly, I conceive; for Ὠρ. is a proper name, being one of that class which become such by an adjective with the Article having so defined some one of a class of things, that it is pointed out as single and apart from the rest. In that stage the adjective should be written with a small initial letter. But when the Article is omitted, it becomes a proper name, and consequently must have a capital. Which gate of the Temple is here meant, the Commentators are not agreed. It seems to have been either the Eastern gate, leading from the court of the women to that of the Israelites (overlaid with Corinthian brass wrought with consummate skill); or that called Susan. Schleusn. observes, that old Constantinople had a gate, which was also called, καθ' ἔσοχον, ἢ ὦραλα, as we find from Smith's Notitia Const. p. 121. I would add, that such names did not by any means supersede the proper names. Thus it appears from Spanh. on Julian, p. 75. that Constantinople was sometimes called by the name Καλλιπολις.

— ἐλεμ.] "alms," i. e. the *stips* or sum given; a signification only found in the later Greek writers.

4. ἀτενίσας εἰς αὐτόν.] See Note on Luke xxii. 56.

5. ἐπέιχεν a.] Sub. δόξαλαμοῖς.

6. ὃ δὲ ἔχω, τοῦτό σοι δίδωμι.] This has the air of a proverbial expression; with which I would compare Aristoph. Lysist. 671. ὄπερ οὖν ἔχω, δίδωμί σοι. Soph. Elect. 450. σικκὰ μὲν τὰδ', ἀλλ' ὅμως ἂ ἔχω, ὅς ἀντ'ῶν.

— ἐν τῷ ὀν.] "by the authority of Jesus [I say]."

7. βῆσεις.] Some here render the word *planta pedis*; but others, better, *feet*; a signification not unfrequent in the later Greek writers, from whom many examples are adduced. The σφυρά are the ankles or instep.

8. ἐξαλλόμενος.] Not so much for *joy*, as many Commentators imagine; nor, as Œcumen. thinks, to try whether he could walk; but, it should seem, at first from ignorance how to walk, by which his essays would be rather *leaping* than walking; just as the imperfect glimmer of the newly acquired sight of the blind man at Mark viii. 24. made him first "see men as trees walking." Ἐξάλλεσθαι well describes the headlong eagerness of the incipient action, as ἔστη, καὶ περιεπ. the other stages of it: "he first leaped, then stood still, and [then] walked," i. e. in a regular manner. See Note on Acts xiii. 11.

11. κρατοῦντος.] Render, "keeping close to," as in Col. ii. 19. 2 Sam. iii. 6.

12. ἀπεκρ. πρὸς τὸν λ.] "addressed the people." Ἐνσεβεία, *præ sanctitate*.

— περ. τοῦ περιπ. a.] There is here an anomaly of construction; which some Commentators seek to remove by supposing an ellipsis of *πρᾶγμα* and *ἐνεκα*; others (as Markl. and Heinrichs), by resolving *περ.* into *ποιηταῖς ὄσει*; comparing Acts xxvii. 1. ὡς δὲ ἐκρίθη τοῦ ἀποπλεῖν ἡμᾶς, and xx. 3. But this principle of *resolution*, though often employed by Philologists, is seldom effectual, as

- Ἰουᾶκ καὶ Ἰακώβ, ὁ Θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, ἐδόξασε τὸν παῖδα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν ὃν ὑμεῖς παρεδώκατε, καὶ ἠρνήσασθε αὐτὸν κατὰ πρόσωπον
- 14 Πιλάτου, κρίναντος ἐκείνου ἀπολίην. ^m Ἐμεῖς δὲ τὸν ἄγιον καὶ δίκαιον ^m Matt. 27. 20. Mark 15. 11.
- 15 ἠρνήσασθε, καὶ ἠτήσασθε ἄνδρα φρονεῖ χαρισθῆναι ὑμῖν. ⁿ τὸν δὲ ⁿ Luke 23. 19. John 18. 40. n Supra 2. 24.
- ἀρχηγὸν τῆς ζωῆς ἀπεκτείνετε ὃν ὁ Θεὸς ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν, οὗ
- 16 ἡμεῖς μάρτυρές ἐσμεν. Καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ, τοῦτον ὃν θεωρεῖτε καὶ οἴδατε, ἐστερέωσε τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἡ πίστις ἣ δι' αὐτοῦ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ τὴν δόξακλειαν ταύτην ἀέναντι πάντων ὑμῶν.
- 17 Καὶ νῦν, ἀδελφοί, οἶδα ὅτι κατὰ ἄγνοιαν ἐπράξατε, ὡσπερ καὶ οἱ ἄρ-
18 χοντες ὑμῶν. ὁ δὲ Θεὸς ἅ προκατήγγειλε διὰ στόματος πάντων τῶν ^o Luke 24. 44.
- 19 προφητῶν αὐτοῦ, παθεῖν τὸν Χριστὸν, ἐπλήρωσεν οὕτω. μετανοήσατε οὖν καὶ ἐπιστρέψατε, εἰς τὸ ἐξιλειφθῆναι ὑμῶν τὰς ἁμαρτίας· ὅπως

being so hypothetical, and explaining nothing solidly. The *ellipses*, too, are liable to the same objection. It should seem that the present idiom proceeded originally from the employing of the Infinitive with *ὡστε* or *εἰς* τὸ denoting *end* or *aim*. This construction was afterwards changed to its *equivalent* τῷ with an Inf., which is often found in the LXX. (see Win. Gr. Gr. § 33. 2. No. 3.), and was then changed in most cases to the *simple* Infinitive. The idiom formerly existed in our own language, and is still used by the vulgar; e. gr. "I should like for to know."

13. ὁ Θεός — ἡμῶν.] The repetition of ὁ Θεός is emphatical; and, as Doddr. observes, "the mention of the God of their Patriarchs was introduced to show that they taught no *new* Religion, which should alienate them from the God of Israel."

— ἐδόξασε] namely, by his resurrection and ascension. ἠρνήσασθε, "renounced and denied him as Messiah." Κρίναντος, "when he had determined."

14. τὸν ἄγιον καὶ ἕκ.] "the Holy and Just one." A cognomen of the Messiah, as in iv. 27. Rev. iii. 7. John x. 36. With ἠτήσασθε — ὑμῖν I would compare Hesiod. Ἔργ. 190. μᾶλλον δὲ κακῶν βεκτήρα καὶ ὑβρίων ἄνερα τιμήσουσι. This sense of *χαρ.*, "to be given up for pardon," is not unfrequent in the later writers.

15. τὸν ἀρχ. τῆς ζωῆς] "the author of life;" namely, as being the first to rise from the dead, he was thereby the cause of all men rising again. See John i. 4; v. 21; xiv. 6. and the Note. So Heb. ii. 10. ἀρχ. τῆς σωτηρίας. It is here observed by the very learned Valckn. that in these speeches of Peter (though not such pieces of finished composition as those of Demosthenes or the other Greek writers) there is a dignity in the historical and a grandeur in the didactic parts, to which it were impossible to add aught.

16. καὶ ἐπὶ — αὐτοῦ.] Render: "And his name (i. e. the power accompanying the invocation of his name) through faith in his name (i. e. him) hath made strong this man whom ye see and know." Ὀλοκληρίαν, complete soundness and health, as in Is. i. 6. and sometimes in the later Classical writers.

17. κατὰ ἄγνοιαν ἔπρα.] "It is somewhat difficult (says Mr. Townsend) to interpret these words in their literal sense, when we remember the numerous miracles of our Lord, and the abundant proofs the Jews received that he was

their promised Messiah." Wolf and others (including Dr. Burton) indeed, attempt to get rid of the difficulty by adopting a different punctuation, and think the expression *ὡσπερ καὶ οἱ ἀρχ. ὑμῶν* belongs not to *ἄγνοιαν*, but to *ἐπράξατε*. And they assign the following sense: "I know that through ignorance you were induced to do as your rulers did." This, however, does violence to the construction. The difficulty may be best removed by not too rigorously interpreting either *οἶδα ὅτι*, (which has often but a faint sense) or *ἄγνοιαν*, but taking the whole as expressed *populariter*, q. d. "I am willing candidly to suppose that," &c. See Scott. *ἄγνοιαν* may (as Whitby proposes) be taken of *error* or *prejudice*. At all events, Peter does not say that their *ἄγνοια*, whatever it might be, was blameless; for as it resulted from pride, prejudice, and worldly mindedness, and was co-existent with ample means of information, it was *criminal*. Nor was ignorance ever held as an excuse for *crime*, unless it were involuntary, when all the ancient moralists granted it was. See my Note on Thucyd. iii. 38 & 40; iv. 98. Thus Paul in 1 Tim. i. 13. urges *such* ignorance in extenuation of his guilt. Criminal, however, as was the ignorance in the present case, the Apostle hints that it admitted of *some* extenuation.

18. ὁ δὲ Θεός — ἐπλήρωσεν οὕτω] q. d. God hath used that ignorance *for good*, by permitting that you should commit this crime; *and moreover*, since thus would be fulfilled the declarations of the Prophets concerning the calamities with which the Messiah should be oppressed. The Rabbins themselves acknowledge that all the Prophets prophesied of the Messiah.

19. μετανοήσατε καὶ ἐπιστρά.] This is the *application* of the discourse, — in which *ἐπιστρά.* is not (as many recent Commentators imagine) a mere synonyme of *μεταν.*; but, as the latter denotes a change of *mind*, so does the former a change of *conduct*; both necessary to real conversion. See Bp. Bull's *Harmonia Apostolica*, p. 9.

— εἰς τὸ ἐξάλ. ὑμῶν τὰς ἁμ.] Ἐξαλείφειν signifies properly *to wipe off oil from any thing*, and sometimes to wipe off characters chalked on a board, or traced on a slate; 3dly, to obliterate any writing, whether on waxed tablets, or written on parchment, either by *scratching* out, or *crossing* out. And, as crossing out accounts in a ledger implies that the sums are discharged, or the payment forgiven, so the word came to mean, in a figurative sense, to *forgive offences*, as in Is.

ἂν ἔλθωσι καιροὶ ἀναψύξεως ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ Κυρίου, καὶ ἀποστείλῃ 20
 τὸν * προκεχειρισμένον ὑμῖν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν· ὃν δεῖ οὐρανὸν μὲν 21
 δεξασθαι ἄχρι χρόνων ἀποκαταστάσεως πάντων, ὧν ἐλάλησεν ὁ Θεὸς
 διὰ στόματος πάντων τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ προφητῶν ἀπ' αἰῶνος. P Ματθ. 22
 σῆς μὲν γὰρ πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας εἶπεν· "Οτι προφήτην ὑμῖν
 ἀναστήσει Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ὑμῶν ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ὑμῶν,
 ὡς ἐμέ· αὐτοῦ ἀκούσεσθε κατὰ πάντα ὅσα ἂν λαλήσῃ πρὸς
 ὑμᾶς. Ἔσται δὲ, πᾶσα ψυχὴ ἣτις ἂν μὴ ἀκούσῃ τοῦ 23
 προφήτου ἐκείνου, ἐξολοθρευθήσεται ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ.

p Deut. 18. 18.
 infra 7. 37.

xliii. 23. (which the Apostle has, no doubt, in mind) *ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ἐξαλείψων τὰς ἀνομίας σου.* also 2 Macc. xii. 42. and Ecclus. xvi. 20. This sense very rarely occurs in the Classical writers. One example, from Lysias, has been adduced by Wets; *ὅπως ἐξαλειφθῆι αὐτῶν τὰ ἁμαρτήματα.* On the kindred notion of *expunging* and *consigning to oblivion*, see my note on Thueyd. iii. 57. To the examples there adduced may be added Æschyl. Ch. 496. and Theb. 15. Joseph. p. 737. 17. Huds.

—*ὅπως ἂν ἔλθωσι, &c.*] The Commentators are by no means agreed on the sense to be ascribed to *ὅπως ἂν*, which most modern Commentators suppose to be *when*, or *after* that, taking it for *ἐπειδὴν*; others, *until*, i. e. waiting until. The latter, however, supposes a harsh ellipsis; and as to the former, though examples of *ὅπως ἂν sensu chronico* are not rare, yet not with *ἂν*. Besides, turn it which way we will, it yields no satisfactory sense. See Scott. It is therefore better, with the Syr. Transl., and many eminent Commentators, from Luther downward, to take it in the sense *so that*, in *order that*, as Luke ii. 35. Matt. vi. 5. et alibi. Thus Tittm. de Syn. II. p. 63. (who adopts this sense) shows at large that *ὅπως never*, properly speaking, denotes time, unless it be time *past*, as in Hom. Od. xxii. 21. Herodo. ii. 13. In the present passage, he observes, it cannot have "notionem futuri exacti," because *ἂν* is added. And he renders, "ut hoc modo veniant dies ἀναψύξεως." The sense, then, is: "that so the times of refreshing may come from the *presence* of the Lord;" i. e. that ye may see with joy the time which the Lord hath appointed as the period of refreshing. Ἀνάψυξις properly denotes a regaining one's breath after it has been interrupted; 2. a breathing-time from some labour, a rest from trouble, or deliverance from evil generally; in which sense it occurs in the Sept. and Philo cited by the Commentators; to which examples I have in Rec. Synop. added others from the Classical writers. See Note on Heb. iii. 11. 3. It signifies (by *implication*) the happy state occasioned by such a change. What particular period is here designated, Expositors are not agreed. It must, of course, be at the *coming* of the Messiah: but some refer that to his coming at the *destruction of Jerusalem*; others, to his coming at the end of the world; and others, again, his coming in the Millenian reign. As to the *first* view, I see not how it can be maintained. The *third* has been ingeniously, but not satisfactorily defended. It seems safest to adopt the *second*; by which the ἀνάψυξις of the present passage will be the same with the ἀνσεις at 2 Thess. i. 7. ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ μετ' ἀγγελων, the restitution of

all things. In the expression ἀπὸ προσώπου we have a Hebrew periphrasis for ἀπὸ Κυρίου, which means, "by God's providence." Καὶ ἀποστείλῃ should be rendered, "and that he may send." Instead of the common reading προκεχειρισμένον, some of the most ancient MSS., most of the ancient Versions, and all the early Edd., except the Erasmian, have προκεχειρισμένον, which is confirmed by several of the ancient Fathers, has been approved by most Commentators, and has been received by almost every Editor from Beng. and Wets. downwards: and justly; for the common reading seems to have been either a *paradiorthosis* of some Critics who did not understand προχειρῆ; or a *gloss* on προχειρῆ; for Suid. explains προχειρίζω for πᾶσι γνωρισμένον ποῦ. Render: "him who was of old destined and appointed for you, (i. e. for your relief and salvation,) even Jesus Christ." Some would sink the *προ*, which, indeed, in Classical Greek is merged in the proper signification of the word; but this is not permitted by 1 Pet. i. 20. Χριστοῦ προγεννημένου πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου.

21. Ἦν δεῖ οὐρανὸν μὲν δεῖ.] The true sense of these words has been imperfectly understood by the Commentators, through their not perceiving their *scope*, which is to anticipate a possible objection,—that if Jesus had been the Messiah, he would have continued on earth, at least after his *resurrection*, and then founded his kingdom. To this the Apostle indirectly replies, that it was *necessary* (i. e. for the purposes mentioned at John xvi., xvii., and xviii.) for the present that he should abide in Heaven, there to remain till the time of restoration; literally, "that *heaven* should have him, and not *earth*;" for δεῖ, as the best Commentators have seen, must mean *occurrere*, not *accipere*.

Ἀποκατάστασις properly signifies a restoration of any thing to some former state; and, by implication, for the *better*, is capable of several interpretations, according to the view taken of the foregoing verse. According to the *second*, it will denote the consummation of all things at the end of the world. On the expression τῶν ἁγίων *προφ.* see Note at Luke i. 70; which passage will serve to confirm and illustrate the τῶν here inserted by the most eminent Editors, on weighty MS. authority.

22—24. One cannot imagine a more masterly address than this, to warn the Jews of the dreadful consequences of their infidelity, in the very words of *Moses*, out of a pretended zeal for whom they were rejecting Christianity, and attempting its destruction. (Doddr.) The Apostle means to say that they should hearken to Christ as the Prophet like unto *Moses*, of whom *Moses* predicted. For that the passage has reference to

24 Καὶ πάντες δὲ οἱ προφηταὶ ἀπὸ Σαμουὴλ καὶ τῶν καθ' ἑξῆς ὅσοι
 25 ἐλάλησαν, καὶ [προ]κατήγγειλαν τὰς ἡμέρας ταύτας. Ἡμεῖς ἐστε ^{q Gen. 12. 3}
 υἱοὶ τῶν προφητῶν, καὶ τῆς διαθήκης ἧς διέθετο ὁ Θεὸς πρὸς τοὺς ^{& 22. 15.}
 πατέρας ἡμῶν, λέγων πρὸς Ἀβραάμ· Καὶ ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου ^{& 26. 4.}
 26 ἐνευλογηθήσονται πᾶσαι αἱ πατριαὶ τῆς γῆς. Ἡμεῖν ^{r Infra 13. 46.}
 πρῶτον ὁ Θεὸς, ἀναστήσας τὸν παῖδα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν, ἀπέστειλεν αὐτὸν
 εὐλογοῦντα ὑμᾶς ἐν τῷ ἀποστρέφειν ἕκαστον ἀπὸ τῶν ποιηριῶν ὑμῶν.
 1 IV. ΑΛΛΟΤΝΤΩΝ δὲ αὐτῶν πρὸς τὸν λαὸν, ἐπέστησαν αὐτοῖς οἱ

Christ, cannot be doubted, since the Apostle affirms it. Indeed, there will be no difficulty in so doing, if we consider the chief scope of the passage, in which (as Schoettg. has well pointed out) the peculiar points of resemblance are intimated at the *ὡς αὐτὸν*, "like unto himself;" namely, 1. in being the minister of a *new covenant*, as Moses was of the old, which the Prophets (especially Jeremiah) had distinctly announced should be done away. 2. in His close communication with God. And as Moses conferred much with God, so did Jesus Christ, who was in the bosom of God his Father. Though, after all, Moses may not have had directly in view this reference; and accordingly, this may be of the number of those passages of the O. T., "which (as Bp. Middleton says) are capable of a two-fold application; being *directly* applicable to circumstances then past, or present, or soon to be accomplished; and *indirectly* to others which Divine Providence was about to develop under a future dispensation."

The passage before us is not a literal quotation; and yet the variations that occur are not such as to affect its fidelity. In the first verse the words are put into another order, and *σοὶ* is altered to *ὑμῖν*, to make the case plainer. And so indeed Moses evidently meant it. After ἀκούσαθε the words *κατὰ* — ὑμᾶς are added by Peter to show the *extent* of the injunction. In the next verse the variations are greater both from the Hebr. and the Sept. Yet (as Bp. Randolph observes) the general sense of both is expressed; for, to advert to the principal discrepancy, the מְיָרָה וְשָׂרָה and ἐκδικήσω ἐξ αὐτοῦ mean, "I will require it at his hands, i. e. I will punish him for it" (namely, his disobedience.) Thus the words ἐξολ. ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ are meant to *illustrate* a somewhat obscure phrase, and to point to the nature and extent of that punishment, the greatest known under the Jewish law. Ἐξολ. is a word found only in the Sept. and the later writers; signifying to "utterly exterminate."

24. πάντες] i. e. (in a restricted sense) a very considerable part; which, as Doddr. remarks, is quite sufficient for the purpose. Καὶ — δι, *quinetiam*. Ἐλάλησαν, "have spoken;" i. e. *prophetically*; for, as Kuin. observes, λαλεῖν is a vox sol. de hac re. Thus Acts xxvi. 22. Heb. i. 1. 2 Pet. i. 21. On the construction of the Genit. belonging to ἡσού, but coming *before* it, I have, in Recens. Synop., adduced two examples; Aristoph. Plut. v. 1052. ἐν τῷ προσώπῳ τῶν βυστίων ὄσας ἔχει, and Eurip. Med. v. 476. ὡς ἴσασιν. Ἐλλήνων ὄσοι Ταυτὸν συνεισέθσαν ἄλογων ἀκρίφας. The αἱ ἡμεῖσαι ταῦτα are the *καιροὶ ἀναψέξω*s before mentioned.

25. υἱοὶ τῶν προφ.] i. e. as the best Commentators explain, "ye are the *disciples* of the

prophets; those to whom the prophecies were addressed." Prophets and teachers were by the Jews styled *fathers*, and their disciples their *sons*. See Note on Matt. xii. 27.

— καὶ τῆς διαθήκης] "[ye are the] heirs by the covenant, and therefore to you the offer of salvation is *first* made. The expression is formed on a Hebraic idiom of יָרַב. The following citation

is made with some small variation from the Hebrew and LXX. The Apostle means to affirm the same thing as St. Paul. Gal. iii. 16, — that by the Messiah, as the descendant of Abraham, shall all nations be blessed. Ἐν before τῷ σπέρμ. is found in all the early Edd; some Versions and Fathers, and has been received by almost every Editor from Beng. and Wets. downwards.

26 ὑμῖν πρῶτον.] The sense of these words will become clearer by supplying, what seems to be omitted (by an idiom frequent in the Scriptural writers), the particle οὖν. "Unto you, then," which very aptly introduces the *conclusion* from what has been said. Ἡμεῖν may be taken (as some direct) for a *Dat. commodi*, and πρῶτον signify *especially*; but the usual sense is preferable, and is required by the preceding verse. Εὐλογοῦντα ὑμᾶς the Interpreters render, "in order to bless you." But this supposes a harsh idiom; and it is better to take εὐλογ. as in apposition, or for ὡς εὐλογ., "as a blesser of you," i. e. one who should bless and make you happy.

— ἐν τῷ ἀποστ. ἕκαστον, &c.] There is here an ambiguity of interpretation, since ἀποστρ. may be taken either in a transitive or in an intransitive sense. The *former* is adopted by the generality of Translators and Commentators, and may be defended. But as it occasions some harshness of construction, and involves something objectionable in sense (unless action be taken for intention), the latter view (which is supported by the most eminent ancient and modern Interpreters) seems preferable. And ἐν τῷ may be taken for *eis τὸν*, denoting *purpose*; or for ἐπι q. d. "on every one of you turning from his iniquities," i. e. if every one of you shall turn. This is confirmed by the words of ver. 19, μετανοήσατε καὶ ἐπιστρέψατε; and by Is. i. 16. (which the Apostle seems to have had in mind) Πάλασαθε ἀπὸ τῶν ποιηριῶν ὑμῶν.

IV. I. ἐπίστησαν αὐτοῖς] "*supervenerunt illis.*" Ἐπίστημι properly signifies "to be presented to the view of any one," in which is inherent some notion of *suddenness*, which occasionally (as here, Luke xx. 1., and elsewhere) implies some notion of *hostility*. On ὁ στρατηγὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ, see Note on Luke xxii. 4.

ἱερεῖς καὶ ὁ στρατηγὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ οἱ Σαδδουκαῖοι, διαπονούμενοι 2
 διὰ τὸ διδάσκειν αὐτοὺς τὸν λαὸν, καὶ καταγγέλλειν ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ τὴν
 ἀνάστασιν τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν· καὶ ἐπέβαλον αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας, καὶ ἔθεντο 3
 εἰς τήρησιν εἰς τὴν αὔριον· ἦν γὰρ ἑσπέρα ἤδη. Πολλοὶ δὲ τῶν 4
 ἀκουσάντων τὸν λόγον ἐπίστευσαν· καὶ ἐγενήθη ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν ἀν-
 δρῶν ὡσεὶ χιλιάδες πέντε. Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν αὔριον συναθροῖναι 5
 αὐτῶν τοὺς ἀρχοντας καὶ πρεσβυτέρους καὶ γραμματεῖς εἰς Ἱερουσα-
 λῆμ, καὶ Ἄνναν τὸν ἀρχιερέα καὶ Καϊάφαν καὶ Ἰωάννην καὶ Ἀλέξαν- 6
 δρον, καὶ ὅσοι ἦσαν ἐκ γένους ἀρχιερατικοῦ. Καὶ στήσαντες αὐτοὺς 7
 ἐν [τῷ] μέσῳ, ἐπυνθάνοντο· Ἐν ποίῳ δυνάμει ἢ ἐν ποίῳ ὀνόματι 8
 ἐποιήσατε τοῦτο ὑμεῖς; Τότε Πέτρος πλησθεὶς Πνεύματος ἁγίου, 9
 εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς· Ἀρχοντες τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ πρεσβύτεροι τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ, εἰ 9
 ἡμεῖς σήμερον ἀνακρινόμεθα ἐπὶ εὐεργεσίᾳ ἀνθρώπου ἀσθενοῦς, ἐν
 τίνι οὗτος σέσωσται· * γνωστὸν ἔστω πᾶσιν ὑμῖν καὶ παντὶ τῷ λαῷ 10
 Ἰσραὴλ, ὅτι ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Ναζωραίου, ὃν ὑμεῖς
 ἔσταυρώσατε, ὃν ὁ Θεὸς ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν, ἐν τούτῳ οὗτος παρῆσθηεν
 ἐνώπιον ὑμῶν ὑγιής. Ὁὗτός ἐστιν ὁ λίθος ὁ ἐξουθενηθεὶς ὑφ' ὑμῶν 11
 τῶν οἰκοδομούντων, ὁ γενομένος εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας. Καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν 12

8 Supra 2. 24.

† Psal. 118. 22.
 Isa. 28. 16.
 Matt. 21. 42.
 Mark 12. 10.
 Luke 20. 17.
 Rom. 9. 33.
 1 Pet. 2. 7.
 Matt. 1. 21.

2. διαπονούμενοι.] Διαπονεῖσθαι signifies, 1. to be wearied out; 2. (as here) to feel aggrieved, be vexed, bear with impatience, a sense found in the LXX., but not in the Classical writers. Διὰ τὸ διδάσκειν α. τὸν λαὸν refers to the Priests; and καταγγέλλειν — νεκρῶν to the Sadducees. Ἐν τῷ Ἰησ. by or in, i. e. by the example of Jesus, as exemplified in Jesus.

3. ἔθεντο εἰς τήρησιν.] Some Expositors think that τήρησις here means the custody of certain persons to whose charge they were committed. But the common interpretation, a prison, is best founded, and is established beyond doubt by ver. 18. ἔθεντο αὐτοῖς ἐν τρησῶσι δημοσίᾳ. This use is, however, confined to the later writers; for, in the passage cited by the Commentators from Thucyd. vii. 86, the sense is a keeping in custody (as, indeed, is evident by the use of the Article); which, indeed, is the primitive sense of the word (as also of the Latin custodia), but came in process of time to denote a place of custody, *carcer*.

4. ἐγενήθη — χιλ. πέντε.] The Commentators are not agreed whether this number is inclusive of the 3000 before converted, or exclusive of it. Yet no persons thoroughly conversant in the idiom of the Greek language can fail to perceive that the former is the sense intended. Ἐγενήθη signifies *was become*, a signification of γίνεσθαι which often occurs in the N. T. and LXX. Ἄνδρῶν signifies, not *men*, but *persons* of both sexes; it being put for ἀνθρώπων, as Luke xi. 31. James i. 20. Acts vi. 11. et al.

5. αὐτῶν] scil. τῶν Ἰουδαίων, to be supplied from the context. By τοὺς ἀρχ., &c. are denoted the Sanhedrim.

6. ἐκ γένους ἀρχ.] i. e. as some think, the chiefs of the 24 Sacerdotal classes; or, as others, the kindred of those who had lately served the office of High Priest.

7. ἐν ποίῳ δυνάμει — ὀνόματι.] To determine the sense of this passage, we must ascertain the scope of the interrogation. Now ἐποιήσατε τοῦτο might refer, as some say it does, to the general conduct

of the Apostles in their ministry. But from ver. 9. it is plain that it refers to the miraculous cure lately performed. Ἐν ποίῳ ὀνόματι further illustrate the sense. The name of a person is indeed often put for the person himself. See also iii. 16. Thus it may mean, by the power of such a person. But as it is certain that the Jews believed very wonderful works, even miracles, to be performed by magic arts and incantation, i. e. invoking the names of certain angels or illustrious Patriarchs, the full sense of ὄνομα may here be retained.

9. εἰ ἡμεῖς σήμερον ἀνακρ.] Render "Since we are called to examination this day." Ἀνακρινέσθαι is a forensic term, signifying to be examined by interrogation. See Note on Luke xiii. 14. Εὐεργεσία ἀνθρώπου ἀσθ. is for εὐεργ. εἰς ἀνθρώπου ἀσθενή, on which use of the Genitive of object, see Winer's Gr. Gr. § 23. 1. At ἐν τίνι sub. ὀνόματι. Comp. v. 7 & 10.

11. See Note on Matt. xxi. 42.

— οὐκ ἔστιν — ἡ σωτηρία.] Many Commentators, from Whitty downwards, have argued from the context that ἡ σωτηρία means "this healing," and σωθῆναι "to be restored to health;" a sense, indeed, found elsewhere; but it cannot be admitted here, because it cannot have any sense varying from that of ἡ σωτηρία just before; and ἡ σωτηρία, notwithstanding what the first-mentioned Commentators may say, cannot mean "the healing," because that signification of the word is found nowhere in the Scriptures, nor; I believe, in the Classical writers. And there is nothing to compel us to adopt it here. The use of the Article does not, because "the healing [in question]" yields an inapposite sense. Indeed there is no proof that the Article is here meant to exert any particular force, much less to be emphatic. I know of no passage in the N. T. where it has such a force, but several where the noun is used in its most abstract sense; in which case the force of the Article is merged in that of the noun. So John iv. 22. ὅτι ἡ σωτηρία ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐστὶ. Rom. xi. 11. ἡ σωτηρία τοῖς ἔθνεσιν [ἐγένετο]. Hebr.

ἐν ἄλλῃ οὐδενὶ ἢ σωτηρίᾳ· * οὐδὲ γὰρ ὄνομά ἐστιν ἕτερον ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν τὸ δεδομένον ἐν ἀνθρώποις, ἐν ᾧ δεῖ σωθῆναι ἡμᾶς.

- 13 Θεωροῦντες δὲ τὴν τοῦ Πέτρου παρόξησην καὶ Ἰωάννου, καὶ καταλαβόμενοι ὅτι ἄνθρωποι ἀγράμματοί εἰσι καὶ ἰδιῶται, ἐθυμίμαζον, ἐπε-
 14 γίνωσκόν τε αὐτοὺς ὅτι σὺν τῷ Ἰησοῦ ἦσαν· τὸν δὲ ἄνθρωπον βλέποντες σὺν αὐτοῖς ἐσῴτα τὸν τετραπευμένον, οὐδὲν εἶχον ἀντειπεῖν.
 15 Κελεύσαντες δὲ αὐτοὺς ἔξω τοῦ συνεδρίου ἀπελθεῖν, συνέβαλον πρὸς
 16 ἀλλήλους, λέγοντες· Τί ποιήσομεν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τούτοις; ὅτι μὲν γὰρ γνωστὸν σημεῖον γέγονε δι' αὐτῶν, πᾶσι τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν Ἱερου-
 17 σαλήμ φανερὸν, καὶ οὐ δυνάμεθα ἀρνήσασθαι. Ἄλλ', ἵνα μὴ ἐπὶ πλεῖον διανεμηθῇ εἰς τὸν λαὸν, ἀπειλῇ ἀπειλησώμεθα αὐτοῖς μηκέτι
 18 λαλεῖν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι τούτῳ μηδενὶ ἀνθρώπων. Καὶ καλέσαντες αὐ-
 19 ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. "ὁ δὲ Πέτρος καὶ Ἰωάννης ἀποκριθέντες ^{in infra 5. 29.}
 πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἶπον· Εἰ δίκαιόν ἐστιν ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑμῶν ἀκούειν

vi. 9. τὰ ἐχόμενα τῆς σωτηρίας. Rev. vii. 10. ἡ σωτηρία τῷ Θεῷ. and xix. 1. ἡ σωτηρία καὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ ἡ τιμὴ — τῷ Θεῷ. In short, it is plain that if there were even an emphasis in the Article, the sense would be "this mode of *salvation*" [namely, by the Gospel which we preach] not, "this *healing*." And there is something to counteract this in xiii. 26. That it must be understood of *salvation*, not of *healing*, is certain from the words following ἐν ᾧ δεῖ σωθῆναι ἡμᾶς; for (as Mr. Holden observes) "St. Peter takes it for granted that ALL must apply to Christ for this salvation. Now all are not afflicted with bodily maladies, but the salvation spoken of is that of which all stand in need; and consequently it must signify spiritual and eternal salvation."

12. οὐδέ.] 'This (instead of οὔτε), found in many MSS. and the Coptic Version, has been approved by Griesb., and received by Lachmann; being, as Fritz. (on Mark, p. 157) has shown, required by propriety of language. How little can be made of οὔτε, will appear from the paraphrase of the passage according to that reading offered by Dr. Burton. That οὐδέ was read, too, in the MSS. from which the Edit. Princ. was formed, which has οὐδὲν, I doubt not; for οὐδέ was likely, in such a context, to be altered to οὐδὲν, especially as the *γ* following would easily be mistaken for a *ν*. The reading in question may, indeed, be suspected to have arisen from correction. But the MSS. are, with one exception, not of the corrected class: and when words like οὐδέ and οὔτε are perpetually confounded in the MSS., grammatical propriety is of greater weight than external evidence.

— τὸ δεδομένον.] Said to be for δὲ δίδοται. But there is rather an ellipsis of κατὰ, *quod attinet ad*. Δεῖ here signifies *licet, permittum est*, as in Luke xiii. 14. (Ἐξήμεραι εἰσὶν ἐν αἷς δεῖ ἐργάζεσθαι.) and sometimes in the Classical writers.

13. τὴν παρόξησην] "the freedom" or boldness of speech. So 1 Tim. iii. 13. περιποιητὰ — πολλὴν παρρησίαν. and Joseph. Bell. i. 10. 7. τῶν πραγμάτων διδόντων παρρησίαν. On this παρρησία a learned Dissertation is written by Walch.

— καταλαβόμενοι] "having perceived," or learnt. This sense of the word occurs also at Acts x. 34. xxv. 25. Eph. iii. 18. Ἀγράμματοι, *unlettered*, i. e.

ignorant of, or but slightly versed in that kind of knowledge which the Jews alone prized, namely, of the Scriptures as explained by their Rabbinical interpreters. (Comp. John vii. 15.) Such is the sense assigned to the expression by the best Commentators; who, however, I think, recede too far from the *Classical* use of the word, by which ἀγράμματοι denoted those who were devoid of learning or science, such as was imparted by the education which fell to the lot of the higher classes. So Athenæus, p. 176 (cited by Valckn.) ἰδιώτης καὶ ἀναλφάβητος. See Note on 1 Cor. xiv. 16. With respect to ἰδιῶται, it means *private* and *plebeian* persons, as opposed to those who hold any office Ecclesiastical or Civil. Ἐπεγίνωσκον, "recognised" as in Matt. xiv. 35. ξὺν τῷ Ἰησοῦ ἦσαν, "that they had been Jesus' companions and adherents." So Mark xiv. 67. καὶ σὺ μετὰ τοῦ Ν. Ἰ. ἦσθα.

14. ἐστῴτα] "standing on his feet;" not, as before, a cripple without any use of them. See supra iii. 7, 8. and compare Mark v. 15. θεωροῦσι τὸν δαιμονιζόμενον καθήμενον, καὶ ἰματισμένον καὶ σωφρονοῦντα, where see Note.

15. κελεύσαντες — ἀπελθεῖν.] This bidding them withdraw was not meant by way of *insult*, but in order that they might consider in private what was best to be done. The expression often occurs in the Historians, where ambassadors, after delivering their message, are desired to withdraw, in order that the Council may deliberate upon it. See Thucyd. v. 112.

16. συνέβαλον.] Sub. γνώμη, or βουλευματα, expressed in Eurip. Phæn. 700.

17. ἀλλ'] nevertheless. A sense not unfrequent, either in the Scriptural or Classical writers. Διανεμηθῇ. Supply τούτο scil. τὸ σημεῖον, the report of this miracle. Διανεμῆσθαι signifies to be distributed among several, and, as used of a report, to be spread abroad. By λαὸν is meant the people at large, as opposed to the Priests, Pharisees, and higher classes. Ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι τούτῳ signifies "in the name of this person," i. e. *Jesus*, the name being (as Kuin. observes) omitted through contempt.

18. παρῆγγεσαν τὸ μὴ φθέγγ. may be rendered, "they interdicted to them the speaking." Διδάσκειν is exegetical of φθέγγ. Καθόλου is for παράπαν.

μᾶλλον ἢ τοῦ Θεοῦ, κρίνατε. οὐ δυνάμεθα γὰρ ἡμῖς ἅ εἶδομεν καὶ 20
ἠκούσαμεν μὴ λαλεῖν. Οἱ δὲ προσαπειλησόμενοι ἀπέλυσαν αὐτούς, — 21
μηδὲν εὐρίσκοντες τὸ πῶς κολάσονται αὐτούς, — διὰ τὸν λαόν· ὅτι
πάντες ἐδόξαζον τὸν Θεὸν ἐπὶ τῷ γεγονότι. Ἐτῶν γὰρ ἦν πλείονων 22
τεσσαράκοντα ὁ ἄνθρωπος, ἐφ' ὃν ἐγγίνοι το σήμερον τοῦτο τῆς
ἰάσεως.

Ἀπολυθέντες δὲ ἦλθον πρὸς τοὺς ἰδίους, καὶ ἀπήγγειλαν ὅσα πρὸς 23
αὐτοὺς οἱ ἄρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι εἶπον. Οἱ δὲ ἀκούσαντες, ὁμο- 24
θυμαδὸν ᾤον φωνήν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, καὶ εἶπον· Δέσποτα, σὺ ὁ Θεὸς
ὁ ποιήσας τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν, καὶ πάντα τὰ
x Psal. 2. 1.
ἐν αὐτοῖς· * ὁ διὰ στόματος Δαυὶδ τοῦ παιδὸς σου, εἰπόν· Ἴνα τί 25
ἐφρούραζαν ἔθνη, καὶ λαοὶ ἐμελέτησαν κενά; παρῆ- 26
στησαν οἱ βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς, καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες συνή-
χθησαν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ, κατὰ τοῦ Κυρίου, καὶ κατὰ
τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ. Συνήχθησαν γὰρ ἐπ' ἀληθείας ἐπὶ τὸν 27

19. *ei dikaiou, &c.*] Of this sentiment see several examples from the Classical writers in Recons. Synop. One must here suffice, where Plato makes Socrates similarly address his judges: *πέισμαι τῷ Θεῷ μᾶλλον ἢ ἑμῖν.* On this subject see a learned dissertation in vol. ii. pp. 596—604. of the *Novus Thesaurus Theologico-Criticus*, (appended to the *Critici Sacri*), entitled “De limitibus obsequii humani;” in which is well traced out the true limits which bound the duty either way, and practical directions are given for the use of the maxim “to obey God rather than man.”

20. *οὐ δυνάμεθα* i. e. “We cannot [consistent-ly with what is right and just;]” or, “we cannot bring ourselves to do it.” So Papinian cited by Wets., “nam quæ facta lædunt pietatem, nec facere nos posse credendum est.” This, it may be noticed, is one of those few passages in which two negatives do not strengthen the negation, but have an affirmative force. See Matth. Gr. Gr. § 601. Butt. Gr. p. 261, and Win. Gr. p. 159, who account for it on the principle that the negatives belong to two different verbs. But, in a case like the present, that explains nothing. It is better to say that the two negatives belong, strictly speaking, to two different clauses, and are suspended on finite verbs, or Infinitives, either expressed or understood, as in *οὐδέεις* (sub. *ἐσσι*) *ὅστις οὐ παύσεται*. In a case where an Infinitive occurs, the Infin. depends upon *ὄσπερ*, or *εἰς* τὸ understood. The ancient Syriac translator well expresses the two clauses by rendering, “We have not power, that we should not speak what we have seen and heard.” The *ἡμῖς* just before is emphatic, q. d. “We, for our parts,” &c.

21. *μηδὲν εὐρίσκοντες τὸ πῶς, &c.*] There is here an anomaly of construction, in discussing which, the Commentators differ. Some think there is an ellipse of *αἰτίου*, which is expressed in Luke xxiii. 14. Others avoid the ellip. by taking *μηδὲν* for *μὴ*, and *πῶς* for *ὅπως*, regarding the *τὸ* as only indicating the following sentence, and consequently pleonastic. But it is better to admit the ellip. than admit such a harshness. So Prof. Dobree renders, “finding no witnesses.” Thus the words following *τὸ πῶς, &c.*, may be considered as exegetical and further evolving the sense.

But the *πῶς* is *not* (as some suppose) in apposition with *μηδὲν*, but depends upon *κατὰ* or *εἰς* understood. Nor does the *τὸ* belong to the *πῶς*, but to the whole sentence following; for the words *τὸ πῶς* — *αὐτοὺς* form grammatically a separate clause. *Διὰ τὸν λαόν* belong (there being a transposition) to *ἀπέλυσαν αὐτούς*. I have pointed accordingly.

23. *τοὺς ἰδίους* i. e. “their associates,” the other Apostles and the disciples at large; as Acts xxiv. 23. John xv. 19.

24—30. On this passage, Bp. Jebb (Sac. Lit. p. 132. seqq.) truly remarks, “that this noble supplicatory hymn, poured forth at once by the whole Christian people, under the immediate influence of the Holy Spirit, is worthy of that inspiration from whence it flowed.” The learned prelate well points out that vv. 27, 28. form a prophetic quotation of *ἴνα τί* — *αὐτοῖς*. And he rightly refers the *γὰρ* to a clause left to be understood: q. d. This prophecy is now fulfilled, for of a truth, &c. Thus the verses are not, as some imagine, parenthetical.

— *σὺ ὁ Θεός, &c.*] A sublime periphrasis for the *Lord of the universe*, with which Wets. compares Joseph. Ant. iv. 3, 2. *Δέσποτα τῶν ἐπ' οὐρανοῦ τε καὶ γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης.* See also the prayer of Hezekiah, Is. xxxvii. 16—20. Here *εἰς* is to be supplied. In *ἐφρούραζαν* the metaphor is derived from the snorting, and other sounds of impatience and rage, emitted by horses. Of *καὶ ἐμελέτ. κενά* the sense is, “and have formed vain plans.” So a proverb cited by Wets. *κενὰ κειοὶ λογιζονται.*

26. *παρῆστησαν.*] Not, as Kuin. imagines, for *ἀνθέστησαν*. The sense (as the parallelism requires) being “they stood side by side for mutual help.” i. e. they banded together. Of this examples may be seen in Steph. Thes. 4599.

27. *συνήχθησαν γὰρ, &c.*] Here, as Bp. Jebb observes, the heathen, the peoples, the kings of the earth, and the rulers, (that is, all the rebellious personages of the second Psalm), are brought forward, as fulfilling whatsoever it was pre-appointed they should do. The equivalent terms in the prophecy and the declaration of its fulfilment correspond — the Rulers, to Herod — the kings of the earth, to Pontius Pilate — the heathen, to the heathen — the peoples, to the peoples of Israel — the Lord (Jehovah), to the

ἅγιον παιδί σου Ἰησοῦν, ὃν ἔχρισας, Ἡρώδης τε καὶ Πόντιος Πιλάτος, 28 σὺν ἔθνεσι καὶ λαοῖς Ἰσραὴλ, ποιῆσαι ὅσα ἡ χεὶρ σου καὶ ἡ βουλή σου 29 προώρῳσε γενέσθαι. Καὶ τὸ νῦν, Κύριε, ἔπιθε ἐπὶ τὰς ἀπειλὰς αὐτῶν, καὶ δὸς τοῖς δούλοις σου μετὰ παύσησίν σου πάσης λαλεῖν τὸν λόγον σου, 30 ἐν τῷ τὴν χεῖρά σου ἐκτείνειν σε εἰς ἡμῶν, καὶ σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα γί- 31 νεσθαι, διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ ἁγίου παιδός σου Ἰησοῦ. Καὶ δεηθέν- των αὐτῶν ἐσαλεύθη ὁ τόπος ἐν ᾧ ἦσαν συνηγμένοι· καὶ ἐπλήσθησαν ἅπαντες Πνεύματος ἁγίου, καὶ ἐλάλουν τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ μετὰ παύ- ῆσίν σου.

32 Ὡς δὲ πλήθους τῶν πιστευσάντων ἦν ἡ καρδία καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ μία· ὡς *Supra* 2. 44. καὶ οὐδὲ εἰς τὸ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐτῶν ἔλεγεν ἴδιον εἶναι, ἀλλ' ἦν ἀ- 33 τοῖς ἅπαντα κοινά. Καὶ μεγάλη δυνάμει ἀτεδίδουν τὸ μαρτύριον οἱ ἀπόστολοι τῆς ἀκυστίσεως τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ· χάρις τε μεγάλη ἦν 34 ἐπὶ πάντας αὐτούς. οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐνδεής τις ὑπῆρχεν ἐν αὐτοῖς· ὅσοι γὰρ κτήτορες χωρίων ἢ οἰκιῶν ὑπῆρχον, πωλοῦντες ἔφερον τὰς τιμὰς τῶν

holy child Jesus — the Lord's anointed, to "Whom thou hast anointed." From this last parallel the learned Prelate elaborately proves that the holy child Jesus is identified with Jehovah of the second Psalm, and skilfully removes the objections which might occur on a superficial view of the passage, by referring to Psalm xlv. "Thy throne, O God, endureth for ever," and showing that the passages under consideration, and all such like, afford mutual light and support.

I have not ventured to follow several eminent Editors in introducing into the text (from many MSS., Versions, and Fathers) the words ἐν τῷ πόλει ταύτῃ, not so much because, as Bp. Jebb remarks, "they have no equivalent in the prophecy," as because it is very difficult to account for their omission, but very easy for their addition.

28. ποιῆσαι ὅσα, &c.] The sense is: "For the purpose of doing — what? why no other than what thy overruling power and predisposing wisdom pre-determined to be done."

29. The verse is well paraphrased by Bp. Jebb thus: "And, as thy wise counsel pre-determined that, through the confederacy of Jews and Gentiles, of kings and rulers, Christ should suffer; so let the same wise counsel be now made conspicuous, in the undaunted preaching of Christ crucified." At τὰ νῦν sub. κατὰ and ὄντα, also πράγματα. Ἐπίθε, i. e. so look upon their threats, as to ward off their execution.

30. ἐν τῷ τὴν χεῖρά σου ἐκτ.] "while thou art stretching forth thine hand, (i. e. exerting thy power) for healing, and while signs and wonders are performing;" for ἐν τῷ must be repeated.

31. Πνεύματος ἁγίου.] The interpretation of some recent Commentators "filled with sacred ardour" is a mere Unitarian gloss. Yet we need not, and, if the propriety of the Article be considered, we must not take Πν. in its personal sense, with Doddr. and Benson; but suppose, with Bp. Middlet., that it denotes the influence of the Holy Spirit, as communicating special and eminent gifts. Indeed, a sensible illapse is implied.

32. ἦν ἡ καρδία — μία.] A proverbial description of close amity, as in Plutarch: Δὸ φίλοι, ψυχὴ μία. Οὐκ ἔλεγεν ἴδιον, "did not call them his own," or allege that as a reason why his poor brethren were not to be assisted therewith. This shows

that their property was really considered as their own; and consequently that the expression κοινὰ in the words following must be taken with limitation; i. e. that they were common, not by possession, but by use! See Note supra ii. 45.

33. μεγάλη δύναμις.] Wolf, Heine, and Kuin., think that the expression is to be understood only of the power of the Apostles' eloquence, &c. But, although I would not exclude the force of that inartificial, but impressive, eloquence, which, founded in conviction, and supported by the consciousness of Divine favour, would give their words an effect rarely to be found in the most polished oratory; yet I must maintain, that there is chiefly meant in the expression, an allusion to what would, above every thing else, enable them to speak with such effect, — namely, the miracles which they were occasionally enabled to work. In short, the term denotes force as regarded the speakers, and efficacy as respected the hearers.

— χάρις τε — αὐτοῖς.] Some Commentators understand χάρις of the favour of God. Others think, that it has reference to the Jewish people, q. d. "the favour of the people rested upon them." But though this be somewhat confirmed by ii. 47., yet there the interpretation first mentioned seems preferable; because if the αὐτοῖς be referred to the Apostles, it will give a reason for the force and efficacy of their preaching. I am, however, inclined to think that the αὐτοῖς is to be referred to the people at large; χάρις being understood of the grace of the Holy Spirit. So Luke ii. 40. καὶ χάρις Θεοῦ ἦν ἐπ' αὐτό. Indeed, thus alone can the γὰρ of the following clause be accounted for; which Translators and Commentators explain away to mean a mere καὶ. Calvin has alone seen that the γὰρ is, as usual, causæ redditio. Though by understanding χάρις of the favour of the people, he assigns a sense not a little frigid.

34. ὅσοι γὰρ κτήτορες — ὑπῆρχον.] Not, "as many as had;" for it is not πάντες ὅσοι, but "such as had," i. e. some of those who had: the ὅσοι being here, as often, put indefinitely. See Calvin and Heumann. Hence may be corrected an error into which Mr. Hinds has fallen in his valuable History of the Rise and Progress of Christianity, vol. i. p. 213. He understands that "all who had lands and houses sold them, and brought in the

πιπρασκομένων, καὶ εἶθουν παρὰ τοὺς πόδας τῶν ἀποστόλων· διεδί- 35
δοτο δὲ ἐκάστῳ καθότι ἂν τις χρεῖαν εἶχεν.

Ἰωσῆς δὲ, ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς Βαρνάβας ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων, (ὃ ἐστὶ με- 36
θερμηνεύμενον, υἱὸς παρακλήσεως) Λευΐτης, Κύριος τῶ γένει, ὑπάρ- 37
χοτος αὐτῷ ἀγροῦ, πωλήσας ἤνεγκε τὸ χρῆμα, καὶ ἔθηκε παρὰ τοὺς
πόδας τῶν ἀποστόλων. V. Ἄνηρ δὲ τις, Ἀνανίας ὀνόματι, σὺν Σαπ- 1
φείρῃ τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ, ἐπώλησε κτῆμα, καὶ ἐνοσφίσατο ἀπὸ τῆς τι- 2
μῆς, συνειδυίας καὶ τῆς γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐνέγκας μέρος τὶ παρὰ
τοὺς πόδας τῶν ἀποστόλων ἔθηκεν. Εἶπε δὲ Πέτρος· Ἀνανία, διὰ τί 3
ἐπλήρωσεν ὁ Σατανᾶς τὴν καρδίαν σου, ψεύσασθαί σε τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ
ἅγιον, καὶ νοσφίσασθαι ἀπὸ τῆς τιμῆς τοῦ χωρίου; Οὐχὶ μένον, σοὶ 4
ἔμενε, καὶ πραθὲν, ἐν τῇ σῇ ἐξουσίᾳ ὑπῆρχε; Τί ὅτι ἔθου ἐν τῇ
καρδίᾳ σου τὸ πρᾶγμα τοῦτο; οὐκ ἐψεύσω ἀνθρώποις ἀλλὰ τῷ Θεῷ.

amount to the Apostles." And to remove the wonder and objection which this would involve, he supposes that the statement of their bringing in their money to the Apostles, by no means implies that it was in all instances *accepted*. This solution, however, is utterly inadmissible. The fact is, that we are not certain (for we are not told so), nor is it probable, that these proprietors sold *all* their possessions. They would benefit the poor more by holding part in reserve, and giving as need required.

Τίθηναι παρὰ is not merely a phrase signifying to commit to the care of, but, when joined with παρὰ πόδας, implies the *reverence* with which the deposit was made.

36. Λευΐτης.] Though the Levites had, as a tribe, no inheritance, yet they were allowed *individually* to hold landed property. Τὸ χρῆμα, the price, the money; a sense almost confined to the plural, though two examples of the singular are adduced, to which I have, in Recens. Synop., added another.

V. After the undissembled liberality of Barnabas, is recorded an example of the *contrary*, in the case of Ananias and Sapphira, and its termination in their sudden death. The nature of their crime has been by some misconceived, by others too much palliated, and by others again unreasonably exaggerated; but, at the most moderate estimate, it must be regarded, even on principles of natural religion, as a crime of no ordinary magnitude, and such as well merited the punishment with which it was visited; and which was more especially *necessary* in the then state of things, in order to prevent the Christian religion from being discredited by the hypocrisy of worldly-minded professors.

1. ἐνοσφίσατο ἀπὸ τῆς τ.] Sub. μέρος, "appropriated part to his own use." We may notice the force of the middle verb.

2. συνειδυίας.] Sub. τοῦτο. The ellipse is *supplied* in Thucyd. vol. ii. 92. 7. Bek. ξυνιδῶς τοῖς ἐτέροις τὸ ἐπιβούλευμα. The older Commentators esteem the crime *sacrilege*, which was punishable with death: but Mede well distinguishes between the *species facti*, and the *circumstantiæ facti*, — namely, *hypocrisy*, and *desire of vain glory*, &c., which was perhaps the chief motive which tempted them to the offence.

3. ἐπλήρωσεν — τὴν καρδίαν σου.] Many recent

Commentators comparing this with that at v. 4. ἔθου ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου τὸ πρᾶγμα τοῦτο, take it to mean no more than "why was thy heart filled with that diabolical plan?" But this is unjustifiably sinking the *personality* of Satan, and his *power* as well as will to suggest evil thoughts to the minds of men. The two expressions above mentioned are by no means inconsistent; for while the assaults of Satan *incite* men to sin, (and such the best Commentators are agreed is the sense of πληρ. τὴν καρδίαν.) their own natural corruption is sufficient of itself to *suggest* evil thoughts. Nor will there be any thing difficult in the interrogation *ἐὰρτι*, &c., if we consider that the *full* force of πληροῦν τὴν καρδίαν τινός, which is πληροφροσίσθαι, implies (as we know Satan's power is *limited*) such a *yielding* to the temptation as, while it argues the free agency of man, makes him at the same time strictly accountable. ψεύσασθαι signifies to attempt to deceive by a lie; the *attempt* being, as often, put for the *performance*. This offence towards the Apostles involved the same crime towards the *Holy Spirit*, under whose inspiration they acted.

4. μένον] "remained unsold." The participle is to be resolved into a verb and participle. Σοὶ, "at thy disposal." A dative *commodi*. At τί ὅτι sub. γέγονε or ἔστι — for τί ἔστιν ὅτι. The Commentators compare in Aristophanes ὅτι τί δὴ; and in Plato ὅτι δὴ τί; Τιθένοι ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ, or εἰς τὴν καρδίαν signifies to deliberately plan and determine on any thing.

— οὐκ ἐψεύσω — Θεῷ.] From a comparison of this verse with the preceding one [where Ananias is said to have lied against the *Holy Ghost*] as well as several other passages [John iii. 6. compared with 1 John v. 4. Matt. ix. 38. compared with Acts xiii. 4. 2 Tim. iii. 16. with 2 Pet. i. 21. John vi. 45. with 1 Cor. ii. 13. 1 Cor. iii. 16. seqq. with 1 Cor. vi. 19.] Theologians have in all ages inferred that the *Holy Ghost* is *GOD*. Wets., indeed, has remarked that δ θεός with the Article is always confined to *God the Father*. But Bp. Middleton has shown that no such distinction is observed: δ θεός and θεός being used indiscriminately, except where grammatical rules interfere. See also the excellent note of Whitty.

The οὐκ — ἀλλὰ is by most recent Commentators rendered *non tam — quam*; which, however, is not very necessary. Perhaps, however, οὐκ may here be taken for οὐ μόνον, as in Thucyd. iii. 45. where see my Note, and also iv. 92. where

5 Ἀκούων δὲ Ἀνανίας τοὺς λόγους τούτους, πεσὼν ἐξέψυξε. καὶ ἐγένετο
 6 φόβος μέγας ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς ἀκούοντας ταῦτα. Ἀναστάντες δὲ οἱ νεώ-
 7 τεροι συνέστειλαν αὐτὸν, καὶ ἐξενέγκαντες ἔθαψαν. Ἐγένετο δὲ ὡς
 8 ὥρων τριῶν διάστημα, καὶ ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ, μὴ εἰδῆσα τὸ γεγονός, εἰσῆλ-
 9 θεν. Ἀπεκρίθη δὲ αὐτῇ ὁ Πέτρος· Εἰπέ μοι, εἰ τοσούτου τὸ χωρίον
 10 ἀπέδουθε; ἡ δὲ εἶπε· Ναί, τοσούτου. Ὁ δὲ Πέτρος εἶπε πρὸς αὐ-
 11 τήν· Τί ὅτι συνεφωνήθη ὑμῖν πειράσαι τὸ Πνεῦμα Κυρίου; ἰδοὺ, οἱ
 πόδες τῶν θαψάντων τὸν ἄνδρα σου, ἐπὶ τῇ θύρῃ, καὶ ἐξοίσουσί σε.
 12 Ἔπεσε δὲ παραχρῆμα παρὰ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐξέψυξεν· εἰσελ-
 θόντες δὲ οἱ νεανίσκοι εὗρον αὐτὴν νεκρὰν, καὶ ἐξενέγκαντες ἔθαψαν
 11 πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς. Καὶ ἐγένετο φόβος μέγας ἐφ' ὅλην τὴν ἐκκλη-
 σίαν, καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς ἀκούοντας ταῦτα.
 12 Διὰ δὲ τῶν χειρῶν τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐγένετο σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα ἐν τῷ

see Duker. As to the syntax of ἐψέσω, Br. Middl. thinks it strange that it should here be used with the *Dative*, while in the preceding verse it is used with the *Accus.* He seems to suppose, perhaps without reason, there is no other instance of the syntax with the *Dative*. The learned Prelate is, at all events, wrong in regarding the *Dat.* as put for the *Accus.* It is rather put for the *Genit.* with *κατὰ*, which yields a much stronger sense, and hence was used in a connexion which required something stronger. Examples of ψεύδουσα κατὰ τινος and καταψεύδ. τινος may be seen in Steph. Thes. and Wetstein's Note on 1 Cor. xv. 15.

5. ἐξέψυξε.] Supply πνεῦμα. On the atrociousness of Ananias's offence, see Wets. ap. Recens. Synop., and on the justice of his punishment, see Limborch, Biscoe, and Doddr. *ibidem*. The *Rationalists*, indeed, defend the Apostle from the charge of excessive severity—by maintaining (alas for the credulous incredulity of scepticism!) that Ananias and Sapphira died not by a Divine judgment, but of fright!! As if it were likely that so very rare an occurrence should have happened to two persons at once. And that the Apostle did not threaten, nor even allude to Ananias's death, is nothing to the purpose, and admits of being satisfactorily accounted for. See Recens. Synop.

6. οἱ νεώτεροι.] Called at v. 10. οἱ νεανίσκοι, and supposed by Hamm., Mosheim, Heinrichs, and Kuin., to have been Church officers (like our *Sacristans*) appointed to perform various duties; such as sweeping and cleaning the Church, preparing for the Lord's supper and the agapæ, &c. This is, they think, confirmed by νεανίσκοι denoting in Alexandrian Greek *servants*, and is countenanced by the use of the Article. They, however, adduce no *proofs* of the existence of such officers, at so very early a period; though we might have expected some *allusions* at least to them in the works of the Apostolical Fathers. There is, then, no sufficient reason to forsake the common interpretation, which supposes of νεαν. to mean "the younger part of the men present." And thus the Article has great propriety. It seems to have been usual for the younger men of the Christian Church to perform, perhaps in rotation, the more laborious offices in the congregation; which were, at so early a period, not yet appropriated to particular persons,—and consequently the persons performing those

offices were not likely to have any distinctive name of office. Συνέστειλαν, for περιέστειλαν, "wound him up;" namely, either in a winding-sheet laid up in the place, or perhaps, in the present emergency, only in a cloak. This sense of συστέλλειν is very rare, and the Commentators adduce only one example, to which I have added another in Recens. Synop. Burial on the same day was (and still is) usual in the East; and I have in Recens. Synop. shown that the custom was not unknown among the Greeks of the earliest ages, having probably been introduced by the Cadmo-Phœnician colonists.

7. ὡς ὥρων τριῶν διάστημα.] Probably at the next Prayer-time.

8. ἀπεκρίθη δὲ αὐτῇ] "addressed her." Ἀποδόσθαι, to sell. There is not (as Kuin. imagines) in the use of the ἀπὸ any reference to the money to be received as the price, since ἀπὸ merely signifies away. Ἀποδίδωμι of itself only denotes to give up or away; just as does our *sell*, from the Anglo-Saxon *syllan*, to let go. Πᾶλω signifies literally to turn over to another (from παλῶ, to turn), and thus to sell. The Hebrew correspondent term properly denotes to deliver up. Thus the *carpere* of the Latin, and the *caup-γιν*, *caup-an*, and *koop-en* of the Northern languages, signify to take to one's self, to buy; and the German *ver-kaufen*, the contrary, namely to give up to another, to sell.

—τοσούτου] "for such a sum [as your husband says]."

9. πειράσαι τὸ Πνεῦμα Κ.] i. e. to try whether the Spirit of God would detect your hypocrisy and fraud.

—οἱ πόδες τῶν θαψ.] The Commentators regard this as a Hebraism, for οἱ θάψαντες; the Hebrews often expressing a man by some member of his body instrumental to some action in question. I have, however, shown in Recens. Synop. (by references to Eurip. Hipp. 657. Orest. 1205. Suppl. 90. and Herc. Fur.) that this idiom is found among the Greek Classical writers, though, I believe, confined to the *Poets*. See Note on Rom. x. 15.

—καὶ ἐξοίσουσί σε.] This does not contain a threat, much less (as Porphyry represents) an imprecation, but a prediction, i. e. "will carry thee out." The same Holy Spirit which revealed to Peter the fraud, made known the punishment which would follow it.

12. διὰ τῶν χειρῶν τῶν ἀπ.] i. e. by the Apostles.

λαῶν πολλά. καὶ ἦσαν ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἅπαντες ἐν τῇ στοᾷ Σολομῶνος· τῶν δὲ λοιπῶν οὐδεὶς ἐτόλμα κολλᾶσθαι αὐτοῖς. ἀλλ' ἐμεγάλυνεν αὐ- 13 τοὺς ὁ λαός· (μᾶλλον δὲ προσετίθεντο πιστεύοντες τῷ Κυρίῳ, πλήθη 14 ἰνδρῶν τε καὶ γυναικῶν) ὥστε κατὰ τὰς πλατείας ἐκφέρειν τοὺς ἄσθε- 15 νεῖς, καὶ τιθέναι ἐπὶ κλινῶν καὶ κρηβάτων, ἵνα ἐρχομένου Πέτρου κῆν ἡ σκιὰ ἐπισκιάσῃ τιτὲ αὐτῶν. Συνήρχετο δὲ καὶ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν 16 περίξ πόλεων εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, φέροντες ἄσθενεῖς καὶ ὄχλουμένους ὑπὸ πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων· οὗτινες ἐθεραπεύοντο ἅπαντες.

Ἀριστὰς δὲ ὁ ὄρχηζεύς καὶ πάντες οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ, ἧ οὕσα αἴρεσις 17

12 — 14. καὶ ἦσαν ὁμοθυμαδὸν, &c.] In this passage there is an appearance of contradiction, or, at least, discrepancy in some things here said, and a seeming incoherence in the clauses respectively; to obviate which various methods have been adopted. Some, considering the passage as incurably corrupt, propose to cancel the whole. But before we resort to so desperate a course, let us consider whether it be absolutely necessary. Many Editors and Commentators place the latter part of ver. 12. καὶ ἦσαν, &c. and the whole of vv. 13 & 14 in a parenthesis. Yet that (as Zeigler and Beck have shown) is contrary to the laws of parenthesis observed by the ancients, and is of too violent and arbitrary a nature to be admitted. Others (as Bp. Sherlock, Dr. A. Clarke, and Mr. Townsend) attempt to remove the difficulty by transposing the verses and clauses thus: v. 14, v. 12. 2d clause; v. 13, v. 12. 1st clause, v. 15. But though "transposition of words is (as Porson observes) the safest of all modes of conjectural emendation," a transposition of clauses and sentences very remote from each other, is a sort of emendation the most licentious, being nearly the same as re-writing a passage. And as, in the present case, the transpositions are of the most violent kind, and wholly unsupported by any evidence, external or internal (for how could the passage have been so transposed, and the transposition been transmitted to all the MSS. and Versions?), the method in question must therefore by no means be thought of. Nor is there, I apprehend, any thing so inextricably confused in the passage as it now stands; which is of a similar kind to those at i. 11. ii. 1, 44. (see also xii. 20), in all of which the expression εἶναι ὁμοθυμαδὸν denotes the meeting together for public worship. And here the words ἅπαντες and ἐν τῇ στοᾷ Σολ. are added, because now that the believers were become so very numerous, they could no longer hold any general assemblies for divine worship in the ὑπερῶνον, which they had before occupied, but were obliged to resort to the portico of the Temple here mentioned. Of course, by ἅπαντες are meant the Christians at large; not, as some have thought, the Apostles. And as τῶν λοιπῶν is opposed to ἅπαντες, it must denote (as Whitby and Doddr. explain) the rest of the worshippers, i. e. those who were not Christians. They, it is said, did not venture κολλᾶσθαι, i. e. (as the term, from the context, must mean) προσερχομαι, to approach or come near them, whether for interference, or otherwise. This view of the sense is supported by the authority of the Pesch. Syr. Version, and that of Œcumenius, who explains the word by προσγγίεν. That κολλᾶσθαι and προσερχομαι are synonymous terms, is plain from x. 28. ἀθέμετον ἴσθιν ἀνδρὶ Ἰουδαίῳ

κολλᾶσθαι ἢ προσερχοσθαι, &c. where see Note. The reason for this may be explained from the awe which, we find from what precedes, had struck the people at the miracles that had been worked.

The next words ἀλλ' ἐμεγάλ. αὐτοὺς ὁ λαός may be rendered, "But the people at large (as opposed to the Rulers) held them in great reverence." Ver. 14 is (as Griesb., Knapp, and Gratz have seen) parenthetical, and meant to show that this awe or respect had, in some cases, induced them to join the Christian society. The sense is, "And believers in the Lord were more and more added." The ὥστε, of course, connects with ἐμεγάλυνεν, meaning that such was the reverence of the people, that, &c.

15. ἐπὶ κλινῶν καὶ κρ.] Since the latter term denotes a small and mean couch, the former a larger and better one, like our sofa; we see that persons of all classes alike resorted to the Apostles for aid.

— ἵνα ἐρχομένου — αὐτῶν.] The approval of this action, which was a superstitious one (as implying that the power of healing was inherent in the Apostles, and not, as it really was, adventitious, and procured at their prayers,) is not to be inferred, even if it were true (which, however, is disputed by most Commentators) that the persons in question were healed; for that would be procured by their faith, without the intervention of the Apostles. However, from what is said in the next verse and xix. 12, it seems (as Kuin. admits) highly probable that many, if not all the persons in question were healed, at least where the faith was strong enough to qualify them for that mercy. And in such a case the superstition would be forgiven, and the faith accepted.

16. συνήρχετο τὸ πλῆθος τῶν περίξ πόλεων.] The common version cannot be tolerated, since it passes over the Article, and supposes a harsh ellipsis of ἀπό. Render: "The bulk of the population (or, as Wakef. renders, "the numerous inhabitants of") the surrounding cities flocked to Jerusalem." At περίξ there is an ellipse of κειμένων or the like, common to all languages; though sometimes the complete expression occurs.

— ὄχλ.] See Note on the kindred phraseology at Luke vi. 18. It is plain that the δαμονίους are distinguished from the sick.

17. ἀναστῆς.] This is regarded by De Dieu and Kuin. as a Hebrew pleonasm; while Casaub. and Heum., more rightly, take it for διεγερθεῖς, i. e. κινήθεις scil. ἐπὶ τοῖς γινόμενοις. In the words following it is implied, though not expressly said, that the High Priest was a Sadducee. And that some of the High Priests (as well as most persons of high rank) were such, we learn from Josephus. Σὺν αὐτῷ seems to be for μετ' αὐτοῦ, denoting to

18 τῶν Σαδδουκαίων, ἐπλήσθησαν ζήλου, καὶ ἐπέβαλον τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν
 19 ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀποστόλους, καὶ ἔθεντο αὐτοὺς ἐν τηρήσει δημοσίᾳ. Ἄγγελος
 20 δὲ Κυρίου διὰ τῆς νυκτὸς ἤνοιξε τὰς θύρας τῆς φυλακῆς, ἐξαγαγὼν
 21 αὐτοὺς εἶπε· Πορευέσθε καὶ σταθέντες λαλεῖτε ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τῷ λαῷ
 22 πάντα τὰ ῥήματα τῆς ζωῆς ταύτης. Ἀκούσαντες δὲ εἰσῆλθον ὑπὸ
 τὸν ὄρθρον εἰς τὸ ἱερόν, καὶ ἐδίδασκον. Παραγεγόμενος δὲ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς
 καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ, συνεκάλεσαν τὸ συνέδριον καὶ πῦσαν τὴν γερουσίαν
 τῶν νῶν Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ ἀπίστευαν εἰς τὸ δεσμοτήριον ἀχθῆναι αὐτούς.
 23 Οἱ δὲ ὑπηρέται παραγεγόμενοι οὐκ εὔρον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ·
 24 ἀνωστρέφαντες δὲ ἀπήγγειλαν, λέγοντες· Ὅτι τὸ μὲν δεσμοτήριον
 εὔρομεν κεκλεισμένον ἐν πάσῃ ἀσφαλείᾳ, καὶ τοὺς φύλακας [ἔξω]
 24 ἐστῶτας πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν· ἀνοίξαντες δὲ, ἔσω οὐδένα εὔρομεν. Ὡς
 δὲ ἤκουσαν τοὺς λόγους τούτους ὁ τε ἱερεὺς καὶ ὁ στρατηγὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ
 25 καὶ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς, διηπόρουν περὶ αὐτῶν, τί ἂν γένοιτο τοῦτο. Πιμα-
 γεγόμενος δὲ τις ἀπήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς [λέγων·] Ὅτι ἰδοὺ, οἱ ἄνδρες
 οὗς ἔθεσθε ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ εἰσὶν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, ἐστῶτες καὶ διδάσκοντες
 26 τὸν λαόν. Τότε ἀπελθὼν ὁ στρατηγὸς σὺν τοῖς ὑπηρέταις, ἤγαγεν
 αὐτούς, οὐ μετὰ βίας, (ἐφοβοῦντο γὰρ τὸν λαόν) ἵνα μὴ λιθασθῶσιν.

be of any one's party. See iv. 13. and Note. Some, however, take it to denote those who were his colleagues in his official duties, or of council with him. But as those could not be many, the *πάρις* seems to exclude that view. *Ἀίρεσις* denotes properly a *taking up any thing*, as a *choice*, or an *opinion*; 2. the *opinion* so taken up; 3. as here, the *party maintaining it*, in which sense it often occurs in the later Classical writers, especially the Philosophers. *Ζῆλος* here denotes a combined feeling of *envy*, *malice*, and *wrath*, on the cause of which see iv. 2. and Note. *Ζῆλος* is not derived from *ζέω* and *λιαν*, as Mr. Valpy supposes: the *λος* is a mere *termination*, of which there are numerous examples. The *η*, as in *βηλός*, *βέβηλος*, and many other words, is formed by *crasis* from the vowel of the root and the *ε* of the termination; for the real termination is — *ελος*, as in *βελος*, *μέλος*, *πέλος*, &c. which seem to have been at first exclusively *adjectival*.

18. ἐν τηρήσει δημοσίᾳ is for εἰς τέρησιν δημ., as supra iv. 13., where see Note. Wakef. wrongly renders, "a common prison," not aware that the *absence* of the Article is no proof that *τηρήσει* is not taken κατ' ἔξοχην, such nouns being often, as Br. Middlet. has shown, vi. 1., anarthrous. Though the learned Prelate does not say in *what cases*, or *why* they are so. It should seem that they are so when the substances designated are things of frequent use, and requiring often to be mentioned. In such a case the Article is *omitted*, because it may be *readily understood*, as in our own language perpetually.

19. ἄγγελος δὲ Κυρίου.] Render "an angel."

20. σταθέντες λαλ.] Beza and Kuin. regard σταθ. as a Hebrew pleonasm, and Grot. thinks it has reference to *constancy*. But it rather seems to be a forensic term, used of those who are *set up to speak*, either as orators and advocates, or as prisoners pleading their own cause. See Acts xvii. 22. xxv. 13.

— τῆς ζωῆς ταύτης] "of this doctrine or religion which leads to salvation." So John vi. 63. ῥήματα

ζωῆς αἰωνίου. See vii. 33. There may, however, as Kuin. thinks, be an *hyperallage*, as in Acts xiii. 26. Compare Rom. vii. 24.

21. ὑπὸ τὸν ὄρθρον] "about day-break." So Thucyd. has ὑπὸ τὴν ἑω. On ὄρθ. see my Note on Thucyd. iii. 112. Τὴν γερουσίαν is supposed to have been added, to explain to foreigners the true meaning of τὸ συνέδριον. That word, however, was so commonly in use with the Greeks, that it could need no explanation. It should rather seem that *γερουσίαν* is added, because the term was especially applied to the Sanhedrim; and so it occurs in Philo and Josephus, though it is also used by Dionys. Hal. to express the Latin *Senatus*.

23. ἐν πάσῃ ἀσφ.] for σὺν πάσῃ ἀσφ., an adverbial phrase for the adverb ἀσφαλεστάτως. Ἐξω is omitted in many MSS., Versions, and early Edd., and is cancelled by almost every Editor from Wets. downwards.

24. ὁ ἱερεὺς.] Taken κατ' ἔξοχην for the High Priest, as in Heb. v. 6., and sometimes in the Sept. and Josephus. By οἱ ἀρχ. are meant the 24 Heads of the sacerdotal classes. See Note on Matth. ii. 4. On στρατηγὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ see Note on iv. 1.

— τί ἂν γένοιτο τ.] On the sense of these words Commentators are not agreed. Many render "quoniam hoc evasurum esset;" others, "quomodo hoc factum fuerit." But no proof has been adduced that such a sense is contained in the words; which are, I conceive, best rendered by Grot., Wets., and Valckn., "quid hoc esset rei," being a popular form of expression, importing, "did not know what to think of," which is expressive of wonder at some circumstances connected with any thing; as, for instance, the *means*, *manner*, or *event* of it. So x. 17. διεπύρει τί ἂν εἴη τὸ ὄραμα.

26. ἵνα μὴ λιθ.] According to the punctuation and construction adopted by all the Editors and Commentators, ἵνα μὴ λιθ. is suspended on εφοβοῦντο. But that involves an unprecedented harshness of syntax; φοβέσθαι being often construed

Ἐπιθρονοῦντες δὲ αὐτοὺς ἔστησαν ἐν τῷ συνεδρίῳ· καὶ ἐπρωτότησεν αὐτοὺς 27
 z Supra 4 18. ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς, ἔλεγον· Οὐ παραγγεῖλια παρηγγεῖλαμεν ὑμῖν μὴ διδάσκειν 28
 ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι τούτῳ; καὶ ἰδοὺ, πεπληρώκατε τὴν Ἱερουσαλὴμ τῆς
 α Supra 4. 19. διδασχῆς ὑμῶν, καὶ βούλεσθε ἐπαγαγεῖν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς τὸ αἷμα τοῦ ἀνθρώ-
 που τούτου. Ἐπεκρίθη δὲ ὁ Πέτρος καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι εἶπον· 29
 b Supra 2. 24. & 3. 15. Πειθαρχεῖν δεῖ Θεῷ μᾶλλον ἢ ἀνθρώποις. Ὁ Θεὸς τῶν πατέρων 30
 ἡμῶν ἤγειρεν Ἰησοῦν, ὃν ὑμεῖς διεχειρίσασθε κρεμάσαντες ἐπὶ ξύλου·
 c Heb. 2. 10. Luke 24. 47. d John 15. 26, 27. Τούτου ὁ Θεὸς ἀρχηγὸν καὶ σωτήρα ὕψωσε τῇ δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ, δοῦναι 31
 μετανοίαν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ἕφεσιν ἀμωριῶν· καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐσμεν αὐτοῦ 32
 μάρτυρες τῶν ἡμεμάτων τούτων, καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα δὲ τὸ ἅγιον, ὃ ἔδωκεν
 ὁ Θεὸς τοῖς πειθαρχοῦσιν αὐτῷ.

Οἱ δὲ ἀκούσαντες διεπίοντο, καὶ ἐβουλεύοντο ἀνελεῖν αὐτούς. Ἐνα- 33
 στάς δὲ τις ἐν τῷ συνεδρίῳ Φαρισαῖος, ὀνόματι Γαμαλιήλ, νομοδιδύ- 34

with *μὴ*, but never with *ἵνα μὴ*. And though some MSS. omit the *ἵνα*, that is but cutting the knot, which may be untied by simply placing *ἐφοβ. γὰρ τὸν λαὸν* in a parenthesis.

28. *παρηγγεῖλαμεν.*] See Note on iv. 17. Pearce, Rosenm., and Kuin. take ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι to mean "respecting this person." But ἐπὶ has never that sense in the N. T., nor, I believe, in the Classical writers. It is plain from many similar passages of the N. T., that ἐπὶ must here denote "resting on the authority of," or "by," in which latter sense ἐν is more usual, and sometimes *no* preposition is found, as Matt. vii. 22. Mark ix. 38. The recent Commentators generally take ὀνόματι as here put *per periphrasin* for *person*. But though this may, in a popular view, be admitted, it is better to suppose the word to signify *authority*, &c. as often elsewhere; and *τοῦτω* to be put, by a common hypallage, for *τοῦτου*. This is required by a kindred passage at Acts iv. 7. ἐν ποίῳ ὀνόματι ἐποιήσατε τοῦτο; thus also in Matt. vii. 22. τῷ σὺν ὀνόματι προφητεῖαν is put for the more usual τῷ ὀνόματι σου. The teaching ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦτω implied, in the *Messiahship* of the person in question, his unjust condemnation, and the accountability of the chief priests for his being put to death.

— *πεπληρώκατε.*] Of this figurative sense of πληρῶ examples are adduced by Wets. Ἐπάγειν ἐπὶ τινα is a phrase denoting *to bring any thing* (always something evil) *upon a person*; and it is used in Demosth. and often in the later writers.

29. εἶπον.] i. e. through the medium of Peter, as is suggested by the use of ἀποκριθεῖς, not ἀποκριθέντες. Thus Kuin. observes, that "in the *Gospels*, too, that is ascribed to many, which properly belongs only to one." See Matt. xv. 15. and Note. This, however, is not confined to the *Scriptures*, but occurs in the *Classical* writers. Thus in Thucyd. iii. 52. we have ἐπελόθοντες ἔλεγον τοιάδε, though the speech was delivered by Astymachus alone.

— *πειθαρχεῖν.*] Used of implicit obedience to the orders of those who exercise authority of any kind. On the sentiment (with which the Commentators compare several from the *Classical* writers) see Note on iv. 19. The reason implied in the preference of the obedience is the same as in a kindred passage of Soph. Antig. 74. Ἐπεὶ πλείων χρόνος "Ὅν δεῖ μ' ἀρῖσκεν τοῖς κάτω (scil. τοῖς Θεοῖς) τῶν ἐνωθέ. Ἐκεῖ γὰρ αἰεὶ κείσονται.

30. *διεχειρίσασθε.*] Διαχειριζομαι in the middle form, but used in a deponent sense, signifies, 1. *to take a business in hand, so as to despatch it*; 2. *to despatch, kill*. This use is only found in the later writers. The earlier ones use διαχρήσασθαι. Ἐξλον denotes, *not a tree, but a post, gibbet, cross*, as x. 39. Gal. iii. 13. It properly signifies a hewn log. So Artemid. Onir. iv. 33. ἐπάδηγν τὴν κεφαλὴν ξέλω.

31. *ἀρχηγὸν καὶ σωτήρα.*] These words are in apposition with τοῦτον, and *μου*, with Kuin. be regarded as put for εἰς ἀρχ. or εἰς τὸ εἶναι. But it is rather for ὡς ἀρχ.; for though apposition is generally employed to supply something for the completion of a definition, it often contains (as Matthiæ Gr. Gr. § 433 observes) not so much an *explanation*, or *fuller determination* of the former, as the *design* of it. See Thucyd. i. 1835.

— *δοῦναι, &c.*] "to be the means of producing repentance, [by his doctrine,] and effecting remission of sins by his all-atoning merits and blood." Comp. ix. 18.

32. τῶν ἡμεμάτων.] Many of the best Commentators take ἡμ. for πραγμάτων, by Hebraism, as referred to the things mentioned at vv. 30 & 31. Others take ἡμ. to denote the ῥήματα τῆς ζωῆς at v. 20; which is preferable, especially as the *doctrines* implied the things. Καὶ—δέ, "quin imo, nay too." At τοῖς πενθοῦσιν there is not (as Kuin. imagines) an ellipse of ἡμῖν, the ἡμῖν being suppressed through modesty.

33. *διεπίοντο.*] Διαπρ. signifies properly *to be sawn through*. Here almost all the best Commentators are agreed that the sense is, "were filled with fury, and, as it were, gnashed their teeth;" a metaphor taken from gnashing the teeth, as one *drives a saw*. Indeed, from the more fully worded expression at vii. 54. διεπίοντο ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν, καὶ ἔβρυχον τοὺς ὀδόντας ἐπ' αὐτῶν, it is plain that there can only be a *metaphor*. After all, our common version, "were cut to the heart," may be tolerated, if it be understood to represent the combined effects of being *stung to the heart* with the just reproaches cast at them, and being *filled with rage and fury* at their accusers. So Plautus Bacch. cited by Steph. Thes. in v. "Heu cor meum finditur. Istius hominis ubi quoque fit mentio?"

34. Γαμαλιήλ.] A frequent name among the Jews; though the Commentators are very much agreed, that this was the celebrated Gamaliel,

σκαλος, τίμιος παντὶ τῷ λαῷ, ἐκέλευσεν ἕξω βραχὺ τι τοὺς ἀποστόλους
 35 ποιῆσαι, εἶπε τε πρὸς αὐτούς· Ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλίται, προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς
 36 ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τούτοις τί μέλλετε πράσσειν. Ἰπρὸ γὰρ τούτων
 τῶν ἡμερῶν ἀνέστη Θεουδᾶς, λέγων εἶναι τινα ἑαυτὸν, ᾧ † προσεκολλήθη
 ἀριθμὸς ἀνδρῶν ὡσεὶ τετρακοσίων· ὃς ἀηρέθη, καὶ πάντες ὅσοι
 37 ἐπείθοντο αὐτῷ διελύθησαν καὶ ἐγένοντο εἰς οὐδέν. Μετὰ τοῦτον
 ἀνέστη Ἰούδας ὁ Γαλιλαῖος ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς ἀπογραφῆς, καὶ ἀπέ-
 στησε λαὸν ἱκανὸν ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ· κακείνος ἀπώλετο, καὶ πάντες ὅσοι
 38 ἐπείθοντο αὐτῷ διεσκορπίσθησαν. Καὶ τὰ νῦν λέγω ὑμῖν· ἀπόστητε
 ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τούτων, καὶ ἄσαστε αὐτούς· ὅτι ἐὰν ἡ ἕξ ἀνθρώ-
 39 πων ἢ βουλή αὕτη ἢ τὸ ἔργον τοῦτο, καταλυθήσεται· εἰ δὲ ἐκ Θεοῦ

son of Simon and grandson of Hillel, and Paul's master.

— ἐκέλευσεν — ἀποστόλους.] Wakef. renders, "bade the Apostles to stay without a little while," — supposing, with Krebs, an ellipsis of ἑαυτοῦς, also, I find adopted lately by Dr. Burton. And indeed this may seem supported by iv. 15. But the ellipsis would be exceedingly harsh, the construction unprecedented, and the sense thence arising jejune. There is really no fault in our common version, except that the idiomatical ἐκέλευσε, which only means *counselled, exhorted*, is translated without any regard to, perhaps in forgetfulness of that idiom; which is the more excusable, since it did not occur to one so conversant with the Classics as was Wakefield, though it is frequent in Thucyd. and other of the best writers. Ἐξω ποιῆσαι, "to remove," is used according to that idiom by which ποιεῖν is employed with various adverbs of place, as ἔσω, ἕξω, ἐντὸς, πῶρρω, by an ellipse of some verb of motion in the infinitive.

35. προσέχετε — πράσσειν.] The construction is, προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς, τί μέλλετε πράσσειν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀνθρ. τ. Examples of this use of ἐπὶ (concerning) τινι after πράσσειν, are adduced by Wets.

36. Θεουδᾶς.] This cannot be the Theudas mentioned by Joseph. Ant. xx. 5, 1, as leader of an insurrection, and destroyed, with all his forces, by Fadus the Procurator; for that took place before the time of Gamaliel's speech. This difficulty some (as Abp. Usher, Capellus, Bp. Pearce, and Wets.) attempt to remove, by supposing the Theudas of St. Luke to be the same with the Judas of Josephus Ant. xvii. 12, 5, who raised an insurrection a little after the time of Herod the First, but was defeated and put to death. And they compare a similar interchange of the names Judas and Thaddæus. This, however, is wholly gratuitous, and by no means probable. It is better (with Scaliger, Casaubon, Camer., Lightfoot, Grot., Hamm., Krebs, Whitby, Doddr., Lardn., Rosenm., and Kuin.) to suppose, on the authority of Origen contra Cels. i. 6, p. 44, that there were two persons of the name of Theudas; though they are not quite agreed as to the period of the insurrection of the first Theudas. The second they suppose to have been son or grandson of the first, who again brought together his scattered adherents. Yet, as Dr. Lardner observes, there were several persons of the same name who were leaders of insurrections within no very long time: four Simons within 40 years, and three Judas' within 10. And as the references in Wets. show that the name Theudas was by no means an un-

common one, there is no occasion to suppose the second to have been a son of the first. Indeed, considering the case of the Simons and Judas, may we not suspect that some of the succeeding demagogues took the name of their predecessors, though not related to them? as knowing how efficient a name, in such cases, always is. From the small number of adherents mentioned (namely 400) it is plain that the insurrection of the first Theudas was not of any great consequence, and therefore was passed over by Josephus.

— λέγων εἶναι τινα ἕ.] Τινα for μέγαν, by an idiom common to both ancient and modern languages. Notwithstanding the custom of Editors, it should seem that τις in this sense is wrongly made an enclitic. It ought to retain its accent, being too insignificant to either lose or incline its accent. Instead of προσεκολλήθη some few good MSS. and Versions have προσεκλήθη, which is preferred by Mor., Hemsterh., Valckn., Schleus., and Kuin., as being too rare a word to have come from the scribes, and therefore changed into one more common. But the scribes rarely changed at all. The changes in the MSS. of the N. T. are chiefly from the ancient Critics, who frequently alter common words to more elegant ones, but very rarely the reverse. And when we consider that προσκολληθῆναι is of frequent occurrence both in the O. and N. T. (even in this Book), and that προσκλίνεσθαι occurs not once, there can be little doubt but that προσεκλήθη proceeded from the Alexandrian Critics, especially as it only occurs in six MSS. of the Alexandrian class. That the framers of the Versions read προσεκλήθη is by no means certain; for they may, as often, have translated liberally.

— διελύθησαν.] Διαλύεσθαι is often used of the *disbanding* of an army, or the *dispersion* of a multitude.

37. τῆς ἀπογραφῆς.] See Note on Luke ii. 1. Ἀπέστησε, "drew away into insurrection;" a signification frequent in the Classical writers from Herodot. downwards, but never, I believe, there used with ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ after it.

38. τὰ νῦν.] Sub. ὄντα and πράγματα. Ἀπόστητε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων is, as at Acts xvii. 29, a euphemism for "put them not to death, nor maltreat them." This signification of the word is said by Markl. to be peculiar to Luke. But something like it occurs in Thucyd. ii. 47. αὐτῶν ἀπέστησαν. With the present passage Pric. compares a very similar one in Diog. Laert. Μὴ ἀποκτείνετε τὸν ἀνθρώπον, ἀλλ', ἐμοὶ πεισθέντες, ἄφ' εἰς τ. — ὅτι ἴαν ᾤ.] With the sentiment see several kindred ones compared in Recens. Synop.

ἔστιν, οὐ δύνασθε καταλύσαι αὐτό· μήποτε καὶ θεομάχοι εὐρεθῆτε. Ἐπέσθησαν δὲ αὐτῷ· καὶ προσκαλεσάμενοι τοὺς ἀποστόλους, δείξαντες 40 παρήγγειλαν μὴ λαλεῖν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ ἀπέλυσαν αὐτούς.
 ° Οἱ μὲν οὖν ἐπορεύοντο χαίροντες ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ συνεδρίου, ὅτι 41 ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ κατηξιώθησαν ἀτιμασθῆναι· πᾶσάν τε ἡμέραν 42 ἐν τῷ ἑρῶ καὶ κατ' οἶκον οὐκ ἐπαύοντο διδάσκοντες καὶ εὐαγγελιζόμενοι Ἰησοῦν τὸν Χριστόν.

e Matt. 5. 10,
11, 12.
Rom. 5. 3.
Phil. 1. 29
James 1. 2.
1 Pet. 4. 13.

VI. ἘΝ δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις πληθύνοντων τῶν μαθητῶν, ἐγένετο 1 γογγυσμὸς τῶν Ἑλληνιστῶν πρὸς τοὺς Ἑβραίους, ὅτι παρεθωρουῖντο ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ τῇ καθημερινῇ αἱ χῆραι αὐτῶν. Προσκαλεσάμενοι 2 δὲ οἱ δώδεκα τὸ πλῆθος τῶν μαθητῶν, εἶπον· Οὐκ ἀρεστόν ἐστιν ἡμᾶς καταλείψαντας τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, διακονεῖν τραπέζις. Ἐπι- 3 σκέψασθε οὖν, ἀδελφοί, ἄνδρες ἐξ ἡμῶν μαρτυρουμένους ἐπὶ πλήρει Πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ σοφίας, οὓς * καταστήσομεν ἐπὶ τῆς χρείας ταύτης.

39. μήποτε καὶ θεομ. εὐρ.] It is not agreed whether these words connect with *ἴσατε*, &c., (as Pric., Hamm., Valckn., and Markl. maintain), or whether there be (as Camer., Beza, Grot., and Kuin. suppose) an ellipse of *ἔρατε*. The latter is confirmed by a *plena locutio* at Luke xxi. 34. Yet the former is the more natural construction, and is espoused by Professor Dobree.

41. χαίροντες.] This is to be construed with *ὅτι ὑπὲρ*, &c. In *κατηξιώθησαν ἀτιμασθῆναι* Casaub. notices the elegant use of the figure *Oxymoron*, which arises when two ideas, repugnant to each other are so joined as not to be really repugnant; but only to seem so. Of this examples are adduced by Wets.

It must be remarked, that though flagellation was employed both among the Jews and Romans for even small delinquencies, yet it was considered a most ignominious punishment.

42. κατ' οἶκον.] This, as it is opposed to *ἐν τῷ ἑρῶ*, plainly signifies *in private houses*; κατ' οἶκον being put in a generic sense, for κατ' οἴκουσ, *from house to house*; since κατὰ here exerts a distributive force; though it is not perceptible in Acts xx. 20. *δημοσίᾳ καὶ κατ' οἴκουσ*.

VI. 1. τῶν Ἑλληνιστῶν.] On the persons meant by these *Hellenists*, the Commentators are not agreed. Some think they were Greek *Proselytes to Judaism*, and now converted to Christianity. But that view is liable to many objections, which are stated in Recens. Synop. It is better, with the greater part and the more eminent of the Commentators, ancient and modern, to suppose that they were *foreign Jews*, whose residence was in Grecian cities, and who consequently ordinarily used the Greek language, but who were occasionally *sojourners* in Judæa. The Ἑβραῖοι were the Jews of Palestine, who spoke what was then called the Hebrew, namely, the Syro-Chaldee.

— παρεθωροῦντο.] The word signifies, 1. to look aside of; 2. to overlook, neglect. Παροῦσι is the term used by the best Classical writers; and παραθεωρῶ occurs, with one or two exceptions, entirely in the later ones. The fault of the neglect in question rested, of course, with the guardians of the poor; who, it is commonly supposed, were persons appointed by the Apostles to attend *in rotation*, or as it might otherwise be con-

venient, to superintend the distribution of the funds for the poor. The best Commentators, however, are of the opinion of Mosheim in his *Comm. de rebus Christianorum ante Constant.* p. 118 & 138, that they were certain persons *always the same*, and all Hebrews, who had hitherto been appointed by the Apostles, but were now to be elected by the people, and that to them were to be added seven persons of the Hellenists. Mosheim and Kuin. think that the whole body of the Jerusalemite Christians was divided into seven divisions, for which there were as many places of public worship; and that hence also *seven persons* were elected for the purpose of taking care of the poor and of strangers, each division choosing one. St. Luke does not, indeed, give a *particular account* of this office, but only touches on the chief heads of early Ecclesiastical history, leaving his readers a most ample field for enlargement, reflection, and conjecture on what is by him so succinctly narrated.

2. οὐκ ἀρεστόν ἐστιν.] “It is not meet or proper;” for by ἀρεστόν the LXX. express the Hebr. טוֹב and יָשָׁר of the Hebr. Our common Version, “it is not *reasonable*,” is not so much improper as obsolete, (for *reasonable*,) though I find it used in Hobbes's *Thucydides*. Τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, “the preaching of the doctrines of the Gospel.” By διακονεῖν τραπέζις is meant, in general, the collection and distribution of the funds to be expended on the support of the poor.

3. ἐπιπέλασθε.] The word properly denotes to *look at, survey*, but here, from the adjunct, to look at *for choice*, to look out; a signification so rare, that not a single example has been adduced. Μαρτυρουμένους, scil. εἶ, “men of good repute.”

— πλήρει Πνεύματος ἁγ. καὶ σοφ.] The sense of Πνεύμ. ἁγ. is exceedingly lowered by many recent foreign Commentators, who take it to denote a *holy ardour*; though, on the other hand, it is raised too high by many old Commentators, who explain it of the *faculty of working miracles*. The maxim *in medio tutissimus ibis* will here, as often, hold good; for the expression must denote the being possessed of those gifts of the Holy Spirit, (some of them supernatural,) which were, in the Apostolic age, vouchsafed to many Christians, and of which St. Paul treats in his Epistles; including, of course, the *graces* of the Holy Spirit,

- 4 ἡμεῖς δὲ τῇ προσευχῇ καὶ τῇ διακονίᾳ τοῦ λόγου προσαναρτήσομεν.
 5 [†] Καὶ ἤρρεσεν ὁ λόγος ἐνώπιον παντὸς τοῦ πλήθους· καὶ ἐξελέξατο [†]Infra 8. 5, 26.
 6 Στέφανον, ἄνδρα πλήρη πίστεως καὶ ἰσχύος ἁγίου, καὶ Φίλιππον, & 21. 8.
 7 καὶ Πρόχορον, καὶ Νικάνορα, καὶ Τίμων, καὶ Παρμενῆαν, καὶ Νικό-
 8 λαον προσήλυτον Ἀντιοχείας, οὓς ἔστησαν ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀποστόλων· καὶ
 9 προσεζάμενοι ἐπέθηκαν αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας. Καὶ ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ
 10 ἤϋθανε, καὶ ἐπληθύνετο ὁ ὄμιθμος τῶν μαθητῶν ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ σφόδρα,
 11 πολὺς τε ὄχλος τῶν ἱερέων ὑπήκουον τῇ πίστει.
 12 8 ΣΤΕΦΑΝΟΣ δὲ πλήρης † πίστεως καὶ δυνάμεως ἐποίει τέρατα καὶ
 13 σημεῖα μεγάλα ἐν τῷ λαῷ. Ἀρέστησαν δὲ τινες τῶν ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς
 14 τῆς λεγομένης Λιβερτινῶν, καὶ Κυρηναίων καὶ Ἀλεξανδρείων, καὶ τῶν

so suitable to the situation of the persons in question. By *σοφία* seems to be denoted not merely *divine* wisdom (or knowledge of the Scriptures), but *human* wisdom, which was equally necessary for the proper discharge of the office; namely, sound judgment, prudence, and knowledge of business. That the persons were called to exercise an *ecclesiastical* as well as a secular office, is clear, — 1. from the expression *ἰσχύος ἁγίου*. 2. from their being ordained by the laying on of hands, which points at an *ecclesiastical* rather than secular office. 3. from the *fact*, that some of those who were appointed, exercised spiritual functions — as *Stephen*. *Καταστήσομεν*, instead of the common reading *καταστήσωμεν*, is found in many good MSS., some Fathers and Versions, and nearly all the early Edd.; and is received by almost every Editor from Wets. downwards. *Χρεία*s simply means business — so *negotii* in the Vulg. and Syr. Versions. It is, however, implied to be of importance; and, therefore, *Steph.* Thes. renders it *necessario muneri*, in which sense there is an example in *Joseph*. Bell. i. 11. 4.

4. *προσκαρτ.*] See Note on i. 14. By *προσευχῇ* may be denoted not only *prayer*, but religious meditation, as preparatory to the discharge of the ministerial duties just afterwards mentioned.

5. *ἤρρεσεν* — *πλήθους*.] This is a Hellenistic phrase, nowhere found in the Classical writers, but formed on the model of the Hebrew יָרַרָרָ. So Deut. i. 23. 2 Sam. iii. 36. The Greeks would have said *ἤρρεσεν παντὶ τῷ πλήθει*.

— *προσήλυτον*.] On the absence of the Article before this word see Prof. Stuart ap. Win. Gr. Gr. p. 60. I cannot, however, agree with him in thinking that *προσήλυτος* denotes *office*, *station*, or *employment*. In that case the *Article* would by no means be *requisite*: and with the Article, it would designate *Nicolaus* as *well known* from that circumstance; which is not likely to have been the case. Besides, the close connection of *προσ.* with *ἄντ.* shows that the sense is “a proselyte of Antioch.”

6. *ἐπέθηκαν αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας*.] Selden and Wolf deduce the origin of laying on hands from the age of Moses, adverting to the seven *Seniores*, on whom Moses laid his hands (Num. xvii. 13.). Hence the custom obtained in the Jewish Church, and was thence introduced into the Christian. As laying on of hands had always been used in praying for the good of any person present, in order to show, *δεικτικῶς*, for whom the benefit was entreated; so it was also, from the earliest ages, a rite of institution to office, which it conferred by *symbol*.

7. *πολὺς τε ὄχλος τῶν ἱερέων ὑπ. τ. π.*] This statement has to some appeared so improbable, that they have either taken refuge in conjecture, or adopted the reading of a few MSS., *Ἰουδαίων*. But the former is unauthorized, and the latter is a mere error of the scribes, arising from ignorance of some abbreviation: besides that is so inapposite, that scarcely any authority could justify it. Many eminent Commentators, including *Kuin.*, take *ὄχλος* to mean the *multitude* of the inferior priests as opposed to the *leaders* of the 24 classes. But that would require the *Article*, and then only *increase* the difficulty; which may best be removed by taking *πολὺς ὄχλος* in a restricted and popular sense, of a *considerable number*. This is confirmed by *Chrysost.*, who interprets it by *πολλοί*. That a comparatively considerable number of the whole (which amounted to about 5000) should have become believers, is not strange, considering the miracles they had witnessed, both from *Jesus* and from the *Apostles*. The expression *ὑπὸ τ. π.* is remarkable, and occurs nowhere else.

8. *πίστεως*.] Several MSS. and Versions, and some Fathers have *χάριτος*, which is preferred by most Commentators, and received by *Griesb.*, *Knapp*, and *Tittm.*; but, I conceive, wrongly; for we may better account for the change of *πίστεως* into *χάριτος* than the reverse. Besides, the MSS. are chiefly such as abound in alterations; not to mention that the *number* of those MSS. is comparatively small, and the testimony of the Versions of no great weight. And although *χάρ.* is not unsuitable, yet *πίστεως* is more to the purpose.

9. *Λιβερτινῶν*] *Who* are meant by these, is a question which will perhaps never be decided. The most probable opinion is that adopted by *Wahl*, that they were *Jews*, who had been taken captive by the Romans in war, and carried to Rome; and having there been manumitted, were accustomed to visit Jerusalem in such numbers as to erect a synagogue for their particular use; as was the case with Jews from other cities mentioned in the context. Others think them to have been the *posterity of Jews*, who had been carried into Egypt and Libya by the Ptolemies or Pompey, and afterwards made free citizens of the places where they dwell. Others again suppose them to have been Jews who inhabited a city or tract called *Libertum*, somewhere in Africa Proconsularis. But there is no proof of the existence of any such city or region. By the *Cyrenæans* and *Alexandrians*, who seem to have had a synagogue to themselves, we are to understand Jews

ἀπὸ Κιλικίας καὶ Λαίας, συζητοῦντες τῷ Στεφάνῳ· καὶ οὐκ ἴσχυον 10
ἀντισητῆσαι τῇ σοφίᾳ καὶ τῷ πνεύματι ᾧ ἔλάλει. Τότε ὑπέβαλον ἄνδρας 11
λέγοντας· Ὅτι ἀκηκόομεν αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος ῥήματα βλάσφημα εἰς
Μωϋσῆν καὶ τὸν Θεόν· συνεκίνησάν τε τὸν λαὸν καὶ τοὺς πρεσβυτέ- 12
ρους καὶ τοὺς γραμματεῖς. Καὶ ἐπιστάντες συνήρπασαν αὐτὸν, καὶ
ῆγαγον εἰς τὸ συνέδριον, ἕστησάν τε μάρτυρας ψευδεῖς λέγοντας· Ὁ 13
ἄνθρωπος οὗτος οὐ παύεται ῥήματα βλάσφημα λαλῶν κατὰ τοῦ τόπου
τοῦ ἁγίου τούτου καὶ τοῦ νόμου· ἀκηκόομεν γὰρ αὐτοῦ λέγοντος· 14
Ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος οὗτος καταλύσει τὸν τόπον τοῦτον, καὶ ἀλλάξει
τὰ ἔθνη ἃ παρέδωκεν ἡμῖν Μωϋσῆς. Καὶ ἀτεισάσαντες εἰς αὐτὸν ἅπαντες 15
οἱ καθεζόμενοι ἐν τῷ συνεδρίῳ, εἶδον τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ πρὸς-
ωπον ἁγγέλου.

VII. Εἶπε δὲ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς, εἰ ἅρα ταῦτα οὕτως ἔχει; ὁ δὲ ἔφη· 1

from Cyrene and Alexandria, in the latter of which places they were so numerous as to fill *two* of the four wards, and had a governor for themselves.

10. σοφία καὶ τῷ πνεύματι.] By the former is meant not merely human, but *divine* wisdom, as supplied by the Holy Spirit; for πνεῦμα, signifies the *influence* of the Spirit, under whose inspiration he spoke.

11. ὑπέβαλον.] Ὑποβ. signifies 1. to put under; 2. to introduce a supposititious child to any mother; 3. as here, to suborn, privily introduce an accuser. Examples occur in the *later* writers.

— λαλ. ῥήματα βλάσφημα, &c.] This constituted a capital offence; for, under the old Jewish Theocracy, it involved the crime of *treason* as well as *blasphemy*. This *blasphemy* against God has been shown by Bp. Horsley in his Answer to Priestley, p. 232, to be asserting the Deity of Christ — which Stephen died attesting.

12. ἐπιστάντες.] See Note on iv. 1. This must be referred to the people, elders, and scribes, not to the suborners; for the *subject* is changed, as often in Scripture and the best writers, especially Thucyd. In such a case, the Commentators take the *καὶ* for the relative; a bungling expedient, which *explains nothing*. We may render, "and they, having come upon him," &c.

13. μάρτυρας ψευδεῖς.] Namely, by intermingling falsehood with truth in their depositions, especially by perverting Stephen's words to a sense not intended by him, or exaggerating what he did say. How they did this, and on the language really held by him, see Recens. Synop.

14. ἀλλάξει.] This implies the notion of *abrogate*, i. e. by the introducing of some *other* law.

15. εἶδον — ἁγγέλου.] Some Commentators think that Stephen's face was made to shine supernaturally, by a visible glory like that of Moses (Exod. xxxiv. 29.). But the far greater number (and those the most eminent) are agreed in interpreting it as a popular form of expression, indicating majesty and divine grace, such as might inspire reverence and awe. And they appeal to Esth. v. 2. 2 Sam. xiv. 17. xix. 27. Gen. xxxiii. 10. This latter interpretation is preferable, since there is nothing said by St. Luke to lead us to suppose that this was a *supernatural glory*, like that of Moses; and as to the passage of Exod., the air and manner of it differ materially from that of

the present. At the same time, the majesty and angelic innocence which shone forth in the countenance of this great protomartyr, can only be ascribed to the power of the Holy Spirit; and therefore the case of Moses may, not improperly, be compared with it.

VII. In this *Apologetical Speech* of St. Stephen (in reply to the High Priest's interrogation, whether the accusation of conspiring to destroy the Jewish religion, was true) there is much which to us appears obscure, though, no doubt, sufficiently intelligible to those to whom it was addressed. Various hypotheses have, indeed, been hazarded, to lessen the difficulty; but it is, after all, more *apparent* than *real*. And if we take into consideration the *scope* of the address; the *character* of the composition, and the *circumstances* under which it was delivered, no wonder is it that there should be found something which may seem abrupt, and even not quite apposite or coherent, or conclusive in the reasoning. To advert to the *scope*, this appears to have been to retort on his accusers the charge they were bringing forward against himself. He shows, by a brief review of the history of the Jews, and a detail of their various rebellions against God, that it was *themselves* rather who were guilty of contempt of their Law; and by their own disobedience and perversity had been the real occasion of the destruction of the *first* temple, as they might be of the *second*. In order to establish his position, he first reviews the early history of their nation, and points out the various instances of their disobedience to God: showing, moreover, that, though the rites of the Mosaic Law were appointed by the command of God himself, yet that the Israelites were not approved unto God solely by those observances. That their temple *might* be destroyed; and yet the true worship of God be carried on acceptably to him: that it even *would* be destroyed, unless they should repent.

To advert to the other particulars, — the *character* of the composition is at once unstudied and inartificial, and therein bears the strongest marks of authenticity. And if we consider the *peculiar circumstances* under which the address was delivered, we shall be at no loss to account for an occasional abruptness and want of coherence. As to the appositeness of the arguments

2 Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοὶ καὶ πατέρες, ἀκούσατε. Ὁ Θεὸς τῆς δόξης ᾤφθη τῷ πατρὶ ἡμῶν Ἀβραάμ ὅτι ἐν τῇ Μεσοποταμίᾳ, πρὶν ἢ κατοικῆσαι αὐτὸν ἐν Χαρὴν, καὶ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτόν· Ἐξέλθε ἐκ τῆς γῆς σου καὶ ἐκ τῆς συγγενείας σου, καὶ δεῦρο εἰς γῆν ἣν ἄν σοι δείξω. Τότε ἐξελθὼν ἐκ γῆς Χαλδαίων κατοίκησεν ἐν Χαρὴν· κακέϊθεν, μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ, μετώκισεν αὐτὸν εἰς 5 τὴν γῆν ταύτην εἰς ἣν ὑμεῖς νῦν κατοικεῖτε. Καὶ οὐκ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ

and illustrations, it must be observed that they were sufficiently apposite for the persons addressed, and quite according to the Jewish manner; the character of the composition being altogether Jewish. Finally, as to the *inconclusiveness* in argument objected to by some, it must be remembered that the course of argument was interrupted, and broken off in the middle by the infuriate multitude. Had it been brought to a conclusion, there would undoubtedly have been nothing left incomplete in that which was *intended* to be proved. The remainder of the address would doubtless have been occupied in *applying* the foregoing narration, to prove what was meant to be evinced. *How* this would have been done, it is by no means difficult to imagine. And the course of argument is here excellently pointed out by Schoettgen and others, whom see in *Recens. Synop.*

Before concluding the present sketch, it may be proper to advert to a charge somewhat more difficult to answer;—namely, that in detailing various particulars of the Jewish history, Stephen has here added some circumstances which seem contradictory to the accounts in the O. T. These will be briefly considered in the notes on the passages themselves, as they occur; in which it will, I trust, be shown, 1. that the discrepancies in question have been *greatly exaggerated*; 2dly that they are, in general, far from being *irreconcilable*; and, 3dly, that if, in one or two instances, they may be really such, yet if we consider that the speaker is arguing with the people, according to *Jewish ideas*, and on *Jewish principles*, and alleging facts which they themselves recognized, there is nothing which can reasonably impeach the veracity, or cast a slur on the inspiration of this great Protomartyr; for in those few particulars it is admitted that he spoke on the authority of those Rabbinical traditions, whose authority his hearers regarded as unquestionable. It is well observed in the Quarterly Review, for 1834, that if these discrepancies were far greater than they are, they need not perplex our faith; since the whole speech of Stephen—the whole view of the history of his forefathers, which it relates with such pregnant brevity, is obviously framed according to the accredited and received notions then prevalent among the Jews. For instance, the Egyptian learning of Moses, and the delivery of the law through the dispensation of angels,—a common tenet among the later Jews. It abounds in *traditional allusions*, which the more rigid Commentators have employed much unprofitable ingenuity in explaining away. It could not, indeed, in common sense or in real wisdom be otherwise. Had Stephen departed in the least particular from the established views of the early history, as taught by the wise men, the scribes and lawyers of the day, he would have given unnecessary offence; the solemn, all-important, all-absorbing question of the divine

mission of Jesus, and the truth of Christianity, would have been in danger of degenerating into, or might have been interrupted by, idle and antiquarian disputes on the interpretation of the text of Genesis.

1. εἰ—ὄπως ἔχει.] On the nature of this idiom, see Note supra i. 6.

2. ἄνδρες—πατέρες.] By ἄνδρες ἀδελφοὶ he means the multitude in general; and by πατέρες, the members of the Sanhedrim. The ἄνδρες is elegantly *pleonastic*.

—ὁ Θεὸς τῆς δόξης] “splendore et majestate insignis.” See Ps. xxiv. 8. xxix. 1.

—πρὶν ἢ κατ., &c.] To remove a seeming discrepancy between what is here said and the account of Moses, the best Commentators are agreed that Stephen here followed the Jewish tradition, (adopted by Philo,) that God appeared *twice* to Abraham,—1st, when living in Chaldea, and 2dly, when resident at Charan.

“This apparent discrepancy (observes the Quarterly Reviewer *ubi supra*), if it were still greater and more evident, it would not in the least perplex our faith. The statement of Stephen strictly harmonizes with the prevailing notions of the time, and, indeed, with no great difficulty, may be brought into accordance with the Scriptures, and this without removing Haran beyond the boundaries of Mesopotamia; though in fact, the situation of Haran is a question of very slight importance. The Jews supposed the first call of Abraham to have taken place, not in *Haran*, but in *Ur, of the Chaldees*. They rested that belief on Gen. xv. 7. So in Neh. ix. 7.; and though the general course of the narrative in Genesis, would lead to the opinion, that no call took place till after the first migration to Charan and the death of Terah, yet the description of the call begins, in our version, with the words, ‘Now, the Lord had said unto Abraham,’ leaving the date of the transaction indefinite; and Rosenmuller observes on the Hebrew word—‘Dixitque, vel potius, dixerat autem, nempe quum esset in Chaldaea, priusquam Carras venisset.’ That this was the established opinion we have the authority of Philo de Abrahamo, vol. ii. p. 11; and of Joseph. Antiq. i. 7. 1. But the most remarkable evidence that the Jews of the later times, at least, drew a distinction between the land of the Chaldeans and Mesopotamia, though the former must have been comprehended within the latter, is to be found in the book of Judith.”

3. δεῦρο.] Sub. ἐλθὲ which is expressed in Aristoph. Thesm. 324.

4. κακέϊθεν—μετώκισεν.] Again, there is a trifling discrepancy between this account and that in Genesis, the most probable solution of which seems to be that which proceeds on the supposition, that here also Stephen followed the tradition of the Jews. See *Rec. Syn.*

5. οὐκ ἔδωκεν.] The best Commentators are agreed that ἔδωκεν is to be taken in a *pluperfect*

κληρονομίαν ἐν αὐτῇ, οὐδὲ βῆμι ποδός· καὶ ἐπηγγέλατο αὐτῷ δοῦναι εἰς κατάσχεσιν αὐτήν, καὶ τῷ σπέρμει αὐτοῦ μετ' αὐτόν, οὐκ ὄντος αὐτῷ τέκνου. ^h Ἐλάλησε δὲ οὕτως ὁ Θεός· ὅτι ἔσται τὸ σπέρμα 6 αὐτοῦ πάροικον ἐν γῆ ἄλλοτρίᾳ, καὶ δουλώσουσιν αὐτὸ καὶ κακώσουσιν, ἕτη τετρακόσια. καὶ τὸ ἔθνος, 7 ᾧ ἂν δουλεύσωσι, κρινῶ ἐγώ, (εἶπεν ὁ Θεός·) καὶ μετὰ ταῦτι ἐξελεύσονται καὶ λατρεύσουσί μοι ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τούτῳ. ⁱ Καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ διαθήκην περιτομῆς. καὶ οὕτως ἐγέννησε 8 τὸν Ἰσαὰκ, καὶ περιέτεμεν αὐτόν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ὀγδόῃ· καὶ ὁ Ἰσαὰκ τὸν Ἰακώβ, καὶ ὁ Ἰακώβ τοὺς δώδεκα πατριάρχας. ^k Καὶ οἱ πατριάρχαι 9 ζηλώσαντες τὸν Ἰωσήφ ἀπέδοντο εἰς Αἴγυπτον. Καὶ ἦν ὁ Θεὸς μετ' αὐτοῦ, ^l καὶ ἐξέλειτο αὐτόν ἐκ πωσῶν τῶν θλίψεων αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔδωκεν 10

Gen. 15. 13.
Gen. 17. 9.
& 21. 2.
& 25. 24.
& 29. 32.
& 30. 5.
& 35. 23.
k Gen. 27. 29.

l Gen. 41. 37.

sense, and that the *οὐ* is for *οὐπω*. *Οὐδὲ βῆμα ποδός* is to be taken like our idiom, "not a foot of land," for, none at all. See Deut. ii. 5. Gen. viii. 1. and the examples of Wets. from the Classical writers. *Εἰς κατάσχεσιν*. Sub. αὐτῆς for *ὥστε κατέχευεν αὐτήν*. *Κατάσχεσις* signifies *occupation*, and, by the adjunct, *possession*.

