CLARK'S

FOREIGN

THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY.

THIRD SERIES.

VOL. V.

Tholuck's Commentary on the Gospel of St John.

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38, GEORGE STREET.
LONDON: J. GLADDING; JACKSON, WALFORD, AND HODDER.
DUBLIN: JOHN ROBERTSON AND CO.

MDCCCLXIII.

COMMENTARY

ON

THE GOSPEL OF ST JOHN.

BY

DR AUGUSTUS THOLUCK,
PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF HALLE.

TRANSLATED FROM THE LAST GERMAN EDITION.

NEW EDITION.

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38, GEORGE STREET.
LONDON: HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO.; SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, AND CO.
DUBLIN: JOHN ROBERTSON AND CO.

MDCCCLXIII.

MURRAY AND GIBB, PRINTERS, EDINBURGH.

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

ONE of the most eminent Biblical scholars, not alone of our country, but of our age, in imparting some of the impressions derived from a sojourn in Europe, says: "To the American Christian who travels on this part of the Continent, Tholuck is undoubtedly the most interesting person whose acquaintance he will make. He possesses a greater personal influence and reputation than any other theologian in Germany."[1] Prof. Park in his Sketch of the Life and Character of Tholuck, makes these remarks: "As a Commentator he has many excellencies. This would be anticipated from the fact that his reading has been so various, and his memory is so retentive; from his almost unequaled facility in acquiring language, and his peculiar intimacy with the Hebrew and its cognate tongues. He is able to write and converse in a great variety of languages, as the English, Italian, Dutch, French, Spanish, Latin, Greek, Arabic, Persian and others. He is, of course, qualified to illustrate the sacred texts by a multiplicity of references; and he quotes with peculiar pertinence and effect from the Oriental, and especially from the Rabbinical writings For a single specimen, read his comment on John vii. 37–39. The classical quotations, too, in his Commentaries, are eminently valuable."[2]

Kaufman observes in the preface to his translation of the fourth edition of Tholuck's John: "Nothing is perhaps more wanted in the theological domain than a good Commentary on the Gospels. On this part of the Bible our language affords the student little that is valuable in a critical and doctrinal view.—In commenting on St. John particularly—the Plato of the inspired circle—it requires a mind of a peculiar order. This mind Tholuck possesses: a happy combination of deep and meditative thought with a Christian heart; a quick apprehension, a glowing imagination, an accurate acquaintance with language, and a nice perception of its force, together with a clear insight into the spiritual nature of man. There is no man more interesting than our author upon the theatre of Germany,

[1] Prof. Robinson, in 1831. Biblic. Reposit. i. 29.

[2] Biblical Cabinet, xxviii. 24.

nor indeed upon the literary arena of any nation. He stands forth pre-eminent among the learned ones of that learned people; he yields to none in versatility of mind, in depth and compass of thought, or in variety of knowledge. . . But a lustre is thrown over all these attainments by his deep and earnest piety. Such a fervor and glow of Christian devotion as everywhere breathe in his writings, are scarcely to be met with in any writer since the days of Leighton. Amid the doubters and infidels of Germany, it is truly delightful to discover such a spirit as Tholuck's; learned and eloquent as the proudest among them, he still preserves the meek simplicity of a child, and brings all his learning and his laurels and lays them down at the feet of Christ."

Müller[1] says: "Every thing presents itself to the mind of Tholuck in large outline. . . Bold and brilliant images are always at his command. Not only does the Holy Bible open to him its treasure-chambers, but the sages of Greece, the ancient and modern teachers of the Church, the Christian lyric poets, present him their most beautiful flowers, and lay at his feet the most apposite expressions. THERE IS GIVEN TO DR. THOLUCK THE POWER OF ENCHANTMENT OVER MIND."

Not one of the Commentaries of this illustrious scholar has passed through so many editions, and found such universal favor, as the one which it is our privilege, in this volume, to offer the reader. To the illustrious Neander, whose "life and whose instructions had taught him to understand the Gospel of the Spirit," Tholuck dedicated the first edition of his Commentary on the Gospel of John. His original plan had been to present an epitome of the exegetical works of the Fathers and of the Reformers, which, upon the Gospel of John, are extraordinarily numerous and rich. In performing this labor, he felt constantly the necessity of marking and correcting the mistakes into which these illustrious men had sometimes been drawn by false or imperfect principles of interpretation. The materials grew under his hand, and took the shape rather of a history of the hermeneutics of the Gospel, than of an exposition of it. He was led, in consequence, to the determination of preparing a compressed Commentary, in which the most valuable portions of the ancient Expositors should be presented in their own language — not so extended indeed in its compass, yet on the general plan which he had pursued in his Commentary on the Romans, (a Commentary which De Wette, remote as he was from its distinctive theological position, pronounced to be superior to any which had appeared on that Epistle.) The only reason for hesitating as to the prosecution of this purpose, was his sense of the peculiar merit of the Commentary of Lücke. A work characterized by

[1] Stud. u. Kritik, viii. 239, quoted by Prof. Park, Sketch 31.

