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COMMENTARY

ON

THE GOSPELS.

§ 12. THE CALLING OF ST MATTHEW. OF FASTING.

(Matt. ix. 9—17; Mark ii. 13—22; Luke v. 27—39.)

It is only incidentally that St Matthew touches upon his call to
the Apostleship, and without bringing prominently forward his
own person. How sacred soever might be to him the moment
which called him into immediate proximity to the Redeemer, his
spiritual eye remained, nevertheless, exclusively fixed upon the
sublime object which he wished to represent to his readers. He
alludes to his call, only for the sake of the events connected with
it. Both St Mark and St Luke give to him, who was called on
this occasion, the name of Levi; but the similarity of the nar-
native itself, together with the identity of the discourses connected
with it, compel us to regard the names, though different, as inten-
ted to denote one and the same individual. All the attempts which
have been made to represent them as denoting different persons,
have proved futile. 1

1 This keeping of their own persons in the background, on the part of the Evan-
gelists, is a peculiar feature of the Gospels; the Evangelists thereby show themselves
to be pure historians, altogether absorbed by the sublimity of their subject. Against
the authenticity of St Matthew, as little can be inferred from the circumstance of his
not making himself known, as against that of St John, for the same reason. The
position of this event appears, no doubt, to be unchronological; but, in the first place,
St Matthew does not pretend to any chronological order; and, in the second place, the
present call of St Matthew presupposes an earlier invitation on the part of Christ.

2 St Mark (ii. 14) calls Levi τὸν τοῦ Ἀλφαῖου. This Alpheus is, at all events, a
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Ver. 9. Matthew, John. The τελώνας = νήπιον, Ἐθνος, which, according to Buxtorf (Lex. Talmud. p. 1065), properly signifies "an exchange." The call ἀναλύει μου, as well as the διώκει ὑστερόν μου (iv. 19, comp. with ver. 22), implies, not only the outward following to which the Lord here invites him, but also the internal spiritual following, which is the real ground of the former. A previous acquaintance with St Matthew must be supposed, for otherwise the Redeemer could not have invited him to leave his official position; and without doubt, St Matthew had already taken the necessary steps to relieve himself from his office.

Ver. 10. St Matthew joyfully received into his house the Saviour who had called him to a nobler office; he prepared for him a δοξή μεγάλης = ἔργιον, Gen. xxvi. 30. This word is also met with in St Luke xiv. 13. (Concerning τελώνες and ἀμαρτωλός compare the remarks on Matt. v. 46). The Evangelist contrasts our Saviour, choosing a publican for an apostle, with the Pharisees who would not even permit any intercourse with those unfortunate beings, who were devoted to the world, but whose hearts, notwithstanding, were often filled with the noblest longings. Yet do these Pharisees not appear as though they had been wicked and malicious; they must be regarded rather as being incapable, from their narrow view, of comprehending the freeness of Christ's love. Our Lord, therefore, opens to them an insight into a much purer life than any of which they were aware.

Ver. 12, 13. Jesus describes, in a few words, his holy office as the Physician of mankind. The man who is exposed to contagion may do well in shunning the diseased person; but the physician hastens to him to relieve his suffering. Jesus represents himself as ἀράπας, i.e. physician of the soul according to Exod. xv. 26, where Jehovah himself says to wretched Israel: Μὴ ἀράπεσθε ἐν τῇ κόλασι. In the parallel passage in which Jesus speaks of His vocation (ἐκτεθα — to the more usual ἐκτεθα ἐκ τῶν κόσμων, signifies the appearing on earth of one belonging to a higher order of things), δικαιοῦ stands, as an exposition, by the side of ἀράπας, in the same manner as ἀμαρτωλός by the side of κακοῦς ἔφεστο. Without denying the universal sinfulness of mankind, we yet see that the sacred writers frequently draw a line of distinction between men. (Comp. different person from the father of James (Matt. x. 3); for the existence of any relationship between St James and St Matthew, cannot be rendered probable by any circumstance whatever.
the remarks on Luke xv. 7.) Sin, as it were, concentrates itself in some individuals. But these are often the very persons on whom the Redeemer, in His grace, first has compassion. The righteous (those who are according to the law less culpable) frequently act the part of the jealous brother on the calling home of the prodigal son. (Comp. the remarks on Luke xv.) The word ἔκλεψε expresses the act of the Redeemer in reference to the ἄμωμος; it signifies the gracious calling of our Lord to partake of His feast of joy. (Comp. on this word and its relation to ἔχλάζειν the remarks on Matt. xxii. 14.) St Luke adds ὅτι μυράνων, which, in St Matthew and St Mark, is an interpolation; the μυράνων (comp. the remarks on Matt. iii. 2) being viewed as the first step towards the kingdom of God. St Matthew, moreover, adds to this idea a reference to Hos. vi. 6. (The word πρέπειναι is redundant, according to the analogy of ἔχλάζειν.) In the words of the Old Testament seer, the dazzling brightness of the rising sun already clearly shines forth; the life manifested in self-denying love appears as outshining all sacrifices ἔκλεψε ἐτιμήτω ἐκκλησίαν. Hence, in these words the sacrifices do not appear to be abrogated, but on the contrary to be consummated, in the true sacrifice, of which all the others are only the types. The word ἐκκλησία signifies love, as it manifests itself to the unhappy, and hence it affords no satisfaction to him who exercises it, but is a pure self-sacrifice. Such an explanation of the γέμματα ἢμᾶς to the γέμματας was to them a powerful exhortation to μυράνων.

Ver. 14. Afterwards, the same Pharisees (according to St Luke), or some disciples of St John who happened to be present (according to St Matthew), or both together (as St Mark, reconciling the difference, says), bring forward another peculiarity of the disciples of Jesus, viz. their abstinence from fasting and stated prayer (Luke v. 33)—on which things even the Baptist himself, in conformity with his Old Testament tendency, laid great stress.

Ver. 15. The Redeemer, as one who always penetrated to the very depths of the spirit, immediately goes to the root of these outward peculiarities, and sets at once before them the internal difference between the Old and New Testament dispensations. In the first place, says Jesus, the peculiar nature of the kingdom of heaven does not rest on such external matters; even in His Church, life would hereafter exhibit itself in a way more analogous to the Old Testament. He therefore compares himself to a
bridegroom, and His disciples to the friends of the bridegroom (comp. the remarks on John iii. 29), and infers, from this comparison, what is necessary for the present purpose. As a marriage is the season for the most heartfelt joy, so also must be the Lord's appearance in the world; streams of light and life filled the hearts; eating and drinking, and full enjoyment, appear as the outward manifestation of inward joy. Sorrow, as indicated by fasting, could take place only at the death of the bridegroom; but then, indeed, so much the more bitter and acute. What is strange in this comparison is, in the first place, that the disciples are designated ὦ τῶ νυμφῶνος (= παρανύμφοι, i.e. companions of the bridegroom to the bridal-chamber; νυμφῶ = νυμφή), since they, together with all believers, are the bride herself. (Comp. Eph. v. 23.) There is, however, another admissible view of the disciples, according to which they appear as the first rays which the rising Sun of the spiritual world sent forth among mankind; they therefore introduced, as it were, the heavenly bridegroom to His earthly bride. In the second place, it is not quite clear how the words ἐγὼ ἀναστήσω are to be connected with the expression ἀναστήσωσαν, by which they are followed. If we regard it as signifying the death of the Redeemer on the cross, the meaning would then appear to be, that the Church would fast during the whole time of His absence, until His coming again in glory. But this idea does not appear very suitable, for this reason, that the resurrection of the Redeemer immediately dispelled the sorrow for His death;—and certainly the Saviour could not have intended to say that His disciples would fast only on the one day during which He remained in the grave. We must therefore look for a more spiritual meaning, which removes the difficulties, and lays hold of an eternal application of the words of our Lord. For His words are spirit and life (John vi. 63), and, as such, they must have a spiritual signification applicable to the Church at all times. What Christ here says, is applicable to His disciples in every age; sometimes they rejoice, sometimes they fast. It is evident that the question at issue is not so much respecting the bodily presence of our Redeemer (ἰδίας ἀληθείας), which, for Judas certainly, was not a time of nuptial joy, as His eternal spiritual presence in the soul (ἰδίας ψυχῆς). But this presence of our Redeemer is more glorious and efficacious after the resurrection than before it. If we apply the words of Jesus to this, we obtain the profound idea,
that even in believers there are internal vicissitudines,—vicissitudines of light and darkness (James i. 17), inasmuch as, at one time, there prevails a nuptial joy, and, at another, grief for the departed bridegroom; and that, accordingly, their outward life also assumes a different character. Yet the joyous disposition is viewed as predominating under the New Testament; whereas, under the Old Testament, it is the grave and serious frame of mind.

Ver. 16, 17. Since, however, there was something in the remarks of the Pharisees and the disciples of St John (ver. 14) which challenged a reply, the Lord finally declares, by means of two similes (Luke v. 36, uses, on this occasion, the expression παρουσίατικα, which is here applicable only in its wider sense; comp. on this the remarks on Matt. xiii.), that the two dispensations do not admit of being confounded. The new spirit requires a new form; and even though, in the New Testament life, we may meet with forms nearly related to the Old Testament state of things, yet they are different from the phenomena of a life purely under the law. Both these similes certainly express the same idea, but they differ in the point of view from which they are conceived; and the difference between these points of view explains the difference which exists between the similes themselves.¹

In the former, that which is new is considered as merely incidental, remedying old evils and necessities—for in this light the Gospel must have appeared to the Pharisees from their own limited point of view. In the latter simile, on the contrary, that which is new appears as essential, while that which is old is re-

¹ *Neander*, in his *Kl. Gelegenheitschr.* S. 144, explains these similes in such a manner, that he does not admit them to have a reference to the relation between the Old and New Testament, but refers them to the disciples of John, who appear as the interrogators; so that Christ explained to them the cause of their astonishment at the difference between their own way of living and that of Christ’s disciples. For this difference is founded on the circumstance that they, namely, the disciples of John, were still moving in the sphere of obsolete Judaism, and hence could not comprehend the spirit of his new doctrine. For this reason, it would be of no use if He were to invite them to adopt the new manner of life of His own disciples. The old garment of the old nature cannot well be mended with a single patch of new cloth; wherever regeneration has not taken place, a reform in detail will not be durable. Although this view contains much that is commendable, yet I prefer that explanation according to which the contrast between the Old and New Testament is sustained; the whole connection imperatively demands this. The difference between the similes is sufficiently explained by the remarks on the different points of view from which they are taken, and which is equally well adapted for assisting in the solution of other difficulties to be met with in the parables of the evangelical history. (Comp. the remarks on Luke xiii. 1, seq.)
garded as merely formal—thus, according to the truth, was the real relation of the two. By the combination of the two similes, our merciful Lord, graciously condescending to human weakness, satisfied the wants of all. The Pharisees themselves could not but perceive that they were unable to screen the imperfections of their dispensation (i.e. of the Old Testament) by the superinduction of the evangelical element; that could have as little a beneficial effect, as an unmoistened piece of new cloth could have, if put on an old cloak. ('Επίσκηπτημα is found only in this passage; according to Suidas, it is τὸ τῷ σκοτίῳ ἐπισκλήματος. The patch of cloth being viewed as filling up a rent, is called πλήρωμα. 'Ράπας, from ράπας, signifies a "piece torn off"—a rag, or patch; ἀγγαφος, "not yet fullfed or dressed.") St Luke, v. 36, views the simile in a different light. He conceives a piece torn off from a new garment, and applied to the mending of an old one. This produces a double disadvantage. For, in the first place, damage is done to the new garment, and in the second, the new piece does not agree with the old garment. This mode of viewing the simile is evidently founded on the attempt to render these two similes more homogeneous; for, according to the view of St Luke, the New Testament, as the new cloak, would be contrasted with the Old Testament; but for this very reason, the representation of St Matthew and St Mark is to be preferred; the account of St Luke appears to be somewhat modified. (The reading ἀπὸ ἰματίου κανοῦ σχίσας in the text of St Luke is no doubt genuine; it was perhaps omitted only in order to assimilate the narrative of St Luke to the description given by the other two Evangelists). In the second simile, the relation subsisting between substance and form, as viewed from the New Testament standing-point, is brought prominently forward; by means of its innate creative power, the substance must produce a form analogous to its own character; wheresoever human self-will should attempt to shut up the spirit into the old form, the immediate result will be the breaking of the form, but, at the same time, the substance also will not be able to manifest itself in a regular way; its innate power will indeed shew itself, but only in irregular phenomena, which are by no means advantageous to the whole. The simile is as simple and intelligible as it is wonderfully profound and full of fine meaning. It is specially the comparison of the principle of evangelical life with the finest natural production which suggests many ideas. (The ἀεικι, ut ro,
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according to eastern custom, skins smeared with pitch on the inside, were used for the preservation of wines; this kind of vessels was very convenient for transportation on asses and camels. St Luke adds, in the 39th verse, another very characteristic feature which relates to the Pharisees. The gracious Saviour himself finds an apology for hearts shut up through the practice of the old statutes and habits, and does not see anything unreasonable in their having some difficulty in getting out of the sphere of their old religious customs, and in venturing into a new and heaving element of life. The Old, although in itself more rigid (as is the Old Testament compared with the New), becomes more pleasant through the influence of habit; at first (ὁδῷας), we do not relish it. At the same time, however, this very expression gently invites us to enter into the new spiritual life which the Redeemer brought to mankind.

§ 13. HEALING OF THE WOMAN WITH THE ISSUE OF BLOOD. RAISING FROM DEATH THE DAUGHTER OF JAIRUS.

(Matt. ix. 18—26; Mark v. 22—43; Luke viii. 40—55.)

After having recorded these conversations which took place at the feast given in his own house, St Matthew proceeds to set forth Jesus as a worker of miracles. Storr (Evang. Gesch. des Joh. S. 303) is no doubt right in saying that St Matthew has here brought together all that occurred in his own house, and before his own eyes. With regard to the chronology, therefore, we must here unhesitatingly follow St Matthew, inasmuch as the other two Evangelists, in vague formulas, go on to the report of other events. (Comp. Mark ii. 23; Luke ii. 1.) But it must appear so much the more strange that St Matthew should describe, in a manner so little graphic, the very events which occurred immediately after his calling, and in his own immediate presence; whereas both St Mark and St Luke present the occurrence in a form so striking and picturesque. It is true that the features which they add to the narrative are, as usual, to some extent, unessential; for instance, the name of the ruler, the age of the damsel, the circumstance of the woman suffering from the issue of blood having sought aid from physicians. But there are other
traits more essential to the narrative, as, for instance, the sending of messengers to inform Jairus of the death of his child, and the notice that Jesus perceived that virtue had gone out from Him. We can, therefore, even here, not mistake the fact that St Matthew writes without precision, and apparently not as an eyewitness; the question only is, whether this fact entitles us to infer that St Matthew is not the author of the gospel. All that can with safety be drawn from this circumstance, is a want of clearness and liveliness in his narrative, and a limited power of comprehension as regards extraneous circumstances. But all this may very well consort with the character of an apostle, for whom, not ingenuity, but spirituality of mind is requisite. St Matthew, moreover, did not lay himself out specially to notice extraneous circumstances, as is the case with St Mark. But in both the narratives which this section gives, our Redeemer again presents himself to our view as a messenger from heaven, such as mankind, in their most secret longings, sigh for as their ideal. With the holiest and purest intentions of love, He combines a fulness of the power of divine life which was poured out in a life-giving stream over this poor world through which He passed. Raised above all miseries and necessities, He does not withdraw from them, but, on the contrary, He lovingly descends into the depths of wretchedness, swallows up for ever death and misery, and wipes away the tears from the faces of the poor. (Isaiah xxv. 8.) Such a Saviour the Prophets had prayed for with ardent desire, and, with confident hope, had promised at the command of the Spirit;—and in the New Testament we see Him rule thus, God and man at the same time—incomparable, and attracting to Himself, with magic power, all hearts susceptible of noble impressions. He is truly the Saviour of His body—the Church! (Eph. v. 23.) St Matthew, ix. 18, brings what follows into direct connexion with what precedes by the words τάντα αὑτῷ λαλούστος αὑτῷ. ("Αγγείῳ is here = ἄγγειον τῆς συναγωγῆς [Luke viii. 41], or ἀγγειονάγωνος [Mark v. 22], i.e. the ruler of the synagogue who presided over the meetings, ἀγγείον vic,—Instead of ἀγγείων, no doubt ἀγγείον must be read, as St Matthew frequently uses ἀγγείον for ἀγγέλον [viii. 19 ; xvi. 14 ; xviii. 28 ; xix. 16], according to the analogy of the Hebrew term וְ and the Aram. term וְ.—The name וַתְּנֵר is וַתְּנָר, Numb. xxxii. 41; Deut. iii. 14.) According to St Matthew, Jairus, at the very outset, declares the damsel to be already dead;
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while, according to St Luke and St Mark, this announcement is made by messengers, only at a later period. But, just because St Matthew wished to omit this particular circumstance, he was obliged completely to bring forward this event; the child was dying when her father hastened to Jesus to seek for aid. Others think that experiments were still being made for the purpose of reviving her; in which case, the message of the servants would refer to the futility of these attempts. St Luke, viii. 42, observes incidentally, that the child was twelve years of age, and the only daughter of the ruler. (Μονογενής is to be understood as in Luke vii. 12.)

Ver. 19. The disciples went with our Lord, who obeyed the call of the agonized father; and both St Mark and St Luke depict the scene, by stating that a crowd of people followed and thronged Jesus (Mark v. 24, συνίδλησον; Luke viii. 42, συνίστημησον.) Rudeness, curiosity, and kind-heartedness, were mixed together in the motley crowd; Jesus bore with them all.

Ver. 20. There now pressed forward a woman diseased with an issue of blood; she had suffered for twelve years, had employed physicians and human aid, but all in vain; her disease had even rendered her poor. (The term δακτυλία of St Mark is ἄρσενιλακτική of St Luke, and signifies “to expend,” with the accessory notion of “spending in vain.” Βίος [Luke viii. 43] = opes, facultates, as in Luke xv. 12, 30; xxi. 4.) She appears as one utterly destitute of comfort, and of hope from human aid, in the extremity of her distress. The faith of the woman was great, but yet she imagined that, at all events, she required a healing touch in order to be cured; she came behind Jesus that she might touch the hem of His garment. Unlike that centurion so strong in the faith (Matt. viii. 8), she did not know that the power of Jesus was efficacious even afar off. False modesty also may, no doubt, have prevented the sufferer from disclosing herself to Jesus; she hoped to obtain aid though she were only to touch His garment. It is evident that she entertained the idea of a sacred atmosphere encircling the heavenly visitant, into which she must strive to enter. The garment she considered to be the conductor of the power. (Comp. Matt. xiv. 26.) It is not likely that the notions of the woman were free from a materialistic view of the miraculous power of Jesus; but, happily, she was to be cured, not by the imaginations of her head, but by the faith of her heart; and this was ardent, and well pleasing to the Lord. (Κεφάλαιον = כֵּפָלָי, Numb. xv. 38 ;
Deut. xxii. 12. (Comp. the remarks on Matt. xxiii. 5.) St Mark and St Luke alone describe more explicitly the effect produced by this touch of the believing woman, and that which was consequent upon it. St Mark, v. 29, makes use of the significant expression ἐζητάνη ἣ συνή τοῦ αίματος, to signify a radical cure of the deep-rooted disease; and adds, ἵνα τῷ σώματι, to show that she experienced a peculiar bodily sensation which gave her the conviction that the malady was removed. (Μάκαρις δὲ τῷ Θεῷ; comp. 2 Maccab. ix. 11. Every disease is, rightly understood, the consequence of sin, and hence, also, a punishment of God, which is intended to lead to a knowledge of sin. Comp. the commentary on Matt. ix. 2.) But with this, both the Evangelists connect an account of the conduct of Jesus towards the healed woman, which is altogether peculiar. St Mark, v. 30, observes that Jesus had perceived that virtue had gone out of Him; St Luke, viii. 46, adds an explanation that Jesus himself uttered the words, ἵναν δύναμιν ἔζηκος τὸ σῶμα. The disciples, in their want of spiritual discernment, imagined that the question of Jesus was occasioned by the pressure of the people, and wondered at the conduct of Christ, but He looked around Him with a searching eye (σπειρομένως, Mark v. 32), and the woman, feeling that she was discovered, approached and confessed, ἵνα αἰτήσῃ ἡ ἀφεῖ ἀμώτης, and did so ἵνα τοῦ λαοῦ, as St Luke, ver. 47, very significantly adds. What first strikes us in this description is, that Jesus makes use of the expression δύναμις ἔζηκας τὸ σῶμα. In consequence of this, the notion imperceptibly begins to arise, that the virtue has operated by a process involuntary on the part of Christ—a notion by which the whole action would be rendered unsuitable. The words in themselves, however, evidently do not imply that the virtue emanated from Christ involuntarily; but we can have as little hesitation in admitting that virtue really proceeded from Christ, as in admitting the doctrine of the Church, that the Spirit proceedeth from the Father and the Son, and is poured out into the hearts of believers. The fulness of spiritual life which our Redeemer had in himself, manifested itself, as it is the nature of the Spirit to do, in its creative and curative character; and that is what is expressed in the words δύναμις ἔζηκας, as the radiance of fire beams forth light and warmth.¹

¹ Hence it is that passages like Matt. xiv. 36; Mark iii. 10, vi. 56; Luke vi. 19, in which we are told that many people supplicated Jesus to be permitted to touch His
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On the other hand, this significant mode of expression forms a powerful contrast to that empty view, according to which Jesus is said to have cured and operated without the pouring forth of virtue. But the view that the efficacious working of Christ took place, in this case, involuntarily, seems to be favoured by the question, "Who has touched me?" when connected with the passage, "I felt that virtue went out of me." If Christ, indeed, did not know that, and when He was curing, the whole transaction appears to be magical and unworthy of the Lord. Each of His cures must be considered as an action of which He was conscious, and which stood in close connexion with the person to be healed, and with his moral condition. Meanwhile, even this feature will become apparent in the case before us, if we look to the following considerations:—It was just her moral cure which induced our Lord to draw her from her concealment into the light, for He had recognized her timid faith, and did not wish that she should be put to shame. Without addressing her, He compels her to come forward spontaneously, and to overcome the false modesty which had prevented her from coming freely and openly before our Lord, and laying her necessitous case before Him. In her secret approach to the Lord for the purpose of touching His garment, faith was, without doubt, manifest; yet in this, her mode of proceeding was not altogether pure and single-minded; fear of man, and false timidity, were at the foundation of it, and these had, as yet, to be overcome. Now, it would have been too hard to have required her, before her cure, to speak openly in presence of the people. Our gracious Lord, therefore, softened the difficulty by making this demand subsequent to the cure, and this helped her along the narrow way. But He could not altogether free her from this, as it was subservient to her spiritual birth, and to the new life. We thus gain the moral standing-point, and perceive in Christ everything well considered and ordered for man's temporal and eternal welfare, according to the measure of His infinite love. Only one question more may be asked, viz. whether it was not substantially an untruth to ask, ἐκ ξηματίσ μου; if He knew that it was she. But if we consider that Christ only wished to bring her to a confession, and that the conceal-
ment of the conviction cannot here be in question, no one can find in this a stumbling-block, any more than we could in the case of a father who should put to the entire number of his children the question,—Who has done this? well knowing the guilty one, but yet desirous of obtaining the free confession of his guilt. ¹

Ver. 22. After this victory of the woman over her old nature, it was now time to comfort her, and to foster the faith which had at first manifested itself but timidly. In the process of healing, the δύναμις of Christ appears as causa efficiens, and the πίστις of the woman as the conditio sine qua non; both combined to complete the work. Our Lord gave her peace not in words only, but in its substantial spiritual effects.

St Mark and St Luke continue to report what turn the events took whilst Jesus was going to the house of Jairus. There came messengers (ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀρχιμαγῶνος ἡκ. δοῦλοι) announcing the death of the child (compare the remarks above on Matt. ix. 18), and requesting that Jesus might not be farther troubled. The Redeemer comforts the trembling father, wavering in his faith, and arrives at length at the house. Both the narrators here mention, by way of anticipation, that Christ took in with Him only certain persons. St Matthew, with greater care, mentions it once more in its proper place, in the 40th verse.

Ver. 23. According to the custom of the Jews, who rapidly hastened on their funerals, Jesus already found funeral music (ἀναλαγή), and howling (St Mark has ἀλλαξαν χρήσις), and wailing (πτετισθαν, pectus plangere = lugere) people before the house. The Redeemer interrupted their noise with the words, ως ἀφίνει τὸ κράσιον, without giving heed to their mocking. This declaration of Christ is so simple and plain, that no one ought even to have tampered with it.²

¹ According to Euseb. H. E. viii. 18, there was set up in Cesarea Pancras, cast in bronze, the statue of Christ, with the woman suffering from the issue of blood, in the act of touching His garment. We have no reason to doubt the veracity of this narrative, inasmuch as the fact is, in itself, anything but improbable.

² Strauss and De Wette are of opinion that the Evangelists see, in this narrative, a raising from the dead; but they are so only, in order that they may have some ground for declaring it to be mythical. I cannot agree with Schleiermacher, who likewise sees in it a raising from the dead, because Christ openly declares, "she is not dead." If we assume a raising from the dead, the words ως ἀφίνει would contain an untruth; for although Christ awakened her, yet, on such an assumption, she must have been dead.
The miracles of our Lord need no adjuncts from human hands; the very absence of ostentation adds to their grandeur. The addition, ἀλλὰ καθώς does not permit us to understand the first expression, as if it meant "she is not dead, because I have the intention of raising her, or, inasmuch as what I intend to do must be regarded as already accomplished." The contrast, εἰς ἀπίθανον ἀλλὰ καθώς, which all the three Evangelists repeat verbatim, does not admit of any prevarication. We have here, consequently, no raising from the dead in the true sense of the words. It is likely that the child was in a deep trance; but viewed even in this light, the act performed by our Lord is not less significant. He presents himself, in such a plain declaration, in the purest moral grandeur. The real moment of death, which man can never ascertain, is perfectly known to Jesus; and of this He declares that it has not yet arrived; but the very circumstance that He knew this—that He knew it before He came—that He knew how to fix the time and circumstances—all these constitute the miraculous part of this act. What was unknown to all of them (Luke viii. 53 has the words σώθεσιν ἤτοι ἀπίθανον, because they had tried every means to restore her) He knew, without having even seen the child; and He openly declared what He knew, and produced thereby life and faith. His miracle was not diminished, by this open declaration, in the eyes

In John xi. 14, it is said of Lazarus, κατείχα, which might well be used, in consideration of the ambiguity of the word; but Christ could not have said of him, εἰς ἀπίθανον. It is, therefore, only the passage in St Matt. xi. 5, where, along with other miracles of Christ, it is said, οὐκ ἐγείρομαι, which affords some semblance of support to the opinion in question. This seems to imply, that St Matthew had related some instances of raising from the dead; but, excepting this passage, his gospel contains no narrative of this kind. But we are by no means entitled to suppose any intention of such a kind in St Matthew; the passage, xi. 5, bears altogether a general character, and may quite well contain χειλετικό περιπτάσεω, although no narrative of that kind had been given; just as the cures of the demoniacs are omitted, although St Matthew had reported such. The use of the plural, οὐκ ἐγείρομαι, might then as well entitle us to infer that St Matthew must have reported several cases of raising from the dead. In such passages the Evangelists were sure that their readers would make the necessary additions from tradition. But although the event is not a raising from the dead, it nevertheless remains a miraculous act. For a miracle is implied in the healing of the child of the deadly disease which had thrown her into a death-like sleep.

1 Physicians distinguish syncope from asphyxia; by the latter they understand the suspension of all the vital functions; and it is this which must here be supposed. The history of Eutychus (Acts xx. 7, seqq.) is quite similar to this. Of the youth mentioned St Paul says, ὅπως αὐτῷ ἐν αἰσθήμαта, which words explain the expressions ἰναιερέφις σῷ σφιμα in our narrative (Luke viii. 55.)
of those present, but was, on the contrary, rendered great and glorious. (Mark v. 42; Luke xiii. 56.) Having here again in view the moral impression, Jesus collected from among the rude mass (who are as prone to mockery as to stupid amazement) a small number of susceptible souls; to them He permitted the undisturbed enjoyment of beholding the returning life of the damsel, in all its manifestations, in order that thereby they might be excited to solemn and sacred thankfulness to God. This impression, however, our Lord commanded them to conceal in the depths of their souls, lest, by their busy talkativeness, they should immediately destroy again the slight spark of life which was but just enkindled. (Mark v. 43; Luke viii. 56. Comp. also the remarks on Matt. viii. 4.) St Mark, with still greater care, reports what happened in presence of the parents, and of St Peter, St John, and St James. (Concerning the presence, on many occasions, of these three apostles only, compare the remarks on Matt. x. 2.) Jesus seized the hand of the damsel and called, בָּשָׂר בָּשָׂר. (The substantive is the Syriac form of בָּשָׂר, which properly signifies "lamb," but is frequently used of children also.) It may be best to consider here the call of Christ, His life-giving word, as the means of resuscitation. Not the slightest mention is made of the application of any other means, and there is no reason for supposing that such were used, though it is not absolutely impossible that such should have been employed, inasmuch as Jesus, upon other occasions, makes use of such means. (Comp. the remarks on Mark vii. 33.) But just because every thing is recorded in a plain and straight-forward manner, and in its proper place, it is as natural to suppose that, where no such thing is spoken of, it did not take place. Christ and the apostles, who were free from all charlatanry, represent the most wonderful occurrences in the plainest and simplest manner; and as our Lord, after having fed thousands with a few loaves, yet, in strict accordance with human nature, gives orders to gather carefully the fragments that remained; so also He, who himself is the life, and who hereafter shall awaken all the dead by His voice (John v. 25), orders that the little child, whom He had awakened from her trance, and whom He declares not to have been dead, should be supplied with food. (Mark v. 43; Luke viii. 55.) He thus permits every thing to go on in a natural and simple way, and manifests thereby a truth of the inner life which forms, in a peculiar manner, the true foil to his great actions.
§ 14. HEALING OF TWO BLIND MEN AND OF A DUMB MAN.

(Matt. ix. 27—34.)

St Matthew alone relates that, during the time which Jesus spent in his house, He healed therein two blind men, and a dumb man. The words, ἀυτῶν δὲ ἰκανομίαν ἴδού κ.τ.λ. (ver. 32), connect immediately the healing of the dumb man with that of the blind men. The similar narrative in St Matthew, xi. 22, seq., must therefore be regarded as a different event. The accusation of the Pharisees, ἵνα δέχοντι τῶν δαιμονίων ἵξελλε τὰ δαιμόνια, will, when that passage is under consideration, be subjected to more special inquiry. As these two narratives of the cures here effected offer no difficulty which may not be solved by means of the remarks previously made, one circumstance only need be mentioned, viz. that the κωφός δαιμονιζόμενος, verse 32, must be distinguished from a dumb man suffering from organic imperfection. The former is dumb in consequence of demoniacal influence. This, no doubt, must have assumed the form of a kind of mania, which must not, however, be viewed as imaginary, but as the consequence of the agency of hostile powers. Their being overcome by the light-giving power of the Redeemer, restores in the sufferer the right psychical and physical relations. This scriptural mode of viewing things which ascribes real effects to real causes, and which, specially, never admits of psychical phenomena without any spiritual or demoniacal influence, appears as simple as it is profound.

§ 15. THE SENDING FORTH OF THE APOSTLES.

(St Matthew ix. 35 ; x. 42. St Mark vi. 7—11. St Luke ix. 1—5.)

After having represented Jesus in chapters viii. ix. as a worker of miracles, St Matthew gives, in chap. x. a series of our Lord's discourses, put together in the same manner as those which make up the Sermon on the Mount. He opens it up by a transition, expressed in general terms, such as we have already met with in St Matthew iv. 23, et seq. He remarks that Jesus went about teaching and healing. We cannot perceive in this passage a limita-
tion to Galilee. The words of St Matthew are, on the contrary, so general, that it is clear that he did not at all intend to fix the localities. But then the Evangelist sets forth how the immediate perception of the condition of the people, which our Redeemer obtained in His wanderings, excited in Him the most heartfelt compassion for the miserable situation of the people of God; and it was just this which formed the motive for His sending forth of the disciples. (Concerning σπαγγυνομαι, compare the remarks on Luke i. 78. Its real and primary meaning is maternal compassion for the helpless child. Instead of the more common word ἰκνηλαμίον—ἰκνάσαν, used of the failing and exhaustion of all strength, Gal. vi. 9, Heb. xii. 3, the less frequently used expression ἰκνυλαμόν should, no doubt, be received in the text, as is done by Griesbach: “Worn out by the cares of life, and scattered [ἰδομένων] by wolves like sheep without a shepherd.” Concerning this figure, compare the remarks on John x. 3, et seq.) The general idea connected with this, ὁ μὲν Ἑρῴμενος πολὺς x. ῥ. λ., stands in St Luke, x. 2, in a more close and definite connexion, as spoken on the occasion of the sending forth of the seventy disciples; for which reason we refer to our remarks on that passage. St Matthew introduces it here, only because it indicates the disposition which filled the soul of Jesus; from this proceeded the sending forth of the twelve apostles, which stands in immediate connexion with it. The thought indicates both the character of the time and of the people, as well as their preparation for the reception of the divine doctrines; and, in addition, the need of such teachers, who should be able to supply their true wants in an effectual manner.

It is evident that the body of the twelve apostles is here assumed as already existing; of its formation the Evangelist reports as little as of the calling of the individuals singly, if we except the fragmentary notices in chap. iv. 18, et seq. St Mark and St Luke appear here likewise more accurate in their statements. They connect with the list of the apostles, the remark that Christ had expressly chosen and installed them as a body. (St Mark says, iii. 14, καὶ ἔστησεν δώδεκα, ἵνα ὦσι μετ' αὐτῶν. St Luke (vi. 13) is yet more definite, προεσήλθε τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτῶν, καὶ ἤκληκτος ἀνὴρ αὐτῶν δώδεκα, οὗς καὶ ἄκτιστος ὡνόμασεν.) Ἀρ-

4 The term ἀνώτερος appears here as a real official title of the twelve. (Concerning
Gospel of St Matthew IX. 35.

According to the narrative of St Luke only, the significance of the installation of the apostles is rendered very prominent. He remarks, chap vi. 12, ἐξῆλθεν (ἐν ἑαυτῷ) εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν προσεύχεσθαι, καὶ ἦν διανυκτείρων ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ. It would appear then that our Redeemer prepared himself by a night spent in prayer, and in the morning installed the twelve apostles. If we consider that, in the election of this body of men, in whose hearts the first germs of truth were to be deposited, everything depended upon a careful selection of persons, we shall then be prepared to form an idea of that momentous transaction. It was a moment in which the foundation-stone of the church was laid. The twelve apostles, as the representatives of spiritual Israel, were together to form, by themselves, a complete unity; it was therefore necessary that they should mutually supplement each other in their dispositions, and carry within themselves the germ of all the various tendencies which afterwards manifested themselves in the Church in grand phenomena. It is only as the discerner of all hearts (John ii. 25) that the Lord was enabled to establish such a band of closely united minds, who were to stand as the representatives of the whole spiritual creation which was to be called into existence. In himself, everything was united in a holy unity; but, as the ray divides itself into its colours, so that one light which beamed forth from Christ fell, in variously modified splendour, into the hearts of His twelve apostles. Thus alone was it possible, that, through this medium, not only a few men, but all, according to their wants and dispositions, might be equally filled with the Gospel. A striking feature in the election of these twelve apostles is, that Judas Iscariot who betrayed the Lord was admitted into this narrow circle. But faith perceives even in this a miraculous, gracious dispensation of our Lord. Evil is everywhere entwined and mixed up with the good, in order that it may be overcome by the redeeming power of Christ. As in paradise there was a serpent, and in the ark a Ham was saved, so it was necessary that there

the relation of this term to similar expressions, compare the comment. on 1 Cor. xii. 28.)

1 This is figuratively represented in Rev. xxi. 14. The twelve apostles, as distinct from St Paul, seem likewise to have had a special reference to Israel after the flesh. (Compare the remarks on Matt. x. 5, 6, and the Introduction to the Epistles of St Paul.)

2 For farther remarks on Judas Iscariot compare the comment. on Matt. xxvi. 24, and John xiii. 27.
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should be a Judas among the twelve apostles, if their circle was truly to represent Israel. Not as if he had been predestinated to evil—Scripture knows nothing of a reprobatio impiorum (compare the remarks on Rom. ix.)—but in order to give him occasion for overcoming, by the help of the Lord, the evil which was in him. It is true that the unhappy man was to become the instrument of our Lord's betrayal, because he did not avail himself of the opportunity; but it was by no means his destiny. The God of mercy only ordains everywhere, in this temporary system of the world, the intermixture of good and evil, in order that the latter might be overcome by the former; or, if it will not allow itself to be overcome, to consummate the good by contrast with the evil. For although Judas brings our Lord to the cross, yet by this very act he must assist in founding an everlasting redemption.

Of the first sending forth of the twelve apostles, which happened under the eye of the Lord himself, both St Mark (vi. 7–11) and St Luke (ix. 1–6) give an account, but without communicating so detailed an instruction as does St Matthew in chap. x. There is no doubt that, in this discourse in chap. x., St Matthew has brought together various elements. St Luke narrates in chap. x. the sending forth of the seventy disciples, on which subject St Matthew is silent, and communicates, on this occasion, a discourse of Jesus addressed to them. This discourse, and chap. xi. of St Luke, wherein Christ gives special admonitions to His disciples, contain many elements of the instructions for the apostles, communicated by St Matthew in chap. x. It is true that there is nothing contained therein unsuitable for the occasion; so that, in this respect, we might unhesitatingly assume that Jesus had spoken the words in this manner; yet this is not probable, because St Luke gives the passages in greater harmony with the context; while the connexion between the various thoughts in the discourse, as given by St Matthew, is often very loose. The simplest method might be to assume that St Matthew intended to put together, in this chapter, the principles which Jesus impressed upon His apostles, at different times, concerning their relation to the world. This becomes the more probable,

1 The hypothesis raised by Dr Paulus (in his Commentary, vol. ii. p. 34), that St Luke and St Mark are narrating a subsequent mission of the twelve apostles, has originated only from the attempt to bring the separate evangelical narratives into a close connexion in point of time; but it is altogether void of internal probability.
because many expressions occurring in the instruction (comp. specially the remarks on Matt. x. 23) went beyond the knowledge which the apostles had at the time when they were sent forth. The special reference of the instruction to the impending mission of the twelve has assumed, in the hands of the Evangelist, a general character; so that in this discourse of Jesus to His disciples, we have received an instruction for them and for their whole apostolic work, yea, for all missionaries of all times. How far this may have been the intention of St Matthew, I leave undecided; but the Spirit, who spoke through him, has given that rich fulness to his representation.

Ver. 1. Jesus, on sending out the twelve apostles by two and two (Mark vi. 7), for their mutual assistance, gives to them, in the first place, a seal of their official authority, viz. the power of healing (ἐξοδαία). It is obvious that the communication of such power of healing could only be by a communication of the power of the Spirit. Hence we find in this passage the first trace of a communication of the Spirit of Jesus to His disciples, which is increased in John xx. 22, and consummated on the day of Pentecost. From this also flows the relation in which the miraculous cures of the apostles stood to their other ministrations. The outward work of healing was the most subordinate and the first; their purely spiritual activity in preaching the word they were able to begin only after the day of Pentecost. In like manner, the Saviour also began by healing the body; but, afterward, He exercised His redeeming power by healing the soul also. It is therefore no great loss which the Church sustained, if, at a subsequent period, the gift of healing departed from her; that which is of far higher importance, for the redemption of souls, the Word, remained with her. A remarkable instance of such communication of the Spirit to others is found in Numb. xi. 17 et seq., where it is related how Moses laid upon the seventy elders of Israel the Spirit which rested upon himself. This is by no means a view of the Spirit bordering on materialism, but is, on the contrary, a representation of Him in His essential nature. As God is love, and, as being love, it is His nature to communicate himself; so it is also the nature of the Spirit, as a divine substance, to communicate himself unceasingly, creating life, and, as a stream,

1 Compare on this point my "Festprogramm über die Aechtheit des Mat.," Arch. ii. 8. 17.
strengthening and refreshing the heart. A Spirit who could not communicate himself would be no spirit, or not a divine spirit. Now Christ, as the image of the invisible Father, continually pours out a fulness of living Spirit, but communicates to every one according to his wants and abilities. As Jesus had purposely not chosen any noble or learned disciples, but those who were poor and despised in the eyes of the world (1 Cor. i. 27), they stood in so much the greater need of a divine power to guide them in the discharge of their functions. This power, however, was to act, pure and unruffled, through them, as pure organs; and the less that their minds had been formed by human influences, the more they were fitted to become such instruments of the Spirit.

Ver. 2. Here follows the list of the apostles, which, for the convenience of the reader, we present, together with the other lists of the same (as given in Mark iii. 13 et seq.; Luke vi. 12 et seq.; and Acts i. 13 et seq.), in the form of a comparative table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST MATTH.</th>
<th>ST MARK.</th>
<th>ST LUKE.</th>
<th>ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Σίμων.</td>
<td>1 Πέτρος.</td>
<td>1 Σίμων.</td>
<td>1 Πέτρος.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Ανδρέας.</td>
<td>2 Ιάκωβος.</td>
<td>2 Ανδρέας.</td>
<td>2 Ιάκωβος.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Ιάκωβος.</td>
<td>3 Ιωάννης.</td>
<td>3 Ιάκωβος.</td>
<td>3 Ιωάννης.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Ιωάννης.</td>
<td>4 Ανδρέας.</td>
<td>4 Ιωάννης.</td>
<td>4 Ανδρέας.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Φιλίττος.</td>
<td>5 Φιλίττος.</td>
<td>5 Φιλίττος.</td>
<td>5 Φιλίττος.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Βασίλειος.</td>
<td>6 Βασίλειος.</td>
<td>6 Βασίλειος.</td>
<td>6 Βασίλειος.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Θωμᾶς.</td>
<td>7 Θωμᾶς.</td>
<td>7 Θωμᾶς.</td>
<td>7 Θωμᾶς.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Ματθαῖος.</td>
<td>8 Ματθαῖος.</td>
<td>8 Ματθαῖος.</td>
<td>8 Ματθαῖος.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Ιάκωβος Αλφα.</td>
<td>9 Ιάκωβος Αλφα.</td>
<td>9 Ιάκωβος Αλφα.</td>
<td>9 Ιάκωβος Αλφα.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Διδάσκαλος.</td>
<td>10 Διδάσκαλος.</td>
<td>10 Διδάσκαλος.</td>
<td>10 Διδάσκαλος.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Αμών Χαρ.</td>
<td>11 Αμών Χαρ.</td>
<td>11 Αμών Χαρ.</td>
<td>11 Αμών Χαρ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Ιουδας Ιωσ.</td>
<td>12 Ιουδας Ιωσ.</td>
<td>12 Ιουδας Ιωσ.</td>
<td>12 Ιουδας Ιωσ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The arrangement observed in these four lists, according to three classes, is so similar, that it cannot be supposed to have had an ac-
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cidental origin; and yet the various statements so differ from each other, that we are prevented from referring them to one written source. Hence it is most natural to suppose that each Evangelist arranged them according to their importance, as that had been acknowledged by the universal consent of the Church. Those who were less known and efficient had the last place assigned to them; those who were best known had the first. Slight modifications, of course, took place in this arrangement—for instance, St Matthew and St Luke place together the apostles who were brothers, in consequence of which St Andrew stands before St James and St John; on the other hand, in St Mark, and in the Acts of the Apostles, the three principal apostles are placed foremost, St Peter being at the head. Among those who were nearly equal in point of importance, as St Philip, St Bartholomew, St Thomas, and St Matthew—arbitrary transpositions take place. But the notion, that some of the apostles were of greater importance than others, is irresistibly forced upon us by the evangelical history—St Peter, St James, and St John, especially, appear as the flower of the twelve. On several important occasions, Jesus took these alone into His intimate companionship. (Besides Mark v. 37, Luke viii. 51, comp. also Matt. xvii. 1 [Mark ix. 2; Luke ix. 28]; Matt. xxvi. 37; [Mark xiv. 33] and John xxi. 19, 20, where St Peter and St John only were taken.) The disciples thus surrounded the Lord in circles, expanding more and more. Nearest to him stood the three, then followed the other nine, then the seventy, and last of all the multitude of His other disciples. Yet, however undeniable the difference among the disciples of Christ may be, this does not imply any esoteric gnostis for those who stood nearer to Him. The mystery of Christ, the highest and simplest truth, was to be preached from the house-tops; but nevertheless, some penetrated infinitely more deeply into the same mystery than the others, and hence became far better fitted to move in immediate proximity to the Lord. As regards the apostles individually, St Peter is put at the head by all the Evangelists; St Matthew calls him τίτων, which certainly is not altogether accidental. (For particulars, comp. the remarks on Matt. xvi. 18.) Concerning the cognomen Ἱερος, comp. the

1 All agree as to the place of Peter, Philip, James the son of Alpheus, and Judas Iscariot; but they differ as regards the places of those between the above named. Yet the classes themselves remain unchanged.
remarks on John i. 42.—St Andrew stands very much in the background throughout the gospel history. (Ἀδριάνος = Ἄδριανος, which may be derived from Ἄδριας). St James, the son of Zebedee, appears only in connexion with the two coryphaei of the apostles, viz. St John and St Peter. According to Acts xii. 2, he died early the death of a martyr. Concerning St Philip, comp. the remarks on John i. 45; he also was from Bethsaida. St Bartholomew (βαρθολόμαις = son of Ptolemy) seems, according to John i. 46, to be identical with Nathanael of Cana. (John xxi. 2.) The evangelical history is silent regarding the latter; St Philip is introduced speaking, in John xiv. 9.—Θωμᾶς, ἄνωθεν, Διὰ τοῦτο. Comp. concerning him, the remarks on John xx. 24.—Μαρτιναῖς, with the addition ἐκ τῆς λόγου; this addition points to St Matthew, the author of the gospel, inasmuch as it is wanting in all other lists of the apostles, and an addition of this kind is made to no other name. It was only the author himself who could, with any propriety, have added it; in his mouth it was a recollection of the undeserved mercy which had been bestowed upon him. Concerning the various persons called James, compare the remarks on St Matthew xiii. 55, and the introduction to the Epistle of St James. I shall here remark only briefly, that I consider St James, the son of Alpheus, to be a different person from St James, the brother (cousin) of the Lord, especially from the passage in St John, vii. 5, ὅτι γὰς ἢ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτῶν ἐπίστευσαν ἐρ γινήσεται. It is only after the ascension of Christ that we find the ἀδελφοὶ τοῦ Κυρίου among the assembled believers (Acts i. 14); and it is therefore not at all possible that some of them should have been among the twelve apostles. The person of St Simon, with the cognomen Ἰακώβαρως, is described in a manner not to be mistaken, by the explanatory cognomen Ἰακώβαρως, which St Luke gives him in his Gospel, as well as in the Acts of the Apostles. (Ἰακώβαρως, from Ἰακώβαρως, to be jealous.) He had, no doubt, belonged to the sect of the

1 On the cognomen Barthelemy, given to St John and St James (Mark iii. 17), comp. the remarks on Luke ix. 54.

2 De Wette (in his comment. on this passage) calls this remark unimportant; but is any other apostle designated after his worldly calling? Is St Peter designated the fisherman, or anything of that kind? Moreover, the expression "publican" has, in a secondary sense, an opprobrious signification, as appears from the phrase "publicans and sinners." Such a cognomen only St Matthew himself could assume. Least of all would some later author of the gospel have chosen it, as it would have been the interest of such an one to extol St Matthew.
Jewish zealots, of whom mention is made by *Josephus* (B. J. iv. 3, 9.) His demagogical zeal, hitherto directed only to outward things, was subsequently directed towards the attainment of spiritual freedom. Greater difficulties, however, present themselves respecting the person of *Δαβδας*, whom St Mark calls *Θαδδας*. As regards, in the first place, the condition of the text of St Matthew, the reading is doubtful. The addition ἐ ἰντικηλθείς is omitted in many codices. Nor does it appear to me, indeed, to belong to St Matthew, who in no other passage makes use of this phrase in connexion with a name. It is probable that it may have crept into the text from some gloss; inasmuch as, on the margin, the very probable supposition was expressed, that the Thaddæus of St Mark was identical with the Lebbeus of St Matthew. *Müll* supposed that this addition had a reference to the name of St Matthew. He regarded the *Δαβδας* = *Λου*, and hence supposed that some one had made this addition in order to direct attention to the circumstance, that St Matthew is called Levi by both St Mark and St Luke. The identity of the names cannot however be proved. *Δαβδας* is probably derived from πληκτος, so that it signifies *cordatus*. *Θαδδας* is perhaps synonymous with Θαυδας (see *Buxtorf*, Lex. Talm. p. 2565; a. v. τὸ *mamma* = to the Hebrew ממא). Both the names are wanting in St Luke (in the Gospel as well as in the Acts of the Apostles); instead of them he has *Ἰωδας* Ἰακώβου, who is not mentioned by either St Matthew or St Mark. That there was a Judas (not Iscariot) among the twelve apostles, clearly appears from St John xiv. 22; and it may be that he is the same person as this Lebbeus or Thaddæus. The ancient Church had, at a very early period, adopted this view. (*Hieron. ad h. l.* calls him ξειωμανος.) The view adopted by many modern commentators, that we ought to supply after Ἰακώβου, not as commonly μικρός, but ἀδελφός, is altogether without foundation. This Judas would then appear to have been the author of the Epistle of Jude, which forms part of the canon of the New Testament, and a brother of James, the son of Alpheus, and of Simon Zelotes; and all these, the ἀδελφοὶ τοῦ Κυρίου;—a view which we shall endeavour to refute when we come to treat of Matthew xiii. 55; John vii. 5, and in the introductions to the Epistles of St James and St Jude. There exists no reason whatsoever for departing from the common mode of supplying the ellipsis; and, for this reason, we must consider this
Judas, with the cognomen Lebbeus, or Thaddeus, to be a different person from Judas, the brother of our Lord. The passage of St John, vii. 5, must here serve as a clue to lead us to the truth; for, according to this passage, the brethren of Jesus did not believe in him, and could, therefore, by no means, have been in the number of the twelve apostles. Finally, ἴδιας ἵστασις = Ῥήμα των, a man of Karioth. (Josh. xv. 25.) This explanation is given also in several MSS. on John vi. 71; xii. 4, in the words ἀπὸ Καριωτοῦ. Other derivations, as, for instance, from ἴδια, falsehood, lie, are obviously intended to convey an allusion to his treacherous deed; but in this very circumstance, the pure character of our gospels is manifested, that as they abstain from every kind of laudatory expression concerning Christ and His acts and discourses, so, in like manner, they avoid all reproachful allusion to Judas. The only remark which they make, as historians, when referring to the name of Judas, is ὁ σαμαρεύως συγγένειος. With this single exception, they allow the stupendous facts in the history of Jesus to speak for themselves; and the simple, truthful descriptions make light and shade appear in their most striking contrast. And thus, viewing every thing in its purely objective light, they despise every kind of paltry, subjective censure.

Ver. 5. To this company of the twelve apostles, Jesus, according to St Matthew, now directs His discourse. It may appear strange that it should proceed on the ground of Jewish exclusiveness, inasmuch as the apostles are prohibited from going to the Samaritans and Gentiles. St Luke, x. 1 has not this limitation in the discourse of Jesus to the Seventy; but these Seventy appear as the representatives of the whole Gentile world, and St Luke alone gives an account of them, as he wrote for Gentiles. Jesus, however, never comes forward as a destroyer of the exclusive privileges of the Jewish people, which had been vouchsafed to them by God himself (compare the remarks on Matt. xxi. 33); on the contrary, He acknowledges them (Matt. xv. 24), and confines His own ministry, on the whole, to Palestine. He, indeed, in slight hints, points to a time at which this exclusiveness will be done

---

1 De Wette, agreeing with Lightfoot, has again declared in favour of the derivation of this appellative from the word ἄρσητοςκότος, "a leather apron," or ὁ ἀρσητοῦκτος, "strangling." The parallel passages in St John, however, seem to be altogether opposed to this derivation; the assertion that ἰδιαίτερα ἰδιαίτερα or ἰδιαίτερα could not have been added as a surname to the proper name, is altogether destitute of proof.
away (John x. 16); but He ministers, in the meantime, among Gentiles and Samaritans only occasionally, whenever their faith constrained Him to do so. (Compare Matt. xv. 21, seq., and John iv.) We cannot by any possibility suppose, that in this there was any accommodation by Christ to the weakness of the disciples: the times, and the immediate destination of the twelve apostles, absolutely required it. It was only at a subsequent period that St Paul received the express command to labour for the Gentile world (Acts ix. 15); and when the Redeemer departed from the earth, He extended the sphere of action of the twelve also to all nations (Matt. xxviii. 19). But it was necessary, first of all, to prepare, in the nation of Israel, a hearth to receive the sacred fire, and to keep its heat in a state of concentration. It was only after the Church had thus been safely established in the midst of the people of God, and after the unbelief of the mass had been fully manifested, that the stream of life was poured out over the wide Gentile world.

Ver. 6. πρόδοτα ἀναλύτα are here used in the sense of sheep who have gone astray, and have been separated from their shepherd, (compare the remarks on Luke xv. 4); with evident reference to Jeremiah l. 6 יָדְכֵנ נַעַרְתִּי אֲנָשִׁית.

Ver. 7. The main burden of their preaching is to be, that the kingdom of heaven is at hand (compare the remarks on Matt. iii. 2; iv. 17); but in the form used by John the Baptist. The directions given to the disciples, together with their destination, were at this, their first mission, altogether different from what they were after the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. The apostles themselves were, as yet, standing on Old Testament ground, and preached repentance as the Baptist had done, and baptized with water as he did (John iv. 2); but, at a subsequent period, after the soil had been prepared by the previous preaching of repentance, they proclaimed the remission of sins.

Ver. 8. With this is connected the promise of miraculous healing, as the first outward manifestation of the coming redemption. (Compare the remarks on Matt. xi. 5). The exhortation διερήσατε was the natural result of circumstances. The disciples might easily have been induced to receive presents, and have thus been imperceptibly led to regard not the faith, but the wealth of the sick, thus inflicting injury on their own souls. They had claims only for the necessities of life. (Very great critical authorities
omit the clause τινος τούτος ἤγετετο; others place it behind λατρεύετε καθαρ- 
οῖς, and this shews it to be not very unlikely a marginal gloss. 
Mill and J. D. Michaelis therefore consider the former words to 
be an addition made at a subsequent period. We might indeed 
well suppose that they were added for the purpose of magnifying 
the apostles; only, that no instance of such a miracle is related, 
and this, of itself, renders it more probable, that the omission ori-
ginated in the circumstance of no instance being recorded of the 
apostles having raised any from the dead. But it does not follow 
that because no such example is given, no such case actually 
occurred.)

Ver. 9, 10. This endowment with spiritual riches, our Lord 
follows up with the exhortation to go forth in the external garb 
of poverty. But this injunction, that no outward preparation for 
their journey is required, is, in reality, only another view of their 
riches. By going forth without being possessed of any human 
resources, they lived upon the rich treasure of their heavenly 
Father. The correct exposition of our passage is best obtained 
from a comparison with Luke xxii. 35–37. In that passage, 
Jesus, a short time before His sufferings, reminds the apostles of 
that rich and glorious time when He was able to send them forth 
without any earthly preparation having been made, and remarks 
that the times were now different (inasmuch as these were the 
days in which the bridegroom would be taken from them)—that 
now every one must prepare himself as well as he could, and to 
the utmost of his power. The leading thought, therefore, is this; 
we live at a time of rich blessings (it is the hour in which the 
light is in the ascendant, which again forms a contrast to Luke 
ii. 53, "This is the L. ur and the power of darkness;" concerning 
which passage, comp. the Commentary), when no human prepara-
tion is required—"love will guide you, love will provide you!" 
The details given must not be too much pressed, but must be 
taken in all the freedom in which the apostles themselves received 
them. St Mark, vi. 8, permits them to take a ἴδιος; but the two 
other evangelists forbid even that;¹ St Matthew forbids also even 
the ἰδιώματα; St Mark permits them. It is a mere trifling with

¹ Gratz, in his Commentary on St Matthew, vol. i. p. 519, is of opinion, that Jesus 
only forbade them to take with them a supply, but not that He prohibited the taking of 
the stuff which was in their hands, or the shoes which were on their feet. Very strange. 
certainly! for who ever carries with him a supply of sticks on a journey.
words to insist here on a difference between ἰσόθματα and σαρδάλια. The words, ἄγιος ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῆς ῥοφής αὐτοῦ (Matt. x. 10), afford the true point of view. The Redeemer, who had himself no place where to lay His head, puts His disciples likewise on a footing of pure faith; as the labourers of God,¹ they had to expect from Him what was necessary for their bodily wants; for the exercise and proof of their faith they went forth without any such careful preparations as the man destitute of faith makes, and must make. It might have been possible for some of the disciples to have had some money with them; but they would not thereby have acted in opposition to this command of Jesus, unless they had taken it with them from unbelief. This command must thus be viewed spiritually—in its relation to the disposition of mind and to faith; and, in this respect, it has its eternal truth, applicable to all labourers in the kingdom of God, at all times and in all places. Yet this word of the Lord must never be viewed without its necessary complement from Luke xxii. 35, seqq.

Ver. 11. There now follow more special precepts with regard to their spiritual ministry. The words ἔρσαρι τῆς ἄγιος must not be explained as applicable to honest, noble dispositions of mind, but to the poor (Matt. ν. 3), the longing, the needy in spirit (Matt. ix. 12); to these alone could the proclamation of a Redeemer be an ἔργες ἐλεον. In the same town, they were not to change their residence. He exhorts them to strive after peace and quietness, in the bustle of their travelling. (In Luke x. 7, the same idea is expressed, with an additional remark; concerning which, see the comment on that passage.)

Ver. 12. The apostles, as the recipients of the spiritual powers which our Redeemer possessed without measure (John iii. 34), and had communedicated to them according to their capacities for receiving them, are enjoined to communicate their gifts. As the sun sheds abroad his rays upon the good and the evil, so they also shall bless the house into which they enter; their blessing, when given to the impure, will return to them. This mode of expression was the result of a real conception of that which is spiritual, and of its power; like the light, it pours itself forth, and returns

¹ The expression ἰσόθματος is a figurative one, according to which mankind are compared to a vineyard or arable field, in which spiritual labour is to be performed. (Concerning this, comp. the remarks on Matt. xiii. 1, seqq.)
again to its source; blessing and intercession are, according to this view, an exhalation and inhalation of the Spirit. These, indeed, are figurative expressions, but they are such as embody a substantial and profound meaning. Led by the Spirit, the apostles enter into a house and say, ἐσπέρη τῷ ὅλῳ τοῦρπο (Luke x. 5), not as a mere empty phrase, like the ἄνευ τῆς of the Jews, but as the sincere indication of their nature and office. The blessing remains where it finds a welcome place (ἀξιός is again to be understood, in the evangelical sense, of all those who are in want of, and long for, salvation and mercy); where it finds no welcome, it returns thence to those who pronounced it, as to its source of life. Hence the Spirit appears as that which is life itself, having its fountains from which it emanates and into which it returns, if it does not find a place wherein to settle, in order to create a new fountain. (John iv. 14; vii. 38.)

Ver. 14. Wherever the feeling of need, and the longing for that which is divine are wanting, thence the messenger of Christ departs; he comes only in order to bring to the sick the message of healing. The words ἵσταται καιρὸς ἄνωτέρω are a symbolical representation of total and utter separation and renunciation. (Acts xiii. 51; xviii. 6.) To express an idea by means of action is very common in the Old as well as in the New Testament, and indeed throughout the whole of the East; this mode of speech is more impressive for sensual man than mere words. (Comp. the remarks on Matt. xxvii. 24.)

Ver. 15. Sodom and Gomorrah are held forth as the symbols of God's justice punishing alienation from himself. The greatness of the guilt stands in proportion to the clearness and purity in which that which is divine has presented itself to him who has hardened himself against its impressions. He who turns away the messengers of Christ, shews himself more hardened than the old sinners of Sodom, because they represent that which is divine, more purely than did Lot and his better contemporaries. (Concerning the whole idea here hinted at, comp. the more extended remarks on Matt. xi. 22, 24.)

Ver. 16. After this description of the lighter side of the apostles' ministry, its darker side, viz. their relation to the enemies of the

---

1 This mode of viewing is rendered specially prominent, in the representation of χάρις and σωτηρία, as given by St John. Comp. the remarks on John vii. 58, 89.
kingdom of Christ, is laid open. The λίσσος, is as much the symbol of cunning malice, as πεταλοιφος is a figure of simple purity; it stands defenceless against the wild power which knows no restraint. This is a very significant picture of the position of every follower of the Lamb (Rev. xiv. 4), among the perverse race of the children of this world. The Lord continues the use of other very significant animal symbolisms, in order to exhort to prudence—a virtue to which it is most difficult for the believer to attain; he fears the character of the old serpent, and prefers to suffer rather than to deceive. In the προστιγμα, the symbol of the Holy Ghost (Matt. iii. 16), the purity of the soul is expressed; (άχιζως = unmixed, pure, without guile); in the ὅρις (Gen. iii. 1), cunning and prudence are expressed. (Φρονμος, φρονσις, derived from φινεως, signifies, in biblical anthropology, understanding, and power of reasoning, which is shewn in adapting itself to circumstances. (Comp. the remarks on Luke i. 17.) It is difficult to combine this wisdom of the serpent with the harmlessness of the dove; but the very command of Jesus testifies that it is not impossible. Yet, in the course of the Christian life, may prudence suffer rather than simplicity, if their union cannot as yet be attained.

Ver. 17, 18. A glance at their impending suffering for the sake of the testimony of Jesus, is now more definitely brought before them. The Lord gives them a hint that their life, which had hitherto moved in a narrow sphere, would be brought forward into the publicity of the great world, and that earthly tribulations of all kinds await the preacher of heavenly peace. (Comp. the remarks on Matt. xxiv. 9.) The συνήθεια are the courts of justice in the provincial towns. (Comp. the remarks on Matt. v. 21. In like manner, it is used in Mark xv. 9.) The discourse ascends from the minor to the major. The ηγεμονις (comp. the remarks on Matt. xxvii. 1) are the Roman Pro-consuls; the βασιλεις, are the Tetrarchs (Acts xii. 1; xxvi. 1). Concerning the words, σις μαρτυρω, comp. the remarks on Matt. viii. 4. In the sufferings which the children of God have to experience from the world for the name of Jesus, their true character—that of suffering and self-sacrificing love—will make itself manifest.

Ver. 19, 20. As a consolation in the prospect of such sufferings, our Lord promises them special help from above. The disciples, inexperienced and unskilled in speaking, are directed to the spirit of all wisdom. The words, μη μεριμνησητε, τως η τι λαλησητε,
exclude all human calculation, and refer the disciples to a principle of a higher nature, to the Spirit from above. The idea, that it is a gift of God to know how to speak a word in season, is already expressed in Isaiah 1. 4. (Comp. the remarks on Luke xxii. 15.) This does not, of course, exclude the use of the natural powers—these, on the contrary, are to be sanctified by this Spirit. The word μημονακάρ, must therefore refer to the anxious collecting of one's own strength, as that is seen in the unbelieving natural man, who is ignorant of any higher source of life and power. Such a reliance on a higher power, however, would be fanaticism, if, first, the conditions of help from above, viz. repentance and true faith, were wanting, and if, secondly, internal impurity should design to apply it for wicked purposes. In order the more to confirm them in the conviction of such help from above, Jesus adds: ὁ γὰρ ὧμις ἵνα ὤλαλοίτης ἐκεῖ. The isolated individuals then disappear altogether in the great struggle between light and darkness; God's cause is at stake, and that is pleaded by His Spirit in those instruments which He consecrates to himself. By this mode of viewing the matter, the single individual gains an invincible power, inasmuch as he is taken from his isolation, and recognizes himself as the member of a great invincible community. The σωμα παράγεσ is primarily contrasted with the spirit of the disciples themselves; the heavenly principle appears, therefore, as already operating in them, although it had not yet displayed itself in its full power. (Comp. the remarks on John vii. 39.)

Ver. 21. Hitherto the discourse has contained nothing which was not in accordance with existing circumstances; but the following verses seem to have another reference, viz. to such circumstances as are described in chap. xxiv. They point to a sphere of action of a wider extent than that which would present itself to the disciples in this, their first mission. Our Redeemer would no doubt speak to them of persecutions, even unto death,¹ only in the last days of His earthly ministry. (Comp. the remarks on Matt. xxiv. 10, 12.) The relations of the disciples, however, were analogous in the various periods of their ministry; and, in so far, these verses also have here their full application. The Gospel is

¹ Very decisive, in this respect, is the passage John xvi. 4, the exposition of which may be compared.
now represented as overruling the natural relations of earthly life. The element of new life, which it has brought into the world, is not arrested in its course by any barriers of relationship or family ties; every where it appropriates to itself susceptible minds. But just thereby does it call forth also opposition in the minds of those who do not lay themselves open to its influence, and the Gospel of peace brings the sword into the bosom of families; for, being the Word of God, it divides asunder the joints and marrow (Heb. iv. 12). The history of the spreading of Christianity proves the literal truth of these prophetic words of our Redeemer. (Comp. the Acta Martyrii Perpetuae et Felicitatis, printed in my Monum. Hist. Eccles. vol. i. p. 96, seqq.) But, inasmuch as phenomena of that kind could not have happened at the time when the Redeemer spoke those remarkable words, they thereby receive a prophetic character.

Ver. 22. The hatred of all men, actuated by purely worldly principles, is specially directed against the name of Jesus. Natural virtue the world may find to be amiable, for the world perceives it to be a blossom of its own life; but it hates what is specifically Christian, for it feels that therein is its death (James iv. 4). The reference to the impending persecutions required some hint concerning the earnestness and endurance necessary for the struggle. The οἱματια is connected with the θυμωμη. The words εις τινος admit, primarily, of a reference only to the individuals, not to the tribulation of the community; for death itself brings to every individual of the company of the faithful, the end of trouble, and the beginning of everlasting safety. Yet the passage reads (and ver. 23 confirms the impression that the sense of these words extends farther) as if it formed part of some prophetic discourse concerning the second coming. That the mention of this second coming, on the occasion of the first mission of the disciples, appears not to be in accordance with existing circumstances, will presently be more fully developed.

Ver. 23. In the view of the impending persecutions, Jesus once more recommends prudence; He advises them to avoid them as much as possible, in order that their souls might not receive any injury by their wilfully entering into danger, or continuing in it. The Church has ever acted according to this precept; it was only Montanistic rigour which sought to prohibit a fleeing from persecution. (The passage άν εν ταυτης ε. ης. is, no doubt, genuine;
its omission in some MSS. originated, most probably, from the similarity in the terminations of the clauses, *homoiooteleuton*. In the closing words, the reference to the second coming of Christ, and to the end (which was already perceptible in ver. 22) clearly appears. The Son of Man is to come again before the disciples who were sent forth should have wandered through all the cities of Israel (*τίλαιν ἑκ. ἱδίω*). Here a difficulty arises, inasmuch as it seems not to have been the intention of the mission that the apostles should travel through the whole country; the sending forth took place, in a great measure, for the training of the disciples themselves. From the feeling, therefore, that the connexion demanded a reference to something about to happen immediately, the explanation originated; "You will not need to hasten through all the towns of Judea, in the persecution which you are to meet with; I will be with you again ere that." But yet to this sense of the words, although grammatically admissible, does not suit, in the first place, the earnest ἀμὴ; and, secondly, Jesus does not come to them, but they come back to Jesus (Luke ix. 10); and finally, the phrase, ἐρχόμενος ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, has a definite doctrinal signification—it always refers to the παροικία. But of this (viz. the παροικία) Jesus cannot, according to the whole context, have well spoken. Nor is anything gained by referring the coming of our Lord to the resurrection, or to the pouring out of the Spirit, or even to the destruction of Jerusalem; for all these events were too remote from the disciples during the first period of their living with Christ. It is a matter of course that the return should be dependent upon the departure from them; but of the latter the Redeemer had not yet spoken. It was only at a subsequent period, viz. shortly before, and at His transfiguration, that He gave to His disciples an insight into these two events (Matt. xii. 40; xvi. 21, 27; xvii. 1, seq.; Luke ix. 22, 31); it was only on this solemn occasion that, by means of heavenly messengers, the Lord himself, in His human consciousness, was made acquainted with the divine counsel, in its whole extent, as concerning the redemption of mankind through His sufferings. Although we can say with the greatest probability, that the passage is here reported not in its original connexion, yet St Matthew has by no means unsuitably interwoven it with the discourse of Jesus. For the words which make mention of the second coming of Christ *expand*, by way of anticipation, the horizon of the reader. The
words amalgamate with the first sending forth of the disciples, that which took place at a subsequent period, and thus form a general instruction for the disciples in preaching the Gospel. It is true that this liberty which the Evangelists, especially St Matthew, allow themselves in the treatment of our Lord's discourses (which appears on a closer examination of the discourses) has, after all, something remarkable in it. (Concerning this, compare § 8 of the introduction). But that which would have destroyed the character of the Gospel, if it had been done by an uncongenial spirit, tends only to add to its splendour, if done by the congenial divine Spirit. The various sentiments of Christ resemble pearls and jewels which the Evangelists freely use, in order to produce the most varied and beautiful works. (Compare on this passage the comment on Matt. xxiv. 1).

Ver. 24. Jesus continues to intimate to the disciples their future destinies, by comparing them with himself. The passage is given in a different connexion by St Luke (vi. 40), and with the addition κατηνεύμενος δὲ τὰς ἰστι ὡς ὁ διδάσκαλος, in which the word κατηνεύμενος must be understood as signifying, perfectly educated, accomplished; so that the meaning of the words would be, "the accomplished disciple resembles his master in all things." (Compare what has been remarked on these words in the comment. on Matt. v. 1., with reference to the connexion of the discourse in St Luke [chap. vi. 20, seqq.]) But just thereby does the thought become involved in difficulties, inasmuch as the remark forces itself upon the reader, that many disciples surpass their masters. The reference to the proverbial mode of speech, contained in these words, is evidently of no avail, for another proverb says, πολλοὶ μαθηταὶ κρίστους διδακτάλοι. The first requisite of a good proverb (and certainly the Lord will not have made use of any, except such as were good) is, that it be the expression of truth. This difficulty, however, is removed, if we consider that the disciple who surpasses his master, ceases, at that very moment, to be his disciple in the true sense of the word; as a disciple, he can go no farther than his master; hence, if he goes farther than the master, he must have had some other master, and, if he has had no human one, the Spirit must have been his teacher, who has brought out that which was dormant in him. These words, viewed thus, have their relative truth every where; but, in an absolute sense, they beautifully express the relation of the disciples
to Christ. He, the image of the Father, could not be surpassed, either by His disciples or by any other; He is Lord and teacher, in the absolute sense, and, compared to Him, no one ever gets beyond the sphere of dependence and instruction. In this relation, then, it is likewise absolutely true, that whatever happened to the master, must also happen to the disciple.

Ver. 25. As the height of the hostile disposition, it is stated that the world will call diabolical, that which is in its purest manifestation, divine; and this, at the same time, implies the contrast, that the world regards the diabolical element as the divine, and thus tries to establish a total exchange of the elements of good and evil. If such be the case with the sun, what must happen to his rays; if the master be treated thus, what must be done to His servants, in whom the glory of the Lord is only reflected? (Oixiasth, comp. ver. 36, domesticus, with reference to the oixiasth.) The passage refers us back to St Matthew ix. 34, in τῷ ἄρχων τῶν δαιμόνων ἡμᾶς τὰ δαιμόνια. (Comp. xii. 24.) This expression is not different from ἑπάλας Ἵλις τῦν, for, in order to be able to cast out devils through him, he must be in the individual that casts them out. As regards the name, Ἵλις τῦν is τῷ ἀγγέλῳ. He was a god of the Ekronites, so called because the power was ascribed to him of removing troublesome flies, as Jupiter also had the cognomen ἀσίμνος, μυγαγός. In the New Testament, however, the reading Ἵλις τῦν, is to be preferred, inasmuch as the Jews, out of derision, changed the name of the idol into a form suggestive of contempt. For, this form of the name (derived from ἀγγέλος and ἀγγέλου) signifies the lord of mire. (Comp. Lightfoot on Matt. xii. 24.) The interpretation of this name, as given by Dr Paulus, is very ingenious. According to him, the form must be resolved into the words ἄγγελος, ἄγγελος, lord of the place, viz. of the subterranean one; to this would very well answer the oixiasth of Christ. But that the prince of darkness is named after a national deity, arises from the circumstance that, according to the constant view of Scripture (comp. the remarks on 1 Cor. viii. 2), heathenish life, devoted to idolatry, appears as the element of darkness.

Ver. 26, 27. Christ keeps the minds of the disciples in a state betwixt fear and implicit faith: by means of the former, He urges them on to earnestness, while, by means of the latter, He preserves them from faint-heartedness. It appears very striking, that
their confidence is based upon the certainty of a future disclosure of all that is concealed. This is the fundamental idea of all the four clauses of these two verses. It is true, that the unveiling of what is hidden, can never, in itself, be the foundation of faith; if the mystery were something evil, it would rather give rise to fear. But, for the bosom which conceals within it that which is holy, but as yet unintelligible to those around, no certainty can be more consoling than to know that the time of its manifestation is approaching, for this is also the time of the victory of the good. Verse 27 contains the explanation of the preceding verse; the two clauses contained in each, must be viewed in conformity with the law of parallelismus membrorum. The words εἰς τὴν σκότος are opposed to κυκάλυμμα, and signify the unintentional darkness which rests on anything; in this case, for instance, on Galilee, a country hitherto unknown, but out of which, nevertheless, a new life arose. On the other hand, the words ως τοίς ως ἄκοιν, correspond with τοῖς κρύπτωσι, and denote here the intentional concealment of that which is hereafter to be communicated, as in the case before us, the opening up of the mysteries of the kingdom of God within the narrow circle of the apostles. The future free proclamation of the divine counsel in all its relations, and the disclosure of all the mysteries in the church by the Spirit, are hinted at in these words. The Church does not know of any mysteries to be kept back. (In the phrase κηρύσσειν εἰς τῶν δαμαστῶν, the form of the ancient houses and roofs must be borne in mind.)

Ver. 28. The general exhortation μη δένασθαι (verse 26) is, in the 28th verse, brought into connexion with the true object of fear, whilst the false objects of fear are excluded. With reference to verse 21, Jesus remarks, that the enemies of physical life should not be objects of fear to a child of God, inasmuch as their power cannot reach the true spiritual life. The words μη δένασθαι τῷ ψυχῇ ἀπεκτίνα, contain an allusion to their purely external power, which is not able to penetrate into the domain of spiritual life, in which the faithful move. This power, however, is ascribed to some other agent, and of him the Lord commands them to be afraid. The following reasons, as it appears, compel us to understand thereby the Prince of darkness: 1st, If those words were to be referred to God, the expression ἐπηκαίνε, must be understood in two different senses, in the same verse, the first

---

1 No stress is to be laid on the change of ἐπηκαίνε τινὲς and ἐπὶ τινές; the former
time, in the sense of *metuere*, the second time, in the sense of *revereri*: 2d, Verses 29 and 30 would not agree with it, inasmuch as God is represented in them, as a protector in times of danger and distress; upon this, verse 31 founds the exhortation *μὴ* ὁσίον *ποιεῖται*, which would then form a contradiction to the *ποιεῖται* in one verse; a word which, moreover, is so emphatically repeated in Luke xii. 5: 3d, It appears unsuitable to say of God, that he destroys souls, inasmuch as it is He who saves them. But a decisive argument against this view would, nevertheless, be afforded by the circumstance, that, in Scripture, the devil never appears as the person who condemns to hell; his whole activity depends upon the permissive will of God. (James iv. 12). Moreover, as verse 33 clearly indicates the possibility of apostacy and denial, the passage is best understood thus: that our Redeemer intends thereby, to give to the disciples a powerful *exhortation* to earnestness, and to diligence in preserving and making sure their calling. It is true that, in this case, we cannot avoid changing the meaning of *ποιεῖται*; such things, however, are not seldom met with. But the exhortation in verse 31, *μὴ* ὁσίον *ποιεῖται*, has, according to this view, a reference to the supposed fidelity of the disciples. (Concerning *γίνεται*, comp. the remarks on Matt. v. 22.) The contrasting of the *ψυχή* with the *σώμα*, is by no means against the threefold division (trichotomy) of man as taught in Scripture, for *ψυχή* here is *ψυχή* ἄνθρωπος. In another view, *σώμα* and *σάρξ* alone, may, with equal consistency, be considered as integral portions of man.)

Ver. 29, 30. As an antidote to fear, Jesus refers the apostles to the almighty aid of God, for whose kingdom they were contending. How should He, who feeds the sparrows and numbers the hairs of the head, not guard the lives of His faithful servants? (The term *στενώθηκα* is here, as frequently in the LXX. used —κακία. An *ἀσσαρίον* was the tenth part of a *δραχμή*.)

Ver. 31. The consolatory power of this doctrine is founded upon the idea of the special providence of God. Everywhere in nature it combines the greatest and the least into one harmonious whole. Thousands are fed, and the crumbs are collected; our

combination also may signify *metuere*; but, in the sense of *revereri*, it certainly is not found in connection with *ἀφίημι*. In the usage of profane writers "to be afraid of," "to reverence," is expressed by *φοβεῖται* ὁσίος ἰ. .
Redeemer rises from his grave, and the linen is left carefully folded together.

Ver. 32, 33. The whole assumes more and more a general character, and, by comparing the parallel passage in Luke xii. 2, seq., it clearly appears that the words were originally spoken in a different connexion. The discourse gradually extends the view more and more to the collective body of all the disciples of Jesus, in their conflict with the world. Christ also appears here as He, the confession of whom has a decisive influence on everlasting weal or woe, and whose testimony is accepted before God and His angels. The confession before men (as the enemies of that which is good) forms a contrast with the confession before the heavenly host. Whosoever takes upon him the ignominy of appearing as a true worshipper of Christ will be received as such when Christ reveals himself in His glory. But this declaration is immediately followed by its contrast (verse 33); in the same manner as the latter fills with fear, so the former allures. The whole declaration has, of course, a reference to believers only, who have recognised the Lord in His true character, and who now venture either to confess openly their faith, or to conceal it through fear; the latter line of conduct must extinguish the light of faith which was kindled in them, and exclude from the kingdom of God.

Ver. 34. As the fear of strife and persecution might easily stand in the way of an open confession, our Lord distinctly points out, that the Gospel, from its very nature, must be the occasion of strife. Not as though strife itself were the object of the Gospel (its object is peace, but peace is only the end and result of the strife), but strife is the necessary consequence of Christ’s coming into the world, or into a heart. Just because in Christ there appears absolute holiness, whilst the ἀνάπτυξις comprises in itself good and evil mixed together, therefore the spirit of Christ (μάχαι, Ephes. vi. 17), cuts off the evil (δαμασκεύω, Luke xii. 51), and along with it him who clings to it.

Vers. 35, 36. Jesus sets forth the results of this separating power of the Gospel, in the same manner as in verses 21, 22. The sword of the Spirit severs the most intimate connexions based upon human relationships, or terrestrial love; it destroys them if they attempt to hold fast the unholy element; but it ennobles them if free scope is everywhere given to the Holy Spirit. That which our Lord here points out as a requirement which He
makes of all believers, viz. to be separated from all earthly ties, even the most intimate, for the sake of union with himself, was already declared by Moses of the Levites: "Who said unto his father and to his mother, I have not seen him; neither did he acknowledge his brethren, nor know his own children: for they have observed thy word, and kept thy covenant. They shall teach Jacob thy judgments, and Israel thy law." (Deut. xxxiii. 9, 10. Comp. Gen. xii. 1.)

Ver. 37. The love of Christ must be stronger than either the love of father or of mother. (Compare the remarks on Luke xiv. 26, where the still stronger expression occurs: μισθός πατέρα εἰς τ. λ.) Very significant is the clause, ὅπει ἵνα μοι δύνης, for Christ himself is the aim and object of believers; they long for himself as He is in the power of His resurrection and in His sufferings. (Compare the remarks on Philip. iii. 10.) This effect of the Gospel—its claiming the whole man—makes the world rage with fury; for this reason it makes to itself another Christ, who allows good and evil to dwell peaceably and quietly together. But if Christ had not been the Truth and the Life itself (John xiv. 6), it would have been a violation of the most sacred duties, if He had demanded that, for His sake, the dearest ties of relationship should be disregarded. It is only God whom we must obey rather than father and mother; and Christ, only because we behold in Him the Father (John xiv. 9). And therefore, by assigning to Him a rank above all that is most dear and sacred, no duty is violated; on the contrary, every duty is purified and ennobled. The command, "Thou shalt honour thy father and thy mother," is thus not abrogated, but fulfilled (Matt. v. 17), inasmuch as man recognises himself in Christ Jesus as a child of the Father, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named (Ephes. iii. 15).

Ver. 38. With this demand of a separation from all earthly ties which faith in the Redeemer, if it be a living one, at all times presupposes, is connected the intimation of a course of life full of sufferings, the end of which is death. How deeply must our Lord have been conscious of the glory and blessedness to be given by Him, if He did not hesitate to draw such a picture of the life of His followers! The words, σταυρωθή λαμβάνειν, spoken before the crucifixion of our Lord, must be explained from the general custom of malefactors being themselves obliged to carry their cross
to the place of execution. In the mouth of Jesus, however, they assume a prophetic character, inasmuch as they were spoken previous to His sufferings. Frisse (in his commentary on this passage) makes a distinction between λαμμάν and αἰτίαν τῶν σταυρῶν, and thinks that, in the latter expression, the spontaneous taking up of the cross is alluded to. The words immediately succeeding, viz. ἀκολούθων ἐκσυνάρευσιν evidently refer to what followed upon the taking up of the cross, viz. the bearing of it, along with the ultimate result—death upon the cross. The life of the followers of Christ here upon earth, is necessarily toilsome, inasmuch as they live continually in the midst of dangers, and sacrifice their own will to the will of God; and, hence, it resembles a continual dying on the cross. Although, according to the context, that which has been here said has a primary reference to a life in the first ages of Christianity—a life exposed to bodily dangers and persecutions, yet it retains its truth at all times as regards the struggles of the believer's inner life; and hence it is, that this same figurative mode of expression is used throughout Scripture. (Gal. ii. 20, v. 24; Romans vi. 6.)

Ver. 39. From this one aspect of the sufferings of a Christian, viz. the persecution and perils of death, the eye is directed to a view more general and enlarged; the death of the old life is the condition of the birth of the new life. That by the terms, ψυχή ἀπελευθεροῦσα, not the loss of the bodily life only for the sake of Jesus can be meant, is evident, partly from the circumstance, that not all the apostles died in consequence of persecution; and yet it cannot be set down to their disadvantage that they were allowed to remain alive; and partly because we may well conceive of a death by persecution which did not correspond with the requirements here made, such as, when it originated from vanity or fanatical excitement, which was by no means a rare occurrence. The words ψυχή ἀπελευθεροῦσα can therefore be understood only in a spiritual sense, and it is only by such a death that the bodily death is sanctified. In the expression ψυχή, the significations soul and life are again blended together. (Compare the remarks on Matt. vi. 25). In this passage, then, a twofold soul is spoken of, of which one is lost, if the other be preserved. If we translate ψυχή by life, it implies a twofold existence, a higher and a lower, between which man has the choice. (The same thought is expressed in the same words in Matt. xvi. 24, 25, and in John xii. 25. Instead of
Gospel of St Matthew x. 39.

εἰρήνη, St John, however, has the word φιλία, which is more intelligible; εἰρήνη here signifies to gain, to attain to.) The passage will become most distinct by being paraphrased in the following way: ὁ εἰρήνη τῆς (σαρκικῆς) ψυχῆς, ἀπολύει αὐτὴν (καὶ πνευματικῆς); καὶ ἀπολύει τὴν ψυχῆς (σαρκικῆς); εἰρήνη αὐτὴν (πνευματικῆς.) That which constitutes true personal identity (the ego) remains the same, but, in the exercise of true self-denial, it becomes dead to sin; the unbelieving man, on the contrary, remains in his natural state of being, and the germ of the higher life can never attain to dominion in him. The expression here made use of by our Redeemer is most simply explained by supposing that the ψυχῆ of man is conceived as standing between two powers, the influence of which he may receive within himself, and by means of which he may be transformed into their nature. Now, as man by nature is more especially exposed to the one (the evil power), the work of renovation implies the renunciation of the old sinful life which has become part of the man, and, instead of it, the entrance into the new life of light. This transition is a death; but, out of this death a new and higher life springs up. The addition of ἓκαστον ἰματί is of importance, inasmuch as it opposes itself to all self-devised means of sanctification and perfecting of spiritual life. A crucifying of the flesh, and self-denial undertaken for one's own sake, for one's own perfecting, are an abomination in the sight of our Lord, since they are always in such a case, the proofs of secret presumption and pride. On the contrary, they must be done

1 Compare Hebrews x. 39, where the words are: εἰρήνης ψυχῆς.
2 The religions of Asia, especially Buddhism, prominently point out and enjoin the duty of self-denial; but as it is practised out of Jesus, and without the perfect ideal of holiness in man, it leads to the most eccentric and foolish exhibitions. The addition, therefore, of ἓκαστον ἰματί is of the highest importance to the precept of self-denial, and furnishes, at the same time, a remarkable proof of the divine dignity of Jesus; for it would have been the highest presumption on His part to require, that all things should be counted but loss for His sake, unless He had been higher than all created beings. In the work of J. J. Schmidt (Über die ältere religiöse, politische und literarische Bildungsgeschichte der Völker Mittelasiens. Petersburg, 1842.) Several characteristic features of such false self-denial are communicated. "Shaghiamuni (the Buddha of the Mongol tribes), when in the form of a king's son, once met on his walk a tigress with her young, nearly dead of hunger. Penetrated with compassion, and there being nothing at hand to refresh and revive her, he withdrew himself, under some pretext, from his retinue, went up to the tigress, and laid himself down before her, that he might be torn in pieces by her. But, perceiving that she was too much exhausted to be able to injure him, he first made incisions in his skin, and allowed her to lick up the blood which flowed from the wounds, whereby she was so much
from love to Jesus, from a principle of obedience to Him, and by
the working of His spirit; it is then only that they bring forth
beautiful fruits, and produce that "holiness, without which no
man shall see the Lord." (Heb. xii. 14.) The medium between
indolence on the one hand, and self-righteous activity on the other,
is very difficult of discovery; but the author of the faith must
here also be himself the finisher of it. (Heb. xii. 2.)

Ver. 40. As a consolation under the great difficulties which
our Lord had set before His disciples, there follows, in conclusion,
a rich thought, pointing out how infinitely dear to the Lord of
the universe are the combatants for truth.¹ As Christ is the
representative of the Father, so He considers His disciples as
His own representatives; whosoever, therefore, receives the dis-
ciples, receives the Lord of the universe himself. (Mark ix. 37.)
The following verses, however, shew that δικαιοσύνη must be taken
emphatically in the following way: "whosoever receives you,
fully conscious of what you are, and for the sake of this your
spiritual character, receives God," and hence derives all the bless-
ing from it, which a visit of the Lord himself, such as that re-
corded in the history of the Patriarchs, is sure to confer. In the
term δικαιοσύνη, there is implied, therefore, not an outward receiving
merely (hospitalio excipere), but, more especially, the opening of
the heart and of the whole inner life, so that a man may be able

strengthened, that she was able to devour him altogether." What a caricature, com-
pared with the sight presented by the life of a true follower of Christ, walking in true,
genuine, Christian self-denial! The duty was conceived of in a far more worthy manner,
by the nobler Mahommedan mystics, especially by Doheladdin Rumi, who thus beauti-
fully expresses the necessity of the death of the old man, in order that the new man
may be brought to life:—

Death ends indeed the cares of life,
Yet, shudders life when death comes near,
And such the fond heart's death-like strife
When first the loved one does appear.
For, where true love is wakened, dies
The tyrant self; that despot dark.
Rejoice then, that in death he lies,
And breathe morn's free air, with the lark.

But certainly it must be admitted, that, between the conception of the duty, and the
realization of it in the life, there is a wide difference.

¹ The reverse side of this picture is pointed out by St Luke x. 16, in the words
λεων ἀφέτευσα x. v. λ. Allusions to this thought are also met with in the Rabbinical
writings; e.g. si quis recipit viros doctos, idem est ac si reciparet Schechinam, i.e. mani-
festationem nummi numinis. Comp. Schöttgen on this passage.
to receive the disciples of the Lord, although he should not have where to lay his head.

Ver. 41, 42. But in order to place in its true light the greatness of the glory of true believers, and to pourtray the blessedness of those who receive them, the Redeemer closes with a remarkable declaration. His disciples, the representatives of the principles of the new Christian life, are compared by Him to the Old Testament saints, προφήταις καὶ δίκαιοις, and He thus infers, that as much as the former stood higher than the latter, by so much higher and more glorious would be their reward. As regards, in the first place, the gradation, the name μαχητής, here given to believers, is remarkable. We might here refer to the Rabbinical usus loquendi, according to which, ἱστορίζει forms the contrast to ἀπείθεις, the latter signifying teacher, master; the former, disciple, servant. But this does not meet the case, as the expression is intended to indicate a peculiarity of the disciples of Jesus. (Comp. Matt. xviii. 6.) According to the context, it is intended to point out, in the first place, the helplessness of the disciples, who, like helpless children, seem to be given over as a prey to misery in this world, but who are preserved and sustained by the help of the Father from above. But, in the second place, the expression has reference to the childlike, innocent, and, specially, the humble sense of the regenerate, who, although exalted and glorious, are yet conscious of their glory without any feeling of presumption or pride. (The passage in chap. xviii. 6, explains this more fully.) This μαχητής of the disciples, is contrasted with the Old Testament piety, which, although more subordinate, possessed something more conspicuous; its two principal forms are pointed out, viz. τροφήσια and δίκαιοτείς. In the former, is specially displayed the fulness of illumination by the Spirit of God, which however, as in the case of Jonah, might well be combined with meagre personal attainments; in the latter, preciseness in obeying the law. (Comp. the remarks on Luke i. 6.) The δίκαιοτέρην appears here as the higher gradation of religious life under the Old Testament, inasmuch as it presupposed a higher degree of personal attainment than the τροφήσια. But, raised far above these two, stands the New Testament life, in which a renewal of the whole man inwardly takes place, and manifests itself outwardly in the life. These three gradations τροφήσις, δίκαιος, and μαχητής, are brought into connexion with those who receive them, and to every one
is promised the μυθής of him whom he receives. (Concerning
the signification of μυθής, comp. the remarks on Matt. v. 12.)
This expression is, in a legal point of view, wholly appropriate;
but in the evangelical point of view, only so far as love, which
appears in it as the active principle, carries its reward in itself.
But as a condition of the μυθής, it is farther added in what man-
ner the reception is to take place—σις ὀνεμα σφερήνων, δικαιον, μαθητῶν.
This σις ὀνεμα contains the key to the whole rather obscure pas-
sage; it is identical with the Hebrew פָּטָה (it is not necessary to
suppose an exchange of the prepositions σις and ii), so that the
name signifies the character and true nature of the person to be
received. Hence, this passage is full of rich meaning. It points
out the moral principle, that every action must be measured by
the disposition from which it proceeds, and that the disposition
is the result of the whole inward state of man. Hence, it is not
the isolated act of receiving, which is considered as the ground
of the reward, but it is the disposition of the soul from which the
act proceeds; and, in the reception itself, nothing depends
upon the person received, but upon the degree of consciousness
and clearness with which the person is received in his true charac-
ter. Hence the sense of these remarkable words is this: who-
ever receives an Old Testament prophet, for the sake of his
spiritual character, and is endowed with the ability of receiving
him, and recognizing him as such, will be rewarded according to
his Old Testament position; the same takes place with regard to
the righteous; but he who receives a disciple of Jesus, i. e. a
child of God, and a citizen of the heavenly kingdom, and re-
freshes him by the merest trifle (a weaker counterpart of διψαται)—
who is thus able to recognize in him, under his insignificant
outward appearance, the effulgence of that which is divine,—who
is able to love it and to do good to it, in its representatives, just
thereby shews that he has dispositions in harmony with this
New Testament dispensation, and hence will also receive the
reward which, under it, is certain. But this reward is an eternal
one (οὐ μὴ ἀκολουθήσῃ τῷ μυθήν αὐτοῦ); and in this it is implied, that
the Old Testament awards to its saints promises of a more earth-
ly character. This thought is exceedingly spiritual; and this is
the reason why it has been so frequently misunderstood by inter-
preters. For, evidently, this thought also is implied in it, that
the individual occupying a lower position, can never be received
as one occupying a higher position, because the higher life is wanting in him; but the individual occupying a higher position may well be received as one occupying a lower position. The disciple of Jesus has always already passed through the law. Many a benevolent, pious Jew, might therefore receive the apostles as prophets or righteous men, because, from his point of view, he could not recognise any thing higher in them; but he who was able to recognise in the messengers of Christ, that specifically new thing which they brought, and who, from love to it, would receive them, received the full rich blessing from Him, viz. the new birth, whilst those also standing on a different ground, if turning toward Him with a heart of love, would receive an appropriate reward. Hence the little ones appear here as bestowing blessings in every direction; indeed "as dying, but yet living; as poor, and yet making many rich; as having nothing, and yet possessing all things." (2 Cor. vi. 9, 10.)

§ 16. JOHN THE BAPTIST SENDS HIS DISCIPLES TO JESUS. DISCOURSES OF JESUS ON THE OCCASION OF THIS MISSION.

(St Matt. xi. 1—30; St Luke vii. 18—35; x. 13—15, 21, 22.)

Ver. 1. St Matthew closes the preceding discourse with the words: διατάσσω τοῖς δώδεκα μαθηταῖς, and thereby clearly indicates the wish that the preceding discourse should be understood as an instruction for the disciples who were sent forth. Of the journey itself, however, he says nothing. St Luke ix. 10, on the contrary, mentions the return in the same way as, in chap. x. 17, he mentions the return of the Seventy. With an indefinite καὶ ἤγιναν, St Matthew proceeds to another subject, viz. the report of the question put by John the Baptist through his disciples. The same report is connected, in St Luke vii. 18, with the history of the raising of the widow of Nain's son, but likewise very loosely, by the general formula: καὶ ἠσθήματο Ἰωάννη εἰς τ. Λ. Hence we cannot, from this, infer any thing definite as to the chronological order of the events. But what is remarkable is the exceedingly minute harmony of the Evangelists, not only in single expressions (as ver. 23), but also in the Old Testament quotation from Malachi, iii. 1 (Matt. xi. 10). The LXX. give an exact translation
of the Hebrew text; but both the Evangelists differ alike from both.\(^1\) We have here again, in St Matthew, a discourse composed of various elements, whilst St Luke gives, in another more definite connexion, that which is here brought together. From the narrative of the mission of the two disciples of John, St Matthew only takes occasion to report the discourses of Jesus in which the different positions of the people, with respect to the person of Jesus, is described. Jesus was as little understood by the proud, as by John the Baptist. The humble recognised that which was divine under even the most varied forms, because indeed, it was only this of which they were in search. With this, chap. xii. connects itself very suitably.

Ver. 2. From the mission of the disciples of John, we are induced to make some enquiries regarding the spiritual condition of the Baptist. He appears here in prison (at Machaerus according to Josephus, Arch. xviii. 5); it is only in a subsequent chapter (xiv. 3 sqq.) that St Matthew, by way of supplementing, gives the necessary information about his imprisonment. The Baptist hears in his prison of the works of Jesus, and is therefore induced to send to Him two disciples, with the question σε έν αιδρήμος, ἢ ἤτερον σφοδρόκωμν. (The expression έν αιδρής has a fixed doctrinal signification, viz. the Messias; perhaps from the passage in Psalm cxviii. 26, ἐν σφόδρῳ ἀπεκαθίσταται.\(^2\) In Heb. x. 37, Christ, with reference to His Parousia, is even called έν αιδρής, i.e. he at whose future coming all prophecy will be fulfilled.) The question of the Baptist seems, then, to indicate an internal uncertainty as to whether or not Jesus was the longed-for Saviour; and such a question must certainly appear very strange from the mouth of the Baptist, after the strong declarations of his faith, and after the experience which he had obtained concerning his relation to Jesus. (Compare Matt. iii. and specially John i. 23.) Hence many have been disposed to consider this question as being intended to strengthen the faith of His disciples who were beginning to faint; others, as containing a call upon Jesus to hasten the carrying out of His plans. The first remark requires no special attention; for the disciples of the Baptist would have been com-

\(^1\) On this point compare Matt. iii. 3; Mark i. 1.

\(^2\) Hengstenberg (Christology, vol. iii. p. 292, et seqq.) derives, on very plausible grounds, the expression from Malachi iii. 1; but it is very probable that several passages of the Old Testament concur in giving it this fixed doctrinal signification.
pletely satisfied by the decided declarations of their master (John i. 29), as we see in the case of the apostles. But the second remark contains some truth. It might, indeed, appear to the Baptist as though Jesus were proceeding too cautiously, inasmuch as he did not understand His secret working upon the souls of men. But it is difficult to conceive that John, if his own faith remained unshaken, should have had no intention beyond that of inducing our Lord to adopt a different mode of procedure; the very form of the question is such as to oblige us to refer it rather to the state of mind of the interrogator himself. For, if we look at the passage now before us with unprejudiced eye, it appears more natural to seek for the ground of the question in the mind of John himself. Our inward experience can alone teach us to understand such events. In the life of every believer, there occur moments of temptation, in which even the firmest conviction may be shaken: nothing, therefore, is more simple than to imagine such a time of inward darkness and abandonment by the Spirit, in the life even of John. We are too much accustomed to think of the character of Scripture saints only under a certain form, and as liable to no change; but excepting only the Lord himself, whose nature was quite peculiar, and must be regarded per se, it is quite evident that internal changes of light and darkness must be supposed in all individuals, even when such are not reported; inasmuch as, by this very struggle, the life of the saints is perfected. Hence, wherever communications so simple and clear are brought before us as the one in question concerning John, there is no reason whatever for doubting. In his gloomy prison at Machaerus, the man of God was no doubt surprised by a dark hour, in which he was struck by the quiet unobtrusive ministry of Christ, and began to doubt the experience of which he had heretofore been the subject. This is clearly implied in the words of Jesus: ἡμᾶς ἔστιν ὅταν ὁ λόγος ἀπεκδηλωθῇ ἐν ἑμῖν (ver. 6), which contain, at once, censure and comfort. For, indeed, it would have been a sad thing for the poor prisoner if he had not stood firm in the hour of temptation, if he really had been offended; but now he was only tempted to be so,—and blessed is the man that endureth temptation (James i. 12). But as, without a struggle, there is no victory for sinful man, so the Baptist also could not be spared such a struggle. The very circumstance, however, of his having sent to Jesus and enquired of Him, shews that he endured the temptation and conquered.
That he asked Him in this manner proves that he was tempted; but that, in his temptation, he asked no one else, but applied to the Saviour himself, proves his faith; and so much the more, as the free life of the Redeemer, so very different from his own, must have appeared rather strange to the austere preacher of repentance. (Compare the remarks on Matt. xi. 19.) The question of John is nothing else than the prayer, "Lord, I believe, help thou mine unbelief;" and this prayer is answered by our gracious Lord. Whosoever asks God whether He be God; whoever asks the Saviour whether He be the Saviour, is in the right way to overcome every temptation,—it is only thus that he can attain certainty. Hence it is, that the words of Jesus concerning John (ver. 7. sqq.) form no contradiction to the supposition that he sent the messengers in an hour of severe temptation. He even thereby proved that he was not a reed shaken by every wind, but that he stood firm and unshaken amid all storms. But when there is no storm, how can firmness be proved? It was then, during the time of his shining, and when the fulness of the Spirit dwelt on him; that God made use of the Baptist for His great purposes among mankind; but in the time of his poverty and abandonment, God perfected him within himself.

Ver. 4, 5. Referring to prophetic passages, such as Isaiah xxxv. 5, 6; lx. 1, Jesus answers the question by a reference to His deeds; the messengers find the Redeemer in the midst of His messianic labours; all that they can report is that He is saving. It is true, that they saw only His outward activity, but the spiritual signification of these outward proceedings was opened up to them by the discourse of Jesus; by the healing, eternal salvation is prefigured. (Concerning προφέρεται, comp. Matt. v. 13.) Εὐαγγελίζωσαί, has here the signification of "hearing the gospel," "receiving the glad tidings." The passage, Isaiah lx. 1, which is here referred to, forbids the interpretation, "the poor preach the gospel." Indeed, a glorious mode of proceeding! alone fitted to convince of His messianic dignity. Not one word about the person of the Baptist—only the words μακάρις ὁ ἄνθρωπος are given to them for consolation and warning. But if it be asked, why the Lord did not speak more fully and plainly, the ready answer is, that such struggles must be fought only in the inner man; the very question was to the Lord a sign of the approaching victory. He left him, therefore, entirely to himself, without any further inter-
ference with him. (Concerning σκάνδαλος, comp. the remarks
on Matt. xviii. 8.)

Ver. 7. For the sake, and in the presence of the people, who
might easily have misunderstood such a question, Jesus ex-
pressed himself more fully, and depicted to them the noble image
of the grave warrior, in order that, on the one hand, they might
know what they might expect from him, and, on the other hand,
might also recognise what he could not give to them. Some of
the disciples of John, who were present, may have given the first
occasion to these remarks. Of himself, Christ is silent, in solemn
repose; upon all He impresses the words: µακάριοι οἱ ἐν οἷς ἔδωκα
σκάνδαλον ἐν ἑμῖν. The manner in which our Lord, from the 7th
to the 9th verse, speaks to those surrounding Him concerning
John, is somewhat dark. It is difficult to obtain a right under-
standing of the various reproving questions of our Redeemer.
The words: καλάμος ὑπὸ ἀνίμου σαλαμάδον, may be figuratively un-
derstood of a light-minded man (as in Ephes. iv. 14; Heb. xiii.
9); or, without any figure, of the reed which grew on the banks
of the river Jordan, and with which the wind sported. In the
latter case, the sense would be the following: “You must
certainly have had some object in view, which made you hasten
to the wilderness; it can certainly not have been your intention
to get a view of something empty, of every day’s occurrence, as,
for instance, a shaking reed, or soft garments.” The third question
must then indeed denote the proper object; they wished to see a
prophet, and that John the Baptist certainly was. Yet the
thought in this shape would be rather meagre,—it would have
been better, in that case, to put only the single question, “You
wished to see a prophet, was it not so? well then, you have seen
him, and the greatest one too; only obey him!” But, if we turn
to the other mode of interpretation, we shall there too meet with
considerable difficulties. The thought, “have you gone out to
see a light-minded or luxurious man?” is too strange, for who
would go to the wilderness to see such a man? or who could
imagine John to be such an one? But, if it be said that the
unsuitable question was only intended to shew that they cer-
tainly thought no such thing, the question again is, For what
purpose are these things brought forward? The passage will
always remain dark, unless verse 16 seq. are compared. That
passage shews that Jesus, in His questions, has only in view the
character of the multitude, and portrays their own contradictions. They evidently went in crowds to the wilderness to see a prophet (as if there were something in a prophet to be gazed at, while they did not desire to hear him); they might well have known how a true prophet would manifest himself to them, and yet, when they perceived his moral earnestness, they did not like him; their impure hearts had longed for a prophet after their own taste. Our Saviour, who searches the hearts of men with eyes of fire, lays open to them this their inconsistency; in hastening out to the prophet, and then desiring that he might not be what he is, and should be something which he cannot be, viz. such an one as themselves. They themselves are the πάλαμος ὑπὸ ἀνίμου σαλεύοντες; as is fully demonstrated in verses 16, 17. "You imagined that you would find a pliable pseudo-prophet, one who would yield to all the caprices of sin, and one altogether like yourselves? You imagined that you would find a sensual teacher, flattering your sensuality? You imagined that you would behold a prophet, just as your fancies had depicted him to you, mighty, glorious, but sparing sin? Indeed you have obtained one, but one who is another Elijah." After this, there follows, first, a farther description of the Baptist, and of the manner of his ministry, with which is then connected a parallel between the person of Jesus and the Baptist—with the remark, that the same character of the same multitude that did not like John, had also been offended at Him, although His appearance was altogether different from that of the Baptist; and they had been offended at Him for this sole reason, that they could never, in any form of the divine, whatever it might be, find the likeness of their sinful selves; and that it was only themselves they were everywhere seeking. The haughty judges of the children of light, who sometimes dislike this, and sometimes that, in them, must, therefore, before all things, come down to humility; the babes (νησίω, ver. 25) who possess it, for this reason also, comprehend what is divine in the most varied forms of its appearance, because they never anywhere care about the form, but always and everywhere about the substance.

Ver. 9. The description of John the Baptist begins with the words καὶ καὶ περισσότερον προφήτων. That the Baptist was more than a prophet (i.e. that in the clearness of his view, he had attained to a point beyond that of the prophets), is inferred from
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Malachi iii. 1, in which a messenger is described as preparing the way for the Messiah. (Concerning this, comp. the remarks on Matt. iii. 3.) By means of this office, the Baptist received a peculiar position, inasmuch as he occupied the intermediate space between the Old and New Testament; nevertheless, according to the whole tenor of his life, he still belonged to the Old Testament, and only formed the link by which the two spheres of religious life are connected. (Comp. what has been remarked on Matt. iii. 21.)

Ver. 11. But the Redeemer proceeds yet farther in his exaltation of the Baptist; as he had placed him above all the prophets, so he places him now above all the γεννητος γυναικῶν. The words ἔγειρον εἰς = οὕτως, have the signification "to raise up," "to call forth" one for a particular purpose, from a great multitude; so that we may supply ὠδίω τῷ Θεῷ (John vii. 52)—γεννητός γυναικός = ἡ γυνὴ τῆς Ἰωάννης, Job xiv. 1; xv. 14. (γέννημα τῆς γυναικός, signifies man in general, but with the accessory idea of frailty or impurity.) The expression, therefore, has its contrast in the phrase γεννητός εἰς τῷ Θεῷ; thus were the first man and Christ, and thus are believers, who are begotten of the Spirit, through Him. (John i. 13.) To this contrast, the closing words of the verse refer, in which the μικρότερος εἰς τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν is placed above John. (Concerning the expression μικρότερος εἰς τῇ β. comp. what has been remarked on Matt. v. 19, where the μίχας and ἰλαχίστος εἰς τῇ β. are contrasted with each other.) Even in the lowest degree of the Christian life, which has been brought to mankind by Christ Jesus, man stands higher than John. Concerning this remarkable thought, it must, in the first place, be well observed, that the μείζων ἰδιαί, ascribed here by the Redeemer to those living in the kingdom of God, must be understood in a Christian sense, so that even the greatest is, at the same time, the humblest, divested of all selfishness and sin, entirely in the sense of Matt. xx. 25, 26. Those in the kingdom of God occupy in so far, therefore, a higher ground, as the possibility of attaining this position, of being divested of self, lies within their reach. This is therefore the general character of all the members of the kingdom of God; and the difference between

1 The comparative μείζων needs not to be taken as the superlative. Compare Winer's Gr. S. 221. The reference of the expression to Jesus himself: "I, the lesser one, am greater in the kingdom of heaven than he," is evidently quite inadmissible. It would have been mock-humility, if Jesus had called himself less than John.
them consists only, partly in the degree in which they have received into all the faculties and powers of their nature the principle of higher life, freeing from all sin, and hence also from pride; partly also, in the more or less copious endowment with those powers on which the varied sphere of activity of the single individual depends. But then, it is self-evident that the **ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ** cannot here refer to every one who is a member of the visible church of Christ; inasmuch as there are many bad fishes in the large net of the kingdom of God. (Matt. xiii. 47, seq.) On the contrary, the meaning of the expression is here limited by the preceding **γιννητοί γυναικῶν**; whence we must infer, that the **βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν** contains only the **γιννητοί ἐν Θεῷ**. The **βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν** is here, then, the kingdom of God in the ideal conception. This community, with all its members, our Redeemer, in verse 11, places above that whole community to which John, with the Old Testament prophets, belonged. The whole passage, therefore, is applicable to those only who are truly regenerated. To many members of the visible church, not even a position equal to that of the representatives of the Old Testament can be granted. But a considerable difficulty still adheres to this passage, inasmuch as the question here arises, as to whether no regeneration took place at all under the Old Testament. In order to answer this question, we must distinguish between regeneration in a narrower, and regeneration in a wider, sense. In the narrower sense, the expression signifies the communication of a higher life and consciousness, which can be effected only through the operation of the Holy Spirit, whose outpouring on mankind depended upon the glorification of Christ. (John vii. 39.) In this more confined sense then, the regeneration of the Old Testament saints is out of the question. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, as well as all the Old Testament saints, beheld the Redeemer only as He who was to come, without having experienced the real effects of His power. (Heb. xi. 13; 1 Pet. i. 10-14.) They were, therefore, in the **Sheol**, and attained to the resurrection only through Christ. (Comp. the remarks on Matt. xxvii. 52, 53.) In the wider sense, however, every important and eventful change in the inner man may be called regeneration; and such a one was no doubt experienced by Abraham and Jacob, on account of which, and especially on account of the new name given to them, they may be justly regarded as the types of the new birth. The
sense of the words οὐχ ἑγέρεται ἐν γυναικὶ γυναικὶ μετὰ Ἰωάννου τοῦ Βαπτιστοῦ, may, accordingly, be still more exactly determined. It is not likely that Jesus intended to subordinate Abraham and Jacob to the Baptist; these occupy, not only as the ancestors, according to the flesh, of the people of God, but specially also as the fathers of all the faithful, a prominent position, and shine in glorious brightness. For, among the members under the Old Testament dispensation, various degrees of attainment, and various positions may be distinguished, as clearly as among the members of the New Testament church. A distinction between προφητεὶς and δίκαιος has been already made above. (Matt. x. 41.) Here we might, to a certain degree, find a third class alluded to, viz. the regenerate of the Old Testament. The Baptist would in that case, be represented only as a δίκαιος, in the noblest legal sense, as a true representative of the law, but from whom was concealed the higher life of the Spirit, such as was experienced by Abraham and Israel, who appear far more as the representatives of the higher order of the things of the evangelical life which was hereafter to be revealed, than of the legal state.

