

CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL  
COMMENTARY  
ON  
THE NEW TESTAMENT.

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

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

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

*THE GOSPEL OF JOHN.*  
VOL. II.

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

*By arrangement Messrs. Clark have secured the sole right of translation of Meyer's Commentary into English.*

CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL  
HANDBOOK

TO

THE GOSPEL OF JOHN.

BY

HEINRICH AUGUST WILHELM MEYER, TH.D.,  
CONSISTORIALRATH, HANNOVER.

TRANSLATED FROM THE FIFTH EDITION OF THE GERMAN.

THE TRANSLATION REVISED AND EDITED BY

FREDERICK CROMBIE, D.D.,  
PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY AND BIBLICAL CRITICISM, ST. MARY'S COLLEGE, ST. ANDREWS.

VOL. II.

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

MDCCCLXXXIV.

PRINTED BY MORRISON AND GIBB,

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON, .

HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO.

DUBLIN, .

GEORGE HERBERT.

NEW YORK,

SCRIPNER AND WELFORD.



## PREFATORY NOTE BY THE EDITOR.



THE translation of this volume has been executed in different proportions by the following gentlemen: as far as chap. xi. ver. 43, by Rev. William Urwick, M.A., and Rev. W. D. Simon, Ph.D.; and from that point to the end, by the Rev. Edwin Johnson, M.A. The whole, however, has been carefully revised and carried through the press by myself. I have also continued the references to the English translations of Winer's and Alex. Buttmann's *Grammars of New Testament Greek*. They are of great value to all students of the original text, for whom it must be remembered that Meyer's *Commentary*, as a strictly critical and exegetical work, is exclusively intended.

F. CROMBIE.

UNIVERSITY OF ST. ANDREWS,  
8th November 1875.

# LIST OF COMMENTARIES

## UPON

### THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN.

---

[It has not been deemed necessary to include in the following list more than a *selection* from the works of those who have published commentaries upon St. John's Gospel. For full details upon the literature of the controversy regarding the authenticity and genuineness, the reader is referred, in addition to Meyer's own Introduction, vol. i., to the very copious account appended by Mr. Gregory to his translation of Luthardt's work on the authorship of the Gospel, recently published by the Messrs. Clark.]

- AGRICOLA (Francis): *Commentarius in Evangelium Ioannis.*  
Coloniae, 1599.
- ALESIIUS (Alexander): *Commentarius in Evangelium Ioannis.*  
Basileae, 1553.
- ANYRALDUS (Moses): *Paraphrase sur l'évangile selon Saint Jean.*  
Salmuri, 1651.
- AQUINAS (Thomas): *Aurea Catena in Lucae et Ioannis Evangelia.*  
Venetiae, 1775. English translation, Oxford, 1841-45.
- ARETIUS (Benedictus): *Commentarius in Evangelium Ioannis.*  
Lausannae, 1578.
- ASTIE (S. J.): *Explication de l'évangile selon Saint Jean, avec une traduction nouvelle.*  
Genève, 1864.
- AUGUSTINE: *Tractatus 124 in Ioannem.* Ed. 1690, iii. p. 2. 290-826.  
English translation, 2 vols. (T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh). 1873-74.
- BAEUMLEIN (W.): *Commentar über das Evangelium Johannis.*  
Stuttgart, 1863.
- BAUMGARTEN (Crusius): *Theologische Auslegung der Johanneischen Schriften.* 2 vols.  
Jena, 1844-45.
- BAUMGARTEN (S. J.): *Auslegung des Evangelii Johannis, cum Jo. Salomonis Senleri praefatione.*  
Halae, 1762.
- BEZA (Theodore): *Commentarius in Novum Testamentum.*  
Geneva, 1556; ed. quinta, 1665.
- BENGEL (J. A.): *Gnomon Novi Testamenti.* Latest ed., London, 1862.  
English translation, 5 vols. and 3 vols. (T. & T. Clark). 1874.

- BISPING (A.): *Exegetisches Handbuch zu den Evangelien*, etc. Erklärung des Evangelium nach Johannes. Münster, 1869.
- BROWN (Rev. David, D.D.): *Commentary on St. John* (in his *Commentary upon the Four Gospels*). Glasgow, 1868.
- BUCER (Martin): *Enarrationes in Ioannem*. Argentorati, 1528.
- BULLINGER (Henry): *Commentariorum in Evangelium Ioannis libri Septem*. Tiguri, 1543.
- CALVIN (John): *Commentarius in Evangelium secundum Ioannem*. Genevæ, 1553, 1555; ed. Tholuck, 1838. Translated into English by Rev. W. Pringle. 1847.
- CHRYSOSTOM: *Homilies on the Gospel of St. John*, translated with Notes and Indices. Library of the Fathers. Oxford, 1848-52.
- CHITTRÆUS (Dav.): *Scholia in Evangelium Ioannis*. Francofurti ad Moenum, 1588.
- CRUCIGER (Caspar): *Enarratio in Evangelium Ioannis*. Witembergæ, 1540. Argentorati, 1546.
- CYRILLUS (Alexandrinus): *Commentarii in Sancti Ioannis Evangelium*. English translation by Dr. Pusey. Oxford. 2875.
- DANAËUS (Lamb.): *Commentarius in Ioannis Evangelium*. Genevæ, 1585.
- DE WETTE (W. M. L.): *Kurzgefasstes Exegetisches Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*. Kurze Erklärung des Evangeliums und der Briefe Johannes. Funfte Ausgabe von B. Brückner. Leipzig, 1863.
- DUNWELL (Rev. F. H.): *Commentary on the authorized English version of the Gospel according to St. John*. London, 1872.
- EDRARD (J. H. A.): *Das Evangelium Johannis und die neueste Hypothese über seine Entstehung*. Zürich, 1845.
- EUTHYMIUS ZIGABENUS: *Commentarius in IV. Evangelia, graece et latine*, ed. Matthæi. 4 vols. Berolini, 1845.
- EWALD (H.): *Die Johanneischen Schriften übersetzt und erklärt*. 2 vols. Göttingen, 1862.
- FEEUS (J.): *In sacro sanctum Iesu Christi Evangelium secundum Joannem pia et eruditae juxta Catholicam doctrinam enarrationes*. Numerous editions. Moguntiae, 1536. Romae, 1517.
- FORD (J.): *The Gospel of John, illustrated from ancient and modern authors*. London, 1852.
- FROMMANN (K.): *Der Johanneische Lehrbegriff in seinem Verhältnisse zur gesammten biblisch-christlichen Lehre dargestellt*. Leipzig, 1839.
- GODET (F.): *Commentaire sur l'évangile de Saint Jean*. 2 vols. Paris, 1863. [New ed. preparing.]
- GROTIUS (H.): *Annotationes in Novum Testamentum*. 9 vols. Gröningen, 1826-34.
- HEINSIUS (Dan.): *Aristarchus Sacer, sive ad Nonni in Joannem Metaphrasin exercitationes: accedit Nonni et sancti Evangelistae contextus*. Lugduni Batavorum, 1627.

- HEMMINGIUS (Nicol.): *Commentarius in Evangelium Joannis*.  
Basileae, 1591.
- HENGSTENBERG (E. W.): *Commentar zum Evangelium Johannes*. 2 vols.  
English translation (T. & T. Clark). 1865.
- HEUBNER (H. L.): *Praktische Erklärung des Neuen Testaments*. 2 vols.  
Evangelien des Lucas und Johannes. 2d ed. Potsdam, 1860.
- HILGENFELD (A.): *Das Evangelium und die Briefe Johannis nach ihrem  
Lehrbegriff*. Halle, 1849.
- HUNNIUS (Aegidius): *Commentarius in Iesu Christi Evangelium secundum  
Joannem*. Francofurti, 1585, 1591, 1595.
- HUTCHINSON (G.): *Exposition of the Gospel of Jesus Christ according to  
John*. London, 1657.
- JANSONUS (Jac.): *Commentarius in Joannis Evangelium*. Louanii, 1630.
- KLEE (H.): *Commentar über das Evangelium nach Johannes*. Mainz, 1829.
- KLOFUTAR (L.): *Commentarius in Evangelium Joannis*. Viennae, 1862.
- KOSTLIN (C. R.): *Lehrbegriffe des Evangelium und der Briefe Johannis*.  
Berlin, 1843.
- KUINOEL (Ch. G.): *Commentarius in Novi Testamenti libros Historicos*.  
4 vols. Leipzig, 1825-43.
- LAMPE (F. A.): *Commentarius analytico-exegeticus, tam litteralis, quam  
realis Evangelii secundum Joannem*. III Tomi.  
Amstelodami, 1724, 1726. Basileae, 1725, 1726, 1727.
- LANGE (T. G.): *Das Evangelium Johannis übersetzt und erklärt*.  
Weimar, 1797.
- LANGE (J. P.): *Theolog: Homiletisch: Bibel Werk. Das Evangelium nach  
Johannis*, 1860. English translation, greatly enlarged.  
ed. Philip Schaff, London and Edinburgh, 1872-75.
- LAPIDE (Cornel. A.): *Commentaria in Scripturam Sacram*. 10 vols.  
(last ed.) Lugduni, 1865.
- LASSUS (Gbr.): *Commentaire Philosophique sur l'évangile St. Jean*.  
Paris, 1838.
- LUCKE (G. Ch. F.): *Commentar über die Schriften Johannis*. 4 vols.  
Bonn, 1840-56.
- LUTHARDT (Ch. E.): *Das Johanneische Evangelium nach seinen Eigen-  
thümlichkeiten geschildert und erklärt*. 2 vols. Nürnberg, 1852-53.  
New ed. Part 1st, 1875. (English translation preparing.)
- LUTHARDT (C. E.): *St. John the author of the Fourth Gospel*. Translated  
by C. R. Gregory. Edinburgh, 1875.
- MAIER (Adal.): *Commentar zum Evangelium Johannes*. 2 vols.  
Carlsruhe and Freiburg, 1843.
- MALDONATUS: *Commentarii in IV Evangelia curavit Sauser*.  
Latest ed. Mainz, 1840.
- MATTHÆI (J.): *Auslegung des Evangelium Johannis zur Reform der Aus-  
legung desselben*. Göttingen, 1837.

- MELANCHTHON (Phil.): *Enarrationes in Evangelium Joannis.*  
Wittenbergae, 1523.
- MORUS (S. F. N.): *Recitationes in Evangelium Joannis.* ed. G. J. Dindorf.  
Leipzig, 1796.
- MUNTER (J.): *Symbolae ad interpretandum Evangelium Johannis ex  
marmoribus et nummis maxime graecis.* Kopenhagen, 1826.
- MUSCULUS (Wolf G.): *Commentarii in Evangelium Joannis in tres Heptadas  
digesti.* Basileae, 1552, 1564, 1580, 1618.
- MYLIUS (G.): *Commentarius in Evangelium Johannis absolutissimus.*  
Frankofurti, 1624.
- NONNUS: *Metaphrasis Evangelii Johannis.* red. Passow. Leipzig, 1834.
- OCOLAMPADIUS (I.): *Annotationes in Evangelium Johannis.*  
Basileae, 1532.
- OLSHAUSEN (H.): *Biblischer Commentar über d. Neue Testament fortgesetzt  
von Ebrard und Wiesinger. Evangelium des Johannes.* 1862.  
English translation (T. & T. Clark). 1855.
- ORIGEN: *Commentarii in Evangelium Joannis.* ed. 1759, vol. iv. 1-460.
- PARITICS (F. H.): *In Joannem Commentarius.* Romae, 1863.
- PAULUS (H. E. G.): *Philologisch-Kritischer und Historischer Commentar  
über das Evangelium des Johannes.* Leipzig, 1812.
- PELAGUS (Christ.): *Commentarius in Joannem per quaesita et responsa, ex  
antiquitate orthodoxa magnam partem erutus.* Frankofurti, 1595.
- ROLLOCK (Rob.): *Commentarius in Evangelium Joannis.*  
Genevae, 1599, 1608.
- ROSENMULLER (J. G.): *Scholia in Novum Testamentum.* 5 vols.  
Leipzig, 1815-31.
- SARCIUS (Erasm.): *In Johannis Evangelium Scholia justa ad perpetuae  
textus cohaerentiae filum.* Basileae, 1540.
- SCHMID (Sebast.): *Resolutio brevis cum paraphrasi verborum Evangelii  
Joannis Apostoli.* Argentorati, 1685, 1699.
- SCHOLTEN (J. H.): *Het Evangelie naar Johannes.*  
Leyden, 1865. Supplement 1866. French translation by Albert  
Reville in *Revue de Théologie.* Strasburg, 1864, 1866. German  
translation by H. Lang, Berlin, 1867.
- SCHWEIZER (Alb.): *Das Evangelium Johannis Kritisch untersucht.*  
Leipzig, 1841.
- SEMLER (J. Sal.): *Paraphrasis Evangelii Joannis, cum notis et Cantabri-  
giensis Codicis Latino textu.* Halae, 1771.
- TARNOVIUS (Paul.): *In sancti Johannis Evangelium Commentarius.*  
Rostochii, 1629.
- THEODORE (of Mopsuestia): *In Novum Testamentum Commentaria.* Ed.  
Fritzsche. Turici, 1847.

- THOLUCK (A.):** *Commentar zum Evangelium Johannis.*  
7th ed. 1857. English translation (T. & T. Clark), 1860.
- TITTMANN (K. Ch.):** *Metetemata Sacra, sive Commentarius critico-exegeticus-dogmaticus in Evangelium Johannis.*  
Leipzig, 1816. (English translation in *Biblical Cabinet*, T. & T. Clark.)
- TOLETUS (Franc.):** *Commentarii et Annotationes in Evangelium Joannis.*  
Romae, 1588, 1590; Lugduni, 1589, 1614; Venetii, 1587.

# THE GOSPEL OF JOHN.



## CHAPTER VIII.

*The section treating of the woman taken in adultery, vv. 1-11, together with vii. 53, is a document by some unknown author belonging to the apostolic age, which, after circulating in various forms of text, was inserted in John's Gospel, probably by the second, or, at latest, by the third century (the Constitutt. Apost. ii. 24. 4, already disclose its presence in the canon), the remark in vii. 53 being added to connect it with what precedes. That the interpolation of this very ancient fragment of gospel history was derived from the *Evang. sec. Hebraeos* cannot, as several of the early critics think (comp. also Lücke and Bleek), be proved from Papias, in Euseb. *H. E.* 3. 39; for in the words ἐκτίθεται (Papias) δὲ καὶ ἄλλην ἱστορίαν περὶ γυναικὸς ἐπὶ πολλαῖς ἁμαρτίαις διαβληθείσης ἐπὶ τοῦ κυρίου, ἣν τὸ καθ' Ἑβραίου εὐαγγέλιον περιέχει, the general expression ἐπὶ πολλαῖς ἁμαρτίαις and the word διαβληθ. merely are not favourable to that identity between the two which Rufinus already assumed. It is, however, only its high antiquity, and the very early insertion of the section in the Johannean text, which explain the fact that it is found in most Codices of the Itala, in the Vulgate, and other versions; that Jerome, *adv. Pelag.* ii. 17, could vouch for its existence "*in multis et Graecis et Latinis Codd.*;" and that, finally, upwards of a hundred Codices still extant, including D. F. G. H. K. U., contain it. Its *internal character*, moreover, speaks in favour of its having originated in the early Christian age; for, although it is, indeed, quite alien to the Johannean mode of representation, and therefore not for a moment to be referred to an oral Johannean source (Luthardt), it is, nevertheless, entirely in keeping with the tone of the synoptical Gospels, and does not betray the slightest trace of being a later invention in favour either of a dogmatic or ecclesiastical interest. Comp. Calvin: "Nihil apostolico spiritu*

indignum continet." The occurrence related bears, moreover, so strong a stamp of originality, and is so evidently not compiled in imitation of any other of the Gospel narratives, that it cannot be regarded as a later legendary story, especially as its *internal truthfulness* will be vindicated in the course of the exposition itself, in opposition to the manifold doubts that have been raised against it. *But the narrative does not proceed from John.* Of this we are assured by the remarkable and manifestly interpolated link, vii. 53, which connects it with what precedes; further, by the strange interruption with which it breaks up the unity of the account continued in viii. 14 ff.; again by its tone and character, so closely resembling that of the synoptic history, to which, in particular, belongs the propounding of a question of law, in order to tempt Christ,—a thing which does not occur in John; still further, by the going out of Jesus to the Mount of Olives, and His return to the temple, whereby we are transported to the Lord's *last* sojourn in Jerusalem (Luke xxi.); also by the entire absence of the Johannean οὖν, and in its stead the constant recurrence of δέ; and, lastly, by the non-Johannean expressions ἑρβρον, πᾶς ὁ λαός, καθίσας ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς, οἱ γραμματ. κ. οἱ Φαρις., ἐπιμένειν, ἀναμάρτητος, καταλείπεσθαι and κατακρίνειν, πλὴν also, in ver. 10 (Elz.). With these various internal reasons many very weighty external arguments are conjoined, which show that the section was not received by any means into all copies of John's Gospel; but, on the contrary, that from the third and fourth centuries it was tacitly or expressly excluded from the canonical text. For Origen, Apollinarius, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Cyril, Chrysostom, Nonnus, Theophylact, Tertullian, and other *Fathers* (except Jerome, Ambrose, Augustine, Sedulius, Leo, Chrysologus, Cassiodorus), as well as the Catenae, are altogether silent about this section; Euthymius Zigabenus, however, has it, and explains it, indeed, but passes this judgment upon it: Χρὴ δὲ γινώσκειν, ὅτι τὰ ἐντεῦθεν (vii. 53) ἄχρι τοῦ· πάλιν οὖν ἐλάλησεν, κ.τ.λ. (viii. 12) παρὰ τοῖς ἀκριβέσιν ἀντιγράφοις ἢ οὐχ εὔρηται, ἢ ὠβελίσται. Διὸ φαίνονται παρέγγραπτα καὶ προσθήκη καὶ τούτου τεκμήριον, τὸ μὴδὲ τὸν Χρυσόστομον δλως μνημονεῦσαι αὐτῶν. Of the versions, the Syr. (in Codd., also of the Nestorians, and in the first edd.), Syr. p. Copt. (in most mss.) Ar. Sahid. Arm. Goth. Verc. Brix. have not the section. It is also wanting in very old and important *Codices*, viz. A. B. C. L. T. X. Δ. κ., of which, however, A. and C. are here defective (but according to Tisch., C. never had it; see his edition of Codex C., *Proleg.* p. 31), while L. and Δ. leave an empty space; other *Codices* mark it as suspicious by asterisks or an obelus, or expressly so describe it in Scholia (see especially Scholz and Tisch.). Beyond a doubt,



this apocryphal interpolation would have seemed less surprising to early criticism had it found a place, not in John's Gospel, but in one of the Synoptics. *But wherefore just here?* If we decline to attribute this enigma to some accidental, unknown cause and thus to leave it unsolved, then its position here may be accounted for in this way: that as an abortive plan of the Sanhedrim against Jesus had just before been narrated, it appeared to be an appropriate place for relating a new, though again unsuccessful, attempt to trip Him; and *this* particular narrative may have been inserted, all the more, because the saying about judging and not judging, in ver. 15, might find in it an historical explanation; while, perhaps, an old uncritical tradition, that John was the author of the fragment, may have removed all difficulty. But even on this view the attempts of criticism to correct the text very soon appear. For the Codd. i. 19, 20 *et al.*, transfer the section as a doubtful appendix to the end of the Gospel; others (13, 69, 124, 346) insert it after Luke xxi. 38. where, especially considering vv. 1 and 2, it would appropriately fit in with the historical connection; and possibly also it might have had a place in one of the sources made use of by Luke. How *various the recensions* were in which it was circulated, is proved by the remarkable number of various readings, which for the most part bear the impress, not of chance or arbitrariness, but of varying originality. D., in particular, presents a peculiar form of text; the section in it runs thus: 'Ιησ. δὲ ἐπ. εἰς τ. ὄρ. τ. ἐλ." Ορθρ. δὲ π. παραγίνεται εἰς τ. ἱερ. κ. π. ὁ λ. ἤρχ. πρὸς αὐτ. Ἀγ. δὲ οἱ γρ. κ. οἱ Φ. ἐπὶ ἀμαρτία γυν. ἐλλημένην, κ. στ. αὐτ. ἐν μ. λ. αὐτῶ ἐκπειράζοντες αὐτὸν οἱ ἱερεῖς, ἵνα ἔχῃσι κατηγορίαν αὐτοῦ διδ., αὐτ. ἡγ. κατέληπται ἐπ. μοιχ. Μωϋσῆς δὲ ἐν τ. νόμῳ ἐκέλευσε τὰς τοιαύτ. λιθάζειν· σὺ δὲ νῦν τί λέγεις; Ὁ δὲ Ἰησ. κ. κ. τ. δ. κατέγραφεν εἰς τ. γ. Ὡς δὲ ἐπ. ἔρωτ., ἀνέκυψε καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· ὁ ἀν. ὡμ. πρ. ἐπ' αὐτὴν βαλλέτω λίθον. K. π. κατακύψας τῷ δακτύλῳ κατέγραφεν εἰς τ. γ. Ἐκαστος δὲ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐξήρχετο, ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, ὥστε πάντας ἐξελεῖν, κ. κατέλ. μόν. κ. ἡ γυνὴ ἐν μ. οὔσα. Ἀνακ. δὲ ὁ Ἰησ. εἶπ. τῇ γυναικί· ποῦ εἰσιν; οὐδεὶς σε κατεκρ.; Κἀκείνη εἶπεν αὐτῷ· οὐδεὶς, κύρ. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν οὐδὲ ἐγ. σ. κ. Ὑπαγε, ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν μηκέτι ἀμάρτανε. — The Johannean authorship was *denied* by Erasmus, Calvin (?), Beza, Grotius, Wetstein, Semler, Morus, Haenlein, Wegscheider, Paulus, Tittmann (*Melet.* p. 318 ff.), Knapp, Seyffarth, Lücke, Credner, Tholuck, Olshausen, Krabbe, B. Crusius, Bleek, Weisse, Lücke, De Wette, Guericke, Reuss, Brückner, Luthardt, Ewald, Baeumlein, Hengstenberg (who regards the section as a forgery made for a particular purpose), Schenkel, Godet, Scholten, and most critics: Lachmann and Tischendorf also have removed the section from the text. Bret-

schneider, p. 72 ff., attributing it to the Pseudo-Johannes, endeavours to establish its spuriousness, and so uses it as an argument against the genuineness of the Gospel; Strauss and Bauer deal with it in the same way, while Hitzig (on *John Mark*, p. 205 ff.) regards the evangelist Mark as the author, in whose Gospel it is said to have stood after xii. 17 (according to Holtzmann, in the *primary Mark*). Its authenticity, on the contrary, was *defended* in early times especially by Augustine (*de conjug. adult.* 2. 7),<sup>1</sup> whose subjective judgment is, that the story had been rejected by persons of weak faith, or by enemies of the true faith, who feared “peccandi impunitatem dari mulieribus suis;”—in modern times by Mill, Whitby, Fabricius, Wolf, Lampe, Bengel, Heumann, Michaelis, Storr, Dettmers (*Vindiciae αὐθεντίας textus Gr. peric. Joh. vii. 53 ff.*, Francof. ad Viadr. p. 1, 1793); Stäudlin (in two *Dissert.*, Gott. 1806) Hug (*de conjugii Christ. vinculo indissolub.*, Frib. 1816, p. 22 ff.); Kuinoel, Möller (*neue Ansichten*, p. 313 ff.); Scholz (*Erklär. der Evang.* p. 396 ff., and *N. T. I.* p. 383); Klee and many others, in particular, also Maier, i. p. 24 f.; Ebrard, Horne, *Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the N. T.*, ed. Tregelles, p. 465; Hilgenfeld, *Evang.* p. 284 ff., and again in his *Zeitschrift*, 1863, p. 317, Lange. Schulthess, in Winer and Engelhardt *krit Journ.* v. 3, pp. 257–317, declares himself in favour of the genuineness of a text purified by the free use of various readings.—Ver. 14. ἡ ποῦ ὑπάγω] Elz. Lachm.: καὶ ποῦ ὑπ. But B. D. K. T. U. X. A. Curs. and many Vss. have ἡ; and καὶ might easily have been repeated from what precedes, while there was nothing to occasion the change of καὶ into ἡ.—Ver. 16. ἀληθής] Lachm. and Tisch.: ἀληθινῇ, after B. D. L. T. X. 33. Or. Rightly; ἀληθής was introduced from the context (vv. 14, 17).—Ver. 20. After ἐλάλησεν Elz. has ὁ Ἰησοῦς, against decisive witnesses.—Ver. 26. λέγω] Lachm. Tisch.: λαλῶ, following important witnesses; but from vv. 25, 28.—Ver. 28. ὁ πατήρ] Elz. Scholz: ὁ πατήρ μου. But μου is wanting in D. L. T. X. κ. 13, 69, 122, al. Slav. Vulg. It. Eus. Cyr. Hilar. Faustin., and is a later addition, intended to mark the peculiar relation of the ὁ πατήρ.—Ver. 29. After μόνον Elz. Scholz have ὁ πατήρ. A gloss which 253, 259 have inserted before μόνον.—Ver. 34. τῆς ἀμαρτίας] wanting only in D. Cant. Ver. Clem. Faustin., witnesses which are too weak to justify our condemning it as a gloss. It was left out on account of the following general expression ὁ δὲ δοῦλος.—Ver. 38. ἃ ἠκούσατε παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς υμῶν] Elz. Scholz: ὃ ἐώρακατε

<sup>1</sup> Nikon, in the 13th century, attributed the omission to solicitude lest the contents should have an injurious effect upon the multitude. See Cotelierius, *Patr. Apos.* i. 235.

παρὰ τῷ πατρὶ ὑμῶν. But B. C. D. K. X. &. Curs. Or. have ᾧ; B. C. K. L. X. &.\* Curs. and some Vss. and Fathers, even Or., read ἡκούσατε and τοῦ πατρὸς. The received text, of which Tisch. has inconsistently retained ἰωράκ., is a mechanical imitation of the first half of the verse. The pronouns μου and ὑμῶν must, with Lachm. and Tisch., following very important witnesses, be deleted as clumsy additions inserted for the purpose of marking the distinction. Finally, α also in the first half has almost entirely the same witnesses in its favour as the second α, so that with Lachm. and Tisch. we must read α in both places. — Ver. 39. ἤτε] B. D. L. &. Vulg. Codd. It. Or. Aug.: ἐστε. So Griesb. Lachm. Tisch.; rightly defended by Buttmann in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1858, p. 474 ff. The seemingly illogical relation of the protasis and apodosis caused ἐστε to be changed into ἤτε, and ἐποιεῖτε into ποιεῖτε (Vulg. Or. Aug.). — After ἐποιεῖτε, Elz. Lachm. have ἔν, which is wanting in important witnesses, and is an unnecessary grammatical addition. — Ver. 51. τὸν λόγον. τὸν ἐμὸν] Lachm. Tisch.: τὸν ἐμὸν λόγον, which is preponderatingly attested, and therefore to be adopted. — Ver. 52. Instead of γεύσεται Elz. has γεύσεσθαι, against conclusive testimony. — Ver. 53. After σεαυτὸν Elz. has σύ, which the best Codd. unanimously exclude. — Ver. 54. δοξάζω] Lachm. Tisch.: δοξάσω, after B. C.\* D. &. Curs. Cant. Verc. Corb. Rd. Colb. Or. Chrys. Ambr. Rightly; the present (comp. the following δοξάζων) would involuntarily present itself to the copyists. — For ἡμῶν (so also Tisch.) Elz. has ὑμῶν (as also Lachm.). The testimonies are divided between the two; but ἡμῶν might easily have been changed into ὑμῶν, after the preceding ὑμεῖς, through not observing the direct construction. — Ver. 57. The reading τεσσαράκοντα, which Chrysostom has, and Euthymius Zigabenus found in MSS., is still in A. and three Curs., but is nothing save an historical *retouche*. — Ver. 59. After ἱεροῦ Elz. Scholz have: διελθὼν διὰ μέσου αὐτῶν, καὶ παρῆγεν οὕτως, words which are wanting in B. D. &.\* Vulg. It. al. Or. Cyr. Arnob. An addition after Luke iv. 30, whence also ἐπορεύετο has been interpolated after αὐτῶν in several witnesses.

---

Vv. 1-3. 'Επορ.] *down from the temple*. — εἰς τ. ὄρ. τ. ἐλ.] where He passed the night; comp. Luke xxi. 37. Displays the synoptic stamp in its circumstantiality of description and in the use of words; instead of ὄρθρου (Luke xxiv. 1), John uses πρωτ' (xviii. 28, xx. 1; comp. πρωτα, xxi. 4); for πᾶς ὁ λαός John uses ὁ ὄχλος and οἱ ὄχλοι; καθίσας ἐδίδ. αὐτ. is synoptical;

on ἐδίδασκεν, however, *without mention of the topic*, comp. vii. 14; the γραμματεῖς never appear in John; nor does he anywhere name the Mount of Olives. — The crowd of people, *after the conclusion of the feast*, would not be surprising, considering the great sensation which Jesus had caused at the feast. — The expression “*Scribes and Pharisees*” is the designation in the *synoptic* narrative for His regular opponents, answering to the Johannean οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι. They do not appear here as *Zealots* (Wetstein, Kuinoel, Staeudlin), whose character would not correspond either with their questioning of Jesus or with their subsequent slinking away; nor even as a *Deputation from the Sanhedrim*, which certainly would not have condescended to this, and whose delegates would not have dared to let the woman slip. It is rather a *non-official tentative attack*, like several that are narrated by the Synoptics; the woman has just been taken in the very act; has, as a preliminary step, been handed over to the Scribes and Pharisees for further proceedings; has not yet, however, been brought before the Sanhedrim, but is first made use of by them for this attempt against Jesus.

Vv. 4, 5. Observe especially here and in vv. 5, 6 the thoroughly *synoptical* diffuseness of the account. — κατελήφθη] with the augment of εἴληφα, see Winer, p. 60 [E. T. p. 84]. On the expression, comp. κατείληπτο μοιχός, Arrian. Epict. 2. 4. — ἐπ’ αὐτοφώρῳ] *in the very act*. Herod. 6. 72, 137; Plato, *Pol.* 2, p. 359 C; Xen. *Symp.* 3. 13; Dem. 378. 12; Soph. *Ant.* 51; Eur. *Ion.* 1214. Comp. Philo, p. 785 A: μοιχεῖαι αὐτόφωροι. On λαμβάνειν ἐπὶ, of taking in adultery, see Toup. *Opp. Crit.* I. p. 101. — The *adulterer*, who in like manner was liable to death (Lev. xx. 10; Deut. xxii. 24), may have *fled*. — λιθοβολεῖσθαι] This word cannot be called un-Johannean (in John x. 31 ff. λιθάζειν is used) because of its being taken from Deut. *l.c.* According to Deut. xxii. 23, 24 the law expressly appoints *stoning* for the particular case, when a *betrothed maiden* allows herself to be seduced by a man in the city, where she could have summoned help. The woman here taken must therefore necessarily be regarded as *such an one*, because the λιθοβολεῖσθαι is expressly referred to a command contained in the *Mosaic law*. From Deut. *l.c.*,

where the betrothed, in reference to the seducer, is termed אִשֶּׁת רֵעֵהָ, it is clear that the crime in question was regarded as a *modified* form of *adultery*, as it is also called εἶδος μοιχείας by Philo, *de legg. special.* ii. p. 311. The rarity of such a case as this made it all the more a fit topic for a tempting question in casuistry. Accordingly, τὰς τοιαύτας is to be understood as denoting the class of adulteresses of this *particular kind*, to whom refers that law of Moses appointing the punishment of stoning: "*adulteresses of this kind.*" That Moses, in Deut. *l.c.*, does not use the expression נָאָה (Lücke's objection) is immaterial, because he has not this word at all in the connection, nor even in the other cases, but designates the thing in another way. Usually the woman is regarded as a *married* woman; and as in Lev. xx. 10 and Deut. xxii. 22, not stoning specifically, but *death* generally is the punishment adjudged to adulteresses of this class, some either infer the internal falsehood of the whole story (Wetstein, Semler, Morus, Paulus, Lücke, De Wette, Baur, and many others; comp. also Hengstenberg and Godet), or assume that the punishment of death, which is not more precisely defined by the law ("to die the death"), must mean stoning (Michaelis, *Mos. R.* § 262; Tholuck, B. Crusius, Ebrard, Keil, *Archæol.* § 153, 1; Ewald, Brückner hesitatingly, Luthardt, Baumlein). As to the last view, judging from the text in Deut. *l.c.*, and also according to Rabbinical tradition, it is certainly an unsafe assumption; comp. Saalschütz, *Mos. R.* p. 571. Here, however, where the λιθοβολεῖσθαι is distinctly cited as a positive provision of the law, we have neither reason nor right to assume a reference to any other precept save that in which stoning is expressly named as the punishment, viz. Deut. xxii. 24 (LXX.: λιθοβολήσονται ἐν λίθοις), with which also the Talmud agrees, *Sanhedr.* f. 51, 2: "Filia Israelitæ, si adultera, cum nupta, strangulanda,<sup>1</sup> cum desponsata, lapidanda." The supposition of Grotius, that the severer punishment of stoning for adultery was introduced after the time of Ezekiel, cannot be

<sup>1</sup> According to the Talmudic rule: "Omnis mors, cujus et mentio in lege simpliciter, non alia est quam strangulatio," *Sanhedr. l.c.* The incorrectness of this rule (Michaelis, *l.c.*) is a matter of no consequence, so far as the present passage is concerned.

proved by Ezek. xvi. 38, 40; Sus. 45; the *Μωϋσῆς ἐνετείλατο*, moreover, is decidedly against all such suppositions.

Ver. 6. *Πειράζοντες αὐτόν*] denoting, not a good-natured questioning (Olshausen), but, agreeably to the standing *synoptical* representation of the relation of those men to Jesus, and in keeping with what immediately follows, *malicious tempting*. The *insidious* feature of the plan consisted in this: "If He decides *with* Moses for the stoning, He will be accused before the Roman authorities; for, according to the Roman criminal law, adultery was not punishable with death, and stoning in particular was generally repudiated by the Romans (see Staedlin and Hug). But if He decides *against* Moses and *against* stoning, He will then be prosecuted before the Sanhedrim as an opposer of the law." That they expected and wished for the *former* result, is shown by the *prejudicial* way in which they introduce the question, by quoting the express punishment prescribed by Moses.<sup>1</sup> Their plan here is similar in design to that of the question touching the tribute money in Matt. xxii. It is objected that the Romans in the provinces did not administer justice strictly in accordance with their own laws; but amid the general immorality of the times they certainly did not conform to the rigour of the Mosaic punishment for adultery; and how easy would it have been before the Roman magistrates to give a revolutionary aspect to the hoped-for decision of Jesus in favour of Moses, even if He had in some way reserved the competency of the Roman authorities! If it be said that Jesus needed only to declare Himself in favour of execution, and not exactly for *stoning*, it is overlooked that here was the *very* case for which *stoning* was expressly appointed. If it be urged, lastly, that when Jesus was required to assume the position of a judge, He needed only to *refer* His questioners to the *Sanhedrim*, and to tell them to take the woman *thither* (Ebrard), that would have amounted to a *declining* to answer, which would, indeed, have been the surest way of escape from the dilemma, but inappropriate enough to the intellectual temperament of Jesus in such cases. *Other explanations of πειράζειν*—(1) They would either have

<sup>1</sup> Observe also, in reference to this, the *οὐ* in ver. 5, which logically paves the way for an answer in agreement with Moses.

accused him to the Romans *imminutae majestatis*, because they then possessed the *jus vitae et necis*, or to the Jews *imminutae libertatis* (Grotius), and as a false Messiah (Godet). But that prerogative of the Romans was not infringed by the pronouncing of a sentence of *condemnation*; it was still reserved to them through their having to confirm and carry out the sentence. Accordingly, B. Crusius gives this turn to the question: "Would Jesus decide for the popular *execution* of the law . . . or would He peradventure even take upon Himself to pass such a judgment" (so, substantially, Hitzig also, on *Joh. Markus*, p. 205 ff., and Luthardt), where (with Wetstein and Schulthess) the law of the Zealots is called in by way of help? But in that case the interrogators, who intended to make use of a negative answer against Him as an overturning of the law, and an affirmative reply as an interference with the functions of the authorities, would then have put *no question at all* relating to the thing which they really wanted (*i.e.* the *execution*, and that immediate and tumultuous). (2) As the punishment of death for adultery had at that time already fallen into disuse, the drift of their question was simply *whether or not legal proceedings should be instituted at all* (Ebrard, following Michaelis). The words themselves, and the design expressed in the *κατηγορεῖν*, which could not take place before the *people*, but before the competent judges, as in Matt. xii. 10, are quite opposed to this explanation. (3) Dieck, in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1832, p. 791, says: As the punishment of death for adultery presupposes *liberty of divorcement*, and as Jesus had Himself *repudiated* divorce, He would, by pronouncing *in favour* of that punishment, have contradicted Himself; while, by pronouncing *against* it, He would have appeared as a despiser of the law. But apart from the improbability of any such logical calculation on the part of His questioners as to the first alternative,—a calculation which is indicated by nothing in the text,—the *ἵνα ἔχ. κατηγο. αὐτ.* is decisive against this explanation; for a want of logical consistency would have furnished *no ground for accusation*.<sup>1</sup> (4) The

<sup>1</sup> What they really wished was to *accuse* Him, on the ground of the answer He would give. Hilgenfeld therefore is in error when he thinks they sought to force Him to give a decisive utterance as the *obligation of the Mosaic law*.

same argument tells against Augustine, Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, Aretius, Jansen, Cornelius à Lapide, Baumgarten, and many other expositors: according to whom an *affirmative* reply would have been *inconsistent with the general mildness* of His teaching; a *negative* answer would have been a decision against Moses. (5) Euthymius Zigabenus, Bengel, and many others, Neander also, Tholuck, Baeumlein, Hengstenberg (who sees here an unhistorical mingling of law and gospel), are nearer the mark in regarding the plan of attack as based upon the assumption, which they regarded as certain, that in accordance with His usual gentleness He would give a *negative* answer: *γινώσκοντες γὰρ αὐτὸν ἐλεήμονα κ. συμπαθῆ, προσεδόκων, ὅτι φείσεται αὐτῆς, καὶ λοιπὸν ἔξουσι κατηγορίαν κατ' αὐτὸν, ὡς παρανόμως φειδομένου τῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου λιθαζομένης*, Euthymius Zigabenus. But this explanation also must be rejected, partly even on *a priori* grounds, because an ensnaring casuistic question may naturally be supposed to involve a *dilemma*; partly and mainly because in this case the introduction of the question by *ἐν δὲ τῷ νόμῳ* would have been a very unwise method of preparing the way for a *negative* answer. This latter argument tells against Ewald, who holds that Christ, by the acquittal which they deemed it probable He would pronounce, would have offended against the Mosaic law; while by condemning, He would have violated as well the milder practice then in vogue as His own more gentle principles. Lücke, De Wette, Brückner, Baur,<sup>1</sup> and many other expositors *renounce* the attempt to give any satisfactory solution of the difficulty. — *τῷ δακτύλῳ ἔγραφεν εἰς τ. γῆν*] as a sign that He was

By an affirmative reply (he says) Christ would have recognised this obligation, and by His non-observance of the law (v. 18, vii. 23) He would have been self-condemned; by a negative answer He would have been guilty of an express rejection of the law. Viewing the matter thus, they could not, indeed, have *accused* Him on account of His answer if affirmative; they could only have charged Him with logical inconsistency. This tells substantially also against Lange's view, viz. that they wished to see whether He would venture, in the strength of His Messianic authority, to set up a new law. If in this case He had decided *in favour* of Moses, they could not have *accused* Him (to the Sanhedrim).

<sup>1</sup> According to Baur (p. 170 sq.), there is nothing historical whatever in the story; it has a purely ideal import. The main idea he holds to be the consciousness of one's own sinfulness breaking the power of every sin, in opposition to the accusation brought against Jesus by the Pharisees, that He associated with sinners, and thus was so ready to forgive.



not considering their question, ὅπερ εἰώθασι πολλάκις ποιεῖν οἱ μὴ θέλοντες ἀποκρίνεσθαι πρὸς τοὺς ἐρωτῶντας ἄκαιρα καὶ ἀνύξια. Γνοὺς γὰρ αὐτῶν τὴν μηχανήν, προσεποιεῖτο γράφειν εἰς τ. γῆν, καὶ μὴ προσέχειν οἷς ἔλεγον, Euthymius Zigabenus. For instances of behaviour like this on the part of one who turns away from those around him, and becomes absorbed in himself, giving himself up to his own thoughts or imaginings, from Greek writers (Aristoph. *Acharn.* 31, and Schol. Diog. Laert. 2. 127) and from the Rabbins, see in Wetstein. Isa. xvii. 13 does not here serve for elucidation. *What* Jesus wrote is not a subject even of inquiry; nor are we to ask whether, by the act, He was symbolizing any, and if so what, *answer* (Michaelis: the answer "*as it is written*"). There is much marvellous conjecture among the older expositors. See Wolf and Lampe, also Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr.* p. 315, who thinks that Jesus wrote the answer given in ver. 7 (after Bede; comp. also Ewald, *Gesch. Chr.* p. 480, ed. 3, and Godet). Suffice it to say, the strange manner in which Jesus silently declines to give a decisive reply (acting, no doubt, according to His principle of not interfering with the sphere of the magistracy (here a matter of criminal law, Matt. xxii.; Luke xii. 13, 14)),<sup>1</sup> bears the stamp of genuineness and not of invention, though Hengstenberg deems this procedure unworthy of Jesus; the tempters *deserved* the *contempt* which this implied, ver. 9. —Observe in ἔγραφεν the descriptive imperfect. The reader *sees* Him writing with His finger. The additions in some Codd. καὶ προσποιούμενος, and (more strongly attested) μὴ προσποιούμε., are glosses of different kinds, meaning "*though He only pretended (simulans) to write;*" and, "*without troubling Himself about them*" (*dissimulans*, Ev. 32 adds αὐτοῦς). See Matthaei, ed. min. *in loc.*

<sup>1</sup> According to Luthardt, to show that the malice of the question *did not deserve an answer*. But the numerous testing questions proposed to Him, according to the Synoptics, by His opponents, were all of them malicious; yet Jesus did not refuse to reply to them. According to Lange's fancy, Jesus assumed the gesture of a *calm majesty*, which, in its *playful ease*, refused to be disturbed by any *street scandal*. Melancthon well says: "Initio, cum accusatur mulier, nihil respondit Christus, *tanquam in aliam rem intentus, videlicet prorsus a sese rejiciens hanc quaestionem pertinentem ad cognitionem magistratus politici*. Postea, cum urgetur, respondet non de muliere, sed de ipsorum peccatis, qui ipsam accusabant."

Ver. 7. Ἀναμάρτητος] *faultless*, here only in the N. T., very often in the Classics. Whether it means freedom from the possibility of fault (of error or sin), as in Plato, *Pol.* I. p. 339 B, or freedom from *actual* sin (comp. γυνὴ ἀναμάρτητος, Herod. v. 39),—whether, again, it is to be understood *generally* (2 Macc. viii. 4), or with reference to any *definite category* or *species* of ἁμαρτία (2 Macc. xii. 42; Deut. xxix. 19), is a matter which can be decided by the *context* alone. Here it must signify actual freedom from the sin, not indeed of *adultery* specially, for Jesus could not presuppose this of the hierarchy as a whole, even with all its corruption of morals, but probably of *unchastity*, simply because a woman who was a sinner of *this* category was here in question, and stood before the eyes of them all as the living opposite of ἀναμάρτητος. Comp. ἁμαρτωλός, Luke vii. 37; ἁμαρτάνειν, Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* x. p. 111; in chap. v. 14, also, a special kind of sinning is intended by μηκέτι ἁμάρτανε; and the same command, in ver. 11, addressed to the *adulteress*, authenticates the sense in which ἀναμάρτητος is used. The men tempting Him knew how to avoid, in outward appearance rather than in reality, the unchastity which they condemned. Taking the words to mean *freedom from sin generally* (Baur, who draws from the passage an erroneous doctrinal meaning, Luthardt, Ewald, Hengstenberg, Godet, following early expositors), we make Jesus propose an impracticable condition in the given case, quite unfitted to disarm His opponents as convicted by their own consciences; for it would have been a purely ideal condition, a standard impossible to man. If we take ἀναμάρτητος, however, in the concrete sense above explained, the condition named becomes quite appropriate to baffle the purpose of the tempting questioners; for the prescription of the Mosaic law is, on the one hand, fully recognised;<sup>1</sup> while, on the other, its fulfilment is made dependent on a condition which would effectually banish from the mind of His questioners, into whose consciences Jesus was looking, all thought of making His answer a ground of accusation to the authorities.—Observe, further, how the general moral maxim to be deduced from the text condemns generally in the Christian

<sup>1</sup> The section cannot therefore be used, as Mittermayer uses it (*d. Todesstr.* 1862), as a testimony of Jesus against capital punishment.

community, viewed as it ought to exist conformably to its ideal, the personal condemnation of the sins of others (comp. Matt. vii. 1; Gal. vi. 5), and puts in its place brotherly admonition, conciliation, forgiveness—in a word, love, as the *πλήρωσις* of the law. — τὸν λίθον] *the stone* which He would cast at her in obedience to the law. — ἐπ' αὐτῇ] *upon her*. See Bernhardt, p. 249; Ellendt, *Lex Soph.* i. p. 467. — βαλέτω] not mere permission, but *command*, and therefore all the more telling. The place of stoning must be conceived as lying outside the city (Lev. xxiv. 14; Acts vii. 56). We must further observe that Jesus does not say *the first stone*, but let the *first* (i.e. of you, ὑμῶν) *cast the stone*, which does not exclude that casting of the first, which was obligatory on the *witnesses* (Deut. xvii. 7; Acts vii. 58).

Vv. 8, 9. Πάλιν, κτλ.] To indicate that He has nothing further to do with the case. According to Jerome<sup>1</sup> and Euthymius Zigabenus, "in order to give space to the questioners to take themselves away;" but this is not in keeping with ver. 6. — ἐξήρχοντο] *descriptive* imperfect. — εἰς καθ' εἰς] Mark xiv. 19. — ἕως τ. ἐσχάτ.] is to be connected with εἰς καθ' εἰς, ἀρξ. ἀπὸ τ. πρεσβ. being an intervening clause. See on Matt. xx. 8.—The πρεσβύτεροι are the *elders in years*, not the *elders of the people*; for there would be no apparent reason why the latter should be the first who should have chosen to go away; besides, the elders of the people are not named along with the others in ver. 3. Those *more advanced in years*, on the other hand, were also *thoughtful* and *prudent* enough to go away first, instead of stopping to compromise themselves further. — ἕως τῶν ἐσχάτ.] attested as genuine by preponderating evidence. It does not refer to *rank*, the *least* (so most modern expositors, even Lücke, B. Crusius, De Wette, Maier, Lange), which the context does not sanction; the context (see εἰς καθ' εἰς) leads us rather to render it '*unto the last who went out*,' i.e. until all were gone. The feature that the eldest (who probably stood nearest to Jesus) were the first to go out, is characteristic and original; but that the going away took place in the order of rank, is a meaning imported into the words by the expositors. After ἀκούσ. the

<sup>1</sup> According to whom Christ wrote the sins of His accusers and of all mortals!

received text has καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς συνειδήσεως ἐλεγχόμενοι, a gloss opposed to very important witnesses; but as to the matter of fact, right enough. — μόνος ὁ Ἰησ., κ.τ.λ.] Augustine well says: "Relicta sunt duo, *miseria et misericordia*." But it does not exclude the presence of the disciples and the crowds of lookers-on at a distance.

Vv. 10, 11. Οἱ κατήγ.] who have accused thee to me, as if I were to be judge. — οὐδεὶς] is emphatic: Has *no one* condemned thee? Has no one declared that thou art to be stoned? Were it not so, they would not have left the woman to go free, and all of them gone away. The κατέκρινεν here designates the *sententia damnatoria*, not as a *judicial sentence* (for the γραμματεῖς and Pharisees had come merely as *asking a question* concerning a matter of law or right), but simply as the judgment of *an individual*. — οὐδὲ ἐγὼ σε κατακρ.: *I also do not condemn thee*. This is not the declaration of the *forgiveness of sin*, as in Matt. ix. 2, Luke vii. 48, and cannot therefore justly be urged against the historical genuineness of the narrative (see, in particular, Hengstenberg); nor is it a mere declinature of *judicial competency*, which would be out of keeping with the preceding question, and with the admonition that follows: on the contrary, it is a *refusal to condemn*, spoken in the consciousness of His *Messianic calling*, according to which He had *not come to condemn*, but to seek and save the lost (iii. 17, xii. 46; Matt. xviii. 11); not to cast out sinners; "not to quench the smoking flax," etc. He accordingly does in this case what by His office He is called to do, namely, to awaken and give room for repentance<sup>1</sup> in the sinner, instead of condemning; for He dismisses her with the admonition μηκέτι ἁμάρτανε. Augustine well says: "Ergo et Dominus damnavit, sed peccatum, non hominem." How striking the force of the *negative declaration* and the *positive admonition*!

Ver. 12. The interpolated section, vii. 53–viii. 11, being deleted, we must look for some connection with vii. 52. This may be found simply as follows. As the Sanhedrim had not been able to carry out their design of apprehending Jesus, and

<sup>1</sup> In connection with the marriage law, it is clear from this passage that, in the case of adultery, repentance on the part of the guilty party makes the continuance of the marriage allowable.

had, moreover, become divided among themselves (as is recorded in vii. 45–52), He was able, in consequence of this miscarriage in their plans against Him (*οὖν*), to come forth afresh and address the assembled people in the temple (*αὐτοῖς*, comp. ver. 20). This renewed coming forward to address them is not, however, to be placed on the last day of the feast, but is so definitely marked off by ver. 20 as a special act, and so clearly distinguished from the preceding, that it must be assigned to one of the *following* days; just as in ver. 21 the similar transition and the recurring *πάλιν* introduce again a new discourse spoken on another day. Others take a different view, putting the discourses in vv. 12–20, and even that also in ver. 21 ff., on the day named in chap. vii. 37; but against this is not only the *πάλιν* of ver. 12 and ver. 21, but the *οὖν*, which in both places bears an evident reference to some preceding *historical* observation. Though Lücke's difficulty, that a single day would be too short for so many discourses and replies, can have no weight, there is yet no sufficient ground for De Wette's supposition, that John did not know how to hold securely the thread of the history. — *I am the light of the world*, i.e. (comp. on i. 4) *the possessor and bearer of the divine truth of salvation* (τ. φ. τῆς ζωῆς), *from whom this saving truth goes forth to all mankind* (κόσμος), who without Christ are dark and dead. The light is not *identical* with the salvation (Hengstenberg), but salvation is the necessary *emanation* therefrom; *without* the light there is *no* salvation. So also Isa. xlix. 6; comp. xlii. 6. To regard the figure which Christ here employs, in witnessing to Himself, as suggested by some outward object—for example, by the two colossal golden candlesticks which were lighted at the feast of Tabernacles (but certainly only on the first day; see Succah v. 2) in the forecourt of the women, where also was the *γαζοφυλάκιον*, ver. 20, on either side of the altar of burnt-offering (Wetstein, Paulus, Olshausen), —is a precarious supposition, as the feast was now over; at the most, we can only associate the words with the *sight* of the candelabra, as Hug and Lange do—the latter intermingling further references to spiritual darkness from the history of the adulteress. But the figure, corresponding as it essentially does with the thing signified, had been given long before, and was quite a familiar

one in the prophetic view of the idea of the Messiah (Isa. ix. 1, xlii. 6 ; Mal. iv. 2). Comp. also Matt. iv. 15, 16 ; Luke ii. 32 ; and the Rabbinical references in Lightfoot, p. 1041. There is really no need to suppose any special suggesting cause, not even the reading of Isa. xlii. ; for though the Scriptures were read in the synagogues, we have no proof that they were read in the temple. To find also a reference to the pillar of fire in the wilderness (Godet), according to which the *ὁ ἀκολουθῶν, κ.τ.λ.*, has reference to Israel's wanderings, is quite arbitrary ; no better, indeed, than the reference of vii. 37 to the rock in the wilderness. — *οὐ μὴ περιπατήσῃ*] The strongly attested, though not decisively confirmed, subjunctive *περιπατήσῃ* (so Lachmann, Tischendorf) would be the *most usual* word in the N. T. after *οὐ μὴ*, and might therefore all the more easily have displaced the future, which could hardly have been introduced through the following *ἔξει*, seeing that the latter word has no connection with *οὐ μὴ*. Upon *οὐ μὴ*, with the more definitely assuring *future*, see on Matt. xxvi. 35 ; Mark xiv. 31. — *ἔξει τὸ φῶς τ. ζωῆς*] As the antithesis of the divine *ἀλήθεια*, the *σκοτία*, is the causative element of death, so is the light the cause of life, *i.e.* of the true eternal *Messianic* life, not only in its consummation after the Parousia, but already also in its temporal development (comp. iii. 15). *ἔξει*, *it will not be wanting to him, he will be in possession of it*, for it necessarily communicates itself to him direct from its personal source, which he follows in virtue of his fellowship with Christ (*"lux enim praeferri solet,"* Grotius). The *ἀκολουθεῖν* takes place through *faith* ; but in the believer, who as such walks no more in darkness (xii. 46 ; Eph. v. 8 ; Col. i. 13), Christ Himself lives (the Johannean "I in you," and the Pauline Gal. ii. 20 ; see on vi. 51), and therefore he has that light of life which proceeds from Christ as a real and inward possession (Nonnus, *ὁμόφοιτον ἐν αὐτῷ*) ; he is *υἱὸς φωτός* (xii. 36), and himself "light in the Lord" (Eph. v. 8). This explanation, not merely the *having Christ with him* (Weiss), is required by the context ; because *ἔξει, κ.τ.λ.*, is the *result* of the *ἀκολουθεῖν*, and therefore of *faith* (comp. iii. 15, 36, v. 24, vi. 47), and accordingly *τῆς ζωῆς* is added.

Vv. 13, 14. This great declaration the Pharisees present

(οἱ Φαρισ.) cannot leave unchallenged; they, however, cleverly enough, while avoiding dealing with its real substance, bring against it a *formal* objection; comp. v. 31. Jesus replies, that the rule of law referred to does not apply to *His* witness regarding Himself, as He testified concerning Himself, not in His own human individuality, but in the conscious certainty of His having been sent from, and being about to return to, heaven—a relation which is, of course, unknown to His opponents, who therefore reject His testimony. The refutation lies in the fact that God is able, without any departure from truth, to testify concerning Himself. — καὶ ἐγὼ μαρτ., κ.τ.λ.] not: *even though I* (Lücke), nor: *although I*, etc. (B. Crusius), for both would require ἐὰν καί; but: *even if*, i.e. *even in case* (*adeo tum, si*), if I for my part (ἐγὼ), etc. See Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 519; Stallb. *ad Plat. Apol.* p. 32 A; Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 151. — ποῦ ὑπάγω] through death, vii. 33. — ἐρχομαί] ἦλθον was previously used of the historical moment of the past; here, however, the *Praes.*, in using which Jesus means His *continuous coming forward* as the ambassador of God. Comp. iii. 31. The latter represents it more as a matter of the *present*. — ἤ] not again καί, because the two points are conceived, not as before *copulatively*, but *alternatively* ("whether I speak of the one or the other, you do not know it"); comp. 1 Cor. xi. 27. The latter is more *expressive*, because it is disjunctive.

Vv. 15, 16. The course of thought repeated with some minuteness (Tholuck), but similarly to vii. 24. The rejection of His testimony by the Pharisees in ver. 13, was an act of *judgment* on their part which, inasmuch as they were unacquainted with His higher position as an ambassador of God, had been determined merely by *His outward sensuous appearance*, by His servant's form (εἰσορόωντες ἐμὴν βροτοειδέα μορφήν, Nonnus), as to which He seemed to them to be an ordinary man. This Jesus tells them, and adds, how very differently He proceeds in this respect.<sup>1</sup> Κρίνειν receives through the context the *condemnatory* sense, and κατὰ τὴν

<sup>1</sup> Hilgenfeld, *Evang.* p. 286, ought therefore not to have concluded that the words, "I judge no man," presuppose the history of the woman taken in adultery.

*σάρκα* is not to be understood of the *subjective* norm (Chrysostom: ἀπὸ ἀνθρωπίνης διανοίας . . . ἀδίκως; De Wette: in a carnal, selfish manner; comp. B. Crusius), but of the *objective* norm (comp. κατ' ὄψιν, vii. 24; Euth. Zigabenus: πρὸς μόνον τὸ φαινόμενον βλέποντες, καὶ μηδὲν ὑψηλότερον καὶ πνευματικὸν ἐννοοῦντες). Comp. 2 Cor. v. 16. — ἐγὼ οὐ κρίνω οὐδένα] *I condemn no one*. There is no need, however, for supplying in thought κατὰ τ. σάρκα, as even Augustine proposed, and after Cyril's example many modern writers (also Kuinoel, Paulus); to the same thing comes Lücke's supplement: *as you do*. This is decidedly to be rejected, partly for the general reason that the proper *point* would have to be supplied in thought, and partly because, in ver. 16, καὶ ἐὰν κρίνω cannot be taken otherwise than absolutely, and *without* supplement. For these reasons *every* kind of supplement must be rejected, whether by the insertion of νῦν, which would point to the future judgment (Augustine, Chrysostom, Euth. Zigabenus, Erasmus, and several), or of μόνος (Storr, Godet), as though John had written αὐτὸς ἐγώ. Jesus rather gives utterance to *His maxim* in the consciousness of having come, not κρίνειν, but to save and bless (comp. on ver. 11), which is what He carried out *principaliter*; but this principle was, *that He refrained from all condemnation of others*, knowing as He did that κρίνειν was neither the end (Brückner) nor the sphere of His life (Hengstenberg). This principle, however, did not exclude *necessary cases of an opposite kind*; and of such cases ver. 16 supplies the necessary explanation. Luther aptly remarks: "He herewith clothes Himself with His *office*;" but an antithesis to *teaching* (Calvin, Beza) is foreign to the verse; and the interpretation: I have no *pleasure* in judging (De Wette), imports into the words what they do not contain.<sup>1</sup> — Ver. 16. καὶ ἐὰν κρίνω δὲ ἐγώ] καὶ δέ here and in ver. 17, *atque etiam*, see on vi. 51. The thought is: *and even if a κρίνειν on my part should take place*, etc. Notwith-

<sup>1</sup> Among the meanings imported into the passage may be reckoned Lange's fanciful notion (*L. J.* II. p. 958), that Jesus can never regard the *real essence* of man as worthy of rejection (but merely the caricature which man has made of his own nature by sin). Where is there anything in the passage about the *real essence of man*?



standing His maxim, not to judge, such cases had actually occurred in the exercise of His vocation, and, indeed, just for the purpose of attaining its higher object—as was, moreover, inevitable with His antagonism to sin and the κόσμος. Comp. Luther: “If thou wilt not have our Lord God, then keep the devil; and the office which otherwise is not set for judgment, but for help and consolation, is compelled to assume the function of condemnation.” Luthardt: “*But my witness becomes a judgment through unbelief.*” This, however, is not in the passage; and Jesus was often enough forced into actual, direct κρίνειν, ver. 26. — δέ] occupies the fourth place, because the preceding words are connected with each other, as in ver. 17, vi. 51; 1 John i. 3; Matt. x. 18, *al.*—According to the reading ἀληθινή (see the critical notes), the meaning of the second clause is: my condemnation is a *genuine* one, *answering to the idea*, as it *ought* to be—not equivalent to ἀληθής (B. Crusius). Comp. on vii. 28. Reason: *For it is not* (like an ordinary human personality, restricted to myself) *I alone* (who condemn), *but I and the Father that hath sent me* (are the κρίνοντες), which fellowship (ὅπερ ἐγὼ κρίνω, τοῦτο καὶ ὁ πατήρ, Euth. Zigabenus) naturally excludes everything that could prevent the κρίσις from being ἀληθινή. Comp. v. 30.

Vv. 17, 18. After the *first* reason in answer to the Pharisaic rejection of His self-witness (namely, that He gave it in the consciousness of His divine mission, ver. 14), and after administering a reproof to His antagonists, in connection therewith, for their judging (vv. 15, 16), there follows a *second* reason, namely, *that His witness to Himself is no violation of the Jewish law, but has more than the amount of truth thereby required.* — καὶ . . . δέ] *atque etiam*, as above in ver. 16. — τῷ ἑμῷ.] emphatically, from the point of view of His opponents (comp. x. 34, xv. 25), who took their stand thereon, and regarded Jesus as a παράνομον, and even in ver. 13 had had in view a well-known prescription of the law. The words of Christ are therefore no doubt anti-Judaic, but not in themselves antinomian (Schweizer, Baur, Reuss), or belonging to a later Christian point of view (De Wette, B. Crusius, Tholuck); nor must they be taken to mean: for Christ and believers the law exists no longer (Messner, *Lehre der Apostel.* p. 345); though,

no doubt, they expressed His consciousness of being exalted above the Jewish law as it then was, and in the strange and hostile form in which it met Him. Accordingly, Keim<sup>1</sup> is mistaken in saying: "In *this* way neither could *Jesus* speak nor *John* write—not even *Paul*." See v. 45–47, vii. 19, 22 f., v. 39, x. 35, xix. 36.—The passage itself from the law is quoted with considerable freedom (Deut. xvii. 6, xix. 15), ἀνθρώπων being uttered with intentional emphasis, as Jesus draws a conclusion *a minori ad majus*. If the law demands two *human* witnesses, in my witness there is still more; for the witnesses whose declaration is contained therein are (1) my own individuality; and (2) the Father who has sent me; as His representative and interpreter, therefore, I testify, so that *my* witness is also *His*. That which took place, as to substance, in the living and inseparable unity of the divine-human consciousness, to wit, *His* witnessing, and *God's* witnessing, Jesus discriminates here only *formally*, for the sake of being able to apply the passage of the law in question, from which He argues κατ' ἄνθρωπον; but not incorrectly (Schenkel): hence, also, there is no need for supplying in thought to ἐγώ: "*As a human knower of myself, as an honest man*" (Paulus), and the like; or even, "*as the Son of God*" (Olshausen, who also brings in the Holy Ghost).

Ver. 19. The question of the Pharisees, who only pretend not to understand what Jesus means by the words ὁ πέμψας με πατήρ, between which and ver. 27 there is no inconsistency, is *frivolous mockery*. "Where is, then, this second witness, thy Father?" He has no actual existence! He ought, surely, to be here on the spot, if, as thou hast said, He were a witness with thee on thy behalf! To regard their question as the expression of a *veritable material apprehension* on their part, that He referred to a *physical father* (Augustine, Bede, and several; also De Wette, Olshausen, Brückner, and, doubtfully, Lücke), some also having found in it a blasphemous allusion to bastardy (Cyril, Ammon), is irreconcilable with the cir-

<sup>1</sup> See his *Geschichtlich. Christ.* p. 14, ed. 3. Note, on the contrary, that it is John himself who stands *higher* than Paul. But not even the Johannean Jesus has broken with the law, or treated it as antiquated. See especially vv. 45–47. His relation to the law is also that of πλῆρωσι.

cumstance that Jesus had already so frequently and unmistakeably pointed to *God* as His Father; the questioners themselves also betray their dissimulation by the word *ποῦ*; they do not ask *τίς*. Totally different is the relation of the question put by Philip in xiv. 8. — The *reply* of Jesus unveils to them with clear composure whence it arose that they put so wicked a question. To take the words *οὔτε ἐμὲ* as far as *μου* as a *question* is less appropriate (Ewald), as it is scarcely likely that Jesus was *taken by surprise*. *Εἰ ἐμὲ ᾗδετε*, etc., rest on the fact that the Father reveals Himself in Him. Comp. xiv. 9, xvi. 3.

Ver. 20. *Ταῦτα τὰ ῥήματα*] Vv. 12, 13. Godet arbitrarily imports into the text “words so important.” Comp. vi. 50. — *ἐν τῷ γαζοφυλῷ*] *At the treasury*. On *ἐν*, as denoting immediate neighbourhood, see Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* iv. 8. 22; Ast, *Lex. Plat.* I. p. 700; Winer, p. 360 [E. T. p. 481], who, however, is of opinion—though it cannot be substantiated—that the *place itself where* the treasury stood was called *γαζοφυλῷ*; so also Tholuck, Brückner. Respecting the *γαζοφυλάκιον*, which consisted of thirteen brazen chests destined to receive the taxes and charitable offerings in the temple, see on Mark xii. 41. In a place so much frequented in the forecourt of the women did Jesus thus speak,—and no one laid hands on Him. — *καὶ οὐδεὶς*, etc.] Historical refrain, constituting a kind of triumphal (comp. vii. 30) close to the delivery of this discourse.

Ver. 21. A *new scene* here opens, as in ver. 12, and is therefore, after the analogy of ver. 12, to be placed in one of the *following days* (so also Ewald; and in opposition to Origen and the *common* supposition). — The connecting word, with which the further discussion on this occasion (it is different in ver. 12) takes its rise, is a word of grave *threatening*, more punitive than even vii. 34. — *οὐν*] As no one had laid hand on Him, comp. ver. 12. — *πάλιν*, as in ver. 12, indicating the delivery of a *second discourse*, not a repetition of vii. 34. — *αὐτοῖς*] to the Jews who were present in the temple, vv. 20, 22. — *ζητήσετε με*] namely, as a deliverer from the misfortunes that are coming upon you, as in vii. 34. But instead of the clause there added, *καὶ οὐχ εὐρήσετε*, here we have the far more

tragic and positive declaration, κ. ἐν τ. ἁμαρτ. ὑμ. ἀποθ. *and* (not reconciled and sanctified, but) *in your sin* (still laden with it and your unatoned guilt, ix. 34; 1 Cor. xv. 17) *ye shall die*, namely, in the universal misfortunes amid which you will lose your lives. Accordingly, ἐν is the state *wherein*, and not the cause *whereby* (Hengstenberg) they die. The text does not require us to understand *eternal* death, although that is the *consequence* of dying in this state. 'Εν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ὑμῶν, however, is to be taken in a *collective* sense (see ver. 24, i. 29, ix. 41), and not as *merely* referring to the sin of *unbelief*; though being itself sin (xvi. 9), it is the ground of the non-extinction and increase of their sin. Between ζητήσετέ με, finally, and the dying in sin, there is no contradiction; for the seeking in question is not the seeking of *faith*, but merely that seeking of *desperation* whose object is merely deliverance from *external* afflictions. The *futility* of that search, so fearfully expressed by the words καὶ—ἀποθαν., is further explained by ὅπου ἐγὼ ὑπάγω, etc., for they cannot ascend into *heaven*, in order to find Jesus as a deliverer, and to bring Him down (to this view xiii. 33 is not opposed). Accordingly, these words are to be taken quite as in vii. 34, not as referring to the *hell* into which they would come through death; for Jesus speaks, not of their condition *after*, but *up to*, their death.

Ver. 22. It did not escape the notice of the Jews that in using ὑπάγω He meant a *voluntary* departure. But that *they* should not be able to come whither *He* goeth away, excites in them, not fear and concern on His account (Ewald), but *impious mockery*; and they ask: Surely he will not *kill* himself, in that he saith, etc.? In this case, indeed, we shall not be able to reach him! The emphasis rests on ἀποκτενεῖ, as the *mode* in which they scornfully conceive the ὑπάγειν to take place. — *Gehenna* being the ὅπου which would follow on such a departure (Joseph. *Bell.* iii. 8. 5, and see Wetstein and Ewald, *Alterth.* p. 232). The scorn (which Hengstenberg also groundlessly denies) is similar to that in vii. 35, only much more malicious.

Vv. 23, 24. Without further noticing their venomous scorn, Jesus simply holds up before them, with more firm and elevated calmness, *their own low nature*, which made them

capable of thus mocking Him, because they did not understand Him, the heavenly One. — ἐκ τῶν κάτω] *from the lower regions, i.e. ἐκ τῆς γῆς* (comp. Acts ii. 19), the opposite of τὰ ἄνω, *the heavenly regions*; ἄνω being used of *heavenly* relations in solemn discourse (Col. iii. 1, 2; Gal. iv. 26; Phil. iii. 14); comp. on ἀνωθεν, iii. 31. 'Εκ designates *derivation*; you spring from the earth, I from the heaven. To understand κάτω as denoting the *lower world* (Origen, Nonnus, Lange), a meaning which Godet also considers as *included* in it, would correspond, indeed, to the current classical usage, but is opposed by the parallel of the second half of the verse. — οὐκ εἰμι ἐκ τ. κόσμου τούτου] *I do not spring from this* (pre-Messianic, comp. αἰὼν οὗτος) *world*; negative expression of His supra-mundane, heavenly derivation.<sup>1</sup> Comp. xviii. 36. Both halves of the verse contain the same thought; and the clauses ἐκ τῶν κάτω ἐστέ and ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου ἐστέ imply, in their full signification, that those men are also of *such a character and disposition* as correspond to their low extraction, without higher wisdom and divine life. Comp. iii. 31. Therefore had Jesus said to them—He refers them again to His words in ver. 24—they would die in their sins; and now He adds the reason: ἐὰν γὰρ, etc.; for only *faith* can help those to the higher divine ζωή in time and eternity (i. 12, iii. 15 f., vi. 40 ff., xvii. 3, *al.*), who are ἐκ τῶν κάτω and ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, and consequently, as such, are born flesh of flesh.—Notice, that in this repetition of the minatory words the emphasis, which in ver. 20 rested on ἐν τ. ἀμ. ὑμ., is laid on ἀποθαν.; and that thus prominence is given to the *perishing itself*, which could only be averted by conversion to faith. — ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι] *namely, the Messiah*, the great name which every one understood without explanation, which concentrated in itself the highest hopes of all Israel on the basis of the old prophecies, and which was the *most present thought* both to Jesus and the Jews, especially in all their discussions—to

<sup>1</sup> Not merely of the heavenly *direction of His spirit* (Weizsäcker), which must be taken for granted in the Christ who springs from above (comp. iii. 31). Wherever Christ speaks of His heavenly descent, He speaks in the consciousness of having had a pre-human, supra-mundane existence (in the consciousness of the Logos), xvii. 5, and lays claim to a transcendent relation of His essential nature. Comp. Weiss, *Lehrbegr.* p. 215 f. Nonnus: ξῖνος ἰφυν κόσμου.

Jesus, in the form, "I am the Messiah;" to the Jews, in the form of either, "Is *He* the Messiah?" or, "*This* is not the Messiah, but another, who is yet to come." Comp. ver. 28, xiii. 19. In opposition to the notion of there being another, Jesus uses the emphatic *ἐγώ*. The non-mention of the name, which was taken for granted (it had been *mentioned* in iv. 25, 26), confers on it a quiet *majesty* that makes an irresistible impression on the minds of the hearers whilst Christ gives utterance to the brief words, *ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι*. As God comprehended the sum of the Old Testament faith in *אני ה' יי* (Deut. xxxii. 39; Isa. xli. 13, xliii. 10), so Christ that of the New Testament in *ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι*. Comp. Hofmann, *Schribbew.* I. p. 63 f. The definite *confession* of this faith is given in xvi. 3, vi. 68, 69; 1 John iv. 2.

Ver. 25. The Jews understand the *ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι* well enough, but refuse to recognise it, and therefore ask pertly and contemptuously: *σὺ τίς εἶ*; *tu quis es?* *σύ* being emphasized for the purpose of expressing disdain; comp. Acts xix. 15. Jesus replies with a *counter-question of surprise* at so great obduracy on their part; but then at once after ver. 26 discontinues any further utterance regarding them, His opponents. His counter-question is: *τὴν ἀρχὴν ὧ, τι καὶ λαλῶ ὑμῖν?* *What I from the very beginning also say to you?* namely, do you ask that? Who I am (to wit, the Messiah, vv. 24, 29), that is the very thing which, from the very beginning, since I have been among you, and have spoken to you, has formed the matter of my discourse;<sup>1</sup> and can you still ask about that, as though you had not yet heard it from me? They ought to have *known* long ago, and to have *recognised*, what they just now *asked* with their wicked question *σὺ τίς εἶ*. This view is not complicated, as Winer objects, but corresponds simply to the words and to the situation. On *ἀρχήν* as used frequently in an adverbial sense, both among the Greeks and by the LXX, with and without the article, to denote time, *ab initio*, *from the very beginning*, see Schweighäuser, *Lex. Herod.* I. p. 104 f.; Lennep *ad Phalar.* p. 82 ff. It *precedes* the relative, because it is the *point* which makes the obduracy of the Jews so very perceptible; comp. iv. 18; Buttmann, *Neut. Gram.*

<sup>1</sup> According to John, at His very first appearance in the temple, ii. 19.

p. 333 d. [E. T. p. 389]. — ὃ, τι] interrogatively, in relation to a question with τίς immediately preceding,—as is frequently the case even in the Classics, so that some such words as *thou askest* must be supplied in thought. See Kühner, II. § 837, note 1; Bernhardt, p. 443; Krüger, § 51. 17. 3. — καί] also, expresses the *corresponding* relation (Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 152), in this case, of *speech* to *being*: what from the very beginning, as *I am* it, so also, *I say* it to you. — λαλῶ] *speak*, not: *say*. Comp. on vv. 26, 43; and see on Rom. iii. 19. Nor does He use λελάληκα, because it is a *continuous* speaking; the sound of it is, in fact, still ringing in their ears from vv. 23, 24. — The passage is also taken *interrogatively* by Matthaei, Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Lücke. The latter<sup>1</sup> renders: *Why, indeed, do I still speak to you at all?* With this view, it is true, τὴν ἀρχὴν is quite compatible; for it is confessedly often used in the Classics for *ab initio*, in the sense of *omnino* (Raphel, *Herod. in loc.*; Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 723; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* I. p. 237; Breitenbach, *ad Xen. Oec.* ii. 12), though only in *negative* propositions, or such whose signification really amounts to a negation,<sup>2</sup> which latter, however, might be the case here (as in Plat. *Demod.* p. 381 D; Philo, *de Abr.* p. 366 C); it is also allowable to take ὃ, τι in the sense of *why* (see on Mark ix. 11; Buttmann, *neut. Gram.* p. 218 [E. T. p. 253]). But the *thought itself* has so little meaning in it, and is so little natural, expressing, besides, a

<sup>1</sup> So, without doubt, Chrysostom also, who gives as the meaning: τοῦ ὅλως ἀκούειν τῶν λόγων τῶν παρ' ἐμοῦ ἀνάξιστόν ἐστι, μήτις γὰρ καὶ μαθεῖν ὅστις ἐγώ εἰμι. Comp. Cyril and Theophylact, also Euth. Zigabenus. Matthaei explains the words in exact accordance with Lücke: "*Cur vero omnino vobiscum loquor? cur frustra vobiscum disputo?*" See *ed. min.* I. p. 575. With this also is in substantial agreement the view of Ewald, who, however, regards the words rather as the expression of righteous indignation than as a question: "*That I should, indeed, speak to you at all!*" It would be more correct to say: "*That I should at all even (still) speak to you!*" But how greatly is the *at all* thus in the way! "Οτι, too, would then need a supplement, which is not furnished by the text. Besides, the following words, especially if introduced without an ἀλλὰ or μίντοι (indicating that Jesus had collected Himself again, and suppressed His indignation), would not be appropriate. In the *Theol. Quartalschr.* 1855, p. 592 ff., Nirschl renders: "*To what purpose shall I speak further to you of the origin, i.e. of God, and my own derivation from Him?*" But on this view Christ ought, at the very least, to have said τὴν ἀρχὴν μου.

<sup>2</sup> See especially Lennep, *l.c.* and p. 94; Brückner on the passage.

reflection, which is at the bottom so empty, and, at the same time, through τὴν ἀρχήν, so expanded and destitute of feeling, that we should scarcely expect it at the lips of the Johannean Jesus, especially in circumstances so lively and significant as the present. Further thus understood, the saying would have no connection whatever with what follows, and the logical connection assumed by Lücke would require the insertion of some such words as περὶ ἐμοῦ. The words would thus likewise stand in no relation to the question σὺ τίς εἶ, whereas John's general manner would lead us to expect an answer which had reference in some significant way or other to the question which had been put. The following are *non-interrogative views*:—(1) "*What I have already said to you at the beginning, that am I!*" So Tholuck after Castalio, Beza, Vatablus, Maldonatus, Clericus, Heumann, and several others; also B. Crusius. Jesus would thus be announcing that He had already, from the very beginning in His discourses, made known His higher personality. The Praes. λαλῶ, as expressing that which still continues to be in the present, would not be opposed to this view; but it does not harmonize with the arrangement of the words; and logically, at all events, καὶ ought to stand before τὴν ἀρχήν (comp. Syriac). (2) "*From the very first (before all things), I am what I also speak to you.*" So De Wette; comp. Luther ("I am your preacher; if you first believe that, you will then learn what I am, and not otherwise"), Melancthon, Aretius, and several; also Maier, who, however, takes τὴν ἀρχήν incorrectly as *thoroughly (nothing else)*.<sup>1</sup> On this view Jesus, instead of answering directly: "I am the Messiah," would have said that He was to be known above all things from His discourses.<sup>2</sup> But τὴν

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Winer, p. 432 [E. T. p. 581], who gives as the meaning: "*I am entirely that which I represent myself as being in my discourses.*" So also Godet: "Absolument ce que je vous dis; ni plus ni moins que ce que renferme ma parole." But τ. ἀρχήν is used in the sense of *completely, entirely*, only in connection with negations (usually, too, *without* the article): *not at all, not in the least*; "cum negatione praefracte negando servit," Ellendt, *Lex. Soph. l.c.*

<sup>2</sup> Under this head belongs also the view taken by Grotius (which is substantially adopted by Lange): "*Primum (in the first instance) hoc sum, quod et dico vobis, hoc ipsum quod me hoc ipso tempore esse dixi, i.e. lux mundi.*" As though we read: *πρῶτον μὲν ὅ, τι καὶ λέγω ὑμῖν*. In the same way as Grotius, has



ἀρχὴν does not mean "above all things," not even in Xen. *Cyr.* i. 2, 3, where we read: τὴν ἀρχὴν μὴ τοιοῦτοι, *at the very outset not such, i.e. not such at all, omnino non tales*; just as little too in Herod. i. 9, where also, as frequently in Herodotus, it denotes *omnino*; comp. Wolf, *Dem. Lept.* p. 278. And how entirely without any reference would be the words *ante omnia* (surely some sort of *posterius* would need to be supplied in thought). Brückner has rightly, therefore, rejected the "above all things" in De Wette's rendering, though regarding it as the only correct one, and keeping to the interpretation "from the very first" in its *temporal* sense. One cannot, however, see what is really intended by the words "from the very first, I am, etc.," especially as placed in such an emphatic position at the commencement of the clause. For Jesus had neither occasion nor ground for giving the assurance that He *had been* from the beginning of His appearance, and still *was*, such as He had declared Himself to be in His discourses, and therefore had not since become different. (3) "Undoubtedly (nothing else) *am I what I also say to you.*" So Kuinoel;—a view which assigns an incorrect meaning to τὴν ἀρχήν, and confounds λαλῶ with λέγω; objections which affect also the similar interpretation of Ebrard: "I am altogether that which I also say to you (that I am He)." (4) "At the very outset I declared of myself what I also explain to you, or what I also now say." So Starck, *Not. sel.* p. 106; Bretschneider. But the supplying of λελάληκα from the following λαλῶ (comp. Dissen, *Dem. de Cor.* p. 359) would only be suggested if we read ὁ, *τι καὶ νῦν λαλῶ ὑμῖν.* (5) Fritzsche (*Lit. Bl. z. allg. Kirchenz.* 1843, p. 513, and *de conform. Lachmann*, p. 53), whom Hengstenberg follows, takes the view: "Sum a rerum primordiis (i. 1) *ea natura, quam me esse vobis etiam profiteor.*" Jesus would thus have designated Himself as the *primal Logos*. Quite unintelligibly for His hearers, who had no occasion for taking τὴν ἀρχήν in the absolute sense, as though reminded of the angel of the Lord in Mal. iii. and Zech. xi., nor for understanding ὁ, *τι κ. λ. ὑμ.* as Fritzsche does; at all events, as far as the latter is concerned, λέγω ought to have been used instead of

Calov. also explained it, taking, however, τὴν ἀρχήν in the sense of *omnino, plane* (consequently like Winor).

λαλῶ. (6) Some connect τὴν ἀρχὴν with πολλὰ ἔχω, etc., ver. 26, and after λαλῶ ὑμῖν place merely a comma. So already Codd., Nonnus, Scaliger, Clarius, Knatchbull, Raphel, Bengel, and, more recently, Olshausen, Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* I. p. 65, II. p. 178, and Baeumlein. In taking the words thus, ὁ, τι is either written ὅτι, *because*, with Scaliger and Raphel (so also Bengel: "*principio, quum etiam loquor vobis* [Dativus commodi: '*ut credatis et salvemini*'] *multa habeo de vobis loqui*, etc."<sup>1</sup>), or is taken as a pronoun, *id quod*. In the latter way, Olshausen explains it, following Clarius: "*In the first place, as I also plainly say to you, I have much to blame and punish in you; I am therefore your serious admonisher.*" Baeumlein, however, renders: "*I have undoubtedly—as I also do—much to speak and to judge concerning you.*" But on this view of the words Jesus would have given no answer at all to the question σὺ τίς εἶ; according to Olshausen, τὴν ἀρχὴν would have to be transformed into πρῶτον, *in the first place*; and the middle clause, according to Olshausen and Baeumlein, would give a quite superfluous sense; while, according to the view of Bengel and Hofmann, it would be forced and unnatural. (7) Exegetically impossible is the interpretation of Augustine: "*Principium* (the very beginning of all things) *me credite, quia* (ὅτι) *et loquor vobis*, i.e. *quia humilis propter vos factus ad ista verba descendi*;" comp. Gothic, Ambrose, Bede, Ruperti, and several others. Calvin rightly rejects this interpretation, but himself gives one that is impossible. (8) Obscure, and an importation, is Luthardt's view (ὅτι, *that*: "*from the beginning am I, that I may also speak to you*"), that Jesus describes the act of His speaking, the existence of His word, as His presence for the Jews; that from His first appearance onwards,

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Hofmann: "At first, namely for the present, because this is the time, when He speaks to them, He has much to speak and to judge about them in words." Τὴν ἀρχὴν is alleged to be used in opposition to αὐτὸ τέλος, i.e. to a time when that which He now *speaks* will be proved by *deeds*, ver. 28. In this way meaning and connection are imported into the passage, and yet the καί (with an appeal to Hartung, *Partik.* I. p. 129) is completely neglected, or rather transferred from the relative to the principal clause. How the passages adduced by Hartung may be explained without any transference, see in Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 635 ff. In particular, there is no ground for supposing the existence of a *trajection* of the καί in the N. T. Hofmann explains, as though John had written: τὴν ἀρχὴν, ὅτι νῦν λαλῶ ὑμῖν, καὶ πολλὰ ἔχω, etc.

He who was then present as the Word of God on the earth had been always used to give Himself a presence for men in the Word. If, according to this view, as it would seem, τὴν ἀρχὴν ὅτι denotes : “*from the beginning it is my manner, that,*” this cannot possibly be in the simple εἰμή, which has to be supplied in thought; besides, how much is forced into the mere λαλῶ ὑμῖν!

Ver. 26. The question in ver. 25 was a *reproach*. To this (not to ver. 24, as Godet maintains) refers the word πολλά, which is placed with full emphasis at the beginning of the verse; the antithetical ἀλλ’, however, and the excluding word ταῦτα, inform us that He does *not* say the πολλά which He has to speak and judge of them (and which He has in readiness, in store); but merely that which He has heard from Him who sent Him. Comp. xvi. 12; 2 John 12. Similarly Euth. Zigabenus, after Chrysostom and B. Crusius. After the question in ver. 25, we must imagine a reproving *pause*. The paraphrase : “I have very much to speak concerning you, and especially to blame; but I refrain therefrom, and restrict myself to my immediate task, which is to utter forth to the world *that* which I have heard from God the True, who has sent me (namely, what I heard during my existence with God, before my mission; comp. on ver. 28<sup>1</sup>)—in other words, to the communication of divine truth to the world.” For divergent views of the course of thought, see Schott, *Opusc.* I. p. 94 ff. After the example of older writers, Lücke and De Wette take the view that Jesus meant to say: “But, however much I have to judge concerning you, my κρίσις is still ἀληθής; for I speak to the world only what I have heard from my Father, who is true.” Comp. also Tholuck. In this way, however, the antithesis has to be *artificially formed*, whilst the *expressed* antithesis between that which Jesus *has* to speak (ἔχω λαλεῖν) and that which He actually *says* (λέγω) is neglected. This is in answer to Ewald also, who imports into ἀλλ’ the meaning: “Yet I will not therefore be afraid, like a man;” and against Hengstenberg, who, after πολλά . . . κρίνειν, supplies in thought: “This is the reason why you will not accept my

<sup>1</sup> So also vv. 33, 40. Not as Beyschlag maintains: immediately before my public appearance. Comp. on vi. 46.

utterances in relation to my person." — *καὶ γὰρ*] and I, for my part, in contrast to God; the word is connected with *ταῦτα*, etc. — *ταῦτα*] this and nothing else. As to the main point, Chrysostom aptly says: *τὰ πρὸς σωτηρίαν, οὐ τὰ πρὸς ἔλεγχον.* — *εἰς τ. κόσμ.*] See on Mark i. 39. Comp. Soph. *El.* 596: *κήρυσσέ μ' εἰς ἅπαντας.* Not again *λαλῶ* (Lachmann, Tischendorf), but *λέγω*, because the notion has become by antithesis more definite: what He has heard, *that* it is which He *says*; He has something else to *say* to the world than to *speak* of the worthlessness of His opponents. The former He *does*; the latter, much occasion as He has for doing it, He *leaves undone*.

Ver. 27. *\*Ω τῆς ἀγνοίας!* οὐ διέλιπεν αὐτοῖς περὶ αὐτοῦ διαλεγόμενος, καὶ οὐκ ἐγίνωσκον, Chrysostom and Euth. Zigabenus calls them *φρενοβλαβεῖς*. But the surprising, nay more, the very improbable element (De Wette) which has been found in this non-understanding, disappears when it is remembered that at ver. 21 a *new* section of the discourse commenced, and that we are not obliged to suppose that precisely the same hearers were present in both cases (vv. 16, 17). The less, therefore, is it allowable to convert non-understanding into the idea of *non-recognition* (Lücke); or to regard it as equivalent to *obduracy* (Tholuck, Brückner); or to explain *ὅτι* as *in which sense* (Hofmann, *l.c.* p. 180); or with Luthardt, to press *αὐτοῖς*, and to give as the meaning of the simple words: "that in bearing witness to Himself He bears witness to *them* that the God who sends Him is the Father;" or with Ebrard, to find in *ἔλεγεν*: "*that it is His vocation*" to proclaim to them; or, with Hengstenberg, to understand *ἐγνώσαν*, etc., of the *true knowledge*, namely, of the *deity of Christ*. For such interpretations as these there is no foundation in the passage; it simply denotes: they knew not (comp. ver. 28) that in these words (*ὁ πέμψας με*, etc.) He spoke to them of the Father. On *λέγειν*, with the accus. in the sense of *λαλ. περί*, see Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Apolog.* p. 23 A; *Phaed.* p. 79 C. Comp. on i. 15.

Vv. 28, 29. *Οὖν*] not merely "a continuation of the narration" (De Wette), but: *therefore*, in reference to this non-understanding, as is also confirmed by the words *τότε γνώσεσθε*, which refer to *οὐκ ἐγνώσαν* in ver. 27, and, indeed, considered

as to its matter, logically correct, seeing that if the Jews had recognised the Messiahship of Jesus, they would also have understood what He said to them of the Father. — *ὅταν ὑψώσητε*, etc.] *when ye shall have lifted up*, namely, on to the cross. Comp. on iii. 14, vi. 62. The crucifixion is treated as an act of the Jews, who brought it about, as also in Acts iii. 14 f. — *τότε γνώσ.*] Comp. xii. 32, vi. 62. Then will the result follow, which till then you reject, that you will know, etc. Reason: because the death of Jesus is the condition of His *δόξα*, and of the mighty manifestations thereof (the outpouring of the Spirit; miraculous works of the apostles; building up of the Church; punishment of the Jews; second coming to judgment). Then shall your eyes be opened, which will take place partly with your own will, and still in time (as in Acts ii. 36 ff., iv. 4, vi. 7; Rom. xi. 11 ff.); partly against your will, and too late (comp. on Matt. xxiii. 39; Luke xiii. 34 f.). Bengel aptly remarks: “*cognoscetis ex re, quod nunc ex verbo non creditis.*”—*καὶ ἀπ’ ἐμαντοῦ*, etc.] still dependent on *ὅτι*, and, indeed, as far as *μετ’ ἐμοῦ ἐστιν*; so that to the universal *ποιῶ*, the special *λαλῶ* and the general *μετ’ ἐμοῦ ἐστιν* (is my helper and support) *together* correspond. Hence there is no brevity of discourse requiring to be completed by supplying in thought *λαλῶ* to *ποιῶ*, and *ποιῶ* along with *λαλῶ* (De Wette, after Bengel). Nonnus already took the correct view (he begins ver. 29 with *ὅτι καὶ*, etc.); and the objection (Lücke, De Wette, and several others) that *οὐκ ἀφῆκε*, etc. would then stand too disconnected, has no force, since it is just in John that the asyndetic continuation of a discourse is very common, and, in fact, would also be the case here if *καὶ ὁ πέμψ.* etc. were no longer dependent on *ὅτι*. — *ταῦτα*] is arbitrarily and without precedent (Matt. ix. 33 cannot be adduced as one) explained as equivalent to *οὕτως*, from a commingling of two notions. By the demonstrative *ταῦτα* Jesus means *His doctrine* generally (comp. ver. 26), *with whose presentation He was now occupied*. But of this He discoursed in harmony with the instructions received from the Father, *i.e.* in harmony with the instructions derived from His direct intuition of divine truth with the Father prior to His incarnation. Comp. ver. 38, i. 18, iii. 13, vi. 46, vii. 16 f. — *οὐκ ἀφῆκε*, etc.] Indepen-

dent corroboration of the last thought, negatively expressed on account of His apparent forsakenness in the face of many and powerful enemies. The *Praet.* refers to the experience felt in every case, during the course of His entire activity, until now (comp. afterwards πάντοτε), not to the point of time when He was sent; the reason afterwards assigned would not be appropriate to this latter reference. Comp. also xvi. 32. — ὅτι ἐγὼ, etc.] because I, etc. Reason assigned for the οὐκ ἀφήκε, etc. How could He ever leave me alone, as I am He who, etc.? (ἐγὼ with emphasis). Comp. xv. 10. Olshausen regards οὐκ ἀφήκε, etc. as the expression of equality of essence, and ὅτι as assigning the ground of His knowledge. The former idea is erroneous, as the meaning of οὐκ ἀφήκε, etc. is identical with that of μετ' ἐμοῦ ἔστιν; and the latter would be an inadequate reason, because it relates merely to moral agreement.

Vv. 30–32. The opening of a new section in the discourse, but not first on the following day (Godet), which must then have been indicated as in vv. 12, 21. — Notice the separation of the persons in question. The πολλοί are many among His hearers in general; among these πολλοί there were also Jewish hierarchs, and because He knew how fleeting and impure was their momentary faith,<sup>1</sup> Jesus addresses to them the words in vv. 31, 32, which at once had the effect of converting them into opponents; hence there is no inconsistency in His treatment of His hearers. — πεπιστ. αὐτῷ] previously ἐπίστ. εἰς αὐτόν. The latter was the consequence of their having believed Him, i.e. His words. — ἐὰν ὑμεῖς, etc.] if you on your part, etc.; for they were mixed up with the unbelieving crowd, and by means of ὑμεῖς are selected from it as the persons to whom the admonition and promise are addressed. They are to abide in the word of Jesus, that is, as in the permanent element of their inner and outer life. For another form of the conception, see ver. 38, xv. 7, xii. 47. Comp. 2 John 9. — ἀληθῶς] really, not merely in appearance, after being momentarily carried away. — γνῶσεσθε τ. ἀλήθ.] for divine truth is the content of the λόγος of Christ, Christ Him-

<sup>1</sup> Mere susceptibility to salvation is not termed Faith by John, as Messner (*Lehre der Ap.* p. 349) assumes in reference to this passage. Also not in vi. 69, or 1 John iv. 16.

self is its possessor and vehicle; and the *knowledge* of it, therefore, first commences when a man believes, inasmuch as the knowledge is the inwardly experienced, living, and moral *intelligence* of faith (xvii. 17; 1 John i. 3 ff.). — ἐλευθερ.] from the slavery, *i.e.* from the determining power, of sin. See ver. 34; Rom. vi. 18 ff. “Ea libertas est, quae pectus purum et firmum gestitat” (Ennius, fr. 340). Divine truth is conceived as the *causa medians* of that regeneration and sanctification which makes him morally free who is justified by faith. Comp. Rom. viii. 2; Jas. i. 20, ii. 12.

Ver. 33. Ἀπεκρίθησαν] No others can be the subject, but the πεπιστευκότες αὐτῷ Ἰουδαῖοι, ver. 31. So correctly, Melancthon (“offensi resiliunt”), Maldonatus, Bengel, Olshausen, Kling, B. Crusius, Hilgenfeld, Lange, Ewald, and several others, after the example of Chrysostom, who aptly observes: κατέπεσεν εὐθέως αὐτῶν ἡ διάνοια τοῦτο δὲ γέγονεν ἀπὸ τοῦ πρὸς τὸ κοσμικὰ ἐπτοῆσθαι. John himself has precluded us from supposing any other to be intended, by expressly referring (ver. 31) to those Jews among the πολλοί (ver. 30) who had believed, and emphatically marking them as the persons who conduct the following conversation. To them the last word of Jesus proved at once a stone of stumbling. Hence we must not suppose that *Jews* are referred to who had remained unbelieving and hostile (as do Augustine, Calvin, Lampe, Kuinoel, De Wette, Tholuck, Lücke, Maier, Hengstenberg), and different from those who were mentioned in ver. 31 (ἀπεκρ. *they*, indef.); nor do the words ζητεῖτέ με ἀποκτ. in ver. 37 necessitate this supposition, inasmuch as those πεπιστευκότες might have at once veered round and returned again to the ranks of the opposition, owing to the offence given to their national pride by the words in ver. 32. Accordingly, there is no warrant for saying with Luthardt that the reply came *primarily* from *opponents*, but that some of those who *believed* also chimed in from want of understanding. The text speaks *exclusively* of πεπιστευκότες. — σπέρμα Ἀβρ. ἐσμ.] to which, as being destined to become a blessing to, and to have dominion over, the world (comp. Gen. xxii. 17 f., xvii. 16), a state of bondage is something completely foreign. As every Hebrew servant was a son of Abraham, this major premiss of their

argument shows that they had in view, not their *individual* or civil (Grotius, Lücke, Godet), but their *national* liberty. At the same time, in their passion they leave out of consideration the Egyptian and Babylonian history of their nation, and look solely at the present generation, which the Romans had, in accordance with their prudent policy, left in possession of the semblance of political independence (Joseph. *Bell.* vi. 6. 2). This, according to circumstances, as in the present case, they were able to class at all events in the category of *non-bondage*. Hence there is no need even for the distinction between dominion *de facto* and *de jure*, the latter of which the Jews deny (Lange, Tholuck). Selden had already distinguished between *servitus extrinseca* and *intrinseca* (the latter of which would be denied by the Jews). On the passionate pride taken by the Jews in their freedom, and the ruinous consequences it brought upon them, see Lightfoot, p. 1045. According to Luthardt, they protest against *spiritual* dependence, not indeed as regards the disposition (B. Crusius), but *as regards their religious position*, in virtue of which all other nations are dependent on them, the privileged people of God, for their attainment of redemption. But the coarser misunderstanding of *national* freedom is more in keeping with other misapprehensions of the more spiritual meaning of Jesus found in John (comp. Nicodemus, the Woman of Samaria, the discourse about the Bread of Life); and what was likely to be more readily suggested to the proud minds of these sons of Abraham than the thought of the *κληρονομία τοῦ κόσμου* (comp. Rom. iv. 13), which in their imaginations excluded every sort of national bondage? Because they were Abraham's seed, they felt themselves as *αἷμα φέροντες ἀδέσποτον* (Nonnus).

Ver. 34. *Δείκνυσιν* (and that with solemn asseveration), *ὅτι δουλείαν ἐνέφηγεν ἂνωτέρω τὴν ἐξ ἁμαρτίας, οὐ τὴν ἐκ δυναστείας ἀνθρώπου*, Euth. Zigabenus. — *ὁ ποιῶν*] instead of keeping himself free from it. — *δοῦλος*] as to His moral personality or Ego, comp. as to the figure and subject-matter, Rom. vi. 17 ff., vii. 14 ff. Analogous examples from the Classics in Wetstein; from Philo in Loesner, p. 149.

Vv. 35, 36. But what prospect is there before the slave of



sin? Exclusion from the kingdom of the Messiah! This threat Jesus clothes in the *general principle* of civil life, that *a slave has no permanent place in the house*; he must allow himself to be sold, exchanged, or cast out. Comp. Gen. xxi. 10; Gal. iv. 30. The application intended to be made of this general principle is this: "The servant of sin does not remain eternally in the theocracy, but is cast out of the midst of the people of God at the establishment of the kingdom of Messiah." There is nothing to indicate that ὁ δοῦλος is intended to refer to *Ishmael* as a type of the bastard sons of Abraham, and ὁ υἱός to *Isaac* as a type of Christ (Ebrard); such a view rather is out of accord with this general expression in its present tense form, which simply marks an universally existing legal relation between the different positions of the *slave* and the *Son* of the house.—εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα] *for ever*, an expression to be understood in harmony with the *relation which has been figuratively represented*. After αἰῶνα a full stop should be inserted, with Lachmann and Kling, because ἐὰν οὖν, etc., is a consequence deduced simply from ὁ υἱὸς μ. εἰς τ. αἰ., not from what precedes, and because ὁ υἱός, etc., begins a new section in the logical progress of the discourse. The course of thought, namely, is this: (1) Whoever commits sin is the bondsman of sin, and is excluded from the Messianic people of God. (2) Quite different from the lot of the bondsman, who must quit the house, is that of the Son (of the Master of the house); hence it is this latter who procures for you actual freedom.—ὁ υἱὸς μένει εἰς τ. αἰῶνα] namely, ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ,—also a general proposition or principle, but with an intentional *application* of the general expression ὁ υἱός to *Christ*, who, as the Son of *God*, retains for ever His position and power in the house of God, *i.e.* in the theocracy;<sup>1</sup> comp. Heb. iii. 5, 6. From this μένει εἰς τ. αἰῶνα it follows (οὖν)

<sup>1</sup> If the *man* who is morally free be supposed to be the object of the intended application of ὁ υἱός—the man, namely, who "holds not merely an historical relation to God, but one that is essential, because ethically conditioned" (Luthardt, comp. De Wette)—we should have to take the second ὁ υἱός in the *sensu eminenti* (of *Christ*). The text, however, especially as ver. 36 is connected with ver. 35 by οὖν, offers no ground for this distinction. Hence, also, it is wrong to apply ὁ υἱός in ver. 35 to those who are liberated by Christ *along with* Christ (Hengstenberg). These first come under consideration in ver. 36.

that if He frees from the state of a bondsman, a *real* and not merely an apparent freedom commences, seeing that, on account of the perpetual continuance of His domestic rights in the theocracy, the emancipation effected by Him must have a real and finally valid result. This would not necessarily be the case if He remained merely for a time in the house; for as both His right and ἐξουσία would then lack certainty and permanence, so the freedom He procured would also lack the guarantee of reality. This line of argumentation presupposes, moreover, that the *Father* does not Himself directly act in the theocracy; He has entrusted to the *Son* the power and control. — The reference of ὁ δούλος to *Moses* (Euth. Zigabenus, after Chrysostom) is foreign and opposed to the text, see ver. 34. Grotius, however, aptly remarks: "tribuitur hic filio quod modo veritati, quia eam profert filius." — ὄντως] *in reality*; every other freedom is mere appearance (comp. ver. 33), not corresponding to its true nature; no other is ἡ παντελὴς καὶ ἀπὸ πασῶν ἀρχῶν ἐλευθερία (Plat. *Legg.* iii. p. 698 A), which alone is that gained through Christ, 1 Cor. iii. 22; Rom. viii. 35, 36; 2 Cor. vi. 4, 5.

Ver. 37. Now also He denies that they are *children of Abraham*, although hitherto they had boastfully relied on the fact as the premiss of their freedom, ver. 33. — ἀλλὰ ζητεῖτε] How opposed to a true, spiritual descent from Abraham! The reproach, however, had its *justification*, because these Jews had already turned round again, and the death of Jesus was the goal of the hierarchical opposition. — οὐ χωρεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν] *has no progress in you*, in your heart. This view of the meaning, which is philologically correct (Plat. *Legg.* iii. p. 684 E; *Eryx.* p. 398 B; ἢ ἐμῆλθεν ὁ λόγος χωρῆσθαι αὐτῷ; Herod. iii. 42, v. 89; Xen. *Oec.* i. 11; Polyb. 28. 15, 12, 10. 15, 4; Aristoph. *Pax*, 472; *Ran.* 472; 2 Macc. iii. 40), thoroughly applies to the persons concerned; because whilst the word of Christ had penetrated their heart and made them for the time believers (vv. 30, 31), it had had no further development, it had made no *advance*; on the contrary, they had gone back again after believing for a moment. Hence, also, it is not allowable to take ἐν ὑμῖν as equivalent to *inter vos* (Lücke, Hengstenberg). Others interpret: *It finds*

*no place in you* (Vulgate: *non capit in vobis*; so Origen? Chrysostom, Theophylact, Erasmus, Castalio, Beza, Aretius, Maldonatus, Corn. a Lapide, Jansen, and several others; also B. Crusius, Ewald, and Baeumlein). Without any warrant from usage.<sup>1</sup> Others again render: It finds no *entrance* into you; so that ἐν ὑμῖν would be used pregnantly, indicating the persistence that follows upon movement. So Nonnus, Grotius, Kuinoel, De Wette, Maier, Tholuck, Luthardt. The expression would have to be referred back to the meaning—*move forward, stretch forward* (Wisdom vii. 23; 2 Pet. iii. 9, and frequently in classical writers). But this explanation is neither indicated by the text (for the words are not εἰς ὑμᾶς), nor is it even appropriate to the sense, seeing that the word of Christ had actually stirred those men to momentary faith. At the same time, this explanation, however, is forced on those who refuse to regard the πεπιστευκότες in ver. 31 as those who answer in ver. 33.

Ver. 38. That my word has thus failed to produce any effect in you, is due to the fundamentally different origin of my discourse on the one hand, and of your doings on the other. — ἐώρακα π. τ. πατρί] by which Jesus means the intuition of the divine truth which He derived from His *pre-human* state (comp. on ver. 28), not from His intercourse with God in time (Godet, Beyschlag), as though this latter were involved in the parallel καὶ ὑμεῖς, whereas the *difference* in the analogous relation is already betrayed by the very difference of expression (ἤκουσατε and παρὰ τοῦ πατρός). — καὶ ὑμεῖς οὖν] *you also therefore*, following my example of dependence on the Father. There is a stinging irony in the word οὖν. — ἤκουσατε] *i.e.* what your father has commanded you. Note the distinction between the perf. and aor. *Who* their father is, Jesus leaves as yet unsaid; He means, however, the *devil*, whose children, *ethically* considered, they are; whereas He is the Son of God in the essential, metaphysical sense. — ποιεῖτε] *habitual* doing (vii. 51), including, but not

<sup>1</sup> Aristot. *H. A.* ix. 40, is not relevant; χαριῇ there is impersonal, and the words mean: *if there is no advance* in their work. — The sense: *It has no place in you*, ought to have been expressed τὸν λόγον οὐ χαριῇτι ἐν ὑμῖν. Comp. xxi. 25, and see on 2 Cor. vii. 2.

exclusively referring to, their wish to kill Him (ver. 37). It is *indicative*, and no more imperative (Hengstenberg, after Matt. xxiii. 32) than in ver. 41.

Vv. 39, 40. The Jews observe that He means another father than Abraham. — Jesus proves to them from their non-Abrahamic mode of action that they are no children of Abraham. — τέκνα and ἔργα are correlates; the former is used in an *ethical* sense, so that here (comp. ver. 37) a distinction is drawn, as in Rom. ix. 8, between the fleshly σπέρμα and the moral τέκνα. — In the reading ἐστε (see the critical notes) there is a change in the view of the relationship, as in Luke xvii. 5 f. See remarks on the passage. On the non-employment of ἄν, see Buttmann in *Studien u. Kritiken* for 1858, p. 485, and his *Neutest. Gramm.* p. 195 [E. T. p. 224]. — νῦν δέ] but under such circumstances, *nunc autem*. — ἄνθρωπον in reference to παρὰ τ. θεοῦ. The λελάληκα following in the *first* person is regular; see Buttm. *Neut. Gramm.* p. 241 [E. T. p. 396]. — τοῦτο] seek to take the life of a man who speaks the truth which he has heard of God — *that Abraham did not do!*<sup>1</sup> The words are far from referring to Abraham's conduct towards the angel of the Lord, Gen. xviii. (Hengstenberg, after Lampe); nor is such a reference involved in ver. 56. — παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ] when I was in my pre-human state, παρὰ τῷ πατρί μου, ver. 38. To this view ἄνθρωπον is not opposed (Bey-schlag), for Jesus must needs describe Himself in this general human manner, if there were to be congruity between the category of His self-description and the *example of Abraham*.

Ver. 41. *You do what your father is in the habit of doing*, — result of vv. 39, 40, though *still* without specifying *who* this father is. "Paulatim procedit castigatio" (Grotius). — As the Jews are not to look upon Abraham as their father, they imagine that some other human father must be meant. In this case, however, they would be bastards, born of fornication (the fornication of Sarah with another man); and they would have two fathers, an actual one (from whom they descend ἐκ πορνείας) and a putative one (Abraham). But inasmuch as

<sup>1</sup> The expression is a *Litotes* ("From the like of this the God-fearing spirit of the patriarch was far removed"), but all the more fitted to put them to shame.

their descent is not an adulterous one,<sup>1</sup> and notwithstanding that Abraham is not to be regarded as their father, there remains in opposition to the assertion of Jesus, so they think, only *God* as the one Father; to Him, therefore, they assign this position: "*We be not born of fornication*," as thou seemest to assume, in that thou refusest to allow that Abraham is our father; *one father only* (not two, as is the case with such as are born of adultery) *have we*, and that *God*, if our descent from Abraham is not to be taken into consideration. For God was not merely the creator (Mal. ii. 10) and *theocratic* Father of the people (Isa. lxiii. 16, lxiv. 8); but His Fatherhood was further and specially grounded in the power of His promise made at the conception of Isaac (Rom. iv. 19; Gal. iv. 23). The supposition that they implicitly drew a contrast between themselves and *Ishmael* (Euth. Zigabenus, who thinks that there is an allusion to the birth of Jesus, Ruperti, Wetstein, Tittmann) is erroneous, inasmuch as Ishmael was not born ἐκ πορνείας. We must reject also the common explanation of the passage as a denial of the charge of *idolatry* (Hos. i. 2, ii. 4; Ezek. xx. 30; Isa. lvii. 3); "our filial relationship to God has not been polluted by idolatry" (De Wette; comp. Grotius, Lampe, Kuinoel, Lücke, Tholuck, Lange, Hengstenberg, Baumlein, and several others). It is quite opposed to the context, however, for the starting-point is not the idea of a superhuman Father, nor are the Jews reproached at all with idolatry; but the charge is brought against them, that Abraham is not their father; hence also the supposition of an antithesis to a combined Jewish *and heathen* descent (Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theophylact, Godet), such as was the case with

<sup>1</sup> Ἐκ πορνείας implies one mother, but several fathers. Who is the one mother, follows from the denial of the paternity of *Abraham*, consequently *Sarah*, the ancestress of the theocratic people. Hence the inadmissibility of Luthardt's explanation based on the idea, "Israel is Jehovah's spouse;" according to which the thought of the Jews would have been: they were not sprung from a marriage covenant of Israel with another, so that Jehovah would thus be merely nominally their father, in reality, however, another; and they would thus have several fathers. Moreover, a *marriage* covenant between Israel and another would be a contradiction, this other must needs also be conceived as a true *God*, consequently as a *strange* God, a notion which Luthardt justly rejects. It is surprising how B. Crusius could adduce Deut. xxiii. 2 for the purpose of representing the Jews as affirming their theocratic equality of birth.

the *Samaritans* (Paulus), is inadmissible. Ewald also takes the same simple and correct view;<sup>1</sup> comp. Erasmus, *Paraphr.* Bengel, however, aptly characterizes the entire objection raised by the Jews as a "*novus importunitatis Judaicae paroxysmus.*" — ἡμεῖς] spoken with the emphasis of pride.

Ver. 42 f. God is not your Father, else would ye love me, because ye would be of like descent with me; ἐνὸς γεγαῶτα τοκῆος ἀρραγέος φιλῆς ἀλύτῳ ξυνώσατε θεσμῷ, Nonnus. This ἀγαπᾶτε ἂν ἐμὲ would be "the ethical test" (Luthardt) of the like paternity; the fact of its *non-existence*, although it *might have existed*, is evidence to the contrary. — ἐγώ] spoken with a feeling of divine assurance. — ἐξῆλθον] the *proceeding forth from that essential pre-human fellowship with God*, which was His as the *Son of God*, and which took place through the incarnation (xiii. 3, xvi. 27, 28, 30, xvii. 8). The idea of a mere *sending* would not be in harmony with the context, the proper subject of which is the *Fatherhood* of God; comp. vi. 62, xvii. 5. — καὶ ἤκω] Result of the ἐξῆλθον: *and am here*, it belongs, along with the rest, also to ἐκ τ. θεοῦ. — οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ, etc.] Confirmation of ἐκ τ. θεοῦ, etc.; *for not even of my own self-determination*, etc. If Jesus, namely, had not manifested Himself as proceeding from God, He might have come either from a third person, or, at all events, ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ; on the contrary, not even (οὐδέ) was this latter the case. — Ver. 43. After having shown them that they were the children neither of Abraham nor of God, before positively declaring *whose* children they actually are, He discloses to them the ground of their not understanding His discourse; for everything that they had advanced from ver. 33 onwards had been in fact such a non-understanding. The form of expression here used, namely, *question and answer* (ὅτι, *because*; comp. Rom. ix. 32; 2 Cor. xi. 11), is an outflow of the grow-

<sup>1</sup> Although characterized by Ebrard as *absurd*. He regards *ἡμεῖς οὐ γεγ.* as merely a "*caricatured form*" of the accusation that they are not Abraham's children, and in this way, of course, gets rid of the need of *explaining* the words. He then takes *ἡμεῖς ἕνα πατέρα ἔχομεν* in the sense of *we and thou have one common Father*, which is incompatible with the word *ἡμεῖς*, which also belongs to *ἔχομεν*, and is, besides, altogether opposed to the context; for the entire dialogue is constituted by the *antithesis* of *we and thou*, *I and ye*. Ebrard's view is an unfortunate evasion of a *desperate* kind.

ing excitement; Dissen, *ad Dem. de Cor.* p. 186, 347. De Wette (comp. Luther, Beza, Calvin) takes ὅτι as equivalent to εἰς ἐκεῖνο ὅτι (see on ii. 18): "I say this with reference to the circumstance that." Illogical, as the clauses must then have stood in the reverse order (διατί οὐ δύνασθε . . . ὅτι τὴν λαλίαν, etc.), because, namely, the words οὐ γινώσκετε denote the relation which is *clear* from what has preceded. — In the question and in the answer, that on which the emphasis rests is thrown *to the end*. His discourse was *unintelligible* to them, because its substance, to wit, His *word*, was inaccessible to their apprehension, because they had no ears for it. For the cause of this ethical οὐ δύνασθε, see ver. 47. λαλιά, which in classical Greek denoted *talk, chatter* (see on iv. 42), signifies in later writers (e.g. Polyb. 32. 9, 4; Joseph. *Bell.* ii. 8. 5), and in the LXX. and Apocrypha, also *Discourse, Sermo*,<sup>1</sup> without any contemptuous meaning. Comp. Matt. xxvi. 73. So also here; indeed, so different is it from ὁ λόγος, that whilst this last mentioned term denotes the doctrinal substance expressed by the λαλιά,—the *doctrine, the substance* of that which is delivered,<sup>2</sup>—λαλιά denotes the *utterance itself*, by which expression is given to the doctrine. Comp. xii. 48: ὁ λόγος ὃν ἐλάλησα; Phil. i. 14; Heb. xii. 7.

Ver. 44. After the negative statement in vv. 42, 43 comes now the positive: Ye (ὁμεῖς, with great, decided emphasis—ye people, who deem yourselves children of God!) *are children of the devil*,<sup>3</sup> in the sense, namely, of *ethical genesis* (comp.

<sup>1</sup> On ἀλλος in bonam partem, see Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* vi. p. 99, vii. p. 140.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. Weizsäcker in *d. Jahrb. für deutsche Theol.* 1857, p. 196 f. But in the gospel it is always the *verbum vocale*, and it should not be confounded with the λόγος of the prologue, which is the *verbum substantiale*; hence, also, it furnishes no evidence of a deviation from the doctrine of the Logos. The consciousness Jesus possessed of speaking, keeping, doing, etc., the λόγος of God, rested on His consciousness of His *being* that which is denoted by the Logos of the prologue. Now this consciousness is not the abstract divine, but that of the *divine-human Ego*, corresponding to the ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο.

<sup>3</sup> In his *Leben Jesu* (p. 338 ff.), Schleiermacher groundlessly advances the opinion that Jesus had here no intention of teaching any doctrine regarding the devil, but wished merely to add force to His reproach by referring to the generally-adopted interpretation of the narrative of the fall. On the contrary, by His reproach, he not merely *lays down* the doctrine, but also further intentionally and explicitly *expounds* it, especially by assigning the ground, ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν, etc. Baur (still in his *Neut. Theol.* p. 393) deduces from this passage that, according

1 John iii. 8, 12), which is further explained from *ἐκεῖνος* onward. The expression must therefore not be regarded as teaching an *original* difference in the natures of men (Hilgenfeld, comp. on iii. 6). — *ἐκ τοῦ πατρ. τ. διαβ.*] *of the father who is the devil*, not of *your* father, etc. (De Wette, Lücke), which is inappropriate after the emphatic *ὑμεῖς*, or ought to have been specially marked as emphatic (*ὑμεῖς ἐκ τοῦ ὑμῶν πατρὸς*, etc.). Nonnus well indicates the qualitative character of the expression: *ὑμεῖς δῆτα τέκνα δυσαντέος ἐστὲ τοκῆος*. Hilgenfeld's view, which is adopted by Volkmar: "Ye descend from the father of the devil," which father is the (Gnostic) God of the Jews, is not only generally unbiblical, but thoroughly un-Johannine, and here opposed to the context. John could have written simply *ἐκ τοῦ διαβ.*, if the connection had not required that prominence should be given to the idea of *father*. But in the entire connection there is nothing that would call for a possible father of the *devil*; the question is solely of the devil himself, as the father of *those* Jews. Erroneously also Grotius, who explains the passage as though it ran, — *τοῦ πατρ. τῶν διαβόλων. — καὶ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας*, etc.] The *conscious will* of the child of the devil is to accomplish that after which its father, whose organ it is, lusts. This is rooted in the similarity of their moral nature. The *desire to kill* is not exclusively referred to, though, as even the plural *ἐπιθυμίας* shows, it is included. — *ἐκεῖνος*, etc.] for *murder* and *lying* were just the two devilish lusts which they were minded to carry out against *Jesus*. — *ἀνθρωποκτόνος ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς*] *from the beginning* of the human race. This more exact determination of the meaning is derivable from *ἀνθρωποκτόνος*, inasmuch as it was through his seduction that the *fall* was brought about, in whose train death entered into the world (see on Rom. v. 12). So Origen, Chrysostom, Augustine, Theophylact, and the majority of commentators; also Kuinoel, Schleiermacher, Tholuck, Olshausen, Klee, Maier, Lange (referring it, however, after the example of Euth. Zigenbenus, also to *Cain*), Luthardt, Ewald, Godet, Hofmann, *Schrift-*

to John, Jesus had little sympathy for the Jews. He is speaking, however, not at all against the *Jews in general*, but merely against the *party that was hostile* to Him.



*bewcis*, I. pp. 418, 478; Müller, *Lehre v. d. Sünde*, II. p. 544 f. ed. 5; Lechler in the *Stud. u. Kritik*. 1854, p. 814 f.; Hahn, *Theol. d. N. T.* I. p. 355; Messner, *Lehre d. Apostel*, p. 332; Philippi, *Glaubenslehre*, III. p. 272; see especially Hengstenberg on the passage, and his *Christol.* I. p. 8 ff.; Weiss, *Lehrbegr.* p. 133 f. Compare the corresponding parallels, Wisd. ii. 24; Apoc. xii. 9, xx. 2; also Ev. Nicod. 23, where the devil is termed ἡ τοῦ θανάτου ἀρχή, ἡ ῥίζα τῆς ἁμαρτίας; see also Grimm on Wisd. i. 1. This view is the only one that is appropriate to the expression ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, which the design of the context requires to be taken exactly (מִבְּרֵאשִׁית, Light-foot, p. 1045), as it must also be understood in 1 John iii. 8. Comp. Joseph. *Antiq.* I. 1, 4. Others refer to Cain's murder of his brother (Cyril, Nitzsch in the *Berl. theol. Zeitschr.* III. p. 52 ff., Schulthess, Lücke, Kling, De Wette, Reuss, *Beitr.* p. 53, Hilgenfeld, Baeumlein, Grimm), which is not, however, rendered necessary by 1 John iii. 12, and would further, without any warrant, exclude an earlier commencement; would be opposed to the national and New Testament view (see on 2 Cor. xi. 3) of the fall and the connection of the present passage; and would finally lack any allusion to it in Gen. iv.; whilst, on the contrary, the antithesis between truth and falsehood, which follows afterwards, points unmistakeably to Gen. iii. Finally, inasmuch as ἀπ' ἀρχῆς must signify some definite historical starting-point, it is incorrect, with B. Crusius, to deny a reference either to the fall or to Cain's murder of his brother, and to take ἀνθρωποκτ. ἀπ' ἀρχῆς as simply a general designation.—Brückner also treats the reference to a definite fact as unnecessary. — ἦν] that is, during the entire past, ἀπ' ἀρχῆς onwards. — κ. ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ. οὐχ ἔστηκεν] does not refer to the fall of the devil (2 Pet. ii. 4; Jude 6), as Augustine, Nonnus, and most Catholics maintain,<sup>1</sup> as though εἰστήκει (Vulg.: *stetit*) had been employed, but is his constant charac-

<sup>1</sup> Comp. also Martensen's *Dogmatics*, § 105. Delitzsch, too (see *Psychol.* p. 62), explains the passage as though *ιστάμενοι* were used: the devil, instead of "taking his stand in the truth," revolted, as the god of the world, selfishly against God; for which reason the world has been "degraded and materialized" by God to a תהו ובהו, etc. In this way a new creation of the world is made out of the creation in Gen. i., and out of the first act in the history of the world, a second.

teristic:<sup>1</sup> and he does not abide in the truth, ἐμμένει, ἀναπαύεται, Euth. Zigabenus. The *truth* is the domain in which *he* has not his footing; to him it is a foreign, heterogeneous sphere of life: the truth is the opposite of the lie, both in formal and material significance. The *lie* is the sphere in which he holds his place; in it he is in the element proper and peculiar to him; in it he has his life's standing. — ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἀλήθ. ἐν αὐτῷ] the inner ground of the preceding statement. The determining cause of this inner ground, however, is expressed by the words ἐν αὐτῷ, which are emphatically placed at the end. As truth is not found *in him*, as it is lacking to *his inner essence and life*, it cannot possibly constitute the sphere of his objective life. Without truth in the inward parts—truth regarded, namely, as a subjective qualification, temper, tendency—that is, without truth in the character, a man must necessarily be foreign to, and far from, the domain of objective truth, and cannot have his life and activity therein. Without truth in the inward parts, a man deals in life with lies, deception, cunning, and all ἀδικία. Note that ἀλήθ. is used first *with*, and then *without*, the article. — ἐκ τῶν ἰδ(ω)ν] of that which is his own, which constitutes the proper ground or essence of his inner man,—of that which is most peculiarly his ethical nature. Comp. Matt. xii. 34. — κ. ὁ πατήρ αὐτοῦ] namely, of the liar; he, generically considered, to wit, the liar as such *in general*, is the devil's child. The characterization of the devil thus aptly concludes with a declaration which at the same time confirms the reproach, ὑμεῖς ἐκ τ. πατρὸς τοῦ διαβ. ἐστέ. The less to be approved, therefore, is the *common* explanation of αὐτοῦ, as standing for τοῦ ψεύδους, which is to be derived from ψεύστης (*mendacii auctor*, after Gen. iii. 4 f.); although, linguistically considered, it is in itself admissible (Winer, p. 181 f. [E. T. p. 138]; Buttmann, p. 93 [E. T.

<sup>1</sup> At the same time, we do not mean herewith to *deny* to John the idea of a *fall* of the devil, or, in other words, to represent him as believing the devil to have been *originally* evil. The passage under consideration treats merely of the evil constitution of the devil *as it is*, without giving any hint as to its origin. This in answer to Frommann, p. 330, Reuss, and Hilgenfeld. In relation to the doctrine of the *fall* of the devil *nothing* is here taught. Comp. Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis*, passim; Hahn, *Theol. d. N. T.* I. p. 319. Such a fall is, however, necessarily presupposed by this passage.

p. 106]). The correct view has been taken also by B. Crusius, Luthardt, Tholuck, Hengstenberg, and as early as Bengel. The old heretical explanation, "*as his father*,"<sup>1</sup> or, "*also his father*," as though αὐτοῦ referred to the *devil*, and the *demiurge*, whose lie is the pretending to be the most high God, were really intended (Hilgenfeld, Volkmar), must be rejected; for, on the one hand, John ought at the very least, in order to avoid being completely misunderstood, to have written ὅτι αὐτὸς ψ. ἐ. κ. ὁ. π. ἀ.;<sup>2</sup> while, on the other hand, he did not in the remotest degree entertain the monstrous, wholly unbiblical notion of a *father of the devil*. Nay, further, a father of *this kind* would not at all harmonize with the context. Even a writer as early as Photius, *Quaest. Amphiloch.* 88, takes the opposite view; as also Ewald, *Jahrb.* V. p. 198 f. It was in the highest degree unnecessary that Lachmann, (*Praef.* II. p. 7), in order to avoid having to refer αὐτοῦ to the devil, should have approved the reading *qui*, or δς ἄν, instead of ὅταν, which is supported by the feeblest evidence: "*qui loquitur mendacium, ex propriis loquitur, quia patrem quoque mendacem habet.*"

Ver. 45. *Because I, on the contrary, speak the truth, ye believe me not* — ἐγὼ δέ] for the sake of strong emphasis, in opposition to the devil, placed at the beginning; and the causative ὅτι, a thoroughly tragical *because*, has its ground in the alien character of the relation between that which Jesus speaks and their devilish nature, to which latter a lie alone corresponds. Euth. Zigabenus aptly remarks: εἰ μὲν ἔλεγον ψεῦδος, ἐπιστεύσατέ μοι ἄν, ὡς τὸ ἴδιον τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν λέγοντι. To take the sentence as a *question* (Ewald) would weaken its tragical force.