such "marked exegetical talent, thorough study of the aids, and impartiality of judgment," might have been supposed to render another unnecessary. But not only were the plan and extent of the work he proposed to himself different from those of Lücke's, but it seemed to him that no one work upon such a book as John could render all others superfluous. The Commentary of Lücke is a very ample exegetico-critical treatment of the Gospel, Tholuck's was meant to be a *Manual* for the student and the scholar. The Commentary which was given to the public in 1826, met with such favor, that within a few months after its appearing it became necessary to make preparation for a second edition, which, with a number of corrections on particular points, but with no essential changes, appeared in 1828. Though many desired that he should give more breadth to his handling, the earlier judgment of Tholuck remained unchanged—he felt that a more imperative want was met by a Manual than would have been supplied by any other form he might have given his work. It would have been easy to enlarge the work, but he aimed at the more difficult task of compression—the task of furnishing a work which should be comprehensive without being bulky, and which, while it avoided superficiality, should not run into excess of detail. The evangelical character of the Exposition, its mild fearlessness in the defense of Christian truth, and especially its views of inspiration, which rose so far above those maintained by the old Rationalism, exposed the work to violent assault. Tholuck was willing to learn from foes as well as from friends, and the severity of the antagonism only made him more thorough in investigation and more deliberate in judgment. Thus the opposition of enemies not only helped to give a wider diffusion to his works, but served to render them more and more worthy of the distinguished favor with which they were received. A third edition appeared in 1831. It was marked by increasing definiteness, fullness, and precision. The interpretation of our Saviour's discourses was almost entirely rewritten, and various improvements of less moment were made. In the preface he expresses his sense of the defects of his work—defects which he would desire and hope to relieve, were he thoroughly to remodel it. To explain Scripture more largely by Scripture, to bring to bear upon each part of the Bible a mind enlarged by a study of the whole, to unite with the exquisite accuracy of Bengel the profoundness of Calvin—these he felt were necessary to the formation of an Expositor of the highest order, one who would fully meet the wants of the Church and of the times. He closes the preface with the hopeful words: "Despite all the clamorers, the edifice of a Christian theology is rising, our ancient faith is justified on the side of scientific theology, of Church history, of exegesis, of criticism, and the *unction of the Power* will procure for all these strivings an entrance into hearts prepared to receive them. Soli *Deo* gloria!"

The changes in the fourth edition, which appeared in 1833, were inconsiderable. This edition found a translator in the Rev. A. Kaufman, Minister of the Episcopal Church in Andover, (Boston: Perkins and Marvin, 1836.) The notices of Mr. Kaufman's translation, in the leading religious periodicals of our country, were, with the exception of the review in the Biblical Repository, generally rather unfavorable, and in some cases severe. The obtrusion into the translator's preface, of private opinions in regard to various points, which seemed to have no very natural connection with Tholuck's work, or with his own labors upon it, gave special offense, and in some cases seemed to lead reviewers to an unjust estimate of the general merits of his work. It would indeed be easy to point out serious mistakes into which Mr. K. has fallen as to the meaning of his author, and the translation is throughout rather hard and mechanical. But it is no small honor to have performed so difficult a work, even tolerably well. The translation shows everywhere conscientious care, and is generally correct. Whatever its imperfections might be, it still met a wide-felt want, and has been largely used by theological scholars in this country and in England. It has for a number of years been out of print.

A fifth edition of the original was issued in 1837, the year after the appearance of the translation. In the four years which had intervened between the fourth and fifth editions, so much that was important in the interpretation of John had made its appearance, that Tholuck felt it a duty to remodel his work, especially in the portion extending from the thirteenth chapter to the end. The number of pages, however, was reduced by the greater compression of the style, and the omission of some of the citations. In 1834, the second edition of Lücke's Commentary had been published, bearing on every page the evidence that the ten years which had elapsed since the appearance of the first had been faithfully used by its author. There was less fire, but far more light and clearness in the work in its new form. There was a general thoroughness, acuteness and finish of treatment displayed in it, yet it was less independent than the earlier edition, not reverential enough in its estimate of Divine revelation, and very unequal in the exposition of different parts. A second edition of the second part of Olshausen's Biblical Commentary had also appeared in 1834. The peculiar charm of this work, which is as familiar now to the English student as to the German, is that it is *one outgushing* of the inmost soul of its author—it has a *unity* and *freshness*, which have made it dear to many who would turn with indifference from works which might justly lay claim to more *thoroughness*. In the preface to the fifth edition of his Commentary, Tholuck gives what he regards as its distinctive character in its relations to these

masterly works: "Were I to express what I regard as the outward relation of my Commentary to the two with which its spirit is most in affinity, I mean the Commentaries of Lücke and of Olshausen, my statement would be this: the Commentary of Lücke pursues at large the learned investigation of many points, especially of critical ones; mine limits itself to meeting the most imperative wants of the preacher, the candidate, and the student, with the effort in every part to present the very largest amount of matter in a small space. To the work of Olshausen, mine stands in this relation, that while in his the grand aim is to present the *thought in its unfolding*, mine to the same degree has regard to the historical and philological needs of the classes of readers just mentioned. Their labor as little makes mine superfluous, as mine does theirs. And though in general we exhibit a unity of theological tendency, yet there is an individual diversity, so that one part of the world of theological readers will feel more drawn to one of us, and another part to another."