6, 7. The passage is from Gen. xv. 13, 14. and as the Commentators remark, is cited from memory. There are several variations from the Sept., all, however, unimportant, except that, 1. *καὶ ταπεινώσουσιν αὐτοὺς* are added in the Sept. after *κακ.* Yet the words are not in the Hebrew, and seem to have come from the margin as a gloss, probably from Judith v. 11.; or perhaps were a different version of *γγγ*. 2. The words *εἶπεν ὁ Θεός* are found neither in the Hebrew nor LXX. But they form no part of the quotation, being a parenthetical remark, such as we often find interposed in citations from the O. T. As to the words *ὡδε μετὰ ἀποσκευῆς πολλῆς* being found in both the Hebrew and the LXX., but not in the N. T., this is no instance of *discrepancy*; because Stephen evidently did not mean to adduce those words, but stops at *ἐξελείπονται*. There is a seeming discrepancy in the words *καὶ λατρεύσουσί μοι ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τούτῳ*, which are neither in the Hebrew nor the Sept. But though not there, something very similar occurs at v. 16. And Stephen does not adduce the words as *immediately following the preceding*. Surenh. too has proved that it was a custom with the Jewish doctors (and therefore sometimes adopted by the writers of the N. T.), when they cited any passages of the O. T., to occasionally *add words elsewhere* employed on the same subject, and occasionally with a slight variation of them *for adaptation*. And, besides, that the words are found *in substance* at v. 16., they seem to have been *suggested* by a kindred passage at Exod. iii. 12. *ἐν τῷ ἐξαγαγεῖν σε τὸν λαόν μου ἐξ Αἴγυπτου, καὶ λατρεύσετε τῷ Θεῷ ἐν τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ*. Thus there is, on the principles of Jewish writing, *no actual discrepancy*.

Πάροικον well expresses the Heb. *גֵר*, because, as the latter is a participial noun, so is the former properly an *adjective*, as appears from Herodot. vii. 235. Thus, in the Heb. *גֵר יִרְיֶה*, *גֵר*, we may suppose a participial noun and the verb substantive as put for the finite verb, from which the participial noun is derived.

— *τετρακόσια*.] The Chronological difficulty here involved is not so much in the thirty years' difference between this estimate and that of Jose-

phus (because *τετρακ.* may be taken as a round number; and even Josephus himself sometimes makes it 400), as how to reconcile this with the *fact*, that the Israelites were in Egypt *at the most* but 243 years. Nor can this difficulty be satisfactorily removed by the *parenthesis* which Markl. would introduce; besides, the construction of the Hebrew will not *permit* it. The difficulty may best be removed by bearing in mind that the *subject* of the verbs *גָרַע* and *גָרַע*, as also of *δουλώσουσι* and *κακώσουσι*, is to be sought in the noun *יֹשְבֵי הָאָרֶץ*, and thus it will be the *inhabitants of that land*. And if the truth of chronology limits the abode of the Israelites in Egypt to 243 years, and assigns 400 as the time which elapsed between Abraham's leaving Chaldaea and the period when they were established in Canaan, I see not how we can suppose otherwise than that the verbs above-mentioned, though having a *common subject* in *גָרַע*, yet have a *two-fold reference*, — in the former verb to the *Egyptians*. in the latter to the *inhabitants of the countries* wherein they sojourned in *affliction* from the time they left to the time they were settled in Canaan. Thus we may render, "And they (i. e. the Egyptians) shall enslave them, and they (i. e. the Edomites, Canaanites, &c.) shall afflict them." It is true that the Commentators, with our common Version, take *גָרַע* as a verb *neuter*; and this is maintained by Rosenm. Yet he is obliged to suppose, with great harshness, the suffix *א* as put for the separate form *אָרַע*. But that is surely *courting* a difficulty, since the verb may be taken in an *active* sense, as it was by the LXX., and is done by Montanus and Gesenius, who in his *Lex.* gives several examples, and *resolves* the suffix *א* into *אָרַע*; though *ellipsis* rather than *resolution* seems to be the principle here to be resorted to.

— *κρινῶ*] "I will punish:" a signification arising from the adjunct. See Pearce.

8. *διαθήκην περιτομῆς*] i. e. the covenant sealed by circumcision. The recent Commentators, for the most part, take it to mean "a precept or rite of circumcision." But the authority for that sense is but slender, and the necessity for it here not very urgent; for the objections raised by Kuin. to the *common* version do not apply to the *above*. This use of the Genit. is frequent.

— *καὶ οὕτως*] "and so," i. e. in virtue of that covenant. *Πατριάρχας*. So called as being the primogenitors and heads of the *πατρίαὶ* or tribes. 9. *ἀπέδοντο εἰς Αἴγ.*] Here there is an ellip-

αὐτῷ χάριν καὶ σοφίαν ἐναντίον Φαραῶ βασιλέως Αἰγύπτου· καὶ κατέστηεν αὐτὸν ἡγούμενον ἐπ' Αἴγυπτον καὶ ὅλον τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ.
 11 Ἦλθε δὲ λιμὸς ἐφ' ὅλην τὴν γῆν Αἰγύπτου καὶ Χαναάν, καὶ θλίψις
 12 μεγάλη· καὶ οὐκ εὗρισκον χορτάσματα οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν. ^m Ἀκούους ^m Gen. 42. 1.
 δὲ Ἰακώβ ὄντα οἷα ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, ἐξαπέστειλε τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν
 13 πρῶτον. ⁿ καὶ ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ ἀνεγνωρίσθη Ἰωσήφ τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς αὐτοῦ, ⁿ Gen. 45. 3.
 14 καὶ φανερὸν ἐγένετο τῷ Φαραῶ τὸ γένος τοῦ Ἰωσήφ. ^o Ἀπουτεῖλας δὲ ^o Gen. 46. 27.
 Ἰωσήφ μετεκαλέσατο τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ Ἰακώβ καὶ πῦσαν τὴν συγγένειαν ^{Deut. 10. 22.}
 15 αὐτοῦ, ἐν ψυχαῖς ἐβδομήκοντα πέντε. ^p Κατέβη δὲ Ἰακώβ εἰς Αἴγυπτον, ^p Gen. 46. 5.
 16 καὶ ἐτελεύτησεν αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν. ^q καὶ μετετέθησαν εἰς ^q Gen. 47. 30.
 Συχέμ καὶ ἐτέθησαν ἐν τῷ μνήματι ὃ ὠνόμαστο [Ἀβραάμ] τιμῆς ἀργυ- ^{Gen. 50. 13.}
 17 ρίου παρὰ τῶν νύων Ἐμμὸρ τοῦ Συχέμ. ^r Καθὼς δὲ ἤγγιζεν ὁ χρόνος ^{Gen. 23. 16.}
 τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, ἧς ὤμοσεν ὁ Θεὸς τῷ Ἀβραάμ, ἠΐξῃσεν ὁ λαὸς καὶ ^{Gen. 33. 19.}
 18 ἐπληθύνθη ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, ἄχρισ οὗ ἀέστη βασιλεὺς ἕτερος, ὃς οὐκ ᾔδει ^{Jos. 24. 32.}
 19 τὸν Ἰωσήφ. Οὗτος κατασοφισάμενος τὸ γένος ἡμῶν, ἐκώκωσε τοὺς ^{Exod. 1. 7, 8.}
 πατέρας ἡμῶν, τοῦ ποιεῖν ἔκθετα τὰ βρέφη αὐτῶν, εἰς τὸ μὴ ζωογο-

either of κομισθόμενον, of which the Commentators adduce many examples, or of κατάγεσθαι, according to Bos. In saying ζηλώσαντες, Stephen means to hint at his own case; for Joseph, though the peculiar favourite of God, yet was hated by his brethren.

10. χάριν καὶ σοφίαν.] The best Commentators regard this as a Hendiadys, for χάριν σοφίας, "favour by his wisdom." But that is contrary to the nature of a Hendiadys. It would be better to suppose a *hysteron proteron*. Yet that will be unnecessary, if we take ἐναντίον as belonging to both χάριν and σοφίαν, with adaptation to each, q. d. "gave him favour in the sight of Pharaoh, and wisdom in his sight, so as to be also esteemed wise."

11. χορτάσματα.] The word is properly used of food for cattle; and (like χορτάζω in the N. T. and the later Greek writers frequently) is very rarely applied to food for men (see Valckn.); when it is, it is only to the coarser sorts, and such as are used from necessity.

12. οἷα.] The plural is used to denote generality of kind, as we say *corra*, or *grain*.

13. ἀνεγνωρίσθη] "made himself known." This use of the Passive (like the Hebrew conjugation Hithpahal) answers to the *reflected* verbs of the modern languages.

14. ἐν ψυχαῖς ἐβδ.] The best Commentators would supply *συμσταμένῃν*. But that is too arbitrary an ellipse. In fact, there is here none at all; for in the passage of Deut. x. 22, on which the present is formed, the ἐν is for *sub*, and ψ is for *with, accompanied by*. So Numb. xx. 20. כָּכָה וְעִם. The best mode of removing the seeming discrepancy in the number is that of Hamm., Wets., and others, who think that the LXX. numbered among the posterity of Jacob the five sons of Manasseh and Ephraim born in Egypt, and that these were omitted by Moses, because they were born after Jacob's departure, but by the LXX. at Gen. xlv. 20. are expressly added by Paral. vii. 14.

16. As to the discrepancy between the present account and that in Gen. xlix. 30, the best Critics are of opinion, that Ἀβραάμ is spurious, and that

μετετέθησαν and ἐτέθησαν are to be referred to the words οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν only, not to Ἰακώβ also; and that at ὠνόμαστο we must supply, from the preceding, Ἰακώβ. The reading of some very ancient MSS. ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν attests at least that, at an early period, Ἀβραάμ was not here, and that something was thought to be wanting; which was, it seems, supplied in two ways. To understand Ἰακώβ from the preceding, is not near so harsh, as in many examples which might be adduced from Thucyd. And indeed there is the less harshness here, since Jacob is the chief subject of these two sentences, that of the other is only incidental.

17. καθὼς] "when;" a very rare sense, but occurring in 2 Macc. i. 31. and formed on that of ὡς, when. It may best be rendered, *as soon as*.

18. οὐκ ᾔδει τὸν Ἰ.] "had no respect for Joseph, or his merits," was ill affected to him and his memory; as 1 Thess. iv. 4. v. 12. Matt. xxv. 13.

19. κατασοφισάμενος.] The sense is, "plotting our destruction by crafty devices;" a sentiment farther evolved in a kindred passage of Judith v. 11, which Stephen, no doubt, had in view: καὶ ἐπέστη αὐτοῖς ὁ βασιλεὺς Αἰγύπτου, καὶ κατασοφίσαντο αὐτοὺς ἐν πόνῳ καὶ ἐν πλίνθῳ, καὶ ἐταπείνωσαν αὐτοὺς, καὶ ἔθετο αὐτοὺς εἰς δούλους. The passage, too, is formed on Exod. i. 10. Sept. Pharaoh's policy is called by Philo the using ἐπινοίας ἀνοσιότρογος. In τοῦ ποιεῖν the Genit. expresses *scope* and *purpose*. Ποιεῖν ἔκθετα is for ἐκθέναι, a term appropriate to the abandonment of infants. It is strange that Hamm., Pearce, and Wakef. should understand this of the Egyptians causing or ordering the exposure, not of the Israelites themselves. The words will not bear that sense, and the context rejects it; for here we have an illustration of the crafty policy of Pharaoh, which was to reduce the Israelites to a state of such extreme misery, that the population might at any rate be kept down even by *infanticide*.

— εἰς τὸ μὴ ζωογ.] "that they might not be preserved," namely, to experience the miserable fate of their parents. On the same principle as that on which the N. American Indian women often destroy their female children. The verb ζωογ. is found also in the Sept.

^a Exod. 2. 2.
Heb. 11. 23.

νεῦθαι. ^b Ἐν ᾧ καιρῷ ἐγεννήθη Μωϋσῆς, καὶ ἦν ἀστειὸς τῷ Θεῷ· 20

^t Exod. 2. 7.

ὃς ἀνειράφη μῆρας τρεῖς ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ. Ἐκτεθέντα 21

δὲ αὐτὸν, ἀνείλετο αὐτὸν ἡ θυγάτηρ Φαραὼ, καὶ ἀνεθρέψατο αὐτὸν

ἐαυτῇ εἰς υἱόν. Καὶ ἐπαιδεύθη Μωϋσῆς πάσῃ σοφίᾳ Αἰγυπτίων· ἦν 22

δὲ δυνατὸς ἐν λόγοις καὶ ἐν ἔργοις. Ὡς δὲ ἐπληροῦτο αὐτῷ τεσσαρα- 23

^u Exod. 2. 11.

κονταετῆς χρόνος, ἀνέβη ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ ἐπισκέψασθαι τοὺς

ἄδελφούς αὐτοῦ τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραήλ. ^v Καὶ ἰδὼν τινα ἄδικούμενον, 24

ἤμυνοτο καὶ ἐποίησεν ἐδίκησιν τῷ καταπονουμένῳ, πατάξας τὸν Αἰγύ- 25

^x Exod. 2. 13.

αὐτοῦ δίδωσιν αὐτοῖς σωτηρίαν· οἱ δὲ οὐ συνῆκαν. ^x Τῇ δὲ ἐπιούσῃ 26

ἡμέρᾳ, ὠφθη αὐτοῖς μαχομένοις, καὶ συνήλασεν αὐτοὺς εἰς εἰρήνην,

εἰπὼν· Ἄνδρες, ἀδελφοί ἐστε ὑμεῖς· ἰναὶ ἄδικεῖτε ἀλλήλους; Ὁ δὲ 27

ἄδικῶν τὸν πλησίον ἀπόσωται αὐτὸν, εἰπὼν· Τίς σε κατέστησεν ἄρχοντα 28

καὶ δικαστὴν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς; μὴ ἀνελεῖν με σὺ θέλεις, ὃν τρόπον ἀνείλες 28

20. ἀστειὸς τῷ Θεῷ.] Ἄστειος is from the dat. sing. of ἀστυ, and properly signifies (like the Latin *urbanus*) *polite* as opposed to ἀγροϊκος. And as the inhabitants of cities are supposed to exceed those of the country not only in politeness, but in comeliness, so ἀστειὸς came to mean *handsome*. Τῷ Θεῷ is by the Commentators referred to a Hebraism; by which, to express the excellence of any person or thing, the name of God, or those of the angels, are subjoined in the Genit. or Dat. to the Positive, which thus attains a Superlative sense. The *Greeks* effect this by an adjective derived from some name of God. Ὅς is to be resolved into "and he."

21. ἐκτεθέντα δὲ αὐτόν.] These words are commonly regarded as Accusatives absolute; though recent Commentators prefer supposing a pleonasm of αὐτόν; which, however, within so short a distance, can hardly be admitted. Perhaps it may better be referred to Matthia Gr. Gr. § 426. 3, by which, to a substantive expressing the leading idea of a proposition, and put at its beginning, is supplied *quod attinet ad*; where the old Philologists supposed an ellipse of κατὰ, but the recent ones suppose a breaking off of the construction. Ἀνελεῖσθαι properly signifies to *take up*, and is often used of raising up drowning men from the sea, or taking up corpses for burial; but sometimes, as here, of taking up exposed children. So Aristoph. *Nub.* 531. κάγω Ἐξεθηκα, παῖς δ' ἔτερα τις λαβοῦσ' ἀνείλετο. By the very nature of the sense there is an adjunct notion of *taking care of*.

22. ἐπαιδεύθη, &c.] In adverting to this circumstance, Stephen, as before, seems to follow the *tradition of the Jews*; for nothing to this purpose is found in *Scripture*.

—πάσῃ σοφίᾳ Αἰγ.] Of παιδεύεσθαι with the dative (ἐν being understood) examples are adduced by Wets., e. gr. *Isocr. τοῖς νεωτέροις ἦθεαι π.* With the expression παιδ. πάσῃ σοφίᾳ Αἰγ. Pricæus compares Lucian *Philop. θαυμάσιος τὴν σοφίαν, καὶ τὴν παιδείαν πᾶσαν Αἰγυπτίων εἰδώς.* This wisdom consisted (as we learn from Philo, in his life of Moses) of astronomy and astrology, the interpretation of dreams, magic, mathematics, medicine, &c. Nay, as Bp. Warburton (who in his *Divine Legislation* everywhere extols the wisdom of the Egyptians) also avers, in the science of *Legislation* and *Civil Polity*. Indeed, all the greatest

writers of antiquity agree in calling Egypt the mother of wisdom and science. See more in *Rec. Syn.*

—δυνατὸς — ἔργοις.] This may seem inconsistent with the impediment, which Moses is known to have had in his speech. Inasmuch that at *Exod.* iv. 16. we find Aaron his *spokesman* to the people. But (as the best Commentators are agreed) *δυνατὸς* and *ἐν λόγοις* are applicable to *persuasive*, and therefore *powerful*, though not *eloquent*, oratory. And that Moses had *this* faculty, we learn from *Joseph. Ant.* iii. 1. 4. and may infer it from *Scripture*. I would here compare *Thucyd.* i. 139. Ἐγγειν τε καὶ πράσσειν δυνατώτατος, where see Note.

23. τεσα. χρόνος.] This circumstance, too, is founded solely on Jewish tradition, of which vestiges are found in the Rabbinical writings. On ἀνέβη, &c. see Note on *Luke* xxiv. 38.

24. ἐποίησεν ἐδίκην.] An Hellenistic phrase for *ξεδίκησεν*. Πατάξας, i. e. unto death, as we find from what follows. Indeed ἐπάταξε should be rendered *slew*, which is supported by the *Pesch. Syr.* So also in *Matt.* xxvi. 31. *Mark* xiv. 27. and in the *Sept.*, formed on the same use of the Heb. הָרַח which (at least in its form *Kal.*) gave birth to the Latin *rec-are*. τῷ καταπονουμένῳ means the aggrieved party. That Moses *intended* to slay the Egyptian, cannot be proved; though *Grot.* shows it was justifiable.

25. συνίναι — σωτηρίαν.] They knew in general from tradition what God had promised to Abraham; and might imagine or hope that the time of their deliverance drew near. Hence from the proof given by Moses of his readiness to venture his very life to serve them, they might have concluded that he was appointed of God to be the means of their deliverance. And Moses might justly suppose that they would so conclude. Such appears to be the full sense intended.

26. συνήλασεν — εἰρήνην.] Συνελάλειν signifies properly to compel a person to go anywhere by hedging him in, and leaving him no other course. It is, however, in the later writers used of *compulsion generally*; and sometimes, as here, the *moral compulsion of earnest persuasion* is meant.

27. τίς σε κατέστησεν — ἡμᾶς.] This has the air of a proverbial expression, and may be compared

29 χθές τὸν Αἰγύπτιον; Ἐφυγε δὲ Μωϋσῆς ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ, καὶ
 30 ἐγένετο πάροικος ἐν γῆ Μαδιάμ, οὗ ἐγέννησεν υἱοὺς δύο. Ὑ Καὶ πλη-^{Exod. 3. 2.}
 ρωθέντων ἐτῶν τεσσαράκοντα, ὄφθη αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τοῦ ὄρους Σινᾶ
 31 ἄγγελος Κυρίου ἐν φλογὶ πυρὸς βιάτου. Ὁ δὲ Μωϋσῆς ἰδὼν ἐθαύμασε
 τὸ ὄραμα· προσερχομένου δὲ αὐτοῦ κατανοῆσαι, ἐγένετο φωνὴ Κυρίου
 32 πρὸς αὐτόν· Ἐγὼ ὁ Θεὸς τῶν πατέρων σου, ὁ Θεὸς Ἀβραάμ καὶ ὁ
 Θεὸς Ἰσαὰκ καὶ ὁ Θεὸς Ἰακώβ. Ἐντρομος δὲ γενόμενος Μωϋσῆς οὐκ
 33 ἐτόλμα κατανοῆσαι. Εἶπε δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ Κύριος· Λύσον τὸ ὑπόδημα
 34 τῶν ποδῶν σου· ὁ γὰρ τόπος ἐν ᾧ ἕστηκας γῆ ἁγία ἐστίν. Ἰδὼν
 εἶδον τὴν κάκωσιν τοῦ λαοῦ μου τοῦ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, καὶ τοῦ στεναγμοῦ
 αὐτῶν ἤκουσα· καὶ κατέβην ἐξελεῖσθαι αὐτούς· καὶ νῦν δεῦρο, απο-
 35 στελῶ σε εἰς Αἴγυπτον. Τοῦτον τὸν Μωϋσῆν ὃν ἠρῆσαντο, εἰπόντες·
 Τίς σὲ κατέστησεν ἄρχοντα καὶ δικαστήν; τοῦτον ὁ Θεὸς ἄρχοντα
 καὶ λυτρωτὴν ἀπέστειλεν ἐν χειρὶ ἀγγέλου τοῦ ὄφθεντος αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ
 36 βιάτῳ. Ὁὗτος ἐξήγαγεν αὐτούς, ποιήσας τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα ἐν γῆ<sup>Exod. 7. & 8.
& 9. & 10. & 11.
& 14. & 16. 1.</sup>
 † Αἰγύπτου, καὶ ἐν Ἐρυθρᾷ Θαλάσσῃ, καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἔτη τεσσαρά-

with what the Sodomites said to Lot, Gen. xix. 9. Compare also Luke xii. 14.

30. Σινᾶ.] Moses says *Horeb*. But the mountain had, like Parnassus, a double summit, forming two peaks, one Horeb, the other Sinai.

— ἐν φλογὶ πυρὸς β.] Literally, in a flame of a bush of fire, i. e. on fire, the Genit. *πυρὸς* being for an adjective. It is scarcely necessary to advert to the unhallowed speculations of some recent foreign Commentators on the nature of this circumstance, which they seek to lower to the level of a natural phenomenon, and endeavour to account for in various ways; but in vain; for the *preternatural* (and what else could have answered the purpose) cannot, after all, be got rid of. It were well if the persons in question would here learn a lesson from the *heathen sages*, the theme of their too indiscriminate admiration. Thus Pind. Pyth. x. 76. *ἔμοι δὲ, θανμάσια Θεῶν τελεσάντων, οὐδὲν ποτε φαίνεται ἔμειν ἄπιστον*. Such is, I conceive, the right reading and punctuation of this passage. The common reading *θαννῆσαι* might well perplex Heyne (who, indeed, confesses that he knows not what to make of it) since it is evidently *corrupt*. That the *metre* admits this reading, cannot be doubted; since the long syllable *σαι* has its equivalent in two short ones: and the two short ones may be pronounced as *one*, *per synizesin*. The term, too, is especially applicable to the works of the *Deity*. See Joel iii. 26. Is. xxv. 1. Hence in Num. xiv. 11. it is in the Alexandrian MS. used to denote *miracle*. With respect to the sentiment itself, it is a profound remark of Pausanias, x. 4, 4. *ἐς τὰ παράδοξα ἀπίστους εἶναι τῶν ἀθροῦστων, οἷς ἂν μὴ παρὰ τὸν ἀβρῶν γένηται βίον θεάμασιν ἐπιτυχεῖν λόγου μείζονα*.

31. Κατανοῆω properly signifies, “to master any thing in thought,” to “understand;” but here, by a usual interchange of the notions of internal and external sense, to *examine*; of which examples are adduced by the Commentators.

32. Ἐντρομος.] Of the same formation with *ἔμφοβος*, words conjoined in Heb. xii. 21. The tremor is, however, to be ascribed not so much to *fear*, as to *awe*.

33. Λύσον τὸ ὑπόδ. &c.] In order to secure a due

cleanliness in the performances of any of the offices of religion, it was, from the earliest ages, directed that the worshipper should take off his sandals before he entered a temple. And the custom still continues in the East, where it, no doubt, originated. From thence it seems to have passed to Egypt, where it was noticed and borrowed by Pythagoras; who, among his other maxims, enjoins *θεῖν ἀνυπόδετον καὶ πρὸς ἱερὰ προσεῖναι*. That it passed early and was adopted universally in the West, is plain from the Greek and Latin citations in Wetstein and others.

34. Ἰδὼν εἶδον.] “*planimissimè cognovi*.” This idiom, (by which to a verb is subjoined a participle, either of the same verb or one of cognate signification), though by most Commentators esteemed a *Ichbraism*, is yet pure Greek; though it occurs so rarely as scarcely to alter the case. The idiom was, no doubt, of Oriental origin, and the few examples found in the Classical writers are among the vestiges of the Oriental origin of the Greek language. Thus they are chiefly adduced from the most *ancient* writers, and in the most *antique* dialects.

— κάκωσιν.] A rare word, of which Wets. adduces only one example from Plutarch. Yet I have noted it also in Thucyd. vii. 4. and 82. ii. 43.

— κατέβην ἐξελεῖσθαι.] From this Kuin. takes occasion to observe, that the ancients supposed the Deity to act much after the manner of men. Yet expressions like the present *κατ’ ἀθροῦσπαθεῖαν*, were rather resorted to from *necessity*, originated in *human ignorance*, and were used in condescension to *human weakness*.

35. τοῦτον — τοῦτον.] The construction is here *κατ’ ἀνανταπόδοτον*, the *τοῦτον* being repeated after the parenthesis. For the sake both of clearness and strength. It is obvious that this is meant to bear upon the case of our Lord Jesus Christ, whom they had rejected, as their forefathers at first did Moses. See Doddr.

— λυτρωτήν.] The word properly means one who redeems another from captivity by paying his *lutron* or ransom.

36. Αἰγύπτου.] Αἰγύπτῳ is found in many MSS. and early Edd., and is preferred by several Editors

a Deut. 18. 15,
supra 3. 22.

κοντα. ^a Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Μωϋσῆς ὁ εἰπὼν τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ· Πρὸ-37
φῆτην ὑμῖν ἀναστήσει Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ὑμῶν ἐκ τῶν

b Exod. 19. 3,
20.

ἀδελφῶν ὑμῶν, ὡς ἐμέ· αὐτοῦ ἀκούσεσθε. ^b Οὗτος ἐστιν 38
ὁ γενόμενος ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ μετὰ τοῦ ἀγγέλου τοῦ λα-
λοῦντος αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ ὄρει Σινᾶ καὶ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, ὃς ἐδέξατο
λόγια ζῶντα δοῦναι ἡμῖν. Ἰδι οὐκ ἠθέλησαν ὑπῆκοοι γενέσθαι οἱ 39
πατέρες ἡμῶν, ἀλλ' ἀπόσαντο, καὶ ἐστράφησαν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν

c Exod. 32. 1.

εἰς Αἴγυπτον, ^c εἰπόντες τῷ Ἀαρὼν· Ποίησον ἡμῖν θεοὺς οἱ προπορεύ- 40
σονται ἡμῶν· ὁ γὰρ Μωϋσῆς οὗτος, ὃς ἐξήγαγεν ἡμᾶς ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύ-
πτου —, οὐκ οἶδαμεν τί γέγονεν αὐτῷ. Καὶ ἐμοσχοποίησαν ἐν ταῖς 41
ἡμέραις ἐκείναις, καὶ ἀνήγαγον θυσίαν τῷ εἰδώλῳ, καὶ εὐφραίνοντο ἐν

d Jer. 19. 13.
Amos 5. 25.

τοῖς ἔργοις τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν. ^d Ἰστρεψε δὲ ὁ Θεὸς, καὶ πυρέδωκεν 42
αὐτοὺς λατρεύειν τῇ στρατιᾷ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ· καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν βίβλῳ
τῶν προφητῶν· Μὴ σφάγια καὶ θυσίας προσηνέγκατέ μοι
ἔτη τεσσαράκοντα ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ; Καὶ 43

and Commentators. The οὗτος is here emphatic, and very significant; q. d. *vir ille inagnus*.

37. ὡς ἐμέ.] Sub. ἀνέστησε taken from ἀναστήσει preceding. See iii. 22. and Note

38. ὁ γενόμενος — μετὰ] “who communicated with the angel;” namely, by acting as mediating interpreter between God and the ἐκκλησία, i. e. the assembly of Israelites congregated on Mount Sinai, at the promulgation of the Law. The construction is γενέσθαι μετὰ τοῦ ἀγγέλου καὶ (μετὰ) τῶν πατέρων ἡ. On the ἀγγέλ., denoting the Angel-Jehovah, see Note on v. 53.

— ζῶντα.] Ζῶντα here means either *valid, efficacious*, or, taking it for ζωποιοῦντα, as John vi. 51, and Heb. x. 20, (and so in Deut. xxxii. 47, the Law is said to be ζῶν,) “most salutary;” namely, as regarded temporal life: or, again, conjoining both significations, “most efficacious and salutary.” Thus the general sense of the passage is: “For even this Moses, who acted as the mediator between the Angel-Jehovah, and the congregation of the people, and who received these revelations of Divine will at the hand of God, even *he* could not secure their obedience to his authority. On the contrary, they rejected his authority, desired to return into Egypt, and seduced Aaron to make the golden calf, trampling on the authority both of Moses and God. See Note supra, v. 35.

39. ἱστρήσαν — Αἴγυπτον.] This is by some Commentators taken to mean, “they were bent on returning, their mind dwelt on returning thither.” See Exod. xvi. 3; xvii. 3. Others interpret, “their affections reverted back to Egypt, its sensuality and idolatry.” See Ezek. xx. 3. Both senses may be included.

40. θεοῖς] i. e. images of God. Οἱ προπορ. ἡμῶν. It was customary with the Oriental nations of antiquity for the images of the gods to be borne before the people in journeys, or military expeditions, since they fancied they thus enjoyed their more effectual protection. See Numb. x. 33. compared with Deut. xxxi. 8. I Sam. iv. 3. (Heinr. and Kuin.)

— ὁ γὰρ Μωϋσῆς, &c.] An *anacoluthon*, to be filled up in translating by *quod attinet ad*.

41. ἐμοσχοποίησαν.] They had seen in Egypt Divinities worshipped under certain forms; and they were led to choose that of a *golden calf*, or

ox, for a symbol of the true God, (though transgressing the Divine command, Exod. xx. 4,) because the Egyptians worshipped Osiris (a former monarch of Egypt, and the inventor or introducer of agriculture, &c.), under the form of a bull (Apis), as the symbol of agricultural labour. (Kuin.) — ἀνήγαγον θυσίαν.] Ἀνάγειν signifies to *bring up*, and, from the adjunct, to *lay upon*; and is often used, especially in the later writers, of laying the victim on the altar. So the Hebr. עָלָה. Εὐφραίνοντο ἐν. The sense is, “celebrated sacrificial feastings to the honour of.” See Exod. xxxii. 6.

42. Ἰστρεψε δὲ ὁ Θεός.] This is variously explained by the Commentators; but the true interpretation is doubtless that of Beza, Pisc., Casaub., Grot., Hamm., Wets., Kuin., and others, *aversus est*, active for passive; or *se avertit*, act. for reflexive. Παρέδωκεν, “gave them up; i. e. *suffered them*, to serve,” &c., as Chrys. and Theophyl. explain. Στρατιᾷ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, כְּבָרֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם, the planets and stars. Ἐν βίβλῳ τῶν προφ.; i. e. the twelve minor (or shorter) Prophets.

— μὴ σφάγια, &c.] An interrogative sentence ushered in by μὴ (answering to the Hebr. הֲ) has generally the force of a negation. But as it appears from Scripture, that the Israelites *did* offer sacrifices to God in the desert, some other mode of explanation must be adopted. I am, therefore, still of opinion, (as in Rec. Syn.) that the idiom has here the force of *assertion*: “Did ye indeed offer to me sacrifices for forty years in the wilderness? [yes;] and yet [καὶ for καίτοι] so little real was your piety, that [in conjunction with my worship] ye raised the tabernacle of Moloch.” The above view is supported by a note of the learned Bornem. on Luke xvii. 9. “Rarissime μὴ interrogativum ita usurpatur, ut, qui loquitur, affirmari rem velit. Factum hoc memini Amos v. 35. indeque Acts vii. 42. μὴ σφάγια καὶ θυσίας προσηνέγκατέ μοι &c. (quo in loco multa frustra Kuinelius tentavit) atque in iis exemplis, quæ hanc in rem laudavit Graser.”

This citation is evidently from the Sept., and in the main agrees with it exactly. The only variations are these, — that οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ is transposed, probably by citing from memory. For ῥεμφάν the Sept. has ῥαφάν; and for Βαβυλωνος

ἀνελάβετε τὴν σκηνὴν τοῦ Μολόχ, καὶ τὸ ἄστρον τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑμῶν Ῥεμφάν, τοὺς τύπους οὓς ἐποιήσατε προσκυνεῖν αὐτοῖς· καὶ μετοικιῶ ὑμᾶς ἐπέκεινα † Βαβυλῶνος. Ἐκ τῆς σκηνῆς τοῦ μαρτυρίου ἦν ἐν τοῖς πατράσις ἡμῶν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, καθὼς διετάξαιτο ὁ λαλῶν τῷ Μωϋσῆ, ποιῆσαι αὐτὴν κατὰ τὸν τύπον ὃν ἐώρακει· ἦν καὶ εἰσήγαγον διαδεξάμενοι οἱ πατέρες

^e Exod. 25. 40.
^f Heb. 8. 5.

^f Josh. 3. 14.

has, together with the Hebrew, *Δαμάσκου*; which variations are discussed on the next verse.

43. τὴν σκηνὴν τοῦ Μολ.] On the subject *which* of the gods the Israelites worshipped under the name of Moloch (which signifies a *Sovereign Lord*) see Recens. Synop. Some suppose *Saturn*; others, *the Sun*, (the *King* of heaven) which is the more probable opinion, since Mol. signifies *King*. Now all the nations of antiquity applied terms indicative of *royalty* to their gods. Thus, besides Moloch, *Bel* or *Baal*. Moloch was an image of immense size and hollow, brass gilt, (like several of the *Birman* idols,) with the face of a calf or bull, and the hands outstretched; very much like the *Mexican* idols described by Humboldt. This, however, only answers to the description of the idol in *after times*. At the period in question the idol was, no doubt, of small size, to admit of being easily hidden from the view of Moses and Aaron; and the σκηνὴ will thus denote a sort of *case* to inclose and convey it in; formed (it may be supposed) in imitation of a real *tabernacle*, and very much like those gilt *shrines*, or small *models* of the temple of Diana at Ephesus mentioned at Acts xix. 24, where see Note. Ἀνελάβετε refers to the bearing it on the shoulders, as in religious processions, or when raised and placed aloft at the celebration of religious worship.

— τὸ ἄστρον τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑμῶν.] i. e. the image of him whom ye account as a God, and worship under the image of a star.

— Ῥεμφάν.] Mr. Townsend has diligently recounted the various hypotheses formed by the learned to reconcile the apparent discrepancy here between the Hebrew, the LXX., and N. T. As to the two last, it is plain that the same name is meant by both. The chief diversity is in the μ, which should seem not to be correct. The Ῥεμφάν of many MSS. of the N. T. or the Ῥαιφάν of the LXX. seems to be the true spelling. Unless it be thought that the μ stands for another φ, of which, indeed, there is some vestige in the MSS. Be that as it may, all the most learned inquirers are agreed that by Ῥεφάν, or Ῥαιφάν, was meant SATURN, of whom it was *one* of the names. And they are almost alike agreed in considering the CHIUN of the Hebrew as only *another name* of the same idol-deity. MOLOCH is also, with probability, supposed to be *another*: the compound idol (thinks Townsend) *originally* designed to represent the great Father, or *Noah*, but who was afterwards made the emblem of the *Sun*, the God of Zebaism. What is meant by the *star* is well explained by Faber ap. Townsend.

— καὶ] “and so,” i. e. because of your idolatry and sinfulness, and that of your fore-fathers. Μετοικιῶ. The word generally imports no more than *to cause to emigrate*; but must here be understood of compulsory removal. Ἐπέκεινα is a compound expression, by an ellipse of μέρη, used for a preposition, and sometimes becomes a mere adverb. It governs the genitive, from the force of the noun μέρη, used in the *plena locutio*.

Instead of Βαβυλῶνος the Sept. has *Δαμάσκου*; a remarkable discrepancy, not easily reconciled. Some consider it as a slip of memory; which is little probable, and indeed cannot be admitted. It may possibly be (as Bp. Pearce supposes) an *alteration* of the speaker, accommodated to the fact; for, as the Israelites were carried so far into Media, (see 2 Kings xvii. 2,) which country lay not only *beyond Damascus*, but *beyond even Babylon*, Stephen, who knew that to be the fact, might justly say, as he does here, *beyond Babylon*; thereby fixing the place of their captivity more explicitly than the Prophet did, who spoke before the event had taken place. I am, however, rather inclined to suppose that the present reading is erroneous, and derived from the margin, where it was meant to state the *place* of the exile. And although the prophecy may be said to be *fulfilled*, as regards *Babylon* as well as *Damascus*, yet certainly there seems no reason why the speaker should have *exaggerated*. Nor are there wanting other instances of a gloss expelling the ancient reading.

44. Having dwelt on the ingratitude, impiety, and idolatry of the Israelites, Stephen adverts to the place of true Divine worship, — the τὴν σκηνὴν τοῦ μαρτυρίου by which the Sept. express the Hebr. הַקֶּדֶשׁ הַקָּדוֹן at Num. xvii. 8, and so called either with reference to the *tables of testimony* contained therein; or from its being the place where God gave witness of his glorious presence. See Exod. xxv. 40. Heb. viii. 5.

— καθὼς διετάξαιτο, &c.] The construction is elliptical, and the sense, when complete, is this: “[so built] as He who had conversed with Moses (i. e. Jehovah) had commanded him to build it, after the model shown to him.” See Exod. xxv. 40. compared with Heb. viii. 5. The drift of the speaker in this and the three next verses is to moderate that self-complacent pride, which they entertained with respect to their Temple, by reminding them that, after the giving of the Law, their ancestors had worshipped God not in a magnificent temple, but in a moveable tabernacle. And therefore, that as the place for Divine worship had been changed at the pleasure of the Deity; so the worship of Him is not so bound to *one* place but that it might again be changed from the present Temple to some other place.

45. διεδεξάμενοι] scil. σκηνὴν, “having received it as handed down from their ancestors.” The words μετὰ Ἰησοῦ are to be construed immediately after οἱ πατέρες. The best Interpreters are agreed that ἐν τῇ κατασχέσει is for εἰς τὴν κατασχέσειν, as Num. xxxii. 5. δόθητω ἡμῖν ἡ γῆ ἐν κατασχέσει. and Deut. xxxii. 51, “into a land possessed by Gentiles.” So supra v. 5. δόδινα εἰς κατασχέσειν αὐτὴν (τὴν γῆν). And so the LXX. render for ἡἰκῆ. I have, with Owen, Gratz, and Kuin., removed the comma after ὁμῶν, because εἰς τῶν ἡμ. Δ. cannot without great harshness be referred to εἰσήγαγον; whereas, when referred to ἐξῶσεν, &c., the construction is natural, and the sense arising excel-

ἡμῶν μετὰ Ἰησοῦ, ἐν τῇ κατασχέσει τῶν ἐθνῶν, ὧν ἔξωσεν ὁ Θεὸς ἀπὸ
 προσώπου τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν ἕως τῶν ἡμερῶν Δαυΐδ. Ἐὸς εὗρε χάριν 46
 ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἠτήσατο εὐρεῖν σκήνωμα τῷ Θεῷ Ἰακώβ.
 Σολομῶν δὲ ὠκοδόμησεν αὐτῷ οἶκον. Ἄλλ' οὐχ ὁ ὕψιστος ἐν χειρο- 47
 ποιήτοις [ναοῖς] κατοικεῖ, καθὼς ὁ προφήτης λέγει· Ἦ οὐρανός 48
 μοι θρόνος, ἢ δὲ γῆ ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν μου· ποῖον 49
 οἶκον οἰκοδομήσετε μοι, (λέγει Κύριος); ἢ τίς τόπος τῆς
 καταπαύσεώς μου; οὐχὶ ἡ χεὶρ μου ἐποίησε ταῦτα πάντα; 50
 Ἐκκλησιαστικὰ, καὶ ἀπερίμητοι τῇ καρδίᾳ καὶ τοῖς ὠσίν! Ὑμεῖς 51
 αἰεὶ τῷ Πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ ἀντιπίπτετε· ὡς οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν, καὶ

lent; for, as Bp. Pearce observes, those nations were not completely driven out till the days of David.

Bp. Newc. well represents the sense of ἔξωσεν by "continued to drive out." Ἀπὸ τοῦ προσώπου is a Hebraism corresponding to פני ה' in the Hebrew Bible, and found in an ancient Punic inscription preserved by Procopius.

46. ἠτήσατο] "asked for himself." De Dieu and Kuin. meet the difficulty involved in ἐνώπιον by a device of construction which is very harsh, and, indeed, unnecessary; for it may be effectually removed by a reference to Ps. cxxxii. 5, on which the expression here is founded, and where עָרַבְתִּי מִשְׁכְּנֵי מִצְרָאֵל may be rendered, by supplying what is necessary to the sense from the preceding member (of which this is an exegetical parallelism), "Until I have found out a [place for; i. e. wherein I may build a] habitation," &c. For all the former member as far as ה' is to be repeated in the latter.

48. ναοῖς.] This is omitted in 7 MSS. and several Versions, and is cancelled by Griesb.; but, without sufficient reason, it being defended by Acts xvii. 24. Mark xiv. 53. Heb. ix. 11, 24; though, I grant, it might be introduced from the first of those passages. Nor is it very probable that the words should have been omitted from the *homeoteleuton*. Internal evidence is against it; but as the external evidence for it is very strong, it must be retained. Οὐ κατοικεῖ suggests the adjunct notion of "is not to be contained by." See *Ecumen*.

49, 50. The variations here from the LXX. will be in a manner none, if λέγει Κύριος be taken as *interposed* from what comes after. In the concluding words, indeed, instead of οὐχὶ—πάντα, we have in the LXX. πάντα γὰρ ἐποίησεν ἡ χεὶρ μου, which is countenanced by the Hebrew; where, if the present copies be correct, the sentence is expressed not interrogatively, but declaratively. I suspect, however, that the text is slightly corrupt, and needs the emendation which it may receive from the N. T. The corruption, if I mistake not, rests on πνεῦμα, which seems not much to the purpose; for to take the π in the sense *for*, is *strained*. Some MSS. omit the π; but that is only *cutting* the knot. I suspect that the Prophet wrote ה' ה' *nomme*? which occurs in Gen. iv. 7. and elsewhere. How easily γ and ה' and ה' and ה' might be confounded, it is scarcely necessary to remark.

I cannot but observe, that in the words immediately following, our common version, "and all these things have been," cannot be justified, as containing no suitable sense, nor such as the He-

brew words compel us to adopt. Still less can I approve Bp. Lowth's version, "and all these things are mine." He, indeed, supposes ה' (which he thinks absolutely necessary to the sense) *lost out of the text*, and to be *supplied from the LXX. and Syr.* But this is rash. The Syriac generally follows closely the LXX., and the Sept. Version is not by any means formed with such accuracy, as to enable us to be sure what was in the Hebrew at the time it was made. Not to say that ה' would not be good Hebrew. I suspect the ἐμὰ of the Sept. to have arisen from an attempt to *make out* the sense by the aid of the context. So far from the addition being indispensable, I see nothing wanting, if the passage be (as it ought to be) thus translated: "All these things did not my hand create? and [accordingly] they all of them were," i. e. brought into being. The passage, indeed, seems to have been in the mind of St. John, Revel. iv. 11. ὅτι σὺ ἔκτισας τὰ πάντα, καὶ διὰ τὸ θέλημα σου ἦσαν καὶ ἐκτίσθησαν.

51. There is here an abruptness of transition, which has led some Commentators to maintain that something was now said which has not been recorded by St. Luke. This, however, proceeds upon a most objectionable principle. The best Interpreters are agreed, that this change of manner, and transition from calm narration to sharp rebuke, was occasioned by some insult, or interruption on the part of the auditors. Yet that might not be, as they imagine, by open tumult, and clamours for the death of the prisoner, but rather (as Doddr. and Kuin. suppose) by low but deep murmurings, or hisses, and threatening gestures; which will account for, and justify the severity of what follows.

—σκληροπράχνηλοι.] In most languages, obstinacy and perversity are expressed by terms derived from the notion of *stiffness*, or *hardness*. See *Recens. Synop.* In ἀπερίμητοι τῇ καρδίᾳ, τῇ καρδίᾳ is added to show that the word is to be taken figuratively. For as circumcision was a symbol of moral purity, so *περιτομή* is, in the Old and New Testament, often applied to the mind and heart. See Jer. iv. 4. Thus by ἀπερίμ. τῇ καρδίᾳ are meant those whose vices are yet uncorrected (see Levit. xxvi. 41. Ezek. xiv. 7, 9.), and by ἀπερίμ. τοῖς ὠσίν. those who turn a deaf ear to all calls to repentance and reformation, "whose ear (in the words of Jerem. vi. 10.) is uncircumcised, and they cannot hearken."

—αἰεὶ—ἀντιπίπτετε] "ye perpetually resist the Holy Spirit," i. e. the testimony of those who speak by the Holy Spirit; which is regarded as tantamount to resisting the Holy Spirit himself. See Matt. x. 40. and the parallel passages. Their

52 ἡμεῖς. Τίνα τῶν προφητῶν οὐκ εἰδίωζαν οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν; καὶ ἀπέ-
 κτειναν τοὺς προκαταγγειλαντας περὶ τῆς ἐλεύσεως τοῦ Δικαίου, οὗ
 53 νῦν ἡμεῖς προδοῖται καὶ φονεῖς γενήθηθε·¹ οὕτως ἐλάβετε τὸν νόμον
 εἰς διαταγὰς ἀγγέλων, καὶ οὐκ ἐφυλάξατε·
 54 Ἀκούοντες δὲ ταῦτα διεπρίοντο ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν, καὶ ἔβρουχον
 55 τοὺς ὀδόντας ἐπ' αὐτόν. Ἐπίρρων δὲ πλήρης Πνεύματος ἁγίου, ἀτε-
 νίσας εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, εἶδε δόξαν Θεοῦ, καὶ Ἰησοῦν ἐστῶτα ἐκ δεξιῶν
 56 τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ εἶπεν· Ἰδοὺ, θεωρῶ τοὺς οὐρανοὺς ἀνεωγμένους, καὶ
 57 τὸν γλῶσσαν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκ δεξιῶν ἐστῶτα τοῦ Θεοῦ. Κράζοντες δὲ
 φωνῇ μεγάλῃ, συνέσχον τὰ ὦτα αὐτῶν, καὶ ὤρηθησαν ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐπ'

¹ Exod. 19. 3,
 εἰς νεφρ.
 Gal. 3. 19.

forefathers had in like manner rejected the proph-
 ets sent from God, and inspired by the Holy Spir-
 it. 'Αντιπίπτειν is properly used of one body fall-
 ing foul of another, and figuratively signifies to
 resist. At καὶ there is an ellipse of οὐτως.

52. τοῦ Δικαίου] "the Messiah;" the term be-
 ing (as Middl. observes) evidently used κατ' ἐξο-
 χὴν to denote Christ. See iii. 14, 22, and Note on
 Luke xxiii. 47. In proof of the fact, that the
 name was used by the Jews to denote the expect-
 ed Messiah, Bp. Middl. has adduced the strong-
 est evidence, in a long extract from § 65. of the
 Dissert. Gener. subjoined to Kennicott's Hebrew
 Bible, to which he has added some additional
 proofs and illustrations.

— προδοῖται καὶ φονεῖς γενήθη.] The former by de-
 livering him into the hands of Pilate, — the latter
 by requiring him to be put to death on false
 charges.

53. εἰς διαταγὰς ἀγγέλων.] This expression in-
 volves some difficulty, and consequently has been
 variously interpreted. Many eminent Commem-
 tators (as Schmid, Grotius, Glass, Heum., Doddr.,
 Krebs, Loesn., and Morus) understand διατ. ἀγγ.
 to mean troops or hosts of angels; q. d. hosts of an-
 gels being present, as witnesses, at the promulga-
 tion thereof. But though that view seems much
 confirmed by Deut. xxxiii. 2. and Ps. lxxviii. 17, yet
 we have no proof of διατ. ever having such a sense.
 And as what the above Expositors urge against the
 sense promulgation, — that to God alone, and not
 to angels, is the promulgation of the Law suited —
 the argument has in reality no force. It is truly
 observed by Calvin, that the best explanation of
 the present passage is one of St. Paul, Gal. iii. 19,
 where he says that the Law was διαταγὰς δι'
 ἀγγέλων, as also at Heb. ii. 1. λαληθεὶς δι' ἀγγέλων.
 This may justly be thought to determine the in-
 terpretation here. I would therefore render, with
 Beza, Calvin, Hamm., Whitby, Wolf, Schoettg.,
 Pearce, Kraus, Heine., Koppe, Kuin., and Wahl:
 "Ye who have received the Law at the appoint-
 ment of angels," i. e. angels being appointed as
 ministering instruments for its promulgation.
 Thus the expression is equivalent to ἐλάβετε τὸν
 νόμον διαταγόμενα δι' ἀγγέλων. In this sense, too,
 the passage was taken by the ancients generally;
 and it is confirmed by a passage of Joseph. Ant.
 xv. 5. 3. ἡμῶν τὰ κάλλιστα τῶν δογμάτων καὶ τὰ δω-
 τὰ τῶν ἐν τοῖς νόμοις δι' ἀγγέλων τοῦ Θεοῦ μαθόντων.
 The plural διαταγὰς is put for the singular, with
 reference (as Bp. Pearce says) to the several
 parts of the Laws of Moses, which were given
 at different times, and were therefore several
 διαταγαί.

At ἐφυλάξατε the discourse seems to have been

quite broken off, otherwise there would have been
 adduced the inferences and application from what
 had been said: on which see Note on ver. 1.

54. See Note supra v. 32, 33.

55. Πνεύματος ἁγίου.] This must denote the influ-
 ence of the Holy Spirit, animating and supporting
 him under the trial he had to encounter.

— εἶδε δόξαν Θεοῦ.] I can by no means approve
 of the view taken by many recent Interpreters,
 who regard the words as no more than a strongly
 figurative mode of expression, importing full per-
 suasion of what he did not see, as if he actually saw
 it. But the words will not, without violence, ad-
 mit of such a construction; and what follows,
 Ἰδοὺ θεωρῶ, quite forbid it, — being a positive as-
 sertion of something really seen. We may under-
 stand δόξαν Θεοῦ, with most Expositors, of the
 Schechinah, or symbol of the Divine presence,
 and suppose that the visual faculties of this illu-
 strious Martyr were, miraculously, so strengthen-
 ed, that the heavens and the throne of God were
 made visible to him; but I would rather, with
 some ancient and modern Commentators, sup-
 pose a visionary representation, — God miraculously
 operating on Stephen's imagination, as on Eze-
 kiel's, when he sat in his house at Babylon among
 the Elders of Judah, and saw Jerusalem, and
 seemed to himself transported thither. See
 Ezek. viii. 1—4.

The best Commentators are agreed that Jesus
 was represented as sitting at the right hand of
 God, to suggest to Stephen the present help and
 support he might expect from the Divine power.

57. συνέσχον τὰ ὦτα.] Συνέσχον τὰ ὦτα signifies
 properly, not to stop the ears (Latin *occludere
 aures*), but to close up the ears by drawing them
 together, called in the Classical writers, *ἐπιλαβεῖν,
 καταλαβεῖν, or ἐπέχεσθαι τὰ ὦτα*. This they did,
 not so much to avoid hearing the fancied blas-
 phemy, as it was a symbolical action expressive of
 detestation and abhorrence: this is plain from the
 passages of the Classical and Rabbinical writers
 adduced in Recens. Syn. So Plutarch, vol. ii. p.
 1095. τὰ ὦτα καταλήψη ταῖς χερσὶ, δυσχεραίνων καὶ
 βδελυττόμενος; That κράζοντες must be considered
 in the same light, and not be viewed as merely
 meant to drown the voice of Stephen, is plain
 from a passage of Irenæus ap. Euseb. Hist. Eccl.
 v. 20, cited by Wets.: εἴ τι τοιοῦτον ἀκήκοεν ἐκείνος
 ὁ μακάριος καὶ ἀποστολικὸς πρεσβύτερος, (Polycarp)
 ἀνακράζας καὶ ἐμφράξας τὰ ὦτα αὐτοῦ — πεφείγῃ ἄν
 τὸν τόπον, where Reading remarks: "Hic mos
 erat veterum Christianorum, ut si forte in familia
 colloquio impium aliquem sermonem et à fidei
 Catholica regulâ dissentientem audiissent, protinus,
 obturatis auribus, sese in fugam darent."

m *Infra* 22. 20.αὐτόν. ^m καὶ ἐκβαλόντες ἔξω τῆς πόλεως, ἐλιθοβόλουν. καὶ οἱ μάρτυ-

ρες ἀπέθεντο τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν παρὰ τοὺς πόδας νεανίου καλουμένου

n *Matt.* 5. 44.
Luke 6. 28.
& 23. 34.Σαῦλον, ⁿ καὶ ἐλιθοβόλουν τὸν Στέφανον, ἐπικαλούμενον καὶ λέγοντα · 59

Κύριε Ἰησοῦ, δεῦαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου! Θεὸς δὲ τὰ γόνατα, ἔκραξε φωνῆ 60

μεγάλῃ · Κύριε, μὴ στήσης αὐτοῖς τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ταύτην! καὶ τοῦτο

o *Infra* 22. 20.εἰπὼν ἐκοιμήθη. · VIII. ^o Σαῦλος δὲ ἦν συνενδοκῶν τῇ ἀναιρέσει αὐ-

τοῦ. Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ διωγμὸς μέγας ἐπὶ τὴν ἐκκλη-

σίαν τὴν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις · πάντες τε διεσπάρησαν κατὰ τὰς χώρας τῆς

Ἰουδαίας καὶ Σαμαρείας, πλὴν τῶν ἀποστόλων. (συνεκόμισαν δὲ τὸν 2

58. ἐκβαλόντες] “having hurried him out of the city.” *Comp.* *Luke* iv. 29.

— ἐλιθοβάλλουν.] Since we have a little further on καὶ ἐλιθοβόλουν τὸν Στ., *Markl.* complains of an unnecessary repetition of the same thing. The difficulty, however (at which even *Valckn.* stumbled) may be removed by either, with *Heinr.*, considering the first ἐλιθοβ. as denoting *preparation* for action; and q. d. they set about stoning him; or (with *Klotz*, *Pearce*, *Rosenm.*, and *Kuin.*) by taking the thing as expressed *more Historically generally*: and then (after an insertion respecting the keeping of the clothes by *Saul*) *particularly*; narrating by *whom* he was stoned, and describing some circumstances which attended the stoning.

— ἀπέθεντο.] A necessary preparation, since the stones destined for such a purpose were exceedingly large. This laying aside garments, in order to be lighter for any office, was usual with the long-vested inhabitants of Greece as well as of the East, and is alluded to by *Aristoph. Vesp.* 408. Ἄλλὰ θαιμάτια βαλόντες, θεῖτε, καὶ βῶατε, καὶ — ἀγγέλλετε.

Though the whole proceeding was illegal and tumultuary, yet, (as *Beza* and *Grot.* observe), they conformed to the *letter* of the law; which directed that in cases of stoning, the witnesses should cast the first stone, — doubtless to denote their *responsibility* for what was done.

— νεανίου.] This term is used of men even in the flower of their age, and sometimes of those who have attained its maturity.

59. ἐπικαλούμενον, &c.] *Bentley* and *Valckn.* propose to insert *Οεόν*. The *ON*, they think, might easily have been absorbed by the preceding *ON*. But that this should have happened *in all* the *MSS.* is very improbable; not to say that the *Article* would be wanted. If, indeed, we were compelled to suppose invocation to *God* I see not how any thing short of the *express insertion* of the word could be admitted. That, however, is *not* the case; and why the Commentators should have been so anxious to make *Stephen* offer up invocation to *God*, I know not; since, as *Markl.* truly observes, “it were contrary to *Stephen’s* intention; — which was to die a martyr to the *Divinity of Jesus Christ*. So that it is only *Him* he invokes.” There is no reason why *Κεῖρον Ἰησοῦν* should not be *supplied* from the following words of the invocation *Κεῖρι Ἰησοῦ*. *Subauditions* from the context being, even in the *Classics*, sometimes taken from the words which *follow*.

Or *ἐπικαλούμενον* may be taken in an *absolute* sense; (an idiom frequent in the best writers) and thus *ἐπικ.* and *λέγ.* may be rendered, “making invocation to this effect.” It is quite plain that *Jesus* is the object of the invocation; which

Kuin. fully admits, confirming this view from *Rev.* xxii. 20. where in the words *ἐρχου, Κύριε Ἰησοῦ*, it is certain that *Jesus* is *addressed in prayer* (as he is here) in terms which necessarily imply *Divine* power, and nothing short of *Deity*, even in language borrowed from his own holy example. See *Luke* xxiii. 34. How ill the *Socinians* digest this may be imagined; but one would scarcely suppose that even *they* could bring themselves to resort to the desperate expedient of supplying τὸν ὄχλον *ad libitum*. That, however, shows their conviction that τὸν Θεόν cannot be supplied.

The best Commentators are agreed that *δέξαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου* must mean, “receive my soul to the mansions of the blessed.” See *Luke* xvi. 9. *John* xiv. 3. and *Notes*, and consult *Schoettg.* ap. *Recens.* *Synop.*

60. μὴ στήσης α. τὴν ἁμ. τ.] *Ἰσσημ*, as *Ἦρψ*,

signifies, by an ellipse of ἐν ζυγῷ or σταθμῷ, (sometimes *supplied*) to weigh, and also (as the custom of remote antiquity was to weigh out, not number, money) to *pay*. And as *God* was by the *Hebrews* represented as weighing the actions of men, by placing the good and the evil ones in a pair of scales separately, (see *Dan.* v. 27. *Ps.* xc. 8.), so the best Expositors take the phrase to mean, “Do not examine their sin in the balance,” and consequently visit it with punishment. But we may more simply consider the sense as “Do not put to the balance this their sin,” i. e. do not put it into the scale which contains their sins, do not impute it to them, lay it not to their charge; as our authorized version renders.

— ἐκοιμήθη.] This is both an euphemism, and meant to suggest the composure with which this *Protomartyr* met so violent a death.

VIII. 1. Σαῦλος — αὐτοῦ.] These words are closely connected with the preceding, from which they ought not to have been disjoined by the division of Chapters. *Συνεῦθ.* signifies to approve of any thing with another. See *Tittm.* de *Syn.* 191.

— πάντες.] This must be received with limitation, for a very considerable number; since there is little doubt but that many of the lower ranks were suffered to remain in *Jerusalem*.

— πλὴν τῶν ἀποστόλων.] *They remained* in order to support the courage of those who stayed, and the faith of those who had fled, being protected by the especial providence of *God*, in order to build the Church at *Jerusalem*, and, by their zeal and courage, to govern it by their wisdom.

2. συνεκόμισαν.] *Συγκ.* signifies properly to bring together; but is specially used as a funeral term, like the Latin *componere*; and sometimes denotes not only the laying out of the body, but other preparations for its interment. This sense is rare

Στέφανον ἄνδρες ἐλλαβεῖς, καὶ ἐποίησαντο κοπετὸν μέγαν ἐπ' αὐτῷ.)

3^p Σαῦλος δὲ ἐλυμαίνεται τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, κατὰ τοὺς οἴκους εἰσπορευόμενος, p Infrā 22. 4.
& 26. 10, 11.

4 σύρων τε ἄνδρας καὶ γυναῖκας παρεδίδου εἰς φυλακὴν. Οἱ μὲν οὖν διασπαρέντες διήλθον, εὐαγγελιζόμενοι τὸν λόγον.

5 Φίλιππος δὲ κατελθὼν εἰς πόλιν τῆς Συμαρίας, ἐκήρυσεν αὐτοῖς

6 τὸν Χριστόν. Προσεῖχόν τε οἱ ὄχλοι τοῖς λεγομένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ Φιλίππου ὁμοθυμαδόν, ἐν τῷ ἀκούειν αὐτοὺς καὶ βλέπειν τὰ σημεῖα ἃ

7 ἐποίει. Πολλῶν γὰρ τῶν ἐχόντων πνεύματα ἀκάθαρτα, βοῶντα μεγάλη φωνῇ ἐξήρχετο· πολλοὶ δὲ παραλελυμένοι καὶ χωλοὶ ἐθεραπεύθησαν.

8 Καὶ ἐγένετο χαρὰ μεγάλη ἐν τῇ πόλει ἐκείνῃ. Λιγὴ δέ τις ὀνόματι

9 Σίμων προὔπηρχεν ἐν τῇ πόλει μαγεύων καὶ ἐξιστιῶν τὸ ἔθνος τῆς

in the Classical writers; but it occurs in Soph. Aj. 1068.

—ἐλλαβεῖς.] It is not agreed among Commentators whether these persons were *Christians*, or not. Most think they were religious Jews, or Hellenistic proselytes, and perhaps secret friends to Christianity. They probably consisted of religious men, both Christians and well-disposed Jews. So Luke ii. 25. such a one is called *δικαίος καὶ εὐλαβής*.

—ἐποίησαντο κοπ., &c.] These words (formed perhaps on Gen. 1. 10.) show, by example, the great honours shown him. On the point of Antiquities see Recens. Synop. and my Note on Thucyd. ii. 34. No. 12. Transl.

3. ἐλυμαίνεται τὴν ἐκκλ.] *Λυμαίνεσθαι* signifies properly to ravage and destroy, as a wild beast; but is often used of *men*, and signifies to waste or spoil, as said of *things*, or to destroy and persecute, as said of *persons*. Thus the sense here is equivalent to that in Gal. i. 13. where Paul says of himself *ἐδίωκον τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἐπέδροον αὐτήν*.

—κατὰ τοὺς οἴκους εἰσπ.] The full sense is, “entering into houses,” “going from house to house.” See v. 42. xx. 20. In the words following the sense is not quite developed; to complete which and rectify the construction an *οὗς* is required after *γυναῖκας*, the comma being cancelled after *εἰσπερευόμενος*.

4. διήλθον.] The Commentators suppose an ellipse of *τὴν χώραν* or *τὰς χώρας*. But it is better to *repeat* κατὰ τὰς χώρας, or at least τὰς χώρας from the preceding.

5. εἰς πόλιν τῆς Συμ.] It is not agreed whether by *Συμ.* is meant the *country*, or its *metropolis* of the same name. The latter is the opinion of almost all the best Commentators; and with reason; since the former interpretation seems excluded by v. 14.; for to say that the *country* had received the Gospel, when it had been only preached at *one city*, would be an exaggeration. The *Article* (as Sychem) is not necessary, since in such a case it is usually omitted, being *implied*. That some of the most ancient MSS. have the *Article* will at least show the *antiquity* of this interpretation; and we may well suppose, that although the name of the city had been recently altered to *Sebaste* in honour of Augustus, it still retained popularly its original appellation.

—ἐκήρυσεν — Χριστόν.] This does not necessarily import more than the *preaching the Gospel* publicly, and offering admonition or exhortation privately. See Hamm. on the distinction between *κηρῶσεν* and *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι*. Their au-

thority to do this may very well be rested on their having the extraordinary and miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit. Though indeed this question, so warmly debated by Whitty, as to their Clerical warrant, is frivolous; since the distinction between the Clergy and Laity was, no doubt, not yet made,—because it was not yet become *necessary*.

6. προσεῖχον.] The best Commentators are in general agreed, that this is for *ἐπίστευον*, “had faith in the Gospel.” Comp. v. 14. Examples from Joseph., Philo, and the LXX., are adduced by the Commentators. Ὁμοθυμαδὸν must be construed with *προσεῖχον*. Ἐν τῷ ἀκ. αὐτοῦς, literally, “on their hearing,” &c.

7. πολλῶν — ἐξήρχετο.] The construction (somewhat obscure by transposition) is thus laid down by Kuin.: *πνεύματα γὰρ ἀκάθαρτα (ἐκ) πολλῶν τῶν ἐχόντων (αὐτῶν), βοῶντα μεγάλη φωνῇ ἐξήρχετο*. Here again we may observe, that *dæmoniacs* and those merely affected with bodily disorders are carefully distinguished. Ἐξήρχετο is an example of the use of the neuter for the passive, the sense being “were expelled.”

9. Σίμων.] Commentators are generally agreed that this is Simon the Cypriot, mentioned by Joseph. Ant. xx. 5. 2. as being a pretender to magic. Προὔπηρχεν is by some Commentators taken by itself, in the sense, “had been staying;” but by others is joined with *μαγεύων*; and rightly, as appears from Lu. xxiii. 12. *προὔπηρχον ἐν ἔχθρα ὄντες*. where see Note. The sense is, “had been professing magic.” *Μαγείω* is a rare word, yet examples are adduced from Hippoc. and Plutarch. On the *μάγοι* in the *original* sense, see Note on Matt. ii. 1. “The appellation was, however, (observes Kuin.) then applied even to strolling mountebanks, pretending to a knowledge of medicine, natural philosophy, and astrology (which included fortune-telling by the stars), all of them being accompanied with the mummery of pretended incantations, and other devices, for evoking departed spirits and expelling *dæmons*.” This Simon, however, was a person of a very superior order to the common run of such persons, being endued with much real knowledge of natural philosophy; though he, it seems, abused it to the purpose of working on the minds of the vulgar by pretended prodigies; throwing them into amazement, doubtless by the exhibition of certain phenomena known only to himself. See Sir Walter Scott’s Essay on Demonology, and Dr. Hibbert’s on Apparitions. Whether he actually used sorcery, or produced

Σαμαρείας, λέγων εἶναι τινα ἑαυτὸν μέγαν· ὃ προσεῖχον πάντες ἀπὸ 10
 μικροῦ ἕως μεγάλου, λέγοντες· Οὗτός ἐστιν ἡ δύναμις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡ
 μεγάλη. Προσεῖχον δὲ αὐτῷ, διὰ τὸ ἰκανῶ χρόνῳ ταῖς μαγείαις ἐξε- 11
 στακέναι αὐτούς. Ὅτε δὲ ἐπίστευσαν τῷ Φιλίππῳ εὐαγγελιζομένῳ τὰ 12
 περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,
 ἐβαπτίζοντο ἄνδρες τε καὶ γυναῖκες. Ὁ δὲ Σίμων καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπίστευσε, 13
 καὶ βαπτισθεὶς, ἦν προσκαρτερῶν τῷ Φιλίππῳ· θεωρῶν τε σημεῖα
 καὶ δυνάμεις μεγάλας γινομένας ἐξίστατο. Ἀκούσαντες δὲ οἱ ἐν Ἱερο- 14
 σολύμοις ἀπόστολοι, ὅτι δέδεκται ἡ Σαμαρεία τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀπέ-
 στείλαν πρὸς αὐτοὺς τὸν Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάννην. οἵτινες καταβάντες προσ- 15
 ἦξαντο περὶ αὐτῶν, ὅπως λήβωσι Πνεῦμα ἅγιον. (οὕτω γὰρ ἦν ἐπ' 16
 οὐδενὶ αὐτῶν ἐπιτεπωκός, μόνον δὲ βεβηπισμένοι ὑπῆρχον εἰς τὸ ὄνο-
 μα τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ.) Τότε ἐπεΐθον τὰς χεῖρας ἐπ' αὐτούς, καὶ 17
 ἐλάβησαν Πνεῦμα ἅγιον. Θεασάμενος δὲ ὁ Σίμων, ὅτι διὰ τῆς ἐπι- 18
 θέσεως τῶν χειρῶν τῶν ἀποστόλων δίδεται τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, προσή-
 νεγκεν αὐτοῖς χρήματα, λέγων· Δότε καὶ μοὶ τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην, ἵνα 19
 ᾧ ἐάν ἐπιθῶ τὰς χεῖρας, λαμβάνῃ Πνεῦμα ἅγιον. Πέτρος δὲ εἶπε 20
 πρὸς αὐτόν· Τὸ ἀργύριόν σου οὐκ ἔστι σοὶ εἰς ἀπόλειαν, οὐ τὴν δω-

extraordinary effects by Satanic influence, as some have supposed, may be doubted.

Some of the Ecclesiastical historians tell us that he pretended to be God the Father, others say the Messiah, or the Paraclete. He was no doubt willing to pass for whatever the multitude should please to account him. And they probably regarded him as the promised Messiah, or at least a divine legate.

— ἐξιστῶν.] See Matt. xii. 22. and Luke xxiv. 22. So Athen. cited by Wolf: ὅς πῦρ τε ἀνόματον ἔπεισι ἀναφθεσθαι, καὶ ἄλλα πολλὰ φράσματα ἐτεχνάστο, ἀφ' ὧν ἐξίστα τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὴν διάνοιαν. And in Onosand. 93. ult. we have: ὀψις καὶ βοή καὶ πάταγος ὅπλων ἐξίστασι τὰς τῶν ἐναντίων διανοίας.

— λέγων εἶναι τινα ἑαυτὸν μέγαν] some extraordinary person. See Note supra v. 36. So also Herodot. iv. 198. δοκεῖ δὲ μοι οὐδ' ἄρετην εἶναι τὴν ἢ Λιβύῃ σπουδαίη, ὥστε ἡ Ἀσίη ἢ Ἐρυθρῇ παραβληθῆναι.

10. πάντες — μεγάλου.] The sense is, “all of every age and station.” Ἔστιν ἡ δυν., &c. This may, with Kuin., be explained by hypallage, in the sense, “The mighty power of God energizes in him.” See Rom. i. 16. 1 Cor. ii. 4.

13. ἦν προσκαρτερῶν τ. φ.] “used to attend on Philip, viz. as a disciple.” See x. 7. Most of the Commentators regard his embracing Christianity as a mere pretence; it is probable that he did not regard Jesus as the Messiah, and was guided by secular views.

14. ἀπέστειλαν πρὸς αὐτούς Π. καὶ Ἰ.] It is plain from what follows, that their primary purpose was to lay hands with prayer on the new converts, and thereby impart to them the gifts of the Holy Spirit. “The Apostles (says Kuin.) seem to have laid down a rule, that converts after being baptized and catechized, should have the imposition of hands, accompanied with prayer, in order to their receiving gifts of the Holy Spirit.

16. ἐπιτεπωκός.] This word is used of what falls with abundance, as x. 44. xi. 15. The ex-

pression is formed on Ezek. xi. 5. ἐπέπεσον ἐπ' ἐμὲ πνεῦμα Κυρίου.

20. τὸ ἀργύριον — εἰς ἀπόλειαν. On the exact nature of what is here said some difference of opinion exists. By many learned Expositors this is regarded as a form of imprecation; with which they compare similar Greek forms, such as ἀπὸλοιου, or βάλλ' ἐς κόρακας or ἐς ὄλεθρον. But it is surely inconsistent with the Spirit of the Gospel to imprecate perdition on any man, however bad: and although the above forms were often used as little more than expressions of peevishness and ill humour, yet no such diminution of sense can be thought of in an Apostle of Christ. But, in fact, there is nothing in the passage before us, that can, properly speaking, be called imprecation. As to the words τὸ ἀργύριόν σου οὐκ ἔστι σοὶ εἶη, they need not, and, I think, ought not to be closely united in sense with εἰς ἀπόλειαν; since they merely import “may your money rest with yourself, i. e. the Optative being often used for the Imperative) keep your money to yourself [I will have nothing to do with it.]” Thus in a similar passage which I have noted in Joseph. Antiq. x. 11. 3. Δανιήλος δὲ τὰς ἡωρεῖς ἤξίου αὐτῶν ἔχειν· τὸ σοφῶν γὰρ καὶ τὸ Θεῖον ἀνωροδοκίῶν εἶναι. where, though the MSS. present no variation, I have no doubt that the true reading is, not ἀτῶν, but αὐτῶν, which, indeed, seems to have been in the copy of the ancient Latin Translator. This emendation indeed is placed beyond doubt by the passage of Dan. v. 17. which Josephus here followed, and which might also be in the mind of the Apostle: Καὶ εἶπε Δανιήλ ἐνώπιον τοῦ βασιλέως, Τὰ ὄματα σοὶ ἔστω, (or as the Alexandrian and other MSS. have, σὺν σοὶ) καὶ τὴν δωρεὰν τῆς οἰκίας σου ἐτέρω ὄδῳ. Now the latter clause there expresses a sense which in the passage before us is left to be understood. Again, neither does the phrase εἰς ἀπόλειαν imply imprecation. By Whitby, Markl., Valpy, A Clarke, and Mr. Holden, it is taken to import prediction, namely, of what would befall him if he did not repent. Yet there is, I apprehend, nothing in the

- 21 ὅτι ἂν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐνόμιμας διὰ χρημάτων κτῶσθαι. οὐκ ἔστι σοι μερίς οὐδὲ κληρος ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ· ἡ γὰρ καρδία σου οὐκ ἔστιν εὐθεία
- 22 ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ. Μετανόησον οὖν ἀπὸ τῆς κακίας σου ταύτης, καὶ δεήθητι τοῦ Θεοῦ, εἰ ἄρα ἀφεθήσεται σοι ἡ ἐπίνοια τῆς καρδίας σου.
- 23 εἰς γὰρ χολὴν πικρίας καὶ σύνδεσμον ἀδικίας ὄρω σε ὄντα. Ἀποκρι-
- 24 θείς δὲ ὁ Σίμων εἶπε· Δεήθητε ὑμεῖς ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ πρὸς τὸν Κύριον, ὅπως μηδὲν ἐπέλθῃ ἐπ' ἐμὲ ὧν εἰρήκατε.
- 25 Οἱ μὲν οὖν διαμαρτυρούμενοι καὶ λαλήσαντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ Κυρίου, ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, πολλὰς τε κάμας τῶν Σαμαρειτῶν εὐηγάσαντο.
- 26 Ἄγγελος δὲ Κυρίου ἐλάλησε πρὸς Φίλιππον, λέγων· Ἀνάστηθι καὶ

words from which prediction can be directly elicited. The nature of the expression must depend upon the *eis*, which here seems to denote *tendency*; as at Rom. v. 16. *eis κατάκριμα*. and vi. 16. *ἀμαρτίας (φεροῦσης) εἰς θάνατον*. Thus it is intended to warn him of the consequences of so employing money, unless (as he gives him to understand at v. 22.) he averts it by timely repentance. As, however, prediction is almost *implied* in warning, both may here be included. Perhaps the term *denuciation* will best express the full import. The above view is, I find, supported by the authority of Calvin, who observes that St. Peter does not *imprecate*, but *ustam vindictam Dei, incutiendi terroris causā, denuntiat prope impendere*. Thus the full sense is, "Keep your money to yourself—for your *own* perdition [not mine]."

21. οὐκ ἔστι — κληρος.] This seems to have been a common phrase, since it occurs in Deut. x. 9. ii. 12. 2 Sam. xx. i. Job. xxii. 25. Τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ, *this matter*; for λόγος and ῥῆμα, after the example of the Heb. דבר, often signify a *thing*.

— ἡ γὰρ καρδία — Θεοῦ.] Formed on 2 Kings x. 15. and denoting that his profession of Christianity was insincere and hypocritical, or corrupted by pursuing bye-ends.

22. εἰ ἄρα ἀφεθήσεται, &c.] *Ei ἄρα* is by many learned Commentators taken in the sense *ut*, as εἴπως in Phil. iii. 11. and sometimes in the Classical writers. And so the Heb. יִשָּׁר *si forte* is rendered *iva* by the LXX. in Exod. xxxii. 30. But to so rare a signification we must not resort; especially as it weakens the sense. The phrase may be taken according to its ordinary use. In order, however, to fully understand the sense, it is to be observed that *ei ἄρα* when occurring anywhere except at the beginning of a sentence, is elliptical; and some participle, (usually *περιόμενος*, or some equivalent term), is to be understood. So Mark xi. 13. *ei ἄρα ἐνόησαι τί*. Acts xvii. 27. *ei ἄρα γε ψηλοφῆσαιαν*, and vii. 1. Sometimes, too, this is the case with the simple *ei*, as Eurip. Heracl. 640. *πάλα γὰρ ὠδίνουσα πῶν ἀφίγμένων, ψυχὴν ἐτήκου, νόστος εἰ γενήσεται*. "Animo tabescebas, (dubitans)," &c. Thus the full sense is: "[trying] whether," &c.; and the doubt implied (as Grot., Dodd., and Holden observe) is not whether, on sincere repentance, Simon would be *forgiven*; but whether he would *sincerely repent*. This is clear from the words of the next verse, *eis χολὴν*, &c., which are illustrative of the matter, and show that the doubt rested on the state of Simon's heart towards God.

VOL. I.

Ἐπίνοια signifies not so much *thought*, as *contrivance, device*; being usually taken in a bad sense. Perhaps it is here slightly emphatical—suggesting how heavy a guilt would have attended the *execution* of such a design.

23. *eis γὰρ χολὴν—ὄντα*.] These words are commonly taken as put for *ἐν γὰρ χολῇ*, &c., according to which, Castalio elegantly renders, "Nam te amaro felle pradium et injustitia restrictum esse video." The best Commentators, however, from Alberti and Wolf to Kuin., have been of opinion (comparing Deut. xxix. 18. with Heb. xii. 15.) that *eis χολὴν* is for *χολὴν*, as Acts xiii. 22. 47. vii. 21. Eph. ii. 15. And they assign the following sense: "I see thou art a most pernicious person, like to a bitter and poisonous plant, a pest to Christian society." So Anthol. Gr. ii. 11. *pāsa γυνὴ χόλος ἐστίν*. The *σύνδεσμος* they take to mean "a mere bundle of iniquity." But the soundness of this whole interpretation may be questioned; for in the passages adduced the *eis* is for *ὡστε*, and there is an ellipsis of *εἶναι*; which is not the case here. Besides, the style of unmeasured reproach involved in *σύνδεσμον*, if not in *χολὴν*, so interpreted, is not characteristic of the sacred writers; whose language, like that of our Lord, is sometimes severe, but never abusive. I must therefore acquiesce in the common interpretation, which yields a sense, though strictly just, little less severe, namely, "thou art immersed in wickedness of the vilest sort, and fast bound in the chains of sin and Satan." *Eis* may be taken for *ἐν*, as often in the N. T. and the Classical writers. In which case *εἶναι* is used in the sense to *come* (as here) or *become*; and the *eis* signifies *at or to*. *χολὴν πικρίας* is by Hebraism for *χολὴν πικροτάτην*.

24. *δεήθητε ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ*.] Thus admitting his own unworthiness. See John ix. 31. By his using the *plural* number we may suppose that John was present. That his repentance, however, was not real, we have every reason to believe, from the circumstances of the case, as well as from his subsequent conduct, as recorded by early Ecclesiastical tradition.

25. *διαμαρτυρούμενοι*.] *Διαμαρτ.* signifies to prove on good evidence, and, by implication, to teach.

26. *ἄγγελος—ἐλάλησε*.] Many recent Commentators suppose this communication to have been made by a *dream*. But there is nothing in the air of the passage to warrant this supposition; and, as Storr observes (Opusc. iii. 178), it is no wonder that Philip should have been admonished *sometimes* (as at 29 & 39) by the internal sugges-

πορεύου κατὰ μεσημβριαν, ἐπὶ τὴν ὁδὸν τὴν καταβαίνουσαν ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλήμ εἰς Γάζαν. (αὕτη ἐστὶν ἕρημος.) Καὶ ἀναστὰς ἐπορεύθη· καὶ 27 ἰδοὺ, ἀνὴρ Λιβύου, εὐνοῦχος, δυνάστης Κανδάκης τῆς βασιλείας Λιβυόπων, ὃς ἦν ἐπὶ πάσης τῆς γάζης αὐτῆς· ὃς ἐηλύθει προσκυνήσων εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, ἦν τε ὑποστρέφων· καὶ, καθήμενος ἐπὶ τοῦ ἄρματος 28 αὐτοῦ, [καὶ] ἀεγίνωσκε τὸν προφήτην Ἡσαΐαν. εἶπε δὲ τὸ Πνεῦμα 29

tions of the Holy Spirit, and *sometimes* (as here) by the personal address of an angel; since, in a similar case, after he had been once and again internally admonished by a *vision* (see Acts xvi. 6. seqq.) he was at length externally admonished by a *messenger sent from God* (v. 10). See also Hammond.

26. αὕτη ἐστὶν ἕρημος.] With these words the Commentators are not a little perplexed; it being not agreed whether they are to be referred to Γάζαν, or to τὴν ὁδόν. So little satisfied, however, are some with either supposition, that Wessel., Valckn., Hein., and Kuin. suspect the words to be an *interpolation from the margin*: but of this there is not the slightest proof; and that is but *cutting the knot*, which may, I think, be very well untied. As to the two foregoing interpretations, that which refers the words to Γάζαν cannot be admitted; for, *taking for granted* that there were then two Gazas, *New Gaza*, and *Old Gaza*, destroyed by Alexander, and here thought to be meant; yet they were so near together, that it is not likely there were *two roads* leading from Jerusalem to each of them respectively. Besides, why a road should be carried to a place nearly uninhabited, it is not easy to see. That, indeed, would require, as Kuin. says, the Article to ἕρημος. Or rather, Luke would have written εἰς τὴν Γάζαν ἧρις ἐστὶν ἕρ. The latter interpretation, which refers it to ὁδόν, is adopted by the best Commentators, ancient and modern (supported by the Syriac Version), who suppose that there were two roads leading from Jerusalem to Gaza; one farther about and carried along the valley of the rivulet Eshcol, the other shorter, but traversing the rough tract of mount Casius, and therefore desert and unfrequented. But that there were two roads rests wholly on conjecture; and thus perspicuity, and even propriety, would require ἧρις ἐστὶν ἕρημος. Yet why embarrass ourselves unnecessarily? There is no reason why we should not, with Rosenm. and others, suppose the words to be those of *St. Luke*, not of the *Angel*, and (referring them, as we must do, to τὴν ὁδόν, &c.) regard them as a remark of the *Evangelist* similar to many such in the N. T. and (as I have elsewhere shown) in the Classical writers. See John vi. 10. and Note. *St. Luke*, I apprehend, means to intimate that it might seem strange that one so desirous to evangelize as Philip, should be sent upon so unfrequented a road as that from Jerusalem to Gaza. *Reland*, indeed, objects that there is no reason why *that road* should be called ἕρημος any more than any other road in Judæa. But that supposes far more knowledge of the ancient state of the country than we have, or is now attainable. *Reland* himself could not have proved that the road was *not* such. If it was carried in a straight course, it must have passed most of the way over a hilly and barren tract, through no city or town of any note. And therefore the epithet ἕρημος, which means uninhabited, i. e. very thinly peopled,

would be suitable enough. So *Arrian*. *Exp. Alex.* iii. 21, 11. Οἱ δὲ εἰδέναι μὲν ἔφασαν (they said they knew a road), ἕρημον δὲ εἶναι τὴν ὁδόν δὲ, ἀνδροίαν. and *Thucyd.* ii. 17. τὰ ἔρημα τῆς πόλεως.

27. I have placed a comma after Λιβύου, because ἀνὴρ Λιβ. stands for a substantive (the ἀνὴρ being almost redundant) and thus cannot well qualify εὐνοῦχος. Εὐνοῦχος signifies properly *cubicularius*, chamberlain, prefect of the bed-chamber. And as such were generally *castrati*, so it came to mean *spado*, an eunuch. And such being, for their supposed fidelity, generally promoted to *other* confidential court offices, hence the term came to mean, in a general way, an officer of state (so here a *Treasurer*, as we find from what follows), whether an eunuch or not. Thus *Potiphar*, *Gen.* xxxix. 1, though called εὐνοῦχος *Pharao*, yet had a wife. *Δυνάστης* signifies properly one who has great power or influence. So μέγας εἶναι τινι in the ancient writers. The construction, however, here requires that it should be taken, not as an *adjective* (with almost all English Translators), but as a substantive, *magnus*, a *grandee*, as *Doddr.* renders. *Wolf* and *Wets.* have proved from *Pliny*, *Dio Cass.*, and *Strabo*, that *Candace* was a family name common to the *Queens of Æthiopia Superior*, or *Meroe*, like *Pharaoh*, to the kings of *Egypt*, which is well illustrated by *Dr. Russell*, in his account of *Nubia*, in the 12th vol. of the *Edinburgh Cabinet Library*.

This person was, no doubt, a Jewish proselyte: as appears, not so much by his reading the *Prophecy* *Isaiah*, as by his coming to Jerusalem to worship there. That eunuchs were not admitted as proselytes, is no proof that he was not one; because εὐνοῦχος does not, we see, necessarily imply that he was an eunuch in the physical sense.

— ἐπὶ πάσης τ. γ.] Sub. τεράγμτος, which is sometimes expressed. Γάζα is a word of Persian origin, and signifies *treasure*.

28. καὶ, καθ. — ἀεγίνωσκε.] I have in this passage adopted a punctuation somewhat varying from any former Edition; yet, I apprehend, demanded by propriety, and the nature of the context. *Render*, “who had gone to Jerusalem to worship there, and was returning; and, as he sat in his chariot, was also reading,” &c. The second καὶ, however, is absent from many good MSS. (including the *Alexandrian* and *Cod. Cantab.*), some Versions, as the *Pesch. Syr.* and *Vulg.*; and arose probably from the confusion occasioned by the true construction of the sentence being misunderstood. In thus reading the Scriptures, and, as it appears from the next verse, *aloud* on a journey, the proselyte was, probably, following the directions of the Jewish Rabbies, who (as we learn from *Schoettg.*) said, that “when any one was going on a journey, and had not a companion, he should study the Law.” That students used to read aloud, appears also from several citations from the Rabbins adduced by *Schoettg.*

29. εἶπε τὸ Πνεῦμα.] Many ancient Commenta-

30 τῷ Φιλίππῳ· Προέειθε καὶ κολλήθητι τῷ ἄρματι τούτῳ. Προσδρα-
 μῶν δὲ ὁ Φίλιππος ἤκουσεν αὐτοῦ ἀναγινώσκοντος τὸν προφήτην
 31 Ἠσαΐαν, καὶ εἶπεν· Ἄρα γε γινώσκεις ἃ ἀναγινώσκεις; Ὁ δὲ εἶπε·
 Πῶς γὰρ ἂν δυναίμην, ἐὰν μή τις ὀδηγήσῃ με; παρεκάλωσε τε τὸν
 32 Φίλιππον ἀναβάντα καθίσαι σὺν αὐτῷ. Ἡ δὲ περιοχὴ τῆς γραφῆς, ^{q Isa. 53. 7.}
 ἣν ἀνεγίνωσκεν, ἦν αὕτη· Ὡς πρόβατον ἐπὶ σφαγῆν ἤχθη,
 καὶ ὡς ἀμνὸς ἐνύπτιον τοῦ κείροντος αὐτὸν ἄφω-
 33 ρος· οὕτως οὐκ ἀνοίγει τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ. ἐν τῇ τα-
 πεινώσει αὐτοῦ ἡ κρίσις αὐτοῦ ἤρθη, τὴν δὲ γενεάν
 αὐτοῦ τίς διηγήσεται; ὅτι αἴρεται ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἡ
 34 ζωὴ αὐτοῦ. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ εὐνοῦχος τῷ Φιλίππῳ εἶπε· Λέομαι
 σου, περὶ τίνος ὁ προφήτης λέγει τούτο; περὶ ἐαυτοῦ, ἢ περὶ ἐτέρου

tors, and, of the modern ones, Bp. Pearce, take this to mean the *angel* mentioned at ver. 26. See Heb. i. 14. This, however, involves much harshness; and it is better, with the most eminent modern Commentators, to regard the words as a popular manner of expression, only denoting that such was the suggestion of the Holy Spirit; so communicated (like the *afflatus* of the Prophets) as that the inspired person could always distinguish such Divine suggestions from those of his own mind. And thus the Holy Spirit might, in a certain sense, be said to speak the words to him.

— κολλήθητι τῷ ἄρμ. τ.] Κολλᾶσθαι with a passive form has (like the Hebrew conjugation *Hothpahl*, which is at once passive and reflective) a reflective sense, and signifies to *attach one's self to, join company with.* So the Heb. קָבַץ in 2

Sam. xx. 2. 2 Kings xviii. 6. Ruth i. 14, where the LXX. use ἀκολουθεῖν. Thus at Ruth ii. 3. κολλήθητι μετὰ τῶν κορσίων, the sense is, “join company with my maidens.” The *chariot* is here (by an usual popular idiom) for the *person in the chariot*; just as, in the Classical writers, *ships* are put for the *sailors* in them.

30. γινώσκεις — ἀναγινώσκεις.] Most Commentators from Grot. downwards suppose a *paronomasia*; with which one might compare that of Julian in his laconic Epistle to Basil: Ἀέγνων, ἔγνω, κατέγνω; to which the Father, with equal wit, and scarcely less brevity, replied: Ἀέγνωσ, ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἔγνωσ. εἰ γὰρ ἔγνωσ, οὐκ ἂν κατέγνωσ. But *paronomasia* in the present case would be frigid, and alike unsuitable to the gravity of the speaker, and the importance of the subject.

31. πῶς γὰρ ἂν δυν.] The γὰρ refers (as often) to a negative sentence omitted for brevity's sake. This omission of short clauses, both negative and affirmative, referred to by γὰρ, is frequent in the Classical writers, and several examples are adduced by Bp. Pearce. The words, we may observe, are a modest apology for ignorance. Ὄδηγ. is used in a figurative sense (*instruct*), as in John xvi. 13. and Ps. xxv. 5.

32. περιοχῆ.] This word usually signifies the *sum* of what is contained in any book, &c., but here it means a *passage* or *section*, of which sense Wets. and Valckn. adduce examples.

— ὡς πρόβατον ἐπὶ σφαγῆν — ζωὴ αὐτοῦ.] These words are taken from Is. liii. 7 & 8, and follow the Sept. exactly: the verbal discrepancies which occur not being found in the Alexan-

drian and other good MSS. of the Sept. Between the Sept., St. Luke, and the Hebrew, there is considerable difference, but not such as materially to affect the general sense. The various modes of reconciliation are fully detailed by Townsend, who laudably endeavours to remove the discrepancy without resorting to any conjectural emendation of the Hebrew. But to entirely reconcile the discrepancy is perhaps impracticable. It will, however, greatly contribute thereto, if we suppose that the LXX. read מִשְׁפָּט בְּעֵצוֹ קָרְל. The מ and ב are easily confounded. A

מ might easily be lost before another מ, and ו might easily arise from the ל following. That the LXX. had ו after בְּעֵצוֹ, we may infer from its being found in the N. T. in almost every MS. This, however, involves no real discrepancy from the Hebrew: for the ו may be taken with the *preceding*, quite as well as with the *following* word. And such, I suspect, is the true reading of the Hebrew. Whether the Hebrew had originally ב before בְּעֵצוֹ or מ, is a matter of more doubt, because מ may mean *at, under, &c.* See Gesen. Lex. in v. That there should be a full stop after בְּעֵצוֹ, cannot, I think, be doubted. Thus the Hebrew may be rendered, “So he opened not his mouth under his oppression. From judgment was he hurried off [to death].” Bp. Lowth, indeed, and Kuin. take בְּעֵצוֹ with the words *following*, and render, “By an oppressive judgment was he cut off.” But the *Hendiadys* thus involved is very harsh; and they are intended to cancel the ו. If we were allowed to do *that*, the sentence would proceed better *without* the Hendiadys. But the LXX., I doubt not, had the ו, and attached to בְּעֵצוֹ. And conjoining these words with what follows, they stumbled at מִשְׁפָּט בְּעֵצוֹ; and not knowing what to make of the first מ in the MSS., they passed it over, and either finding an ו after מִשְׁפָּט in their MSS., or else supplying it, to make up the sense, rendered *as well as they could*, and thus gave a sense [“he was deprived of a just judgment”] very applicable to *Christ*, but not, I conceive, intended by the *Prophet*.

The words τὴν δὲ γενεάν — αὐτοῦ, are, like the correspondent Hebrew ones (of which they are a literal rendering), so obscure, that the true sense cannot be fully determined. Hamm., Doddr., Kuin., and most recent Commentators, take the

τινος; Ἀνοίξας δὲ ὁ Φίλιππος τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ 35
 τῆς γραφῆς ταύτης, εὐηγγέλισατο αὐτῷ τὸν Ἰησοῦν. Ὡς δὲ ἐπορεύοντο 36
 κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ἦλθον ἐπὶ τι ὕδωρ· καὶ φησιν ὁ εὐνοῦχος· Ἴδοὺ, ὕδωρ·
 τί κωλύει με βαπτισθῆναι; [εἶπε δὲ ὁ Φίλιππος· Εἰ πιστεῖτε εἰς 37
 ὅλης τῆς καρδίας, ἔξουσιν. ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ εἶπε· Πιστεύω τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ
 Θεοῦ εἶναι τὸν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν.] καὶ ἐκέλευσε στήναι τὸ ὕδωρ· καὶ 38
 κατέβησαν ἀμφότεροι εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ, ὃ τε Φίλιππος καὶ ὁ εὐνοῦχος· καὶ

sense to be, "who can describe the guilt of the men of his time [from whom he suffered such things]?" But this is negated by what follows. Bp. Lowth renders, "and his manner who would declare?" i. e. bear witness in his favour? q. d. *No one*. This sense of ἤθη has countenance in the Arabic. The *circumstance* was manifestly fulfilled in Christ: and the point of Hebrew Antiquities on which it depends is admirably illustrated by Dr. Kennicott and Bp. Lowth. The interpretation too, is much confirmed by the words following, and is probably the true one.

In the words ὅτι αἶραι — αὐτὸδ the *sense* is the same as in the Hebrew; but the Sept. Translators either read otherwise, or translated freely.

35. ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τ. γ. τ.] Compare a kindred passage of Luke xxiv. 27. Γραφὴ ἀσ used of a single passage of Scripture, occurs in Mark xv. 58. and elsewhere. In εὐηγγέλισατο αὐτῷ Ἰ (which words signify, "he instructed him in the doctrine and principles of the religion of Jesus,") it is implied that he commenced by referring the words of the prophecy to Jesus, and from thence introduced whatever else he had to communicate. In Ἰησοῦν we have the *person* put for the *thing*, as Luke iii. 18. Acts xvi. 10. Gal. i. 9. 1 Pet. i. 12. An idiom frequent in the Classical writers, on which see Matth. Gr. Gr. § 409.

36. τι ὕδωρ.] Probably some fountain or pool, formed by a brook either running into the Eshcol rivulet, or formed at a bend of the Eshcol itself.

— Ἴδοὺ, ὕδωρ — βαπτισθῆναι.] From this we may infer, that Philip had fully instructed the Eunuch on the nature and necessity of baptism as an initiatory ordinance of Christianity; and that the Eunuch had professed his wish to receive, and Philip his willingness to administer it at a fit opportunity. In τι κωλύει the sense must not be *pressed upon*; for, from the examples of that phrase, and the *quid vetat* or *prohibit* of the Latin, it is probable that the sense meant to be expressed by the Eunuch was this: "Here is an opportunity for the thing to be done forthwith."

37. There has been no little debate as to the authenticity of this verse, which is not found in many of the best MSS. and most of the ancient Versions, including the Pesch. Syriac, and is omitted in several citations of the Fathers, as also in the Edit. Princ. Moreover, in some of the MSS. which *do* contain it, it is found with great diversity of reading. It is, therefore, cancelled or rejected by Grot., Mill, Wets., Pearce, Matth., Newc., Griesb., Tittm., Knapp, Kuin., Gratz, and Vat. It was, indeed, defended by Whitby and Wolf — strenuously, but not, I think, successfully. It is surely *not*, as Wolf contends, necessary to the context. The *external* evidence *against* it is certainly, if not equal to that *for* it, at least pretty strong. And *internal* is decidedly *against* it; for no good reason can be imagined why it should have been *thrown out*, or omitted inad-

vertently; whereas, for its *insertion* we may easily account, — namely, from the anxiety of well meaning, but misjudging persons to remove what they thought an abruptness; and to somewhat qualify what they deemed too favourable to haste in administering baptism; moreover to remove a stumbling-block from the rite not being described as performed in *due form*. As to Whitby's argument, on the ground that the verse was probably omitted in later times, because it opposed the delay of baptism which the catechumens experienced before they were admitted into the early Church, it has no force whatever. For surely if the verse be *removed*, the delay of baptism would seem to be still *more* opposed. The strongest argument brought forward for the authenticity of the passage is that it was read by Irenæus (see his work Adv. Hier. iii. 12. p. 196.), by Cyprian, nay, as Mill and others say, by *Tertullian*. But, upon referring to the passage (de Baptismo C. 15.), I find not a shadow of proof that the verse was read by him, but a probability that it was *not*. As to the authority of *Cyprian*, it is not great; for he generally follows the *Vulgate*, which has the verse. But indeed, had it been cited by Irenæus, it would only prove the great *antiquity* of the passage, not its *genuineness*. That, however, would show the caution of the primitive Church on this head, and prove that it required, previous to the administration of baptism to adults, an unhesitating avowal of belief in the *Divinity* as well as divine legation of Jesus Christ. See Doddr.

38. ἐκέλευσε στήναι τὸ ὕδωρ.] "He gave orders for the carriage to be stopped."

— ἐβάπτισεν αὐτόν.] No doubt, with the use of the proper form; but whether by immersion, or by sprinkling is not clear. Doddr. maintains the *former*; but Lardner ap. Newc. the *latter* view; and, I conceive, more rightly. On both having descended into the water, Philip seems to have taken up water with his hands, and poured it copiously on the Eunuch's head. It is, indeed, plain, from various passages of the Gospels, that baptism was then administered by the baptizer, after having placed the person to be baptized in some river or brook. And that plenty of water was thought desirable, we learn from John iii. 23. But though this may seem to favour *immersion*, yet the other method might as well be adopted. Water *might*, indeed, be *fetched* in a vessel for the purpose of pouring it on the head of the person. Yet that it should *not*, may be accounted for by a reference to the climate, customs, and opinions of the people of Palestine, without rendering it necessary to suppose that nothing but a purpose of *immersion* could originate the custom for the baptizer and the baptized to both go into water of some depth. We learn from Euseb. Eccl. Hist. ii. 1, that the Eunuch afterwards preached the Gospel in Ethiopia.

39 ἐβάπτισεν αὐτόν· ὅτε δὲ ἀνέβησιν ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος, Πνεῦμα Κυρίου ἤρπασε τὸν Φίλιππον· καὶ οὐκ εἶδεν αὐτόν οὐκέτι ὁ εὐνοῦχος, ἐπορεύετο γὰρ τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ χαίρων. Φίλιππος δὲ ἐνρέθη εἰς Ἀζωτῶν· καὶ διερχόμενος εὐγγελίζετο τὰς πόλεις πάσας, ἕως τοῦ ἔλθῃν αὐτὸν εἰς Καισάρειαν.

1 IX. Ὁ ΔΕ Σαῦλος ἔτι ἐμπνέων ἀπειλῆς καὶ φόρου εἰς τοὺς ^{† Infra 26. 10.}

2 μαθητὰς τοῦ Κυρίου, προσελθὼν τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ, ἠτήσαιο παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐπιστολὰς εἰς Λαμασκὸν πρὸς τὰς συναγωγάς, ὅπως εἰάν τις εὐρη

τῆς ὁδοῦ ὄντας, ἄνδρας τε καὶ γυναῖκας, δεδεμένους ὑγίμῃ εἰς Ἱερου- ^{† Infra. 22. 6.}

3 σαλίμ. Ἐν δὲ τῷ πορεύεσθαι ἐγένετο αὐτὸν ἐγγίσειν τῇ Λαμασκῷ, ^{† Gal. 1. 13.} ^{† 1 Tim. 1. 13.} ^{† 1 Cor. 15. 8.} ^{† 2 Cor. 12. 2.}

39. Πνεῦμα Κυρίου ἤρπασε τὸν Φ.] In some ancient MSS. and late Versions are inserted between Πνεῦμα and Κυρίου the words ἅγιον ἐπέπεσον ἐπὶ (or εἰς) τὸν εὐνοῦχον, ἄγγελος δὲ: which reading is approved by Hamm. and Towns.; but without reason; for it is a manifest interpolation of those who thought the *snatching up* of Philip more suitable to an angel than to the Holy Spirit. And there might be some ground for this, if we were to understand, with several Commentators (as Doddr. and Scott), that Philip *was caught up and carried through the air supernaturally*; for examples of which they refer to I Kings xviii. 12. 2 Kings ii. 16. Ezek. iii. 14. There is, however, no necessity to suppose that to be the case here. Nay, according to Bp. Middleton's Canon, the *personal* sense here in πνεῦμα is inadmissible; while, as Mr. Rose observes on Parkh. p. 700, if ἤρπασε be translated "caught away," it seems required. I quite agree with Parkh. and Mr. Rose, that nothing miraculous is here intended. ἤρπασε may very well be understood of the *imperative suggestions* of the Holy Spirit; which Philip doubtless well knew how to distinguish from the motions of his own mind. The meaning, therefore, seems to be that assigned by Mr. Rose, as follows: "Philip went away quickly under the direction and influence of the Spirit." And I would compare Herodot. iv. 13. Ἐφ' ἧ δὲ Ἀριστίης — ἀπικλοῦσθαι εἰς Ἰσσηρόνας, φ ο β δ λ α μ π τ α ς γ ε ν δ ο υ ε ν ο ς. The strong term ἤρπασε might, indeed, seem *selected* to suggest the *unwillingness* with which Philip must have torn himself away from this promising convert. Perhaps, however, no more may be meant than "hurried him away," as *αἰρεῖν* is sometimes used of the influence of the Holy Spirit in the LXX., so I Kings xviii. 12. καὶ πνεῦμα Κυρίου ἀρεῖ σε εἰς τὴν γῆν ἣν οὐκ οἶδα. and 2 Kings ii. 16. μή ποτε ἤρην αὐτὸν πνεῦμα Κυρίου.

40. ἐνρέθη εἰς Ἀζ.] The rendering *inventus est (was found)*, is so unsatisfactory, that most recent Commentators adopt that of Drusius, *fuit extitit (was, or abode)*, of which sense they adduce examples. But I prefer, with Beza, to suppose that the passive is used in a reciprocal or reflective sense, as in French *il se trouva* stands for *il fut trouvé*, made his appearance. There is an imitation of the Hebrew idiom, by which passive forms often have a reciprocal sense, as נִצְּרָה. And so even in Greek. Thus in Herodot. iv. 4. we have the similar expression φανέντα ἀπὸν εἰ Προκοῦν. The air of the expression seems to refer to the *rapt feeling* with which Philip left the Eunuch and went to Azotus.

IX. 1. There is great reason to think (see

Towns. Chr. Arr.) that what is now related took place before the baptism of the Eunuch, nay even before the journey of Peter and John into Samaria. See Dr. Burton, who thinks that Saul may have set out at the end of the feast of Tabernacles, and that his conversion took place at the same time as the conversions in Samaria.

—ἐμπνέων ἀπ.] Markl. sees not how ἐμπνέων, or even ἐκπνέων, can mean "breathing out threatening;" and he would conjecture ἐμπλέως. But no alteration is necessary. Ἐμπνέειν signifies, 1. to inhale, and, by implication, exhale breath by the nostrils; 2. to breathe. Now to do this with quickness and vehemence, *implies* strong emotion, especially that of *anger*. In the later Greek writers, the word denoting the *kind* of passion is expressed in the *Genit.*, by an ellipse of ἀπὸ, signifying *origin, cause, &c.* In the earlier writers the Accus. is chiefly used. Examples are adduced in Rec. Syn. I shall here only adduce *one*, and that for emendation; since it is miserably corrupt, though the Editors pass it over sicco pede. It is in Nicephori Hist. Byz. p. 47. Ἐτι δὲ πνεύων κατὰ τῆς ἀσεβείας, τὸ ἱερὸν τῶν Ναζωραίων σχῆμα καθόβρισεν. Read: ἐτι δ' ἐμπνέων κ. τ. εὐσεβείης, &c. It is evident that the historian had in mind the passage before us, otherwise πνέων might be tolerated, and then I should suspect that κακὰ had been lost, absorbed by the κατὰ following.

2. ἐπιστολὰς] i. e. letters credential. Article for Pron.

—τῆς δόξαι.] For ταύτης τῆς δόξαι, as John vii. 17. Ὅδο; denotes not only a *way of life*, but a *way of thinking*, (as Judith v. 8. ἐκβῆναι ἐξ δόξαι τῶν γούτων.) and hence a *sect*, either in *philosophy*, (as Suid. in v. Ἐμπεδοκλῆς, and Lucian Herm. p. 577.) or in *religion*, as here and in xxii. 4. ταύτην τὴν δόξαι ἰδωῖα. and xxiv. 14. From the populousness of Damascus, its constant communication with Jerusalem, and its being, probably, the place whither most of those who fled at the murder of Stephen took refuge, the number of Christians was likely to be considerable. So great was the authority of the Sanhedrim with the foreign Jews, that they readily submitted to its decrees in all matters spiritual; as for instance the suppression of what was esteemed heresy; especially as the then Ruler of Damascus. Aretas, king of Arabia, was either, according to some, a Jewish proselyte, or at least was well affected to the Jews, and permitted the exercise of this authority in things spiritual, on the part of the Sanhedrim.

3. On the subject of the conversion of St. Paul, now recorded by Luke, I cannot too strongly reprobate the hypothesis of certain foreign Theolo-

καὶ ἔξαιφνης περιήστραψεν αὐτὸν φῶς ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ· καὶ πεσὼν 4
ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, ἤκουσε φωνὴν λέγουσαν αὐτῷ· Σαούλ, Σαούλ, τί με διώ-
κεις; Εἶπε δέ· Τίς εἶ, κύριε; ὁ δὲ Κύριος εἶπεν· Ἐγὼ εἰμι Ἰη- 5
σοῦς, ὃν σὺ διώκεις· [σκληρόν σοι πρὸς κέντρα λακτιζῆν. τριῶν τε 6
καὶ θαμβῶν εἶπε· Κύριε, τί με θέλεις ποιῆσαι; καὶ ὁ Κύριος πρὸς
αὐτόν·] ἄλλα ἀνάστηθι καὶ εἰσελθε εἰς τὴν πόλιν, καὶ καληθήσεται
σοι τί σε δεῖ ποιεῖν. Ὅτι δὲ ἄνδρες οἱ συνοδεύοντες αὐτῷ εἰσθήκισαν 7
ἐννεοί, ἀκούοντες μὲν τῆς φωνῆς, μηδένα δὲ θεωροῦντες. Ἠγέρθη δὲ 8
ὁ Σαῦλος ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς· ἀνεωγμένων δὲ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτοῦ, οὐδένα

t Infra 22. 9.
& 26. 13.

gians, who, building on the crude and half developed views of De Dieu, Elsn., and Hamm., regard the circumstances of the case as by no means miraculous; but as produced solely by certain terrific *natural phenomena*; which they suppose had such an effect on the high-wrought imagination, and so struck the alarmed conscience of Saul, as to make him regard as a reality, what was merely produced by fancy. I have at large considered, and, I trust, thoroughly confuted this unfounded notion in Recens. Synop. Suffice it here to say, that Paul, however ardent might be his temperament, and vivid his imagination, *could not* so far deceive himself, as to suppose that the *conversation* (related by him at large in his speech before Agrippa) really took place, if there had been no more than these Commentators tell us. And it were utterly inconsistent with truth and honesty to dress up *vivid fancies*, and manufacture into *dialogue*. Besides, he is so minute in his description as to say it was in the *Hebrew language*; and the address, as given most in detail at ch. 26., is a somewhat long one. Moreover, if he were so worked upon by his own high-wrought feelings,—that could not be the case with his attendants: and yet it is said that “they also, struck dumb with astonishment, *heard the voice*, though they saw no one.”

Besides, if *φωνή* could be taken (though no proof of such a sense is established) to denote *thunder*, what would be more absurd than. “I heard a clap of thunder saying?” And his fellow travellers on hearing the — what? *the clap*, and seeing no one [whom could they have expected to see?] were mute with astonishment. Moreover, *φῶς* is nowhere used of *lightning*; nor is lightning anywhere said *περιαστράπτειν*. Finally, when we are told that this *φῶς* exceeded the brightness of the mid-day sun, how can it be understood of *lightning*? The light was doubtless, like the *δόξα Θεοῦ* presented to the view of St. Stephen, vii. 55., and meant to represent the *Schechinah*.

5. *σκληρόν*—*λακτ.*] A proverbial form, common alike to the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. The words *σκληρόν*—*πρὸς αὐτόν* are not found in a considerable number of the best MSS. and Versions, including the Syr. Peschito; nor in several citations of the Fathers, nor in the Ed. Pr.; and they are rejected by almost every Critic of eminence from Erasmus, Beza, and Grot., down to Tittm. and Vater. And rightly, for notwithstanding what Wolf urges in defence of the passage, there can be little doubt that it was introduced from the parallel passages at xxii. 10. xxvi. 14. It might well be expected that the *historian* should be less circumstantial than the *personal narrator* of facts. When the passage in question was brought in, the *ἄλλα* was sure to be ejected as worse than useless.

7. *εἰσθήκισαν ἐννεοί.*] As this seems at variance with the words *πάντων καταπεσόντων ἡμῶν εἰς γῆν* in the account of his conversion by St. Paul himself to Agrippa, Acts xxvi. 14. several expedients have been devised to remove the discrepancy. The most approved one is that of Valla and others, who suppose that they had first fallen down and then risen again. But though this is *preferable* to that of Beza and others, who remove the difficulty by almost silencing the *εἰσθήκισαν*, explaining it *verc*; yet it is liable to several objections, which I have urged in Recens. Synop. The best solution may be, to suppose that Paul's companions at first *stood fixed* and mute with astonishment — and then, struck with awe at what they regarded as indicating the presence, however invisible, of a supernatural Being, fell with their faces to the ground, as Saul had done. Ἐννεοί, “mute,” and, by implication, senseless. The word denotes not so much one who is destitute of the natural faculty of speech or hearing, as one in whom it is suspended, or accidentally lost.

—*ἀκούοντες μὲν τῆς φωνῆς.*] This seems at variance with the account at xxii. 9. *τὸ μὲν φῶς ἔδρασσαντο, τὴν δὲ φωνὴν οὐκ ἤκουσαν τοῦ λαλοῦντός μοι.* Of the various modes of removing the discrepancy (stated and discussed in Recens. Synop.) the most satisfactory one is to take *ἤκουσαν*, with Grot., Bowyer, Valck., Dobret, Kuin., and Schleus., in the sense *understood*, a signification of the word often occurring in the N. T. This signification, and also the construction, is found sometimes in the Classical writers, and often in the LXX. One *very apposite* example will suffice. Gen. xi. 7. *συγχύωμεν αὐτῶν τὴν γλῶσσαν, ἵνα μὴ ἀκούσωσιν ἕκαστος τὴν φωνὴν τοῦ πλησίον.*

They heard the sound of the voice which addressed Saul, — but did not, it seems, fully understand the *sense* of what they heard; either from imperfect acquaintance with the Hebrew language, or rather because the words would not to them carry their meaning so plainly, as to the conscience-stricken Saul. Possibly, too, the words might be pronounced in a low tone, as meant only for Saul.

8. *οὐδένα ἔβλεπε.*] i. e. neither *Jesus*, whom he opened his eyes to see, nor even his companions — in fact, he was *blind*. That on rising and opening his eyes, he had lost the power of seeing *any one*, whether *Jesus* or his companions, is also clear from xxii. 11. *ὡς δὲ οὐκ ἐν ἔβλεπον ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης τοῦ φῶτος ἐκείνου*: where, from the context, it is obvious that the sense is: “having been blinded by that glorious light.”