Ver. 46. Groundlessness of this unbelief. Εἰ μὴ, διότι τὴν ἀλήθειαν λέγω, ἀπιστεῖτέ μοι, εἶπατε, τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν ἐλέγχει με περὶ ἁμαρτίας ὑπ' ἐμοῦ γενομένης, ἵνα δόξητε δι' ἐκείνην ἀπιστεῖν; Euth. Zigabenus. Ἀμαρτία, *fault*, is not to be taken in the intellectual sense, as *untruth, error* (Origen, Cyril, Melancthon, Calvin, Beza, Bengel, Kypke, Tittmann, Kuinoel, Klee, and

<sup>1</sup> Hence, also, the readings ὡς and καθὼς καί, instead of καί, which, though early in date, are supported by feeble testimony.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. Nonnus: ψεύστης αὐτὸς ἔφν, ψ: οὐδέμονος ἐν γενεῇ τῆς.

others), but, as it is employed without exception in the N. T., namely as equivalent to *sin*. Jesus boldly urges against His opponents His unassailable moral purity—and how lofty a position of superiority does He thus assume above the saints of the Old Testament!—the fact that against Him can be brought *ἀμαρτίας ὄνειδος οὐδὲν* (Soph. *O. C.* 971), as a guarantee that He speaks the truth; justly too, for according to ver. 44 *ἀλήθεια* must be regarded as the opposite of *ψεῦδος*, whereas a lie falls under the category of *ἀμαρτία* (comp. *ἀδικία*, vii. 18). The conclusion is from the genus to the species; hence also it is inadmissible to take *ἀμαρτία* in the special sense of "*fraus*" ("qua divinam veritatem in mendacium converterim," Ch. F. Fritzsche in Fritzscher *Opusc.* p. 99), "*wicked deception*" (B. Crusius), "*sin of word*" (Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 33 f.), "*false doctrine*" (Melancthon, Calvin), and so forth. Even in classical usage *ἀμαρτία*, in and by itself, would denote neither *error* nor *deception*, but only acquire this specific meaning through an addition more precisely determining its force.<sup>1</sup> Considered in itself it denotes *fault*, *perversity*, the opposite of *ὁρθότης* (Plat. *Legg.* i. p. 627 D, ii. p. 668 C). Comp. *δόξης ἀμαρτία*, Thuc. i. 32. 4; *νόμων ἀμαρτία*, Plat. *Legg.* i. p. 627 D; *γνώμης ἀμάρτημα*, Thuc. ii. 65. 7. Remark further, in connection with this important passage: (1) The argument is based, not upon the position that "*the sinless one is the purest and surest organ of the knowledge and communication of the truth*" (Lücke); or that "*the knowledge of the truth is grounded in the purity of the will*" (De Wette, comp. Ullmann); for this would presuppose in the consciousness in which the words are spoken, to wit, in the consciousness of Jesus, a knowledge of the truth obtained *mediately*, or, at all events, acquired first in His *human* state; whereas, on the contrary, especially according to John's view, the knowledge of the truth possessed by Jesus was an *intuitive* one, one possessed by Him in His *pre-human* state, and preserved and continued during His human state by means of the constant intercourse between Himself and God. The reasoning proceeds rather in this way:

<sup>1</sup> Polyb. 16. 20, 6, is, without reason, adduced by Tholuck against this view. In the passage referred to, *ἀμαρτίας* are *faults*, *goings wrong* in general. The sentence is a general *maxim*.

Am I really without *sin*,—and none of you is able to convict me of the contrary,—then am I also without *ψεῦδος*; but am I without *ψεῦδος*, then do I speak the *truth*, and you, on your part (*ὑμεῖς*), have no reason for not believing me. This reasoning, however, is abbreviated, in that Jesus passes at once from the denial of the possibility of charging Him with *ἀμαρτία*, to the positive, special contrary which follows therefrom,—leaving out the middle link, that consequently no *ψεῦδος* can be attributed to Him,—and then continues: *εἰ ἀλήθ. λέγω* (Lachmann and Tischendorf correctly without *δέ*). Further, (2) the proof of the sinlessness of Jesus furnished by this passage is purely *subjective*, so far as it rests on the decided expression of His own moral consciousness in the presence of His enemies; but, at the same time, it is as such all the more striking in that the confirmation of His own testimony (comp. xiv. 30) is added to the testimony of *others*, and to the *necessity* of His sinlessness for the work of redemption and for the function of judge. This self-witness of Jesus, on the one hand, bears on itself the seal of immediate truth (otherwise, namely, Jesus would have been chargeable with a *κανχᾶσθαι* of self-righteousness or self-deception, which is inconceivable in Him); whilst, on the other hand, it is saved from the weakness attaching to other self-witnessings, both by the whole evangelical history, and by the fact of the work of reconciliation. (3) The sinlessness itself, to which Jesus here lays claim, is in so far *relative*, as it is not absolutely divine, but both is and must be *divine-human*, and was based on the human development of the Son of God.<sup>1</sup> He was actually *tempted*, and *might have sinned*; this abstract possibility, however, never became a reality. On the contrary, at every moment of His life it was raised into a practical impossibility.<sup>2</sup> Thus He *learned* obedience (Heb. v. 8). Hence the sinlessness of Jesus, being the result of a normal development which, at every stage of His earthly existence, was in perfect

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Gess, *Pera. Chr.* p. 212. At the same time, the sinless development of Jesus is not to be subsumed under the conception of *sanctification*. See also Dörner's *Sinless Perfection of Jesus*, and the striking remarks of Keim, *Geschichtl. Chr.* p. 109 ff., ed. 3, also p. 189 f.

<sup>2</sup> Any moral stain in Christ would have been a negation of His consciousness of being the Redeemer and Judge.

conformity with the God-united ground of His inner life (comp. Luke ii. 40, 52), must always be regarded as conditioned, so far as the human manifestation of Jesus is concerned, by the entrance of the Logos into the relation of growth; whilst the unconditioned correlate thereto, namely, *perfection*, and accordingly *absolute* moral goodness—goodness which is absolutely complete and above temptation at the very outset—belongs alone, nay, belongs *necessarily* to God. In this way the apparent contradiction between this passage and Mark x. 18 may be resolved. For the rest, the notion of sin as a necessary transitional point in human development is shown to be groundless by the historic fact of the sinlessness of Jesus. See Ernesti, *Ursprung der Sünde*, I. p. 187 ff.

Ver. 47. Answer to the question in ver. 46,—a syllogism whose minor premiss, however, needs not to be supplied in thought (De Wette: "Now I speak the words of God"), seeing that it is contained in (ὑμεῖς) ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἐστέ. That Jesus speaks the words of God is here *taken for granted*. The major premiss is grounded on the necessary sympathy between God and him who *springs from God*, who *hears* the words of God, that is, *as such*, he has an *ear* for them. The words, ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ εἶναι, in the sense of being spiritually constituted by God, do not refer to Christian regeneration and to sonship,—for this first begins through faith,—but merely to a preliminary stadium thereof, to wit, the state of the man whom God draws to Christ by the operation of His grace (vi. 44), and who is thus prepared for His divine preaching, and is given to Him as His (vi. 37). Compare xvii. 6. — διὰ τοῦτο—ὅτι] as in v. 16, 18. See on x. 17.—Note in connection with ver. 47, compared with ver. 44, that the moral dualism which is characteristic, not merely of John's Gospel, but of the gospel generally, here so far reveals its metaphysical basis, that it is traced back to the genetic relation, either to the devil or to God—two opposed states of dependence, which give rise to the most opposite moral conditions, with their respective unsusceptibility or susceptibility to divine truth. The assertion by Jesus of this dualism was not grounded on historical reflection and a conclusion *ab effectu ad causam*, but on the immediate *certitude* which belonged to Him as *knowing the heart* of man. At the

same time, it is incorrect to suppose that He assumes the existence of two classes of human nature differing radically from each other at the very outset (Baur, Hilgenfeld). On the contrary, the moral self-determination by which a man surrenders himself either to the one or the other principle, is no more excluded than the personal guilt attaching to the children of the devil (vv. 24, 34); though their freedom is the more completely lost, the more completely their hearts become hardened (ver. 43). The problem of the *metaphysical relation* between human freedom and the superhuman power referred to, remains, however, necessarily unsolved, and, indeed, not merely in this passage, but in the whole of the New Testament (even in Rom. ix.—xi.); comp. also 1 John iii. 12, iv. 4. But the freedom itself, in face of that power, and the moral imputation and responsibility remain intact, comp. iii. 19–21.

Vv. 48, 49. In ver. 42 ff. Jesus had denied that His opponents were sons of God, and had stamped them as children of the devil. This procedure they regard only as a confirmation of the accusation which they bring against Him (λέγομεν) of being a *Samaritan*, i.e. an heretical antagonist of the pure people of God (for in this light did they view that despised people of mixed race), and *possessed with a devil* (vii. 20). So *paradoxical*, not merely presumptuous (as Luthardt explains Σαμαρ.), and so *crazed* did the discourse of Jesus appear to them. No reference whatever was intended to iv. 5 ff. (Brückner, Ewald). On καλῶς, *aptly*, comp. iv. 17, xii. 13.—Ver. 49. ἐγὼ δαιμόν. οὐκ ἔχω, etc.] The emphatic ἐγὼ does not contain a retort by which the demoniacal element would be ascribed to His opponents (Cyril., Lücke),—a reference which would require to be indicated by arranging the words οὐκ ἐγὼ δαιμ. ἔχω,—but stands simply in opposition to the following καὶ ὑμεῖς. With quiet earnestness, leaving unnoticed the reproach of being a Samaritan, Jesus replies: I for my part am not *possessed*, but *honour* (by discourses which you consider demoniacal, but by which I in reality preserve and promote the glory of God) *my Father*; and you, on your part, what is it that you do? You *dishonour me*! Thus does He unveil to them the *unrighteousness* of their abusive language.

Vv. 50, 51. *I, however, in contrast to this unrighteousness by which you wound my honour, seek not the honour which belongs to me—ἐστιν ὁ ζητ. κ. κρίνων, there is one (comp. v. 45) who seeks it* ("qui me honore afficere velit," Grotius), *and pronounces judgment, that is, as a matter of fact, between me and my revilers.* The expression *καὶ κρίνων* includes a reference, on the one hand, to the *glorification of Jesus*, by which He was to be justified (xvi. 10; comp. the *διό*, Phil. ii. 9); and, on the other, as regards His *opponents*, a hint at their just *punishment* (with eternal death, ver. 51). Hence He adds in ver. 51 a solemn assurance concerning *that which is necessary to the obtaining of eternal life, instead of this punitive κρίσις*, to wit, the keeping of His word; thus deciding that the exclusion of His opponents from eternal life was inevitable as long as they did not return to *μετάνοια*; but also pointing out the only way to salvation which was still remaining open to them. Quite arbitrarily some have treated ver. 51 as not forming part of His discourse to His enemies. Calvin and De Wette remark: After a pause, Jesus turns again to those who believed on Him, in the sense of ver. 31. Lücke maintains, indeed, that the discourse is addressed to His opponents, but regards it rather as the conclusion of the line of thought begun at ver. 31 f. than a direct continuation of ver. 50. The connection with ver. 50 is in this way likewise surrendered. The discourse is a direct continuation of the import of *καὶ κρίνων*, for the result of this *κρίνειν* to the opponents of Jesus is *death*. — *ἐάν τις*, etc.] Note the emphasis which is given to the pronoun by the arrangement of the words *τὸν ἐμὸν λόγον*. It is the word of *Christ*, whose keeping has so great an effect. *τηρεῖν* is not merely keeping in the heart (Tholuck), but, as always, when united with *τὸν λόγον*, *τὰς ἐντολάς*, etc., keeping by *fulfilling* them (ver. 55, xiv. 15, 21, 23 f., xv. 20, xvii. 6). This fulfilment includes even the faith demanded by Jesus (iii. 36; comp. the conception of *ὑπακοή πίστεως*), and also the accomplishment of all the duties of life which He enjoins as the fruit and test of faith. — *θάνατον οὐ μὴ θεωρ. εἰς τ. αἰ.*] not: *he will not die for ever* (Kaeuffer, *de ζωῆς αἰών.*, not. p. 114), but: *he will never die*, i.e. he will live eternally. Comp. ver. 52, xi. 25 ff.,



v. 25, vi. 50. *Death* is here the antithesis to the *Messianic ζωή*, which the believer *possesses* even in its temporal development, and which he will never *lose*.—On *θεωρ.* comp. Ps. lxxxix. 44; Luke ii. 25; see also on iii. 36. The article is not necessary to *θάνατος* (xi. 4, and very frequently in the N. T.); see Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* II. p. 234.

Vv. 52, 53. The Jews understood Him to speak of *natural* death, and thus found a confirmation of their charge that He was mad in consequence of being possessed with a devil. It is in their view a senseless self-exaltation for Jesus to ascribe to His word, and therefore to Himself, greater power of life than was possessed by Abraham and the prophets, who had not been able to escape death.—*νῦν ἐγνώκ.*] “antea cum dubitatione aliqua locuti erant,” in ver. 48, Bengel.—*γεύσεται*] a different and *stronger* designation, not intentionally selected, but the result of excitement. Comp. on the expression Matt. xvi. 28, and the Rabbis as quoted by Schoettgen and Wetstein; Leon. Alex. 41: *γεύεσθαι ἀστόργου θανάτου*. The image employed, probably not derived from a death-cup,—a supposition which is not favoured by the very common use of the expression in other connections,—serves to set forth to the senses the *πικρότης*, the bitterness of experiencing death. Comp. the classical expressions, *γεύεσθαι πένθους*, Eur. *Alc.* 1072; *μόχθων*, Soph. *Trach.* 1091; *κακῶν*, Luc. *Nigr.* 28; *πόνων*, Pind. *Nem.* 6. 41; *πενίης*, Maced. 3; *δίστου*, Hom. *Od.* φ, 98, *χειρῶν υ*, 181. The kind of experience denoted by *γεύεσθαι* is always specified in the context.—Ver. 53. *Surely thou art not greater* (furnished with greater power against death), and so forth; *σύ* is emphatic. Comp. iv. 12.—*ὅστις*] *quippe qui, who verily*; assigning the ground.—*τίνα σεαυτ. ποιεῖς*] *What sort of one dost thou make thyself?* (v. 18, x. 33, xix. 7), “quem te venditas?” (Grotius), that thy word should produce such an effect?

Vv. 54, 55. Justification against the charge of self-exaltation contained in the words *τίνα σεαυτ. ποιεῖς*. Jesus gives this justification a *general* form, and then proceeds to make a *special* declaration regarding *Abraham*, which makes it clear that He is really greater than Abraham.—*ἐγὼ—ἐμαυτόν*] emphatic designation of self (comp. v. 30, 31, vii. 17);

δοξάσω, however, is not the *future* [see the critical notes] (although εἰν with the indicative is not absolutely to be condemned; see on Luke xix. 40; Matt. xviii. 19), but, according to regular usage, the *Conj. Aor.*: in case I shall have glorified myself. — ἔστιν ὁ πατήρ μου, etc.] *my Father is the one who glorifies me*, He is my glorifier. The Partic. Praes. with the article has a *substantival* force, and denotes *habitual, continuous* doing; hence it refers not merely to a particular mode and act of δοξάζειν exclusively, but to its whole course (in the works wrought, in the divine testimonies, and in His final glorification).—ὁν ὑμεῖς λέγετε, etc.] On the construction see x. 36. Comp. on v. 27, ix. 19; Acts xxi. 29. Jesus unfolds to them why this activity of God, by which He is honoured, is hidden from them; notwithstanding, namely, their theocratic fancy, “*it is our God*,” they have not known God.<sup>1</sup> Jesus, on the contrary, is certain that He knows Him,<sup>2</sup> and keeps His word. — ὁμοίος ὑμῶν ψεύστης] *a liar like unto you*. “*Mendax est qui vel affirmat neganda, vel negat affirmanda*,” Bengel. The charge points back to ver. 44; ὁμοίος with the Gen. as in Theophr. *H. pl.* ix. 11, also Xen. *Anab.* iv. 1. 17; see Bornemann, *ad h. l.* — ἀλλά] *but*, far from being such a liar. — τὸν λόγ. αὐτ. τηρῶ] exactly as in ver. 51. The entire life and work of Christ were in truth one continuous *surrender* to the *counsel* of God, and *obedience* (Phil. ii. 8; Rom. v. 19;

<sup>1</sup> Not because they held another divine being, their own national god, to be the highest (Hilgenfeld); but because they had formed false conceptions of the one true God, who had manifested Himself in the Old Test., and had not understood His highest revelation in Christ, in consequence of their blindness and hardness of heart. Comp. ver. 19, and see Weiss, *Lehrbegr.* p. 60 f. In Hilgenfeld's view, indeed, John teaches that the Jewish religion, as to its substance, was the work of the *Demiurge*, and it was only without his knowledge that the Logos hid in it the germs of the highest religion! By the same exegesis by which this doctrine is derived from John, one might very easily show it to be taught by Paul, especially in the sharp antagonism he assumes between νόμος and χάρις,—if one desired, i.e. if one were willing to bring down this apostle to the period of transition from the Valentinian to the Marcionite Gnosis.

<sup>2</sup> *Regarding Himself*, Jesus does not say ἑγωμεν (although considered in itself He might have said it, comp. xvii. 25), because He here speaks in the consciousness of His *immediate, essential* knowledge of the Father.—According to Ewald, the words, “*It is our God*,” contain an allusion to well-known songs and prayers which were constantly repeated. But the frequent occurrence of “*our God*” in the O. T. is quite sufficient to explain their import.

Heb. v. 8) to the divine will, whose injunctions He constantly discerned in His fellowship with the Father, iv. 34. Comp. as to the subject-matter, ver. 29.

Ver. 56. *Εἶτα κατασκευάζει καὶ ὅτι μείζων ἐστὶ τοῦ Ἀβρ.*, Euth. Zigabenus, and, indeed, in such a manner, that He, at the same time, puts the hostile children of Abraham to shame. — *ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν*] with a reproving glance back to ver. 39. — *ἡγαλλιάσατο, ἴνα ἴδῃ*] *he exulted to see*; the object of his exultation is conceived as the goal to whose attainment the joyous movement of the heart is directed. He rejoiced in the anticipation of seeing my day, i.e. of witnessing the day of my appearance on earth.<sup>1</sup> As to its historical date, *ἡγαλλιάσατο* does not refer to an event in the *paradisaical* life of Abraham; but, as Abraham was the recipient of the Messianic promise, which described, on the one hand, the Messiah as His own σπέρμα, himself, however, on the other hand, as the founder and vehicle of the entire redemptive Messianic development for all nations, the allusion is to the time in his *earthly* life when the promise was made to him. His faith in this promise (Gen. xv. 6) and the certainty of the Messianic future, whose development was to proceed from him, with which he was thus inspired, could not but fill him with joy and exultation; hence, also, there is no need for an express testimony to the ἡγαλλ. in Genesis (the supposed reference to the *laughing* mentioned in Gen. xvii. 17 which was already interpreted by Philo to denote great joy and exultation, and which Hofmann also has again revived in his *Weissag. und Erfüll.* II. p. 13, is inadmissible, on a correct explanation of the passage). So much, however, is presupposed, namely, that Abraham recognised the *Messianic* character of the divine promise; and *this* we are justified in presupposing in him who was the chosen recipient of divine revelations. For inventions of the Rabbis regarding revelations of future events asserted, on the ground of Gen. xvii. 17, to have been made to Abraham, see Fabric. *Cod. Pseudepigr.* I. p. 423 ff. The *seeing* of the day (the experimental percep-

<sup>1</sup> *ἡμέρα ἡ ἡμέρα* expressly denotes (hence not *τὰς ἡμέρας τὰς ἡμέρας*, comp. Luke xvii. 22) the exact, particular day of the appearance of Christ on earth, i.e. the day of His birth (Job iii. 1; Diog. L. 4. 41), from the Johannine point of view, the day on which the *ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο* was accomplished. This was the great epoch in the history of redemption which Abraham was to behold.

tion thereof through the *living to see it*, Luke xvii. 22; Polyb. x. 4. 7; Soph. *O. R.* 831, 1528; and see Wetstein and Kypke on the passage) to which (*ἵνα*) the exultation of Abraham was directed, was, for the soul of the patriarch, a moment of the *indefinite future*. And this seeing was *realized*, not during his earthly life, but in his *paradisaical* state (comp. Lampe, Lücke, Tholuck, De Wette, Maier, Luthardt, Lechler in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1854, p. 817, Lange, Baeumlein, Ebrard, Godet), when he, the ancestor of the Messiah and of the nation, learnt that the Messianic age had dawned on the earth in the birth of Jesus as the Messiah. In like manner the advent of Jesus on the earth was made known to Moses and Elias (Matt. xvii. 4), which fact, however, does not justify us in supposing that reference is here made to occurrences similar to the transfiguration (Ewald). In Paradise Abraham saw the day of Christ; indeed, he there maintained in general a relation to the states and experiences of his people (Luke xvi. 25 ff.). This was the object of the *καὶ εἶδε καὶ ἐχάρη*; it is impossible, however, to determine exactly the form under which the *εἶδε* was vouchsafed to him, though it ought not to be explained with B. Crusius as *mere anticipation*. We must rest contented with the idea of *divine information*. The apocryphal romance, *Testamentum Levi*, p. 586 f. (which tells us that the Messiah Himself opens the gates of Paradise, feeds the saints from the tree of life, etc., and then adds: *τότε ἀγαλλιάσεται Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ κ. Ἰακώβ καὶ πάντες οἱ ἄγιοι ἐνδύσονται εὐφροσύνην*), merely supplies a general confirmation of the thought that Abraham, in the intermediate state of happiness, received with joy the news of the advent of Messiah. Supposing, however, that the relation between promise (*ἡγαλλιάσατο, ἵνα ἴδῃ*, etc.) and fulfilment (*καὶ εἶδε κ. ἐχάρη*), expressed in the two clauses of the verse, do require the beholding of the day of Christ to be a *real beholding*, and the day of Christ itself to be the day of His *actual appearance*, *i.e.* the day of the *incarnation* of the promised One on earth, it is not allowable to understand by it, either, with Raphelius and Hengstenberg, the appearance of the angel of the Lord (Gen. xviii.), *i.e.* of the Logos, to Abraham; or, with Luther, "*the vision of faith with the heart*" at the announcement made

in Gen. xxii. 18 (comp. Melancthon, Calvin, and Calovius);<sup>1</sup> or, with Olshausen, a *prophetic* vision of the δόξα of Christ (comp. xii. 41); or, with Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, Erasmus, and most of the older commentators, also Hofmann, the beholding of an event which merely *prefigured* the day of Christ, a *typical* beholding, whether the *birth* of Isaac be regarded as the event in question (Hofmann; see also his *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 304 f.), or the offering up of Isaac as a sacrifice, prefiguring the atoning sacrifice and resurrection of Christ (Chrysostom, Grotius, and many others). According to Linder, in the *Stud. und Krit.* 1859, p. 518 f., 1867, p. 507 f., the day of Christ denotes nothing but the time of *the birth of Isaac*, which was promised in Gen. xviii. 10, so that Christ would thus appear to have represented Himself as one of the angels of the grove of Mamre (comp. Hengstenberg), and, by the expression *ἡμέρα ἡ ἐμή*, to have denoted a time of *special, actual revelation*. Taken thus, however, the day in question would be only *mediately* the day of Christ; whereas, according to the connection and the express designation *τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἐμήν*, Christ Himself must be the *immediate subject of the day*, as the one whose appearance constitutes the day emphatically *His*—His *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, analogously to the day of His second advent (Luke xvii. 24; 1 Cor. i. 8, v. 5; 2 Cor. i. 14; Phil. i. 6, ii. 16; 1 Thess. v. 2; 2 Thess. ii. 2); hence, also, the plural had not to be employed (in answer to Linder's objection). — *καὶ ἐχαρή*] appropriately interchanged for *ἡγαλλ.*, the latter corresponding to the first outburst of emotion at the unexpected proclamation.

Ver. 57. The Jews, referring *κ. εἶδε κ. ἐχάρη* to the earthly life of Abraham, imagine the assertion of Jesus to imply that He had lived in the days of the patriarch, and professed to have been personally acquainted with him! How absurd is this! — *πεντήκοντα*] Placed first to indicate emphasis, corresponding to the position afterwards assigned to the word *ἄβρ.* Fifty years are specified as the period when a man *attains his full growth* (comp. Num. iv. 3, 39, viii. 24 f.; Lightfoot, p. 1046 f.): thou hast not yet passed the full age

<sup>1</sup> Bengel also: "Vidit diem Christi, qui in semine, quod stellarum instar futurum erat, sidus maximum est et fulgidissimum."

of manhood! Consequently, neither the reading τεσσαράκοντα is to be preferred (Ebrard), nor need we conclude either that Jesus was above forty years of age (the Presbyters of Asia Minor in Iren. II. 22. 5); or that He was taken to be so old διὰ τὴν πολυπειρίαν αὐτοῦ (Euth. Zigabenus); or that He looked so old (Lampe, Heumann, Paulus); or that they confounded "the intensity of the devotion of His soul" as it showed itself in His person, with the traces of age (Lange, *Life of Jesus*). In the act of instituting a comparison with the two thousand years that had elapsed since Abraham's day, they could not well care about determining very precisely the age of Christ. In answer to E. v. Bunsen (*The Hidden Wisdom of Christ, etc.*, Lond. 1865, II. p. 461 ff.), who seeks to establish the correctness of the statement in Irenaeus, see Rösch in *Die Jahrb. für deutsche Theol.* 1866, p. 4 f. Without the slightest reason, Bunsen finds in the forty-six years of chap. iv. 2, the age of Christ. But even Keim is not opposed to the idea of Christ being forty years of age (*Gesch. Jes.* I. p. 469; comp. his *Geschichtl. Chr.* p. 235).

Ver. 58. Not a continuation of the discourse in ver. 56, so that Jesus would thus not have given any answer to the question of the Jews (B. Crusius); but, as the contents themselves, and the solemn ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λ. ἵμ. shows, an answer to ver. 57. This reply asserts even more than the Jews had asked, namely, πρὶν, etc., before Abraham became, or was born (not: was, as Tholuck, De Wette, Ewald, and others translate),<sup>1</sup> I am; older than Abraham's origin is my existence. As Abraham had not pre-existed, but came into existence<sup>2</sup> (by birth), therefore γενέσθαι is used; whereas εἰμὶ denotes being per se, which belonged to Jesus, so far as He existed before time, as to His divine nature, without having previously come into being. Comp. I. 1. 6; and see even Chrysostom. The *Praesens* denotes that which continues from the past, i.e. here: that which continues from before time (i. 1, xvii. 5). Comp. LXX.; Ps. xc. 2; also Jer. i. 5. Ἐγὼ εἰμὶ must neither be taken as ideal

<sup>1</sup> Also the English Authorized Version.

<sup>2</sup> This view, "*factus est*," forms a more significant correlate to εἰμὶ than if γενέσθαι were taken as equivalent to *nasci*, which in itself would be also correct (Gal. iv. 4; and see especially Raphelius on the passage).

being (De Wette), nor as being Messiah (Scholten), and transferred into the *counsel of God* (Sam. Crellius, Grotius, Paulus, B. Crusius), which is forbidden even by the use of the *Praesens*; nor may we, with Beyschlag, conceive the being as that of the real *image of God*,—a thought which, after ver. 57, is neither suggested by the context, nor would occur to Christ's hearers without some more precise indication; nor, lastly, is the utterance to be regarded merely as a *momentary* vision, as in a state of *prophetic elevation* (Weizsäcker), inasmuch as it corresponds essentially to the permanent consciousness which Jesus had of His personal (the condition, in the present connection, of His having seen Abraham) pre-existence, and which everywhere manifests itself in the Gospel of John. Comp. on xvii. 5, vi. 46, 62. The thought is not an intuitive *conclusion* backwards, but a *glance* backward, of the consciousness of Jesus (against Beyschlag). Only noteworthy in a historical point of view is the perverse explanation of Faustus Socinus, which from him passed over into the Socinian confession of faith (see *Catech. Racov.*, ed. Oeder, p. 144 f.): "Before Abraham becomes Abraham, *i.e.* the father of many nations, I am it, namely, the Messiah, the Light of the world." He thus admonishes the Jews to believe on Him while they have an opportunity, before grace is taken from them and transferred to the heathen, in which way Abraham will become the father of many nations.

Ver. 59. The last assertion of Jesus strikes the Jews as *blasphemous*; they therefore set themselves, in the spirit of zealotry, to inflict punishment (comp. x. 31). A stoning in the temple is mentioned also by Joseph. *Antt.* xvii. 9. 3. The *stones* were probably building stones lying in the fore-court. See Lightfoot, p. 1048. — ἐκρύβη κ. ἐξῆλθεν] *He hid Himself* (probably in the crowd), and went out (whilst thus hidden).<sup>1</sup> The word ἐκρύβη explains how He was able to go out, and therefore (how very different from this is Luke iv. 30!) *precludes* the notion of anything *miraculous* (ἀόρατος αὐτοῖς κατέστη τῇ

<sup>1</sup> Hengstenberg reverses the logical relation: καὶ ἐξῆλθε stands, he says, for ἐκρύβη, and describes the manner in which He hid Himself,—a purely arbitrary statement. Even if ἐκρύβη had been used, it would be that which preceded the ἐκρύβη (egressus), as in the case of ἀπειλῶν, xii. 36.

ἐξουσία τῆς θεότητος, Euth. Zigabenus; comp. Grotius, Wolf, Bengel, Luthardt, Hilgenfeld, and even Augustine),—a notion which gave rise to the addition in the *Text. Rec.* (see the critical observations), which Ewald defends. Baur, who likewise defends the *Text. Rec.* (p. 384 ff.), finds here also a *docetic disappearance* (comp. on vii. 10 f.); if, however, such was John's meaning, he selected the most unsuitable possible terms to express it in writing ἐκρύβη (comp. on the contrary, Luke xxiv. 31: ἄφαντος ἐγένετο ἀπ' αὐτῶν) and ἐξῆλθεν ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ. The "*providential protection of God*" (Tholuck) is a matter of course, but is not expressed.—There is no exegetical ground for supposing that the simple close of the narrative is designed to *prefigure* the death of Christ, which, being accomplished under the appearance of legality, released the Lord from the judgment of Israel, so that He left the old Israel as the school of Satan, and, on the other hand, gathered around Him the true Israel (Luthardt). Note how the breach between Jesus and the Jews gradually approached the extremity, and "how admirable, even in the details, is the delineation of the ever-increasing intensification of the crisis" (Ewald, *Gesch. Chr.* p. 477, ed. 3).



## CHAPTER IX.

VER. 4. ἐμέ] B. D. L. κ.\* Copt. Sahid. Aeth. Arr. Cant. Cyr. Nonn. read ἡμᾶς. Instead of the following με, L. κ.\* Copt. Aeth. Arr. Cyr. also have ἡμᾶς. Had the saying been changed into a general proposition, and had ἐμέ therefore been altered into ἡμᾶς, then, instead of με, ἡμᾶς must necessarily have been used *in all cases alike*. ἡμᾶς, which Tisch. also adopts, appears to be the original reading (instead of ἐμέ). It was changed into ἐμέ, because the plur. appeared inappropriate, and on account of the following με; this latter, on the other hand, was assimilated to ἡμᾶς in L., etc.—Ver. 6. After ἐπέχρισε, Lachm. and Tisch. read αὐτοῦ; so A. B. C.\*\* L. κ. Cursives, to which also D. must be added with αὐτῶ. On the other hand, the τοῦ τυφλοῦ that follows is wanting in B. L. κ. Cursives (D. has αὐτοῦ). It is put in brackets by Lachm., deleted by Tisch. We ought to read: ἐπέχρ. αὐτοῦ τὸν πηλ. ἐπὶ τ. ὀφθ. τοῦ τυφλοῦ. Αὐτοῦ was referred to the blind man; in that case, however, either this αὐτοῦ itself must be deemed out of place (on account of the following τοῦ τυφλοῦ), or τοῦ τυφλοῦ must be omitted.—Ver. 7. νίψαι] bracketed by Lachm., wanting only in A.\* and the Codd. of the It. A copyist's omission after ver. 11; hence, also, A.\*\* has supplied καὶ νίψαι after Σιλ.—Ver. 8. προσαίτης] Elz.: τυφλός, in opposition to decisive authorities. A correction.—Ver. 11. εἰς τὸν Σιλωάμ] Elz., Scholz: εἰς τὴν κολυμβήθραν τοῦ Σιλωάμ, in opposition to very weighty testimonies. Repetition from ver. 7.—Ver. 14. ὅτε] B. L. X. κ. 33, Codd. It. Cyr.: ἐν ᾗ ἡμέρα. So Lachm. and Tisch. Correctly: the redundant expression was easily supplanted by the word ὅτε, which readily suggested itself.—Ver. 16. Lachm. and Tisch.: οὐκ ἔστιν οὗτος παρὰ θεοῦ ὁ ἄνθρ., after B. D. L. X. κ. 33, 157. The position in the Elz. (οὗτ. ὁ ἄνθρ. οὐκ ἐ. π. τ. θ.) is a transposition to make the reading easier.—Ver. 17. After λέγουσιν weighty witnesses require the insertion of οὖν, which Lachm. and Tisch. have adopted. Lachmann's insertion of οὖν, however, after ἀπεκρ. in ver. 20, is supported solely by B. κ., whereas A. and other uncials and Cursives have δέ. Both seem to be additions; as also the following αὐτοῦς,

which is wanting in B. L. X.  $\kappa$ . Cursives, Verss. Cyr. — Ver. 25.  $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon\nu$ ] to be deleted, as is done by Lachm. and Tisch. A mechanical addition opposed by weighty witnesses. — Ver. 26. The preponderance of evidence is in favour of  $\delta\epsilon$  in place of  $\sigma\upsilon\nu$  (Lachm.);  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\nu$ , however, with Lachm. and Tisch., after B. D.  $\kappa$ .\* Verss. Nonn. Aug., is to be deleted, as an addition which would readily suggest itself. — Ver. 28. After  $\epsilon\lambda\omicron\iota\delta$ . Elz., following Cursives, Vulg. Codd. It., inserts  $\sigma\upsilon\nu$ ; instead of which B.  $\kappa$ .\* Sahid. Cyr. Ambr. read  $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\lambda$ , and D. L.  $\kappa$ .\*\* Verss.  $\omicron\iota\ \delta\epsilon\ \epsilon\lambda$ . Various modes of establishing the connection. — Ver. 30. The reading  $\epsilon\nu\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron$  (approved by Rinck) is only found in X.  $\Lambda$ . and Cursives, and is on that ground alone to be rejected; at the same time, it bears witness, also, to the fact of the original position of  $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$  being immediately after  $\epsilon\nu$  (Tisch.:  $\epsilon\nu\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ , with B. L.  $\kappa$ . Cursives, Cyr. Chrys.). The reading  $\epsilon\nu\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\ \sigma\upsilon\nu$  found in D. may be explained from the circumstance that the relation of  $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$  presented a difficulty. Instead of  $\theta\alpha\nu\mu$ . we must, with Tisch., read  $\tau\omicron\ \theta\alpha\nu\mu$ ., as in B. L.  $\kappa$ . Cursives, Cyr. Chrys. How easily might the superfluous  $\tau\omicron$  be suppressed! — Ver. 35.  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ ] B. D.  $\kappa$ . Aeth.:  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\acute{\omega}\pi\omicron\upsilon$ , because Jesus was accustomed thus to designate Himself. — Ver. 36.  $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\acute{\iota}\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}$ ] Elz. Lachm. do not read  $\kappa\alpha\iota$ ; the evidence for it, however, is very weighty, and it may easily have been passed over by clumsy copyists. — Ver. 41.  $\eta\ \sigma\upsilon\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\rho\tau$ .]  $\sigma\upsilon\nu$ , bracketed by Lachm. and deleted by Tisch., is wanting in decisive witnesses. A connective addition; superfluous, and weakening the force.

Ver. 1 f. The direct connection, by means of  $\kappa\alpha\iota$ , with the preceding words  $\epsilon\acute{\xi}\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\nu\ \epsilon\kappa\ \tau.$   $\dot{\iota}\epsilon\rho\omicron\upsilon$ , and the correlation of  $\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omega\nu$  therewith, makes it impossible, without arbitrariness, to take any view but this,—that the healing of the blind man, instead of not being determinable with chronological exactness (Hengstenberg), must rather be placed soon after Jesus had left the temple, whilst He was still on His way, and on the very same day, the record of whose scenes commences with viii. 21. This day was a Sabbath (ver. 14); not, however, the one mentioned in vii. 37 (Olshausen), but a later one, see on viii. 12. The objection that the calmness which marks the transaction, and the presence of the disciples, are not in keeping with the scene which had occurred shortly before (viii. 59), and that therefore another day ought to be assumed (De Wette and others), has little force; for the calmness of the

bearing of Jesus is anything but a psychological riddle, and the disciples might easily have gathered round Him again. — *παράγων*] *in passing by*, namely, the place where the blind beggar was (probably in the neighbourhood of the temple, Acts iii. 2). Comp. on Matt. ix. 9, and Mark ii. 14. — *τυφλὸν ἐκ γενετῆς*.] So much the *greater* was the miracle; comp. Acts iii. 2, xiv. 8. The supposition, based on ver. 5, that this blind man represents the *κόσμος*, to which Jesus, having been spurned by the Jews, now turns (Luthardt), is the less warrantable, as the stress in that verse is laid on *φῶς*, and not on *τοῦ κόσμου* (comp. even viii. 12). This healing of the blind is not *intended* to have a figurative import, though it is afterwards *used* (ver. 39 ff.) as a figurative representation of a great idea. — *τίς ἤμαρτεν*, etc.] The notion of the disciples is not, that *neither* the one *nor* the other could be the case (Euth. Zigabenus, Ebrard, comp. also Hengstenberg); but, as the positive mode of putting the dilemma shows, that *either the one or the other* must be the case. See Baeumlein, *Partic.* p. 132. They were still possessed by the popular idea (comp. on Matt. ix. 2, also the book of Job, and Acts xxviii. 4) that special misfortunes are the punishment of special sins; against which view Jesus, here and in Luke xiii. 9 ff., decidedly declares Himself. Now, as the man was *born* blind, *either* it must have been the guilt of his *parents*, which he was expiating,—a belief which, in accordance with Ex. xx. 5, was very prevalent (Lightfoot, p. 1048), and existed even among the Greeks (Maetzner in *Lycurg. in Leocr.* p. 217),—*or he himself* must have sinned even whilst in the womb of his mother. The latter alternative was grounded in the popular notion that even an embryo experiences emotions (comp. Luke i. 41, 43), especially evil emotions, and that the latter predominate (see Sanhedr. f. 91. 2; Beresh. Rabba, f. 38. 1, b.; Lightfoot), comp. Wetstein. The explanation of the question from the belief (which there is also no right to assume as presupposed in Matt. xiv. 2) in the *transmigration of souls* (Calvin, Beza, Drusius, Aretius, Grotius, Hammond, Clericus, and several others) is as inadmissible as the assumption of a belief in the *pre-existence of souls* (Cyril, De Wette, Brückner). For apart from the uncertainty of the fact whether the doctrine of the

transmigration of souls was entertained by the Jews in the days of Christ (see Tholuck on the passage, and Delitzsch *Psychol.* p. 463 f. [E. T. p. 545 f.]), those two doctrines could not have been popularly known among the people, and therefore must not be assumed to have been held by the disciples, although it is true that the pre-existence of souls, both of good and bad, is an unquestionable article of doctrine in *Wisd. viii. 19 f.*, as also with Philo and the Essenes, with the Rabbins, and in the Cabbala (see Grimm on *Wisdom of Solomon* in the *Exeget. Handb.* p. 177 f.; Bruch, *Lehre v. d. Præ-existenz d. Seel.* p. 22). It is quite out of place, however, to refer to the *heathen* view of the pre-existence of souls (Isidorus and Severus in *Corder. Cat.*). Tholuck's suggestion, finally, that the thought, though obscurely conceived, is, that the blind man, through being born blind, is marked out as a sinner in virtue of an *anticipation* of punishment, both contradicts the words, and is altogether destitute of biblical support. In Luthardt's view, the disciples, in accordance with *Ex. xx. 5*, regarded the second of the two supposed cases as alone possible, but mentioned the first as a possibility, in order that *Christ* might solve the riddle which *they* were unable to solve. Similarly Baeumlein and Delitzsch, who looks upon the question as the mere expression of perplexity resulting from a false premiss. It is an arbitrary procedure, however, to ascribe such a difference to two cases regarding which a question is asked in *precisely the same form*, or to treat the possibility in the one case as posited merely in appearance. The disciples considered *both* cases *possible*, and wished to know which of them was *real*. At the same time, however, they deemed a *third* case out of the question, and this was the error in the dilemma which they put forth,—an error which Jesus (ver. 3) lays bare and corrects by setting before them the *Tertium datur*. — *ἵνα τυφλ. γένῃ.*] The retributive result, in accordance with the teleological connection of the divine destiny. That the man was *born* blind might have been previously known to those who asked the question; or the man himself might just have informed them of the fact, for the purpose of adding force to his request for alms (ver. 8).

Ver. 3. Οὐ παντελῶς ἀναμαρτήτους αὐτοὺς φησιν, ἀλλ'

ὄσον εἰς τὸ τυφλωθῆναι αὐτόν, Euth. Zigabenus. — ἀλλ' ] sc. τυφλὸς ἐγεννήθη. — τὰ ἔργα τοῦ θεοῦ] *the works of God*, i.e. *what God works*, was to be manifested in Him. The expression must be left in this general form (it first acquires its more exact force in ver. 4); it denotes the entire *category* of which such miraculous healings were a particular *species*; hence the works of God were set forth and brought to light in this concrete case, to wit, in the man (ἐν αὐτῷ) who experienced the divine miraculous power. In the connection of the divine decree, however, from which everything accidental, everything independent of the divine plan, is excluded, this φανέρωσις must stand in the relation of a *purpose* towards the sufferings which, in this particular concrete case, are miraculously removed. Hence ἵνα φανερ., etc., is a thought which contains the true nature of the *Theodicy* for all sufferings. According to Weiss, *Lehrbegr.* p. 201, the ἔργα θ. are *spiritual* operations, namely, the *enlightenment of the world*, symbolically set forth by this healing of the blind. This, however, anticipates the doctrinal *application* which Jesus Himself makes of the work which He wrought (ver. 39).

Ver. 4. By means of the participative ἡμᾶς (see the critical observations), Jesus includes the disciples with Himself as helpers and continuers of the Messianic activity. The further progress of the discourse is indicated by the *pronoun* which, for the sake of emphasis, is placed at the *beginning of the sentence*; the *subject* is thus specified through whose activity the φανέρωσις mentioned in ver. 3 is to be accomplished. "It is *we* who are destined by God to work His works as long as we live, and until death put an end to our activity." There is no hint whatever in the text that Jesus wished to meet the scruples of the disciples on account of the healing which He was about to perform *on the Sabbath* (Kuinoel); indeed, as far as the disciples were concerned, to whom Sabbath healings by Jesus were nothing new, there was no ground for such a procedure. — τοῦ πέμψ. με] Jesus does not again say ἡμᾶς;<sup>1</sup> for *His* mission involved also that of the disciples, and it was He who commissioned the disciples (xiii. 20, xx. 21). — ἕως]

<sup>1</sup> Which Ewald prefers in opposition to his own translation. But see the critical note.

so long as, denoting contemporaneous duration, very frequently so in the classical writers subsequently to Homer, with the praes. or imperf. See Blomfield, *Gloss. ad Aesch. Pers.* 434.—*Day* and *Night* are images, not of *tempus opportunum* and *importunum*, nor even of αἶὼν οὗτος and μέλλων (Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, Ruperti, and others); but (for Jesus was thinking of His speedy departure out of the world, ver. 5) of *life* and *death* (comp. Hom. *Il.* ε. 310, λ. 356; Aesch. *Sept.* 385; *Pers.* 841; Plat. *Apol.* p. 40 D, and Stallbaum thereon; Hor. *Od.* 1. 28. 15). The latter puts an end to the activity of every one on earth (even to that of Christ in His human manifestation). By the different use made of the same image in xi. 9 f., we are not justified in regarding it as including the period of the *passion* (Hengstenberg). Moreover, Christ was still working whilst He hung on the cross. Olshausen's view is wrong: ἡμέρα denotes the *time of grace*, which was then specially conditioned by the presence of Christ, the Light of the world; with His removal *darkness* assumed its sway. Against this view the general and unlimited form of the expression ὅτι οὐδεὶς δύναται ἐργάσθαι (which Olshausen arbitrarily restricts by adding "for a time," and "in spiritual matters") is in itself a decisive objection; not to mention that Jesus regarded His death, not as the beginning of spiritual darkness, but as the very condition of greater enlightenment by the Spirit (xvii. 7, xv. 26, xiv. 26, *al.*). With Olshausen agrees substantially B. Crusius; comp. also Grotius, Bengel, and several others. Luthardt also refers day and night to the *world*, whose day-time coincided with the presence of Christ in the world, and whose night began when He departed out of the world; as soon as He should leave the world, no other could occupy His place in the accomplishment of redemption; from that time onward, there would be no longer a redemptive history, but merely an appropriation of redemption. But apart from the hair-splitting character of the distinction thus drawn, the grounds adduced against Olshausen hold substantially good against this explanation also, especially that ἐργάσθαι—which here has no determining object, as in the previous case—and οὐδεὶς are quite general; and accordingly, ἔρχεται νῦν—ἐργάσθαι must be

regarded as a commonplace. Godet finds in *νύξ* the thought of the *evening rest*, which Christ was to enjoy in His *heavenly* state. This is incorrect, however, because it is not *evening* but *night* that is mentioned, and because *δύναται* would then be inappropriate.

Ver. 5. A more precise description of His earthly vocation, characteristically expressed in relation to the sight which was to be bestowed on the blind man. "*Οταν*, however, is neither *quamdiu* (as it usually is) nor *quandoquidem* (so Lücke and Fritzsche, *ad Marc.* p. 86),—which latter usage is foreign to the N. T., and is only apparently found in passages such as Thuc. 1. 141. 5, 142. 1,—but: *When (quando, at the time in which) I am in the world, I am the Light of the world.* It expresses the necessary *contemporaneity* of the two relations. He cannot be in the world, says Christ, without at the same time enlightening the world. *Thus*, also, did it behove Him to show Himself in the case of this blind man. *φῶς* is employed, it is true, in a spiritual sense, as in i. 5 ff., viii. 12, but also with a significant reference to the sight which was to be restored to the blind man. In healing him, that enlightening activity of Jesus by which those who did not see were to be made to see (see ver. 39), is set forth in a transaction which, though primarily sensuous, was also suggestive of spiritual enlightenment (ver. 37 f.). In itself the first clause of the verse—*ὅταν . . . ᾧ*—might have been dispensed with (viii. 12); its utterance, however, in connection with ver. 4, was occasioned by the consciousness that He was soon to depart from the world, and that after His departure the present mode and action of the *φῶς εἶναι*, which were bound up with His corporeal earthly career, must come to an end. Then Christ would work through the Paraclete and through the vehicles of the Paraclete, as the Light of the world.

Ver. 6 f. For what reason Jesus anointed the eyes of the blind man with clay John does not inform us; but this does not justify us in leaving the question unanswered (Brückner). The procedure was certainly not adopted for the purpose of *defying the hierarchy* (Ewald) because it was the Sabbath, according to which view it would have had nothing to do with the healing itself. At the same time, it was

equally far from being of a *medicinal* nature; for often as spittle was applied in the case of diseases of the eye (see Wetstein and Lightfoot), the means employed bore no proportion to the rapidity with which the cure took place, especially considering that the man was *born* blind; the same remark applies also to Mark vii. 32 and viii. 23. To treat the anointing with the clay as merely a *means of awakening faith* (comp. Lücke), or as a *test of faith* (Calvin), and, consequently, as having a purely *psychological* effect, is to represent the entire procedure as adopted solely with an eye to *appearances*, to making an impression on the blind man. On this view, accordingly, the ointment of clay had in itself nothing to do with the cure performed, which is scarcely reconcilable with the truthfulness and dignity of Jesus. Regard for this latter rather compels the assumption that the ointment was the *real medium* of the cure, and formed an essential part of the act; and that, accordingly, the spittle was the *continens of the objective healing virtue*, by means of which it came into, and remained actively in contact with, the organism. Comp. Tholuck and Olshausen, who characterize the spittle as the *conductor* of the healing virtue; Lange also, who, however, conjoins therewith the psychological action referred to above; and even Nonnus, though he draws a very arbitrary distinction, terming the spittle *λυσίπονον*, and the *πηλός, φαισφόρον*. There is nothing against this mode of viewing the matter, in the fact that Jesus used a medium in so few of His miracles of healing, and in so many others employed no medium at all (as also in the case of the blind men of Jericho, Matt. xx. 20 ff.; Mark x. 46 ff.); for He must Himself have known when it was necessary and when not, though no clearer insight into the causal connection between the means and the result is vouchsafed to us. We have no authority for attributing to John a view of miracles which regarded them as *mysteries*, and which prevailed at a later date (De Wette, comp. B. Crusius); for with his christology he, least of all, would find occasion for its adoption; besides, that the procedure followed in the case of this miracle was unique, and thus its speciality was carefully substantiated by the judicial investigation which grew out of the occurrence. According to Baur (comp. Ewald,



as above), the miracle was performed in this circumstantial way in order that it might wear the appearance of a work done on the *Sabbath*; the supposition, however, is incorrect, if for no other reason, because the healing by itself, apart altogether from the circumstances attending it, was a breaking of the Sabbath. Baur, indeed, regards the whole narrative, notwithstanding the remarkable circumstantiality and naive liveliness which mark it, as an *invention*; so also Strauss, Weiss, comp. the note after ver. 41. In harmony with his view of the figurative design of the entire healing, Luthardt (comp. also Godet) interprets the anointing with clay to mean: "He must become blind who wishes to receive sight" (the sending to the pool of Siloam being intended to typify the *ἐρχεσθαι πρὸς αὐτόν*, iii. 20 f.). But interpretations of this sort have no warrant in the text, and furnish at the same time unintentional support to the unhistorical view of those who treat the narrative as the mere vehicle of an idea,—a remark which holds good against Hengstenberg, who, like Erasmus<sup>1</sup> and others, regards *πηλός*, after Gen. ii. 7, as the symbol of creative influence, although in this case we have only to do with an *opening* of the eyes (vv. 10, 14), and that by means of a subsequent washing away of the *πηλός*.—*καὶ ἐπέχρισεν αὐτοῦ τ. πηλὸν ἐπὶ τ. ὀφθ. τ. τυφλοῦ*] According to this reading (see the critical note), *αὐτοῦ* must be referred to the *spittle* of Jesus; He rubbed the *ointment made* of it and the clay on the eyes of the blind man.<sup>2</sup>—*εἰς τὴν κολυμβ.*] not dependent on *ὑπαγε* (comp. on Matt. ii. 23), which is not connected with *νίψαι* even by a *καί* (against Lücke and Winer), but: *Into the pool of Siloam*, so that the *πηλός* is washed away *into the pool* by the process of cleansing which takes place on the edge of the basin. Comp. on the pregnancy of this mode of expression, Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* ii. 2. 10; Winer, p. 387 [E. T. p. 517]).—On the *Pool Siloam* (Foun-

<sup>1</sup> Erasmus, *Paraphr.*: "paternum videlicet ac suum verius opificium referens, quo primum hominem ex argilla humore macerata finxerat. Ejusdem autem erat auctoris restituere quod perierat, qui condiderat quod non erat." So substantially, also, Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, Beza, and several others. Comp. also Iren. 5. 15.

<sup>2</sup> Note the naive, attractive *circumstantiality* which is characteristic of the entire narrative.

tain, Isa. viii. 6; Luke xiii. 4: Pool, Neh. iii. 15) and its doubtful situation,—which, however, Robinson (II. p. 142 ff.), following Josephus, re-discovered at the entrance of the Tyropœum Valley, on the south-east side of Zion,—see Tobler, *d. Siloahquelle u. d. Oelberg*, 1852, p. 1 ff.; Rödiger in *Gesen. Thes.* III. p. 1416; Leyrer in *Herzog's Encykl.* XIV. p. 371 ff. The expression *κολυμβ. τοῦ Σιλ.* denotes the pool formed by the fountain Siloam (ὁ Σιλ., Luke xiii. 4; Isa. viii. 6).—*The washing in the pool of Siloam* is no more to be regarded as a medicinal prescription than the application of the *πηλός* (the Rabbinical traces of a healing virtue of the water relate to the digestive organs, see Schoettgen), but was required by Jesus for the purpose of allowing the clay the necessary time for producing its effect, and, at the same time, this *particular* water, the pool of Siloam, was mentioned as being *nearest* to the scene of the action (in the vicinity of the temple, viii. 59, ix. 1), and as certainly also *well known* to the blind man. According to Lange, *L. J.* p. 635, the intention of Jesus, in prescribing the sacred fountain of the temple, was to set manifestly forth the *co-operation of Jehovah* in this repeated Sabbath act. But neither John nor the discussion that follows in ver. 13 ff.—in the course of which, indeed, the pool is not once mentioned—betray the slightest trace of this supposed mystery. This also in answer to the meaning imported by Godet into the text, that Siloam is represented as the type of all the blessings of which Christ is the reality, so that, in the form of an action, Christ says, “*Ce que Siloé est typiquement, je le suis en réalité.*” This does not at all harmonize with the narrative; in fact, on such a view, the confused notion would result, that the true Siloam sent the blind man to the typical Siloam in order to the completion of his cure,—that the *Antitype*, in other words, sent him to the *Type*! —ἀπεσταλμένος] The name *חִיִּזְי* (which even the LXX. and Josephus give in Greek as *Σιλωάμ*) denotes originally *missio* (sc. *aquarum*), i.e. *outflow*; but John, adopting a typical etymology, renders it directly *חִזְזִי*, *missus*, which in itself was grammatically allowable, either after the analogy of *חִזְזִי* (see Hitzig on Isa. viii. 6), so that the word would be a strengthened particip. Kal with a passive signification, or, in

virtue of the resolution of the dagesh forte in the particip. Piel into *yod* (see Tholuck, *Beiträge zur Sprachenerklär.* p. 120 ff.; Ewald, *Lehrb. d. Hebr. Spr.* § 156 a.). He thus finds, namely, in the name of the pool, a noteworthy typical reference, not indeed to Christ, the messenger of God, the true Siloam (as Theophylact, Erasmus, Beza, Calvin, Corn. a Lapide, and many other earlier commentators, also Schweizer, Ebrard, Luthardt, Hilgenfeld, Lange, Hengstenberg, Brückner, Godet maintain), but to the circumstance that the blind man was *sent* to this pool by Christ. The pool of מִשְׁכַּח has the "*nomen et omen*" of this *sending away*. The context naturally suggests nothing further than this.<sup>1</sup> Nonnus aptly remarks: ὕδωρ στελλομένοιο προώνυμον ἐκ σέο πομπῆς. Comp. Euth. Zigabenus: διὰ τὸν ἀπεσταλμένον ἐκεῖ τότε τυφλόν. It is arbitrary with Wassenberg and Kuinoel to pronounce the entire parenthesis spurious (it is absent only in Syr. and Pers. p.), a view to which Lücke also inclined, out of regard for John. But why should a fondness for typical etymologies have been foreign to John? Comp. the much more peculiar example of Paul in Gal iv. 25. Such things leave the pneumatic character of the evangelist unaffected. — ἀπηλθεν] which he, being well acquainted with the neighbourhood, was able to do without any one to take him by the hand, τυφλῷ ποδί (Eur. *Hec.* 1050), as, indeed, many blind men are able in like manner to find their way about alone. — ἦλθε] namely, to his dwelling, as is indicated by the words οἱ οὖν γείτονες which follow. Jesus did not meet him again till ver. 35.

Vv. 8-12. Καὶ οἱ θεωροῦντες, etc.] *And they who before had seen him that he was a beggar*, the previous eye-witnesses of his being a beggar. The καί gives the force of universality: *and in general*; the partic. *praes.* has the force of the *imperfect*. — ὁ καθημ. κ. προσαιτ.] *who is accustomed to sit there and beg.* They had known him for a long while as occupied in no other way than in begging. — The peculiarly

<sup>1</sup> Not to the fact that in ἀπισταλμ., which would denote "*freely flowing, streaming*," a deliverance from certain evils was found, as Ewald supposes. It is quite a mistake to suppose any allusion to the *water of baptism* (Calovius, after Ambrose, Jerome, and others); as also to identify the name with מִשְׁכַּח in Gen. xlix. 6 (Grotius). The simple and correct view is taken also by Bengel, De Wette, and several others; by Baumlein with hesitation.

vivid and detailed character of what follows renders it probable that John derived his information from the lips of the man himself after he had become a believer. — Ver. 11. *ἄνθρωπος λεγομ. Ἰησοῦς*] “nescierat caecus celebritatem Jesu,” is the opinion of Bengel and others. But he must surely have learnt something more regarding his deliverer than His mere name. The quondam blind man conducts himself rather throughout the whole affair in a very impartial and judicious manner, and for the present keeps to the *simple matter of fact*, without as yet venturing on a further judgment. — *ἀνέβλεψα*] may signify, *I looked up* (Mark xvi. 4; 2 Macc. vii. 25; Plat. *Pol.* vii. p. 515 C; *Ax.* p. 370 C; *Xen. Cyr.* vi. 4. 9). So Lücke; but this meaning is inadmissible on account of vv. 15, 18, which require, *I became again seeing, visum recepi*. Comp. Matt. xi. 5; Tob. xiv. 2; Plat. *Phaedr.* p. 243 B. As regards the man *born* blind, indeed, the expression is inexact, but rests on the general notion that even one born blind has the natural power of sight, though he has been deprived of its use from his very birth, and that he *recovers* it through the healing.<sup>1</sup> — That the man is able to give, at all events, the *name* of his benefactor, is intelligible enough from the inquiries which he would naturally institute after he had been healed. But the circumstance that whilst at the outset he expresses no opinion regarding the person of Jesus (see previously on *ἄνθρ. λεγ. Ἰησ.*), he notwithstanding afterwards declares Him to be a *Prophet* (ver. 17), and *One sent of God* (ver. 33), though he was first brought by Jesus Himself to believe in Him as the *Messiah* in vv. 35 ff., is entirely in keeping with the *gradual nature* of the development through which he passed. Such a gradation is, indeed, natural and necessary in some cases, whereas others differently constituted are at once carried to the goal by the force of the first impression received. This in opposition to Baur's supposition that the narrator *designedly* so framed his account

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Grotius: “Nec male *recipere* quis dicitur, quod communiter tributum humanæ naturæ ipsi abfuit.” In Pausanias, also (*Messen.* iv. p. 240), we read of one who was born blind and received sight, *ἀνίβλεψι*. Comp. *Evang. Nicod.* 6, where the man born blind who there speaks says: *ἐπίθην τὰς χεῖρας ἐπὶ τ. ἰφθαλμούς μου, καὶ ἀνίβλεψα παραχρῆμα*.

that the miracle should be viewed as an ἔργον θεοῦ *primarily in its pure objectivity*. — εἰς τὸν Σιλωάμ] here the name of the pool; hence the Rec. has εἰς τ. κολυμβ. τ. Σιλ.,—a *correct* gloss.

Ver. 13 f. "Ἀγουσιν] These belong still to the persons designated in ver. 8. They act thus because the healing had taken place *on the Sabbath* (ver. 14), the violation of which they, in their servile dependence, believed it to be their duty not to conceal from the guardians of the law who ruled over the people. It does not, however, follow, from the fact that there were no sittings of the courts on the Sabbath, that the man was not brought on the day of the healing (so Lücke and several others suppose), but that by πρὸς τοὺς Φαρισ. is meant neither the *Sanhedrim* (Tholuck, Baeumlein), nor a *synagogal court* (Lücke, Lange),<sup>1</sup> of which, moreover, the text contains no notice (comp. vii. 45, xi. 47). Especially must it be remembered that in John the Sanhedrim is never simply designated οἱ Φαρισαῖοι (not even vii. 47), but always οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς κ. οἱ Φαρισ., or (vii. 32) in the reverse order. The *Pharisees as a corporate body* are meant, and a number of them might easily have come together at one of their houses to form a kind of sitting.—τὸν ποτὲ τυφλ.] A more precise definition of αὐτόν; see Buttman, *Neut. Gr.* p. 342 [E. T. p. 400].—Ver. 14 assigns the reason *why* they bring him.—τὸν πηλόν] the clay in question.

Vv. 15, 16. Πάλιν] Glancing back at the same question asked by *others* (hence καὶ οἱ Φαρ.) in ver. 10.—πηλὸν, etc.] *a clay* *He laid on mine eyes* (μου ἐπὶ τ. ὀφθ.), etc. Comp. on xi. 32. Note how the man only states what he himself felt; hence there is no mention of the spittle. Compare already ver. 11.—ὅτι τὸ σάββ. οὐ τηρεῖ] A Rabbinical precept specially forbids the anointing of the eyes with spittle on the Sabbath. Maimonides Schabb. 21. Even if this were not yet in existence or recognised as binding, still the general principle was admitted that healing should take place on the Sabbath solely in case of danger to life (Schoettgen and Wetstein ad Matt. xii. 9).—ἄλλοι] who judged more candidly and conscientiously. Grotius well remarks: "Qui nondum occaluerant."

<sup>1</sup> Of such subordinate courts with twenty-three members there were two in Jerusalem. See Saalschütz, *Mos. R.* p. 601.

They conclude from the *miraculous* element in the healing, so far as it implied a special *divine* help, which would not be vouchsafed to a *sinner* who disregarded God's commands, that there must be something peculiar in this action performed on the Sabbath, rendering it unfair to pass the judgment in question on its performer without further consideration. — The *Hyperbaton* in the position, οὐκ ἐστὶν οὗτος παρὰ θεοῦ ὁ ἄνθρ., serves to lay stronger emphasis first on οὗτος, and then on παρὰ θεοῦ. Comp. in general Bernhardy, p. 460. — σχ[ίσμα] comp. vii. 43.

Ver. 17. As there was such a difference of views among those who were assembled, they feel it to be of importance to ascertain the opinion of the man who had been healed. It might lead to further light being thrown on the affair. The *subject* of λέγουσιν is οἱ Φαρις., neither the *hostile* among them merely (Apollinarius and many others), nor the *well-wishers* alone (Chrysostom and his followers). — πάλιν] a *repetition* of the question after ver. 15. — ὅτι] εἰς ἐκείνο, ὅτι; see on ii. 18. Theodore of Mopsuestia well remarks: ὑπὲρ ὧν.—προφήτης] who had shown Himself to be such by this miracle. Comp. iii. 2, iv. 19, vi. 14, *al.* Thus the faith of the man became clear and confirmed by the controversy of the Pharisees. And he makes *confession* of what he up to this time believes.

Ver. 18. Observe that the mere verb is not again employed, nor even οἱ Φαρισαῖοι, but οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, *i.e.* the hostile hierarchical party among the assembled Pharisees, which now carries on further proceedings. Comp. ver. 22. — οὐκ ἐπίστ. placed emphatically at the beginning of the verse. — οὖν] as the healed man had declared Him to be a prophet. They now suspected the existence of a fraudulent understanding between the two. — ἕως ὅτου] *till they called*, etc. Then first, after these had come and made their declaration, were they unable any longer to call the cure in question (vv. 26, 34). — αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἀναβλέψ.] *of him who had himself again become seeing*, concerning whom his own parents must surely know best.

Vv. 19-21. To the two questions put in ver. 19 exactly corresponding answers are returned in vv. 20, 21; the second, however, twice *nesciendo*. — ὃν ὑμεῖς λέγετε] opposed to the personal unbelief of the questioners; ὃν as in vi. 71. — πῶς]

how does it happen that? — οὐν] as it is alleged that he was born blind. — Ver. 20. πῶς δὲ ἄρτι βλέπει, ἀγνοεῖν λέγουσι, φοβούμενοι τοὺς Ἰουδαίους. "Ἐξω κινδύνου καθιστῶντες ἑαυτοὺς, ἐπὶ τὸν τεθεραπευμένον παραπέμπουσι τὴν ἐρώτησιν, ὡς ἀξιοπιστότερον αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ τοιούτῳ ζητήματι, Euth. Zigabenus. — ἡμεῖς] opposed to the αὐτός . . . αὐτόν . . . αὐτός, afterwards thrice repeated, and asyndetically, with passionate emphasis. ἡλικίαν ἔχει] *he himself is of full age*; comp. Herod. 3. 36, 7. 18; Thuc. 8. 75; Polyb. 9. 23. 9, *al.* See Kypke, I. p. 387; Loesner, p. 150. — αὐτὸς περὶ αὐτοῦ] *he will himself speak concerning himself.* αὐτοῦ with the Spir. lenis. Buttm. *Neut. Gr.* p. 97 f. [E. T. p. 112]).

Ver. 22. "Ἦδη γὰρ συνετέθ.] *for—so great cause had they for that fear—the Jews had already agreed, had already come to an understanding with each other; conspiraverant, Vulgate.* Comp. Luke xxii. 5; Acts xxiii. 20; Thuc. 4. 19; 1 Macc. ix. 70; Ast, *Lex. Plat.* III. p. 340. The context does not justify the assumption of a *decree of the Sanhedrim* to that effect. The hope, however, was cherished of being able without difficulty to convert the arrangement in question into a decree of the Sanhedrim; and the parents of the blind man might easily have come to know of this. We can easily understand that they should prefer exposing their son rather than themselves to this danger, since they must have been certain that he would not for the sake of his benefactor refuse to make the dangerous confession. — ἵνα] *that which* they had agreed on is conceived as the *intention* of their agreement. Comp. ἀξιοῦν ἵνα in Dem. *de Cor.* 155 (see Dissen on the passage), and Nägelsbach on the *Iliad*, p. 62, ed. 3. — ἀποσυνάγ. γέν.] Exclusion from the fellowship of the synagogue, and in connection therewith from the common intercourse of life, was probably at this time the sole form of excommunication. See on Luke vi. 22.

Vv. 24, 25. Δὸς δόξαν τ. θεῷ] "*Speciosa praeformatio,*" Bengel; for they expect a declaration prejudicial to Jesus, such as the man had hitherto refused to make, and therefore employ this sacred and binding requirement to declare the truth, by which God would be honoured, inasmuch as to speak the truth was to show reverence to Him. Comp. Josh. vii. 19; Esr. x. 11; 3 Esr. ix. 8. — ἡμεῖς οἶδαμεν, etc.] This assertion of hierarchical

authority (ἡμεῖς with emphasis) was intended to overawe the man, and give a bias to his judgment. In vain. With cautious reticence he prudently refers them simply to what had actually happened; this alone was known to him (comp. Soph. *O. C.* 1103: οὐκ οἶδα πλὴν ἔν); but not *whether*, etc.—τυφλὸς ὢν] *being blind*, namely, in his natural state, from birth. Comp. iii. 13.

Vv. 26, 27. As they are unable to attain their end, they return to the question as to the *How?* (comp. ver. 15) in order conclusively to establish the fact in the course of this second examination of the man. He, however, with his straightforward, honest mind (ἀνὴρ ἀδόνητος, Nonnus), becomes irritated, and even embittered, at this repeated interrogation. — καὶ οὐκ ἠκούσατε] is taken as a declaration: *and ye have not listened thereto* (taken heed). It would correspond better, however, to the naive character of the man, and to the liveliness of his irritation, as also to the succeeding ἀκούειν, which denotes simply “*hear*,” if we were to take it as a *question*: *And have you not heard it?* — τί] *why*, as you surely must have heard it. — μὴ καὶ ὑμεῖς] *surely not you also*, like others. To the θέλειν, etc., would correspond the effort to be convinced of the reality of the miracle that had been performed. Chrysostom, Bengel, and several others, consider that καί indicates that the blind man confessed himself to be one of His disciples, or that it was his intention to become one. His development, however, had not yet advanced so far. See vv. 35, 36. But that his benefactor had *disciples* about Him (ver. 2), he must certainly have learnt from others.

Vv. 28, 29. Ἐλοιδορ.] as preliminary to the following words. Passionate outburst in an unrighteous cause. — σὺ εἰ μαθ' ἐκ.] They had been unable to get out of him any declaration *against* Jesus, and regarded his behaviour, therefore, as a taking part with Christ. Bengel aptly remarks on ἐκείνου: “Hoc vocabulo removens Jesum a sese.” Comp. on vii. 11. — Ver. 29. ἡμεῖς] once again with proud emphasis. — Μωϋσῇ] has the emphasis in opposition to τοῦτον, which thus receives the *more contemptuous* a meaning (vi. 42, and often). — πόθεν ἐστίν] *i.e.* by whom he is sent. Comp. viii. 14.

Vv. 30–33. The passionateness of the Jews now *emboldens the man to make a further confession* (ver. 17). — ἐν γὰρ τούτῳ



τὸ (see the critical notes) θαυμ. ἐστίν] *Why, herein* (in this state of the case) *is a marvellous thing, that ye know not from whence He is, and (that) He hath opened mine eyes.* The force of the θαυμαστόν lies in καὶ ἀνέφξε, etc., in virtue of the groundless nature of that ignorance to which actual testimony was thus borne; see vv. 31–33. Concerning a man who has done that, ye ought surely to know, etc. γάρ, “respicit ad ea, quae alter antea dixerat, et continet cum affirmatione conclusionem, quae ex rebus ita comparatis facienda sit,” Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 242. Comp. on 1 Cor. xi. 22. It is often thus used, especially when “miratio rei aut aliorum incredulitatis adsignificatur,” Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* I. p. 332. Comp. Xen. *Mem.* iv. 2. 6. — ὑμεῖς] *Ye people*, who ought to know this best. — Ver. 31. The man now *proves* to them, onwards to ver. 33, how clearly it is evident from the act of Jesus that He is no sinner (ver. 16), but a pious man, yea, a man sent of God. He begins his proof with a major premiss, which he postulates as universally conceded and known (οἶδαμεν, Job xxvii. 9, xxxv. 13; Ps. lxvi. 18, cix. 7; Prov. xv. 29; Isa. i. 15), and which rests on the idea that miracles are answers to prayer (comp. xi. 41 ff.; Mark vii. 34). A sufficient reason for not assuming that Jesus actually pronounced a prayer aloud in performing the miracle (as Ewald thinks), is the silence of John, who would scarcely have omitted this detail from a narrative so minute as this. Ver. 32. Minor premiss; then in ver. 33, conclusion, both in popular form. — οὐδέν] effect *nothing*—is restricted by the connection to miraculous deeds such as the one here recorded.

Ver. 34. Thou wert born with thy whole nature laden with sin, so that *nothing* in thee is pure from sins; but thou art *entirely*, through and through, a born reprobate.<sup>1</sup> They entertain the same prejudice regarding sinfulness before birth (not of the parents) to which the disciples had previously given expression (ver. 2), and make here a spiteful application thereof. Comp. on ὅλος, xiii. 10. The notion of “*heightened original sin*” (Hengstenberg, after Ps. li. 7) is not appropriate to the connection, as the inference from being born blind implies ἁμαρτίας committed before birth.—Note the contemptuous

<sup>1</sup> Nonnus: σύγγονος ἀμπλακίησιν ἱμαιώθη; ὅλος ἀνὴρ.

emphasis of the *σύ . . . σύ*. — *διδάσκ. ἡμ.*] The emphasis rests here, not on *διδάσκ.*, but on *ἡμᾶς*: dost thou comport thyself as our *teacher*? — *ἐξέβαλ. αὐτ. ἔξω*] not a designation of *excommunication* (Olshausen, De Wette, Tholuck, Baeumlein, and many older commentators), as no sitting of the Sanhedrim had taken place; and, besides, how indefinite a mode of designating the matter would it be! although *ἐκβάλλειν* is frequently used by Thucydides, Xenophon, and others to denote *exile*. Comp. also 3 John, ver. 10. As the context suggests nothing else, and as there is not a hint of a sentence of excommunication, which might perhaps have been pronounced a few days later in the synagogue (Ewald), we must simply explain: *they cast him out*. Significant enough as the final result of the hostile and passionate discussion. Comp. Chrysostom, Nonnus, and Theophylact, who, however, transfers the scene to the *temple*. The remark of Maldonatus is correct: “*ex loco, in quo erant.*” Comp. Bengel, *Dem.* 1366. 11; Acts vii. 58.

Vv. 35, 36. The inner connection is formed, not by the thought that Jesus, when He had heard, etc., *wished to confer on the man rich compensation* (Chrysostom and several others); but, as the question *σύ πιστεύεις*, etc., shows (thou believest on the Son of God? which presupposes an *affirmative* reply), Jesus heard of his being cast out, inferred therefrom that the man had confessed Him to be the Messiah, and therefore asked when He met him, etc. The conclusion which Jesus arrived at was substantially correct; for he who had been born blind had confessed regarding Him that He was *παρὰ θεοῦ*, although the man did not yet consciously associate with this more general predicate a *definite reference to the Messiah*. Lücke finds in *πιστεύεις* merely the *inclination* to believe; were this, however, its force, we must have had *θέλεις πιστεύειν*, or some other similar *mode of expression*. Like *πιστεύω* in ver. 38, *πιστεύεις* here also denotes *actual faith*, namely, in the *manifested Messiah*.—The words *τὸν υἱὸν τ. θεοῦ*<sup>1</sup> must be taken, not in their metaphysical (Olshausen, Ebrard), but simply in their theocratic signification (comp. i. 50), as the man who had been

<sup>1</sup> τ. υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (see the critical notes) Jesus could not have expected the blind man to understand, as included in this question.

born blind, to whose notions Jesus had to accommodate Himself, could and did only understand this at the time. That Jesus, however, *on His side*, and *for Himself*, entertained the higher view, must be taken for granted. — Ver. 36. Surprised by this question, and quickly taking it as a point of connection, the man puts a counter-question, which was designed to show that he is *unable* as yet to believe in the Messiah, though *ready* to do so as soon as he shall know Him. With regard to καὶ τίς ἐστὶ, comp. xiv. 22, and on Mark x. 26. — ἴνα] Design of the inquiry, as in i. 22.

Vv. 37, 38. Καὶ . . . καὶ] *thou hast actually seen Him, and*, etc. Comp. on vi. 36. The substantial meaning of the second clause is: *and hearest Him speak with thee*; but it has a more concrete and lively turn. — ὥρακας] refers to the *present* interview, not to a former one; for he had not *seen* Jesus whilst the act of healing was being performed, and he had not returned to Him from Siloam (see on ver. 7). The use of the *perf.* as the present, of completed action (thou hast a view of Him), need not surprise (Bernhardy, p. 378). — ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν] ἐκεῖνος is not predicate (Hilgenfeld in his *Zeitschrift*, 1859, p. 416); but, as John's very favourite manner is, *subject*, demonstratively comprehending the foregoing participial designation of the same, as in i. 18, 33, v. 11. Comp. 2 Cor. x. 18. So also in the Classics, although they more frequently use οὗτος in this way (see Krüger on Thuc. 2. 15. 4). The connection alone, then, shows whether the person intended is some one else, or, as in this case, and in xix. 35, the *speaker himself*, who presents himself *objectively* as a *third person*, and thus introduces himself to the individual addressed with special emphasis. At the same time, the force of ἐκεῖνος is not thus transformed into that of *idem* or *ipse*.<sup>1</sup> — κύριε] “jam augus-

<sup>1</sup> In relation to the erroneous assertion that ἐκεῖνος in xix. 35 betrays an author different from the Apostle John (see on the passage), the Johannine use of the word was discussed at length by Steitz in *d. Stud. u. Krit.* 1859, p. 497 ff.; Buttmann in the same journal for 1860, p. 505 ff.; and then again by Steitz in the *Stud. u. Krit.* for 1861, p. 368 ff. These controversial discussions (see, finally, Steitz in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschr.* 1862, p. 264 ff.) were in so far unnecessary, as the use of ἐκεῖνος in John does not deviate from the genuine Greek usage; and as the context of xix. 35 shows, as clearly as that of the present passage that the *person who speaks* is pointed to, being presented objectively as though he were a third person.

tiore sensu ita dicit, quam dixerat," ver. 36, Bengel. — προσεκύνησεν αὐτῷ] John uses προσκυνεῖν solely of *divine* worship, iv. 20 ff., xii. 20. The man was seized by the feeling—as yet indeed vague and indistinct—of the *divine* δόξα, the bearer of which, the Messiah, the object of his newly awakened faith and confession, stands before him. The higher conception of ὁ υἱὸς τ. θεοῦ has struck him.

Ver. 39. An *Oxymoron*, to which Jesus (comp. 1 Cor. i. 18 ff.), seeing at His feet the man born blind, and now endued not only with bodily, but also with spiritual sight, gives utterance with profound emotion, addressing Himself, moreover, not to any one particular person (hence εἶπεν without the addition of a person, comp. i. 29, 36), but to those around Him in general. From among these the Pharisees then (ver. 40) come forward to reply. The compact, pregnant sentence is uttered irrespectively of the man who had been blind, who also in a higher sense appears in ver. 36 as still μὴ βλέπων, and in ver 38 as βλέπων. — εἰς κρίμα] *telically*, i.e. to this end, as is clear from the more exact explanation ἵνα, etc., that follows. This κρίμα<sup>1</sup> is an *end*, though not the *ultimate end*, of the appearance of Jesus. He came to bring about, as a matter of fact, a *judicial decision*; He came, namely, in order that, by means of His activity, *those who see not might see*, i.e. in order that those who are conscious of the lack of divine truth (comp. the *poor in spirit* in Matt. v. 3) might be illumined thereby, and *they who see might become blind* (not merely: *appareant caeci*, as Grotius and several others explain), i.e. those who fancy themselves to be in possession of divine truth (comp. Luke xi. 52; Matt. xi. 25; Rom. ii. 19; 1 Cor. i. 21, iii. 18), might not become participators therein; but (comp. Isa. vi. 9 f.) be closed, blinded, and hardened against it (like the self-conceited Pharisees). The point of the saying lies in this: that οἱ μὴ βλέποντες is *subjective*, and βλέπωσι *objective*; whereas οἱ βλέποντες is *subjective*, and τυφλοὶ γένωνται

<sup>1</sup> On this accentuation of κρίμα, see Lobeck, *Paral.* p. 418; comp., however, Lipsius, *grammat. Unters.* I. p. 40. — The word itself is used by John only in this place. It denotes, not the *trial* which is held, the *judicial procedure* (κρίσις), but its result, the *judicial sentence* which is pronounced, the *decision* of the court, what is judicially measured out, etc. Hence κρίμα λαμβάνειν, βαστάζειν, etc.

*objective*.<sup>1</sup> — *κρίμα* is neither merely *separation* (Castalio, Corn. a Lapide, Kuinoel, De Wette, and several others), nor equivalent to *κατάκρισις* (Ammonius, Euth. Zigabenus, Olshausen); but what Christ here says regarding Himself is a *matter of fact*, a retributive judicial arrangement, affecting both sides according to the position they take up relatively to Him. Hence there is no contradiction with iii. 17, viii. 15, xii. 47. Comp. also Weiss, *Lehrbegr.* p. 186 f. If, with Godet, we understand *οἱ μὴ βλέποντες* and *οἱ βλέποντες* of those who have not and those who have the knowledge of the Jewish law, we must refer *βλέπωσι* and *τυφλοί* to the *divine* truth which Christ reveals. A twofold relation is thus introduced, to which the words *λέγετε ὅτι βλέπομεν*, ver. 41, are also opposed.

Ver. 40. *Pharisees* were no doubt in His company, whose object was to mark all the more carefully His further behaviour after the performance of the miracle, not apostate disciples of Jesus (Chrysostom, Euth. Zigabenus), or adherents of a Pharisaic spirit (Lange). See x. 6, 21. They imagine that, in conformity with the opinion which Jesus entertains regarding them, He must needs reckon them among the *μὴ βλέποντες*; and they fail altogether to perceive that, according to the sense in which He used the expression,—which, however, they do not understand,—He must include them among the *βλέποντες*. That they, the wise men of the nation, should be *μὴ βλέποντες* or *τυφλοί* (comp. Matt. xv. 14), seems to them, in their conceit, so astonishing and singular, that they ask: *But we also are surely not blind?* The Pharisees did not understand Jesus to be speaking of *physical* blindness (Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, and several others), because otherwise they would certainly *not* have put such a question.

<sup>1</sup> It is true, indeed, that the *μὴ βλέποντες* are *susceptible*, and the *βλέποντες* *unsusceptible*; but this was not determined by the consideration that the former believed without seeing, whilst the latter refused to believe, notwithstanding all they had seen of Jesus (see Baur, p. 179); on the contrary, the susceptibility of the one and the unsusceptibility of the other were rooted in their inner relation to Christ, which is necessarily moral, and the result of free self-determination. Indeed, against the view now controverted, ver. 41 alone is decisive, apart even from the mysterious designation of the matter by a circumstance occurring in connection with it. Comp. Delitzsch, *Psych.* p. 162. — On *μὴ βλέπειν*, *to be blind*, comp. Soph. *O. C.* 73; *O. R.* 302; see also Xen. *Mem.* i. 3. 4. On *τυφλοί*, in the figurative sense, see Soph. *O. R.* 371.

Ver. 41. Alas! Jesus intends to say, Ye are not blind. *Were ye blind* (as I intended the *μὴ βλέποντες* in ver. 39), that is, people who are conscious of being destitute of the true knowledge,<sup>1</sup> *then ye would be without sin*, i.e. your unbelief in me would not be sinful, just because it would involve no resistance to divine truth, but would simply imply that ye had not yet attained thereunto, a result for which ye were not to blame. *But now ye assert we see* (profess to be possessors of divine truth); the consequence whereof is, that *your sin remaineth* (is not removed),<sup>2</sup> i.e. that your unbelief in me not only is sinful, but also this, your sin *continues to exist, remains undestroyed* (*ἀνεξάλειπτος μένει*, Theodoret, Heracleon), because your conceit is a perpetual ground for rejecting me, so that you cannot attain to faith and the forgiveness of sin. "Dicendo videmus, medicum non quaeritis," Augustine. "Si diceretis: *caeci sumus*, visum peteretis et peccatum jam desisset," Bengel. According to Lücke (so also substantially Baeumlein), whom J. Müller follows (*Lehre v. d. Sünde*, I. p. 286, ed. 5), the meaning is: "Were you blind, i.e. without the *capability* of knowledge, there would be no sin (guilt) in your unbelief; you would then be *unable* to believe with knowledge. But so long as you say, notwithstanding all your blindness, We see, and therefore do not put away your conceited self-deception, so long your unbelief cannot depart, but must remain." Against this view are the following objections: 1. *Τυφλοί*, because answering to *μὴ βλέποντες* in ver. 39, cannot denote *incapacity* for knowledge; 2. The antithesis *λέγετε ὅτι βλέπ.* suggests for *τυφλοί*, not the objective, but the subjective meaning; 3. *Ἀμαρτία* is thus taken in different senses in the two halves. Other imported meanings are: *Were you blind*, like the *multitude* which you regard as blind, *perhaps* you would have no sin, etc. (Ewald, as though besides *ἂν* John had written also *τάχα* or *ἴσως*); or (Hengstenberg), if ye suffered merely from the simple blindness of the human race, which is blind from birth, ye would

<sup>1</sup> Not, *physically blind*, as Nonnus, Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, and several others here, as well as in ver. 40, after the example of Chrysostom, wrongly understand.

<sup>2</sup> Not, "*The sin remains yours*" (Ewald). Comp. xv. 16.

have no sin of decisive significance, no unpardonable sin; as though there were the slightest reference to anything of the kind! Substantially correct are Erasmus, Beza, Grotius, and several others; comp. Luthardt and Ebrard; still οὐκ ἂν εἴχ. ἀμ. ought not to be transposed into, "*then would your sin forgive you.*" The explanation of Godet is a natural consequence of his interpretation of ver. 39, but founders on the words λέγετε ὅτι βλέπομεν.<sup>1</sup>

OBSERVATION.—The absence from the Synoptics of the miracle performed on the man born blind ought to have found its explanation simply in the circumstance that it did not take place in the (Galilean) sphere of the synoptic narrative, and ought not to have been made the ground of an attack on its historical credibility, as was done by Strauss (who compares the healing of Naaman in 2 Kings v. 10); by Weisse (who derives the narrative, by means of a misunderstanding, from ver. 39); and by Baur (who regards this story as the intensified expression of the healings of the blind recorded by the synoptists, p. 245 f.); whilst Gfrörer, on the contrary, content with asserting the presence of unhistorical additions, comes to a conclusion disadvantageous to the synoptists.—According to Baur (p. 176 ff.), the narrative of the miracle was definitely and intentionally shaped, so as to *set forth faith in its pure objectivity*, the susceptibility to the divine as it is affected by the pure impression of the divine element in the ἔργα θεοῦ, even when it is not yet aware who is the subject of these ἔργα. "It clings to the thing itself; and the thing itself is so immediately divine, that in the thing, without knowing it, one has also the person." In such wise are arbitrary, and not even relevant (see Brückner), abstractions from history converted into the *ground* of history. Ammon makes the occurrence a natural healing of an *inflammation of the eyes!* a counterpart to the converse travesty of some of the Fathers, who express the opinion that the *blind man lacked eyes altogether*, and that Jesus formed them out of the πηλός, as God at first formed man from the earth (see especially Irenaeus, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Nonnus); comp. on ver. 6 f.

<sup>1</sup> "S'ils appartenient à la multitude ignorante, leur incrédulité à l'égard de Jésus pourrait n'être qu'une affaire d'entraînement (it would be merely a sin against the Son of man); mais éclairés, comme ils le sont, par la connaissance de la parole de Dieu, c'est sciemment, qu'ils rejettent le Messie" (this is a sin against the Holy Ghost). In this case, however, Jesus must have said: οὐ δὲ βλάπτει, not οὐ δὲ λίσσει ὅτι βλέπομεν, which Godet, it is true, regards merely as an allusion to the question in ver. 40; whilst in reality it is the key to the correct understanding of the entire passage.

## CHAPTER X.

VER. 3. *καλεῖ*] A. B. D. L. X. *κ*. Curss. Cyr.: *φωνεῖ*. Recommended by Griesb., accepted by Lachm. and Tisch. Correct; the following *κατ' ὄνομα* was the occasion of writing the more definite word alongside, whence it was then introduced into the text. — Ver. 4. *τὰ ἴδια πρόβατα*] Lachm. and Tisch.: *τὰ ἴδια πάντα*, after B. D. L. X. *κ*.\*\* Cursives, Copt. Sahid. Cyr. Lucif. Cant. *πάντα*, after the preceding occurrence of the word, passed mechanically over into *πρόβατα*. — Ver. 5. *ἀκολουθήσωσιν*] Lachm. and Tisch.: *ἀκολουθήσουσιν*, after preponderating testimony; the Indicat. was displaced by the usual conjunct. — Ver. 8. *πάντες*] is omitted in D. Cant. Ver. Foss. Didym., and *πρὸ ἐμοῦ* is absent from E. F. G. M. S. U. *Δ. κ*.\* Cursives, Verss. the Fathers. The omission of *πάντες* is to be explained from its being superfluous; and that of *πρὸ ἐμοῦ*, which Tisch. has deleted, from the Gnostic and Manichæan misuse of the passage in opposition to the Old Testament. — The place of *πρὸ ἐμοῦ* after *ἤλθον* is decisively attested (Elz., Scholz.: before *ἤλθον*). — Instead of *τίθησιν*, ver. 11, *δίδωσιν* (Tisch.) is too feebly attested. So also *δίδωμι*, ver. 15. — Ver. 12. *τὰ πρόβατα* after *σκορπ.* is wanting in B. D. L. *κ*. Cursives, Verss. Lucif.; bracketed by Lachm. and suppressed by Tisch. But why should it have been added? Appearing as it would altogether superfluous, it might easily be passed over. — Ver. 13. *ὁ δὲ μισθωτ. φεύγει*] wanting in B. D. L. *κ*. Cursives, Verss. Lucif.; bracketed by Lachm., rejected even by Rinck, and deleted by Tisch. But how easily might the eye of a copyist pass at once from *ὁ δὲ μισθ.* to *ὅτι μισθ.*, so that *ὁ δὲ μισθ. φεύγει* was omitted. This explanation is suggested further by A.\* which omits *μισθ. φεύγει ὅτι*. — Ver. 14. *γινώσχομαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἐμῶν*] B. D. L. *κ*., most of the Verss. Cyr. Epiph. Nonn.: *γινώσκουσίν με τὰ ἐμά*. Recommended by Griesbach, accepted by Lachm. and Tisch. This active turn is a transformation in harmony with the following verse, in which also there is no passive expression. — Ver. 16. The position *δεῖ με* (Lachm. and Tisch.) is strongly supported, but would easily suggest itself as the more usual instead of *μὲ δεῖ*. — *γενήσεται*] B. D. L. X. and some Verss.: *γενήσονται*. Mechanically introduced after the preceding plural form. — Ver. 18.



αἴρει] Tisch.: ἦρεν, only after B. K.\* — Ver. 26. Instead of οὐ γάρ we must read, with Tisch., ὅτι οὐκ, after B. D. L. X. K. Curss. Or. Cyr. Chrys. — καθὼς εἶπον ὑμῖν] wanting in B. K. L. M.\* K. Curss. Verss. and Fathers. Bracketed by Lachm. The apparent incongruity caused the omission. — Ver. 29. ὃς δέδωκε] D.: ὁ δέδωκός. A stylistic alteration. B. L. K.\* Copt. Sahid. Vulg. It. Goth. Tert. Hil.: ὁ δέδωκεν. A. B. X. It. Vulg. read μερίζον afterwards. The latter is to be regarded as original, and because the neuter was not understood relatively to ὁ πατήρ as the source of the alteration, ὁ δέδωκεν — Ver. 33. λέγοντες] is, with Lachm. and Tisch., after preponderating testimony, to be deleted. — Ver. 38. πιστεύητε] Tisch.: πιστεύετε, after inadequate evidence for this irregularity, especially as πιστεύετε precedes and follows; for instead of the following πιστεύσατε, decisive evidence renders it necessary, with Tisch., to read πιστεύετε. — ἵνα γινῶτε καὶ πιστεύσητε] Lachm. and Tisch.: ἵνα γινῶτε κ. γινώσκητε, after B. L. X. Curss. Copt. Sahid. Arm. Aeth. and some Fathers. Correctly; not being understood after γινῶτε, γινώσκ. was altered into πιστεύσ. — αὐτῷ] B. D. L. X. K. Curss. and most of the Verss., also Or. Athan. and others, have τῷ πατρί. Recommended by Griesbach, accepted by Lachm. and Tisch. With such decided witnesses in its favour, justly; for the emphasis lying in the repetition of the word might easily escape the copyists. — Ver. 42. ἐκεῖ] Decisive evidence assigns it its place after αὐτόν. So also Lachm. and Tisch.

Ver. 1.<sup>1</sup> The new chapter ought to have begun with ix. 35; for x. 1–21 constitute *one* act with ix. 35–41, as is evident both from the circumstance that x. 1 ff. follow immediately without the slightest indication of a change having taken place, and also from ver. 6 (comp. ix. 41). The parable is therefore still addressed to the Pharisees of chap. ix.; as ver. 21 also shows by the reference which it contains to the healing of the blind man. — ἀμὲν ἀμὲν, etc.] After the punitive words of ix. 41, Jesus now, with solemn earnestness, and through the medium of a parable, unveils to them how their hostile relation to Him, in rejecting Him, whilst at the same time regarding themselves as the leaders of the people of God, necessarily made them the corrupters of the nation. His discourse proceeds, however, without any objection or contra-

<sup>1</sup> On the parable, see Fritzsche in *Fritzschiör. Opusc.* p. 1 ff.; Voretzsch, *Diss. de John x.* 1–18, Altenb. 1838.

diction being raised by His opponents; for they did not understand the figure, ver. 6; many also fail to understand the explanation, and despise the speaker as crazy (ver. 20); whilst others, again, yield to the impression made by the penetrating truth of His words (ver. 21). It happened, accordingly, that Jesus was able to carry out the beautiful allegory (ver. 6) in all its detail, without interruption, as it were in one breath; and had therefore, at its close, nothing further to do than to let the words spoken produce their natural impression. Their primary effect was a division among His hearers (ver. 19), in accordance with ix. 39; such as had already showed itself in ix. 16. — ὁ μὲν εἰσερχόμενος, etc.] The flocks of sheep spent the night in a fold (αὐλή, <sup>ἡ</sup>πλῆ) surrounded by a wall, at whose gate an under-shepherd (ὁ θυρωρός, ver. 3) kept watch during the night. See especially Bochart, *Hieroz.* I. p. 482, ed. Rosenm. Opposed to the εἰσερχόμε. διὰ τ. θύρας (the emphasis lies on the last word) is the ἀναβαίνων ἀλλαχόθεν, *who gets up* (on to the wall, for the purpose of coming into the αὐλή, over it) *from elsewhere*, i.e. from another direction than that indicated by the gate. There is only *one* gate. On ἀλλαχόθεν, which is equivalent to the old classical ἄλλοθεν, see Ael. *H. A.* 7. 10; *V. H.* 6. 2; 4 Macc. i. 7. — κλέπτ. κ. ληστῆς] *Thief and robber*; a climactic strengthening of the idea (Bornemann, *Scholia in Lucam*, p. xxx.; Lobeck, *Paralip.* p. 60 f.); the individual features, however, of the soul-destroying, selfish procedure thus indicated (Ezek. xxxiv. 8; Mal. ii. 8; Jer. xxiii. 1) are not to be dissevered. — For the *explanation of the figure* we must note,— (1) The αὐλή τῶν προβάτων is the *Church of the people of God*, whose members are the πρόβατα (comp. Ps. xxiii., lxxvii. 21, xcv. 7, c. 3), conceived in their totality as the future community of the Messianic kingdom (xxi. 16 f.); comp. Matt. xxv. 32, consequently *as to their theocratic destination* (ideally). It is in itself correct, indeed, as to substance, to assume a reference to the *predestinated* (Augustine, Lampe) (though not in the Augustinian sense); but in form it introduces something foreign to the context. (2) The θύρα is not to be left without its proper signification (Lücke, De Wette); nor to be taken as denoting in general the *legitimus*

*ὁρῶ*, the *divine calling*, the *approach ordained by God*, and the like (Maldonatus, Tholuck, Luthardt, Brückner, Hengstenberg, Godet, and several others); but *Christ Himself* is the door; indeed, He Himself in ver. 7 expressly thus interprets the point, because His hearers had failed to understand it.<sup>1</sup> The true leaders of the theocratic people can enter on their vocation in no other way than *through Him*; *He* must qualify and commission them; *He* must be the mediator of their relation to the sheep. Quite a different position was taken up by the Pharisees; independently of Him, and in an unbelieving and hostile spirit towards Him, they arrogated to themselves the position of the leaders of the people of God. It is thoroughly arbitrary to assume that Jesus did not here intend by the figure of the gate to denote Himself, notwithstanding the distinct declaration contained in ver. 9. Chrysostom, Ammonius, Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, and several others, have perversely interpreted the doors of the *Holy Scriptures*. "Ipse textus addit imagini interpretationem qua contenti sumus," Melancthon.

Vv. 2, 3. Ποιμὴν] *Shepherd*, without article *qualitatively*; it characterizes such a one, not specially as the *owner* (the antithesis to the hireling first appears in ver. 12), but in general, in opposition to the *robber*.—ὁ θυρωρὸς ἀνοίγει] belongs to the *description* of the legitimate mode of entering, and is not intended to have any special explanation; for which reason also no further notice is taken of it in vv. 7, 8. It must not, therefore, be explained either of *God* (Calvin, Maldonatus, Bengel, Tholuck, Ewald, Hengstenberg, following vi. 44 f.); or of the *Holy Spirit*, Acts xiii. 2 (Theodoret, Heracleon, Ruperti, Aretius, Corn. a Lapide, and several others, also Lange); or of *Christ* (Cyril, Augustine); or of *Moses* (Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Euth. Zigabenus, Luther, following Deut. xviii. 15); or of *John the Baptist* (Godet, after i. 7). He enters into the fold, *and the sheep hear His voice* (His call, His address, His appeal); they *listen* to it as to the voice which is *known* to them (comp. ver. 4). Comp. the shepherd's cry to his flock, "σῖττα," in *Theocr.* iv. 46,

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Ignat. *ad Philad.* 9, where Christ is termed *θύρα τοῦ πατρὸς*; also Herm. *Past.* 3; *Sim.* 9. 12.

viii. 69. — τὰ πρόβατα] are the sheep in the fold generally. It was common for several flocks to pass the night in one fold; and their shepherds, because they come every morning to lead out the individual flocks, are known to *all* the sheep in the fold. On the contrary, τὰ ἴδια πρόβατα are the sheep which *belong to the special flock* of him who has entered;<sup>1</sup> these he calls κατ' ὄνομα, i.e. not merely ὀνομαστί (that would be merely ὄνομα, or ὀνόματι, or ἐπ' ὀνόματος, Polyb. 5. 35. 2, 11. 15. 1), but distributively — *by their names, each by its name*, ἐκ τῆς εἰς ἕκαστον ἄκρας φροντίδος, Euth. Zigenbenus. To give to the individual animals of their flock a *name* was not an unusual custom among the shepherds of ancient times. See *Interpp. ad Theocr.* 5. 101; Pricaeus on the passage. In Lange's view (*Leben Jesu*, II. p. 955) the ἴδια πρόβ. are the *favourite sheep* (image of the elect), the bell-wethers, which are followed by the whole flock (τὰ πρόβατα, ver. 4). This is incorrect; for, on the one hand, ἴδια alone would not sufficiently support this notion (comp. ver. 12); and on the other, ἐμπροσθεν πορεύεται and ἀκολουθεῖ, ver. 4, are so completely correlate, that αὐτῶν and τὰ πρόβατα must necessarily be the same: at all events, αὐτοῖς must otherwise have been used instead of αὐτῶ, ver. 4. — ἐξάγει] to pasture, vv. 9, 10. Looking back to ix. 34, 22, Godet imports into the words the idea of separation from the old theocracy, which is devoted to ruin.<sup>2</sup> Such a thought is contained neither in the words (*Pollux*, i. 250) nor in the context.

Ver. 4. *And when he has brought out all his own sheep* (those belonging to *his* flock), and so forth. He leaves none behind (πάντα, see the critical note). ἐκβάλλη pictures forth the *manner* of the ἐξάγειν. He *lays hold on* the sheep which he has called to him, and brings them out to the door. — The

<sup>1</sup> Into the beautiful general figure of τὰ πρόβατα, the word ἴδια introduces a special, individual element, which makes it all the richer and more telling. It has been incorrectly maintained (by Bengel, Luthardt, Hengstenberg, and others), that although ἴδια is first associated with πρόβατα when it occurs for the second time, the πρόβατα which hear must necessarily be the same as those which are afterwards described as τὰ ἴδια πρόβατα. These latter are no doubt among the πρόβατα which hear; but it is only τὰ ἴδια that the shepherd calls by name, and so forth. Thus the particular Church belongs to the Universal.

<sup>2</sup> Similarly even Luther: "It denotes the Christian freedom from the law and judgment."

idea, which is symbolically set forth in vv. 3 and 4, is that of the living, loving *fellowship* which subsists between the leaders of the people of God, whom Christ has appointed, and Christ Himself, for the satisfaction of the spiritual needs of the Church, both in general and in particular.

Ver. 5. Ἀλλοτρίῳ δὲ, etc.] *A stranger, however, who does not belong to them as their shepherd.* It is not exclusively the ἀναβαίνοντες ἀλλαχ. of ver. 1 who are here intended, but *every other one* in general who is not their shepherd. The fellowship referred to in vv. 3 and 4 is portrayed according to its *exclusive* nature. — οὐ μὴ ἀκολουθήσουσιν] *future* (see the critical note), as in viii. 12. It is not *prophetical* (Lampe: of the “cathedra Mosis plane deserta,” comp. Luthardt), but describes what *will be the result* of the intervention of a stranger. The sheep will certainly not follow, but flee from him.

Vv. 6, 7. Παροιμία] Every species of discourse that deviates from the common course (οἶμος); hence in the classical writers especially—*proverb* (Plat. *Soph.* p. 261 B; *Soph. Aj.* 649; *Ael. N. H.* 12. 22; *Lucian, Nigr.* 1. 37; comp. 2 *Pet.* ii. 22). It denotes here, as corresponding to the Hebrew *ḥōp*, if we define the conception more exactly, not *parable* (because it is not a history), but *allegory* (see Wilke, *Rhetor.* p. 109). Suidas: ἡ παροιμία ἐστὶ λόγος ἀπόκρυφος δι’ ἐτέρου προδήλου σημαίνόμενος. — The *Pharisees* do not understand the meaning of what He thus *allegorically* delivered to them, and therefore (οὖν, ver. 7) Jesus sees Himself compelled to begin again (πάλιν), and to explain to them, first of all, the *main point* on which the understanding of the whole depended, namely, how the *door* in ver. 1 is to be understood. It is incorrect, accordingly, with most recent commentators (also Hengstenberg and Godet), to say that we have a second parable with a different turn; if Christ had not intended even in ver. 1 to describe Himself as the θύρα, He would only have confused His hearers in ver. 7, instead of clearing matters up. — ἐγώ] with great emphasis. — τῶν προβάτων] *to the sheep*, as is required by ver. 1; not, *through which the sheep enter into the fold* (Chrysostom, Euth. Zigabenus, Wolf, Lampe, Fritzsche, Ebrard, Hengstenberg, Baeumlein, Godet, and

others), so that Jesus characterizes Himself as the *tutorem ac nutritorem* of the sheep (Fritzsche). Christ, however, is the door to the sheep, so far as the true spiritual leaders of the people of God receive through Him the qualification and appointment to their vocation. See on ver. 1.

Ver. 8. See Ewald, *Jahrb.* ix. p. 40 ff. The actual antithesis to the *ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ θύρα* is formed by the many who had come forward to be the teachers and leaders of the people of God, without connecting their working with Christ. He describes them from the point of view of the time at which they came forward *before me*; they came forward *before* Christ had appeared as the door to the sheep; they had developed their power and activity since the time of the second temple, in a way that gradually grew more and more pernicious, and they formed now the party of *hierarchica*, specially *Pharisaical*, antagonists of Christ. The members of this *hierarchica* caste are intended; the expression used by Christ, however, is popular, and not to be pressed as hard and unhistorical (Hase); the use of the present *εἰσὶ*, moreover, gives it a living relation to the leaders of the people, as they then actually were before his eyes. On the other hand, passages like vii. 19, v. 39, 45, iv. 22, exclude even the possibility of a reference to Moses and the prophets; hence the inadmissibility of Hilgenfeld's idea that the saying is "very harshly *anti-Judaistic*," as also that it refers to the entire Old Testament past, *i.e.* to all the pre-Christian leaders of the people of God,—an application which he tries to justify by bringing in the Gnostic dualism. It is also inadmissible to set aside in any way the temporal meaning of *πρό*, whether it be made to mean, with Calovius: *in advance of me* (*antequam mitterentur*); or, with Brückner (after Stier): *before* they have sought and found me as the door; or, with Wolf, to convert it into *χωρίς*,—a view which comes substantially to that of Olshausen ("without connection with the Logos"); or, with Tittmann and Schleusner, to take it for *ὑπέρ*, *loco*, and with Lange to import into this view, "instead of me," the further notion of *absolute pre-eminence*, as though the one who advances forward designed completely to set aside the one who was put in the background. *πρό*, in the sense of *instead*, is foreign to

the New Testament, and rare also in Greek writers. But when ἤλθον, with a view to the removal of everything objectionable, is taken *pregnantly*, making it express an *arbitrary* or *unauthorized*<sup>1</sup> coming forward (Hieronymus, Augustine, Isidore, Heracleon, Euth. Zigabenus, Luther, Melancthon, Jansen, and several others; also Luthardt, Ebrard), a meaning is imported into the word, which in itself, indeed, may be regarded as a matter of course, but which, at the same time, must have been distinctly expressed (say, as in ver. 43), if it were to be *emphatical*.<sup>2</sup> This also against B. Crusius, who lays the stress on the *intention* expressed in ἤλθον ("in order to give the people a new time"). The explanation, finally, of *false Messiahs* (Chrysostom, Cyril, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Euth. Zigabenus, Theophylact, Grotius, Maldonatus, Hammond, Tittmann, Schleusner, Klee, Weizsäcker, and several others), is unhistorical, as they first began to come forward after Christ's day; a circumstance on which B. Bauer, however, grounds a charge of anachronism against John. De Wette considers the discourse to be out of harmony with the wisdom and gentleness of Jesus. But the worthless men, to whose entire class He alludes, stood actually in His presence, and had surely done enough to call forth His severity and wrath. — κλέπται εἰςὶ κ. λησται] namely, of the sheep, ver. 1. Comp. the wolves in sheep's clothing. Instead of πάντες ὅσοι, ἅπαντες ὅσοι would have been still stronger, Strabo, p. 18, l. 11, Isocr. *Loch.* 12. — ἀλλά]. The want of success which attends this predatory (soul-destroying) procedure. — οὐκ ἤκουσαν] *did not listen to them*. For *their* adherents did not belong to the true people of God (τὰ πρόβατα).

Ver. 9. Ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ θύρα] τῷ διπλασιασμῷ τοῦ ῥητοῦ βεβαιοῖ τὸν λόγον, Euth. Zigabenus. — δι' ἐμοῦ] *emphatically*

<sup>1</sup> Nonnus takes it in the sense of *creeping in secretly*: πάντες ὅσοι πάρος ἤλθον ὑποκρίσσονται τιδὶλρ.

<sup>2</sup> In ἤλθον by itself, so far as it precedes πρὸ ἐμοῦ, it is impossible to find, as Luthardt does, the thought "on his own responsibility," or "so that he places Christ after himself." ἤλθον denotes neither more nor less than the simple *venerunt*; as in ver. 10. ἐγὼ ἤλθον is equal to the simple *ego veni*; the emphasis rests primarily on πάντες ὅσοι, *omnes quotquot*, and then on πρὸ ἐμοῦ, which is placed at the end.

occupying the front place, excluding every other mediation. — εἰσέλθῃ] namely, to the sheep in the fold. Comp. vv. 1, 7. The subject is therefore a *shepherd* (τις), who goes in to the sheep through the door. Others, on the contrary (Chrysostom, Euth. Zigabenus, Maldonatus, Bengel, and several others; also Fritzsche, Tholuck, De Wette, B. Crusius, Maier, Baeumlein, Hengstenberg, Godet, and several others), regard the *sheep* as the subject, and the *θύρα* as the gate for the sheep. But there is no ground for such a change of figure, seeing that both the word εἰσέρχεσθαι in itself after vv. 1 and 2, and also the singular and masculine τις, can only refer to the *shepherd*; besides, another mode of entrance than *through the door* is for the sheep quite *inconceivable*; consequently the emphatic words δι' ἐμοῦ, so far as the ἐγώ is the *door*, would be without any possible antithesis. — σωθήσεται] is not to be understood directly of the *attainment of the Messianic redemption* (compare especially 1 Cor. iii. 15), as Luthardt and older commentators suppose, after 1 Tim. iv. 16, for that would be foreign to the context (see what follows); but means: *he will be delivered*, i.e. he will be set free from all dangers by the *protecting door*;—the *interpretation* of the figure intended by Jesus does undoubtedly signify safety from the *Messianic ἀπώλεια*, and the guarantee of future *eternal redemption*. This happy σωθήσεται is then followed by *unrestrained and blessed service*, which is graphically set forth by means of the words εἰσελ. κ. ἐξελ., as in Num. xxvii. 17, as an unhindered entering in and going out of the fold, at the head of the flock, whilst engaged in the daily duty of tending it; and by νομὴν εὐρήσει, as the finding of pasture for the flock (ποιμνίων νομάς, Soph. O. R. 760; compare Plat. Legg. iii. p. 679 A: νομῆς γὰρ οὐκ ἦν σπάνις). That this νομή in the interpretation of the allegory is ψυχῆς νομή (Plat. Phaedr. p. 248 B), which works for the eternal life of those who are fed through the evangelical grace and truth which they appropriate (comp. ver. 10), does not need further urging.

Ver. 10. The opposite of such a one as entered δι' ἐμοῦ, is the *thief* to whom allusion was made in ver. 1; when he comes to the sheep, he has only selfish and destructive ends in view. Comp. Decm. 782. 9: ἃ φησι φυλάττειν πρόβατα,



αὐτὸς κατεσθίων. — ἐγὼ ἦλθον, etc.] Quite otherwise *I! I* have come (to the sheep), etc. By this new antithesis, in which Christ contrasts *Himself*, and not again the shepherd appointed through Him, with the thief, the way is prepared for a transition to another use of the figure which represents Him no longer as the door (from ver. 11 onwards), but as the true *Shepherd Himself* (Matt. xxvi. 31; Heb. xiii. 20; 1 Pet. ii. 23). Compare the promise in Ex. xxxiv. 23; xxxvii. 24, in contrast to the false shepherds in Ezek. xxxiv. 2 ff. — *ἵνα ζωὴν ἔχωσι*. The opposite of *θύση κ. ἀπολ.*; the sheep are not to be slaughtered and perish, but are to have *life*; and as the nature of the reality set forth requires, it is the *Messianic* life in its temporal development and eternal perfection that is meant. — *καὶ περισσὸν ἔχ.*] *and have it abundantly* (overflowingly), *i.e.* in the *figure*: rich fulness of nourishment (comp. Ps. xxiii.); as to the thing, abundance of spiritual possessions (grace and truth, i. 14, 17), in which the *ζωή* consists. Incorrectly Vulgate, Chrysostom, Euth. Zigabenus, Grotius, and many others, compare also Ewald, who interpret the passage as though *περισσότερον* were used, *more than ζωή*, wherewith is meant—the *kingdom of heaven*; or, according to Ewald, “Joy, and besides, constantly increasing blessing.” The *repetition* of *ἔχωσιν* gives the second point a more independent position than it would have had if *καί* alone had been used. Comp. ver. 18; Xen. *Anab.* i. 10. 3: *καὶ ταύτην ἔσωσαν καὶ ἄλλα — ἔσωσαν*.

Ver. 11. *Ἐγὼ*] Repeated again with lively emphasis. It is no other. — *ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός*] *the good*, the excellent *shepherd*, conceived absolutely as He ought to be: hence the article and the emphatic position of the adjective. In Christ is realized the ideal of the shepherd, as it lives in the Old Testament (Ps. xxiii.; Isa. xl. 11; Ezek. xxxiv.; Jer. xxiii.; Zech. xi.; also Mic. v. 3). With the conception of *καλός* compare the Attic *καλὸς καγαθός* (also Tob. vii. 7; 2 Macc. xv. 12), and the contrary: *πονηρός, κακός, ἄδικος*. — In the following specification of the things in which the good shepherd proves himself to correspond to his idea, *ὁ ποιμ. ὁ καλός* is solemnly repeated. — *τιθέναι τ. ψυχήν*] As to substance, though not as to the meaning of the words, equivalent to *δοῦναι*

τ. ψ. (Matt. xx. 28). It is a *Johannean* expression (xiii. 37 f., xv. 13; 1 John iii. 16), without corresponding examples in Greek classical writers (against Kypke, I. p. 388); and must be explained, neither from the simple שׂוּם, Isa. liii. 10 (Hengstenberg), nor from שׂוּם נֶפֶשׁ בְּחַיִּים (Judg. xii. 3; 1 Sam. xix. 5), where בְּחַיִּים is *essential*; but from the idea of the sacrificial death as a ransom that has been paid (Matt. xx. 28; 1 Tim. ii. 6). Its import accordingly is: *to pay down one's soul, impendere*, in harmony with the use of *τιθέναι* in the classics, according to which it denotes *to pay* (so frequently in Demosthenes and others; see Reiske, *Ind. Dem.* p. 495, ed. Schaef.; Dissen, *ad Dem. de Cor.* p. 271). Compare Nonnus: *καὶ ψυχῆς ἰδίης οὐ φείδεται, ἀλλὰ ἐθήσει λύτρον ἑῶν ὄτων. — ὑπέρ]* *for the good of*, in order to turn aside destruction from them by his own self-sacrifice. Compare xi. 50 f. It is less in harmony with this specific point of view, from which the sacrifice of the life of Jesus is regarded throughout the entire New Testament, to take *τιθέναι*, with De Wette, Ebrard, Godet, as denoting merely *lay down* (as in xiii. 4); or to assume the idea which is foreign to the passage, "*to offer as a prize for competition*" (Ewald).

Ver. 12 f. In opposition to the idea of the good shepherd, we have here that of the *hireling*. The term *μισθωτός* must not be taken to refer to the conduct of the *Pharisees* in their leadership of the people (Baeumlein and older writers, also my own view previously), as these hierarchs are included in the characteristic designation of *Thieves and Robbers* (vv. 8, 2), with which the description of the hireling, who is *cowardly*, and *careth not* for the sheep, would not harmonize. Nor can it be directed against the mode in which the *legitimate priesthood* lead the people, as Godet thinks; for the priesthood consisted to a large extent of *Pharisees*, and formed with these latter, as far as antagonism to Christ was concerned, one great party (vii. 32, 45; xi. 47, 57; xviii. 3). The expression *ὁ μισθωτός* rather represents those leading teachers of the people of God, *who, instead of being ready to sacrifice their lives for the community, flee from danger, and forsake, with feelings of indifference and disregard, their charge*. Under the figure of the *μισθωτός*, there rise to the view of Christ the many cross-

forsaking teachers, who would arise even in the apostolic age (Gal. vi. 12 ; Phil. iii. 18), and to whom the Apostle Paul forms the most brilliant historical contrast. The question by whom the *μισθωτός* is to be regarded as *hired*, leads beyond the purpose of the allegory, which is to set forth, in contrast to the good shepherd, the idea of a shepherd who, influenced solely by *self-interest*, takes charge of a flock, which is *not his own property*. — *καὶ οὐκ ὦν ποιμήν*] is closely connected with *ὁ μισθ.* *δέ* : *he, however, who is a hireling* (hired for wage) *and is not a shepherd*, — shepherd in the sense of being *owner* of the sheep which he leads out to pasture ; hence the words *οὐ οὐκ εἰσὶ*, etc., are added for the purpose of more emphatically expressing the meaning. Note that Christ possesses a Church (flock) even before His death ; partly, according to the old theocratic *idea*, namely, that of the old people of God as His *ἱδιοι*, i. 11 ; partly *in reality*, namely, the totality of those who believed on Him, whom the Father has given Him (vi. 37) ; partly *proleptically* (ver. 16) ; though, as far as He is concerned, they are first *purchased* (compare Acts xx. 28 ; Titus ii. 14) by Him through His death, after which event began the extension of His shepherd's functions to all, by the drawing of His Holy Spirit (xii. 32). — There is no justification for interpreting the *wolf* specially, either of the *devil* (Euth. Zigabenus, Aretius, Olshausen, and several others ; admitted even by Chrysostom) ; or of heretics, after Acts xx. 20 (Augustine, Jansen, and several others). It is a general image of every sort of *power, opposed to the Messiah*, and bent on destroying the kingdom of God, which may make its appearance ; this power, however, as such, has its causal and ruling principle in the devil, xii. 31 ; xiv. 30 ; Matt. x. 16. — *ἀρπάζει αὐτὰ κ. σκορπίζει τὰ πρόβ.*] *he snatches them* (namely, the individuals on which he falls), *and scatters the sheep, i.e. the mass of them, the flock* ; hence the word *πρόβαρα* is neither superfluous nor harsh (De Wette). — *ὅτι μισθωτ. ἐστὶ*] nothing else. This and what follows supplies the ethical key to the behaviour described. — Notice further, that whilst in verse 12 we read *ὁ μισθ. δέ*, here we have *ὁ δὲ μισθ.* ; because the antithesis of the hireling was first brought forward in ver. 12, and greater emphasis was secured

by the immediate connection of *μυσθ.* with *ὁ*. Comp. Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 378.

Ver. 14 f. After the description of the hireling, there now follows again that of the *opposite*,—the characterization of Himself as the good shepherd, first specifying His intimate acquaintance with His sheep, and then repeating His readiness to *sacrifice Himself* on their behalf. The latter point constitutes the *refrain* of the characterization (vv. 17, 18), being here concretely expressed (it is different in ver. 11, where it was predicated of the good shepherd *in abstracto*). — *καθὼς γινώσκει με*, etc.] The nature and mode, the holy nature of that reciprocal acquaintanceship. Compare xiv. 20, xv. 10, xvii. 8, 21. As between God and Christ, so also between Christ and His people, the reciprocal knowledge is a knowledge growing out of the most intimate fellowship of love and life,—that fellowship which directly involves *γινώσκειν*; comp. on Matt. vii. 23. — *τίθημι*] near and certain future. The clause *κ. τ. ψ.* is not dependent on *καθὼς*.

Ver. 16. The repeated mention of His sacrificial death, by which the union of Jews and heathen into one community of believers was to be effected (see on Eph. ii. 14), raises His look to the future when He (as the good shepherd *lifted up on high*, compare Heb. xiii. 20; 1 Pet. ii. 25) shall be the guide also of the *heathen*, who have become believers, and whom he now *prophetically* terms His sheep. Compare xi. 52, xii. 32,<sup>1</sup> and prophetic utterances, such as Mic. iv. 2; Isa. xlix. 1 ff., lii. 13 ff., liii. 10 ff. But the thought that He does not need the faith of the Jews (Hengstenberg after Ruperti) is

<sup>1</sup> The relation of ver. 16 to what precedes corresponds entirely to the New Testament idea, that salvation proceeds from the Jews to the heathen (comp. iv. 22, xi. 52). This advantage of the Jews is also to be recognised as acknowledged by John, to whom we are not to ascribe the idea of a perfect equality of the two (Lücke, B. Crusius; comp. also Messner, *Lehre der Ap.* p. 355). The heathen who are to be gained are, however, even before they are recipients of salvation, *τίνα τ. θεοῦ*, and Christ has them as His sheep, according to the ideal view of the future, as an actuality so far as it is certainly fixed in the counsel of God (comp. Rom. xi. 28). It is therefore incorrect to explain the mode of expression from the fellowship with God realized through *conscience* (Luthardt); because, to be a child of God and an adherent of Christ presupposes *regeneration*. For this, however, they are destined by the divine election of grace, and fitted and prepared by the prevenient divine drawing.

arbitrarily imported into the passage as an intervening link of logical connection. The *Jews outside Palestine* (Paulus) are not intended, as they form part of the fold of the *Jewish* theocracy, to which the words ἐκ τῆς αὐλῆς ταύτης refer, and within which Jesus Himself lived and spake; hence also the demonstrative ταύτης. — ἔχω] He is their *owner*. Comp. Acts xviii. 10. "Hoc verbum habet magnam potestatem," Bengel. — ἀ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τῆς αὐλῆς ταύτης] *which are not out of this fold*, which are not derived from it. This expression, however, does not imply that Jesus conceived the heathen *as also in an αὐλή* (in answer to De Wette); for the emphasis rests not on ταύτης, but on τῆς αὐλῆς, and the characteristic feature of the heathen is the *διασπορά* (vii. 35, xi. 52);<sup>1</sup> whilst the thought of a divine leading of the heathen (Acts xiv. 17, xvii. 27) does not correspond at all to the figure of an αὐλή, of which the conception of theocratic fellowship constitutes an essential feature. Compare the figure of the olive tree in Rom. xi. 17; Eph. ii. 12; Matt. viii. 11. — δεῖ] according to the divine decree. — ἀγαγεῖν] neither *adducere*, *fetch* (Vulgate, Luther, Beza, and many others; also Tholuck, Luthardt, Hengstenberg, Godet); nor *συναγαγεῖν*, xi. 52 (Nonnus, Euth. Zigabenus, Theophylact, Casaubon); but *lead*, as shepherd, who goes before the sheep, and whom they follow, ver. 4. Bengel's remark is appropriate: "Non opus est illis *solum* mutare;" for the shepherd who leads also the heathen is the *exalted* Christ, πάντων κύριος, Acts x. 36. — καὶ γενήσεται, etc.] *and will become*, inasmuch as I lead, besides my sheep out of the Jewish αὐλή, those other sheep of mine, also, *one flock* (consisting of the two parts, ἀμφοτέρωθεν, Nonnus), *one shepherd*. This is the happy issue; by the asyndetic collocation, all the conception of unity (μία, εἰς) is made to appear with more marked prominence. Compare 1 Cor. x. 17; Eph. iv. 5. On εἰς ποιμήν, observe in reference to γενήσεται: "de jure Jesus semper unicus est pastor; de jure et facto igitur unus fiet," Bengel. The *fulfilment* of His declaration, which began with the conversion of the heathen by the apostles, is still advancing, and will be first completed with the realization

<sup>1</sup> Correctly Bengel: "*alias oves dicit, non aliud ovile; erant enim dispersae in mundo.*"

of what is spoken of in Rom. xi. 25 f. The *Stoic* dream of the union of all men ὡςπερ ἀγέλης συννόμα νόμῳ κοινῷ συντρεφομένης (Plut. *de fort. Alex.* 6) has been dispelled; the *idea*, however, considered in itself, goes on realizing itself in Christ till the judgment day.

Vv. 17, 18. Christ's self-delineation as the Good Shepherd is finished. Jesus now further bears testimony to that which filled His heart, while setting forth this great vocation, which was only to be fulfilled by dying and rising again, namely, *the love of His Father*, which rests upon Him just because of that which He has declared concerning Himself as the good shepherd. — διὰ τοῦτο . . . ὅτι] is to be taken as in all the passages where it occurs in John (v. 16, 18, viii. 47, xii. 18, 39; 1 John iii. 1): *therefore—because, namely, διὰ τοῦτο* referring to what had *preceded*, and ὅτι introducing a more precise explication of διὰ τοῦτο. The sense consequently is: *therefore, because of this my relationship as Shepherd, of which I have spoken down to ver. 16, my Father loves me, because, namely, I (ἐγώ; no other does so or can do so) lay down my life, in order to take it again.* Note in particular: (1) The explanation ὅτι . . . μου is pragmatically correct, because it is just the readiness to sacrifice His life which is the main characteristic of the good shepherd (vv. 11, 15). (2) ἵνα πάλ. λάβω αὐτήν do not belong to ἀγαπ., but express the *intention* or *design* of τίθ. τ. ψ. μου (not merely its *result*, as Theodore of Mopsuestia, Euth. Zigabenus, Grotius, and many suppose; or its *condition*, as Calvin, De Wette, and several others maintain); for the ground of the love of God lies not merely in the sacrifice considered by itself, but in the fact that the Good Shepherd, when He gives up His life, is resolved to take it again, in order that He may continue to fulfil His pastoral office till the final goal is reached, when all mankind shall constitute His flock. Indeed, only on the condition of His taking His life again, could He fulfil the office of Shepherd unto the final completion contemplated in the divine decree, and referred to in ver. 16. For this reason, also, ἵνα cannot be regarded as introducing the *divine* intention (Tholuck), because the ground of the Father's love must lie in the volition of *Jesus*,—which volition, it is true, corresponds to the Father's

will, though this is not here expressly declared, but first in ver. 18. — Ver. 18. It must be, however, not an *unwilling*, but a *voluntary* self-sacrifice, if it is to form the ground of the love of the Father to Him; hence the words οὐδεις . . . ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ (*mea ipsius sponte*). Nor must He proceed to effect this voluntary sacrifice of His own authority; but must *receive a warrant thereto*, as also for that which He had in view in so doing, viz. the resumption of His life; hence the words: ἐξουσίαν . . . λαβεῖν αὐτήν. Nay, more; even *this very thing* which He purposed to do, namely, the surrender and resumption of His life, must have come to Him as a *commission* from God; hence the expression: ταύτην τ. ἐντολήν . . . πατρός μου, in which ταύτην (*this and not something different*) is emphatic, and τὴν ἐντολήν is correlate to the idea of ἐξουσία, as this latter is grounded in the divine *mandate*. Notice further: (1) The ἐξουσία, the power *conferred* (so also in xix. 10 f., not *power* generally), lies in the relation of subordination to God, of whom the Son is the *commissioned representative*, and to whom He submits Himself voluntarily, i.e. from no compulsion exerted by a power outside of Himself, but with self-determined obedience to the Father (xiv. 30 f.; Matt. xxvi. 53). Equality of nature (Olshausen) is the presupposition of this moral harmony. (2) The view which pervades the New Testament, that Christ did not raise Himself from the dead, but was raised by the Father, is not affected by this passage, inasmuch as the *taking* again of His life, for which the divine-human Christ had received authorization, implies the *giving* again of the life, to wit, the re-awakening activity of the Father. This giving again on the part of God, by which Christ becomes ζωοποιηθεὶς πνεύματι (see 1 Pet. iii. 19, and Huther on the passage), and that ἐξουσία, which Christ receives from God, are the two factors of the resurrection—the former being the *causa efficiens*, whilst the latter, the ἐξουσία of Christ, is the *causa apprehendens*. Compare *Constitutiones Apostol.* 5. 7. 8: ἐαυτὸν προστάγματι τοῦ πατρὸς διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν ἀνεγείρας. — (3) ταύτην τὴν ἐντολ. embraces the aforementioned twofold ἐξουσία; justly so, inasmuch as the authorization to die and to rise again was only formally divided according to its two aspects. Chrysos-

tom and several others erroneously refer ταύτην to the dying alone.