With all their various changes, these editions were nevertheless not so radically different as to affect the identity of the work. But between the appearance of the fifth edition (1837,) and of the sixth, (1844,) a revolution in the criticism of the Gospel had taken place. The works of Strauss (1835,) and of kindred writers, the masterly vindications by Neander and others, which they called forth, and the appearance of an extraordinary number of books of high merit, bearing on the interpretation of John, had made it necessary that the sixth edition should be newly elaborated from beginning to end. Not only did Tholuck perform this labor thoroughly, but he enriched his work by new researches in neglected portions of the ancient mines, so as to make it an ampler store-house of the old, even while he was bringing to it fresh treasures of the new. Though much of the matter of the other editions was dropped, and what was retained was compressed as much as possible, yet the new edition embraced nearly fifty pages more than the latest of the old. This edition the writer was induced to translate at the request of the publishing house of Smith, English & Co., Philadelphia, in connection with Messrs Clark of Edinburgh, the publishers of the well known Foreign Theological Library, who have already published translations of various works of Dr Tholuck. Regarding the work as one of science, not as one of art, he has believed that the mere graces of style should be freely sacrificed where such a sacrifice seemed to be demanded by exactness in reproducing the author's meaning. The work of Tholuck has been revised throughout, his references of almost every kind have been verified, and, in a number of cases, corrected. As a convenience even to the scholar, and as an indispensable aid to others who may use the work, the numerous citations in the learned

languages are accompanied by a translation. The writer has made various additions, which will be found indicated at the points at which they are introduced.

The translation was commenced in 1854, and was sufficiently advanced to have been furnished for the press in 1855. Various causes led, however, to a postponement of its publication to the present time. Meanwhile a seventh edition of Tholuck's John made its appearance. It will not be necessary to state its distinctive features, as the author's preface to it will be given. From this edition important additions have been made, which are indicated by the bracket, [ ]. Two Appendices of valuable matter have also been made from it, for the first of which the writer is indebted to the kindness of Prof. T. F. Lehman, of this city. As the translation comprehends the whole of the sixth, and so much of the seventh edition, it claims, in this combination, an advantage over either edition of the original, as in the seventh much of the most valuable matter of the sixth is omitted, under the supposition that the reader has access to the earlier editions.

Though the labor of translation has been carried on amid the duties and interruptions connected with the pastoral office, yet it is hoped that a conscientious care has so far overcome these difficulties that the defects will be found rather in the form than in the substance of the work.

CHARLES P. KRAUTH.

122 CENTRE AVENUE, PITTSBURGH, PENN'A.

AUTHOR'S PREFACE TO THE SIXTH EDITION.

SINCE the appearance of the fifth edition of this Commentary, theological literature has been enriched to such an extent with works which have exercised an influence on the exposition of the Gospel of John, that we could not avoid the labor connected with a new elaboration in every part of our Commentary, in the earlier editions of which the changes had been but occasional. In the preparation of this sixth edition, we have used and have had special regard to the following recent works: Neander, Life of Jesus, 3d ed.; Strauss, Life of Jesus, 4th ed.; Krabbe, Life of Jesus; the critical writings of Lützelberger, Schwegler, Bruno Bauer; Lücke's Commentary, 3d ed.; De Wette's Commentary; Ebrard, Scientific Critique of the Evangelical History; Mau, on Death, the wages of sin; and others. We could not use the Commentary of Baumgarten-Crusius, nor Köstlin's System of John, in the body of our work, but have noticed them in a supplement. Among the older interpreters, of whom the other Expositors have hitherto made no use, or but an occasional one, we have consulted throughout, especially the following: Luther in his Sermons, Bucer, Crell, Maldonatus. We have used Bengel with even more frequency than before. In this way the work has been extended beyond the size of previous editions. May it be destined in this new form also, to secure a favorable hearing and to promote science.

DR. A. THOLUCK.

HALLE, Nov. 4th, 1843.

PREFACE TO THE SEVENTH EDITION.

In permitting this Commentary, after an interval of twelve years, once more to go forth to the world, the lapse of so considerable a time, during which so many meritorious works upon this Gospel have made their appearance, has rendered it necessary that this new edition should be elaborated anew. It will be found that in preparing it we have not consulted merely aids of recent date, but also a number of the older Expositors, hitherto little used or not used at all, Origen in *scattered* passages in his works, and some other Greek Expositors, Luther, Brentius, Tarnov, Gerhard, the ingenious Bucer, Bullinger, Musculus, and others. I could not use in the *earlier* part of my work, the 3d ed. of Meyer, nor the Danish Commentary of Klausen, 1855.—The expressions bearing on dogmatics, have also been more thoroughly discussed. As regards the critical question which has grown into such magnitude, I must confess that after renewed investigation, during which it has been my constant effort to give due weight to the views of those who differ from me, I feel constrained to abide by my earlier judgment, not excepting even the Passover question. If it should seem to some of the reviewers, that various points of the exegesis have not been handled sufficiently at large, I would remark, that brevity was an element of the original plan of this work, and that consequently the reader is not to look in it for such extended discussions as he finds in my Commentaries on Romans and on the Sermon on the Mount.