On the blindness of Saul the Commentators before mentioned again exert themselves to exclude all supernatural agency; but in vain. See

9 ἔβλεπε· χειρωγαγοῦντες δὲ αὐτὸν εἰσήγαγον εἰς Δαμασκόν. Καὶ ἦν
 10 ἡμέρας τρεῖς μὴ βλέπων, καὶ οὐκ ἔφαγεν οὐδὲ ἔπιεν. Ἦν δὲ τις μα-
 11 θητής ἐν Δαμασκῷ ὀνόματι Ἀνανίας· καὶ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ Κύριος
 12 ἐν ὄραματι· Ἀνανία. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν· Ἰδοὺ ἐγώ, Κύριε. Ὁ δὲ Κύριος
 13 πρὸς αὐτὸν· Ἀνασιᾶς πορεύθητι ἐπὶ τὴν ὁύμνην τὴν καλουμένην Εὐ-
 14 θείαν, καὶ ζήτησον ἐν οἰκίᾳ Ἰούδα Σαῦλον ὀνόματι, Τυρσεῖα· ἰδοὺ
 15 γὰρ προσεύχεται, καὶ εἶδεν ἐν ὄραματι ἄνδρα ὀνόματι Ἀνανιαν εἰσελ-
 16 θόντα καὶ ἐπιθέντα αὐτῷ χεῖρα, ὅπως ἀναβλέψῃ. Ἀπεκρίθη δὲ ὁ
 Ἀνανίας· Κύριε, ἀκήκοα ἀπὸ πολλῶν περὶ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς τούτου, ὅσα
 14 κακὰ ἐποίησε τοῖς ἁγίοις σου ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ· καὶ ὧδε ἔχει ἐξουσίαν
 15 εἶπε δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ Κύριος· Πορεύου, ὅτι σευθὸς ἐκλογῆς μοι εἰσὶν
 οὗτος, τοῦ βασιτάσαι τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐνώπιον ἐθνῶν καὶ βασιλέων, υἱῶν
 16 τε Ἰσραὴλ. Ἐγὼ γὰρ ὑποδείξω αὐτῷ ὅσα δεῖ αὐτὸν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνοματός
 μου παθεῖν.

Recens. Synop. The most plausible view taken on that hypothesis, is to consider it as a temporary *amaurosis*, as the medical writers call it, such as is induced by excess of light. This, however, involves more difficulties than the common view, and leaves them unsolved. For 1. how is it consistent with what we read further on,—that *scales* had grown over the eyes? 2. This amaurosis is, as they themselves admit, an affection which lasts but a very short time; whereas Saul's blindness continued about *three days*. 3. How are we to account for a blindness, so complete as to be accompanied with *scales* over the eyes, leaving Saul *so soon*,—nay, immediately on Ananias's laying his hands on him. 4. How is it that *Saul alone*, and none of his companions, was struck with this *amaurosis*?

The *ἔφαγε χειρωγαγούς αὐτὸν εἰσήγαγον* here; a circumstance introduced to show utter blindness, and which often occurs in the Classical writers. It should seem that in the case of Saul, as in that of Elymas, the blindness was not only *judicial*, but *typical* and emblematical. In the former case it was probably meant, by withdrawing his attention from external thoughts, and turning them inward, to favour reflection and self-examination, and thus lead to repentance.

9. *ἡμέρας τρεῖς.*] We need not understand *three complete days*, but suppose that among these three days is to be reckoned that on which Saul reached Damascus, and that on which Ananias came to him and removed his blindness. Thus when it is said that Christ was in the sepulchre *three days*, we know, it was, in fact, but one whole day and a part of two others.

—*οὐκ ἔφαγεν οὐδὲ ἔπιεν.*] We might, in any other case, understand this of extreme abstinence. But to suppose it *here* (with several recent Commentators) were an unwarrantable *lowering* of the sense; as indeed in most of the passages to which they appeal as examples of this hyperbole, as they term it. *Complete fasting* was very suitable under Saul's present awful visitation, which he could not know would ever be removed. Indeed the terror and remorse he felt, and the total absorption of his mind on a new and momentous subject, with the exercise of self-examination and

earnest prayer for mercy and pardon, would leave him no inclination to eat and drink for the time mentioned, even had not his body been too disordered to admit of it.

11. *Εὐθεῖαν.*] I have so edited, with Beza, Wets., and others, for *εὐθ.*, because the word is evidently a substantive and a *proper* name.

—*Σαῦλον ὄν.*] Sub. *ἄνδρα*, and perhaps *καλούμενον*. The manner in which Saul is mentioned here and at ver. 13, quite discountenances the conjecture of many recent Foreign Commentators, that Saul and Ananias were acquainted with each other. I have, in Recens. Synop., shown how unfounded is this notion. Indeed how many difficulties are *created* by the attempt to reduce every thing to the level of common occurrence, or sometimes by even attempting to *intermix* the natural and the preternatural.

—*προσεύχεται*] is praying, namely, for pardon, and deliverance from the just judgment of God.

13. ὁ Ἄν.] A few ancient MSS. and early Edd. omit the Article, which is cancelled by almost all Editors from Matth. to Vater; but without reason. Its insertion is agreeable to strict propriety. See Middl. Gr. A. Ch. iv. And it is far more likely that the Scribes should inadvertently omit than *insert* it.

—*τοῖς ἁγίοις σου.*] A periphrasis simply denoting *Christians*, as the Jews were styled *יְהוּדָיִם*.

Both expressions denote what is *supposed* to be the case in persons so designated, and suggest what they *ought* to be.

14. *ἴδε*] “in this place.” As Heb. xiii. 4.

15. *σκεῦος ἐκλογῆς.*] A Hebraism for *σκ. ἐκλεκτόν*, a chosen *instrument* to work my purposes. For though *σκεῦος* (as also the Heb. כְּלִי) properly denotes an *utensil*, or *piece of furniture*, yet, like כְּלִי in Is. xiii. 5., it sometimes denotes *organon*, in both its literal and metaphorical sense, i. e. a person well adapted to the execution of any purpose. Thus Polyb. cited by Grot. *Δαμοκλῆς δὲ ἦν ἡπρητικὸν σκεῦος, καὶ πολλὰς ἔχον ἀφορμὰς εἰς πραγμάτων οἰκονομίαν.*

—*βασιτάσαι.*] There is a *significatio praeiens*, the word signifying to carry [forth] and make known.

16. Jesus does not actually bid Ananias to lay

Ἀπῆλθε δὲ Ἀνανίας καὶ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, καὶ ἐπιθείς ἐπ' 17
 αὐτὸν τὰς χεῖρας εἶπε· Σαουλ ἀδελφέ, ὁ Κύριος ἀπέσταλκε με, (Ἰησοῦς
 ὁ ὀφθαλμοὶ σοι ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ τῇ ἡρώου) ὅπως ἀναβλέψῃς καὶ πληρωθῆς Πνεύ-
 ματος ἁγίου. Καὶ εὐθὺς ἀπέπεσον ἀπὸ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ 18
 λεπίδες, ἀνέβλεψε τε παραχρῆμα· καὶ ἀναστάς ἐβαπτίσθη· καὶ λαβὼν 19
 τροφὴν ἐτίσχυεν. Ἐγένετο δὲ ὁ Σαῦλος μετὰ τῶν ἐν Λαμμασκῷ μαθη-
 τῶν ἡμέρας τινάς. Καὶ εὐθὺς ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς ἐκήρυσσε τὸν 20
 † Χριστὸν, ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ. Ἐξίσταντο δὲ πάντες οἱ 21
 ἀκούοντες, καὶ ἔλεγον· Οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ πορθήσας ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ
 τοὺς ἐπικαλουμένους τὸ ὄνομα τοῦτο· καὶ ὧδε εἰς τοῦτο ἐληλύθει ἵνα
 δεδεμένους αὐτοὺς ἀγάγῃ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς; Σαῦλος δὲ μᾶλλον ἐνεδυ- 22
 ναμοῦτο, καὶ συνέχυνε τοὺς Ἰουδαίους τοὺς κατοικοῦντας ἐν Λαμμασκῷ,
 συμβιβάζων ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός. Ὡς δὲ ἐπληροῦντο ἡμέραι 23
 u 2 Cor. 11. 32. ἱκαναί, συνεβουλεύσαντο οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἀνελεῖν αὐτόν· ἠγγνώσθη δὲ τῷ 24
 Σαῦλῳ ἡ ἐπιβουλὴ αὐτῶν· παρετήρουν τε τὰς πύλας ἡμέρας τε καὶ

his hands upon Saul: but that was implied, and Ananias could not but perceive that the affair was to take place in coincidence with the vision. Hence he tells Saul that the Lord hath sent him for that purpose.

17. ὅπως πληρωθῆς Πν. ἁγ.] Jesus had not indeed told Ananias *this*, but he well knew it was impossible that Saul could be able to effect what he was to effect without a copious effusion of the Holy Spirit, which is implied in πληρωθῆς.

18. εὐθὺς ἀπέπεσον — λεπίδες.] What but *supernatural* power could produce this? It is pitiable to see the miserable straits to which those Commentators are reduced, who seek to account for this on *natural* principles. Nothing can be plainer, than that St. Luke means to represent the removal of the blindness, as he had done the infliction of it, as *supernatural*. It may not, however, be the less true that there is a disorder of the eyes, sometimes occurring in the East, called *λείωμα*, produced by certain humors in the eyes, which becoming *concrete*, form as it were scales. Thus Schleus. refers to Tob. ii. 9. and vi. 10., and cites Tob. xi. 13. καὶ ἐλεπίσθη ἀπὸ τῶν κανθῶν τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτοῦ τὰ λευκάματα. See Foes. *Æcon.* Hipp. p. 230. But this, as I learn, is a *lingering* disorder. And to bring it on suddenly and without a natural cause, and to remove it suddenly and alike without a natural cause, cannot but be *miraculous*.

19. ἡμέρας τινάς.] Not *certain* days, but *some* days. On the chronological difficulty supposed to be involved in this and the following verses, see Note on Gal. i. 17.

20. Χριστόν.] 13 MSS., most of the Versions, and Irenæus, have Ἰησοῦν, which is preferred by Grot., Mill, and Beng., and edited by Griesb., Knapp, and Tittm., with the approbation of Michaelis, Morus, Valckn., Rosenm., and Kuin. The preference, however, seems due to Χριστόν, as being the more *difficult* reading; whereas the former bears the stamp of *emendation* upon it. The corruption may be attributed to those who stumbled at τὸν Χρ., taking it only to denote the same thing with Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, and not being aware that τὸν Χρ. may be for τὸν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν; and that that is sometimes only a *proper name*, even in the Gospels and Acts, as has been proved by

Bp. Middl. See Note on Mark xi. 43., where he observes, that “the commonness of the name Jesus among the Jews both rendered an *addition* necessary, and also contributed to the gradual substitution of that addition for the real name.” Thus all objection is removed, Χρ. being equivalent to Ἰησοῦν.

22. συμβιβάζων] “evincing,” as in I Cor. ii. 16. Συμβιβάζειν properly signifies to *put together*, as carpenters’ work. And since he who *proves* any thing does it by showing the connexion, and tracing the chain of facts or reasonings, so it comes to mean to *demonstrate*, a sense which occurs in I Cor. ii. 16. and sometimes in the LXX.; but rarely in the Classical writers. Ὁ Χριστός should be rendered “the Messiah;” for here it is plainly an *appellative*, descriptive of that office. See Note supra v. 20.

24. ἠγγνώσθη — αὐτῶν.] This clause perturbs the construction, and is, therefore, removed by the Syr. Version and Wakef., and placed after παρετήρουν — ἀνέλωσι. That, however, is scarcely allowable, even in a *Translation*. In preference to supposing so very harsh a transposition, I would regard the clause with Abp. Newc., as parenthetical. But thus παρετήρουν is brought into the closest connexion with οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι as its Nominative. And the statement runs counter to that in 2 Cor. xi. 32. where St. Paul says not that the *Jews*, but that the *soldiers* of the Ethnarch of King Aretas occupied the gates, that he might not escape. Some Commentators, indeed, (as Kuin.), attempt to remove this discrepancy by supposing, either that the Jews may be said to have done *what they did*, by another, they having *suggested* the thing; or that the Jews by the authority of the Ethnarch, watched the gates in *conjunction with the soldiers*. Of these two solutions the *second* is preferable; but it may be doubted whether it be quite satisfactory. I would rather suppose that οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι is *not* the true Nomin. to παρετήρουν, but rather ἀνθρώποι understood, by a very common ellipsis. Thus the sense may be expressed as if the verb had been impersonal, “A watch was set at the gates, that he might be apprehended.” Thus the discrepancy will be effectually removed. It was not *likely* that the Governor of the city should suffer a few

25 νυκτός, ὅπως αὐτὸν ἀνέλωσι· λαβόντες δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ νυκτός,
 26 καθῆκαν διὰ τοῦ τείχους, χαλάσαντες ἐν σπυρίδι. Παραγεγόμενος δὲ
 ὁ Σαῦλος εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, ἐπειρᾶτο κολλᾶσθαι τοῖς μαθηταῖς· καὶ
 27 πάντες ἐφοβοῦντο αὐτὸν, μὴ πιστεύοντες ὅτι ἐστὶ μαθητῆς. Βαρνάβας
 δὲ ἐπιλαβόμενος αὐτὸν, ἤγαγε πρὸς τοὺς ἀποστόλους· καὶ διηγῆσατο
 αὐτοῖς πῶς ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ εἶδε τὸν Κύριον, καὶ ὅτι ἐλάλησεν αὐτῷ, καὶ
 28 πῶς ἐν Λαμασκῷ ἐπαρῆρησιάσατο ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. Καὶ ἦν μετ'
 αὐτῶν εἰσπορευόμενος καὶ ἐκπορευόμενος ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ, καὶ παρῆρησιαζό-
 29 μενος ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ· ἐλάλει τε καὶ συνεζήτει πρὸς τοὺς
 30 Ἑλληνιστάς· οἱ δὲ ἐπεχείρουν αὐτὸν ἀνελεῖν. Ἐπιγινόντες δὲ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ
 κατήγγυον αὐτὸν εἰς Καισάρειαν, καὶ ἐξαπέστειλαν αὐτὸν εἰς Τυρόν.

lawless foreigners φρουρεῖν τὴν πόλιν, i. e. τὰς πόλιν.

25. καθῆκαν διὰ τοῦ τείχους.] Dodd. and Wakef. translate, "by the side of the wall," which is at least more perspicuous than our common version, "by the wall." It is not easy, however, to see how this could be done; and from a comparison with the parallel passage at 2 Cor. xi. 33. καὶ διὰ θυρίδος, it is plain that δὲ must here mean *through*, i. e. by an aperture. So Luke v. 19. διὰ τῶν κεράμων καθῆκαν αὐτὸν, and elsewhere. The Philological Commentators here fail us; but I have in Recens. Synop. supplied the deficiency by citations from Aristoph. Vesp. 354 and 379., Athen. p. 214., Palaephatus § 9. and Procop. p. 155., whence it appears this was often done. We are not, however, to understand by the θυρίδος above mentioned, a *window* in the wall itself (for the exceedingly thick city walls of the ancients scarcely admitted of windows), but in some turret on the wall, or perhaps a window of some house connected with the wall, so as to have part of the house above it. For it is certain that this was *sometimes* the case, as is clear from Thucyd. ii. 4, and the passages of the Classical writers cited by me in the Note there. It may be added, that this was an *Eastern* custom, exceedingly ancient, as appears from Josh. ii. 15. (of Rahab and the spies) where some of the Greek Translators render καὶ κατεχάλασεν αὐτοὺς διὰ τῆς θυρίδος ἐν σχοινοῦ, ὅτι ὁ οἶκος ἦν ἐν τῷ τείχεϊ. So a Rabbinical writer cited by Wets. on 2 Cor. xi. 33. "Domus in mœnibus exstructa, cujus paries exterior est murus urbis."

26. παραγεγόμενος — εἰς Ἱερ.] Not immediately, but after having gone (for the second time, it should seem) into Arabia. See Note on Gal. i. 17. This circumstance Luke omits, because he only meant to narrate such parts of St. Paul's history, and more public ministrations, as especially illustrated the providence of God over him, and the mode in which he was brought to devote himself to the conversion of the Gentiles. Chrysost. here remarks (p. 723.): Τί οὖν; τιοῦτον κίνδυνον διαφυγῶν, ἅρα ἴσταται; οὐδαμῶς· ἀλλ' ἀπέρχεται ἐνθα μειζόνος ἀν' αὐτοῦ ἐξέσσει, where for the confessedly corrupt ἴσταται Seville conjectures φεύγει; for the true mode of emendation seems to be this: ἅρα ἴσταται read ἄρ' ἀφίσταται. The verb ἀφίστασθαι is used in the sense *desert*, *abandon*, both in the Scriptural and Classical writers. But Chrys. seems to have had in view Luke viii. 13. καὶ ἐν καιρῷ πειρασμῷ ἀφίστανται. See also 1 Tim. iv. 1 Heb. iii. 12.

27. Βαρνάβας δέ.] Paul is supposed to have

been previously known to Barnabas; nay, to have been a fellow disciple with him under Gamaliel.

— ἐπιλαβόμενος.] The older Commentators interpret this "taking him;" by which it will be a mere pleonasm. And for the sense "received him into hospitality," assigned by Schleus. and others, there is no authority. It seems to denote (by an idiom common to our own language) "taking him by the hand," i. e. giving him his countenance, society, and aid. Thus the Syriac Version expresses it by "accepit;" better *suscepit*. This signification is rare; but there is an example in Eccles. iv. 11. ἡ σοφία υἱὸς αὐτῆς ἀνέψωσε, καὶ ἐπιλαμβάνεται τῶν ζητούντων αὐτῶν. The above interpretation I find supported by the authority of Tittmann de Syn. N. T. p. ii. p. 7., who also deduces the passage of Eccles. and besides the Scholiast on Æschyl. Pers. 739. ὁ θεὸς ἐξυπνίεται, who explains ἐξυπνίεται by ἐπιλαμβάνεται. Συνεπλ. is frequent in this sense. Ἦγαγε. Anglice, *introduced*. Διηγῆσατο must be referred to *Barnabas*. And the purport of what he says seems to be this: "If the Lord hath spoken to him, is it for us to shun him? if he has been bold in preaching the Gospel, is it for us to be timidly cautious in receiving him?"

* 28. εἰσπορευόμενος καὶ ἐκπ.] This is a phrase expressive of familiarity and intimacy. See i. 21. The construction here (not noticed by the Commentators) is as follows: καὶ ἦν μετ' αὐτῶν ἐν Ἱερ. εἰσπ. καὶ ἐκπορ. And καὶ παρῆρσ. repeat ἦν; for the sense is not, I conceive, (as Wakef. thought,) that Saul used much freedom of speech with the Apostles; though that is countenanced by the Vulgate. In fact, ἦν παρῆρησιάζόμενος is put for ἐπαρῆρησιάζετο, (as was well seen by the Pesch. Syriac translator) and thus connects well with ἐλάλει and συνεζήτει following, the sense being here, as at Eph. vi. 20. that he used freedom and boldness in the cause of Jesus, and the spread of the Gospel.

30. κατήγγυον.] This may have reference to the situation of Cæsarea on the sea-coast, as compared with the upland region of Damascus. So Plutarch Vit. Cic. (cited by Wets.) αὐτὸν οἱ πεδονατοὶ πάντες ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκίας κατήγγυον εἰς τὸ πῆλον. But perhaps the sense is, "conducted him," as in Thucyd. iv. 78. οἱ ἀγωνοὶ — κατέστησαν αὐτὸν ἐς Δίον. and Acts xvii. 15. καθιστῶντες τὸν Παῦλον ἤγαγον ἕως Ἀθηνῶν. It is strange that Dodd. and Scott should take the Cæsarea here of *Cæsarea Philippi*, since (as Calmet well observes) when Cæsarea is mentioned without any addition, it means *Cæsarea of Palestine*. There is nothing in Gal. i. 21. to *compel* us (as Dodd. imagined)

Αἱ μὲν οὖν ἐκκλησίαι καθ' ὅλης τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ Γαλιλαίας καὶ Σαμα- 31
ρείας εἶχον εἰρήνην, οἰκοδομοῦμεναι καὶ πορευόμεναι τῷ φόβῳ τοῦ
Κυρίου, καὶ τῇ παρακλήσει τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐπληθύνοντο.

Ἐγένετο δὲ Πέτρον, διερχόμενον διὰ πάντων, κατελθεῖν καὶ πρὸς 32
τοὺς ἁγίους τοὺς κατοικοῦντας Λύδδαν. Ἐῦρε δὲ ἐκεῖ ἄνθρωπόν τινα 33
Αἰνέα ὀνόματι, ἐξ ἐτῶν ὀκτώ κατακείμενον ἐπὶ κρᾶββάτῳ, ὃς ἦν παρα-
λελυμένος. Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Πέτρος· Αἰνέα· ἰάται σε Ἰησοῦς ὁ 34
Χριστός· ἀνάστηθι καὶ σιγῶσον σεαυτῷ. Καὶ εὐθέως ἀνέστη· καὶ 35
εἶδον αὐτὸν πάντες οἱ κατοικοῦντες Λύδδαν καὶ τὸν Σαρωτῖν· οἵτινες
ἐπέστρεψαν ἐπὶ τὸν Κύριον.

Ἐν Ἰόππῃ δέ, τις ἦν μαθήτρια ὀνόματι Ταβιθά, ἣ διεμνηνευομένη 36
λέγεται Δορκάς· αὕτη ἦν πλήρης ἀγαθῶν ἔργων καὶ ἐλεημοσυῶν ὧν
ἐποίει. Ἐγένετο δὲ, ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις ἀσθενήσασαν αὐτὴν ἀπο- 37
θανεῖν. λούσαντες δὲ αὐτὴν ἔθηκαν ἐν ὑπερώῳ. Ἐγγὺς δὲ οὔσης 38

to suppose the former; since *εἰς* there does *not* mean (when, indeed, does it!) *through*, but *unto*. And the expression *εἰς τὰ κλίματα Συρίας* would only induce us to suppose, that after having taken ship at Cæsarea, Saul did not go to Tarsus *by crossing the sea*; but as in his later voyages, by taking coasting vessels, and stopping at the principal maritime cities of Syria, (as Laodicea and Antioch), and perhaps proceeding from the latter place to Tarsus by land, through Upper Syria and Cilicia Campestris. He took this course, probably, in order to spread the Gospel over the flourishing and populous commercial places all along that coast, and especially among the Hellenists. Whereas, if he had gone *by land* from Cæsarea *Philippi*, he would have traversed a mountainous and thinly inhabited country, almost entirely peopled by heathens.

31. οἰκοδομοῦμεναι.] We have here an *architectural* metaphor; though the Commentators are not agreed whether it should be taken in the physical sense, of *increase in number* of persons, or metaphorically, of *increase in spiritual knowledge* and the grace of God. The *former* is mostly adopted by the older, the latter, by the recent Commentators; which is preferable, being supported by very many passages of the N. T., and far more agreeable to the construction. It is well observed by T. Sykes (ap. Doyly and Mant) that the term *edification* as applied to *individuals*, signifies sometimes advancement in knowledge of our duty, but generally an improvement in the *practice* of it. It is, however, usually, as here, applied to Christian communities, with reference to the duty of promoting peace, order, and unity, in the Church; to the duty of establishing and strengthening by the practice of all charity, that household of God which is built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets; Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone, Eph. ii. 19.

32. From this verse to Ch. xi. 18. are related the journeys undertaken by *Peter* (who had hitherto confined his Evangelical labours to *Jerusalem*, with the exception of a short visit to *Samaria*, related at viii. 14.) for the purpose of visiting and confirming the churches founded in Palestine, and, by his preaching, increasing the numbers of their members.

33. Αἰνέα.] From the name, he seems to

have been an Hellenist; and, as the air of the passage seems to suggest, a Christian. Κατακείμενον ἐπὶ κρᾶββ. Perhaps we need not suppose that he had been literally ten years laid on a bed; but that he had been ten years, as we say, *bedridden*.

34. στρώσον σεαυτῷ.] This expression, like *κοῖτον ποιεῖσθαι* in Herodot. vii. 17, has reference not to such *portable couches* as cripples were laid upon, to excite charity, but to a bed of large size, and suited to Æneas's respectable station in life. Here Chrys., Calvin, and Doddr. remark on the different mode in which this miracle was performed, as compared with *Christ's*. "By thus speaking (says Calvin) Peter meant to openly declare, that he was only the *instrument*, while the miracle was performed by the virtue of Christ; that he might thus give the glory to Christ alone."

35. οἵτινες ἐπέστρεψαν.] Some Commentators (as Pearce, Wakef., Heintz., and Kuin.) take *ἐπίσιν* in a *pluperfect* sense, "*had turned*," rendering: "and all the inhabitants of Lydda and Saron who had turned to the Lord saw him." But that yields a very awkward sense; as if no *others* had seen the person when healed, *but the Christian converts*. Whereas *all* must have seen him. And that is what Luke seems to have meant to say; and after that, to describe the *effect* which the miracle had on the inhabitants of the place where it was worked, and its district. Comp. v. 42. The *οἵτινες* here has, in strictness, the force of a *relative*; but it may (as the relative *ἕς* often is) in translation be resolved into its equivalent *καὶ* and *ἐκείνους*. In fact, relatives in most languages are compounded of such; as, for instance, *qui* of *que* and *ille*, and *quis* of *qui* and *is*. As to the relative *ἕς*, it was formed from the old demonstrative *ἕς*, with the ellipsis of the conjunction. The usage falls under the rule of *Matth. Gr. Gr.* § 477. "The relative sometimes serves, as in Latin, to connect propositions, instead of the demonstrative."

36. πλῆθος ἀ. ἔ.] "abounding in, studios of good works." So John i. 14. πλῆθος ἡρώτων.

37. λούσαντες δὲ αὐτήν.] As we cannot suppose that *men* would do such an office, (though there are passages in Herodotus which prove that it was in *Egypt* performed by men undertakers) we may, with Pearce and Markl., take *λούσαντες*

Ἀύδης τῇ Ἰόππῃ, οἱ μιθηταὶ ἀκούσαντες ὅτι Πέτρος ἐστὶν ἐν αὐτῇ,
 ἀπέστειλαν δύο ἄνδρας πρὸς αὐτὸν, παρακαλοῦντες μὴ ἀνῆσθαι διε-
 39 θεῖν ἕως αὐτῶν. Ἀναστάς δὲ Πέτρος συνῆλθεν αὐτοῖς· ὃν παραγε-
 νόμενον ἀνήγαγον εἰς τὸ ὑπερῶον, καὶ παρέστησαν αὐτῷ πῶσαι αἱ
 χῆραι κλαίονσαι καὶ ἐπιδεικνύμεναι χιτῶνας καὶ ἱμάτια, ὅσους ἐποίει μετ'
 40 αὐτῶν οὕσα ἡ Δορκάς. Ἐκβαλὼν δὲ ἔξω πάντας ὁ Πέτρος, θεὸς τὰ
 γόνατα προσηύξατο. καὶ ἐπιστρέψας πρὸς τὸ σῶμα, εἶπε· Ταβιθά,
 ἀνάστηθι. Ἢ δὲ ἤνοιξε τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῆς· καὶ ἰδοῦσα τὸν
 41 Πέτρον ἀνεκάθισε. Δούξ δὲ αὐτῇ χεῖρα ἀνίστησεν αὐτήν· φωνήσας
 42 δὲ τοὺς ἅγιους καὶ τὰς χήρας, παρέστησεν αὐτὴν ζῶσαν. Γνωστὸν δὲ
 ἐγένετο καθ' ὅλης τῆς Ἰόππης· καὶ πολλοὶ ἐπίστευσαν ἐπὶ τὸν Κύριον.
 43 Ἐγένετο δὲ, ἡμέρας ἱκανὰς μείναι αὐτὸν ἐν Ἰόππῃ παρὰ τινι Σίμωνι
 βυρσεῖ.

1 X. ἈΝΗΡ δὲ τις ἦν ἐν Καισαρείᾳ ὀνόματι Κορνήλιος, ἑκατοντάρχης
 2 ἐκ σπειρης τῆς καλουμένης Ἰταλικῆς, εὐσεβῆς καὶ φοβούμενος τὸν Θεὸν
 σὺν παντὶ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ, ποιῶν τε ἐλεημοσύνας πολλὰς τῷ λαῷ, καὶ
 3 δέόμενος τοῦ Θεοῦ διαπαντός. Εἶδεν ἐν ὄραματι φανερωῶς, ὡσεὶ ὥραν
 ἐννάτην τῆς ἡμέρας, ἄγγελον τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰσελθόντα πρὸς αὐτὸν, καὶ

as put for *λοῦσαι*, by reference to *ἄνθρωποι* understood, that being a general term, and including females. Or it may be regarded as a popular mode of expression, in a *general* sense, merely denoting that she was washed and laid out. The masculine is here used for either sex, as being what the Grammarians call the *worthier* gender. That women are here meant, there is the more reason to think, since we learn both from the Scriptural and ancient writers in general, that *women* were employed on such offices, even towards men. So Ennius cited by Wets. *Tarquinius corpus bona femina lavit et unxit*. And Socrates (as we learn from Plato *Phæd.*) chose to take a bath just before he drank the fatal cup, ὥστε μὴ πράγματα ταῖς γυναῖξιν παρέχειν. Accordingly we cannot doubt that women always performed such offices to *women*.

38. μὴ ἀνῆσθαι] “not to delay.” A sense rare in the earlier, but frequent in the later writers. We may hence clearly infer they had a hope of Peter’s being able to bring the dead person to life.

39. ὑπερῶον.] See Note supra i. 13.
 — ἐπιδεικνύμεναι — Δορκάς.] The sense is: “Showing coats and garments such as Dorcas used to make when she was with them.” The use of the Imperfect to denote *custom* is not unfrequent. It is not certain whether the garments shown were, as the common opinion is, *stocks* of clothes provided for the poor; or (what is the opinion of some recent Commentators and of the ancients, Cyprian), such garments as the widows then had on. That, however, seems countenanced neither by the words themselves (for thus the *article* would be requisite at *χιτῶνας* and *ἱμάτια*; and *ἄ*, not *σα*, would have been used), nor by the air of the context: not to say that there is something *frigid* and jejune in the latter view; while the former is perfectly natural and appropriate. The widows meant to justify, as it were, their grief, by showing Peter how industriously active Tabitha had been in her domestic duties,

and how much she would be missed. That the women of ancient times, even those of the higher ranks, used to manufacture garments for the family use, is well known, and established by various proofs. There is no doubt, too, that these works were, by benevolent and charitable mistresses of families, carried on, not for the use of the family alone, but to give to the poor, and such as could not make them for themselves. And these widows had, doubtless, as we may infer from the air of the passage, partaken of Tabitha’s bounty in all their other respects.

40, 41. ἐκβαλὼν ἔξω.] See Note on Matt. ix. 25. and compare 2 Kings iv. 33.

41. παρέστησεν αὐτὴν ζῶσαν.] There is great elegance in this use of *παρίστημι*, *exhibeo*, of which Wets. adduces an example from Sext. Emp. 254. ὅτε Ἀδμήτω δ’ Ἡρακλῆς τὴν Ἀλκίπτιν γῆθεν ἀναγαγὼν παρέστησεν.

43. παρὰ.] Not “with,” but “in the house of,” as the French say *chez soi*; there being an ellipsis of *ἐπιζήμιος* expressed at x. 6.

X. 1. σπειρης — Ἰταλ.] So called, as being chiefly formed of Italians; for most of the Roman corps in Syria and Palestine were composed of *provincials*. By this the older Commentators understand a *Legion* called the *Italian Legion*. And indeed such a Legion is mentioned in Tacitus, Dio Cass., and Josephus. But the expression *σπείρα* will not admit of such a sense: nay, there is (as Biscoe has shown) great reason to think that the Legion of that name was *not yet in existence*. *Σπείρα* can only mean a *cohort*; though, from what has been adduced by Biscoe, Valdem., and Kuin., it seems we are not to understand an ordinary *Legionary* cohort, but one similar to the *Prætorian* cohorts of the Roman Emperors, and forming the body-guard of the Roman President of Syria, and garrisoning Cæsarea. Of this Italian cohort mention is made by Arrian *Tact.* p. 73. (cited by Wets.) *προεστρατήθησαν ἐπὶ αὐτῶν οἱ τῆς σπείρης Ἰταλικῆς πεζοί*. whence it appears

εἰπόντα αὐτῷ· Κορηήλιε. Ὁ δὲ ἀτερίσας αὐτῷ καὶ ἔμφοβος γενόμενος 4
εἶπε· Τί ἐστὶ, κύριε; εἶπε δὲ αὐτῷ· Αἶ προσευχαί σου καὶ αἶ ἐλε-
ημοσύνη σου ἀνέβησαν εἰς μνημόσυνον ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ. Καὶ νῦν 5
πέμψον εἰς Ἰόππην ἄνδρας, καὶ μετέπεμψαι Σίμωνα ὃς ἐπικαλεῖται
Πέτρος· οὗτος ξηρίζεται παρὰ τινι Σίμωνι βουρσί, ᾧ ἔστιν οἰκία παρὰ 6
θύλασσαν· [οὗτος λαλήσει σοι τί σε δεῖ ποιεῖν.] Ὡς δὲ ἀπῆλθεν 7
ὁ ἄγγελος ὁ λαλῶν † τῷ Κορηλίῳ, φωνήσας δύο τῶν οἰκετῶν αὐτοῦ,
καὶ στρατιώτην εὐσεβῆ τῶν προσκαριτερούτων αὐτῷ, καὶ ἐξηγησάμενος 8
αὐτοῖς ἅπαντα, ἀπέστειλεν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν Ἰόππην. Τῇ δὲ ἐπαύριον, 9
ἔδοιοποροῦντων ἐκείνων καὶ τῇ πόλει ἐγγιζόντων, ἀνέβη Πέτρος ἐπὶ τὸ
δάμα προσεύξασθαι περὶ ὧσαν ἔκτην. Ἐγένετο δὲ πρόσπειρος, καὶ 10
ἤθελε γεύσασθαι· παρασκευαζόντων δὲ ἐκείνων, ἐπέπεσεν ἐπ' αὐτὸν
ἔκστασις. Καὶ θεωρεῖ τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνεωγμένον, καὶ καταβῆνον ἐπ' 11

that the cohort consisted both of infantry and cavalry.

With respect to Cornelius, it has been debated whether he was a Gentile or a Jewish Proselyte. Commentators are now generally agreed on the former (see Valckn. in Rec. Syn.); but though a Gentile, that he was a worshipper of the one true God, and probably the first-fruits of the conversion of the Gentiles to Christianity.

4. *τί ἐστι, κύριε.*] A popular form of respectful answer to the call of a superior, though sometimes to that of an inferior, varying according to the tone of voice with which it is pronounced. Kuin. aptly cites Esth. v. 1. *τί ἐστιν, Ἐσθῆρ;* thus there is an ellipsis of some such words as *αἰτημά σου* which is supplied at Esth. vii. 2.

— *ἀνέβησαν ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ.*] This is only an Oriental and figurative way of expressing that any thing has come to the knowledge of God. Nor does it necessarily imply the Jewish notion, that men's prayers are carried up by angels to God in heaven. In *εἰς μνημ.* we have the Hellenistic use of *μνημόσυνον* for *μνημεῖον*, corresponding to the Heb. זכרון. The word almost always implies, as here, an honourable remembrance; and *εἰς μνημ.* here and at Matt. xxvi. 13. is put for *ὥστε μνησθήναι*.

5. *καὶ νῦν.*] A hortatory form. See Elsner.

6. *ξηρίζεται*] for *ξενοδοχεῖται*; a sense occurring elsewhere in the Acts, and in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and rarely found except in the later writers.

— *βουρσί.*] The Attic writers used *βουροδέψης*, literally a skin-softener, corresponding to our *currier*. With them *βουρσί* only denoted a *skinner*, though there can be little doubt but that, among the ancients, the two trades were often conjoined, as far as the rougher sorts of tanning were concerned: and both were proverbially mean occupations, and held in such contempt by the Jews, that various laws were in force regulating the exercise thereof. See Rec. Synop. Thus the house being *by the sea-side* (i. e. as opposed to the *harbour*, and consequently out of the city) was in conformity to a law, which obliged tanners to have their workshops outside of towns. They were always placed near rivers, or by the sea, for the convenience of water, so necessary for their trade.

— *οὗτος — ποιεῖν.*] These words do not appear

in many of the best MSS., Versions, and Fathers, with the Edit. Princ., and are written so very differently in others, that almost all Critics and Editors are agreed that they are from the margin, introduced from ix. 6. xi. 14. xxii. 10.

7. *τῶν προσκαρ. α.*] Pric., Schleus., and Kuin. take *προσκαρ.* to mean “of those who stood sentry.” But there is perhaps no sufficient reason to abandon the common version, “of those who waited upon him,” namely, as *domestics*; for it seems that centurions were allowed to use some of their soldiers in that capacity. This sense is confirmed by the use of the word *supra* viii. 13, and is perhaps *required* by the *ἐκείνων* at ver. 10, where see Note.

10. *πρόσπειρος.*] A word said to occur nowhere else, though *κατάπειρος*, *ἐκπειρος*, and *δέξπειρος* are found. The *προς* has an intensive force, as derived from the signification in *addition* to. I know no other example of *προς* with an adjective, except it be *προσηγής*. At *γεύσασθαι* sub. *τῆς τροφῆς*. This idiom we should suppose would be used solely of taking a slight refreshment: but it is very often used of *taking a meal*, without reference to the quantity of food eaten. See my Note on Thucyd. ii. 70. The Classical writers rarely, if ever, use the word thus, *absolutely*; in which we may trace the force of the middle voice, by which the word means to *feed one's self*, and thence to *eat*.

— *ἐκείνων.*] Several MSS. and Origen have *αὐτῶν*, which *seems* to have greater propriety, since *ἐκείνος* is rarely found in this *absolute* use; but it is perhaps an emendation, especially as it comes from a quarter fruitful in such. Besides, *ἐκείνων* may even have greater propriety, if we consider it as having reference to the *τῶν προσκαριτερούτων αὐτῷ* *supra* v. 8.

— *ἔκστασις.*] The word properly signifies a *removal of any thing from any former situation* or state; but it is here applied to that removal of the *mind from the body*, by which, even though awake, we are insensible to external objects, and our senses are so far from conveying to us the impressions of those objects, that the mind seems, as it were, to have *retired* from the body, and to be wholly absorbed in the contemplation of internal and mental images. We may render “an *ecstasy*,” or *trance*. Lightf. observes that there were seven ways in which God formerly revealed himself to men: 1. by dreams; 2. by apparitions while they were awake; 3. by visions while they

αὐτὸν σκεῦός τι ὡς ὀθόνην μεγάλην, τέσσαρα ἄρχαί; δεδεμένον, καὶ
 12 καθιέμενον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς· ἐν ᾗ ὑπήρχε πύργος τὰ τετράποδα τῆς γῆς καὶ
 13 τὰ θηρία καὶ τὰ ἑρπετὰ, καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. καὶ ἐγένετο φωνή

slept; 4. by a voice from heaven; 5. by the Urim and Thummim; 6. by inspiration, or auricular revelation; 7. by a sort of rapture or ecstasy (as here and Gen. ii. 21.), which was of all other modes the most excellent, and by which a man was *snatched into heaven* (2 Cor. xii. 2.), and *was in the Spirit* (Rev. i. 10.).

11. σκεῦός.] The word (derived from σκέω, or κίω, *tego*) signifies any article of furniture which is adapted to *contain* any thing, — a *vessel*. ὀθόνην may mean either a sheet, or a *wrapper*, such as has ever been in use in the East to throw over any thing or person. So Aristoph. *Vesp.* 595. τῶν δ' αἰμὴν λεπτάς δὲ θάλασσαν ἔχον, οἱ δὲ χιτῶνας. Of this word the etymon is *given up* in despair by the Etymologists. But may it not come from ὄθω, cognate with ὄω and οἴω, to *bear* or *carry*? as our *sheet* comes from the Ang. Sax. *þreccan*, to cast or throw [over]. It is of the same form as σφενδόνη, ἀγρόνη, περόνη, βελόνη, &c.

On the typical intent of this and other parts of the vision, see a learned Dissertation by B. Duy-sing, in vol. ii. p. 610—20 of the *Novus Thes.* Theol. appended to the Dutch Edition of the *Critici Sacri*. In opposition to the view adopted by Hammond and others, he is of opinion that every thing included in the sheet (namely, four-footed and wild beasts, reptiles, and fowls of the air), were *unclean*; the whole object of the vision being to impress on the mind of the Apostle a *new doctrine*, relating to the *Gentiles only*, and not to the Jews and Gentiles together. "The sheet (says he) was a type of the *Christian Church*, separated from the world, which included every kind of people. It was *bound at the four corners*, to signify that the whole world should be received into the universal Church of God. It *descended from heaven*, in the same manner as the New Jerusalem is represented in the Apocalypse. And the *drawing back* of the sheet to heaven was meant to teach us that the Church, which has its origin from heaven, will return victorious to heaven." Thus the *four corners* have reference to the *four corners of the earth*, with allusion to the four cardinal points.

— ἀρχαίς.] Ἄρχῃ signifies the *extremity* of any thing of an oblong form, — since each end may be considered as a beginning. See Galen ap. Rec. Syn. And, as in things of the form of a parallelogram, (as in a web of cloth) each end, having two angles, may be said to have *two* of these ἀρχαί; thus ἀρχαί might here be rendered *extremities*, or corners; though "*ends*" is the more accurate version. Wakef., indeed, renders "by four strings," referring, for an example of that signification, to a passage of Diod. Sic. And Bp. Middleton regards this as "a singularly happy criticism, and as probably worth all that remains in his New Testament." I can neither agree with the learned Prelate in his commendation, nor (low as I rate the value of Wakefield's labours on the N. T.) in the *censure* which it implies. After carefully examining all the authorities which have any bearing upon the point in question, I cannot discover any *proof* of the signification which Wakef. and Bp. Middl. adopt. The passages to which I allude are the following: Galen de Chirurg. ii. Exod. xxviii. 23. Diod. Sic. i. 109. ἀρχῇ

σχοίνιον. Lucian iii. 83. δεσμῶν ἀρχάς. Herodot. iv. 60. τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῦ στρόφου. Eurip. Hipp. 772. πλεκτάς πειραμάτων ἀρχάς. Philo Jud. vol. ii. p. 117. δοκίδος τὰς ἀρχάς. But the first and second passages only prove that either or both ends of any oblong body may be called ἀρχαί. The rest show that it was not unfrequently used of the end of a rope or band. On which see Jacobs on Anthol. Gr. T. xi. p. 50. So far the proof only amounts to this, — that ἀρχῇ may denote the end of any thing, and, with the addition of a word signifying *band*, the end of a rope; but there is no proof that it ever meant a rope. Yet the passage of Diod. Sic. (T. i. 104. Edit. Bip.) was thought by Bp. Middl. to *supply* this proof. It respects the manner of harpooning the Hippopotamus, and the words are these: αὐτῷ ἐνὶ τῶν ἐμπαιγμάτων ἐάπροντες ἀρχάς στυπίας, ἀφ' αἷται μίχρους ἀν παραλυθῆ. But the very erudite WESSELIUS, in his Note, determines it to mean "*hempen cable-ends*." These were probably stronger than the rest of the cable; and they were, no doubt, fastened together, for the purpose of holding fast the Hippopotamus; hence the plural is used. Of this sense of ἀρχῇ, to denote end, Wessel. adduces two examples, from Plutarch and Philo Jud. And finally, he so explains the present passage of Acts. Bochart, indeed, most ingeniously, conjectures on the passage of Diod. σπώστας or ἀράστας (which latter had also occurred to myself); but they are unnecessary, if the above mode of explanation be adopted. At all events, there is no proof made out that ἀρχῇ can of itself, denote a rope; which would involve an intolerable *catachresis*. The two learned Critics were deceived by not attending to the nature of the term δεδεμένον, which is often, as here, a *vox prægnans*, including the sense ἀπὸ or ἐκ σχοίνιον. So Matt. xxi. 2. εὐρίστετε ὄνον δεδεμένον. Mark xi. 4. τὸν πῶλον δεδεμένον. In this case the ἀπὸ or ἐκ must be understood according as the sense be *suspension from* (as in the present passage), or *lying to*, as in the foregoing. Thus we may render "at the four ends." Bp. Middl., indeed, objects to the introduction of the *the*, because *there is no Article in the Greek*; forgetting that he thus falls into the very error for which he so often censures Wakef.; that of not bearing in mind those many cases where the *absence* of the Article affords no presumption of the noun's being indefinite. The present falls under the case of nouns used κατ' ἐξοχήν; or rather nouns which, though by their very definite sense, they point only to certain individuals of a genus; yet that is so well understood, that the Article may be safely omitted. And this is still more frequently the case when the noun is accompanied with an adjective, and preceded by a preposition. Here ἐπὶ is understood.

12. καὶ τὰ θηρία.] These words are omitted in a few MSS., and some Versions and Fathers. And Griesb. and others are inclined to cancel them; but without reason; for the number of those MSS. is but five, and the omission of them may readily be accounted for from the two καί's. Or the framers of the text of those MSS. (*altered ones*) may have thought the words unnecessary, and better away. Either of these reasons, and especially the latter, may have occasioned their

πρὸς αὐτόν· Ἀναστάς, Πέτρε, θύσον καὶ φάγε. ὁ δὲ Πέτρος εἶπε· 14
Μηδαμῶς, Κύριε· ὅτι οὐδέποτε ἔφαγον πᾶν κοινὸν ἢ ἀκάθαρτον. Καὶ 15
φωνή πάλιν ἐκ δευτέρου πρὸς αὐτόν· Ἄ ὁ Θεὸς ἐκαθάρισε, σὺ μὴ
κοίνου. Τοῦτο δὲ ἐγένετο ἐπὶ τρεῖς· καὶ πάλιν ἀνελήφθη τὸ σκεῦος 16
εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν.

Ὡς δὲ ἐν ἑαυτῷ διηπόρει ὁ Πέτρος, τί ἂν εἴη τὸ ὄραμα ὃ εἶδε, καὶ 17
ἰδοῦ, οἱ ἄνδρες οἱ ἀπεσταλμένοι ἀπὸ τοῦ Κορονηλίου, διερωτήσαντες
τὴν οἰκίαν Σίμωνος, ἐπέστησαν ἐπὶ τὸν πυλῶνα· καὶ φωνήσαντες 18
ἐπυνθάνοντο, εἰ Σίμων ὁ ἐπικαλούμενος Πέτρος ἐνθάδε ξενίζεται. Τοῦ 19
δὲ Πέτρου * διενθυμουμένου περὶ τοῦ ὄραματος, εἶπεν αὐτῷ τὸ Πνεῦμα·

x *Infra* 15. 7. Ἰδοῦ, ἄνδρες τρεῖς ζητοῦσὶ σε· * ἄλλὰ ἀναστάς κατὰβηθι, καὶ πορεύου 20

omission in the *Versions* also, which, indeed, are not good evidence in matters of this kind. As to the evidence of the *Fathers*, it is but slender when it regards the omission of words which seem not very necessary. Besides, the common reading is placed beyond doubt by the recurrence of this passage verbatim *infra* xi. 6. without any Var. lect., except that *one Version* and Epiphanius omit καὶ τὰ θηρία. Some MSS., both there and here, place τῆς γῆς, not after τεράποδα, but either after τὰ ἐρπετὰ, or after τὰ θηρία. This, however, arose either (as Matth. supposes) "ex pluralitate membrorum," or rather from a desire to clear the construction of the clause, which the ancient Critics perceived (though the Commentators have not) to be as follows: ἵππορχε πάντα τὰ τετρ. καὶ τὰ θηρία καὶ τὰ ἐρπετὰ τῆς γῆς. Thus τῆς γῆς corresponds to τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, and is not to be regarded, with Vorst. and Kuin., as a Hebrew pleonasm. Τεράποδα denotes the tame beasts, בְּרֵייתָ, as θηρία the wild ones, חַיָּה. Wet. compares Orpheus Argon. 73. κληῖσσω δὲ τε θήρας, ἢδ' ἐρπετὰ καὶ περηνά. On the thing here typified (the removal of the distinction of clean and unclean meats, and the abrogation of the ceremonial law), even the Jewish Rabbies supposed that at the coming of the Messiah the distinction would be done away.

14. μηδαμῶς.] This and οὐδαμῶς (forms of denial and repugnance) are relics of the old word ἀμῶς, which in the ancient language signified *aliquis*. In the place of this formula is sometimes used μὴ γίνωτο· Absit! or μὴ δῆτα by the Tragedians. (Valckn.)

— κοινόν.] This term properly signifies what belongs to all, as in Sap. vii. 3. κοινὸς ἀήρ. But the Hellenists applied it (like the Heb. חַיָּה) to what was profane, i. e. not holy, and therefore of common and promiscuous use; as Ez. xlii. 20. (where it is opposed to ἅγιον), and Joseph. Ant. xii. 13. τὰ θεῖα ἐκφύραεν ἐπὶ κοινούς ἀνθρώπους. They also applied the term to what was impure, whether naturally, or legally, (as in Mark vii. 2. compared with I Macc. i. 47, 62.); and finally, it was used of meats forbidden, or such as had been partaken of by idolaters, and which, as they rendered the eaters thereof impure, were themselves called κοινὰ and ἀκάθαρτα, terms also applied to the eaters. (Kuin.)

15. ἐκαθάρισε] i. e. hath declared pure, or made so by removing the law which forbade its use. Thus, by κοίνου is meant "account impure." So Scheoth Rabba, fol. 118, 3, it is said (on Job xxxi. 3.) "the stranger did not lodge in the street," Non enim Deus κοινός, profanum judicat quemquam hominem, sed omnes recipit. It is well

observed by Kuin. that in the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, any one is said to do a thing who declares it to be done, as in Levit. xiii. 3. 13, and 17, μαινεῖν and καθαρίζειν are so used, and συγκλείειν in Gal. iii. 22. The Classical writers abound in examples. All this was (as Br. Warburton has shown, vol. vi. p. 70.) equivalent to "saying, that the distinction between meats was abolished; and consequently that the *Gentiles* were to be admitted into the Church of Christ."

16. ἐπὶ τρεῖς.] There is not (as Kypke and Kuin. imagine) a redundancy in the ἐπὶ, which signifies unto, or as far as; it must always be understood in this phrase, and is generally expressed, or (at least εἰς) in the best writers. The vision was thrice repeated, for greater certainty, and to fix it more strongly on Peter's mind. So Genes. xli 32. "And for that the dream was doubled unto Pharaoh twice: it is because the thing is established by God, and God will shortly bring it to pass." The number three, too, was one in general use among the early Christians for such sort of repetition. So St. Paul besought the Lord thrice that the thorn in the flesh might be removed. Nor was it confined to Christians only, but the same was in use among the Heathens, as Br. Pearce shows from Virg. *Æn.* p. 174. So also Horace *Carin.* iii. 22, 3. (of Diana) "Virgo quæ laborantes in utero puellas ter vocata audis."

17. τί ἂν εἴη] "what it might mean." Of this phrase Kypke adduces examples from the Classical writers; all of which have ποτε added, except one from Palæph. *Ἐθαύμασαν* τί ἂν εἴη τὸ γεγονός. Peter's doubt was not whether the distinction of meats was abolished, but whether that implied a removal of the distinction between Jews and Gentiles; a doubt soon removed by the messengers.

19. διενθυμουμένου.] So almost all the Editors from Beng. and Wets. to Vat. edit, from many MSS., Versions, Fathers, and the Edit. Princ., instead of the common reading ἐνθυμουμένου, which is confirmed by those passages of Cyril and other Fathers cited by Boissonade ap. Steph. Thes. Indeed compounds are often changed to simples by the scribes. Were not the authority for διενθ. considerable, I should suspect that the δι arose from the εἰ a little before at διερωτήσαντες and διηπόρει. And this is countenanced by the fact that διενθυμίσθαι is nowhere else found. Many examples might be adduced of compound verbs which have no better origin than the mistakes of scribes; though they have been unwarily introduced into the new Edition of Steph. Thes.

— εἶπεν αὐτῷ τὸ Πν.] This must, notwithstand-

- 21 οὐν αὐτοῖς, μηδὲν διακρινόμενος, διότι ἐγὼ ἀπέσταλκα αὐτούς. Κατα-
 βίας δὲ Πέτρος πρὸς τοὺς ἄνδρας [τοὺς ἀπεσταλμένους ἀπὸ τοῦ Κορ-
 νηλίου πρὸς αὐτὸν,] εἶπεν· Ἰδοὺ, ἐγὼ εἰμι ὃν ζητεῖτε· τίς ἡ αἰτία
 22 δι' ἣν πάρεστε; οἱ δὲ εἶπον· Κορνηλῖος ἐκιοτινάρχης, ἀνὴρ δίκαιος
 καὶ φοβούμενος τὸν Θεὸν μαρτυρούμενός τε ὑπὸ ὄλου τοῦ ἔθνους τῶν
 Ἰουδαίων, ἐχρηματίσθη ὑπὸ ἀγγέλου ἁγίου, μεταπέμψασθαι σε εἰς τὸν
 23 οἶκον αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀκοῦσαι ῥήματα παρὰ σοῦ. εἰσκαλεσάμενος οὖν
 αὐτοὺς ἐξῆνε. Τῇ δὲ ἐπαύριον ὁ Πέτρος ἐξῆλθε σὺν αὐτοῖς, καὶ τινες
 24 τῶν ἀδελφῶν τῶν ἀπὸ [τῆς] Ἰόππης συνῆλθον αὐτῷ. Καὶ τῇ ἐπαύ-
 ριον εἰσῆλθον εἰς τὴν Καισάρειαν· ὁ δὲ Κορνηλῖος ἦν προσδοκῶν
 αὐτοὺς, συγκαλεσάμενος τοὺς συγγενεῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς ἀναγκαίους
 φίλους.
 25 Ὡς δὲ ἐγένετο εἰσελθεῖν τὸν Πέτρον, συναντήσας αὐτῷ ὁ Κορνηλῖος,
 26 πεσὼν ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας προσεκύνησεν. Ὁ δὲ Πέτρος αὐτὸν ἤγειρε, λέ-
 27 γων· Ἀνάστηθι· καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς ἄνθρωπός εἰμι. Καὶ συνομιλῶν αὐτῷ
 28 εἰσῆλθε, καὶ εὐρίσκει συνεληλυθότους πολλούς, ἔφη τε πρὸς αὐτούς· ^{y John 1. 9.}
 Ἦμεῖς ἐπίστασθε ὡς ἀθέμιτόν ἐστιν ἀνδρὶ Ἰουδαίῳ κολλῆσθαι ἢ προσ-
 29 θαστον λέγειν ἄνθρωπον. Διὸ καὶ ἀναντιόφῳτως ἦλθον μεταπεμφθεῖς.
 30 πυνθάνομαι οὖν, τίνι λόγῳ μετεπέμψασθέ με; Καὶ ὁ Κορνηλῖος ἔφη·
 Ἀπὸ τεταρτῆς ἡμέρας μέχρι ταύτης τῆς ὥρας ἤμην νηστεύων, καὶ τὴν

ing the dissent of Ros. and Kuin. be understood of the influence or inspiration of the Holy Spirit, as indeed Grot. explains it.

20. μηδὲν διακρ.] "making no scruple," namely, that thou art called to visit a heathen: On διακρ. see Note on Mark xi. 23.

21. τοὺς ἀπεσταλμένους—αὐτὸν] These words do not appear in very many MSS. Versions, and Fathers, and are with reason cancelled by almost every Editor of note.

—ἐγὼ εἰμι ὃν ζητεῖτε.] So Eurip. Orest. 374. δὸ' εἶπ' Ὀρέστης—ὃν ἱστορεῖς. See Virg. Æn. i. 593.

24. τῇ ἐπαύριον] on the morrow after the day he had set out; for the journey, being one of 15 hours' distance, was too great for one day.

—τοὺς ἀναγκαίους φίλους] Οἱ ἀνάγκαιοι, like *necessarii* in Latin, denotes 1. relations by consanguinity; 2. those by affinity; 3. persons connected by the bonds of friendship. When φίλοι is added, the sense is more determinate, and means confidential and intimate friends.

25. εἰσελθεῖν] Sub. τοῦ, as dependent on ἔνεκα understood, which is expressed in several MSS.

—προσεκύνησεν] This carried with it a prostration of the body to the earth, and was a mark of profound respect; which was rendered in the East not only to monarchs, but also to others persons of high dignity; though by the Romans it was rendered to the Deity alone. Certainly Cornelius, who was εἰσεβής καὶ φοβούμενος τὸν Θεὸν could not intend to offer any mark of respect inconsistent with his duty to God. He, no doubt, regarded Peter (as having been the subject of a preternatural communication) in the light of a Divine legate; and, as such, entitled to a mark of reverence like that offered to the Deity himself. Especially as he must have been aware, that Oriental custom allowed of such a mark of

profound reverence being shown from man to man. Peter, on the other hand, bearing in mind the very different custom of the Romans, with unaffected religious humility declined it.

23. ἀθέμιτον] This is not well rendered *unlawful*; for that would require *παράνομον*. Where-as the sense here is ἀσεβῆς ἢ ἀνόσιον. We may render *nefas est*. The phrase οὐ θέμ. ἐστι often occurs in the LXX., and sometimes in the Classical writers. Προσέρχεσθαι, to enter any one's house, is a further evolving of the sense contained in κολλῆσθαι, on which see Note on v. 13.

—ἄλλοφύλω] The word properly means only a foreigner; but, as Kuin. observes, it is in the Sept., Philo, and Joseph. used (as here) in a double sense, so as to denote such as are not Jews, either by birth or by religion, and elsewhere styled ξένοι or ἄλλοθριοι, Gentiles.

—καὶ ἐμοὶ] The καὶ is for καίτοι, and yet.

29. ἀναντιφῶτως] "without hesitation." The word occurs only in the later writers. Ἀδύωφ, account, cause, or reason; as 1 Cor. xv. 2. τίνι λόγῳ ἐπηγγελισάμην ἡμῖν. So Eurip. Iph. Taur. 353. τίνι λόγῳ προσβέβετε;

30. ἀπὸ τεταρτῆς—νηστεύων] Several eminent recent interpreters take this to mean, that Cornelius had fasted from the time of his vision to the time when Peter arrived. And this would seem to be called for by the correspondence of ἀπὸ and μέχρι. But it involves a great improbability, and adverts to a circumstance which Cornelius would not have been likely to mention. Besides, it is liable to other and verbal objections, which are well stated by Kuin., who would take the ἀπὸ for πρὸ, as xv. 7. 2 Cor. viii. 10. ix. 2. and ἡ in Prov. viii. 23. and elsewhere. Yet ἀπὸ can never properly be said to be put for πρὸ. When it seems to be so used, there is an ellip., for τὴν

ἐνάτην ὥραν προσευχόμενος ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ μου· καὶ ἰδοὺ, ἀνὴρ ἔστη ἐνώπιόν μου ἐν ἐσθῆτι λαμπρᾷ, καὶ φησὶ· Κορηήλιε, εἰσηκούσθη σου 31 ἢ προσευχῇ, καὶ αἱ ἐλεημοσύναι σου ἐμνήσθησαν ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ. Πέμψον οὖν εἰς Ἰόππην, καὶ μετακάλεσαι Σίμωνα ὃς ἐπικαλεῖται Πέ- 32 τρος· οὗτος ξενίζεται ἐν οἰκίᾳ Σίμωνος βουσέως παρὰ θάλασσαν· ὃς παραγεγόμενος λαλήσει σοι. Ἐξαντῆς οὖν ἔπεμψα πρὸς σε· σὺ τε 33 καλῶς ἐποίησας παραγεγόμενος. Νῦν οὖν πάντες ἡμεῖς ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ πάρεσμεν ἀκοῦσαι πάντα τὰ προστεταγμένα σοι ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ.

z Deut. 10. 17.
2 Chron. 19. 7.
Job 31. 19.
Wisd. 6. 7.
Eccl. 35. 16.
Rom. 2. 11.
Gal. 2. 6.
Eph. 6. 9.
Col. 3. 25.
1 Pet. 1. 17.
a Luke 4. 14.

Ἐξάντῃς δὲ Πέτρος τὸ στόμα εἶπεν· Ἐπὶ ἀληθείας καταλιμβάνο- 34 μαι, ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι προσωπολήπτης ὁ Θεός· ἀλλ' ἐν παντὶ ἔθνει ὁ 35 φοβούμενος αὐτὸν καὶ ἐργαζόμενος δικαιοσύνην δεκτὸς αὐτῷ ἐστι. Τὸν 36 λόγον ὃν ἀπέστειλε τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ, ἐναγγελιζόμενος εἰρήνην διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, (οὗτός ἐστι πάντων Κύριος) ἃ ἡμεῖς οἶδατε· τὸ γε- 37 νόμενον ἡμεῖς κατ' ὅλης τῆς Ἰουδαίας, ἀρξάμενον ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα ὃ ἐκήρυξεν Ἰωάννης· ἃ Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἀπὸ Ναζαρετ, 38 ὡς ἔχρισεν αὐτὸν ὁ Θεὸς Πνεῦματι ἁγίῳ καὶ δυνάμει, ὃς διήλθεν ἐνεργετῶν καὶ ἰώμενος πάντας τοὺς κατὰδυναστευομένους ὑπὸ τοῦ Δια- 39 βόλου, ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς ἦν μετ' αὐτοῦ. Καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐσμεν μάρτυρες πάντων, 39 ὧν ἐποίησεν ἐν τε τῇ χώρῃ τῶν Ἰουδαίων καὶ ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ· ὃν καὶ 40 ἀνεῖλον κρεμίσαντες ἐπὶ ξύλου. Ὁ τοῦτον ὁ Θεὸς ἤγειρε τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ,

b Luke 4. 14.

c Supra 2. 24.

τετάρτην ἡμέραν ἀπὸ ταύτης τῆς ἡμέρας. Thus the sense (as Beza, Grot., Pearce, and Kuin. have seen) is: "At the 4th day from to-day, i. e. four days ago, I was fasting up to this hour."

— λαμπρᾷ] not bright, but white; as in Luke xxiii. 11. περιβαλὼν αὐτὸν ἐσθῆτα λαμπρὰν, and sometimes in the later Classics. Some MSS. have here λευκῇ, of course a gloss, but a good one.

31. προσευχῇ] At ver. 4. we have προσευχά: but the sense is the same, προσευχῇ being here, as very often, put in a generic sense, for a continued custom of prayer.

33. καλῶς ἐποίησας παραγ.] So Herodot. v. 24. εὖ ἐποίησας ἀφιόκμενος.

34. προσωπολήπτης] i. e. one who is partial in his attentions, and shows his favours with preference to rank, dignity, or other grounds of external superiority, to the neglect of those who are destitute of these advantages. See Lu. xx. 21.

35. ἀλλ' ἐν παντὶ ἔθνει—ἔστι] This use of ἐργάζεσθαι like that of πρῶν or ὑπὸν, with δικαιοσύνην, and other words expressive of actions or moral dispositions, involves a notion of habit. No examples are adduced by the Commentators from the Classical writers; and I can only instance one of the verbal ἐργάτης, in Lycop. Cass. 128. ἐργάτης δίκης. In order to avoid the dangerous notion which has been grafted on these words, as if to fear God, and work righteousness, under any form of religious belief, were the only duties essential to salvation, see the excellent remarks of Dr. Hales, and especially of Mr. Townsend.

36. τὸν λόγον—Κύριος, &c.] There is here a perplexity of construction, which the Commentators seek in various ways to remove, either by making some slight alteration, or by taking the Accus. for a Nominat. But (as I have shown in Recens. Synop.) none of these modes is admissible, and the only satisfactory one is (with several

of the older and some of the most eminent recent Commentators) to connect τὸν λόγον with οἶδατε in the next verse, and place οὗτος—Κύριος in a parenthesis, thus repeating ἡμεῖς, as synonymous with λόγον, and in apposition with it. At ἀπέστειλε repeat ὁ Θεός from the context. Λόγος here signifies the doctrine of Christ, as xiii. 26. Πάντων, both Jews and Gentiles; for, as Lord of all, he must intend the salvation of all. Κύριος suggests that high dignity of the Redeemer, which is more distinctly expressed supra v. 31. Thus the passage may be rendered, with Prof. Scholefield, as follows: "The word which he sent to the children of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ (he is the Lord of all), ye know: even the matter which took place throughout all Judæa, beginning from Galilee, after the baptism which John preached; concerning Jesus of Nazareth, how God anointed him," &c.

38. Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἀπὸ Ναζαρετ] This is suspended on the οἶδατε preceding; and in οἶδατε Ἰησοῦν, ὡς ἔχρισεν αὐτὸν there is a common Greek idiom. Thus there is no transposition, as Kuin. imagines. Ἐχρυσεν, by a metaphor taken from the mode of inaugurating kings, signifies invested, and endowed, namely, at his baptism. See iv. 27. and Luke iv. 18. And in Πνεῦματι ἁγίῳ καὶ δυνάμει there is a Hendiadys. The sense is, "with the powerful influence of the Holy Spirit." See Bp. Middl. The general sense couched in ἐνεργετῶν is particularized and exemplified in the words following καὶ ἰώμενος—Διαβόλου, where καταδύν. ὑπὸ τοῦ Διαβόλου seems to be a more explicit mode of speaking for δαμονοζομῶντος.

39. ὃν ἀνεῖλον κρεμ. ἐπὶ ξύλου] Render, "whom they slew by hanging on a gibbet." See Note supra v. 30. Before ἀνεῖλον, καὶ is found in many of the best MSS., several Versions and Fathers, and in the Ed. Princ.; and is rightly admitted by

41 καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν ἐμφανῆ γενέσθαι· ^d οὐ παντὶ τῷ λαῷ, ἀλλὰ μόνουσι ^d Infra 13. 31.
 τοῖς προκεχειροτονημένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἡμῖν οἵτινες συνεφέγομεν καὶ
 42 συνεπίομεν αὐτῷ μετὰ τὸ ἀναστῆναι αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν. ^e Καὶ παρήγ- ^e Infra 17. 31.
 γειλεν ἡμῖν κηρύξαι τῷ λαῷ, καὶ διαμαρτυρήσασθαι, ὅτι αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ ^e Rom. 14. 10.
 43 ὠρισμένος ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ κριτῆς ζώντων καὶ νεκρῶν. ^f Τούτῳ πάντες ^f 2 Cor. 5. 10.
 οἱ προφῆται μαρτυροῦσιν, ἄφεισιν ἀμαρτιῶν λαβεῖν διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος ^f Jer. 31. 34.
 44 αὐτοῦ πάντα τὸν πιστεύοντα εἰς αὐτόν. ^g Ἐν λαλοῦντος τοῦ Πέτρου ^g Mich. 7. 15.
 τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα, ἐπέπεσε τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς ἀκού- ^g Infra 15. 9.
 45 οντας τὸν λόγον. Καὶ ἐξέστησαν οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς πιστοὶ, ὅσοι συνῆλθον
 τῷ Πέτρῳ, ὅτι καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ ἔθνη ἡ δωρεὰ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐκκέ-
 46 χυται· ἥκουον γὰρ αὐτῶν λαλούντων γλώσσαις, καὶ μεγαλυνόντων
 47 τὸν Θεόν. Τότε ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Πέτρος· ^g Infra 15. 8.
 ταί τις, τοῦ μὴ βαπτισθῆναι τούτους, οἵτινες τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον

Beng., Wets., Matth., Griesb., Titt., and Vat., since it is strongly supported by *internal* as well as *external* evidence.

41. οὐ παντὶ τῷ λαῷ, ἀλλὰ, &c.] Dr. Paley has ably pointed out a remarkable instance of the fairness of the sacred writers, in thus stating that Christ, after his resurrection, appeared to his *disciples alone*, when they might have asserted the appearance of Christ in general terms, so that it might have been supposed that he had appeared to his foes as well as his friends. This, if they had thought of any thing but the truth of the case, they would have done. As it is, their fairness is of more advantage to their testimony, than the difference in the circumstances of the account would have been to the nature of the evidence.

— προκεχειροτ.] I would not, with Kuin., take this for the simple *χειροτ.*, since as the *χειρ.* imports *appointment*, so does the *προ* import *previous* destination. Μετὰ τὸ ἀναστῆναι ἔ. v. some Editors and Commentators join with v. 40., placing the intermediate words οὐ παντὶ — συνεπίομεν αὐτῷ in a parenthesis. They they are induced to do because, they urge, we do not find that our Lord *drank*, however he might *eat*, with his disciples after his resurrection. Yet though that be not directly said, it seems *implied* at John xxi. 13. See Chrys. in loc.

43. ἄφεισιν ἀμαρτιῶν — αὐτῶν] From the anomalous nature of the construction here, several recent Editors write αὐτῶν..., to indicate that the sentence was left incomplete, namely by the falling of the Holy Spirit on the hearers, and their breaking out and speaking in new tongues. This method, however, is at once hypothetical and unnecessary; for the words in question contain a complete *sense*, though not a very regular *construction*, being intended, I conceive, to show the subject and *substance* of that testimony, namely that whosoever, &c., the construction being a *Latin* one. So the passage was understood by the Pesch. Syr. Translator, and by the authors of our common Version. The passages of the Prophets here meant are such as the following: Isa. xxviii. 16. "Behold I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone," &c., and "whosoever believeth in him shall not be confounded." Comp. viii. 14. Zech. xiii. 1., where he says that a fountain shall be opened for sin, &c. Thus from *μαρτυροῦσιν* we must take *μαρτυροῦντες* (to usher in the next clause), understanding it in the sense *de-*

claring, as John iv. 44. *ἐμαρτύρησεν, ὅτι προφήτης ἐν τῷ ἴδιᾳ πατρίδι τιμὴν οὐκ ἔχει.* Moreover, the πάντες, which the Commentators say must be taken *restrictedly*, for *very many*, may have its usual force; for all the prophets more or less testify of Christ. So Luke xxiv. 27. καὶ ἀρχόμενος ἀπὸ Μωϋσέως καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν προφητῶν, διηρμήνευεν αὐτοῖς ἐν πάσαις ταῖς γραφαῖς τὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ. And though all have not said that whosoever believeth, &c., yet πάντες need not be referred to the elliptical *μαρτυροῦντες*.

44. τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον] i. e. the *influence* of the Holy Spirit, which has been before spoken of, (see Middl.) implying its *extraordinary gifts*, and especially, as we learn from v. 46, the speaking in languages foreign and before unknown to them. See supra ii. 4. and Notes; from a comparison of which passage with the present it is plain that by γλώσσαις is here meant (as there) *ἐτέραις γλώσσαις*, (and as is plain from the context) καθὼς τὸ Πνεῦμα ἐδόλον αὐτοῖς ἀποθλέγγασθαι, as is there expressed. To have heard them speak the praises of God and Christ in their *own* language (Greek or Latin) would have conveyed no proof that they had received the gift of the Holy Spirit. Besides, compare v. 47. with xi. 16. The γὰρ, too, at v. 46, has reference to a clause omitted, q. d. "[And that it had been poured forth on these persons was certain] for" &c. I should not have thought it necessary to point out what is so plain, had not the sense been egregiously misstated by Noesselt, Heincr., and Kuin.

47. μὴ τὸ ὕδωρ κολῶσαι] Wherever κολῶ takes (as here and in Luke vi. 29, and sometimes in the Classical writers) the *Accusative of a thing*, the verb may be supposed to have a *significatio prægans*, including that of another verb, namely one of *taking* or *using*. The τοῦ μὴ βαπτ. is for ὥστε μὴ βαπτ. In this idiom the μὴ is said to be pleonastic; and this the grammarians tell us, extends to all verbs which involve a sense of denial, especially verbs of *hindering*. See Matth. Gr. Gr. δ 533. Obs. 3. Thus the μὴ is sometimes omitted. But, in fact, there is no pleonasm, — since the μὴ belongs to *another sentence*, in which occasionally the verb in the preceding is to be repeated with some modification. As to the *omission* of the μὴ, that takes place chiefly when the verb of *hindering* is followed by another in the Infinitive without a τὸ; in which case the Infia. forms part of the preceding sentence, and therefore cannot

ἐλαβον, καθὼς καὶ ἡμεῖς; προσετίαξέ τε αὐτοὺς βαπτισθῆναι ἐν τῷ 48
ὀνόματι τοῦ Κυρίου. τότε ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν ἐπιμεῖναι ἡμέρας τινας.

XI. ἮΚΟΤΣΑΝ δὲ οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ οἱ ὄντες κατὰ 1
τὴν Ἰουδαίαν, ἔτι καὶ τὰ ἔθνη ἐδέξαντο τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ. Καὶ 2
ὅτε ἀνέβη Πέτρος εἰς Ἱερουσόλυμα, διεκρίνοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ ἐκ περι-
τομῆς, λέγοντες· Ὅτι πρὸς ἄνδρας ἀκροβυστιάν ἔχοντας εἰσῆλθες, καὶ 3
συνέφαγες αὐτοῖς. Ἀρξάμενος δὲ ὁ Πέτρος ἐξετίθειτο αὐτοῖς καθεξῆς, 4
λέγων· Ἐγὼ ἤμην ἐν πόλει Ἰόππῃ προσερχόμενος, καὶ εἶδον ἐν ἐκ- 5
στάσει ὄραμα, καταβῆναι οὐρανοῦ, ὡς ὀθόνην μεγάλην τέσσαρσιν 6
ἀρχαῖς, καθιεμένην ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ ἦλθεν ἄχρως ἐμοῦ· εἰς ἣν 7
ἀτενίσας κατενόουν καὶ εἶδον τὰ τετράποδα τῆς γῆς, καὶ τὰ θηρία καὶ 8
τὰ ἔρπετά, καὶ τὰ πετεινά τοῦ οὐρανοῦ· ἤκουσα δὲ φωνῆς λεγουσῆς 9
μοι· Ἀναστὰς, Πέτρε, θύσον καὶ φάγε. εἶπον δέ· Μηδισθῶς, Κύριε· 10
ὅτι πᾶν κοῖτον ἢ ἀκάθαρτον οὐδέποτε εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸ στόμμι μου.
Ἀπεκρίθη δέ μοι φωνὴ ἐκ δευτέρου ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ· Ἄ ὁ Θεὸς ἐκα- 9
θάρισε, σὺ μὴ κοῖνου. Τοῦτο δὲ ἐγένετο ἐπὶ τρεῖς, καὶ πάλιν ἀνεπαύ- 10
σθη ἅπαντα εἰς τὸν οὐρανό. καὶ ἰδοὺ, ἐξαυτῆς τρεῖς ἄνδρες ἐπέστησαν 11
ἐπὶ τὴν οἰκίαν ἐν ἧ ἡμην, ἀπεσταλμένοι ἀπὸ Καισαρείας πρὸς με.
Ἐῖπε δέ μοι τὸ Πνεῦμα συνελθεῖν αὐτοῖς μηδὲν διακρινόμενον· ἦλθον 12
δὲ σὺν ἐμοὶ καὶ οἱ ἑξ ἀδελφοὶ οὗτοι, καὶ εἰσῆλθομεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον
τοῦ ἀνδρός· ἀπήγγελέ τε ἡμῖν πῶς εἶδε τὸν ἄγγελον ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ 13
αὐτοῦ σταθέντα καὶ ἐπόντι αὐτῷ· Ἀπόστειλον εἰς Ἰόππην ἄνδρας,
καὶ μετάπεμψαι Σίμωνα τὸν ἐπικαλούμενον Πέτρον, ὃς λαλήσει ῥήματα 14
πρὸς σε, ἐν οἷς σωθήσῃ σὺ καὶ πᾶς ὁ οἶκός σου. Ἐν δὲ τῷ ἄρξι- 15
σθαί με λαλεῖν, ἐπέπεσε τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐπ' αὐτοὺς, ὥσπερ καὶ
ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ἐν ἄρχῃ. Ἐγινίσθη δὲ τοῦ ῥήματος Κυρίου, ὡς ἔλεγεν· 16
Ἰωάννης μὲν ἐβάπτισεν ἕδατι, ὑμεῖς δὲ βυπτισθήσεσθε ἐν Πνεύματι
ἀγίῳ. Ἐὶ οὖν τὴν ἰσὴν δωρεὰν ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Θεὸς ὡς καὶ ἡμῖν 17
πιστεύσασι ἐπὶ τὸν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, ἐγὼ δὲ τίς ἡμην, δυνατὸς
καλῦσαι τὸν Θεόν; Ἀκούσαντες δὲ ταῦτα ἠσύχασαν, καὶ ἐδόξαζον τὸν 18
Θεόν, λέγοντες· Ἄραγε καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ὁ Θεὸς τὴν μετάνοιαν ἔδωκεν
εἰς ζωήν.

properly take a μὴ, though instances are found where it is used.

43. βαπτισθῆναι] It is not said by whom they were baptized; but there can be little doubt that (as the ancient and best modern Commentators supposed) the persons who baptized them were some of those whom Peter brought with him from Joppa. For it is to be observed, that the Apostles themselves rarely baptized. See John iv. 2. 1 Cor. i. 14. and notes.

XI. 2. διεκρίνοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν] "expostulated with him, litigating the question." The word answers to the Heb. וַיִּשְׁפַּח and וַיִּשְׁפַּח, and signifies properly to be impleaded in a suit with another—then to be opposed in argument.

3. ἀκροβ. ἔχοντας] Synonymous with ἐν ἀκροβυστία ὄντας, which is of frequent occurrence. "those who are uncircumcised."

5. τέσσαρσιν ἀρχαῖς] The true sense of this ex-

pression has been fully explained supra x. 11. It may suffice here to observe that the sense in the present passage cannot be made complete without supplying ἐδεμένῃ, which is expressed in the parallel passages, and here by the Syriac Translators.

17. εἰ] "siquidem," "if [as was the case]." — ἐγὼ δὲ τίς ἡμην, δυνατὸς.] The δὲ is omitted in many MSS. and Versions; but, I suspect, from the difficulty of explaining it. Yet it may very well be rendered *denique*, then. There is great spirit in this turn of expression, with which Wets. compares from Lucian, ἠρώτα τὸν Δ. τίς ὦν, χλευάζει τὰ αὐτοῦ. The Commentators pass over the difficulty in construction as regards δυνατὸς, which is, by a harsh ellipsis, put for ὥστε δυνατὸς εἶναι. Thus the Syr. well renders *qui sufficere ad*. &c.

18. μετάνοιαν.] It here means the grace of repentance.

19 ¹ΟΙ μὲν οὖν διασπαρέντες ἀπὸ τῆς θλίψεως τῆς γενομένης ἐπὶ ¹Supra 8. 1.
 Στεφάνῳ διήλθον εἰς Φοινίκης καὶ Κύπρου καὶ Ἀντιόχειας, μηδεὶν
 20 λαλοῦντες τὸν λόγον, εἰ μὴ μόνον Ἰουδαίους. Ἦσαν δὲ τινες ἐξ αὐτῶν
 ἄνδρες Κύπριοι καὶ Κυρηναῖοι, οἵτινες εἰσελθόντες εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν,
 ἐλάλουν πρὸς τοὺς † Ἑλλημιστάς, εὐαγγελιζόμενοι τὸν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν·
 21 καὶ ἦν ζεῖρ Κυρίου μετ' αὐτῶν· πολὺς τε ἄριθμὸς πιστεύσας ἐπέ-

19. οἱ μὲν οὖν διασπ.] The particle μὲν οὖν is *resumptive*, reverting to what was said supra viii. 1. Ἀπὸ is here for ὑπό, as often both in the Scriptural and Classical writers. Commentators differ in their explanation of the force of ἐπὶ Στ., some rendering it *sub*, others *post*. The latter seems preferable.

20. Considerable difference of opinion here exists, both as to the *reading* and the interpretation. The reading of all the MSS. but two (A and D) is Ἑλλημιστάς. These two have Ἑλληνας, which is also thought to be supported by the Syr., Arabic, Copt., Æthiopic, and Vulg. Versions, and by Chrys., Theophyl., and Æcumen. This reading, too, has been preferred by almost every Critic and Commentator except Matthæi, and has been edited by Griesb., Knapp, Tittm., and Vater. Not, of course, upon the strength of *external* evidence, for that is next to none; the MSS. being very few, and *altered* ones; the testimony of Versions too in a case like this is of little weight; and that of the Fathers scarcely greater, especially as they sometimes cite Ἑλλημιστάς. Besides, of the two MSS. which here have Ἑλληνας, the principal one (namely, the Alexandrian) has this very reading in the place of Ἑλλημιστάς, supra ix. 29, where it is by all Editors admitted to be a spurious reading. The same may be said of two of the Versions. And surely what was a *παράδοξοις* in one case was likely to be so in the other. As, then, Ἑλληνας is thus deficient in *external* evidence, the preference must rest on *internal*. Let us therefore see whether that really exists. The chief ground consists in the *opposition* (denoted by μὲν καὶ δὲ), which, it is alleged, exists between the persons addressed by these teachers respectively: those at ver. 19 addressing themselves to the *Jews* only; consequently those at ver. 20 to such as were *not Jews*. Thus Mr. Hinds (in his history of the rise and progress of Christianity, vol. i. p. 249) maintains that “the opposition expressed by the particles μὲν καὶ δὲ indicates that the Cyprians and Cyrenæans were *not* doing what the dispersed were doing, namely, preaching to the *Jews alone*; but that they, on the contrary, were preaching — to whom? Not to the Hellenists, for they were *Jews* (and to them by the dispersed the Gospel had been preached, as in the case of Philip); but πρὸς τοὺς Ἑλληνας, the Gentiles, namely, the devout Gentiles.” To this representation, however, several exceptions may be made. 1. The Cyprians and Cyrenæans (for so the name should be written) ought not to be distinguished from the dispersed, since in St. Luke’s account they are considered as the *same persons*; the Cyprians and the Cyrenæans being said to be τινες ἐξ αὐτῶν — of whom? Of the dispersed. 2. As far as the arguments for Ἑλληνας depend upon there being an *opposition* intended, expressed by μὲν καὶ δὲ, it is a very bad one; for in truth there is *no opposition* at all. Certainly the circumstance of the two verses being introduced respectively by μὲν καὶ δὲ will not *prove* it: for here the μὲν is coupled

with οὖν, and has, in the present case, that use which Hoogeveen de Part. speaks of, No. viii. ἐν ἐπανόδοις, i. e. in transitions, when a writer goes back to something which had been begun to be treated on, but had been interrupted by some digression. Of this he adduces several examples, namely, Aristot. de Repub. i. 7. Thucyd. iv. 76, 77. Acts xxviii. 5; in all of which cases the sentence commencing with the resumptive μὲν οὖν is followed by another commencing (as here) with δὲ, which, however, is never an *adversative*, but always has a *continuative* force, and may be rendered *autem*.

Having, then, shown the fallacy of this opposition as depending on the μὲν καὶ δὲ, let us see whether any opposition is intimated by the *context*. Those (it is said) who had been dispersed by the troubles which followed the martyrdom of Stephen, fled, and traversed the country, passing through Phœnicia (for so I understand it) and proceeding some to Antioch. In their way thither (namely in Syria) they (i. e. both those who went to Antioch, and those who went to Cyprus) preached the Gospel to *none* but *Jews*. Those who went to Antioch, on their arrival thither, preached the word — to whom? To the Hellenists, i. e. foreign Jews, namely, such as spoke the Greek language; to whom, therefore, the Cyprians and Cyrenæans, who were Grecians, would be very fit preachers. The sacred writer, we may observe, could not very well say *Jews*, because Jews living in the foreign countries of Asia Minor and among Greeks, were called *Hellenists*. Now surely there is no such opposition as to compel us to suppose that St. Luke meant persons the opposite to Jews, namely *Gentiles*. Had there been any opposition intended, it might have been (as Matthæi supposes) between *Jews speaking Hebrew* and those *speaking Greek*. But there is, in fact, no opposition.

Having thus removed all objection to the reading Ἑλλημιστάς, and shown that it *may be*, and, as far as external evidence can prove any thing, *is*, the true reading, I will now show that Ἑλληνας *cannot* be such, since, if external were in its favour, internal evidence would condemn it. If the nature of ver. 19 be considered, and if it be borne in mind that it is *resumptive* of what the writer had been relating at viii. 4, we shall see that the events recorded in vv. 19 & 20 of this Chapter must have taken place immediately after those at viii. 4, which immediately followed the martyrdom of Stephen, and consequently took place *before* the vision of Peter and the conversion of Cornelius; so that the Gospel could not have been preached to the *Gentiles*, because there had hitherto been no authority so to do. Indeed, had those Jews felt authorized to preach the Gospel to the *Gentiles*, they would have been far more likely to have first turned themselves to the *Jews* (i. e. the Hellenists) resident at Antioch, whose influence was, we may learn from Josephus Bell. vii. 3, 3, very great over the minds of the Anti-

στρεφεν ἐπὶ τὸν Κύριον. Ἰκούσθη δὲ ὁ λόγος εἰς τὰ ὅτια τῆς ἐκκλη- 22
σίας τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις περὶ αὐτῶν· καὶ ἐξαπέστειλαν Βαρνάβαν
διελθεῖν ἕως Ἀντιοχείας. ὃς παραγενόμενος καὶ ἰδὼν τὴν χάριν τοῦ 23
Θεοῦ ἐχάρη, καὶ παρεκάλει πάντας τῇ προθέσει τῆς καρδίας προσμένειν
τῷ Κυρίῳ· οὗ ἦν ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς καὶ πλήρης Πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ 24
πίστεως, καὶ προσετέθη ὄχλος ἱκανὸς τῷ Κυρίῳ. Ἐξῆλθε δὲ εἰς 25
Ταρσὸν ὁ Βαρνάβας ἀναζητῆσαι Σαῦλον, καὶ εὗρων αὐτὸν ἤγαγεν αὐτὸν
εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν. Ἐγένετο δὲ αὐτοῦς ἐνιαυτὸν ὅλον συναχθῆναι ἐν τῇ 26
ἐκκλησίᾳ, καὶ διδάξαι ὄχλον ἱκανὸν, χρηματίσαι τε πρῶτον ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ
τοὺς μαθητὰς Χριστιανούς. Ἐν ταύταις δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις κατήλθον 27

ochians in religious matters. Dr. Burton, indeed (who supports the reading "Ἑλλήνας") thinks that what is mentioned at ver. 20, took place a considerable time after that in the preceding verse. That view, however, involves far too great a harshness and improbability to be admitted. Of course, equally objectionable as is the reading "Ἑλλήνας" must be the interpretation by which "Ἑλληνιστὰς" is taken for "Ἑλλήνας." As to those who (like Salmassius) would take Ἑλλ. here to mean *proselytes of the gate*, there is no proof whatever that "Ἑλληνιστὰς" ever had that sense. Certainly the word is never so used in the N. T. Wherever St. Luke has occasion to express that idea, he uses the term *προσῆλυτος*, as ii. 10. vi. 5. Could the word, indeed, have borne that signification, the sense arising would have been a good one; for we learn from Josephus Bell. viii. 3, 3, that there were great numbers of Jewish proselytes at Antioch. And to the conversion of such the Apostles and preachers of the word would have made no objection. But in the very same Chapter Josephus also notices the very great number of *Jews* who lived at Antioch above all other places of Syria.

22. ἰκούσθη εἰς τὰ ὅτια τῆς ἐκκλ.] This is accounted an Oriental redundancy. But it is better to consider it as a stronger expression than ἰκούσθη by itself, and formed by a blending of two expressions, i. e. "to come to the ears of," and "to be heard by."

23. τὴν χάριν τ. θ.] "the favour and kindness of God," viz. in its effects, the admission of the Gentiles to the benefits of the Gospel.

— τῇ προθέσει τ. κ.] The Genit. of the noun in regimen has here, as often, the force of an adjective; and the sense must be, "with hearty and determined purpose and intent. This is, however, not (as it is usually esteemed) purely a Hebrew idiom, being occasionally found in the Classical writers. So Herodian cited by Wolf: *ποθεῖν τινα ἀληθεῖ ψυχῆς διαθεσθαι*. Προσμένειν signifies properly to remain by, and, with a Dat. of thing, signifies to persevere in, but with that of person, to continue attached to.

24. ὅτι ἦν ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός.] This may, as Heinr. says, be meant to give a reason why the Christians at Jerusalem chose Barnabas for the mission to Antioch. But I cannot agree with him that the words ὃς παραγενόμενος — τῷ Κυρίῳ are parenthetical. They ought rather to be referred chiefly to what immediately precedes in ver. 23. The sense of the expression ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός may be assimilated to an idiom of our own language, by which the expression a good man includes the notions of virtue or integrity, and benignity or gentleness. So Joseph. Antiq. xii. 9. 1. ὃς ἀγαθὸς ὢν ἀνὴρ.

The next words καὶ πλήρης Πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ πίστεως must not be explained away as they are done by many recent Interpreters, but have assigned to them their full force.

26. συναχθῆναι ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ.] This is usually rendered "assembled," or "assembled themselves, with the Church." And certainly this use of *συνάγεσθαι* to signify being assembled for religious worship is frequent. Here, however, it is unsuitable; and the true sense (though not pointed out by the Expositors (seems to be, "were associated [as colleagues] in the congregation." And this indeed seems to be what is meant by the *conversati sunt* of the Vulgate, and the expression of the Syriac, "they met upon equal terms in the congregation."

— χρηματίσαι — Χριστιανούς.] *Χρηματίζειν* signifies, 1. to despatch business; 2. to so despatch it as to obtain a name. Hence, 3. it came at length to mean "to be named or called." Of this sense (which occurs also in Rom. vii. 3.) several examples from Philo and Joseph. are adduced by the Commentators. It must, however, be allowed to involve a harsh catachresis. And this would be rather increased, were we (with Benson, Dodr., Bingham, and Towns.) to render "were called by Divine appointment;" and increased unnecessarily; for why should it not be thought as likely that the followers of Christ should have received the distinctive name, which they now needed, from men? Why call in Divine interposition so needlessly? Besides, the occurrence of πρῶτον seems to exclude that view. There is another and more difficult question connected with these words, — namely, whether the followers of Christ gave this appellation to themselves, or whether it was bestowed on them by others? The best Commentators are of the latter opinion, and Wets. and Kuin. adduce many arguments why the former view cannot be admitted; not all of them equally cogent, but, upon the whole, sufficient to establish their position. It was, indeed, the interest of the Christians to have some name which might not, like the Jewish ones (Nazarenes or Galilæans) imply reproach. And though the appellations *believers*, or *saints*, might suffice among themselves, yet the former was not sufficiently definite for an appellation; and the latter might be thought to savour of vanity. They would therefore be not disinclined to adopt one. Yet the necessity was not so great as to stimulate them to do this very soon: whereas the people at large, in having to speak of this new sect, would soon need some distinctive appellation; and what so distinctive as one formed from the name of its founder. Thus we find from Philostr. Vit. Ap.

28 ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων προφήται εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν. Ἀριστοῦ δὲ εἷς ἐξ αὐτῶν ὀνόματι Ἀγνυβος, ἐσήμανε διὰ τοῦ Ἰνεύματος λιμὸν μέγαν μέλλειν εἶσθαι ἐφ' ὅλην τὴν οἰκουμένην· ὅστις καὶ ἐγένετο ἐπὶ Κλαυδίου Καίσαρος. ^m τῶν δὲ μαθητῶν, καθὼς ὑποροεῖτό τις, ὄρισεν ἕκαστος αὐτῶν ^{m Rom. 15. 23.}
 29 εἰς διακονίαν πέμψαι τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ ἀδελφοῖς· ⁿ ὃ καὶ ^{1 Cor. 16. 1.}
 ἐποίησαν, ἀποστείλαντες πρὸς τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους διὰ χειρὸς Βαρνάβου ^{2 Cor. 8. 1.}
 καὶ Σαύλου. ^{Gal. 2. 10.}
^{n Infra 12. 25.}

1 XII. ΚΑΤ' ἐκέειον δὲ τὸν καιρὸν ἐπέβηκεν Ἡρώδης ὁ βασιλεὺς
 2 τὰς χεῖρας κακῶσιν τινας τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας. Ἀνέλε δὲ Ἰάκωβον
 3 τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἰωάννου μαχίρα. Καὶ ἰδὼν ὅτι ἀρεστόν ἐστι τοῖς Ἰου-

viii. 21, that the disciples of Apollonius were called by the Greeks (it is not said by *themselves*) Ἀπολλώνιοι. And it was likely that the Gentiles should resort to such a sort of appellation, — since in that age those who were followers of any sect, or partizans of any leader, were usually called after their teacher or leader, by a term ending in — *ιος* or *ανιος*. There is no reason to think, with Wets. and Kuin., that the name Χριστιανοὶ was given in *derision*. When used by Agrippa (Acts xxvi. 28.) there is no proof that it was a term of reproach. Had he intended *derision*, he might have employed the term *Nazarene*, which was still in much use among the Jews, and what is remarkable, has continued in the East to the present day. Thus the followers of Christ would be the more likely to adopt the appellation Χριστιανοί, both for convenience, and to keep out a term of reproach. That they soon *did* adopt it, we find from 1 Pet. iv. 16. εἰ δὲ ὡς Χριστιανὸς (πάσχει.) μὴ ἀσχυνέσθω (scil. πάσχειν) where the appellation occurs as one applied by the followers of Christ to *themselves* as well as given by others.

27. προφήται.] The term seems here to denote persons who, with more or less of the supernatural gifts of the Holy Spirit, applied themselves to teaching or preaching; and occasionally, under a more than usual influence of the Holy Spirit, foretold future events. This sense of the word is supposed to be confined to the Scriptures; but I have met with it in the Classical writers. e. gr. Herodian, v. 5, 21. ὑποδήμασι λίθου πεποιημένοις ἔχροντο, ὥσπερ οἱ κατ' ἐκείνα τὰ χρόνια προφητεύοντες. where Irmisch refers to Sext. Emp. p. 227. Lucian i. 391. Diad. Sic. 199. Herodot. 555—49.

28. ἐσήμανε] “he declared, or announced.” The term was often applied to the uttering of predictions, &c. “Ὁλην τὴν οἰκ. Bishop Pearce has adduced many solid reasons for supposing that this expression denotes not the *whole world*, not even the *Roman Empire*, but *Palestine alone*, as in Luke ii. 1, where see the Note. The same view is adopted, and ably supported by Walch, Doddridge, Krebs, Michaelis, Hales, and Kuin., who adduce statements of the *four famines* which history has recorded as happening in the reign of Claudius. As, however, all the countries put *together* would not make up a tenth even of the *Roman Empire*, they think it plain that we must understand the words of that famine which (as we learn from Josephus. Antiq. xx. 2, 6.), in the fourth year of Claudius, overspread Palestine; and for the relief of the *Christians* suffering under which, some money was being collected at Antioch. The poor Jews *in general* were, as we learn from Josephus, relieved by Helena

Queen of Adiabene, who sent to purchase corn in Egypt.

29. καθὼς ὑποροεῖτό τις;] “in proportion to the ability of each.” Sub. χρημάτων, which is sometimes expressed. Εὐπορ. is a comparative term, and does not necessarily imply *wealth*, but only competence. So Muson. cited by Kyrrke: ἀλλ' εὐποροὶ χρημάτων ὄντες· τινὲς δὲ καὶ πλοῖστοι. “Ἐρισαν,” “determined.” The word signifies 1. *terminare*; 2. *determinare*; 3. *decernere*.

— εἰς διακονίαν.] Literally, “for a service.” “for the relief of.” So Heb. vi. 10. οὐκ οὐκάντων τοῖς ἁγίοις. This relief was the more necessary, since, independently of the present famine, the Christians at Jerusalem were generally poor. In sending this bounty they did but imitate the example of the foreign Jews; who (as Vitringa has proved) used to send contributions for the relief of their poor brethren at Jerusalem.

30. τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις.] Hamin, has here an able annotation on the origin and various uses of *πρεσβύτεροι*, showing that in the Christian Church of the Apostolic age (which was formed almost wholly on the model of the synagogue), the term *πρεσβύτεροι* (a term implying rather the *wisdom* of age, than age itself) was synonymous with *ἐπίσκοποι*. Their common office and duty (in the words of Forbiger ap. Schleus. Lex.), was in general to *govern* the Christian Church, not to *teach*; to *preside* over things sacred, to administer the sacraments, especially the Eucharist, to decide on Ecclesiastical matters, to compose and settle differences, and finally to set an example to all of rectitude of doctrine and sanctity of life. See xx. 17. 23. Phil. i. 1. 1 Tim. iii. 1. Tit. i. 5. 7. and consult an elaborate Note of Mr. Towns. on this subject, vol. ii. p. 151. sq.

XII. 1. ἐπέβηκεν—τὰς χεῖρας.] Literally, took in hand, set about. The Classical writers use the expression, but without *χεῖρα* or *χεῖρας*; though they more frequently use *ἐπιχειροῦν*. It seems therefore to be Hellenistic Greek; which is confirmed by its occurring in Deut. xii. 7. ἐφραθήσθε ἐπὶ πάντων οἷα εἶν ἐπιβάλητε τὰς χεῖρας. The English translations are needlessly literal.

3. ἰδὼν ὅτι ἀρεστόν ἐστι τοῖς Ἰουδ.] By “the Jews” some understand the *Synhedrim*. And, indeed the word has that meaning in the Gospel of *St. John*: but never, I apprehend, in *St. Luke's* writings. We may therefore understand it of the Jews generally, both rulers and people. And that Herod was fond of obliging the Jewish people, we learn from Joseph. Ant. xix. 7. 3. Yet he may have been *partly* induced to practise this harshness towards the Christians, from his being

δαίους, προσέθετο συλλαβεῖν καὶ Πέτρον (ἦσαν δὲ ἡμέραι τῶν ἀζύμων) ὄν καὶ πύσις ἔθετο εἰς φυλακὴν, παραδοὺς τέσσαρασι τετραδίοις στρα- 4
τιωτῶν φυλάσσειν αὐτὸν, βουλόμενος μετὰ τὸ πύσχα ἀναγαγεῖν αὐτὸν
τῷ λαῷ. Ὁ μὲν οὖν Πέτρος ἐτηρεῖτο ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ· προσευχὴ δὲ ἦν 5
ἐκτενὴς γινομένη ὑπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ. Ὅτι 6
δὲ ἔμελλεν αὐτὸν προάγειν ὁ Ἰερῶδης, τῇ νυκτὶ ἐκείνῃ ἣν ὁ Πέτρος
κοιμώμενος μεταξὺ δύο στρατιωτῶν, δεδεμένος ἀλύσει δυοῖ, φύλακές τε
πρὸ τῆς θύρας ἐτήρουν τὴν φυλακὴν. Καὶ ἰδοὺ, ἄγγελος Κυρίου 7
ἐπέστη, καὶ φῶς ἔλαμψεν ἐν τῷ οἰκήματι· πατάσας δὲ τὴν πλευρὰν
τοῦ Πέτρου ἤγειρεν αὐτὸν, λέγων· Ἀνάστα ἐν τάχει. Καὶ ἐξέπεσον
αὐτοῦ αἱ ἀλύσεις ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν. εἶπε τε ὁ ἄγγελος πρὸς αὐτόν· Περι- 8
ζῶσαι, καὶ ἐπόδησαι τὰ σανδάλιά σου· ἐποίησε δὲ οὕτω. καὶ λέγει
αὐτῷ· Περιβιβαλοῦ τὸ ἱμάτιόν σου, καὶ ἀκολούθει μοι. Καὶ ἐξελθὼν 9
ἠκολούθει αὐτῷ· καὶ οὐκ ᾔδει ὅτι ἀληθὴς ἐστὶ τὸ γινόμενον διὰ τοῦ
ἄγγελου, ἐδόκει δὲ ὄραμα βλέπειν. Διελθόντες δὲ πρῶτην φυλακὴν 10
καὶ δευτέραν, ἦλθον ἐπὶ τὴν πύλην τὴν σιδηρῶν τὴν φέρουσαν εἰς τὴν
πόλιν, ἣτις αὐτομάτῃ ἠνοίχθη αὐτοῖς· καὶ ἐξελθόντες προῆλθον ὄμην

a great zealot for the Jewish religion; for Joseph there says, τὰ πάρα καθαρῶς ἐτήρα; and adds that he never omitted to attend on his religious duties at the Temple.

— προσέθετο συλλ.] “proceeded to apprehend.” So Luke xx. 11, 12. προσέθετο πέμψαι. where see Note. This idiom occurs in the LXX. and is called a Hebraism, ἤν, being so used with an Infinitive following.

— ἡμέραι τῶν ἀζύμων] “the days of the paschal feast, during which they were ordered to have unleavened bread in their houses.” See Deut. xvi. 6. Exod. xii. 13. Before ἡμέραι several MSS., some of them ancient, prefix the Article, which is admitted by Matth., Griesb., Knapp, and Tittm. But Bp. Middl. justifies the omission on the principle, that “in propositions which merely affirm or deny existence, the name of the person or thing whereof existence is affirmed or denied, is without the Article. So Matt. xiv. 6. γενεσίων ἀγομένων Ἰερῶδου. and John v. 1.” That principle, however, is, I apprehend, too refined and far-fetched. It is better in such a case to say, that the Article is omitted because unnecessary, the addition of the noun in the Genit. sufficing to establish the definiteness. Here there is also an *ellipsis*, the complete phraseology being ἦσαν ἐν αἱ ἡμέραι αἱ ἡμέραι τῶν ἀζύμων. This probably led to the *α* being at first marked in the margin, which afterwards crept into the text.

4. τετραδίοις.] The τετραδίων was, as we learn from Polyb., the regular number for a guard, (as a file is with us), and four such quarterions were thought necessary to guard the cell and all the approaches to it, and for necessary relief of guard.

5. ἐκτενής.] “intense, fervent.” So Luke xxii. 44. ἐκτενέστερον προσήχετο. The metaphor (which is taken from a rope at full tension) is found in the LXX. Judith iv. 7. 2 Macc. xiv. 38.

6. μεταξὺ—ἐνστί.] Prisoners, when thus carefully guarded, were usually, among the Romans, secured with a single chain; one end of which was attached to the right hand of the prisoner, and the other to the left hand of the person who guarded him. In the present instance, for better

security, there were *two* chains, each fastened to a soldier. I would compare Eurip. Iph. Taur. 456. ἀλλ’ οὐτε χεῖρας δεσμοῖς διδύμοις Συνειροσθέντες χωροῦσσι.

7. ἄγγελος Κυρίου ἐπίστη.] The sceptical school in Germany deny the reality of this angelic appearance, and seek to account for Peter’s release, from natural causes. But Mr. Towns. has shown that in their eagerness to do away angelic and miraculous interference, they suppose circumstances which involve even a *greater* miracle. Οἰκήματι, for δεσμοτηρίω, by a frequent euphemism or *υποκοσμημῶς*. See my note on Thucyd. iv. 47. No. 3. (Transl.) On the *situation* of this prison there has been no little difference of opinion. Wolf thinks it was near to the judgment hall; De Dieu and Fessel that it was in the Court of Herod’s palace, and was his *private* prison; while Walch supposes it to have been in one of the towers of the innermost of the three walls which surrounded the city, and the iron gate, he thinks, was at the entrance of the tower. This last opinion is the most probable, and is confirmed and illustrated by what I have said in my note on Thucyd. ii. 4.

— πατάσας τὴν πλευράν.] As is usual in rousing persons from sleep.

8. περιζῶσαι.] See Note on Luke xii. 35.

— ἐπόδησαι τὰ σανδάλια σ.] This is, as Clrys. remarks, a beautifully graphic circumstance: for, in the haste of his sudden departure, Peter would be likely to forget to bind on his sandals. The angel therefore tells him to do it; thereby intimating to him his perfect *security*.

10. πρῶτην—σιδηρῶν.] φυλακὴ here means one of the *parties* on guard. We may suppose what is here called the *first* guard to have been the two soldiers stationed at the door of the cell: the *second*, those stationed at the door which led out of the building into a court yard: and the *third*, those at the iron gate which led out of the court into the city. Αὐτομάτῃ, literally, *self-moved*. The word is used both of persons and things, and must be rendered accordingly. Pric. and Wets. adduce several examples of the word in this sense,

11 μίαν· καὶ εὐθὺς ἀπέστη ὁ ἄγγελος ἀπ' αὐτοῦ. καὶ ὁ Πέτρος γενόμενος ἐν ἑαυτῷ, εἶπε· Νῦν οἶδα ἀληθῶς ὅτι ἐξαπέστειλε Κύριος τὸν ἄγγελον αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐξείλετό με ἐκ χειρὸς Ἡρώδου καὶ πάσης τῆς προσδοκίας τοῦ λαοῦ τῶν Ἰουδαίων. Συνιδόν τε ἦλθεν ἐπὶ τὴν οἰκίαν Μαρίας τῆς μητρὸς Ἰωάννου τοῦ ἐπικαλουμένου Μάρκου, οὗ ἦσαν ἱκανοὶ σὺνηθροισμένοι καὶ προσευχόμενοι.

13 Κρούσαντος δὲ τοῦ Πέτρου τὴν θύραν τοῦ πυλῶνος, προσῆλθε 14 παιδίσκη ὑπακοῦσαι, ὀνόματι Ρόδη· καὶ ἐπιγνοῦσα τὴν φωνὴν τοῦ Πέτρου, ὑπὸ τῆς χαρῆς οὐκ ἤνοιξε τὸν πυλῶνα, εἰσδραμοῦσα δὲ ἀπίγ- 15 γελειν ἐστῆναι τὸν Πέτρον πρὸ τοῦ πυλῶνος. Οἱ δὲ πρὸς αὐτὴν εἶπον· Μαινή· ἡ δὲ διίσχυρίζετο οὕτως ἔχειν. οἱ δὲ ἔλεγον· Ὁ ἄγγελος αὐτοῦ 16 ἐστίν. Ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ἐπέμενε κρούων· ἀνοίξαντες δὲ εἶδον αὐτὸν, καὶ

and as used of doors, from Homer (Il. ε. 749.) downwards. So the Latin writers (as Virgil *Æn.* vi. 82.) used the expression *suâ sponte*. The circumstance of a door self-moving was regarded by the ancients, both Jews and Gentiles, as a prodigy, attesting the presence of the Deity.

11. γενόμενος ἐν ἑαυτῷ.] “When, recovering from his surprise, he tranquilly exercised his understanding,” and found it was not a *dream*, but reality.

— πᾶσης τῆς προσδοκ.] The best Interpreters are agreed, that *προσδοκίας* must be taken by metonymy, for the *thing* expected, i. e. his execution, as in Genesis xlix. 10. *ἕως ἀν ἔλθῃ καὶ αὐτὸς προσδοκία ἐθνῶν*. Thus the sense is, “from what was fully expected by,” &c. The Syr. renders “ab omni *machinatione*.” I suspect that he read *προλοχέας*, “lying in wait,” and indeed *προλοχέας* occurs in Thucyd. and other writers. *Λαοῦ* is added to *Ἰουδ.* because at the time of the Passover the whole nation, in a manner, was assembled.

12. συνιδόν] “on considering,” namely, his situation and the circumstances connected with it.

13. κρούσαντος — τὴν θύραν.] This phrase occurs also in Luke xiii. 25. and often in the later writers; the earlier ones use *κόπτειν*. The two words differ in sense as our *rap* and *knock*. *τὴν θύραν τ. πυλῶνος*, the porch-door or outer-gate, as opposed to the inner door which led immediately to the court around which the apartment was built. By *παιδίσκη* many Commentators understand *the portress*. But though that office was often performed by females, it is improbable, considering the narrow circumstances of the Christians at Jerusalem, that there should have been one at this house. Besides, that would require the *Article*. The sense seems to be simply “a damsel,” i. e. a maid-servant. Ὑπακοῦσαι signifies properly to *listen*; but when used of the office of a *Porter* (which it often is in the best writers), carries with it, by implication, other significations corresponding to the actions connected therewith; as, to inquire the *name* of the person knocking. So in Lucian. *Icarom.* p. 292, *ἐκοπτον προσελθὼν τὴν θύραν ὑπακούσας δὲ δ' Ἐρμῆς καὶ τὸννομα ἐκπιθόμενος*. Xen. *Symp.* i. 11. *κρούσας τὴν θύραν, εἶπε τῷ ὑπακούσαντι εἰσαγγεῖλαι*, &c. No extraordinary caution (such as Br. Pearce imagines) is implied.

15. μαινή.] A popular form of expression, used of any one who utters what is incredible. *Διίσχυρίζετο*, “positively asserted.”

— ὁ ἄγγελος αὐτοῦ ἐ.] Many eminent Inter-

preters take this to mean “a messenger sent from him.” But the word will not admit that sense; neither is it likely that Peter could have sent a messenger; still less that the maid should not have known the voice of a messenger from Peter's voice. The sense must be, “his angel,” i. e. his tutelary angel, such as the Jews, and indeed the Gentiles, thought was appointed to every person, or at least every good person. They also supposed, that on the death of the person, this angel sometimes appeared in his exact form, and spake with his voice, to the friends or acquaintance of the deceased.

Thus there is nothing but what is plain and intelligible. Br. Middl., however, taking exception to the employment of the *Article* here; (see Note on John viii. 44.) and yet finding no sufficient authority for its being cancelled, proposes to consider the *αὐτοῦ* as an *adverb*, and taking the *Article* for the pronoun possessive, would render “His angel is there;” which, however, renders *transposition* necessary, *ἔστιν αὐτοῦ*. But for this there is no authority except that of *one MS.*, and therefore in that it may very well be supposed to have been *accidental*, arising from the scribe's inadvertently *omitting αὐτοῦ*, and then *supplying* it, but not in its place; or from the Critic's fancying this would be a neater way of placing the words. If, however, we were to adopt that position of the words, and to take the *αὐτοῦ* as an *adverb*, yet, I apprehend, the *Article* could not stand for the pronoun possessive; since that idiom *has its limits*, and cannot be used where any *very great uncertainty* would arise. As to the *αὐτοῦ* being, as he thinks it *may, understood*, according to his Canon iii. l. 4., that is the weakest part of Br. Middleton's system. See Note supra v. 1. The learned Prelate, indeed, seems to have himself suspected his position to be untenable, by proposing to read *ὁ ἄγγελος αὐτοῦ ἐστίν αὐτοῦ*, which he would have us suppose is not a *Critical conjecture*, because it is *compounded of two readings*. But as there is next to no authority for the *αὐτοῦ* after *ἐστίν*, it can be viewed in no other light. Besides, when there is indeed *MS. authority* for two readings taken separately; and yet none for those readings taken *conjunctly* — to *unite* them and form one reading, is neither more nor less than *Critical conjecture*. Nay, what is more, the second *αὐτοῦ* would be pleonastic and useless — quite unsuitable to the *brevity* of such exclamations, — and, in short, “*nive Sithoniâ frigidius.*”

ἐξέστησαν. Κατασείσας δὲ αὐτοῖς τῇ χειρὶ σιγᾶν, διηγήσατο αὐτοῖς 17
 πῶς ὁ Κύριος αὐτὸν ἐξήγαγεν ἐκ τῆς φυλακῆς. εἶπε δέ· Ἀπαγγέλαιε
 Ἰακώβω καὶ τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ταῦτα. καὶ ἐξεληθὼν ἐπορεύθη εἰς ἕτερον
 τόπον. Γενομένης δὲ ἡμέρας, ἦν τάραχος οὐκ ὀλίγος ἐν τοῖς στρατιώ- 18
 ταις, τί ἄρα ὁ Πέτρος ἐγένετο. Ἡρώδης δὲ ἐπιζητήσας αὐτὸν καὶ μὴ 19
 εὑρὼν, ἀνακρίνας τοὺς φύλακας ἐκέλευσεν ἀπαχθῆναι. καὶ κατελθὼν
 ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας εἰς τὴν Καισάρειαν διέτριβεν. Ὅτιν δὲ ὁ Ἡρώδης 20
 θυμομαχῶν Τυροῖς καὶ Σιδωνίοις· ὁμοθυμαδὸν δὲ παρήσαν πρὸς
 αὐτὸν, καὶ πείσωντες Βλάστον τὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ κοιτῶνος τοῦ βασιλέως,
 ῥητοῦντο εἰρήνην, διὰ τὸ τρέφεσθαι αὐτῶν τὴν ζωὴν ἀπὸ τῆς βασιλικῆς.
 Τακτῇ δὲ ἡμέρᾳ ὁ Ἡρώδης ἐνδυσάμενος ἐσθῆτα βασιλικήν, καὶ καθίσας 21
 ἐπὶ τοῦ βήμιτος, ἐδημηγόρει πρὸς αὐτούς. Ὁ δὲ δῆμος ἐπεφώνει· 22
 Θεοῦ φωνὴ καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρώπου! Παροχρῆμα δὲ ἐπάταξεν αὐτὸν ἄγγε- 23
 λος Κυρίου, ἀνθ' ὧν οὐκ ἔδωκε [τὴν] δόξαν τῷ Θεῷ· καὶ γενόμενος
 σκωληκόβρωτος, ἐξέφυξεν. Ὁ δὲ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἤψανε καὶ ἐπλη- 24
 θύνετο. Ἡ Βαρνάβας δὲ καὶ Σαῦλος ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, πλη- 25
 ρώσωντες τὴν διακονίαν, συμπαραλαβόντες καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν ἐπικληθέντα
 Μάρκον.

o 1 Kings 5. 9,
11.
Ezek. 27. 17.

p Isa. 55. 11.
supra 6. 7.
infra 19. 20.
Col. 1. 6.
q supra 11. 29.