Ver. 12. From the description of the person of the Baptist, our Redeemer proceeds to describe the peculiar character of the time; and this leads him to the objurgatory discourse in verse 16. "As the man is great whom God has raised as the precursor of the kingdom of the Messiah, so the time also in which he works, is rich in blessings: the more culpable, therefore, are they who do not avail themselves of it." The ἡμῖν ὁ Ἰωάννος, must be understood of the time of his publicly appearing to preach repentance, and as the terminus a quo; in the words ιν αὐτοῦ, the terminus ad quem is only in so far intimated as that the favourable time still lasted, which must, however, be by no means considered as now brought to a close. The thought of a time favourable for the growth of all that is good, is expressed in a peculiar manner, by the words: ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν βιάζεται. In Luke xvi. 16, a simi-

---

1 Hengstenberg, in his Christology, vol. iii. p. 472, has misunderstood this my view, as though I denied repentance and faith to the Baptist; I only meant to say, that he does not pre-eminently represent faith; St Paul could therefore not have used the Baptist as the representative of the life of faith, as he did Abraham in Rom. iv. We cannot conceive of any δίκαιος of the Old Testament, as being destitute of πίστις, according to Heb. xi., only, that Old Testament faith did not, like that of the New Testament, imply the possession of divine things, but only the hope, as it is clearly expressed in the passages quoted. (Heb. xi. 13; 1 Pet. i. 10, seq.)
lar expression is found: ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰσαγγελιζομένη καὶ τὰς εἰς αὐτὴν βιάζοντας. With this thought corresponds entirely what follows in our passage: καὶ βιωσάλ ἀφετέρων αὐτην. No doubt the words of this verse must be understood thus: that they represent one view of the phenomenon of which the Lord speaks. In that time of powerful excitement, there was manifested among mankind generally, but especially among the Jews, a fervent longing, a desire after a change of condition, which broke forth with much greater violence the longer it was repressed. In so far as this longing was really pure, according to its inward nature, so far also the βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ might be regarded as its object; but, inasmuch as it had something impure attached to it, and was mixed up with much that was false, it is called βιάζοντας, and a ἀφετέρων is ascribed to it. For although these terms are meant, in the first place, to express only the greatness of the zeal and earnestness for that which is divine, which excited so powerfully the minds of men at the time of our Lord, yet it is impossible not to see, in the choice of these words, a gentle censure for the manner in which this zeal manifested itself. If it had been the intention of our Redeemer to bring forward the other view of the same phenomenon, He might have said: “Heaven is, as it were, now opened; streams of the Spirit are poured out over mankind with life-giving energy.” But it was better adapted for His purpose to set forth the activity of men. With this St Luke vii. 29, 30, connects itself very naturally; as, in this passage, the ardent desire of the poor after truth is contrasted with the haughty contempt of it on the part of the Pharisees. (Διακινόω forms a contrast with ἀφετέρως, the former signifying “to regard as just,” “to approve,” in which signification it is found, immediately afterwards, in Matt. xi. 19 [see farther remarks in comment. on Rom. iii. 21], the latter signifying “to despise.”)

Ver. 13. The peculiar condition of the spiritual world, prevailing at that time, is still more distinctly brought out, according to St Matthew, by the declaration of Jesus, that the law and the prophets prophesied only until John; that with him then, the great turning-point of the old and new worlds had come. The thought appears in a different connexion in Luke xvi. 16; but, in St Matthew, it is so clearly connected with the whole, that we are disposed to consider it as having been spoken on this occasion. For, if the whole Old Testament dispensation closed with John,
it was natural that, with his appearance, a powerful spiritual movement should take place among mankind, which, like the travail of a parturient woman, should precede the birth of a higher order of things. But in the expressions in this verse, we are, in the first place, struck by the connexion of ἄνθρωπος with the prophets; so that it also appears as prophesying. The ἄνθρωπος = προφήτης, signifies here the element from which the prophets, as its representatives, proceeded, and it is the nature and power of the law to prophesy of Christ. By awakening the consciousness of sin, it calls forth also the longing for the Redeemer, without entirely satisfying it. In the second place, the question is as to how the word προφητεύειν is to be explained. It might be understood: “the prophesying activity continues until John—himself included.” But, in the first place, John himself was not properly a prophet in the Old Testament sense; he only bore witness of Him who was now present, and invited to repentance; in the second place, moreover, the prophesying activity continued even after John (Acts xi. 28). It is, therefore, better to understand it of the prophecies themselves, and its meaning to be: “with John the prophecies are fulfilled; they do not extend beyond him.” But this thought seems to be unfounded; inasmuch as so many prophetic oracles reach down to the establishment of the kingdom of God on earth, in the remotest future. Yet the words which follow in verse 14, compel us to decide in favour of this view; in them John is represented as Elijah, and this points to the end of all prophecy. (Mal. iv. 5.) Hence, it is probable, that we must add this passage to the many other passages in which, both according to the words of Christ, and those of the apostles, every thing appears consummated at their time. The explanation of this striking declaration cannot however be given in this place, but will be found in our remarks on Matt. xxiv. 14.

Ver. 14. As if for addition and confirmation, Christ subjoins, moreover, that this John was also the promised Elijah. As regards, in the first place, the notion of the appearance of Elijah, to which the words ἐκ μιᾶς ἐκκλησίας refer, it rests on Mal. iii. 23, 24: κατακόρυφος και κάταθλος ἐστιν ἐκ τῆς μιᾶς ἐκκλησίας. The LXX. have very correctly referred these words to the Tishbite; and so likewise has Sirach xlviii. 10; according to grammatical rules the word ἐκκλησίας requires a reference to a definite historical person. It might be made a question whether the reference to this definite person could not
be viewed figuratively, by supplying ἐν σπέρματι καὶ δύναμι "Ηλίου, as it is in St Luke i. 17. This would appear even more probable, if the New Testament itself did not furnish more exact information concerning it. According to St Matt. xvii. 3, Moses and Elijah appeared as heavenly messengers to the Redeemer in His transfiguration; whereby the figurative explanation of that promise is rendered improbable. Striking, however, is the declaration in the passage before us, that John is Elijah; whereas he himself declares he is not. (John i. 21.) But even if the words ὦ Σίλετς διδάσκαι, did not indicate it, yet the whole connexion of this passage with the other passages which treat of Elijah, clearly shows1 that the Redeemer called him so only in a certain sense, viz., because he acted ἐν σπέρματι καὶ δύναμι "Ηλίου, as Scripture says. (Luke i. 17.) Elijah, the zealous preacher of repentance, is, as it were, the type of John. The question, however, is, whether we are to believe that that Old Testament prophecy has been entirely fulfilled in the appearance of John or of Elijah himself, at the time of Christ's transfiguration. We feel inclined to doubt this, when we read that the prophet Malachi (iii. 23,) adds that Elijah will be sent, νῦν ὁ ἄγγελος τοῦ νῦν ἐρχομένου. It seems, therefore, not an improbable supposition, that this prophecy, although fulfilled in a certain sense, must be regarded as yet not wholly fulfilled. (Comp. remarks on Rev. xi. 6.) As it is the nature of the Old Testament prophecies that the subject of the prophecy may appear in a previous manifestation, without its import being thereby fully exhausted, so it is here likewise. The time of Christ was by no means the prophesied ἀγέλος τοῦ νῦν; but that whole time which reached to the destruction of Jerusalem had a certain resemblance to the last days; and so it had also an element (John the Baptist) which prefigured the future appearance of Elijah. It is likely that, from such a train of ideas, the indefinite: ὦ Σίλετς διδάσκαι arose.

Ver. 15. For the purpose of directing the attention to those appearances in the present time, Christ adds the solemn, earnest

---

1 The opinion of Hengstenberg (in the passage referred to, p. 474), that the words ὦ Σίλετς διδάσκαι were meant only to indicate that the non-acknowledging of Elijah in John had its foundation in a defective spiritual disposition, is indeed very probable, on account of the words immediately following, ὦ Ἰχσοῦ Ἰωάννης αὐτός ἰδ. so that the same would be—"if you would only comprehend it, he is the Elijah that is to come." Meanwhile, this has no influence at all upon the main idea, that the prophecy of Malachi cannot be exhausted by the appearance of the Baptist.
GOSPEL OF ST MATTHEW XI. 16—19.

words: ἀξοῦν ἀκούσω, ἀκούσω. (ἀκούσω = ἰδεῖν, intelligere; hence ἀκούσω of the faculty of the understanding.) According to the intention of Christ, His discourse must have contained something not less worthy of investigation than requiring it, and by this, the admonition was called forth. From the remarks already made, it will appear that the words have not yet lost their profound meaning.

Ver. 16, 17. That which was alluded to in ver. 7, is now more fully set forth in figurative language. Our Redeemer reproves His fickle contemporaries by comparing them to capricious children whom it is impossible to please in any way, and who understand neither mildness nor severity. (Concerning γεμάω = γεμίζω, those living together at one period, comp. the remarks on Matt. xxiv. 34. The text of St Matthew has been altered here in various ways; instead of ἄγορας—ἀγοράς has been adopted; instead of ἰδάναι—ἵδαν, in place of which St Luke has ἀλληλοὺς. The usual reading, however, deserves the preference, both from internal and external reasons.) The terms αὐλίω, ἱγνίω, refer to children's plays, both amusing and grave. But the whole figure would be misunderstood, if the speaking children were made to represent Jesus and John, who again are the representatives of mildness and severity; whilst the other children spoken to were meant to represent the fickle multitude. On the contrary, both the classes of children—those who speak as well as those who are addressed—are to be viewed as the representatives of the fickle contemporaries of Jesus, so that the sense would be the following: "The generation resembles a host of ill-humoured children, whom it is impossible to please in any way; one part desires this, and the other that, so that they cannot agree upon any desirable or useful occupation."

Ver. 18, 19. This figurative discourse is immediately followed by the literal declaration; John was too severe for them, and Jesus too mild. (Concerning the phrase ἀκούσων ἰδού, comp. the rem. on Matt. xii. 24.) The difference between the Old and New Testament dispensations appears here in a striking manner, in the description of their respective representations, although this description is frequently misunderstood. In John, we per-

3 Similar formulas are used by Jewish teachers, e. g. in the Zohar: qui audit audiat, qui intellectit intelligat. Besides, in the Gospels, the formula ἰδού ἂν s. r. l. is found very frequently in Revelations; but it is altogether wanting in the Gospel of St John.
receive the strict observer of the law, who displays, in his appearance, a rough moral severity, and abstains from all intercourse with the sinner; in our Redeemer, on the other hand, we see the impossibility of sinning, joined with a merciful love, which urges Him not to withdraw even from the most wretched, for their impurity cannot tarnish His heavenly purity, whilst His divine light is able to illuminate their darkness. John is a noble human phenomenon, a flower of the earth; Jesus stands forth as a heavenly appearance, as the offspring of a higher world. Blessed were at that time, and blessed now are, those who are not offended at Him, but receive Him just as He is! The words καὶ ἰδιαίωσθε ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν ἁκισθῶν αὐτῆς; (St Luke adds τῶν ἁκισθῶν), form the close of this thought. These words, like so many other words of the Lord, resemble many-sided polished jewels, which send forth their splendour in more than one direction; a peculiarity which is not wanting, even in many sentences of ingenious wise men of this world. When considered by themselves, they may be viewed in various ways; and in every aspect they are full of meaning. But, considered as connected with the words immediately preceding and following, one meaning must, of course, be most conspicuous. The expression: τὰ ἁκιστὰ τῆς σοφίας, evidently points to a contrast with what precedes, where the children of folly are described from the folly of their judgments. (The καὶ must therefore be taken as in an adversative sense, and ἰδιαίωσθαι as above in Luke vii. 29, in the sense, “to declare just,” hence “to acknowledge as such,” “to praise,” “to laud.”) The thought would then be: “wisdom (which is found fault with by foolish men) is justified, and defended, and represented as wisdom by her children, viz. by their conduct as regards her arrangements.” With this, Matt. xi. 25, seq. in which the ἡ σοφία are described as the truly wise, would agree very well. (Neither the aorist, nor the signification of the ἰδιαίωσθαι, are in favour of the translation, wisdom is blamed in her children.) But this thought acquires a peculiar charm, when we consider that Scripture does not speak of wisdom in the abstract, but as a heavenly person, yea, that Jesus calls Himself the Wisdom. (See note on Luke xi. 49, compared with Matt. xxiii. 34; John i. 1, and Sirach xxiv. 4, seq.) In this case, then, the Redeemer here appears as speaking with reference to His divine nature, and the aorist ἰδιαίωσθε acquires a peculiar significance. The same phenomenon which He reproves at the time then
present, viz. that foolish men take offence at the ways of wisdom, has repeated itself at all times; but at all times the children of wisdom have justified their mother, and will do so even now. The Redeemer appears here, therefore, as the bestower of all spiritual blessing from the beginning of time, as the generator, from the beginning of the world, of all the earthly representatives of wisdom whom He now, closing the series of manifestations, represents personally, in all her fulness and glory. (We must reject all those expositions of the passage which lead to the exclusion of the contrast with that which precedes; as, for instance, that according to which ἔγερας is to be supplied after καὶ; so that the clause ἰδίων ἦν ὁ λ. is, so to speak, still put into the mouth of the censorious Jews, according to whose notions the τίτικα σοφίας are merely pretended children of wisdom.)

Ver. 20. The reproving discourse which follows, is found, in its original connexion, on the occasion of the sending forth of the Seventy, in Luke x. 13, seq.; but St Matthew has, very properly, introduced it in this part of his narrative. The whole discourse of the Redeemer was already a censure upon his contemporaries; but, in the following words, the reproof is uttered, in its utmost severity, against those who had most clearly seen His glory. The whole passage again represents the same principle, but only from a different point of view, which we dwelt upon in Matt. x. 41. As a reward is not regulated by the deed itself, but by the disposition from which it springs, and the consciousness by which it is accompanied; so punishment also will not be determined by the outward aspect of the deed, but by the inward disposition of which it is the evidence, and by the consciousness which it presupposes. The guilt of Tyre, Sidon, and Sodom, is in this passage represented as less; first, because their inhabitants occupied a less advanced position than did the Jews at the time of Christ; and secondly, because that which was divine appeared to them in a form which was far less dazzling. At the time of Christ, however, the feeling of need was met in the person of Christ, the purest manifestation of the Divine, condescending, moreover, to the weakness of men, by events which could not reasonably fail to affect them. But, nevertheless, men hardened themselves against these powerful impressions of the Spirit, and did not repent; this, therefore, enhanced their guilt exceedingly. By the greater guilt of the latter, however, the guilt of the former is, in
no way, diminished; it remains what it is; but, compared with the more fully developed manifestations of sin, it is recognised relatively.

Ver. 21. ἕσπαζη, a small place in Galilee, on the shores of the lake of Gennesaret, near Capernaum, is mentioned only here. Some expositors write, without any reason, χώρα Ζήν. It is evident that towns are here spoken of (ver. 20). In the same quarter was situated the better known town Βηθουσά, (derived from νη and νής, i.e. fisher's town.) The two together appear as the representatives of that highly favoured region, where the footsteps of the Lord were seen so long, and His hand dispensed so many blessings. Tyre and Sidon, on the contrary, are mentioned as the wealthy and voluptuous representatives of gross sensual enjoyment, which, as such, had been frequently denounced by the prophets of the Old Testament. (Is. xxiii.) The phrase: μετανοεῖν ἐν σάλλῳ καὶ σωτηρίᾳ, is the well known Old Testament description of an earnest disposition to repentance, which manifests itself in corresponding outward acts. (1 Kings xxi. 27; 2 Kings vi. 30; Jonah iii. 6, 8.)

Ver. 22. The term ἡμῖνα κρίσιν is used, in its most general sense, to denote the period which will at length come, when good and evil which, in the present course of the world, are mixed together, shall be separated. (Comp. further remarks on Matt. xxiv.) "Ἀντις or ἀντις, derived from ἀνέκω, "tolerable," "endurable." (See concerning the same thought, Matt. x. 15.) The comparative, as well as the whole context, leads us to the notion of there being different degrees of punishment for the wicked; some are, as it were, in mitissima damnatione as Augustine says. His notion of the relative degree of punishment seems to imply, that it may be even remitted; and this must be unhesitatingly conceded of the lesser forms of sin. (Comp. further remarks on Matt. xii. 32.)

Ver. 23. The same thing applies, in a higher degree, to Capernaum. (See note on Matt. iv. 13.) This insignificant Galilean country-town, had become the fixed residence of the Messiah, and had thereby gained a higher importance. The choice of the town for His abode, on the part of the Redeemer, can evidently not be conceived of as the result of mere chance, but as being intimately connected with the reputation and susceptibility of its inhabitants. Here the nucleus of the kingdom of God might, and should have
been formed. Instead of that, however, only a few joined themselves with entire devotedness to the Lord; the others, destitute of faith, persevered in their unholy walk. The more dazzling, therefore, the light was to which they opposed themselves, the longer it was shining around them, the more their guilt was enhanced. The latter is described in the words: ἡμεῖς ἔδωκαν καθίσθησιν, in uttering which, our Redeemer very likely may have had before His mind Old Testament passages, such as Ezek. xxxi. 10; Isa. xiv. 15, lvii. 9. The expression καταστάσεως occurs nowhere else in the New Testament; it is the reverse of ἔφυη, hence deijici, "to be brought down." The ὑπάρχειν is contrasted with ἔδωκεν or ἔδωκα ὑποκειμένα, ὑποκείμενον = ὑπηκόουσα. Such expressions, taken from the Greek mythology, just as 2 Pet. ii. 4, alludes even to the ῥάγαρας, the language of Holy Scripture admits without hesitation, if only they were common in the mouths of the people, and had a true foundation. The true and simple fundamental idea of Heaven and Hades, is just this: that evil and good, which are, even here on earth, already separated in their nature and essence, although externally, they are placed beside each other, shall ultimately be separated externally also. Inasmuch as the ἡμείς κατάστάσεως is just the act of reducing to its ultimate principle that which appears here mixed together, the being cast down into the Hades signifies the return of the single wicked individual to his element. At the great separation, which is impending over the universe, every individual life will be attracted and governed by the power of that element to which it granted admission into itself. He who admitted the Spirit and light of Christ, will be drawn by Him into His kingdom of light; he who allowed the power of darkness to rule in his heart, will become a prey to the power of darkness; every one according to the degree of his guilt, which only God can determine, (see note on Matt. vii. 1,) since it is dependent upon the degree of the impression which the light made upon man, and against which he hardened himself. It is strange that some expositors should have explained this passage of external prosperity: "Thou art a very wealthy and prosperous town, but thou shalt greatly decline." Whatever man cherishes in his heart, that he finds again even in the word of God; he

1 Concerning ἔδωκα, compare the remarks on Luke xvi. 28. According to the general view contained in the Old Testament, the Gehenna is here included in the ἔδωκα.
makes a god for himself, and makes his Redeemer speak just as suits him best, and as he would have spoken. (Comp. 2 Pet. ii. 20.) The more guilty Caperraum is then contrasted with Sodom, with the remark: ἵνα ἀν διὶ μίητη τῆς σῆμερον. These words, unless they are meant to signify nothing, are remarkable, inasmuch as they shew that our Redeemer ascribes, even to that which is past, no absolute necessity. He evidently acknowledges, even here, the freedom of self-determination, and the possibility of things having been otherwise, if men had been obedient to God. This, in a moral aspect, so important a view of history, as being wholly based upon the free actions of individuals, lies at the foundation of the whole Scripture doctrine.

Ver. 25. That the following words were not spoken in immediate connexion with those preceding, St Matthew himself indicates by the words: ἐσπαγω γὰρ καὶ ὧν. It appears as though this formula of transition places an interval between that which precedes and that which follows. St Luke x. 21, seq. states distinctly the suitable connexion of the words. We have, therefore, good reason to suppose that St Matthew again followed his practice of bringing into a new connexion the elements of our Lord's various discourses, inasmuch as it was not at all his object to give a chronological survey of the life of Jesus, but to describe His labours and influence from general points of view. The same Spirit, who had spoken through the Lord, guided the disciple also in the arrangement. This may again be seen in the position of the following verses; they form a very appropriate contrast with the preceding objurgatory discourse against the unbelieving; they are the commentary on the words in ver. 19, ἡ σοφία ἰδιακιώτη αὐτοῦ τῶν τίτινων αὐτῆς. The whole passage (ver. 25–30) is, moreover, remarkable in St Matthew, on account of the sublime flight of the thoughts therein displayed. It is quite in the language and spirit of St John. It may be seen from them, that it is the same Jesus who speaks in St Matthew and St John; the individuals only, who hear and receive His discourses, are different; and for that reason, each of them represents Him, just as his individual disposition of mind had enabled him to recognise Him. Ver. 25, 30, now open up to us an insight into the innermost recesses of our Redeemer's heart—a heart burning with love to His brethren. Conscious of His divine majesty and glory, He humbly condescends to the lowly, and seeks to comfort the forsaken. The real
substance of Christianity, the condescension of the Divine to the weak and poor, is here celebrated in inspired language. Compared with this, all human greatness, wisdom, and glory, sink into the dust. (St Matthew begins ἄνωθεν; εἰς ἐν ἑαυτοῦ, ἀνωθενθέντα being used according to the analogy of the Hebrew וֹסָי. [Comp. note on Luke i. 60.] Luke x. 21, on the other hand, points out the inward rejoicing and exulting of the Lord’s spirit, in the words: ἄγαλλιάσατο τῷ πνεύματι. Here the words: τῷ ψυχῇ could not have been appropriately used, inasmuch as they would have pointed rather to the human nature of the Redeemer, as in Matt. xxvi. 38. The joy here spoken of is a purely objective joy, in which the world of spirits shares, and which is represented, in its perfection, in the inner life of the Lord.) Christ commences with the praise of God, on account of the dispensations of His providence. (Ἐξαιρετικῶς = τῷ seq. Deitiv, “to praise,” “to laud,” Rom. xiv. 11, and frequently in the LXX.) According to the well-known Old Testament designation, God is represented as the Lord of the universe, in evidently intended contrast with the θεός = ἡμῖν (Matt. x. 42), στοιχεῖ οἱ πνεύματι. For the idea of the θεός does not only imply that which is undeveloped, but also that which is inexperienced and helpless; for which reason it stands here in contrast with σοφή and συνειδή. The former of these two expressions refers more to that which is divine, the latter to that which is earthly; the σοφία is the result of the νοῦς (reason), but the συνειδή, that of φησίς (understanding).1 Hence it cannot be said precisely, that the wise and prudent possessed a false wisdom and prudence; they had in their knowledge much that was true, and were, in this respect, more advanced than the disciples of the Lord. But their wisdom and prudence was, at the best, earthly, marred, therefore, by many defects, and unable to penetrate the depths of that which is divine. Christ, on the contrary, brought a heavenly wisdom; and the first condition for the reception of it was poverty, and the being emptied of man’s wisdom. For this reason, human wisdom became in itself an obstacle to the reception of the pure light which beamed down from the opened heavens, whilst the simplest and lowliest men—such as were conscious of their poverty and blindness in things divine and human, but burned with a longing after truth—received it most readily and deeply. (Comp. 1 Cor. i.

1 Compare the Author’s Opusc. Theol. (Berol. 1838), p. 159.)
19.) It is this wonderful dispensation—that the Lord of heaven and earth espoused the poorest and the most wretched—which our Saviour here celebrates with exultation. The term ταύτα comprehends, therefore, all that which was peculiar in the life of Christ, and which has been conferred upon mankind through His ministry. The men who could comprehend it, received it by an ἀποκάλυψις. Human σοφία is a fruit of intellectual activity and spontaneity; the heavenly σοφία, on the contrary, is an effect of the divine activity on human receptivity, which is the root of the life of faith. But, whilst πίστις belongs altogether to the καθιστα, the σοφία, in its heavenly form, is a blossom of the νοῦς. The ἀποκάλυψις, however, is contrasted with an ἀπεκάλυψις, an expression which might be considered as being in favour of the doctrine of absolute predestination. (Comp. Matt. xiii. 13, 14.) There is, however, nothing which prevents us from understanding ἀπεκάλυψις in this passage as meaning merely “not to reveal;” so that the sense would be, “they are left to their earthly wisdom.” We here, therefore, pass over the reference to the doctrine of predestination, which will hereafter frequently occupy our attention.

Ver. 26. Once more our Redeemer breathes forth His feelings of thankfulness to the Father; ναὶ τοῖς ἐξελεγόμενοις σοὶ. (Concerning ἐξελεγόμενοι = ναὶ, see note on Luke ii. 14.) Inasmuch as the divine will is the pure manifestation of the divine nature, since God can never will any thing but what He is, this implies the idea, that this very grace conferred upon the poor, and upon babes, along with true heavenly wisdom, is an effect of the pure self-denying love of God, manifesting itself in the communication of His own nature. The love of God, the absolute reverse of envy, induces Him to descend into souls, and just into the souls of the poor and needy. Without being enlightened from above, man does not know nor understand this wonderful love of God, since he loves only splendour and fulness—not poverty; but the very person of Jesus is the clearest proof and manifestation of it; in Him there dwelt the fulness of the Godhead bodily; and yet this divine manifestation was most unpretending and humble. From the Father, the Lord of heaven and of earth, our Lord passes to Himself, the visible representation of this pure love of God, and describes Himself as working, just in the same manner as that which He celebrated in the Father; He invites all the needy to enjoy the fulness of God which is in Him.
Ver. 27. The transition from the Father to the Son may be explained by the following thought: "the organ through which the Father reveals Himself, as the eternal mercy, is the Son himself." First, the Redeemer brings forward the thought of his eternal power, in the words: άνατα μοι αρχιδόνη ἐν τῷ πατρί. The term άνατα refers back to the χώρας οὐρανός καὶ γῆς in ver. 25, so that the passage forms a parallel to the words of the Lord: ἵδοι μοι ἡ τάσα ξύωσια ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐν γῇς (Matt. xxviii. 18), in which Christ, the Son of God, is represented as the ruler of the world, to whom the same honour and worship are due as to the Father, and in whom alone the Father reveals himself to mankind. (John xiv. 9.) But whilst the βασιλεία belongs originally to the Father, it is only given (αρχιδόνη) to the Son, inasmuch as He is at the same time Man; for which reason, at the end of the kingdom of God, the Son gives it back into the hands of the Father. (1 Cor. xv. 28.) Starting from this fundamental relation, our Redeemer then points out His special relation to the Father, in reference to the ἰησοῦς, and thence deduces the doctrine, that all the true ἀποκάλυψις to the babes, comes only through Him; that therefore all knowledge gained without Him, and out of Him, is merely human knowledge, and, therefore, unsatisfactory. In the first place, then, the Lord represents the mutual relation between Father and Son, by saying: οὑδεὶς ἰησοῦς στὸν οὐφε ηδή ο πατής, οὑδεὶς τῷ πατρίῳ τις ἰησοῦς ηδή η ηδή. οὐ ηδή. It is remarkable, that the Fathers often invert this passage in their quotations. (Comp. on this subject, my Gesch. der Evang. S. 292, f.) Irenæus even says in a passage (Adv. Hær. iv. 14), that the heretics had intentionally made this inversion, according to which they read first: οὑδεὶς ἰησοῦς στῷ πατρίῳ ηδή η ηδή οὐφε; but that is very improbable, because Irenæus himself frequently inverts the two members of the verse. Now the reading itself is not contested by the MSS; the question then only is, why the position of the members should be just as it is. The ἰησοῦς στῷ οὐφε is no doubt here placed first, because it forms the principal subject; Jesus wishes to impress upon His followers, that no man can come to the true knowledge of God, except through the Son, for "no man can come to the Father except by me." (John xiv. 6.) If Jesus had wished to represent it absolutely, οὑδεὶς στῷ πατρίῳ ἰησοῦς ηδή η ηδή η ηδή would very likely have been placed first. It is just in the contrast of the two members, that the peculiar mutual relation, as
it exists between the Father and the Son, is indicated, according to the words ο οικών, in 1mol, καθως in sol. The Father beholds himself in the Son, as οικών, ἀπαντάμα τῆς δόξης (Heb. i. 3); the Son finds himself again in the Father, so that the Son is the self-manifestation (Selbstobjectivierung) of the Father, which, as a divine, and hence everlasting act, has begotten the Son as an everlasting Being. (About the particulars concerning the relation between the Father and the Son, see the note on John i. 1.) This mutual act of recognising and being recognised, between the Father and the Son, is communicated to mankind by the Son as the Word, as the manifestation of the Father, who is concealed within himself. (Comp. remarks on 1 Cor. xiii. 12; Gal. iv. 9.) This revelation, it is true, depends on the will of the Son (τέλος θελήται), which, however, must not be conceived of as an arbitrary one, but as guided by merciful love and wisdom. If any one should here object, that if the Son communicates the knowledge of God to any one, as indeed He has communicated it from everlasting to certain individuals, it is then no more the Son alone who knows the Father, but these also along with the Son; we would answer, that in the individual knowing God, it is Christ himself, by His Spirit, who knows the Father (Gal. ii. 20); if, therefore, the whole Church hereafter will know the Father by the Spirit of Christ, yet, in this infinite number of individuals, it is only the Son who recognises the Father, inasmuch as they are all one in Christ. (Gal. iii. 28; 1 Cor. xii. 12.) Hence it is clear, that the ἰδιαίωσις is no mere intellectual knowledge of divine things (this is just the nature of the wisdom of man, whose knowledge of God has no power of creating divine life), but the life of God in man, and of man in God, which, it is true, is not without knowledge, but contains within itself the knowledge, with the essence of it. The ἰδιαίωσις τῷ θεῷ is, therefore, based upon divine love, upon God communicating His nature to the beings whom He has created. “It is only light that beholds light; only that which is divine recognises what is divine.”

Ver. 28. The following verses, which we find only in St Matthew, and which seem to stand here in their appropriate place, are a commentary on the words in ver. 5: οι πνευματικοί πνευμ-γιαλλονται. He, to whom all things are delivered by the Father.

1 Concerning the recognition of the Father through the Son, and of the Son through the Father, compare the pregnant texts, John x. 14; 1 John ii. 18, 14.
calls to himself the heavy laden—not the rich, the great, and the glorious—that is to say, He gives himself to them. The two terms, κοπιῶντες καὶ παραβαίνοντες, denote the same condition (that of being under sin and its consequences); the former pointing out its active, the latter its passive feature. The sense of suffering beneath the yoke of sin, can originate in man only from that which is divine; the ungodly man feels at his ease under it. Inasmuch as that which is divine in man, strives after deliverance from sin, they are called κοπιῶντες; inasmuch as they feel its pressure, and their inability to free themselves from it, they are called παραβαίνοντες. The removal of this whole condition is promised by the Redeemer in the ἀνάστασις. Faith in Him brings back the lost harmony in inner and outer life, and with it, peace and rest to the soul. (Comp. Jer. vi. 16. The idea of ἀνάστασις corresponds with that of John: ζωὴν ἐχεῖν καὶ ζητεῖσκεν. [John x. 10.] As soon as the magnet of life has found its pole of attraction, peace and rest follow. The ἀνάστασις, in its higher degree, and unchanging state, is ζωή.)

Ver. 29, 30. But as that which is holy in man is encumbered with a heavy burden, in consequence of sin within and around him, the divine life, with its claims, appears to man at first as something burdensome and oppressive, because the discord in man is not immediately removed after his entering into the element of the good. For this reason, the Redeemer speaks also of a ζωής and φορέων, which He himself imposes. But it appears as χρηστός and ἤλευσθη, when compared with the burden of sin. For, from the latter, man's nobler self suffers directly; it causes, therefore, the deepest oppression of the soul, and of this characteristic feature, the oppressive yoke of the Pharisaical ordinances partook, inasmuch as they were born of sin, and checked the development of divine life. (Comp. remarks on Matt. xxiii. 4.) The burden of Christ, on the contrary, is only felt by man, inasmuch as he is still encumbered with sin; but man's nobler self feels Christ's Spirit and life to be a homogeneous element; and thus it is that the believer can exult and sing praises inwardly, although, outwardly, he be perishing daily. (2 Cor. iv. 16.) This struggle with sin, the believer must enter upon, according to the command of Christ (αρατία signifies the positive activity on entering upon the struggle—comp. remarks on Matt. x. 38), and learn of Christ. In a manner not to be mistaken, then, Jesus here
represents himself as King and Prophet, who imposes the yoke of His rule, and offers His doctrine for acceptance; but His is a mild rule and teaching, when compared with the service of sin, and all which has originated from it (as for instance the Pharisaical observances); and it is just this mildness which the Redeemer urges as a motive for taking His yoke. Besides this train of thought, there seems to be another in this passage. The expression ζυγὸς μου, namely, may not only be explained: "the yoke which I, as ruler, impose upon others," but it may also be understood: "the yoke which I myself bear;" so that it is equivalent to the cross of Christ. Viewed in this light, the words ὅτι ξυγὸς ἵνα σωθήσῃ κ. α. also acquire a new signification. From the meekness of Jesus in carrying His cross or yoke, His disciples should learn the same disposition of mind; for thereby every burden becomes easy, and every suffering is overcome. If any one walks under the burden of sin, as a common burden; if he bears all the sufferings of time as the consequences of the universal guilt of mankind, then it may be said he walks in self-denying love, takes upon him the yoke (does not merely allow it to be imposed upon him), and thereby finds rest for his soul; for disquietude originates in self-will, which refuses to bear a due share of the burden of sin. According to this train of thought, our Redeemer regards Himself also as a bearer of the cross and yoke, as in all things He was made like unto men, His brethren; only, that He did not bear the burden on His own account, but on ours. It is only to this mode of interpretation, that the expression, τασινός τῷ καθίσματι, is suitable. A ruler may, with reference to his subjects, be said to be πρίγος, but not τασινός. As little, therefore, as God is ever said to be τασινός, just as little is the Redeemer, according to His divine nature; τασινοφροσύνη is the character only of the creature; and Christ calls himself τασινός, only in so far as He is man, and all human, as well as divine attributes, appertain to Him. Holy Scripture expresses the act of the incarnation of the Son of God by κατοίκω, and the humiliation of the Son of God as man by τασινόω. (Comp. remarks on Philip. ii. 6–8). This shews, that in this passage the Redeemer did not intend to speak of himself only as the Son of God, but pointed also to His human nature (and the divine and human natures must be considered to be united in His holy person—a union miraculous, and to us inconceivable); He to whom all things were delivered by the Father himself,
bears the yoke with us, and hence puts His hand along with us to the heavy burdens of life; and, though the only Lord, He is, at the same time, a servant. (Comp. Matt. xxiii. 4-11). He not only gives commands, but enables us also to obey them, inasmuch as He, by the power of the Spirit, brings it about that they do not appear heavy. (1 John v. 3.) The expression, τῆς καθιστικής, describes the humility of the Redeemer, as in entire accordance with the bent of His holy will, and originating in the very depth of His heart; hence humility appears in Him as the cheerful result of free choice. There is, then, certainly a difference between ταξινωθείς τῆς καθιστικής and ταξινωθείς τῷ στιγματί = ἐπὶ τὰς ἑτέρας, Prov. xxix. 23. (Comp. Ps. xxxiii. 18 [LXX.] with σταυχικός τῷ στιγματί, Matt. v. 3.) The latter expression denotes an attribute of sinful man, and marks what is laudable, only in so far as the knowledge of poverty and wretchedness is a condition of all help from above; but in this sense the expression cannot be applied to Christ. He was ταξινωθείς τῆς καθιστικής but elevated and rich τῷ στιγματί, inasmuch as the bent of His will, and the disposition of His heart, are not towards what is high, but towards what is lowly. Ἡς ταξινομοσύνη is therefore ἡ λαλεῖ; but the use of ταξινομοσύνη when speaking of the perfectly holy One, and of sinful man, is peculiar to the language of Scripture. Even in the Old Testament, the LXX. use it for expressions, such as ἀποκρίνεσθαι, ἀποκρίνεσθαι, corresponding with the terms σταυχικὸς and ταξινωθείς of the New Testament. Among the ancient profane writers, the term is very rarely (for instance by Plutarch) used in a noble sense. The peculiar use of the word is connected with the peculiar idea. Whilst we everywhere meet, in the natural man, with a striving after that which is high, which originates in a dim consciousness of his deep fall, Scripture teaches, more darkly in the Old Testament, more distinctly in the New, that the safest way to salvation, and to the highest exaltation, is to humble ourselves to the lowest poverty. It is only in the lowest depths of repentance, and of bitter self-knowledge—producing a merciful love to all our fellow-men,—that the soul can receive the powers of divine life, and rise again to the highest degree of exaltation. In the life of our Redeemer who, from love, became like unto sinful man, this way, which alone leads to peace, is exemplified.
§ 17. THE DISCIPLES PLUCK EARS OF CORN.

(Matt. xii. 1—8; Mark ii. 23—28; Luke vi. 1—5.)

In the subsequent twelfth chapter of St Matthew, the Evangelist reports several events (among others, a cure in ver. 9, seq.), which are, however, held together by a common bond, and which thus likewise make evident the plan of St Matthew to arrange the life of Jesus according to certain striking points of view. It is the rising hostility of the Pharisees to Jesus, by which all the single events in this section are connected, and on account of which the various occurrences seem to be reported. It is probable, from the more minute account of St John, that the hostility of the Pharisees to Jesus assumed a more decided form, only after He had come to Jerusalem for the celebration of the feast. (John v. 1, sqq.) As, however, St Matthew pays no attention either to time or place—as he does not intend to restrict his communications either to Galilee or to any other locality—as he reports without stating the places, and as his aim only is to place before the eyes of his Jewish readers the life of Jesus in its various aspects, we must here also give up any exact arrangement of the single occurrences, and this the rather, because inferences respecting this arrangement, drawn from the internal condition of the reports, cannot but be arbitrary. (Comp. Dr Paulus Commentary, Th. ii. Anf.) An impartial comparison of the other two Evangelists, leads to the same result. For, although St Mark connects the narrative of the cure of the withered hand, immediately with the plucking of the ears of corn, yet he differs, in chap. iii. 7—19, so very much from St Matthew, and brings forward in these verses circumstances so entirely different, that nothing is gained for a chronological arrangement, even though, in iii. 20, he comes back to events which St Matthew also reports in this chapter. Still more striking is the manner in which St Luke differs from St Matthew; inasmuch as, in the passage parallel to Matt. xii. 22, sqq., he enters upon the record of the last journey of Jesus to the feast (Luke xi. 14, sqq.), and then returns, at the end of the chapter, to viii. 19, sqq.

1 The opinion frequently expressed by modern critics, that St Matthew intended to give only reports of Christ's sojourn in Galilee, has been refuted in the Author's "Programme über die Aechtheit des Matthäus"
The first narrative then—that of the plucking of the ears of corn by the disciples—is introduced by St Matthew, with the very indefinite expression: in ἵκεν τῷ καιρῷ—a formula admitting of wider and narrower limits, and corresponding to the general phrase: καὶ ἤγγελον, used by St Mark. But St Luke here uses a peculiar expression: in σακάκτων δινερόπωτω. From this formula, we might be able, perhaps, to infer something decisive in favour of a chronological arrangement, if its signification were not so completely indeterminate. The word seems to have been formed by St Luke himself, and is not met with either in the Biblical writings, or any where else. According to the common opinion, which was first advanced by Scaliger, the expression: διεπερόπωτον σακάκτων is meant to designate the first Sabbath after the second day of the Passover; so that it might be resolved into: σακάκτων πρωτον ἀνά δευτέρας ἀνά τοῦ πάσχα. For, according to the Messianic institution (Levit. xxiii. 11–25), the first ears of corn were offered to the Lord on the second day of the Passover (τοῦ πάσχα); and from this day, seven Sabbaths were counted to the day of Pentecost. The Sabbath following after this second day of the Passover, is thought to be designated by διεπερότων. The plucking of the ripening ears by the disciples agrees very well with this supposition; yet, it must be considered that the harvest was protracted until the day of Pentecost, which indeed was the real Feast of Harvest; the disciples might, therefore, have walked through the fields at a later period also. Furthermore, Jesus must have left Jerusalem very soon, if He wandered through the fields of Galilee on the first Sabbath after the feast, which, as it is well known, was celebrated during a period of seven days. Finally—The explanation is indeed very ingenious, and may be correct, but proofs in support of it are altogether wanting. We may well imagine, that every first Sabbath of two closely following each other, and, as it were, belonging to one another, was thus named; and such a case frequently occurred. For, on the first and last of the two great festivals, the first and the last of the seven days were celebrated, and these might very easily be followed or preceded by a Sabbath, so that these two days of rest followed each other. The same was the case with the Pentecost and New Moons. The first of these two days of rest was then called διεπερότων. In favour of this explanation, although it likewise cannot be proven, would be the omission of the article,
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which points in a manner not to be mistaken to many ἀφεναία δευτερόγενων. (The Hebrew נִאנָא or נִנָא is translated by the LXX. sometimes ἀφεναῖον, sometimes ἀφεναία, and both the forms occur in the New Testament likewise.)

Ver. 2. The plucking of ears of corn, in so far as it was done for appeasing hunger, was permitted by the law (Deut. xxiii. 25); it was only forbidden to use the reaping-hook. But the Pharisaic Micrology, which had perverted the simple Mosaic commandment of external rest into a grievous institution, added the plucking of ears of corn on the Sabbath-day to the forbidden labours. They divided all business into thirty-nine main classes (called Fathers), many of which, moreover, had subdivisions (called Daughters).

Ver. 3, 4. Jesus, therefore, endeavours to raise them from their narrow standing-point to a spirit of greater freedom, and this, in such a manner that, from the law itself, He points out to them its free application; and the result at which He aims is, that the law, with its arrangements, must be understood and treated spiritually. The first example adduced is that of David. The well-known narrative of this occurrence, which took place when David fled before Saul, is found in 1 Sam. xxi. 1, sqq. The ἀργον προβαθμών = νῦν πρό, were placed on small tables in the sanctuary of the tabernacle. (Exod. xxxv. 13, xxxix. 36.) The addition made by St Mark ii. 26, ἵνα Ἀβιαθαρ, presents some difficulties. For, according to the narrative in the Old Testament, it was not Abiathar, but his father Abimelech, who was at that time high-priest; and the expression ἵνα, cannot be understood in any other way than signifying at the time when he was in office. (Compare Luke iii. 2, iv. 27; Acts xi. 28.) Besa considered this passage to be an interpolation; but there is no ground for this opinion. The MSS., with a very few exceptions, are in favour of the reading. It is most simple and natural to say: the Evangelist has confounded father and son, which might easily happen, as Abiathar was the better known of the two. If any one will not admit this (to which I, however, can see as little objection as to the adoption of various readings), we might suppose that the father likewise bore the name of Abiathar, although no proof for this can be given.

Ver. 5. St Matthew and St Mark, when taken together, give us the discourse of Jesus complete. St Matthew first adduces
another example from the Old Testament, from which it may be seen that the law concerning the rest of the Sabbath must be understood spiritually. (Compare John v. 17, where Jesus, from the unceasing creative activity of God, vindicates an unlimited activity for himself also.) According to Numb. xxviii. 9, certain sacrifices had to be offered up by the priests in the temple on the Sabbath; this duty presupposed work of various kinds, and yet the priests were without guilt in it. The clause: σακατεον θεον ζηλαιον = τον βεβλην (Ez. xx. 16), is therefore to be understood in this way: "they would (according to your false notions), desecrate the Sabbath." Evidently the words: in τον θεον are here intended to form a contrast with θεον ζηλαιον, "they desecrate it in that place where, on account of its holiness, it should be least expected."

Ver. 6. From the temple, Jesus passes on to the circumstance then present. Of the two readings, ματισων and ματησων, the latter, as being more difficult, is no doubt to be preferred. It is supported, moreover, by very important authorities among the MSS. The ματισων could only form a contrast with νομει, i. e. the author of the law—Moses,—whilst the neuter draws a parallel between the relations of the priests to the temple in general, and the relation between the disciples and Christ. The sense then is: "the point which is here at issue is something of much greater importance than that connected with the temple service; if even in the latter, the letter of the law could be understood and treated with spiritual freedom, how much more may not it be done here." It is true, that it arose solely from the importance of His person, that the relations were more important here; and in so far, even the reading ματησων gives no bad sense. In verse 8, the same thought is expressed with greater precision.

Ver. 7. This whole reasoning from the Old Testament, must already have convinced the Pharisees how little they had understood the sense of the sacred Book. According to St Matthew, our Redeemer still further continues to bring this before them in a more definite way. They had wished to censure the disciples as transgressors of the law, and in this very censure they had transgressed it themselves. Their leaning towards externals had prevented them from entering into the spirit of the writings of the Old Testament, and so they had not understood the meaning of the profound words of Hosca vi. 6: ἰλαθη δι' ἰλαθως καὶ οὐ συναισια.
(Comp. note on Matt. ix. 13.) In these words of the prophetic discourse, the spiritual standing was indicated to which mankind were to be raised by the Gospel; according to which, it is not the external deed as such, but the internal disposition of mind, and more especially the disposition of self-denying merciful love, which is truly well-pleasing in the sight of God. This merciful love, however, was wanting in the censure of the Pharisees. They were neither concerned about truly correcting the disciples, nor animated by pure zeal for the cause of God; on the contrary, it was envy and internal bitterness which prompted them to find fault with the disciples, and hence they persecuted the Lord himself in His disciples, by their apparent zeal for their Lord. They condemned the guiltless (κατιδίκασαν τούς ἄναρτους); for the disciples had not plucked the ears of corn from ennuı̂ or mere pastime, but from hunger (ver. 1); they had abandoned whatever they had themselves possessed, and were without the necessaries of life, while labouring for the kingdom of God. Hence, they were in a position similar to that of David the servant of God, who, in the service of the Lord, hungered likewise with his followers; and to that of the priests who were obliged to work in the temple on the Sabbath, and who thus, for the sake of the Lord, seemed to break the law of the Lord. For this reason they might also, without hesitation, eat of the shew-bread of the Lord; for what belonged to God belonged to them also. The disciples, accordingly, appear as priests of a higher order in the kingdom of God, to whom, in a higher degree, belonged that which the law itself had commanded to the priests of the Old Testament.  

Ver. 8. The conclusion of our Lord’s discourse points to the exalted rank of His person, and hence of His disciples. In St Mark ii. 27, it is preceded by a rich idea: το σαςωσαν διά του ἄνθρωπον ἵνα, τοῦ ἄνθρωπος διά το σαςωσαν. Inasmuch as σαςωσαν stands here per synecdoche for the law with all its ordinances, the Pharisaic micrological view of the Old Testament is, in these words, contrasted with the Christian, free, and spiritual view of it.  

1 In the parallel passage Luke vi. 4, Cod. D. has a remarkable addition, which probably was taken from an apocryphal Gospel: τῇ ἀντῇ ἤμερῃ Ἰωακείμεν τῇ ζητήσει τῷ ἄνθρωπῳ, εἰ μὴ ἡμᾶς τῇ κοινῇ, μακάριοι εἰ, εἰ δὲ μὴ δεῖμα, εἰς τῇ ἡμέρᾳ αὐτῶν καὶ σημασίας τῇ τῷ νῦν. (On the sense of this addition, comp. the remarks on Rom. xv. 22.)
According to the former, the commands themselves, and the external legal observance of them, are the end to which man is only subservient. In such a view of it, the law is a grievous burden. According to the Christian view, however, man, and his training for heaven, are the end; whilst the commands, and the external observance of them, are only means for this end. From this point of view, the law appears, in its true import, as a gift of love from our paternal God, who trains man by means of external ordinances, only until he becomes able to receive the inward law in his heart. (Jerem. xxxi. 33.) It is impossible that, in the concluding thought, which is common to all the three Evangelists: κύριος τῶν αυθελάτων ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, the term: ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου should be parallel to ἄνθρωπος, in Mark ii. 27; for, although sinful man does not exist on account of the law, but, on the contrary, the law exists on account of man, yet it would be altogether unsuitable to say, that man is the lord of the law, or of any one of the legal institutions. He only could say so of himself, who was the ideal of man. υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου must then be here understood as the contrast of ἄνθρωπος, and hence the Messianic dignity of the Redeemer is declared in this expression. Being the Lord of heaven (1 Cor. xv. 47), although walking here on earth in the humble form of a man, the Messiah is raised above every legal institution, inasmuch as His will is the law itself; yet, He nowhere appears as abrogating any law, but as fulfilling it in a spiritual sense. (Matt. v. 17.) Thus our Redeemer fulfils the Old Testament law of the Sabbath also, by recommending internal repose of the soul, and rest in God.

§ 18. JESUS CURES A WITHERED HAND.

(Matt. xii. 9—21; Mark iii. 1—6; Luke vi. 6—12.)

Ver. 9. The same subject is still farther brought out on another occasion, when Jesus healed a sick man. He avails himself of this event, in order to open the eyes of the Pharisees to a more spiritual discernment of the Old Testament; for, notwithstanding their repugnance to Him, our Redeemer did not yet give them up. It is impossible not to observe how vague are the formulas of transition used by St Matthew. The words: μετατάσας ἑαυτοῦ, would
lead us to connect this event with that immediately preceding; but from St Luke vi. 6, we see that there was an intervening period of at least eight days, and that the occurrence now to be narrated happened on another Sabbath. The words, σίς τιν συναγωγήν αὐτῶν ἠλθεν, prove as clearly that he paid no attention at all to the localities; for nothing had been previously mentioned to shew who are meant by the αὐτῶν. (The χίς ἔγα = ἔξησαμένη by Mark, as the expression so naturally derived from the appearance indicates, is a hand lamed by paralysis, and deprived of vital power; a mere luxation is here out of the question.)

Ver. 10. According to St Matthew, the Pharisees endeavoured to entrap Jesus by an invidious question; St Luke and St Mark allude, in general terms only, to their malicious intentions, but do not introduce them as speaking. (The word σατανησίων is often used by St Luke in the signification, insidioso observare [Luke xiv. 1; xx. 20.] In Gal. iv. 10 it has another cognate signification, superstitioso observare. The notion of anxious observation is common to both.) Christ, however, perceived their intention, not merely from the question (for that might have originated from a well-meaning disposition also), but by means of His power of discerning the hearts, which was very different from a merely reflective supposition concerning their intention (Comp. remarks on John ii. 25.—Concerning the διαλογισμοί [Luke vi. 8], comp. note on Luke ii. 35; Matt. ix. 4).—St Mark and St Luke, again, give a more graphic detail of the outward circumstances connected with this event than St Matthew. They describe how Jesus ordered the sick man to come forward, so that he might be seen by all; and how He then, by directing their looks to the sufferer, endeavoured to rouse the consciences of those men, grown callous by their pretended strict obedience to the law. The question, however, which Jesus puts to the assembled Pharisees (Mark iii. 4; Luke vi. 9) is of a rather singular character. For it seems as if the question at issue were not about the ἀγαθοτήτας or κακοτήτας, but about the σωτήρας and μη σωτήρας. But it is just from this contrast, so apt to mislead them, that our Saviour wished to free them, and to point out to them that the not doing

1 In the apocryphal additions to the genuine Gospel of St Matthew, as Jerome found them in the Gospel of the Nazarenes, this sick man was declared to have been a cœmentarius. Jerome (Comm. in Matt. p. 47) writes that he said: "Cœmentarius eram, manibus victum quaeritans; precor te, Jese, ut mihi restituas sanitatem, ne turpiter mendicum cibos."
might often be a sin. Now, however, it was clear that man should not sin on the Sabbath, any more than on another day; and hence (so Christ argued) it might, under peculiar circumstances, not only be permitted, but even be a duty, to work on the Sabbath day. The law of observing the Sabbath is thus reduced by the Lord to the higher law, not to commit any sin.

Ver. 11. St Matthew goes on to narrate how the Redeemer appealed to the consciences of all those who were present—asking, whether they would not, on the Sabbath, draw out a sheep from a well into which it had happened to fall. Jesus draws an inference a minori ad majus: how much more is the faithful Shepherd of souls bound to save on the Sabbath day a little sheep of His flock which had fallen into the pit of perdition! This indeed is a veritable Sabbath-work, a true service of God! (The same thought, in a somewhat different connection, is found in Luke xiv. 5. For βασιλεὺς St Luke has φίλιας; vita.) The Pharisees held their peace (Mark iii. 4), and hence confessed themselves overcome by the truth of the discourse (Luke xiv. 5). This susceptibility, coupled with so much hardness, raised very different sentiments in the heart of the Redeemer: περιπλάνάμενος αυτούς μετ’ ἀγάπης συλλυπούμενος ἐπὶ τῇ σαρώσει τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν (Mark iii. 5). A sorrowful, sympathizing anger is not at all a contradiction. It is only in sinful man that boiling rage stifles the more gentle feelings of sorrow and sympathizing grief. In our Redeemer, as in the heart of God, the heat of anger is identical with love; whilst He hates sin, He has mercy upon the sinner. (The substantive παθεῖν is, besides in this passage, found only in Rom. xi. 25; Eph. iv. 18. The verb, on the other hand, occurs very frequently. It is derived from παθέω, collus, and signifies, primarily, “obduracy,” “insensibility,” especially to moral impressions; but thence it passes to the notion of ἑπιλαμψις, because blindness is bodily insensibility to the impressions of light.)

Ver. 13. After this address, which so deeply struck their hearts, our Redeemer cures the sick man. (Ἀσθανάστης of bodily healing = ἀπεκείνος Exod. iv. 7; in like manner Matt. viii. 25. It signifies, primarily, in integrum restitutum, to restore to the former, original condition. Thus it is often used in a spiritual sense. Compare note on Matt. xxi. 11.)

Ver 14. The disclosure of sin either awakens repentance, or anger, if man is insensible to it; such was the case with the
Pharisees also. The host of priests, attacked in their most secret sin, joined for the defence of their kingdom. There was no longer the opposition of individuals, but of a powerful body, whose enmity was called forth by the light which emanated from Christ. According to Mark iii. 6, the crafty priests immediately attempted to form a coalition with the secular powers; he says: μετὰ τῶν Ἰεροδιανῶν συμβούλιον ἐποίων. These Ἰεροδιανοὶ were courtiers and adherents of Herod Antipas, the ruler of Galilee (Matt. xxii. 16; Mark xii. 13), whom the Pharisees undertook to gain over to their interests, because they could effect nothing without the secular power. Their wicked intentions became evident even at that time; they hardened their hearts against the beneficial influences of the Holy Spirit, ἵπποδησαν ἀνοίας, as Luke vi. 11 very significantly expresses it, for every departure from God is folly.

Ver. 15. But as the hour had not yet come, in which the Lord was to be delivered into the hands of His enemies, (Matt. xxvi. 45), He left them and withdrew into retirement. The narrative of Matt. xii. 15, 16, finishes with the same kind of general formula, as we have already frequently met with (iv. 23, sqq.; ix. 35, sqq.). According to the parallel passage (Mark iii. 7, sqq.), Jesus went to the Lake of Gennesaret, and, among the multitudes who sought Him there, there were not only persons from Idumea, Tyre and Sidon, but also from Judea and Jerusalem—(Comp. iii. 22, where γραμματίς ἀπὸ Ἰεροσολύμων κατα-ζήτεις are expressly mentioned) which clearly proves that Jesus had already exercised His ministry in Judea and Jerusalem. It is probable that many events narrated by St Matthew and St Mark happened in, or around Jerusalem; only, the Evangelists omit any mention of the locality; no intimation is to be found that, before His last journey to the feast, Jesus limited the sphere of His ministry to Galilee. According to the farther report of St Mark (iii. 19), the throng of people was so great, that they became troublesome to our Lord (Ἐλίζειν), and He was obliged to enter into a vessel in order that thence He might be able to teach them. (In the phrase: ἵνα σκοτάζω προσκαρτήσῃ αὐτῷ, the expression προσκαρτήσῃ is used in the sense of præsto esse, “to be at one’s disposal.”) Here also Jesus endeavoured earnestly and impressively to inculcate (ἐπηρεάσας), that His abode and dignity should not be made

1 The uncritical Epiphanius describes the Herodians as a religious sect. (Epiph. Haer. Osseni. p. 44.)
GOSPEL OF ST MATTHEW XII. 17, 18.

known, (να μὴ φανερώσω αυτὸν τοίχωσιν, Mark iii. 12; Matt. xii. 16.) According to the context, this command of Jesus chiefly implies, that He wished every political movement in His favour to be avoided on the part of those Jews who were filled with false notions concerning the Messiah, that He might thus take from His adversaries every even apparent occasion of accusing Him. (Compare, concerning this, the remarks on Matt. viii. 4.)

Ver. 17. St Matthew avails himself of this quiet retirement of Jesus, which formed so striking a contrast to the tumultuous enterprises of the false Christs of a later period, in order to quote a remarkable passage of the Old Testament (Isaiah xlii. 1–4) in which this character of the Messiah is pointed out. The Messiah is there described as possessing the same gentleness and meekness as He had displayed in His discourse, Matt. xi. 28–30. (Concerning the phrase ὅτως προκοπήφ, comp. remarks on Matt. i. 22.)

Ver. 18. This quotation of the Old Testament is also treated in a peculiar way. St Matthew follows neither the LXX, nor the Hebrew text verbatim; on the contrary, he makes use of the text for his purpose in a free translation. The LXX have, in the first place, added to the translation their own exposition; they add to Isaiah xlii. 1: Ἰακώβ ὁ ταξις μου Ἰσραήλ ὁ ἐκάλεσάς μου. The reference of this passage to Israel, i. e. to the whole body of the truly faithful among the people, is, indeed, not incorrect; but St Matthew could not make use of it for his purpose (at least, not without an explanation); hence, he adheres to the words of the original text ἐκάλεσάς μου which presented a more natural reference to Jesus, and translates by ἠθεῖν the word ἐκάλεσάς omitted by the LXX. But, with full warrant, the Evangelist refers these words to Jesus, inasmuch as our Redeemer was not only a member of the collective body of the true worshippers of God in Israel, but their representative; and many expressions, especially ver. 4 (蜃τῆς ἐκάλεσάς μου), shew that the prophet had such an one in his view. The word ἠθεῖν (Hebr. נקח, LXX στενοβίπτασα from αἰμεῖν, which is found only in this passage, differs from the signification of the word in the original text; yet the word ἀκάθρο “to seize,” “to lay hold on,” = αἰμεῖν, might well be taken in that sense. The word ἠθεῖν the LXX render better by ἱκοῖν, than St Matthew by ἀκαθαρία. It may be, however, that St Matthew chose the expression on account of the subsequent prophetic discourses of Christ concerning the judgment.
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Ver. 19. The words of this, and of the following verses, extol the gentle character of this beloved Son of God. St Matthew has transposed the first two expressions, the words of the Hebrew text being סיר סיר סיר (the LXX has ἄνησον instead of ἔσον.) In the subsequent clause τὸν ἔλεγον (LXX, ἔσον) is rendered freely, ἐν ταύτῃ ἡλεόμενος, and has no doubt a reference to the ἄναψησθεν (sic ἐν ἑλεόμενον) in ver. 15.

Ver. 20. As ver. 19 described the quiet, noiseless ministry of Christ (for all the noise and tumult connected with His ministry proceeded not from Jesus, but from the people; our Lord always endeavoured to quell the tumult), which the carnally minded Jews had not at all expected of the Messiah, inasmuch as, in their vain mind, they imagined that He would appear in noisy splendour, and tumultuous glory; so this verse expresses His condescending affability, ministering to the necessities of the suffering and feeble. The expressions, κάλαμος συντριμμένος and λίος τυφώμενος, are natural figures of the broken, perishing life; it is represented as the business of the Messiah again to strengthen and excite it. The last words from Isaiah xiii. 3: ἡ τῆς μισθοῦς τῆς, which the LXX renders εἰς ἑλέον εἰς εἰλον κρίνει, St Matthew has rendered with a deviation: ἔσον γὰρ εἰς εἰλεόν τὴν κρίνει εἰς νίκος, which latter expression would rather suggest ράγι. (Comp. 2 Sam. ii. 26.) We may suppose that the Evangelist had another reading before him, or, that the words εἰς νίκος are explanatory of εἰς ἑλέον; for the carrying out of the κρίνει to the ἑλέον is indeed the victory.1

Ver. 21. St Matthew has omitted the first words of Isaiah xiii. 4, thinking them less adapted to his purpose; but he quotes the concluding words καὶ συνενδεκατοι, which he renders: καὶ ἐνδεικτικὲς ἐδοξήσεις; and this agrees verbatim with the LXX. We cannot but notice here the exact agreement with the LXX, in opposition to the Hebrew text, when looking at the former deviation; and this can hardly be otherwise explained than by a different reading. For the very word ἔσον must have appeared to St Matthew very suitable for his purpose. As regards the Messianic explanation of this whole passage, it has lately been defended by Umbreit, in his beautiful treatise on the servant of

1 Others, as for example Gessensius (on this passage), translate ἔσον by "mildness," a signification justly not admitted by Umbreit, in the treatise which will be presently quoted.
God, (Heidelberger Studien und Kritiken, B. I. H. 2.) This ingenious expositor has very correctly understood the idea of the suffering and victorious innocence, and of the moral power of the servant of God, who is no other than the Lord and King Jehovah; only, he appears to overlook the identity of the servant of God in the various passages. The difficulty of referring the various, and apparently contradictory, attributes to one individual, disappears when we suppose the idea of a multiplicity being represented by a unity. The various expositions of this difficult passage concerning the servant of God (from Isaiah xl. to lxvi.), according to which, either the whole nation of the pious, or the prophets in the nation, are thereby understood, are not in strict contradiction to the Bible or Messianic exposition, inasmuch as all this is implied in the idea of the Messiah. The Messiah represents the ideal of the true Israel, whilst the pious and the prophets represent it as it actually existed.

§ 19. OF THE CALUMNIES OF THE PHARISEES. JESUS' SEVERE REBUKES OF THEM.

(Matt. xii. 22—45; Mark iii. 20—30; Luke xi. 14—26, 29—32.)

To think of a more intimate connexion of the narrative which follows, with what precedes, is in St Matthew, out of the question, inasmuch as, after the general formulae in ver. 15, 16, the narrative is taken up by a simple ἐν ἑαυτῷ. In Luke xi. 14, sqq., we find ourselves transported into a perfectly strange territory; and Mark iii. 20 again leads us back to the sending forth of the twelve Apostles, where the report of their return is followed by an indefinite: καὶ συνήχθησαν πάλιν ἐξ Χριστοῦ. The addition, however in ver. 22, ὦ γραμματίτης ὦ ἀπὸ Ἰουδαίων καταγόμενος, renders it probable, that a feast in Jerusalem has preceded. But, on the one hand, it is uncertain which of the feasts is to be understood; and, on the other, we might imagine that the journey of these scribes was not at all connected with a feast; while this supposition would be admissible, only, if it were remarked that these doctors were Galileans. But since this is not mentioned, we may conceive that they were emissaries sent out by the chief men of Jerusalem, and these might arrive at any time in Galilee.
At all events, it will be advisable not to determine what has been left undetermined. In St Mark iii. 21, another remarkable circumstance is added, which will presently occupy our attention (when we shall comment on Matt. xii. 46); but then he immediately states the impudent charge of the Pharisees against the Lord, without referring to the cause which called it forth. St Matthew just represents the opposition of the Pharisees in its gradual growth, until it reaches its climax, in accusing Christ of a connection with the kingdom of the evil one, and of madness.

Ver. 22. According to the account of St Matthew, the cure of a demoniac, who was at the same time dumb and blind, was the cause of the bold and impudent accusations of the Pharisees. (Luke xi. 14 points out his dumbness only, without however denying that he was blind also.) It is evident that the sick individual must have been suffering from a very peculiar disease, as it is only thus that the remarkable astonishment of the multitude, and the inferences which they draw from the cure, can be accounted for. (Matth. xii. 23 uses the phrase: ἐξέστασις κάνεις ἐπὶ δόξας. The verb as well as the noun ἐξέστασις are, in the New Testament, frequently used to express violent fear or astonishment; [Mark ii. 12, v. 42; Luke v. 26; Acts iii. 10.] Concerning υἱὸς τοῦ Δαίδ, compare remarks on Luke i. 35.) It is clear, however, that the sick person is called δαιμόνιος, not because he was dumb or blind, or, as in the present case, both at the same time, but, on the contrary, because these affections in him were accompanied by other physical and psychical phenomena which pointed to spiritual influences. (Compare the remarks on Matt. vii. 9, 27, seq.)

Ver. 24. The more striking the deed of Christ appeared, and the more the wonder and sympathy of the simple multitude were excited by the cure of a most unfortunate being who seemed to be cut off from all living intercourse,—the more fearful was the wrath of the priestly host, who might well perceive that the ministry of Jesus would destroy their dominion. They breathed blasphemy into the hearts of the simple-minded, by insinuating that the powerful effects which were moving them, were the work not of the Holy One, but of the unholy one. Inasmuch as mighty effects infer mighty causes, they accused Him of a union with Beelzebub. (Compare the remarks on Mark x. 25.) The accusation formerly made (δαίμονι Ἰησοῦ, Matth. xi. 18) was less se-
vere. It is true the phrase δαίμονον ἵππος, is by no means = μαίνεως, as John x. 20 clearly shews, where both the phrases are connected by means of καί, and hence cannot be identical unless we suppose the writer to have made use of a gross tautology. The μαίνεως, indeed, may be conceived of as the consequence of the δαίμονον ἵππος, and being, as such, not necessary, but commonly connected with the δαίμονον ἵππος, it might be supplied even here. But, in itself, δαίμονον ἵππος, signifies only "to be ruled over, to be guided by an evil spirit," = ἵππος ἵππος δαίμονος. The difference therefore betwixt this expression and that used in xii. 24, consists in this, that here a direct influence of the ἵππος τῶν δαίμων is asserted, while, in the other passage, merely that of an evil being in general; and farther, that the performance of miracles by means of the power of darkness, presupposes a peculiar wickedness of disposition; whereas in the δαίμονον ἵππος, there is assumed rather an unconscious state of dependence upon the evil one.

Ver. 25, 26. Jesus knew their hearts (see Luke vi. 8), and the evil thoughts which were in them. (Concerning διαλογισμὸς, διανόημα ἐνθαματικὸς, comp. remarks on Luke ii. 35; Matt. ix. 4.) He first endeavoured to instruct them by means of arguments, and a representation of the circumstances. (According to Mark iii. 23, ἐν παρακολουθίᾳ, on which comp. Matt. xiii. 3. The parabolical character of the discourse is particularly obvious in Mark iii. 27.) This endeavour of the merciful Redeemer who knew what was in their hearts, is full of consolation. We are entitled to infer from it, that He perceived in their hearts the germs also of something better, to the vivification of which He might direct His attention in the course of His instructions. Had these unfortunate men, who called light darkness, and converted that which was holy into an unholy thing, not been blinded by passion, they would then have committed the sin against the Holy Ghost (Matt. xii. 32), and thus have been deprived of all hope of forgiveness. But in that case, it would have been inconceivable that our Saviour should have addressed to these people who could not be redeemed, words having a tendency to deliver them from their error! For Jesus endeavours, in the first place, to lay open before them the contradictory character of their charge. He compares a town, a family, in short any united community, with the kingdom of Satan, and argues thus: As nothing of this kind
can maintain its existence without a certain order and union of the members, so neither, in like manner, can the kingdom of darkness. (Μη ἡσυχασθαι, διὰ μη ἡσυχασθαι, denote "to be in a state of internal division, mutual strife;" they are the reverse of ἰναισθαι. In like manner ἵππος ἰναισθαι, ὕππος ἰναισθαι denote "to be cut off from existence and subsistence" = τίλος ἰχνή, Mark iii. 26.) The whole argumentation, however, seems to be rather dark. We might be disposed to think that the character of the kingdom of darkness consists just in this, that peace and unity are wanting, and that strife rules instead of them. But how then can an inference against strife be drawn from the nature of the kingdom of darkness? We might answer to this remark of Christ against the charge of His opponents: "this very circumstance, that evil is in strife with itself, proves that it cannot have a lasting existence." But this difficulty will be removed, if we consider that the Lord does not say: "no kingdom, town, or family in which there is strife (namely, among the members who constitute the community) can stand;" for in that case we should be obliged to say that there is no kingdom, town, or family at all, for there is none in which there is not some strife. He, on the contrary, only very wisely expresses himself thus: no kingdom, nor any similar united community, can stand, if, as such, it be divided against itself. If, then, strife be not silenced in a kingdom, as soon as it comes into opposition with another kingdom, it must be regarded as dissolved; but if, in this opposition, it keep together as a living unity, then the internal divisions among its individual members do not make its existence impossible. Jesus thus does not deny that there are divisions in the kingdom of darkness, for that is rather its nature; but this He maintains, that it forms a united community in opposition to the kingdom of Good. It is for this reason also that it is said: εἰ ὁ σατανᾶς τῶν σατανῶν ἵππαλαι. This passage therefore cannot be made use of to prove that σατανᾶς stands for evil angels in general. (Compare above the remarks on Matt. viii. 28.) On the contrary, it signifies, as the article shows, the ἄγανω τῶν δαιμονίων. This ἄγανω, being the representative of the whole, cannot be against himself; otherwise he could not (and with him his kingdom, which is himself) maintain such an opposition to that which is good. Moreover, that here "a kingdom of the evil spirits is assumed, cannot possibly be doubted when viewed exegetically," even according to the
opinion of Dr Paulus (Com. Th. ii. S. 89). Hence it will be necessary to have recourse to artificial means, in order to remove this troublesome doctrine from Holy Scripture.

Ver. 27, 28. After having thus proved the absurdity contained in the thought, that Beelzebub would attack his own kingdom, Jesus passes on to another objection. Jews also cast out demons (οἱ υἱοὶ ἡμῶν †—the Pharisees and Scribes are considered as fathers in the faith, and hence, as fathers of the faithful Jews), by whom (ἐν τοῖς) do they cast them out? This question is based upon the principle: no effect without a cause; now, as the Pharisees acknowledged the cures of Jewish exorcists, they were obliged to assign a cause for them. They could not assume an evil power, partly from what has been previously said, and partly because the general popular notions would not have admitted of it; hence there remained no alternative but to assume a good power. From these insignificant demonstrations of a good power appearing seldom, and isolated, the Lord makes an inference regarding the number of cures of otherwise incurable diseases, which he had effected, and from this He concludes that the kingdom of God is at hand. The βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ must here be taken in a general, indefinite sense, as that order of things, in which that which is divine will manifest itself as victorious in this temporary system of things. This then was very properly connected with the appearance of the Messiah, and in so far the expression signifies the Messianic times. (Instead of ἐν στινυματι, Luke xi. 20 has ἐν δακτυλίῳ Θεοῦ, according to the analogy of the Hebrew רֹצָח [comp. Exod. viii. 19: וְעָלֹךְ רֹצָח וְרֹצָח]. רֹצָח, is a figurative expression for power, with the accessory idea of a manifestation of divine power, more secret and difficult to be perceived.) There is no doubt that the Jewish notions of evil spirits, and of their casting out, were mixed up with much superstition. Josephus (Bell. Jud. vii. 6, 3) relates, that there grew a root in the neighbourhood of Machaerus, by means of which evil spirits were cast out, whom he considers as ποιμένων ἄνθρωποι στυῖματα. The same writer relates in his Antiq. viii. 21, 5, an instance of exorcising by means of such roots, with the aid of Solomonic formulas of incantation. In like manner, an evil spirit is cast out by means of the liver of a fish in Tob. viii. 2. But such an admixture of superstition

Chrysostom understands by this expression, the Apostles; no doubt he thought that he could not ascribe to the Jews the gift of casting out demons.
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does not prove there is at the bottom of the thing itself no truth to which the false notions connected themselves. We may well imagine, that many Jewish exorcists, by faith in the help from above, performed acts which had some resemblance to the cures effected by Jesus (Acts xix. 14); only, that they must be regarded as feeble and isolated effects of spiritual power.

Ver. 29. How thoroughly Jesus comprehends the struggle between good and evil, is shewn by the third parable in which He infers, from the nature of the contrast, that such phenomena as were seen in His ministry, could be explained only as the result of an absolute preponderance of power. The kingdom of darkness, as a united community, is here contrasted with the kingdom of light; both the kingdoms being viewed in their personal representations. But though the contrast is viewed as a real one, yet it by no means appears as an absolute one, inasmuch as in the good there is always the power of conquering. St Luke carries out the figure more carefully. The evil one is represented as an armed man protecting his castle; (αἰλή stands here for palace, as in Matt. xxvi. 3, a large building surrounded with courts or porches.) An ἵππος only can conquer him, deprive him of his armour (πανοπλία), and divide the spoil. (σκύλα, St Matthew and St Mark have σκύλη = αἰλή, which frequently signifies "arms," in which sense it may form a parallel with the πανοπλία. As the contrast to σκύλα, which are distinguished from the armour, it might be taken in the sense of furniture, possessions in general.) This parable, applied to the special circumstances here spoken of, indicates that the deliverance of individuals, fettered by the chains of darkness, is possible, only through the preponderating power of light. But the great practical truth which is taught in the parable is this: that the evil is not merely a μηδὲ, not merely the destitution of all consciousness of God, but something real, although indeed not substantial nor absolute, like the good. The reality of the evil is based upon the disturbed relation of the powers to each other. This want of harmony, however, really exists in the universe, proceeds from one point, and acts powerfully, and can therefore be overcome only by a greater,

The parable is based upon the passage Is. xlvi. 24, 25, where the ἵππος corresponds to the ἵππος. The description of St Luke agrees entirely with the prophetic discourse according to the version of the LXX.
harmoniously working power. This harmony likewise proceeds from a centre, viz. the Redeemer; His redeeming efficacy is the harmonious principle of life, overcoming the disharmony.

Ver. 30. After these discourses of Jesus addressed to the understanding, His language assumes another colouring—the earnest prevails in it. To the Pharisees and Scribes—who, as the representatives of the Theocracy, ought to have been for the Redeemer and His cause, if they had truly acted up to their calling, He represents, that, in their position, mere indecision for Him, was decision against Him. (The two parallel members contain the same thought. The contrast of συνάγεσις and σκέφτηκεν, is no doubt borrowed from the figure of collecting treasures of any kind.) Notwithstanding all the earnestness expressed in this discourse, the thought breathes forth mildness; our Redeemer does not regard them as absolute enemies, but still views them as undecided friends; distinctly pointing out, however, at the same time, that indecision was their ruin. If it should be said that this expression may perhaps have reference to other Pharisees who had not uttered that bold accusation, we would answer, that there is no indication of it in the discourse, and that Christ's former mode of speaking to the calumniators, evidently here also admits of the same lenient method of interpretation. But this proverbial saying forms an apparent contradiction to the similar one: ὅσοι οὐκ ἔστιν καθĆ ιμῶν, οὐκίς ιμῶν ἰσόν (Luke ix. 50; Mark ix. 40). This utterance, however, refers to persons having no distinct call to labour for the kingdom of God, in whom, therefore, the want of decision for the truth may be as certainly considered a favourable sign of their good disposition, as the indecision of the Pharisees was to Him a sign of their evil disposition. It is here quite out of the question to refer this proverbial saying to the kingdom of darkness, in which case the ματίς ιμῶν and καθĆ ιμῶν could be applied only to the subject to be drawn from the context, while the first person would be used only proverbially, so that this sense would arise: “the common remark, he who is not with me, &c. may with full truth be applied to the devil.”

Ver. 31, 32. With this idea is then connected a description of the fearful guilt into which all plunge themselves who were against Jesus (καθĆ ιμῶν). But in order to place this guilt in its true light, our Lord compares it with other very culpable actions
—specially with blasphemies. This difficult passage requires a careful consideration on account of its doctrinal importance. In the first place, as regards the various expressions used by the Evangelists, there is, in Luke xii. 10, a similar thought, but expressed in an abbreviated form. It stands there in quite a different, and far less suitable connection. A comparison of his account with that of the others does not, therefore, contribute to our understanding of the passage. St Mark has the words in the same connexion as St Matthew, but more briefly, and with less peculiarity. It is in St Matthew alone that the thought appears fully brought out; and we find it here again proved, that he knows how to make up, by care in the communication of the discourses, for what he frequently wants in vividness of description. If, then, we follow St Matthew, the substance of the thought is, that all sins may be forgiven with the exception of one, and this one is described by St Matthew: εἰς τὴν λέγον κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἅγιον, βλασφημία τοῦ πνεύματος. St Mark, on the contrary, calls it, βλασφημία εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον. In order to illustrate the idea, it is, moreover, added, that even βλασφημία (according to St Mark), and speaking against the Son of man (viz. λέγον κατὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, according to St Matthew), will be forgiven,—but not the sin against the Holy Ghost. It cannot, therefore, be said that ver. 31 and 32 express the same truth; for although ver. 31 contains the preliminary remark, that the sin against the Holy Ghost cannot be forgiven, yet ver. 32 points out the new and important thought, that even the sin against the Son may be forgiven, but that the sin against the Holy Ghost can not. The expressive remark, moreover, is added: οὐ γὰρ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ὁ Διακονοῦντος. This simple thought, however, it is very difficult to explain; partly, because it stands quite isolated, inasmuch as no other passage of the New Testament speaks expressly of this sin; partly, because it is in itself dark, and stands in connection with other difficult doctrines, e. g. with the doctrine concerning the Holy Ghost. Nor can difficulties such as these be removed by means of grammatical and philological enquiries; every one solves them in the way which best accords with his own fundamental views.

1 On the sin against the Holy Ghost, compare the instructive treatises by Grashoff (Stud. 1833, H. 4), Gurlitt (Stud. 1834, H. 3), and Tholuck (Stud. 1836, H. 2). Yet, from the fear of too great digression, I have been only very rarely able to take notice of the points therein suggested.
In order to explain such a passage correctly, it is necessary that the expositor should be in Christ; the passage must be misunderstood by every one who is not in Christ. After a comparison of Heb. vi. 4, sqq.; x. 26, sqq.; 1 John v. 16, we must, in the first place, discard all such views as would reduce the sin against the Holy Ghost to local and temporary circumstances, so that it could not have been committed in any sense either before or afterwards. In the second place, we must discard every explanation which would weaken the moral import of the words, by affixing to these words, "that the sin against the Holy Ghost cannot be forgiven" (notwithstanding the addition, "neither in this world nor in that which is to come") the meaning: that it can be forgiven, but only with greater difficulty than other sins. Finally, the Christian expositor must likewise discard every explanation of this remarkable passage which understands, by the sin against the Holy Ghost, any act or deed detached from the whole moral condition of the individual sinning; it must always be considered as the fruit of a previous sinful course of life. As the first two modes of exposition destroy the profound meaning of the word of God, and connect the most important moral relations with localities or vague phrases; so the latter view evidently leads into errors which perplex the conscience, inasmuch as some unfortunate man, in an unguarded moment of his life, may easily be plunged into a sin which somewhere, and at some time, has been explained as meaning the sin against the Holy Ghost. As regards, now, the biblical exposition itself, the passages already quoted (Heb. vi. 4, sqq. x. 26; 1 John v. 16) lead us to think of a fearful gradation in sinning, in which man is as little disposed to believe, as he is in a progress in holiness, as it is taught in the doctrine of the δικαιοσύνη τοῦ Θεοῦ. For although the phrase: βλασφημήσας τὸ τοῦ κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ is wanting in those passages, and the point at issue is, indeed, somewhat different, viz. the loss of the higher life in Christ already received, whilst here the question at issue seems to

---

1 Who does not here recall to mind the strange definition which Reinhard gives of the sin against the Holy Ghost, in his Dogmatik, S. 321: Delictum quorumdam Judaeorum (1) qui summa perinnacia duci, miracula Jesu, quorum evidentiam negare non poterant, a diabolo profici voluerunt. This exposition is so much the more unsuitable, as the gospel history does not at all tell that the Pharisees who used this language (Matt. xii. 24) had committed the sin against the Holy Ghost; it appeared only possible that they might commit it; and it is against this that Jesus warns them.
be the refusal to receive it; yet the comparison of such parallel passages is by no means unimportant, inasmuch as we recognise from them the severe import of the φως ἀφθάσις. As a parallel in another point of view, the remarkable passage in St Matt. x. 41, 42, presents itself to our notice; for as in that passage, already explained above, a gradation in good, and the reward awaiting it, were taught, so here we have a parallel gradation in evil, and the ruin accompanying it. The degrees, however, are here not so clearly defined as in Matt. x. 41, 42; but it is evident from a closer examination that here, too, three degrees of sin are to be distinguished, as there, three degrees of righteousness. It is generally acknowledged that the βλασφημία τοῦ πνεύματος or the εἰσίν (SC. λόγον) κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἀγίου is the lowest degree; but in what the εἰσίν λόγον κατὰ τοῦ οὐ ἄνθρωπον is distinguished from it, is doubtful. Some have understood ὁ οὐς τοῦ ἄνθρωπον = ἄνθρωπος, as we find it in Mark iii. 28: τάνα ἀφθάσιται τὰ ἁμαρτήματα τοῖς οὐς τῶν ἄνθρωπων. (Τιὸ τῶν ἄνθρωπων in this case = τοῖς οὐς.) But this view is inadmissible, for this simple reason, that the singular ὁ οὐς τοῦ ἄνθρωπον with the article, is never used as a general designation of man; it is, on the contrary, the name of the Messiah, and stands parallel with the πνεῦμα ἄγιον. The sin against the Son of man is pointed out as something peculiar, by the formula, καὶ ὃς ἂν (iān is a less authorized reading) ἦσαν λόγον. After it had been remarked in the second clause of ver. 31, that the βλασφημία τοῦ πνεύματος will not be forgiven, the sin against the Son of Man is still specially mentioned, with the remark, that even it may be forgiven.—The third class of sins is more obscurely indicated, inasmuch as the Father is not expressly mentioned along with the Spirit and the Son; but the reference to the Father is necessarily implied in the words, τάσα ἁμαρτία καὶ βλασφημία ἀφθάσιται τοῖς ἄνθρωποις. (Matt. ver. 31. Comp. also Mark iii. 28.) For every sin, but specially every blasphemy, has, at bottom, a reference to God.  

1. Lucke remarks on 1 John v. 16 (8. 233) that the sin against the Holy Ghost is a species of the ἁμαρτίας τῆς Σάτανας, spoken of by John in the passage referred to. I am disposed rather to place them in an inverted relation; for we might also say the sin which St John describes is a sin against the Holy Ghost. The difference between the two expressions seems to consist only in this, that the name, sin against the Holy Ghost, points to the object to which the sin refers, whilst the name, sin unto death, places in the foreground the consequence of the sin to the individual who commits it. (Compare Lehnerd's Treatise on 1 John v. 16. Königsberg, 1832.)

2. It is only apparently that this is contradicted by some passages, in which, as in Acts vii. 11, βλασφημία ἁμαρτάνει λαλεῖν is applied to men; for in that passage Moses is
Blasphemy cannot by any means be uttered against an angel or a man. There appear, then, three gradations in sinfulness. First, sins against God the Father; then, against the Son; and finally, against the Holy Ghost. For the two first degrees there is a possibility of forgiveness (on the supposition of repentance and faith); it is only for the last that it is excluded. This gradation is the safest guide for a correct explanation of the passage. As we already remarked, when commenting on St Matt. x. 41, 42, the value of a deed must be determined both according to the object to which it refers (so that, in a political point of view, it is not a matter of indifference whether I confer a benefit on a king or on a peasant, nor, in a spiritual point of view, whether I confer it on a prophet or on a righteous man), and to the degree of moral development of the individual performing it. In like manner, it is also with the growth of sin. The internal condition of the agent, and the relation of the act to the object, determine the degree of guilt. The Redeemer has here to do with persons who recognise their occupation with divine things as their calling, and who had attained to a certain amount of spiritual knowledge; the higher this was conceived to be, the more perilous was their position, if, notwithstanding, they gave themselves up to sin. A child is incapable of committing blasphemy, because it has no knowledge of God; and even though it should repeat blasphemous words, it would utter only words, because its inward sense cannot comprehend their meaning. But the Pharisees, who knew of God, but hardened themselves against His exhortations, required the warning, that man can become so completely callous, as regards impressions of what is divine, that reconciliation is no longer possible. Such a word, uttered with the force of love, might yet rouse their hearts from their carnal security, in which they were staggering along on the brink of the abyss. But the Saviour of the world wishes to deprive no one of the comfort of forgiveness; He proclaims it to all ἡμᾶς and βλασφήμοι, on the supposition, of course, of true repentance and genuine faith. The ἡμᾶς, as distinguished from βλασφήμοι, are sins committed against man viewed as a divine ambassador. It is therefore the will of God that is blasphemed in his person; for which reason the words, τις Μωσέως καί τις Θεόν, are added as an explanation. In Rom. xiv. 16, τις ἡμᾶς stands for that which is divine, as 2 Pet. ii. 2, ὅς τις καλλίστος for the ordinance of God. Of course what applies to Moses applies to the apostles also. (Compare Rom. iii. 8; 1 Cor. iv. 13; x. 30). This with reference to the remarks of Grashoff, loc. cit. S. §55, sq.
or any other creature; while ἁμαρτίαι denote sins against the Divine Being himself. In order to commit the latter, a knowledge of God must be presupposed, and farther, a degree of inward sinfulness prevailing over the light of this knowledge. Such an internal state is represented as yet affording hope of redemption; the superior power of grace is able yet to stir up the hidden susceptibility of good. But if the higher revelations of the Divine in Christ Jesus be perseveringly rejected; if with these increased opportunities for receiving the Holy Spirit, there be, from impurity of life, a progressive shutting of the heart against the light, pardon and redemption become impossible, inasmuch as the internal susceptibility of being moved by that which is holy dies away altogether. The gradation of sin appears here, therefore, to depend upon the development of the inner life, and the deeper knowledge of divine things thereby rendered possible. He who has only a general knowledge of God can, therefore, sin only against God the Father. He who is more advanced, and able to recognise the Son of Man, is in a position also to reject the deeper and more inward revelations of the Divine manifested in Him; but he who is able to recognise that which is divine in its purest and clearest revelation as the Holy Ghost, may, through impurity of the heart, harden himself against the loudest voice of truth.

Hence a high degree of knowledge of God is not a guarantee against sin; on the contrary, the greatest sin presupposes the greatest degree of knowledge; it is only purity, sincerity, and humility of heart which, in every degree of development, afford such security. But inasmuch as this very disposition was wanting in the Pharisees, they were in the way of committing the sin against the Holy Ghost.

1 Of so-called cursing or swearing, and thoughtless abuse of the name of God, we cannot here think; inasmuch as it is done thoughtlessly, the sin consists only in the very thoughtlessness which can effect such guilt.

2 The resisting the Holy Spirit (Acts vii. 51), the grieving of the same (Eph. iv. 30), even the embittering and provoking of the Holy Spirit (Isa. lixiii. 10), are still to be carefully distinguished from the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost which is the real unpardonable sin against the Holy Ghost. Graubner (loc. cit. S. 947) considers the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost as a species of the genus Sin against the Holy Ghost—a view, however, which does not seem to be countenanced by our text.

3 The Reformed, that is, the Calvinistic Church, is led by the doctrine of predestination, to assert that it is impossible for a regenerated person to commit the sin against the Holy Ghost. The Lutheran Church, on the contrary, asserts that it is only such a person who is capable of committing it.
Without entering, at present, into any more minute discussion concerning the doctrine of the Trinity, let us simply conceive of Father, Son, and Spirit, as gradations in the revelation of the Divine Being. The knowledge of God as the Father has reference to the power and wisdom; that of the Son, to the love and mercy; that of the Spirit, to the holiness and perfection of the one Divine Being. He who is able to recognise the holiness and perfection of the Divine, according to the degree of progress in his knowledge (and that not merely in imagination, but in reality), and who, nevertheless, shuts his heart to their influences, yea, calls even holiness unholiness,—proves that his innermost eye is darkness. Accordingly, the words, ἄγιον ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, must not be understood as signifying merely "to speak against the unpretending human appearance of the Messiah;" it must be distinctly pointed out, that he who sinned, thus felt an internal impression of the divine which shone forth in Christ, and yet allowed no room for this impression. He who opposes himself to the melting power of such a revelation, sins heinously; yet by means of the perfect holiness, and the impression of awe and terror called forth by it, the hardening produced thereby may yet be overcome; but where this also is rejected, there is spiritual death. It is altogether shifting the point of view for a right understanding of the passage, if the πνεῦμα ἁγίου be understood only of the general power of God manifested in the miracles. It is the less easily conceivable how, in the non-recognition of such a power, creating merely an impression of might, an unpardonable sin should be committed, as evil miracles also will be performed by satanic agency, and these so deceptive, that even the elect, were it possible, might be thereby misled (Matt. xxiv. 24). It is even here that pardon is in its proper place. The πνεῦμα ἁγίου in our passage is the highest revelation of God, as the absolutely Holy and Perfect One. Inasmuch, then, as in the per-

---

1 This view would be, on the whole, similar to the one referred to above, according to which ἵπτι τοῦ ἀνθρώπου is = ἀνθρώπου. For whosoever really saw in Christ only what is human, because he possessed no deeper susceptibility for the Divine, sinned no more in cursing Christ than he would by doing so to any other man. It is the inward intention, of which, it is true, God alone is the judge, by which the deed must be measured.

2 Πνεῦμα ἁγίου has always a reference to what is moral. The notion of mere power occupies a subordinate place in it. But πνεῦμα by itself signifies, for instance in Matt. xii. 28, power only with reference to its higher origin.
son of Jesus, the Godhead dwelt, and inasmuch as Father, Son, and Spirit are always inseparably connected, the impurity of men, according to the degree of their development, might, in sinning against Him, sin against Father, Son, and Spirit, according as they perseveringly resisted the effects of divine power, love, and holiness which proceed from Him. But, on the other hand, the purity of the heart, coupled with an equally developed knowledge, might, through Him, receive Father, Son, and Spirit. But where the sense for the higher revelation of the Divine in humanity, as it appeared in Christ Jesus, was as yet wanting, there a man might think to see in Jesus a prophet or a righteous man in the Old Testament view, and then receive from Him the blessing which, according to his position, was needful for him. Thus our Redeemer became all things to all men; to the pure in heart, a dispenser of blessings for every degree of their development; to the impure, a reproving Judge, in the mean time, in order to lead them to repentance; and to judgment, when they had, by their obduracy, closed the way to repentance (Luke ii. 34). It is manifest, then, that the sin against the Holy Ghost can be committed even now; for since the Divine in the person of Jesus manifests itself continually in the church, sin in single individuals, even where there is the highest degree of knowledge, may oppose itself to His beneficial influence. Were it not so, either the time in which alone such a sin was possible would appear to be placed in the background, or the earnestness with which the Redeemer speaks of it would have in it something strange. But if, as frequently happens with persons who are touched by the effects of grace, earnest repentance is accompanied with the thought, that they may have committed the sin against the Holy Ghost, and be thereby excluded from forgiveness—a thought which may be of very pernicious consequences to sensitive minds, and may, at least for a time, keep back the consolations which flow through the word of grace,—every one to whom the cure of souls is committed, or who is asked for advice, may, with full confidence, invite all such to cry in faith for mercy. For whosoever vexes himself with the thought that he may have committed the sin against the Holy Ghost, proves, by his very grief and self-accusation, that he has not committed it; he who has really committed it will defend himself against all reproach. But even if sin should have developed itself in any soul in a very alarming form, so that, as
in the case of Judas Iscariot, the grief of repentance should threaten to degenerate into despair; yet, even in such a case, the exhortation to believe in pardoning love is still in its right place, inasmuch as the sin against the Holy Ghost is unpardonable, not because God is unwilling to forgive, but because man has become unable to believe that God can forgive. If, then, the proclamation of grace takes a hold of the heart, it is actually proved that the sin against the Holy Ghost has not been committed.

The passage which now occupies our attention is, in doctrinal theology, also referred to as the principal text for the doctrine of the eternity of punishment. All other passages which treat of an αἰώνας κρίσεως are less definite than this, in which it is expressly added: ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι μίλλουν. It is true that the term αἰῶν, αἰώνες, (in the phrases: εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, αἰῶνες κρίσεως in St Mark), as also the phrase: αἰῶν οὗτος and μῦλλον (in St Matt.) have a vague sense, capable of various interpretations. The Bible does not know of any metaphysical expressions, and hence, has not one for eternity in the sense of timelessness, (Zeitlosigkeit), absence of time. All the biblical expressions for this idea denote long periods connected with one another. The phrase: εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα is quite parallel with the other phrases: εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνες τῶν αἰῶνων (Gal. i. 5), which denote the aeternitas a parte post or the future, conceived as an indefinitely extended period; but the phrase: ἀν' αἰῶνας is = ἀν' τῶν αἰῶνων, πρὸ τῶν αἰῶνων, by which the aeternitas a parte ante, or the past, is conceived as an indefinitely extended period. Aion is therefore like τῆς = αἰῶνας, ἐν τῆς, as is proved by the formula συνίσταται τοῦ αἰῶνος, which is identical with συνίσταται τῶν αἰῶνων. (Comp. 1 Cor. x. 11, the expression: τὰ τιπ τῶν αἰῶνων.) But as the same expressions are applied to the eternity of God, as well as to a long enduring period, according to the conception of the creature; as the terms: κρίσεως, κόλασις, αἰώνας, κρίμα, πῦρ αἰώνων, form the contrast to ζωή αἰώνως; no objections can be raised against the eternity of punishment from philological reasons. But the feeling against the doctrine of the eternity of the punishment of the wicked, which shews itself among the defenders of an ἄνω θάνατος τῶν σάντων, (and they have been found at all times, and are, at the present time, more than at any former period), may often have its foundation in a loose moral sense; yet it has no doubt also a deep root in noble minds,—it is the expression of a heartfelt desire for a perfect harmony in the creation. But, viewing it
from a merely exegetical point of view, we must confess that no passage of the New Testament affords a clear and positive testimony for the fulfilment of this longing. The scriptural terms used to denote the resolving of the disharmony arising from sin into a harmony—ἀφοσία, καταλλαγῇ, ἀπολύτρωσις—all denote a being fettered by the evil; hence a mixture of good and evil, as it represents itself in human nature after the fall. Hence, the terms above mentioned can, according to the doctrine of Scripture, never be applied to the spirits of the kingdom of darkness, nor to men who, by persevering and continued resistance to the drawings of grace, have become the subjects of the same kingdom. But if it were said that evil, as a thing created and temporary, must share also the general character of what is temporary, viz. cessation and annihilation, and that the ages (αἰῶνες) of the course of this world, though they may bring a lasting punishment to the wicked, must yet at length come to an end; there is indeed a text of Scripture pointing to this passing away of time itself along with all its temporary phenomena, into the abyss of eternity when time shall be no longer, viz. the mysterious words in 1 Cor. xv. 28, on which the commentary is to be compared. But the mysterious character of the passage itself, along with the circumstance that no mention is made in it of the evil and its dissolution, entitles us to scarcely any thing more than conjectural inferences as regards the eternity of punishment; the words of our Redeemer, in Matt. xii. 32, remain as an awful testimony to the fearful character of sin, and its consequences. The same words, however, besides affording such a testimony, are also a consolation, inasmuch as they promise the possibility of forgiveness even of sins committed against the Father and Son, hence of sins of a very heinous character. For the addition: ὅτι ἐν τῷ μιλλανὶ αἰῶνι is certainly not overstrained, if we infer, “that all other sins can be forgiven in the world to come,” always supposing, of course,

1 If we were to interpret our passage from 1 Cor. xv. 28, in such a manner that it were only asserted in it, that the sin against the Holy Ghost will be forgiven, neither in this αἰῶν, nor in the αἰῶν to come, but that after that αἰῶν, forgiveness might be obtained, this would evidently contradict the meaning of the writer. For in Matt. xii. 82, the εἷς ἀφιθήσεται is, in a decided manner, contrasted with the ἀφιθήσεται: the addition, ὅτι ἐν τούτῳ τῷ αἰῶνι, ὅτι ἐν τῷ μιλλανὶ, is only employed completely to exhaust the ὅτι; hence to strengthen, not to weaken it. St Matthew by no means imagines that, subsequently to the αἰῶν μιλλαν., there is still to come another period of the world’s existence; it is, on the contrary, completed in the αἰῶν ἐκεῖνος and μιλλαν.
as has been already remarked, repentance and faith. (Comp. rem. on 1 Peter iii. 18, seqq.) This is also indicated by such passages as Matt. v. 26, compared with xviii. 34, for the ἐλθέων εἰς φυλακήν, ἵνα ἐν ἁπάσῃ τῷ ἑσύχασθην κοινωνίαν is evidently very different from χρήσει αἰώνος. (Comp. the remarks on Matt. xviii. 34; Luke xvi. 19, seqq.) But that the doctrine of the forgiveness of some sins in the αἰών μίλλων, is not in contradiction with the doctrine of the judgment, is shewn by the following exposition of the relation of αἰών δόγμα to the αἰών μίλλων. For the former expression, the New Testament uses also ῥῆν αἰών (Tit. ii. 12; 2 Tim. iv. 10), κατάθεσις δόγμα (Mark x. 30), αἰών τοῦ κόσμου τοῦτου (Ephes. ii. 2), αἰών ἑκάστης σοφίας (Gal. i. 4). Instead of αἰών μίλλων we find also the expressions: αἰών ἐ εἰκόμενος (Mark x. 30), αἰών ἐκεῖνος (Luke xx. 35), αἰών ἡ ἐπικράτεια (Ephes. ii. 7). The phrase: κόσμος μίλλων does not occur. The old controversy about the relation of the Rabbinical terms ἅλεσσις and ὑπεράσπις, which was carried on with so much vehemence between Witsius and Rhenferd (comp. Koppe's Exc. i. on the Epistle to the Ephesians), as to whether the Messianic time or eternity is to be understood by αἰών μίλλων, is pretty barren, and does not touch the substance of the contrast; the αἰών μίλλων comprehends indeed both, just as the βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ (comp. remarks on Matt. iii. 2), which, however, does not exclude the idea that, at one time, the one relation prevails in the expressions, and at another time the other. In general, the αἰών μίλλων forms the contrast to the whole temporary order of things, the peculiarity of which is, that in it good and evil are mixed together. In so far it stands just in the midst between the kingdom of light and that of darkness, and forms the contrast to the βασιλεία τῶν οὐσιῶν. For, although the good also has its root in the temporary order of things, yet the evil apparently prevails, on which account, Gal. i. 4, the αἰωνιότατος is even termed σοφίας, βασιλεία τοῦ ἐξοχοῦ τοῦ σκότους. This temporary order of things is contrasted with the future one, in which the mixture of good and evil will be put an end to, and the dominion of the former will be fully established. The term: αἰών μίλλων, with its synonyms, is therefore related to the βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, it only views the same phenomenon from a different point, and is also used somewhat differently. It is not applied to individuals, as we remarked of the βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ (comp. remarks on Matt. iii. 2); it is nowhere said: the αἰών μίλλων exists for some one, or in some one.
It has reference always to the collective body of the church, or of mankind. But, on the other hand, the usus logendi is in so far the same, that αἰών μίλλων as well as βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ is used in a twofold sense as to its manifestation; sometimes the αἰών μίλλων appears as having already come and taken effect; at others, it appears as still future. Instances in which the αἰών μίλλων appears as already existing, are 1 Cor. x. 11; Heb. vi. 5, ix. 26, in which the συντήρησις τῶν αἰώνων (= τίλη τῶν αἰώνων), as the transition from the αἰών οὐκ to the μίλλων, is conceived as being present. This must be accounted for in the same manner as in the βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ, regarding which, the same usus logendi prevails. As, with the person of Christ, and the foundation of the Church, the kingdom of God was present in its germ, so, in like manner, the world to come was contained in it, and present in the world which now is; just as, according to St John, the ἐκκλησία αἰώνος exists for the believer, not only as something future, but as already present to him. (Compare the remarks on 1 John iii. 14.) Generally, however, the αἰών μίλλων is viewed as being yet future, and, accordingly, its appearance takes place with the συντήρησις τοῦ αἰώνος (τεύχω), when the Divine will be manifested as the ruling and conquering power, and sin, as cast out. This period the apostles conceived of as being very near at hand, and, moreover, they did not distinguish in their conception the single features which are distinguishable therein—especially not the first and the second resurrection—just as little as their distinguishing features are brought out in the expression βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ. The analogy of the Old Testament prophets, who, in their prophecies concerning the advent of the Messiah, were not accustomed to distinguish between His twofold coming, may serve to explain this phenomenon. (For further remarks on this subject, compare note on Matt. xxiv. 1.) If then, in our passage an ἀφιετεία is thought possible in the αἰών μίλλων, that signification of the term predominates, according to which eternity, and the general judgment preceding it, are excluded therefrom. The αἰών μίλλων is here viewed as the world to come, which, at some future period, shall reveal itself in the victory of good here on earth, and sinners in the Sheol are assumed as belonging thereto. The preaching of the Gospel to the unbelieving contemporaries of Noah (1 Pet. iii. 18), involves such a forgiveness in the αἰών μίλλων, for all who are disposed to believe in it.

VOL. II.
Ver. 33. That which now follows seems to countenance the opinion of those who believe that the Pharisees, to whom Christ was speaking, had, by their very speech (ver. 24), committed the sin against the Holy Ghost. The words in Mark iii. 30: ἐὰν ἑγὼν ἀκαθαρσίας ἔχω, seem likewise to favour this view; inasmuch as, by these words, the discourse on the sin against the Holy Ghost is connected with the preceding blasphemous speech of the Pharisees. But, as I have already stated, the preceding discourses of Jesus (ver. 25, sqq.), especially when compared with the passages, 1 Cor. ii. 8; Acts xiii. 27, 28; Luke xxiii. 34, render this, in my opinion, very improbable. For, even admitting, as we may well do, that the ἐγκληματικός mentioned there, are different from those spoken of in our passage, yet, as they even crucified the Lord of glory, they cannot, by any means, have been less guilty than those who would not acknowledge His miracles to be divine. It is, however, mentioned that they crucified Him from ἐγκυσσα; and how much soever their ἐγκυσσα may have been the consequence of their sin and guilt, yet the sin against the Holy Ghost can be committed only where there is knowledge and consciousness, since it must be conceived of as the highest development of sinfulness. The words in Mark iii. 30, retain indeed their full import, if the discourse on the sin against the Holy Ghost be referred to the probable final issue of the sin of those Pharisees. For if any man, who has attained to that degree of knowledge which the Pharisees, as the heads and teachers of the people, possessed, could say of the miracles of the Son of God, who displayed before them all His glory, that they were wrought by the evil spirit,—that man is certainly in the way which leads directly to the sin against the Holy Ghost, although he may not yet have made sufficient progress to be able to commit the sin itself.

Ver. 34, 35. Our Saviour contrasts good and evil with each other, in the same manner as this contrast manifests itself in the phenomena of nature:—the good tree bringeth forth good fruit; the corrupt tree, evil fruit. (Comp. remarks on Matt. vii. 18, sqq. The ἔστω [ver. 33] in a sense analogous to the Latin facere, ponere, “to set,” or “plant a tree,” &c.). More closely related to the passage under review is Luke vi. 43-45, which must here be compared. For, just as in the passage before us, St Luke there compares the inward productive power of man ((cp. 45)
with the creative power of the tree, and adds: that as the fruit of a tree indicates its character, and as we may thus draw an inference from the one as to the nature of the other, so also is it with man; wherever the root of the spiritual life is poisoned, there evil deeds will spring forth. (St Luke adds, very suitably, in ver. 45, Ἑναωθὶς τῆς καρδίας; the καρδία is here again viewed as the centre of the ζωῆς,—hence, of all individual life and self-determination.) Now, it is quite evident, that from the general principle: ἵν τοῖς καρποῖς τὸ δίκηγον γινώσκεται, our Lord infers that the Pharisees are evil, and hence unable, in this their condition, to do anything which is good. He calls them: γενήματα ἰχθύν (see comment. on Matt. iii. 7), and from the wicked speech which they uttered, He pointed to the inward source from which it flowed. (All external things are expressions of the internal—σῶμα the counterpart of καρδία—εἰρήναμα = Ἑναωθὶς, the fulness of the inner life which, in every one, even the feeblest, manifests itself in deeds of some kind.) But then the whole passage has, apart altogether from the connexion with what precedes, its difficulties, and these by no means inconsiderable. For, it seems as if the comparison were putting what is moral on a par with what is physical, and establishing among men an internal difference, according to which some are good and others evil, and must, therefore, act accordingly. Now as the Pharisees are here called evil, it seems as if the sin against the Holy Ghost were to be ascribed to them as a necessary consequence of the wickedness of their hearts,—a view which would overthrow the opinion which we expressed above. The doctrine expressed in these sentences, viz. that there exists a necessary difference between those who are good and those who are evil would, in the first instance, be in opposition to the scope of the whole Bible. As we can conceive of no one among our fallen race who, from an inward necessity, must produce what is good out of his good treasure; so, in like manner, we cannot conceive of any one, who, in a similar way, should bring forth only that which is evil. In all fallen man, good and evil appear as being mixed together. The correct explanation of this difficult passage is, therefore, no doubt to be found in this: that our Redeemer conceived of man in his ideal condition—such as He himself represented—and contrasts him with fallen man, who, as the prey of the pernicious influence of the kingdom of darkness, without the help of restoring grace, is a true picture of evil. This
forlorn state of humanity, as opposed to the perfect Christ, was represented by the Pharisees. Rejecting the grace offered in Him, they gave free scope in their hearts to the power of darkness, and, under its influence and inspiration, they uttered their wicked speeches. The kingdom of the devil calls itself the kingdom of God. The contrast is thus maintained in all its force; and even the physical necessity which the words of Jesus seem to ascribe to the actions of man, though at first sight offensive, is seen in its full truth. For it is certain that man must act in accordance with the element in which the source of his innermost life pre-eminently moves. If that be as yet worldly, man will act in a worldly manner in whatever he does; but if, by regeneration, he has received a divine nature, he will thenceforth act in a manner which is pure and good. Neither the vulgar, coarse, Pelagian view of liberty, nor absolute predestination, with its gratia irresistibilis, is known to Scripture; and for that reason the contrast in our passage is neither absolute nor eternal. The γενήσεως ἰχθύων which, as such, cannot do any thing which is good (πᾶς δύνασθi in ver. 34 must be understood in its real sense of spiritual and physical inability for that which is good) may, by grace, cease to be what they are, and may, by repentance and faith, change their nature. Thus even the Baptist preached (Matt. iii. 7, 8): γενήσεως ἰχθύων, τίς οὐδεὶς ὑμῖν μητρὶ φυγεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς μελλόντος δραγμῆς (namely, being such as you at present are; the old man must die); τούτους οὖν καραθεῖν ἄξιον τῆς μετανοίας. And thus also does Christ preach here. And just because He preaches repentance to the generation of vipers, they cannot as yet have committed the sin against the Holy Ghost, since, in that case, the proclamation of repentance to them would have been a mockery. The corrupt tree, then, which in its natural state bringeth forth evil fruit, must be ennobled by a noble graft; and, in like manner, must natural man be renewed by regeneration, and become an image of Him whose heart overflowed with mercy and grace.

Ver. 36, 37. The efforts of our Redeemer to come to the assistance of those Pharisees who were rushing into the abyss of sin, are plainly pointed out in the subsequent verses, in which He places before their eyes the significance of sin in its spiritual aspect. Recognising only the deed as real guilt, they may have considered their sin as a very trifling one, inasmuch as they had only spoken. Jesus now leads them to a higher moral point of
view, according to which it is just the spiritual intention, even if it should manifest itself in a word only, which is the object of divine justice. The ἤμα ἀγνό (it must be taken as Nomin. absol.) is purposely chosen in contradistinction to the ἤμα φησιν which they had spoken; ἀγνό = ἀγνό, ἀχέρον signifies in itself an inferior degree of liability to punishment; but just on this account is the thought rendered more emphatic and distinct. The words, λόγον ἑποδίσκων indicate, in the first instance, only that, in the eye of God, even the most secret emotions of evil are sure to find their punishment. But the more that the word has reference to spiritual things, the more punishable becomes the abuse of it; yea, it is even the word, as the manifestation of what is in man, in which the whole nature of man is revealed. The λόγοι are contrasted with the ἄγαλμα. The latter appear to sensuous man to be of greater importance because they are more easily perceived by the senses. But every deed is, in reality, only an embodied word, or every word may give birth to a deed. The word is here considered by the Redeemer as an inward action, and is, therefore, made the object of judgment. As man speaks, so he is; and as he is, so will he be judged. The λόγοι are therefore not merely external, but more particularly internal words, manifesting the spiritual emotions of the inner life. He, therefore, who hypocritically speaks good words shall also be judged according to his words, because they are hypocritical. (Δικαιοθεία is the reverse of καταδίκηθεία, hence pro justo declaravi, but with the supposition of being just and righteous [see remarks on Rom. iii. 21]. The words ἐκ τῶν λόγων indicate the influence of the λόγοι on the χρήσει).

Ver. 38. In St Matthew, this section is immediately followed by a rebuke addressed to some Pharisees who wished to see a sign. St Luke reports the elements of this discourse in a different order indeed, but with a literal agreement. The connexion in St Matthew is simple and plain; so that nothing can be said against the introduction of the words in this place, except that the whole account in St Luke bears throughout stronger marks of originality; for which reason we shall do well in giving him the preference here also. But whether the τίς who ask the sign in this place, be or be not identical with the Pharisees who, ver. 24,

1 Chrysostom has already remarked this. He understands by ἤμα ἀγνό not only wicked, but also useless words, τί μάταις, τί γίλατα κατὰ ἀπάτη.
spoke the blasphemous words (concerning whom St Luke, xi. 15, likewise said, τίνς ἀναίων), is of little importance with a view to the exposition. The expressions made use of by our Lord to dismiss them (ver. 39), shew that they occupied the same moral position as the others. Yet, by Luke xi. 16, where their request of σωτήριον appears to be anticipated, the supposition is rendered very probable, that one party expressed themselves in this way in order to put Christ to the test, and the others, in another mode. (Luke xi. 16, ἵτεροι δὲ συμβάλλοντες σωτήριον παρ' αὐτοῦ ἵκερ τοὺς ἵκερ οὐρανοῦ.) The σωτήριον appears at the same time more distinctly determined as one ἵκερ οὐρανοῦ.

A σωτήριον (σωτήρ) is a miracle, not per se, but in its relation to something else, in so far as it proves, signifies, indicates something; as, in the case before us, the Messianic dignity of Jesus. (Compare Comment. on Matt. iv. 12). Apart from everything miraculous,—as a mere testimony for the disposition of the heart (as Dr Paulus would have us to understand it), the word is never used in the New Testament. The σωτήρα ἵκερ οὐρανοῦ (or ἀνὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ according to Mark viii. 11, or even ἵκερ οὐρανοῦ, Rev. xii. 1) are contrasted with the σωτήρα ἵκερ γῆς, and seem to carnal man to be required of the Messiah, inasmuch as they imply greater power.