When I began to elaborate anew the three Commentaries, (on the Epistle to the Romans, on the Sermon on the Mount, and on this Gospel,) the prospect seemed but slight, in the feeble state of my eye-sight, that I should be able to complete them, yet God has helped me, and given me strength to carry the work through. Should I still be blessed with the same aid, I shall with heightened pleasure, and with fresh love for the work, enter on a continuation of the preliminary History of Rationalism, in which my next task will be the delineation of "the *ecclesiastical* life" of the seventeenth century.

A. THOLUCK.

July 2d, 1857.

[CONTENTS.[1]

[1] The *arrangement* of the matter differs to some extent in the two editions. To facilitate comparison, that of the 7th is given, with the pages on which the matter will be found in the Translation.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. Particulars of the Life of John the Evangelist.

The father of the Evangelist was Zebedee, a Galilean fisherman; his mother's name was Salome. His birth-place was probably Bethsaida, (בֵּית צַיְדָה "fishing place,") a fishing village on the sea of Galilee, the native place also of Peter, Andrew and Philip. This seems to be a natural inference from his intimate acquaintance with them, and from his being with them, Matt. iv. 18–21, John i. 40. The parents of John could not have been altogether poor: Zebedee had "hired servants," Mark i. 20; Salome was one of the women who provided for the Saviour's wants, Matt. xxvii. 56, and who purchased spices to embalm him, Luke xxiii. 55; and our Saviour, when he was dying, commended Mary to the care of John, and requested him to take her εἰς τὰ ἴδια, to his own house. That Zebedee was in good circumstances, and in a respectable social position, may perhaps also be inferred from the fact that John was known by the high priest, John xviii. 15. Under these circumstances, the supposition is natural that the Evangelist had received some education. He is, indeed, enumerated (Acts iv. 13,) among the "ignorant," (ἰδιώταις,) but the Pharisees regarded all persons as such who had not pursued the Rabbinic study of the law, all who were not תַּלְמִידֵי חֲכָמִים, pupils of the Rabbins. It is probable that from his earliest years he had a religious bent. His mother Salome appears to have been a woman of piety, such was the devotion with which she attached herself to Jesus; her mind, too, was probably occupied with the Messianic hopes, as we infer from the narrative in Matt. xx. 20, from which we gather also her devoted love to her children.

Such a mother would be likely to exercise at an early period a hallowed influence on her children, and this would be fostered in John by his mode of life as a fisherman, which often led him to pass the quiet watches of the night on the waters, amid the enchantments of a region resembling that which encircles the Lake of Lucerne. (See Seetzen in Winer, Reallex. in the article Genezareth; Clarke in Raumer's Palästina, 2d ed. p. 58.) When, therefore, John the Baptist made his appearance and announced everywhere the near approach of the kingdom of God, it was natural that John, at that time a youth, should, under the impulse of a hallowed aspiration, attach himself to this herald of Christ. We find in Theophylact the tradition, that John's father, Zebedee, was an uncle of the Baptist. The Baptist, in prophetic intuition, depicted the exalted destination of Jesus. From himself, as the one who was to prepare the way, he referred men to him who was the true light of the world. The docile Disciples turned to Jesus, and among these, together with Andrew, was John, who, from the very first interview, was so attracted, that he remained with the Messiah, whom he had now found, from the fourth hour of the afternoon until in the night. Nevertheless, Jesus did not at once take him as a constant companion, though John probably accompanied him for a few days. (See on ch. ii. 2.) It was characteristic of the divine wisdom of the Saviour as a teacher, that he placed the germ in the soul and allowed it little by little to unfold itself. John returned to his occupation, and some time after, when Jesus was wandering by the sea of Galilee, he called to constant companionship with him the Disciple whose soul had been aroused at an earlier period, and the call was at once obeyed, Luke v. 10, Matt. iv. 21. This Disciple, then, by the whole course of his life, is a representative of that class of Christians who, by a gentle and gradual unfolding of their inner life, have become what they are, as Paul, on the other hand, is a representative of those who have been transformed by a sudden conversion. In his intercourse with the Redeemer, John now revealed such a tenderness of heart, a disposition so susceptible of moulding, an attachment so profound, as to render him peculiarly dear to Christ, to which John himself alludes, though without mentioning his own name, John xiii. 23, xix. 26, xx.