17. κατασείσας τῇ χειρὶ σιγᾶν.] Κατασεῖν signi-
 fies to wave the hand downwards; a mode of en-
 joining silence. See xiii. 16. xix. 33. xxi. 40. It
 occurs also in the best writers, from whom exam-
 ples are adduced by the Commentators.

— ἐπορεύθη εἰς ἕτερον τόπον.] Where, we are left
 to conjecture; the expression being quite indefi-
 nite. Some suppose *Cæsarea*; others, with more
 probability, *Antioch*; others, again, *Rome*; which
 last opinion, though long strenuously contended
 against by Protestant Commentators, has lately
 been ably maintained by Mr. Townsend, vol. ii.
 p. 140. seqq. in a Dissertation on St. Peter's
 visit to Rome and the writing of St. Mark's Gos-
 pel.

19. ἀνακρίνας τοὺς φύλακας, &c.] "after exam-
 ining the keepers [and finding they offered nothing
 in justification] ordered them to be led away
 for execution." Ἀπάγειν is a vox sol. de hac re,
 εἰς θάνατον ἢ ἐπὶ θανάτῳ being generally expressed,
 but sometimes left to be understood, for death is
 in this formula always implied. Thus there is no
 reason to suppose, with some, that their punish-
 ment was not unto death.

— διέτριβεν] scil. ἐκεῖ, which is implied in the
 preceding, as at xiv. 3. The word is generally
 expressed, as in John iii. 22. xi. 64.

20. θυμομαχῶν Τυροῖς.] Θυμομαχεῖν signifies
 "to have war at heart with," to be hostilely dis-
 posed towards, and sometimes to be at war with;
 which last signification is here adopted by some
 Commentators. But that involves such improb-
 ability, and is so destitute of Historical support,
 that it is better to interpret the expression ῥητοῦντο
 εἰρήνην, on which the foregoing view is founded,
 in a metaphorical sense, i. e. they sought to be
 friends with, as εἰρήνην ἔχουσι elsewhere, and to
 take θυμομ. in the first mentioned and general
 sense. Kuin., with great probability, traces the
 origin of this misunderstanding to commercial jeal-
 ousies, arising from Herod's having formed so ad-
 mirable a port at *Cæsarea*. Ὅμοθυμαδὸν, conjointly,
 i. e. both Tyrians and Sidonians. Πείσωντες

Βλάστον. The full sense is, "having prevailed
 on Bl. [to give them his aid in the business]." See
 Matt. xxviii. 14. Gal. i. 10.

21. τακτῇ] "appointed," as the day of public
 audience. It appears from Joseph. Ant. xix. 7,
 2. to have been the second day of the Games then
 celebrating in honour of *Cæsar*. Βήματος signifies
 not *tribunal*, as in Matt. xxvii. 19., but a raised
suggestus, presenting the appearance of a throne,
 in the theatre, where Herod viewed the games
 and delivered the oration.

— πρὸς αὐτούς.] Not the people, as some imag-
 ine, but the ambassadors; which is required by
 what precedes, and δημηγορεῖν, as often in the
 later writers, signifies simply to deliver a speech.

22. ὁ δῆμος.] Chiefly, if not exclusively, the
Gentiles, (multitudes of whom inhabited *Cæsara*),
 and set on by the courtiers and flatterers, as we
 find from Josephus; from whom we also learn,
 that the persons in question did really profess
 to regard him as a God; no doubt in that
 qualified sense in which the Roman Emperors
 were called *Divi*, not only after their death, but
 even in their lifetime; and in which the Greeks
 sometimes applied the term to great personages,
 (see Pind. Olymp. v. sub. init. Aristid. iii. 249,
 250. Eunap. Præf. p. 120. 163. Appian i. 635.
 Joseph. p. 533. ult.) but yet in such a sense as
 the Jews could not receive; and it clearly ap-
 pears from Joseph. that the Jews were incensed
 with him for receiving this impious adulation.

23. ἐπάταξε] i. e. "struck him with disease."
 The expression ἄγγελος Κυρίου ἐπάτ. must at any
 rate mean that the disorder was inflicted by a Di-
 vine judgment, and not brought on by dysentery
 arising from a cold caught, as many recent Com-
 mentators pretend; whose arguments I have re-
 futed in Recens. Synop. The circumstance of
 his being σκωληκόβρωτος will not prove that the
 disorder was of human origin, because the Deity
 often vouchsafes to act by second causes. Thus
 the seeming discrepancy between this account,
 and that of Josephus, is not really such. The

1 XIII. Ἦσαν δὲ τινες ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ κατὰ τὴν οὖσαν ἐκκλησίαν ἡ Ἰνφρα 14. 26.
 προφήται καὶ διδάσκαλοι, ὃ τε Βαρνάβας καὶ Συμεὼν ὁ καλούμενος
 Νίγερ, καὶ Λούκιος ὁ Κυρηναῖος, Μιναῖν τε Ἡρώδου τοῦ τετραρχοῦ
 2 σύντροφος, καὶ Σαῦλος. * Λειτουργούντων δὲ αὐτῶν τῷ Κυρίῳ καὶ
 νηστεύοντων, εἶπε τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον· Ἀφορίζατε δὴ μοι τὸν [τε]
 3 Βαρνάβαν καὶ τὸν Σαῦλον εἰς τὸ ἔργον ὃ προσκέκλημαι αὐτούς. Ἐ τότε
 νηστεύσαντες καὶ προσευξάμενοι, καὶ ἐπιθέντες τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῖς, ἀπέ-

8 Supra 9. 15.
 infra 22. 21.
 Rom. 1. 1.
 Gal. 1. 15.
 & 2. 8.
 Eph. 3. 8.
 1 Tim. 2. 7.
 2 Tim. 1. 11.
 Matt. 9. 28.
 Rom. 10. 15.
 1 Supra 6. 6.
 & 8. 15.
 & 14. 23.

historian narrates the *secondary* causes of Herod's death; the sacred writer considers the *primary* one, even the immediate interposition of Heaven. And this will hold good whether we take the ἀγγελος literally, or metaphorically; though it seems safer to take it (as does Doddr.) of the *real*, yet *invisible*, agency of a celestial spirit. See 2 Sam. xxiv. 16. 2 Kings xix. 35. Nor is there any discrepancy as to the *secondary* cause of his death, namely, the *disorder* of which he died. For although Josephus only mentions most violent pains in the bowels, and *dysentery*; yet that is very consistent with St. Luke's account; since the *dysentery* might very well be occasioned by *worms*; especially as, in such a case, the *dysentery* is preceded by violent pains in the bowels. See Thucyd. ii. 49. 6. However, Josephus may not have meant *dysentery*; for the terms he uses, ἀλγίματα τῆς γαστρὸς and ἀλγίματα κοιλίας, may have only had reference to the violent pains occasioned by worms eating the bowels. Be that as it may, we may very well account for Josephus's making no mention of *worms*, from motives of *delicacy*, and especially as many tyrants, even in some measure the *first* Herod, had died of that (or a similar disorder, the morbus pedicularis); as for instance Antiochus Epiphanes. See 2 Macc. ix. 5. which passage St. Luke seems to have had in view. At the same time, it is plain from Josephus's manner, that he regarded Herod's death as brought on by *Divine interposition*. Thus he says that the exclamations of the adulators were οὐδὲ ἐκένω πρὸς ἀγαθῶν. And he represents Herod himself as avowing his persuasion that his death was brought on by Almighty Providence, to give the lie, as it were, to the impious assertions of the flattering multitude.

XIII. From this Chapter to the end of the Book, Luke narrates the various journeys of Paul, undertaken for the conversion of the Gentiles.

1. διδάσκαλοι.] i. e. publicly appointed teachers in the Church, mentioned also in 1 Cor. xii. 23. and Eph. iv. 11., where see Notes.

—Ἡρώδου.] That this is Herod Antipas, and not (as Grot. supposes) Agrippa the second, son of King Agrippa the first, whose death was recorded at xii. 23., has been proved by Walch in a Dissertation de Menachemo, of which the substance is given by Kuin., and may be seen translated in Recens. Synop.

—σύντροφος.] This is properly an *adjective*, signifying *brought up with*, (and in this sense only occurs in the earlier writers) but it is also used as a *substantive*, equivalent to our *foster-brother*, and is explained δμογάλακτος in the Glossaries. But the sense *foster-brother* sometimes implied also that of *table-fellow* and *school-fellow*. For it was not unusual in ancient times for children to be brought up with the sons of kings and great men.

Examples are adduced by Raphel, Wets., and Munth., to which I add Joseph. Ant. xiv. 9. 5. and Bell. i. 10. 9. The custom continued even to modern times, as in the case of our James the first.

2. λειτουργούντων τ. κ.] *Λειτουργία* denotes the discharge of some public office, whether *civil* or *religious*. In the Classical writers it is almost always used in the civil sense; but in the Scriptural, in the religious. In the O. T., and sometimes in the New, (as Heb. x. 11.), it denotes the ministration of the Priests and Levites. *Here λειτουργεῖν* might denote the discharge of all the duties of the ministerial office, both public and private, (praying, preaching, teaching, exhorting, &c.), but it seems only to denote the *public* duties. Καὶ νηστεύοντων is meant to signify, that while they were thus engaged they were *fasting*; perhaps on an occasion of more than usual solemnity, when *fasting* had been added to prayer, &c., probably to ask a blessing on the means taken to spread the Gospel. The direction from the Holy Spirit was, it seems, communicated to them while thus engaged.

Of the difficulty which many have found, to reconcile the Apostolic commission of Paul by the *Holy Spirit*, with his having been set apart for the work of evangelizing the Heathen by Ecclesiastical officers, even of an inferior rank, the best solution is that of Mr. Townsend, — who supposes that the condescending of Paul to become the Apostle of the Church at Antioch, so far as it might be useful to the Catholic Church to act with their sanction, does not imply that their authority was superior to his. His object may have been to obtain in those places which were under the influence of Antioch, a better or an easier introduction than he would have otherwise experienced. There is some reason to think, with Hooker, Hales, and Mr. Townsend, that both Paul and Barnabas were now set apart for their Apostleship, to supply the vacancies in the original number; one having been killed by Herod, the other appointed bishop of Jerusalem.

—ἔπε τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον.] Here and at ἐκπεμφθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ Πνεύμ. τ. ἁγ. at v. 4. the Personality and Deity of the Holy Spirit is evidently implied.

—ἀφορίζατε δὴ μοι.] Ἀφορίζειν signifies 1. to *separate*; 2. (by implication) to *destine*; 3. to *appoint*, as here. The δὴ is *hortative*, and may be rendered *now*. The μοι seems to have the *imperative* force, highly suitable to the Divine dignity of the speaker. Of this idiom, (little known even to Critics), the following are examples. Ps. cxviii. 19. ἀνοίξατέ μοι πύλας. Thucyd. v. 10. τὰς πύλας ἀνοίγετω ἔμοι. Eurip. Iph. Aul. 1340. ἀπαχάλατ' ἔμοι μέλαθρα. Soph. Ed. Col. 1475. Lucian i. 718. 645. The προς in προσκέκλημαι is not pleonastic, but signifies *unto*, as if it were written πρὸς ὃ κέκλημαι.

3. νηστεύσαντες καὶ προσευξ.] The *fasting* seems

λοσαν. Οὗτοι μὲν οὖν, ἐπιπεμφθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου, 4
κατήλθον εἰς τὴν Σελεύκειαν, ἐκεῖθεν τε ἀπέπλευσαν εἰς τὴν Κύπρον.

u *Supra* 12. 25. ^u Καὶ γενόμενοι ἐν Σαλαμῖνι, κατήγγελλον τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν ταῖς 5

x *Supra* 8. 9. συναγωγαῖς τῶν Ἰουδαίων· εἶχον δὲ καὶ Ἰωάννην ὑπηρέτην. ^x Διελ- 6

θόντες δὲ τὴν νῆσον ἄχρι Πάφου, εὗρόν τινα μάγον, ψευδοπροφήτην,

Ἰουδαῖον, ᾧ ὄνομα Βαρισησοῦς, ὃς ἦν σὺν τῷ ἀνθυπάτῳ Σεργίῳ Παύλῳ, 7

ἀνδρὶ συνεῖ. Οὗτος προσκαλεσάμενος Βαρνάβαν καὶ Σαῦλον, ἐπέξή-

γ *Exod.* 7. 11. ^γ τησεν ἀκοῦσαι τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ. ^γ Ἀντίστατο δὲ αὐτοῖς Ἐλύμας 8

2 *Tim.* 3. 8. ὁ μάγος (οὕτω γὰρ μεθερμηνεύεται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ) ζητῶν διαστρέψαι 9

τὸν ἀνθύπατον ὑπὸ τῆς πίστεως. Σαῦλος δὲ (ὁ καὶ Παῦλος) πλησθεὶς 9

to be put first, because this solemnity (no doubt, performed some time after that on which the order of the Spirit was received) was ushered in *indictio jejunio*. So v. 2. *λειτουργούντων καὶ νηστευόντων*, where see Note and xiv. 23. *προσευξάμενοι μετὰ νηστειών*.

6. μάγον.] See Note *supra* viii. 9. *Ψευδοπροφήτην*. Pearce thinks it means *false teacher*. But the full sense must be one who falsely claims to speak under Divine inspiration, whether in foretelling future events, or in making known the will of God. "Ὁλην is added before νῆσον by Griesb., Tittm., and Vater, from several MSS., Versions, and Fathers. But the evidence of the two last is here not material, and the word seems to have come from the margin.

7. ἀνθυπάτω.] Supposed by Grot. and Hamm. to be applied, by an error of title, for ἀντιστρατήγῳ. But Lardner and Kuin. have vindicated the accuracy of the expression; proving by reference to Dio Cass. and other writers, that those who presided over the provinces by the appointment of the Senate (and Cyprus was *then* of that number, though it had once been Prætorian), were styled Proconsuls, though they had never filled the chair. That the title did really belong to the Roman governors of Cyprus, has, indeed, been placed beyond all doubt by Bp. Marsh Lect. P. v. p. 85. sq., by reference to a coin (to be found in the Thesaurus Morell. p. 106.) struck in the very age in which Sergius Paulus was governor of that Island. It was coined in the reign of Claudius Cæsar, whose head and name are on the face of it; and in the reign of Claudius Cæsar St. Paul visited Cyprus. It was a coin belonging to the people of that island, as appears from the word ΚΥΠΡΙΩΝ on the reverse; and though not struck while Sergius Paulus himself was governor, it was struck, as appears from the inscription on the reverse, in the time of Proclus, who was *next* to Sergius Paulus in the government of that island. And on this coin the same title ἈΝΘΥΠΑΤΟΣ, is given to Proclus, which is given by St. Luke to Sergius Paulus. "That Cyprus (continues the learned Prelate) was a Proconsulate, is also evident from an ancient inscription, of Caligula's reign, (the predecessor of Claudius), in which Aquilius Scæurus is called the Proconsul of Cyprus."

— συνεῖ] "a man of ability." Literally, (as we say), a *clever* man; so Thucyd. i. 74. iii. 37. Galen, cited by Wets., speaks of him as a person excellently versed in philosophy; which will confirm the sense of μάγος above assigned. Sergius had, no doubt, been learning something of Philosophy and natural religion, if not the Jewish

religion, from Elymas. Hence it was likely that he should send for those who taught a religion professing to be an *improvement* on the Jewish; and as likely that this should be opposed by Elymas, who was influenced only by worldly views.

8. Ἐλύμας.] From an Arabic word signifying *doctus*, or *sapiens*. So our *wiz-ard* from *wise*.

— διαστρέψαι.] At this some Commentators stumble, and Valekn. and Griesb. conjecture ἀποστρέψαι. But that is wholly destitute of authority, *Versions* having no weight. And if even it did occur in a few MSS., it must be rejected as a gloss. The common reading is confirmed by a similar construction in *Exod.* v. 4. *ἵνατί διαστρέψετε τὴν λαὸν ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων;* The reason for the apparent anomaly in syntax is, that there is a significant *prægnans*, namely, "to pervert and turn," i. e. to turn from the faith by a perversion and misrepresentation of it. So he is represented at v. 10. as *διαστρέφων τὰς δόξας Κυρίου*.

9. ὁ καὶ Παῦλος.] Sub. *καλούμενος*; for the Article is put for the Pron. relative, on which see *Win. Gr.* p. 57. fin. With respect to the name Παῦλος, it is well observed by Wets. that though Luke has before invariably called him Saul, now, no sooner has he mentioned the name of Paul, than Saul becomes so obliterated that we nowhere find it used again either by Luke, Peter, or Paul, in his Epistles. For this the Commentators are not a little perplexed to account. Some suppose that he had always had *both* names. But then why should Luke have hitherto invariably used Saul, and now as invariably Paul? Others are of opinion that Saul changed his name after his conversion. But that is refuted by his being called Saul by Luke *after* that time, and up to the present. Saul must have *himself* changed his name; not, however, as some imagine, out of humility, and deference to the Proconsul; but, it should seem (as Beza, Grot., Dodd., and Kuin. suppose), because he was now brought very much among Greeks and Romans, to whom the name *Saul* was unknown, but *Paul* familiar, especially as they would *pronounce* Saul like Paul. It may be added, that the name *Paul*, being a Roman one, would be so much the more suitable to a Roman citizen. And as the reason for the alteration, on taking the solemn charge he had now received, would be stronger than ever, — there can be no doubt that it was *now made*. It should seem by Luke's expression, that while he adopted this name, he yet did not absolutely *abandon* the other. Though as he was now the Apostle of the Gentiles, there was a propriety in Luke's henceforward giving him that name which he bore among Gentiles.

- 10 Πνεύματος ἁγίου, καὶ ἀεινήσις εἰς αὐτὸν, ἔειπεν· Ὡς πλήρης παντός ^{z Matt. 13. 38.}
 δόλου καὶ πάσης ἡδαιουργίας, ὡς Δαβόλου, ἐχθρὸς πάσης δικαιοσύνης! ^{John 8. 44.}
 11 οὐ πάντῃ διαστρέφων τὰς ὁδοὺς Κυρίου τὰς εὐθείας; καὶ νῦν ἰδού,
 χεῖρ [τοῦ] Κυρίου ἐπὶ σέ, καὶ ἔση τυφλός, μὴ βλέπων τὸν ἥλιον, ἄχρι
 καιροῦ. Παραορῆμι δὲ ἐπέπεσεν ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἀγλῆς καὶ σκότος· καὶ
 12 περιάγων ἐξήτει χειραγωγούς. Τότε ἰδὼν ὁ ἀνθρώπιτος τὸ γεγονός
 ἐπίστευσεν, ἐκπλησόμενος ἐπὶ τῇ διδραχῇ τοῦ Κυρίου.

— πληθεὶς Πν. ἁγ.] “filled with the influence and inspiration of the Holy Spirit,” not under the impression of spleen or anger.

10. ἡδαιουργίας.] The word denotes 1. facility of action; 2. levity and carelessness, whether any action be good or evil; 3. villainy and wickedness in general, or rather what is designated by our *knavery* or *trickery*. Upon the whole, the word (which occurs chiefly in the later writers) corresponds to, and is indeed the *same* with our *rogue*, anciently written *rage*.

— διαστρέφων τὰς ὁδοὺς K.] Much learning has been employed to little purpose on this word *διαστρ.*, especially from pressing too much on the metaphor. It is also debated whether τὰς ὁδοὺς K. means the Lord's *religion*, or the *ways and purposes* of the Lord. Since the examples adduced of the former signification have only the *singular*, the latter is preferable, especially as it yields nearly the same sense. The words may be thus rendered: “misrepresenting the upright counsels and purposes of the Lord [for the salvation of men].” In this figurative diction there is, I conceive, an allusion to Is. xl. 4. “the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough ways plain,” i. e. according to the LXX. (in the three principal MSS.) and the N. T. ἡ τραχὺ εἰς ὁδοὺς λείας. And so ver. 3.

11. ἰδού] As we say, *Mind!* take notice! Χεῖρ τοῦ Κυρίου ἐπὶ σέ. A Hebrew phrase, denoting that Divine punishment is suspended over a person. See Exod. ix. 3. Job. xix. 21. The τοῦ before Κυρίου is omitted in very many MSS., Fathers, and early Edd.; and perhaps is not genuine; though Bp. Middl. is of opinion that, if retained, it would not follow that χεῖρ would want the Article.

— ἔση τυφλός, μὴ βλ. τ. ἡ.] This is thought to be a Hebrew mode of asserting the same thing, both by affirmation and by negation of the contrary. But the idiom occurs also in the *Greek* and *Latin* writers, and is only a relic of primitive simplicity of diction. It does not involve *pleonasm*, for the latter phrase serves to explain and strengthen the former; as in a kindred passage of Luke i. 20. καὶ ἰδού, ἔση σιωπῶν, μὴ δυνάμενος λαλῆσαι. Here, however, μὴ βλέπων τὸν ἥλιον is so much *stronger* an expression than τυφλός, (for all but persons *born* blind have some faint view of the sun) that there is a sort of *climax*, and we might render freely, “thou shalt be blind—yea *stone blind!*”

— ἄχρι καιροῦ.] The Latin Versions render it “usque ad tempus.” And so the Syriac and some Oriental ones. Yet that would require μέχρι, as is proved by Tittm. de Synop. p. 37, who rightly observes: “ἄχρι nou finem, sed ipsam durationem denotat, seu tempus totum, quo res quædam duravit, sed μέχρι finem designat, quo esse desiit, nisi addatur verbum, cujus notione ipsius termini s. finis tollatur cogitatio. ut in μέχρι παντός.” He

regards ἄχρι καιροῦ as equivalent to ἕως τέλους, i. e. μέχρι τέλους, *permanently*. But though right in the *rule*, he seems wrong in the *application*. The truth is, that the literal sense of ἄχρι καιροῦ is “during some time.” Though as duration for a *certain time only*, necessarily implies termination at the *end* of that time, so ἄχρι καιροῦ may be *popularly* taken for μέχρι καιροῦ. The sense here is, I conceive, well expressed by our English Versions. But although the words of the Apostle express no more than this,—yet, as καιροῦ is used (which chiefly signifies a *point of time*), not χρόνου, he meant, I apprehend, to *hint* at that sense which might be more correctly phrased by μέχρι καιροῦ; meaning by καιροῦ the *time of his repentance and reformation*. Whether that time would ever arrive, the Apostle, it seems, knew not; the Holy Spirit not having informed him. And he felt so much doubt,—that he only just uses an expression which might fall short of driving the man into despair. Had he felt *hope*, he would perhaps have said (as at Heb. ix. 10.), μέχρι καιροῦ διορθώσεως.

— ἐπέπεσεν ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἀγλῆς καὶ σκότος.] Passing by the vain speculations of some Commentators on the *nature* of this blindness, and the unallowed hypotheses of the sceptical school, by whom it is denied to have been produced supernaturally, I would only observe, that there is here *not* a hendiadys; but it should seem that the supervention of the blindness is *graphically* described, by various stages of the affection. See Note on Acts iii. 8. First a *cloud*, as it were, came over the eyes, which soon increased to *darkness*, and that terminated in that “*total eclipse*, in which the Sun is dark!”

12. There is something awkward in this verse, as regards ἐπίστευσεν and ἐκπλησόμενος. Some various readings exist; though only such as show that the ancient Critics endeavoured to remove the difficulty by *emendation*; i. e. either by inserting ἰθαύμασεν, or making ἐπίστ. and ἐκπλ. change places. The *latter* mode is preferable; but it is supported by only one MS.: and no reason can be assigned why, if that were the true position of the words, the verb ἐξεπλήσαστο should not have been written. The Syriac Translator, indeed, renders as if he so read; but he, no doubt, rather gave what he conceived to be the *sense*, than followed the *words* of his original. Moreover, there is no example of πιστέειν with ἐπὶ and a Dative of *thing*, unless where the thing is put for the person. Whereas examples of ἐκπλησόμενοι with ἐπὶ and a Dative of *thing* are frequent, and especially with διδάχῃ, e. gr. Matt. xxii. 33. Mark i. 22. xi. 18. Luke iv. 32, and very often elsewhere. The same syntax is found in the Classical writers. The words ἐκπλησόμενος—Κυρίου are, I conceive, meant further to unfold the sense couched in ἰδὼν τὸ γεγονός with reference to the miracle, and may be freely rendered, “being amazed

a *Infra* 15. 38.

^a Ἀναθρόντες δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς Πύφου οἱ περὶ τὸν Παῦλον, ἦλθον εἰς 13
Πέργην τῆς Παμφυλίας. Ἰωάννης δὲ ἀποχωρήσας ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὑπέ-
στρεψεν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα. Αὐτοὶ δὲ διελθόντες ἀπὸ τῆς Πέργης, παρε- 14
γένοντο εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν τῆς Πισιδίας, καὶ εἰσελθόντες εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν
τῆ ἡμέρα τῶν σαββάτων, ἐκάθισαν. Μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν τοῦ νόμου 15
καὶ τῶν προφητῶν, ἀπέστειλαν οἱ ἀρχισυνάγωγοι πρὸς αὐτοὺς, λέγοντες·
ἄνδρες ἀδελφοὶ, εἰ ἔστι λόγος ἐν ὑμῖν παρακλήσεως πρὸς τὸν λαὸν,
λέγετε. ^b Ἀναστὰς δὲ Παῦλος, καὶ κατασείσας τῆ χειρὶ, εἶπεν· ἄνδρες 16
Ἰσραηλῖται, καὶ οἱ φοβούμενοι τὸν Θεὸν, ἀκούσατε. ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ λαοῦ 17
τούτου [Ἰσραὴλ] ἐξελέξατο τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν· καὶ τὸν λαὸν ὑψωσεν
ἐν τῇ παροιμίᾳ ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτῳ, καὶ μετὰ βραχίονος ὑψηλοῦ ἐξήγαγεν
αὐτοὺς ἐξ αὐτῆς· ^d καὶ ὡς τεσσαρακονταετῆ χρόνον * ἐτροφοφόρησεν αὐτοὺς 18

b *Supra* 12. 17.
& 19. 33.
& 21. 40.
c *Exod.* 1. 1.
& 6. 8.
& 12. 31.
& 13. 14.
d *Exod.* 16. 2,
35.
Num. 14. 34.
Psalm. 95. 10.

at this [authoritative] mode of teaching the Lord," i. e. his religion; i. e. "when he saw its truth confirmed by such power [of miracles]." For it is not the *internal* evidence of the truth (as Dodd. understands) which is here had in view, but its *external* evidence. This, indeed, is placed beyond doubt by the *authentic* interpretation of St. Luke himself, in his Gospel, iv. 32. καὶ ἐπελήσοντο ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ· ὅτι ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ ἦν ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ.

13. οἱ περὶ τὸν Π.] This comes under one of the three divisions into which this idiomatic use of the Article masc. plur. with an Accusative of person is distributed; by which is meant "the person (as principal) and his company." But if we understand it of Paul and Barnabas only, it would seem harsh. May we not, then, suppose that some *other persons* had associated themselves with them, as subordinate helpers in the work of evangelization? That Mark had accompanied them is certain from the next Chapter. This idiom being used shows that Paul was already esteemed the principal, though Barnabas was, on many accounts, entitled to high consideration, and is mentioned first in the Divine appointment.

14. ἐκάθισαν] "took their seat," no doubt in the place where, as doctors, they had a right to sit. See Mr. Townsend's *Excursus* here, (formed from the elaborate researches of Grot., Lightf., Mede, and Vitringa,) "on the officers, and modes of worship in the synagogues."

15. εἰ ἔστι — λαὸν, λέγετε.] The full sense seems to be "If either of you have any word [of exhortation] to address to the people, speak it." This instruction and exhortation was usually taken from the portions read of the Pentateuch or Prophets.

16. κατασείσας τῆ χειρὶ.] See note on xii. 17. In this address, which, as Dodd. observes, "seems chiefly intended to illustrate the Divine economy in opening the Gospel gradually, and preparing the Jews, by temporal mercies, for others of a higher nature," the Apostle (to use the words of Mr. Townsend) "reminds his hearers of the former mercies of God to the family of Abraham, and the prediction that their Messiah should be descended from David; and asserts that this Messiah was Jesus of Nazareth. He appeals to the well-known fact of the resurrection of Christ from the dead, as the principal evidence of the truth of his declaration, and concludes with enforcing that one important truth, in which the whole human race are so immediately interested, that forgiveness of sins is to be

proclaimed through Him alone; and that Christ alone can justify the Christian, not only from those offences, from which they were typically purified by the ceremonial law, but from those sins also for which that law had made no provision."

— οἱ φοβ. τὸν Θεόν.] By these are meant the proselytes of the gate, — the οἱ σιβόμενοι προσήλυτοι. So Joseph. Ant. xiv. 7, 2, makes a similar distinction between Ἰουδαῖοι and σιβόμενοι. These persons were such as, having abandoned idolatry, worshipped the true God, and therefore, though they did not receive circumcision, were yet permitted to attend at the synagogues. Those Gentiles who received circumcision were reckoned as Jews. (Kuin.)

17. ἐξέλεξατο] "chose as objects of his peculiar blessing." Ὑψωσεν is well explained by Elsn. and Dodd. "raised them out of a calamitous state," referring to several passages of the Psalms, to which I would add lxix. 14. μετὰ βραχ. ὑψηλοῦ, i. e. by the exertion of a mighty power.

18. ἐτροφοφόρησεν.] It is exceedingly difficult to determine which of the two readings here found (ἐτροποφόρησεν and ἐτροφοφόρησεν) is to be adopted. The latter has been preferred by H. Steph., Casaub., Mill, Pfaff, Hamm., Beng., Ernesti, Pearce, Wakef., Valckn., Morus, Schleus., Rosenm., Kuin., and Towns.; and has been edited by Griesb. and Knapp. The former, which is the common reading, however, has been ably supported by Grot., Gataker, Deyling, Whitby, Wolf, Wets., Dodd., Matth., and others. Many arguments are adduced by the disputants on both sides, which are either irrelevant, or inconclusive. What increases the perplexity is, that the words may easily be, and often are confounded by the scribes. Nay, in certain senses which the terms admit, the ideas noted by the two words merge into each other. Hence some advocates for the common reading have, in almost every passage, cited as authority for ἐτροποφορέω, maintained that ἐτροποφ. is the true reading; but without reason. There can be no doubt but that both words were in use. For though we may doubt whether τροποφορέω be analogically formed, yet we must bend to use, and the similar form διτροφορέω defends the seeming anomaly. That π and φ are interchanged in pronunciation, is an argument which draws both ways; while that the words are often confounded by scribes, is an argument which makes far more for the new than the old reading. Yet, upon the whole, external

- 19 ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ^c καὶ κυθελῶν ἔθνη ἐπτά ἐν γῆ Χαναάν, * κατεκληρονόμησεν^e αὐτοὺς τὴν γῆν αὐτῶν. Καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα, ὡς ἔτεσι τετρακοσίοις
 20 καὶ πεντήκοντα, ἔδωκε κριτὰς ἕως Συμουὴλ τοῦ προφήτου· ἠκείθεν
 21 ἦρσαντο βασιλεῖα· καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Θεὸς τὸν Σαοὺλ υἱὸν Κίς,
 22 ἄνδρα ἐκ φυλῆς Βενιαμίν, ἔτη τεσσαράκοντα·^e καὶ μετὰ τούτων, ἤγειρεν αὐτοῖς τὸν Δαυὶδ εἰς βασιλεῖα, ὃς καὶ εἶπε μαρτυρήσας· Ἐγὼ οὖν
 23 τὰ θελήματά μου.^h Τούτου ὁ Θεὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ σπέρματος καὶ ἔπαυ-
 24 γελίαν † ἤγειρε τῷ Ἰσραὴλ σωτῆρα Ἰησοῦν, ἰ προκηρῦξάντος Ἰωάννου

e Jos. 14. 1, 2.
 Jud. 2. 16.
 & 3. 9.
 f 1 Sam. 8. 5.
 & 9. 15.
 & 10. 1.
 Hos. 13. 11.
 g 1 Sam. 13. 14
 & 15. 29.
 & 16. 13.
 Paul. 89. 20.
 aptra 7. 45.
 h 2 Sam. 7. 12.
 Isa. 11. 1.
 i Mal. 3. 1.
 Matt. 3. 1.
 Mark 1. 2.
 Luke 3. 3.
 John 3. 23.

testimony is so decidedly in favour of the latter (ἐτροφ. being found in very few MSS.), that if that were all we had to consider, it ought to be preferred. Internal evidence, however, is also to be taken into the account, and that is strongly in favour of the new reading. It is the less usual and more difficult term, and is far more suitable to the context; ἐτροφοφ. consorting better with ὑψωσεν, and ἐξήγαγεν before. Nay, as Kuin. observes, "the other can scarcely be borne out by facts; for it appears from Ps. xcv. 10. Heb. iii. 17. and other passages, that God did not very patiently bear their perversity." Finally, that τροφοφ. is boni commatis, is attested by its occurring also in Deut. i. 31, in 2 Macc. vii. 27, and in Macarius; also τροφόφορος in Eustathius. Thus the inferiority in external is compensated by the superiority in internal testimony; and, accordingly, this knotty point might be only decided "ad Calendar Græcas," were we not enabled to call in another principle, which may serve to turn the scale. No unprejudiced inquirer can doubt that the Apostle had in view Deut. i. 31; nay, Beng. and Kuin. with much probability, conjecture that Deut. i. and Is. i. were the two chapters of the O. T. which had been read that day. But, upon inspecting the passage, it will be obvious, that τροφοφορέω, and not τροποφορέω, is there the true reading. It is supported by 5-6ths of the MSS. (See Dr. Holmes' Sept.), and by Symm. and Aquila, and is required there by the context. Moreover, the great bulk of the MSS. and the Hebrew require that we should read not τροφοφορήσει, but ἐτροφόρησε, as the Apostle seems to have read. The words of the whole passage are, Ἐγὼ δετε — ὡς ἐτροφόρησά σε Κύριος ὁ Θεός σου, ὡς εἶπες τροποφορήσαι ἄνθρωπος τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, κατὰ πᾶσαν τὴν δόδον εἰς ἣν ἐπορεύθητε, ἕως ἤλθετε εἰς τὴν τόπον τούτου. Ἐτροφόρησεν is also confirmed by Numb. xi. 12. Δάβε αὐτὸν (scil. τὸν λαὸν τούτου) εἰς τὴν κόλπον σου, ὡσεὶ ἄραι τιθῆναι τὸν θηλάζοντα, εἰς τὴν γῆν ἣν ὤμοσας τοῖς πατέρας αὐτῶν; for it is probable that this passage too was in the mind of the Apostle, and that the two passages are respectively images of a father carrying his little son over the rough places of a road, and of a nurse carrying an infant in her bosom. There, I conceive the image terminates; and does not extend to feeding, which some ancient Interpreters seem to have thought; as we may infer from the Const. Apost. vii. 36, Hesych., and the Peschito Syriac, Arabic, Coptic, and Æthiopic, and two very ancient Latin Versions. Thus the question at issue has, I apprehend, been finally decided in favour of ἐτροφόφωσεν.

19. κατεκληρονόμησεν.] Such is the reading of many MSS., and several Fathers, and early Editions, which is adopted by almost every Critic and Editor of note, instead of the common read-

ing κατεκληροδότησεν. And justly; for though κατεκληροδότης is the less usual term, and therefore the other might seem a gloss, yet its authority is not very well established. It is found, indeed, in the LXX.; but the MSS. vary.

20. ὡς ἔτεσι τετρ. καὶ π.] As to the discrepancy between this number and that at 1 Kings vi. 1, we need not suppose an error either in one or the other, though the Apostle's number is confirmed by Josephus; but (with Mr. Towns.) take the words to mean: "and after these things, which lasted about the space of 450 years, he gave them judges, until Samuel the Prophet," i. e. from the time that God chose the fathers, (which some fix to the birth of Isaac) to the time the land was divided to them by lot, was nearly 450 years; and then God appointed judges in Israel. Or we may suppose (with Lightf. and Perizon.) that in this number are reckoned the years of the reigns of the tyrants, who occasionally held Israel in subjection during the dynasty of the Judges; and which, when added, make up exactly 450. Thus no error will attach to either passage, and only different modes of computation be supposed to be adopted.

21. ἐκείθεν.] This is properly used of place; but sometimes of time, as here and in Xen. cited by Kuin. Ἐτη τεσσαράκοντα. The truth of this is attested by Josephus. And the Apostle probably derived his information from the same source as the historian, — namely, the ancient records which were preserved in the Temple.

22. εἶπον — θελήματά μου.] The words are compounded of Ps. lxxxix. 20, and 1 Sam. xiii. 14, with some slight modification, on which mode of citing from the O. T. see Note on vii. 7.

— ἄνδρα κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν] viz. in his undeviating pursuit of the plans God would have carried into effect, and in accomplishing His purposes. For καρδία here signifies will or purpose. Nor is this use merely what the Commentators call it, a Hebraism; since similarly in Æschyl. Agam. 9. we have ὡς γὰρ κρατεῖ γυναικὸς ἀνδρόβουλου, ἐπιτρέφει κέαρ, for so I would point the passage, which has been admirably emended by Bp. Blomfield; though, had the learned Editor recollected the force of κέαρ just mentioned, he would not have assigned to κρατεῖ the arbitrary and precarious sense of jubet, but would have perceived that it denotes simply "has prevailed;" i. e. has obtained its purpose, namely, that it should be so; a signification not unrequent in Thucydides.

23. ἤγειρε — σωτῆρα ἱ.] Griesb. and Matth. edit, from several MSS., and some Versions and Fathers, ἤγαγε, supposing the common reading to be a gloss. But though this may seem required by the Canon of preferring the more difficult reading, yet an exception is always allowed where

k John 1. 20, 26, 27.
 Matt. 3. 11.
 Mark 1. 7.
 Luke 3. 16.
 l Matt. 10. 6.
 supra 3. 26.
 & infr. v. 46.
 m John 16. 3.
 supra 3. 17.
 infr. 2. 21.
 1 Cor. 2. 8.
 1 Tim. 1. 13.
 n Matt. 27. 20,
 21, 22.
 Mark 15. 11, 12,
 13.
 Luke 23. 18,
 21, 22, 23.
 John 19. 6.
 o Matt. 27. 59.
 Mark 15. 46.
 Luke 23. 53.
 John 19. 38.
 p Supra 2. 24.
 q Matt. 23. 2,
 16.
 Mark 16. 6, 14.

πρὸ προσώπου τῆς εἰσόδου αὐτοῦ βάπτισμα μετανοίας πινὲ τῷ λαῷ
 Ἰσραὴλ. ^k Ὡς δὲ ἐπλήρου ὁ Ἰωάννης τὸν δρόμον, ἔλεγε· τίνα με 25
 ὑπονοεῖτε εἶναι; οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐγώ· ἀλλ' ἰδοὺ, ἔρχεται μετ' ἐμέ, οὗ οὐκ
 εἰμὶ ἄξιος τὸ ὑπόδημι τῶν ποδῶν λῦσαι. ^l Ἄδελφοί, υἱοὶ γένους 26
 Ἀβραάμ, καὶ οἱ ἐν ὑμῖν φοβούμενοι τὸν Θεόν, ὑμῖν ὁ λόγος τῆς σωτη-
 ρίας ταύτης ἀπεστάλη. ^m Οἱ γὰρ κατοικοῦντες ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ, καὶ οἱ 27
 ἀρχόντες αὐτῶν, τοῦτον ἀγνοήσαντες καὶ τὰς φωνὰς τῶν προφητῶν τὰς
 κατὰ πᾶν σάββατον ἀναγινωσκομένας, κρίναντες ἐπλήρωσαν. ⁿ Καὶ 28
 μηδεμίαν αἰτίαν θανάτου εὐρόντες, ᾗτησαντο Πιλάτον ἀναγεῖσθαι αὐτόν.
^o Ὡς δὲ ἐτέλεσαν * πάντα τὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ γεγραμμένα, καθελόντες ἀπὸ 29
 τοῦ ξύλου, ἔθηξαν εἰς μνημεῖον. ^p Ὁ δὲ Θεὸς ᾗγειρεν αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν· 30
^q ὃς ἄφθθ ἐπὶ ἡμέρας πλείους τοῖς συναραβίσι αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλι- 31

that reading is at variance with the *norma loquendi*. Now *ἄγειν σωτήρα*, as Wets. observes, occurs nowhere; while *ἄγειρεν* is found in Judg. iii. 9 & 15. Besides, the MSS. in favor of *ἄγαγε* are comparatively few. And it has little support from Versions; while *ἄγειρε* is confirmed by the Pesch. Syr. It should seem that *ἄγαγε* arose merely from an error of the Scribes, who often confound *ει* (abbrev.) with *αι*, and *γ* with *ρ*. It is truly observed by Wets.: "Εγείρειν σωτήρα scribitur Jud. iii. 9. 15. ἄγειν σωτήρα nusquam." Instead of *σωτήρα Ἰησοῦ* Matthæi edits, from several MSS., *σωτήριαν*; but rashly; for, as Mill long ago remarked, that reading arose from a mistake of the scribes, who mistook the abbreviation of *σρα εν* for *σριαν*; i. e. the abbreviation of *σωτήριαν*. And to this the learned and diligent collator of Biblical MSS., *Kinck*, assents. *Σωρ.* does not, as Matthæi thought, require the Article; because (as Bp. Middleton suggests) "nouns in apposition, not explanatory of the essence of the preceding noun, but of the *end* or object, are always anarthrous." See also Luke ii. 11.

24. πρὸ προσώπου.] This corresponds to the Hebr. *נִפְגַּל*, and simply signifies *before*. *Εἰσόδου*, "entrance upon his office;" in which sense the word is used in the Classical writers. On *βάπτ.* *μετανοίας*, see Note on Matt. iii. 2.

25. ὡς ἐπλήρου.] Render, "when he was finishing his course," i. e. towards the close of his course, or ministry. *τίνα* is taken by many eminent Commentators for *ὄντινα*, in the sense "I am not he whom you suppose me to be." Of this they adduce examples; yet not one where the *τις* commences a sentence. It is therefore better to take the *τίνα* (according to the common interpretation) as interrogative, and then suppose, in the next sentence, an ellip. of *αὐτος*; which, when Christ is meant, is often, through reverence, suppressed. There is, besides, more of Pauline spirit in this construction.

27. οἱ γὰρ κατοικοῦντες.] The *γὰρ* is not *causal*, but has reference to some clause omitted, and may be rendered *etenim*.

— τοῦτον ἀγνοήσαντες — ἐπλήρωσαν.] There is here a difficulty of construction; to remove which several eminent Commentators suppose a *transposition*; and taking *κρίναντες* with *τοῦτον*, and *ἀγνοήσαντες* with *τὰς φωνὰς*, they assign the following sense: "They who dwelt at Jerusalem in condemning Him, not having known the voices

of the prophets, which are read every sabbath day, have fulfilled [the prophecies]." But this does too much violence to the construction to be admitted. It is better (with Grot., Wolf, and Kuin.) to take *ἀγνοήσαντες* as belonging to both *τοῦτον* and (by adaptation of signification) to *τὰς φωνὰς τ. π.*, in the sense. "not knowing Him to be the Messiah, and not understanding the words of the prophecy." At *κρίναντες* (for *κατακρ.*) sub. *αὐτόν* taken from *τοῦτον* preceding, and render: "by condemning." *Ἀγνοήσαντες* cannot be again supplied at *ἐπλήρωσαν*, yet it is *implied*; the meaning being, that they unwittingly fulfilled the prophecies. So Joseph. Bell. iv. 6. 3. adverting to such prophecies, says of the Zelotæ: *οἷς οὐκ ἀπιστήσαντες* [I conjecture *ἐπιστ.*] *διακόνοῦς ἑαυτοῦς ἐπέθεσαν*.

29. καθελόντες — μνημεῖον.] There has been a difficulty started, — that "the same persons who condemned Jesus did not bury him." To remove which, some Commentators would take the words *καθελόντες* — *ἔθηκαν impersonally*; and, indeed, active verbs are sometimes taken passively, or even impersonally. But the principle is here inapplicable, and savours too much of a device for the nonce; as does also the method of supplying *Ἰουδαῖοι*. Grot. and Rosenm. suppose the Article omitted; by which the sense will be, "those who took him down," meaning Joseph and his companions. But this is *forcing* a sense on the passage which could not be meant; for to express that, the Article must have been used; it being, as Bp. Middl. observes, in such instances *never omitted*. Nay, as he further remarks, even this would not remove the objection; for Joseph and his companions did not take down the body, but the *executioners*. He regards the wording as a trifling inaccuracy; which the Apostle, hastening to the grand subject of the Resurrection, cared not to avoid. It may, however, be doubted, whether there be any inaccuracy at all. It seems to be only a *popular form of expression*, by which any one is said to *do* what he *procures* or permits to be done by another. Those who brought about his crucifixion might be familiarly said to *bring him to his grave*, though they did not deposit him there. What the Apostle meant to say is this, — that when they had (unwittingly) done all that was predicted of him [up to his death], they had him taken down and buried [and thought there was then an end of him]. This last clause, though not expressed, is perhaps *alluded to* in the adversative *δὲ*, which commences the next sentence, "But not so; — God raised him." &c.

32 λαίας εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, οἵτινες εἰσι μάρτυρες αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὸν λαόν. ¹ Καὶ Luke 24. 36. John 20. 19. & 21. 1. supra 1. 3. 1 Cor. 15. 5, 6. 1 Gen. 3. 15. & 22. 18. & 26. 4. & 49. 10. Deut. 18. 15. 2 Sam. 7. 12. Psal. 132. 11. Isa. 4. 2. & 7. 14. & 9. 5. & 40. 10. Jer. 23. 5. & 33. 14. Ezek. 34. 23. & 37. 21. Dan. 9. 24, 25. & Paal. 2. 7. Heb. 1. 5. & 5. 5. 1 Isa. 55. 3. u Paal. 16. 10. ἡμεῖς ὑμᾶς εὐαγγελιζόμεθα τὴν πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ἐπαγγελίαν γενομένην· ὅτι ταύτην ὁ Θεὸς ἐκπεπλήρωκε τοῖς τέκνοις αὐτῶν ἡμῖν, ἀνα-
 33 στήσας Ἰησοῦν· ² ὡς καὶ ἐν τῷ ψαλμῷ τῷ δευτέρῳ γέγραπται· ³ Τίός ⁴ μου εἶ σὺ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε. ⁵ Ὅτι δὲ ἀνέστησεν αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν, μηκέτι μέλλοντα ὑποστρέφειν εἰς διαφθοράν, οὕτως ⁶ εἴρηκεν· ⁷ Ὅτι δώσω ὑμῖν τὰ ὅσια Δαυΐδ τὰ πιστά. ⁸ Διὸ καὶ ἐν ἐτέρῳ λέγει· ⁹ Οὐ δώσεις τὸν ὀσιόν σου ἰδεῖν δια-
 34 φθοράν. ¹⁰ Δαυΐδ μὲν γὰρ ἰδίᾳ γενεᾷ ὑπηρετήσας τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ βουλή, ¹¹ ἐκοιμήθη, καὶ προσετέθη πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἶδε διαφθο-
 37 ράν· ὃν δὲ ὁ Θεὸς ἤγειρεν, οὐκ εἶδε διαφθοράν. ¹² Ἰγνωστὸν οὖν ἔστω

32. καὶ ἡμεῖς ὑμᾶς εὐαγγ. &c.] There is here a certain perplexity of construction, which some seek to remove by taking ἐπαγγελίαν for the fulfilment of the promise. But that is straining the interpretation. It is better, with Bengel, Heum., Heint., and Kuin., to suppose a sort of Hebraic *synchysis*, by which the ταύτην just after is redundant, laying down the following construction: εὐαγγελιζόμεθα, ὅτι τὴν πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας γενομένην ἐπαγγελίαν ὁ Θεὸς ἐκπεπλήρωκε. To this method these Critics resort, because an Accus. of thing after that of person with εὐαγγ. is, they say, unexampled. A somewhat bold assertion, which seems contradicted by the present passage, and certainly is so by Rev. xiv. 6. εἶδον ἄλλον ἄγγελον — ἐχοντα εὐαγγελίον αἰώνιον εὐαγγελίαι τοὺς κατοικοῦντας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, in which construction the Accus. of person comes first. And indeed εὐαγγ. often occurs in the N. T. with the accus. of person. So Luke iii. 18. πολλὰ μὲν — εὐαγγελίζοντο τὸν λαόν. The Accus. of thing may depend on some preposition understood; or rather on ἀγγέλλοντες to be fetched, *per synesin*, out of the verb. Here, at any rate, it must be supplied before ὅτι ταύτην, &c. Those who have any thing promised them, are in Scripture peculiarly said εὐαγγελιζέσθαι. So Heb. iv. 2. καὶ γὰρ ἔσμεν εὐαγγελισμένοι, “to us pertains that promise.” Thus it appears that the above *synchysis* need not be supposed to exist.

33. υἱός μου — σε.] “It is not (Mr. Holden observes) meant, that by raising up Jesus from the dead, God begat him in the relation of a Son; but that by raising him, God declared him to be the Messiah, according to the promise made to the fathers, ver. 32; and also, that by so raising him, he declared him to be his only begotten Son, according to what is written at Ps. ii. 7. Thus the Apostle states the resurrection as a proof that in Christ was fulfilled the promise unto the fathers, and the prophecy in Ps. xi.: for though the words had probably a primary reference to David, yet it bore a secondary and more important reference to Christ. So also, in the next verse, the Apostle proves that the Messiah promised to the fathers was to be raised from the dead without undergoing corruption.”

34. ὅτι δὲ — εἴρηκεν.] The reasoning seems to be, that “it might be inferred that the resurrection in question would be final and permanent, from the words which God had spoken by his prophet (Is. lv. 4.) as follows: ‘I will give,’ &c.” The Apostle does not add, *de suo*, ὅτι δώσω ὑμῖν, but he merely introduces δώσω, because in the clause in question it is to be supplied from the preceding one, εὐαγγέσαι, &c. And thus it is

supplied in Br. Lowth's version. “*Osia* is by most interpreters explained “*mercies*,” by some “*benefits*,” which latter sense is preferable. Yet Tittm. de Synon. p. 25. denies that *osia* can mean this; and he (with Br. Pearce) takes the sense of τὰ ὅσια to be “the sacred things of David,” i. e. the covenant made with David, and confirmed by an oath; meaning the performance of it. And thus τὰ ὅσια πιστὰ will be equivalent to the ὄρκια πιστὰ of Homer. But there is surely a greater difficulty in regarding τὰ ὅσια as taken in so far-fetched a sense. And unless we suppose that the Sept. Translators entirely mistook the sense of the Hebrew *יְרֵכָה*, we can scarcely render otherwise than “the benefits mercifully promised;” as in 2 Chron. vi. 42. Schleus. in his Lex. adduces an example of this sense of τὰ ὀσιον (*benefit*) from Clemens. Ep. ad Corinth. Cap. I. πῶσα δὲ αὐτῷ (scil. Christo) δφέλοιμεν ὅσια. The Apostle argues, that these merciful promises have been proved to be sure and true by their fulfilment in the resurrection of Jesus; which resurrection (so accomplished as that, agreeably to the prophecy at Ps. xvi. 10, his body did not experience that corruption which results from permanent death) proved him to be the Messiah promised to the Fathers.

36. The Apostle here proceeds to show, that those words are not applicable to David; and then leaves it to be inferred that the person there meant must be Jesus,—the only one who had been so raised from the dead as not to return thither, or experience corruption. The construction has been thought doubtful; since ὑπηρετήσας may be construed either with ἰδίᾳ γενεᾷ, or with τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ βουλή. The former method is adopted by some Interpreters and the E. V.; but the latter is the more natural construction, and yields a better sense; and such as is very applicable to one who was “the man after God's own heart,” by accomplishing his purposes. See ver. 22. It is also confirmed by the ancient Versions, and by the use of the word in the Classical writers,—where ὑπηρετεῖν is often followed by a noun signifying wishes, commands, &c. ἰδίᾳ γενεᾷ, “in his own generation,” or age. See Luke xvi. 8.

— προσετέθη πρὸς τοὺς π.] An expression derived from the O. T. (as Gen. xlix. 29. xxv. 8. Judg. ii. 10.), in which there is an allusion to those vast caves, or subterraneous vaults, in which the Hebrews (as also the Egyptians, Babylonians, and other Oriental nations) used to deposit the dead of a whole family or race; sometimes arranged in recesses by the side of the vault, and sometimes

supra 2. 27. & c. ὑμῖν, ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, ὅτι διὰ τούτου ὑμῖν ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν καταγγέλ- 38
 supra 2. 29. λεται καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων, ὧν οὐκ ἠδυνήθητε ἐν τῷ νόμῳ Μωϋσέως 39
 y Luke 24. 47. δίκαιωθῆναι, ἐν τούτῳ πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων δικαιούται. Βλέπετε οὖν, μὴ 40
 1 John 2. 12. ἐπέλθῃ ἐφ' ὑμᾶς τὸ εἰρημένον ἐν τοῖς προφήταις. Ἰδετε, οἱ 41
 Rom. 3. 24. & 8. 3. καταφρονηταὶ, καὶ θανατώσατε, καὶ ἀφανίσθητε· ὅτι
 Gal. 2. 16. ἔργον ἐγὼ ἐργάζομαι ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ὑμῶν, ἔργον ᾧ
 Heb. 7. 19. & 9. 15. οὐ μὴ πιστεύσητε, ἐάν τις ἐκδιηγῆται ὑμῖν.
 z Rom. 10. 4. Ἐξιόντων δὲ αὐτῶν [ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς τῶν Ἰουδαίων] παρεκάλουν 42
 a Habak. 1. 5. [τὰ ἔθνη] εἰς τὸ μεταξὺ σάββατον λαληθῆναι αὐτοῖς τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα.

laid upon each other, until the place was quite full of bodies.

38, 39. The Apostle now applies the doctrine which he has already stated and proved, and proceeds, by inference, to show the benefits to be obtained by faith in the Messiahship of Jesus, and to point out the great superiority of the justification and remission of sins to be attained through him over that supplied by the Law of Moses. In short, here (as Dr. Hales observes) he states the doctrine of justification by faith, which forms the basis of the argument in his Epistles to the Romans, Galatians, and Hebrews. The full sense of the passage is thus ably traced and pointed out by Bp. Bull, Harm. Evang. p. 53, and Examen Censuræ, p. 39: "Duo videtur Apostolus affirmare, nempe, non tantum per Jesum remissionem peccatorum, spiritualem sc. (quam Lex non omnino concessit) annunciari; sed et credentem justificari in ipso ab omnibus, à quibus nemo per Legem Mosis (ne carnaliter quidem) justificari poterat. Hinc infert Apostolus, non quaerendam in Legge Mosaica Justificationem, sed confugiendum ad aliud plenioris misericordiae Fœdus, nempe Fœdus illud in Christi Jesu Sanguine stabilitum." They could not be justified even carnaliter, since, as Mr. Scott observes, "the only effect of the sacrifices and purgations of the Mosaic law was admission into the congregation again, whence the breach of some positive ceremony had excluded a man: and some offences punishable with death admitted no sacrifice at all. Whereas this atonement of Christ reaches to the perfect and eternal forgiveness of every kind and degree of transgression in them that sincerely believe and obey him."

40. To this encouragement to faith, intended for the well-disposed, the Apostle subjoins a warning, meant for the refractory. Ἐν τοῖς προφ., i. e. that division of the O. T. called the Prophets. See Note on John vi. 45.

41. Ἰδετε, &c.] A citation from Habak. 1. 5. (though a similar apostrophe in Is. xxviii. 14. may have been in the mind of St. Paul) in which a word is omitted not necessary to the sense, and one or two supplied to make it clearer. Both the Apostle and the LXX. vary from the Hebrew, as regards οἱ καταφρονηταὶ and ἀφανίσθητε, in the former instance preserving the true reading, which seems to be not כַּנְיִים, but כַּנְרִים, which is read in some MSS., and confirmed by the Syriac and Arabic Versions. With ἀφαν. there is more of difficulty. The common version "Perish" is generally considered indefensible, as not even warranted by the Hebrew; and Beza, Doddr., Pearce, Wakef., Schlens., Wahl., and Kuin., render "disappear;" viz. for shame and fear; a sense which Schlens. thinks reconcilable with the

Hebrew, since רָשָׁע signifies both *rastari* and *stupere*. If so, the LXX. took the worse signification. But probably they read differently, namely, instead of רָשָׁע, they read רָשָׁה, and be exceedingly amazed. This I suspect to be the true reading in the Hebrew; for the letters might easily be confounded, and a ה lost after a י. Thus there will be a *climax*; רָשָׁה or רָשָׁה being a far stronger term (namely, to be destroyed, i. e. die, with amazement) than רָשָׁה. What idea St. Paul himself would have affixed to the word, as it respected the prophecy, we cannot know. But it should seem that he took occasion, from the ambiguity of signification, to hint to his unbelieving hearers a warning as to the consequences of their unbelief and rejection of the Messiah. The "work" was the ruin of their country, which certainly happened in their time, since it was done not many years afterwards.

42. There is in this verse much diversity of reading, and consequently variety of interpretations. Almost all the recent Editors are agreed in inserting ἀδῶν (for which there is great authority in MSS., Versions, Fathers, and early Edd.), and cancelling ἐκ τῆς—Ἰουδαίων and τὰ ἔθνη, with as great authority. Matth., however, retains τὰ ἔθνη, which may certainly be tolerated if the words be taken to denote the Jewish proselytes, mentioned in the next verse. But they are probably from the margin; as also, it should seem, are ἐκ τῆς—Ἰουδαίων, though the objection which Kuin. makes to τῶν Ἰ. (that of being useless and offensive) is refuted by xiv. 1. And after all, both the passages may be genuine, and have been excluded by the early Critics on the same grounds (some of them false) that they are objected to by Kuin. Or perhaps τῶν Ἰ. only may have come from the margin, as meant to denote the subject of the participle ἐξιόντων, as τὰ ἔθνη would seem to be meant to supply that of the verb παρεκάλουν. There is not a more frequent case of marginal glosses (often introduced into the text) than when verbs or participles absolute are put without a subject. In the present instance, τῶν Ἰ. seems to have been supplied to ἀδῶν, and ἐκ τῆς συν. to ἐξιόντων, and finally τὰ ἔθνη παρεκάλουν; introduced, I suspect, after τῶν Ἰ. The whole passage may be thus rendered: "As they (i. e. Paul and Barnabas) were departing from the synagogue, they (i. e. the congregation, or the Gentile proselytes) expressed a desire that these words might be spoken to them (i. e. that the same subject should be treated of) on the next sabbath day. And when the synagogue had broken up, many of the Jews and devout proselytes followed Paul and Barnabas." Paul and Barnabas did not go out, as Kuin. chooses to take for granted, before the conclusion of the service;

- 43^b λυθείσης δὲ τῆς συναγωγῆς, ἠκολούθησαν πολλοὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων καὶ τῶν σεβομένων προσηλύτων τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ τῷ Βαρνάβῃ· οἷτινες προσλαλοῦντες αὐτοῖς, ἐπειθον αὐτοὺς ἐπιμένειν τῇ χάριτι τοῦ Θεοῦ.
- 44 Τῷ δὲ ἐρχομένῳ σαββάτῳ σχεδὸν πᾶσα ἡ πόλις συνήχθη ἀκοῦσαι τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ. Ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι τοὺς ὄχλους, ἐπήσθησαν ζήλον, καὶ ἀπέλεγον τοῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ Παύλου λεγομένοις, ἀντιλέγοντες
- 46 καὶ βλασφημοῦντες. Ὁ Παρόψησιμάμενοι δὲ ὁ Παῦλος καὶ ὁ Βαρνάβας εἶπον· Ἐμῖν ἦν ἀναγκαῖον πρῶτον λαληθῆναι τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ· ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἀπωθεῖσθε αὐτὸν, καὶ οὐκ ἀξίους κρίνετε ἑαυτοὺς τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς, ἰδοὺ στρεφόμεθα εἰς τὰ ἔθνη. Ὁ Κύριος· Τέθεικά σε εἰς φῶς ἔθνων, τοῦ εἶναί σε

b Matt. 23. 15.
supra 11. 23.
infra 14. 22.

c Matt. 10. 6.
supra 1. 8.
& 3. 25, 26.
& 13. 26.
infra 18. 6.
& 28. 23.
Exod. 32. 10.
Deut. 32. 21.
Isa. 55. 5.
Matt. 8. 12.
& 21. 43.
Rom. 10. 19.
d Isa. 49. 6.
& 42. 6.
Luke 2. 32.

for the service, except a brief concluding prayer, terminated with the *discourse*; but we are only to understand that they went out *first*, accompanied probably by the rulers of the synagogue; the people meanwhile reverently keeping their seats; and on their having left the place, the whole congregation broke up and departed.

The words εἰς τὸ μετὰ σάββ. are by many Commentators supposed to mean "on some intermediate week day." But that is refuted by v. 44., and the sense expressed in our common Version is, no doubt, the true one. It is adopted by the best recent Commentators, and confirmed by the ancient Versions. Μετὰ in the later writers has often the sense *post*. It is here put for μετὰ τοῦτο.

43. ἐπιμένειν — Θεῷ] i. e. to perseverance in their belief of the Gospel, called also in 2 Cor. vi. I. Phil. i. 7. Heb. xiii. 9. κατ' ἐξοχὴν, the *grace* of God, "as containing (says Doddr.) the richest display of his grace, i. e. the free pardon of our sins by Christ, and the provision he hath made for our sanctification and eternal happiness." See Rom. vi. 4. Col. i. 6.

44. ἐρχομένῳ.] Griesb., Knapp, and Tittm., edit, from 7 MSS., ἐχομένῳ, which Rinck approves, on the ground of its being the more learned and apt reading. And certainly this would hold good in an elegant *Classic*; but for that very reason ἐχομ. may be suspected to have come from the *ancient Critics*. Especially as the MSS. in which it is found are mostly such as have been altered. And as τῷ δὲ ἐρχομένῳ scil. ἡμέρᾳ is found not unfrequently in *Joseph.*, nay, ἐτους ἐρχομένου in *Thucyd.*, who has not a few *archaisms*, we may suppose that this use of ἐρχ. for ἐπορχ. was an idiom of the popular dialect, derived from antique and perhaps Oriental use.

45. ἀντιλέγοντες καὶ βλ.] "both contradicting and reviling," i. e. adding insult to opposition. Ἀντιλ. καὶ are omitted in several MSS. and Versions, and marked as probably to be cancelled by Griesb. But they were manifestly thrown out by the early Critics, who, it seems, stumbled at the tautology. The reading ἐναντιοβούμενοι for ἀντιλ., found in a few MSS. and preferred by Grot., Beza, and Beng., is only another mode of removing the tautology.

46. ἀναγκαῖον] i. e. by being so ordained in the counsels of God.

— καὶ οὐκ ἀξίους — ζωῆς] i. e. since you act as if ye judged yourselves unworthy of, &c. Whether it be a *metonymy*, as the Commentators regard it, or not, this is certainly a *delicate turn*, such as is

found in the best writers, from whom examples are adduced by Wets.

— στρεφόμεθα εἰς τὰ ἔθνη.] We are not to understand by this, that Paul gave up the Jews, and became the Apostle of the Gentiles only; for he became such much later, and even then never to the *abandonment* of the *Jews*. In fact, the Jews of Antioch alone are meant; and by τὰ ἔθνη not the Gentiles at large, nor even the Gentiles of Antioch only, but chiefly the Gentile proselytes before mentioned; though the Gentiles at large may be *included*, since the Apostle would have been as ready to admit *them* as converts, as he had been to admit the Proconsul. That he deemed himself at full liberty to do this, is plain from the *application* which he gives to the words of Isaiah xlix. 6., which he now adduces as his authority.

47. τέθεικά σε εἰς φῶς, &c.] The words exactly correspond to the LXX., at least in the Alexandrian and other MSS., though the common text (formed on the Vatican MS.) has δέωκα for τέθεικα, which is the more literal version of the Hebrew, of which τει. is a *free* rendering. In the common text are added εἰς διαθήκην γένους, of which the sense is, "as a bequest to the nation." But I suspect the words to have come from the margin. Τέθεικα should be rendered, "I have appointed," or "ordained." It is strange that Kuin. should consider this passage as properly applicable to *Isaiah* only, and his calling to the prophetic office, and merely *accommodated* by St. Paul to his own case. The words are scarcely applicable to the Prophet *at all*, and there are many parts of the Chapter, from whence this passage is taken, that *cannot possibly* apply to the Prophet, and have no propriety but as referred to the *Messiah*, "whose character and office (to use the words of Bp. Lowth) were exhibited in *general* terms at the beginning of Chap. xlii., but here is introduced *in person*, declaring the full extent of his commission; which is not only to restore the Israelites, and reconcile them to their Lord and Father, from whom they had so often revolted; but to be a light to lighten the Gentiles, to call them to the knowledge and obedience of the true God, and to bring them to be one church together with the Israelites, and to partake with them of the same common salvation procured for all by the great Redeemer and Reconciler of man to God." This passage of the Prophet might well be said to be *their warrant* for preaching to the Gentiles; and in some sense contains an *injunction*, since the Messiah could only be a light and salvation to the Gentiles by the means of those

εἰς σωτηρίαν ἕως ἰσχύτου τῆς γῆς. ἀκούοντα δὲ τὰ ἔθνη ἄρχαιρον, καὶ ἐδόξαζον τὸν λόγον τοῦ Κυρίου· καὶ ἐπίστευσαν ὅσοι.

who should spread his Gospel. Paul, however, himself had received a sort of *positive* injunction, since (as we find from Acts xxii. 17—21.) on his first visit to Jerusalem after his conversion, Jesus appeared to him in a trance and said, "Depart, for I will send thee hence far off to the Gentiles."

48. ἐδόξαζον τὸν λόγον τοῦ Κ.] i. e. recognized the excellency of it, as worthy the impartiality of the God of the whole universe.

—καὶ ἐπίστευσαν ὅσοι—αἰώνιον.] There are few passages of which the interpretation has been more warmly debated than the present; and that from its being supposed to involve an important doctrine. Most Calvinistic Interpreters take *τεταγμένοι εἰς* to mean *fore-ordained*, or *predestinated unto*, by *God's decree*; the persons in question being represented as *believing under that decree*. In refutation of which, some Anti-Calvinistic Commentators rather apply themselves to show that the doctrines of Calvinism are untenable, than that they cannot be found here. But the only question before us is, what may be supposed to be the true sense of the words *τεταγμένοι εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον*, in their present position. Now there would seem to be no vestige of any thing savouring of an absolute decree, or predestination. The expression is not *προτεταγμένοι*, (much less, as invariable usage elsewhere would require, *προωρισμένοι*), but simply *τεταγμένοι*. There is neither *προ* nor any thing equivalent. We have besides, no mention of *God*, no such addition as *ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ*. Objections which are sufficiently obvious, and which have been strongly urged by Grot., Hamm., Wolf, Whitby, and A. Clarke. Though, indeed, were those *all* that could be urged against the interpretation in question, they might perhaps be deemed insufficient to disallow it. For *τεταγμένοι* might (though there is no *proof* of any such sense either in the Scriptural or Classical writers) mean *destined*. And if *destined* could be *supposed* to be the sense, the argument founded on the omission of *ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ* would not be of any great weight, since that might be thought *understood*, as in Eph. i. 11. *προορισθέντες κατὰ πρόθεσιν*. &c. Thus the sense which the above Commentators assign might, after all, be tolerated if the *context would permit it*. But that is by no means the case. There is assuredly nothing, either in the context, or in the language used by St. Luke, either in this Book or in his Gospel, that can lead us to suppose any such sense intended here: nay, there is not a little that utterly *excludes* it. This, however, is a field into which our limits will not permit us to enter. See Hamm. cited in Recens. Synop. Suffice it to say (confining ourselves to the *context*) that it is forbidden by the word *ἐπίστευσαν*, which, under the present circumstances, can mean no more than, that they "believed in the Lord Jesus, and received the religion which he came to promulgate." Yet it cannot be supposed that *all* who did so were predestined to eternal salvation. "There were, doubtless, (as Schoettg. observes), among those believers, many hypocrites and evil livers; who eagerly enough embraced the *theoretical truth*, but cared not for the *practice*. These, then, could not be predestined." And we do not find that those who believed at *other times* were *predestined*; some *falling away*, as is represented in the parable of the Sower. Nor is it likely that such as believed should come in all at

once, but gradually. *Ἐπίστευσαν*, then, can have no reference to their *persevering* or not *persevering*. Besides, as the best Commentators are agreed (see Grot., Hamm., Whitby, Schoettg., Rosenm., and Kuin.) there is here an *opposition*, arising from a tacit comparison between the conduct of these Gentiles, on the one hand, and of the Jews, on the other. The Gentiles (*τεταγμένοι εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον*, and who accordingly received the Gospel) are contrasted with the Jews mentioned at ver. 46., who, by rejecting it, acted as if they thought themselves not worthy of eternal life. In short, *ἐδόξαζον τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ* is there opposed to *ἐδόξαζον τὸν λόγον τοῦ Κυρίου*; and *ὡς ἀξίους κρίνετε ἑαυτοὺς τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς, το ἦσαν τεταγμένοι εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον*. See Krebs and Wets. And as no *absolute decree* can, by the words *ὑπὸ ἡν ἀναγκαῖον*—*λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ* be supposed in the *latter case*, (see the able Note of Whitby) so none must be supposed in the *former*. The former act was voluntary, and so must the latter.

Having, then, seen what *cannot* be the meaning of the words, let us examine what *is* probably their sense. And in order to that, let us advert to their *construction*. Now here I would not adopt the construction laid down by many Interpreters of consideration, who would connect *εἰς ζωὴν* with *ἐπίστευσαν*. That is too violent a method, and requires an authorized sense to be assigned to *ζωὴν αἰώνιον*. The natural construction must be preserved, and such a sense assigned to *τεταγ.* as may be suitable to *εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον*, and is permitted by the usage of the Scriptural as well as the Classical writers. Many eminent Commentators trace in *τεταγ.* a *military metaphor*, and take the sense to be, "those who had arrayed themselves for salvation," namely, by hearing the word of God, and not resisting the work of the Holy Spirit on their hearts. Thus taking the passive here in a *reciprocal* sense; and than which nothing is more common. Yet there is something so *far-fetched* in this *military metaphor*, that almost all the above Expositors are compelled to abandon it, when they descend to *full* explanation. It should seem best neither, on the one hand, to fancy any deeply recondite theological mystery, nor, on the other, to suppose any *far-fetched* allusion; but to take the words in their plain and popular acceptation. Now *τάσασθαι εἰς* sometimes signifies to be *thoroughly disposed for*, or *purposed for*, *bent on*; (like the expression *εὐθετος αἶνα εἰς*) where the *middle* or *reciprocal* force is very apparent, as often in Josephus. And this may justly be supposed the sense here intended. Of this signification examples are adduced by Krebs and Loesner; of which none. Bp. Middl. thinks, is so much to the purpose as that from Max. Tyr. Diss. x. p. 102. (Heins.) *ἐπὶ σαρκῶν ἡδονῶν συντεταγμένος*. Yet had the learned Prelate examined the passage in the best editions (namely, those of Davies and Reiske), he would have found that they have there edited, from some MSS., *συντεταγμένος, ἡμμοδιῆ ἰντεντῦς*. In so editing, however, they were *wrong*; for though the context requires the sense *bent on, entirely disposed for*, yet that is no proof that *συντεταγμένος* is the true reading. It may rather be suspected of being a *conjecture* suggested by the context. I have no doubt that *τεταγμένος*, the old reading, is the right one; and that the *συν* is not genuine, but arose from the *σ* preceding:

49 ἦσαν τεταγμένοι εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον. διεφέρετο δὲ ὁ λόγος τοῦ Κυρίου
 50 δι' ὅλης τῆς χώρας. ° οἱ δὲ Ἰουδαῖοι παρώτρυναν τὰς σεβόμενας γυν- ^{e 2 Tim. 3. 11.}
 ναῖκας καὶ τὰς εὐσεβήσασα, καὶ τοὺς πρώτους τῆς πόλεως, καὶ ἐπήγειραν
 διωγμὸν ἐπὶ τὸν Παῦλον καὶ τὸν Βαρνάβην, καὶ ἐξέβαλον αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ
 51 τῶν ὁρίων αὐτῶν. † Οἱ δὲ ἐκτιναζόμενοι τὸν κοινοτὸν τῶν ποδῶν ^{f Matt. 10. 14.}
 52 αὐτῶν ἐπ' αὐτοὺς, ἦλθον εἰς Ἰκόνιον. οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ ἐπληροῦντο χα- ^{Mark 6. 11.}
 ρᾶς καὶ Πνεύματος ἁγίου. ^{Luke 9. 6.}
^{infra 14. 6, 11.}
^{& 18. 6.}

1 XIV. ἘΓΕΝΕΤΟ δὲ ἐν Ἰκονίῳ, κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ εἰσελθεῖν αὐτοὺς
 εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν τῶν Ἰουδαίων, καὶ λαλῆσαι οὕτως ὥστε πιστεῦσαι

for it is well known that *συν* in composition was often written in MSS. *σ*. Thus the passage in question is even more apposite than Bp. Middl. considered it; *τεταγμένος* of itself giving the required sense. To the examples above mentioned I am enabled to add others from Plato de Legg. vi. p. 563. *φρίσις εἰς ἀρετὴν τεταγμένη*. 2 Macc. vi. 21. *οἱ δὲ πρὸς τῷ σπλαγγισμῷ τεταγμένοι*. Ps. lviii. 1. "Are your minds set upon righteousness?" In all which cases the *middle* sense is very apparent, and confirms the remark of Chrysost. that the expression *τεταγμένοι* is employed to show that the thing is not a matter of *necessity*, or what is *compulsory*. Thus, so far from favouring the system of *absolute election*, the words rather support the *opposite* doctrine, namely, that God, while "binding nature fast in fate, left free the human will."

The above, then, is very probably the true sense of the passage. Though even if the sense *ordained* were retained, it would not necessarily involve the doctrine of predestination. For in *this context* such would be (as has been seen) quite out of place. In that case we might, with the most eminent of the recent Commentators, as Morus, Schoettg. Rosenn., and Kuin., suppose the expression meant according to the usage of common life, without any reference to metaphysical subtleties, and not to the exclusion of all *conditions* or all means on the part of man for obtaining salvation; which would be opposed to Phil. ii. 13. seqq. It being in the expression *τεταγμένος* understood and *supposed* that the *cause* of their being so ordained or destined was *their faith*. This is confirmed by the Rabbinical citations adduced by Lightf., Schoettg., and Wets., from which it is plain that the expressions "to be ordained or destined to eternal life, or eternal destruction," were in frequent use among the Rabbis, but not with any reference to any *decree*, or to the exclusion of conditions; e. gr. Midrasch Mischle, 16. 4. *Si non facit pœnitentiam, ordinatus est ad iudicium gehennæ*. In his Note on the present passage, Calvin, as may be supposed, strenuously maintains the sense of *predestination*; but with singular want of success. What Hamm. says of "the *no-reasons* produced that incline it that way," is entirely applicable to Calvin's note. The only attempt at argument he makes, is, that St. Luke does not say *ordinati ad fidem*, but *ordinati ad vitam*. But that is a most frivolous objection: for if *such* an expression had been employed, it would certainly have been one less pertinent than any other to be found elsewhere in the same writer. Whereas that of *ordinati ad ritum*, contains a sense at once profound and worthy of the Evangelist; the full meaning being—"whose minds were in a fit state

to judge of the evidence for the truth of the Gospel, who were seriously concerned about their salvation, and were thoroughly *disposed* to make all sacrifices to obtain eternal life." Indeed, it argues little knowledge of human nature ("what is in man") not to see that the sacred writer has here reference, not to a mysterious theological doctrine, but (with a deep knowledge of human nature *as it is*) has respect to those powerful *moral motives* which induce the will and govern the man. "Hopes and fears (says the great Dr. South) govern all things. They are the two great handles by which the will of man is to be taken hold of, when we would either draw it *to* duty, or draw it off from sin. [Hence he who holds the *conscience*, holds the man.—Ed.] They are the most efficacious means to bring such things home to the will as are apt to work upon it. Every man, in all that concerns him, here stands influenced by his hopes and fears; and those by rewards and punishments, the proper objects thereof. And the *Divine law* is the grand adamantine ligament, tying both of them fast together, by assuring rewards to our hopes, and punishments to our fears. So that man being bound by the peremptory decree of heaven, must by virtue thereof, indispensably *obey* or *suffer*." At the same time, while we contend that the doctrine of predestination can by no means be found *here*, yet it is proper to bear in mind that the *dispositions* of the persons in question could not have been what they were, or have been originally such, from themselves; but must be ascribed to the *preventing grace* of God, to which it is owing that men are ever disposed to embrace or obey the Gospel of Christ.

50. τὰς εὐσεβήσασα] "women of rank." See Note on Mark xv. 43.

—ἐξέβαλον ἀπὸ τῶν ὁρίων.] These may seem strong terms. But we need not suppose that *force* was employed in removing the Apostles; which, as no *resistance* was made, would have been unnecessary. This kind of *order for departure* used to be given in due form; and there were sometimes officers appointed to superintend the execution of it, by conducting the person over the borders. So Thucyd. ii. 12. *καὶ ἐκέλευον ἐκτὸς ὄραν εἶναι ἀθημαρῶν, ἐμπιμπουσί τε ἀγῳαίσι.*

52. χαρᾶς] "the consolations of the Gospel." Πνεύμ. ἁγ. This must be explained of the gifts and graces of the Holy Spirit for *sanctification*, and not for *working miracles*, since hands had not been laid upon them for that purpose.

XIV. 1. κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ.] The earlier Commentators suppose an ellip. of *ἔθος*. But it is better, with the later ones, to take it as equivalent to *ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ*; Heysch. explaining it by *δμοῦ*, and both

Ἰουδαίων τε καὶ Ἑλλήνων πολὺ πλῆθος. Οἱ δὲ ἀπειθοῦντες Ἰουδαῖοι 2
 ἐπήγειραν καὶ ἐκάκωσαν τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν ἐθνῶν κατὰ τῶν ἀδελφῶν.
 ἔκτανον μὲν οὖν χρόνον διέτριψαν παρήρησιαζόμενοι ἐπὶ τῷ Κυρίῳ τῷ 3
 μαρτυροῦντι τῷ λόγῳ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ, [καὶ] δίδοντι σημεῖα καὶ
 τέρατα γίνεσθαι διὰ τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν. Ἐσχίσθη δὲ τὸ πλῆθος τῆς 4
 πόλεως· καὶ οἱ μὲν ἦσαν σὺν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις, οἱ δὲ σὺν τοῖς ἀποστό-
 λοις. ἦ ὤς δὲ ἐγένετο ὁρμὴ τῶν ἐθνῶν τε καὶ Ἰουδαίων σὺν τοῖς 5
 ἄρχουσιν αὐτῶν, ὑβρίσαι καὶ λιθοβολῆσαι αὐτοὺς, ἰσυνιδόντες κατέφυ- 6
 γον εἰς τὰς πόλεις τῆς Λυκαονίας, Λύστραν καὶ Δεφβην, καὶ τὴν περι-
 χωρον, καὶ ἦσαν εὐαγγελιζόμενοι. 7
 Καὶ τις ἀνὴρ ἐν Λύστροις ἀδύνατος τοῖς ποσὶν ἐκάθητο, χωλὸς ἐκ 8
 κοιλίας μητρὸς αὐτοῦ ὑπάρχων, ὃς οὐδέποτε περιεπεπατήκει. Οὗτος 9
 ἦκουε τοῦ Παύλου λαλοῦντος· ὃς ἀτενίσας αὐτῷ, καὶ ἰδὼν ὅτι πιστιν

expressions being used by the LXX. to express the Hebr. **קָרַן**. By Ἑλλήνων are meant τῶν σεβόμενων Ἑλλ. as they are called at xvii. 4; equivalent, it should seem, to τῶν σεβόμενων προσηλυτῶν at v. 43.

2. ἀπειθοῦντες.] “refusing belief, unbelieving,” **μη πιστεύοντες**. A sense occurring also at xvii. 5; xix. 9. John iii. 36. Heb. xi. 31, but rarely found in the Classical writers. Yet it occurs in Hom. Od. v. 43. It generally means to refuse obedience.

— ἐπήγειραν — ἀδέλφῶν.] Kypke and Krebs maintain that the true construction is, ἐπὶ τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν ἐθνῶν κατὰ τῶν ἀδ., καὶ ἐκάκωσαν. And it is true that τὰς ψυχὰς — τῶν ἀδ. are intended principally for ἐπήγειραν, as appears from xiii. 50. Yet perhaps those words are meant to be referred also to ἐκάκωσαν, two clauses being thus blended into one. Render, “instigated and embittered the minds of the Gentiles against the brethren;” of which sense of κακῶ examples are adduced from Josephus. This verse is parenthetical; the μὲν οὖν at the beginning of the next verse has a *resumptive* force, and may be rendered accordingly.

3. παρήρησιαζ. ἐπὶ τῷ Κ.] Most Commentators take this to mean “being bold in the profession of Jesus;” i. e. his doctrine and religion. But perhaps that would require ἐν τῷ Κ. It is better, with Grot., Pisc., Mor., Kuin., and Schleus., to render “speaking freely, in reliance on the Lord;” i. e. on Christ, as most Commentators explain, or, as Grot. and Kuin. understand, *God*. Similar uncertainties of interpretation often occur; but they, at least, strongly attest the grand doctrine of the *Deity of Christ*.

The καὶ before δίδοντι is omitted in many of the best MSS. and Versions, and in almost all early Edd. It crept into the later Erasmus Editions, and was thence introduced into the third of Steph. It has been, very properly, cancelled by Matth., Griesb., Knapp, and Vater, both from *internal evidence* (since we may account for its omission, but not for its insertion) and from *propriety of language*; for (as Rinck observes) where a later participle is meant for the explication of a preceding one [and denoting *by what means*, i. e. how] the copulative is usually absent, as at vv. 17. & 22. See Note on ix. 28. Also Middl. Gr. A. iii. 3, 4. Wakef. has well rendered, “by granting.”

4. ἐσχίσθη.] When σχίζεσθαι has the metaphorical sense to be divided in opinion, γνώμας is generally added by way of explanation, though some-

times omitted, as here and in some passages cited by the Commentators.

5. ὁρμῆ.] This is by some rendered *impetus*, *assault*. But that sense is negated by the συνιδόντες at v. 6. The best Commentators take it to denote *impulse*, of which sense Munthe adduces several examples. In those passages, however, the word is used with ἐπίπεσι, while here it rather seems to denote a set design, full purpose, ὁρμὴ ἐγένετο being for ὁρμῶντο scil. τὰ ἔθνη.

6. συνιδόντες.] The sense (mistaken by the Translators) is, “having taken consideration [respecting the matter, and what was best to be done].” So xii. 12. συνιδῶν τε ἦλθε.

— τὰς πόλεις τῆς Α.] Here the Article is not without force, though it is not expressed by our Translators. Nor need the Commentators have supposed a transposition, thus: κατέφυγον εἰς Α. καὶ Δ. τὰς πόλεις τῆς Α.; for then the Article would have been improper, even in the Greek, *Iconium* being a city of consequence. The truth is, that Λύστραν and Δεφβην fall under the rule of *apposition for definition's sake*, (i. e. to determine the whole by specifying the parts. See Matth. Gr. Gr. § 431 & 432) and the use of the Article falls under that of *insertions in hypothesis*; moreover, the words τῆς Λυκαονίας are added by way of explication. If the Article, however, be allowed its force, it would appear that Luke did not reckon *Iconium* as being in Lycaonia. And yet Strabo, Pliny, and Steph. Byz. do. But Xenophon in his *Cyrop.* reckons it in *Phrygia*, though on the borders of Lycaonia. And probably so it continued till the Roman conquest; and even then was *popularly* regarded as in Lycaonia.

8. ἐκάθητο.] Wakef. and Kuin. scruple at the sense *sat*, and render “was,” or dwelt; a frequent sense of κάθημαι, derived from the Hebr. **קָרַן**. And this interpretation is confirmed by the Pesch. Syr. Yet I prefer the common signification, — meant, it should seem, to express *graphically* the condition of this poor wretch, who had never walked. ἄδύνατος signifies not *weak*, or *infirm*, or *disabled*, as some English Translators render; but *helpless in his feet*, or, as Wakef. expresses it, *who had no use of his feet*. Χωλὸς does not mean *lame*, as Newc. and Wakef. render, but a *cripple*; i. e. according to the true derivation of that word (not perceived by the Etymologists, which is suggested by the *old* spelling of the word) *creeply*,

παροχημέναις γενεαῖς εἴασε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη πορεύεσθαι ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐ-
τῶν. Καὶ τοι γε οὐκ ἀμάτηρον ἐαυτὸν ἀφῆκεν, ἀγαθοποιῶν, οὐρανό- 17
θεν † ἡμῖν ἑτεροῦς διδοῦς καὶ καιροῦς καρποφόρους, ἐμπιπλῶν τροφῆς
καὶ εὐφροσύνης τὰς καρδίας † ἡμῶν. Καὶ ταῦτα λέγοντες, μόλις κατέ- 18
πασαν τοὺς ὄχλους τοῦ μὴ θύειν αὐτοῖς.

q 2 Cor. 11. 25.
2 Tim. 3. 11.

Ἐπιπλῶν δὲ ἀπὸ Διοχείας καὶ Ἰκονίου Ἰουδαῖοι, καὶ πείσαντες 19
τοὺς ὄχλους, καὶ λιθάσαντες τὸν Παῦλον, ἔσυρον ἔξω τῆς πόλεως, νομί-
σαντες αὐτὸν τεθνήσκειν. Κυκλωσάντων δὲ αὐτὸν τῶν μαθητῶν, ἀνιστὰς 20

16. πάντα τὰ ἔθνη.] Not "all nations," (which would not be agreeable to facts) but all the nations, ὧν, the *Gentiles*. (Pearce and Markl.) Πορεύεσθαι ταῖς ὁδοῖς, to follow the course of their own imaginations respecting the Divine nature and worship; and to whom he had not given a revelation of his will either by Divine legates or by Revelation. The εἴασε, however, does not imply allowance, but abandonment. See Whitty.

17. οὐκ ἀμάτηρον ἐαυτὸν.] Ἀμάτηρος unwit-
nessed as to existence, nature, attributes, &c. There is an elegant *meiosis* in οὐκ ἀμαρτ. for πολυ-
μάτηρον, of which I have adduced many examples on Thucyd. ii. 41. οὐ δὲ τοι ἀμαρτῶν γε τὴν ἐναν-
την παροσχόμενοι.

— ἀγαθοποιῶν, &c.] There is a beautiful remark on this effect, in Synes. 192. A. ἐπεὶ δὲ οὖν ἅπαντες γέγονε τὰ κακὰ, τῆς θείας σοφίας καὶ ἀρετῆς καὶ δυνάμεως ἔργον ἐστίν, οὐ μόνον τὸ ἀγαθοποιεῖν φύσει γὰρ, ὡς εἰπεῖν, αὐτῆ Θεοῦ, ὡς τοῦ πυρός τὸ θερμάνειν. καὶ τοῦ φωτὸς τὸ φωτίζειν. Hence the name *God*, which means the Good Being, the Giver of all Good.

Instead of ἡμῖν many MSS., Versions, and Fathers have ἡμῖν; and, a little after, for ἡμῶν, ἡμῶν. Both these readings are received by Griesb., Knapp, and Tittm.; and I should have followed them, notwithstanding the insufficiency of external testimony, (for in words so similar MSS. have little authority) had I not suspected the readings to be emendations of the Alexandrian school. And though ἡμῖν and ἡμῶν would be more agreeable to strict propriety; yet ἡμῖν and ἡμῶν have more of nature and simplicity. The Apostle speaks (through delicacy) κοινῶς, q. d. "you as well as ourselves, both of us." There is in οὐρανῶθεν ἑτεροῦς διδοῦς something (blended with the simplicity of early times) almost poetic. So Aratus cited by Grot.: ὕδατος ἐρχομένοιο Διὸς παρά. which passage was probably in the mind of the Apostle; and if so, it will add another to the proofs (few in number) that he was not unacquainted with the Greek Classical writers; and it is remarkable that one of the passages alluded to is from the same Aratus. See xvii. 23. and Note.

— ἑτεροῦς.] The Plural is used with reference to the two periodical rains, called in James v. 7. τὸν πρότερον καὶ τὸν ὕψιμον. and by Philo p. 390. καιροῦς ἑτεροῦς. The plural is rare; yet Lucian i. 104. has ἑταί τε βραχάιοι καὶ βλαῖοι. Sir Isaac Newton, (as Dr. Hales observes, vol. iii. 511.) has in the *Scholium Generale* of his Principia, finely improved this argument of the Apostle — "From blind metaphysical necessity, which is always and everywhere the same, there arises no variation of things, p. 529. ; or no variety of moist and fruitful, of dry and barren seasons, produced by God's PROVIDENCE, only; in order to reward or punish his rational creatures."

— ἐμπιπλῶν — ἡμῶν.] Grot., Triller, and

Schleus., attempt to remove the apparent harshness of this phraseology by taking εὐφροσύνης of wine, and τὰς καρδίας in the sense stomachs. A more ill-founded and tasteless criticism cannot well be imagined. Little better is that of Rosenm. and Kuin., who take τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν, by Hebraism for ἡμᾶς. There need not be any perplexity. We have only to suppose a sort of *synchysis* or *brachylogia*. The sense, fully expressed, would be, "filling our stomachs with food, and our hearts with gladness."

"The Apostle (observes Dr. Hales) leaves them to draw the conclusion from these premises, that it must be the height of ingratitude [and impiety] to transfer to the creature the worship due only to the Creator."

19. καὶ πείσαντες — ἔσυρον.] The sense is here obscured by a blending of two sentences into one, and by a peculiar idiom in πείθ. (which word is here used as supra xii. 20. καὶ πείσαντες βλ.) whereby it signifies to bring any one over to one's own views or wishes. Thus the full sense is, "And having prevailed on the multitude (to permit them to stone Paul) and having stoned him, they drew him out of the city." There may, however, be in πείθ. a *sensus prægnans*, for, "having persuaded the multitude that they were impostors and magicians, and prevailed upon them to," &c. It is here pithily remarked by Calvin: "In hac historiâ graphicè nobis pingitur mundi pravitas," i. e. how much more easily they are persuaded to evil than to good, to superstition than to true religion.

The force of the words ἔσυρον ἔξω τῆς πόλεως is not well pointed out by Expositors. Σέρω, it may be observed, is a *vox solemnis de hac re*, having reference to the brutal insults offered to the dead bodies of executed malefactors, which were at last dragged by the heels out of the city-gates (according to the law which enjoined their removal) and if not interred, were cast as food for the dogs and birds of prey. So Herodian i. 13. 11. Σέροντες τὰ σώματα, καὶ πᾶσαν ὕβριν ἐνυβρίσαντες, ἐβρίψαν, &c., and v. 13, 17. παρέδσαν σέρειν καὶ ἐνυβρίσειν τοῖς βουλομένοις, namely, the bodies of Antoninus and Soæmis. Sometimes they used to be so dragged out of the city (or wherever the carcase was to be thrown) by a hook. So Ælius Lampr. tells us that the Roman people voted that the body of Commodus should "unco trahi et in cloacas conjici." This may serve to show the exceedingly miserable state to which the Apostle was reduced. Inasmuch that it is doubtless to this he especially alludes at 2 Cor. xi. 23. ἐν θανάτοις πολλάκις. There is a similar construction at xii. 20. καὶ πείσαντες B. ἤσαντο εἰρήνην.

— νομίσαντες αὐτὸν τεθνήσκειν.] There is no sort of foundation for the irrelevant fancy of Pric. and Wets. that Paul pretended to be dead. He was, no doubt, in a swoon and senseless; and when we consider that he had been stoned at least almost

- εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν πόλιν· καὶ τῆ ἐπαύριον ἐξῆλθε σὺν τῷ Βαρνάβῃ εἰς
 21 Δέρβην. Εὐαγγελισάμενοί τε τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνην, καὶ μαθητεύσαντες
 22 ἱκανούς, ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς τὴν Λύστραν καὶ Ἰκόνιον καὶ Ἀντιόχειαν, ἔπι-
 στηρίζοντες τὴν ψυχὰς τῶν μαθητῶν, παρακαλοῦντες ἐμμένειν τῇ πίστει,
 καὶ ὅτι διὰ πολλῶν θλίψεων δεῖ ἡμᾶς εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ
 23 Θεοῦ. ^a χειροτονήσαντες δὲ αὐτοῖς προεβυτέρους καὶ ἑκκλησίαν, προσ-
 ευξάμενοι μετὰ νηστειῶν, παρέθεντο αὐτοὺς τῷ Κυρίῳ εἰς ὃν πεπιστεύ-
 24 κεισαν. Καὶ διελθόντες τὴν Πισιδίαν, ἦλθον εἰς Παμφυλίαν· καὶ
 25 λαλήσαντες ἐν Πέργῃ τὸν λόγον, κατέβησαν εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν· ἡκούθη δὲ
 26 ἀπέπλευσαν εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν, ὅθεν ἦσαν παραδεδομένοι τῇ χάριτι τοῦ
 27 Θεοῦ εἰς τὸ ἔργον ὃ ἐπλήρωσαν. ^b Παραγενόμενοι δὲ καὶ συναγαγόν-
 τες τὴν ἑκκλησίαν, ἀνήγγειλαν ὅσα ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς μετ' αὐτῶν, καὶ
 28 ὅτι ἤνοιξε τοῖς ἔθνεσι θύραν πίστεως. διέτριβον δὲ ἐκεῖ χρόνον οὐκ
 ὀλίγον σὺν τοῖς μαθηταῖς.

to death, we shall see that his being enabled to walk home, and the next day to set out for Derbe, can be regarded in no other light than as involving the preternatural.]

^{22.} παρακαλοῦντες.] And is wrongly supplied in our common Version. The sense is, "by exhorting them." See Note supra v. 3. In καὶ ὅτι διὰ, &c., there is (as Krebs and Kuin. observe) an idiom, by which another word of cognate signification is to be supplied from one which has preceded; here λέγοντες from παρακαλοῦντες. The διὰ πολλῶν — Θεοῦ must not, with many recent Commentators, be confined to that time, but regarded as a general declaration intended for every age, that the working out of our salvation is not to be accomplished without numerous trials and tribulations.

^{23.} χειροτονήσαντες a.] Erasm., Calvin, and Beza, and, more latterly, Knatchb., Raphael, Doddridge (indeed all the Presbyterian Commentators), take the sense to be, "having ordained their elders by the votes of the people." But the most learned Interpreters have long rejected this interpretation; which requires a very strained sense to be put on χειροτον., — and one, moreover, which is forbidden by the αὐτοῖς following. There is, indeed, no point on which the most learned have been so much agreed as this, that χειρ. here simply denotes "having selected, constituted, appointed." See Hammond, Whitby, Wolf, and especially Kuin. At the same time it is granted by some able maintainers of this interpretation, that the appointment in question is not the same thing with the formal Ecclesiastical ordination of a somewhat later period. And, on the other hand, the Presbyterians themselves admit, that imposition of hands accompanied this χειροτονία. But if it did not amount to the solemn ordination of a later period, there is the less reason to suppose, (as many do), that the consent of the people was previously obtained for these appointments. However, the imposition of hands, which both parties admit, taken in conjunction with the solemn fasting and prayer, which accompanied the appointment, seem to show that it was, in fact, Ecclesiastical ordination; while, at the same time, it seems probable that the situation of these Elders differed very much from the stated Pastors of a somewhat later age, when believers were divided into the

two separate classes, of Clergy, and Laity. At the period now in question, the Presbyters probably exercised their ministry, in conjunction with the trades or professions to which they had been brought up. But when, in the next generation, it was thought expedient that Presbyters should be confined to their sacred duties, and kept apart from all secular occupations, — (which by the way, occasioned the two classes, of Clergy and Laity) then ordination would become a much more solemn affair, and the conferring of it such as not to be committed to any but to the highest rulers of the Church, who succeeded to the duties of the Apostles.

— προσευξάμενοι μετὰ νηστ.] i. e. "using prayer with fasting," *inducto jejunio*. See Note on xiii. 3. — παρεθεντο τῷ Κ.] "committed them to the Divine protection." So xx. 32. παρατίθεμαι ὑμᾶς τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ τῷ λόγῳ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ. and i. Pet. iv. 19.

^{26.} ὅθεν ἦσαν παρῶ.] Παρῶ. is here synonymous with παρατίθεσθαι supra ver. 23. But though the general sense of the passage be clear, yet with ὅθεν the Commentators are not a little perplexed. Nay even those mighty Grecians, Hemster. and Valckn., thought the difficulty so great as to warrant Critical conjecture. They would read ἦσαν here, "whence they had gone." However, the MSS. afford no countenance; the Greek is questionable; and the form is not in use in the N. T. The common reading must be retained, and explained as it may. Now the best Commentators are of opinion that ὅθεν is to be taken for ὅπου; referring for examples to Matt. xxv. 24 & 26. Exod. xxx. 36. This, however, explains nothing, and in fact does but evade the difficulty. It is better to suppose a *significatio prægnans*, arising from a blending of two expressions; q. d. whence they had been commended, &c., and from whence they had gone commended, &c.; i. e. where, on their departing, they had been commended. Render, "whence they had set out, commended," &c. Ἐπλήρωσαν is well translated by Newcome and Wakefield "had fulfilled, or performed." When the Aorist is put for the Imperf., it is generally to be understood of action recently past, and is mostly used in narration.

^{27.} μετ' αὐτῶν.] The Commentators are not agreed whether the sense is "by their means,"

x Gen. 17. 10.
 Lev. 12. 3.
 Gal. 5. 1, 2.
 Phil. 3. 2.
 Col. 2. 8, 11,
 16.
 y Gal. 2. 1.
 supra 11. 30.

XV. ^x *ΚΑΙ* τινες κατεθόντες ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας, ἐδίδασκον τοὺς 1
 ἀδελφούς· "Οὐ εἰ μὴ περιτέμνησθε τῷ ἔθει Μωϋσέως, οὐ δύνασθε
 σωθῆναι. ^y Ἐνομένης οὖν στάσεως καὶ [συ]ζητήσεως οὐκ ὀλίγης τῷ 2
 Παύλῳ καὶ τῷ Βαρνάβῳ πρὸς αὐτοὺς, ἔταξαν ἀναβαίνειν Παῦλον καὶ
 Βαρνάβαν καὶ τινες ἄλλους ἐξ αὐτῶν πρὸς τοὺς ἀποστόλους καὶ πρεσ-
 βυτέρους εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ, περὶ τοῦ ζητήματος τούτου. Οἱ μὲν οὖν, 3
 προπεμφθέντες ὑπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, διήροχον τὴν Φοινίκην καὶ Σαμά-
 ρειαν, ἐκδιηγούμενοι τὴν ἐπιστροφὴν τῶν ἐθνῶν· καὶ ἐποίουν χαρὰν 4
 μεγάλην πᾶσι τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς. ^z Παραγερόμενοι δὲ εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ, ἀπέ- 4
 δέχθησαν ὑπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέ-
 ρων, ἀγγεῖλαιαν τε ὅσα ὁ Θεὸς ἐποίησε μετ' αὐτῶν. Ἐξανάστησαν δὲ 5
 τινες τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς αἰρέσεως τῶν Φαρισαίων πεπιστευκότες, λέγοντες
 ὅτι δεῖ περιτέμνειν αὐτοὺς, παραγγέλλειν τε τηρεῖν τὸν νόμον Μωϋσέως.

(i. e. instrumentality) or, "to them," for αὐτοῖς. The latter mode of interpretation is adopted by the best Expositors, and is confirmed by several passages of the O. T.; but the former seems more agreeable to what follows. This may, however, have been a popular idiom comprehending both those senses.

XV. On the then situation of the Church at Jerusalem, and on the circumstances which led to the celebrated Apostolic decision of the question respecting the use of circumcision and the other forms of the Mosaic Law, as also on the nature and extent of that decree, I must refer my readers to Recens. Synop.

1. τινες.] These are thought to have been Antiochians, and Jewish converts, who had formerly been Pharisees, and still retained an attachment to the forms of the Mosaic Law. At ἐδίδασκον τοὺς ἀδελφούς must be understood λέγοντες.

— περιτ.] Circumcision is put for the whole of the ritual law of Moses, as being the principal ceremony, binding the person who underwent it to the observance of the rest. Ἐθει, "institution."

2. στάσεως.] Notwithstanding what Br. Pearce objects, there is no reason why it should not be rendered *dissention*, or *disputation*; of which sense the Commentators adduce two or three examples, as *Ælian* V. H. ii. 34. cited by Wakef. Ὡ βέλτιστοι. τί στασιάζετε καὶ διαφέρεσθε ἐπὶ ὀλίγων ἡμερῶν; to which I would add a most apposite one from *Æschyl.* Pers. 744. *Blomf.* Λόγος κρατεῖ σαφηνῆς, τῶ δὲ γ' οὐκ ἔνι στάσις. And so *xliii.* 10. πολλὰς δὲ γενομένης στάσεως, κ. τ. λ.

— συζητήσεως] "mutual discussion," or controversy. This seems meant to explain and qualify στάσεως. Wets., Matth., Knapp, Griesb., and Vater edit *ζητήσ.*, from several MSS. and some Versions, and the Ed. Princ.; but without reason. The evidence of the Versions tends the contrary way. Nothing is more common than for compounds to be changed by the scribes into simples. Besides, *ζητ.* would here be a term not strong enough, and *συζητ.* is required, which occurs at ver. 7, whence the editors in question affirm the present reading to have been altered. But that is quite a gratuitous supposition. Ἐταξαν, scil. οἱ ἀδελφοί, the brethren at large, not the *Præpositi Ecclesiæ*, as Hamm. supposes.

3. προπεμφθέντες.] This is by some rendered "*præmissi, commissioned, delegated*;" by others, more rightly, *honorificè deducti*, "set forward on their way;" a mark of respect usually rendered to eminent persons among the ancients; and always shown to *Apostles*, and of which we have mention further on in this Book and in the Epistles. The *οἱ* is put for the pronoun demonstr., and consequently the punctuation should be that which I have adopted. Ἐπιστροφὴν, "conversion." Formed on the use of *ἐπιστρέφεσθαι*, as at xi. 21. xiv. 15. Ἐπόουν χαρὰν μεγάλην, "occasioned great joy." So *Aristid.* cited by Wets.: ὁ δὲ Θεὸς ἐποίησέν μοι χαρὰν ὑπερμεγέλην.

4. ἀπέδεχθησαν] "were received with distinction," as *xviii.* 27.

5. Ἐξανάστησαν ὅτι τινες — λέγοντες.] These words are so manifestly St. Luke's, that plain readers would be surprised to learn that any other opinion had ever been formed. And yet many eminent Commentators, stumbling at what they think the harshness of the answer, or decision, being given before the question, or difficulty, had been propounded, suppose the words to be those of the Jewish party at Antioch, reported by Paul and Barnabas. But although a transition from the oblique to the direct is occasionally found (as in i. 4. xvii. 7. and Luke v. 14), yet here it would be peculiarly harsh, and the ellip. of λέγον, which they propose, is inadmissible. Besides, *ἐξανάστημι* would not be a suitable term. In fact, the difficulty is quite imaginary; for as the words ἀνήγγειλαν — αὐτῶν cannot but signify that they gave an account of what had happened to them in the exercise of their mission, so the difficulty which brought them there could not fail to be mentioned. See *Kuin.*, who refers to a similar brevity at Acts xi. 3. Thus all difficulty vanishes, and *ἐξανάστησαν* has peculiar propriety, "then there started up," not "rose up," as in most versions. The word is often used in *Thucyd.*, *Xenoph.*, and the best writers, in the sense to start forth from ambush, or suddenly. The Judaizing party, on hearing the matter first propounded, suddenly and hastily started up, saying that it was proper to, &c. This opinion, it is plain, was given, not at a public assembly, called for the purpose of considering the matter in question, but probably at a private meeting to receive them on their return. The assembly denoted by *συνήχθησαν* was plainly another, called for the purpose of deciding on the ques-

6 Συνήχθησαν δὲ οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ἰδεῖν περὶ τοῦ
 7 λόγου τούτου. ^a Πολλῆς δὲ συζητήσεως γενομένης, ἀναστὰς Πέτρος εἶπε ^a Supra 10. 20. & 11. 1, 2.
 πρὸς αὐτούς· ἄνδρες ἀδελφοὶ, ὑμεῖς ἐπίστασθε ὅτι ἀπ' ἡμερῶν ἀρ-
 8 χαίων ὁ Θεὸς ἐν ἡμῖν ἐξελέξατο διὰ τοῦ στόματός μου ἀκοῦσαι τὰ
 8 ἔθνη τὸν λόγον τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, καὶ πιστεῦσαι. ^b καὶ ὁ καρδιογνώστης ^b h 1 Chron. 29. 9. & 29. 17.
 Θεὸς ἐμαρτύρησεν αὐτοῖς, δοὺς αὐτοῖς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, καθὼς καὶ ^c
 9 ἡμῖν· ^c καὶ οὐδὲν διέκρινε μεταξὺ ἡμῶν τε καὶ αὐτῶν, τῇ πίστει κα- ^c Psal. 7. 9. Jer. 11. 20. & 17. 10. & 20. 12. supra 10. 43. &c. 1 Cor. 1. 2. c 1 Pet. 1. 22. d Gal. 5. 1.
 10 θαρσίσας τὰς καρδίας αὐτῶν. ^d Νῦν οὖν τί πειράζετε τὸν Θεὸν, ἐπι-
 11 θεῖναι ζυγὸν ἐπὶ τὸν τράχηλον τῶν μαθητῶν, ὃν οὔτε οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν
 11 οὔτε ἡμεῖς ἰσχύσαμεν βαστάσαι; ^e Ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ Κυρίου ^e e Eph. 2. 4, 8. Titus 3. 4.

tion after due deliberation. Πιστοποιήσας is Part., for Sub., and must be taken after τινες as determining the sense. The words *ὅτι δὲ* — *Μωϋσέως* are, I think, not *in oratione directā*, but *indirectā*, as they are taken in our common version, and that of Doddr., confirmed by the Syr. Pesch.

6. *συνήχθησαν οἱ ἀπ.*] Thus was assembled what is called the *First Council* at Jerusalem, to counteract the baneful heresy which had sprung up from the bitter root of *Pharisaism*, and disturbed the harmony and concord of the infant Church. On the *time* of this council, see Towns. ii. 177—179; on its *nature*, see Vitring. de Syn. p. 598. seq. and the writers referred to by Wolf. On the *circumstances* which led to it, and the rise and progress of the *heresy* it was meant to counteract, see Dr. Hales iii. 513. sq.

— *ἰδεῖν περὶ.*] This, by an idiom found both in Hebrew, Greek, and English, signifies, “to consider about.” See Cant. vi. 11.

— *περὶ τοῦ λόγου*] “concerning the matter spoken of,” which, as Dr. Burton observes, involved *two questions*. 1. Whether the Gentiles should be circumcised. 2. Whether they should observe the customs of the Mosaic law. The former was answered decidedly in the *negative*; the latter partly in the *affirmative*. The *συζητήσεως* just after must be understood of disputation between the Apostles and presbyters, and those persons who had at the former private meeting given their opinion so positively.

7. *ἀπ' ἡμερῶν ἀρχαίων.*] The Interpreters are not agreed on the sense of this expression. Several of them take it to mean a *principio*, “from the *beginning* of the *Gospel*.” But the purpose in question was not made known till the conversion of Cornelius; for that is plainly alluded to in *διὰ στόματος*. And the expression will appear to be not inapplicable to that period (13 or 14 years before) if we consider that *ἀρχαῖος* is (as De Dieu and Grot. have shown) used simply of what has happened *heretofore*, — whether many ages before, or only a few years; of which examples are adduced.

There is more difficulty in *ἐν ἡμῖν ἐξελέξατο*, with which the Commentators are much perplexed. It is, however, pretty much agreed among the learned, that the expression is to be regarded as a Hebraism, קָרַב in Hebrew taking after it *ע*, *ἐν*. And thus it will be equivalent to *ἡμῶς ἐξελ.* That mode of solution, however, is precarious; and this occurrence of *ἡμῖν* and *μου* in the same clause would be harsh. As to *ἐν ἡμῖν*, it is, after all, best rendered in our common version (confirmed by the Syr. and De Dieu), “amongst us.” Then *ἐμὲ* may be *supplied* (as in the Syr. and Bohem. Ver-

sions), which is *suppressed* through delicacy, as in very many passages which I could adduce from Thucyd. The Apostle, after uttering the word *ἐξελ.*, does not add *ἐμὲ* and *κηρύσσειν τὸν λόγον*, &c., as he might have done, but omits them, and gives the sentence another turn, so as to avoid egotism.

8. *καρδιογνώστης.*] See Note on i. 24. By this the Apostle hints, that God can best determine *who* are worthy of being admitted as Christians, and who not; as also on the rites and ceremonies to be enjoined on them.

— *ἐμαρτύρησεν αὐτοῖς.*] The sense (unperceived by the Interpreters) seems to be, “hath borne testimony in their favour,” “hath testified his approbation,” namely, by giving them the Holy Spirit. *Μαρτυρῶ* with a Dative also implies *favourable* testimony. This signification occurs in Luke xi. 48, and often in the Classical writers.

9. *οὐδὲν διέκρινε*] “made no distinction.” A remarkable idiom, of which the Commentators adduce no apposite example. The following, however, which I have noted, will supply the deficiency. Thucyd. i. 49, 7. *διεκέκρτο οὐδὲν ἔτι*. Diod. Sinop. ap. Athen. p. 239. *οὐχὶ διακρίσας τὴν πενχῶν ἢ ψουλιαν*. By *τὰς καρδίας* are denoted, not their *minds*, but their *souls* and *consciences*: these were sanctified by the Holy Spirit, and purified by the great truths of the Gospel.

10. *πειράζετε τὸν Θεὸν*] i. e. “try the forbearance of God, by perversely resisting his will.” So 1 Cor. x. 9. *καθὼς καὶ τινες αὐτῶν ἐπειράσαν*. Heb. iii. 9. and often in the O. T., as Exod. xvii. 2, 7. Such is the interpretation of Schleus. Lex.; which is, upon the whole, the best founded. Others may be seen in Recens. Synop. At *ἐπιθεῖναι* sub. *ῶστε*.

11. *ἀλλὰ διὰ* — *κακείνοι.*] There are few passages which, with the appearance of plainness, involve more difficulty than this; as may be imagined from the variety of senses assigned to the words by Commentators. And no wonder: since *ἡμεῖς*, though concealed in *πιστεύομεν*, and *κακείνοι*, are capable of being applied to different persons; and the ellip. at *κακείνοι* may be filled up in two ways. The *we* is by some referred to the *Apostles* Peter and James; by others to *Peter only*. *Neither* method, however, can be admitted. Again, *κακείνοι* is referred by some to *οἱ πατέρες*; by others, to *Paul* and *Barnabas*: both, I conceive, erroneously. It is, I think, plain that *we* and *those*, which are antithetical, must denote no other than the same persons as *αὐτοῖς* (i. e. the *Gentiles*) and *ἡμῖν*, similarly antithetical at ver. 8, and *ἡμῶν* and *αὐτῶν* at ver. 9, namely the *Jewish* and the *Gentile converts*. Again, there is, I apprehend, at *διὰ τῆς χάρι.* &c. the very common ellip. of *μόνον*.

Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ πιστεύομεν σωθῆναι, καθ' ὃν τρόπον κάκεινοι. Ἔσι-
γησε δὲ πᾶν τὸ πλῆθος, καὶ ἤκουον Βαρνάβα καὶ Παύλου ἐξηγουμένων
ὅσα ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι δι' αὐτῶν.

f Supra 12. 17.

Ἔ Μετὰ δὲ τὸ σιγῆσαι αὐτοὺς ἀπεκρίθη Ἰάκωβος, λέγων· Ἄνδρες ἀδελ-
φοί, ἀκούσατέ μου. Ἐ Συμμεῶν ἐξηγήσασθε, καθὼς πρῶτον ὁ Θεὸς ἐπέ-
14 σκέψατο λαβεῖν ἐξ ἔθνων λαὸν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ. Καὶ τούτῳ 15

g 2 Pet. 1. 1.

συμφωνοῦσιν οἱ λόγοι τῶν προφητῶν, καθὼς γέγραπται· Ἡ Μετὰ 16
12. ταῦτα ἀναστρέψω καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω τὴν σκηνὴν

h Amos 9. 11,
12.