Ver. 39. Jesus dismissed them and their demand with a rebuke (γωνία = ἴκερ means primarily "age," "period of life;" then, those living together at the same period. [Comp. remarks on Matt. xxiv. 34]. In the same connexion as in this place, the word μοιχαλίς is found also in Matt. xvi. 4—which passage is the real and verbal parallel passage to that under consideration. The expression must be explained in harmony with the uniform Old Testament mode of speaking, according to which all that is of an unbelieving and unholy character is viewed as being born of unholy love, and therefore presupposes a separation of the soul from the Lord. According to a profound mode of viewing the relation of the soul to God, to which frequent references will hereafter be made, the spiritual turning away of the soul from the Creator to the creature is represented as adultery. Compare Gesenius' Hebrew Lexicon, s. v. יבש, יבוש, יבשות.) The dismissal of these sign-seekers evidently militates in no degree against the

1 Comparisons with John viii. 41 are here quite inadmissible; μοιχαλίς does not signify "begotten in adultery" (spurium) but practising adultery.
value which we elsewhere (John v. 20, x. 25) see Jesus putting upon His miracles. For, as His miracles had always a moral aim, they suppose a susceptible disposition of heart for that which is holy. Where this disposition was wanting, they had so little effect, that even the most stupendous miracles could be ascribed to an unholy power (ver. 24). It thus appears, then, as the curse of sin, that that which is divine is withheld in its exalted and blissful manifestations. To the evil generations, only the invisible sign of the prophet Jonas is due.

Ver. 40. To what extent our Redeemer intends to give to the Pharisees the sign of the prophet Jonas, is indicated by the Evangelist himself in the words: ὥσπερ γὰς κ. τ. Λ. There can be no doubt that there is more than one point of similarity in the parallel between the resurrection of Jesus and the fate of Jonas, which is here brought forward. In the first place, both had reference to the persons themselves (on account of which St Luke, xi. 30, employs the words: ἐγένετο Ἰωνᾶς σημαίνω, Jonas himself was the sign); secondly, both the deliverance of Jonas out of the fish, and the resurrection of Jesus were unseen signs, given only to the faith (of the adversaries); thirdly, the ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ κητόνου may form a parallel with ἐν τῷ καρδίᾳ τῆς γῆς, as a contrast to the demanded σημαίνω ἐν οὐρανῷ. The main point of resemblance, however, which forms the connecting link betwixt the two is this, that as the preservation of Jonas was not seen by the Ninevites, so also the greatest miracle which takes place on the person of the Son of Man was to remain invisible to the eyes of the Pharisees; the mystery of the Lord's glory is concealed from the vulgar eyes of the adulterous generation. The exposition of this passage attempted of late, according to which the σημαίνω Ἰωνᾶ is understood to be his preaching to the Ninevites (in which case, ver. 40 is turned into a misunderstood interpretation of the words of Jesus on the part of St Matthew), has originated from a total misconception of the entire connection, and sufficiently refutes itself.

1 De Wette is wrong in thinking that St Matthew has given an erroneous explanation of the words of Jesus, just in the same manner as John ii. 21, misunderstood, according to him, a similar declaration. But St John's explanation is as little erroneous (comp. Comment. on John ii. 21) as the explanation here given by St Matthew in the words Ἰησοῦς γὰς κ. τ. Λ. is false and self-invented. The chief argument which seems to have led De Wette to adopt that opinion, is the view, that it must be doubted "whether Jesus predicted His resurrection so distinctly," or, to speak out more openly, whether Jesus has risen at all.
The reference of Christ's words to the history of Jonas contains further, for the biblical expositor, an important hint as regards the exposition of this Old Testament event; but with the exposition itself, we are not at present concerned. Jesus in other passages also (Matt. xvi. 1, ff.) makes use of what occurred to Jonas, in order to compare His resurrection with it. The τοῦτο ἡμίγεις καὶ ἡμίγεις νύκτις must be explained according to the Hebrew mode of speaking; a νυκτίς = νύ, and does not require that just three times twenty-four hours should have elapsed. Now as the Redeemer rested in the grave on three days, he thereby fulfilled the prediction with all the precision which is to be observed throughout Scripture; there is never manifested in it any micrological anxiety and scrupulosity. As in nature, so also in the Scripture, there is regularity combined with liberty; and hence it is that it affords scope to liberty, and states and fulfills all prophecies in such a manner that they may be believed, and yet may be contradicted. The Holy Scriptures would altogether miss their aim if, by mathematical precision and strictness, they would compel belief. The parallel between ἐν τῇ κοιλῇ τοῦ κήπους and ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ τῆς γῆς must not be overlooked. The former words are a quotation from the LXX., which translates יִשְׂרָאֵל, Jon. ii. 1, by κήπους. The καρδία = מפי, signifies the interior in general. The term seems unsuitable for expressing the resting in the grave; nor is the parallel very striking. Might it not be that these words have a further reference to the condition of the soul of Jesus after death? (Compare Comment. on 1 Pet. iii. 19; Ephes. iv. 8.) The words bear only a general inferential character, and at the time when they were spoken, may not have been understood either by the Pharisees or by the disciples,—as was the case with so many other declarations, the full meaning of which was opened up to them only at a subsequent period. Moreover, the Lord had not as yet distinctly spoken of His death. The whole, therefore, remained in a mysterious darkness, just as it was proper that it should; it was for the present, as it were, a hieroglyph, the deciphering of which was reserved for future times. One might well say that in such passages the Redeemer prophesies of and for Himself; for, although doubtless the whole great course of His work was laid open before His soul when He began it by being baptized in the Jordan; it is yet not improbable, that the single great incidents in it—especially His death and all the details connected with it—
were only by degrees brought, with greater distinctness, before His human consciousness. The history of the transfiguration (Matt. xvii. 1, sqq.) seems to countenance this view. (Compare, for fuller remarks, the Comment. on the passage referred to.)

Ver. 41. 42. By the mention of the history of Jonas, the Lord is led to notice in His discourse, another event, by which He might set forth the depths to which the generation of this period had sunk. Although no visible sign had been vouchsafed to the Ninevites, they yet believed when Jonas preached and called them to repentance: and the Queen of the South hastened uninvited to Solomon, in order that she might learn wisdom from him. But the Pharisees would not even so much as accept what was offered to them. In these comparisons, the reproof was so much the more severe, as, in both cases, they were Gentiles—above whom the Jews were so fond of exalting themselves—who gave those proofs of faith; just as was the case in the similar comparison in xi. 20, sqq. The judgment and resurrection are here again mentioned as the period of final, unerring decision, when every thing will be manifested in its innermost nature. (Nimwai = ἀνδρις; Nimut = ἱππη ἄθροι, according to a well-known Hebraism; Josh. viii. 20; x. 6. The Sasideous v actor is the ἰππη ἄθροι, 1 Kings x. 1. The expression νόμος points in an indefinite manner to the south, to Arabia Felix. The περιβολη ἰππη = ἱππη ἄθροι is a well-known phrase of the Old Testament, taken from the popular view of the world.) The less the splendour was by which the Ninevites and the Arabian queen were overcome, the more culpable must appear the opposition to the very ideal of holiness. (Πλιθον ἑονδα, Σολομωνος ἰδιος, comp. Matt. xii. 8.)

Ver. 43. St Luke—who, throughout the whole of his eleventh chapter, has arranged in a peculiar manner the various elements, as we shall afterwards see, and who in ver. 27 and 28 inserts a separate little story—brings the following words (Matt. xii. 43-45) into immediate connexion with the demoniac and his cure, from which, in St Matthew also (xii. 22, sq.), every thing sprang. These words may indeed have had their place after the history of the cure; but St Matthew has arranged them, according to his custom, in an independent, and by no means unskilful, manner. He connects them, after the closing words of ver. 45: οὐσιτας ἤτοι καὶ τῇ γαρ ταύτῃ τῇ τοπηφη, with the main part of the conversation regarding the γαρ τοπηφη καὶ μνήματι (ver. 39). It might indeed appear
strange how such a thing could be said of the Pharisees, who, after all, must be understood as referred to in the γινά μικαλικε, ver. 39. For as no demon was cast out from them, we cannot see how such an one could return into them. And on the other hand, as there was neither a longing nor faith in their hearts, we can as little see how the casting out of a demon could be spoken of, even although we were to understand the return of the same as something that might be expected at some future period. It is only from a misunderstanding of the passage that the ἀτυχία itself could be regarded as the demon to be cast out. But as the Pharisees, as pars pro toto, may, with full propriety, be regarded as representing the whole people who had imbibed their spirit, so also the Jewish people of that time, viewed as a greater individuality, might be regarded along with the Jewish people of former times as a person in different stages of development. That among the people there were always some, such as the apostles and other noble-minded individuals, who did not share in the general corruption, forms no argument against such a view; for all these did not, as such, properly belong to the people; they rather stood above them. The Babylonish captivity appears in the history of the Jewish nation as a period of purification, as a true casting out of the demon of idolatry under fearful paroxysms. After their return, the Jews appear in greater purity than they ever did before. But instead of idolatry, the more dangerous Pharisaism returned; and this was, after all, the same spirit of idolatry, but only in different forms. It was in the fetters of this spirit that our Redeemer found the nation, which would not now suffer itself to be emancipated, so that it was like one possessed with an evil spirit, and who had sunk back into his old disorder. Indeed a profound and significant application of the comparison! It is only the future tense in ver. 45: ὁτας ἱσταὶ ἐν τῇ γυναικείᾳ ταύτῃ, which may appear inconsistent with the view which we have stated, inasmuch as, according to it, every thing appears as past. But the ἱσταί can evidently refer only to what immediately precedes it: τὰ ἱστατα χισθαν τῶν τριῶν; and indeed the evil consequences of the relapse of the Jewish people manifested themselves very strikingly only after they lost their independence. But if we should refer the ὁτας ἱσταί to the whole parable, so that the casting out of the demon and his return with seven others were to take place at some future period, then the whole passage would remain unintelli-
gible; for, neither among the Pharisees alone, nor in the whole
nation, did there appear any events which might be viewed in this
light.

In the words of ver. 43, 44, we have the parabolic represen-
tation of a Jewish popular idea, indeed we may say of an idea
universally held. Evil, viewed as the disharmony, as the desert, is
found in the physical world also, as it were, as an echo and ex-
pression of the evil in the spiritual world. The deserts of the
earth are the witnesses of the sin of mankind—a visible proof
of the disappearance of the Paradise. Now, as things related
to one another appear to man to be also connected with one
another, deserts were considered as habitations of evil spirits;
so that what was made desolate by sin became also the local
abode of evil. (Isaiah xiii. 21; xxxiv. 14; Rev. xviii. 2; Tob.
vi. 3; Baruch iv. 35.) Of this simple idea, which has its foun-
dation in the depths of human nature, our Redeemer here
avails himself, in order that He may draw a graphic picture of
evil. The whole description appears in a parabolic form; and
for this reason the single features must not be over-strained.
It is nevertheless certain that not every thing in it rests upon an
empty accommodation to a national and baseless superstition, but
upon the simple truth, that in the great creation all the parts
form one whole, and the spiritual world is reflected in the phy-
sical. According to the description of Jesus, the evil spirit hav-
ing been overcome by the power of the good, is seen escaping to
the desert (ῥόπος ἀνέδρος = ἰζημος i.e. ἐπὶ, ἐπὶ ἐπὶ, Isaiah xxxv. 1;
Joel ii. 20) seeking rest (ον ἁπανασ, see remarks on Matt. xi.
29), the loss of which is a characteristic of evil. But mere change
of place cannot give rest to a spirit; it finds its rest only in God,
its primeval source. It is therefore represented as returning to
the soul which had become the abode of evil.

Ver. 44. Carrying out the figure of the house, Jesus describes
the guilt of a man freed for a time from the power of the evil one.
The term σχολαιζω points out the guilt incurred by negligence
and sloth—the cause of a relapse into sin; the terms συμπομαίνω
(from σαφεω “to sweep,” Luke xv. 8,) and κυκλοσμαίνω denote only
the alluring and charming character of the abode which a puri-
fied soul offers. Here also the figure is based upon the notion
that sin, as moral defilement, has its analogy in the visible world;
he who is unclean is allured by what is clean and pure, which,
however, is defiled by contact with him. All these are figures; but how deep is the truth which lies in them! The soul appears here as the bride wooed by heaven and hell. She may receive the former or the latter; but the spirit whom she receives transforms her into his own nature, and makes her his bodily.

Ver. 45. Just as the good is inwardly making continual progress—inasmuch as it is impossible to conceive of its being stationary—so the evil also grows and matures. The evil, when once raised to the sphere of the good, but sinking back, must fall the more deeply the higher it had been raised (John v. 14). There are gradations even among the evil ones (σωμάτων κομψότητα, compare remarks on Ephes. vi. 12). The discourse closes, at length, with the general idea, that every relapse is more dangerous than the disease itself. This was likewise evident in Israel. At the time of the Babylonish captivity, the chastising rod of the Lord produced some effect; but when the Creator came unto His own (John i. 12), His own had become estranged from Him, and received Him not. (Ta σφορα is, as it were, the original, simple state of suffering; ta ἰσχαρα, the state of relapse).

§ 20. THE ARRIVAL OF THE MOTHER AND BROTHERS OF JESUS.

(Matt. xii. 46—50; Mark iii. 31—35; Luke viii. 19—21).

The importance of St Mark for the right understanding of many sections of the Gospel history, through the addition of minor traits, becomes here very palpable. If we had the accounts of St Matthew and St Luke only, we should be at a loss to understand why Jesus did not even admit His mother and His brethren to His presence. The declaration also that His disciples are His true relatives would be somewhat startling, if St Mark did not come to our aid. At the beginning of the section explained on a former occasion (Mark iii. 20, 21), he relates that Jesus had gone into a house with His disciples, and that this house was surrounded by crowds of people, so that while engaged in spiritual labour, they could not find time even to appease their hunger (ὅτε μὴ δύνασθαι αὐτῶς μῆτε ἄρτον φαγεῖν). Here His relatives (οἱ ταλαγοι) came to lay hold of Him (κρατῆσαι "to seize" "to arrest"), in order to bring Him to a place of safety; for they said:
Concerning ἵψον ματ. xii. 23; here it is μαίνεσθαι, the consequence of the δαμάσκον ἵψον of which He was accused by the Pharisees; by the hostile power, man seems to be driven out of himself, and of his self-possession. This notice explains the whole scene. The wicked Pharisees had succeeded in impressing, with their blasphemous assertion, even the relatives of Jesus, who had been induced thereby to make an attempt to bring Him back from His (to their view) pernicious ways. Without this hint we should have been obliged to content ourselves with St Luke's statement in ver. 19, εἰς ἡδύναται συνεχῶς αἵρετο διὰ τὸν Ἰχθος, by which, however, the whole occurrence would have remained enveloped in considerable obscurity. We might easily conceive from John viii. 5, how the unbelieving ἄλλος might be carried away by such a rumour; but it is not so easy to understand how even His mother could give credit to it; we should suppose her faith to have been immoveable. But, in the first place, it may, from the account of the Evangelists, be supposed that Mary in nowise shared the opinion of His brethren, but merely accompanied them on their journey, in order, perhaps, to mitigate their perverted zeal. No decisive argument can be advanced against such a supposition. But, on the other hand, it is by no means so improbable that Mary too should not have experienced moments of weakness, when her faith was fainting and struggling. The long series of years which had elapsed since the great events which she had experienced, the form in which her son's ministry manifested itself—a form so entirely different from any which she may have imagined—may have been a severe trial for her, and, like John the Baptist, she may have doubted (Matt. xi. 2, sqq.). She had certainly not given up her faith, but it is possible that, according to the prophecy given to her (Luke ii. 35), it was just now severely tried, and the anxious mother came rather to obtain consolation from her son and Lord, than to take Him home, and yet, influenced by the tormenting rumour, asking at the same time, Art thou He who is to come? It is such traits as these that instil so much life into the evangelical history. It is quite erroneous, as we have already remarked, when commenting on Matt. xi. 1, to conceive of all the heroes of the Gospel-history as unwavering characters. The stupendous events in the life of Jesus must, doubtless, have been connected with great fluctuations in all those who surrounded Him, and these form in-
tbral features of the rich picture which cannot be effaced. It is not in the least to the prejudice of the holy character of the persons brought before us in holy Scripture, that they appear in states of such inward fluctuation. No saint has ever become so without heavy struggles, in which the billows may often have passed over his head. Through all these the Son of God himself led the way.

Ver. 46. While Christ was yet talking to the people, the μητης and the ἀδελφων (concerning them compare Matt. xiii. 55) arrived. They stood ἐξω (see Mark iii. 31) outside the house, and sent in messengers.

Ver. 47, 48. On receiving information thereof, Christ refused to see them. This, it is true, is not stated in express words; but the form of the language: ὁ δὲ ἀπερχόμενος ἐξω, compels us to take this view. He neither went out, nor did He allow them to come in; on the contrary, He continued His discourse. It is probable, indeed, that He may have seen them after the close of it, but not before it. The whole answer would otherwise lose its point.

Ver. 49, 50. St Mark adds here another graphic feature: προσδήμανος κύκλω, and then called the whole host of His disciples, ἡ μητης μου και οἱ ἀδελφων μου. But St Matthew, in ver. 50, applies the expression not only to those present, but also to a wider, a universal circle, inasmuch as the doing of the will of God (according to St Luke: λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀποκαλεῖ και ποιεῖ) is brought forward as the criterion of spiritual relationship. The terms μητης and ἀδελφων, which were suggested by the circumstances, here therefore include the general idea of relationship which is viewed by Jesus in its most ideal form, as the spiritual and moral unity in one loftier whole, which is the kingdom of God. What strikes us, however, in this representation is, that our Redeemer seems to consider himself as altogether a member of this great community,—yea, even as a subordinate member, since He speaks of the μητης. On the one hand, we might here well fall back upon the much used formula, that, in expressions of this kind, the words must not be overstrained. But, on the other hand, we might also say, that this view expresses the lowliness of the Son of Man, who said: they are my mother and my brethren, where He might have said: they are my children. But even this would not fully exhaust the thought; and it would appear as though the words: ἡ μητης μου were used by the Lord to indi-
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cate a peculiar view of this community, according to which the same community of the faithful who, when considered separately, are His brethren, may, when viewed as a unity, be called His mother, inasmuch as, in the church, that which is divine continually assumes a human appearance, and Christ is continually born anew in her.


(Luke vii. 36—viii. 3.)

By means of a definite chronological statement, St Matthew, in this instance, connects the following 13th chapter with the preceding one; and as St Mark iv. 1 agrees with this, we must consider these two chapters as belonging to one another. For this reason, this will be the most appropriate place for introducing a narrative which is found in St Luke alone; and brought into the closest connexion with the account of the parable of the sower by this Evangelist. It is true that we cannot, even in this case, think of asserting a strict order; for, while in Matt. xiii. 1 we find: ἐν ἵματι ἡμισέως, so that the parable must have been spoken on the same day that the events mentioned in the preceding chapter happened, we read in St Luke, after the narrative of the anointing: ἔν τῷ ἐκσκέτῳ (sc. ἔκσκέτῳ) ἤνισθε, by which formula all that follows is, at all events, transferred to a later day. This section ought then to have been placed before St Matt. xii., provided that every thing mentioned in chap. xiii. took place on one and the same day. But as St Matthew's dates leave it altogether uncertain where the day begins; as St Luke, too, has remarked nothing about the time of the anointing, it was impossible to fix the exact time with any greater certainty. For this reason, and on account of the agreement of the subsequent section, we have inserted the narrative in this place.

With regard to the occurrence itself, the first question which presents itself is,—In what relationship does it stand to a similar event narrated in St Matt. xxvi. 6–13? (Compare also Mark xiv. 3, sqq.; John xii. 1, sqq.) Schleiermacher (in his Versuch über den Lucas, S. 110, ff.) has lately, in an acute and ingenious manner, objected to the diversity of the occurrences, which was,
for a long time, universally held. He declares them to be identi
cal, and thinks that the account, as given by St Luke, had been
misunderstood by the reporter from whom St Luke received it,
and noted down by him in its present form. At first sight there
appears much indeed which is in favour of this view. It appears
strange to assume two narratives in which a woman anointed
Jesus at a feast given in the house of a certain Simon. It ap-
pears strange that a woman of bad reputation, but otherwise un-
known to the master of the house, should have obtruded herself
on such an occasion. But the matter appears still more extra-
ordinary, if we assume that the occurrence is the same, and that
in St Luke we have only a distorted representation of it. For,
in the first place, it is easily explained how Mary could so freely,
in the presence of a company, express her attachment to the
person of Jesus, as, according to the accounts of St Matthew, St
Mark, and St John, the feast was given by a family on friendly
terms with Lazarus; and Simon ι λαζάρος, whom St Matthew and
St Mark mention as the host, must be considered as a relative or
intimate friend of this very family. But for this very reason, it is
altogether inexplicable how this same friendly host should have
expressed himself in a way which was, even in the remotest de-
gree, liable to be so misunderstood as, according to the account
of St Luke, was the case. It is even improbable that, in the pre-
sence of Jesus, he should have expressed any suspicion at all; and
still more improbable that he should have uttered an insinuation
of that kind against the sister of Lazarus. Even supposing that
it was not the intention of the speaker to denote, by the term
ἀλαζαρολός, a sinful woman in the coarse sense of the word, and
that this severe view of the word arose from the misconception
of the reporter whom St Luke followed; yet it is clear that some-
thing of that kind, which was liable to be thus misunderstood,
must have been said by Simon the leper. For such a supposition,
however, there was no occasion at all, according to the accounts
of St Matthew, St Mark, and St John; but, on the contrary, there
was every thing against it. The expression of Mary's love seems
to have had in it something touching and affecting; it was only
Judas who blamed the waste of the precious ointment. Suppos-

1 I attach no weight to the circumstance that, according to St Luke vii. 37, the
event happened in a town, whereas Bethany was a πόλις (John xi. 1); the two ap-
pellations may not have been so strictly distinguished.
ing the circumstances to have been such as those so minutely described by the three Evangelists, we could not imagine any occasion for all the speeches which, in St Luke, are connected with this event; on the contrary, every thing testifies against the assumption that any such speeches were uttered by the Lord in the midst of his favourites of Bethany. Hence, if the occurrence narrated by St Luke is to be identical with the anointing by Mary the sister of Lazarus at Bethany, there is then in St Luke not only a misunderstood view of it, but a total distortion; the occurrence has become specifically different. But this is partly incompatible with the authority of the biblical writings, as held by Schleiermacher himself, and partly also with the position of St John, who was no doubt acquainted with St Luke's Gospel also, as Schleiermacher himself supposes. This scholar even pretends to find traces—although he has not mentioned them—of the fact that St John knew both the accounts. These traces I have not been able to discover; but so much appears certain to me, that if a narrative so completely distorted could have crept into St Luke's Gospel, St John would not have omitted to notice it as such. If, then, by assuming the identity of the events, difficulties so substantial present themselves, it will be more natural to maintain their diversity. For, although it may be strange that something similar twice happened in the house of a certain Simon, yet it is by no means impossible or contradictory; especially as the name Simon was one of so very common occurrence among the Jews. And whatever may appear to be offensive in the circumstance of a woman intruding herself at a feast, it is, on the one hand, greatly mitigated by eastern customs and manners, and, on the other hand, the peculiar circumstances of the woman of whom St Luke speaks, are altogether unknown to us. If it had been, e. g. a woman out of the circle of those who continually surrounded Christ, her approach to the Redeemer is easily explained. Finally:—As regards the omission by St Luke of the anointing at Bethany, which one might be supposed to consider as a sign favourable to the identity, it can be of little importance, inasmuch as similar omissions occur in all the Gospels, e. g. in St John's, where there is no mention at all of the institution of the Supper. According to the opinion of many ancient interpreters, this woman, who, according to St Luke, anointed Jesus, is supposed to have been Mary Magdalene; but no reason whatever can be
assigned in support of this opinion. On the contrary, as Mary Magdalene is immediately afterwards (in viii. 2) mentioned without any reference to the event here narrated, it seems quite improbable that it was she, unless we assume that St Luke purposely did not wish to mention her name, and that the words, ἀφ᾽ Ἡς δαυ-μῆνα ἵστα ἰερήμου, are meant as an indication of her guilt. As there is thus an entire want of any distinct statement, we shall do best in leaving the person undetermined.

Ver. 36. It is possible that this Pharisee himself had been healed by Jesus, and that, not feeling any true gratitude, he thought that he might acquit himself of his obligation by an invitation. (See remarks on ver. 47.)

Ver. 37. πῶς is here commonly understood to mean Nain, because in vii. 11, the history of the raising from the dead of the widow's son at Nain had been reported; but the formulas of transition in ver. 17, 18, 20, 36, are by far too general to afford sufficient ground for this supposition. The woman is called ἀρ. ἀγοραία ἢς ἐν κάτω τοῦ ὀλίσθημον. The name stands for σκευός ἐν ἀραβιστήσιν.

Ver. 38. The scene must be conceived of in accordance with ancient customs—according to which, those who were eating lay stretched out (accommovere, ἀναλίπονται), their feet being bare, or covered only with sandals. The fervour of her grateful love, manifested itself in her affectionate approach; but the feelings of shame and contrition allowed her to approach only the feet of the Redeemer. The case was different with Mary the sister of Lazarus; her love was not less ardent, but there was less of the sense of shame; she anointed the head of the Lord. (Comp. remarks on Matt. xxvi. 7; Mark xiv. 3. Both here narrate probably with greater accuracy than John xii. 3.)

Ver. 39. The Pharisee, void of love, and unfit for the immediate impression of such an exhibition of love, takes occasion from

1 I cannot refrain from quoting here the words of a noble man who reproves, with reference to the anointing of Jesus, the uncharitable criticising, by a cold and dead generation, of the ardour of his own love for the Saviour, and of its manifestation. The excellent von Both, has published the following words of Humann, in the preface to his edition of Humann's works (5. ix. of vol. 1): "Jerusalem—it is the city of a great king! To this king whose name is great, and unknown as His glory, flowed forth the little river of my authorship, despised like the waters of Siloah that go softly (Is. viii. 6). Critical severity persecuted the dry stalk, as well as the flying leaf of my muse; because the dry stalk whistled and played with the little children, who sit in
this to make reflections on the character of Jesus. Under the circumstances, it was impossible that such could have happened at the feast in Bethany; for such an individual there was no room there. \((\text{Eisai} \, v \, i\alpha\tau\pi\varepsilon = \text{πρός} \, \text{τον})\) As regards earthly purity, there is some truth in the thought that the pure is contaminated by a touch of the impure (see remarks on Matt. xi. 19); but in the case of Jesus, it is destitute of truth, because of His overwhelming power, of which, however, the Pharisee had not the slightest notion. The circumstance, that the appearance of the woman at the feast excited no astonishment, leads us to suppose that she was acquainted with either the Pharisee or Jews. But notwithstanding this acquaintance, the Pharisee may well have imagined that her secret sins had remained concealed from Jesus.

Ver. 40, 41. The Pharisee who was not so wicked as he was coarse-minded, is instructed by the merciful \(\phiιλος \, v\nu \, \alpha\mu\gamma\epsilon\tau\omega\lambda\nu\), by means of a narrative, in which He represents both the relation of the woman, and that of the Pharisee himself, to God.

Ver. 42, 43. The comparison between the more and the less of love, necessarily leads to a parallel between the Pharisee and the woman; and hence the supposition is very probable, that the Pharisee too was indebted to Jesus for some benefit.

Ver. 44–46. The conduct of the Pharisee is contrasted with the fervent love of the woman, who did more than was demanded either by custom or by the circumstances. The water for the feet (Gen. xviii. 4; Judg. xix. 21), the kiss (Gen. xxxiii. 4; Exod. xviii. 7), and the offering of ointment, have reference to well known Jewish, or rather universal Eastern, custom. The distinguished Pharisee had omitted the offer of such courtesies, because, very likely, he considered the invitation itself to be a

the market place, and because the flying leaf was tossed about, being giddy with the ideal of a king, who could say of Himself with the greatest meekness and humility: 'one greater than Solomon is here.' As a devoted lover wearied the ready echo with the name of his beloved mistress, and does not spare any young tree of the garden or forest with engraving the initials and characters of her beloved name:—thus was the remembrance of the fairest among the children of men (Ps. xlv. 3), even in the midst of the king's enemies, like unto a Magdalene—ointment poured out, and flowing down like the precious ointment upon the head of Aaron, which ran down upon his beard—flowing down to the skirts of his garments. The house of Simon the leper was filled with the odour of the gospel-anointing; but some merciful (or rather merciless) brethren and critics, were angry with what they called the ordure, and their nostrils were filled with the odour of death only. Precious and profound words! and full of hints for those who can see and hear.
sufficiently high honour. Jesus reproves this coldness towards his benefactor—a coldness which was, at the same time, coupled with so much of self-conceited exaltation above the woman.

Ver. 47. The contrast before referred to appears here anew. Although the words: ἡ δὲ ἔλειγος ἄφιναι state the thought only generally; yet they may very appropriately include the οὐ δέλειγος ἄφιναι, which was not uttered solely from polite consideration. The first member of this verse presents some difficulty; for, according to it, love does not appear as the consequence (as is pointed out in the second member of the verse—quite in accordance with the parable), but as the cause of forgiveness. The ὅτι, as well as the Αὐτός ἤγαγα, represent love as that which precedes, and is the ground of, forgiveness. It has indeed been asserted (comp. Schleusner’s Lex. ii. 325), that ὅτι stands for the Hebrew יָדָ, יָדָ in the sense of δό; but neither the passages in the Old Testament referred to (Ps. xvii. 6; cxvi. 10; Deut. xxii. 24, and others) are to be thus understood, nor is the word ever found, with this signification, in the New Testament. (Passages such as John viii. 44; 1 John iii. 14, are erroneously referred to.) Further.—In order to escape the difficulty offered by the Aorist, ἀγαπάω is taken with the signification: “to give a proof of love,” so that the sense of the verse would be: “thou mayest, therefore, infer that many sins are forgiven to her, for she has given me a great proof of her love.” But such a view is opposed by the signification of ἀγαπάω, as it immediately appears in the second member of the verse, for it signifies a state, and not a mere action. The sense evidently is, not that she has loved, and that her love is now past, but that she is constantly living in love. It is thrown back into the past, merely in order to connect it with the forgiveness; we must, therefore, rather attempt to overcome the difficulty involved in the thought. The Roman Catholic Church has misinterpreted 1 it, inasmuch as she considers forgiveness to depend upon merit; she understands ἀγαπάω of active love, proceeding from natural powers, and makes forgiveness depend upon it. According to the parable, however, this cannot be the sense. But in order to be able to receive forgiveness, it is supposed that

1 De Wette, in commenting on this passage, makes the remark: “We are now beyond the polemical opposition to the Roman Catholic doctrine of justification by works.” I very much doubt this. The natural resort of an unrepenting heart is the effort to gain salvation through works; and this manifests itself even within the evangelical church, in forms not exactly Roman Catholic.
love exists in the heart as a receptive activity, which must be the more intense, the greater the guilt to be forgiven appears to man. If this receptive love (which is identical with repenting faith), really receives within itself the grace of forgiveness, it then displays and manifests itself as active love, as in the case of this woman in her conduct towards Jesus. In this love, she, as it were, makes the power which enkindled the life in her, the receptive pole of her activity, so that accordingly, in these words of our Lord, love is represented in the wonderful forms of its manifestation, in harmony with which it appears sometimes as active, sometimes as passive, but always the same. We may therefore say, that this is the sense of the words: he who is to believe in forgiveness must carry within himself an analogous fund of receptive love, which, as soon as the pardoning power of love, as it were the positive pole, approaches it, manifests itself in the same ratio as the guilt, which is taken away, increases. At the same time, there is implied in this, an allusion to the peculiar arrangement of the Lord, that where sin abounds, grace does much more abound (Rom. v. 20); not as though sin could produce anything which is good, but only because the grace and mercy of the Lord reveals itself in the brightest manner to those who are most miserable. The Pharisee was not without love; he loved a little, thinking that he had received only a little; but the woman who had received every thing, loved ardently, with all the energy of her life.  

Ver. 49, 50. With this is connected a solemn repetition of the forgiveness, in the words: ἄφιναι σου καὶ αὐσπίδια, at what they who were present were astonished. Compare concerning this, the remarks on Matt. ix. iii. where faith and its relation to forgiveness are treated of.

A transition, describing in general terms the activity of Jesus, (Luke viii. 1–3), introduces us to the parables. Our Redeemer went about through cities and villages preaching the kingdom of God, and was accompanied by living witnesses of His redeeming power. The persons specially named are, 1. Mary of Magdala. (Compare remarks on Matt. xv. 39.) Her condition previous to her restoration, is described as having been peculiarly distressing.

1 Compare what has been said in Matt. xiii. 58, on the relation of receptive love to faith. The important passage Hos. ii. 19, 20, ought also to be compared, as, in the words of the prophet, faith and love penetrate each other.
(on ἵπτας ἰαμάλων, compare Matt. xii. 45); all her faculties and powers seem to have been a prey to the effects of darkness. 2. Joanna the wife of Chuza. (Εὐθερωτας = εὐθερωτας, steward.) 3. Susanna, ὦ γυνή. The last two are mentioned only here; but Mary Magdalene is known from the history of the Passion. (Matt. xxvii. 55.) According to that passage, however, others also, and probably those mentioned here, remained steadfast in their adherence to the Lord, even up to the moment of His being nailed to the cross. These women afforded Him support out of their private property (ὑπάρχοντα, opes, facultates), and ministered unto Him. The more rarely the Gospel history opens up glances into the external circumstances of those who surrounded the Redeemer, the more charming they are to the reader; they throw a peculiar light upon His whole conduct while on earth. Around the celestial phenomenon which presents itself in Him, there is thrown a human garb, in every respect genuine; it is only inwardly that His glory shines, and its brightness is manifested externally only to bless others. He who supported the spiritual life of His people, did not disdain to be supported by them bodily. He was not ashamed to take upon himself poverty, and that to such a degree, that He was obliged to depend upon the alms of charity. It was only others whom He fed miraculously; as for Himself, He lived upon the love of His people. He thus loved, and allowed himself to be loved, in perfect, pure love. He gave every thing to men, His brethren, and He received every thing from them, and enjoyed in this the pure happiness of love, which is perfect only when it is at the same time giving and receiving. What a trait in the character of the Messiah! Who could have invented such things! He who fed thousands by a word, himself lived on the substance of the poor. It was necessary that such a life should be led, in order that it might be so recorded.

1 The same is remarked of Mary, in Mark xvi. 9, in a connexion altogether different. It therefore appears that her deliverance from demoniacal influences was considered as something altogether peculiar. Her former condition was pre-eminentely distressing, but so much the more gloriously was the power of the Lord manifested in her, and so much the more evident was her love to the Lord. Every where (compare the history of the Resurrection) she is named first among the women.

2 It is remarkable that it is only women of whom it is said ἀκοῦσας ἀκοῦσας ἀκοῦσας ἀκοῦσας τῶν ἀνεστηκτων αὐτῆς, and who, with a touching attachment, were devoted to the Lord, as is shown by the history of the Resurrection. The weaker half of the human race were the first to arrive at the knowledge of the strength which they possessed in Christ.
§ 22. THE COLLECTION OF PARABLES.

(Matt. xiii. 1—53; Mark iv. 1—20, 30—34; Luke viii. 4—15; xiii. 18—21.)

In the progress of the Gospel history, as narrated by St Matthew, we are now brought to a collection of parables. There is something extraordinary in this collection, inasmuch as it seems not to be in accordance with this mode of teaching, to accumulate parables. For as they are intended to present truth under a veil, and to stimulate to meditation and inquiry, their significance would be weakened by bringing many together in an oral discourse. In consequence of the varied relations contained in the parables, the mind would rather feel distracted and bewildered than stimulated; and hence their aim would be missed. But the case is different in a written discourse. The reader can reflect at leisure on the single parable, may compare one with the others, and thereby obtain a clearer insight into the peculiarities of each. For this reason, a collection of parables is peculiarly adapted for a written discourse. But although, according to what has been stated, a collection of parables is quite adapted to St Matthew's mode of a collective representation, the question might be asked, whether it might not be more appropriate to suppose that St Matthew has, in this case, not so much formed a collection of parables spoken at different periods, as that he has narrated them with historical precision, in the same manner as Jesus, when teaching, delivered them one after another. In order to support such an opinion, we might refer to several passages in St Luke's Gospel,—especially to xiv. 28; xvi. 31, where Jesus is uttering a series of parables; and yet every thing proves that, in this passage, the original connection has been preserved. To this we must further add, that all the parables found in this collection have, in common, a reference to the kingdom of God, so that there was no risk of the hearers being distracted, inasmuch as one parable explained the other—as well as the manner in which St Matthew depicts the scene (ver. 1, sqq.)—Jesus sitting on the sea-shore surrounded by a crowd of people whom He teaches, and then, in xiii. 53, reports the close of Christ's teaching on the present occasion. But to this view we must object, for this reason, that St Luke, in that case, must be supposed
to have transposed some of the parables, inasmuch as he narrates what is contained in St Matt. xiii. 18–21, in quite a different, although a very appropriate, connexion. Moreover, we saw already, in the Sermon on the Mount, in what an indefinite sense St Matthew uses such opening and closing formulas; and as he evinces no local or chronological interest, we cannot lay much stress upon them. It cannot well be reconciled with the scene as described in St Matt. xiii. 1, sqq. that, according to ver. 10, the disciples came to Him, and asked Him concerning the meaning of the parable which He had spoken. That evidently could not have been done in presence of the assembled multitude, but belonged solely to the private circle of the disciples. St Mark iv. 10, shews that we are right in this supposition; for he adds that this question was addressed by the disciples to the Lord, ὅτι ἦν ἀπαντῶν. Here, then, we at once perceive that not every thing must be considered as being closely connected, which St Matthew thus represents. He has anticipated the interpretation of the first parable, since it could have taken place only after Jesus had withdrawn from the crowd, and was alone with His disciples, just as it is stated in ver. 36, on the occasion of the second interpretation. According to ver. 36, it appears doubtful whether the Lord spoke the last three parables still to the people, or to the disciples only. At all events, the discourse must have been interrupted, and the closing formula, ἵππησαν ὅ ἵπποις τάς παρεξελεγκτας ταύτας, in ver. 53, thus acquires a relation to ver. 1, different from that which, at first sight, it appeared to have. Under these circumstances, it is no doubt best to suppose that St Matthew himself here formed a collection of parables, which would quite agree with his invariable mode of representing facts. The circumstances in which the Evangelist introduces them will nevertheless retain their perfect truth. Jesus no doubt delivered some parables under these very circumstances, and St Matthew connected some others with them, in order the more fully and vividly to bring before his readers this mode of Jesus' teaching. St Mark and St Luke, indeed, quite agree with St Matthew in the order of the first parable, but the subsequent ones are differently arranged. By this view, we do not in the least deny an intimate connection of the parables related in St Matthew xiii.; on the contrary, it distinctly comes out in the communication of them. The seven parables which St Matthew communicates in this chapter are intended to charac-
terise the various relations of the kingdom of God. The \textit{first} parable considers the relation of various classes of men to the divine word; the \textit{second} considers their relation to the kingdom of the wicked one; the \textit{third} and \textit{fourth} depict the greatness of the kingdom of God, when compared with its insignificant beginnings; the \textit{fifth} and \textit{sixth} point out the value of the kingdom of heaven; and, finally, in the \textit{last}, there is a description of the mixed condition of the church on earth, which will continue until the day of judgment.

And now with regard to the parable itself, and its use in the New Testament, the Greek terms \textit{παρασκολή, παραμία}, completely correspond with the Hebrew \textit{בְּשָׁנָה}. Both of the words are used in a certain indefinite sense. Just as \textit{בְּשָׁנָה} frequently signifies a proverbial saying, (\textit{Gnome}) a normal precept, so also does \textit{παρασκολή} whenever a comparison is implied in the proverbial saying. (Luke iv. 23; Matt. xv. 15.) Common similes also, even without being proverbial or normal, occur under the same designation. (Mark iii. 23; Luke v. 36; vi. 39.) Most commonly, however, the name is used in the first three Gospels (for neither the term nor the thing itself is found in St John’s Gospel, or in any of the other writings of the New Testament) of a peculiar mode of teaching, of which there are some analogous examples in the Old Testament (Is. v. 1 [which \textit{Mashal} is used by Jesus himself. Comp. Mark xii.]. Ezek. xvii. 1, sqq.; Judg. ix. 7, sqq.; 2 Kings xiv. 9; 2 Sam. xii. 1), and which is most nearly related to the fable (\textit{λόγος}, \textit{ένδεικνυόμενος}, \textit{άντος}). The \textit{parable} differs from the \textit{simile} chiefly in this:—that in the latter the subject is not introduced as being connected with a definite person or fact, which is the case with the parable whenever it appears fully carried out. These, it is true, are often indicated only, not fully developed, as \textit{e. g.} in Matt. xiii. 44, 45—the parables of the hidden treasure, and the merchantman. But, even in this unfinished form, they are different from mere similes or allegories, inasmuch as the basis of the definite simulated fact may still be recognised in them. But it is more difficult to point out the difference between the \textit{parable} and the \textit{fable}. The ancients, especially \textit{Aristotle} (Rhet. ii. 20), whom Cicero (de Invent. i. 30) and Quinctilian (Inst. v. 11) follow, place the difference only in the more or less ample treatment, inasmuch as to them the fable appears as the more finished production—the \textit{parable} as the less finished. But among recent
writers, Lessing makes this difference, that the fable represents
the single fact as real, the parable, only as possible. According
to Herder, it consists in this, that the fable avails itself of irrational
nature, the parable, of the rational one. But no one of these
opinions is free from difficulties. To judge from the biblical pa-
ralle, it also represents the occurrence as a real one, and not merely
as possible, as e. g. the very first parable of the sower. (Matt. xiii.
4.) This makes against the view taken by Lessing. Against
that of Herder are the Old Testament parables above referred to,
especially Ezek.xvii. 1, sqq. in which the inanimate creation is the
subject of the action, and yet no one could say that it is a fable.
And on the other hand, in the fables of Aesop, men are frequently
introduced for the purpose of conveying through them the lessons
of the poet. The difference is, without doubt, altogether internal.
The ground occupied by the writer of fables is lower, and hence
his aim also is subordinate. The fable intends to point out only
earthly virtues, or commendable qualities. Now, as earthly virtues
—prudence, skilfulness, laboriousness, and such like—have their
representatives in certain classes of animals, the irrational animal-
world may be most advantageously used for this form of instruc-
tion. If men are introduced in a fable, they always appear in a
character in which they are related to the animal-world. But the
parable introduces us into a higher—a purely moral domain. Its
object is to represent heavenly dispositions of life, or circumstances
arranged in a divine manner. For this reason, its element is pre-
eminently in the world of men. Wherever the parable touches
upon the irrational element, it there views it as depending upon
the higher divine power. When men appear in the fable, they
are viewed in their lower aspect, while, in the parable, even irra-
tional nature is regarded in its highest aspect. From the whole
tendency of holy Scripture, the fable could find no place in it,\(^1\) because it is continually its object to view and point out what is
divine in man; but the parable is its true element. One might
almost say that the whole Old Testament is a real parable in facts,
which in its history teaches divine things. In the New Testament,
the Son of God concealed the truth revealed in Him under para-
bolic veils, in order thus to afford instruction for all degrees of

\(^1\) At the most, Judg. ix. 7, sqq. might be regarded as a fable, but, owing to the cir-
cumstances connected with this passage, it is on purpose that no higher point of view
is brought out in it.
development and knowledge at the same time, and to bring it about that one party should be as profoundly initiated into the mystery of the doctrine of the kingdom of God as the other should be left in darkness regarding its nature.\(^1\)

Ver. 1, 2. Our Redeemer went from His dwelling-place (probably in Capernaum) to the sea (the Lake of Gennesareth), and, in order to withdraw himself from the crowd, he entered into a ship which happened to be there. The people were standing on the land (ἐνὶ τῇ γῆς) by the sea (τῷ τῇ Βαλαμσα, Mark iv. 1).

Ver. 4—9. The parable of the sower is one of the few of which we possess an authoritative explanation by the Lord:—and this is of the greatest importance, not only for the understanding of the single narrative, but also for the deduction of principles bearing upon the exposition of all the parables. We may, especially, gather from it what is usually most difficult in the exposition of parables: namely, how far the single features of the parabolical discourse have, or have not any significance. In the same manner as shallness may make light of all that is profound in the word of God, by saying, that this or that is mere ornament, may superstition make a mountain out of every mole-hill. (Ver. 4. To τὰ συνυπάρτητα St Luke adds: τῷ εὐφρασε, analogous to the Hebrew נבון נבון. Βάσως τῇ γῆς γῆς = βάσως γῆς.—Καρμπισίζοια signifies "to be burnt up, scorched by the sun;" ξεπαινεῖσθαι "to wither," "to dry up altogether." Ver. 7, ἀναζαίνω = ἐκ, ἐκ, "to grow up," "to spring up." St Mark iv. 8, has the same numbers as St Matthew—only inverted—which shews that nothing farther is to be sought for in their position. The well-known formula of emphasis: ὅ ἐστιν ἐν αἷς ἡ λα. calle to examination.)

Ver. 18—23. We immediately subjoin to the parable the exposition by the Lord, which the disciples asked from Him when they were alone (καταμωλας, Mark. iv. 10). The intervening important discourses we shall afterwards consider. The words: ἄλησατι τῷ ταραζόλη, must not be translated: hear the exposition of the parable; (Schleusner has even a special number, s. v. ταραζόλη, in which he assigns to it the signification of: "expla-

---

\(^1\) Modern literature has been enriched with some very instructive works on the parables. Retterberg and Schultze are the authors of prize essays on this subject for the Göttingen University (both published in Göttingen, 1828). A more ample treatise, De Parabolæ Ræmæ Nature Interpretatione, &c. was written by Ungen (Lipsiae, 1828). The most recent, and the fullest exposition is by Lisco. It is translated into English, by Fairbairn (Clark's Bib. Cab. vol. xxix.)
nation of a parable’); on the contrary, it is only by comprehending it that a history becomes a parable. Our Lord draws a parallel between the four kinds of fields, and the four kinds of disposition of heart in those who receive the word of God, scattered abroad (Luke viii. 11). The parable here passes at once to a real discourse; for, whereas in the parable the seed is mentioned which develops differently, according to the nature of the soil into which it falls, here the individuals are introduced in whom this development takes place. The real discourse is, in a peculiar manner, mixed up with the parabolical language, as in St Matthew, in the phrases: ὁ χαίρω τῇ ὑδόν, ἵνα τὰ πιστεύῃ, ὅς τάς ἀκακίας στηρίζει. In St Luke only (viii. 14, 15) the neuter several times occurs. As regards the description of the first disposition of heart, it is not represented per se, but only in its consequences, which, however, admit of an inference as to the disposition itself. An ἀχωνία of the word is supposed, but not a σωτία; on the contrary a losing of it. Although a positive cause, lying external to the individual described, is assigned for this losing; namely, the prince of darkness who is anxious to prevent the gaining of souls (ἵνα μὴ πιστεύσεις σωθῆναι, Luke viii. 12), yet, it is quite evident that the possibility of such an agency of the prince of this world has its reason even in the disposition of the mind. The figure (the ἰδίος) indicates a hardness which arose from, and was brought about by, external causes. There is in them a want of susceptibility, an inability to believe, which prevents them from receiving the word. Even though in such an individual, that which is divine should find a certain entrance into the heart (ἐν τῇ ἀφοθείᾳ Matt. xiii. 19), yet it is not received in its nature and essence (μὴ σωμάτως); it does not sink deep enough to be secured against the attacks of the hostile principle; but into the γνὴ καλή (ver. 23), the evil power does not enter, and hence the divine element may there freely display itself. It is remarkable, that in this first part of the parable, the πιστεύω (ver. 4) are explained by the ποιησις (according to St Mark, σωτίας, according to St Luke, διάκολος)—

1 In the phrase ἀκακίασιν ἐν τῇ ἀφοθείᾳ, it is not necessary to interchange  ὅς with ἵν; it means: the seed which was scattered abroad, and is now in the heart.

2 It is to me incomprehensible how Schleiermacher (Glaubenslehre, B. 1, S. 218) can say that “the terms here are of doubtful interpretation, and that the enmity of men to the divine word is as obvious as the reference to the devil.” The terms: ῶ σωμάτος, ῶ διάκολος (with the article, and without anything preceding to which they might possibly be referred) cannot by any means be explained as referring to man.
an explanation which, if it had not been given by the Lord himself, would scarcely have been received. The figure (τὰ στεινά) would have been explained as meaning the general notion of injurious influences. But here we have evidently a passage in which our Redeemer speaks of the devil in a didactic manner, and that too, without having been solicited, and in the narrowest circle of his disciples. The description of the second disposition of heart, is that of a kindred one, although differing very much in its outward manifestation. In the heart there is the same want of susceptibility for what is divine (τὰ στεινά); it is only the exterior which is capable of being moved and excited to what is noble. For this reason, the beginning of life raises fair expectations (μικὰ σπείρας λαμβάνει λόγον Θεοῦ), but the plant cannot take deep root; (ικμᾶς [Luke viii. 6] = ύγρότης) the nourishing moisture is wanting; for this reason, such an one is a πρόσκαμος (which St Luke explains by πρός καρδίναταιστεινά), the contrast to an αἰώνιος (2 Cor. iv. 8). In the hour of temptation (καίρὶ πυραμοῦ), which St Matthew and St Mark by the terms ἁλλης and διωγμὸς characterise more specially as coming from without, they fall away (St Luke, ἀφίεται; St Matthew and St Mark: σκάνδαλον; compare concerning σκάνδαλον, the remarks on Matt. xviii. 8). The use of ἴλος (Matt. xiii. 6) in parabolical language, in the signification of “scorching heat,” is found in the Old Testament also. (Ps. cxxi. 6; Isaiah xlix. 10, comp. with Rev. vii. 16.) In the third disposition of heart, it is not insensibility which prevents the development of the divine word. The thorns choking the germ are the heterogeneous elements which in the mind are mixed up with the principle of divine life. Good and evil are accordingly conceived of as existing in the inward life, in parallel development, but in such a manner that the latter attains to an ascendancy over the former, and suppresses it. As that which prevents the growth of the heavenly germ, two forms are pointed out, in which sin manifests itself in the present temporary course of the world (αἰῶν στοχ). First, the μίσος, the oppressive, burdensome part of this earthly life, whereby men are drawn away from God; and, secondly, the ἀπάτη τοῦ πλούτου, the alluring part of it, which, in a delusive manner, seems to appease the cravings of the soul. This second form of the pernicious influences of the worldly principle is more fully described by St Luke viii. 14, in the additional clause: ἡσυχαῖ τοῦ βίου. (Βίος signifies here, like seculum, the
temporary existence of man as he appears mixed up with sin [comp. 2 Tim. ii. 4]. From this the Church Fathers derived: βιωτικόν, βιωτικά = secularìa, "what belongs to," "what concerns this world." Comp. Suiceri Thea. s. h. v. and Luke xxi. 34 ; 1 Cor. v. 3, 4.) St Mark uses instead of ἥδονα, the expression αἱ σείγι τὰ λαοῦ ἐνθημέναι, so that other allurements of the external world, as exercising equal effects, are placed in co-ordination with the αἵλους. These heterogeneous things withdraw from the divine the undivided attention which it requires, and hence it cannot display itself in its power. (Συμμετέχουσι τῷ λόγῳ, ἀκαθόρσα γίνεσθαι, οὐ τελεσφοροῖς, according to St Luke. The word τελεσφορῶς is found only in the passage Luke viii. 14 ; it signifies "to bring to the end," "to finish.") But the fruit of the Spirit is the end of the inner spiritual life, which the word of God, sown into the heart, is to attain (Gal. v. 22), inasmuch as this supposes that it has exercised its full influence upon the whole inner man. That this spiritual fruit grows up from the divine word sown in the heart, is just the characteristic feature in the fourth and last disposition of heart which the Redeemer calls figuratively γὰρ καλῆ, a spiritual soil, with full receptivity, in which the progress of development is not interrupted by any of those obstacles above mentioned. The various expressions of the Evangelists render most perceptible the influence exercised upon such hearts by what is divine. According to St Matthew, ἄξιως is connected with a συνίαι, with a seizing of the divine in its very nature, and in a manner opposed to the catching away, in ver. 19. According to St Mark, it is a παραδίκεσθαι, a receiving into the depth of life, opposed to the losing in ver. 15. According to St Luke, it is a ναρίχα, which points out the activity of the will in preserving the acquired principle of divine life, and in keeping off all heterogeneous influences, opposed to ver. 14. St Luke has, moreover, the significant expression: ἐν ἰσόμορφη, in order to represent the bringing forth of fruit, as the result of the gradual progress of the internal penetration of the inner life by that which is divine, and which does not by any means depend upon the mere spontaneous determination of the will. St Matthew and St Mark farther point out, in figurative language, the various degrees of fruitfulness. Without overstraining the meaning of ἰκαρός, ἦκαρον, τρικάρονα, we may yet assert that the numbers do not only indicate different degrees of endowment with powers, on which the abundance of
fruit depends (comp. Matt. xxv. 14, sqq.), or the degrees of carefulness devoted to the promotion of their growth; but that they are also intended to indicate, that even in this part of the great kingdom of God, everything is distributed according to order and rule, and hence, that the powers, faculties, and dispositions bestowed upon the various individuals are not scattered without rule, but granted according to law and order.

In the account by St Luke viii. 16–18, and by St Mark iv. 21–25, there follow immediately after the explanation of the parable thus given by the Lord, certain words which are awanting in St Matthew, but which are not without importance for the deeper understanding of the similitude. The connexion of these verses with the foregoing parable is obvious, if one only keeps in view the circumstance that the Saviour, in passing on to another comparison, is shewing how the apostles were the γὰρ καλός, and therefore called to bring forth seeds and fruits, which in their turn were destined to produce still more extensive results. The light which has been kindled, and which is intended to diffuse its radiance, is thus equivalent to the seed scattered abroad and designed to grow up, and the general idea which follows, ὡς γὰρ ἰστι τι ἐξεύρετος κ. τ. λ. contains merely the affirmation that everything wrapped up in the divine word shall gradually unfold and develop itself. To this is subjoined the admonition, βλέπετε οὖν καθ' ἀνάλογον δοθήσεται ἀνθρώπου, καὶ διὰ διὰ μὴ ἵνα ἐρχθή καὶ διὰ δοξῆ ἐρχθή, ἀφοβεῖται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ. The same words stand at Matt. xiii. 12, but are somewhat differently introduced. The original connexion may probably have been preserved by St Luke and St Mark. For according to them, the words were obviously designed to prevent a possible misunderstanding of the parable, lest it should be supposed that the states of mind, described as existing in different men, originated in any inherent necessity, or that the consequent variety of effects flowing from the word of God in them, arose from such a source. The admonition βλέπετε κ. τ. λ. and especially the remark ὡς γὰρ ἰνα ἐρχθή κ. τ. λ. takes for granted the freedom of choice and the influence of self-determination, amidst

---

1 The same intermingling of the two comparisons of seed and light is found also in Philo; Αἴσχυλος ἐν γοργ. μέν εἶναι ἀπ' ἀναφερομένως οἷς ἢ ἐν ἡμεῖς ἡ θεοφανὴς φωνή εὐεργέτου ἀγαθῶν ἡμῖν προετοιμάζει τῷ Ομοίῳ, αἷς διαφοραίς ἔσοραί σε εἰρήνην δοκεῖν. De vita theort. Opp. v. ii. p. 482, Mangey.
all differences of internal organization. For, according to the
connexion, the ἵππος the μνῆμα (as conjoined with the ὑπὲρ
ἵππος) refer to the fruit which was really produced, or only ap-
parently brought forth. The ἵππος admits also of being referred
to the γαρ ἐκλεισθείς to which the fruit stands related simply as effect
to cause, but the former view is to be preferred. Thus under-
stood, the whole sentence (Gnome) affirms that wheresoever that
which is divine has once manifested itself in fruit-producing
power, it goes on to develop its influences ever more purely and
more nobly; but wheresoever it fails of effectual operation, there,
not merely the old state returns, but the man sinks deeper, and
loses even that which he vainly imagined himself to possess.
This idea plainly leads to the further conclusion that the states
of mind depicted in the parable are not to be conceived of as
definitely restricted to separate individuals, but are rather to be
regarded as realized in the same person successively in different
periods and situations of life, so that as well, on the one hand,
may the hard stony heart, by a faithful using of grace, be en-
nobled into a good and fruitful soil for the divine word, as, con-
versely, may the good ground, on the other hand, by faithlessness,
be desolated and destroyed. But this implies no denial of the
fact, that in different individuals there naturally exist predomi-
nant tendencies towards the one or the other of these mental
states, such predominance arising from the blessing of pious, or
the curse of impious conduct. Only, every man must be viewed
as a free agent; and as the Bible nowhere teaches the existence
of a decretum reprobationis, according to which, sin concentrates
itself of necessity on certain natures, just as little does it teach
the existence of a gratia irresistibilis, in virtue of which, good
concentrates itself of necessity on certain individuals. We are
rather made everywhere to see that the Divine government of
the world, which has its foundation in necessity, is in harmony
with a world full of beings who are free agents, and who are
never forced by compulsion under the influence of good or evil.
The most favoured individuals, if personally unfaithful, can at-

1 All who hold the doctrine of the saints' perseverance, with its kindred truths, will
dissent, as the Translator does, from this statement and some others which follow.
If the author really understood this truth as implying that men are not free agents,
but driven by force (durch Zwang,) to good or evil, he could not have known what
the Calvinistic system of doctrine really is.—T.
tain not the slightest advancement in good, while the least favoured, if personally faithful, may develope themselves most attractively. By the principle, therefore,—he who has much, of him shall much be required,—the apparent unrighteousness connected with the different positions in which men are born, is fully removed. Only in St Mark do we find the statement added (Mark iv. 26—29), in which the comparison of the seed sown in the field is taken with a modification such as does not occur in the other evangelists. It stands in immediate connexion with the preceding idea, that wheresover the divine root has entered into a soul, it evermore manifests its blessed influence according to the power which dwells in it, and which develops itself outwardly. The comparison therefore sets forth this indwelling energy (and in this respect it is allied to the parable of the leaven), quite as strongly as it does the inability of him who soweth the seed of the Divine word to effect its growth, that growth proceeding wholly from itself as the general law of all development implies. (Mark iv. 26, 27, contains a representation of the gradual growth of the seed without the co-operation of the sower; ἐκείνην, ἰησοῦναι is merely a description of what happens in ordinary life, which excludes any further attention to the seed that has been sown. Independently of the efforts of man, the earth itself [αὐράματα] brings forth fruit. What properly belongs to the seed is here attributed to the earth, as that on which the growth of the seed depends; in other respects it is of no importance to the understanding of the similitude. The expression αὐράματα, that which moves of itself, which grows of itself, does not occur elsewhere, except at Acts xii. 10. The mode of growth by progressive stages, is described by the words χέφος [the first springing of the corn which is grass-like], στάχνης [the sprouting of the ears], σῖρας [the ripened grain.] In verse 29th, παξαμψαφι, scil. πανώπαφι is used after the analogy of the Latin se dare, tradere, as Virgil, Georg. i. 287, writes multa adeo gelida melius se nocte dederunt. Compare also the Hebrew נב, the Chaldee נב, Ezra vii. 19, [see Buxt. Lex. Talm. p. 2422.] ἀκτίφασι σickle, stands for the labourers bearing the sickle; the σείροι, see Matt. xiii. 39.) There is only one difficulty in this parabolic discourse, as given by Mark, the circumstance namely, that the sower, who after scattering the seed goes away, is none other than the ὦς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, as our Lord’s own explanations afterwards shew (Matt.}
xiii. 37), and as is indeed indicated by the very fact, that the Lord, when the harvest is come, sends the reapers into the field, an act which, according to Matt. xiii. 39, must be referred to the time of the χρήσ. But in what sense it can be said of the Lord that he lets the field grow without caring for its advancement, one does not well see, inasmuch as grace is required equally at the commencement and throughout the course of the divine life. Everything would appear to harmonize better if we could suppose that by the αὐτοψαρας αὐτων is to be understood any and every teacher who may be labouring in the Lord's vineyard, and who certainly after implanting the word in the heart, must, in respect to its future growth, leave it to take its own course. Perhaps, however, such difficulties shew that the similitude ought not to be pushed thus far. The very nature of a similitude implies that on some point or other, the thing compared must differ from that to which it is likened, else the two would be identical. Only, in this case we feel ourselves shut out from having recourse to this explanation, by observing that the specific point on which the whole comparison turns, is just this very abandonment of all care for the seed after it has been sown. Unless, therefore, the whole is to have the appearance of inanity, meaning and force must be given to this point. Perhaps then, according to Matt. ix. 15, the meaning of the entire parabolic discourse may be taken in this way: although the inner life in man is never, during the course of its development, absolutely without the grace and the presence of the Lord, yet may it be said that there are two special periods when that grace is pre-eminently active. The first is the commencement of the life (the sowing), the second is the ripening of the fruit (the harvest.) Between these points lies a period, during which it may be said, that comparatively the soul is without the Lord, the divine life implanted in man developing itself according to its own inherent power, and to this season perhaps, a season of internal struggle and turmoil, the Lord here refers. Thus understood, the comparison gains for itself, at least, a specific meaning, and its connexion is made clear with what had gone before. Nor does this explanation exclude a reference to individual human teachers, only this does not appear as the thing primarily intended.

It is in another sense, however, that the words: ἐκ γειν αὐτων χρήσις r. λ. are interwoven as part of this discourse by St Matt. in the
verses before us, the exposition of which we are now to give. According to ver. 10, sq. the disciples came to Jesus and asked him generally what His purpose was in thus speaking in parables, (διατείμαται; λέγεις αὐτοῖς;). The Lord replies, that He employed them on account of the differences that existed among the various classes of His hearers, some of whom He wished to understand Him, others not. In speaking by parables, this twofold object would be gained, for every thing that it was needful for Him to state would thus be declared, but in a form so veiled that only those understood it who were designed to understand it. Among these the disciples are mentioned first of all, and in this connexion it is said δόντι γὰρ ἵνα τ. λ., (ver. 12.) The idea thus appears set in a different light from that in which we find it with St Luke and St Mark. The apostles are represented as the ἵκεντες on whom, for this reason, there flows in the πέτρωσμα, the λατρεύει, however as the εἰς ἵκεντες, who lose for this reason what they already have, to whom the appearance of the light tends to bring destruction. Before considering, however, this idea, which is further developed in the following verses, we must attend to the expression: μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τῶν υἱῶν (τοῦ Θεοῦ). It marks the general object of the παρασκευάζων, and in those very parables which follow throughout this chapter, constant reference is prominently made to the βασιλεία. The word μυστήριον then, from μαίνο to shut up, to conceal, is in the New Testament used to denote the Divine counsels, decrees, doctrines, which, as such, could never have become known to men as such, to men if left to themselves. (So the Heb. γεγραμμένος in the Old Testament.) Nowhere, however, are these decrees, &c. represented as absolutely eternally hid, and incapable of being known; but God, who at the prompting of His own love, reveals himself and all that is in Him, is constantly by his ἀποκάλυψις revealing his μυστήρια; yet not in such a way that they cease to be μυστήρια, they retain for ever their divine character, which exalted them above all the powers of discovery belonging to man himself, only instead of hidden, they have become unveiled μυστήρια. (1 Cor. ii. 7. Rom. xvi. 25.) According to this view, the μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τῶν υἱῶν denote the whole system of Divine counsels, ordinances, and doctrines, which have been revealed through Christ, and through the new economy which he founded. These stand in contrast, as it were, with the μυστήρια τοῦ θεοῦ, which, after the fulfilment of the Old
Testament economy, had to make way for a new system of μυστή-
ρια. This whole collection of mysteries, however, was made
known only to some (ὑμιν διδότας γινώσκει), from others it was hid,
(according to St Mark ρως ἵκως, as opposed to the apostles ῥως
ἵκως. As to the mode of expression used by St Paul in regard to
this matter, comp. 1 Cor. v. 12, 13; Col. iv. 5; 1 Thess. iv. 12.)
In the use of the word διδότας, it is impossible not to see a refer-
ence to the decree of God. It implies first, the positive exercise
of divine grace, its communicating or imparting the blessing, and
then, negatively, it implies the inability of man’s will to attain of
itself the thing bestowed. He uses the expression in the same
sense as at Matthew xix. 11; xx. 23, and especially at John iii.
27; vi. 65; xix. 11, with the addition of ἀνωθεν, εἰς τοὺς ὄρανος.
But this idea, that the passage asserts the giving and the with-
holding a knowledge of the secrets of the divine kingdom, forms
precisely the great difficulty that meets us in this and the follow-
ing verses (ver. 13–15), where at greater length it is explained,
and founded on Old Testament prophecy.

According to the narrative of Matthew xiii. 13, the idea cer-
tainly seems put in such a form as to intimate that Christ’s
speaking in parables was simply a consequence resulting from the
blindness and insensibility of a portion of His hearers. For the
expression employed is εἰ παραπολεμαῖς λαλῶ διδασκάλους ὧν βλέπουσι
καὶ λεγεῖν, while St Mark and St Luke in the corresponding passage
give ἃ ὃς βλέποντες μὴ βλέπωσι, words which obviously mean that
their failing to understand him was the object designed by our
Lord in using the language of parables. But that in St Matthew’s
account of our Lord’s discourse he meant to convey no meaning
different from that of the other evangelists, is shewn first by the
quotation from the Old Testament, which of itself expresses as
strongly the same idea, and in the next place, if we take the διδασκάλους
in verse 13, to denote the cause which led to his speaking in parables,
it implies something self-contradictory. “For this reason do I
speak to them in parables, because they do not understand,” is a
mode of thought which could in no respect be explained or jus-
tified.1 For if they wholly failed to comprehend him, one does

---

1 The words could only be so interpreted if the parables were to be considered as
means for facilitating the understanding of the subject referred to. But against this
view the passage εἰσέβαλεν αὐτῷ ὁ κύριος (v. 11), is so decisive that the point admits of no
further discussion.
not see why the Lord did not speak at once in simple unfigurative terms—that would at least have given a chance of His being understood somewhat better than speaking before men of dull apprehension in language obscure and veiled. And according to this view, the possibility of his being understood must, to a certain extent, be assumed, as otherwise it would have been more to the purpose for Him to have refrained from speaking altogether. On the other hand, the idea is a very simple one:—"I speak in parables in order that they may not understand," and this view has been attempted to be got rid of simply on account of the dogmatic difficulties it involves—difficulties which do not concern the interpreter of Scripture. According to the connexion therefore, the words in Matt. xiii. 13 should be translated only in this way, "I speak to them in parables, for seeing, they see not," so that the result is represented as an effect contemplated and designed. This is plainly shewn also immediately afterwards at ver. 15, by the expression μὴ ποτε ἴδωσι, in the prophecy of Isaiah (comp. Mark iv. 12.) Attempts have been made, it is true, to put such a meaning on the μὴ ποτε here, and the ἰδα in St Luke and St Mark, as to take away from both particles the idea of design. And it is not to be denied that μὴ ποτε (as was already remarked in regard to ἰδα on Matt. i. 22,) sometimes, in the New Testament, wants the sense of intention, or design. Especially convincing in support of this view of μὴ ποτε, is the passage 2 Tim. ii. 25, μὴ ποτε δι' αἰτίας διώκοντες μετάνοιαν, which it is utterly impossible to translate, "in order that God might not grant them repentance," but rather "whether God (μὴ ποτε) will not bestow on them repentance." According to this the passage before us (ver. 15) might be rendered;—whether they might not see, whether they might not hear. The reference however to the prophecy (Isa. vi. 9, 10), which is also introduced in the same sense at John xii. 39, sqq.; Acts xxviii. 26, sqq. admits no interpretation of the passage except the teleological. St Matthew and also St Luke in the Acts of the Apostles, follow with some unimportant variations the reading of the LXX. while John,"on the contrary, has given a translation of his own which expresses however the idea of the passage with the closest accuracy. He writes ὀχὶ ἵδωσαντο στατίσθεν, and ἰδα μὴ ἴδωσι, so that the utmost violence must be done in interpreting the passage before the words will bear any other sense than this, that the design was they should not understand. The con-
nexion of the words also as given in the Old Testament clearly shews the same meaning. (Compare Gesenius in his Commentary on the passage Isa. vi. 9, 10.) It is represented as the penalty, as the curse of sin, that it prevents man's understanding the revelation of that which comes from God. (The ἐβίστην and ἄκοιμη, as contrasted with the ὅπως συνίασα, ὅπως ἵκη, denote the opportunity which had been given of understanding the Divine, inasmuch as it had been opened up in their immediate presence, while they did not possess the susceptibility necessary for embracing it. This want of susceptibility—the inability to believe—is denoted by ἰκανίωσθη = ἂπηρ, "to become fat," in the sense of "to become unfeeling or insensible." It stands as parallel to the ἀπιστεῖ, and ἄπηρ, which in the Greek are rendered βαφίως ἄκοιμη, καμαμίων. Καμαμίων is a barbarous form for κακαμίων = κλίνει τοῖς ἐφθαλμοῖς. The verb ἐκτιμήσῃ = ἠμεῖ, to abandon a path which had been already entered on, is here as frequently elsewhere used to denote the inward turning of the soul from darkness to light. In the last clause, καὶ ἰάσομαι αὐτοῖς, a various reading, ἰάσομαι, is found, which certainly has been transferred from the LXX. in order to lessen the hardness of the passage by giving to the words the sense of "but I will heal them." This interpretation however does not agree with the connexion of the Hebrew, in which ἰόρης ἰόρη holds a position entirely parallel. In St Mark accordingly, the whole force of the idea is preserved, only the figure implied in ἰάσομαι, is explained by the words ἰα ἐν μῇ ἄρθη αὐτοῖς τα ἀμαρτήματα, a rendering which is also given in the Chaldee version.) According to the connexion then as found in the prophet, the passage Isa. vi. 9, 10, refers primarily to the cotemporaries of Isaiah. St Matthew sees in it a reference to the cotemporaries of Jesus, not judging capriciously, but taking a profound view of its real import. For that which was exhibited in the days of Isaiah did not differ from what occurred in the times of Jesus—making allowance for circumstances—it was essentially the same. The Divine, as set forth in the discourse of Isaiah, was met by the insensibility of the people whom he summoned to spiritual effort, and the curse of their sin lay in this, that they did not even see the Divine as it existed in him. In the time of Jesus the same nation was dealt with in the same way, with only this difference, that in Jesus there was exhibited to the people the purest manifestation of the Divine, a faint reflection of which was all that could be beheld in Isaiah
Inasmuch then, as even this glory of the Divine light remained unperceived by them, the curse of sin in all its magnitude was exhibited to view, and the prophet’s words consequently met in this with their entire fulfilment. And as in this instance, so is it generally with the New Testament writers—the phenomena of life in the Old Testament are viewed in the original root whence they sprang, and are seen to have corresponding analogies more fully developed amidst the occurrences of a later period. (As to the bearing which the train of thought in this passage has on the doctrine of predestination, see further what is said in Rom. ix.)

Ver. 16, 17. In contrast to the curse, therefore, which strikes these hardened hearts, there follows here that blessing which falls to the share of the disciples as men of receptive minds. The ἵψαλμοι, Χρα, are mentioned as the organs of reception in general, something corresponding to which belongs to the inner man. At Luke x. 23, these words occur in a quite different connexion, which will afterwards engage our attention. He adds, that Jesus addressed these words to the disciples when by themselves (καὶ ἀναμόνας, Mark iv. 10, 34), a fact which might have been inferred even from their contents. The comparison of His disciples to the προφήται, and the δίκαιοι, of the Old Testament (Luke, instead of the δίκαιοι, has the word βασιλῆς, an expression, however, which must in this case be held as applying to righteous kings,) would have been unintelligible to the multitude. Besides, the idea expressed in ver. 17, is simply an exposition of the frequently occurring τλευθερωσεῖς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ (Matt. xii. 41, 42.)

All the longing desires of the pious throughout the Old Testament centred in the person of the Messiah. To behold him was the loftiest object of Old Testament hope. This benefit was granted to the disciples, and their whole blessedness, all their glory, consisted in this, that they were illumined by the radiance of the Sun of righteousness. The special grace thus vouchsafed is brought to their remembrance by Christ, not in order to exalt them above the Old Testament saints, but to lay them low before the Lord.

Ver. 24–30. From this same comparison of seed-sowing, a second similitude arises, which however contemplates a different aspect of the kingdom of God. Of this parabolic statement also, an authentic explanation is given by the Lord, ver. 36–41, which we shall take up at the same time. (The ἐκκυσθεὶς ἡ βασιλεία τῶν
οδηγῶν ἀνθρώπῳ, is an abbreviated form of expression—one point of the similitude is brought prominently forward, and on it the comparison is concentrated. Here it is the man who scatters the seed, and so at ver. 33, it is, the ζων, at ver 44, the ἡσυχασμός, at ver. 47, the σαγήνη, at ver. 45, the ἄνθρωπος ἰματος. The word παραδίναι, = πάντες, is here selected with reference to the enigmatical character of parabolical language—he laid the parable before them, for the purpose of opening it up. In the σπίρων ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ, we must beware of supposing that there is any confounding of ἑαυτοῦ and ἐν, he sowed upon his field as the place of his labour. The night-time is described as ἐν τῷ καθίσματι τῶν ἀνθρώπων, as at Job xxxiii. 15. Ver. 25. ζιζάνια, in the Talmud, כַּת. Comp. Buxtorf. Lex. Talm. fol. 680, Suid. נ in γφ א 당, i. e. lolium [Virg. Ecl. v. 37, infelix lolium] cockle, darnel. The weed shewed itself first at the springing time [βλαστάνει], and latterly when the fruit was forming [καρπῶν ποιήσας], and it could not therefore have been stifled by the grain. Ver. 28. αὐτήκοντες συλλέξώμεν. This is represented as spoken according to the analogy of the Hebrew, נָחַל, in the ἥριον of the αὐθεντικότης, but neither here nor in any other passage where נל is used are we to regard it as an empty pleonasm. Ver. 30. δισοντης, = δ τοι, occurs only here; δισοντης is also an ἀγαθόν ἱεράμων, Τὸ ἄρξατον of Exodus xii. 22. An Old Testament comparison lies at the foundation of this whole parable of the burning up of the tares. Comp. 2 Sam. xxiii. 7, where the same reference had already been made to the final judgment. The ἀνθίσσει corresponds to the Hebrew, נֵיאַ, "granary, storehouse."

Ver. 36—43. The explanation of the parable was in this instance also communicated to the disciples when alone, after the people had been dismissed (ver. 36). In brief sentences our Lord expounds the several portions of the comparison, the last point however, the final separation of the good from the bad, on which the whole turns, being more shortly given. But for this express exposition by Christ another interpretation would unquestionably at first sight have suggested itself. Jesus explains the field as being the ξώμος, the good seed as the υἱὸς τῆς βασιλείας, the ζιζάνια as the υἱὸς τοῦ θυματίου, and consequently the whole human race, good and bad together, are viewed as the corn that is growing up in the ξώμος, a word which here seems like orbis terrarum, to denote the universal earth. The generality of this reference does not appear at first sight to agree with the connexion, for the subject of dis-
course is not the whole world (ver. 24), but rather the βασιλεία τῶν οὐζανῶν. That in the general world evil intermingles itself with good, is obvious at a glance, but it is strange that in the kingdom of God itself, onward to its close, the same intermixture should be seen, for the express design of that kingdom is to represent the good. Beyond all doubt, however, this similitude must be understood of the kingdom of God, which is here termed the world, inasmuch as viewed ideally, it is destined to pervade the whole κόσμος, or conversely, the κόσμος, viewed ideally, is seen as destined of God to become His kingdom. The derangement of this original purpose by the influence of the kingdom of darkness, the Saviour will here explain, and He undertakes to define the relative connexion of good and evil in the church of God on earth, as well under the Old as the New Testament, down to the final judgment. The νῦν τοῦ ανθρώπου, consequently appears here again, in His ideal dignity (comp. Dan. vii. 13), as the adversary of the διάσπασις, while from the beginning onward He has been working out the victory of good among the human race. This, moreover, is another passage belonging to the number of those in which Christ refers in His teaching literally and directly to the devil. The disciples had requested here an authoritative exposition of a similitude that was dark to them. In no point of view was this an occasion for conceding to popular prejudice (even if the idea of such accommodation were not essentially inconsistent with the holy character of Jesus), and still less for having recourse to the use of proverbs or any thing else of the kind. While, however, according to this view, the parable as a whole is clear, yet on particular points we are met by important difficulties. Thus the way in which the νῦν τῆς βασιλείας, and τῶν πονηρῶν, are set in contrast, seems to point to an absolute severance of individuals, which might again seem to favour the doctrine of predestination. But the prohibition forbidding the rooting out of evil (ver. 28) at once sufficiently shews that neither are the νῦν τῆς βασιλείας conceived of as entirely dispossessed from the evil, nor the νῦν τῶν πονηρῶν as wholly dissociated from the good. The one class appear only as in a certain respect the concentration of good (not however as though any gratia irresistibilis preserved them from falling back), the other as the concentration of evil (not however as though any decetum reprobationis forced them into wickedness, and held them back from the possibility of repentance), drawn by birth, circumstances, education, now more
towards the one element, now more towards the other. For though all men are involved in sin, yet are they not all in an equal degree under its power; sincerity, uprightness, and susceptibility for everything good, being beyond all mistake manifest in some, while others display malice, obstinacy, hardness of heart. It is strange however, that this prohibition to separate these elements before their becoming ripe should be the thing omitted in the Lord’s explanation, whether it be that St Matthew has abridged his exposition, or whether it be that the Saviour wished merely to set prominently forth the great final separation, thus sufficiently indicating that until that separation take effect, no arbitrary, and therefore merely pernicious attempt to dissever them ought to be made.¹ It is indeed self-evident that this does not prohibit the severance of what is sinful from that which is good; it is only meant that no individual person should be shut out from intercourse with the good as incorrigible, there is always the possibility that the beneficent influence of good may awaken up in him the slumbering elements of improvement. At the same time, however, it admits of no doubt, that according to the meaning of this parable, all violent interference with the course of life led by the sinful members of the church (not merely death, but also final excommunication), as well as every arbitrary effort to realize absolute purity of communion on earth (Donatism), is forbidden, because the former leads to harshness and injustice, the latter inevitably to pride and blindness. For as within man, even the best, there exists a mixture similar to that which prevails without him, the effect can only be most pernicious, if, overlooking the sin that is in his soul, he holds himself forth to others as a pure member. The view here inculcated leads simply to humility, mildness, and to constant watchfulness at the same time, for the improvement of one’s self and others. For there is no intention to prohibit admonition, or appropriate church discipline or any other methods of dealing with the lives of sinful members of the church, if only not forcible in

¹ The view of this parable recently put forth by Steiger (Ev. K. Z. Feb. 1833, p. 113, sqq.) to the effect that it is simply prophetico-historical, i.e. that it contains no admonitions intended to guide the conduct of believers, but merely instructs us in the truth that the church shall never on earth be pure, is obviously untenable, for in that case the account of the servant’s zeal in wishing to root out the weeds, and the Lord’s prohibition, would be mere decorations incidentally introduced to adorn the similitude—a supposition which clearly is most arbitrary, and destructive to the character of the parable.
their nature. What man however is unable to separate, that the all-knowing God dissepers finally in the συνίστασις τοῦ αἰώνος τοῦτον. The meaning of this expression cannot here be very accurately determined, generally and comprehensively it denotes simply the conclusion of this temporal course of the world which contains the mixture of good and evil. That this severance is advancing of itself step by step, that it has been going on throughout the course of the world’s history, that it was decisively manifested in the founding of a visible kingdom of God, and will be finally consummated in the universal judgment—are truths not touched on in the passage here before us. There is merely presented to us the great principle of biblical Theodicy, that one day the holy and the unholy shall be mutually and wholly separated, but up to that period they shall remain ripening together, each according to its own nature. (Comp. in regard to συνίστασις τ. α. what is said at Matt. xii. 31; and xxiv. 1). In the account of the εἰρήνη, as here given, the βασιλεία τ. θ. is contemplated as the only thing that exists, that is in being, out of which it is merely required that foreign admixtures be expelled, in order to manifest its real nature. (The sending of the ἀγγελός, and the whole manner in which the punishment is represented, will be found explained more fully at Matt. xxiv. 31; xxv. 30, 31. The σκότος, be it also observed, and the συνέτος τῆς ανεμίας, are not to be taken as synonymous—the former is the more forcible expression. Κάμινος συρῆς = τῆς αἰώνος. As to κλαυθῶς καὶ βρεγμένος ἔδωκεν, see on Matth. viii. 12.) After the expulsion of evil as the element of darkness, good reveals itself in its pure nature as light. (Τότε οἱ δίκαιοι ἐκλαμψαν, as children of light—children of God the σαρή τῶν φῶν [James i. 17]. The words are chosen with reference to Dan. xii. 3. Comp. Wisdom iii. 7, 4; Ezra vii. 55.)

The third parable of the mustard seed is at once seen to be far less fully carried out than the two which precede it. It approaches the character of a mere comparison, for it is simply the nature of the mustard seed itself, and of the plant growing out of it, which is employed to illustrate the βασιλεία τ. θ. In Luke this parable, and the following one of the leaven, also occur, but in another connexion, which we shall afterwards consider more at length. (In the parable the μακρι τερον, and the μείζον, with the genitive following them, have certainly the force of the superlative, only too much stress in this respect must not be laid on them. The selec-
tion of this particular plant is perhaps to be explained from its qualities as a seasoning; which in the parable that immediately follows, forms also the tertium comparationis. Λάχανος, = Fenn, vegetables, cabbage-like plants generally. The πίπτα εν υπόστασις, appear here in a connexion wholly different from that at Matt. xiii. 4, as representing all those who seek protection and refuge in the kingdom of God, according to Ezek. xvii. 23, which passage seems to lie at the foundation of this whole comparison. Inasmuch as in the separate forms which exist throughout creation various characters seem to find expression, they admit also in the parabolic language of Scripture of being understood in a variety of senses.) The idea which this parable is obviously designed to set forth, is simply this—that in the manifestation of what is Divine, the beginning and the end of its development stand related to each other in an inverse ratio. Springing from invisible beginnings, it spreads itself abroad over an all-embracing field of operations. As however the kingdom of God may be conceived of at one time in its totality, at another in its speciality, i.e. as manifested in a greater or smaller sphere, in nations, or in private individuals, so also may the parables which set forth particular aspects of the kingdom of God be viewed. The rich thoughts deposited in them possess the same truth for the whole body, as for the private members, because truth is universally alike and consistent with itself.

Ver. 33. The fourth parable of the leaven is very nearly allied to the foregoing, illustrating like it the all-pervading power of that which is from God, and the efficiency of which does not depend on the extent of the mass on which it may have to act. The two parables differ simply in this, that, in the former, that of the mustard seed, the divine kingdom is exhibited as manifesting its powers outwardly in that of the leaven as unseen, as working in secret. The leaven shews it at the same time acting on another element which it strives to transmute, and draw into the nature of its own being, whereas in the parable of the mustard seed, the only point brought into view is the inherent development of that which is divine viewed by itself. (Ζύμη is used, Matt. xvi. 6; 1 Cor. v. 7; Gal. v. 9, in a bad sense, with reference to the passover feast, Ex. xiii. 3. Its pervasive, seasoning power, forms here the single point of comparison with that which is divine; wisdom, the eternal mother of life, having sunk down into human nature.
in order to hallow it. The word ἐγχυτρίζω, indicates its secret, invisibly-acting influence. Ἀλευρός, stands for the substance of the φώγαμα, the meal, of which the dough was to be formed. The measure, σάρος, according to Ὁσερῆ [Antiq. ix. 2], contains μίχων παί ἦμιοι Ἰταλίκων. The mention of the particular measure individualizes the comparison as the nature of a parable requires. It were wrong expressly to apply the particular number to spiritual subjects, yet are we not perhaps altogether to deny some reference here to spirit, soul, and body, as the three powers of human nature which are to be sanctified by that which is divine).

Ver. 44–50. The last three parables, which however are given more in the shape of hints than of full detail, exhibit the kingdom of God in a way peculiar to themselves. They bring out the relative positions in which men stand to it, while the preceding parables had adverted partly to the nature of that kingdom in itself, and partly to the relation in which it stands to men. This peculiarity makes it not improbable that, as Matt. ver. 36, had already indicated, these latter parables were spoken confidentially to the inner circle of His disciples, with whose position, relatively to the kingdom of God, they singularly harmonize, as indeed with that of all who are connected with it like them as preachers of the Gospel. The first two parables respecting the treasure in the field, and the pearls, come into contact in the same way as those of the leaven and the mustard seed. They represent the absolute value of divine things as compared with the relative value of every prized earthly treasure, and enjoin the sacrifice of the latter for the sake of the former. The abandonment, for the sake of the Divine, of a man's whole possessions, whether external (property, goods, possessions,) or internal (opinions, usages, tendencies by which life had been swayed), the apostles had begun to put in practice, and the Saviour here intimates, that step by step they would be required to carry it out. But while the two parables are thus allied, a difference is yet obvious between them. In both the precious object (the Ψηλαφεῖς, or the μαγγαίην, appears, it is true, as concealed, but human effort in searching for the concealed treasure is differently represented in them. In that of the pearls a noble active nature is exhibited, which, under the pressure of inward impulse, seeks after (ζητεῖ:) the true, and strives for the exalted till it gets sight of the essence of everything that deserves a wish in the divine, as revealed in Christ its centre, and by complete self-re-
nunciation becomes possessed of it. In the similitude of the
Treasure in the field, on the other hand, it is a more receptive turn
Of mind in reference to the divine which is presented to our notice.
It comes unsought, unlooked for, yet has the soul the will and the
Power, at any price, to acquire possession of it, only the active
Exertion (the ζητήσεως) is wanting. The history of a Peter and a
Nathaniel exemplify these forms in which the principle of life
Developes itself among men (comp. John i.) In the parable of
The treasure hid in the field, not only is bold, joyful, self-sacrificing
Zeal (ἀρχόντης ἡμῶν ἡμῶν ἡμῶν ἡμῶν) commended, but praise seems
Also given to prudential management in divine things, inasmuch
As the man who finds the treasure hides it again, and then buys
The field from the owner without saying anything of the treasure
Contained in it. The singularity of this will be considered and
Explained when we come to the difficult passage, Luke xvi., res-
pecting the unjust steward. Another thing peculiar to the parable
Of the pearls is the contrast between unity and plurality. It ex-
presses in a peculiar way the absolute importance of the one thing,
And the merely relative value of everything else. Naturally this
One thing can be no mere doctrine, no dogma, but something
Essential; it must be the divine in the human, as exhibited in the
Person of Christ. That man should in his own experience find
God in himself, and himself in God—this is the one pearl for
Whose acquisition he must, in a peculiar sense, be willing to part
With all things that he may win all things. The oneness of the
Pearl, however, does not contradict the idea that there are a
Multitude who seek it, for just because it is in itself the divine,
Therefore may each man seek and find it. It exists everywhere,
Inasmuch as the divine germ lies slumbering in all hearts, and
Requires only to be awoken by quickening, and life from on
High.

The last similitude of the fishing-net is again closely allied to
The second of the tares in the field. In both there is represented
The intermingling of good and bad in the βασανίσεως τ. ὑ., which are
to be separated only at the end of the day. For, what in the
Parable of the tares is denoted by the harvest, is here shadowed
Forth by the completing of the draught of fishes. In verses 49,
50, the parabolic discourse indeed is explained in such a way as
to correspond, word for word, with verses 41, 42, and our obser-
Vations on the former passage therefore apply equally to this.
GOSPEL OF ST MATTHEW XIII. 51, 52.

The difference between the two similitudes might perhaps be most properly stated thus. In that of the tares, the βασιλεία τ. Θ. is set forth in its ideal form, as identical with the whole νέαν, while in this of the fishing-net, on the other hand, the kingdom of God is taken according to its real appearance, as a smaller whole defined and marked off within the νέαν, but including within itself the tendency to diffuse itself over all. This is pointed out by the circumstance, that it is from the Ἁλαβάνα, which represents the whole, that fishes are taken into the net of God’s kingdom. Thus explained, the passage is another evidence to prove that the Saviour himself acknowledged no pure communion in his visible church on earth. It appertains to the wondrous leadings of God’s grace, that everywhere in the course of this transitory world, evil intermingles itself alongside of good. As in the ark a Ham appears along with Shem and Japhet,—as in the company of the twelve, a Judas,—so has the spiritual Israel, the spiritual Jerusalem, a Babel in its bosom. By this arrangement the opportunity of repentance is everywhere put within reach of the evil, and the child of light, amidst his struggles with the enemy, is carried on towards perfection. Not till the ἔκδοτι ἴσχατη, will an entirely pure fellowship of saints be exhibited. The parable gives us further an important hint as to the ἄγγελος, to whom the work of making a separation is entrusted. For it is obvious that they are the same persons who first cast out the net, then draw it to shore, and afterwards separate the fishes. If we compare then Matt. iv. 19, where the Lord promises to the apostles that He will make them ἔλεγχος ἀφρότοις, it appears that by the ἄγγελος, we are to understand no spiritual beings from the heavenly world, but men whom God has furnished as His messengers and servants, by infusing into them heavenly powers for trying and proving the spirits of others. Thus had the ῆς already been styled at Mal. ii. 7, τοῦ ἀφρότου ἄγγελος. Although therefore the apostles in one sense are themselves fishes (ιχθύσ) caught in the net of God’s kingdom, yet are they in their renewal and regeneration so transformed, that they take part in the spiritual work of Him who first took them by the might of His love, an intimation which is not without importance for the understanding of other passages, such as Matt. xxiv. 31; xxv. 31, compared with Jude ver. 14; 1 Cor. vi. 2, 3; xi. 31.

Ver. 51, 52. St Matthew concludes this collection of parables
with the question of Jesus to the disciples, σωθατε ταῦτα πάντα. If we compare Mark iv. 13, we find a word of reproach uttered by Jesus against the little power of the understanding possessed by the disciples, and this question may therefore be translated—have ye now then at last comprehended all this? Not as though they should have gained an understanding of it without explanation, but along with it and through means of it. For St Mark observes, iv. 34, καὶ δίδικες μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἔφηλι πάντα. (The verb ἐστίν, points plainly to what was enigmatical [ῥήτορ] in the parabolic discourses of Christ.) On receiving the affirmative reply of the disciples, the Saviour gives under another similitude a view of the peculiar nature and ministry of a γραμματικός in that more exalted sense in which the character ought to belong to the apostles. The διὰ τοῦτο refers back to the preceding καὶ κύριος of the apostles, the force of it being—"on this account can ye now fulfill your calling for," &c. &c. Obviously, however, the reading τῷ βασιλείᾳ must here be preferred to the other in βασιλείᾳ, or εἰς βασιλείᾳ, which can have arisen only from a misunderstanding of the passage. For it is not simply the members of God's kingdom who are here spoken of, but those who act as teachers in behalf of the members. The expression γραμματικός τῷ βασιλείᾳ μαθητευτικός is therefore to be explained as meaning a scribe who has been instructed, and who, by means of instruction, has become capable of labouring for the kingdom of God, who therefore himself, in the first instance, belongs to it, and who, moreover, hath penetrated into its deep things that he may be able to lead others the further. Obviously our Lord intends to contrast His apostles with the Jewish Ἠρῴ, the γραμματικός τῷ βασιλείᾳ τῷ γῆς μαθητευτικός. These latter learn earthly wisdom after a human method for earthly ends; the apostles, and by consequence, all who resemble them, draw instruction from the eternal Word (John i. 1), the fountain of all wisdom and truth, for heavenly objects. The relation in which these spiritual γραμματικός stand to the church is compared by the Lord to the relation in which the father of a family stands to the members of the household. He has wisely provided his stores, and out of them divides to every individual according to his wants. (The Ἑσαυφές is here equivalent to the ταμίαν, in which the new and old supplies lie treasured up. The ἰζιλλίπη is equivalent to ἀξίωμα, promere.) It is probable that something more definite than the mere idea of
diversity is denoted by the ἀνεπικτετελεῖα. The most natural course is to refer it to the great distinction between the law and the gospel, in the due apportioning of which lies fundamentally the whole employment of one instructed for the kingdom of heaven, inasmuch as the inner life of the soul is oscillating for ever betwixt these opposite points, as will be further explained on Rom. vii.

Ver. 34, 35. In conclusion, let us now consider the words with which St Matthew finally closes those parables that were uttered in the hearing of the people—words, however, which are applicable to the parabolic mode of speaking generally. St Matthew, with whom St Mark (iv. 34), agrees, observes that in general Jesus never spoke, χρησὶ παρατελεῖα— that is, never to the ἐκλογα, for, to His disciples He expounded these parables. In considering this idea, we must in the first place understand the παρατελεῖα in the more general sense of comparison, similitudo; only one does not well see, even when it is thus explained, how the position can entirely be made good, that Jesus never spoke without similitudes. The shortest mode of explanation is to view the negation as merely a relative one, or if this seems inadmissible, it may then be said that the καθὼς ἔδοξαντο ἀκούν of Mark iv. 33, supplies us with a solution, inasmuch as even though the Saviour, in a literal sense, did not always speak in similitudes, yet was He never understood aright by that multitude, so little fitted for the reception of spiritual truths. With this, the quotation that follows well agrees, in which the mystery that runs through the whole ministry of the Messiah is brought forward into view. (In regard to the formula ἐσι τιτηρωθή, see on Matth. i. 22. The passage quoted is found at Ps. lxxviii. 2, in a poem by Asaph. According to the account of Jerome [in his commentary on the passage,] the name of Isaiah stood in the passage of Matth. as given in the old MSS., but without doubt it was interpolated, because the writer of the Psalms did not seem to the transcriber to be a prophet—a name which it was usual to restrict to the persons primarily so called.) The first half of the verse agrees with the Hebrew and the LXX., the second, however, varies from both. The words προέσκισαν προέχωμαι ἀπό ἀπεκθησέντων. The words as given by St Matthew are so peculiar that they furnish another argument for the independence of the Greek text. The phrase, ἀπὸ κατατολὴς κόσμου,
in the sense of ἀνατολάριος, does not once occur in the Old Testament; in the New Testament, on the contrary, it is very common, Matth. xxv. 34; Luke xi. 50; John xvii. 24, and often besides. At the foundation of it lies that figure which compares the world to a building whose erection commences with the foundation κατακόλη. Only in this passage, however, do we find the verb ἐπιεύμα, which the LXX. also employ at Ps. xviii. 2, in translating ἐπιρρή, and which is very commonly used by the Gnostics to express their emanation-doctrine of the streaming forth of being. The expressions ἄνατολος and ροή imply the idea of a dark, enigmatical mode of speaking, as an outward covering, and, along with this, the reality of deep thoughts full of profound meaning. The ἄνατολος and ροή are the eternal mysteries of the world and of human history which Christ unfolds for those who comprehend his discourses, but which remain hid from the multitude. The poet utters the words of the quotation in connexion with the rest of the psalm, and ὑπο and ῥοή: refer in the first instance to the leadings of God’s ancient people. This then is another passage added to those which seem to countenance the idea that the phrase ἄνατολαριος does not imply the fulfilment of a prophecy. But that St Matthew saw in it such a fulfilment—(even if he were wrong in taking this view,) is clearly shewn from his translating ἐπιρρή by ἀνατολάριος κατακόλη ου καθεμοι, while from the connexion of the psalm it refers primarily to the times of Moses. The expositor therefore ought not in this case to reject the most obvious meaning of the formula—a meaning which the writer himself plainly intended to give it. If we ask, however, how it is conceivable that the Evangelist can see in these words the fulfilment of a prophecy, the explanation may be given in the following way. What the prophets utter as men inspired by the Spirit of God and through his power, is really spoken by the Logos, the Son, who in all inspired Scripture reveals himself through them. In thus far then it is Christ’s part alone to say ἀνατολαριος κατακόλη ου σώμα μου, for without his power it is impossible for any to find out or reveal divine secrets, and what the poetic writer of this psalm says respecting wisdom and revelation, he utters only through him.
§ 23. JESUS IN NAZARETH.

(Matt. xiii. 53—58; Mark vi. 1—6; Luke iv. 14—30.)

The older expositors (Storr also, and Dr Paulus at the present day,) assume that in these narratives the Evangelists refer to distinct visits paid by Christ to Nazareth at separate periods. According to this view, St Matthew refers to a later period when Christ returned and taught a second time in his native town, while St Luke records the earlier visit. As to this, the only question is, how to connect Christ’s presence at Nazareth on the first occasion with the imprisonment of John (for according to the parallel passages [Mark i. 14; Matt. iv. 12], the two events seem to hang together), and next, how to find for the second visit a proper place in the history, inasmuch as St Mark puts it in a different connexion from St Matthew. Schleiermacher, however, has conclusively proved (on the writings of St Luke, p. 63), that the narratives refer to the same occurrence. For if the narrative of St Matthew were transferred to the later years of Christ’s life, it is not easy to suppose that the inhabitants of Nazareth could ask πώς τούτῳ ἡ σοφία; and still less can it be thought that the events recorded by St Luke are posterior to those related by St Matthew. In point of internal character both histories are entirely alike, and the single circumstance that countenances the idea of their being distinct, is the chronological succession of events.¹ This very fact, however, is another proof that there is, especially in St Matthew and St Mark, the absence of any prominent attempt to trace the course of events according to the period of time in which they happened. St Matthew, at the commencement and conclusion of his narrative, uses general formulae, xiii. 53, μετὰπερὶ ἕκατὸν καὶ ἑκατὼν x. v. l.; xiv. 1, ἐν ἑκατοβις τῷ καιρῷ. Mark vi. 6, breaks off so indefinitely that even if he had in general followed the thread of chronology, he here obvi-

¹ Sieffert (p. 89, sqq.) thinks that the wrong position assigned to this narrative disproves the apostolic origin of the Gospel. But as the whole of these occurrences at Nazareth happened before the calling of St Matthew (comp. Luke iv. 14, sqq.) one does not see how it is precisely as to the events of this period that St Matthew must have been so accurately informed. Besides, it is far from his object to trace the chronological course of events.
ously let it fall from his hand with the words καὶ περίχως τάς χώμας κύκλω διδάσκων. The words used to denote the transition of the narrative to a new subject—μετέτριπτο τις εἰς ἐκλεισμὸν τῷ καιρῷ are obviously so vague that they do not even amount to anything so definite as afterwards or at the same time, in however wide a sense these expressions be taken—they are rather, according to the standing-point of the Evangelist, to be understood as meaning generally, "Jesus came once upon a time to his native city." In the connexion as it stands in St Matthew, the whole narrative is plainly introduced, not for its own sake—it serves simply as a key-stone to the collection of parables. The whole emphasis lies on the words περίχως τις εἰς ἐκλεισμὸν καὶ εἰς διδάσκοντα. This εὐσπίρτης of Jesus was unfolded in the parables here recorded, and the relation in which those around him stood to it, is shewn in the following narrative. They knew it well, but took offence at his immediate earthly connexions, and despised on this account the blessing which Jesus was come to bring to them. St Luke, on the other hand, relates the occurrence for its own sake, and unquestionably he is in respect of chronology more correct, although the vagueness of the formule (Luke iv. 14, 15), do not admit of an accurate determination of the time—only that the occurrence belongs to the commencement of our Lord's ministry, is more than probable.¹ Him, therefore, we shall follow mainly in our exposition, adding at the end the particulars given by St Matthew and St Mark.

Luke iv. 16, 17, represents most graphically Christ's entry into the synagogue at Nazareth. The words καὶ περίχως τις εἰς ἐκλεισμὸν (comp. Acts xvii. 2,) do not refer to an earlier period, for that Jesus, previously to the commencement of his public ministry, delivered addresses in the synagogues, is improbable even on the shewing of this narrative. The narrator rather refers by anticipation to his subsequent course of labour. According to the practice of the ancient synagogue, men who were deemed trust-worthy, even though not rabbis, might deliver doctrinal addresses to those assembled. They usually stood up while reading God's Word (ἀνίστησιν ἀναγινώσκων, ver. 16,) the servant of the synagogue

¹ Yet De Wette thinks Luke may have placed the incident at too early a period.
² In reference to this custom quotations are given by Lightfoot on the passage. In the first it is said,—Non legunt in leges nial stantos. Имo non licet legenti, allicui roì ininiti. Unde autem tenetur legens stare? Quia Scriptura dicit: tu autem mecum sita.
(ὑψηλὴς, ver. 20) handed the roll, and the teacher, after reading the section, sitting down delivered his discourse (ver 20). After a section from the books of Moses, there followed a passage from the prophets. The account given in this narrative corresponds closely to the usual practice, the only doubtful point being whether the Redeemer read the passage from the prophets set down for that Sabbath or not. To me the latter view seems probable. On the contrary supposition, one must assume that first an extract from the law, and next this passage from Isaiah, had been read, but in this way the deep impression of these prophetic words must have been greatly weakened. Besides, the words ἀναστύησεν τῷ βιβλίῳ ἑαυτῷ, point not so much to reflection or previous calculation, but to the Holy Spirit himself, as guiding to the discovery precisely of that passage in which the Messiah's appearance was predicted.

Ver. 17. The βιβλίον is to be conceived of as a roll, so that ἀναστύησεν retains its literal sense of unfolding or unrolling. The person who presented it was undoubtedly the γραφή, the ιερίς, ver. 20 (comp. Buxt. lex. p. 730.)

Ver. 18, 19. The passage Isaiah lxi. 1, is quoted by St Luke freely, and therefore with some variations, from the LXX. Many changes, however, have been adopted from the translation into our text, as for instance the additional clause, ἰδεῖτε τῶν συντριμμένων τὴν δικαιίαν after the ἀρεταλκή με. The clause ἀποστήλατε τροφαίλου ἡμῶν ἐν ἁφίσι, on the other hand, is found neither in the Hebrew text nor LXX. translation of the passage, and consequently must have been inserted by the Evangelist quoting from memory. The passage, moreover, in its prophetic connexion, belongs to that majestic prediction of the ἔρημος, ὀξύς, which fills the second half of Isaiah. It contains under the figure of the prophet and the enlightened portion of the people, who are now spoken of literally, as Israel, and now as an individual person, a prediction of the Messiah, in whom, as its individual representative, the holy Israel is presented to view. In this light does the Redeemer now make himself known while explaining the words of the ancient seer as fulfilled in himself.

The reader in the prophets was called ὁ δείκτης, i.e. according to Buxt. Lex. Talm. p. 1719, dimiitens, he who read last and dismissed the people. According to this, one may suppose that the reading of the passage from the law was already completed, and that Jesus as maphir, now concluded the service of God.
The expression ἀναστήσας ἐν ο dü ἡμῖν occurs also in the same form at Isaiah xlii. 1, lix. 21. It denotes the exalted character of Him who was sent from God, and furnished with power from on high. The words ιχθύος μι, refer more definitely to his being furnished with spiritual power for the royal and priestly offices of the Messiah, the separate forth-putting of which powers, the following narrative records. ο δ εὐαγγελίσθη εἰς ἡμᾶς is nothing more than the simple εἰς, and assigns the ground of the spiritual anointing, "for he anointed me to preach good tidings to the poor." The εὐαγγελίσθη εἰς ἡμᾶς (᾿εὐαγγέλιον) points out that which was the primary work of the Messiah. The εὐαγγελίσθη, like the εὐαγγελίσθη σινμαρι of Matt. v. 3, are those who have been awakened from natural death to anxiety, within whom the felt need of an atonement has been excited. The εὐαγγέλιον was brought to these men through means of the very appearance of the Messiah, of faith in Him and His help against sin with all its inward and outward consequences. The ἄρσεις and the ἀνάστησις, are specially brought forward as the real results effected by the Spirit-anointed Redeemer. The saving power of the Messiah, which is one and the same, is represented first as breaking the bonds of sin, then as removing the insensibility of the darkened mental eye; so that it is merely two aspects of the same subject which are brought forward, and these have their analogies in the physical world. The expression κηρύσσας (κηρύξ) however, implies that the ἄρσεις and ἀνάστησις were not set forth as something merely distant and future, but as close at hand, so that the annunciation and the thing announced go together. The beautiful idea of the clause ἰδοὺ αὐτὸς ἑκατέρῳ συντετειμένως τὴν καρδίαν, in which is expressed the tender act of the Saviour lifting up all who were bowed and bent down, is omitted by the Evangelist, in order that he may, in a seemingly pleonastic form, once more repeat the idea of the ἄρσεις. But the τιθεμένων puts us at once in mind of the συντετειμένως, ἐκ τῆς, to break up, to crush in pieces. ἐκ τῆς, to be in a state of brokenness, equivalent to the Hebrew ἓκτενες, Is. lviii. 6.) And the ἀναστῆλα ἐν ἀρσει, is in the same passage parallel to the τιθεμένος. The ideas of healing, deliverance, restoration to our original state, are here intermingled. There is, moreover, something remarkable in the relation between the words τυφλὸς ἀνάστησις, ἀναστῆλα τιθεμένος ἐν ἀρσεί, and the Hebrew text of the passage, Isa. lxii. 1. Both there and in the LXX., the last words are wholly wanting; the
first do not accurately correspond to the Hebrew text. The words of the latter run יָבֹא בִּין יָלָדָיו, and they are rendered τοῦ ποταμοῦ ἀνα-χλίαν. The expression יָבֹא בִּין had been read as one word, in the sense of the opening of closed eyes; יָלָדָיו captives, was seemingly taken to mean, men with eyes bound up; but this does not agree with the connexion of the passage in the prophet, which does not admit any other rendering than "release to those that are bound." The words ἀποστείλας τιβασμίνους ἐν ἀφίσιν, which are entirely wanting in Is. lxi. 1, have undoubtedly been taken by St Luke from the parallel passage, Isa. lvi. 6, and interwoven here with the former. In this expression he again follows the LXX. It thus appears that the writers of the New Testament deal very freely by those of the Old. With memories uncertain and wavering like those of other men, confusing passages, mistaking words, the heavenly Spirit of truth, who inspired and led them, yet so manages all, that nothing untrue, nothing that may mislead, has resulted, but the truth itself is rather presented in a new aspect, and its real nature the more completely revealed. Finally, the concluding words, ξηρασία ἐναυτήριν κυρίου δικτύον, are again taken from Is. lxi. 1. The LXX. have simply rendered νῦν by καλέσαι. The phrase τοῦ ποταμοῦ, like the νῦν which follows it, denotes the whole period of New Testament life, during which they who receive into their souls the mind of Christ the beloved, appear as themselves also through him well-pleasing to God. Ephes. i. 6.

Ver. 20. It may be a doubtful question whether the Saviour read merely these words, or brought forward also the following verses. To me the former supposition seems the more probable. He wished simply to proclaim a joyful message, and invite the inhabitants of Nazareth to embrace it,—the immediately succeeding verses, however, contain a threatening of the day of wrath. (Πρώτων is found only in this passage, to lay together, to roll up. Ἀπείθεια, to look with sharp unflinching gaze, a favourite word with St Luke).

Ver. 21, 22. The expression ἔξω ἀνέσω, is not by any means

---

1 In regard to the quotations from the Old Testament in the New, compare the striking treatise by Tholuck, in the supplement to his Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews. Hamburg, 1836.

2 It is strange that several of the Fathers understood this passage to mean that Christ preached only one year (and some months). Comp. Clem. Alex. Strom. i. p. 407. Orig. de princ. vol. i. p. 160.) As to the erroneous nature of this view, see more at length in the Comm. on John ii. 13, v. i. vi. 4.
to be held redundant; it indicates the solemn and weighty mode in which he entered on his discourse. In the clause ἡ γραφὴ πελάργων, St Luke gives shortly the contents of Christ's address. That this passage must be specially understood as an authentic exposition of the Old Testament prophecy, can admit of no doubt. (On πελάργων, see besides at Matt. i. 22.) To suppose that there is here any concession or accommodation to popular sentiments, would be to wound the Gospel to its very foundations. The preaching of Jesus in Nazareth was a preaching of grace; the unbelievers themselves admitted this, but they took offence at his earthly connexions, and squandered without improvement the ἵνα νυν κύριον δακτύλοι. The expression, λόγοι τῆς χάριτος, refers primarily to the outward charms of the Saviour's speech, but that must be considered simply as the visible result of the grace which revealed itself in him. He manifested before His hearers the fulness of His χάρις and ἀληθινὰ. (John i. 14.)

That it was the well-known family connexions of Jesus against which the inhabitants of Nazareth took offence, is shewn both by St Matthew and St Mark. They recount the names of all His family, and wish, as it were, to mislead themselves into the conviction that He is merely one of them. Like all sensual men, strangers to the spiritualities of the unseen world, they look on that which is divine, and for the reception of which they want all perceptive power, as something absolutely unattainable, and they hold themselves far off from it, should it seek, with its transforming influences, to enter the circle of their own life. This is especially true when its influences are brought to bear through means of those whom they see moving amidst earthly connexions analogous to their own. In the phrase ὁ τεῦ τίκτων ὑμῶν, the prevalent popular idea was embodied, and that impression was wisely permitted, because the idea of the heavenly origin of Jesus could be of use only to believers. St Mark, however, in the parallel passage, terms Jesus himself ὁ τίκτων, inasmuch as the Saviour, amidst His earthly connexions, and before His coming publicly forward as the Messiah, undoubtedly followed the calling of Joseph, a circumstance which formed part of his humiliation. Christian antiquity saw, in the facts thus recorded, nothing offensive, for the real life of Jesus was in every respect unseen. Adopt-

1 St Mark does not name Joseph, he only says of Jesus that he was ὁ Ἰουδαῖος Μαχίας, which probably indicates that Joseph was already dead.
ing apocryphal additions, Justin tells us ταύτα γὰς τὰ τιττωνικὰ ἱστορία ἵκον ἀδεξόνων ἢκον, ἐφεξῆ καὶ ἔνωμ, διὰ τῶν καὶ τὰ τῆς διπλοτοῦσας συμπλεκτικὸς ἱδαπατον καὶ ἱνειρή βίον. (Dial. c. Tryph. Jud. p. 316. Paris 1636.) As respects the ἄδελφαι here named, and the ἄδελφοι who are left nameless, a question may arise as to whether they were full brothers, or step-brothers, or cousins. The middle opinion, that they were step-brothers, is the least of all supported by proof, having nothing to rest on but the tradition that Joseph, at a former period of life, had been married to a woman named Salome. It may, therefore, be at once set aside. Between the two views which remain, it is hardly possible, owing to the defect of proof, to decide with historic certainty. At first sight, however, everything seems to conspire in favour of the opinion that the brethren and sisters of Jesus were really Mary's own children, and great pains have recently been taken to establish this view.¹

1. Their names are given in immediate connexion with that of the mother. 2. We have no ground for supposing that Joseph's marriage with Mary was a marriage only in appearance, and Matt. i. 25, rather seems to be a positive testimony on the other side. (Compare, however, the Comm. on the passage.) Yet a careful examination tends rather to discountenance this, and support the latter opinion, that the so-called ἄδελφοι τοῦ κυρίου were cousins to Jesus. For first of all, it is conclusively proved, that none of these four brethren of Jesus can have belonged to the number of the twelve apostles, although among them there were two who bore the similar names of James and Judas. For, according to John vii. 5, they did not believe in Jesus. And at Acts i. 14, they are still markedly separated from the apostles, although they appear here as believers.* It is expressly stated,

¹ Compare Stier's Andeut. Part i. 404, sq., and Clemen in Winer's Zeitschrift für wiss. Th. Part iii. p. 329, sq. Also Schneckenburger's Beitr. p. 214, sq., annot. in Iac. epist. p. 141. Tübing. Zeitschr. 1829, p. 47, sq., 1830, p. 2, sq. If, however, Joseph had been the father of the persons who are termed Christ's brethren, and if Mary, the mother of Jesus, had been their mother, some of them would surely, for once at least, have been styled "the son of Joseph," since it was common for the Jews to use the name of the father in denominating each other. According to our view, the "brethren of Christ" are sometimes also styled "sons of Cleophas."