Vv. 19-21. Πάλιν] see ix. 16. — ἐν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις.] These words refer to the *Pharisees* (ix. 40) who, in keeping with their relationship to Jesus (against De Wette), are designated according to the *class* to which they belonged (as the Jewish hierarchical opposition). The majority of them clung to the hostile judgment (compare viii. 48), which they had contemptuously expressed; some of them, however, felt themselves impressed, and deny the assertion of the rest. Comp. ix. 16. — τί αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε] *i.e.* of what use is it to you to listen to His discourses? — καὶ μαίνεται] in consequence of being possessed by a demon. — μὴ δαιμόνιον, etc.] *surely a demon cannot*, etc.; a confirmation of that denial from the miracle which had given rise to the entire discussion. We see from this that these ἄλλοι belonged to the more unprejudiced and conscientious class which had given expression to its feelings in ix. 16. At the same time, the conclusion must not be drawn that they would have refused to recognise any demoniacal miracles (were they even in themselves beneficent),—Matt. xii. 24 is opposed to this view; but they believed it impossible to attribute a miracle of so *great* a kind to a *demon*, who must have been working through the medium of Jesus. Note, moreover, that even here they do not get further than a *negative* judgment.

Vv. 22, 23. A new section; the proceedings at *the feast of the Dedication of the Temple*. — As there is not the least hint of a return journey to Galilee or Peraea, and as vv. 26 ff. point back to the discourse concerning the Good Shepherd, we must needs suppose that Jesus remained in Jerusalem and the neighbourhood between the feast of Tabernacles and the feast of Dedication (about two months), and did not labour outside of Judaea; He first leaves Judaea in ver. 30. Compare also Wieseler, p. 318; Ewald, *Gesch. Christi*, p. 471. The insertion here of a journey to Galilee or Peraea (as recently proposed, especially by Ebrard, Neander, Lange *L. J.* II. p. 1004 f., Riggenbach, Luthardt, Godet) is dictated by harmonistic presuppositions and clumsy combinations (suggested especially by the narrative of the journey in Luke ix.



51 ff.), and not by the requirements of exegesis; for *πάλιν* in ver. 40 cannot be reckoned among such requirements. — *τὰ ἐγκαίνια*] *the feast of Renewal*, founded by Judas Maccabaeus, to commemorate the purification and consecration anew of the temple after its desecration by Antiochus Epiphanes, celebrated for eight days every year, from the 25th Kislev onwards (the middle of December), and especially distinguished by the illumination of the houses; hence also termed *τὰ φῶτα*. See 1 Macc. iv. 50 ff.; 2 Macc. i. 18, x. 6 ff.; Joseph. *Antiq.* xii. 7. 7. From this festival (הַחֲנֻכָּה) sprang the Christian Church Dedication Festival, and its name *ἐγκαίνια*. See Augusti, *Denkw.* III. p. 316. — *ἐν Ἱερουσ.*] The celebration was not restricted to Jerusalem, but was universal (see Lightfoot, p. 1063 f.); the words *ἐν Ἱερουσ.* are added because Jesus was still there. — *κ. χειμῶν ἦν*] a remark added for the sake of John's Gentile Christian readers, for whom the statement that it was *winter* when the festival occurred, would be sufficient to explain why Jesus walked about in Solomon's porch and not in the open air; hence the explanation, *stormy weather* (Matt. xvi. 3, so Er. Schmid, Clericus, Lampe, Semler, Kuinoel, Lange), is not in harmony with the context. — The *στοὰ Σολομῶνος* (comp. Acts iii. 11) was a portico on the eastern side of the temple buildings (hence denominated *στ. ἀνατολική* by Josephus in his *Antt.* xx. 9. 7), which, according to Josephus, was a relic from Solomon's days which had remained intact during the destruction of the temple by Nebuchadnezzar. The mention of this particular part of the temple is one of the traces of the writer having himself been an eyewitness; events like this no doubt impressed themselves on the memory so as never to be forgotten (comp. viii. 20). Any reason for Jesus being in the porch, beyond the one given in the words *καὶ χειμῶν ἦν* (Luthardt, after Thiersch, *Apost. Zeitalter*, p. 73: "for the purpose of expressing in a *figurative* way the *unity of the Old and New Covenants*"), must be rejected as arbitrary, seeing that John himself gives no hint to that effect.

Ver. 24. *Οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι*] Here too the standing party of opposition. — *ἐκύκλωσαν*] *encircled* Him. The word graphically sets forth the urgency and obtrusiveness of the Jews;

but neither implies that Jesus had been deserted by His followers (Lange), nor represents the Ἰουδαῖοι as pushing in *between* Him and His disciples, and so enclosing Him in their midst (Godet). — ἐλεγον αὐτῷ] "This speak they out of a false heart, with a view to accusing and destroying Him," Luther. According to Hengstenberg, they really vacillated between an inclination and disinclination to believe. But see vv. 26, 31. They desire an *express* and thoroughly *direct* declaration, though not as if making a last attempt to induce Jesus to take up the rôle of a political Messiah (Lange). — τ. ψυχ. ἡμ. αἶρεις] αἶρειν not in the sense of *take away* (Nonnus: ὑποκλέπτεις φρένα; Elsner: *enecas*); but in that of *lift up*. It denotes to *excite* the soul, which, according to the connection, may be due to very different mental influences (Eur. *Ion.* 928; *Hec.* 69; Aesch. *Sept.* 198; Soph. *O. R.* 914; Prov. xix. 18; Philo, *de Monarch.* I. p. 218; Joseph. *Antt.* iii. 2. 3; iii. 5. 1); in this case, by *strained expectation*, which thou causest us. The explanation: ἀναρτᾶς μεταξὺ πίστεως κ. ἀπιστίας (Euth. Zigabenus, and many others), is an approximation to the *sense*, but is not the precise signification of the words. — εἰ σὺ εἶ, etc.] *if thou*, and so forth, as in Luke xxii. 67.

Vv. 25, 26. Jesus had not only *told* them (on many occasions, if not always so directly as, for example, to the woman of Samaria, or the man born blind) that He was the Messiah, but had also testified to the fact by His Messianic *works* (v. 36). But they do not believe. The actual *proof* of their unbelief is first subjoined in the second clause: *for ye belong not to my sheep*; otherwise ye would stand in a totally different relation to me than that of unbelief; ye would hear my voice, and know me, and follow me, vv. 4, 14, 27. — ἐγὼ . . . ὑμεῖς] Reproachful antithesis. — καθὼς εἶπον ὑμῖν] belong, as both Lachmann and Tischendorf also punctuate, to *what precedes* (comp. i. 33); but not, however, in such a way that Jesus merely makes a retrospective reference to the figure of the πρόβατα (Fritzsche: "ut similitudine utar, quam supra posui"), which would render this repulse very meaningless; but in such a way that Jesus recalls to their recollection the *negative declaration itself* as having been already uttered. It

is true, indeed, that He had not given *direct* expression to the words *ὅτι οὐκ ἐστὲ*, etc. in the preceding allegory; *indirectly*, however, He had done so, namely, by a description of His sheep, which necessarily involved the *denial* that the *Ἰουδαῖοι* belonged to them. That this is the force of *καθ' εἰπ. ὑμ.*, He Himself declares by the exhibition of the relation of His sheep that follows. We are precluded from regarding it as an introduction to *what follows* (Curss., Cant., Corb., Arr., Euth. Zigabenus, Tholuck, Godet), in which case a comma ought to be placed before *καθώς*, and a colon after *ὑμῖν*, by the circumstance that Jesus nowhere else quotes and (in the form of a summary) *repeats* a longer discourse of His own. In keeping with the style of the Gospels, only a brief, sententious saying, such as xiii. 33, would be fitted for such self-quotation. In this case, however, the quotation would embrace at least vv. 27 and 28.—The circumstance that Jesus should refer to this allegory about two months after the date of vv. 1–21, which has been erroneously used as an argument against the originality of the discourse (Strauss, Baur), may be simply accounted for by the assumption that during the interval He had had no further discussions with His hierarchical opponents,—a supposition which is justified by its accounting for the silence observed by John relatively to that period. The presupposition involved in the words *καθώς εἶπον ὑμῖν*, that Jesus here has in the main the same persons before Him as during the delivery of His discourse regarding the shepherd, has nothing against it; and there is no necessity even for the assumption that John and Jesus conceived the discourses to be directed against the *Ἰουδαῖοι* as a *whole* (Brückner).

Vv. 27, 28. Description of the relation of the *πρόβατα* to Him (comp. vv. 4, 14), which brings clearly to view that the *Ἰουδαῖοι* cannot belong to them. Notice in ver. 27 the *climactic parallelism* of the two halves of the verse as far as *δίδωμι αὐτοῖς* (ver. 28), after which, commencing with *καὶ οὐ μὴ ἀπόλ.*, etc., the discourse goes on to express in a double form the inseparableness of the blessed relationship. On the emphatic polysyndeton, compare vv. 3, 12.—*τὰ πρόβ. τὰ ἐμά*] the sheep which belong to *me*.—*ζωὴν αἰών.*] also conceived already in its temporal development, iii. 15, v. 24,

and repeatedly. — *καὶ οὐ μὴ ἀπόλ.*] The negation belongs to the verb; this declaration: "they shall certainly not perish," will be accomplished in eternity. The lost sheep, *i.e.* the sheep which has been separated, and wandered away from the flock (Matt. x. 6; Luke xv. 4), typifies him who is separated from the protection and gracious leading of Christ, who has fallen into unbelief. Compare the following *καὶ οὐχ ἀρπάσει*, etc., where this protection and gracious leading is set forth with still more concrete tenderness by the words *ἐκ τῆς χειρός μου*. His hand protects, bears, cherishes, leads them. Liberty and the *possibility of apostasy* are not thus excluded (in answer to Augustine and the teaching of the Reformed Church); he who has fallen away is no longer a *πρόβατον*, but on the part of Christ everything is promised by which preserving grace is secured, and this is the ground of the *Certitudo salutis*.

Vv. 29, 30. Explanation of the assertion just made, *οὐχ ἀρπάσει*, etc. If in *my* hand, they are also in the hand of my *Father*, who is greater than all, so that an *ἀρπάζειν*, etc. is *impossible*; I am one with Him. — *ὃς δέδωκέ μοι*] *sc. αὐτά*. On the import of the words, compare on vi. 37. In characterizing God as the *giver of the sheep*, Jesus enables us to see how fully He is *justified* in appealing, as He here does, to the Father. — *μείζον* (see the critical note): *something greater*, a greater potency. On the neuter here employed, compare Matt. xii. 6 (Lachmann). See Bernhardt, p. 335; Kühner II. p. 45; Dissen *ad Dem. de Cor.* p. 396 (*πονηρὸν ὁ συκοφάντης*). — *πάντων*] Masculine. Compare *τίς*, ver. 28, and *οὐδεὶς*, ver. 29. Without any limitation: *all* besides God. — *καὶ οὐδεὶς δύναται*, etc.] Necessary consequence of the *μείζον πάντων*, but not setting aside the possibility of losing the grace by one's *own fault*, vi. 66. — *ἐκ τ. χειρ. τοῦ πατρ. μου*]. This expression, *τοῦ πατρ. μ.*, is due to the presupposition, flowing out of *ὃς δέδωκέ μοι*, that God did not let the sheep out of His hand, *i.e.* out of His protection and guidance, when He gave them to Christ. But this continued *divine* protection is really nothing else than the protection of *Christ*, so far, that is, as the Father is in the Son and works in Him (see vv. 37, 38); hence the latter, as the organ and

vehicle of the divine activity in carrying out the Messianic work, is not separated from God, is not a second some one outside and alongside of God ; but, by the very nature of the fellowship referred to, *one with God* (compare Weiss, *Lehrbegr.* p. 205 f.). Compare on *ἐν ἑσμεν*, 1 Cor. iii. 8. *God's* hand is therefore *His* hand in the accomplishment of the work, during the performance of which He administers and carries into execution the power, love, and so forth of God. The unity, therefore, is one of *dynamic* fellowship, *i.e.* a unity of action for the realization of the divine decree of redemption ; according to which, the Father is in the Son, and moves in Him, so that the Father acts in the things which are done by the Son, and yet is greater than the Son (xiv. 28), because He has commissioned, consecrated, and sent Him. The *Arian* idea of *ethical agreement* is insufficient ; the reasoning would miss its mark unless unity of *power* be understood (on which Chrysostom, Euth. Zigabenus, and many others, also Lücke, justly lay emphasis). The *orthodox* interpretation, which makes it denote *unity of essence* (Nonnus : *ἐν γένος ἑσμεν* ; Augustine : *unum*, delivers us from Charybdis, that is, from Arius, and *sumus* from Scylla, that is, from Sabellius), specially defended by Hengstenberg, though rejected even by Calvin as a misuse of the passage, goes beyond the argumentation ; at the same time, in view of the metaphysical character of the relation of the Son to the Father, clearly taught elsewhere, and especially in John, the Homousia, as the essential foundation, must be regarded as presupposed in the fellowship here denoted by *ἐν ἑσμεν*.

Vv. 31, 32. The Jews understood the expression in ver. 30 to refer to *essential unity*, and in their tumultuous and angry excitement would even stone (Lev. xxiv. 10 f.) the *blasphemer* ; the overawing impression, however, produced by Christ's reply was powerful enough to restrain them. — *ἐβόησαν*] *sustulerunt* (Vulgate), *ἀνῆρταζον* (Nonnus) *they lifted up stones*, with the intention of throwing them at Him. The word is more characteristic than *αἶψα* in viii. 59, though on account of *πάλιν* the two must have the same import ; hence the interpretation : *they fetched* (Hengstenberg, Godet, and others), is less exact. Compare Hom. *Od.* λ. 594 ; Soph. *Aj.*

814; Polyb. 15. 26. 3. — *πάλιν*] viii. 59. — *καλὰ ἔργα*] not specially: works of *love* (Kuinoel, B. Crusius), but in general: *præclara opera, distinguished works*.<sup>1</sup> — *ἔδειξα ὑμῖν*] *have I showed you*, v. 20. Comp. ii. 18; Ps. lxxviii. 11; Plat. *Crat.* p. 430 E: τὸ δεῖξαι λέγω εἰς τὴν τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αἴσθησιν καταστήσαι. — *ἐκ τοῦ πατρός μου*] *from my Father*, who is in me, and from whom, therefore, they go out through me. Compare vv. 37, 38. — *διὰ ποῖον*, etc.] *propter quale*, etc. Not without the irony of profound indignation (comp. 2 Cor. xii. 13) does Jesus ask, *What, then, is the character of that one of His works, on account of which they are about to stone Him?* (*λιθάζετε*, see Bernhardt, p. 370; Buttm. *Neut. Gr.* p. 178 [E. T. p. 205]). Not as though He did not *know why* they were intending to stone Him, but probably in the consciousness of having actually shown Himself by His works to be something totally different from a blasphemer. — *περὶ βλασφημ. καὶ οὗτι*] *for blasphemy, and, indeed, because*. The reproach: “thou makest thyself God” (comp. v. 18), *i.e.* a divine being (i. 1), was a consequence of the mistaken view taken of ver. 30, which they had interpreted of essential unity. *Καί* connects with the general charge a more exact definition of that on which it was based.

Vv. 34–38. Jesus *justifies* Himself from the reproach of blasphemy by defending His assertion that He was the Son of God—the words of ver. 30 which had excited the opposition amounted to this—from the *Scriptures* (vv. 34–36); He then sets forth the unity affirmed in ver. 30 as credibly attested by His *works* (vv. 37, 38).

Vv. 34–36. In Ps. lxxxii. 6, *unrighteous authorities of the theocratic people*—not *angels* (Bleek), nor yet heathen princes (De Wette, Hitzig)—whose approaching destruction, in contrast to their high *dignity*, is intended to stand out, are called *gods*, agreeably to the old sacred view of rulers as the representatives of God, which was entertained in the theocratic nation. Compare Ex. xxi. 6, xxii. 8, 28. From this, Jesus draws the conclusion *a minori ad majus*, that He might call

<sup>1</sup> Jesus was the more able thus to designate His acts, because He characterized them as works of *God* performed through Him. The explanation of Luthardt says too little: “Works with which no fault can be found.”

Himself *God's Son* without blasphemy. He is surely far more exalted than they (*ὃν ὁ πατήρ ἡγάλασε*, etc.); and nevertheless had designated Himself, not *θεός*, as though wishing to make a God of Himself, but merely *υἱὸς τ. θεοῦ*.<sup>1</sup> — *ἐν τῷ νόμῳ*] Spoken of the Old Testament generally, of which the law was the fundamental and authoritative portion. Comp. xii. 34, xv. 25; Rom. iii. 19; 1 Cor. xiv. 21. — *ὕμῶν*] as in viii. 17. — *ἐκείνους*] *whom?* Jesus takes for granted as known. — *εἶπε*] namely, *ὁ νόμος* (compare afterwards *ἡ γραφή*), not *God* (Hengstenberg). — *πρὸς οὓς*] *to whom*, not *adversus quos* (Heinsius, Stolz), which does not follow from the context. There is nothing to warrant the supposition that the *prophets* are also referred to (Olshausen). — *ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ*] Neither the *λόγος ἄσαρκος* (Cyril), nor the *revelations* of God (Olshausen, comp. Godet), but the *saying of God just mentioned*: *ἐγὼ εἶπα*, etc. This saying belongs, not to the time when the Psalm was written, but to that earlier period (the period of the *induction* of the authorities into their office, comp. Ps. ii. 7), to which God, the speaker, points back. — *καὶ οὐ δύναται*, etc.] This clause, though containing only an auxiliary thought, and not a main point of the argumentation (Godet), has been without reason treated as a parenthesis; whereas both in point of structure and sense it is dependent on *εἶ*: *and it is impossible*, etc. So also Ewald, Godet, Hengstenberg. — *λυθῆναι*] The Scripture (consequently, also, that saying of the Psalms) cannot be *loosened*, i.e. *cannot be deprived of its validity*. Comp. Matt. v. 19; John v. 18, vii. 23; Herod. 3. 82; Plat. *Phaedr.* p. 256 D; *Gorg.* p. 509 A; Dem. 31. 12, 700, 13. The *auctoritas normativa et judicialis* of the Scriptures must remain unbroken. Note, in connection herewith, the idea of the *unity* of the Scriptures as such, as also the pre-supposition of their *theopneustia*. — *ὃν ὁ πατήρ ἡγάλασε*, etc.] That is surely something still greater than the *λόγος τ. θεοῦ*,

<sup>1</sup> Hengstenberg incorrectly remarks: "He *accepts* the charge, 'Thou makest thyself God.'" On the contrary, He does not enter on it at all, but simply justifies the predicate, "*Son of God*," which He had assumed for Himself. But Beyschlag also is wrong when he says (p. 106): "That which Jesus here affirms concerning Himself (*ὃν ὁ πατήρ ἡγάλασε*, etc.) might equally have been affirmed by every prophet." On such a view, no regard would be paid to the relation of *πατήρ* and *υἱός*.

addressed to authorities when they were installed in their offices. In this question, which is placed in the apodosis, and which expresses surprise, the object, which is correlate to the ἐκείνους of ver. 35, is very emphatically placed at the commencement; and ὑμεῖς (*you people*) is placed over against the inviolable authority of the Scripture. — ἡγίασε] *hath consecrated*, a higher analogue of the consecration to the office of prophet (Jer. i. 5; Sir. xlv. 4, xlix. 7), denoting the divine consecration to the office of *Messiah*, who is the ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ (vi. 69; Luke iv. 34). This consecration took place on His being sent from heaven, and immediately before His departure (hence ἡγίασε καὶ ἀπέστ.), in that the Father not merely “*set apart*” the Son to the work (as though the word ἐξελέξατο had been used; Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* I. p. 86; comp. Euth. Zigabenus, Hengstenberg, and Brückner), but also conferred on Him the Messianic ἐντολή and ἐξουσία, with the fulness of the Spirit appertaining thereunto (iii. 34), and the power of life (v. 26), and the πλήρωμα of grace and truth (i. 14). — ὅτι βλασφημεῖς] The reply which, in view of ὄν, etc., we should have expected to be in the oblique construction (βλασφημεῖν or ὅτι βλασφημεῖ, comp. ix. 19), passes over with the increasing vivacity of the discourse into the direct construction; compare viii. 54, and see Buttm. *Neut. Gr.* p. 234 [E. T. p. 272]. — ὅτι εἶπον] *because I said*. He had said it *indirectly* in vv. 29, 30.

Vv. 37–39. Your unbelief, which lies at the foundation of the judgment ὅτι βλασφημεῖς, would then be justifiable, if I were not, etc. In the other case, however, you ought to believe, if not me, at all events my works, in order that you, etc. — εἰ οὐ ποιῶ] if I leave them undone. Comp. Buttm. *Neut. Gr.* p. 297 [E. T. p. 346]; Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 278. — τὰ ἔργα τοῦ πατρ. μ.] which my Father works; compare on ix. 3, xiv. 10, also ver. 23. — μὴ πιστ. μοι] not merely permissive, but an actual *command*, as in the case of the following πιστεύετε (see the critical note). The alternative is *decided*: they *ought* not to believe Him, if, etc. — ἐμοί] My person in and by itself, apart from the actual testimony borne to it by the ἔργα. — *To believe the works*, is to hold for true the testimony which is contained in them (v. 36). The *object* of



faith is that which Jesus declares concerning Himself, and what, in agreement therewith (comp. xiv. 11), the works prove concerning Him. According to the reading *ἵνα γινώτε κ. γινώσκητε* (see the critical note), which Hengstenberg, notwithstanding, rejects as giving an unbearable meaning, Jesus describes this as the end to be attained by His prescription: *in order that ye may attain to knowledge, and may (permanently) know*, etc.—drawing a distinction between the *act* and the *state* of knowledge. Compare *ἐπιμεληθῆναι καὶ ἐπιμελεῖσθαι*, Plat. *Legg.* viii. p. 849 B. — *ὅτι ἔν ἐμοὶ ὁ πατ. κἀγὼ ἐν αὐτῷ*] *This now is the unity which He meant in ver. 30*; not *essential* unity (old orthodox explanation of the *περιχώρησις* *essentialis patris in filio et filii in patre*, see Calovius), although it is metaphysically the fundamental condition, but *dynamic* unity: the Father lives and moves in Christ, who is His active organ, and again Christ is in the Father, so far as Christ in God is the power which determines the execution of the divine *ἔργον*. The thought that Christ has in God “the ground of His existence and working” (De Wette), lies far remote from the words *κἀγὼ ἐν αὐτῷ*, because the relation of the clauses of the proposition must be *equal*. But this relation is nothing else than that of inner, active, *reciprocal fellowship*. In accordance therewith, the Father is in the Son, as in the executor of His work, as the Son is also in the Father, because Christ is the regulative and determining *agens et movens* of the work of redemption in the Father. Comp. the many Pauline passages which represent all the divine redemptive activity as taking place *in Christ*; e.g. Rom. viii. 39; Eph. i. 3 ff. — Ver. 39. *οὕν*] In consequence of this defence, which averted the threatened tumultuous stoning, for which the Jews had begun to prepare themselves. The supposition that *πιάσαι* denotes laying hold of *with a view to carrying out the stoning*, is opposed by the *πάλιν*, which refers back to vii. 30, 32, 44 (against Calvin, Luthardt, Hengstenberg). — *καὶ ἐξῆλθεν*, etc.] And yet they were unable to carry their plan into execution; *He escaped out of their hands*, which are conceived as already stretched out after Him. *How* this deliverance was effected must be left undetermined (Kuinoel: by the arrival of His adherents; Hengstenberg: by the inde-

cision of His enemies); of any miraculous element (*e.g.* becoming invisible) in His escape, although assumed by many early commentators, and even yet by B. Crusius and Luthardt, John gives no hint. Comp. on viii. 59. Euth. Zigabenus: ἀναχωρεῖ διὰ τὸν θυμὸν τῶν φθονερῶν, ἐνδιδοὺς αὐτῷ λωφῆσαι καὶ λῆξαι τῇ ἀπουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ.

Vv. 40–42. Πάλιν.] i. 28. — πέραν τ. Ἰορδ.] He went away from Jerusalem, *beyond the Jordan* (as in vi. 1, xviii. 1) to *Peraea*, and, indeed, to the place, etc. Instead of allowing themselves to be won over to faith and redemption, the Ἰουδαῖοι had grown ever more hardened and decided in their hostility, till it had reached the extreme; the Lord then finally gives them up, and knowing that His hour was near, though not yet fully come, He withdraws for a calm and undisturbed, although brief, season of activity to *Peraea*, where He was safer from the hierarchs (comp. xi. 54); and in the place *where John was when he baptized for the first time* (namely, i. 28; later, in Salim, iii. 23), there could be as little lack of susceptible hearts as of quiet, elevating, and sacred memories for Himself. — ἔμεινεν ἐκεῖ] How long, we cannot precisely ascertain, as He spent also some time in Ephraim before the feast of the Passover (xi. 54 f.). In any case, however, the ἔμεινεν ἐκεῖ lasted but for a very short period, as is evident also from the word νῦν in xi. 8. — καὶ πολλοί, etc.] “Fructus posthumus officii Johannis,” Bengel. — ἔλεγον] not αὐτῷ, but a bearing of testimony in general. — Ἰωάννης μὲν, etc.] Logically we should expect μὲν after σημεῖον; but even classical writers frequently disregard logical precision in their mode of placing μέν and δέ. See Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* i. 6. 11; Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 168. — σημεῖον ἐποίησεν οὐδέν] A characteristic feature of the history of John, which in this respect also has remained free from fanciful additions; the people, however, referred to the circumstance in view of the σημεία which *Jesus* had wrought, as they had been informed, elsewhere, and probably here also, before their own eyes. In this way we may also account for μὲν not occupying its strictly logical position. — The repetition of Ἰωάννης in ver. 42 is part of the simplicity of the style, which is here faithfully reflected, and is further in harmony with the feeling of reverence entertained by the

people for the holy man whose memory still lived among them. — ἀληθὴς ἦν] As was actually shown by the works of Jesus. In this way, their experience of the truth of the testimony of John became the ground of faith in Christ. What a contrast to the experiences which Jesus had *just* had to pass through among the Ἰουδαῖοι! The ray of light thus vouchsafed to Him in the place where He first commenced His labours, is here set forth in all historical simplicity. Baur, however (p. 182 f., and *Theol. Jahrb.* 1854, p. 280 f.), maintains that the people are merely represented as speaking these words in order that the entire preceding description of the life and works of Jesus may be surveyed from the point of view of the σημεῖα. John himself gives a comprehensive retrospect, but in the right place, namely, at the close of the activity of Jesus in xii. 37 ff., and in how different a manner! — ἐκεῖ (see the critical note), placed emphatically at the end of the verse.

## CHAPTER XI.

VER. 12. *οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ*] A. 44 have merely *αὐτῶ*. D. K. Π. κ. Curss. Verss.: *αὐτῶ οἱ μαθηταί* (so Lachm. and Tisch.). B. C.\* L. X. Copt.: *οἱ μαθ. αὐτῶ*. The simple *αὐτῶ* is the original reading; *οἱ μαθ.* was written in the margin; then was introduced into the text partly before and partly after *αὐτῶ*; and in the former position brought about the partial change of *αὐτῶ* into *αὐτοῦ*.—Ver. 17. *ἔλθων . . . εὗρεν*] Lachm.: *ἦλθεν . . . καὶ εὗρεν*, solely after C.\* D. Partly before (so Lachm. in the margin), partly after *ἡμέρας* (so Elzev. and Lachm.), stands *ἦδη*, which, however, is altogether omitted (so Tisch.) by A.\* D. Curss. Verss.: *τέσσα. ἦδη ἡμ.* must be regarded as the original reading (B. C.\*). The word *ἦδη*, beginning and ending with H, was easily passed over, as standing immediately before *ἡμέρας*, which also begins with H, and was then restored in the wrong place.—Ver. 19. Instead of *καὶ πολλοί*, we must, with decisive testimonies, read *πολλοὶ δέ* with Lachm. and Tisch.—*αὐτῶν*] after *ἀδελφοῦ* must, with Tisch., after B. D. L. κ., be deleted as a usual addition.—Ver. 21. *ὁ ἀδελφ. μου οὐκ ἂν ἐτεβνήκει*] Lachm. and Tisch., after decisive witnesses, read *οὐκ ἂν ἀπέθανεν ὁ ἀδ. μου*. If *ἐτεβνήκει* had been the original reading, it would have been found as a various reading also in ver. 32; it is a clumsy interpretation.—Ver. 22. *ἀλλὰ*] is wanting in B. C.\* X. κ. Curss. Verss. Chrys. Bracketed by Lachm., deleted by Tisch. An antithetical interpolation.—Ver. 29. *ἐγείρεται*] B. C.\* D. L. κ. Curss. Verss.: *ἡγέρθη*. So Lachm. A mechanical transposition into the historical tense, with which the reading *ἤρχετο* (instead of *ἤρχεται*) in the same Codd., except D., is also connected.—Ver. 30. After *ἦν* Lachm. and Tisch. have *ἔτι* (B. C. X. κ. Curss. Verss.). An addition more precisely determining the meaning, which other witnesses place before *ἦν*.—Ver. 31. *λέγουτες*] B. C.\* D. L. X. κ. Curss. Verss.: *δύξαντες*, which, as an unusual expression, must with Tisch. be received into the text on the authority of these decisive witnesses.—Ver. 32. The position of *αὐτοῦ* before *εἰς τ. πόδ.* (Elz. and Lachm. place it after) has the decision of the Codd. in its favour.—*εἰς*] B. C.\* D. L. X. κ. Curss.: *πρός*. So Tisch., and the

witnesses are decidedly in its favour. — Ver. 39. Instead of τετελευτηκότος, Elz. has τεθνηκότος, in opposition to decisive testimonies. A gloss. — Ver. 40. The future form ὄψῃ has decisive evidence in its favour (Lachm. and Tisch.). — Ver. 41. After λίθον Elz. places οὗ ἦν ὁ τεθνηκώς κείμενος, in opposition to decisive testimony. Other witnesses have other explanatory additions. — Ver. 45. α] Lachm. has ὁ, after A.\*\* B. C. D. Curss. Verss. (in ver. 46, also, the ὁ is adopted by Lachm., although the evidence in its favour is weaker). The one act, which is meant, would easily suggest the singular. — After ἐποίησεν Elz. inserts ὁ Ἰησοῦς. An unusual addition, opposed to overwhelming evidence. — Ver. 50. διαλογίζεσθε] A. B. D. L. κ. Curss. Or. Cyr. Chrys.: λογίζεσθε. Recommended by Griesbach; adopted by Lachm. and Tisch., and correctly too; διαλογίζεσθαι was more familiar to the copyists from the other Gospels. — Ver. 57. δὲ καὶ] Lachm. and Tisch. have deleted καὶ on the authority of decisive witnesses. — Instead of ἐντολήν, B. J. M. κ. Curss. Or. (twice) have ἐντολάς, which, with Tisch., is to be adopted. The Recepta is a correction.

Ver. 1 f.<sup>1</sup> This stay of Jesus in retirement, however, is terminated by the sickness of Lazarus (δὲ). — Simplicity of the style of the narrative: *But there was a certain one sick*, (namely) *Lazarus of Bethany, of the town*, etc: ἀπὸ (vii. 42; Matt. ii. 1, xxvii. 57) and ἐκ both denote the same relation (i. 46 f), that of *derivation*; hence it is the less allowable to regard the two sisters and the brother as *Galileans*, and Mary as the *Magdalene* (Hengstenberg).<sup>2</sup> That Lazarus *lived* also in Bethany, and was lying ill there, is plain from the course of the narrative. For change of preposition, without any change of relation, comp. i. 45; Rom. iii. 30; 2 Cor. iii. 11; Gal. ii. 16; Eph. i. 7; Philem. 5; Kühner, II. p. 219. — This Bethany, situated on the eastern slope of the Mount of Olives, and, according to ver. 18, about three-quarters of an hour's walk from Jerusalem (see on Matt. xxi. 17), was characteristically and specially known in evangelistic tradition owing to the two sisters who lived there; hence its more exact description by the words ἐκ τῆς κώμης Μαρίας, etc.,<sup>3</sup> for the sake of distinguishing it from

<sup>1</sup> On the whole section relating to the raising of Lazarus, see Gumlich in the *Stud. u. Kritiken*, 1862, pp. 65 ff., 248 ff.

<sup>2</sup> In the *Constit. Apost.* 3. 6. 2, also, Mary Magdalene is expressly distinguished from the sister of Lazarus.

<sup>3</sup> This genitive, presupposing, as it does, the nominative form Μάρια, is opposed to the adoption in John of the Hebrew form Μαρριάμ, which, in the

the Bethany mentioned in i. 28 (see critical note on i. 28).—For the legends about Lazarus, see especially Thilo, *Cod. Apocry.* p. 711; Fabric. *Cod. Apocr.* III. pp. 475, 509.—*ἡν δὲ Μαρία*, etc.] Not to be put in a parenthesis. A more exact description of *this* Mary,<sup>1</sup>—who, however, must not be identified with the woman who was a sinner, mentioned in Luke vii., as is done still by Hengstenberg (see on Luke vii. 36, 37 f.)—from the account of the anointing (Matt. xxvi. 6 ff.; Mark xiv. 3 ff.), which John presupposes, in a general way, as already *known*, although he himself afterwards takes occasion to narrate it in xii. 1 ff. So important and significant did it appear to him, while tradition, besides, had not preserved it in its pure original form (not even in Matthew and Mark).—*ἦς ὁ ἀδελφὸς*, etc.] Thus, to refer to Lazarus as the brother of *Mary*, was perfectly natural to the narrative, and after ver. 1 is clear in itself. Entirely baseless is Hengstenberg's remark: the relation of Lazarus to the *unmarried* Mary was more intimate than to the *married* Martha, who had been the wife of Simon the leper, Matt. xxvi. 6 (which is a pure invention). See in general, against the erroneous combinations of Hengstenberg regarding the personal relations of the two sisters and Lazarus, Strauss, *Die Halben und die Ganzen*, p. 79 ff.

Vv. 3, 4. Merely the *message* that the beloved one is sick. The *request* lay in the message itself, and the addition *ὁ φιλεῖς* supplied the motive for its fulfilment.—*εἶπεν*] spoken generally, and not addressed to any definite person, but in the hearing of those present, the messenger and the disciples. Sufficient for the moment as a preparation both for the sisters and the disciples.—*οὐκ ἔστι πρὸς θάνατον*] *πρὸς* refers to destination (comp. afterwards *ὑπέρ*): *it is not to have death for its result*, which, however, does not mean, as the antithesis shows: it is not *deadly*, he will not die of it. The idea of death is used

various passages where the name occurs, is supported by very varying testimony, in some cases by very strong, in other passages, however, by no evidence at all.

<sup>1</sup> On account of her predominant importance, and from being so well known, Mary is mentioned *first* in ver. 1. Had she been the *elder* sister (Ewald), there would be no apparent reason why Martha should be mentioned first in vv. 5, 19, and 20. Comp. also Luke x. 38, where Martha appears as mistress of the house.—Lazarus seems to have been younger than the sisters, and to have held a subordinate place in the household, xii. 2.

with a *pregnancy* of meaning, and the words signify : he shall not fall a prey to death, as death usually is, *so that no reawakening takes place* ; *θάνατος γὰρ κυρίως ὁ μέχρι τῆς κοινῆς ἀναστάσεως*, Euth. Zigabenus. Comp. Matt. ix. 24. That Jesus certainly knew, by His higher knowledge, that the death of Lazarus was *certain* and *near at hand*, though the death must be conceived as not having yet actually taken place (see on ver. 17), is confirmed by ver. 14 ;—for the assumption of a second message (Paulus, Neander, Schweizer) is purely arbitrary. With this significant declaration, Jesus designed to supply to the sisters something fitted, when the death of their brother took place to stimulate the hope to which Martha gives actual expression in ver. 22. There is no warrant for dragging in a reference to the spiritual and eternal life of the resurrection (Gumlich). — *ὑπὲρ τῆς δόξ. τ. θ.*] *i.e.* for the *furtherance* of the honour of God. Comp. ix. 3. The emphatic and more definite explanation of the expression is given in *ἵνα δοξασθῇ*, etc.—words which, containing the intention of God, state the *kind* and *manner* of the *ὑπὲρ τ. δόξ. τ. θ.*, so far, namely, as the glorification of the *Son* of God involves the honour of *God Himself*, who works through Him (comp. v. 23, x. 30, 38). It is in these words, and not in ver. 25 (Baur), that the doctrinal design of the narrative is contained. Comp. vv. 40, 42.

Ver. 5 is not an elucidation of ver. 3 (De Wette), seeing that ver. 4 intervenes ; nor is it a preparation for ver. 6 (B. Crusius : “although He loved them all, He nevertheless remained”) ; but explains the motive impelling Him to open up to them the consolatory prospect referred to in ver. 4 : “Felix familia,” Bengel. — *ἡγάπα*] An expression chosen with delicate tenderness (the more sensuous *φιλεῖν* is not again used as in ver. 4), because the *sisters* are also mentioned. Comp. Xen. *Mem.* ii. 7. 12 ; Tittmann, *Synon.* p. 53 ; and Wetstein. Martha is named *first*, as being the mistress of the house, and the eldest (ver. 19 f.). Compare the preceding note. Hengstenberg’s remark is arbitrary : “Mary could not bear to be separated from Lazarus, because she had been most deeply affected by his death.”

Vv. 6, 7. *Οὖν*] Resumption of the narrative after the observation in ver. 5. — After ver. 6 a colon only ought to be

placed, for the course of the narrative is this: "When He now heard that he was sick, He remained *there*, indeed, etc.; (but) *then*," etc. — μέν] logically is quite correct after τότε: *then*, indeed (*tum quidem*), *when* He heard, He did not immediately go away, but remained still two days. There is no corresponding δέ after ἔπειτα, as one would naturally expect, because the adversative relation, which was in view at first, has given way to one of simple succession (comp. Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 539; Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Phaed.* p. 89 A; Baumlein, *Partic.* p. 163). — ἔπειτα μετὰ τοῦτο] *deinde postea* (Cic. *p. Mil.* 24), as in the Classics also (comp. Plat. *Phaedr.* p. 258 E: ἔπειτα λέγει δὴ μετὰ τοῦτο) synonymous adverbial expressions are frequently conjoined (Kühner, II. p. 615; Fritzsche, *ad Marc.* p. 22). Comp. τότε ἔπειτα, which occurs frequently even in Homer; Nägelsbach on the *Ilias*, p. 149, ed. 3. — The question *why Jesus did not at once leave for Bethany* is not solved by the assumption, that He designed to *test* the *faith* of the parties concerned (Olshausen; Gumlich also mixes this reason up with his otherwise correct view), which would, in opposition to ver. 5, have amounted to a harsh and arbitrary delaying on His part; nor is it explained by the similar notion, that the message of ver. 4 was meant first to produce its effect (Ebrard), as though there had not been without that time enough for this; just as little is it accounted for by the supposition that important *business* connected with His work in Peraea still detained Him (Lücke, Krabbe, Neander, Tholuck, Lange, Baumgarten), for John gives not the slightest hint of such a reason, and it is a purely *à priori* assumption. It is to be explained by a reference back to ver. 4, according to which Jesus was conscious of its being the *divine will* that the miracle should be performed precisely under the circumstances and at the *time* at which it actually was performed, and no otherwise (comp. ii. 4), for the glory of God. The divine δεῖ, of which He was conscious, decided Him, and that, under a moral necessity, lest He should act ὑπὲρ μόραν, to remain still; the same δεῖ again impelled Him at once to depart, when, in virtue of His immediate knowledge, He became aware of the death of His friend. Comp. on ver. 17.



All the more groundless was it to make use of the delay of Jesus as an argument against the historical truth of the narrative (Bretschneider, Strauss, Weisse, Gfrörer, Baur, Hilgenfeld), according to which Jesus intentionally allowed Lazarus to die, in order that He might be able to raise him up again (Baur, p. 193). — εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν] for they were in Peraea, x. 40. The more definite goal, *Bethany*, is not at first mentioned; but is specified afterwards, vv. 11, 15. The less reason, therefore, is there for finding a special design in the use of the words εἰς τ. Ἰουδ. (Luthardt: "into the land of unbelief and hostility"), a meaning which Godet and Gumlich import also into πάλιν.

Ver. 8. The question breathes solicitude for the safety and life of the beloved Master. — νῦν] *just now*, refers to the recent events which, though past, seemed still to form part of the present, x. 31. Hence the use of the *imperfect*; see Kühner, II. p. 385. — πάλιν] emphatically at the beginning. — ὑπάγεις] Present, as in x. 32.

Vv. 9, 10. The sense of the allegorical answer is this: "*The time appointed to me by God for working is not yet elapsed; as long as it lasts, no one can do anything to me; but when it shall have come to an end, I shall fall into the hands of my enemies*, like him who walketh in the night, and who stumbleth, because he is without light." In this way Jesus sets aside the anxiety of His disciples, on the one hand, by directing their attention to the fact that, as His time is not yet expired, He is *safe* from the apprehended dangers; and, on the other, by reminding them (ver. 10) that He must make *use* of the time apportioned to Him, before it come to an end.<sup>1</sup> So substantially Apollinaris (διδάσκει ὁ κύριος, ὅτι πρὸ τοῦ καιροῦ τοῦ πάθους οὐκ ἂν ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων πάθῃ καὶ διδάσκει τοῦτο διὰ παραβολῆς, ἡμέρας μὲν καιρὸν ὀνομάζων τὸν πρὸ τοῦ πάθους, τὸν δὲ τοῦ πάθους νύκτα), Ruperti (only partially), Jansen, Maldonatus, Corn. a Lapide, Wolf, Heumann, and

<sup>1</sup> Not, as Godet interprets: that He *dare not lengthen* the working time appointed to Him by the divine will, that He may not venture to *add to it as it were a thirteenth hour*. Such a thought was totally foreign to the minds of the disciples in giving their warning. All that they desired was, that He should *not shorten* His life by exposing Himself to the threatening danger of death.

several others; also Maier and B. Crusius; comp. Ewald and Hengstenberg. On individual points, note further: (1) δώδεκα is placed emphatically at the beginning, signifying that the day referred to is *still running on*, and that anxiety is still premature (not: *only* twelve hours; Bengel correctly remarks: "jam multa erat hora, sed tamen adhuc erat dies"). The supposition that Jesus spoke the words early in the morning, at sunrise (Godet, Gumlich), is as arbitrary as it is unnecessary. (2) τὸ φῶς τ. κόσμ. is the *light of the sun*, so designated in harmony with the elevated tone which marks the entire saying; the words ὅτι . . . βλέπει belong merely to the *details* of the picture, and are not intended to be specially *interpreted* (for example, of the guidance of the divine will, as Godet thinks, following older commentators). (3) Applying the figure to Jesus, *night* (ver. 10) commenced with the ἐληλύθεν ἡ ὥρα, xvii. 1 (comp. xii. 27); the ἡμέρα with its twelve hours was then over for Him, and, according to the divine decree, the προσκοπή in His path which, with the close of the twelfth hour, had become dark, must now follow,<sup>1</sup> in that He fell into the hands of His enemies; till then, however, οὐπω ἐληλύθει ἡ ὥρα αὐτοῦ, vii. 30, viii. 20. (4) The expression ὅτι τὸ φῶς οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν αὐτῷ, which is also a detail not intended for interpretation, is not equivalent to: *he has not*, etc. (Ewald; it is also inadmissible to take this view of Ps. xc. 10), but is an outflow of the notion that, in the case of a man walking in the night, it is dark *in him*, i.e. *his representation* of his surroundings is dark and without light, so that he cannot discover his whereabouts *in his consciousness* of that which is round about him. Grotius: "in oculis ejus;" but the expression ἐν αὐτῷ suggests the inner intuition and representation. (5) Substantially the same, and decisive for the view which the disciples would take, are the thought and figure in ix. 3 f.; hence also here neither is ἡμέρα to be taken as an image of *tempus opportunum* (Morus, Rosenmüller, Paulus, Kuinoel), nor νύξ of *tempus importunum*;

<sup>1</sup> The idea set forth is therefore not "the wish to be active *beyond the ordained goal and limit of life*," which would, indeed, be absurd (Tholuck's objection); but to be set free of activity *on the attainment of the ordained goal of life*. When the twelfth hour has passed, *night* falls on the wanderer, and he stumbles.

nor is it any more allowable to say, with Gumlich and Brückner (comp. Melanchthon, Beza, and Calvin), that  $\phi\omega\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa.\ \tau.$  is *God*, who shows the Son the way, so that this latter thus walks *in the day*, and His person and work remain unendangered ( $\omicron\upsilon\ \pi\rho\omicron\sigma\kappa\acute{o}\pi\tau\epsilon\iota$ <sup>1</sup>); similarly Baeumlein; Lücke, on the other hand, rightly refers  $\tau\eta\varsigma\ \eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\varsigma$  to the "*day's work*" of Christ, which has its *definite limit* (its twelve hours); but then he explains  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\eta\ \eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha$  of fulfilling the *duties of His calling* (comp. Melanchthon), which is always the way of safety, and takes  $\nu\acute{\upsilon}\xi$  as an image of *unfaithfulness to one's calling*, which leads to destruction. In this way, however, two totally different meanings are assigned to the figurative term  $\eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha$ , the second of which is the more decidedly to be rejected, as the mention of twelve hours is evidence that the *temporal* explanation alone is correct. For this reason, further, we must reject not only the view taken by De Wette, who regards the day as the image of "*upright, innocent, clear action*," the twelve hours, as the *ways and means* of action, and the night as the *lack of prudence and singlemindedness*; but also that of Luthardt: "He who keeps within the limits of his calling will not strike against anything, will not make false steps, for the light of the world, *i.e.* the will of God, gives him light; he, however, who passes beyond the limits of his calling will go wrong in his doings, seeing that he is guided, not by God's will, but by his own pleasure." Tholuck also diverges from the consistent carrying out of the temporal view; for, though understanding the twelve hours of the day of the fixed *time* of the vocation, he afterwards introduces the calling itself: "Whoso abides not by his calling will come to damage." Comp. Schweizer, p. 106; also Lange, who combines several very different views. According to Chrysostom, Theophylact, and Euth. Zigabenus, the walking in the day denotes either a *blameless walk*, in which a man has no need to be afraid; or *fellowship with Christ* (so also

<sup>1</sup> Ver. 10.  $\tau\omicron\ \phi\omega\varsigma\ \omicron\upsilon\kappa\ \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu\ \acute{\iota}\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\ \acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\nu$  is then explained by Brückner, after Matt. vi. 22 f., to mean that the eye, which has received the light, becomes itself a lamp, and so the whole man is illumined. But how could Jesus expect the disciples to understand so far-fetched an illusion? If such had been His meaning, He must have used, in agreement with Matt. vi. 23, some such words as:  $\acute{\omicron}\tau\iota\ \tau\omicron\ \phi\omega\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\ \acute{\iota}\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\ \sigma\kappa\acute{o}\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\nu$ .

Erasmus: "quandiu vobis luceo, nihil est periculi; veniet nox, quando a me semoti conturbabimini."<sup>1</sup> Vatablus, Clarius, Lampe, Neander). Both are incorrect, for the simple reason that the disciples had expressed concern, not for *themselves*, but for *Christ*, by their question in ver. 8 (Chrysostom and his followers arbitrarily remark that they had been more in anxiety, ὑπὲρ ἑαυτῶν); and because the former of these views would furnish no explanation of the *mention of the hours*, which is just the key to the figure. This objection holds good also against Hilgenfeld, *Lehrbegr.* p. 263, who brings out as the meaning of Jesus: He has the light absolutely in Himself, and for Him, therefore, no dark point can exist in His earthly course. On this view, moreover, ver. 10 remains without explanation. Olshausen, adopting the second view of Chrysostom, is prepared to accept an unhermeneutical double meaning of ἡμέρα;—in the one case, mindful of His near brotherly relationship to men, Jesus regarded Himself as accomplishing His ordained *day's work*; but, in the other case, He had in view His higher dignity as the *spiritual enlightener*, in the rays of whose brightness the disciples would have nothing to fear.<sup>2</sup> Comp. Bengel, who thinks that τὸ φῶς τ. κόσμ. τούτου signifies the "providentia Patris respectu Jesu, et providentia Christi respectu fidelium."

Vv. 11-13. Καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο λέγει] This representation separates the two discourses, between which a pause is to be conceived as intervening.—The *death* of Lazarus, which had just taken place, and became the occasion of the determination to leave at once (ver. 7; see on ver. 17), is described

<sup>1</sup> So in the *Paraphr.* But in the *Annotat.* he takes substantially our view: "Dies habet suas horas, nec is nostro arbitrio fit brevior aut longior; et ego tempus habeo praescriptum, quo debeam redimendi orbis negotium peragere, id Judaeorum malitia non potest anticipari: proinde nihil est, quod mihi timeatis."

<sup>2</sup> Ebrard adopts Olshausen's view in the following more definite shape: "The day has its determinate measured duration. If a man use the day as *day*, i.e. the time for working given him by God as a *time of working*, he needs to be in no fear that his working will bring him mischief, for the light of the mundane sun illumines him. But he who walks as though it were *night*, i.e. without working the will of God, would procure for himself eternal mischief, because he had not in him the light (in the absolute sense, i. 5)." In this way the essential elements are read into the passage; and what a strange difference in the conceptions found in the same expressions! How could the disciples have possibly understood their Master!

(comp. Matt. ix. 24), in view of his resurrection, by the word *κεκοίμ.*, *has fallen asleep*, the event having become known to Him by *immediate knowledge* (spiritual far-seeing). Hence also the *definiteness* of His statement, to which the addition of the words *ὁ φίλος ἡμ.* communicates a touch of painful sensibility. In saying *ἡμῶν* also, He claims the loving sympathy of His disciples. — *ἐξυπνίσω*] *awaken out of sleep*; a late Greek word, rejected by the Atticists. Lobeck *ad Phryn.* p. 224. Comp. Acts xvi. 27. — The *misunderstanding* of His disciples, who thought of the sleep which follows after a crisis has been passed through (see examples of the same thing in Pricaeus; comp. also Sir. xxxi. 2, and Fritzsche's remarks thereon), loses its apparent improbability (against Strauss, De Wette, Reuss) when we refer back to ver. 4, the words of which they had naturally understood, not in the sense intended by *Jesus*, which was that He would raise him up from the *dead*, but, after the analogy of ix. 3, as signifying that He purposed to come and miraculously heal him. The journey thereby involved, however, they did not desire (ver. 8); the expression *κεκοίμῃται* accordingly corresponded to their wishes; hence the conclusion at once drawn, that he must be on the way to recovery, and the effort, by calling attention to this fact, to make the journey appear unnecessary. The very earnestness of this their desire, caused them to overlook the *significant* nature of the words *ἵνα ἐξυπνίσω αὐτόν*, and to fail to see that it would have been absurd thus to speak of one who was *really* asleep. Such a mistake on their part is psychologically intelligible enough.<sup>1</sup> The notion that ver. 4 had led them to believe that Jesus had already *healed at a distance* (Ebrard, Hengstenberg), and that, *in consequence*, they necessarily understood sleep to refer to recovery, is incompatible with the fact that the words of ver. 4 do not at all suggest such a healing (how different in iv. 50!); and that if they had thought of such a healing having taken place, they would have grounded their *σωθήσεται* on that fact, and not on the approach of *sleep*; they would consequently, too, have dissuaded from this journey as unnecessary in a very *different*

<sup>1</sup> "Discipuli omni modo quaerunt Dominum ab isto itinere avocare," Grotius;  
 "libenter hanc fugiendi periculi occasionem arripiunt," Calvin.

way. According to Bengel (and Luthardt), the disciples believed, "somnum ab Jesu immissum esse Lazaro ut eveniret quod praedixerat ipse ver. 4." But there is no exegetical support for this view, not even in the use of the first person singular *πορεύομαι*, which finds its very natural explanation in the connection with *ἐξυπνίσω* (the case is different with *ἄγωμεν*, ver. 7), without that supposition (against Luthardt).

Ver. 14 f. *Παῖρ ῥησίᾳ*] i.e. without the help of figurative hints as in ver. 11. Comp. x. 24, xvi. 25. — *Δάξ. ἀπέθ.*] Now a declaration of the *simple occurrence*; hence there is no addition to the word *Δάξ* as in ver. 11. — *δι' ὑμᾶς*] is immediately explained by the words *ἵνα πιστεύσ.*; for every new *flight* of faith is in its degree a *progress* towards belief, comp. ii. 11. The words *ὅτι οὐκ ἦμ. ἐκεῖ* are to be taken together with *χαίρω*. If Jesus had been there, He would not have permitted His friend to die (against Paulus), but have saved him even on the sickbed; in this case the far greater *σημεῖον* of His *δόξα*, the raising him from the dead, would not have taken place, and the faith of the disciples would therefore not have had the benefit of it, though, just on the eve of the death of their Lord, it stood greatly in need of being increased. Bengel aptly remarks: "cum decoro divino pulchre congruit, quod praesente vitae duce nemo unquam legitur mortuus." — *ἵνα*] indicates the telic direction, or *intention* of the emotion (not merely hope, De Wette). Comp. viii. 56. Remark that Jesus rejoices not at the sorrowful event *in itself*, but *at the circumstance* that He was not there, in consequence whereof it assumed a salutary relation to the disciples. — *ἀλλ'*] Breaking off; Herm. *ad Vig.* p. 812; Baeuml. *Partic.* p. 15. And the summons is now brief and measured.

Ver. 16. *Thomas* (ΘΩΜΑΣ = ΔΙΚΗ), after the Greek translation of his name (*twin*), was called among the Gentile Christians *Didymus*. That *Jesus* gave him this name for the purpose of signifying that his nature was one which halted, and was divided between the old and the new man, is an invention of Hengstenberg's, which he even goes so far as to base on Gen. xxv. 23 f. — Notwithstanding what had been said in ver. 9, Thomas looked upon the return of Jesus as leading to His death; with His quick temperament, he at once expresses

what is in His mind; immediately, however, manifesting the resignation and courage of love,<sup>1</sup> seeing that their business now was to obey the clearly and definitely declared will of the Lord (differently in xiv. 5, xx. 24). There is no ground for charging him here with "inconsideratus zelus" (Calvin); or "Fear and Unbelief" (Chrysostom, Euth. Zigabenus); dualism of Belief and Unbelief (Hengstenberg), and the like. — *μετ' αὐτοῦ*] refers to Jesus,<sup>2</sup> not to Lazarus (Grotius, Ewald). — *συμμαθητής* occurs in the New Testament only in this place; but see Plat. *Euthyd.* p. 272 c.

Ver. 17. *Ἐλθών*] into the neighbourhood of Bethany, see ver. 30. That Jesus went by the direct road, may be taken for granted in view of the end He had before Him; to insert here events from the Synoptic Gospels for harmonistic purposes, only causes confusion. — *εὔρεν*] namely, after inquiry. — *τέσσαρας*] As we must assume that Lazarus did not die before the day on which the words of vv. 7 ff. were spoken, whilst Jesus was made at once and directly aware of the departure of His friend, then, if the Lord, as is probable, commenced the journey on the same day, and if Lazarus, agreeably to the Jewish custom, was buried on the day of his death, two full days and parts of two other days (the first and fourth) must have been spent in travelling to Bethany. No material objection can be urged against this supposition, seeing that we do not know how far northwards in Peraea Jesus was sojourning when He received the message announcing the illness. The *usual* opinion—still entertained even by Luthardt, Ebrard, Gumlich, Hengstenberg, Godet—is, that Lazarus died and was buried on the very day on which Jesus received the message. Were this the case, Jesus must have remained that day and the two following in Peraea, and have first begun the journey on the fourth day (a journey which some suppose to have occupied merely ten or eleven hours, or even a shorter time),<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Soph. *Fragm.* 690. Dind.: *θανόντι καὶ αὐτὸν συνθανὼν ἴσως μ' ἔχου.* Eur. *Suppl.* 1009 ff.

<sup>2</sup> This reference follows in accordance with the context from ver. 8 and from *καὶ ἡμεῖς*, in which the *καὶ* points to Jesus. On the thought, comp. Matt. xxvi. 35 and parallels.

<sup>3</sup> But see van der Velde, *Reise durch Syr. u. Pal.* II. p. 245 ff. The actual road was undoubtedly considerably longer than the distance in a straight line.

and completed it on the same (Ebrard) or on the following day. On this supposition, however, Jesus would either not have known of the death of His friend before the third day, which would be quite opposed to the character and wording (vv. 4, 6) of the narrative; or else He would know of it as soon as it happened, and therefore at the time of the arrival of the messenger, which would alone accord with the tone of the entire history; in this latter case, the two days' postponement of His departure, which, notwithstanding He had resolved on, would be unnatural and aimless, and the words of ver. 4, which treat the sickness of Lazarus as still continuing, would have been inappropriate. Correctly, therefore, have Bengel (on ver. 11 with the comparison of iv. 52) and Ewald fixed the death of Lazarus as contemporaneous with vv. 7, 8, so that the occurrence of the death and the knowledge thereof possessed by Jesus determined His leaving at once. They would then have arrived at Bethany on the fourth day (comp. on i. 28).

Ver. 18. This observation explains the fact mentioned in the following verse, that so many of the *Ἰουδαῖοι* (from the neighbouring capital) were present. — *ἦν*] The use of the *pract.* does not of itself necessarily imply that Bethany had ceased to exist at the time when the writer wrote, but might be explained (as it *usually* is) from the general connection with the past events narrated (see on Acts xvii. 21; Krüger on *Xen. Anab.* i. 4. 9; Breitenbach, *ad Xen. Hier.* 9. 4). At the same time, as John is the only one of the evangelists who uses the *pract.* thus (see besides xviii. 1, xix. 41), and as he further wrote a considerable time after the destruction of Jerusalem, it is more natural to suppose that Jerusalem and the surrounding neighbourhood was presented before his mind as lying waste, and Bethany also as *no longer existing*. — ἀπὸ σταδίων δεκαπ. *fifteen stadia off, i.e. about three-eighths of a geographical mile.* On this mode of describing the distance (Apoc. xiv. 20) see Buttm. *Neut. Gr.* p. 133 [E. T. p. 153]. Compare also xii. 1, and on Acts x. 30. A stadium =  $589\frac{1}{2}$  feet Rhenish ( $606\frac{3}{4}$  feet English) measure.

Ver. 19. *Ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων*] is generally taken as equivalent to *Ἱεροσολυμιτῶν*, but altogether without ground.



Wherever John uses the term "*the Jews*," unless it be in the purely *national* sense (as in ii. 6, ii. 13, iii. 1, iv. 9, and frequently), to distinguish them as a *nation* from other nations, he constantly means the *Jewish opposition* to Jesus. See on i. 19. So also here (compare Brückner, Gumlich, Godet). On them, however, the miracle produced the noteworthy deep impression which will be recorded in vv. 45, 46. The Lazarus family, which, without doubt, was a highly respected one, must—and might it not have been so, notwithstanding its friendship with Jesus?—have had many acquaintances, perhaps also relatives, among these Jews. — *πρὸς τὰς περὶ Μ. κ. Μ.*] is not quite identical in force with *πρὸς τὴν Μ. κ. Μ.* (so Lachmann after B. C. L. X. κ.), but describes *the two sisters with their surroundings* (Bernhardy, p. 263; Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* ii. 4. 2; comp. Acts xiii. 13). The words might also denote the sisters alone, according to later Greek usage (see Valckenaer, *Schol. ad Act.* xiii. 13; Lehrs, *Quaest. Ep.* p. 28 ff.); *this* usage, however, is quite foreign to the New Testament, besides that, in the present connection, the expression employed has its special propriety, they being *men* who had come. It implies, moreover, that the household was one of a *higher* class. — *ἴνα παραμ. αὐτ.*] The expression of sympathy and consolation, which was connected with definite formalities, lasted usually seven days (1 Sam. xxxi. 13; 1 Chron. x. 12; Judith xvi. 23). See Lightfoot, p. 1070 ff.

Ver. 20. Martha, now also discharging her duties as hostess, and in consequence coming more into contact with others from without, is first informed of the coming of Jesus (*how?* must be left undecided), and with judicious haste goes at once to meet Him, without exciting attention by communicating the fact to her sister. — *ἐκαθέζετο*] For the manifestations of sympathy were received *sitting*. See Geier, *de Luctu Hebraeorum*, p. 211 ff. Comp. Dougt. *Anal. ad Ez.* viii. 14.—Note the different nature of the two sisters, as in Luke x. 38 ff.

Vv. 21, 22. *Εἰ ἥς ᾧδε*] Not a reproach, but a lament: *if Thou wert here*, and stayedst not in the distant Peraea. — *καὶ νῦν*] Without *ἀλλά* (see the critical note) the expression simply connects past and present: *and now*, when he is dead.

She then gives expression *indirectly* ("ob voti magnitudinem," Grotius) to her *confidence*, which had quickly arisen in consequence of the arrival of Jesus, that by His prayer He would be able to raise the dead one to life. Having the confidence, she expresses the *wish*. We can understand from ver. 4 why, now that the *healing* could no longer be effected, she should think of a *resurrection*; for with her faith in Jesus, and her knowledge of His wonderful works, she must have felt sure that the declaration of ver. 4 would be fulfilled in some way or other. The less, therefore, may we adopt Calvin's judgment: "*magis affectui suo indulget, quam se contineat sub fidei regula.*"—The *position of the words* αἰτήσῃ τὸν θεόν, δώσει ὁ θεός is emphatic; their emphatic character is further heightened by the repetition of ὁ θεός (comp. *Xen. Mem.* i. 3. 2: εὔχετο δὲ πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς . . . ὡς τοὺς θεοὺς κάλλιστα εἰδότες). This word αἰτεῖσθαι, *to beg for oneself*, is not elsewhere used of Jesus praying to God (but ἐρωτᾶν, παρακαλεῖν, προσεύχεσθαι, δεῖσθαι); it corresponds to the intensity of Martha's *emotion*, which would lead her to choose the more concrete, more human expression (comp. *Matt.* vii. 9; *John* xv. 16, *al.*). Thus *naively*, as to *form*, does she speak in the excitement of her feeling; for the idea of the superhuman relation of Jesus to God had not as yet presented itself in any way to her mind. But as to *substance* she was right; see vv. 41, 42.

Vv. 23, 24. Jesus understood her, and promises ἀναστήσεται ὁ ἀδ. σου! He meant<sup>1</sup> to carry out the purpose stated in ver. 11, but *expressed* Himself ambiguously—no doubt intentionally—in order to lead the faith of Martha away from her merely personal interest, and to raise it rather to the higher general domain of the one thing that is needful. His words might as easily denote a raising up to be accomplished at once, as the resurrection at the last day. Martha ventures to take

<sup>1</sup> That is, He meant the *raising of Lazarus*, which *actually* afterwards took place, and which was the fulfilment of the ἰζυρνίζειν; παλίνρσας ἰγίριται, Nonnus. Quite in opposition to the progress and connection of the narrative, with its beautiful significance, is Hengstenberg's remark: "Jesus means *specially* the resurrection at the *last day*, and along therewith, also, His *transference to Paradise.*" The soul of the deceased must already have been in Paradise, *Luke* xliiii. 43.

it only as a consolatory word of promise relatively to Lazarus' participation in this *latter* resurrection; she had previously dared to hope for so much, that she was not now able to interpret so indefinite a reply in her own favour. Accordingly, her response expresses the resignation of disappointment, which would now so naturally present itself to her mind; at the same time, it was an answer full of submission, and not one of "as it were further inquiry" (De Wette, compare Calvin).

Vv. 25, 26. Jesus connects with her answer that which He intended to say, as fitted to draw her faith from her own interest to *His person*: *I, no other than I, am the resurrection and the life, i.e. the personal power of both, the one who raises again, and who makes alive.* Comp. xiv. 6; Col. iii. 4. The *ζωή* after the *ἀνάστασις* is its positive result (not its ground, as Luthardt and Ewald think), the *eternal* life, which, however, also presupposes the happy state of *ζωή* in Hades, in Paradise (Luke xvi. 22, xxiii. 43). In the course of what follows, Jesus tells who it is that *experiences* Him as this power of resurrection and life,<sup>1</sup> namely, *ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ*. The thought is in both clauses the same; they form a parallelism with a positive and negative declaration concerning the same subject, which, however, in the second clause, is described not merely by *πιστεύων* again, but by *ζῶν καὶ πιστεύων*, because this was the only way of making the significant antithetical reciprocal relationship complete. With a view to this end, *dying* denotes in the first clause physical death, whereas in the second clause it is used in the higher sense; whereas, *vice versâ*, *life* is spoken of in the first clause in the higher sense, in the second in its physical sense. *Whoso believeth in me, even if he shall have died* (physically), *will live* (be a partaker of *ζωή*, *uninterruptedly*, as, prior to the resurrection, in Paradise, so, by means of the resurrection, *eternally*); *and every one who lives* (is still alive in time) *and believes in me, will assuredly not die for ever, i.e. he will not lose his life in eternity*, viii. 51,—a promise which, though not excluding physical death in itself, does

<sup>1</sup> It is not merely *ζωή* that is carried out in what follows (Luthardt); for the life which Jesus ascribes to the believer, even in death, finds its completion precisely in the resurrection.

exclude it as the negation of the true and eternal ζωή, vi. 50. Compare Rom. viii. 10. In accordance herewith, ζῶν neither can nor may be taken in the *spiritual* sense (Calvin and Olshausen): to apply καὶ ἀποθ., however, to Lazarus, and ζῶν to the sisters (Euth. Zigabenus, Theophylact), is inadmissible, simply because Lazarus was to be raised again solely to *temporal* life. Both are to be left in their generality. — On πᾶς Bengel remarks ingeniously: “hoc versu 25 non adhibitum ad majora sermonem profert,” and on πιστ. τοῦτο: “applicatio . . . per improvisam interrogationem valde pungens.”

Vv. 27, 28. Martha's answer *affirms* the question, and gives the *reason* for the affirmation; for to Messiah alone could and ought thanks to be due for that which is mentioned in ver. 25 f.<sup>1</sup> — ἐγώ] With the emphasis of conscious assurance. — πεπίστευκα] I have convinced myself, and believe. Comp. vi. 69. — ὁ Χριστὸς, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ] The second predicate, although conceived by Martha still in the popular theocratic sense, and not yet understood in its *essentially* divine import (comp. on i. 50), satisfactorily expresses her faith in the divinely-conferred ἐξουσία of her friend, and is correlative to the ὁ εἰς τ. κόσμ. ἐρχόμενος, and to be connected with it. The *present* ἐρχόμενος is employed because she looks for the advent of the Messiah as close at hand. Compare on Matt. xi. 3; Luke ii. 25, 38. — Ver. 28. That Martha called her sister *at the bidding of Jesus*, is clear from καὶ φωνεῖ σε; and any doubt as to whether He actually commissioned her to do so is baseless (Brückner, compare Tholuck; Hengstenberg, after Chrysostom). — λάθρα] not φανερώς, that is, *whispering* these words to her *secretly*, so that the Ἰουδαῖοι in ver. 31 who were present—these men so hostilely disposed towards the beloved Teacher—might not observe *what* she should say to her, in order that they might not disturb the further consolation and elevation which she now, with the faith in her heart that she had just so decidedly expressed, expected for her sister

<sup>1</sup> The simple and full affirmation of what was asked is contained therefore in ναί, κύριε, and ἐγὼ πιστεύω is not a *Confiteor* in response to the question freely formed by Martha (Godet, after Lange); on the contrary, her *Confiteor* is contained in the words ναί, κύριε, and the further words πιστεύω, etc., express the *holy foundation* on which her ναί rested in her heart.

and herself from Jesus. — ὁ διδάσκ.] This designation, which had probably been customary in the family, was sufficiently intelligible to her sister; she did *not need* to mention His name, nor does she *mention* it, for the sake of secrecy. Compare Mark xiv. 14.

Vv. 30, 31. He had remained *outside the place*, not, however, because of the proximity of the grave (He did not even know where it was, ver. 34, against Hengstenberg and others), but doubtless because Martha had informed Him of the presence of the many *Ἰουδαῖοι*,—which it was so natural for Martha to do, that Luthardt should not have called it in question. He did not desire their presence whilst He said to Mary what He intended to say, for which reason also He had her called *secretly*. His intention, however, was not realized, for the Jews thought that when Mary went away so hastily she had gone to the grave (on this custom see Geier, *de Luctu Hebr.* VII. 26, and Wetstein), and followed after her, in order not to leave her alone in her sorrow without words of sympathy and consolation. On εἰς τ. μνημ. comp. ver. 38, xx. 1.

Ver. 32. *Ἐπεσεν*, etc.] Not so Martha, ver. 21. Mary's feelings were of an intenser and stronger kind. — αὐτοῦ πρὸς τ. πόδας] *at His feet* (πρὸς, Mark v. 22, vii. 25). So afterwards, μου ὁ ἀδελφός, *my brother* had not died, as in xiii. 6, and very often in the New Testament and in Greek writers; see Kühner, § 627 A 4; Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Rep.* p. 518 C. — εἰ ἦς ὦδε, etc.] like Martha in ver. 21, but without adding anything beyond her tears. This thought had unquestionably been the oft-repeated refrain of their mutual communications on the subject of their sorrow.—No further conversation takes place, because the *Ἰουδαῖοι* by coming with her disturbed them, vv. 31, 33; according to Luthardt, because Jesus wished a *deed* to take the place of *words*; but of this there is no hint in the text.

Vv. 33, 34.—Τοὺς συνελθ. αὐτῇ Ἰουδ.] *The Jews who had come with her* (see on Mark xiv. 53). Note the emphatic *κλαίουσαν . . . κλαύοντας*. — ἐνεβριμήσατο τῷ πνεύματι] Alone correct are the renderings of the Vulgate: *infremuit spiritu*; of the Gothic: *inrauhtida ahmin*; and of Luther: *er ergimmete im Geiste*, *He was angered in the spirit*. On τῷ

πνεύματι, comp. xiii. 21; Mark viii. 12; Acts xvii. 16. The words βριμάομαι and ἐμβριμάομαι are never used otherwise than of hot *anger* in the Classics, the Septuagint, and the New Testament (Matt. ix. 30; Mark i. 43, xiv. 5), save where they denote snorting or growling proper (Aeschyl. *Sept.* 461; Lucean, *Necyom.* 20). See Gumlich, p. 265 f. For this reason the explanation of sharp *pain* (so also Grotius, Lucke, Tholuck, who thinks the word denotes a painful, sympathetic, and shuddering movement, not expressed in sounds, B. Crusius, Maier, and several; compare already Nonnus) must be rejected at the very outset, as opposed to the usage of the word. The same applies also to Ewald's notion<sup>1</sup> that it is simply a somewhat stronger term for στενάζειν or ἀναστενάζειν (Mark vii. 34; comp. viii. 12). But at *what* was He *angered*? This is not expressed by τῷ πνεύματι (against this supposition ἐν ἑαυτῷ in ver. 38 is sufficiently decisive), as though He were angry at being affected as He was (τῷ πάθει). This view, which quite misconceives the humanity of Jesus, is taken by Origen, Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, and several others.<sup>2</sup> Nor was His anger enkindled at *death as the wages of sin* (Augustine, Corn. a Lapide, Olshausen, Gumlich); nor at the *power of death* (Melancthon, Ebrard),<sup>3</sup> the dread foe of the

<sup>1</sup> "As though compelled to gather up all the deepest powers of love and compassion, first, in deepest emotion, repeatedly sighing and weeping," *Gesch. Christi*, p. 486. Somewhat differently in the *Johann. Schr.* I. p. 322: "Like an old hero of the primeval age, like a Jacob, who, gathering together the deepest forces of his spirit, prepares for the combat, and in the midst of the struggle weeps aloud." Melancthon has a similar idea.

<sup>2</sup> To much the same effect is Cyril's view, who takes τῷ πνεύματι to mean the Holy Spirit, and to be used *instrumentally*: τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, Jesus was angered at the human compassion which He had felt. Hilgenfeld, in his *Lehrbegr.* p. 260, *Evang.* p. 296 (comp. Köstlin, p. 139), has recently modified this view as follows: a genuinely human feeling threatened to tear away the human person joined with the Logos from His fellowship with the Logos, and the displeasure of the Logos was therefore only able to express itself inwardly, to vent itself on the humanity. See, on the contrary, Weiss, *Lehrbegr.* p. 257. Interpretations like these spring from a soil which lies altogether outside the domain of exegesis. More simply, but also doing violence to the moral nature of the human compassion felt by Jesus, is the view taken by Merz (in *die Würtemb. Stud.* 1844, 2): He became angry with Himself because He had felt as if His heart would break.

<sup>3</sup> So also Luthardt (who is followed by Weber in his *Zorne Gottes*, p. 24): "He was angered at death and him who has the power of death, His antagonist,

human race (Hengstenberg); nor at the *unbelief* of the Jews (Erasmus, Scholten) as well as of the sisters (Lampe, Kuinoel, Wichelhaus, *Komm. üb. d. Leidensgesch.* p. 66 f.); nor, finally, at the circumstance that *He had not been able to avert this melancholy occurrence* (De Wette). The last-mentioned notion is appropriate neither to the idea, nor to the degree of anger, nor to ver. 4; and the whole of these references are *imported* into the text. Brückner's opinion: the anger is that of the Redeemer, misunderstood by His enemies, and not understood by His friends, is also an importation; so also Godet's forced expedient: Jesus was *indignant* that, in performing this His greatest miracle, to which He found Himself pressed by the sobbings of those who were present, *He should be pronouncing His own death-sentence*; Satan purposed making it the signal of His condemnation, and some even of those who were weeping were destined to become *His accusers*. As though anything of all that were either to be found in the passage, or were even hinted at in it! The reference lying in the context was overlooked in consequence of the word *Ἰουδαῖοι* not being taken in the sense in which it is constantly used by John, namely, as the designation of the hostile party. It must be remembered that, in ver. 38 also, this inward wrath of the Lord was aroused by the behaviour of the Jews noticed in ver. 37. He was angered, then, at the *Jews*, when He saw them lamenting with the deeply-feeling Mary, and professing by their cries (of condolence) to share her feelings, whilst at the same time aware that they were full of bitter hostility to Him who was the beloved friend both of those who mourned and of him whom they mourned, nor is ver. 45 inconsistent therewith. Accordingly, the moving cause of His wrath lay solely in that which the text states (*ὡς εἶδεν . . . κλαίοντας*); the separative expression: *αὐτὴν κλαίουσαν . . . Ἰουδαίους κλαίοντας*, sets forth the contrast presented by the procedure of the two, whilst going on together before Him. Alongside of the lamentation of Mary, He could not but see that the *κλαίνειν* of the *Jews* was *hypocritical*, and this excited His strong moral

that he had done such a thing to Him, that he had thus penetrated into His innermost circle, and had thus, as it were, thrown out threatenings against Himself." Comp. Kahnis, *Dogmatik*, I. p. 504: "at the *unnaturalness* of death."

indignation and wrath. John has simply expressed this indignation by the right term, without, as Lange thinks, combining in *ἐνεβριμῆς*. the most varied emotions of the mind, as in a "*divine thunderstorm of the spirit*." By the addition of *τῷ πνεύματι* the indignation experienced by Jesus is defined as having been *felt in the depths of His moral self-consciousness*. During this experience, also, the *πνεῦμα* of Jesus was a *πνεῦμα ἀγῶσύνης*; see on Rom. i. 4. John might also have written *τῇ ψυχῇ* (see on xii. 27); but *τῷ πνεύματι* is more characteristic. — *καὶ ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτόν*] not equivalent to *ἐταράχθη τῷ πνεύματι*, xiii. 21; nor even denoting, "*He allowed Himself to be troubled (agitated), surrendered Himself to the agitation*" (De Wette); but, as the active with the reflective pronoun necessarily requires, *He agitated Himself*, so that the *outward manifestation*, the bodily shuddering, during the internal movement of indignation, is designated by the words, and not the emotion itself.<sup>1</sup> Euth. Zigabenus remarks, in the main correctly: *διέσεισε συμβαίνει γὰρ τινάσσεσθαι τὰ ἀνώτερα μέρη τῶν οὕτως ἐμβριμωμένων*. The use of the reflective expression has no dogmatic basis (Augustine, Bengel, and several; also Brückner and Ebrard suppose that it was designed to exclude the notion of the *passivity* of the emotion), but is simply due to its being more descriptive and picturesque. The reader is made to *see* how Jesus, in His inner indignation, *shakes Himself and shudders*. — *ποῦ τεθείκ. αὐτόν;*] This question He puts to Mary and Martha, and it is they also who answer it. Having experienced the stirrings of indignation, without any further delay, gathering Himself up for action, He now asks that which it was in the first instance *necessary* for Him to know. The assumption made by Hengstenberg,<sup>2</sup> that He already *knew* that which He asked, is due solely to exegetical presuppositions, and reduces the question to a mere formality.

Ver. 35. *Ἐδάκρ. ὁ Ἰ.*] He weeps, whilst on His way to the sepulchre, with those who were weeping. Note the eloquent, deeply-moving *simplicity* which characterizes the narrative;

<sup>1</sup> As Hengstenberg maintains ("Jesus stirs Himself up to energetic struggle," etc.); compare also Godet.

<sup>2</sup> So also Gumlich, after Augustine, Erasmus, Jansen, and others.



and remark as to the subject-matter, how, before accomplishing His work, Jesus gives full vent to the *sorrow* which He felt for His friend, and for the suffering inflicted on the sisters. It is also worthy of notice, that *δακρύνειν* is here used, and not again *κλαλεῖν*,—His lamenting is a *shedding of tears* in quiet anguish, not a weeping with loud lamentation, not a *κλαυθμός* as over Jerusalem, Luke xix. 41. It is a delicate discrimination of expressions, unforced, and true. According to Baur, indeed, tears for a dead man, whose grave was being approached in the certainty of his being raised to life again, could not be the expression of a true, genuinely human fellow-feeling. As though such feelings could be determined in a manner involving such deliberation, and as if the death of His friend, the grief of those by whom He was accompanied, as well as the wailings of the sisters, were not sufficient, *of themselves alone*, to arouse His loving sympathy to tears! It is precisely a genuine human emotion, which neither could nor should resist the painful impression produced by such a moment. But those obliterate the delicate character of this trait with their hard dogmatic hand, who make the tears shed by Christ refer to “the *misery of the human race* pictured forth in Lazarus” (Hengstenberg, comp. Gumlich).

Vv. 36, 37. The *Ἰουδαῖοι* express themselves variously: those who were better disposed say, How must He have *loved* Lazarus whilst alive (*imper.*), if He thus weeps for him now that he is dead; those who were maliciously and wickedly disposed treat His tears as a welcome proof, not of His want of love (Luthardt), but of His *inability*, apart from which He must surely have been able to heal Lazarus of his *sickness*, even as He had healed the blind man of his blindness! In this way they at the same time threw doubt on the reality of the healing of the blind man (for they regard it as the *major* in their conclusion *ad minus*), and suppose, moreover, that Jesus did not come sooner to Bethany because He was unable to save Lazarus; for the conclusion drawn by them implies that He had received information concerning the sickness. The *malicious* signification of the question in ver. 37 has been correctly recognised by Chrysostom, Nonnus (*ἀντιάχρησαν*), Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, Erasmus, Calvin, Bengel, and

most of the older commentators, as also by Luthardt, Lange, and Godet; some recent writers, however, as Lücke, De Wette, Tholuck, Maier, Brückner, Ewald, Gumlich, Hengstenberg, groundlessly reject this view, notwithstanding that the following words, *πάντα ἐμβριμ.*, rightly interpreted, find their explanation in these expressions of His opponents.—The circumstance of their appealing to the *healing of the blind man*, instead of to the *awakenings from the dead*, recorded by the Synoptics, is no argument against the reality of the latter miracles (Strauss); not even is this appeal less appropriate (De Wette), but it was, on the contrary, naturally suggested by their *own most recent experience*; it was also thoroughly appropriate, inasmuch as they were thinking, not of a raising from the dead, but simply of a *healing* of Lazarus, which was to have been effected by Jesus. — *ἵνα*] the thought is: be active, *in order that*. Comp. on Col. iv. 16. — *καὶ οὗτος*] like the blind man whom He healed. For the *healing* (the opposite of *μὴ ἀποθανῆ*) is the point of comparison.

Ver. 38. This *πουνήα* (Chrysostom) of the *τινές* stirred afresh, in the midst of His pain, His deep, though quiet, indignation; in this case, however, it was less noticeable, not being attended with the *ταράσσειν ἑαυτὸν* of ver. 33. — *εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον*] *to the grave* (not *into*, see what follows; comp. ver. 31). The sepulchral vaults were entered either by a perpendicular opening with steps, or by an horizontal one; they were closed either by a large stone, or by a door. They exist in great numbers, down to the present day; Robinson, II. p. 175 ff., and his more recent *Researches*, p. 327 ff.; Tobler, *Golgotha*, p. 251 ff. The grave of Lazarus would have been of the first kind if *ἐπέκειτο ἐπ' αὐτῷ* be rendered: *it lay upon it*; the one at present shown as the grave of Lazarus, though probably without sufficient reason (see Robinson, II. p. 310), is such. But *ἐπέκ. ἐπ' αὐτ.* may also mean: *it lay against it, before it* (comp. Hom. *Od.* 6. 19: *θύραι δ' ἐπέκειντο*); and then the reference would be to a grave with an horizontal entrance. No decision can be arrived at. The description of the grave would seem to imply that Lazarus was a man of some position.

Vv. 39, 40. While Jesus called upon those present to take

away the stone (which was done, as related in ver. 41), Mary waited in silent resignation. On Martha, however, with her mobile practical tendency, the command of Jesus, which was equivalent to a wish to *see* Lazarus, produced a *terrifying* effect. Her sisterly heart (hence ἡ ἀδελφὴ τοῦ τετελ.) shudders at the thought, and rises up against it, and she will not see the corpse of her beloved brother, already passing over into a state of putrefaction, exposed to the gaze of those who were present;—from the fact of his having already lain four days, she *concludes*, with good reason, that he must already have begun to stink. For her earlier idea of a possible resurrection (ver. 22), which, moreover, had been entertained only for a time, had passed over, owing to the expressions of the Lord in vv. 23–26, into the faith in Christ, as the *Resurrection* and the Life in general, through whom the dear departed one also liveth (ver. 26). Accordingly, it is incorrect to suppose that her wish was to call the attention of Jesus to the magnitude of the work to be performed by Him, with a view to calling forth a new confirmation of His promise (Hengstenberg); on the contrary, far removed from such reflections, she now *no longer at all expects the reawakening of the corpse*, and that, too, not from unbelief, but because the higher direction which her faith had received through Christ's words had taught her resignation.—The *embalming* of the body (its fumigation, embrocation, and envelopment in spices, as also its anointing, xii. 7) can *not* have taken place; otherwise Martha could not have come to the conclusion which she expresses. This omission may have been due to some cause unknown to us; but the supposition that the sisters still *intended* carrying out the embalming is inadmissible owing to the ἡδὴ ὄξει.—τεταρταῖος] *of the fourth day* (comp. on ver. 17), that is, one buried for that time. See Wetstein. Comp. Xen. *Anab.* vi. 4. 9: ἡδὲ γὰρ ἦσαν πεμπτῆσσι (dead); Diog. Laert. 7. 184.—The gentle reproof contained in ver. 40 refers to vv. 23 ff., and is justified; for that which He had said regarding the glory of God in ver. 4 was to be realized by means of the *ἀναστ.* promised in ver. 23—promised in the sense present to Christ's mind. At the same time, the performance of the miracle was itself dependent on the fulfilment of the condi-

tion *ἐὰν πιστευσ.* (which had been required also in vv. 25 f.); to *unbelieving* sisters He could no more have restored the dead brother than to an unbelieving Jairus his child (Luke viii. 50), or to the widow of Nain her son, if her attitude towards His compassion and His injunction *μὴ κλαῖε* (Luke vii. 13) had been one of unbelief.

Vv. 41, 42. Jesus *knows* that His prayer, that God would suffer Him to raise Lazarus to life,—a prayer which He had previously offered up in stillness, perhaps only in the inarticulate yearnings of His heart,—has been heard, and He *thanks* God for hearing it. Petition and thanksgiving are not to be conceived as blended in one (Merz in *die Württemberg. Stud.* 1844, 2, p. 65; Tholuck); nor is the latter to be regarded as *anticipatory* (Hengstenberg), as though He *offered thanks* in the certain anticipation of the hearing of His *prayer* (Ewald, comp. Godet). Not that He offers thanks because the hearing of His prayer was unexpected and un hoped for (*εἶπον*); no, He for His part (*ἐγώ*) knew, even whilst He was asking God in stillness, that God always heard Him;<sup>1</sup> but because of the people standing by, etc. — Some have stumbled at ver. 42, and looked on it either as *spurious* (Dieffenbach in Bertholdt's *Krit. Journ.* vol. i. p. 8), or as a *reflection of the evangelist* who puts this “show-prayer” (Weisse), or even “sham-prayer” (Baur), into the mouth of Christ for the purpose of supplying an argument for the story (De Wette; see, on the other hand, Brückner), or for the divinity of Christ (Strauss, Scholten). But it is just He, the One who is most intimate with the Father, who may indulge in reflection even in prayer, if His reflections relate to God, and *are* prayer. The opposite judgment applies an arbitrary standard to the subject. Moreover, if it had been *his own* reflection, John would probably have said: *διὰ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους* instead of *διὰ τ. ὄχλον*. Comp. ver. 45. — *εἶπον*] as in vi. 36: *I will have said it*, namely the *εὐχαριστῶ σοι*, etc. To refer to ver. 4 (Ewald) is inadmissible even on account of *διὰ τ. ὄχλον* alone. — *σι*] Thou and no other. They shall be convinced of it by learning from my thanksgiving that *my* working takes place

<sup>1</sup> Correct reason for this: *πάντοτε θέλω εὐχαριστῶ* (Euth. Zigabenus); but also, conversely, *πάντοτε θέλω εὐχαριστῶ*; see v. 30, xii. 27.

in *Thy* strength, in the full certainty of a victory of *Thy* sending.

Vv. 43-46. *With a loud voice, He cried out*; this was the vigorous medium through which He caused His miraculous power to operate. — The expression δεῦρο ἔξω (*hither out! huc foras!* without verb; comp. Hom. *Od.* θ. 192; Plat. *Pol.* iv. p. 445 D, v. p. 477; D. Stallb. *ad Plat. Apol.* p. 24 C) includes in itself the resurrection-call, but does not imply that the act of reawakening has been already performed (Origen). Nonnus correctly remarks: ἄπνοον ἐψύχωσε δέμας νεκροσσοῦς ἡχώ. Jesus did not here call out ἐγείρου or ἐγέρθητι (as in the case of the daughter of Jairus, and of the son of the widow of Nain, Luke viii. 54, vii. 15), because the words δεῦρο ἔξω seemed the most natural to employ in the case of a dead man already lying *in the tomb*. — δεδεμ. τ. μὸδ. κ. τ. χεῖρ. κειρίαις] By Basil (θαύμαζε θαῦμα ἐν θαύματι), Chrysostom, Euth. Zigabenus, Augustine, Ruperti, Aretius, Lightfoot, Lampe, and several others, this is regarded as a *new miracle*, to which is reckoned, besides, even the covering up of the countenance. An arbitrary disfiguration of the fact to the point of introducing apocryphal elements. It is not necessary, with the purpose of escaping from this view, that the aor. ἐξήλαθε should be understood *de conatu* (Kuinoel); nor to assume that each limb was enwrapped *by itself*, as was the custom in *Egypt* (Olshausen, De Wette, B. Crusius, Maier); but the winding-sheet in which the corpse was wound from head to foot (Matt. xxvi. 59), thus embracing the entire body (see Jahn, *Arch.* I. 2, p. 424), might, especially as it had to hold no spices (ver. 39), be slack and loose enough to render it possible, after it had been loosened by his movements, for the awakened man to come forth. He was not completely freed from the grave-clothes, till the command λύσατε αὐτόν had been given. — κειρία] *Girdle, bandage*; in the N. T. it occurs only here, but see Prov. vii. 16; Aristoph. *Av.* 817; Plut. *Alc.* 16. — καὶ ἡ ὄψις αὐτοῦ σουδ. περιεδ.] *special* mention is here added of the last part of the complete death-dress in which he issued forth from the tomb, not, however, in the participial form (Kühner, II. p. 423). *His face was bound about with a napkin*. On περιεδ. comp. Job xii. 8; Plut. *Mor.* p. 825 E. — λέγει

αὐτοῖς] to those who were present in general, as in ver. 39. *Let him go away* (comp. xviii. 8). With strength so completely restored had he risen again. But any further excitement was now to be avoided.

OBSERVATION.—*On the history of the resurrection of Lazarus, which constitutes the culminating point of the miraculous activity of our Lord, we have to remark:* (1) The assumption of a merely *apparent death* (Paulus, Gabler in his *Journ. für auserl. theol. Lit.* III. p. 235 ff.; Ammon, *Leben Jesu*, III. p. 128; Kern in the *Tüb. Zeitschr.* 1839, I. p. 182; Schweizer, p. 153 ff.) is decidedly opposed, both to the character of Jesus Himself, and to the style and purpose of the narrative, which is distinguished for its thoughtful tenderness, certainty, and truthfulness. (2) To reduce the account to a strange *misunderstanding*, according to which, either a conversation between Christ and the two sisters, on the occasion of the death of Lazarus, regarding the resurrection, led to the rise of the story of the miracle (Weisse, II. p. 260 ff.); or, the latter has been confounded with the account of the awakening of the (only apparently dead) youth of *Nain*,—*Nain* being an abridgment of the name *Bethany*, as Gfrörer, *Heiligth. und Wahrh.* p. 311 ff., thinks; as also to suppose that the Lazarus of the parable in Luke xvi. has been converted, in the tradition prevailing at Ephesus, into a Lazarus raised from the dead by Jesus (Schenkel), is an arbitrary and violent procedure, simply incompatible with the genuineness of the Gospels. (3) The complete *annihilation* of the history into a *myth* (Strauss) is a consequence of pre-suppositions which, just in connection with so detailed and unique a narrative as this,<sup>1</sup> reach the very acme of boldness and arbitrariness, in order to demonstrate by misrepresentation of individual features the existence of internal improbabilities, and the want of external evidence for the credibility of the narrative. (4) The *subjective theory* of the occurrence, according to which it is said to be a form created<sup>2</sup> by the writer him-

<sup>1</sup> Ewald, *Gesch. Chr.* p. 484. "No narrative of this apostle is pervaded by so intense a glow and rapid liveliness of description as this, in which he undertakes to set forth, in one great picture, the trembling of Jesus for the life of His friend, the attendant struggle with the darkness of the world, and the calmness and joy of victory, prominent over all, and undisturbed from first to last; while these pierce in between the still higher tones of the consciousness of His Messianic glory and of its confirmation in power."

<sup>2</sup> This self-creation is said to be, according to Baur, p. 247, an intensification of the (two) synoptical raisings from the dead (comp. Scholten): "the superlative to the lower degrees, on which the Synoptics remained stationary." The

self for the purpose of setting forth the idea of the *δῶξα* of Christ (Baur, p. 191 ff.), which then first rightly yields itself to recognition, when it demonstrates itself in its death-denying power (comp. Keim, *Gesch. J. I.* p. 132), makes out of the miracle of the history a miracle which is the production of the second century, a creation of the idea in a time which bore within itself the conditions for productions of quite a different kind. That very *artistic* style of representation which, in the account of this last and greatest miracle, is most strikingly prominent, is only comprehensible from the personal, profound, and sympathizing recollection which had preserved and cherished, even in its finest traits, the truth and reality of the event with quite peculiar vivacity, fidelity, and inspiration. No narrative of the N. T. bears so completely the stamp of being the opposite of a later invention. But in none, again, was the glow of the hope of the Messianic fulfilment so immediately operative, in order to preserve and animate each feature of the reminiscence. This also in answer to Weizsäcker, p. 528, who leaves it undecided how far the *allegorical* moment of the narrative assumed by him—the setting forth, namely, of the doctrine that believers have everlasting life—is attached to *actual facts*. But in this way, with ideal assumptions, even the best attested history would fall into the dead condition of *à priori* doubt. And what an incredible height of art in the allegorical construction of history must we ascribe to the composer! Yet Holtzmann also (*Judenth. u. Christenth.* p. 657) appears to think only of an allegory ("living hieroglyph"). (5) It certainly appears surprising that the *Synoptics* are silent concerning the raising of *Lazarus*, since it was an event in itself so powerful to produce conviction,<sup>1</sup> and so influential in its operation on the last development of the life of Jesus. However, this is not inexplicable (Brückner), but is connected with the entire distinguishing peculiarity of John; and the *argumentum e silentio* employed against the latter must—the genuineness of the Gospel being granted—rather turn against the Synoptics if their silence were conceivable only as the consequence of their want of acquaintance with the history (Lücke, De Wette, Baur). But this silence is intelligible, not on the supposition of tender considerateness towards the family at Bethany (Epiphanius,

name Lazarus is significantly taken from the parable, Luke xvi. The substantial contents of the narrative are in ver. 25, and all else unsubstantial form.

<sup>1</sup> It is well known what Spinoza himself (according to Bayle, *Dict.*) is said to have confessed: "that could he have persuaded himself of the truth of the raising of Lazarus, he would have broken in pieces his whole system, and would have embraced without repugnance the ordinary faith of Christians."

Grotius, Wetstein on xii. 10, Herder, Schulthess, Olshausen, Baumlein, Godet; so also with pictorial fancifulness, Lange, *L. J.* II. 2, p. 1133 f.), whereby—even setting aside the fact that Luke also wrote only a few years earlier than John, and not before the destruction of Jerusalem—there is suggested something that is altogether arbitrary,<sup>1</sup> and in unparalleled contradiction to the feeling and spirit of that early Christian time. Just as little is it to be explained from the fact that the deep and mysterious character of the history placed it in the class of what belonged to the special mission of that evangelist who had been in most confidential relations with Jesus (Hengstenberg),<sup>2</sup>—a view which is not to be adopted, for the reason that the synoptical raisings from the dead also are not less profound and mysterious, as lies, indeed, in the *facts themselves*. Rather is that silence of the Synoptics only comprehensible when we consider that the latter keep within a circle of their notices, so limited in extent that, before they open, with the entrance of Christ into Jerusalem (Matt. xxi. and parall.)—and thus with the so-called Passion-week—the scene of the last development, they have not introduced any part at all of the Lord's ministry in the metropolis and its immediate neighbourhood; but up to that point confine themselves absolutely to the proceedings of Jesus in Galilee, and generally to those which took place at a remote distance from Jerusalem (the geographically nearest miraculous work is the healing of the blind men at Jericho, Matt. xx. 29 ff.). This, as their Gospels actually prove, is the *allotted province* to which the older evangelistic historical writings confined their task and performance, and this task included the Galilean raisings from the dead, but excluded that of Lazarus. John, on the other hand, conversely, choosing from the different classes of miracles, selected one from the raisings from the dead, not a Galilean one, but that which lay beyond that older theatre of history, and was most closely

<sup>1</sup> It would have certainly sufficed, instead of passing over the entire history in silence, simply not to have mentioned the *names*, as in the case of Peter's smiting with the sword. And is it supposed, then, that when the synoptists wrote (thirty years and more after the Lazarus incident), the resolution to put him to death, xii. 10, was still to be feared! Is it known that at so late a period Lazarus and his sisters were still alive?

<sup>2</sup> So also Philippi, *der Eingang des Joh. Ev.* 1866, p. 11 f. He thinks that Matthew related nothing of that which was reserved for John; that he *knew* that the latter also would write his Gospel. A classified distribution of the material of this kind is in itself very improbable when compared with the spirit of the apostolic time, even irrespective of the fact that the first Gospel, in its present form, cannot have proceeded from the hands of the apostle.



connected with the last great period of the history. In this way he has hereby certainly supplied—as he has done in general by his notices from the Judæan ministry of the Lord—an essential defect of the older evangelical narrative. The acquaintance of the Synoptics, which is undoubtedly to be assumed, with the raising of Lazarus, makes their silence regarding it appear not inexcusable (Baur's objection), but simply a consequence of that limitation which the older evangelistic historical writings had prescribed to themselves, so that the latter neither contain any mention of the stay of Jesus in Bethany at that time, nor of His subsequent sojourn in Ephraim, but make the Messianic entrance of Jesus to proceed from Jericho onwards, excluding any lodging in the family of Bethany; comp. on Matt. xxi. 1, note. (6) The fact that in the accusation and condemnation of Jesus no use was made of this miracle, neither against nor for Him (employed by Strauss, and especially by Weiss), cannot be evidence against its historical character, since the Jews were prudent enough to give a *political* colour to their accusation, and since the disciples *could* not appear in favour of Jesus, and He Himself *would* not enter upon a more minute defence of Himself; while Pilate, as judge, even if he had heard of the act, and had interested himself about it, yet was not warranted to introduce it into the examination, because it was not brought forward either as a confirmation or as a refutation of the charge. Moreover, had the evangelist set down this history only as an introduction to the entry which follows, etc. (Keim), he would have had least occasion to leave the further development without any reference to it. (7) The impossibility of an actual awakening from the dead is relative, not absolute (as Jesus' own resurrection shows), and cannot yield a counter-proof *a priori*, even setting aside the fact that the  $\eta\delta\eta\ \delta\zeta\epsilon\iota$  rests on an inference only, however probable—where, as here, the worker is the bearer of the *divine*  $\zeta\omega\acute{\eta}$ . He entirely ascribes the result to *God*; but this applies to all His miracles, which were indeed  $\epsilon\rho\gamma\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \pi\alpha\tau\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ , and Christ was the Fulfiller through the power of God. Hence Schleiermacher's proposal (*L. J.* p. 233) to put Christ—with the exception of the firm persuasion, that that which He prayed for is also done by God—*outside the realm of miracle*, erroneously puts aside the question. It is *Christ* who raised Lazarus, ver. 11, but therein also was to be seen an  $\epsilon\rho\gamma\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\kappa\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \pi\alpha\tau\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ , x. 33.

Vv. 45, 46. This occurrence makes an overwhelming impression upon the party adverse to Jesus, upon the *'Ιουδαῖοι*. Many of the *'Ιουδαίους*—those, namely, who had come to

Mary, and had seen the act of Jesus—believed on Him. A certain number, however, of them (of these who had become believers) went away (from the scene of the miracle) to the Pharisees, and said to them, etc., but with *well-meaning* intent, in order to put them in possession of a correct account of the act, and to bear witness to them of the miracle (comp. Origen). The *ordinary* understanding of the passage finds here *two sections among the 'Ιουδαῖοι who had come to Mary*; many of them had become *believers*, but certain of them remained *unbelieving*, and the latter had denounced Jesus to the Pharisees with evil intent (as a Goëte, thinks Euth. Zigabenus; as a sacrilegious person, who had disinterred the corpse, thought Theophylact; as a *dangerous person*, think most commentators), or communicated the fact, simply with *the* view of obtaining a judgment upon it (Luthardt). The error of this interpretation lies in not observing that John has not written τῶν ἐλθόντων (which is the reading of D), but οἱ ἐλθόντες, κ.τ.λ., so that ἐκ τῶν 'Ιουδαίων is said *generally* of the 'Ιουδαῖοι *in general*, and οἱ ἐλθόντες (*ii, qui, etc.*) *more closely defines* the πολλοί; instead of *τινές*, however, ver. 46, there now remain no *others*, none who had *not* become believers, since ἀπῆλθον indicates that they went *away from the place* to the Pharisees, while in the preceding only the Jews *who came to Mary* are mentioned. Lachmann and Tischendorf have rightly placed a comma after 'Ιουδ. — πρὸς τὴν Μαρίαν] for the same reason as in ver. 1 she was named *first*,—here she is briefly named *alone*. Hengstenberg strangely imports into the words an antithesis to those who had come only for *Simon's* sake. See on vv. 1, 2.

Vv. 47, 48. Now, since Jesus had, even according to the testimony of His earlier opponents, even raised a dead man, the matter becomes too serious for the Pharisees to permit them to look on any longer without taking a decisive step. The *chief priests* (with whom they have accordingly communicated) and *they themselves* summon a *sitting of the council*, i.e. a sitting of the Sanhedrin. On συνάγ. συνέδρ. comp. Diod. Sic. ii. 25. Not to be translated: they assembled *the Sanhedrin*. The article in that case, as throughout, where it is expressed with συνέδρ., must have been used. — τί ποιοῦμεν] *What are we to do?* The Indic. is used (see Stallbaum,

*ad Plat. Symp.* p. 176 A); for that something must *now* *definitively* be done, was undoubted. Comp. Acts iv. 15, 16. — *οτι*] the simple *for*, as statement of the *ground* of the question. — *ουτος ο ανθρ.*] contemptuously. — *ουτω*] without interposing. — *καλ ελεύσονται, κ.τ.λ.*] so they fear, in keeping with the *political* view of the Messiah. Comp. vi. 15. And they *really* fear it (against Strauss, Weiss, who here see an invention); they do not merely delude themselves with it (Luthardt); nor do they wish to give to their proper motive (envy, Matt. xxvii. 18) only another colour (Calvin, Hengstenberg). Now, when they saw the last outbreak before their eyes, their calculation must necessarily be shaped according to the *popular conception* of the Messiah, and according to the effects which this notion would produce upon the mass (uproar, etc.). — *αρουσιν*] they will *take away* (*tollent*, Vulgate), not equivalent to *απολέσουσιν* (Euth. Zigabenus, Beza, Grotius, Lücke, De Wette, Tholuck, Hengstenberg, and several others), which is less appropriate to the egoistic sense, which is concerned about the withdrawal of their *own power*. Nonnus well remarks: *αφαρπάξουσιν. — ημων*] correlative to *Ρωμαίοι*, placed first *with the emphasis of egoism*, though not as genit. of separation (*away from us*), since such a construction with *αίρω* is only poetical (Kühner, II. p. 160); but: the place and nation *belonging to us*. — *τον τόπον*] is to be defined solely from the emphatic *ημων*; *our place*, i.e. the holy city (Chrysostom, Grotius, Ewald, Baumlein, Godet), the residence of the Sanhedrin and of the entire hierarchy. Hence neither: *the country* (so most commentators, as Luther: "country and people"), nor: *the temple* (Maldonatus, Lücke, De Wette, Maier, B. Crusius, Hengstenberg). The latter is neither to be supported by Acts vi. 13, nor by passages like 3 Esdr. viii. 78; 2 Macc. v. 19; Matt. xxiii. 38. The Sanhedrists apprehend that the Romans, who had, indeed, acquiesced in great part hitherto in the hierarchical constitution of the Jews, and the spiritually political sway of the Sanhedrin, would enter Jerusalem, and remove the city as well as the people (*ἔθνος*, Luke xxiii. 2; Acts x. 22, *et al.*) from the rule of the Sanhedrin, because it knew so badly how to maintain order.

Vv. 49, 50. Caiaphas, however, solves this question of

helplessness, censuring his colleagues on account of the latter, since the means to be adopted had been clearly put into their hands by circumstances. — *εἰς τὴν*] *unus quidam*. Comp. Mark xiv. 47, 51, *et al.*; Bernhardt, p. 442. This one alone was a man of counsel. — *Καϊάφας*] see on Matt. xxvi. 3; Luke iii. 2. — *τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐκείνου*] He was high priest of *that year*. The previous and following time is left out of consideration, not, however, negatived, but simply *that remarkable and fatal year* is brought into prominence. Comp. xviii. 13. The supposition of an annual *change* in the office cannot be ascribed (against Bretschneider, Strauss, Schenkel, Scholten) even to a Pseudo-John, considering his manifest acquaintance elsewhere with Jewish affairs; but to appeal to the fact that the high priests were frequently changed in those times, and that actually before Caiaphas several were only a year in office, Josephus, *Antt.* xviii. 2. 2 (Hengstenberg), is least of all applicable in the case of Caiaphas, who was already in office, A.D. 25. Again, the assumption of an alternative holding of the office by *Annas* and Caiaphas, in virtue of a *private* agreement (comp. on Luke, *loc. cit.*; so Baur, ascribing this view to the Pseudo-John, and Maier<sup>1</sup>), is as purely arbitrary (see Bleek, p. 257) as the pretended allusion to the change of *Asiarchs* (Gfrörer). — *ὁμῶς*] *you, people*. — *οὐκ οἶδατε οὐδὲν*] that you can still ask: *τί ποιοῦμεν*. — *οὐδὲ λογιζέσθαι*] (see critical notes): *nor do ye consider that, etc.* The proud, discourteous style of this address evinces *passionate feeling* generally, not exactly the manner (Josephus, *Bell.* ii. 8. 14) of *Sadduceeism* (Hengstenberg, Godet); from Acts v. 17 it is by no means clear that Caiaphas was a Sadducee. — *ἡμῖν*] for us Sanhedrists. — *ἵνα*] *in συμφάσει*, *ἵνα*, as in xvi. 7, the conception of divine destination is expressed: that it is of advantage to us *that one man must die*, etc. — *ὑπὲρ*] *in commodum*, in order that the people may be preserved from the destruction which threatens them, ver. 48. — *ἀπόληται*] through their subjugation, and the overthrow of the national

<sup>1</sup> Here, too, belongs the supposition of Ebrard (apud Olshausen), that the two alternated with each other in the offering of the annual sacrifice of atonement. And that John means to say that in that year this function fell to Caiaphas. But he does not say so.

independent existence. — Observe the interchange of *ἔθνος* (the people as a *nation*) and *λαός* (the people as a political, here theocratic, *community*). — The principle itself, which regarded in itself may be moral and noble, is expressed in the feeling of the most ungodly and selfish policy. For similar expressions, see Schoettgen and Wetstein. To refer the scene to a legend afterwards current among the Christians (Weizsäcker), is opposed to the earnest narrative of the evangelist.

Vv. 51, 52. Observation of John, that Caiaphas did not speak this out of his own self-determination, but with these portentous words—in virtue of the high priest's office which he held in that year—involuntarily delivered a *prophecy*.<sup>1</sup> — The high priest passed in the old Israelitish time for the bearer of the divine oracle, for the organ of the revelation of the divine decisions,<sup>2</sup> which were imparted to him through the interrogation of the Urim and Thummim (Ex. xxviii. 30; Num. xxvii. 21). This mode of inquiry disappeared, indeed, at a later time (Josephus, *Antt.* iii. 8. 9), as the high-priestly dignity in general fell gradually from its glory; nevertheless, there is still found in the prophetic age the belief in the high priest's prophetic gift (Hos. iii. 4), exactly as, in Josephus, *Antt.* vi. 6. 3, the idea of the old high-priesthood as the bearer of the oracle distinctly appears, and Philo, *de Creat. Princ.* II. p. 367, sets forth at least the *true* priest as prophet, and consequently idealizes the relation. Accordingly — as closely connected with that venerable and not yet extinct recollection, and with still surviving esteem for the high-priestly office—it was a natural and obvious course for John, after pious reflection on those remarkable words which were most appropriate to the sacrificial death of Jesus, to find in them a disclosure of the divine decree,—expressed without self-knowledge and will,—and that by no means with a “sacred irony” (Ebrard). Here, too, the extraordinary *year* in which the speaker was invested with the sacred office, carries with it the

<sup>1</sup> Here there is the conception of an *unconscious* prophecy, so far as that which Caiaphas spoke in another sense must yet, according to divine direction, *typically* set forth the substance and object of the redemptive death. See Düsterdieck, *De rei propheticae natura ethica*, Göttingen 1852, p. 76.

<sup>2</sup> See generally Ewald, *Alterth.* p. 385; Keil, *Arch.* I. p. 182.

determination of the judgment; since, if at any time, it was assuredly in this very year, in which God purposed the fulfilment of His holy counsel through the atoning death of His Son, that a revelation through the high-priestly organ appeared conceivable. ἀρχιερ. ὧν certainly bears the main emphasis: but τοῦ ἐναντ. ἐκ. is again significantly added to it (not, as De Wette thinks, "mechanically, as it were"), as in ver. 49.<sup>1</sup> For Rabbinical passages on *unconscious* prophecies, see in Schoettgen, p. 349. The notion of prophecy, however, is different from that of the הִרְחֵב (against De Wette); comp. on xii. 27, 28. The latter is a *heavenly voice* of revelation. — ὅτι] not: *that*, according to which what follows would directly state the *contents* of προεφήτ., but: he gave utterance to a prophecy *in reference to the fact that* (ii. 18, ix. 17, et al.). For what follows goes *beyond* that which the words of Caiaphas express. — ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἔθνους] Caiaphas had said: ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ; but John turns to the *negative* part of ver. 50 (κ. μὴ ὄλ. τὸ ἔθνος ἀπόλ.), because he wishes to set the Gentiles over against the Jews, and this separation is *national*. Comp. Luke vii. 5; John xviii. 35. *For the benefit* of the nation Christ was to die; for through His atoning death the Jews, for whom, in the *first instance*, the Messianic salvation was designed, iv. 22, were to become partakers by means of faith in the eternal saving deliverance. But the object of His death extended still further than the Jews; not for the benefit of the *nation* alone, but *in order also to bring together into one the scattered children of God*. These are the *Gentiles*, who believe on Him, and thereby are partakers of the atonement, children of God (i. 12). The expression is *prophetic* and, just as in x. 16, *proleptic*,<sup>2</sup> according to the N. T. *predestinarian* point of view (Rom. ix. 24 ff., xv. 27; Gal. iii. 14; Eph. i. 9 ff.;

<sup>1</sup> According to Tholuck, τ. ἱναυτοῦ ix. should be understood in the sense that the high priest himself was bound to explain that in this year a greater and more general collective sacrifice was to be offered than that offered by him once a year on behalf of the people (Heb. ix. 7). But how can this lie in τ. ἱναυτοῦ ix.? especially as ἀρχιερεὺς, κ. τ. λ., is said only to make the προεφήτ. explicable, but expresses nothing as to the relation of the high-priestly *sacrifice*. This also against Luthardt's similar interpretation, I. p. 87.

<sup>2</sup> Calvin well remarks: "Filios ergo Dei, etiam antequam vocentur, ab electione aestimat, qui fide tandem et sibi et aliis manifestari incipiunt."

Rom. viii. 29, 30, xi. 25, 26, xvi. 25, 26; Eph. iii. 4 ff.; Col. i. 27; Acts xiii. 48, xviii. 10), from which they appear as those who, in order to further their entrance into the filial state, are drawn by God (vi. 44), are given by the Father to the Son (vi. 37), and endowed with the inward preparation (vi. 65). Euth. Zigabenus rightly remarks: τέκνα μὲν οὖν τοῦ θεοῦ τὰ ἔθνη ὠνόμασεν ὡς μέλλοντα γενέσθαι. This likewise in answer to Hilgenfeld, *Lehrbegr.* p. 153, *Evang.* p. 297, according to whom the Gentiles, as *natural* children of God, who do not first *become* so through Christianity, are said to be meant (but see i. 12, iii. 3, 6, *et al.*). A *filial state toward God out of Christ* is opposed to the N. T., not only as Hilgenfeld puts it, from a Gnostic, dualistic point of view, but also, as Luthardt conceives it (comp. also Messner, *Lehre der Ap.* p. 330 f.), referring the essence of it only to the *desire* after Christ (Tholuck, Weiss, Godet, to the *susceptibility*). This is only the *preliminary step* to the filial state. The *gathering into one*, i.e. *to a unity*, to an undivided community, is not intended in a *local* sense; but, amid their local dispersion, they were to become united in a higher sense, in virtue of a faith, etc., through the *κοινωνία τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος*, as *one communion* ἐν Χριστῷ. Chrysostom aptly remarks: ἐν σῶμα ἐποίησεν ὁ ἐν Ῥώμῃ καθήμενος τοὺς Ἰουδαίους μέλος εἶναι νομίζει ἑαυτοῦ. The uniting with the believing *Jews* (the *ποιεῖν τὰ ἀμφότερα* ἔν, Eph. ii. 14) is not spoken of here, but in x. 16; here only the Christian *folding together* of the scattered *Gentiles themselves*. For the expression *συνάγειν* (and the like) εἰς ἓν, comp. Plat. *Phileb.* p. 378 C; Eur. *Or.* 1640, *Phoen.* 465.

Vv. 53, 54. Οὖν] In consequence of this word of Caiaphas, which prevailed.—Ἰνα] They held deliberations with one another, *in order*, etc., Matt. xxvi. 4.—παρρησ.] frankly and freely, vii. 4.—ἐν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις] He withdrew Himself—since those deliberations of the high council, whether through Nicodemus or otherwise, had become known to Him (οὖν)—from intercourse with His Jewish adversaries, and betook Himself to the sequestered village of *Ephraim*, according to Eusebius 8 miles, according to Jerome 20 miles (so also Ritter, XV. p. 465, XVI. p. 531 ff.) N.E. from Jerusalem, in Judaea; according to Josephus, *Bell.* iv. 9. 9, in the neigh-

bourhood of Bethel, comp. 2 Chron. xiii. 20 (according to the Keri). It can hardly be the present village of *Taiyibeh* (see Robinson, II. p. 337 f.), considering its more westerly situation. Hengstenberg identifies it on insufficient grounds with Baal Hazor, 2 Sam. xiii. 23; and Vaihinger, in Herzog's *Encycl.*, with עֵיִתָּה, Josh. xviii. 23. The mention of the *desert* is not opposed to the north-easterly situation of Ephraim, as Ebrard thinks; for the desert of Judaea (*i.e.* ἡ ἔρημος κατ' ἐξοχὴν) extended as far as the region of Jericho. — εἰς τ. χώραν, κ.τ.λ.] He departed *into the country* (as opposed to Jerusalem, the capital city); then a more precise definition of the place to which He withdrew, namely, *the neighbourhood of the desert*; and, finally, definite mention of the place, *a town named Ephraim*. On χώρα, comp. Plat. *Legg.* v. p. 745 C, vii. p. 817 A; Mark i. 5; Acts xxvi. 20; 3 Macc. iii. 1.

Ver. 55. Ἦν δὲ ἐγγ. τ. πάσχα τ. Ἰ.] Comp. ii. 13, vi. 4. — ἐκ τῆς χώρας] as in ver. 45,—accordingly: *out of the country* (as opposed to Jerusalem), not: *out of that district* (Grotius, Bengel, Olshausen). — ἵνα ἀγνίσ. ἐαυτ.] refers to the legal usages of self-purification, which varied greatly according to the degrees of the Levitical uncleanness (washings, sacrifices, etc.). These, in compliance with the general principle of appearing before God pure (Gen. xxxv. 2; Ex. xix. 10, 11), were completed before the beginning of the feast, in order to obtain from the priest the declaration of ceremonial cleanness, Num. ix. 10; 2 Chron. xxx. 17, 18, *et al.* Comp. xviii. 28. Pilgrims accordingly set out according to their needs, in good time *before* the feast; see Lightfoot, p. 1078, and Lampe.

Ver. 56. The people, owing to the sensation which Jesus had in so many ways already aroused, and the edict of their spiritual superiors against Him (ver. 57), have taken a lively interest in the question, whether He will venture, as heretofore, to come to the feast. Their anxious *question* is a *double question*; *What think you?* (do you think) *that He certainly will not come?* Since He has not performed the pilgrimage with any of them, and is not yet present, His coming is strongly *doubted of* among them. Lücke: what do you think (in reference to this), *that* He does not, etc. But on that view His not coming would be already presupposed as *certain*,



which would be premature. To understand the words in the sense that *He is not come* (Erasmus, Castalio, Paulus, and several others; not the Vulgate) is grammatically incorrect. The passages quoted by Hartung (*Partikell.* II. p. 156) do not apply here.<sup>1</sup> See Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* II. p. 412. — The inquiry is interchanged *in the court of the temple*, because it was there that His appearance was to be looked for; while ἐστηκότες vividly represents the groups as standing together.

Ver. 57. With the explanatory δέ (καί is spurious) the particular circumstance is now added, *on account of which* men so greatly doubted of His coming. — δεδώκεισαν] comes first with emphasis. Already had the directions of the rulers in question been given. — ἵνα] *object*, and therewith contents of the ἐντολαί, the issuing of which we are to think of as the fruit of the sitting, ver. 47 ff., and of the further deliberations, ver. 53.

<sup>1</sup> Tholuck (who otherwise follows our interpretation) incorrectly adduces Polyb. iii. 111. 1. In that passage ~~π~~ stands with the perf. quite as in Gal. iv. 11.

## CHAPTER XII.

VER. 1. ὁ τε θνητός] is wanting in B. L. X. &. Verss. Bracketed by Lachm., deleted by Tisch. But those testimonies are here the less decisive, since the word before ὃν ἐγ. ἐκ. νεκρ. ὁ 'Ι. appeared entirely superfluous, and hence was easily dropped. For its addition there was no reason. — Ver. 2. ἀνακ. σὺν αὐτῷ] Elz.: συνανακ. αὐτῷ, against decisive testimonies. — Ver. 4. Instead of 'Ιουδ. Σίμ. 'Ισκαρ., Tisch. has merely 'Ιουδας ὁ 'Ισκαρ., and that before εἰς, according to B. L. &. Cursives, Verss., where, however, the position before εἰς is not so strongly supported. Σίμωνος was, after vi. 71, xiii. 2, 26, readily added. — Ver. 6. εἶχεν καὶ] B. D. L. Q. &. Cursives, Copt. Vulg. Or.: ἔχων. A correction of the style. — Ver. 7. εἰς τ. ἡμέρ. τ. ἐνταφ. μ. τετήρ.] Lachm. and Tisch.: ἵνα εἰς τ. ἡμέρ. τ. ἐνταφ. μου τηρήσῃ, after decisive testimonies. Not being understood, the words were altered according to the thought in the parallel passages, especially Mark xiv. 8. — Ver. 8 is entirely wanting in D., and, had the counter testimony been stronger, would have been liable to the suspicion of having been interpolated from Matt. xxvi. 11, Mark xiv. 7, if it stood *before* ἄφες, κ τ. λ., and occupied the characteristic position of words as in the Synoptics (πᾶντοτε first). — Ver. 13. ἔκραζον] Lachm. and Tisch., ἐκραύγαζον, after preponderating evidence. The *Rcc.* is from Matt. and Mark. — Ver. 15. θυγάτηρ] θυγάτηρ (Lachm., Tisch.) is so decisively supported, that the vocative—which of itself might easily find its way into the text—must be traced to the LXX., Zecl. ix. 9. — Ver. 17. ὅτι] The witnesses are much divided between ὅτι and ὅτι (Tisch.); but the latter (A. B. Q. &. ) is the more strongly attested. Nevertheless ὅτι, which Lachm. also has, is to be preferred; it was changed into ὅτι, because mechanically referred to the preceding ὁ αὖ μετ' αὐτοῦ. — Ver. 22. καὶ πάλιν] Lachm. and Tisch.: ἔρχεται, and then before λέγουσιν: καί, according to A. B. L. Cursives, Codd. d. It. Aeth. Rightly. The more closely defining καὶ πάλιν was added to the repeated ἔρχεται (so &. ); and as this had at a later time displaced the verb, the καί before λέγουσιν also disappeared, as a disturbing element. Had the verb been written as a gloss, ἔρχονται would have been found. — Ver. 25. Instead

of ἀπολείπει, read with Tisch. ἀπολλύει, according to B. L. &, etc. The future was introduced through the parallelism. — Ver. 26. εἰάν τις] Elz.: καὶ εἰάν τις, against such weighty testimony, that καὶ was already rightly deleted by Griesb. — Ver. 30. The position of ἡ φωνὴ αὐτῆς (Lachm., Tisch.) is decisively accredited. — Ver. 31. The first τοῦτου is wanting in witnesses of too weak authority to cause its rejection (Griesb.). — Ver. 35. ἐν ὑμῶν] Elz.: μεθ' ὑμῶν, against preponderating testimonies. An interpretation. — Vv. 35, 36. Instead of ἔως, Lachm. and Tisch. have both times ὥς, after decisive testimony. The first ἔως arose through the final letter of the preceding περιπατεῖτε, and the more readily, as a reminiscence of ix. 4 suggested itself. The second ἔως then followed of itself, but has, besides, some other testimonies (including &.) than the first. — Ver. 40. ἐπιστραφ.] Lachm. and Tisch.: στραφ., according to B. D. & 33. The compound form is from the LXX., Isa. vi. 10 (hence also many witnesses have ἐπιστρέψουσιν). On the other hand, ἰάσωμαι (so Lachm. and Tisch.) instead of ἰάσωμαι is so decisively supported by almost all the Uncials, that it is not to be traced to the LXX., but the conjunctive is to be regarded as an attempt to conform to what precedes. — Ver. 41. ὅτι] Lachm. and Tisch., after decisive testimony: ὅτι, which, not being understood, was altered. — Ver. 47. καὶ μὴ πιστεύσῃ] Lachm. and Tisch.: κ. μ. φυλάξῃ, according to preponderating testimonies, and rightly; for πιστ. has manifestly arisen from the preceding (vv. 44, 46). The omission of the μὴ in D. and Codd. of the It. is to be explained from the apparent paradox.

Vv. 1, 2. Οὖν] is the simply *resumptive* particle by which the narrative *returns* to *Jesus*, whom it had quitted at xi. 55. To assume a sequence from xi. 57, so that He is supposed to go to Bethany, either on account of His safety, or of its nearness to Jerusalem (Luthardt: "so consciously and freely He went to meet death"), and in order to put to shame the thought mentioned in xi. 55–57 (Hengstenberg), as though δέ or ἀλλά were expressed,—is not supported by any indication in the text. — πρὸ ἑξ. ἡμ. τοῦ π.] *six days before the Passover*. Comp. Amos i. 1. Frequently thus in Plutarch, Appian, Josephus. See Kypke, I. p. 393 f. Analogously in definitions of *space*, as in xi. 18. It is no Latinism. As regards the *reckoning* of the six days, it is to be observed that, since the 14th Nisan, on the evening of which the paschal meal was kept, was wont to be counted as already belonging entirely to

the feast (see on Matt. xxvi. 17), and hence also had been already called *ἡμέρα τοῦ πάσχα* (see Introd. § 2), the 13th Nisan is most naturally assumed to be the *first* day before the Passover; consequently the *sixth* day will be the 8th Nisan, *i.e.* (since the 14th Nisan, on which Jesus, according to John, died, was a *Friday*) the *Saturday* before Easter. So also Ebrard, Godet, and Ewald, *Gesch. Chr.* p. 511, who, however, in the *Johann. Schr.* I. p. 329, without any sufficient grounds, finds the previous evening probable, so that John at once names the full day of the sojourn, with which Godet also substantially agrees. But according to the *Synoptics*—because they make the 14th Nisan a Thursday—it would have been the *Friday* before Easter.<sup>1</sup> Against the above assumption of the *Saturday* as the day of arrival, the law of the Sabbath day's journey (see on Matt. xxiv. 20) is no objection (against Grotius, Tholuck, Wieseler, and several others), since it is not clear *from what place* Jesus started on that day; He may, indeed, have arrived from a place that lay *very near* at hand. Others, reckoning the 14th Nisan as the first day before Easter, regard the 9th Nisan as the day of arrival.<sup>2</sup> Others, again, including in their calculation even the 15th Nisan, arrive at the result of the 10th Nisan (Monday); so Hilgenfeld, Baur, Scholten, where we have the twofold interest directed against the historical truth of the Gospel, to obtain the day of the month for the selection of the paschal lamb (Ex. xii. 3), and find the day of the week which opened the Christian Easter week, and from this chronology to demonstrate the secondary relation of our evangelist to the Synoptics. Yet Baumlein also reckons in this way. — *ἦλθεν εἰς Βηθάνιαν*] according to the Harmonists (including Heng-

<sup>1</sup> As also Wieseler, Hengstenberg, and others assume, who (see on xviii. 28) regard the account of John, in respect to the day of Jesus' death, as agreeing with that of the Synoptics.