See Luke xvii. 10. At κάκεινοι the true gram-
matical ellip. would be πιστεύουσαι. But, among
the other peculiarities of the Hellenistic style, is
that of *anomalous ellipsis*; as here of σωθῆσονται.
Finally, the ἀλλὰ is *adversative* (answering an ob-
jection), and signifies *inō, nay, yea*, as in 2 Cor.
vii. 11. Thus we may render: "yea, by the grace
of our Lord Jesus Christ alone do we trust we
shall be saved—in which same way they too are
alone to be saved." The *inference* is obvious, and
therefore left to be *supplied*,—that a thing so
unimportant to salvation as the observation of the
ceremonies of the Mosaic Law ought not to be
exacted from the Gentile converts. The true
reasoning in *we* and *they* was alone perceived by
Œcumenius, Hamm., Whitby, Dodd., A. Clarke,
and Scott. The sentiment here is the very same
as that in Galat. ii. 15, 16. Rom. iii. 30.

Here I must take occasion to notice the able
discussion by Dr. Hales as to the time when the
conduct of St. Peter, on another occasion, which
drew forth such severe reprobation from St. Paul,
really took place. He shows (after Basnage), in
a most convincing manner, that his tergiversation
at Antioch was *not* (according to common opinion)
after the speech at the Council at Jerusalem, but
before it, as much as four or five years, and so
early as the time of Herod's persecution, when
Peter first went to Antioch, A. D. 44, Acts xii. 17,
and was then followed by Paul and Barnabas,
Acts xii. 25; by which we may consider his speech
on the present occasion as a public recantation of
his former error. "It *must* (says Basnage) have
taken place *before* this Council, otherwise Peter
might have opposed the authority of their *Decree*
as a shield against the attacks of the Judaizers.
Indeed, nothing but the most undeniable evidence
could induce us to suppose what would otherwise
subject the noble-minded and straight-forward
Apostle to the charge of the most glaring incon-
sistency of conduct with his own doctrine.

12. πλῆθος.] The word does not here signify
multitude, but *assembly* (as Luke xxiii. 1. and
elsewhere) consisting of persons convened for the
special purpose of considering this question. The
passage may be freely rendered, "Whereupon the
assembly at large kept a reverential silence, and
listened to Paul and Barnabas while recounting,"
&c. That was done for the purpose of *establish-
ing* the facts on which the validity of Peter's rea-
soning rested.

13. ἀπεκρίθη] "addressed [the assembly]."

14. καθὼς] for ὡς, how. Πρῶτος is not well
rendered at the *first*, because that might seem to
mean at the Beginning of the Gospel. See Note
on v. 7. Dodd. and Newc. well translate "*first*."
Ἐπισκέψασθε λαβεῖν, &c. A blending of two clauses
into one, for ἐπισκ. τὰ ἔθνη (ὡστε) λαβεῖν ἐξ αὐτῶν λαὸν
ε. τ. ὁ. On ἐπισκ. see Note on Luke i. 68. Ἐπι-

τῷ ὀν.α., "in order to bear his name, and be called
his peculiar people, by professing his Religion."

16—17. This quotation is taken from the
LXX., with the following unimportant variations.
Μετὰ ταῦτα is used for ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ, to give
the *sense* more clearly. Ἀναστρέψω is supplied,
though without any thing corresponding to it in
the Hebrew, for the same cause. The next clause
is *compressed*, by blending the two parts of a paral-
lelism into one. The words καθὼς αἱ ἡμεῖς τοῦ
αἰῶνος are omitted; and with reason, since they
make no sense. The Translators ought to have
seen that there is an ellipsis of כּ in כּי. Though,
indeed, כּי יתכן (occurring in Mich. vii. 14.
and Is. lxvii. 9.) may have been considered as a
sort of adverb. Finally, the words τὸν Κόσμον are
not found in the LXX., at least in the Vatican
text. Yet there is no real discrepancy, since
it is impossible to suppose the above to be cor-
rect, the sense being left so miserably incomplete.
The Alexandrian text supplies τὸν Κόσμον, which
is adopted by Abp. Newc. as representing the true
reading of the Hebrew text. But rashly; for
there can be little doubt that it is from the mar-
gin. And the conjecture of the learned Prelate
that יתכן was changed into יתכן, however inge-
nious, must be pronounced unfounded, and is
negated by τὸν Κόσμον not being brought in after
ἐκείνη. I have no doubt that the reading of the
Aldine, Pachom, and perhaps several other copies
of the Sept., represents the true text; viz. ἐκεί-
νησιν με. The μ. was changed into α, and the
ε absorbed in οι. The τὸν Κόσμον of St. James was
a gloss on the με, and perhaps had at an early pe-
riod expelled the textual reading in some MSS.
At any rate it was *adopted* by St. James, as mak-
ing the sense yet clearer. Still between the Sept.
even thus emended, and the Hebrew, there is an
important variation. Correspondent to ὅπως αὖ
ἐκείνησιν—ἀνθρώπων is ירשו את שארית ארצו
למען ירשו את שארית ארצו.

ארצו. "that they may possess the residue of
Edom." But that makes such bad sense (even
after all that Rosenm. has done with it) there can
be no doubt that the words are corrupt. And this
suspicion is countenanced by the remarkable
varr. lectt., none of them, however, giving any
aid. The corruption seems to be anterior to the
Masoretic recension, and the true reading is, I
doubt not, what Lightf. supposed, for ירשו את
to read ירשו את, and for ארצו to read ארצו.

But, to turn from words to things, it is not true,
as some imagine, that the Apostle *accommodates*
the passage to the propagation of the Gospel among
the Gentiles. The Prophet himself doubtless so
meant it,—at least, if he fully comprehended the
sense of the prediction he was inspired to make.
Nay, even the sceptical Rosenm. admits, "Quæ
hic pollicetur vates *multo sunt ampliora et mag-
nificentiora*, quam ut Hiskia; tempore, aut post

Δαυῖδ τὴν πεπρωκυῖαν· καὶ τὰ κατεσκευασμένα αὐ-
 17 τῆς ἀνοικοδομήσω, καὶ ἀνορθώσω αὐτήν· ὅπως ἀν-
 ἐκζητήσωσιν οἱ κατάλοιποι τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὸν Κύ-
 ριον, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, ἐφ' οὓς ἐπικέκληται τὸ
 ὄνομά μου ἐπ' αὐτοῦς· λέγει Κύριος ὁ ποιῶν ταῦ-
 18 τα πάντα. Γνωστὸν ἅπ' αἰῶνός ἐστι τῷ Θεῷ πάντα τὰ ἔργα αὐ-
 19 τοῦ. Διὸ ἐγὼ κρίνω μὴ παρενοχλεῖν τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν ἔθνῶν ἐπισταίτου-
 20 σιν ἐπὶ τὸν Θεόν. ἰ ἀλλὰ ἐπιστεῖλαι αὐτοῖς τοῦ ἀπέχεσθαι ἀπὸ τῶν
 ἀλισγημάτων τῶν εἰδώλων, καὶ τῆς πορνείας, καὶ τοῦ πνικτοῦ, καὶ τοῦ

i Infr. ver. 29.
 Gen. 9. 4.
 Lev. 3. 17.
 & 17. 14.
 Deut. 12. 23.
 1 Cor. 8. 1, 9,
 10.
 & 10. 14, 20, 21.
 1 Thess. 4. 3.

reditum e Babylonico exilio, aut Hyrcani tem-
 pore, impleta censeri possunt.”

—σκηνήν.] The word properly signifies a booth
 or hut, but sometimes denoted a permanent house,
 and figuratively a family; and, when applied to a
 royal family, its reign or kingdom. Κατασκάπτω
 was often used of the utter destruction of houses
 or cities. See Bp. Blomf. on Æschyl. Theb. 46,
 who (as does also Kypke) adduces many exam-
 ples; though not one that exactly suits the pre-
 sent use. The following may therefore prove ac-
 ceptable. Ælian V. H. xii. 54. τὴν πατρίδα κατάρ-
 κισε κατεσκευασμένην ὑπὸ Φιλίππου.

—ἐκζητῶν τὸν Κύριον.] This phrase here and at
 Rom. iii. 1. Heb. xi. 6. signifies, by an imitation
 of the Heb. עָרַב אֶת יְהוָה or עָרַב אֶת יְהוָה, to earnestly
 seek, for the purpose of praying to, and serving
 him. The κατάλοιποι τῶν ἀνθρώπων is explained
 by the τὰ ἔθνη in the next clause. In ἐπ' αὐτοῦς
 there is a Heb. pleonasm.

18. γνωστὰ — αὐτῶν.] There has to many Com-
 mentators appeared so much abruptness in the
 introduction of this remark, as to require much to
 be supplied, in order to unite the words in a chain
 of reasoning with the preceding. To remedy
 which, some propound novel interpretations; and
 others would cut out the words ἐστι — αὐτῶν, and
 insert γνωστὰ ἀπ' αἰῶνος with the preceding. But
 there is very little authority for either interpreta-
 tion; and the cancelling is negated by both the
 Hebrew and Sept. Besides, supposing the words
 away, then something is wanting; and yet some-
 thing which would never have been thus supplied.
 In fact, the verse seems necessary as a link in the
 chain of reasoning; and though it be introduced
 abruptly, yet it is in a manner very agreeable to
 the Hellenistic and Scriptural style, which deals
 much in such axiomatic sentences. Chrys. (as
 I have proved in Recens. Synop.) certainly read
 the words; and the sense they are meant to con-
 vey seems to be this: God is immutable. He
 hath determined from all eternity (so that the thing
 is not a novelty) to found a spiritual kingdom into
 which not only Jews, but Gentiles shall be received.
 Thus the scope of the verse is to engraft on the
 correspondence of the conversion of the Gentiles
 with ancient prophecies a reflection on the pre-
 sence and providence of God.

19. ἐγὼ κρίνω.] The sense is, “My judgment
 or decided opinion [on the matter] is.” So Thy-
 cyd. iv. 60. ὡς ἐγὼ κρίνω, and the Latin Ita censeo.
 Μὴ παρενοχλεῖν, “to give them no molestation.”
 The παρὰ does not, as many fancy, import “un-
 necessarily,” but coalesces with the ἐν and ὄχλ.,
 to make up the sense. It seems to be a popular
 form of expression, and the only apposite exam-
 ple cited by the Commentators is Arrian. Epict.

i. 9. Μηδὲ παρενοχλήσης τοῖς νέοις, μηδὲ τοῖς γέρονσι
 See Heb. xii. 15.

20. ἐπιστεῖλαι αὐτοῖς.] “to direct them by let-
 ter,” as Acts xxi. 25. At τοῦ ἀπέχεσθαι the Genit.
 is dependent on ἕνεκα understood, equivalent to
 ἵνα ἀπέχωνται. But to advert to the particulars
 of the prohibition. τῶν ἀλισγημάτων, &c.; the term
 ἀλισγημα is Hellenistic, and derived from ἀλισγεῖν,
 to pollute. How that signification arises the Lex-
 icographers do not tell us. Perhaps it may be
 derived from ἀλίξω and ἀλίω, to roll, which in a
 neuter sense may mean to roll one's self, i. e. to
 wallow. And then, by an easy transition, (per-
 haps by a metaphor borrowed from swine, see 2
 Pet. ii. 22.) it may denote to suffer pollution. Be
 that as it may, both it and the noun are used alike
 of physical and moral defilement, especially that
 of idolatry, as the greatest. See Dan. i. 8. Ec-
 clus. xl. 33. Mal. i. 7, 12., where the subject is
 meat offered to idols. Here, however, to deter-
 mine the sense, the words τῶν εἰδώλων are added.
 Now though the word might denote any partici-
 pation in idolatry, yet the passages of Daniel and
 Malachi (which were probably in the mind of the
 Apostle), as well as the ancient glosses of Hesych.
 and Suid. (formed, no doubt, from the early Scho-
 liasts), determine it to be the eating of meat offer-
 ed to idols, not merely in the temples, but even the
 purchasing of it for use, when it was taken for
 sale into the public market. For, we learn from
 the passages cited by the Commentators, that
 among the Gentiles, after a victim had been sacri-
 ficed in the temple, and a portion had been given
 to the Priests, and sometimes another eaten by
 the offerer and his friends on the spot, — the resi-
 due was often taken home by the priests for do-
 mestic use, and sometimes was sent to the public
 shambles to be sold. The flesh, however, was,
 of course, held in abomination by the Jews; (see
 1 Cor. x. 20.) and therefore the use of it was very
 properly forbidden, in order that no needless of-
 fence might be given to the Jewish Christians.

—καὶ τῆς πορνείας.] Most Commentators are
 much at a loss to account for this being inserted
 among things of themselves lawful, but from
 which the Gentiles were to abstain, lest they
 should offend the Jewish Christians: πορνεία,
 having never been accounted as a thing permit-
 ted; and no reason would appear why, if greater
 offences are mentioned with smaller ones, this
 alone should be taken; which, they think, would
 go far to put the things mentioned in this list on
 a level. To remove this difficulty, many methods
 have been devised, some proceeding on Critical
 conjecture. Thus Bentley proposed to read χοι-
 ρείας, pork. A conjecture, however, utterly un-
 authorized. Others seek to remove the difficulty
 by supposing some unusual sense of the word;

k Neh. 9. 1,
supra 13. 27.

αἵματος. ^k Μωϋσῆς γὰρ ἐκ γενεῶν ἀρχαίων κατὰ πόλιν τοὺς κηρύσσον- 21
τας αὐτὸν ἔχει, ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς κατὰ πᾶν σάββατον ἀνυμνωσόμενος.

Τότε ἔδοξε τοῖς ἀποστόλοις καὶ τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις σὺν ὅλῃ τῇ ἐκκλη- 22
σίᾳ, ἐκλεξαμένους ἄνδρας ἐξ αὐτῶν πέμψαι εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν σὺν τῷ Παύλῳ
καὶ Βαρνάβᾳ· Ἰουδαν τὸν ἐπικαλούμενον Βαρσαβάν, καὶ Σίλαν, ἄνδρας
ἡγουμένους ἐν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς, γράψαντες διὰ χειρὸς αὐτῶν τάδε· Οἱ 23
ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί, τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν
καὶ Συρίαν καὶ Κιλικίαν ἀδελφοῖς τοῖς ἐξ Ἑθνῶν, χαίρειν. ^lἘπειδὴ 24

l Gal. 2. 4,
supra ver. 1.
l John 2. 19.

some interpreting, *spiritual whoredom*, viz. idolatry: others, *marriage with idolaters*; others, again, *meat sold in the public shops*. Each of these is open to insuperable objections, (stated in Recens. Synop.) and in particular to *this* (which is applicable to all those interpretations) that no *recondite* or *uncommon* sense could be intended; since in public edicts words are supposed to be employed in their usual sense. And here there is no sufficient reason to abandon the common version, *fornication*; that having been well defended by Grot., Wets., Valckn., Schoettg., Pearce, Nitzsch, Rosenm., Kuinöel, Scott, Wahl, and particularly Bp. Marsh, who satisfactorily removes the objections to the word being taken in its ordinary sense, — showing that there are other instances to be found of moral and positive precepts, duties of common and perpetual obligation, mingled with local and temporary ones, in the same list, — as in the Decalogue. “And since (continues he) it appears from the Acts of the Apostles, and the Epistles of Paul, that the precepts of the Pentateuch were abrogated only by degrees, it seems by no means extraordinary that the Decree of the Council in Jerusalem should contain a mixture of moral and positive commands.” I would add, that it is not unimportant in this view, to remark that in the words of the decision actually sent (v. 29.), we find the *two kept separate*, πορείας being put apart from the rest, and placed last. As to the objection founded on πορνεία being never ἀδιάφορον, it might not in theory, or philosophical speculation, but was so considered *practically*. No one who is at all acquainted with the Classical writers can doubt, that simple fornication was, by the Heathens, considered as no crime at all. We find that even their *religion* permitted, nay encouraged, licensed fornication. Hence the recommendation of chastity of *this* kind (for that contained in abstaining from *adultery* could not need enforcing) was highly necessary, the main purpose (as Grot. observes) of this list being to *flagrant sins*, the Gentile Christians ought to abstain, in order to coalesce with the Jewish Christians without offence. And there was the more occasion to give the injunction, since, for many reasons, (which are detailed in Recens. Synop.) fornication and idolatry were in the minds of the Jews inseparably connected, (compare I Cor. x. 7. 8. v. 11. Eph. v. 5. Col. iii. 5. Rev. ii. 14. 20.) and particularly since whoredom was especially committed at the heathen temples, and licensed by the idolatrous priests. See particularly Exod. xxxiv. 14—16.

— τοῦ πικτοῦ] scil. κρέατος (*supplied* in Athen. L. ix.) meaning flesh of animals killed by strangling, which was very prevalent among the ancients, both Greeks, Romans, and Orientals. They used to encrease the carcase of the animal

(so killed that the blood should remain in it) in an oven, or deep stewing vessel, and thus cook it in its own vapour or steam. As to the *blood* — the heathens, when butchering an animal, carefully preserved this, and mixing it up with flour and unguents, formed various sorts of dishes. Now as *both* the foregoing sorts of food were strictly forbidden by the Mosaic Law, there was ample reason to forbid them to the *Gentile Christians*, in order to avoid giving offence to their Jewish brethren. That an injunction so local in its nature, and of such temporary obligations, cannot be binding on Christians of *these* times, and must cease with the circumstances which gave occasion to it, has been convincingly shown by Schoettg. and Doddr., whom see in Recens. Synop.

²¹ Μωϋσῆς γὰρ, &c.] Here again, there has been imagined to be such abruptness of transition, and want of connexion between this subject and the preceding, that many have supposed something to have been lost out of the text. But the connexion, though obscure, may be traced as follows: “[And remember the breach of these will occasion not only private but *public* scandal,] for the Mosaic religion has for a very long period backward, had its professors in every city, and its Scriptures publicly read in the synagogues every sabbath-day.”

²² ἔδοξε τοῖς ἀποστόλοις — πέμψαι.] The syntax in ἐκλεξαμένους is generally thought not agreeable to the *proprietas lingue*; and γράψαντες deviates entirely from it. There ought, it is said, to have been written ἔδοξε τοῖς ἀπ. ἐκλεξασθαι ἄνδρας καὶ πέμψαι. Ἐκλεξαμένους, however, is as regular as ἐκλεξαμένοις, and is more frequent in the *later* writers, (as Josephus) the sense being “having chosen men from among themselves, to send [them].” Yet it is not exactly put (as Kypke and Rosenm. think) for ἵνα ἐκλεξόμενοι πέμψωσι, but is a *different* construction, in which the Accus. is closely associated with the Infin., and τὸ is understood. Thus it serves to explain what was meant by the “*it*” in “it seemed good.” As to γράψαντες for γράψωσι, that is merely an *anacoluthon*, such as in long sentences, especially containing parenthetical clauses, is not unusual. So Thucyd. iii. 36. ἀντοῖς — ἐπικαλοῦντες. iv. 42. τοῖς Συρακουσίοις — ὁρῶντες, and often; in which cases the participle in the Nomin. is used as if a verb in the third person plur. indic. had preceded. “Ἄνδρας ἡγουμένους, denotes “leading men;” a Hellenistic idiom by which the Participle is used as an adjective or substantive. It occurs in the Participial form with an Article, put for a noun, in Luke xxii. 26.

²³ χαίρειν.] Sub. λέγουσι or the like. The idiom frequently occurs in the *later* writers, and is said by the minor Greek Lexicographers to have originated with Cleon the demagogue, who

- ἠκούσαμεν ὅτι τινὲς ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐξελθόντες ἐπίρραξαν ὑμᾶς λόγοις, ἀνα-
 σκευάζοντες τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν, λέγοντες περιτέμνεσθαι καὶ τηρεῖν τὸν
 25 νόμον, οἷς οὐ διεστείλαμεθα· ἔδοξεν ἡμῖν γενομένοις ἑμοθυμαδόν,
 ἐκλεξαμένους ἄνδρους πέμψαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς, σὺν τοῖς ἀγαπητοῖς ἡμῶν
 26 Βαρνάβη καὶ Πάυλῳ, ἠνθρώποις παραδεδωκόσι τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν ^{m Supra 13. 50.}
 27 ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. ἀπεστάλκαμεν
 οὖν Ἰούδαν καὶ Σίλαν, καὶ αὐτοὺς διὰ λόγου ἀπαγγέλλοντας τὰ αὐτά.
 28 ἔδοξε γὰρ τῷ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι καὶ ἡμῖν μηδὲν πλέον ἐπιτίθεσθαι ὑμῖν
 29 βῆρος, πλὴν τῶν ἐπιτάγης τούτων· ἠ ἀπέχεσθαι εἰδωλοθύτων, καὶ ^{n Supra v. 20.}
 αἵματος, καὶ πνικτοῦ, καὶ πορνείας· ἐξ ὧν διατηροῦντες ἑαυτοὺς εὖ ^{Infra 16. 4.}
 πράξετε. ἔρῳσθε. & 21. 25.
- 30 Οἱ μὲν οὖν ἀπολυθέντες, ἦλθον εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν· καὶ συνυγαζόντες
 31 τὸ πλῆθος, ἐπέδωκαν τὴν ἐπιστολήν. Ἀναγνόντες δὲ, ἐχάρησαν ἐπὶ τῇ
 32 παρακλήσει. Ἰούδας δὲ καὶ Σίλας, καὶ αὐτοὶ προφῆται ὄντες, διὰ λόγου

prefixed it, in the place of εὖ πρόσσειν, to his *dis-
 tich*, announcing the victory at Pylum. Yet it
 was used a very short time after by one not like-
 ly to have imitated Cleon, namely, Xenophon.
 Cyr. iv. Κύρος Κυαζάροι χαιρείν. In the Horatian
 "Celso gaudere et bene rem gerere refer" there
 is allusion to both forms.

24. ἐτάραξαν.] See Note on Matt. ii. 3. and
 comp. Gal. i. 7.

—ἀνασκευάζοντες.] Ἀνασκ. properly signifies to
pack up any thing for removal; as in Thucyd. i.
 18. and elsewhere; 2. to remove, as in Xenoph.
 An. vi. 2, 5; 3dly, from this *packing up* and re-
 movable, easily arises the sense of *carrying off*,
plundering. Thus the sense here seems to be,
 "removing and perverting your minds [from the
 truth]." Λέγοντες περιτέμ., "telling you to be cir-
 cumcised," i. e. that you should be circumcised.
 Οἷς οὐ διαστ. Sub. οὐδὲν, "to whom we gave no
 direction or authority [so to act]." The οὐδὲν is
 necessary to be supplied, because οὐ διαστ. almost
 always signifies to forbid.

25. γενομένοις ἑμοθυμαδόν.] Sub. ἐπὶ τῷ αὐτῷ,
 which is expressed at ii. 1. where see Note.

26. παρὰ τὰς ψυχὰς, &c.] i. e. "have jeop-
 arded their lives," by a slight hyperbole, as the
 Commentators say. Though, considering that
 Paul was being stoned at Lystra, to use his own
 expression, ἐν θανάτῳ, the hyperbole is scarcely
 any. Ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὄν., on behalf of the religion.

27. καὶ αὐτοὺς διὰ λόγου ἀπαγγ. τὰ αὐτά.] I have
 on Thucyd. vii. 8. 10. (Transl.) treated on the
 subject of the bearers of public letters or de-
 spatches, being usually allowed to explain any ob-
 scurity therein. The truth is that such were, in
 the earlier ages, always sent, in the form of *ver-
 bal messages*, by trusty persons to deliver by word
 of mouth; and that had continued even up to the
 age of Thucyd. On the introduction, however,
 of *written messages*, or despatches, during the
 Peloponnesian war, still the custom was retained
 of permitting the messenger to explain any ob-
 scurity in the Epistle, or to give further *particu-
 lars* of matters only briefly adverted to in the let-
 ter; nay occasionally to act as a sort of *ambassa-
 dor*, and treat on the business at issue. Some-
 times, however, the messengers were forbidden
 to say any thing; and therefore the words καὶ
 αὐτοὺς διὰ λόγου, &c., here, may be considered as
 informing the persons addressed, that the messen-

gers were empowered to deliver the same message
 by word of mouth, and of course more fully and
 explicitly, if desired. Ἀπαγγέλλοντας. Pres. for
 Fut.: or render "who are to tell you by message."
 So Fritsch. de Rev. not. Bibl. p. 31. says it may
 be rendered, "qui nunc nuntiant, or, ut nuntiant,"
 i. e. as he adds "permixtis temporibus dati et red-
 diti nuntii."

28. ἔδοξε γὰρ.] I know not why all the English
 Translators should render the γὰρ "for." It is
 plainly *resumptive*, and put for οὖν, as often in the
 Sept. Ἐδοξε, "it hath seemed good," the term
 used in decrees. Τῷ ἁγ. Πνεύμ. καὶ ἡ., by Hendia-
 dys, "to us who are deciding under the influence
 of the Holy Spirit."

—βῆρος.] It was an early, and especially Orien-
 tal form of expression to apply the terms βῆρος,
 ζυγός, &c., to all laws, orders, &c., enjoined on
 those subject to any one's authority, whether
 they were heavy or light. See Rev. ii. 4. Matt.
 xxiii. 4. and Note. Ἐπιτάγης (with which many
 Commentators are puzzled, and propose various
 conjectures, — all unnecessary), formed from the
phrase ἐπ' ἀνάγκης, comes from the old adjective
 ἐπανάγκης, which is preserved only in the Nomin.
 or Accus. neuter. It is found in the best writers
 from Herodot. downwards, but only as an *adverb*.
 Here it may be an *adjective*, by the ellip. of ὄντων.

29. εὖ ποίεστε.] This does not mean, "you
 will do right," as many Commentators suppose,
 but, "it will be happy for you," "it will tend to
 your salvation." Comp. Eccles. viii. 12. Is. iii.
 10. Jerem. xlii. 6.

30. ἀπολυθέντες.] See Note v. 33. Ἐπέδωκαν
 τὴν ἐπ. A vox sol. de hac re.

31. ἐχάρησαν ἐπὶ τῇ παρακ.] I know not why so
 many eminent Commentators should have inter-
 preted παρακλήσει *exhortation*, or *instruction*. The
 common interpretation, (confirmed by all the an-
 cient Versions), *consolation* or *comfort*, is more
 suitable and natural. They rejoiced at the com-
 fort which this Epistle gave them, by the assur-
 ance that they were delivered from whatever was
 burdensome in the Mosaic Law. See more in
 the able Note of Calvin. This use of the Arti-
 cle, however, as referring to something which
 may be supplied from the context or the subject
 matter, is rather uncommon.

32. προφῆται.] See xi. 27. and Note. Ep. Pearce
 in Rec. Syn., and especially Mr. Townsend's

πολλοῦ παρεκάλεισαν τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς καὶ ἐπειστήριζαν. Ποιήσαντες δὲ 33
 χρόνον, ἀπελύθησαν μετ' εἰρήνης ἀπὸ τῶν ἀδελφῶν πρὸς τοὺς ἀποστό-
 λους. [ἔδοξε δὲ τῷ Σίλᾳ ἐπιμεῖναι αὐτοῦ.] Παῦλος δὲ καὶ Βαρνάβας 34
 διέτριβον ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ, διδάσκοντες καὶ εὐαγγελιζόμενοι, μετὰ καὶ ἑτέρων 35
 πολλῶν, τὸν λόγον τοῦ Κυρίου.

ΜΕΤΑ δὲ τινὰς ἡμέρας εἶπε Παῦλος πρὸς Βαρνάβαν· Ἐπιστρέψαν- 36
 τες δὴ ἐπισκεψάμεθα τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς ἡμῶν κατὰ πᾶσαν πόλιν, ἐν αἷς
 κατηγγέλαμεν τὸν λόγον τοῦ Κυρίου, πῶς ἔχουσι. Ὁ Βαρνάβας δὲ 37
 ἐβουλεύσατο συμπαραλαβεῖν τὸν Ἰωάννην τὸν καλούμενον Μάρκον·
 Ἐπιβύβησεν δὲ Ἰωάννης, τὸν ἀποστάντα ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἀπὸ Παμφυλίας, καὶ μὴ 38
 συνελθόντι αὐτοῖς εἰς τὸ ἔργον, μὴ συμπαραλαβεῖν τοῦτον. Ἐγένετο 39
 οὖν παροξυσμὸς, ὥστε ἀποχωρισθῆναι αὐτοὺς ἀπ' ἀλλήλων, τὸν τε Βαρ-
 νάβαν παραλαβόντι τὸν Μάρκον ἐκπεῦσαι εἰς Κύπρον· Παῦλος δὲ 40
 ἐπιλεξάμενος Σίλαν ἐξῆλθε παραδοθείς τῇ χάριτι τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑπὸ τῶν
 ἀδελφῶν. διήρχετο δὲ τὴν Συρίαν καὶ Κιλικίαν, ἐπιστηρίζων τὰς ἐκκλη- 41
 σίας. XVI. Ἡ Κατήνησε δὲ εἰς Λέβηθ καὶ Λύστραν. καὶ ἰδοὺ μα- 1

o Supra 12, 12,
 25.
 & 13. 5.
 Col. 4. 10.
 2 Tim. 4. 11.
 Philem. 24.
 p Supra 13. 13.

q Supra 14. 6.
 infra 17. 14.
 & 19. 22.
 & 20. 4.
 Rom. 16. 21.
 1 Cor. 4. 17.
 Phil. 2. 19.
 1 Thess. 3. 2.
 1 Tim. 1. 2.
 2 Tim. 1. 5.

elaborate dissertation (here introduced) on the spiritual gifts, tithes and offices in the Church at Antioch. See also the Note on 1 Cor. xii. 10. Διὰ λόγον πολλοῦ, "in a discourse of considerable length." Παρεκάλ., "exhorted, admonished, and instructed them;" stating, we may suppose, the grounds and reasons on which the determination of the Synod was founded, showing why the whole ritual was not enjoined, and why a part was retained; and withal defining the cause, nature, and extent of the duty of abstaining, in certain cases, from things naturally lawful.

33. ποιήσαντες χρόνον] "having stayed some time." An idiom confined to the later and especially the Hellenistic writers. Μετ' εἰρήνης, means, "with good wishes and prayers for their welfare," or whatever was included in the Heb. □יהשׁ.

34. ἔδοξε — αὐτοῦ.] This verse is omitted in several MSS. and Versions, and is rejected by Mill, Wets., Pearce, Newc., Kuin., and Griesb., bracketed by Vat., and cancelled by Matthæi. The reason which they assign for its having come to be inserted, is, that it was done to account for what might have seemed strange and inconsistent in Silas being said to have gone with Jude to Jerusalem; whereas, a few days after, he is said to have been chosen by Paul as his companion in his journey to visit the churches. Yet (say the Critics in question) "he may have gone to Jerusalem, and been sent for from thence, and the circumstance of his sending for, been omitted to be mentioned." I must own that there is nothing to negative this in the expression μετὰ τινὰς ἡμέρας, (especially if it be taken of the first mention of a plan which might not be carried into execution for some short time,) that being an indefinite term, which may, at least, mean after not a very few days. See xvi. 13. There is however, something very hypothetical in this way of accounting for the insertion. Instances of insertions for such a purpose, are very rare indeed, and not to be increased without urgent cause; as tending to lessen our confidence in the integrity of the Divine word. On the other hand, if we suppose the verse to be genuine, its omission

may readily be accounted for; namely, to remove a seeming inconsistency, a person being here said to have stayed, who was just before said to have gone; in which case the readiest course, — and that on a level with the capacity of even the scribes, — would be to cancel the verse. And Critics and Commentators having felt the same difficulty, might resort to the same mode of removing it. Whereas it may satisfactorily be obviated by less violent means, namely, by taking ἀπελθ. not in the sense departed, but in the usual one dimissi sunt (as in the Vulg.), meaning their dismissal and departure from the place where the brethren were assembled, not from Antioch itself. It should seem that between the time when they left the meeting, and that fixed on for their actual departure, Silas, from a desire to longer enjoy the society of Paul, resolved to stay longer at Antioch. One might, indeed, have expected that it should have been added, that Jude went on his journey. But this was not absolutely necessary, and such omissions are frequent. Words to that effect are, indeed, found in some MSS. and Versions; but it is so very difficult to account for their omission, and so easy for their insertion (from the margin) that they cannot be received. Thus internal evidence is decidedly in favour of the genuineness of the verse; and external evidence even more.

36. ἐπισκεψάμεθα τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς — πῶς ἔχουσι.] This may be a common Grecism for ἐπισκ. πῶς ἔχουσιν οἱ ἀδελφοί. Or at πῶς ἔχουσι we may supply σκεψόμενοι, from ἐπισκεψ. The ἐπισκ. must here denote inspection of their state as Christian professors. Hence was derived the use of the term ἐπισκοπος in the sense Bishop, which not long afterwards arose.

38. ἤξιον] (which signifies, wished or thought proper) must be closely united with μὴ συμπαραλαβεῖν, as in several passages of Thucyd. cited in Recens. Synop.

XVI. 1. κατήνησε] Literally, "went down to." A sense often occurring in this Book, and found in the later Greek writers.

- 1 θητής τις ἦν ἐκεῖ, ὀνόματι Τιμόθεος, υἱὸς γυναικὸς τινος Ἰουδαίας
 2 πιστῆς, πατρὸς δὲ Ἑλλήνου. ῥ ὃς ἐμαρτυρεῖτο ὑπὸ τῶν ἐν Λύστροις καὶ ^rSupra 6. 3.
 3 Ἰκονίῳ ἀδελφῶν. ῖ Τοῦτον ἠθέλησεν ὁ Παῦλος σὺν αὐτῷ ἐξελεθεῖν, καὶ ^s1 Cor. 9. 20.
 λαβὼν περιέτεμεν αὐτὸν, διὰ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους τοὺς ὄντας ἐν τοῖς τόποις ^{Gal. 2. 3.}
 ἐκείνοις· ῗδεισαν γὰρ ἅπαντες τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ ὅτι Ἕλλην ὑπῆρχεν.
 4 Ῐς δὲ διεπορεύοντο τὰς πόλεις, παρεδίδουν αὐτοῖς φυλάσσειν τὰ δόγ- ^tSupra 15. 20,
 ματα τὰ κεκριμένα ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων τῶν ἐν
 5 Ἱερουσαλήμ. Αἱ μὲν οὖν ἐκκλησίαι ἐστερεοῦντο τῇ πίστει, καὶ ἐπερί-
 σσεον τῷ ἁριθμῷ καθ' ἡμέραν.
 6 Διελθόντες δὲ τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ τὴν Γαλιτικὴν χώραν, κωλυθέντες
 7 ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος λαλήσωσι τὸν λόγον ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ, ἐλθόντες
 κατὰ τὴν Μυσίαν ἐπείραζον † κατὰ τὴν Βιθυνίαν πορεύεσθαι· καὶ
 8 οὐκ εἴασεν αὐτοὺς τὸ Πνεῦμα. Ῐ Παρελθόντες δὲ τὴν Μυσίαν, κατέ- ^uInfra 20. 6.
 9 βησαν εἰς Τρωάδα. καὶ ὄραμα διὰ τῆς νυκτὸς ὤφθη τῷ Παύλῳ· ²Cor. 2. 12.
 ἀνὴρ τις ἦν Μακεδῶν ἐστῶς, παρακαλῶν αὐτὸν καὶ λέγων· Διὰ εἰς ²Tim. 4. 13.

— ἦν ἐκεῖ] Whether this is to be understood of *Derbe*, or of *Lystra*, Commentators are not agreed. The present passage favours the opinion that he was of *Lystra*; while that at xx. 4. is thought by some to prove him to have been of *Derbe*. But the *Δερβαιοὺς* there must refer to *Gaius*, and *Gaius* only, otherwise St. Luke would have written *καὶ Γάϊος καὶ Τιμόθεος, Δερβαιοὶ*. He does not add *Ἀνατροῖας* to *Τιμ.*, because it was unnecessary, he having, he thought, expressed that *here*. And certainly the *ἐκεῖ* cannot well be understood of any other than *Lystra*, since that was the last mentioned place. From the position of the cities there can be no doubt that the Apostles went to *Derbe* first, and then to *Lystra*.

3. *περιέτεμεν α.*] He had not been circumcised, because (as we learn from the Rabbins) his mother had no right to do that without the father's consent. The reason why *Paul* circumcised him (which he might do without violation of Christian liberty, as being of *Jewish birth*), and because, though circumcision was not enjoined as *necessary* to the Gentile converts, it might be sometimes *expedient*) is just after suggested, namely, that he might not offend the Jews, who would conclude Timothy to be uncircumcised, because his father was a Gentile, and, consequently would not listen to his teaching; therefore the Apost. accommodated himself to the prejudices of weak brethren. On the contrary, he did not permit *Titus*, who was of Gentile birth by *both* parents, to be circumcised, because it was demanded to be done by the false teachers as necessary to salvation. *There* conscience could not allow him to give way.

6. Ῐ Ἀσίᾳ] This must here denote that part of Asia Minor which was peculiarly so called, i. e. *Proconsular Asia*, of which *Ephesus* was the capital. *How* this hindrance was imparted to them, whether by dream or otherwise, is uncertain.

7. κατὰ τ. Β.] Several MSS. have *εἰς*, which is adopted by Griesb. and other Editors; but without reason, since external evidence is decidedly in favour of *κατὰ*, and indeed internal too; for *εἰς* was doubtless only an alteration to remove a tautology. Versions ought not to have been appealed to by Griesb., since in a case like this

they have no authority, and Fathers very little, because they often quoted from memory.

— Πνεῦμα] Nine MSS. add Ἰησοῦ, and others, with several Versions and some Fathers, τῷ Ἰησοῦ, which is adopted by Mill and Wets., and received into the text by Griesb., Knapp, Tittm., and Vat., as had been long ago done by Beza. And it is expressed by Doddr., Newcome, and Wakef. Yet there seems no sufficient evidence of its genuineness to warrant its reception. The external evidence is weak, as far as regards MSS.; and Versions and Fathers are, in a matter of this kind, not quite unexceptionable testimony. But, to advert to internal evidence, it would at first sight seem that as Πνεῦμα Ἰησοῦ is a very rare expression, occurring nowhere else, but in Phil. i. 19. (and there in a different sense) we may far better account for the omission than for the insertion of Ἰησοῦ. And yet we do not elsewhere find that rare expressions are cancelled by the scribes. Besides, when any very rare forms of expression are connected with important doctrinal questions, we are to advert to the possibility, nay probability, that they may have been tampered with by the ancient Theologians, either by adding something to the text, or by removing something from it. Now, it appears from the Note of Wets. that the Romanists, a little after the printing of the Greek Text, maintained that Ἰησοῦ had been expunged by the Nestorians; which is incredible. They might rather have been expected to add than to remove it. The addition, however, I suspect, came from the *Arians*, who would have more reason to add it, in order to destroy so decided an example of τὸ Πνεῦμα in the personal sense. Thus it is caught up by all the Socinian interpreters. And when once introduced by the *Arians*, it would be likely to be admitted by the *Nestorians*, who would rather have it than not. From the former of these it was, I suspect, foisted into the *Vulgate*, and by the latter into the *Syriac* Version, and from thence it would be easily transmitted to the *Aethiopic*, *Coptic*, and *Armenian* Versions. Finally, the word is strongly discountenanced by the context. For, to use the words of Bp. Middl., “in the preceding verse we are told that the Apostles were forbidden of the Holy Ghost to preach the word in Asia; in the present,

Μακεδονίαν βοήθησον ἡμῖν ὡς δὲ τὸ ὄραμα εἶδεν, εὐθέως ἐζητήσα- 10
 μεν ἐξελθεῖν εἰς τὴν Μακεδονίαν, συμβιβάζοντες ὅτι προσέκκληται ἡμῶς
 ὁ Κύριος εὐαγγελισασθαι αὐτούς. Ἀναχθέντες οὖν ἀπὸ τῆς Τρωάδος, 11
 εὐθυδρομήσαμεν εἰς Σαμοθράκην, τῇ τε ἐπιούῃ εἰς Νεάπολιν, ἐκεῖθ' ἐν 12
 τε εἰς Φιλίππους, ἣτις ἐστὶ πρώτη [τῆς] μερίδος τῆς Μακεδονίας πό-
 λης, κολωνία. Ἰμμεν δὲ ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ πόλει διατρίβοντες ἡμέρας τινάς·
 τῇ τε ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαββάτων ἐξήλθομεν τῆς πόλεως παρὰ ποταμὸν, οὗ 13

that on their attempting to go into Bithynia, the Spirit suffered them not." It is, therefore, highly unnatural that the τὸ Πνεῦμα of the latter verse should be meant of any other than the τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα of the former.

10. ἐζητήσαμεν] As St. Luke here uses *we*, after having before all along used *they*, it is plain that he himself became the companion of Paul and Timothy in this journey.

— συμβ.] See Note on ix. 22.

12. πρώτη τῆς μερίδος τῆς Μακ. πόλις] No little perplexity here exists, from a difficulty to reconcile the present statement with the actual state of things then existing. According to the sense assigned by the Pesch. Svr. and some others, "which is the metropolis of the country of Macedonia," the words will involve an inaccuracy; *Thessalonica* being undoubtedly the capital. And if we take πρώτη for "most considerable," it will be equally irreconcilable with facts. Indeed, by so interpreting we overlook the force of μερίδος in such a connection, which can only be "portion," i. e. *district*. And that Macedonia had long been divided into four districts, we learn from the Historians. Indeed coins of the *Provincia prima* and *secunda* have been found. Hence it has been the opinion of many learned men that instead of πρώτη τῆς we should read πρώτης; by which the sense will be, "which is a city of the Provincia prima of Macedonia." But not a single MS. is found to support this conjecture; which, indeed is little supported by probability, as introducing a sort of minute circumstance not very likely to have been adverted to by the sacred writer. It is better, therefore, to retain the common reading; explaining it as we best may. Now the matter hinges on whether πρώτη may be supposed to mean "the principal," or "a principal." If we fix on the former sense, we encounter the objection, that Philippi was not even the capital of the district, but *Amphipolis*, as we learn from Livy and Diodorus. Hence Michaelis and Kuin. adopt the latter sense; and they appeal to the unexceptionable evidence of Eckel Doctr. Vet. Numm. P. I. Vol. 4. p. 282. in attestation of the fact, that πρώτη was sometimes so applied as to mean a principal, though not the principal city of a country. And certainly, this view being admitted, all objection on the score of geographical exactness will be removed. I am, however, inclined to think the word πρώτη was meant to have the sense "the principal." Nor is there any thing really formidable in the objection, that Amphipolis was the capital; for though Amphipolis had been originally the capital, yet it is very probable (as Wets. and Pearce suppose) that, after the battle of Philippi, that city was raised to the dignity of capital of the district, in the place of Amphipolis, which was then on the decline; especially since, we know, it was the policy of the Romans to make their colonies the capitals of the countries where they were situated. As, however, we have

no historical proof of this transfer, it may be better (with Bp. Pearce) to understand πρώτη in the sense most considerable and important, in commerce, wealth, and population. And such the Romans would be especially anxious their colonies should be; and many causes would contribute to make them such. Still one difficulty yet remains. Whichever of the above senses be adopted, the τῆς before μερίδος is worse than useless; and has, I suspect, caused all the perplexity in question. Bp. Middl., indeed, places it in the least objectionable point of view by reading, "which is the chief city of its district, a city of Macedonia, a colony." But this is doing a manifest violence to the construction, and injury to the sense, which is thus very jejune. And Professor Scholefield acknowledges that he is by no means satisfied with that mode. I would therefore suppose a slight corruption to have crept into the text, occasioned by a mistake in placing the article τῆς. Now the first τῆς is not found in three ancient MSS., the Syriac Version, and Chrys.; nor does it appear to have been in the Copies read by the Pesch. Syr. and Vulgate Translators; nor in the originals of those MSS. which have μερίς, plainly by a confounding of the abbreviation of the termination δος with σ. And as external testimony is not wanting against this τῆς, so neither is internal; for it is inexplicable except on Bp. Middl.'s violent construction. I suspect, therefore, that it crept in by a mistake of the scribes; since those MSS. which have not the τῆς here, have it before Μακεδ.: and though it is there not found in ten MSS. (some of them of the highest antiquity) all of them have the τῆς before μερίδος. May we not, then, suppose that the article, which ought properly to be inserted but once, was first inserted in the wrong place, and afterwards (error gathering force like a snowball) both in the right place and the wrong. I have ventured to double bracket the τῆς, which is cancelled by Lachmann. Render "which is the most considerable city of a district of Macedonia." Mr. Arundell, in his Travels in Asia Minor, notices two medals, one bearing the inscription Εφεσιων . πρωτων . Ασιας . and another, Σμυνια . Πουστη . Ασιας . καλλι . και μεγαθει.

13. παρὶ ποταμὸν] "by the river side;" not "by a river," as our English Translators render, and the Article is omitted chiefly on account of the notoriety of the river, but partly by reason of a preposition being used. This ποταμὸς is a mere rivulet, formed by the fountains, from which Philippi derived its first name, *Crenides*, and running into the Strymon. A striking attestation to the truth of the narrative; for the river is so small as only to be found in the best recent maps on a large scale.

— οὗ ἐνομίετο προσευχῆ ε.] The Commentators are not agreed on the sense of these words; which the earlier ones take to mean "where prayer was wont to be made;" while the later ones interpret,

ἐνομιζέτο προσευχὴ εἶναι, καὶ καθίσαντες ἐλαλοῦμεν ταῖς συνελθούσαις
 14 γυναιξί. Καὶ τις γυνή ὀνόματι Λυδία, πορφυρόπωλις πόλεως Θυατι-
 ρων, σεβομένη τὸν Θεὸν, ἤκουεν ἧς ὁ Κύριος διήνοιξε τὴν καρδίαν,
 15 προσέχειν τοῖς λαλουμένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ Παύλου. * Ὡς δὲ ἐβαπτίσθη, καὶ
 ὁ οἶκος αὐτῆς, παρεκάλεισε λέγουσα Ἐξ κεκρίκαται με πιστὴν τῷ Κυ-
 ρίῳ εἶναι, εἰσελθόντες εἰς τὸν οἶκόν μου μέναιτε. καὶ παρεβιάσατο

x Gen. 19. 3.
 & 33. 11.
 Jud. 19. 21.
 Luke 24. 29.
 Heb. 13. 2.

“where, according to [the Jewish] custom, there was a proseuche, or oratory.” That such places (not edifices, but groves, like the ancient Druidical temples) were then frequent where no synagogue was found, is proved by the Commentators; as also that such were situated, for the convenience of purification, by a river-side. Yet I see not how ὁ ἐνομιζέτο εἶναι can have the above sense, still less be taken for οὗ ἦν, with others. Neither do I see any force in the objections,—that the common interpretation yields too indefinite a sense, and is incorrect in phraseology. The former has not a shadow of reason; and the latter is overturned by one of the passages adduced to establish the other interpretation, namely, *Philo contra Flaccum*: Διὰ πυλῶν ἐκχυθέντες ἐπὶ τοῖς πλησίον αἰγιαλοῦς, τὰς προσευχὰς ἀφῆρποντο, οὐ ἐνομιζέτο προσευχὴ εἶναι, where we have the very phrase, and in the very sense of the common interpretation. And although it is accompanied with the term *προσευχή*, *proseucha*; yet it is evident that Philo thought it necessary to add the words following, in order to determine the sense. It should therefore seem that, for a similar reason, *St. Luke* chose to use a *circumlocution*, in preference to a term which might require this very circumlocution to explain it. It is true that at ver. 16. the words *πορευομένων εἰς προσευχὴν* seem to require *προσ.* to be taken in the sense *proseucha*. But though I am not prepared to assert that the rendering “as we were going to prayer” is there to be justified (notwithstanding that in *Joseph. Vit.* § 57, I find ἡμῶν τὰ νόμιμα ποιοῦντων, καὶ εἰς προσευχὰς πορευομένων), since that would make the notice of the time when the circumstance took place too indeterminate, and be not a little frigid, yet it may be observed that the sense *proseucha* would require the Article. Indeed, I know of no passage of any writer where it occurs in this sense without the Article. See *Joseph. Vit.* § 54. It seems pretty clear, however, that *προσευχὴν* there is used in the very same sense as the expression here at ver. 13, namely, by circumlocution, to denote the place οὗ ἐνομιζέτο προσευχὴ εἶναι, the place where prayer was wont to be made; not indeed (as I would understand) a regular building, such as the *Proseuchæ* were, but a mere grove; as when *Apion ap. Joseph. Contr. Ap. τ. 2.* says of Moses, αἰθρίους προσευχὰς ἀνήγειν. Yet this sense, too, requires the Article; which, therefore, I have (with *Griesb., Lachm., and Rinck*) introduced, on the authority of many MSS. of the Western Class, and also of *Origen* and *Theophyl.*

With respect to the time when the circumstance mentioned at ver. 16 took place (which Commentators are so perplexed to determine), it should seem to have been on the first day that Paul and Silas went to the prayer-meeting. The δὲ there is transitive and resumptive (v. 14 & 15 being in some degree parenthetical), and serves to introduce a narrative which, according to the order of time, ought to have come in at ver. 13 between *προσευχὴ εἶναι* and *καθίσαντες*. Though, indeed,

there was some reason for mentioning it where it is, since, we find, the same occurrence took place several times afterwards on other days.

—ἐλαλοῦμεν.] Not “discoursed with,” as *Wakef.* renders; for λαλεῖν must here be taken in the sense of *discourse to*, as a public teacher or preacher. Thus the preceding καθίσαντες alludes to the posture adopted, which was that of teaching. See *Matt. v. 1.* and *Note*. It is plain that the congregation consisted of women only, not, as is commonly supposed, a mixture of both sexes. To account for which, we may suppose that since that separation of the sexes, which always subsisted in regular buildings, such as synagogues, was impossible in places like *proseucha*, the same end was effected by the sexes attending at different times.

14. Λυδία.] Some take this as a name of country, and to be joined with γυνή. But the ὀνόματι associated with it shows it to be a proper name. The name was common both among the Greeks and Romans. Πορφυρόπωλις means a seller not of purple dye, as some suppose, but of purple vests, for the dying of which the Lydians were famous; who seem to have participated in, or succeeded to the reputation of the Tyrians. She seems to have been a resident of Thyatira in Lydia, where her vests were manufactured, but sojourning at Philippi, for the purposes of her business. By the expression just after σεβομένη τὸν Θεὸν is meant, that she was a devout Gentile, worshipping the one true God, or a proselyte of the gate.

—διήνοιξε τὴν καρδίαν.] The expression was probably derived from the Hebrew; for it occurs in the Jewish prayers, as also in 2 *Macc. i. 14.* δ. τὴν καρδίαν ἐν τῷ ἵμῳ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν τοῖς προστάγμασι. The mind is said to be closed against admonition, when either from prejudice, it cannot discern the truth, or, from pride and perversity, will not admit it. Hence, to open the mind or heart denotes, to render it more intelligent,—to cause that any one shall better perceive the truth, and more readily yield assent to it. The opening in question was effected by the grace of God working by his Spirit with the concurrent good dispositions of Lydia.

15. πιστὴν τῷ Κυρίῳ.] “a true believer in the Lord [and his religion],” so as to be fit to be admitted to baptism. The expression elsewhere occurs without the addition of τῷ Κ., and then denotes a Christian.

—παρεβιάσατο ἡμᾶς.] This term, like ἀναγκάζω, is used of the moral compulsion of urgent entreaty, such as, in a manner, compels the person to grant the request. *St. Luke* here, and in his Gospel xxiv. 29, seems to have had in mind Gen. xix. 3, where Lot, it is said, κατεβιάζετο (many good MSS. have παρεβ., which is probably the true reading), the angel to enter; also 1 *Sam. xxviii. 23,* καὶ οὐκ ἐβουλήθη φαγεῖν, καὶ παρεβιάσαντο αὐτὸν οἱ παῖδες καὶ ἡ γυνή. The παρα signifies præter [scil. voluntatem], and thus παρεβιάζειν is a stronger term than ἀναγκάζειν.

y 1 Sam. 28. 7. ^{infra} 19. 24. ἡμᾶς. ^y Ἐγένετο δὲ, πορευομένων ἡμῶν εἰς τὴν προουεχὴν, παιδίσκην 16
 τινὰ ἔχουσαν πνεῦμα Πύθωνος ἀπαντῆσαι ἡμῖν, ἧτις ἐργασίαν πολλὴν
 παρέχε τοῖς κυρίοις αὐτῆς μαντειομένη. Ἄντη κατακολουθήσασα τῷ 17
 Παύλῳ καὶ ἡμῖν, ἔκραζε λέγουσα· Οὗτοι οἱ ἄνθρωποι δοῦλοι τοῦ
 Θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου εἰσὶν, οἵτινες καταγγέλλουσιν ἡμῖν ὁδὸν σωτηρίας!
 z Mark 16. 17. ^z Τοῦτο δὲ ἐποίει ἐπὶ πολλὰς ἡμέρας, διαπονηθεὶς δὲ ὁ Παῦλος, καὶ 18
 ἐπιστρέψας, τῷ πνεύματι εἶπε· Παραγγέλω σοι ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ
 a 2 Cor. 6. 5. Χριστοῦ ἐξέλθειν ἀπ' αὐτῆς. καὶ ἐξῆλθεν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ. ^a Ἰδότες δὲ 19
 οἱ κύριοι αὐτῆς, ὅτι ἐξῆλθεν ἡ ἐλπίς τῆς ἐργασίας αὐτῶν, ἐπιλαβόμενοι
 τὸν Παῦλον καὶ τὸν Σίλαν, εἰλκυσαν εἰς τὴν ἀγορὰν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀρχον-
 b 1 Kings 18. 17. ^{infra} 17. 6. τας. ^b Καὶ προσμαγόντες αὐτοὺς τοῖς στρατηγοῖς, εἶπον· Οὗτοι οἱ 20
 ἄνθρωποι ἐκταράσσουσιν ἡμῶν τὴν πόλιν, Ἰουδαῖοι ὑπάρχοντες· καὶ 21
 καταγγέλλουσιν ἔθνη, ἃ οὐκ ἔξεστιν ἡμῖν παραδέχεσθαι οὐδὲ ποιεῖν,
 c 2 Cor. 11. 25. ¹ Thess. 2. 2. ^{Phil.} 1. 13. ῥωμαίοις οὐσί. ^c Καὶ συνεπέστη ὁ ὄχλος κατ' αὐτῶν, καὶ οἱ στρατη- 22
 γοὶ περιόρῳζαντες αὐτῶν τὰ ἱμάτια, ἐκέλευον ῥαβδίσειν· πολλὰς τε 23

16. παιδίσκην] i. e. a female servant or slave.
 — ἔχουσαν πνεῦμα Πύθων.] Πύθων was properly an appellation of Apollo. But, as he was the God of Divination, it came to be applied to soothsayers, conjurers, and those who pretended to evoke spirits. Now as *ventriloquism* was a most useful art to persons of that profession, they generally acquired more or less of it; hence the word is sometimes explained to mean ventriloquist in the Greek Lexicographers. Now whether this girl was a ventriloquist, has been much debated; but the *negative* is the view adopted (and, I think, rightly) by the most eminent Commentators. See Deyling, Wolf, and Kuin. There is no sufficient reason to suppose so from the *name*, and still less from the *circumstances*. This is closely connected with another, and more important question, — *whether she was a pretender to the gift of divination*. This also has been by Deyling, Wolf, Walch, and Biscoe, decided in the *negative*. There is somewhat to countenance the opinion of certain eminent recent Commentators, that she was a *lunatic*, who (like Johanna Southcote) fancied that she was inspired to foretell future events. See Rec. Syn. and Townsend in loc., in his Dissertation on the nature of the Spirit of Divination in the Pythoness; whence it will appear that this notion involves insuperable difficulties, being inconsistent with the view taken by the Sacred writer; which requires us to suppose (as the ancient, and most modern Commentators have done) that the girl was *possessed with an evil Spirit*, which enabled her to occasionally foretell future events. So Hesychius explains Πύθωνα by δαιμόνιον μαντικόν. The expression, then, is a kindred one with that used by St. Luke in his Gospel, iv. 33. ἄνθρωπος ἔχων πνεῦμα δαιμόνιον ἀκαθάρτου.

— ἐργασίαν.] This word, from ἐργάζεσθαι, to make money (as we say), signifies *gain*.

— τοῖς κυρίοις.] Fischer and Vater take this as plural for singular, as in Luke xix. 33. That passage, however, is of a different nature; and to call in *enallage* would be here entirely *unnecessary*: since Grotius and Wahl have fully proved, that the *common possession* of a slave, especially when exercising any gainful trade, was not unfrequent.

17. δοῦλοι τοῦ Θεοῦ — σωτ.] Though the expression δούλος Θεοῦ was in use among the Gentiles, to signify those devoted to any God as his Priests, yet as ὁδὸς σωτηρίας was one quite unknown to them, we might imagine that both expressions were derived from persons who had heard Paul and Timothy preach; but that it is best to suppose the words pronounced by the *daemons* through the organs of the girl and thus bearing the same honourable testimony to the Apostles, as had been borne by the *demons* to our Lord.

19. ἐξῆλθεν.] There seems to be (as Valckn. remarks) a *paronomasia* with the preceding ἐξῆλθεν, since with the going out of the *daemon* was gone their hope of gain. Ἐπιλαβόμενοι, “having [caused to be] apprehended;” as xviii. 17. xxi. 30. and Luke xxiii. 26. Ἐλκεῖν, like *strāre* and the Latin *rapere*, is often used of *impleading* any one, and consequently obliging him to go to judgment. Ἀρχοντας is a *general term*; in the place of which is, in the next verse, substituted the more *special* one *στρατηγοί*; for so, it seems, the magistrates at Philippi were called.

20. ἐκταράσσουσιν] “are causing great disturbance to.” The *εκ* is intensive. The charge made was two-fold: 1. that they were disturbers of the peace; and, 2. teachers of unlawful religious customs and rites: both charges alike falling under the cognizance of the magistracy. And though the Romans were not intolerant; — yet, in their permission to foreigners to worship God according to their consciences, it was understood that there should be no *public* attempts at proselytism. And whenever the *former* charge was connected with the latter, the magistrates were bound to punish. In Ἰουδαῖοι ὑπάρχοντες it is suggested that their offence is greater by the persons being, as foreigners and of a most despised nation, those who ought the less to have ventured to commit it.

22. περιόρῳζαντες.] This use of the word is like that of the Latin *scindere*, and the corresponding words in Greek; and denotes a hasty, and, if done by another, a violent, stripping off of clothes. So Xenoph. p. 742. τὴν ἰσθητα περιόρῳζαντες. and Diod. Sic. L. xvii. 35. οἱ τὰς ἑσθ. περιόρῳζονται. The scourging was probably ordered as a temporary punishment, to satisfy the people; the

ἐπιθέντες αὐτοῖς πληγὰς, ἔβαλον εἰς φυλακὴν, παραγγείλαντες τῷ δε-
 24 σμοφύλακι, ἀσφαλῶς τηρεῖν αὐτούς· ὅς παραγγελίαν τοιαύτην εἰληγῶς,
 ἔβαλεν αὐτούς εἰς τὴν ἐσωτέραν φυλακὴν, καὶ τοὺς πόδας αὐτῶν ἥσφα-
 25 λίσατο εἰς τὸ ξύλον. ^d Κατὰ δὲ τὸ μεσονύκτιον Παῦλος καὶ Σίλλυς ^d ^{Supra 4. 31.}
 προσευχόμενοι ἤμουν τὸν Θεόν· ἐπηκροῶντο δὲ αὐτῶν οἱ δέσμοι.
 26 Ὁ ἄφρων δὲ σεισμός ἐγένετο μέγας, ὥστε σαλευθῆναι τὰ θεμέλια τοῦ ^e ^{Supra 5. 19.}
 δεσμοτηρίου· ἀνεώχθησάν τε παρακρήμα αἱ θύραι πᾶσαι, καὶ πάντων ^{& 12. 7.}
 27 τὰ δεσμὰ ἀνέθη. Ἐξυπνος δὲ γενόμενος ὁ δεσμοφύλαξ, καὶ ἰδὼν ἀν-
 εργήμενος τὰς θύρας τῆς φυλακῆς, σπασάμενος μάχαιραν ἔμελλεν ἐαντὸν
 28 ἀναιεῖν, νομίζων ἐκπεφευγέναι τοὺς δεσμοίους. Ἐφώνησε δὲ φωνῇ με-
 γάλῃ ὁ Παῦλος, λέγων· Μηδὲν πράξης σεαυτῷ κακόν· ἅπαντες γὰρ
 29 ἐσμεν ἐνθάδε. Αἰτήσας δὲ φῶτα εἰσεπήδησε, καὶ ἔντρομος γενόμενος
 30 προσέειπε τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ τῷ Σίλλῃ· ^f καὶ προαγαγὼν αὐτούς ἔξω, ἔφη· ^f ^{Luke 3. 10.}
 31 Κύριοι, τί με δεῖ ποιεῖν, ἵνα σωθῶ; Οἱ δὲ εἶπον· Πίστευσον ἐπὶ ^{supra 2. 37.}
 32 τὸν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, καὶ σωθήσῃ σὺ, καὶ ὁ οἶκός σου. Καὶ ^{& 9. 6.}
 ἔλαλθσαν αὐτῷ τὸν λόγον τοῦ Κυρίου, καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ. ^{John 3. 16, 36.}
 33 Καὶ παραλαβὼν αὐτούς, ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ τῆς νυκτός, ἔλουσεν ἀπὸ τῶν ^{& 6. 47.}
^{1 John 5. 10.}

final examination of the charge being reserved for another occasion.

24. τὴν ἐσωτέραν φυλ.] So Liv. Hist. xxxiv. 44. Pleminius in *inferiorem* demissus carcerem est. Jails were not so strongly built at the *outer* part as the *inner*; to which there was access by several gates, and where sometimes there were subterraneous dungeons. Chains, too, were then added (to secure the prisoners committed there), and a machine called *ξύλον*, of wood bound with iron, in which the arms and head were sometimes confined (as in our *pillory*), but more frequently the *legs* only; not, however, as in our *stocks*; for the machine was one in which the *feet* were constrained and bruised. Hence it was called *ξύλοπῆδη*, *ποδοκάκη*, and *ποδοστράφη* (Heb. קֶבֶט, Job. xiii. 27.) Or, finally, one in which all the members were held, by being thrust through five holes. See more in Grot., Pric., Elsn., and Kuin.

25. ἤμουν τὸν Θεόν.] i. e. returning thanks to God for the honour done them of suffering in his cause (see v. 41. and Matt. v. 11, 12.), and for the support He afforded them under affliction. The circumstance of the other prisoners "hearing them" is recorded, to intimate that they prayed aloud, doubtless in order to testify their conscience to be void of offence, and their joy in the Holy Ghost.

26. ἀνεώχθησαν — πᾶσαι.] 'The opening of doors of themselves was always thought to attest the presence of God or an angel. See xii. 10.

— καὶ πάντων τὰ δεσμὰ ἀνέθη.] By this most Commentators understand, that the chains of the prisoners were relaxed, though not so much as to place them quite at liberty. This, however, is difficult to conceive; and, from the use of the word in the Classical writers (see the examples cited by Wets.), ἀνέθη τὰ δεσμὰ can only signify, "were freed from their chains." Yet, as the *doors* were, at the same time, opened, it would seem surprising that the prisoners should not have made their escape; which is by some Expositors attributed to their *extreme astonishment!* But that is surely a most frigid conceit: and the

circumstance must undoubtedly be ascribed, with all the best Interpreters, to *Divine interposition*, so as to correspond to the rest of this supernatural transaction. The great intent of which seems to have been, to evince, in the most decided manner, the presence of the Deity. And as the opening of the prison doors might have been ascribed to *accident* and a *natural cause* (namely, the earthquake), therefore the prisoners were likewise *all of them* set free from their chains; yet held enchained by a secret influence, that they should not endeavour to make their escape. All which plainly bespoke the *miraculous*. Whether in this unbinding of the prisoners there was meant to be (as Dr. Clarke supposes) any symbolical allusion to the Gospel as "proclaiming deliverance to the captives, and the opening of the prison-doors to the bound," may be considered, to say the least, doubtful.

28. μηδὲν — κακόν.] An euphemism, like that of Xenophon, cited by Wets.: *ἐδοδοῖκε γὰρ μή τι ἐαυτὸν ἐλογάσθαι δεινόν*.

29. ἔντρομος.] Various causes might produce this feeling; and among these, that of *awe*, as in the presence of Divine legates, attested to be such by the supernatural occurrence already witnessed.

30. ἔξω] i. e. out of the inner jail.

— τί με δεῖ — σωθῶ;] I have, in Recens. Synop., proved that this cannot mean (as Markl., Morus, Rosenm., and Stolz. suppose) "what must I do to be *safe*?" viz. from the punishment of the magistrates, or from the wrath of Heaven, for harshly treating such good persons; but, as the whole of the context requires, "by what means can I attain *eternal salvation*?" He knew they professed to show the means, — and their commission to do it was now established beyond doubt.

31. πιστεύσον ἐπὶ — σου.] "Embrace the Christian religion, i. e. so as to obey it, and thou and all thy family shall attain salvation." See Doddr. It is *taken for granted* that his family became Christians as well as himself.

33. ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ τῆς ν.] "at that very hour

g Luke 5. 29.
& 19. 6.

πληγῶν, καὶ ἐβαπτίσθη αὐτὸς, καὶ οἱ αὐτοῦ πάντες παραχοῦμα· ³ ἀν- 34
αγαγὼν τε αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ, παρέθηκε τραπέζαν, καὶ ἡγα-
λιάσατο παροικί πεπιστευκῶς τῷ Θεῷ.

Ἡμέρας δὲ γενομένης, ἀπέστειλαν οἱ στρατηγοὶ τοὺς ἑαβδούχους, λέ- 35
γοντες· Ἀπόλυσον τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἐκείνους. Ἀπήγγειλε δὲ ὁ δεσμο- 36
φύλαξ τοὺς λόγους τούτους πρὸς τὸν Παῦλον· Ὅτι ἀπεσιτάκασιν οἱ
στρατηγοὶ ἵνα ἀπολυθῆτε· νῦν οὖν ἐξελθόντες πορεύεσθε ἐν εἰρήρῃ.

h Infra 21. 25.

Ἡ ὁ δὲ Παῦλος ἔφη πρὸς αὐτούς· Δείραντες ἡμᾶς δημοσίᾳ ἀκατακρί- 37
τους, ἀνθρώπους Ῥωμαίους ὑπάρχοντας, ἔβαλον εἰς φυλακὴν, καὶ νῦν
λάθρα ἡμᾶς ἐκβάλλουσιν; οὐ γάρ· ἀλλὰ ἐλθόντες αὐτοὶ ἡμᾶς ἔξαγα-
γέτωσαν. Ἀνήγγειλαν δὲ τοῖς στρατηγοῖς οἱ ἑαβδούχοι τὰ ῥήματα 38

i Matt. 8. 34.

ταῦτα· καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν ἀκούσαντες ὅτι Ῥωμαῖοι εἰσι, ¹ καὶ ἐλθόντες 39
παρεκάλεισαν αὐτούς, καὶ ἔξαγαγόντες ἡρώτων ἐξελεῖν τῆς πόλεως.
Ἐξελθόντες δὲ ἐκ τῆς φυλακῆς εἰσήλθον εἰς τὴν Λυδίαν· καὶ ἰδόντες 40
τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς, παρεκάλεισαν αὐτούς, καὶ ἐξήλθον.

XVII. ΔΙΟΔΕΤΣΑΝΤΕΣ δὲ τὴν Ἀμφίπολιν καὶ Ἀπολλωνίαν, 1
ἦλθον εἰς Θεσσαλονικίην, ὅπου ἦν ἡ συναγωγὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων. Κατὰ δὲ 2

of the night," unseasonable as it was. Ἐλουσεν ἀπὸ τῶν πλ. It is not necessary to suppose ἔλουσε put for ἐλ. καθαρίζων, with Pisc., or, with Kypke, Kuin., and Campb., to take ἀπὸ in the sense *propeller*, supplying σώματα. The true mode of taking the passage is to consider it as a blending of two forms of expression, — namely, ἔλουσεν αὐτούς, and ἀπέλουσεν αἶμα τῶν πληγῶν. So Hom. II. Σ. 345. ὄφρα τάχιστα Πάτροκλον λούσειαν ἀπο βρότον αἱματόενα. where λούσειαν — αἶματ. is for ἀπολούων β. αἶματ.

37. ἔφη πρὸς αὐτούς] i. e. to the beadles, by a message, it should seem, sent by the Jailor. In δείραντες — ἐκβάλλουσιν there is such spirit, brevity, and point (almost each word forming a head of complaint), as could not easily be paralleled, even in the writings of Demosthenes. Ἀκατακρίτους signifies, "not found guilty, on trial [of any wrong.]" On the Roman law on this point, and on the privileges of Roman citizens in foreign countries, the Commentators adduce numerous Classical illustrations and references. In *what sense* Paul was enabled to call himself a *Roman citizen*, is a point much debated. Some think it was on the ground that Tarsus was a Roman *colony*, or at least a *municipium*. Now the *municipia* were properly Italian towns, on which had been conferred the *jus civitatis*; whereby the citizens of those places had the public and private rights of *Quirites*; and moreover made their own laws, and elected their own magistrates. There were, however, some *municipia* which had *not* the right of suffrage; and so possessed not the full *jus civitatis*. Yet Tarsus (Paul's birth-place) was neither a colony nor a *municipium*, but an *urbs libera*. See Pliny v. 27. Now *these free cities* lived under their own laws, had their own magistrates, were independent of the jurisdiction of the Roman president, and were not occupied by Roman garrisons. With this freedom the Tarsæans had been presented by Augustus, as a compensation for the damages they had sustained in the cause of Julius Caesar, in the course of the Civil War. That the Tarsæans had *not* the *jus civitatis Romanae*, is also hence apparent, that the Roman

Tribune, notwithstanding he knew Paul to be a Tarsæan (see xxi. 39.), ordered him to be scourged (xxii. 14.), though he desisted as soon as he understood that he was a Roman citizen. See xxii. 27. seq. It should therefore seem, as some suppose, that one of Paul's ancestors had had this freedom given him, for some service rendered to Cæsar in the civil wars.

When it is said ἡμᾶς Ῥωμαίους ὑπάρχ., the Commentators, supposing that *Silas* was not a Roman citizen, would take the singular as put for the plural, *dignitatis gratiâ*. But there is no necessity to resort to any such precarious device; for though, that "Silas is (as they say) nowhere else called a Roman citizen," be true, yet it is nowhere said, or even hinted, that he was *not* so. That he was, his very name *Silas*, for *Sylvanus*, renders probable. Nor was the *jus civitatis*, in its most limited sense, then so very difficult to be acquired.

— οὐ γάρ.] An elliptical formula, like many similar ones in Latin and English, in which the brevity (to be supplied by *ποιεῖν ἔδει* or the like) is very well suited to a feeling of indignation. Ἄλλα ἐλθόντες, &c., which would thus be a sort of symbolical action, expressive of their conviction of their innocence. It appears from the Commentators to have been not unfrequently resorted to.

39. παρεκάλεισαν αὐτούς] "appeased them."

40. εἰσήλθον εἰς τὴν Λ.] Some stumble at this idiom, and would read Λυδίαν. But the MSS. give no countenance; and it has been proved by Wolf, Alberti, Heumann, Kypke, and Valckn., that εἰσερχεσθαι εἰς τινα is often used in the sense "to enter into any one's house." Several MSS. indeed, have πρὸς, which has been adopted by almost all the recent Editors. But without any good reason, for it seems to have originated in the emendation of the Alexandrian Critics.

— παρεκάλεισαν.] We may here unite the senses of *admonishing*, and *exhorting*, and perhaps *comforting*. See Note on 2 Cor. ii. 4.

XVII. 1. ἡ συναγωγὴ τῶν Ἰ.] Br. Middl. ob-

τὸ εἰωθὸς τῷ Παύλῳ εἰσῆλθε πρὸς αὐτοὺς, καὶ ἐπὶ αἰβηβυτι τρίμ διε-
 3 λέγετο αὐτοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν γραφῶν, ^k διανοίγων καὶ παρατιθέμενος, ὅτι ^h Paul. 22. 7.
 τὸν Χριστὸν ἔδει πιθεῖν καὶ ἀναστῆναι ἐκ νεκρῶν, καὶ ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ⁱ Matt. 16. 21.
 4 ὁ Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς, ὃν ἐγὼ καταγγέλλω ὑμῖν. ^l Καὶ τινες ἐξ αὐτῶν ^{John 1. 42.}
 ἐπέουθησαν, καὶ προσεκληρώθησαν τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ τῷ Σίλῳ, τῶν τε ^l Luke 21. 26, 46.
 σεβομένων Ἑλλήνων πολὺ πλῆθος, γυναικῶν τε τῶν πρώτων οὐκ ὀλίγα. ^{John 18. 17.}
 5 Ζηλώσαντες δὲ οἱ ἀπειθοῦντες Ἰουδαῖοι, καὶ προσλαβόμενοι τῶν ἀγο-
 ραίων τινὰς ἄνδρας πονηροὺς, καὶ ὀχλοποιήσαντες, ἐθορούβουν τὴν πόλιν·
 ἐπιστάντες τε τῇ οἰκίᾳ Ἰάσονος, ἐζήτην αὐτοὺς ἀμυγεῖν εἰς τὸν δῆμον·
 6 ^m μὴ εὐρόντες δὲ αὐτοὺς, ἔσυχον τὸν Ἰάσονα καὶ τινὰς ἀδελφούς ἐπὶ ^m Supra 16. 20.
 τοὺς πολιτάρχας, βοῶντες· "Οτι οἱ τὴν οἰκουμένην ἀναστατώσαντες, οὗτοι
 7 καὶ ἐνθάδε πάρεσις! ⁿ οὓς ὑποδέδεκαί μῖσον. Καὶ οὗτοι πάντες ⁿ Luke 23. 2.
 ἀπέναντι τῶν δογματῶν Καίσαρος πράσσουσι, βυσιλεία λέγοντες ἕτερον ^{John 19. 12.}
 8 εἶναι, Ἰησοῦν. Ἐτύραξαν δὲ τὸν ὄχλον καὶ τοὺς πολιτάρχας ἀκούοντας
 9 ταῦτα. Καὶ λαβόντες τὸ ἱκανὸν παρὰ τοῦ Ἰάσονος καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν,
 10 ἀπέλυσαν αὐτούς. ^o Οἱ δὲ ἀδελφοὶ ἐνθέως διὰ τῆς ρυκτὸς ἐξέπεμψαν ^o Supra 9. 2.
 τὸν τε Παῦλον καὶ τὸν Σίλαν εἰς Βέροιαν. οἵτινες περιμερόμενοι, εἰς

jects to our English Version, "a synagogue of the Jews," and would render "the synagogue," as signifying merely that the Jews of the surrounding district had their synagogue there. That, however, is so little satisfactory (see xiv. 1. and Note, and compare xvii. 10.), that it is better to suppose the Article to have here crept in from the ἦν preceding. It is not found in *three* of the most ancient MSS., and perhaps others, such minute points escaping the most careful collators. To suppose that that was the *only synagogue* in Macedonia, though there might be many *proseuchæ*, is too hypothetical.

2. 3. διελέγετο — παρατιθ. The full sense is, "he discourses unto them out of the Scriptures," i. e. drawing from them his arguments, proofs, and illustrations. The two next words διανοίγων and παρατ. have reference to the two principal parts of the ratiocination. 1. *Opening out and bringing to light truth* (which was said to lie at the bottom of a well). 2. *Laying down and propounding* various truths, in order, from a collation of particulars, to deduce some general conclusion:— as here, ὅτι οὗτός ἐστι, &c. At ὅτι ἐν — ὑμῖν there is a transition from the oratio *obliqua* to the *directa*. See Acts i. 4.

4. προσεκληρώθησαν τῷ Π. The verb has a reciprocal sense, "joined themselves to," "took their lot with."

— γυναικῶν τῶν πρώτων.] The τῶν εὐσημῶνων infra ver. 12 & xiii. 50, "honourable matrons" wives, or widows. Thus Apuleius speaks of *feminas primatas*.

5. τῶν ἀγοραίων.] Ἀγοραῖος denotes "belonging to the forum, or market," and carries various significations according to the business done there, whether as applied to *things*, or *persons*. As regarded the *latter*, it denoted *market-people*; some of whom being *petty chapmen*, others acting as porters, nay, even *mere idlers*; (who, like the Lazzaroni at Naples, almost *lived* in the market). So Horace Ars. Poet. 245. *innati triviis ac pene forenses*. The term came at length to mean persons of the basest sort, — the dregs of society.

Πονηροὺς is wrongly rendered by Br. Pearce, Abp. Newc., and others, "wicked." But as it is meant to qualify the τῶν ἀγοραίων, it is better to render τινὰς ἄνδρας πονηροὺς, "some mean fellows." This signification of *ponhos* is indeed somewhat rare; but I could adduce several examples. The following will suffice: Thucyd. viii. 73. τινὰ μοχθηρὸν ἄνθρωπον (a beggarly fellow) ὠστρακισμένον — διὰ πονηρίαν, because of his meanness. Aristoph. Eq. 181, where τὸ μέγας γίγνεσθαι is opposed πονηρὸς καὶ ἀγορᾶς εἶναι. And in Xenophon the *πολιταὶ ποιηροὶ* are often opposed to the *οἱ χρηστοί*, the *better sort*. See also Lucian i. 433. Hence may be understood Thucyd. vi. 53. διὰ πονηρῶν ἀνθρώπων πίστιν (by the credence of mean persons) πάντο χρηστοῦ τῶν πολιτῶν κατέδου, where all the Translators and Commentators have fallen into the same blunder as on this passage of the N. T. Possibly the framers of our common Version meant to express the above sense when they rendered "lewd fellows;" for in the passage of Thucyd. viii. 73. Hobbes renders *μοχθηρὸν* by a *lewd fellow*. Indeed the word may very well have such a sense, since in *that* signification it is derived from the A. S. *leof* *gregarius*, "one of the mob," from *leob*, a mob.

— τὸν δῆμον.] Not "the people," as E. V.; much less "the mob," as Doddr. renders; but the *popular assembly*; a signification frequent in Thucyd., Xenoph., and the best writers.

6. ἔσυχον.] This is to be taken like *εἰλκυσαν* at xvi. 19, where see Note. Πολιτάρχας, "the city magistrates;" a later form, for *πολιτάρχους*, which is found in Æneas Poliorc. C. 26.

— τὴν οἶκ. ἀναστατώναντες] This expression is to be taken in a *popular* sense, and not to be too rigorously interpreted. *Ἀναστ.* is a word only found elsewhere in the LXX. It is for *ἀναστατῶν ποιήσαντες*.

7. ὑποδέδεκαί] "has received as guests and friends." So in Luke xix. 6. James ii. 25, and often in the Classical writers. It is for *δέχεσθαι ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον*.

9. καὶ λαβ. τὸ ἱκανόν.] Τὸ ἱκανὸν λαβεῖν is a translation of the Latin law phrase *satisfactionem accipere*,

p Isa. 34. 16.
Luke 16. 29.
John 5. 38.

q 1 Thess. 2. 4.

r Infra 18. 5.

τὴν συναγωγὴν τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἀπήεσαν. Ὅτιοι δὲ ἦσαν εὐγενέστεροι 11
τῶν ἐν Θεσσαλονικίᾳ· οἵτινες ἐδέξαντο τὸν λόγον μετὰ πάσης προθυ-
μίας, τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν ἀνακρίνοντες τὰς γραμὰς, εἰ ἔχοι ταῦτα οὕτως.
Πολλοὶ μὲν οὖν ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐπίστευσαν, καὶ τῶν Ἑλληνίδων γυναικῶν τῶν 12
εὐσχημόνων, καὶ ἀνδρῶν οὐκ ὀλίγοι. Ὡς δὲ ἐγνώσαν οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς 13
Θεσσαλονικῆς Ἰουδαῖοι, οἱ καὶ ἐν τῇ Βεροίᾳ κατηγγέλη ὑπὸ τοῦ Παύ-
λου ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἦλθον κακῆ σαλεύοντες τοὺς ὄχλους. Εὐθὺς 14
δὲ τότε τὸν Παῦλον ἐξαπέστειλαν οἱ ἀδελφοὶ πορεύεσθαι ὡς ἐπὶ τὴν
θάλασσαν· ὑπέμενον δὲ ὁ τε Σίλας καὶ ὁ Τιμόθεος ἐκεῖ. Ὅι δὲ 15
καθιστῶντες τὸν Παῦλον, ἤγαγον αὐτὸν ἕως Ἀθηνῶν· καὶ λαβόντες
ἐντολὴν πρὸς τὸν Σίλαν καὶ Τιμόθεον, ἵνα ὡς τάχιστα ἐλθῶσι πρὸς
αὐτὸν, ἐξήεσαν.

Ἐν δὲ ταῖς Ἀθήναις ἐκδεχομένου αὐτοῦ τοῦ Παύλου, παρωζύνητο 16
τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ θεωροῦντι κατείδωλον οὔσαν τὴν πόλιν.

to take surety, the opposite of which is *καὶνὸν δοῦναι*. The purport of the engagement probably was, that he would send away Paul and Silas forthwith, and would undertake to keep the peace.

11. *εὐγενέστεροι*.] Not more noble (for the men, we may suppose, were but tradesmen), but more ingenuous and well-disposed. So the best of the later Commentators take the word; and they adduce examples of this sense, which occurs chiefly in the later writers. So Philo de Nobil. p. 904. Ἐπεὶ δὲ τοιῦν ἡ εὐγένεια κεκαθαμένης διανοίας καὶ καθαρῶσις τελείως κλήρος οἰκίης, μόνους χρῆ λέγειν εὐγενεῖς τοὺς σώφρανας καὶ δικαίους. Perhaps, however, both significations may be included, viz. the better sort of persons (more respectable), and better disposed. And so Chrys. seems to have taken the word when he explains *ἐπιεικτέροι*. Thus Thucyd. viii. 93. ἀνθρώπους ἐπιεικεῖς, where I have fully explained the idiom.

— τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν.] The Article would seem to have no force, and is omitted in several MSS. It must, however, be retained; since we may better account for its omission than for its insertion. To account for its being used here, it is proper to bear in mind, that καθ' ἡμέραν is often used with the Article for the adjective *ἡμερινοί*. The substantive is generally expressed, but sometimes omitted, and left to be supplied from the context, or the subject-matter. Here *ἔθος* may be supplied, and the common ellip. of *κατὰ* supposed. Thus the sense will be, “in their daily habits of life;” equivalent to the Thucydidean *τὸν καθ' ἡμέραν βίον*, or the Æschinæan *τὴν καθ' ἡμέραν διαίταν*. And so the best writers say τὸ καθ' ἡμέρ, “*quantum ad me attinet*.”

— ἀνακρίνοντες.] This is well explained by Chrys. ἀνερευνῶντες. The *ἀνα* is intensive, and this sense of *κρίνω* springs from that primitive sense to separate, to sift the corn from the chaff, and, metaphorically, to sift out any thing, by separating truth from falsehood, or right from wrong.

12. τῶν εὐσχ.] See Note on xiii. 50. The word belongs both to *γυναικῶν* and to *ἀνδρῶν*.

13. σαλεύοντες] “agitating,” from *σάλοσ*, the *surge of the sea*. The Classical writers have many passages where political turbulence is compared to the tossing of a tempestuous sea. See Soph. *Ed. Tyr.* 25.

14. πορ. ὡς ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν.] Markl. asks to what sea? and would read *Θεσσαλίαν*. His query,

however, may be satisfactorily answered. In the case of places situated, like Berea, between two seas, to go to the sea must denote to the nearest sea; and if embarkation for a voyage be implied, the nearest sea-port may be supposed. That, in the present case, was *Pydna*. Thus in a kindred passage of Thucyd. i. 137, Admetus, to remove Themistocles out of the reach of those who were seeking his life, sends him ἐπὶ τὴν ἑρθερα θάλασσαν, which must mean the Ægean; and as we afterwards learn, to Pydna. But had τὴν θάλασσαν been written, the *Adriatic* must have been understood.

The ὡς ἐπὶ our English Translators render “as if;” or “as it were;” which compels them to suppose that this going to the sea was only a stratagem to deceive his enemies; who might suppose he was taking ship, when he, in fact, meant to go to his destination by land. The ὡς, however, is but a slender foundation on which to erect such a notion. There can be no doubt but that the two words ὡς ἐπὶ are to be taken together, and understood, as in many passages of the Classical writers cited by the Commentators (e. gr. Pausan. *καταβάτων ὡς ἐπὶ θάλασσαν*, to which I could add others from Thucyd.) where the ὡς is pleonastic. Or the sense may be *unto*, i. e. down to. And so ἐπὶ τὴν θάλα in Thucyd. vi. 66.

15. καθιστῶντες is not (as Kuin. imagines) for οἱ προπέμποντες, but for *κατάγοντες*, as in a kindred passage at ix. 39. *κατήγαγον αὐτὸν εἰς κ*. The present term, however, is equally correct. So Thucyd. iv. 78. *κατίστησαν* (scil. οἱ ἀγοντες) αὐτὸν εἰς Διον. where I have adduced examples from Xenoph., Plutarch, and Jambl. The construction requires an *εἰς*, or *ἐπὶ*, or *δὲ*, as in the earliest example of this idiom, Hom. Od. v. 274. *ἀγ. Πύλονε. Wets.*, however, cites an example of *μέχρι* from Arrian, which comes near to the *εἰς* of Luke.

16. ἐν αὐτῷ.] This is added, by a Hebraism, as in Dan. vii. 15. “I was grieved in my spirit in the midst of my body;” which passage was perhaps in St. Luke’s mind.

— κατείδωλον] “full of idols.” This force of *κατὰ* is found in many words, as *κατάδένδρος*, *κατάμπελος*, &c. With respect to the *fact*, it is fully established and copiously illustrated by Wets.; e. gr. Pausanias says, that Athens had more images than all the rest of Greece; and Petronius tells us, “it was easier to find there a God than a man.”

17^a Διελέγετο μὲν οὖν ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις καὶ τοῖς σεβασμένοις, ^aSupra ver. 4.
καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀγορῇ κατὰ πᾶσαν ἡμέραν πρὸς τοὺς πραιτυρχάνοντας.

18 Τινὲς δὲ τῶν Ἐπικουρείων καὶ τῶν Στωϊκῶν φιλοσόφων συνέβυλλον αὐ-
τῷ· καὶ τινες ἔλεγον· Τί ἂν θέλοι ὁ σπερμολόγος οὗτος λέγειν; οἱ
δὲ· Ἐξῶν δαιμονίων δοκεῖ καταγγελεύς εἶναι. ὅτι τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ τὴν

To the passages of Pausan., Strabo, and Lucian, cited by Wets., I add Thucyd. ii. 33. *θεσταῖς δεῖτε ἡσίοις νομίζοντες*, where see my note.

17. *διελέγετο* — τοῖς Ἰ. κ.] See Mr. Townsend's remarks, in loco, on St. Paul's plan of preaching; in which he shows the Apostle's wisdom in varying his manner of address according to the persons to whom he spoke, and the circumstances in which he was placed, — and this with especial reference to his conduct at Athens — which was a model to all Christian missionaries to foreign lands. See also the learned dissertations by Olearius and Schlosser, *de Gestis Pauli in Urbe Athen.* in vol. xiii. p. 661. seqq.

— τῇ ἀγορῇ.] There were many market-places, but the most considerable were the Ceramicus, or *old*, and the Forum Eretricum, or *New Forum*: the former of which is supposed to be the one here meant by Ikenius and Schleus., the latter by Kuin. and most Commentators. And that this was by far the most frequented, being in the most thickly inhabited part of the city, confirms the latter opinion.

— τοὺς παρατ.] “those whom he might happen to meet with.” The Forum was best adapted to his purpose, because it was the place where people met for conversation. And from the citations of Wets. it appears, that that was the place where Socrates, and many other Philosophers, had been accustomed to hold their discussions.

18. Ἐπικουρείων καὶ τῶν Στ.] The Epicureans were practically *Atheists*, — since they held that the world was neither created by God, nor under the direction of his Providence. *Pleasure* they accounted the *summum bonum*, and *virtue* to be practised only for the sake of pleasure, not for its own sake. They maintained that the soul was material, like the body, and would perish with it, leaving nothing to be either hoped or feared after death. As to the *Stoics*, they did, indeed, believe in the *existence of a God*, but held such chimerical notions of his nature, attributes, and providence, as rendered that belief almost nugatory. They maintained, that both God and man were bound by a *necessitas fatalis*; that the wise man yielded in no respect to God; of whom they believed that his nature was *fire*, and diffused throughout the world. On the condition of the soul after death, and on the existence of a state of rewards and punishments, they varied in opinion; but all denied the *immortality* of a future state. Nay, some thought that, sooner or later, the soul merged in the celestial fire of the Deity. Thus while the former denied the existence, or at least providence, of God; the latter, though professing to believe both, — yet, by ascribing all human events to fate, destroyed the foundation of all religion as much as the former. It is obvious that *both* the above systems were as far as possible removed from the doctrines of Christianity; and therefore it is no wonder that the latter should have been both unaccountable and unacceptable to these Philosophers. There were, besides, two other sects,

the *Platonists*, and the *Peripatetics*, the latter of whom probably came not near Paul, since their places of discussion were far removed. The opinions of the former made far nearer approaches than those of the other sects to the doctrines of Christianity; and these probably formed the far greater part of those who gave a qualified approbation of Paul's doctrines, by proposing to “hear him again” on the subject of the immortality of the soul.

— σπερμολόγος.] The word was used *properly* of small birds (*sparrows*, &c.), which live by picking up scattered seeds; but *metaphorically*, to denote those *raupers*, who frequented the market-places, and lived by picking up any scattered or refuse produce; and generally, *persons of abject condition* without any certain means of support. Again, as the tribes of small birds which live by picking up seeds are especially garrulous, — the word came to denote a *prater*; and some Commentators think that is the sense here. But probably *both* senses may be intended, viz. “an insignificant babbler.”

— ἔξῶν δαιμ. καταγγ.] We are not here to understand *Gods* in the full sense of the term. It has been proved by the Commentators cited in Recens. Synop. (to whose matter I have subjoined much that is important from Max. Tyr., Jambl., Plutarch, Liban., Diog. Laert., Dion. Halic., Pindar, and others), that there was properly a *distinction* (though not always observed), between *θεοὶ* and *δαίμονες*, by which the former denoted Jupiter and the other Gods *by origin* — the latter those who had *become* so, though originally men. These, according to some, included the *heroes*, as Hercules; though others made a *third class* of those. The above, then, were all the classes which, properly speaking, were reckoned as *Divinities*. But the Pagan Theology comprehended another order of beings, called *δαίμονια*, holding the midway between *divinities* and *mere men*, who were supposed to act as *mediators* between God and men, by revealing the Divine will, and helping the imbecility of man. One of these was said by Socrates to visit him; on which, Xenoph. Mem. i. 1, 2. tells us, was founded the charge against him of introducing *κατὰ δαίμονια*, almost the same expression as that used of St. Paul. Some eminent Commentators think that the Athenians meant by this to express that the place claimed by Paul for Jesus, was in this last class. But it is plain that what they heard the Apostle say of Jesus would give them a notion of a Being who was at least a *δαίμων*, and that one of the higher order. Nay there is great reason to believe that *δαίμωνιον* (and even *θεός*, as is plain from the charge being elsewhere worded as *τὸ περὶ Θεῶν καινοσημεῖν*) was sometimes used in the sense of *δαίμων*, as in the above cited passage of Xenoph. and those of Diog. Laert., Dio Cass., Ælian, and Josephus, cited by Wets., where the expressions *κατὰ δαίμονια εἰσηγγέσθαι*, or *εἰσφέρειν*, and *ἔξῶν δαιμόνας εἰσάγειν* are equivalent.

— τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ τὴν ἀνάστ.] Many eminent Interpreters, ancient and modern, as Chrys., Æcumen.,

ἀνάστασιν αὐτοῖς εὐηγγελίζετο. ἐπιλαβόμενοι τε αὐτοῦ, ἐπὶ τὸν Ἄρειον 19
 πάγον ἤγαγον λέγοντες· Δυνάμεθα γινῶναι, τίς ἢ καινὴ αὕτη ἢ ὑπὸ
 σοῦ λαλουμένη διδασχῆ; ξενίζοντα γάρ τινα εἰσφέρεις εἰς τὰς ἀκοὰς 20
 ἡμῶν· βουλόμεθα οὖν γινῶναι, τί ἂν θέλοι ταῦτα εἶναι. Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ 21
 πάντες καὶ οἱ ἐπιδημοῦντες ξένοι εἰς οὐδὲν ἕτερον εὐκαίρουν, ἢ λέγειν
 τὶ καὶ ἀκούειν καινότερον.

Selden, Hamm., Spencer, Cudworth, Warburton, Valckn., and Doddr., take ἀνάστ. (written Ἀνάστα-σιν) as the name of a new Goddess. And certainly there is not a little to urge in favour of that view, on which see Rec. Syn., and especially Cudworth's Intellectual Syst. B. I. ch. xxxiii., who shows at large, that the heathens were accustomed to deify not only virtues and vices, but many of the powers of nature. Yet the common interpretation, which is strenuously maintained by Bentley, bears in its simplicity the stamp of truth; the sense being, "preached Jesus, and the resurrection of the dead through Him;" He being the first fruits of those that slept. This, too, seems required by v. 31. ἀναστήσας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν. and 32. ἀκούσαντες ἀνάστασιν τῶν νεκρῶν. As to the use just before of the plural δαιμόνια, it may readily be accounted for from an idiom of frequent occurrence in all languages, and mostly used when a charge is made against any one. Thus it may be considered as said *per hyperbolen*. It is not, however, improbable that they might so far mistake St. Paul, as to suppose that he preached two Gods, i. e. God, and Jesus Christ. The God (namely, Jehovah) preached by him, and avowedly different from the Jupiter of the Athenians, might very well be esteemed by them a new and foreign God.

19. ἐπιλαβόμενοι αὐτοῦ.] Commentators are not agreed whether this expression is to be regarded as importing *violence*, or *not*. There are examples in the N. T. of both uses. The former (which is supported by the ancient Versions, and is adopted by many Commentators), is most agreeable to the context. And it is countenanced by the *fact*, — that the Areopagus was a tribunal for the trial of impiety, such as the introducing of the worship of foreign deities. See a Dissertation of Scheidius de Areopago, and p. 674. seqq. of vol. xiii. of the Critici Sacri. Yet, after all, it may be doubted whether there was any thing of *apprehension*, properly so called, — since there is no appearance of any *regular trial* before the court of Areopagus. There is, indeed, reason to think, that this court retained but a shadow of its ancient consequence, — and (like the *Inquisition* in the present day) had abated much of its ancient severity in matters of religion, — otherwise foreign deities would not have been so worshipped as they then were at Athens. A stronger proof of which cannot be imagined than the following passage of Aristophl. Horæ, cited by Athen. L. ix. p. 372., where, after speaking of the abundance of every kind of produce supplied by the season, in such a manner that whatever was wanted could be had at any season, and one could scarcely tell what time of the year it was, this bounty of nature and the Gods is ascribed by a speaker (I imagine, the Horæ personified) to the piety of the Athenians; Τοῦτοις ὑπάρχει τιπὲρ ἐπειδὴ τοῦ Θεοῦς σέβουσιν· Τοῦ τοῦ is replied by one who stigmatizes the fondness of the Athenians for foreign superstitions, Ἀπέλαυσαν ἄρα σοῦ βίττις ἡμᾶς. Ὡς σὺ φῆς·

τὶ ἢ τὶ Αἴγυπτον αὐτῶν τὴν πόλιν πεποιήκας ἀντ' Ἀθηναίων. (where the *confessed* corruption, which defied the endeavours of Brunck and others, may be easily removed, by simply, for τὶ ἢ τὶ, reading Τητί; Quid enim, what then?) Αἴγυπτον αὐτῶν τὴν πόλιν πεποιήκασ' (for πεποιήκασι) ἀντ' Ἀθ. The form τητίδη often occurs in Aristophanes; and the error in question might easily arise. By saying that they had made an *Egypt* of Athens, it is meant, they had filled it as full of Gods. And of *Egypt* it was said, there one might sooner find a God than a man. But to return, — taken in conjunction with the preceding verse, the words, I conceive, suggest rather a *tumultuary* proceeding, on the part of the two classes of persons just before mentioned, than a *regular trial*. They, it should seem, thought proper to call Paul to a public account; and considered no place so proper as the hill of judgment called Areopagus. Thus the words just after, δυνάμεθα γινῶναι; (with which Wets. aptly compares from Plautus "possum scire, quo profectus, cujus sis, aut quid veneris?") as also βουλόμεθα γινῶναι. Paul, too, does not address them as *judges*, nor seek any justification of his conduct, but as *philosophers*. If, then, any of them were, as was Dionysius, *Areopagites*, they were there not sitting *ex officio*, but as private individuals. Perhaps this may account for the little seriousness or ceremony which the Apostle experienced.

— δυνάμεθα γινῶναι.] This is Hellenistic Greek; both in the use of δύνασθαι for "to be permitted," and in the not prefixing some particle of interrogation.

20. ξενίζοντα.] Literally, "things which strike us with surprise." The use of ἀκοὰς in the plural is thought to be rarely found out of the N. T. Yet I have in Recens. Synop. adduced examples from Euripides, Ælian, Herodian, Polyb., and Themist.

21. οἱ ἐπιδημοῦντες ξένοι.] The distinction between the ἀστοὶ and ξένοι was at Athens very marked. The ἀστοὶ considered themselves as alone possessing any rank; while all the rest were included indiscriminately under the name ξένοι. They called themselves the ἀστροθῆνες, or first inhabitants: the rest they styled ἐπίλυτες, or *new comers*. There was, however, a class between one and the other, called μέτοικοι, *sojourners*, who had a sort of *jus civitatis*. Now it has been debated whether by οἱ ἐπίδ. ξένοι are to be understood all the ξένοι, or only the μέτοικοι, or both of them. Kypke and Kuin. adopt the *second* view; and rightly; for though ξένων might include both (so Thucyd. ii. 36. πῶν ἑμῶν καὶ ἀστρον καὶ ξένων), yet since ἐπίδμ. is here added; and as the difference between the μέτοικοι and the ξένοι was, that the former were regular residents of the city, and accordingly obliged to take the oath of allegiance, and participate in military service: the latter were merely *sojourners* drawn thither by business and pleasure.

— εἰς οὐδὲν ἕτερον εὐκαίρουν] nulli rei magis vaca-

22 Σταθεὶς δὲ ὁ Παῦλος ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ Ἀρείου πάγου, ἔφη· Ἄνδρες
 23 Ἀθηναῖοι, κατὰ πάντα ὡς δεισιδαιμονεστέρους ὑμᾶς θεωρῶ. Διερχό-
 μενος γὰρ καὶ ἀναθεωρῶν τὰ σεβάσματα ὑμῶν, εἶπον καὶ βωμῶν ἐν ᾗ
 ἐπεεῖγαπτο· Αἴνωστον Θεῶν. Ὅν οὖν ἀγνοοῦντες εὐσεβεῖτε, τοῦ-

bant. Εὐκαίρ. is for σχολάζειν, by a use confined to the later writers. The next words are graphic, and point at the chief traits of the Athenians' *garrulity* and *rage for novelty*, on which see many passages from the Classical writers in Recens. Synop. At Athens there were places called *λεσχάι*, appropriated to the reception of news-mongers.

22. In this brief but pithy address (which would doubtless have been longer, had it not been broken off by the scoffs of some, and the listlessness and abrupt departure of others) the Apostle wisely accommodates himself to the circumstances of his hearers. After a complimentary *exordium*, such as was usual in publicly addressing the Athenians, as also by a *præoccupatio benevolentia* frequent in the ancient Orators, he notices the *occasion* which led to his addressing them; and shows, that it is his desire to enable them to satisfy their wish of worshipping even *unknown gods*, by pointing out that *great Being* (to them hitherto unknown) who is the *ONLY AND THE TRUE GOD*; some of whose chief attributes, and the various benefits he hath wrought, Paul then proceeds to recount. From thence he infers the *duty* incumbent on God's creatures, of seeking, i. e. *worshipping* Him; at the same time noticing certain erroneous modes thereof, which had originated in utter ignorance of his true nature. This introduces an exhortation to *abandon* these errors, fortified by an announcement of a future day of judgment, and punishment for all wilful disobedience to the will of God. Now this implied a present state of accountableness, and the duty of guiding themselves by the light of that Gospel, which God had been pleased to reveal by Jesus Christ.

— *δεισιδαιμονεστέρους.*] This is commonly understood to mean "too superstitious." But that sense (formed on the Vulgate *superstitiosiores*) cannot by any means be defended. Neither, I apprehend, can that assigned by Dr. Hales, "too much addicted to the worship of *dæmons*." For, in either case, it were admitting (what surely could not be supposed) that there was a degree of superstition that was *good*. For the same reason, the sense ascribed by Calvin, Beza, Campb., and Newc., "somewhat too religious," cannot be admitted; for surely no one can be *too religious*. The most eminent Expositors for the last century have been of opinion that *δεισιδ.* is here employed in the *good* acceptation, to denote "very religious," i. e. attentive to religion [as far as they understood it]. That the expression will bear this sense, has been established by a multitude of proofs. And that the *Athenians* were very attentive to religious observances, has been proved on the testimonies of the ancient writers of every kind — Dramatists, Historians, and Philosophers; and has been evinced especially by Bishop Warburton in his *Divine Legation*, vol. ii. p. 6 — 8. See Note supra verse 19. That such is the sense intended in the present passage, is pretty evident from the *air of the context*, and will appear by a consideration of the *circumstances* in which the Apostle was then placed. To a people like the Athenians, so particularly observant of all the rules of courtesy on such

occasions of public address, it was surely far more probable that the Apostle (with that discretion which ever attempered his zeal) should here choose to commence with the language of conciliation rather than *abrupt rebuke*; which, indeed, would have been the more pointed, considering that it was customary for foreigners who had to address the people, to begin with paying some compliment to the place; a respect *due* to this city, as being the mother of arts and sciences. Nevertheless, we shall, perhaps, not err, if we suppose that St. Paul purposely selected the ambiguous term *δεισιδ.*, because he could not conscientiously use *εὐσεβής*; since the Gods whom they worshipped were, in his estimation, *dæmons*. So I Cor. x. 20. ὅτι ἂν θεοὶ τὰ ἔθνη δαιμονίου θεοί, καὶ οὐ θεοί. He commends their *worshipping*; but shows that they "worship" they "know not what" (John iv. 22.), meaning, that they are very religious in their way. That the comparative here means *very*, and not *too*, is plain from the words following. And this view of the sense is supported by the authority of the Pesch. Syriac Version. The *ὡς* does not mean *quasi*, as some take it: and so far from its abating (as Campb. supposes) the import of the comparative, it is *intensive*; as it always is, either when the comparative is put for the superlative, or when, as here, it notes a *high* degree of the positive.

23. τὰ σεβάσματα ἴ. Not *devotions*, but (as Frasm., Koppe, Schleus., and Kuin. render) the objects of your worship, as shown in temples, altars, images, sacrifices, &c.

— *ἀγνώστῳ Θεῶ.*] These words have occasioned no little perplexity to biblical interpreters. The difficulty hinges on *this* — that, although we find from Pausan. i. 1, v. 14, and Philostr. Vit. Ap. vi. 3, that there were at Athens altars inscribed "to unknown *Gods*," yet no passage is adduced which makes mention of any altar "to an unknown *God*." Now Jerome, and others would remove this difficulty, by supposing, that the inscription in question was, Ἄγνωστοι Θεοί, or rather Θεοί Ἀσίας καὶ Εὐρώπης· καὶ Λιβύης Θεοί ἀγνώστοι καὶ ἕλνοι. But, as Bp. Middl. observes, "that is a most improbable supposition; and, indeed, the manner in which the inscription is introduced makes it incredible that St. Paul could intend merely a remote or vague allusion." Indeed *thus* (as Kuin. observes) the whole force of the Apostle's argument would be taken away, nay, his *assertion* would not be true. Therefore, "that the altar (as Middl. remarks) was inscribed simply Ἄγνωστῳ Θεῶ, must either be conceded, or all inquiry will be in vain." And, as Baronius and Wonna have observed, "though there might be *several* altars at Athens and elsewhere inscribed to *unknown Gods* generally, or to the *unknown Gods* of any particular part of the world, yet that there might occasionally be one inscribed to *one* of them, is extremely probable." Bp. Middl., indeed, thinks that the words of the author of the *Philopatris* (apud Lucian) πῆ τὸν Ἄγνωστον τῶν ἐν Ἀθήναις, are decisive, that Ἄγνωστῳ Θεῶ, in the singular, was a *well-known* inscription. Now this *would*, indeed, be the case, if the *Philopatris* stood in the same circumstances as almost

t Gen. 1. 1.
2 Chron. 6. 30.
Psal. 33. 6.
& 124. 8.

τον ἐγὼ καταγγέλλω ὑμῖν. Ἐὸ Θεὸς ὁ ποιήσας τὸν κόσμον καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ, οὗτος οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς κύριος ὑπάρχων, οὐκ ἐν χειροποιή-

every other work of the Classical writers preserved to us. But, in fact, that tract (which was written, as Gesner has proved, not by *Lucian*, but by an imitator of his style and manner, who lived 200 years after him, in the time of the Emperor Julian, and who bore the same name) contains (as I can attest, after having carefully examined the whole for the purpose of knowing) little short of *twenty* passages, written with manifest allusion to various parts of the Scriptures, chiefly of the N. T. There can be no doubt, then, that the writer had the present passage in view (the article having the use *κατ' ἔξοχην*, to denote the *well-known*), and consequently *his* testimony will only serve to prove, (what, however, is of some consequence) that the *singular* number was used by St. Paul. But though no other writer seems to have recorded the existence of any altar so inscribed, yet the thing has *probability* to support it: and no argument from the *silence* of authors can be drawn to the discredit of any writer of unimpeached integrity.

The question, however, as Bp Middl. observes, is, "was this inscription meant to be applied to *one* of a possible multitude, as if we should impute any kindness or any injury to an unknown benefactor, or enemy,—or was it meant to be significant of the *one true God*?" He maintains that the latter opinion (though the general one) is ungrounded. It involves, he thinks, a great improbability, that an inscription so offensive to a Polytheistical people could have been tolerated. Nay, he affirms that it is inconsistent with the propriety of the Article; and maintains that the *omission of the Article*, the *position of the words*, as also the rules of ordinary language and the custom of inscriptions, alike require that the words should be rendered "to an unknown God," or "to a God unknown." He asserts that the discourse of the Apostle is, even according to that way of taking *ἀγνώστῳ*, very pertinent; and that the mention of *any* unknown Deity gave him a sufficient handle for the purpose in question. But, on the supposition that the sense is, "to an unknown God," we are encountered with the difficulty, how it could happen that an altar should have been so inscribed. The best solution of which is, that it had been erected by the Athenian people, in acknowledgment of some signal benefit received by the city at large; which seemed attributable to *some* God, though to *whom* was uncertain. If this were the case, there would be little difficulty in supposing, (with Chrys., Theophyl., and Isidore, of the ancients, and several learned moderns), that the benefit in question was the removal of the Pestilence, which almost depopulated the city, so finely described by Thucydides. And this is thought to be proved by Diogenes Laert. i. 10. Yet (waiving the *fabulousness* of the story) we may observe that he says nothing about an *unknown* God, but represents the altars as erected Θεῷ προσήκοντι. And so far from being inscribed Θεῷ ἀγνώστῳ, he says they were ἀνόνομοι, *without any inscription*. And to suppose that the one at Athens here meant had such an inscription, is far too hypothetical to be admitted. Not to say that, from the words of Diogenes, it seems very unlikely that there should have been one at Athens. That there were altars at Athens inscribed Θεοῖς ἀγνώστοις καὶ ξένοις, is

nothing to the present purpose; since the union of *ξένοις* with *ἀγνώστοις* alters the allusion in *ἀγν.*, and the passage merely attests that the Athenians were much attached to foreign superstitions. So Strabo L. x. p. 472. Falc. observes: Ἀθηναῖοι δ' ὥσπερ περὶ τὰ ἄλλα φιλοξενούντες διατελοῦσιν, οὕτως περὶ τοὺς Θεοὺς· πολλὰ γὰρ τῶν ξενικῶν ἱερῶν παρεδίξαντο. If it be asked, to *whom*, then, was the altar in question inscribed? I answer, doubtless, to the one true God, the Creator and Lord of all things: which, indeed, seems to be required by the *course of argument* in the passage, as thus stated by *Wonna*, in a Dissertation on the present subject, vol. ii. p. 464 of the *Thesaurus Theolog. Philol.*; "Quemcunque Deum Apostolus Atheniensibus annuntiavit, is est verus Deus. Sed quem Deum Athenienses ignorantes coluerunt, eique aram inscripserunt, est is Deus, quem Apostolus Atheniensibus annuntiavit. E. Is Deus, quem Athenienses ignorantes coluerunt, eique aram inscripserunt, est verus Deus. Major et Minor ex textu liquido constant." This, he shows, was also the opinion of Clemens Alex. and Augustine, of the ancient Commentators; and of the modern ones, Baronius, Menochius, and Heinsius. To which names may be added, as *instar omnium*, *Cudworth*, *Intell. System. i. 4. 13.* From what he says, and especially from what is adduced by Bp. Warburton, in *Sect. 4. L. ii.* of his *Divine Legation*, it is plain that the ancient philosophers, both of Egypt, Greece, and Rome, were well acquainted with the doctrine of the *Unity* of the Godhead, to inculcate which was the grand end of the *Mysteries*, where (as he has shown) the errors of Polytheism were detected, and the doctrine of the Unity taught and explained.

With respect to the *term* here applied to the Deity, *ἀγνώστος*, it appears, from what is said by *Cudworth* and *Warburton*, to have been by no means unusual. So *Damascius* (See *Cudworth*, *Intell. Syst. i. 4. 13.*), says, the Egyptian Philosophers of his time had found in the writings of the ancients that they held *one principle* of all things, and worshipped it under the name of the *Unknown Darkness*. So also in the celebrated Saitic inscription: *I am all that was, is, and shall be: and my VEIL HATH NO MAN UNCOVERED.* And the Deity might well be so called, because He is not only *invisible* (hence the Egyptian appellation of the Deity, *HAMMIM*, *invisible*), but, in respect of his nature and essence, *incorporeal*, being, as *Josephus Contr. Ap.* (cited by *Cudworth*) says, *δυνάμει μόνον ἡμῖν γινώσκος, ὁποῖος δὲ κατὰ οὐσίαν ἀγνώστος*. As to the objection urged by Bp. Middl., that thus Θεῷ ἀγνώστῳ would here have been written, it has very little force; and a mere question of *position* as respects one writing in a foreign language, involves too minute a criticism to stand in the way of a sense excellent in itself, and demanded by the context. Not to say, that the *inscription* might have Θεῷ ἀγνώστῳ, and St. Paul might thus alter it, whether inadvertently, or to give greater prominence to the word on which his argument was meant to rest. Or even St. Luke might alter its position. Moreover, in the *Pesch. Syr. Version* we have *hidden*, from the Chaldee *to hide*. And, besides this, the Translator sub-

25 τοις ναοῖς κατοικεῖ, ἡ οὐδὲ ὑπὸ χειρῶν ἀνθρώπων θεραπεύεται προσ- & 146. 8.
 δόμενος τινός, αὐτὸς διδούς πᾶσι ζωὴν καὶ προὐν καὶ τὰ πάντα. supra 7. 48.
 26 ἡ ἐποίησέ τε ἐξ ἐνός αἵματος πᾶν ἔθνος ἀνθρώπων κατοικεῖν ἐπὶ πᾶν & 14. 15.
 τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γῆς, ὀρίσας * προσεταιγμένους καιροῦς, καὶ τὰς ὁρο- Rev. 14. 7.
 27 θεσίας τῆς κατοικίας αὐτῶν· ζητεῖν τὸν Κύριον, εἰ ἴσῃ γε ψηλαφή- u Gen. 2. 7.
 σιαν αὐτὸν καὶ εὐροῖεν· καίτοιγε οὐ μαχρὸν ἀπὸ ἐνός ἐκάστου ἡμῶν Psal. 50. 3.
 28 ὑπάρχοντα. ἐν αὐτῷ γὰρ ζῶμεν καὶ κινούμεθα καὶ ἐσμέν· ὡς καὶ z Deut. 32. 8.

joins the } emphatic (corresponding to the Greek article) to both words; which proves at least that he must have understood the expression of the *one* true God. As to the argument that the inscription would have been too offensive to Polytheists to be *allowed*, it is of no force; for it is well known how tolerant the people of Athens then were; and we may suppose that the inscription was worded by the same person or persons who erected the altar (doubtless, philosophers, who had been initiated in the greater Mysteries), and that with such discreet ambiguity, by the omission of the article, as to leave it uncertain whether it was meant to express *one* out of many, or the *one alone true God*.

— ὃν ἀγνοοῦντες ἐβ. Render, “whom ye worship without knowing him.”

24. The Apostle now proceeds to the *true nature and worship* of the Deity. It is justly observed that this seemingly plain statement of the truth is so skilfully managed, as to be directed against the irreligious scepticism of the philosophers and higher ranks, as well as the gross superstition of the common people. On the sentiment *οὐκ ἐν χειροποιήτοις*, &c. see vii. 43. and Note.