* Those who maintain the identity of the apostles, James and Judas, with the ἄδελφοι τοῦ κυρίου of the same name, appeal especially to the fact that Alpheus, who is mentioned as the father of James (Matt. x. 3), is the same person with Clopas or Cleophas, the husband of Mary, who was sister to the mother of Jesus (John xix. 25.) According to the mode in which Greek names are formed from the Hebrew, it was possible that
however, respecting Mary, the wife of Cleophas, and sister to the mother of Jesus (John xix. 25), that she had sons, two of whom, James and Joses, are named to us by St Matthew (xxvii. 56.) According to this, then, the two mothers who were of the same name themselves, must have had sons whose names were also alike. Certainly it may possibly have been so, yet the number of persons in the New Testament bearing similar names must in that case be immoderately increased. But how John xix. 26, can accord with the opinion that Mary had sons of her own, it is impossible to see. Beyond all doubt she would have been taken charge of by them, and not entrusted to John, who stood without the circle of the family connexion. When one considers that according to Hebrew usage γας is the common term for cousin; and that two of the so-called brethren are demonstrably the Lord’s cousins; the preponderance of proof unquestionably inclines to the conclusion that Jesus had no brethren of his own after the flesh. 1 If Joseph died young, one may suppose that Jesus and Mary dwelt in the house of her sister, that Jesus grew up along with her sons, and this circumstance would explain very simply how it happens that Mary, the mother of Jesus, and her sister’s sons, should sometimes be named together.

Luke iv. 23. Jesus looked at once through the hearts of the men of Nazareth, and saw that they could not penetrate into his real nature, beneath the cloud of humiliating earthly circumstances which enveloped his hidden glory. He held up, therefore, before them, as in a glass, the likeness of themselves, giving them thus to see that they were incapable of knowing him. For their benefit he quotes from the Old Testament examples to shew that so early as the times of their fathers, the Divine found no acceptance among those most closely connected with the prophets, and

1 The opinion that Joseph and Mary had children born to them, I am further led to reject, on the ground that, according to the Old Testament predictions, it is difficult to conceive of any continuation of the stem of David, the line out of which the Messiah was to come forth. We conceive of it as a fitting thing that in Jesus, the everlasting Ruler, who arose from the house of David, the stock was finished. What we read of David’s descendants at a future period (compare Euseb. H. E. iii. 20) refers beyond doubt to the children of some collateral line.
that, impeded in the development of its influences among them, it had to take refuge among the heathen. The Saviour's first words, however, intimate clearly that the inhabitants of Nazareth had desired to see his miracles, and had remarked that he might perform a miracle on himself, changing himself from a poor man into a rich,—from a lowly man into a mighty. This carnal appetite for the marvellous, the Saviour here, as elsewhere, repels. (Compare on Matt. xii. 38, 39, xvi. 1, sq.) He performs no miracle, in order by its splendour to blind, but to heal, and to strengthen the poor, the weak, the needy. (Πάνως ἡσύχας, ye assuredly say to me. The word σάββατος often occurs in Luke [Acts xviii. 21; xx. 22; xxviii. 4.] Respecting ταρατον, see on Matt. xiii. 1. Here it denotes like ψε a proverb.) The meaning of ἵστατος σεωρόν, is simply this,—shew your skill on yourself; are you great—do you allege that as a Saviour you can give deliverance? then deliver yourself from poverty. Thus did the blinded people mock his love when on the cross (Matt. xxvii. 42), and thus does selfishness ever manifest itself in the heart that is alienated from God. Pure love, however, set free from selfishness, gives rather than takes (Acts xx. 35), becomes poor in order to make others rich (2 Cor. viii. 9.) Wetstein on the passage, quotes, moreover, from the Rabbins proverbs of the same meaning; for example, from Tanchuma on Genes. p. 61, medice sana clandicationem tuam. In connection with the things of this world, the idea is in some respects true, in the kingdom of grace it is false. The concluding words of the verse shew further with what latitude the introductory remark at Luke iv. 14, the general formula of transition, must be taken. Jesus had, after his temptation, been to Capernaum, and there performed miracles, (ἰς is the correct reading, and means in behalf of, for the benefit of Capernaum,) the report of which had reached Nazareth. This proves that even in St Luke the chronology is hard to trace, and that we cannot even in his case conclude from the immediate collocation of events, that they followed each other directly in point of time. In the words πωλείς καὶ Ἰδι, the pride and arrogance of the natural man are most plainly expressed. They demand miracles, as though they had, from being his countrymen, a special right to them. Yet do they mock him who claims to be more than they, disparaging themselves in their self-contradictory pride. Meanwhile they cannot subdue the impression which
his divine presence had made on them, for they are astonished. (V. 22.)

Ver. 24. This verse forms, in the account of St Luke, the climax of the narrative. With St Matthew and St Mark it rather falls incidentally into the course of the history which is looked at from a point of view entirely different. Most appropriately does St Luke introduce this occurrence at the outset of Christ's ministry, and narrate it with such care, for the reception he met with when commencing his official labours in his native town, exhibited to view, as in a mirror, the peculiar experience of his whole subsequent career. St Matthew and St Mark further add: the prophet is of no esteem in τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ καὶ in τοῖς συγγενεία. By these words the picture is cut down within narrower limits, but its leading outlines remain the same. As Christ's brethren believed not (John vii. 5), so neither did the inhabitants of Nazareth believe, and like the latter, so the whole people of the land disbelieved, εἰς τὰ ίδια ἦλθε καὶ εἰ τίδοι αὐτόν εἰς παρίλαξον. (John i. 11.) The kingdom of God passed over to the heathen, and to them even St Luke himself went as a preacher. As, however, after the resurrection, the brethren of Christ were among the believers. (Acts i. 14), so shall Israel, who at the time of the great resurrection (Rom. xi. 25) turn back to the Lord. That which happened, however, to Christ personally, he applies to all prophets, οὕτως ἄρβης δεὶκτῆς ἵνα in τῇ μαρτυρίᾳ αὐτοῦ. For in the case of every prophet, the Divine that is within him comes into conflict with the sinful, as it exists among his cotemporaries, and the more close the connexion in which they stand after the flesh, the more incomprehensible to the worldly man is the distance which separates them after the spirit. The spectacle of the prophet entangled amidst those irritating connexions with this earthly life in which all are involved, rendered it more difficult under this lowly guise, to trace the presence of the heavenly element.

Ver. 25–27. The examples by which the Lord illustrates the working of this divine power, passing by those which are near and acting on those at a distance, are taken from 1 Kings xviii. 1, sq., xvii. 12, sq. The ἵνα τείχι καὶ μὴν ἕξετα, are also given at James v. 17, but, according to 1 Kings xviii. 1, the time seems merely to have extended over the second, and into the third year. If, however, we compute it, not from the coming of the rain, but from the flight of Elijah, 1 Kings xvii. 9, as Benson has proposed,
the difficulty disappears. ἡγεσυτα = ἐξ Ἕλθε a small town betwixt Tyre and Sidon. The whole stress is to be laid on the fact, that heathens instead of Israelites saw the miracles of the prophet.

Ver. 28, 29. These parallel cases from amidst the heathen, wounded the vanity of the Nazarenes; they drove out their prophet, and so made the words of Jesus true. Nay, they even intended to take his life, as they wished to cast him down from the hill on which their town was built. (Compare on Matt. ii. 23.) (ὄφείς, eye-brow, steep precipice. Hesych. τα ἵππλα καὶ ἄρεστίμανα ἤπατα.)

Ver. 30. The unbelieving Nazarenes, eager to see a miracle, met, in his escape, with a proof of his wonder-working power, of which, however, they took no heed.—Διηλόν διὰ μίας αὐτῶν ἐρροῦσο the Evangelist records. These words in themselves certainly do not indicate anything miraculous; some fortunate accident might have made it possible for an individual to escape from the excited and irritated inhabitants of a whole city. But any one who holds that nothing happens by accident, and that least of all this could be the case in the history of the Son of God, any one, moreover, who enquires exegetically into the view of the writer, must be forced to confess the meaning here expressed to be this: Jesus departed through the midst of them without restraint or hindrance, inasmuch as being the Mighty One, his divine power held their limbs and senses bound. No one could take from him his life, unless when he freely gave it. (John x. 18.) In the same way also is the narrative at John viii. 59 to be understood.

St Matt. (xiii. 58) and St Mark (vi. 5) remark in conclusion, that Jesus performed few miracles in Nazareth. According to the more minute account of St Mark, he healed a few sick persons by laying his hands on them. Probably this was before his address in the synagogue, for after it the scene of uproar immediately broke forth. There is no need to suppose that this contradicts Luke iv. 23, if we only assume that these cures had taken place in quiet family circles, for surely the good seed was not wholly wanting even in unbelieving Nazareth. The mode of expression, however, employed by St Mark, is remarkable, ιδοῦμαι τὰ δέκα ἀνέπτυχα αὐτῶν (which contrasts painfully with Matthew viii. 10, where Jesus wonders at faith), and οὐκ ἔδωκεν ἵνα ὁμοθαλῆν ὀδύνην δύναμιν ποιήσῃ. These words strikingly explain the relation of πίστις to the miraculous power of Christ. Faith appears here once more (compare
what was said on Matthew viii. 1.) as a condition indispensable to the manifestation of that miraculous power, which as the positive pole requires the negative, demanded susceptibility of mind before it could impart its gifts. The ὁξ ἱδναρ is therefore to be taken quite literally, as denoting an internal impossibility—obviously not one of a physical kind—but a divine, a moral impossibility. Since God can save no impenitent sinner, as such, who refuses humbly to mourn over his guilt, so Jesus cannot heal where faith is wanting. Hence it appears that the object of the miracles is not to produce faith, they presuppose faith as existing, but where it already is they can purify and confirm it, and at the same time awaken the mind to correct knowledge. For, clearness of understanding does not necessarily go together with depth and liveliness of faith. It is not likely that the views of that heroine of the faith, the Canaanitish woman (Matthew xv. 22,) were very clear, but her heart burned with love, and her whole soul was full of susceptibility for the power of the Spirit from on high. Hence was she enabled, as it were, to compel (if I may so speak,) the reluctant Saviour to perform a miracle. (Compare on Matthew xv. 28.) Faith, therefore, in all stages of its development, proceeds from the heart, its resting-place is in the immediate sphere of the inner life, it is receptive love, as grace is communicative love. The operation, however, of that which is divine (grace), which unites itself to faith, seeks to pervade the powers of knowledge and understanding, as indeed it does the whole man, in all his faculties. By mere powers of knowledge, however, no man attains to faith, nor shall any be saved by mental speculation, yet well may a believing heart enjoy salvation, amidst much confusion of ideas. (Compare Proverbs iv. 23.)

§ 24. THE BAPTIST’S DEATH.


The chapters in Matthew which here follow (xiv.—xvii.) no longer resemble, in character, those that had gone before; no thread of connexion can be traced, guiding the arrangement of their several portions. Not till the 17th chapter, does the distinctive peculiarity of St Matthew, his method, namely, of combining
fragments of various discourses, again appear. The chapters which here immediately follow, I am inclined to regard as supplements of a historic kind to the preceding sections (Rubriken.) Although the unchronological character of St Matthew still remains, yet in the frequent mention made of Christ’s death a disposition may be observed to anticipate the subsequent period. As regards the first incident in chapter xiv., the account of the Baptist’s death, it is obviously of a supplementary character,—the fact of his execution is supposed to be long past. St Luke (iii. 19, 20) had anticipated it. The mention of the views current regarding Christ, points, however, to a period when the reports respecting him had already obtained wide circulation, and the fact that the disciples were acquainted with the nature of these rumours is easily explained, if one considers that their mission must have brought them in contact with persons of various kinds. From this point down to the end of the section, the position of St Mark relatively to St Matthew, is peculiar. He follows him closely and throughout, only in two cases (vii. 32-37; viii. 22-26,) inserting short narratives of cures which St Matthew does not give. The account, Matthew xvii. 24-27, of the coin in the mouth of the fish, he omits. This can hardly be explained, unless we suppose them to have used the same sources of information, yet on what grounds St Mark leaves out particular topics, it would be difficult to tell. The peculiar method, however, with which St Mark brings forward his subjects runs unchanged through these sections; particular narratives he presents far more graphically than St Matthew, but at the same time he is continually occupied with things external.

Ver. 1. The expression in ἰς ἐπὶ ὅ ἔσαια is here used in all its vagueness, inasmuch as the preceding occurrence happened at the commencement of the Lord’s ministry, while the account of Herod which follows belongs to a later period. (Concerning Herod [Antipas] and ἄρας, compare on Matthew ii. 22; Luke iii. 1.) The vain worldling seems at first to have given himself little trouble about Jesus, he never heard of him till his fame had been widely spread.

Ver. 2. St Matthew merely records the impression which the information about Christ made on the tetrarch; St Mark and St Luke state, in addition, the various rumours respecting him which were in circulation among the people. Subsequently they both repeat the same rumours on an occasion when St Matthew also gives them
(xvi. 14), and we will therefore defer the fuller consideration of them till we come to Matthew xvi. 14. As to Herod, St Mark, agreeing with St Matthew, relates that he believed Jesus to have been John raised from the dead. He expresses this opinion directly to those about him. (πατὶ δὲ ἀνέκ. "οτρ). According to St Luke, it was the mere report of this which disturbed him (ὁράσει, Luke ix. 7), yet he wished to see Jesus (Luke ix. 9), which would rather lead us to the opposite conclusion, namely, that he himself disbelieved the report as to John's resurrection. (Compare Luke xxiii. 8.) This seeming contradiction disappears, however, when we consider how completely this worldly man must have been involved in darkness. At the first hearing of the report his heart would be shaken with fear, for conscience would testify that from a desire to please others and against his better knowledge (see Mark vi. 26,) he had let the Baptist be murdered. A mind so superficial as his, however, would soon pacify itself and become convinced of the improbability of the whole matter. His Sadduceeism would come to his aid (see on Mark viii. 15, compared with Matthew xvi. 6,) and put to flight every idea of a probable existence beyond the grave. A consistent carrying out of their opinions on the part of such sensualists is not to be looked for; they deny the reality of what is divine, yet amidst their very denial their heart quakes with the secret belief of it. With metempsychosis we have here nothing to do, for it is clear they did not believe that John's soul had passed into another body, but that he was himself personally risen from the dead. Not even at John ix. 3, are we to look for traces of a belief in metempsychosis, or the pre-existence of souls, during the times of the apostles. (Compare the Comment. on that passage.)

Ver. 3, 4. The aorists are, according to the connexion, clearly to be understood as equivalent to the pluperfect tense. (Compare Winer's Gram. p. 251.) The place of John's imprisonment was, according to Josephus (Antiq. xvi. 5, 2), the fortress of Machaerus. The notorious Herodias, with whom Antipas lived in incestuous connexion, was the daughter of Aristobulus, a son of Herod the Great. The latter married her to his son Philip, (who is not to be confounded with Philip the Tetrarch, see on Matthew ii. 22), who was disinherited by his father, and lived subsequently merely as a private individual. For this reason, his wife, Herodias, preferred the connexion with the tetrarch, Antipas,
that she might become a reigning princess. Antipas cast off, in her favour, his former wife, the daughter of Aretas, the Arabian prince. (Compare Josephus, Antiq. xviii. 5, 1.) John, the severe preacher of repentance, had dared to rebuke this scandalous union, and drawn upon himself the unmitigated hatred of Herodias. In Antipas himself, it would appear, there often arose feelings of a better nature. (Mark vi. 20.)

Ver. 5. St Mark paints (ver. 20) Herod in more favourable colours, so that it is Herodias who appears as the special enemy of St John. (v. 19, to rage, in anger to lay snares for; Luke xi. 53.) St Matthew, however, ascribes to Herod the intention of putting John to death, only, he remarks, that he feared the people. The expression in St Mark, ιδὼς αυτὸς ἄνδρα δίκαιον καὶ ἅγιον, seems to indicate that his conscience had been roused, and this is confirmed by what follows. (Συνηρεσία means here to guard as a protector, to preserve from the machinations of Herodias.) The eager hearing of John refers not to the time of his imprisonment, during which any interview between the prince and the Baptist is hardly conceivable, but to an earlier period, before he was shut up. At such a conference John might well have called his attention to the unlawfulness of his union with Herodias, as well as to other things of the same kind. (Compare Luke iii. 19; Ἡρώδης — ἴδων μεταμορφομένος ὑπ' Ἰωάννου τινι Ἡρῴδιαδος — καὶ αὐτῷ πάντων ἐν ἑαυτοῖς πονηρῶν.)

Ver. 6. It is safer to understand γείσα as meaning birth-day, than the commencement of his reign; not a single passage can be brought to shew that the entry on a reign was usually so denoted. Besides, so early as Joseph’s time, the Pharaohs kept the ἡμέρα γείσας. (Genesis xi. 20.) St Mark employs the general expression ἡμέρα ἰκανος = ὡς τὸν festive day, and paints the guests at the feast. The expression μεγιστικός, seems of Persian origin. Josephus (Antiq. ix. 3, 2) ranges them along with the satraps. The LXX. use the word among others for ἥξις. Daniel v. 1. In the New Testament it occurs again only at Rev. vi. 15; xviii. 23. Here it seems to denote the highest civil officers at the court, as χαλιάξεω does the highest military officers. The χριστὸν τῆς θαλαθαίς, would, in that case, mean the wealthiest men of the province. We are doubtless to understand the dancing of the daughter of Herodias to have been the mimic dance, but not

VOL. II.
exactly or necessarily unchaste. On the part of the step-daughter (Salome was her name), this is hardly conceivable.

Ver. 7. The verb προφυλαχθεῖν occurs at Acts xix. 33, in its most obvious sense of to draw forth, to lead out; figuratively, it means to instruct any one, to train for some purpose. At Exodus xxxv. 34, it stands for προφυλάσσειν. The wicked mother directed the maiden to John the Baptist, and she asked for his head. The weak Antipas granted it, though with a reluctant mind. (ἐγὼ αὐτῆς sc. ἦταν, Mark vi. 25.)

Ver. 9, 10. The weak fear of man extracted from the tetrarch the order for the beheading; he was ashamed before the assembly to recall his too hasty promise. The inward state of Pilate's mind was similar when the demand was made that he should suffer Jesus to be led forth to death—only he was overcome by fear, Antipas by shame. Mark vi. 27 uses the Latin name ἔκκουλήτως, by which the executioner was commonly designated. The mode of writing the word varies between spiculator (from spiculum, a spear with which they were armed,) and speculator—the former seems the preferable.

Ver. 11, 12. As the execution seems to have been so soon carried into effect, the feast must have been held in the castle of Machaerus itself, or in the neighbourhood. The faithful disciples buried the body (Mark vi. 29, has πτωμα) of their master as the last token of their respect.

§ 25. FEEDING OF THE FIVE THOUSAND.

(Matt. xiv. 18—21; Mark vi. 30—44; Luke ix. 10—17; John vi. 1—15.)

This account of the feeding of the five thousand is fixed down chronologically by John vi. 4, to a certain date (see as to the explanation of ἣν ἂν ἔγγυσά τοῖς πάσχας the Comment. on the passage), only there is no way of throwing a bridge from John over to the three earlier evangelists. (See the Introduction, § 7.) St Mark and St Luke place this feeding immediately after the return of the disciples from their mission. The account of John's execution, which they both interpose, may have been inserted for this reason, that Jesus was first informed of it by the disciples, on their return. By St Matthew, however, that mission is placed in
an entirely different connection, (see chapter x.) so that their accounts can only be made to harmonize by supposing, as Dr Paulus does (see above on Matt. x. 1), that the disciples were sent forth on two separate occasions, which, however, one can hardly imagine to have been the case. The conjoining, besides, of Christ's retirement into the desert, with his receiving the news of John's death, is extremely simple and probable. As his hour was not yet come, he went into quietude, partly that he might avoid all hostile machinations, partly that he might in prayer to God and converse with his disciples, meditate on, and make known those mighty events in the kingdom of God which were steadily approaching nearer. (Compare on Mark i. 35.) As the people crowd thither after Him, the scene of His subsequently feeding the multitude rises on our view.

Ver. 13. St Matthew informs us in the most general terms ἵνα κρίνῃς ἰναιεῖς ἵκτεν εἰς ἰκανον, leaving undetermined what the ἰκανον refers to, for the last account we have of Jesus (Matt. xiii. 53–58) mentions no locality. Only the expression in πλῆθυ points to His passing over to the opposite side of the sea of Gennesareth, an inference which John vi. 1, and Luke ix. 10, confirm. The latter mentions Bethsaida. This town, however, must not be confounded with the city of the apostles (John i. 44), which lay on the western shore of the sea. This second Bethsaida was situated on the eastern bank, close to where the Jordan flows into the lake. At first it was a village, but Philip the tetrarch raised it to the rank of a city, and named it Julias. (Josephus, Antiq. xviii. 3; Wars of the Jews, ii. 13; compare Von Raumer's Palest. p. 100). According to Mark (ver. 31), this retirement was intended also for the sake of the disciples, that they might rest from the labours (ἀνασαλώθη ἰλίγον) which the pressure of the people had caused them. They had even been prevented taking their necessary food. Eager, however, for help (though it was only outward aid that in the first instance they sought), the people hastened after them into the uncultivated region whither our Lord had withdrawn, and he had compassion on

1 De Wette (on Luke ix. 10) thinks that Luke places this feeding in a different locality from Matthew and Mark; he knows nothing of a passage across the sea, and conceives Bethsaida to have been on the western shore. But this is sufficiently disproved by the single circumstance that there was no desert near the western Bethsaida, it was surrounded by the most fruitful land.
them. (See respecting σωλάγγελσαι on Luke i. 78.) He taught, therefore (Luke and Mark), and afterwards performed cures (Matthew.) As to the words (especially as given by Mark), compare the passage Matt. ix. 36. They contain allusions to Old Testament passages, such as Numbers xxvii. 17; Isaiah liii. 6. St Luke (ix. 11) mentions as the subject of his teaching, the Βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ, under which expression is here comprehended, in an indeterminate and general way, that more exalted heavenly life which Christ was come to render the dominant principle here on earth. (Compare on Matt. iii. 2.)

Ver. 15, 16. In narrating the course of the miracle, John deviates from the synoptical Gospels. He states that the Saviour put to Philip the question, how shall we buy bread for so many? while the synoptical writers tell us that the apostles had applied to Jesus to dismiss the people, that they might disperse themselves and find provisions in the villages that lay immediately around. It is easy, however, to reconcile both accounts. As the day was now far gone (Mark vi. 35, ἠδρα σωλάλη, like the expression ἠμέα σωλάλη, in the LXX. at Genesis xxix. 7), some of the disciples enquired of Jesus as to the time when the people would be dismissed. John mentions another circumstance occurring at another moment, either before or after the inquiry of the disciples, the question, namely, put by Jesus to Philip. If, as Bengel supposes, the charge of providing food had been entrusted to him, the special object in putting the question must have been a moral one. Philip must have his mind awakened (John vi. 6, ἤγετο ὁ Ἰησοῦς περάσας αὐτόν), that he might be able to understand aright the approaching miracle. Philip, however, appears here as at John xiv. 8, unable to get free from his earthly standing-point, he refers to the sum of money that would be required for feeding them. (200 denarii = 40 rix dollars. This sum is given also by Mark vi. 37.)

Ver. 17. Another difference in the narrative, which it is just as impossible to regard as of material consequence, arises from the circumstance that John vi. 8 expressly names Andrew as the person who mentioned the boy with the five loaves and the two fishes (ἰκεύον properly means merely by-meat, any thing eaten with bread; the other Evangelists define it by ἱκεῖν).
while Matthew, Mark, and Luke make the apostles say that there was no food whatever at hand. These last Evangelists have looked on Andrew as speaking for all the apostles, and expressing their mind. The expression εικάσας ἰν (the ἰν is not to be taken as having the force of the indefinite article, but as distinctly intimating that none else besides this boy had brought food with them), forbids our supposing that the five loaves and two fishes were merely the disciples' own supply of food. John immediately places, in direct contrast, the whole number present (τῶν τι ἰσιν εἰς τοιοῦτον), with the whole supply of provisions. (The assigning of the number at 5000 is alike in all the narratives, only Matthew and Mark do not mention it till the conclusion. Matthew remarks, enhancing it still more, ἧδε γυναικῶν καὶ σωλήνων. The method of arranging them at the meal facilitated much the reckoning. The agreement of the numbers, as well of those who were fed, as of the provisions set before them, is not to be overlooked. It is a strong testimony to the truth of the narrative, later tradition would have corrupted the numbers.)

Ver. 18, 19. The Saviour causes the crowd to be ranged in regular order, and proceeds to divide the small supply of food. (The ἵππας, where the Saviour was at this time, was grassy pasture ground, without towns or villages. In the same way ἴππας is used to denote pasturage. We are not therefore to conceive of any thing like sandy wastes, but rather of steppes. Συμπίπτον denotes here the persons who partake of a meal together, like our German word Gesellschaft, a company. Luke uses instead, the term κλάσας, the reclining or sitting together at food; each company of fifty was looked on as forming a party by itself. The repetition of the word denotes, according to Hebrew usage, the separate distribution, instead of the Greek ἰνα. Like a painter drawing from a vivid conception of the scene, Mark calls the separate parties τραία, spaces separately and carefully marked off; for example, garden-beds. It is so used by Homer. Mark adds, that some of these parties consisted of 100, others of 50, nay, he does not forget to notice the freshness of the grass. (ἰνα χλωφή χίφης—χλωφής = ἔρει in the LXX.) These traits originate wholly in his mode of recording events, which seizes chiefly on the externals of the narrative. In detailing the division itself, Mark (41) adds expressly, καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας ἰμιέσθησαν τὰς. These words clearly intimate that, according to the view
of the narrator, the two fishes were the object subdivided among all, Jesus had only this small supply for satisfying the multitude. The words of John, ἔχεις ἔθηκα (vi. 11), exclude all idea of a merely seeming satisfaction to the wants of the crowd; every one partook as much as he desired; that was the standard of supply to which, on this occasion, the food was adapted.

Ver. 20, 21. The command to gather up the fragments admitted of being carried into execution, for our Lord was standing in one fixed position when he broke the bread and the fishes (fragments of which latter, the minute and accurate Mark informs us were also collected), at which point they would naturally collect themselves, and means might also be taken before-hand for keeping them clean. The twelve baskets (as to which all the four Evangelists are agreed), shew that the fragments that remained over were of greater amount than the loaves had been at first. Probably each apostle took a basket to complete the gathering of the fragments, hence the twelve. The union of this savingness and care with creative power is something so peculiar, that it impresses, beyond all mistake, a heavenly character on the narrative. Never would such a thing have been invented. Nature, that mirror of divine perfections, places before our eyes the same combination of boundless munificence, and of truest frugality in imparting her benefits.

The Evangelists close their narratives with nothing certainly like exclamations or expressions of surprise,—John only remarking what an impression the incident had made on the people. They concluded from it that Jesus was the prophet who had been promised, and wished to take Him by force and make Him the sovereign of their outward worldly kingdom. Whether such an ebullition is conceivable, if the multitude (a caravan returning from a festival, as is conjectured) had satisfied themselves with the provision which themselves had made for the journey, and in the most courteous way, left untouched the small supply of food placed before them by the apostles, we leave intelligent and believing readers to infer for themselves.

In considering the fact itself thus recorded, it obviously belongs to that class of Christ's miracles, the object of which is nature. In the other, and first class of miracles, there is, for the Christian mind, this facility towards the understanding of them, that we have, in the faith of the individual who (for ex-
ample in the case of a cure) is the object of the miracle, a channel for the communication of the wondrous power and its effectual operation. But in cases where physical nature is seen as a simply passive object, the miracle easily assumes the appearance of being magical. The best way of escaping from this false impression is, never to view those miracles which refer to the natural world as standing apart from human beings, but as in living union with them. The mere increase of food is not the point on which stress is here to be laid, but its increase for persons who were in a certain state of mind. It is when such miracles are thus conjoined with the wants of human nature, as these were manifested in the individuals actually present, that they appear in the character which really belongs to them. As the Lord, in general, performed no cure save where he found faith, so he generally bestowed no food save where he found spiritual hunger. As regards the fact itself, we pay no attention to those representations, which, in contradiction to the true exegesis, explain away all that is miraculous; but just as little ought we to tolerate any views of it which are positively antinatural. This, however, must be done, if we suppose the materials to have been increased without a real interposition of Divine power. Rather let us believe that the same power which flowed forth from Jesus to heal the sick, here produced, in obedience to his will, another physical effect. In these cures it appeared more as setting in order, as restorative,—in this case more as creative. The most correct view of the matter then is

1 It is repugnant to common sense when, in reply to this, Strauss asks (vol. ii. p. 206), what was done then with unbelievers? The supposition is, that where Christ performed a miracle all were believers.

2 Pfenninger says of it: “What usually takes place in three quarters of a year between seed time and harvest, is said here to have been done within a few minutes, while the food was being divided. Thus the narrative will have us believe in an increase wondrously hastened forward, and I could more easily discredit the fact were I the most believing of men, or I could credit it were I the most unbelieving, sooner than really and truly believe that the narrative does not intend to make us believe it.” The pitiful remark of Strauss, in reply to this profound view of Pfenninger, that for the production of bread, besides the natural process of growing, there is required also the artificial work of grinding and baking, originates assuredly in something worse than mere intellectual incapacity, namely, in his entire disbelief in a living God. But for this, he would not have had such difficulty in supposing that the Divine agency had replaced the work of man.

3 Yet in no gospel narrative is a pure exercise of creative power ascribed to the saviour. As nature, out of the seed corn, revolves a new creation so Christ turns
undoubtedly this, that under the hands of the Saviour, and by
His divine power, an increase of the means of food must be held
to have taken place. As, by the touch of his hand, he healed
and blessed, so in the same way He made. Along with this, how-
ever, the idea is still to be firmly retained, that these appearances
were merely natural processes, extremely hurried forward in
point of time; for real formations must, in every case, be brought
about as the result of a course of real developments. These de-
velopments, however, we know, are capable of being hastened,
and that to an extent which it is impossible for us to limit. The
right conception, however, of what a miracle really is, carrying
us back to a supernatural causality, drives us to make such sup-
positions. No phenomenon is conceivable, unless in connexion
with powers sufficient for its causation. In the person of Jesus,
however, those higher powers which regulate all the processes of
nature, interfere with and control natural life, directly and to its
innermost centre,—for, supreme and creative, like a God he
ranges through all productions or formations of the elements,
ordering and wielding them for the high objects He aims at. As
regards the increase of the means of food, similar things were
seen formerly, under the Old Testament. Elijah, with twenty
loaves (2 Kings iv. 42, sq.), fed one hundred men. Oil and meal
increased to the widow at Serepta. (2 Kings iv. 1, sq., comp. also
1 Kings xvii. 1, sq.) Manna and quails nourished the Israelites
in the desert. (As to the typical meaning of this, see on John
vi.) What was there done by God in heaven and from afar, is
here effected by God visible and near at hand. (Ps. cxlv. 15, 16.)

water into wine and increases the already existing bread, but without a substratum to
begin with, He makes neither wine nor bread. I observe that in these remarks I refer
only to the recorded facts; how far it is conceivable that Christ's miraculous powers
might have been put forth in a different form, is another question. According to
gospel history, the Saviour constantly appears as the restorer of creation. He creates
no new men, but he transforms the old; he makes no new bodily members formerly
wanting, but he restores the old that were useless. The same thing applies to the
miracles of the Old Testament; for even in the case of the manna, the supernatural
increase of a natural production may be supposed, and not the creation of matter ab-
solutely new.
§ 26. JESUS WALKS ON THE SEA.

(Matt. xiv. 22—36; Mark vi. 45—56; John vi. 16—21.)

The following narrative of our Lord's walking on the sea is akin to the preceding, in so far as it also manifests Christ's dominion over the natural world; his dominion, however, being exercised in a totally different respect. For it is not so much an interposed influence brought to bear on nature, that is here spoken of, the special difficulty in this case consists in his withdrawing himself personally from the control of earthly natural laws. The difficulty, however, which is commonly found in this occurrence, disappears, or at least is considerably diminished, if, along with that close affinity which connected the body of Christ with those of other men, we clearly recognise at the same time its distinctive peculiarities. It is common to conceive of the glorifying of our Lord's body, as effected either at the resurrection or ascension, and as the work of a moment. But if we suppose the Spirit's work, in glorifying and perfecting Christ's body, to have been spread over the Saviour's whole life (certain periods being still distinguished as seasons of special activity), much that is obscure will be made clear. A body thoroughly of the earth, chained down by unseen bands to earthly matter, cannot shake itself free from its origin, but that a higher bodily frame, teeming with the powers of a loftier world, should rise above the earthly level, is less surprising.¹ This transaction, then, of Christ's walking on the sea, is not to be viewed as a work wrought upon him and effected by magic, as though some external power had laid hold on him and borne him up, but as the result effected by his own will, the forth-putting of an energy inherently belonging to himself. If this power was seldom used, it was because the Saviour never did wonders for the sake of doing them, but to serve some useful end. Thus in the present instance, the manifestation of his hidden glory was designed to build up his disciples in the faith. They saw more and more

¹ The absurd questions which Strauss (vol. ii. p. 182, second edition) gets up in reply to this explanation, he might have spared himself, had he been willing to reflect that the freeing of Christ's body from its bondage to earth, is not inconsistent with its being entirely at the disposal of his own free will.
with whom they had to do, and perceived that he was the revelation of the invisible Father; (Matt. xvi. 16); their Jewish prepossessions, as to the Messiah, were more and more cleared up in his light. The Old Testament representations of Jehovah's glory were in living reality set before their eyes in the life of Jesus. He alone spreadeth out the heavens and walketh on the waves of the sea. (Job. ix. 8.) We will not disturb those heavenly images of a Divine government among men, by reviewing the attempts that have been made, in defiance of just exegesis, to reduce their weighty significance to the level of every-day generalities. Such pictures, taken from the Lord's life, set before us in miniature his whole mighty work and influence on the inner mental world of man; they are full of exhaustless meaning.—As respects the form of the narrative, the superiority in vivid and graphic description belongs to St Matthew. The incident which befall Peter, who wished to come to Jesus over the water, is, for example, recorded by St Matthew alone. The account by St John is short, and like most narratives of events contributed by that Evangelist, is given chiefly for the sake of the discourses which are connected with it. The motive which led to the breaking up of the assembly, and the removal of the disciples, is, however, distinctly assigned by John, who thus confirms the accuracy of the connexion between this and the preceding occurrences as stated in common by the three other Evangelists. The miraculous supply of food excited in these worldly men a desire to make Jesus the Messianic king. From their importunities He withdrew by retiring to the solitude of a mountain for prayer, (Matt. xiv. 23,) but He caused His disciples to go before Him by ship to the other side of the sea. Mark vi. 45 specifies Bethsaida, John vi. 17 mentions Capernaum as the point to which their course was directed. As the two places, however, were close to each other, the disciples may have intended first to put in at the one point, and then sail on to the other. (The expression ἀναγκάζεται in St Matthew and St Mark, ver. 22 and 45, means merely earnest, impressive exhortation, and this was needed apparently because the disciples were unwilling to separate from their Lord.)

Ver. 24, 25. John (vi. 16) mentions the evening as the time of their setting sail. From his supplemental remark καὶ εἰς Ἰερούσαλημ πέρα ἀνεθεὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, it would appear that they had con-
continued to look for Jesus rejoining them, and it was probably their thus waiting for Him which delayed so long the period of their setting sail. As the darkness of night now came on, and a storm arose, the scene became full of terror, which well agrees with the whole circumstances of the narrative. Through gloom and tempest came the Lord, walking onwards over the raging waves, to the help of His disciples in their tossing boat. St Matthew and St Mark observe that the wind, besides being fierce, was contrary to them, (ἵναριας), so that the force of the waves struck the boat more violently. (βασινιζωδα.) According to John, they had already rowed a distance of 25–30 stadia, (ἰλαύνιν), and consequently more than half-way across, (the sea was 40 stadia broad, about one German mile; Joseph. Bell. Jud. i. 3, 35), when they saw Jesus walking on the sea. According to St Matthew and St Mark, it was now towards the morning, about the fourth watch. (φυλακή = ἀνευρέω.) Before the Exile the Jews had divided the night into three parts, afterwards they adopted the four Roman divisions of three hours each. In the expression ἀνευρέω, σις αὐτῶν, the idea of His leaving the place where He was formerly staying, is concisely conjoined with that of His going to meet the disciples.

Ver. 26, 27. The disciples seeing Jesus walking on the sea took fright; they believed that they saw a φάντασμα. The word φάντασμα, stands in a similar connexion at Luke xxiv. 37. The term is to be understood in all its latitude like our word gespenst, apparition, which, according to popular notions, means any sort of incorporeal appearance, without very accurately defining the idea of it. That any thing of a bodily nature could walk on the sea, was inconceivable to the disciples, and there came upon them, therefore, the terror which usually accompanies all unwonted spiritual appearances. The word uttered by Jesus, ἵνα σίμι, again reassures the disciples. In Him they had already recognized what was unusual, they saw in Him the ruler of the invisible world, His friendship they themselves enjoyed, and knew that He ever came to their aid in moments of danger. The expression ἵνα τὴν θαλάσσην or ἵνα τὴν ἔδαφος, (in St Matthew), and afterwards at Matt. xiv. 28, 29, ἵνα τὰ ἑδάφος, certainly may mean beside the sea, inasmuch as the bank of the sea or river is con-

1 One German is equal to about 42 English miles.—T.
ceived of as elevated above the level of the water. (2 Kings ii. 7; Dan. viii. 2; according to the LXX.) Of itself, however, is never means ad, juxta, (compare Fritsche Comm. in Matt. p. 503), but unquestionably it denotes to or towards any thing, versus. (Acts xvii. 14.) The parallel passage, John xxi. 1, is very accurately explained by Fritsche, ἰδαίμων ἰωάκ ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῶν μαθητῶν ἐκ τῆς Σαλάβος, (οὖν) in such a way that the formula bears its usual meaning. But that in the passage before us there is no evading the obvious meaning of the words as denoting that Christ walked over the waves of the sea, appears plainly from the narrative taken as a whole. If differently understood, it becomes either trivial or deceptive. The opinion which would hold it a myth is sufficiently refuted by the calmness of the narrators. Least of all can St Matthew's account of Peter's walking on the sea be reconciled to it. Obviously it stands forth as a naked fact.

Ver. 28–31. The special feature in the conduct of Peter, the account of which is here contributed by St Matthew, is quite in keeping with that disciple's character. In the same way something of a similar kind is also told of him after the resurrection of Jesus (John xxi. 7, sq.) Fiery and ardent, full of burning love for the Lord, he cannot wait patiently the moment of his near approach, but hastens to meet him with most daring courage. As John is called the disciple whom the Lord loved, ἐν ἤγατα ἐν Ἰησοῦ, (John xxi. 7), so might it be said of Peter that he loved the Lord. In other words, as the nature of John was pre-eminent for being receptive and profound, Peter's was distinguished for activity and energy. As however this power of love wherewith he embraced the Saviour was not yet freed from selfishness, it betrayed him into mistakes of very different kinds. Once more in the case before us, his over hasty impetuosity brings about a fall. The whole of this little history is a rich picture of the inner life—a commentary on the words of the prophet, the heart of man is a froward and timorous thing (Jer. xvii. 9.) Without the command (not the bare permission) of the Lord, Peter ventures himself out of the ship. Trusting to the ἡλιθιός, he walks forth, but at sight of the hurricane, he sinks. (Kαραστρίζωσας occurs again at Matt. xviii. 6, in the sense of sinking, or being sunk into the ἑρέτ.) Yet faith remains so far firm that he only seeks aid from Jesus. (Here he already calls him βίγμα, with reference to
his higher nature, the knowledge of which had previously been revealed to Peter [see on Matt. xvi. 16.] So also, on seeing this dominion exercised by Jesus over the powers of nature, the other disciples take occasion to make the confession at ver. 33, ἀληθῶς Θεῷ ὑπὲρ σέ. Comp. on Matt. xvi. 16.) Christ gave him help along with a word of rebuke, ἔληφθεν, which, however, is a different thing from ἠσιοῖς. The point of reproof was merely that the faith which existed in him was not beyond being shaken. (Διστάξει occurs again at Matt. xxviii. 17. Literally it means to turn in two different directions, hesitating and undetermined which to follow. Whence it denotes in general to be in doubt, and is equivalent to ἀμφίσθεια.) In this case it once more plainly appears, as in all the miracles of Christ, that faith was the intermediate element, through means of which He performed them on men. So long as the inner soul of Peter was purely and simply turned towards the person of the Lord, he was capable of receiving within himself the fulness of Christ's life and Spirit, so that, what Christ could do, he could do, but so soon as his capacity for receiving the Spirit was contracted by his giving place and weight to a foreign power, the result was that the latter entered his heart, repressed the influence of Christ, and thus the sea-walker fell back under the dominion of earthly elements. Analogous to this is the way in which faith on the Lord's strengthening and upholding power conducts us securely over the agitated sea of a sinful life, but assuredly it only too often happens that the weakness of this faith sinks down into the waters. The peculiarity of the Gospel narratives, which makes them capable of such an application to the inner life, does not belong to them by accident, nor is it to be viewed as a capricious or arbitrary thing actually to apply them thus. Far rather is it true that founding on the significance and importance of the Saviour's position as the centre of all spiritual life, everything in him and with him rises into a higher significance.

Ver. 32, 33. According to St Matthew and St Mark, the disciples, in the strongest terms, express their astonishment (Mark vi. 51, καὶ ἔτεινεν—ἐκ στοιχείων—ἐξισωσθήμεν,) and adoration. (The meaning of προσκυνήσεως, which had otherwise been vague, is at Matt. xiv. 33, accurately defined by the confession which follows that He was the Son of God. See as to this more at length on Matt. xvi. 16.) Christ, along with Peter, stepped on board the ship, the wind
calmed down, (ἀνέμος ἰνυπαίρει, see above, Mark iv. 39, = γαλήνη ἲνυπνητο), and they gained the further shore. The account given at John vi. 21, ἦσθεν λατείνη αὐτῶν, seems to differ from the others, as though the disciples had intended taking Him on board when they suddenly found themselves already at the land. Read by itself the statement of John would leave the impression that the εἰσίνοις τὸ φλοῖον ἐγνέφε ἐκ τῆς γῆς, seemed to him to imply something miraculous. But as the disciples had in the first instance sailed half the distance before they saw Jesus, as they had the wind against them, and as during the scene between Christ and Peter, they assuredly forgot their ears, they cannot well have very very speedily reached the shore. The meaning of εἰσίνοις, however, is vague, and none of the narrators give marks to fix the time; we can therefore conceive of a rapid rowing forward of the ship through the calm, and an immediate landing thereafter. The only difficulty that remains is the ἦσθεν λατείνη, in so far as it is usually held to imply the non-fulfilment of the purposed intention, in which case there would result an open contradiction to the two other narrators. We might certainly at once, in this as in other cases, admit that a contradiction really exists, inasmuch as the Gospel history makes no claim to exemption from trifling and unimportant irregularities. At all events, we would rather do so than either hold ἦσθεν to be here redundant, or that it means to do a thing eagerly and joyfully, (so that the sense should be—they took Him eagerly and joyfully on board), a construction for which there is no support in the usage of the New Testament. The following, however, appears to me a simple way of escaping from the difficulty. The disciples were afraid that they saw spirit, which naturally they wished as far as possible from their ship. Jesus, however, explained to them that it was He. Thereupon it is simply added that on receiving this explanation they strove to take Him in, with the natural ellipsis, and they took Him in accordingly—after which they directly gained the land. (The verb σηκύνω then retains in this case its literal meaning of active volition, see Passow in Lex sub voce. For, in order to take in Christ while the ship was on her course, certain preparations were needful, such as the taking down of the sail, &c. The whole of these operations are denoted by the σηκύνω.

1 In profane writers, especially in Xenophon, (Cyrop. I. 1 3, 1, 5, 19. Anab. II. 6, 6, and 11), this use of σηκύνω frequently occurs.
and the expression consequently implies the effectual carrying out of these preparations. The clause therefore, if completed, would run thus: ἔθελον οὖν λαξάεν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ πλοῖον καὶ ἱλατον.)

Ver. 34–36. Both Evangelists conclude this narrative with the general remark that immediately after the return of Jesus many sick persons applied for His help, and strove simply to touch the hem of His garment. (Compare what is said on Luke viii. 44.) St Mark is more copious in his language, but without adding any new ideas, only that when he passes on to relate their arrival at the opposite shore, immediately after stating the astonishment of the disciples at Christ's walking on the sea, he adds: οὗ συνήκαν ἵνα τοῖς ἄγοροις, (ellipsis for ἵνα τῷ δαίμονι ἐν τοῖς ἄγοροις γνωμίνη.) St Mark means to say that they might have been sufficiently enabled from that miracle of feeding the multitude to see His divine nature, if their capacity for receiving the truth had not been so weak. (Respecting πεπολύθαι, [callo obduci, then to become hardened, insensible], see Mark viii. 17; Rom. xi. 7. It is parallel to παχύνεσθαι, Matt. xiii. 15. The verb πεπολύμεθαι, Mark vi. 53, from ρέματι, to land, occurs only here.)

§ 27. OF WASHING THE HANDS.

(Matt. xv. 1—20. Mark vii. 1—28.)

As to the connexion of this event chronologically with that which precedes it, little can be said, owing to the vagueness of those forms of expression which are used to unite them. It would be rash to draw any inference from the presence of the Pharisees and Scribes who came down from Jerusalem. For the fact that they came from Jerusalem does not prove that they belonged to Jerusalem, and just as little that they were sent for the purpose of watching him. One can only infer from the form of Christ's discourse against the Pharisees, that the occurrence belongs to the latter period of his ministry, for during His earlier labours He did not usually express himself so strongly against them as He does here.

Ver. 1, 2. It was so completely in keeping with the true spirit of Pharisaeeism to rebuke every deviation from that external ritual
which they counted holy, that the question of these Pharisees may be accounted for without supposing that they were designedly lying in wait for Christ. Such scruples arose from the peculiar character of their minds. The παράδοσις τῶν προεκκλησίων are the same with the δύματα ἄγαφα, which gradually under the learned men of the Jews formed around the Mosaic law a new and holy circle of traditions. St Mark feels himself called on, for the sake of his non-Jewish readers, to explain more particularly the practice of eating with the hands washed. (κονίκος = κοκυ Acts x. 14, conjoined with ἀχαδερος, here it is equivalent to ἀναπτυς. He observes that among the Pharisaic Jews it was the general custom (πάντες οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι is to be taken in connexion with προεκκλησίων τὴν παράδοσιν, for the Sadducees did not observe such ordinances.) The meaning of συμμή συνονται τὰς χεῖρας is uncertain. Undoubtedly, however, συμμή is to be taken in the usual sense of hand, fist, so that the method in which the Jews washed before eating is here pointed out. The hands seem to have been used alternately, the one in washing the other. The Syriac translators have rendered it frequently, generally, as though they had read it συνη. Either the translator had heard the word wrong, or he did not know how to translate συμμή. St Mark, after explaining the practice of washing the hands, next proceeds to other usages of the same kind, for ablutions of all sorts (among the rest those applicable to the priests, Exod. xxix. 4; xxx. 18, sq., compared with Heb. ix. 10), were common among the Jews. He confines himself, however, to those washings which accompanied meals. The term βαστιχος is different from νησσαβας; the former is the dipping and rinsing, or cleansing of food that has been purchased, to free it from impurities of any kind; the term νησσαβας implies also the act of rubbing off, such as takes place in all forms of washing. In precisely the same way do the Rabbins distinguish between πηρι and συνης (πηρι). (Compare Lightfoot on the passage. βαστιχος is here, as at Heb. ix. 10, Ablution, washing generally.) The words συνης, ξης, χαλκιος, are different names for vessels. Ποτηριον denotes a drinking vessel; ξης, corrupted from the Latin sextarius, means a vessel for holding or measuring fluids; χαλκιος means a vessel of brass, the nature of which we cannot more accurately determine. The καλαί here, must, according to the connexion, be referred to the couches on which the ancients were wont to recline at meals. (Compare Mark iv. 21.)
Ver. 3, 4. In recording the following discourse, addressed by Jesus to the Pharisees (down to ver. 11), St Mark varies from St Matthew, inasmuch as he makes the Saviour begin at once with the quotation from Isaiah, while in St Matthew it forms the conclusion. The latter is unquestionably the more natural position. Appropriately the description of the Pharisees stands first, and then follows the passage from the prophet, in confirmation, as it were, of what had been said. The leading idea of the whole passage, however, is neither more nor less than the opposition of their human institutions to the commandment of God. The real test of a spurious faith is the substituting of the former of these for the latter, or the placing it above the latter. In this way the Spirit is withdrawn from the service of God, it becomes a mere human service. This corruption of the Divine by means of the human, the Saviour explains by an example, shewing how the Pharisaic hypocrisy subverted a holy precept of God by an ordinance calculated to promote their own earthly selfish advantage. Jesus quotes Exod. xx. 12; xxi. 17, in order to shew what, according to the Divine ordinance, is the true relation in which children stand to their parents. The Mosaic regulation, the Lord (Mark vii. 10) here acknowledges as one which proceeded directly from God, because God spake through Moses, and his ordinances possessed divine authority. The verb κακολογεῖν, (—βλασφημεῖν), stands in antithesis to τιμᾶν, in the same way that μαχροχέφως γίνεται, in the first (not fully quoted) passage, does to the verb ἀποθέεσθαι. According to the standing-point of the theocracy, the highest curse and the highest blessing were thus conceived of in a form level and obvious to the senses.

Ver. 5, 6. This holy commandment the Pharisees taught men to evade by the ordinance,—"Temple offerings take precedence of all gifts in behalf of parents." As to the construction, we observe, first, that the clause δῶσων (sc. ἵνα), διὰ ἓν ἐν ἵμιον ὕφελθε, is obscure. The idea is that the parents are making a request, and the children are refusing it, with the explanation that the thing which it would have been becoming (ἵν' stands for ἵν, compare Winer, p. 285) in them to grant, they had already decided to give to the temple. (Δῶσων = ἐν ἵμιον, applies as well to bloody as to unbloody offerings.) On this they found the inference that it is not incumbent to give them anything. Probably it is to be presumed either that the priests took a small portion of the gift in-
stead of the whole, or that they knew how to instil it into the children that they would acquire special merit by those temple-offerings. It is not conceivable otherwise that any child could have been induced to act thus towards his parents. The second difficulty lies in the expression καὶ ὃ ἐγένετο τίμησο. St Mark guides us here to the right meaning. In the first place, the future τίμησον is a false reading; it does not agree with ἵππος. In the next place, the καὶ ὃ corresponds to ἵππος, and introduces the supplementary remark—“if any one says your property is consecrated to the temple, it is then unnecessary for him to honour his father and his mother.” The verb τίμησο (in the sense of giving bodily support), is thus chosen simply to bring out more markedly the contradiction to the divine commandment. It is needless, however, to suppose that any thing requires to be understood, as, for example, ἀναλίθως ἱππός. Hence our Lord deduces the inference that by means of what is human they subvert what is divine (ἀναλίθως is used especially in regard to laws. Gal. iii. 17).

Ver. 7–9. After this Jesus applies the prophetic words of Isaiah xxix. 13, to the piety of the Pharisees. The two evangelists agree, word for word (only instead of ὃ λαβεῖς ἔβρεις, St Mark has ἔβρεις ὃ λαβεῖς) in the quotation. The LXX. deviates from the original much in its expressions, although the idea is the same. This agreement of St Matthew and St Mark in a passage containing a deviation, and which is quoted from memory, would lead to the inference that the one had used the other’s gospel, or that they had drawn from some common source. (The text of St Matthew in this quotation is in many MSS. corrected after the LXX. St Mark being less read and less expounded, is free from such interpolations.) The simple idea then expressed by the prophet is this,—the outward service of God, unless the whole inner man take part in it with the living energy of mind and will (both being comprehended by the term ἄρσις = ἂν) is in the highest degree offensive to God. Isaiah spake these words to the Jews of his day, as the connexion of the passage shews, yet both evangelists remark that Christ observed καλῶς προερήμησεν πρὶν ἦμεν, an expression which may serve as a commentary to the words ὅτως προερήμησε. An explicit reference in these words to the cotemporaries of Jesus, the Saviour, and also the evangelists, in this passage, must have discovered, in thus far, that as Christ was the central point of all life and being under the theocracy, every
mental tendency and aim, even though embodied in representatives who had existed previously, yet gathered round Him in the full development and display of their inherent qualities. The whole Old Testament history was prophetic of Christ and of those around him in this respect, that every where, in the continually recurring contest between light and darkness, between truth and error, there were displayed the types of that which in its highest energy developed itself in and around Christ. (As to ἑπεξεργάζεται, see on Matt. vi. 2).

Ver. 10, 11. The general idea which throughout this conversation impressed itself on the Saviour’s mind, namely, that purity is to be sought for within the soul and not in externals, he puts forward before the great mass of the people, as the germ of many other fruitful thoughts (ἔχλος in contrast to the μαθηταί) for the benefit of all those who were able to penetrate its meaning and properly to apply it. As the idea, however, was expressed figuratively (in reference to the words ἐπὶ τῶν ζηλῶν, see on Matt. xiii. 3). Jesus at a later period, after he had dismissed the people (Mark vii. 17) prompted by a request from the disciples, whose organ (according to St Matthew) Peter once more was, gives an exposition of it. (Matt. xv. 17–19).

Ver. 12–14. St Matthew adds, however, a parenthetical remark explanatory of the Pharisees and the relation in which they stood to the kingdom of God—a remark which may have been called forth by the anxiety of the disciples lest the Pharisees should have taken offence at his discourse, and lest this should have led to fatal results. (As to σεκίνοντες, see on Matt. xviii. 6). The words of Christ in which he allays their anxiety on this point, refer also to the parable of the field and the different kinds of seed, to the end of the bad seed and of the plants which spring from it. (Matt. xiii. 24, sq. especially ver. 30, συλλίγειτε τὰ ζιζάνια εἰς τ. λ.) The term ἐξερχόμεναι therefore expresses the idea of the final judgment, and the Saviour chose for the statement o? this idea a figurative form of expression already familiar to the disciples. It is a false interpretation, however, to refer the φυσία to the doctrine of the Pharisees, and not to themselves personally. (Literally the φυσία is the act of planting itself, then, the thing planted = φυτεύμα.) That were a false attempt to weaken the idea of the κατάκρισις the total cutting off from all communion with what is good), which is openly announced here as formerly
it was at chap. xiii. 30. Undoubtedly the Pharisees are God's creatures as well as other men, but in as far as the falsehood of their mental tendencies consequent on a state of soul alienated from God had become amalgamated with their innermost personal identity, and only in such identification do such tendencies exist at all, in so far do they belong not to God but to the devil. The expression ἦν ὁικὸς ἤφθασιν ὃ παθής μοι ὁ οὐδὲνος must therefore be completed by supplying, as the Evangelist intended, ἀλλὰ ὁ διάκολος, who according to Matt. xiii. 25, 38, casts in the bad seed. (The τίνη διάκολον mean the same thing, see on John viii. 44.) An absolute predestination or material difference (in the Manichean sense) between the good and the evil is not to be understood here; no one is by birth a τίνη διάκολον, he becomes such only by his corrupt will and continued striving against grace. But what applies to the leader, Jesus attributes also to the followers (see on Matt. xxiii. 15). The perverted suffer along with the perverter, obviously according to the principle laid down at Luke xii. 47, 48. The figurative form of the expression is besides intelligible by itself. Luke vi. 39, inserts it amidst the contents of the sermon on the mount. (As to βδόνος, see Matt. xii. 11.)

Ver. 15, 16. Hereupon follows the request of the apostles (Peter being their representative), that He would explain the figurative discourse (παραστάσει, see on Matt. xiii. 3). Jesus rebukes their defective powers of comprehension (σῶνας, understanding, νοῦς, reason; comp. on Luke ii. 47), and then explains to them the similitude. (The expression ἄχμη, literally means on the moment in the Greek profane writers, and comes also to be used as synonymous with ἵνα). The explanation itself, however, is even yet very difficult.

Ver. 17. In the sentiment formerly stated (ver. 11), it must have appeared at the very outset a difficulty to the disciples that Christ's explanation ὥσπερ ἔσωχάμενοι ἐστὶν ὁ σώμα ὁ κακός; seemed to contradict the Old Testament, which taught the distinction between clean and unclean meats. As Christ acknowledges the divinity of the Old Testament (Matt. v. 17), he must see something important even in its laws respecting food. That these, however, were wholly void of meaning, the Saviour, in explaining the words, does by no means say. He only gives prominence to the contrast between what is external and internal, and calls attention to the circumstance, that food, as being external (ἐξωτικὸν
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\(ισωργυμένον \varepsilon \tau \ ιδο\), could never reach or pollute the inner soul. He does not however say, that what is outward may not cause outward pollution, or that it is thus of no consequence what a man may eat. This was hint enough to the disciples that our Lord left to the Jewish laws all their significance as to externals (and as types of what was spiritual), and only intended to rebuke the Pharisaic transposition, which put the external in room of the internal. St Mark, who here formally paraphrases the words of St Matthew, gives a correct view of the first half of the thought. The food taken into the outward organ for its reception (the mouth) enters not into the inner man (\(καρδία =  α\)), but goes into the \(κολλία\) in order to nourish the bodily organism. The additional clause \(καὶ \varepsilon \ έρθε\) \(ί\) \(ξε\) \(άλ\) \(λ\) \(ε\) \(τ\) \(α\), is partly intended as the climax of those explanations, which shew how thoroughly external the process of taking food is, and partly designed to intimate that nature herself has already assigned the means by which that which is nourishing in food may be separated from that which is impure. St Mark, in his explanatory way, expresses this in the words \(καθαρίζο\) \(ν\) \(πά\) \(ν\) \(τ\) \(ά\) \(βε\) \(ζ\) \(ώ\) \(μ\) \(α\) \(ν\) \(α\). The neuter gender (the readings \(καθαρίζο\), \(καθαρίζι\), are the corrections of transcribers to diminish the difficulty) refers to the whole of what precedes, in such a way that \(ν\) \(τ\) \(ό\) \(ι\) \(ν\) \(τ\) \(ι\) \(καθαρίζο\), must be supplied.

Ver. 18, 19. The internal however is here set in contrast over against that which is outward, and the defilement of man properly so called (the soul of man) is pointed out. To this impurity of soul the Pharisees gave no heed while carefully avoiding that which was external. In this second idea here propounded, however, there are also internal difficulties. For, in the first place, it does not appear that it is the mere \(καπνό\) \(ο\) \(μ\) \(ε\) \(λ\) \(ω\) \(θ\) \(α\) \(ν\) (the manifestation of feeling by word or deed), but the very presence of corrupt feeling itself which pollutes, and assuredly (as Matt. v. 28 shews) the Saviour was far from wishing to exclude the belief of this. But secondly, the \(καρδία\) is represented as the source of evil actions (ver. 19, \(ι\) \(κ\) \(τ\) \(ή\) \(καρδίας \(ι\) \(ε\) \(ί\) \(ε\) \(χ\) \(ο\) \(να\) \(τ\) \(α\) \(ί\) \(λ\) \(ω\) \(γ\) \(ι\) \(ω\) \(μ\) \(ι\) \(ο\) \(λ\) \(ι\) \(ο\) \(ν\) \(τ\) \(ι\) \(ο\) \(υ\) \(ν\)

1 It is unquestionably wrong to look on this as containing an abrogation of the Old Testament laws respecting food, such as we afterwards find at Acts x. 10. The Old Testament, as typical and external in its ordinances (ενί \(τ\) \(ι\) \(ν\) \(μ\) \(ε\) \(λ\) \(λ\) \(ι\) \(τ\) \(ο\) \(ν\) \(α\), Heb. x. 1), could effect only outward purification (Heb. ix. 13, \(τ\) \(ι\) \(ν\) \(τ\) \(η\) \( ε\) \(κ\) \(ο\) \(μ\) \(η\) \( κα\) \(μ\) \(β\) \(ι\) \(ν\) \(τ\) \(α\), but this the Pharisees, according to their usual mistake of the outward for the inward, confused with spiritual purity, and to point out this error is the object of Jesus.
yet one does not see how in that case man can be made unclean, for, to his innermost soul he is unclean already. Only that which is pure admits of being defiled, not that which is already unclean. This leads us more closely and accurately to define the meaning of the expression ἐκτρεμόμεθα ἵν τοῦ σώματος, (the opposite of the foregoing ἐκτρεμόμεθαι) an expression which seems intended to mark the relation in which the will stands to these evil thoughts. The general fact that evil thoughts enter into the mind of man, is a consequence of the universal sinfulness of the race, but that any particular evil thoughts gain power over him sufficient to manifest themselves in outward act, is the result of the will, and its voluntary choice. By peccata actualia, however, the habitus peccandi is strengthened, and thus also the noble germ of human nature is defiled. The καθαρία here, therefore, is not the source of evil thoughts, but the canal, as it were, through which they flow, and through which in like manner the Spirit of grace pours good thoughts into man.¹ In no respect is man the absolutely free and independent creator of his own thoughts and inclinations (which Pelagianism would make him), but he possesses the power equally of rejecting what is bad and admitting what is good into his soul, or the reverse. It is very obvious therefore, what value is to be put upon the opinion of those who infer from these words that the heart produces at will evil thoughts (or good), and that these do not originate in the kingdom of darkness. "Doth a fountain send forth from the same opening sweet water and bitter?" James iii. 11. (Comp. as to καθαρία and διαλογισμός at Luke i. 51; ii. 35; Matt. ix. 4.) In the enumeration of the several forms of evil propensities which is given also by St Mark more at length, ἁπάλης is not to be referred to sexual impurity, as elsewhere at Rom. xiii. 13; 2 Cor. xii. 21; Gal v. 19, al. freq.) for it stands quite apart from πορνεία and μορφέως. It is best understood as denoting an evil-disposed wilfulness of mind, and its results. The expression ἑφαρμός πονηρός, however, corresponds to the Hebrew רע רע, Prov.

¹ Krabbe (on Sin and Death, Hamburg, 1836, p. 131, note), thinks that "καθαρία is here the innermost will in so far as it, acting unconditionally, co-operates for the production of actual sin." But that is what I doubt—whether the human will can act unconditionally and independently of every thing beyond itself. A good action has for its condition the influence of God, an evil action that of the kingdom of darkness and its prince. How this does not subvert the true freedom of the will, is shewn in our remarks on Rom. ix. 1.
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xxiii. 6; xxviii. 22; which denotes an envious, malicious glance. It is connected with the idea that such a look is capable of inflicting injury. (Comp. Matt. xx. 15.) The last expression ἀρεσκόντα = ἀνοια, refers to forms of sin and wickedness in which stupidity is prominently exhibited—"senseless wicked acts."

§ 28. THE HEALING OF THE CANAANITISH WOMAN’S DAUGHTER

(Matt. xv. 21—31; Mark vii. 24—31, [32—37; viii. 22—26.])

Without marking accurately either time or place, St Matthew (and St Mark also, who follows him,) proceeds to the narrative of a cure, in which, however, our interest is awakened, not so much by the act of healing itself, as by the antecedent circumstances. St Mark once more distinguishes himself by giving minute traits which illustrate the outward action, but he leaves out also essential features, for example the statement at Matt. xv. 24, as to the relation of the heathen to the people of Israel, which casts so much light on the whole transaction.

Ver. 21. The μῆτρα Τίμου, St Mark describes more definitely by ἀνέποια. The Lord approached these boundaries, but that he really passed over them, is at once rendered improbable by the idea stated at ver. 24.¹ The woman, however, came to meet him. (Ver. 22, ἀπὸ τῶν ὅσιων ἐξετάν ἐξελθοῦσα.)

Ver. 22. The woman is called by St Matthew (in the true phraseology of Palestine), χαναναία, but by St Mark ἰλληνίσις συρφοίνησα (the better manuscripts have this form instead of συρφοίνησα, which certainly is a more correct Greek form of the word, but on this very account is less deserving of being admitted into our text.) The addition of τῷ γίνει obviously marks her descent from the inhabitants of that region; ἰλληνίσις refers to the language she spoke and her education, which, as was usual in those countries about the time of Christ, were Grecian.

Ver. 23, 24. She prays in behalf of her daughter who was possessed of a devil, but the Lord refuses her as a heathen with the

¹ De Wette asserts (on the passage) "it is not said here that Jesus entered on foreign ground with a view to exercise his ministry." But after commencing his official career, he continually exercised it, and he did so specially in the present case. It is thus, to say the least of it, not probable that he crossed the boundary.
words εἰς ἄνωστάλην x. r. l. (comp. on Matt. x. 5, 6.) Intentionally and wisely did the Saviour confine his ministry to the people of Israel. Only on certain heroes of the faith from amidst the heathen world did Jesus bestow grace as the representatives of nations who as yet were far from the covenants of promise.

Ver. 25, 26. To the woman who still impressively repeated her request, Jesus again addressed the same reply, but in a sharper form. Representing himself as the steward of the mysteries of God and dispenser of all the heavenly powers of life, he compares the Israelites to the children of the family, and the heathen to the dogs. (Κύνις is used contemptuously as at Philip. iii. 2. Neither the Old Testament nor the New recognises the noble nature of this animal. Comp. on Luke xvi. 21. The diminutive certainty has a milder sense. Still the thought remains very sharp and bitter, and he designs it to be so.)

Ver. 27. The woman’s faith, however, humbly receives the reply in all its bitterness, and child-like she takes the position assigned her, claiming no place within the temple; she is content to remain standing as a door-keeper in the outer court, and pleads simply for that grace which was fitting for the occupant of such a station. (Taking up the comparison she entreats a gift of the ψυχία. The expression occurs again only at Luke xvi. 21, in regard to Lazarus the sick man, and in a similar connexion. It is from ψύχειν, to rub down, to crush in pieces.)

Ver. 28. Overcome as it were by the humble faith of the heathen woman, the Saviour himself confesses μυγάλη σου ἡ πίσις, and straightway faith received what it asked. This little narrative lays open the magic that lies in a humbly-believing heart more directly and deeply than all explanations or descriptions could do. Faith and humility are so intimately at one, that neither can exist without the other, both act as by a magic spell on the unseen world of the spirit, they draw the heavenly essence itself down into the earthly. In this cure faith is again obviously seen not as knowledge, not as the upholding of certain doctrines for true, but as an internal state of the mind—the tenderest susceptibility for what is heavenly—the most entire womanhood of the soul. When yearning faith, by coming in contact with the objects it longs for, becomes seeing faith, out of such a mental state there certainly spring beliefs and doctrines of all kinds, which, as being the product of this inward and immediate operation, may themselves be
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... termed πίστις. Usually, however, the Christian mind finds more difficulty in understanding the conduct of Christ than in the depth of this heathen woman’s faith. It would seem as if he who knew what was in man (John ii. 25) must have been constrained at once to help this woman, as her faith could not have been concealed from him, and even although for wise reasons he was led to confine his ministry to the Jews, yet as in other instances he made exceptions (comp. on Matt. viii. 10), so might he have done in her case at once without laying on her the burden of his severity. Nay, the severity seems so very severe, that it were difficult to find a place for such a trait in the beauteous portraiture of the mild Son of man. It is Christian experience alone which opens our way to the right understanding of this. As God himself is compared by our Lord to an unjust judge who often turns away the well-grounded supplication (Luke xviii. 3. sq.), as the Lord wrestles with Jacob at Jacob’s ford, and thus exalts him to be Israel (Gen. xxxii. 24, sq.), as He seeks to kill Moses who was destined to deliver his people (Exod. iv. 24), so faith often in its experience finds that the heaven is of brass, and seems to despise its prayers. A similar mode of dealing is here exhibited by the Saviour. The restraining of his grace, the manifestation of a treatment wholly different from what the woman may at first have expected, acted as a check usually does on power when it really exists, the whole inherent energy of her living faith broke forth, and the Saviour suffered himself to be overcome by her as he had when wrestling with Jacob. In this mode then of Christ’s giving an answer to prayer we are to trace only another form of his love. Where faith is weak, he anticipates and comes to meet it; where faith is strong, he holds himself far off in order that it may in itself be carried to perfection.

Ver. 29–31. According to both evangelists, Jesus after this left the western boundary of Palestine, and turned back to the sea of Genesareth. (As to διατάξομας, see on Matt. iv. 25). Without marking more closely the connexion, local or chronological, the narrative ends in one of those general concluding formulæ, which plainly shew either that the author never intended to produce a historical work closely cohering in its several parts, or that he embodied just as they stood certain separate narratives which

1 As to the faith of the woman, in behalf of her daughter, see on Matt. xvii. 14 sq.
were complete in themselves. To me it seems not unlikely, from the frequency with which such forms of conclusion occur in Matthew (comp. iv. 23-25; ix. 8, 26, 31, 35, 36; xiv. 34-36,) and their mutual resemblance, that he interwove into his work minor treatises of this kind which had perhaps at an earlier period been written down by himself. There is a peculiarity in the use of ἡνθαλήγετο which occurs in this passage in the enumeration of the sufferers who assembled around Jesus. The same word is found at Matt. xviii. 8, conjoined as in this case with ἔμφασις, and there it obviously means one maimed. But never in any other case is it recorded as an express fact that Christ really restored bodily members which had been cut off, and a cure of this kind would ill accord with his usual mode of healing. It is better therefore to take ἡνθαλήγετο here in the sense in which the word is usually employed by profane writers, as meaning, bent, crooked, bowed down. As the denial of Christ’s higher, heavenly, miraculous power is an error, so it contradicts the gospel narrative to hold that this miraculous power put forth its energy without internal law or order, to guide its manifestations. Never does the Lord create members to replace those which had been cut off, but he certainly heals those which had been injured: never does he create bread without a substratum to begin with, but certainly he increases that which previously existed. The question, then, whether he was not able to have done such things, must be cast aside, as not to be entertained; it is enough for us that he did them not. Still the principle stands fast which is implied in the very idea of Christ’s divine nature, that boundless as was his power, it was yet fully regulated by laws, inasmuch as the Spirit himself is law, and all spiritual manifestations are included in a cycle of high and heavenly laws, in the course of which cycle they form the system of nature (das Natürliche). This is confirmed by the short narrative of the healing of the man who was deaf and dumb (κωφος ὁ λειπάλιος, i. e. hard of hearing, and for this reason as not hearing his own voice, speaking unintelligibly; according to ver. 35, therefore, he at once spoke on his hearing being restored), which Mark here inserts (vii. 32-37), and which he alone records. Minute and circumstantial in his narrative, he recounts here, as in the similar account of healing the blind man, (viii. 22-26), many particulars as to the external form of Christ’s cures which bring them vividly before the mind’s eye. With these notices
may be compared both the account of the disciples performing cures with oil (which Mark vi. 13 alone gives), and also the narrative in John ix. 6, according to which Christ applied spittle in the same way when healing one born blind. The oil is to be regarded as merely an ordinary outward means of cure (Luke x. 34), which the disciples, disbelieving, as it were, the full efficacy of their miraculous powers, (Matt. xvii. 20), applied at the same time. It is a wholly unscriptural view that Christ, along with their heavenly miraculous power, had enjoined his disciples to employ the expedients of domestic medicine, he rather permitted them the use of the oil in accommodation to their weakness. Leaving this out of view, there remain in these narratives the following peculiarities. (1.) It is a new thing that Jesus should take those who are about to be healed apart by themselves (Mark vii. 33, ἀπολαξάμενος ἀντων ἀπ' τοῦ ἐχλευ κατ' ὑδαί ; viii. 23, ἐξάγαγεν ἀντων ἐκ τῆς κύμης.) It is not to be thought that this was done out of anxiety lest the people on seeing his treatment of the sick should be led into all sorts of superstition. This would have applied as much to the sick themselves who belonged to the people, and shared their views. A single word, moreover, would have been enough to provide against such superstition. It is better to seek the ground of it in something belonging personally to the sick themselves. As their moral healing was the ultimate end of their physical cure, the Saviour ordered everything external so as to contribute to that object. Amidst the outcry of popular tumult beneficial impressions could with far more difficulty be made on them. And with this also agrees the command given to both, that they should preserve silence as to their cure. (Comp. vii. 36; viii. 26. See what is said on this at Matt. viii. 4. (2. The mention made of the gradually advancing process of cure in the blind man's case is peculiar. According to Mark viii. 24, after the first touch of Jesus he saw darkly and obscurely. "I see men as trees (the power of measuring extension by the eye was probably as yet awanting) walking." After the second touch he was wholly restored. Obviously, therefore, the cures performed by Christ were no magical transactions, but real processes. In the case of the blind man the course of the cure may have been retarded for this reason, that his disease was deeply seated, and a too rapid process of recovery might have been injurious. We remarked something of the same kind in dealing with the history
of the Gergesene (Matt. viii. 28), from whom the demon did not depart till the command of Jesus had been twice given. (3.) The application of spittle is peculiar to these narratives, which is also mentioned again at John ix. 6. In regard to this, we must at once reject, as unworthy of the dignity of Christ, the opinion which holds that he was himself misled by the popular notion that attributed to the spittle healing virtues, and which, further, infers from this that the thing here recorded must be understood even in cases where it is not mentioned, and so would transform Christ into an ordinary physician, acquainted with the use of certain remedies. That other opinion is also to be rejected according to which Christ employed this means in order to aid the weak faith of those who were to be healed. For on the one hand the Lord does not make use of this means in cases where weakness of faith really existed (Mark ix. 24), and on the other, it is incongruous to endeavour by a thing so wholly external to remove the inner want of the soul. We must therefore have looked on the employment of the spittle as a thing that exercised real influence, even though we had been unable to shew any link of connexion in regard to it. But as we already observed that the laying on of Christ’s hands (so here the holding of his finger to eye and ear) must, as it were, be considered as the medium of conveyance for spiritual power (it is only in singular cases that this power imparts itself from afar, and without the means of communication being visibly interposed. See on Matt. viii. 10), so it is in a way analogous to this that we are to look on the use of his own spittle. (Mark vii. 34, gives in Aramaic the exclamation of Christ, ἰρραθα——παντόχθονι. It is the authoritative summons of Christ adapted to the present case, it is the expression of his divine will, of whose fulfilment that Son who had called on the Father [εἶς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀναφεράτθη εἰς ἔριον, ver. 34.] was fully assured. The form of the word is the imperative of the Aramaic conjugation Ethpael, ἰρραθα = ἰρраθα [in Syriac ἱῷδα from the root ἱῷ,] — ver 37. The exclamation καλὼς σάντα πνεύμα, almost reminds us of the history of creation, where it is said σάντα, δος ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος καλὰ λίαν, Gen. 1. 31. The ministry of the Messiah seems to be viewed as a καίνη κρίας =

! In the case of the deaf and dumb, however, it is not to be overlooked that the actions of Christ (the touching of his ears and tongue, the looking up to heaven), were obviously calculated to make him aware of what was about to be done with him in order to rouse his faith, which could not be done in his case by words.
According to Mark viii. 22, the healing of the blind man took place at Bethsaida [see as to it on Matt. xi. 21], by which we are here probably to understand the place of that name on the eastern shore of the sea of Genesareth. Yet is the description of the locality even in St Mark indefinite, so that we cannot with certainty decide where the cure took place.—Ver 25. The expression ἵσθαι νοῦν ἀνακλίσαι, is not to be referred to the restoration of the sight, that is afterwards expressed by ἀνακλήσαι, in integrum restitui. Rather is the ἀνακλίσαι equivalent to the Hebrew Hiphil, "he caused him, after laying his hands on him the second time, to look up," and then he saw ῥήλανγες. That word, which is found only here, literally means "shining from afar, radiant," from ῥήλα, in the distance. Here, according to the connexion, it means plainly, distinctly.")

§ 29. FEEDING OF THE FOUR THOUSAND.

(Matt. xv. 32—39; Mark viii. 1—10.)

The account which follows of feeding the four thousand is conjoined by St Matthew to the preceding context without any mark to determine the time when it happened, and by St Mark with the indefinite words ἵνα ἵσθαι τοὺς ἡμέρας. The latter gives us once more separate minute traits, which make the narrative more graphic, as for example, ver. 3, τοὺς αὐτῶν μακρόθεν ἠκούοι; and in ver. 1 the amplification of St Matthew's laconic expressions. The latter alone informs us that the number of four thousand is reckoned apart from the women and children (ver. 38). The narrative itself certainly contains no new points when compared with the first account of feeding the five thousand, Matt. xiv. 13, sq. The single circumstance to be inquired into, therefore, is whether we are to regard this whole occurrence as distinct from the other, or whether, by a mistake of St Matthew (and after him of St Mark), the same instance of feeding has been twice recorded. This latter view has been put forward by Schleiermacher (on Luke, p. 137), and Schultz (on the Lord's Supper, p. 311). De Wette also and others see in this second account a repetition of the first fact drawn from tradition. The chief ground for this supposition is thought to lie in the circumstance that one cannot
conceive how the disciples, if they had once had experience of such a miracle, could ever in similar circumstances have asked unbelievingly πῶς ἦμιν ἣμας ἄρετος τοιοῦτος ἂντας ἐχθάνας ὑξίον τοιοῦτον; (ver. 33). But there is the less weight to be laid on this remark when we find that on various occasions the disciples forget things which it should have been impossible for them to forget. For example, the plainest declarations as to Christ's sufferings and death they seem never to have heard when the event really took place. If we suppose then that some considerable time elapsed between these two miraculous entertainments, that meanwhile they had frequently met with analogous cases when the disciples and those around them were for the moment in want (one may call to mind the plucking of the ears of corn), when the Lord however did not see it right to help them in this manner, it will then be very conceivable that on the instant of their feeling want it did not suggest itself to the disciples that the Saviour would here be pleased in this form for the second time to put forth his might. We are all the more disposed to declare in favour of this explanation, as there is otherwise not the least improbability in the same fact having occurred a second time under analogous circumstances, just as the narratives of cures are repeated in similar cases. To admit, on the other hand, that the narrative in this case is not authentic, is to open the way for consequences affecting the authority of the Gospel which the Christian mind could never admit, unless they rested on certain historic proofs, which are here wholly wanting. A new and fully detailed history of events which did not really take place could be given neither by an apostle of the Lord nor by an assistant whose gospel rested on the authority of a second apostle. Still less could both narrators at a subsequent period (Matt. xvi. 9, 10; Mark viii. 19, 20), put into the mouth of our Lord an allusion to a fact which really did not take place.¹ If the narrative forced us to

¹ The passage here quoted is also of importance for our object in this respect, that the remark of the disciples, ἦμιν ἄρετος σὺν λιέβεσιν (Matt. xvi. 7), shows that even after the second miraculous feeding the disciples could not imagine that their being in the company of the Son of man made it needless for them to take provisions for the body. Jesus finds it necessary to rebuke them for this unbelief, and reminds them of both miraculous entertainments. One can hardly conceive a stronger proof that the second feeding is authentic. Meanwhile superficial modern criticism knows how to set it quite easily aside by the cheap assertion that it was only after the formation of the
such assumptions as this, the authority of both gospels would be
overthrown. The supposition that a fully detailed narrative of
fact is a pure invention is quite another thing from the admission
of some trifling historical oversight—for example, whether there
were one or two blind men. To this it must be added, that on
closer examination the invention of the fact by tradition is wholly
improbable. For in the first place, if this second narrative of
feeding the people had owed its origin to tradition, many things
would have been added by way of embellishing it. The unadorned
style in which the second incident is told, precisely as was the
former even as regards the separate words, vouches for its apostolic
origin. Nay, this narrative, so far from any effort to display
the fact in brighter colours, sets it forth as of less importance. In
the former case there were 5000, here only 4000, and yet there
are here seven loaves while formerly there were only five, although
the less the number of loaves the more marvellous must the mir-
acle appear. It is precisely in these little circumstances that the
handiwork of tradition would most easily be detected. What
could any one gain by inventing the account of Christ's having
fed 4000 men, when in fact he had already fed 5000? It is not
thus that the fictions of tradition run. If we had read here of
Christ having fed 10,000 men with one loaf, the probability of
forgery had been greater. Is any one ready to say that this
second fact may be the real one while the former is the fictitious,
in which the number of the fed is increased and of the loaves
diminished? This however is the most improbable of all views
of it—that any one should place last the real fact as being the
less important and put first the false. Obviously an unconscien-
tious narrator will overdo the truth itself, and for this reason he
places last the invented fact as being the most striking. We
can discover then only proofs for the authenticity of this second
feeding as narrated, none whatever to shew that it is spurious;
for, in regard to the disciples, we can easily admit that previ-
two fabulous reports as to the feeding, that this whole conversation was—invented.
At this rate any fact one chooses may be struck out of the narrative.

1 With great naïveté Strauss (vol. ii. p. 203) describes these as "eager remarks
into which one had better not enter." By all means, for this wanton critic had nothing
to allege against them, except that the first feeding was a myth as well, i. e. a lie.
Thus, with this man, one lie is built upon another. One who honestly calls things by
their right names, which certainly makes a fatal impression, does not, Strauss thinks
know how to penetrate the depths of the mythic view.
ously to their being furnished with power from on high their memory was often weak, indeed they themselves state quite plainly that it was so with them. They walked in a new world full of spiritual and bodily wonders, amidst which they could not find themselves at home until the Spirit came upon them, and brought to their minds all things that the Lord had said to them and done. (John xiv. 26). (As to Magdala [Matt. xv. 39], and Dalmanutha [Mark viii. 10], see on Matt. xvi. 5.)

§ 30. WARNING AGAINST THE LEAVEN OF THE PHARISEES.

(Matt. xvi. 1—12; Mark viii. 11—21.)

Along with his narrative of the second miraculous feeding, the evangelist conjoins the account of an incident which shews the weakness of the disciples. When Christ used the words προσίχεστέ αὐτοὶ τῆς ζύμης τῶν Παρισίων, they thought they were reproved on account of having forgotten to take bread, while the Saviour was thinking only of the spiritual influence put forth by the Pharisees. Every thing in this section is connected with Christ's words of rebuke and warning against the Pharisees; but since neither in the preceding nor following context are they further spoken of, it is rendered probable that the evangelist merely points out the occasion when those words, so intimately connected with the account of the feeding, and on which he laid such peculiar stress, were spoken. It can moreover excite no surprise that the Pharisees, when they demand of Jesus a sign (and a sign from heaven too, Luke xi. 16), should have been rebuked in terms similar to those at Matt. xii. 38, sq. by a reference to the sign of Jonas. There is nothing to justify the assumption (which Schulz defends loco citat.) that Jesus had spoken the words only once, but that the narrator, drawing from impure tradition, had twice recorded them. It may be that portions of the addresses here incorporated by Matthew were originally spoken in another connexion (for example, verses 2, 3, which are given by Matthew alone, but which yet appear to me to be quite as appropriately placed here as at Luke xii. 55, 56, on which passage see the exposition of the words), but the whole is to be viewed as a new occurrence. For if the Pharisees more than once eagerly desired
a sign from heaven—and this, from their entire devotedness to externals, may easily be supposed—it is also conceivable, on the other hand, that the Saviour more than once addressed them as a γενάτα σωμάτα καὶ μορφάκις, and alluded to the great Jonah-sign. (For the exposition of Matt. xvi. 1–4, see on Matt. xii. 38, sq.)

The peculiar essence of the narrative St Mark, as one plainly sees, has rightly seized. He brings everything relating to the conversation of Jesus with the disciples, which is the main point, very carefully forward (viii. 13, sq.) They pass together across the sea to the further shore. This points us back to Matt. xv. 39; Mark viii. 10, where Magdala and Dalmanutha are mentioned as the places to which Christ betook himself. The latter of these places is mentioned only here, but it lay probably in the neighbourhood of Magdala, which is named by Matthew. Μαγδαλα (from ἱππος a tower, for which reason it is not to be written μαγδάλα or μαγδαλά) lay on the eastern shore of the sea, in the district of the Gadarenes. One of the Marys (with the surname of Magdala) was undoubtedly a native of this town. On their voyage across, the conversation here recorded took place, and to their accounts of it both evangelists prefix the remark that the disciples had forgotten to take bread. (The careful St Mark even adds that they had only one loaf, εἰ μὴ ἴνα ἐγεῖν ὡς εἰςέν μεθ ἑαυτῶν. Such traits indicate the extreme accuracy of the sources of information employed by St Mark; it is not thus that myths are formed. It would ill accord also with the idea that the second narrative of feeding the multitude is fictitious.) The remark of Jesus, ὅταν καὶ προσέχετε ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης τῶν Φαρισαίων must be accounted for, and for this reason, did the narrators prefix the request for a miracle which shortly before the Pharisees had addressed to Jesus.

An apparent contradiction seems to arise between Matt. xvi. 6 and Mark viii. 13, inasmuch as the former conjoins the Sadducees, the latter Herod, with the Pharisees. Herod, however, stands merely for his party (Matt. xxii. 16; Mark iii. 6), in which the laxity of the Sadducees in point of opinion both religious and moral, was mixed up with political objects. (Comp. on Matt. xiv. 2, which passage does not contradict this view.) If, therefore, the Sadducees be not precisely identical with the Herodians, yet are they nearly akin,—doctrine holding the more prominent place with the former, politics with the latter.
Against their whole tendency and aim does the Saviour mean to
give warning. Then, although ζυμη is immediately explained at
Matt. xvi. 12, as διαχυτί, yet is this not to be looked on apart
from the whole circumstances amidst which it stands; for, outwardly considered, there was much truth in the doctrine of the
Pharisees (Matt. xxiii. 3). The διαχυτ was merely that which
came forth from them, and consequently it was that which, as
it were, infected others and spread the plague of these men. At
Luke xii. 1, therefore, it is said most correctly ἡ ζυμη τῶν Φαρι-
σαίων ἵστην ὑπόκρισιν, for with them the danger lay in their hypo-
crisy, with the Sadducees in the Epicurean pursuit of enjoyment
—on the part of both in their alienation from God, and mental
idolatry. The term ζυμη belongs to those figurative expressions
in Scripture which may be applied in either of two opposite
ways. (See on Matt. xiii. 33.) That application of it accord-
ing to which it denotes the corrupting (fermentation-causing)
element of evil, is the original one. It rests even on Old Testa-
ment usage, the purification of the house from leaven, for the
paschal feast is the symbol of inward purification and sanctifica-
tion (1 Cor. v. 7.)

Ver. 7. The disciples, who lived as yet more in the outer than
the inner world, mistook the connexion of Christ’s remark with
the conversation formerly held with the Pharisees. They did seek
for some connexion, but permitted themselves at once to make
a transition from the ζυμη to the bread. They attributed to
Jesus, doubtless, their Jewish prepossessions as to food (that
Jews ought not to eat with heathen), and looking to the hostile
relation in which he stood to the Pharisees, they deemed that
he meant to prohibit their receiving food from them. This took
place within their mind (διαγριζότα εἰς ἵππους), and found utter-
ance in the words (ταῦτα ἵστη αὕτη λέγει) δι' αὔριας εἰς ἤλαξον. The
whole is so drawn from the life, that any thing like a fiction de-
rived from later tradition is not to be thought of. This occur-
rence also supports most decisively the second account of feeding
the multitude.

The Saviour rebukes their weak faith, and reminds them of
the two visible proofs of help received from him in time of need.
Outward bread, the Saviour means to say, would not fail them,
only let them not slight the enjoyment of the true and pure
bread of life,—that would be the surest preservative against
hankering after the χαρά of the Pharisees. (St Mark expands the discourse further; St Matthew gives shortly and concisely its essence. One should say that St Mark rather rewrote and expanded than epitomised St Matthew.)

§ 31. CONFESSION OF THE DISCIPLES. PROPHECY OF JESUS RESPECTING HIS OWN DEATH.

(Matt. xvi. 13—28; Mark viii. 27—ix. 1; Luke ix. 18—27.)

St Matthew and St Mark transfer the scene of the following narrative into the region of Caesarea Philippi. (The town is not to be confounded with Caesarea Stratonis, which lay on the sea. [Acts xxiii. 23, sq.] Caesarea, called Philippi from the tetrarch of that name who enlarged the city, lay on the north-east side of Palestine [Joseph. Antiq. xviii. 2, 1.] It was not far from Magdala and Gerasa. Originally the town was called Paneas. Philip, in honour of the emperor, named it Καισαρεία, as Bethsaida was, in honour of the emperor's sister, called Ἰωνίας [Joseph. ibid.]) St Luke gives no note to mark the time, but subjoins this incident immediately after his account of the first feeding of the multitude. Schleiermacher (loco citat. p. 138) draws from this an inference unfavourable to the genuineness of the narrative of the second feeding as given by St Matthew and St Mark. Could we cut out it and all connected with it, he remarks, St Matthew and St Luke would appear quite to harmonize in respect to the chorography. The supposition that the second feeding must be transferred to the western side of the sea (while the first took place on the eastern shore), certainly appears, according to Von Raumer's remark (Palestine, p. 101), to be untenable. Meanwhile what has been already advanced should be sufficient to shew the impossibility of identifying the two, and thus no weight is to be laid further on the circumstance to which Schleiermacher has drawn attention. In the important narrative which follows, moreover, St Matthew comes forward as the leading historian. He informs us (xvi. 17—19), that after the confession of the disciples, through Peter as their organ, a remarkable declaration was added by the Lord, as to which the two others are silent,¹

¹ It is remarkable that St Mark, whose Gospel, according to the tradition of the ancient
St Mark, it is true, once more subjoins in his account several minute
and peculiar traits (for instance ver. 27, that the conversation
was carried on even during the journey), but into the essential
meaning of the remarkable transaction he gives no deeper insight.

Ver. 13, 14. The conversation on the road to Caesarea (in τῇ δόξῃ
Mark viii. 27), begins with the question of Jesus, τίνα με λέγοντι
οἱ ἄνθρωποι; (some manuscripts have falsely left out με, it was
omitted simply because of the following expression, τὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ
ἀνθρώπου, which contains more closely the definition of με. The
whole clause is to be taken thus, ἤμε τὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου [ὡς ἠδιατε]
ὁμα. Then would the disciples be led forward from the idea of
the ἰδίς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, to that of the ἰδίς τοῦ Θεοῦ. [v. 16.] The
question itself undoubtedly had its ground in the special circum-
stances as they stood at the time. Its object, however, was to
awaken the disciples to a deeper consciousness of the dignity of
Christ. According to the disciples, then, some merely saw in
Jesus, John the Baptist (risen from the dead), others Elias.
(Compare on Matt. xiv. 2, and the parallel passages, Mark vi. 15,
Luke ix. 8). These men therefore did not see in Jesus the
Messiah himself, but certainly they saw a person who stood in
close connexion with his (speedily to be expected) advent. (Acc-
ording to Malachi iv. 5, the appearance of Elias was expected
before the Messiah. See more particularly as to this, on Matt.
xvii. 10 sq., and Luke i. 17). There were, however, still others
who held Jesus to be Jeremiah, or some one of the old prophets,
(προφήτως τις τοῦ ἄγγελον, Luke ix. 8-19). All viewed him thus
as a remarkable phenomenon, and placed him at least in close
connexion, according to their several prevalent ideas, with the
coming Messiah. They did not declare their belief in him as
the Messiah himself, doubtless for this reason, that the whole
ministry of Christ appeared to them to stand in contradiction
to their Messianic expectations. The opinion that one of the
ancient prophets had re-appeared in Christ, is undoubtedly to
be understood in such a sense that the Jews believed really in

church, rested on the authority of St Peter (Comp. Introd. § 5), should be the writer
who omits to notice the important place which St Peter held. One might have attributed
this to modest reserve, were it not that in the passage parallel to Matt. xiv. 29-31, St
Mark has also passed over in silence a special communication respecting Peter, which,
however, is not to his praise. The supposition that St Mark, in writing his Gospel, used
that of St Matthew, can in truth with great difficulty be reconciled with these facts.
their resurrection, but not as though they believed that their souls had anew made their appearance in the person of Jesus (according to the doctrine of μεταφύσεως or μετασωμάτωσις). For since, according to Jewish opinion, the first resurrection (see on Luke xiv. 14, compared with Rev. xx. 5) was connected with the appearance of the Messiah (his first appearance in humiliation not being dissevered from his second in glory, but associated with it as the prophets do,) and the setting up of his kingdom, so the idea very readily suggested itself that forerunners of the resurrection would precede that mighty period. From no express statements of the Old Testament, except in the case of Elias, did this opinion derive any support, for unless violence were done to it, the reference to the passage, Isaiah lxi. 6, sq., is inapplicable. In the New Testament also there is nothing to favour it (see however, on Moses and Elias at Matt. xvii. 4), and we can attribute it therefore only to Rabbinical legends. Around the person of Jeremiah especially there had gathered a circle of traditions (comp. ii. Maccab. ii. 7, 8; xv. 14), they termed him, by way of eminence, προφήτης τοῦ Θεοῦ. Isaiah was also named among the forerunners of the Messiah, iv Esra ii. 18. (Compare on all connected with this, Berthold Christ. Jud. § 15, p. 58, sq.)

Ver. 15, 16. Alongside of these opinions of the people respecting the person of Jesus, there is here set forth the judgment of the disciples. They declare him to be the Χριστός = Φυσις himself, and thus dissever themselves from the popular views, according to which Jesus was held to be a forerunner of the Messiah. In how far, however, it may have been, this confession of Jesus as the Messiah which gave occasion to the following words of Christ, μακάμε τώρα, is not very obvious, for already had they been spoken respecting the disciples when they first attached themselves to Jesus. (John i. 41, 42.) The whole relation in which Christ stood to his disciples, which must be viewed as implying an ever-advancing development, requires that in this case, the confession of the disciples should have been fuller and more complete than before. For the understanding then of this remarkable passage, Matthew is specially important, for with all his deficiency in outward and graphic descriptive power, he yet, amidst his simplicity and plainness, often shews great depth of insight. Thus, after Χριστός, he adds, by way of explanation, ἵνα τῶν Θεού τοῦ Ζωτος. This remark is most important in tracing the meaning of the ex-
pression τοῦ θεοῦ. For obviously, the expression cannot be precisely identical with θεότης, since in that case there would arise a tautology. Rather must the idea of the τοῦ θεοῦ be viewed as intended to fix more closely the sense of the first expression. The meaning, therefore, which most naturally results is this,—at first the disciples, in acknowledging Christ as the Messiah, had merely, according to their Jewish prepossessions, seen in him a distinguished man raised up and furnished by God for special objects. In closer intercourse with the Saviour there was, through the working of the Spirit, opened up to them a view into his higher nature, they recognised in him a revelation of God, and without thinking of any theory as to the generation of the Son, they termed this revelation, in that personal manifestation in which it stood visibly before them, the Son of God. (Comp. on Luke i. 35.) The article points to the definite, Divine, central—manifestation which they perceived in Jesus having been by the prophecies of the Old Testament instructed as to its real nature. We must conceive of the disciples as living in this, and step by step advancing in their knowledge of it. When Matthew expressly adds τοῦ θεοῦ ζωντας, this epithet (τὸ ναόν) obviously has reference not to idols, there being no reason for here contrasting the true God with them, but to the reality of the Divine manifestation in Christ. The image of the Divine, as reflected in him, was so strong and powerful, that through it the Father, as his original, was for the first time properly revealed in his wondrous essence. All former life-revelations of the living one, were dead when contrasted with that fulness of life which the appearance of Jesus sent forth in streams. (John i. 4.)

Ver. 17. According to this view, the import of the blessing pronounced by the Saviour on hearing this confession becomes obvious. For, if this confession of Jesus as the Son of God were genuine, it necessarily implied that divine things had been ex-
peremptorily manifested to the soul itself, since no man knoweth the Son but the Father, and he to whom the Father will reveal him. (Compare on Matt. xi. 27; 1 Cor. xii. 3.) But the revelation of the divine within the soul as that which giveth life and being from on high, of itself imparts blessedness. (The μακάριος, if, is as at Matt. v. 4, not a mere expression of praise, but an express assurance of that eternal and blessed existence which the preceding confession implies.) The confession leads our Lord back, by way of inference, to an antecedent ἄπευβαλαίριστος, for the divine glory of Christ was concealed under an outwardly mean appearance, and could therefore become known only through an inward manifestation. This revelation he expressly refuses to ascribe to σάρξ και ἄμα, but traces to the πατὴρ. (The addition εἰς τοὺς ὄργανοις ἵστοράμας, stands in contrast to the ἰστήρας, which is implied in σάρξ και ἄμα.) That formula denotes what is human abstractly considered, which, as such, is transitory and vain. The phrase corresponds to the Hebrew בָּשַׁם, which is very common among the Rabbis, [comp. Lightfoot on the passage], and had previously occurred also in the Apocrypha, [Sir. xiv. 18], and in the New Testament, Gal. i. 16; Heb. ii. 14; 1 Cor. xv. 50; Ephes. vi. 12.) The reference here therefore is to other men as well as to the natural human powers of Peter himself, so that the sense here is "nothing human, no power or faculty of man, has been able to impart to you this knowledge, only the divine can teach us to know the divine." This declaration was made by the Saviour to Peter, along with the address Βασιλείς. It is exceedingly probable that this is intended to form a contrast to the foregoing Ἐριστοὺς ὄνειρος. Simon denotes here, as does Jesus, the human personality of the individual; son of Jonas is probably used here in a figurative sense. Primarily indeed it is a genealogical designation, (see on John i. 43; xxii. 16, 17,1) but as Hebrew names generally are descriptive, Christ here looks to the import of the name. Perhaps he referred it to "a" a dove, and in that case this meaning would arise, "Thou Simon art a child of the Spirit, (alluding to the Holy Ghost under the symbol of a dove,) God the Father of spirits, Heb. xii. 9, hath revealed himself to thee." Where God reveals himself there is formed a spiritual man.

1 Βασιλείς Dan. vi. 1, viii. 13 = Heb. 12. It may be presumed that Jesus in this conversation with his disciples spoke Aramaic. Ἐριστοῖς, contracted from "Jesus, (comp. John i. 43.) — Ἑρίστος according to the LXX. at 1 Chron iii. 24, "Jesus."
Ver. 18, 19. Here follows a new installation of the Apostles. After they had in a true sense acknowledged Christ, the Lord could open up to them also the real import of their own office. Let us first examine into the true meaning of the words, that we may be able to fix in our view more closely their reference to the person of St Peter. The symbolic name which the Saviour gave to St Peter immediately after his first reception as his disciple, (comp. on John i. 43,) he here renewes with a definite explanation of its meaning. St Peter was to be the πάτερ of the building of the church. (The church is represented as a ναός, a common figure, compare 1 Cor. iii. 9; 2 Cor. vi. 16; 1 Peter ii. 5. The Old Testament temple is viewed as the type of the church, and so also is the σακύβη regarded in the epistle to the Hebrews, chap. viii.) The church, as a spiritual structure, must rest naturally on spiritual ground; it is St Peter, therefore, with his new inward spiritual properties, who appears as the supporter of Christ's great work among mankind. Jesus himself is the creator of the whole,—St Peter, the first stone of the building. (Compare 1 Pet. ii. 5.) The firmness of the building shews itself in sustaining the onsets of assailing powers. (Matt. vii. 24, sq.) These are here termed πολλα ὑδώ. Hades (βυθόω) the abode of dark destructive powers, is often represented as a palace, with firm and close confinement, in order to mark the power of its bulwarks and the greatness of its strength. (Job xxxviii. 17; Ps. xix. 14; Isaiah xxxviii. 10,) This war-palace stands opposed to the holy temple of God, (comp. on Luke xi. 21, 22,) and appears with all its powers as assailing it, but not overcoming it, for against ἄλως there is arrayed βυθοῖς in the fullness of its power. Still retaining the same figure, then, the Lord of this temple names St Peter as its guardian; he receives the key of it with full authority to use it, and consequently to grant admission or to shut out.

1 In the gospels this is the only passage where the ἀγγέλων stands as = βασ. τ. Θ. In another sense the expression occurs at Matt. xviii. 17. In the writings of St Paul, on the other hand, ἀγγέλων is the usual expression for the visible communion of Christians. Βασ. τ. Θ. is used by him rather for the ideal, heavenly fellowship. In the Hebrew ἀγγέλων corresponds to ἀγγέλιον.

2 Compare Euripides Hecuba v. 1, where it is said of the lower world, σνίνιον πολιμίτο ἐν ἀληθέσι βουσταί.

3 Jeremiah i. 10, forms a striking parallel to the prerogative of forgiving or retaining sins here imparted to the disciples. For the Lord there says to the prophet, "I put my words in thy mouth, see I set thee this very day over nations and kingdoms that thou
(Isaiah xxiii. 22; Rev. iii. 7, explain this symbolic expression,—
That the same St Peter is first termed the πύλη, then the κύριος
[see Isaiah xxii. 22,] of the building is to be explained from that
free treatment of figurative expression which, with all their
accuracy, prevails in the discourses of our Lord. The terms θύρα
and λαβύριον, for shutting and opening, are to be explained from
the ancient custom of simple antiquity to fasten doors by tying.
The passage, John xx. 23, which is in fact parallel to this, has in
explaining the comparison, used the terms ἀπείρωσις and χείραρχη.) The
representation thus given exhibits the earthly and the heavenly as
united in the Church. Inasmuch as heavenly powers are acting
within the church, it is not dissevered by its perfected organs
from the heavenly, rather has it its sanction in the heavenly.
Obviously it is only the ideal church which is here spoken of with
its ideal representatives.¹ In so far as a sinful element exists in
the external church, (Matt. xiii. 47,) the words admit of no
application to it. Of the real everlasting church, however, they are
for ever true. Further, the power which here is merely promised,
is, at a later period, (John xx. 23,) in point of fact, imparted.

It remains for us, however, to speak of St Peter’s position rela-
tively to the other disciples. That which at ver. 19 is spoken to
St Peter is at Matt. xviii. 18, John xx. 23, addressed to all the
apostles. The contents of ver. 18 are again found at Rev. xxi. 14,
and Gal. ii. 9, applied to all the apostles. One cannot therefore
find in these words anything that is peculiar to St Peter; he
merely answers as the organ of the college of apostles, and Christ
acknowledging him as such, replies to him and speaks through him
to them all. Only this ought never to be overlooked, that St Peter
is and was intended to be really the representative actively of the
company of apostles, (of St John the same thing may be said in
a passive point of view, comp. on John xxi. 21.) For it is im-
possible to conceive that the same thing which the Lord here

shouldest root out, break in pieces, throw down, and destroy, and build and plant.”
What in the Old Testament is given in an outward, is in the New Testament given in
an inward form.

¹ It is certainly true at the same time that the ideal church exists nowhere else
than in the real, as the kernel within the shell. If this be overlooked we are lost in
empty idealism. But certainly the outer form is not the same thing with the higher
being which animates it, just as the soul is not without the body, yet the body must
not be taken for the soul itself.
addresses to St Peter could have been spoken to St Bartholomew or St Philip; no one save St Peter could have been called the representative of the apostles. The personal difference between the apostles individually and the pre-eminence of Peter, has been denied merely on polemic grounds in opposition to the Catholic Church, which certainly deduced inferences from it for which there was not in Scripture the slightest ground, (comp. on Matt. x. 2, and John xxi. 15.) But that which is through St Peter bestowed on the apostles, was again through the apostles conferred on the whole church, as is obvious from the real nature of its inner being, according to which it follows that the existing representatives of the church (i.e. the really regenerate) exercise the powers granted by the Lord to that church, not, however, in any way which they may themselves think proper, but according to the intimations of that same Spirit whom to know and to obey is essential for the believer. That the apostles then and their true successors in the Spirit turned with the word of truth towards one place and away from another, that they followed up their labours on one man and not on another, in this consisted the binding and loosing. The whole new spiritual community which the Saviour came to found took its rise from the apostles and their labours. No one became a Christian save through them, and thus the church through all time is built up in living union with its origin. Christianity is no bare summary of truths and reflections to which a man even in a state of isolation might attain; it is a life-stream which flows through the human race, and its fountains must reach every separate individual who is to be drawn within this circle of life. The Gospel is identified with, and grown into union with, the persons. That which lies wrapt up in Christ Jesus as the centre or germ of the new life, first spreads itself forth in the company of the twelve, (comp. on Acts i. 16 sq.) and from them into the widening circle of life, which gradually expanded over the church. Already, however, have we referred to the fact, that the Lord's words to St Peter were spoken to him as a new man, and are true only when viewed with reference to this new nature. That the old man in St Peter was incapable of labouring for the kingdom of God—to say nothing of its being a rock—is shewn by the following context, v. 22 sq. The usual explanation, therefore, of the passage which the Protestant Church¹ is wont to oppose to the

¹ This explanation some of the fathers of the church had already given. Gratz fol-
view of the Catholics, according to which the faith of Peter, and the confession of that faith, is the rock, is entirely the correct one,—only the faith itself and his confession of it must not be regarded as apart from St Peter himself personally. It is identified with him—not, however, with the old Simon but with the new Peter. (Peter as the new name being understood as denoting the new man. Rev. ii. 17.) Hence the power of binding and loosing can be affirmed only of that which it divine in Peter (and the other disciples) for God alone (in so far as he works through one man or in the whole church) can forgive sin, (see on Matt. ix. 4, 5.) Although, therefore, the forgiving of sins is a prerogative of the church in all ages, yet since the power of the Holy Ghost in the church is manifested no more in its original concentration, that forgiveness is imparted only conditionally, on the supposition, namely, of true repentance and living faith, whose existence it is not possible for spiritual or clerical men to discern, since the gift of trying the spirits has ceased (I Cor. xii. 10.) It is for the Lord alone to do this.

Ver. 20, 21. On this advance in knowledge the Saviour immediately founds their introduction to a closer acquaintance with His work as the Redeemer; He openly declares to them that He, the Messiah, the Son of the living God, must suffer, but that in these sufferings He would be perfected. He wished to accustom them by degrees to bear this thought. The former prohibitions forbidding them to speak of his dignity (see on Matt. viii. 4), had reference undoubtedly to the people who were accustomed to associate with the term "Messiah" a series of external ideas which would only have been obstructions in Christ's way. For fuller details as to ἔρχεται, γαμματισμός, and προεύπνεω, see on Matt. xxvi. 57; John xviii. 12.) Respecting the prophecy of Christ which he here utters in regard to himself, we remark, that a figurative exposition of his words which would make them mean, "I shall to appearance sink, but soon and gloriously shall my cause make itself good," is too shallow to claim our approval. Christ speaks too often, and in circumstances the most varied, of his death and his fate generally (see on John ii. 19; Matt. xxvii. 63, according to which last passage, the Pharisees place a watch at his grave, for this reason that he had spoken of his resurrec-

lowing Du Pin, (de antiqua ecclesiae disciplina) has brought together the passages in his work on Matt. part ii. p. 110 sq.
tion), to permit our thinking of any thing but death literally as such. In the δέι τάδε, however, the death of Christ is viewed as a necessary one. At the parallel passages, Matt. xx. 18; Mark x. 33, there stands the simple future παραδείσωσται x. r. λ. What this δέι was intended to mean is shewn plainly by Luke xviii. 31 (parallel to the last quoted passages), where it is said τελεσθήσεται πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα διὰ τῶν προφητῶν τῷ ιησοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. (Comp. Luke xxiv. 26, 27, 44, 46. In the last passage it is said ὅτως γίγνεται καὶ δυτικό ἰδεί τάδε τῷ Χριστῷ.) The prediction of Messiah's sufferings in the prophets was not, however, arbitrary, but proceeded from the internal necessity of the divine counsels. Only for the sake of the disciples does the Lord go back to Scripture, explaining it to them authoritatively, and comfort them by the fact that the Old Testament also knows of a suffering Messiah. It might, however, possibly appear as if the disciples had, post eventum, put all these statements in more specific detail into the mouth of Jesus, for example, the chronological reference in the case of the resurrection. The same view might be taken of Matt. xx. 18, 19, and the parallel passages in Mark and Luke, in which all the particulars of Christ's sufferings are fore-mentioned, that He should be reviled, spit upon, scourged. The character of the Gospel history would not in its essentials be altered indeed, even if we were to suppose that the Evangelists after the event had more fully and particularly filled up our Lord's shorter declaration as to his sufferings, only if one considers how already in the Old Testament, especially at Ps. xxiii. 17, 19; Is. l. 6; liii. 4, sq., the Messiah's sufferings had been stated in full detail, no offence can ever be taken at the specialty of Christ's predictions. It is, however, a thing wholly and entirely inadmissible to raise a doubt as to whether the Saviour possessed generally a foreknowledge of his own death. To draw from the disconsolate state of the disciples on the death of the Lord, an inference against his having previously mentioned the resurrection, is incompetent for this reason, that the doctrine regarding a suffering Messiah was, among the Jews of Christ's time, forced very much into the background. (See on John xii. 34. Comp. Hengstenberg's Christology, p. 252, sq.) When Christ therefore died, the disciples, who were still influenced by popular opinion, thought not of his resurrection, for in regard to every thing they were staggered. The contrasts through which
the life of Christ passed before their eyes, were so dreadful that they were stunned and confounded.