2, xxi. 7. It is evident, too, from some narrations of the Evangelists, that Jesus conferred certain tokens of distinction on three of his Disciples, of whom John was one. Matt. xvii. 1, xxvi. 37, Mark v. 37. After the ascension of Christ, John resided in Jerusalem, where Paul finds him (Gal. ii. 9,) on his third journey, (about A. D. 52,) though no mention is made of him on Paul's first visit, (Gal. i. 19.) As he took the mother of Jesus to his own house, that in accordance with the request of Jesus he might sustain to her the part of a son, (John xix. 27;) and as this house probably was in Jerusalem, tradition has drawn the inference that he did not leave Jerusalem before Mary's death, which according to Eusebius took place A. D. 48. This much is certain, that John at the time when Paul was in Ephesus, that is A. D. 58 or 59, was not yet in that city which became the scene of his later labors; for not only would not Paul labor in places which had been occupied by others, and therefore would not have intruded upon the territory occupied by John, but besides there is a scene (Acts xx. 17,) in which mention of John could not have been avoided, had he then been in Ephesus. When, too, Paul wrote his Epistles to Timothy at Ephesus, John was not there. Yet when Paul afterward comes to Jerusalem, (Acts xxi. 18,) he does not find John there; his absence, however, can hardly have been more than temporary, like the one mentioned, Acts viii. 14. The first occasion for John's leaving Jerusalem was probably furnished by the death of Paul, as Asia Minor, where especially the Christian Churches were very numerous, but where also doctrinal errors of the most dangerous character germinated, was the very region to demand the oversight and fostering care of an Apostle. This would bring us to about A. D. 65 or 66. In Palestine, as we learn from Gal. ii. 9, the Apostle still had the stricter legal tendency. Even the Apocalypse, at least rests decidedly on an Old Testament back-ground, and several men who sprung from John's school, (if that expression be allowable,) Papias, Hegesippus and Irenæus, were Chiliasts; Hegesippus, in fact, had Ebionitish tendencies. As regards the Easter festival, John and his disciples followed the Jewish usage. If we consider the type of his Epistles and Gospel as that which is distinctively characteristic of John, we can hardly speak with

propriety of John's school, since the Letter of Polycarp, the Epistles of Ignatius, and the Epistle to Diognetus, have more points of accordance with Paul than with John, though instances of the latter are by no means wanting. How is this to be explained?[1] Lützelberger has on this ground denied that the Apostle resided in Asia Minor; Schwegler (see § 6,) and other theologians of the school of Dr. Baur, are the more ready to receive the Revelation as the work of John, that they may regard the Gospels and Epistles as spurious. This is a mere cutting of the knot. We may perhaps say, that what is characteristic of John does not in general find imitators to the same extent as that which is distinctive of Paul, (a fact to which the later periods of the Church also add their confirmation;) that in addition we must bear in mind the more limited energy of this Apostle in practical life, (even in Acts iii. 6, Peter is the one who speaks and acts;) that the Churches in Asia Minor, moreover, were not founded, but simply taken care of, by him; that the Gospel and Epistles were the work of his closing years; that the more Judaizing type had already obtained predominance through the agency of a majority of the other Apostles—in Asia Minor especially, both Andrew and Philip had labored.

During the period of the labors of the Evangelist in these portions of Asia Minor, he was banished by one of the emperors to Patmos, one of the islands of the Sporades in the Ægean sea, where, according to Rev. i. 9, he wrote the Apocalypse. Irenæus (Adv. Hæres. v. 30,) and Eusebius following him, (Hist. Eccles. l. iii. c. 18,) say that the Apocalyptic vision was given to John at the end of the reign of Domitian. If this account may be credited, (see § 3,) the banishment must have occurred under Domitian, (died A. D. 96.) We find in addition in Tertullian, (Præscript. adv. hæret. c. 36,) and in Jerome, who adopts his statement, (adv. Iovin. l. i. c. 14, in Matt. xx. 23,) and in other writers, an account of John's being taken to Rome under Domitian, of his being cast into a vessel of boiling oil, of his miraculous deliverance from it, and of his being subsequently removed to Patmos. As this statement, however, rests on the authority of no ancient writer except Tertullian,

[1] See p. 36.

who was not very critical, and as this sort of capital punishment was unknown in Rome, no importance can be attached to it. (See Mosheim, Dissertat. ad Hist. Eccles. vol. i. p. 497, seq.) There is an independent testimony that John suffered for the faith, in the fact that Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, (about A. D. 200,) calls him μάρτυς, "a martyr," (Euseb. His. Eccles. v. 24.) The return from exile is to be dated under Nerva, (Euseb. His. Eccles. l. iii. c. 20, 23. Jerome, Catal. Scriptor. Eccles. c. 9.) In the ecclesiastical tradition he appears as the centre of the Church-life in Asia Minor, insomuch, that in the controversies, as for example the one about Easter, and in the struggle with the Gnostics, he is referred to, and frequent mention is made of his disciples and hearers. When upward of ninety years of age, (according to Jerome, he was a hundred, according to Suidas, a hundred and twenty years old,) he died at Ephesus, in the reign of Trajan.

§ 2. CHARACTER OF JOHN THE EVANGELIST.