25. *οὐ θεραπεύεται* [“is not served or ministered unto by the hands of men;” i. e. by temples, sacrifices, &c. This is the primary sense of *θεραπέω*. On which see my note on Thucyd. ii. 51. No. 5. At *προσδόμενος* there may seem to be an ellip. of *ὡς*. But, in fact, the apposition *includes* that sense. Wets. notices the consummate prudence by which the Apostle so tempers his discourse, as, at one time, to contest on the side of the vulgar against the philosophers at large; and, at another time, with the philosophers against both. This he illustrates with references to the opinions of the Stoics and Epicureans (on which see Note supra v. 13), and of the common people respectively. With the *sentiment* Wets. and Kypke compare several similar ones from the Philosophers; chiefly the later ones, who may be supposed to have profited by the Scriptures. So Hierocles, p. 25. *ὅστις τιμᾷ τὸν Θεὸν ὡς προσδόμενον*, &c. The Apostle here seems to have had in view 3 Macc. ii. 9.

For *τὰ πάντα* many MSS. have *κατὰ τὰ πάντα*, which was preferred by Wets. and edited by Math., but without reason. For the authority of MSS. is very slender in so minute a variation. And it is very probable that the *κατὰ* arose, as often, from the juxta-position of *καὶ* and *τὰ*. Besides, the sense yielded by *κατὰ τὰ πάντα* is very unsatisfactory; whereas, that of *καὶ τὰ πάντα* is extremely apposite, viz. “all things necessary to the sustaining of life,” and which are particularized in a similar passage at xiv. 17.

26. *αἵματος* “race.” See Note on John i. 13. Wets. compares Anthol. iii. 31. 6. Ἄπει — ἐιδε

αἵματος. and Virg. *sanguine* ab uno. With respect to the *sentiment*, by thus tracing back the origin of mankind, the Apostle perhaps meant to check the vanity of the Athenians, who maintained that they were *ἀποχθόνους* and *γενεαίς*. See my Note on Thucyd. i. 2. & ii. 36. The words *ὀρίσας — κατοικίας αὐτῶν* may be rendered, “having appointed certain determinate periods [for their inhabiting] and the boundaries of the regions they should inhabit.” There seems a reference to the records of the early colonization and settling of the earth, in the Books of Moses. For Vulg. *προτ.* many MSS. and early Edd. have *προστ.*, which is adopted by almost every Editor from Beng. and Wets. to Vater.

27. The Apostle now suggests the grand *design of man's creation*; namely, *ζητεῖν τὸν Κύριον*, to worship his Maker. See the noble Hymn of Cleanthes, given entire in Recens. Synop.

— *εἰ ἄρα γε ψηλ. &c.*] These words are exegetical of the foregoing; and the sense is, [to try] if indeed they could, by the glimmering light of reason, “feel out and find him.” A Hendiadys for *εἰ ψηλαφῆσαντες εὐροῖεν*, if by investigating they could find out His attributes, will, &c. The Apostle may here have had in mind a passage of Plato Phæd. § 47, where he censures those who *feel after God in the dark*, by resting in second causes, without carrying up their inquiries to that *first cause*; and consequently worshipping the creature rather than the Creator. This passage of Plato is well rendered and illustrated by Dr. Hales, iii. 526. as follows: “They are unable to distinguish, that it is one thing to be the [secondary or immediate] cause of the existence of something, and another to be THAT [PRIMARY] CAUSE, without which the other could not be a cause at all. In this respect the many [rather *multitude*, Ed.] seem to be groping, as it were, in darkness (*ψηλαφῶντες ὡς ἐν σκότει*), using others' eyes rather than their own; so as to denominate [the secondary] the CAUSE ITSELF.” Here I would remark, that the version, “using others' eyes rather than their own,” misrepresents the sense intended, being founded on the old and corrupt reading *ὄμματι*, instead of what is undoubtedly the true one, *ὀνόματι*, which has been restored by Fischer, and certainly is required in order to make the words following apposite. The last words, *ὡς αἴτιον αὐτὸ προσγοροῦν* ought rather to have been rendered, “so as to call it a *cause* [whereas it is only that without which the real or actual cause τὸ αἴτιον τῷ ὄντι could not have existed].”

28. *ἐν αὐτῷ — ἐσμέν.*] Many here recognize a *climax*. But it rather seems to be a strong mode of expression, for “To Him we owe life and every faculty connected with it — by Him we are what we are.” The link in the chain of reasoning which connects this verse with the last clause of the preceding, is well pointed out by Dr. Hales.

τινες τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς ποιητῶν εἰρήκασι· Τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος
 ἔσμεν. Ὑ γένος οὖν ὑπάρχοντες τοῦ Θεοῦ, οὐκ ὀφείλομεν νομίζειν 29
 χρυσῷ ἢ ἀργύρῳ ἢ λίθῳ, χαράγματι τέχνης καὶ ἐνθυμίσεως ἀνθρώ-
 που, τὸ θεῖον εἶναι ὅμοιον. Ἐ τούς μὲν οὖν χρόνους τῆς ἀγνοίας 30
 ὑπεριδῶν ὁ Θεός, τανῦν παραγγέλλει τοῖς ἀνθρώποις πᾶσι πανταχοῦ
 μετανοεῖν· Ἐ διότι ἔστησεν ἡμέραν, ἐν ἣ ἡ μέλλει κρίνειν τὴν οἰκουμένην 31
 ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, ἐν ἀνδρὶ ᾧ ὤρισε, πίστιν παρασχὼν πᾶσιν, ἀναστήσας
 αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν. Ἀκούσαντες δὲ ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν οἱ μὲν ἐχλεύαζον, 32
 οἱ δὲ εἶπον· Ἀκουσόμεθά σου πάλιν περὶ τούτου. Καὶ οὕτως ὁ 33
 Παῦλος ἐξῆλθεν ἐκ μέσου αὐτῶν. Τινὲς δὲ ἄνδρες κολληθέντες αὐτῷ 34
 ἐπίστευσαν· ἐν οἷς καὶ Διονύσιος ὁ Ἀρεοπαγίτης, καὶ γυνὴ ὀνόματι
 Δάμαρις, καὶ ἕτεροι σὺν αὐτοῖς.

XVIII. META δὲ ταῦτα χωρισθεὶς ὁ Παῦλος ἐκ τῶν Ἀθηναίων 1
 ἦλθεν εἰς Κόρινθον· Ἐ καὶ εὗρών τινα Ἰουδαῖον ὀνόματι Ἀκύλαν, 2

— τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς π.] for τῶν ὑπετέρων π., of which Wets. cites an example from Longinus. Τοῦ γὰρ γένος ἔσμεν. These words occur both in Arat. Phæn. 5, and in a Hymn of Cleanthes on Jove v. 5, given at length in Recens. Synop. Similar sentiments are adduced from several other writers by the Commentators; as Pind. Nem. Od. σ. ἐν ἀνδρῶν, ἐν Θεῶν γένος, to which I have added an interesting passage of Apollonius Epist. 44, no doubt fabricated by Philostratus, and formed on an imitation of this passage.

29. γένος οὖν, &c.] Here the Apostle adduces the conclusion, that mankind are bound to worship God THEIR FATHER; and that not with idolatrous, but spiritual worship, as being a Spiritual Being (see John iv. 23 & 24), and not like images made by human art.

30, 31. The Apostle now points out the subject of his preaching—JESUS AND THE RESURRECTION; to attend to which he excites them by hope and by fear. To call forth their love of God, and hope in Him, he tells them that their past ignorance of His true nature and worship God was pleased to overlook, and excuse their evil deeds; but had now sent His Son (that Divine Teacher so ardently wished and longed for by the wisest philosophers) to teach men how to worship God aright, and to save them, upon condition of repentance, for what was past, and reformation for the future. To work on their fear of the Divine Majesty, he apprises them that if they did not listen to the Lord Jesus and his Gospel, they would incur condign punishment, at the general resurrection and subsequent judgment held by him.

— μετανοεῖν] i. e. to cease to do evil and learn to do well; true repentance implying reformation. See Note on Matt. iii. 2. On the nature of true repentance, and how accepted in the Gospel system, see Bp. Warburton's Works, vol. vi. p. 307.

31. ὁδοὶ ἔστησεν, &c.] q. d. "[And there is need that you should repent, and reform your lives] for you must give an account," &c. Ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ; i. e. in such strictness of justice as must exclude all mercy to the impenitent and unreformed.

Ἀνδρὶ is (as Ecumenius observes) spoken οἰκονομικῶς, denoting, the God-man Jesus, &c.

— πλὴν παρασχῆν here signifies (as often) "to produce faith in any thing, or confidence in any one's pretensions," by adducing sufficient proofs.

32. οἱ μὲν ἐχλεύαζον.] This feeling of contempt and ridicule of the doctrine in question will not appear so strange, when we consider how wholly unaccustomed were men's minds to the notion of a resurrection of the body, and consequently the identity of man in a future state. Of this their mythological accounts of Elysium had said nothing. And the thing, at first consideration, involved so much to stagger their faith, that the feeling was perhaps natural; but ought to have been suppressed by the consideration of the omnipotence of the great God who had pleased that life and immortality should be brought to light by the Gospel of Christ.

— ἀκουσόμεθά σου π. π. τ.] I cannot accede to the opinion of those who here recognize a wish to hear more; for if so, why should they not hear it then,— for the Apostle had not wearied his gay fastidious hearers with obscure prolixity. The feeling seems to have been that of indifference and distaste; or rather we may consider this as a civil way of saying, We will hear no more of this at present. Some other time will do. See Doddr. and Scott. Thus the Apostle's reception was so very discouraging, that he, in disgust, terminates his discourse; which, therefore, may be said to have been as much interrupted and cut short as Stephen's was, and others recorded in this Book, nay, even some of our Lord's discourses to the Jews, in St. John's Gospel. Had that not been the case, St. Paul would doubtless have enlarged on the nature of that religion whose divine origin had been thus attested by God himself.

34. κολληθέντες] "having become his converts." See Note on v. 13. Γυνή, "a matron," no doubt, of some rank, as being here mentioned. The glosses (for they are no more) of the most ancient MSS. attest the early belief of this.

XVIII. 2. Ἰουδαῖον.] Whether Aquila was then a Christian is by the recent Commentators thought doubtful. But Luke often omits (as indeed do all ancient writers) minute circumstances, which may easily be supplied; and this probably is one of them; especially since the expression προσῆλθεν αὐτοῖς implies a sort of connection, now was probably that of identity of religion. Now there had been a congregation of Christians at Rome from the earliest period of the Gospel;

Ποντικὸν τῷ γένει, προσφάτως ἐληλυθότα ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας, καὶ Πρί-
 σκυλλαν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ (διὰ τὸ διατεταχέναι Κλαύδιον χωρίζεσθαι πάν-
 3 τας τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἐκ τῆς Ῥώμης) πρόσῃλθεν αὐτοῖς· ὁ καὶ διὰ τὸ c Infra 20. 34.
1 Cor. 4. 12.
2 Cor. 11. 9.
& 12. 13.
1 Thess 2. 9.
2 Thess. 3. 8.
 ὁμότεχρον εἶναι, ἔμενε παρ' αὐτοῖς καὶ εἰργάζετο· ἦσαν γὰρ σκηνο-
 4 ποιὸι τὴν τέχνην. Διελέγετο δὲ ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ κατὰ πᾶν σάββατον,
 5 ἔπειθέ τε Ἰουδαίους καὶ Ἕλληνας. ὁ Ὡς δὲ κατήλθον ἀπὸ τῆς Μακε-
 δονίας ὁ τε Σίλας καὶ ὁ Τιμόθεος, συνέειχτο τῷ † πνεύματι ὁ Παῦλος,
 6 διαμαρτυρούμενος τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις τὸν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν. ὁ Ἀντιπασσομένον
 δὲ αὐτῶν καὶ βλασφημούντων, ἐκτιναζόμενος τὰ ἱμάτια, εἶπε πρὸς αὐ-

which is supposed to have originated with some who had been present at the feast of Pentecost, when the Holy Ghost was imparted; and was doubtless increased by those Jewish Christians, who had occasion to repair to that city on commercial or other business.

— προσφάτως] for πρόσφατος, which, the Grammarians say, properly signifies *recently slain*, but is used, both in the Classical and Hellenistic writers, in the sense *recent*. So Pindar Pyth. iv. ult. πρόσφατον Θήβα ξενωθείς.

— διατεταχέναι] “had issued a διάταγμα, or decree.” This is noticed by Sueton. Claud. C. 23. thus, Judæos, impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes, Româ expulit. This *Chrestus* is by most recent Commentators supposed to have been a Hellenistic Jew; but by the ancient and earlier modern ones taken to mean Jesus Christ, which is the best founded opinion. The tumults in question were dissensions between the Jews and Christians (whether Jewish or Gentile), and other political disturbances which so mighty a moral revolution was sure to produce; in which sense Christ might well say “he came not to send peace, but a sword.” The change of *Christus* to *Chrestus* was likely to be made, and, in fact, we know *was* sometimes made. And Christ might, by means of his religion, be said to be the *impulsor*.

3. σκηνοποιοί.] Few terms so plain as this have given rise to more debate on the interpretation. The *general* opinion, both of ancients and moderns, is that it signifies *tent-makers*. Some Commentators, however (perhaps thinking it too mean a trade for the Apostle of the Gentiles), have devised other interpretations, e. gr. *weavers of tapestry* — *makers of mathematical instruments* — *saddlers*. But for any of these significations there is very slender authority; and St. Luke, writing in a plain style, must be supposed to use such a word as this in its *ordinary* sense; not to say that the two first mentioned trades would require far more exact skill and devoted attention than could be expected in one like Paul, the greater part probably of whose time was spent so very differently. There can be little doubt that St. Paul's trade was (as Chrysost. says) that of a maker of *tents*, formed of leather or thick cloth, both for military and domestic purposes; the latter sort having been, from the scarcity of inns, much used throughout the East in travelling; nay, in that warm climate, were, during the summer season, employed as *houses*.

4. ἔπειθε.] This is strangely rendered by Kuin. and others *doccebat*; for *πειθῆναι* must surely, *from the subject*, mean “swayed their minds, persuaded them [to embrace Christianity];” the *action* being here, as often, put for the *endeavour*. So 2

Cor. v. 11. εἰδότες τὸν φόβον τοῦ Κυρίου ἀνθρώπους πεῖθμεν. By Ἕλληνας we must understand *Proselytes of the gate*.

5. τῷ πνεύματι.] Some MSS., several Versions, and a few Fathers, have τῷ λόγῳ, which is preferred by Beng., Pearce, and Kuin., and edited by Griesbach, Knapp, and Tittm.; but without sufficient reason. The external authority for that reading is slender, and the internal by no means strong. The above Editors, indeed, urge that *λόγῳ* is to be preferred, as being the more *difficult* reading. But it must be observed, that that canon has its exceptions, and especially when the reading in question would do violence to the proprietas linguæ, or yield an absurd or unsuitable sense: which is the case here; for the sense “was occupied in preaching,” is one surely most frigid, inasmuch that Morus and Heinrichs render *συνείχετο cogebatur*, yet without assigning any tolerable sense to τῷ λόγῳ. But whence, then, it may be asked, arose τῷ λόγῳ? I answer, from a marginal or interlineary scholium, of some one who had in his copy, not *ἐνείχετο*, but *ἐπέκειτο*; and thus suggested that *λόγῳ* should be supplied, or substituted for *πνεύματι*, as required by *ἐπέκειτο*. That such must have been the reading in *Jerome's* copy, is plain from his (Vulgate) version *instabat verbo*. Indeed the common reading might seem to claim a preference on the score of being the more *difficult* reading; for Markland professes himself unable to understand it. Though, indeed, from a sort of mental *idio-syncrasy*, that Critic perpetually found or made *difficulties* where none but himself could see them. Here *συνείχετο τῷ πνεύματι* is capable of a very good sense; namely, as Beza, Luther, Calvin, and others explain, “intus et apud se æstuat præ zeli ardore,” “he was under the impulse of ardent zeal.” So v. 25. ζῆλον τῷ πνεύματι. and xx. 22. δεδομένον τῷ πνεύματι.

6. ἀντιπασσομένον.] “contradicting and opposing by words:” a military metaphor, of which Elsn. and Markl. adduce two examples; but there is one more apposite in Thucyd. iii. 83. τὸ δὲ ἀντίτεταχθαι ἀλλήλοις τῷ γνώμῃ ἀπίστως ἐπὶ πολλὸν δύνειχεν.

— ἐκτιναζόμενος τὰ ἱμάτια.] A symbolical action (with which we may compare Nehem. v. 13.), like shaking the dust off one's shoes at any one, thereby signifying that we renounce all intercourse with him. See note on xiii. 51. At τὸ αἶμα, &c. sub. τῷ ἔργῳ. By *αἶμα* is meant *destruction*; i. e. figuratively, perdition in the next world. This manner of speaking was common to the Hebrews (see 2 Sam. i. 16. Ezek. xxxiii. 4.) the Greeks and the Romans. See examples in Elsn. and Wets., who rightly derive it from the very ancient custom of putting hands on the heads of victims for sacrifice, and imprecating on them

τούς· Τὸ αἶμα ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν ὑμῶν· καθαρὸς ἐγὼ· ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν εἰς τὰ ἔθνη πορεύσομαι. Καὶ μεταβάς ἐκῆθεν ἦλθεν εἰς 7 οἰκίαν τινὸς ὀνόματι Ἰούστου, σεβόμενον τὸν Θεόν, οὗ ἡ οἰκία ἦν συν-
 f1 Cor 1. 14. ομοροῦσα τῇ συναγωγῇ. Ἐκρίστος δὲ ὁ ἀρχισυνάγωγος ἐπίστευσε τῷ 8 Κυρίῳ σὺν ὅλῳ τῇ οἰκῷ αὐτοῦ· καὶ πολλοὶ τῶν Κορινθίων ἀκούοντες
 g Infrā 23. 11. ἐπίστευον καὶ βεβαπίζοντο. Ἐῖπε δὲ ὁ Κύριος δι' ὀράματος ἐν νυκτὶ 9
 h John 10. 16. τῷ Παύλῳ· Μὴ φοβοῦ, ἀλλὰ λάλει, καὶ μὴ σιωπήσῃς· ἡ δὲ οἰκία ἐστὶν ἐμὴ μετὰ σοῦ, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐπιθήσεται σοὶ τοῦ κακῶσαι σε· διότι λαὸς ἐστὶ μοι πολὺς ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ. Ἐκάθισέ τε ἐνιαυτὸν καὶ μῆνας ἕξ, 11 διδάσκων ἐν αὐτοῖς τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ.

Γαλλίωνος δὲ ἀνθυπαυεύοντος τῆς Ἀχαΐας, κατεπέστησαν ὁμοθυμαδὸν 12 οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι τῷ Παύλῳ, καὶ ἤγαγον αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸ βῆμα, λέγοντες· Ὅτι 13 παρὰ τὸν νόμον οὗτος ἀναπειθεὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους σέβασθαι τὸν Θεόν.
 i Infrā 25. 11. Ἰ Μελλόντος δὲ τοῦ Παύλου ἀνοίγειν τὸ στόμα, εἶπεν ὁ Γαλλίων πρὸς 14 τοὺς Ἰουδαίους· Εἰ μὲν οὖν ἦν ἀδίκημά τι ἢ ῥαδιουργημα πονηρὸν, ὃ Ἰουδαῖοι, κατὰ λόγον ἀνῆνεσχόμεν ὑμῶν· εἰ δὲ ζήτημά ἐστι περὶ 15 λόγου καὶ ὀνομάτων καὶ νόμου τοῦ καθ' ὑμᾶς, ὄψεσθε αὐτοί· κριτῆς γὰρ ἐγὼ τούτων οὐ βούλομαι εἶναι. καὶ ἀπῆλασεν αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ 16
 k 1 Cor. 1. 1. βήματος. Ἐπιλαβόμενοι δὲ πάντες οἱ Ἕλληνες Σωσθένην τὸν ἀρχι- 17

the evils which impeded over the sacrificer, or the nation. *Εἰς τὰ ἔθνη πορεύσομαι* must not be understood as implying *abandonment* of the Jews, but an especial attention to the Gentiles.

7. *μεταβάς ἐκῆθεν.*] Not from the house of Aquila (thus *shifting his lodgings*), as most Commentators suppose; but from the *synagogue*, that being, no doubt, the place where the foregoing exhortations had been pronounced; as is plain from the words *διελήγετο ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ*. Besides, if *συναγ.* be not taken as the substantive of place referred to, *there is no other*. Ἦλθεν εἰς οἰκίαν must be understood to mean "entered into," "entered upon, a house," for the purpose of teaching and preaching, perhaps in an upper apartment appropriated to that purpose. See a kindred passage at xix. 9.

— *συνομοροῦσα*] "conterminous, contiguous." The word occurs, I believe, nowhere else; though *συνόμορος*, from which it is derived, is found in the ancient glossaries. The *Classical* term is *συνορίω*, used by Polybius. And, indeed, some MSS. *here* have *συνοροῦσα*; though doubtless from emendation.

9. *λάλει καὶ μὴ σιωπήσῃς.*] This intermixture of the Imperat. with the Subjunct. is thought to be a Hebraism. Be that as it may, there is no *pleonasm*; for the Subjunct. form is more significant than the Imperative, there being an ellip. of ὅρα, q. d. Mind that ye be silent!

10. *λαὸς ἐστὶ.*] The best Commentators remark, that the persons in question are called Christ's people by *anticipation*; just as the Gentiles, who should afterwards embrace the Christian religion, are in John x. 16. already called the *flock* of Christ.

11. *ἐκάθισε*] "took up his abode." A Hellenistic use of the word, as in Luke xxiv. 49.

12. *Γαλλ. ἀνθυπ. τῆς Ἀχ.]* The best Commentators are agreed that the sense is, "on Gallio becoming Proconsul." *Κατεφθισμη* is a very rare

word, but may be compared with *κατεπιχειρέω* and others.

13. *παρὰ τὸν νόμον — Θεόν.*] As much as to say: "The Roman people permit us Jews in Greece to worship God after the rites of the Mosaic Law (See Joseph. Ant. xiv. 40; xvi. 2. and the Note on Acts xxiv. 6.); but this fellow teaches things *contrary* to our Law, and excites disturbances among us."

14. *ἀδικ. ἢ ραδιουργημα π.*] The best Commentators regard ἀδικ. as equivalent to *παρανόημα*, any serious offence, and *ραδ.* they define *flagitium*. It should rather seem to correspond to the minor class of offences with us styled *larceny* (hence, indeed, the word *rogue* is derived. See Note on xiii. 10.), or even those petty breaches of the peace which with us are called *misdemeanours*. The *ραδ. πονηρὸν* perhaps had reference to those *mischievous frolics* often played off in Heathen countries in ridicule of the Jewish rites and ceremonies, like Alcibiades' defacing of the Hermae, ridicule of the mysteries, &c., and such as that which Josephus tells us was committed by a Roman in ridicule of circumcision; and which were always severely punished, when the authors could be detected, by the Roman magistrates. Ἄν ἠνεσχόμεν. "I should bear with you, lend a patient ear to you."

15. *λόγον καὶ δόγμα.*] i. e. of doctrine and names [of the respective supporters, as of Moses and of Christ] and of the law which ye hold [as compared with another newly promulgated]. Ὁψέσθε. See Matt. xxvii. 4. σὺ ὄψει.

17. *ἐπιλαβόμενοι δέ.*] Render, "Whereupon the Greeks laying hold of," &c. There is no reason to suppose "Ἕλληνες should be cancelled. By πάντες οἱ Ἕλλ. are denoted all the Greeks, namely, both Christians and heathens, of whom the latter as well as the former were incensed at the bitter spirit evinced by the Jews, and were glad to take this opportunity of insulting them. Sos-

συνάγωγον, ἔτυπον ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ βήματος· καὶ οὐδὲν τούτων τῷ Γαλλίῳ ἔμελεν.

- 18 Ὁ ΔΕ Παῦλος ἔτι προσμείνας ἡμέρας ἰκανὰς, τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ἀποτα-^{1 Num. 6. 18. infra 21. 24.}
ξάμενος, ἐξέπλει εἰς τὴν Συρίαν· καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ Πρίσκιλλα, καὶ Ἀκ-
19 λας, κειράμενος τὴν κεφαλὴν ἐν Κεγγραεῖς· εἶχε γὰρ εὐχήν. Κατήνησε
δὲ εἰς Ἐφεσον, κικέεινους κατέλιπεν αὐτοῦ· αὐτὸς δὲ εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν
20 συναγωγὴν, διελέχθη τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις. Ἐρωτῶντων δὲ αὐτῶν ἐπὶ πλείονα
21 χρόνον μείναι παρ' αὐτοῖς, οὐκ ἐπένευσεν· ^m ἄλλ' ἀπειάξαιτο αὐτοῖς,^{m 1 Cor. 4. 19. James 4. 15. Heb. 6. 3.}
εἰπὼν· Δεῖ με πάντως τὴν ἑορτὴν τὴν ἐρχομένην ποιῆσαι εἰς Ἱεροσό-
22 λυμα· πάλιν δὲ ἀνακάμψω πρὸς ὑμᾶς, τοῦ Θεοῦ θέλοντος. Καὶ ἀν-
23 ἦχθη ἀπὸ τῆς Ἐφέσου· καὶ κατελθὼν εἰς Καισάρειαν, ἀναβάς καὶ
23 ἀσπασάμενος τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, κατέβη εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν. Καὶ ποιήσας χρό-
νον τινα, ἐξῆλθε, διερχόμενος καθεξῆς τὴν Γαλιτικὴν χώραν καὶ Φρυ-
γίαν, ἐπιστηρίζων πάντας τοὺς μαθητάς.
- 24 Ἰουδαῖος δὲ τις Ἀπολλῶς ὀνόματι, Ἀλεξανδρεὺς τῷ γένει, ἀνὴρ λό-^{n 1 Cor. 1. 12.}
25 γιος, κατήνησεν εἰς Ἐφεσον, δυνατὸς ὢν ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς. Ὁ Οὗτος ^o Ἰνφρα 19. 3.
ἦν κατηχημένος τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ Κυρίου, καὶ ζῶν τῷ πνεύματι, ἐλίλυε

thenes, who seems to have been successor to Crispus as Ruler of the synagogue, was thus treated, as being, no doubt, the spokesman, and perhaps the promoter of the persecution. By ἔτυπον is merely to be understood beating him with their fists. probably as he passed through the crowd out of the Hall of justice; thus, as it were, running the gauntlet.

— οὐδὲν τούτων τῷ Γ. ἔμ.] “took no notice of these things;” not choosing to notice the assault, or interfere in the religious disputes of the parties. Οὐδὲν, for οὐ, as often after μέλει, which has a dative of *person* and a genitive of *thing*, either with or without a preposition.

18. κειράμενος τὴν κεφαλὴν.] Commentators are not agreed whether this is to be referred to *Aquila* or to *Paul*. Yet all who were distinguished for knowledge of Greek (as Chrys., Œcum., Isid., Erasm., Beza, Calvin, Casaub., Salmas., Grot., Heinsius, Hamm., Whitby, Valckn., Wakef., Schleus., Heinr., Kuin.), and almost every *Editor* of the N. T., have adopted the former view, which is supported by the ancient Versions, and as it involves far more probability, and avoids the difficulties attendant on supposing *Paul* to be meant, it deserves the preference. The sense, then, is, “after having shorn his head at Cenchrea,” which was the port where he embarked on his voyage. The Commentators are generally agreed that the vow was not one of *Nazarite*, but a *rotum civile*, — such as was taken during or after recovery from sickness, or deliverance from any peril, or on obtaining any unexpected good, importing to consecrate and offer up the hair, the *shaving* of which denoted the *fulfilment* of the vow.

19. κικέεινους κατέλιπεν αὐτοῦ, &c.] The sense is obscurely expressed, but there is no necessity to adopt the expedient proposed by Doddr., of transposing this clause, and placing it after θέλοντος, v. 21. The fact is that Paul had brought them with him, on his voyage to Cæsarea, as far as Ephesus, and there put them on shore; and, the ship stopping there a short time, including a sabbath-day, Paul took the opportunity of preaching to the Jews; to whom his discourse was so acceptable,

that they pressed him to remain longer with them: which request, however, he was obliged to refuse, because if he permitted the ship to go without him, he should probably not be able to meet with another to convey him in time for the feast at Jerusalem.

21. ἑορτὴν ποιῆσαι.] A Hellenistic phrase. The sense is merely, “I must spend the feast time.” Δεῖ με must be taken *populariter*, according to an idiom of our own language. The Apostle’s purpose may be supposed to have been to promote the cause of conversion, and the communication between the Christians of Jerusalem and of other parts of the world. Hence we may suppose that this feast was the *Passover*.

22. ἀναβάς] namely, to Jerusalem as some of the best Commentators are agreed. This may, indeed, seem a somewhat harsh omission; but as εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα occurred only a little before, it is not so. To take ἀναβάς, with some Commentators, of *Cæsarea*, involves far greater harshness, since it would exclude all mention of the going to Jerusalem, the great object of Paul’s voyage into those parts. Κατέβη εἰς Ἀντ. would not be applicable to Cæsarea, whereas it is to Jerusalem; for Paul would, no doubt, go by sea, perhaps by Cæsarea.

24. Ἀπολλῶς.] A name contracted from Ἀπολλώνιος, as *Eraphras* from *Eraphroditus*, and *Artemas* from *Artemonius*. A full account of every particular concerning Apollos may be seen in a learned dissertation of J. Pfeizer, at p. 691 — 701. vol. xiii. of the *Critici Sacri*.

— ἀνὴρ λόγιος.] An expression denoting, in the earlier writers, a *man of letters*, especially an historian; but in the later ones an *eloquent man*, which is probably the sense here (especially as the word is so used in Joseph. and Philo), though some Commentators adopt the first-mentioned signification. Δυνατὸς ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς, “well versed in the interpretation of the Scriptures of the O. T.”

25. κατηχημένος τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ Κυρίου.] By the expression ὁδὸς τοῦ Κυρίου must (as appears from the words following) be meant that *part* of God’s

καὶ ἐδίδασκεν ἀκριβῶς τὰ περὶ τοῦ Κυρίου, ἐπισταμενος μόνον τὸ βάπτισμα Ἰωάννου· οὗτός τε ἤρξατο παρόρησιάζεσθαι ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ.²⁶
 π1 Cor. 3. 6. ἀκούσαντες δὲ αὐτοῦ Ἀκύλας καὶ Πρίσκιλλα, προσελάβοντο αὐτὸν, καὶ ἀκριβέστερον αὐτῷ ἐξέθεντο τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ δόξιν. Ἡ Βουλομένου δὲ αὐτοῦ διελθεῖν εἰς τὴν Ἀχαΐαν, προτρεψάμενοι οἱ ἀδελφοὶ ἔγραψαν τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἀποδέξασθαι αὐτόν· ὃς παραγεγόμενος συνεβάλετο πολὺ τοῖς πεπιστευκόσι διὰ τῆς χάριτος. εὐτόνως γὰρ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις διακατῆ-²⁷
 ἤλεγχετο δημοσίαι, ἐπιδεικνύς διὰ τῶν γραφῶν, εἶναι τὸν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν.

q Supra 18. 24.
 l Cor. 1. 12.

r John 7. 39.
 sup. 10. 44. &c.

XIX. Ἡ ἘΓΕΝΕΤΟ δὲ, ἐν τῷ τὸν Ἀπολλῶ εἶναι ἐν Κορίνθῳ, 1
 Παῦλον διελθόντα τὰ ἀνωτερικὰ μέρη, ἐλθεῖν εἰς Ἐφεσον· καὶ εὐθὺν
 τινὰς μαθητὰς, ἵεπε πρὸς αὐτούς· Ἐἰ Πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐλάβετε πιστεύ- 2

plan for the salvation of man by a Redeemer, as it regarded the doctrine and methods of John the Baptist, which enjoined repentance and reformation, and the being baptized unto the faith of the future Messiah. Or, taking *Κόριθος* here to denote *Christ*, we may understand, "instructed in the doctrine of a Messiah," not, in the doctrine of *Jesus Christ*; for Apollos knew only the doctrine of *John*, who baptized *εἰς τὸν ἑρχόμενον*, preached repentance, and announced the coming of the Messiah: (see *Matt. iii. 2.* compared with *Acts xix. 4.*) while by the *more accurate instruction* which he received from Aquila and Priscilla, must be understood that of the Messiahship of *Jesus*, and what he had enjoined for faith and practice, in order to the attainment of everlasting salvation. By τὸ βάπτισμα is meant, per synecdochen, the doctrine of John the Baptist, of which baptism was a principal feature. Now it is implied that Apollos had received this baptism; and also by ἐπιστάμενος μόνον, that he had not received *Christian* baptism, though Mr. Scott supposes so. It is generally believed that he had been baptized by *John* himself, and had since that time obtained some knowledge of the Gospel; though he had not been baptized unto the faith of *Christ*. This, however, involves much improbability. It should rather seem that he had been baptized *not long before* by one of *John's* disciples; and, in short, was become one of the sect of the *Johannites*, which existed about this period, and on which see *Tittmann's* *Introd.* to the Gospel of *St. John*. Ἀκριβῶς has reference, not to the doctrine, but to the manner of teaching it, namely, as exactly as he knew how. Thus there will be no occasion to read, with *Sherlock*, *Markl.*, and *Wakef.*, οὐκ ἀκριβῶς. They adduce, indeed, a passage of *Athenæus*, p. 91. as an example of a similar omission of the negative particle, where the necks of shell-fish are said to be ὀσκατέργαστοι· ἐὶδὲ τοῖς ἀσθενοῦσι τὸν στόμαχον οἰκεῖσι. But there it is better to read ἀνοικεῖσι, since the *av* might easily be absorbed by the *ov* preceding. The word occurs in good authors, especially the later ones.

26. παρόρησιάζεσθαι.] This may have reference not only to his descending on the necessity of repentance and reformation, but to his freely pointing out many errors in the usual mode of understanding the Scriptures, especially the Prophecies. This, from his great knowledge of the Scriptures, he would be qualified to do, and might speak authoritatively.

27. προτρεψάμενοι.] Exhorting him [to carry into effect his resolve].

— συνεβάλετο — χάριτος.] It is plain that *συνεβ.* must mean, "contributed [to the spiritual advantage of]." But on the sense and construction of διὰ τῆς χάριτος Commentators are not agreed; some, as *Pisc.* and *Hamm.*, construing it with τοῖς πεπιστευκόσι; others, and indeed almost all the best Expositors, (together with the *Pesch.* *Syr.* *iac.*), with *συνεβάλετο*. The latter method seems far preferable; for to construe it with τοῖς πεπιστευκόσι not a little embarrasses the sentence; and no such phrase as πιστεύειν διὰ τῆς χάριτος elsewhere occurs in Scripture. Not to mention that the sense thus arising would be here little suitable: where as it might be expected that something should be said of the *especial grace of God* being afforded to one so zealous in preaching the Gospel. The transposition is by no means harsh; and, we may suppose, was here adopted because the words could not well have been introduced between *συνεβάλετο* and its dative, especially as πολὺ was also interposed. The omission of διὰ τῆς χάριτος in the *Cod. Cant.*, the *Vulg.*, and some *Fathers*, seems not to have been (as *Dr. Clarke* imagines) from accident, but from design, in order thus effectually to remove the harshness in question. The question, however, is, what is the sense? *Beza*, *Camer.*, *Raphel*, *Wets.*, *Rosenm.*, and *Heinr.*, take τῆς χάριτος to mean *grace of diction and manner*, as in *Luke iv. 22.* τοῖς λόγοις τῆς χάριτος. But that sense would here be not important enough, and thus τοῦ λόγον would be indispensable. There can be no doubt that τῆς χάριτος is for τῆς χάριτος τοῦ Θεοῦ, a phrase so frequent, that sometimes τοῦ Θεοῦ is dispensed with. So *Rom. xii. 3.* διὰ τῆς χάριτος τῆς δοθεῖσης. also *xii. 6. xv. 15.* and especially *Rom. v. 17.* οἱ τὴν περισσεύαν τῆς χάριτος λαμβάνοντες. where τοῦ Θεοῦ must be supplied. And so at *xix. 9.* τὴν δόξιν is for τὴν δόξιν τοῦ Κυρίου.

XIX. 1. τὰ ἀνωτερικὰ μέρη] "the upper and inland regions," namely, *Phrygia* and *Galatia*. See my *Note* on *Thucyd. i. 7.*

— μαθητάς.] Many recent Commentators think that these persons were only believers in a Messiah, and followers of *John the Baptist*. But thus they could not have been *Christ's* disciples at all. Besides *Paul* addresses them as if baptized in the name of *Jesus*; which at least implies that they must have publicly professed faith in *Jesus Christ*.

σαντες; οἱ δὲ εἶπον πρὸς αὐτόν· Ἄλλ' οὐδὲ εἰ Πνεῦμα ἅγιόν ἐστιν
 3 ἠκούσαμεν. εἶπέ τε πρὸς αὐτούς· Εἰς τί οὖν ἐβαπτίσθητε; οἱ δὲ
 4 εἶπον· Εἰς τὸ Ἰωάννου βάπτισμα. Ἐἶπε δὲ Παῦλος· Ἰωάννης μὲν
 5 ἐβάπτισε βάπτισμα μετανοίας, τῷ λαῷ λέγων, εἰς τὸν ἐρχόμενον μετ'
 6 αὐτὸν ἵνα πιστεύσωσι· τουτέστιν εἰς τὸν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν. Ἀκούσαν-
 7 τες δὲ ἐβαπτίσθησαν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ. καὶ ἐπιθέν-
 8 τος αὐτοῖς τοῦ Παύλου τὰς χεῖρας, ἦλθε τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐπ'
 9 αὐτούς, ἐλάλουν τε γλώσσαις καὶ προεφήτεον. Ἦσαν δὲ οἱ πάντες ἄν-
 10 δρες ὡσεὶ δεκαδύο. Εἰσελθὼν δὲ εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν, ἐπαρήρσιάζετο,
 11 ἐπὶ μῆνας τρεῖς διαλεγόμενος καὶ πείθων τὰ περὶ τῆς βσιυειείας τοῦ
 12 Θεοῦ. Ὡς δὲ τινες ἐσκληρόνουντο καὶ ἠπειθουν, κακολογοῦντες τὴν
 13 ὁδὸν ἐνώπιον τοῦ πλήθους, ἀποστάς ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἀφώρισεν τοὺς μαθητὰς,
 14 καθ' ἡμέραν διαλεγόμενος ἐν τῇ σχολῇ Τυράννου τινός. Τοῦτο δὲ
 15 ἐγένετο ἐπὶ ἔτη δύο· ὥστε πάντας τοὺς κατοικοῦντας τὴν Ἀσίαν ἀκού-
 16 σαι τὸν λόγον τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, Ἰουδαίους τε καὶ Ἑλλήνας. Ἐνθά-
 17 μες τε οὐ τὰς τεχούσας ἐποίει ὁ Θεὸς διὰ τῶν χειρῶν Παύλου·
 18 ὥστε καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀσθενούντας ἐπιφέρεσθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ χρωτὸς αὐτοῦ
 19 σουδάρια ἢ σιμικίνθια, καὶ ἀπαλλάσσεσθαι ἀπ' αὐτῶν τὰς νόσους, τὰ

a Matt. 3. 11.
 Mark 1. 4, 8.
 Luke 3. 16.
 John 1. 26.
 supra 1. 5.
 & 11. 16.

t Supra 2. 4.
 & 8. 6.
 & 8. 17.
 & 10. 46.
 & 11. 15.

u 2 Tim. 1. 15.

x Mark 16. 20.
 supra 14. 3.

y Supra 5. 15.

It should seem that the men had been, some time before, baptized by some of *John's* disciples, but had been not long at Ephesus; when, partly by means of Apollos, and partly of Aquila, they became convinced of the truth of the Christian religion (and were disciples of Aquila); though they were not yet thoroughly acquainted with its doctrines, nor had yet been formally baptized.

2. εἶπε πρὸς αὐτοὺς· Εἰ &c.] Here (as not frequently in interrogative sentences where the words of any speaker are recorded), there is a blending of the oratio directa and indirecta, q. d. He asked whether they had received, — and he asked them saying, have ye received?

— ἀλλ' οὐδὲ — ἠκούσαμεν.] This, according to the sense assigned by our common Version, would imply such ignorance as, even on the supposition that the men were only *Johannites*, would be incredible. But indeed it is quite unnecessary to so interpret; for Grotius, Bp. Pearce, and others have proved, that *ἠδόμενον*, or *λαμβανόμενον* must be supplied at *ἔστι*· meaning that they had not heard whether the Holy Spirit was imparted — or, as Bornem. expresses, the full sense, Tantum abest, &c., so at John vii. 39. οὐκ ᾔδει ἦν Πνεῦμα ἅγιον, where our Version very properly expresses the *ἠδόμενον*. In both passages the extraordinary influences of the Holy Spirit must be understood.

3. εἰς τί.] Sub. *βάπτισμα*. Εἰς here, and often, does not denote *purpose*, as most Commentators suppose; but *eis* with the Accus. is put for *ἐν* [by] with a Dative. as in forms of swearing, e. gr. Matt. v. 35. εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα, which is just after followed by *ἀμνησεν ἐν τῇ γῇ*.

4. βάπτ. μετανοίας] meaning, “a baptism which bound those who underwent it to repentance, reformation, and purity of life.” See xiii. 24. and Note. *τουτέστιν*, εἰς τὸν Χ. Ἰ. are the words of the *Apostle*, briefly importing, “Now that Messiah whom John bound you to worship is *Jesus*.” No doubt Paul proceeded to enlarge on the evidence for the Messiahship of Jesus, and to point out the benefits of his religion, and its doctrines.

6. ἐλάλουν — προεφ.] Contrary to the opinion of many recent Commentators, I must maintain the sense to be, “they spake with [foreign] tongues, and used their gift in the exercise of the *προφητεία*, or inspired teaching and preaching. It is plain that *γλώσσαις* here is for *ἐτέραις γλώσσαις*, as in the kindred passage of Acts ii. 4. ἤσαντο λαλῶν ἐτέραις γλώσσαις, where see Note. We may observe a *climax*; *προφητεία* being a higher gift than *λαλῶν γλώσσαις*. So I Cor. xiv. 5. *μεῖζον γὰρ ὁ προφητεύων ἢ ὁ λαλῶν γλώσσαις*.

9. ἐσκληρ. καὶ ἠπειθουν.] A sort of Hendiadys; “obstinately refused to yield credence.” So *Ecclus. xxx. 11. μήποτε σκληρονθῆς ἀπειθήσῃ σοι*. See also Ps. xciv. 8. and Heb. iii. 8. *Ἀποστάς* must be understood of separation from the synagogue and church communion, and preaching elsewhere. See Note on xviii. 7.

— ἐν τῇ σχολῇ Τυράννου τ.] What sort of a school this was, biblical Critics are not quite agreed. Lightf., Vitringa, Hamn., Doddr., and Schoettg. suppose it to have been a kind of *Beth-Midrash* or *Divinity Hall*, designed for reading theological lectures. Others, as Pearce, Rosenm., and Kuin., think it was a *philosophical lecture-room*, and that Tyrannus was a rhetorician, or sophist. If the former conjecture be correct, he was probably a converted Jew; if the latter, a converted Gentile. *Tyrannus* was a not uncommon name, answering to our *King*.

10. πάντας.] This may be taken, with many Commentators, in a qualified sense; but there was such a constant influx of persons to this emporium and capital of Asia Minor, that there could not be many individuals but had heard, at least by the report of others, of the doctrines of Christianity. By *Ἀσίαν* is meant the province of which Ephesus was more immediately the capital, and nearly corresponding to the ancient *Ionía*.

12. σουδάρια.] See Luke xix. 20. *Σιμικίνθια*, from the Latin *semicinctum*, a half-girdle, or garment, equivalent to our *apron*.

τε πνεύματα τὰ πονηρὰ ἐξέρχεσθαι ἀπ' αὐτῶν. Ἐπεχείρησαν δὲ τινες 13 ἀπὸ τῶν περιεχομένων Ἰουδαίων ἑξορκιστῶν ὀνομάζειν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἔχοντας τὰ πνεύματα τὰ πονηρὰ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, λέγοντες· Ὁρκίζομεν ὑμᾶς τὸν Ἰησοῦν ὃν ὁ Παῦλος κηρύσσει. Ἦσαν δὲ τινες υἱοὶ 14 Σευᾶ Ἰουδαίου ἀρχιερέως ἐπίτα, οἱ τοῦτο ποιοῦντες. Ἀποκριθὲν δὲ τὸ 15 πνεῦμα τὸ πονηρὸν εἶπε· Τὸν Ἰησοῦν γινώσκω, καὶ τὸν Παῦλον ἐπίσταμαι· ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνες ἐστέ; Καὶ ἐφαλλόμενος ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ὁ ἄνθρωπος 16 πρὸς ἐν ᾧ ἦν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ πονηρὸν, καὶ κατακυριεύσας αὐτῶν, ἴσχυσε κατ' αὐτῶν, ὥστε γυμνοὺς καὶ τετραυματισμένους ἐκφυγεῖν ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου ἐκεῖνου. Τοῦτο δὲ ἐγένετο γνωστὸν πᾶσιν, Ἰουδαίοις τε καὶ 17 Ἕλλησι, τοῖς κατοικοῦσι τὴν Ἐφεσον· καὶ ἐπέπεσε φόβος ἐπὶ πάντας αὐτοὺς, καὶ ἐμεγαλύνετο τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ. Ἐπολλοὶ τε τῶν 18 πεπιστευκῶν ἤρχοντο ἑξομολογούμενοι καὶ ἀναγγέλλοντες τὰς πράξεις αὐτῶν. Ἰκανοὶ δὲ τῶν τὰ περίεργα πράξαντων, συνενέγκαντες τὰς βίβλους κατέκαιον ἐνώπιον πάντων· καὶ συνεψήφισαν τὰς τιμὰς αὐτῶν, καὶ εὗρον ἀργυρίου μυριάδας πέντε. Ὁὕτω κατὰ κράτος ὁ λόγος τοῦ 20 Κυρίου ἤρξανε καὶ ἴσχυεν.

z Matt. 3. 6.

a Isa. 55. 11. supra 6. 7. & 12. 24.

b Supra 18. 21. Rom. 15. 25. Gal. 2. 1.

c Supra 13. 5. Rom. 16. 23. 2 Tim. 4. 20.

d 2 Cor. 1. 8.

^b Ως δὲ ἐπληρώθη ταῦτα, ἔθετο ὁ Παῦλος ἐν τῷ πνεύματι, διελεύσων τὴν Μακεδονίαν καὶ Ἀχαΐαν πορευέσθαι εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, εἰπὼν· Ὅτι μετὰ τὸ γενέσθαι με ἐκεῖ, δεῖ με καὶ Ῥώμην ἰδεῖν. Ἀποστείλας 22 δὲ εἰς τὴν Μακεδονίαν δύο τῶν διακονούντων αὐτῷ, Τιμόθεον καὶ Ἐραστον, αὐτὸς ἐπέσχε χρόνον εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν. Ἐγένετο δὲ κατὰ τὸν 23

13. περιερχ.] See Note on iv. 7. Such persons were called by the Greeks ἀγόροι, and by the Latins *circulatores*. They were a kind of men who (like our travelling quacks, or mountebanks, or conjurers), pretended to cure violent disorders beyond the skill of the physician, and even to cast out devils; and all this with the use of certain incantations, or charms made effective, partly by administering certain powerful medicines, and partly by strongly operating on the imagination.

14. τινες.] This must be construed with ἐπίτα, "some seven persons, sons of Seva." See xxxiii. 23. and Thucyd. iii. 11. vii. 37.

15. τὸν Ἰησοῦν γινώσκω — τίνες ἐστέ:] q. d. "I recognize the authority of Jesus and Paul, but yours I disavow." Wets. compares from Isæus οὐ δὲ τίς εἶ; οὐ γινώσκω σε.

16. ἐφαλλόμενος.] This use of the word (which is by a metaphor taken from wild animals) is rare, and not exemplified by the Commentators. I have, however, in Recens. Synop., adduced several examples from Homer.

— κατακυρ. αὐτῶν, ἴσχ. κατ' α.] Almost all Commentators for the last century are agreed in taking ἴσχυσε κατ' αὐτῶν to denote "exercised force over them by maltreating them," as in Wisd. xix. 20. But it may perhaps be regarded as a seemingly pleonastic, yet very significant expression, importing more than either term would mean alone. Ἰσχυσε κατὰ is for κατίσχυσε. Γυμνοὺς must be taken in a qualified sense, as in one of our own idioms.

18. ἑξομολ. καὶ ἀναγγ.] The expressions are nearly synonymous, and denote frank and open confession, with a narration of all circumstances.

By the *πράξεις* are especially meant *magical* practices, though also including sins of every kind.

19. τὰ περίεργα.] *Περίεργος*, as applied to persons, signifies *nimis sedulus, male curiosus*; and hence, as applied to things, *supervacuous, vanus*. Thus it was used to denote the "superstitious vanities" of magic; a sense occurring both in the Scriptural and Classical writers. See Rec. Syn. The books here mentioned were, no doubt, treatises on magic; such as those of Artemidorus, and Astrampsychus on the interpretation of dreams. Ephesus was the chief resort of the professors of the black art, who drew up what are called in the Classical writers Ἐφέσια γράμματα; which were scrolls of parchment inscribed with certain formulæ, and bound to the body, being used as *amulets*. See more in a Dissertation of J. C. Ortlob, at p. 703. seqq. Vol. xiii. of the Critici Sacri. Of pernicious books being publicly burnt, several examples are adduced by Wets.

— ἀργυρίον.] What *kind* of silver coin is here meant — whether the silver shekel or the drachm — cannot be determined. The latter is the more probable opinion.

20. κατὰ κράτος] for ἰσχυρῶς, *extremely*. Ἰσχυεῖν is well explained by Schleus, *rim exseruit*.

21. ἔθετο ἐν τῷ πν.] "statuit apud se, resolved in his mind." The best Commentators have been long agreed in assigning this sense, in preference to referring the expression to the *Holy Spirit*.

22. ἐπέσχε χρόνον.] Ἐπέσχε signifies, 1. to hold to any thing (ἐπι), and 2. to keep to, stay; and has a reflected force by the ellip. of ἐπιτόν. In the sense of *stay*, it occurs either *without*, or (as here) *with* the addition of an Accusative (depending on κατὰ), denoting duration of time.

24 καιρὸν ἐκέϊνον τάρχατος οὐκ ὀλίγος περὶ τῆς ὁδοῦ. ° Δημήτριος γάρ τις ^e *Supra* 16. 16.
 ὀνόματι, ἀργυροκόπος, ποιῶν καιοὺς ἀργυροῦς Ἀρτέμιδος, παρέχεται τοῖς
 25 τεχνίταις ἐργασίαν οὐκ ὀλίγην· οὓς συνυθηροίους, καὶ τοὺς περὶ τὰ
 τοιαῦτα ἐργάτας, εἶπεν· Ἄνδρες, ἐπίστασθε ὅτι ἐκ ταύτης τῆς ἐργασίας
 26 ἡ εὐπορία ἡμῶν ἐστὶ· ° καὶ θεωρεῖτε καὶ ἀκούετε ὅτι οὐ μόνον Ἐφέ-
 σον, ἀλλὰ σχεδὸν πάσης τῆς Ἀσίας ὁ Παῦλος οὗτος πείσας μετέστησεν
 27 ἱκανὸν ὄχλον, λέγων ὅτι οὐκ εἰσὶ θεοὶ οἱ διὰ χειρῶν γινόμενοι. Οὐ
 μόνον δὲ τοῦτο κινδυνεύει ἡμῖν τὸ μέρος εἰς ἀπελεγμὸν ἐλθεῖν, ἀλλὰ
 καὶ τὸ τῆς μεγάλης Θεᾶς Ἀρτέμιδος ἱερὸν εἰς οὐδὲν λογισθῆναι, μέλ-
 λειν δὲ καὶ καθαιρεῖσθαι τὴν μεγαλειότητα αὐτῆς, ἣν ὅλη ἡ Ἀσία καὶ
 28 ἡ οἰκουμένη σέβεται. Ἀκούσαντες δὲ, καὶ γενόμενοι πλήρεις θυμοῦ,
 29 ἔκραζον, λέγοντες· Μεγάλη ἡ Ἄρτεμις Ἐφεσίων! ° καὶ ἐπλήσθη ἡ ^f *Infra* 20. 4.
 πόλις ὅλη συγχύσιως· ὦρησάν τε ὁμοθυμαδὸν εἰς τὸ θέατρον, συν-
 30 αρπάσαντες Γαῖον καὶ Ἀρίσταρχον Μακεδόνας, συνεκδήμους τοῦ Παῦ-
 λου. Τοῦ δὲ Παύλου βουλομένου εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὸν δῆμον, οὐκ εἶων
 31 αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταί. Τινὲς δὲ καὶ τῶν Ἀσιαρχῶν, ὄντες αὐτῷ φίλοι,

24. ἀργυροκόπος.] The word signifies a *worker in silver*; but whether we are here to understand a *silversmith*, or a *manufacturer of small coins*, is uncertain. The former (which is the opinion of the best Commentators) is the more probable. The *ναὶ ἀργυροῖ Ἄρτ.* are supposed to have been small silver models of the Temple of Diana at Ephesus (one of the wonders of the world), or at least of the *chapel*, which contained the famous statue of the goddess. These were much bought up, both for *curiosity* (being memorials of a building so matchless), and for *purposes of devotion* (as are the models of the Santa Croce at Loretto, in modern times), and were carried about by travellers or others, like the *moveable altars* in use among the Roman Catholics; the model being always provided with a small image of the goddess. There is little doubt, too, that the ἀργυροκόποι also executed large coins representing the temple, with the image of Diana, of which some have been preserved.

— παρέχεται τοῖς τεχνίταις, &c.] “produced much gain to,” as Acts xvi. 16. ἦτις ἐργασίαν πολλὴν παρέειχε τοῖς, &c. By the *τεχνίταις* are here denoted the *chief workmen*; and by the *ἐργάται*, the inferior citizens employed in manufacturing the rougher work of these portable chapels. Τὰ τοιαῦτα, i. e. statuary, painting, and such sort of matters connected with the Pagan religion.

25. ἡ εὐπορία ἡμῶν.] This is a term of middle signification, and is to be interpreted according to circumstances. See Note supra xi. 29.

26. πείσας μετέστησεν] “has by his persuasions drawn away.” Μεθίσταναι signifies properly to *change the position* of any thing; to remove any one from any present station; and, figuratively, to alienate any one’s attachment to another. Of all which senses examples are adduced by Kypke.

— λέγων ὅτι οὐκ εἰσὶ θεοὶ οἱ διὰ χ. γιν.] The heathens (at least the ignorant multitude) regarded the images of the gods as the *gods themselves*. Hence the makers of these were called *θεοποιοί*. And on the removal of the images, they supposed the *gods themselves* to be taken away. The better instructed, indeed, did not harbour so gross a fancy; yet they maintained that the gods

in illis LATUISSE, and that hence they were *θεοί*, and filled with the presence of the Deity. They readily allowed that the gods did not *need* images; which, they said, were only invented in condescension to the weakness of men; and only meant as *helps, to raise the soul to heaven*, and as symbols and handmaids to Religion. They regarded the images as *representatives* of the gods; and as such entitled to every honour. Finally, they maintained that they did not adore the *images*, but only the *gods*, who, as it were, resided in them. In fact, the idolatries of the Romish Church have been ever defended by these and such like arguments; which were indignantly rejected by the great Christian Apologists (in their answers to Celsus, Porphyry, and Julian), who would, doubtless, were they alive now, be as strenuous opposers of *Romish* as they were once of *Pagan* idolatry.

27. ἡμῖν τὸ μέρος.] The sense seems to be, “this our part of the common employment, this our business.” So the Syr. and Arab. Versions. The Dat. is for the Genit.

— ἀπελεγμὸν] *disgrace*, from ἀπελέγχεσθαι, to be utterly refuted or rejected. The word occurs in Symmachus, and *ελεγμὸς* in the Sept. The construction of this passage is somewhat anomalous; and it has therefore been treated as corrupt, and has been tampered with by both ancient and modern critics. But no change is necessary, — since the style is what is called *popular*, and the construction is: κινδυνεύει τὸ ἱερὸν — λογισθῆναι, τὴν τε μεγαλειότητα αὐτῆς μέλλειν καὶ καθαιρεῖσθαι.

29. θέατρον] as being the place of public resort for every kind of business or pleasure. Συνεκδήμους, fellow travellers, or, as others explain, townsmen, those who had left their country together with Paul.

31. Ἀσιαρχῶν.] These *Asiarchs* were of the number of those annual magistrates, who, in the eastern part of the Roman Empire, were (like the Roman *Ædiles*) superintendents of things pertaining to religious worship, the celebration of the public games, &c. They were called, according to the *province* over which they presided, either *Asiarchs*, *Lyciarchs*, *Bithynarchs*, or *Syriarchs*,

πέμπαντες πρὸς αὐτὸν παρεκάλουν μὴ δοῦναι ἑαυτὸν εἰς τὸ θέατρον.
 Ἄλλοι μὲν οὖν ἄλλο τι ἔκραζον· ἦν γὰρ ἡ ἐκκλησία συγκεχυμένη, καὶ 32
 οἱ πλείους οὐκ ᾔδεισαν τίνος ἕνεκεν συνεληλύθεισαν. ἢ Ἐκ δὲ τοῦ 33
 ὄχλου προεβίβασαν Ἀλέξανδρον, προβαλόντων αὐτὸν τῶν Ἰουδαίων· ὁ
 δὲ Ἀλέξανδρος κατασεισας τὴν χεῖρα, ᾗθελεν ἀπολογεῖσθαι τῷ δήμῳ.
 * Ἐπιγρόντες δὲ ὅτι Ἰουδαῖός ἐστι, φωνὴ ἐγένετο μία ἐκ πάντων ὡς ἐπὶ 34
 ᾧρας δύο κραζόντων· Μεγάλη ἡ Ἄρτιμις Ἐφείων! Καταστείλας δὲ 35

h Supra 12. 17.
 & 13. 16.
 infra 21. 40.

&c. The office was only for a year, and was elective; a certain number of persons (in Proconsular Asia, ten) being elected by the cities, and sent to form a common council at some principal city. Of these the Proconsul appointed one to be the Asiarch; the rest being his colleagues, and also styled Asiarchs: for those who had borne the office were afterwards called Asiarchs by courtesy. And hence Kuinoel thinks it uncertain whether the Asiarchs here mentioned were those actually in office (the Council being held at Ephesus) or those who had been so. But the air of the context evidently points to the former; and, indeed, the use of the article (which, in the latter case, was very unlikely to have been used) makes it certain.

— μὴ δοῦναι ἑαυτὸν εἰς τὸ θέατρον.] I cannot agree with Valckn. and Kypke, in regarding this as a forensic mode of expression, like εἰσελθεῖν εἰς δῆμον just before. For though they adduce examples of this use from Josephus, yet there εἰς κίνδυνον is added. It should rather seem to be a popular form of expression, denoting, “not to trust himself in the theatre.” So Cicero C. Verr. iii. 19. Populo se ac coronæ daturum. This, therefore, may be considered one of the Latinisms in St. Luke.

33. This verse involves no little obscurity, partly from the words here occurring being used in a somewhat uncommon sense; but chiefly from the construction being left incomplete, and the circumstances of the transaction in question being rather to be gathered from what is said, than distinctly narrated. Hence considerable difference of opinion exists, both as to the construction and the sense. The construction commonly adopted is προεβίβασαν Ἀλέξανδρον ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου· which, though involving a somewhat harsh transposition, might be admitted, if the context allowed of it. But this it does not; for thus no tolerable account can be given of the transaction in question. It must therefore be taken before προεβίβασαν (as was done by the Pesch. Syr. Translator, and is the method adopted by all the best Interpreters), and a nominative supplied, — either τινες, as referred to ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου, or the common ellipsis ἀνθρωποι must be supposed at προεβίβασαν· the sense of which term will depend upon the view taken of the affair then going forward; which has been not a little misunderstood by some Expositors, as Hammond and Bp. Pearce. It should seem that certain well-disposed persons of the people present, with a view to quiet the tumult, were desirous to set up some one to address the multitude, and endeavour to appease their wrath, by showing that there was no good reason for it. Now the Jews present were sure to join them, because they saw that the anger of the multitude was directed against both the Christians and themselves: and they were anxious that the speaker should at least take the blame

off their shoulders, and lay it, — where it ought, they thought, to be, — on the Christians. They therefore proposed, as a proper person to speak, one Alexander, who, it seems, had a talent for public speaking, and was a Proselyte of the gate; the same probably with Alexander the copper-smith. No other view but this can make any thing intelligible. Hence it appears that προεβ. cannot mean (as our common Version renders) drew out, still less (as Prof. Scholef.) “thrust forth;” for the word has never that sense; and here the context would not permit it. It has not, I think, been sufficiently borne in mind by Expositors, that προεβιβάζω and ἀναβιβάζω are very often used of setting any one up to speak, especially as an advocate for others: sometimes, however, only to express their sentiments. Examples in abundance are supplied by the Commentators and Steph. Thesaur. The above interpretation is supported by the authority of the Pesch. Syr. Version, which renders προεβίβασαν, by

אָפּעבן], appointed; literally, “set him up, made him get up [to speak];” this being of the Aphel Conjugation from יָרָס, to rise.

Προβαλόντων just after may be taken in a metaphorical sense for proposing him, recommending him [as a fit person]. Of the sense proponere, Wets., Kypke, and Stephens in his Thesaur., furnish numerous examples. These words προβαλόντων αὐτὸν τῶν Ἰουδαίων are added, to point out the prominent part taken by the Jews in the transaction; who, indeed, had some cause to feel alarmed for their safety, since their hostility to all idol-worship was well known, and the bitter animosity felt towards them by the multitude is plain, from their refusing to hear the speaker because he was a Jew. Of ἀπολογεῖσθαι the sense is clearly that of addressing the people, to show them that no insult had been offered to the worship of Diana; or, at least, that the Jews were not the persons who had done the wrong.

34. ἐπιγρόντες.] This (for the common lection ἐπιγρόντων) is the reading of many of the best MSS., of almost all the early Edd., and of several Fathers; and it is adopted by almost every Editor from Wets. to Vat. And rightly; for besides the strong external evidence, internal evidence is quite in its favour, it being the more difficult reading. It is, however, not so much a Nominative absolute, as it involves an anacoluthon.

35. Κατασέλω signifies properly to put down, as Ps. lxx. 8. καταστ. τὸ κέρας τῆς θαλάσσης. But it is more frequently used in a metaphorical sense, of quieting a tumult.

— γραμματεῖς.] It is easier to determine the rank and duties of this office, than to represent the term by any corresponding one of modern

ὁ γραμματεὺς τὸν ὄχλον, φησὶν Ἄνδρες Ἐφεσῖοι, τίς γὰρ ἐστὶν ἄν-
 36 θρωπος ὃς οὐ γινώσκει τὴν Ἐφεσίων πόλιν νεωκόρον οὖσαν τῆς μεγά-
 λης [Θεᾶς] Ἀρτέμιδος καὶ τοῦ Διοπετεῦς; Ἀναντιρρήτων οὖν ὄντων
 37 τούτων, δεόν ἐστιν ὑμᾶς κατεσταλμένους ὑπάρχειν, καὶ μηδὲν προπετεῖς
 38 βλασφημοῦντας τὴν * Θεὸν ὑμῶν. Εἰ μὲν οὖν Δημήτριος καὶ οἱ σὺν
 αὐτῷ τεχνῆται πρὸς τινα λόγον ἔχουσιν, ἀγόρευοι ἀγονται, καὶ ἀνθύ-

languages. From the passages of ancient writers adduced by Wets., it appears that he was *President of the Senate*, and that his duties embraced most of those of our *Chancellor, and Secretary of State*. It may be conjectured that this functionary (of different dignity in different cities) was so called, from being the keeper of the archives, containing all the *γράμματα* of the State; as public treaties, decrees, and documents of every kind.

— τίς γὰρ ἐστὶν, &c.] Pearce and Markl. observe that the γὰρ has reference to some clause omitted, and to be filled up thus: [There is no need of this clamorous repetition of "Great is Diana,"] for what man is there, &c. Of this elliptical use of γὰρ at the beginning of a speech, they adduce an example from Herodot. vi. 11. Ἐπὶ σοῦ γὰρ ἀκριβῆς ἔρχεται ἡμῖν τὰ πάγματα; q. d. I am now induced to address you; for our affairs are in the utmost danger.

— νεωκόρον.] The word at first denoted a *sweeper of the temple*. Afterwards, however, (when the humility of religious devotees made the office sought after even by persons of rank,) the term was employed to denote a *curator*, one whose office it was to see that the temple was kept clean and in good repair, and furnished with every thing proper for the celebration of public worship. Moreover, what was properly applicable only to a *person*, was transferred, by *Prosopœia*, to *cities*; especially as it was usual to *personify* them. And thus, by an accommodation of the sense, the term came to signify *devoted, consecrated to*: in which acceptation it was used not only of *Ephesus*, but also of other cities of Greece and Asia Minor. Nay, sometimes one and the same city was called *νεωκόρος*, with respect to three or even four different gods. So great was this devotion of the Ephesians to Diana, that we find from *Ælian Var. Hist. iii. 26.* the city was styled an *ἀνάθημα*. And that it should have been thus attached to her service, we may easily imagine; since by devoting itself to the goddess, the city was said to have been formerly saved from destruction, when about to be stormed by *Cæsus*. (See *Herodo. i. 25.*) The dedication in question, we learn, was accomplished by a very significant action,—namely, that of fastening cords to the walls and gates, and tying the other end to the pillars of the temple: the very manner in which the Island of *Rhenea* was dedicated to *Apollo* by *Polycrates*. See *Thucyd. iii. 94.*—Θεᾶς before Ἀρτέμιδος (which is not found in several MSS. and Versions) is, perhaps rightly, cancelled by *Griesb., Knapp, and Tittm.*

— τοῦ Διοπετεῦς.] Sub. ἀγάλματος, which is supplied in the *Syr. Version*. It is remarkable that images of an antiquity so remote, as to ascend beyond all historical record, were feigned by the priests to have come "from heaven." And from heaven, in a certain sense, they might

be said to have come, as far as regards the *material*; at least in the *first* rude images of the gods, — since *aerolites* of immense size, and most grotesque shapes, are known in all ages to have fallen from the skies. One or two of these might, in the infancy of society and the origin of idolatry (bearing, by a *lusus naturee*, a rude resemblance to the human bust) have been regarded as images of gods, and (as coming from the skies) sent from heaven to be worshipped. Afterwards, similar *aerolites*, not *naturally* shaped like a bust, would be so formed by *art*. Of the latter kind were, I suspect, the far-famed *Palladii* of *Troy* and of *Athens*, both said to be *διοπετῆ*. Sometimes, however, in a rude condition of society, the *aerolite* was left in its natural state, without any attempt to form it into a bust. Of this we have at least two instances; one in the famous *black stone* in the *Kaaba* at *Mecca*, — which there is reason to think has been an object of worship from the earliest ages; — the other, in what we read in *Herodian v. 3.* where he mentions as existing in the *Temple of the Sun* (at *Baalbec*) a sort of image not *χρωσοῖπτον*, but *ἀνεογαστόν*, of black stone, and of a conical figure, bearing in form a resemblance to the sun, and said to be *διοπετῆς*. Probably, too, the image of *Diana* at *Ephesus*, though said to be of *ebony*, was, in fact, of black stone.

36. κατεσταλμένους] "quiet and orderly." Μηδὲν προπ. πρήττειν, "to do nothing precipitate," is an *euphemism* not uncommon in the *Classical* writers. See *Note on 2 Tim. iii. 2.*

37. ἡγάγετε γὰρ.] Here again the γὰρ refers to a sentence omitted, q. d. [And that you have been hasty and rash is certain,] for you have brought hither, &c.

— Θεῶν.] Such, for the common reading Θεῶν, is found in many MSS., nearly all the early Edd., and some *Fathers*; and it is preferred by *Mill*, and adopted by *Wets., Matth., Griesb., Tittm., and Vat.* It is also confirmed by *internal testimony*; since the scribes were far more likely to change Θεῶν into Θεὸν than the contrary, as appears from this, — that some who had Θεῶν in their originals changed τῶν into τὸν, which *Griesb.*, by a grievous blunder, has *edited*.

38. λόγον.] Some take this to mean a *case at law*; but others, more agreeably to the simple style of *Luke*, interpret it a *complaint*, by an ellipsis of *ρομφῆς*, like the *Heb.* רבך in *Exod. xviii. 16.* So *Col. iii. 13.* ἴαν τις πῶς τινα ἔχη ρομφῆν. At *infra xxiv. 19.* and *Matt. v. 23.* we have simply ἔχειν τι. Ἀγόρευοι scil. ἡκούται, "court days [appointed for trying causes]." *Hesych.* explains ἀγορευτῶν by δικαιοδογίαν. Ἀγονται, are [appointed to be] holden.

— ἀνθρώποι.] The only satisfactory way of accounting for the *plural*, is to regard it not so much as an *hyperbole*, as a *popular idiom*, — by which the *plural* is put for the *singular*, in a *generic* sense, q. d. "It is for laws and proconsuls to de-

πατοὶ εἰσιν· ἐγκαλείτωσαν ἀλλήλους. Εἰ δέ τι † περὶ ἐτέρων ἐπίζη- 39
τεῖτε, ἐν τῇ ἐνόμῳ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐπιλυθήσεται. Καὶ γὰρ κινδυνεύομεν 40
ἐγκαλεῖσθαι στάσεως περὶ τῆς σήμερον, μηδενὸς αἰτίου ὑπάρχοντος
περὶ οὗ δυνησόμεθα ἀποδοῦναι λόγον τῆς συστροφῆς ταύτης. καὶ ταῦτα 41
εἰπὼν ἀπέλυσε τὴν ἐκκλησίαν.

i 1 Tim. 1. 3.

XX. ⁱ ΜΕΤΑ δὲ τὸ παύσασθαι τὸν Θόρνον, προσκαλεσάμενος 1
ὁ Παῦλος τοὺς μαθητὰς καὶ ἀσπασάμενος, ἐξῆλθε πορευθῆναι εἰς τὴν
Μακεδονίαν. Διελθὼν δὲ τὰ μέρη ἐκεῖνα, καὶ παρακάλεσας αὐτοὺς 2
λόγῳ πολλῶν, ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα· ποιήσας τε μῆνας τρεῖς, γενομέ- 3
νης αὐτῷ ἐπιβουλῆς ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων μέλλοντι ἀνάγεσθαι εἰς τὴν
Συρίαν, ἐγένετο γνώμη τοῦ ὑποστρέφειν διὰ Μακεδονίας. ^k Συνείπετο 4
δὲ αὐτῷ ἄχρι τῆς Ἀσίας Σώπαιτρος Βεροιαῖος· Θεσσαλονικέων δὲ Ἀγι-
σταρχος καὶ Σεκοῦνδος, καὶ Γάϊος Δερβιαῖος, καὶ Τιμόθεος. Ἀσιανοὶ
δὲ, Τυχικός καὶ Τρόφιμος. Οὗτοι προελθόντες ἔμενον ἡμᾶς ἐν Τρω- 5
άδι· ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐξεπλεύσαμεν μετὰ τις ἡμέρας τῶν ἀξέμων ἀπὸ Φιλίπ- 6
πων, καὶ ἦλθομεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν Τρωάδα ἄχρις ἡμερῶν πέντε,
οὗ διετρίψαμεν ἡμέρας ἐπτά. ^l Ἐν δὲ τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων, συνηγμέ- 7
νων † τῶν μαθητῶν [τοῦ] κλάσει ἄρτον, ὁ Παῦλος διελέγετο αὐτοῖς,
μέλλων ἐξίνααι τῇ ἐπαύριον· παρέτεινέ τε τὸν λόγον μέχρι μεσονυκτίου.
^h Ἦσαν δὲ λαμπάδες ἰκαναὶ ἐν τῷ ὑπερώῳ οὗ ἦσαν συνηγμένοι. καθή- 8
μενος δὲ τις νεανίας ὀνόματι Εὐτύχος ἐπὶ τῆς θυρίδος, καταφερόμενος 9

k Supra 16. 1.
& 19. 29.
l Infra 21. 29.
& 27. 2.
Col. 4. 7, 10.
1 Cor. 1. 14.
Eph. 6. 21.
2 Tim. 4. 12,
20.
Titus 3. 12.

1 Supra 2. 42,
46.
1 Cor. 10. 16.
& 11. 20.

cide such matters." I would compare Isæus p. 51, 3, οὐσῶν δικῶν, "though there was a power of seeking justice." Ἐγκαλείτωσαν ἀλλήλ. is for ἐγκαλῆσαι εἰσαγγέτωσαν, "let them go to law with each other."

39. ἐτέρων.] i. e. other matters of public concern, whether political or religious. For περὶ ἐτέρων 10 MSS. (some very ancient) have περαιτέρω, which was undoubtedly read by the Pesch. Syriac Translator. It is likewise found in the very ancient *Itala*, and was probably read by the Vulg.: for *alterius* there seems to be an error of the scribes for *ulterioris*. So elegant a term as *περαιτέρω* was sure to be roughly handled by the scribes; especially as *τε* preceded, and *ἐ* and *αἰ* are, by Itacism, continually interchanged. In confirmation of this reading see the passages adduced in my Note on Thucyd. iii. 81. ex. gr. Æschyl. Prom. 255. Μῆπου τι προῦβης τῶνδ'ε καὶ περαιτέρω.

— τῇ ἐνόμῳ ἐκκλ.] Not "a lawful assembly," for the Art. is not pleonastic, but "the regular assembly:" τῇ κυρίᾳ, which is a pointed way of hinting that the present assembly was *not* such.

40. κινδυνεύομεν.] The second person is delicately used for the first, per κοινῶσιν. Στάσις, in the law sense, denoted not only *sedition*, but *tumult*, and is further explained by συστροφῆς following, which signifies a tumultuous assemblage, ζήτησις, as a Classical writer would have said.

XX. 3. ποιήσας.] A Nominat. absolute, or rather an anantapodoton. At αὐτῷ ἐπιβ. ὑπὸ, &c. ἐπιβουλῆ, as a verbal, takes the construction of the verb from which it is derived. On the plot in question Commentators variously speculate. It was probably one to contrive means to make away with Paul while on the voyage. At ἐγένετο γνώμη

repeat αὐτῷ, from the preceding, "It was his purpose."

6. μετὰ τὰς ἡμ. τ. ἀζ.] "after Passover time;" for the Jews spoke of their festivals in the same way as we do, when we say *Christmas-time*, or *Michaelmas-time*. Ἀχρις ἡμέρας π., "within five days." This use of the word is Hellenistic, and found at Rom. viii. 22. xi. 25. See Tittm. de Syn. p. 35.

7. μιᾷ τῶν σαββ.] See Note on Matt. xviii. 1. — τῶν σαββ.] About 17 MSS. and several Versions have ἡμῶν, which is preferred by Grot., Mill, and Beng., and edited by Griesb., Knapp, Tittm., and Vat. But without sufficient reason. See Matth. The τοῦ is omitted in many MSS. and almost all the early Edd., and is cancelled by Matth. and Griesb. It probably came from the margin, especially as it is not found supra xv. 6. On the thing itself see ii. 42.

8. See Note on John vi. 10.

9. τῆς θυρίδος] "the window;" which, it seems, was a kind of lattice, or casement, admitting of being thrown back, so as to let air into the apartment, heated by so much company and so many lamps. The thing is well illustrated by Mr. Jowett, in the Missionary Reg., and Mr. Arundel in the 2d vol. of his interesting "Discoveries in Asia Minor." Καταφερόμενος ὑπνω, for εἰς or πρὸς ὑπνον, of which latter construction examples are adduced by the Commentators. The former is Hellenistic, but occurs in Parthen. Erot. 10. εἰς βλῆν ὑπνον καταφέρεισθαι. The Commentators closely connect the καταφ. with ἔπεισεν, taking it to mean only ἔπεισεν κάτω. But the latter may denote the completion of the action described as in progress at καταφερ. Ἄρθ is for ὑπὸ; or it may be rendered, "from the effects of sleep."

ὑπὸν βαθεῖ, διαλεγόμενου τοῦ Παύλου ἐπὶ πλεῖον, κατενεχθεὶς ἀπὸ τοῦ
 10 ὑπνου, ἔπεσεν ἀπὸ τοῦ τριστέγου κάτω, καὶ ἤρθη νεκρός. ^m Καταβὰς ^{1 Kings 17.}
 δὲ ὁ Παῦλος ἐπέπεσεν αὐτῷ, καὶ συμπεριλαβὼν εἶπε· Μὴ θορυβεῖσθε· ^{2 Kings 4. 34.}
 11 ἡ γὰρ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ ἔστιν. Ἀναβὰς δὲ καὶ κλάσας ἄρτον καὶ
 12 γευσάμενος, ἐφ' ἱκανόν τε ὁμιλήσας ἄχρις αὐγῆς, οὕτως ἐξῆλθεν. Ἦγα-
 13 γον δὲ τὸν παῖδα ζῶντα, καὶ παρεκλήθησαν οὐ μειζίως. Ἡμεῖς δὲ
 προελθόντες ἐπὶ τὸ πλοῖον, ἀνίχθημεν εἰς τὴν Ἄσσον, ἐκεῖθεν μέλλον-
 τες ἀναλαμβάνειν τὸν Παῦλον· οὕτω γὰρ ἦν διωτευαγμένοι, μέλλον

— τριστέγου] “the third story;” for *στέγος* signifies not only a *roof*, but the *flooring* of an upper apartment, as being a roof to the apartment below. So the Latin *tristega tecta*, the third floor. And Juvenal iii. 199. *Tabulata tecta*.

— ἤρθη νεκρός.] Many recent Commentators from Bp. Pearce suppose the word to mean “was taken for dead.” They urge that persons falling from a high place are often found in a swoon; and that there is nothing in the context that would lead us to think the lad was *dead*. Nay that Paul himself says, “he is *not* dead.” The first argument, however, has no force against the plain words of St. Luke. And the second and third have next to none. There is no trait in the Apostles and Evangelists more remarkable, than their avoiding every thing like *setting off* any circumstance to the utmost. Again, it by no means follows from St. Paul’s stretching himself upon the young man that he thought him alive, or meant to see whether he was so or not. The Apostle, by doing the very thing which Elijah in similar circumstances did, evidently regarded him as dead; and, no doubt, imitated the Prophet in offering up fervent prayers that he might be brought to life. And as to the expression of St. Paul, ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ — ἔστιν, we are no more to infer from *that*, that the young man was *not dead*, than, in the narration at Matt. ix. 14., from the words οὐ γὰρ ἀπέθανε, that the damsel was not dead. See the Note there.

10. συμπεριλαβὼν] “embracing.” A sense very rare in the Classical writers, though *one* example, from Plutarch, is adduced by Wets.

11. κλάσας ἄρτον καὶ γευσάμενος.] Some difference of opinion here exists as to whether this is to be understood of the *Eucharist*, or of a *common meal*. The older Expositors adopt the *former* view; those from Gröt. downwards, in general, the *latter*; and, I think, upon good grounds. For it may be observed, 1. that the expression *κλῆν ἄρτον* is only applied to the *Apostle*. 2. Wherever that phrase is used of the *Eucharist*, it is used *simply*, never with the addition of *καὶ γευσάμενος*; especially since the term *γεύσασθαι* did not imply eating *little*, but (by an idiom found in our own language) denoted *taking food*, whether little or otherwise. 3. The following term *ὁμιλήσας* suggests the idea of a *common meal*, since wherever it occurs in Scripture it is used of *ordinary conversation*, not of *preaching*, as in the Ecclesiastical writers; for which *διαλέγασθαι* is used, as just before. Not to mention, that as the Apostle had already so exceeded the usual time in his discourse,—he would not, at that unseasonable hour of the night, *resume* it, and continue it “a good while, till day-break;” nor would he then *celebrate the Eucharist*, which had doubtless been administered at an early period of the meeting.

The meal in question was doubtless taken by St. Paul to strengthen him for his journey.

— οὕτως ἐξῆλθεν.] Render, “then he departed;” which is the sense expressed by the Syr. and the best modern Interpreters. Compare I Thess. iv. 17.

12. ἤγαγον] for *εἰσήγ.* The sense seems to be, “Now they had brought in,” probably just before the Apostle departed. And so in the Cod. Cant. is added *ἀσπάζομένων αὐτῶν*, “as they were bidding each other farewell;” (see xx. i. xxi. 6.) doubtless an insertion from the margin, but which serves to show the view of the sense adopted by the most ancient Interpreters. We may observe, that the introduction of this minute circumstance, though a little out of place, bears upon it the stamp of nature and truth.

— ζῶντα] “alive and well.” That such is the sense, and not *alive* only, (as is alleged by those Commentators who deny the miracle), is clear from the context, especially the words following. Of this sense of ζῶν (but little known or borne in mind by Interpreters) examples occur in John iv. 50. *ὁ υἱός σου ζῶν.* (where see Note) 2 Kings i. 2. and Is. xxxviii. 9. (comparing the Heb. and Sept.) Soph. Trach. 235. *καὶ ζῶντα καὶ θάλλοντα κοῦ νόσω βράβν.* Æschyl. Agam. 660. *καὶ ζῶντα καὶ βλέποντα.* Gen. xlviii. 27. Ὑγιαίνει ὁ πατήρ ἡμῶν ὁ παρθύβτης; to which the answer is *ὕγιαίνει ὁ πατήρ ἡμῶν, ἔτι ζῶν.*

13. προελθόντες ἐπὶ τὸ πλοῖον.] No ship has been recently spoken of: but at v. 6. mention was made of one sailing from Philippi. Therefore Bp. Middl., with reason, supposes this to be the ship implied; in which, it seems, Luke and his party performed their coasting voyage from Philippi, touching at Troas and other places by the way, till they reached Patara, and there embarked on board another vessel bound to Phœnicia. There is, I think, little probability in the supposition of Doddr., Pearce, Michaelis, and Kuin., that the ship had been hired for the voyage; which would surely involve a cost disproportionate to the resources of the Apostle. The stay made by him may be accounted for by supposing, that the ship made occasionally a stop on account of commercial business. It should seem that Paul and his companions depended for their passage on such coasting vessels as they should meet with, and which would be likely to most forward them on their way to Jerusalem; embracing, at the same time, every opportunity (afforded by the occasional stoppage of those vessels for the purposes of trade) to salute and instruct their Christian brethren by the way.

— μέλλων πεζεῖται.] On the reason for this Commentators variously speculate. See Recens. Synop. I am still of opinion, that it was simply to avoid the tedious and (considering the want

αὐτὸς πεζεύειν. Ὡς δὲ συνέβαλεν ἡμῖν εἰς τὴν Ἄσσον, ἀναλαβόντες 14
 αὐτὸν ἤλθομεν εἰς Μιτυλήνην· καὶ κείμενον ἀποπλεύσαντες, τῇ ἐπιούσῃ 15
 κατηντήσαμεν ἀντικρὺ Χίου. τῇ δὲ ἐτέρᾳ παρεβάλομεν εἰς Σάμον· καὶ
 n *Infra* 21. 12. μέιναντες ἐν Τρωγυλλίῳ, τῇ ἐχομένῃ ἤλθομεν εἰς Μίλητον. ⁿ Ἐκρινε 16
 γὰρ ὁ Παῦλος παραπλεύσει τὴν Ἐφεσον, ὅπως μὴ γένηται αὐτῷ χρονο-
 τριβῆσαι ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ· ἔσπευδε γὰρ, εἰ δυνατὸν ἦν αὐτῷ, τὴν ἡμέραν
 τῆς Πεντηκοστῆς γενέσθαι εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα.

Ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς Μιλήτου πέμψας εἰς Ἐφεσον, μετεκαίεσται τοὺς πρεσ- 17
 o *Supra* 19. 10. βυτέρους τῆς ἐκκλησίας. ὡς δὲ παρεγένοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· 18
 Ἔμεις ἐπίστασθε, ἀπὸ πρώτης ἡμέρας ἀφ' ἧς ἐπέβην εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν,
 πῶς μεθ' ὑμῶν τὸν πάντα χρόνον ἐγενόμην, δουλεύων τῷ Κυρίῳ μετὰ 19
 πάσης ταπεινοφροσύνης, καὶ [πολλῶν] δικρῶν, καὶ πειρασμῶν τῶν
 συμβάντων μοι ἐν ταῖς ἐπιβουλαῖς τῶν Ἰουδαίων· ὡς οὐδὲν ὑπεστειλά- 20
 μην τῶν συμφερόντων, τοῦ μὴ ἀναγγεῖλαι ὑμῖν καὶ διδάξαι ὑμᾶς δη-
 p *Mark*. 1. 15.
 Luke 24. 47. μοσίᾳ καὶ κατ' οἴκους, ^p διαμιμνησόμενος Ἰουδαίοις τε καὶ Ἕλλησι τὴν 21
 εἰς τὸν Θεὸν μετάνοιαν, καὶ πίστιν τὴν εἰς τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν
 Χριστόν. Καὶ νῦν ἰδοῦ, ἐγὼ δεδεμένος τῷ πνεύματι πορεύομαι εἰς 22

of skill in the ancient navigators) dangerous circumnavigation of the promontory of Lectrum, which extends a long way into the sea; inasmuch that the distance from Troas to Assos is about one-third shorter by land than by sea. And the Apostle's perils by sea had been so great, that he might well prefer going by land; especially when the distance was shorter.

15. Τρωγυλλίῳ.] The MSS. vary, Matthæi edits Τρωγίλιῳ, which is certainly supported by several passages of Thucydides, in which we have Τρώγιλος mentioned as one of the ports of Syracuse; but never Τρώγυλος. It was so called from an adjacent village of that name. I suspect that Τρωγίλιος is merely another form (originally diminutive) of Τρώγιλος, and the primitive force of each was that of our *ness*.

17. τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους.] As these persons are at ver. 23 called ἐπισκόπους, and especially from a comparison of other passages (as 1 Tim. iii. 1.), the best Commentators, ancient and modern, have with reason inferred that the terms as yet denoted the same thing. Ἐπίσκοπος might denote either an *overlooker*, or a *care-taker*; and these senses would be very suitable to express the pastoral duties. But the word might also (correspondently to the Heb. רִבְּבָה) denote a *ruler*, or *governor*, an idea naturally arising out of the former. The term πρεσβύτεροι was borrowed from the Jewish Hierarchy, and corresponded to the כְּהֵנִי, or Archisynagoga of the Jews. Now all πρεσβύτεροι were officially ἐπίσκοποι. Yet we are not therefore to infer that there was no *superintending supreme* authority in the primitive Church; for reason will show that no society can exist without some laws, and consequently persons to administer those laws. There can, then, be no doubt but that *one* of the presbyters (as there were *many* at Ephesus) was, in such a case, invested with authority over the others, and consequently was a *Bishop* in the modern sense of the term. And since, after Episcopacy, in that sense, was established, it became proper to have a *name* by which to designate the *ruling*

Presbyter, none seemed so proper as ἐπίσκοπος, because it was far better fitted to denote the *Episcopal* than the *Pastoral* duties; while πρεσβ. had, no doubt, been always more in use to denote the *pastoral* or ministerial.

Markl. rightly infers from ver. 25, that Paul convoked not only the Presbyters of Ephesus, but of the *district*; no part of it being far from Ephesus (namely, *Asia proper*, the ancient Ionica), the *Christians* of all which constituted the *Church* of Ephesus.

18. πῶς μ. ἔ. ἐγενόμην] “How I have conducted myself among you.”

19. δουλεύων — ταπεινοφ.] “discharging the ministry of the Lord with all humility and modesty.” The μετὰ must be repeated at ἀκρῶν, and rendered, with a small accommodation of the sense, *amidst, or amongst*. So the Heb. בְּ, *by*. Συμβ. ἐν, בְּ “which happened through or by.” See my Note on Thucyd. ii. 70. N. 3.

20. οὐδὲν ὑπεστ.] Ὑποστῆλαισθαι signifies, in the Middle form, “to withdraw one's self through fear;” and, in a deponent sense, “to withdraw, keep back any thing.” In ἀναγγεῖλαι καὶ διδάξαι there seems to be a reference to the Gospel preached, being at once a *message* and an *instruction*. It is plain from the foregoing term δημοσίᾳ, which has reference to meetings of the *whole* congregation at once, that κατ' οἴκους must mean, not “from house to house,” but “in private houses” (the κατὰ only denoting *rotation*), namely, those where separate parts of the whole number of Christians met. So κατ' οἶκον supra ii. 46. where see Note. Or we may (with Mosheim de rebus ante Const. i. 37.) suppose δημοσίᾳ to denote the place where the delegates from the different congregations, of which the Church of Ephesus was composed, met; and κατ' οἴκους, the houses where the different congregations assembled.

22. δεδεμένος τῷ πνεύματι.] Many Commentators take πνεύματι to mean the *Holy Spirit*. But thus δεδεμένος admits of no satisfactory sense, and the next clause discountenances this interpretation. It is better, with others, to take πνεύματι of the

- 23 Ἐρουσαλήμ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ συνανηθήσονται μοι μὴ εἰδώς· ⁹ πλὴν ὅτι τὸ ^q Infra 21. 4.
 Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον κατὰ πόλιν διαμαρτύρεται λέγον, ὅτι δεσμά με καὶ
 24 θλίψεις μένουσιν. Ἴ ^r Ἄλλ' οὐδενὸς λόγον ποιούμεναι, οὐδὲ ἔχω τὴν ψυ- Infra 21. 13.
 χὴν μου τιμίαν ἐμαντῶ, ὡς τελειῶσαι τὸν δρόμον μου μετὰ χαρᾶς, καὶ Gal. 1. 1.
 τὴν διακονίαν ἣν ἔλαβον παρὰ τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, διαμαρτύρασθαι τὸ Tit. 1. 3.
 25 εὐαγγέλιον τῆς χάριτος τοῦ Θεοῦ. Καὶ νῦν ἰδοῦ, ἐγὼ οἶδα ὅτι οὐκέτι
 ὕψεσθε τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ὑμεῖς πάντες, ἐν οἷς διήλθον κηρύσσων τὴν Luke 7. 30.
 26 βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ. Διὸ μαρτύρομαι ὑμῖν ἐν τῇ σήμερον ἡμέρᾳ, ὅτι Eph. 1. 11.
 27 καθαρὸς ἐγὼ ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος πάντων· ^a οὐ γὰρ ὑπεστειλάμην, τοῦ 1 Pet. 5. 2.
 28 μὴ ἀναγγεῖλαι ὑμῖν πᾶσαν τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ. Ἰ ¹ Προσεχετε οὖν 1 Tim. 3. 1, 2.
 ἐαντοῖς καὶ παντὶ τῷ ποιμνίῳ, ἐν ᾧ ὑμᾶς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἔθετο Phil. 1. 1.
Eph. 1. 7.
Col. 1. 14.
1 Pet. 1. 19.
Rev. 5. 9.

mind of St. Paul; a very frequent sense of the word. Δεδεμένος is well explained by Rosenmüller, Kuin., and Middl., "under a strong impulse of my mind;" by a metaphor very similar to that in *συνέχεσθαι τῷ πνεύματι* at xviii. 5, where see Note.

23. πλὴν ὅτι.] Sub. ἐν and τοῦτο, "But this one thing [alone I know] that." So Soph. El. 426. πλείω δὲ τούτων οὐ κάποιτα· πλὴν ὅτι πέμπε με, &c. The ἐν is supplied by Aristoph. Pac. 227. See Hoogew. de part. in voc. Τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον is rightly taken by the best Commentators to denote *persons endued by the Holy Spirit*. The Holy Spirit in every city testified by the mouth of inspired prophets. See xxi. 4, 11. Μένουσαι, "await me." This seems to be a Latinism.

24. οὐδενὸς λόγον ποιούμεναι] "I make no account of;" care not for any thing. An idiom occurring in the best writers. Not so the phraseology of the next clause, which is in the *popular* style; and ἔχω is employed according to the Latin use of *habeo*. Markl. and Kuin. think there is an ellip. of οὗτω, which is expressed in a similar passage of Liban. p. 407, cited by Wets. μήτ' οὕτω ποτὲ μέγα ἠγάσασιν τὴν ψυχὴν, ὥστε πόθω τὸν ζῆν βλάψαι τὴν ἐνέγκασαν. In τελειῶσαι τὸν δρόμον, there is an *agonistic* metaphor. Τελειῶσαι is employed in two senses, adapted to the two different clauses to which it belongs. Διαμαρτύρασθαι—Θεοῦ is exegetical of διακονίαν.

25. ἰδοῦ.] The sense of the expression, (as at ver. 22,) is *Mind!* Οἶδα ὅτι οὐκέτι ὕψεσθε τ. π. μ. As it is next to certain that the Apostle did again visit Proconsular Asia, after his release from imprisonment at Rome, the Commentators are at a loss to reconcile what is here said to facts. They suppose, either that all the Presbyters now present were dead when St. Paul again visited Asia, or that he might mean, he should not see them *all* again. The former solution, however, is too much like a "device for the nonce," and the latter is far-fetched and unnecessary; since we have only to suppose that the Apostle here speaks ἐν πνεύματι, according to his human spirit or mind, and therefore (as he said just before) μὴ εἰδώς, *not certainly* knowing that it *would* be so, but *presaging* such from the threatening intimations he had received. Indeed the form οὐδ' ὅτι, or even εἰ οὐδ' ὅτι, is perpetually used in the best writers to denote something far short of certain knowledge, and only of *opinion*, or *present persuasion*. See my Note on Thucyd. iii. 34.

28. There is scarcely any passage of the N. T. on which the opinions of Critics and Expositors are more divided than the present. In exami-

ing what is the true *reading*, in order to ascertain the exact *sense*, we find the MSS. offering no less than *SIX* readings, namely, τοῦ Θεοῦ:—τοῦ Κυρίου:—τοῦ Χριστοῦ:—τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Κυρίου:—τοῦ Κυρίου Θεοῦ:—and τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ: The relative merits of these are discussed by Wets., Griesb., Kuin., and Dr. Pye Smith, *Script. Test.* Vol. iii. p. 66. sq., who decide in favour of Κυρίου. On the contrary, other Critics of not less eminence, as Mill., Bengel, Wolf, Venema, Michaelis, Ernesti, Valckn., Wassenberg, Matth., Wakef., Tittm., Vater, Bp. Middl., Gratz, and Rinck, reject Κυρίου, and almost all read Θεοῦ: though some, as Matthæi and Middl., prefer τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ. It is indeed a question of very difficult decision; in which the Critical arguments usually employed *draw two ways*; inasmuch that a Critical Jury might most *prudently* return a verdict of *NON LIQUET*, and thus a positive determination of the exact reading might be deferred ad *Græcæ Calendaras*. In the former Edition of this work I decided in favour of the common reading τοῦ Θεοῦ. But I have been induced, by the remarks and suggestions offered, in an able Critique on this work in the *Eclectic Review* for Dec. 1832, to give the whole question a most attentive consideration, the result of which I shall proceed to lay before the reader.

And first let us examine the state of the evidence before us. Perplexing as it appears, yet it may be much cleared by the consideration, that *three* out of the above six Varr. Lectt. (namely τοῦ Χριστοῦ,—τοῦ Κυρίου Θεοῦ,—and τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Κυρίου) are scarcely entitled to the appellation of *varr. lectt.*, being partly formed on the others, and partly proceeding from an evident *alteration* to avoid a *difficulty*: and having scarcely any authority of MSS., they merit no attention, except as furnishing *data* to assist us in judging of the *remaining three PRIMARY READINGS*, namely, τοῦ Θεοῦ;—τοῦ Κυρίου;—and τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ. Let us now examine these readings, as to the evidence *external* and *internal*. As to the *former*, Κυρίου is supported by 13 MSS. (five of them very ancient, and the rest neither ancient nor very valuable), by the Coptic, Sahidic, and Armenian Versions, and some Fathers, chiefly Latin. 2. Τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ is supported by *one* very ancient MS. and 63 others, none of much antiquity or consequence, but of *different families*; also by the Slavonic Version, the Edit. Princ., et Plantin. 3. Τοῦ Θεοῦ is supported by the most ancient of the MSS. (the Cod. Vat.) and 17 others; some of the 10th, 11th, or 12th centuries, but most of them more modern: also by the Pesch. Syr. in

ἐπισκόπους, ποιμαίνειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ, ἣν περιποι-
 ῆσατο διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος. "Ἐγὼ γὰρ οἶδα τοῦτο, οὐ εἰσελεύσον- 29
 ται μετὰ τὴν ἄφιξίν μου λύκοι βαρεῖς εἰς ὑμᾶς, μὴ φειδόμενοι τοῦ

some MSS.; by the *Latin Vulgate*; and, according to some, the *Æthiopic*. Finally, it is quoted, or referred to, by Ignat., Tertull., Basil., Chrysost., Epiph., Ambrose, Theophyl., Æcumen., and 12 other Fathers of the Greek and Latin Church. Now it is manifest, that τοῦ Κυρίου is greatly inferior in MS. authority to τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ, and not superior to τοῦ Θεοῦ; and of the 4. valuable Venice MSS. lately collated by Rinck, two have τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ, one τοῦ Κυρίου Θεοῦ, and one Θεοῦ. And as τοῦ Κυρίου was evidently formed on τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ, that is decisive. Consequently the reading τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ has an undoubted superiority as to external evidence. As to internal, the reading Θεοῦ has been contended for by eminent Critics (though with very different views) strenuously, but, I now think, not quite successfully; for while the phrase ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ occurs 12 times in St. Paul's Epistles, ἐκκλησία τοῦ Κυρίου is found nowhere in the N. T.: consequently, it was far more probable that Κυρίου should be altered to Θεοῦ than Θεοῦ to Κυρίου. Besides, the former might be done without any evil intention, while the latter could only arise from sinister design; which ought surely never to be imputed without very strong reasons. Now if τοῦ Θεοῦ be the true reading, the sense will be that assigned by the above-mentioned learned Reviewer, "Feed the Church of Him who is God, which he hath purchased with his own blood;" implying an assertion at once of the *Deity* and the *Humanity* of our Lord, without confounding the "two natures." Yet this is somewhat harsh, and cannot fairly be elicited from the words; and therefore there is the less reason to impute the reading to any pious fraud on the part of the *Trinitarians*. And as little reason is there to impute the reading Κυρίου to an alteration of the *Arians*; for, not to say that they never had the power to foist in a reading, so as to introduce it into above two-thirds of the Copies, they were not driven to do so from necessity; and having, as we see in the case of Mr. Wakefield, contrived such a sort of interpretation as to keep out any sense that might compromise their opinions. It may, indeed, be argued that τοῦ Θεοῦ, as being unquestionably the most difficult reading, ought to be preferred. And it is true that the readings may perhaps all of them be accounted for as so many various attempts to soften that harshness. Yet that is perhaps too hypothetical.

Let us now proceed to examine the comparative evidence, external and internal, for the readings τοῦ Κυρίου and τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ. Now external evidence is decidedly in favour of the latter; but internal evidence is somewhat in favour of the former; for though Bp. Middl. (after Matth.) thinks it quite as probable that the readings τοῦ Θεοῦ and τοῦ Κυρίου may have arisen by dividing the reading τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ, as that the reading τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ was compounded of those readings; nevertheless, since the former circumstance so very rarely occurs, and the latter so frequently in all writers, I really cannot agree with the learned Prelate. I am quite disposed to assent to the observation of Dr. Pye Smith, that, "τοῦ Κυρίου being admitted to be the original reading, all the others may be accounted for by suppositions

easy and probable in themselves, and known to have been realized in numerous instances." But, to advert to the evidence as regards the *secondary* readings,—the reading Χριστοῦ supports that of Κυρίου; and the reading τοῦ Κυρίου Θεοῦ supports τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ; while τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Κυρίου, I think, supports τοῦ Θεοῦ: for it seems to have arisen from the alteration of some who, stumbling at the harshness of Θεοῦ, subjoined καὶ Κυρίου, in order to supply some word to which τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος could be applied. Under all the circumstances, I have thought proper (with Matthæi and Vater), to admit the words Κυρίου καὶ; but, from the state of the comparative internal evidence, I have not chosen, with Vater, to bracket καὶ Θεοῦ; since, as all the other readings may be accounted for (though with less probability), on the supposition that τοῦ Θεοῦ is the true reading, it may, after all, be such; and it must be owned that the testimony of Versions and Fathers is strongly in its favour, and also that it is found in the most ancient of MSS. And certainly it is more likely to be the original reading than τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ.

It is scarcely necessary to observe that if the reading τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ be authentic, it affords a strong proof of the Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ; since (as Bp. Middl. has shown at large) the sense must be, "of Him being (i. e. who is) both Lord and God." And even if τοῦ Κυρίου be the true reading, yet the passage will still bear attestation to the same doctrine; for, (as the learned Reviewer above mentioned observes), the phrase "Church of the Lord" equally denotes the Divinity of the Proprietor and Redeemer of the Church, the Object of its worship, who has given himself for it, that he might sanctify it, and present it to himself a glorious Church, Eph. v. 27; where (as Dr. Burton remarks) we should rather have expected τῷ Θεῷ; but St. Paul uses ἐκ τῶν on account of the union of the Father and the Son.

— ἦν περιποιήσατο.] Περιποιεῖσθαι signifies "to make one's own by purchase." See Dresig. de V. A. p. 378. and Winer's Gr. Gr. § 32. 2. The term was often used of acquiring a right to any one's services, by preserving or sparing his life in war. See Herodot. i. 110. Wets. compares Dionys. Hal. iv. 11. ἦν (scil. γῆν) ἐμῆς δι' αἵματος ἐκτήσασθε.

29. St. Paul here adverts to the reason for this solemn admonition, namely, the danger which would shortly overtake the Church from false teachers, whose voracity would be as great as their hypocrisy. We have here the same metaphor as at Matt. vii. 15. 16., where see Note. In the present instance, however, there is a tacit allusion to the case of the shepherd, or his watch-dogs appointed to guard the flock, gratifying their voracity by even preying on the flock itself. So Dio Cass. p. 389. ἐπὶ γὰρ τὰς ἀγέλας ὑμῶν φίδαικες, οὐ κτίας οὐδὲ νομῆες, ἀλλὰ λύκους πέμπετε. Themist. Orat. viii. οἰκοῖν οὐδὲ τὸν ποιμαίνειν πασῶν σου ταχθῆντα, εἰ λῆκος ἀπὶ ποιμένος ὄφθειν, κερταίνειν τὴν προσκρούσαν ἑκην ἴα. So 2 Cor. xi. 20. the Apostle, with allusion to such teachers, says: ἀνέχουσε τῶν ἀφροῦν, φρόνιμοι ὄντες ἀνέχουσε γὰρ, εἰ τις ὑμᾶς καταουλοῖ, εἰ τις κατεσθίει, &c. In ad-

- 30 ποιμῖον· ^ακαὶ ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν ἀναστήσονται ἄνδρες λαλοῦντες διε- x Ps. 41. 9.
Matt. 26. 21.
supra 1. 17.
1 John 2. 19.
y Supra 19. 10.
- 31 στραμμένα, τοῦ ἀποσπῆν τοὺς μαθητὰς ὀπίσω αὐτῶν. ^γ Διὸ γοηγοεῖτε, z Supra 9. 31.
Eph. 1. 18.
μνημονεύοντες ὅτι τριετίαν, νύκτι καὶ ἡμέραν, οὐκ ἐπαυσάμην μετὰ
- 32 δακρύων ρουθειῶν ἓνα ἕκαστον. ^β Καὶ τανῦν παρατίθεμαι ὑμᾶς, a 1 Sam. 12. 3.
1 Cor. 9. 12.
2 Cor. 11. 9.
& 12. 13.
b Sup. 18. 3.
1 Cor. 4. 12.
1 Thes. 2. 9.
2 Thes. 3. 8.
c 1 Cor. 9. 12.
ἀδελφοί, τῷ Θεῷ καὶ τῷ λόγῳ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ, τῷ δυναμένῳ ἐποι-
κοδομήσαι, καὶ δοῦναι ὑμῖν κληρονομίαν ἐν τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις πᾶσιν.
- 33 Ἀργυρίου ἢ χρυσοῦ ἢ ἱματισμοῦ οὐδενὸς ἐπεθύμησα· ^δ αὐτοὶ δὲ a 1 Sam. 12. 3.
1 Cor. 9. 12.
2 Cor. 11. 9.
& 12. 13.
b Sup. 18. 3.
1 Cor. 4. 12.
1 Thes. 2. 9.
2 Thes. 3. 8.
c 1 Cor. 9. 12.
- 34 γινώσκειτε ὅτι ταῖς χρεῖαις μου καὶ τοῖς οὐσι μετ' ἐμοῦ ὑπηρετήσαν αἱ d Infra 21. 5.
35 χεῖρες αὐταί. ^ε Πάντα ὑπέδειξα ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὕτω κοπιῶντας δεῖ ἀντι-
λαμβάνεσθαι τῶν ἀσθενούντων, μνημονεύειν τε τῶν λόγων τοῦ Κυρίου
Ἰησοῦ, ὅτι αὐτὸς εἶπε· Μακάριον ἐστὶν διδόναι μᾶλλον ἢ λαμβάνειν.
- 36 ^δ Καὶ ταῦτα εἰπὼν, θεῖς τὰ γόνατα αὐτοῦ, σὺν πᾶσιν αὐτοῖς προσηύ-
37 ξατο. Ἰκανὸς δὲ ἐγένετο κλαυθμὸς πάντων· καὶ ἐπιπεσόντες ἐπὶ τὸν
38 τράχηλον τοῦ Παύλου, κατερίλουν αὐτόν· ὀδυνώμενοι μάλιστα ἐπὶ τῷ
λόγῳ ᾧ εἰρήκει, ὅτι οὐκέτι μέλλουσι τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ θεωρεῖν.
προπέμπον δὲ αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ πλοῖον.
- 1 XXI. Ὡς δὲ ἐγένετο ἀναχθῆναι ἡμᾶς ἀποσπασθέντας ἀπ' αὐτῶν,
ἐνθυδρομήσαντες ἤλαθον εἰς τὴν Κῶν, τῇ δὲ ἐξῆς εἰς τὴν Ῥόδον,

diction to *rapacity* and, it should seem, *hypocrisy*, the Apostle, in the next verse, subjoins the *sowing of heresies and schisms*, such as those of Phygellus and Hermogenes, and others, who afterwards promulgated the Nicolaitan errors, against which some passages of St. John's Gospel seem directed.

30. *διστραμμένα*] "erroneous." So Arrian opposes *δόγματα ὀρθὰ* καὶ *διστραμμένα* καὶ *στροβιλὰ*. The metaphor is the same as that in our adjective *wrong*, which comes from the Ang. Sax. *wrinnzan* to *twist*; and literally signifies [something] wrested from the right (i. e. straight) line or conduct.

31. *τριετίαν*] i. e. about the space of three years; for there is no occasion to suppose that the Apostle here speaks with arithmetical exactness. Though indeed, if to the *two* years he taught in the School of Tyrannus be added the three months he taught in the synagogue, and the time he taught privately with Aquila and Priscilla, we have something not far short of three years.

32. *καὶ τῷ λόγῳ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ*.] *Λόγῳ τῆς χάριτος*. may (with several eminent Interpreters, ancient and modern), be taken, by a Hebraism, for the *grace itself*, per Hendiadyn. And thus *δυναμὴν* would be referred to *God*. But it is perhaps better taken (with Pisc., Wolf, Heinr., Kuin., the Syr., Arab., and our common Version) to mean the *Gospel and its doctrines*, which can alone edify men, &c. See 2 Tim. iii. 13. Eph. ii. 20. 1 Cor. iii. 10. The *ἐπ' ἐν ἐποικοδομήσει* may refer to the *gradual* edification of the Gospel, as buildings are raised, *course by course*, by the architect. The metaphor in *κληρονομία* is meant to suggest the *certainly* of the rewards *laid up* in heaven for the righteous. *Τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις* does not (as most Commentators imagine) here and at xxvi. 13, and Heb. x. 14., denote simply *Christians*, but "those who have *walked worthy* of their high calling in baptism."

33. What is here said was evidently suggested by the conduct of the false teachers. By *ἡμα-*

τισμός is meant that handsome clothing which among the Hebrews was reckoned part of any one's wealth. See Matt. vi. 19. 2 Kings v. 26., and especially a passage of Thucyd. ii. 97., where, in reckoning up the revenues of the king of Thrace, one item consists of *δῶρα ὑφαντά τε καὶ λεία, καὶ ἡ ἄλλη κατασκευὴ*, stuffs, both embroidered and plain, and other household furniture. These it might have been supposed he had accepted as presents, especially since Ephesus was famous for the manufacture of stuffs. And we may infer from 1 Cor. xi. 21. that the teachers were paid partly in goods.

34. *αἱ χεῖρες αὐταί*] "these hands," holding them up. There is a similar beauty in xxvi. 29. *παρεκτός τῶν δεσφῶν τοῦτων*. The Commentators compare several passages of the Classical writers, scarcely any much to the purpose. I have, however, in Recens. Synop., adduced a very apposite one from Philostrat. Vit. Ap. ii. 26. *πολλὰ δὲ μοι καὶ ἀπὸ δένδρων φέεται, ὧν γεωργοὶ αἰδέ αἱ χεῖρες*. Finally, *τοῖς οὐσι μετ' ἐμοῦ* may be regarded as a popular negligence of style, for *ταῖς τῶν ὄντων μετ' ἐμοῦ*.

35. *πάντα ὑπέδειξα ὑμῖν*.] Sub. *κατὰ*, and take *ὑπέδειξα* for *ὑποδείγματα ἔδωκα*, as in a kindred passage of John xiii. 15.

— *μακάριον — λαμβάνειν*.] This is one of the sayings of our Lord unrecorded in the Gospels, (see John xxi. fin.) such as, no doubt, there were then many circulated among the Christians, and some of which are recorded by the early Fathers; on which see Fabric. Cod. Apoc. N. T. 1. 131., and especially the very scarce tract of *Koerner de Sermonibus Christi ἀγράφοις*, Lips. 1776. 8vo. With the *sentiment* the Commentators compare many from the Classical writers; and others may be seen in my Note on Thucyd. ii. 97. *νόμον — λαμβάνειν μᾶλλον ἢ δίδοναι*. *Μακάριον* signifies "*magis juvat*," is attended with a greater blessing.

37. *ἐπιπεσόντες ἐπὶ τὸν τράχ.*] According to an Oriental custom, still retained in the East.

κακείθεν εἰς Πατάρα. Καὶ εὐρόντες πλοῖον διαπερῶν εἰς Φοινίκην, 2
 ἐπιβάντες ἀνήχθημεν. ἀφανέντες δὲ τὴν Κύπρον, καὶ καταλιπόντες 3
 αὐτὴν εὐώρυμον, ἐπλέομεν εἰς Συρίαν, καὶ κατήχθημεν εἰς Τύρον·
 ἐκεῖσε γὰρ ἦν τὸ πλοῖον ἀποφορτιζόμενον τὸν γόμον. ° Καὶ ἀνευρόν- 4
 τες τοὺς μαθητὰς, ἐπεμείναμεν αὐτοῦ ἡμέρας ἐπτά· οἵτινες τοῦ Παύ-
 λου ἔλεγον διὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος, μὴ ἀναβαίνειν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ. "Οτι 5
 δὲ ἐγένετο ἡμᾶς ἐξαρτῆσαι τὰς ἡμέρας, ἐξελθόντες ἐπορευόμεθα, προ-
 πεμπόντων ἡμᾶς πάντων, σὺν γυναῖξί καὶ τέκνοις, ἕως ἔξω τῆς πόλεως·
 καὶ θέντες τὰ γόνατα ἐπὶ τὸν αἰγιαλὸν προσηνξάμεθα. Καὶ ἀσπασά- 6
 μνοι ἀλλήλους, ἐπέβημεν εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, ἐκεῖνοι δὲ ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς τὰ
 ἴδια. Ἡμεῖς δὲ τὸν πλοῖον διανύσαντες, ἀπὸ Τύρου κατηντήσαμεν εἰς 7
 Πτολεμαῖδα· καὶ ἀσπασάμενοι τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς ἐμείναμεν ἡμέραν μίαν
 παρ' αὐτοῖς. ° Τῇ δὲ ἐπαύριον ἐξελθόντες [οἱ περὶ τὸν Παῦλον] ἤλ- 8
 θομεν εἰς Καισάρειαν· καὶ εἰσελθόντες εἰς τὸν οἶκον Φιλίππου τοῦ
 εὐαγγελιστοῦ, [τοῦ] ὄντος ἐκ τῶν ἐπτὰ, ἐμείναμεν παρ' αὐτῶ. ἡ τού- 9
 τῶν δὲ ἦσαν θυγατέρες παρθένου τέσσαρες προφητεύουσαι. Ἐπιμερόν- 10
 των δὲ ἡμῶν ἡμέρας πλείους, κατῆλθί τις ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας προφήτης

e Supra 20. 23.
 infra ver. 12.

f Supra 20. 36.

g Supra 6. 5.
 & 8. 26, 40.
 Eph. 4. 11.

h Joel 2. 28.
 supra 2. 17.

i Supra 11. 28.