Ver. 22, 23. If, however, we find on the part of the disciples an incapacity to penetrate in thought the mysterious contrasts presented by the life of Christ even after our Lord's crucifixion, previous to which they had yet to experience so much, far more must it have been impossible for them at the period here referred to. They could not endure that the Son of God should be a sufferer. The manner in which our Lord, however, casts back the declaration of Peter, who again speaks as the representative of all the apostles, points to something more than simple deficiency in the comprehension of an idea hard to be understood. Peter wholly misunderstood the relation in which he stood to the Lord; he came forward to admonish and correct Him, and that which Christ had represented as necessary (for his work) he seeks to put far from Him. (The ἧς τοις αἰῶνιοι = ἔσορας, 1 Chron. xi. 19.) But even this does not exhaust his meaning. The expression ἱκάνον μου ἰδία, which follows, points to the idea that Peter’s remark was not merely sinful as respected his own standing-point, but formed a temptation to the Lord. Peter, we find here, perhaps from having his vanity excited by the praise which had been bestowed immediately before, sunk back to the standing-point of the natural man—and along with him the other disciples whom Jesus here rebukes through Peter, just as, at ver. 18, 19, he had conjoined them with him in praise. (Mark viii. 33, indicates this by his expression ἰδὼν τοὺς μαθητὰς αἰῶνοι.) It is the part of the natural man, however, τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων φρουρίων, and of the new man τὰ τῶν Θεοῦ φρουρίων. It is not the ἀνθρώπως κομβός who is here spoken of, but only the ἄνθρωπος (1 Cor. ii. 14), who, incapable of receiving the Divine in its real nature, draws it down to the level of his low human sphere. But in a case where the co-existence of the old and the new man (in those who are regenerate but not yet perfected) is admitted as intelligible, and the alternate predominance now of the one and now of the other, it is also clear how Jesus can here rebuke that same Peter whom he had just praised. For this difference of expression was dependent on the varied prevalence of the new or the old man in the same individual. It only remains for us to say something more particularly of the ὑπάρχειν ὑπόν μου, σατανᾶ. These words are to be explained by the expression which follows ἱκάνον.
λόγῳ τούτῳ, by the addition of which St Matthew greatly facilitates our understanding the whole of this remarkable narrative, and again furnishes proof of how accurate he is in the setting forth of events, even though he does overlook their external features. For, unquestionably the Saviour must be conceived of as having maintained one continuous conflict with temptations. The great periods of such temptations at the commencement and termination of his ministry, exhibit merely in a concentrated form, what ran through his whole life. Here then, for the first time, there meets our view a moment in which temptation assails Him by holding forth the possibility of escaping sufferings and death. It was all the more concealed and dangerous that it came to Him through the lips of a dear disciple, who had just solemnly acknowledged his Divine dignity. What we remarked in the case of the history of the temptation (see on Matt. iv. 1, sq.) must in this instance also be faithfully kept in view. From the clear and pure fountain of Christ's life no unholy thought could flow; but insomuch as He was to be a conqueror victorious over sin, it had to draw near, that in every form He might overthrow it; and upon his human nature, which only by degrees received within itself the whole fulness of the Divine life, sin, when it drew near, did make an impression. Such a holy moment have we here. With the glance of His soul, the Saviour at once penetrated the source whence sprang this ποιεῖν οὐ, and killed in their very origin the evil roots that were springing. From this it is at once obvious how we are to understand the address συναρέω, which was directed to Peter (συναρέω εἰς τῷ πίνακι.) The opinion that Peter is here termed an evil counsellor, or rather an adversary¹ (from ζητήσῃ), stands completely self-refuted; the rock of the Church cannot possibly be at the same time an adversary, and yet Peter did not, by having spoken these words, cease to be the rock of the Church. Satan is none other than the ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τῶν, who has his work in the children of unbelief (Ephes. ii. 2), and also in the children of faith, in so far as the Spirit of Christ has as yet not sanctified them, i.e. in so far as the old man, still exposed to sinful influences, yet lives in them. This influence had Peter (as the organ of the others, who are to be conceived of as under

¹ As regards the mere usage of the words, this explanation may be justified by referring to such passages as 1 Kings xi. 14; 2 Sam. xix. 22. In the New Testament, however, συναρέω never occurs in the sense of adversary.
the same guilt) admitted into his heart without knowing what he did. Our Lord, however, brings him to the consciousness of what he was doing, by naming the element out of which sprang the thought which he had been weak enough to express. And thus, even as in the foregoing confession (ver. 16), the Divine was seen as predominant in the mind of Peter, so evil now asserts its power over him; and here, therefore, we have in his case an exhibition of that ebbing and flowing of the inner life, which every one experiences within himself who has felt in his heart the redeeming power of Christ. Where sin is powerful, there does grace excel in power (Rom. v. 20); conversely, however, where grace is mighty, there sin also puts itself mightily forth.

Ver. 24-26. Immediately after these words, Jesus, transferring his discourse from the narrower circle of his disciples to a more extensive audience (according to St Mark and St Luke), subjoins an admonition on the subject of self-denial. The thoughts themselves we have already unfolded at Matt. x. 37, sq., and the only point for inquiry here is, what association of ideas connects these verses with the foregoing. The fact that Christ must die, does not seem to imply as a necessary consequence, the death of his disciples, for indeed Christ died expressly to the end that we might live. Of bodily death this is undoubtedly true, but the life and death of Jesus is a pattern for his church (1 Peter ii. 21.) What the Saviour experienced, that must all his redeemed ones also experience spiritually; they taste the power of his resurrection, but previously also that of his sufferings (Phil. iii. 10.) To be made alive in the new man (in the \( \varphi \nu \chi\nu \varphi \thau \nu \mu \mu \alpha \alpha \nu \kappa \eta \)), necessarily implies the dying of the old. (Comp. the remarks on Matt. x. 37, sq.) The expression of Peter (ver. 22) had flowed from the natural dread of conflict, sufferings, and death, and hence does our Lord exhort all who would follow him to undertake these willingly, and for the sake of heavenly things to sacrifice all the earthly. The gain of the \( \chi\nu \mu \omega \varsigma \) with its sensuous enjoyments (ver. 26), could never satisfy man's immortal part. Is the world, then, the object of his efforts? He loses, in that case, his real happiness. The sacrifice of what is heavenly alone brings real pain, the sacrifice of what is earthly pure joy. The latter may be compensated, the former never.¹ In the words \( \tau \iota \delta \omega \varsigma \gamma \alpha \upsilon \varepsilon \mu \omicron \omega \nu \tau \varsigma \omicron \varsigma \).
ἀνάλλαγμα there is an implied declaration that only God could have found an ἀνάλλαγμα for the souls of men. (Comp. on Matt. xx. 28.) Ἀνάλλαγμα is nearly allied to λύτρον, although not entirely synonymous. It denotes the purchase-money, the object for which a man exchanges any thing, as Sir. vi. 15, φίλεν σιν τευχῖν ἵνα ἐστιν ἀνάλλαγμα. Thus, while the ἀνάλλαγμα proceeds on the idea of possession, λύτρον refers to a state of slavery, out of which the λύτρον gives deliverance. In this respect, the expression ἀνάλλαγμα would correspond to λύτρον, but it does not occur in the New Testament. The verb ἀναλλάσσω, however, in the sense of to set free, occurs at Heb. ii. 15. To this admonition to self-denial St Mark and St Luke subjoin the corresponding threatening. (As to the contents of the verse, compare the parallel passage Matt. x. 32, 33.) The shunning to enter into conflict and suffer- ing, is in fact to be ashamed of the Lord, and to sacrifice the eternal for the sake of the temporal. And this will, at the day of judgment, display its fatal results. (As to the formula ἠρέθη δὲ Ἡγήμων ἐν δήτῃ μετὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων τῶν ἁγίων, see on Matt. xxiv.)

Ver. 27. From what has gone before, it is plain, that the formula ἀποδέχεσθι ἰδάσκῃ κατὰ τὴν σφαξιν ἄνυσι, must be understood in such a way, that the σφαξις denotes not individual ἡγεμόνις of this or of that kind, but the whole inward course of life (the τὸν κόσμον or Ἰσραήλ ἐκδαιμίνι,) which flows from faith or from unbelief, and shews itself in the fruits of the one or of the other.

Ver. 28. In order to render his mention of the ἡμέρα κρίσεως more impressive, the Saviour sets forth its threatening nearness. As at Matt. x. 23, I here refer once more to the leading passage Matt. xxiv., inasmuch as this same idea, that the day of the Lord’s return was near at hand, must be understood in the same way all through the New Testament. Here, the death (Σάραπος γενοκοσμηθεὶς = γήπεδος,) of some who were present—as the longest livers, is assigned as the period of the Parousia. (The words οὐδεὶς ἀνωτέρως are to be understood of the whole multitude who surrounded him, the apostles as well as the others.) One involuntarily calls to mind here the enigmatical words at John xxi. 22, on which compare the commentary. The parallel passages in St Mark, and St Luke refer not so much to the coming of Christ, as to the coming of his kingdom (St Mark adds ἐν δυνάμει,) and these expressions may be understood as describing the powerful manifestation of living Christian principle, without reference to the per-
sonal return of Jesus. But the immediate connexion of those words with the foregoing context, in which the ἐγκυσθαί in ἐν δικεῖν refers so unmistakeably to the Parousia, does not admit of this explanation. The coming of the kingdom falls at the same period with his coming personally.

§ 32. THE TRANSFIGURATION OF JESUS.

(Matt. xvii. 1—18; Mark ix. 2—13; Luke ix. 28—36.)

In regard to the following important occurrence, some preliminary remarks are necessary, that we may gain the right standing-point for correctly comprehending it—all the more necessary from the great diversity of opinions respecting it which have been put forth. At the outset, we summarily reject those views which reduce the fact itself to a dream or an optical delusion, and we deal in the same way with the views as to thunder and lightning, and passing mists, which some would substitute for the voice of God, and the light-cloud. Other explanations, however, which find here either a myth, or a vision without any outwardly visible fact, must be more closely examined. Primarily, then, as respects the mythical hypothesis, it has historical analogy to support it. But he who finds it impossible to place the Judæo-biblical history on a level with the development of history among other nations, must be precluded, as was formerly observed, by this general character of the Bible narrative, from admitting in any case the slightest mythic element. In it, we have a history of God amidst the human race, in which every thing appears actually carried into effect, which human fancy, springing from the real longings of the soul, has arranged in mythic forms, and as a beautiful garb around the histories of other nations. Besides, in this narrative of the transfiguration, particulars are given which directly contradict every idea of a mythical construction. That which is mythical, as being the offspring of fancy, is everywhere from its very nature obscure and indefinite, but here, as everywhere, the evangelists maintain their historic calmness. Contrary to their usual practice, they narrate with one voice, that the transfiguration took place six days after what was previously recorded. If
we consider that the evangelists wrote thirty years at least after the event, it is obvious how deeply the solemn occurrence must have imprinted itself on their memories, from their so accurately retaining the time. According to Luke ix. 37, the healing of the sick boy, which all the evangelists agree in placing directly after the transfiguration, took place the following day. A thing of this kind ill agrees with the mythic structure. The history obviously reads like the simplest narrative of a fact. As respects the view, however, that it is a vision which is here recorded, the occurrence is certainly styled an ἡμετέρων (== ד signify, ἐμπνευστε) at Matt. xvii. 9, only the expression does by no means always imply a purely inward mental contemplation; it is often used also in cases where an object outwardly visible was present. It merely denotes, in general, objects which become known to us by the sense of sight, in contradistinction to those made known to us verbally (comp. Acts xii. 9). And further, the view which holds the occurrence before us to have been a vision, is wholly untenable, for this reason, that no instance exists of such an inward vision having been revealed in one and the same way to many individuals at once, and these separate individuals also, occupying standpoint so very different, as was the case with Christ and the three disciples. We take our stand, then, on the simple literal sense of the narrative, which in the first place was assuredly that intended by the narrators; and in the next place, admits, in the view of the Christian mind, of being thoroughly defended. For if we assume the reality of the resurrection of the body, and its glorification, truths which assuredly belong to the system of Christian doctrine, the whole occurrence presents no essential difficulties. The appearance of Moses and Elias, which is usually held to be the most unintelligible point in it, is easily conceived of as possible, if we admit their bodily glorification. In support of this idea, however, Scripture itself gives sufficient intimations, (Deut. xxxiv. 6 compared with Jude 9; 2 Kings ii. 11, compared with Sir. xlvii. 9, 13), which men have accustomed themselves to set down as belonging to biblical mythology,—but what right they had to do so is another question.

1 Gratz (Part ii. p. 166,) appeals also to 2 Pet. i. 17. As however the genuineness of the epistle cannot be certainly established, we must not bring forward this interesting passage in the character of a proof. Yet ought it assuredly to be read.
Gospel of St. Matthew XVII. 1.

Taken then as literally true, the incident has a twofold meaning. **First,** it is a kind of solemn installation of Jesus into his holy office before the three disciples, chosen for the purpose of being present at it. It was intended that they should be confirmed in the truth of the foregoing confession (Matt. xvi. 16,) and more fully enlightened as to the dignity of Jesus. In this point of view, the Old Testament furnishes, in the history of Moses, a parallel to the transfiguration. Along with Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu, he ascended Mount Sinai, received there the law, and shone to such a degree that he had to cover his countenance. (Compare Exodus xxiv. with xxxiv. 30 sq.; 2 Cor. iii. 7 sq.) So also Christ was here installed as the spiritual lawgiver, inasmuch as the voice said *ἄνω τὸν ἄξων* (Matt. xvii. 5.) His word is law to his people. But **secondly,** the fact has a reference to Jesus himself. For, the transfiguration takes its place along with the baptism, the temptation, and other occurrences in which Jesus is himself the object of the event, and his inner life is exhibited in the course of its development. Throughout the whole of his earthly ministrations, the Saviour appears in a twofold point of view; on the one hand as the Redeemer already making reconciliation, and so as active, and on the other as inherently advancing his own perfection. (Heb. ii. 10, ἵνα πάντωσιν τοῖς θεοὺς τῶν ἁγίων τῆς αὐξησίας διὰ παθημάτων τιτλισσον.) Only by degrees, did the human individuality of Jesus receive into itself the Divine universality. The transfiguration then, formed one period in the course of this development. It was a representation prefiguring the kingdom of God, in which the risen saints shall dwell around Jesus, and the heavenly messengers opened up to him more fully and deeply the counsel of God in the work of redemption (Luke ix. 31). Should we conceive of the transfiguration as not effected instantaneously, but as a thing gradually prepared for, it would be even in this view not without important meaning. (Compare the Commentary, Part II.)

Ver. 1. With perfect unanimity, which runs with trifling exceptions through the whole narrative, the evangelists relate that the transfiguration took place after six days, reckoning from the occurrence which precedes it. (The ἡμείᾳ ἑκάστῳ in Luke are merely to be counted according to another way of enumerating the days.) The mountain they describe in the most general terms, (ἀς ἡγεῖται) and we are left therefore merely to conjecture in de-
termining where the event occurred. The preceding incident took place at Caesarea Philippi (Mark viii. 27), and there has therefore been a disposition to seek the mountain on the eastern side of the sea of Gennesareth. But it is impossible to shew that, during the six intervening days, Christ had not changed his locality. The early fathers of the church conceived it to have been Mount Tabor, (Hos. v. 1, in the LXX, Ἰρακίων,) for no other reason assuredly but that it is the highest mountain in Galilee. It seems strange, however, that in this case Jesus takes only three disciples with him, for it would appear that the same confirmation of their faith was equally necessary for the others. Already, however, at Matt. x. 1, we remarked, that the disciples held distinct positions in reference to the person of Jesus. The three disciples here named seem obviously in the Gospel narrative, to have formed the circle which most nearly surrounded Jesus. As they here beheld him glorified, so at a later period (Matt. xxvi. 37), they witnessed his deepest sufferings. The ground of this distinction which the Saviour made among the twelve, was obviously no arbitrary one, but arose from the difference in their dispositions and vocation. And this consequently made a different training necessary. An esoteric, secret course of instruction communicated by the Lord to these three is not to be thought of. Everywhere, stress is laid by Christ, not on the imparting of a doctrinal system, but on the renewal of the whole man.

Ver. 2, 3. While Jesus then, was engaged in prayer, (Luke ix. 29,) there took place a change in his person—his face and his dress shone brightly. It is not said by the narrators, whether this glory shone from within or came upon him from without. But as Moses and Elias are mentioned in immediate connexion with

1 It is remarkable that the most important incidents in the life of our Lord, (the transfiguration, sufferings, death, ascension,) took place on mountains, as also that it was his custom to ascend mountains for prayer. In the same way, in the Old Testament, sacrifices were offered on mountains, and the temple also was built on a mountain. This is connected with the Scriptural system of symbols, according to which mountains were compared to the vault of heaven. Hence so often in the Old Testament does the expression occur "mountains of ascent, everlasting hills" (Gen. xliv. 26; Deut. xxxiii. 15; Ps. xi. 1; lxvii. 8; cxli. 1; Hab. iii. 20; Rev. xiv. 1.) It is interesting to observe the parallelism of this with the idol-mountains of ancient natural religions (compare Baur's Theology, Part I. p. 189). The learned man we have named compares even the German name Himmel (heaven,) with the Indian Himalayas, the primeval idol mountains of the Hindoos.
it, and as they also shone (according to Luke ix. 31) so it is probably the design of the narrators to represent the whole scene as illumined by a bright light (δίκαι, ἀπαντησί) for it is ever in this form that men conceive of what is exalted. One may therefore conceive of the two things as both united in the person of Jesus, he was irradiated by light shed on him from without, and He himself shone from within. St Mark paints, after his manner, the outward brightness of the clothing (ix. 3), the indefinite term, however, μεταμορφώθηκα, employed by St Matthew, is paraphrased by St Luke, with the words τὸ ἱλατζ τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ ἠνέκοσμον ἐγένετο. According to the intention of the narrator, these words might merely mean to say, that his countenance wore an unwonted, an elevated expression. The characteristic shining or radiance St Matthew brings forward with special prominence (comp. Dan. xii. 3; Rev. x. 1). It is a natural symbol, to conceive of that which is Divine as light; in no nation and by no individual is the heavenly presented under the emblem of darkness. The fullness of the radiance betokens very naturally the degree of purity in the revelation from on high. In these figurative forms of speech, do mankind throughout all their tribes express themselves; for it corresponds to that essential existence which reveals itself inwardly to every mind. (Paul uses the word μεταμορφώθηκα in describing the internal processes of regeneration, Rom. xii. 2; 2 Cor. iii. 18). It is strange that any question should have been raised as to how the disciples could have known Moses and Elias, partly because of the obvious answer, that in the conversations as to the occurrence which immediately follow, Jesus may have informed them, and partly because to any one living in the spirit of Scripture, such characters as Moses and Elias must be conceived of as bearing a peculiar impress that could not be mistaken.

Luke ix. 31, 32 gives some additional particulars, which are of the highest importance for our understanding the whole occurrence. He remarks, first, that Moses and Elias had spoken of the decease of Jesus (ἐκουσί in the sense of the end of life, death, as at Wisdom vii. 6; 2 Peter i. 15,) which awaited him in Jerusalem. The peculiarity here is the contrast, which a myth never would have hit on, implied in uniting the act of transfiguration with the deepest humiliation. It would seem, however as if the Saviour's glory had in its reality been exhibited to him in order to strengthen him for victory. Yet even after this his soul faltered,
even although he here tasted the glory. (The expression ἔλεγον ἦτο, it may be added, is unquestionably to be understood as referring not so much to the fact of the death itself, as to its more immediate circumstances and relations. Moses and Elias appear merely as ἄγγελοι, as messengers from the higher world.) Luke however relates further, that Peter and his two companions were heavy with sleep, and had in the act of rousing themselves (διαγγελοῦσαντες,) beheld the glory of Jesus and of the two men. Even in the same way did sleep overcome these three disciples amidst the sufferings of Jesus at Gethsemane, (Matt. xxvi. 40,) where Luke relates (xxii. 45), that they slept from grief (ἀναίμως λύσαντο). Great mental agitations, whether of joy or sorrow, are fatiguing. Their solemn situation amidst the loneliness of night upon a mountain—with the Saviour apart—all this must have taken hold of their souls, and physically worn them out. Nothing however can be more incorrect, contradicting both history and Scripture, than to conclude that owing to this drowsiness they were unable correctly to observe what passed. The accuracy of their narrative rests obviously not so much on their own observations as on their subsequent conversation with Jesus. Had the disciples fallen into any mistake, the truthfulness of Jesus would at once have undeceived them. Far rather does the simple narrative of the circumstances as they happened, even of such as seemed unfavourable to themselves, vouch for their honesty and straightforwardness.

Ver. 4. Peter, the speaker, breaks silence (ἀναφράσκοντας, see on Luke i. 60,) and expresses his astonishment at this spectacle. Elsewhere, fear is the feeling awakened by apparitions from the higher world (see on Luke i. 12), as indeed in this case also it immediately shews itself at ver. 6 on the part of the disciples, when they heard the voice. To account then for what is so strange in this declaration of St Peter, St Mark and St Luke immediately subjoin the words μὴ εἰδώς ἢ λέγει. These words refer not by any means to the drowsiness of the disciples, but to their inward state of ecstasy. The elevation of the scene hurried them away; they were lifted, as it were, above themselves. (The expression κύριος in the address is explained more clearly by the parallel terms Ἰακώβον and Ἰωσήφανα in St Mark and St Luke. It has

1 As to the name Ἰακώβον compare on Matt. xxiii. 7.
not here as yet the pregnant meaning which it has acquired in
the writings of St Paul, who uses κύριος = πάπας). Among the
Evangelists it is St Luke who already here and there (xi. 39; xii.
42; xiii. 13,) makes this use of δ' κύριος in contradistinction to κύριος.
(Compare however on Matt. xxi. 3.) The meaning of the expres-
sion σκηναὶς πνεύματι obviously is merely this—would that for a
lengthened period we might remain in this place and in this com-
pany! (Compare the remarks on ver. 10.) The words express
his inward longing after the kingdom of God, in which the saints
and those who are raised from the dead shall be for ever around
the Lord. Inasmuch as Peter speaks of three tents, he places
himself and his two companions humbly in the background as the
servants of the three. The whole form of the address however
shews that St Peter acknowledged Jesus as the primary figure in
the picture; the representatives of the old covenant appear to him
as merely subordinate, as messengers from the heavenly Father to
the Son.

Ver. 5. Again however the scene suddenly changes; even
the three disciples who were admitted to see Jesus in his
glory, were shut out by a bright cloud from the company of the
other three. Most graphically is the scene presented to us by
Luke. The two messengers, Moses and Elias, made a movement
to one side, went apart (Luke ix. 33, ἐν τῷ διαχωρισθείς αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ
αὐτοῦ,) while St Peter was yet speaking the bright cloud came,
and Jesus with the two entered into it. All the three were thus
enclosed as in a sanctuary; the disciples stood without. On this,
you became greatly afraid, partly because they felt themselves
alone, disavowed from their Lord, and partly because the new ap-
pearance of the light-cloud terrified them. (I prefer with Gries-
bach the reading μερίδα φωτός, although the most numerous and
best MSS. have φωτινή. For, φωτός was probably changed into
φωτινή because of the apparent contradiction with ἰσχισθαι. It
seemed impossible that a cloud of light could darken or overshadow,
while it was easy to conceive of a bright cloud casting a shadow.
The reading φωτινή consequently better admits of the usual sense of
μερίδα being retained. According to the view of the author, how-
ever, the words ἰσχισθαι αὐτοὺς are used in regard to the light-
cloud, only in so far as it prevented the disciples from seeing.
The most intense light is — σκότος. Hence, in the language of Scrip-
ture the expressions are used synonymously, God dwelleth in φως
and in darkness, 1 Tim. vi. 16; Exod. xx. 21. The voice then, which spake from the midst of the cloud, leaves us in no doubt what we are to think of it. It is the voice of the Father who instalts the Son (Ps. ii. 7, γνωρίζεται) as the governor of his kingdom, and commands that he be obeyed. (Compare as to αὐτοῦ ἀκούσας, the passage Deut. xviii. 18, in which the first Lawgiver promises a second and more exalted.) The cloud was the Schechinah (compare Buxt. Lex. Talm. s. h. v. Bertholdt. Christ. jud. p. 111,) the symbol of the Divine presence, into which Moses entered on Mount Sinai (Exod. xx. 21), and which descended upon the Tabernacle and in the Temple (Exod. xl. 34; 1 Kings viii. 10). As regards the voice and the words uttered, all that is necessary will be found in our remarks on Matt. iii. 17. We must not however overlook here the additional clause αὐτοῦ ἀκούσας, which is wanting on the occasion of the baptism. (It is taken from Deut. xviii. 15, νοεῖται ὁ ἄνθρωπος) By these words is the peculiar character of the scene marked out. The Messianic Son of God, who has already laboured and taught under the Divine commission, is now formally appointed the Lord and Ruler of the earth, in presence of the representatives of the heavenly and earthly world. What the tempter had set before the Lord (Matt. iv. 8, πᾶσας τὰς βασιλείας τοῦ κόσμου,) is here conferred on him by the Creator of all things, and indeed not merely the dominion of earth but that also of heaven. To this solemn transaction does the Saviour look back, when he says ἔδωκα ἡμῖν εἰρηναία ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς (Matt. xxviii. 18). The gospel history thus enables us to follow plainly the separate periods in the καθήμενος of the Son of God. Here, at his appointment to his everlasting kingdom, it is at the same time shewn to him how he must by his own blood purchase his church.

Ver. 6–8. Now the disciples lost all consciousness, they sank on their faces, and saw Jesus alone. (Compare as to the sinking down of the disciples, Dan. x. 8, 9; Rev. i. 17. In both cases the touch of the hand acts restoratively, it infuses power into men disabled by the sight of the Divine Majesty.)

Ver. 9. In a historical point of view this verse is specially remarkable, from the fact that it forms primarily the basis on which rests the credibility of the occurrence which precedes it. The conversation respecting it with the Saviour precludes every suspicion of a misunderstanding which must otherwise have been
raised. Further, the prohibition forbidding them to say anything of what had taken place, gives indication of the fact, that Jesus did not impart the same information equally to all the disciples, but that he had as it were a smaller circle of fellowship within the circle of his followers. Certainly, however, we should mistake the matter, did we infer from such an indication that there was any system of doctrines which Jesus communicated to some and withheld from others. That is the error of the Alexandrine fathers and Gnostics. But not less were it an error, to deny that there was any distinction in the communications made by Jesus to his different disciples. It is difficult however to assign here the ground of the prohibition (compare on Matt. viii. 4). Any abuse or misunderstanding of such a fact, of which there was obviously a risk only in the case of the general multitude, might, so far as the disciples were concerned, have easily been guarded against, by correct information. To me it seems probable that this prohibition rested on no other ground than the exclusion of the other disciples from being present at the occurrence—they could not as yet bear everything. (At John xvi. 12, the same thing is, in regard to other events, applied to the whole apostles.) According to Luke ix. 36, the disciples obeyed. St Matthew himself therefore received his information of the event only after the resurrection. We must obviously conceive of the disciples as engaged at that time in the liveliest interchange of all their experiences. Mark remarks (ix. 10,) that this word sank deeply into the hearts of the disciples (ἐλήφθη τοῦτο ἀπὸ αὐτῶν, to seize on, to hold fast, as something important. Compare at Luke ii. 51, the verb ἀφέωνατο,) and occasioned also separate conversations among them. It was the αὐξόμενος at which they stumbled. The idea they were accustomed to form of it they could not reconcile with the person of the Messiah whom they had just seen in heavenly glory, for it presupposed his death. This little trait singularly confirms the truthfulness of the narrative.

Ver. 10–13. St Luke here closes the narrative, but St Matthew and St Mark give an extract from a most important conversation which arose in consequence of the occurrence just recorded. It referred to the person of Elias, whom the learned among the Jews usually associated with the appearance of the Messiah. There is

1 The idea, that the prohibition was given merely to prevent these disseminating their misapprehension, stands self-refuted.
an obscurity however in the introduction to the discourse, which commenced, according to St Matthew, with the question of the disciples, τι οὖν ἦν γραμματεῖς ἐκ τ. Λ. The οὖν points back to something that had gone before, and the whole inquiry leaves the impression that the disciples believed the opinion of the learned Jews to have been incorrect, for which reason Christ confirms it as right. It is most natural certainly to view the reference as pointing back to ver. 4, where St Peter hoped that Elias would now remain with them, and enter on his labours. Instead of that, he at once disappeared, and for this reason he asks what they were to make of the above opinion. Jesus declares it, according to Mal. iv. 5, to be wholly correct, and defines the kind of labours in which he was to engage by the words ἔποικα σαρκίσαι πάντα (= ἐκ τ. in the passage referred to.) For as the Tishbite once laboured of old as an emendator sacrorum, so shall he also come forth at his second appearance. He is no creator of a new order of things in the spiritual life, but (by legal strictness and earnestness) he stems the course of sinful confusion, and re-introduces a state of order. Into this scene the Messiah steps forth as a Creator. Christ however intimates that one had already exercised for him this office, but the γραμματεῖς had put him to death. The disciples understood (according to earlier notices, see on Matt. xi. 14) him to mean the Baptist. What is expressed however so decidedly here, ἐως ἡλιακὴ ἡ ἡλιόπ, must be modified according to the statement of Matt. xi. 14. (Compare the remarks on the passage referred to.) For, the appearance of Elias at the transfiguration as little exhausted the prediction of the prophet (Mal. iv. 5), as did the sending forth of the Baptist. Each was merely a prefiguration, adapted to Christ's first appearance in his humiliation (which the Old Testament never plainly marks as distinct from his second coming in glory), but the prophecy itself remains awaiting its fulfilment at Christ's future appearance (compare on Rev xi. 3 sq.1) While Jesus, at Matt xvii. 12, draws a parallel between the fate of St John and his own coming down, St Mark reads the prophecies of the Old Testament as predicting the sufferings of St John. Καθὼς γίγασας εἰς αὐτόν, he writes at ix. 13. Now nothing of the kind is expressly predicted of St John, nor does the history of Elias admit of being typically referred to him,

1 As to the history of the interpretations which have been given of the passage in Malachi, compare Hengstenberg’s Christology, vol. iii. p. 444, sq.
for Elias did not die in the persecution. It is probable therefore that the evangelist brings together here (as at Matt. ii. 23), in one collective quotation, all the passages of Scripture in which the persecution of prophets and pious men is spoken of. Besides, the answer of Christ in St Mark, acquires, through the peculiar collocation of the thoughts, a character quite different from that which it bears in St Matthew. It has been conjectured that the text is corrupt, but without any ground for the idea. Obviously, according to St Mark, the Saviour sets over against the inquiry of the disciples another question, in order to rouse them to reflection. And in this way the following is the meaning, “The Scribes say Elias must first come;” Jesus replied, “Elias certainly cometh first (φωτεινός = φωτεινὸς), and setteth all in order; but how in that case can it stand recorded of the Son of Man that he must suffer much and be rejected?” By the question thus retorted, Jesus wishes to rouse his disciples to the conviction, that the prediction respecting the preparatory ministry of Elias is not to be understood absolutely. He certainly setteth all in order, but the sins of men prevent his efforts taking effect. And in conclusion, the assurance is subjoined, that Elias is already come in the person of the Baptist (i.e., of St John working in σωμάτι καὶ ὅμοιος Ἡλίου. See on Luke i. 17).

§ 33. HEALING OF THE LUNATIC.

(Matt. xvii. 14—23; Mark ix. 14—32; Luke ix. 37—45.)

The three evangelists are still parallel in this narrative, and the indication of the time given by St Luke, in τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἡμῖν, again conjoins the narrative so introduced in the closest way with what had gone before. St Mark exhibits himself once more in this history in his well-known character. The epileptic boy he paints like a master, and the whole situation in which the cure was wrought. One sees as it were the people continuously streaming together, and the paroxysms amidst which the beneficent power

---

1 Hengstenberg (Christol. vol. iii. p. 478) is of opinion, indeed, that Jezabel had intended to kill Elias, and that although her purpose did not, like that of Herodias, take effect, yet no weight is to be laid on this difference. But in this opinion I cannot share. A type demands in every case facts, not mere intentions.
of Jesus overcame the evil influences by which the child was possessed. The narrative of this cure demands in itself only some short remarks, for the analogous passages already met with, make it sufficiently intelligible. Some things, however, peculiar to this cure, will require extended explanations.

Ver. 14, 15. St Matthew calls the sick boy (he was his father's only child, Luke ix. 38) a σελήνωμος. According to ver. 18, however, he, like St Luke and St Mark, viewed the disease as brought by an evil σπύμα. Now the representations of St Mark and St Luke agree perfectly with epilepsy,¹ which, as is well known, being founded on a diseased excitement of the nerves in the lower part of the body, is connected with the changes of the moon. It is not unlikely that the secret sins of the boy (comp. on ver. 21) had destroyed his health. St Mark and St Luke plainly intimate that the disease was not continuous, but that the child fell into paroxysms. (Mark ix. 18, διὸν ἂν αὐτὸν καταλῦει. Luke ix. 39, μόνος ἀποχωρεῖ ἂν αὐτοῦ, i.e. the paroxysms endure unusually long.) The gnashing and foaming (τρίζει καὶ ἀφρίζει), and the dying away, and the wasting of the sick (Εξηλασθεὶς), most graphically represent his condition. (The ἀλαλων of St Mark refers only to articulate speech, which in such moments would be suspended; it does not therefore stand in contradiction to χαδζειν [to utter inarticulate tones] as employed by St Luke.)

Ver. 16, 17. The disciples had not been able to heal the sick child. It is altogether an unfounded conjecture to suppose that not all the disciples, but only certain of their number (and those the weakest in faith), are here alluded to. The words of reproof are general,—so general indeed that not only may they have included all the disciples, but the people at the same time, and especially the father of the sick boy. The apostles appear here merely as the representatives of the whole, but on them the rebuke certainly falls most heavily. Jesus, however, did not stand there for the sake of the apostles alone, not with them alone had he to deal, the burden of all rested on Him. (The verb ἀνιψεθαί = ἔσσω to bear the load of sin. The expression γινώσκεις μοι agrees with Deut. xxxii. 5, where LXX. give it as the rendering of ἔσσω.)

¹ I agree substantially with the view given of this narrative in the very successful exposition of Dr Paulus (Comment. Part II. p. 571, sq.) with only this difference, that he has missed here, as elsewhere, the fact, that the evangelists mean to refer the origin of the disease ultimately to the spiritual world.
Mark ix. 20—27, alone sets clearly before us the course of the
cure with living graphic power. As the boy drew near to Christ,
a paroxysm overtook him. Jesus upon this began a conversation
as with the Gergesene (compare Mark v. 9, sq.), but here only
with the father, owing to the unconsciousness of the son. The
object of this conversation was, by means of the peace and secu-
ritv which it breathed, to still the raging element and inspire
confidence. The father now obtained an opportunity of recount-
ing the sufferings of his miserable child; the convulsions, he
states, often threatened in a moment to destroy even his life, by
casting him into fire or water which might be near. The hostile
influence awakened within him an impulse to self-destruction.
Jesus thereupon commends to him the all-prevailing power of
faith (see as to this subject on Matt. xvii. 20), and calls upon
him to believe. The unfortunate man exclaims (almost with
spasmodic impulse), πιστῶ, βοήθει μοι τὴν ἰστίαν. Thus the Sa-
vior first shews himself here to the father as a μακαρικὴς πίστις
before he heals the son. Amidst the struggles of anxiety, the
power of faith is by the help of Christ produced in the unbeliev-
ing soul, and then the deliverance is vouchsafed. This passage
is one of the most important to our understanding the nature of
πίστις, as laid down in the Gospels. It is not the acknowledg-
ment of certain doctrinal truths that is here spoken of (that is
merely a consequence resulting from it); Jesus is not here im-
parting instruction; and the disciples also, supposing they had
healed the sick child, would assuredly not have prefaced that
cure by any doctrinal discourse on the Messiahship of Jesus.
Rather is the πίστις an internal state or frame of soul,—we have
termed it receptivity (compare on Matt. viii. 10), into which that
which is Divine may find admission. Here, however, we see that
this state of soul is not to be looked on as altogether independent
of man’s own efforts. Earnest striving and prayer is fitted to call
it forth. Both these imply, it is true, that the germ of faith
already exists (there must always be an ὑπόστασις ἰληκιωμένων in
the soul if man is to be able to pray), but no one is to be re-
garded as by nature wholly destitute of the germ of faith; only
by a continued course of sin could it be destroyed, and so a man
be brought to the πιστεύων τῶν δαμάσκων (James ii. 19), which, pro-
perly speaking, is no faith. (Compare Neander’s small Gelegen-
heitezchr. p. 31, sq.) There is yet, however, a difficulty here in
the circumstance, that the faith of the father seems to benefit the son. (In the same way, already, at Matt. viii. 5, sq. where the officer believes and the servant is healed, and at Matt. xv. 22, sq. where the mother's faith stands in a similar relation to the cure of the daughter). As it has been established that ἀνθρώπινα is the ground of a refusal to heal (compare on Matt. xiii. 58), so it may naturally be presumed that the persons cured also exercised faith. Hence one might hold the opinion that two transactions perfectly distinct from each other, must in these cases be supposed to have taken place. First, there is the healing of the sick person, whose faith Jesus perceived, though he did not then himself express it; next, there is the awakening of faith in the parents or the masters, which was not connected with the cure. Yet a connexion precisely of this kind seems to be asserted here. At Mark ix. 23, the cure of the child appears to be expressly conjoined with the faith of the father. It thus seems that a separate and special bond of union here found place between them. If we ask ourselves, then, whether the child not grown up could be conceived of as exercising faith on behalf of his parents, as well as the parents on behalf of the child, the inquiry would hardly meet from any one with an affirmative reply, and consequently it seems not improbable that the child is here viewed as in a state of union and dependence on his parents from whom he received his being; such an union as is again in infant baptism supposed to exist between the child and the sponsors, as the representatives of the church. It occurs to one here very naturally to suppose such an union of posterity to their parents as is expressed in Heb. vii. 5, and which also lies at the foundation of the whole account of the connexion in which Adam and Christ stand to the human race. (Comp. on Rom. v. 13, sq.) Something analogous also seems, according to the passage Matt. viii. 5, sq. to be pointed out in the relation between the master and his servant; only, it is self-evident that in this union the relation is merely to be viewed as something accidental, for it may even be conceived of as reversed. After this conversation with the father, there follows immediately the cure itself, which again, as in the case of the Gergesene, calls forth a violent paroxysm, ending in the entire prostration of all his powers. (Comp. Mark v. 15). The boy was so exhausted with the fierceness of the reaction, that they thought him dead (Mark ix. 26), but the touch of Jesus again inspired the powers of life.
Ver. 19, 20. After the cure the disciples came to Jesus, and within their more narrow circle (κατ' ἰδίαν, Matt. xvii. 19), inquired why it was that they could not heal the sick child. St Luke wholly omits this important conversation. St Mark so curtails it that its essential meaning cannot be perceived, and it seems to bear on its surface a somewhat different sense; and here again, then, his graphic power of conception shews itself rather in what is external. St Matthew, on the contrary, goes into the essence of the matter, especially in regard to the discourse of Jesus, and one forgives him therefore willingly that want of exactness with which he treats the outward features of the incidents recorded. Such points speak decisively enough for the apostolic origin of his Gospel. On the part of the apostles, also, Jesus now reproves the ἀπιστία, and plainly charges them with guilt in the want of πίστις. They, too, might have cried out βοήθει τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ ἡμᾶς. The position of the apostles (as of men in general), relatively to that which is Divine, thus appears here as not essentially different from that of the person who was to be healed. Does man wish to receive heavenly powers? he must stand passively to principle, compared with the simple act of reception on the part of him who was to be cured. Thus we plainly see here different gradations of faith. (Compare what is said more in detail on Rom. iii. 21.) Along with the reception of the principle of life, there comes an increase in the soul's susceptibility of it, and thus faith goes on to perfection in itself. The apostles had already for a long time been in communion with Jesus, and never had been without faith on Him, yet Christ marks here within them the want of the germ of real faith (κόκκος αἰνάπιστος), or as one might call it, of creative faith, for in this character it ought to shew itself in them. Faith is thus a living internal state, inherently developing itself, as that which is Divine gradually becomes predominant and effectual within the soul; but in all stages of its development, the fundamental condition of the καθολικος (in which faith dwells [Rom. x. 9], and not in the νοῦς) continues one and the same. (Compare on Matt. xxii. 21,)—Jesus now presented to their view the portraiture of perfect faith, whose effect it is that to men ἰδίως ἄνωτερον. (Compare Mark ix. 23, πάντα δυνατά τῷ πιστεύοντι.) Nothing could be a greater mistake than to make shallow the deep meaning of these words by the explanation that
they are spoken hyperbolically. We read at Matt. xix. 26 respecting God, ἡ Θεος ἡ θανατική (compare the parallel passages Mark x. 27; Luke xviii. 27). These words guide us to an understanding of the true meaning of this eulogium on faith. Just because faith is a susceptibility, a receptivity for that which is divine, it communicates to the individual in whom it is developed the very nature itself of that which is divine; and under the guidance of the Divine power which animates the believer, he is brought, according to the degree of development imparted to him, into those circumstances in which he must through faith come off victorious. The πάντα, therefore, is to be taken in its widest sense, only not to be referred to every kind of fanciful caprice (which might originate with forward unbelieving men), but to be restricted to the real wants of the believer. Such a case of need the believers had encountered, but they had neglected earnestly to supplicate that help from on high which they required in the circumstances. The description of the omnipotent power of faith is moreover figurative. First, faith is conceived of as in its minimum state, and then the maximum of effectual power is ascribed to it. (See as to the πάντας on Matt. xiii. 31. The overturning of mountains is an expression selected unquestionably in allusion to passages of the Old Testament. Compare Job ix. 5; Zech. iv. 7. In the New Testament, Paul repeats the statement at 1 Cor. xiii. 2. Another similar figure to denote what is impossible for man, but possible for God in believers, is seen at Luke xvii. 6. In the passage Matt. xxi. 21 [Mark xi. 23], the figure of the overturn of mountains is repeated.

Ver. 21. The connexion of the following verse with the preceding context is obscure. "This kind (scil. τὸν δαιμόνιον, according to what goes before) goeth not out but by prayer and fasting." (The fasting being viewed as an accompanying means of cure along with prayer). The immediate connexion of the words, with the reproof administered to the apostles for their unbelief, leads obviously to this meaning,—"this obstinate enemy was not to be overcome in the same way that many others are.

1 Sieffert (at supra, p. 100) wishes to refer τοποτε ὁ γινης to the unbelief of the apostles themselves. But I know of no instance in which unbelief, which was something negative, could be compared with demons who must be driven out. This view of the passage seems to me inadmissible.
It was needful for you, with prayer and fasting, earnestly to strive after more of the power of faith, and then might you have been victorious." The προσωπική and μορία relate thus to the disciples themselves. And yet both may be referred also to the person cured; ye ought to have enjoined on him similar duties, and then ye would have been enabled effectually to heal him. The reference in this view to Luke ix. 42, ἀρείων, ἄνθρωπος τῷ πάσχεν τῷ ἀνήρῳ is certainly most correct; it is not unlikely that the Saviour had exhorted the father to a wise treatment of his son. According to the connexion of ideas in St Mark, this reference of prayer and fasting to the cured boy, who probably had by sins of impurity plunged himself into this nervous disorder, obviously preponderates. In St Matthew it is perhaps best to combine both references.

Ver. 22, 23. In the concluding verses the evangelists are entirely agreed in introducing a new mention of the Saviour's sufferings (compare on Matt. xvi. 21). The words stand without any visible connexion with what goes before. It is, however, not improbable that from time to time the thought of His approaching sufferings struck Jesus, and then, as the narrative here presents it to us, He suddenly expressed what He felt to His disciples, especially when, leaving the larger sphere of public labour, He retired more into solitude and the private circle of His nearest friends. (This is indicated at Mark ix. 30, by the words ὁ γὰρ ἠλλοιλήσαι ἵκα τίς γνῷ [sc. αὐτός]). This declaration, however, must only have been at the time of a fragmentary nature, for the disciples could not reconcile themselves to the idea of their Messiah's sufferings,—that Messiah from whom they expected the end of all suffering (Mark ix. 32; Luke ix. 45, ὧν ὅσον τῷ ἢμα τωτά.) Meanwhile the expression of that deep and painful emotion carried them away involuntarily (Matt. xvii. 23, ἰλαμμόθησαν αἰσθήμα), but the lofty and serious majesty which was seen diffused around the whole nature of Jesus, deterred them from asking further as to the transaction He had alluded to (ἵπτομαι ἐγώθηκεν in St Mark and St Luke), and so there remained for them only the dark impression of some mighty event which must be expected.
§ 34. THE COIN (STATE) IN THE FISH'S MOUTH.

(Matt. xvii. 24—27.)

Before proceeding to consider the occurrence itself which is here recorded, we must cast a glance at the connexion. Mark ix. 33, as also Matthew, makes the Lord come to Capernaum, but connects immediately with his arrival the narrative of the conversation as to who should be the greatest in the kingdom of God. He relates most minutely that this conversation took place in the house, and was introduced by a question put by Jesus, as to what they had talked of by the way. Now, according to the view of Dr Paulus (Comment. Part ii. p. 621), St Peter had not been present at the commencement of this conversation, but had come in subsequently while it was going on (Matt. xviii. 21), and it is simply to account for his absence that this narrative of St Peter's taking the fish is inserted by St Matthew. But, for this conjecture the whole account gives not the slightest occasion; nay, Mark ix. 35 rather mentions the twelve as all present at the commencement of the conversation. The expression εὑρών αὐτῷ at Matt. xviii. 21, merely means that St Peter came close to Him when addressing Jesus. If the evangelist had distinctly intended to represent St Peter as absent, he would have stated so in plainer terms. It is far more natural to suppose that St Matthew added in conclusion this little narrative of St Peter's taking the fish, because it happened just at the time, and in order that he might introduce once more in chap. xviii. a more lengthened collection of various fragments of discourse which he did not wish to interrupt. Moreover, Christ's conversation with St Peter as to the census, might have been considered of importance in respect to the discourse which follows, as will afterwards be shewn. The nature of the discourses, as they are given in Matt xviii., by no means demands, as will afterwards be shewn, the absence of St Peter, even if they were spoken the one after the other, in the same order in which we read them in St Matthew. St Peter's taking the fish was undoubtedly (owing to the proximity of the sea) the work of a few moments, and we may therefore justly suppose him present at what follows.

As regards the incident itself, however, the account cf which
we read at Matt. xvii. 24–27, it is not to be denied that the natu-
ral explanation which Dr Paulus (ut supra) has given of it,
brings forward points that deserve consideration. Taking the
narrative in the usual sense, there is much in it that strikes one
as strange. First, it is at the very outset, a strange thing that
the coin should have been in the mouth of the fish. It seems
more to the purpose to conceive of it as in the xwriq, especially
as the fish was caught by an ἀγγείον (hamus, fishing-hook), the
use of which presupposes the opening of the mouth. In the next
place, however, the object aimed at seems to stand in no fitting
connexion relatively to the miracle. The miracles of Jesus have
always a definite relation to the well-being of man, or they are
designed to authenticate the Messiahship of Jesus, and prepare
the way for faith in it. Here it does not appear that we can
trace a connexion with any of these objects, for the occurrence
referred to Peter personally, and to him alone, yet was he already
convinced of the Messiahship of Jesus; the address of Jesus
(ver. 25) presupposes faith as already existing in him. Besides,
as Jesus was in Capernaum, even if his bag was empty (John
xii. 6; xiii. 29), he might in this place have obtained the small
sum in a more simple way. Thus the proposal to explain the
expression Ἱψής στατήρα (ver. 27), as meaning "thou shalt ob-
tain the coin (stater) for the fish" (by selling it), will appear as
not so entirely inadmissible. For, even according to this very
explanation, the transaction, taken in a symbolical point of view,
bears a beautiful meaning, as shewing how Christ, as the Lord of
nature, caused to be taken from the great treasure-house of the
Father what he required. One feels at first sight all the more
tempted to accede to this view, because it appears to be in any
case a strange thing that at the close of the history the usual
conclusion of miraculous narratives is wanting—namely, that
Peter at the command of Jesus both did and experienced what
had been said to him. But looking now without prejudice or
prepossession to the narrative, one certainly ought not to conceal
the difficulties presented by this explanation of Dr Paulus. If at
ver. 27 we take the words as we find them, καὶ ἁπτόμενοι τὸ σώμα αὐτοῦ
ἰψής στατήρα, it must be confessed that the narrator means to
say that the stater (coin) would be found in the mouth. It must
be granted indeed that ἰησοῦς may mean to acquire, to obtain
(without defining the way in which a thing is obtained), but the
fact that the acquisition of this piece of money is connected so closely with the opening of the mouth, unquestionably is in contradiction to the opinion that the money was to be raised from the sale of the fish. The remark of Paulus on this point, that the opening of the mouth refers merely to his taking the fish off the hook, and that this was needful because it would otherwise have died more speedily, and so would have been of less value, is obviously too far-fetched. It is clear that this mode of explaining away what is supernatural is suggested not by the text itself, but by reflection. In the next place, it is not to be overlooked, that plainly only one fish was intended to be caught. Paulus will have it that ἵκτωρ is to be taken collectively, but the addition of ἐπει 'ους altogether forbids this. (Compare Fritsche on the passage.) But in poor Capernaum, where fish were common, the sum of money here named could not possibly have been obtained for a single fish. As it is, however, the primary duty of an expositor to render the meaning of his writer's text, so must we here maintain, that St Matthew means to relate that Jesus commanded St Peter to take a fish, and foresaw that it would bear a stater in its mouth. Fritsche is quite right in saying, that, according to the opinion of the narrator, there were two things of a miraculous nature; first, the foreknowledge of Jesus; and next, the fact that the fish had the coin in its mouth, not in its body. Such, however, being the result yielded by the interpretation of the passage, we cannot leave it standing in opposition to the character of Christ; and it thus becomes a question whether, contrary to the above remarks, the fact can be placed in harmony with the whole nature of Jesus. The main question here requiring to be settled is this, whether such an exertion of miraculous power as we find set forth in the passage, was opposed to the principles of Jesus; the other observations offered will then disappear of their own accord, or will lose their weight. It must ever be maintained as a leading principle, that every miraculous act of Christ had an object which stood connected with his whole Messianic work. What can have been the object of this miracle of Jesus? We must naturally suppose that He was without money, when the tax-gatherers made their demand. Now to receive gifts if they were offered Him, was in no way against the decorum of His position as the Messiah; it rather formed one part of that peculiar appearance which He presented, that without possessions
of His own, He went about here below in perfect poverty, in order that He might receive bodily sustenance from those whom He nourished with the bread of life; nay, what men gave, God gave through them (see Luke viii. 2). But it is altogether a different thing to suppose that Jesus, even when destitute of money, could have been reduced to borrow it of any one;¹ that would have been against the decorum Divinum. It belonged to the form of His office that His heavenly Father should nourish Him from day to day by working on one and another, and inducing them to furnish everything needful to supply His necessities. But among men the righteous never could be left to beg (Ps. xxxvii. 25). Accordingly, the matter may be conceived of in this way. The tax-gatherers came at a time when no money was at hand; Peter over-hastily promised payment; and Jesus, though He rebuked this rashness, deemed it proper here, as in other cases, to fulfil all righteousness; an opportunity was in this way given Him of taking from the full treasure-house of His heavenly Father. To send Peter a-fishing with a view to sell the fish caught, would have been to prosecute a calling and trade to which the Son of God was not appointed; and so this which was her adopted, remained, as the only form of taking from the fulness of the Father. At the same time I cannot decidedly declare in favour of this explanation; and I acknowledge that I hold this to be the most difficult miraculous narrative in Gospel history. Hence, the simplest course that remains, is merely to bring the miracle into immediate connexion with Peter, who, at particular moments, certainly acknowledged the higher powers that dwelt in Christ, but who also soon lost again the vivid impression of His Divine nature. Christ might have been able in another way to obtain the money; but in order to convince Peter of His higher nature, and freedom from all earthly laws, He causes him to seek it in this way. In Peter's answer to the collectors, that the Lord would pay the contribution, there was implied a mistake as to his peculiar position; and although Jesus might appeal to His Divine Sonship, which, at a former period, Peter had already confessed,

¹ It will excite no surprise that the feelings of Dr. Strauss give a different response. He sees, as in many other things, nothing offensive in this, that the Son of God is made to contract debt to man. In such a case there is no difference between begging and borrowing. Compare, moreover, 2 Kings iv. 1, sq. where Elisha also performs a miracle in order to discharge a debt.
yet the Saviour seems to have wished still more deeply to impress on his mind a view of His exalted dignity.

Ver. 24. As respects the relative value of the money which this narrative refers to, the στατήρ is = 4 drachmas or Roman denarii. These formed a Jewish shekel. The δίδακτον is therefore = half a shekel, i.e. to about 10 good groschen. The stater thus amounted to 20 good groschen.¹ This sum of itself,² and still more, the conversation which follows, shews that it is not a civil tax but a temple tax that is here spoken of. According to Exodus xxx. 13, sq. every Israelite was required to pay such a contribution; and in the time of Josephus (Antiq. xviii. 9, 1), even the foreign Jews paid it. The question put by the collectors of this assessment, whether Jesus would pay it, assuredly arose from the circumstance of these persons believing that as a theocratic teacher he would regard himself as free from such an impost. But Peter, to whom the question was addressed in the absence of Jesus, believed, that with His strong religious feelings, He would make it a point to pay such holy taxes, and answered affirmatively.

Ver. 25, 26. Jesus perceived at once that on the part of Peter this arose from unconsciousness. In his answer he had contemplated Jesus rather under the aspect of legal piety than in that of his ideal dignity, and Jesus therefore anticipated his remark (ποιηθείς αὐτῶν) by the question τί σοι δοξήσῃ Σίμων; He awakens by this inquiry the feeling of His own higher position, as well as that of Peter himself, above the constitution of the Old Testament temple. Jesus here runs a parallel between earthly kings and earthly tribute (τίλν, customs-duities on goods, χρηματικ, head-money on persons), and the heavenly King, and spiritual contributions; as with the kings their own are free from taxes, so also in the things of heaven. For, what God's children possess belongs to God,—they have no property exclusively their own,—they contribute out of and into their own purse,—they are therefore free. Jesus places himself, here on a level with Peter, but it is obvious that from this figurative mode of speaking nothing can be inferred affecting our idea of the υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ. The mean-

¹ The good groschen is equal to rather more than 1½d. The Marien-groschen is of less value.—T.
² The double article also τῷ διδάκτῳ λαμβανόμενοι, indicates a reference to certain appointed persons entrusted with the collection of the temple offerings.
ing is simply this,—we belong to a higher order of things than that to which the commandment in question (Exod. xxx. 13) applies; not for us did God give it, we pay to the temple not a poor tax, but we ourselves belong to it wholly, with all that we are and have. Jesus thus elevates Peter, and places him on his own standing-point,—a position for which he certainly was not yet fully trained, but to which, in as far as he was a renewed man, he already belonged. The Lord's words at the same time clearly prove that Jesus acknowledged and honoured the Old Testament order in general as a Divine institute,—unless this be assumed, the words have no meaning. Only, He contemplated the whole temple service in its preparatory character, and led on the disciples so to view it.

Ver. 27. While thus conscious that He stood above the Old Testament economy (comp. xii. 8), the Saviour yet subjected Himself to it, as in general, up to the time when His work on earth was finished, he in no respect assailed or withdrew from the existing order of the divine service. Only at Christ's atoning death was the law completed and finished, and a new form of religious life arose in the church, in which the laws of the Old Testament acquired their true spiritual meaning. Here, in this subordination to the law, does Jesus make obvious the weakness of those around Him (see as to οὐκ ἄφησαί on Matt. xviii. 6); He wished neither to give them offence nor lead them to believe that He did not reverence the law of the Old Testament. It is certain, also, that the basis laid down here is the general principle πρίν οὖν ἔκδηλος πᾶσα δικαιοσύνη. (Comp. on Matt. iii. 15)

§ 35. ON THE CHARACTER OF THE CHILDREN OF THE KINGDOM.

(Matt. xviii. 1—35; Mark ix. 33—50; Luke ix. 46—56.)

The words ἀναστηρεμένων αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ (Matt. xvii. 22,) again seem to unsettle the whole chronological connexion by their vagueness; nor do the parallel passages in St Mark and St Luke give any more certain data. The contents, however, of the succeeding context, make it probable that no great interval in this instance elapsed between what had preceded and what now follows. The conversation as to pre-eminence in the kingdom of
God in which the disciples were engaged on the way to Capernaum (Mark ix. 33), may have been occasioned by the transfiguration, and the preference there shewn for certain of their number, and as all the three narrators give exactly the same connexion of events, this supposition being of itself possible, ought to be received as probably true. It is true at the same time that each of the evangelists contributes to the narrative something different from the others. St Luke is the shortest;—he has merely the admonition to humility. St Mark gives also the warning against offences in an extremely expanded form, as his manner is. St Matthew, however, adds still further particulars. It is not impossible so to conceive of the antecedent circumstances, that all these different points may on this occasion have been made by Christ the subjects of conversation, simply on account of what had fallen out among the apostles. The evangelists themselves give details according to which we may infer the following to have been the course of events. The disciples not merely conversed as to their pre-eminence in the kingdom of God, but fell into a sharp contest on the point. Hence the admonition at Mark ix. 50, σημεῖα ἐπὶ ἀλλήλοις). In the altercation, they not merely boasted the one over the other, but by hard words wounded each other's feelings; nay, the disciples by this gave such offence to each other, or to any individual who might be present, that their faith might have been shaken in the reality of any higher life as existing within the circle that surrounded Christ, or in the more exalted vocation exercised by himself personally. This would explain how Christ should successively have discoursed of humility, of offences, of grace towards sinners, of being reconciled. This view, however, rests simply on conjecture as to the contents of that conversation between the disciples. It is also possible that St Matthew, according to his custom, has again assembled together portions of different discourses relating to kindred topics.¹ The tie which in this chapter connects the different portions, is the endeavour to depict the true character of the children of God in the words of Christ. Much had already occurred which might be viewed as attributing to the disciples something of outward importance; especially might Christ's very address to Peter as to the temple-

¹ Compare here the remarks on Matt. xiv. 1, and the introductory observations to chap. xiv. 1
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taxes (Matt. xvii. 25), be so misunderstood. Against this error St Matthew now places a representation of the inner spiritual nature of discipleship as standing in direct contradiction to an earthly domination. Yet Christ does not deny that there is a difference in the places which shall be occupied in the future kingdom of God; he merely sets forth that frame of mind by which all abuse of this truth is obviated.

Ver. 1. Most graphically does Mark ix. 33, sq. again depict the scene. The conversation as to who should be the greatest had taken place by the way. In the house our Lord questions the disciples on it, and they, conscious of guilt, are silent, whereupon, by a symbolic act, He sets clearly before their view the nature of God's kingdom. First, however, it is to be carefully marked here, that the Saviour by no means denies that the apostles possess special dignity in the kingdom of God; which indeed he could not do, for it is promised them by himself (comp. on Matt. xix. 28). Further, he does not deny that there is a distinction between his different disciples, for in the same way he gave ground for making that distinction (see on Matt. xvii. 1). Thus the error of the disciples did not consist in believing that a difference exists among the members of the kingdom, or in cherishing the consciousness that God had called them to something great, but in this, that they viewed their calling in a worldly, earthly light, and regarded supremacy in the kingdom of God as resembling supremacy in an earthly kingdom. The very idea of a kingdom, it is true, presupposes necessarily government and subordination; but in the kingdom of God the government is specifically different from earthly rule. This distinction the Saviour here develops, inasmuch as, according to Mark ix. 35, he represents the πρωτος in the kingdom of God as the ἰσχατος, the κυριος as the διάκονος τῶν. (Comp. on Matt. xx. 28). Thus in the Divine kingdom the power of self-sacrificing, devoted, self-abasing love (which, in the Saviour himself, is seen in its glorious perfection), is the one turning-point on which all pre-eminence depends; while conversely, in the world, he who rules is wont to make use of the governed simply for himself, his own benefit, his reputation and glory. The fleshly minds of the disciples therefore, mistaking the idea of God's kingdom, had induced them in the future mani-

1 So we find it in Clemens Alex. quis dives salvetur, chap. 21.
festation of Christ's glory to look for the gratification of selfish hopes. These the Lord destroys, inasmuch as he intimates that only he who has divested himself of all self-seeking, and who lives in pure love and lowly self-renunciation, shall there reign, or exert commanding influence. (The words here τοῖς μαθηταῖς τοῖς clearly express the idea that all the disciples were on a level in this respect that they, as standing immediately around the Lord, were called alike to exercise the most important influence in the kingdom of God—only on this point did they dispute as to who among themselves should be the greater, the more influential. The occurrence related at Matt. xvii. 1, might easily occasion such reflections.)

Ver. 2–4. Very naturally, according to the account of St Matthew, is there subjoined here the symbolic act of Jesus in placing a child, (παιδίον is not παις a slave or servant, but with reference to regeneration a child, one who is new-born) in the midst of them, and in him setting forth the character of those who should have influence in the kingdom of God. That it is not the character of this individual child that he here speaks of (according to the legend it was the martyr Ignatius), is shewn at once by the immediately following words γινεσθε ὡς τὰ παιδία. Jesus merely brings forward in this individual child the general character of children, as a model for the members of the kingdom of God. For, although the general sinfulness of human nature certainly shews itself at once in children, yet does humility and an unassuming disposition peculiarly distinguish the child's nature; the king's son is not ashamed to play with the son of a beggar. This unassuming disposition is here the point of comparison. Certainly it is exercised by children unconsciously, while on the part of believers it is to be deliberately cherished. The comparison therefore does not on all points hold good, which it could not possibly do, for this reason, that nothing in the earthly sphere could be found perfectly analogous to the spiritual man who is the subject of the comparison. Into such an unassuming frame does the Lord now exhort that the disciples turn their minds (στρέψατε to change their spiritual tendency, instead of walking on high they must go forward in lowliness), then would they find entrance to the heavenly kingdom. The passage is thus wholly parallel to the important verse, John iii. 3, for the γινεσθε ὡς παιδίον is nothing else than the new birth, in which alone such an unassuming child-like feeling can be im-
planted. By the resolutions and efforts of the natural man it cannot be produced. As an evidence of this child-like feeling Christ brings prominently forward the ταπινοῦν ἴαυτόν (in opposition to the ἵψον ἴαυτόν); as the child, in whatever circumstances placed, will unassumingly be content with a lowly position, so should also the new-born saint, instead of climbing to high stations, step down to the secure valley of humility. The expression ταπινοῦν ἴαυτόν retains here its widest meaning, inasmuch as even in the regenerate, constant and positive effort is needful to keep down the old man as the source of pride. The term ταπινοῦν may therefore be viewed as a special and stronger expression for becoming a child, and the μείζων ἵναι εἰς τῇ βασι. may be regarded as contrasted with the simple εἰς ἱδησθαι εἰς βασι.

Ver. 5. St Matthew, who alone had given the preceding verses, shews himself here again exceedingly accurate in the setting forth of our Lord’s discourses. According to St Mark and St Luke, who do not give these verses, it is not so easy to understand the presenting of the child, nay, it acquires with them a different meaning. They both speak directly of the receiving of the child, as to which also St Mark (ix. 36), can even add ἵνα γαγαλάξῃς ἰδίᾳ, an act which, in the first instance, would not agree with the representation of St Matthew; for since, according to him, the child was simply a symbol of humility, it must in these circumstances have been a meaningless act to embrace him. (In Luke ii. 28, the term ἵνα γαγαλάξῃς = δικαίωσις εἰς ἱδησθαι refers to little children, in whom alone the character of humility is purely developed. The verb προσκαλίσωσις at Matt. xviii. 2, does not contradict this; it is only necessary that we do not understand it exactly as meaning sucklings.) This, however, agrees well with the connexion as given in St Mark and St Luke, according to which the παιδίον expresses mainly the idea of a beloved, a dear one. But it may be asked here, how shall we trace the connecting links of thought; for if St Matthew, in the first instance, gives another application to the setting forth of the child, he goes on at ver. 5 to use the term δικαίωσις, and follows this up at ver. 6 by the opposite of δικαίωσις, so that from this agreement of the three Evangelists, we must hold that these words were spoken on the occasion referred to. It certainly seems from the connexion here, most natural to consider the δικαίωσις as an act of unassuming self-humbling love so that it connects itself with the declaration
But with this view, the last clause at Luke ix. 48, ὁ μικρότερος ἐν πάσιν ὑμῖν τ. ἀ. little harmonizes, for it is there apparent that the disciples are themselves the μικροί who are to be received, not the recipients. (Compare also Mark ix. 41, from which this plainly follows.) Accordingly the connection may better be understood in this way. Be ye eager to become lowly, little-noticed as this child, for the little ones (the regenerate who have the true child’s feeling) are very dear and precious to the Lord, so that he regards what is done to them as done to himself. According to this chain of ideas, then, that which St Matthew relates must be held as having previously occurred; for it is this which contains the ground of Christ's attachment to them. The expression σωζόν = μικροὶ ver. 10, is then the symbol of the regenerate. (See on Matt. x. 42.) The only thing still remaining obscure is how the expression ἐν σωζόν δίχασα, ἰμι δίχασα should precisely in this discourse be used to denote God's fatherly love for his spiritual children. The simplest explanation is, that this description of it is occasioned by the preceding admonition (set forth clearly by Matt.) to enter into the kingdom of God. With this, as something future, stands closely connected the δίχασα, as that which is present, so that the meaning is —"He who thus humbles himself in true lowliness, is great in the kingdom of God; may even already amidst those connexions with the world in which the regenerate appear as sufferers, they are so precious to the Lord that he holds what is done to them as done to himself." (as to the thought itself, compare Matt. x. 40, sqq. where it already occurred in another connexion.)

In St Mark (ix. 38—41), and St Luke (ix. 49, 50), there follows here a question by St John with the answer of Jesus, which St Matthew has omitted, as not belonging to the main scope of the discourse, but as rather interrupting it. The shortness with which St Luke touches this intervening question of St John, would have left many things obscure, if the more exact account of St Mark had not enabled us to trace the connexion. For the preceding words of Jesus, in which he speaks of the δίχασα of the little ones, plainly refer to the relation in which the disciples stood to those around them. St John, who may not have been able to penetrate fully into the meaning of our Lord’s words, brings forward a circumstance which had perhaps occurred at the time, and had particularly struck himself, and he lays it before the Saviour.
Some one, it would appear, who doubtless had seen our Lord’s miracles, or those of the apostles, had himself made the attempt to heal in the name of Jesus. The disciples, in their selfish exclusiveness, saw in this an infringement on their spiritual jurisdiction, and inasmuch as he did not habitually attach himself to the company of Jesus, had interdicted him. This the Saviour reproves, and refers his disciples to that comprehensive love and humility of the true ἰσθια τοῦ Ἑσυ, who child-like receive and acknowledge all that is akin to themselves, under whatever form they find it. The individual referred to is thus viewed as one befriended by the benevolent Saviour of men, and represented to the disciples as one from whom they might expect support, it being at the same time implied that he would not be left without a blessing. Thus understood, then, this incident takes its place most fittingly in the context; it is, as it were, an example of how the Lord does good to those who favour his disciples, even when these latter cannot understand a right the proofs of love. The Gnome (the sententious phrase) in which Jesus expresses the doctrine which he wished on this occasion to teach his disciples, ἐς εἰς ἵνα καθ’ ἡμῶν ἰσθια ἡμῶν ἵνα, is parallel to the statement at Matt. xii. 30, ἐ μὴ ἐν μετ’ ἐμοὶ καὶ ἐμοὺ ἵνα, which is found also at Luke xi. 23. Both are equally true of different persons and grades of vocation. He whose calling is to a sphere of spiritual labour, is already against the Lord and his cause, if he do not positively further them; he whose vocation is of a lower grade, who may be placed in a state of spiritual dependence on others, (as the people were ruled by the Pharisees), is already in favour of God’s cause, if he keep himself free from the generally prevailing hostile influences, and so continue susceptible of the divine. It must, however, ever remain a singular circumstance, that, even in Christ’s own times, persons should have used his name for the working of miracles without attaching themselves to his circle; it is a proof of the general notice which the works of Jesus had attracted. At a later period, we find, in the history of Simon Magus (Acts viii.) and the seven sons of Sceva (xix. 13, sq.) something of the same kind. If, however, the

1 A narrative precisely similar is recorded at Numbers xi. 27, sq. When Eldad and Medad prophesied in the camp, Joshua said to Moses, “My lord Moses, forbid them.” But Moses replies, “Enviest thou for my sake? would God all the Lord’s people prophesied, and that the Lord would put his Spirit upon them!”
apostles judge of these men in a way wholly different from what the Saviour does here, the cause of the difference must assuredly be sought in the motive from which such a use of the name of Jesus proceeded. It might, as in the case of the person here mentioned, flow from faith—perhaps an unconscious faith—in Christ's heavenly power, and was therefore to be borne with, (although the declarations of Jesus respecting him certainly do not exclude the necessity of his being further instructed, and made to know that the special object of Christ's coming was not to impart the gift of working miracles, but to change the human heart); but on the other hand it might proceed from motives wholly impure, as with the sons of Sceva, and must in that case be unconditionally resisted. For, these men used the name of Jesus as a peculiarly powerful form of adjuration, just as they would other formulae of their art, for their selfish objects. Thus, it is not the outward act itself, but rather the feeling from which it flows, that determines its being admissible or not.

Ver. 6. The idea which follows of the σκάνδαλον ἐν τῶν μικρῶν, connects itself most appropriately with the ἔχθροι of ver. 5. He merely expresses the opposite thought, so that the sense of these words is, "the little ones are so precious to the Lord, that whatever good is done them he looks on as done to himself, and rewards it; whatever evil is inflicted on them, he most indignantly punishes." The peculiar form, however, in which this thought is brought out by St Matthew, and more especially by St Mark, does not seem to suit the context; one does not see in what connexion it stands with the strife among the apostles. This might render it probable that there are inserted here portions of discourses originally spoken in another connection. (Comp. on Matt. v. 29, 30, where something similar occurs). But at Matt. xviii. 10, 14, we again find marked references to the antecedent μικροῖ, and at Mark ix. 50, also the clause εἰρηνεύετε ἐν ἀλληλοίς again points back to the strife among the disciples, from which the discourse took its rise. We must then hold it proved that these words respecting the σκάνδαλον really stand connected with the rest of the discourse. For, even granting that these words had originally been spoken in other circumstances by the Lord, this much is clear, that both evangelists meant here to place them in a fitting connexion. It only remains, then, that we regard the sense of μικροῖ as modified in such a way that the expression here forms the
counterpart of μίγας. Usually the New Testament employs the term μιχτες to denote believers, the regenerate in general (see more fully on this point at Matt. x. 42,) but again we also find a distinction drawn between the great and the small in the kingdom of God, (see at Matt. xi. 11, and v. 19). Applying this distinction here, the connexion of the passage admits of being taken in this way. The strife among the disciples as to their place in the kingdom of God might have given offence to the other believers, so that they might have been perplexed as to whether the truth dwelt within that circle where such things could occur. This led the Lord to declare his mind as to the guilt of those who gave offence, even to the weakest among the believers. The seventh verse, in Matt. however, seems to be in opposition to this view of the connexion, for the σκάνδαλα are there ascribed to the πλοῦς. In reference to this, however, we must observe, that the disciples, in so far as they gave offence to believers, did themselves belong to the πλοῦς; and thus the Saviour here passes over from the particular to the general, just as at Matt. xvi. 23, he traces Peter's declaration at once to the origin of evil from whose influence he was not yet wholly free. With this, also, ver. 8 sq. well agrees, where he is speaking of ιων ἡ σκάνδαλις, man being thus viewed as presenting an inward conflict between the New and the Old in his heart.

As to the meaning of σκάνδαλον, the old form of the word σκανδάλητον properly denotes a trap for ensnaring animals, then in general, a noose, a snare, the laying of nets. In the New Testament it is transferred to spiritual things, and under σκάνδαλον everything is included which can hinder the development of spiritual life, or deter men from faith in the Divine = πτάκομαι, in Hebrew נָעַשׂ, a cord, a noose, or παρέξω, offence. (On this account also in the New Testament, γίνεται, έτι αντί stand connected with σκάνδαλον, see Rom. xi. 9). The verb σκανδάλιζω consequently means, to give offence, to prepare spiritual obstruction, σκανδαλίζομαι, to take offence. There is a peculiarity, however, in the meaning of σκανδαλίζω in ver. 8 of this passage, according to which the σκανδαλίζω and the σκανδαλίζομαι appear as united in the same individual. This internal conflict in man himself is to be explained, as has been already said, from regeneration, through means of which that new man is made alive who wrestles with the old man and struggles for the victory. The greatness of the
guilt involved in giving spiritual offence, or in deterring the little ones from a life of faith, is depicted by the Saviour in a form which addresses itself to the senses, inasmuch as he represents the sin of these delinquencies as greater than those crimes on which the heaviest political punishment is inflicted. (The συμφέρει ἀυτῷ expresses a stronger, namely, a spiritual and eternal punishment.

—The sinking into the sea was not practised among the Jews, but it certainly was in use among other nations. See, for example, Sueton. August. c. 68. Instead of the less usual expression μύλος, ὅνυχας in St Matthew and St Luke, St Mark has λίθος μυλικός. Μύλος = μύλη denotes properly the mill itself, and in a secondary sense the mill-stone. The word ὅνυχας is commonly used of the lower mill-stone, which does not move. The adjective form, ὅνυχας, is not in use as applied to it. The words μύλος ὅνυχας therefore cannot well mean the lower and heavier mill-stone. We do better to continue taking it in the sense of set in motion by asses, as expressing the size of the stone. The ass mill-stone is contrasted with the stone of a mill driven by the hand of man.)

Ver. 7. The same thought again meets us at Luke xvii. 1, where we shall more closely consider it. Here it stands only in an incidental form, and unconnected with the rest of the discourse. (Κλαμος the counterpart of βασ. τ. θ. See in regard to it what is said more at length in the exposition of John i. 9).

Ver. 8, 9. After speaking of offence given to others, Jesus passes on to that inward offence which he who is born again may give to himself. The general meaning of the words lies clear to our view. The cutting off hand and foot, the plucking out of the eye, is intended to denote the denying ourselves to what is dearest and most indispensable to the outward life, when through those sinful influences which act from without, it endangers the spiritual life. But here, as at Matt. Ver. 29, 30, a difficulty is raised by the additional clause καλὸν ἵστη τοίς ὑπὸ ἒσομαι τὶς ἡ τῆς χων (σε. αἰῶνον) χωλὴν, κυλὴν μονόθελημον.¹ For, to regard this as a mere embellishment, which has no meaning of its own, is what I cannot consent to. The sense of the whole comparison rather seems to be this. The cutting off of hand or foot, can, as is self-evident, be only taken as denoting something spiritual, since the

¹ Compare as to μονόθελημον Lobeck’s Phrynichus, p. 136. The pure Greek form is ἵστηθος.
outward act were meaningless (compare on Matt. xix. 12), unless the inward root of sin were destroyed. Hand, foot, eye, here appear to be used by the Saviour to denote mental powers and dispositions, and he counsels their restraint, their non-development, if a man find himself by their cultivation, withdrawn from advancing the highest principle of life. The every-sided development of all our faculties, the inferior, as well as the more elevated, is certainly to be regarded as the highest attainment, yet he who finds by experience that he cannot cultivate certain faculties,—the artistic for example,—without injury to his holiest feelings, must renounce their cultivation, and make it his first business, by pains-taking fidelity, to preserve entire the innermost life of his soul, that higher life imparted to him by Christ, and which, by the dividing and distracting of his thoughts, might easily be lost; nor must it give him any disturbance if some subordinate faculty be thus wholly sacrificed by him. Assuredly, however, we must add, that this loss is only in appearance, for, in the development of man’s higher life, everything of a subordinate kind which he had sacrificed, is again restored with increase of power. But in the first instance, he has the real experience of such a sacrifice, and it still remains true that it is a more elevated and better thing to succeed in learning how to cultivate even the lower faculties in harmony with the higher life. Only, where that cannot be, man ought to choose the safer course. St Mark gives, moreover, a very lengthened version of this discourse, without, however, adding anything to the thought. The simple ποιεῖς αἰώνοις of St Matthew is in St Mark paraphrased by γίνεσθαι, ποιεῖς ἀσκητὸν ὅτου ἐκκαλεῖς αὐτὸν ὡς τίμιον καὶ τὸ ποιεῖς ὡς κατανυστάτων. The words are taken from Isaiah lxxvi. 24, whence they had already been quoted at Sir. vii. 19; Judith xvi. 21. They depict the αὐτοῦ by imagery taken from death and putrefaction, inasmuch as ἡ αἰώνιος is contrasted with Ἰαννίας αἰώνοις. (See as to ποιεῖς αἰώνοις the remarks on Matt. xii. 32).

1 Thus also had Origen already spoken (Comm. in Matt. Tom. xiii. ed. de la Rue, vol iii. 603). When Tholuck remarks (Comm. on Sermon on the Mount, p. 234,) in opposition to this that my exposition bears a modern character, inasmuch as the distinction of the various mental faculties belongs to modern metaphysical philosophy—his objection appears to me ill-founded, for men have always perceived the distinction between different powers of mind. What people ever wholly confounded memory with reason—the fancy with the will?
The expression σωλήν = πυὲς denotes properly the worm that devours the dead body (Ps. xxi. 7; Sir. x. 13); here standing in parallelism with πυὲς, it must be understood as inflicting pain. The seeming tautology in the passage τὸ πυὲς ἀληθῶς δουλεύειν τὸ πυὲς οὐ σώματα, disappears when we supply αὐθεντικοῦ to the πυὲς as in the case of the antecedent σωλήν, which stands so placed also in Isaiah. For in that case the first expression is a general description of the place of punishment, the second, the special infliction of its agonies on these guilty ones.

The remark is interesting which stands at the conclusion of these words in Mark, ver. 49, 50, τὰς γὰς πυὲς ἀληθῶς καὶ πᾶσα ζωὴ ἀληθῶς. This thought closes very appropriately the foregoing discourse, for it concentrates into one general principle, as it were, what had previously been set forth. The πᾶς πυὲς ἀληθῶς neither refers simply to the πυὲς ἀληθῶς, nor merely to the exhortation to self-denial, but it includes both, so that the πᾶς is to be understood in a literal sense as denoting the whole human race. The sense of the expression therefore is this, because of the general sinfulness of the race, every individual must be salted with fire, either on the one hand, by his entering of his own free will on a course of self-denial and earnest purifica-

on his iniquities, or on the other hand, by his being carried against his will away to the place of punishment. The πυὲς appears here first as the cleansing, purifying element (so it often does, for example, Malachi iii. 2; Sir. ii. 5.), and then, as that which inflicts anguish. But, for him who submits in earnest to the pain which is necessarily associated with the overcome of sin, it works beneficially. (1 Pet. iv. 1). The term ἀληθῶς is well chosen to express the effect of fire, first, because of the succeeding quotation, in which salt is spoken of, and next, however, because it is in the highest degree an apt description of fire, for the operation of salt is closely allied to that of fire. From this it is, that according to the deep and true system of Scripture symbols, salt derives its peculiar meaning, especially as applied to sacrifices. According to Lev. ii. 13, all sacrifices must be seasoned with salt. That passage is here referred to in such a way that one might supply the words ὡς γίγνεται. The Old Testament practice, therefore, of seasoning sacrifices with salt, is here regarded by our Lord in its deeper meaning. As every sacrifice is on the part of him who offers it, a type of his inwardly devot-
ing himself with all that he is and has to the eternal source of his being, so the salt was intended to shew that such a sacrifice could never be well-pleasing to God without the pain of self-denial, and the quickening influences of the Fire-Spirit from on high. The fire-baptism (Matt. iii. 11) is just this act of purification in the saints through the salt of self-denial, and even the Son of God himself submitted to it, though he was sinless, in order that he might in the fire of suffering, perfect and glorify the human nature which he had assumed. According to this view then the grammatical connection of the clauses must be so explained that the expression καὶ σᾶς δυσὶν ἄλιπτος τῶν which accompanies it, but must be taken as presenting a visible type of the spiritual transaction which the former words describe. It is not necessary, however, on this account to give to the καὶ the meaning of sicuti, quem-admodum; we have only to supply διὰ τοῦτο, so that the sense should be, "and for this reason (as it stands written) must every sacrifice be salted with salt." We have, therefore, in this passage, an authoritative explanation of the meaning of a sacrifice, and of what was implied in the rite, the ceremony of presenting them to the Lord sprinkled with salt. ¹ Among the manifold other explanations of this passage, we are specially bound to reject as contrary to the use of the language, that which takes ἀλλήλοια = Ῥιπτερα in the sense of being annihilated referring to Is. li. 6. For in the latter passage the word Ῥιπτερα has a meaning wholly unconnected with the term Ῥιπτερα salt. (Compare Gesen. in Lex. sub. voc.) Certainly the connection of ver. 50 with the preceding context is difficult. For the discourse makes a transition to the nature of salt in general, and brings forward the circumstance that if it have lost its strength there is no means by which it may be regained. The same thought occurred at Matt. v. 13; Luke xiv. 34; but in such a connection that the disciples are themselves called the ἀλλήλοια ἁτις γην in so far, namely, as they are the seasoning, quickening element, acting

¹ Hamann has already said in allusion to this passage, "the anxiety which prevails in the world is perhaps the only proof of our heterogeneous constitution. For were nothing wanting to us we should act as the heathen, and the transcendental philosophers who know nothing of God, and are enamoured of lovely nature. This impertinent disquietude, this holy hypochondria, is the fire by which we are salted sacrifices." (Works, Part vi. p. 194.)
on mankind. Here the import of the thoughts is somewhat modified, but not essentially changed. For, in the disciples themselves, a distinction is drawn between the natural life by which they were allied to the κόσμος (Compare Matt. xviii. 17), and the heavenly higher principle of life which animated them. It is here enjoined on them to preserve this last, and so to pervade with salt from heaven, step by step, all their faculties and dispositions of mind. In the passage, Matt. v. 13, they are called ἀλας τῆς γῆς in so far as they, compared with the great mass of men, were prevailingly filled with the power of heavenly fire. In both passages, however, here as well as at Matt. v. 13, man's own faithfulness is represented as called for to guard the salt of the Spirit. To call forth that higher life, is what man cannot do, it is a pure gift of grace, but he can stifle it, or he can protect it as a mother can secure the child that is under her heart, to a certain extent, from harm and mischance, though she has not the power of calling it into existence. In this exhortation, therefore, ἐχθρί in ιεροῦ ἀλας there lies an admonition to earnestness in self-denial and perseverance, as the means by which the gift bestowed may be preserved. And this admonition is sharpened by recalling to their minds the impossibility of seasoning salt which lost its powers (ἐν τίνι ἄνω ἄρτους). The closing words καὶ ἐγνώσται ἐν ἀλλήλων point back to the commencement of the discourse at Mark ix. 33. Perhaps the expression ἀλας ἐχθρί is intended to form a contrast to the ἐγνώσται. The former seems to describe a sharp, biting mode of action, the latter, one that is mild and soft; both are to be conjoined in the regenerate; in regard to the ungodliness that is in the world he must reprove and rebuke, and in so far he must, like Christ himself, (Matt. x. 34), bring in strife, but in regard to all that is congenial and kindred in the children of God, gentleness must prevail. As therefore salt cannot season salt, but only that which is unsalted, so the living energy of the children of God should not be expended in contests among themselves, but devoted to the awakening of life in the world. The closeness with which the last verses in Mark connect themselves both with the preceding context and with the commencement of the whole discourse, makes it to my mind very unlikely that they had originally stood in any other connection, and here, therefore, we have an instance in which St
Mark also contributes to the train of thought something peculiarly his own.

Ver. 10.—While hitherto St Matthew has had St Mark to give a parallel account, he is left now to recount the discourse alone down to the end of the chapter. The connection of thought between the first clause and the preceding context is simple, inasmuch as the καταφρονίας ver. 10 refers back to the σκανδαλίζων of ver 6. It is not necessary to remark, that in this case also the μικροί are the regenerate, and consequently anything like a special connection between angels and children, we are unable here to discover. The ground is a peculiar one of which our Lord here avails himself to enforce the exhortation against despising the little ones. He brings forward their preciousness in the view of his Father in heaven, (who is also their Father, for believers bear within them the life of Christ, see ver. 5), in the remark which he makes, “their angels continually see God’s face.” Here then in the first place as respects the words βλέπει τό πέπλωμα τοῦ πατέρας, this expression is by no means to be reduced to a mere piece of oriental phraseology, it rather describes simply the reality of the existing relationship. The degree of their nearness to God marks the degree of holiness in their nature, and the meaning, therefore, designed to be conveyed is this, that the regenerate, (even the most insignificant members of the kingdom of God) as being the representatives of the highest holiness on earth are also themselves, in the heavenly world (in which all the phenomena exhibited on earth have their root) represented by the holiest beings. Any existing analogies to this, which political arrangements may exhibit, are merely a more or less intentional imitation of the original relationship. (Compare 1 Kings: 8; Esther i. 14; Jerem. lii. 25). The idea of angels who take their stand in immediate proximity to the Father often meets us amidst the teachings of Scripture, (Dan. vii. 10; Rev. i. 4; iv. 4) but in no passage elsewhere do we find that these angels particularly are placed in such a connection with believers as is here indicated by the words ἀγγελοὶ αἰών. Although, however, in a certain sense this passage stands alone, and is also not peculiarly of a didactic character, yet must we not conceive that it formed any accommodation to Jewish myths. There was not the slightest occasion to bring forward this idea here unless it had possessed an inter-
nal truth. That every individual had his angel, according to the
sense in which the idea is taken by the fathers of the Church,
(Compare Schmidt de Angelis tutelaribus in Illgen’s Denkschrift,
Leipsig 1817) this passage does not expressly state. In Daniel,
angels are spoken of as the representatives of whole nations, (x.
20; xii. 1.) and according to this we may conceive that one angel
represents many persons. Yet on the other hand, Acts xii. 15
countenances the idea that there is a representation of individuals.
In any case the passage contains something obscure, for there are
no others by comparison with which light may be cast on it.
Perhaps in regard to these angels we may be reminded of the
pre-existent ideal of man himself, so that the angels would cor-
respond to the fervers of Zoroaster. Often is the angelic world
moreover viewed in Scripture as standing connected with be-
lievers, (Ps. xxxiv. 8; Ps. xci. 11; Heb. i. 14) while the de-
velopment of the church appears as the central point of the whole,
(1 Peter i. 12).

Ver. 11–14. In some MSS. (B. L and others) verse 11 is
wanting; it might have been taken from Luke xix. 10, where
he has also the following verses in connection with kindred to-
pics. But first, it is improbable that this verse from a passage of
St Luke’s gospel, and that assuredly not parallel, should have
been thrust in here; and in the next place, it agrees too closely
with St Matthew’s context to prevent our believing this much, at
least, that St Matthew had himself inserted it in this passage, even
though we must certainly leave it matter of doubt whether the
words may have been spoken originally in the precise connection
in which we find them here. For the ἦς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου stands be-
side the ἄγγελοι as one exalted above them, and the fact that the
μικροί are the object of the mission of the Son of man, is a new
proof of their preciousness in the sight of God. The term ἀνθρώ-
πος plainly points already to the following parable of the lost
sheep, whose fuller exposition will find a place at Luke chap xv.
Here I only observe with reference to its connection with the
rest of the discourse, that the contrast between the strayed sheep
and the ninety-nine which did not stray, would stand wholly
isolated, unless, as was remarked above, we keep fast hold of the
distinction between the μικροί and the μεγάς which runs through

1 Meyer gives an extract from this treatise in the Blatt. f. hoh. Wahrheit, Th. i. 8.
163. sq.
the discourse. The parable thus acquires in this passage a modified sense foreign to it in St Luke, where it is rather employed to represent the δίκαιος and the ἄδικος in their relation to Divine grace.

Ver. 15–17. It was already mentioned in the general remarks on this chapter, that the following thoughts on forgiveness may also belong to the discourse as integral parts of it, if we assume that the strife among the disciples had led to offences, that St Peter had been the person offended, and on this very account, therefore, the one exhorted to forgiveness. But although the following parable (ver. 22–35,) certainly agrees very well with this supposition, yet to my mind it is rendered improbable by the connection of the ideas in ver. 18, 19, with the rest of the discourse. Had the disciples been themselves both the offenders and the offended, these verses would hardly have formed part of the exhortation, for they are better fitted to lift up the disciples than to humble them. I can more easily suppose that St Matthew, as his manner is, has conjoined kindred elements with the thoughts that form the basis of the discourse. In this instance he wished to depict the character of the children of the kingdom in their humility and meekness. After having, in what goes before, warned believers against offending weaker brethren, the discourse brings to view the opposite point of the contrast, and describes how a believer should conduct himself if injury be inflicted upon him, (ἵνα ὁ ἀδελφός σου ἀμαρτήσῃ εἰς σὲ) and specially if it be done by a fellow believer (ἀδελφός is here a brother Christian, a member of the kingdom of God). This instruction, however, is conceived in terms so general, that it at once stands forth as a precept for the whole church, and it rests on the spiritual character of the disciples of Jesus and the everlasting presence of Christ in the midst of his church. This makes it improbable in the highest degree that these words were occasioned by a strife among the disciples themselves, otherwise ver. 18 must be held as meaning "if one of you exclude another from the communion of God's kingdom, that exclusion is held as effectual in the sight of God," an idea that is obviously untenable. The disciples were not to exclude one another; but they are here viewed as the real and the pure germ of the church, which no power of evil should overcome; but if room was left for their being sinned against by their brethren less enlightened than themselves by Christian principle, they must in that case act on
the rule here laid down. Thus the βασιλ. τ. ουρ. (ver. 23,) by no means appears in this passage as a communion absolutely perfect, (compare on Matth. xiii. 47,) but as one in which the good exerts a predominating influence, repressing consequently, and restraining the evil; so that this passage once more plainly shews that the Saviour intended to found an external church in which, as a kernel in its shell, the ideal kingdom of God should be developed. The disciples are set forth as representatives of this kernel of God's kingdom; to them is entrusted the guiding and ruling of this community, they are the αλας, and have to care for the preservation of the whole body in the strength of Him who is unceasingly amongst them. If they (through unfaithfulness) were to lose their power, the kingdom of God would fall to pieces; the sin even of others should be repressed by them. It must, however, here again be carefully observed, that these injunctions of the Saviour do not apply to the form of the outward church at all times, (Compare as to this on Matt. v. 39, sq.) but are valid only in reference to true believers. For, the external church, since the fourth century, exists in an Old Testament form, and to persons who stand wholly on the legal footing, such distinctions as the above have no meaning; against the injuries of the world a Christian has the protection of the magistrates, and he errs if he believes that owing to this ordinance of Jesus he may not call in their aid.¹ This admonition at every step, first apart, then before certain witnesses, and finally in presence of the church, presupposes a state of mind not hardened against the power of the truth, even where no threat is used to enforce it. The complete carrying out of it would overset the order of civil society, as completely as if each man were to give his coat to any one who had demanded of him his cloak. For the unawakened unconverted man it is wisdom to act on God's precept, "Eye for eye, tooth for tooth," (Matt. v. 22.) Fritzsche's remark (on the passage) is most correct, that it is better to place the interpunctuation after ἀντών than after μόνον. The phrase μεταξύ σου καὶ σου ἀντών is perfectly sufficient by itself, and the μόνον τά σου ἁξιόν is fittingly conjoined into a distinct clause, for thus the idea of individuality stands here in contrast to the plurality subsequently mentioned. The leading principle of the whole line of conduct

¹ In this way must 1 Cor. vi. 1 be understood, in the exposition of which further details will be given.
prescribed is mildness, long-suffering, and an earnest endeavour to give ascendancy to the Divine in the mind of a brother. The dialogue, therefore, does not deal merely with the isolated fact of the offence given, but refers to the whole state of the offender's soul from which that act proceeded. The point it concerned them to aim at, was to change this frame of mind, and to this reference is made by the term κρατάων scil. εἰς τοῦτο αἰώνον. Every ἀμαρτάων, especially against a brother, is an act of tolerance to the dominion of the sinful principle, (1 John iii. 8,) and this would lead to the ἀπάλλαξι of the brother. When, therefore, any one, by the gentle power of love, wins a brother for their kingdom, he κρατάων = σῶτηρ ἄντον by the power, as is self-evident, of Christ working in him. Love, after being once repulsed, should put more strength into a renewed effort, the admonition is made more impressive and solemn by the presence of others. The Saviour here refers to Deut. xix. 15. (The ἀμαρτάω corresponds here to the Hebrew ἄμαρτα in the sense of causā, a cause in law; σῶτηρ is put for oral testimony, in which the deponent is himself produced in evidence.) He here applies this Mosaic ordinance in an elevated form, suited to the higher circumstances in which it is used. For it is not evidence against an erring brother that in the first instance is here spoken of, but simply an impressive mode of working on this mind. If this produced no impression on him, then the presence of witnesses certainly took the form of evidence against him, inasmuch as his case was laid before the whole church. This appears as the final attempt to call forth the influence of a Christian spirit in the brother who had erred and who clung to his error. The ἰκανονία here, like ἡ τιμία, is the assemblage of the whole believers in one place, to which assembly the separate individual belonged as a member. If he also refuse to follow this most emphatic rebuke, then the only means of help, as well as the sole punishment, is to exclude him from the community. Where the higher life has left a soul, the withdrawal of fellowship with kindred minds is often the surest means of rousing its slumbering aspirations. (The expressions and τελώνιον denote that sphere of life generally, which is outlying beyond the Christian circle.)

Ver. 18.—As to the thought contained in this verse, compare on ver. 16, 17. Here the only question is, in what way the
Evangelist wishes the words to be understood, as connected with the context. Plainly, the ἰματια must be held parallel with the ἰκκλησία of the foregoing verse, so that the sure and binding nature of the church's decision is here intended to be affirmed. "What in such a case the church ordains, is no mere human decision, but inasmuch as the Divine is here on earth manifested in the church, the conclusion at which the church arrives takes effect in a higher sense."

Ver. 19, 20.—The connection of the following verses with the preceding is simply this: the spiritual power of the church to bind and to loose depends on the operation of the heavenly Father in it; that operation, however, is not dependent on the extent of the congregation, or on the place (one might add, according to Matt. xxviii. 20, on the time); God in Christ is universally present in His church. (The πάντα ἰματια gives no incongruous meaning; the authority of manuscripts favours the omission of the ἰματια.) The ἰκκλησία is here contemplated in the narrowest form in which it appears (δύο ἂν τυρνης); an individual can form no communion, but any plurality of persons who bear within them the same principle of higher life, constitutes a κοινωνία τοῦ πνεύματος (1 John i. 3), and consequently a church. From the κοινωνία, therefore, may proceed a συμφωνία (an harmonious agreement of will for some special end,) and this the Father hears. To the expression ἐξ ὑπὸς γῆς corresponds the παντὶς ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, so that the church appears as united to the Father by the πνεύμα, and the latter carries into effect the wishes of the former. The general expression, περὶ παντὸς πνεύματος, is usually so restricted, that the meaning is held to be—everything fitted to advance the welfare of the church, or that belongs to the sphere of Christian life. This is certainly correct, in thus far, that things spiritual form the sole object of a believer's labours, an object in which for him everything else terminates, in so far as it is in itself good. But just because every thing does so terminate, must the πάν πνεύμα be taken in a literal sense, inasmuch as every thing, in so far as it stands connected with the wants of the church, may form the object of a believer's prayers. The possibility of abusing this command, or rather, this high permission, given by the Saviour to his own people, is excluded by the fact, that it is only the Spirit of the Father in Christ Jesus him-
self who creates and calls forth the ἡμερία τοῦ πνεύματος with the thence arising συμφωνία, and the prayer in the peculiar case. When, then, all this does not really exist, or is set forth in mere deceptive show, the words of the Lord find no application; but wherever it in reality is found, there his words are eternally true. It is wholly independent of time and place; wheresoever (ὡς scil τότε,) the believers may be assembled together if they meet in the name of Jesus (and pray in His name,) there the Lord is in the midst of them.¹ (And, according to Matt. xxviii. 20, the time is also of no importance, εἰδὼς μεθ' ἡμῶν εἰμὶ σάκες τὰς ἡμέρας.) What defines the thought in these words is the expression εἰς τὸ ἵματά. (The εἰς here is not to be confounded with ἐν. In the formula εἰς τὸ ἵματά, the name is, as it were, the point of union, so that it corresponds to the German auf seinem Namen, upon his name. In the formula ἐν ὑμεῖς, the name is the uniting power by means of which the conjunction is conceived of as effected and maintained. Compare on Matt. xxviii. 19). Ὁμωμεν, however, (= εἰς) (compare on Luke i. 35,) denotes the person, the Being himself, not indeed as incapable of being known, or as actually unknown, but as manifested. The assembling, then, in the name of Jesus, and the praying in his name, presupposes the life of the spirit of Jesus as already existing in those so meeting together. It is no isolated act which every one in all circumstances is able, by the self-determining power of his own mind, to do; it requires rather as a necessary condition, that man should be under the power of living Christian principle. But, as even the believer has dark moments within his soul, he may, from negligence and want of watchfulness, be present in the assemblies of believers, but not in the name of Jesus, so that this makes a watchful, self-conscious state of faith necessary; for the object to be aimed at in our advancement as Christians, is, that we never be without prayer (Luke xviii. 1, sq.), never without the name of Jesus, either when alone, or in the company of others. (Compare further as to prayer in the name of Jesus on John xiv. 13, 14; xvi. 24.) If, moreover, the Father be spoken of at ver. 19, and the

¹ Interesting allusions to this truth, that the divine is present in the human assemblies of those who seek it, are to be found among the Rabbins. Thus, in the Treatise Pirke Aboth, iii. 2, it is said, duo si assident mensae et colloquia habent de lega נתי (the symbol of God as acting, of the Son, compare on John i. 1,) quiescit super eos secundum Mal. iii. 16.
Son be at ver. 20 represented as the Person present in the assembly (and consequently, as the person who acts and who fulfils prayer), this is explained simply by the relation of the Father and the Son. For, in so far as the Father manifests himself only in the Son, and the Son works out only what the Father prompts, (John viii. 28), the operation of Father and Son is the one and the same agency of the living God. To assemble in the name of the Father, and to pray in Him, apart from the Son, is an impossibility, it is merely to pray in one's own name, which is no prayer; for, whosoever denieth the Son, hath not the Father. These last verses, also, have once more an elevated tone like that of St John's Gospel, and seem to have been spoken in moments of holiest exultation. The parable which follows, at once sinks again into a lower region, for this reason, however, assuredly, because St Peter's question proved that he, (and with him, certainly the other disciples also), was not then prepared to enter into the full understanding of the foregoing thought.

Ver. 21, 22. If St Peter in what follows speaks of forgiveness, there had yet been no express mention made of that subject by Jesus in the preceding discourse, but the whole precepts (ver. 15, sq.) as to the treatment of erring brethren, had proceeded necessarily on the supposition of forgiveness. The man who, in his own heart, gives way to anger, will continue to cherish a sense of the individual offence; but the man who forgives will strive as an εἰρηνοτοῦς (Matt. v. 9,) to remove the ground of the sin from the heart of his brother. The state of St Peter, however, so little advanced, did not admit of his understanding even the fundamental idea of forgiveness. Mistaking the nature of pure love, which never can do otherwise than love, he conceives of some limit to forgiveness, being apprehensive, as is usual with natural men, that boundless forgiveness must be a thing impossible. (The ἴσταξις, as also the following ἔσορθοντα ἵστα, contains merely the idea of the limited and the unlimited, expressed, according to the Jewish practice, by the number seven. Compare Gen. xxxiii. 3; 1 Kings xviii. 43).

Ver. 23. The Saviour, having perceived from St Peter's question how far his discernment was here at fault, proceeds to explain to him in a parable the grounds on which a member
of God’s kingdom must ever stand ready to grant forgiveness, for, only through forgiveness extended towards himself could he have obtained entrance into that kingdom. To every individual, even to such as took their stand on the footing of the law, this must have formed a decisive motive to forgiveness. It was only the law of recompense to which expression was thus given. While, therefore, the enquiry of St Peter seemed to presuppose a right, according to which man might act at his own discretion in bestowing forgiveness or withholding it, the Saviour explains that nothing of this kind existed. He who was himself in debt for his all could advance a claim for nothing. (As to the formula ὥμοιωθη ἡ βασιλεία τῶν ὄντων ἀνθρώπων, (compare Matt. xiii. 24.—λόγον συνάχθη, rationem conferre, to take account. The δοῦλοι are, as the summing up shews, the servants to whom the disciples are here compared).

Ver. 24-26. The sum of 10,000 talents is very great. If it were the Hebrew talent, (ятия = 3000 shekels, see Exodus xxxviii. 25, 26,) it would amount to fifteen millions of dollars. The magnitude of the sum, however, agrees well, on the one hand, with the management of a king; and on the other hand, with the idea which the parable is intended to express, namely, that the sinner’s debt to God is too great for him to discharge. According to ancient custom, the family of the debtor was considered as all belonging to the creditor. In the Old Testament, however, this custom is seen as mitigated by the wise institution of the jubilee year, in which the debtor must, along with his family, be set free. (Comp. Levit. xxv. 39, sq.) The wish of the debtor to see the payment postponed, (μακροθυμήσῃ, in construction with ἵπτε, as well as with στή, means in the New Testament to exercise forbearance, to give a respite,) and his hope of discharging the debt, are merely an expression of anxiety and care, but the thing is to be viewed as in itself impossible, and for this reason, also, the king compassionately forgives him the debt.

Ver. 27-30. The severity of the debtor towards his own subordinates contrasts most strikingly with the mildness of the king, (As to σπλαγχνίζομαι, see on Luke i. 78.—The verb ἀπολύω, as denoting deliverance from personal confinement and slavery, is dis-

1 Taking the dollar at 3s. 6d. this would amount to L2,625,000 sterling.—Tm.
tinguished from the remission of the debt.—Δάνιον, borrowed money, occurs only in this place). The σύνδογος is not to be conceived of as standing on the same footing with the first; the intention merely is to bring out the equally dependent relation of both to the king, in order to mark more prominently the severity of the debtor. On the same ground also, so small a sum (100 denarii = 12 dollars) is mentioned.

Thus, then, in that idea which the parable is intended to exhibit, this point stands prominently forth, that every debt or sin of man against his fellow-man (his σύνδογος) is unimportant when compared with his sin against God, and never therefore can he enforce his demand against man, while conscious of his own greater debt towards God. This hard-hearted servant, whose feelings the graciousness of the king failed to soften, permits himself to inflict even bodily violence on his debtor, which the customs of antiquity allowed him to do. (The verb ευσχημόνιον is not pleonastic, it is the necessary antecedent of συγχριν = ἀγχριν. In ver. 28, the reading ἦ τι δραίλεσον is to be preferred to δ τι. This last plainly betrays its real nature as a correction of the ἦ τι, which is not to be understood as implying that the debt is in any way doubtful, but merely as a courteous mode of expression. The formula ἠς ἵ αὐτὸς τὸ δραίλεσσι, reminds one of Matt. v. 26. As to its meaning in connection with the idea of the parable, see on ver. 34).

Ver. 31-33. It is not undesignedly that ἄμων and not δεήμι is mentioned as the feeling of the rest of the δείλοι, for, the former denotes the nobler emotion as cherished by men standing on the same footing with the offender, (compare ver. 34,) and by it are the rest of the servants contrasted with the single hard-hearted fellow-servant. If we suppose that Peter had been the offended party in their contention, and so corresponded to the creditor, while some one else was the debtor, and that not directly forgiveness, but revenge, sprung up in his heart, the parable certainly gains a very special application. But we have already called attention to the difficulties of this supposition. In our Lord’s rebuke the reception of δεήμι is set forth as a motive for the exercise of it towards others, and it is precisely in this circumstance that the whole point of the parable lies.

Ver. 34, 35. Against the hard-heartedness, however, of the sinner, δεήμι manifests itself on the part of the Lord. Where man
cherishes compassionate sorrow for the sins of his fellow-men, (λύτη, see ver. 31), wrath reveals itself on the part of God. For, in the case of man, conscience testifies that he has within him the roots of that same sin which he sees in his brother, but in God there is the pure hatred of evil. The idea of the Divine ἡμῖν does not contradict God's love (whose manifestation in mildness is χάρις), but rather, the wrath of God is nothing else than the manifestation of himself as love, in opposition to evil. According to his righteousness, therefore, which gives to every one his due, and which naturally cannot be conceived of as dissociated from the essence of the Divine love, God does good in his grace to those akin to him, but inflicts woe in his wrath on those alienated from him. Since man, however, is not evil itself, but only in one or another respect admits it within him, God's anger is directed merely against the evil that is in him. In the Divine wrath, therefore, there is displayed only another form of God's sanctifying agency. When his operations in mercy are misunderstood or abused, as by this servant, his punishments come into action. The punishment is here explained as a παραπτώματα τῶν θανατώτατος ἐν ἡ φυλακῇ. The βασιλείς are, according to the connection, the guardians of the prison, who, also, were certainly employed to inflict torture. There were, however, no special racks or tortures provided for debtors. It is precisely this punishment which ver. 35 denounces against the hard-hearted, who refuse to forgive as they have been forgiven. The additional clause, ἀφίναις ἀπὸ τῶν καρδιῶν, (Ephes. vi. 6, ἐν ψυχῆς,) expresses more clearly the nature of true forgiveness, which is here intended to be put forward as a characteristic of the children of the kingdom. It is no mere outward act, but presupposes a state of mind which only true repentance can produce. Of this inner state the outward act of forgiveness, by word or deed, is merely the corresponding expression. (The words τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν I am disposed, with Fritzche, to hold as genuine, in opposition to Griesbach and Schulz; for, as ver. 35 contains the application and short exposition of the parable, it is very much to the purpose to explain the δίκαιος by the term παραπτώματα. The verb ἀφίναις is also commonly conjoined with an object, comp. Matt. vi. 14, 15; Mark xi. 25, 26). The formula παραπτώματα εἰς φυλακήν, ἵνα δὲ ἀπέδω τὰν τὸ θριλήματος, still demands here our special consideration in its connection with the creditor. Already at Matt
v. 26, we remarked that it could not denote everlasting punishment; in the words ἔως ὅτι it is implied obviously that a limit is fixed. For, should it be said that in any event the punishment must be viewed as an endless one, inasmuch as the debt could never possibly be liquidated, it is undoubtedly true, that the creature never can get free from his obligations to the Creator. But since, according to the representation in the parable, the hard-hearted servant is not devoid of repentance (he willingly admits his debt), he is also susceptible of the Divine forgiveness, and this cannot be conceived of as existing without manifesting itself.¹ The purport of the whole, then, clearly seems to be this, that when love shews itself in a way so imperfect, that it is seen merely in the receptive form, not in the communicative, there is, in that case, no fitness for the kingdom or God. The man devoid of love is committed to the φυλακὴ, that the conviction of his real state may be brought home to him. Thus it is plain that it is not the standard of the law which is here applied, (for, according to law, it is not unrighteous to take violent measures in enforcing debt), but that of the Gospel. He who wishes, however, to be meted by this measure, must himself apply it to others. (Matt. vii. 2.) As the hard-hearted servant did not so act, the severity of the law fell on his own head. The φυλακὴ here is thus = ἔως = ἀνάπτυξις the general assembling-place of the dead who did not die in the Lord, but all of whom, it does by no means follow, shall on this account sink into eternal condemnation. (Compare more at length on Luke xvi. 19, sq.) According to 1 Peter iii. 19; Matt. xii. 32, there

¹ The translator may perhaps be allowed to say that this view is one to which he cannot assent. If the amount of repentance implied in the sinner's merely admitting that in point of fact he is a sinner, be sufficient to ensure ultimate salvation, few indeed can fail of reaching heaven. In that case broad were the way leading to life! But how the parable can fairly be so construed, it is impossible to see. The consignment of the servant to prison is done in the way of punishment, it is done in wrath (ἐγκρίνομεν), and the period fixed for terminating that punishment is, confessedly, one which can never come. In the parable these points seem essential and distinctive. They ought not to be explained away, even though they stand us in a doctrine so solemn as that of eternal punishments. The reader who wishes to investigate the truth of Scripture on this subject, may consult with advantage the "Miscellaneous Observations" of President Edwards,—the more lengthened work by his son, Dr. Edwards of Newhaven, entitled "The salvation of all men strictly examined, and the endless punishment of those who die impenitent, argued, &c," and Fuller's Eight Letters to Vidler on the doctrine of Universal Salvation.—Pa.
is plainly such a thing after death as deliverance from the \( \Phi \nu \lambda -\alpha x \delta \) in behalf of some, and, according to the connection of the parable, we must avail ourselves of that fact in explanation of the circumstances here presented to us. Absolute exclusion from the face of the Lord is made to depend on the entire want of active and receptive love, and so, on the want of faith, without which there can be no love in the soul. (See on Matt. ix. 2; xiii. 58.)
IV.

PART FOURTH.

OF CHRIST'S LAST JOURNEY TO JERUSALEM, AND CERTAIN INCIDENTS WHICH TOOK PLACE THERE.

(Luke ix. 51.—xxi. 38; Matt. xix. 1.—xxv. 46; Mark x. 1.—xiii. 37.)

FIRST SECTION.

REPORT OF THE JOURNEY BY LUKE.

(Luke ix. 51.—xviii. 14.)