<sup>2</sup> This must therefore, according to the calculation which gave Saturday for the 8th Nisan, have been the *Sunday* (Hase, De Wette). But if we hold that John does not fix the day of death differently from the Synoptics, we get as the result the *Saturday* (Wichelhaus and several others), reckoning backwards from Thursday the 14th Nisan inclusive. Further, the 9th Nisan is expressly fixed as the day of arrival in Bethany by Theophylact, and recently by Lücke and several others.

stenberg and Godet), making a circuit by Jericho, which is as inappropriate to the Johannean as to the synoptical account (see on Matt. xxi. 1). The return by Jericho is not reconcilable with the notice in xi. 54, where He, in fact, by the healing of the blind men, and by the visit to Zacchæus, awakened so much attention. — ὅπου ἦν Λάζαρος, κ.τ.λ.] added, on account of the great importance of the matter, without any further special purpose, yet with emphatic circumstantiality. — ἐποίησαν] the family of Bethany, namely, xi. 1, 2, which is clear from the following κ. ἡ Μ. δὲ κ.<sup>1</sup> On this and the other variations from the narrative of Matt. xxvi. 6 ff., Mark xiv. 3 ff., which, however, do not set aside the identity of the occurrence (different from Luke vii. 3 ff.), see on Matt. xxvi. 6 ff. The peculiarity of John's account is founded on the fact of the writer's being an eye-witness; but is referred by Baur, p. 256 ff., to an eclectic and arbitrary treatment, dependent on an ideal point of view; comp. also Hilgenfeld. — ὁ δὲ Λάζαρος εἰς ἡν, κ.τ.λ.] appears, indeed, a matter of course (hence Baeumlein and others believe Simon the leper to be indicated as the entertainer); but the *complete restoration* of him who had been raised from the dead is so weighty a consideration with John, that he further specially brings him forward as the present table companion of his Restorer. This also in answer to Marcker, *Passim*. p. 17.

Vv. 3, 4. To explain the *great quantity* of the ointment (12 ounces) as the outcome of the superabundance of her love (Olshausen), is arbitrary. Mary did not anoint *with* the whole

<sup>1</sup> That this meal is to be placed still on the same day, therefore Saturday, at the usual time of the evening repast, appears from the fact that the ἰσάβριον does not follow before ver. 12 (against Wichelhaus, p. 153 f.). The Sabbath is not opposed to this, since the preparations which had possibly been necessary for the meal might already have been made on the preceding day, if the family—which is a supposition sufficiently obvious—knew that Jesus was coming.—But the supposition that the meal was a *solemn banquet*, where Godet, following Bengel, introduces a company of the inhabitants of Bethany as the subject of ἰσάβριον, finds no support in the text, where, besides Jesus and the disciples, only the members of the family (no other participators) are named, and has the *serving* of Martha against it, which only bespeaks the usual domestic entertainment, although the gratitude and respect of the family had more richly set forth the meal expressly given to *Him*, to which the description δι᾽ αὐτοῦ αὐτῶν (Mark vi. 21) with the dative points.

pound, but with a *portion* of it (comp. on ver. 7). On πιστικός,<sup>1</sup> *genuine, unadulterated*, see on Mark xiv. 3. — πολυτίμου] belongs to μύρον, as πολυτελ., Mark xiv. 3. — τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ] repeated, on account of the correlation with ταῖς θριξίν αὐτῆς, in order to make prominent the greatness of the love; with her *hairs*, His *feet*. — ἐκ τῆς ὁσμῆς] ἐκ *causal*. Comp. Matt. xxiii. 25; Rev. viii. 5; Plat. *Phaedr.* p. 235 C; *Dem.* 581. 26, *et al.* — εἰς ἐκ τ. μαθ. ἀ.] the rest did not agree with him; but it was *Judas*, etc. — ὁ μέλλων, κ.τ.λ.] This utterance stood in truth already in psychological connection with this *destiny*; see on vi. 71.

Vv. 5, 6. Τριακοσίων] Mark xiv. 5 sets forth the climax in the tradition by ἐπάνω τριακ. The mention of the *price* itself (about 120 Rhenish guildens, or about £10) is certainly original, not the indefinite πολλοῦ of Matt. xxvi. 9. — πτωχοῖς] without the article: to *poor people*. — κ. τ. γλωσσ. εἶχε κ. τ. β. ἐβάστ.] gives historical definiteness to the general κλέπτῃς ἦν. He had the chest, the cash-box (see as regards γλωσσόκ. 2 Chron. xxiv. 8; Lobeck, *ad Phryg.* p. 98 f.), in his keeping, and bore away that which was thrown into it, *i.e.* he *purloined* it. This closer definition of the sense of βαστάζειν, *auferre* (xx. 15; Matt. vii. 17; Polyb. i. 48. 2, *et al.*), is yielded by the *context*. See Krebs, *Obs.* p. 153. So Origen, Codd. of the It. Nonnus, Theophylact, Cornelius a Lapide, Kypke, Krebs, and several others, including Maier, Grimm; comp. Lange.<sup>2</sup> The article does not signify that he had taken away *all* the deposits (objection of Lücke and several others), but refers to the *individual cases* which we are to suppose, in which deposits were removed by him. The explanation *portabat* (Vulgate, Luther, Beza, and many others, including Lücke, De Wette, B. Crusius, Luthardt, Ebrard,

<sup>1</sup> If John adopted this word from Mark, — which, considering the rareness of its occurrence, is probable, and may have been done quite involuntarily, — this shows no literary dependence, and does not justify the suspicion that he also drew the subject-matter from this source (Hilgenfeld). Should πιστικός be the adjective of a proper name (Pistic), all objection would disappear of itself. Comp. on Mark xiv. 3, note 2. Goth. also has *pistikeinis*.

<sup>2</sup> Who, however, explains: *he laid hold of*. But βαστάζειν denotes to *lay hold of* only in the sense of ἑλαφᾶν (Suidas). See Reisig, *ad Soph. O. C.* 1101; Ellendt, *Lex Soph.* I. p. 299. And also in this sense only in the tragic poets.

Wichelhaus, Baeumlein, Godet, Hengstenberg, Ewald ; Tholuck doubtful) yields a meaning which is quite tautological, and a matter of course. The *βαλλόμενα* were gifts of friends and adherents of Jesus for the purchase of the necessities of life and for charitable uses. Comp. Luke viii. 3 ; John xiii. 29. That the disciples had acquired earnings by the labour of their hands, and had deposited such earnings in the bag, nay, that even Jesus Himself had done so (Mark vi. 3),—of this there exists no trace during the period of His ministry. — The question, why Jesus had not taken away the custody of the chest from the dishonest disciple (which indeed, according to Schenkel, he probably did not hold), is not answered by saying that He would remove every pretext for treason from him (Ammonius, Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, and several others), or that He did not desire violently to interfere with the development of his sins (Hengstenberg) ; for neither would harmonize with the educative love of the Lord. Just as little, again, is it explained by suggesting that Judas carried on his thefts *unobserved*, until perhaps shortly before the death of Jesus (Lücke), which would be incompatible with the higher knowledge of the Lord, ii. 25 ; comp. vi. 64, 71. The question stands rather in the closest connection with another—how Jesus could adopt Judas at all as a disciple ; and here we must go back solely to a *divine destination*, Acts i 16, ii. 23. Comp. the note after vi. 70, 71. That the custody of the chest had been entrusted to Judas only by *agreement of the disciples among one another* (Godet), is an assumption which quite arbitrarily evades the point, while it would by no means have excluded the competency of *Jesus* to interfere.

Vv. 7, 8. According to the *Recepta*, Jesus says : “ She has fulfilled a higher purpose with the spikenard ointment (*αὐτό*) ; *in order to embalm me with it to-day* (as though I were already dead), *has she* (not given it out for the poor, but) *reserved it.*” Comp. on Matt. xxvi. 12. According to the correct reading, however (see the critical notes) : “ Let her alone, *that she may preserve it* (this ointment, of which she has just used a portion for the anointing of my feet, not give it away for the poor, but) *for the day of my embalmment*” (for behoof of that). Nonnus aptly remarks : ὄφρα φυλάξῃ σώματος ἡμετέρου κειμή-

λιον, εἰσέκεν ἔλθῃ ἡμετέρων κτερέων ἐπιτύμβιος ὥρῃ. Comp. also Baeumlein. According to this view, the *ἡμέρα τοῦ ἐνταφ.* is the *actual, impending* day of embalment, in opposition to which, according to the *Recepta*, the present day of the anointing of the feet would be represented *proleptically* as that of the anointing of the corpse. The thought of the *Recepta* is that of the Synoptics; the Johannean carries with it the supposition of originality, and, comparing the thoughtful significance of the two, the Johannean is more in harmony with the circumstance that Mary anointed *the feet merely*, and by no means resembles a faulty correction (Hengstenberg, Godet). The circumstance that, afterwards, the corpse of Jesus was not actually anointed (Mark xvi. 1), can, in view of an utterance so rich and deep in feeling, afford no ground for deserting the simple meaning of the words. — *τηρεῖν* is to be explained, agreeably to the context (comp. ii. 10), as an antithesis to *ἐπράθη*, ver. 5, but not by the quite arbitrary assumption that the ointment had remained over from the burial of Lazarus (Kuinoel and several others); but to understand *τηρήσῃ* of the past; that she *may have preserved* it (B. Crusius, Ebrard) is grammatically wrong.<sup>1</sup> According to Ewald, *τηρεῖν* is to be understood, as elsewhere, of festal usages (ix. 16): “*Let her so observe this on the day of my burial,*” so that Jesus would have that day already regarded as equivalent to the day of His burial, when such a loving custom was suitable. But as regards *τηρεῖν*, see what precedes; instead of the indefinite *αὐτό, it*, however, *τοῦτο* was at least to have been expected. — Ver. 8. Reason of the statement introduced with *ἵνα, κ.τ.λ.* — *μεθ’ ἐαυτῶν*] in your own neighbourhood, so that you have sufficiently immediate opportunity to give alms to such. For the rest, see on Matt. xxvi. 11.

V. 9–11. *Οὖν*] since Jesus thus tarries in the neighbourhood. The lively intercourse among the pilgrims to the feast tended the more to spread the information. — *ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων*] here again (comp. xi. 19), not generally of the *inhabit-*

<sup>1</sup> The modification of this rendering in Luthardt: “Let her rest as regards the fact that she has kept the ointment for me with the design (even though unconscious) of preserving it for the representation, beforehand, of the day of my embalment,” is a grammatical impossibility. Similarly, however, Bengel.



*ants of Jerusalem* (so usually), but, according to the standing usage in John, of the *Jewish opposition*. They came, *not for Jesus' sake alone*, to observe Him further, but *in order also to see Lazarus*, and to be convinced of His actual and continued restoration to life. Since, however, *many* of the *Ἰουδαῖοι* went forth (from Jerusalem) for the sake of Lazarus, and became *believers* in Jesus, the chief priests (*i.e.* not indeed the Sanhedrim as such in general, but rather that part of it which composed its hierarchical head) took counsel to put Lazarus also to death. We have here, accordingly, the antithesis, that the sight of Lazarus subdues many of the hitherto adverse party to faith (comp. already xi. 45); and on the other hand, that the extreme Right of the hierarchy resolves the more energetically to counterwork this. — ἡλθον] Still on Saturday evening and Sunday. The procession of *people* took place then on Sunday (ver. 12). — ἐβουλ. δέ] Simple continuation of the narrative; hence, neither is δέ to be understood as *namely*, nor ἐβουλ. as the *pluperfect* (Tholuck). — οἱ ἀρχιερ.] It was indeed for the interest of the *hierarchy* (not exactly for that of the *Sadducees*, Acts v. 17, as Lampe thought, since the chief priests are here adduced *as such* generally, not according to their possible *sectarian* tendency) to remove out of the way the living self-witness also on whom the miracle had been wrought, not merely the worker of the miracle Himself. The tyrannical power, in this way, proceeds consistently, in order, as it imagines, to put away even the recollection of the affair. "Praeceptis est malitia et semper ultra rapit," Grotius. — ὑπῆγον] not: *they fell away* (Cornelius a Lapide, Lampe, Paulus), which, without closer definition, does not lie in the word, but rather: *they took themselves off, they removed to a distance*; so great an attractive power did the matter possess for them, and then *followed* the falling away. The separation in the position of the words: πολλοὶ . . . τῶν Ἰουδαίων, brings both points emphatically out.

Vv. 12, 13. Τῇ ἐπαύρ.] after the day designated in ver. 1, consequently Sunday (*Palm Sunday*), not: after the deliberation mentioned in vv. 10, 11 (Ebrard and Olshausen, *Leidens-gesch.* p. 36). — ὄχλ. πολ. κ.τ.λ.] Unprejudiced pilgrims to the feast, therefore not Ἰουδαῖοι again. — ἀκούσαντες] perhaps

from the Ἰουδαῖοι in ver. 11 who had returned as believers. — τὰ βαῖα τ. φ.] as a symbol of joy. The article τῶν (not τᾶ) contains the element of definiteness; the branches of the palm-trees *standing on the spot*. On βαῖον comp. 1 Macc. xiii. 51; Symm. *Cant.* i. 8; Sturz, *Dial. Al.* p. 88. The expression: the palm branches of the palms, is similar to οἰκοδεσπότης τῆς οἰκίας, and the like, Lobeck, *Paralip.* p. 536 f. The *thing itself* has in other respects nothing to do with an analogy to the *Lulab* at the feast of Tabernacles (Lev. xxiii. 40). Comp. however, 1 Macc. xiii. 51. — ὑπάντησιν αὐτῷ] see Buttmann, *Newt. Gr.* p. 156 [E. T. p. 320]. — ὡσαννά, κ.τ.λ.] See on Matt. xxi. 9. — βασιλεὺς τ. Ἰ.] *without* the article (Lachmann has it; Tischendorf, καὶ ὁ): *the King of Israel who comes in the name of the Lord*.

Vv. 14, 15. Εὐρὼν δὲ, κ.τ.λ.] The more detailed circumstances, how He had obtained the young ass (ὄνῳριον), are passed over by John; hence he is not in contradiction with the Synoptics (Matt. xxi. 2 ff. parall.). — καθὼς ἐστι γεγρ.] Zech. ix. 9. See on Matt. xxi. 5. John cites very freely from memory; hence the omission of the other prophetic predicates (even of the παῖς in Matt.), because he has in his eye simply the point of the *riding in upon the young ass*, as a Messianic σημεῖον excluding all doubt. All the more fitted to tranquillize, then (μὴ φοβοῦ), in ever more peaceful array, without horse and chariot, is the coming of the King of Zion. Instead of μὴ φοβοῦ, John might also have said χαῖρε σφόδρα (LXX.); but there floated before him, in his citation from memory, simply the opposition to that terror by which otherwise a royal entrance may be accompanied. "*The Church's figure of the cross*" (Hengstenberg) did not yet lie on this ass's foal, otherwise John would not have passed over the ὕψ of the passage, nor have found the emphasis in μὴ φοβοῦ.

Ver. 16. Observation by John. Comp. ii. 22, xx. 9. *But this* which here took place, namely, that Jesus mounted a young ass which He had obtained, *His disciples at first* (when it took place) *did not understand*, so far, namely, as the connection of the matter with the prediction of the prophet remained still hidden from them; *when, however, Jesus was glorified, they remembered* (under the illumination of the Spirit,

vii. 39, xiv. 26) *that this*, this riding on the young ass, did not accidentally occur, but *that it was written of Him*, and that *they* (the disciples) *did this*, nothing other than this which had been written of Him, *to Him*, on the occasion of that entrance,—in bringing, namely, the ass to Him, whereby they became the instruments of the fulfilment of prophecy. In this ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ there is the echo from John's recollection of the way and manner of the εὐρὺν ὄναριον as known from the Synoptics. To take ἐποίησαν generally: *they* (indef.) *did*, and to refer it to ver. 13 (De Wette, Ewald, and older commentators), is incorrect, since the first two ταῦτα can only point to vv. 14, 15. — On ἐπ' αὐτῷ see Bernhardt, p. 249. Winer, p. 367 [E. T. p. 491].

Vv. 17, 18. Οὖν] Leading back again after the intermediate observation of ver. 16 to the story, and that in such a way that it is now stated how it was *the raising of Lazarus* which so greatly excited both the people who thronged with Jesus from Bethany to Jerusalem (the Ἰουδαῖοι who had become believers, vv. 9, 11, and others, certainly including many inhabitants of Bethany itself), and the multitude which came to meet them from Jerusalem (ver. 12). — ἐμαρτ. κ.τ.λ. ὅτι]<sup>1</sup> for they had, in truth, *themselves seen* the reanimated man; had also, perhaps, *themselves witnessed* in part the process of the miracle, or at least heard of it from eye-witnesses, and could accordingly *testify* to His resurrection. — ἐφώνησεν . . . νεκρῶν] The echo of their triumphant words. — διὰ τοῦτο . . . ὅτι] *On this account* (on account of this raising from the dead), namely, *because*; see on x. 17. — ὑπήντησεν] not pluperfect in sense, but: *they went to meet* (as already stated above, vv. 12, 13). — ὁ ὄχλος] The article points to ver. 12. — ἤκουσαν] namely, previously, in Jerusalem. — τοῦτο] with emphasis; hence also the separation in the order of the words.

NOTE.—While we necessarily recognise the main difference between the Synoptics and John, namely, that according to the

<sup>1</sup> With the reading ὅτι (see critical notes), ἱμαρτ. would have to be taken absolutely. *the people bore witness*, who, viz. were with Him at the raising of Lazarus. Comp. Luther, Erasmus, and many others. Thus the ὄχλος would be the same as in xi. 42, which, however, is not appropriate to ver. 12 and ver. 18, and would only tend to confuse.

former, the journey of Christ to Jerusalem is made from *Jericho*, where He had remained for the night at the house of Zacchaeus, and the stay in Bethany is excluded (see on Matt. xxi. 1, note), the Messianic entry is yet *one and the same* event in all four evangelists. Against the assumption of an *entry on two occasions* (Paulus, Schleiermacher, *üb. d. Schriften des Luk.* p. 243 ff., and *L. J.* p. 407 ff.), according to which He is said first to have made an entry from Jericho, and, one or two days later, again from Bethany, the very nature of the transaction is decisive, to which a repetition, and one moreover so early, was not appropriate, without degenerating into an organized procession. Only in the view of its occurring once, and of its being brought about accidentally, as it were, by the circumstances, does it retain a moral agreement with the mind of Jesus. With this view, too, all four accounts conform, and they all show not merely by their silence respecting a second procession, but also by the manner in which they represent the one, that they are entirely ignorant of any repetition. Such a repetition, especially one so uniform in character, would be as improbable in itself, as it must be opposed to the course of development of the history of Jesus, which here especially, when the last bloody crisis is prepared for by the entry of the Messianic King, must preserve its divine *decorum*, and finds its just measure in the simple fulfilment of the prophetic prediction.

Ver. 19. Contrast to the triumph; the despairing self-confession of the *Pharasaic adversaries*, not as Chrysostom, in spite of the article in *οἱ Φαρισ.*, explained of the quiet friends of Jesus among the Pharisees. — *πρὸς ἑαυτούς*] *to one another*; but *ἀλλήλ.* is not employed, because the utterance is to appear as *limited to the particular circle*. Comp. on vii. 35. — *θεωρεῖτε, κ.τ.λ.*] *You perceive that we profit nothing*, namely, by our previous cautious, expectant, feeble procedure. “Approbant Caiaphae consilium,” Bengel. — *ὁ κόσμος*] designation, indicative of their despair, of the *great multitude*. Comp. *ἅνθρωποι* in the Rabbins. See Wetstein. — In *ἀπηλθεν* (is gone from thence) is contained, by means of the pragmatic connection with *ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ*, the representation of the falling away from the legitimate hierarchical power. Comp. *ὑπηγον*, ver. 11.

Ver. 20. The *Hellenes* are, as in vii. 35, not Greek *Jews*, *Hellenists* (Calvin, Semler, B. Crusius, Ewald), but *Gentiles*, — proselytes, however, as is shown by what follows (note espe-

cially the pres. part. ἀναβαιν.: who were wont to go up), and that of the *gate*, like the Aethiopian chamberlain, Acts viii. 27, not *pure* Gentiles (Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, Salmasius, Selden, and several others, including Paulus, Klee, Schweizer). — *Where* did the scene take place? Probably in the court of the temple, with which locality, at least, the entry just related, and the connected transactions, onwards to ver. 36, best correspond. According to Baur, however (comp. also Scholten), the whole affair is to be referred simply to the *idea of the author*, who makes Jesus, under the ascendancy of Jewish unbelief, to be glorified by believing heathendom. This idea is that of the history itself. Bengel rightly observes: “Praeludium regni Dei a Judaeis ad gentes transituri.”

Vv. 21, 22. The Messianic hope, which they as proselytes share, draws their hearts to Him whose Messiahship has just found so open and general a recognition. They wish to see Jesus, that is, to be introduced to Him, in order to make His nearer personal acquaintance, and this it is which they *modestly* express. For *mere* seeing, as in Luke xix. 3, any intervention of a third party (as Brückner now also recognises) would not have been required.—Whether they came to Philip *accidentally*, or because the latter was *known* to them (perhaps they were from Galilee), remains undetermined. To presuppose in Philip, on account of his Greek name, a *Greek education* (Hengstenberg), is arbitrary. — κύριε] not without the tender of honour, which they naturally paid even to the disciple of a Master so admired, who truly appeared to be the very Messiah.—That Philip first communicates the proposal to Andrew, who was possibly in more confidential relations with Christ (Mark xiii. 3), and who was on terms of intimacy with him by the fact of the same birthplace (i. 45), and that *with* him he carries out their wish, rests on the circumstance that he was himself too timid to be the means of bringing about an interview between the Holy One of God—whose immediate destination he knew to be for Israel—and *Gentiles*. His was a circumspect nature, prone to scruples (vi. 5 ff., xiv. 8, 9). “Cum sodali, audet,” Bengel. Note the stamp of *originality* which appears in such side-touches. — In the reading ἐρχεται

Ἄνδρ. κ. Φ. καὶ λέγουσι τῷ Ἰ. (see critical notes), observe (1) the lively manner of representation in the repetition of ἔρχεται; (2) the change of the singular to the plural of the verb, which also is found in the classical writers. Xen. *Anab.* ii. 4. 16, and Kühner *in loc.*

Ver. 23. The proposal of the Gentiles which had been brought to Him, awakens in Jesus, with peculiar force and depth, the thought of His approaching *death*; for through His *death* was His salvation in truth to be conveyed to the Gentiles (x. 16, 17).—Accordingly, that wish of the Gentiles must appear to Him as already a beginning of that which was to be effected by His death. Hence His *answer to those two disciples* (not to the Ἕλληνες, Ebrard), which is pervaded by a full presentiment of the crisis at hand, and at the close, ver. 27, resolves itself into a prayer of deep emotion, but, by means thereof, into complete surrender to the Father. This answer is consequently neither *inappropriate* (De Wette), nor does it contain an indirect *refusal* of the request of the Greeks (Ewald, Hengstenberg, Godet); nor is the *granting* of it to be thought of as having taken place before, and as having *been passed over in silence* by John (Tholuck, B. Crusius, and older commentators), which the text refutes by the words ἀπεκρίνατο αὐτοῖς, which continue the narrative without any further remarks; nor is the petition of the Gentiles to be regarded as *indirectly complied with*, namely, by the fact that the apostles brought it before Jesus, and that the latter then began to speak (Luthardt)—which amounts to the improbability that Jesus, by the following speech, desired to make a display before those Gentiles (whom Ewald also supposes to have been present); but the *admission* of the Gentiles which was to have taken place *after* this outpouring of emotion, did not, however, take place, because the voice from heaven, ver. 28, interrupted and changed the scene.<sup>1</sup> The theory that in v. 23 ff. the synop-

<sup>1</sup> According to Ewald, *Gesch. Chr.* p. 527, Jesus would, in *granting* the request, be exposed to a *temptation*, and have done something at this last development out of keeping with His previous ministry, which would have awakened disquiet, furnished a new embarrassment to the hierarchs, etc. But we may also conversely pass the judgment that Jesus, on the very threshold of His death, could not have designed to refuse an actual manifestation of His universal destination, which He, moreover, had expressed in x. 16,—offered so

tical accounts of the transfiguration, and of the conflict of soul in Gethsemane, are either fused into a historical mixture (Strauss), or formed into an ideal combination (Baur), proceeds from presuppositions, according to which it is possible to adduce even Gal. ii. 9 as a witness against John xii. 20 (see against this, Bleek, p. 250 ff.), as Baur has done. — ἐλήλυθεν] Placed first with emphasis. — ἵνα] Comp. xiii. 1, xvi. 2, 32. The hour is conceived of absolutely (in the consciousness of Jesus the present *hora fatalis* κατ' ἐξοχήν), and that which is to take place in it, as the divine appointment for its having arrived. — δοξασθῇ] through *death*, as the necessary passage to the heavenly glory. Comp. xvii. 5, vi. 62; 1 Pet. i. 11.

Ver. 24. My death, however, is *necessary* to the successful and victorious development of my work, as the wheat-corn must fall into the earth and die, in order to bring forth much fruit. The *solemn assurance* (ἀμήν, ἀμήν, κ.τ.λ.) is in keeping with the difficulty of getting the disciples to accept the idea of His death. — ἀποθάνῃ] For the *vital principle* in the corn, the *germ*, forces itself out; thus the corn is *dead*, and become a prey to dissolution, comp. 1 Cor. xv. 36 — αὐτὸς μόνος] *by itself alone*, vi. 15. Ast, *Lex. Plat.* I. p. 314. The life of the corn which has not fallen into the earth remains limited and bound to itself, without the possibility of a communication and unfolding of life outwards issuing from it, such as only follows in the case of *that* corn which dies in the earth through the bursting forth of the living germ, and in this way of death produces much fruit. Thus, also, with Christ; it is through His death that there first comes upon all peoples and times the rich blessing which is destined for the world. Comp. ver. 32.

Ver. 25. As it is my vocation, so also is it that of those who are mine, to surrender the temporal, in order to gain the eternal life. Comp. Matt. x. 39; Luke ix. 24, xvii. 33.—The ψυχή is in each instance the *soul*, as αὐτήν also is to be taken in like manner in each instance. This is clear from its being distinguished from ζωή. *He who loves his soul*, will not let it

accidentally, as it were,—especially since the conversion of the Gentiles to the Messiah was grounded in prophecy. To yield to the prayer was, further, by no means to make a full surrender to the petitioners.

go (ὁ φιλοψυχῶν ἐν καιρῷ μαρτυρίου, Euth. Zigabenus), *loses it* (see critical notes)—i.e. he thereby brings about that it falls into the death of everlasting condemnation; and he who hates his soul in this world (gives it up with joy, as something which, moreover, is a hindrance to eternal salvation, and in so far must be hated) will preserve it for everlasting life, keep it to himself as a possession in the everlasting Messianic life. Note the correlatives: φιλῶν and μισῶν, ἀπολέσει and φυλάξει (comp. xvii. 12), ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ τούτῳ (in the pre-Messianic world), and εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον. — On μισεῖν, whose meaning is not to be altered, but to be understood relatively, in opposition to φιλοψυχία, comp. Luke xiv. 26. "Amor, ut pereat; odium ne pereat; si male amaveris, tunc odisti; si bene oderis, tunc amasti," Augustine.

Ver. 26. Requirement and promise, in accordance with that which was expressed generally in ver. 25. — ἀκολ.] on the way of my life-surrender; comp. Matt. x. 38, xvi. 24. — ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγώ] comp. xiv. 3, xvii. 24. The pres. tense represents the fut. as present: *where I am, there will also my servant be*, namely, after I have raised him up (vi. 39, 40, 44, 54) in the Parousia. Comp. xiv. 3, xvii. 24. That following after me will lead him into blessed fellowship with me in my kingdom. Comp. Rom. viii. 17; 2 Tim. ii. 11, 12. For the counterpart, see vii. 34. According to Luthardt (comp. Euth. Zigabenus 1), the being *on the same way* is meant, consequently the contents of that requirement are simply turned into a promise. A feeble tautology, especially after ver. 25 (εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον). — εἰάν τις ἐμ. διακ. κ.τ.λ.] Parallel with the preceding, further designating, particularly and specifically, the promised happiness, and that in the light of the divine recompense contained in it. This thought is expressed by the conjunction of διακονῇ and τιμήσει, which verbs have the emphasis (it is different previously, when ἐμοί . . . ἐμοί bore the emphasis); he who serves me, him will the Father honour, actually, through the δόξα in the everlasting life, comp. Rom. ii. 10, viii. 17. The διακονεῖν, however, is here to be understood with the previously enjoined quality of following Christ.

Vv. 27, 28. The realization of His sufferings and death, with



which His discourse from ver. 23 was filled, shakes Him suddenly with apprehension and momentary wavering, springing from the human sensibility, which naturally seeks to resist the heaviest suffering, which He must yet undergo. To define this specially as the feeling of *the divine anger* (Beza, Calvin, Calovius, Hengstenberg, and many others), which He has certainly appeased by His death, rests on the supposition, which is nowhere justified, that, according to the *object* of the death (i. 29, iii. 14, x. 11, 12; Matt. xx. 28; Rom. viii. 3, iii. 25; 2 Cor. v. 21, *et al.*), *its severity* also is measured in the consciousness. Bengel well says: "*concurrerat horror mortis et ardor obedientiae.*" The Lord is thus moved to *pray*; but He is for the moment uncertain for *what* (τί εἶπω), ἀπορούμενος ὑπὸ τῆς ἀγωνίας, Euth. Zigabenus. *First*, a momentary fear of the sufferings of death (comp. on Luke xii. 50) obtains the upper hand, in virtue of that human weakness, in which even He, the Son of God, because He had become man, had His share (Heb. iv. 15, v. 7, 8), and He prays: *Father, save me from this hour*, spare me this death-suffering which is awaiting me, quite as in Matt. xxvi. 39, so that He thus not merely "cries for support through it, and for a shortening of it" (Ebrard). But immediately this wish, resulting from natural dread of suffering and death,<sup>1</sup> yields to the victorious consciousness of His great destiny; He gives expression to the latter (ἀλλὰ διὰ τοῦτο, κ.τ.λ.), and now prays: *Father, glorify Thy name*; *i.e.*, through the suffering of death appointed to me, let the glory of Thy name (of Thy being in its self-presentation, comp. on Matt. vi. 9) be manifested. The fulfilment of this prayer was brought about in this way, that by means of the death of Jesus (and of His consequent δόξα) the divine decree of salvation was fulfilled, then everywhere made known through the gospel, in virtue of the Holy Spirit (xiv. 16 ff.), and obedience to the faith established to the honour of the Father, which is the last aim of the work of Christ, Phil. ii. 11. — ἡ ψυχὴ μου] not as a designation of *individual* grief (Olshausen), but as the seat of the affections generally. He

<sup>1</sup> Which in itself is not only not immoral, but the absence of which would even lower the moral greatness and the worth of His sacrifice. Comp. Dorner, *Jesu sündlose Vollkommenh.* p. 6.

might also have said τὸ πνεῦμά μου (comp. xi. 33, 38), but would then have meant the deeper basis of life, to which the impressions of the ψυχή, which is united with the σάρξ, are conveyed. Comp. on Luke i. 46, 47. — πᾶτερ, σῶσόν με, κ.τ.λ.] The hour of suffering is regarded as present, *as though He were already at that hour*. To take the words *interrogatively*: shall I say: save me? etc. (so Chrysostom, Theophylact, Jansen, Grotius, Lampe, and many others, including Lachmann, Tholuck, Kling, Schweizer, Maier, Lange, Ewald, Godet) yields the result of an actual prayer interwoven into a reflective monologue, and is therefore less suitable to a frame of mind so deeply moved. — ἀλλά] objecting, like our *but no!* See Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 36; Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 13 f. — διὰ τοῦτο] *Wherefore*, is contained in the following prayer, πᾶτερ, δόξασον, κ.τ.λ. Consequently: *therefore, in order that* through my suffering of death *Thy name may be glorified*. The completion: *in order that the world might be redeemed* (Olshausen and older commentators), is not supplied by the context; *to undergo this suffering* (Grotius, De Wette, Luthardt, Lange, Ebrard, Godet; comp. Hengstenberg: "in order that my soul may be shaken") is tautological; and Lampe: *to be saved*, is inappropriate. The τοῦτο is here *preparative*; let only διὰ τοῦτο . . . ταύτην be enclosed within dashes, and the sense is made clearly to appear: *but no—therefore I came to this hour—Father, glorify*, etc. Jesus might have said: ἀλλὰ, πᾶτερ, δόξασον σου τὸ ὄνομα, διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ ἦλθον ἐ. τ. ὦ. τ. But the language, deeply emotional, throbs more unconnectedly, and as it were by starts. — The *repetition* of πᾶτερ corresponds to the thrill of filial affection. — σου stands emphatically, in the first place, in antithesis to the reference which the previous prayer of Jesus contained to Himself. On the subject-matter, comp. Matt. xxvi. 39. — οὖν] corresponding to this petition. — φωνή ἐκ τ. οὐρ.] The voice which came from heaven: *I have glorified it* (in Thy mission and Thy whole previous work), *and shall again* (through Thine impending departure by means of death to the δόξα) *glorify it*,<sup>1</sup> is not to be regarded as actual, natural *thunder* (according to the O. T.

<sup>1</sup> The reference of ἰδοῦσα to the O. T. revelation, which is now declared to be closed (Lange, *L. J.* II. p. 1208), is without any foundation in the context.

view conceived of as the voice of the Lord, as in Ps. xxix., Job xxxvii. 4, and frequently), in which only the *subjective disposition*, the so-attuned *inner ear* of Jesus (and of the disciples), distinguished the words *καὶ ἐδόξασα, κ.τ.λ.*; while others, less susceptible to this divine symbolism of nature, believed only in a general way, that in the thunder an angel had spoken with Jesus; while others again, unsusceptible, understood the natural occurrence simply and solely as such, and took it for nothing further than what it objectively was. So substantially, not merely Paulus, Kuinoel, Lücke, Ammon, De Wette, Maier, Baeumlein, and several others, but also Hengstenberg.<sup>1</sup> Several have here had recourse to the later Jewish view of *Bath-Kol* (by which, however, only real literal voices, not natural phenomena, without speech, were understood; see Lübkert in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1835, 3), as well as to the Gentile interpretations of thunder as the voice of the gods (see Wetstein). Against this entire view, it is decisive that John himself, the ear-witness, describes a *φωνὴ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*, which was an objective occurrence; that he further repeats its express words; that, further, to take the first half of these words referring to the past, as the product of a merely subjective perception, is without any support in the prayer of Jesus; that, further, Jesus Himself, ver. 30, gives His confirmation to the occurrence of an actual voice; that, finally, the *ἄλλοι* also, ver. 29, must have heard a *speech*. Hence we must abide by the interpretation that a *voice actually issued from heaven*, which John relates, and Jesus confirms as an objective occurrence. It is a voice which came miraculously from God (as was the case, according to the Synoptics, at the baptism and the transfiguration), yet as regards its intelligibility conditioned by the subjective disposition and receptivity

<sup>1</sup> See, in answer to him, some appropriate observations in Engelhardt, in the *Luth. Zeitschr.* 1865, p. 209 ff. He, however, refers the *δοξάσω* to the fact that the Son, even in His sufferings, will allow the will of God entirely to prevail with Him. The glorifying of God, however, by means of the death of Jesus, which was certainly the culminating point of His obedience to the Father, reaches further, namely (see especially xvii. 1, 2) to God's honour through the Lord's attainment of exaltation throughout the whole world by means of His death. As *ἰδοῦσα* refers to His munus *propheticum*, so *δοξάσω* to the fact that He attains to the munus *regium* through the fulfilment of the munus *sacerdotale*.

of the hearers (so also Tholuck, Olshausen, Kling, Luthardt, Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* I. p. 391 f., Lange, Ebrard, Godet following the old commentators), which sounded with a *tone as of thunder*, so that the definite words which resounded in this form of sound remained unintelligible to the unsusceptible, who simply heard that majestic kind of sound, but not its contents, and said: *βροντὴν γεγενέσθαι*; whereas, on the other hand, others, more susceptible, certainly understood this much, that the thunder-like voice was a *speech*, but not what it said, and thought an angel (comp. Acts xxiii. 9) had spoken in this thunder-voice to Jesus. This opinion of theirs, however, does not justify us in regarding the divine word which was spoken as also actually communicated by angelic ministry (Hofmann), since, in fact, the utterance of the *ἄλλοι* is not adduced as at all the true account, and since, moreover, the heavenly voice, according to the text, appears simply and solely as the *answer of the Father*.

Vv. 30, 31. *Ἀπεκρίθη*] not to the *disciples* (Tholuck), but, according to ver. 29, with reference to these two expressions of opinion from the *people*. He lets their opinions, as to what and whose the voice was, alone, but recognises in their hearts the more dangerous error, that they do not put the voice (this thunder or this angelic speech, according to their supposition) in any relation to themselves. — *δι' ἐμέ*] to assure me that my prayer has been heard; "*novi patris animum in me*," Erasmus. — *δι' ὑμᾶς*] in relation to you to overcome unbelief, and to strengthen faith. Comp. xi. 42. — *νῦν κρίσις, κ.τ.λ.*] Not an interpretation of the voice (Hengstenberg), but also not without reference to *δι' ὑμᾶς* (Engelhardt), which is too weighty an element. Rather: how the crisis of this time presses for the use of that *δι' ὑμᾶς*! — *νῦν . . . νῦν*] with triumphant certainty of victory, treating the near future as present; *now, now*, is it gone so far! He speaks "*quasi certamine defunctus*," Calvin. — *κρίσις*] Now is *judgment*, i.e. judicial (according to the context: condemnatory) decision passed upon this world, i.e. on the men of the *αἰὼν οὗτος* who reject faith. This judgment is an *actual one*; for in the victory of the Messianic work of salvation, which was to be brought about by the death of Jesus, and His exaltation

to the heavenly glory connected therewith,<sup>1</sup> the κόσμος was to be set forth in the entire sinfulness and weakness of its hostility towards Christ, and thereby in fact judged.<sup>2</sup> Comp. xvi. 9, 10, 33. This victory the ruler of this world in particular (τ. κόσμ. τ. solemnly repeated), the devil, was to submit to;<sup>3</sup> his dominion must have an end, because the death of Jesus effected the reconciliation of humanity, by which reconciliation all were to be drawn away from the devil by becoming believers, and were to be placed under the spiritual power of the Christ exalted to glory, ver. 32, Rom. v. 12 ff.; Phil. ii. 9-11. He is called the ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, as the ruler of the unbelieving, Christ-opposing humanity (comp. 2 Cor. iv. 4; Eph. ii. 2, vi. 12), as in the writings of Rabbins, he, as ruler of the Gentiles, in opposition to God and His people, bears this as a standing name (שׂר העלם). See Lightfoot and Schoettgen, also in Eisenmenger, *Entdeckt. Judenthum*, I. p. 647 ff. Here he is so called, because the very κρίσις of his dominium, the κόσμος, was declared. — ἐκβληθήσεται ἔξω] The necessarily approaching removal of the power of the devil through the death and the exaltation of Jesus is vividly represented as a casting out from his empire, namely from the κόσμος οὗτος. Only this supplement is

<sup>1</sup> There lies in it, accordingly, no opposition to the belief in the last judgment (against Hilgenfeld, *Lehrbegr.* p. 274), as has been supposed from a misinterpretation also of iii. 19, 20, in spite of the repeated mention of the last day, and in spite of v. 27, against which here the very absence of the article should have been a warning. Again, what is subsequently said of the devil (as also the passages xiv. 30, 31, xvi. 11) is not to be explained from the Gnostic idea, that the devil, through his having contrived the death of Christ, but having after His death recognised Him as the Son of God, had been cheated, and so forfeited his right (Hilgenfeld). Of such Gnostic fancies the N. T. knows nothing. The conquest of the devil is necessarily granted along with the atoning effect of the death of Jesus, and through the operation of the Spirit of the exalted one it is in process of completion until the Parousia.

<sup>2</sup> As hereafter the devil is the subject which is cast out, so here the κόσμος is the subject which is judged. This in answer to Bengel: "judicium de mundo, quis posthac jure sit obtenturus mundum." Grotius explains κρίσις simply of the vindicatio in libertatem; humanity is to be freed from its unjust possessor; consequently as regards the material contents, substantially as Bengel, comp. also Beza.

<sup>3</sup> Schleiermacher, indeed (*L. J.* p. 343), interprets the ἄρχ. τ. κ. τ. of "open force" in its conflict against the activity of Jesus. In reference to the declarations of Jesus regarding the devil, it is most markedly apparent with what difficulty Schleiermacher subordinated himself to exegetical tests.

yielded by the context, not τῆς ἀρχῆς (Euth. Zigabenus, Beza), nor τοῦ δικαστηρίου (Theophylact), nor out of the kingdom of God (Ewald), and least of all τοῦ οὐρανοῦ (Luke x. 18; Rev. xii. 8, so Olshausen; hence the reading *κάτω*). The indefinite rendering: he is *repulsed* (De Wette; comp. Plat. *Menex.* p. 243 B; Soph. *Oed. R.* 386), or to be *removed from the presence of the judge* (Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* I. p. 449), is not sufficient, on account of the appended ἔξω. — Note further, that the victory here announced over this world and over the reign of the devil was indeed decided, and commenced with the death and the exaltation of Christ, but is in a state of continuous development onwards to its consummation at the last day (comp. Rev. xx. 10); hence the passages of the N. T. on the continuing power and influence of the devil (2 Cor. iv. 4; Eph. ii. 2, vi. 12; Rom. xvi. 20; 1 Pet. v. 8, and many others) do not stand in contradiction to the present passage. Comp. Col. ii. 15.

Vv. 32, 33. And I shall establish my own dominion in room of the devil's rule. — *καγώ*] with victorious emphasis, in opposition to the devil. — *ἐὰν ὑψωθῶ ἐκ τ. γῆς*] so that I shall be no more upon the earth. Comp. on *ὑψώω ἐκ*, Ps. ix. 14. Probably Jesus (differently in iii. 14) used the verb *רום* (comp. Syr.): *אם הרמתי מן הארץ*. This exaltation from earth into heaven to the Father (vii. 33; Acts ii. 33, vi. 31) was to be brought about by the *death of the cross*; and this *manner* of His death, Jesus, in the opinion of John, indicated (xviii. 32, xxi. 19) by the word *ὑψωθῶ* (comp. iii. 14, viii. 28). According to John, it is then the designation of the return from earth to heaven, which Jesus gives by *ὑψωθῶ ἐκ τ. γ.*, not merely a representation of His *death*, so far as the latter exalts him to the Father, but an announcement of the *manner* of the death (comp. xviii. 32, xxi. 19), through which He will end His earthly life, because He was to die *exalted on the cross*. But this interpretation of John's does not justify us in straightway understanding *ὑψ. ἐκ τ. γ.* of the *crucifixion* (so the Fathers, and most older commentators, including Kling, Frommann, Hengstenberg), which is forbidden by *ἐκ τῆς γῆς*, nor in finding therein<sup>1</sup> a "*sermo anceps*" (Beza

<sup>1</sup> "His suspension on the cross appears to Him the magnificently ironical

and several others, including Luthardt, Ebrard, Godet, comp. Engelhardt), since by the very force of ἐκ τ. γ. the double sense is *excluded*. It belongs to the freedom of mystic exposition linking itself to a single word (comp. ix. 7), as it was sufficiently suggested, especially here, by the recollection of the ὑψωθῆναι already employed in iii. 14, and is therewith just as justifiable in itself in the sense of its time as it is wanting in authority for the historical understanding. To this mystical interpretation is opposed, indeed, the expression ἐκ τῆς γῆς (comp. Isa. liii. 8); but John was sufficiently faithful in his account not to omit this ἐκ τ. γῆς for the sake of his interpretation of ὑψωθῶ, and simply adhered to this ὑψ., and disregarded the context.<sup>1</sup>—On εἰν, comp. on xiv. 3.—πάντας ἐλκ. πρὸς ἑμᾶντ.] *all*, i.e. not merely adherents of all *nations*, or all *elected* ones and the like, but *all men*, so that thus none remain belonging to the ἀρχῶν τοῦ κόσμου τούτου. But to the latter, to the devil, stands opposed, not the mere πρὸς ἐμέ, but to myself, to my own community. Comp. xiv. 3; ἑμᾶντόν never stands for the simple ἐμέ, not even in xiv. 21 (against Tholuck). The ἐλκύειν takes place by means of the Holy Spirit, who, given by the exalted Lord (vii. 39, xvi. 7), and representing Himself (xiv. 18, 19), wins men for Christ in virtue of faith, and, by means of internal moral compulsion, places them in the fellowship of love, of obedience, and of the true and everlasting ζωή with Him. Comp. vi. 44, where this is said of the Father. The fulfilment of this promise is world-historical, and continually in process of realization (Rom. x. 18), until finally the great goal will be reached, when all will be drawn to the Son, and form one flock under one shepherd (x. 16). In this sense πάντας is to be left without any arbitrary limitation (Luthardt's limitation is baseless: *all, namely, those whom He draws to Himself*). For the manner in which Paul recognised the way and manner of the last consummation of the promise thus made, see Rom. xi. 25, 26.

Ver. 34. The people—rightly understanding εἰν ὑψ. ἐκ τ. γῆς, ver. 32, of an exaltation to take place by the way of death

emblem of His elevation on the throne," Godet. An ironical touch would here be very strange.

<sup>1</sup> Scholten sets aside the whole comment as an interpolation.

—gather thence, that in accordance therewith no everlasting duration of life (*μένει*, see on xxi. 22) is destined for Him on the earth, and do not find this reconcilable with that which *they* on their part (*ἡμεῖς*) had heard out of the Scripture (*νόμος*, as in x. 34) of the Messiah (*ἡκούσ.*, namely, by reading, comp. Gal. iv. 21). They reflect on the scriptural doctrine (comp. also the older book of Enoch) of the everlasting kingdom of the Messiah, which they apprehend as an earthly kingdom, and especially on passages like Ps. cx. 4, Isa. ix. 5, 7, and particularly Dan. vii. 13, 14. — From the latter passage, not from ver. 23, where He does not speak to the people, they put in the mouth of Christ the words *τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρ.*, as He had designated Himself so frequently by this Messianic appellation, in order at once to make manifest that He, although He so terms Himself, yet on account of the contradictory token of the *ὑψωθῆναι ἐκ τ. γῆς* which He ascribes to Himself, cannot be the Danielian Son of man, He who was so characterized in the Scripture; *the* Son of man, by which name *He* is wont to designate Himself, must in truth be quite another person. — *οὗτος*] this strange Son of man, who is in opposition to the Scripture, over whom that *ὑψωθῆναι* is said to be impending.<sup>1</sup> That the speakers, however, were unacquainted with the appellation *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρ.* for Jesus (Brückner) is, after the first half of the verse, not to be assumed.

Vv. 35, 36. Jesus does not enter upon the question raised, but directs the questioners to that one point which concerns them, with the intensity and seriousness of one who is on the point of taking His departure. To follow this one direction must indeed of itself free them from all those doubts and questions. — *ἐν ὑμῖν*] among you. — *περιπ. ὡς τὸ φῶς ἔχετε*] On the reading *ὡς*, see the critical notes. *Walk as you have the light*, i.e. in conformity with the fact that you have among you the possessor and bearer of the divine truth (comp. on viii. 12); be not slothful, but spiritually active, and

<sup>1</sup> The inquiry has in it something pert, saucy, as if they said: "A fine 'Son of man' art thou, who art not to remain for ever in life, but, as thou dost express it, art to be exalted!" To the Danielian Son of man an everlasting kingdom is given, Dan. vii. 14. This also in answer to Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 79.



awake in the enjoyment of this relation, just as one does not rest and lie still when he has the bright light of day, but walks in order to attain the end in view before the darkness breaks in (see what follows). On *ὥς* as assigning the motive (*in the measure that*), comp. generally on xiii. 34, and here especially on Gal. vi. 10. Ellendt aptly says, *Lex. Soph.* II. p. 1008: “nec tamen causam per se spectatam, sed quam quis, qualis sit, indicat.” The signification *quamdiu* (Baeumlein) is not borne by *ὥς*, not even in *Soph. Aj.* 1117 (see Schneidewin *in loc.*), *Phil.* 635. 1330. — *ἵνα μὴ σκοτία, κ.τ.λ.*] *in order that*—which would smite you as a penal destiny in retribution of your *μὴ περιπατεῖν*—darkness (the element opposed to the divine truth of salvation, which still at present shines upon you) *may not seize you*, like a hostile power. Comp. i. 21: *ἐσκοτίσθη ἡ ἀσύνετος αὐτῶν καρδιά.* On *καταλάβῃ*, comp. 1 Thess. v. 4; also in the classics very frequently of danger, misfortune, and the like, which befall any one. Arrian, *Alex.* i. 5. 17: *εἰ νῦν καταλήφεται αὐτοῦς. — καὶ ὁ περιπ., κ.τ.λ.*] and how dangerous would this condition be! This is brought home in a sentence from ordinary life; comp. xi. 9, ix. 4. — *ποῦ ὑπάγει*] *whither he is departing*, iii. 8. Thus the *ἐσκοτισμένος* goes away, without knowing the unhappy end, into everlasting destruction; comp. 1 John ii. 11. For the opposite of *this ποῦ ὑπάγει*, see viii. 14, 21, xvi. 5, *et al.* — *ὥς τ. φῶς ἔχετε*] Repeated and placed first with great emphasis. — *πιστεύετε εἰς τ. φῶς, ἵνα, κ.τ.λ.*] More minute designation of that which was previously intended by the figurative *περιπατεῖτε*. — *υἱοὶ τοῦ φωτός.*] Enlightened persons. See on Luke xvi. 8; Eph. v. 8. — *γέννησθε*] not *be*, but *become*. Faith is the condition and the beginning of it; comp. i. 12. — *ἐκρύβῃ ἀπ’ αὐτῶν*] The situation in viii. 59 is different. He now, according to the account of John, withdraws from them into concealment, probably to Bethany, in order to spend these last days of life, before the arrival of His hour, in the quiet confidential circle, not as a prelude, “*summi iudicii occultationis Domini*” (Lampe, Luthardt), which is not indicated, and is all the more without support, that the last discourse was not condemnatory, but only hortatory.

Ver. 37. At the close of the public ministry of Jesus there now follows a general observation on its results in respect to faith in Him, as far as ver. 50.—*τοσαῦτα*] not *so great* (Lücke, De Wette, and several others), but *so many*,<sup>1</sup> vi. 9, xiv. 9, xxi. 11. Comp. the admissions of the Jews themselves, vii. 31, xi. 47. The *multitude* of the miracles, *i.e.* the *so-often-repeated* miraculous demonstration of His Messianic *δόξα*, must have convinced them (comp. xx. 30), had they not been blinded and hardened by a divine destiny. The *reference*, however, of *τοσαῦτα* is not: *so many as have hitherto been related*, for our Gospel contains the fewest miraculous narratives,—but it lies in the *notoriety* of the great multitude in general. Comp. xiv. 9; 1 Cor. xiv. 10; Heb. iv. 7.—*ἔμπροσθ. αὐτ.*] *before their eyes*.—*οὐκ ἐπίστ. εἰς αὐτ.*] summary statement.

Ver. 38. "*Ἰνα*] *in order that*, according to divine determination, the prophecy might be fulfilled. This "*in order that*" contains the definite assumption that the prophet Isaiah predicted what, according to divine destiny, was to come to pass; thus, then, the historical fulfilment stood in necessary relation of final cause to the prediction. Comp. on Matt. i. 22.—*ὃν εἶπε*] similar pleonasms, which, however, as here, may denote an *emphatic* circumstantiality, are found also in the Greek writers, as in Xen. *Cyr.* viii. 2. 14, *Anab.* i. 9. 11. The passage is Isa. liii. 1, closely following the LXX. The lament of the prophet over the unbelief of *his* time towards *his* preaching (and that of his fellows, *ἡμῶν*), and towards the mighty working of God announced *by him*, has, according to the Messianic character of the whole grand oracle, its reference and fulfilment in the unbelief of the Jews towards *Jesus*; so that in the sense of this fulfilment, the speaking subject (addressing God, *κύριε*, comp. Matt. xxvii. 46), which Isaiah introduces, is *Jesus*, not the *evangelist* and those of like mind with him (Luthardt).—*τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμ.*] *to that heard from us*, *i.e.* to the message which they receive from us (comp. on Rom. x. 16), not: which *we* receive (comp. Sir. xliii. 24), namely, actually in Christ (Luthardt), as Hengstenberg also understands it of that which we have received through revelation (comp. Euth.

<sup>1</sup> Comp. on the distinction between the two notions, the phrase current in the classics, *τοσαῦτά τε καὶ τοιαῦτα*, Heindorf, *ad Plat. Gorg.* p. 456 C.

Zigabenus). Comp. on the genitive, Plat. *Phaedr.* p. 274 C; Pausan. viii. 41. 6; Pind. *Pyth.* i. 162. The *plural*, however, ἡμῶν, comprises God and Christ in the fulfilment. — ὁ βραχίον κυρ.] Plastic expression for the *power* of God (comp. Luke i. 51; Acts xiii. 17; Wisd. v. 16, xi. 21; Bar. ii. 11; Isa. li. 5, lii. 10), and that according to the Messianic signification; in the *miraculous signs of Christ* — in which the unbelieving do not recognise the *brachium Dei*. “In se exsertum est, sed caeci non viderunt illud,” Bengel. But to understand *Christ Himself* (Augustine, Photius, Euth. Zigabenus, Beda, Rupertus, Zeger, Jansen, Maldonatus, Calovius, and several others) is required neither by the original text nor here by the connection.

Vv. 39, 40. Διὰ τοῦτο . . . ὅτι] as always in John (see on x. 17): *therefore*, referring to what *precedes*, on account of this destiny contained in ver. 38—*namely, because*, so that thus with ὅτι the reason is still more minutely set forth. Ebrard foists in an entirely foreign course of thought, because Israel has not *willed* to believe, therefore has she not *been able* to believe. Contrary to that Johannean use of διὰ τοῦτο . . . ὅτι, Theophylact, Beza, Jansen, Lampe, and several others, including Lücke, Tholuck, Olshausen, Maier, B. Crusius, Luthardt, take διὰ τοῦτο as *preparative*. — οὐκ ἠδύναντο] not: *nolebant* (Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, Wolf), but—and therewith the enigma of that tragic unbelief is solved—*they could not*, expressing the *impossibility* which had its foundation in the divine judgment of obduracy. “Hic subsistit evangelista, quis ultra nitatur?” Bengel. On the relation of this inability, referred back to the determination of God, to moral freedom and responsibility, see on Rom. ix.—xi. — τετύφλωκεν] The passage is Isa. vi. 9, 10, departing freely from the original and from the LXX. In the original the *prophet* is said, at the command of *God*, to undertake the blinding, etc., that is, the intellectual and moral hardening (“*harden the heart*,” etc.). Thus what God then *will allow* to be done is represented by John in his free manner of citation as *done by God Himself*, to which the recollection of the rendering of the passage given by the LXX. (“the heart has *become hardened*,” etc.) might easily lead. The subject is thus neither *Christ* (Grotius,

Calovius, and several others, including Lange and Ebrard), nor the *devil* (Hilgenfeld, Scholten), but, as the reader would understand as a matter of course, and as also the entire context shows (for the necessity in the divine fate is the leading idea), *God*. Christ first appears as subject in *ιάσομαι*. — *πεπώρ.*] *has hardened*. See Athenaeus, 12, p. 549 B; Mark vi. 52, viii. 17; Rom. xi. 7; 2 Cor. iii. 14. — *καὶ στραφῶσι*] *and (not) turn, return to me*. — *ιάσομαι*] Future, dependent on *ἴνα μή*. See on Matt. xiii. 15. The moral corruption is viewed as *sickness*, which is *healed* by faith (vv. 37, 39). Comp. Matt. ix. 12; 1 Pet. ii. 24. The healing *subject*, however, cannot, as in Matt. xiii. 15, Acts xxviii. 27, be *God* (so *usually*), simply because this is the subject of *τετύφλωκεν*, *κ.τ.λ.*, but it must be *Christ*; in *His* mouth, according to the Johannean view of the prophecy from the standpoint of its fulfilment, Isaiah puts not merely the utterance in ver. 38, but also the words *τετύφλωκεν . . . ἱάσομαι αὐτούς*, and thus makes Him say: God has blinded the people, etc., that they should not see, etc., and should not turn to Him (Christ), and He (Christ) should heal them. Nonnus aptly says: *Ὁφθαλμούς ἀλάωσεν ἐμῶν ἐπιμάρτυρας ἔργων . . . μὴ κραδίη νοέωσι . . . καὶ μοι ὑποστρέψωσι, νοοβλαβείας δὲ σαώσω ἄνδρας ἀλιτράινοντας ἐμῶ παιήονι μύθῳ*. Thus the 1st person *ιάσομαι* is not an instance of "*negligence*" (Tholuck, comp. his *A. T. im N. T.* p. 35 f. ed. 6), but of *consistency*.

Ver. 41. *Ὅτι*] (see the critical notes): *because he saw His glory, and (in consequence of this view) spoke of Him*. This was the *occasion* that moved him, and it led to his speaking what is contained in ver. 40. — *αὐτοῦ*] refers to *Christ*, the subject of *ιάσομαι*, ver. 40, and the chief person in the whole subject under contemplation (ver. 37). According to Isa. vi. 1 ff., the prophet, indeed, beheld *God's* glory, *God* sitting upon His throne, attended by seraphim, etc.; but in the O. T. theophanies, it is just Christ who is present as the *Logos*,<sup>1</sup> and

<sup>1</sup> From which a conclusion can as little be drawn against the personality of the Logos (Beyschlag, p. 166 f.), as from the angelic theophanies against the personality of the angel or angels concerned (not even in Rev. v. 6). That the idea of angels in the N. T. wavers between personality and personification is not correct. Observe also, that the self-revelation of the devil does not set aside the personality of the man who is the bearer of it (as Judas). Further,

their glory is His. See on i. 1. Of course the glory of Christ *before* the incarnation is intended, the *μορφή θεοῦ* (Phil. ii. 6), in which He was. — *καὶ ἐλάλ. περὶ αὐτοῦ*] still dependent on *οἷτι*; *ἐλάλησε* has the emphasis as the correlate of *εἶδε*.

Vv. 42, 43. *Ὁμως μέντοι*] *yet, notwithstanding*, Herod. i. 189; Plat. *Crit.* p. 54 D, *Men.* p. 92 E; comp. the strengthened *ὁμως γε μέντοι*, Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 343; Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 172 f. It limits the judgment on the unbelief of the Jews, which had previously been expressed in general terms. — *καὶ ἐκ τ. ἀρχ.*] *even of the Sanhedrists* (in secret, vii. 48). — *διὰ τοὺς Φαρισ.*] the most hostile and dreaded party opposed to Jesus in and outside the Sanhedrim. — *ἀποσυνάγ.*] comp. ix. 22. — *τὴν δόξ. τ. ἀνθρ.*] *the honour coming from men.* Comp. v. 44. — *τὴν δόξ. τοῦ θεοῦ*] *the honour which God imparts.* Comp. Rom. iii. 23. They preferred the *honour of men* (*potius*, see on iii. 19) rather than to stand in honour with *God*. Theirs was thus not yet that faith strengthened for a free confession, as Jesus demands it (Matt. x. 32), with the setting aside of temporal interests; Augustine calls it *ingressus fidei*. Where subsequently the right *advance* followed, the unhesitating *confession* also was forthcoming, as in the cases of Nicodemus and of Joseph of Arimathaea. But that of *Gamaliel* is not applicable here (Godet); he did *not* get so far as faith. — On *ἤπερ*, as strengthening the negative force of the *ἣ* (comp. 2 Macc. xiv. 42), see Kühner, II. sec. 747, note 4.

Vv. 44, 45. The closing observations on Jewish unbelief, vv. 37-43, are ended. Over against this unbelief, together with that faith which stood in fear of men, vv. 42, 43, John now gives further, vv. 44-50, an energetic *summing up*, a condensed *summary* of that which Jesus has hitherto clearly and openly preached concerning His personal dignity and the divinity of His teaching, in condemnation of such conduct ("*Jesus, on the other hand, cried and said,*" etc.), whereby the reprehensible nature of that unbelief and half-belief comes clearly into view. So substantially Bengel, Michaelis, Morus, Kuinoel, Lücke, Tholuck, Olshausen, Maier, Schweizer,

the *αὐτοῦ*, implying the identity of Christ with the Logos, here shows clearly enough that the latter is viewed as personal. Comp. also Pfleiderer, in Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr.* 1866, p. 258.

B. Crusius, Reuss, Baur,<sup>1</sup> Lange, Brückner, Weizsäcker,<sup>2</sup> Ebrard, Baeumlein, Ewald, Godet. Ver. 36 is decisive for the correctness of this interpretation, according to which Jesus has departed from the public scene of action without any announcement of His reappearance; and it is confirmed partly by the nature of the following discourse, which contains mere echoes of earlier utterances; partly by the fact that throughout the whole discourse there are no addressed persons present; partly by the aorists, *ἐλάλησα*, vv. 48, 49, pointing to the concluded past. This is not in opposition to *ἔκραξε καὶ εἶπεν* (against Kling, De Wette, Hengstenberg; also Strauss in the interest of the non-originality of the Johannean discourses), since these words (comp. vii. 28, 37, i. 15) do not of themselves more closely define the point of time which is intended. Hence we are neither to assume, with De Wette, that with John the recollection of the discourses of Jesus shaped itself "under his hand" into a discourse, genuine indeed, but never delivered in such language (what unconsciousness and passivity he is thereby charged with! and see, in opposition, Brückner); nor are we to say, with Chrysostom and all the older commentators, also Kling and Hengstenberg, that Jesus here for once did publicly so speak (*ἐνδόντος τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις τοῦ θυμοῦ, πάλιν ἀνεφάνη κ. διδάσκει*, Euth. Zigabenus), in accordance with which several lay hold of the explanation, in contradiction with the text, that He spoke what follows *in ipso discessu*, ver. 36 (Lampe). But when Luthardt (following Besser, in the *Zeitschr. f. Luth. Theol.* 1852, p. 617 ff.) assumes that Christ spoke these words *in the presence of* the disciples, and with reference to the Jews, there stands in opposition to this not only the fact, generally, that John indicates nothing of the kind, but also that *ἔκραξε* is not appropriate to the circle of disciples, but to a scene of publicity. *Crying aloud He exclaimed*, whereby all His hearers were made sensible enough of the importance of the address, and the excuse of ignorance

<sup>1</sup> Baur, however, finds in this recapitulatory discourse only a new proof, that with John historical narration is a mere form of his method of representation. Comp. also Hilgenfeld.

<sup>2</sup> Yet the ideas (against Weizsäcker, in the *Jahrb. f. Deutsche Theol.* 1857, p. 167 f.) contained in this speech are not different from those of the prologue. The form is different, but not the matter; and the prologue contains more.

was cut off from them. — ὁ πιστ. εἰς ἐμὲ, κ.τ.λ.] A saying which John has not in the previous discourses. Comp., however, as to the thing, v. 36 ff., vii. 29, viii. 19, 42, x. 38. — οὐ . . . ἀλλ'] simply negating. The object of faith is *not* the personality of Jesus in itself,—that human appearance which was set forth in Him, as if He had come in His own name (v. 43),—but *God*, so far as the latter reveals Himself in Him as in His ambassador, by means of His words and deeds. Comp. vii. 16; Mark ix. 37. Similarly: *He who beholds me*, etc., ver. 45. Comp. i. 14, xiv. 9. Yet in *this* connection the negation (οὐ θεωρεῖ ἐμέ) is not expressed, although it *might* have been expressed; but what had to be affirmed was, that the beholding of Christ was *at the same time* the beholding of His Sender. In *His* working and administration, the believing eye beholds that of the *Sender*; in the δόξα of the *Son*, that of the *Father*, i. 14; Heb. i. 3.

Ver. 46. Comp. viii. 12, ix. 5, xii. 35, 36. — ἐγώ] *I*, no other, *I am the light*, as possessor and communicator of the divine truth of salvation, *come into the world*, etc. — μὴ μείνῃ] as he is, in a state of unbelief, but that he may be enlightened. Comp. ver. 36, i. 4 ff.

Vv. 47, 48. Comp. iii. 17, 18, v. 45 ff., viii. 15 ff. — *If any one shall have heard the words from me*, does not denote hearing in the sense of *believing* (Lücke), but a hearing which is in itself indifferent (Matt. vii. 26; Mark iv. 15, 16, xviii. 20); and by the κ. μὴ φυλάξῃ which follows (see the critical notes), that very faith which follows hearing is *denied*. φυλάσσειν, namely, denotes not indeed the mere *holding fast, guarding* (ver. 25), but, as throughout, where doctrines, precepts, and the like are spoken of (see especially Luke xi. 28, xviii. 21; Rom. ii. 26), the keeping by actual *fulfilment*. But this takes place simply by *faith*, which Christ demands for His ῥήματα: *with faith* the φυλάσσειν comes into action (hence the *Recepta* κ. μὴ πιστεύσῃ is a correct gloss); the *refusal of faith* is the *rejection of Christ* (ἀθετεῖν, here only in John, but comp. Luke x. 16; 1 Thess. iv. 8), and *non-adoption of His words*, ver. 48, is the opposite of that φυλάσσειν so far as its essence is just the ὑπακοή τῆς πίστεως. — On ἀκούειν with a double genitive, as in Luke vi. 47, Acts xxii. 1, comp. xviii. 37; and see Buttmaun, *N. T. Gr.*

p. 145 [E. T. p. 167]. — ἐγὼ οὐ κρίνω αὐτόν] *I, in my person, am not his judge*, which is further meant *generally*, not exclusively, of the *last* judgment, but in a *condemnatory* sense, as opposed to σώζειν, as in iii. 17 — Ver. 48. ἔχει] Placed first with great emphasis: he *has his judge*; he *stands already under his trial*. But this judge, says Christ, is not Himself, as an individual personally considered in and by Himself, but His spoken word; this and nothing else will be (and therewith all the terror of the *last* decision breaks in upon the mind) the determining rule of the *last* judgment. It is *Christ*, indeed, who holds the judgment (v. 22, 27), but as the bearer and executor of His word, which constitutes the divine power of the judgment. Comp. vii. 51, where the law judges and takes cognisance. How decisively does the present passage declare against the attempt of Scholten, Hilgenfeld, Reuss, and others, to explain away the last judgment out of John! Comp. vv. 28, 29; 1 John iv. 17.

Vv. 49, 50. Comp. vii. 16, v. 30. — δτι] gives the reason for the expression in vv. 47, 48: for how plainly *divine* is this my word! — ἐξ ἐμαυτοῦ] αὐτοκέλευστος, Nonnus. — αὐτός] *ipse*. — ἐντολ. ἔδ.] He has *given* (laid upon) me a charge, what I should say, and what I should speak. The former designates the doctrine according to its contents, the latter the publication of it through the delivery which makes it known. Comp. on viii. 43; Rom. iii. 19. For similar accumulations of the verbs of speaking in Greek writers, see Dissen, *ad Dem. de Cor.* p. 187; Lobeck, *Paral.* p. 61. — ἡ ἐντολὴ αὐτοῦ] namely the commission which has just previously been more minutely designated. This is, because it is in truth the outflow and channel of the divine redemptive will, *eternal life* (according to its temporal development and eternal consummation); it *is* this, however (comp. vi. 33, xvii. 17; comp. xi. 25, xiv. 6), not as the mere means, but as, in its fulfilment, the efficient power of life in virtue of the grace and truth which are received by believers out of the fulness of Jesus, i. 14, 16. — οὖν] Since that ἐντολή is of so great efficacy, how could I speak that which I speak otherwise than as the *Father* has said it to me (at my appointment)? Observe the correlation of ἐγὼ and ὁ πατήρ, as well as the measured simple solemnity of the close of this address.



## CHAPTER XIII.

VER. 1. ἐλήλυθεν] Lachm. and Tisch.: ἦλθεν, according to preponderating evidence. The perfect arose from xii. 23.—  
 Ver. 2. γενομένου] B. L. X.  $\aleph$ . Cant. Or.: γινομένου (but Or. has once γενομ.). So Tisch. The aorist was introduced through the non-observance of the point of time, as being the more current form in the narrative.—'Ιούδα Σίμ. 'Ισκ., ἵνα αὐτὸν παραδῶ] B. L. M. X.  $\aleph$ . Copt. Arm. Vulg. Codd. It. Or.: ἵνα παραδῶ αὐτὸν 'Ιούδας Σίμωνος 'Ισκαριώτης. So Lachm. on the margin, and Tisch. (both, however, reading παραδοῖ, according to B. D.\*  $\aleph$ . only). This reading, considering the important witnesses by which it is attested, is the more to be preferred, as it was very early misunderstood, because it was supposed that the seduction of Judas by the devil was here related (so already Origen). The *Recepta* is an alteration in consequence of this misunderstanding. The conjunctive form παραδοῖ, however, remains generally doubtful in the N. T.—  
 Ver. 3. ὁ 'Ιησοῦς] is wanting in B. D. L. X. Cursives, Vulg. It. Or. Bracketed by Lachm., omitted by Tisch. It was mechanically repeated from ver. 1.—  
 Ver. 10. The position of the words οὐκ ἔχει χρεῖαν is decisively attested.—  
 Instead of ἦ, important witnesses have εἰ μὴ (so Lachm.), which, however, is an attempt at explanation or correction. Tisch. has deleted ἦ τ πύδας, but only after  $\aleph$ . Or. one Cod. of It. and Vulg. mss. An old omission, occasioned by the following καθαροῦλος.—  
 Ver. 12. ἀναπεσών] Lachm.: καὶ ἀναπ. according to A. L. Verss. Chrys. In favour of καὶ, witness also B. C.\*  $\aleph$ . Or., which have καὶ ἀνέπεσεν (so Tisch.). The καὶ before ἔλαβ. is omitted by Lachm. after A. L. Verss. Since καὶ before ἀναπ. is in any case decisively accredited; since, further, the witnesses for ἀνέπεσεν are more important than for ἀναπεσών; and since, had ἀναπεσών been the original reading, it would not have been resolved into καὶ ἀνέπεσεν, but into ἀνέπεσεν καὶ,—we must read with Tisch. καὶ ἀνέπεσεν, so that the apodosis first begins with εἶπεν. This was not observed, and it was made to commence either after πύδας αὐτῶν (thus arose the reading in Lachm.), or after ἱμάτ. αὐτοῦ (hence the *Recepta*).—  
 Ver. 22. οὖν] is wanting in B. C. and certain Verss.; deleted by Tisch. Was easily passed over

after the last syllable of ἔβλεπον. — Ver. 23. ἐκ τῶν (Elz.: τῶν) is decisively attested. — Ver. 24. πῦθίσθαι, τίς ἂν εἴη] B. C. L. X. 33. Aeth. Ver. Rd. Vulg. Or.: καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· εἰπὲ τίς ἐστίν. So Lachm. and Tisch. Rightly: the *Recepta* is added, as a gloss, after what John does in ver. 25. κ. has the gloss *alongside* of the original reading in the text. — Ver. 25. ἐπιπίπτειν] B. C.\* K. L. X. Π.\* κ.\*\* Cursives, Or.: ἀναπείσων (so Lachm.). But ἐπιπίπτειν does not occur elsewhere in John; and how readily would the familiar expression of lying *at table* suggest itself to mechanical copyists! — Instead of οὖν, Elz. and Lachm. have δέ. Witnesses are much divided. Originally, no particle at all appears to have been found; so B. C. Or. Griesb. — After ἐκείνος, important witnesses (including B. C. L.) have οὕτως, which, however, although defended by Ewald, very readily arose from οὗτος, which was added to ἐκείνος in explanation, as it is still found in K. S. U. A. — Ver. 26. βάψας τὸ ψωμίον ἐπιδώσω] Tisch.: βάψω τ. ψ. καὶ δώσω αὐτῷ, after B. C. L. Copt. Aeth. Or. But ἐπιδιδόναι, which is not elsewhere found in John, does not betray the hand of an interpreter, and therefore the reading of Tisch. is rather to be considered as the usual resolution of the participle, with neglect of the compound. — Instead of βάψας, as above, Lachm. has ἐμβάψ., following A. D. K. Π. Theodoret. Although these witnesses form the preponderance among those which read the participle, yet ἐμβάψ. might be very readily introduced from the parallels, Matt. xxvi. 23, Mark xiv. 20; and for the originality of the simple form, the weighty witnesses (B. C. L. etc.) who have βάψω (not ἐμβάψω) are accordingly all the more to be taken into account. Therefore, too, below, instead of καὶ ἐμβάψας (so also Lachm.), with B. C. L. X. κ. 33. Or. Cyr., βάψας οὖν (so Tisch.) ought to be read (D. has καὶ βάψας). — After ψωμίον, Tisch. has, moreover, λαμβάνει καί, following B. C. L. M. X. κ.\*\* Aeth. Or. Rightly: it was, through misapprehension, omitted as irrelevant. — Instead of Ἰσκαριώτῃ, Lachm. should consistently, following B. C. L. M. X. κ. Cursives, Codd. It. Or., here also (see on vi. 71) have read Ἰσκαριώτου (as Tisch. has). — Ver. 30. Instead of εὐθὺς ἐξῆλθ., read with Lachm. and Tisch. ἐξῆλθ. εὐθύς. — Ver. 31. After ὅτε, Elz. Lachm. and Tisch. have οὖν; rightly, since B. C. D. L. X. κ. Cursives, Verss. Or. Cyr., turn the scale in favour of οὖν, while the omission (Griesb. Scholz) was the more readily suggested, as there was an inclination to begin the new sentence with ἦν δὲ νύξ. — Ver. 32. εἰ ὁ θ. ἔδοξ. ἐν αὐτῷ] is rejected by Scholz as “inepta iteratio,” and bracketed by Lachm. The words are wanting in B. C.\* D. L. X. Π. κ.\* Cursives, Verss. Tert. Ambr. But the very repetition and the *homoeoteleuton* would so readily

occasion the omission, that these adverse witnesses cannot overthrow the reading.—Ver. 33. The order ἐγὼ ὑπάγω (Lachm. Tisch.) is too decisively attested to admit of its being derived from viii. 21.—Ver. 36. The order ἀπολ. δὲ ὕστερον (without μοι) is to be adopted, with Lachm. and Tisch.; so also in ver. 38, ἀποκρίνεται (instead of ἀπεκρίθη).—Ver. 38. The form φωνήσῃ (Lachm. Tisch.) is decisively accredited; and instead of ἀπαρνῆσῃ, ἀρνήσῃ is, with Lachm. and Tisch., following B. D. L. X. 1. Or., to be read, in place of which the compound was introduced from Matt. xxvi. 34 and the parallel passages.

Vv. 1-5. On the construction, note: (1) vv. 1-5 are not to be taken together as a single period (Griesbach, Matthaei, Schulz, Scholz, Bleek, Ebrard, and several others); as Paul also (in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1866, p. 362 ff., 1867, p. 524 ff.) defines the connection: "*He stands up before the Passover feast at the meal then taking place,*" which latter would be a collateral definition of πρὸ τ. ἑορτ. τ. π. To take the whole thus together will not do, because εἰς τέλος ἡγάπ. αὐτοὺς being connected with πρὸ δὲ ἑορτ. τ. π. gives an orderly finish to the construction of ver. 1, and with καὶ δείπνου γιν. a new period begins; consequently (this also in answer to Knapp, Lücke, Ebrard, and several others) εἰδώς, ver. 3, cannot be the resumption of εἰδώς, ver. 1. Rightly have Lachmann and Tischendorf closed ver. 1 with a *full stop*. Comp. Hengstenberg and Godet, also Ewald. (2) It is not correct to join πρὸ τῆς ἑορτ. τ. πάσχα to εἰδώς (Kling, Luthardt, Riggenbach, Graf in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1867, p. 741 ff.; before him also Baeumlein in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1846, p. 397), because the expression would be too vague and indefinite as a statement of the point of time in which the definite consciousness of His hour had entered the mind of Jesus; the definite day before the feast would be *designated* as such (perhaps by πρὸ μιᾶς ἡμέρας τοῦ πάσχα, comp. xii. 1; Plut. *Sull.* 37). But that πρὸ τῆς ἑορτῆς—comp. with xii. 1—must denote this very *day before* the feast, namely, the 14th Nisan (Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 295, Lange, Baeumlein, and several others, including Paul and Hengstenberg), is an altogether arbitrary assumption. Just as incorrect is it (3) to refer it to ἀγαπήσας (Wieseler, Tholuck, see in opposition Ewald, *Jahrb.* IX. p. 203), so that

the love entertained *before the feast* stands over against the love entertained *until the end*,—which assumption is extorted simply by an attempt at harmonizing, is opposed to the order of the words (*ἀγαπήσας . . . κόσμῳ* must in that case have stood *before εἰδώς, κ.τ.λ.*), and—through the *division* which is then made to appear of the love of Jesus (the love *before the feast*, and the love *from the feast onwards*)—is in contradiction with John's more reflective and spiritual manner; while it leaves, moreover, the participial clause *εἰδώς . . . πατέρα* without appropriate significance. The simple literal mode of connection is rather: *Before the feast, Jesus gave, as He knew, etc., to His own the closing proof of love. Whilst, then, a meal is being observed, as the devil already, etc., He arises from the meal, although He knew that the Father, etc.* There is thus nothing to place in a parenthesis.

Ver. 1. *Πρὸ δὲ τ. ἑορτ. τ. πάσχα*] *πρό* is emphasized by means of the intervening *δέ*. Jesus had arrived at Bethany six days before the Passover, on the following day (xii. 1, 12) had entered Jerusalem, and had then, xii. 36, withdrawn Himself into concealment. But yet *before* the paschal feast began,<sup>1</sup> there followed the closing manifestation of love before His death, which John intends to relate. *How long* before the feast, our passage does not state; but it is clear from ver. 29, xviii. 28, xix. 14, 31, that it was not first on the 14th Nisan, as the harmonists have frequently maintained (see, however, on xviii. 28), but<sup>2</sup> *on the 13th Nisan*, Thursday evening, at the Supper. On the 14th Nisan, in the evening, the festival commenced with the *paschal* meal, after Jesus had been crucified on the afternoon of the same day. Such is the view of John; see on xviii. 28. — *εἰδώς, κ.τ.λ.*] Not, "*although He knew*" (this is unpsychological, Hengstenberg), but *because He knew*. He gives expression to that which inwardly drew and impelled Him to display towards His own a further

<sup>1</sup> Rightly has Rückert observed, *Abendm.* p. 26, that by *πρὸ δὲ τῆς ἑορτῆς* the possibility of thinking of a point of time within the Passover, and thus even of the paschal meal, is precluded for the reader who has advanced so far. Incorrectly, Riggenbach, *Zeugn. f. d. Ev. Joh.* p. 72: there hangs over the present passage "*a certain darkness*." Certainly, if we set out from a harmonistic point of view. With such, rather is it entirely irreconcilable.

<sup>2</sup> See also Isenberg, *d. Todestag des Herrn*, 1868, p. 7 ff.

and a last token of love; He *knew*, indeed, *that for Him the hour was come, to pass onward*, etc. (*ἵνα*, comp. xii. 23). On *μεταβῆ*, comp. v. 24; 1 John iii. 14. — *ἀγαπήσας*, κ.τ.λ.] is regarded by interpreters as co-ordinated with *εἰδώς*, κ.τ.λ., according to the well-known usage, which rests on a logical basis, of the *asyndetic* connection of several participles (Voigtler, *ad Luc. D. M.* xii. p. 67 ff.; Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* i. 1. 7); so that the meaning would be: *As He had* (ever) *loved His own*, so also at the very last He gave them a true proof of love. But opposed to this is the absence of an *ἀεί*, which Nonnus supplies, or of *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς*, or *πάλαι* or the like, along with *ἀγαπήσας*, whereby a correlation with *εἰς τέλος* would have been established. In addition to this, the clause *τοὺς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ*, not in itself indispensable, but expressive of sorrow, is manifestly added in reference to the preceding *ἐκ οὗ κόσμου τ.*, and thereby betrays the connection of *ἀγαπήσας* . . . *κόσμῳ* with the final clause *ἵνα μεταβῆ*, κ.τ.λ. Hence: "*in order to pass to the Father, after He should have* (not *had*) *loved*," etc. This, "*after He should have loved*," etc., is a testimony which His conscience yielded Him with that *εἰδώς*, κ.τ.λ. — *τοὺς ἰδίους*] This relationship—the N. T. fulfilment of the old theocratic, i. 11—had its fullest representation in the circle of apostles, so that the apostles were pre-eminently the *ἴδιοι* of Jesus. — *εἰς τέλος ἡγάπ. αὐτούς*] to be connected with *πρὸ δὲ τῆς ἑορτ. τ. π.*: *at last* (*εἰς τέλος* is emphatic) He loved them, *i.e. showed them the last proof of love* before His death.<sup>1</sup> How, the *καὶ δείπνου*, κ.τ.λ., which immediately follows, expresses, namely, by means of the washing of the feet, hence it cannot be understood of the whole work of love in *suffering* (Graf). *εἰς τέλος* denotes *at the end, finally, at last*. Luke xviii. 5 (see commentary *in loc.*); Hdt. iii. 40; Xen. *Oec.* xvii. 10; Soph. *Phil.* 407 (and Hermann's note). So also 1 Thess. ii. 16. It may also denote *fully, in the highest degree* (Pflugk, *ad Eur. Hec.* 817 Schweighäuser, *Lex. Polyb.* p. 616; Grimm on 2 Macc. viii. 29); but this yields here an inappropriate gradation, as though Jesus had now exercised His love to the

<sup>1</sup> Ebrard's inconsiderate objection (on Olshausen, p. 337) against my connection of *εἰς τέλος ἡγάπ.* with *πρὸ τ. ἑορτῆς*, since *εἰς τέλος ἡγάπ.* is the last *performance* of love, will probably be found by him to fall of itself to the ground.

utmost (in answer to Godet). It was the *like* love with the preceding ἀγαπήσας, only the *last proof* before departure; for His hour was come. — On ἡγάπησεν, of *actually* manifested love, comp. ver. 34; 1 John iv. 10, 19; Eph. ii. 4, v. 2, 25.

NOTE.—From the present passage—since πρὸ τῆς ἑορτῆς gives the chronological measure for the following supper, and therewith for the whole history of the passion—already appears the irreconcilable variance in which John stands towards the Synoptics in respect of the day of Jesus' death. See details on xviii. 28. Even if πρὸ τῆς ἑορτ. were to be connected with εἰδώς, this statement of time would nevertheless only be historically explicable from the fact that Jesus, conformably to the certainty which entered His mind *before the feast*—"my hour is come"—did what follows not first *at the feast*, i.e. after the beginning of the feast on the evening of the 14th Nisan, but just *before* the feast (i.e. at least on the evening of the 13th Nisan), in the consciousness that now His time was fulfilled, satisfying His love for the last time. Luthardt incorrectly concludes that, if Jesus knew already *before* the feast, etc., He must have died *at the feast*. Of such an antithesis the text contains in truth not the slightest indication. Rather, if Jesus knew *before* the feast, etc., and acted in this consciousness, we are not at liberty to move forward the δεῖπνον, and that which is connected therewith, *to* the feast. The matter lies simply thus: If the supper were that of the 14th Nisan, then John could not say πρὸ τῆς ἑορτῆς, but only either πρὸ τοῦ δείπνου τοῦ πάσχα (which sense is imported by Hengstenberg); or, on the other hand, like the Synoptics, τῇ πρώτῃ τῶν ἁζύμων (Matt. xxvi. 17), or τ. πρώτη τῆς ἑορτῆς. The 15th Nisan was already ἡ ἑπαύριον τοῦ πάσχα (LXX. Num. xxxiii. 3: חַמִּשָּׁה עָשָׂר בְּחֹדֶשׁ, comp. Josh. v. 11); but the 14th was הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה ה' פֶּסַח, Num. xxviii. 16, *et al.*, ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ πάσχα. Comp. *Introd.* § 2.

Vv. 2-5. And (*et quidem*) this εἰς τέλος ἡγάπησεν αὐτούς He fulfilled at the supper by the washing of the feet. — *δείπνου γινομ.*] Note the *present* standing in relation to the present ἐγείρεται, ver. 4 (see critical notes). *Whilst it is becoming supper-time*, i.e. *whilst supper-time is on the point of being kept*. They had already *reclined* for the purpose, vv. 4, 12. According to the *Recepta*, γενομ., the meal was not yet over (Luther and several others, including Klee and Hofmann, p. 207, who explains as though μετὰ τὸ δεῖπνον were ex-

pressed), but already in progress,—supper had *begun*. This itself was, according to ver. 1, not the *paschal supper*, but (hence also without the article<sup>1</sup>) an ordinary evening meal on the 13th Nisan (in opposition to the synoptical account) in Jerusalem (not in Bethany, see on xiv. 31), the *last* repast of Jesus before His death, at which He founded the Lord's Supper (xiii. 21 ff., 38, xviii. 1). The *institution of the Supper* is not mentioned by John,—not as though he were unacquainted with it (Strauss), or had perceived no ecclesiastical rite at all involved in it (Scholten), but because it was universally known (1 Cor. xi.), and the practice itself was in daily use (Acts ii. 46). Accordingly, not repeating the account of this, because known to all, he rather selected from the abundance of that last night what he found, over and above, to be most in harmony with his peculiar object, the making known the *δόξα* of the *λόγος* in the flesh,—in the washing of the feet *χάρις*, in the discourses *χάρις* and *ἀλήθεια*. According to Schenkel, John desired by his silence to preclude the notions of a *magical* effect resulting from the Lord's Supper, and the later *controversies* concerning it. As though such a purpose would not have required the very opposite procedure, viz. distinct *instruction*! Baur's assumption, p. 264, is, that the evangelist has dated back the importance of the Supper to the second Passover, chap. vi., because he did not wish to allow the last meal of Jesus to pass for the same as that in the Synoptics, namely, as a paschal meal. Comp. also Scholten, p. 289 ff. But for this purpose such an inversion of the synoptical material would not have been at all necessary. He could have mentioned the institution of the Supper at the last meal in such a way that this would nevertheless *not* have been a paschal meal.—*τοῦ διαβόλου ἤδη, κ.τ.λ.*] cannot serve merely as a *prelude* to the *subsequent* and more frequent mention of

<sup>1</sup> Certainly it is often indifferent whether the article stands with *δῆλον* or not, but here it *must* have stood, had it been intended to indicate that solemn meal of the 14th Nisan, the venerable *meal of the feast*. In xxi. 20 the article had to be expressed, because it *points backwards*. This in answer to Tholuck. Hofmann, Lange, and Paul also get over too readily the want of the article; and even Graf imports the meaning, which is incompatible with the absence of the article: "After the principal part of the supper, the eating of the paschal lamb, was over."

the relation of Jesus to the traitor (vv. 10, 18, 21, 26, 27, 30), as Godet maintains, which would be only a formal purpose, and one not in correspondence with the tragically solemn emphasis. Again, it is not even intended to make us sensible of the *forbearance* of Jesus, who Himself washed the feet of *Judas*<sup>1</sup> (Euth. Zigabenus, comp. Chrysostom, Calvin, and several others), nor generally, as it were, the mere *nearness* (ἤδη) *in point of time* of the last destiny, which He yet employed in such a work of love (this, indeed, was already contained in εἰδώς, κ.τ.λ.), but—to what the ἤδη points—the *undisturbed clear elevation* of this His might of love over the outbreak, *already so near*, of the tragic *devilish* treachery, which could not even now, immediately before its occurrence, confuse His mind. According to the reading 'Ιούδας Σίμ. 'Ισκαριώτης (see the critical notes), we must explain: *the devil having already formed the design that Judas should deliver Him up*, so that the καρδιά is not that of *Judas* (Luthardt, Baeumlein), as in the *Recepta*, but that of the *devil* (comp. Vulgate); as also in the classics βάλλειν or βάλλεσθαι εἰς νοῦν, εἰς θυμόν, ἐν φρεσίν, very frequently denotes *in animum inducere, statuere, deliberare*. See Wetstein *in loc.*; Kypke, II. p. 399; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* I. p. 294. The more current this mode of speech was, the less can we be surprised in an anthropomorphic representation of the devil at the mention of his heart (in answer to Lücke, Godet, and others), in which he has his ἐπιθυμίας (viii. 44), μεθοδείας (Eph. vi. 11), νοήματα (2 Cor. ii. 11), etc. As the heart of *God* may be spoken of (Acts xiii. 22), so also the heart of the *devil*. — 'Ιούδας Σίμ. 'Ισκαρ.] The full name, and at the close contains a shuddering emphasis.—The participial clause, further, is not to be placed in a parenthesis; it is co-ordinated with δείπνου γινόμεν. — εἰδώς, κ.τ.λ.] *Although He knew* (ὅμως εἰς ἄκραν συγκατέβη ταπεινώσειν, Euth. Zigabenus). The consciousness of His divine elevation rested, while on this threshold of death, in the fact that now, being on the point of entering, by stepping over this threshold, upon His glorification, the *Messianic fulness of power*, which had formerly been bestowed upon Him on the occasion of His mission (Matt.

<sup>1</sup> Otherwise special prominence must have been given in what follows to the washing of his feet.



xi. 27), which extended over all things, and was limited by nothing, was given into His hands for complete exercise (comp. on xvii. 2, Matt. xxviii. 18); and that *God*, as He was the source of His coming (comp. on viii. 42), so is the goal of His present departure. — On πάντα δέδωκεν αὐτῷ comp. 1 Cor. xv. 25; Eph. ii. 22; Phil. ii. 9-11, *et al.* — Ver. 4. ἐγείρεται, κ.τ.λ.] Note how the *whole representation regards things as present*; to the historic present correspond the present and perfect participles γινομ., βεβληκ., εἰδώς, vv. 2, 3. On τίσ. τὰ ἰμάτ. comp. Plut. *Alc.* 8. — The *washing of the feet* was wont to take place *before the beginning* of the meal, by the ministry of *slaves* (see Dougt. *Anal.* II. p. 50; Stuck. *Antt. conviv.* p. 217); it was not, however, always observed; see on Luke vii. 44. Hence we cannot argue, from the omission of it up to this point at this meal (for the guests had already reclined at table), either *against* (Wichelhaus) or *in favour of* (Lange: the host was bound to eat *with his family*) the supposition that the meal was the Passover meal.—Any *peculiar cause* for the extraordinary procedure of Jesus is not intimated by John; and to drag in such from the dispute among the disciples about rank, mentioned in Luke xxii. 24 ff. (so, following the older commentators, Ebrard, Hengstenberg, Godet, with various representations of the scenic associations; also Baur, who, however, regards the narrative only as the exposition, given in a historical form, of Matt. xx. 26, 27, and Luke xxii. 26, 27, 28, after Strauss had maintained it to be a mythical rendering of a synoptical discourse on humility), is arbitrary in itself, since John, fully as he introduces his narrative in vv. 1, 2, gives not the slightest indication of the above, while it is appropriate neither to the position nor to the validity of the account of Luke (see on Luke xxii. 24). The symbolical act of departing love must, especially since Jesus had already reclined at table, have been the outcome of the moment, arising from His own urgent consideration of that which was needful for the disciples and for His work. Comp. Ewald, *Gesch. Chr.* p. 542.—διέζωσεν αὐτ.] setting forth the *personal performance* more than the means (comp. xxi. 18). He is, in truth, entirely a *servant*, πάντα μετὰ πάσης προθυμίας αὐτουργήσας (Euth. Zigabenus). — βάλλει ὕδωρ] *He pours water.* Comp. Pla-

nudius in Bachmann, *Anal.* 2. p. 90, 18. — εἰς τ. νιπτ.] into the wash basin standing by. "Nihil ministerii omittit," Grotius. — ἤρξατο] for the act commenced was interrupted when Peter's turn came, and not till after ver. 10 was it continued and finished. John employs the ἤρξατο, so common in the other evangelists, here only in this minute description. — ᾧ] with which (Hom. *Il.* x. 77, *Od.* xviii. 66; Athen. x. p. 443 B), or instead of ὃ, by attraction (Rev. i. 13, xv. 6), as in xvii. 5, 11.

Vv. 6-9. Ἐρχεται οὖν] So that He then made a commencement with *another disciple*, not with *Peter himself* (so Augustine, Beda, Nonnus, Rupertius, Cornelius a Lapide, Maldonatus, Jansen, and other Catholics in the Romish interest; but also Baumgarten-Crusius, Ewald, Hengstenberg). With *whom* (Chrysostom and Euth. Zigabenus point to Judas Iscariot, whom, however, Nonnus makes to be last) is left altogether undetermined. — σύ μου, κ.τ.λ.] ἐκπλαγείς εἶπε τοῦτο καὶ σφόδρα εὐλαβηθεῖς, Euth. Zigabenus. The emphasis lies, in the first instance, upon σύ; not afterwards, however, on μου, as if ἐμοῦ had been used, but on τ. πόδας: Dost *Thou* wash my feet? The present νίπτεις, like λβαζέτε, x. 32, and ποιεῖς, ver. 27. — Ver. 7. Note the antithesis of ἐγὼ . . . σύ. What *He* did was not the external work of washing (so *Peter* took it), but that which this washing signified in the *mind* of Jesus, namely, the σημεῖον of the morally purifying, ministering love. — μετὰ ταῦτα] namely, through the instruction, vv. 13-17. To refer this to the *later apostolic enlightenment and experience* (Chrysostom, Grotius, Tholuck, Hengstenberg, Ewald, and several others) is not justified by the text (comp. γινώσκετε, ver. 12), and would have been expressed, as in ver. 36, by the antithesis of νῦν and ὕστερον. — Ver. 8. Peter, instead of now complying, as became him, refuses with definite and vehement decision. But Jesus puts before him a *threat* connected with the necessity of this feet-washing, which could only have its ground and justification in the *higher moral* meaning of which the act was to be the quiet symbolic language. Thus He intends what He now says not of the external performance as such in and by itself, but of the ethical contents which it is symbolically to set forth, after Ho

had already indicated, ver. 7, *that* something higher lay in this act. It is precisely John who has apprehended and reported in the most faithful and delicate manner how Jesus knew to employ the sensuous as a foil to the spiritual, and thus to ascend, first enigmatically, then more clearly, and ever higher, towards the very highest. He says: *If I shall not have washed thee, thou hast no part with me.* Thereby He undoubtedly means the *feet-washing* which He intended to perform (τοὺς πόδας σου was to be understood as a matter of course, according to the connection,—against Hofmann, II. 2, p. 323), yet according to the *ethical* sense, which it was to set forth symbolically, and impress in a way not to be forgotten. Washing is the old sacred picture of moral purification. Hence the thought of Jesus divested of this symbolical wrapping is: *If I shall not have purified thee*, just as I now would wash thy feet, *from the sinful nature still adhering to thee, thou hast no share with me* (in the eternal possession of salvation). When Hengstenberg here takes the washing as the symbol of the *forgiveness of sins* (according to Ps. li. 4), this is opposed to vv. 12 ff. — Peter, as ver. 9 shows, did not yet understand the higher meaning of the Lord's words; he could but take His answer in the external sense that immediately offered itself (*if, in disobedience to me, thou dost not suffer thyself to be washed by me, thou hast*, etc.). The thought, however, of being a man separated, by further resistance, from Jesus and His salvation, was sufficiently overpowering for His ardent love to make him offer forthwith not merely His feet, but also the remaining unclothed parts of His body, His hands and His head, to be washed; καὶ ἐν τῇ παραιτήσει καὶ ἐν τῇ συγχωρήσει σφοδρότερος, ἑκάτερα γὰρ ἐξ ἀγάπης, Cyril — εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα] *while eternity lasts*, spoken with passion. Comp. 1 Cor. viii. 13. — μέρος ἔχειν μετά τινος] denotes the *participation in the same relation, in the like situation with any one*, Matt. xxiv. 51, Luke xii. 46, after the Hebrew מִן כָּל (Deut. xii. 12), and עִם כָּל (Deut. x. 9, xiv. 27; Ps. l. 18). The expression in the classics would be οὐκ ἔχεις or μετέχεις μέρος μου. It is the denial of the συγκληρονόμον εἶναι Χριστοῦ, and thus the threatening of exclusion from the ζωὴ and δόξα of the Lord.

Vv. 10, 11. Jesus sets the disciple right, and that by proceeding to speak of the washing in question according to the spiritual sense of which it is to be taken as the symbol, in order thereby to lead the disciple, who had misunderstood Him, to the true comprehension of the matter. According to the mere verbal sense, He says: "*He who has bathed needs nothing further than to wash his feet* (which have been soiled again by the road); *rather is he* (except as to this necessary cleansing of the feet) *clean in his entire body.*" But this statement, derived from experience of the sensuous province of life, serves as a symbolical wrapping of the ethical thought which Jesus desires to set forth: "*He who has already experienced moral purification in general and on the whole in fellowship with me, like him who has cleansed his whole body in the bath, requires only to be freed from the sinful defilement in individual things which has been again contracted in the intercourse of life; as one who has bathed only requires again the washing of his feet, but in other respects he is clean as to his whole moral personality.*" This necessity of *individual purification* demanding *daily penitence*, which Jesus here sets forth in the λελουμένος by τοὺς πόδας νίψασθαι, how manifest it became in the very case of Peter! *Eg.*, after he denied his Lord, and after the hypocrisy exhibited at Antioch, Gal. ii. To illustrate the *entire spiritual purification*<sup>1</sup> by ὁ λελουμένος, however, suggested itself so very naturally through the very feet-washing, which was just about to be undertaken as its correlate, that an allusion to *baptism* (Theodore of Mopsuestia, Augustine, Ruperti, Erasmus, Jansen, Zeger, Cornelius a Lapide, Schoettgen, Wetstein, and many others, including Olshausen, B. Crusius, Ewald, Hengstenberg, Godet), perhaps after 1 Cor. vi. 11, cannot be made good, while it is not even requisite to assume a reference to the by no means universal custom of bathing before meals. The word is to be thought of as the *purifying* element represented in ὁ λελουμένος; as also in the simile of the vine, which is analogous in regard to the matter of fact depicted, the καθαροί ἐστε,

<sup>1</sup> Calvin well remarks: "Non quod omni ex parte puri sint, ut nulla in illis macula amplius haereat, sed quoniam praecipua sui parte mundati sunt, dum scilicet ablatum est regnum peccato ut iustitia Dei superior sit."

xv. 3, is referred back only to the *word* of Christ as the ground thereof. But the notion of ethical *purification* must, in the connection of the entire symbolism of the passage, be also strictly and firmly maintained in οὐ χρεῖαν . . . νίψασθαι; so that the latter is not, as Linder, in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1867, p. 512 ff., thinks, intended to suggest that the clean man even may undergo the feet-washing,—not, however, for the object of purification, but as a token of love or humble subjection. —καὶ ὑμεῖς καθαροὶ ἐστε] Hereby Jesus now makes the application to Peter and his fellow-disciples of what was previously said in the form of a general proposition: “Ye also are clean,” as I, namely, have just expressed it of the λελουμένος; you also have attained in your living fellowship with me through my word to this moral purity of your entire personality; but—so He subjoins with deep grief, having Judas Iscariot in view—but not all! One there is amongst you who has frustrated in his own case the purifying influence of this union with me! Had Peter hitherto not yet seized the symbolical significance of the discourse of Jesus, yet now, on this application καὶ ὑμεῖς, κ.τ.λ., and on this tragical addition ἀλλ’ οὐχὶ πάντες, its meaning must have dawned upon his understanding. —ἥ] gives a comparative reference to the absolute expression οὐκ ἔχει χρ.: has no need (*further*) than. Comp. Xen. *Mem.* iv. 3. 9; Herod. vi. 52: οὐ δυναμένους δὲ γινῶναι ἢ καὶ πρὸ τούτου (*better* than even formerly); Soph. *Trach.* 1016; Winer, p. 473 [E. T. p. 638]. —τὸν παραδίδ. αὐτόν] *His betrayer*, Matt. xxvi. 48; John xviii. 2.—Further, what has been said of an *anti-Petrine aim* in this passage, in spite of i. 43, vi. 68, 69 (Strauss, Schwegler, Baur, Hilgenfeld), by which the desire for an Ebionitic lavation of the whole body has actually been ascribed to Peter (Hilgenfeld), is altogether imaginary.

Vv. 12, 13. Γινώσκετε, κ.τ.λ.] *know ye*, etc.; ἐρωτᾷ ἀγνοοῦντας, ἵνα διεγείρῃ εἰς προσοχήν, Euth. Zigabenus. Comp. Dissen, *ad Dem. de Cor.* p. 186. —τί] namely, according to the spiritual contents whose symbolical representation was the act that was presented to the senses.—Ver. 13. Ye call me Teacher and Lord. It was in this way that the pupils of the Rabbins addressed their teachers, רבי and מר; and so also did the disciples address Jesus as the *Messiah*, whose pupils

(Matt. xxiii. 8) and δούλοι (ver. 16) they were. Comp. on ὁ διδάσκ., xi. 28. On the nominativus *tituli*, see Buttmann, *N. T. Gramm.* p. 132 [E. T. p. 151]. φωνεῖν does not signify *to name*; but in the *article* lies the σὺ present to the mind in the act of calling upon (Krüger, § 45. 2. 6).

Vv. 14, 15. It is not the act itself, but its moral essence, which, after His example, He enjoins upon them to exercise. This moral essence, however, consists not in lowly and ministering love *generally*, in which Jesus, by washing the feet of His disciples, desired to give them an example, but, as ver. 10 proves, in *the ministering love which, in all self-denial and humility, is active for the moral purification and cleansing of others*. As Jesus had just set forth *this* ministering love by His own example, when He, although their Lord and Master, performed on the persons of His disciples the servile duty of washing their feet,—as an emblem, however, of the efficacy of His love to purify them spiritually,—so ought they to wash one another's feet; *i.e. with the same self-denying love to be reciprocally scrviceable to one another with a view to moral purification*. The interpretation of the prescription ὁφείλετε, κ.τ.λ., in the *proper* sense was not that of the apostolical age, but first arose at a later time, and was followed (first in the fourth century, comp. Ambrose, *de sacram.* iii. 1; Augustine, *ad Januar. cp.* 119) by the introduction of the washing of the feet of the baptized on Maundy Thursday, and other symbolical feet-washings (later also amongst the Mennonites and in the community of Brothers). 1 Tim. v. 10 contains the non-ritualistic reference to hospitality. The feet-washing by the *Pope* on Maundy Thursday is a result of the pretension to represent Christ, and as such, also, was strongly condemned by the Reformers. Justly, however, the church has not adopted the feet-washing into the number of the *sacraments*; for it is not the practice itself, but only the spiritual action, which it thoughtfully represents, that Jesus enjoined upon the disciples. And it is solely to this moral meaning that the promise in ver. 17 is attached; and hence the essential marks of the specific sacramental idea, corresponding to the essence of baptism and of the Supper—sacramental institution, promise, and collative force—are wanting to it. This in answer to

Böhmer, in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1850, p. 829 ff., who designates it an offence against Holy Scripture, that the Protestant church has not recognised the feet-washing as a sacrament, which, outside the Greek church,<sup>1</sup> it was explained to be by Bernard of Clairvaux (*"Sacramentum remissionis peccatorum quotidianorum"*), without any permanent result. Baeumlein also expresses himself in favour of the maintenance of the practice as a legacy of Christ. But its *essence* is preserved, where the *love*, from which the practice flowed, abides. Nonnus aptly designates the καθὼς ἐγὼ, κ.τ.λ. as ἰσοφυὲς μίμημα. The practice itself, moreover, cannot in truth be carried out either everywhere, or at all times, or by all, or on all. — ἐγὼ . . . καὶ ὑμεῖς] Argumentum a majori ad minus. The majus implied in ἐγὼ is further, by means of the subjoined ὁ κύριος κ. ὁ διδάσκ., brought home with special force to the mind, and therefore, also, the principal moment, ὁ κύριος (comp. ver. 16), is here *moved forward*. — ὑπόδειγμα] Later expression, instead of the old παράδειγμα. Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 12. — ἴνα, κ.τ.λ.] Design in setting the example: that, as *I* have done to you (*"in genere actus,"* Grotius), you also may do, namely, in ministering to one another in self-denying love for the removal of all sinful contamination, as *I*, for my part, have just figuratively fulfilled in your case, in the symbol of the feet-washing, this very ministering love directed to your moral purification.

Vv. 16, 17. Truly you, the lesser (ἀπόστολος: *one sent*), may not dispense with the performance of that which *I*, the greater, have here performed. Comp. xv. 20; Matt. x. 24; Luke vi. 40. — ταῦτα] That which *I* have set forth to you in accordance with the above (vv. 13–16) by my ὑπόδειγμα, by means of the feet-washing, and have made an obligation. — εἰ expresses the general, and ἐάν the particular, additional condition. Comp. on the twofold *protasis*, Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Phaed.* p. 67 E, *Apol.* p. 20 C; Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 512; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* I. p. 493. The εἰ makes a *definite* supposition (οἴδατε δὲ αὐτὰ παρ' ἐμοῦ μαθόντες, Euth. Zigabenus); ἐάν is *in case* you, etc. The knowing is objectively granted, the doing subjectively conditioned. — μακαρ.] said in refer-

<sup>1</sup> In which it has been preserved as a custom in monasteries.

ence to the happiness of the present and future *Messianic* ζωή. Comp. on xix. 29.

Vv. 18, 19. Οὐ περὶ πάντ. ὑμῶν λέγω] Namely, this that ye μακάριοι ἐστε, κ.τ.λ. "Est inter vos, qui non erit beatus neque faciet ea," Augustine. Unnecessarily and inappropriately, Tholuck refers back to ver. 10. — ἐγώ] *I for my part*, opposed to the *divine* determination (ἀλλ' ἕνα, κ.τ.λ.), according to which, however, the selection of apostles must take place in such a way that the traitor entered into the number of the chosen. In a very arbitrary manner Tholuck gives the *pregnant* meaning to ἐξελεξ.: whom I *peculiarly* have chosen. — οἶδα] I know of what *character* they are, so that I do not therefore deceive myself, if I do not say of you all, etc. — ἀλλ'] is *ordinarily* taken as the antithesis of οὐ περὶ π. ὑμ. λ., and is supplemented by τοῦτο γέγονεν (namely, that I cannot affirm, ver. 17, of you all); whilst *others* connect it with ὁ τρώγων, κ.τ.λ., and ἕνα ἡ γρ. κλ. is taken as an intermediate sentence (Semler, Kuinoel; admitted also by Lücke). The former view has no justification in the context, which suggests a τοῦτο γέγονεν just as little as in 1 Cor. ii. 9; the latter does not correspond to the importance which this very sentence of purpose has in the connection. The only supplement *in accordance with the text* is (comp. ix. 3, i. 8): ἐξελεξάμην αὐτούς: *But I made the choice in obedience to the divine destiny, in accordance with which the Scripture* (that which stands written, comp. xix. 37; Mark xii. 10; Luke iv. 21) *could not but be fulfilled*, etc. Comp. vi. 70, 71. The passage, freely cited from the original, is Ps. xli. 40, where the theocratic sufferer (*who* is unknown; not *David*, whom the superscription names) utters a saying which, according to divine determination, was to find its *Messianic* historical fulfilment in the treason of Judas. — ὁ τρώγ. μετ' ἐμοῦ τ. ἄρτ.] Deviating from the original (τῷ ἵππῳ), and from the LXX, yet without substantial alteration of the sense (*intimacy of table-companionship*, which, according to Hellenic views also, aggravated the detestable character of the crime; see Pflugk, *ad Eur. Hec.* 793), and involuntarily suggesting itself, since Judas actually *ate with Jesus* (τρώγ., vi. 56–58). — ἐπῆρεν] *has lifted up*. Note the *preterite*; Judas, so near to



an act of treason, is like him who has already lifted up his heel, in order to administer a kick to another. To explain the figure from the tripping of the foot in wrestling (πτερνίζειν), in the sense of overreaching, is less appropriate both to the words and to the facts (Jesus was not *overreached*). — Ver. 19. ἀπ' ἄρτι] not *now*, but as always in the N. T. (i. 52, xiv. 7; Matt. xxiii. 39, xxvi. 29, 64; Rev. xiv. 13): *from this time forward*. Previously, He has not yet *definitely* disclosed it. — πιστεύετε, κ.τ.λ.] Ye believe that I am He (the Messiah), and that no other is to be expected; see on viii. 24. How easily might the disciples have come to vacillate in their faith through the success of the treason of Judas, if He had not foreseen and foretold it as lying in the connection of the divine destiny! Comp. xiv. 29. But by means of this predictive declaration, what might have become ground of *doubt* becomes ground for *faith*.

Ver. 20. And for the furtherance and confirmation of this your fidelity in the faith, which, in spite of the treason arising from your midst, must not vacillate, I say to you, that ye may confidently go forward to meet your calling as my ambassadors (xx. 21). The *high and blessed position* of my ambassadors remains so unimpaired, that whoever accepts *them* accepts *me*, etc. The more, however, that Jesus could not but apprehend a disheartening impression from the treason on the rest of the disciples, the more earnestly (ἀμὴν, ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμ.) does He introduce this encouragement. Comp. Calvin: Christ would "*offendiculo mederi*;" and Grotius: "*ostendit ministeria ipsis injuncta non caritura suis solatiis*." The antithesis of the treason to the dignity of the apostolic circle (Hilgenfeld) He certainly does not mean to assert, so self-evident was this antithesis. But neither do the words serve to confirm the πιστεύς, ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι (Ebrard); to this the first half of the verse is not appropriate, in which, indeed, Godet, without any justification, would wish to give to the simple εἶναι the limiting sense: He among you, who is *really* my ambassador. Further: to join ver. 20 with vv. 16, 17 (Lampe, Storr, Klee, Maier, Hengstenberg, comp. Brückner) is an arbitrary construction, which Kuinoel aggravates by explaining the words as a *gloss* from Matt. x. 40, added to ver. 16,

and which subsequently entered the text in the wrong place, as Lücke also has revived the suspicion of a gloss (from Luke ix. 48). The absence of connection, employed by Strauss as an argument against the originality, is external, but not in the sequence of the thought itself; and besides, the emotion and agitation of Jesus are here to be taken into consideration. Only in view of the manifest identity of the saying with that of Matt. x. 40, we are not to explain it in an essentially different sense (Luthardt explains of the sending of those needing the ministry of love to the disciples). But to drag in here the dispute about rank, which Luke xxii. 24 ff. places *after* the supper (Baeumlein), is groundless, and of no use in the way of explanation.

NOTE.—The story of the feet-washing, vv. 1–20,—after Bretschneider, Fritzsche, and Strauss had rejected it as a mythical invention, whilst Weisse had recognised only individual portions in it as genuine,—has been justly defended by Schweizer, p. 164 ff., in conformity with its stamp of truth and originality, which throughout indicates the eye-witness; in opposition to which, Baur can only recognise a free formation out of synoptical material (see on vv. 2–5) in the service of the idea, as also Hilgenfeld, comp. Scholten. The non-mention of the occurrence in the Synoptics is explained from the fact that with them the situation is quite different, and the main point is the institution of the Supper.

Vv. 21, 22. The thought of Jesus recurs in deep excitement and agitation—owing to which, probably, an interrupting pause occurred—back to the traitor;<sup>1</sup> it constrains Him now to testify with the most straightforward definiteness what He knows, but at which He had previously only hinted: *One of you will betray me!* Comp. Matt. xxvi. 21, 22, in comparison with whose representation that of John is to be preferred. — τῷ πνεύματι] *in His Spirit* (xi. 33), not: through the *divine* Spirit (Hilgenfeld). — ἐβλεπον οὖν, κ.τ.λ.] “*percussi rei atrocitate vix credibili animis probis minimeque suspicacibus,*” Grotius. Judas may likewise have *dissembled*.

<sup>1</sup> The course of thought which Godet supposes is pure invention: “If the true apostle carries within himself God (ver. 20), the traitor carries in himself Satan” (ver. 25).

Vv. 23, 24. There was, however, reclining at table, one of the disciples, etc., so that ἦν belongs to ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ (Luke xvi. 23). The custom was to lie with the left arm supported on the cushion, and the feet stretched out behind, so that the right hand remained free for eating. The one who lay next reached, with the back of his head, to the *sinus* of the girdle (κόλπος, Luke vi. 38; Plin. *ep.* iv. 22) of the first, and had the feet of the first at his back; in like manner, the third in the κόλπος of the second. See Lightfoot, p. 1095 f.—δν ἡγαπ. ὁ Ἰ.] κατ' ἐξοχήν. Comp. xix. 26, xx. 2, xxi. 7, 20. It serves to explain the fact that he was Jesus' *nearest* table-companion. And here, out of the recollection of that sacred, and by him never to be forgotten moment, there *first* breaks from his lips this nameless, and yet so expressive *designation* of himself. It is very arbitrary, however, to take this as a *circumlocution* for his name (Gotthold, Bengel, Hengstenberg, Godet); such a view should have been precluded already by the circumstance that δν ἡγ. ὁ κύριος is never employed (but always ὁ Ἰησοῦς).—According to the reading κ. λέγει αὐτῷ· εἰπέ τίς ἐστίν (see critical notes), Peter supposes, with the hasty temperament which marked him, that John, as the confidant of Jesus, would know whom the latter meant.<sup>1</sup> The λέγει is to be imagined as spoken in a *whisper*, to which also the νεύει, depicting the occurrence in a lively manner, points. Should εἰπέ be taken as: "say to Jesus" (Ewald), either περὶ οὗ λέγει would be omitted, or instead of λέγει, λέγεις would be expressed.

Vv. 25, 26. Graphic representation. Raising himself from the κόλπος of Jesus to His breast, nearer to His ear, he draws close to Him, and asks (in a whisper).—ἐγώ] *I, for my part.*

<sup>1</sup> In this and other individual traits (xviii. 15, 16, xix. 26, 27, xx. 2, 3, xxi. 3, 4, xviii. 10, xiii. 8, xxi. 15, 16) the design has been discovered to make Peter appear in a less advantageous light than John, or to make him appear so generally,—which would be in keeping with the anti-Judaic tendency of the author. See especially Baur, p. 320 ff. Comp. Hilgenfeld, *Evang.* p. 335; Spaeth in *Hilgenf. Zeitschr.* 1868, p. 182 f. But if the author had actually entertained this design, it would have been an easy thing for him—since he is said to have disposed of the historical material in so altogether free a manner—to have satisfied it in dogmatic points (which would be principally concerned), and yet more easy, at least in i. 43, and vi. 68, 69, to have remained silent. Comp. on vv. 10, 11.

— τὸ ψωμ.] which he meanwhile took into His hand. — ἐπιδώσω] *shall give away*. The morsel is to be thought of as a piece of bread or meat, which Jesus dips into a broth on the table (not into the *Charoseth*, see on Matt. xxvi. 23, since the meal, according to John, was not the paschal meal). — The closing words of ver. 26 contain something of tragic solemnity.<sup>1</sup> By the designation of the traitor, it was not the curiosity of John, but his own *love*, which Jesus satisfied, and this by means of a token not of *apparent*, but of *real* and sorrowful goodwill towards Judas, in whom even now conscience might have been awakened and touched, by means of a token at the same time, such as most naturally suggested itself at table to the Lord as the head of the family, expressive of forbearance towards the traitor. This in answer to Weisse, who psychologically mishandles the entire representation as a fiction derived from ver. 18, and finds the true occurrence only in Mark, whilst Strauss gives the relative preference to Luke (xxii. 21).

Vv. 27, 28. Καὶ μετὰ τὸ ψωμ.] *and after the morsel, i.e.* after Jesus had given him the morsel, ver. 26. So frequently also in the classics a single word only is used with *μετά*, which, according to the context, represents an entire sentence. See Ast, *ad Plat. Leg.* p. 273 f., *Lex. Plat.* II. p. 311; Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* XIII. p. 82. — τότε] *then, at that moment*, intentionally bringing into relief the horribly tragic moment. — εἰσῆλθεν, κ.τ.λ.] so that he was therefore from henceforward a man possessed by the devil, Mark v. 12, 13, ix. 25; Luke viii. 30; Matt. xii. 45. The expression (comp. Luke xxii. 3) forbids a *figurative* interpretation (that Judas completely hardened himself after this discovery was understood by him to have been made), which is already to be found in Theodore of Mopsuestia. The complete hardening, in consequence of which he *could* no more retrace his steps, was simply the immediate consequence of this possession by the devil. But against a magical causal connection, as it were, of the entrance of the devil along with the morsel, Cyril already justly declared himself. The representation rather is, that now, just when Judas had taken the morsel without inward compunction, he was given

<sup>1</sup> To this belongs also the circumstantial λαμβάνει καὶ after ψωμ. (see critical notes). Jesus has put the morsel in the broth (βάψας), and then takes it, etc.

up by Christ, and therewith is laid open to the unhindered entrance of the devil (καθάπερ τινὰ πύλην τὴν τοῦ φυλάττου-  
τος ἐρήμην, Cyril), and experiences this entrance. John did not see this (in the external bearing of Judas, as Godet supposes); but it is with him a *psychological certainty*. — ὁ ποιεῖς, ποίησον τάχιον] *What thou purposest to do* (comp. ver. 6; Winer, p. 249 [E. T. p. 304]), *do more quickly*. In the *comparative* lies the notion: *hasten it*. So very frequently in Homer θάσσον. See Duncan, *Lex. ed. Rost*, p. 524, and generally Nägelsbach, *Anm. z. Ilias*, p. 21, 314, ed. 3; on the graecism of τάχιον, Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 77. The imperative, however, is not *permissive* (Grotius, Kuinoel, and several others); but Jesus *actually wishes* to surmount *as soon as possible* the last crisis (His ὥρα), now determined for Him in the connection of the divine destiny. The resigned, characteristic decision of mind brooks no delay. To suggest the intention, on the part of Jesus, that He *wished to be rid of the oppressive proximity of the traitor* (Ambrose: “ut a consortio suo recederet,” comp. Lücke, B. Crusius, Tholuck), is to anticipate what follows.

Vv. 28, 29. Οὐδεὶς] Even John not excepted (against Bengel, Kuinoel, Lange, Hengstenberg, Godet), from whom the thought was remote, that now already was the treason to be accomplished. — πρὸς τί] *for behoof of what*. — Ver. 29. γάρ] Proof, by way of example, of this non-comprehension. Some of the disciples had taken those words as an order, to *hasten a matter of business known to Judas*, the bearer of the chest. They had therefore two more definite suppositions between which they wavered, both produced by a helpless state of mind, but not irrational, since it is not said that they meant instantaneous attention to the command, even in the course of the night. — εἰς τ. ἑορτ.] belongs to ὧν χρ. ἔχ. There was therefore as yet *no matter needful for the feast purchased*. This, following as it does the statement of time already adduced in ver. 1, presupposes that the present meal was not the *festal* meal, for the latter belonged to the *feast itself*, which, according to ver. 1, was still *impending* (against Wieseler, pp. 366, 381, Tholuck, Lange, Luthardt, Baeumlein, Hengstenberg, Paul in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1866, p. 366 f., and

several others). See also Bleek, p. 129 f.; Rückert, *Abendm.* p. 27 f.; Hilgenfeld, *Paschastr.* p. 147; Isenberg, p. 10 f. — τοῖς πτωχοῖς] placed first as the other subject referred to in this second supposition. Comp. Gal. ii. 10. This giving to the poor is likewise thought of as designed for the approaching *celebration*, because they attempted thereby to explain the *present* order to the purveyor.—In the transition into the indirect form of speech, ἦ, κ.τ.λ. must be supplied; *or that He said that to him, in order that he, etc.*

Vv. 30, 31. *Δαβὼν οὖν*] connecting with ver. 27. With ἐξῆλθεν εὐθύς begins the fulfilment of the command of Christ, given in ver. 27. How erroneous therefore is Hengstenberg's statement, in spite of the εὐθύς: he went away first at the close of the meal! Before the ἐξῆλθεν the supper, indeed, is said to have its place, and Judas to have taken part in it! — ἦν δὲ νύξ] The meal had begun in the evening, and —when one considers also the time consumed in the feet-washing—had already advanced into the night. This *conclusion* of the narrative respecting Judas presents, unsought, something *full of horror*, and precisely in this simplest brevity of expression something that profoundly *lays hold* of the imagination. Comp. Luke xxii. 53. With ὅτε οὖν ἐξῆλθε begins a fresh break in the narrative. To omit οὖν (see critical notes), and to connect these words with ἦν δὲ νύξ (Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, and several others, including Bengel, Paulus, Ewald), has against it, apart from the critically certified οὖν, the considerations that the following λέγει would stand very abruptly,<sup>1</sup> ὅτε ἐξῆλθε itself would be very superfluous, and the deeper emphasis of the mere ἦν δὲ νύξ at the close would be lost.

Vv. 31, 32. *Νῦν ἐδοξάσθη, κ.τ.λ.*] The traitor is gone, and thereupon the heart of the Lord, which has become freer and more at ease, outflows first as in an anticipation of triumph. In view, namely, of the near and certain end, He sees in His death, as though He had already undergone it, *His life-work as accomplished*, and Himself thereby *glorified*, and in this *His glorification the glory of God*, who completes *His* work

<sup>1</sup> Ewald supposes that "by an old mistake" ὅτε οὖν ἐξῆλθε had dropped out before λέγει. But such is the reading of Cyril only.

in the work of the Son. The *δόξα* intended by Jesus is accordingly not that which is contained for Him in the feet-washing and in the departure of Judas, which would not correspond to the sublime and victorious nature of this moment (against Godet). But neither, again, is it the *heavenly* glory (Luthardt); for to this the future *δοξάσει*, ver. 32, first refers, and this change of tense possesses a determinative force. Rather does the *ἐδοξάσθη* denote the *actual* *δόξα*, which lies in the fact, and of which the manifestation has begun, *that now at length His earthly work of salvation is brought to a state of completion*, the task appointed to the Son by the Father is *discharged*. It is the glory of His *death*, the splendour of His *τετέλεσται*, which He contemplates, feels, declares as already begun. — *ἐν αὐτῷ*] *in Him*, in His person, so far as it has been glorified. — Ver. 32 has a *climactic* relation to ver. 31, passing from the *δόξα*, which He has on the threshold of *death*, to the heavenly glory, which from this time God will secure to Him (hence the future *δοξάσει*). — *εἰ ὁ θεὸς ἐδοξ. ἐν ἑαυτῷ*] Solemn repetition, in order to subjoin a further thought. — *ἐν ἑαυτῷ*] To be referred to the subject, not, with Ewald, to Christ: *in Himself*, corresponding, as recompense, to the *ἐν αὐτῷ*. He will be so glorified by God, that His heavenly glory will be *contained in God's own peculiar* *δόξα*; His glory will be none other than the divine glory itself, completed in God Himself (comp. Col. iii. 3) through the return into the fellowship of God out of which He had come forth, and had been made man. Comp. xvii. 4, 5. — The first *καί*, ver. 32, is the *also* of the corresponding relation (on the other hand, again); and the second: *and that* (Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 145). On the idea of the *recompense*, comp. xvii. 4, 5; Phil. ii. 9. — *εὐθύς*] *straightway*; for how immediately near is this blessed goal towards which my death is the departure!

Ver. 33. The *εὐθύς* changes—when He glances at His loved ones, whom He is to leave behind—His mood, which but now was that of victory, again into one of softness and emotion. Here, in the first place, the tender *τεκνία* (comp. xxi. 5) with all the intensity of departing love. — *μικρόν*] Accusat. neut. Comp. xiv. 16, xvi. 19; Heb. x. 37; LXX.

Job xxxvi. 2; Sap. xv. 8, *et al.* — ζητήσετε] the seeking of *faith* and *love* in distress, in temptation, etc. — καὶ καθὼς, κ.τ.λ.] and as I have said, . . . say I now also to you.<sup>1</sup> — τ. 'Ιουδ.] to these, however, with a penal reference, vii. 34, viii. 21, 24, and with the threatening addition, κ. οὐχ εὐρήσετε. And for the disciples the οὐ δύνασθε ἐλθεῖν is intended only of the *temporal* impossibility. See xiv. 2, 3. — ἄρτι] emphatically at the end, as in vv. 7, 37, xvi. 12. He could no longer spare them the announcement.