XXI. 3. ἀφανέντες τὴν Κ.] So the textus receptus, as well as the Ed. Princ., and almost all the MSS. The Stephanic reading ἀφανέντες was taken from the Erasmus Editions, in which it was probably only a typographical error. Stephens and Beza conjectured ἀναφάντες, which would make it correct in Grammar, and perhaps in idiom, since ἀποκρύπτει τὴν γῆν is so used. See the examples adduced by me in Recens. Synop. and on Thucyd. v. 65. 7. And so the Latin idiom *aperire terram*, to make land, or a coast. Yet very different is the idiom here adopted, of which the Commentators cite examples, (as Theophan. p. 392. ἀναφανέντων δὲ αὐτῶν τὴν γῆν) and regard this as a nautical idiom for ἀναφανίσως τῆς Κύπρου. There is, indeed, a sort of *hypallage*, (ἀνεφάνην τὴν Κύπρον being equivalent to ἀνεφάνη μοι ἡ Κ.), and an ellip. of *κατά*. The sense is, "being brought into view of Cyprus." See the Vulg.

—καταλιπόντες αὐτὴν εὐώρυμ.] "leaving it on the left." Of this idiom examples are adduced by Wets. Perhaps there is an ellip. of *κατά*.

—ἦν ἀποφορτιζόμενον] for ἀπεφορτιζέτω, literally "was unloading;" though in reality (by an interchange of past with present, to denote what is intended and soon to happen) it signifies "was soon to unload." See Win. Gr. Gr. § 396. C. This ship, and that mentioned at xxvi. 2. seem to have been in the carrying trade.

4. τοὺς μαθητὰς] "the disciples," i. e. such persons as were disciples. There is no necessity (as Bp. Middl. supposed) to omit the Article.

—ἔλεγον—μὴ ἀναβαίνειν.] There may seem something strange in these persons, under the impulse of the Spirit, bidding Paul not to go to Jerusalem, when it was doubtless the will of God that he should go. To remove this difficulty, some Commentators take *διὰ τοῦ Πνεύμ.* to mean "ex proprio spiritu." Such a phraseology, however, would be unprecedented. Still more objectionable are other methods adopted by foreign Commentators. See Recens. Synop. The expression must retain its force, and be rendered, "under the influence of the Holy Spirit." The difficulty,

however, which that involves, will be removed by supposing in ἔλεγον—μὴ ἀναβαίνειν an idiom common in all the best writers, e. gr. Thucyd. vi. 29. ἔλεγον—πλεῖν: by which the words, being used *populariter*, may be understood as limited by some clause omitted; and thus the sense will be, "they counselled him [if he valued his safety] not to go to Jerusalem." The Spirit did not order them to bid him not go; but only enabled them to predict, that there would be *danger* in his going. It is plain that Chrysost. so took the words; for he explains them by *προφητεύουσι τὰς θλίψεις*. And that Paul so understood what they said, is certain; for if he had really regarded himself as *forbidden* by the Holy Spirit to go he would not have gone.

5. ἐξαρτῆσαι] "had completed." This use of *ἐξαρτῆζειν ἡμ.* is Hellenistic.

6. ἀσπασόμενοι ἀλλήλ.] "having bade adieu." —*εἰς τὰ ἴδια*.] See John xvi. 32, and Note. Τὸ πλοῖον, i. e. the ship by which they had sailed from Patara to Tyre.

7. τὸν πλοῖον διαν.] The only mode of removing the difficulty involved in this expression is (with Markland and Kuin.) to take the Aorist as put for the Present, and render "thus accomplishing our voyage," i. e. the *sailing* part of our journey.

8. ἐξελθόντες—εἰς Κ.] It is not quite certain, whether they went by sea or by land; and Commentators are divided in opinion. Now *ἐξελθ.* can only mean *departing*, and that is more suitable to going by land than by sea. There can be little doubt but that they went by land; the ship, it seems, stopping at Ptolemais longer than they could conveniently stay. Besides, the land journey to Cæsarea was more convenient than that by sea; which must have been tedious and dangerous on account of doubling the formidable promontory of Mount Carmel. That they left their companions of the ship, is plain from the qualifying clause *οἱ περὶ τὸν Παῦλον*, which, however, recent Editors have unadvisedly cancelled, on the authority of some Manuscripts and Versions.

9. προφητεύουσαι] "endowed with the faculty of

11 ὄνοματι Ἄγαθος· ^k καὶ ἐλθὼν πρὸς ἡμᾶς, καὶ ἄρας τὴν ζώνην τοῦ ^k Supra 20. 23. infra ver. 33.
 Παύλου, δήσας [τε] αὐτοῦ τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τοὺς πόδας, εἶπε· Τὰδε
 λέγει τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον· Τὸν ἄνθρωπον, οὗ ἐστὶν ἡ ζώνη αὕτη, οὕτω
 δῆσουσιν ἐν Ἱερουσαλῆμ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, καὶ παραδώσουσιν εἰς χεῖρας ἐθ-
 12 νῶν. Ὡς δὲ ἠκούσαμεν ταῦτα, παρεκαλοῦμεν ἡμεῖς τε καὶ οἱ ἐντόπιοι,
 13 τοῦ μὴ ἀναβαίνειν αὐτὸν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ. ^l Supra 20. 24. Ἀπεκρίθη [δὲ] ὁ Παῦλος·
 Τί ποιεῖτε κλαίοντες καὶ συνθροῦπτοντές μου τὴν καρδίαν; ἐγὼ γὰρ οὐ
 μόνον δεθῆναι, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀποθανεῖν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ ἐτοιμῶς ἔχω ὑπὲρ
 14 τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ. ^m Matt. 6. 10. Luke 11. 2. & 22. 42. Μὴ πειθομένου δὲ αὐτοῦ, ἡσυχά-
 σαμεν, εἰπόντες· Τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Κυρίου γενέσθω.
 15 Μετὰ δὲ τὰς ἡμέρας ταύτας † ἀποσκευασμένοι ἀνεβαίνομεν εἰς Ἱε-
 16 ρουσαλήμ. Συνῆλθον δὲ καὶ τῶν μαθητῶν ἀπὸ Καισαρείας σὺν
 ἡμῖν, ἄγοντες παρ' οἷ ξενισθῶμεν Μνάσωνι τινι Κυπρίῳ, ἀρχαίῳ
 μαθητῆϊ.

speaking or preaching under divine inspiration." See ii. 13.

11. ἄρας τὴν ζώνην, &c. εἶπε.] Thus following the custom of the Prophets of the O. T., who, in order to impress more strongly on men's minds the things which they had to communicate (whether predictions or declarations), used to employ some corresponding *external* sign symbolical of the thing. See Jerem. xiii. 1; xxvii. 2. seqq.; xxxviii. 10 & 11. 1 Kings xxii. 11. Ez. iv. 1-13. See also vv. 11 & 12. Hos. i. 2. seqq. (Grot. and Wets.) It was not, however, confined to the *Prophets*; for the employment of *symbolical actions* was a custom generally prevalent in the early ages, both among the Jews and the Gentiles. See Note supra xix. 35.

12. οἱ ἐντόπιοι] "the inhabitants [of the place]," i. e. (with the limitation suggested by the circumstances of the case) the Christians of Cæsarea. Ἐντόπιος is properly synonymous with ἐγγενής, "a native of any place;" but it was, by the later writers, used for ἐγχώριος, an inhabitant of a place. Yet the former signification is found in Soph. Ed. Col. 841.

13. τί ποιεῖτε.] This is regarded by Markl. as a popular form, for τί βούλεσθε; and Kuin. observes, that verbs denoting *action* often indicate, not the *effect* of the action, but only the intent and will. But τί ποιεῖτε is not, as he imagines, pleonastic. As to the idiom, it is found even in our own language. In συνθροῦπτοντες the συν has an intensive force, as in συντρίβειν, συγκλᾶν, συντήκειν, &c., and denotes utter destruction of a thing by its being crushed together, and thus broken up. Pricæus compares numerous passages of the Classical writers. It is strange he should have forgotten to adduce the "Quid me querelis exanimas tuis?" of Horace. The sense of κλαίοντες καὶ συνθ. is "by weeping, and [thus] quite subduing my courage." Hence the γάρ in the following sentence will have great propriety, q. d. For *courage* I have, being ready, &c. In ἐτοιμῶς ἔχω we have an example of that use of ἔχω by which it is so joined with an adverb, as to form a phrase equivalent to εἶμὲν and the *adjective* corresponding to that adverb. With this noble sentiment compare a similar one of St. Paul, 2 Cor. xii. 15.

15. ἀποσκευασμένοι.] There has here been no little debate as to the *reading*. The MSS. fluctuate between ἀποσκ., ἐπισκ., παρασκ., and ἀποραζά-

μενοι, of which the last two are merely *glosses* on the preceding. Ἐπισκευασ. is found in several good MSS. and early Edd., as also in Chrysost., Theophyl., and Œcumen., is preferred by most Critics, and is edited by Beng., Matth., Tittm., and Vat. But without sufficient reason. The object, indeed, to ἀποσκ., that the word can only signify to *unpack* baggage; whereas the context requires the sense to *collect* one's baggage for a journey; which ἐπισκευάζεσθαι does express, being of frequent occurrence in the best writers. This is very true. But how then are we to account for the alteration of the ordinary term ἐπισκ. into what has been thought the anomalous term ἀποσκευασμένοι? This, I conceive, will go far to prove, that the new reading is a mere *gloss*, and the old reading the true one. As to alleging that ἀποσκ. is not susceptible of the required sense, it were surely hypercritical to set limits to the significations of certain Greek words. And as ἀποσκευῆ both in the Sept. and the Classical writers often denotes *baggage* (see Steph. Thes. and Schleus. Lex. V. T.), why should not ἀποσκευάζεσθαι mean to *pack up one's baggage*, just as from ἀποσκευῆ in the sense *exoneratio alvi*, we have the verb ἀποσκευάσασθαι to signify *exonerare alvum*. In fact, an *example* has been adduced by Palaiet from Dionys. Hal. ix. 23. οὐδὲ ἀποσκευάσασθαι διέταμιν ἔσχον οἱ φέλοντες· ἀλλ' ἀγαπητῶς αὐτὰ τὰ σώματα εἰτάσαν, οὐδὲ τὰ ὅπλα πολλοὶ φυλάττοντες. To which I add Polyb. iv. 81, 11. τὰ ἀπὸ τῆς χῶρας ἀποσκευάζοιτο, where, though the sense is *removed*, yet that includes the *primary* idea, of *packing up*, previous to removal. Griesb. has here shown unusual discretion, by retaining the common reading; perhaps because *Mathuri rejects it*.

16. ἄγοντες — Κυπρίῳ.] The sense of the passage is plain; but not so the *construction*. Most Commentators from Grot. to Kuin. recognize here a *Hebraism*, the datives Μνάσωνι τινι Κυπρίῳ being put, like the Heb. ה, for accusatives with πρὸς. Yet, it may be observed, the two Apostles were not going to *call on* Mnason, but to *lodge at his house*. It is, therefore, better (with Beza, Byn., Wolf, Valckn., and Bornem.) to suppose here a frequent idiom, (usually called *Attic*, but in reality extending to the *common dialect*) by which a noun is attracted to the case of the relative, as in Matt. vii. 2. Lu. i. 4. Acts xxii. 24; xxiii. 28. Rom. vi. 17. ἐπικροῦσατε ἐκ καρδίας εἰς ἕν παρεδόνθη

Γενομένων δὲ ἡμῶν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, ἀρμένως ἐδέξαντο ἡμῖς οἱ ἀδελ- 17
 φοί. ⁿ τῇ δὲ ἐπιούσῃ εἰσῆει ὁ Παῦλος σὺν ἡμῖν πρὸς Ἰάκωβον, πάν- 18
 τες τε παρεγένοντο οἱ πρεσβύτεροι. Καὶ ἀσπασάμενος αὐτούς, ἐξηγῆτο 19
 καθ' ἕνα καὶ ἕνα ὡς ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι διὰ τῆς διακονίας
 αὐτοῦ. ^o Οἱ δὲ ἀκούσαντες ἐδόξασον τὸν Κύριον· εἶπόν τε αὐτῷ· 20
 Θεωρεῖς, ἀδελφέ, πόσαι μυριάδες εἰσὶν Ἰουδαίων τῶν πεπιστευκότων·
 καὶ πάντες ζηλωταὶ τοῦ νόμου ὑπάρχουσι. Κατηγήθησαν δὲ περὶ σοῦ, 21
 ὅτι ἀποστασίαν διδάσκεις ἀπὸ Μωϋσέως τοὺς κατὰ τὰ ἔθνη πάντας
 Ἰουδαίους, λέγων μὴ περιτέμνειν αὐτοὺς τὰ τέκνα, μηδὲ τοῖς ἔθνεσι
 περιπατεῖν. Τί οὖν ἐστὶ; πάντως δεῖ πλῆθος συνελθεῖν· ἀκούσονται 22
 γὰρ ὅτι ἐλήλυθας. ^p Τοῦτο οὖν ποιήσον, ὃ σοι λέγομεν. εἰσὶν ἡμῖν 23
 ἄνδρες τέσσαρες εὐχὴν ἔχοντες ἐφ' ἑαυτῶν· τούτους παραλαβὼν ἀγρί- 24
 σθητι σὺν αὐτοῖς, καὶ δαπάνησον ἐπ' αὐτοῖς, ἵνα ξυρῶσονται τὴν κε-
 φαλήν· καὶ † γῶσι πάντες, ὅτι ὧν κατήχηται περὶ σοῦ οὐδὲν ἐστίν,
 ἄλλὰ στοιχεῖς καὶ αὐτὸς τὸν νόμον φυλάσσων. ^q Περὶ δὲ τῶν πεπιστευ- 25

τύπον διδάχῃς, for τῷ τύπῳ διδάχῃς, eis den par. Thus in the present passage it is as if there had been written: ἄγοντας (ἡμᾶς, to be supplied from ἡμῶν preceding) παρὰ Μνάσωνά τινα, Κέπριον, ἀρχαῖον μὴθ. παρ' ᾧ ξενισθῶμεν. Examples of the phrase ἄγειν παρὰ are adduced by Bornem., who says it is pretty frequent in the Greek writers. Of the name *Mnason* several examples are adduced by Wets. It seems formed from the Future *μνήσω* of *μνάω*, to make any one remember; just as is *μνήμων* from *μνήμηαι*. It is *Doric* for *Mneson*. Of the same form are several words in Greek, as *Σείσων*, *Καίσων*, *Δάσων*, *Φάσων*, &c.

13. Ἰάκωβον.] Peter and John were, it seems, both absent; and James (son of Alphæus; see xv. 13.) is supposed to have presided, both in his Apostolical character and as Bishop of Jerusalem, at the meeting now held to consider of the business which regarded Paul.

21. κατηγήθησαν π. σ.] "they have been informed concerning thee." For Fab. on Sext. Emp. 285. 339. has shown *κατηγέσθαι* to mean "auditione et famâ percipere." See Note on xviii. 25.

22. τί οὖν ἐστὶ;] This (as in 1 Cor. xiv. 15. 26.) seems to be a popular formula, similar to our "what then!" i. e. what then [is to be done]; Sub. *πρακτόν*. Markl. compares "quid ergo est?" and *quid igitur est?* in Cicero and Livy. So that it may be a *Latinism*; for I am not aware that it ever occurs in the Greek Classical writers. Though the formula *τί οὖν* (which sometimes occurs in the Philosophers, and of which Kypke cites examples from Arrian on Epict.), is somewhat *similar*.

— πάντως δεῖ πλῆθος συνελθεῖν.] Pisc., Beza, and Grot. understand this of a *regular convocation of the people*, as contradistinguished from the *Presbyters*. But à Lapide and Pricæus, with all the best recent Commentators, seem right in determining the sense to be, "It is unavoidable, but that a multitude should flock together;" which is quite agreeable to what follows. *Δεῖ* like *ἀνάγκη*, often denotes only what *must and will* happen.

23. τοῦτο οὖν ποιήσον.] The best Commentators are agreed that this is to be regarded as the language of *advice*, not of authoritative *command*. For a justification of the conduct of the Apostle,

in thus conciliating the Jews (to the compromise, as some have thought, of the leading doctrines of the Gospel) see Witsius de *Vitâ Pauli* x., Dr. Hales iii. 536. sq., and Townsend. Suffice it to say, that though the Apostle taught that *Jewish* as well as *Gentile* Christians are freed from the observance of the Mosaic Law, yet he never forbade the *Jewish* converts to observe it, or any part of it, on the score of *expediency*. Since he occasionally did so, that he might "gain the more" to Christ. See 1 Cor. ix. 20. Acts xvi. 3. Whether *εὐχὴν* is to be understood of *votum civile*, undertaken on account of recovery from sickness, or deliverance from calamity, or a *vow of Naziritiship*, is not agreed. The last is the more probable opinion, since the term *ἀγνίσθαι* which follows is appropriate thereto. See Numb. vi.

24. ἀγνίσθητι, &c.] i. e. "undertake the same abstinence and purity enjoined by the vow," and pay their expenses for them; namely, those of the sacrifice, on going to the temple, for the purpose of being released from the vow by shaving the head. From what has been adduced by Wets., Wits., and Lardner, it appears that this participation in the *ἀγνεία* did not necessarily make the person *himself* a *Nazarite*; and also, that to so participate with, and pay the expenses of *Nazarites*, was not unusual among the Jews, and was regarded as a mark of singular piety.

— ἵνα ξυρῶσονται.] Meaning, that they may end their vow by shaving their heads: which they could not do till the termination of their vow: and that could only be by offering sacrifice: but they not being able to provide the offering, could not shave their heads. Thus the phrases to *cause any Nazarite to be shorn*, and to *pay his expenses*, came to be convertible. So Maimonides says: "Mihî incumbit ut *radatur Naziræus per me*."

— γῶσι.] Many MSS. read *γνώσονται*, which is supported by some Versions, and edited by Griesb. and Tittm. But it seems to have arisen *ex emendatione*. *Στοιχεῖς φυλάσσω τὸν νόμον* signifies, "that thou livest in the habitual observance of the law;" *Στοιχεῖν*, like *περιπατεῖν* and the Heb. *לָּהֵל*, being used of habitual action.

25. περὶ δὲ τῶν πεπ., &c.] The *δὲ* is *adversative*, and the sense is, "But as to the *Gentiles*,

κότων ἐθιῶν ἡμεῖς ἐπεστείλαμεν, κρίναντες μηδὲν τοιοῦτον τηρεῖν αὐ-
 τοὺς, εἰ μὴ φυλάσσεσθαι αὐτοὺς τό τε εἰδωλόθυτον καὶ τὸ αἷμα, καὶ
 26 πρικτὸν καὶ πορνείαν. Ἦ τότε ὁ Παῦλος παραλαβὼν τοὺς ἄνδρας, τῇ ^{† Num. 6. 13.}
 ἐχομένη ἡμέρᾳ σὺν αὐτοῖς ἀγνισθεῖς εἰσῆι εἰς τὸ ἱερόν, διαγγέλλων ^{Infra 24. 18.}
 τὴν ἐκπλήρωσιν τῶν ἡμερῶν τοῦ ἀγνισμοῦ, ἕως οὗ προσηρέχθη ὑπέρ
 27 ἐνὸς ἐκάστου αὐτῶν ἢ προσφορᾶ. Ὡς δὲ ἔμελλον αἱ ἐπὶ ἡμέραι συν-
 τελεῖσθαι, οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀσίας Ἰουδαῖοι θεουσάμενοι αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ,
 συνέχεον πάντα τὸν ὄχλον, καὶ ἐπέβυλον τὰς χεῖρας ἐπ' αὐτὸν, κράζον-
 28 τες· Ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλίται, βοηθεῖτε! οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ κατὰ
 τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τοῦ τόπου τούτου πάντας πωταγοῦ δι-
 δάσκων· ἔτι τε καὶ Ἑλληνας εἰσήγαγεν εἰς τὸ ἱερόν, καὶ κεκοίνωκε
 29 τὸν ἅγιον τόπον τοῦτον. Ἦσαν γάρ [προ]εωρακότες Τυόφιμον τὸν ^{‡ Supra 20. 4.}
 Ἐφέσιον ἐν τῇ πόλει σὺν αὐτῷ, ὃν ἐνόμιζον ὅτι εἰς τὸ ἱερόν εἰσήγαγεν ^{2 Tim. 4. 20.}
 30 ὁ Παῦλος. Ἐκινήθη τε ἡ πόλις ὅλη, καὶ ἐγένετο συνδρομὴ τοῦ λαοῦ· ^{Infra 26. 21.}
 καὶ ἐπιλαβόμενοι τοῦ Παύλου, εἶλκον αὐτὸν ἔξω τοῦ ἱεροῦ· καὶ ἐν-
 31 θείως ἐκλείσθησαν αἱ θύραι. Ζητούντων δὲ αὐτὸν ἀποκτεῖναι, ἀνέβη
 32 φάσις τῷ χιλιάρχῳ τῆς σπείρης, ὅτι ὅλη συγκέχυται Ἰερουσαλὴμ· ὡς
 ἔξαιτῆς παραλαβὼν στρατιώτας καὶ ἑκατοντάρχους, κατεδουμένον ἐπ' αὐ-
 33 τούς. Οἱ δὲ ἰδόντες τὸν χιλιάρχον καὶ τοὺς στρατιώτας, ἐπαύσαντο
 34 τὸν Παῦλον. Ἦ τότε ἐγγίσας ὁ χιλιάρχος ἐπελάβετο αὐτοῦ, ^{‡ Supra ver. 11.}
 καὶ ἐκέλευσε δεθῆναι ἀλύσει δυοῖ· καὶ ἐπυρθάνετο τίς ἂν εἴη, καὶ τί
 34 ἐστι πεποιηκός. Ἄλλοι δὲ ἄλλο τι ἐβίων ἐν τῷ ὄχλῳ. μὴ δυνάμενος δὲ
 35 παρεμβολῆν. Ὅτε δὲ ἐγένετο ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀναβιθμούς, συνέβη βιαστᾶζε-

[the case is different, and] we have ordered [thus];
 determining that," &c.

26. ἀγνισθεῖς.] See Note supra v. 24.

— διαγγέλλων τὴν ἐκπλήρ., &c.], "giving notice
 [to the Priests] of the [period of the] completion
 of the days of purification;" which the persons
 themselves, it seems, had not been able to do,
 because they could not provide the offering. The
 period, as it appears from what follows, was *that*
day week. Every one, it seems, was allowed to
 fix the period of his votive purification, either
 when he *commenced* it, or at any time during its
 course; so that the Priests had proper notice, in
 order to make the necessary arrangements as to
 the victims, &c. "Ἐως οὗ," "at which;" as in
 Luke xv. 8. xxii. 16. 18. John ix. 18. Προσφορᾶ
 is the *θύσια προσφερομένη*. See Eph. v. 2.

27. αἱ ἐπὶ ἡμέραι.] As the number of days had
 not been before mentioned, this must be put for
 αἱ ἡμέραι, ἐπὶ ὅσας. Συνέχεον is for *συνεκίνουν*.
 So Demosth. cited by Schleus. Lex. *συναχθεῖ ὅλην*
τὴν πολιτείαν.

28. βοηθεῖτε.] The sense is, "Come to our
 aid [in apprehending this person]." A sense of
 the word very frequently occurring in Thueyd.
 and the best writers. Ἑλληνας is considered by
 Kuin, as an exaggeration for Ἕλληνα. But it is
 better to suppose an idiom, found in all langua-
 ges, by which the plural is used instead of the
 singular, taken generically; a *single* action being
 spoken of as if it were *habitual*.

29. προεωρακότες.] The *προ* is not found in very
 many MSS., several Versions, and Fathers, and

all the early Edd. except the Erasmusian, and is
 cancelled by Beng. and Mtith.

30. συνδρομή.] The word is often used of *riot-
 ous assemblage*. See Wets.

— εἶλκον αὐτὸν ἔξω τοῦ ἱεροῦ.] i. e. in order (as
 Chrys. suggests) to avoid polluting the Temple
 with murder; and also, it should seem, to be
 more unrestrained, than the Priests and Levites
 could decently permit them to be; who appear
 to have themselves closed the doors, in order to
 preserve the Temple from pollution, and be
 thought to have no hand in whatever might en-
 sue.

31. φάσις; for *φήμη* is confined to the later writ-
 ers.

33. δεθ. ἀλ. δυοῖς.] See Note supra xii. 6. Per-
 haps in the present case the feet also were bound
 with a chain. At least so we may suppose from
 supra v. 11.

34. τὸ ἀσφαλές.] "what was assuredly the truth."
 So xxii. 30. xxv. 26. Παρεμβολῆ properly signi-
 fies a place where tents *παρεβάλλοντι*. But it
 here denotes the barracks in the castle of Antonia.
 And this is confirmed by the ἀναβιθμούς just
 after; for the castle of Antonia was situated on
 an eminence.

35. τοὺς ἀναβ.] This term is supposed to de-
 note the flight of stairs leading from the portico
 of the Temple to the castle of Antonia, which
 nearly joined the Temple, being built (as we find
 from Joseph. B. v. 5. 3.) at an angle of it. In il-
 lustration of the present passage, I would adduce
 an apposite one of Joseph Bell. v. 5. 8. ἐνδοτέρω

π Luke 23. 18.
John 19. 15.
infra 22. 22.

σθαι αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τῶν στρατιωτῶν διὰ τὴν βίαν τοῦ ὄχλου. ἡκολούθει 36
γὰρ τὸ πλῆθος τοῦ λαοῦ, † κράζον· Λίρε αὐτόν!

Μέλλων τε εἰσάγεσθαι εἰς τὴν παρεμβολὴν ὁ Παῦλος λέγει τῷ χιλι- 37
άρχῳ· Εἰ ἔξεσι μοι εἰπεῖν τι πρὸς σε; Ὁ δὲ ἔφη· Ἑλληνιστὶ γινώ-
σκεις; οὐκ ἄρα σὺ εἶ ὁ Αἰγύπτιος ὁ πρὸ τούτων τῶν ἡμερῶν ἀνα- 38
στατώσας, καὶ ἐξυγαλὼν εἰς τὴν ἔρημον τοὺς τετρακισχιλίους ἀνδρας
τῶν σικαρίων; Ἔπει δὲ ὁ Παῦλος· Ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπος μὲν εἰμι Ἰου- 39
δαῖος Ταρσεὺς τῆς Κιλικίας, οὐκ ἀσήμερον πόλεως πολίτης· δέομαι δὲ
σου, ἐπίτριψόν μοι λαλῆσαι πρὸς τὸν λαόν.

γ Supra 9. 11,
30.
& 22. 3.

Ἐπιτρέψαντος δὲ αὐτοῦ, ὁ Παῦλος ἐστῶς ἐπὶ τῶν ἀναβαθμῶν κατέ- 40
σισε τῇ χειρὶ τῷ λαῷ· πολλῆς δὲ σιγῆς γενομένης, προσεφώνησε τῇ
Ἑβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ, λέγων· XXII. Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, καὶ πατέρες, ἀκού- 1
σατέ μου τῆς πρὸς ὑμᾶς νῦν ὑπολογίης. Ἀκούσαντες δὲ οἱ τῇ Ἑβραϊδὶ 2
διαλέκτῳ προσεφώνει αὐτοῖς, μᾶλλον παρεσχόν ἡσυχίαν. Καὶ φησιν·

ε Supra 12. 17.
& 13. 16.
& 19. 33.

δὲ τούτου (scil. ἦν) τὸ πᾶν διάστημα (I read from
Cod. Bigot., ἀνάστημα, *aedificium, structura*), τὸ δὲ
ἐνδὸν βασιλείῳ εἶχε χώραν καὶ διάθεσιν. μεμρίστο γὰρ
εἰς πᾶσαν οἰκὸν ἰόαν τε καὶ χοῦσιν, περιστά τε καὶ
βαλανεία καὶ στρατοπέδων ἀλλῆς πλατείας, ὡς τῷ μὲν
πάντα ἔχειν τὰ χρεώδη, πόλεις εἶναι δοκεῖν, τῇ πολυ-
τελείᾳ δὲ βασιλείου. where by the *περιστά* are meant
courts surrounded by columns. And by the στρα-
τοπέδων ἀλλῆς πλατείας, the *soldiers' barracks*, laid
out, it should seem, in *quadrangles*. As to the
words πόλεις εἶναι δοκεῖν, they are, perhaps, cor-
rupt. If correct, they can only refer to *barracks*;
and then βασιλείου must be wrong, and βασιλεια
would be required. But *such* a description would
not be suitable to the *barracks*, and is, no doubt,
meant of the *whole of the citadel*, which formed a
sort of *military city*. Now this sense (which is
undoubtedly the true one) may be obtained by
simply reading πόλεις instead of πόλεις, and for
δοκεῖν, δοκεῖ, or, from the Cod. Bigot., δοκοῖν,
which evidently requires πόλεις.

— βασιλάζεσθαι] “carried on their shoulders;”
for security against the violence of the people.
Pric. and Wets., however, think the term does
not mean that he was literally *carried*, but was
borne off his legs by the press. And they produce
a passage of Dio Chrys. where one is described
βαδίζοντα — ὑπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου. But there is here
nothing said about a great press.

36. αἶρε αὐτόν] “away with him,” viz. from the
earth. So xxii. 22. αἶρε ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς.

37. εἰ ἔξεσι, &c.] On this idiom, which arises
from a blending of the *oratio directa* with the
indirecta, I have before treated.

— Ἑλληνιστὶ γινώσκεις.] Sub. λαλεῖν, supplied in
Nehem. xiii. 24. This is not a Latinism, since
we find in Xen. Cyr. vii. 5, 11. τοὺς Συριστὶ ἐπι-
σταμένους. The *interrogation* here, as often, im-
ports surprise.

38. Αἰγύπτιος, &c.] The story is related in
Joseph. Ant. xx. 8, 6, and Bell. ii. 13, 5; between
which, however, and what is here said, a consid-
erable discrepancy exists; for Josephus, in the
latter passage, reckons them at 30,000. Many
methods have been adopted to remove the dis-
crepancy. Of which most are mere devices for
the nonce, and proceed wholly upon supposition.
The only effectual mode is that supplied by the
aid of *criticism*, applied to the texts of the two

writers, in one of whom there must be some error,
doubtless proceeding from the *scribes*. Now there
is no reason to suppose any error in *St. Luke's*
text, since the MSS. agree, and the number is a
very probable one. The error, therefore, must
rest with *Josephus*, as his Editor, Aldrich, has
seen: though he has not succeeded in showing
where it lies. That there is a corruption in Jo-
sephus is certain; the number 30,000 being in-
credibly large. And while in his *Antiq.* he says
the number was 30,000, and of these πλείστοι,
very many, were slain; yet in his *Wars*, though
he does not mention the *total* number, he says
that 400 were slain, and 200 taken prisoners.
Now 400 cannot be considered *very many* out of
30,000. To remove this discrepancy, Aldrich
would in the *Antiq.* read *τεκισχιλίους* instead of
ἑκατοκτῶν. A conjecture, however, little proba-
ble: and, indeed, it is not the number of the
prisoners that we are concerned with, but that of
the *slain*. I am persuaded that the error rests
on *τριμυρίους*. Yet I would not, with Aldrich,
read in the *Antiq.* *τετρακισχιλίους*, on purpose
to make the accounts of Josephus and St. Luke
exactly agree. But for *τριμυρίους* I would read
τρισεχιλίους, which will make Josephus consistent
with himself; for certainly 600 may be consid-
ered *many* out of 3000. And the difference between
the accounts in Josephus and that of the Chiliarch
(not St. Luke) is of no consequence. It is scarce-
ly necessary to observe how frequently *χιλίοι* and
μυριοι in composition with *die*, &c. are confound-
ed, from the similarity of the contractions and
single words to denote the numbers in question.
Had indeed the real number been 30,000, Jose-
phus would not have omitted in his *Antiq.* to ad-
vert to the *great multitude* of persons.

— σικαρίων.] The term seems to denote *ban-
ditti*, literally *cut-throats*; from *sica*, the short
cutlass (of Oriental origin, in fact the *Krisse* of
India and China), which was carried under the
arm like the Italian *stiletto*. From being *private*
assassins, the Sicarii at length became public
murderers and rebels. The air of the question
seems to imply, that the officer had been told,
that Paul was that Egyptian.

39. οὐκ ἀσήμερον πόλ.] An elegant litotes, to de-
note “a celebrated city.” So Steph. Byz. calls
it πόλεις ἐπισημοτάτη.

- 3 Ἐγὼ μὲν εἰμι ἀνὴρ Ἰουδαῖος, γεγεννημένος ἐν Ταρσῷ τῆς Κιλικίας, ἀνατεθραμμένος δὲ ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ παρὰ τοὺς πόδας Γαμαλιήλ, πεπαιδευμένος κατὰ ἀκριβειαν τοῦ πατρῷου νόμου, ζηλωτὴς ὑπάρχων
- 4 τοῦ Θεοῦ, καθὼς πάντες ὑμεῖς ἐστε σήμερον· ὅς ταύτην τὴν ὁδὸν ἐδίωξα ἄχρι θανάτου, δεσμεύων καὶ παραδιδούς εἰς φυλακὰς ἀνδρας τε
- 5 καὶ γυναικας· ὡς καὶ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς μαρτυρεῖ μοι, καὶ πᾶν τὸ πρεσβύτεριον· πυρῶν καὶ ἐπιστολὰς δεξιόμενος πρὸς τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς, εἰς Λαμασκὸν ἐπορευόμεν, ἄζων καὶ τοὺς ἐκέῖσε ὄντας δεδεμένους εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, ἵνα τιμωρηθῶσιν. Ἐγένετο δὲ μοι πορευομένη καὶ ἐγγίζοντι τῇ Λαμασκῷ, περὶ μεσημβρίαν, ἐξαίφνης ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ περιαιρούμαι φῶς ἰκανὸν περὶ ἐμέ. Ἐπεσον τε εἰς τὸ ἕδαφος, καὶ ἤκουσα φωνῆς λεγούσης μοι· Σαοὺλ Σαοὺλ, τί με διώκεις; Ἐγὼ δὲ ὑπεκρίθην· Τίς εἶ, κύριε; εἶπε τε πρὸς με· Ἐγὼ εἰμι Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος, ὃν σὺ διώκεις. Οἱ δὲ σὺν ἐμοὶ ὄντες τὸ μὲν φῶς ἐθιάναντο, καὶ ἔμφοβοι ἐγένοντο· τὴν δὲ φωνὴν οὐκ ἤκουσαν τοῦ λαλοῦντός μοι. Ἐῖπον δέ· Τί ποιήσω, Κύριε; ὁ δὲ Κύριος εἶπε πρὸς με· Ἀναστὰς πορευέου εἰς Λαμασκὸν· κἀκεῖ σοι λαληθήσεται περὶ πάντων ὧν τέτακται σοι ποιῆσαι. Ὡς δὲ οὐκ ἐνέβλεπον, ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης τοῦ φωτός ἐκείνου, χειραγωγούμενος ὑπὸ τῶν συνόντων μοι ἦλθον εἰς Λαμασκόν. Ἄντις δὲ τις, ἀνὴρ εὐσεβὴς κατὰ τὸν νόμον, μαρτυρούμενος ὑπὸ πάντων τῶν κατοικούντων Ἰουδαίων, ἐλθὼν πρὸς με καὶ ἐπιστὰς εἶπε μοι· Σαοὺλ ἀδελφέ, ἀνάβλεψον· καγὼ αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ ἀνέβλεψα εἰς αὐτόν.
- 14 Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν· Ὁ Θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν προεχειρίσατό σε γινῶναι τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἰδεῖν τὸν δίκαιον, καὶ ἀκοῦσαι φωνῆν ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ· ὅτι ἔση μάρτυς αὐτῷ πρὸς πάντας ἀνθρώπους, ὧν ἐώρακας καὶ ἤκουσας. Καὶ νῦν τί μέλλεις; ἀνιστὰς βίπτισαι καὶ ἀπόλουσαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας σου, ἐπικαλεσάμενος τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου.

a Supra 9. 11. & 21. 39.
2 Cor. 11. 22.
supra 5. 34.
Gal. 1. 14.
Rom. 10. 2.

b Supra 8. 3. & 9. 1.
infra 29. 9.
1 Cor. 15. 9.
Gal. 1. 13.
1 Tim. 1. 13.
c Supra 9. 2.
infra 26. 12.

d Supra 9. 3.
infra 26. 12.
1 Cor. 15. 8.
2 Cor. 12. 2.

e Infra 26. 14, 15.

f Supra 9. 7.
Dan. 10. 7.

g Supra 9. 17.

h Supra 8. 14. & 7. 52.
infra 26. 16.
1 John 2. 1.

i Matt. 3. 11.
Mark 1. 4.
Luke 3. 3.

XXII. 3. ἀνατεθραμμένος — πεπαιδ.] The Commentators are not agreed on the construction; some joining παρὰ τοὺς πόδας Γ. with the preceding, others with the following words. The former mode is generally adopted by the ancient and early modern Commentators, the latter by the more recent Interpreters. The former, however, seems preferable. As to the regularity, which the other construction would impart to the passage, that is not characteristic of the Scriptural style, nor indeed very much of the style of the ancients in general. And to the tautology of which they complain, we may oppose a harsh transposition in their own mode of construction.

The expression παρὰ τοὺς πόδας is an idiom importing no more than our being educated under such and such a master. Πεπαιδευμένος — νόμον, "trained [by him] to the most exact knowledge of the religion and laws of my country." Rosenm. thinks that ἀκριβειαν has reference to the ceremonies and institutions of their ancestors. But Wets., Morus, Schleus., and Kuin. ascribe to it the signification severity, as in Acts xxvi. 5. and Sapient. xii. 21. And so Isocr. cited by Wets. νόμος μετὰ ἀκριβείας κείμενος. It is difficult to decide the preference, and there may be an *hypallage*. By νόμος (Kuin. observes) must be under-

stood not merely the patria lex, but also the πατρικαὶ παραδόσεις mentioned in Gal. i. 14. Τοῦ Θεοῦ signifies as of God's [law,] i. e. what he then esteemed such. The Apostle speaks somewhat obscurely; intending by this use to delicately refute the charge of blaspheming the Law, by so speaking of it as to tacitly admit its divine origin.

4. ἔς.] The relative must be resolved, as often, into the demonstrative with a copula. Comp. Ezek. iii. 22.

13. ἀνάβλεψον.] Ἀναβλέπειν properly signifies to look up, and sometimes only to look; namely, when it is followed by εἰς τινα, at any person or thing. In the Classical writers τινι is used for εἰς τινα or τι. See Matth. Gr. p. 553, in which, among other passages, is cited Eurip. Ion. 1436. Ἄλιον δ' ἀναβλέπει λαμπάσι. Sometimes the *ava* signifies *re*, and thus (βλέπειν signifying to see) ἀναβλέπειν has the sense to recover sight, or sometimes (as in John ix.) to receive, obtain the faculty of sight.

14. τὸν δίκαιον] "the Just one." See Note on Luke xxiii. 44—47.

16. ἀναστὰς βάπτισαι.] So supra ii. 38. βαπτισθήτω — εἰς ἄφυσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, reference being made, in each passage, to the method appointed by Christ for remitting the sins of those who rightly

k ^{Supra} 9. 26. k' Ἐγένετο δέ μοι ὑποστρέψαντι εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, καὶ προσερχομένου μου 17
 ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, γενέσθαι με ἐν ἑκστασει, καὶ ἰδεῖν αὐτὸν λέγοντά μοι· 18
 Σπεύσον καὶ ἔξελθε ἐν τάχει ἐξ Ἱερουσαλήμ· διότι οὐ παραδέξονται
 I ^{Supra} ver. 4. σου τὴν μαρτυρίαν περὶ ἐμοῦ. ¹ Καὶ γὰρ εἶπον· Κύριε, αὐτοὶ ἐπίστησαν- 19
 ται, οὐ ἐγὼ ἤμην φυλακίζων καὶ δέρον κατὰ τὰς συναγωγὰς τοὺς
 m ^{Supra} 7. 58. & 8. 1. πιστεύοντας ἐπὶ σέ· ^m καὶ ὅτε ἐξεχείτο τὸ αἷμα Στεφάνου τοῦ μάρτυ- 20
 ρός σου, καὶ αὐτὸς ἤμην ἐφροσῶς καὶ συνευδοκῶν τῇ ἀναιρέσει αὐτοῦ,
 n ^{Supra} 9. 15. & 13. 2. καὶ φυλάσσων τὰ ἱμάτια τῶν ἀναιροῦντων αὐτόν. ⁿ Καὶ εἶπε πρὸς με· 21
 Gal. 1. 15. & 2. 8. Πορεύου, οὐ ἐγὼ εἰς ἔθνη μακρὰν ἔξαποστελῶ σε.
 Eph. 3. 8. ὁ Ἰησοῦς δὲ αὐτοῦ ἄχρι τούτου τοῦ λόγου, καὶ ἐπῆραν τὴν φωνὴν 22
 1 Tim. 2. 7. αὐτῶν, λέγοντες· Αἰεὶ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς τὸν τοιοῦτον· οὐ γὰρ * καθῆκεν
 2 Tim. 1. 11. οὐδὲν ζῆν. Κραυγάζοντων δὲ αὐτῶν, καὶ ὄριπτόντων τὰ ἱμάτια, καὶ 23

receive this sacrament; for (as Doddr. observes) "God did not ordinarily give any particular person any public and visible token of pardon till he had submitted to baptism, which being a visible token of favourable regard, and a seal of pardon, might be said to wash away sins. See Calvin's Instit. iv. 15. 14."

17. καὶ προσερχομένου μου.] A change of construction, for προσερχομένου μοι. On ἐν ἑκστασει (see Note at x. 10.), we must be content to see through a glass darkly. Mr. Hinds refers this not to the first visit to Jerusalem, but to that which immediately preceded his formal appointment by the Church at Antioch; which he thinks more agreeable to the chain of argument in the Epistle to the Galatians.

19, 20. Meaning to say, "Lord, as these (the Jews) well know how bitterly I persecuted those who believed in Thee, they must be convinced it is only on irresistible conviction, that I am become a preacher of the faith I once persecuted; and, accordingly, I may hope that they will hearken to my preaching." See Doddr. and Pyle.

19. φυλακίζων] "committing to prison," from φυλακή, a jail. The word is rare, but occurs in Sapient. xviii. 4.

20. On συνευδοκῶν see Note at viii. 1. And on φυλ. τὰ ἱμάτια, see Note on vii. 58. The persons employed in the office of stoning used to throw off their clothes like the *Athletæ*. So Macho ap. Athen. 348. F. where it is said that in the Gymnasia there were persons appointed τὰ ἱμάτια τῶν αἰσάντων λαμβάνοντας τηρεῖν.

21. πορεύου.] The Lord overrules the plea by simply repeating the order: the only instance I believe in Scripture.

22. καθῆκεν.] This, for the common reading καθῆκον, is found in very many MSS., early Editions, and Fathers. And it has been received by almost every Editor from Wets. to Vater; to whose decision I have deferred, though it is by no means clear to me whether καθῆκον be not the true reading; for though external evidence be in favour of the other, yet, in so minute a matter as the difference between ο and ε, MSS., have little or no authority. Internal evidence seems decidedly in favour of καθῆκον; and that, as Rinck suggests, not only because it is the more recondite and difficult reading, but since the other readings καθῆκεν and καθῆκαν may the more readily be accounted for as emendations of this. And though a present sense be here required, yet

καθῆκον is susceptible of this, by the ellipsis of ἐστὶ (as in a passage of Philo de Mundo, cited in Steph. Thes. 3147. D.), which is supplied infra xix. 36. ἴδον ἑπαι, and 1 Pet. i. 6.

23. ὄριπτόντων τὰ ἱμάτια.] The Commentators are by no means agreed on the sense of this phrase. That it cannot mean, as some explain, "rending their garments," nor "shaking their garments," as if in rage, is plain. Many (as Pric., Wets., Roscni., Schl., Heindr., Kuin., and Wahl) take it to mean, "tossing up their garments;" and suppose that this was done by those who were too distant to otherwise participate in the tumult. They also observe that this tossing up of garments, like waving of garments, was a mark of approbation. I see not, however, how ῥίπτω will bear the sense toss up, nor how it could be thought to import any thing but disapprobation and anger. After all, the true interpretation seems to be that of Grot., Tirinus, Park., and Bretsch., "tossing off, and casting down their garments;" as a preparation for violence; (just as our pugilists doff their clothes to box) a symbolical action quite in unison with the violent expressions of such of their companions as stood near; the whole forming a lively picture of rabid fury.

There is, in fact, but a union of two senses, each separately occurring in both the Scriptural and Classical writers, viz. to cast down, and to cast off; one implied in the other. The above interpretation is indeed placed beyond doubt by a very similar passage of Plato de Rep. p. 665. Ἦγού ἐπὶ σὲ πάντων πολλοὺς ὅσον βέβηκτας τὰ ἱμάτια, γυμνοὺς λαβόντας· ὅ τι ἐκάστω παρένυγεν ὄπλον, θεῖν διατεταγμένους. For ῥίπτωντων here several ancient MSS., with Theophylact and Eusebium, and one of the early Editions, have ῥίπτόντων. I have, however, retained the former, — not only because external evidence is decidedly in its favour, but internal also; ῥίπτωντων, being a stronger expression, and therefore more suitable; if, at least, Hermann on Soph. Ag. 235. is right in saying that ῥιπτεῖν is a frequentative form of the simple verb ῥίπτειν.

In κοινοῦτον βαλλόντων εἰς τὸν ἄερα we have another symbolical action, quite in unison with the preceding; for Grot., Wets., and Kuin., rightly take it of kicking up, or otherwise throwing up dust into the air; which, as appears from the Classical citations of Wets., and the accounts of modern travellers, was then, and still is, in the East, a frequent mode of raising a tumult: in our vulgar idiom "kicking up a dust."

24 κοιροῦτόν βυλλόντων εἰς τὸν ἕρμα, ἐκέλευσεν αὐτὸν ὁ χιλιάρχος ἄγεσθαι
εἰς τὴν παρεμβολήν, εἰπὼν μάλιστα ἀνετάζεσθαι αὐτὸν, ἵνα ἐπιγῶ δι'
25 ἣν αἰτίαν οὕτως ἐπεφώνουν αὐτῷ. Ἦς δὲ † προέτεινεν αὐτὸν τοῖς p. Supra 16. 37.
ἱμαῖσιν εἶπε πρὸς τὸν ἐσιῶτα ἐκατόνταρχον ὁ Παῦλος· Εἰ ἄνθρωπον
26 Ῥωμαῖον καὶ ἀκατάκριτον ἔξεστιν ὑμῖν μιστίζειν; Ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ ἐκα-
τόνταρχος, προσελθὼν ἀπήγγειλε τῷ χιλιάρχῳ, λέγων· Ὅρα τί μέλλεις
27 ποιεῖν· ὁ γὰρ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος Ῥωμαῖός ἐστι. Προσελθὼν δὲ ὁ χιλι-
άρχος εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Λέγε μοι, εἰ σὺ Ῥωμαῖός εἶ; ὁ δὲ ἔφη· Ναί.
28 Ἀπεκρίθη τε ὁ χιλιάρχος· Ἐγὼ πολλοῦ κεφαλαίου τὴν πολιτείαν ταύ-
29 τὴν ἐκτησάμην. ὁ δὲ Παῦλος ἔφη· Ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ γεγένημαι. Εὐθέως
οὖν ἀπέστησαν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ οἱ μέλλοντες αὐτὸν ἀνετάζειν. καὶ ὁ χιλιάρ-
χος δὲ ἐφοβήθη, ἐπιγυνοῦς οὐ Ῥωμαῖός ἐστι, καὶ ὅτι ἦν αὐτὸν δε-
δεκώς.

24. μάλιστα ἀνετ.] The plural is here used, with reference to the many things of which the μαστιξ was formed. Ἀνετάζειν signifies properly to examine carefully; but here *questionem habere*, denoting examination by torture. See Gen. xii. 17. xvi. 6. Wisd. ii. 19. 2 Macc. vii. 37. Sept.

— ἐπεφώνουν αὐτῷ.] The word signifies literally to raise the voice at a person; and has therefore two senses, either *acclamo, applaud*, as in Acts xii. 22.; or *inclamo, exclaim against*, as here.

25. ὡς δὲ προέτεινεν αὐτὸν τοῖς ἱμαῖσιν.] There are few passages which, from variety of reading, and diversity of interpretation, are more perplexing than this. Not less than six or seven varr. lectt. exist; but the only material diversity is between the singular προέτεινεν, and the plural προέτεινον. For the latter there is considerable authority in MSS. and Versions; and it is adopted by Griesb. and Tittm. Yet the singular ought, by every principle of Criticism, to be retained, as being the more difficult reading; and the recent collations of Rinck confirm it. As to the sense of the passage, see the full details in Recens. Synop. Suffice it here to say, that one great error seems to run through most modern interpretations;—which is to take ἱμαῖσι in the sense *scourges*; q. d. “they stretched him up for the scourges.” This is very harsh; and I know of no authority for that use of ἱμαῖσι in the plural. There is no doubt that the ancient and some modern Interpreters rightly take it in the ordinary sense *straps or thongs*; as Mark i. 7. Luke iii. 16. John i. 27. The plural is used because, it seems, the prisoner was fastened to the post, or block, with two straps. The employment of the Article, as Bp. Midd. suggests, shows that these thongs or belts were in common use. This view is exceedingly confirmed by a passage of an ancient Greek Martyrologist adduced by me in Rec. Syn. from a tract called *Martyrium Turachi*: περιελόντες αὐτοῦ τὸ πάλλιον, καὶ περὶ ζώσαντες, τεῖνατε, καὶ νεύροις ὡμοῖς τύψατε—δήσαντες αὐτὸν—τεῖνατε, καὶ νεύροις ὡμοῖς χύσατε τὸ νῶτον αὐτοῦ—τεῖνατε αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς πάλιοις, καὶ νεύροις ὡμοῖς μαστίζετε. These straps, or belts, were, it should seem, fastened about the person something like the harness of our horses, at the same time confining his hands; and were then attached to the post by some ring or buckle there provided to receive them. In short, the mode was, I apprehend, exactly like that now adopted in Russia, in applying the punishment of the knout,—of which Captain Frankland, in his

late Travels in Russia, vol. ii. gives the following description:—“It is a large solid piece of wood, about seven feet in height, thrust end-ways in the ground in an inclining posture. At the top is a groove cut for the reception of the neck of the sufferer; at the two sides are two other grooves for the arms. On the part fronting the spectators, opposite to the side on which the sufferer is placed, are three iron rings, to which the hands, neck, and feet of the criminal are made fast by thongs.” Προέτ. must (though not one of the Commentators has seen it) be referred to the Centurion, who, also, is said to do what he orders to be done, and sees done. Thus the construction is as if Luke had written Ἦς δὲ προέτεινεν αὐτὸν ὁ ἐκατόνταρχος [ἐν] τοῖς ἱμαῖσι, εἶπε πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ Π. an *hypallage* common in the best writers. The sense is: “and now Paul said to the Centurion, as he was having him bent forward [to the block], and [bound round] with the belts,” &c. The ellip. of ἐν is supplied in a kindred passage of Job xxxix. 10. δῆσαις δὲ αὐτὸν ἐν ἱμαῖσι ζυγοῦσιν.

—τὸν ἐσιῶτα.] The Article has reference to the custom of the Romans, to have a centurion to stand by at the execution of any punishment.

28. ἐγὼ πολλοῦ—ἐκτησάμην.] These words imply surprise how a person of Paul’s mean appearance could possess this. Perceiving which, the Apostle makes a rejoinder removing this difficulty: “Aye, but I am even so by birth.” Κεφαλαίου (at which supply χρῆμα) signifies properly the total arising from the addition of several small sums; but as that generally implies a tolerably large sum, so it came to mean a considerable sum. On the various modes whereby the freedom of Rome could be attained by foreigners; i. e. by merit, or favour, by money, or by being freed from servitude, and on the peculiar nature of the freedom claimed by the citizens of Tarsus, see Recens. Synop.

29. ἐφοβήθη—ἔτι ἦν αὐτὸν δεδ.] On the privilege of a Roman citizen under arrest, see the Notes of Kuin. and my own in Rec. Syn.; where I have proved that the term δεδ., here used, refers only to his having had the belts applied in order to scourging, not to his being put in irons, for Paul’s citizenship was of a class which did not exempt him from that; and, in point of fact, we find the bonds retained after his liberation from the whipping-post, and he is afterwards called ὁ δεδαιστος.

Τῇ δὲ ἐπαύριον βουλόμενος γῶναι τὸ ἀσφαλές, τὸ τί κατηγοροῦται 30
 παρὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ἔλυσεν αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τῶν δεσμῶν, καὶ ἐκέλευσεν
 ἐλθεῖν τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ ὄλον τὸ συνέδριον αὐτῶν· καὶ καταγαγὼν
 τὸν Παῦλον ἔστησεν εἰς αὐτοὺς. XXIII. Ἰ 1
 Ἰ 1 Kings 22. 24. Ἰ 2 Tim. 1. 3. Ἰ 1 Kings 22. 24. Ἰ 2 Tim. 1. 3. Ἰ 1 Kings 22. 24. Ἰ 2 Tim. 1. 3.
 Jer. 20. 2. Jer. 20. 2. Jer. 20. 2. Jer. 20. 2.
 John 18. 22. John 18. 22. John 18. 22. John 18. 22.
 a Lev. 19. 35. a Lev. 19. 35. a Lev. 19. 35. a Lev. 19. 35.
 Deut. 17. 4, 9. Deut. 17. 4, 9. Deut. 17. 4, 9. Deut. 17. 4, 9.
 & 25. 12. & 25. 12. & 25. 12. & 25. 12.
 τῷ συνεδρίῳ εἶπεν· Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, ἐγὼ πάσῃ συνειδήσει ἀγαθῇ
 πεπολίτευμαι τῷ Θεῷ ἄχρι ταύτης τῆς ἡμέρας. Ὁ δὲ ἀρχιερεὺς Ἀνα- 2
 νίας ἐπέταξε τοῖς παρεσιῶσιν αὐτῷ τύπτειν αὐτοῦ τὸ στόμα. Ὡς τότε 3
 ὁ Παῦλος πρὸς αὐτὸν εἶπε· Τύπτειν σε μέλλει ὁ Θεός, τοῖχε κεκο-
 νιαμένη! καὶ σὺ κάθεη κρίνων με κατὰ τὸν νόμον, καὶ παρωνομῶν
 κελεύεις με τύπτεσθαι; οἱ δὲ παρεσιῶτες εἶπον· Τὸν ἀρχιερεῖα τοῦ 4
 Θεοῦ λοιδορεῖς; ἔφη τε ὁ Παῦλος· Οὐκ ἤδειν, ἀδελφοί, ὅτι ἐστὶν 5
 ἀρχιερεὺς· γέγραπται γάρ· Ἀρχοντα τοῦ λαοῦ σου οὐκ ἐρεῖς
 κ α κ ὤ ς. Ἰ 6
 u Infrā 24. 15, u Infrā 24. 15, u Infrā 24. 15, u Infrā 24. 15.
 21. 21. 21. 21.
 & 28. 5, 6. & 28. 5, 6. & 28. 5, 6. & 28. 5, 6.
 Phil. 3. 5. Phil. 3. 5. Phil. 3. 5. Phil. 3. 5.
 δὲ ἕτερον Φαρισαίων, ἔκραζεν ἐν τῷ συνεδρίῳ· Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, ἐγὼ

30. ἔστησεν εἰς αὐτοὺς.] The full sense seems to be, "set him up to speak face to face, as to the charges they brought against him." On this use of καθίστημι see my Note on Thucyd. iv. 84. 1. The *παρὰ* just before is for ἀπὸ or ὑπὸ, "at the instance or accusation of." See Winer's Gr. Gr. p. 139. med. and 140. Note.

XXIII. 1. πεπολίτευμαι.] "I have conducted myself." The word properly signifies to *act as a citizen*, and sometimes to have the conduct of state affairs. See my Note on Thucyd. i. 84. 5. Hence it came to mean *conduct one's self, behave, &c.*, in which sense the word frequently occurs in the later writers. Ἐν πάσῃ συνειδήσει, "according to the dictates of my conscience [whether, as at first, ill informed, or not]." See Whitby and Dodd.

2. The Ananias here meant, is undoubtedly Ananias, son of Nebibaeus, (See Joseph. Ant. xx. 5, 3.), who had discharged the pontifical office under the procuratorship of Quadratus, predecessor of Felix. By Quadratus he was sent a prisoner to Rome, together with Annas, prefect of the temple, to give an account of his high-priesthood to Claudius Caesar (see Joseph. Ant. xx. 6, 2.). But by the intercession of Agrippa, Junior, they were acquitted, and returned to Jerusalem. Ananias, however, was not reinstated in the pontifical office. For during the procuratorship of Felix it was filled by Jonathan, who (as Josephus tells us, Ant. xx. 10.) was successor to Ananias. This Jonathan was, afterwards, by the connivance, at least, of Felix, assassinated in the temple by some *sicarii*. See Joseph. Ant. xx. 8, 5, and the Note on Acts xxii. 4. The office then remained unoccupied until king Agrippa appointed Ishmael, son of Phabæus, Joseph. Ant. xx. 8, 3. Hence, at the period in question, Ananias was not High-Priest, but was usurping the dignity. (Krebs and Kuinoel.) See also Benson and Biscoe, Boyle Lectures. It should rather seem that Ananias was not *usurping* the office, but *holding it provisionally*. To this unjustifiable violence towards the Apostle he was induced, we may suppose, 1. by Paul's solemn asseverations of innocence, which gave the lie to the accusations of the Chief Priests. 2. By his addressing them as *Brethren*, not *Fathers* or *Rulers* of Israel. 3. From his having

been liberated by Roman soldiers, and throwing himself on their protection, as a Roman citizen.

3. τύπτειν—κεκονιαμένη.] This is regarded by most Commentators as a *prediction*; while others (as Camer., Zeger, Limb., Wets., Heumann, and most of the recent Commentators), regard it as a *formula malé precantis*; q. d. God smite thee, as thou hast smitten me! There is, indeed, some reason to think that Ananias came to a violent death about six years after. Yet we are hardly warranted in recognising a *prediction*; for the words have not the *air* of a prediction. Nor is there any *proof* of the *fulfilment* of such a prediction; since, if Ananias *did* perish by violence, it would still be uncertain whether that was a judgment upon him for *this*, or for other bad actions in his life. We may rather consider the expression as the ebullition of a spirit impatient of injury: not, however, regarding the word as a *formula malé precantis*, but as merely the acrimoniously worded expression of a *persuasion*, that God would punish Ananias for this outrage. This view is confirmed by Chrysost., Jerome, and Augustine. See Dr. Graves in D'Oyly and Mant.

Τοῖχος κενον. was a common metaphor to designate *hypocrisy*. See Note on Matt. xxiii. 37. How applicable this reproach was, we find from Josephus.

—καὶ σὺ κάθεη, &c.] The *καὶ*, when prefixed to interrogative sentences implying admiration, is best rendered *itane? and so, so then?* See Kuin. Παρωνομῶν for παρὰ τὸν νόμον. For κρίνων there is no occasion to read, with Valcken., κρινῶν; the Present being put for the Future.

5. οὐκ ἤδειν—ἀρχιερεῖς.] That the Apostle should have been ignorant of the presence of the High Priest, would seem strange; and has accordingly occasioned some difference of opinion. Of the various solutions of the difficulty offered by Commentators (See Recens. Synop.), *two* only seem to have any semblance of truth: 1. that of Chrysost., Dionys., Cajet., Gataker, Wolf, Michaelis, and Townsend, who prove, from the history of the times, as recorded in Josephus, that the office of the High Priest was then vacant, and that Ananias was only discharging its duties *pro tempore*; which Paul, having been in Jerusalem only a few days, might not be aware of. If this be thought not satisfactory, we may, with

Φαρισαῖός εἰμι, υἱὸς Φαρισαίου· περὶ ἐλπίδος καὶ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν
 7 ἐγὼ κρίνομαι! Τοῦτο δὲ αὐτοῦ λαλήσαντος, ἐγένετο στίσις τῶν Φα-
 8 ρισαίων καὶ τῶν Σιδδουκαίων, καὶ ἐσχίσθη τὸ πλῆθος. ^x Σιδδουκαῖοι x Matt. 22. 53.
Mark 12. 19.
Luke 20. 27.
 μὲν γὰρ λέγουσι μὴ εἶναι ἀνάστασιν, μηδὲ ἄγγελον μήτε πνεῦμα·
 9 Φαρισαῖοι δὲ ὁμολογοῦσι τὰ ἀμφότερα. ^y Ἐγένετο δὲ κρουγῆ μεγάλη· y Supra 5. 39.
& 22. 7, 17. 18.
infra 25. 25.
& 28. 31.
 καὶ ἀναστάντες [οἱ] γραμματεῖς τοῦ μέρους τῶν Φαρισαίων διεμύχοντο,
 λέγοντες· Οὐδὲν κακὸν εὐρίσκομεν ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τούτῳ· εἰ δὲ
 10 πνεῦμα ἐλάλησεν αὐτῷ ἢ ἄγγελος· — μὴ θεομιχῶμεν. Πολλῆς δὲ γενο-
 μένης σιάσεως, εὐλαβηθεὶς ὁ χιλιάρχος μὴ διασπασθῆ ὁ Παῦλος ὑπ'
 αὐτῶν, ἐκέλευσε τὸ στράτευμα καταβῆν ἀρπάσαι αὐτὸν ἐκ μέσου αὐτῶν,
 ἄγειν τε εἰς τὴν παρεμβολήν.
 11 ^z Τῆ δὲ ἐπιούσῃ νυκτὶ ἐπιστὰς αὐτῷ ὁ Κύριος εἶπε· Θάρσει, z Supra 18. 9.
 Παῦλε· ὡς γὰρ διεμαρτύρω τὰ περὶ ἐμοῦ εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ, οὕτω σε δεῖ
 12 καὶ εἰς Ρώμην μαρτυρῆσαι. ^a Ἰενομένης δὲ ἡμέρας, ποιήσαντίς τις a Infra v. 20,
30.
Matt. 25. 74.

Bps. Sanderson and Mann, Episcop., Bengel, Wets., Pearce, Valckn., Morus, Schott, and Kuin. (supported by the ancient Commentaries as found in the Catena) take the expression *οὐκ ᾔδειν* in the sense, "I did not reflect or consider" (as it were excusing a momentary impetuosity.) And they compare Eph. vi. 8. Col. iii. 24. and some passages from Classical writers. So in Acts vii. 18. for *ᾔδει* some MSS. have, by *gloss*, *ἰμψόθη*. Bornem., indeed, denies that the word ever has that sense.

6. *περὶ ἐλπίδος καὶ ἀναστ. νεκ.*] The best Commentators here suppose a *Hendiadys*. Yet we may render, "for the hope of the dead and their resurrection." · Comp. Ps. xvi. 5. 1 Thess. iv. 13.

8. *ἀμφότερα*.] Both the ancient and modern Interpreters stumble at this — since there seem to be three terms above mentioned, *resurrection*, *angel*, and *spirit*. To avoid this difficulty, some would cancel *μηδὲ ἄγγελον*. Others propose another (but most harsh) mode of punctuation. Others, again, remark that *ἀμφότερον* might, by a writer not very attentive to accuracy, be used of *more than two*. But of this they adduce no good proofs; and it involves a sort of imputation both unjust and irreverent. The sacred writer, I conceive, *meant* to advert to the two points of difference between the Pharisees and Sadducees; and the two things referred to are the *Resurrection*, and the *Existence of Immaterial Beings*; *πνεῦμα* and *ἄγγελος* being considered as falling under the same head. *Ὁμολογοῦσι "profess [belief in]."

9. *διεμάχοντο*] "they contended [on behalf of Paul]." The word is also used by the Classical writers; not, however, followed by *λίγοντες*. but by an *Infin.* with an *Accus.*, as in Thucyd. iii. 40 & 42, where see my Notes.

— *εἰ δὲ πνεῦμα, &c.*] Here we have only to suppose an *apostrophe*, — such as is often found in the best writers, when something *which we do not care to directly mention* is omitted. Chrys. supplies *ποιῶν ἔγκλημα*, and the Pesh. Syr. something similar. The words following, *μη θεομιχῶμεν*, are omitted in 7 MSS., 4 inferior Versions, and some Fathers, and cancelled by Griesb. and Knapp; but without reason. The *external* authority for so doing is very slender; and the *internal* is quite against the omission. Kuinoel acutely traces the

origin of the omission to an ill founded *objection* to the words, as if too much favouring Christianity. To suppose them introduced from v. 39. is too hypothetical. All that can be said is, that the two passages are very similar. Besides, the *apostrophe* before would be intolerably harsh without these words.

The *angel*, or *spirit*, is thought to have reference to the two *kinds of appearance*, which those who were inclined to think with Paul ascribed to the *Divine vision* narrated by the Apostle; for those appearances were always supposed to take place through the medium of an angel, or a *spirit*. Certain recent Commentators here attempt to *explain away* all idea of Divine appearance; considering the whole as a *MERE dream* produced by the workings of high wrought imagination, and the resolution previously taken by Paul to avail himself of *any opportunity* of appealing to Cæsar; and this from a desire to go to Rome, foreseeing that he should be able to accomplish much good there. "Hence (say they), as the event turned out *accordingly*, he, as usual, ascribed the dream to a Divine appearance!" How little such a notion will bear examination (being no other than the same flimsy hypothesis advanced by these Commentators on various other occasions) it needs but little reflection to discover. So far from the resolution to make this appeal *giving occasion to the dream*, the appeal was most probably not thought of until *after the dream*; certainly not *carried into execution* till more than two years after; though many opportunities had, in the mean time, occurred for the Apostle to have appealed unto Cæsar; which he, however, did not. Nor is it probable that he would have done so *at last*, had he not been *compelled*, for his personal safety. I mean not to deny that the Apostle had thought of going to Rome: but surely he would be anxious not to go as a *criminal*. The vision then, was undoubtedly supernatural.

10. *μη διασπασθῆ*.] Pric., Kyp., and Wets. have proved by examples, that the term is often used of *great violence*, but *short of death*. Τὸ σπάρτεμα, "the forces." The word is a *vox medicæ significationis*, and signifies sometimes a whole army, sometimes, as here, a *small force*.

11. *ἐπιστάς*.] See Luke ii. 9. Acts xii. 7.

τῶν Ἰουδαίων συστροφὴν, ἀνεθεμάτισαν ἑαυτοὺς, λέγοντες μήτε φαγεῖν
 μήτε πιεῖν, ἕως οὗ ἀποκτείνωσι τὸν Παῦλον. Ἦσαν δὲ πλείους τεσσα- 13
 ράκοντα, οἱ ταύτην τὴν συνωμοσίαν πεποικηότες· οἵτινες προσελθόντες 14
 τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσι καὶ τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις εἶπον· Ἀναθέματι ἀνεθεμάτισα-
 μεν ἑαυτοὺς μηδενὸς γεύσασθαι ἕως οὗ ἀποκτείνωμεν τὸν Παῦλον.
 Νῦν οὖν ὑμεῖς ἐμφανίσατε τῷ χιλιάρχῳ σὺν τῷ συνεδρίῳ, ὅπως αὖριον 15
 αὐτὸν καταγάγῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ὡς μέλλοντας διαγινώσκειν ἀκριβέστερον τὰ
 περὶ αὐτοῦ· ἡμεῖς δὲ, πρὸ τοῦ ἐγγίσει αὐτὸν, ἔτοιμοι ἐσμεν τοῦ ἀνε-
 λεῖν αὐτόν. Ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀδελφῆς Παύλου † τὸ ἕνεδρον, 16
 παραγεγόμενος καὶ εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν παρεμβολήν, ἀπήγγειλε τῷ Παύ-
 λῳ. Προσκαλεσόμενος δὲ ὁ Παῦλος ἕνα τῶν ἑκατοντάρχων, ἔφη· Τὸν 17
 νεανίαν τοῦτον ἀπάγαγε πρὸς τὸν χιλιάρχον· ἔχει γάρ τι ἀπαγγεῖλαι
 αὐτῷ. Ὁ μὲν οὖν παραλαβὼν αὐτὸν ἤγαγε πρὸς τὸν χιλιάρχον, καὶ 18
 φησιν· Ὁ δέσμιος Παῦλος προσκαλεσάμενός με ἠρώτησε τοῦτον τὸν
 νεανίαν ἄγαγεῖν πρὸς σε, ἔχορτί τι λαλήσαι σοι. Ἐπιλαβόμενος δὲ τῆς 19
 χειρὸς αὐτοῦ ὁ χιλιάρχος, καὶ ἀναχωρήσας κατ' ἰδίαν ἐπυνθάνετο· Τί
 ἐστὶν ὃ ἔχεις ἀπαγγεῖλαι μοι; ὁ εἶπε δὲ· “Ὅτι οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι συνέθετο 20
 τοῦ ἐρωτῆσαι σε, ὅπως αὖριον εἰς τὸ συνέδριον καταγάγῃς τὸν Παῦλον,
 ὡς μέλλοντες τι ἀκριβέστερον ἐπυνθάνεσθαι περὶ αὐτοῦ. Σὺ οὖν μὴ 21
 πεισθῆς αὐτοῖς· ἐνεδρεύουσι γὰρ αὐτὸν ἐξ αὐτῶν ἄνδρες πλείους τεσ-
 σαράκοντα, οἵτινες ἀνεθεμάτισαν ἑαυτοὺς μήτε φαγεῖν μήτε πιεῖν ἕως
 οὗ ἀνέλθωσιν αὐτόν· καὶ νῦν ἔτοιμοι εἰσι, προσδεχόμενοι τὴν ἀπὸ σοῦ
 ἐπαγγελίαν. Ὁ μὲν οὖν χιλιάρχος ἀπέλυσε τὸν νεανίαν, παραγγείλας 22
 μηδενὶ ἐκλαλήσαι, ὅτι ταῦτα ἐνεφάνισας πρὸς με. καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος 23
 δύο τινὰς τῶν ἑκατοντάρχων εἶπεν· Ἐτοιμάσατε στρατιωτίας διακοσίους,
 ὅπως πορευθῶσιν ἕως Καισαρείας, καὶ ἵππεῖς ἐξῆδομήκοντα, καὶ † δεξιο-

^b Supra v. 12.

12. συστροφὴν] “a conspiracy.” A signification of which I have produced examples from Dionys. Hal., Josephus, and Artemid., in Recens. Synop. These persons were probably *Zelotæ*, or *Sicarii*, set on by Ananias and his party.

— ἀνεθεμάτισαν ἑ.] This ἀναθ. implied the binding one's self under a curse to do any thing; and (as Selden and Wets. have shown) was sometimes, as in the present case, accompanied with a resolution not to eat or drink until the accomplishment of the thing vowed. Such execrable vows were, Doddr. observes, not unusual with the Jews; who claimed a right to punish those whom they considered transgressors of the law, even unto death.

15. ἐμφανίσατε] “give notice by letter.” A forensic term. Διαγινώσκω has here the sense, also forensic, of *examine*, literally *determine* some point, of which examples are given by Wets. and Loesner. Πρὸ τοῦ ἐγγίσει αὐτόν. Namely, that the Sanhedrim might not be thought to have any hand in the thing.

16. Παῦλον τὸ ἕνεδρον] “the plot laid against Paul.” Perhaps we should here read *ἐνέδρον*, as at xxv. 3, where all the MSS. have *ἐνέδρα*. The word is used here and in that passage simply for *ἐπιβουλὴ*, a *plot*, as in Ps. x. 8. Josh. viii. 9. Herodian iv. 5, 7; vii. 5, 8. Joseph. Bell. i. 5. 8. *ἐξελ-*

θεῖν εἰς τὴν ἐνέδραν, “to go forth to carry into effect.” &c.

19. ἐπιλαβόμενος τῆς χειρὸς α.] This is a popular form of expression, not to be pressed on, signifying little more than *taking aside*, as appears from the examples adduced by Pricæus, from Ach. Tat. and Herodian.

20. ὡς μέλλοντες τι ἀκριβ. πυνθ.] See Joseph. Vit. § 2. συνόντων — ὑπὲρ τοῦ παρ' ἐμοῦ περὶ τῶν νομίμων ἀκριβέστερόν τι γινώσκειν.

21. τὴν ἀπὸ σοῦ ἐπαγγελίαν.] The Commentators are not agreed whether this should be explained *promise*, or *order*. There is much to be urged for either sense, but the context rather requires the latter. Render “the order to be given by you, for Paul to be brought up.”

22. παραγγείλας — πρὸς με.] A blending of the *oratio directa* and indirecta, as sup. i. 4.

23. δεξιοβάβους.] With this word the Commentators have been not a little perplexed. Some would read *δεξιοβάβλους*, from one MS. and a few Versions. But that plainly arose from the *conjecture* of those who could not understand *δεξιοβάβους*, which is generally supposed to denote *lictors*, like our *provost marshal* and his attendants. But although there is reason to think that the word came, in after ages, to bear that sense, yet it were absurd to suppose *so many* lictors to be attendant on the tribune's forces, as that 200

24 λάβους διακοσίους, ἀπὸ τρίτης ὥρας τῆς νυκτός· κτήνη τε παραστῆσαι, ἵνα ἐπιβιβάσαντες τὸν Παῦλον διασώσωσι πρὸς Φίλικα τὸν ἡγεμόνα·
 25 γράψας ἐπιστολὴν περιέχουσαν τὸν τύπον τοῦτον. Κλαύδιος Ἀσσίας
 26 τῷ κρατίστῳ ἡγεμόνι Φίλικι χαίρειν. Ὁ ἄνθρωπος τοῦτον συλληφθέντα c supra 21. 33.
 27 ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, καὶ μέλλοντα ἀναιρεῖσθαι ὑπ' αὐτῶν, ἐπιστάς σὺν
 28 τῷ στρατεύματι ἐξειλόμην αὐτὸν, μαθὼν ὅτι Ῥωμαῖός ἐστι. Βουλόμενος
 29 δὲ γνῶναι τὴν αἰτίαν δι' ἣν ἐνεκάλουν αὐτῷ, κατήγγυον αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ
 30 συνέδριον αὐτῶν· ὃν εὔρον ἐγκαλούμενον περὶ ζητημάτων τοῦ νόμου
 31 αὐτῶν, μηδὲν δὲ ἄξιον θανάτου ἢ δεσμῶν ἔγκλημα ἔχοντα. Μηνυθείσης δὲ μοι ἐπιβουλῆς εἰς τὸν ἄνθρωπον μέλλειν ἔσεσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ἐξαντιῆς ἔπεμψα πρὸς σε, παραγγείλας καὶ τοῖς κατηγοροῖς λέγειν τὰ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐπὶ σοῦ. ἔρῳσο.
 31 Οἱ μὲν οὖν στρατιῶται, κατὰ τὸ διατεταγμένον αὐτοῖς, ἀναλαβόντες
 32 τὸν Παῦλον, ἤγαγον διὰ τῆς νυκτός εἰς τὴν Ἀντιπατρίδα. Τῇ δὲ ἐπαύριον ἐάσαντες τοὺς ἵππους πορεύεσθαι σὺν αὐτῷ, ἐπέστρεψαν εἰς
 33 τὴν παρεμβολὴν· οἷτινες εἰσελθόντες εἰς τὴν Καισάρειαν, καὶ ἀναδόντες
 34 τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τῷ ἡγεμόνι, παρέστησαν καὶ τὸν Παῦλον αὐτῷ. Ἀναγνούς δὲ ὁ ἡγεμὼν, καὶ ἐπερωτήσας ἐκ ποίως ἐπαρχίας ἐστὶ, καὶ τυθό-

should be sent to guard one prisoner. One of the most probable opinions is that of Beza, Drus., Kuin., Schleus., and Wahl, that they were the Tribune's *body guards*; so called from taking the right side of any one (as being the *unguarded* side. See Thucyd. iii. 23. v. 10. 71.), and thus protecting him. I should rather think, however, that they were a kind of troops *attendant* on the heavy-armed and the cavalry, like the *ἄμπτοι* mentioned in Thucyd. v. 57. see my Note there. They were, it should seem, light-armed, and similar to the *lanxearii*, who (as we find from Ammian. xxi. 13., cited by Wets.) covered in battle the right flank. They seem to have performed the duties both of *exploratores*, and of *attendant soldiers* on the heavy armed, and probably sometimes that of *body guards* on the principal officers, like our *sentinels*.

24. κτήνη.] There is no occasion to suppose (with Kuin.), that the beasts were for Paul and the two soldiers who held his chains. We may imagine them to have been for Paul only; for in so long and rapid a journey he would require more than one horse. The cavalry, we know, used (as the Tartars and other Oriental nations now do) often to take with them each a led horse; by which means they travelled very long distances without stopping.

25. περιέχ. τὸν τύπον τοῦτον.] There is no necessity (with Valckn., Heintr., and Kuin.), so to press on the primitive sense of the word, as to suppose that St. Luke has given us not the letter, but only the substance of it. It should rather seem that Luke wrote from a copy of the letter, preserved by himself or by Paul, from the persons who kept the public records. Paul, during his tedious captivity at Cæsarea, would be desirous of knowing the contents of the Epistle (which was of the sort called *elogia*), and probably preserved a copy, which Luke had the opportunity of using.

26. κρατίστῳ.] The usual and formal epithet

employed in addressing a magistrate; as we say, your *Excellency*. On χαίρειν and ἔρῳσο, see Note on Acts xv. 23.

27. σὺν τῷ στρατεύματι.] Not "with an army;" but "with the force [under my command]." So at Joseph. Bell. i. 7, 2. Πίσωνα εἰσπέμπει μετὰ στρατιᾶς I would render, "sends Piso with a body of troops."

— μαθὼν ὅτι Ῥωμ. ἐστὶ.] It is in vain to attempt to clear Lysias (as some Commentators do) of petty misrepresentation. He ventured to take a little more credit for zeal, in behalf of his fellow citizens, than he deserved.

31. ἤγαγον διὰ τῆς — Ἀ.] From the ancient itineraries brought to light by the researches of Reland, we are enabled pretty correctly to trace both the route and the different stages of it: namely, to Neapolis 22 miles; to Lydda (or Diospolis) 10; to Antipatris 10; to Cæsarea 6. But 42 miles would seem a distance too great for one night; even supposing all the rapidity of a forced march. And yet the words ἤγαγον εἰς τὴν Ἀ. seem to claim this sense; at least no other would be thought of in a *Classical* writer. Most Commentators (as Reland, Biscoe, Doddr., Schleus., and Kuin.) think it is not necessary to suppose that he was conveyed thither in one night; and they render *by night*, i. e. by the *next* night. But it could only mean in the *course* of the next night, which would be too long a time to allow. It therefore appears safer to understand διὰ τῆς νυκτός of the night on which they set out. And perhaps no more is meant by this expression (which seems a popular idiom) than that they conveyed Paul *all night long towards* Antipatris, and arrived there without halting. Now, as they might, by a forced march (the cavalry helping the infantry), arrive thither by ten or eleven o'clock in the morning; and as by far the *greater part* of the journey would be really accomplished by night, they might be said to have conveyed him thither διὰ τῆς νυκτός.

33. ἀναδόντες.] Vox solemnis de hac re.

μενος ὅτι ἀπὸ Κιλικίας· Διακούσομαί σου, ἔφη, ὅταν καὶ οἱ κατήγο- 36
ροί σου παραγένωνται. ἐκέλευσέ τε αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ πραιτωρίῳ τοῦ Ἡρώ-
δου φυλάσσεσθαι.

d Supra 23. 2.

XXIV. ^d ΜΕΤΑ δὲ πέντε ἡμέρας κατέβη ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς Ἀνανίας μετὰ 1
τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ ῥήτορος Τερτύλλου τινός, οἵτινες ἐνεφάνισαν τῷ
ἡγεμόνι κατὰ τοῦ Παύλου. Κληθέντος δὲ αὐτοῦ, ἤρξατο κατηγορεῖν ὁ 2
Τερτύλλος, λέγων· Πολλῆς εἰρήνης τυγχάνοντες διὰ σοῦ, καὶ κατορθω- 3
μάτων γινομένων τῷ ἔθνει τούτῳ διὰ τῆς σῆς προνοίας πάντη τε καὶ
πανταχοῦ, ἀποδεχόμεθα, κράτιστε Φῆλιξ, μετὰ πάσης εὐχαριστίας. Ἴνα 4
δὲ μὴ ἐπὶ πλείον σέ ἐγκόπτω, παρακλιῶ ἀκουσαί σε ἡμῶν συντόμως,
τῇ σῇ ἐπιεικείᾳ. Εὐρόντες γὰρ τὸν ἄνδρα τούτον λοιμὸν, καὶ κινουῦντα 5

35. διακούσομαι.] This implies a diligent and thorough hearing. Τῷ πραιτωρίῳ τ. Ἡ. i. e. a palace formerly built by Herod, but then used as the residence of the provincial governor.

XXIV. 1. μετὰ δὲ πέντε ἡμ.] This is by some of the best Commentators explained, *from Paul's arrival at Caesarea*; by others, *from the time of the notice given to the High Priest by Lysias*, which was on the day before Paul's arrival at Caesarea.

— ἐνεφάνισαν.] Sub. ἐναντίως. See John xiv. 22. and Note. Almost all the best Commentators are agreed in regarding this as a *forensic* term, equivalent to the Latin one *comparere in judicio*, or *coram iudice*. It may, however, have the signification assigned by the Syr. Vers., Ammonius, Pric., Grot., and Wets., *gave information*.

— ῥήτορος.] The word properly denotes an *orator*. But as orators, who harangued on the public business before the public assembly, sometimes had the causes of private persons confided to them, — so it came to signify an *advocate*, and at length merely a *pleader*, or *barrister*, as here.

3. εἰρήνης.] The word here signifies public and political tranquillity; namely, from the troubles under which they had laboured, of rebels, brigands, robbers, and other disturbers of the peace. That Felix deserved this praise, appears from Joseph. Ant. xx. 8. 4. cited by Wets. And so at Bell. i. 10. 5. he says, that when Herod had put down the bands of robbers, the people celebrated his praises, saying *ὡς εἰς εἰρήνην αὐτοῖς παρῶν*, that he came to them for peace.

— κατορθμάτων.] Κατορθῶν is properly a term used in *bowling*, and signifies, primarily, *to take a straight course down to the end*; metaphorically, *to conduct an affair to a prosperous issue*; and, in the passive, *to be conducted*, &c.: as Thucyd. ii. 65, where *κατορθώμενα (πράγματα)* are opposed to *σφαλέντα, unsuccessful*. Thus *κατόρθωμα* denoted the *things* thus brought to a *successful issue*.

— διὰ τῆς σῆς προν.] Elsn. observes that the *old Romans* used to ascribe national prosperity to the Gods; while, in after times, whatever happened prosperously was ascribed to the prudent counsels, and even the *τύχη* of their rulers, or generals, without any mention of Divine Providence.

— πάντη τε καὶ πανταχοῦ.] It is not agreed among Expositors whether these words should be taken with the *preceding*, or with the *following*. The *former* mode makes the better construction, and yields the better sense; namely, “in every

respect (or, ‘at all times’), and in every place.” We may observe an elegance in this juxtaposition of terms commencing with the same syllable, something like *alliteration*. Many examples of which may be seen in Rec. Syn.

— ἀποδεχόμεθα.] The word signifies properly *to accept at any one's hands*, and, by implication, *to approve, commend*, and is used both of *persons and things*.

4. ἵνα μὴ — ἐγκόπτω.] The full sense is, “That I may not [longer than is necessary] detain you [from other business].” The term *ἐγκόπτειν* signifies properly to cut a ditch, as a separation between two plots of ground; and hence, to separate, detain from, &c.

— συντόμως.] The construction here is left imperfect; so that, as the words stand, we must supply *λεξόντων* from the subject-matter. Yet this involves such a harshness, that I am inclined to suspect some corruption in *συντόμως*, for which I would conjecture *συντόμως (vehementer, enixe)* to be construed with *παρακλιῶ*. Thus it will exactly correspond to the Latin phrase — “*Te vehementer rogo*,” of frequent occurrence in the best writers, and probably employed, on the present occasion, by Tertullus; of which St. Luke has thus given a literal version. And although no MS. is adduced as having *συντόμως*, yet the two words are frequently confounded by the scribes; on which see Hensterh. and Kuster on Aristoph. Plut. p. 71; Heyne's Homer v. 492; and Wessel. on Diodor. Sic. i. 279. λεπηθῆναι συντόμως, where *συντόμως* is evidently the true reading, though not found in any MS. And the expression may very well be explained to mean *earnestly*; since the adjective *συντόμως* is often opposed to *ἀνείματος*, both in a *proper* and in a *metaphorical* acceptation. Thus the full sense is, “But that I may no longer hinder thee [I will cease this preface], and have earnestly to entreat thee, of thy benignity and condescension, to hear what we have to say.” Τῇ σῇ ἐπιεικείᾳ is well rendered in the Vulg. “*pro tua clementiâ* :” the very expression, I imagine, used by Tertullus; the word *clementiâ* being in the ancient Latin Greek Glossaries explained by *ἐπιεικεία*.

5. εὐρόντες γὰρ, &c.] The γὰρ has the *inchoative* force, and may be rendered *nempe*. In εὐρόντες the Commentators suppose an ellip. of *ἐμὲν*, so that εὐρόντες ἐμὲν may be taken for εὐρομεν; of which they adduce examples. But in the passages they cite, no other principle could be resorted to: here there is no such compulsion; and it is better to regard the phraseology as falling

στάσιν πᾶσι τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις τοῖς κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην, πρωτοστάτην τε
 6 τῆς τῶν Ναζωραίων αἰρέσεως ὅς καὶ τὸ ἱερόν ἐπέiraσε βεβηλώσαι, ^{e Supra 21. 28.}
 ὃν καὶ ἐκρατήσαμεν, καὶ κατὰ τὸν ἡμέτερον νόμον ἤθελήσαμεν κρίνειν.
 7 Παρελθὼν δὲ Λυσίας ὁ χιλιάρχος μετὰ πολλῆς βίας, ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν
 8 ἡμῶν ἀπήγαγε, κελύουσας τοὺς κατηγόρους αὐτοῦ ἔρχεισθαι ἐπὶ σέ·
 παρ' οὗ δυνήσῃ αὐτὸς ἀνακρίνας περὶ πάντων τούτων ἐπιγνώναι, ὧν
 9 ἡμεῖς κατηγοροῦμεν αὐτοῦ. * Συνεπέθεντο δὲ καὶ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, φάσκον-
 τες ταῦτα οὕτως ἔχειν.
 10 Ἀπεκρίθη δὲ ὁ Παῦλος, νέυσαντος αὐτῷ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος λέγειν· Ἐκ
 πολλῶν εἰῶν ὄντα σε κριτὴν τῷ ἔθνει τούτῳ ἐπιστάμενος, εὐθυμότερον
 11 τὰ περὶ ἔμαντοῦ ἀπολογούμαι· δυναμένου σου γινῶναι, ὅτι οὐ πλείους
 εἰσὶ μοι ἡμέραι [ἦ] δεκαδύο, ἀφ' ἧς ἀνέβην προσκνηήσων ἐν Ἱερου-
 12 σαλήμ· ^{f Infra 25. 8. & 28. 17.} καὶ οὔτε ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ εὐρόν με πρὸς τινα διαλεγόμενον, ἢ ἐπι-
 σύστασιν ποιοῦντα ὄχλου, οὔτε ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς οὔτε κατὰ τὴν πό-
 13 λιν· οὔτε παραστήσασί με δύνανται περὶ ὧν νῦν κατηγοροῦσί μου.
 14 Ὁμολογῶ δὲ τοῦτό σοι, ὅτι κατὰ τὴν ὁδόν, ἣν λέγουσιν αἰρεῖσιν, οὕτω

under the figure *anacoluthon*; especially as the sentence is long and involved: of which numerous examples might be adduced from Thucyd. See Note on xvi. 22.

—λοιμὸν] for λοιμικόν, according to the usage of the best writers, from whom examples are adduced by Wets. and Kypke, almost entirely, however, from the later writers, as Ælian V. H. xiv. 11. δόξης φρόντιζε, ἀλλὰ μὴ ἔσω λοιμὸς, καὶ μὴ μεγάλη νόσος, ἀλλὰ ὑγίεια. Strictly speaking, the noun here is not put for the cognate adjective; but is used according to a frequent Greek idiom, by which a noun in its most abstract sense is, as it were, *personified* by taking the attribute inherent in the noun, and applying it to a person.

—πρωτοστᾶτην.] The word properly denoted the first man on the right in a line of troops. So Thucyd. v. 71. ὁ πρωτοστᾶτης τοῦ δεξιῶ κέρως, where see my Note. But it is in the later writers used to denote a *front rank man*, and sometimes, figuratively, a principal person. On Ναζωρ. see Note at ii. 22.

8. παρ' οὗ.] Namely, to *Paul*; though some ancient and modern Commentators refer it to *Lysias*. The ἀνακρίνας is supposed to refer to the examination by torture.

9. συνεπέθεντο.] So read many MSS., some Versions and Fathers, and the early Edd., with the exception of the Erasmus, for the vulg. συνέθεντο, and it has been adopted by almost every Editor from Wets. down to Vat.; and perhaps rightly. But the common reading may be defended, in the sense *assented*; and if ὧν just before be the true reading, this must likewise. Συνεπέθεντο signifies “acted in concert in the attack.” So Thucyd. iii. 54. συνεπιτίθενται ἐς ἑλενθριαν, and Deut. xxxii. 27. Ps. iii. 6.

10. νέυσαντος] “*nutu significavit.*” Or the sense may be, “gave him permission by a nod or beckoning;” on the nature of which expression, and the similar one νέματι χρῆσασθαι, &c., I have treated in my Note on Thucyd. i. 134.

—κριτήν.] This term is used, because the Procurator united the *judicial* functions to the civil and military ones. Τὰ περὶ ἔμαντοῦ ἀπολ. Sub. πράγματα. Munthe aptly compares Diod. Sic. p. 351. τὰ καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἀπολογησάμενος.

11. ἡμέραι δεκάτιο.] The chronology of this period may be adjusted as follows:—On the *first day* Paul arrives at Jerusalem. 2d. Attends the meeting of the Presbyters. 3d. Commences his week of votive abstinence, which he continues on the 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, and 8th (for that seems required by the words at xxi. 27. ὡς δὲ ἔμελλον ἀ ἐπτά ἡμέραι συντελεῖσθαι). On the same day he is assaulted by the Jews, and committed to the castle. On the 9th day he is brought before the Sanhedrim. The 10th he spends in the castle (during which the plot against him is formed). On the night of the 10th he is removed to Antipatris, where he arrives early on the 11th day; and on the 12th he reaches Cæsarea. The *remaining* day is *not reckoned*, probably (as Kuin. suggests) because it is not in question, as he could then excite no tumult.

The Dative *μοι* may be accounted for on the principle mentioned by Matth. Gr. Gr. § 390.

The *ἦ* before δεκάτιο is not found in very many MSS. and some Fathers, and the early Edd., and is cancelled by Wets., Matth., Griesb., Tittm., and Vat.; and rightly; for it is far easier to account for its insertion than for its omission.

12. ἐπισύστασιν.] The word is somewhat rare; but it is found in the Sept., Joseph., Sext., Emp., and others cited by the Commentators. Συνίστασθαι is found in the best Classical writers. See my Note on Thucyd. v. 34.

14. ὁμολογῶ, &c.] After having refuted the charge of sedition, the Apostle proceeds to answer that of taking up and maintaining a religion different from that of his countrymen. This he does by showing that the doctrines he professes are not *mere novelties* (or *sectarian*); but that he worships the same God with the Jews, receives the same sacred books, and has the same belief in the resurrection, both of the just and of the unjust; conformably to which he labours to preserve a conscience void of offence towards God and towards man.

Ἀίσιας properly denotes only the taking up of an opinion, whether well or ill founded; and sometimes it was applied to the *persons* who maintained the opinions. Hence many eminent Commentators here render it *sect*; a sense which the word does bear in other passages of Luke.

λατρεύω τῷ πατρὶ ὁ Θεῶ, πιστεύων πᾶσι τοῖς κατὰ τὸν νόμον καὶ τοῖς
 προφήταις γεγραμμένοις· Ἐλπίδα ἔχων εἰς τὸν Θεόν, — ἣν καὶ αὐτοὶ 15
 οὗτοι προσδεχονται, — ἀνάστασιν μέλλειν ἕσθθαι νεκρῶν, δικαίων τε
 καὶ ἀδικῶν. ἢ Ἐν τούτῳ δὲ αὐτὸς ἀσκῶ, ἀπρόσκοπον συνειδηθῆν ἔχειν 16
 πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν καὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους διαπαντός. Ἰδιῶν δὲ πλειό- 17
 νων παρεγενόμην ἐλεημοσύνας ποιήσω εἰς τὸ ἔθνος μου καὶ προσ-
 φοράς· ἢ ἐν οἷς εὐχρόν με ἠγγισμένον ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, οὐ μετὰ ὄχλου οὐδὲ 18
 μετὰ θορύβου, τινὲς [δὲ] ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀσίας Ἰουδαῖοι· οὓς † δεῖ ἐπὶ σοῦ 19
 παρεῖναι καὶ κατηγορεῖν, εἴ τι ἔχοιεν πρὸς με. ἢ αὐτοὶ οὗτοι εἰπάτω- 20
 σαν, [εἰ] τι εὐχρον ἐν ἐμοὶ ἀδίκημα, στάντος μου ἐπὶ τοῦ συνεδρίου,
 ἢ περὶ μιᾶς ταύτης φωνῆς, ἣς ἔκραξα ἐστῶς ἐν αὐτοῖς· Ὅτι περὶ 21
 ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν ἐγὼ κρίνομαι σήμερον ὑφ' ὑμῶν!
 Ἀκούσας δὲ ταῦτα ὁ Φηλιξ ἀνεβάλετο αὐτοὺς, ἀκριβέστερον εἰδὼς 22
 τὰ περὶ τῆς ὁδοῦ, εἰπὼν· Ὅταν Λυσίας ὁ χιλιάρχος καταβῆ, διαγνώ-

g Dan. 12, 2.
John 5, 28, 29.

h Supra 23. 1.

i Supra 11, 29.
Gal. 2, 10.
Rom. 15, 25.

k Supra 21, 26,
27.

l Supra 23. 6.
& 26. 20.

But the context will here scarcely permit it, and it should seem that Paul means to take exception at the *invidious* sense which the word admitted; and in which it was used by his opponents; just as in our word *new-fangled*, which properly denotes only *what is newly taken*. That Luke and Josephus sometimes use the word in a *good* sense is no proof that that was the general acceptance. *Paul* (with whose phraseology we have here to do) always uses it in a *bad* sense, of an opinion taken up on slight grounds; and so does Peter. And this is here required by the words *δδν* and *ὡς λέγουσι*.

τῷ πατρὶ Θεῶ is for τῷ Θεῷ τῶν πατέρων, as in v. 30. Gen. xxxii. 9, 10, and elsewhere. Of the phrase *πάτριοι Θεοὶ* the Commentators adduce many examples from the Classical writers. But the sense, in almost all the passages cited, is not the *Gods of any one's ancestors*, but the *Gods worshipped at any place*. A more apposite example may be found in Thucyd. ii. 71, where see my Note. As the privilege of worshipping their *θεῶς πάτριος* had been secured to the Jews by many Imperial charters, so Paul hereby throws himself under the protection of the Roman laws.

15. *δικαίων τε καὶ ἀδικῶν*.] For that was the *general* opinion of the Pharisees; though some of them believed only in a resurrection of the *just*. The opinion, however, (as Drus. and Kuinoel show,) was new and not extensively held.

16. *ἀσκῶ*.] This is to be taken intransitively; of which use the Commentators adduce several examples; and others may be seen in Bp. Blomfield's Note on *Æschyl. Prom.* 1102.

— *ἀπρόσκοπον συνειδηθῆν*.] *Ἀπρόσκ.* is one of those adjectives which admit either an active or a passive sense. The *former* is here adopted. What is properly applicable only to the *person* acting, or to the *action*, is applied to the *conscience*, as being the regulator of the conduct.

17. Here the Apostle answers to the *third* point of accusation, *profanation of the Temple*. *Δι' ἐτῶν πλειόνων*, “after very many years;” of which sense of *διὰ* I have cited several examples in Recens. Syn. *Ποιεῖν ἐλεημοσύνας* is an *Hellenistic* phrase signifying to *give* alms. Here, however, it must, from circumstances, be interpreted to *present* them. Paul hints that as his purpose was

both benevolent and pious, he was unlikely to have been guilty of profanation of the Temple.

18. *ἠγγισμένοι*] “living in votive sanctimony.” *Τινὲς δὲ*. So the Erasmus and Stephanic Edd. read. But the *δὲ* (which is not found in the Ed. Princ. and some other early Edd.) was cancelled by Beza, though recalled by Griesb., but, as I have proved at large in Recens. Synop., very uncritically.

19. *δδν*.] It is not easy to determine the true reading here. Several MSS. and most Editions from Beza downwards, have *ἔδει*, which is thought to be supported by some Fathers and Versions. If this were a matter wherein the *proprietas linguæ* could decide, there would, I think, be no hesitation in preferring *ἔδει*; notwithstanding what Matthæi says, that *one is as good Greek as the other*; which may be doubted. See Bornem.

20. *αὐτοὶ οὗτοι*] “these very persons.” *Εἰ* before *τι* is not found in very many MSS., Versions, and early Edd., and is cancelled by most Editors from Wets. to Vat.; rightly, it should seem; for we can far better account for its insertion than for its omission. *Ἀδίκημα* may be rendered *misdeemeanour* or *offence*. So xviii. 14. *εἰ ἀδίκημα τι ἢ βλάβη ὀργηται*.

21. *ἢ*] “otherwise than.” In *περὶ μιᾶς ταύτης φωνῆς* there is, as Beza remarks, a delicate irony, q. d. except for this one speech, [if they can make an offence of that]. See 2 Cor. xii. 13.

22. *ἀνεβάλετο αὐτοὺς*] “*ampliarit illos*,” put off the decision of their causes. *Ἀναβ.* signifies to defer a thing (*ava*) to another time, as *ἀνατιθέναι τὸ ἔργον*. It has almost always an Accusative of the *thing*, and is sometimes used *absolutely*. But when the business deferred is not our own, but another's, we may be said figuratively to put *him* off. And so here, and sometimes in the later Classical writers.

— *ἀκριβέστερον εἰδὼς τ. π. τ. δ.*] The best interpretation of these words is that of our common Version and Wets. “having become better acquainted with Christianity,” namely from the account just given by St. Paul, as well as from what he had learnt during his residence at Cæsarea. *Ἡ δδδς* seems to have been the name given to the sect of Christians by the Jews; though by the Gentiles they were generally called *Χριστιανοί*. *Διαγιώσθαι τὰ καθ' ὑμᾶς* may be rendered, “I will

23 σομαι τὰ καθ' ὑμᾶς· ^m διαταζόμενος τε τῷ ἑκατοντάρχῃ τηρεῖσθαι ^{m infra 27. 2. & 28. 15.}
τὸν Παῦλον, ἔχειν τε ἄνευσιν· καὶ μηδένα κωλύειν τῶν ἰδίων αὐτοῦ
ὑπηρετεῖν ἢ προσέρχεσθαι αὐτῷ.

24 Μετὰ δὲ ἡμέρας τινὰς παραγινόμενος ὁ Φῆλιξ σὺν Δρουσίλλῃ τῇ
γυναικί [αὐτοῦ,] οὖσῃ Ἰουδαία, μειτεπέμψατο τὸν Παῦλον, καὶ ἤκουσεν

25 αὐτοῦ περὶ τῆς εἰς Χριστὸν πίστεως. Διαλεγομένου δὲ αὐτοῦ περὶ
δικαιοσύνης καὶ ἐγκρατείας καὶ τοῦ κρίματος τοῦ μέλλοντος ἕσσεσθαι,
ἔμφορος γινόμενος ὁ Φῆλιξ ἀπεκρίθη· Τὸ νῦν ἔχον, πορεύου· καιρὸν

decide the [matter at issue] between you." See more in Rec. Syn. and Bp. Pearce.

23. τῷ ἑκατοντ.] Render, "the centurion," that one of the two centurions sent from Jerusalem with Paul; one of whom (xxiii. 31.) had left him at Antipatris; the other had gone with him to Cæsarea, there to remain in charge of him.

— τηρεῖσθαι and ἔχειν ἄνευσιν in this verse, are of such opposite senses, that it would seem they cannot be conjoined. Hence most recent Commentators place no stop after ἄνευσιν, but connect ἔχειν ἄνευσιν with the words following, which they suppose exegetical of these. See Kuin. This, however, is scarcely satisfactory; and the ἔχειν seems to have a signification more special. There can be little doubt but that the words are to be taken with the preceding, as they were by the ancients and the earlier modern Commentators. And if so, ἔχειν τε ἄνευσιν must be meant to qualify the τηρεῖσθαι: and the sense must be, "He ordered him to be kept in hold, and [at the same time] to enjoy some relaxation [of his confinement]; namely, as some Commentators think, by being kept ἐν φυλακῇ ἀδέσμω. But that is irreconcilable with xxvi. 25, and perhaps inconsistent with the due security of his person, as his friends were allowed to visit him. It should rather seem, that what is meant by the ἄνευσις is the changing the close custody of a prison into the milder durance of the custodia militaris, on which see Note supra xxii. 29. Of the phrase ἔχειν ἄνευσιν in this sense an example is cited by Loesner from Philo; and δοῦναι ἄνευσιν occurs in 2 Chron. xxiii. 15, and 3 Esdr. iv. 62. This view of the sense is supported by the authority of the Pesch. Syr. Version, in which the words are closely connected with the preceding; and Schaaf renders, "Præcepit Centurioni ut servarent Paulum in quiete." Rather it should be, "præcepit Centurioni ut custodiret

Paulum cum lenitate;" for **ܦܥܘܠܘܣܝܢ** may very well bear that sense, since its feminine form **ܦܥܘܠܘܣܝܢܐ** has it at Eph. iv. 2. Col. iii. 12, and 2 Cor. x. 1.

As to **ܥ** in this sense, that is almost its perpetual use. And moreover, the masculine form has a similar sense at 2 Cor. vii. 7, and 1 Tim. vi. 17. The words καὶ μηδένα — αὐτῷ are not meant to explain the preceding order, but to add another privilege, which did not belong to the custodia militaris, but solely appertained to the custodia libera, or the φυλακὴ ἀδέσμω.

I must not omit to state, that instead of τὸν Παῦλον ten MSS. and some inferior Versions have αὐτὸν, which was preferred by Mill and Beng., and has been edited by Griesb., Tittm., and Vat.; but rashly. For though it may seem countenanced by a Critical reason, yet it is, in fact, not; since if

αὐτὸν were the original reading, we can scarcely conceive why such a marginal gloss as τὸν Παῦλον should have been so prevalent, as to eject the true reading in all the MSS. but ten. So very wide difference in MS. authority between the two readings should make us rather suspect that αὐτὸν came from the margin, where it was probably placed to express that it should be supplied per ellipsis at ἔχειν. The remark, it may be supposed, was made by those who did not perceive the true connection and construction.

— τῶν ἰδίων] i. e. "all persons in any way connected with him, whether as relations or friends." Of which sense Loesner adduces some examples from Philo. Ὑπηρετεῖν is for διακοινῆν.

24. αὐτοῦ.] This is omitted in several MSS. and Theophyl., and is cancelled by Griesb. and others; perhaps rightly; for in several MSS. ἰδία is read; and in some both ἰδία and αὐτοῦ. Thus there is some reason to suspect both of them to be from the margin. The words οὖσῃ Ἰουδαία seem meant to assign the reason why Felix brought Drusilla with him. She, being a Jewess, would take some interest in the question as to the truth of the Christian religion. By ἤκουσεν αὐτοῦ περὶ is, I conceive, meant "heard what he had to say concerning."

25. δικαιοσύνης καὶ ἐγκο.] These are especially mentioned, both as being the principal of the moral duties (which the Apostle, doubtless, treated on, with reference to their being necessary to prepare for the judgment to come) and because his auditors were especially deficient in those duties. For by ἐγκράτεια he meant not temperance, but continence, or chastity; of which use Kuin. adduces one example from Xenoph., and I have in Recens. Synop. added two others, from Joseph. and Sext. Emp. Of τοῦ κρίματος, τοῦ μ. the sense is not well expressed, either in our common English Version, or that of Wakefield; the former not expressing the Article, and the latter rendering, "a judgment to come." The τοῦ seems to have reference to the doctrine, as being well known to Drusilla, and not unknown to Felix.

— ἔμφορος γινόμενος.] On the nature and extent of this feeling, some difference of opinion exists. See Rec. Syn. Here it is well to avoid the two extremes, either of supposing Felix's feeling to have been that of trembling terror (as does Doddr.), or (as Bp. Pearce, and most of the recent foreign Commentators), simply an uneasy feeling. For the former view there is no warrant in the phraseology; since though the words ἔκφορος and ἐντρομος are joined in Heb. xii. 21, yet ἐντρομος is a stronger term than ἔκφορος, which is merely an adjective formed on the phrase ἐν φόβῳ εἶναι. And as little is to be found in the context for the latter; for considering the subject, (which could not fail to embrace the performance of the moral duties in their principal branches) of justice and

δὲ μεταλαβὼν, μετακλέσομαι σε· ἕνα [δὲ] καὶ ἐπιζῶν, οὗ χρέματα 26
 δοθήσεται αὐτῷ ὑπὸ τοῦ Παύλου, ὅπως λύσῃ αὐτόν· διὸ καὶ πικρό-
 n *Infra* 25. 14. *τερον* αὐτὸν μεταπεμπόμενος ὁμίλει αὐτῷ. Ἡ Διέτις δὲ πληρωθείσης 27
 ἔλαβε διάδοχον ὁ Φῆλιξ Πόρκιον Φῆστον· θέλων τε χάριτας καταθέ-
 σθαι τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ὁ Φῆλιξ, κατέλιπε τὸν Παῦλον δεδεμένον.

XXV. ΦΙΣΤΟΣ οὖν ἐπιβὰς τῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ, μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀνέβη 1
 εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα ἀπὸ Καισαρείας. Ἐνεφάνισαν δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς καὶ 2
 οἱ πρῶτοι τῶν Ἰουδαίων κατὰ τοῦ Παύλου, καὶ παρεκάλουν αὐτόν,
 αἰτούμενοι χάριν κατ' αὐτοῦ, ὅπως μεταπέμψῃται αὐτόν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, 3
 ἐνέδραν ποιοῦντες ἀνελεῖν αὐτόν κατὰ τὴν ὁδόν. Ὁ μὲν οὖν Φῆστος 4
 ἀπεκρίθη, τηρεῖσθαι τὸν Παῦλον ἐν Καισαρείᾳ, ἑαυτὸν δὲ μέλλειν ἐν

temperance, to make us fit for the mercy of God in Christ — and that with reference to the solemn period when we must give an account of the deeds done in the body. Whether, indeed, the Apostle made his observations personally applicable to Felix and Drusilla (who were both notorious for their breach of both justice and continence), may be doubted; it being little probable that he would choose so far to overlook the rules of good manners. And certainly Felix could not fail to apply to his *own* case what was put *generally*. Hence, I apprehend, it was *not* (as has been generally supposed) his discoursing of the *last judgment* only that raised this alarm in the breast of Felix, but the necessary connection of that doctrine with his own notorious breach of the moral duties. So Bp. Sanderson in his Sermons ad Populum, p. 147, says: "The thing that made Felix tremble was that Paul's discourse fell upon those *special* vices wherein he was notably faulty, and were then clapped in close upon him."

— τὸ νῦν ἔχον.] Sub. μέρος χρόνου and κατά. An Attic and elegant form, meaning "for the present," of which the Commentators adduce many examples. I have in Recens. Synop. compared a similar dismission, from nearly the same cause, received by Plato from Dionysius, the tyrant of Sicily. Καὶρὸν μεταλαβῶν is regarded as a Hellenistic phrase for καιρὸν λαβῶν, or καιροῦ μεταλ. Yet Kypke has adduced *one* example from Polyb. ii. 16. On the difference between this and the Classical idiom see Rec. Syn.

26. ἕνα δὲ καὶ ἐπιζῶν.] This is taken by the Commentators as a participle for the verb ἤλπισε. But it may, in construction, be suspended on the ἀπεκρίθη preceding; which has dependent on it *two* expressions, denoting the *two causes* which induced Felix to give Paul his dismission; 1. because he felt uneasiness and apprehension, and 2. because it was his *policy* to dismiss him and send for him again and again, in order to get a bribe to set him at liberty; for it appears from Joseph. Antiq. xx. 8, and Bell. ii. 141. that corruption of this kind was then common. And Felix might suppose that as Paul was one of the leaders of a sect disposed to raise money for any pious purpose, a considerable sum might be raised for his release. The δὲ is omitted in very many MSS. and some Versions, and early Edd., and is cancelled by Wets., Matth., Griesb., Knapp, and Tittm. It *may* have been a mere emendation on the καὶ following; but I cannot approve of its being cancelled, because of such passages as Thucyd. i. 25, 3. ὑπέεξαντο τὴν τιμωρίαν, νομιζόντες, &c. ἕνα δὲ καὶ μίσει, &c.

27. διέτις πληρωθ.] Namely, from Paul's imprisonment by Lysias. It is truly observed by Lightf., that the sacred writers often number by tacit or unnamed epochs, as in 2 Sam. xvi. 7. 2 Chron. xxii. 2. Ez. i. 1.

— χάριτας καταθέσθαι τοῖς Ἰ.] An elegant phrase, by which favours are considered as a *deposit*, to be taken up afterwards. The Commentators adduce many examples; and others may be seen in my Note on Thucyd. i. 33.

It was usual for Roman governors to confer *some* favours upon the people on vacating their post; and *one* of these, as we learn from Joseph., was a general gaol-delivery; probably given here, but the benefit of which Paul was denied, that a *greater* favour might be done to the Jews.

XXV. 1. ἐπιβὰς τῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ.] This should be rendered, "after entering upon his government." It may be observed, that ἐπαρχία was the name applied to the *larger* provinces, to which were sent Proprætors or Proconsuls; while the *smaller* ones were termed ἐπιτροπαί, and their Governors ἐπιτροποι, Procurators. These, indeed, were little more than *collectors* of the *revenues*; though in some provinces they exercised the *judicial* functions, and indeed most of those held by the ἐπαρχοί. Now Judæa, from particular circumstances, was one of these. Hence it might be called ἐπαρχία; and so Josephus sometimes terms the Governor ἐπαρχος. Ἐπιβ. is a vox sol. de hac re.

2. ἐνεφάνισαν] "laid a charge before him." See Note supra xxiv. 1.

3. αἰτούμενοι χάριν κατ' αὐτοῦ.] There seems a harshness in this expression; which is indeed not found in some MSS. and Versions, where is read παρ' αὐτοῦ. But that is evidently a mere emendation. It is *better* to take κατὰ (as I proposed in Recens. Synop.) in the sense *concerning*. Yet even that is unnecessary; for we may consider the expression as a *brevilocutionis* for αἰτούμενοι χάριν ἐν εἰκῇ τῇ κατ' αὐτοῦ. And this is confirmed by the words at v. 15. αἰτούμενοι εἰκὴν κατ' αὐτοῦ. In ἐνέδραν ποιοῦντες we need not, with many of the best Commentators, take ποιοῦντες in a Future sense; for the difficulty alleged by them may be removed by taking ἐνδὲ π. *figuratively*, for "having laid a plot," as in xxiii. 16. ἀκόσως τὴν ἐνέδραν, and often both in the O. T. and the Classical writers.