HITHERTO, we have been able to make the Gospel of St Matthew the ground-work of our exposition, as it was easy, in the course of his narrative, to take up the little that was peculiar to St Mark or St Luke. In this fourth part, however, we find ourselves compelled, throughout the first section, to take St Luke for our guide, as he records incidents and discourses of the Saviour which none of the other Evangelists touch. Since St Luke, in recording this series of communications, which are peculiar to himself, proceeds on the fact of a journey to Jerusalem which seems to be described as the last; and since the Saviour on various occasions throughout this section is described as engaged in travelling (ix. 57; x. 38; xiii. 22; xvii. 11,) it is not improbable that we are in it furnished with a report of the journey. Certainly, however, it is difficult to say what journey this report is intended to recount. For, should we hold that the section contains a report of the last journey of Jesus from Galilee to Jerusalem, an opinion which one might adopt on comparing Luke xviii. 35; xix. 29, with Matt. xx. 17, 29; xxi. 1, then the account of St Luke would come into direct contradiction with that of St John. For,
according to the latter Evangelist, the Lord left Galilee to attend
the feast of dedication (x. 22,) and never returned to Galilee, but
remained in Perea. (John x. 40, where is found added the state-
ment καὶ ἐπέστησεν ἐκεῖ;) From Perea the Saviour came back to Beth-
any in order to raise Lazarus (John xi.) After this miracle, how-
ever, he went to Ephraim in the neighbourhood of the desert,
(John xi. 54,) and stayed there with his disciples. It thus appears
that, according to St John, the journey of Jesus to the last pass-
over did not begin exactly at Galilee; there intervenes, it would
rather seem, his stay at Jerusalem during the feast of dedication,
and at Perea and Ephraim in the interval. St Luke, on the other
hand, makes it appear as if Jesus went directly from Galilee to
the passover. If, however, to escape these difficulties, we under-
stand the account as applying to the journey from Ephraim to
Jerusalem, our view would well harmonize with the passage Luke
ix. 51, for the lifting up of the Lord is there expressly spoken of,
which stands in direct connection with his journey from Ephraim
to the passover. But in that case the passage Luke x. 13 sq., in
which the guilt of the cities, Chorazin and Bethsaida, is treated
of, would be altogether away from its proper connection, for Jesus
had left Galilee long before. Further, Luke x. 38 could not be
reconciled with this view, for, according to that passage, Jesus is
already in Bethany, while at xvii. 11, he again appears on the
boundaries of Samaria and Galilee, and not till Luke xix. 29
(compare Matt. xxii. 1; Mark xi. 1,) makes entry into Jerusalem.
Besides, in that case there would, according to the narrative of St
Luke, be too great a space left vacant in the life of Christ. Hence
must the chronological series of events be at once and wholly
abandoned, and the idea of our having in this section a journal of
travel must be given up, unless it be possible to remove these
differences between this account and that of St John, for to him
undoubtedly the preference is due where the accuracy of chrono-
logical or topographical statements is in question. This, however,
seems to be effected most simply by the hypothesis of Schleier-
macher, (on the writings of St Luke, p 158, sq.,) that the section
before us should be considered as made up of the narratives of
two journeys.¹ This acute and learned man observes most cor-

¹ Care should be taken that we are not tempted to confound this hypothesis with De
Wette's view of this section, which he thus expresses:—"We shall have to notice in
this section an unchronological and unhistorical collection, which was occasioned pro-
rectly, that, not Luke xviii. 14, must be regarded as the conclusion of the section, but Luke xix. 48, where the entry into Jerusalem is recorded. With this, the account of the journey fittingly ends, while at Luke xviii. 14, no termination is to be found. The whole of this report, then, according to Schleiermacher's view, St Luke inserted without change, and it again owed its existence to some one who made use of two smaller imperfect reports of two different journeys of Christ, and incorporated the one with the other, not knowing that between the two he abode for a time at Jerusalem. The conjoining of the narratives of these two journeys Schleiermacher does not ascribe to St Luke himself, for this reason, that his practice is to insert into his narrative the compositions of others unchanged. Now, although this last opinion seems to me unsupported by proof, and that St Luke is rather to be considered as having elaborated the materials presented to him, (it is by no means improbable that St Luke rewrote certain passages, even though he did insert into his work others unchanged, ex. gr. the family histories [ch. i. ii.] as holy relics), yet on the whole this view is satisfactory. For, according to it, St Luke can be completely reconciled with the more precise account of St John. The circumstance that at Luke x. 38, Jesus is already at Bethany, while at xvii. 11, he is again on the borders of Galilee and Samaria, is easily explained, if the former passage be referred to the time of Christ's presence in Jerusalem at the feast of dedication, the latter to his presence at Ephraim (John xi. 54). The expressions used by St John regarding the Lord's stay at Ephraim (διακής μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ) allow very well the idea that short excursions were made from that point, or that he had gone out of the direct road in travelling up to Jerusalem at the last passover. This being presupposed, the only difficulty that remains in the section, is, that nothing should be said of Christ's coming to Jerusalem, and his stay there. What is recorded in Luke x. 25, sq. ; xiii. 1, sq., might certainly have happened in

bably by the circumstance that St Luke found a good deal of gospel material which he could not elsewhere arrange into its place, and which, consequently, he here threw together.

1 If, nevertheless, in our exposition, we keep to Luke xviii. 14, as the conclusion of the section, this is done simply because our leading object is not criticism so much as the full understanding of the facts in themselves. To facilitate this, however, we must, after Luke xviii. 15, again take St Matthew as our groundwork, because his Gospel, subsequently to that point, becomes richer in detail.
Jerusalem, but there is no distinct intimation to that effect. This *argumentum a silentio*, however, is the less calculated to overturn the entire hypothesis, because the circumstance easily admits of being explained from the general want of topographical references. The feast journeys are entirely omitted in St Luke, as also in St Matthew and St Mark, and consequently it is not surprising that he does not give his readers fuller information as to the minuter incidents after the last journey from Galilee. It is enough that on matters of fact there is not the slightest contradiction between the account of St John and that of St Luke.

For the rest, with respect to the *mode of treatment*, St Luke's peculiar way of rendering the *discourses* of Jesus, is in this section very manifestly displayed. (Compare the Introduction, § 6). With great delicacy and truth does he give the *nuances* of the dialogue. This accuracy is certainly due in the first instance to the original author of the report which St Luke made use of, only the evangelist shews that he knew how to appreciate such a report, by not defacing such peculiarities; and besides, in the Acts of the Apostles, St Luke displays in his own writing a similar skill.

§ 1. JAMES AND JOHN ARE INCENSED AGAINST THE SAMARITANS.

(*Luke ix. 51—56.*)

The words with which St Luke's lengthened account opens, can only be understood as applying to the Saviour's last journey, which ended in his being offered on the cross and exalted in the resurrection. The expression ἀναλήψις (the substantive is found only in this passage, the verb, on the contrary, is often used, of Christ's exaltation to the Father's right hand. Acts i. 2, 22; 1 Tim. iii. 16,) denotes here Christ's elevation to the Father, which necessarily presupposes his humiliation. That it is not his being lifted up on the cross which primarily we are to understand, is shewn by the expression ἡμέρας τῆς ἀναλήψεως, in which the whole process of his exaltation, from the resurrection to the ascension, is included. (Only figuratively, according to the analogy of John xii. 32, 33, could the expression refer to the crucifixion).
The period of this exaltation is regarded as fixed by a higher necessity, and the lapse of passing time down to that point as a blank which must be filled up. (Whenever the words πλησιόνθαι or συμπλησιόνθαι [the two expressions are used synonymously] are applied to time, we must always thus assume that some definite period has been fixed, either by human [Acts ii. 1] or Divine [Gal. iv. 4] determination). But it may be a question how far this fixed period can be said to have already come on the occasion of Christ's departure from Galilee, when, according to St John, so much was to intervene before the passover. The expression employed, ἐν τῷ συμπλησιόνθαι τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ἁγιασμὸς seems more applicable to the journey of Jesus from Ephrasm to Jerusalem (John xi. 54,) than when he was leaving Galilee for the feast of dedication. But, looking at the circumstances simply from the standing-point of a Galilean, and such we must suppose the narrator to have been, it is easy to explain how the Saviour's last departure from Galilee must stand in direct connection with his end, and all that intervenes be passed over in silence. In his view the scene of all Christ's mighty labours moved between Galilee and Jerusalem; and so soon, therefore, as he had finally left the former place, Christ's work, in the view of the writer, seemed finished. The formula πρὸς τὴν στοιχείωσιν, corresponds to the Hebrew, תְּרוּמָה שְׁתֵּי חָלִיא, Jerem. xxi. 10. The LXX. indeed so translates it. Gesenius [in Lex. sub. voc. שְׁתֵּי] compares with it the phrase at Ezek. iv. 3, שְׁתֵּי חָלִיא by which, however, the LXX. translate ἠτοματιζόμενον πρὸς τὴν στοιχείωσιν.

Ver. 52, 53. In order to prepare a lodging, and provide the necessary supplies, the Saviour sent messengers forward to a Samaritan village, but the inhabitants turned them away.—Συμαρήσιν, in the Hebrew יִשְׂרָיֵל (from יִשְׂרָיֵל, the capital of the district), denotes, as is well known, an inhabitant of that province of Palestine, in which, after the Babylonian exile, there arose a mixed population formed from the Jews left behind, and the foreign tribes transplanted thither. (2 Kings xvii. 24). They arrayed themselves against the Jews who returned from the exile, and at a later period they set up on Mount Gerizim a peculiar form of worship modelled on that at Jerusalem. (Compare the fuller account of this in Winer's Bibl. Realllex. p. 597, sq.)

opposition continued down to the time of Christ and after it (John iv. 9, οὐ διδασκοντα ἰουδαῖοι Σαμαρηταις), although, as was natural, it did not shew itself alike vehemently in all individuals (John iv. 30), nor at all times. At festival seasons, when the religious life among the Jews and Samaritans was in its fullest vigour, their hostility was most powerfully developed, the more especially that a leading point of difference between them was the place of Divine worship. Hence, in this instance, it is mentioned as the ground of their unfriendliness; δι... τὸ πρὸς... Ιερουσαλήμ. (In regard to this use of πρὸς compare 2 Sam. xvii. 11. νῦν δὲ ποιήσας νῦν. The term δέχονται includes, as at Matt. x. 14, and the parallel passages, all the friendly services of hospitality in its widest sense).

Ver. 54. That James and John, who were here introduced as speaking, are the two brethren, the sons of Zebedee, is in the highest degree probable, even though Mark iii. 17, as will be immediately shewn, cannot be adduced in proof of the fact. In their fiery zeal against the churlishness of the Samaritans, they are inclined to bring down on them a destructive judgment, and only await the command of their Lord (οἶκος) to be themselves the instruments of carrying such a judgment into effect. A bold faith reveals itself in these words, and a powerful conviction of the Lord’s majesty, and of the relation in which they stood to him. Thus far there was nothing blameworthy in the spiritual position which they occupied. But the form in which it was manifested bore altogether an Old Testament type, they spoke from the standing-point of the Lex Talionis. On noticing, therefore, the expression of disapproval in the look of Jesus, they sought to ground their declaration on an example from the Old Testament, appealing to what is related in the history of Elias (2 Kings i. 10, 12). (The omission of the words ὡς καὶ Ἡλατη ἵπποις in some MSS. is assuredly a false reading. The following words plainly contrast the disciples with Elias, the Old Testament with the New.)

Ver. 55, 56. As Jesus saw that this fiery zeal of his disciples was not a mere outburst of feeling, but arose from their confounding the relation of the economy of the Old Testament with the New, he in a few words guides them to a right view of the point. After his lengthened intercourse with them, he might have taken it for granted that the distinction between the two economies was not
only clearly known to them, but that in the inner life of their souls, they were familiar with it. The simple mention of it was sufficient to recall them to the conviction that the compassionate love of the Gospel had been forgotten by them, in the justice of the law. The term πιάμα, therefore, in these words of the Lord, is to be understood in its usual sense, for between the ύμικ and the Elias there is a contrast in respect of the principle that animates the two. This principle is the πιάμα. Both principles were pure and from God, but that which is Divine in its forward course of development among men, stands forth in its perfect form, in the πιάμα of the Gospel, whose essence is grace and mercy, which were personified in the Saviour (John i. 17). Elias, therefore, does nothing wrong when he commands fire to fall from heaven, he rather, as the ἀγγελος of God, exercised justice. But Jesus did better, inasmuch as he exercised mercy, which he had come to render supreme amidst the human race. The disciples therefore sinned only in so far as they who ought to have received into their hearts the perfect spirit of forgiving love, permitted still the Old Testament spirit of avenging justice to prevail over them. As they were aware of the distinction, and had access to the spirit of pure love, they sinned in that very act which on the part of Elias was right. (At Heb. xii. 24, the same contrast is denoted by Christ and Abel. Abel's blood demands vengeance, as representing justice, the blood of Jesus pleads for forgiveness, for in him dwelleth grace). Many are of opinion that it was in consequence of this occurrence, that the sons of Zebedee received the name of Βασιλευς (Mark iii. 17). As regards, first, the etymological explanation of the expression, it has already been rightly given by Mark, inasmuch as he adds δυνατος, τω εις τοις εαν εκπαιδευθείς λέγει τιμησ. (The βασιλευς is probably the Galilean form for βασιλεις, however, and the kindred ψευδεις in the sense of to quake, to tremble, to roar, expresses most accurately the

---

1 The most numerous and best MSS. (particularly A, B, C, E, G, H, L, S, and others, see the New Testament of Griesbach—Shults on this passage,) even omit the words of the textus receptus, να δυνατος τω εις τοις εαν εκπαιδευθείς λέγει τιμησ. as given by the Cod. D. and others. In any case, the longer recension of the words of Jesus, δυνατος εις τοις εαν εκπαιδευθείς εις ψευδεις, is an unauthentic addition, and even the shorter form of it is not beyond suspicion. The supplementary clause, however, corresponds perfectly with the whole connection, and the origin of the gloss is easily explained, inasmuch as the λεγεις seemed to call for a closer definition.
idea of the βετδρή). The only thing remaining obscure is, what this name refers to. The older Christian expositors found the point of resemblance in the majestic and exalted impressions which thunder makes, so that the name, sons of thunder, was used not in the way of blame but of praise, as expressing the strength of that holy zeal which animated the sons of Zebedee. Modern expositors, however, for the most part refer to the fact before us, and understand it in the way of censure, and as intended to characterize a false and merely natural zeal. (See further details in the learned treatise by Gurlitt in Ullmann's Studien, vol. ii. part iv. p. 715, sq.). Were it proved that the name referred to this passage, the latter explanation would undoubtedly recommend itself as the more probable, for the term ἐνδυμαζός, in Christ's discourse, could not easily be reconciled with any name of praise. The disciples, therefore, could only have been put in mind of the name, (already on a former occasion bestowed on them) so that the connection would stand thus, "know ye not that ye ought to be led by another spirit, inasmuch as ye are the sons of zeal." But, even supposing this connection to be the right one, it seems to yield no thought that suits the context, for there is nothing contradictory between the name of the disciples and their conduct, inasmuch as they shewed no want of zeal but of mildness. A contradiction of this nature, however, is assuredly required by the connection. Besides, on other grounds, it seems to me improbable, that the name ἡφικ βετδρή is to be associated with the occurrence here recorded. For, in the first place, it is unexampled in Bible history, and stands opposed to the idea of the new name, that a second designation should be given to any one in the way of punishment. In this way, his sin would be, as it were, immortalized. Secondly, the position in which the name stands at Mark iii. 17, is against the idea that the title ἡφικ βετδρή implies censure. It stands quite parallel to the name Peter which was given to Simon, and it is therefore hardly credible that the first name is one of praise, marking the spiritual character of the first apostle, while the second was a bye-word conveying blame. This is the less to be thought when we consider that the three apostles first named at Mark iii. 17, and furnished with surnames, are precisely those who stood nearest to the Lord. This circumstance leads us to conclude that the early fathers of the church were wholly right
when they saw in the name Ἰωάννης a description of the spiritual character of the two sons of Zebedee. Thus the bestowal of these names acquires in the case of the apostles the same significance which the new names (Abraham for Abrami, Israel for Jacob) have in the Old Testament. They characterize the new men, and are, as it were, symbols of the new nature. (Is. lxxii. 2; lxv. 15; Rev. ii. 17.) How far the name Ἰωάννης agreed with the personal dispositions of St James and St John, cannot be shewn in regard to the former, for no detailed account of him is given. In reference to St John, however, it appears very doubtful how far the name is appropriately chosen, as it has been usual to conceive of him as very soft. But as has already been often remarked, to look on St John as a man of weak character, is wholly to mistake his nature. His whole writings shew that, with all his mildness and gentleness, there existed in him great elevation of thought and keenness of zeal against evil, and it was this which the surname in question was intended to denote, for it was the union of energy with humility (in Peter), of decision and keenness with gentleness (in St James and St John), which formed the basis of their new nature.

2. OF FOLLOWING JESUS.

(Luke ix. 57—62; Matt. viii. 19—22.)

The short passage which here follows, flowing directly from the contemplation of the immediate circumstances, appears to hold its place most appropriately in the narrative of the journey. Some one (according to St Matthew he was no less than a γερομακατὸς) who had been mightily attracted by the Saviour, expressed by the way a wish to accompany Jesus, and Jesus sets before his view

1 Let John’s first epistle especially be read. It is full of Divine Ἰωάννης as well in its descriptions of the true spirit as of the false, (comp. iv. 1, sq.) He who considers the Apocalypse to have been written by John will not fail to trace in it also the character of spiritual power.

2 A doubt as to this view may be raised by the circumstance that the name Sons of Thunder never elsewhere again occurs. Had it been intended as the designation of their new nature, one may suppose that like the name Peter it would have been generally used. As it was, however, bestowed on two persons at once, it could not like the name Peter come into general use, and this sufficiently explains its being passed over in silence.
the difficulties attending his life and labours. In St Matthew a portion of this passage stands amidst a collection of the miracles of Jesus, and consequently in a less appropriate connection. Nay, in the account of St Matthew there is wanting that very point which, with St Luke, stands prominently forth as the connecting link with the preceding narrative. For, as the sufferings which his enemies were preparing for the Saviour had been there described, so the following history states how it stood between Jesus and those friends whose affections His appearance and His words attracted. One portion of them pressed most hastily forward, but a single word as to the difficulties caused them to withdraw; another portion of them were called by the Lord himself, but their anxiety on the subject of the world deterred them from at once embracing the call. In St Luke, then, we are not to overlook the contrast between ἵνα τίς προς αὐτόν and ἵνα δὲ οἱ Ἰησοῦς προς ἐνέκριν, ver. 59, by which the several positions of Christ's different friends are marked.

Ver. 57, 58. The address ἄκολουθω σοι ὥσπερ ἀν ἄπειρχη plainly implies a certain consciousness already of the difficulties involved in being the companion of Jesus. The ὥσπερ ἀν ἄπειρχη cannot refer merely to the change of locality, but denotes dangers, for example those attending the journeys of Jesus to the feasts, in which every one acquainted with the circumstances (and that this well-disposed γραμματικός was acquainted with them we must believe,) must have seen peril both for the person of the Saviour and those about Him. The words then are akin to the exclamation of St Thomas, ἔχομεν καὶ ημεῖς ἵνα ἀναθάναμον μετ' ἄνων, (John xi. 16,) and with St Peter's declaration. Matt. xxvi. 35, inasmuch as both these exclamations, like that of the Scribe before us, came from the natural man, who, failing to weigh the greatness of the self-denial required, soon started to the path, but soon fell. According to the connection, the term ἄκολουθω refers primarily to an external companionship, but it also involves at the same time a spiritual following, i. e. the choice of that path of life which Christ opened up, a conversation in righteousness and truth, and consequently the undertaking of a contest with unrighteousness and falsehood. The Lord acknowledging, indeed, the good intentions of the suppliant, but perceiving his weakness, sets before him in the strongest terms the difficulty of following him. The want of necessaries, which are provided by the Creator
even for the lower animals, of personal property and the shelter of a roof, must be encountered in following the Son of man. (The expression πωλήσει occurs only in this passage. Hesychius explains it as τόπος ὁ τά θήρια κοιμάται.—Κατασκήνωσις = τῦμπα). The proper sense of οὗτος ἰχθυν ποι ἐν κεφαλής κλίνω is that of the entire renunciation of everything which man can call his own, which was exhibited even externally in the life of the Saviour, but which in a spiritual sense must be repeated in the life of all His followers, as we are taught at 1 Cor. vii. 29, sq. Although it is not expressly recorded what effect this admonition of Jesus produced, yet from the following narratives we may infer that probably it had deterred the γεμαμματικός. The remarks of the two persons whom Jesus asked to follow Him lead us to conjecture that they could not as yet resolve to abandon everything in order to embrace Christ, for the necessity of so doing is brought forward as the main idea of the short narrative. (See on Matt. xix. 27.)

Ver. 59, 60. As in the preceding case, the Scribe had volunteered to follow the Saviour, Jesus in this instance himself gives the invitation to do so. While the former, however, was deterred by difficulties, the latter were apparently held back by sacred duties. The truth of greatest prominence to be drawn from the following narrative, and to which most importance should be given, is this, that not merely sins and crimes (which call first for forgiveness through that repentance and faith which the following of Christ presupposes) but even legal righteousness, nay, attentions to the noblest duties of earthly relationship, may keep man back from the following of Jesus. The ἢ Ἰαβαί παρίσα and the ἀποτάκασαι τοῖς ἐς τὸν οἶκον must be held, when viewed from an earthly standing-point, to denote even noble and tender duties. (The verb ἀποτάκασαι, ver. 61, is in the sense of to take leave. The relatives are to be considered as at a distance, so that he means to stipulate for a journey home.) We have here, therefore, a commentary of fact on Matth. x. 37. In obeying the command of Christ all other duties are absorbed; not that they are thus depreciated in importance or neglected, but that every act of man is put into its right place relatively to the final end of the individual himself, as well as of the whole body. From this standing-point then, can the Saviour ask the son to abandon to others even the last duties he owes to a deceased father, the point of time favourable for turning the whole of his
life into a higher course of action must be seized at once. This man having already become a believer, must now decide on consecrating his life to the preaching of God's word (διάγγελλε τῷ βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ). The expression ἄρει τοὺς πνεούς Σάφαι τοὺς ἰαυτῶν πνεούς, has here assuredly no reference to the Jewish opinion that he who touched the dead became polluted. Jesus merely wished to bring immediately to a decision the man whom he had called to follow him, and induce him to give up for his sake every thing in itself lawful, nay, even that which was considered necessary. Just as little ought the πνεοῦ to be referred to the grave-diggers, a view which enfeebles the whole sense of the passage. The Saviour rather regards the call given as a call to ζωῇ αἰώνος, and demands that the person called should unconditionally resolve in favour of it, and that he should leave everything of an external nature (even such acts of piety towards a deceased father after the flesh) to those who were as yet wholly occupied with externals, instead of which occupations he should yield obedience to the call of his Heavenly Father. Thus the word πνεοῦ must in one of these instances be understood as used figuratively of those who have not yet been awakened from the death of natural life (Rom. vii. 8 sq.) The dead, who are to be buried, are naturally those deceased in a bodily sense; but inasmuch as it is said Σάφαι τοὺς, ἰαυτῶν πνεούς it is unquestionably intimated that the deceased were in a condition in no respect essentially different from that of the living who were to bury them.

Ver. 61, 62. To the last, who like the others presents himself as a follower, the Saviour replies with the statement of a general principle which rebukes his declaration, and conveys the idea that an unconditional determination was necessary for having part in the kingdom of God. The expressions ἄρει ἐπίκαιλεν ἑαυτὸν ὑδατογον and βλέπον εἰς τὰ βωσιω, denote figuratively, a state of indecision, irresolution. (Gen. xix. 26.) In opposition to this we are to look on the entire determination of the will as a necessary requisite to labouring in the kingdom of God (ἐνώνως, well-ordered, fitting, suitable. See Luke xiv. 35), which lays claim to all the powers of man. This sentence, however, as well as the preceding ἄρει τοὺς πνεούς X. τ. λ. contains a truth of permanent importance for all times and circumstances of the church, for never can any one be a disciple of Christ save he who renounces all that he
has (Luke xiv. 33), and strives to love God with all his powers (Mark xii. 30); since Christ's call to follow him is the call of God, and man must serve no master beside God (Luke xvi. 13).

§ 3. THE SENDING FORTH OF THE SEVENTY DISCIPLES, WITH THE ADDRESS OF JESUS TO THEM.

(Luke x. 1—24; [Matt. xi. 20—27.])

The sending out of the seventy disciples stands in immediate connection with the special object of St Luke's gospel. St Matthew and St Mark, who wrote merely for Jews, record only the mission of the twelve; St Luke, for the sake of the heathen, narrates the sending forth of the seventy, and in the following discourse omits all ideas that might bring to mind Jewish particularism, ideas such as are mentioned at Matt. x. 5, sq. (Compare Eisenmenger's entd. Judenthum, Part ii. p. 3, sq. respecting the notion of the Jews that there were seventy distinct nations on the earth.) The passage, Num. xi. 16 sq. regarding the seventy elders to whom Moses imparted of his spirit, may be compared as parallel. To this corresponded the Sanhedrim of seventy assessors with the president (κατ' αὐτῷ) who represented Moses. From the idea that the members of the Sanhedrim were seventy-two in number (i. e. twice six times six, or six times twelve), arose the reading ἵκηδες ἔξωρα δύο, which is supported certainly by some good MSS. (as B. D.) but must yield in authority to the common one. Strikingly, however, as this fact agrees with the whole scope of the gospel of St Luke, it seems little accordant with its immediate connection as it stands in this journal of travel. The sending forth of the disciples when they were all on the road, appears unsuited to the circumstances. It would seem to us, therefore, as if in the information thus given, a passage from some earlier period of the narrative had been inserted into the account of their last journey. Perhaps the Saviour, shortly before his final departure from Galilee, having given up all hope of Chorazin, Bethsaida, Capernaum, sent forth once more the seventy messengers into some other region. This well agrees both with the mention of the fall of these cities (x. 13—15), and also with the remarkable declaration (ver. 18) which expresses the confident assurance of the triumph of his cause notwithstanding all oppo-
sition and unbelief. The μέντε ραῦτα (ver. 1) however, cannot strictly be taken in its chronological meaning, but must be understood generally somewhat in the sense of moreover (Schleiermacher on St Luke, p. 169). The address of the Lord to his departing disciples as given by St Luke, closely resembles that in St Matthew (chap. x.), only this latter evangelist gives every thing more completely and at greater length. Similar circumstances assuredly led most naturally to similar ideas, but closely as the different clauses agree, changes and transpositions are not improbable. The mention of the unbelieving cities, however, connects itself fittingly with the context in St Luke, while it stands only very loosely in its place at Matt. xi. 20-24. For, if the Lord had closed his preaching in Galilee, and knew that never more should he set foot within it, this would give, as nothing else would, its full meaning to the reproof in which he rebukes the unbelief of those who so long had listened to him and seen his works.

Ver. 1. The word ἄνὴρες points to a specific act of election, such as, according to Matt. x. 1 sq., took place in the case of the twelve, to a formal ἄνὴρες (Luke i. 80). The verb ἀναδίηνυμι is to be understood in the sense of "to appoint," with the accessory idea of a solemn and public setting-forth of the dignity bestowed. (Compare 2 Macc. ix. 23, 25; x. 11; xiv. 12; 3 Esr. ii. 3.) The disciples were moreover sent out two and two (ἀνὰ δύο), that they might mutually support each other, and might, in the places which Jesus intended to visit, prepare men's minds beforehand for his coming.

Ver. 2. St Luke here places at the outset of the discourse of Jesus, the same thought which at Matt. ix. 37, 38, precedes the choosing of the twelve; though certainly the connection in St Matthew is more loose, inasmuch as the words with him, primarily refer to the sight of the people without leaders or teachers. At the foundation of the expression Σπεροθέτως, there obviously lies that comparison according to which the divine word is likened to seed, and mankind to the field. (Compare Matt. xiii. 4, sq.) According to this the Old Testament period is to be considered as the time during which the Divine Word had been in operation, whose great result was that lively sense of the need of atonement which shewed itself among the people. This is viewed as a Σπεροθέτως when compared with what had gone before, but as compared with what
was to follow, it appears as merely the given possibility of a new and nobler seed, whose harvest was to be expected in the end of the day at the coming of the Son of man in his glory. The apostles and all the ἰεράν, in the first instance, stand forth simply as witnesses of the ἀποστόλοι; but in another respect, in so far, namely, as they have themselves received the higher element of life imparted by the Gospel, they appear as those who are called to disseminate it more widely abroad, and indeed this is referred to by the admonition διηθήσει τοῦ κυρίου. The fervent prayer of those who have themselves already been received into the kingdom of God, and who labour in the spirit of it, is the means of procuring its ever wider extension, by the stirring up of living labourers for it. The very sending out of the seventy was of itself an answer to the prayer, which, on the occasion of sending forth the twelve, Jesus urged his disciples to offer.

Ver. 3, 4. According to St Luke, the discourse, immediately after the command to go forth, begins with the mention of threatening dangers. Matt. x. 16, where our more detailed observations may be seen, gives the same thing at a later period. This remark, respecting the relation of believers to the world, seems to be contradicted by what follows, μὴ βασάνης x. τ. λ. For, while the allusion to the λόγος seems to awaken fear and anxiety, the subsequent admonition to go forth without the preparation of human foresight, bespeaks believing confidence. But this contrast is the very thing here intended. "Without considering such danger, go forth free from care, every thing shall be provided for you."

(As to particulars, compare my remarks on Matt. x. 9, 10.— Βαλάντιον = ἰδις [Job xiv. 17] in translating which it is used by the LXX. is allied to πήμα, crumena.) The μηδενα κατὰ τῆν ἱδίν ἀσφάσιος still remains obscure, even though in seeking an explanation, we call to our aid the oriental practice of saluting each other by tedious forms of courtesy, and so causing detention; for, the injunction—ye must not linger!—agrees neither with what goes before, nor what follows. It is better to understand ἀσφάλεια as meaning to salute, to receive, or welcome as a friend, with the secondary sense of seeking for favour. In this way the expression stands on the same footing with those which precede it.

1 Compare the parallel passage 2 Kings iv. 29, where Elisha enjoins on Gehazi the greatest haste, and says ἀργον γὰρ ἐν ἐκκαίρω σου ἵπποι ὄψιν πάντα ἐς τοῦ μετέχοντος εἰς εὐρετήματα ἐφ᾿ αὐτός.
which all denote preparations for the journey, measures of human foresight.

Ver. 5, 6. As to the conduct which Jesus exhorts his messengers to pursue towards those with whom they sojourn, compare Matt. x. 13. The Spirit seeks what is akin to itself, and where that is wanting, finds no abode. The expression given by St Luke, ὑδε εἰσὶν, in some respects conveys a meaning peculiarly its own, in others it is a clearer and closer statement than that of St Matthew, who merely speaks of the δικαία ἄξια or μὴ ἄξια. According to St Luke, those minds disposed to receive the Gospel must be distinguished from those in the same house who were resolved to reject it. To the former the blessing of God's kingdom is promised, to the latter not.

Ver. 7. The exhortation, that in the house where they had taken up their quarters, they should content themselves with what the inhabitants had to give (τὰ σας αὐτῶν), is connected in St Luke so closely with the μὴ μεταχαίνειτε ἵνα τὸ σιτίον τοῦ δικαίου τῆς ἁπάτης, that the latter idea is more completely modified by it, than is the case at Matt. x. 11, where this connection is wanting. It seems, according to the representation of St Luke, that our Lord had intended to warn them against leaving the cottages of the poor, and seeking instead the dwellings of the rich. The ἵσταμαι in the field of God, receives his μετακόμισις, (St Matthew has ἔσορθη x. 10), i.e. his bodily nourishment, and the supply of his necessities. The seeking for more than this, cometh of evil.

Ver. 8–11. According to the connection in St Luke, the cures, and the preaching of the kingdom of God, appear in the light of spiritual rewards for bodily services. In St Matthew the same ideas are brought forward in another connection. (Compare Matt. x. 8). As to their conduct towards those who resisted them, compare Matt. x. 14. (Ἀπομάκρυνθαι is found only here. It corresponds to the ἐκπομπή in St Matthew). As to the former, the ἵγνυμι ἦ βασιλεύς, τ. θ. is a message of joy, so it is to these a message of terror, implying for the one the possibility, for the other the impossibility of their entering it.

Ver. 12–15. The woe which the Lord utters against such an unbelieving city, is most appropriately followed by a curse on the places which had been the witnesses of his greatest glory. The connection here seems to be that in which the passage originally stood, at the close of the labours of Jesus in Galilee, although St
Matthew (xi. 20—24) has inserted the words not unfittingly into his context. (As respects the exposition, see the details in St Matthew, ut supra).

Ver. 16. According to St Luke, the address of Jesus to the seventy concludes with the general idea, that he, the Saviour, was himself conscious of such living union with his own, that what was done to them was done to him. (Compare on Matt. x. 40, where the same thought, but only as viewed from one side, is expressed).

Ver. 17. The circumstance, that in the following passage the return of the disciples is anticipated, goes to prove the correctness of the opinion that it is impossible in this section of St Luke to keep hold of the chronological thread. The discourses of Jesus connected with this return, form a well compacted whole, so that here again the account of St Luke possesses more the character of originality than that of St Matthew. First, the evangelist makes the disciples on their return express to Jesus their child-like joy for the deeds which in his name they had been able to perform. (The βαςίνα ἵκολομον is one of the many miracles which they did. This might appear to them of special importance, as it presupposed a control over the mighty kingdom of evil). Most deeply is this representation drawn from the life. A secret joy seizes a man when he finds that he acts with an energy more than human, for example, that through him the spiritually dead are awakened. In this joy there is the implied testimony that man is called to act with power from on high, but there lies in it also a temptation so dangerous, that the Saviour, though he acknowledges the joy as right and well-founded, yet warns them at the same time against giving themselves up to it without watchfulness, and exhorts them to keep fully in view the foundation of that real joy which can never lead astray.

Ver. 18. Singularly remarkable is the declaration of the Lord which, according to Luke, follows immediately after the expression of joy on the part of the disciples. Inasmuch as he makes a transition from the βαςίνα to ἡμῖν himself, without any occasion for it, and in the most private circle of his own disciples, we must say that here again is a passage belonging to the number of those (compare on Matt. xiii. 39) from which it may be rightly inferred that the Saviour himself teaches the existence of a prince of darkness, and that this is by no means to be looked on as a
Jewish superstition. Here would have been the place, even on the supposition of Christ's accommodating himself to the views of the multitude, in which to point out the unfounded and ruinous nature of such a belief, and to advise the use of the idea (as some think it should be used) only from extreme necessity, and in the way of accommodation. As to the thought, however, which the expression of Christ ἴδε ὧν ἦμερα τὴν ἡμέρα τῆς ἡμέρας. contains, the ἴδε is naturally not to be understood of bodily sight, but of spiritual contemplation, for the object seen was itself of a spiritual kind. The nature of spiritual vision, however, involves the conception of the future as present. We may, in explanation, compare the parallel passage, John viii. 56, where Jesus says of Abraham, ἴδε τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἡμέραν. As here in prophetic vision Messiah and the whole Messianic future is represented as present in spirit to Abraham, so the Saviour in this passage says that he beheld as a present event the throwing down of the dominion of evil. The preterite tense ἴδε, therefore, must be referred not merely to the period during which the seventy were absent, but to past time in general, so that the meaning would be,—long ere this have I seen in spirit the power of evil as a thing overthrown. For, the cures wrought by the disciples, are obviously to be considered not as the causes, but as the effects of the overthrow. Because the power of evil was broken by the Saviour's appearance in the midst of mankind, and through him the energies of a higher life were imparted to the disciples, therefore could they do such deeds. It was impossible, however, for the deeds of the disciples to effect that which was the object of Christ's whole appearance. But being the results of the overthrow of evil, their actions were at the same time the evidences of that great victory, and thus far was their joy well-grounded, and the transition made by Christ from their deeds to the overthrow of Satan himself, sufficiently accounted for. The figurative expression πάντες ἐν τῷ ὄμασι, is assuredly chosen after the remarkable passage, Is. xiv. 12, in which the king of Babylon (as the type of the prince of darkness) is represented as by proud effort scaling the heavens, that he might set his throne above the stars of God, but cast headlong from his self-chosen exaltation. The LXX. translate it τοῦ ἤκτορον ἐν τῷ ὄμασι ὁ ἱωσφόρος. Compare as to this the expositors of Isaiah). The addition ἔστω ἱωσφότης depicts (as at Zech. ix. 14) the swiftness of the fall. The whole passage consequently
expresses the same thought which lies in John xii. 31, ὁ ἀγγελος τοῦ κίσμου τοῦτου ἵνα λύσῃ τοὺς εἰς ζωὴν ἐξαιρεῖται ἔξω (according to another reading it is even κάτω βληθότας, to which consequently ὄψωθηκεν of the Saviour forms an appropriate contrast), namely this, that in Christ and with Christ, evil is seen as overcome, and good is displayed in all its glory. We may compare also on this point the peculiar representation given in the Revelation of St John, where, however, the casting out of Satan (xii. 7, sq.) is distinguished from the complete chaining up of his power (xx. 2, sq.)

Ver. 19. This verse mentions exemption from all liability to personal injury, as a new result of the victory thus won by truth,—of that victory which our Lord, in the spirit of prophecy, beheld as actually wrought out. As the Saviour's power sets the captive free, so does it preserve his people from the assaults of hostile force during their subsequent progress. Ὄρθω καὶ σκοτεινοί are mentioned, as being amongst animals the representatives of the kingdom of evil, in which poison is collected, and through which it infects, on contact, physical injury. (Compare Ps. xci. 13.) The expression originates in that profound view of natural life pervading all Scripture, (compare further on Rom. viii. 19, sq.) according to which sinful disturbances in the spiritual world express themselves also in the physical. What follows καὶ ἵνα πᾶσαν δύναμιν (ἐν σεβασμῷ) τοῦ ἵππου, fills up the first expression, and extends it so as to comprehend every form of assault from the world of evil. The mightier power of Jesus gives security against the influence of these in every shape. Such passages as Mark xvi. 17, 18; Acts xxviii. 5; shew that here we are by no means to exclude all reference to what is external. Only, in general, this reference is associated with the continuance of the Charismata as the manifestations of the Spirit of Christ exhibited externally. After these Charismata have ceased, the spiritual application of the words alone stand prominently forth. (Ἄθλιον stands as = βλαστεῖται, as at Rev. vii. 2, 3. Compare Mark xvi. 18).

Ver. 20. To these words, which acknowledge as well-founded the triumphant declarations of the disciples (ver. 17), there is now subjoined a warning. According to the connection, therefore, the words μὴ χαιρεῖτε—χαιρεῖτε δὲ, are not to be understood as an absolute prohibition of joy over the power of the Spirit in them, but only as forbidding them to rejoice even over that as
an isolated fact. For, in that case, should the believer make the
effects of God's Spirit through himself the only or the leading
object of his attention and joy, he is in danger of withdrawing
his view from the source of this higher life, and no sooner does
he cease to draw from that fountain, than life dries up, and self-
indulgence, vanity, pride, spring up in his soul. For this reason
does the Saviour here bring forward as the true and abiding ob-
ject of a Christian's observation and joy, ἐν τῇ νόμῳ τῷ μαθήτῃ ἡγάρη
τῆς ὲδραμος. At the foundation of this remark, there lies the
figure of the βικλώς τῆς ζωῆς, in which the names of believers are
inscribed, a figure which, in the Old Testament, had already
been frequently used, (Exod. xxxii. 32; Ps. lxix. 28; cxxxix.
16). The inscribing is conceived of as the act of God (ἡγάρη
ἐν τῇ ἑδραμος Θεοῦ), so that the election of grace by which the saints
are chosen, and which they have themselves certainly to make
sure (2 Pet. i. 10), is thereby denoted. Hence, in contrast with
human agency authoritatively gifted with higher powers, there
is set forth a Divine agency in connection with and acting upon
man; the former is a very doubtful object of joy, for by means
of it self-pleasing and vanity easily insinuate themselves, inas-
much as the will is seldom delivered from self. Divine grace on
the other hand, and its manifestation, the calling of man, is
clearly the object of holiest joy, for God's will is as pure as it is
unchangeable, and in his election of grace therefore, of which he
can never repent (Rom. xi. 29), the ground of all salvation and
all blessedness to mankind is laid. Even, therefore, if he can-
not perform any great spiritual deeds (2 Cor. xii. 9), this re-
 mains as the joy of the believer, which, as being personally his
own, he can never be deprived of, that he lets his soul satisfy
itself in the grace of God.

Ver. 21, 22. With singular appropriateness there is here added
this expression of holy joy on the part of our Lord, which stands
in strong contrast with the joy of sense (ver. 17) as felt by
the disciples. The latter exulted over the glorious exterior of
the work, the Saviour drew his delight from its hidden glory,
from this, namely, that God's true wisdom was revealed by the
Father, not to the prudent and wise ones of the world, but to
the ἦσυχος, in whom, amidst the concealed circle of his new cre-
ation as it flourished unseen, he had his quiet and humble joy.
Rightly, then, did the divine consciousness rest in this lowliness
and self-humiliation. Conscious of his dignity as God, he acknowledged himself as the Organ of every true revelation of God, and at the same time as its object. (For the more minute details compare on Matt. xi. 25–27, where the same words occur but in a more loose connection.)

Ver. 23, 24. These verses were already explained more in detail at Matt. xiii. 16, 17, where they stand in a wholly different connection. Here, the leading idea of both verses, that superabundant grace had been manifested towards them (the disciples), unites them closely to what goes before, for they namely were the chosen ones to whom the Lord revealed more than to the saints of the Old Testament. Only, in this connection the στραφης των μαθητῶν καὶ Ἰδιαίτερες occasions some obscurity. The στραφης may easily be understood as referring back to ver. 21, where the Saviour in his discourse addresses himself to God, but the Ἰδιαίτερα remains a difficulty, inasmuch as the whole preceding discourse had already been spoken in the most private circle of his disciples. As the common text, however, has the words στραφης των μαθητῶν Ἰδιαίτερα before ver. 22, the Ἰδιαίτερα may best admit of being explained thus. While the discourse was going on, some hearers had gathered around him, (as the following 25th verse sq. immediately shews); on their account Jesus spake the last words in a low tone to those more immediately about him, uttering the rest aloud in the hearing of all. In this case, the reading of the common text (ver. 22) would be the correct one, and that view ought to be at once adopted for this further reason, that the omission of the clause may easily be explained owing to the parallel words which follow, but the addition of it can hardly be accounted for. Whether the words, however, were originally spoken here, or in the connection in which St Matthew gives them, or whether the Saviour, as in the case of such a declaration may well be conceived, more than once gave utterance to them, it is in this case hard to decide.

§ 4. PARABLE OF THE TENDER-HEARTED SAMARITAN.

(Luke x. 25–37.)

The following narrative appears likewise very appropriate in a journal of travel; it is drawn as from the life. A lawyer comes up to Jesus on the road, in order to hold conversation with the
renowned prophet. His purpose does not seem to have been precisely bad; it was rather the mere love of novelty which induced him to try how Jesus would express himself. The Saviour's way of dealing with him, does not permit us to suppose that he was a Sadducee who put the question, one who himself believed in no ζωή αἰώνων, and who was now only asking in irony after the way to Utopia. He seems rather to have held the views common among the Pharisees, and only to have been desirous of discovering what more or better knowledge than his own, Jesus possessed. The ἰσαίας, therefore, here has no connection with the laying of snares for Christ, to make him politically suspected,—an attempt which, according to the gospel history, the Pharisees frequently permitted themselves to make, (compare Matt. xxii. 15, sq.) This narrative rather is parallel to Matt. xxii. 35, sq. The question regarding ζωή αἰώνων was not suited to a design that was simply wicked. With amazing wisdom does our Lord on the present occasion treat this blind lawyer. Entramelled in his Rabbinical particularism, he asks some outward rule by which to set bounds to the duties of love, and not lie under the necessity of exercising that affection on all hands. Instead of giving him such a wished-for rule, the Saviour relates a narrative, in which nothing more is said of the object of love, which properly the νομικός had asked after, but of those who exercise love. A Priest, a Levite, members of the same order with the enquirer, and persons on whom the observance of the law was especially incumbent, pass heartlessly by, reckoning that the sufferer might probably be no neighbour. The Samaritan, whom they deemed a heretic, exercised the love of love. In every point from which it can be viewed, reproving, rebuking, demanding repentance, this parable must have arrested the questioner. He must have felt that not merely was his question false, but so also was the whole state of mind from which it could have proceeded. To the man who was asking after a law for the exercise of love, it must have become obvious that he had it not himself, and knew it not, inasmuch as its single law is this, that it is a law to itself. Love loves, and asks not when, how, where; it is the primordial, innermost life, which ignores

1 According to the view which refers this gospel especially to the heathen, this putting forward of one not a Jew as the model of pure love, possessed something peculiarly attractive.
the whole world of reflections and prudential rules, and blesses the enemy even though he pierce its heel. Into this world of pure love which the heart of Jesus contained (for whosoever exercises it has it only through him), he opens up a glimpse for the benefit of the νομικός hardened in his legal subtleties, and that was the only means by which he could be helped out of his heartless state. Thus Jesus exercised towards even him that very love, the knowledge of which he was teaching him; he blessed the ἰκτυράξων.

Ver. 25—27. The expression νομικὸς is not essentially distinct from γραμματικὸς and νομολογίσκος, and the words therefore are unquestionably interchanged. Compare Matt. xxii. 35 with Mark xii. 28; Luke v. 17 with verse 21. St Luke employs for the most part the term νομικὸς as more intelligible to his readers, (Luke vii. 30; xi. 45, 46, 52; xiv. 3), while the Hebraizing St Matthew uses γραμματικὸς = διδάκτων. It is the more generic term, while φασισταί denotes a particular party among the νομικοὶ. A Sadducee might also be a νομικὸς. (Compare on Matt. xxii. 35.) The question as to eternal life, being the final object of all theological enquiry, is put forward by the lawyer, under the conviction that, in replying to it, Jesus must bring out whatever was peculiar in His opinions. (The formula κληρονομὴν ζωῆς αἰώνος, or βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ [1 Cor. vi. 9, 10; xv. 50] has, without doubt, its foundation in the comparison of the land of Canaan [as the outward type of eternity], and of rest in it, to eternal life. The expression κληρονομὴν τῆς γῆς at Matt. v. 5, refers to this.) The Saviour, however, refers him to the old well-known word of God, saying, as it were, what thou askest has lain from of old expounded in the revealed word; take it thence for yourself. The lawyer now brings forward most correctly the passages Deut. vi. 5, in connection with Numb. xix. 18, (which passages are in a similar way conjoined by another lawyer at Mark xii. 33), wherefore, it only remained for him to translate into living fact the contents of these deep words, which, rightly understood, involve the whole New Testament. That this had not as yet been done by him, the result of the conversation shews It is further remarkable, in regard to the quotations of this passage, here as elsewhere in the gospels, to observe the way in which they deviated from the Hebrew text and from the LXX. In Hebrew there stand the expressions בּוּ, בּוּ, כּוֹ. The LXX. translate these,
diánoia, ψυχή, δύναμις. In the quotations of the evangelists, how-
however, the words run thus:—

Luke x. 27. xarðia, ψυχή, ἱσχύς, διάνοια.
Mark xii. 30. xarðia, ψυχή, διάνοια, ἱσχύς.
Mark xii. 33. xarðia, σύναισ, ψυχή, ἱσχύς.
Matt. xxii. 37. xarðia, ψυχή, διάνοια.

This constant difference of the gospel quotations from the LXX.
in the rendering of ἡ και τὴν ἀληθινήν αὐτῶν ἔστω, leads almost to the conjecture
that the evangelists either followed another reading, or that this
version of it had been taken by one of them from another. For,
it is inconceivable that this deviation should have taken the same
form in the three evangelists, if they had written independently
of each other. To me it seems most probable, that in this instance
the mutual agreement originated with St Luke, and passed over
from him to St Mark and the Greek St Matthew. (As to the
meaning of the synonyms in the passage, compare my Program
xxii. 37.) The exalted idea, however, of loving God with all our
powers, and loving Him also wholly with them all, embraces at
once the whole, both of religion and morality.¹ For, the addition
καὶ τὴν ἀληθινήν αὐτῶν ἔστω, is at bottom only an unfolding of
the contents of the first commandment, as Matt. xxii. 37 sq. shews.
In love to God, which, on the part of the creature, can only take
the form of receptive love, there lies the love of his will, and
consequently the implied love of one's neighbour. To draw,
however, from the command thus to love God, the inference,
that man must therefore be able to do it in his own strength,
would be wholly out of place. Since only that which is divine
knoweth God (compare on Matt. xi. 27,) so only that which is
divine can love God; and when God commands us therefore to
love God, it involves for the creature an injunction to receive the
Spirit of God, in whom alone he can be loved. This Spirit,
however, the New Testament imparts, and consequently this com-
mand of the Old Testament (as indeed the whole law) for its
fulfilment, presupposes the gospel. This same Spirit, who teaches
us to love God, wholly and entirely with all our faculties, alone

¹ As to this and the following thoughts, compare the fuller discussion on the pas-
sage Matt. xxii. 37, sq.
enables also us to love our neighbour aright. As pure love to
God loves God more than it does self apart from God, so it also
loves God more than our neighbour apart from God; but self and
our brother being looked at as in God, and God in them, true
self-love and genuine brotherly love are then at one with the
love of God. Hence does the Lord say that the second com-
mandment is like unto the first (Matt. xxii. 39), for this reason,
that it is the same thing with it. Love to one's neighbour, if it
be genuine love, that is, if the creature be loved not merely as a
creature (for in that lies the distinctive character of natural
love,) is nothing else than love to God. This even the following
parable shews.

Ver. 28, 29. The answer of the lawyer was in itself satisfactory
to the Saviour, but he directly urged him to follow out the com-
mand into action, remarking that life lay in the practical fulfilling
of it. But it was by this precisely that the corruption within
him was brought out to view; his knowledge wanted that decision
of the will fitted to carry it out into life, and this want of moral
power again obscured his discernment. He asks, feeling himself
struck—who then was his neighbour? a question which in his
own mind he must have felt himself able to answer, if he had
sought to exercise perfect love. (Δικαιών has no peculiar meaning
here; it merely refers, through the word ἱερόν, to the person
wishing to justify himself.) Just because of his want of experi-
ence, Jesus transfers him into the midst of the realities of life,
and makes him behold love actually loving. (The term ὑπελαμ
ζάνν = ἁπαξισθόναί, excipere, is in the New Testament found
only here. It occurs frequently in the LXX.; Job ii. 4; iv. 1.)

Ver. 30–33. The traveller whom the robbers assaulted is per-
haps to be conceived of as a Jew; for in that case it would on the
one hand be more striking that the priest and Levite refused him
their help, and on the other hand that the Samaritan gave him
assistance when he might so easily have availed himself of a
sophistical excuse. But it may be said that the priests would
have aided a Jew; and perhaps therefore it is best to view the sick
man as a heathen. (Ἀπείκων is not different from παρί-
χων. It is found in the New Testament only here. Συγκρίζω
also occurs only here in the New Testament. It denotes an
accident. Among profane writers also this form of the word
rarely occurs; συγκρινως is more usual.)
Ver. 34, 35. Most carefully is the compassionate treatment which the despised Samaritan bestows on the suffering stranger, delineated. From the impulse of love he does even more than was incumbent. (Wine and oil, well-known means of cure in the East. The παρακεφαλι is the Caravanserai of the nearest place, that at Jericho, perhaps, in the neighbourhood of which Jesus might then be staying.) It is a fine trait, that he cares also for the subsequent wants of the sick man, and promises to repay the outlay.

Ver. 36, 37. The enquiry now had certainly changed sides. The lawyer asked, ver. 29, who was the neighbour to whom support should be given. Jesus enquires who was the neighbour,—was it the man who exercised or who refused to exercise love? Even here, however, lay the great doctrine, that love is not determined by its object, but has inherently in itself its own standard. Pure love, however, loves even an enemy, as here the Samaritan does the sufferer who is a stranger, and one who from difference of creed might have appeared hostile. The acknowledgment, therefore, that true love dwelt in him, involved an answer to the question, and thus it only remained to impress upon his mind the admonition νοις ὑμῶν. It was an obvious suggestion to trace in the compassionate conduct of the Samaritan a figurative representation of the Saviour's work. The wounds of the sick (Is. i. 6), which they who sat on Moses' seat left undressed, he whom they reviled as a Samaritan (John viii. 48) bound up with oil and wine.

§ 5. MARY AND MARTHA.

(Luke x. 38—42.)

Equally appropriate to a journal of travel is the following little narrative, which at once transports Jesus to Bethany, in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem (John xi. 1), for which reason, as was formerly remarked, it cannot be the mere journey from Ephraim to Jerusalem, of which a history is here given, as in that case it would be inexplicable how Jesus should again, at the passage Luke xvii. 11, make his appearance on the borders of Galilee. That Martha and Mary, however, are to be sought for nowhere else than in Bethany, is certain from gospel history; in
this passage Martha is described as possessing a house of her own in the κώμη. Whether she was a widow, or lived unmarried with her sister and Lazarus, cannot be determined. The evangelists are remarkably sparing in their historic notices of the persons mentioned by them. They confine themselves to what is barely necessary, and devote themselves rather to the delineation of their spiritual life. Hence the account of the two sisters here given, marks them, though in few touches, so strikingly and clearly, that they are often chosen as exemplars of the peculiarities of two distinct religious tendencies. We find in Martha the type of a life busily devoted to externals, such as is frequently exemplified in this passing world; in Mary, the type of quiet self-devotion to the Divine as the one thing needful. To a certain extent both tendencies will be combined in each believer, but it is not to be overlooked that there are different vocations, and many are better fitted for busy outward labour than an inner contemplative life, although the most active must be from the depths of his soul given up to the Lord, and the man of contemplation must consecrate his energies to the advancement of God's kingdom. Hence, even the Saviour's word of rebuke to Martha (ver. 41) is no absolute censure, and is rather occasioned by her own antecedent remark (which shews that she had mistaken her own place as well as Mary's) than called forth by her conduct itself. Martha serves, as it were, only as a foil to the figure of Mary, in whom appears a mind wholly and undividedly given up to the influence of God. She is another example of the complete fulfilment of the command ἀγαπής κώμην τίν Θεόν σου ιη δης τής καρδίας σου (x. 27). The Samaritan practised it in an active, Mary in a receptive form.

Ver. 38-40. Probably Jesus had enjoyed opportunities of becoming acquainted with the family at Bethany during his former yearly journeys to the festivals. Mary sets herself confidently at his feet to listen to the words of her Lord; Martha busies herself to provide the best outward entertainment she could for the beloved guest. (We are to view the παρακαβίζων παρά τοὺς πίθας as denoting merely Mary's staying beside Jesus, and certainly in an attitude fitted to catch his instructive and life-awakening words). Martha was zealous meanwhile about externals, which certainly were necessary in part, but with self-gratification she gave her-

1 Among the apostles, St Peter corresponded to Martha, St John on the other hand to Mary.
self up entirely to them. ἐφιστάθη, distracted, in the New Testament occurs only here, in the Old Testament frequently; also the substantive πεισματικὸς = τῷ, Eccles. i. 13; ii. 23, 26. The word διακονία includes here all domestic services in which Martha lost herself with needless bustle). From this satisfaction in her own occupations arose the reproving speech directed against her sister; perhaps conscience stirred her up, and testified that Mary had more of Jesus than she. But as her craving for the heavenly was not sufficiently strong and pure, she suffered herself to be fettered by external activities, which in reality were more agreeable to her, and out of this state of mind arose her speech. Jealous of Mary, she wished her to be as she herself was. (The verb συναντιάζωπικοῦς, to support, to help, occurs again only at Rom. viii. 26.)

Ver. 41, 42. The address of Jesus to Martha refers less to household activity in itself (for that must be cared for) than to the state of mind in which she went about it, and the comparison she instituted in this respect between herself and Mary. He rebukes first the μεσιμάν and μεσάζων (the word occurs only here in the New Testament, it corresponds to the Latin turbare), that is, her restless spirit of action, as moved by the impulses of creature-affection; and he next contrasted the σωλά with the ἡ, along with an intimation that for the sake of the former she was losing the latter, while yet this latter, not the former (compare on Matt. iii. 14, 15), was of essential necessity (χείλια). It is one of the peculiarities of the Saviour’s discourses, that they often in few words say all that is necessary to bring everlasting truth, in some special view of it, home to all times and circumstances. Standing on the spiritual central-point, he without violence entwined the minutest and least important circumstances of the present with the loftiest eternal verities. In the efforts of the two sisters the Lord places together the nothingness of all love and care for the creature, in comparison with care for what is everlasting. The one thing must so be laid hold of by the soul, that no striving after anything else must similarly rouse it; and having

---

1 The clause ἵνα τεκνὶ χείλια is wanting in Cod. D. Other MSS. read ἵνα γεωργω or ἵνα θυσία. On these readings J. D. Michaelis founds his translation—one dish is enough for us. Certainly the reading ἵνα γεωργω seems to be grounded on some such idea. The common text, however, is sufficiently established by critical authorities, and the reference of the passage to a dish of food is altogether excluded, as well by the ἵνα as also by the subsequent expression ἵνα ἐξελθῃ μύγα.
begun with the one thing it will be able to deal not merely with many things, but with all things else—not in such a way, however, that these shall have the ascendancy and take captive the mind's life, but that it shall itself bear sway and bring every act into harmony with the main design of life. This pure and holy effort after the one and the Eternal portion, had Mary chosen. The expressions μίας and ἤματος mutually determine each other's meaning. The former points to the election of grace, the latter to man's free determination to embrace it. By the combination of the two (2 Pet. i. 10) spiritual life is rendered complete, inasmuch as the individual then lays hold of the gift as his own, and in doing so places it beyond the reach of loss. Without the free decision of his will to embrace it, a man may lose his calling (Matt. xxv. 29). For Martha, the thought thus expressed includes also this warning, to care for the one thing first, and in that way to make her calling (which certainly was a different one from that of Mary) equally firm and imperishable.

§ 6. DIRECTIONS RESPECTING PRAYER

(Luke xi. 1—13.)

That the following discourses belong to the last passover-journey is by no means unlikely. Only, the indefinite in τῆς τινί shews that a close adherence to localities formed no plan of the writer, and he may, therefore, often have been guided in his arrangement more by the connection of the matter than by local association. Although, however, portions of this section are placed by St Matthew in the sermon on the mount, yet must we grant, that they hold in St Luke a better position, for, on the one hand, the sermon on the mount bears generally, as is obvious, the manifest character of a collection, and on the other, what is here imparted suits better the close of Christ's labours than their commencement. Especially does this apply to the Lord's prayer, which, spoken at the end of the Saviour's public ministry, acquires the character of a sacred legacy left behind him to his church. The subsequent exhortations to prayer also, and instructions as to its efficacy, appear peculiarly fitted for the time when the Lord's visible presence was to be withdrawn from the apostles, on which account St John (xvi. 23. sq.) introduces simi-
lar passages into the last chapters, which contain the parting discourse of Jesus.

Ver. 1-4. As to the detailed exposition of the Lord's prayer compare Matt. vi. 9-13. It only remains for us to speak here of the particular form it bears in the text of St Luke, for it is not to be doubted that the text in this gospel has been interpolated from the more lengthened recension of St Matthew. First, in the address, the words ἡμᾶς ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς are undoubtedly genuine in St Matthew, but like the entire petition γενοβήτω τῷ Σαλαμᾶ σου x. t. λ. which is the firmly established reading of St Matthew, they are in St Luke of questionable authority. The same thing applies also to the concluding words ἀλλὰ ὑσσάς ἡμᾶς x. t. λ. It is true that by these omissions the prayer is in no respect rendered specifically different, for the γενοβήτω x. t. λ. is merely a further carrying out of the ἐλθόν σου ἡ βασιλεία, in the same way that the ἀλλὰ ὑσσάς x. t. λ. contains a filling up of the antecedent idea μὴ σινίγχης ἡμᾶς τίς σιωπήσῃ. But the beautiful inner harmony which the prayer exhibits as given by St Matthew is wanting in the shorter recension of St Luke, for the first half of it (compare on Matt. vi. 9), comprising only two clauses, is disproportionately curtailed. The recension of St Matthew should therefore be considered as the original form of the prayer, for what is peculiar to him cannot possibly be a mere amplification originating in later traditions, that of St Luke on the other hand should be viewed as an abbreviated form, inasmuch as he is found dealing in a similar way with many of those passages which St Matthew has included in the sermon on the mount. (Compare the beginning of the sermon on the mount.)

Ver. 5-8. After the prayer has been imparted, there are fittingly subjoined admonitions as to the use of it. Especially is persevering earnestness of supplication urgently enjoined. In the first verses this is done in the form of a parable, in the last (9-13) by figurative expressions. The latter verses have already at Matt. vii. 7 sq. been explained; the parable of the benighted traveller who by continued entreaty prevails with his neighbour and causes him to fulfil his desire, is peculiar to St Luke. It has no difficulties beyond the single circumstance, that as appears from this comparison, the impure motives as well of the supplicant (the ἀναίθω) as of him who suffered himself to be persuaded, form the point of comparison connecting them with
the most exalted relations. (Of the same nature is Luke xviii. 1 sq. which passage also treats of prayer, and in it God is compared to an unjust judge). But first as respects the ἀναίδεια of the suppliant, it is not to be overlooked that he is here pleading not for himself but for his guest; his pressing importunate petitions acquire thus a nobler motive; he entreats bread that he may not be compelled to violate the holy rites of hospitality. From him who suffers himself to be prevailed on, it is impossible to dissociate an unworthy motive; the nobler one of love is expressly excluded, and he grants what is asked, only that he may get rid of the suppliant—and yet this is applied to God. Here, however, we must have recourse to that usage in regard to parables (compare on Matt. ix. 16) according to which the likeness is often expressed, not in conformity with the objective truth, but as modified to meet the subjective position of him for whose understanding and instruction it is designed. Here the Saviour places himself on the standing-point of the man who knows from experience that God often delays long the fulfilment of prayer delineating him as one directly unrighteous (see on Luke xviii. 1), in doing which he merely sets forth fully the impression which in such circumstances a petitioner weak in the faith feels made on himself, and he adds the requisite exhortations according to this impression. Thus do the parables constantly present the appearance of having proceeded from the liveliest conceptions of man's circumstances, and they furnish a true reflection of spiritual things as seen in connection with our every-day earthly condition. How far the interpretation of individual traits in the parable (for example here the μυστηριόν as denoting the time of deepest inner darkness and need) should be carried, must certainly remain somewhat uncertain. In the parables of Jesus, however, which proceed upon powers of conception so rich, it ought on the whole to be maintained as a rule that no single trait is lightly to be overlooked, unless obviously the keeping hold of it does violence to the similitude as a whole.
§ 7. THE HEALING OF A DUMB MAN. THE DISCOURSES OF JESUS THEREUPON.

(Luke xi. 14—28.)

What is contained in this paragraph has already been considered in detail at Matt. xii. 22–30, and 43–45. We simply observe here, in regard to the arrangement, that the position in the history assigned to the occurrence by St Luke, merits undoubtedly the preference. The fearful outbreak of hatred on the part of the Pharisees and lawyers in the accusation that Jesus cast out spirits by the power of the prince of darkness, seems to belong to the end of his ministry. The words also (Luke xi. 24–26) as to the return of the evil spirit, stand immediately after the cure in a connection more appropriate than in St Matthew, who inserts before them the subsequent discourse (Luke xi. 29, sq.) as to the sign of Jonah. From the account of this cure, besides, down to Luke xiii. 9, everything hangs closely together, and confirms the conjecture that St Luke in this section made use of a journal of travel furnished by an immediate eye-witness. Many things betray such an origin. The only thing in this section peculiar to St Luke is the narrative (ver. 27, 28,) of the woman who blessed the mother of Jesus for her son's sake. This little history distinguishes itself so remarkably for naïveté and originality, that it gives no slight evidence for the correctness of St Luke's narrative. The invention or inappropriate insertion of it is hardly conceivable. Without doubt we owe to some eye-witness the account of this conversation conducted by Jesus on the occasion of his healing the dumb man. As respects further the contents of this narrative, it is not unimportant on account of the striking answer of Jesus in which the practical aim of all the Saviour's efforts is made apparent—that he cared not to excite wondering astonishment, but only to bring about a saving change of the whole life. The woman was certainly, as her exclamation shews, struck with the power and wisdom of Jesus, but, without taking the words home to herself and applying them to her own salvation, she is lost in contemplating his glory, and extols his blessedness through his mother, to whom she is led as a woman first to refer. This want of practical interest the answer of Jesus reproves, but in such a way that the woman,
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who had meant well in her remarks, could not feel herself offended, while both she and the others present must have yet been led to observe what was essential in the appearance of Christ. (In the word μενοῦσα, there is on the one hand an implied acknowledgment of what was true in the woman's exclamation, but on the other an intimation that the ἀνασκόλουθος καὶ φυλάσσων τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ stood still higher. The passage might be translated thus:—he who lets the word of God operate spiritually within him, and is thereby born again, stands higher than her who after the flesh was the mother of the Messiah. This spiritual blessing, however, is open to you all—appropriate it to yourselves.)

§ 8. CONTINUANCE OF THE DISCOURSES OF JESUS.

(Luke xi. 29—36.)

What was needful for the understanding of ver. 29—32 has been given already at Matt. xii. 38, sq. In regard to the place assigned to it, however, the narrative of St Luke deserves the preference; as was already observed in our exposition of St Matthew (ut supra), partly because we find on the part of St Luke greater originality, especially as respects the arranging of Christ's discourses, and next because in this very section the accuracy of his narrative is clearly manifest. According to St Luke, the Saviour directed his rebuke expressly to the mass of the assembled people, and the allusion to the people of Nineveh agrees well with this. In the closing verses of this section, two thoughts are subjoined by St Luke in the discourse of Jesus, which at Matt. v. 15; vi. 22, 23, were already explained in the Sermon on the Mount. It is of itself very possible that such gnome-like sentences may have been spoken by Christ on many occasions, just as the first passage, Luke viii. 16, again occurs in another connection. Meanwhile the connection, especially of the latter idea in St Matthew, is not so simple as to give it the appearance of being there in its immediate and original place. Here, on the other hand, the admonition to care for the purity of the inward sight, connects itself so with the preceding ideas, that its very peculiarity seems proof of its originality. But the whole connection of ideas (from

1 Axiomatic, pithy.—Tr.

Digitized by Google
ver. 33–36) requires careful development, for it is not at first obvious. To those who asked a sign from heaven the Lord had held forth the example of the Ninevites and the queen of the East, who were prepared to acknowledge the Divine in far less glorious manifestations of it, in Jonah, namely, and Solomon. From this thought Jesus makes a transition to the object of all revelations of the Divine among mankind, namely, ἡ δὲ εἰσηγημένη (ἐστὶν ὁ Κόσμος τῷ Θεῷ) τῷ φῶτος βλέπων. The perfect revelation of God in Christ himself, is so constituted, that its glory radiates far and wide, striking every eye. The eye itself certainly must be sound and clear if it is to take in purely the impressions of the truth. Hence the admonition to bring the eye into a rightly constituted state. What here seems strange, however, is that at ver. 33, λύχνος being that which giveth light, denotes the Saviour himself as the φῶς τῶν κλήσεων, while again in ver. 34 it means the ability to take in the light—to see. Already, however, at Matt. vi. 22, 23, it was remarked that a light itself was needful for the reception of the light (as a negative pole for the positive), and the darkness here is not to be considered as simply the absence of light, but as that which resists every reception of the light, and consequently as the moral impurity which flies every discovery of itself by the power of light. In order to receive the light of Christ, therefore, the eye must be ἀγάλματι, and then does it work with an influence so quickening and light-giving, that the φῶς ἐν ἀγάλματι pervades the man. The figure here is only distinguished from that brought forward at Matt. vi. 22 (where the particulars may be compared), by the additional clause ver. 36. There seems, however, a tautology implied in this additional statement, εἰ ὁ κόσμος σου ἔλεγεν φωτισθῆναι ἢ σωτισθῆναι συνειλανθῇ. The ὡς which follows, however, indicates very naturally a silently implied διότι, by means of which the following sense would arise:—"The enlightenment of man (owing to the similitude having been taken from the outward eye, the body stands for man's inner being), by the reception of the Divine light through means of a single and clear eye, brightens him so entirely (amidst the darkness around) that he shines (inwardly and spiritually) as when outwardly (under night) a light irradiates one with its beams." It is not, therefore, a merely ideal knowledge of God and divine things that is here spoken of, but the communication of a higher life-principle, which has the power
of forming in him to whom it is imparted a fountain of similar life (John iv. 14). The whole passage, therefore, pourtrays believers as men transformed by the influence of Christ (of the ϕασιν τοῦ κόσμου) into φωστήρες ἐν κόσμῳ (Phil. ii. 15), enlightening what lies around them.¹ (In ver. 35 σκότη, as elsewhere σκίτω, is used in the sense of to take care, to guard oneself. In the New Testament this meaning occurs only here—ver. 36, σφορα is = φίγγος, the shining, gleaming flash).

§ 9. REBUKE TO THE PHARISEES AND LAWYERS.

(Luke xi. 37—54.)

As respects the following discourse against the φασιστῶν and νομικῶν, the thoughts, which, according to St Luke's account, it contained, are given by St Matthew, but as his custom is, he conjoins them with others wanting in St Luke, so as to form a complete whole. In this form the separate ideas will be found more fully explained on Matt. xxiii. We merely consider here the discourse in St Luke viewed as a whole. Its form leaves no room for doubt that here again we have in St Luke the account of an eye-witness, while the discourse in St Matthew (ch. xxiii.) shews itself manifestly to be a composition consisting of kindred portions of discourses which might have been spoken by Jesus on very different occasions. For, in the first place, the account of St Luke starts from a definite historic occasion. During the Saviour's discourse which followed the cure of the dumb man (xi. 14), a Pharisee came up and invited him to dine (in the exposition of ἀγιότητα, ver. 37, there is no ground for deviating from the common meaning prandere). As he observed that Jesus ate without having washed his hands, and loudly expressed his astonishment at this after the meal was finished, Christ at once commenced a conversation as to the connection of inward and outward purity. Owing to this observation of the Pharisee, the discourse was directed first against them—the reason, however, which led Christ to extend it also to the νομικῶν is stated by St Luke at ch. xi. 45. One of the lawyers, namely, applied the words to himself, and therefore the Lord turned to that party and rebuked their errors.

¹ Compare also Dan. xii. 8; (Matt. xiii. 43); 1 Cor. xv. 41, 42.
In the second place, the discourse concludes (ver. 53, 54) with a
general remark by the writer, that such a public declaration had
brought the opponents of Jesus to the firm determination to
overthrow him as the destroyer of their whole power over the
people. In St Matthew all those points are wanting which shew
that the account of St Luke had been drawn on the spot and from
the life. St Matthew, on the contrary, gives an address in which
he has put together all the antipharisaical elements to be found in
the discourses of Jesus; these he has arranged with skill and dis-
cernment, into a new and entire whole. (In the closing verses
of this section at Luke xi. 54, there occur some unusual expres-
sions. As respects first the ἰδιεῖται, it means, as at Mark vi.
19, insidiari. In the LXX. it occurs at Gen. xlix. 23. Only
at this passage in the New Testament does ἀποστοματίζων occur.
According to Timaeus, in the Platonic Lexicon, when intransi-
tive it is = ἀπὸ μνήμης λίγων, to recount from memory. Transi-
tively, however, it means to cause one to tell something, digging
it as it were out of his mouth. Suidas says, ἀποστοματίζων φαίο τὸν
dιδάσκαλον ἐκ τῆς κήλης τὸν πάιδα λίγων ἄττα ἀπὸ στόματος. With this
meaning the subsequent ἰδιεῖται well agrees [which word does
not again occur save at Acts xxiii. 21] as also does the expres-
sion τηρεῖται, which is intended to describe the ensnaring nature
of the questions put by Christ’s enemies, examples of which are
brought forward at Matt. xxii. 15, sq. The word ἰδιεῖται, from
ἰδεῖ, corresponds even in point of etymology with the Latin insi-
diari.)

§ 10. VARIOUS DISCOURSES OF JESUS.

(Luke xii. 1—59.)

To the contents of the following paragraphs the same remarks
may be applied which were made on the foregoing. The same
thoughts, for the most part, again occur also in St Matthew,
where they are arranged in various connections, according to the
method adopted by that evangelist in combining portions of dif-
ferent discourses. Even if separate, gnome-like (axiomatic)
declarations of Christ might have been spoken by the Saviour at
different times, yet is it difficult to conceive that more lengthened
portions of discourse, agreeing word for word, could have been
uttered more than once. In examining the originality of the section, however, everything in this instance again speaks in favour of St Luke. For, at the very beginning of the chapter, he again connects the discourse that follows with a definite historic occurrence. As soon as Jesus left the house of the Pharisee, and stepped out amidst the numerous masses of the assembled people, He continued addressing to His disciples the discourse respecting the Pharisees, pointing out the danger which threatened them from these self-seeking men, and referring them to that higher aid which stood ready for them. This discourse, which the Lord carried on with His disciples amidst a wide circle of surrounding people, was suddenly interrupted by an individual from amidst the crowd, with a request so strangely out of place, that the very contrast between this incident and the discourse of Jesus goes to prove the originality of the account used by St Luke in this section. For this man, full of his little domestic affairs, asks that the Saviour would settle a quarrel about an inheritance in his family. The mild Son of man holds it not beneath His dignity to lead even this erring one back into another path. By narrating a parable, Jesus takes the trouble to make obvious to him the nothingness of earthly possessions (ver. 16–21). And then He resumes the address to His disciples, which had been interrupted, taking up in such a way the thread which had been let fall, that the intervening words are woven into the connection. The Father's care for those who seek after the spiritual, forms once more the subject of His discourse, with an intimation that all spiritual blessings are infinitely exalted above everything earthly. After the possession of the former, therefore, the Lord exhorts His people to strive and not to slacken in their zeal, but to persevere like the expectant servants of their Lord. Here St Peter again breaks in on the discourse of Jesus (ver. 40), and asks to whom he meant to apply these words, to them alone or to all. This question leads Jesus to go still farther into the parable He had chosen, of servants who await their lord's return, and so to develop it as to convey the answer sought of Him, and bring the apostles to the conclusion that He spake of His own departure and return. This then brings the Lord finally (ver. 54–59) to address a reproof to the crowd, in which He even charges them with that very hypocrisy against which He had at the commencement warned them. He reminds them of the visible signs of His
presence, and earnestly exhorts them not to mistake these signs. Thus the whole is so connected, and shews itself by the intermediate questioning to be so plainly the original account of an eyewitness, that it cannot be dissevered. Its connection with what goes before makes us see in it plainly a portion of that great journal of travel which St Luke used in writing his work. The separate thoughts, here given in their original connection, St Matthew, according to his custom, re-arranged under certain general points of view.

Ver. 1. The account of St Luke begins with a well-marked historical connection in point of time with the foregoing narrative, (in scil. χρόνος in the sense of meantime, during which period, synonymous with in το Mark ii. 19; Luke v. 34.) While he was at meat (Luke xi. 37,) the people assembled before the house of the Pharisee, in order to obtain a sight of the prophet. (The μεγάλος denotes, like the μεγάλος, great, but indefinite numbers.) Here then the Lord begins an address of warning against the Pharisees, directed, in the first instance, certainly to His disciples, but plainly uttered in the presence of the people, (ver. 13, 54, whose ears many of His words may have reached. The exposition of the words was already given at Matt. xvi. 6. As the explanation of ζόμος, there is here expressly added the clause ητίς ησιν Ἰωάννου. The bringing forward of this in particular is very naturally accounted for from the fact that all the remarks of our Lord's preceding rebuke, as also the whole blameworthy peculiarities of the sect, centred in their ἐπίθεσις. To the spirit of the Gospel, indeed, nothing is more opposed than hypocrisy, for, whether in its grosser or more refined form, whether consciously or unconsciously cherished, it ever implies a contradiction between the inner man and the outer form. This contradiction is removed by Christianity, which establishes the ἀπλοτητικ of the soul, and attaches value to every outward appearance only so far as it is the genuine expression of the inner life. (The term προς, therefore, is to be taken as meaning, first of all, above all, as at Matt. vi. 33.)

Ver. 2–12. The words which follow have been already explained, namely, ver. 2–9, at Matt. x. 26, sq. (compare Luke viii. 17), ver. 10, at Matt. xii. 31; Mark iii. 28, ver. 11, 12; at Matt. x. 19, 20. The connexion of the words with the admonition to beware of the Pharisees is also so simple as to be self-evident.
Only, there is something obscure in ver. 2 and ver. 3, in regard to their connection with what goes before and follows. As to conjoining the discovery of what is concealed with the warning against hypocrisy, in the sense of “the secrets of the hypocrite shall one day be laid open,” it is not to be thought of, because at verse 3 the revealing agency is ascribed to the Apostles themselves. We must rather supply, therefore, at this passage, the words μὴ ἐνώπιον, as is expressly done at Matt. x. 26.

On the one hand this open revelation of the inner man forms the contrast to hypocrisy, and on the other the display, in its full glory, of that divine truth which the Apostles were called to advocate, necessarily consummates its triumph. Hence, even if opponents arise against it, the powerful protection of God will shield the champions of the truth. What is said at ver. 10, of the sin against the Holy Ghost, was fully considered on a quite different occasion. (Compare on Matt. xii. 31.) Yet is it at the same time not improbable that the Saviour in this connection referred back to the main idea formerly expressed. For, the warning against apostacy led him very naturally to speak of the lowest stage of declension. In contrast, however, to the sin against the Holy Ghost there is brought forward at the conclusion (ver. 12), the help to be received from the Holy Ghost, the aid imparted to those who are steadfast to their faith in the Redeemer.

Ver. 13—16. The narrative which follows is peculiar to St Luke, according to whom some one from among the crowd requested Jesus to support him in a lawsuit. This little episode is instructive in so far as it shews the way and manner in which Jesus conducted himself regarding those affairs which enter into the external relations of political and civil life. He wholly refrained from such interference, and confined his labours entirely to the internal and moral world; out of this no doubt there arose an entire reformation of all political and civil relations, brought about by the labours of Jesus, but at first he left these externals unassailed, seeking only to establish the new life within. An important hint this for all who are called to the work of the ministry! Interference with exterior relations characterises sectarian effort, which has to do not with men’s hearts but with dominion over them and their money. (ἀναστήσεως occurs again at Acts vii. 27, 35, in the sense of arbitrer, freely chosen umpire. Μετορρύπα, met with only here in the New Testament, means, according to
Grotius, on the passage, qui familiae hercissoundaef, communis dividendo, aut finibus regundis arbitrer sumitur.) To make the man who had so awkwardly interrupted his discourse, aware of his spiritual state, Jesus gives him in the following verses a warning against πλούσιος. One may conceive of a wish being entertained for the division of an inheritance without πλούσιος, but in the case of this man, the very moment he chose for making his application to Christ shews that worldliness had repressed all sympathy with things spiritual, and this entanglement is the root of πλούσιος, the subjugation of life to things earthy. As respects the construction of the latter half of verse 15, it must be observed, first, that undoubtedly αὐτῷ is the right reading, and that in this entirely Hebraizing passage the pronouns must be explained after the usage of the Hebrew language. The thought contained in the passage would be easy if the words ἐν τῷ ἵππῳ ὑπερχύτοσαν αὐτῷ were wanting. By this additional clause some expositors (for example Paulus) have been induced erroneously to supply αὐτῷ before the ἵππῳ κ. τ. λ. so as to bring out this meaning,—even if any one has many possessions, yet is the life of the body not part of his property, i.e. he has no control over his life. This explanation seems to agree with the following parable, according to which even the rich man speedily loses his bodily life. But verse 21 at once opens to our view another sense in which the life may be understood by the words πλούσιος ἐς θεόν. Only relatively is death a loss, for the πλούσιος ἐς θεόν it is a gain. It is most correct then to view ζωὴ as denoting true life, in so far as it implies σωτηρία. The construction then is simply this, that the thought has been in substance completely expressed by the words ἐνυπνεῖται τίνι ἡ ζωὴ αὐτοῦ ἰδίᾳ, the words εἰ τῶν ὑπερχύτοσαν αὐτῷ, however, which follow, bring forward from the preceding πεποίημι this additional idea, that no spiritual power can be ascribed to the possession of earthly goods. There are then two opinions here combined in one—"Life consists not in superabundance," and "out of earthly portions nothing spiritual can flow." The parable which follows, therefore, teaches as well that earthly blessings may be lost, as the necessity of laying up imperishable treasures along with the possession of which ζωὴ is at the same time bestowed, and which ζῶντος is so little able to take away that it rather introduces us to the full enjoyment of them.

Ver. 16—21. Here follows a parable, whose object by no means
is to warn against the abuse of riches, but against riches themselves, that is, against the soul's placing its dependence on any transitory possession. This dependence may exist as well on the part of him who has much as of him who has little, although in the case of the former the temptation is greater. In the same way, however, can the true πτωχεία πνεύματος (Matt. v. 3), exist amidst great possessions. According to the views of the world and the decisions of the law, the man whom Jesus brings forward in the parable does nothing unrighteous; rather does he act wisely; just as the man who from amidst the crowd wished to force on his brother to a division of the inheritance does nothing against the law. But in both cases predominance was given to that natural life which cleaves to the creature, devoting to it its whole affections, and in that condition man is a νηστέος, and consequently is transitory as the passing objects which he loves. With this state of soul the Saviour contrasts another and an opposite, in which man sets his affections on things eternal, and holds and uses all his transitory possessions not for their own sake, but to promote the everlasting welfare of himself and others. This being his state he is a πτωχεύω, even though he may have great possessions, while one in the condition of a beggar may be a πλούσιος οίκως. This expression is most characteristic in opposition to the Σναυπόθεν & ιαυτός. For in human effort every thing depends on the final object towards which it is directed. In man's usual efforts after the things of sense the I (self) is the object of all exertion; and that poor I, with its transient joy and peace, falls during this very effort a prey to φθορά; in genuine effort, however, it is God the eternal, unchangeable, immortal, (1 Tim. vi. 16,) who becomes the object followed after, and while man therefore is laying up treasure for God (οίκος is not to be confounded with ινός or πτωχεύω, he is at the same time laying up for himself, for where his treasure is, there also is his real I. (Matt. vi. 21.) Compare the beautiful treatise of Clemens Alex. τίς ἐ σωζόμενος πλούσιος, which contains a Commentary on the history at Mark x. 17, sq. full of rich and deep thoughts. In the Pauline epistles compare 1 Cor. vii. 29, sq. where we are taught to possess as though we possessed not. (Ver. 16, σωζόμενος, means to bear abundantly, fruitfully. In the New Testament it is found only here,—ver. 19, ἐκ τῆς ἐνεχθής μαντείας stands certainly for αὑτός; it is, however, to be carefully noted that the words ἐνεχθής, ἐνεχθής, and πτωχεύω are not used promiscue
for the person who is the subject of discourse, but are severally applied in certain relations as these become more particularly prominent. In this case, for example, neither ἐδμα nor ἐνίμα could have been employed. According to the divine ordinance nourishment is required by the body, but the ἐνίμα has relation to nobler than sensuous blessings and food. The ἔννοια, as being capable of education and development, can refer as well to the lower region of the ἐνίμα as to the higher one of the ἐνίμα. In this very thing consequently does the point of the thought before us lie, that he gave up to the ἐνδικοῖς that ἔννοια which he should have consecrated to the ἐννοματικοῖς.

Ver. 22—31. In what follows of his discourse our Lord comes back to his disciples, taking again ver. 12 as his starting point from which to carry on his remarks, and keeping in view the contents of the parable. Warning them against anxious care for the world, He points his disciples to our heavenly Father as their true helper in every strait, and remarks that, while trusting in his aid, there was no necessity for such an anxious gathering together of the means of bodily support as is exhibited in the case of the rich man. The whole discourse, it may be added, is founded on the supposition, that circumstances might well give occasion and temptation enough for cherishing such anxieties. The particulars have already been more fully explained at Matt. vi. 25—32.

Ver. 32. With the words μὴ δοκῇ the discourse obviously returns to the standing-point of ver. 4, where the Redeemer, styling the disciples his friends, exhorts them μὴ δοκῇν. The confidential mode of his address, however, μηδὲν τοῦμεν with which the foregoing φίλοι μου (ver. 4), may be set down as parallel, does not seem to agree with the idea of a conversation before the multitude (ver. 1.) At least, in the passage, John xv. 14, 15, where the Lord also calls his disciples his friends, it is done in the innermost circle of those belonging to him. But in what follows, there immediately (ver. 33) occurs the plainest reference to ver. 21, which words again were addressed to one amidst the crowd, (ver. 13), so that it is not possible to divide this discourse into separate elements, as spoken (before the people and before the disciples) at different times. It is impossible, especially because of ver. 41. The only supposition we can form therefore is, that the disciples were nearest to Jesus, standing close round him, and
part of his words did not reach the multitude; but on the other hand the Saviour perhaps intended that to some his words should be completely audible, while all should receive at least the general impression of them. Thus the conclusion of his address, (ver. 54, sq.) which contains a distinct appeal to the multitude, charges them with ἰδίωκες, with a warning against which the discourse opened. (Compare ver. 1 with ver. 56.) Even the marked, and at first sight strange separation of the μικρὸν ποίμνιον from the great multitude (retained under the entanglements of Pharisaic influence), was perhaps designed on this account by the Saviour, and even if many of the particular allusions were unintelligible to the crowd (as, for instance, the account which follows of watching for his own return, must certainly have been unintelligible), yet far less stress is laid on these than on the impress of rebuke and reproof which the whole discourse bears. This must have driven men to a decision for or against him; the better disposed would attach themselves to the little flock, the rest went over entirely to his enemies. And this circumstance itself shews that the discourse is in its right place in the account of the last journey to Jerusalem, for, only towards the close of the ministry of Jesus would it have been appropriate to make such a demand for a decisive choice.

In the idea of the ποίμνιον, however, there is implied a reference not merely to their connection with Jesus as the shepherd, (John x. 12), but also, as the μικρὸν indicates, to the relation in which the disciples stood to the world. The expression reminds us of the relation of sheep to wolves, (Matt. x. 16.) To comfort them, as it were, under the sufferings and persecutions of the world, the Saviour promises that the kingdom should be bestowed on them by the Father, under which term in this passage, as being the opposite of κόιμος (ver. 30) in its widest application, inwardly as well as outwardly, we must understand a state of things, in which God's will is supreme, and beneath that supremacy it must be well with the good. Most appropriately, however, does the διώκων here correspond with the ζητῶν (ver. 31.) For it was only with this, that the promise of outward aid and support was primarily associated, and now the Saviour adds that the exalted object after which they strove was already their own. The pro-

---

* The ζητῶ— the seeking. — Tr.
terite here is to be retained in its literal sense, for this reason, that the Saviour views the disciples as the first bearers of that new life which he was called to bring into the world, and looks on them in the election of grace. If Jesus speaks here quite generally, without mentioning the ὑδ ης ἀπωλέως (as in the similar passage, John xvii. 12), this was certainly done, partly because he spoke in presence of the multitude, partly because the time of Judas was not yet past, and so there still remained the hope of winning him, and finally it might yet be said that even Judas was chosen, but made not his election sure (2 Peter i. 10) and so fell through his unfaithfulness.

Ver 33. In the following verses (down to verse 36) the Redeemer subjoins admonitions to the effect that they should walk as children of the kingdom, and members of the little flock. The picture is carried out in contrast to the preceding representation of the worldling anxious for the interests of the body and of self. The latter amasses for himself possessions and goods, the former sells them, the latter seeks ease and pleasure (ver. 19) the former stands amidst struggles and contests (ver. 35). It may be a question, however, in what sense the exhortation expressed in general terms, πολύντας ἥτα ἵππον ἑαυτῶν ἵματι, is to be understood. In the first place, it is not to be conceived that we have here any general admonition to Christians, otherwise the passage, 1 Cor. vii. 29, sq. would contradict it. Freedom in a spiritual sense from all earthly possessions, is assuredly to be considered as the highest aim of every member of the kingdom; by it alone can the outward act acquire real significance. A second question, however, certainly arises, whether the Lord means here to give his disciples a special precept; and according to Matt. xix. 27, it appears by no means improbable that he does.¹ According to Matt. xix. 21 also, Jesus, in certain cases where a too strong attachment to worldly possessions was manifested, appears to have required the entire giving up of these goods, and to have meant his injunction to be understood in good earnest, and in a literal sense. Yet, in any case, we must say that the necessity for such external renunciation must be regarded as something of subordinate importance, for all out-

¹ Luke xxii. 86, however, shows that even on the part of the disciples themselves the expression πάντα ἀφέως is to be taken with limitations. Compare also on John xxii. 8. In the parallel passage at Matt. vi. 19, only the negative side is brought forward to view, μὴ Ξεπαξιῶθεν ὑμῖν Ξεπαξιῶθεν, ἵνα τις γνω.
ward blessings being as Clemens Alex. (in the treatise above referred to) says, ἔξωματα, and therefore to be held possession of, so may they lawfully be thus held, if only they do not acquire the mastery. In the case of the disciples, however, it might be of importance that in this respect as in others they should be seen resembling their Lord. The remaining words of ver. 33 (as also ver. 34) agree entirely with the verses, Matt. vi. 20, 21, already explained. Instead of the transitory, the eternal is enjoined on us as the sole object of our endeavours, inasmuch as the καρδία (along with the ψυχή whose centre lies in the καρδία) identifies itself, as it were, with the object sought after. The only thing peculiar to St Luke is the additional clause συμπάθοι ἱεροτέις βαλάντια μὴ σαλινώμεια, in which the βαλάντιον (see Luke x. 4) stands for what is contained in the crumenā. The treasures which grow not old, therefore, are equivalent to the Eternal. (The word διαλειπτος, inexhaustible, is in the New Testament found only here).

Ver. 35, 36. In regard to what follows in the account of St Luke, there occur kindred elements at Matt. xxiv. 42, sq. The two passages are so closely akin, that we cannot well suppose Christ to have twice spoken the same words at different periods, and in different circumstances. It thus becomes a question, in which of the two evangelists the original connection of the words may have been preserved. To me it once more seems in this case probable, that (as was remarked generally on Luke xii. 1) St Luke has the more closely recorded the circumstances. For the whole account of St Luke is so peculiar, that it evidently reports to us a conversation which really took place, with its various turns and interruptions, while it is equally obvious that St Matthew (ch. xxiv.) combines portions of discourses which all refer to the same topic, namely the Lord's return to the earth. In favour of the view that St Luke or the author of the account he made use of, has possibly introduced here something foreign to the occasion, there is merely the obscurity of the connection, and the circumstance, that the following context seems to point to the Parousia, which is not referred to in what goes before. But though the connecting thread which prevades all is fine, it is not wanting. For, all that is said from ver. 4 and onwards of the persecutions awaiting the disciples, and from ver. 22 of their entire separation from worldly possessions, and striving after eternal blessings, was based upon the idea that the Lord's protecting presence was to cease, so
that the μικροῖς συμμορίαν (ver. 32) must be so explained that the flock is viewed as bereft of their shepherd, and exposed in consequence to all the assaults of the enemy. With this leading idea what follows is closely connected, inasmuch as the disciples are commanded to continue true, throughout the period of abandonment which stood before them, and that faithfulness would meet its reward from the Lord on his return. Granting then, that in the preceding context, no express reference is made to his return, yet the abandonment of the disciples presupposes the departure of their Lord, and this departure presupposes necessarily that one day he shall return, and these two ideas form the supports on which the whole connection of the passage rests. The multitude, who equally heard this address, must certainly have failed to understand the idea of his return, which was a difficulty even to the disciples, but it was not for them that the discourse was primarily intended, and then, figurative though it was, it bore a meaning intelligible to all, as admonishing them faithfully to adhere to the true Lord. This exhortation formed at the same time a warning against hypocrisy, (ver 56), which was greatly needed by the multitude, who listened indeed eagerly to Jesus, but from fear of the Pharisees shrank from a decision in his favour. (Compare on Matt. xxiv. 51, where instead of the ᾠνίστοι in St Luke there stands the more accurate ἠνοχυρίατοι.) The principal thoughts in the following verses, in so far as they relate to the Parousia, will be found explained more fully at Matt. xxiv., to which passage we now refer. Verses 35 and 36, like verse 33, retain primarily the preceptive form. The ideas of these verses St Luke has modified in a peculiar way. The general comparison of servants who wait for their Lord, is more nearly defined by the circumstance, that he is represented as returning from the feast (ἀναλύειν ἐκ τῶν γάμων). We cannot therefore view this passage as a parallel one to Matt. xxv. 1, sq., for, in that chapter, the bridegroom is represented as coming to the marriage feast, and the virgins as waiting for him. The similitude of the marriage feast points in every case to the relation of Christ to his church, (compare Matt. ix. 15). To the church, however, in its wider acceptation, all the members of Christ's body assuredly belong, and among them consequently the apostles are included. But the separate members may be viewed as standing in different relations to each other, according as this or that disposition acquires a certain ascendancy over their character. Some-
times they are pre- eminent for active effort (δουλεία), sometimes their natures are more receptive, or contemplative, (παρθένω), and the figurative modes of expression are modified accordingly. (Compare more detailed remarks on Matt. xxv. 1, sq.; 14, sq.) Here the apostles are represented as men of activity, and for this reason they appear as the stewards of God's house, in the absence of the Lord at the heavenly banquet, that is, at his union with the church above, to which there is an analogy in his union with the church of the saints on earth at his return—his coming to the marriage-feast (Ὀφίππος περικμωμιαν and λόγων καθισμων are the usual figurative expressions denoting to be prepared and ready, ἡκετος γινομαι, ver. 40. Compare Jer. i. 17; 1 Pet. i. 13; Matt. xxv. 1.)

Ver. 37, 38. After this exhortation to a faithful decision in favour of the Lord (the opposite of ὄπειρος, ver. 46, compared with Matt. xxiv. 51), there is subjoined the thanks and the blessing bestowed on such faithfulness. First of all, the return of the Lord is represented as wholly uncertain, in regard to the watch of the night in which it may be expected, and the reward of faithfulness as equally great, whatever the period of time over which it was extended. (This recalls to mind the parable, Matt. xx. 1, sq., according to which the labourers, though called at different periods, yet receive equal recompense. Our more detailed remarks may be consulted on the passage itself). Naturally there seems greater difficulty entailed by the later coming of the Lord, and the longer waiting which this implies. (It is intentionally that no mention is made of the first night-watch, for the banquet itself falls within it. As, however, allusion is made only to the second and third, Jesus seems here to have made use of the old division of the night amongst the Jews into three night-watches. Compare on Matt. xiv. 25.)—The description of the reward given to the true servants is altogether peculiar; these ideas are found only in Luke. For the Lord reverses their relative positions; he becomes the servant, they are the masters. In a passage, which also is peculiar to himself (chap. xvii. 7—10), St Luke has described the usual practice, that when a servant returns from labour, his master first requires him to attend to his personal comfort, and then permits him to take his own food, without thanking him for these exertions, inasmuch as he has only done what he was bound to do. The contrast of
these two passages may be explained in this way, that the aim of Luke xvii. 7, sq. is to bring forward the humble, unassuming state of mind of those truly faithful servants of the Lord who say ἵνα δοῦλοι ἄγιοι ἐσμέν. The passage before us, on the other hand, brings to view the self-humbling nature of the Son of man, so rich in grace, who not only places his servants on a level with himself, but sets himself beneath them. Thus, while the former passage gives expression to righteousness, that before us expresses grace, in regard to the relation of the servants to their Lord. The form, however, under which our Lord's self-sacrificing love for his servants is here set forth, is borrowed from that promise which runs through all Scripture, of a great feast which, at the setting up of God's kingdom, our Lord shall hold with his own. (Compare on Matt. viii. 11). This διδοθεὶς τῷ γεννών τῷ άγίῳ (Rev. xix. 9) has its type in that last meal of Jesus when He instituted the sacrament of the Supper, and according to John xiii. 1, sq. the Saviour acted on that occasion altogether in harmony with what is here promised; He conducted Himself like the servant, and considered His disciples as the masters. What then took place, was an outward type of what once in the end of the day, the Lord shall do to his own people, who until death remain true to his commandments. (For further details see on Matt. xxvi. 29). With this the Saturnalia of the ancients may not inappropriately be compared, which also in symbolic form, gave expression to the idea that one day mankind should form a family of brethren. Thus even the Lord of heaven is not ashamed to present Himself as the first-born among many brethren (Rom. viii. 29; Heb. ii. 11).

Ver. 39, 40. The Saviour, however, adds (modifying the previously used comparison of the servant waiting for his Lord) as a warning, that the time of the master's return is altogether uncertain; it must therefore be expected that he may come at any moment (ver. 35, 40, as parallel to ver. 38), and even at that instant He may appear when least of all men anticipate His return. (As to this thought, so important to our understanding the doctrine of the Parousia, compare the more detailed remarks at Matt. xxiv. 43, 44). Here, however, the comparison of a master at a distance, whose return is waited for by his servants, whom he had left behind to manage the household affairs (compare ver. 42, sq.) is conjoined with another, which serves more
fully to bring out the unexpected nature of his coming—the figure, namely, of the goodman of the house, who defending himself from the assault of a thief, and not knowing the hour of the thief’s approach, must be continually on the watch. That this comparison has absolutely no meaning, beyond expressing the idea of suddenness, is certainly not probable. It is in the first place, used in the New Testament so commonly with reference to the return of Christ (Matt. xxiv. 43; 2 Peter iii. 10; Rev. iii. 3; xvi. 15), that we cannot fail to suppose some special reference to be implied in the expression. Further, we must not overlook the reason why some nobler comparison—of which so many must have presented themselves—was not selected in order to shew forth the suddenness. And, finally, the accurate filling up of the figure in some of the passages (for example here and at Matt. xxiv. 43), according to which, the master of the house is set in opposition to the thief, and the breaking in of the latter depicted, is not calculated to support the opinion which refuses to lay any stress on the various features of the comparison itself. Rather does the remark made on Matt. ix. 16 apply here, that our Lord frequently uses figurative expressions taken from the standing-point of his enemies. In this case, the comparison of the "κλεπτὸς" is taken from the feelings of those who, amidst the life and movement of earth, view themselves as in their own proper home. These take fright at the coming of the Son of Man, as at the inbreaking of a thief; through Him they believe it is all over with their (supposed) property and possessions. Here, then, is seen the feeling of all worldly-minded men, concentrated as it were in the "οἰκοδεσπότης", under whom we can (according to Matt. xii. 29; Luke xi. 21) understand no other than the "ἀξιών τοῦ κόσμου τῶν τῶν. Thus understood, the comparison acquires, on the one hand, its own definite meaning, and on the other, there is also assigned a ground for the uncertainty of our Lord’s return, which will be more closely examined and remarked upon at Matt. xxiv. 43. It seems, however, an obscure point, how this comparison of the "κλεπτὸς" can be interwoven with that of the "δοῦλο", as is done in this passage, and at Matt. xxiv. 43. The ground of it is probably this. The Apostles themselves, although on the one side they are the representatives of the "βασιλεία τ. Θ. (ver. 32), yet appear on the other, as by no means removed from the region of
the κόμος, — they still bear the worldly element within them (1 John ii. 16), and require for this reason very earnest admonitions to fidelity, and warnings against unfaithfulness (ver. 9, 10, 47, 48). In so far, however, as the disciples themselves still belong to the region of the κόμος, in so far do they also share its character; they cherish fear, namely, for the manifestation of the Divine, and for this reason could the Lord here conjoin two things apparently foreign to each other.\(^1\) Like the disciples, every believer bears a double character; as a member of the kingdom of God, he is a διώκω τοῦ Θεοῦ, in so far, however, as the old man and consequently the world lives within him, he carries in himself that which is enmity against God, and according to this position, he must partly long for, and partly dread the coming of the Lord, as that act which shall reveal the κεντρά τῶν ανθρώπων. According to that standing-point of exalted contemplation, therefore, from which the Saviour spoke, He viewed all the separate individuals in the connection which their lives bore to the whole, and found the key of heaven and hell, of bliss and anguish, in the hearts of each.

Ver. 41. It is easy to explain how St Peter should here have put the question, whether this was spoken to them alone, or to all (even to the διώκω, ver. 1). For the discourse had in fact acquired a general character, inasmuch as that part of the disciples' nature had been brought into view, through which they were still connected with the world. Peter's question, therefore, in this connection, is a plain testimony to the direct originality of the whole narrative.

Ver. 42–46. The Saviour's reply to the question of St Peter is not given definitely, as the circumstances themselves required that it should not. The Saviour spake in presence of a great multitude of people, and His intention was that a different impression should be produced by His words on His disciples, and on the crowd; He could not therefore answer with absolute precision to the somewhat indiscreet question of Peter. To this it must be added, that in fact an absolutely definite decision would not have been founded on truth. For, however certain it is, that in the church of Christ every member should not be a mas-

---

\(^1\) *Schleiermacher* (on Luke, p. 189) seems to me altogether groundlessly to doubt the authenticity of the connection here. It is wholly improbable that this verse alone should be an interpolation in a discourse which hangs so closely together.
ter (James iii. 1), yet, on the other hand, it is no less established that in a certain respect every believer is a δοῦλος, τ. Θ., and must watch for the coming of the Lord. Accordingly, Jesus so answers the question, that in a full and literal sense he applies what was said to the disciples as the representatives of those called to be instructors in the Church. In the next place, however, he transfers it to all, ver. 48, in so far as they can be considered as δοῦλοι, admitting even that their insight and intelligence is developed in a lower measure. In the following verses, the idea of ver. 36 is carried further out, and in such a way as to delineate those δοῦλοι who, holding sway over the other servants, regulate the whole household economy. In this, the reference to the Apostles cannot be mistaken. First, the fidelity, and then the unfaithfulness of such servants, is depicted with their consequences: but as to these we reserve the particulars till we come to the exposition of Matt. xxiv. 45–51, which verses closely agree with those before us. Although, as was remarked above, we in this instance again give the preference to the position of these words in the account of St Luke, as being that which they originally held; yet, in ver. 46, the reading μετὰ τῶν ἀνίμων must yield to that of St Matthew, who has μετὰ τῶν ὑποκρίτων. In this reading the original expression seems to be preserved, and in the text of St Luke the more general idea seems falsely to have crept in. The few critical authorities in favour of inserting ὑποκρίτων in the text of St Luke can claim meanwhile no regard. The reference to the ὑποκρίται accords strikingly with ver. 1, as compared with verse 56. In this expression, moreover, preserved by St Matthew, we may find an indication that the words in St Matthew are borrowed from the very connection, as given here, a connection which points so naturally to ὑπέχεια.
§ 10. VARIOUS DISCOURSES OF JESUS.

(Luke xii. 47—59.)

Ver. 47, 48. These verses also, in which the contrast between two classes of servants is set prominently forth, belong exclusively to St Luke. Most intimately are they connected with the rest of the discourse, and plainly go to prove that its several parts form one compact whole. There is especially an entire correspondence between them and verses 9 and 10. As the admonition to confess Christ is there combined with the warning against denying him, and the degree of guilt is represented as determined by the degree of knowledge, so is it in this passage. (To the adjectives τολλάς and ἰλίγας, we must supply τιληγάς.) There seems, however, something strange implied in the contrast, and one is tempted to interpret the μὴ γνῶς so as to make it mean one having no complete and sufficient knowledge; for, according to the principle here laid down, a man who knew nothing could not be punished in any degree. But it is better to leave the contrast between γνῶς and μὴ γνῶς standing in its full force, and to lay the emphasis, instead, upon δοῦλος. The very idea of a δοῦλος implies dependence on the Lord’s will, and an obligation to make exertions for the sake of that will. Even in ἄγωνα itself there is involved the guilt of him who knows not the will of his Lord, only, it is naturally less than
his who knowingly transgresses the Lord's will. These words reach equally, in this way, the disciples, who were acquainted with the will of our Lord, and those persons who stood farther off, though well inclined towards him, who took delight indeed in his beautiful parables and discourses full of wisdom, but hypocritically refused to enquire after the will of Christ. The general gnome or sententious saying which concludes ver. 48 is found also at Matt. xxv. 29, but certainly with such a modification of the thought as to make it probable that in that passage of St Matthew it stands also in its original connection. According to the whole nature of the words, they might easily admit of various applications. The idea that the final judgment of men depends as its condition on the extent of their powers and their light, (comp. on Matt. xxv. 14 seqq.) is, according to the nature of a parallelism, repeated in both members of the sentence. No new trait is added in the second half, so that the repetition has no object except to make the thought more impressive. Compared, however, with the foregoing δουλος γνωσθαι and μη γνωσθαι the maxim (Gnome) forms a step in advance, for the δουλος γνωσθαι is not, as such, one to whom much is given, he may have only a single little talent entrusted to him. Besides, therefore, the γνωσθαι το Σιλιμαα, something else falls to be added as that which determines the judgment pronounced, namely, a man's being furnished with greater or lesser powers, and having a wider or narrower sphere of action allotted to him.

Ver. 49, 50. At first sight it might seem to the reader that the thread of connection had here wholly escaped him. The Saviour comes to speak of himself personally, his destiny, his sufferings, and the effect of his appearance as destroying false peace. These ideas do not seem, however, to belong to the subjects here treated of. But on carefully weighing the leading thoughts of the passage, the following train of ideas presents itself, making it in the highest degree probable that this portion forms equally with the rest an integral part of the whole. The last section of the discourse of Jesus had something in it very earnest and solemn, one might almost say alarming. The consciousness that our responsibility increases with the talents entrusted to us, might have stirred up anxiety on the part of the disciples. This anxiety the Lord alleviates by placing himself at their side, with that most exalted commission to impart higher life to the whole human race, but with the prospect of encountering for this very reason the greatest
labours. Before each of his disciples, therefore, the Saviour places as a thing inevitable, the necessity of entering into a severe struggle, for, this his own appearance entailed on himself. The very thing indeed rebuked by him in his final address to the multitude, which included the conflict-fearing adherents of Jesus, is this, that they stood still in a state of hypocritical indecision; he counsels therefore that they should, without delay, unite with their enemies. According to this view of it, the connecting ideas may have been omitted, but in reality, everything in the discourse stands closely connected. St Luke alone has the words ταγ γάλανυ κ. τ. λ. of ver. 49; they contain a reference to passages of the Old Testament, such as Is. iv. 4. The expression ταγ (comp. Matt. iii. 11) denotes here the higher spiritual element of life which Jesus came to introduce into this earth, with reference to its mighty effects which manifest themselves in the way of quickening all that is akin to it, and destroying all that is opposed. To cause this element of life take up its abode on earth, and wholly to pervade human hearts with its warmth, was the lofty destiny of the Redeemer. (The expression εις Σιλω, ει is best explained, as Kuenöl has done, from the Hebrew. As this use of ει corresponds with εις, so does τι with τε. Comp. Song of Solomon viii. 4.) The true human feeling, far removed from all Stoical indifference, which led Christ to shrink from that hard path of suffering which stood before him, finds expression in the wish that his work were already over, and that the fire might burn itself out without such pain. (Comp. on Matt. xxvi. 39.) The suffering itself is denoted by βασινομα, as to which word compare the details at the parallel passages, Matt. xx. 22; Mark x. 38. (The term σωζουμαι constringi is used with reference to bodily sufferings [Matt. iv. 24; Luke iv. 38], and is also applied, however, to a mental state of distress and inward agony [Luke viii. 37]. Comp. as to the pain of Jesus' soul, and terror in prospect of his sufferings, on Matt. xxvi. 37. seqq.)

Ver. 51—53. The labours of the Messiah, as exciting strife, are farther delineated, quite in accordance with Matt. x. 34, seqq., which passage should here be compared. The Jews had been accustomed to associate with their conceptions of the Messiah, the idea of everlasting peace to themselves (σωζων τον Is. ix. 5), at most they thought of him as a warrior contending against the heathen. Instead of this, Jesus led them into conflict against the sin which they found within them and around them. Their ad-
mitting this element of separation from it, was the condition necessary to their receiving his εἰρήνη.

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

Ver. 56, 57. The address ἐνοχριτα points markedly back to the commencement of the discourse at ver. 1. The ἐνοχριτα of the Pharisees is here charged on the whole people, in so far as they suffered themselves to be prevailed on by that sect to refuse following out the impressions made on their souls and give honour to the truth. The expression implies also the possibility of their attaining true insight and a right decision, which possibility, however, was not realized from their cowardice and aversion to conflict. (Over against the πρόσωπον τῆς γῆς there is placed in Matt. the σμικρά τῶν καρυῶν, a characteristic expression, which ascribes to the spiritual world a physiognomy similar to what might be traced in the external. The great coming events of the spiritual world announce themselves to the eye of the soul just as the physical processes of
the visible world do to the meteorologist.) That something else is spoken of at ver. 57, is shewn at once by the expression τι δι' αυτῶν οὐ κρισθή. But this new expression conveys the same idea formerly treated of, only under another similitude. Every exercise of the xρίσιν presupposes something of a higher nature from which the discriminating agency (requiring as well insight as power) proceeds, and something lower from which must be removed that intermixture which demands the discriminating effort. This partition may be effected by the man himself (through the help of the Spirit received by him), and in that case he is delivered from the future judgment. (1 Cor. xi. 31.) But this very carrying out of a judgment originating with the man himself, and on his own behalf, is a pure determination in favour of what is good, it is the opposite of ὑπερθέντος, the guilt of which Jesus charged upon the multitude, just for this reason, that they could not in his ministry recognise the entrance of an unknown spiritual power, inasmuch as they did not wish to acknowledge it, for they had not admitted it freely and deeply enough into their own souls, to enable it there to carry out its work. Thus the word διάκονος, in so far as it forms the transition to the following parable, may denote in one respect the truth in a matter of legal dispute, but in another respect, in the highest and objective sense, it means that which is righteous, as it was perfectly manifested in Christ. The term xρίσιν, however, here, is equivalent to διὰ κρίσιν (Matt. xvi. 3), or διακρίσιν (Luke xii. 56), as every putting to the proof presupposes a partition, a separation into the original component parts, a value being at the same time set upon them.

Ver. 58, 59. The following parabolic discourse has been incorporated by Matt. v. 25, 26, into the Sermon on the Mount. It would not in itself be at all improbable that such a mode of expression should have been more than once repeated, but the composition of the Sermon on the Mount in general, and the connection of this passage in particular, may well make it somewhat unlikely that the words in St Matthew are in their own place. Here indeed the course of thought at first sight is not easily traced, but it appears all the more close when one penetrates into the meaning of the discourse. That an idea so rich, however, and manifold in its relations, should be placed by St Matthew in his context according to a different view from that which in this passage it was originally intended to bear, is not in any respect surprising, for one special advantage of para-
bolic and figurative modes of expression lies in this very adaptation to different relations. As respects the connection in the passage here before us, the antecedent ἀφ' ἰαυτῶν κρίνεις conducts us obviously to the idea expressed in the following verses. "Suffer not yourselves to be judged by any other, but judge ye yourselves." The man who agrees with his opponent, judges himself thus far, that he does his enemy right as against himself, and satisfies him in his demands. The Saviour thus plainly admonishes his hearers to take account of all moral claims on them, (the ἀντιδίκως represents the law), and as respects these, to place themselves right while living here on earth, that their position might not be the harder before the holy Representative of these in eternity. When the law, however, appears here in the light of the enemy from whom man is to free himself (ἀπαλλάσσεσθαι ἀν' αὐτοῦ), it is viewed as in that relation in which it subserves generally the accusing principle. The accusation loses its power, when the sinful man abandons the defence of his evil case, with self-accusations enters into the region of the truth, and appeals from the righteousness to the grace of God. Should he fail, however, here in delivering himself by upright repentance¹ from the trammels of the accusation, the judgment would strike him when it is too late. The two expressions ἀγίων and κρίνης are clearly so related to each other in the parable, that ἀγίων denotes the inferior magistracy of the city, κρίνης the judge in a court of higher jurisdiction. In explaining the similitude accordingly, κρίνης means the Supreme Judge, God himself, ἀγίων an earthly power representing the unseen righteousness of God, for example, the Apostles in their spiritual authority. It is next mentioned as a termination of the affair that is fitted to inspire terror, that the guilty one is cast into prison. (The πράξις of St Luke corresponds to the ἴσητιν of St Matthew. The expression occurs only here in the sense of exactor, ἥρ, from πράσσω, Luke iii. 13. Instead of πτηδώντις = quadrans, which occurs in St Matthew, St Luke has λεπτὸν scil. νόμισμα. Mark. xii. 42 reckons two λέπτα to one quadrans.) As to the meaning of the prison, and the period assigned for his being delivered from it, comp. on Matt. v. 26, xviii. 34. Here the whole is meant to enforce the earnest use of present privileges, and make apparent

¹ For this reason there follows immediately at Luke xiii. 3, 5, the command, μὴ γὰρ ἴσητιν.