If we connect the image of John which his Gospel and Epistles give of their author, with certain traits of his life, which antiquity has preserved to us, he appears to us as a tender, affectionate, rather feminine character — a character which already displays itself in the diffluent and hovering recital, and especially in the passages where, with elegiac sadness, he speaks of the unbelief of the world; chap. i. 10, xi. 3, xix. 32, xii. 37. Originally, this tenderness was not destitute of a certain susceptibility to sudden flashes of anger, as is by no means rarely the case in this class of feminine dispositions; they are repelled as vehemently as they are attracted. Of this kind is the trait recorded, Luke ix. 54. From the Old Testament point of view, the anger of the Disciple in the case we have alluded to, was just, for it was an anger directed against wicked men; but our Lord leads him to observe that such a frame of mind is not the proper one for a disciple of the *New* Testament. (We must notice in v. 55, the position of the ὑμεῖς.[1]) There is another aspect, also, in which

[1] The prevalent opinion, that this incident had led to the application of the surname "sons of thunder," to John and his brother, (Mark iii. 17,) is rendered less

he appears in the narrative of the Evangelists in an unsanctified character. Selfishness reveals itself in the trait, Mark ix. 38, where he utters expressions of jealousy toward those who, without leaving all to follow Christ, as the Apostles had done, had become partakers in the power of working the miracles which attended the Gospel. Selfishness also appears, Mark x. 35, (see Matt. xx. 20,) where he and his brother, through their mother, solicit Christ for an earthly distinction in the kingdom of the Messiah. We are led, then, to the supposition that the characteristics of love, humility, and mildness, the expression of which we find in the writings of the Evangelist and in his later history, were the result of the renewing grace of God, of the influence of the spirit of Christ on the Disciple who yielded himself to it. We must not forget, however, that the tenderness of John, when he became penetrated by the spirit of Christ, was in no sense an enervate softness. With all the diffluence of his descriptions, a severe moral earnestness reveals itself in his Epistles: 1 John i. 6, iii. 9, 20, v. 16, 2 John 10, 11. Polycarp (in Irenæus,) mentions a judgment expressed by John toward the close of his life, in which we recognize the Disciple of whom Luke ix. 54, tells us. John fled from a bath in which he found the heretic Cerinthus, saying that he feared that it would fall upon their heads. We have also had, however, preserved to us narratives, on which there is an impress of the character of love which reveals itself in his Gospel and Epistles. Clemens Alexandrinus, in his book, *τίς ὁ σωζόμενος πλούσιος*,[1] (what rich man can be saved,) c. 42, narrates the following: "Listen to a story, or rather to a genuine tradition, of the Apostle John, which has been faithfully treasured in memory. On his return from Patmos to Ephesus, he visited the neighboring regions to ordain bishops and organize Churches. While he was engaged in exhorting and comforting the brethren in a city

probable on the view we take of that occurrence, for there is not then in the words of Christ an absolute reproof, and they lose something of their severity. The name, at least, would not then be entirely one of reproach, but would merely mark the strength of their natural fervor. [The name "sons of thunder" can have no reference to their eloquence; for at the time it was conferred on them, they could not have given proofs of their eloquence. The most natural explanation of it is afforded by their manifestation of violent emotion, as in Mark ix. 38, Luke ix. 54. (Here, however, the text is not settled beyond the word *ἐπετίμησεν*.) 7th ed.]

[1] The original is given in Olshausen's Monum. Præcip. i. 17–20. (Transl.)

near Ephesus, whose name is given by some, he noticed a handsome, spirited young man, toward whom he felt himself drawn so powerfully, that he turned to the bishop of the congregation with the words: 'I commit him to you, before Christ and the congregation, who are witnesses of my heartfelt earnestness.' The bishop received the young man, promised to do all in his power, and John, at parting, repeated the same charge. The elder took the youth home, educated and watched over him, and finally baptized him. After he had given him this seal of the Lord, however, he abated in his solicitude and watchfulness. The young man, too early freed from restraint, fell into bad company. He was first led into lavish habits, and finally drawn on to rob travelers by night. Like a spirited steed that springs from the path, and rushes madly over a precipice, so did his vehement nature hurry him to the abyss of destruction. He renounced all hope in the grace of God; and as he considered himself involved in the same destiny with his companions, was ready to commit some startling crime. He associated them with himself, organized a band of robbers, put himself at their head, and surpassed them all in cruelty and violence. Some time after, John's duties again called him to that city. When he had attended to all the other matters, he said to the bishop: 'Well, bishop, restore the pledge which the Saviour and I entrusted to thee, in the presence of the congregation!' The bishop at first was alarmed, supposing that John was speaking of money, and charging him with embezzlement. But when John continued: 'I demand again that young man, and the soul of my brother,' the old man sighed heavily, and with tears replied: 'He is dead!' 'Dead?' said the Disciple of the Lord; 'in what way did he die?' 'He is dead to God,' responded the old man; 'he became godless, and finally a robber. He is no longer in the Church, but, with his fellows, holds the fastnesses of a mountain.' The Apostle, when he heard this, with a loud cry, rent his clothing and smote his head, and exclaimed: 'To what a keeper have I committed my brother's soul!' He takes a horse and a guide, and hastens to the spot where the band of robbers was to be found. He is seized by their outguard; he makes no attempt to escape, but cries out; 'I have come for this very purpose,