Ver. 34. *Commandment* now of the departing Lord for those who, according to ver. 33, are to be left behind, which He calls a *new* one, *i.e.* one not yet given either in the Decalogue or otherwise, in order the more deeply to impress it upon them as the specific rule of their conduct. The *novelty* lies not in the commandment of love in itself (for see Lev. xix. 18, comp. Matt. v. 43 ff., xix. 19, xxii. 37, 38), nor yet in the *higher degree* of love found in καθὼς ἠγάπ. ὑμ., so that the requirement would be, that one should love one's neighbour not merely ὡς ἑαυτόν, but ὑπὲρ ἑαυτόν (Cyril, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, and many, including especially Knapp, *Scr. var. arg.* p. 369 ff.), since καθὼς does not indicate the degree or the type (see below), and since, moreover, the O. T. ὡς ἑαυτόν does not exclude, but includes the self-sacrifice of love. The novelty lies rather in the *motive power* of the love, which must be the love of *Christ* which one has *experienced*. Comp. 1 John iii. 16. Thereby the commandment, in itself old, receives the new definiteness (αὐτὸς αὐτὴν ἐποίησε καινὴν τῷ τρόπῳ, Chrysostom), the definiteness of loving ἐν Χριστῷ, and therewith the new moral absolute character and contents, and is given forth with this specifically N. T. definition, founded on faith in Christ, a *new* commandment. Comp. Luthardt, Ebrard, Brückner; also Baeumlein, Hengstenberg, and Godet, who, however, take along with this the *circle* of Christian love (ἀλλήλους) as a point of novelty. Grotius treats this in a similar way to these last-named commentators, when he, as

<sup>1</sup> Luther incorrectly begins a new sentence with καὶ ὑμῖν ("and I say to you now: a new commandment," etc.). Ebrard's rendering is also quite erroneous.



also Kölbing (in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1845, p. 685 ff.), regards *Christian brotherly love*, in its distinction from the general love of one's neighbours, as the *new commandment* which is prescribed. Nevertheless, this distinction rests simply upon the fact that Christian brotherly love must be mutually determined and sustained by the *personal experience of the love of Christ*, or else it is destitute of its peculiarly Christian character; hence it is always *this* point alone which forms the substantial contents and the distinguishing moment of the *new commandment* as such, as none could be more intensely and truly conscious of it than John himself, especially whilst he wrote the *καίνην* and the *καθὼς ἡγάπησα ὑμᾶς*. Opposed to the sense of the word are the interpretations: a commandment which contains all laws of the N. T., in opposition to the many laws of the O. T. (Luther); *praeceptum illustre* (Hackspan, Hammond, Wolf), *mandatum ultimum* = Testament (Heumann); further: *ὀπλοτέρην ἐν ᾗ πᾶσι*, a *youngest* commandment (Nonnus); further: a commandment *that never grows old*, with ever youthful freshness, as though *ἀεὶ καινήν* were expressed (Olshausen<sup>1</sup>); further, a *renewed* commandment (Calvin, Jansen, Maldonatus, Schoettgen, Raphel, and already Irenaeus), or even one that *renews* the old man (Augustine); further: a commandment *unexpected* by you (Semler, on the presumption of the dispute about precedence which had just taken place, Luke xxii. 24 ff.). According to De Wette, *καινήν* refers to the fact, that in the commandment lies the *principle of the new life brought by Christ*. Thus, therefore, *καινή ἐντολή* would be here a new moral *principle* (comp. Gal. vi. 2), opposed to the O. T. principle of righteousness. That that is the new *ἐντολή* (comp. already Melancthon) is, however, not *expressed* by these simple words. Against the sense, finally, and without any indication in the text, is Lange's view: a new *διαθήκη* which is the *institution of the Supper* which Christ here founded. This, besides, is opposed to the obvious parallel passages, 1 John ii. 8. — *ἵνα ἀγαπ. ἀλλ.*] The contents of the commandment are set forth as the *purpose* of the *ἐντ. καιν. διδ. ὑμ.* — *καθὼς ἡγάπ. ὑμ.*] is to be

<sup>1</sup> So also Calovius, who, however, mingles together many other interpretations of various kinds.

separated only by a comma from ἀλλήλ., containing the *agens*<sup>1</sup> of the ἀγαπ. ἀλλ., and then, by means of ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς, κ.τ.λ., the ethical purpose of the ἡγάπ. ὑμ. which belongs here is added; the emphasis, however, lies on ἀγαπᾶτε ὑμᾶς, καὶ ὑμεῖς. Hence: that ye may *love* one another, in conformity with the fact that I have loved *you*, and, indeed, have loved you with the design that *you also*, on your part, etc. That here καθὼς, however, does not express the *degree*, but the corresponding relation, which constrains to the ἀγαπ. ἀλλ., appears with logical necessity from the subjoined sentence denoting purpose ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς κ.τ.λ. (without an οὕτως, which Ewald interpolates in his explanation). It is similar to our *wie denn* (as then) (comp. on xii. 35; 1 Cor. i. 6; Eph. i. 4; Matt. vi. 12), *stating the ground*, as ὡς also is very frequently used in the classics (Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 766; Ast, *Lex. Plat.* iii. p. 584). To take the sentence καθὼς . . . ἀλλήλους as a parallel to the preceding ἵνα ἀγαπ. ἀλλ., whereby καθὼς ἡγ. ὑμ. is emphatically placed first (so many commentators, from Beza to Hengstenberg and Godet), would cause no difficulty in the case of Paul, but does not correspond to the simple style of John elsewhere. — ἡγάπησα] Aorist; for Jesus sees Himself already at the end of the work of His loving self-devotion. Comp. ver. 1. Further, ver. 34 is not to be explained in such a manner that Christ imparts a new *legislation*, in opposition to the Mosaic (Hilgenfeld, comp. above, Luther). He, indeed, does *not* say νόμον καινόν. The ἐντολὴ καινὴ belongs rather to His πλήρωσις of the law (Matt. v. 17), especially in respect of Lev. xix. 18, and does not exclude, but includes, the other moral precepts of the law.<sup>2</sup>

Ver. 35. Ἐν τούτῳ] *in that*, with εἰάν following; comp. 1 John ii. 3. — ἐμοί] not dative, but *mei*, with emphasis, however, as in xv. 8, comp. xviii. 36. — How greatly love was really the *Gnorisma* of the Christians (1 John iii. 10 ff.), see e.g. Tertullian, *Apol.* 39.

<sup>1</sup> This *agens* can be the love evinced by Christ only on the ground of *faith*; hence John fully accords with the Pauline view of faith, *which is operative through love*, but does not (against Baur, *N. T. Theol.* p. 397) place love immediately in the position which faith holds with Paul.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. in Paul love as the fulfilment of the law; see also Weiss, *Joh. Lehrbegr.* p. 166.

Vv. 36-38. The words spoken in ver. 33 are still in Peter's mind; he has not understood them, but can the less therefore get quit of them, and hence asks: *ποῦ ὑπάγεις*; Jesus does not directly answer this, but points him to the personal experience of a later future, in which he (on the way to a martyr's death) will follow after Him (comp. xxi. 18, 19), which at present is not possible. The latter statement surprises the fiery disciple, since he already feels that he is ready to sacrifice his very life for Him. Jesus then quenches this fire, ver. 38. *οὐ δύνασαι*] not meant of *moral* ability (against Tholuck, Hengstenberg), as Peter took it, but of *objective* possibility as in ver. 33. The disciple also has "his hour," and Peter had first a great calling before him, xxi. 15 ff.; Matt. xvi. 18. — τ. *ψυχ.* *θήσω*] See on x. 11. In the zeal of love he mistakes the measure of his moral strength. — On the discrepancy, that Matthew and Mark place the prediction of the denial on the way to Gethsemane (Luke xxii. 23 agrees substantially with John), see on Luke xxii. 31. The declaration of ver. 38 itself is certainly more original in John and Matt. xxvi. 34, Luke xxii. 34 (without *δὲ*), than in Mark xiv. 30.

NOTE.—The question, to what place in John's narrative the celebration of the Supper belongs, is not to be more precisely determined on the ground of Matt. xxvi. 23-25 (against Luke xxii. 21), than that the Supper finds its place, not before the departure of Judas,<sup>1</sup> consequently first after ver. 30. Nothing more definite can be said (Paulus, B. Crusius, Kahnis, place it immediately after ver. 30, against which, however, is the reading *οὖν* before *ἔξῃ* in ver. 30; Lücke, Maier, and several others, between vv. 33 and 34, opposed to which is the question of Peter, ver. 36, which looks back to ver. 33; Neander, Ammon,

<sup>1</sup> That Judas did not join in celebrating the Supper (Beza and several others), has been recently (also by Kahnis, not by Hofmann and Hengstenberg, who places the celebration before *ἔξῃ*, ver. 30) almost universally recognised, although formerly (even already in the Fathers) the opposite view preponderated, and, owing to a dogmatic interest, was supported in the Lutheran Church against the Reformed, on account of the participation of the unworthy. See Wichelhaus, *Komm. zur Leidensgesch.* p. 256 f. In quite a different interest has Schenkel maintained that Jesus did not exclude the traitor from the solemnity; that He, in fact, desired thereby to remove even the pretext "*for its again being made an ordinance,*" and that without preparation or antecedent confession He granted an unconditional freedom of participation.

and Ebrard, after ver. 32; Tholuck, in ver. 34; Lange, indeed, says: the ἐντολὴ καινὴ, ver. 34, is the ordainment of the Supper itself; Olshausen, after ver. 38), since the entire arrangement of John in these chapters leaves the Supper completely out of consideration, and, what is to be particularly noted here in ver. 30, xiv. 1 ff., is so inseparably connected together, that, in reality, there remains nowhere in his representation an opening for its insertion. This betrays, indeed, the free concatenation of the discourses on the part of John, but not his non-acquaintance with the institution (Strauss), and cannot justify the extreme assumptions, that it is to be placed, in spite of the periodic structure of vv. 1-4, already before the feet-washing (Sieffert, Godet), or first after xiv. 31 (Kern). So also Bengel, Wichelhaus, and Röpe, in so far as they make Jesus, in xiv. 31, to be setting out for the Paschal Supper to Jerusalem. See on xiv. 31. According to Schenkel, the feet-washing does *not* fall within the last hours of Jesus, but at an earlier period, whereby, of course, all difficulty would be removed.

CHAPTER XIV.

BEFORE *πορεύομαι*, ver. 2, *ὅτι* (Lachm. Tisch.) is decisively attested. Its omission is therefore to be explained from the fact that it was taken for the recitative *ὅτι*, as which it appeared superfluous, since the recitative *ὅτι* is so frequently passed over in the Codd. — Ver. 3. *καί* before *ἵτοιμ.* is wanting in A. E. G. H. K. Δ. Curss., some Verss., Phot. Deleted by Matth. and Lachm. D. M. Curss. Syr. Cant. Theophyl. Euth.: *ἵτοιμάσαι*. This mechanical repetition from what precedes was the cause of the omission of the *καί*, which, however, is still very strongly attested by B. C. L. N. U. X. Δ. &. Vulg. It. and important witnesses. — Ver. 4. *οἶδατε, καὶ τ. ὁδὸν οἶδατε*] B. C.\* L. Q. X. &. 157, Copt. Aeth. Pers. p. Verc. have merely *οἶδατε τ. ὁδόν*. So Tisch., whilst Lachm. only brackets the *καί* and the second *οἶδατε*. The Recepta is an explanatory expansion; against it ver. 5 also witnesses. — Ver. 5. *δυνάμεθα τ. ὁδὸν εἰδέναι*] Lachm. and Tisch.: *οἶδαμεν τὴν ὁδόν*, according to B. C.\* D. Codd. It. Cyr. Tert., among which, however, a few (including D.) have *τ. ὁδ. οἶδ.* The Recepta is an explanatory expansion. Ver. 7. *ἐγνώκειτε ἄν*] B. C.\* L. Q. X. Curss. Cyr. Ath.: *ἄν ἤδειτε*, or (X.) *ἤδ. ἄν*. From viii. 19. — Ver. 9. *ποσούτον χρόνον*] Lachm. Tisch.: *ποσούτω χρόνω*, according to D. L. Q. &. Cyr. The accusative is an unnecessary gloss. — Ver. 10. *αὐτὸς ποιεῖ τὰ ἔργα*] Tisch.: *ποιεῖ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ*, according to B. D. &. Rightly. The *αὐτός*, added in explanation, dislodged the *αὐτοῦ*, and that in such a way that it took its place (L. X.) in some instances, in others was placed before the verb. — Ver. 11. After *ἐμοί* Elz. has *ἐστίν*. A supplementary addition against decisive testimony. — *μοι* at the end is rejected by Schulz, deleted by Tisch. It suggests the suspicion of being a mechanical repetition; besides, the omitting witnesses (amongst them Codd. D. L. &. 33) are sufficiently strong. — Ver. 12. *μου*] is, according to preponderating evidence, with Lachm. and Tisch., to be deleted. — Ver. 14 is entirely wanting in X. Δ. Curss., some Verss. Chrys. Nonnus; witnesses, however, which are too weak to permit us, with Rinck, to condemn it, especially since, on account of the similar beginning in vv. 14 and 16, and considering its superfluous

character, it might very easily be passed over. — Ver. 15. *τηρήσατε*] Tisch.: *τηρήσετε*, according to B. L.  $\kappa$ . (?) Curss. Euseb. But the future readily arose from the entire surrounding. — Ver. 16. *μένη*] B. L. Q. X.  $\kappa$ . Codd. It. Goth. Copt. Syr. and several Fathers have  $\eta$ . So Lachm. (but, with B., after *αἰῶνα*) and Tisch. Rightly; *μένη* is a more closely-defining gloss from ver. 17. — Ver. 17. *ἔσται*] Lachm.: *ἔστιν*, according to B. D.\* Curss. Verss. Lucif. According as *MENEI* was taken as present (E. G. K. M. U. X.  $\Lambda$ .) or as future (Vulg.), *ἔστιν* or *ἔσται* may be written after it; hence it is only the preponderance of witnesses which decides, and this is in favour of the future. — Ver. 20. Since the first *ὑμεῖς* stands in some of the witnesses after, in some before, *γνώσ.* (so, only bracketed in Lachm.), while in some it is entirely wanting (A. Verss. Fathers), it must be regarded as an addition. — Ver. 22. Instead of *καὶ εἰ*, Elz. and Lachm. have merely *εἰ*, in accordance with preponderating evidence. But *καί* (which  $\kappa$ . also has) might be readily passed over by clumsy copyists, especially, too, as the preceding *κύριε* might occasion its being overlooked. — Ver. 23. *ποιήσομεν*] Lachm. and Tisch.: *ποιησόμεθα*, in accordance with important witnesses (D. also with *ἐλεύσομαι*  $\kappa$ . *ποιήσομαι* declares for the middle voice). Rightly; the middle, which John uses nowhere else, was unfamiliar to the copyists. — Ver. 28. *ἡγαπᾶτε*] D.\* H. L. and a few Curss.: *ἀγαπᾶτε*, to which Buttmann, in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1858, p. 481 f., gives the preference. Too weakly attested; and how easily would a stumbling-block be found in the imperf., as denying love to the disciples! — Between *ἔτι* and *πορεύομαι* Elz. has *εἶπον*, against decisive witnesses. An interpolation in conformity with the preceding.

Ver. 1.<sup>1</sup> From Peter Jesus now turns, with consolatory address in reference to His near departure, to the disciples generally; hence D. and a few Verss. prefix *καὶ εἶπεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ* (so also Luther, following Erasmus). But the cause of the address itself is fully explained in John's narrative by the situation, and by no means requires the reference, arbitrarily assumed by Hengstenberg, to Luke xxii. 35–38.

<sup>1</sup> Luther's exposition of chap. xiv., xv., xvi. belongs to the year 1538. He terms these discourses "the best and most consoling sermons that the Lord Christ delivered on earth," and "a treasure and jewel, not to be purchased with the world's goods." — Luther's book (which originated in sermons, which Casp. Cruciger took down) is among his most spirited and lively writings. How highly he himself esteemed it, see in Matthesius, *elfte Pred.* (ed. Nürnberg. 1592, p. 119a).

The whole of the following farewell discourses, down to xvii. 26, must have grown out of the profoundest recollections of the apostle, which, in a highly intellectual manner, are vividly recalled, and further expanded. It coheres with the entire peculiarity of the Johannean narrative of the last Supper, that the Synoptics offer no parallels to *these* farewell discourses. Hence it is not satisfactory, and is not in keeping with the necessary personal recollection of John, to regard him as taking his start from certain *primary words of earlier gospels*, which he, like an artist of powerful genius, has transfigured by a great, but, at the same time, most appropriate and enchanting transformation (Ewald). — *μὴ ταρασσ.*] by anxiety and apprehension. Comp. xii. 27. It points to what He had spoken in the preceding chapters of His *departure*, not, as Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, and many thought, to *Peter's denial*, after the prediction of which the rest of the disciples also might have become anxious about their constancy. This is erroneous, because the following discourse bears no relation to it. — *πιστεύετε, κ.τ.λ.*] By these words Jesus exhorts them not to faith generally (which they certainly had), but to that confident assurance by which the *μὴ ταρασσεσθαι* was conditioned: *trust in God, and trust in me.* To take, in *both* cases, *πιστεύετε* as *imperatives* (Cyril., Gothic, Nonnus, Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, Bengel, and several others, including most moderns, from Lücke to Hengstenberg and Godet) appears most in conformity with the preceding imperative and the direct character of the address.<sup>1</sup> Others: the first *πιστ.* is indicative, and the second imperative: *ye believe on God, believe therefore on me* (Vulgate, Erasmus, Luther in his *Exposition*, Castalio, Beza, Calvin, Aretius, Maldonatus, Grotius, and several others). Luther, who takes the first sentence as a hypothetical statement, which in itself is admissible (Bernhardy, p. 385; Pflugk, *ad Eur. Med.* 386, comp. on i. 51), has in his translation taken *πιστεύετε*, in *both* cases, as *indi-*

<sup>1</sup> So also Ebrard, who, however, in conformity with a supposed Hebraism (see on Eph. iv. 26), finds the inappropriate meaning: "*Believe on God, so ye believe on me.*" Thus the emotional address becomes a reflection. Olshausen arrives at the same sense, taking the first *πιστ.* as imperative, the second as indicative.

*catives*. According to any rendering, however, the inseparable coherence of the two movements (God in Christ manifest and near) is to be noted. Comp. Rom. v. 2.

Vv. 2, 3 serve to *arouse* the πιστεύειν demanded in ver. 1, to which a *prospect so blessed* lies open. In the house of my Father are many places of sojourn, many shall find their abiding-place (μονή only here and in ver. 23 in the N. T.; frequent in the classics, comp. also 1 Macc. vii. 38), so that such therefore is not wanting to you also; but if this were not the case I would have told you ("ademissem vobis spem inanem," Grotius). After εἶπον ἂν ὑμῖν a full stop must be placed, and with ὅτι (see critical notes) πορεύομαι a new sentence begins. So, first Valla, then Beza, Calvin, Casaubon, Aretius, Grotius, Jansen, and many others, including Kuinoel, Lücke, Tholuck, Olshausen, B. Crusius, De Wette,<sup>1</sup> Maier, Hengstenberg, Godet, Lachmann, Tischendorf. But the Fathers of the church, Erasmus, Luther, Castalio, Wolf, Maldonatus, Bengel, and many others, including Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 464, and Ebrard, refer εἶπον ἂν ὑμῖν to what follows: if it were not so, then I would have said to you: I go, etc. Against this ver. 3 is decisive, according to which Jesus actually says that He is going away, and is preparing a place.<sup>2</sup> Others take it as a question, where, however, we are not, on account of the aorist εἶπον, to explain: would I indeed say to you: I go, etc. (Mosheim, Ernesti, Beck in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1831, p. 130 ff.)? but: would I indeed have said to you, etc.? In this way there would neither be intended an earlier saying not preserved in the Gospel (Ewald),<sup>3</sup> possibly with the stamp of a gloss on it (Weizsäcker), or a

<sup>1</sup> He terms the assertion "somewhat native." But it has rather its full weight in the faith presupposed in the disciples, that He cannot leave them uninstructed on any essential point of their hope. Comp. Köstlin, *Lehrbegr.* p. 163.

<sup>2</sup> This reason is valid, whether we read now in ver. 3 καὶ ἰουμάσω, or with Lachmann merely ἰουμάσω: Hofmann follows the latter, and connects therewith, as well as with ἰάν, artificial and laboured departures from the simple sense of the words. Ebrard also adopts a forced and artificial view, according to which ἰουμάσας is said to be objective: bring about your presence; but ἰουμάσω (without καί) must point to the making accessible for the disciples. How could a listener hit upon this difference of idea in the same word?

<sup>3</sup> He would also place ἵ δι μὴ . . . τόπον ὑμῶν within a parenthesis, and finds here either a saying out of a now unknown gospel, or rather out of the fragment supposed to have been lost before chap. vi.



reference to the earlier sayings regarding the passage into the heavenly world (Lange). But for the latter explanation the saying in the present passage is too definite and peculiar; while the former amounts simply to an hypothesis which is neither necessary nor capable of support on other grounds.—The οἰκία τοῦ πατρὸς is not *heaven generally*, but the peculiar *dwelling-place* of the divine δόξα in heaven, the place of His glorious throne (Ps. ii. 4, xxxiii. 13, 14; Isa. lxiii. 15, *et al.*), viewed, after the analogy of the temple in Jerusalem, this earthly οἶκος τοῦ πατρὸς (ii. 16), as a heavenly sanctuary (Isa. lvii. 15). Comp. Heb. ix. — πολλαί] ἱκαναὶ δέξασθαι καὶ ὑμᾶς, Euth. Zigabenus. The conception of *different degrees* of blessedness (Augustine and several others) lies entirely remote from the meaning here; for *many* the house of God is *destined and established*, and that already ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, Matt. xxv. 34. — ὅτι πορεύομαι, κ.τ.λ.] *for I go*, etc., assigns the reason of the assurance: ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ . . . πολλαί εἰσιν, so that εἰ δὲ μὴ, εἶπον ἂν ὑμῖν is to be regarded as logically inserted. The πορεύομαι ἐτοιμάσαι, κ.τ.λ., however, is an actual proof of the existence of the μοναὶ πολλαί in the heavenly house of God (not of the εἶπον ἂν ὑμῖν, as Luthardt thinks, placing only a colon after ὑμῖν), because otherwise Jesus could not go away with the design of getting prepared for them in those μοναὶ a place on which they are thereafter to enter, a place for them. This ἐτοιμάζειν τόπον presupposes μονὰς πολλὰς, in which the dwelling-place to be provided must exist. The idea is, further (comp. the idea of the πρόδρομος, Heb. vi. 20), that He having attained by His death to the fellowship of the divine δόξα, purposes to prepare the way for their future συνοξασθῆναι with God (comp. xvii. 24); but “therefore He speaks with them in the simplest possible, as it were, childlike fashion, according to their thoughts, as is necessary to attract and allure simple people,” Luther.—Ver. 3. Καὶ ἐὰν . . . τόπον] Emphatic repetition of the consolatory words, with which the still more consolatory promise is united: *I will come again, and will (then) receive you to myself*. Jesus says, καὶ ἐὰν, not κ. ὅταν, for He will not mention the *point of time* of His return, but what *consequences* (namely, the πάλιν ἔρχομαι, κ.τ.λ.) will be connected with this departure of His,

and preparation of a place of which He had just given them assurance. The *πορεύεσθαι κ. έτοιμ, κ.τ.λ.*, is the conditioning fact which, if it shall take place, has the *πάλιν έρχεσθαι, κ.τ.λ.*, as its happy consequence. Comp. xii. 32. The nearness or remoteness of the appearance of this result remains undefined by *έναν*. Comp. Düsterdieck on 1 John ii. 28, where the reading *δταν* is an alteration proceeding from clumsy copyists.—By *πάλιν έρχομαι* Jesus means, and that not indefinitely, or with any approach to a spiritual signification (De Wette), but distinctly and clearly, His *Parousia* at the last day (vi. 39, 40, xi. 24), and not His *resurrection* (Ebrard), to which the following *κ. παραλ., κ.τ.λ.*, is not appropriate. That in John also (comp. 1 John ii. 28), and in Jesus, according to John (comp. xxi. 22, v. 28, 29), as in the whole apostolic church, the conception existed of the *Parousia* as near at hand,<sup>1</sup> although, on account of its spiritual character in the Gospel, it steps less into the foreground, see in Kaeuffer, *de ζωής αιων. not.* p. 131 f., comp. also Frommann, p. 479 f.; Lechler, *Apost. und Nachapost. Zeit.* p. 224 ff.; Wittichen in the *Jahrb. f. D. Th.* 1862, p. 357 f.; Weiss, *Lehrbegr.* p. 181. On this His glorious return He will receive the disciples into His personal fellowship (as raised from the dead or transformed respectively), and that as partakers of His divine *δόξα* in the heavenly sanctuary which has descended with Him to the earth, in which a place will be already prepared for them. He comes in the glory of His Father, and they enter into fellowship with Him in this *δόξα* in the Messianic kingdom. Comp. Origen and several others, including Calvin, Lampe, Luthardt, Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* I. p. 194, Hilgenfeld, Brückner, Ewald. The explanation of a coming, only regarded as such more or less *improperly*, in order to receive the disciples by a blessed death into heaven (Grotius, Kuinoel, B. Crusius, Reuss, Tholuck, Lange, Hengstenberg, and several others), is opposed to the words (comp. xxi. 22)

<sup>1</sup> However decidedly this is still denied by Scholten, who finds in John only a *spiritual* coming, in the sense, namely, that the *Spirit* of Jesus *remains*. According to Keim (*Geschichtl. Chr.* p. 45, ed. 3), the fourth Gospel has, "in sufficiently modern fashion, relegated the future kingdom to heaven," and "broken off the head" of the expectation of the *Parousia*. But the head is *exactly* in the present passage.

and to the mode of expression elsewhere employed in the N. T. respecting the coming of Christ, since death does indeed translate the apostles and martyrs to Christ (2 Cor. v. 8; Phil. i. 23; Acts vii. 59; see on Phil. i. 26, note); but it is nowhere said of Christ that He *comes* (in order to be personally present at their dying bed, so Hengstenberg, indeed, thinks) and *fetches* them to Himself. Except in the Paraclete, Christ first *comes* in His glory at the Parousia. The interpretation, however (according to vv. 18 ff.), that here "only the spiritual return of Christ to His own, and their reception into the full sacred fellowship of the Spirit of the glorified Christ" (Lücke, Neander, Godet) can be intended (comp. Olshausen, Ebrard), is not to be approved, for the reason that Jesus Himself, ver. 2, has decisively provided beforehand for the words being understood of His actual return, and of local fellowship with Him (in vv. 18 ff. the entire context is different). — *πρὸς ἑμαυτὸν*] spoken in the consciousness of the great value which the love of the disciples placed on fellowship with His own person. Only with *Himself* have faith and love the final object of hope, and their blessed reward<sup>1</sup> in the Father's house.

Vv. 4, 5. In order now to lead the disciples to that which, on their side, in respect of the promise contained in ver. 3, was the main practical matter, He says, arousing inquiry: *And whither I go . . . ye know the way* (so, according to the amended reading, see critical notes) which leads thither, namely, to the Father. And the disciples, had they already been more susceptible to the communications of the Lord respecting His higher Messianic destiny, must have known it, —this way,—since Christ had already so frequently set Him-

<sup>1</sup> It is incorrect to maintain that in John the notion of reward is entirely wanting (so Weiss in the *Deutsch. Zeitschr.* 1853, pp. 325, 338, and in his *Petr. Lehrbegr.* p. 55 f.). As Christ seeks in prayer eternal glory for Himself as a reward, xvii. 4, 5, so He assigns it to the disciples also as a reward. See xvii. 24, xii. 25, 26, xi. 26. Here applies also the promise of *ἰδεῖν τὴν βασιλ. τοῦ θεοῦ*, iii. 3, 5, and the resurrection at the last day, v. 28, 29, vi. 40, 54. Comp. 1 John iii. 2, 3, where the future transfiguration and union with Christ is expressly designated as the object of *ἰλπίς*, as well as John viii., where even the expression *μισθὸν πλῆρη* is employed, and is to be understood of eternal blessedness (see Düsterdieck, II. p. 505).

self forth as the only Mediator of salvation, as in chap. vi., x. 1 ff., xi. 25, *et al.* He means, that is, not the way to *suffering and death*, which He Himself is about to tread (Luther, Jansen, Grotius, Wetstein, also Tholuck and Luthardt), but the way designated in ver. 6 (*He Himself is that way!*) along which every one is directed who would attain to that glorious fellowship with the Father. — *ὅπου ἐγὼ ὑπάγω* is an anacoluthon, with the emphasis of the certainty of the near and blessed completion, and *ἐγὼ* has the accent of self-conscious and unique pre-eminence.—Thomas, as in xx. 25, speaks the language of sober, hesitating intelligence, not of dejection, at the approaching suffering of the Lord, as Ebrard thinks. He seeks *information*; *ᾤετο γὰρ αἰσθητὸν εἶναι τινα τόπον, ὅπου ὑπάγει, καὶ ὁδὸν ὁμοίως τοιαύτην*, Euth. Zigabenus. The *heavenly ποῦ*, however distinctly Jesus had already designated it, Thomas did not yet know clearly how to combine with his circle of Messianic ideas; but he desired to *arrive at clearness*. That Thomas is here cited without the name *Αἰδύμος*, which is added in xi. 16, xx. 24, xxi. 2, is accidental, and without the design which Hengstenberg imports (that he does not speak here according to his *individual spiritual* character). — *πῶς, κ.τ.λ.*] “*Quodsi ignoretur, quæ sit meta, non potest via sub ratione viae concipi*,” Grotius.

Ver. 6. *I* (no other than I) *am the way*, on which men must go, in order to come to the Father in His heavenly house, vv. 2, 3, *and the truth, and the life*. But since no one, without going the prescribed *way*, without having appropriated the *truth* to himself, and without bearing in himself the *life*, can come to that goal, *οὐδεὶς, κ.τ.λ.*, is thus the exponent to all *three* particulars, not merely to the first. The three moments lay down the proposition that no other than Christ is the Mediator of eternal salvation with God in the Messianic kingdom, according to three several characteristic aspects which are co-ordinated, yet in such a way that the advance is made from the general to the particular. The characteristic of the mediation of salvation, in the first point, is not designated with reference to *matter* (as in *ἡ ἀλήθεια* and *ἡ ζωή*), but as to *form*, in so far, namely, as the mediation of salvation itself is therein expressed in a specific *figure* (comp. x. 9). On individual points, note :

(1) Christ is the *Way*, not because He ὑπέδειξε τὴν ὁδόν (Cyril, Melancthon, and many others), whereby both the expression and the figure are departed from, and the relation of things is not sufficiently attended to, but because in His personal manifestation the mediation of salvation is objectively given, absolutely the sole mediation for all men, but which has to be made use of subjectively, that is, by faith on Him, like the man who is aiming at a goal, and for that purpose must take and pursue the given way which is the means of its attainment. (2) Christ is the *Truth*, because He is the self-revelation of God which has been manifested (vv. 7, 9), the Light that is come into the world, without the appropriation of which salvation is not obtained. (3) He is the *Life* (Col. iii. 4), because He is the Principle and Source of eternal life (in its temporal development and future consummation); so that whoever has not received Him into himself by faith (vi. 50, 51, xi. 25, 26), has become a prey to spiritual and eternal death; comp. Ignatius, *ad Trall.* 9: οὐ χωρὶς τὸ ἀλήθινον ζῆν οὐκ ἔχομεν; *ad Eph.* 3: Χριστὸς τὸ ἀδιάκριτον ἡμῶν ζῆν. These three points are not to be separated according to time (Luther: beginning, middle, end; so also Calvin), but Christ is all three *at once*,—in that He is the one, He is also the second and the third,—although this cannot justify an arbitrary fusion of the three predicates (as would be the Augustinian *vera via vite*). — οὐδεὶς ἔρχεται, κ.τ.λ.] the Johannean *sola fide*. Note how ver. 6 is the *summary of the most perfect self-confession* of the Son regarding Himself and His work.

Ver. 7. *Had you known me* (for they had indeed not known that He was the *Way*), *you would also have known the Father* (of their non-acquaintance with whom their οὐκ οἶδαμεν, ποῦ ὑπάγεις, ver. 5, had testified).—The emphasis changes (otherwise in viii. 19); it lies in the protasis on ἐγνώκ., not on the enclitic μέ; in the apodosis on τ. πατ. μου. — καὶ ἀπ' ἄρτι, κ.τ.λ.] *and*—which I can nevertheless now add—*from henceforward* (after I have told you in ver. 6 so definitely and fully what *I* am) *you know Him, and have* (in me, ver. 9) *beheld Him*. This view of the meaning, which flows immediately out of the context, vv. 6 and 9, the point of which is the idea of the adequate self-revelation of God in Christ, entirely excludes

any interpretation of the two verbs in a future sense (Chrysostom, Kuinoel, and many others), and the reference to a future *terminus a quo* (Chrysostom, Lücke, Ewald, and several others), which is wont to be assumed as the time of the communication of the Spirit, nay, even a mentally supplied "*I hope*" (De Wette) with ἀπάρτι. The reference of ἀπάρτι to the whole time of their fellowship with Christ since their conversion (Hengstenberg), is, even in a linguistic point of view, impossible. See on xiii. 19, i 52. In that case only νῦν could stand. Godet's remark is also incorrect: "*at the point at which my teaching has now arrived,*" as if ἄρτι merely were expressed. — On καί, which, without altering its meaning, significantly subjoins an adversative clause (*and . . . i.e. and nevertheless*), see on vii. 28.

Vv. 8, 9. *Philip*, like Thomas in a certain hesitation, corresponding to his want of apprehension, has not yet understood the ἐώρακατε αὐτόν; instead of seeing it fulfilled in the manifestation of Jesus Himself, it excites in him the wish that the Lord would bring about a *Theophany*, perhaps such as Moses once beheld (Ex. xxiv. 9, 10), or desired to see (Ex. xxxiii. 18), or the prophets had predicted for the inauguration of the Messianic kingdom (Mal. iii. 1 ff.). — ἀρκεῖ ἡμῖν] and then *are we contented*; then we see the measure of the revelation of the Father, given to us by Thee, fulfilled to such a degree that we do not covet a further until the last glorious appearance. — On the dative of duration of time, τοσοῦτ' χρόνῳ (see critical notes), comp. Buttmann, *N. T. Gram.* p. 161 [E. T. p. 186]. — καὶ οὐκ ἔγν. μὲ] *And thou hast not known me?* A question of melancholy surprise, and hence also in loving emotion, He addresses him *by name*. Had Philip *known* Jesus, he would have said to himself, that in Him the highest revelation of God was manifested, and the wish to behold a Theophany must have remained foreign to his mind. Hence: *He who has seen me has seen the Father*; for He reveals Himself in me, I am ἀθηήτοιο τοκῆος συμφυὲς ἐνθεον εἶδος ἔχων βροτοειδέϊ μορφῇ, Nonnus. The proposition is to be left in *objective generality*, and ἔωρ. is not to be limited to *believing* seeing (Luther, Lücke, De Wette, and many others). *Every one* has, if he has seen Christ, seen the Father *objectively*; but only he who

has *known* Christ for that which He is, *subjectively* also, "according to the sight of the Spirit and of faith," Luther. Comp. i. 14, v. 37.

Vv. 10, 11. This language of thine amounts indeed to this: as though thou didst not believe that, etc. — *ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐν τ. πατρὶ, κ.τ.λ.*] On this mutual fellowship, which "*virtutis potius quam essentiae elogium est*" (Calvin), see on x. 38. Comp. xvii. 21. Here the *ἐγὼ ἐν τ. πατ.* stands *first*, because the matter in question is the way which the knowledge has to take *from the Son to the Father*. — *τὰ ῥήματα . . . τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ*] (see critical notes): the proof of this union of mine with the Father is, *that I do not speak of myself*; but the proof *for that* (for this *ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ οὐ λαλῶ*) is, that the Father *does His works through me*. The *δέ* is therefore *continuative* (*autem*), not antithetical. Further, we must neither say that the *ῥήματα* are to be reckoned along with the *ἔργα*, nor that *τὰ ἔργα* signifies the *business of teaching* (Nösselt); but, from the fact that the Messianic *works* (see on v. 36) are the works of the *Father*, it is inferred, with necessary dialectic certainty, from whom also the *discourses* of Jesus proceed; if the former are divine, the latter must be adequately related thereto. The first proposition is often arbitrarily supplemented from the second, and *vice versa*.<sup>1</sup> This, however, does not agree with the Greek mode of allowing, in antithetic propositions, one clause to be completed from the other (Kühner, II. p. 603 f.; Bernhardt, p. 455), and would here run counter to the *context*, since Jesus, ver. 11, desires to have deduced from the *ἔργα* that which He had brought into light by *τὰ ῥήματα . . . λαλῶ*. Hence we are not to get out of the difficulty either by the assumption of an "incongruity in the antithetic propositions" (Tholuck), or, with Lange, pronounce that the words belong *pre-eminently* to the Son, the works *pre-eminently* to the Father, which is not contained in the expressions, and would be an un-Johannean *halving* of the thought (v. 19, viii. 28, xii. 49); nor are we to assume, with Ewald, that a *lesser significance* is to be ascribed to the works in opposition to the

<sup>1</sup> The words which I speak to you, I speak not of myself; and the works which I do, I do not of myself, but the Father who is in me. He teaches me the words, and does the works—De Wette, comp. Bengel.

words. — ὁ ἐν ἐμοὶ μένων] expressing the ὁ ἐν ἐμ. ὧν as *enduring* (he who does not depart from me). According to the reading ποιεῖ τ. ἔργα αὐτοῦ (see critical notes), the works of Jesus are set forth as the works of God, which the Father performs, that is, in virtue of His immanence in the Son, making them to operate in an outward direction. — Ver. 11. From Philip, Jesus now turns to the disciples collectively, and that *with an exhortation* to the faith, in reference to which He had been obliged to *question* Philip in a manner implying doubt. — πιστεύετε μοι] namely, without anything further, in addition to my personal assurance. — ὅτι] not *because* (Bengel), but *that*, as in ver. 10. — διὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτά] *On account of the works themselves (in and of themselves)*, irrespective of my oral testimony, believe me in this. The works are the actual proofs of that fellowship, v. 19, 20, x. 37, 38.

Vv. 12, 13. Truly, on the compliance with this πιστεύετε μοι there awaits an activity like my own, yea, and still greater. What encouragement to fidelity in the faith! Schott, *Opusc.* p. 177, imports the meaning: "neque ad ea tantum provoco, quae me ipsum hucusque vidistis perficientem, imo," etc. Comp. also Luthardt, according to whom Jesus proceeds to a still further *demonstration of His fellowship with God*. — ὁ πιστ. εἰς ἐμὲ] intended not to have a general application, but to refer (comp. vv. 11, 13) to the *disciples*. On εἰς ἐμέ, Bengel aptly remarks: "qui Christo de se loquenti (see πιστ. μοι, ver. 11), in Christum credit." — καὶ ἐγὼ] *he also*, in comparison, emphatically repeating the subject. Xen. *Mem.* i. 2. 24. — καὶ] heightening the effect: *and besides, indeed*. See Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 145 f. — μείζονα τούτων] *greater than these*, ἂν ἐγὼ ποιῶ, comp. v. 20, and on the thought, Matt. xxi. 21, 22. It is not, however, to be referred to *single separate* miracles, which are reported by the apostles; Ruperti names the healing power of Peter's shadow, Acts v., and the speaking in foreign tongues, which latter Grotius also has in view; Bengel appeals to Acts v. 15, xix. 12; Mark xvi. 17 ff. A measuring of miracles of this kind by their magnitude is throughout foreign to the N. T. Rather in μείζονα τούτων is the notion of ἔργα *expanded*, so that its predominant signification is not that of miraculous deeds in the narrower sense



(as in *ἃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ*), but in a broader sense, the world-subduing *apostolic activity* generally, produced by the Holy Spirit (xvi. 18 ff.) in the diffusion of the gospel, with its light and life, amongst all peoples, in the conquest of Judaism and paganism by the word of the cross, etc. The history of the apostles, and especially the work of Paul, is the commentary thereon. These were *ἔργα* of a greater kind than the miracles proper which Jesus wrought,<sup>1</sup> and which also, categorically, those of the apostles resembled. — *ὅτι, κ.τ.λ.*] *assigns the reasons* of the preceding assurance, *τὰ ἔργα ἃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ . . . μείζ. τούτ. ποιήσει* (not merely the *μείζονα*, for which limitation no reason presents itself), and this statement of reason continues to the end of ver. 13, so that *καὶ ὅ, τι ἂν* still depends on *ὅτι*. Since He is going to the Father, and is thereby elevated to the position of heavenly rule, He will do all that they shall ask in His name, there can be no doubt that the assurance of those *ἔργα* will be justified. So, substantially, Grotius, Lücke, Olshausen, De Wette, Ewald, Godet, comp. already Cyril. Considering the internal coherence, and the immediately continuative *καί*, ver. 13, it is incompetent to separate ver. 13, as if it were independent, from ver. 12, whereby *ὅτι ἐγὼ πρὸς τ. π. πορ.* is taken either merely in the sense: *ὑμῶν λοιπὸν ἐστὶ τὸ θαυματοργεῖν, ἐγὼ γὰρ ἀπέρχομαι* (Chrysostom, so Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, Erasmus, Wolf, Kuinoel, Ebrafd, and several others); or more correctly, because really assigning a reason, with Luther: "for through the power that I shall have at the right hand of the Father, . . . I will work in you," etc. Comp. Calvin and several others, including B. Crusius, Luthardt, Hengstenberg. — *ἐγώ*] In opposition to the *πιστεύοντες*, who continue their activity on earth. — *ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου*] Comp. xv. 16, xvi. 23. The prayerful request to God (for it is to God that the absolute *αἰτήσητε* refers, comp. xv. 16) is made in the name of Jesus, if this name, Jesus Christ, as the full substance of the saving faith and confession of him who prays, is in his consciousness the *element in which* the prayerful activity lives and moves, so that thus that

<sup>1</sup> "For He assumed only a small corner for Himself, a little time for His preaching and working of miracles; but the apostles and their successors went through the whole world," etc.—Luther.

Name, embracing the whole revelation of redemption, is that which specifically measures and defines the disposition, feeling, object, and contents of prayer. The express use of the name of Jesus therein is no specific token; the question is of the *spirit* and *mind* of him who prays. The apostolic mode of expression is analogous: to be, have, say, do, anything, etc., ἐν Χριστῷ, ἐν κυρίῳ. Comp. on Col. iii. 17, and see also Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 357, and generally Gess, *d. Gebet im Nam. Jesu*, 1861. The renderings: *invocato meo nomine* (in connection with which reference is irrelevantly made to Acts iii. 6, Chrysostom, Nonnus, Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, Maldonatus, and several others); *me agnoscentes mediatorem* (Melancthon); *ut mea causa faciat* (Grotius); *per meritum meum* (Calovius and several others); *in my mind, in my affairs* (De Wette), and the like, are partly opposed to the words, partly too narrow, and comprised in the foregoing explanation. But if we proposed to interpret, with Godet: *in my stead*, that is, *in such a way as though I myself were the subject that prays through you*,<sup>1</sup> the first person ποιήσω would be inappropriate to a *self-hearing*; and essential prayers like those for the forgiveness of sin would be excluded. — τοῦτο ποιήσω] nothing else. This definite and unlimited promise rests upon the fact that the petition of him who prays in the name of Jesus is in harmony with the will of Christ and of God, but in every case subordinates itself in the consciousness of him who prays to the restriction: not my, but Thy will! hence also the *denial* of a particular petition is the *fulfilment* of prayer, only in another way. Comp. 2 Cor. xii. 8, 9.—That Christ asserts the ποιεῖν of Himself (xv. 16, and xvi. 23 of the Father), lies in the consciousness of His unity with God, according to which He, even in His exalted condition, is in the Father, and the Father is in Him. Hence, if, through the fulfilment of these petitions, the Son must be glorified, the *Father* is glorified in the Son; wherefore Jesus adds, as the *final aim* of the τοῦτο ποιήσω: ἵνα δοξασθῇ ὁ πατ. ἐν τῷ υἱῷ. Comp. xiii. 31. The *honour of the Father* is ever the last object of all that is

<sup>1</sup> So also Weiss, *Lehrbegr.* p. 272, who regards the *works* only as the object of prayer. But for this the expression is too general; just as general, xvi. 23 ff. The *works* are *subsumed* under the general statement.

attained in the affairs of the Son, xii. 28, xi. 4; Phil. ii. 11; Rom. xvi. 25 ff.; Gal. i. 5; Eph. iii. 21. Note the emphatic collocation *ὁ πατήρ ἐν τῷ νῦν*, where, however, the main stress lies upon *ὁ πατήρ*.

Ver. 14. *Τὸ αὐτὸ λέγει βεβαιῶν μάλιστα τὸν λόγον*, Euth. Zigabenus. But this is done to make it specially prominent that *He* is the active subject. Bengel well remarks: "*ἐγὼ hoc jam indicat gloriam.*"

Ver. 15. A new exhortation—to keep His commandments in proof of their love to Him—in order, ver. 14, to attach a new promise thereto. But exhortation and promise are thus necessarily connected, as in vv. 11, 12 ff. Hence the latter not without the former. Comp. ver. 21. — Note the emphatic *τὰς ἐμάς*: which you have *from me*; they are not those of the O. T., but the completion of these. Comp. on xiii. 34.

Vv. 16, 17. The *καί* is in both instances *consecutive*. On the concession of thoughts, see ver. 21. — *ἐγὼ*] Emphatically introducing, after what He had required of the *disciples*, what *He on His part* will do as the Mediator of the divine love. The *ἐρωτήσω* does not conflict with xvi. 26, 27, where there is a different relation of time. *ἐρωτᾶν* is in John the standing word in the mouth of Jesus, when He addresses the Father in prayer, xvi. 26, xvii. 9, 15, 20. But there is no difference of meaning from *αἰτεῖν*, see 1 John v. 16. — *ἄλλον παράκλητον*] *another Advocate* (instead of myself), another, who will as counsellor assist you. The word is found in the N. T. only in John, namely, also in xiv. 26, xvi. 7, 1 John ii. 1, and the signification given holds good in Dem. 343. 10, Diog. Laert. iv. 50, Dion. Hal. xi. 37, and passages from Philo in Loesner, p. 496 f., both in the proper judicial sense (*Advocate*), and also in general as here (so also Philo, *de opif. m.* p. 4 E, and Letter of the Church of Vienne in Eusebius, v. 2). With this agrees also the Talmudic *פְּרָקִי*. See Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* p. 1843, and generally Wetstein *in loc.*; Düsterdieck on 1 John ii. 1, p. 147 ff. Rightly, after Tertullian and Augustine, Melanchthon, Calvin, Beza, Grotius, Wolf, Lampe, and several others, have most of the moderns so interpreted it (see especially Knapp, I. p. 115 ff.). See also Hahn, *Theol. d. N. T.* I. p. 225. The equally ancient

explanation: *Comforter* (Origen, Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, Jerome, Erasmus, Castalio, Luther, Maldonatus, Jansen, Lightfoot, and several others, including van Hengel, *Annot.* p. 40 ff.), rests on a confusion with παρακλήτωρ (LXX. Job xvi. 2) in Aquila and Theodotion, Job xvi. 2, which, on account of the passive form, is on that ground contrary to usage.<sup>1</sup> Equally incorrect is the rendering *Teacher* in Theodore of Mopsuestia, Ernesti, *Opusc.* p. 215, Luthardt, Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 17. — Observe on ἄλλον, that in 1 John ii. 1 *Christ Himself* might also be designated as παράκλητος, without implying any difference of doctrine (Baur, Schwegler, Hilgenfeld). Nonnus aptly says: Χριστῷ σύγγονον ἄλλον. — ἵνα ἡ μεθ' ὑμ. εἰς τ. αἰῶνα] *in order that He may; not as I now, again be taken from you, but be with you (i.e. may stand at your side protecting, helping, strengthening you against all hostile powers; comp. Matt. xxviii. 20) for ever.* Comp. 2 John 2. In the Paraclete, however, Christ Himself is present with His own (Matt. xxviii. 20); for in the mission of the Spirit, who is the Spirit of Christ (Rom. viii. 9; Gal. iv. 6), the self-communication of the exalted Christ takes place (Rom. viii. 10; Gal. ii. 20), without, however, the Paraclete ceasing to be an ἄλλος, a different—although dependent on the Son—subject than He;<sup>2</sup> the obscure idea that the Paraclete is “*the Christ transfigured to Spirit*” (Tholuck) is un-Johannean and unbiblical generally. Comp. on 2 Cor. iii. 17. See also, against the mingling together of the idea of the Logos with that of the Spirit, in Reuss; Godet, II. p. 480. — τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας] *the Spirit of Truth, i.e. the Holy Spirit, who*

<sup>1</sup> Certainly it is obvious that the interpreter could not be responsible for this confusion which is opposed to the language; but for *this* he is responsible, that he should not thrust it upon John, if another use of the word, grammatically correct, is undoubtedly before us. This in answer to Hofmann's too readily adopted observation in his *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 16.—Luther has correctly explained the word itself by *advocate*, but inconsistently translated it *Comforter*. The Vulgate has *paracletum*, the Codd. of It. in some cases the same, in others *advocatum*. Goth. has *paraklētu*.—Were the word not *Advocatus*, but the active form, it must have been, not παράκλητος, but παρακλητικός (Plato, *Rep.* p. 524 D). Comp. *ισικλητικός, ἀνακλητικός*, and others.—The usual designation of counsel in the Greek writers is, moreover, *σύνδικος* or *συνήγορος*. On παράκλητος, comp. Hermann, *Staatsalterth.* § 142. 16.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. Wörner, *d. Verhältn. d. Geistes zum Sohne*, p. 93.

is Possessor, Bearer, and Administrator of the divine ἀλήθεια. He is the divine principle of revelation, by whose activity in human hearts the redemptive truth given by God in Christ, i.e. the truth κατ' ἐξοχήν, is transformed into knowledge, made to be vitally appropriated, and brought to powerful moral expression. Nonnus: ἀτρεκίης ὀχεταιγόν. Comp. xv. 26, xvi. 13. The opposite: τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς πλάνης, 1 John iv. 6. — ὁ κόσμος] *The unbelieving*, as opposed to Christ and His work. These are unsusceptible to the Spirit, because the capacity of inward vision (of experimental perception) of the Spirit is wanting to them, and He is to them something unknown and strange, so that they have thus no subjective point of attachment at all for the reception of the Spirit. Comp. 1 Cor. ii. 14. — ὑμεῖς δὲ, κ.τ.λ.] The presents γινώσκετε and μένει (not *manebit*, as the Vulgate has, and as Ewald also proposes *μενεῖ*) are as little to be taken *as future* as the presents in the first clause of the verse. They denote the *characteristic* relation of the disciples to the Spirit without reference to any definite time. They are *absolute* presents: *but you know Him, since He has His abiding amongst you* (not far from you, but in your midst, in the Christian community), *and* (the discourse now first enters the point of view of definite time) *will be in you* (in your own hearts). This being the specific character of His relationship to you, how should He be an unknown something to you? Let the gradation be observed: παρ' ὑμῖν . . . ἐν ὑμῖν. On the latter, Nonnus: ὁμόστολον ἔσται ὑμῖν, πάντας ἔχον νοερόν δόμον. — Note, generally, the Trinitarian relation here and ver. 26, and particularly (against B. Crusius and Tholuck) the definitely expressed *personality* of the Paraclete. See Köstlin, p. 109; Hofmann, I. p. 192 f.; Melancthon, *in loc.* But in passages, again, like i. 33, xx. 22, the *presupposition* of the *personality*, whose life and powers are communicated, is by no means excluded.

Ver. 18. Development of the consolatory element in this promised communication of the Spirit, onwards to ver. 21. — οὐκ ἀφήσω ὑμ. ὀρφ.] *I will not leave you behind, as those who* (after my departure) *are to be orphans* (ver. 27; Mark xii. 19; Tob. xi. 2; Sir. vi. 2. 1; Macc. xii. 41; *Soph. Aj.* 491; *Phil.* 484). The expression itself (comp. *τεκνία*, xiii. 33) is that of

the πατρικὴ εὐσπλαγχνία (Euth. Zigabenus).—*ἔρχομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς*] Without mediatory particle (γάρ) in the intensity of the emotional affection. That Jesus means by this *coming*, i.e. according to the connection *coming again* (see on iv. 16), not the final historical *Parousia* (Augustine, Beda, Maldonatus, Paulus, Luthardt, Hofmann), is shown by the whole of the following context (quite otherwise, ver. 3). See, especially, ver. 19, where it is *not the world*, but the *disciples* who are to see Him, which is as little appropriate to the *Parousia* as the *ἔτι μικρόν*;<sup>1</sup> further, vv. 20, 21, where *spiritual* fellowship is spoken of, the knowledge of which cannot first begin with the *Parousia*, and ver. 23, where *μονὴν παρ' αὐτῷ ποιησ.* is not in harmony with the idea of the *Parousia*, since in this the disciples take up their abode with *God* (ver. 3, comp. 2 Cor. v. 8), not *God* with *them*, which takes place through the communication of the *Spirit*. Most of the older expositors refer to the *Resurrection* of Christ, and to the new *union with the Risen One*. So Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, Ruperti, Erasmus, Grotius, and many others, and again Kaeuffer, Hilgenfeld, Weiss, and, with a spiritualizing view of the resurrection, Ewald. But opposed to this are vv. 20, 21, 23, xvi. 16, 22, 23, expressions all of which equally point to a higher *spiritual* fellowship,<sup>2</sup> as the οὐκ ἄφ. ὑμ. ὀρφ. also already presupposes a new *abiding* union. Justly, therefore, have most of the moderns (Lücke, Tholuck, Olshausen, B. Crusius, Frommann, Köstlin, Reuss, Maier, Baeumlein, Godet, Scholten, but also already Calvin and several others) understood by the *Paraclete* the *spiritual* coming of Christ, in which He Himself, only in another form of existence, came to the disciples. It is not yet, indeed, the *consummation* of the reunion; this latter first takes place at the *Parousia*, and therefore up to that time the state of orphanage still relatively continues, the

<sup>1</sup> Without ground, 1 John ii. 18, Rev. xxii. 7, 12, are appealed to for the setting aside of this shortness of time. How much later were these passages written than our *ἔτι μικρόν* was spoken!

<sup>2</sup> Which historically took its beginning, not with the appearances of the Risen One, so enigmatic to the disciples themselves, removed and estranged from the old confidential relations, but first with the outpouring of the Spirit. Thenceforward Christ lived in them, and His heart beat in them, and out of them He spake.

community seeks its Lord (xiii. 33), and waits for Him; and believers have to regard themselves as ἐκδημοῦντες ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου (2 Cor. v. 6), whose life in Him with God is not yet revealed (Col. iii. 1-4) (in answer to Luthardt's objections). Others explain it in a twofold sense, so that Christ intended His Resurrection, and at the same time His spiritual return. So Luther, Beza, Lampe, Bengel, Kuinoel, De Wette, Brückner, Lange, Ebrard; where De Wette, with this interpretation, assigns the first place to the spiritual thought, as also Hengstenberg. But the *bodily* ἔρχεσθαι is not indicated at all (as, if so, it would have been, in opposition to the mission of the Paraclete, by the addition of an ἐγὼ αὐτός), and the entire promise of the Paraclete, of which the present passage is an integral part, transports to a time in which the Resurrection of Christ had long passed. Generally, however, to maintain a twofold sense can only be justified by evidence from the connection.

OBSERVATION.—That Jesus, according to John, does not speak at all in express terms of His resurrection, but only in allusions like ii. 19, x. 17, 18, is in entire harmony with the spiritual character of the Gospel, according to which the return of the Paraclete was the principal thing on which the hopes of the disciples had to fix themselves. From death to the δόξα, out of which Jesus had to send the Spirit, the resurrection formed only the transition. But that He also cannot have in reality predicted His resurrection with such definiteness as it is related in the Synoptics, is clear from the whole behaviour of the disciples before and after the occurrence of the resurrection, so that in this point also the preference belongs to the Johannean account. See on Matt. xvi. 21.

Ver. 19. Ἔτι μικρ.] *sc. ἐστι.* Comp. xiii. 33, xvi. 16; Heb. x. 37; Hos. i. 4; Ps. xxxvii. 10.—οὐκέτι θεωρεῖ] Corporeally. Comp. also Acts x. 41.—θεωρεῖτε] But you, whilst the world no more beholds me, *do behold me*, although corporeally I am no more present, through the experience of my spiritual presence;<sup>1</sup> you behold me *spiritually*, in that you experience my presence and my communion with you, in

<sup>1</sup> Not: through the *being caught away to me at the Parousia* (Luthardt). The οὐκίτι θεωρεῖ and the θεωρεῖτε must certainly be contemporaneous. Invisible for the world (comp. vii. 33, 34), Christ is beheld by *His own*.

the communication of myself, and in my working upon you by means of the Paraclete. The *terminus a quo* of the present tenses, which represent the near future as present, is, indeed, not quite the same in θεωρεῖ and θεωρεῖτε, since the ὁ κόσμος με οὐκέτι θεωρεῖ already begins with the death of Jesus, but the ὑμεῖς δὲ θεωρ. με first after His return to the Father; this distinction, however, disappears before the Johannean view of the death of Jesus as a departure to God. — ὅτι ἐγὼ ζῶ, κ. ὑμ. ζήσεσθε] Not: *because I live, you also will live* (Nonnus, Beza, Godet), but, corresponding to the progress of the discourse (comp. ver. 17), a statement of the reason of what precedes: *for I live, and you shall live*. Note the change from the present to the future, and that ζῶ and ζήσεσθε cannot without arbitrariness be taken as essentially different in idea, but that ζῶ manifestly, since it exists without interruption (present), denotes *the higher life of Christ independent of death*, of Christ, who, by His departure to the Father, becomes a partaker of the heavenly *glory*. Christ *lives*, for He is, indeed, Himself the Possessor and bearer of the true ζωή (comp. v. 26); death, which translates Him into the glory of the Father, by no means breaks off this true and higher life of His (although His life ἐν σαρκί ceases), but is only the medium of the consummation and transfiguration of this His ζῆν into the everlasting heavenly ζωή and δόξα (comp. Col. iii. 3, 4). Out of *this* consciousness the Lord here utters the words: ἐγὼ ζῶ. And He adds thereto: καὶ ὑμεῖς ζήσεσθε: *and you shall live*, i.e. you shall be partakers (in its temporal development on to its glorious consummation) of the same higher ζωή, liable to no death (xi. 26), under the life-giving (vi. 33) influence of the Spirit. "Stat enim illud fixum, nullam fore ejus vitam membrīs mortuis," Calvin. Thus the life is in both essentially *alike*, only with this difference, that it is original in Jesus, and with His approaching departure is already at its glorious consummation; but in the case of the disciples, being imparted by Christ in the Holy Spirit, who is the πνεῦμα τῆς ζωῆς (Rom. viii. 2), it is, in the first instance, to be unfolded within (before the Parousia as the living fellowship with the exalted Christ), in order to become, at the Parousia by means of the resurrection (Rom. viii. 11)



and relative transformation (1 Cor. xv. 51, 52), the participation in His δόξα. Comp. the idea of the συζῆν τῷ Χριστῷ in Paul, Rom. vi. 8; 2 Cor. vii. 3; 2 Tim. ii. 11. The moment which assigns the reason (ὅτι) lies simply in this, that the above two-sided ζῆν is the necessary condition of the promised θεωπεῖτέ με. If the higher ζωή, that is meant, were to be the lot only of Christ, and not also thereafter (through the working of the Spirit) that of the disciples, there could be no mention of a beholding of the Lord on the part of the disciples. The *paritas rationis* for the mutual relation would be wanting, and thereby the disciples would lose the capacity (the eye, as it were) to see Christ. But thus *the living behold the Living One*. The reference to the resurrection of Jesus has led to interpretations like that of Grotius (comp. Euth. Zigabenus): you shall see me *actually alive* ("non spectrum") and *remaining in life* amidst the impending dangers; or (so Theophylact, comp. Kuinoel): I shall, as having risen, be *alive*, and you shall be as *newly made alive* for joy! or: *I rise again*, and you shall (at the last day) *arise* (so Augustine). Again the interpretation of ζήσεσθε in Weiss (*Lehrbegr.* p. 70) of the new life, which arises in the disciples through the reappearance of the Risen One, who is recognised by them (as in the case of Thomas, xx. 28), is a forced expedient, proceeding from an erroneous assumption, and is not appropriate, moreover, to ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, ver. 20, which is definite and valid for all disciples, nor to the intimate reciprocal confidence of vv. 20, 21; wherefore Weiss again, adding violence to violence, explains ver. 21 of the further unfolding of the new communion begun with the appearances of the Risen One (p. 276). Had the resurrection been spoken of, the simplest explanation would be that of Kaeuffer, p. 136: "quae instat fortunæ vicissitudo nec me nec vos poterit pessumdare," according to which, however, a thought of much too small importance would result, and, besides, the change of tense is overlooked. But if, according to the above, both ζῶ and ζήσεσθε must embrace time and eternity, then De Wette has incorrectly limited ζήσεσθε to the *life of faith* with its joyous victory over death and the fear of death; on the other side again. Luthardt has erroneously understood it only of the *life of*

*transfiguration* after the Parousia, because ἐγὼ ζῶ can only denote the glorified life,—an assumption, however, which is unsupported, since the expression used is not ἐγὼ ζήσομαι.

Vv. 20, 21. *At that day*; <sup>1</sup> in the *historical* fulfilment this was the day of Pentecost. Not: *at that time* (De Wette), or, as Hengstenberg twists it: in the *period of time*, beginning with the day of the *resurrection* (comp. Weiss); for a definite fact, marked off in point of time, is treated of, and this is the advent of Christ in the Paraclete. Comp. xvi. 23.—γνώσεσθε, κ.τ.λ.] This dynamic immanence of Christ in the Father (see on x. 38), which exists even in His state of exaltation (Col. iii. 3), like the analogous reciprocal relation between Him and the disciples, according to which they live and move in Him and He in them (Gal. ii. 20), was to become for them a matter of experimental acquaintance through the Spirit.—Ver. 21. General moral condition of this promised γνώσεσθε. Comp. ver. 15.—ὁ ἔχων, κ.τ.λ.] Augustine: “qui habet in memoria et servat in vita.” The ἔχειν, however, is rather the internal *possession* of the commandments, obtained by faith, the appropriated living presence of them in the believing consciousness, as the consequence of the ἀκούειν. Comp. v. 38.—ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν] with great and exclusive emphasis.—In ἀγαπηθῆσ. and ἀγαπήσω lies the peculiar mutual love.—καὶ ἐγὼ ἀγαπ.] ὡς ἀμφοτέρων τὰ αὐτὰ θελόντων κ. ἀποδεχομένων, Euth. Zigabenus.—ἐμφανίσω αὐτῷ ἐμαυτόν] corresponds to the γνώσεσθε, which was to commence through this very *causing of Himself to appear* in virtue of the communication of the Spirit. On ἐμφαν., comp. Ex. xxxiii. 13, 18; Sap. i. 2; Matt. xxvii. 53. The expression is such, that it sets forth the relation of the self-demonstration of the Lord to *His individual loving ones*, not His manifestation at the *Parousia*, which certainly will be glorious and universal (in answer to Luthardt). Those who explain it of the resurrection of Christ understand the appearances of the Risen One to be referred to, 1 Cor. xv. (Grotius, Hilgenfeld, and many others).

Ver. 22. *Judas* (Thaddaeus or Lebbaeus, Matt. x. 3; not,

<sup>1</sup> Luthardt, according to his view of the entire passage, must understand the day of the *Parousia*, whereby he assigns to γνώσεσθε the moment of the *completed* knowledge.

however, a brother of the Lord, Acts i. 13, 14, but son of one James, Luke vi. 16)<sup>1</sup> expects a *bodily* appearance of Christ in Messianic glory, has in this view misunderstood Jesus, and is therefore surprised that He has spoken of His ἐμφανίζειν ἑαυτὸν as having reference only to the man who loves Him, and not also to the world of the unbelieving, on whom the Messiah when He appeared was in truth to execute judgment. — τί γέγονεν] *What has come to pass*, in respect to the fact that, etc.? What occurrence has determined Thee, etc.? See Kypke, I. p. 403 f. The foregoing καί as in ix. 36. — The addition οὐχ ὁ Ἰσκαρ. was indeed, after xiii. 30, quite superfluous, but is to be explained as an involuntary outflow of the deep loathing felt at the traitor of like name. The latter is not to be thought of as *again present* (Bengel).

Vv. 23, 24. Jesus repeats—and that was sufficient for the removal of such a misunderstanding—substantially, yet now at once placing love as the principal matter in the immediate foreground, the condition to which His self-revelation, ver. 22, is attached, by more closely defining it according to its divine and blessed manner of existence; and shows from this, and from the antithesis added in ver. 24, that the κόσμος—this κόσμος which hates Him and is disobedient to Him—is quite incapable of receiving that self-revelation. The more precise explanation, πρὸς αὐτ. ἐλευσόμ. κ. μονὴν παρ' αὐτῷ ποιησόμεθα, is intended to make this very incapacity still more distinctly and deeply felt. At the foundation of the expression lies the theocratic idea, realized in this spiritual fellowship, of the dwelling of God amongst His people (Ex. xxv. 8, xxix. 45; Lev. xxvi. 11, 12; Ezek xxxvii. 26 ff.), with which also the later representation of the dwelling of the Shekinah with the pious (Danz in Meuschen, *N. T. ex Talm. ill.* p. 701 ff.) is connected. *This* representation, however, is not to be assumed here, since Jesus means an *invisible* presence. In the plural of *communion*, ἐλευσόμεθα is the clear expression of the *divine-human* consciousness, x. 30. — On the genuinely Greek expression μονὴν ποιεῖν, see Kypke, I. p. 404. The *Middle* (see critical notes): *we will make to ourselves*. — παρ' αὐτῷ] The *unio mystica*, into which God and Christ enter

<sup>1</sup> Nonnus correctly remarks: οὐδὲ Ἰακώβου, κ. οὐ θρασὺς Ἰσκαριώτης.

with man by means of the Paraclete,<sup>1</sup> is presented in the sensuous form of the taking up an abode *with Him* (comp. vv. 17, 25), *i.e. in His dwelling* (comp. i. 40, Acts xxi. 8, *et al.*), under His roof. They come, like wanderers from their heavenly home (ver. 2), and *lodge with Him*, "will be daily His guests, yea, house and table companions," Luther. — The λόγοι, *discourses*, are the individual parts of the collective λόγος, and the ἐντολαί are the *preceptive* parts of the same, and form, therefore, a more special conception than the λόγοι. — καὶ ὁ λόγος ὃν ἀκούετε, κ.τ.λ.] *and*—from this you may infer how unfitted such a man is to experience that visitation—the word which ye hear (now, still!), etc. Comp. vii. 16, viii. 28, xii. 49, 50, iii. 34. He therefore rejects God Himself. The second person (ἀκούετε) is individualizing (not to be limited to what was said in vv. 23, 24, as Godet takes it), and makes the expression at the close of this portion of the address more lively.

Vv. 25, 26. We are to suppose a pause before ver. 25; Jesus looks back upon all that He has hitherto said to them at His farewell supper, and of which so much still remained to them enigmatical, and continues: "*These things have I spoken to you, whilst I (still) tarry with you; but the Paraclete who, after my impending separation from you, will have come to you from the Father, He will further instruct you,*" etc. — ἐν τῷ ὀνόμ. μου] Specific definiteness of the act of sending. God sends the Spirit *in the name of Jesus*, *i.e.* so that what the name Jesus Christ comprises in itself, forms the *sphere in which* the divine thought, counsel, and will lives, and is active in the sending. Comp. on ver. 13. The name of Jesus is the only name which includes in itself the eternal salvation of men (Acts iv. 12); but God intends and designs, in the mission of the Spirit—the *causa meritoria* of which lies already in this name, and the appearance of which is attached to the glorification of Jesus (viii. 39)—nothing else than this Name, the complete saving knowledge of which, its confession, influence, glorification, etc., is to be brought about and advanced through the mission of the Spirit, as in general, all that He has done in

<sup>1</sup> Not: "in the divine elevation above space and time" (Weiss, *Lehrbegr.* p. 276), which introduces here a speculative idea which is very remote from the meaning.

the carrying out of His redemptive counsel, He has done ἐν Χριστῷ, Eph. i. 3 ff. The notion: *at my request* (comp. Godet: "in meam gratiam"), is not contained in the words, although, according to ver. 14, the prayer of Jesus *precedes* (in answer to Lücke, De Wette, Ebrard, Godet, and several others). Better, but only an approximation, and wanting in precision, is the interpretation of B. Crusius: in my *affair*, and of Melancthon and several others: *propter me*. The rendering, *in my stead* (Euth. Zigabenus and several others, including Tholuck, Baeumlein, Ewald, Weiss), is not appropriate, since, according to it, the Spirit would not appear as the Representative of Christ (comp. v. 43), but *God*, as *in Christ's stead*, executing the *mission*—which would be absurd. It must in that case run: ὁ ἐλεύσεται παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου, comp. xvi. 7. — In the ministry of the Spirit ὑμᾶς διδάξει πάντα is the general feature: *He will not leave you uninstructed respecting any portion of the divine ἀλήθεια* (comp. xvi. 13): to this the particular is then joined: καὶ ὑπομνήσει, κ.τ.λ.: *and (and especially) will He bring to your recollection*, etc. To the first belong also new portions of doctrine, not yet delivered by Jesus (see on xvi. 12), also disclosures of the future (xvi. 13). On ὑπομνήσει, κ.τ.λ., comp. e.g. ii. 22, xii. 16. ἃ εἶπον ὑμῖν might also be referred to διδάξει πάντα (Luther, Melancthon, Grotius, Calovius, and several others), but xvi. 12, 13 justifies the ordinary reference, which also logically at once suggests itself, merely to the second πάντα, and nevertheless excludes the misuse of the present passage in favour of Catholic *tradition* (see on xvi. 12), as well as of the revelations of *fanaticism*. Of the actual fulfilment of the entire promise, the apostolic discourses and letters supply the full proof. — εἶπον] Not merely now, but generally, as the context, by the first πάντα, demands.

Ver. 27. "These are last words, as of one who is about to go away and says good-night, or gives his blessing," Luther. — εἰρήνην ἀφ' ἡμῶν ὑμῖν] The whole position of affairs, as Jesus is on the point of concluding these His last discourses (ver. 31), as well as the characteristic word εἰρήνη, introduced without further preface, justifies the ordinary assumption that here there is an allusion to the Oriental greetings at partings and

dismissals, in which שָׁלוֹם (*i.e.* not specially : *Peace of soul*, but generally : *Prosperity*) was wished. Comp. 1 Sam. i. 17, xx. 42, xxix. 5 ; Mark v. 34 ; Luke vii. 50, viii. 48 ; Acts xvi. 36 ; Jas. ii. 16 ; also the Syrian *pacem dedit*, in the sense of *valedixit* in Assem. Bibl. I. p. 376 ; and finally, the epistolary farewell-greeting, Eph. vi. 23 ; 1 Pet. v. 14 ; 3 John 15. That which men were wont to *wish* at departure, namely, *prosperity*, Jesus is conscious of *leaving behind*, and of *giving* to His disciples, and that in the best and highest sense, namely, *the entire prosperity of His redemptive work*, “ fore ejus benedictione semper felices ” (Calvin), in which, however, the *peace of reconciliation with God* (Rom. v. 1), as the first essential element, is also *included*. To assume (with Lücke) in the expression a reference, at the same time, to the O. T. peace-assuring and encouraging address שָׁלוֹם לָכֶם (Gen. xliii. 23 ; Judg. vi. 23, *et al.*), is less in harmony with the *departing* scene, and the remote μὴ παρασέσθω, κ.τ.λ., as well as with the expression of this consolatory address. — εἰρ. τ. ἐμὴν δίδ. ὑμ.] More precise definition of what has preceded. It is *His*, the *peculiar* prosperity proceeding from *Him*, which He *gives* to them as His bequest. Thus speaks He to His own, who, on the threshold of death, is leaving hereditary possessions : “ I *leave behind*, I *give*,” in the consciousness that this will be accomplished *by His death*. So also Jesus, whose δίδωμι is to be understood neither as *promitto* (Kuinoel), nor even to be conceived as first taking place through the Paraclete (who rather brings about only the *appropriation* of the salvation given in the death of Jesus).—*Not as the world gives, give I to you!* Nothing is to be supplied. *My giving to you* is of quite another kind than the giving of the (unbelieving) *world* ; its giving bestows treasure, pleasure, honour, and the like, is therefore unsatisfying, bringing no permanent good, no genuine prosperity, etc.<sup>1</sup> Quite out of relation to the profound seriousness of the moment, and therefore irrelevant, is the reference to the usual empty formulas of salutation (Grotius, Kling, Godet). — μὴ παρασέσθω, κ.τ.λ.] “ Thus does He conclude exactly as He first (ver. 1) began this discourse,” Luther. The short asyndetic

<sup>1</sup> Hengstenberg introduces quite groundlessly a reference to the ἀγάπη, which the world gives, according to xvi. 33.

(here supply οὖν) sentences correspond to the deep emotion.—*δειλιάω* (Diod. xx. 78) here only in the N. T., frequently in the LXX., which, on the other hand, has not the classical (*δοκιμώτερον*, Thomas Magister) *ἀποδειλιάω*.

Ver. 28. Instead of being terrified and alarmed, you should *rejoice*, that I, etc. *ἡκούσατε, κ.τ.λ.* (ver. 18) prepares for this. — *εἰ ἡγαπ. με*] intended by Jesus to be understood in its ideal sense, of true, complete love, which consists simply and solely in entire self-surrender to Him, so that all other interests are subordinated to it. — *ὅτι ὁ πατήρ μου μείζων μου ἐστίν*] Statement of the reason for the joy which they would have felt (*ἐχάρητε*): *since my Father is greater*, as generally, so particularly, more powerful (comp. ver. 12, viii. 53, x. 29; 1 John iv. 4) *than I*; since I, consequently, through my departure to Him, shall be elevated in the higher fellowship with Him, *to far greater power and efficiency* for my aims, for victory over the world, etc. Comp. Melancthon. In *this* gain, which is awaiting me, how should not he rejoice who loves me? *Others* find the motive to joy indicated by Christ in the *glory and blessedness* which awaits Him with the Father. So Cyril (*τὴν ἰδίαν δόξαν ἀναληψόμενος*), and several, including Tholuck, Olshausen, Kling, Köstlin, Maier, Hilgenfeld, Hengstenberg, Baeumlein, comp. Godet. But thus the motive would lie only in the departure to the Father generally (with which the attainment of the *δόξα* was necessarily associated), not to the Father's superior *greatness of being*, irrespective of the fact, that on this view the reference which Jesus would be giving to the love of the disciples would contain something selfish. *Others* render: the occasion of joy lies in the more powerful *protection* which the *μείζων πατήρ* would assure to the disciples, beyond what He, during His presence on earth, was able to do (Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, and several others, including Kuinoel, Lücke, De Wette). But this does not apply to the condition of love to *the person of Jesus*, for the above explanation changes it rather into love towards His *work*. *Others*, as Luther, Beza, Grotius, Bengel, Lampe, mingle together in the determination of the cause of joy, the interest of Christ *and* of the disciples; comp. Calvin: "*quia haec ultima est meta, ad quam tendere vos*

oportet." — The *μειζονότης* of the Father (formerly the point of controversy with the Arians, see Suicer, *Thes.* II. p. 1368) does not rest in the pre-eminence of the *unbegotten* over the *begotten* (Athanasius, Faustinus, Gregory Nazianzus, Hilarius, Euth. Zigabenus, and many others, including again also Olshausen), for which special expedient the text offers no occasion whatever, nor again in the temporal *humiliation* of Christ (Cyril, Augustine, Ammonius, Luther, Melancthon, Calvin, Beza, Aretius, and many others, including De Wette, Tholuck, and Luthardt), since God is also greater than the *exalted* Christ (see ver. 16, *ἐρωτήσω*, xvii. 5; 1 Cor. xv. 27, 28; Phil. ii. 9–11; 1 Cor. iii. 23, xi. 3, and generally throughout the N. T.), as He was also greater than the pre-existent Logos (i. 1–3); but in the *absolute monotheism of Jesus* (xvii. 3), and of the whole N. T. (see on Rom. ix. 5), according to which the Son, although of divine essence,<sup>1</sup> and *ὁμοούσιος* with the Father (i. 1; Phil. ii. 6; Col. i. 15–18, *et al.*), nevertheless was, and is, and remains *subordinated* to the Father, the immutably Highest One, since the Son, as Organ, as Commissioner of the Father, as Intercessor with Him, etc., has received His whole power, even in the kingly office, from the Father (xvii. 5), and, after the complete accomplishment of the work committed to Him, will restore it to the Father (1 Cor. xv. 28). The remark of Hengstenberg is incorrect: Only such a pre-eminence of greatness on the part of the Father can be intended, as came to an end with the departure of Christ to the Father.

Ver. 29. *And now, even now, when my departure is approaching, I have said it to you, namely, ὅτι πορεύομαι πρὸς τ. π.,* ver. 28, not what was said in ver. 26, as Lücke thinks. — *ὅταν γένηται*] *cum factum fuerit*, namely, through my death; comp. xiii. 19. — *πιστεύσητε*] Not absolutely, so that it would express *of itself* what is more precisely defined in xiii. 19 by *ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι*; but: *that you may believe it*, namely, that I have gone to the Father. Comp. *πιστεύετε μοι*, ver. 11. The point for the departing Lord was, that

This forms the previous assumption of the declaration, which otherwise would be without meaning and relevancy. Comp. on x. 30. In truth, from the mouth of an ordinary human being it would be an utterance of folly.



when His approaching death should take place, the disciples should have the true believing apprehension of it, namely, as His departure to the Father.

Ver. 30. Οὐκέτι πολλὰ, κ.τ.λ.] “Quasi dicat: temporis angustiae abripiunt verba,” Grotius. — *For the prince of the world* (see on xii. 31) *is coming* (is already drawing near). Jesus sees the devil himself in the organs and executors of his design (xiii. 2, 27, vi. 70; Luke iv. 13). — τοῦ κόσμου] is here emphatically placed first in antithesis to ἐν ἐμοί. — καὶ ἐν ἐμοὶ οὐκ ἔχει οὐδέν] *and in me* (antithesis of the κόσμος, xvii. 16) *he possesses nothing*, namely, as pertaining to his dominion, which more minute definition flows from the conception of the ἄρχων; hence neither ποιεῖν (Kuinoel), nor μέρος (Nonnus), nor “of which he could *accuse* me before God” (Ewald), is to be supplied; nor again is the simple sense of the words to be transformed into “he has no *claim* on me” (Tholuck, Hofmann, and several others); comp. Luther: “cause and right.” In any case, Christ expresses the full *moral freedom* with which He subjects Himself to death (x. 18). The *sinlessness*, which Cyril, Augustine (“in me non habet quicquam, nullum omnino scilicet peccatum”), Euth. Zigabenus, Cornelius a Lapide, and many others, including Olshausen, here find expressed, certainly lies at the foundation as a necessary causal *presupposition*, since only provided that Jesus were sinless, could the devil have in Him nothing that was his, but is not directly *expressed*. That He has already overcome the world (xvi. 33) is not the reason (Lücke), but the consequence of His freedom from the prince of the world. — The καὶ is not: *but* (Ebrard, Godet); for the antithesis first follows with ἀλλά. Therefore: he comes, and is powerless over me (wherefore I needed not to surrender myself to him), *but, nevertheless, that*, etc., ver. 31.

Ver. 31. *That the world may know*, etc. (as far as οὗτω ποιῶ), *rise* (from table), *let us go hence!* In order to bring the world to the knowledge of my love and my obedience to the Father (“ut mundus desinat mundus esse et patris in me beneplacitum agnoscat salutariter,” Bengel), let us away from here, and go to meet the diabolical power, before which I must now fall according to God’s counsel! The apodosis

does not begin so early as *καὶ καθώς* (Grotius, Kuinoel, Paulus), in which case *καί* would mean *also*, and a reflection less appropriate to the mood of deep emotion would result. If a full point be placed after *ποιῶ* (Bengel, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Ewald), which, however, renders the sentence heavy, and makes what follows to stand too abruptly, then after *ἀλλ'* a simple *ἔρχεται* would have to be supplied. Comp. xv. 25. — After the summons *ἐγείρεσθε, κ.τ.λ.*, we are to think of the company at table as having risen. But Jesus, so full of that which, in view of the separation ever drawing nearer, He desired to impress on the heart of the disciples, and enchained by His love for them, takes up the word anew, and standing, continues to address chap. xv. and xvi. to the risen disciples, and then follows the prayer of chap. xvii., after which the actual departure, xviii. 1, ensues. This view (Knapp, Lücke, Tholuck, Olshausen, Klee, Winer, Luthardt, Ewald, Brückner, Bleek, following the older expositors, also Gerhard, Calovius, and Maldonatus) appears to be correct from this, that John, without any indication of a change of place, connects xv. 1 immediately with xiv. 31; while, that the following discourses, and especially the prayer, were uttered *on the way* (Ammonius, Hilarius, Beda, Luther, Aretius, Grotius, Wetstein, Lampe, Rosenmüller, Lange, Ebrard), is neither in any way indicated, nor reconcilable with xviii. 1, nor psychologically probable. A pure importation, further, is the opinion of Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, Erasmus, and several others, that Christ, xiv. 31, went with the disciples to a more secluded and safer place, where He ("sur la pente couverte de vignes, qui descend dans la vallée du Cédron," Godet) delivered chap. xv., xvi., xvii.; so also is Bengel's harmonistic device, which Wichelhaus has adopted, that the locality of the discourse from xiii. 31<sup>1</sup> to xiv. 31 had been outside the city, but that now He set forth to go to Jerusalem for the passover.<sup>2</sup> Others, while De Wette abides

<sup>1</sup> Bengel on xiii. 31: "*λίγαι*: dicit postridie, nempe mane, feria V."

<sup>2</sup> So also again Röpe, *d. Mahl des Fusswasch.*, Hamb. 1856, p. 25 f., who, following Bynæus, assumes that in *ἐγείρεσθε, κ.τ.λ.* is contained the setting forth from Bethany for Jerusalem, and that chap. xv.-xvii. were then spoken at the paschal meal on the 14th Nisan, in reference to the institution of the Supper.

by the hypothesis of an *hiatus* between chap. xiv. and xv., the reason of which remains unknown, have sought to make use of the *ἐγέλπεσθε, ἄγωμεν*, Matt. xxvi. 46, Mark xiv. 42, in spite of the quite different historical connection in Matthew and Mark, in order to charge the author with a clumsy attempt to interweave that reminiscence in his narrative (Strauss, Scholten); in opposition to which Weisse, with equal arbitrariness and injustice, accuses the supposed editor of the Gospel with having placed in juxtaposition, without any link of connection, two Johannean compositions, of which the one closed with xiv. 31, and the other began with xv. 1. Baur and Hilgenfeld, indeed, make the synoptic words, divested of their more definite historical justification, stand here only as a sign of *pause*. The Johannean words, and those in the Synoptics uttered in Gethsemane, have *nothing* to do with one another; but the apparent incongruity with the present passage speaks, in fact, in favour of the personal testimony of the reporter, before whose eyes the whole scene vividly presented itself. Comp. Bleek's *Beitr.* p. 239.

## CHAPTER XV.

VER. 4. Tisch. has the forms μένη and μένητε; similarly, ver. 6, μένη. Lachm. also has the latter and μένητε, ver. 4. Considering the divided state of the evidence (A. B.  $\kappa$ . in particular agree in favour of μέν.), no decision can be come to. — Ver. 6. τὸ πῦρ] Elz. Lachm. have merely πῦρ, against preponderating testimony. In the passages of similar meaning, Matt. iii. 10, vii. 19, Luke iii. 9, there is likewise no article found, which, consequently, was more readily omitted than added. — Ver. 7. αἰτήσεσθε] A. B. D. L. M. X. Curss. Verss. Chrys.: αἰτήσασθε. Recommended by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. and Tisch. This preponderant attestation, the reference of the word to the fut., and the immediate proximity of the future tense, decide in favour of the genuineness of the aorist. — Ver. 8. γενήσεσθε] Rinck and Lachm.: γένησθε. The witnesses are greatly divided. But the conjunctive is a correction after φέρητε. — Ver. 11. μείνη] A. B. D. Curss. Vulg. It. *et al.*: ἦ. Recommended by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. Rightly; after the previous frequent recurrence of the verb μένω, μείνη very readily and involuntarily arose here out of the last syllable of ἔμιν and the following ἦ. — Ver. 13. The deletion of τις (Tisch.) is too weakly supported. It came to be passed over as being superfluous. — Ver. 14. ὁσα] D. L. X.  $\kappa$ .: ἄ. So Lachm. Tisch. The singular ὁ is found in B. Codd. of It. Goth. Aeth. Cypr. Lucif. The witnesses alone are decisive, and that for the plural, more precisely for ἄ. — Ver. 15. The order λέγω ὑμῶς (Lachm. Tisch.) is accredited by preponderating evidence. — Ver. 21. ὑμῶν] Lachm. and Tisch.: εἰς ὑμῶς, after B. D.\* L.  $\kappa$ .\*\* 1, 33, Verss. Chrys. Rightly; the more current and customary dative flowed of itself from the copyists' pens, as it was also added in xvi. 3. — Ver. 22. εἰχόν] Here and in ver. 24 Lachm. and Tisch. have the Alexandrine form εἰχόσαν, according to B. L. II.\*  $\kappa$ . 1, 33, Or. Cyr. Not to be adopted, since this form is certainly found only in Rom. iii. 13, in a citation from the O. T. (ἰδοὺ τοὺς ἄνθρωπους), while here the evidence is not sufficiently strong (not found even in A.). Buttmann, in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1858, p. 491 f., supposes that εἰχόσαν arose from the original εἰχόν ἄν. Yet of ἄν no further trace is

found in the critical witnesses, and its (rhetorical) omission (see Buttmann, *l.c.* p. 489) is quite free from doubt. — Ver. 24. *πεποίηκεν*] A. B. D. J. K. L. X. Π. Σ. Curss. Chrys.: *ἐποίησεν*. So Lachm. Tisch. The testimony in favour of this rendering is decisive.

Ver. 1. Since the picture is introduced altogether without any intermediate reference, it is natural to assume some external occasion for it, which John has not related.<sup>1</sup> That which most obviously suggests itself is the *look at the cup of wine* (comp. Matt. xxvi. 29: τὸ γέννημα τοῦ ἀμπέλου), which precisely at *this* supper had assumed so great significance. Comp. Grotius and Nösselt, *Opusc.* II. p. 25 ff., also Ewald. Had Jesus spoken what follows on the way (see on xiv. 31), or even, as G. Hier. Rosenmüller (in F. E. Rosenmüller, *Repert.* I. p. 167 ff.) supposed, in the temple, then in the former case the walk through vineyards (comp. especially Lange, who assumes the existence of garden-fires by night, and Godet), and in the latter case the golden vine at the gate of the temple (Joseph. *Antt.* xv. 11. 3, *Bell.* v. 5. 4), might be supposed to present a suitable occasion. It is more arbitrary to suppose (Knapp, Tholuck) a vine whose tendrils had crept into the room (comp. Ps. cxxviii. 3), or: that there was at full moon a view of the vineyards from the room (Storr), or of the golden vine of the temple (Lampe). Most arbitrary of all, however, is the supposition that John may have placed the similitude, in itself genuine, here in the wrong place (De Wette). If the thought of the cup at the meal just concluded did not so spontaneously suggest itself, it would be safer, with Lücke and B. Crusius, to assume *no* external occasion at all, since the figure itself was so frequent in the O. T. (Isa. v. 1 ff.; Jer. ii. 21; Ezek. xv. 1 ff., xix. 10 ff.; Ps. lxxx. 9 ff.; comp. also Lightfoot and Wetstein); and therefore (comp. Matt. xxi. 33 ff.) the disciples who were standing around Him could immediately, and of themselves, see Jesus set forth under this venerable figure (Luthardt and Lichtenstein, following Hofmann, also Ebrard). — ἡ ἀληθινή] *the actual, i.e. containing*

<sup>1</sup> Almost throughout the entire chapter (as far as ver. 18) the particles of connection between the individual utterances are wanting, and this is in keeping with deeply stirred and intense emotion.

the reality of the idea, which is figuratively set forth in the natural vine (comp. on i. 9, vi. 35), not in antithesis to the *unfruitful* vine, *i.e.* the degenerate people of Israel (Ebrard, Hengstenberg), which is here remote, since the Lord is designating *Himself* as ἄμπελος, not His ἐκκλησία (this is regarded as in antithesis to the Jewish). Christ is the *Vine* in relation to His *believing ones* (the branches), whose organic connection with Him is the constant, fruitful, and most inward fellowship of life. Quite similar as to the thing is the Pauline figure of the head and the members (Eph. v. 30; Col. ii. 19). The *vine-dresser* (γεωργός, Matt. xxi. 23, *et al.*; Aelian, *N. A.* vii. 28; Aristaen. i. 3) is *God*; for He has sent Christ, and established the fellowship of believers with Him (vi. 37, *et al.*), and tends it in virtue of His working through Christ's word, and (after His departure) through the power of the Holy Spirit.

Ver. 2. As on the natural vine there are fruitful and unfruitful branches (*i.e.* *tendrils*, Plat. *Rep.* p. 353 A; Pollux, vii. 145), so there are in the fellowship of Christ such as evince their faith by deed as by faith's fruit, and those amongst whom this is not the case. — The latter, who are not, with Hengstenberg, to be taken for *the unbelieving Jews* (as is already clear from ἐν ἐμοί and from ver. 5), but for the *lip-Christians* and those who say Lord! Lord! (comp. those who believe without love, 1 Cor. xiii), God separates from the fellowship of Christ, which act is conceived from the point of view of divine retribution (comp. the thing, according to another figure, viii. 35); the former He causes to experience His purging influence, in order that their life of faith may increase in moral practical manifestation and efficiency. This purification is effected by means of temptations and sufferings, not *solely*, but by other things *along with* these. — πᾶν κλῆμα ἐν ἐμοί] Nominat. absol. as in i. 12, vi. 39, xvii. 2, with weighty emphasis. — αἶρει] *takes it away* with the pruning-knife. It forms with καθαίρει a "suavis rhythmus," Bengel. — τὸ καρπ. φέρ.] *which bears fruit*; but previously μὴ φέρ.: *if it does not bear*. — καθαίρει] *He cleanses, prunes*. Figure of the moral καθαρισμός,—continually necessary even for the approved Christian,—through the working of divine grace, xiii. 10. —

For a *political* view of the community under the figure of the vine, see in Aesch. *adv. Ctesiph.* 166; Beck.: ἀμπελουργοῦσί τινες τὴν πόλιν, ἀνατετμήκασί τινες τὰ κλήματα τὰ τοῦ δήμου.

Ver. 3. Application of the second half of ver. 2 to the *disciples*, in so far as they belong to the κλήματα; as a preparation for the exhortation in ver. 4. "Already are *ye* clean" (such purified κλήματα); already there has taken place *in your case*, that which I have just said. The ἤδη ὑμεῖς glances at the multitude of those who were yet to become καθαροί *in the future*. That their purity *originally* is intended, not excluding the necessary continuance and practical further development of the relation (comp. xiii. 10), is understood as a matter of course, and see ver. 4. The *mundi* cease not to be *mundandi*. — διὰ τ. λόγον] διὰ, as vi. 57 of the *ground*; hence: *on account of* the word, *i.e.* because the word ("provided it be received and apprehended in faith," Luther, comp. Acts xv. 9) is the power of God (Rom. i. 16), in virtue of which it effects its καθαίρει, ver. 2; Jas. i. 18; 1 Pet. i. 23. Comp. Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* II. p. 162, I. p. 197; Nägelsbach, *z. Ilias*, p. 39 f., ed. 3. The *word*, however, is the *whole* word, the entire doctrine which Jesus has delivered to them (comp. on viii. 43), not the utterance in xiii. 10 (Hilgenfeld, Ebrard).

Ver. 4. To this purity, however, must be added the continuous *faithful persistence* in my living fellowship. — ἐν ἐμοί] here: *on* (not *in*) *me*, συμπεφυῶτες ἐμοί (Nonnus), as is required by what follows, hanging on me as the branches hang on the vine, ver. 2. Euth. Zigabenus aptly remarks: συγκολλώμενοί μοι βεβαιώτερον διὰ πίστεως ἀδιστακτου καὶ σχέσεως ἀρρήκτου. — κἀγὼ ἐν ὑμῖν] to the fulfilment of the requirement<sup>1</sup> is attached the promise: *and I will abide on you*—συνὼν τῇ δυνάμει, Euth. Zigabenus—with the whole power of spiritual life, which I impart to my faithful ones; I will not separate myself from you, like the vine, which does not loosen itself from its branches. On μενῶ as a supplement, see Bornemann in the *Sächs. Stud.* 1846, p. 56. The harsher mode of completing the sense: *and cause that I abide on you* (Grotius, Bengel), is not demanded by ver. 5, where ὁ μένων . . . αὐτῷ

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Weiss, *Lehrbegr.* p. 74.

is the fulfilled μέινετε . . . ὑμῖν. — ἐὰν μὴ μέινῃ, κ.τ.λ.] *If he shall not have abided, etc., refers merely to οὐ δύναται καρπὸν φέρειν* (as in v. 19), and is so far a more exact definition of the ἀφ' αὐτοῦ, "*vi aliqua propria, quam habeat extra vitem,*" Grotius. — οὕτως οὐδὲ ὑμεῖς] *so neither you, namely δύνασθε καρπ. φέρειν ἀφ' αὐτῶν, i.e. ποιεῖν τι χωρὶς ἐμοῦ*, ver. 5. Bengel well remarks: "Hic locus egregie declarat discrimen naturae et gratiae," but also the *possibility of losing* the latter.

Ver. 5. Abide on me, I say, for I am the vine, ye the branches; thus then only *from me* (not ἀφ' αὐτῶν, ver. 4) can you derive the living power for bearing fruit. And you must *abide* on me, as I on you: so (οὗτος: *he*, no other than *he*) will you bring forth *much* fruit. In this way, by means of ἐγὼ . . . κλήματα the preceding ἐν ἐμοί, and by means of ὁ μένων, κ.τ.λ., the preceding μέινετε is confirmed and brought into relief. Hence also the emphatic position of ἐγὼ and μένων. — ἀγὼ ἐν αὐτῷ] Instead of καὶ ἐν ᾧ ἐγὼ μένω, this clause—not relative, but appending itself in an easy and lively manner—is introduced. See on this classic idiom, Bernhardt, p. 304; Nägelsbach, *z. Ilias*, p. 6, ed. 3; Buttmann, *N. T. Gr.* p. 327 f. [E. T. p. 382]. — χωρὶς ἐμοῦ] *χωρισθέντες ἀπ' ἐμοῦ*, out of living fellowship with me. Comp. Eph. ii. 12; Tittmann, *Synon.* p. 94. Antithetic to ἐν ἐμοὶ μένειν. — ποιεῖν οὐδέν] *effect nothing*, bring about nothing, passing from the figure into the proper mode of presentation. The *activity of the Christian life in general* is meant, not merely that of the apostles, since the disciples are addressed, not especially in respect of their narrower vocation, but generally as κλήματα of Christ, which standing they have in common with all believers. The utter incapacity for Christian efficiency without the maintenance of the living connection with Christ is here decidedly and emphatically expressed; on this subject, however, Augustine, and with him ecclesiastical orthodoxy, has frequently drawn inferences too wide in favour of the doctrine of moral inability generally (see especially Calovius); since it is only the ability for the specifically *Christian* ποιεῖν τι (the καρπὸν φέρειν) which is denied to him who is χωρὶς Χριστοῦ. For this *higher* moral activity, which, indeed, is the only *true* one, he is unable (iii. 6), and in this sense



it may be said with Augustine, that Christ thus spoke, "*ut responderet futuro Pelagio*;" where, however, a natural moral volition and ability of a lower grade in and of itself (comp. Rom. ii. 14, 15, vii. 14 ff.) is not denied, nor its measure and power more exactly defined than to this effect, that it cannot attain to Christian morality, to which rather the ethical power of the living fellowship with Christ here depicted, consequently the new birth, is indispensable. Luther well says: "that He speaks not here of the natural or worldly being and life, but of fruits of the gospel." And in *so far* "*nos penitus privat omni virtute, nisi quam suppeditat ipse nobis*," Calvin.

Ver. 6. *Νῦν λέγει καὶ τὸν κίνδυνον τοῦ μὴ ἐν αὐτῷ μένοντος*, Euth. Zigabenus; and how terrible in its tragic simplicity! — *ἐὰν μὴ τις*] *nisi quis manserit*. See Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 289. Comp. iii. 3, 5. — *ἐβλήθη ἔξω, κ.τ.λ.*] The representation is highly vivid and pictorial. Jesus places Himself *at the point of time of the execution of the last judgment*, when those who have fallen away from Him are gathered together and cast into the fire, after they have been *previously* already cast out of His communion, and become withered (having completely lost the higher true ζωή). Hence the graphic lively change of tense: *In case any one shall not have abided on me; he has been cast out like the branch, and is withered* (already before the judgment), *and* (now what takes place at the last day itself) *they gather them together*, etc. The *aorists* therefore neither denote what is wont to be (Grotius), nor do they stand for futures (Kuinoel, B. Crusius, and older expositors), nor are they to be explained "*par la répétition de l'acte aussi longtemps que dure l'opération de la taille*" (Godet); nor are they designed, as in Matt. xviii. 15, to express that which is at once done or appointed to be done with the non-abiding (so most expositors, including Lücke, Winer, Tholuck, De Wette, Luthardt, Weiss, Hengstenberg; comp. Hermann, *de emend. Grammat.* p. 192 f.; Buttmann, *N. T. Gram.* p. 172 [E. T. p. 199]). To the latter interpretation is opposed the circumstance that, in point of fact, the being cast out and being withered cannot be appointed or effected immediately at and with the falling away, but that

conversion and re-adoption must remain open (comp. ἡ πρόσληψις, Rom. xi. 15), if εἰ μὴ τις, κ.τ.λ. is not to have in view the time of the judgment at the last day. The ἐβλήθη, κ.τ.λ. appears as a definite result and as a completed act of the past,<sup>1</sup> and that, as the further pictorial description, κ. συνάγουσιν, κ.τ.λ., shows, from the standpoint of the last day (comp. also Heb. vi. 8, x. 27), and further in such a way that it is accomplished between the beginning of the falling away and the last day on which the gathering together and burning is now performed.<sup>2</sup> — ὡς τὸ κλήμα] as the branch, which has not remained on the vine, but has been broken off or cut off, and cast out of the vineyard. But the vineyard represents the fellowship of the Messianic people of God, out of which he who has fallen away from Christ has been thrust. Hence ἔξω refers to the vineyard, so far as this is the community. Outside it, the ζωή of the man who has fallen away, which he had derived from Christ, has completely perished and is dead. This is expressed by ἐξηράνθη, by which the man is identified with the withered branch, which is his image. Euth. Zigabenus well remarks: ἀπώλεσεν ἣν εἶχεν ἐκ τῆς ρίζης ἱκανάδα χάριτος. — καὶ συνάγ. αὐτὰ, κ.τ.λ.] Jesus now represents as present what is done with these cast-out and withered branches at the last day. The polysyndeton (comp. x. 3, 12; Matt. vii. 27, et al.) and the simply solemn expression has much in it that seizes the imagination. The subject of συνάγ. and βάλλ. is understood of itself; in the figure it is the servants of the γεωργός, as to the thing, the αἰθέριοι δρηστῆρες (Nonnus), the angels, are intended (Matt. xiii. 41). — εἰς τὸ πῦρ (see critical notes): into the fire, already burning for this purpose, by which, in the interpretation of the figure, Gehenna is intended (Matt. xiii. 42, xxv. 41, iii. 10, vii. 19, v. 22, et al.), not also the fire of the divine anger generally (Hengstenberg). — καὶ καλεῖται] and they burn! The simple form (οὐ μὴν κατακαίονται, Euth. Zigabenus) as in Matt. xiii. 40. "Magna vi positum eximia cum majestate," Bengel.

<sup>1</sup> Hence the aorist, instead of which the perfect was not required, as Luthardt objects. The ἥδη κέρπεται of iii. 18 is conceived of differently.

<sup>2</sup> The reading μὴν (see critical notes) would not essentially alter the sense; it expresses: nisi quis manet, i.e. until the judgment.

Ver. 7. After thus deterring from non-abiding, in ver. 6, now again an inducement to abiding. But the *figure* now ceases, and leaves in what follows some further scarcely accordant notes (vv. 8, 16) behind. — ἐὰν μείν. ἐν ἐμοί] Still in the sense of the figure, as the branches on the vine; but with καὶ τὰ ῥήμ. μ. ἐν ὑμῖν (*in animis vestris*), expressing the necessary consequence of a man's abiding on Jesus, the language at once becomes *proper*, no longer figurative. — ὁ ἐὰν θέλ.] stands first with emphasis; but such an one wills and prays simply and solely in the name of Jesus (xiv. 13, 14), and cannot do otherwise.

Ver. 8. A further carrying out of this incitement to abiding on Him, and that by bringing out the great importance, rich in its results, of this granting of prayer, which is attached to the abiding required. — ἐν τούτῳ] *Herein*, to this a *forward* reference is generally given, so that ἵνα, κ.τ.λ. is the contents of τούτου. But thus understood, since ἵνα is not equivalent to ὅτι, this ἵνα would express, that in the *obligation* (you *ought*, ver. 12, comp. on vi. 29), or in the *destination* to bear much fruit, the δόξα of the Father is given. This is not appropriate, as it is rather in the actual fruit-bearing itself that that δόξα must lie, and hence ὅτι must have been employed. To distinguish ἵνα, however, merely by supplying "as I hope" (Lücke) from ὅτι, does not satisfy the telic nature of the word.<sup>1</sup> Hence (and not otherwise in 1 John iv. 17) ἐν τούτῳ, as in iv. 37, xvi. 30, is to be taken as a *retrospective* reference (so also Lange), and that not to the μένειν in itself, but to the immediately preceding ὁ ἐὰν θέλητε αἰτήσασθε κ. γενήσ. ὑμῖν, *so far*, namely, as it takes place in him who abides in Christ. *In this granting of prayer allotted to the μένειν ἐν ἐμοί*, says Jesus, a twofold result—and this a high incentive to that μένειν—is given, namely, (1) when what you ask falls to your lot, then in this result *my Father has been glorified* (ἔλλαχε τιμὴν, Nonnus), *that you*—for that is God's *design* in this His δοξάζεσθαι—*may bear much fruit* (which is just to be the actual further course of that granting of prayer, comp. ver.

<sup>1</sup> Cyril already rightly recognised that ἵνα cannot be an explanation of ἐν τούτῳ, but only a statement of the purpose of ἰδοὺ. ὁ πατ. μ. But quite irrelevantly he referred ἰδοὺ. ὁ πατ. μ. to the mission of the Son.

16); and (2) *you will*, in virtue of the fulfilment of all your prayers, *become*, in a truly proper and specific sense, *my disciples*, who belong to no other (note the emphatic possessive ἐμοί, as in xiii. 35), since this hearing of prayer is the holy characteristic simply and solely of *my* disciples (xiv. 13, 14). — The future γενήσεσθε may depend on ἵνα (comp. on ἰάσομαι, xiii. 40, see also on 1 Cor. ix. 18; Eph. vi. 3), as Ewald connects it; independently, however, of ἵνα, and therefore connected with ἐν τούτῳ, the words convey more weight in the independence appropriate to their distinctive contents. The Lord, however, does not say ἔσσεσθε, but He sees the full development of His discipleship beginning with the ἐν τούτῳ.

Vv. 9, 10. But as μαθηταί of Christ, they are the object of His love; hence, in addition to the general exhortation to abide on *Him*, there comes now, further, the particular, to abide in His love, which is done by keeping His commandments, according to the archetype of *His* morally harmonious relation to the *Father*. — *As the Father has loved me, I have also loved you* (aorists, because Jesus, at the boundary of His life, stands and looks back, xiii. 1, 34); *abide* (keep yourselves continually) in my love.<sup>1</sup> When others extend the protasis to ὑμᾶς, and first begin the apodosis with μείνατε (Maldonatus, Grotius, Rosenmüller, Olshausen, and several others), this is opposed by the fact that between καθὼς ἡγάπη με ὁ π. and μείνατε, κ.τ.λ. no correlation exists; for the ἀγάπη ἡ ἐμὴ is not love to me (Maldonatus, Grotius, Nösselt, Kuinoel, Baeumlein, and several others), but: my love to you, as is clear from ἡγάπησα ὑμᾶς and from the analogy of ἡ χαρὰ ἡ ἐμὴ, ver. 11;<sup>2</sup> comp. vv. 12, 13. Olshausen mingles the two together, the active and passive love. — ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ μου] = ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ τῇ ἐμῇ. But the latter purposely lays emphasis on the thought that it was nothing less than *His* love, that love so great and holy, as He had just expressed by καθὼς

<sup>1</sup> Instead of μείνατε, Ewald conjectures μίνητε, which he still makes depend on ἵνα, ver. 8; but this is unsuitable, since καθὼς appears without καί.

<sup>2</sup> That ἡ ἀγάπη ἡ ἐμὴ might denote love to me, should not have been called in question, as being contrary to the genius of the language. Comp. φιλία τῇ σῇ, Xen. Anab. vii. 7. 29; Thucyd. i. 137. 4: διὰ τὴν σὴν φιλίαν, Rom. xi. 31.

ἡγάπ., κ.τ.λ., in which they were to abide. — *τετήρηκα*] Self-witness in the retrospect which He takes of His whole ministry on the threshold of its accomplishment. — *κ. μένω αὐτοῦ ἐν τ. ἀγάπῃ*] Consequence of *τετήρηκα*. The prominent position of *αὐτοῦ* corresponds to the consciousness of the happiness and the dignity of abiding in the love which His *Father* bears to him (x. 17, xvii. 24). The present includes continuance also for the future; hence it is not, with Ewald, to be accented *μενῶ*.

Ver. 11. Conclusion of the section vv. 1-10 (*ταῦτα*). — *ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ, κ.τ.λ.*] Note the juxtaposition of *ἡ ἐμὴ* and *ἐν ὑμῖν*; that *my* joy may be *in you*, i.e. that the same joy which *I* have may be *yours*. The holy joyous tone of soul is intended, the conscious moral courage of joy, which also rises victorious over all suffering, as Christ, in virtue of His fellowship with the Father and of His obedience towards Him, must and did possess it (comp. xvii. 13), and as it is so often audible in Paul's writings also in the sense of Christ (1 Cor. vii. 30; 2 Cor. xiii. 11; Phil. ii. 17, 18, iv. 4; Rom. xiv. 17; Gal. v. 22). Yet *ἡ ἐμὴ* is not: the joy *produced by me* (Calvin, De Wette), or of which I have opened to you the spring (Tholuck), which is forcing a meaning on the simple possessive expression (comp. iii. 29, xvii. 13; 2 Cor. ii. 3), and does not satisfy the significant juxtaposition of *ἡ ἐμὴ* and *ἐν ὑμῖν* (comp. 2 Cor. ii. 3: *ὅτι ἡ ἐμὴ χαρὰ πάντων ὑμῶν ἐστίν*). The explanations: *mea de vobis laetitia* (corresponding to *χαίρειν ἐν*; so Augustine, Schoettgen, Lampe, Kuinoel, Ebrard, Hengstenberg, and several others), or even: *gaudium vestrum de me* (Euth. Zigabenus, Grotius, Nösselt, Klee, and several others), are to be rejected because the correct reading is *ἡ* (see critical notes). Luthardt: that *my* joy may have its *cause and object in you* (not in anything else). This is grammatically correct (*ἐν* of causal foundation): the *πληρωθῆ*, however, which is subsequently said of the joy of the disciples, presupposes that in the first clause the joy of the *disciples themselves*, the *consummation* of which is intended, is already indicated; *πληρωθῆ* otherwise would remain without corresponding correlation. Had the object been merely to express the *reciprocity* of the joy, we would necessarily have

expected in the second half simply: *καὶ ἡ χαρὰ ὑμῶν ἐν ἐμοί*. See, in answer to Luthardt, also Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 325 f. — If *Christ's* joy is in His own, *their* joy will be thereby *completed* (comp. iii. 29), developed to its full measure in contents, purity, strength, victoriousness, etc. Comp. xvi. 24; 1 John i. 4; 2 John 12. Hence: *κ. ἡ χαρὰ ὑμ. πληρωθῇ*.

Vv. 12, 13. Now, for the purpose of furnishing a more exact guide to this joy, is given the *precept of reciprocal love, founded on the love of Christ* (xiii. 34), which is the sum of the conception of the *ἐντολαί*, ver. 10, Jesus' *peculiar, specific* precept (*ἡ ἐμὴ*). — *ἵνα* you should (see on vi. 29). — Ver. 13 characterizes the *καθὼς ἠγάπ. ὑμᾶς*. *A greater love than this* (just designated by *καθὼς ἠγάπ. ὑμᾶς*) *no one cherishes*; it is the *greatest* love which any one can have, such as, according to the divine purpose, shall impel to this (*ἵνα*), *that* (after my example) *one* (indefinite) *should give up his soul for the advantage of his friends*. For a like readiness to self-sacrifice the *greatness* of my love shall be the motive, 1 John iii. 16. The *ordinary* interpretation, according to which *ἵνα* is taken as *expository of ταύτης*, does not correspond to the idea of purpose in *ἵνα*, and the attempts to preserve this conception (e.g. De Wette: in *ἀγάπη* there lies a law, a will, comp. Luthardt, Lange; Godet: the culminating point of loving effort lies therein) are unsatisfactory and forced expedients. On *τιθέναι τ. ψυχ.*, see on x. 11; on *τις*, corresponding to the universal *one* (*man*, Ger.), *any one*, see Nägelsbach, *z. Ilias*, p. 299, ed. 3. — The difference between the present passage and Rom. v. 6 ff. (*ὑπὲρ ἀσεβῶν*) does not rest upon the thing itself, but only on the different point of view, which in Romans is general, and here is limited, according to the special connection, to the circle of friends, without excepting the friends from the general category of sinners. To *designate* them, however, by that quality, was not relevant in this place. Against the weakening of the idea of *φίλων*: "those who are actually objects of His love" (Ebrard), ver. 14 should have been a sufficient guard.

Ver. 14. "*For his friends*," Jesus had just said. There was a presumption implied in this, that He also would die for His *friends* (Euth. Zigabenus briefly and correctly points out

the sequence of thought by supplying at the end of ver. 13 : *καθὼς ἐγὼ ποιῶ νῦν*). And who are these? *The disciples* (*ὑμεῖς*), if they do what He commands them.—The conception of the *φίλοι* is that of the loving confidential companionship with Himself, to which Christ has raised them; see ver. 15. Later on, He designates them even as His *brothers*, xx. 17.

Ver. 15. The *dignity*, however, which lies in this designation "friends," was to become known to them. — *οὐκέτι*] *No more*, as before (xii. 26, xiii. 13 ff.). No contradiction to ver. 20, where Jesus does not anew give them the *name* of *δοῦλοι*, but only *reminds* them of an earlier saying; nor with Luke xii. 4, where He *has* already called them friends; which, however, is also not excluded by the present passage, since here rather the previous designation is only indicated *a potiori*, and the new is intended *in a pregnant* sense, which does not do away with the objective and abiding relationship of the disciples, to be *δοῦλοι* of Christ, and their profound consciousness of this their relationship (Acts iv. 29; Rom. i. 1; Gal. i. 10; Phil. i. 1, *et al.*); as generally Christians are at once *δοῦλοι* and *ἀπελεύθεροι κυρίου* (1 Cor. vii. 22), at once *δοῦλοι* and yet His brothers (Rom. viii. 29), at once *δοῦλοι* and yet His *συγκληρονόμοι* (Rom. viii. 16). — *αὐτοῦ ὁ κύριος*] Although he is *his* lord. — *τί ποιεῖ*] Not: what he *intends to do* (Grotius, Kuinoel, and several others), which is not appropriate in the application to Jesus, whose work was in full process of accomplishment, nay, was so near to its earthly consummation, but the *action itself*, whilst it is going on. The slave, although he sees it externally, *is not acquainted with it*, does not know the proper nature of the action of his master (comp. Xen. *ep.* i. 3), because the latter has not taken him into his confidence in respect of the quality, the object, the means, the motives, and thoughts, etc.; "servus tractatur ut ὄργανον," Bengel. — *εἰρηκα*] Ver. 14. *πάντα ἃ ἤκουσα, κ.τ.λ.*] does not refer to all the *doctrinal* teaching, nor again is it elucidated from the quite general saying, viii. 26 (Tholuck); and just as little does it require the arbitrary and more exact definition of that which is necessary to salvation (Calvin), of the principles (De Wette), of that designed for communication (Lücke, Olshausen), by which it is sought to avoid the apparent contradiction with xvi. 12;

but<sup>1</sup> it alludes to that which the Father has laid upon Him *to do*, as appears from the context by the correlation with *ὅτι ὁ δοῦλος οὐκ οἶδε, κ.τ.λ.* He has made known to the disciples the whole *saving will* of God, the *accomplishment* of which had been entrusted to Him on His being sent from the pre-existent state into the world; but that does not by any means also exclude instructions standing in the context, which they could not bear at the present time, xvi. 12.

Ver. 16. Along with this dignity, however, of being Jesus' friends, they were not to forget their *dependence* on Him, and their destiny therewith appointed.—*ἐξελέξασθε . . . ἐξελεξάμην*] as Master . . . as disciples, which is understood of itself from the historical relation, and is also to be gathered from the word chosen (vi. 70, xiii. 18; Acts i. 2). Each of them was a *σκεῦος ἐκλογῆς* of Christ (Acts ix. 15); in each the initiative of this peculiar relation lay not on his but on Christ's side. Hence not to be taken merely in a general sense of the selection for the fellowship of love (Euth. Zigabenus, Luther, and several others, including Luthardt, Lange).—*ἔθηκα ὑμᾶς*] *have appointed you*, as my disciples, consequence of the *ἐξελεξάμην*. The "*dotation spirituelle*" (Godet) goes beyond the meaning of the word, although it was historically connected with it (Mark iii. 14, 15). Comp. on *τιθέναι*, *instituere*, *appoint* (not merely *destine*, as Ebrard thinks), 1 Cor. xii. 28; 1 Tim. i. 12; 2 Tim. i. 11; Heb. i. 2; Acts xx. 28, *et al.*; Hom. *Od.* xv. 253, *Il.* vi. 300; Dem. 322. 11, *et al.* The rendering of Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, is incorrect: I have *planted* you (Xen. *Oec.* xix. 7, 9). The figure of the vine has in truth been dropped, and finds only an echo in the *καρπὸν φέρειν*, which, however, must not be extended to *ἔθηκα*, since the disciples appear not as planted, but as *branches*, which have grown and *remain* on the vine. Quite arbitrarily, Bengel and Olshausen see here a *new* figure of a *fruit-tree*.—*ἵνα ὑμεῖς ὑπάγ.*] *that you on your side may go away*, etc., is by Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, in consequence of their interpretation of *ἔθηκα*, erroneously explained

<sup>1</sup> This, at the same time, in answer to Beyschlag, p. 101, who considers a reference here to the pre-existent state as *absurd*. Comp. also against the same, Johansson, *de Chr. praeexistentia*, p. 14.



by *ἵνα ἐκτελεσθε αὐξανόμενοι*. Nor does it merely denote "*independent and vital action*" (De Wette, Lücke, Baumgarten-Crusius, Luthardt, Godet; comp. Luther: "that you sit not still without fruit or work"), or "*continual movement*" (Hengstenberg), with which sufficient justice is not done to the peculiarity of this point, which, in truth, belonged in the most proper sense to the disciples' calling. According to Ebrard, it is said to be simply an auxiliary verb, like *ίρε* with the supine. It signifies rather the *execution of the ἀποστολή*, in which they were to *go away* into all the world, etc. Comp. Luke x. 3; Matt. xxviii. 19. — *μὲνη*] comp. iv. 36. The results of their ministry are not again to decline and be brought to naught, but are to be continuous and enduring even into the *αἶον μέλλων*. — The *second ἵνα* is *co-ordinated* with the first. See on vv. 7, 8. It is in truth precisely the granting of prayer here designated which brings about the fruit and its duration in all given cases. Comp. the prayers of Paul, as in Col. i. 9 ff.; Eph. iii. 14 ff. — *ἐν τῷ ὀνόμ. μ.*] See on xiv. 13.

Ver. 17. At the close (comp. ver. 11) of this section, vv. 12-16, Jesus refers once more to its main point, *reciprocal love*. — *ταῦτα*] *points backwards*, as in ver. 11, namely, to what is contained in vv. 12-16, so far as the contents are of a *preceptive* nature. And *that which* is therein enjoined by Jesus on the disciples has for its object (*ἵνα*), etc., as He had in truth required this duty at the very *beginning* of the section. The remainder of the section (vv. 14-16) was indeed not directly of a preceptive nature, but in support and furtherance of what had been enjoined.

Vv. 18, 19. But now your *relation to the world!* as far as ver. 27. — In your fellowship, *love*; from without, on the part of the unbelieving, *hatred* against you! Consolation for you: *γινώσκετε* (imperat.) *ὅτι ἐμὲ πρῶτον ὑμῶν* (i. 15), *μεμίσηκεν*. Comp. 1 Pet. iv. 12, 13. This hatred is a *community of destiny with me*. A further consolation: this hate is the proof that you no longer belong to the *world*, but to *me* through my selection of you (ver. 16); therein exists the *reason* for it. How must that fact tend to elate you! Comp. 1 John iii. 13, iv. 5. — The fivefold repetition of *κόσμος* is

solemn. Comp. iii. 17. — τὸ ἴδιον] “*Suum* dicitur pro *vos*, atque sic notatur *interesse mundi*,” Bengel. Comp. vii. 7. They have become a *foreign* element to the world, and therefore with the object of its *antipathy*; χαίρει γὰρ τῷ ὁμοίῳ τὸ ὅμοιον, Euth. Zigabenus; comp. Plat. *Lys.* p. 214 B; τὸ ὅμοιον τῷ ὁμοίῳ ἀνάγκη ἀεὶ φίλον εἶναι.

Ver. 20. A recalling of xiii. 16, presupposing, however, a different application than in that passage—namely, a slave has no better lot to claim than his lord (comp. Matt. x. 24, 25). — *If they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you; if they have kept my word, they will also keep yours.* Which of these two cases will in general occur, Jesus leaves to the judgment of the disciples themselves, since they in truth knew from experience how it had gone with Him. To take the second clause *ironically* (“quasi dicat: non est, quod hoc speretis,” Grotius, Lampe), is appropriate neither to the seriousness of the first, nor to the tone of the whole passage. Olshausen’s view is incorrect (comp. B. Crusius, Maier, Godet), “if *many*, etc.,” where, in the first half, according to Godet, we should have to think of the *mass* of the people. But the variation of the subjects is a pure importation. Finally, when Bengel and other older expositors (in Wolf) interpret τηρεῖν as *watch*, this is quite opposed to the Johannean usage of τὸν λόγον τηρεῖν (viii. 51, xiv. 23, 24, and frequently), comp. ver. 10, and it would also be too weak a conception after the first half of the verse. Irrespective of this, usage would not stand in the way of such rendering, Gen. iii. 15 (according to the usual reading); Dem. 317 ult., 1252. 8; Soph. *O. R.* 808; Arist. *Vesp.* 364; Thuc. iv. 108. 1, vii. 80. 1; Lys. iii. 34.

Ver. 21. Ἀλλά] antithesis to the *consolation* against this state of persecution: ταῦτα πάντα π. εἰς ὑμ., however, presupposes that the second of the cases supposed in ver. 20 is *not* the actual one. The *consolation* lies in διὰ τὸ ὀνομά μου: *because my name is your confession.* “The name of Christ from your mouth will be to them nothing but poison and death,” Luther. Comp. Acts iv. 17, ix. 14, xxvii. 9. This thought: it is for the sake of Christ’s name that I suffer (Acts ix. 16), ought to exalt the persecuted (πρὸς τιμὴν μὲν ὑμῶν τοῦτο ποιούσιν, Ammonius), and did exalt them (Acts

v. 41, xxi. 13, *et al.*), and they boasted of these sufferings (Rom. v. 3 ; 2 Cor. xi. 23 ff., xii. 10, 11 ; 1 Pet. iv. 12 ff.), which constituted their holy pride (Gal. vi. 17) and their joy (Phil. ii. 17, 18). Comp. Matt. x. 22, xxiv. 9, v. 11. According to *others* (including Lücke, De Wette, Hengstenberg), ὅτι οὐκ οἶδασι, κ.τ.λ., has the emphasis. But in that case the moment διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου is arbitrarily set back, and rendered unnecessary, although throughout the whole of the following discussion the reference of the persecutions to Christ is the prominent and dominant point (see especially vv. 25-27). Hence ὅτι οὐκ οἶδασι, κ.τ.λ., is to be taken as subordinated to διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου, as giving, that is, the explanation thereof. Had they possessed the true acquaintance with God, they would, because God has sent Christ, have also known Christ (comp. Luke xxiii. 34), and would not for His name's sake have persecuted His disciples.

Vv. 22-24. *Sinfulness*, not of this non-acquaintance with God (Ebrard, Ewald, Godet), but, as vv. 23-25 show, of this hatred of the name of Jesus, in respect of which they are inexcusable, since He has *come* and *spoken to them* (vv. 22, 23), and done before their eyes His *Messianic works* (miracles), ver. 24. — ἀμαρτ. οὐκ εἶχον] For their hatred of my name would then be *excusable*, because, without my appearance and discourses, the true knowledge of Him who sent me—and the non-acquaintance with whom is in truth the ground of their hatred (ver. 21)—would have remained inaccessible to them. My appearance and discourses ought to have opened their eyes, and brought them to the knowledge of Him who sent me ; but since this has not taken place, their hatred against me, which flows from their non-acquaintance with Him who sent me, is *inexcusable* ; it is the hatred of hardened blindness before God's revelation of Himself in my advent and discourses.—The moment of the protasis lies in ἦλθον and ἐλάλ. αὐτοῖς *together* (not merely in the latter) ; ἦλθον is the Messianic ἐρχεσθαι, correlative to the preceding τ. πέμψαντά με. The ἀμαρτία, however, referable to the μισεῖν,<sup>1</sup> must

<sup>1</sup> Hence, too, on the question as to the salvation of the heathen, to whom Christ has not been preached, nothing is to be gathered from the present passage ; and one may now, with Augustine, decide in favour of *mitiores poenae*

not be referred merely to *unbelief*, which does not correspond to the context in vv. 19, 21, 23-25 (in answer to Bengel, Luthardt, Lange, Hengstenberg, and several others). The words ἁμαρτ. οὐκ ἔχειν, ix. 41, were spoken of *unbelief*. — The non-occurrence of αὖν with εἶχον is as in viii. 39. — νῦν δέ] *But thus, since I have appeared and have spoken to them.* — πρόφασιν οὐκ ἔχουσι, κ.τ.λ.] In that supposed case they would have *no sin*, so far, namely, as their hatred would be only an excusable *peccatum ignorantiae*; but as the matter stands, they have no *pretext* in respect of their sin (to which they are subject through their hatred); they can allege nothing by way of *escape*. πρόφασιν ἔχειν, *to have evasions, exculpations*, only here in N. T., very frequently in the classics; Dem. 526. 15; Plat. Pol. v. p. 469 C; Xen. Cyr. iii. 1. 27. Antithesis: ἀφελεῖν πρόφασιν, Dem. 26. 2, 635. 24. Euth. Zigabenus well remarks: ἀποστερεῖ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἀπάσης συγγνώμης ἐθελοκακοῦντας. — Ver. 23. And how exceedingly great is this sin! Comp. v. 23. — Ver. 24, parallel to ver. 22, as there from the discourses, which the unbelieving have *heard*, so here similarly from that which they have *seen*, revealing their guilt. — οὐδεὶς ἄλλος] that is, according to their nature and appearance, *divine works*, v. 36, ix. 3, 4, x. 37, xiv. 10, *et al.* — νῦν δὲ καὶ ἐώρακασι, κ.τ.λ.] *But thus* (νῦν δέ, as in ver. 22), *they have actually seen* (as vi. 36), and yet *hated both me and my Father*. Not merely *μεμίσ.*, but also already *ἐώρακ.*, is connected with καὶ ἐμέ, κ.τ.λ.; *in the works* they have seen Christ (x. 25) and the Father (xiv. 10); for both have revealed themselves in them, which, indeed, the unbelieving have seen only as an external sensuous occurrence, not with the inward understanding, giving significance to the outward *σημεῖα*; not with the eye of spiritual knowledge and inward being, vi. 26.

Ver. 25. Yet this hatred against me stands in connection with the divine destiny,<sup>1</sup> according to which the word of

for them, or, in confirmation of their condemnation, propose, with Melancthon, to extend the words of Christ to the *protevangelium* in paradise, and bring in at the same time the natural moral law, Rom. ii.

<sup>1</sup> Which, as a matter of course, and according to vv. 22-24, does not do away with responsibility. Comp. Weiss, *Lehrbegr.* p. 151.