² Compare on Matt. v. 21.
the danger to which those exposed themselves who heard Jesus, expressed pleasure in his words, but under the rebukes of their own conscience, refused, from dread of the contest, with their whole hearts to devote themselves to him and his cause.

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

(Luke xiii. 1—9.)

The connection of what follows with the preceding context, is once more very intimate, and the account bears the same traces of originality. For, as Jesus was thus speaking (ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ καινῷ χαίροντι), some individuals from amongst the crowd came up and reported an act of violence of which Pilate had been guilty. They understood Jesus in his speech quite correctly thus far, that he spoke of the unfaithfulness of men, and the punishments which in this way they brought on themselves. But, according to the usual evil practice of the human heart, they thought not of taking home with feelings of penitence that unfaithfulness to themselves, but applied it to others, and in the murder of these Galileans discovered the infliction of a judgment from God. The view which holds sufferings of every kind to be the punishment of sin, is certainly by no means false, for without sin there would be no suffering amongst men. The error, however, lies in this, that sin and punishment are not so distributed here below that each instance of suffering on the part of an individual must be the consequence of his own sin. Hence we cannot from such suffering infer the antecedent sin of the sufferer, but rather the sin of the whole body to which each individual belongs. Hence, the Saviour is at pains to awaken equally in all the consciousness of guilt, and preventing them from regarding those on whom some special suffering was inflicted as more guilty than themselves, or than the rest of the community. By this mode of explanation, the feeling of sympathy for all kinds of suffering was awakened, and true repentance called forth for sin not only our own, but that of the human race, with which the Saviour specially had to do. For that feeling is nothing more than the consciousness of our need of an atonement, and forms, consequently, an indispensable requisite to our receiving those higher
powers of life for the overthrow of sin which Jesus came to bring into the world. From the course, however, which the conversation thus took, it is clear that Chapter xiii. is a sermon on repentance, addressed to the people, and an admonition calling for entire decision on the part of the disciples; only this sermon on repentance bears a character of peculiar strength, it being his last, inasmuch as the period of Jesus' public ministry was now drawing to a close.

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

Ver. 4, 5. A similar example of sudden destruction which had overtaken certain Jews is farther adduced by Jesus himself. Eighteen persons had been crushed by the fall of a building. As to this incident, also, history has no farther information to give. Such an accident the Saviour once more teaches us here, ought not to be used in drawing harsh conclusions as to those on whom the suffering came, but should form an inducement for each individual to practice repentance. It thus is by no means the opinion of Jesus that such occurrences should, as accidental, physical transactions, be carefully kept apart from all connection with the moral world. On the contrary, he teaches here, and all Scripture teaches,
that sin and suffering stand closely associated, only, this connection
must not be viewed as individual, but as general in its nature, for
it is when thus viewed that each affliction brings a blessing. (πυργός = ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ means any large high building standing isolated.
[Matt. xxii. 33.] As the building here is described as situated
on the brook Siloah—comp. on John ix. 7—it may have been the
garden-house of some distinguished man.)

Ver. 6-9. The discourse of Jesus, thus strong in its reproof, is
closed by a parable, in which the merciful Son of Man brings the
side of grace prominently into view. He appears as the advocate
of men before the righteousness of our heavenly Father, and he
procures for them space for repentance. This idea of God's final
sentence being delayed, that time may be left men to turn, runs
throughout all Scripture. Before the Flood, there was appointed
a space of 120 years (Gen. vi. 3); Abraham prays in behalf of
Sodom (Gen. xviii. 24, seqq.); the destruction of Jerusalem did not
follow till forty years after the ascension of Jesus; and the coming
of Christ is delayed through the long-suffering of God (2 Peter iii.
9.) This view brings clearly out as well the freedom of God as
the freedom of man, and rescues the course of things in the world
from inflexible and cold necessity. In the first instance, the
σωτήρ here stands figuratively for the Jewish people, as at Hosea ix.
10. Amidst other nations they appear as especially noble and des-
tined to work out great results, but their abuse of privileges, granted
them by the free grace of God, caused them to fail in bringing
forth spiritual food; they fell from their vocation and lost their
talent. Yet, even on their behalf, did the Saviour go to the death,
and time must yet be given that the effect of preaching the suffer-
ings and death of Jesus might be seen. But since even the fire of
this preaching did not melt their hearts, the people fell under the
awful judgment of God. The history of Israel, however, is a type
of mankind generally, who are called to spiritual life, and thus far
the parable is to be referred to the great community of the church
and its final judgment. Nay, according to the design of our Lord,
the whole may be traced in each individual case, and we may there-
fore say that this parabolic mode of speaking on the part of Jesus
admits of applications endlessly diversified. If we are to interpret
the period of time mentioned (τρία χρόνα) as referring to the era of
Jesus' public ministry, then the expression τότε τρία which
follows, must be taken in a more general sense, namely, as denoting
the period between Christ's ascension and the destruction of Jerusalem, during which the means of spiritual quickening and strength were afforded to the people, in the right use of which they both could and should have escaped destruction. (The circumstance that the fig-tree grew in a vineyard [ἵν τῷ ἅμαρτελών] is not to be viewed as contradictory to Deut. xxii. 9, inasmuch as this Mosaic command merely forbids the mingling of different sorts of plants. The fig-tree, however, may have had a separate place in the garden to itself. Καταγέννω is found only at this passage of the New Testament, except in the writings of St Paul, where it is of frequent occurrence. It is — ἁγέννω, i.e. ἁγέννω ποιν, to render useless or fruitless. St Paul employs the word in a more comprehensive sense for to abolish. Σχάστειν and καταψία βάλλαι stand for all the means at the disposal of a gardener for advancing the growth of a tree. According to the authority of Manuscripts the reading καταψία is undoubtedly to be preferred to the more common one of κατοψία. It is from κατοψιον.—In the concluding words κω μίν ποιήση—εἰ δὲ μήγα there is an Anantapodoton, inasmuch as the addition obviously suggested by the connection is not given.)

§ 12.—THE CURE OF A SICK WOMAN.

(Luke xiii. 10—21.)

The close connection of the different paragraphs observed by us in the last chapters, here in some measure disappears. Without any particular note of the time, Jesus is found teaching in a synagogue. This agrees, however, most appropriately with his journey, and another intimation which seems to meet us in what follows, points back to the preceding context. For, the narrative which here follows is, as it were, an example of the Pharisaic hypocrisy, which the Saviour rebuked at Chapter xii. Hence, does Jesus at once address the ruler of the synagogue by the title (ver. 15), ἴστο-χριστά. The writer then must have recorded the occurrence not for its own sake (at Luke vi. 6, a narrative of the same kind had been already given), but, for the purpose of showing how the priests (Pharisees for the most part in sentiment) comported themselves. Quite in accordance with this view do we see once more at ver. 17
the well-inclined ἐλπίδα, rejoicing it is true in Jesus, but without deciding on throwing off for his sake the spiritual yoke of the Pharisees. The two parables also of the mustard seed and the leaven, which Matt. xiii. 31, seqq., has incorporated with his great parable collection, harmonize most appropriately with this position which Jesus and his little flock occupy betwixt the priests and the people. Its invisible nature for the most part, the losing of the new element of life in the old, and the triumph which it gains through its indwelling power—this all forms the point of comparison between these similitudes and that to which they more immediately refer. We might then with the utmost probability conceive of them as placed here in their original connection. 1 As respects the narrative itself of the cure, it presents no particular difficulties. The expression ντίμα αἰθμίας, which is more nearly defined by ver. 16, denotes not a merely physical disorganization, but one accompanied by such psychological phenomena as seem to indicate pernicious influences. A disease is never as such attributed to the evil spirit; there must always be suspicious symptoms conjoined with it. The word συγκύστεν is employed as the opposite of ἀνακύστεν. The former stands here in an intransitive form. The latter is equivalent to the following term ἀναμβάζειν, which denotes, however, at the same time, the removal of this organic defect. The hypocritical priest does not venture to cast blame on Jesus, but inveighs against the poor blind people, and pretends that his wretched outward service surpassed in value the service of love. The Lord lays open this hypocrisy, by shewing that the healed woman had done nothing in the way of labour, that He had loosed a chain which held her bound, and done a thing the like of which they did themselves every Sabbath. The use of λύειν and δίδων here is peculiar—the meaning of the words being transferred from physical and applied to spiritual relations. Again, however, the Saviour, without any ground or occasion for it, traces back the disease to Satan. Wherefore such accommodations if no truth lay at the foundation of the idea? (Comp. moreover, the parallel narrative at Matt. xii. 10, seqq.; Luke vi. 6, seqq.)

1 The parable of the mustard seed with the expression ἡ γὰρ ἡ δέσμη ἔφερεν (ver. 19), points back not obscurely to the foregoing similitude of the fig-tree (ver. 6).
§ 13. CONVERSATIONS OF JESUS BY THE WAY.

(Luke xiii. 22—35)

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

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

Ver. 23, 24. The first conversation here recounted by St Luke begins with a question put by an individual as to the number of the οὐκ ἔμενοι. This question takes for granted at the outset that impression of solemnity which the discourses of Jesus bear, and which must naturally have become stronger towards the end of his public labours. With the idea that the number is small, there stands associated, according to the connection of the passage, the idea of its being difficult to unite one's self to it. The Saviour, in his reply, does not say exactly that they were only few who should partake of the σωφροσύνα (the opposite of ἀκροβυσσία), for looked at simply in itself, the number of the οὐκ ἔμενοι is even great (Rev. vii. 9); it is only when viewed relatively, and as compared with the lost, that it is small (Matt. vii. 14). Rather does he at once give such a turn to the answer, as to lead the attention
of the enquirer, and of all whose minds were in the same state, back to themselves. The enquiry as to the number presupposes a certain bent of mind towards things without. This false position, which proceeds in all cases from self-security, our Lord here rebukes, so that his words may be paraphrased thus: "Look not to others, but to your own selves." To make the thought more keen, it is, however, added further, that not only are those lost who strive not for things divine, but many also who do care for them. As being thus ζητοῦντες, the enquirers held themselves secure, but this security Jesus unsettles for them, by remarking that mere striving is not sufficient to attain the end in view. (The comparison of the σκυφη Σώφα—other authorities have inserted πόλις, taking it from Matt. —was already explained at Matt. vii. 13, 14. It is of such a kind that Jesus may frequently have used it, and in both evangelists, therefore, it may occupy its original place.) This thought has in it something dark and difficult, especially when one compares such passages as Matt. vi. 33, Luke xii. 31, in which the very ζητῶν τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ is held forth as the only thing required for the attaining of it. The following words, however, which are peculiar to St Luke, clear away this obscurity.

Ver. 25. In parabolic language, then, there is here set before us the master of a house expecting at evening the members of his family, and at a fixed hour shutting the doors. (The word ἵστησας = ἔτρει denotes merely the transition from a state of rest to one of progressive activity.) The members of the family, then, who have been negligent, remain inexorably shut out. They attempt to avail themselves of their close connection with the master of the house, but they can only appeal to things external. The want of real love and true obedience to the master, shewed that they were no genuine members of the household. Allusions to this parable are found at Matt. xxv. 10, seqq.; Matt. vii. 21, seqq.; viii. 11, seqq. But as a whole it is peculiar to St Luke. As regards the exposition of it, it cannot possibly prove satisfactory to say that the ζητῶν is to be viewed as an imperfect undecided seeking, for the emphasis here is obviously laid on the ὅπως ἴδομενς to which there corresponds in the parable the expression ἀποκαλίζων τῷ Σέραν. Nay, in the very πληρεῖς, πληρεῖς ἄνευ νημίων, the effort is represented as a very lively and earnest one, but not the less as ineffectual and rejected. It is not the weakness of the endeavour which is blamed, but its being out of season, the right time having
been squandered away. This is represented as not less culpable, nor less extreme in the dangerous nature of its consequences, than the want of all effort. We are thus led to the idea, that for the thriving of the divine seed, all different seasons are just as little alike as for the growth of the seed-corn in the field. He who has not sowed in spring, must expect no success how earnestly soever he labours in harvest. The Saviour himself marks these seasons by the contrast between day and night (John xi. 9, seqq.), the hour when darkness (or light) bears away (Luke xxii. 53); the former must be employed for developing the course of life, the latter allows of nothing being done. There was such a period of blossoming in the kingdom of God (when it suffered violence on the part of those who longed after it, Matt. xi. 12), at the time when John the Baptist and Christ arose; but as the death of Jesus approached, the quickening power of the Spirit was withdrawn, and dark night overshadowed men's hearts. Of this Jesus warns the well-inclined but undecided, who comforted themselves with their 

\[\text{\textit{γνώστα}}\], and reminds them that it must come to a real entrance being made into the kingdom of God,—they must give up all in order to gain all. The alternation of such seasons, favourable and less favourable for the growth of what is good, which may be traced in all relations, nations, and individuals, does not involve any thing difficult to be reconciled with the righteousness of God, unless the same rule of judgment were applied to those living in the unfavourable periods as to those who experienced the stirring influences of more favoured times. Taking for granted a separate rule of judgment, however, this idea of a difference in different times, is as certainly based upon experience as it is in accordance with the great designs of God towards mankind, for, just as little as a tree can bring forth blossoms and nothing more—as it is necessary rather that the blossoms fall off in order that fruit may be produced, just so little can man be carried to perfection by the joyous influx of heavenly powers. If his life has become in some degree strengthened, there follow conflicts through means of which his nature is still further developed. The seasons of stirring life, however, must be employed in order to escape from the old state; then comes the hour when darkness bears away, when the tardy and negligent can no more be brought to the birth, even though it be true that such dark seasons as these may bring a rich blessing for the man awakened to newness of life— as, for example, is shewn by the history of Peter at the time of our
Lord's sufferings. According to this view (as was already re-
marked at Matt. vii. 21, seqq.), the words ὁ ἐν ὑδα ὑμᾶς ἵνα ἀπο-
λλείπτην in Matt., and describe the severance, in point
of nature, between the Lord and these pretended members of the
household, their living in the old natural state, their unregenerate
condition.

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

Ver. 28, 29. In its closing verses this discourse of our Lord
acquires further a peculiar application, inasmuch as it exhibits in
the light of servants to the ὁ ἐν ὑδα ὑμᾶς, the Jews, in the first
instance, who, because of their unfaithfulness (as to the great
majority of their number) were excluded from the kingdom of God,
in order that in their stead the heathen, who received the word with
willingness, should be invited to partake its eternal joys. (As to
the words see more at length on Matt. viii. 11, 12.) In itself,
however, the parable goes further, and may be understood of the
heathen as a body as well as individually, inasmuch as the funda-
mental idea of it is universally true and universally applicable.
GOSPEL OF ST LUKE XIII. 30, 31.

Here, where it stands at the conclusion of our Lord's labours among his own people, the restriction of the parable to them is perfectly in accordance with its connection.

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

It was moreover already remarked (Matt. viii. 11), that in this exclusion of the ζητούντες from the βασιλεία τ. Θ. we are not to see the loss on their part of eternal salvation. The kingdom of God set forth here, is obviously the blessed communion of the saints at the return of the Lord (comp. on Matt. xxv. 12.) The representation given (Luke xiii. 25) shews plainly that it is not intended to represent the love of what is good and delight in it as absolutely wanting (comp. on Matt. xxv. 45), but only as weak and undecided, by which means, certainly, an entrance into the βασιλεία is rendered impossible—but not by any means does it follow that salvation can be thereby prevented. Thus the βασιλεία τ. Θ. in this passage also (as Matt. viii. 11) denotes not eternity as the perfected development of creation, but the dominion of the good made visible on earth, which shall present itself to view as the living communion of all the saints of all times.

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

Ver. 32, 33. That this insinuation expresses not the views of the Pharisees but those of Herod is improbable in the highest degree, especially as Luke afterwards relates (xxiii. 8) that Herod eagerly desired to see Jesus. Besides, it is obvious that he had the means readily within his reach of banishing Jesus, if he had wished to be rid of him. It is far more natural to suppose that the Pharisees, to serve their own wicked ends, had made use of a report as to the evil intentions of Herod, which may easily have arisen after the murder of John. The opinion in question derives much less apparent support from the fact that Jesus calls Herod a Fox, than from his charging them to report it to Herod. This circumstance admits, indeed, of being understood in this way, "Behold I see through your plan; you act as if you would give me good advice, and you are the mere delegates of my cunning enemy." The words, however, have a sarcastic bearing, even if the Pharisees are not regarded as expressly the delegates of Herod. Those who hypocritically pressed themselves on him as good friends and counsellors, he refers to the man whom they denounced as his enemy—he places them consequently on the same footing, so that what strikes him reaches them also, nay, in reality, under the name of Herod, it is they alone who are aimed at. This ought to be held the more probable that it can hardly be believed that Jesus, who was so ten-
der in observing decorum towards all in authority, should have given to his own ruler the opprobrious name of ἀλωνιζε. If, however, the words of Jesus were directed against the Pharisees, who had either for their own ends made use of a mere report, or had at once fabricated it, his reply acquires the striking meaning, that this fox (an expression in which not merely cunning but weakness, and consequently that which is contemptible, forms the point of resemblance), of whom they pretended to give an account, existed nowhere else than in their own hearts; and that while acting the part of his counsellors, they cherished real enmity within. This led very naturally (ver. 33) to the mention of Jerusalem, where they laid the scene of their intrigues. This view of the occurrence agrees also with that reproof directed against the Pharisees which runs through all these chapters (from chap. xi. onwards), and which is carried still farther forward in chap. xiv. The words which follow also ἰδον ἐν Σίναλλω κ. τ. λ. are rendered sharp and pointed if they are applied to the Pharisees, "Ye who are set for the salvation of the people ought to know that my labours are not merely not pernicious, but in the highest degree beneficial, but your wickedness does not cease to persecute me." (Τελευτωμαι is to be taken transitively, sc. ταῦτα τὰ ἰδία—I fulfil these and all my works). In connexion with this idea, the definition of time is obscure, σήμερον, ἄφρον καὶ τὴν πρῶτην. It is wholly incredible and incapable of proof, that this expression can indicate an entirely indefinite period. Least of all can the passage, Hosea vi. 2 (ἡμέρα τῆς ἐρήμου), the exposition of which besides is difficult, be adduced in support of this view, and other instances are wholly wanting. It follows, however, from the general laws of thought, that to-day, to-morrow, and the day after, is the assigning of a period perfectly definite. One does not see, however, what is meant to be said by this exact announcement, "for three days I still continue to perform miracles here." The idea is made still more obscure by what follows, for instead of τὴν there stands as the parallel expression ἰχθυώμην. ("Εκείνως in the sense of to touch, to strike upon. The expression ἰμείρα ἰχθυώμην occurs at Acts xxii. 26. Compare also Mark i. 38). The πλην δὲ forms here a contrast to what goes before,

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

2 The assigning of an indefinite period of time can be effected only by the use of as is shewn in the example quoted by Wetstein on this passage, from Arrian Epict. iv. 10, τὸν αὐραίον ὅ τις τὰ σημεῖα δεῖ τὸν κατὰ κατ' ἑαυτὸν ἀνάφθηκεν ἐκ ἑαυτοῦ.
which however will not come clearly out to view, should the words (as Dr Paulus thinks they should) be translated, "See I still require about three days to heal the sick, but (should Herod command it) I will take my departure earlier." For this rendering the context seems to give no ground, not to mention that the idea is very tame, and accords ill with the sarcastic and biting discourse. For the understanding of the passage it is of especial importance to bear in mind, that the whole discourse which the Pharisees were to carry an account of to Herod, is (in this respect) seigned, that only in point of form therefore does it stand connected with their remark. In respect of the thought contained in it, the address is directed against the Pharisees and their wickedness. Consequently the meaning of the words may be taken thus: "I have to exercise my blessed office for a certain time; for this time, however, I must walk and work, and no power can touch me (mine hour is not yet come); but in Jerusalem it will come, and there will ye gain power over me. Your victory, however, will be your ruin, and Him whom ye shall have rejected, ye shall never more behold, till the time of his final return." The expression to-day, to-morrow, and the day after, is therefore a symbolic description of the whole public ministry of Jesus, which is in point of time exactly measured off, and which no earthly power can shorten.—The closing idea of ver. 33 is also remarkable, δὲ ὃιν ἐνδίχεται προφήτην ἀπολέσαι ἔξω Ἰεροσολήμ. From ver. 35 it is clear that Jerusalem is viewed as the seat of the Theocracy, and centre of Pharisaic intrigue, so that the sense of the words is "not in Galilee, no! in your chief city must I die." The Saviour, however, proceeds to extend the idea, so as to include the prophets generally, and explains that it was necessary they should die in Jerusalem. (Ἐνδίχεται used impersonally = ἀνδίχειτω οἰς, Luke xvii. 1. It means, it is allowable, it is possible. Τὰ ἐνδίχειμα = διωνά.) In regard to this there is just one thing that seems strange. John the Baptist, who, as the latest instance of a slain prophet, must have stood before every one's view, had been put to death, not in Jerusalem, but precisely in this very territory of Herod. The expression therefore uttered in this general form seems neither correct nor suited to the circumstances. One might be tempted to read τὸν προφήτην, so that the person of the Messiah should be alone denoted, but there is no manuscript which has the article, and we must here as elsewhere remain true to our principle of giving admission to no
conjecture into the text of the New Testament. Besides, in ver. 34 the idea is immediately extended to include the prophets generally. Hence, we can only say that the Saviour here attributes to the order of prophets, not including himself in it, but standing as its representative (see ver. 34), what is true of the majority of its members. In any case, however, a certain obscurity attaches to this mode of expression in the existing circumstances. It is easier finding something satisfactory to say on the idea of its being necessary that prophets should die (and especially that the Prophet should) in Jerusalem. Jerusalem was the centre of the national, and especially the religious life of the people of Israel (for which reason at ver. 34 the prophets are described as sent to Jerusalem, in so far as this city represented the land and the people), the altar as it were of the whole nation, since no sacrifice was to be offered except in the temple at Jerusalem. In it therefore must the ministry of the prophets concentrate itself, and their last great work also, their death of martyrdom, must be completed there. As the offering of Isaac was of old presented on Mount Moriah (Gen. xxii. 2), so the reality of which it was the type, could be exhibited only in Jerusalem. The free government of God generally fixes itself to time and place, and the freedom of man's actions, without being subverted or restricted, must yet fulfil the eternal arrangements of God. Freedom and necessity mutually pervade, but do not subvert each other in Bible history. To the Pharisees, moreover, as those who had assumed the defence of the Theocracy, nothing stronger could be said than this, your chief city with its temple and altar is the murderess of all God's servants, a great altar as it were on which the saints have fallen sacrifices. (Comp. Lament. iv. 13.)

Ver. 34, 35. The concluding verses have been incorporated by Matt. xxiii. 37–39, into his great discourse in reproof of the Pharisees. Here, in St Luke, they hold undoubtedly their original place. The mention of Jerusalem awakens the deepest sorrow in the heart of Jesus for the unbelief of the city. The murderess of the prophets should in her children have been gathered to the flock of God, but they would not. But as by the abuse of their freedom, they frustrated as it were the one of God's plans, they against their own will fulfilled the other. What they would not take from the living Prophet, they must receive from the dying. The words πασάντις ἐξελέησαι αὐτόν, describe not merely the pains taken by Jesus himself for the salvation of the people, as represented by Je-
rusalem, but the expression denotes the whole exertions of the prophets taken together. This leads the Saviour back wholly to himself, in so far as he was in his divine and eternal nature the Prophet of prophets. (Comp. Luke xi. 49 with Matt. xxiii. 34, where Christ is represented as sending forth all the prophets.) This idea casts back a light which determines the meaning of the expression ὦν ἐνίγχεται περιφήνι ἀπολίσαν ἢς Ἱερουσαλήμ, ver. 33. (The beautiful figure of the fowl which gathers its young under its wings is after Ps. xvii. 8; Is. xxxi. 5. The comparison strikes every mind of deep thought as a tender expression of maternal love in natural life. Thus we read in Euripides Hercul. fur. v. 71, οἱ τὰ Ἡσάλλουι παῖδες, οὓς ὑποτήρους ἑαυτῷ ποιεῖ, ὡς ὑφιμίὴν, ὑφισάβα, a peculiar expression for placing the young beneath the mother.) After this apostrophe to Jerusalem, the discourse again turns to the disciples, and the Saviour adds reprovingly, ἀφίνεται ὑμῖν ὁ ὡς ὑμῶν. (The addition ἤγορα is taken from the parallel passage in Matt. xxiii. 38.) The expression ὡς (in its more extended meaning like ῥώς) is certainly selected here in accordance with Psalm lxix. 25 (Comp. Acts i. 20), in which passage the house’s being left desolate is enumerated along with other imprecations. The ὡς, however, has in every case a special reference to the Temple as the central point of theocratic life, which, in so far as it was the ὡς Θεοῦ, might also be appropriately termed the ὡς ἤγορα. The desolation of the Temple, however, and the departing from it of the gracious presence of God, was identical with the going down of their entire worldly priestly power, which of necessity must have been associated with the entrance of Christ’s spiritual and heavenly kingdom. The two could not co-exist. Inasmuch as the Pharisees, therefore, seemingly triumphant, put Jesus to death, they in this very act laid the foundations for ever of His kingdom, and destroyed their own. Further, the concluding words λέγω δι’ ὑμᾶς κ. τ. λ. are difficult. The idea, indeed, that they should not see the Saviour, stands as an expression of rebuke in close connexion with what goes before; but in the first place, there is an obscurity as to what period the ἔστω to ἐρείπη κ. τ. λ. is meant to denote,¹ and next, it seems to contradict the reprov-

¹ Compare what was remarked upon the kindred and striking passage Matt. xxvi. 64, ἠ' ἢτοι ἢν ἔδωκα τὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀντίκεισθαι κ. τ. λ. Matt. xxiii. 39, in the passage parallel to that before us, has the words ὑμῖν μὲν μαρτυρὶς ἀν' ἔργον κ. τ. λ. — The ἔστω is best taken impersonally, “it comes.” Some MSS. have supplied ἔργον or ἡμῖν.
ing character of the preceding discourse, that the Pharisees themselves are exhibited as saluting the Lord. For, that the words ἱλαρημός x. τ. λ. are to be understood as an act of homage, admits (according to Matt. xxi. 9, compared with Ps. cxviii. 26) of no doubt. The first of these difficulties can be removed only after the second has been cleared out of the way. This would be brought about, however, if we were to read something like ἵνα εἰρων, so as to make the meaning of the discourse this, “Ye unbelievers shall see me no more (as the soft, mild Son of Man) till they welcome me (the pious, namely) at my return as the righteous Judge of the world.” In other words, “Ye shall see me again only as your Judge.” But this reading is wholly without support from any critical authority, and can therefore have no claim on our assent. The use of the second person leads to an entirely different meaning, which, more closely considered, is remarkably appropriate, and suited, in the highest degree, to the character of the Lord, who walked even amidst his enemies as one ἀληθής χάρις. The passage then promises them a change even of their feelings, and, as flowing from this, an acknowledgment of the Messianic dignity of Jesus. That which here they could not comprehend,—the ministry of Jesus, peculiar in itself, and opposed to their whole nature and disposition of mind, was, according to this promise, to be made clear to them afterwards, and they would raise their voices in unison with the jubilant tones of those who, waiting for their Lord, would meet Him with the cry ξαίρει, καίρει, καίρει. The passage expresses then the final victory of the Saviour over all his enemies, whom he punishes in such a manner that he wins them for himself. It is impossible, however, to determine whether this victory and the coming of Christ was to take place at some point of time near at hand, such as the pouring out of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost, and the conversion of many priests therewith connected (Acts vi. 7), or the destruction of Jerusalem, or whether it be the return of Jesus to his kingdom or to the judgment of the world. For, in the first place, as was already remarked on Matt. x. 23, the idea of the near approach of our Lord’s coming runs through the whole New Testament in such a way, that each of the periods above alluded to falls quite within the time when men expected the return of Jesus, and further, the idea itself contains references to so many things, that, in passages like this, no point can be found, which compels us necessarily to conclude in favour
of the one or of the other. It is best, therefore, to take the expression in the entire comprehensiveness which it will admit of, and consider the meaning of the Saviour to be this, that at each coming of the Lord, at one or other of those preliminary appearances in which the Good is exhibited to view as triumphant, but most completely at that which is final and decisive, the enemies of the Saviour should ever lay themselves down as a footstool beneath his feet. (Comp. on Matt. x. 23, but especially on Matt. xxiv. 1, seqq., where every thing relating to the Return of Christ is treated of connectedly.)

14. JESUS DINES WITH A PHARISEE.

(Luke xiv. 1—24.)

This new section agrees well with its place in a journal of Travel (comp. ver. 1 with xi. 17), and partakes that style of narrative which we have already learned to trace in it. The healing of one afflicted with dropsy in the house of a Pharisee on the Sabbath, gives rise to a conversation in which Jesus gives instruction through means of parabolic narratives.¹ In a way uncommonly graphic, St Luke represents the discourse as directed first to the guests, and then to the host (ver. 7 and 12), and, finally, the exclamation of one of the guests (ver. 15) calls forth a particular parable applicable to him and those like minded. The peculiar connection of the whole forms also once more the best voucher for the originality of the narrative.

Ver. 1—6. The cure of the man afflicted with dropsy, which may well be conceived of as completed before the time of the repast, contains nothing in itself worthy of remark. It serves merely as a point of connection for introducing the following conversation. As the Pharisees had frequently already blamed the cures wrought by Christ on the Sabbath, He himself starts the question whether such acts of healing could be contrary to the law. As at Matt. xii. 11, Luke xiii. 15, the Lord leads those present to reflect on their own experience, and makes them feel the sharp self-contradiction

¹ The Pharisee is styled τις τον ἄρχοντα τῶν Φαρισαίων = ἄρχοντας. We are not to suppose that those ἄρχονται are here meant who are sometimes spoken of as opposed to the Pharisees, ex. gr. John xii. 42.
in which they were landed by casting blame on Christ's free labours of love, inasmuch as they, where their own earthly advantage was involved, did the same things which they objected to in Him. It is not to be overlooked, however, that in this last period in which the hatred of the Pharisees against him was most distinctly expressed, the Saviour does not withdraw from them. Obviously, Jesus hoped, by the power of the truth, to gain over for himself and the cause of God the better disposed, at least, among them. (As to the φαρισαίος ἐφρον ver. 1, see the particulars on ver. 15—On παρατηρήσει see at Luke vi. 7.)

Ver. 7. Throughout the following three comparisons, then, there runs the one great exhortation to humility, which was, above all things, necessary for the proud Pharisees. In the first (ver. 7–11), with reference to the obvious and manifest strife for precedence among those present, it is so put as to teach self-humiliation; in the second (ver. 12–14), looking to the brilliant company which the Pharisee had invited together, it is so put as to make the calling in to him of the poor and miserable appear a duty; and, in the last (ver. 16–24), with regard to the eager hope cherished by the Pharisee for the kingdom of God (ver. 15), it is so managed that the conduct of God in calling men to his kingdom, excluding from it the satiated rich as decisively as He invites into it the hungry poor, is held forth as a rule not to be neglected for similar conduct on our part. Even though there were, therefore, special causes at work in each case for the modification of the fundamental idea, yet the occasion which gave at first this turn to the conversation of Jesus was probably the cure of the ἀμαρτωλός. Even though the Pharisees and Lawyers were silent (ver. 4, 6) as to the question of Jesus, yet undoubtedly their look sufficiently expressed contempt for the unfortunate man, and this at once led the Saviour (ver. 5) to bring forward despised animals (ὁποῖος,¹ and βοῦς) in the similitude—"If ye at once hasten, σὺν the Sabbath, to draw an ass out of the pit, it well becomes me to bring

¹ The reading ὁποῖος has, in point of weighty critical authorities (the MSS. A. B. E. C. H. M. S. give it), much support. The connexion, however, is most in favour of ὁποῖος. The whole passage contains a conclusion drawn a minori ad majus, and with this it is obvious that ὁποῖος does not agree. The reading ὁποῖος may easily have originated with persons who overlooked this form in which the inference is drawn in the passage, and supposed that the necessity of healing on the Sabbath would be rendered far more clear by selecting the case of a child, love to whom would inevitably constrain his parents to save him on the Sabbath.
help to a man who will be suffocated by water." In what way the bodily assistance is a type of the spiritual calling of those who were healed, is particularly shewn by ver. 21, seqq., where it is just the miserable (such as the cured man in this instance) who are set forth as the called, while the proper guests (the Pharisees, as representatives of the economy of the Old Testament) remain shut out from the feast. And now, as the guests at the commencement of the repast eagerly strove for the highest places (πρωτοκλίταις ἵζειλ γοντό), which conduct arose from the same self-sufficiency in which their contempt for the dropsical man originated, Jesus rebukes this in the first instance. (Ἐπιχειρεῖν scil. τοῦ animum adverseret. Acts iii. 5.)

Vers. 8—11. Without much veiling his design, the Lord reproves quite openly the vanity of the Pharisees; throughout the following parable the reference is entirely unconcealed. (As to παρεξελυθή comp. on Matt. xiii. 1. The parabolic form here is not completely carried out.) As respects, however, the meaning of the narrative, it is very strange that so subordinate a motive should be brought forward by means of which to induce self-abasement on the part of man. For it appears to be false humility, and consequently concealed pride, to take a seat low down in order that one may gain the honour of being elevated. Christ appears to give here rather a refined prudential rule than a pure ethical precept, and that the more correct course is to take just that seat which properly belongs to one. But the apothegm (ver. 11) which gives finally the fundamental idea of the parabolic narrative, makes obvious the reason why this form of presenting it was adopted. In that single display of self-sufficient vanity our Lord perceived that inner state of the heart which was the fundamental cause of those very appearances they made in spiritual things. The object he has to do with is the purifying of the foundation, and his representations, therefore, take such a form as to involve a warning against spiritual pride.

Over against the ἰφόνων ιαυτῶ there must be placed the expression most strongly contrasted to it, and that is not merely to refrain from self-exaltation, but positively to humble ourself (τασινωθείν ιαυτώ). In order to bring this contrast clearly out in the parable, the expression ἀναστάτων εἰς τὴν ἱσχαραν ῶτον is placed over against κατακλίσεως εἰς τὴν πρωτοκλίσιαν. But that which in the affairs of earth would prove only a half rule (inasmuch as the sitting low down of set purpose must be held as only another form of
displaying vanity), is, in spiritual things, true and right in its fullest sense; for then, in fact, it is not the mere absence of the positive manifestations of pride that is of effect, but the attack upon secret sin which exists even where it does not shew itself. These positive sanctifying efforts carried on in the power of the Holy Spirit are denoted by the ταυτών ἰαυτών. This expression also presupposes an antecedent higher position (which is, however, to be carefully distinguished from the υψών ἰαυτών,) inasmuch as the ταυτών cannot be humbled any more. (Comp. on the apothegm at ver. 10, what is said on Matt. xxiii. 12.)

Vers. 12—14. The statements of our Lord in what follows are not different in substance from the preceding discourse addressed by him to the guests (ἐλέγχε καὶ ῥῦε κεκληκτοὶ αὐτῶν.) For, the following parable is only a continuation of the foregoing. As the guests ought to humble themselves by selecting the lowest place, so should the host humble himself by inviting the poorest. Only, according to the different standing-points of guest and host there stands out in the first similitude more prominently an unassuming disposition; in the second, a feeling of condescending humble love. Hence one may view the two parables as adapted for persons of different positions in the kingdom of God. It is not to be thought of that we have here an entertainment furnished at the public expense, as Dr Paulus has inferred, from the injunction forbidding the inviting of relations. This prohibition is rather to be held parallel with Luke xiv. 26, “He who hateth not father and mother is not worthy of me.” It is only intended to shew the necessity of being delivered from what is merely sensitive and natural in our love; that higher love imparted in regeneration ennobles all the natural ties of affection. (Ἀνάστασις, maimed, one who wants a member, = πηγώς, from πηγώ, to mutilate. It is found again in the N.T. only at Luke xiv. 21.—Comp. as to the idea of a recompense, in passages which take for granted an evangelical standing-point, on Matt. v. 12; x. 42.) The mention of the ἀνάστασις τῶν δικαιων, without any occasion to call it forth, is an evident indication that the distinction made by the Jews between the first and second resurrection was acknowledged by our Lord as correct. Such passages as Rev. xx. 5 (where the expression ἀνάστασις ἡ πρώτη occurs); 1 Cor. xv. 22, 23; 1 Thess. iv. 16,

1 Comp. on this the remarks at Matt. xiii. 2.
shew also that the Apostles themselves had embraced this distinction within the circle of their ideas. In the book of Revelation the whole conclusion of the work would be entirely unintelligible without it. The rationalistic expositors were unprejudiced enough to acknowledge that this doctrine was supported by the New Testament, but they employed it in proof of their view that the Apostles (and in part the Saviour himself) were entangled in Jewish prejudice, or that they accommodated themselves to such errors. (As to the opinions of the Jews, comp. Bertholdt in the Christ. Jud. § 35, p. 176 seqq.) We shall afterwards take pains to shew (in a preliminary way, indeed, on Matt. xxiv.¹) that the distinction drawn between the two resurrections stands in closest unison with the whole circle of doctrines as to the final issue of all things, and that only when we adopt it do many passages of Scripture acquire their true meaning.

Ver. 15. One of the guests understood quite correctly the expression used by the Saviour as to the ἀνάστασις ὑπαίων. He places it in connexion with it, not eternal salvation, which properly is associated with the general resurrection, but life in the kingdom of God. Hence the βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ here is, as the context shews, that state in which the will of God shall have dominion on earth,—the restoration of earth to its original condition. In this state did the Jews hope to live in peace under the sway of Messiah, along with the risen saints of the Old Testament, whose representatives, the progenitors of their race, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, are mentioned by name (Matt. viii. 11; Luke xiii. 28.) The joyful hope of Messiah's speedy appearance was usually associated with the blessed anticipation of life in the Messianic kingdom. In substance, this series of ideas was entirely correct, and corresponded as well with the predictions of the Old Testament as with the representations of the New, only, the Jews in general formed grossly material conceptions of the Messiah's kingdom, and forgot the internal conditions which required to be fulfilled in order to their being admitted into it. As members of the nation of God, they believed that they must in any event be incorporated into God's kingdom. From this position of security and self-sufficiency seems to have proceeded the exclamation uttered by one of the guests. When

¹ As to the distinction also between the ἀνάστασις ἐν τοῖς νεκροῖς and ἀνάστασις τῶν ἄναμον, comp. the observations on Matt. xxii. 31.
Jesus mentioned recompense in the kingdom of the Messiah at the resurrection of the just, he called out in a transport of joy, including himself as a sharer in the scene of blessedness, μακάριος ἡ, φάγεται ἄρτον ἐν τῷ βασιλείῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Nothing like malice, deceit, scorn, or intentional hypocrisy is to be traced in these words; the following parable exposes merely the feeling of worldliness on the part of those who are invited into the kingdom of God, but through their worldliness forfeit their invitation. This comes home to the individual in common with the whole party of Pharisees and lawyers to whom he belonged, but was not aimed at himself personally and alone. The peculiar exclamation, however, and the close connexion of the following parable with it, and with all that goes before, speaks again most decidedly in favour of the originality of this whole account. (The reading ἄρτον, instead of ἄρτον φαγεῖν, is merely an explanation of the Hebrew mode of speaking for the sake of Greeks, fashioned after the style of ver. 12.) The expression ἄρτον φαγεῖν stands undoubtedly as equivalent to taking a meal (see ver. 1), and corresponds to מַעַּית, Gen. xliv. 16, 32. Here the context points once more to the great Messianic feast (comp. Matt. viii. 11; Luke xiii. 28), which, according to the passages in the prophets (for example Is. xxxv. 6), is viewed as the opening scene of the kingdom of God. (Comp. Bertholdt in the Christ. Jud. § 39, p. 196. Eisenmenger, in his Entd. Judenth. ii. 872 seqq. gives the tasteless fables of the later Rabbins as to this feast. The phrase ἵοδιν καὶ πίνειν, is to be distinguished from the expression ἄρτον φαγεῖν, the former denoting continued fellowship, a life becoming and suitable [in the kingdom of God]. Comp. on Luke xxii. 30.)

Ver. 16. With great wisdom does our Lord in the following parable guide the Pharisee, who had praised so loudly the joys of the kingdom of God, back from externals to that which is internal. For, he teaches that the mere invitation is not enough, but everything depends on whether a man avails himself of it. The first half of it represents the manifold forms in which worldly men (especially the Jews) abuse the Divine Call; the second half explains the conduct of God, and shews that others instead of those called are invited into the kingdom of God. At Matt. xxii. 1,

---

1 Compare Rev. xx. 6, where in like terms it is said μακάριος καὶ ἄγιος ὁ ἵκως πλέον ἐν τῇ ἐναττάσει τῇ πρώτῃ.
seqqu., there is a parable recorded which is closely allied to that before us, but it is carried out in a way too independent and distinct to allow of our believing it to be the same with that of Luke. Undoubtedly, Jesus has availed himself at different times and in different ways of the same fundamental ideas. If the parable then starts with the idea of the δεῖσιν μεγά, this has obviously a retrospective reference to ver. 15, and it stands as the Messianic feast for the kingdom of God generally, to which God causes men to be invited (and the Jews certainly first) by his enlightened ministers and servants. (The καλίων here denotes therefore, in a dogmatic sense, the vocatio, and involves both the announcement that such a kingdom exists, and also the inward incitement to enter into it. Yet this impulse, given by the Spirit according to the will of God, is no compulsory one; it only facilitates the determination of the will. Compare the more detailed remarks on Matt. xx. 16.)

Ver. 17—20. In the form of the narrative, it is a peculiar circumstance that those who had previously been invited, were, at the moment when the feast commenced, once more put in mind of it (ἀκα τοῦ δεῖσιν), and this was evidently selected in order to express the more exactly and impressively that form under which the divine invitation had come to the Jews. Not only had the invitation to God's kingdom come to them generally through the prophets, but when it did arrive they were by the Baptist again specially warned to this effect, πάντα εἶναι ἐν χίλιοι καὶ τῆς ζωῆς καὶ σωτηρίας. The following παραιθέων is therefore so much the guiltier, the more pressing had been the invitation. (Παραιθέων to make excuse is used for recusare and excusare. The former meaning is found at Acts xxv. 11; the latter is obviously implied at ver. 19, in the expression ἵχε μὴ παραθέμενον, which corresponds to habeas me excusatum. To the ἀόρ μιᾶς it is best to supply γνώμης or φωνης, for it is intended to bring out the common keynote of them all.) As the invitation, however, was given only to many (ver. 16, comp. the remarks on Matt. xx. 16), this determines the meaning of the πάντες (ver. 18)—they are the πάντες oi xeklidemou. It would be to carry the expression too far, however, should we hold that the first invited were the Jews, and that those afterwards (ver. 21) called are the heathen, inasmuch as the

* Compare as to this the details at Matt. xxii. 1.
Apostles, and all those believers who attached themselves to Jesus himself, were Jews. According to the immediate connexion of the passage, therefore, we must understand those first invited to be the representatives of the Old Testament Theocracy, and under the πτωχοί (ver. 21), that company of private individuals (among whom also that ἰδρωτικὸς must be included, ver. 2), whom Jesus honoured with his fellowship and prepared for the kingdom of God. In that case the words ἔξαντο ἀπὸ μιᾶς παρακτίδας τῶν ἔχουσι retain their literal meaning, for in point of fact, we do not see a single individual among the advocates of the Theocracy openly and decisively attach himself to the Lord. We are not, however, to think that for this reason all reference of the parable to Jews and heathen is excluded, only this is not its primary and literal application. The various forms of excuse put forward by those invited, denote in general their bondage to the world. The two first set forth the gross manifestations of worldliness; the third is more refined, but is a mere pretext. The taking of a wife ought not to have withdrawn him from God, but should have aided his advancement in the divine life. According to this view of the construction of the parable, the modes of expression are arranged in which they severally refuse to come. The former, who suffer themselves to be entangled by gross worldliness, feel conscious of their sin, and give a more refined turn to their excuse—ἰδρωτῷ σο, ἵνα μὴ παρακτίδας τῶν ἔχουσι; the latter, however, considered the bond which kept him back as sufficient to exonerate him, and simply declares ἵνα τοῦτο ὦ δύναμαι ἠλθῃ. In reality, however, all are alike.

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

§ 15. THE DEMANDS OF JESUS ON HIS DISCIPLES.

(Luke xiv. 25—35.)

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

Ver. 25—27. The opening words in which the Saviour states to the people the necessity of entire decision, we have already had at Matt. x. 37, seqq., in the instructions addressed to the Apostles. It is very possible certainly that Jesus had on several occasions expressed the same thought, especially where he had, as we have already remarked on Matt. (ut supra), an Old Testament foundation to proceed upon. (Deut. xxxiii. 9, 10.) Again, also, at John xii. 25, the same idea recurs only in an altered form. These instructions, however, (Matt. x.) are so put together, as plainly to bear the character of a compilation, and it is in this place therefore that we are to view the passage as standing in its original connection, especially as the circumstances under which the Apostles were first sent out, are less in harmony with these ideas. As respects, however, the exposition of the passage itself, all that is needful has already been given in our remarks on Matt. x. 37, seqq., and we are called here to consider that only which is peculiar to St Luke. To him belongs the expression μοιὶ and the extension of the hatred, so as to include the Φοιχή. This is treated of, however, in a similar way, only under different expressions, at Matt. x. 39, for between the ἀπελίσκω τὴν Φοιχήν αὐτοῦ and the μοιὶ no essential difference can be perceived. Instead of μοιὶ, however, Matt. x. 37 has μὴ φιλεῖν πατέρα ὑπὲρ ἰμαί. It must seem a thing of doubtful propriety simply to reduce the positive μοιὶ, and make it equivalent to the more negative μὴ φιλεῖν ὑπὲρ. The expression is too cutting for it not to have been chosen intentionally; and in this case we have no title to deprive it of its point. We should also feel the more at ease in leaving this idea untouched, inasmuch as the Son of love can have enjoined no hatred save that which is holy. How such a topic could in the then existing circumstances form the subject of discourse, may be rendered obvious from the following considerations.

The representation of Matt. is so conceived that the divine is set forth in its superiority as compared with the created, and hence a
quantitative expression is chosen to describe our love of the one or of the other. St Luke, however, views—as is also allowable—the Divine and the created as standing in simple and direct opposition to each other, an attitude which they always assume whenever the latter strives to cease being what it really is—a transitory thing—and begins to make itself esteemed eternal and unchangeable. Out of this opposition, then, there springs up of necessity the hatred of the creature as well as the love of the Divine, according to the principle, "no man can serve two masters, he must hate the one and love the other." (Luke xvi. 13.) The pure love of the Divine, therefore, involves necessarily the pure hatred of the sinful, which things created become, in so far as they will make themselves pass for what is eternal. The idea, therefore, retains its simple truth when taken with all its point, if it be thus paraphrased, "He who cometh to me (not outwardly, but with the inward turning of his whole being) dare love nothing apart from me (but all things in me); rather must he be so situated as to be able to pass on the tenderest ties of this present life, a judgment so discriminating and enlightened by the Spirit, (and consequently to free himself so far from all the attachment and dependence of feeling and its implied partialities) as to be capable of purely hating what is sinful in them." Thus does the Saviour in these words demand of his followers that they occupy an exalted standing-point, looking down from which they may be able clearly to distinguish the Divine from the ungodly, even in the nearest of those objects presented to them (and therefore the most difficult to be judged of.) From this standing-point it is possible to unite both love and hatred towards the same object, as, for example, our Lord, in regard to Mary his mother, and his disciples, hated what was sinful in them as purely as he loved what was godly, and for this reason it is that the commandment here given does not abrogate the precept to "honour father and mother." In the unrenowned man, on the contrary, neither love nor hatred is pure; in loving the objects of his affection, he loves also their sin; in hating the objects of his dislike, he hates their godliness as well; it is only the purity and discrimination of the Divine Spirit that can teach man to judge aright, and to love God and the things of God as decidedly as he hates what is ungodly. Thus, it is obvious that we have here no commandment which a natural man standing under the law should attempt to put in practice; for should he
make the endeavour, then, inasmuch as the spiritual gift of discrimination is availing to him, everything must naturally be thrown into confusion, and that which is most sacred be perverted into that which is most unholy. (On ver. 27, see fuller details at Matt. x. 38.)

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

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

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

1 Hence Augustine (Confess. viii. 6) says with great truth of some persons who had begun in faith the conflict with the old man, "edificabant turrim sumptu idoneo, reliquendi omnia sua et sequendi te." The giving up of one's own is identical with the laying hold of Christ.
§ 16. PARABLES RELATING TO THE COMPASSIONATE LOVE OF GOD.

(Luke xv. 1—32.)

In the words of transition which connect what follows with what goes before ἵνα δι' ἐγγίζοντος ἡ. τ. λ., there is given no distinct statement of the relation in which the former stands to the latter. It may be supposed that a space of time intervened. But the manner in which the parables which follow are placed in contrast with those that went before, makes it in the highest degree probable that they are closely connected together. For, while at xiv. 28, seqq. there was set forth the strong earnestness which is required in order to confess Christ and follow him, the opposite half, as it were, supplementary to this, is now brought forward, namely, the compassionate love displayed in the Gospel, inasmuch as Jesus calls the poor and miserable to himself. It asks from these the same thing which was laid before those to whom the parables of building the tower and the conflict were addressed, only, to these miserable ones the demand is not as it was to the undecided and the irresolute, something burdensome, but it is to them a gain and a pleasure to be laid under the necessity of forsaking all and serving him alone whom their soul loves. The compassionate love of God which forms the contrast to the hard-hearted Pharisees, meets here with the entire giving up of himself on the part of the lost (ver. 21), which stands opposed to the calculating adherence of the wavering (xiv. 26, seqq.), inasmuch as he pleads for that as an act of grace, which to the others is a burdensome duty, namely, the serving of God. In the first two parables the former reference predominates, in opposition to the Pharisees with their cold condemnations of men, God appears as the compassionate Being who lovingly receives the lost to himself; in the third there is, in addition to this, the second point of contrast carefully carried out.

Ver. 1, 2. As Jesus finished the preceding discourses, which were spoken by him without doubt after the journey had been completed for the day, there gathered around him a company of men really in need of aid, not with the view of insidiously listening to him, but of receiving from him life and spirit (ἀπό ζωῆς καὶ πνεύματος.) Among these were πλωτας (see on Matt. v. 46), and other persons,
who more grossly, or with greater refinement, had transgressed the law. For, in every case where the ἄμαρτωλός and the δίκαιος (ver. 7) are set in contrast, we are to trace in the former the outward and visible transgression of the law, as in the latter the idea of the outward observance of the law. Gross forms of transgression are not excluded here, as is shown obviously by the parable of the lost son, who is intentionally described as one καταφαγὼν τὸν βίον μετὰ ποτίων (ver. 30.) On this contrast depends the whole point of these three parables. The Pharisees, in the consciousness (not merely hypocritical) of their δικαιοσύνη, despised the ἄμαρτωλός to whom righteousness according to the law was in fact wanting. But, the relation in which the righteousness of the law and the righteousness of faith stand to each other, is the very point on which the following parables are intended to cast light. (Διαγγέλγυῖω is = to the more common γρηγύρω, to murmur, to be averse. Προσδίκησθαι and συνεδρίαν denotes every kind of contact, closer or more remote; Προσδίκησθαι is = to the frequently occurring δίκησθαι [comp. Matt. x. 40], in the sense of to render the services of love, which presupposes an inclination of mind. The term συνεδρίαν points to closer contact in continuous intercourse.) There is truth in the Pharisaic principle of abstaining from intercourse with sinful and defiled men, if it proceed from anxiety to avoid being tempted by their sins. In them, however, it was the result of haughty feeling which made them keep at a distance from such unfortunate men, even when their minds shewed an inclination towards something better.

Ver. 3–7. The first parable recounted to the Pharisees by Jesus, (ἐπὶ πρὸς αὐτῶν ver. 3 compared with xvi. 1), is derived from a similitude already frequently employed in the Old Testament, according to which the relation between God and the people of Israel is compared to that between a shepherd and his flock. Even for the very form of viewing the comparison which we here meet with, the Old Testament furnishes analogies (Jerem. l. 6; Ezek. xxxiv. 11, 12, 16.) The main reference of the parable then it is quite impossible to mistake, inasmuch as the ἄπωλος which the shepherd seeks after, is just the same with the ἄμαρτωλός whom the Saviour receives in love, while the Pharisees despise them. But the references of the particular portions call for closer examination. For, first of all, it may be a question how the seeking and finding of the lost sheep on the part of the shepherd stands connected with
the μετάνοια which at ver. 7 and 10 is attributed to the ἀμαρτωλός, for, the parable mentions nothing of a change of state on the part of the lost one. According to the meaning of the parable, however, the labour of the shepherd in seeking and finding the sheep must be understood of God’s operations on the sinner’s heart, through means of which He awakens in him the μετάνοια. This parable, therefore, forms in this respect a contrast to the following one of the lost son, in which there is represented, not what God does, but what man does in the work of conversion. In a similar way (as was remarked on Matt. xiii. 44, seqq.) do the parables of the treasure in the field, and the merchant seeking pearls, stand mutually related to each other. In the second place, there is set before us, not merely the seeking of the lost sheep, but also the κατάληψις (ver. 4) of the ninety and nine. To this refers, on the one hand, the contrast between the ἡμῶν and the ὁδός, and on the other hand the circumstance that at ver. 7 the returning sinner is elevated more highly than those who never were lost. (This idea is more fully carried out in the parable of the lost son, ver. 22, seqq.) This certainly seems strange when we consider that those who are not lost are described as, δίκαιοι, δίκαιος ὁ κρίνων έξοικεί μετάνοιας (ver. 7), and seeing they had in point of fact never wandered from the close fellowship of the flock, they thus deserved praise for their faithfulness. But, from the connexion of the Law and the Gospel to each other, this difficulty admits of being easily removed, and the meaning of the parable retained in its literal application. For the law certainly carries with it this design, to incite man to keep it, and if he do keep it he acquires a δίκαιος ὁ τῷ νόμῳ, and does not need any μετάνοια in regard to the positive transgression of the law. This δίκαιος ὁτα, however, is incapable of leading to that higher life which the Gospel demands, but which it also bestows where there exists a susceptibility for it. There are only two ways, then, in which this can arise, either through such earnestness in the observances of the law, that a man cannot satisfy himself with an exterior legality (as the Pharisees did), but must strive also after an inward conformity to that law; or, when he, being left to himself, falls into sin. In the first case, he soon experiences his inability to subjugate the hidden world within him, and thus the law works the ἀποκάλυψις τῆς ἀμαρτίας (Rom. iii. 20), and such a δίκαιος (see on Luke i. 5) may then possess at the same time true longing after and susceptibility for the atonement.
In the second case, however (which is that here intended), the striking and marked transgression of the law palpably brings his sin home to a man, and he is brought also to μετάνοια, inasmuch as, where sin was powerful, there grace often shows itself the more powerfully (Rom. v. 20.) In both cases, however, there rests on the μετάνοια, the possibility of a transition into a state of spiritual life more perfect than the mere δικαιοσύνη τοῦ νόμου can reach, the state of regeneration namely; whither this last leads is shewn by the righteous brother (ver. 25, seqq.) in the third parable. Thus, what the Saviour means to shew the Pharisees is just this, that these sinners whom they deepised could, through the mercy of God, be elevated to a higher state of spiritual life than it was possible for them to reach in their present condition. That they also could come to μετάνοια, however, if they would only consent to lay aside their coldness and hardness of heart, is intimated at ver. 31. Finally, we must not in the parable overlook the χαρὰ in τῷ οὐρανῷ (ver. 7), ἰνάσιον τῶν ἀγγέλων τοῦ Θεοῦ (ver. 10), with which ver. 22 seqq. should be compared. The joy of these divinely compassionate beings forms a most strongly marked contrast to the vexation of the Pharisees because sinners were received (ver. 2, 25, seqq.) The kingdom of the Good thus appears standing in mutual connexion and living unity, so that if one member rejoices, all members rejoice along with it. Heaven and earth are joined together by the bond of perfectness—love. Consequently, the absence of love must be seen by the Pharisees as implying ungodliness and exclusion from the lively fellowship of heaven. (The comparison is, moreover, found at Matt. xviii. 12, seqq. taken up and incorporated with the context there. It needs no proof, however, that here in St Luke it holds its original position.)

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

Ver. 11–19. It is by so much the easier to trace what is peculiar in the third parable of the lost Son. There is minutely set forth in it the process of his going astray step by step, and his return to repentance and faith, while in the first parable this was merely intimated, and prominence given, instead, to the operations of the Father. Here, these find no place in the picture till they are manifested at the moment of the Son’s return, and then, in parallelism with the Father’s love, there is the severity of the other son, towards whom, however, the love of the Father still continues the same. With regard to the Pharisees (ver. 1) the first half of the parable is an apology for the ἐλλογέω and ἀμαρτωλοί whom they despised, inasmuch as it partly leads us to infer that they are capable of nobler impulses to repentance and faith, and partly, it is made plain that God prizes and willingly receives them. In the strongest manner, then, are these ἀμαρτωλοί admonished and encouraged, in the first half of the parable, freely and joyfully to embrace the offered grace. The second half, however, places their own likeness before the eyes of the Pharisees, and contains a sermon of reproof addressed to them. The commencement of the parable ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἱδρυς δύo υἱόων purposedly places the two parties (the δίκαιος and the ἀμαρτωλοί) on a similar footing in relation to God. The description of the sons themselves, however, by the terms πατέρως and σπουδάστερος (ver. 11, 25) may apply appropriately to the heathen and the Jews, although primarily the connexion does not lead us to this contrast. A parable which, like that of the lost son, represents the relation of man to God in its essential points, naturally finds, in general, its fitting application wheresoever these points are developed. The abandoning of his father’s house on the part of the son points at once to man’s falling away from God, out of which the whole of his other backsliding gradually develops itself. (In the expression τὸ ἰπιζάλλων μέτοι τῆς οὐσίας, the verb ἰπιζάλλω is used intransitively. In a similar way, Tob. vi. 13, σοι ἰπιζάλλω κληρονομία αὐτῆς.—Brug as frequently — οὐσία, ἑκάστον, Luke viii. 43; xxi. 4.) In describing the living in sin, the strong expression ζῶν ἀσώτος is designedly chosen, and, according to ver. 30, we must retain it in all its force, for to this does the argumentation
of Christ refer, to represent one who is beyond all mistake an ἀμαρτωλός as capable of returning to God. (*Ἀμωτός from ἀμωμί is like perditus, a man who has fallen completely under the dominion of sensual enjoyment.*) Without, then, any express mention of it, there is in this parable also a reference to the repentance-awakening grace of God which follows after the lost son. Outward distress, poverty, hunger, the felt consequences of his sin, first awaken in him, according to the Divine dispensation, the consciousness of guilt, and that this consciousness may, in the mind of the sinner, combine with faith in the love of God, it is necessary to presuppose the revelation of that love whose consumption is exhibited in the offering up of God's Son, John iii. 16. The aim of the parable, however, causes this to remain in the background, for which reason, also, it can only be supplied from the doctrine of Scripture taken as a whole, and is a thing here silently understood (ver. 15, κολλάδει — to the Hebrew מֵעָבָד.) He sank down to the lowest depth of earthly misery. (Kεφάνια, as applied to the tree which is found under the name of κεφάνια, κεφώνια, denotes the fruit of the plant known under the name of John's bread, which in the East is commonly used as fodder.) This suffering, however, called up life in his innermost being, and with sincere self-condemnation and deep repentance, there was combined faith in the Father. In this frame of mind, then, were given the elements of his salvation. (In the characteristic expression εἰς τὸν τοῦτον, we find his previous state indicated as that of one who had lost himself. In ver. 17, ἁρμός, as being human food, stands in contrast to κεφάνια, which are intended for lower animals.—The μετάνοια here is shewn to be of a pure character, by the express reference to that which is Divine, implied in the words εἰς τὸν τοῦτον. He discerned sin in its root and essence as the transgression of the Divine will. The words ἰνώσιον τούτου are parallel to the Hebrew מְעַבָּד, which at 1 Sam. xx. 1, occurs in this very connection מְעַבָּד, מְעַבָּד, מְעַבָּד.)

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

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

Ver. 31, 32. The concluding verses add an entirely new feature to the picture. The compassion of the father who reproves sin with tenderness, remains unchanged even when brought to bear on the audacity of the elder son, who was bold enough to condemn his proceedings, an intimation being thus given to the Pharisees that for them, as well as others, Divine grace set open the way of νικάνοια, but that in their case equally with that of the ἀμαρτωλότι
was the path to πίστις. For, what they were outwardly, and in a form more gross, that the Pharisees also were inwardly, and in a way more refined; and it is just when assuming such forms that sin becomes most dangerous and ruinous, partly because its real nature is detected with greater difficulty, and partly because, being more spiritual in its nature, it takes a deeper hold at once on the soul and on the outward life. (On this point see at Matt. xxii. 31, in which passage this idea is set forth in express terms.) The father, moreover, in his reproof brings forward certain things which were wrong in the position of the elder son. In the true paternal feeling he views the son as his fellow-possessor (πάντα τὰ ἵππα, σὰ ιστόν), but the latter, in the spirit of a slave, draws shyly back, and does not venture in his father’s sense to view these possessions as belonging to himself, but stands there avariciously and eagerly demanding, in the confidence of his own self-righteousness, that the father should urge on his acceptance that which in a filial spirit he should himself have asked for. Thus the perverse position in which the Pharisees had placed themselves towards God and men, is in these words made known to them, and a powerful exhortation to repentance is brought home to their hearts. The account given by St Paul of the inability of the ὅμοιος to work out δικαιοσύνη (as set forth in Rom. iii. and Gal. iii.), and of the necessity for another way of salvation through πίστις and χάρις, forms the best commentary on these parables.

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

(Luke xvi. 1—31.)

The contents of the following parable, belonging apparently to an entirely different department, might at the first glance render it doubtful whether or not there exists here any demonstrable link of connection. But inasmuch as nothing is indicated in the way of conclusion or the commencement of anything new, the reference of chap. xvi. 1, 14, 15, to chap. xv. 1, makes it probable that a connection really does exist; for Jesus, according to these passages, appears to be continually speaking before the same hearers, only addressing himself now more especially to one, now to another party of them. Nor
can one fail to see, on a closer examination, how the subject-matter is connected with what goes before. The whole xvi. chap. forms a parallel to the xv. What we were taught in the latter (the xv.) of God's compassionate love, is set forth in the xvi. chap. as the object for man to aim at in his own sphere. This reference to human affairs the Saviour was led very naturally to make, by the position of the Pharisees and Publicans. The former, in their unfeeling coldness, were avaricious (xvi. 14), for which reason this tendency had already been exhibited at xv. 29 in the elder brother, who was intended to represent the Pharisees. The Publicans, on the contrary, though for the most part they had become rich by unrighteous transactions, yet practised charity in their sincere μυρώνια—for example, Zacchaeus, Luke xix. 8. Hence does our Lord in the following parables teach the right use of earthly possessions. In the first, however, respecting the unjust steward, the representation given is of such a nature, that true charity, which, when embodied in outward acts, takes the form of an expenditure of one's possessions (the proper contrast to the false expenditure of his goods on the part of the lost son), is seen to be at the same time true wisdom, while the want of charity is folly. This view implied, in the first place, a defence of the despised Publicans, who are to be conceived of as belonging to the μαθηταί (ver. 1), with an admonition urging them to continue the same use of their property, while it involved, on the other hand, a rebuke to the Pharisees, who considered themselves as wise as they were righteous (ver. 15.) Inasmuch as they wished half to serve God as representing the Theocracy, but at the same time half to serve Mammon (ver. 13), they acted unrighteously, and became fools in their false wisdom. The final results of such false wisdom are delineated in the following parable (ver. 19, seqq.), by the remark which points out the important consequences which true wisdom may produce in behalf of man. (With an allusion to the δικαιοθαι ἐκ τῆς άιώνιως σκπνάς, ver. 9.) Should we ask, however, on what grounds the Lord might not have chosen a comparison to shew the nature of true wisdom, which might at the same time have exhibited δικαιοσύνη, and consequently a liberal application of his own means, and not those of another; the cause of it can have been no other than this, that it would have been impossible in that way to bring clearly to view that twofold reference to God and the world which to the Saviour was precisely the point of greatest importance. In ver. 13

VOL. II.
there lies the key to our understanding the peculiar form of the parable. For, both parties, the Publicans as well as the Pharisees, stand as it were between two poles. On the one side, they stand in connection with the world and its earthly ties, on the other side, with God and divine things. The only difference lay in this, that the Publicans (those, namely, who were here present whom Jesus kindly received [xv. 1], and who are now to be reckoned to the number of the μαθηταί [xvi. 1]), were outwardly most deeply involved in the world, but their inner man burned with earnest longing after that which is Divine; the Pharisees, on the other hand, were outwardly chained to things Divine, as the born representatives of the Theocracy, but their inward life was attached to the world, and they even made use of their spiritual character for earthly ends. In order to teach, therefore, what was right in regard to this position betwixt two such attractive forces, our Lord selects the precise representation here employed, which from two opposite points of view, and, for the benefit as well of the Publicans as of the Pharisees, sets in a clear light the idea contained in ver. 13, "No man can serve two masters, he must despise the one in order to cleave to the other." Man has not and never can have anything of his own (comp. on Luke xiv. 33), he is for ever a mere ἐκκόψας. The only question is whose ἐκκόψας he considers himself to be, whether of the God of tender love (whom chap. xv. sets forth), or of the hard-hearted world and its Prince. In reference to the Publicans, therefore, the parable contains the exhortation entirely to renounce the master with whom, by means of outward circumstances, they continually stood associated. In regard to the Pharisees, however, it involves the reproof that their half-heartedness could lead to nothing like the true service of God. According to this view, the ἄνθρωπος πλούσιος (ver. 1) is nothing else than the κόσμος or its representative the ἀγαθον τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, to whose service the τιλώναι, through their external circumstances, are supposed to belong. According to ver. 13, God is to be considered as the other and real master (the representative of the δεχόμενοι τις τὰς αἰώνιος σκηνάς, ver. 9) who stands opposed to this ἐκκόπτοντος. This true Lord has service rendered to him in the right way, even by the wise διασκορπίζων τὰ ῥάγχων τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πλούσιον, who despises the one in order to belong wholly to the other, and with the possessions of the one labours for the objects of the other. That man acts, however, in opposition to
his own interests (and is thus unwise) who, like the Pharisees, seeks to place the service of the one on a level with that of the other. The figurative representation of unrighteousness could thus be made use of here without causing any misunderstanding, for this reason, that it so markedly expresses the felt inward experience of the man who feels himself placed between two such opposite attractive forces. On the other hand, however, to expend the things which belong to the κόσμος in behalf of God and his objects can never be to act falsely, for the κόσμος, as well as its ἄρχων, are not the true possessors. As God thus is in the last instance the right-ful Lord, such an overreaching of the κόσμος as Jesus here teaches is the way truly to uphold what is right; all is rendered back to God to whom all belongs. There was no reason to apprehend, however, such a perversion of his words as though a man ought to deprive others of their property in order thus to expend it, for this was already sufficiently prohibited by the commandment, "thou shalt not steal." The very delineation of the ἀδικία in touches so vivid excludes all possibility of such a misunderstanding. According to this view, the parable, though referring primarily to temporary circumstances, possesses its everlasting truth; in things temporary are shadowed forth things constantly abiding. For, in the same light in which the Publicans are here presented to our view, do men stand at all times, in so far as they are possessed of property. Possession in itself, as a circumscribed and exclusive right to certain things, is the product of sin in the κόσμος, of which man knows nothing in the βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ.¹ While maintaining, therefore, such a possessory right, man is an ἀκονίτομος of the ἀρχων τοῦ κόσμου τοῦτου. If he prove true to this master, he works in his interest, and so heaps up possessions upon possessions; but if he prove untrue to him, and pass over as a member into the βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ, into the service, consequently, of another lord, then he labours in the interest of this new master, and squanders the possessions of

¹ It is chiefly the difference of opinion in regard to the rights of property which makes it so difficult for expositors to agree in their understanding of this parable. According to the prevailing opinion, it is only illegal possession which deserves blame, and from the standing-point of law this is correct. In the same way, it is only an act of perfidy which is held to deserve punishment. But Christ looks on humanity in a point of view far higher, and contemplates the original state of Paradise as restored. According to this view, no mention can be made of any right of possession which excludes from others the use of the property possessed, and it is in this way that our Lord here treats the relation in which man stands to the things of this world.
the first, expending them on spiritual objects. This points again to xiv. 35, where the children of the kingdom were exhorted ἀπενάσωσαν τῶν, and by means of this explanation the connection is seen to be carried thus far back.

The great mistake, as it seems to me, in the common exposition of the parable, consists in this, that under the ἀνθρωπος πλούσιος God is understood to be meant.¹ In this view of it we cannot conceive how two masters should be spoken of at ver. 13, or how we should be taught to squander possessions belonging to the God of love. For had it been intended to teach by this a beneficent expenditure of one’s means, the steward acting thus would not have been displaced by God; but if it be a false, wasteful prodigality of one’s possessions that is meant, such as was condemned in the case of the lost son, one cannot see how this is to be reconciled with the declarations at ver 8–13, in which his faithfulness in minor matters is praised. For, that a parable should teach precisely the opposite of what the narrative itself mentions, can never again be maintained after the striking train of reasoning by Schulz (on the parable of the unjust steward, p. 98). The rich man can represent only the world in whose service the Publicans stood. To spend their wealth in such a way as to devote it to the interests of their higher Lord, and at the same time to their own (real and everlasting) benefit, is the only thing that could be enjoined on these men for imitation.² The exposition of Schulz (ut supra), is, in my view, essentially the right one, only this learned critic neglected clearly to refer the ἀνθρωπος πλούσιος to the world,

¹ This explanation Jansen has even yet retained in his valuable Treatise (in the Studien und Kritiken by Ullman, ii. vol., 4th part, p. 699, seq.), to the disadvantage of his general view. On the other hand, there lies much truth in the polemical discussion which the author carries out against Schleiermacher. In exactly the same way does Schneckenburger (Contrib. p. 55) understand by the πλούσιος God. Very arbitrarily, therefore, must he hold ver. 13 to be a later interpolation.

² If one were inclined, with De Wette, to say that the ἀνθρωπος πλούσιος in the parable was intended to have no meaning, such an opinion might more readily satisfy us were it not that the arbitrary disjunction of particular features from the parable favours a superficial exposition of Scripture. Substantially the exposition of the parable is entirely given up by De Wette, inasmuch as ver. 10—13, which can alone furnish the key to our understanding of it, are explained by him as standing quite unconformably to the remaining portions. He thinks also that there is in the narrative itself an internal improbability which the expositor must be satisfied to take as he finds. After all, the parable, in the opinion of this learned critic, contains something paradoxical, and yet it gives us this idea, which is worthy of Christ, that men should expend their earthly means for the advancement of the kingdom of God.
and was therefore, in his otherwise correct explanation, forced to have recourse to this turn, "that it is not the man's whole corrupt nature and conduct, nor his worldly standing-point, nor his profligate ungodly feeling and mean selfishness which is praised, but his well-considered, effective mode of dealing with the possessions still standing at his disposal." (Ut supra, p. 103.) It seems to me undeniable, however, that the meaning of the parable will fit still more closely into the narrative which contains it, if we hold that the rich man stands parallel to the world and its Prince. By Schulthess (Theol. Annals Tubig. 1827, March, p. 213 seqq.) this view of the reference has been rightly brought forward. The explanation of Schleiermacher (on the writings of St Luke, p. 202 seqq.), according to which the Publicans are meant by the steward, and the Romans by the master, is not specifically different from my own view, inasmuch as the Romans form the representatives of the χαμιος. Only on this point must I refuse to agree with Schleiermacher when he wishes to mitigate the character of the εξωνεμος της αδικιας. In the very aggravation of his αδικια lies the whole point of the narrative.

Ver. 1. The expression δις καὶ προς τοὺς μαθητας αὐτοῦ points back to xv. 3, where the discourse was directly addressed to the Pharisees. Now, in addition to them, the Saviour turns also to his μαθηται in such a way that both parties, Pharisees and Publicans, are addressed together, and thus in the parable there may be traced a reference to both. The μαθηται, however, here embrace in the widest sense all the adherents of Jesus, both the Apostles (who are especially mentioned in xvii. 5) and the well-inclined τιμωνια together. The Apostles, it might be said, had indeed already practised the commandment to free themselves from Mammon (comp. on Matt. xix. 27), but, on the one hand, they were not as yet in their hearts wholly delivered from the love of their possessions, so that an admonition to continue in the renunciation of Mammon cannot seem inappropriate even for them; and,

---

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

2 As to the many other (for the most part wholly untenable) expositions of the parable, compare the well-known treatises by Schreiter and Keil. The following recent explanations of this difficult passage are also worth reading, viz. by Grossman, Lips. 1828; Niedner, Lips. 1826; Zyro Stud. und Kritik. Jahrg. 1831, h. 4; and Bahnmeyer (Bahnmeyer in Kleiber's Stud. vol. i. part 1, p. 27, seqq.)
on the other hand, we may remember that Judas was included among them, who was still the slave of φιλαγγυμία, and the parable may be considered at the same time as a warning for him—as it was to the Pharisees. That the ἄνθρωπος τις πλούσιος, then, cannot have been intended to denote God, might be conjectured, first of all, from the word τις itself, which gives a certain vagueness to the idea, which obviously is inconsistent with such an interpretation. The words might be translated, "some rich man, of whom there are many to be found." In this way it must be some usual connexion, such as is wont to subsist in the sinful κόμως, that is intended to be denoted. In the second place, the comparison in ver. 19 is obviously unfavourable to the view that the rich man denotes the Godhead. For, in this latter parable, the πλούσιος is the representative of the κόμως; but it is altogether an improbable thing that in two parallel parables the same expression should denote something wholly different or rather opposite. If one considers, further, how there runs through the whole language of Scripture the view that πτωχός is to be held equivalent to ἐσθιζός, and πλούσιος to ἀσθενής, it must assuredly be confessed that any reference of the expression ἄνθρωπος πλούσιος to a noble character seems inappropriate. The common relations of the ἄνω ὄντος are intended to be delineated in the parable, and therefore as is the εἰκονήμας, such also is the κόμως (Comp. on ver. 8.) There is implied, moreover, in the idea of the εἰκονήμας (as Schulz, ut supra, p. 44, shews) that he is more than a mere δῶλος. He is to be viewed as the administrator and curator (of the master who on some occasion was absent), and as one, therefore, who could the more freely act without control in regard to the possessions of his Lord. The εἰκονήμας is thus all the more appropriately the representative of man, in so far as he has to a certain extent the independent management of his possessions. Respecting this εἰκονήμας, then, the report went abroad, and there were willing informers who carried it to his master, that he wasted the property intrusted to him. (Διασκόρπιζεν, as at Luke xv. 13. The διαζάλλειν, which occurs in the New Testament only at this place, does not by any means imply an attempt to calumniate by false reports, but rather to inform, to accuse even when the ac-

1 Certainly in the parables of Jesus ignoble characters are sometimes compared to God (comp. Luke xviii. 1, seqq.), but that is in cases where the ground is distinctly made known on account of which this very comparison was chosen.
 cottation contains what is well-founded.) In the case of this steward, it is intended that this very ἀδικία should stand forth as a leading feature of his character.

Ver. 2, 3. The rich man calls the ὀικονόμος to account (ἀποδίδονα λέγον = δίδονα λέγον, Rom. xiv. 12), and announces to him his approaching dismissal (οὐ δυνήσῃ ἦν ὁ ὀικονόμῳ) from office. The period that had to elapse previous to his removal, the wise steward seeks still to employ for his own advantage. The means of support which happen to be mentioned (σκάτωτιν and ἵππῳ, which last is ἵψυ [Ps. cix. 10], and bears the sense of stipem rogare), the delicately educated steward finds unsuited to him, partly because he was unaccustomed to hard labour, and partly because he feared the opinions of men. This representation refers primarily to the common opinions of a man, who in a worldly-wise way knew how to extricate himself from difficulties, and to cast off every thing burdensome. In the application of the parable there is a delineation of that spiritual wisdom which chooses the true way to blessedness (that of pure love), which is at the same time the most secure.

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

Ver. 8. When the Lord (that is the ἀδρέων τῶν πληθυσμῶν, ver. 1) was informed of this new perfidy, he praised (notwithstanding his wrath against the ὀικονόμος, which, according to ver. 2, must be taken for granted) the wisdom with which he had known how to make himself safe for the future. For as the judge would have taken from the steward what he possessed, in order to repay his master in some measure for his losses, there remained nothing for him to do but to make himself friends by such acts of kindness.
No one could interfere to prevent them giving to him of their own. Did we view the words καὶ ἵστησαν ὁ κύριος x. τ. λ. as the language of the Evangelist, so that the ὁ κύριος were to be understood as meaning Christ, the whole representation would be entangled and confused. The address of Christ in which he makes application to his hearers so obviously begins only at ver. 9, with the words κρίγας ὑμῖν λέγω that the former view of the words may be held to be impossible. It might be more questionable whether τῆς ἀδικίας should be connected with οἰκονόμασι or with ἵστησαν. Schleiermacher decides in favour of the latter. But the immediately following expression μαρωνιᾶς τῆς ἀδικίας of ver. 9, and the analogous phrase κρίγας τῆς ἀδικίας (Luke xviii. 6) are obviously in favour of the connexion with οἰκονόμασι, not to mention that the succeeding words ὅτι φρονίμοιτι ἐτοίμων do not well admit of our assuming the ἀδικία as also an object of praise. The whole connexion, however, speaks most strongly in favour of the construction οἰκονόμασι τῆς ἀδικίας, inasmuch as the point of the narrative lies in this, that the impure wisdom of the worldly man is contrasted with the pure (though seemingly impure) wisdom of the children of God. The term ἀδικία, however, forms here the contrast to δικαιοσύνη in the widest sense of the word. All that is unlawful, every transgression of an ἰντολή (such as in this case openly took place) forms the ground of ἀδικία in the relation of man to God. Hence even if the steward’s conduct towards his master’s debtors did not amount to an act of unrighteousness in the narrower sense of the word, yet in the wider meaning of it which we have referred to it did, for in acting as he did he transgressed the law. Certainly, however, ἀδικία is to be distinguished from literal wickedness (πανογία σοφία.) (See further on in this verse.) The final words of the parabolic narrative ὅτι φρονίμοις ἐτοίμων bring forward the lesson it was mainly intended to teach, namely to inculcate wisdom (the opposite of μωρία.) The expression φρονίμοις (ἐπίφασι) stands connected with σοφίας (understanding), in the same way that σοφία (έπιφασι) does with νόης (reason.) Prudence denotes the active exercise of the soul’s powers, which shews itself especially in duly making use of outward circumstances in order to attain (good as well as evil) objects. Wisdom denotes the receptivity of the soul—its standing open for the influence of a higher world to act upon it. In cases where the νόης is pre-eminently active, it is usually a difficult thing to keep
the ἀληθής equally in exercise, and this forms the subject of the Saviour's rebuke in what follows. The admonition is thus analogous to that given at Matt. x. 16, "Be ye wise as serpents." The parabolic narrative then concludes with the words ὁτι φρονίμως ἐπισήμαν, and at ver. 9 there follows the express application of it for the benefit of the disciples commencing with κέφαλοι ὑμῶν. The words therefore inserted between, belong neither to the one portion nor the other, but form an intermediate remark intended to lead the hearers on ward to the comprehension of the parable. For, the ὑπὸ τοῦ άληθος τοῦτο are there set in contrast to the ὑπὸ τοῦ φαρώσ in such a way that the ἀκονόμος is obviously included in the former, and is meant to be placed in opposition to the disciples (ver. 1) as the members of the βασιλεία τ. Θ. (Comp. as to αἰῶν οὐκος on Matt. xii. 31.) That which connects the two is the φρονήματι, in which the children of the world surpass the children of light (Christians are often termed the ὑπὸ τοῦ φαρώσ, John xii. 36, 1 Thess. v. 5, as those who have been illuminated by the true light, John i. 4) in reference to their circumstances in life. (The somewhat obscure expression εἰς τὴν γενεὰν τὴν ἁπάντων is to be referred to both parties in such a way that to each class there is ascribed a γενεά, in regard to which they exercise φρονήματι. It is best to take γενεά in the common meaning of generation, those of one race living together. The ὑπὸ τοῦ άληθος τοῦτο, and the ὑπὸ τοῦ φαρώσ must be conceived of as two families having two ancestral heads, God and the world, who impart to each their peculiar character.) From these words, so important for the understanding of the parable, it plainly follows that the relation of the ἀκονόμος to the ἀνθρώπων πλούσιος (ver. 1) is precisely that which subsists between the world and its children. Worldly men labour in the spirit of the world their master, when they amass treasures for this earthly life. In this respect they often display uncommon prudence. This is easy for them, because they suffer the higher powers to slumber, and concentrate all their affections on earthly things. Altogether otherwise is it with the members of the kingdom of God; aiming at a higher life they often are forgetful of what is prudent in regard to the things of earth. The harmonious combination of both would be perfection. The connexion of this with what follows (ver. 13), however, would lead to the inference that the ὑπὸ τοῦ άληθος τοῦτο are not to be taken as precisely identical with the ἀνθρώποι. For we must steadfastly keep it in mind that
Jesus had the Pharisees in his eye, who vacillated backwards and forwards between God and the world. One who was properly ποτερός we must hold to be as decided against God, as the child of light is for Him. Between the two there stand the ὑπὲρ τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ, belonging, it is true, through the general sinfulness of man, to the σκότος, but not absolutely hostile to the φῶς, striving rather to combine light and darkness. In this position stood the Pharisees, and our Lord seeks to convince them of the impurity of such a state. At the same time he wishes to prevail on the Publicans unreservedly to decide in favour of God.

Ver. 9. The positive application of the parable, which begins with the words παρὰ λίγῳ ὑμῖν, shews that the exposition given above, to which we are led in the first instance by the connexion, harmonizes also perfectly with the Saviour's own explanation. For the sense of the words ποιήσατε ἵνα τής φίλους κ. τ. λ. is obviously to be completed thus—employ the unrighteous mammon in making yourselves friends with as much prudence as that steward did in the circumstances in which he was placed. There is thus αἱ ἀδίκιαι presupposed as existing in their case, and the counsel is given that they release themselves from it. The 13th verse adds, that this can be done only by despising the one master. The sole question that can arise is, how far the μαμωνᾶς τῆς ἀδίκιας forms the subject of discourse. (Comp. as to μαμωνᾶς on Matt. vi. 24.) In regard to the Publicans this expression may certainly refer to the circumstance that they (as ἀμαθεῖοι) had made much gain in an unlawful way. But the following opposition of ἰλαχιστον and πολύ leads to some more general inference. The mammon is looked upon as something necessarily as such connected with ἁδίκια; it is as it were the bond by which every individual is bound to the αἰῶν ὅτις and its Prince. This bond must therefore be severed, nay mammon must itself be used with prudence for the furtherance of spiritual ends. Keeping close to and carrying out the representation of the parable, our Lord views the δικαιοθαι (ver. 4) as a consequence of the making of friends. Without such a definite intimation given by the Saviour himself, one might have been tempted to regard this as a mere decoration. The primary difficulty here is the δικαίωσις. For, not to mention the reading ἰλαχιστη, there are good MSS. (such as A. D. L.) which read ἰλαχιστη. In that case μαμωνᾶς or βίος would need to be supplied. This reading does not betray itself as an
alteration in conformity to ver. 4, so as to bring out the meaning, "As the steward hopes that his friends on his dismissal will receive him, so ought you also to make yourselves friends who may receive you if you are reduced to starvation." For, it is altogether inappropriate that a spiritual reception should be placed in contrast to bodily starvation. Perhaps it is a mere mistake of the transcriber, inasmuch as the ἵνα which follows might give occasion for the omission of the τι. The ἵνα τηρεῖ is the only reading which agrees to the connexion. It furnishes us with the idea that by means of worldly things he may prepare for himself assistance to meet his spiritual wants. (Ἐκλείπων occurs in the sense of to want, to be destitute of, for example Luke xxii. 32; here it means to want the power of life, to die. So it is frequently used in the Old Testament for θνη. In the New Testament it occurs only here in this sense. The reference to death as the moment of reckoning, as well with a view to punishment as reward, is in this passage exceedingly appropriate. Comp. in the following parable, ver. 22.) The words διερχομαι τις τάς αἰωνίους σκηνάς, with reference to verse 4, form an expression for spiritual assistance. There is nothing precisely analogous to the expression in the New Testament, for passages like Heb. viii. 2, Rev. xiii. 6, refer to the Tabernacle of the Covenant, of which there is no mention made here. The nearest parallel is furnished by John xiv. 2, ἐν ὑπηκοία τοῦ σαρκος μου μεναι πολλαὶ σιν. The σκηναὶ denote here the higher and permanent state of being, in opposition to the earthly and transitory. There remains, however, still a difficulty in the idea, as to how the φίλων could receive others into everlasting habitations, and who they are whom we are to conceive of as thus presented to us. Since the discourse is addressed to the μαθηταί, we cannot, as it seems to me, think of the Apostles, who were included among the μαθηταί, and to them as to all the other disciples—especially the rich Publicans—there is addressed the exhortation to make friends with mammon. Should it appear then improper generally that the privilege is to be conceded to all and every one of receiving into the everlasting habitations, we might refer the words to the person of Jesus himself, in union, however, with the inhabitants of the heavenly world, who previously (xiv. 10) and subsequently (xvi. 22) are introduced as actively employed. For, that which belongs properly to Christ, may be ascribed also to his people, especially to the Apostles, in
so far as Christ's strength is conceived of as purely working in them, and they have received power to bind and to loose (Matt. xvi. 19.) But inasmuch as this power was as yet conferred on them only in spe as it were, since they had not received the Holy Ghost (for which reason also Peter immediately at Matt. xvi. 23 could again give Satan access to himself), therefore also is the commandment in part addressed to them to make friends with mammon. For, were we disposed to consider the Apostles alone as the δεχόμενος εἰς τὰς αἰωνίους σκηνάς, and to view the admonition to make friends with mammon as addressed solely to the Publicans, the representation given in the parable furnishes positively no ground for separating into two halves the μαθητεία who are mentioned at ver. 1.

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

Ver. 13. The concluding words we have already met with at Matt. vi. 24, in the Sermon on the Mount. That their position
here is an original one, and not merely that in which they occur in Matt., does not need to be pointed out. Every word of the verse fits here most closely into the whole parable. The εἰκόναμος points back to the εἰκόναμος. The one master is the ἀνθρώπος ἔλεος; the other is the possessor of the ἀληθινός, the contrasted terms μισόν and ἄγαπη, as also ἀνθρωπος and καταφρονεῖν refer to the application of the possessions against the one and in favour of the other master. The wavering inclinations of the Pharisees would in this way be wholly excluded, but the Lord means also to exhort his disciples to give up all, and to be wholly for God. The verse completes the explanation given by Jesus of the foregoing parable, and leaves no room for doubt as to the mutual connexion of its parts as one whole.

Ver. 14. Although the parable (according to ver. 1) was addressed primarily to the μαθηταί, yet was it not intended that the Pharisees should be excluded. (Hence the words ἡχον τὰντα καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι.) Their covetousness was rebuked by this very parable of the wicked steward; and in anger at this reproof they gave expression to their ill-will in mockery of Jesus, not only in looks but also in words. (Εὐμυθρυμήζω, the compound verb, occurs also at Luke xxiii. 35. The simple verb is found only at Gal. vi. 7. In the LXX. it stands as = ἔρωτε ἀθροή to scoff, to mock, to turn up the nose.) This incident leads the Saviour to address his discourse again directly to the Pharisees (ἵστω ἀθροή), and in another parable once more to hold before them a view of the consequences of their φιλαγγυρία. We thus once more find St Luke very accurate here in setting before us the turns of the dialogue, and might at once have inferred from this, that in this case, (vers. 15–18), as in others, we should not fail to find a close connexion. Certainly the verses which follow are very obscure, and it may possibly be that St Luke has communicated them to us in a somewhat abbreviated form. Perhaps, however, the Saviour speaks also intentionally in a somewhat obscure way, since he could hardly hope to win over the Pharisees to his side, and for this reason, in order not to make them so deeply responsible, he may have wished only incidentally to touch upon the relation in which the Old Testament economy (to which the Pharisees belonged externally, although inwardly they had no love for it) stood to that of the New Testament, which relation was now unfolding itself before them.
Ver. 15. The very first verse of this dialogue is, in regard to its connexion, obscure.¹ The Saviour blames the Pharisees for their hypocrisy: they set themselves forth in the view of men as δικαιοι (δικαιον ἰαντον = ἔρημον used here, in the legal sense, to represent one’s self as a close observer of the law), while in the view of God, who looks, not like men, on that which is without, but on that which is within (καθεον = ἔρημον), they are not so. In the concluding words the ὑπολογεῖτο is mentioned as the ground of this displeasure on the part of God (Βδιλυγμα from βδιω, to stink, the strongest expression for that which is displeasing to God, it stands for ἔρημον, and is used especially with reference to idols. In the ὑπολογεῖτο also there is implied a reference to that which is idolatrous, which robs God of his glory, and gives it to self.) According to what goes before, the discourse seems to relate to covetousness or attachment to earthly possessions, but neither to hypocrisy nor to pride. In the same way also, in ver. 15 itself, there does not seem to be any connecting link between the first and second ideas—between hypocrisy and pride. The explanation of this difficulty lies in the more profound conception of φιλαγγυα as being ἡκα παντος ῥον κακων (1 Tim. vi. 10). Φιλαγγυα, inasmuch as it is attachment to things transitory viewed generally, involves everything evil. Especially and primarily in the case of the Pharisees did it imply hypocrisy, for outwardly they bore a spiritual appearance, and therefore seemed to cherish love for God, the Eternal. Over their love of gold they knew how to cast the garb of careful zeal for God, i.e. for the temple. Along with hypocrisy, however, there was further necessarily bound up a selfish pride, for it was their semblance of righteousness on which they founded their claims. Although, therefore, the expression το εν ανθρωποις ὑπολογεῖτο is rather general in its terms, and denotes any form which pride may assume, yet does it primarily point to that most dangerous manifestation of it, Pharisaic selfishness, as exhibited in a

¹ By the difficulty of tracing a connexion in the following verses, De Wette has suffered himself to be misled into agreeing with Strauss, who finds in them certain wholly unimportant reminiscences of the separate sayings of Jesus. But as St Luke shews himself elsewhere an accurate writer, who carefully preserves the connexion, it is impossible to suppose that he has written down continuously sentences wholly unconnected, and especially that he has done so between two parables, which are obviously so nearly related to each other. Even though we could not shew any connexion therefore, we ought yet to trust in St Luke, so far as to believe that in this combination he had before him a train of ideas which we cannot now bring out into view.
fictitious serving of God, which, in His view, is idolatry. Hence
the word ἰδιωτα is to be regarded as standing in contrast to
ταπεινόν: as the latter alone pleases God, so does the former offend
Him (Luke xiv. 11.)

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

¹ The is ἀδερφῶις is not to be taken as meaning ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἀδερφῶις, but it is equi-
valent to ἰδιωτα τῶν ἀδερφῶις (see immediately before.) In the same way we find at
1 Tim. iv. 15, ἰδιωτα τῶν τῶν τίμων.
things. Still further, ver. 18 does not agree with the circumstances of history, for Herod's brother had not given to his wife her bill of divorce, but Herod had seduced her from him. The clause, therefore, ὃ ἀνολύων κ. τ. λ. does not by any means agree with the circumstances supposed to be referred to. Scarcely any other explanation of the passage (ver. 18) can suggest itself, except the following figurative one. Verses 16 and 17 set, in the first instance, the Old Testament economy (νόμος καὶ προφητεία) in its temporary and restricted duration (in which respect, as an institute preparatory to the New Testament, it terminates with John the Baptist), over against its everlasting character (in which respect it is in a spiritual sense completed, and still subsists in the New Testament). The reference to it under the former of these aspects announces to the Pharisees the approaching overthrow of that visible theocratic kingdom, for the support of which they wrought, and the blooming forth of a new and higher order of things, into which were pressing all susceptible and tender souls, especially the Publicans, whom the Pharisees despised. The second aspect of it, which brings out into view the everlasting truth, wrapt up in the law, sets before them, on the one hand, the fact that they themselves as well as the Publicans, might find entrance into this new kingdom, whose future approach the Old Testament had already foretold; and calls their attention, on the other hand, to the circumstance that this same economy on which, as on a sure foundation, they were resting, pronounced on them a sentence of condemnation, inasmuch as the laws of recompense, on which it was grounded (and which are of force even in regard to a coming world), are the eternal laws of God. (This is referred to in the following parable, at verses 29, 31, in which Moses and the prophets are described as a full and satisfying divine revelation, which leaves without excuse the man who does not make use of the law, or who arbitrarily casts off its authority.) The relation then in which men stand to the divine law, which is binding on them, is viewed as a marriage; and our Lord denies that there ought ever to be a wilful breaking up of such bonds. The man who does this, and from his own choice enters into another connexion, is guilty of spiritual adultery. Under this comparison our Lord sets forth at once the unfaithfulness of the Pharisees towards God, inasmuch

1 Compare as to this the remarks on Matt. v. 17.
as they loved mammon more than Him; and also their inability to enter into the new element of that life introduced by the Gospel, though they vainly imagined they could do so, being persuaded that they were certainly members of the kingdom of God. For such a transition, however, there was required an inward deliverance of the soul from the law, which in their case did not exist. The unusual nature of this figurative exposition of the passage forms assuredly a less difficulty in the way of our receiving it (inasmuch as St Paul at Rom. vii. 1, seqq., describes under the same image the relation in which the soul stands to the law) than does the form in which the comparison is here applied. In this there is certainly something to make us doubt its correctness. For in that passage of St Paul the law is viewed as the husband and the soul as the wife; here, however, the figure is reversed: the law would be the wife, and the man, who is connected with it, would be the husband. And yet we can easily perceive why this view of the comparison is here adopted. For the thing here spoken of was not so much the standing of the soul as subordinate to the law that was the subject of the Apostle’s discourse in the passage referred to, for which reason he represented the law as bearing authority, as being the husband; here it is rather the relation in which the Pharisees stood to the whole theocratic institutions of the Old Testament that is spoken of. In these the Pharisees were the ruling power (the Pharisees being taken for the whole dominant priestly party), and hence the turn here given to the comparison was more appropriate to the relation in which they stood, as seen from this point of view. The word μηχείνα, as used to denote spiritual unfaithfulness to God, is founded on a figure of speech so common that it needed no special mention. The idea that he who leaves his true wife and joins himself to another, breaks the marriage, stands here parallel with the serving of two masters (ver. 13.) Any thing of the kind is incompatible with that oneness of the whole course of life which the true service of God demands. He who thus attempts to hold with both sides, necessarily falls under the sentence of the law, which in this respect has its everlasting retribution, and which still exhibits its power even in the future world (ver. 29, 31.) There still, however, appears another difficulty in the way of the figurative exposition of this passage implied in the circumstance, that while it gives meaning and force to the first half of the verse, πασὶ ἐκ ἀπολύων τήν...
The second half of the verse also acquires meaning and application, when we contemplate the Pharisees in the false and double position which they occupied. For, their sin consisted not merely in this, that they failed to hold the law in the everlasting sense of it (ver. 17), inasmuch as they loved gold and goods more than God, but also in this, that now when the time of its dissolution was at hand, they wished to maintain the Old Testament economy under that aspect of it which was transitory (ver. 16), that is to say, the visible theocratic kingdom which it established, and which was to them a source of riches. That which God had loosed they wished still to regard as maintaining its binding power; that which God had bound they wilfully unloosed; and thus they were guilty of a double spiritual adultery. The right thing for them would have been to have let themselves be set free by the Spirit of God from the ancient covenant, and then, with upright souls, to have entered into the new Gospel covenant, in which the Old Testament, in so far as it is everlasting in its nature, is still found to subsist. According to this view, the two halves of ver. 18 correspond closely to the two preceding verses, and the whole idea is rendered internally complete. The following parable also acquires in this way, for each of its separate parts, a distinct reference to what precedes, having for its subject the unchanging nature and meaning of the law (ver. 29, 31), which the Pharisees overlooked. (As to the details of the verses, compare the remarks on the parallel passages at Matt. xi. 12, v. 18, 32.)

Ver. 19. That the following parable contains a reference to the preceding one of the unjust steward is self-evident. For, as in the first an example was set before us shewing how man must shake himself free from mammon, so is there here given the example of a rich man who applies his possessions merely to his own enjoyment. Intentionally he is represented not as vicious (πονη-
he is simply worldly-minded. In Lazarus, on the other hand, there is brought before us a person of whom the rich man might have made use for the promotion of his heavenly interests (Luke xvi. 9.) Here also then is beneficence, warm-hearted love for the brethren once more enjoined. There is another point referred to in the parable, which, though less clearly brought out, is of great importance as a connecting link with the parable which precedes it. In the conversation between the rich man and Abraham, it is distinctly stated that the former, as being an Israelite (for which reason he calls Abraham his father, ver. 24, 27), considers the latter as his natural helper and protector. The parable is designed to set forth the vanity of this confidence in their natural descent, which all the Pharisees cherished. For Abraham refers him to Moses and the prophets (ver. 16, 17), and condemns him through these. The *jus talionis* which serves as a basis to the whole of the Old Testament, is brought forward by Abraham (ver. 25) in order to convince him of the justice of his sufferings. Moses, on whom the Pharisees rested their hopes, is thus brought forward to pronounce their condemnation. (The parable is consequently a commentary on John v. 45–47.) The parable, however, does not conclude at this point; the rich man still, though abandoning *himself* to his own fate, appeals from righteousness to mercy, and asks that Lazarus should be sent to his brethren. Abraham, however, leaves them also to Moses and the prophets. It is here to be remarked, that what Abraham refuses, God in Christ has performed, so that in this parable we have at once a representation of the essential nature of the law, and also an intimation that one was required, who should go beyond it. In this respect we may see in Lazarus, whose resurrection the rich man longs for, a type of Christ, in whose resurrection the object of his prayer was actually effected. That any special fact should have served as the foundation for this parable is scarcely probable, at least it is unnecessary to assume this, for there is nothing peculiar in the outward aspect of the parable—poor men before the doors of rich men may be found everywhere. Hence also the name Δάκης is probably symbolical = "νησιοκατηκομμένος" the helpless, the forsaken. As the rich man then represents the feelings of the worldly (not gross vice, for this man, who lived after the desires of his own heart, was obviously capable (ver. 27) of nobler emotions), so is Lazarus the type of pious men who are
divested of all that is earthly. Hence, in so far as Christ belonged to that number, or rather represented in its perfection this character of complete poverty, in so far is the parable applicable to himself. But the relation of Lazarus to Abraham, which the parable maintains throughout, does not permit us to extend this application to Christ, except in a general way, unless indeed we were inclined to view Abraham as symbolically representing God the Father. While, therefore, in the first parable, a steward is exhibited in connexion with the world and with those who are to receive him into everlasting habitations, the world, on the other hand, is here represented in connexion with the needy pious man, in such a way, however, as to shew what was the right application to make of the doctrine given in the preceding parable. In this way it is evident how much richer the sense of the narrative becomes when it is viewed as a parable, than when we regard it as history. As a parable, it expresses the general relation in which the pleasure-seeking world stands to those pious ones who have not where to lay their heads. (The account of the rich man contains merely the features of a pleasure-seeking worldling—Ἐνδούσαμος occurs only at Luke viii. 27—Βύσσος = γαα, with which ἤστιν and ἔστι are used as synonymous. It means fine cotton. Πορφυρα, like ἵππος, denotes the colour, and that which is dyed with it.)

Ver. 20, 21. In contrast to the rich man, Lazarus is described as wanting the most common necessaries—he had not where to lay his head. (Πυλῶν, the range of pillars enclosing the court of the palace through which the door opened into it. As to γυναῖκα, comp. Matt. xv. 27. Shut out from human society, he laid claim, along with the lower animals, merely to the crumbs that remained.) Nay, like another Job, he was besides afflicted with disease, and covered with ulcers (ἡλεημ.) But no man attended to him or bound up his wounds—the dogs licked them. (Ἄστελείχω is found only in this passage. It does not appear that the expression can refer to the sympathy of the dogs, of which there is no indication in the context. The words denote rather the entire abandonment of him on the part of man: his wounds stand open, and instead of human help, the dogs surround him. Their licking the wounds may denote their eagerness and greediness rather than their sympathy. Dogs bear in the Old and New Testament a character exclusively evil; they never ap-
pear as the symbols of fidelity or even of kindliness.) That Lazarus represents at the same time a spiritual character of true piety and godly fear, is not expressly stated, but the connexion necessarily leads us to infer it. The parable also incidentally contradicts that Jewish prejudice which the Pharisees especially cherished (and which the book of Job had formerly been written to refute), that the sufferings of individuals are the consequence and punishment of their own individual sins, and consequently that a sufferer can never represent one that fears God. All sufferings, even those of the pious, are certainly an evidence of the sin of the whole race. The saint does not withdraw himself from the consequences of this general sinfulness, but accepts them with patience and childlike resignation, in that form in which God, for the perfecting of the individual and of the whole community, sees it right to lay them on him. Suffering thus appears in the hand of God as an advantage, a means of moral perfection; and he whose efforts are directed to avoiding all suffering here below, gives himself up wholly to self-seeking, hardens his heart against the wretched, whose sufferings might have awakened him to sympathy, and so deprives himself of the blessedness which is implied in loving.

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

Ver. 24–26. This view of the entirely reversed relation of the two men, forms the subject of the following dialogue: the rich man who upon earth was εὐφημοῦμενος καθ’ ἡμῖν καὶ κακοῦς, pleads now for an act of kindness to himself, which even Lazarus in his poverty had not needed to ask. (Καραψιχίμ, to refresh, to cool, is not found elsewhere in the New Testament.) But, even this, according
to the inexorable law of retribution (eye for eye and tooth for tooth) is refused him; he has received his **ματαιοῦ** (Matt. vi. 2.) His earthly labours had brought him a rich earthly reward. Along with the whole ground of his labours, however, the reward itself sank down and perished. Besides this law of retaliation, there is also here brought to his mind the existing separation of the elements of good and evil which takes place at death. The **ψομος** puts an end to the existing mixture of good and evil which is found in this present world, and like gathers itself to like, and finds pain or pleasure in the very circumstance of its being beside that which is akin to it. (**Χάσμα**, from **χαίνω**, to gape, to stand open, means the gulf, the abyss: it is found in the New Testament only in this passage. In the word **ἰστήνουσα**, there is implied a reference to the fixed and unchangeable nature of this appointment. In the same way Hesiod calls the hall **ἔνα Σωλ Τιτνησι ἐνα Ζώρω ἡκοίνη παιχύσασαι**, in his Theogony, v. 740, α **Χάσμα μέγα.** Here, however, there arises the difficult question, how in that portion of the parable which rises beyond the sphere of this present life, the figurative and the real stand connected with each other, a question which we are all the more uncertain how to meet, inasmuch as purely didactic passages respecting the state of souls between death and the resurrection are not to be found in Scripture. Keeping hold of the general principle, that the most careful use is to be made of every feature in a parable, it appears to me that the following are the true ideas to be deduced from the figurative representation here given: 1st, That departed souls are assembled together in one appointed place. 2d, That they are separated from each other according to their fundamental characters, for good or evil, but that they are mutually conscious of each other's state. 3d, That after death a transition from the good to the evil, or the reverse, is impossible. On the other hand we are to view, as a parabolic representation, the dialogue which takes place, as well as the description of the pain, and of the wished for refreshment. The former, the dialogue, viz. is to be regarded as representing the living reciprocal action of the natures of the two, the longing after deliverance on the one side, and the voice of the law on the other. The latter, as a representation addressed to the senses, setting forth the analogous experiences of man's psychical being.¹

¹ Compare the treatise (well worth perusal) by Beckers, "Communications from the most remarkable writings of past centuries, as to the state of the soul after death." Augsburg, 1835.
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For the right understanding, however, of the whole delineation, it is of first importance to keep clearly in view that it is not everlasting salvation or condemnation which is here described, but the middle state of departed souls between death and the resurrection. The Bible knows nothing either of the expression, the immortality of the soul (God is ὁ μόνος ἐχων ἀθανασίαν, 1 Tim. vi. 16), or of the modern doctrine as to immortality. It is the doctrine with regard to the ἀνάστασις which gives its peculiar colouring to the description of the state after death. Down to the ἀνάστασις, the soul, stripped of its organ, is in an intermediate state, in which the experience of pain or of joy is regulated according to the moral condition of each individual, but that state is still one merely of transition, and not till the resurrection, and the χρίσει ἱσχάτη, does the final decision take effect. The dwelling place of souls when unclothed from the body is termed in the language of Scripture ἡ ὀργή, and with special reference to the sinful individuals who are found in this place, ἄγων, γίνεσθαι, φυλακή (Matt. xviii. 34; 1 Peter iii. 18); while with reference to the pious it is styled κόσμος Ἀρμαρίου, παράδεισος. (Luke xxiii. 43.) From this παράδεισος, we must be careful to distinguish the upper Paradise, as the Rabbis term it, which is spoken of at 2 Cor. xii. 4, (Comp. Eisenmenger's Etnd. Judenth., vol. 2, p. 296, f. 318.) Although separated from each other (ver. 26), yet all departed souls, while awaiting the resurrection, are assembled together in this place, only in a different state of felt joy or suffering according as they have devoted themselves to good or evil, and in different gradations of feeling, according to the degree of their spiritual development. Even in the case of the pious, however, their stay in School takes the form of longing desire, inasmuch as union with their bodies in their glorified state is a condition necessary to their being

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

2 The expression μῆλος Ἀρμαρίου is found only in this passage. There is a parallel expression in passage, John i. 18, where the Son is described as ἐστι νῦν καὶ ἐστι παρὰ τῷ παραθετέον. The phrase is not taken from the feast with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (Matt. viii. 11), for it is not to be conceived of as taking place among the joyful abodes of Hades, but in the βασιλεία τῶν θεών. It is better to take the expression as denoting figuratively the most intimate immediate union and fellowship.
made perfect. In this way are to be explained those expressions of the Old Testament, as to the staying in Schoel, the misunderstanding of which has led to the mistake that the Old Testament knows nothing of the soul's continued existence after death. It only brings this forward less frequently, because of the low state of development among the people, and, indeed, it could not, so long as the Saviour had not yet appeared, point forward to living with the Lord in the heavenly world. For, faith in the Saviour leads the regenerate at once into his heavenly fellowship (John iii. 18; v. 24; vi. 40, 47; xi. 25, 26; xii. 26; xiv. 2) in such a way, that the imperfection of their state in Schoel appears in the New Testament as overcome. Those passages of Scripture (for example Matt. xii. 32; 1 Pet. iii. 18; iv. 6) whose contents the Church, in her doctrine as to the descensus Christi ad inferos, found occasion to embody in the very heart of her doctrinal system, speak of a return from the φυλακῆς (= Schoel, Hades), and of the possibility therein implied of sin being forgiven after death. This representation can be construed only on the supposition of an intermediate state lasting till the resurrection, after which there follows the ἁδίως ἀγάμη, which presupposes an antecedent judgment. By this ἁδίως ἀγάμη evil men are wholly given over to condemnation, which is locally described by the terms Gehenna, or the Abyss in a more restricted sense (τοῦ τοῦτος, Rev. xx. 14, 15.) In our parable, therefore, nothing can possibly be said of the everlasting condemnation of the rich man, inasmuch as the germ of love, and of faith in love, is clearly expressed in his words, and obviously the whole standing-point of the picture is seen as taken before the Resurrection, and the final manifestation of those who are raised up. Abraham thus appears merely as an inhabitant of Paradise as it exists in Hades, and as the representative of the law. According to it the rich man found himself in pain, but compassionate love might take pity on him, for its responding notes were not wanting in his heart.

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

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

*Compare John Frederick Von Meyer's treatise on Hadra. (Franf. 1810), and Blätt. f. hoh. Wahrh. part 6, p. 222, seqq.
doctrine of the resurrection of the body, acknowledged this distinction without qualification. It lies also at the foundation of the Rabbinical writings (comp. Eisenmenger's Ent. Jud. vol. 2, sec. 5, 6.) And even in the Roman and Grecian mythology there are found descriptions closely akin to the Hades of the Old Testament (comp. Hesiod in the Theogony, v. 713, seqq. and Virgil in the Æneid, vi. ver. 540, seqq.) The rationalistic expositors, who are less under the influence of doctrinal truth (see Paulus on the passage), willingly find traces of these views in the New Testament, drawing, however, from this the very false inference that the Saviour and his apostles accommodated themselves to, or were entangled by, Jewish opinions. If, however, without suffering ourselves to be influenced by philosophic or dogmatic opinions, we closely compare the doctrine of the New Testament as to the relation of the ϕυσις and the πνεῦμα, of the resurrection and the κρίσις, the result will be not only that the explanation which we have given of the condition of the ϕυσις after death brings into harmony the various different modes of expression found in Scripture, but that it alone furnishes the key to many an enigma which on any other mode of explanation remains unintelligible. Especially does it enable us to explain the difference of those states into which souls depart at death, and more particularly in the case of those whose minds were undeveloped, and who had not come to a decision in favour either of good or evil, in their relation to blessedness or misery,¹ better than it can be done according to the common view. The doctrine of the Bible as to an intermediate state, in which departed souls pass their time till the Resurrection, enables us to see how the expressions of the law's severity may be combined in the destiny of these souls with the tenderness of forgiving love.