Take me to your captain!' Their captain, completely armed, is waiting for them to bring him, but, recognizing John as he approached, flees, from a sense of shame. John, nevertheless, forgetting his age, hastens after him with all speed, crying: 'Why, my child, do you flee from me—from me, your father, an unarmed old man? Have compassion on me, my child; do not be afraid. You yet have a hope of life. I will yet give account to Christ for you. If needs be, I will gladly die for you, as Christ died for us. I will lay down my life for you. Stop! Believe, Christ hath sent me.' Hearing these words, he first stands still and casts his eyes upon the ground. He next throws away his arms, and commences trembling and weeping bitterly. When the old man approaches, he clasps his knees, and with the most vehement agony pleads for forgiveness, baptizing himself anew as it were with his own tears: all this time, however, he conceals his right hand. But the Apostle, pledging himself, with an appeal to God for his truth, that he had obtained forgiveness from the Saviour for him, implores him even on his knees, and the hand he had held back he kisses as if it were cleansed again by his penitence. He finally led him back to the Church. Here he pleaded with him earnestly, strove with him in fasting, urged him with monitions, until he was able to restore him to the Church—an example of sincere repentance and genuine regeneration." To this narrative from the life of the holy Disciple, which bears so strikingly the impress of his heart, Jerome (Comm. ad Galat. vol. iii. p. 314, Mart.[1]) adds the following trait: "When John had reached his extremest old age, he became too feeble to walk to the meetings, and was carried to them by young men. He could no longer say much, but he constantly repeated the words: 'Little children, love one another!' When he was asked why he constantly repeated this expression, his answer was: 'Because this is the command of the Lord, and because enough is done if but this one thing be done.' "

At a recent date, Neander, and specially Lücke, have designated "vehemence and choler" as "the individual temperament" of the Apostle; but certainly no other vehemence is supposable

[1] Migne ed. vii. 433.

than one which stands to tenderness as the opposite pole in the one orb of character. Some just remarks on this point will be found in Br. Bauer, Kritik der Evangelischen Geschichte des Johannes, p. 400, f. and a comprehensive exhibition in Frommann, Johann. Lehrbegriff, p. 22.

§ 3. LANGUAGE, PERIOD AND PLACE IN WHICH THE GOSPEL OF JOHN WAS COMPOSED.

The unanimous testimony of antiquity is, that the Apostle wrote his Gospel in Ephesus. We are led to the same conclusion by internal marks, as for example, that the author has regard to the Hellenistic Jewish theosophy, and for the most part to readers out of Palestine. (John ii. 6, 13, iv. 9, v. 1, 2.) Another mark of the same kind, is his skill in the use of the Hellenistic Greek. This is so great, when we compare it with the style of the Apocalypse, that if the Evangelist John be the author of the latter, the Gospel, to all appearance, must have been written at a considerably later period. According to Irenæus, adv. hær. v. 30, 3, the Apocalypse was *seen* (ἑωράθη) by John *toward the end of the reign of Domitian*, (who died 96.) If we suppose that the vision was committed to writing about the time of its appearance, it would fix the date of the Apocalypse at about A. D. 95; if we now place the composition of the Gospel at about A. D. 100, (and we can hardly put it later,) we shall only have an interval of five years between the writings, a space of time which seems too brief to account for the great diversity in their language. If we might, in accordance with the highly plausible internal marks, fix the time of writing the Revelation under Galba, (A. D. 68 or 69,) the time thus obtained would be all-sufficient. See Dannemann, Wer ist der Verfasser der Offenbarung Johannis? 1841. The recent investigations of Dr. Paulus, Hug, Credner, (1841,) have rendered it probable that the Greek language was extensively used in Palestine. James himself, (the brother of our Lord,) who never was out of his native land, in his Epistle writes, comparatively speaking, good Greek. John, then, may have had some knowledge of the Greek even during his residence in Jerusalem; if he was banished soon after his entrance on his

new sphere in Asia Minor, he could at that time have had little practice in it; the interval, on the contrary, of from ten to twenty years subsequent to his return, must have had an essential influence. (See Tholuck's Glaubwürdigkeit der Evangelischen Geschichte. 2d ed. 283.) The style of the Gospel, too, leaves on the mind a general impression that its author was not a practiced writer, for the structure of the sentences is defective to a very unusual degree. As much as John falls below Paul in this respect, its solution nevertheless to be be found not so much in his want of practice in the management of language, as in the diversity of the peculiar genius of each; for the dialectic mode of thinking is entirely foreign to John, whose turn of mind appears to be very plain and simple. With a uniformity which has few exceptions, his words arrange themselves between the particles δέ and οὖν; the extent to which the latter is used, is in fact quite striking. Such is the case for instance, chap. xix. 20, 21, 23, 24, (twice,) 26, 29, 30, 31, 32, 38, 40, 42. Quite as common is the simple connection with καί, iii. 14, v. 27, viii. 21, 49, xvii. 11. In a single case, however, we find ὅμως—μέντοι, xii. 42, καίτοιγε, iv. 2, the simple μέντοι, vii. 13, xii. 42, as also καὶ—τέ, vi. 51, viii. 16, 17, xv. 27, εἰ νῦν—δέ, ix. 41, xviii. 36. The uniformity in the use of certain fixed words and phrases, of which the three Epistles especially present examples, is no less to be referred as a general matter to the peculiarities of his genius, to a certain meditative simplicity, all whose ideas reduce themselves to a few comprehensive terms, such as μαρτυρία, δόξα, ἀλήθεια, φῶς, σκότος, ζωὴ αἰώνιος, μένειν, (see chap. v. 37.) Still we must admit, that the facility of expression in John falls short of that in Paul, and is indubitably below that of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Of departures from pure Greek, there are no examples which excite more difficulty than many of Paul's deviations from classic usage, though Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. vii. 44, goes too far, when he asserts that John wrote ἀπταίστως, (without slips of style.) Of barbarisms may be mentioned, ἔγνωκαν xvii. 7, and according to Cod. A. D. ἑώρακεν, also in v. 6, according to some MSS.; also Joh. xv. 20, εἴχοσαν for εἶχον, χαρήσομαι xvi. 20, 22, for χαρῶ, ἀληθινός iv. 37, vii. 28, if we take it in the sense of ἀληθής. Of solecisms, οὐ μή. in the dependent question, xi. 56, and in