Scripture must be fulfilled by their hatred: *they have hated me groundlessly*. The passage is Ps. lxi. 4, or xxxv. 19, where the theocratic sufferer (David ?) utters that saying which has reached its antitypical Messianic destination in the hatred of the unbelieving against Christ (comp. on xiii. 18). The passage Ps. cix. 3, which Hengstenberg further adduces, does not correspond so literally, as is also the case with Ps. cxix. 161 (Ewald). — ἀλλ' *sc.* μεμισήκασίν με, as the ground-thought of what precedes. — δωρεάν] ὀψῆ, *immerito*, according to the LXX., but opposed to the Greek signification (*gratis*). Comp. 1 Sam. xix. 5 ; Ps. xxxiv. 7 (where Symmachus has ἀναίτιως) ; Sir. xx. 21, xxix. 6, 7. — The *irony* which De Wette discovers in ἐν τῷ νόμῳ αὐτῶν: "they comply faithfully with what stands in their law," is an erroneous assumption, since ἵνα πληρ. is the usual formula for the fulfilment of *prophecies*, and since νόμος here, as in x. 34, stands in a wider sense, while αὐτῶν is to be taken as τῷ ὑμετέρῳ, viii. 17 (see *in loc.*), comp. ὑμῶν, x. 34. Bengel well says: "*in lege eorum, quam assidue terunt et jactant.*"

Vv. 26, 27. Over against this hatred of the world, Jesus further appeals confidently, and in the certainty of His future justification, to the *testimony* which the *Paraclete*, and also the *disciples themselves*, will bear regarding Him. The *Paraclete* was to give testimony of Christ *through the disciples*, in speaking forth from them (Matt. x. 20 ; Mark xiii. 11). But the testimony of the disciples of Christ was at the same time also *their own*, since it expressed their own experiences with Christ from the beginning onwards, i. 14 ; 1 John i. 1 ; Acts i. 21, 22. Both were, in so far as they, filled and enlightened by the divine πνεῦμα, delivered *His* instructions (xiv. 26), and what *they themselves* had heard and seen of Jesus, *both* consequently ἐν πνεύματι, *one* witness ; it is, however, separated into its two actual factors (comp. Acts i. 8 ; Rom. viii. 16, ix. 1), and they are kept apart. — ὃν ἐγὼ πέμψω ὑμ. παρὰ τοῦ πατρ.] How ? see xiv. 16. As ἐγὼ is used with the weight of authority, so also has the more exact definition: τὸ πνεῦμα τ. ἀληθ. (see on xiv. 17), and the addition ὁ π. τ. πατρ. ἐκπορ., in emphatic confirmation of the above παρὰ τοῦ πατρός, the pragmatic weight of causing to be felt the

*truth* and *validity* of the Spirit's testimony, which thus goes back to the *Father*. The general expression ἐκπορ., however, which is without any definite limitation of time, does not refer to the immanent relation of subsistence (*actus hypostaticus*), but, agreeably to the connection, to the being efficaciously communicated outwards<sup>1</sup> from the Father, by means of which, in every case that occurs, the Spirit is received. "Itaque hujusmodi testimonia nec a Graecis (against the *filioque*) nec contra Graecos (against the διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς) . . . satis apposite sunt citata," Beza. For the dogmatic use in the interest of the Greek Church, see already in Theodore of Mopsuestia. Recently, Hilgenfeld especially has laid great stress on the hypostatic reference, and that in the sense of a Gnostic emanation. — ἐκεῖνος] opposed to the Christ-hating world. — περὶ ἐμοῦ] of my Person, my work, etc. Comp. 1 John v. 6. — καὶ ὑμεῖς δέ] *atque vos etiam*. Comp. on vi. 51, viii. 17. — μαρτυρεῖτε] *ye also are witnesses, since ye from the beginning* (of my Messianic activity) *are with me* (consequently *are able to bear witness of me from your experience*). Jesus does not say μαρτυρήσετε, because the disciples *were* already the witnesses which they *were to be* in future. They were, as the witnesses, *already forthcoming*. ἐστὲ denotes that which still continues from the commencement up to the present moment. Comp. 1 John iii. 8. μαρτυρ. taken as *imperative* would make the command appear too abrupt; considering its very importance, a more definite unfolding of it was necessarily to be expected, which, however, is not missed, if the words are only a part of the *promise* to bear witness (in answer to B. Crusius and Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 19). An echo of this word of Christ regarding the united testimony of the Spirit and of the apostles is found in Acts v. 32, also in Acts xv. 28.

<sup>1</sup> The Spirit goes out if He is sent, xiv. 16, 26; Gal. iv. 6. Comp. the figurative expression of the *outpouring*. See also Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* I. p. 203 f.

## CHAPTER XVI

VER. 3. After ποιῆς. Elz. has ὑμῶν, against decisive testimony. — Ver. 4. ἡ ὥρα] Lachm. : ἡ ὥρα αὐτῶν, according to A. B., a few Cursives, Syr. ; also L., Cursives, Vulg. It. Arr. Cypr. Aug., who, however, omit the αὐτῶν that follows. This betrays an already ancient variation in the position of the αὐτῶν, which was only at one time original, which, placed *before* μνημον., was readily drawn to ὥρα, and then also again restored *after* μνημον. D. 68, Arm. have *no* αὐτῶν at all, which is explained from its original position *after* μνημον., in which it appeared superfluous. — Ver. 7. ἐὰν γὰρ ἐγώ] ἐγώ, which is wanting in Elz. Tisch., has important testimony against (B. D. L.  $\Sigma$ .) and for it (A. E. G. H. K. M. U.  $\Delta$ .  $\Lambda$ .) It was, however, because unnecessary, and also as not standing in opposition, more readily passed over than added. — Ver. 13. εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν] Lachm. : εἰς τὴν ἀλήθ. πᾶσαν (A. B. Y. Or. Eus.) ; Tisch. : ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ πάση (D. L.  $\Sigma$ . Cursives, Verss. Fathers). The reading of Lachm. has stronger attestation, and is, in respect of the position of the words, supported by the reading of Tisch., which latter may have arisen through a comparison of the construction of ὁδηγ. with ἐν in the LXX. (Ps. lxxxvi. 10, cxix. 35, *et al.* ; Sap. ix. 11, x. 17). — Ver. 15. λαμβάνει] Elz. : λήψεται, against decisive testimony ; from ver. 14. — Ver. 16. οὐ] B. D. L.  $\Delta$ .  $\Sigma$ . Curss. Verss. (including Vulg. It.) Or. *et al.* : οὐκ ἐστὶ. Recommended by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. and Tisch. An interpretation in conformity with ver. 10 and xiv. 19. — ὅτι ὑπάγω πρὸς τ. πατ.] is wanting in B. D. L. Copt. Sahid. Cant. Ver. Verc. Corb. Bracketed by Lachm., deleted by Tisch. An addition from ver. 17, whence also the ἐγώ in Elz. after ὅτι,—which ἐγώ, however, is in ver. 17, with Lachm. and Tisch., to be deleted, in conformity with A. B. L. M.  $\Lambda$ .  $\Sigma$ . Curss. Verss., since it is supported by only very weak testimony in the above addition in ver. 16. — Ver. 19. After ἔγνω, Elz. Lachm. have οὐν. A connective addition, instead of which δέ is also found. — Ver. 20. The second δέ has been justly deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. in conformity with B. D.  $\Lambda$ .  $\Sigma$ . 1, It. Copt. Arm. Syr. Goth. Cypr. It was added in mechanical repetition of the antithesis. — Ver. 22. The order οὐν μὲν οὐν λύπ. ἔχ. is,

with Tisch., to be preferred on preponderating testimony. But instead of ἔχεται, read with Lachm. ἔξετε, after A. D. L. Curss. Verss. Fathers; the present was mechanically introduced after ἔχει, ver. 21, and on occasion of the νῦν. — ἀρεῖ] Lachm.: ἀρεῖ, according to B. D.\* r. Vulg. Codd. It. Cypr. Hil. Explanatory alteration in accordance with the preceding futures. — Ver. 23. ὅτι ὅσα ἄν] Many variations. As original appears the reading in A., ὁ τι ἄν (so Lachm. in the margin), in connection with which copyists were induced, through the preceding λέγω ὑμῖν, to take ΟΤΙ (differently from xiv. 13) recitatively, which thus led to the readings ἄν τι (so Lachm. and Tisch., comp. xx. 23), ἰάν τι, ὅσα ἄν, and thus the ὅτι, which had now become superfluous, disappeared in many copies (not R., which has ὅτι ὁ ἄν). — ἐν τῷ ὀνόμ. μου] is placed by Tisch. after δώσει ὑμῖν, in conformity with B. C.\* L. X. Y. Δ. R. Sahid. Or. Cyr. Rightly; the ordinary position after πατέρα is determined by xiv. 13, xv. 16, and appeared to be required by ver. 24. — Ver. 25. Before ἔρχεται, Elz. and Lachm. (the latter in brackets) have ἀλλ', contrary to important testimony. A connective addition. — Instead of ἀναγγελῶ, ἀπαγγελῶ is, with Lachm. and Tisch., to be adopted on decisive testimony. The former flowed from vv. 13, 14, 15. — Ver. 27. θεοῦ] B. C.\* D. L. X. R.\*\* Verss. Cyr. Did.: πατρός. A gloss by way of more precise definition (Verss. have: *a deo patre*). — Ver. 28. παρά] Lachm. and Tisch.: ἐκ, which is sufficiently attested by B. C.\* L. X. Copt. Epiph. Hil. (in D. is wanting ἐξῆλθον . . . πατρός), and, in conformity with what immediately precedes, was dislodged by παρά. — Ver. 29. παρρησ.] Lachm. and Tisch.: ἐν παρρησ., in conformity with B. C. D. R. Rightly; ἐν, because unnecessary, after ver. 25, came to be dropped, and the more readily after ΝΥΝ. — Ver. 32. νῦν] is, in conformity with decisive testimony, with Lachm. and Tisch., to be deleted. — Ver. 33. ἔχεται] So also Tisch. But Elz. Lachm.: ἔξετε only, after D. Verss. (including Vulg. It.) and Fathers. The present is so decisively attested, that the future appears to be simply a closer definition of the meaning (comp. ver. 22).

Ver. 1. Ταῦτα λελάλ. ὑμῖν] As the same expression, xv. 11, pointed back to the preceding section, vv. 1–10, and then ταῦτα ἐντέλλομαι ὑμῖν, ver. 17, to vv. 11–16, so here ταῦτα λελ. ὑμ. refers to xv. 18–27, so that the substantial contents of this section are intended, namely, *that which had been said of the hatred of the world*. — ἵνα μὴ σκανδαλ.] Comp. Matt. xiii. 21, xxiv. 10, xi. 6. Prepared beforehand, and armed by Christ's communications, they were not to be made to stumble



at Him, but were to oppose to the hatred of the world all the greater efficiency and constancy of faith.

Vv. 2, 3. Of the ταῦτα, ver. 1, He now gives certain concrete manifestations, which might tend to their becoming offended. — ἀποσυναγ.] See on ix. 22, xii. 42. — ἀλλ'] *At*, i.e. *nay, further!* it introduces the antithesis of a yet far heavier, of a bloody fate. Comp. on 2 Cor. vii. 11. To take ἀποσυναγ. ποιῆς. ὑμ. *interrogatively* (Ewald), is unnecessarily artificial. — ἵνα] *That which* will take place in the ὥρα is conceived as the *object of its coming*: there is coming an hour, in order that, etc. Comp. on xii. 23. — πᾶς ὁ ἀποκτ., κ.τ.λ.] *that every one, who shall have put you to death, may think that he offers a sacrificial service to God* (namely, through the shedding of your blood). On λατρεία, *cultus* (Plat. *Apol.* p. 23 C, *Phaedr.* p. 224 E; Rom. ix. 4), here, by means of the προσφέρειν, the standing word used of sacrifices (see Matt. v. 23, viii. 4; Acts vii. 32; Heb. v. 1; Schleusner, *Thes.* IV. p. 504), in the special reference of *sacrificial* divine service, comp. Rom. xiii. 1; Heb. ix. 1, 6. The maxim of Jewish fanaticism is well known (and how often was the pagan enmity against the apostles no better!): "Omnis effundens sanguinem improborum, aequalis est illi, qui sacrificium facit," *Bammidbar Rabba*, f. 329. 1. On this δοκεῖν, comp. Saul's example, Acts xxvi. 9; Gal i. 13, 14. — On ver. 3, comp. xv. 21. Jesus once more recalls with *profound sadness* this tragic source of such conduct, the inexcusableness of which, however, He had already decisively brought to light (xv. 22 ff.). The supposed purpose of making the adversaries contemptible in the eyes of the disciples (Calvin, Hengstenberg) must have been indicated had it existed.

Ver. 4. Ἀλλά] *At, breaks off* the enumeration (Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 15). Jesus will not go further into details, and recurs to the thought in ver. 1. The explanation: "although it is not to be expected otherwise, I have nevertheless foretold it to you" (Lücke, De Wette), is the less agreeable to the text, since ταῦτα λελάλ. had just been already said, and that without any antithetic reference of the kind. The explanations of Tholuck and Lange, again, are importations: "but so little would I terrify (?) you hereby, that I have only (?) said it to

you," etc. — ταῦτα] What was said in vv. 2, 3. — αὐτῶν, ὅτι ἐγὼ εἶπ. ὑμ.] Attraction. See Winer, p. 581 f. [E. T. p. 665 ff.] — ἐγώ] with weighty emphasis: *I*, the Person, with whom your faith is concerned. Comp. ver. 1, ἵνα μὴ σκανδαλ. — ἐξ ἀρχῆς] xv. 27. The question, how this declaration of Jesus may be reconciled with the announcements found in the Synoptics, even from the time of the Sermon on the Mount, of predestined sufferings (Matt. v. 10 ff.; Luke vi. 22 ff.; Matt. x. 16 ff.; Luke xii. 4 ff.; Matt. xxi. 12 ff., xxiv. 9), is not solved by saying that here φοβερώτερα ἐκείνων (Euth. Zigabenus, comp. also Chrysostom) are announced (see, on the contrary, Matt. x. 16–18, 28); or that Christ spoke at an earlier period *minus aperte et parcius* (Bengel, comp. Grotius), and in much more *general* terms (Ebrard), but now more expressly set forth *in its principles* the character of the world's attitude towards the disciples (Tholuck, comp. Lange); or, that He has now stated more definitely the *cause* of the hatred (Lampe); or, that He utters it here as a *parting word* (Luthardt); or even, that at an earlier period, because the thoughts of the disciples had not yet dwelt upon it, it was "*for them as good as not said*" (Hengstenberg); but the difference lies clearly before us, and is simply to be recognised (comp. also Godet), to be explained, however, from the fact that in the Synoptics more general and less definite allusions belonging to the earlier time appear with the more definite form and stamp of later expressions. The living recollection of John must here also preponderate as against the Synoptics so that his relation to theirs here is that of a corrector. — ὅτι μεθ' ὑμῶν ἤμην] It would have been unnecessary in the time of my personal association with you, since it is not till after my departure that your persecution (up to that time the hatred of the world affected *Himself*) is to commence. "Because you have me with you; they cannot well but leave you in peace, and can do nothing to you, *they must have done it to me previously*, but now it will begin," etc., Luther. Comp. Chrysostom, Euth. Zigabenus, Grotius. As yet they had suffered *no* persecution; hence the thought, "I could console you" (Lücke, De Wette, and older expositors), is not to be introduced. The interpretation also: "now first, when I pro-

mise you the Spirit, can I thus openly speak to you" (Bengel, Tholuck), is not in harmony with the words.

Vv. 5, 6. *Now, however*, this my μεθ' ὑμῶν εἶναι is past! *Now I go away to Him who has sent me*, and in what a mood of mind are you at the prospect of this my impending departure! *None of you asks me: whither dost Thou go away? but because I have spoken this to you*, namely, that after my departure such sufferings shall befall you, *grief has filled your heart*, so that you have become quite dumb from sorrow, and blunted to the higher interest which lies in my going home to Him who sent me. According to De Wette and Lücke, there is said to be a want of exactness in the entire presentation, resting on the fact that ver. 6 does not stand before καὶ οὐδεὶς. The incorrectness of this assumption, in itself quite unnecessary, lies in this, that the first proposition of ver. 5 is thus completed: "But now at my departure I could not keep silence concerning it," by which the 6th verse is anticipated. According to Kuinoel and Olshausen, a full point should be placed after πέμψ. με, and a pause is to be assumed, in which Jesus in vain awaited a question, so that He continued subsequently with an interrogation: "Nullusne vestrum me amplius interrogat, quo abiturus sim?" But the assumption of pauses (others, including De Wette, make the pause after ver. 5) is, when the correlation of the conjunctions is so definitely progressive, unwarranted. — The fact that already in xiii. 36 the question had been put by Peter ποῦ ὑπάγεις (comp. the question of Thomas, xiv. 5), does not stand in contradiction with the present passage; but Jesus censures simply the degree of distress, which they had now reached, in which none among them fixed his eye on the goal of the departing One, and could come to a question for more definite information respecting it. — ἡ λύπη] simply, in abstracto: sadness.

Ver. 7. *Nevertheless*, how should you raise yourselves above this λύπη! How is my departure your own gain! By its means the Paraclete indeed will be imparted to you as a support against the hatred of the world. — ἐγώ] in the consciousness of this personal guarantee. — ἵνα ἐγὼ ἀπέλθω] ἐγώ in contradistinction to the Paraclete, who is to come in His place (xiv. 16); ἵνα expresses the δεῖ as *divinum*, as in

xi. 50. On the dependence of the mission of the Paraclete upon the departure of Jesus, see on vii. 39.

Ver. 8.<sup>1</sup> The threefold ministry of the Paraclete towards the unbelieving Jews and Gentiles. *Thus* will He be your *counsel* against the κόσμος! — ἐλέγξει] *convict*, namely, through His testimony of me, xv. 26. This ἐλέγξει, of which the apostles were to be the bearers in their office, is the activity which *convinces* the person concerned (*arguendi ratio exprobandi*), which reveals to him his unrighteousness, and puts him to shame (iii. 20, viii. 9, 46; 1 Cor. xiv. 24; Tit. i. 9; Matt. xviii. 15; Luke iii. 19, *et al.*), and the consequence of which may be in the different subjects either conversion (1 Cor. xiv. 24), or hardening and condemnation (Acts xxiv. 25; Rom. xi. 7 ff.). To apprehend it only of the latter side of the matter (Erasmus and many others, including De Wette, Brückner, and especially Wetzel, following the Fathers), is not justified by περὶ κρίσεως, since the κρίσις is intended, not of the κόσμος, but of the devil, and stands opposed to the Johannean view of the deliverance of the world through Christ; the unbelieving world (ver. 9) is to be convicted of the *sin* of unbelief; and this, to him who is not hardened, is the way to faith (comp. xvii. 20, 21), and therewith to separation from the world. Godet well designates the threefold ἐλέγξει as the moral victory of the Spirit through the preaching of the apostles. As the first prominent example, see the discourse of Peter, Acts ii., with its consequences. — περὶ ἁμαρτίας, κ.τ.λ.] The objective contents of the ἐλέγξει set forth separately in three parts (themata). See, respecting the individual points, on vv. 9–11.

Ver. 9. First part: *in reference to sin* He will convince them. The more exact definition, *as to how far* He will convince them περὶ ἁμαρτίας; *so far as they, namely* (ὅτι, equivalent to εἰς ἐκεῖνο ὅτι, ii. 18, ix. 17, xi. 51), *do not believe on me*, which He will reveal to them *as sin*, and will bring them to a consciousness of guilt; ὅτι ἁμαρτάνουσι μὴ πιστεύοντες ἔτι, Euth. Zigabenus. Following Calvin (comp. already Apollinarius, Ammonius, and also Luther), De Wette

<sup>1</sup> See Wetzel, *ib. d. Elenchus des Parakl.* John xvi. 8–13, in the *Zeitschrift f. Luth. Theol.* 1856, p. 624 ff.

and Brückner (comp. also Ebrard) interpret not of the conviction of sin, so far as the *unbelief* of the world will be brought to its consciousness *as sin*, but of *sin generally* ("qualis in se sit hominum natura," Calvin), of the condition under the wrath of God, in which the world, as opposed to the ever-increasing multitude of believers, who are victorious through the power of truth, appears involved, *because it does not believe*, for faith is the bond between the sinful world and God. Comp. Lange, who understands the rejection of Christ as the essential manifestation of all sin, as also Wetzel and Godet; which, however, does not correspond to the simplicity of the words.<sup>1</sup> On the ἔλεξις of the world περὶ ἁμαρτ., and that with regard to its converting power, comp. 1 Cor. xiv. 24, 25. Tholuck makes out of the simple ἁμαρτίας the *guilt* of sin, and that the *unpardonable* (ix. 41). — Note further that ὅτι is the exponent, not of ἁμαρτίας, but of ἐλέξει περὶ ἁμ.

Ver. 10. The second particular: *in reference to righteousness*, accordingly to the opposite of ἁμαρτία. As, however, in ἁμαρτίας the subject is the *world itself*, the ἔλεξις of which is described, so the subject of δικαιοσύνη is *Christ*; hence the more exact definition: *so far as I, namely, go to my Father, and you see me no more*; δικαίου γὰρ γνῶρισμα τὸ πορεύεσθαι πρὸς τὸν θεὸν κ. συνεῖναι αὐτῷ, Euth. Zigabenus; δικαιοσύνη, since it thus, in virtue of the context, is necessarily an attribute of *Christ*, denotes *His guiltlessness and holy moral perfection*. The unbelieving held Him to be an ἁμαρτωλός (comp. ix. 24), and put Him to death as such (xviii. 30); He was, however, the δίκαιος (1 John ii. 1, 29, iii. 7; comp. Acts iii. 14, vii. 52; 1 Pet. iii. 18), and was proved to be such by the testimony of the Paraclete, in virtue of which the apostles preached the exaltation of Christ to the Father (comp. Acts ii. 33 ff.), and thereby the world was convicted as guilty περὶ δικαιοσύνης, the opposite of which the unbelieving assumed in Christ, and thought to be confirmed by the σκάνδαλον of His cross. So substantially Chrysostom and his successors, Beza, Maldonatus,

<sup>1</sup> The sense would be this: in reference to sin He will convince them that *unbelief is the true essence of sin*. How easy would it have been for Jesus to have actually said this! for example, by: περὶ ἁμαρτίας, ὅτι ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐστὶν ἡ ἀπιστία. And such an expression of the thought assumed would have been quite Johannean.

Bengel, Morus, Tittmann, and several others, including Lücke, Klee, Olshausen, De Wette, B. Crusius, Maier, Godet, Baeumlein. Since, according to the analogy of the remaining parts, *Christ* must be the subject of *δικαιοσύνη*, then already on this ground we must reject not only the interpretation of Grotius of the compensatory *justice of God*,<sup>1</sup> and that of the Socinians and Kuinoel, *quod jus et fas est* (Matt. xii. 15), but also that of Augustine, Erasmus, Luther,<sup>2</sup> Melancthon, Calvin, Calovius, Jansen, Lampe, Storr, Hengstenberg, and several others, that the *righteousness of man through faith* in the Pauline sense is intended,<sup>3</sup> which also De Wette (with the modification that it is its victorious power in the world which is spoken of) inappropriately mixes up with the other interpretation. The form which Luthardt gives to the interpretation of Augustine, etc., that the passage does not indeed express that Christ has by means of His departure *acquired* righteousness, but rather that He has *rendered* righteousness *possible*, because faith in Himself as invisible, is likewise opposed by the fact that Christ would not be the subject to which *δικαιοσύνη* was ascribed; and it contains, moreover, too artificial a reflection, which is not even appropriate, since faith in Christ cannot be conditioned by His invisibility, although faith must exist in spite of the invisibility of Christ (xx. 29). The thought is rather: "The fact that I go to the Father, and that I shall then be removed from your eyes, will serve to the Spirit in His *ἐλεγχίς* of the world as a demonstration of the fact that I am *δίκαιος*."<sup>4</sup> And thus the by no means idle, but tender

<sup>1</sup> "Deum aequum esse rectorem, ut qui me extra omnem injuriæ contactum in suae majestatis consortium receperit." Comp. also Ewald, *Jahrb.* VIII. p. 199, and *Johann. Schr.* I. p. 381.

<sup>2</sup> "For Christians should know no other righteousness, as the ground of their standing in the sight of God . . . , than this departure of Christ to the Father, which is nothing else than that He has taken our sins on His neck," etc.

<sup>3</sup> Here also Ebrard's view comes in, who, indeed, considers the Pauline sense of *δικαιοσύνη* to be remote, but explains it: of the righteousness, *which the world should have and has not*, since it has cast out the Lord, and compelled Him to go to the Father, and to hold intercourse with His own only in an invisible manner. This interpretation is incorrect, for the reason that, in accordance with it, the *ἐλεγχίς* *πρὸς* *δικαιοσύνης* would substantially coincide with the *ἐλεγχίς* *πρὸς* *ἁμαρτίας*. Moreover, the *rejection* of Christ and His invisible *intercourse* with His society is an *imported* meaning.

<sup>4</sup> What Wetzel finds over and above this in the words: that in Christ "*αὐ*

and sympathetic expression, *κ. οὐκέτι θεωρεῖτέ με*, as denoting the translation into the invisible world, is an outflow of the thoughtful and feeling *interest* of Jesus in the approaching *pain of separation which the disciples* were to experience, to whom this grief, in view of the higher object of that *ἐλεγξίς* of the world, could not be spared. A reference to the *scorn of the world* to be expected on the removal of Jesus, as if He were thereby to be manifested an impostor (Linder, in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1867, p. 514 ff.), is remote from the connection. De Wette's remark is incorrect: that *κ. ὑμεῖς θεωρεῖτέ με* was rather to be expected. *That* must have been expected if, with Tholuck, it had to be explained of the *moral purity* (= *ζωή*) only to be found in Christ, the revelation of which was completed by the spiritual communication of the exalted One, who now may be contemplated *spiritually* instead of bodily. But thus all essential points would have been read between the lines.

Ver. 11. If the Paraclete by means of His testimony convinces the world of its sin of unbelief, and of Christ's righteousness, then the *third ἐλεγξίς* also cannot be wanting, which must refer to *him*, who rules the unbelieving world, and is the original enemy of Christ and His kingdom, to the *devil*. He is *judged*, i.e. *actually condemned*, by the fact that Christ has accomplished His world-redeeming work, whereby in truth every one who becomes a believer is withdrawn from the sway of the devil, so that his cause in and with the fulfilment of the redemptive work is objectively a *lost* one. Comp. on xii. 30, 31. *Of this* the Paraclete will penally convict the world, dependent on the dominion of the devil, in order that the world, in acknowledgment of the sinfulness of its unbelief (ver. 9), and of the holy righteousness of the Christ rejected by it (ver. 10), may turn its back in penitence on the prince of the world, over whom already sentence has been pronounced (ver. 10). Thus, by means of the apostolic preaching is accomplished on the *κόσμος* the *officium Spiritus s. elenchticum*.

*righteousness rests, and from Him again all righteousness proceeds,*" is indeed a correct dogmatic deduction from the present passage, but is not contained in the words themselves as their meaning.

NOTE.—The three more precise definitions with *ὅτι* (vv. 9–11) express the relations from the standpoint of the *presence of the speaker*. Hence, in ver. 9, the *present πιστεύουσιν* (which was altered at a very early period—so Vulg. and It.—into *ἐπίστανται*); hence also in ver. 10 the *present ὑπάγω* and the *second person θεωρεῖτε*, because Jesus is speaking to the *disciples*, and it is in fact His departure from *them* which is filling His mind, which lively directness of style De Wette unjustly criticizes as surprisingly inappropriate; hence, finally, in ver. 11 the *perfect κέκριται*, because Jesus sees Himself at the end of His work, and therewith the actual condemnation of Satan already completed and secured. Comp. ver. 33.

Ver. 12. Jesus breaks off, and states the reason. — *πολλά*] Much, that belongs to the entirety of the divine *ἀλήθεια* (ver. 13). That He means only *further developments* (Luther, Melancthon, and many others, including Lücke, De Wette), is not to be deduced (see *in loc.*) from xv. 15, comp. xiv. 26. Nevertheless, the portions of doctrine themselves, which may belong to the *πολλά*, although they are in general to be sought for in the letters and discourses of the apostles, cannot be completely determined; but neither are they, with Grotius (comp. Beza), to be limited to the “*cognitio eorum, quae ad ecclesias constituendas pertinent*” (spirituality of the kingdom of Christ, abolition of the law, apostolic decrees), because we are not fully acquainted with the instructions of Jesus to His disciples. In general, it is certain that information respecting the further development of His work, and particularly matters of knowledge which, as history attests, still necessitated special revelation, as the immediate calling of the Gentiles, Acts x., and eschatological disclosures like 1 Cor. xv. 51, Rom. xi. 25, 1 Thess. iv. 15 ff., form *part* of their contents. The non-apostolical Apocalypse (against Hengstenberg and others), as likewise the *ἀποκαλύψεις* granted to Christian prophets in the N. T., are here, where Jesus is concerned with the circle of *apostles*, left out of consideration. Augustine, however, is already correct generally: “*cum Christus ipse ea tacuerit, quis nostrum dicat: illa vel illa sunt?*” Since, however, we cannot demonstrate that even the oral instruction of the *apostles* was completely deposited in their writings (especially as undoubted epistles are lost, while



very few of the original apostles left behind them any writing), *Tradition* in and of itself (*in thesi*) cannot be rejected, although its reality in regard to given cases (*in hypothesis*) can never be proved, and it must therefore remain generally without normative validity. Comp. on 1 Cor. xi. 34. In opposition to tradition, Luther limited πολλά, in entire contradiction of the context, to the *sufferings* that were to be endured. — ἔχω] I have in readiness, viii. 6; 2 John 12; 3 John 13. — βασιτάζειν] That which is too *heavy*, for the spiritual strength, for understanding, temper, strength of will, cannot be *borne*. Comp. Kypke, I. p. 404 f. On the thing: 2 Cor. iii. 2. Note, further, Bengel's appropriate remark, to the effect that the Romish traditions can least be borne by those who have the Spirit. — ἄρτι] at the end, as in xiii. 33.

Ver. 13. Τὸ πν. τ. ἀλ.] See on xiv. 17. — ὁδηγ. ὑμ. εἰς τ. ἀλ. πᾶσαν] *He will be to you a guide into all the truth*. Comp. ver. 23; πᾶσαν, according to its position after τ. ἀλ. (see critical notes), does not belong to the verb, as if it expressed the *complete introduction* (Lücke), but describes, as in v. 22, divine truth in its entirety, according to its collective contents. Comp. v. 22: τ. κρίσιν πᾶσαν, Plat. *Theæt.* p. 147 E, τὸν ἀριθμὸν πάντα δίχα διελάβομεν; Krüger, § 50. 11. 11. As to the thing, πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν, Mark v. 33 (Krüger on *Thuc.* vi. 87. 1), would not be different; only in the present passage, ἀλήθεια is the idea *immediately prominent*. — οὐ γὰρ, κ.τ.λ.] Reason, from the origin and compass of His communications. — ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ] αὐτοκέλευστος, ἀνήκοος, Nonnus. This negative definition is, indeed, the denial of anything conceived of after a human manner, which absolutely *cannot* be ("spiritus enim, qui a semet ipso loquitur, non spiritus veritatis, sed spiritus est mendacii," Ruperti; comp. already Ignatius, *ad Eph. interpol.* 9), but serves completely to set forth the unity of the Spirit's teaching with that of the Lord.<sup>1</sup> Comp. v. 19. — ὅσα ἂν ἀκούσῃ] *All, whatsoever He shall have heard from God*, so that He will

<sup>1</sup> "Consequently He sets, for the Holy Spirit Himself, a goal and measure of His preaching, that He shall preach nothing new nor different from that which Christ and His word is, so that we may have a certain mark of truth and touchstone, to judge of false spirits," Luther.

withhold from you nothing of that which has been divinely heard by Him.<sup>1</sup> The Spirit, however, hears from God not externally as a Subject separated from God, but (comp. 1 Cor. ii. 11) through an *interna acceptio*; for He is in God, and proceeds from Him, xv. 26. That the hearing from God, not from Christ (Olshausen, Kling, B. Crusius, Luthardt, Hengstenberg, Godet: from both), is meant, is to be already assumed on account of the *absolute ἀκούση*, and ver. 15 renders it certain. On *ἀκούση* itself, comp. also Luther: "The faith must make its way universally over all creatures, and not cleave to thoughts of listening to bodily preaching, but lay hold of a preaching, word, and hearing *in essence*." — τὰ ἐρχόμενα] So that you, through the ἀποκάλυψις of the Spirit, will also become acquainted with the *future* (ἀ δ' ἐρχόμενα μοῖρα, Soph. Trach. 846), the knowledge of which belongs to the whole ἀλήθεια (particularly the eschatological developments). Comp. Isa. xli. 22, 23, xlv. 7, xlv. 11: τὰ ἐπερχόμενα. Further, τὰ ἐρχόμενα belongs also to that denoted by ὅσα ἂν ἀκούση, and is related to it as species to genus, so that καὶ brings into relief from that which is general, something further that is particular.

Vv. 14, 15. For *me*, with a view to glorify *me* (ἐμέ, with emphasis), will the Paraclete, as is said in ver. 13, operate, for the advancement of *my* δόξα among men, since He will announce to you nothing else than what is *mine*, what according to the identity of substance is *my* truth, of which *I* am the possessor and disposer.<sup>2</sup> Justly do I designate the *divine* truth, which He is to announce, as *my* property, since all that the *Father* has, i.e. according to the context, the *whole truth* possessed by the *Father* (Col. ii. 3), belongs properly to *me*, as to the Son, who was in intuitive fellowship with the Father (i. 18), went forth from the Father (viii. 42), was consecrated (x. 36)

<sup>1</sup> When Godet says, on ver. 13: "The word in xiv. 26 included the formula of the inspiration of our Gospels; ver. 13 gives that of the inspiration of the Epistles and of the Apocalypse," the simple addition must be made, "in so far as and to the extent in which these writings are actually apostolic."

<sup>2</sup> Every claim that anything belongs to what Christ terms τὰ ἰσού must necessarily, according to the *analogia fidei*, be measured by His and His disciples' extant word; hence the present passage, in like manner, as ver. 13, excludes all the pretended claims of fanaticism.

and sent for the accomplishment of His work, and, moreover, continually lives and moves in the Father, and the Father in Him. Comp. xvii. 10. Calvin, in opposition to the *ontological* interpretation, well observes, that Christ speaks: "*de injuncto sibi erga nos officio.*" Note further, the emphatic, all-embracing *πάντα ὅσα, κ.τ.λ.*, as major premiss in the argument from the universal to the particular; hence all the less is ver. 14 to be referred, with Grotius and Hengstenberg, merely to the announcement of what is *future*. — *λαμβάνει*] Conceived as a *constant* relation.

Ver. 16. *Soon*, after a *short* separation, will this arrival of the Paraclete, and in it our spiritual reunion, take place. Comp. xiv. 19. — *κ. ὄψεσθέ με*] As in xiv. 18, 19, not to be referred to the *resurrection* (as Lange, Ebrard, Hengstenberg, Ewald, Weiss still maintain, in spite of ver. 23, comp. with Acts i. 5, 6), nor to the *Parousia*,<sup>1</sup> but to the *spiritual* vision of Christ in the ministry of the Paraclete, which they experience, and that without any double meaning. See on xiv. 18. — Were *ὅτι ὑπάγω πρὸς τ. πατ.* genuine (but see the critical notes), it would assign the reason for the promise *ὄψεσθέ με*, since the seeing again here intended is *conditioned* by the departure to the Father (ver. 7).

Vv. 17, 18. Jesus makes a pause; some of His disciples (*ἐκ τ. μαθ. αὐτ. sc. τινές*, as in vii. 40) express (in a whisper) to one another, how enigmatic this language, ver. 16, is to them. They indicate, accordingly (ver. 18), the *μικρόν* that was mentioned as the point of unintelligibility: "what shall *this be*, what does *He* mean by *μικρόν*?" Note *τοῦτο* placed first with emphasis, as well as the article with *μικρόν*, pointing backwards. — *καὶ ὅτι ὑπάγω πρ. τ. πατ.*] *ὅτι* is reciprocal. Since the words in ver. 16 are not genuine, we must assume that the disciples place what Jesus said in ver. 10, in connection with these enigmatic words, ver. 16, and *here* take up along with the point *there* expressed in their seeing Him no

<sup>1</sup> The *πάλιν μικρόν*, which decidedly opposes this interpretation, because it is entirely unrelated to the first *μικρόν*, leads Luthardt to the supposition that the return of Christ is here promised to the disciples in such a way, that they were to see in the transitory return of the *risen one* a pledge of the future *Parousia*. But of this Jesus certainly says nothing, either here or in what follows.

more:—ὕπαγω πρ. τ. πατ.—in order to receive an explanation regarding it, probably feeling that this explanation must necessarily serve for the clearing up of the obscure words before them.

Ver. 19. Jesus observes what they would ask (comp. vi. 6), and extracts from them (as one who knows the heart, ii. 25; see subsequently ver. 30) the inquiry, not, however, setting aside the point, which they had also introduced from His earlier discourse (ὕπαγω πρ. τ. π.), but deferring it till the solemn conclusion of His instruction, ver. 28.

Vv. 20–22. He gives no explanation of the meaning, but depicts the *interchange of sorrow and joy*, which the not seeing and seeing again will bring with them. In this way they might, with the correct *apprehension* and *hope*, advance towards the approaching development. — κλαύσετε κ. θρηνήσ. ὑμεῖς] ὑμεῖς with peculiar emphasis, moved to the end, and placed immediately before ὁ δὲ κόσμ. The mourning and lamentation, this loud outburst of the λύπη of the disciples over the death of Jesus (not: “over the community of Christ given up to death,” Luthardt), becomes yet more tragic through the contrast of the joy of the world. — εἰς χαρὰν γενήσεται] *will be turned into joy*, namely, when that ὄψεσθί με takes place. — Ver. 21. ἡ γυνή] *the woman*; the article is *generic*, comp. ὁ δοῦλος, xv. 15. — ὅταν τίκτῃ] *when she is on the point of bringing forth*. — ἡ ὥρα αὐτῆς] *her hour of distress*, ὥρα βαρυνώδινος, Nonnus. Comp. afterwards τῆς θλίψεως, which denotes the distress during the occurrence of birth. — ἄνθρωπος] *a man*. In this lies a *self-consciousness* of the maternal joy. — εἰς τὸν κόσμ.] *born and therewith come into the world* (i. 9, xviii. 37). An appeal to the Rabbinical מֵיִתְּרָא בֵּינָא is not required. — The picture of the *woman bringing forth*, to set forth the sorrow which issues in joy, is also frequent in the O. T. (Isa. xxi. 3, xxvi. 17, lxvi. 7; Hos. xiii. 13; Mic. iv. 9, 10). Its importance in the present passage Jesus Himself states, ver. 22, definitely and clearly, and in regard to it no further exposition is to be attempted. In accordance with this view, the grief and the joy of the *disciples* is the *sole* thing depicted, not also the passage of Christ through death to life (Brückner), as the birth of the new fellowship for the disciples, and the like. There is much arbitrary interpretation

in Chrysostom, Apollinarius, Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, Rupert, and several others, including Olshausen, according to whom the *death of Christ* is said to appear as the *sorrowful birth-act of humanity*, out of which the God-man comes forth, glorified to the eternal joy of the whole; even in De Wette the living Christ is subjectively a child of the spiritual productivity of the disciples. Similarly Tholuck, also Lange, in conformity with his explanation of Christ's *resurrection*, understanding this as involving the birth of the new humanity out of the birth-sorrow of the theocracy; comp. Ebrard, who finds depicted the resurrection of the Lord as the birth of the community, which is begotten and suckled from His heavenly life. Since, further on, the *Parousia* is not referred to, and the *ὑμεῖς*, ver. 22, are the *disciples*, we must not, with Luthardt, explain it of the *passage of the community into the state of glorification* at the future coming of Christ (Rev. xxi. 4), so that the community is to be thought of as "bringing forth in its death-throes the new state of things." — Ver. 22. According to the amended reading (see the critical notes): *you also will consequently* (corresponding to this *παροιμία*) *now indeed* (over my death, which is immediately impending) *have sorrow; but again I shall see you*, etc. That here Christ does not again say *ὄψεσθέ με*, as in ver. 19, is only a change in the correlate designation of the same fact (Godet's explanation is an artificial refinement, which, expressed in vv. 19 and 22 according to both its aspects, is, by means of vers. 23 and 25, obviously designated, neither as the *Parousia*,<sup>1</sup> nor as the return by the *resurrection*, or at least as taking its beginning from this (see on xiv. 18), but as the *communication of the Paraclete*). The exalted Christ, returning to them and the Holy Ghost, *sees them again*. — *ἀρχει*] represents the certain future as present.

<sup>1</sup> In interpreting it of the *Parousia*, the assumption is forced on one, that with *ἀμὴν, ἀμὴν λέγω, κ.τ.λ.*, a new section of the discourse commences, which refers to the *intermediate time* until the *Parousia*. See especially Luthardt and Lechler, p. 225. This is certainly opposed, and decisively, by the *ἐν ἑκείνῃ τ. ἡμέρᾳ*, ver. 26, which is solemnly repeated, and points back to ver. 23. And the above assumption is, in and of itself, entirely arbitrary. Comp. the *ἀμὴν, κ.τ.λ.*, ver. 20. In interpreting it of the *Resurrection*, Ebrard sees himself necessitated to give to *οὐκ ἰρωτήσ. οὐδὲν* the limitation: *in the sense of ver. 19. A pure importation.*

Climax of the representation. Then your joy will be *incapable of being taken from you*, on account of the renewed fellowship, like this itself (Matt. xxviii. 20).

Vv. 23, 24. Happy result of this spiritual reunion in reference to the disciples' official relationship: *illumination—granting of prayer*. — ἐν ἐκείνῃ τ. ἡμ.] On the day that I shall again be seen by you (spiritually), not: "if the disciples shall spiritually have given birth in themselves to the living Christ" (De Wette); not: on the never-ending day which is to begin with Easter in their souls (Lange), to which the interpretations of Ebrard and Hengstenberg also substantially amount, comp. Brückner. — ἐμὲ οὐκ ἔρωτ. οὐδέν] Because, that is, the enlightenment through the *Paraclete* will secure you so high a sufficiency of divine knowledge, that you would have no need to question *me* (note the emphatic ἐμὲ) about anything (as hitherto has been the case so frequently and so recently, ver. 19). The discourse of Peter, Acts ii. 14 ff., is a living testimony of this divine certainty here promised, which took the place of the want of understanding.<sup>1</sup> Chrysostom, Grotius, and several others, including Weizsäcker and Weiss, incorrectly take ἔρωτ. to mean *pray*. Comp. vv. 19, 30. — ἀμὴν ἀμὴν, κ.τ.λ.] The further good to be promised is introduced with emphatic asseveration in the consciousness of its great importance. — In adopting the reading δώσει ὑμῖν ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι μου (see the critical notes), we must explain: He will give it you, *in virtue of my name*, by its power as the *determining motive* (Winer, p. 362 [E. T. p. 575]), because then you have not prayed otherwise than in my name (see on xiv. 13). The interpretation: *in my stead* (Weiss), yields a paradoxical idea, and has opposed to it ver. 24. — ἕως ἄρτι, κ.τ.λ.] Because, that is, the higher illumination was wanting to you, which belongs thereto, and which will be imparted to you through the medium of the *Paraclete* only after my departure. You are wanting up to this time in the spiritual ripeness and maturity of age for such praying, as the highest step of prayer that may be heard. This reason appears in harmony with the text from the reciprocal relation of ἐν ἐκείνῃ τ. ἡμέρᾳ and ἕως

<sup>1</sup> Scholten's view is a misunderstanding of an enthusiastic kind, to the effect that this saying overthrows the entire Protestant principle of Scripture.

ἀρτι, if we note that by ἐμέ οὐκ ἔρωτ. οὐδέν that very divine clearness and certainty is expressed, which is still wanting to them ἕως ἀρτι. The reason, therefore, is not to be determined in this wise, that Christ had not yet been glorified (Luthardt), and had accordingly not yet become to the disciples that which He was to become (Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 358, comp. Hengstenberg). — [να] Divinely ordained object of the λήψεσθε. — ἡ χαρὰ ὑμ.] Ver. 22. It is to be *filled up*, i.e. to be complete, that nothing may be wanting to it. Comp. xv. 11. There is thus *fulfilled* in the disciples, after their reception of the Spirit through the granting of their prayers, the consolatory picture of the bearing woman in her joy after the sorrow she has surmounted. Luthardt also transposes vv. 23, 24 into the time *before* the last future; but necessitated to this, he should *not* have referred ver. 16 ff. to the Parousia.

Ver. 25. Ταῦτα] that, namely, after which the disciples, in vv. 17, 18, had asked, and what He Himself, ver. 20 ff., had more fully carried out; that, consequently, which had been spoken of His departure and of His being seen again, and its circumstances and consequences. He has uttered this in improper, allegorical expressions (ἐν παροιμ., comp. on x. 6, and on the generic plur., Mark xii. 1), proportioned to their capacity of comprehension; but when the hour of the fulfilment of the promise of the Paraclete shall have arrived, He will then, and that by means of the Paraclete, no longer speak to them under such sensuous veils of thought, but without circumlocution, and directly, frankly and freely (παρρησία, adverbial instrumental dative, as in xi. 14), give them tidings of the Father. In answer to Luthardt, who refers ταῦτα to all that was previously said, including the discourse on the vine (comp. also Godet), xvi. 1 is already decisive, and also the fact that before ver. 19 the *disciples* have spoken.

Vv. 26, 27. Ἐν ἐκ τ. ἡμ. ἐν τῷ ὄν. μ. αἰτήσ.] Because enlightened by the Paraclete. Comp. ver. 24. Bengel's remark is apt: "Cognitio parit orationem," and that the prayer to be heard in the name of Jesus.<sup>1</sup> — καὶ οὐ λέγω,

<sup>1</sup> "For thou comest not in thine own name, work, or merit, but on this, that it is announced to thee by the Holy Spirit what God's will and command is, which He has performed through Christ," Luthier.

κ.τ.λ.] *and I say not*, etc.; I would therewith promise something for that coming time that may be dispensed with. For on my part (ἐγώ) an intercession on your behalf in order to the hearing of these your prayers will not at all be needed, because, that is, they are just prayers *in my name* (see on xiv. 14). The opposite meaning is deduced by Aretius, Grotius, Wolf, Rosenmüller, Kuinoel: that οὐ λέγω ὑμ. means: *I will not mention at all*, so that the intercession is thus designated as a matter of course. Against this the following αὐτὸς γὰρ, κ.τ.λ., is decisive. There is no contradiction, however, with xiv. 16, xvii. 9, since in these places the intercession of Christ belongs to the time *prior* to the communication of the Paraclete. — αὐτός] *ipse*, from the proper divine impulse of love, without my intercessory mediation being required to that end. — φιλεῖ] “*amat vos*, adeoque vos exaudit,” Bengel. The present denotes that the future is represented as present. They have then the πνεῦμα νιοθεσίας, Rom. viii. 15; Gal. iv. 6; along with which, however, the intercession intended in 1 John ii. 1, Heb. vii. 25, Rom. viii. 34, on the part of the exalted Jesus, is not excluded. This intercession is not required in order to the hearing of prayer, if it is made in virtue of the Spirit in the name of Jesus, but rather generally in order to the continued efficacy of the atonement on behalf of believers. — The reason of that αὐτὸς . . . φιλεῖ ὑμᾶς is: ὅτι ὑμεῖς, κ.τ.λ.: “for He will not thus remove Himself out of the midst, that they should pray without and exclusive of Him,” Luther. Note ὑμεῖς ἐμέ: because *ye* are they who have loved *me*. πεφιλ. is *placed first* as the correlate of φιλεῖ; and with logical correctness, since faith, in this definiteness of development (ὅτι . . . ἐξήλθον), could in its progress gradually unfold itself only in their loving bond to Christ, by means of the exercise and experience of this love. On the *perfects*, as the presents of the completed act, Bengel says, and rightly: “*amore et fide prehensum habetis*,” Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 543, incorrectly explains them from the standpoint of the Parousia, from which a glance is taken backwards to the love that has been borne to the close. The entire promise has nothing to do with the Parousia; see on vv. 16, 22, xiv. 18. — ἐξήλθον] See on viii. 42.



Ver. 28. With ἐξῆλθον, solemnly, and with still more definite precision by means of ἐκ τοῦ πατρός, a fresh confirmation of these fundamental contents of faith is commenced, and the return to the Father is subjoined,—and with this a conclusion is made with the same thought,—now, however, by means of the intervening explanatory clauses, brought nearer to the understanding of the disciples—from which the whole discussion, vv. 16, 17, took its rise. A simple and grand summary of His entire personal life.

Vv. 29, 30. The disciples, aroused, nay, astonished (ἰδε), by the clearness of the last great declaration, now find the teachings contained in vv. 20-28 so opened to their understanding, and thereby the enigmatical character of vv. 16, 17 so solved, that they judge, even *now*, that in this instruction just communicated He speaks so openly and clearly, so entirely without allegorical disguise, that He is *at the present time* doing for them (not merely a *prelude* thereof, as Hengstenberg tones down the meaning) that, for the attainment of which He had in ver. 25 pointed them to a *future* hour. But as He, by this teaching in vv. 20-28, had anticipated (ver. 19) the *questions* which they, according to vv. 16, 17, had upon their heart, they are also in this respect so surprised, that they at the same time feel certain that He knows all things, and needs not first to be inquired of, since He replies unasked to the questions on which information was desired; hence the *future* things promised by Him in the words ἐν ἐκείνῃ το οὐδέν, ver. 23, may likewise already exist as *present*, on account of His unlimited knowledge. “Exultant ergo ante tempus perinde acsi quis nummo uno aureo divitem se putaret” (Calvin); but however incomplete their understanding was as yet, it was sufficient for them to experience a deep and vivid impression therefrom, and to lead up to the expression of the decided confession of faith, ἐν τούτῳ πιστεύομεν, κ.τ.λ. Augustine exaggerates when he says: “Illi usque adeo non intelligunt, ut nec saltem se non intelligere intelligent. Parvuli enim erant.” Schweizer has very arbitrarily declared ver. 30 to be spurious; but Lange maintains that the disciples regarded a ray of light from the Spirit, which they now received as the beginning of an uninterrupted holiday of the Spirit. This

is least of all to be established by ἐν τούτῳ, κ.τ.λ. — Ver. 29. νῦν] *Now*, what Thou first didst promise as *future*, ver. 25. — Ver. 30. νῦν] What we, according to thy declaration, ver. 23, should first become aware of *at a future time*. The obvious retrospective reference, given in the words themselves that are employed, of ver. 29 to ver. 25, and of ver. 30 to ver. 23, is neither to be concealed nor denied. — [ἵνα] as in ii. 25. — ἐν τούτῳ] *propter hoc*, Acts xxiv. 16. Comp. ἐν ᾧ, *quoniam* (Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* II. p. 93). ἐν denotes causal dependence (Bernhardy, p. 211). Not now for the first time does their faith begin, that (ὅτι) Christ came forth from God (see ver. 27), and not for the first time do they believe it on the ground that He knows all things; but for their *present* faith in the divine origin of Christ they acknowledge to have found a new and peculiar *ground of certainty* in that which they said in ver. 30; comp. on ii. 11. Lange erroneously says that ὅτι denotes *because*; “in this our faith is rooted, *because* Thou,” etc. The procession of Christ from His pre-human existence with God was indeed not the *ground* of faith (this were His words and works, xiv. 10, 11, x. 38), but the grand *subject* of faith (ver. 27, xvii. 8, xx. 31). Comp. 1 John iv. 2, 3; 2 John 7. According to Ewald, ἐν τούτῳ would express that *in which* they believe, namely, in the fact *that* (ὅτι), etc. But John never designates the object of faith by ἐν (Mark i. 15); he would probably have written τοῦτο πιστ. (xi. 26).

Vv. 31, 32. Since ἄρτι must bear the emphasis, and since Jesus could not and would not doubt of<sup>1</sup> the faith of the disciples *at this moment*, ἄρτι πιστ. is not to be taken *interrogatively*, with Euth. Zigabenus, Calvin, Wetstein, and several others, including Kuinoel, Olshausen, De Wette, B. Crusius, Tischendorf, Hengstenberg, Ewald (according to the analogy of i. 51, xiii. 38, xx. 29), but *concessively*: “*Now, just now*, ye believe, but how soon will ye become vacillating?” οἱ λέ-

<sup>1</sup> “He will not punish them nor discountenance them, as those who are as yet weak and without understanding, but answers them in the most friendly manner, as though He should say: Ye are good pious children, you may probably imagine that you understand and believe, and it is indeed true that you now believe, as you in truth acknowledge from the heart that He went forth from God (which is ever the true faith), but ye know not how it will go, and how weak your faith is,” etc., Luther.

γοντες πιστεύειν φεύξεσθε μικρὸν ὕστερον, κινήσεως ὑμῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ φόβου τῆς πίστεως, Apollinarius. The faith itself did not pass away (hence there is no contradiction to ver. 27, comp. Luke xxii. 32), but it did not stand the test of self-denial and of heroism. This must first appear in the school of conflict and experience. — καὶ ἐλήλυθεν] so immediately at hand is it. — ἵνα] See on ver. 2. — εἰς τὰ ἴδια] into *His own*, i.e. His own place of sojourn (xix. 27; Plat. *Pol.* 8, p. 543 B). Opposite of *κοινωνία*, which is thus rent asunder: ἀπόσσυτος ἄλλος ἀπ' ἄλλου, Nonnus, comp. Plat. *Gorg.* p. 502 E: ἔνεκα τοῦ ἰδίου τοῦ αὐτῶν ὀλιγωροῦντες τοῦ κοινοῦ. On the predication itself comp. Matt. xxvi. 31, and on its fulfilment xxvi. 56. — καί] The emphatic *and* . . ., which (with a pause to be supplied in thought) unexpectedly introduces the contrast. See on vii. 28. — οὐκ εἰμὶ μόνος, κ.τ.λ.] The calm, clear self-consciousness of the Father's protection, elevated above all human desertion, comp. viii. 29. The *momentary* feeling which appears in Matt. xxvii. 46 is not in conflict with this.

Ver. 33. "That is the last word given, and struck into their hand by way of good-night. But He concludes very forcibly with this, and therefore has He finished the entire discourse," Luther. — ταῦτα] pointing back, at the close of the whole discourses again resumed from xiv. 31, to chap. xv. 16. — ἐν ἐμοὶ εἰρήνην . . . ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ θλίψιν] exact correlates: *in me* (living and moving), i.e. in vital fellowship with me: *Peace*, rest of soul, peace of heart (comp. xiv. 27); *in the world*, i.e. in your intercourse with the unbelieving; *affliction* (xvi. 21, and see xv. 18 ff.). — ἐγώ] Luther aptly remarks: "He does not say: Be comforted, *you* have overcome the world, but this is your consolation, that *I, I* have overcome the world; *my* victory is your salvation." And upon *this* victor rests the imperishability of the church. — νενίκη. τ. κόσμ.] The perfect states the victory immediately impending, which is to be gained through His glorification by means of death, as already completed. Prolepsis of the certain conqueror on the boundary of His work. Comp. xii. 31, xiii. 31. But if *He* has overcome the anti-Messianic power of the world, how could *His own*, in spite of all θλίψις, become dispirited, as though He would give up His work, which was to be continued by their

means, and suffer His victory to fall to the ground? Comp. rather 1 John v. 4, 5, iv. 4. Therefore *θαρσεῖτε*. Paul especially is a living commentary on this *θαρσεῖν*. See *e.g.* Rom. viii. 37; 2 Cor. ii. 14, iv. 7 ff., vi. 4 ff., xii. 9, his discourse before Felix and Festus, etc. Comp. Luther's triumphant exposition.

# CHAPTER XVII

VER. 1. ἐπῆρε] B. C.\* D. L. X. κ. Curss. Or. Cyr.: ἐπάρας without the following καί. So Lachm. Tisch. A frequently-occurring improvement of the style. In like manner is the reading τελειώσας, ver. 4, instead of ἐτελείωσα to be regarded. — ἵνα καί] καί is condemned by decisive witnesses. — Ver. 3. γινώσκωσι] Tisch.: γινώσκουσιν, following A. D. G. L. Y. Δ. Λ. An error in transcription, instead of which Lachm., following B. C. E. κ., has rightly retained the conjunctive. — Ver. 4. Between the forms δέδωκα and ἔδωκα, the Codd. in this chap. vacillate in various ways. — Ver. 7. ἐστίν] Tisch.: εἰσίν, according to preponderant evidence. The *Recepta* is an attempted improvement. — Ver. 11. Instead of ᾧ Elz. has οὕς, against decisive witnesses. The too weakly attested reading δ (D.\* U. X.), which is a resolution of the attraction, testifies also in favour of ᾧ. — Ver. 12. ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ] after αὐτῶν, is wanting in the majority of witnesses; deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. An addition after ver. 11. — — Instead of οὕς, Tisch. has ᾧ, according to B. C.\* L. Mechanical repetition from ver. 11. — Ver. 16. The position of οὐκ εἰμί after ἐγώ (Lachm. Tisch.) is decisively attested. — Ver. 17. After ἀληθεία the Edd., except Lachm., have σου, which must be deleted on the decisive testimony of A. B. C.\* D. L. 1, Vulg. It. Goth. Sahid. Cyr. Did. Ambr. Aug. A more definite exegetical definition in accordance with what follows. Bengel aptly remarks in his *Appar.*: “persaepe veritas apud Joh. . . nunquam additur *Dei*.” — Ver. 19. The order ᾧσιν καὶ αὐτοί (Lachm. Tisch.) is decisively attested. — Ver. 20. Instead of πιστευόντων Elz. has πιστευούτων, contrary to decisive testimonies. — Ver. 21. ἐν ἡμῶν ἐν ᾧσιν] B. C.\* D. Codd. of It. Sahid. Arm. Ath. Hil. Vig. Tisch. have merely ἐν ἡμῶν ᾧσιν. Lachm. has ἐν in brackets. This ἐν is a glossematic addition. — Ver. 23. καὶ ἵνα] B. C. D. L. X. Curss. Verss. Fathers have merely ἵνα. καί is rightly deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. An interpolation irrelevant to the connection, made without attending to the construction of ver. 21. — Ver. 24. οὕς] B. D. κ. Copt. Goth. Vulg. ms.: δ. So Tisch. Considering the weighty attestation, and that οὕς very readily suggested itself as an improvement, δ must be regarded as the original reading. Comp. on ver. 11.

Vv. 1, 2.<sup>1</sup> The parting discourses to the disciples are finished, and that with the words, giving assurance of victory, ἐγὼ νενίκα. τ. κόσμ. But now, before Jesus goes forth into the fatal night, as He casts a parting glance on His disciples, who are standing there ready to move on (xiv. 31), and on the whole future of His work, now to be completed on behalf of earth, His communion with the Father impels Him to *prayer*. He prays aloud (ver. 13) and long on His own behalf (vv. 1-5), on behalf of His disciples (vv. 6-19), and on behalf of those who are to become believers at a later time (vv. 20 ff.), with all the depth, intensity, clearness, and repose of the moral need, and of the childlike devotion of the Fulfiller. Because He, by this prayer, prepares Himself for the high-priestly act of the atoning self-sacrifice (see especially ver. 19), it is justly termed the *precatio summi sacerdotis* (Chytraeus), an appellation which is arbitrarily explained by Hengstenberg from the Aaronic blessing (Lev. ix. 22; Num. vi. 22 ff.). Luther aptly says: "that He might fully discharge His office as our sole high priest." — ταῦτα ἐλάλησεν . . . καὶ . . . καὶ] Not negligence of style (De Wette), but solemn circumstantiality. — εἰς τ. οὐρ.] does not serve to establish the point that Jesus spoke *in the open air* (see on xiv. 31; so Ruperti, Grotius, Ebrard, Hengstenberg, and many others), nor is the suggestion needed (Gerhard) that through the window of the room the heavens were accessible to view, but the eye of one who prays is *on all occasions* raised toward heaven. Comp. Acts vii. 55. — ἡ ὥρα] *The hour* κατ' ἐξοχήν, i.e. the hour of my death, as that of my passage to Thee, xiii. 1, xii. 23. — δόξασον . . . δοξάσῃ] The former through the *elevation into the heavenly glory* (comp. ver. 5), the latter through the *revelation of the glory of God*, so far, that is, as the victory of the gospel in the world, and the entire continuance and consummation of the divine work of redemption was conjoined with the heavenly glorification and ministry of Christ. To refer δόξασον to the *earthly, moral* glorification of Christ in the recognition of His Person and cause (Didymus, Nösselt, Kuinoel, De Wette, Reuss), or to the *communication of the true God-consciousness to humanity* (Baur), is opposed to the

<sup>1</sup> Luther's exposition of chap. xvii. belongs to the year 1534.

context, because Christ means His glorification through His death, but this in John is constantly the *personal heavenly* glorification. Note further σου τὸν υἱόν and ὁ υἱός σου; the emphasis of the σου, which is moved to the first place, is related to the prayer as *assigning a reason for it*; it is in truth *Thy* Son whom Thou art to glorify. — Ver. 2 presents to the Father the *definite motive* for the fulfilment of that which was prayed for, and that in such a manner that καθὼς . . . σαρκός corresponds to the preceding δόξασον σου τὸν υἱόν, and ἵνα πᾶν, κ.τ.λ., which contains the purpose of ἔδωκας αὐτῷ ἔξουσ. π. σ., is correlative to ἵνα ὁ υἱός σ. δοξ. σε.<sup>1</sup> — καθὼς denotes the motive contained in the relation of *fitness, in the measure that, according as*. Comp. on xiii. 34. — *Full power over all men* has the Father given to the Son on His mission (xiii. 3), for He has endowed Him as the sole Redeemer and Saviour with power for the execution of the decree of salvation, which extends to all; none is exempted from His Messianic authority. But this ἐξουσία He cannot carry out without returning to the heavenly δόξα, whence He must carry on and complete His work. By πάσης σαρκός, however, the *whole of humanity*—and that in its imperfection (see on Acts ii. 17), conditioned by the very fact of the σάρξ, iii. 6, by which it is destitute of eternal life—is, with a certain solemnity of the O. T. type (כל בשר), designated. The expression is not elsewhere found in John, but it corresponds exactly to this elevated mood of prayer. — ἵνα πᾶν, κ.τ.λ.] Not a mere statement of the contents and compass of the ἐξουσία (Ebrard): no, in the attainment of the blessed *design* of that fulness of power (comp. v. 26, 27) lies precisely that glorification of the Father, ver. 1. Not all, however, without distinction, can receive eternal life through Christ, but (comp. ver. 6) those whom the Father has *given* to the Son (through the attraction by grace, vi. 37, 39, 44, 65) are such, designated from the side of the *divine* efficiency, the same who, *on their*

<sup>1</sup> Ewald begins a new sentence with καθὼς, which is first completed in ver. 4, so that ver. 3 is a parenthesis: "*Even as Thou gavest to Him full power . . . I glorified Thee upon the earth.*" But the *periodic* form which thus arises is less in harmony with the manner of this prayer; and the change of persons in vv. 2 and 4 betrays the want of mutual connection.

side, are the *believing* (i. 12, iii. 15, *et al.*), not “the spiritual supramundane natures” whom Hilgenfeld here discovers. Comp. besides, on vi. 37, 39. — αὐτοῖς] to be referred to the subjects of the absolute (Buttmann, *N. T. Gr.* p. 325 [E. T. pp. 379, 380]) collective πᾶν (Bremi, *ad Isocr.* I. Exc. X.). Note further the weighty parallel arrangement δέδωκας αὐτῷ, δώσῃ αὐτοῖς. On the form δώσῃ, see Buttmann, *N. T. Gr.* p. 31 [E. T. p. 36]. Not *future* conjunctive (Bengel, Baeumlein), but a corrupt form of the aorist.

Ver. 3. The continuative δέ adduces, in keeping with the connection, a more precise definition<sup>1</sup> of ζωὴ αἰώνιος (not a transposition of its idea, as Weiss holds), and that with a retrospective glance to the glorification of the Father in ver. 1. On ἐστίν, comp. on Rom. xiv. 17; John iii. 19. — *In this consists eternal life, that they should recognise* (ἵνα, comp. on vi. 29) *Thee as the only true God* (as Him to whom alone belongs the reality of the idea of God, comp. 1 Cor. viii. 4), *and Thy sent one Jesus as Messiah.* This knowledge of God here desired (which is hence the believing, living, practical knowledge, καθὼς δεῖ γινῶναι, 1 Cor. viii. 2), is the ζωὴ αἰώνιος, so far as it is the essential subjective principle of the same, unfolding this ζωή out of itself, its continual, ever self-developing germ and impulse (comp. Sap. xv. 1, 3), even now in the temporal evolution of eternal life, and at a future time, besides, after the establishment of the kingdom, in which faith, hope, and love abide (1 Cor. xiii.); the fundamental essence of which is in truth nothing else than that knowledge, which in the future αἰών will be the perfected knowledge (1 Cor. xiii. 12), comp. 1 John iii. 2. The contents of the knowledge are stated with the precision of a Confession,—a summary of faith in opposition<sup>2</sup> to the polytheistic (τ. μόνον ἀληθ. θεόν, comp. v. 44; Deut. vi. 4; 1 Cor. viii. 5; 1 Thess. i. 9) and Jewish κόσμος, which latter rejected Jesus as Messiah, although

<sup>1</sup> No formal definition. See the apposite observations of Riehm in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1864, p. 539 f.

<sup>2</sup> An antithesis which might present itself naturally and unsought to the world-embracing glance of the praying Jesus, on the boundary line of His work, which includes entire humanity. But He had also thought further of the ἰξουσία πένος σαρκός, which was given to Him. This likewise in opposition to Weiss, *Lehrbegr.* p. 56, who considers the antithesis foreign to the connection.



in Him there was given, notwithstanding, the very highest revelation of the only true God. It is in the *third person*, however, that the praying Jesus speaks of Himself from ver. 1 forwards, placing Himself in an objective relation towards the Father during the first intensity of this solemn mood, and first at ver. 4 continuing the prayer with the familiar ἐγώ; He indeed mentions His *name* in ver. 3, because in the connection of the self-designation through the third person, it here *specifically* suggested itself, in correspondence to the *confessional* thought. — Χριστόν] is an appellative predicate: as *Messiah*, comp. ix. 22. To connect it as a proper name with Ἰησ. (*Jesus Christ*, comp. i. 17), to ascribe to the evangelist an offence against historical decorum (Bretschneider, Lücke, De Wette), and to see in this a proof of a later reproduction (comp. Tholuck and Weizsäcker, p. 286; also Scholten, p. 238), would be to accuse the writer, especially in the report of such a prayer, of a surprising want of consideration. Luthardt also takes Χριστόν as a proper name, which he thinks was here, in this extraordinary moment, used for the first time by Jesus, and thereby at the same time determined the use of the word by the apostles (Acts ii. 38). So also Godet, comp. Ebrard. But Jesus prayed in Hebrew, and doubtless said יֵשׁוּעַ הַמָּשִׁיחַ, from which expression a proper name could by no means be recognised. The predicative view of τ. μόν. ἀλ. θεόν and of Χριστόν is also justly held by Ewald. — Although τ. μόνον ἀληθ. θεόν refers solely to the *Father*, the true divine nature of *Christ* is not thereby excluded (against the Arians and Socinians, who misused this passage), all the less so as this, in accordance with His (Logos) relationship as dependent on the Godhead of the Father, forms the previous assumption in ὃν ἀπέστειλας, as is certain from the entire connection of the Johannean Christology, and from ver. 5. Comp. Wetstein, and Gess, *Pers. Chr.* p. 162. Hence it was unnecessary,—moreover, even a perversion of the passage, and running counter to the strict monotheism of John, when Augustine, Ambrose, Hilary, Beda, Thomas, Aretius, and several others explained it as if the language were: *ut te et quem misisti Jesum Christum cognoscant solum verum Deum*. Only One, the *Father*, can absolutely be termed the μόνος

ἀληθ. θεός (comp. ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός, Rom. ix. 5), not at the same time Christ (who is not even in 1 John v. 20 the ἀληθινὸς θεός), since His divine entity stands in the relation of *genetic* subsistence to the Father, i. 18, although He, in unity with the Father, works as His commissioner, x. 30, and is His representative, xiv. 9, 10.

Vv. 4, 5. Once more the prayer of ver. 1, δόξασόν σου τὸν υἱόν, but stating a different reason for it ("ostendit, non iniquum se petere," Grotius), and setting forth the δόξα more definitely. — ἐγὼ σε ἔδοξ. ἐπὶ τ. γ.] *By what*, is expressed by the following parallel proposition, which is subjoined with asyndetic liveliness. The Messianic work glorified *God*, to whose highest revelation, and therewith to His knowledge, praise, and honour it bore reference. Comp. ver. 6. — The *aorists* ἔδοξ. and ἐτελεί. are employed, because Jesus stands at the goal of His earthly activity, where He already includes in this account the fact which puts a close to His earthly work, the fact of His death, as already accomplished. Christ is not passive in His sufferings; His obedientia *passiva* is *active*, the highest point of His activity. — καὶ νῦν] *And now*, when I take leave of this my earthly ministry. — In what follows note the correlation of με σύ with ἐγὼ σε, in which the thought of *recompense* (comp. διό, Phil. ii. 9) is expressed. The emphasis lies on ἐγὼ and σύ, hence after με no comma should stand. — παρὰ σεαυτῷ] so that I may be united with *Thyself* in heavenly fellowship (Col. iii. 3), corresponding to ἐπὶ τ. γῆς. Comp. on xiii. 32. — The δόξα, which Jesus possessed before the creation of the world, and thus in eternity before time was (εἶχον, which is to be understood *realiter*, not with the Socinians, Grotius, Wetstein, Nösselt, Löffler, Eckermann, Stolz, Gabler, comp. B. Crusius, Schleiermacher, *L. J.* p. 286 f., Scholten, *ideally* of the *destinatio divina*), was the divine glory, *i.e.* the essentially glorious manifestation of the entire divine perfection and blessedness, the μορφή θεοῦ (Phil. ii. 6) in His pre-existent state (John i. 1), of which He divested Himself when He became man, and the resumption of which, in the consciousness of its once enjoyed possession,<sup>4</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Not merely in a momentary anticipation, in which it appeared before the eye of His spirit (Weizsäcker). Comp. on viii. 58. It is a perversion of the

He now asks in prayer from God. Had Christ contemplated Himself as the eternal archetype of humanity in His pre-historical unity with the proper personal life of God, and attributed to Himself in *this* sense the premundane δόξα (Beyschlag, p. 87 f.), His expression εἶχον παρὰ σοί would stand in contradiction therewith, because this latter separates the subject that had been in possession from the divine subject in such a manner that the former was *with* the latter, and possessed the glory, as then also the glory *again* prayed for would not be *adequate* to that already formerly *possessed*; for the essence of the former is the σύνθρονον εἶναι θεοῦ, which consequently that of the latter must also have been. Comp. on vi. 62. — For the fulfilment of this prayer: Phil. ii. 9; 1 Tim. iii. 16; Heb. i. 8, 13; Acts ii. 34; 1 Pet. iii. 22, *et al.* The δόξα, however, which His believing ones beheld in Him in His *earthly working* (i. 14), was not the heavenly majesty in its Godlike, absolute existence and manifestation,—that He had as λόγος ἄσαρκος, and obtained it again in divine-human completeness after His ascension,—but His temporally divine-human glory, the glory of God present in earthly and bodily limitation, which He had in the state of κένωσις, and made known through grace and truth, as well as through His entire activity. Comp. on i. 14; see also Liebner, *Christol.* I. p. 323 f.

Vv. 6-8. Hitherto Jesus has prayed *on behalf of Himself*. But now He introduces His *intercession on behalf of His disciples*, which begins with ver. 9, by representing them as *worthy* of this intercession. — σοῦ] With emphasis, as opposed to τοῖς ἀνθρώπ., in the deep feeling of the holiness and greatness of the task discharged. — What the *name of God* comprises in itself and expresses (see on Matt. vi. 9), was previously made known to the disciples only in so far as it brought with it its O. T. imagery; but the specific disclosures respecting God and His counsel of salvation resting in Christ, and His

exegetically clear and certain relation when Weizsäcker finds in such passages, instead of the self-consciousness of Jesus reaching back into His pre-human state, only “the culminating point of an advancing self-knowledge.” That here, however, and in ver. 25, different modes of apprehending the person of Christ are intimated (Weizsäcker in the *Jahrb. f. D. Th.* 1862, p. 645 ff.), cannot be established on exegetical grounds. See on ver. 25.

entire redemptive relation to men, which Christ had given them by virtue of his prophetic office (the *Christian* contents, therefore, of the divine name), entitled Him to pray; ἐφ' ἀνέ-  
 ρωσά σου τ. ὅν., κ.τ.λ. Comp. Col. i. 26, 27. A reference to the *Jewish practice of keeping secret* the name of *Jehovah* (Hilgenfeld) lies entirely remote from the meaning. — οὗς δέδωκ. μοι ἐκ τ. κόσμου] Necessary definition of τοῖς ἀνθρώ-  
 ποις (hence not to be connected with σοὶ ἦσαν); whom Thou hast given to me out of the world (separated from out of the unbelieving, xv. 19), that is, the *disciples* (see vv. 8, 11), as objects of the divine counsel of salvation God has given them through attracting them by His grace; see on vi. 37. — σοί] Possessive pronoun, as in ver. 9; they belonged to Thee, were Thine, “per fidem V. T.,” Bengel. Comp. i. 37, 42, 46, 48, and generally viii. 47, vi. 37, 44. Therefore not in the sense of predestination (Beza, Calvin), but of *motive*, from which God, to whom they indeed already inwardly belonged, has drawn them to Christ. God knows His own. The non-ethical interpretation of *property generally* (Cyril.: ἴδια γὰρ πάντα θεῷ), or, as “Thy creatures” (Hengstenberg), yields no special statement of reason. — καὶ τὸν λόγον σου τετηρ.] and with what result gavest Thou them to me! On τ. λόγον σου, comp. vii. 16, xii. 48, 49, and on τετηρ., they have kept Thy word (by faith and deed), viii. 51, xiv. 23. — νῦν ἔγνωκαν, κ.τ.λ.] Progress in the representation of this result, which is now advanced so far, that they have recognised (and do recognise, *perfect*) all that the Father has communicated to Christ as that which it is, as proceeding from God. All which Thou hast given to me points not merely to the *doctrine* (De Wette), but to the *entire activity* of Jesus (Luthardt), for which He has received from the Father a commission, direction, power, result, etc. Comp. ver. 4, xii. 49, v. 36. A more definite limitation is arbitrary, because not demanded by what follows, which rather establishes the general expression (ver. 7) by means of the particular (τὰ ῥήματα). — Ver. 8 gives the causative demonstration (ὅτι, *for*), how they attained to the knowledge of ver. 7,<sup>1</sup> namely, (1) on the part of Jesus, in

<sup>1</sup> Ewald begins with ὅτι (*because*), a protasis, the apodosis of which (*I there-fore beg*) follows in ver. 9, in such a manner, however, that from αὐ πρὶ τού

that He communicated to them *the words given Him by God*, i.e. that which He, as Interpreter of God, had to announce (nothing else); and (2) *on their part* (αὐτοί), in that they have adopted this,<sup>1</sup> and have actually known it (vii. 26). Thus with them that ἔγνωσαν in ver. 7 *has come to completion*. — καὶ αὐτοί] is only to be separated by a comma from what precedes, and, further, is connected with ὅτι. The καὶ ἐπίσ-τευσαν, κ.τ.λ., parallel to ἔγνωσαν ἀληθῶς, κ.τ.λ., adding *faith* to knowledge (see on vi. 69), and the above ἐξήλθον (comp. on viii. 42), leading back to the Fatherly behest, whereby it is accomplished, *completes* the expression of the *happy result* attained in the case of the disciples. Note, further, the historical aorists ἔλαβ. and ἐπίστ. in their difference of sense from the perfects.

Ver. 9. *I pray for them!* Both in ἐγώ and in περὶ αὐτῶν there lies a *motive* element in reference to God. That which lies in περὶ αὐτῶν is then further made specially prominent, first negatively (οὐ π. τ. κόσμ. ἐρ.), and then positively (ἀλλὰ περὶ, κ.τ.λ.). — οὐ περὶ τοῦ κόσμου] has no *dogmatic* weight, and is therefore not to be explained in the sense of the condemnation of the world (Melanchthon), or of absolute predestination (Calvin, Jansen, Lampe), or of the *negation of such intercession in general* (Hengstenberg), but refers simply and solely to *this present* intercession, which has in truth no relation to those who are strangers to God, but to His own, whom He has given to Jesus,—and this should all the more *move* Him to fulfil the prayers. Prayer for the unbelieving has been enjoined by Jesus Himself (Matt. v. 44), and was, moreover, offered by Himself upon the cross (Luke xxiii. 34), and for them did He die, comp. also ver. 20; but here He has only the disciples in view, and lays them, by the antithesis οὐ περὶ τ. κόσμου, the more earnestly on the Father's heart. Luther well says: "At other times one should pray for the world,

πίσμου το ἔρχομαι, ver. 11, a parenthesis is introduced, and then first with πάτη ἀγίς comes the supplication conveyed by ἰρωτῶ. But this complicated arrangement is neither necessary nor appropriate to the clear and peaceful flow of the language of this prayer as it stands.

<sup>1</sup> i.e. They have not rejected the *ρήματα*, but have allowed them to influence themselves. This is the necessary pre-condition of knowledge and of faith. Comp. Weiss, *Lehrbegr.* p. 28.

that it may be *converted*." Comp. ver. 21. — ὅτι σοί εἰσι] Ground of the intercession: *because they*—although given to me—are *Thine*, belonging to Thee as my believing ones, since they *were* Thine (ver. 6) already, before Thou gavest them to me.

Ver. 10. Καὶ τὰ ἐμὰ πάντα . . . ἐμὰ] is parenthetic (on καὶ parentheticum, see Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* I. 13, p. 35), and καὶ δεδόξ. ἐν αὐτοῖς is still in connection with ὅτι, ver. 9, containing a second ground of the intercession. — As regards the above parenthesis, when Jesus prayed ὅτι σοί εἰσι, ver. 9, His glance was extended from this concrete relation to the category, to the *general reciprocal community of property*, which, in matters relating to His work, exists between Him, the Son and plenipotentiary of the Father, and the Father. Both have the same work, the same aim, the same means, the same power, the same grace and truth, etc., in common; neither has and works separate from the other, and for Himself; God in Christ, and He in God. Comp. on xvi. 15. Luther aptly remarks: "It would not yet be so much if He simply said: All that is mine is Thine; for that every one can say . . .; but this is much greater, that He inverts the relation, and says: All that is Thine is mine; this no creature can say in reference to God." — δεδόξ. ἐν αὐτ.] *I am glorified in them*, in their person and activity, in so far as they are bearers and furtherers of my glory and knowledge upon earth, so precious and important, then, that I pray for them. What is already begun, and is certainly to be further accomplished in the near future, Jesus views, speaking in the *perfect* with prophetic anticipation, as completed and actually existing (Kühner, II. p. 72), and ἐν denotes the relation resting on, contained in them, as in xiii. 31, 32, xiv. 13.

Ver. 11. Before He now gives expression to the special supplication itself (πάτερ ἄγιε, τήρησον, κ.τ.λ.), He first brings forward the peculiar *ground of need*, connecting in profound emotion its individual members unperiodically by καὶ. — οὐκέτι εἰμι, κ.τ.λ.] Thus He speaks, "nunc quasi provincia sua defunctus," Calvin. — καὶ οὗτοι, κ.τ.λ.] "hos relinquam in tantis fluctibus," Grotius. — ἄγιε] As in ver. 25, δίκαιε, so here ἄγιε is added *significantly*; for to guarantee that which

Jesus would now pray (τήρησον, κ.τ.λ.) is in harmony with the holiness of His Father, which has been revealed to Him in entire fulness, a holiness which is the absolute antithesis of the ungodly nature of the profane world.<sup>1</sup> Placed by their calling in this unholy κόσμος, they shall be guarded by the holy God so as to abide faithfully in His name. In harmony with this antithesis of the holiness of God to the nature of the world, stands the petition, "hallowed be Thy name," at the head of the Lord's Prayer. Comp. also 1 John ii. 20; Heb. xii. 10; 1 Pet. i. 16; Rev. vi. 10. Thus the Father discharges the obligation lying on Himself, if He keeps the disciples of the Son in His name. — ἐν τῷ ὀνόμ. σ.] Specific sphere, in which they are to remain through being so kept; the name of the Father is made known to them (vv. 6, 26), and with a happy result (vv. 6–8); thus are they to persevere in His living acquaintance and believing confession, not to depart out of this holy element of their life. — ᾧ δέδωκ. μοι] ᾧ by attraction, instead of ᾧ, which, however, does not stand instead of οὗς (Bengel, comp. Ewald and Godet, who would read ᾧ, see the critical notes), but: God has given His name to Christ, and that not in the sense of the divine nature entering into manifestation, as Hengstenberg here drags in from Ex. xxiii. 21, but rather in the sense of ver. 6, for revelation to the disciples; He has for such a purpose delivered His name to Him as the object of a holy commission. In conformity with this, the Lord prays that God would keep them in this His name, in order that they, in virtue of the one common faith and confession resting on the name of God, may be one (in the spiritual fellowship, of like mind and love, comp. vv. 22, 23), in conformity with the archetype<sup>2</sup> of the ethical unity of the Father and the Son (comp. the Pauline εἰς θεὸς κ. πατὴρ πάντων, κ.τ.λ., Eph. iv. 6). Hence ἵνα expresses the object of τήρησον, κ.τ.λ., not of δέδωκ. μοι.

Vv. 12, 13. A more definite outflow of heart concerning

<sup>1</sup> According to Diestel in the *Jahrb. f. Deutsche Theol.* 1859, p. 45, God is here conceived of as ἅγιος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, which is the completion of the N. T. ἅγιος τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. But of this there is neither any indication in the context, nor do we find generally the idea of God as of the ἅγιος τοῦ Χριστοῦ expressed. Hengstenberg refers too exclusively to the power of the holy God.

<sup>2</sup> Bengel: "Illa unitas est ex natura, hæc ex gratia; igitur illi hæc similis est, non æqualis."

ver. 11. — ὅτε ἤμην, κ.τ.λ.] As in ver. 11, οὐκέτι εἰμὶ ἐν τ. κόσμῳ, Jesus speaks as though He had already departed out of the world. “Jam in exitu mundi pedem irrevocabilem posuerat,” Ruperti on ver. 11. — ἐγὼ] That which *Thou* mayest now do, ver. 11. — οὗς δέδωκ. μοι ἐφύλ., κ.τ.λ.] Not a parenthesis, but a further expression of the *τήρησις* just described, in which a sorrowful but telically clear and conscious mention of Judas obtrudes itself. — ἐφύλαξα] Through the *φυλάσσειν* (*custodire*) is the *τηρεῖν* (*conservare*) accomplished. Comp. Sap. x. 5; Dem. 317. ult. The disciples were handed over to Him for *protection and guardianship*, *ut eos salvos tueretur*. This He has accomplished, and none of them has fallen into destruction (*i.e.* into eternal destruction through apostasy, which leads to the loss of ζωή), except him who belongs to destruction (Matt. xxiii. 15), *i.e.* who is destined to destruction. Comp. vi. 64, 70. Jesus does not like to name Judas, who forms this tragical exception (εἰ μὴ is not equivalent to ἀλλά, as Scholten thinks), but his destruction—and therein the purity of the consciousness of Jesus in the matter is expressed—is *nothing accidental*, capable of being averted, but is prophesied as a divine destiny in the Scripture, and *must take place in fulfilment thereof*. On account of xiii. 18, it is without warrant to think of another saying of Scripture than, with Luther, Lücke, and several others, of Ps. xli. 10 (Kuinoel: the prophecies of the death of Jesus generally are intended; Lange, *L. J.* II. p. 1412: Isa. lvii. 12, 13; Euth. Zigabenus, Calovius, and many, Ps. cix. 8, which passage, however, has its reference in Acts i. 20). The designation of *Antichrist* by ὁ υἱὸς τ. ἀπωλ., 2 Thess. ii. 3, is parallel in point of form. In the *Evang. Nikod.* 20 (see Thilo on the passage, p. 708), the devil is so called.—Ver. 13. *But now I come to Thee, and since I can no longer guard them personally as hitherto, I speak this* (this prayer for Thy protection, ver. 11) *in the world* (“jam ante discessum meum,” Bengel), *that they*, as witnesses and objects of this my intercession, knowing themselves assured of Thy protection, *may bear my joy* (as in xv. 11, not xiv. 27) *fulfilled in themselves*. On this expression of prayer regarding the influence which the *listening to prayer* should have upon the *listeners*, comp. xi. 42. Luther well says: “that they, through the



word, apprehended by the ears, and retained in the heart, may be consoled, and be able cheerfully to presume thereon, and to say: See, this has my Lord Christ said, so affectionately and cordially has He prayed for me," etc.

Vv. 14, 15. The intercession addresses itself to a *particular, definite* point of the *τήρησις* prayed for, namely, *ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ*, ver. 15, and this is introduced, ver. 14, from the side of their *necessities*. — *ἐγώ*] antithesis: *ὁ κόσμος*. — *ἐμίς. αὐτούς*] *has conceived a hatred against them* (Aor., see Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 197; Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* i. 1. 18). This hatred Luther terms "the true court colours of Christians that they bear on earth." Further, see on xv. 18, 19. — The more precise definition of *τήρησις* follows in ver. 15 negatively and positively. They are *not* ("for I have still more to accomplish by their means," Luther) *to be taken out of the unbelieving world* which hates them (which would take place by death, as now in the case of Jesus Himself, ver. 11), but *they are to be kept* by God, so that they ever come forth, morally uninjured, *from the power of Satan surrounding them*, the power of the prince of the world. *ἐκ τ. πονηροῦ* is not, with Luther, Calvin, and many others, including Olshausen, B. Crusius, Hengstenberg, Godet, to be taken as *neuter*, but comp. 1 John ii. 13 ff., iii. 12, v. 18, 19, iv. 4; Matt. vi. 13; 2 Thess. iii. 3; comp. on *τηρεῖν ἐκ*, Rev. iii. 10, also *φυλάσσειν ἐξ ἐπιβουλῆς* in Themist. 181. 19 (Dindorf). Nonnus: *δαίμονος ἀρχεκάκοιο δυσαντήτων ἀπὸ θεσμῶν*.

Vv. 16, 17. From the *τηρεῖν* which has been hitherto prayed for, the intercession now advances to the positive *ἀγιάζειν*, ver. 17; and this part of it also is first *introduced* in ver. 16, and that by an emphatic resumption of what was said in ver. 14 on the side of the *condition fitted* for the *ἀγιάζειν*. — *ἀγλασον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ ἀληθ.*] The disciples were *in the truth*, for since they had believingly accepted the word of God given to them by Christ, and had kept it (vv. 6, 12), the divine truth, the expression of which that word is, was the *element of life*, in which they, taken from the world and given to Christ, were found. Now He prays that God would not merely keep them (that He has previously prayed for), but yet further: He would *provide them with a holy consecra-*

tion (comp. on x. 36) in this their sphere of life, whereby is meant not indeed the translation into "the true position of being" (Luthardt), but the equipment with divine illumination, power, courage, joyfulness, love, inspiration, etc., for their official activity (ver. 18) which should ensue, and did ensue, through means of the Holy Spirit, xiv. 17, xv. 26, xvi. 7 ff. Comp. on *ἐν*, Sir. xlv. 4. Ordinarily it is taken *instrumentally*, in virtue of, by means of (Chrysostom, Nonnus, Theophylact, Calvin, and many others, including Lücke, Tholuck, Godet), but in arbitrary neglect of the analogy of the correlate *τηρεῖν ἐν*, vv. 11, 12; whilst De Wette, B. Crusius, Baeumlein, just as arbitrarily here again mix up also the notion of *τηρεῖν*; "so that they *remain* in the truth," whereby the *climactic* relation of *τηρεῖν* and *ἀγιάζειν* is misapprehended. When, with Luther, ("make truly holy"), *ἐν τ. ἀλήθ.* has been taken as equivalent to *ἀληθῶς*, of *complete* sanctification in opposition to their hitherto *defective* condition (Hengstenberg), against the view is decisive, not indeed the article (comp. Xen. *Anab.* vi. 2. 10), but rather the following *ὁ λόγος, κ.τ.λ.* The reading *ἐν τ. ἀλ. σου* is a *correct*, more precise definition arising from a gloss. — *ὁ λόγος ὁ σὸς ἀλήθ. ἐστι]* a supporting of the prayer, in which *ὁ σὸς* has peculiar weight; *Thy word* (xiv. 24, xii. 49, vii. 16), the word of no other, *is truth*. How shouldst Thou, then, not grant the *ἀγιάζειν* prayed for? That *ἀλήθ.* is *without the article*, does not rest upon the fact that it is a predicate, but upon the conception that the *essence* of the *λόγος* is truth, so that *ἀλήθ.* is *abstract*, not a noun appellative. Comp. iv. 24, 1 John iv. 16.

Vv. 18, 19. In support of the prayer for the *ἀγιάζειν* of the disciples, there now follow further two *motives for its being granted*, deduced, (1) from the mission of the disciples into the world, on which account they need consecration; and (2) from Christ's own personal consecration for the purpose of their *ἀγιασμός*, which purpose God will not be willing to leave unattained. — *καθὼς ἐμέ, κ.τ.λ.]* Placed first with pragmatic weight; for as He could not execute His mission without the divine consecration (x. 36), so neither could they who were sent by Him. — *κάγώ]* Not instead of *οὕτως ἐγώ* (De Wette), but simply: *I also* have sent. Comp. xv. 9, xx. 21, *et al.* —

ἀπέστειλα] The mission was indeed not yet objectively a fact (xx. 21; Matt. xxviii. 19), but already conceived of in its idea in the appointment and instruction for the apostolic office (Matt. x. 5 ff.). Comp. on iv. 38. — Ver. 19. Note the emphatic *correlation* of αὐτῶν . . . ἐγὼ ἑμαυτόν . . . καὶ αὐτοί.— The ἀγιάζω ἑμαυτόν, not including in it *the whole life* of the Lord (Calvin, Hengstenberg, Godet), but now, when the hour is come, to be carried out, is the *actual consecration, which Christ, in offering Himself through His death as a sacrifice to God, accomplishes on Himself*,<sup>1</sup> so that ἀγιάζω is substantially equivalent to προσφέρω σοι θυσίαν (Chrysostom), comp. 4 Macc. xvii. 19; ἀγιάζειν, ὡς ἱερῆ, is a sacred word for *sacrifices* in the O. T., see Ex. xiii. 2; Deut. xv. 19 ff.; 2 Sam. viii. 11; Esr. v. 52; Rom. xv. 16; comp. also Soph. Oed. Col. 1491; Dion. H. vii. 2. Christ is at once the Priest and the Sacrifice (Epistle to the Hebrews); and *for* (ὑπέρ, in commodum, xv. 13) *the disciples* He performs this sacrifice,—although it is offered for all,<sup>2</sup>—so far as it has, in respect of the disciples, the *special purpose*: that they also may be consecrated in truth, namely, in virtue of the *reception of the Paraclete* (πνευματικῇ πυρὶ γνῶα λελουμένοι, Nonnus), which reception was conditioned by the death of Jesus, xvi. 7. The καί has its logical justification in the idea of *consecration* common to both clauses, although its *special* sense is different in each; for the *disciples* are, through the sacrifice of Jesus, to be consecrated to God *in the sense of holy purity, endowment, and equipment* for their calling. On the other hand, the self-consecration of Christ is *sacrificial*,—the former, however, like the latter, the consecration in the service of God and of His kingdom. Comp. on the self-consecration of Christ, who yields Himself voluntarily to be a sacrifice (x. 18, xv. 13), Eph. v. 2: παρέδωκεν ἑαυτόν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν προσφοράν, κ.τ.λ.; that is the idea of the present passage, not that He renounced the mortal σάρξ, and entered fully into the divine mode of existence and fellowship (Luthardt).

<sup>1</sup> Comp. generally, Ritschl in the *Jahrb. f. D. Theol.* 1863, p. 240 f.

<sup>2</sup> Already this solemn ὡς ἱερῆ (vi. 51, x. 11, xi. 50, xv. 13, xviii. 14; 1 John iii. 16) should have prevented ἀγιάζω ἑμ. from being understood in the *ethical* sense of the *ripening to moral perfection* through faithful, loving obedience towards the Father (so Wörner, *Verhältn. d. Geistes z. Sohne Gottes*, p. 41 f.). Simply correct is Euth. Zigabenus, ἰγὼ ἱκουσίως θυσιάζω ἑμαυτόν.

See also Heb. ix. 14. — ἐν ἀληθείᾳ] Modal definition of ἡγιασμένοι: *truly* consecrated, Matt. xxii. 16; 2 Cor. vii. 14; Col. i. 6; 1 John iii. 18; 2 John 1; 3 John 1. See on 2 Cor. *loc. cit.*; LXX. 2 Reg. xix. 17 (where, however, ἐν is doubtful); Sir. vii. 20; Pind. *Ol.* vii. 126. In the classics the mere dative and ἐπ' ἀληθείας are frequent. The *true* consecration is not exactly an antithesis to the *Jewish sanctimonia ceremonialis* (Godet and older expositors), to which nothing in the context leads, but simply sets forth *the eminent character of the relation generally*. As contrasted with every other ἀγιότης in human relations, that wrought through the Paraclete is the *true* consecration. Comp. Luther: "against all worldly and human holiness." So substantially,<sup>1</sup> Chrysostom, Euth. Zigabenus, Beza, Calvin, Bengel, and several others, including Hengstenberg, Godet. The interpretation which has recently, after Erasmus, Bucer, and several others, become current, viz. of Lücke, Tholuck (?), Olshausen, De Wette, B. Crusius, Luthardt, Lange, Brückner, Ewald, that ἐν ἀληθ. is not different from ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, ver. 17, is erroneous, because the article is wanting which here, in the retrospective reference to the truth already articulated and defined, was thoroughly necessary; for of an antithesis "to the state of being in which the disciples would be found over and above" (Luthardt), the text suggests nothing, even leaving out of sight the fact that a *state of sanctification* in such an opposite condition would be inconceivable. Without any ground, appeal is made, in respect of the absence of the article, to i. 14, iv. 24, where truth is expressed as a general conception (comp. viii. 44) (Sir. xxxvii. 15; Tob. iii. 5; 2 Tim. ii. 25, iii. 7), and to 3 John 3 (ver. 4 is with Lachm. and Tisch. to be read ἐν τῇ ἀληθ.), where ἐν ἀληθ. must be taken as equivalent to ἀληθῶς,<sup>2</sup> and consequently as in the present passage and as in 3 John 1.

<sup>1</sup> In so far as they understand ἐν ἀληθ. of the *true* ἀγιάζισθαι, in which, however, they find an antithesis to the *typical* holiness of the O. T. sacrifice, as e.g. Euth. Zigabenus: ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ὡς τιθεμένοι ἐν ἀληθινῇ θυσίᾳ· ἡ γὰρ νομικὴ θυσία τύπος ἦν, οὐκ ἀλήθεια. Comp. Theophylact; also Holtzmann, *Judenth. u. Christenth.* p. 421.

<sup>2</sup> The passage means: "I rejoiced when brethren came and gave witness for Thy truth (i.e. for Thy morally true Christian constitution of life), as Thou *truly*

Vv. 20, 21. In His prayer for the *disciples* for their preservation and sanctification (vv. 11–19), Jesus now also includes *all who* (comp. Rom. x. 14) shall *believe on Him* (πιστευόντων, regarding the future as present) *through the apostles' word* (διὰ τοῦ κηρύγματος αὐτῶν, Euth. Zigabenus). The *purpose* for which He also includes these: *that all* (all my believing ones, the apostles and the others) *may be one* (ethically, in likeness of disposition, of endeavour, of love, etc., on the ground of faith, comp. Eph. iv. 3 ff.; Rom. xv. 5, 6; Acts iv. 32). — This ethical unity of all believers, to be specifically Christian,<sup>1</sup> must *correspond* as to its original type (καθώς) *to the reciprocal fellowship between the Father and the Son* (according to which the Father lives and moves in the Son, and the Son in the Father, comp. x. 38, xiv. 10, 11, xv. 5), the *object* of which, in reference to believers collectively, is, *that in them also the Father and the Son may be the element in which they* (in virtue of the *unio mystica* brought about through the Spirit, 1 John i. 3, iv. 13; 1 Pet. i. 4) *live and move* (ἵνα κ. αὐτοὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ὦσιν). — This ethical unity of all believers in the fellowship with the Father and the Son, however (comp. xiii. 35), *shall serve to the unbelieving world as an actual proof and ground of conviction that Christ, the grand central point and support of this unity, is none other than the sent of God.* “That is the *fruit* which must follow through and from such unity, namely, that Christ's word shall further break forth and be received in the world as God's word, wherein stands an almighty, divine, unconquerable power and eternal treasure of all grace and blessedness,” Luther, in opposition to which, Calvin gets into confusion by introducing the doctrine of predestination, making of πιστεύειν a *reluctant agnoscere*; so also Scholten. Thus the *third ἵνα* is *subordinated* to the first, as introducing its

(in deed) walkest.” καθώς, κ. τ. λ., that is, not forming a part of that testimony of the brethren, gives to this testimony the confirmation of John himself. As the brothers have testified for Gaius, so he *actually* walks. This John *knows*, and the brethren have told him nothing new by that testimony, however greatly he has rejoiced in the fact of receiving such a testimony concerning his Gaius. Therefore he adds, with loving recognition, *as thou truly walkest.* That testimony therefore only corresponds to the reality.

<sup>1</sup> “Non vult concordiam coetus humani, ut est concors civitas Spartana contra Athenienses,” Melancthon.

further aim; the *second*, however, because containing the definition of the aim of καθώς, κ.τ.λ., is related to the first *explicatively*.

Vv. 22, 23. What He on His part (ἐγώ) has done in order to bring about this unity of His believing ones and its object—a newly introduced and great thought of the power of His kingdom—not still dependent on ὅτι (Ewald). — τὴν δόξαν] The heavenly glory. Comp. 1, 5, 24. This, once already possessed by Him before the incarnation, the Father has *given* to Him, not yet, indeed, *objectively*, but as a secure possession of the *immediate future*; He has *obtained* it from God, *assigned* as a property, and the actual taking-possession is now for Him close at hand. In like manner has *He given* this, His δόξα, in which the eternal ζωή, vv. 2, 3, is consummated, to His *believing ones* (αὐτοῖς), who will enter on the real possession at the Parousia, where they *συνδοξάζονται* (Rom. viii. 17), after that they, up to that time, τῇ ἐλπίδι ἐσώθησαν (Rom. viii. 24) Comp. on Rom. viii. 30. They *are* in Christ already His *συγκληρονόμοι*, and the Spirit to be received will be to them the ἀρραβὼν τῆς κληρονομίας (Eph. i. 14; 2 Cor. i. 22, v. 5), but the actual entrance on the inheritance is first accomplished at the Parousia (xiv. 2, 3; Rom. viii. 11; Col. iii. 4). But this relation does not justify us in interpreting διδόναι as *destinare* (Gabler, B. Crusius), or at least δέδωκα as *constitui dare* (Grotius), while the explanations also which take δόξα of the *glory of the apostolic office* in teaching and working miracles (Chrysostom, Theophylact, and, but with intermixture of other elements, Euth. Zigabenus, Erasmus, Vatablus, Grotius, and several others, including Paulus and Klee), or of the *inner glory of the Christian life* (Olshausen, comp. Gess, p. 244), of the *life of Christ in believers*, in accordance with Gal. ii. 20 (Hengstenberg), of *sonship* (Bengel, comp. Godet, who refers to Rom. vii. 29), of *love* (Calovius, Maldonatus), of *grace and truth*, i. 14 (Luthardt, Ebrard, a part also of Tholuck's and Brückner's interpretation), are opposed to the context.<sup>1</sup> See immediately, ver. 24. — ἵνα ᾧσιν ἐν, κ.τ.λ.] For what a strong bond of unity must lie in the sure warrant of fellowship in eternal δόξα! Comp. Eph. iv. 4. — ἐγὼ ἐν αὐτοῖς κ. σὺ ἐν

<sup>1</sup> The δόξα is explained away also by Weizsäcker in the *Jahrb. f. Deutsche Theol.* 1857, p. 181. It is said to be substantially the same as the λόγοι, ver. 14.

ἐμοί] Not out of connection with the construction (De Wette), since it fits into it; not even beginning a new proposition, and to be completed by εἰμὶ (Augustine, Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, Beda, Beza, Bengel, and several others, including Luthardt), since thus the discourse on the δόξα would be, in opposition to the context (see ver. 24), interrupted; but an *appositional separation from ἡμεῖς*, from which it is therefore, with Lachmann and Tischendorf, to be divided only by a comma. In ἡμεῖς is contained: ἐγὼ καὶ σύ, and both are pragmatically, i.e. in demonstration of the specific internal relation of the ἐν εἶναι of believers to the oneness of the Father and the Son, thus expounded: *I moving in them, and Thou in me*. In accordance with this appositional, more minute definition, the ἵνα ὥσω ἐν is again taken up with liveliness and weight ("see how His mouth overflows with the same words," Luther), and that in the expression containing the *highest degree of intensity*: ἵνα ὥσι τετελειωμένοι εἰς ἐν, that they may be *completed* to one (to one unity), be united in *complete degree*. εἰς in the sense of the *result*. Comp. passages like Plato, *Phileb.* p. 18 B: τελευτᾶν τε ἐκ πάντων εἰς ἐν; Dem. p. 368. 14: εἰς ἐν ψήφισμα ταῦτα πάντα συνεσκεύασαν. — ἵνα γινώσκη ὁ κόσμος, κ.τ.λ.] Parallel to ἵνα ὁ κόσμος πιστεύσῃ, ver. 21, adding to faith the *knowledge* connected therewith (conversely, ver. 8), and then completing the expression of the happy result to be attained by the designation of the highest *divine love*, of which the believer is conscious in that knowledge. We are not even remotely to think of the "*forced conviction of rebels*" (Godet); against this vv. 2, 3 already declare, and here the entire context. Note rather how the glance of the praying Jesus, vv. 21–23, rises up to the highest goal of His work on earth, when, namely, the κόσμος shall have come to believe, and Christ Himself shall have become in fact ὁ σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου (iv. 42, comp. x. 16). This at the same time against the supposition of *metaphysical dualism* in Hilgenfeld. — κ. ἡγάπησας, κ.τ.λ.] *and hast loved them* (as a matter of fact, through this sending of me) *as Thou hast loved me*, therefore with the same Fatherly love which I have experienced from Thee. Comp. iii. 16; Eph. i. 6; Rom. v. 5, viii. 32.

Ver. 24. What He has already bestowed on them, but as yet as a possession of hope (ver. 22), He *wills* (θέλω) that they may also partake of in reality. He does not merely *wish* it (against Beza, Calvin, B. Crusius, Tholuck, Ewald), but the Son prays in the consciousness of the ἐξουσία bestowed on Him by the Father according to ver. 2, for the communication of eternal life to His own. This consciousness is that of the most intimate confidence and clearest accord with the Father. Previously He had said ἐρωτῶ; “nunc incrementum sumit oratio,” Bengel. The idea of the *last* will, however (Godet), is not to be imported here. — The relative definition is placed first emphatically, because justifying the θέλω according to its contents. This is *neutral* (δ, see the critical notes), whereby the persons (ἐκείνοι, i.e. the disciples and all believers, ver. 20) are designated *in abstracto*, according to their category (comp. ver. 2, vi. 37), and the moment of δέδικας μοι, which is a motive cause to the granting of the prayer, becomes more prominent *in and of itself*. — ἵνα] *Purpose* of θέλω (they *should*, etc.), and therewith its *contents*; see on Luke vi. 31. — ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ, καὶ ἐκεῖνοι, κ.τ.λ.] shall be realized at the *Parousia*.<sup>1</sup> See on xiv. 3, also on ἀναστήσω αὐτὸ, κ.τ.λ., vi. 39. — θεωρῶσι] *behold*, experimentally, and with *personal participation*, as συνδοξασθέντες, Rom. viii. 17, 29, and συμβασιλεύοντες, 2 Tim. ii. 12. The opposite: behold death, viii. 51.<sup>2</sup> Against the interpretation that the beholding of the δόξα of Christ *in itself* (its reflection, as it were) constitutes blessedness (Olshausen, comp. Chrysostom and Euth. Zigabenus), ver. 22 testifies, although it is also essentially included in it, 1 John iii. 2; Heb. xii. 14. — ἦν ἔδωκας μοι, ὅτι, κ.τ.λ.] Further added in childlike feeling of gratitude to τὴν ἐμήν, and that *proleptically* (comp. εἰμὶ), because the Lord

<sup>1</sup> The intermediate state denoted in Phil. i. 23 (see *in loc.*) is not meant (Hengstenberg), nor a *part* of the meaning (Godet), but as what follows shows, the *completed fellowship of glory*. Comp. 1 John iii. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Baur thus explains away the historical sense: “They behold this glory, see it in reality before them, if in them, through the communication of the true God consciousness, and of the eternal life thereby conditioned, through which they have become one with Jesus and the Father, just as He is one with the Father, the divine principle (*to this*, according to Baur, διδωκα, ver. 22, refers) has realized itself as that which it is in itself.”



is on the point of entering into this *δόξα* (ver. 1), as if He had already received it (comp. ver. 22): *whom Thou gavest me, because* (motive of the *ἔδωκ.*) *Thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world* (πρὸ κατ. κ. not belonging to *ἔδωκ. μ.*, as Paulus and B. Crusius think). The *δόξα* of Christ, as the *λόγος ἄσαρκος* (ver. 5), was, according to the mode of view and expression of the N. T., not one *imparted* to Him from love, but in virtue of the ontologically Trinitarian relation to the Father,<sup>1</sup> that which pertained with metaphysical necessity to the Son in the unity of the divine nature, the *μορφή θεοῦ*, which He as *θεὸς λόγος*, i. 1, *had*, being from eternity eternally with the Father (ver. 5); whereas the *δόξα* *here* intended is in His exaltation after the completion of His work, since it concerned His entire person, including its human side, that *given* to Him by the Father from love (Phil. ii. 9), from *that* love, however, which did not first originate in time, but was already cherished by the Father toward the Son before the foundation of the world. That *δόξα* possessed by Jesus before His incarnation, to which for the most part (as still Luthardt, Ebrard, Hengstenberg) reference is wrongly made, whereby, according to ver. 5, *ἔδωκας* would have to be conceived of as brought about through the generation of the *μονογενῆς*, was the *purely divine*; that given to Him through His exaltation is indeed the same, into which He now again has entered, but because it is the glory of the *λόγος ἑνσαρκος*, *divine-human* in eternal consummation (Phil. ii. 9). Comp. on ver. 5, i. 14. *Nowhere* in the N. T. is the *premundane* *δόξα* of the Son designated as *given* to Him (Phil. ii. 6; Col. i. 15; 2 Cor. viii. 9), although this would be imaginable in and of itself as an eternal self-communication of Fatherly love (comp. Brückner and Ebrard).<sup>2</sup> Further, it is strangely incorrect that the *δόξα*, which the Father has *given* to the Son, has been explained here differently from that in ver. 22.—The *love* of the Father to the Son before the foundation of the world implies the *personal pre-*

<sup>1</sup> Comp. J. Müller, *Von der Sünde*, II. p. 183 f.

<sup>2</sup> Euth. Zigabenus: τὴν δόξαν τῆς θείας φύσεως, ἣν διδωκὲς μοι, οὐχ ὡς ἰλάττονι ἢ ὑπερμεγαλύνῃ, ἀλλ' ὡς αἴτιος, εἰπὺν ὡς γεννήσας με. But in the N. T. this mode of presentation is unsupported; in ver. 26, to which Johansson appeals, *ἰδωμεν* in truth refers first to the time of the sending into the world.

*existence* of the latter with God, but is not reconcilable with the idea of the pre-temporal *ideal* existence which He has had in God, as the archetype of humanity. This in answer to Beyschlag, p. 87, who considers the relation as analogous to the eternal election of grace, Eph. i. 4, Rom. viii. 29; which is not appropriate, since the election of grace concerns those as yet *not in existence*, namely, *future* believers, whom God *προέγνω* as future. The Son, however, whom He loved, must personally exist with the Father, since it was in Christ that the motive already lay for the election of grace (see on Eph. i. 4). Comp. also on ver. 5. To suppose that God, according to the present passage, had loved *His own ideal of humanity* before the foundation of the world, the idea consequently of His own thought, is an idea without any analogy in the N. T., and we thereby arrive at an anthropopathic *self-love*, as men form to themselves an ideal, and are glad to attain it.

Vv. 25, 26. Conclusion of the prayer: Appeal to the *justice* of God, for, after that which Jesus here states of Himself and of the disciples in opposition to the world, it becomes the righteous Father not to leave ungranted what Jesus has just declared, ver. 24, to be His will (*θέλω, ἴνα, κ.τ.λ.*). Otherwise the final recompense would fail to come, which the divine *justice* (1 John i. 9) has to give to those who are so raised, as expressed in ver. 25, above the world; the work of divine *holiness*, ver. 11, would remain without its closing *judicial consummation and revelation*. — *καὶ ὁ κόσμος, κ.τ.λ.*] The apparent want of appropriateness of the *καί*, from which also its omission in D. Vulg. *et al.*, is to be explained, is not removed by placing, with Grotius and Lachmann, only a comma after ver. 24, and allowing *καὶ ὁ κόσμος σε οὐκ ἔγνω* to run with what precedes, since this thought does not fit into this logical connection, and the address *πάτερ δίκαιε*, according to the analogy of ver. 11, leads us to recognise the *introductory* sentence of a prayer. According to Bengel and Ebrard, *καὶ . . . καί, et . . . et*, correspond to one another, which, however, does not allow either of the antithetic character of the conceptions, or of the manifest reference of the second *καί* to *ἐγὼ δέ*. Following Heumann, De Wette, Lücke, Tholuck make *καί* correspond to the following *δέ*, so that two relations

occurring at the same time, but of opposite kinds,<sup>1</sup> would be indicated: "whilst the world knew Thee not, yet I knew Thee." Not to be justified on grammatical grounds; for τέ . . . δέ (Kühner, II. p. 418; Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 92 f.; Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 741 f.), but never καί . . . δέ, is thus employed, and the passages of that kind adduced by Lücke from Plato, *Menex.* p. 235 E (where καὶ ἄλλους means *also* others), and *Eryx.* p. 393 E (where καὶ ἐλάχιστα is *only even* the least), are not in point; in other passages (as *Soph. Ant.* 428) καί is the simply connective *and*, without reference to the subsequent δέ. The καί in the present passage is rather the *and* serving to link on an *antithetic* relation (*and notwithstanding*), and is of very frequent occurrence, particularly in John, see on vii. 28. Had Jesus said: πᾶτερ, δίκαιος εἶ, καὶ ὁ κόσμος, κ.τ.λ., then καί would have been free from any difficulty. Nevertheless, the connection and its expression is the same. Christ is, in the address πᾶτερ δίκαιε, absorbed in the thought of the *justice* of God now invoked by Him, the thought, therefore, of this self-revelation of God, which was so easily to be recognised (*Rom.* i. 18 ff.), in spite of which the world, in its blinded security, has not known Him (*comp.* *Rom.* i. 28), and gives expression to this latter thought in painfully excited emotion (*Chrysostom*: *δυσχεραίνων*), immediately connecting it by καί with the address. After πᾶτ. δίκαιε we may suppose a pause, a break in the thought: *Righteous Father*—(yea, such Thou art!) *and* (and yet) *the world knew Thee not!*<sup>2</sup> Luthardt also, with Brückner's concurrence, takes καί as *and yet*, but so that it stands in opposition to the revelation of God through Christ previously (see ver. 22) stated. Too indefinite, and leaving without reason

<sup>1</sup> Hence also the reading: *ὅτι καὶ ὁ π. σ. οὐκ ἔγνω, ἀλλ' ἐγὼ, κ.τ.λ.*, which is found not merely in Hippolytus, but also in the *Constit. Ap.* 8. 1. 1.

<sup>2</sup> This interpretation is followed also by Hengstenberg. But Ewald places καὶ ὁ κόσμος to γινώσκω, ver. 26, in a parenthesis, and then takes ἵνα ἡ ἀγάπη, κ.τ.λ., still as the contents of εἶλω, ver. 24. How broken thus becomes the calm, clear flow of the prayer! According to Baumelein, the parallel clauses would properly be καὶ ἐγὼ σὶ ἔγνω καὶ οὗτοι ἔγνωσαν; but there is interpolated before the first clause an opposite clause, which properly should have μὴ, so that then the main thought follows with δέ. Alike arbitrary, but yet more contorted, is the arrangement of Godet.

the characteristic *πάτερ δίκαιε* out of reference. — *ἔγνων*] namely, from Thy proofs in my words and deeds; *ἔγνων*, on the other hand (Nonnus: *σύμφυτος ἔγνων*), refers to the immediate knowledge which the Son had in His earthly life of the Father moving in Him, and revealing Himself through Him. Comp. viii. 54, 55. Not without reason does Jesus introduce His *ἐγὼ δέ σε ἔγνων* between the *κόσμος* and the disciples, because He wills that the disciples should be where He is (ver. 24), which, however, presupposes a relative relation of equality between Him and them, as over against the world. — *οὗτοι*] Glancing at the disciples. — *ὅτι σύ με ἀπῆστ.*] The specific element, the central point of the knowledge of God, of which the discourse treats; *δείκνυσιν ἐνταῦθα, μηδένα εἰδοτα θεόν, ἀλλ' ἢ μόνον τοὺς τὸν υἱὸν ἐπεγνωκότας*, Chrysostom. Comp. vv. 8, 23, xvi. 27, *et al.* — Ver. 26. Whereby this *ἔγνωσαν* has been effected (comp. ver. 7), and will be completely effected (*γνωρίσω*, through the Paraclete: *καὶ . . . καί, both . . . and also*), that (purpose of the *γνωρίσω*) *the love with which Thou hast loved me* (comp. ver. 24) *may be in them, i.e. may rule in their hearts,*<sup>1</sup> *and therewith—for Christ, communicating Himself through the Spirit, is the supporter of the divine life in believers* (xiv. 20 ff.; Rom. viii. 10; Gal. ii. 20; Eph. iii. 17),—*I in them.* On *ἀγάπην ἀγαπᾶν*, see on Eph. ii. 4. So rich in promise and elevating with the simply grand “*and I in them*,” resounds the word of prayer, and in the whole ministry and experience of the apostles was it fulfilled. As nothing could separate them from the love of God in Christ (Rom. viii. 39), Christ thus remained in them through the Spirit, and they have conquered far and wide through Him who loved them.

NOTE.—The *originality* of the high-priestly prayer stands upon the same footing with that of the longer discourses of

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Rom. v. 5. Bengel aptly remarks: “*ut cor ipsorum theatrum sit et palaestra hujus amoris*,” namely, *διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου*, Rom. *l.c.* According to Hengstenberg (comp. also Weiss, p. 80), Jesus merely intends to say: “that Thou mayest love them with the love with which Thou hast loved me.” But this does not suit the expression *ἐν αὐτοῖς ᾗ*, neither in itself nor in the parallel relation to *καὶ ἐν αὐτοῖς*. An inward efficacious presence must be thereby intended.

Jesus generally in the Evangelist John. The substance of the contents is original, but the reproduction and vivid remodelling, such as could not come forth from the Johannean individuality, with which the recollection had grown up, otherwise than with quite a Johannean stamp. Along with this, however, in reference to contents and form, considering the peculiarly profound impression which the prayer of this solemn moment must necessarily have made upon the spirit and memory of that very disciple, a superior degree of fidelity of recollection and power of reddition must be assumed. How often may these last solemn words have stirred the soul of John! To this corresponds also the self-consciousness, as childlike as it is simple and clear in its elevation, the victorious rest and peace of this prayer, which is the noblest and purest pearl of devotion in the whole of the N. T. "For so plainly and simply it sounds, so deep, rich, and wide it is, that none can fathom it," Luther. Spener never ventured to preach upon it, because he felt that its true understanding exceeded the ordinary measure of faith; but he caused it to be read to him three times on the evening before his death, see his *Lebensbeschr.* by Canstein, p. 145 ff. The contrary view, that it is a later idealizing fiction of a dogmatic and metaphysical kind (Bretschneider, Strauss, Weisse, Baur, Scholten), is indeed a necessary link in the chain of controversy on the originality of the Johannean history generally, but all the more untenable, the more unattainable, the depth, tenderness, intensity, and loftiness, as is here sustained from beginning to end, must have been for a later inventor. But to deny the inward truth and splendour of the prayer (see especially Weisse, II. p. 294), is a matter evincing a critically corrupt taste and judgment. The *conflict of soul in Gethsemane*, so soon after this prayer which speaks of overcoming the world and of peace, is indeed, considering the pure humanity of Jesus (which was not forced into stoical indifference), psychologically too conceivable, not, indeed, as a voluntarily assumed representation of all the horrors of death from the sin of the world (Hengstenberg), but rather from the change of feelings and dispositions in the contemplation of death, and of *such* a death, to be made to pass as an historical contradiction to chap. xvii. See on Matt., note after xxvi. 46. John himself relates nothing of the crisis of the conflict of soul; but this is connected with his peculiarity in the selection of the evangelical material in general, and he might be determined in this matter particularly by the account already given of the similar fact, xii. 23 ff., which *he only* adduces, whilst that conflict of soul was already a common property of Scriptural tradition (comp. also Heb.

v. 7), which he as little needed to repeat as the institution of the Lord's Supper and many other things. That that conflict of soul had not for John the importance and historic reality which it had for the Synoptics, is, considering the free selection which he has made out of the rich material of his recollection, a hasty conclusion (in answer to Baur, in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1854, p. 224). The historic reality of the Gospel facts, if nothing essential is otherwise opposed to them, is not affected by the silence of John.

## CHAPTER XVIII.

VER. 1. The *Recepta* τῶν κέδρων has the preponderance of testimony, Griesb. Scholz, Lachm., following A. S. Δ. Verss. Hier. Ambr. have τοῦ κεδρών; Tisch., following D. Ν. 2 Cod. of It. Sah. Copt.: τοῦ κέδρου. The reading τοῦ κεδρών is to be preferred, since we cannot suppose that John somehow connected the name קדר with κέδρος or κέδρον, as was done in 2 Sam. xv. 23 and 1 Kings xv. 13, LXX. — Ver. 4. ἐξελθὼν εἰπεν] B. C.\* D. Curss. Verss. Or. Syr. Chrys. Aug.: ἐξῆλθεν καὶ λέγει. So Lachm. and Tisch. Rightly; the *Recepta* is an alteration after ver. 1, which was made, because what was intended by ἐξῆλθεν was not distinguished from that expressed by it in ver. 1. — Ver. 6. δτι] which, though deleted by Lachm. and Tisch., has very important witnesses for and against it; yet how readily would it come to be omitted after ver. 5! — Ver. 10. ὡτίον] Tisch.: ὡτάριον, after B. C.\* L. X. Ν., which (comp. also on Mark xiv. 47) is all the more to be preferred, that the better known ὡτίον is found in Matt. — Ver. 11. After μάχαιρ. Elz. has σου, against decisive witnesses, from Matt. xxvi. 52. — Ver. 13. αὐτίον] has against it witnesses of such importance, that Lachm. has bracketed, Tisch. deleted it. But, unnecessary in itself, how readily might it be passed over after the similar final sound of the preceding word! — Ver. 14. ἀπολίσθαι] Lachm. Tisch.: ἀποθανεῖν. The witnesses are very much divided. ἀποθ. is from xi. 50. — Ver. 15. ἄλλος] Elz. Griesb. Scholz, Tisch.: ὁ ἄλλος. The article is wanting in A. B. D. Ν. Curss., but retains, notwithstanding, a great weight of testimony, and might readily come to be omitted, since it appeared to have no reference here. — Ver. 20. Instead of the first ἐλάλησα, λελάληκα (Lachm. Tisch.) is so decisively attested, that the Aor. appears to have been introduced in conformity with the following aorists. — The article before συναγ. is decidedly condemned by the evidence (against Elz.). — Instead of the second πάντοτε, Griesb. Lachm. Tisch. have πάντες, which is to be preferred, on account of preponderant testimony, and because πάντοτε might readily be mechanically repeated from the preceding πάντοτε; πάντοθεν (Elz.) rests on conjecture

(Beza) and Curss. — Ver. 21. *ἰπερωτ.*; *ἰπερώτ.*] The simple forms (Lachm. Tisch.) are preponderantly attested. The compound forms were readily introduced through the concurrence of the two E's (*μΕΕρωτ.*), in recollection of ver. 7. — Ver. 22. Read with Lachm. Tisch., according to B. *κ.* It. Vulg. Cyr. *ἐς παριστ. τῶν ὑπ.* Various transpositions in the Codd. — Ver. 24. After *ἀπίστ.*, Elz. Lachm. Tisch. have *οὖν*, which has important witnesses for and against it. Since, however, other Codd. read *δέ*, and several Verss. express *καί*, any particle is to be regarded as a later connective addition. — The same various connective particles are found inserted in Codd. and Verss., after *ἠρνήσατο*, ver. 25. — Ver. 28. *πρωί*] Elz. Scholz: *πρωτα*, against decisive testimony. But how readily might the quite unnecessary *ἵνα* disappear! — Ver. 29. After *Πλάτος* Lachm. and Tisch. have *ἕξω* (B. C.\* L. X. *κ.* Curss. Verss.), which other witnesses first place after *αὐτούς*. This different position, and the importance of the omitting witnesses, show it to be an interpolation, with a view to greater definiteness of designation. — *κατά*] is deleted by Tisch., according to B. *κ.\** alone. Being unnecessary, it was passed over. — Ver. 34. *αὐτῷ* after *ἀπεκρ.* in Elz. is decisively condemned by the witnesses. — Ver. 37. *ἰγώ*. *Ἐγώ*] The omission of one *ἰγώ* (Lachm. has bracketed the second, Tisch. has deleted the first) is not sufficiently justified by B. D. L. Y. *κ.* Curss. Verss. Fathers, since the omission was so readily suggested in copying, if the weight of the repeated *ἰγώ* was not observed.

VV. 1, 2. *Ἐξῆλθε*] from *Jerusalem*, where the meal, xiii. 2, had been held. The *ἄγωμεν ἐντεῦθεν*, xvi. 31, was now first carried out; see *in loc.*: *πέραν τοῦ χειμ.* then expresses: *whither* He went; see on vi. 1. — *τοῦ Κεδρών*] Genit. of apposition (2 Pet. ii. 6, comp. *πόλις Ἀθηνῶν* and the like). On this torrent dry in summer (*χειμαρρῶς*, Hom. *Il.* xi. 493; Soph. *Ant.* 708; Plat. *Legg.* v. p. 736 A; Joseph. *Antt.* viii. 1. 5), *נִיָּרָה*, i.e. *niger, black stream*, flowing eastward from the city through the valley of the same name, see Robinson, II. p. 31 ff; Ritter, *Erdk.* XV. 1, p. 598 ff. As to the name, comp. the very frequent Greek name of rivers *Μέλας* (Herod. vii. 58. 198; Strabo, viii. p. 386, *et al.*). — *κῆπος*] According to Matt. xxvi. 36, a garden of the estate of Gethsemane. The owner must be conceived as being friendly to Jesus. — *ὅτι πολλάκις, κ.τ.λ.*] points back to earlier festal visits, and is a



more exact statement of detail, of which John has many in the history of the passion. We see from the contents that Jesus offered Himself with conscious freedom to the final crisis. Comp. ver. 4. — *Typological* references (Luthardt, after older expositors: to *David*, who, when betrayed by Ahithophel, had gone the same way, 2 Sam. xv. 23; Lampe, Hengstenberg, following the Fathers: to *Adam*, who in the garden incurred the penalty of death) are without any indication in the text.