4. ἀπεκρίθη τηρεῖσθαι.] I have in Recens. Synop. shown that the sense cannot be (as most Translators and Commentators suppose), "he answered, ordering that Paul should be kept;" but, that by reason of the clause following, it can admit of no other sense than "He answered, that Paul was in

5 *τῆς ἐκπορεύσεως*. οἱ οὖν δυνατοὶ ἐν ἡμῖν, φησὶ, συγκαταβύβντες, εἰ
 6 *τι ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἀνδρὶ τούτῳ, κατηγορεύουσιν αὐτοῦ. Διατρίψας δὲ ἐν*
αὐτοῖς ἡμέρας οὐ πλείους ὀκτώ, [ἢ δέκα] καταβύβας εἰς Καισάρειαν, τῇ
ἐπαύριον καθίσας ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος, ἐκέλευσε τὸν Παῦλον ἀχθῆναι.
 7 Παραγενομένου δὲ αὐτοῦ, περιέστησαν οἱ ἀπὸ Ἱερουσολύμων καταβεβη-
 8 *κότες Ἰουδαῖοι πολλὰ καὶ βερέα αἰτιάματα φέροντες κατὰ τοῦ Παύλου,*
8 ἃ οὐκ ἔσχον ἀποδείξαι· ὁ ἀπολογουμένου αὐτοῦ· "Οτι οὔτε εἰς τὴν o Supra 24. 12.
νόμον τῶν Ἰουδαίων, οὔτε εἰς τὸ ἱερόν, οὔτε εἰς Καισάρια τὴν ἡμεῶν. infra 23. 17.
 9 Ὁ Φῆστος δὲ, τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις θέλων χάριν καταθέσθαι, ἀποκριθεὶς τῷ
 10 *Παύλῳ εἶπε· Θέλεις εἰς Ἱερουσόλυμα ἀναβῆς, ἐκεῖ περὶ τούτων κρίνε-*
σθαι ἐπ' ἐμοῦ; Εἶπε δὲ ὁ Παῦλος· Ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος Καισαρίας
ἐστὼς εἰμι, οὐ με δεῖ κρίνεσθαι. Ἰουδαίους οὐδὲν ἠδίκησα, ὡς καὶ σὺ
 11 *κάλλιον ἐπιγινώσκεις·* P *εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἀδικῶ καὶ ἄξιον θανάτου πέπραχά* P Supra 19. 11.
τι, οὐ παραιτοῦμαι τὸ ἀποθανεῖν· εἰ δὲ οὐδὲν ἐστὶν ὧν οὗτοι κατηγο-

confinement at Cæsarea;" meaning, that where his place of confinement was, and where the residence of the Procurator was, there his trial ought to be. This mode of taking the words is confirmed by the Peschito Syr. and the Vulg. At *ἐκπορεύεσθαι* there is an ellip. of *ἐκεῖ*, as often in verbs of motion. The blending of the oratio directa et obliqua is frequent in Luke.

5. οἱ δυνατοί.] The sense is, "the persons of consequence among you," the οἱ πρώτοι just before. So the Syr. and Arab., and most of the best modern Commentators, who adduce many examples from Philo and Josephus. I add Thucyd. iii. 27. ii. 65. iii. 47. viii. 63.

6. ἡμέρας — δέκα.] There are few passages more perplexed by variety of reading than this. The common reading *ἡμ. πλείους ἢ δέκα* cannot well be defended; for its external authority is not great, and its internal very slender. Beza, Beng., and Grot. have seen that the context requires that the *οὐ*, which is found in many of the best MSS. inserted before *πλείους*, should be adopted. And so Beza edited; though the word was afterwards thrown out by Schmid, or the Elzevir Editor. Are we, then, to read, with Griesb., Knapp., and Tittm., *ἡμέρας οὐ πλείους ὀκτώ ἢ δέκα*? I think not; for there is no proof that the ancients used such an idiom of what was *past* and *certain*. Besides, it will be difficult to account how *ὀκτώ* could have been omitted; for I suspect that the reading of Griesb. is compounded of *two* readings — *ὀκτώ* and *δέκα* — each found in the MSS., of which the true one is *ὀκτώ*; for which there is great authority in MSS., Versions, and early Editions. The mistake, I apprehend, arose from *italicism*, which would produce a var. lect. upon ἢ (3), namely, ἔ (10). If, however, the first mentioned objection to Griesbach's reading could be removed, I would receive it; for in *οὐ πλείους ἢ ἢ ἔ*, *one ἢ* might easily absorb the other. At present, I have edited as Wets. directs should be read, except that, instead of cancelling the words in question, I have left them in within brackets.

7. αἰτίματα.] Several MSS. and early Edd. have *αἰτίωματα*, which is adopted by Wets., and edited by Griesb., Knapp., Lachmann, and Valpy; but wrongly: for there is no proof that such a word as *αἰτίωμα* ever existed; and it is so contrary to

analogy, that it scarcely *could*; especially as it was not *needed*, *αἰτίωμα* being in use, as I have, in Recens. Synop., proved by examples from Thucyd., Eurip., Dio Cass., and Plutarch.

9. *Θέλεις, &c.*] It does not appear that Festus knew any thing of the intended assassination of Paul, on the road between Cæsarea and Jerusalem. He might say this, partly to gratify the Jews (who, he saw, were so earnestly desirous to get Paul to Jerusalem), and partly because he was at a loss, as he pretended (v. 20), how to proceed in the case, and willing to shift the matter from himself; otherwise he could not but know, that a person who was *innocent at Cæsarea* could not be found *guilty at Jerusalem*; and he plainly saw that Paul was *innocent*. Why, then, did he not *acquit* him? Because he durst not disoblige the Jews. But Paul was so well acquainted with their temper, that he chose to trust himself to *Heathens* rather than to those of his own religion; and he had *reason* to suspect that Festus would *give him up*, rather than incur the displeasure of the Jews; so that his safest way was to *appeal to the Emperor*, as a *Roman Citizen*. (Markland.) Paul, as being a Roman citizen, whose cause had been brought into the President's court, could not be *compelled* to have his cause shifted to Jerusalem, to be tried by the Sanhedrim.

10. τοῦ βήματος K.] "Cæsar's Court;" for it might be so called, as being held by the President on the authority of Cæsar, and in his name. At *με δεῖ κρίνεσθαι* there is an ellip. of *μόνον*, alluding to what he well knew was their design, to have him tried by the Sanhedrim, subject to the President's confirmation, who, he hints by the words further on, *οὐδέτις με ἐθέναται χαρῆσασθαι*, would give him up to their fury. (See v. 16.)

11. εἰ μὲν γὰρ — ἀποθανεῖν.] The sentence is expressed *populariter*, and the *γὰρ* has reference to a clause omitted. The sense may be thus represented: "For tried I desire to be, so that it be but at a proper tribunal; and if I be found guilty of any offence which by the Roman laws is punished with death, I shall not decline even death." Οὐ παραιτοῦμαι τὸ ἀποθανεῖν is an elegant and not unusual formula, of which the Commentators adduce many examples.

ροῦσί μου, οὐδεὶς με δύναται αὐτοῖς χαρίσασθαι. Καίσαρα ἐπικαλοῦμαι. Τότε ὁ Φῆστος συλλαλήσας μετὰ τοῦ συμβουλίου, ἀπεκρίθη· 12 Καίσαρα ἐπικέκλησαι; ἐπὶ Καίσαρα πορεύσῃ.

Ἡμερῶν δὲ διαγενομένων τινῶν, Ἀγρίππας ὁ Βασιλεὺς καὶ Βεργίη 13 q *Supra* 24. 27. κατήτησαν εἰς Καισάρειαν, ἀσπασόμενοι τὸν Φῆστον. ἼΩς δὲ πλείους 14 ἡμέρας διέτριβον ἐκεῖ, ὁ Φῆστος τῷ βυσιλεῖ ἀνέθετο τὰ κατὰ τὸν Παῦλον, λέγων· Ἀνὴρ τις ἐστὶ καταλελειμμένος ὑπὸ Φήλικος δέσμιος, περὶ οὗ, γενομένου μου εἰς Ἱερουσόλυμα, ἐνεφάνισαν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ 15 r *Deut.* 17. 4. πρεσβύτεροι τῶν Ἰουδαίων, αἰτούμενοι κατὰ αὐτοῦ δίκην· ἔπρος οὓς 16 ἀπεκρίθη, οὐκ ἔστιν ἔθος Ῥωμαίοις χαρίζεσθαι τινα ἄνθρωπον εἰς ἀπόλειαν, πρὶν ἢ ὁ κατηγορούμενος κατὰ πρόσωπον ἔχοι τοὺς κατηγοροῦντας, τόπον τε ἀπολογίας λάβοι περὶ τοῦ ἐγκλήματος. Συνελ- 17 θόντων οὖν αὐτῶν ἐνθάδε, ἀναβολὴν μηδεμίαν ποιησάμενος, τῇ ἑξῆς καθίσας ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος, ἐκέλευσα ἀχθῆναι τὸν ἄνδρα· περὶ οὗ σι- 18 θέντες οἱ κατηγοροὶ οὐδεμίαν αἰτίαν ἐπέφερον ὧν ὑπενόουν ἐγώ· ζη- 19 τήματα δὲ τινα περὶ τῆς ἰδίας δεισιδαιμονίας εἶχον πρὸς αὐτὸν, καὶ περὶ τινος Ἰησοῦ τεθνηκότος, ὃν ἔφρασκεν ὁ Παῦλος ζῆν. Ἀπορούμενος 20 δὲ ἐγὼ εἰς τὴν περὶ τούτου ζήτησιν, ἔλεγον, εἰ βούλοιο πορεύεσθαι εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, κακεῖ κρίνεσθαι περὶ τούτων. Τοῦ δὲ Παύλου ἐπικαλε- 21 σαμένου τηρηθῆναι αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ διάγνωσιν, ἐκέλευσα

— οὐδεὶς — χαρίσασθαι.] With this use of *χαρίσασθαι*, to signify “give up [for trial] (which was equivalent to condemnation and death; so *infra* v. 16. *χαρίζεσθαι εἰς ἀπόλειαν*) I would compare a similar one in Cicero’s Oration pro Caelio. v. 1. Here we have a delicate mode of censuring *Festus* for wishing to do a favour to the Jews at the Apostle’s expense, and meant to hint to him that he has not the power. The expression *δύναται*, Grot. observes, refers to *lawful right*, as much as to say, “no one can, *salvo jure*.”

— Καίσαρα ἐπικαλοῦμαι.] On the nature and extent of this privilege of a Roman citizen’s appealing unto Cæsar in extreme cases, see *Rec. Syn.*, where it is shown that the appeal in question was a *privilege*, which could not (as Grot. and Kuin. imagine) have been *disallowed* by Festus.

12. τοῦ συμβουλίου.] *Ἡ παρέδροι*, or *assessores* of the President, something like the *σύμβουλοι* of the Lacedæmonian kings and generals mentioned in Thucyd. See *Casaub. Exerc. Antibar.* p. 137.

— Καίσαρα ἐπικέκλησαι;] Some Editors make the sentence *declarative*. But that, I think, weakens the spirit of the words, and the interrogation is confirmed by the Syriac and Vulg.

13. ἀσπασόμενοι τ. Φ.] “to congratulate and pay their respects to.” See 2 Kings x. 13.

14. ἀνέθετο τὰ κατὰ Π.] “related the circumstances of Paul’s case,” thus referring it to his better judgment. With the τὰ κατὰ τὸν Π. I would compare Thucyd. iii. 68. τὰ κατὰ Πλατῶνα.

15. δίκην] for *καταδίκην*, judgment, i. e. condemnation and punishment; as in 2 Thess. i. 9. A signification occurring in the Classical writers, from whom Kuin. adduces several examples.

*16. χαρίζεσθαι — ἀπόλειαν.] A brief manner of expression, of which the sense is, “to give up any one to condemnation and destruction (i. e. capital punishment) out of favour to another.”

So Seneca says *damnare aliquem gratiâ scil. alijcus*, and *ἀπόλεια* is so used in *Hist. of Bel* and *Dr.* v. 41. τοὺς εἰς αἰτίους τῆς ἀπολείας. The sense of τόπον ἀπολογίας λάβοι is, “and shall have opportunity for exculpating himself.” This sense of *τόπος* indeed often occurs with *διδόναι*, but very rarely with *λαμβάναι*.

17. ἀναβολὴν μ. ποιησάμενος] “making no delay.” An elegant phrase. So Thucyd. ii. 42, 4. ἀναβολὴν τοῦ δεινοῦ ἐποιήσατο.

18. περὶ οὗ.] This must be construed with *οὐδ’ αἰτίαν ἐπέφερον*, and ὧν ὑπενόουν is for [ἐκείνων] ἃ ἔπεν. scil. αἰτίαν ὑπενεχθῆναι. Festus might think it was a charge of sedition. Ἐπιφέρειν αἰτίαν is a frequent phrase in the best Greek writers, corresponding to the *crimen inferre* of the Roman ones.

19. ζητήματα] “subjects for discussion and controversy.” *Δεισιδαιμονίας* here denotes not *superstition*, but, as the best Commentators have been long agreed, *religion*. Indeed, the word is always used in a *good* sense in the N. T., as it often is in Josephus.

20. ἀπορούμενος — ζήτησιν.] The τούτου I would not (with some) refer to the question about Jesus and his resurrection; but, by an ellipsis of *πρόγματος*, to the whole matter in debate, the religion itself. By τούτων just after understand *ἐγκλημάτων*. “Here (observes Beza) Festus dissembles his offence, yet *convicts himself*: for why did he not acquit an accused person against whom nothing had been proved? For the same reason that he wished to have him removed for trial to Jerusalem; — namely, to *gratify the Jews*.”

21. ἐπικαλ. τηρηθῆναι. At *τηρ.* sub. *εἰς τό.* Or *ἐπικαλ.* may be rendered “making his appeal;” which includes the sense “*claiming*.” *Διάγνωσις*, *cognitionem*, “*determination*.” It has reference to the sense *cause* involved in *αὐτόν*.

— Σεβαστοῦ] Augustus. The surname borne

22 τηρεῖσθαι αὐτὸν, ἕως οὗ πέμψω αὐτὸν πρὸς Καίσαρα. Ἀγρίππας δὲ πρὸς τὸν Φῆστον ἔφη· Ἐβουλόμην καὶ αὐτὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀκοῦσαι. ὁ δὲ· Ἀῦριον, φησὶν, ἀκούσῃ αὐτοῦ.

23 Τῇ οὖν ἐπαύριον ἐλθόντος τοῦ Ἀγρίππα καὶ τῆς Βερνίκης μετὰ πολλῆς φαντασίας, καὶ εἰσελθόντων εἰς τὸ ἀκροατήριον, σὺν τε τοῖς χιλιάρχοις καὶ ἀνδράσι τοῖς κατ' ἐξοχὴν οὗσι τῆς πόλεως, καὶ κελεύσαντος

24 τοῦ Φῆστον, ἡχθῆ ὁ Παῦλος. καὶ φησὶν ὁ Φῆστος· Ἀγρίππα βασιλεῦ, καὶ πάντες οἱ συμπαραόντες ἡμῖν ἄνδρες, θεωρεῖτε τοῦτον, περὶ οὗ πᾶν τὸ πλῆθος τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐπέτυχόν μοι ἔν τε Ἱεροσολύμοις καὶ

25 ἐνθάδε, ἐπιβωῶντες μὴ δεῖν ζῆν αὐτὸν μηκέτι. Ἐγὼ δὲ κατελιβόμενος supra 23, 9. infra 26, 31. μηδὲν ἄξιον θανάτου αὐτὸν πεποιχέναι, καὶ αὐτοῦ δὲ τούτου ἐπικαλε-

26 σαμένου τὸν Σεβαστὸν, ἔκρινα πέμπειν αὐτόν. Περὶ οὗ ἀσφαλῆς τι γράψαι τῷ Κυρίῳ οὐκ ἔχω· διὸ προήγαγον αὐτὸν ἐφ' ἑμῶν, καὶ μάλιστα ἐπὶ σοῦ, βασιλεῦ Ἀγρίππα, ὅπως, τῆς ἀνακρίσεως γενομένης, σχῶ

27 τι γράψαι. Ἄλογον γάρ μοι δοκεῖ, πέμποντι δέσμιον μὴ καὶ τίς κατ' αὐτοῦ αἰτίας σημιῖναι.

1 XXVI. ἈΓΡΙΠΠΑΣ δὲ πρὸς τὸν Παῦλον ἔφη· Ἐπιτρέπειά σοι ὑπὲρ σεαυτοῦ λέγειν. Τότε ὁ Παῦλος ἀπελογεῖτο ἐκτείνεις τὴν χεῖρα·

2 Περὶ πάντων ὧν ἐγκαλοῦμαι ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων, βασιλεῦ Ἀγρίππα, ἡγῆμαι

by all the Emperors from Cæsar Octavianus, who first assumed it.

22. Ἐβουλόμην — ἀκοῦσαι.] Abp. Newcome wrongly renders, "I desire to hear;" the Vulg. and Erasm. still worse, "volebam." The Syr. and almost all other Versions and Translations rightly render *vellem*, "I could wish." Yet there is *not*, as Camer. imagines, an ellip. of *ἄν* ; for, as I have fully proved on Thucyd. iv. 54, 3. (Ed. and Transl.) Imperfects Indicative are often put for Pluperfects Subjunctive; of which I have adduced numerous examples. The sense therefore is, "I could have wished to have heard him myself;" a modest way of saying, "I could wish to hear him." Such a curiosity in Agrippa was very natural.

23. φαντασίας] "pomp," state; literally, *display*. Of the word and the sense several examples are adduced by the Commentators, as Hippocrat. ποιεῖν μηδὲν περιέργως, μηδὲ μετὰ φαντασίας. Heliodor. φαντασίας τῶν δορυφόρων, καὶ κόμπου τῆς ἄλλης θεαματίας, which exactly represents the sort of pomp here meant. The word is, indeed, susceptible both of a good and bad sense; but there is no reason to here suppose the latter, with some Commentators. Ἀκροατήριον is explained *judgment-hall*, as *auditorium* is often used in the Latin. If such be the sense, it is a Latinism. As, however, there was no *trial*, it should rather seem to mean "a private examination room," where accused persons had a hearing before they were committed to prison. Τοῖς κατ' ἐξοχὴν οὗσι is for ἐξόχοις, as ἡ ζωὴ ἢ κατ' ἐπιπέδιον for εὐσεβίης.

24. οἱ συμπαραόντες ἢ ἄ.] equivalent to *συμβουλοῖ* mentioned supra v. 12, but others; namely, persons of consideration and friends of the President, to whom he showed the courtesy of giving them a place on the bench, as Wets. shows; re-

ferring to Joseph. Ant. xvi. 11, 2. 4. τὸν βασιλευόντα νῦν ἡμῶν καὶ σοὶ παρακαθεζόμενον. xvii. 5, 3.

— ἐπέτυχόν μοι] "have made urgent application to me." The word properly signifies "to address one's self to, hold converse with any one;" and it is usually *implied*, that the purpose is some request or petition. And this is sometimes, as here, expressed by a preposition, ex. gr. *ὑπὲρ*. So also in Polyb. iv. 76. Theophr. Char. 1. 2. Wisd. viii. 21. xvi. 23. ἐπέτυχον τῷ Κυρίῳ καὶ ἐδέχθη αὐτοῦ. See Note on Heb. vii. 25.

26. τῷ Κυρίῳ.] Render, "to [my] Sovereign." A title of the Emperors, corresponding to the Roman *Dominus*, which is said to have been rejected as invidious by Augustus and Tiberius. It had afterwards, however, been used by succeeding Emperors, though instances of its use so early as this are very rare. Its being employed in *conversation* is much more than if it had occurred in any public writing. This force of *Κεῖριος*, by which it means Sovereign, is, I conceive, communicated by the *Article*, which is taken κατ' ἐξοχὴν, to denote the Supreme Lord. So in an Inscription found at Smyrna: Καὶ ὅσα ἐπετύχονεν παρὰ τοῦ Κυρίου Καίσαρος Ἀδριανοῦ.

— ἀνακρίσεως.] This does not denote a regular trial, but a previous examination in order to trial; a sense often found in the Civilians, from whom Grot. adduces several examples; and Schlessn. refers to Taylor on Demosth. iii. 55. and cites 3 Macc. vii. 4. ἄνευ πάσης ἀνακρίσεως καὶ ἱερέσεως.

XXVI. 1. ἀπελογεῖτο] In this is implied *οὕτως*, or *λέγων*. Ἐκτείνεις τὴν χεῖρα is said *graphice*, such being the attitude for a set speech.

2. ἡγῆμαι ἐμπνῶν μακάριον, &c.] Here we have a beautiful *προθεράπεισι* (i. e. previous conciliation), as the ancient Rhetoricians called it, such as we find at xvii. 22. Pricæus compares a similar commencement of an oration before the Emperor

ἐμαντὸν μακάριον μέλλον ἀπολογεῖσθαι ἐπὶ σοῦ σήμερον· μάλιστα 3
γνώστην ὄντι σε πάντων τῶν κατὰ Ἰουδαίους ἐθῶν τε καὶ ζητημάτων.
διὸ δέομαί σου, μακροθύμως ἀκοῦσαί μου.

Τὴν μὲν οὖν βίωσίν μου τὴν ἐκ νεότητος, τὴν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς γενομένην 4
ἐν τῷ ἔθνει μου ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἴσασι πάντες οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, ἠρογοινώ- 5
σκοντές με ἀνωθεν, (ἐὰν θέλωσι μαρτυρεῖν,) οὐ κατὰ τὴν ἀκριβεστάτην
αἴρεσιν τῆς ἡμετέρας θρησκείας ἔζησα Φαρισαῖος. Ἐκείνη ἐπ' ἐλ- 6
πίδι τῆς πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ἐπαγγελίας γενομένης ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ
ἔστηκα κρινόμενος, εἰς ἣν τὸ δωδεκάφυλον ἡμῶν ἐν ἐκτενεῖα νύκτα καὶ 7
ἡμέραν λατρεῦον ἐλάττει κατανηῆσαι· περὶ ἧς ἐλπίδος ἐγκαλοῦμαι,
βασιλεῦ Ἀγρίππα, ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων. Τί; ἄπιστον κρίνεται παρ' 8
ὑμῖν, εἰ ὁ Θεὸς νεκροὺς ἐγείρει; Ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν ἔδοξα ἐμαντῷ πρὸς 9

† Supra 23. 6.
Phil. 3. 5.
u Gen. 3. 15.
& 22. 18.
& 26. 4.
& 49. 10.
Deut. 18. 15.
2 Sam. 7. 12.
Psal. 132. 11.
Isa. 4. 2.
& 7. 14. & 9. 6.
& 40. 10.
Jer. 23. 5.
& 33. 14.
Ezek. 34. 23.
& 37. 24.
Dan. 9. 24.
Mich. 7. 20.
supra 24. 15. 21.
x Supra 8. 3.
& 9. 1. & 22. 4.
1 Cor. 15. 9.
Gal. 1. 13.
1 Tim. 1. 13.

Maximus, by Apuleius, "Gratulor quòd mihi copia et facultas, te Judice, obtigit, purgandæ apud imperitos Philosophiæ, et probandi mei." And Wets. compares Themist. Orat. p. 233. Ἐγὼ δὲ ἐμαντὸν εὐδαίμονι ὑπολαμβάνω, ὅτι σε κηρύτταν ελαχον οἱ ἐμὸι λόγοι.

3. γνώστην] for ἐπιστάμενον or εἰδῶτα, which are, indeed, found in some MSS. but are glosses. The Commentators regard γνώστην ὄντι σε as Accusatives absolute, of which they adduce examples. See also Elsm. on Eurip. Heracl. 693. It is however as well to account for them on the principle of *anacoluthon*. By the ἔθνη are meant the *institutes, laws, and rites* of the Jews; and by the ζητήματα, the *questions*, which arose upon the *interpretation* of those laws, &c. That this compliment was not unmerited has been shown at large by Lardner.

— μακροθύμως] "patiently." See xxiv. 4. It is judiciously observed by Chrysost. that he says δέομαί σου μακροθύμως ἀκοῦσαί μου, since he was going to speak of himself, (which is always invidious), and was about to deliver a somewhat long speech.

4. βίωσιν] "mode of life." A word occurring nowhere else but in the Preface to Eccles. : διὰ τῆς ἐννόμου βιώσεως, and in Ps. 33. 6. Symm.

5. θρησκείας] *religion*, as in James i. 27. The word, like *δεισιδαιμονία*, was, however, used by the Classical writers to denote *superstition*.

6. ἐπ' ἐλπίδι — τοῦ Θεοῦ.] Commentators are not agreed on what is meant by ἐλπίδι. Chrysost. and most of the earlier *modern* Commentators understand the *hope of the resurrection of the dead*. So also Grot., Hammond, Whitty, Pearce, Doddr., Newc., and others, who appeal to Acts xxiii. 6. xxiv. 15. But almost all the later Commentators, as Michaelis, Wakef., Kuin., &c., think this referred to v. 7. and explain it of the hope of the *Messiah*. Whitty, indeed, strenuously encounters this interpretation; but not, I conceive, successfully. At least this cannot be meant exclusively; for, as Mr. Scott says, "it is certain that the promise of a Redeemer was the most prominent part of the revelation made unto Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and the grand subject of prophecy; while the doctrine of the *resurrection* was not so fully revealed in the O. T. as in the New." "Thus the resurrection of Jesus (continues he) demonstrated that he was the promised Messiah, against all the unbelieving Jews; and the doctrine of the resurrection, against the Sadducees. The latter were instigated to persecute the Apos-

tes, for "preaching through Jesus the resurrection of the dead;" (iv. 1 — 3. xxiii. 6 — 10.) the former, for preaching the very person whom they had crucified, as the Messiah, and as risen and 'exalted to be a Prince and Saviour.' Yet the whole nation expected a Messiah; and all, except the Sadducees, professed to believe the doctrine of the resurrection. In general, all that remained of the twelve tribes, wherever dispersed, hoped for the accomplishment of the promise concerning the Messiah, and a resurrection to eternal life through him." It may be added, that though the principal meaning of ἐλπίδι must be the promise of the *Messiah*, yet that included the promise of the *resurrection of the dead* by His means, as it was proved to have been fulfilled in Jesus Christ's rising from the grave: and as His resurrection was the pledge and proof of our own, it may here be admitted as a *secondary* sense; especially since St. Paul adds here (as at xxiii. 4.) περὶ ἧς ἐλπίδος ἐγκαλοῦμαι ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων.

7. δωδεκάφυλον.] A periphrasis for "the Jewish nation," at which Sub. ἔθνος; I would compare τὸ Ἐλληνικὸν in Thucyd.

8. τί; ἄπιστον — ἐγείρει;] "What! is it considered by you as a thing incredible, that God is to raise the dead?" The older Commentators take the τί for διὰ τί, *why?* But the punctuation *τι* (found in the Greek Scholiasts), has been adopted by the best Commentators from Beza, downwards; and rightly; since it is far more spirited, and agreeable to Paul's style. See Rom. iii. 9. vi. 15. The *τι* may be rendered *siquidem*, "if [as is the case];" a sense often found both in the Classical and the Scriptural writers. The force of the argument is this: "You will not deny that God can raise the dead; why then deny that Jesus can have been raised, and thus be proved to be the Messiah?"

9. ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν ἔδοξα, &c.] The transition is abrupt, and the connexion disputed. The sense seems to be this: "And remember, however positive you may be in your opinion, and however you may act according to the dictates of your conscience, you may be mistaken, and your conscience deceived. I, for instance, thought with myself (i. e. was self-persuaded), that I ought," &c. In ἐμαντῷ ἔδοξα there is an idiom, (confined, however, to the first person, and almost always the present tense) of which many examples are adduced by Wets. Δεῖν — πρᾶξαι. The phraseology is idiomatical (of which many examples are adduced by Wets.) and may be rendered, "that

10 τὸ ὄνομα Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Ναζωραίου δεῖν πολλὰ ἐναντία πράξει. ὃ καὶ ^{Supra 8. 3.}
 ἐποίησα ἐν Ἱερουσολύμοις· καὶ πολλοὺς τῶν ἁγίων ἐγὼ φυλακῆς κα-
 ἐκλεισα, τὴν παρὰ τῶν ἀρχιερέων ἐξουσίαν λαβών· ἀναιρουμένων τε
 11 αὐτῶν κατήρεγκα ψῆφον. Καὶ κατὰ πάσους τὰς συναγωγὰς πολλὰκις
 τιμωρῶν αὐτοὺς ἡγάγαζον βλασφημεῖν· περισσοῶς τε ἐμμαινόμενος
 12 αὐτοῖς, ἐδίωκον ἕως καὶ εἰς τὰς ἕξω πόλεις. ^{Supra 9. 2. & 22. 6.} Ἐν οἷς καὶ πορευόμενος
 εἰς τὴν Δαμασκὸν μετ' ἐξουσίας καὶ ἐπιτροπῆς τῆς παρὰ τῶν ἀρχι-
 13 ρέων, ἡμέρας μίσης κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν εἶδον, βυσιλεῦ, οὐρανόθεν ὑπὲρ ^{Supra 9. 3.}
 τὴν λαμπρότητα τοῦ ἡλίου, περιλάμψαν με ὡς καὶ τοὺς σὺν ἐμοὶ
 14 πορευομένους. Πάντων δὲ καταπεσόντων ἡμῶν εἰς τὴν γῆν, ἤκουσα
 φωνὴν λαλοῦσαν πρὸς με, καὶ λέγουσαν τῇ Ἑβραϊδί διαλέκτῳ· Σαοῦλ,
 15 Σαοῦλ, τί με διώκεις; σκληρόν σοι πρὸς κέντρα λακίξειν. Ἐγὼ δὲ
 εἶπον· Τίς εἰ, κύριε; ὃ δὲ εἶπεν· Ἐγὼ εἰμι Ἰησοῦς ὃν σὺ διώκεις.
 16 ἀλλὰ ἀνάστηθι, καὶ σιῆθι ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας σου· εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ὤφθην
 σοι, προχειρίσασθαί σε ὑπηρετήν καὶ μάρτυρα ὧν τε εἶδες ὧν τε ὀφθή-

I was bound, in many ways, to oppose the doctrine of Jesus."

10. τῶν ἁγίων] "the Christians." The name the disciples then bore among themselves. Ἀναιρουμένων αὐτῶν. The sense is, "when they were being put to death;" for trial was, it seems, equivalent to execution. It is not necessary, (with many recent Commentators), to suppose this spoken with reference to Stephen only, and consequently a Rhetorical or Oratorical amplification; for though no other execution but Stephen's is recorded in the N. T., yet (as Doddr., Hasselaar, and Heine have shown), there is reason to think that many did occur; to which there are at least allusions. See viii. 1. ix. 31. xxii. 4. Κατήρεγκα ψῆφον is (as the best Commentators are agreed) to be taken, not in its full sense (for Paul was not a member of the Sanhedrim), but metaphorically, of consenting to and approving of what was done. Of this examples are adduced by the Commentators from the Classical writers.

11. κατὰ πάσας τὰς συν.] This is mentioned as being the place where the punishment was inflicted. Πολλὰκις τιμωρῶν should be rendered "by chastising them continually." Βλασφημεῖν, i. e. the name of Christ, and thus to abandon the Christian religion and apostatize. That this was then done, we learn from this passage and Plin. Epist. xiii. 97. cited by Grot. And that it was still more practised afterwards, we find from Euseb. H. E. vi. 34, and a Homily of Hippolytus cited by Pricceur.

— τῶν αὐτῶν ἡνάγκ. βλασφημεῖν.] The Christian converts were then, and still more afterwards, compelled by torture to pronounce certain forms expressive of abuse of Jesus, and consequently abandonment of his religion; as appears from Pliny's Epist. xiii. 97. Euseb. Hist. Eccl. vi. 34. and other passages cited in Recens. Synop. This was, however, but a repetition of the same cruelty that had been exercised by the Heathens towards the Jews, ἵνα βλασφημήσωσι τὸν νομοθέτην, ἢ φάγωσιν τὴν ἀσυνήθησαν, as says Josephus Bell. ii. 8, 10.

— περισοῶς ἐμμαινόμενος.] A very strong expression, which may be rendered "and being exceedingly infuriate against them." Ἐμμαινέσθαι is very

rare; yet it is formed regularly from ἑμμανής. Εἰς τὰς ἕξω πόλεις, "to foreign cities;" referring to Damascus, though not, as we may imagine, to Damascus only.

13. ἡμέρας μίσης.] Sub. ἐπί. That the Attics used this expression occasionally (though more frequently μέσον ἡμέρας, or μεσοῦσης) is proved by Abresch. in loc. On this verse, and up to v. 15. see Note on ix. 5. seqq.

16. ἀνάστηθι.] Namely, as ready to execute my mandates.

— προχειρίσασθαι.] Sub. εἰς τὸ. Προχειρ. signifies to select, and, by implication, to appoint.

— ὑπηρετήν.] Since a person cannot be said to be a minister of what he has seen, though he may be a witness, Markl., with the Vulgate Translator, places a comma after ὑπηρετήν. The comma, however, is not quite essential to this sense; for it will only be necessary to keep ὑπηρετ. distinct from ὧν τε εἶδες. Nay, as εἶναι must be understood both at ὤφθην, and μάρτυρα, &c., propriety requires that there should be no comma. Ἐπηρετήν must be taken, by virtue of the context, to mean "my minister." So in Rom. xv. 16. Paul, adverting, as it seems, to this very circumstance, says it was done εἰς τὸ εἶναι με λειτουργὸν Ἰησοῦ Χ. εἰς τὰ ἔθνη.

— ὧν τε εἶδες — σοι.] The construction is rather unusual; but not such as to need the conjectures of Castalio and Markl. The first ὧν is for ἐκείνων ἕ. (see xxii. 15); and the second ὧν for ἐκείνων [καθ' ἑ]. Ὁφθήσονται does not mean *revelabo tibi*, as Mor., Rosenm., Schleus., and Kuin. suppose. Nor is there any reason to abandon the common interpretation, "I shall be seen, or revealed;" i. e. will reveal myself to thee (see Isa. xxx. 2); which may be understood 1. of the personal appearance of Christ to Paul; 2. of the revelations which were vouchsafed to him. This view I find supported by the authority of the learned Thiele, in his Specimen Nov. Comm. in N. T. p. 8, where he shows that the general sense is, "eorum quæ et vidisti et videbis [me tibi monstrante,]" meaning (he says) "et eorum in quibus tibi videbor," (i. e. conspiciendum me præbui) "et eorum quæ jam vidisti" (i. e. in quibus me tibi conspiciendum jam præbui.)

σομαί σοι, ἔξαιρούμενός σε ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν, εἰς οὓς νῦν 17
 σε ἀποστέλλω, ^b ἀνοῖξαι ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν, τοῦ ἐπιστρέψαι ἀπὸ σκότους 18
 εἰς φῶς καὶ τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ Σατανᾶ ἐπὶ τὸν Θεόν, τοῦ λαβεῖν αὐτοὺς
 ἄψαισι ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ κληῖρον ἐν τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις, πιστεῖ τῇ εἰς ἐμέ.
 "Ὅθεν, βασιλεῦ Ἀγρίππα, οὐκ ἐγενόμην ἀπειθής τῇ οὐρανίῳ ὀπτασίᾳ" 19
 ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἐν Λαμασκῷ πρώτον καὶ Ἱεροσολύμοις, εἰς πᾶσάν τε τὴν 20
 χώραν τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, ἀπήγγελλον μετανοεῖν, καὶ ἐπι-
 στρέφειν ἐπὶ τὸν Θεόν, ἕξια τῆς μετανοίας ἔργα πράσσοντας. ^d Ἔνεκα 21
 τούτων με οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι συλλαβόμενοι ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, ἐπειρωτῶτο διαχειρί-
 σασθαι. Ἐπικουρίας οὖν τυχῶν τῆς παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἕχρι τῆς ἡμέρας 22
 ταύτης ἔστηκα μαρτυρούμενος μικρῷ τε καὶ μεγάλῳ, οὐδὲν ἐκτὸς λέγων
 ὧν τε οἱ προφῆται ἐλάλησαν μελλόντων γίνεσθαι καὶ Μωϋσῆς, ^e εἰ 23
 παθητὸς ὁ Χριστὸς, εἰ πρώτος ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν φῶς μέλλει κυ-
 αγγέλλειν τῷ λαῷ καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσι. Ταῦτα δὲ αὐτοῦ ἀπολογουμένου, 24
 ὁ Φῆστος μεγάλη τῇ φωνῇ ἔφη· Μαίην, Παῦλε· τὸ πολλά σε γράμ-
 ματα εἰς μανίαν περιτρέπει! Ὁ δέ· Οὐ μαινομαί, φησι, κράτιστε 25
 Φῆστε, ἀλλ' ἀληθείας καὶ σωφροσύνης ὁμήματα ἀποφθέγγομαι. ^f Ἐπι- 26
 σταται γὰρ περὶ τούτων ὁ βασιλεὺς, πρὸς ὃν καὶ παρόρησιαζόμενος
 λαλῶ· λανθάνειν γὰρ αὐτόν τι τούτων οὐ πείθομαι οὐδέν. οὐ γὰρ
 ἐστὶν ἐν γονίᾳ πεπραγμένον τοῦτο. Πιστεύεις, βασιλεῦ Ἀγρίππα, τοῖς 27

b Isa. 35. 5.
 & 42. 7. & 60. 1.
 Eph. 1. 8.
 Col. 1. 13.
 1 Pet. 2. 25.

c Supra 9. 20.
 28. & 13. 14.
 & 22. 17. 21.
 Matt. 3. 5.

d Supra 21. 30.

e Supra v. 18.
 1 Cor. 15. 20.
 Col. 1. 18.
 Rev. 1. 5.
 Luke 2. 32.

f John 18. 20.

17. ἔξαιρούμενος.] The older Commentators explain this "delivering from," as vii. 34; xii. 11; xliii. 27. Galat. i. 7. But that signification is scarcely permitted by the context, and, therefore, most of the later Interpreters rightly explain it "choosing," "separating for myself;" a signification occurring in Deut. xxxii. 3. Job xxxvi. 21; xlix. 7. and often in the Classical writers. This is very suitable to the context; for thus it would be a further unfolding of the sense at προχειρίσασθαι σε ἐμπρέτην. And it is confirmed by what was said by our Lord to Ananias: σκέδος ἐκλογῆς μοι ἐστὶν οὗτος τοῦ βασιλέως, &c.

— εἰς οὓς.] This may be understood both of the Jews and the Gentiles: though the words which follow are more applicable to the latter; which interpretation is confirmed by the words νῦν ἀποστ.; for it appears that Paul was, for many years of the earlier part of his ministry, employed in Heathen countries. See Gal. i. 17, seqq.

18. πιστεῖ τῇ εἰς ἐμέ.] The older Commentators (misled by the Vulg.) in general construe these words with ἡγιασμένοις. The best of the later Expositors, however, have seen that they must be taken with λαβεῖν. And this is confirmed by the Peschito Syr. Version, so also even Beza and Calvin; whom see. See also Bp. Bull's Examen Censuræ vii. 12. I have removed the comma after ἁμαρτιῶν because (as Bp. Bull has shown) λαβεῖν ἄψαισι ἁμαρ. and λαβεῖν κληῖρον ἐ. τ. ἡγ. point out the two benefits from God through Christ, which denote what is elsewhere called being "justified by faith."

22. οὐδὲν ἐκτὸς — γίνεσθαι.] Constr. λέγων οὐδὲν ἐκτὸς [ἐκείνων] ἢ οἱ προφ. ἐλ. μελλόντων [for μέλλοντα] γίνεσθαι. The μελλόντων is drawn to μέλλοντα by the ὧν. I have, for μαρτυρούμενος, edited μαρτυρόμενος, with many MSS., early Edd., and editors; as also agreeably to the usage of the N. T.,

in which (as Rinck observes) μαρτυρεῖσθαι has always a passive, and μαρτυροῦσθαι a deponent sense. And so also in the Classical writers, as Thucyd. vi. 80.

23. εἰ παθητὸς, &c.] The Interpreters are agreed, that εἰ is for ὅτι, nempe quod. But it may signify "seeing that [supply by those writings]." This is confirmed by the sense of παθητὸς, which is best rendered "must suffer." Schleus. acknowledges that it may be rendered "qui pati debet." Ἐξ ἀναστ. νεκρῶν may be rendered either "after the resurrection from the dead," or, "by the resurrection;" but the latter is preferable, and is confirmed by i. 13.

24. μανίην] The more recent Commentators are generally of opinion that this means no more than "Thou art a visionary enthusiast!" of which sense of μανίεσθαι they adduce several examples from the Classical writers. But the words following, τὰ πολλὰ — περιτρέπει will not admit this sense; and, therefore, the common interpretation, "thou art mad," which is, with reason, defended by Kuin., must be retained. It has always been the common notion, that devoted attention to mental pursuits tends to madness; in illustration of which Wets. and Kypke adduce many passages from the Classical writers, as Lucian Solæc. σὺ δὲ ὑπὸ τῆς ἄγαν παιδείας διέφθορας. Petron. 43. Scimus te præ literis fatuum esse. Εἰς μανίαν περιτρέπει, "is driving thee to madness." These words of Festus seem to have interrupted the thread of the Apostle's reasoning; otherwise he would, probably, have proceeded to allege some particular proofs from the Prophets of what he had said.

27. πιστεύεις — προφῆταις; οὐδὰ ὅτι πιστεύεις. Of this elegant use of the interrogation immediately followed by an answer on the part of the speaker himself, several examples are adduced by Grot.

28 προφήταις; οἶδα ὅτι πιστεύεις. Ὁ δὲ Ἀγρίππας πρὸς τὸν Παῦλον
 29 ἔφη· Ἐν ὀλίγῳ με πείθεις Χριστιανὸν γενέσθαι. Ἐὖ ὁ δὲ Παῦλος
 εἶπεν· Εὐζαίμην ἂν τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ ἐν ὀλίγῳ καὶ ἐν πολλῷ, οὐ μόνον
 σέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάντας τοὺς ἀκούοντάς μου σήμερον γενέσθαι τοιοῦτους
 30 ὁποῖος κἀγὼ εἰμὶ, παρεκτός τῶν δεσμῶν τούτων. Καὶ [ταῦτι εἰπόντος
 αὐτοῦ,] ἀνέστη ὁ βασιλεὺς, καὶ ὁ ἡγεμὼν, ἢ τε Βερνίκη, καὶ οἱ συγ-
 31 καθήμενοι αὐτοῖς. ἢ Καὶ ἀναχωρήσαντες ἐλάλουν πρὸς ἀλλήλους, λέγον- ^h Supra 23. 9.
 τες· Ὅτι οὐδὲν θανάτου ἄξιον ἢ δεσμῶν πρῶσσει ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος.
 32 Ἀγρίππας δὲ τῷ Φήσιτῳ ἔφη· Ἀποκλείσθαι ἡδύνατο ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος,
 εἰ μὴ ἐπεκέκλητο Καίσαρα.

1 XXVII. ἰ^ΩΣ δὲ ἐκρίθη τοῦ ἀποπλεῖν ἡμᾶς εἰς τὴν Ἰταλίαν, παρε- ⁱ Supra 25. 12.
 δίδουν τὸν τε Παῦλον καὶ τινὰς ἑτέρους δεσμώτας ἐκιοτινάτῳ, ὀνόματι
 2 Ἰουλίῳ, σπειρίας Σεβαστῆς. ^k Ἐπιβάντες δὲ πλοίῳ Ἀδραμυτινηῷ † μέλ- ^k 2 Cor. 11. 25.
 λοντες πλεῖν τοὺς καὶ τὴν Ἀσίαν τόπους, ἀνιχθήμεν, ὄντος σὺν ἡμῖν ^h supra 19. 29.
^h 20. 4.
^h Col. 4. 10.

and Pricæus, (so Lucian Dial. Meret. Τὶ φῆς; ποιήσεις ταῦτα; ποιήσεις, οἶδα,) yet none such as to equal in beauty the present passage. Inasmuch that Longinus de Subl., who at § 18. treats of this as a component of the *Sublime*, as he had on another occasion adduced an example of the *Sublime* from the Mosaic: "Let there be light, and there was light:" so he might have adduced the present passage of St. Paul; especially as in his Frag. I. Edit. Toupii, he reckons Παῦλος ὁ Ταρσεὺς among the celebrated Grecian orators.

28. ἐν ὀλίγῳ — γενέσθαι.] If there be any ellip. at ἐν ὀλίγῳ (which may be doubted), it is *διωστή-ματι* or *μέτρῳ*. See Bos Ellips. p. 172. For the sense here must be "within a little," or *almost*, though the phrase usually signifies "in a short time." Yet *one* example of the other sense is adduced by Grotius from Plato, to which I would add Thucyd. i. 18. But was Agrippa *serious* in what he said? The earlier ones think he *was*, but the later ones generally that he was *not*, and they suppose the words to have been uttered sarcastically. For this last notion, however, there is no ground. Yet I am inclined to think, with Markl., that the words were merely a *civil speech*, pronounced in that complimentary insincerity into which good-natured, easy, and unscrupulous persons, like Agrippa (such as he is characterized by Josephus) are apt to run. Besides, it is unlikely that any strong impression could have been made *so soon*; or that, if made, Agrippa would have *interrupted* the Apostle; and then left him almost as abruptly as Felix had done, or Pilate did our Lord;—without waiting to hear the conclusion of his sentence. This, no doubt, arose from the Apostle's having become (as Markl. observes) more personal in his application to Agrippa concerning religion than he liked.

29. ἐν πολλῷ.] There has been some doubt as to the sense here; but the context determines it to be "*altogether*;" though it would be difficult to find another example of that signification. We may, however, account for it by supposing a *paronomasia* upon ἐν ὀλίγῳ. And this seizing on the words of another, and giving them a turn in favour of our own cause (which marks an able orator) often requires a slight distortion of the sense of a word or phrase. Παρεκτός τ. ὁ. τ. Spoken *εικτικῶς*, holding out his chains. This proves that St. Paul was then *not* (as some imagine) ἐν φυλακῇ

ἀδέσμῳ, but was in *custodia militari*, chained to the soldier who guarded him.

30. ταῦτα εἰπόντος αὐτοῦ.] These words are omitted in a few MSS. and Versions, and are cancelled by Griesb. But external evidence is so strongly in favour of the words, that notwithstanding internal is rather against them, they ought not to be cancelled.

32. εἰ μὴ ἐπεκέκλητο K.] For thus the power of the judge, whether for acquittal, or condemnation, had ceased, and the cognizance of the cause rested solely with the superior court.

XXVII. 1. ἐκρίθη] "was determined." Namely, by the decision of Agrippa and Festus, that Paul must be sent to Italy. At τοῦ ἀποπλεῖν there is not, as most suppose, an ellip. of *περὶ*; but τοῦ with the *infm.* is here, as *supra* xxvi. 18. and elsewhere, put for *iva* and a *subjunctive*; only here the *iva* is as often for *ὅτι*.

—παρεδίδουν.] Namely, οἱ δεσμοφύλακες.
 —σπειρίας Σεβ.] From the time of Augustus Octavianus, legions took the name *Augustan*. Thus in (Claudian Bell. ix. 422. mention is made of a *legio Augusta*. Hence many Commentators are of opinion that, as in all the other legions, so in the five cohorts stationed at Cesarea, there was *one* cohort called the *Augustan*; or that the cohort here mentioned was a legionary cohort of an *Augustan legion* stationed in Syria and Judæa.

2. πλοίῳ Ἀδραμ.] As we say, "a London vessel," a "Liverpool vessel," &c. Adramyttium was in Mysia opposite to Lesbos; whither, it seems, the ship was bound. The Centurion, however, seems to have intended not to remain with the vessel to its place of final destination; but only to some point of Asia Minor, from which he might meet with a convenient passage to Italy, expecting to find some ship in the ports of Lycia or Caria, on board of which he might embark his soldiers and prisoners for Rome. The event answered his expectation: for at Myra in Lycia he found an Alexandrian vessel bound for Italy.

—μέλλοντες.] Several of the best MSS. and Versions have *μέλλοντι*, which is preferred by Mill, Beng., and Pearce, and edited by Griesb. and Knapp, with the approbation of Kuin., who thinks the change of *μέλλοντι* into *μέλλοντες* was made in accommodation to *επιβάντες* preceding

1 Supra 24. 23.
2 25. 16.

Ἀριστάρχου Μακεδόνος Θεσσαλονικίως. ἵτη τε ἐτέρη κατήχθημεν εἰς 3
Σιδῶνα· φιλονθρώπως τε ὁ Ἰούλιος τῷ Παύλῳ χρησόμενος, ἐπέτρεψε 4
πρὸς τοὺς φίλους πορευθέντι ἐπιμελείας τυχεῖν. Κακέϊθεν ἀναχθέντες 4
ὑπεπλεύσαμεν τὴν Κύπρον, διὰ τὸ τοὺς ἀνέμους εἶναι ἐναντίους. τό τε 5
πέλαγος τὸ κατὰ τὴν Κιλικίαν καὶ Παμφυλίαν διαπλεύσαντες, κατήλθο- 6
μεν εἰς Μύρα της Λυκίας. Κακέϊ εὐρών ὁ ἑκατόνταρχος πλοῖον Ἀλεξ- 6
ανδρῶνον πλέον εἰς τὴν Ἰταλίαν, ἐνεβίβασεν ἡμᾶς εἰς αὐτό. Ἐν ἱκαναῖς 7
δὲ ἡμέραις βραδυπλοοῦντες, καὶ μόλις γενόμενοι κατὰ τὴν Κνίδον, μὴ 7
προσεῶντος ἡμᾶς τοῦ ἀνέμου, ὑπεπλεύσαμεν τὴν Κρήτην κατὰ Σαλμῶ- 8
νην· μόλις τε παραλεγόμενοι αὐτήν, ἤλθομεν εἰς τόπον τινα καλούμενον 8
Καλοὺς Αἰμένας, ᾧ ἔγγυς ἦν πόλις Λασαία. Ἰκανοῦ δὲ χρόνου διαγε- 9
ρομένου, καὶ ὄντος ἤδη ἐπισηαλοῦς τοῦ πλοῦς, διὰ τὸ καὶ τὴν νηστειάν

and ἀνήχθημεν following. That, however, is too hypothetical; and the reading *μῆλλοντι* looks like a mere emendation; to improve which others supplied *εἰς* or *ἐπί*. The reading of other MSS., *μῆλλοντος*, confirms the common reading; since it is evidently a mere error of the scribes. No change is necessary; for the scope of the words *μῆλλοντες*—τόπως seems to have been, to assign a reason why they went on board this Adramyttian vessel; namely, because they had to coast the [southern] part of Asia; for that is the sense of *πλεῖν*, &c. *Μῆλλοντες* may very well be rendered intending, or being bound, as we say.

3. ἐπιμελείας τυχεῖν] “to receive their kind attention.”

4. ὑπεπλεύσαμεν τὴν Κ. &c.] The Commentators have been not a little perplexed with these words and those at ver. 5, as far as *διαπλεύσαντες*. And that, chiefly from ignorance of the nautical term *ὑποπλεῖν*, but partly from inattention to the situation of the places mentioned. Now in sailing from Sidon to the coast of Lycia, it is probable that, had the weather been fair, they would have taken a course to the South of Cyprus, not, however, nearer its shores, except at the S. W. promontory, *Zephyrium*, and thence would have struck across to Rhodes, or the coast of Caria. As, however, we are told, the winds were contrary (viz. though varying, yet all more or less adverse), they changed that course, and *ὑπεπλεῖο*. τὴν Κ. Now, for the winds to be contrary, they must have been N. or N.E., or N.N.E., or such like. And then the best way to evade their force would be, to sail close under the coast of Cyprus, after having cut across to the promontory of Pedalium so as to reach the bay of *Catium*. That they coasted along *Palestine*, and then made for the *Eastern* promontory of Cyprus (as the best Commentators think), is improbable, because they would thus be brought more into the wind’s eye (as the sailors say), and into tempestuous seas. At all events, it is plain that *ὑποπλεῖν* must mean to sail under the lee of any high land (such as is Cyprus), so as to get shelter from it. From *Zephyrium* it is plain they crossed over (*ὑπεπλεύσαντο*) to Myra in Lycia; a port of great celebrity, and, (as appears from a passage of Porphyry cited by Wets.) was the one generally used in passing from Cyprus to Lycia or Caria, as also in the passage from Egypt to Lycia.

6. πλοῖον.] Here, as often in the Classical writers, the word denotes a ship of burden, as opposed to a ship of war. Such, it appears, the

Alexandrian corn vessels were; and this was probably one (see v. 38). On these vessels, and the corn trade from Egypt to Italy, see Hasæus de navibus Alexandrinis, Crit. Sac., vol. xiii. p. 717, and Bryant’s remarks on Euroclydon, in his *Analysis of Myth.*, vol. iii. p. 343—9. Myra is indeed out of the track to *Dicaærelia* in Italy; but the winds had been contrary, and the ship had made for the Lycian coast for shelter.

7. μὴ προσεῶντος ἡμᾶς τοῦ ἀνέμου.] *Προσεῶντος* presents some difficulty, to remove which Markl. would read *πρόσω ἴωντος*. But that is unnecessary; for the common reading may have the very same sense, *πρὸς* in composition being often used for *πρόσω*. See the passages of Soph., Eurip., and Diod., cited by me in *Recens. Synop.* Thus the sense is, “not letting us make any progress.” I have, however, sometimes thought that the true reading might be *προσωθῶντος*. So Hor. Od. iv. 12, 3. *Impellunt autimæ lintea Thraciæ.* Ἵπεπλεύσαμεν. The sense is, “we ran under,” i. e. made for Crete, at Salome, and coasted along the island. This they did, thinking they should get more into the wind.

8. παραλεγόμενοι] “doubling it.” The wind might be adverse; and doubling promontories was to the ancients a long and difficult affair; and usually effected (as we may infer from the term here employed) by *towing*.

—ἦν πόλις Λασαία.] Of this we find no mention in the Classical writers. Hence the Commentators either resort to conjectures, or suppose this one of the towns of the *hundred-cities* island not mentioned by the geographers or other writers. This, however, is cutting the knot. I rather suspect that *Lasos* is meant, which occurs in Pliny’s list of the inland towns; and *Lasæa* was, it is plain, such. The difference is trifling; since *πόλις Λασαία* means the city of Lasos. And this is confirmed by Hesych. *Λασίον πόλις, ἢ χωρίον.* where read *Λασαίων*. The situation of Fair-Havens is, by the modern term being discovered, fixed to a piece a little to the N.E. of Cape Leon, the present C. Matala. *Lasæa* is supposed to be on the brow of the hills which rise about 4 miles from the shore.

9. διὰ τὸ τὴν νηστειάν ἤδη παρελ.] It is strange that *νηστειάν* should have so perplexed Markl., as to have led him to suppose it corrupt, and to propound various emendations, all unnecessary. Br. Middl. notices the absurdity of Markland’s reasoning, without being aware that it was borrowed at second hand from *Erasm.* and *Casaub.* The

10 ἤδη παρεληλυθέναι, παρήγει ὁ Παῦλος λέγων αὐτοῖς· Ἄνδρες, θεωρῶ
 ὅτι μετὰ ὕβρεως καὶ πολλῆς ζημίας οὐ μόνον τοῦ γόρτου καὶ τοῦ
 11 πλοίου, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν μέλλειν ἕσθαι τὸν πλοῦν. Ὁ δὲ
 ἑκατόνταρχος τῷ κυβερνήτῃ καὶ τῷ ναυκλίρῳ ἐπέειπε μᾶλλον, ἢ τοῖς
 12 ὑπὸ τοῦ Παύλου λεγομένοις. Ἀνευθέτου δὲ τοῦ λιμένος ὑπύρχοντος
 πρὸς παραχειμασίαν, οἱ πλείους ἔθεντο βουλὴν ἀναχθῆναι κἀκίθην,
 εἶπως δύναιτο καιαντήσαντες εἰς Φοίνικα παραχειμαῖσαι, λιμένα τῆς
 13 Κρήτης βλέποντα κατὰ Λίβυα καὶ κατὰ Χῶρον. Ἐποπνεύσαντος δὲ
 Νότου, δόξαντες τῆς προθέσεως κεκρατηκέναι, ἄραντες ἕσσαν παρελέ-
 14 γοντο τὴν Κρήτην. Μετ' οὐ πολὺ δὲ ἔβαλε κατ' αὐτῆς ἄνεμος τυφω-

true view seems to be that of Chrys. and Œcumen., adopted by Pisc., Beza, Rosenm., Mid., and Kuin., who observe that Luke designates the time, after the manner of the Jews; and means a certain season of the year, so called from the great Fast which fell at that time; just as we speak of *Christmas, Lady-day, Michaelmas, &c.*, whether we be Protestants or Romanists. And this was usual with the Heathens. So Thucyd. ii. 78. περὶ Ἀρκτοῦρου ἐπιτολάς (where see my Note), and Theophr. Ch. Eth. 3. τὴν θάλατταν ἐκ Διονυσίαν πλοῖμον εἶναι. The Article here is used κατ' ἕξοχὴν. So Philo de Vit. Mos. (cited by Loesu.) calls it τὴν λεγομένην νη-σταίαν, meaning the day of expiation, the great Fast on the tenth of the month Tisri, about the tenth of October, answering to our *old Michaelmas*. Thus, even in our times, the Levantine sailors particularly dread what they call the *Michaelmas flows*.

10. ὕβρεως.] Grot., Wets., Kypke, and Kuin. rightly explain this *injuria*; comparing Joseph. Ant. iii. 5. τῶν ὄμβρων ὕβρις, and Antholog. iii. 22, 58. θαλάττης ὕβρις. And so *injuria* in the Latin. Grot. observes that ὕβρις respects the persons, ζημία the goods; comparing Philo. ζημία χρημάτων.

11. τῷ κυβερνήτῃ καὶ τῷ ναυκλ.] These offices were properly distinct, on the nature and difference of whose duties I have copiously treated in Recens. Synop., adducing a great body of proofs and illustrations from the Classical writers. Suffice it here to say, that the former term denoted the *master*, the latter the *supercargo*. But it was only large merchant ships, like this, that had both. The smaller had but one person for both offices, who was then called *ναυκλησος*.

12. πρὸς παραχ.] Put for πρὸς τὸ παραχειμαῖζειν. The word occurs in Polyb. and Diod.

— εἰς Φοίνικα] “to Phenix” (not Phœnice); the present port *Sphacia*. From its description (with which I would compare Pausan. v. 25, 2. ἄκραν τετραμμένην ἐπὶ Λιβύης καὶ Νότου) we may, (as Grot. and Schmid. think) infer that the port was formed by two jutting horns, which looked to seaward to the S. W. and N. W. respectively.

13. ἄραντες.] The Commentators generally supply ἀγκύραν, which is is often expressed, as in several passages cited by Wets. This term, however, may also allude to the raising the masts, which were usually lowered on shore. So in Thucyd. vii. 26. ἄρας ἐκ τῆς Αἰγύπτου, where the Schol. supplies τὰ ιστία. Yet, after all, from the expression ἔβαλε κατ' αὐτῆς just after (on which see Note) it should seem that Luke intended τὴν ναῦν to be supplied; which is confirmed by Thucyd. i. 52. τὰς ν α ὕς ἄραντες ἀπὸ γῆς, where I have there shown that when ναῦν is expressed or under-

stood, the phrase has respect to what we call *heaving ship*, or leaving a port where she had been drawn on shore.

— ἕσσαν.] With this word the Commentators have been not a little perplexed. I have in Recens. Synop. fully proved that there is no need to resort to conjectures. The word is used by the best writers, not only poets, but prose writers; as Herodot. iv. 3; vii. 233. Joseph. Ant. i. 20, 1; xix. 2, 4. Hippocrates, Plutarch, &c. It signifies, not *neerer*, but *very near*, and here answers to our nautical term *in shore*, and (as sailors say) *to near* the shore. Thus the phrase ἕσσαν παραλίγεισθαι signifies to *coast along close inshore*. The mariners were probably proceeding partly by their oars (for the wind was only a side wind, and of little use), and partly by being *towed*, which was called *ἡμυλοκείσθαι*, and has been copiously illustrated by me on Thucyd. iv. 25.

14. αὐτῆς.] It is not agreed to what this has reference. Some suppose to *προπέσειω*, others to *πρόρας*. But it is *better* (with most eminent Commentators) to refer it to Κρήτην. Yet that yields a frigid and inept sense. I would take it to mean the *ship itself*, with reference to ναῦν just before left to be supplied at ἄραντες. This is confirmed, and the force of ἔβαλε (which is wrongly rendered by *Toup disconcerted*) is illustrated by Pind. Pyth. xi. 60—62. Ὅρθῶν κλείεσθον ἰὼν τὸ πῖν ἢ Μέ τις ἄνεμος ἕξω πλοῦν Ἐβαλε, ὡς δὲ ἄκατον εἰναλίαν.

— ἄνεμος τυφωνικός.] i. e. a wind like a *typhoon*: the name then, and to the present day, given to a tempestuous wind prevailing in the Mediterranean, and blowing a sort of *hurricane*, in all directions from N. E. to S. E.; and perhaps meant by Homer *Odys. ε. 313*, and Virg. *Æn. i. 103—12*. The word is, I think, wrongly derived by the Etymologists from *τύφος, fumo*; it rather comes from *τύφος*, cognate with *τύπω* and *τύπω*, and properly signifies the *Striker*; which is confirmed and illustrated by Æschyl. *Agam. 637*. Blomf. Ναὺς γὰρ πρὸς ἀλλήλαια Ἐθρῆκι πνοῖ· Ἡρεῖκον· αἱ δὲ, κερουπολυμεναι βία Χιμῶν τυφῶ, σεν ἄλη τ' ὄμβροκτύπω, Ἐλχοντ' ἄφαντος, ποιμένος κακὸν σπρόβω.

It remains, however, to discuss the yet more difficult term *Ἐνροκλόσω*, which has so perplexed Commentators and Critics, that they have anxiously sought a change of reading, either from MSS. or from the conjectures of the learned. Various objections have been made to the common reading; but of no great weight. As to the chief objection, the *incongruity of the compound*, — κλόσω may signify not only a *wave*, but a *rough wavy sea* (see the examples in Steph. Thes.); and must have been sometimes used as an *adjective* (which indeed, I suspect, was its *original form*),

νικῶς, ὁ καλούμενος † Εὐροκλύδων. συναρπασθέντος δὲ τοῦ πλοίου, καὶ 15
 μὴ δυναμένου ἀνοφθαλμεῖν τῷ ἄνεμῳ, ἐπιδόντες ἐφερόμεθα. Νησίον 16
 δὲ τι ὑποδραμόντες καλούμενον Κλαύδην, μόλις ἰσχύσαμεν περικρατεῖς
 γενέσθαι τῆς σκάφης ἣν ἄραντες, βοηθείαι ἐχρῶντο ὑποζωννύντες τὸ 17

as appears from the adjective Ἐρικλύδων, which is used by a later Greek writer ap. Steph. Thes. Of the conjectures which have been proposed, the only ones that merit attention are Εὐροκλύδων and Εὐρακλύδων. For the former (which has been proposed by Toup, Ernesti, Bryant, and Kuin.) there is no authority at all. Besides, the compound would be contrary to analogy; since there is no instance of εἶρω with a substantive; and even those with adjectives are almost confined to the Poets; and moreover, the sense arising (*wide-wary*) is too feeble. For the latter, (namely Εὐρακίλων, N. N. E. wind) which has been proposed by Grot., Mill, Le Clerc, Bentley, and Beng., there is some, though but very slender, authority in MSS. and Versions: while the objections against it are,—1. that it would not be formed analogically, but ought to be Εὐρακίλων. 2. That it would be heterogeneously compounded of Greek and Latin. And ἀκίλων could not well represent *aquilo*. Besides, the name was doubtless the same that had prevailed for centuries;—and was therefore not likely to be otherwise than Greek throughout, not Greek and Latin. 3. It would not at all correspond to the accurate descriptions of the τρυφῶν, or *Tulzone*, given by ancients and moderns; who agree in representing it not as a *point-wind*,—but as shifting about, in all quarters from N. E. to S. E., *East prevailing*. Hence it is clear that both external and internal evidence unite in requiring the common reading to be retained; the sense of which may be thus expressed: “the wave-stirring Easter,” or, literally, “*East-souser*,” which designation is confirmed and illustrated by the numerous passages of the Greek and Latin Classical writers adduced by me (chiefly from Wets.) in Recens. Synop.

15. συναρπασθέντος τοῦ πλοίου.] An expression often used of tempestuous winds; as is proved by the examples adduced by the Commentators: to which may be added Æschyl. Agam. 610. χεῖμα—ἦρπασε (scil. αὐτόν.) Ἄνοφθαλμεῖν, to bear up against the wind; *face* it. At ἐπιδόντες there is an ellipsis, either of πλοῖον, as many Commentators suppose; or, rather, of ἑαυτοῦς; which latter is confirmed by Lucian cited by Elms.: ἐπιτρέψαντες οὖν τῷ πνεύματι, καὶ παραδόντες αὐτοῖς ἐχειμαζόμεθα. and Arrian. Epict. iv. 9. οἱ ἀπαξ ἐνόητες εἰσάπαν ἐπέδωκαν ἑαυτοῖς, καὶ ὡς ὑπὸ βέματος παρεβήσαν. The sense of ἐφερόμεθα is “we were driven or drifted.”

16. ὑποδραμόντες.] Not “running up to,” but “running under;” i. e. close under shore. So Themist. p. 152, cited by Wets.: τὰ μὲν (partly) ὑποδραμοῦσαι, τὰ δὲ περιδραμοῦσαι.

—Κλαύδην.] The name given by Mela and Pliny countenances the reading Κλαύδην found in some Versions, &c. But the common reading is confirmed by Hierocl. ap. Ptolom. iii. 7. and Athenæus. Περικρατεῖς εἶναι, for περικρατεῖν, “to become masters of,” “secure the boat;” which, it seems, whether it had been towed by a rope, or had hung fastened to the ship, or been on deck, had been washed away by the waves.

17. βοηθ. ἐχρῶντο, ὑποζ. τ. π.] This passage has occasioned no little perplexity to the Commentators, who are not agreed on the sense of βοηθ.

and ὑποζ. Some take βοηθ. of the *aid* or *united help* of the mariners and the soldiers, or other passengers. But thus the sense would be very imperfectly expressed. Others take it of the *tackling*, ropes, hooks, chains, &c. by which assistance is rendered to a ship in rough weather. No *proof*, however, of this signification has been adduced. As to ὑποζ., both the above classes of Interpreters are agreed, that it must be taken of that *undergirding*, which, they say, was employed by the ancients as well as the moderns; whereby thick cables were drawn round a rickety ship, to keep the timbers tight together. In proof and illustration of this the Commentators adduce a great number of passages from the Classical writers. But, upon close examination, it will appear (as I have in some measure shown in Recens. Synop.) that scarcely any one of these is to the purpose; for the *sine funibus Vix durare carinæ* Possint imperiosius Æquor, of Horace, Od. i. 14. is uncertain; as may be imagined, since no Commentator, except Baxter, takes it to refer to the ungirding of a ship with ropes. And although in Hesych., in voc. ζωμεῖματα, we have the gloss σχοινία κατὰ μέσον τὴν ναῦν δεσμεύμενα; yet that is known to refer to Aristoph. Eq. 279; and is only the opinion of a *Grammarians* on the sense of the word there; which is better explained by the *Scholiasts*, by *Suidas*, and even by another gloss of Hesych. himself, to mean ὑποζώματα· ζῶλα τῶν νεῶν, which is far more agreeable to the context and the subject. And this is confirmed by the Schol. on Thucyd. i. 29. ζεῖζαντες (ναῦς), where he speaks of these ζῶλα (calling them ζυγώματα), as *stays* necessary to bind together a rickety ship's hull. And so Theogn. Adm. 513. νηὸς τοι πλεωρήσαιν ὑπὸ ζυγῶ θήσομεν; i. e. *υποθήσομεν ζυγά*. In fact, all the passages that have been adduced in proof or illustration of the above *undergirding* belong to that operation, which is alluded to in the passages just cited, and which may be called *under* (or *inner*) *belting*. The passages, indeed, of *Arrian*, are not quite decisive; but they are far better interpreted of *inner-belting* than *undergirding*, because the subject is *refitting for the purpose of war*. The passage of Polyb. admits of no other sense. Those of *Plato*, which are mere *allusions*, are far better so understood, because the term ὑποζώματα is employed. And however the ancients might sometimes apply their cables in the above way, yet they would scarcely have cables *made* for the purpose. The passage of Athen. p. 204, however, is quite decisive, where he says that the gigantic ship of Ptolemy Philopator had twelve ὑποζώματα, each 100 feet long. So also in the passage of *Plutarch*, which I have myself adduced in Rec. Syn., there is mention of these ὑποζώματα, which are said to be of *brass*. From what I have written on the passage of Thucyd. there can be no doubt but that the ζυγώματα, or ὑποζώματα, were pieces of strong *planking* to serve as *stays*, to bind the inner frame-work of a ship together; and were sometimes, in the case of an exceedingly large ship, put in at *first*, but usually after the ship had been some time in service, and had grown rickety. So Galen uses the term metaphorically, to denote

πλοῖον· φοβοῦμενοι τε μὴ εἰς τὴν Σύρην ἐκπέσωσι, χαλάσαντες τὸ
 18 σκεῦος, οὕτως ἐφέροτο. Σφοδρῶς δὲ χειμαζομένων ἡμῶν, τῇ ἐξῆς ἐκ-
 19 βολὴν ἐποιοῦντο· καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ αὐτόχειρες τὴν σκευὴν τοῦ πλοίου
 20 ἐρῶσίψαμεν· μῆτε δὲ ἡλίου μῆτε ἄστρων ἐπιφανόντων ἐπὶ πλείονας
 ἡμέρας, χειμῶνός τε οὐκ ὀλίγου ἐπιχειμένου, λοιπὸν περιηρεῖτο πῶσα
 21 ἔλπις τοῦ σωθῆσθαι ἡμᾶς. Πολλῆς δὲ ἀσιτίας ὑπαρχούσης, τότε στα-
 θεῖς ὁ Παῦλος ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν εἶπεν· Ἔδει μὲν, ὃ ἄνδρες, πειθαρχή-
 σαντίς μοι μὴ ἀνάγεσθαι ἀπὸ τῆς Κρήτης, κερδησαί τε τὴν ὕβριν
 22 ταύτην καὶ τὴν ζημίαν. Καὶ τανῦν παραιῶ ὑμᾶς εὐθυμεῖν· ἀποβολὴ
 23 γὰρ ψυχῆς οὐδεμία ἔσται ἐξ ὑμῶν, πλὴν τοῦ πλοίου. Πιῶσθη γάρ
 24 μοι τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ ἄγγελος τοῦ Θεοῦ, οὗ εἰμι, ὃ καὶ λατρεύω, λέγων·
 Μὴ φοβοῦ, Παῦλε, Καίσιρι σε δεῖ παραστήναι· καὶ ἰδοὺ, κηχάρισται

the *midriff*, or *diaphragm*, which is the *inner be-
 lying of the human body*.

Another argument for the interpretation I propose, is this, — that, according to the *other* interpretation, *βοηθείας ἐχρῶντο*, which occupies the most prominent place in the sentence, would be almost useless. At least we should expect *ὑπερῶνυνο το πλοῖον, βοηθείας χρῶμενοι*. But to advert to *βοηθείας*, in whichever of the two ways above detailed, the word be taken, it will be little suitable. I have no doubt but that the true sense is that, in which (as Wets. attests) it is used in the Greek writers on mechanics, namely, *props* or *stays*, viz. the *ζυγὰ* or *ζυγώματα* above mentioned. Thus the sense is, “they had recourse to props and stays, undergirding the ship [with them].” Those had been, no doubt, provided for any emergency; and there is reason to think that, in the largest class of merchant ships, *carpenters* were regularly employed. This was certainly the case in ships of *war*; for Xenoph. de Republ. Athen. 12, enumerating the various officers on board a trireme, reckons the *ναυπηγοί*.

— τὴν Σύρην.] i. e. the Syrtis *major* on the coast of Africa, estimated at 4000 or 5000 stadia in circumference, and occupying the whole of what is now called the Gulf of Sidra.

— χαλάσαντες τὸ σκεῦος.] On what is meant by τὸ σκεῦος, the Commentators are not agreed. Some say the *sails*. But I have in Rec. Synop. shown that this sense cannot be admitted. Others take it to mean “the anchor,” which was certainly *part of the σκεῦη*. Yet the sailors were not in *soundings*; and if they had been, they would have let down *two* anchors, as v. 29. If we consider what *other ὄπλα* may deserve to be called τὸ σκεῦος, we cannot doubt but that it must be the *mast*. And this signification is confirmed by the Syr. Ver. and adopted by Grot., Heraldus, Bolten, and Kuin. Χαλᾶν is used because the masts of the ancients were so formed as to go into a *socket*, and be raised or lowered at pleasure. The sense seems to be, that they lowered both masts and every sort of tackling which carried any canvass. If this be not admitted, we may, I think, suppose, that σκεῦος denotes the sail-yard at the poop, called ὁ ἀρτέμων at v. 40.

18. ἐκβολὴν ἐποιῶντο] “heaved overboard,” [the lading]; for of that the ἐκβολή, when used without any addition, is to be understood; since the order of the circumstances (as Grot. rightly observes) is, first, that the *lading* should be thrown overboard, as here; then the *tackling*, v. 19;

and lastly, the *provisions*, as v. 33. From the Classical citations of Wets. it appears that this ἐκβολὴ was not very unfrequent in ancient navigation: and, in violent storms, *necessary*, as the Classical citations of Wets. and Pric. prove; to which may be added, Jonas i. 5. ἐκβολὴν ἐποίησαντο τῶν σκευῶν. Æschyl. Agam. 978. καὶ τὸ μὲν πρὸ χρημάτων κτησίαν ὄκνος βυλῶν, Σφενδῶνας ἀπ’ εὐμέτρου, Οὐκ ἔδν πρόπας ὄδμος, where for ὄδμος I would read γόμος. See also Theb. 767—9.

19. τὴν σκευὴν.] Synonymous with the σκεῦη at Jonas i. 5, and signifying all the *armamenta* navis, otherwise called ὄπλα, as masts and yards, sails, ropes, &c. (see Thucyd. vii. 24.), including the *luggage* of the passengers; for σκευὴ has sometimes that sense.

20. μῆτε δὲ ἡλίου—ἡμᾶς.] This non-appearance of the sun and stars was to the ancients at all times perplexing, especially in tempestuous weather. Under such circumstances they were reduced to the utmost straits — not so much by want of practical skill in navigation, as by being destitute of what Lord Byron finely calls “The *feeling* Compass — Navigation’s soul.”

— χειμ. ἐπιχειμένου.] Ἐπικ. is a very significant term; and Wets. cites an example of χειμῶνος ἐπιχειμένου from Plato; and Wolf compares the Virgilian “*tempestat incubuit silvis*.” See also Ps. lxxxviii. 7.

21. ἀσιτίας.] This is best rendered *inedia* a neglect of food, for which they could not, in their present state, have either appetite or relish. See Ps. cii. 4.

— κερδήσαι—ὕβριν καὶ ζημίαν.] To explain this seemingly strange expression, we need not, with many of the older Commentators, extend the μὴ to κερδήσαι, and render κερδ. *suffer*; but we may have recourse to a sense of κερδ. found in the best writers, on which I have fully treated in Recens. Synop. and on Thucyd. ii. 44. where I have shown that the literal sense is, “But it behoved you to have hearkened to me, and not to have loosed from Crete; and thus you would have been *gainers* by all this disgrace, (i. e. frustration) and this loss.”

23. οὐ] scil. δοῦλο; as Exod. xxxii. 26. Who is the Lord’s? and Levit. xx. 26. So also in Is. xlv. 14. where the LXX. render יְהוָה יְהוָה by καὶ σοὶ ἔσονται ὁ δὸ ἄλο. Λατρεύω, as Kypke observes, implies *strenuous* and *active* service.

24. κηχάρισται σοι—σοῦ.] Χαρίζεσθαι τινα or τινα sometimes signifies “to grant any one’s life for

σοι ὁ Θεὸς πάντας τοὺς πλείοντας μετὰ σοῦ. Διὸ εὐθυμείτε, ἄνδρες· 25
 πιστεύω γὰρ τῷ Θεῷ, ὅτι οὕτως ἔσται καθ' ὃν τρόπον λελάληταί μοι.
 m Infrn 23. 1. ^m εἰς νῆσον δὲ τινα δεῖ ἡμῶς ἐκπεσεῖν. Ὡς δὲ τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτῃ νύξ 26
 ἐγένετο, διαφερομένων ἡμῶν ἐν τῷ Ἀδρία, κατὰ μέσον τῆς νυκτὸς ὑπε- 27
 ρόουν οἱ ναῦται προσάγειν τιὰ αὐτοῖς χώραν. Καὶ βολίσαντες εὗρον 28
 ὄργυιὰς εἴκοσι· βραχὺ δὲ διαστήσαντες, καὶ πάλιν βολίσαντες, εὗρον
 ὄργυιὰς δεκαπέντε· φοβούμενοί τε μήπως εἰς τραχεῖς τόπους ἐκπέσωμεν, 29
 ἐκ πρύμνης ῥίψαντες ἀγκύρας τέσσαρας, ἤχοντο ἡμέραν γενέσθαι.
 Τῶν δὲ ναυτῶν ζητούντων φυγεῖν ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου, καὶ χυλασάντων τὴν 30
 σκάφην εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, προσάσει ὡς ἐκ πρώρας μελλόντων ἀγκύρας
 ἐκτείνειν, εἶπεν ὁ Παῦλος τῷ ἑκατοντάρχῃ καὶ τοῖς στρατιώταις· Ἐὰν 31
 μὴ οὔτοι μείνωσιν ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ, ὑμεῖς σωθῆηται οὐ δύνασθε. Τότε οἱ 32
 στρατιῶται ἀπέκοψαν τὰ σχοινία τῆς σκάφης, καὶ εἴυσαν αὐτὴν ἐκπε-
 σεῖν. Ἄχρι δὲ οὗ ἔμελλεν ἡμέρα γίνεσθαι, παρεκάλει ὁ Παῦλος ἅπαν- 33
 τας μετὰλαβεῖν τροφῆς, λέγων· Τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτῃ σήμερον ἡμέραν
 προσδοκῶντες, ἄστοι διατελεῖτε, μηδὲν προσυλαβόμενοι. ⁿ Διὸ παρεκάλῳ 34
 ὑμᾶς προσλαβεῖν τροφῆς· τοῦτο γὰρ πρὸς τῆς ὑμετέρας σωτηρίας
 ὑπάρχει· οὐδενὸς γὰρ ὑμῶν θρῶξ ἐκ τῆς κεφαλῆς πεσεῖται. ^o Εἰπὼν 35
 δὲ ταῦτα, καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον, εὐχαριστήσας τῷ Θεῷ ἐνώπιον πάντων, καὶ
 κλύσας ἤρξατο ἐσθίειν. Ἰϋθνημοὶ δὲ γινόμενοι πάντες, καὶ αὐτοὶ προσ- 36
 ἐλάβοτον τροφῆς· ^p ἦμεν δὲ ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ αἱ πᾶσαι ψυχαὶ διακόσται 37
 ἑβδομήκοντα ἕξ. Κορεσθέντες δὲ τροφῆς, ἐκούφιζον τὸ πλοῖον ἐκβαλ- 38
 λόμενοι τὸν σῖτον εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν. Ὅτε δὲ ἡμέρα ἐγένετο, τὴν γῆν 39

n Matt. 10. 30.
 Luke 12. 7.
 & 21. 18.

o 1 Sam. 9. 13.
 John 6. 11.
 1 Tim. 4. 3.

p Supra 2. 41.
 & 7. 14.
 Rom. 13. 1.
 1 Pet. 3. 20.

another;" and examples are adduced by the Commentators. Here, however, it means, to spare any one's life on account of another.

27. *τεσσαρεσκ.*] Namely, from their having left Fair-havens. *Διαφερ. ἡμῶν*, "as we were tossed up and down." The sense is almost confined to the later writers.

—*Ἀδρία.*] By this is meant not what is now called the Adriatic gulf, but the Adriatic sea, which, as the Commentators have proved from Ptolemy, Strabo, &c., comprehended what had originally been called the *Ἰόνιον πέλαγος*, and denoted the sea between Greece, Italy, and Africa. See my Note on Thucyd. i. 24. τὸν Ἰόνιον κόλπον.

—*προσάγειν τιὰ αὐτοῖς χώραν.*] There is here a nautical *hypallage*, like *ἀναφανίτες τὴν Κ.* at xxi. 3. in either case originating in the optical deception, by which, on approaching a coast, the land seems to approach to the ship, not the ship to the land. Of this examples are adduced by the Commentators from both Greek and Latin writers. Nay, our own seamen have the same idiom, when they speak of *nearing* a coast, and *fetching* a port.

28. *ὄργυιὰς.*] The word comes from *ὀρέγασθαι*, and denotes the space that a man may compass by stretching out his arms to the farthest.

29. *τραχεῖς τόπους.*] "rocky ground."

—*ἐκ πρύμνης.*] However unusual it may now be for anchors to be dropped from the *stern* of a ship, yet the passages adduced by Wets. and Pearce show that such was very usual in ancient times: nay, that even in modern times the same custom continues. in the ships plying between

Alexandria and Constantinople: also that *four* anchors were thought necessary on occasions of great peril, and *two* ordinarily in a tempestuous night. *Ἠθχ. ἡμ. γει.* This has the air of a proverbial expression, of which Wets. cites two examples from Longus, signifying "to anxiously wish for day."

30. At *μελλόντων* sub. *αὐτῶν*; an *clipp.* usual when the participle is accompanied with an *ὡς*.

31. *ὁ ἐνώπιον*] i. e. humanly speaking. For the promise of safety was conditional, and involved the obligation to use the ordinary means for preservation: to neglect which would have been tempting God. See Calvin.

33. *προδοκῶντες.*] Namely, for the storm to cease. "Ἄστοι διατελεῖτε. A popular form of speaking, which denotes "ye have taken little or no food," no regular meal. Examples are adduced by Kypke from Josephus.

34. *τροφῆς.*] Sub. *τι. τοῦτο γὰρ.* &c. "this will be promotive of your safety." A sense of *πρὸς* frequent in the best writers, especially Thucyd. *Οὐδενὸς γὰρ.* &c. "little or nothing." An oriental and proverbial phrase, on which see Note at Matt. x. 30. and Luke xxi. 18.

37. The number 236 may seem large; but the Alexandrian vessels were very bulky, and fitted out for carrying a great number of passengers. Thus Joseph. in Vit. C. 3. (cited by Pearce) says the ship in which he sailed, and which was cast away in the Adriatic sea, had 600 persons on board.

38. *τὸν σῖτον.*] The best Commentators are agreed that this must signify the *provisions*, which

οὐκ ἐπεγίνωσκον· κόλπον δὲ τινα κατενόουν ἔχοντα αἰγιαλόν, εἰς ὃν
 40 ἐβουλεύσαντο, εἰ δύναντο, ἐξῶσαι τὸ πλοῖον. Καὶ τὰς ἀγκύρας περιε-
 λόντες εἶον εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, ἅμα ἀνέντες τὰς ζευκτηρίας τῶν πηδα-
 λίων· καὶ ἐπάραντες τὸν ἀρτέμονα τῇ πνεύσει κατεῖχον εἰς τὸν
 41 αἰγιαλόν. Ἡ Περιπεσόντες δὲ εἰς τόπον διθάλασσον, ἐπόκειλαν τὴν ^{q 2 Cor. 11. 25.}
 ναῦν. καὶ ἡ μὲν πρόωρα ἐρείσασα ἔμεινεν ὑσιλεύτος, ἡ δὲ πρῶτα
 42 ἔλυτο ὑπὸ τῆς βίας τῶν κυμάτων. Τῶν δὲ στρατιωτῶν βουλή ἐγένετο,
 43 ἵνα τοὺς δεσμώτας ἀποκτείνωσι, μήτις ἐκκολυμβήσας διαφύγοι. Ὁ δὲ
 εκατόνταρχος, βουλόμενος διασῶσαι τὸν Πυῦλον, ἐκόλυσεν αὐτοὺς τοῦ
 βουλήματος, ἐκέλευσε τε τοὺς δυναμένους κολυμβῆν, ἀποφύψαντας πρῶ-
 44 τος ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἐξίναι, καὶ τοὺς λοιποὺς, οὓς μὲν ἐπὶ σαισίον, οὓς
 δὲ ἐπὶ τινῶν τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ πλοίου· καὶ οὕτως ἐγένετο πάντας διασω-
 θῆναι ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν.

was to be reserved till the last, the *lading* and *tackling* being before thrown overboard.

39. τὴν γῆν οὐκ ἐπέγ.] A brief mode of expression, denoting "they took a view of the country; but recognised it not." Κόλπον — ἔχοντα αἰγιαλόν. As all inlets have *shores*, Schmid. and Kuin. construe the words thus: κατενόουν αἰγιαλόν ἔχοντα κόλπον τινα, "they perceived a shore having a certain creek." This, however, is doing violence to the construction. We must retain the natural one, and take αἰγ., with Grot., Matth., and Schleus., in a *popular* sense, to denote a *practicable* shore. And indeed the passages cited by those Commentators prove that αἰγιαλός signifies properly a *sandy* shore (as opposed to a rocky one) and consequently one convenient for landing. Κόλπος is taken in a sense which Theophyl. says is usual in the *common* dialect, viz. an *inlet*. This is on the N.W. side of the island, and now called La Cala di San Paolo. Ἐξῶσαι τὸ πλοῖον, "to strand the vessel." On this sense of ἐξωθεῖν see my Note on Thucyd. ii. 90.

40. περιελόντες.] This cannot mean, as several Commentators imagine, "having taken up the anchors;" for that sense would require ἀνελόντες, or ἀνελόμενοι; neither, as they were without boats, could they *weigh* the anchors; but the sense must be (as the best Interpreters, ancient and modern, are agreed) "removed the anchors," viz. by cutting the ropes and leaving them in the sea. And εἶον must (with De Dieu, Wets., Pearce, Markl., Schleus., Heinr., and Kuin.) be referred to the anchors, not to the vessel; still less to themselves.

— ἀνέντες τὰς ζευκτ. τῶν πηδ.] "having loosened the bands of the rudders." So Eurip. Hel. 1536. speaks of the rudder as fastened ζεύγλαισι. Some Commentators are not a little perplexed with the circumstance of *two* rudders being spoken of to one ship. But Grot., Bochart, Elsn., Schefler, Lips, and Perizon. have proved, that among the ancients large ships of burden had *two* rudders. To the passages cited by them in proof I have in Recens. Synop. added a passage, yet more apposite than any, from Orpheus in Argonaut. 274. Καὶ οἱ ἐπ' ἄρτια θῆκαν ἀρρήτα πορπίοντες, ἴστών τ' ἡδ' ὀδῶνας· ἐπὶ δ' αὐτ' οἴη κας ἐῶσαν, Πρωμῶθεν ἀρτήσαντες, ἐπισφίξαντο δ' ἱμάσιν. From which passage it appears probable that the rudders were regularly taken off when the ship was in port, and were laid up in the docks. But the question is, *how* and *where* were they fixed on?

VOL. I.

Many (as Alberti, Bp. Pearce, and Kuin.) think that the rudders were one at the stern, and the other at the bow of the ship; while others suppose both to have been at the stern. I know not, however, of the numerous passages cited by the above Commentators, any one that *determines* this point; but that which I have adduced from Orpheus undoubtedly *does*: yet it decides the *contrary* way, namely, that they were both at the *pramēh*. — ἐπάραντες τὸν ἀρτέμονα τῇ πν.] The term ἀρτέμων, it rarely occurs, is almost unnoticed by the ancients, and hence its sense is disputed. Luther took it to mean the *mast*; and Erasmus the *sail yard*: interpretations devoid alike of proof and probability. Bayf., Jun., Alberti, and Wolf, with more probability, explain it the *large sail of the poop*, answering to our *mizen sail*, and even yet called by the Venetians *arimenon*. The best founded opinion, however, seems to be that of Grot., Voss, Heum., Wets., Mich., Roscnm., and Kuin., who understand by it a small sail near the prow, called by Pollux the *dolon*, which was used to keep the ship steady, and to prevent its working too much, when the larger and upper sails were set. See the passages of Papius and Juvenal Sat. xii. 68. cited from Wets. in Recens. Synop.

— κατεῖχον] scil. τὴν ναῦν; an ellipsis sometimes supplied in Homer and Herodot.

41. περιπεσόντες εἰς τόπον διθ.] Διθάλασος has not here its usual signification an isthmus which divides seas, but denotes a peninsular promontory. The word, indeed, is usually applied to peninsulas of the largest size; but sometimes also to narrow *spits* of land jutting out into the sea; and sometimes to those *tanice*, partly above and partly under water, which guide the currents, and therefore make the place *εὐθάλασσον*, and consequently rough. So Clemens; cited by Wets. διθάλασσοι καὶ θηριώδεις τόποι. and Dio Chrys. Orat. v., who, speaking of the Syrtes, says it is surrounded by βράχεια καὶ διθάλαττα καὶ τανίον. The *spit* of sand in question was an elongation of a *ness*, represented in Cluverius's Map, and noticed by Dorville in his Sicilia.

— ἐρείσασα] "having fixed itself." On this idiom, by which words with an active force, and generally active use, have sometimes a reflective sense, see my Note in Recens. Synop. With ἔμεινεν ὑσιλεύτος, Pric. compares Virg. "Illiusque prora pendit."

44. οὓς μὲν — οὓς δέ] for τοὺς μὲν — τοὺς δέ. On 75

r Supra 27. 26.

r Rom. 1. 14.
I Cor. 14. 11.
Col. 3. 11.t Mark 16. 15.
Luke 10. 19.
u Supra 14. 11.

XXVIII. ¹ ΚΑΙ διασωθέντες, τότε ἐπέγνωσαν ὅτι Μελίτη ἡ νῆσος ¹
καλεῖται. ² Οἱ δὲ βάρβαροι παρεῖχον οὐ τὴν τυχοῦσαν φιλανθρωπίαν ²
ἡμῖν· ἀνάψαντες γὰρ * πυρὰν, προσελάβοντο πάντας ἡμᾶς, διὰ τὸν ὑετὸν
τὸν ἐφρεσιῶτα, καὶ διὰ τὸ ψύχος. Συστρέψαντος δὲ τοῦ Παύλου φρυγᾶ- ³
νων πλῆθος, καὶ ἐπιθέντος ἐπὶ τὴν πυρὰν, ἔχιδνα ἐκ τῆς θέρμης ἐξελ-
θοῦσα καθῆψε τῆς χειρὸς αὐτοῦ. Ὡς δὲ εἶδον οἱ βάρβαροι κρεμᾶμενον ⁴
τὸ θηρίον ἐκ τῆς χειρὸς αὐτοῦ, ἔλεγον πρὸς ἀλλήλους· Πάντως φονεὺς
ἔσιν ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος, ὃν διασωθέντα ἐκ τῆς θαλάσσης ἡ δίκη ζῆν
οὐκ εἶσεν. ⁵ Ὁ μὲν οὖν ἀποτινάξας τὸ θηρίον εἰς τὸ πῦρ, ἔπαθεν ⁵
οὐδὲν κακόν. ⁶ Οἱ δὲ προσεδόκων αὐτὸν μέλλειν πίμπρασθαι, ἢ κατα- ⁶
πίπτειν ἄφρω νεκρόν· ἐπὶ πολὺ δὲ αὐτῶν προσδοκῶντων, καὶ θεω-

which idiom see Matth. Gr. Gr. Ἐπὶ τινων τῶν ἀπὸ τ. πλ., "some of the things which came out of the ship," i. e. barrels, boxes, &c.

XXVIII. I. Μελίτη.] It was an old opinion, strenuously supported in the last century by *De Rhoer*, that this is not the *African* Melita, but another, on the coast of Illyricum; and has been of late revived, and ably defended by Mr. Bryant and others. Yet it is, I conceive, untenable, as had long ago been proved by Scaliger, Bochart, Cluv., Cellar., and Wendelin, de Melita Pauli.

2. οἱ δὲ βάρβαροι.] The pride of the Greeks and Romans accounted men of all other nations barbarians. The not being able to speak the languages of those countries involved the charge of *barbarism*; and indeed that is by many supposed to be the primitive sense of the word. See the Note on Rom. i. 14. But that is at variance with the *etymon*, rightly referred to an *Oriental* origin; though not from the Arabic *berber*, to *nurmur*, but from the Punic *berber*, a *shepherd*. Now it was originally appropriated to the indigenous and pastoral inhabitants of Africa; who, to their more civilized fellow-men on the other side of the Mediterranean, appeared *rustics* and barbarians. Hence the term *βάρβαρος* came at length to mean a *rustic* or *clown*.

— οὐ τὴν τυχ. φιλανθ.] "no common benevolence, or kindness." An elegant *litotes*. Ἀνάψαντες πυρὰν. The best Commentators are agreed that this signifies "having set fire to a pyre [of wood];" a signification found both in the LXX. and the Classical writers. The common reading "lighting a fire" would require πῦρ. Προσελάβοντο, "took us into their protection and care." Ἐφρεσιῶτα. Qui *ingruerat*, as Grot. well renders. So Polyb. p. 1053. cited by Wets. ὤσσε διὰ τὸν ἐφ ε-στ ὦ τ ἄ ζῆφον μηθὶ ποῖς ἐν ποσὶ ἀνασθαι βλεπαιν.

3. συστρέψαντος.] "when he had heaped together." There is something *graphic* in the term. Wets. compares Hesych. οἱ γναφῆς ἀκανθῶν σωρὸν συστρέψαντες. By *φρύγανα* is meant dry brushwood, fit for fuel. So Xenoph. cited by Wets. φρύγανα συλλέγοντες ὡς ἐπὶ πῦρ.

— ἐκ τῆς θέρμης.] Our common version renders "out of the heat." But the best Interpreters, ancient and modern, are agreed that the sense is "præcalorem," "urged by the heat." For to take *θέρμης* for *πυρὸς* would be unprecedented. Καθῆψε is for *καθῆψατο*, by a common Hellenistic idiom. Many eminent Commentators and Critics, indeed, maintain that it is not said the viper *bit* Paul; and that *καθῆπτετο*, even were that *written*, could not have such a sense. I have, however, in Recens. Synop.

shown that this position is untenable. Among other passages which I have cited is Cantic. i. 6. καθῆπτερό μου ὁ ἦλιος, "laid hold on me" (as we say) tanned my skin. Upon the whole, it is undeniable that *καθῆπτεσθαι* signifies to *lay fast hold of*, *fasten on*. But this, when used of a serpent, necessarily *implies biting*. As to the argument from the words *ἔπαθεν οὐδὲν κακόν* at ver. 5, it is exceedingly weak; for, even in a *Classical* writer, the position of the clause, and the air of the narration, would exclude any such sense as that "the reptile had not hurt Paul." But in a *Hellenistic* writer the *popular* sense, which may be denoted by the words, namely, that "no harm came of it," must be preferred. Besides, such is so evidently the opinion of St. Luke (whom we cannot suppose to have been mistaken) that no other sense than the common one must be thought of. Besides, how, it may be asked, can a serpent *hang* by any part of a man's body (as at ver. 4.) but by his *teeth*?

4. τὸ θηρίον.] The word is used, not of *beasts*, properly so called, but of *serpents*; though it primarily means any *wild creature*; and Galen uses the word *Theriac* to denote medicines to cure the bite of a serpent.

— φονεὺς ἔστι — εἶσεν.] The words are to be taken in their plain and popular sense, — and such refinements as those resorted to by Elsn., Heins., and others, are not to be thought of. The people seem to have meant to reason thus: "Die he surely will, and no doubt for some crime worthy of death; and considering that he has been thus rescued from the jaws of a watery grave, and brought here to suffer death, surely he must have been guilty of the greatest of crimes, — murder." From the passages of the Classical writers adduced by Grot., Pric., and Wets., it appears that the ancients thought Divine justice sometimes delivered criminals out of dangers, in order to reserve them for heavier calamities and severer punishments. Οὐκ εἶσεν, "has not suffered to live;" considering him as already dead; which proves that they must have been very sure the serpent had bitten Paul.

6. πίμπρασθαι, ἢ κατ. &c.] Here are accurately represented the *two classes* of symptoms which supervene on the bite of a poisonous serpent, according to the virulence of the poison, and the strength of the body to which it is communicated. The *first* represents the swelling, and *inflammation*, in the beginning local, then general, which brings on a burning fever, that quickly destroys the patient. The *second* is the effect of the *strongest* poison on the *weakest* body.

ρούντων μηδὲν ἄτοπον εἰς αὐτὸν γινόμενον, μεταβαλλόμενοι ἔλεγον θεῶν
 7 αὐτὸν εἶναι. Ἐν δὲ τοῖς περὶ τὸν τόπον ἐκείνον ὑπῆρχε χωρία τῷ
 πρώτῳ τῆς νήσου, ὀνόματι Ἰοπλίῳ, ὃς ἀναδεξιόμενος ἡμῶς τρεῖς ἡμέρας
 8 φιλοφροῦς ἐξένισεν. Ἐγένετο δὲ τὸν πατέρα τοῦ Ἰοπλίου πυρετοῖς ¹⁵ James 5. 14,
 καὶ δυσεντερίᾳ συνεχόμενον κατακτεῖσθαι· πρὸς ὃν ὁ Παῦλος εἰσελθὼν,
 9 καὶ προσευξάμενος, ἐπιθεῖς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῷ, ἴασατο αὐτόν. Τοῦτου
 οὖν γενομένου, καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ, οἱ ἔχοντες ἀσθενείας ἐν τῇ νήσῳ, προσ-
 10 ἦρχοντο καὶ ἐθεραπεύοντο· οἱ καὶ πολλαῖς τιμαῖς ἐτίμησαν ἡμᾶς, καὶ
 ἀναγομένοις ἐπέθεντο τὰ πρὸς τὴν χρεῖαν.
 11 Μετὰ δὲ τρεῖς μῆνας ἀνήχθημεν ἐν πλοίῳ παρακεχειμακίτι ἐν τῇ
 12 νήσῳ, Ἀλεξανδρίῳ, παρασήμῳ Διοσκούροις· καὶ καταχθέντες εἰς Συ-
 13 ρακούσας, ἐπεμείναμεν ἡμέρας τρεῖς· ὅθεν περιελθόντες καιρητήσομεν
 εἰς Ῥήγιον, καὶ μετὰ μίαν ἡμέραν, ἐπιγενομένου νότου, δευτεραῖοι

—μηδὲν ἄτοπον εἰς αὐτὸν γ.] This phrase is Hellenistic in its manner, and corresponds to the *επαθεν οὐδὲν κακὸν* just before, and confirms the common interpretation of that expression. Ἄτοπον is not unfrequent in the best writers in the sense *evil*. It here denotes *producing harm to the body*, in which sense it is often used in the best writers, especially the *Medical* ones.

—θεῶν.] The Commentators are needlessly minute in debating *what* God; for the question is undeterminable; and, after all, the word might be used in that *lower sense* (to denote a *Divine person*) which is occasionally found in the later writers, especially *Philostratus* in his life of *Apolonius*.

7. χωρία] *estates*. See Note on Matt. xxvi. 36. Τῷ πρώτῳ. This *may* be interpreted, with most Commentators, “the principal person of the island;” a sense frequent in the N. T. As, however, the term is often found in Inscriptions and Coins, even of *Malta*, used in the sense *Governor*, — *Grot.*, *Bochart*, and also the best recent Commentators are, with reason, of opinion that it signifies the *Prefect of the island*; yet ver. 27. defends the common interpretation.

—ἀναδεξιόμενος — ἐξένισεν.] “taking us to his house, kindly entertained us.” Ἀναδ. is used for ὑπαδ. Yet one example of this sense is adduced by *Wets.* from *Ælian*. *Ξερίζειν* and *φιλ.* are usual terms on this subject.

8. πυρετοῖς — συνεχόμενον.] There was no necessity for *Dr. Owen* to have conjectured *πυρετῶ*, since of the plural in a singular sense examples are adduced by *Munthe*, as also of *febres* in the Latin from *Ammian* by *Wets.* And several might be added from *Hippocrates*. Perhaps the plural may be used with reference to those *fits*, or *paroxysms*, by which fever makes its attacks. And possibly the *θερμαῖς ἰσχυραῖς* of *Thucyd.* ii. 49. may be interpreted on the same principle. Συνέχεσθαι is a *vox sol. de hac re*, on which see Note on *Mark* i. 30. On οἱ ἔχοντες ἀσθενείας. see *Luke* xiii. 11. sq.

10. πολλαῖς τιμαῖς ἐτίμησαν ἡμᾶς.] Many of the best Commentators are of opinion, that *τιμαῖς* is here to be taken in a sense frequent in the Classical writers, and not unknown in the Scriptures, to denote *honorary rewards*. So *Ecclus.* xxxviii. 1. *τίμα* λατρῶν πρὸς τὰς χρεῖας τιμαῖς αὐτοῦ. 1 *Tim.* v. 17. οἱ καλῶς προσεστῶτες πρεσβύτεροι διπλῆς τιμῆς ἀξιοῦσθωσαν: the former of which passages was

probably in the mind of *St. Luke*. The sense seems to be “*honorary presents*.” Not, however, of *money* (which Paul probably would refuse) but of *necessaries*. The words following seem meant to give an example of the kind of honorary presents made. Ἐπέθεντο is well explained by *Wets.*, “*onerarunt nos, et cumulata ingesserunt, et nec potentibus inposuerunt;*” referring to *Ruth* iii. 15.

11. παρασήμῳ Διοσκούροις.] The τὸ παράσημον, or *insigne*, was that from which the ship derived its name. It was a painting or bas-relief on the prow, of some god or hero, or sometimes *animal*; nay, even *inanimate substance*, as *shield*, &c. See *Ovid Trist.* i. 10, 1., and *Virg. Æn.* v. 115. seqq. The poop bore the picture, or image, called the *tutela*, of some god, under whose protection the ship was supposed to be placed. Both the *tutela* and the *insigne* were of gold (or rather gilded metal), ivory, or other rich material. So *Virg. Æn.* x. 171. Et aurato fulgebat *Apolline* puppis. Thus, of the ship mentioned in the above cited passage of *Ovid*, the *numen tutelare* was *Minerva*, placed on the poop; but the *insigne*, or *παράσημον*, was a helmet of *Minerva* painted on the prow; and this gave name to the ship. Yet such was not the invariable custom. Sometimes the *tutela* and the *παράσημον*, were the same; as, for instance, whenever (as often happened) the effigies of the Deity himself, to whose protection the ship was committed, supplied the place of an *insigne*; then the ship was called by the name of that God who was painted or carved on the prow. Thus the Alexandrian ship in which Paul sailed had the *Diascuri* for an *insigne* as well as a *tutela*; whence, too, it was called *Διοσκούροις*.

12. ἐπεμείναμεν ἡμέρας τρεῖς.] No doubt, in a great measure for commercial purposes.

13. περιελθόντες.] Not “fetching a compass,” but “coasting about,” as most Translators render; with reference, I imagine, to the promontories, especially that of *Taurus*, to be doubled in coasting the Sicilian shore; for, in the former sense, the term would not be justified by geographical truth; unless, indeed, it were to be understood of taking a course, by reason of a Westerly wind, very much to the East, and so getting to *Rhegium* by *tacking*. And from the *ἐπιγενομένου νότου* in the next verse, it is certain that the wind had shifted, and was not the same. But if so, they could not coast along Sicily.

— ἐπιγ. νότου.] “the South wind having arisen.”

ἦλθομεν εἰς Ποτιόλους· οὗ εὐρόντες ἀδελφούς, παρεκλήθημεν ἐπ' αὐ- 14
τοῖς ἐπιμεῖναι ἡμέρας ἐπτά· καὶ οὕτως εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην ἦλθομεν. Καὶ 15
κἄθ' ἐν οἷς ἀδελφοὶ ἀκούσαντες τὰ περὶ ἡμῶν, ἐξῆλθον εἰς ἀπάντησιν ἡμῶν
ἄχρις Ἀπλίου φόρου καὶ τριῶν ταβερνῶν· οὓς ἰδὼν ὁ Παῦλος, εὐχα-
ριστήσας τῷ Θεῷ, ἔλαβε θάλασσαν.

y Supra 24. 23.
& 27. 3.

Ἦ "ΟΤΕ δὲ ἦλθομεν εἰς Ῥώμην, ὁ ἐκατόνταρχος παρέδωκε τοὺς δεσμί- 16
ους τῷ στρατοπεδάρχῃ· τῷ δὲ Παύλῳ ἐπετροπή μένειν καθ' ἑαυτὸν,
σὺν τῷ φιλάσσοιτι αὐτὸν στρατιώτῃ. Ἐγένετο δὲ μετὰ ἡμέρας τρεῖς 17

z Supra 21. 33.
& 24. 12, 13, 14.
& 25. 8.

συγκαλέσασθαι τὸν Παῦλον τοὺς ὄντας τῶν Ἰουδαίων πρώτους· συνελ-
θόντων δὲ αὐτῶν, ἔλεγε πρὸς αὐτούς· Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, ἐγὼ οὐδὲν
ἐναντίον ποιήσας τῷ κυρῷ ἢ τοῖς ἔθουσι τοῖς πατριώταις, δέσμιος ἐξ Ἰερο-
σολύμων παρεδόθην εἰς τὰς χεῖρας τῶν Ῥωμαίων· ἅ οἵτινες ἀνακρίναν- 18
τές με ἐβούλοντο ἀπολῦσαι, διὰ τὸ μηδεμίαν αἰτίαν θανάτου ὑπέρχειν
ἐν ἐμοί. Ἐπιτελεσθέντων δὲ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ἠγαγῆσθαι ἐπικαλέσασθαι 19

a Supra 22. 24.
& 24. 10.
& 25. 8.
& 26. 31.

b Supra 25. 11.

Καίσαρα, οὐχ ὡς τοῦ ἔθνους μου ἔχων τι κατηγορησῆσαι. Καὶ ταύτην 20
οὖν τὴν αἰτίαν παρεκάλεισα ὑμᾶς ἰδεῖν καὶ προσλαλῆσαι· ἔνεκεν γάρ
τῆς ἐλπίδος τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ τὴν ἄλυσιν ταύτην περιέκειμαι. Οἱ δὲ πρὸς 21
αὐτὸν εἶπον· Ἡμεῖς οὔτε γράμματα περὶ σοῦ ἐδεξάμεθα ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰου-
δαίας, οὔτε παραγενόμενός τις τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἀπήγγειλεν ἢ ἐλάλησέ τι

Of this idiom examples are given by Wets. and Munthe. On the idiom in *δευτεραῖοι*, see Note at John xi. 39. They were now in the regular track of vessels from Alexandria to Rome, as Wolf infers from Suet. Vesp. C. 5.

14. *παρεκλήθημεν — ἐπτά* "we were entreated to stay seven days." It is probable that they had arrived there on the day after the Lord's day. Hence they were requested to stay the *next* Lord's day over, to give an opportunity to *all* the Christians of hearing Paul's preaching. See Note on Gal. i. 18.

15. *ἐκῆθεν — ἀκούσαντες* "having heard from thence," viz. from Puteoli, either by letter or by message. No doubt there was a constant communication between the two places.

— *εἰς ἀπάν. ἡμῶν ἄχρις Ἀ.* The distance (51 miles) marks the *profound respect* paid to Paul by the Roman Christians.

— *τριῶν ταβερνῶν.* These are supposed to have been *inns*, for the refreshment of travellers passing to and from Rome; but they were probably rather *retail shops* for the sale of all sorts of catables and drinkables. Thus Zosimus ii. 10. calls them the *τρία καταπέδια*; and indeed this was the usual sense of *taberna*, which word Donatus well derives from *Trabena*, such being at first *wooden houses for shops only*.

16. *παρῶκε, &c.* It was ordered by law that all those sent as prisoners to Rome should be delivered to the custody of the *Praefectus Praetorii*, and guarded in the Pretorian camp. Here Luke has expressed himself with extreme brevity; but his meaning seems to be this:—"The Centurion delivered his prisoners to the charge of the Prefect [by whom] it was permitted to Paul," &c. *καθ' ἑαυτὸν*, i. e. "apart from the other prisoners," who were confined in the *caeræ castrens*. A great favour this; for even those, to whom the *libera custodia*, or *φυλακῆ ἄδεσμος* was granted, were yet usually confined in a part of the public prison,

called the *δεσμοτήριον* *λευθέριον*. So in Philostr. V. A. vii. 22. *ἐκέλευσε τὸ λευθέριον οἰκῆν δεσμοτήριον.*

— *σὺν τῷ φυλ. α. σ.* And, as appears from v. 20., and according to the invariable custom of persons kept in such sort of durance, chained by the hand to the soldier. Nay, from Joseph. p. 314. 7. we find that even King Agrippa, when in confinement at Rome, was chained to a soldier.

17. *ποιήσας* "though I had done;" a somewhat unusual sense of the participle. Ἐναντίον must be *accommodatd* in sense to the two clauses to which it belongs, namely, "nothing injurious to the Jewish people, or at variance with the customs," &c.

19. *οὐχ ὡς — κατηγορησῆσαι.* Literally, "not as having aught to accuse my own nation of," i. e. not intending thereby to accuse.

20. *ἔνεκεν γάρ.* The *γάρ* refers to a clause omitted; q. d. [And I may justly claim to be free from all offence to my nation, nay, even to be *at-tach'd* to it] *for*, for the hope of Israel (i. e. the long expected Messiah), &c.

21, 22. The latter of these two verses shows that the former must, in interpretation, be qualified, and the sense contained in both may be thus expressed:—"We have neither received any letters from Judæa [containing any bad account of thee] nor have any of the brethren come here and related or spoken aught of evil concerning thee. But we wish to hear from thee what thou thinkest, or hast to say, concerning this Sect [viz. in its justification]; for it has come to our knowledge that it is everywhere spoken of." There is something obscure and indefinite in the wording, which may partly be ascribed to the delicacy of the speakers. They say they have heard no evil of him, because they did not regard his professing Christianity as involving any thing *πονηρόν*; such rather respecting *actions* than opinions. Ἀξιοῦμεν — *φρονεῖς* is a delicate way of asking what he has to say in *defence* of Christianity,

- 22 περὶ σοῦ πονηρόν. ^d Ἀξιούμεν δὲ παρὰ σοῦ ἀκούσαι ἃ φρονεῖς· περὶ ^d Supra 24. 5,
 μὲν γὰρ τῆς αἰρέσεως ταύτης γνωστόν ἐστὶν ἡμῖν ὅτι παταχοῦ ἀντιλί-
 23 γεται. ^e Ταξάμενοι δὲ αὐτῷ ἡμέραν, ἦκον πρὸς αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν ξηρίαν ^e Supra 26. 6.
 πλείονες· οἷς ἐξετίθετο διαμαρτυρούμενος τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ,
 πείθων τε αὐτοὺς τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ἀπὸ τε τοῦ νόμου Μωϋσέως καὶ
 24 τῶν προφητῶν, ἀπὸ πρῶτῃ ἕως ἔσπερας. ^f Καὶ οἱ μὲν ἐπέθοντο τοῖς ^f Supra 17. 4.
 25 λεγομένοις, οἱ δὲ ἠπίστον. Ἀσύμφωνοι δὲ ὄντες πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἀπε-
 λόντο, εἰπόντος τοῦ Παύλου ῥῆμα ἐν· Ὅτι καλῶς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον
 26 ἐλάλησε διὰ Ἰσαίου τοῦ προφήτου πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν, ^g λέγον· ^g Isa. 6. 9,
 Πορεύθητι πρὸς τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον καὶ εἰπέ· Ἀκοῦ ^g Ezek. 12. 2,
 ἀκούσετε, καὶ οὐ μὴ συνῆτε· καὶ βλέποντες βλέψετε, ^g Matt. 13. 14,
 27 καὶ οὐ μὴ ἴδητε. ἐπαχύνθη γὰρ ἡ καρδιά τοῦ λαοῦ ^g Mark 4. 12,
 τούτου, καὶ τοῖς ὡσὶ βαρέως ἤκουσαν, καὶ τοὺς ὀφ- ^g John 12. 40,
 θαλμοὺς αὐτῶν ἐκάμμυσαν· μήποτε ἴδωσι τοῖς ὀφ- ^g Rom. 11. 8.
 θαλμοῖς, καὶ τοῖς ὡσὶν ἀκούσωσι, καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ συν-
 28 ὧσι καὶ ἐπιστρέψωσι, καὶ ἰάσωμαι αὐτούς. ^h Γνωστὸν ^h Supra 13. 46,
 οὖν ἔστω ὑμῖν, ὅτι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἀπεστάλη τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ Θεοῦ. ^h & 18. 6,
 29 αὐτοὶ καὶ ἀκούονται. Καὶ ταῦτα αὐτοῦ εἰπόντος, ἀπῆλθον οἱ Ἰου- ^h Luke 24. 47.
 δαῖοι, πολλὴν ἔχοντες ἐν ἑαυτοῖς συζήτησιν.
 30 ἘΜΕΙΝΕ δὲ ὁ Παῦλος διετίαν ὅλην ἐν ἰδίῳ μισθώματι, καὶ ἀπε-
 31 δέχεται πάντας τοὺς εἰσπορευομένους πρὸς αὐτὸν, κηρύσσων τὴν βασι-
 λεῖαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ διδάσκων τὰ περὶ τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ
 πάσης παρόψιας, ἀκωλύτως.

which they probably understood to be alluded to in the words ἕνεκεν τῆς ἐλπίδος τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ.

23. ταξάμενοι, &c.] "having appointed," or as the sense rather seems to be, "having agreed with him for;" on which signification of the word, see my Note on Thucyd. i. 99. Ἐξετίθετο

διαμ., "he earnestly set forth." See xviii. 26. Πείθων αὐτοὺς τὰ περὶ, &c. Sub. κατά.

26, 27. See Note on Matt. xiii. 14, 15. With this I would compare Soph. Aj. 85. where Minerva says to Ulysses, ἐγὼ σκοτώσω βλέφαρα καὶ ὀφθαλμοὺς.