Ver. 27–31. In the concluding verses of this remarkable parable, our Lord makes the rich man present a petition in behalf of his brethren. In this prayer there is clearly expressed a lov-

¹ This doctrine as to an intermediate state of the soul after death must not be confounded with the Roman Catholic doctrine of Purgatory. According to Roman Catholic principles, Purgatory refers only to believers who have not yet reached perfect holiness. Of such a purifying fire for the perfecting of believers, Scripture knows absolutely nothing. (See on 1 Cor. iii. 18.) In the middle state of Hades are found only those who had previously been Christians and unbelievers. Inasmuch as many are, from no fault of their own, destitute of faith, divine grace there opens up to them the possibility of their attaining to it.
ing remembrance of his brethren, as well as faith in the compassionate love of God: things which both shewed that in his soul there still remained germs which rendered him capable of entering into the kingdom of love. He merely had not cherished and developed it as he ought to have done, and in the hour of his own need became for the first time conscious of the truth. Upon this prayer being presented, Abraham, who here appears as the representative of the law,1 sets before him the circumstance that they (the brethren) were in possession of the law, and that they might follow it. That which Abraham leaves unfulfilled, divine mercy h校区, through Christ, carried into effect; He returned from the dead that he might win men and bring them to God. The prayer of this individual, therefore, may be viewed as the general voice of longing desire which met with its fulfilment in the resurrection of Christ. In reference to the Pharisees, the words taken in this way bear the following meaning: "Thus shall ye also long after that which ye are now refusing." The passage is closely related to Luke xiii. 35; Matt. xxiii. 39, where the Pharisees are also exhibited as overcome by the Saviour. Certainly, however, Luke xvi. 31, ελεησως και των προφητων ευχομενες, ουδε ηδη τωι Εκ νεκρων αναστησαν, involves also a prophecy that many would refuse to believe in this miracle of love implied in his resurrection. Thus it is impossible to conceive of any thing more fitted to arrest the Pharisees than this parable. A son of Abraham, who knew Moses and the prophets, comes after death, not to the meeting-place of the Fathers, but to the place of woe, where longings after aid manifest themselves in him. The Pharisees must have seen in all this a picture of their own doom. The despised Lazarus, on the other hand (the representative of publicans and sinners), whose sighs the rich man had never listened to, reaches the place of joy, and his assistance is begged for by the sufferer. In the same way shall ye—such is, as it were, the language of the parable—also seek help from those whom here ye despise; but even according to Moses, on whom your dependence is placed (John v. 45, seq.), ye shall be refused. Nothing can pity or aid you but grace, which repays evil, not with evil, but with good.

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

(Luke xvii. 1—10.)

Ver. 1, 2. The commencement of this section points obviously back to xvi. 1, 14, and this circumstance must at once make it probable that a link of connexion will not be wanting between what goes before and what follows. The opening sentences form most clearly a sequel to the reproof which had been addressed to the Pharisees. It is they who are represented as giving offence, as preventing many from entering into the kingdom of God—against them is the woe denounced, and the disciples are warned against them. The words are most appropriate as a conclusion to the discourse, inasmuch as our Lord, seeing that his earnest admonitions remained without effect, now gave up all efforts in their behalf, and abandoned them to their own perverted feelings. At Matt. xviii. 6, 7, the same ideas occur on the occasion of Christ's placing a child in the midst of the disciples, only the order of the two verses is inverted. The contents, however, of both verses are of that kind that one can easily suppose them to admit of more than one application. (As to the relation in which the verses stand to the connexion in St Matthew, see the passage itself.) As respects the ideas expressed in the first verse (the detailed consideration of which was not given in St Matthew), there is contained in it an interesting notice of the relation subsisting between that necessity which regulates the progress of humanity as a whole, and the freedom of action possessed by men as individuals. For, the ground of the occurrence of σκάνδαλα is to be sought, partly in the sin which exists, and partly in the necessity for advancing the church, which must, through this very opposition, be carried forward to perfection. Notwithstanding, however, the necessity for these σκάνδαλα on the one hand, yet this does not excuse the σκάνδαλοι, inasmuch as evil can take effect in an individual only through the consent of his own will. The wondrous government of God which knows how to bring good out of evil, is thus the only thing which can make the insinuation of that evil intelligible as a means of progress, while it takes place without His active co-operation (Ἄνεξηκτῶν — ἀδίκων, comp. Matt. xviii. 7.)
Ver. 3, 4. From the malicious εκανάλαξεν, however (of the Pharisees), our Lord distinguishes the sins of brethren (the Publicans), arising from their weakness. As the former demands severe punishment, the latter calls for gentle reproof and continued forgiveness. While we must separate from the former that we may not ourselves receive damage (προσχέσεις οὐανοίς), the latter must be kindly borne with. Kindred statements are found at Matt. xviii. 15, 22 (where see the exposition), but these words also are of such a nature that there is nothing improbable in their being more than once repeated. At both passages they may stand in their right connexion.

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

Ver. 6. Our Lord acknowledges the correctness and truth of this desire, inasmuch as he sets forth the actings of faith, as that by which even the impossible is rendered possible. This passage also has something analogous to it at Matt. xvii. 20, and the frequent occurrence of these parallel passages from St Matthew, makes the belief that we have here a compilation of the fragments of different
discourses, such as is found in the Sermon on the Mount, easily intelligible. But even though this were granted, there must yet be here some thread of connexion, for we cannot hold that any careful writer would heap up an incoherent aggregate of passages; and then the whole character of St Luke is against such a supposition, as clearly as that of St Matthew is in favour of it. Especially in the report of this journey is there to be seen a remarkable example of the connected conversations (not discourses) of Jesus; and for this reason do I believe that, in general, the original course of the dialogue has been preserved, and the whole history communicated to us in a highly abbreviated form by St Luke. The figure, moreover (compared with Matt. xvii. 20), is somewhat modified. The act of planting in the stormy sea, like the overturning of the mountain in that passage, is the emblem of that which is impossible for human power, and for the laws of earthly development. Once more, therefore, πίστις is viewed as a susceptibility for the principle of a higher life. (Συνάμφιον = πρόπλη, the well-known sycamore, which especially in Egypt grows abundantly, and the wood of which was manufactured into mummy cases, comp. Gesenius in his Lex. sub. voc.)

Ver. 7–10. After this recommendation of faith, which naturally includes the advice that they should earnestly care and strive for its advancement, there follows a parabolic description of the relation in which the disciples stand to their Lord, which obviously grows out of the context in the following way. According to the εἰρήνης ἡμᾶς πίστις, a certain mournful sense of the difficulty of the struggle awaiting them, and a longing after speedy rest and reward, must be regarded as having formed the prevailing sentiment in the minds of the apostles. In reference to this, Jesus reminds them of the relation in which they were placed; they stood there as δοῦλοι to the κύριος, and the business of a δοῦλος is to labour for the affairs of his master, and in obedience to his will. This labour of theirs, however, yields no merit; it is merely duty. Certainly it may seem as if this view contradicted that given by Luke xii. 37, where it is said that our Lord will set down the faithful δοῦλοι to table, and will himself serve them. The difference between these representations, however, is to be explained by the different standing-points from which the Saviour speaks. In the former passage he spoke from the standing-point of grace which blesses us more than we can ask or think. Here he brings out into view the strictly legal
standing-point, in order to call the attention of the disciples to their own inward impurity. The lowly Son of Man, therefore, here appears as the commander whom all must serve, and the point of the parable brings home to the apostles, and through them to all the members of the church, the fact that man in the service of God can acquire no merit; that the highest faithfulness is nothing more than duty, and, consequently, that he still continues destitute of all other ground of confidence save the grace of God. (Ἀγορευτική and ποιμαίνειν, figurative expressions for those spiritual labours to which the apostles were called.) Intentionally does the Saviour make choice of the relations of ordinary life, in which the servant after labouring must still wait upon his master. The expression μη χάριν ἵππυς is also intended accurately to characterize the relative condition of a servant. Though the climax of the thought be given in the shape of a formal sentence, yet we must obviously view it as a lively expression of real inward feeling. The word ἄχρητος occurs at Matt. xxv. 30 in a positive sense, denoting culpable, useless. Here it is rather used negatively as applicable to him who performs no (special) χρήσια, but only does what is required of him, and who can receive a reward therefore only through grace. It involves in so far the idea of the ταξινόμησις, in which, according to the usage of Scripture language, there is implied the consciousness of one’s own want of desert or merit in relation to the Divine Being.

§ 19. THE HEALING OF TEN LEPERS.

(Luke xvii. 11—19.)

While we have hitherto been able to trace a close thread of connexion, a new section obviously begins at ver. 11. Mention is again made of the journey to Jerusalem (comp. ix. 51), but along with the obscure, incidental remark, that the Saviour travelled διὰ μίσου Σαμαρείας καὶ Γαλιλαίας (comp. as to this on Luke ix. 51), while, according to x. 38, he was already in Bethany. Certainly the expression διὰ μίσου is not in any case to be understood as referring to his travelling through the countries referred to in their whole extent, but only to his touching upon them near their boundaries, yet even with this explanation it is difficult to con-
ceive how it was done. The simplest view seems to be, as was already pointed out at ix. 51, to understand the words as applying to incidental journeys made by Him from Ephraim (John xi. 54), for, to connect them with the sending out of the Seventy, and to make Jesus slowly follow them (as Schleiermacher does at p. 214), is in opposition to the passage, Luke x. 30, which represents the Saviour as being already in Bethany. In our view, according to which Luke ix. 51 describes his departure from Galilee, this return of Jesus into the northern districts, after being already at Bethany, x. 38, agrees very well with John, if only we do not restrict his presence to the city of Ephraim itself, but suppose that, according to his usual practice, he made excursions into the neighbourhood. When connected, moreover, with the account of the place of the leper's return, the expression in ver. 14, ἐγένετο εἰς τῷ ἱππάγον αὐτούς ἰκαθαιρέθησαι, leaves no room for doubt that the cure was a sudden and remarkable one, that it caused instantly the return of the one leper, which is to be conceived of as happening in the νόμισμα itself. (As to the narrative of the cure, see more detailed remarks on Matt. viii. 2.) In the gospel of St Luke, this narrative has a special importance, for this reason, that the single grateful leper who forms the contrast to the nine ungrateful, was an ἀλληγορικ. There was thus set forth on this occasion the fact, that the heathen (to whom the Samaritans were nearly allied) were not excluded by the Saviour from the kingdom of God, but were called in some respects before the Jews.

§ 20. THE COMING OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

(Luke xvii. 20—37.)

The preceding narrative of a cure is again followed by a conversation, which extends down to xviii. 14, and in which once more a close connexion may be traced. It resembles the foregoing great conversation (from xiv. 25 onward) in this respect, that here also the Pharisees appear as opposing the disciples (comp. xvii. 20, 22, 37; xviii. 1, 9.) It is important to understand the connexion of this section with Matt. xxiv., many of the passages of which are parallel to it. The much more close and
marked connexion of the verses in the section before us, as well as the relation in which this discourse of Christ stands to that given in Luke xxi. (which obviously corresponds to the discourse in Matt. xxiv.) in this respect that both, though treating of the same theme, are yet entirely apart, and do not in a single passage repeat each other; and, finally, the general character of St Matthew as a compiler, and of St Luke as a close narrator of facts—are all circumstances which make it in the highest degree probable, that at Matt. xxiv. we have the fragments of various discourses combined into one, all relating to the manifestation of the kingdom of God, while here in St Luke we have a discourse exactly recorded (though only perhaps in the form of extracts) as it was delivered. The ideas themselves require to be considered in connexion with the general doctrine, concerning the close of all things, which will be found at Matt. xxiv. Here we confine ourselves to pointing out the connexion in which the words stand in the narrative of St Luke, and to the exposition of such passages as are peculiar to the discourse as here given.

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

1 See Schleiermacher on St Luke, page 217, seqq. Only I cannot agree with him in thinking that in Matt. xxiv. there is no connexion of any kind; it is only more loose, and the whole more freely put together. (See as to this the exposition on Matt. xxiv.) The sections stand related to each other in the same way as in the Sermon on the Mount
expectations of its glorious manifestation. All of outward glory which the Pharisees had conceived of as combined in the setting up of an earthly Messianic kingdom, is comprehensively expressed by the term σαρακένθησις. (The expression is in the New Testament found only here; it denotes literally the act of perceiving, of observing; and then, secondarily, every thing that excites observation. At Exod. xii. 42, Aquila has rendered ἵπποι by σαρακένθησις.) In the second place, the Saviour withdraws the kingdom of God wholly from the visible world, as it exists in space—οὖς ἰδού, ἰδού δῆς, ἰδού ἵστ; and, in the last place, he transfers it to the inner spiritual world (ἵνα ἡμᾶς ἑστήκατε.) The expression ἵνα ἡμᾶς does not make the Pharisees to be members of the kingdom of God, but only sets before them the possibility of their being received into it, inasmuch as its manifestation within the soul is represented as the universal criterion of it. The explanation of ἵνα ἡμᾶς by “among you,” which has been adopted not only by Paulus, Fleck, Bornemann, but also by De Wette, must be utterly rejected for this reason, that the clause so understood forms no contrast to the antecedent ἰδού δῆς. The term ἵστ is not meant to convey any further meaning than that the kingdom was at that moment existing in some of them. It may seem, however, that this ideal view of the kingdom of God presents a contradiction to the following discourse (addressed to the disciples), in which the ἡμέρα τοῦ νόμου τοῦ ἀνθρώπων is referred to in such terms as represent it as an outward fact producing outward effects. These effects, it is true, in so far as they wear an aspect of terror, form a counterpart to the σαρακένθησις which the Pharisees looked for, and the arrival of the Son of Man is represented in contrast to the δῆς and ἵστ (ver. 21) as a thing which suddenly seizes upon all men. Still, however, it remains true that the βασιλεία is here represented as external, while at ver. 21 it is termed ἵνα ἡμᾶς εἴσελθε. (Still more clearly do Matt. xxiv. and Luke xxii. represent the appearance of the βασιλεία as an external one.) This double view, however, and representation of the manifestation of God’s kingdom (see on Matt. iii. 2), sets forth those two divisions of it which mutually complete each other. The kingdom of God is seen in its origin to be purely spiritual, as distinctively as it is in its completion to be also external. It appeared in its spiritual form, while Christ was present in his humiliation. And for this reason does the Saviour bring before the Pharisees that aspect of it, in regard to which they were wholly mistaken. In its
external manifestation shall the kingdom of God reveal itself, when Christ comes in his glory, and in this form does the Saviour particularly set it forth at Matt. xxiv. and Luke xxi. Here he brings forward the future revelation of the kingdom only in connexion with the fact, that periods of suffering must go before it, and that the appearance of the Son of God himself will bring dismay upon a world entangled in the sensual pursuits of life.

By this means would the disciples, on the one hand, be comforted amidst their approaching struggles, and aroused to watchfulness, that they might encounter them in faith; while, on the other side, the Pharisees would be impressed with the conviction that the manifestation of the kingdom did not necessarily carry with it any thing of a joyful nature to them; but, on the contrary, would bring upon them destruction (as happened to those living in the time of Noah and Lot), unless they were enabled to acknowledge and embrace the kingdom of God in its spirituality and inward revelation, as it presented itself in the appearance of the suffering Son of Man. Thus viewed, the following discourse has something so perfect and complete in itself that one cannot doubt that the Saviour uttered it as found here, and St Matthew, according to his custom, had worked up the separate portions of it into that lengthened discourse, in which he brings together the statements of Jesus as to his Parousia. Vers. 22–25 are all addressed in the first instance to the disciples. The Saviour in these words takes it for granted, that they knew that the ἡμέραι τοῦ ισοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (the manifestation of the kingdom of God taken in its ideal aspect) were already come, and merely points them to that dark hour which had yet to overtake them before the inward germ could reach its outward manifestation. Our Lord at the same time warns them against the dangers arising from the false worldly hope of the speedy appearance of the kingdom (ἰδοὺ ἰδαί, ἰδοὺ ἰκά!), inasmuch as he represents this appearance not as standing in connexion with individual persons, or classes of persons, but as an act of divine Omnipotence, the traces of which were every where to be found, and which blends all that is akin to it into one great living unity. Before, however, this revelation of divine things in their glory could be effected by the Son of Man, his humiliation must take place (analogous passages to Luke xvii. 25 are to be found at Matt. xvi. 21; xvii. 22; the idea was certainly expressed more than once by the Saviour in different forms),
and in this way the contrast between exaltation and humiliation is impressively set forth.

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

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

1 The mention of the night (ver. 34) forms no contradiction to the mention of the day (ver. 31); the expression stands merely in general for the point of time. Nor are we, with De Wette, to think of the comparison according to which the coming Messiah is styled a thief in the night. The intention rather seems to be merely to bring forward, vers. 34—36, different situations, in which various individuals find themselves similarly placed, while the state of their souls is altogether diverse, and this diversity is shown by the decisive act which severs them.
and animates them, itself imparts the higher life. This view, according to which the positive and the negative are at once transferred and attributed to the subject himself, is elsewhere rare in Scripture. The explanation of ζωγονίν by to keep alive, is to be rejected as an unworthy depreciation of a profound thought.

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

1 By the comparison with Matt. xxiv. some have been falsely led to take the πώς — ὅποια in the sense of quomodo. No distinct reference, however, to Judea and Jerusalem had gone before, and hence was the question, Where should all this take place? very appropriate in the mouth of the terrified disciples. The word ὅποια, which follows of itself, sufficiently determines the meaning.
§ 21. ON THE EFFICACY OF PRAYER.

(Luke xviii. 1—14).

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

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

Ver. 2-5. In the exposition of the parable, every thing depends upon our not softening down the force of the expression ξυρίζεις τῆς ἄδειας, for ver. 7 places God so markedly in contrast with this ξυρίζεις, that, from the fact of the widow having been heard by the latter, the conclusion is drawn that far more surely shall suffering believers be heard by God. There is implied also an intimation that the apparent ἄδεια is still only a wise form in which his love is made manifest. (The formula θεόν μὴ φοβοῦμαις, ἀνθρωπον μὴ ἤρεσικμανος, is the strongest expression for regardlessness; and yet even this may be overcome by persevering prayer, although the suppliant is satisfied only from a desire to be rid of her importunities. Ἐνεπίστευεν, in the sense of revereri, occurs again at Luke xx. 13; Matt. xxii. 37. al. freq.) Purposely there is also attributed to the ξυρίζεις, when at last he formed the resolution to do justice to the persecuted widow (ἰδικεῖσθαι means to administer, to exercise δίκη, then to avenge, to punish), an impure motive. The love of justice does not move him, but his desire for ease (διὰ τὸ παρίγχως μου καταφέρει) and the fear of her still farther troubling him. (By the words εἰς τίλος, the term ἵπποιδίζεις is marked out as indicating
the very climax of urgent entreaty on the part of the persecuted widow. The word ἰπτωτιὰκεῖται occurs again only at 1 Cor. ix. 27. It means literally to strike under the eye, then generally, to trouble greatly, to oppress. The reading ἰπτωτιὰζη or ἰπτωτιὶζη —ἰπτωτιὰκεῖται is the Doric form of ἰπτωτιζω —is supported by a good many authorities. It does not, however, yield an appropriate meaning, inasmuch as it is a softer expression, meaning to press little or gently. Probably the term ἰπτωτιὰκεῖται appeared to the transcribers too strong an expression as applied to a χρηστά, for which reason they substituted a milder word.)

Ver. 6–8. The parable is followed by a few words intended to apply it to existing circumstances. Obviously it was not the Saviour's design to explain the individual features of the parable; he speaks neither of the χρηστά nor the ἀντιδίκας. The connexion, however, shews that the χρηστά is the emblem of the persecuted Church (Isa. liv. 1), and her enemy a symbol for the Prince of this world, in whom we see concentrated every thing opposed to the βασιλεία and its development, which, under the guidance of God, must be carried forward till it reach perfection. Our Lord lays stress merely upon the declaration of the Judge, in contrast to whom are set forth the love and justice of God, in order that the very opposition may bring out more impressively the truth that is to be taught. (The question in which the idea is embodied serves also to express it more strikingly; it awakens a conviction of the truth in the mind of the hearer.) The ἵκληκτοι (see as to them on Matt. xxii. 14) are mentioned as the object of the divine care (ἵκληκτοις with reference to ver. 4.) These, down to the time when the Son of Man shall be revealed in glory (according to vii. 22, seqq.) appear exposed to the assaults of sin on the part of the kingdom of darkness, but they shall be delivered with a strong arm by the Lord at his appointed time, inasmuch as they continue in the faith, which finds its necessary expression in unceasing prayer (βοῶν ἡμῖν παῖς νυκτὸς — the πάντων, ver. 1.) In this way it is not their continued supplication which forms the condition of the ἵκληκτοι, but rather their having been elected. The elect are, according to their very nature, the persevering believers whom their Father in heaven will unfailingly deliver. The assistance from on high is, however, expressly represented with reference to verse 4, as delayed according to the counsel of God. To the expression οὐκ ἦδίησαν ἐπί χρῆσον, the term μακροθυμεῖν of ver. 7 stands
parallel. (Μακροθυμία corresponds commonly with πάθος or ἔργον in the sense of to bear with long-suffering and patience. As applied to God, the expression takes for granted the relation in which he stands to the sins of men. Here the only thing brought forward is the general idea of delay which is implied in the exercise of long-suffering. Still, however, it is a remarkable thing that such an expression should have been chosen in this connexion. For, since the ἰδικτοῖ are to be conceived of as still belonging to sinful humanity, and since the delay of their deliverance is not to be regarded as accidental, but as a thing intended, having for its object the purification of these very elect, the term μακροθυμία thus acquires an exceedingly refined meaning.) With the expression ἵνα σιγήν, however, the words ἵνα τάχει stand contrasted at ver. 8. It is best to explain the expression in such a way that the time of trial is supposed to be past. "As soon as the object of the sufferings has been gained, deliverance shall also be immediately vouchsafed." This representation, moreover, stands true as well in regard to the whole body as for each separate ἰδικτοῖς, inasmuch as the advancing development of the whole body is perfectly analogous to that of each individual member. When an individual is called away from this lower scene, that event is to him the coming of the Lord. This coming of the Lord is spoken of in the concluding verses from ver. 8, onwards, in such a way that the divine ἰδικησίς is represented as therein vouchsafed. It is difficult to see, however, how the question expressive of doubt, δόει σιγήν τῷ πιστ. ἣν ἵνα τάχει γίνη, is connected with the context. Should we translate the words, "will he find faith?"—that is, will men believe him—the idea thus expressed would be altogether foreign to the connexion of the passage. For the coming of the υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου was, at xvii. 24, described as ἀσέβεα, a comparison intended to express the impossibility of mistaking it; and besides, in the act of pronouncing the final sentence, the question is not, whether men believe him with whom they have to do to be the Judge. The use of the article (ὦν πίστιν, which only a very few MSS. omit, and that for no other reason assuredly than because they mistook the meaning of the passage) points to another explanation of the words, "will the Son of Man find the (true, requisite) faith?" This, however, would mean, Would there be any ἰδικτοῖ?—and thus it appears as if the Saviour himself represented the triumph of his whole work as a questionable thing, which is utterly incon-
ceivable. If, however, we compare ch. xvii. 26, 28, and especially Matt.xxiv. 22, it would appear that the Saviour hereby meant to set forth in the most impressive way the necessity of earnest prayer, inasmuch as the number of the elect in comparison of those who perish (as in the case of Noah's and Lot's contemporaries) would be very small, and even this small number would require special divine support to render them victorious. Thus the doubtful inquiry after πίστις connects itself closely with the admonitions given in ver. 1, διὸ πάντως προσέχεσθαι, inasmuch as the greatness of the danger rendered obvious the necessity of careful effort. The πίστις therefore required by the Saviour is not a mere assent to the truth, that Jesus is the Saviour, for at his coming all would clearly recognize him as such; but πίστις marks the leading characteristic of the mental state of all those who are found enduring at the coming of the Lord, in so far as their hearts have received the influence of the Spirit of Christ, and been transformed into his image. Where this kindred spirit does not pervade the innermost recesses of their personal thought and feeling, they can never be incorporated into the βασιλεία, in which the Spirit of Christ is the ruling element.

Ver. 9. It is more difficult to point out the connexion between the next parable and that which goes before it. At first sight certainly it seems that the description of those against whom the parable is directed (περιπλήκτης ἢρ ἰαυραὶ ἦσιν δικαίοι), agrees entirely with the Pharisees (xvii. 20); but Schleiermacher rightly reminds us (p. 221) that it contradicts the idea of a parable, to bring before the Pharisees the figure of a pharisee in a parabolic picture. He conceives, therefore, that it was some of the disciples themselves who had expressed themselves with undue forwardness, and whom the following parable was intended to reprove. If we suppose, however, that all the preceding context is connected together in the way Schleiermacher assumes, it would also seem an inappropriate thing, for the purpose of rebuking the disciples, to borrow a figure in the parable from the Pharisees who were actually present (xvii. 20.) Hence it seems to me probable that this parable was originally spoken by our Lord in another connexion, but was here inserted by St Luke with reference to the Pharisees who are pointed to at ver. 9 in a way too marked to be otherwise explained. Even though Jesus might therefore, in the original connexion in which the parable was spoken, have designed to rebuke some other per-
sons, St Luke might yet make use of it here to manifest the Saviour's feelings against the Pharisees.

Ver. 10–12. The scope of this parable once more implies (as was observed at Luke xv.) that there was to be ascribed to the Pharisee a δικαίωμα in point of fact, but certainly one of a merely external and legal kind; to the ῥελώνης, however, in point of fact, there was to be ascribed ἀδικία. For in this passage as in the former (loc. citat.), the intention was to set forth the relation of the βασιλεία (which reveals itself to him who is penitent, and conscious of his many wants) to the situation of man under the law. The endeavour to view the law and to keep it in mere externals, may lead to self-love and self-righteousness, which banishes man more completely from God than does the transgression of the law, in the event of this awakening a longing after an atonement. A shameless and reckless state of mind certainly in which the transgression of the law ends, where repentance and the felt need of an atonement are wanting, is worse than both. The representatives of these two mental tendencies, the self-loving, arrogant fulfillers of the law, and the humble transgressors of it, are viewed in the common connexion in which, while engaged in prayer, they stand towards God, and the ideas which in this relation suggest themselves to their minds, are taken as the exponents of their real mental nature. (The words προσνύχετο πρὸς Ιανύν correspond to the τῇ Ἱερουσαλήμ. In the expression σταυρὸς προσνύχετο a reference is made to the old Jewish practice to pray standing, 1 Kings viii. 22; 2 Chron. vi. 12; Mark xi. 25.) The first half of the prayer put into the mouth of the Pharisee might have been the real expression of pure piety, if, in the εὐχαριστῶ σοι, there had been implied a genuine acknowledgment that his better moral state was the work of divine grace, and hence that all the honour of it belonged to God; but then such an acknowledgment of what God had done could never have been made without some expression of humiliation for his own unfaithfulness, which is ever most clearly recognized where God works the most powerfully. It is in all cases the peculiar object of the law to work this εἰσινως τῆς ἀμαρτίας, an object which must necessarily be attained in the case of all who are purified. The impurity of the Pharisees who rested in the outer form, and never entered into the inner nature of the law's operations, draws, as a reward from the keeping of that law, a self-satisfied vanity—a result which nothing but their impurity could have effected. Even
the forms of Old Testament piety (the ἡσυχία, ἀνδικαστικός, compare on Matt. xxiii. 23), which ought to lead the soul into hidden self-knowledge, and are designed to awaken the sense of poverty and humility, the feeling that man owes his all to God—even these does this self-righteous spirit transform into the delusive works of its own fancied merit. But the more the amount of these accumulates, the deeper does man sink; the only means of elevating himself is to cast off the burden, and exercise repentance even on account of these seeming good works. (As to the meaning of σάκαρος, week, see on Matt. xxviii. 1.)

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

Ver. 14. On account of the foundation on which he thus stands, the τελώνης is styled a δικαιομένος, because along with repentance and faith there is given to him at the same time the δίκαιος, which springs from them. Nothing but a total misunderstanding of the Saviour's meaning, however, can lead us to interpret the words as implying that mere repentance is sufficient to our attaining salvation. Rather does our Lord intend, as at Luke xv., to set forth the fact that only susceptible souls like those of the publican are fitted for the reception of his own benefits; while the Pharisees, on the other hand, exclude themselves from these blessings. Hence does the Gnome (sententious saying), already explained by us at Luke xiv. 11, significantly conclude the parable, for it brings forward as well on the one hand the ruinous consequences of pride, as it does on the other the blessed results of humility. (See also on Matt. xxiii. 12, and Acts x. 35.)
B. SECOND SECTION.

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

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

In St Luke the connexion extends (as we already observed on
Luke ix. 51) down to xix. 48, where it seems probable that the
great narrative of this journey closes. From this point, however,
we follow once more the account of St Matthew, who again comes
forward as the leading narrator. That we had in St Luke,
moreover, passed over to the account of Christ's last journey to
Jerusalem is now most obvious, inasmuch as St Matthew's account
leaves no room to doubt that he is referring to that last journey,
and at the same time, from this point onwards, he agrees for the
most part with St Luke in the subject-matter of his narrative.
In this section, the only thing peculiar to St Luke is the history
of Zacchæus; and he inserts also here (xix. 11, seqq.) a parable
which St Matthew gives at a later period (xxv. 14, seqq.) As
respect, however, the course of the narrative in St Matthew, the
connexion of this section is somewhat obscure, for it is difficult
to determine whether or not in what follows the hand of the
author is again to be traced, bringing together kindred materials.
At first sight this does not seem to have been the case. The
two chapters which follow seem to contain merely a train of
separate incidents and discourses, without any connecting link
to bring them together. As St Luke also gives much of what is
here recorded, one might think that St Matthew, when it came
near the end of Christ's ministry, had kept close to the course of
the history, and had narrated the incidents successively as they
took place. But in opposition to this, there stands the fact, that
in the following chapters down to xxv., the character of St
Matthew as a compiler is again most obviously apparent, so that
we could not by any means say that he had adopted a new mode
of treatment. We cannot look upon this part of the work as an
historic addition (as we did chap. xiv.—xvii.), inasmuch as the portions of discourse which precede it are too few. In general the historical element which St Matthew has embodied in this section, appears in some respects to be so short and incidental (as at Matt. xix. 13—15; xx. 17—19) that we can scarcely conceive it to have been in this form the proper object of the narrative. But such superior prominence is given once more to the discourses of Jesus, that one is tempted to regard the history as a mere subordinate accompaniment. In support of this view, we may discover, on a closer examination of the section, one general topic, the bringing out of which may have served for St Matthew’s guidance in arranging the materials embodied in his work. The Evangelist makes use of the various points in the history, in order that he may interweave into the ever-advancing narrative those ideas which he wishes to carry out; but these historical events are not in themselves the immediate object of his statements. The general topic referred to, is obviously the assigning of those requisites demanded from Christ’s sincere disciples. There is mentioned as the first of these, deliverance from all earthly connections and ties (marriage and riches); as the second, humility, which rejoices in being able to do service to others. These requisites demanded of the Messiah’s sincere disciples are not, however, set forth in an abstract form, but rather depicted in a concrete shape, by facts to which the descriptive discourses are subjoined. According to this view, therefore, the closest connexion appears to subsist between chap. xviii. and the two which follow (comp. the remarks on Matt. xviii. 1.) In the former, namely, the character of the children of the kingdom, as we expressed ourselves, was delineated, and the forgiveness of erring brethren was above all things enjoined. In the following chapters, there is set forth rather the relation in which the disciples stand to the temptations of the world; and it is asserted, that to shake one’s self free from them, is an essential requisite for the disciple of Jesus.

§ ON MARRIAGE.

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

As regards the commencement of this section (Matt. xix. 1, 2), the Evangelist, who is followed by St Mark, mentions in it shortly
the journey of Jesus to Judea. That it is his last journey from Galilee to the Capital, which is spoken of, is shewn by comparing Matt. xx. 17, 29, with xxii. 1. As was formerly remarked, however (on Luke ix. 51), it is only from the narrative of St John that we become more closely acquainted with the details of the Saviour's last journey. All the less, therefore, owing to the great brevity of St Matthew, ought we, from the words πηγα τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, to draw any conclusion as to the direction in which that journey was prosecuted. Unquestionably, Christ on leaving Galilee might, in the first instance, take the direct road through Samaria towards Jerusalem, and yet St Matthew might refer to Perea, inasmuch as the Saviour, according to John xi. 54, again travelled northward from Jerusalem, and abode in Ephraim, from which point he may certainly have made short excursions (comp. on Luke xvii. 11.) Without therefore distinguishing between the main journey and the shorter excursions, St Matthew might combine into a single expression an allusion to his leaving Galilee, touching on Perea, and coming back to Judea. For, the whole mention of the journey is obviously enough a mere formula of transition, as is shewn by the subsequent expression, ἔχολοφθαν αὐνῷ ὧς καὶ πολλοὶ κ. η. λ., and the remark that Jesus cured many, instead of which Mark x. 1, has taught. (The expression πηγα τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, which stands loosely connected in St Matthew, is put in a more determinate form by St Mark, who conjoins the δὲ τοῦ πηγα τοῦ Ἰορδάνου with ζηκήσεως.)

Ver. 3. On the occasion of a difficult question in controversy being put with an impure view (παιδίζοντες αὐνότ) by the Pharisees to our Lord, relative to the grounds of divorce, St Matthew unfolds (in the words of Jesus) the New Testament idea of marriage, and points out the relation in which the ministers of the New Testament stood to it. This leading point in the narrative is omitted in St Mark, who has intended merely to give the naked fact, but afterwards records also the conversation, in a connexion however so transposed, as to make it obvious that the narrative appears in his gospel in a form decidedly less original than with St Matthew. For, according to St Mark, the Saviour refers the enquirers at once to Moses, who had permitted a bill of divorce to be given. The reason of this permission Jesus deduces from the sins of men, inasmuch as in the idea of marriage there is not implied any provision for the possibility of divorce. According
to this way of presenting the matter, it would appear as if the only question were, whether divorce should or should not be permitted (as is shewn also at Mark x. 2), while St Matthew takes it for granted, that, according to the opinion of the enquirers, divorce was allowable, and makes them merely ask as to the conditions under which it should be permitted. (This is pointed to by the ἀπολύσαι κατὰ τὰς ἀνίαν, Matt. xix. 3.) This enquiry, which arose most naturally from the circumstances of those times (while that of St Mark was very inappropriate to them), is most fittingly followed in St Matthew, by the declaration which stands equally in decisive opposition to both views, that there ought to be no divorce; and by an appeal to Moses, the regulation which permitted it is shewn to have been occasioned solely by sin. We have here again an instance, shewing that St Matthew, when dealing with profounder thought, surpasses in originality St Mark, whose power of perception is confined to things external. (The idea that these enquirers meant to refer to the marriage of Herod Antipas, within whose jurisdiction this incident may have occurred [although there is no indication whatever that it really did so], is, according to my view, inadmissible for this reason, that the Saviour would in that case have more speedily dismissed them. The enquiring Pharisees did not tempt our Saviour so much from malice as from the love of novelty; they wished to see what deliverance Jesus would give upon the celebrated Rabbinical point of controversy.) The form of the question as set forth by St Matthew is ἤζειν ἀνθρώπῳ (is it a regulation valid for all men; comp. ver. 5), ἀπολύσαι τήν γυναῖκα αὐτῶν κατὰ τὰς ἀνίαν, points to the exposition so much contested among the Rabbins, of the words «ΩΤΟΣ ΤΩΣ in the passage Deut. xxiv. 1, in which Moses, in cases of divorce, commands the making out of a bill of divorce. The school of Hillel explained the words as meaning, that when anything in his wife displeased a husband, it should form a sufficient reason for his giving her up. The adherents of Rabbi Schammai took the expression in a more restricted sense, as referring only to what was scandalous and dishonourable (according to this view the LXX. render it ἀσχημον σφάγμα.) In the words κατὰ τὰς ἀνίαν («ΩΤΟΣ ΤΩΣ) there is expressed therefore that exposition of the Mosaic law which agrees with the opinions of Hillel's followers, and the question consequently is so put as to request his opinion on the correctness of that view.
The lawfulness of divorce itself (according to ver. 7) is taken for granted.

Ver. 4—6. In replying to the question, Jesus takes no notice whatever of the conflicting expositions, but unfolds the original view of marriage as founded on the ideal relation of the sexes. In this there is necessarily implied the indissoluble nature of the bond, inasmuch as marriage, according to its true import, was intended to be the union of man and woman, both body and soul. Our Lord, with reference to this view, points the Pharisees to the holy originals of the Old Testament (whose divine nature he openly confirms by thus using them), and refers first of all to Gen. i. 27. (The Hebrew words are given according to the LXX.; the αὐτοῖς corresponds to the ἐκ.)—To the ἅτο ἀνθρώπου St Mark subjoins κυρίων. He has undoubtedly, according to Gen. i. 1, understood the expression καιροῦ τῆς θεοῦ, as applying to the whole act of creation, described in the first chapter, and hence he includes the creation of man, as forming an integral part of the whole work.) Undoubtedly our Lord intended by mentioning the circumstance that man and woman were created at once, to intimate that they are therefore to be regarded as forming one connected, and for this reason, indivisible unity, a truth which is expressly stated at ver. 6. This reference to the Mosaic account of man's creation, however, the Saviour follows up by a formal quotation from Gen. ii. 24, which also follows the LXX. (The καὶ στόρυ is without doubt to be referred to the subject before mentioned, ἦ πτοιχος.) For, although according to the narrative of Genesis, the words in question are spoken by Adam, yet our Lord refers them to God [as is done all through the Epistle to the Hebrews], and correctly, in as far as he is by His Spirit properly the author and creator of Scripture, and the individuals who speak are to be regarded merely as the organs of his spirit. Only on this supposition is there any force in the argument drawn from Adam's words.) According to the connexion this passage points also to the indissoluble nature of the marriage tie which the Lord wishes to bring out in opposition to the low views of it held by the Pharisees. The strength of this bond is represented as being so great and overpowering that the closest ties of another kind (as those to parents) are dissolved by it. (In Adam's words the leaving of father and mother must be understood as directly applicable to his descendants, to whom, under the feeling of that oneness of nature which connected
him with his wife, he could attribute the same emotions, being conscious that they belonged universally to the race of man. The Apostle had a still deeper meaning in view in writing the important passage, Eph. v. 31, 32.) The peculiar characteristic of the marriage tie, however, is set forth by the expression ἰδιαί σις σάξα μία, which points back to the words ἵνα ἐν τούτῳ (κ. β.), by which in the second chapter of Genesis ver. 24 stands connected with verse 23. This bodily conformability is the condition of (τα ζώα), the attractive power uniting man and woman; and we are made to see that the peculiar characteristic of marriage consists in there being between the truly married man and woman not only ἵνα συνελμα and μία συνελμα (which is found also in other kinds of high relations) but also σάξα μία. Marriage in its ideal form, as originally constituted, and as again restored by Christ, appears thus as an union of the entire nature of man in the feeling of love, out of which all union (which consists in giving and receiving) proceeds. It presupposes unity and conjunction of soul and spirit, but has the bodily union of the sexes as its characteristic peculiarity—an union which, on the one hand, is the lowest form of connexion, for it has its analogies in the animal world; but, on the other hand, when it is founded on an antecedent combination of soul and spirit, is the very summit and flower of all union and communion, and for this very reason forms the condition of the continuance of the whole human race. It is owing to the holy nature of this bodily union that it is to be considered as indissoluble, as one which man cannot, and which only God can dissever, and which the Omniscient does really dissever only in cases (according to the permission given in the Old Testament for divorce), where there did not exist between the parties an union in every respect complete, for example in a marriage where the union of soul was wanting, and consequently where the external union was a mere form. Besides this reference of the passage, however, founded primarily on the context, there is another point contained in it deserving of remark, on account of the peculiar expressions selected. For the words stand thus (in St Matthew as well as in St Mark) καὶ ἵνα ὁ ὁμοιὸς ὁ τὸς σάξας μίας. They contain therefore the most decisive declaration on the subject of monogamy, which can alone be considered as in harmony with the true idea of marriage. The permission of polygamy in the Old Testament can only be considered, like divorce, as a temporary relaxation on the part of God. This declaration,
moreover, is so much the more remarkable, as it is given by our Lord himself (though at the same time in the words of the Old Testament) and is to be found only in the translation of the Seventy (the original Hebrew text runs thus, יַעֲנוּ נַעֲרֵי נַעֲרֵי.) We have here, therefore, a new instance of this translation being made use of, even where it differs from the original (see on this at Luke iv. 18.) The view which these translators, owing to their correct perception of the Old Testament passage, introduced, is acknowledged by the Saviour as right, and confirmed by his divine authority.

Ver. 7, 8. The Pharisees understood Jesus quite correctly as meaning that he disallowed divorce in every form (see on Matt. v. 31), and in opposition, they put to him the question, how could Moses then have admitted of divorce? The special question as to the ἄρτια of divorce, they entirely depart from. On this our Lord informs them that this divine ordinance in the Old Testament was rendered necessary by the σχημασθείσα of men. (In the Old Testament, at Ezek. iii. 7, the adjective σχημασθήσεσ is occurs as equivalent to ἀρτιὰν; σχημασθείσα, σχημασθήσης denotes, in the language of the New Testament, a state of insusceptibility for spiritual harmony or discord. From the blunted state of moral feeling, therefore, the Saviour deduces the permission given for divorce, which is a benefit, inasmuch as it often prevents greater sins.) The possibility of the law’s severity being thus relaxed by a God of holiness and of truth is easily explained, when one calls to mind that sin has destroyed the ideal of the marriage relationship as a perfect union of spirit, soul, and body, so that the holiest marriage among sinful men can only be viewed as an approximation to this ideal. In so far, therefore, as every marriage connexion is merely imperfect, wisdom requires that provision be made for the possibility of its being dissolved, inasmuch as the outward union of those who are inwardly separate is only a delusion. The divine law, therefore, does not contradict itself when in the Old Testament divorce is permitted, and in the New Testament is forbidden; for, while this latter prohibition has respect to true marriage as corresponding to its ideal, the former permission refers to marriages such as are found in point of fact among sinful men, which carry with them no real union, and for this very reason demand, among other preliminary suppositions, the possibility that the tie may be dissolved.
Ver. 9. Here St Matthew concludes the conversation with the Pharisees that he may make room for subjoining the admonitions which Jesus addressed to his disciples, and which he wished them to lay to heart. Mark x. 10 relates very appropriately the circumstance that the disciples had commenced the following conversation when alone (in τὴν σίξιν), after retiring from the company of the Pharisees. In the first place, then, our Lord repeats the principle (already expressed at Matt. v. 32), that he who, after a separation, marries again, commiteth adultery, and he who induces a woman separated to enter anew into marriage, causeth her also to commit adultery. This principle stands obviously in closest connexion with what goes before. For, since marriage, according to its very nature, is indissoluble, every new connexion entered into in consequence of a separation must be considered as adultery; he who wishes to separate must at least, after the separation, remain unmarried. In Mark x. 12 the idea is somewhat modified, in so far as the woman is represented as separating herself from the man, but this does not in any way essentially alter the case. The only case our Lord excepts is that of παρενία, by which we are to understand here every kind of unlawful carnal intercourse on the part of a married person, the man as well as the woman. This forms an abolition, in point of fact, of the bodily unity of the married persons, and is therefore not so much a ground for their separation as the separation itself. Where this has taken place, therefore, a second marriage is permitted even by our Lord; but whether this permission only extends to the innocent party is not clear.—Undeniably, then, as was already remarked at Matt. v. 31, this passage forms the most important declaration by our Lord on the subject of marriage, for it does not here, as in the former instance, stand connected with commandments, the literal carrying out of which is self-evidently impossible. According to this, therefore, it is easy to see how the marriage tie is held to be indissoluble in the Catholic Church. Not the less, however, had the Reformers a perfect right to act as they did in softening down this strictness, and refusing to carry out exactly the ideal view of marriage as applicable to the visible Church, many of the members of which were still living in the hardness of heart which distinguished Old Testament times. For, Jesus has never acted the part of a mere external lawgiver; he has enacted no laws which, under all circumstances, must, according to the very letter, be applied to the external
relations of life, but he is an inward lawgiver for the Spirit. He who has not the Spirit, and does not live in Him, is not the man for whom the commandments of Christ were given; he stands under the authority of Moses. The relaxation then made by Moses must be still in force in favour of such a man. As not a single other external law, however, has been given by Christ which admits of being at once applied to politico-ecclesiastical relations as does the commandment, Thou shalt not steal; so it is not probable that the only other instance of his giving such precept should be in the case of marriage. That Jesus meant his words thus to apply to the hidden Church, and not indiscriminately to the visible Church, is shewn clearly by what follows.

Ver. 10, 11. For, the disciples expressed their astonishment at these strict principles, obviously on the supposition that in this sinful world one may easily be united in marriage with a person from whom he might wish himself separated. To this the Saviour replies ὃ πάντας Χριστός ἂν λάθον τοῖς ἄλλοις δίδηκαν. The λόγος ovis naturally is that which precedes, not that which follows; for the words would not otherwise contain any answer to the question. In that case, however, it is clear that Jesus had not intended to give utterance to any literal commandment, for that would have embraced all. For, these words have no meaning unless it be necessary to reach a particular spiritual standing-point before one can understand the way in which the command of Jesus is to be applied and acted on. (In ver. 10 αἰρεῖ, like ἄρα καὶ causa, is to be understood as meaning “relative connexion in the eye of the law.”)

Ver. 12. There is a difficulty here, however, in regard to the connexion of the ἵκι γὰρ ἑυμοίχαι κ. τ. λ. with what goes before. How does the remark as to the ἑυμοίχαι stand connected with what

---

1 Considering the keenness and importance of the discussions as to the severance of the marriage tie, and the re-marriage of those who have been separated, which are carried on even at this moment within the Evangelical Church, I take the liberty, notwithstanding what was said on Matt. v. 81, to add the following remarks. An absolute refusal to marry a second time any who have been separated would be equivalent to the Catholic view, which acknowledges only a separatio quoad torum et mensam, but not quoad vinculum. In the Evangelical Church this practice has never prevailed, and experience shows that it has not lost anything thereby in regard to the state of its morals as compared with the Catholic Church. The only point, therefore, to be aimed at, is to throw as many difficulties as possible in the way of divorces, but, in cases where they really take place, to admit of a second marriage, for otherwise there would be no real separation. The only exception which must be admitted in regard to this rule is, that in case of adultery the adulterer should not marry her with whom he has sinned, but
is previously said on the indissoluble nature of marriage? Without
doubt it is connected in this way, that Jesus means to confirm the
declaration of the apostle, "it is better not to marry." There is
a holy state in which man may continue as a eunuch (although
eunuchs are from of old the most despised of men. See Isaiah lvi.
3), but it is not for every individual to attempt it. It is only when
man for the sake of God refrains from marriage that a blessing
rests on it—he gives up the prospect of earthly posterity that he
may have spiritual children. In this case also, therefore, our Lord
gives no positive law. Without laying upon any one a burdensome
yoke, he merely says σίδιν εὐνούχων, leaving it for every individual
to decide freely as he thinks right, and concludes his discourse
with the declaration ὁ δυνάμενος χαμην χωρίων, which, taken in
connexion with the preceding ὁ διὸτε, must be understood as re-
ferring to a special work of grace in this instance, namely of a

certainly some other. If, in opposition to this, it be alleged that the Church can in no
way give her blessing to a marriage which our Lord, in the passage before us, has de-
scribed as adulterous, it must not be overlooked that the marriage of those who have
been separated is not by any means said to be in itself adulterous, from this it would
follow that God, in the Old Testament, had given liberty to commit adultery, but only
that it appears as adultery when seen from the purer standing-point of the spirit of
Christianity. Those whose marriage tie has been severed stand exactly on the same
footing with the murderer. Seen from the standing-point of the spirit of Christianity,
he is a murderer who hates his brother, but it is self-evident that, in an ecclesiastic-
opolitical point of view, hatred cannot be dealt with in precisely the same way as murder.
And yet it is in this light that the marriage of those who have been separated (which
must ever remain an ecclesiastical-political institution) is regarded when in the visible
Church every such union is declared to be adulterous. The most that one can say,
therefore, is this. Since the Church has it in charge to render the pure spirit of the
Gospel more and more predominant in the hearts of all her members, and, consequently,
to impart gradually to them all the true idea of marriage, so it is her bounden duty to
deal with the marriage of those who have been separated in a different way from the
case of others who never were separated. The former must be conducted in private,
and consummated according to a formula uttered so as to show that the blessing of the
Church is bestowed on this kind of union only in the shape of a wish that God by his
Spirit would turn their hearts, and lead them now at least to true views of the nature
of marriage. As the law of God blessed the adulterous marriage of David and Bath-
sheba, so far as to continue through it the line of the Messiah's descent, so the compas-
sionate One can sanctify unions similar, and in themselves doubtful, without giving
man authority to prevent them entirely by his prohibitions. It were to be desired,
besides, that in practice men should wait for a change in the laws of the Church, and
that every separate individual should not take the liberty to innovate on the existing
order of things. Should this kind of freedom be generally acted on, it would lead to a
state of things similar to that which exists in North America, and marriage would
consequently be degraded into a mere civil act. This could not be considered as any-
thing else than a retrograde step of a dangerous kind.
χάρισμα τῆς εὐχαριστίας, which every one has not given to him. For this very reason, however, there cannot be here any law spoken of for all or for any, such as the clergy, for instance, but the whole idea of the passage is rather to be explained according to 1 Cor. vii., to which chapter we would refer as a commentary on this declaration of our Lord.

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


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

Ver. 16. During the journey (Mark x. 17, ἵκτοροι ἀνθρώποι ἰνὲς ὑπονήμωνοι αὐτοῦ) there pressed forward an ἄξιος (Luke xviii. 18, probably a young man of some noble family [Matt. xix. 22] who had been chosen president of the synagogue at some place not more particularly described) into the presence of Jesus, and asked him for spiritual instruction and assistance. That the zeal of this young man was pure, and the reverence he shewed for Jesus (γυναικεῖας ἀντίκεν according to St Mark) was well meant, is clearly seen both from the way in which Jesus treats him, and from the Saviour's own express declaration. (Comp. Mark x. 21). But the erroneous nature of his religious efforts is sufficiently shewn at once by the very question which he puts. Noble in disposition, and filled with ardour
in the pursuit of what is good, he seems to have struggled after holiness and perfection in a legal manner; but being destitute of all deeper insight into the nature of sin or of righteousness, these exertions only filled him with self-satisfaction, and he hoped, through the assistance of Christ, that he would attain in this to still higher advancement; that he would have new work given him to do in order that he might heap up for himself the greater amount of spiritual possessions. The object of his efforts, described in general terms, he represents as being the ἡ ἄιων οὐτος, and he seemed to give it the pre-eminence over the life and the blessings of the ἄιων οὐτος; in reality, however, he was still cleaving to the good things of this world. The address διδάσκαλε ἀγαθε, as well as the enquiry τί ποιήσω, are not in themselves of a captious kind, and may have proceeded (like the question Acts ii. 37) from a truly penitential frame of mind. But the decisive remark which St Matthew has preserved to us τί ἀγαθὸν ποιήσω betrays the inward perversion of his nature. Being utterly unable to discern the true nature of what is really good, he takes it for granted that he possessed in himself the possibility and the capacity of bringing forth something that was ἀγαθὸν out of the treasure of his own heart, and he merely enquires as to the τί. Besides the good things heretofore performed and amassed by him, he wishes to add new forms of splendid good works. Probably he expected and hoped to have some kind of strict legal observances laid upon him, which it would have flattered his pride to have performed in his own strength.

Ver. 17. With astonishing wisdom does our Lord treat this young man. First he awakens in him a conscious perception of the true nature of what is really good. The address of Jesus to the enquirer is given by the gospel history in a twofold Recension, but it admits of no doubt that in St Matthew the reading τί με ἰγωνίζεις περί τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ; εἰς ἵστιν ὁ ἀγαθὸς is the right one. For, in the first place, it is supported by very weighty authorities (B.D.L. many versions and Fathers); next it is the more difficult, and the reading τί με λέγεις ἀγαθὸν might easily be taken from St Mark and St Luke. It is more difficult to determine which of the two may have been the original Recension. I consider the form of the question as given by St Matthew to be the original one, for according to it Christ subjoins his remark in the closest connexion with the τί ἀγαθὸν ποιήσω. But the τί με λέγεις ἀγαθὸν
contains an idea so peculiar, that assuredly it cannot have proceeded from tradition. To me, therefore, it appears most probable that of this conversation on the subject of the ἀγαπῶ we have, in the two Recensions, only fragments preserved to us, but these sufficiently enable us to form a well-grounded opinion as to the contents of that conversation. For, as regards the leading object of the discourse, according to the version of it in St. Matthew, it is evident that our Lord, by the remark τι ἐγινετετη x. v. λ., means to awaken in the young man a conviction, that there sprang in his heart no fountain of good out of which he could produce, at will, whatever he chose; that in general the ἀγαπῶ was not diverse, nor manifold, but was, in the highest sense, One, namely, God himself, the αὐτοκαθαρᾶ. This idea, rightly understood, carried with it an intimation that there was nothing good in him (unless perhaps his higher vocation), and consequently an exhortation to repentance, and still farther, the information, that what is good is not to be found by heaping up work upon work, but by coming to God, who, as being the Good, imparts also to men all that is good when he gives them himself. According to the version of this, as given by St. Mark and St. Luke, we find the same reference to God as the source of all good, in the very words also of the Saviour himself, but we find in addition an important hint as to the position in which this young man stood to Christ. The address διδάσκαλη ἀγαπὴ is referred to in the question τι με λέγεις ἀγαπῶς. The young man may have used the ἀγαπὴ as a mere phrase in order to introduce into his discourse a complimentary epithet. The unconsciousness thus manifested Jesus reproves in these words, in order that he may lead him to an idea of that which is truly good. For, that the enquirer only saw in Christ a mere (though indeed a distinguished) διδάσκαλος, from whom he might acquire information of one kind or other, the Saviour perceived beyond a doubt, both from his question, and from the character of the man; but one having such views could not appropriately use the epithet ἀγαπῆς. He rejects this name, therefore, and refers him to Him who was Goodness itself. But in this our Lord does not deny that he himself is the ἀγαπῆς, inasmuch as the one true God stands reflected in him as his image, only it was not fitting that this truth should be presented to the young man in a dogmatic form, but should develop itself as a living reality from his own inward experience. Could
he have been prevailed upon to exercise faith in the words of Jesus, as a revelation of the highest good, and could he have felt it his duty to abandon all in order to follow him (ver. 21), it would in that case have been made clear to him that this one God was not a being distant and inaccessible, before whom he had to adorn himself with good works, but was inexpressibly near to him, insomuch as He had revealed Himself to him by His Son, and in him by His Spirit.

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

Ver. 18-20. The young man, however, in his moral blindness, believes that he has kept the commandments. Boldly and boastfully does he confess πάντα ταῦτα ἑρμαξάμεν, and he even adds ἵνα ἴσαντός μου. We must suppose that there was at all events about him a certain external δικαιοσύνη, there was manifestly a moral effort made by him. But, in the first place, he was entirely devoid of an insight into the hidden spiritual nature of the commandments (as that is developed in Matt. v.); and, in the next place, he had no perception of the true Old Testament δικαιοσύνη (as that is described at Luke i. 6.) For, this δικαιοσύνη had, as the companion of earnest legal striving, a deep longing after holiness and perfection, which concentrated itself in the expectation of the Messiah, while in this young man there was exhibited a forward self-satisfaction which led him to ask τι ἵνα ἴσαντός; Matt. xix. 20.
(The Evangelists use great liberty in enumerating the commandments. St Matthew gives them most fully; he has subjoined also the passage Lev. xix. 18. Mark x. 19 has comprehended the latter precepts of the Decalogue under the words μὴ ἀποστείχῃς. The term ἀποστείχῃ is used there in the sense of to rob, to appropriate what is another's, just as at 1 Cor. vi. 8, where it is joined with ἀδική.)

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

1 It were well to read in connexion with this the golden treatise of the able and ingenious Clement of Alexandria, Quis dives salvetur, which contains the most profound commentary on this narrative. On the words πάθοι τα ὑπέρπεθα εἰς, he remarks, τι δι' εἰρήνης; ὦς δ' ἄρεσίν μου διέχειται τοις, τα ὑπάρχουσαν εἰδίκειν ἀποκαφεῖαι συμπαθέσαι καὶ ἀποτελεῖται ἀπό τιν τερματών ἄλλα τὰ ἀγαθατά πιστίς τερματών ἕξερεν τος γράμματος, τα περὶ αὐτά πεινῶν καὶ ἱστον, τας μείζονας τας ἀκάθαρτα νῦν βιον, ἅ τι σπέρμα τος ζωῆς συμπαθέως. ὁμιλλαμένα μὲγα καὶ ζωαλτίς το ὑπάλληλος ἀπωθεῖ.
which entered into the New Testament life, and which the Saviour here opens to him, but for that life in the βασιλεία there must in all cases be the giving up of all one's own (comp. ver. 24, seqq.) The circumstance that the invitation to enter into the kingdom of God was given to this young man under the form of the injunction τάλιζον σου τα ἰνάγχονα arose undoubtedly from this, that this individual was tied to the κόσμος, principally through mammon, and therefore at his entrance into the βασιλεία this bond must be severed. If we call to mind the leading temptation of this young man involved in another part of his character, he might possibly have been able to fulfil a commandment of this kind, to sell his goods without gaining anything by the act, for the advancement of his inner life; nay, he might have been injured by it, for his pride might have found support from it as from a work performed in his own strength. But, on the other hand, if the young man could have rendered obedience to this commandment of our Lord, he could only have been enabled to do so by the strength of God through faith, for it was the main bond which kept him fettered. Irrespective then of the particular form which this commandment assumes, it contains nothing beyond what is comprised in the general law given by Jesus to all his disciples, "he who does not give up all for my sake, is not worthy of me;" and although each is held in bondage by his own separate tie, yet is it incumbent on every one to sacrifice all things. In this command of our Lord, therefore, requiring the young man to sell his property, we are not to conceive of the external possession as standing apart from the inward love of it. The latter would be effectually mortified by the relinquishing of the former, and only in thus far is any importance to be attached to the external sacrifice. Again, the selling of his possessions is to be viewed as merely the one side of an act, which is only rendered complete by the following of Jesus consequent thereon. The former is the negative (the deliverance from the κόσμος); the latter is the positive (union with the βασιλεία and its Lord.) St Mark also (x. 21) immediately adds, ἐξας τὸν σταύρον, as denoting continued perseverance in the following of Christ, and the difficulties which are connected with it. In the same way also the self-denial is not to be conceived of

χρησάτως μὴ ἐνι λόγῳ ζωῆς. Μὴν μὲν γὰρ ἐν ἑαυτῷ οἱ καθήμενοι, παρακλήσεις Ἡ Θεία καὶ δινώσχεις Θεῷ, καὶ ἀπὸ τινα τις ἀνεψιμενον μακραόρθαν καὶ Στεφανίστε (cap. xi.)
as a work standing by itself, but as deriving all its importance from this, that it is done for the sake of Jesus (ver. 29.) It is when viewed in this light also that the ἢ σοι ὑπερεξῆ, in the words of our Lord, first acquires its full meaning; for this ἢ is nothing less than the crucifying of the whole old man (which in the case of this youth existed in the form of attachment to riches), and so is equivalent to πάντα, inasmuch as in the one thing all things are included. The entrance into this one thing is also the way to πάντα (Matt. xix. 21), for this reason, that it can be effected only in the strength of God, and man can become perfect and good only in this way, that the one perfect and good God make his heart his temple. (Comp. on Matt. v. 48.) The truth of Christ's words, that the new birth into eternal life consists in the giving up of all that is our own, and in the consecration of our whole property and possessions to him who is their Author, must have deeply impressed the young man. For, as Jesus outwardly had not to lay any commands upon him, and as in the Old Testament law, no requirement of such a kind was anywhere to be found, it would appear as though he might with a good conscience have refused it. But that he could not do. The spirit who accompanied the words of Jesus had deeply penetrated his heart, had enlightened the darkness within, had revealed to him the true (though hitherto entirely unknown) way of regeneration, and so he found himself taken prisoner by the power of the truth. But the chain which he carried was too heavy, he could not call forth within his heart that free determinate choice in favour of the narrow way, which is absolutely necessary, and the scarcely opened gate of Paradise closed itself again before his weeping eyes.

Ver. 23, 24. Over the subsequent course of this young man's life, there is cast a veil. It is not impossible, however, that his feeling of pain may have changed subsequently into pure μετάνοια, and that upon this ground he may afterwards have found deliverance from those bonds in which he lay as yet too firmly fettered. Our Lord, in the meantime, at once employs this impressive incident for the edification of his disciples, but not in such a way as

---

1 If it had been merely the gold as such which had kept him from entering the kingdom of God, the idea would be correct, that God might have set him free from it by a conflagration or something of that nature. But the only thing that would avail was his inward deliverance in soul from earthly possessions, and the God who made man's nature free, wishes also to have its free choice in favour of what is good.
to make the weakness of the young man a subject for scorn or rebuke, but in order that he might lay bare the similar state of feeling which existed in the hearts of many, and so might lead them to humble themselves. With warning looks surveying the circle of his followers (περιεψάμενος, Mark x. 23), Jesus exclaims, δυσκόλως πλούσιος εἰσιν οἱ τῶν βασιλείας τῶν ὀφειλόντων. And when the disciples were astonished, the Saviour once more repeats the same words with the strongest emphasis (according to Mark x. 24.) Obviously the expression, πλούσιος (according to St Mark and St Luke, χρήματα ἐξω), points back to the κτήμαta πολλά of the young man (ver. 22), but the additional clause of St Mark, which more accurately defines it, προκειμένοις εἰς τοὺς χρήματα, points at once to the right interpretation. Clearly the difficulty of entering the kingdom of God cannot depend upon the χρήμαta or the ἱδρύων as such, for, absolute poverty admits of being viewed as a state that brings along with it manifold temptations. (See Matt, xiii. 22.) If understood merely of external possessions, the similitude here chosen would evidently be too strong, for it denotes not so much the difficulty as the impossibility of the rich man, unless he previously becomes, in a spiritual sense, poor, entering into the kingdom of God. It is the state of mind, therefore, in which possessions are held, which the Saviour represents as being such an hindrance. This is not to be viewed, however, as confined merely to what is properly avarice, but as including also the so-called legitimate appropriation of the good things of this world (comp. on Luke xvi. 1, seqq.) which is prevalent and permitted in the κόσμος, and regarded as the greatest good fortune. In the βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ, every individual is merely an αἰχμέος of God, has therefore renounced all his own possessions, and consecrated them to God the only Lord. Hence the Saviour requires this inward renunciation as a condition of the ιδρύων εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ. For this reason, however, at the same time, the idea of the πλούσιος acquires a more extensive meaning; the beggar may be rich in desire and concupiscence, and the possessor of treasures may be poor (thus David generally in the Psalms is called poor, as being πτωχὸς πνεύματι, set free from all the ties of possession

1 At the same time, however, it should not be denied that a fulness of earthly blessings carries with it pre-eminently the temptation to attach one's self to the world. In all cases, however, the fetter which peculiarly binds a man, must be sought for within him, and not in things external.
and property, compare Rev. xxii. 24.) He who is without gold or goods may be rich in so-called good works, in knowledge, or art, or natural dispositions, if he appropriate such gifts to himself, and do not ascribe them to their Author. Riches, however, whatever form they take, invariably act in the same way, inasmuch as they attach man to the ξύλος, in which things created assume to be separate and independent; while in the kingdom of God this independence is cancelled, and all things ascribed to God. Where the former is maintained, therefore, this union of life with God cannot be realized. (Δύσκολος means, primarily, difficult to satisfy, then in general difficult. It is the opposite of εὐκοσίος, without trouble, easy. The figure of κάμηλος, which is not to be confounded with καμήλος, a rope, a ship's cable, is a common one in the East. Instead of the camel the elephant is also sometimes mentioned [compare Lightfoot and Schottgen on the passage.]

Instead of τυφαμα ας Mark and St Luke have τυφάλια from τύφη, a hole, an opening.)

Ver. 25, 26. It is evident that the disciples understood the discourse of our Lord in this more extended application. Their astonishment and the idea τίς ἐγα δύναται σωθῆναι, shew plainly that they regard every man in his natural state as a σιλοῦσιος, because of his inward attachment to earthly things. Were we to refer the question merely to those who are outwardly rich, it would obviously lose all its force. Ver. 27 also shews that the disciples (although in a literal sense they were no σιλοῦσιοι) had recognized the giving up of all their property as a duty necessarily binding on them, from which circumstance we may see that they understood the idea in a spiritual sense. Accordingly, the question τίς ἐγα δύναται σωθῆναι expresses a deep feeling of man's strong attachment to the creature, from which, of himself and by himself, he cannot set himself free (in the same way as at Rom. vii. 24), and for this very reason requires a σωθῆς. The exercise of this saving power on the part of God is referred to at ver. 26. Here our Lord acknowledges the ἄδικανον on the part of man (because the ἄδικανα τής σαφῆς makes it impossible for him to fulfil the commandment to love God above all, Rom. viii. 3), but refers to the aid of the Almighty. This is to be considered, however, not as a thing manifesting itself without a man, but as that which operates within him, for which reason the πάντα δύναται πιστιεῖν (comp. Mark ix. 23.)
Ver. 27. The new question of St Peter appears at first sight not to agree with what precedes it. It must seem strange that after the disciples had just asked \( \text{τις ἀγα διναται σωθηναι} \), they should now consider the difficulty to have been perfectly overcome in their own case. One would be tempted to conclude that St Matthew had inserted here what was spoken at another time, were it not that St Mark and St Luke agree with him, and warrant our believing that we have here the original connexion. This connexion also admits of being perfectly defended, if we view the remark of St Peter here (who again speaks as the representative of all the Apostles) as the expression of the uncertainty of his mind as to whether they had in reality satisfied these difficult demands of the \( βασιλεία \). Feeling that much yet remained within him of attachment to the creature, St Peter mentions one act of his life which bore a resemblance to that which Christ had required of the young man. But as to whether that act was enough, he, in the exercise of genuine \( υπάρχειν, \) remained uncertain. The words \( \text{τι ημι ισον,} \) therefore, are not to be understood as referring to a reward, for St Peter must otherwise be held to have been in a state of mind in which ver. 25 would be altogether inapplicable to him, and the answer of Jesus also, ver. 28-30, would be transformed into a reproof. Rather must we refer the words to the disciples' state of mind in such a way that their meaning shall be, "What shall fall to our lot, what shall befall or happen to us; wilt thou judge of us as of the young man, or does such a decisive act still remain to be done by us?" This stands most appropriately connected with what follows, inasmuch as Jesus, on the strong ground of comfort which he gives, removes that uncertainty of the disciples which proceeded from their tender faithfulness, and assures them of this that they are his.

Ver. 28. St Matthew gives in the most complete form those ideas through means of which Jesus imparts this comfort to his disciples, and in such a way that they closely correspond with the context. For, the Saviour speaks first of the special prerogatives bestowed upon the disciples as the representatives of the kingdom of God in this new order of things, and then (ver. 29) he goes on to mention all those who, for the sake of the kingdom, have given up every thing upon earth. St Matthew alone has the first verse, in which the special prerogatives of the disciples are spoken of. One might believe that St Luke had omitted the words because he
considered them less intelligible for his heathen readers, as referring to views which were peculiarly Jewish, if he had not also given them at xxii. 28, seqq. in another connexion, but in such a way that we cannot conceive of the words having been transferred from St Luke into St Matthew. The idea has its own peculiar place in both Evangelists. As regards the idea itself, expressed in ver. 28, it is in the first place remarkable that the Saviour, without having any occasion to do so, should have, of his own free inward movement, unfolded it to the disciples, and in this way should obviously have favoured their earthly prejudices concerning the Messiah, in opposition to his own views, if he meant to declare that there was no reality in their expectations. This is the more strange, inasmuch as the connexion here does not make this declaration at all necessary, for any kind of laudatory acknowledgment of the disciples' faithful strivings would have been enough for them. Even the theory of accommodation, therefore, is here reduced to difficulties, and it is obvious that those act more simply who attribute the idea here expressed to Jesus himself, and recognise him as participating in it.¹ This opinion we must feel all the more inclined to adopt, inasmuch as in this passage there is expressed nothing more than is to be found everywhere stated in the gospels and apostolic writings. The ἁλυγμνσια denotes merely the coming forth of the βασιλεια from its concealment in the inner world of the Spirit, into the outer world, or the spiritualizing of the outer world from within (comp. the remarks on this at Matt. viii. 11; Luke xvii. 20.) The selection of the expression ἁλυγμνσια to denote this arises from the magnificent idea of drawing a parallel between the whole and the individual. In the passage Titus iii. 5, baptism (λουπτεν ἁλυγμνσιας) appears as the means which brings about the new birth of the individual. That which takes place morally in the individual is transferred to the whole body, which having been altered by sin, requires and looks forward to a restoration not less than does the separate individual. This restoration naturally has its beginning in the domain of awakened souls, but as, in the progressive advancement of the individual, it goes forward from the πνευμα to the final glorifying of the κοσμα (comp. Rom. viii. 11), so also the perfecting power of the Spirit gradually pervades the outward visible world taken as a whole. Without distinguishing the separa-

¹ The recent attempts to explain the passage as ironical, shew how difficult it is if the simple meaning of the words be given up. Comp. Fleck de regno divino, pag. 436, seqq.
rate steps, the term παλιγγενσία comprehends the whole in one general expression. Thus, as the Saviour's resurrection is primarily a type prefiguring the final glorifying of the bodily organisation of man, so is the ἀνάστασις τῆς σαρκὸς generally a type of the material world in its glory, which is accurately described by St Paul (Rom. viii. 18, seq.), in a discourse properly didactic, but is in the new Testament taken for granted in the discourses of Jesus, and is at last, in Revelation, described as present. Man, therefore, as a Microcosm, appears as an emblem prefiguring every stage of development in the Macrocosm, and, just as it is only in the glorifying of the body that the development of an individual's whole life has its consummation, even so the glorifying agency of the Spirit reaches its climax only in the pervading of the material world. This rich idea the Saviour sets before his disciples, and, with reference to their sacrificing of the αἱ ὠν ὄντος, points them forward to the μέλλων into which they had already, in a spiritual sense, entered, by the giving up of their possessions, into which, however, they would one day visibly enter on its final manifestation. In this state of things, the Saviour appears as the βασιλεὺς, inasmuch as the βασιλεία therein realized is the whole sphere of life pervaded and ruled over by the Spirit and influence of Jesus, (Καθ' ἐν τῇ Σεβοῦ is to be viewed as a symbolic expression for dominion. In the words Σεβοῦ δέξῃ, we may trace—inasmuch as the thing spoken of is the manifestation of what is concealed [comp. Rom. viii. 18]—that outward display of light and glory [analogous to the Hebrew יְהִי] which encompasses every appearance of what is divine. In the αἱ ὠν ὄντος, the δέξα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου is in its nature entirely inward and spiritual.)

Now, the fact that in this ruling power of our Lord (i. e. a decisive spiritual power which authoritatively imposes terms—see in regard to it on Matt. xx. 20), believers are set forth as partaking, is merely the general idea of the Christian system, according to which nothing which exists in the Saviour lies shut up exclusively in him, but just as the love of God appears as a thing which fully communicates itself through him to others, so does the Redeemer impart himself with the whole fulness of his gifts to his church as his own body. Hence, as his people share his sufferings, they partake also of his δέξα. (Rom. viii. 17, συμπάσχομεν ἵνα καὶ συνδεσθῶμεν; comp. also 2 Tim. ii. 20.) Naturally, therefore, this applies at once to his disciples generally, but it has also a more
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special reference to them as apostles in particular. As the representatives of the twelve tribes (comp. Matt. x. 2), they received most directly and purely into their souls that overflowing spiritual element which Jesus brought down to the earth into the midst of mankind (and primarily into the midst of the people of Israel), in such a manner that they themselves became in turn flowing fountains of eternal life (John iv. 14), with which they rendered a world fruitful. Hence they most completely partook of the character of Jesus, as King, and that is the sense of the symbolical expression, that they were to sit on twelve thrones (as subordinate rulers) surrounding the throne of the Lord. (Comp. on Rev. iv. 4; xxi. 14.) Finally, there is also ascribed to the apostles, as the representatives of the church generally, the exercise of χηρισμός (a special manifestation of the general expression dominion.) This also is at 1 Cor. vi. 2 ascribed to the whole church as such, inasmuch as through the Spirit of the Lord which pervades it, there is given to it at the same time the power of discernment in its own real nature, and so of separating and sifting. As the church already uses this gift of the Spirit in the office of the keys (comp. on Matt. xvi. 19), so, upon being itself made perfect at its final manifestation, does it exercise this gift in a perfect sense in the same office. Thus we must say, that at the foundation of the whole of this peculiar train of thought, there lie Jewish ideas as to the course of the world's development, and the place which the twelve tribes hold in regard to mankind. Views, however, which at the same time perfectly correspond to the decree of eternal wisdom, and are supported by the mode in which these things are viewed and set forth every where in Scripture. Only we must be careful that the gross and material light in which these ideas were viewed by high and low among the Jewish people, is not confounded with the ideas themselves—ideas which obviously

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

Ver. 29. From the special, the Saviour passes over to the general, and states that not merely they (the apostles), but every one who renounces the world, will receive his μυσθίς (Matt. v. 12.) As to the idea of Christian self denial, and of self-denial for the sake of Jesus (in which way alone it becomes Christian), see more particularly on Matt. x. 37, seqq. (Instead of ἵνα καὶ τυχεῖν μοι, Matt. has ἵματι. ᾠνομαὶ = ἤτοι, is put for the person himself in his proper individuality. St Luke has ἵνα καὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ, as St Mark has also added ἤπειρον τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, which in so far is identical with ἵματι, as in the person of the Saviour, the gospel and the kingdom are represented in a living form, and as it is only by the power which proceeds from his person that the kingdom is founded apart from or without him.) The idea of recompense shortly alluded to by St Matthew, St Mark gives, in a very enlarged form—an uncommon circumstance with him; for even when he gives the substance of Christ's discourses, he usually abridges them. St Luke has already embodied in the discourse the contrast between καὶ τοῦ ὁτός and αἰῶν ἐξών μον ος; St Mark, however, enumerates minutely all the individual details of the recompense. One might say that this enumeration is a commentary on 1 Tim. iv. 8. Even in this present life on earth true piety bears within itself its own reward. Especially the giving up of all one's own possessions to the general community is simply for each individual to acquire the whole. (So that in this sense also it is true "all things are yours," 1 Cor. iii. 21, 22.) In the church of God, as in a kingdom which is in the course of gradual development, the believer, through true heart-fellowship and brotherly communion, receives back what he lost through the sin which is in that κόσμος from which he judicially separated himself (1 Cor. i. 31)—receives it indeed in a higher measure (ἡκοστικολοκάλισθη, St Luke has τολλακόλισθη.) (Comp. as to αἰῶν οὐτός and ἐξών μον on Matt. xii. 31.) The addition μιστά διωγμῶν by St Mark is peculiar to him alone. (The reading διωγμῶν is assuredly an alteration made in order to remove the difficulty.) Certainly, therefore, the simplest view which it remains for us to take of these words, is to regard them as added to the discourse, in order to represent the joys of the αἰῶν οὐτός even in this form of brotherly Christian love, as in many ways
troubled and disturbed, and in this way to set forth the everlasting life as the untroubled and peaceful state of being. For, the church in which the individual believer already receives back even outwardly what he gave up, is never on earth free from persecution, until the αἰών μέλλων comes, and with it the βασιλεία. Thus the whole statement, being transferred and applied to the present state of things as existing in the world, has no reference whatever to the hopes set before us in the Apocalypse.

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

Matt. xix. 30, and
Mark x. 31.

συναλλάξεις εἰσοχατοι πεζοτι
καὶ εἰσοχατοι πεζοτι.

Matt. xx. 16.

ησυχατοι οι εἰσοχατοι πεζοτι, καὶ οι
πεζοτι εἰσοχατοι.

The first form (Matt. xix. 30) is also analogous to the expression at Luke xiii. 30, συναλλάξεις εἰσοχατοι, οι εἰσοχατοι πεζοτι καὶ εἰσι πεζοτι, οι εἰσοχατοι εἰσοχατοι. For the distinction of the thought in the two cases is this: according to the first form of the apothegm there are some in both the classes (the πεζοτι and the εἰσοχατοι) who are represented as passing from the one to the other. According to the second form, however, all (the article οι εἰσοχατοι, οι πεζοτι, is not to be overlooked) are set forth as belonging to the class opposite their own. On closer examination, however, this difference of form in the apothegm is found to be only in appearance, inasmuch as at Matt. xx. 16, the article does not refer to the πεζοτι and εἰσοχατοι as such, but to the συναλλαξι, who are described (xix. 30) as existing among them. And in this very thing the connexion of the passage is sufficiently indicated, for Matt. xx. 20, seqq. sufficiently shews in what way the passage, Matt. xix. 28, might be misunderstood by the disciples, inasmuch as the old
man in them belonging to the ἔδωκες was by no means entirely destroyed, and they therefore interpreted the privileges and prerogatives after a carnal manner. For this reason the Saviour brings forward the circumstance, that along with them (the τετωροί), others called at a later period (ἰσχαροί) would receive an equal reward, and by this reference warns them against feelings of envy and self-seeking. We are not to think of Judas or other apostates (standing at a distance), since the following parable does not represent the first labourers as unfaithful, for which reason they received their full reward.

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

God is here to be considered as the ἀναλογίαν, inasmuch as at verse 8 the ἐπιγραφος, by whom the dividing of the μοναδικ is

---


2 Compare the commentary on Matt. xi. 19.
effected, symbolises Christ. The ἄμυλῶν = ἡγεμόνες however, is viewed (as at Isa. v. 1) as the emblem of that spiritual kingdom which the Lord of heaven founds on earth, and causes to be cultivated by his servants.1 The ἐγκάμαι, therefore, are the pastors and bishops of the church of God, all those to whom a spiritual office is intrusted, and the souls of men are the ἄμυλῶν on which their labours are to be expended. It is certain, however, that this reference to the pastors is not to be understood as confined to the outward office-bearers of the church, but as applying to the inward call to spiritual labours; and in so far as this call is not to be understood as awanting in the case of any living member of the church, the parable has, at the same time, its general application to all believers, only, the μεθόπης is not to be understood as denoting salvation (for nothing is said here of the difference between being saved and lost), but as referring to a special reward of grace, consisting in the difference of place assigned to different individuals in the kingdom of God in allusion to xix. 28; xx. 20.

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

1 The frequent comparison of the kingdom of God to a vineyard (Matt. xxi. 33, seqq.) is assuredly founded deeply on the fact that the Saviour, according to his profound views of nature, traced in wine and in the vine the fittest analogies in the whole external world to express the highest relations of the spiritual world. (Comp. on John xv. 1, seqq.)
not as the gift of grace, but as something which they deserved. The
συμφωνία applies also strikingly to those covenants into which God
entered with his people, in which (according to the Divine conde-
sension) there is an implied reference to mutual engagements and
promises. The heathen, on the contrary, were called, without any
covenant, into the kingdom of God. Not so much from any need
of them, as out of pity for them in their state of idleness, the faith-
ful master of the house from time to time (at marked periods of
great advancement in the kingdom of God) called new labourers
into his vineyard, and they confided with simple trust in the faith-
fulness of the Lord. Thus, though apparently at a disadvantage,
their childlike faith in such a Lord placed them really at an advan-
tage. In regard to the apostles this is most markedly exhibited
in the calling of St Paul. The Lord took him from his course of
busy idleness, and called him into the vineyard where the Twelve
were already at work, and so he laboured more than they all
(1 Cor. xv. 10.) The parable lays especial stress (comp. ver. 6, 7,
with 12) on those who were called at the eleventh hour. Primarily
the intention of this may have been merely to give point to the
contrast between the μια ἡμέρα and the whole day. Especial interest
attaches to this point of time, as well in regard to the individual
Christian, in which case it refers to late conversion, as also to the
whole church, in which case it applies to those who are called in
the latter days.

Ver. 8–12. This portion of the parable contains the greatest
difficulties. In the first place, a question arises as to the view
which we are to take of the ἐπιστροφή γνώμης. As the closing period
of the day (viewed as the season of labour), the evening brings the
final sentence. Thus in the case of the individual, the evening is
to be understood as denoting death, in the case of the church, as
the καιρὸς ἰσχατός, or the entering into the βασιλεία. These things,
which to us seem so wide apart, were regarded by the apostles as
happening simultaneously, inasmuch as they viewed the coming of
Christ as an event about to take place immediately, and our Lord
himself did not speak of it in any other way (comp. on Matt xxiv.)
In the second place, the circumstance that a denarius was distrib-
buted alike to all, must not be so explained as to imply a denial
that there are degrees of future glory, for other parables, and
especially that of the talents, at Matt. xxv. 14, seqq. expressly
teach this doctrine. Rather does the equal denarius simply denote
the equality of all, in so far as they are partakers of the same blessedness, which completely satisfies the desires of every individual, although the capacities of these separate individuals may be very different. In the last place, however, the most obscure point of all seems to be the possibility of a γεγυγμένον among the πέντετοι. Should a comparison be made between this and Luke xv. 25, seqq., we must remark that in that case the elder son is represented as occupying exclusively the standing-point of the law; but here the πέντετοι appear as labourers (and faithful labourers, for they receive their denarius) in the kingdom of God. Besides, as the distribution of the μαθιαῖα takes place in the evening (that is, after their training in holiness was complete), it is impossible to conceive that there still existed in these first-called a mixture of the old and the new. We must therefore say that this parabolic representation does not mean to assume that there is anything analogous to this γεγυγμένον in the real spiritual relationships which it sets forth, but is intended to give instruction by contrast, so that the sense of the whole would be this: inasmuch as such murmuring, as the parable shews, on the part of the envious labourer against his comrades, is a thing in itself wholly inconceivable amidst the relationships of heaven (inasmuch as he in whom it was found would by that very circumstance shew himself to be living beyond the pale of the kingdom of love), therefore all labourers in the Lord's vineyard must betimes give up every claim of their own, and trust themselves simply to the mercy of God. In such a lowly position they would also experience in their own souls feelings of compassion towards their brethren (Καλωσ, glowing heat during the day, comp. Luke xii. 55.)

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

Ver. 16. In the concluding words our Lord shortly points back
to the apothegm (xix. 30.) Thus, according to this parable, it is as though he had said the first-called (who are described above) stand in a position less favourable than those called at a later period. With this one apothegm, however, there is conjoined another, which, at xxii. 14, concludes the parable of the king's marriage-feast. There it refers to the entire failure of some who had been called, to embrace or hold to their call; here it is applied in a modified sense; for, even although those called at the eleventh hour are to be conceived of as pre-eminently diligent, yet the parable gives not the slightest hint that those first invited were less assiduous. Rather did they receive their reward along with the others. The contrast between κλητοὶ and ἐκλεξκοι cannot here be referred to the invitation to enter God's kingdom, and the actual coming and arraying of one's self for it (as at xxii. 14), but merely to the different relationships which believers themselves hold to the kingdom of God, the distribution and bestowal of which depends upon the free grace of God. The ἐκλεξκοι, therefore, in this case, are the ἱσχαροι, the κλητοὶ are all the ἰγνάται, including also the πέντε. The κλητοὶ, however, labour in a constrained position for the sake of reward; the ἐκλεξκοι in a state of freedom, labour in the spirit of inward desire and love. In so far as this more favoured position and the love which they cherish is not their own work, but the work of grace within them, in so far must it be referred to an ἰκληγή, which, however, is not to be regarded as a thing limited on the part of that love which imparts itself to all, but as a thing straitened only by the narrowness of men's own hearts. Further, it seems very doubtful whether the apothegm, as given in this passage, stands in its original connexion at Matt. xxii. 14, at least it has a much more definitely marked position in the context, at which passage our more lengthened remarks may be seen.

§ 3. OF HUMILITY.

(Matt. xx. 17—28; Mark x. 32—45; Luke xviii. 31—35.)

Referring back to what was said on Matt. xix. 1, we merely observe here that the mention made of the approaching sufferings of Jesus Christ, as given in the context of St Matthew, stands once more connected with the succeeding narrative. If we view
ver. 17–19 as isolated, they are as it were lost, but, taking them in connexion with what follows, they at once acquire a position and a bearing in regard to the whole narrative. They shew in the person of the Saviour himself how the character of self-denying humility is an indispensable requisite for the true disciple of Jesus, and in the discourse of Jesus respecting the earthly claims of the children of Zebedee, which follows in connexion with the narrative, everything bears equally on the proof of this truth, and for this reason the discourse concludes (ver. 28) with the same thought which forms the commencement (ver. 18, 19) of the passage before us. In this way our Lord's sufferings are mentioned merely for the purpose of shewing the disciples that the like sufferings were awaiting them. In the context of St Luke certainly the mention of the sufferings of Jesus stands more isolated as a fact which occurred in the course of his last journey (comp. Luke ix. 51), but, according to the whole arrangement of the subject-matter in his account of the journey, this very form of recording it is the appropriate one. St Luke gives it, in point of fact, what successively happened, without selecting any general points of view around which to arrange his materials.

Ver. 17–19. St Matthew remarks, as a point in the narrative of external interest, that our Lord by the way (as they were approaching Jerusalem) had taken his Twelve apart (καὶ ἰδίαι) and foretold to them what awaited him at Jerusalem. St Mark (x. 32) adds this trait, that the disciples had with fear and astonishment (ἐλαφοῦντο καὶ ἀκαλοῦντος ἐξεχείλοντο) seen the Saviour proceed towards Jerusalem, the seat of his fiercest enemies (comp. John xi. 16.) As respects the prophecy itself regarding the sufferings and resurrection of Jesus, the remarks already made at Matt. xvi. 21 may be consulted. The Christian mind cannot be conscious of having any interest in tracing to the words of Christ himself every separate detail in the traits which are here given of our Lord's sufferings as still future. The great point with which, above all, we have to do, is the contrast between the death and resurrection. But the external evidence goes to support the conclusion that even these individual traits (such as the ἱματιζόμενοι, μασσαρυζόμενοι) are derived from Christ's own words, for the agreement of the three narratives is here so close that we are driven to the supposition of literally accurate reports; vague and uncertain tradition would have called forth greater differences. Besides, the Old Testament representa-
tions (especially Ps. xxii.; Isa. l. 6, liii.; Hos. vi. 2) already contain all these traits, and, for this reason, their being brought forward before the event is sufficiently authorized (1 Cor. xv. 3, 4.) St Luke remarks (xviii. 34) that on this occasion also (comp. on Matt. xvi. 22) the disciples were once more unable to comprehend the words of Jesus, i. e., they felt themselves incapable of conceiving of such contrasts being united in the life of a single person, the highest glory (in miracles never equalled) with the deepest humiliation, and this again combined with the highest exaltation in his resurrection. To this there was added the fact, that the idea of a suffering Messias, although it did exist among the Jewish people, was yet greatly overlooked, and consequently everything connected with it which Jesus spoke, found only a weak response within the circle of their preconceived ideas.

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

¹ Wetstein ad. loc. cites from the Midrasch Tehillim, the passage, futurum est, ut
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denote merely (according to the general analogy which is every-
where to be met with, that with great men and princes he whom
they honour sits next them) the highest prerogatives, and the
influence founded on them. Without doubt the vain mother had
formed the opinion, and by means of it had incited her sons, that
the inauguration of the Messianic kingdom was about immediately
to take place (Luke xix. 11.) Jesus they considered as the
Sovereign and possessor of that kingdom, and, therefore, falling
at his feet, they requested of him the highest places of honour.

Ver. 22, 23. The most difficult point of all, however, is the
circumstance that this enquiry, which seems to proceed from a
materialistic view of what was said at Matt. xix. 28, is not re-
jected by our Lord, for in the first instance, the Saviour merely
brings forward the difficulties which had to be overcome before
they could attain such places of honour; but when the disciples,
with child-like simplicity, declared themselves willing to encounter
all conflicts, our Lord does not deny that, as a general truth, there
were such places of honour to be had, nor that these places were
accessible to them, but he merely declares that the Messiah can-
not bestow them; that it is God who gives them, ὁ δὲ ἡγεῖσαι. From
the turn thus given to the discourse, it is true, one may
conclude with some probability that the Saviour meant to inti-
mate that these places of honour were not intended for them, but
the surprising thing is, that this was not declared to them in the
most positive manner; that they were not told that there did not
exist any such places of honour in the kingdom of God; and
farther, that the opinion seems to be favoured that such places
really existed. To this it must be added, that in what immedi-
ately follows, Jesus speaks of the μήγας and the πτῶς ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ,
as at Matt. v. 19. But as the Saviour at the same time, ver.
22, says to the disciples ὃν ἂν ὄδηγης ἐν ἀνίκτοι, he openly blames
the position they had assumed. This surprising combination
of censure and of remark, coinciding with the ideas of the dis-
ciples, finds its solution in what follows (v. 24—27.) Here
we have merely to speak of the figures under which the Sa-
viour sets forth the conflict by which the attainment of glory in

Deus summe benedictus faciat regem Messiam sedere ad dextram suam et Abrahamum
ad simistrum suam. Here, however, the Messiah appears as Himself sitting on the
right hand of God, but nothing occurs in the passage respecting two different persons
who are to sit at the right and left of the Messiah.
the kingdom of God must be preceded. In regard to this struggle as applicable to himself personally, our Lord had spoken immediately before. A bright contrast to this conflict is presented by the joyful look into coming glory. "The flesh would always be glorified before it is crucified; it would rather be exalted before it is humbled," says Luther. Now, in the first place, as regards the state of the text, the figurative expression βάπτισμα in St Matthew has without doubt been interpolated from St Mark. For, St Mark in this instance, again (as also ex. gr. ix. 45, seqq.), has given a fuller report of the discourse, without, however, adding to it any ideas peculiar to himself; his important additions belong almost entirely to a fuller statement of the facts (compare on the text of St Matthew the N. T. by Griesbach-Schulz ad loc.) The figurative expression σωρήματος (= σώρος), which is common to both, denotes in the Old Testament already (Isa. li. 22), punishment, sufferings, and the fundamental idea is assuredly that of a cup of poison to be drunk.  

In the New Testament (Matt xxvi. 42) the Saviour describes his sufferings as a bitter cup given him by the Father. The figurative expression βάπτισμα added by St Mark (compare on Matt. iii. 11), refers to baptism by fire, and involves at once the idea of a painful going down (a dying in that which is old), and also of a joyful coming up (a resurrection in that which is new), as Rom. vi. 3, seqq. shews. Such a path of suffering, in order to his being made perfect (Heb. v. 8, 9), our Lord declared (Luke xii. 50) stood as yet before himself. According to the living corporate union, however, which subsists between our Lord and his people, as they have part in the δόξα, so likewise have they in his παθήματα, and only where these latter really take effect can they look forward to the former (Rom. viii. 17, 2 Tim. ii. 11, 12.) To this connexion our Lord calls their attention, in order to awaken them to a sense of the magnitude of those conditions under which alone the δόξα of the βασιλεία can be reached. When the disciples, however, on being asked δίνασθι περὶ τὸ σωρήμα; reply δινάμεθα, it is by no means to be supposed that they misunderstood the words of Jesus, and took them in a good sense (σωρήμα as meaning the cup of joy—βάπτισμα the washing out of the handbason of the king, according to Von Meyer's view ad loc. The

1 Perhaps it might also be referred to a bitter drink of healing medicine, in which case the figure would combine the idea of what was unpleasant with what was at the same time salutary.
very form of the question δινασθε σιν must at once render such a misunderstanding impossible. Undoubtedly they rather meant to express their determination to follow the Lord through all difficulties. Nor are we to consider this declaration as a thing wholly perverse and sinful; Jesus takes it up and deduces from it the inference that the heart of the disciples was really sincere, and that they were in earnest in their intention to follow him, only they were wanting in a correct insight into the greatness of the sin which still existed within them, as well as into the greatness of the struggle in which they were to be engaged. Their δυνάμεια, therefore, unquestionably expresses a strong feeling of self-righteousness, otherwise they would never in such a conflict have trusted in self.

Ver. 24, 25. The ten other disciples who probably were absent during the scene (ver. 20), were offended at the two brothers when they heard of their request, their envy being undoubtedly excited by the circumstance that James and John had wished to be exalted above them. For this reason Jesus assembled them (the ten) around him (προσεκλεσάμενος αὐτοῖς), and, without uttering one word of direct reproof, spoke to them of exaltation in the kingdom of God, as compared with earthly elevation, in order to make them aware of the real nature of the former, and explained to them this character as applicable to himself (whom they all acknowledged as the βασιλιέως of the βασιλεία they hoped for), in such a way that his discourse (ver. 28) returns to the point from which (ver. 18) it started. According to this view, however, the following words appear to be not so much a rebuke addressed to the two, as a didactic discourse addressed to the ten. But, as was already remarked, the idea of a special exaltation and glory in the kingdom of God is not in the least condemned, but is acknowledged as correct. For, the comparison of the ἀξιωματικός and μεγάλος has positively no meaning, if it was intended that there should be no σωτήρ and μεγάλος in the kingdom of God. Their existence is obviously taken for granted by our Lord—only a contrast is drawn between the κατακυρίευσιν and κατεξουσιάζεσθε which takes place in the world, (words compounded with κατά have often a subsidiary meaning of evil import, for example κατανομή, Phil. iii. 2. κατακυρίευσιν occurs again at 1 Peter v. 3, in the same sense in which it does here; and it is only in appearance that it bears another meaning at Acts xix. 16. Κατεξουσιάζεσθε does not again occur in the New
Testament), and the διάκονος and δοῦλος ἡμαῖς which prevails in the kingdom of God. From the parallel thus drawn, however, we can explain the obscurity which attaches to the connexion of the Redeemer’s whole discourse. Amidst the relations of the ἀδιαπόσπαστος δυναμικὴ ἡμῶν, dominion rests on physical force, and the advantage of it is seen in the subjugation of others, and the service rendered by them. In the βασιλεία all pre-eminence rests on love and truth, and love teaches us to serve others, and not to let ourselves be served. But inasmuch as love is the mightiest power, so that love which shews itself in its highest perfection as ministering and dying, overcomes everything, and in union with the Son of love, all those who open their heart to its influence rule in the power of it. But, as different degrees of capacity for its influence exist in different individuals, the ruling power naturally exists at the same time in different degrees, which, however, are dependent on the call of the Father (ὁ θεός ἐξοίκεσεν ἐπὶ τοῖς παρθένοις), not on the mere free will of man. Thus the disciples were not in the wrong in assuming that there were steps and degrees of approximation to the Lord, and in the extent to which men were partakers of his living power; but, on the contrary, that something of this kind must be supposed, is at once shewn by the relation in which Christ stood to his disciples on earth, inasmuch as the Seventy were further removed from him than the Twelve, and among these again three (Peter, John, and James) stood the nearest to him, while only John rested on his bosom. And precisely similar are the results of experience in regard to the different degrees of efficiency in the different members of the church. Thus an Augustinian, for example, by the power of the truth, exercised a predominant influence over whole centuries, such as millions of believers never possessed. The mistake of the disciples consisted rather in confounding the character of earthly and divine authority. The former, owing to the sinfulness of human nature, is combined with oppression and slavery; the latter has, as its result, a blessing for all who yield themselves to its influence. But, in order to be delivered from sinful self-will, which often knows how to assert its power even under the form of spiritual influence, man requires to have his soul, in the first instance, thoroughly humbled, and to pass through that baptism of suffering, in which the old man is wholly given over to death. The new man thence arising, who belongs to the kingdom of God, can in that case, according to the measure of his calling, have domi-
nion, i. e. exercise spiritual influence, without falling into the danger of assuming a worldly \textit{xaraxurgioun}. The Saviour places before his followers the likeness of such a holy self-sacrificing, lowly ministering love for their imitation; intimating that in it alone lies his royal might and power; and that his kingdom was only to be built up in such a way that its members should bear within them the same love, and in the exercise of it should vanquish and gain over for that kingdom the hearts of men.

Ver. 28. In the remarkable verses\footnote{The Codex D has here also a long passage added, which is transcribed at some length from Luke xiv. 7, seq., but which cannot, in any case, be considered as belonging to the text in St Matthew.} which conclude this conversation, the Saviour represents himself, in the first place, as the pattern of his disciples, so that, according to the principle, "the disciple is not above his Lord," as laid down at Matt. x. 24, the \textit{diakonhsai} must form the character of all the sincere disciples of Jesus, but the \textit{diakonethnai} (according to ver. 25) must be dissociated from them as something belonging to the world. The divine dominion is one which only gives, and never, like that of the world, one which demands. In the next place, the idea which in these verses connects itself with the general truth of the Gospel \textit{kai douvai tiv \textit{psiychi autou ligeon anfi pollon}, acquires, through this connexion with the preceding context, such a reference to what goes before, as can well make it a conceivable thing that one should fail to find in it a statement of the distinctive peculiarity of the death of Jesus, its atoning and vicarious nature. For, while, in the life of believers, there can be found something analogous to the \textit{eis filai diakonethnai alla diakonhsai}, this does not appear to be the case with the \textit{psiychi douvai}, if it be viewed as a vicarious death, and seeing that, in the parallel drawn between Christ and his people, not the slightest hint is given that the resemblance is confined to the former, and does not extend to the latter, one might be led to the erroneous conclusion, that we are to view the death of Jesus here merely as the climax of the \textit{diakonhsai}, and consequently to say that the words merely mean that every believer, as a member of the \textit{basileia} must (just as Christ did) sacrifice his individual life to the general body. Besides, as the synoptical gospels (with the exception of Matt. xxvi. 28) do not contain any other similar declaration in Christ's own words, impartiality requires from us the confession, that this passage, taken by itself, cannot prove the
doctrine of Christ's vicarious death, especially as the same expressions here used to describe it, may denote any kind of death in the way of sacrifice. (Comp. Jos. ii. 14, Joseph. de Maccab. c. vi. Wetstein ad loc. has collected other passages from profane writers.) But if the doctrine be elsewhere proved (comp. on Rom. iii. 21, seqq.; v. 12, seqq.) then the passage assuredly acquires a high significance, inasmuch as it lays down, in the words of our Lord, the germ of the apostolic doctrine. For, the structure of the words is obviously such, that the doctrine of our Lord's vicarious death may be indicated in them. The single point which can be brought forward on the other side, is the idea above-mentioned, that the ἐκκαθαρίζω δοῦνα is not really different from the διακονήσας, and as surely as the latter is appointed for all, so surely must the same view be taken of the former, which yet cannot be said to be true in regard to Christ's atoning death.¹ To maintain that in the latter words something which peculiarly and exclusively refers to Christ is placed along side of that which is applicable to others, in such a way that the passage must be translated, "As the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, so ought ye also willingly to serve; but, besides, the Son of Man has given up his life as an atonement for many, which is altogether inapplicable to you," assuredly such a supposition would have no claim to our assent. But the idea admits of being easily explained in the view of the Christian mind, without supposing such an uncalled for interpolation, if we only remember that Scripture everywhere views the death of Christ as a type of the death of the old natural man (comp. on Rom. vi. 3), and in this respect the words ἐκκαθαρίζω δοῦνα acquire a sufficient and satisfactory connexion with the preceding context (comp. on Matt. x. 39.) On this supposition, however, that there is one point in which the death of Christ admits of being compared with the death of all believers in regard to the old man, there is at the same time nothing to prevent our supposing that the death of Christ involves other points, which admit of no comparison, and also that these are referred to in the words before us. The circumstance, however, that Jesus himself seldom brings forward that which is specific in the nature of his own death (comp. nevertheless on John iii. 14; vi. 51; x. 11; xii. 24),

¹ Compare the passage 1 John iii. 16, to which the same thing exactly applies.
arises from this, that any statement of it in a doctrinal form might easily have been misunderstood; for, amidst the bulk of the people, the Old Testament notices of a suffering Messiah, though not certainly wholly misapprehended, were yet put very much into the background, and the apostles, on the whole, shared in these views. (Compare Hengstenberg on the Suffering Messiah, in his Christology of the Old Test. p. 252, seqq.) As it was not in general, therefore, the peculiar work of Christ to communicate dogmas, but rather to implant in men's souls the element of a heavenly life, to impart to them a spirit of truth, from which all eternal verities were unceasingly to be developing themselves anew, so he gradually and with wisdom led his disciples forward, in order that, after his atoning death, they might be enabled to receive such a spirit. Hence the entire form of his earlier ministry bears a legal colouring; Jesus was as it were his own prophet, and led men gradually to himself, the heavenly Christ; but of what importance would abstract statements as to the death of purest love have possibly been to those men who were as yet unable to perceive the very nature of such love? Not until the death of the love itself had revealed to their hearts the glow of that life which dwelt in him, did they understand that the death of the Lord from heaven could be nothing else than atoning, the death of the second Adam could be no other than vicarious. As regards, moreover, the individual details of this important passage, we must in the first place view the expression ὑπωμεν ἔν ψυχή, as denoting, according to John x. 18, a free-will offering. The use of the term ψυχή here, however, is of importance, as distinct from πνεῦμα. For, although the meaning life is here applicable, yet that life is to be regarded as concentrated in the ψυχή, and this (which is to be viewed in its connexion with the σῶμα and its αἷμα) appears as the peculiar object offered in the sacrifice (comp. on Luke xxiii. 46.) The term λύτρον, as applicable to the ψυχή of Jesus, occurs only here; it points to a δαυλία, which is in this way (by the giving up of the soul) to be discharged. Hence the term λύτρον implies the idea of what is precious (1 Peter i. 18, 19), by which that of highest value, immortal human souls, for whose deliverance no earthly thing sufficeth, might be saved. In the ideas there lies a strong Oxymoron. The διωμεν ἐν ψυχή, on the part of the Saviour, lays the foundation for the λαμβάνειν or the σῶμα τας ψυχάς των ἀνθρώπων. (The word λύτρον, however, although the substantive
occurs only here [at 1 Tim. ii. 6, there is ἀντιλυπησιν], lies at the foundation of all the various expressions used in Scripture for the atoning work of Christ. The term most commonly used by St Paul is ἀπολυπησις; the simple λυπησις, besides Luke i. 68, ii. 38, occurs also at Heb. ix. 12; λυπησις only at Acts vii. 35; λυπησις at Luke xxiv. 21; Titus ii. 14; 1 Peter i. 18.) The preposition ἀναί here used, occurs only in this passage, and at 1 Tim. ii. 6, in the word ἀντιλυπησι. That which most usually, and especially in the language of St Paul, denotes the relation of Christ's death to mankind, is the word ἵνα (Luke xxii. 19, 20; Rom. v. 6, 8; viii. 32; 2 Cor. v. 14, 15 [here it is most obviously equivalent to ἀναί]; Titus ii. 14; 1 Tim. ii. 6; 1 Peter ii. 21; iii. 18; iv. 1); but ἵνα also occurs (Matt. xxvi. 28; Mark xiv. 24; Gal. i. 4; Rom. viii. 3), and even διὰ (1 Cor. viii. 11.) It is undeniable that from the use of these prepositions nothing absolutely decisive can be deduced in support of the doctrine of a vicarious atonement, inasmuch as they may be translated for the benefit of, for the advantage of. On the supposition, however, that this doctrine is elsewhere proved, it is impossible not to see that the prepositions which are used do not exclude this idea. Especially the most obvious and common sense of ἀναί is over against, i.e. in the case of valuation, instead of, instar (comp. Homer Il. ix. 116, 117, ἀναί με πολλαὶς λαῖδε ἵναι ἐστίν ἀνιψίν διὸς ζωῆς κηρείᾳ φιλήσθη). One is instead of many, he outweighs them, replaces them), and for the use of ἵνα, as equivalent to ἀναί, comp. 2 Cor. v. 20, ἵνα καὶ άναθεματισθήσης. Finally, as respects the use of πολλαὶς in this passage, and which is found also at Matt. xxvi. 28, Mark xiv. 24 (while at 1 Tim. ii. 6, there stands πάνω), the passage, Rom. v. 15, 18, 19, is particularly instructive, for both expressions are there interchanged. We may say, that while πάνω points to the divine intention, πολλαὶς refers to the result. As respects his love, Christ died for all, although the power of his death, in point of fact, only falls to the lot of many (compare farther details on the passage referred to.)
§ 4. THE HEALING OF TWO BLIND MEN IN JERICHO.

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

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

§ 5. CHRIST'S VISIT TO ZACCHEUS.

(Luke xix. 1—10.)

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

Ver. 1, 2. The city of Jericho lay near Jerusalem (at the distance of 150 stadia), for which reason the entry into the capital is narrated directly atMatt. xxi. 1, seqq. The city itself ( cidade) is extremely ancient. The Hebrews found it in existence when under Joshua they took possession of the land of Canaan. Their palms and balsam gardens made the inhabitants famous, and brought them trade; for this reason an αξυξηραλος was appointed to their city. The name ζαυκενες occurs again at 2 Macc. x. 19
it corresponds to the Hebrew וַיִּהוּ, from הוֹוּ, to be pure, and is frequently interchanged with וַיִּהוּ (comp. Gesenius in Lex.)

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

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

Ver. 7, 8. Those in whom the Pharisaic feeling prevailed, could not bear the intercourse of the Messiah with sinners, and murmured. The idea of the ἀμαρτωλός, therefore, is not to be restricted here, not to be referred merely to his rank and connexions in life, but, as the following context shows us, is to be taken in a personal sense. Schleiermacher, however (on Luke, p. 238), supposes most justly that the declaration of dissatisfaction and the vows of the publican were not uttered till the morning of Christ’s departure. The conversations between our Lord and Zacchaeus, which must be supposed to have taken place, would, in that case, better account for
his engagements, and especially is it true that what follows will find a much more close connexion through the expression ἀκούοντας αὐτῶν τὰ ἔργα (xix. 11.) Farther, the words of Zaccheus express first the feeling of thankfulness for the mercy which had been shewn him, and next the feeling of penitence and the acknowledgment that he was bound as much as possible to make reparation for his sins. The idea that the declaration ἵνα τινὸς τι ἱσυφοράνθησα x. r. λ. is an expression of his righteousness, and of his having a good conscience, would conduct us wholly to the standing-point of the Pharisees. It is rather an acknowledgment of guilt. (As to καταλῦω, compare Luke ii. 7; ix. 12.—On συκοφαντίω see at Luke iii. 14.)

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

§ 6. THE PARABLE OF THE TALENTS.

(Luke xix. 11—28; [Matt. xxv. 14—30.])

The following parable is here so expressly joined to the historical connexion by distinct historic data (ἀκούοντας αὐτῶν, ver. 11, and εἰσῆλθα τὰ ἔργα ἱσυφοράνθησα ἵστορες, ver. 28), and has besides in its constituent parts so distinct a reference to the prominent circumstances, that we cannot doubt it stands here in its proper place. For, in the parable the twofold relation in which the ruler stands is kept in view, on the one hand to his δοῦλοι (ver. 13), and on the
other to his τολῆται. Each of these finds its separate development and its peculiar application. The servants represent the apostles and disciples, the citizens the Jewish people. In the case of the former their faithfulness or unfaithfulness to the trust committed to them is praised or blamed; in the case of the latter their disobedience to their rightful Lord is punished. The idea, however, which is brought forward as connecting these two relations is this (ver. 11), that they (αὐτοῖς being used as comprehending both the disciples and the people) were expecting the revelation of the Messianic kingdom immediately (παραχεῖμα) on his arrival at Jerusalem. Without denying that such a revelation would one day take place, our Lord directs the minds of His disciples merely to the future (ver. 12), and draws their attention to that which is most important, namely, to the great final award which it will bring along with it for all; for the faithful servants the fulness of the blessing, but bitter punishment for the unfaithful—a truth which carried with it a solemn admonition for all the disciples, urging them to fidelity; for the rebellious citizens (by whom we are to understand the whole Israelitish people, held under the power of Pharisaic influence and opposed to the Lord) wrath and destruction (ver. 14, 27.) Such representations were fitted to withdraw the attention of all from mere externals to that which was internal, in order to prepare them for receiving the right blessing from the appearance of the Messiah. But, inasmuch as St Matthew (xxv. 14-30) has inserted the parable into a collection of similitudes, which all have reference to the future kingdom of God, we will consider it more closely in that connexion, which will serve so greatly to explain its contents. It is true that Schleiermacher (p. 239) has cast a doubt on the identity of the two parables, but in my view without any sufficient grounds; for, first as respects his remark that what is said of the hostile citizens who would not have the Lord to reign over them forms the leading point in the parable, and that it would not therefore have been left out by St Matthew, the manner in which the similitude is carried out by St Luke at once shews that this is nothing more than a point of subordinate importance, for it is disposed of and finished in two verses (ver. 14, 27.) The Saviour's great object was to shew the disciples that the Parousia (his second coming) was not so near at hand; it was only incidentally that the uncalled accusers of the acts of the Messiah (ix. 7) have their attention directed to what they must expect on his return. St
Matthew, therefore, might properly leave out the subsidiary point, which was of no importance whatever in his collection of parables (Matt. xxv.), intended as that collection was solely for the members of the βασιλεία. It certainly appears to me unlikely that Christ should have brought forward this parable once again in a simpler form. The shape in which St Matthew gives it is simply to be set down to the account of that Evangelist. But what St Matthew has omitted might be left out without in the least altering the essence of the parable. The one connexion represented as subsisting between the Lord and his servants, does not exclude the idea of another between him and the citizens. There remains, therefore, only this single remark, that the parable in St Matthew seems to be wholly different, inasmuch as all the servants in St Luke receive an equal sum, and the faithful servants severally acquire a different amount of gain, while in St Matthew they receive different sums, and all acquire the same amount of gain. Here I am certainly not unwilling to suppose that St Luke has retained the original form of the parable, inasmuch, namely, as the mention of ten servants is a point which harmonizes well with the ten virgins (Matt. xxxv. 1), and the equal division of the talents, understood as referring to that calling into the kingdom of God which fell equally to the lot of all the disciples, and the furnishing of them with power from above, which was essentially needful for it, seems most appropriate to the great lesson primarily intended to be taught (the faithful use of that which a man has received.) But the parable is not in any respect essentially altered by the view given of it in St Matthew; for if St Matthew makes more to be bestowed on one and less on another, he yet adds one other trait (by which, however, the similitude is not rendered a different one), that the powers bestowed on different individuals, for labouring in the kingdom of God, are different; but since less is demanded from those who are less fully furnished, it comes to be, after all, essentially the same thing. For, as respects the main point in the representation of the servants, the contrast, namely, between the faithful and the unfaithful, it is in the two accounts entirely the same. Hence I cannot think (with Schleiermacher, p. 240) that the Saviour had spoken the parable in the simpler form of St Matthew, and at a later period repeated it in the more extended form of St Luke. It rather seems to me probable, that while given by St Luke here
in its original form, and in its chronological connexion, St Matthew has, according to his usual practice, inserted the parable, with slight modifications, into a collection of similitudes, which were intended to explain the relations of the Parousia to the servants of God.
SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE BY THE AUTHOR.

Respecting the note at p. 191, it should be kept in view that the terms there selected as descriptive of myths should be applied only to the so-called myths of the New Testament. An unintentionally fictitious construction of myths (a very different thing from deception or falsehood) must undoubtedly be assumed in the histories of other nations. In the New Testament, however, according to the principles laid down at vol. i. p. 29, sq. it cannot exist, and, therefore, the assuming of myths here, is equivalent to the assumption of fraud and falsehood.
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