Ver. 3. The *σπεῖρα* is the *Roman cohort* (see Matt. xxvii. 27; Acts xxi. 31; Polyb. xi. 23, i. 6, xxiv. 3 ff.; Valckenaer, *Schol.* I. p. 458 f.), designated by the article as the *well-known* band, namely, because serving as the garrison of the fort Antonia, distinguished by what follows from the company of *officers of justice* appointed on the part of the Sanhedrim, and not to be explained of the *Levitical temple-watch* (Michaelis, Kuinoel, Gurlitt, *Lect. in N. T. Spec.* IV. 1805, B. Crusius, Baumlein). That Judas arrived with the *whole σπεῖρα* is, as being disproportionate to the immediate object (against Hengstenberg), not probable; but a *division*, ordered for the present service, especially as the chiliarch himself was there (ver. 12), *represented* the cohort.<sup>1</sup> Of this co-operation of the Roman military, for which the Sanhedrim had made requisition, the Synoptics say nothing, although Hengstenberg takes pains to find indications of it in their narrative. John's account is *more complete*. — *φανῶν κ. λαμπ.*] with *torches* and *lamps* (the latter in lanterns; Matt. xxv. 1 ff.). Comp. Dion. H. xi. 40. Extreme precaution renders this preparation conceivable even at the time of full moon. The *arms* are understood to have been, as a matter of course, carried by the soldiers, but not by the *ὑπηρέται*, and are mentioned as helping to complete the representation. — The *καί's* are not *accumulated* (Luthardt), not one of them is unnecessary.

<sup>1</sup> This is quite sufficient for the inexactness of popular information. We have hence neither to understand a *manipulus* (i.e. the third part of the cohort), for which an appeal is erroneously made to Polyb. xi. 23. 1, nor, generally, a *band*, a detachment of soldiers (2 Macc. viii. 23, xii. 22; Judith xiv. 11). The latter, not because it is *Roman* military that are spoken of; the former, not because although Polybius elsewhere employs *σπεῖρα* as equivalent to *manipulus* (see Schweighäuser, *Lex.* p. 559), yet a whole *maniple* (some 200 men) would here be too many.

Vv. 4, 5. This advance of Judas occasioned (οὖν) Jesus to come forth, since He knew all that was about to come upon Him, and consequently was far removed from any intention of withdrawing Himself from His destiny, of which He was fully and clearly conscious. — ἔρχεσθαι, of *destinies*, happy (Matt. x. 13) and unhappy (Matt. xxiii. 35; Aesch. *Pers.* 436, 439; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* I. p. 686 f.), in the classics more frequently with the dative (Thuc. viii. 96. 1) than with ἐπί. — ἐξῆλθεν (see the critical notes): *from the garden*, ver. 1, Nonnus: κῆπον ἑάσας. The context yields no other meaning, and ver. 26 is not opposed to it. Hence not: from the *garden-house* (Rosenmüller, Ewald), or from the *depth* of the garden (Tholuck, Maier, De Wette, Luthardt), or from the *circle of disciples* (Schweizer, Lange, Hengstenberg). — εἰστήκει δὲ καὶ Ἰούδας, κ.τ.λ.] *Tragic moment in the descriptive picture* of this scene, without any further special purpose in view. Tholuck arbitrarily remarks: John wished to indicate the *effrontery* of Judas; and Hengstenberg: he wished to guard against the false opinion that the ἐγὼ εἰμι was intended to convey to the officers something unknown to them. *This* he could surely have been able to *express* in few words.—The *kiss* of Judas (Matt. xxvi. 47 ff.), instead of which John gives the above personal statement (as Strauss indeed thinks: in order to the *glorification* of Jesus), is not thereby excluded, is too characteristic and too well attested to be ascribed to tradition, and cannot have followed (Ewald) the question of Jesus (ver. 4), but, inasmuch as the immediate effect of the ἐγὼ εἰμι did not permit of the interruption of the kiss, must have *preceded*, so that immediately on the exit of Jesus from the garden, Judas stepped forward, kissed Him, and then again fell back to the band. Accordingly, John, after the one factor of the betrayal, namely the *kiss*, had been already generally disseminated in tradition, brings into prominence the other also, the *personal statement*; hence this latter is not to be ascribed merely to the *Johannean Jesus* (Hilgenfeld, Scholten).

Ver. 6. *They gave way,—drew back* (see on vi. 66), *and fell to the earth* (χαμαί = χαμᾶζε, very frequently in the classics also); this was regarded, first by Oeder in his *Miscell. sacr.* p. 503 ff., and recently by most expositors (including Lücke,

Tholuck, Olshausen, De Wette, B. Crusius, Ewald, Bæumlein), as a *natural* consequence of terror and of sudden awe, in support of which reference is made to the (weaker) analogies from the history of M. Antonius (Val. Max. viii. 9. 2), and of Marius (Velleius Paterc. ii. 19. 3), even of Coligny; whilst Brückner would conceive of the effect at least as "scarcely as purely human." Lange, however, likewise deduces it from terror of conscience, and finds the miracle only in the fact that it was not unexpected by the Lord, and not undesigned by Him. But, presumptively, the falling to the ground of itself, and the circumstance that the text designates those who fell down generally and without an exception, so that even the Roman soldiers are to be understood along with the rest, justifies the view of the ancient commentators, also adopted by Strauss (who, however, as also Scholten, views the matter as unhistorical), Ebrard, Maier, Luthardt, Hengstenberg, Godet, that it was a *miraculous* result of the *power of Christ* (Nonnus: οἰστρηθέντες ἀτευχέϊ λαίλαπι φωνῆς). Christ wished, before His surrender, to make known His might over His foes, and thus to show the voluntariness of His surrender. He *could* remain free, but He is *willing* to surrender Himself, because He knows His hour is come, xvii. 1.

Vv. 8, 9. Jesus *was apprehensive* of the seizure at the same time of the disciples. That *hands had already been laid on them* (Bengel, B. Crusius, and several others), the text does not say. He should and would suffer *alone*. — ἵνα πληρ., κ.τ.λ.] Divinely-determined *object* of ἀπεκρίθη, in reference to the words εἰ οὖν, κ.τ.λ. John discovers in the saying, xvii. 12 (the quoting of which, without verbal exactness, should be noted as an instance of the free mode of citation in the N. T.), a prophetic reference to the preservation of the disciples from their being also taken prisoners along with Him, *so far, that is*, as the Lord, in virtue of this protection, *brought none of them into destruction*, namely, by occasioning the apostasy into which many a one would have fallen had he also been taken prisoner. This prophetic reference (against Schweizer's and Scholten's severe judgment) is justified by the fact that Jesus, in xvii. 12, delivers a *closing* avowal of His activity on the disciples' behalf; consequently, that which is still further to be done

on their behalf must be conformable to that saying, and appear as the fulfilment, as the actual completion of what was therein expressed.

Vv. 10, 11. Comp. Matt. xxvi. 51 ff. and parall. — οὖν] In consequence of this danger, which he now saw for Jesus. On its position between Σίμ. and Πέτρ., comp. xxi. 7.—Only John here *names* Peter, and also *Malchus*.<sup>1</sup> Personal considerations, which may have kept the names so far away from the earliest tradition, that they are not adduced even by Luke, could now no longer have influence. — δοῦλον] *slave*, therefore none of the officials of the court of justice, ver. 3, but also not the guide of the temple-watch (Ewald). The slave had accompanied the rest, and had pressed forward. — τὸ ὠτάριον] not *purposely* (Hengstenberg), but the blow which was aimed at the head *missed*. — *Cast the sword into the sheath!* certainly more original than the calmer and more circumstantial words in Matt. On θήκη, *sheath*, see Poll. x. 144. In the classics, κολεός. Comp. Hom. *Od.* x. 333: κολεῶ μὲν ἄορ θεοῦ. — τὸ ποτήρ.] Comp. Matt. xx. 22, xxvi. 39. The suffering of death which He must now, after He has become clearly conscious of God's will and object (iii. 14, 15, vi. 51), approach, is the cup to be drunk, which the Father has already *given* to Him (into His hand), δέδωκε. — αὐτό, as in xv. 2.

Vv. 12–14. Οὖν] Since no further attempt at resistance dared be made. In the complete statement: *the cohort and the tribune* (ὁ χιλιάρχος τῆς σπείρης, Acts xxi. 31), *and the servants*, any special design (Luthardt: the previous occurrence, ver. 6, had for its result that now *all* helped, in order to secure Him) is not to be supposed, since ἡ σπείρα, κ.τ.λ., is the subject not merely of συνέλαβον and ἔδησαν, but also of ἀπήγαγον. Tholuck's remark, however, is erroneous: that the soldiers had now first again (?) united with the Jewish watch. — συνέλαβον, κ.τ.λ.] A non-essential variation from Matt. xxvi. 50, where the capture takes place *before* the attempt at defence made on Peter's part. For ἔδησαν, see on Matt. xxvii. 2. — On *Annas*, see on Luke iii. 1, 2. To him, which circumstance the Synoptics pass over, Jesus was *at first* (πρῶτον) brought,

<sup>1</sup> A name of frequent occurrence; see Wetstein. In *Phot. Bibl.* cod. 78, a Sophist is so called. Hengstenberg gives artificial interpretations.

before He was conducted to the actual high priest, Caiaphas (ver. 24). An extrajudicial *preliminary examination* had first to be gone through. And *Annas* had been selected for this purpose because he was *father-in-law* of the actual high priest (ἦν γὰρ πενθερός, κ.τ.λ.); thus they believed it to be most certain that *he* would act beforehand<sup>1</sup> for his son-in-law, who then had to conduct the proper judicial process in the Sanhedrin, with sufficient care for the object in view. Ewald's assumption (*Gesch. Chr.* p. 562), that Annas was at that time invested with the office of *superior judicial examiner* (אבִּי בֵּית דִּין), does not correspond to the fundamental statement of John, which merely adduces the relation of *father-in-law*; and therefore, also, we are not to say with Wieseler and others (see also Lichtenstein, p. 418 f.), that Annas was president, Caiaphas vice-president of the Sanhedrin; or that the former still passed as the proper and legitimate high priest (Lange); or even that John conceived of an *annual exchange of office* between Annas and Caiaphas (Scholten; comp. on xi. 49). Quite arbitrarily, further, do others suppose: the house of Annas lay *near to the gate* (Augustine, Grotius, and many), or: Jesus was led, as *in triumph*, first to Annas (Chrysostom, Theophylact, and several others). — Ver. 14 points back to xi. 50, on account of the prophetic nature of the saying, which had now come so near its fulfilment. Hence also the significant τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐκείνου is repeated.

Ver. 15. Ἡκολούθει] correlative to the ἀπήγαγον, κ.τ.λ., ver. 13, and the imperfect is *descriptive*. — ὁ ἄλλ. μαθ.] *The other disciple known* to the reader, whom I do not name. *Self-designation*; not a citizen of Jerusalem (Grotius), not Judas Iscariot (Heumann), not some unknown person (Augustine, Calovius, Calvin, Gurlitt). Only the first rendering corresponds to the article, and to the peculiarity of John's manner. A tendency to elevate John above Peter is here as little to be found as in xx. 2, 3 (Weizsäcker would conclude from this passage that a *scholar* of John was the writer); it is a simple reproduction of the contents of the history. — γνωστός] *whence* and *how* is undetermined. Nonnus: ἰχθυόλου παρὰ τέχνης; Ewald: because he was *related* to the priestly

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Steinmeyer, *Leidensgesch.* p. 115 f.

stock (see *Introd.* § 1); Hengstenberg: from earlier religious necessities. *γνωστός* does not mean *related*. — τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ, and then τοῦ ἀρχιερέως, cannot, after ἀπήγ. αὐτ. πρὸς Ἀνναν, ver. 13, and ἡκολούθει, κ.τ.λ., ver. 15, refer to Caiaphas, but, as Ewald also assumes, though Baeumlein groundlessly disputes it, only to *Annas*, as the high priest (he had been so, and still enjoyed the title, see Luke iii. 2; Acts iv. 5), to whom Jesus was brought. The observation on the acting ἀρχιερ. Caiaphas (ὅς ἦν, vv. 13, 14) was indeed only an *intermediate observation*, which the reference demanded by the course of the history of ἀρχιερ. to Annas cannot alter. Accordingly, both the following denial of Peter (vv. 16–18) and the examination (vv. 19–21), and the maltreatment (vv. 22, 23), took place in the dwelling of Annas. Of the synoptic examination before Caiaphas, John gives no account, and only briefly indicates in ver. 24 that Jesus was sent away to Caiaphas; a step which followed after the examination before Annas, presupposing as well known the trial before Caiaphas, which took place after this sending away. On the second and third denials, which are likewise to be placed in the court of Annas, see on ver. 25. This exegetic result, according to which John does not give any account of the hearing in the presence of Caiaphas,<sup>1</sup> but indicates as the locality of the three denials the court of Annas (see on Matt., note after xxvi. 75), is

<sup>1</sup> Considering that this examination was well known from the older Gospels, of which he was fully aware, it was quite sufficient for him to recall the recollection of it simply by the observation inserted in ver. 24—a proof of his independence of the Synoptics. Others have sought to explain the silence of John on the examination before Caiaphas differently, but in a more arbitrary manner, as e.g. Schweizer: that after ver. 14 this examination appeared to the apostle as a mere formality not worth consideration. But as the *judicial* process proper, it was nevertheless the *principal* examination. According to Brückner, John has directed his principal aim to the denial of Peter and to the proceedings before Pilate. But this needed not, nevertheless, to have led him to be entirely silent on the examination before Caiaphas. According to Schenkel, Jesus, according to the present Gospel, underwent *no examination* at all before Caiaphas. But why then does John relate that Jesus was led away to Caiaphas? According to Scholten, John has kept silence regarding the examination before the latter in order not to cause Jesus to make the confession that He was the (Jewish) Messiah, Matt. xxvi. 64. As if this would have required the omission of the whole history! And the confession of Jesus, Matt. xxvi. 64, is sublime enough even for John.

opposed to the older and modern system of harmonizing (Cyril, Erasmus, Luther, Beza, Calvin, Grotius, Wolf, Bengel, and many others, including Lücke, Tholuck, Klee, De Wette, Maier, Baeumlein<sup>1</sup>), according to which, if one common court be not assigned to the dwellings of the two high priests (so again Hengstenberg in particular; comp. on ver. 24), the leading away to Caiaphas is already presupposed in ver. 15, and then ver. 24 is disposed of with forced arbitrariness, partly on critical, partly on exegetical grounds; see on ver. 24. The above exegetic conclusion is confirmed even on harmonistic principles, namely, from the side of the examination, by the fact that vv. 19–21 present no resemblance at all to the Synoptic examination before Caiaphas, as also that there is no trace in John of *judicial* proceedings before the Sanhedrim. Further, we are not to conclude, from the silence of the Synoptics as to the examination before Annas, that they knew nothing of it (Schweizer); but because it was no *judicial* examination, it might easily fall into the background in the circle of tradition followed by them. On the other side, the credibility of John (against Weisse) must turn the scale as well in favour of the historical character of the above examination as of the occurrence of the three denials in the court of *Annas*, without granting that the Synoptic and Johannean denials are to be counted together as so many different ones, beyond the number of three (Paulus). But when Baur takes the account of the examination in Annas' presence to proceed from the *design* of strengthening the testimony of the unbelief of the Jews by the condemnatory judgment of the *two* high priests, and (see in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1854, p. 285) of bringing into prominence the surrender of Jesus by the Jewish authority into the hands of the Roman, as brought about by *both* high priests, this is opposed by the fact, setting aside the entirely incidental manner in which Caiaphas is mentioned, ver. 24, and the arbitrary character of such inventions generally, that John as little mentions a *sentence* delivered by Annas as by Caiaphas, which nevertheless suggested itself so naturally in ver. 24, and the place of which is by no means supplied, as respects Caiaphas, by xi. 50.

<sup>1</sup> Also Brandes, *Annas u. Pilat.*, Lemgo 1860. See in opposition, Weiss in the *Lit. Bl. d. allg. K. Z.* 1860, Nr. 39.

Vv. 16-18. *Peter*, who had no acquaintance in the house, had not been admitted into the court (αὐλή, ver. 15), but stood, after John had gone in with the procession, *outside at the door*;<sup>1</sup> hence John obtains, by means of the portress (Joseph. Antt. vii. 2. 1; Acts xii. 13), permission to introduce him. The εἰσάγαγε refers to *John*; by Erasmus, Grotius, Ewald, and several others, it is referred to the *portress*, but in that way would give an unnecessary change of subject. The portress at the gate within the court asks of Peter, when admitted: "*But art not thou also,*" etc.? The καί carries the presupposition that *John*, whom she had notwithstanding also admitted for acquaintance' sake, was a disciple of Jesus; the *negative* question rests on the feeling that probably she ought not otherwise to have admitted him. — τοῦ ἀνθρ. τούτου] contemptuously, not compassionately (Chrysostom, Theophylact, and several others). — After the denial, Peter, whom, notwithstanding, his love to the Lord still detains at least in the open place, finds himself among the slaves (of Annas) and the officers of justice (the soldiers, ver. 3, appear to have gone with Jesus into the building as an escort), with whom he stands at the fire of coals in the court, and warms himself. Holding aloof, he would have been seized. *John*, probably by help of his acquaintanceship, pressed with others *into the interior of the house*, not exactly into the audience-chamber.

Vv. 19-21. Οὖν] Again connecting the narrative with vv. 13, 14, after the episode of Peter. — περὶ τ. μαθητ. αὐτ. κ. π. τ. διδασχ. αὐτοῦ] Annas<sup>2</sup> then put general questions, in keeping with a private hearing of the kind, but well planned, so as to connect something further according to the eventual reply. — Jesus, as far as possible, not to inculcate His disciples (vv. 8, 9), replies, in the first instance (and further questioning was broken off, ver. 22), only to the second point of the interrogation, and that by putting it aside as

<sup>1</sup> It was the street door of the court, the αὐλίσια θύρα (see Dorvill. *ad Char.* p. 31, Amst.; Dissen, *ad Pind. Nem.* i. 19, p. 361).

<sup>2</sup> Not Caiaphas. Hengstenberg imagines the situation: "Annas presides, as it were (?), at the examination, but Caiaphas might not hand over to him the properly judicial function." So also Godet.



something entirely aimless, appealing to the publicity of His life. — ἐγὼ παρρησίᾳ, κ.τ.λ.] *I, on my part, have frankly and freely* (comp. vii. 4, xi. 54) *spoken to the world*; παρρησ. is to be taken *subjectively, without reserve*, not: *openly*, which it does not mean, and which is first contained in τῷ κόσμῳ. The κόσμος is the *whole public*, as in vii. 4, xii. 19. — ἐν συναγ. κ. ἐν τ. ἱερῷ] *in synagogue* (see on vi. 59) and *in the temple*. He appeals to His work of teaching not merely in *Jerusalem*, but as He has *always* carried it on, though He does not mean by πάντοτε to deny His public discourses in other places (in the open air, etc.), but only to express that He never, in the course of His teaching, withdrew Himself from synagogues and from the temple. — ὅπου πάντες, κ.τ.λ.] refers to the *temple*. — καὶ ἐν κρυπτῷ ἐλάλ. οὐδέν] By which, of course, the private instructions given to His disciples (comp. also Matt. x. 27) are not denied, since it is the ministry of the *Teacher of the people* that is here in question; and besides, those private instructions do not fall under the category of *that which is secret*. — τί με ἐρωτ.] *For what object dost thou ask me?* μέ does not bear the emphasis; otherwise ἐμέ would have been used. — The second τί, *quid*, depends on ἐρώτησον. — ἐρώτ. τ. ἀκηκ.] “Hoc jubet lex, a testibus incipi,” Grotius. — οὗτοι] The ἀκηκοότες, not pointing to John and Peter (Ewald).

Vv. 22, 23. Whether ῥάπισμα is a *blow on the face, box on the ear* (so usually), or *stroke with a rod* (Beza, Bengel, Godet), cannot be decided. Comp. on Matt. xxvi. 67. But the former, because the blow was wont to be the chastisement for an impudent speech (comp. Acts xxiii. 2), is the more probable, and δέρεις is not opposed to it (2 Cor. xi. 20). That which here one of the officers of justice, who stood in waiting (see the critical notes), takes upon himself for the honour of his master (“fortis percussor et mollis adulator,” Rupert.), can hardly be conceived as taking place in an orderly sitting of the Sanhedrin before the acting high priest (in Acts xxiii. 2 it is done *at the command* of the latter), but rather at an extra-judicial sitting. — οὕτως] So unbecomingly (Fritzsche, *ad Marc.* p. 150 f.; Bremi, *ad Lys. et Aesch.* p. 124, 355); comp. on 1 Cor. v. 3. — Ver. 23. Important for

the ethical idea expressed in Matt. v. 39.<sup>1</sup> Comp. the note on Matt. v. 41. — *μαρτύρησον*] *bear witness*. He must, in truth, have been an ear-witness.

Ver. 24. By the incident vv. 22, 23, the conversation of Annas with Jesus was broken off, and the former *now sent Him bound* (as He was since ver. 12) *to Caiaphas*,—therefore now for the first time, not already before ver. 15. In order to place the scene of the denials in Caiaphas' presence, it has been discovered, although John gives not the slightest indication of it, that Annas and Caiaphas inhabited *one house with a court in common* (Euth. Zigabenus, Casaubon, Ebrard, Lange, Lichtenstein, Riegenbach, Hengstenberg, Godet). In order, also, to assign the hearing of 19–21 to Caiaphas, some have taken *critical* liberties, and placed ver. 24 after ver. 14 (so Cyril, who, however, also reads it, consequently, a second time in the present passage, which Beza admits),<sup>2</sup> or have moved it up so as to follow ver. 13 (a few unimportant critical witnesses, approved by Rinck); some also have employed *exegetical* violence. Ver. 24, that is, was regarded either as a *supplemental historical statement in order to prevent misunderstanding*; so Erasmus, Castalio, Calvin, Vatablus, Calovius, Cornelius a Lapide, Jansen, and several others, including Lücke, Tholuck, Krabbe, De Wette, Maier, Baumlein; or the emphasis was laid on *δεδεμένον*, to which word Grotius ascribed a force explanatory of the following denial, but Bengel one explanatory of the previous maltreatment. These exegetic attempts coincide in this, that *ἀπέστειλεν* is understood in a *pluperfect* sense: *miserat*, and is regarded as *supplying an omission*.<sup>3</sup> The aorist, in order to adduce this as a supplemental addition, would rather be: *Annas sent Him*. But when the *Aor.* actually stands, making a *supplemental statement*, the

<sup>1</sup> Luther: "This thou shouldst therefore understand, that there is a great difference between these two; to turn the cheek to the one, and with words to punish him who strikes us. Christ must suffer, but nevertheless the word is put in His mouth, that He should speak and punish what is wrong. Therefore, I should separate the *mouth* and the *hand* from one another."

<sup>2</sup> Comp. Luther, who, after ver. 14, comments: "Here should stand the 24th verse. It has been misplaced by the copyist in the turning over of the leaf, as frequently happens."

<sup>3</sup> So also Brandes, *Annas u. Pilat.* p. 18 f., who adduces many unsuitable passages in proof.

context itself incontestably shows it (the pluperfect usage of the aorist in *relative* clauses, Kühner, II. p. 79; Winer, p. 258 [E. T. p. 343], is not relevant here), as in Matt. xiv. 3, 4 (not Matt. xvi. 5, xxvi. 48, xxvii. 27, nor John i. 24, 28, vi. 59). Here, however, this is altogether not the case (see rather the progress of the history, vv. 13, 24, 28), and it is only a harmonistic interest which has compelled the interpretation, which is least of all justified in the case of John. John had the pluperfect at command just as much as the aorist, and by the choice of the latter in the sense of the former he would, since the reader has nothing in the context to set him right, have expressed himself so as greatly to mislead, while he would have given, by the whole supplemental observations, the stamp of the greatest clumsiness to his narrative, which had flowed on from ver. 15 down to the present point. The expedients of Grotius and Bengel are, however, the more inappropriate, the more manifest it is that δεδεμένον simply looks back to ver. 12, ἔδῃσιν αὐτόν. The sole historical sequence that is true to the words is given already by Chrysostom: εἶτα, μηδὲ οὕτως εὐρίσκοντές τι πλέον, πέμπουσιν αὐτὸν δεδεμένον πρὸς Καϊάφαν.

Vv. 25-27. When Jesus was sent to Caiaphas, Peter was still on the spot mentioned in ver. 18, standing and warming himself. There follow his *second and third denials*, which, therefore, according to the brief and accurate narrative of John, who relates the denials generally with more precision, took place likewise in the court of *Annas*. The text gives no indication that Peter followed Jesus into the house of Caiaphas. Comp. Olshausen, Baur, Bleek. For the agreement of Luke with John in the *locality* of the denials, but not in the more minute determination of time, see on Luke xxii. 54-62. — εἰπον] Those standing there with him, ver. 18. — The individual, ver. 26, assails him with his own eye-witness. — ἐγώ] I, for my part. — ἐν τῷ κήπῳ] *sc. ὄντα*. The slave *outside* the garden (for, see on ver. 4) has been able, over the fence or through the door of the garden, to see Peter *in the garden* with Jesus. When the blow with the sword was struck, he cannot (in the confusion of the seizure of Jesus) have had his eye upon him, otherwise he would have cer-

tainly reproached him with *this* act. — ἀλέκτωρ] *a cock*. See on Matt. xxvi. 74. The *contrition* of Peter, John does not here relate in his concise account; but all the more thoughtfully and touchingly does this universally known psychological fact receive historical expression in the appendix, chap. xxi.<sup>1</sup>

Ver. 28. Εἰς τὸ πραιτώριον] *into the praetorium*, where the procurator dwelt, whether it was the palace of Herod (so usually), or, more probably, a building in the tower of Antonia (so Ewald). Comp. on Matt. xxvii. 27; Mark xv. 16. — πρῶτῃ] *i.e.* in the fourth watch of the night (see on Matt. xiv. 25), therefore toward daybreak. Pilate might expect them so early, since he had in fact ordered the σπείρα, ver. 3, on duty. — αὐτοί] *They themselves* did not go in, but caused *Jesus* only to be brought in by the soldiers, ver. 3. — ἵνα μὴ μιανθῶσιν, ἀλλ' ἵνα φάγ. τὸ πάσχα] On the emphatic repetition of the ἵνα, comp. Rev. ix. 5; Xen. *Mcm.* i. 2. 48. The entrance into the pagan house, not purified from the corrupt leaven, would have made them levitically impure (μιαίνω, the solemn word of profanation, Plat. *Legg.* ix. p. 868 A; *Tim.* p. 69 D; Soph. *Ant.* 1031, LXX. in Schleusner, III. p. 559), and have thereby prevented them from eating the Passover on the legal day (they would have been bound, according to the analogy of Num. ix. 6 ff., to defer it till the 14th of the following month). Since φαγεῖν τὸ πάσχα throughout the N. T. (Matt. xxvi. 17; Mark xiv. 12, 14; Luke xxii. 11, 15; comp. εἰτοιμάζειν τὸ πάσχα, Matt. xxvi. 19; Mark xiv. 16; Luke xxii. 8; θύειν τὸ πάσχα, 1 Cor. v. 7; Luke xxii. 7; Mark xiv. 12; see also Ex. xii. 21; 2 Chron. xxxv. 13) denotes nothing else than *to eat the paschal meal*, as פָּסַח לֶכֶל, 2 Chron. xxx. 18, comp. 3 Esr. i. 6, 12, vii. 12, it is thus clear that on the day, in the early part of which *Jesus* was brought to the procurator, the paschal lamb *had not yet been eaten*, but *was to be eaten*, and that consequently *Jesus* was crucified on the day *before the feast*. This result of the Johannean account is undoubtedly confirmed by xiii. 1, according to which πρὸ τῆς ἑορτῆς gives the authoritative standard

<sup>1</sup> Which, indeed (see Scholten, p. 382), is alleged to be a *mistake* of the appendix, the writer of which did not see through the (anti-Petrine) tendency of the Gospel.

for the whole history of the passion, and that in such wise that the Jewish Passover feast was necessarily still *future* when Jesus held His last meal with the disciples, with which latter, then, the seizure, condemnation, and execution stood in unbroken connection; further, by xiii. 29, according to which the Johannean last supper cannot have been the paschal meal; finally, by xix. 14 and 31 (see on those passages), as, moreover, the view that the murdered Jesus was the antitype of the slaughtered paschal lamb (xix. 36), is appropriate only to that day as the day of His death, on which the paschal lamb was slaughtered, *i.e.* on the 14th Nisan.<sup>1</sup> Since, however, as according to the Synoptics, so also according to John (xix. 31), Jesus died on the *Friday*, after He had, on the evening preceding, held His last meal, John xiii., there results the variation that, according to the *Synoptics*, the feast begins on *Thursday evening*, and Jesus holds the actual Jewish *paschal meal*, but is crucified on the *first feast-day* (Friday); in opposition to which, according to John, the feast begins on *Friday evening*, the last supper of Jesus (Thursday evening) is an *ordinary meal* (see Winer, *Progr.*: δειπνον, de quo Joh. xiii., etc., Leips. 1847), and His death follows on the *day before* the feast (Friday). According to the *Synoptics*, the Friday of the death of Jesus was thus the 15th Nisan; but according to John, the 14th Nisan. We can scarcely conceive a more indubitable result of exegesis, recognised also by Lücke, ed. 2 and 3, Neander, Krabbe, Theile, Sieffert, Usteri, Ideler, Bleek, De Wette, Brückner, Ebrard, *Krit. d. Evang. Gesch.*, ed. 2 (not in Olshausen, *Leidensgesch.*, p. 43 f.), Ewald, Baur, Hilgenfeld, Hase, Weisse, Rückert, *Abendm.* p. 28 ff., Steitz, J. Müller, Koessing (Catholic), *de suprema Chr. coena*, 1858, p. 57 ff., Kahnis, *Dogm.* I. p. 417, Pressensé, Keim, and several others. Nevertheless, harmonistic attempts have been made as far as possible to prove the agreement, *either* of the Synoptics with John (so mostly the older harmonists, see Weitzel, *Passahfeier*, p. 305 f.; recently, especially Movers in the *Zeitschrift f. Phil. u. Kathol. Theol.*, 1833, vii. p. 58 ff., viii. p. 62 ff., Maier, *Aechth. d. Ev. Joh.*, 1854, p. 429 ff.,

<sup>1</sup> Tertullian, *adv. Jud.* 8: "Passio perfecta est die azymorum, quo agnum occiderent ad vesperam a Mose fuerat praeceptum."

Weitzel, Isenberg, *d. Todestag des Herrn*, 1868, p. 31 ff., and several others), or of John with the Synoptics (so most later harmonists).<sup>1</sup> Attempts of the first kind break down at once before this consideration, that in the Synoptics the last meal is the *regular*<sup>2</sup> and *legal* one of the 14th Nisan, with the Passover lamb, slaughtered of necessity on the *selfsame* day between the two evenings in the forecourt (comp. Lightfoot, p. 470 f., 651), but not a paschal meal *anticipated* by Jesus contrary to the law (abrogating, in fact, the legal appointment, see Weitzel), as Grotius, Hammond, Clericus, and several

<sup>1</sup> Chrysostom gives a choice between the two attempts at reconciliation. *Either* John means by τὸ πρῶτον : τὴν ἑσπέρην τὴν αὔραν ; or, Christ anticipated the celebration on the day before the Passover of the Jews, τῇ αὐτῇ τὴν αὐτοῦ σφαγὴν τῇ παρασκευῇ, on which the O. T. paschal meal was solemnized. In this way Chrysostom already writes the programme for the whole of the later investigations on this point down to the present day. For the history of the controversy, see in Wichelhaus, *Kommentar über d. Leidensgesch.* p. 191 ff.

<sup>2</sup> The view which became current at the time of the Reformation and afterwards among the older theologians, especially through Casaubon's and Scaliger's influence, that the Jews *had postponed* the Passover for a day, was entirely baseless, but found all the more ready acceptance because there remained thereby time in full accordance with the law for the observance of the paschal meal on the part of Jesus. According to this view, which has again been recently supported by Philippi (*Glaubensl.* I. p. 266 f., ed. 2), the Jews, in order not to be bound for two days running to the strictness of the Sabbath observance, transferred the first feast-day, which at that time fell on the Friday, to the Sabbath ; whereas Christ abode faithfully by the legal term ; the synoptical account goes by this legal determination, but the Johannine by the former arbitrary one. From *Mat.* Luke xxii. 7, no inference whatever can be drawn in favour of this harmonistic expedient, which is without any historical support. Serno (*d. Tag d. letzten Passahmahls*, Berl. 1859) has sought, in a peculiar way, to confirm the correctness of both accounts by the doubling of the feast-days during the *diaspora*. According to this, it may have come about that for the Galileans in Jerusalem that was already the first day of the Passover, which for the Jerusalemites was but the day before the feast. In this way the twofold representation was stamped on the page of history. Against this it is at once decisive that the Galileans did not belong to the *diaspora*. See, moreover, Weiss, in the *Lit. Bl. d. allg. K. Z.* 1860, Nr. 42 ; Wieseler and Reuter's *Repert.* 1860, p. 132 ff. ; Ewald, *Jahrb.* XI. p. 253 f. On the above doubling of the feast-days, see Ideler, *Handbuch d. Chronol.* I. p. 513 ff. According to Isenberg, *l.c.*, "many thousand strangers," in order not to break in upon the Sabbath with the preparation for the Passover meal, held this meal already on the 13th Nisan. So also did Jesus, in order to institute the Lord's Supper as the fulfilment of the Passover feast, and to die as the Antitype of the Passover lamb. The above pre-supposition, however, is unhistorical. A paschal lamb on the 13th Nisan is to the Jewish consciousness an impossibility.

others thought, also Kahnis, *Abendm.* p. 14, Krafft, p. 130, Godet, p. 629 ff., who appeals specially again to Matt. xxvi. 17, 18, Märcker, *Uebereinst. d. Matth. und Joh.* p. 20 ff., who thinks the non-legal character of the meal is *passed over in silence* by the Synoptics. Those attempts, however, according to which John's account is made to be the same as that of the Synoptics (Bynaeus, *de morte J. Ch.* III. p. 13 ff., Lightfoot, p. 1121 ff., Reland, Bengel, and several others; latterly, especially Tholuck, Guericke, Olshausen, B. Crusius, Hengstenberg *in loc.*, and in the *Evang. K.-Zeit.* 1838, Nr. 98 ff., Wieseler, *Synopse*, p. 333 ff., and in Herzog's *Encyklop.* XXI. p. 550 ff., Luthardt, Wichelhaus, Hofmann in the *Zeitschr. f. Prot. u. Kirche*, 1853, p. 260 ff., Lichtenstein and Friedlieb, *Gesch. d. Lebens J. Chr.* p. 140 ff., Lange, Riggenbach, von Gumpach, Röpe, *d. Mahl. d. Fusswaschens*, Hamb. 1856, Ebrard on Olshausen, Baeumlein, Langen, *Letzte Lebenstage Jesu*, 1864, p. 136), are rendered void by the correct explanation of xiii. 1, 29, xix. 14, 31, and, in respect of the present passage, by the following observations: (a) τὸ πάσχα cannot be understood of the sacrificial food of the feast to the exclusion of the lamb, particularly not of the *Chagiga* (חַגִּיגָה), the freewill passover offerings, consisting of small cattle and oxen, according to Deut. xvi. 2, on which sacrificial meals were held; see Lightfoot), as is here assumed by the current harmonists,<sup>1</sup> since rather *by φαγεῖν* is the Passover lamb constantly designated (comp. generally Gesenius, *Thes.* II. p. 1115), also in Josephus and in the Talmud (אֵלֶּל הַפֶּסַח), and consequently no reader could attach any other meaning to it;<sup>2</sup> in Deut. xvi. 2, 3, however, פֶּסַח

<sup>1</sup> Although the eating of the *Chagigah* was not necessarily restricted to the 15th Nisan, but might take place well enough on any of the following Passover feast-days; hence a *religious obligation* as regards the 15th Nisan by no means lay in the way of their entering the Gentile house, so that they might be able to eat the *Chagigah*. But the partaking of the *paschal lamb* was restricted to its definite day, the 14th Nisan.

<sup>2</sup> Paul also, in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1866, p. 367 ff., and 1867, p. 535 ff., explains it of the eating of the Passover lamb, but thinks that they had not been able to accomplish the eating on the evening that preceded the *ἑσπέρη*, and now "at the first grey of morning" desired to make up for that which was omitted in the urgency of their haste. What an irregularity against the law (Lev. xxiii. 5, Deut. xvi. 7; Saalschütz, *M. R.* p. 407 f.) and usage is thus imagined, without the slightest indication in the text! And the thought of such a completely exceptional early eating could not be entertained by the Jews, moreover, for this

does not mean "as a passover" (Hengstenberg, comp. Schultz on Deut. p. 471), but likewise nothing else than *agnus paschalis*, from which, then, אֶת־הַפֶּסַח are distinguished as other sacrifices and sacrificial animals (comp. vv. 6, 7), whereby with עִלֵּי, ver. 3, we are referred back to the *whole* of the eating at the feast. 2 Chron. xxxv. 7-9 also (comp. rather vv. 11 and 13) contributes as little to prove the assumed reference of *πάσχα* to the Passover sacrifices generally, as Ex. xii. 48 for the view that to *eat* the Passover signifies the celebration of the feast in general; since, certainly, in the passage in question, the general *ποιῆσαι τὸ π.* (*prepare*) is by no means equivalent to the special *ἔδεται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ*.<sup>1</sup> (b) The objection, that entering the Gentile house would only have produced pollution *for the same day* (יִמּוֹ בְּבֹל),<sup>2</sup> which might have been removed by washing before evening, and therefore before the beginning of the new day, and that consequently the Jews would have still been able to eat the Passover lamb, which was to be first partaken of in the evening (see especially Hengstenberg, Wieseler, and Wichelhaus, following Bynaeus and Lightfoot), cannot be proved from Maimonides (*Pesach.* iii. 1, vi. 1), must rather, in view of the great sacredness of the Passover feast (comp. xi. 55), be regarded as quite unsupported by the present passage (at all events *in reference to the time of Jesus*), irrespective also of this, that such a pollution would have been a hindrance to the personal *slaughtering* of the lamb, and certainly was, most of all, avoided precisely by the hierarchs, 2 Chron. xxx. 17, 18. (c) On the whole of

reason, that they must indeed stand by, and did stand by their delinquent, could not leave him as he was, and go thence, in order to eat the neglected Passover. —Aberle, in the *Tüb. Quartalschr.* 1863, p. 537 ff., admits indeed the difference of John's representation from that of the Synoptics, but thinks the Johannan day of death of Jesus appears through their account (in itself correct), and that they intentionally expressed themselves in an ambiguous manner (incorrect). See against Aberle, Hilgenfeld in his *Zeitschr.* 1865, p. 94 ff.

<sup>1</sup> 2 Chron. xxx. 22, where the eating of the feast sacrifices generally (הַמִּזְבֵּחַ) is spoken of, proves nothing whatever for the special expression: "eat the Passover," rather is *distinguished* from it.

<sup>2</sup> Judith xii. 7-9 proves nothing in this respect for our passage (against Hengstenberg), where the evening bath of Judith falls at most (comp. Grotius) under the point of view of Mark vii. 4, where there is no question of any eating of a holy, festal character.



the inadmissible plea, which has been raised from the history of the Easter controversies against this, that John places the death of Jesus on the 14th Nisan, see *Introd.* § 2. (d) It has even been asserted, in order to make the account of John apply to the synoptic determination of time, that the time of the Passover meal was not the evening of the 14th Nisan at all, but the evening of the 13th Nisan (consequently the beginning of the 14th); so, after Frisch, recently Rauch in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1832, p. 537 ff., according to which our φαγεῖν τ. πάσχα was understood of the eating of the ἄζυμα. But the evening of the 14th (consequently the beginning of the 15th) stands so unassailably firm on the foundation of the law, according to Jewish tradition, and according to Josephus (see De Wette in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1834, 4; Lücke, II. p. 727 ff.), that the above attempt is simply to be noted as a piece of history, as also that of Schneckenburger (*Beitr.* p. 4 ff.), which is based on the error that xix. 14 is the παρασκευή for the *Feast of Sheaves*. (e) Had John conceived the last Supper to be the Passover meal, there would certainly not have been wanting in the farewell discourses significant references to the Passover;<sup>1</sup> they are, however, entirely wanting, and, moreover, the general designation of the Supper itself, δεῖπνον γινόμενον, xxii. 2 (comp. xii. 2), agrees therewith, to remove from the mind of the unprejudiced reader the thought of the festival meal.—Is, however, the difference between John and the Synoptics incapable of being adjusted, the question then arises, *On which side historical accuracy lies?* Those who dispute the authenticity of the Gospel could not be in doubt on this point. But it is otherwise from the standpoint of this authenticity, and that not of mediate authenticity at second hand (assuming which, Weizsäcker gives the preference to the synoptic account), but of that which is immediate and apostolical. If, that is to say, in the case of irreconcilable departures from the synoptic tradition, the first rank is in general, *à priori*, to be conceded to John, as the sole direct

<sup>1</sup> This circumstance is also decisive against the invention of an *anticipated* Passover. For precisely at a Passover feast of so *exceptional* a character the Passover idiom which furnished its motive would not have been kept at a distance by John, but would have been brought by him into the foreground.

witness, whose writing has been preserved unaltered ; if, further, the representation also by the Apostle Paul of Christ as the Passover Lamb applies only to the Johannean determination of the day of His death (see on 1 Cor. v. 7) ; and if, along with this, Paul's account of the institution of the Lord's Supper does not run counter (in answer to Keim) to this Johannean determination ; if, further, even the statement of the Judaism, which was outside the church, that Jesus was executed *vespera paschatis* (ערב הפסח), i.e. on the 14th Nisan, supports the account of John (see *Sanhedr.* 6. 2 f., 43. 1, in Lightfoot, *ad Act.* i. 3), where the fabulous element in the Talmudic quotation of the *circumstances* attending the execution does not affect the simple date of *time* ; if the conducting of a criminal trial<sup>1</sup> and execution on the first feast-day, even after the most recent attempts to show their admissibility (see especially Wieseler, p. 361 ff.), is at least highly improbable (see Bleek, p. 139 ff. ; Ewald, *Alterth.* p. 415), and is opposed by Acts xii. 31 ff., and in the case before us would be regarded as an exception from the rule,<sup>2</sup> in fact, imprudent and irreconcilable with the great danger which was well known to the Sanhedrin (*Matt.* xxvi. 5) ; if, generally, the 15th Nisan, with its Sabbath character, and as the legal day of the festive gathering in the temple, is altogether unsuitable to all the undertakings, processions, and parades which were set on foot by the hierarchs and by the people on the day of Jesus' death, as well as to the taking down from the cross and the burial ; if, on the other hand, the custom of setting at liberty a prisoner (*ver.* 39) most naturally corresponds to the idea, and therewith to the day of the paschal lamb, to the idea and to the day of *forgiveness* ; if, finally, even in the Synoptics themselves, traces still exist of the true historical relation, according to which the day of Jesus' death must have been no first day

<sup>1</sup> This difficulty drives Hilgenfeld (*Paschastr. d. alten Kirche*, p. 154, also in his *Zeitschr.* 1863, p. 338 ff.), after the precedent of Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenth.* I. p. 407 ff., to the desperate assumption that no actual criminal proceedings took place at all. Neither in *Matt.* xxvi. 3, nor xxvi. 57, and xxvii. 1, is an actual Synedrium intended, but only councils summoned by the high priest.

<sup>2</sup> Among the Greeks also, an execution on a feast day was regarded as a profanation and pollution, and was, if it exceptionally took place, as in the case of Phocion (*Plutarch, Phoc.* 37), a great scandal ; see Hermann, *Gottesd. Alterth.* § 43. 12.

of the feast, but a day of traffic and labour (Matt. xxvi. 59, 60; Mark xv. 21, 42, 46; Luke xxiii. 26, 54, 56), as, moreover, the opinion of the Sanhedrin, Matt. xxvi. 5, Mark xiv. 1: *μὴ ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ!* corresponds to the Johannean account, and to the haste with which, according to the latter, the affair was despatched, actually still before the feast,—then all these moments are just so many reasons, the collective weight of which is decisive *in favour of John*,<sup>1</sup> without the further necessity of making an uncertain appeal to the present calendar of the feast, according to which the 15th Nisan may not fall on a Friday (see against his application to *that* period, Wieseler, p. 437 f.), and to the prohibition, Ex. xii. 22, against quitting house and town after the Passover meal (see on Matt. xxvi. 30, and Wetstein on Mark xiv. 26).—The question *how the correct relation of time in the synoptic tradition could be altered by a day*, withdraws itself from any solution that is demonstrable from *history*. Most naturally, however, the institution of the Lord's Supper suggests the point of connection, both by the references, which Jesus Himself in His discourses connected therewith gave to the Supper in its bearing on the Passover meal, by the idea of which He was moved (Luke xxii. 15), as also by the view of the Supper as the anti-typical Passover meal, which view must necessarily have been developed from the apostolic apprehension of Christ as the Paschal Lamb (xix. 36; 1 Cor. v. 7), so far as He in the Supper had given Himself to be partaken of, Himself the perfected Passover Lamb, which He, simply by His death, was on the point of becoming. Thus the day of institution of the Supper became, in the anti-typical mode of regarding it, an *ideal* 14th Nisan, and in the tradition, in virtue of the reflective operation of the idea upon it, gradually became an *actual* one, and consequently the *παράσκευή*, which was firmly established as the day of death, became, instead of the preparation of the Passover (14th Nisan), as John has again fixed it, the

<sup>1</sup> Here the appeal urged by Movers to *Tr. Sanhedr. f. 63. 1*, is by no means required, according to which the members of the Sanhedrin might not eat anything on the day on which they had pronounced a sentence of death. On this showing, they absolutely *could* not have had the design of eating the *Chagigah*.

preparation of the Sabbath,<sup>1</sup> this Sabbath, however, regarded, not as the first day of the feast, as in John, consequently not as the 15th Nisan, but as the second day of the feast (16th Nisan).—Further, the deviation of John from the Synoptics is the less to be employed as a reason for doubting the genuineness of the former, the more improbable it is in itself that a later inventor, who nevertheless sought apostolic authority, would have run the risk of entering into conflict with the prevailing tradition in so extremely important a determination, and, in subservience to the idea of Christ as the perfected Passover Lamb (see especially Baur, p. 272 ff., and in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1854, p. 267 f.; Hilgenfeld, *Pascha streit d. alten K.* p. 221 ff.; Schenkel, p. 362 f.; Keim, *Gesch. J. I.* p. 132; Scholten, p. 282 ff.), to date back by a day the execution of Christ. Were the Johannean history, in so far substantially unhistorical, a production resulting from the idea of the Passover lamb, then certainly this idea would itself stand forth with far more of purpose and expression than it does (especially, for instance, in the farewell discourses), and would have been indicated, not merely on the occasion of the wound in the side, xix. 36, in the light of a single token; in that case one might believe oneself justified, with Weisse, *Evangelienfrage*, p. 130, in laying to the charge of the writer of the Gospel that he had, in conformity with certain presuppositions, put together the sequence of events for himself partly in an *accidental* and partly in an arbitrary manner.

Vv. 29, 30. In the prudent concessive spirit of Roman policy towards the Jews in the matter of religion, Pilate<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Moreover, the *Passover* meal, on the Friday evening, could by no means have been deranged by the dawning of the Sabbath. For the slaying and roasting of the lamb took place *before* the dawn of the Sabbath, and the pilgrims were wont to arrive early enough in Jerusalem (comp. xi. 55). The burning of the remains of the lamb was not, however, prevented by the Sabbath (Schoettgen, *Hor.* I. p. 121), and generally the rule held good: "Si quis unum praeceptum observat, ille ab observatione alterius praecepti liber est," Sohar, *Deut. princ.* f. 107, c. 427. This also in answer to Isenberg, *l.c.* Besides, the paschal lamb was a *sacrifice*, the arrangements connected with which the Sabbath consequently did not prevent, even if the 14th Nisan itself was a Sabbath.

<sup>2</sup> The whole behaviour of Pilate in all the following proceedings is depicted with such psychological truth, that the opinion that his interest in Jesus was ascribed to him only by the evangelist (Strauss, Baur, Schenkel), can appear

comes forth to them, and demands first of all, *in accordance with regular procedure, a definite accusation*, although he knew it, ver. 33; "*sed se scire dissimulabat*," Ruperti. The defiance of the hierarchy, however, uttered in an evil conscience, demands of him, contrary to all forms of legal procedure, that he should assume the *delivering-up* of the prisoner *itself* as a warrant of crime. *Him* who is not a mis-doer, they reply, *they would not have delivered up to the procurator*. They had in truth themselves sufficient power to punish, although not extending to execution. If, therefore, the offence exceeds this power of theirs to punish, so that the surrender to the procurator takes place, this surrender is sufficient proof that the person is a criminal. The *kind and manner* of the crime (Tholuck: criminal offence against the citizens) is not yet defined by their words. The idea: "one hand washes the other" (Lange), lies entirely remote.—*κατὰ τοῦ ἀνθρ. τοῦ-του*] is, further, uttered with a feeling of *indifference*, not: "against such a pious and renowned a man," Luther.

Ver. 31. Since they bring forward no definite charge, Pilate refers them to their own tribunal (the Sanhedrim). As he, without such an accusation, from which his competency to act must first arise, *could* take no other course than at once refer the matter to the regular Jewish authority, he also *incurred no danger* in taking that course; because if the *κρίνειν*, i.e. the judicial procedure against Jesus, should terminate in assigning the punishment of death, they must nevertheless come back to him, while it was at the same time a *prudent* course (*φρόνον ὁξὺ νοήσας*, Nonnus); because if they did not wish to withdraw with their business unfinished, they would, it might be presumed, be under the necessity of laying aside their insolence, and of still coming out with an accusation. If *κρίνειν*, which, according to this view, is by no means of doubtful

only as the consequence of presuppositions, which lie quite outside the history. Note particularly how just his *suspicion* against the *Jews*, owing to their personal behaviour, must have been from the first; and how, on the other hand, owing to Jesus' personal bearing, his *sympathy* for Him must have developed and increased, so that in the mind of the procurator strength of character and of conscience alone was wanting, to prevent him, after perverted measures and concessions, from yielding ignominiously at last. See also Steinmeyer, *Leidens-gesch.* p. 143 ff.

signification (Hengstenberg), be understood as meaning to *condemn*, or even to *execute* (Lücke, de Wette, who, as already Calvin and several others, finds therein a *sneer*), which, however, it does not in itself denote, and which sense it cannot acquire by means of the following ἀποκτεῖναι, something of a very *anticipatory* and relatively *impertinent character* is put in the procurator's mouth. — ὁμοίως] With emphasis. — The answer of the Jews rests on the thought that this κρίναι was, on their part, already an accomplished fact, and led up to the sentence for execution, which they, however, were not competent to *carry out*. They therefore understood the κρίναι not as *equivalent* to ἀποκτεῖναι, but regarded the latter as the established *result* of the former. Any limitation, however, of ἡμῶν οὐκ ἔξεστιν, κ.τ.λ. (to the *punishment of the cross*, as Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, Calovius, and several others think; or to the *feast day*, as Semler and Kuinoel suppose; or to *political crimes*, so Krebs), is imported into the words; the Jews had, since the domination of the Romans (according to the Talmud, forty years before the destruction of Jerusalem; see Lightfoot, p. 455, 1133 ff.), lost the *jus vitae et necis* generally; they could, indeed, sentence to death, but the confirmation and execution belonged to the superior Roman authority. See generally Iken, *Diss.* II. p. 517 ff.; Friedlieb, *Archäol.* p. 96 f. The stoning of Stephen, as also at a later period that of James, the Lord's brother (Josephus, *Antt.* xx. 9. 1), was a *tumultuary act*. Comp. also Keil, *Archäol.* II. p. 259.

Ver. 32. The aim ordained in the divine purpose, why the Jews, in consequence of having lost the right of life and death, were obliged to answer “ἡμῶν οὐκ ἔξεστιν, κ.τ.λ.” Otherwise, Jesus, as a false prophet and blasphemer of God, would have been *stoned* (like Stephen, and comp. viii. 59, x. 31), but would not have been visited with the Roman punishment of *crucifixion*, namely, as one guilty of high treason, as He, with His pretensions as Messiah, could not but appear to be before the Roman courts; and the word of Jesus, xii. 32, would have remained unfulfilled.

Vv. 33, 34. Pilate does not, indeed, enter at present into further discussion with the Jews, but, because he quite per-

ceived that they had set their minds on the punishment of death, he returns into the praetorium, into which Jesus, ver. 28, was led, and causes Him to be summoned before him, in order personally to examine him; taking a sufficiently inconsistent course, instead of simply persisting in his refusal on account of the want of a definite ground of accusation, and waiting first for some further step on the part of the Jews. His question: *Thou art the king of the Jews?* which, moreover, carries with it a contemptuous sound of unbelief (he does not ask, for example, *σὺ λέγεις, κ.τ.λ.*, or the like), is explained, even without a *κατηγορία* on the part of the Jews, from the fact that the arrest, because made with the help of the *σπείρα*, ver. 3, could not have taken place without previous intimation to and approval by Pilate, who therefore must also have been acquainted with its reason,—hence all the less, with Ewald, is the presentment of a written accusation to be presumed, or, as is ordinarily done, need it be suggested that the Jews, even after ver. 31, had come forward with the *κατηγορία*. This agrees with Luke xxiii. 2, but is not indicated by a single word in John, who could not have passed over so essential a point as a matter of course, and how easily and briefly could he have done so! By his counter-question, ver. 34, Jesus does not desire, as Olshausen, Neander, Godet, Ewald, and several others suppose, to gather the more exact *sense* of the question,—whether, namely, it is intended in a Jewish and theocratic or in a Roman and political sense (for such a separation of the ideas concerning the Messiah was neither to be presumed in Pilate, nor to be suggested by this question of Jesus),—but He simply claims the *right to know the author* of the accusation, which was contained in the words of Pilate; to know, therefore, whether Pilate put to Him the above question at his own instance, and without foreign prompting; or, on the other hand, at the prompting of others. That the latter was the case, He indeed knew; the *ἄλλοι* stood, in fact, before the door; but Pilate ought to speak out and set forth clearly the *status causae*. It was that which Jesus could demand, and with all the intrepidity of innocence did demand, without exactly intending to evoke a *movement of conscience* (Hengstenberg), which He could not at this point

expect in the cold man of the world; or to call his attention to the *suspicious source* of the accusation (Luthardt, Tholuck, Brückner), to which the ἄλλοι, which is altogether without bias, is not appropriate.

Vv. 35, 36. The answer of the procurator, irritated and haughty, gives in μήτι . . . εἰμι an indirect denial of the first question, and therewith also an affirmation of the second. — μήτι ἐγὼ Ἰουδαῖός εἰμι] Ἐγὼ, with proud emphasis: you do not surely suppose that *I*, I your procurator, am a *Jew*? How should *I* of myself think of trying thee as a *Jew* and as *king of the Jews*? The emphasis of ἐγὼ, Nonnus denotes by: μὴ γὰρ Ἰουδαῖος καὶ ἐγὼ πέλον; — the *opposite* of that: *Thine own nation* (τὸ ἔθνος τὸ σόν), and *especially* (καί) *the high priests*, have delivered thee to me; what hast thou done? No further ceremony! — Jesus now *confesses* His kingship,<sup>1</sup> but, in the first instance, only *negatively* (positively: ver. 37): “The kingdom which is *mine* does not arise (like other kingdoms) out of this *world* (which endures only until the establishment of my kingdom); if the kingdom which is *mine* proceeded out of this *world*, the servants whom *I* (οἱ ἐμοί) have would assuredly fight that I should not be delivered (which is done, xix. 16) to the Jews (the hierarchical opposition); but as it is (since they do not fight for me), *my* kingdom is not from *thence*” (ἐντεῦθεν = ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου). — Note in this *Demonstratio ad oculos* the solemn repetition of ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τ. and of ἡ βασιλεία ἡ ἐμή, as well as that ἐντεῦθεν, *from here, hence*, is expressed *deictically*, as a vivid opposition to that which is *coelitus*, and, finally, that in ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, not τούτου, which might also have been omitted, but κόσμου bears the emphasis. The ὑπηρέται οἱ ἐμοί are not the servants whom He *would* have in the case supposed (Lücke, Tholuck, Hengstenberg, and several others), but He *has* His servants, they are His *disciples and adherents* (not the *angels*, as Luthardt thinks), xii. 26; 1 Cor. iv. 1; 2 Cor. vi. 4, xi. 23; 1 Tim. iv. 6; but even not from this world (xvii. 16), they also do not *fight*, etc. Note how also, in the

<sup>1</sup> This confession must, according to Schenkel, have probably been spoken on another occasion. Groundless supposition. Comp. 1 Tim. vi. 13, and Huther *in loc.*



designation of His own by ὑπηρεται, the *kingly* consciousness expresses itself.

Ver. 37. A βασιλεία Jesus had actually ascribed to Himself in ver. 36, which Pilate certainly did not expect; hence he asks, in surprise and not without a flash of haughty scorn: *Nonne igitur rex tu es?* since thou, that is, speakest of thy βασιλεία. On οὐκοῦν, not elsewhere found in the N. T., see Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem. Exc.* III. p. 517 ff.; Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 198. The sentence is an inference, but asking (*is it not then true, that thou art a king?*) whether the questioned person agrees. — ὅτι] Confirmation of the assertion expressed by σὺ λέγεις (comp. Matt. xxvi. 25). — ἐγώ] Corresponding to the contemptuously emphasized σὺ at the end of Pilate's question, emphasized with noble self-consciousness, and still more emphatically brought into prominence by the ἐγώ, which immediately begins the next sentence (*"potens anadiplosis,"* Bengel); the repetition of εἰς τοῦτο twice also adds weight. — γεγένν. and ἐλήλ. εἰς τ. κόσμ.] must, according to Grotius, Lücke, and De Wette, designate the *birth* and the *official appearance*; a separation which is not justified by the Johannean ἔρχεσθαι εἰς τ. κόσμ., in which the birth is substantially included (iii. 17, ix. 39, xi. 27, xii. 47, xvi. 28, i. 9). The ἐλήλ. εἰς τ. κόσμ. sets forth the birth once again, but in relation to its specific higher nature, as the *entrance of the sent of God into the world*, so that the divine ἀποστέλλειν εἰς τὸν κόσμον (iii. 17, x. 36, xvii. 18) is correlative.<sup>1</sup> The *coming into the world* is related to the conception of *being born*, as the leaving of the world (xvi. 28) and going to the Father to the conception of dying. — ἵνα μαρτυρ. τῇ ἀληθ.] He was to bear *testimony* on behalf of the divine truth, for He had seen and heard it with God. Comp. iii. 11, 32, i. 17, 18. — ὁ ὢν ἐκ τ. ἀληθ.] *Genetic* designation (comp. on Gal. iii. 7) of the adherents of His kingdom; their origin is the divine truth, *i.e.* their entire spiritual nature is so constituted, that divine truth exercises its formative in-

<sup>1</sup> Calovius aptly says: Christ was so born, "ut quum antea fuerit apud patrem, in tempore nascendo in mundum venerit, a patre in mundum missus." Contrary to the words and the context is Scholten's view, that γινί. denotes the premundane procession from God.

fluence upon them. These are the souls drawn by the Father (vi. 44 ff.), and given to Christ as His own. Comp. viii. 47. Bengel correctly observes: "*Esse ex veritate* praecedit, *audire* sequitur." — ἀκούει μου τ. φωνῆς] *hears from me the voice*, i.e. (otherwise, xii. 47), he gives ear to that which I speak, follows my call, command, etc. With this Jesus has declared Himself regarding His kingdom, to the effect partly that He is a king, and with what definition He is so, partly as to what subjects He has; and thus He has *completely* answered the question; in no sense, however, as Hengstenberg thinks, has He *omitted* to answer it as too difficult for Pilate's comprehension, and expressed Himself instead concerning His *prophetic* office. The πᾶς ὁ ὦν, κ.τ.λ. belongs *essentially* to the characteristic of His kingdom; a special design, however, entertained in this point, with reference to Pilate (an appeal to his religious consciousness, Chrysostom, Olshausen, Neander; justification as to why Jesus has not more adherents, Calvin; a reminder for Pilate, how he would have to lay hold upon salvation), lies entirely remote from the sense, equally remote with an appeal "*a caecitate Pilati ad captum fidelium*," Bengel, or from the *judge* to the *man* (Hengstenberg).

Ver. 38. Pilate, now fully convinced that he has before him an innocent and harmless enthusiast, asks, with that air of contemptuous *deprecation* which is peculiar to the material understanding in regard to the abstract and supersensual sphere, *What is truth?* A *non ens*, a *phantom*, he thus conceives it to be, with which *He* would found a kingdom; and weary of the matter, and abruptly breaking it off, he goes straightway forth to the Jews, and declares to them that he finds no guilt in Jesus,<sup>1</sup> from which definite declaration it is seen that by the above question he does not mean at all to designate the matter merely as not coming within his jurisdiction (Steinmeyer). Something of good-nature lies in this conduct, but it is the weak and shallow good-nature of the

<sup>1</sup> Here we are to think of the sending away of Jesus to Herodes Antipas. See on Luke, note after xxiii. 12. But how could the fourth evangelist have omitted this episode, had he been a *Gentile Christian*, and had designed to concentrate the guilt of the death of Jesus as much as possible on the *Ἰουδαῖοι*? This in answer to Baur and Schenkel.

man of the world who is indifferent towards higher things ; nothing of the disconsolate tone of the searcher for truth (Olshausen) is to be imported. Against the view of Chrysostom, Theodorus Heracl., Euth. Zigabenus, Aretius, and several others, however, that Pilate had *actually* become desirous to be acquainted with the truth (Nonnus even thinks: καὶ Πιλάτος θάμβησε) ; it is at once decisive that he immediately turns his back and goes out. — *Whence did John learn of this conversation of Pilate with Jesus?* He can hardly have been himself an ear-witness of it.<sup>1</sup> But whether the fact be that it was communicated by Pilate in his own circles, and that hence it reached John, or whether it be that some ear-witness of the interview himself brought the information to John, the matter is not inconceivable (in answer to Scholten), and in no case have we the right to ascribe the account merely to the *composition* of John (Strauss), as Baur especially finds impressed on the declarations of Pilate that he “ finds no guilt in Jesus,” only the *tendency of the evangelist* to roll the guilt as far as possible off Pilate’s shoulders, and place it on those of the Jews, which purpose also the question, What is truth? is intended to serve, in which Baur suggests the sense: how can one make a crime out of truth?

Vv. 39, 40. Instead of stedfastly protecting the innocence of Jesus, he seeks, unwisely enough, in order not to be unpopular, a circuitous way, by which he practically surrenders the innocent one. — *ἴνα, κ.τ.λ.*] A custom exists amongst you: *I ought to release to you*, etc. On the thing itself, see on Matt. xxvii. 15. — *ἐν τῷ πάσχα*] Pilate could thus express himself as well on the 14th (against Hengstenberg), as also on the 15th Nisan, but the releasing itself corresponds most naturally to the sacred significance of the 14th. Comp. on ver. 28. Moreover, it is in itself more probable that the statement of the time of this customary release as one that was legally stationary is expressed even in the *strict* sense of τὸ πάσχα (Lev. xxiii. 5; Num. xxviii. 16). — *βούλεσθε . . . ἀπολύσω*] *Do you wish that I should release?* Deliberative conjunctive. Comp. on Matt. xiii. 28; Kühner, II. § 464. — *τὸν βασιλ. τ. Ἰουδ.*] Unwise and scornful bitterness. Hengstenberg

<sup>1</sup> So Steinmeyer, *Leidensgesch.* p. 143.

imports a serious view of the idea of *Messias*, which certainly Pilate was not equal to. — *πάλιν*] presupposes a general clamour already raised in vv. 30 and 31. — *Βαραββ.*] See on Matt. xxvii. 16. — *ἦν δὲ ὁ Β. ληστής*] Tragical addition. The designation by *ληστής* does not exclude the statement in Mark xv. 7; Luke xxiii. 19; *λησταὶ φονεύουσι*, Soph. *O. R.* 719. According to Matt. xxvii. 17, Pilate offered a *choice* between Barabbas and Jesus; Mark, and also Luke, agree with **John**.

CHAPTER XIX.

VER. 3. καὶ ἔλεγον] B. L. U. X. A. Π. Σ. Curss., most Verss. Cyr. Nom. Aug.: καὶ ἤρχοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ ἔλεγον. Rightly adopted by Lachm. and Tisch. The *Recepta* originated in a mechanical way, just as readily through an erroneous transition from the first αὐτόν to the second, as through the apparently unnecessary, indeed unsuitable, character which ἤρχ. πρ. αὐτ. might possess. — ἐδίδουν] Lachm. and Tisch.: ἐδίδοσαν. But see on xv. 22. — Ver. 4. Elz. Scholz: ἐξῆλθεν οὖν. Lachm.: καὶ ἐξῆλθεν. The witnesses are very much divided, but there is preponderant testimony in favour of καὶ ἐξῆλθ. (A. B. K. L. X. Π. Curss. Syr. Aeth. Cyr.). Nevertheless, considering the frequency of such insertions, the omission of the particle (Griesb. Tisch.) is sufficiently justified by D. Γ. Σ. Curss. Verss. — ἐν αὐτ. οὐδ. αἰτ. εὐρ.] Very many variations, amongst which the simple αἰτ. οὐχ εὐρ. would, with Tisch., be preferable, if it were not that it has only Σ.\* in its favour. — Ver. 6. αὐτόν] is omitted after the second σταύρ. in Elz. Tisch., but has the preponderance of testimony in its favour, for amongst the Uncials only B. L. omit it. Nevertheless, the addition was so easily suggested of itself, and through Luke xxiii. 21, Mark xv. 13, John xix. 15, that it is to be regarded as a supplement. — Ver. 7. ἡμῶν] is wanting in B. D. L. Δ. Σ. Vulg. It. Or. Hil. Aug. Deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. But how easily might its omission have been caused, partly by the preceding syllable MON, partly by its being apparently superfluous! — Ver. 10. After λέγει, Elz. Lachm. have οὖν, which, indeed, is wanting only in A. Σ. Curss. Syr. Perss. Copt. Arm. Slav. Cyr. (deleted by Tisch.); considering, however, the appropriateness of the connection which it expresses, it would hardly have been omitted had it been genuine. The copyists can scarcely have felt that there was anything cumbrous (in answer to Lücke, De Wette) in the expression. — Ver. 11. ἐῖχες] A. D. L. X. Y. A. Π. Σ. Curss.: ἔχεις. Defended by Buttmann in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1858, p. 485 ff., adopted by Tisch. An old copyist's mistake, which is supported by none of the Verss. except Copt., and by none of the Fathers, which, however, crept in readily enough after the shortly preceding ἔχω. — Ver. 12. ἔκραζον] Lachm. Tisch.:

ἐκράυγαζον, according to important witnesses, indeed, but derived from vv. 6, 18, 40, whence B. D. Curss. have directly repeated ἐκράυγασαν. — Ver. 13. τοῦτον τὸν λόγον] The genit. plur., and that either τούτων τῶν λόγων, or, more strongly still, τῶν λόγων τούτων, is so decisively attested, that the latter, with Lachm. and Tisch., is to be adopted. The *Recepta* is derived from ver. 8. — Ver. 14. Instead of δέ after ὥρα, Lachm. and Tisch. have ἦν, on decisive testimony; δέ is a stylistic correction. — ἔκτῃ] D. L. X. Δ. Ν.\*\* Curss. Chronic. alex. (the latter appealing to the ἀκριβῆ ἀντίγραφα, nay, even to the ἰδιόχειρον of John!) Nonn. Sev. ant. (appealing to Euseb.) Ammon. Theophyl.: τρίτῃ. An old harmonistic alteration in conformity with Mark xv. 25 (comp. Matt. xxvii. 45; Mark xv. 33; Luke xxiii. 44). — Vv. 16, 17. Instead of ἦγαγον, Elz. has ἀπήγαγον, against decisive testimony. But B. L. X. Curss. Codd. N. Copt. Cyr. entirely omit καὶ ἦγαγον. So Lachm. and Tisch. But if the continuation had here been supplied from the parallel passages, not ἦγαγον, but ἀπήγαγον (comp. Matt. xxvii. 31; Luke xxiii. 26), would have the preponderance of testimony. Καὶ ἦγαγον, however, might easily have disappeared in the course of transcription, owing to a transition having been at once made from the first καὶ to the second. — τὸν σταυρ. αὐτοῦ] Lachm.: αὐτῷ τ. στ. (B. X.); Tisch.: αὐτῷ τ. στ. (L. Ν. Or.). The latter, in favour of which D. also testifies with αὐτοῦ, is to be preferred. The reflexive pronoun was frequently neglected. The *Recepta* is an alteration in conformity with the most current mode of expression. — Ver. 20. The order of the words 'Εβρ., 'Ρωμ., 'Ελλ. (so Tisch., according to B. L. X. Ν. Curss. Copt. Sah. Aeth. Cyr.) has probability, considering the standpoint of Pilate, in its favour. — Vv. 26, 27. Instead of ἰδοῦ, we should, in conformity with important testimony, read both times with Lachm. and Tisch. ἴδε, frequent in John (he has ἰδοῦ only in iv. 35, xvi. 32, and from the LXX. xii. 15), though we are not to assume any difference of meaning between the two forms. — Ver. 29. οὖν] is wanting in A. B. L. X. Codd. It., whilst a few other witnesses (including Ν.) have δέ. Rightly deleted by Lachm. Tisch. — οἱ δὲ πλῆς. σπύγγ. δξ. καί] Lachm.: σπύγγ. οὖν μεστὴν τοῦ ὄξους, according to B. L. X. Ν. Curss. Verss. Cyr. Hilar. So also Tisch., but without τοῦ, which X. Ν. do not contain. The *Recepta* is shaped in conformity with Matt. xxvii. 48, Mark xv. 36, where οἱ δέ was readily suggested as an insertion on account of the change of persons. — Ver. 31. Instead of ἐκείνου, Elz. has ἐκείνη, against decisive testimony. — Ver. 35. καὶ ὑμεῖς] Elz. has merely ὑμεῖς. But καὶ is so strongly attested, and might be so readily omitted as being without reference, that it must be

preserved. — Ver. 40. ἐν ὁδῷ.] The mere ὁδῷ. (Elz. Lachm.) is very strongly attested (B. K. L. X. Y. Π. Σ.), but the superfluous ἐν might readily be passed over, comp. xii. 44, especially as the preponderance of parallel passages present the mere dative.

Vv. 1-3. Οὖν] After the miscarriage of this attempt at deliverance, Pilate will at least make *this* further venture to see whether the *compassion* of the Jews is not to be awakened. Hence he causes the *scourging* to be carried out on Jesus' person, to which punishment He in any case, if He were to be crucified, must be subjected; and hopes, in the folly of his moral vacillation, by means of such maltreatment, although inflicted without sentence and legality, to satisfy the Jews, and avert something worse. Comp. on Matt. xxvii. 26. With a like purpose in view, he also gives Him up to the contumelious treatment of the soldiers, who deck Him out as *king* (xviii. 39) with a crown of thorns (see on Matt. xxvii. 29) and a purple mantle (comp. on Matt. xxvii. 28; Mark xv. 17). — ἔλαβεν] shows the simple style of the narrative. — κ. ἥρχ. πρ. αὐτ.] See the critical notes. It is a *pictorial* trait. He stands arrayed before them; *they go up to Him* and do obeisance to Him! — ῥαπίσματα] As in xviii. 22. Codd. of It. add *in faciem*.

Vv. 4, 5. Πάλιν] For, according to xviii. 40, Pilate has returned into the praetorium, and has caused Jesus to be scourged, ver. 1. The scourging was certainly carried out so that the Jews could see it. The prisoner, scourged and arrayed like the caricature of a king, he causes to be led forth in his train. — ὑμῖν] *Vobis*; what follows gives the more exact explanation of this reference. — ἵνα γνῶτε, κ.τ.λ.] For had he found Him guilty, he would certainly not make the repeated attempt, implied in this leading forth and presentation of Jesus to them, to change the mind of the Jews, but would dispose of the matter by ordering execution. — Ver. 5. ἐξῆλθεν . . . ἱμάτιον is not a *parenthesis*, but the narrative, according to which Jesus comes forth *in the train of Pilate*, proceeds without interruption, in such a manner, however, that with λέγει (Pilate) the subject suddenly changes; see Heindorf, *ad Plat. Euthyd.* p. 275 B; Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* ii. 1. 8. — φορῶν] Not φέρων; for the kingly attire is now to the close

of the proceedings His permanent garb (Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 585). — The short significant *ecce homo!* behold the man, whose case we are condemning! has its eloquent commentary in the entire *manifestation of suffering* in which the ill-treated and derided one was set forth. *This suffering* form cannot be the usurper of a throne! The words are gently and compassionately spoken, and ought to excite compassion (comp. already Chrysostom); it is in ver. 14 that he first says with bitterness: ἴδε ὁ βασιλεὺς ὑμῶν.

Vv. 6–8. Of the presence of the *people* (who perhaps kept *silence*, Lücke thinks; comp. Luthardt, according to whom the high priests desired to forestall any possible expressions of compassion on the part of the people) the text says nothing; the Ἰουδαῖοι, xviii. 31, 38, were just pre-eminently the ἀρχιερεῖς of the present passage. — ὅτε οὖν εἶδον] The spectacle, instead of calming their bitterness, goads them on. — λάβετε αὐτὸν ὑμεῖς, κ.τ.λ.] A *paradox*, amounting to a peevish and irritated refusal, since the Jews did not possess the *right* of execution, and crucifixion was certainly not a *Jewish* capital punishment. Crucify him yourselves, if you will have him crucified!—Now, however, they introduce the authority of their law, according to which Jesus (as being a blasphemer, namely, of God, Lev. xxiv. 16; Matt. xxvi. 63, 64) must die. They thus prudently give to their demand another legal basis, to be respected by the procurator in conformity with Roman policy, and to the accusation the corresponding religious sanction. An admission, however, that their political suspicion of Jesus had only been a pretext (Steinmeyer), is not contained in this; it is only another turn given to the charge. — ἡμεῖς] With haughty emphasis, opposed to the preceding ἐγὼ . . . αἰτίαν. On ὅτι υἱὸν, κ.τ.λ., comp. v. 18, x. 33. — μᾶλλον ἐφοβ.] *His fear only became the greater* (μᾶλλ., see v. 18), namely, of suffering Jesus to be executed. To the previous *fear of conscience* was now, in truth, added the fear of the *vengeance of a God*, namely, of Jehovah, the God of the Jews, in case the assertion mentioned should turn out to be true. He explained to himself the υἱὸς θεοῦ after the analogy of pagan *heroes*, like the centurion, Matt. xxvii. 54. That he was moved by the idea of the unity of God (Hengstenberg)



has nothing to support it; nay, viewed in the light of the wanton words, xviii. 38, very improbable.

Vv. 9, 10. He therefore took Jesus again away with him into the praetorium for a private audience. — *πόθεν*] asks after His *origin*, but not in the sense of the place of birth (Paulus), but in the sense occasioned by *υἱὸν θεοῦ*, ver. 7, in order to obtain a declaration from Jesus *on this point*, whether He were of human or divine origin. Comp. on viii. 14; Matt. xxi. 25. — *ἀπόκρι. οὐκ ἔδωκ. αὐτῷ*] Both this observation, as well as the peculiarity of Pilate's question, betraying a certain timidity, *πόθεν εἰ σύ* (how entirely different is his question, xviii. 33; while here he *shrinks* from asking directly), has the stamp of originality. Jesus is *silent*; for what He would have had to say would only have been misunderstood by Pilate, or not understood at all (xvii. 25; Matt. vii. 6). Moreover, He had already in truth sufficiently indicated His heavenly origin, xviii. 36, 37, had Pilate only possessed susceptibility for the truth. But as it was, he was unworthy of further discussion, and in the silence of Jesus it is precisely the self-assurance and greatness of the Son of God which are implied. Luthardt explains it *from the assumption* that Jesus will not give Pilate occasion to release Him from motives of fear, and thereby to interfere with the will of God. But on that supposition He must also have withheld the great and bold words, ver. 11. A resolute opposition on the part of the sceptical man of the world to the desire of the Jews, Jesus assuredly neither hoped nor feared. — Ver. 10. *Καὶ φοβεῖται καὶ φοβεῖ*, Euth. Zigabenus. — *ἐμοὶ οὐ λαλεῖς*;) *ἐμοὶ* bears the emphasis of mortified power, which then also attempts alike to *terrify* and to *entice*. To mention *at first* the *σταυρῶσαί σε*, and *then*, not before, the *ἀπολύσαί σε*, corresponded to the state of the procedure. But A. B. E. & Lachm. Tisch. have the converse order, which would, however, more readily suggest itself to the mechanical copyist. The repetition of *ἔξουσ.* *ἔχω* is *solemn*.

Ver. 11. With a clear and holy defiance, to defend against this expression of personal power at least, the supremacy of the Father, Jesus now speaks His *last* word to Pilate. He points the latter, with his *ἐξουσία* which he has put forward,

by the reference *σταυρῶσαί σε*, to the highest authority which has invested him with that *ἐξουσία*, but at the same time, with conciliatory mildness, deduces from it a standard to diminish the guilt of the judge. The saying breathes *truth and grace*. — οὐκ εἶχες] *Thou wouldst not have*.<sup>1</sup> "Indicativus imperfecti sine ἄν h. l. in firmissima asseveratione longe est aptissimus," Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* vii. 6. 21. See also Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Sympos.* p. 190 C; Bremi, *ad Lys. Exc.* IV. p. 438 ff.; Winer, p. 286 [E. T. p. 383]. — δεδομένου] Namely, the *ἐξουσιάζειν κατ' ἐμοῦ*. See Kühner, II. sec. 421; Bernhardt, p. 335. Not: the definite act of condemnation (Steinmeyer). — ἄνωθεν] *i.e. from God*, iii. 3, 31. That even the *heathen* could understand. Had Jesus said *ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς μου*, he would not have understood it. Pilate stands before Jesus with the *ἐξουσία* to destroy Him; but he has this power from *God*, and he would not possess it if God had not appointed him for the fulfilment of His destiny concerning Jesus. For this reason, however (*διὰ τοῦτο*), that is, because he here acts not in independent self-determination, but as the divinely-ordained organ of the procedure which is pending against Him, he is not indeed free from sin, since he condemns Jesus contrary to his own conviction of His innocence; but greater is the guilt of him who delivered Jesus into Pilate's hands, since that divinely-bestowed *ἐξουσία* is wanting to the latter. The logical connection of the *διὰ τοῦτο* rests on the fact that the *παραδιδούς μέ σοι* is the *high priest*, to whom, consequently, no power is given by God over Him, the *Messiah*, who in truth is higher than the high priest; to *Pilate*, on the other hand, the *Roman* potentate, this power is lent, because, as bearer of the highest magisterial authority, he derives his warrant from God (comp. Rom. xiii. 1), to decide

<sup>1</sup> Buttmann, on account of the absence of ἄν, would interpret the reading εἶχες as follows: "*Thou hadst*, *i.e.* when thou didst receive the accusation against me . . . no power over me, unless it was given to thee by God for that purpose." See *Stud. u. Krit.* 1858, p. 501. But irrespective of the dragging in, in this necessitous manner, of this exacter definition of time in εἶχες, it is in truth precisely the *undoubted* possession of the *ἐξουσία* which forms the presupposition of the *διὰ τοῦτο* κ.τ.λ. that follows. With the reading *ἔχες*, which Buttmann prefers, he explains: "*thou hast* no power over me, if it had not been given thee from above," p. 494. But why in that case should the *pluperf.* ἦν διδομένου stand? Instead of ἦν, *ιστί* must have been used, in conformity with the sense.

concerning every one who is brought before his court, and therefore also concerning the Messiah, who has been accused and delivered up as a pretender to a crown. This power Pilate possessed simply as a *Roman* potentate; hence this point of view does not *confuse* the matter (Luthardt), but makes it *clear*. As *δεδομ.* is not to be transmuted into the notion of *permission* (Chrysostom), so also there is nothing to be found in *διὰ τοῦτο* which is not yielded by the immediate context. Hence we are not to understand with Euth. Zigabenus (comp. Theophylact): *δίετι ἐξουσίαν ἔχεις καὶ οὐκ ἀπολύεις με*, so that the lesser degree of guilt rests on the weakness and timidity of Pilate (comp. Luther); nor with Grotius (comp. Bengel, Baeumlein, and already Ruperti): because thou canst not know so well as the Jews (to whom *ὁ παραδ.* is referred) who I am; nor even with Lampe: because the Jews have received no such power from God, have rather *assumed* it to themselves (Luthardt); but solely in harmony with the context: *because thou hast the disposal of me, not from thy proper sovereignty, but from having been divinely empowered thereto.* — *ὁ παραδιδούς*] *he who delivers me up to thee*; the affair is still *in actu*, those who deliver Him up stand without; hence the *pres.* The expression itself, however, cannot, as elsewhere in John (xviii. 2, xiii. 2, xi. 21, xii. 4, vi. 64, 71; comp. Mark xiv. 21), mean *Judas*, who here lies entirely remote from the comparison, especially since *σοι* is used with it, nor even (so most interpreters) be understood collectively of the *Jews*. It is rather the chief of the Jews, *the high priest Caiaphas*, who is meant (so also Bengel, and now Ewald; comp. Luthardt, Baumgarten, p. 388, Hengstenberg), who ought to have recognised the Messiah, and not to have assumed to himself any power over Him. — *μείζονα*] compares the sin of the *παραδιδούς* with that of *Pilate*, not with itself, so that its guilt is designated as *aggravated* by the misuse of the *ἐξουσία* of Pilate (Calvin, Wetstein, Godet, also Baur).<sup>1</sup> The guilt which belonged to the *παραδιδούς* in and

<sup>1</sup> Baur in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1854, p. 283: "Since thou hast in my case the magisterial power over life and death, those who surrender me to thee, incur by their action, in itself immoral, all the greater guilt, if they abuse the magisterial authority given to thee for their own objects."

by himself, was in truth not aggravated by the delivering over *into the hands of the regular magistracy*, which was rather the orderly mode of procedure.<sup>1</sup>

Ver. 12. *Ἐκ τούτου*] Not: *from this time forward* (so usually); for *ἐξήτει, κ.τ.λ.*, is a particular act, which is immediately answered by the Jews with loud outcries; but: *on this ground*, as vi. 66, occasioned by this speech of Jesus (so also Luthardt and Lange). — *ἐξήτει, κ.τ.λ.*, *he sought* to release Him (x. 30; Luke v. 18, xiii. 24, xix. 3; Acts xxvii. 30, *et al.*). In what this attempt, which, though made, yet remained unaccomplished (hence imperf.), may more definitely have consisted, John does not say, and therefore it was, probably, only in renewed representations which he made. That which is usually supplied, as though *μᾶλλον*, as in v. 18, were expressed therewith: he sought *still more*, he sought *most earnestly* ("previously he appears to John rather to have played with the matter," Lücke), and the like, is capriciously imported, as also the rendering: now *he demanded peremptorily*, etc. (Steinmeyer). — With *ἐὰν τοῦτον, κ.τ.λ.*, the Jews cunningly enough again return to and fasten upon the political side of the accusation, *ὡς οὐ παροπτίον τῷ Πιλάτῳ διὰ τὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ Καίσαρος φόβον*, Euth. Zigabenus. How greatly must he, who in so many features of his administration had anything but clean hands (Josephus, *Antt.* xviii. 3. 1 ff.; Philo, *de legat. ad Caj.* p. 1033), have desired to see avoided an accusation before Tiberius, so suspicious and jealous of his authority! (Suetonius, *Tib.* 58; Tacitus, *Ann.* iii. 38.) Comp. Hausrath, *Christl. Zeitgesch.* I. p. 312 ff. — *φίλος τοῦ Καίσα.*] Not in the *titular* sense of *amicus Cæsaris*, as high officials bore this title (see Wetstein; Grimm on 1 Macc. ii. 18), in which, however, the sense of *confidant* (counsellor) of Caesar exists; but *faithful to the emperor*, friendly to him, and readily devoted to his interests (Xen. *Anab.* iii. 2. 5). — He who makes himself a *king*, by the fact, that is, of *declaring* himself to be such

<sup>1</sup> According to Steinmeyer, p. 156, Jesus would say: "Thy power, on the other hand, to release me, is already as good as wrested from thee on the part of the *παρεδιδ.* *μί σοι*; but on that very account *thy sin* is the less." But this interpretation of *διὰ τοῦτο* is in truth altogether untextual, as the entire conception to which it would refer is first imported.

(comp. x. 33), thereby *declares himself* (ἀντιλέγει) *against the emperor*. Accordingly, ἀντιλέγει is not generally: he *opposes* (Grotius, De Wette, Maier); but the emphasis lies upon the correlates βασιλέα and Καίσαρι.

Ver. 13. These speeches penetrate the mind of Pilate, dismayed at the thought of Rome and the emperor. He will now, formally and solemnly, deliver the final sentence, which must be done, not *in the praetorium*, but *outside* in the open air (see Josephus, *Bell.* ii. 9. 3, ii. 14. 8); he therefore causes Jesus to be brought out, and *seats himself*, taking his place *on the judicial seat, at the place which is called Lithostroton, but in Hebrew, Gabbatha*. — ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος] Modal definition of ἐκάθ. εἰς τόπον. — Since τόπος here denotes a definite and distinguished place, the article is as little required as with πόλις, ἀγρός, and the like in such cases. Comp. Matt. xxvii. 33; Kühner, II. p. 129. — The place where the tribunal stood, before the praetorium in Jerusalem, bore the *Greek* name, derived from its *Mosaic floor* (see Wetstein and Krebs, p. 158 f.) of Λιθόστρωτον, *i.e.* *stone-joining*, but in the *Aramaic dialect* that of ܠܝܬܪܬܐ, arising from its *elevated position*; two *different* names, therefore, derived from *different properties*<sup>1</sup> of the same place. Further, this place is mentioned neither in Josephus nor in the Rabbins. The name Γαββ. is not to be derived from ܡܠܟܐ, *hill* (Hengstenberg), against which would be the double β (comp. Γαβαθᾶ, Josephus, *Antt.* v. 1. 29, vi. 4. 2), but from ܒܐ, *ridge, hump*. See generally Fritzsche, *Verdienste Tholuck's*, p. 102; Tholuck, *Beitr.* p. 119 ff.

Ver. 14. Day and hour of the decisive moment, after which the narrative then proceeds with καὶ λέγει, κ.τ.λ., without the necessity of placing ἦν δὲ . . . ἔκτη in a parenthesis (rather, with Lachm. and Tisch., between two points). — παρασκ. τοῦ πάσχα] That the παρασκευή may not be understood of the weekly one, referable to the *Sabbath* (vv. 31, 42; Luke xxiii. 54; Mark xv. 42; Matt. xxvii. 62; Josephus, *Antt.* xvi. 6. 2, *et al.*), but may be referred to the *Passover* feast-day,

<sup>1</sup> Ewald attempts to refer Γαββαθᾶ also back to the signification of ܠܝܬܪܬܐ by assuming a root ܢܒܥ, but in the signification of ܩܒܥ (Aram. : *insert*). Too bold an hypothesis. In the LXX. ܠܝܬܪܬܐ. (Cant. iii. 10; 2 Chron. vii. 3; Esth. i. 7) corresponds to the Hebr. ܩܒܥ.

of which it was the preparation-day, John expressly subjoins τοῦ πάσχα. It was certainly a *Friday*, consequently also a preparation-day before the Sabbath; but it is not *this* reference which is here to be remarked, but the reference to the *paschal feast* beginning on the evening of the day, the first feast-day of which fell, according to John, on the Sabbath. The expression corresponds to the Hebr. עֶרֶב הַפֶּסַח, not indeed verbally (for παρασκευή = עֲרוּכָה), but as to the thing. Those expositors who do not recognise the deviation of John from the Synoptics in respect of the day of Jesus' death (see on xviii. 28), explain it as: the *Friday in the Passover week* (see especially Wieseler, p. 336 f.; Wichelhaus, p. 209 f., and Hengstenberg *in loc.*, also Riggenbach). But it is in the later ecclesiastical language that παρασκ. first denotes directly Friday (see Suicer, *Thesaur.*), as frequently also in the *Constitt. ap.*, and that in virtue of the reference to be therewith supplied to the Sabbath; which, however, *cannot* be here supplied, since *another* genitival reference is expressly given. An appeal is erroneously made to the analogy of Ignat. *Phil.* 13. *interpol.*, where it is said that one should not fast on the Sunday or Sabbath, πλὴν ἐνὸς σαββάτου τοῦ πάσχα; for (1) σάββατον in and of itself is a *complete* designation of a day; (2) σάββ. τοῦ πάσχα here denotes by no means the Sabbath in the Easter-tide, but the *Sabbath of the Easter-day*, i.e. the Saturday which precedes Easter-day, Easter Saturday. All the more decidedly, however, is this harmonistic and forced solution to be rejected, since, further, all the remaining statements of time in John place the death of Jesus *before* the first feast-day (see on xiii. 1, xviii. 28); and since John, if he had had the first feast-day before him as the day of death, would not have designated the latter (subtle evasions in Hengstenberg), with such a want of distinctness and definiteness, as "the Friday in Passover" (which in truth might have also been any other of the seven feast-days), especially here, where he wishes to proceed with such precision that he states even the *hour*. Comp. further Bleek, *Beitr.* p. 114 f.; Rückert, *Abendm.* p. 31 ff.; Hilgenfeld, *Paschastr.* p. 149 f., and in his *Zeitschr.* 1867, p. 190. Against Schneckenburger, *Beitr.* p. 1 ff., who, by referring παρασκ. to the *feast of harvest*, likewise brings

out the 15th Nisan as the day of death, but makes it a Wednesday, see Wieseler, p. 338 f. — ἔκτῃ] According to the Jewish reckoning of hours, therefore twelve o'clock at noon,—again a deviation from the Synoptics, according to whom (see Mark xv. 25, with which also Matt. xxvii. 45, Luke xxiii. 44 agree) Jesus is *crucified* as early as *nine* o'clock in the morning, which variation in the determination of this great point of time includes much too large a space of time to allow us to resolve it into a mere indefiniteness in the statement of the hour, and, with Godet, following Lange, to say lightly: “the apostles had no watch in hand,” especially as according to Matt. and Luke the darkening of the earth is already expressly ascribed to the sixth hour. Since, however, with Hofmann,<sup>1</sup> with whom Lichtenstein agrees, we cannot divide the words: ἦν δὲ παρασκευή, τοῦ πάσχα ὥρα ἦν ὡς ἕκτῃ, but it was preparation-day, it was about the sixth hour of the paschal feast (reckoned, namely, from midnight forwards), which forced and artificial explanation would absolutely set aside παρασκευή, in spite of τοῦ πάσχα therewith expressed, and would yield an unexampled mode of computation of hours, namely, of the *feast*, not of the *day* (against i. 40, iv. 6, 52); since, further, the reading in our present passage is, both externally and internally, certain, and the already ancient assumption of a copyist's mistake (Eusebius, Beza, ed. 5, Bengel; according to Ammonius, Severinus, τινὲς in Theophylact, Petavius: an interchange of the numeral signs γ and ς) is purely arbitrary; since, further, as generally in John (comp. on i. 40, iv. 6, 52), the assumption is groundless,<sup>2</sup> that he is reckoning according to the *Roman* enumeration of hours (Rettig, Tholuck, Olshausen, Krabbe, Hug, Maier, Ewald, Isenberg; substantially so Wieseler, p. 414, who calls to his aid the first feast-day, Ex. xii. 29, which

<sup>1</sup> In the *Zeitschr. f. Prot. u. Kirche*, 1853, Oct. p. 260 ff., and *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 204 f.

<sup>2</sup> In fact, it is precisely in the present passage that the *inadmissibility* of the Roman enumeration of hours is shown. For if Jesus was brought πρῶτῃ, xviii. 28, to the praetorium, it is impossible that after all the transactions which here took place, including the scourging, mocking, and also the sending to Herod (who questioned Him in λόγοις ἱκανοῖς, Luke xxiii. 9, and derided Him), the case can have been matured for sentence as early as six o'clock in the morning, that is, at the end of about two, or at most three hours.

begins precisely at midnight) ; since, finally, the *quarter of a day* beginning with this hour cannot be made out of the third hour of Mark (Calvin, Grotius, Jansen, Wetstein, and others, comp. Krafft, p. 147 ; see in opposition, Mark xv. 33, 34), and just as little (Hengstenberg, comp. Godet) can the sixth hour of John (comp. iv. 6) be taken into consideration only as the *time of day* in question ;<sup>1</sup>—the variation must thus be left as it is, and the preference must be given to the disciple who stood under the cross. The Johannean statement of the hour is not, however, in itself improbable, since the various proceedings in and near the praetorium, in which also the sending to Herod, Luke xxiii. 7 ff., is to be included (see on xviii. 38), may probably have extended from πρωτ, xviii. 28, until noon (in answer to Brückner) ; while the execution, on the adjacent place of execution, quickly followed the judicial sentence, and without any intermediate occurrence, and the death of Jesus must have taken place unusually early, not to take into account the space which ὥσεί leaves open. Comp. Marcus Gnost. in Irenaeus, *Haer.* i. 14. 6 : τὴν ἑκτην ὥραν, ἐν ᾗ προσηλώθη τῷ ξύλῳ. For the way, however, in which even this statement of time is deduced from the representation of the paschal lamb (the writer desired to bring out the הערב, Ex. xii. 6 ; Lev. xxiii. 5 ; Num. ix. 3), see in Weisse, *Evangelienfrage*, p. 131. — ἴδε ὁ βασιλ. ὑμῶν !] Pilate is indeed determined, on ascending his judicial seat, to overcome his sentiment of right ; but, notwithstanding, in this decisive moment, with his moral weakness between the two-fold fear of the Son of God and of the Caesar, he still, before actually yielding, makes the *bitter* remark against the Jews : *see, there is your king !* imprudently, without effect, but at least satisfying in some degree the irony of the situation, into the pinch of which he sees himself brought.

Vv. 15, 16. The bitterness is still further embittered. To

<sup>1</sup> On this theory Hengstenberg forms the certainly very simple example : the combination of the statements of Mark and John yields the result, that the sentence of condemnation and the leading away falls *in the middle*, between the third and sixth hour, therefore *about 10.30 o'clock*. Were this *correct*, the statements of both evangelists would be *incorrect*, and we should avoid Scylla to fall into Charybdis. — Godet only renews the idle subterfuge that in Mark xv. 25 the crucifixion is reckoned *from the scourging forwards*.



the impetuous clamour which demands crucifixion, the question of Pilate: *your king* shall I crucify? is only the feeble echo of Ἰδε ὁ βασις. ὑμ., whereupon, with the decisive οὐκ ἔχομεν βασιλέα, κ.τ.λ., although it perfidiously denied the sense of the hierarchy, the again awakened fear of the emperor at last completely disarms the procurator, so that now then (τότε οὖν) the tragic and ignominious final result of his judicial action comes out: Χριστὸν ἐκὼν ἀέκων ἀδίκῳ παρέδωκεν ὀλέθρῳ, Nonnus. — αὐτοῖς] *to the chief priests*. ver. 15. To these Jesus was *given over*, and that, as a matter of fact, not merely by the sentence of itself (Hengstenberg), that He might be crucified under their direction by Roman soldiers (ver. 23, comp. Matt. xxvii. 26, 27). Comp. viii. 28; Acts ii. 23, iii. 15. παρέδ. does not signify to *yield* to their desire (Grotius, B. Crusius, Baeumlein).—On crucifixion in general, see on Matt. xxvii. 35.

Vv. 17, 18. The *subject* of παρέλαβον, which is correlative to παρέδωκεν, ver. 16, and of ἡγαγον, is necessarily, according to ver. 16, the ἀρχιερεῖς, not the soldiers (De Wette, B. Crusius, Hengstenberg, Baeumlein, and older expositors). The former are the persons<sup>1</sup> who act, which does not exclude the service and co-operation of the soldiers (ver. 23). — βασις. ἑαυτῷ τὸν σταυρ. (see critical notes): *Himself bearing the cross*.<sup>2</sup> See on Matt. xxvi. 32, and Charit. iv. 2; and on *Golgotha*, on Matt. xxvii. 33. — ἐντεῦθ. κ. ἐντεῦθ.] Comp. LXX. Dan. xii. 5; ἐνθεν καὶ ἐνθεν, Herod. iv. 175; Soph. *Aj.* 725; Xen. *Cyr.* vi. 3. 3; 1 Macc. vi. 38, ix. 45; 3 Macc. ii. 22, not Rev. xxii. 2. On the thing itself, comp. Luke xxiii. 33. John gives peculiar prominence to the circumstance, adding further, μέσον δὲ τ. Ἰησ. Whether, and how far, the Jews thus acted *intentionally*, is undetermined. That, perhaps, they scornfully assign to their “king” the *place of honour*! That Pilate desired thereby to deride them, in allusion to 1 Kings xxii. 19 (B. Crusius, Brückner, Lange), we are not to suppose, since the

<sup>1</sup> By which also the fact is confirmed that John had not in his mind the first feast-day, which certainly possessed the authority of the Sabbath.

<sup>2</sup> The assistance of Simon in this, John, who here gives only a *compendious* account, has passed over as a subordinate circumstance, not, as Scholten thinks, in conformity with the idea that the Son of God needed no human help.

subject of *ἐσταύρ.* is the Jews, under whose direction the crucifixion of the principal person takes place, and, at the same time, the two subordinate individuals are put to death along with Him. Pilate first appears, ver. 19. Of special *divine conceptions* in the intermediate position assigned to the cross of Christ (see Steinmeyer, p. 176), John gives no indication.

Vv. 19, 20. *Ἐγραψέ*] Not a supplemental statement: *he had written* (De Wette, Tholuck), but: *he wrote* (caused to be written), whilst the crucifixion took place without; and when it had taken place, he caused the *τίτλος* (solemn Roman expression for a public inscription, particularly for the tablets, naming the criminal and his offence, see Lipsius, *de cruce*, p. 101, and Wetstein) to be placed on the cross. He himself was not present at the crucifixion, Mark xv. 43, 44.—*ὁ βασιλ. τῶν Ἰουδ.*] Consistent bitterness in the designation of Jesus. Ver. 20. *τῶν Ἰουδαίων*] of the hierarchic party. — *ἐγγύς ἦν, κ.τ.λ.*] See on Matt. xxvii. 33. — *καὶ ἦν γεγραμμ., κ.τ.λ.*] No longer dependent on *ὅτι*, since *τῶν Ἰουδαίων*, ver. 20, unlike ver. 19, is not to be taken in a general sense. It rather attaches to the first circumstance, on account of which the *ἀρχιερεῖς* made their proposal, ver. 21, to Pilate (*τοῦτον . . . Ἰουδαίων*, ver. 20), a second assigning a reason therefor, namely: *it* (that which ran on the *τίτλος*) *was written in three languages*, so that it could be read by everybody, including foreigners. For an inscription, even in *four* languages, on the tomb of Gordian, see in Jul. Capitolin. 24.

Vv. 21, 22. The Jewish opponents of Christ have, with hierarchic tact, deciphered the resentful bitterness in the *τίτλος*, hence the chief priests among them suggest to Pilate, etc. The expression *οἱ ἀρχιερ. τ. Ἰουδ.* does not stand in contrast to the *βασιλεὺς τ. Ἰουδ.* (Hengstenberg, Godet), but the high *clerus* of the opposition desired not to see the ancient sacred designation of Messiah profaned. — *μὴ γράφε*] The writing, because still capable of being altered, is conceived as not yet concluded. — *ὁ γέγραφα, γέγραφα*] Formal way of designating that with what is written the matter is unalterably to rest. Analogous formulae from the Rabbins, see in Lightfoot. Comp. also 1 Macc. xiii. 38; *ὅσα ἐστήκαμεν . . . ἔστηκε*. Now, too late, he who was previously so weak in

character stands firm. In this subordinate point at least he will have his own opinion, and not expose his weak side!

Vv. 23, 24. Οὖν] again connects the history, after the intermediate narrative respecting the superscription, with ver. 18. — ἐσταύρωσαν] For they were the *executioners* of the crucifixion. — τὰ ἱμάτ. αὐτοῦ] *His garments*, with the exception, however, of the χιτῶν, which is afterwards specially mentioned, the shirt-like under-garment. The account of John is more exact and complete than that of the Synoptics (Matt. xxvii. 35; Mark xv. 24; Luke xxiii. 34). — τέσσαρα] There were accordingly four soldiers, the ordinary τετράδιον στρατιωτῶν (Acts xii. 4). — ἐκ τῶν ἄνωθεν ὑφαντὸς δι' ὅλου] *From the top* (where the button-hole was, ἀπ' αὐχένος, Nonnus) *woven quite through, throughout*, so that thus the garment was a single texture, woven from above entirely throughout, without seam, similar to the priestly vestment in Joseph. *Antt.* iii. 7. 4. See Braun, *de vestitu Hebr.* p. 342 ff.; Rosenmüller, *Morgenl.* V. p. 273 f. On the adverbial δι' ὅλου, comp. Asclep. 16; Nicand. 1; Plut. Mor. p. 695 f.; Bernhardt, p. 235, also δι' ὅλων, Plat. *Soph.* p. 253 C. — ἵνα ἡ γραφή, κ.τ.λ.] This casting of lots for the χιτῶν, after the division of the ἱμάτια, was not an accidental occurrence, but was in connection with the divine determination for the fulfilment of Scripture, which says, etc. The passage is Ps. xxii. 19, closely following the LXX. The suffering of the theocratic sufferer, in this psalm, is the prophetic type of the suffering of the Messiah. “*They have divided my garments amongst one another* (ἐαυτ. = ἀλλήλους, comp. Luke xxii. 17), *and cast lots over my raiment*,”—this complaint of the Psalmist, who sees himself as being already subjected to the death of a criminal, and the division of his garments among his executioners therewith connected, has found its Messianic fulfilment in the corresponding treatment of Christ, in so far as *lots* have also been cast over *His* raiment (in reality, over His under-garment). In this fulfilment the χιτῶν was that portion of His clothing on which the ἐπὶ τὸν ἱματισμόν μου ἔβαλον κληρὸν was historically carried out; but we are not, for this reason, to say that John took τὸν ἱματισμόν as equivalent to τ. χιτῶνα (Lücke, De Wette. — οἱ μὲν οὖν στρατ. τ. ἐποί] Simple (reminding one

of Herod., Xen., and others) concluding formula for this scene of the *soldiers'* proceedings. On *μὲν οὖν*, see on Luke iii. 18. — *ταῦτα*] That related in vv. 23, 24. A *secret* allusion,<sup>1</sup> in these closing words (Hengstenberg, Godet), is arbitrarily forced upon them.

Vv. 25-27. Another narrative, selected by John, and peculiar to him, as elevated and striking in its contents as it is simple and tender in form, and all the more unjustly relegated to the inventions made (Strauss, Baur, Schenkel) in the interest of John, although in the Synoptics (Matt. xxvii. 56; Mark xv. 40) the women mentioned stand *afar off*, which standing *afar off* is to be placed *after* the present scene, not *before*, as Lücke and Olshausen, in opposition to the synoptical account, are of opinion. — *ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ... Μαγδαληνῇ*] Are only *three* women here named (*usual* opinion), so that *Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ* is in apposition to *ἡ ἀδελφὴ, κ.τ.λ.*; or are there *four* (Wieseler in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1840, p. 648 ff., Lücke, Lange, Ewald, Laurent, *Neut. Stud.* p. 170 f.), so that *Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ* is to be taken by itself, and the women are brought forward in *two pairs*? The Syr. already interpreted in the latter mode, and hence inserted a *καί* before *Μαρία* (as also Aeth. and Pers.); so also have Lachm. (ed. *min.*, not in the large edition) and Tisch. interpunctuated (without a comma after *Κλωπᾶ*). As it is highly improbable of itself, and established by no instance, that two sisters bore the same name,—as, further, it is in keeping with the peculiarity of John not to mention his *own* name, if he also does not mention his *mother*,<sup>2</sup> or even his brother James,

<sup>1</sup> Hengstenberg: "But the occupation itself stands under a secret direction, and sacred irony passes over irony to the side of profane irony." Here Scholten coincides with Hengstenberg, supplying: "who knew nothing of the O. T., etc."

<sup>2</sup> He does, indeed, name in xxi. 2 his *father*. But the latter appears so without participation in the evangelical history, that he might appear to John's mind in his Christian relation, especially in the late period of the composition of the appendix, chap. xxi., more foreign and remote, and that consequently a hesitation might not exist in reference to naming him, as there did in the case of the mother, founded on a delicate and more spiritual consideration. — Scholten changes the mother into an *allegorical* person, in whom the *Church* is represented, to care for which was to be incumbent on John, not on Peter. So substantially also Späth in Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr.* 1863, p. 187.

by name (see on i. 42), and as, according to Matt. xxvii. 56, Mark xv. 40, Salome was also amongst the above-named women, Wieseler's view, which is not throughout opposed by any well-founded doubts,<sup>1</sup> is to be deemed not "a mere *learned refinement*" (Hengstenberg), but *correct*, so that thus the unnamed ἡ ἀδελφὴ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ is Salome, the mother of John. — ἡ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ] *The wife of Klopas*, according to Matt. xxvii. 56, Mark xv. 40, Luke xxiv. 10, mother of the younger James, hence *Klopas* is to be taken as *Alphaeus*, ἁλφῆ, Matt. x. 3. According to Ewald, on the other hand, the *mother* of *Kleopas*, Luke xxiv. 18, and according to Beza: the *wife* of this *Kleopas*. — Μαγδαλ.] See on Matt. xxvii. 56. — That Jesus enjoins on *John* to care for Mary, although the latter had several sons of her own, is not sufficiently explained by the unbelief of the brothers (vii. 5), for His speedy triumph over this (Acts i. 14) could not be hidden from Him (ii. 24, 25); but it presupposes the certainty in His mind that generally to *no other's* hand could this dear legacy<sup>2</sup> be so well entrusted. That Mary had no other sons (see in opposition to this vii. 3, and on Matt. i. 25) is, indeed, still inferred by Hengstenberg. For γύναι, comp. on ii. 4. — The words to the disciple, *behold thy mother*, meet no stumbling-block in the fact that he had his own actual mother, nay, that she herself was also present (see on ver. 25), but leave his relation to the latter untouched, and form with the ἴδε ὁ υἱὸς σου a parallelism, which expresses the filial care and protection which Mary, on the one hand, was to *expect* from John; which John, on the other hand, was to *exercise* towards Mary. — καὶ ἀπ' ἐκείνης τῆς ὥρας, κ.τ.λ.] Not to be regarded as a parenthesis; to be taken with strict literality, that John *forthwith*, after Jesus had accomplished His end upon the cross, entered on his

<sup>1</sup> Insufficient objections in Luthardt, Brückner, Baeumlein, Weizsäcker, and others. According to Euth. Zigabenus, Ebrard, Hengstenberg, and several others, ἀδελφὴ would signify *sister-in-law*.

<sup>2</sup> This noblest blossom of dying piety is violently removed into a sphere foreign to it, if it is transported into *dogmatic* ground, as Steinmeyer, p. 200, does. According to him, the death of the *Atoner for all men*, as such, has completely cut asunder the tie that hitherto existed; by *this* death Jesus departed out of every naturally-conditioned individual fellowship, and like Melchizedek must also appear as ἀμήτωρ. Of *such* a meaning, John gives not the slightest indication.

charge. Whether and where he possessed a property of his own is matter of conjecture. If he received Mary into his *dwell-  
ing*, into his *family circle*, formed by Salome, and perhaps by his brother, then εἰς τὰ ἴδια (comp. xvi. 32) was a correct expression. Ewald well remarks on such traits of individual significance in the Gospel of John: "it was for him at a late period of life a sweet reward to call up reminiscences of all that was most vivid, but for the readers it is also, without his will, a token that only he could have written all this." If, indeed, the designation of the disciple *beloved* by Jesus as a *self-designation* were a *vanity* (Scholten), nay, an arrogant and scornful *self-exaltation* (Weisse), then it could *not* have been he who wrote all this. But the consciousness of pre-eminent love on the part of the Lord, true, clear, and still glowing with all intensity and strength, in the heart of the old man, is inconceivable without the deepest humility, and this humility, which has long since ceased to have anything in common with the feeling evinced in Mark x. 35 ff., Luke ix. 54, has precisely in that most simple of all expressions, *ὁν ἡγάπα*, its most correspondent expression and its necessary and sacred justification, which is as little to be passed over in silence, or to be denied, as is the consciousness of Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 10.

Ver. 28. *Μετὰ τοῦτο*] Not indefinitely *later*, but *after this scene* with Mary and John. — *εἰδὼς, κ.τ.λ.*] *as He was aware* (xiii. 1) *that His death was already at hand, that consequently all was already accomplished, in order to bring the Scripture to fulfilment*, in respect of the accomplishment of its predictions concerning His earthly work, He now still desires, at this goal of accomplishment, a refreshment, and says: *I thirst*. Accordingly, *ἵνα τελ. ἡ γραφή* is to be referred to *πάντα ἡδὴ τετέλ.*, as Cyril (?), Bengel, Michaelis, Semler, Thalem., van Hengel (*Annot.* p. 62 ff.), Paulus, Tholuck, Hofmann,<sup>1</sup> Luthardt, Lange, Baeumlein, Scholten, Steinmeyer, have connected it. This is the correct construction, because *πάντα ἡδὴ τετέλ.* leaves us no room to think of a fulfilment of Scripture still *remaining behind*, and consequently *excludes* the connection of *ἵνα τελ. ἡ γρ.* with *λέγει*; because, further, *τελειώθη* is *selected*

<sup>1</sup> *Weissag. u. Erf.* II. p. 146. On the other hand, Hofmann, in the *Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 314, has altered his views, and connects *ἵνα τελ. ἡ γρ.* with *λέγει*.

simply for the sake of its reference to τετέλ. (it is the πληρωσις of Scripture, *to which now nothing more is wanting*), and because John never makes the statement of purpose, "that the Scripture might be fulfilled," *precede* the moment of fulfilment, and even where a single definite fact is the fulfilling element, always actually *adduces* the passage of Scripture in question (xvii. 12 is a retrospective indication of a passage already before *adduced*). Hence the *ordinary* interpretation must be given up (Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, Ruperti, and many others, including Lücke, De Wette, Brückner, Strauss, B. Crusius, Baur, Ewald, Hengstenberg, Godet), that ἵνα τελ., κ.τ.λ. refers to λέγει διψῶ, so that it contains the scriptural ground of the *thirst*, to which Jesus gave expression, and of the *drinking of the vinegar* which was given to Him, and Ps. lxix. 22 is the passage intended; where, however, the drinking of vinegar is the work of scorn and of malice, which would not be at all appropriate *here*, since it is simply the *quenching of thirst* immediately before death that is in question, without other and further background. — πάντα ἤδη τετέλ.] τουτέστιν ὅτι οὐδὲν λείπει τῇ οἰκονομίᾳ, Chrysostom; ἤδη (*already*) points to the very *early* occurrence of His death (Nonnus: θοῶς).

Vv. 29, 30. Ἐκεῖτο] as in ii. 6. The vessel was in readiness for the purpose of quenching the thirst of those crucified (who had always to suffer much therefrom), with sponge and stalk of hyssop, which were to serve for handing it up. — ὄξους] *vinegar*, i.e. small sour wine (from the skins of grapes already pressed), which served as a drink for labourers and soldiers; Wetstein on Matt. xxvii. 34; Hermann, *Privatalterth.* § 26. 10. Of the bitter *stupifying drink*, which Jesus had disdained to receive (Matt. xxvii. 34, 35; Mark xv. 23, 24), John says nothing. On the drink tendered to him, Luke xxiii. 36, see *in loc.* — The subject of σπόγγον, κ.τ.λ. is not named; yet there can be no doubt about who are meant, the *soldiers*. — ὑσσώπῳ] *More exactly* than in Matt. xxvii. 48, and since the hyssop grows stalks from 1 to 1½ feet high (Bochart, *Hieroz.* I. 2. 50; Celsius, *Hierobot.* I. p. 407 f.), such an one was fully sufficient to reach to the mouth of Jesus on the not lofty (Salmasius, *de*

*cruce*, p. 284) cross.<sup>1</sup> — αὐτοῦ τῷ στόματι] *to His mouth*. That the stalk was precisely of *hyssop*, is accidental; as *hyssop* of *scorning*, in opposition to the *hyssop* of *reconciliation*, Ps. li. (Hengstenberg), it is not to be thought of, since the tender of the drink in the present passage is certainly not an act of scorn. Moreover, it is precisely such non-essential special statements as these which have flowed from the most vivid recollection of an eye-witness. — τετέλεσται] Quite as in ver. 28, to be referred to the *work* of Jesus. Comp. xvii. 4. It is *by Him* brought to completion with this *act of the last death-suffering*. Further, Bengel aptly remarks: "hoc verbum in corde Jesu erat, ver. 28, nunc ore profertur." — παρέδ. τὸ πν.] *He gave over* (to God) *His spirit*, characteristic designation of dying, in conformity with that which dying *was* in *Jesus'* case. It is the *actual* surrender of His self-conscious Ego on the decease of the body; the *verbal* surrender, Luke xxiii. 46,<sup>2</sup> appears, since John has, instead of it, the simply grand concluding word τετέλεσται, to belong to the enlarging representations of tradition, but, after the bowing of the head, would be no longer suitable, and hence must be assumed as taking place after τετέλεσται. — Note further, that the εἶναι εἰς τ. κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς meant in i. 18 did not now take place, but first by means of the ascension (xx. 17).

Ver. 31. Οὖν] *Therefore*, since Jesus was already dead. Their object was already attained; so now the Sabbath also should still have its rights. "Magnifici honoratores Dei, cum in conscientia mala reposuissent sanguinem justī," Ruperti. — ἵνα μὴ μείνῃ, κ.τ.λ.] Contrary to the Roman custom, of leaving the corpse to putrefy on the cross (comp. on Matt. xxvii. 58), on the part of the Jews, the injunction has to be applied respecting the removal of the *hanged person*, Deut. xxi. 22, 23 (comp. Joseph. *Bell.* iv. 5. 2), especially in the

<sup>1</sup> Least of all with a *dogmatic* background, although Steinmeyer assumes that δέσφω is a *request to His enemies*, and thereby illustrates the *love*, which completed the act of *atonement*. This request, he thinks, only the dying *Mediator* could have made.

<sup>2</sup> Of the seven words on the cross, only Matt. xxvii. 46, according to Schenkel's too rash conclusion, is to be considered as altogether beyond doubt. Mark also has only this one (xv. 34), Luke has three (xxiii. 34, 43, 46), and John likewise three (xix. 26, 27, 28, 30).



present case where with sunset the Sabbath began, and *this a great Sabbath*, and therewith a wish was expressed to see the crucified ones removed and interred in the interval before the beginning of the holy day. — παρασκευῇ] Because it was the *day of preparation*, namely, τοῦ σαββάτου, for the Sabbath. This reference of παρασκ. necessarily follows from ἐν τῷ σαββάτῳ. But the parenthesis ἦν γὰρ μεγάλη, κ.τ.λ. indicates why they wished not to have the Sabbath, especially *on that occasion*, desecrated by the bodies remaining on the cross; because *great*, i.e. pre-eminently holy (comp. vii. 37; Isa. i. 13), was the day of that Sabbath, because, that is, it was (not merely generally a Sabbath in the Passover feast time, but) at the same time the *first day of Passover*, the 15th Nisan. It was thus a Sabbath *with twofold authority*, since the first feast-day also had the character of a Sabbath (Lev. xxiii. 7–15). With a Quartodeciman usage of speech (Hilgenfeld) the designation of the Sabbath in the present passage has nothing to do. See Steitz in the *Jahrb. f. Deutsche Theol.* 1861, p. 113 ff. As the *second* feast-day, however, which is the day that results from the attempts at harmonizing (see on xviii. 28), it could only be termed μεγάλη, for the reason that on this day, i.e. the 16th Nisan, the *feast of Sheaves* took place, Lev. xxiii. 10 ff. (see especially Wieseler, p. 385 f., 344). But how could John have presupposed, in his readers, without any indication, a reference to *this*? These could explain to themselves the μεγαλότης of that Sabbath only from ver. 14, from the fact, namely, that the παρασκευὴ τοῦ σαββάτου of which John speaks was at the same time, according to ver. 14, παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα. — ἵνα κατεαγῶσιν κ.τ.λ.] For two were, indeed, still living, and also with respect to Jesus they had at least no certainty that He was actually dead. On the apparent contradiction with Mark xv. 44, see on ver. 38. The *crushing of the legs* with clubs (*crucifragium*, σκελοκοπία) was to accelerate death (as John also manifestly views it, comp. ver. 33), and that in a barbarous manner, in order to take nothing from the severity of the punishment. See Lactantius, *Instit. div.* iv. 26; Lipsius, *de cruce*, ii. 14. It also appears as a punishment by itself, Suetonius, *Aug.* 67; Seneca, *de ira*, iii. 32; and see generally Wetstein, also Lipsius, *ad Plaut.*

*Asin.* ii. 4. 68. The addition of a *finishing blow*, by which (therefore not by the crucifragium in itself) death was brought about, cannot be shown, least of all, from ver. 34, against Michaelis, Semler, Kuinoel, Hug. On the aorist form with syllabic augment from *κατάγνυμι*, see Winer, p. 68 [E. T. p. 85].

Vv. 32, 33. To assume, on account of Mark xv. 39 (comp. Matt. xxvii. 54), that these soldiers were *others* (sent out by Pilate) than those who had crucified Jesus (Storr, Kuinoel, Olshausen, Maier, Lange), is indicated by nothing in the text, where rather *οἱ στρατιῶται* are those already *known*. The *ἦλθον* is only *pictorial*, and the *centurion* does not come into consideration with John. — Since they came to Jesus last, we must suppose that two each began on the two sides of the three crosses.

Ver. 34. The soldiers, *when they saw*, etc. The death of Jesus, in keeping with their attitude of indifference in the matter, had therefore been unobserved by them (in answer to Hengstenberg); they now omitted the leg-breaking in His case, as aimless in the case of one already dead. *But one pierced Him with a lance in the side*. Wherefore? Not in order to *ascertain whether* He was actually dead; for, according to the context, the thrust took the place of breaking the legs. Hence it must be assumed, according to the analogy of the latter, that the object of the thrust was *to make quite sure* of the death of Jesus, *i.e.* in case He should not yet be altogether dead, to put Him completely to death. — *αὐτοῦ τ. πλευράν*] *His side*. *Which?* is not clear; but the *left*, if he who dealt the thrust stood before the cross, was most naturally at hand. — *ἐνυξέ*] Neither the word itself (since *νύσσειν* ordinarily denotes *violent* thrusting or stabbing; especially frequent in Homer, see Duncan, ed. Rost, p. 796), nor the person of the rude soldier, nor the weapon (*lance*, belonging to the heavy armour, Eph. vi. 11), nor the purpose of the thrust, nor the palpable nature of the opening of the wound, to be assumed, according to xx. 27, nor *ἐξεκέντησαν*, ver. 37, admit the interpretation, which is implied in the interest of an apparent death, of a superficial *scratch* (Paulus). — *αἷμα κ. ὕδωρ*] *is*, considering the difference and significance of the two

substances, certainly not to be taken as a *hendiadys* ("a reddish lymph," Paulus<sup>1</sup>). Whether the blood and water issued forth *contemporaneously* or *after one another*, does not appear from the words. In the *natural*<sup>2</sup> mode of regarding this twofold issue, it is thought *either* (1) that Jesus was *not yet dead*, but simply *died* in consequence of the thrust, which pierced the pericardium with its watery lymph, and at the same time the chamber of the heart, from which the blood welled (so the two physicians Gruner in the *Commentat. de Jesu Chr. morte vera non simulata*, etc., Halle 1805), to which, however, the mode of contemplation of the entire apostolical church is opposed, which was certain, and had the personal testimonies of Christ Himself to the fact that in His *crucifixion itself* the putting to death was accomplished. Or (2) it is assumed that the blood had been *decomposed* in the corpse (Hase, Krabbe, and several others), so that *serum*, bloody water, and *placenta*, clots of blood, separately issued forth; which separate outflow, however, of the constituent

<sup>1</sup> To this conclusion Hofmann also (*Weissag. u. Erfüll.* II. p. 148 f.) again involuntarily returned, understanding *undecomposed*, still *flowing* blood, as a sign that the body of Jesus was exempt from corruption. See, in opposition, also Luthardt. But Hofmann, in his *Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 490, has renounced the above interpretation, and now has represented the matter thus: the bleeding away of the dead one had been so complete, that at last not blood, but water flowed, and this was to the apostle a proof that Jesus' corpse remained exempt from corruption, which begins with the decomposition of the blood. Comp. also Baumgarten, p. 423 f., and Godet. But so physiological an observation and conclusion is not to be adopted without some more precise indication; and of the *complete* bleeding away on which, *finally*, water flowed, the text says nothing, but speaks simply and solely of blood and water, which issued forth.

<sup>2</sup> In a natural way, but in a higher sense, Lange, II. p. 1614 f., explains the phenomenon from the process of *change* through which the body of Christ was passing. A precarious expedient, in which not only is the possibility of a clear representation wanting, but also the essential and necessary point of the reality of the *death*, as of the condition of separation from the body, is endangered, and instead of the *death*, the beginning of another modality of corporeal *life* is conceived; while, generally also, the process of this assumed change must have been passed through in a very material way. Besides, the body of the Risen One had not yet been transformed (He still eats, still drinks, etc.), though *altered* and become more spiritual, but the *transformation* first begins at the *ascension* (comp. 1 Cor. xv. 51-53). A possible *preparation* for this transformation from the moment of death onwards is beyond the scope of any more exact representation, and very precipitate is the conclusion that this preparation must also have announced itself by some sign in the wounded body.

parts of blood cannot, in the case of a fresh body that had been healthy, be anatomically established. Or (3) the *heart* is considered, just as the Gruners suppose, as having been pierced through, though the death of Jesus is assumed to have already *previously* taken place (Beza, Calvin, Grotius, Wetstein, and several others), as also Ewald, *Gesch. Chr.* p. 584 (the death of Jesus was a sudden breaking of the heart), holds to be most probable. Not substantially different is the view of the English physician William Stroud, *A Treatise on the physical cause of the death of Christ*, London 1847, comp. Tholuck, who, besides the cavity of the heart, brings into consideration also the two bags of the diaphragm, with the fact of their fluidity in corpses. This mode of regarding the matter renders unnecessary the entirely arbitrary theory of Ebrard, p. 563 ff., of *extravasations* and *sugillations* which the thrust occasioned,<sup>1</sup> and would be quite satisfactory if John had desired to give an account generally of a natural, physiological effect of the lance-thrust. But irrespective of the fact that he adduces nothing which would allow us to think in ὕδωρ not of actual *water*, but of *lymph* (ἰχώρ), he desires to set forth the phenomenon manifestly as something entirely *unexpected* (note also the εὐθύς), *extraordinary*, *marvellous*. Only thus is his solemn asseveration in ver. 35, and the power of conviction for the Messiahship of Jesus, which he finds in the truth of the ἐξῆλθεν, κ.τ.λ., to be comprehended. To him it was not a *subsidiary circumstance* (Ebrard, comp. Lücke on ver. 35, and Baeumlein), which convinced the *soldier who gave the thrust* of the death of the Crucified One, but a *miraculous σημεῖον*, which further set forth that the corpse was that of the divine *Messiah* (τρανώς διδάσκον, ὅτι ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπου ὁ νυγείς, Euth. Zigabenus), of whose specific calling and work, blood and water are the speaking *symbols*, in so far, that is, as He has by blood brought the redemptive work to completion, and by means of *water* (i.e. by means of the birth from above, which takes place through baptism, iii. 5) has

<sup>1</sup> They originated, he thinks, through the distension of the muscles, and from them the water issued; but in penetrating deeper the lance also touched places of fluid blood. — But in this way not αἷμα καὶ ὕδωρ, but ὕδωρ καὶ αἷμα would have issued forth.

appropriated it ; a significance which Tholuck also esteems probable in the sense of the Gospel. Comp. also Steinmeyer, who, however, ascribes to the water only the *subordinate* purpose, to place the blood under the point of view of the definite (purifying) operation. Luther : " our redemption is concealed in the miraculous work." Comp. 1 John v. 6, where, however, τὸ ὕδωρ, agreeably to the standard of the *historical* point of view (ἐλθών), stands first. See also Weiss, *Lehrbegr.* p. 255. We must abide by this exegetical conclusion<sup>1</sup> (comp. Hengstenberg on ver. 37), and must renounce the demonstration of natural connection not less than in other miraculous appearances of the evangelical history.<sup>2</sup> The *figurative* interpretation or *explaining away of the fact itself* (Baur, p. 217 ff. : by reference to vii. 38, 39 : it is the representation, contemplated by the writer in a spiritual manner, of the idea that with the death of Jesus there immediately begins the fulness of spiritual life, which was to proceed from Him on behalf of the world) is only possible on the assumption that neither *John* nor He gave an *historical* account, as further Baur (see p. 272 ff.), whom Scholten follows, refers the entire narrative of the omission to break the legs, and of the side-thrust, simply to the dogmatic interest of representing Jesus as the true Paschal lamb, and

<sup>1</sup> Fathers and artists have decked it out in monstrous colours, e.g. Nonnus, διδύμαις λιβάδισσιν, first blood, then θίσκικον ὕδωρ flowed ; Prudentius, *Enchir.* 42 : both sides were pierced ; from *one* blood, from the *other* water flowed. See also Thilo, *ad Cod. Apocr.* p. 587 f. In the two substances the two sacraments were symbolically seen, as Augustine, Chrysostom, and many others ; Tertullian, Euth. Zigabenus, and several others saw therein the baptism of water and the baptism of blood. Comp. Cornelius a Lapide *in loc.* *Baptism* and the *Lord's Supper* have also recently been found set forth in several ways in water and blood. See particularly Weisse, II. p. 326 f. In this way historic truth is of course given up. Hilgenfeld, *Evang.* p. 317 : " The redemptive death is the condition of the Christian sacrament generally, which here in its twofold form figuratively flows forth from the body of the crucified One." This, he thinks, naturally suggested itself to John, since according to his representation Jesus was the true paschal sacrifice, the recognition of which in the *Gentile world* is brought into view by the lance-thrust of the *Roman* soldier. Other arbitrary explanations in Strauss.

<sup>2</sup> The symbolic signification in regard to the true *expiatio*, and the true *lavacrum*, is also assumed by Calvin ; but he disputes the supernatural element in the fact : " *naturale enim est, dum coagulatur sanguis, omisso rubore fieri aquae similem.*"

thereby the turning-point at which the O. T. economy of religion ceased to exist, and the new began, the essence of which is contemplated in the blood and water that flowed out. See in opposition to Baur: Grimm in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1847, p. 181 ff., and 1849, p. 285 ff.

Ver. 35. After *μαρτυρία* a comma only should be placed, and nothing should be put within a parenthesis, neither *καὶ ἀληθινὴ . . . λέγει* (van Hengel), nor *κ. ἀληθινὴ . . . οἶδεν* (Schulz), since the discourse progresses simply and without interruption by *καί. — ὁ ἑώρακ.*] placed first with great emphasis; the correlate *κακεῖνος* has subsequently the like emphasis. *He who has seen it*, not heard only from others, but himself has been an *eye-witness*, *has testified it* (herewith, ver. 34), namely, this outflow of blood and water. *This* was indeed the apparently so incredible thing, not also the omission of the leg-breaking. When in the third person, in which John here speaks of *himself* while passing over His name, commentators have found the diversity of the writer and the witness betrayed (Weisse, Schweizer, Köstlin, Hilgenfeld, Tobler, Weizsäcker), this was simply a misapprehension, running counter to *κακεῖνος οἶδεν, κ.τ.λ.*, of the circumstantially solemn style which fully corresponds to the quite extraordinary importance which John attributes to the phenomenon. The *ἐκεῖνος*, that is to say, is the *speaking subject himself* presented objectively, identical therefore with the *ἑωρακώς*, which clearly appears from the context by the pres. *λέγει*, and the final clause *ἵνα κ. ὑμ. πιστ.*, especially also by the correlation of *καὶ ὑμεῖς* with the subject. Comp. on ix. 37. Hence we are by no means to assume that the *secretary* of the apostle speaks of him by *ἐκεῖνος* as of a third person (Ewald, *Jahrb.* 10, p. 88), but *the apostle himself* presents himself objectively as the *ille*, like a third person; he may at the same time have employed another as amanuensis (which does not follow even from chap. xxi.) or not; comp. xxi. 24. — *ἀληθινὴ*] placed with emphasis at the head of the clause (*αὐτοῦ* has then the next emphasis); not, however, equivalent to *ἀληθής*, as is usually assumed, contrary to the constant usage of John (and the moment of *ἀλήθεια* first follows afterwards), but: a *true* testimony is *his* witness, which corresponds in reality to the

idea of a *μαρτυρία*—namely, for the very reason that he himself has seen what he testifies. Comp. on viii. 16. — *ἵνα*] Neither to be taken as dependent on *ὁ ἔωρ. μεμαρτ.* (Lücke), nor as independently: “and therefore should,” etc. (De Wette), but, as the position of the words requires, stating the purpose of *λέγει*: he knows that he says true, says *that you also* (his readers) *may believe*, as he himself has believed through means of that miraculous appearance, namely, *on Jesus the Son of God*. As frequently in John (comp. on ii. 11), *πιστεύειν* is also here not first the entrance into faith, but *a higher and stronger degree of faith*, which one experiences, the *πιστεύειν* in a new and exalted potency. Comp. xxi. 31. Others, as Baeumlein, still have incorrectly referred *πιστ.* merely to what was last mentioned as object, whereby in truth the comparison with John himself, which lies in *καὶ ὑμεῖς*, would not be at all appropriate, because John has *seen* (not merely believed) what took place. The *solemn absolute πιστεύειν*, with its destination of purpose, makes the assumption of special designs in view, which have been ascribed to John in his testimony of the outflow of blood and water, appear unwarranted, namely, that he desired to prove the actual death of Jesus (Beza, Grotius, and many others), especially in opposition to *docetic* error, Hammond, Paulus, Olshausen, Ammonius, Maier, and several others. Doubts of a naturalistic and docetic kind might rather have derived support than have been precluded by the enigmatic outflow, which excited the derision of Celsus, in Or. ii. 36. The Valentinians maintained: *ἐξεκέντησαν δὲ τὸ φαινόμενον, ὃ ἦν σὰρξ τοῦ ψυχικοῦ*, *Exc. ex Theod.* 62.

Vv. 36, 37. Not without scriptural ground do I say: *ἵνα κ. ὑμεῖς πιστεύσητε*; *for that is accomplished*, which I have just testified, vv. 33, 34, concerning the lance-thrust, which took the place of the omitted leg-breaking, in the connection of the divine determination *for the fulfilment of the scriptural saying* (*γραφὴ* as in xiii. 18): *a bone of Him shall not be broken* (Ex. xii. 46; Num. ix. 12).<sup>1</sup> To John as to Paul

<sup>1</sup> As regards its essential substance quite undestroyed, not like a profane dish of roast meat with bones broken in pieces, was the paschal lamb to be prepared as a sacrifice to God (Ewald, *Alterth.* p. 467 f.; Knobel on Lev. i. 7). Any peculiar *symbolical* destination in this prescription (Bähr and Keil: to set forth

(1 Cor. v. 7) Christ is the *antitype* of the *paschal lamb* intended in the historical sense of that passage, in which Baur and Hilgenfeld of course find the *formative* factor of the history. Ps. xxxiv. 21 (Grotius, Brückner), because the passage speaks of the protection of *life*, cannot here be thought of. —The second passage of Scripture, to which, moreover, the reader himself is left to supply the same telic connection, which was previously expressed by *ἵνα ἡ γρ. πληρ.*, contains the O. T. prediction of the *lance-thrust* which has been narrated, so far as it concerned precisely the *Messiah*: *they will look on Him whom they have pierced*,—an expression of the future, repentant, believing recognition of and longing for Him who previously was so hostilely murdered. The subject of both verbs is the *Jews* (not the *Gentiles*), whose work the entire crucifixion generally (comp. Acts ii. 23, 36), and consequently mediately, the *ἐκκένησις* also is. The passage is Zech. xii. 10, where the language is used of a martyr, who at a later time is repentantly mourned for. The citation is freely made from the original (so also Rev. i. 7), not from the LXX., who take קָרָן improperly: *κατωρχήσαντο*, *have insulted* (Aquinas, Theodotus, and Symmachus have also *ἐξεκέντησαν*, and rightly). John also follows the reading וְלֹא,<sup>1</sup> which Ewald also prefers. — *εἰς ὃν*] Attraction = *εἰς ἐκεῖνον ὃν*, comp. vi. 29. To make *εἰς ὃν* dependent on *ἐξεκέντ.* (Luther, after the Vulgate: “they will see *into whom they have pierced*,” Baur: “that they have, namely, pierced *into Him* from whose side blood and water flowed”) corresponds neither to the original, nor to the Greek construction, according to which not *ῥακεντεῖν εἰς τινα*, but *ἐκκ. τινα* is said (Rev. i. 7; Judg. ix. 54; 1 Chron. x. 4; Isa. xiv. 19; 2 Macc. xii. 6; Polyb. v. 56. 12, xv. 33. 4, xxv. 8. 6). It always denotes *pierce*,

the unity of those who eat) cannot be established, not even by a retrospective conclusion from 1 Cor. x. 17.

<sup>1</sup> Not וְלֹא; Umbreit's observation in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1849, p. 104, that the passage of Zech. has a *Johannan* element for the idea of the Messiah, because God identifies Himself with the Messiah, applies only to the reading וְלֹא, which further Hofmann, *Weissag. u. Erf.* II. p. 152 f., has sought, in a very tortuous way, to unite with the following accus. וְאֵת אֲנִי; he is followed by Luthardt: “They will longingly look up to me, after Him (i.e. expect, entreat of me *Him*) whom they,” etc.



*stab.* So also here Jesus was not indeed first killed by the lance-thrust, but this thrust formed, as its conclusion, a part of the whole act of putting to death, and formed, therefore, the Messianic fulfilment of the prophetic word. On *ὁράω εἰς*, *look upon*, in the sense of regard, desire, hope, etc., comp. Xen. *Cyr.* iv. 1. 20; Soph. *El.* 913; Stanley, *ad. Aesch. Sept.* 109. Just so *ἀποβλέπειν εἰς* or *πρός*: Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* iv. 2. 2. The LXX. have *ἐπιβλέφονται πρὸς*. The *time of the fulfilment* of this prophetic *ὄψονται, κ.τ.λ.*, is, as also in the original, that of the beginning of *repentance and conversion*; comp. viii. 28, xii. 32; not the day of *judgment* (Euth. Zigabenus, Grotius, and several others, comp. already Barnab. 7), to which *ὄψονται*, with the *mere* accus., as in Rev. i. 7, not with *εἰς*, would be appropriate. — A word of Scripture, speaking *specially of the outflow of blood and water*, does not, indeed, stand at the command of John; but if the facts themselves, with which this outflow was connected, namely, the negative one of the non-breaking of the legs (ver. 36), and the positive one of the lance-thrust (ver. 37), are predicted, so also in the miraculous *σημεῖον*, by which the thrust was accompanied, is justly, and on the ground of Scripture (*γάρ*, ver. 36), a special awakening of faith (ver. 35) to be found. — Schweizer, without reason, considers vv. 35–37 as spurious.

Vv. 38, 39. *Μετὰ ταῦτα*] Vv. 32–34. The request of Joseph of Arimathaea (see on Matt. xxvii. 57), that he might *take away* (*ἄρῃ*) the corpse, does not conflict with ver. 31. For let it be noted that the expression in ver. 31 is *passive*, not stating the subject who takes away. The Jews, who make the request, presume that it would be the soldiers. Pilate had granted the request in ver. 31, and had charged the soldiers with its execution, consequently with the breaking of the legs, and removal. The breaking of the legs they have in fact executed on the two who were crucified with Him, and omit it in the case of Jesus; and as *Joseph* requests from the procurator that he may take away the body of Jesus, and obtains permission, the order for removal given to the soldiers was now recalled in reference to *Jesus*, and they had to remove only the other two. It is, however, very conceivable that Joseph had still *time*, after vv. 32, 34, for

his request, since the soldiers after the crucifragium must certainly first await the complete decease of the shattered bodies, because it was permitted to remove only bodies actually dead from the cross. Thus there is neither here, and in ver. 31, a contradiction with Mark xv. 44 (Strauss); nor does *μετὰ ταῦτα* form, as De Wette finds, "a great and hitherto unnoticed difficulty;" nor are we, with Lücke, to understand ἄρῃ and ἥρῃ of the *fetching away* of the bodies (which the soldiers had removed), with which a groundless departure is made from the definition of the sense given in ver. 31, and a variation is made in an unauthorized way from Luke xxiii. 58; Mark xv. 46. — τὸ πρῶτον] *The first time*, iii. 2. Comp. x. 40. It does not exactly presuppose a subsequent still more frequent coming (in vii. 50 also there is only a retrospective reference to what is related in chap. iii.), but may also be said simply with reference to the *present public* coming to the *dead person*, so that only the *death* of Jesus had overcome the previous fear of men on the part of Nicodemus. *Myrrh-resin* and *aloe-wood*, these fragrant materials (Ps. xlv. 9) were placed in a pulverized condition between the bandages (ver. 40); but the *surprising quantity* (comp. xii. 3) is here explained from the fact that superabundant reverence in its sorrowful excitement does not easily satisfy itself; we may also assume that a portion of the spices was to be designed for the *couch* of the body in the grave, 2 Chron. xvi. 14.

Vv. 40–42. Ἐν ὀθονίοις] *In bandages*, so that He was enveloped therein, Plato, *Legg.* ix. p. 882 B; *Pol.* viii. p. 567 C; Judith xvi. 8. — καθὼς ἔθος, κ.τ.λ.] The custom of the Egyptians (Herod. ii. 86 ff.), *e.g.*, was different; amongst them the practice was to take out the brain and the intestines, or at least to deposit the body in nitre for seventy days. — ἐν τῷ τόπῳ] *in the district*, in the place. On ἐτέθη, used of the interment of bodies, comp. Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Rep.* p. 469 B. — The garden with the new grave, which as yet had been used for no other burial (and thereby worthy of the Messiah, comp. Luke xxiii. 53, xix. 30; Mark xi. 2), must have belonged to a proprietor, who permitted, or himself put it to this use. According to Matt. xxvii. 60, it belonged to Joseph himself; but see *in loc.* — διὰ τὴν παρὰ σκ.] On

account of the haste, then, which the nearness of the commencing Sabbath enjoined. Retrospect of ver. 31. — On the relation of the Johannean account of the *ἐνταφιασμός* of Jesus to Matt. xxvii. 59, and parallel<sup>1</sup> passages, see on Matt.

<sup>1</sup> According to Krenkel, in Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr.* 1865, p. 438 ff., implying a denial of the apostolical origin of our Gospel, Nicodemus is said to be identical with Joseph of Arimathaea, and the *ἐνταφιασμός* in the present passage to be **unhistorical**.

## CHAPTER XX.

VER. 11. τῷ μνημείῳ, instead of the *Recepta* τὸ μνημεῖον, is decisively attested. — ἔξω] stands in B. O. X. Δ. κ. \*\* 1, 33, Verss. Fathers *before* κλαίουςα, but is wanting in A. κ. \* Verss. Lachm. It is to be placed before κλαίουςα; so also Tisch. Being unnecessary in itself, it came to be readily passed over, considering the like final vowel of τῷ μνημείῳ ἔξω, and partially again restored in the wrong place. — Ver. 14. ταῦτα] Elz.: καὶ ταῦτα, against decisive witnesses (of which L. has ταῦτα δέ). — Ver. 16. Ἐβραϊστί] wanting in Elz., and is bracketed by Lachm., but so strongly attested, that it was far more probably passed over as superfluous and self-intelligible, than added to the text. — Ver. 17. μου] after the first πατέρα is wanting in B. D. κ. Codd. It. Or. (twice as against thrice) Chrys. Epiph. Deleted by Tisch., bracketed by Lachm. Was more readily added from the surrounding context than omitted, hence the omitting witnesses are strong enough for its deletion. — Ver. 18. ἀπαγγέλλουσα] Lachm. and Tisch.: ἀγγέλλουσα, according to A. B. J. X. κ. Codd. It. Since other important witnesses have ἀναγγέλλ., and copyists were not conversant with the simple form (it is not elsewhere found in the N. T.), ἀγγέλλ. is to be preferred. — Ver. 19. συνηγμένοι] after μαθ. is by Lachm. and Tisch. deleted, on decisive testimonies. A more exactly defining gloss. — Ver. 21. ὁ Ἰησοῦς] is omitted by Tisch., and, considering the frequency of the addition on sufficient testimonies, justly. — Ver. 23. ἀφίενται] Lachm.: ἀφένται. The weight of testimony is very much divided; ἀφένται, however, was the more readily introduced for the sake of uniformity with κεκράτ., the more familiar it was to copyists from the Synoptics. — Ver. 25. Instead of the second τύπον, Lachm. and Tisch. have τόπον. So A. J. Curss. Vulg. Codd. It. Syr. Pers. Or. Hil. Ambr. Aug. Correctly; τύπον came to be mechanically repeated, whilst the design of the different words was left unnoticed. — Vv. 28, 29. Before ἀπεκρ., Elz. has καί, before Θωμᾶς; ὁ, and before πεπίστ.: Θωμᾶ. Merely additions contrary to decisive witnesses, as also αὐτοῦ also after μαθητ., ver. 30, is, on important testimonies, to be, with Lachm. and Tisch., deleted.

Vv. 1, 2. On the designation of the first day of the week by *μία τῶν σαββ.*, as well as on the irreconcilable deviation of John,<sup>1</sup> who ("for *brevity's* sake!" Hengstenberg, indeed, thinks) makes only Mary Magdalene go to the grave, from the Synoptics, see on Matt. xxviii. 1. Of a *hastening beforehand* on the part of Mary, in advance of the remaining women (Luthardt, Lange, Ewald), there is no trace in the text. But when Luthardt even is of opinion that John, from the point of view of placing over against the consummation of Jesus Himself the perfecting of the disciples' faith, *could* not well have mentioned the other women (*why* not?), this would be a very doubtful consideration in reference to the historical truth of the apostle; just as doubtful, if he left other women without mention only *for the reason* that he heard the *first intelligence* from the mouth of the Magdalene (Tholuck). The reason, borrowed from *οἶδαμεν*, for the supposed plurality of the women is abundantly outweighed by *οἶδα*, ver. 13. — *σκοτίας ἔτι οὐσης*] Consequently not first after sunrise, Mark xvi. 2. See *in loc.* "Ostenditur mulieris sedulitas," Grotius. — *εἰς τ. μνημ.*] *to the grave*; comp. xi. 31, 38. — *ἐκ τοῦ μνημ.*] The stone had *filled* the opening of the grave outwards. — *καὶ πρὸς, κ.τ.λ.*] From the repetition of *πρὸς*, Bengel infers: "non una fuisse utrumque discipulum." But comp. ver. 3, and see, generally, Buttmann, *Neut. Gr.* p. 293 f. [E. T. p. 340 ff.]; comp. also Kuhner, *ad Xen. Mem.* i. 2. 52, i. 3. 3. — *ὄν ἐφίλει*] Comp. xi. 3, of Lazarus. Elsewhere of John: *ὄν ἠγάπα*, xix. 26, xxi. 7, 20. With *ἐφίλει* the recollection speaks with more feeling. — *οἶδαμεν*] The plur. does not presuppose that Mary had gone *not alone* to the grave, which is opposed to the account of John, but in her excitement she includes *also the disciples*, with whom she was speaking, and generally *those also who stood nearer to the Crucified One*, along with herself, although they as yet knew nothing of the removal itself. She speaks with a certain self-forgetfulness, from the

<sup>1</sup> In no section of the evangelical history have harmonists, with their artificial mosaic work, been compelled to expend more labour, and with less success, than in the section on the resurrection. The adjustment of the differences between John and the Synoptics, as also between the latter amongst themselves, is impossible, but the grand fact itself and the chief traits of the history stand all the more firmly.

consciousness of *fellowship*, in opposition to *the* parties to whom she attributes the *ἡρᾶν*. Note, further, how the possibility of having arisen remains as yet entirely remote from her mind. Not a word of any angelic communication (Matt. xxviii. 2; Mark xvi. 5; Luke xxiv. 4 ff., xxiv. 23), etc., which some, of course, seek prudently to cover by an intention on John's part to be *concise* (see especially Hengstenberg). — The harmonists, who make Mary to have only *hastened on before* the rest of the women, must lead them to Peter and John by *another* way than that which she followed. But surely it would have been most natural for her, in the first instance, to run to meet her companions who were following her, with the marvellous news, which, however, with Ewald, who makes the plur. *οἶδαμεν* indicate this, could only be read between the lines.

Vv. 3, 4. Note the change of the aorists and pictorial imperfects; comp. iv. 30. — Luke xxiv. 12 mentions only Peter; but comp. also Luke xxiv. 23. See *in loc.* The more rapid running of John, and then, again, the greater boldness of Peter, vv. 5, 6, are individual traits so characteristically original, that here (comp. on xviii. 15) it is highly inappropriate to charge the writer with an intention to place John before Peter (Strauss), or with the endeavour not to allow John, as opposed to Peter, to stand at least in the background (Baur).<sup>1</sup> — *τάχιον τοῦ Π.*] Love impelled both, and gave wings to their steps; but the *youthful* John *ran more quickly forwards* (*προέδρ.*, comp. Xen. *Anab.* iv. 7. 10) *than* Peter, whose *consciousness of guilt* (Lampe, Luthardt), especially *after* his bitter repentance, hardly restrained his running, as little as it withheld him, ver. 6, from stepping *before* John. Euth. Zigabenus is simply correct: *ὡς ἀκμαιότερος τὸν πόνον τοῦ σώματος*.

Vv. 5–8. *John* is withheld <sup>by</sup> natural terror (not dread of pollution, as Wetstein, Ammon, and several others think) from going in at once; the bolder and older *Peter*, however, goes in, and then, encouraged by his example and presence, John also enters. — Note how earnestly the fourth Gospel also states the fact of the *empty* grave, which is by no means

<sup>1</sup> This also in answer to Späth in Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr.* 1868, p. 189 f.

veiled in the darkness of an experience made in twilight, and of the reports of the women (Weizsäcker). — βλέπει, *he sees*; on the other hand, ver. 6, θεωρεῖ, *he contemplates*. See Tittmann, *Synon.* p. 111 f., 120 f. — τὰ ὀθόνια] The handkerchief (ver. 7) must consequently have so lain, that it did not meet the eye of John, when he, standing before the grave, bent down (παρακύνψας), *i.e.* bowed his head forwards through the low entrance in order to see within (Luke xxiv. 12; Sir. xxi. 23, xiv. 23; Lucian, *Paras.* 42, *et al.*, Aristoph., Theocr., Plutarch, etc.). Observe, further, that τὰ ὀθόνια here in ver. 6 is placed first (otherwise in ver. 5) in opposition to τὸ σουδάριον. — τὸ σουδάριον.] xi. 44; Luke xix. 20. — χωρίς] used adverbially (*separatim*) only here in the N. T., very frequently in the Greek writers. — εἰς ἓνα τόπον] belongs to ἐντετυλιγμ.: *wrapped up* (Aristoph. *Plut.* 692; *Nub.* 983) *in one place apart*, so that it was not, therefore, lying along with the bandages, but apart in a particular place, and was not spread out, but folded together. In so *orderly* a manner, not in precipitate confusion, did that take place which had been here done. In ἓνα is implied that the ὀθόνια and the handkerchief occupied *two* places. How thoroughly does this whole pictorial representation, comp. with Luke xxiv. 12, reveal the eye-witness! — εἶδε] Namely, the state of matters in the grave just related. — ἐπίστευσεν] that Jesus was *risen*. Comp. ver. 25. This, the grand object of the history, taken as a matter of course, and, from these unmistakeable *indicia*, now bringing conviction to the disciples, and see ver. 9. Hence neither generally: he believed *on Jesus as the Christ*, as in xix. 35 (Hengstenberg, Godet), nor merely: he believed *that which Mary*, ver. 2, *had said* (Erasmus, Luther, Aretius, Jansen, Clarius, Grotius, Bengel, Ebrard, Baeumlein, and several others, following Augustine and Theophylact). The articles left behind in the grave and laid aside, as related, in so orderly a manner, testified, in truth, precisely *against* a removal of the corpse. See already Chrysostom, Euth. Zigabenus, Nonnus. The *singular* only satisfies the never-to-be-forgotten *personal* experience of that moment, but does not exclude the contemporaneous faith of Peter also (in answer to Hilgenfeld and others), as is, moreover, unmistakeable from the following plur.

ἤδειςαν, although even Hengstenberg makes Peter, in conformity with Luke xxiv. 12, remain standing only in *amazement* (in which Godet also substantially follows him), but of which John says never a word.

Vv. 9, 10. Γάρ] Had they already possessed this understanding of Scripture at that time, the inspection made in the empty grave would not have been first needed, that there might be faith in the accomplishment of the resurrection. — ὅτι] εἰς ἐκεῖνο, ὅτι. See on ii. 18, ix. 17, xi. 51, xvi. 9. — δεῖ] Divine necessity. Comp. Luke xxiv. 26, 44, ix. 22. This knowledge of Scripture (comp. 1 Cor. xv. 4) first arose in their minds by means of the Risen One Himself (Luke xxiv. 27, 46 ff.; Acts i. 3), and subsequently in completeness through the outpouring of the Spirit (Acts ii. 24 ff.). Moreover, the personal previous declarations of Christ concerning His resurrection first became clear to them *ex eventu* (ii. 21, 22), hence they are not indeed to be called in question, but they (comp. x. 17, 18) cannot have been so definite in their purport as in the Synoptics (see on Matt. xvi. 21). — οὖν] Since they had now convinced themselves of the fact of the resurrection, they must now await further events. — πρὸς ἑαυτούς] home, πρὸς τὴν ἑαυτῶν καταγωγὴν, Euth. Zigabenus. Comp. Luke xxiv. 12 and Kypke thereon, also Wetstein on the present passage.

Vv. 11–13. Mary has followed to the grave the two disciples who ran before, but does not again meet them (they must have gone back another way), and now stands weeping at the grave, and that ἔξω, for further she dares not go. Yet she bends down in the midst of her weeping, involuntarily impelled by her grief, forward into the grave (see on ver. 5), and beholds two angels, etc. On the question of these: τὶ κλαίεις, Ammonius correctly observes: ἐρωτῶσι δὲ, οὐχ ἵνα μάθωσι, ἀλλ' ἵνα πάνσηται. — *Appearances of angels*, whom Schleiermacher indeed was here able to regard as persons commissioned by Joseph of Arimathaea (*L. J.* p. 471), are certainly, according to Scripture, not to be relegated into the mere *subjective* sphere; but they communicate with and render themselves visible and audible simply and solely to *him* for whom they are real, whilst they are not perceptible by others (comp.



xii. 29); wherefore we are not even to ask where the angels may have been in the grave during the presence of Peter and John (Griesbach thought: in the side passages of the grave). — ἐν λευκοῖς] Neut. : *in white*. That ἱμάτια are meant is a matter of course. See Winer, p. 550 [E. T. p. 739]. Wetstein *in loc.* Clothed in *white*, the pure heavenly appearances, in keeping with their nature of light, represent themselves to mortal gaze. Comp. Ewald, *ad Apoc.* p. 126 f. — ὅτι ᾗραν] *Because they, etc.* As yet the deep feeling of grief allows no place for any other thought. Of a message from angels, already received before this, there is no trace in John. The refrain of her deeply sorrowful feeling: *they have taken away my Lord*, etc., as in ver. 2, was still unaltered and the same. — On the *number and position* of these angels the text offers no indications, which, accordingly, only run out into arbitrary invention and poetry, as *e.g.* in Luthardt: there were *two* in antithesis to the two joint-crucified ones; they had *seated* themselves because they had no occasion to contend; seated themselves *at the head and at the feet*, because the body from head to feet was under the protection of the Father and His servants.

Vv. 14, 15. Her conversation with the angels is interrupted, as she turns round and—sees Jesus standing by, but unrecognised by her. — ἐστράφη εἰς τ. ὀπίσω] Whether accidentally only, or as seeking after her Lord, or because she heard the rustle of some one present, is not clear. Unauthorized, however, is the view of the scene adopted by Chrysostom, Theophylact, and Euth. Zigabenus, that the angels, on the sudden appearance of Jesus, had expressed their astonishment by their mien and gestures, by which Mary's attention had been aroused. — καὶ οὐκ ᾔδει, κ.τ.λ.] The unfamiliar clothing, her own troubled and weeping glance, and, along with this, the entire remoteness from her mind of the thought of the accomplished resurrection—all this may have contributed to the non-recognition. The essential cause, however, is to be found in the mysterious alteration of the corporeity and of the appearance of Jesus, which manifests itself from His resurrection onwards, so that He comes and disappears in a marvellous way, the identity of His person is doubted and again recognised, etc. See on Matt. xxviii. 17. That John imagined a

*withholding* of her vision, as in Luke xxiv. 16 (Calvin, Grotius, comp. already Ammonius), is in nowise indicated. Again, the *ἐν ἑτέρᾳ μορφῇ*, Mark xvi. 12, does not apply here. — *ὁ κηπουρός*] Naturally, since this unknown individual was *in the garden*, and already so early. Quite unnecessary, however, is the trivial assumption that He had on the *clothing of the gardener* (Kuinoel, Paulus, Olshausen, and several others), or: He was clothed with the *loin-cloth*, a piece of raiment used for field and garden labour, in which He had been crucified (altogether without evidence, comp. on xxi. 18) (Hug's invention in the *Freib. Zeitschr.* VII. p. 162 ff., followed by Tholuck). — *κύριε*] Address arising from her deeply prostrate, helpless grief. — *σὺ*] With emphasis, in retrospect of ver. 13. — *αὐτόν*] She presumes that the supposed gardener has heard her words just spoken to the angels. — *καὶ γὰρ αὐτ. ἀρῶ*] in order to inter Him elsewhere. Her overflowing love, in the midst of her grief, does not weigh her strength. "She forgets everything, her feminine habits and person," etc., Luther.

Ver. 16. Jesus now calls her *by name*. Nothing more. By the *voice*, and by *this voice*, which utters aloud her *name*, she was to recognise Him. — *σπραφέϊσα*] She had therefore, after ver. 14, again turned towards the grave. — *ῥαββουνί*] See on Mark x. 51. — The *Ἑβραϊστί* is, indeed, matter of course, and in itself is superfluous; but in this circumstantiality there lies a certain solemnity in the delineation of the impressive moment. Note how, on the mention of her name, there follows nothing further on her side also, except that she utters the expressive *Rabboni*! More she *cannot* in all the throng of joyful surprise. Thus took place the *ἐφάνη πρῶτον Μαρία τῇ Μαργδ.*, Mark xvi. 9.

Vv. 17, 18. Mary sees: it is the Lord. But affected and transported in the highest degree by His miraculous appearance, she knows not: is it He *bodily*, actually come forth out of the grave,—again become corporeally alive and risen? Or is it, on the other hand, His glorified *spirit*, which has been already *raised up to God*, and which again has descended to appear to her, so that He has only the bodily form, not the corporeal substance? Therefore, to have the certainty which her love-filled heart needed in this moment of sudden, pro-

foundest emotion, she would *take hold of, handle* Him, in order by feeling to obtain the conviction which the eye alone, in presence of this marvellous happiness, could not give her. This, however, Jesus prevents: *touch me not!* and gazing into her soul, gives her, by His own assurance, the certainty which she seeks, adding, as a reason for that repulse: *for I am not yet ascended to the Father*, therefore, as yet, no glorified spirit who has again come down from heaven whither he had ascended.<sup>1</sup> She would touch the Lord, as Thomas did subsequently, not, however, from unbelief, but because her faith strives after a definiteness with which her love cannot dispense. Only this interpretation, which is followed also by Baeumlein, strictly corresponds to the words generally, especially also to the γάρ, which assigns a reason, and imports no scenic accompaniments into the incident which are not in the passage; for ἄπτου leaves the reader to suppose nothing else that Mary desired to do, save simply the mere ἀπτεσθαι, therefore no embracing and the like. But scenic accompaniments are imported, and go far beyond the simple ἄπτου, if it is assumed that Mary *clasped the knees of Jesus* (comp. the frequent ἀπτεσθαι γούνων in Homer, *Od. a.* 512, *o.* 76, *φ.* 65, *ω.* 357, *et al.*), and desired, as *supplex*, to manifest her προσκύνησις to Him, as to a Being already glorified and returned from God (my first edition), or as *venorabunda* (so Lücke, Maier, Lange, Hilgenfeld, comp. Ewald). This could not be expected to be gathered by the reader from the mere *noli me tangere*; John must, in that case, have said, μὴ ἄπτου μου γονάτων, or μὴ γονυπετεῖ με, or μὴ προσκύνησόν μοι, or the like, or have previously related what Mary desired,<sup>2</sup> to which

<sup>1</sup> In οὕτω γάρ, &c. &c., is expressed, therefore, not “the dread of permitting a contact, and that which was thereby intended, before the ascension to the Father should be accomplished” (Brückner); but Jesus means thereby to say that Mary with her ἀπτεσθαι already presupposed in Him a condition which had not yet commenced, because it must have been preceded by His ascension to the Father.

<sup>2</sup> This also in answer to Baur, who thinks that Jesus was precisely on the point of ascending (see on ver. 18), and therefore did not wish to allow Himself to be detained by Mary *falling at His feet*. Comp. Köstlin, p. 190; Kiukel in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1841, p. 597 ff.—Among the ancient interpreters I find the strict verbal rendering of ἀπτεσθαι most fully preserved in Nonnus, who even refers it only to the clothing: Mary had approached her right hand to His garment; then Jesus says: ἰμῶν μὴ ψαῖι χιτῶνων.

it may be added, that Jesus elsewhere does not refuse the *προσκύνησις*; comp. especially Matt. xxviii. 9. He does not, indeed, according to Luke xxiv. 39, repel even the handling, but invites thereto; but in that instance, irrespective of the doubtfulness of the account, in a historical point of view, it should be noted (1) that Jesus, in Luke, *loc. cit.* (comp. John xx. 24 ff.), has to do with the direct doubt of His disciples in the reality of His bodily appearance, which doubt he must expressly censure; (2) that in the present passage, a *woman*, and one belonging to the *narrower circle of His loving fellowship*, is alone with Him, to whom He might be disposed, from considerations of sacred *decorum*, not to permit the *ἄπρεσθαι* desired in the midst of overflowing excitement. How entirely different was the situation with the sinning woman, Luke vii. 37 (in answer to Brückner's objection)! Along with the correct interpretation of *ἄπρεσθαι*, in itself, others have missed the further determination of the sense of the expression, either in this way: Jesus forbade the handling, because His wounds still pained Him (Paulus)! or: because His new, even corporeally glorified life was still so delicate, that He was bound to keep at a distance from anything that would disturb it (so Olshausen, following Schleiermacher, *Festpred.* V. p. 303); or: because He was still bodiless, and first after His return to the Father was again to obtain a body (Weisse). There is thus imported what is certainly not contained in the words (Paulus), what is a thoroughly arbitrary presupposition (Paulus, Olshausen), and what is in complete contradiction to the N. T. idea of the risen Christ (Weisse). Others take the saying as an *urging to hasten on with that which is immediately necessary*;<sup>1</sup> she is not to detain herself with the *ἄπρεσθαι*, since she can

<sup>1</sup> At this conclusion Hofmann also arrives, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 524: Mary is not, in her joy at again having Jesus, to *approach and hang upon Him*, as if He had appeared *in order to remain*, but was to carry to the disciples the joyful message, etc. But even with this turn the words do not apply, and the thought, especially that He had appeared *not to remain*, would be so enigmatically expressed by *οὐτω γὰρ, κ.τ.λ.*, that it could only be discovered by the way, in nowise indicated, of an indirect conclusion. That *ἄπρεσθαι* may denote *attach oneself, fasten oneself on* (comp. Godet: "s'attacher à"), is well known; but just as frequently, and in the N. T. throughout, it means *take hold of, touch, handle*, also in 1 Cor. vii. 1; 1 John v. 18.

see and touch Him still at a later period (so, with a different explanation in other respects of *ἅπτεσθαι* itself, Beza, Vatablus, Calovius, Cornelius a Lapide, Bengel, and several others); by which, however, an arbitrarily adopted sense, and one not in keeping with the subsequent *ἀναβαλῶ, κ.τ.λ.*, would be introduced into the confirmatory clause, nay, the prospect opened up, in reference to the future *tangere*, would be inappropriate. Others, that Jesus demands a greater proffer of honour; for as His body has already become divine, the ordinary touching of feet and mode of intercourse is no longer applicable (Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, Erasmus, Jansen, and several others). How inept in itself, and illogical in reference to the following *οὐπω γὰρ, κ.τ.λ.*! Others: it was a refusal of the enjoyment now sought in His appearance, which as yet is untimely, and is to take place not "terrestri contactu," but *spirituali* (Melanchthon, Calvin, Aretius, Grotius, and several others; substantially also, but under various modifications, Neander, De Wette, Tholuck, Luthardt, Lange, Baumgarten, Hengstenberg, Godet),<sup>1</sup> by which, however, the proper contents, constituting the essence of the supposed sense, is arbitrarily read between the lines. Others still differently, as e.g. Ammon: Jesus desired to spare Mary the touch of one levitically unclean! and Hilgenfeld, *Evang.* p. 318: the refusal of the reverential touch was made by

<sup>1</sup> Melanchthon: "Reprehenditur mulier, quod desiderio humano expetit complexum Christi et somniat eum revixisse ut rursus inter amicos vivat ut antea . . . ; nondum scit, fide praesentiam invisibilis Christi deinceps agnoscendam esse." So substantially also Luther. According to Luthardt, Mary would grasp, seize, hold Jesus fast, in order to enjoy His fellowship and satisfy her love. This Jesus denies to her, because at present it was not yet time for that; abiding fellowship as hitherto will first again commence when He shall have ascended, consequently shall have returned in the Paraclete; it will not then be brought about corporeally, but the fellowship will be in the Spirit. According to Baumgarten, a renewed *bodily* fellowship is promised to Mary, but completely freed from sin, and sanctified by Christ's blood. According to Hengstenberg, Mary would embrace Jesus in the opinion that now the wall of separation between Him and her has fallen; but the Lord repels her, for as yet His glorification is not completed, the wall of separation still in part subsists, etc. Godet: "It is not yet the moment for thee to attach thyself to me, as if I were already restored to you. For I am not as yet arrived at the state in which I shall be able to contract with my disciples the superior relation which I have promised to you;" thus substantially like Luthardt.

Jesus, for the reason that He was not yet the man again united with the Logos, but at present only the Man raised again from His grave.<sup>1</sup> Both interpretations are entirely foreign to the meaning. Scholten's view (p. 172) is also an impossibility, as if Jesus had said οὐπω μὲν γὰρ, κ.τ.λ., as one already glorified. *Conjectures* even have been attempted; Vogel: μὴ σὺ πτόου, Gersdorf and Schulthess: μου ἄπτου, or σύ μου ἄπτu. — πρὸς τοὺς ἀδελφ. μου] *This designation of the disciples as His beloved associates in the filial relation to God, through His now fulfilled earthly work (comp. πρὸς τ. πατέρα, κ.τ.λ.), is not at all intended to serve the purpose of tranquillizing them on account of their flight (Bengel, Luthardt, comp. Luther). Of this the text contains no indication, all the less that the expression is found only in the address to Mary, but not as to be communicated to the disciples. Rather has the designation its reference to Mary herself, who is to gather from it, that the loving fellowship of the Lord with His own, far removed from being dissolved by the new conditions of this miraculous manifestation, rather continues, indeed, now first (comp. xv. 15) has its completion. Note the like expression in Matt. xxviii. 10, where, however (see in loc.), the pointing to Galilee is an essential variation in the tradition; against which Luthardt, without reason, objects that Matt. xxviii. 10 refers to the promise, xxvi. 32. Certainly; but this promise already has, as its historical presupposition, the appearance of the Lord before the disciples, which was to be expected in Galilee, as the same also, xxviii. 16 ff., is actually set forth as the first and only one in Matthew. — ἀναβαίνω, κ.τ.λ.] The near and certain future. To announce this consequence of His resurrection to the disciples, must be all the more on His heart, since He so frequently designates His death as His departure to the Father, and had associated with it the personal hope of the disciples. That should not be different through His resurrection; it was only the passage*

<sup>1</sup> In his *Zeitschr.* 1868, p. 436, Hilgenfeld modifies his interpretation to the extent that Jesus, as the Risen One, did not as yet desire to be the object of the reverence which belonged to Him as Lord of the Church (Phil. ii. 10). This was then first to begin, when, after His ascension, He should appear before His believing ones as Dispenser of the Spirit (vi. 62, 63). But even thus the points to be understood are imported from a distance.

from death to the heavenly glory. As to the *mode and way* of the ascension ἀναβ. contains *nothing*. The added κ. πατέρα ὑμῶν and κ. θεὸν ὑμῶν was, however, intended to confirm the hope of the disciples in respect of their own συνδοξασθῆναι, since in truth, in virtue of their fellowship with Christ, the Father of Christ was also become *their* Father, the God of Christ (to whom Christ solely belongs and serves, comp. Matt. xxvii. 47, and see, in detail, on Eph. i. 17) also *their* God (comp. on Rom. i. 8); that is now, after the execution of the redemptive work, entirely accomplished, and will one day have also the fellowship in δόξα as its final result, comp. Rom. viii. 17, 29. Note in πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, κ.τ.λ., that the article does not recur, but embraces all in the unity of the Person. To understand the pres. ἀναβ., however, of that which ensues *forthwith and immediately*, and in the following way (Baur, p. 222 ff., and *Neutest. Theol.* p. 381, Hilgenfeld, and others), that already the appearance that follows is to be placed *after the ascension* (comp. Ewald, who understands the pres. of the ascension as already *impending*), is decisively opposed by the fact of the later appearance, vv. 26, 27, if this is not given up as actual history, or if the extravagant notion of *many* ascensions is not, with Kinkel, laid hold of.

Vv. 19, 20. Comp. Luke xxiv. 36 ff., where, however, the handling and the eating is already added from tradition. The account in Mark xvi. 14 is different. Schweizer's reasons against the Johannean origin of vv. 19–29 amount to this, that, according to John, the resurrection of Jesus was no external one on *this side* of the grave, and that consequently the appearances could only be visionary. Against this ii. 21, 22, x. 17, 18 are already decisive, as well as the faith and the testimony of the entire apostolic Church. — τ. θυρῶν κεκλεισμ.] can all the less be without essential significance, since it is repeated in ver. 26 also, and that without διὰ τὸν φόβον τ. Ἰουδ. It points to a *miraculous* appearance, which did not require open doors, and which took place while they were closed. The *how* does not and cannot appear; in any case, however, the ἄφαντος ἐγένετο, Luke xxiv. 31, is the correlate of this immediate appearance in the closed place; and the constitution of His body, changed, brought nearer to

the glorified state, although not immaterial, is the condition for such a liberation of the Risen One from the limitations of space that apply to ordinary corporeity. Euth. Zigabenus: ὡς λεπτοῦ ἤδη καὶ κούφου καὶ ἀκηράτου γενομένου τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ. More minute information concerning this change withdraws itself from more definite judgment; hence, also, the passage can offer no proof of the Lutheran doctrine of ubiquity, especially as the body of Jesus is not yet that which is glorified in δόξα. According to B. Crusius, and already Beza and several others (comp. also Thenius, *Evangel. der Evangelien*, p. 45), the doors must have suddenly opened of themselves. But in this way precisely the *essential* point would be passed over in silence. According to Baeumlein, nothing further is expressed than that the disciples were assembled *in a closed room*.<sup>1</sup> But how easily would John have known how *actually to express* this! As he has expressed himself, τ. θυρῶν κεκλεισμ. is the definite relation, under which the ἦλθεν, κ.τ.λ. took place, although it is not said that He passed διὰ τ. θυρ. κεκλ., as many Fathers, Calovius and others, represent the matter. — εἰς τὸ μέσον] *into the midst*, after ἔστη, as in Herod iii. 130, and frequently. Comp. on ver. 7, xxi. 3. — εἰρήνη ὑμῖν] The usual greeting on entrance: *Peace to you!* This first greeting of the risen Lord in the circle of disciples still resounded deeply and vividly enough in the heart of the aged John to lead him to relate it (in answer to Tholuck); there is therefore no reason for importing the wish for the peace of *reconciliation* (comp. εἰρήνη ἡ ἐμὴ, xiv. 27). — ἔδειξεν αὐτοῖς, κ.τ.λ.] In proof of the corporeal identity of His Person; for on the hands and on the side they must see the *wounds*. This was sufficient; it was not also required to exhibit the *feet*. Variation from Luke xxiv. 40, when the feet are shown instead of the side, the piercing of which is not related by the Synoptics. All the

<sup>1</sup> Schleiermacher, *L. J.* p. 474, does not make the *room* at all, but only the *house* to be closed, and says there "may also have been somebody who had been appointed to open." Schenkel, to whom the Risen One is "*the Spirit of the Church*," can, of course, only allow the entrance through closed doors to pass as an *emblem*. Scholten, who considers the appearances of the Risen One to be *ecstatic contemplations of the glorified One*, employs the closed doors also for this purpose.



more groundlessly is the present passage employed against the nailing of the feet (see generally on Matt. xxvii. 35); the more groundless also is the opinion that the *σάρξ* of Christ was only the already laid-aside earthly envelope of the Logos (Baur). Comp. on i. 14. — οὖν] In consequence of this evidence of identity. Terror and doubt, certainly the first impression of miraculous appearance, now gave way to joy. And from out their joyful thoughts comes the utterance of John: *ιδόντες τὸν κύριον*.

Vv. 21, 22. Οὖν] For now, after the joyful recognition, He could carry out that which He had in view in this His appearance. Hence He began once again, repeated His greeting, and then pursued His further address. The repetition of *εἰρήνη ὑμῖν* is not a *taking leave*, as Kuinoel, Lücke, B. Crusius, and several others, without any indication in the text, still think, which brings out a strange and sudden change from greeting to departure, but emphatic and elevated *repetition of the greeting*, after the preliminary act of self-demonstration, ver. 20, had intervened. Hengstenberg makes an arbitrary separation: the first *εἰρ. ὑμῖν* refers to the *disciples*, the second to the *apostles* as such. — *καθὼς ἀπέσταλκε, κ.τ.λ.*] Comp. xvii. 18. Now, however, and in fact designated a second time, according to its connection with the proper divine delegation, the mission of the disciples is formally and solemnly ratified, and how significantly at the very first meeting after the resurrection, to be witnesses of which was the fundamental task of the apostles! (Acts i. 22, ii. 32, iv. 2, *et al.*) *ἐνεφύσησε*] To interpret it merely as a *symbol* of the impartation of the Holy Spirit, according to the relationship of breath and spirit (comp. Ezek. xxxvii. 5 ff.; Gen. ii. 7) (Augustine, *De trin.* iv. 29, and many others: “*demonstratio per congruam significationem*”), neither satisfies the preceding *πέμπω ὑμᾶς*, nor the following *λάβετε, κ.τ.λ.*; for, in connection with both, the breathing on the disciples could only be taken as *medians of the impartation* of the Spirit, *i.e.* as *vehicle for the reception*, which was to take place *by means of* the breathing, especially as *λάβετε* (let the imperat. and the aor. be noted) cannot at all *promise* the reception which is first in the *future* (Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Grotius, Kuinoel, Neander,

Baeumlein, and several others), but expresses the *present actual* reception. So substantially Origen, Cyril, Melanchthon, Calvin, Calovius, and several others, including Tholuck, Lange, Brückner (in answer to De Wette's symbolical interpretation), Hengstenberg, Godet, Ewald, and several others; whilst Baur considers the whole occurrence as being already the fulfilment of the promise of the Paraclete,<sup>1</sup> which is an anticipation, and inapplicable to the idea of the *mission* of the Paraclete. The later and full outpouring of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost, by which Christ returned in the Paraclete, remains untouched thereby; moreover, we are not to understand merely the in-breathing of a χάρις δεκτική for the later reception of the Spirit (Euth. Zigabenus). An actual ἀπαρχή of the Holy Spirit is imparted to the disciples on account of a special aim belonging to their mission. Bengel well says: "arrha pentecostes." It belongs to the peculiarities of the miraculous intermediate condition, in which Jesus at that time was, that He, the Bearer of the Spirit (iii. 34), could already impart such a special ἀπαρχή, whilst the full and proper *outpouring*, the fulfilment of the Messianic baptism of the Spirit, remained attached to His exaltation, vii. 39, xvi. 7. The article needed as little to stand with πνεῦμα ἁγ. as in i. 33, vii. 39; Acts i. 2, 5, and many other passages. This in answer to Luthardt, who lays the emphasis on ἁγίων; it was a *holy* spirit which the disciples received, something, that is, different from the Spirit of God, which dwells in man by nature; the breath of Jesus' mouth was now *holy* spirit (comp. also Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 522 f.; Gess, *Pers. Chr.* p. 251; Weiss, *Lchrbegr.* p. 289), but this is not yet the spirit of the world-mighty Jesus; it is not as yet τὸ πνεῦμα ἁγίων, but nevertheless already the basis of it, and stands intermediately between the word of Jesus on earth and the Spirit of Pentecost. Such a sacred intermediate thing, which is *holy* spirit and yet not *the* Holy Spirit, the new living breath of the Lord, but yet only of like kind to the Spirit of

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Hilgenfeld in his *Zeitschr.* 1868, p. 438, according to whom here, as in ver. 17 the ascension, the feast of Pentecost should be taken up into the history of the Resurrection. The originally apostolic idea of apostles is, so soon as Paul is called by the *Risen One*, "adjusted" according to the Pauline.

God (Hofmann), cannot be established from the N. T., in which rather πνεῦμα ἅγιον with and without the article is ever the Holy Spirit in the ordinary Biblical dogmatic sense. Comp. on Rom. viii. 4; Gal. v. 16. The conceivableness of the above intermediate Spirit may therefore remain undetermined; it lies outside of Scripture. — αὐτοῖς] belongs to ἐνηφύσησε. Comp. Job iv. 21.

Ver. 23. The peculiar authority of the apostolical office, for the exercise of which they were fitted and empowered by this impartation of the Spirit. It was therefore an individual and specific charismatic endowment, the bestowal of which the Lord knew must be still connected with His personal presence, and was not to be deferred until after His ascension,<sup>1</sup> namely, that of the valid remission of sins, and of the opposite, that of the moral disciplinary authority, consisting not merely in the authorization to *receive into the Church* and to expel therefrom,<sup>2</sup> but also in the authorization of pardoning or of inflicting penal discipline on their *fellow-members*. The apostles exercised both authorizations, and it is without reason to understand only the former, since both essentially belonged to the *mission* (πέμπω, ver. 21) of the apostles. The promise, Matt. xvi. 19, xviii. 18, is similar, but not equivalent. The apostolic power of the keys in the sense of the Church is contained directly in the present passage, in Matt. only indirectly. It had its *regulator* in the *Holy Spirit*, who separated its exercise from all human arbitrariness, so that the apostles were therein *organs of the Spirit*. That was the divine guarantee, as the consecration of moral certainty through the illumination and sanctification of the judgment in the performance of its acts.

<sup>1</sup> Hence the objection: "they required at present no such impartation" (Hofmann), is precipitate. They made use of it first at a future time, but the bestowal was still to take place face to face, in this last sacred fellowship, in which a quite peculiar distinction and consecration was given for this gift.

<sup>2</sup> This in answer to De Wette and several others, including Ahrens (*Amt d. Schlüssel*, 1864, p. 31), who explains it of the reception or non-reception to baptism, and to the forgiveness of sins therewith connected. So also Steitz in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1866, p. 480. But baptism is here, without any indication of the text, imported from the institution, which is non-relevant here, in Matt. xxviii. 18 ff. On the apostolic penal discipline, in virtue of the κρατῆν τὰς ἀμαρτίας, on church members, comp. the apostolic handing over to Satan, and see on 1 Cor. v. 5.

— On *ἄν* instead of *ἐάν*, see Hermann, *ad Viger.* pp. 812, 822; frequently also in the Greek prose writers. — *ἀφένται*] *They are remitted*, that is, by God. — *κρατῆτε*] He abides by the figure; opposite of loosing: *hold fast* (Polyb. viii. 20. 8; Acts ii. 24). — *κεκράτ.*] *They are held fast*, by God. Here the perf.; for the *κρατεῖν* is on the part of God no *commencing* act (such is the *ἀφιέναι*). — That to Thomas, who was at that time absent (ver. 24), the same full authority under the impartation of the Spirit was further particularly and supplementarily (after ver. 29) bestowed, is, indeed, not related, but must be assumed, in accordance with the relation of the necessity contained in the equality of his position. — The objections of Luthardt against our interpretation of this verse are unimportant, since in reality the eleven are thought of as assembled together (vv. 19, 24); and since the assertion, that *all* charismatic endowments first date from Pentecost onwards, is devoid of proof, and is overthrown precisely by the present passage; comp. also already Luke ix. 55. Calovius well says: “ut antea jam acceperant Spiritum ratione sanctificationis, ita nunc accipiunt *ratione ministerii evangelici*.” The full outpouring with its miraculous gifts, but on behalf of the collective church, then follows Pentecost.

Vv. 24, 25. *Θωμᾶς . . . Δίδυμος*] See on xi. 16. — *οὐκ ἦν μετ’ αὐτῶν, εἰκὸς γὰρ, αὐτὸν μετὰ τὸ διασκορπισθῆναι τοὺς μαθητὰς . . . μήπω συνελθεῖν αὐτοῖς*, Euth. Zigabenus. There may also have been another reason, and conjectures (Luthardt: melancholy led him to be solitary, similarly Lange) are fruitless. — Thomas shows himself, ver. 25 (comp. on xiv. 5), in a *critical tendency of mind*, in which he does not recognise the statement of eye-witnesses as a sufficient ground of faith. From this, however, we perceive how completely remote from his mind lay the *expectation* of the resurrection. In the fact that he wished to feel only the wounds of the *hands* and of the *side*, some have found a reason against the *nailing of the feet* to the cross (so still Lücke and De Wette). Erroneously; the above demand was sufficient for him; in feeling the wounds on the feet, he would have required something which would have been too much, and not consistent with decorum. Comp. on Matt. xxvii. 35. — *τύπον* is then

interchanged with *τόπον* (see critical notes), as correlative to *seeing* and *feeling*. Comp. Grotius: "*τύπος videtur, τόπος impletur.*"—*βάλω τὴν χεῖρά μου, κ.τ.λ.*] is regarded as a proof of the peculiar *greatness* of the wounds. But he would lay his hand in truth not in the *wounds*, but in the *side*, in order, that is, there to touch with his fingers the wound on the mere skin, which, at the same time, must also have been in so far considerable enough.—Note, further, the *circumstantiality* in the words of Thomas, on which an almost defiant reliance in his unbelief, not melancholy dejection (Ebrard), is stamped.

Vv. 26, 27. "Interjectis ergo diebus nulla fuerat apparitio," Bengel. This appearance is contained *only* in John.—*πάλιν ἦσαν ἔσω*] points back to the same locality as in ver. 19. Wetstein, Olshausen erroneously transfer the appearance to *Galilee*. They were again *within*, namely, in the *house* known from ver. 19 (comp. Kypke, I. p. 412), and again from a like self-intelligible reason as in ver. 19, *with closed doors*. But that they were gathered together *for the celebration of the resurrection-day* (Luthardt, Lange), and that Jesus desired by His appearance to sanction this solemnity (Hengstenberg), is without any indication.—The invitation, ver. 27, presupposes an *immediate knowledge* of what is related in ver. 25, which precisely in John least of all required an indication (in answer to Lücke, who, as also Schleiermacher, supposes a communication of the disciples to Jesus).—Bengel, moreover, well remarks: "Si Pharisaeus ita dixisset: *nisi videro*, etc., nil impetrasset; sed discipulo pridem probato nil non datur."—*φέρε . . . καὶ ἴδε*] The wounds in the hands he is to feel *and see*; the wound in the side, under the garments, only to *feel*. Observe the similarity in circumstantiality and mode of expression of the words of Jesus with the expression of the disciple in ver. 25.—*καὶ μὴ γίνου ἄπιστος, ἀλλὰ πιστ.*] Not: *be*, but: *become* not unbelieving, etc. Through his doubt of the actual occurrence of the resurrection Thomas was *in danger of becoming* an unbeliever (in Jesus generally), and in contradistinction to this his vacillating faith he was, through having convinced himself of the resurrection, *to become* a believer.

Vv. 28, 29. The doubts of Thomas, whose faith did not now require actual contact (hence also merely *ἑώρακας*, ver. 29), are converted into a straightforward and devoted confession; comp. xi. 16. — *ὁ κύριός μου κ. ὁ θεός μου*] is taken by Theodore of Mopsuestia ("quasi pro miraculo facto Deum collaudat," ed. Fritzsche, p. 41) as an exclamation of astonishment directed to God. So recently, in accordance with the Socinians (see against these Calovius), especially Paulus. Decisively opposed to this view is *εἶπεν αὐτῷ*, as well as the necessary reference of *ὁ κύρ. μου* to Christ. It is a confessional *invocation of Christ* in the highest joyful surprise, in which Thomas gives the fullest expression of profound emotion to his faith, which had been mightily elevated by the conviction of the reality of the resurrection, in the divine nature of his Lord. The powerful *emotion* certainly appears in and of itself little fitted to qualify this exclamation, which Ewald even terms *exaggerated* for the dogmatic *conception*; but this is outweighed (1) by the account of John himself, who could find in this exclamation only an echo of his own *θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος*, and of the self-testimonies of Jesus concerning His divine nature; (2) and chiefly by the approval of the Lord which follows. Erasmus aptly says: "*Agnovit Christus utique repulsurus, si falso dictus fuisset Deus.*" Note further (1) the *climax* of the two expressions; (2) how the amazed disciple keeps them apart from one another with a solemn emphasis by repeating the article<sup>1</sup> and the *μου*. This *μου*, again, is the outflow "*ex vivo et serio fidei sensu*," Calvin. — Ver. 29. The *ὁ κύριός μ. κ. ὁ θεός μου* was the complete and highest *confession of Messianic faith*, by the rendering of which, therefore, the above *μὴ γίνου . . . πιστός* was already fulfilled. But it was the consequence of the *having seen* the Risen One, which he should not have required to do, considering the sufficient ground of conviction which lay in the assurance of his fellow-disciples as eye-witnesses. Hence the loving *reproof* (not *eulogy*, which Paulus devises, but also not a confirmation of the contents of faith as conferred by Thomas, as Luthardt assumes, which is first implied in *μακάριοι, κ.τ.λ.*) for him who has attained in this *sensuous* way to

<sup>1</sup> See Dissem, *ad Dem. de cor.* p. 374.

decisive faith, and the *ascription of blessedness* to those who, without such a sensuous conviction, have become believers,—this is to be left as a *general truth*, and not to be referred to the *other disciples*, since it is *expressed* in a general way, and, in accordance with the supersensuous and ethical nature of faith, is universally *valid*. In detail, note further: (1) to read *πεπίστευκας* *interrogatively* (with Griesbach, Scholz, Lachmann, Ewald) makes the element of *reproof* in the words, indicated by the emphatic (comp. i. 51) precedence of *ὅτι ἑώρ. με*, appear with more vivid prominence; (2) the perf. is: *thou hast become believing and believest now*; the aor. participles *ιδόντες* and *πιστεύσ.* do not denote *wont* (Lücke), which usage is never found in the N. T., and would here yield no suitable meaning, but those who, regarded from the point of time of the *μακαριότης* predicated of them, *have not seen*, and yet have believed; they have *become* believers without *having* first seen. (3) The point of time of the *μακαριότης* is, in correspondence with the general proposition, the *universal present*, and the *μακαριότης* itself is the happiness which they enjoy through the already present, and one day the eternal, possession of the Messianic *ζωή*. (4) The *μακαριότης* is not denied to Thomas, but for his warning the *rule* is adduced, to which he also ought to have subjected himself, and the *danger* is pointed out to him in which one is placed if one demands sight as a way to faith, as he has done. (5) The antithesis to the present passage is, therefore, not that of faith on account of that which has externally *taken place*, and of faith *certain in itself of its contents* (Baur, comp. Scholten), but of faith (in a thing that has taken place) with and without a personal and peculiar perception of it by the senses. (6) How significant is the declaration *μακάριοι, κ.τ.λ.*, standing at the close of the Johannean Gospel! The entire historical further development of the church rests in truth upon the faith which has not seen. Comp. 1 Pet. i. 8.

Vv. 30, 31. Conclusion of the entire book (not merely of the *main portion* of it, as Hengstenberg maintains); for chap. xxi. is a supplement. — *πολλὰ μὲν οὖν*] *Multa quidem igitur*.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> It serves as a concluding summary, so as to allow a moment thereby prepared to follow by *ἔτι*. Comp. Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 178.

See Klotz, *ad Decar.* p. 663. — καὶ ἄλλα] On the well-known καί after πολλά (*et quidem alia*), see Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 146. Comp. Acts xxv. 7. — σημεία] *miraculous signs*, by which He has proved Himself to be the Messiah, the Son of God (ver. 31). Comp. xii. 37. To this corresponds in general also the conclusion of the appendix, xxi. 25. Correctly so, by way of proposition, Euth. Zigabenus, further Calvin, Jansen, Wolf, Bengel, Lampe, Tholuck, De Wette, Frommann, Maier, B. Crusius, Luthardt, Hilgenfeld, Hengstenberg, Godet, Baeumlein, Scholten, and several others. Justly might John, looking back upon his now finished βιβλίον, adduce as its contents from the beginning of his history down to this conclusion, *a potiori*, the σημεία which Christ had wrought, since these form the distinguishing characteristic in the working of Jesus (comp. x. 41), and the historical basis, with which the rest of the contents (particularly the discourses) are connected. Others have taken σημεία in exclusive, or at least, like Schleiermacher, pre-eminent reference to the *resurrection: documenta resurrectionis* (comp. Acts i. 3). So Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, Ruperti, Luther, Beza, Calovius, Maldonatus, Semler, and several others, including Kuinoel, Lücke, Olshausen, Lange, Baur, Ewald, and several others. But to this corresponds neither the general and absolute σημεία in itself, nor the predicate πολλά κ. ἄλλα, since Christ, after His resurrection, both in accordance with the accounts in the Gospels, and also with that of 1 Cor. xv., certainly appeared only a few times; nor, finally, ἐποίησεν and ἐν τῷ βιβλ. τούτῳ, which latter shows that John (for ἐνώπ. τ. μαθητ., moreover, does not point to another writer, against Weizsäcker) has in view the contents of *his entire Gospel*. — ἐνώπ. τ. μαθ.] So that accordingly still many more σημεία might have been related, as by an eye-witness, by John, who, in truth, belonged to the μαθήται; hence this addition is not to be employed as a ground for the interpretation by Chrysostom, etc., of σημεία, because, that is to say, Jesus performed the signs before His death in the sight of the *people*, etc. (comp. xii. 37). — ταῦτα δέ] *sc. τὰ σημεία*, namely, those recorded in this book, this selection which composes its contents. — ἵνα πιστεύσ.] refers to the readers, for whom the



Gospel was designed. "*Scopus evangelii*," Bengel. Comp. *Introd.* § 5. See also, as regards πιστεύσ., on xix. 35. Of the *conversion of the Gentiles* (Hilgenfeld) to the faith, there is no mention.—ὁ υἱὸς τ. θεοῦ] in the Johannean sense. Without being *this*, He would not be the promised *Messiah*. — πιστεύοντες] *in your believing*. Thus, then, the ζῶν ἔχειν is conceived of as a possession already beginning with faith; faith, however, as a subjective *principle* of life, quite as with Paul, although the latter more sharply separates from one another, as conceptions, justification, and life.<sup>1</sup> — ἐν τῷ ὀνόμ. αὐτοῦ] belongs to ζῶν ἔχ. *In the name of Jesus*, as the object of faith (i. 12), the possession of life is causally founded. — Baur, in accordance with false presuppositions, holds vv. 30, 31 to be *spurious*, because the previously-related appearances (which, according to Baur, took place from out of *heaven*) should in themselves so bring to a close the appearance of the Risen One, that we cannot think of further appearances of this kind (πολλὰ κ. ἄλλα).

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Schmid, *Bibl. Theol.* II. p. 391.

## CHAPTER XXI.

VER. 3. Instead of ἐνέβησαν, Elz. has ἀνέβησαν, against decisive testimony. — After πλοῶν, Elz. Griesb. Scholz have: εὐθύς, which is condemned by decisive testimony. — Ver. 4. γεινομ.] Tisch.: γινεμ., which is to be preferred, since to the witnesses C.\* E. L, A. B. with γεινομ. are to be added; though with the copyists γεινομ. was more current. — εἰς] Lachm. Tisch.: ἐπὶ. The Codd. are very much divided; ἐπὶ came to be more readily added as a gloss than εἰς. Comp. Matt. xiii. 2, 48; Acts xxi. 5. — Ver. 6. ἴσχυσαν] Tisch.: ἰσχυον, according to preponderant testimonies. The aorist form was involuntarily suggested from the surrounding context (ἐβαλον, ἐλκῶσαι). — Ver. 11. ἐπὶ τῇς γῆς] Lachm. Tisch.: εἰς τὴν γῆν, according to A. B. C. L. κ., etc. Nevertheless, the *Recepta* is to be retained. Ἐπὶ τὴν γ. (so D. Curss.) was written as a gloss in some instances,—in others, after ver. 9, εἰς τ. γ. was written. — In vv. 15, 16, 17, as in i. 43, instead of Ἰωάν, we are to read: Ἰωάννου. — Ver. 17. πρόβατα] A. B. C.: προβάτια. Rightly adopted by Tisch. The *Recepta* is a repetition from ver. 16. Tisch. has, indeed, even already in ver. 16, προβάτια, but only according to B. C., so that the testimony of A. appears first for ver. 17. — Ver. 22. Read with Lachm. Tisch., μοι ἀπολούθεις. — Ver. 25 is wanting in κ.\*, is explained in Scholia as an addition, and has in detail the variations α̃ (Lachm. Tisch.) instead of ὅσα; Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς (D.), in one Cod. of It. with the addition: *quae non scripta in hoc libro*; οὐδ' (Lachm. Tisch.) instead of οὐδέ; χωρήσειν (Tisch. according to B. C.\* κ.\*\* Or.); at the conclusion ἀμήν (Elz.).

Chap. xx. 30, 31, bears so obviously the stamp of a formal conclusion worthy of an apostle, while chap. xxi., moreover, begins in a manner so completely unexpected, that this chap. can appear only as a *supplement*. The question is, however,<sup>1</sup> *whether this supplement proceeds from John or not*. This question first became a subject of investigation from the time of Grotius, who saw in the chapter a supplement of the *Ephesian*

<sup>1</sup> See generally Hoelemann, *der Epilog des Evang. Joh.*, in his *Bibelstudien*, II. p. 61 ff.

*church*, composed after the apostle's death by the bishop (perhaps by John the Presbyter). Since all witnesses contain the chapter, a judgment can only be pronounced from *internal* grounds. These, however, decide *only against* ver. 25, which contains an exaggeration so surprising, unapostolical, and in such absolute contradiction to the Johannean simplicity, intelligence, and delicacy, that it is impossible that it can have proceeded from the pen of the apostle, but must appear probably as a later, although very ancient, form of conclusion, an apocryphal and inharmonious echo of xx. 30. The omission<sup>1</sup> of ver. 25 in  $\aleph^*$ , and its suspicious character in the Scholia, rests upon a correct critical feeling. On such feeling, however, also rests the fact that this omission and suspicion have not likewise affected ver. 24, which throughout contains nothing that John could not have written, but rather forms a worthy conclusion to the entire supplement of chap. xxi., and does not by *οἶδαμεν* betray the work of a strange hand (see the exegetical notes). The grounds, moreover, brought forward against the authenticity of vv. 1–23 are untenable. For (1) it by no means follows from ver. 23, that at the time of the composition the apostle was already dead (Weizsäcker, Keim, and others), since the speech there mentioned required the correct historical explanation precisely *for the eventuality* of his death, which was still *future*. Comp. Ewald, *Jahrb.* III. p. 172. (2) The advent of Christ, mentioned in vv. 22, 23, is without any reason declared to be non-Johannean. See on xiv. 3. Just as little is (3) the self-designation, ver. 20, un-Johannean; it corresponds rather just as well to the importance which the recollection, therein expressed, of the never-to-be-forgotten moment must have had for John, in and of itself, as also to the connection into which it is interwoven. See on ver. 20. Further, (4) the individual expressions<sup>2</sup> which are designated as non-Johannean (as e.g. ver. 3, *ἔρχεσθαι σὺν* instead of *ἀκολουθεῖν*; ver. 4, *πρωίως*

<sup>1</sup> According to the usual statement, ver. 25 should also be wanting in Cod. 63. This, however, Tisch. (*Wann wurden unsere Evangelien verf.* p. 127, ed. 4) declares to be an error. On ver. 25 in  $\aleph$ . Tisch. passes this judgment: the copyist of this Cod. did not find the verse in his copy, and therefore did not add it; but the words are supplied, "ab eo qui eadem ætate totum librum recensabat ac passim ex alio exemplari corripbat atque augebat," *Cod.  $\aleph$ . ed. Lips. p. LIX.*

<sup>2</sup> For a minute discussion of the peculiarities of language in chap. xxi., and their variation from the Gospel, see in Tiele, *Annotatio in locos nonnull. ev. Joh. ad vindicand. huj. ev. authent.*, Amst. 1853, p. 115 ff. In answer to Scholten, who believes he has found most linguistic deviations, see Hilgenfeld in his *Zeitschr.* 1868, p. 441 ff.

γινωσκ. instead of πρωτ; ver. 12, τολμᾶν and ἐξεταζεῖν; ver. 18, φέρειν instead of ἄγειν) are, taken together, phenomena so unessential, nay, having for the most part in the sense of the context so natural a foundation, that they, especially in consideration of the later time of the composition of the supplement, do not leave at all any serious difficulty behind them, and are far outweighed by the otherwise completely Johannean stamp, which the composition bears in itself, in the language, in the mode of presentation, and in the individual features which betray the eye-witness (how entirely different is the section concerning the adulteress!). For, in particular, (5) the alleged want of Johannean clearness and demonstrativeness is removed partly by correct exposition, partly in the question as to the genuineness, rendered ineffective by the fact that John, even in the earlier part of the Gospel, does not always narrate with equal clearness and demonstrativeness. (6) It is not correct to say that with the spurious conclusion the entire chapter also falls to the ground,<sup>1</sup> since the non-Johannean conclusion may have been added to the Johannean chapter, especially as, on the assumption to be made of the genuineness of ver. 24, the appendix itself did not proceed without a conclusion from the hand of the apostle. In accordance with all that has been advanced, the view is justified, *that John by way of authentic historical explanation of the legend in ver. 23, some time after finishing his Gospel, which he had closed with xx. 31, wrote chap. xxi. 1-24,<sup>2</sup> as a complement of the book, and that this appendix, simply because its Johannean origin was immediately certain and recognised, already at a very early period, whilst the Gospel had not yet issued forth from the narrower circle of its first readers (Einh. sec. 5), had become an inseparable part of the Gospel; but that simply owing to the fact that now the entire book was without a principal conclusion, the apocryphal conclusion, ver. 25, exaggerating the original conclusion, xx. 31, came to be added.* This addition of ver. 25 must have been made at a very early date, because only a few isolated traces of the spuriousness of ver. 25 have been preserved, which, however, by the evidence of N.\* go back to a very ancient time; while, on the other hand, in reference to vv. 1-24, not the faintest echo of a critical tradition is found which would have testified against the genuineness. Tisch. also designates only ver. 25 as spurious. — The apostolic

<sup>1</sup> Much more correct would it be to say: the chap. *partially* betrays, in so striking a manner, the Johannean delicacy and originality (pre-eminently vv. 15-17), that the *whole* stands along with it as a production of the apostle.

<sup>2</sup> Vv. 1-14 hardly have an object unknown to us (Brückner), since they are in simple objective historical connection with what follows.

origin of the chapter was *controverted*, amid the setting forth of very different theories, especially its derivation from the author of the Gospel, after Grotius, by Clericus, Hammond, Semler, Paulus, Gurlitt (*Lectio. in N. T. Spec.* III., Hamb. 1805), Bertholdt, Seyffarth (*Beitr. zur Specialcharakt. der Joh. Schriften*, Lpz. 1823, p. 271 ff.); Lücke, Schott, De Wette, Credner, Wieseler (*Diss.* 1839 : John the Presbyter wrote the chap. after the death of the apostle), Schweizer, Bleek, Schwegler, Zeller, Baur (because it is not in keeping with the main idea of the whole), Kostlin, Keim, Scholten, and several others; Brückner has doubts. In opposition to Baur's school, according to which it is said to be designed, along with the entire chap., for the purpose of exalting the apostle of Asia Minor over Peter, see especially Bleek. — The Johannean origin, or at least the derivation from the writer of the Gospel, is defended, but in such a way that recently vv. 24, 25 have been for the most part rejected by Calovius, Rich. Simon, Mill, Wetstein, Lampe, Michaelis, Krause (*Diss. Viteb.* 1793), Beck (Lips. 1795), Eichhorn, Kuinoel, Hug, Wegscheider (*Einkl. in d. Ev. Joh.*), Handschke (*de auct. v. c. 21 ev. Joh. e sola orat. indole dijud.*, Lips. 1818), Erdmann (*Bemerk. üb. Joh.*, Rostock 1821), Weber (*authentia . . . argumentor. intern. usu vindic.*, Hal. 1823), Guerike, Redding (*Disput.* Groning. 1833), Frommann, Tholuck, Olshausen, Klee, Maier, B. Crusius (not decidedly),<sup>1</sup> in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1849, p. 601 ff., Luthardt, Lange, Laurillard (*Disp. L. B.* 1853), Ebrard (on Olshausen), Hengstenberg, Godet, Hoelemann, Schleiermacher (at least in respect of the contents). According to Ewald (*l.c.*, comp. also *Jahrb.* X. p. 87), a friend of the apostle (probably a presbyter at Ephesus), of whose hand, probably also of whose art, John availed himself in the composition of the Gospel, wrote the appendix for himself alone at a later date, without desiring in the slightest degree to conceal that it was by a different individual. In his *Johann. Schriften*, I. p. 54 ff., Ewald ascribes the composition to the same circle of friends, in which the Gospel may have remained perhaps for ten years before its publication; that the apostle himself, however, permitted the publication with this appendix (inclusive also of vv. 24, 25) before his death. Similarly Baeumlein. — Very superficially and peremptorily does Hengstenberg designate the entire view that chap. xxi. is a supplement, as leading to a view of the accidental nature of the authorship, which is unworthy of the apostle, and in conflict with the character of

<sup>1</sup> He, as also Lange, Hengstenberg, Hoelemann, ascribes also vv. 24, 25 to the apostle, in opposition to which Luthardt regards 24, 25 as a testimony added from the Ephesian church.

the Gospel. Hilgenfeld assigns the chap., *with inclusion of vv.* 24, 25, to the evangelist, who, however, was not the apostle. Comp. also Bretschneider, p. 182.

Vv. 1, 2. *Μετὰ ταῦτα*] Referring, in conformity with the nature of a supplement, to the *last* narrative *before* the conclusion in xx. 30, 31. — *ἐφάνερωσεν ἑαυτόν*] Comp. the passive expression, Mark xvi. 12, 14; it is, however, precisely the reflexive expression which is Johannean, see vii. 4. It presupposes a *state of concealment*, from which He now again (*πάλιν* points back to ver. 14, to the two preceding appearances, xx. 19, 26) came forth and *made Himself manifest* to His disciples, brought Himself into view,—not a *spiritual* existence (De Wette), not “a sphere of *invisibility*, in which He moves by Himself” (Luthardt, comp. Tholuck), but rather a wonderfully altered existence, no longer belonging to ordinary intercourse, brought nearer to a state of glorification, yet still material, *διὰ τὸ λοιπὸν ἄφθαρτον εἶναι τὸ σῶμα καὶ ἀκήρατον*, Chrysostom. — *ἐπὶ τῆς θαλ.*] *on the lake*, because the shore is *over* the lake. Comp. on Matt. xiv. 25; Xen. *Anab.* iv. 3. 28: *ἐπὶ τοῦ ποταμοῦ*, and passages from Herodotus in Schweighäuser's *Lcx.* p. 245. It belongs to *ἐφάν.* — *ἐφάνερωσε δὲ οὕτως*] *sc. ἑαυτόν*, not, as Hengstenberg imports from ii. 11, *τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ*. Further, an *iteration* of this kind, in simple, continuous narration, is not elsewhere found in John. But he may here have purposely written in so diffuse a manner as a set-off to the distortions of actual fact in tradition (comp. ver. 23). — Of the seven disciples, ver. 2, the last two remain unnamed. Hence they are probably (vi. 60, vii. 3, viii. 31, xviii. 19) to be deemed disciples in the wider sense, with which ver. 1 does not conflict (in answer to Hengstenberg, who conjectures Andrew and Philip), since the two unnamed are simply subordinate persons. That of the disciples in the narrower sense the sons of Zebedee are mentioned *last*, is in harmony with the composition of the narrative by John himself. All the less is any deeper or emblematic significance to be sought as lying behind the succession of the names, or even behind the number seven. Another composer would probably have placed the sons of

Zebedee immediately after Peter. — ὁ ἀπὸ Κανᾶ τ. Γαλ.] added, without any special design, in this supplement of late composition. According to Hengstenberg, the representative of the first miracle (chap. ii.) could not but be indicated, which is pure invention. — οἱ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου] does not occur elsewhere in John; but, at the same time, it is only here that the occasion presents itself to him to mention in a series of names himself<sup>1</sup> and his brother along with others. — On the tradition which Luke sets forth, which is altogether irreconcilable with Galilean appearances of the Risen One, useless upon arbitrary harmonistic presuppositions (such as even Luthardt entertains), see on Luke xxiv. 50. Acts i. 4 does not, however, necessarily presuppose, in reference to the appearances, that none took place in Galilee. Matthew, on the other hand, excludes the appearances which took place before the disciples at Jerusalem, which are related by John xx. See on Matt. xxviii. 10. Harmonistic expedients also in Hengstenberg and Godet.

Vv. 3, 4. Ἐρχόμ. κ. ἡμεῖς σὺν σοί] John has not employed ἀκολουθεῖν, nor said ἄγωμεν κ. ἡμεῖς (xi. 16), because he has *thought* just what was said.—The *circumstantiality* is not un-Johannean (Lücke), but comp. e.g. i. 39, 40, ix. 1–12. In particular, moreover, the ὑπάγω ἀλιεύειν is only the simple language of familiar association, in which neither a “*brusque tone*,” nor “an *internal impulse, a presentiment*” (Godet), is to be recognised. The disciples desire again to pursue their earthly employments, “*quod privatos homines decebat*,” Calvin. — ἐξῆλθον] from the place indicated in ver. 2, probably Capernaum, out to the lake, ver. 1. — By *night* the fishing was productive. Comp. on Luke v. 5; Aristot. *H. A.* viii. 19. But *they caught nothing*. How entirely different was it afterwards, when they cast out *at the bidding of the Lord!* — ἔστη] Expressing the sudden appearance. Comp. xx. 19, 26. — εἰς τ. αἶγ.] Comp. xx. 19, 26. — οὐ μέντοι, κ.τ.λ.] To be explained from the entirely altered condition and appearance of the Risen One. Chrysostom assigns the reason to the will of Jesus: οὐκ εὐθέως ἐαυτὸν δείκνυσιν, comp. also Luthardt and Hengstenberg, of which

<sup>1</sup> Hence Nathanael cannot be John (Späth): comp. on i. 46.

John, however, gives no indication. Comp. rather on xx. 14.

Vv. 5, 6. Παιδία] Not un-Johannean (1 John ii. 14, 18), although in xiii. 33 τέκνία is used. — μή τι προσφάγ. ἔχετε] The emphasis lies, as frequently, on the concluding word: *you are not, I suppose, (already) in possession of something to eat?* The question presupposes the opinion of the questioner, that they had probably as yet taken nothing, as well as the thought that in the opposite case He need not step in. That, however, He designates *fishes* exactly by προσφάγιον, is grounded on the fact that He intends to take a *breakfast* with the disciples on the fishes, after which He inquires. On προσφάγ. itself, which is, like the Attic ὄψον, used especially of fishes (comp. προσφάγημα, Moeris, p. 204. 24; προσόψημα, Athen. iv. p. 162 C, vii. p. 276 E), see Sturz, *Dial. Al.* p. 191; Fischer, *de vitis*, *Lcx.* p. 697 f.—The disciples simply answer: *no*; they have therefore taken Him for an entire stranger, who perhaps wishes to buy fishes for breakfast. The παιδία, intended by Jesus in the sense of fatherly love, they may have regarded, in the mouth of the unknown, as a friendly designation of the *state of service* (Nonnus: παῖδες ἀλὸς δρηστήρες; Euth. Zigabenus: τοὺς ἐργατικούς). Comp. on vi. 6. — εἰς τὰ δεξιὰ μ.] They had the net then in the lake, on quite another side of the boat. — οὐκέτι] *no more*, as previously, when it was empty and light. Observe the pictorial imperf. ἴσχυον (see the critical notes). — ἐλκύσαι] *draw*, draw up the submerged net. On the other hand, σύροντες, ver. 8: *tugging*, *dragging forth*. See Tittmann, *Synon.* p. 57 f. — ἀπό] *on account of*. See Bernhardt, p. 224.—To regard the above fruitless toils (on the left, it is thought), and this abundant take on the right, as a figure of the apostolic activity, in relation first to the *Jews* and then to the *Gentiles* (Grotius, Weitzel, Hengstenberg, Godet, Hilgenfeld, and several others), is too special, and not even conformable to history (Gal. ii. 9; Acts xxii. 20, *et al.*, comp. Luthardt), without prejudice, moreover, to the symbolism of the draught of fishes in itself; see note after ver. 14.

Ver. 7. Πάλιν τὰ ιδιώματα τῶν οἰκείων ἐπιδείκνυνται τρόπων οἱ μαθηταὶ Πέτρος καὶ Ἰωάννης. Ὁ μὲν γὰρ θερμότερος,



ὁ δὲ ὑψηλότερος ἦν· καὶ ὁ μὲν ὀξύτερος ἦν, ὁ δὲ διορατικώτερος. Διὰ τοῦτο ὁ μὲν Ἰωάννης πρῶτως ἐπέγνω τὸν Ἰησοῦν ὁ δὲ Πέτρος πρῶτος ἦλθε πρὸς αὐτόν, Chrysostom. Comp. xx. 3 ff. — τὸν ἐπενδύτην διεζώσατο] He had laid aside the ἐπενδύτης, and was in so far *naked*, which, however, does not prevent his having on the shirt, *χιτωνίσκος*, according to the well-known usage of *γυμνός*,<sup>1</sup> *nudus*, and ער (see Perizonius, *ad Ael. V. H.* vi. 11; Cuper. *Obs.* i. 7, p. 39, *Interpp. zu Jes.* xxx. 2; Grotius *in loc.*). In order, however, not to appear unbecomingly in his mere shirt before Jesus, he girded around him the ἐπενδύτης, i.e. he drew it on, so that he gathered it together by means of a girdle on his body. Hengstenberg says incorrectly: he had the ἐπενδύτ. on, and only girded himself *in the same* (accus. of closer definition), in order to be able to swim the better. The middle with accus. of a *garment* always denotes to *gird oneself therewith* (Lucian, *Somm.* 6, *de conscrib. hist.* 3). Comp. περιζώνουσθαι, Rev. i. 13. The ἐπενδύτης is not equivalent to *χιτών* (Fischer, Kuinoel, Bretschneider), but an *overwrap*, an *overcoat*. Any garment drawn over may be so called (see the LXX. in Schleusner, *Thes.* II. p. 436; Soph. *fragm.* in Pollux, vii. 45; Dind. 391, comp. ἐπένδυμα in Plut. *Alex.* 32); it was, however, according to Nonnus and Theophylact, in the case of fishermen, and according to the Talmud, which has even appropriated to itself the word אפנרתא, in the case of workmen generally, a linen article of clothing (possibly a short frock or *blouse*) which, according to the Talmud, was worn, provided with pockets, over the shirt (according to Theophylact, also over other articles of clothing). See especially Drusius *in loc.* According to Euth. Zigabenus, it reached to the knees, and was without sleeves. — *γυμνός*] He had, in point of fact, no other clothing on except the mere shirt (comp. Dem. 583. 21: γυμνὸν ἐν τῷ χιτωνίσκῳ); for precisely διὰ τὴν γύμνωσιν (Theodoret, Heracleus) he quickly put on the ἐπενδύτης, which had been laid aside during his work. — He reached the land *swimming*, not *walking* on the water (Grotius and several others), which is an imported

<sup>1</sup> This also in opposition to Godet, according to whom Peter was *quite naked*. This would have been disgraceful even amongst barbarians. See Krüger on Thuc. i. 6. 4.

addition. The ἔβαλεν ἑαυτὸν graphically represents the *rapid self-decision*.

Vv. 8, 9. Τῷ πλοιαρ.] *in the little boat*, on board of which they remained; local dative. Comp. Herod. v. 99: ἀπικέατο εἰκοσι νηυσί. See generally Becker, *Homer. Blätter*, p. 208 f. — The γάρ in the parenthesis states the reason why they did not quit the vessel; they could in this way also quickly enough reach the shore, which was very near (200 cubits =  $\frac{1}{2}$  stadium 300 feet, see Wurm, *de ponder*, etc., p. 195; Hermann, *Privatalterth.* § 46. 7). — On the form πηχῶν instead of the Attic πηχέων, see Lobeck, *ad Phryg.* p. 245 f. On ἀπό, see on xi. 18. — τὸ δίκτυον τῶν ἰχθ.] *the net, which was filled with the fishes* (ver. 6). Comp. on this genit., Nägelsbach, *z. Ilias*, p. 31, ed. 3. — Ver. 6. βλέπουσιν, κ.τ.λ. John relates simply what they *saw* on landing, namely, a *fire of coals lying there, and food lying thereon* (i.e. a *mess of fish*, see on vii. 9; the singul. not of a *single* fish, as Beza, Hengstenberg, Godet, and others think, but *collectively*, as also ἄρτον, comp. Polyb. xxxiv. 8. 6: τὸ θαλάττιον ὄψον), and *bread*. That this preparation for the breakfast to be given was made by *Jesus*, would be understood by the reader as matter of course (see vv. 12, 13). But how He brought together the materials, and who kindled the fire, cannot be determined; He might, before He called to the disciples, have Himself, or by other hands, made the preparations. Hence the narrative yields no *miracle* (bringing forth out of nothing, thought Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, Grotius, Calovius, Maldonatus, and several others; but Nicephorus, Jansen, Luthardt: the *angels* had provided Him therewith; finally, Hengstenberg, Godet: without more precise definition of the marvellous *How*), nor even the *appearance* of such (Lücke). But *wherefore* did Jesus make this *preparation*? Because the disciples were to eat *with Him* the early meal, with which He designed to connect so significant a transaction as that related in vv. 15 ff.; *He* willed to be the *giver of the meal*. Much that is irrelevant in the older expositors. According to Luthardt, the design is to depict how Jesus, without requiring their aid, knows how to feed the disciples from *His* own resources. But to what purpose any such

further representation, since He had long ago miraculously fed thousands before the eyes of the disciples?

Vv. 10, 11. 'Ενέγκατε, κ.τ.λ.] for the completion, conformably to their needs, of the dish of fish already found upon the fire of coals. That the eating of Jesus and of the disciples was no material, but a *spiritual* one (the enjoyment which Jesus has from the activity of His apostles), is a fiction of Hengstenberg's. — According to ver. 11, Peter alone draws the full net to land, which, of course, since it hung on the vessel, which lay on the shore, was easier than to draw it up out of the water into the boat, ver. 6. According to Hengstenberg, he is, indeed, named only as being the chief person, because he was the *middle point of the spiritual fishing*. The statement of the *number* of the fishes is as little an *apocryphal* trait as the statement of the number of those who were miraculously fed, vi. 10, and all the less, since it is not a *round* number which is named. The *μεγάλων* heightens the miraculous effect. — *καὶ τοσούτων ὄντων, κ.τ.λ.*] Regarded by John as *incomprehensible*, and as effected by *Christ*; by Strauss, as manifestly *legendary*, as well as the number of the fishes, which, however, might, notwithstanding, be to the minds of the disciples, in relation to this *miraculous* experience, important enough, and sufficiently so not to be forgotten. On the allegorical interpretations of the number 153, see note after ver. 14.

Vv. 12, 13. 'Αριστον is, as little as in Matt. xxii. 4, Luke xi. 38, the *principal meal*, which, in spite of ver. 4, Hengstenberg suggests in the interest of allegorical interpretation, but *breakfast*. — *ἐτόλμα*] *dared*, presumed. Although, that is, it had been possible for them, in respect of the external appearance, to doubt whether He was the Lord, they were nevertheless convinced of His identity, and hence dared not to ask Him: Who art thou? Reverential awe (comp. already iv. 27), in presence of the marvellous appearance of the Risen One, deprived them of the courage to do so. According to Augustine, Beda, Jansen, and several others, they dared not *doubt*, which however, is not expressed. Chrysostom aptly remarks: οὐκέτι γὰρ τὴν αὐτὴν παρῤῥησίαν εἶχον. . . . τὴν δὲ μορφήν ἀλλοιοτέραν ὁρῶντες καὶ πολλῆς ἐκπλήξεως γέμου-

σαν, σφόδρα ἦσαν καταπεπληγμένοι, καὶ ἐβούλοντο τι περὶ αὐτῆς ἐρωτᾶν ἀλλὰ τὸ δέος καὶ τὸ εἰδέναι αὐτοὺς, ὅτι οὐχ ἕτερός τις ἦν, ἀλλ' αὐτὸς, ἐπεῖχον τὴν ἐρώτησιν. — ἐξετάσαι] *to explore* (Matt. ii. 8, x. 11; Sir. xi. 7, xiii. 11, frequently in the classics), *sciscitari*; strong expression from the point of view from which the respectful timidity of the *disciples* regarded the daring nature of the question. — εἰδότες] Constructio κατὰ σύνεσιν. See Kühner, II. § 419a; Krüger, § 58. 4. 5. — Ver. 13. ἔρχεται] The δεῦτε, ver. 12, has summoned the disciples to the place of the meal where the fire of coals was; Jesus Himself, who had therefore stood at some distance therefrom, now steps forward, in order to distribute the breakfast. — τὸν ἄρτον] points back to ver. 9, but τὸ ὀψάριον to vv. 9 and 10: the bread lying there, etc. Both are again *collective*. It is not merely *one* loaf and *one* fish which Jesus distributes, as Hengstenberg, for the purpose of symbolically interpreting it of a heavenly reward of toil, assumes; see ver. 10. — A *thanksgiving* before the δίδωσιν is not related, not as though Jesus omitted τὰ ἀνθρώπινα (Euth. Zigabenus); nor as though He did not desire positively to offer Himself to their recognition (Lange, in opposition to ver. 12); nor, again, as though the meal was to be a *silent*<sup>1</sup> one (Luthardt, who adds: "for such is the table fellowship of Jesus and His own in the present aeon"); nor, again, because the meal represented future blessings (Hengstenberg),—but because here it is not a question of any proper meal, as in Luke xxiv. 20, but rather only of a *breakfast*, of a morning meal, partaken of only while standing (there is no mention, moreover, of a lying down), which also was not to have, like that early meal of Paul, Acts xxvii. 35, a character of solemnity. It was not this breakfast in itself, which Christ prepared for the disciples, but that which preceded (the draught of fishes) and succeeded (vv. 15 ff.), which was the *object* for which the Risen One here appeared.

<sup>1</sup> That the meal passed *generally in entire silence*, as also Hengstenberg suggests, as little appears from the text as that Jesus did not Himself partake of it (Hengstenberg). In favour of a symbolical interpretation of details, a dismal and extravagant character is given to the incident. But the text breaks off with the distribution of the bread and of the mess of fish, and it says *nothing* of the *progress* of the breakfast.

Ver. 14. Τοῦτο ἤδη τρίτον] *This time already for the third time.* See on 2 Cor. xiii. 1.—ἤδη presupposes, on the one hand, that, according to John, *until now* any other appearances before the disciples had *not* taken place, with the exception of the three related (xx. 19 ff., 26 ff., xxi. 1 ff.); but, on the other hand, that at a *later* date several other appearances occurred. Since he, moreover, refers his τρίτον only to the appearances that were made to the *circle* of disciples (not to individual persons), a wider scope is thereby given to harmonists; in no case, however, can they succeed in reconciling the three appearances with the statements of *Paul*, 1 Cor. xv. 5 ff., especially as there εἶτα and ἔπειτα (in opposition to Wieseler) denote *chronological* sequence. The Apostle Paul is charged, on the supposition that his account is to be understood in an internal way, with a great arbitrariness, when it is asserted that the *three* appearances related by John are comprized in εἶτα τοῖς δώδεκα in Paul (Luthardt, Lange). Not even can ὥφθη Κηφᾶ in Paul be reconciled with John. To John, however, must be accorded the preference over the tradition followed by Paul, so far as the latter does not agree with the former.

NOTE.—To the *draught of fishes*, to contest the historical truth of which, in a manner which evinced arbitrariness, and in part even malice, the similarity of the earlier history, Luke v. 2 ff., afforded a welcome opportunity (Strauss, Weisse, Schenkel, and several others), a symbolical destination has, since the most ancient times (Chrysostom and his followers, Cyril, Augustine, and many others), been ascribed, and in general justly, since the word of Jesus, Matt. iv. 19, parall., gives, naturally enough, the psychological solution why He, as the Risen One, performs, precisely in *this* fashion, a miraculous work in the presence of His disciples. The tradition in which, from the above word, the draught of fishes, Luke v., took shape (see on Luke v. 1 ff.), has, although pushing forward the later occurrence, nevertheless apprehended with right feeling the idea which it contained. The disciples themselves could not but find in the words of that first call, Matt. *loc. cit.*, the key to the symbolical significance of the miraculous fact, in which that word, which Jesus had spoken at the beginning, was now, on the boundary of their earthly intercourse with Him, and before the restoration

(a renewed calling, as it were) of Peter, set forth and sealed as a fact with the highest appropriateness. Only in respect of the interpretation of this symbolism, we have no right to go beyond Matt. iv. 14, and read more therein than the *rich blessing of the apostolical office*, of which the *men fishers* of Jesus were to be the possessors. To go further, and, with Augustine, to expound all the individual features of the history allegorically (so recently, especially Weitzel in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1849, p. 618 f., Luthardt, Lange, Hengstenberg), is groundless and arbitrary, and without any definable limits. Especially is an interpretation of the fish meal, which refers it to the heavenly supper,<sup>1</sup> "which the Lord prepares for His own with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of God" (Olshausen, after Augustine), all the less authorized, since this supper of the kingdom does not concern the apostles *as such*, and consequently something that is remote would be mixed up with the reference. It is certainly in the present passage only an *ἀπρωton*, a breakfast, which was merely to serve as a handle for the appearance, and for the draught of fishes, as well as for the further scene with Peter. In a manner which serves as a special warning have the allegorical tendencies of the Fathers, in respect of the number of fishes, displayed themselves, as, *e.g.*, Severus, Ammonius, Theophylact (also *τρίς* in Euth. Zigabenus) see depicted in the 100 fishes the Gentiles, in the 50 the Jews, and in the 3 the Trinity; whilst Jerome, who is followed by Köstlin in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1851, p. 195, and Hilgenfeld recognises in the 153 fishes, in spite of the fact that they were *large* ones only, *all genera piscium*, and thereby the *universality* of the apostolic activity,<sup>2</sup> which Ruperti derives from the text even by an arithmetical analysis<sup>3</sup> of the number; whilst Hengstenberg, on the other hand (after Grotius), thinks to find the key in the 153,600 strangers, 2 Chron. ii. 17, so that John counts a fish

<sup>1</sup> Even the *Lord's Supper* was found by Augustine to be signified, and he went so far as to say: "*piscis assus Christus est passus.*"

<sup>2</sup> Hilgenfeld in his *Zeitschr.* 1863, p. 446: "The copious take . . ., *i.e.* the *spiritual harvest from the Gentile world*, is now added to the provision of fish and bread already lying ready, I think, for the feeding of the *Jewish* people (comp. John vi. 12)." The fundamental thought is, he thinks, in x. 16.

<sup>3</sup> Recently *enigmatic numeration* has been attempted in the case of these fishes, so that according to the Hebrew numerical letters,  $118 + 35 = \text{ינה שמען}$  is =  $\Sigma \mu \omega \nu \lambda \omega \alpha$ . See *Theol. Jahrb.* 1854, p. 135; on the other hand: Ewald, *Jahrb.* vi. p. 161. Volkmar also (*Mos. Prophetie*, p. 61 f.) gives the enigmatic solution of the number as "*Simeon Bar Jona Kepha.*" — Calvin already correctly observes: "*quantum ad piscium numerum spectat, non est sublime aliquod in eo quoad reconditum mysterium.*"

for every thousand (with which the surplus of 600 falls away) — That John *says nothing* regarding the symbolical determination of the draught of fishes, is sufficiently explained from the fact that *Jesus Himself* does not expressly declare it, but allows the thing to speak its silent symbolic language for itself, as He also has not Himself interpreted the symbolism of the withered fig-tree (Matt. xxi. 21).

Vv. 15-17. The *thrice-repeated* question: "ut illi occasionem praeberet, triplicis abnegationis maculam triplici professione eluendi," Wetstein, which Hengstenberg arbitrarily denies. — Σίμων Ἰωάννου] Thrice the same complete mention of the name with a certain *solemnity of deeply-moved affection*. In the use of the name *Simon Joh.* in itself, we are not to recognise—since certainly it is not at all susceptible of proof, that Jesus elsewhere addressed the apostle by the name Peter or Cephas—another and special purpose as in view, neither a reminiscence of the lost confidence (De Wette), nor of the human presupposition of the apostolical calling (Luthardt), nor a replacement into the natural condition for the purpose of an exaltation to the new dignity (Hengstenberg). The name of Peter is not *refused* to him (Hoelemann). — ἀγαπ.] He does not ask after his *faith*; for this had not become wavering, but the *love* proceeding from the faith had not been sufficiently strong. — τούτων] ἡ οὗτοι, than these my other disciples. They are still *present*; comp. on ver. 20. Peter had *given expression*, in his whole behaviour down to his fall, to so pre-eminent a love for Jesus (let vi. 68, let the washing of the feet, the sword-stroke, and xiii. 37 be borne in mind), and in virtue of the distinction, of which Jesus had deemed him worthy (i. 43), as well as by his post at the head of the apostles (comp. on Matt. xvi. 18), into which he was not now for the first time to be introduced (Hengstenberg), so pre-eminent a love was to be *expected* from him, that there is sufficient occasion for the πλείον τούτων without requiring a special reference to Matt. xxvi. 33 (from which, in comparison with John xiii. 37, a conclusion has been drawn adverse to the Johannean authorship). — *Peter in his answer* places, instead of the ἀγαπ. (*diligis*) of the question, the expression of *personal heart emotion*, φιλῶ, amo (comp. xi. 3, 5, xx. 2), by which he

gives the most direct satisfaction to his inmost feeling; appeals, in so doing, in the consciousness of the want of personal warranty, to the Lord's knowledge of the heart, but leaves the *πλείον τούτων* unanswered, because his fall has made him humble, for which reason Jesus also, in tender forbearance, is silent as to that *πλείον τούτων* in the questions that follow—vivid originality of the narrative, marked by such delicacy of feeling. — *βόσκει τὰ ἀρνία μου*] Restoration to the previous standing, which the rest of the apostles did not require, therefore containing the primacy of Peter only in so far as it already previously existed; see on Matt. xvi. 18. — *ἀρνία*] Expression of tender emotion: *little lambs*, without obliteration of the diminutive signification also in Rev. v. 6; Isa. xl. 11, Aq. The discourse becomes firmer in ver. 16, where *πρόβατα*, and again, more touched with emotion in ver. 17, where *προβάτια*, *little sheep* (see the critical notes), is found. By all three words, the *ἀρχιποίμην*<sup>1</sup> means *His believing ones* in general (1 Pet. v. 4), without making a separation between beginners and those who are matured (Euth. Zigabenus, Wetstein, Lange, and several others), or even between laity and clergy (Eusebius, Emiss, Bellarmine). Maldonatus aptly remarks: the distinction is *non in re, sed in voce*, where, notwithstanding, he, with other Catholic expositors, erroneously lays emphasis on the fact that precisely to Peter was the *whole* flock entrusted; the latter shared, in truth, with *all* the apostles, the same office of tending the entire flock. — *πάλιν δεύτερον*] See on Matt. xxvi. 42. — *ποίμαινε*] More universal and more expressive of *carefully ruling* activity in general (Acts xx. 28; 1 Pet. v. 2; Rev. ii. 27, vii. 17, and see Dissen, *ad Pind. Ol. x. 9*) than *βόσκει*, in which rather the special reference of *nourishing* protective activity is brought out (Hom. *Od. μ. 97, ξ. 102, et al.*; comp. *βοσκή* and *βόσκημα*, *victus*, and the compounds like *γροβοσκεῖν, et al.*; see also

<sup>1</sup> To apply the sense of the thrice-uttered behest so differently: duty of individuals; care for the whole; leading in of individuals for the whole (Luthardt), — is a separation of the idea which cannot be proved by the change of the words, and is entirely out of keeping with the mood of emotional feeling. In each of the three expressions lies the *whole* duty of the shepherd. "Quam vocum vim optime se intellexisse Petrus demonstrat, 1 Pet. v. 2," Grotius.



Philo, *deter. insid. pot.* I. p. 197; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* I. p. 312 f.). The latter, therefore, corresponds to the diminutive designations. — In His third question, ver. 17, Jesus takes up the *φιλω σε* of Peter, and cuts, by means of the thus altered question, still more deeply into his heart. Peter was troubled about this, that Jesus in this third question appeared to throw doubt even upon his *φιλεῖν*. Hence now his more earnest answer, with an appeal to his Lord's *unlimited knowledge of the heart*: *σὺ πάντα οἶδας, κ.τ.λ.*, which popular and deeply emotional expression is not to be interpreted of absolute omniscience (Baur), but according to the standard of xvi. 30, ii. 25, iv. 19, vi. 64, i. 49 f.

Ver. 18. With the thrice-uttered *βόσκε τὰ προβάτιά μου* Peter is again installed in his vocation, and with solemn earnestness (*ἀμήν, ἀμήν, κ.τ.λ.*) Jesus now immediately connects the prediction of *what he will one day have to endure* in this vocation. The prediction is clothed in a *symbolic* form. Comp. Acts xxi. 11. — *ὅτε ἡς νεώτερος*] than now. Peter, who had been already for a considerable time married (Matt. viii. 14), was at that time of middle age. In the antithesis of past youth and coming old age (*γηράσῃς*) the *present* condition certainly remains without being characterized; but this, in the vivid delineation of the prophetic picture, must not be pressed. Every expression of prophetic mould is otherwise subject to its "obliquity" (against De Wette). But the objection of the want of a simplicity worthy of Jesus (De Wette) is, considering the entire concrete and illustrative form of the prophecy, perfectly unjust. Note, moreover, that *ὅτε ἡς νεώτερος . . . ἤθελες* is not designed with the rest for symbolical *interpretation* (refers perhaps to his self-willedness before his conversion, Euth. Zigabenus, Luthardt, or in the earlier time of youth, Lange; to the autonomic energy in his calling, Hengstenberg), but serves only as a plastic preparation for the prediction beginning with *ὅταν δὲ γηράσῃς*, as a further background, from which the predictive figure the more vividly stands out in relief. — *ἐκτενεῖς τὰς χεῖρ. σου*] Feebly stretching them out to the power of strangers, and therewith surrendering thyself to it. Then will *another* (undefined subject of the hostile power) *gird thee*, i.e. *surround thee with*

fetters as with a girdle, bind thy body around with bonds, and convey thee away, whither thou wilt not, namely, to the place of execution (comp. Mark xv. 22); for with *ὅπου οὐ θέλεις*: *τῆς φύσεως λέγει τὸ συμπαθὲς καὶ τῆς σαρκὸς τὴν ἀνάγκην, καὶ ὅτι ἄκουσα ἀπορρήγνυται τοῦ σώματος ἢ ψυχῆ*, Chrysostom. Note further, that as with the three clauses of the first half of the verse there is a complete correspondence formed by means of the three clauses of the second, namely (1) by *ὅταν δὲ γῆρ.*; (2) by *ἄλλος σε ζώσει*; and (3) by *οἷσει ὅπου οὐ θέλεις*, the words *ἐκτενεῖς τὰς χεῖράς σου* form no independent point, but only serve for the illustration of the second, graphically describing the surrender into the power of the *ἄλλος*, who will perform the *ζώσει* (not the *joy* at being bound with fetters, Weitzel). All the less were the Fathers, and most of the later expositors (including Tholuck, Maier, De Wette, Brückner, Hilgenfeld, Hengstenberg, Baumlein), justified in making *ἐκτεν. τ. χεῖρ. σ.* precisely the characteristic point of the prediction, and in interpreting it of the *stretching out on the transverse beam of the cross*, in which case we must then, if *ἄλλος σε ζώσει* is not, as designating passivity, to be volatilized into a general expression (Hengstenberg), refer the *ζώσει* to the *binding to the cross* before the nailing thereto (so already Tertullian, *Scorp.* 15), or again, to the *girding round with the loin cloth* (which, however, can by no means be historically proved by *Ev. Nicod.* 10, see Thilo, *ad Cod. Apocr.* I. p. 582 f.), as also Brückner and Ewald have done. It is decisive against the entire explanation, referring it to the crucifixion, that *οἷσει ὅπου οὐ θέλεις* would be quite *incongruous* not before but after the stretching out of the hands and girding,<sup>1</sup> and it must in that case be understood of the *bearing* to the cross by the executioner's assistants (Ewald, comp. Bengel), according to which, however, in spite of this very special interpretation, the reference of the *stretching out of the hands* to the crucifixion

<sup>1</sup> A resource has indeed been sought with Casaubon by referring *εκτ. τ. χεῖρ. σ.* to the circumstance that before the crucifixion took place the cruciarii were carried about "*collo furcae inserto et manibus dispressis et ad furcae cornua deligatis*," Wetstein. But the *girding*, as it necessarily points to binding round the body, would be an *inappropriate* figure of the attaching the *hands*.—Logical subtleties cannot succeed in putting right the incongruity above alluded to, although Brückner has made the attempt.

must be again given up, and there would remain only the above doubtful binding on of the girdle round the loins as a specific mark of crucifixion. *Others* (so especially Gurlitt and Paulus) have found nothing more than the prediction of actual *weakness of old age*, and therewith made of the saying introduced in so weighty a manner something that says nothing. Olshausen refers to youth and old age in the *spiritual life*; <sup>1</sup> Peter, that is to say, will in his old age be in manifold ways hindered, persecuted, and compelled against his will to be active then and there, of which experiences his cross is the culminating point. In a similar manner Tholuck: the apostle is given to understand how he, who had been still governed in the earlier period of his life more by self-will, will come more and more under a higher power, and will submit himself at last even with resignation to the martyr-death destined by God. Comp. Lange, and even Bleek, p. 235 f., who by the ἄλλος actually understands Jesus; a mistaken view also in Mayerhoff, *Petr. Schr.* p. 87. All such spiritual allusions fall to the ground in virtue of ver. 19, as, moreover, ὅπου οὐ θέλεις also is not appropriate, the supposed representation of complete surrender, and instead of it probably ὅπου ἄρτι οὐ θέλεις must have been expected. Unsuitable also would be ὅταν γηράσῃς, since in truth that spiritual maturity of the apostle could not first be a subject of expectation in his old age. Beza is correct: "Christus in genere praedicat Petri mortem violentam fore." Nonnus: Ὁψὲ δὲ γηράσκων ταυύσεις σέο χεῖρας ἀνάγκη | καὶ σε περισφίγξουσιν ἀφειδέες ἄνδρες ἄλλοι, | εἰς τινα χώρον ἄγοντες, ὃν οὐ σέο θυμὸς ἀνῶγει. And beyond that point we cannot go without arbitrariness. Comp. also Luthardt and Godet.

Ver. 19. A comment, quite of Johannean stamp, on the remarkable saying. Comp. xviii. 32, also xii. 33. — ποίῳ θανάτῳ] i.e. by what *manner* of death, namely, by the death of *martyrdom*, for which Peter, bound round with fetters, was conveyed to the *place of execution*. John, who wrote long after the death of Peter, presupposes the details as *well known*,

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Euth. Zigabenus: to the life of Peter under the law, in which he has acted with self-will, the full maturity of the ἡλικία πνευματικὴ is opposed, in which he will stretch out his hands for crucifixion, etc.

as also Clem. *Cor.* I. 5. Peter was *crucified*, as tradition, from the time of Tertullian, *Scorp.* 15,<sup>1</sup> *de praescr.* 35, and Origen in Eusebius, credibly relates; the reader had therefore to take this special element of the *ποιότης* of the execution from history, as the fulfilment of the less definite word of prophecy, *in addition to*, but not to *derive it from*, the words of Christ themselves. — *δοξάσει τ. θεόν*] For such a death tended to the *glorifying of God*, in whose service he suffered for the revelation of His counsel and for the victory of His work (comp. xvii. 4, 6); hence *δοξάζειν τ. θεόν* became "magnificus martyrii titulus," Grotius. See Suicer, *Thes.* I. p. 949. Comp. also Phil. i. 20; 1 Pet. iv. 16; Acts v. 41. — *ἀκολουθεῖ μοι*] On the *announcement* of the martyrdom which is destined for Peter in his old age, there now follows, after a pause, the *summons* thereto, and that in the significant form: *follow me!* Comp. xiii. 36; Matt. x. 38, xvi. 24. This, then, refers, according to the context, to the following of Christ in the like death that He had died, *i.e.* in the *death of martyrdom*, which Peter is to *undergo*. Luther: "give thyself willingly to death." Too special is the interpretation which refers it to the death of the *cross*, since this was not expressly characterized in ver. 18 (against Euth. Zigabenus and many others). Quite in opposition to the context, however (see also ver. 22), others, after Chrysostom and Theophylact, have referred it to the *appointment to be oecumenical bishop*. The reference to the guidance of the church is by no means to be *connected* with that to the death of martyrdom (Ewald, *Jahrb.* III. p. 171), since *ἀκολ.* is the opposite of *μένειν*, ver. 22. Others, again, have divested the words of all significance: Jesus had something particular to speak of with Peter, and hence summoned him *to go with Him*. In this way Kuinoel, Paulus, and even Tholuck and Schleiermacher, whilst Grotius, Bengel, Luthardt, Lange, Hengstenberg, Brückner, Baeumlein, Godet attempt to melt away the proper and symbolical meaning.

Vv. 20, 21. From *ἀκολουθοῦντα* — which here, as belonging to the *narrative*, is, as a matter of course, not to be taken in the significant sense of the *ἀκολουθεῖ* belonging to the language of Jesus, ver. 19—it results that Jesus, during

<sup>1</sup> "Tunc Petrus ab altero cingitur, cum cruci adstringitur."

the preceding conversation with Peter (not now first, in accordance with ἀκολουθεῖ μοι, ver. 19, as Luthardt assumes; for this ἀκολ. μοι is to be left purely in its higher sense), has gone away with him a little distance from the disciples. Peter, engaged in walking with Jesus, turns round (ἐπιστραφεῖς, comp. Matt. ix. 22) and sees that John is following them. — δὲν ἠγάπα ὁ Ἰησοῦς] Not to be connected with ἀκολουθ. ("he knew that Jesus loved his company," Ewald, *loc. cit.*), but comp. xiii. 23. — ὃς καὶ ἀνέπεσεν, κ.τ.λ.] Retrospect of the special circumstance, xiii. 25; hence, however, not: who also lay at table, etc. (Hengstenberg and others), but: who also laid himself down (with the head) at the well-known Supper (ἐν τῷ δειπνῷ) on the breast of Jesus. Ὁς . . . παραδ. σε is not to be placed within a parenthesis, since with ver. 21 a new sentence begins. The subjoining of this observation is not intended to state the reason for John, as the confidant of Jesus, following Him (Bengel, Luthardt, Lange, Godet); but to prepare the way for the following question of petty jealousy, in which the point of the further narrative lies, while it indicates the consideration which determines Peter to put this question, *whether possibly a destiny of suffering might not in like manner be contemplated for the disciple so pre-eminently beloved and distinguished by Jesus, this ἐπιστήθιος of the Lord.* According to Chrysostom, Theophylact, and Euth. Zigabenus (similarly Olshausen), the intention is to make the reader sensible of how far bolder than at the Last Supper Peter has now become after his restoration. But the subsequent question neither presupposes any special boldness (comp. on ver. 22), nor, considering the peculiar situation of the Last Supper, was a want of boldness the reason why Peter did not himself put the question, xiii. 25. The καί after ὃς expresses the relation corresponding to δὲν ἠγάπα; Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 152. — οὗτος δὲ τί] sc. ἔσται. See Buttman, *Neut. Gr.* p. 338 [E. T. p. 394]. Nonnus: καὶ τί τελέσσει οὗτος ἐμὸς συνάεθλος; but what will become of this man if the result is to be such for me? Will the issue be otherwise with him? οὐκ ἀκολουθήσει σοι; οὐ τὴν αὐτὴν ἡμῶν ὁδὸν τοῦ θανάτου βαδιῖται; Euth. Zigabenus. The rendering: but what shall this man? Shall he then now be with us (Paulus and several others), a part of

the false explanation of ἀκολουθεῖ μοι, ver. 19. On the neut. τί, comp. Acts xii. 18; Xen. *Hell.* ii. 3. 17: ἔσοιτο ἡ πολιτεία; Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Rep.* p. 332 E.

Ver. 22. Jesus gives, in virtue of His personal sovereignty over the life and death of His own (comp. Rom. xiv. 9), to the *unwarranted* question, put by Peter, too, not merely out of curiosity, but even from a certain *jealousy* (Chrysostom, Erasmus, Wetstein, and several others import: out of particular *love* to John),<sup>1</sup> the answer: that it does not at all concern him, if He have possibly allotted to John a more distant and happier goal, and leads him, who had again so soon turned away his gaze from himself, immediately back to the task of ἀκολουθεῖ μοι imposed upon him, ver. 19. — μένειν] Opposite of the ἀκολουθεῖν, to be fulfilled by the death of martyrdom; hence: *be preserved in life*. Comp. xii. 34; Phil. i. 25; 1 Cor. xv. 6; Kypke, I. p. 415 f. Olshausen (and so substantially even Ewald) arbitrarily adds, after Augustine, the sense: "to tarry in quiet and peaceful life."<sup>2</sup> — ἕως ἔρχομαι] By this Jesus means, as the solemn and absolute ἔρχομαι itself renders undoubted, His final historical *Parousia*, which He, according to the apprehension of all evangelists and apostles, has promised will take place even before the passing away of the generation (see note 3 after Matt. xxiv.), not the destruction of Jerusalem, which, moreover, John far outlived (τινὲς in Theophylact, Wetstein, Lange, and several others, including Luthardt, who sees in this destruction the *beginning* of the *Parousia*, in opposition to the

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Luthardt: "only loving interest for his comrade," to which, however, the reproving τί πρὸς σί, ver. 22, does not apply.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. Godet, who, strangely enough, finds here an allusion to the fact that John remained at rest in the boat, and with his comrades (except Peter) towed the full net to land, where Jesus was. This allusion again includes the other, that John, in the history of the development of the founding of the church, received "a calm and collected part." And with this Godet finally connects: At the great gospel draught of fishes in the Gentile world, where Peter at the beginning stood foremost, "John assisted thereat until the end of the first century, a type of the whole history of the church, and here begins the mystery—perhaps he is therewith associated in an incomprehensible manner until the end of the present economy, until the vessel touches the shore of eternity." Thus, if we depart from the clear and certain sense of the words, we fall into the habit of *phantasy*, so that we no longer *expound*, but *invent* and *create*.

view of the N. T. generally, and to ver. 23); not the world historical conflict between Christ and Rome, which began under Domitian (Hengstenberg); not the carrying away by a gentle death (Olshausen, Lange, Ewald, after the older expositors, as Ruperti, Clarius, Zeger, Grotius, and several others); not the leading out from Galilee (where John in the meanwhile was to remain) to the scene of apostolic activity (Theophylact); not the apocalyptic coming in the visions of John's revelation (Ebrard); not the coming at any place, where John was to *wait* (Paulus)! See rather xiv. 3; 1 John ii. 28, iii. 2. On *ἕως ἔρχομαι* (as 1 Tim. iv. 13), *as long as until* I come, see Buttmann, *Neut. Gr.* p. 199 [E. T. p. 231]. In *σύ μοι ἀκολ.*, *σύ* bears the emphasis, in opposition to the other disciples.

Ver. 23. Hence there went forth (comp. Matt. ix. 26), in consequence of this answer of Jesus, the following legend<sup>1</sup> among the brethren (Christians): *that disciple dies not* (but remains in life until the Parousia, whereupon he experiences, not death, but change, 1 Thess. iv. 17; 1 Cor. xv. 51, 52). —The legend, which correctly took *ἔρχομαι* in the solemn sense of *Maranatha* (1 Cor. xvi. 22), would with reason have inferred its *οὐκ ἀποθνήσκει* from the word of Christ, had the latter run categorically: *θέλω αὐτὸν μένειν ἕως ἔρχ.* From the manner, however, in which Jesus expressed Himself, a *categorical judgment* was derived from the *conditional* sentence, and consequently the case supposed by Jesus, the occurrence of which is to be left to the judgment of experience (*ἐάν*, not *εἰ*), was proclaimed as an actually existing relation. This John exposes as an overstepping of the words of Jesus, and hence his observation intimates, that it was straightway asserted, but without reason, on the ground of that saying: *this disciple dies not*,—that rather the possible occurrence of the case supposed by *ἐάν θέλω* must be left over to the experience of the future, without asserting by way of anticipation either the *οὐκ ἀποθνήσκει* or the opposite. Considering the expected nearness of the Parousia, it is conceivable enough how John himself does not in a general way declare the saying, which was in circulation about him, to be incorrect, and

<sup>1</sup> Which therefore did not originate from the Apocalypse (Baur, Hilgenfeld).

does not refute it (it *might* in truth be verified through the impending Parousia), but only refers to its conditional character ("leaves it therefore to hang in doubt," Luther), and places it merely in its historical light, with verbally exact repetition of its source. According to others (see especially Heumann, B. Crusius, Hengstenberg), John would indicate that there is yet *another* coming of Jesus than that which is to take place at the close of history. But this other the expositors have here first invented, see on ver. 22.—After the death of the apostle, the legend was further expanded, to the effect that he slumbered in the grave, and by his breath moved the earth. See *Introd.* § 1, and generally Ittig, *sch. capita hist. eccl.* sec. I. p. 441 ff.

Ver. 24. *Conclusion by John* to this his supplement, vv. 1-23, which he makes known as his work, and the contents of which he maintains to be *true*. To his *book* he had given the conclusion, xx. 31; all the less should the apostolic legitimation be wanting to the *appendix* added by him at a later time. — *περὶ τούτων* and *ταῦτα* refer to the supplementary narrative in vv. 1-23. — Observe the change of participles, *pres.* *μαρτυρῶν* (for his *witness*, i.e. his eye- and ear-witness, still continued a living one in an oral form) and *aor.* *γράφας*.<sup>1</sup> — *οἶδαμεν*] Not *οἶδα μὲν* (Chrysostom, Theophylact); but John, as he has avoided throughout in the Gospel, in accordance with his delicate peculiarity, the self-designation by *I*, here speaks *out of the consciousness of fellowship with his readers at that time*, none of whom the aged apostle justly presupposed would doubt the truth of his testimony. With this *good apostolical confidence* he utters his *οἶδαμεν*. He *might* have written, as in xix. 35, *οἶδεν* (Beza so conjectured). But his book up to this appendix, chap. xxi., had belonged in truth already for a considerable time to the narrower circle of his first readers; they could not therefore but know from it how truly he had testified concerning all that he had written; all the more could he now, when by

<sup>1</sup> Note also how the witness is *identical* with the *γράφας*, so that John himself expressly announces himself as the composer of the appendix, and consequently also of the whole Gospel, with which the assumption that the Gospel proceeds from the apostle *through a second hand*, stands in contradiction.



way of supplement he further added the appendix, conceive what was to be said concerning the truth of the contents in the above form of fellowship, and as he *conceived* it, so he *says* it; as he is in so doing certain of the concurrence of his readers (comp. 3 John 12) with his own consciousness, so he *writes* it. According to this, no satisfactory reason is apparent for recognising in οἶδαμεν a composer *different* from the γράψας (Bleek, Baeumlein), and conceiving of the *Ephesian presbyters or friends of the apostle* as the subject, whether the chapter be now ascribed to them (or to an individual among them) (Grotius, Lücke, Ewald, Bleek, and several others), or only vv. 24, 25 (Tholuck, Luthardt, Godet, and several others), or again merely ver. 24, ver. 25 being rejected (Tischendorf).

Ver. 25. *Apocryphal conclusion* to the entire Gospel (see the critical notes) after the Johannean appendix, vv. 1–24, had been added. — ὅσα] ᾗ, which Lachmann, Tischendorf, after B. C.\* X. κ. Or. read, would give the relative definition simply as to *matter* (*quae* fecit); but ὅσα gives it *quantitatively* (*quot* fecit), as, frequently also in the classics, ὅσος follows after πολὺς (Hom. *Il.* xxii. 380; Xen. *Hell.* iii. 4. 3). The ἐποίησεν (without σημεῖα, xx. 31) designates the working of Jesus in its entire universality, but as that which took place on *earth*, not also the *Logos* activity from the beginning of the world, as, in spite of the name ὁ Ἰησοῦς, comp. xx. 30, Hoelemann, p. 79 ff., assumes, who sees in ver. 25 the completion of the symmetry of the gospel in keeping with the prologue. The pre-human activity of the Logos might be an object of speculation, as i. 1 ff., but not the contents of the histories, which were still to be written καθ' ἑν, not the task of a gospel. Hence the composer of ver. 25, moreover, has throughout indicated nothing which points back further than to the activity of the Incarnate One,<sup>1</sup> and not even has he written ὁ Χριστός, or ὁ κύριος, or ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, but ὁ Ἰησοῦς. — ἅτινα] *quippe quae, utpote quae*. The relative is likewise *qualitative* (Kühner, II. § 781, 4, 5, and *ad Xen. Mem.* ii. 1. 30), namely, in respect of the great multitude; hence not the simple ᾗ. — καθ' ἑν] *one by one, point by point*. See

<sup>1</sup> For that καθ' ἑν should point back to i. 3, and τὸν κόσμον to i. 10, is without any internal justification, and could be discovered by no reader.

Bernhardy, p. 240; Ast, *Ilex. Plat.* I. p. 639 f. — οὐδὲ αὐτὸν τ. κόσμ.] *ne ipsum quidem mundum*, much less a space in it. — οἶμαι] Placed in John's mouth by the composer of the concluding verse. — χωρῆσαι] to *contain* (comp. ii. 6; Mark ii. 2). The infin. aor. after οἶμαι without αὖν, a pure Greek idiom (Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 751 ff.), expresses what is believed with certainty and decision. See Bernhardy, p. 383, and on the distinction of the infin. pres. (Pflugk, *ad Eur. Hec.* 283) and future, Kühner, II. p. 80 f. — τὰ γραφόμενα] the books, *which*, if the supposed case occurs, *shall be written*. The world is too small, then thinks the writer, to include these books within it, not, as Luthardt suggests, to embrace the *fulness of such testimonies*, to which he inaptly adds, since in truth it is *books* that are spoken of: "for only an absolutely external circumference is in keeping with the absolute contents of the Person and of the life of Christ." Hengstenberg also applies the expression of external dimension to the "*internal overflowing greatness*;" comp. Godet; the *object* of the history is greater than the world, etc.; Ebrard's remark is singular: there would be no *room in literature* for the books. In a manner opposed to the context, Jerome, Augustine, Ruperti (who says: the world is "et ad quaerendum fastidiosus est ad intelligendum obtusus"), Calovius, Bengel, and several others have explained it of the *capacitas non loci, sed intellectus* (comp. on Matt. xix. 11). — Not only is the inharmonious and unspiritual *exaggeration* in ver. 25 *un-Johannean* (unsuccessfully defended by Weitzel, *loc. cit.* p. 632 ff., and softened down by Ewald, with a reference also to Coh. xii. 12), it is also apocryphal in character (comp. similar hyperboles in Fabricius, *ad Cod. Apocr.* I. p. 321 f., and Wetstein *in loc.*), but also the *periodic* mode of expression, which does not agree with the Johannean simplicity, as well as the first person (οἶμαι), in which John in the Gospel never speaks; moreover, nowhere else does he use οἶεσθαι, which, however, is found in Paul also only once (Phil. i. 17). The variations are (see the critical notes) of no importance for a critical judgment.