the direct question, xviii. 11, *ἵνα* after the demonstrative, xv. 8, xvii. 3, the Hebraistic construction, vii. 4, &c. to which may be added viii. 39, if with Griesbach we read *ἐστε* for *ἦτε*.

As specimens of good Greek, we may cite the forms *οἱ περὶ Μάρθαν*, xi. 19, the use of *νῦν*, xi. 8, *πρὸ ἓξ ἡμερῶν*, xii. 1, *ἤπερ*, xii. 43, *ὅμοιος*, with the genitive, viii. 55, (of which there is no other instance in the New Testament,) *Ἱεροσόλυμα*, inflected after the Greek, while in the Apocalypse it is written *Ἱερουσαλήμ*, &c. As peculiarities, we may mention the frequent use of the pronoun, vi. 71, vii. 7, ix. 39, the demonstrative with *ἵνα*, xv. 8, xvii. 3, 1 John iv. 17, the repetition of a positive thought in a negative form, i. 23, xv. 6, 1 John ii. 27, 2 John 9.[1] Winer would have done a desirable thing, had he given in his Grammar of the New Testament the characteristics of the language of the different authors; Lücke has neglected this in the 3d ed. of his John also. See in regard to the *mode in which the thought is presented* in John's Gospel, Scyffarth, Beitrag zur Special charakteristic der Johann. Schriften, Lpz. 1833; as regards the *language*, Schott, Isagoge in N. T. p. 150.

The unanimous testimony of antiquity designates this Gospel as the one which was written last, a statement which internal criteria of various kinds conspire to sustain. It already presupposes the synoptical report, (see this point treated more at large below,) it stands to the others in the relation of a supplement, it gives us the discourses of Jesus with less verbal exactness, &c.

§ 4. DESIGN AND PLAN.

In the question in regard to *object*, we must distinguish the general design from the subordinate one. Every thing which the Gospel history has recorded, has the general design of extending and establishing faith in Christ and his saving doctrine. With this view, Luke prepared his narrative for Theophilus, as he mentions at the beginning of his Gospel. This was also John's general purpose, as he says himself, xx. 31. The question now rises, whether we are obliged besides

[1] To the peculiarities in the formation of sentences belong the construction with *καί—καί*, as in vi. 36, ix. 37, et al., and that the second period of a sentence embraces more than the thought in the first, v. 41, 42, ix. 41, xiv. 10, 1 John i. 3.

this to suppose a special design. This Gospel is of such a nature as to lead us readily to that supposition. It has throughout a special didactic character, offers a different circle of truth from that of the synoptical Gospels, and continually recurs to it. It would seem from this, that he had a distinct, heterogeneous dogmatic tendency to oppose. The arrangement and matter of his history differ from those of the other Evangelists in respects which are not without significance. This might lead us to suppose that his design was to furnish a supplement to the other Evangelists. The idea of a polemical dogmatic design besides the general one, is held by Irenæus, (adv. haer. l. iii. c. 12,) who says it was John's purpose to confute the errors of the Gnostic Cerinthus. Many of the ancient and modern theologians concur in the view of this ancient father: some of them, however, suppose a more general polemical aim against Gnostic and Docetic errors at large, whilst many think that they discover in the Gospel besides this, a polemical aspect toward the sect of disciples of John or Zabians, (Baptizers.) So the Socinians, Schlichting and Wolzogen; so too Grotius, Herder, (Erläut. zum N. T. aus einer neueröffn. morgenl. Quelle, p. 11,) Overbeck, (Neue Vers. üb. d. Ev. Joh.) who regard the aim as specifically polemic against the Zabians; besides these, Michaelis, Storr, Schmidt, Hug, Kleuker, who regard the aim as polemic toward both Gnostics and Zabians. Some, as for example Kleuker, and more recently L. Lange, (Beiträge zur ältesten Kirchenq.) think they can detect a polemical purpose against carnal Judaizers. The most recent negative criticism of Lützelberger returns to the idea of a polemic aim against the disciples of John the Baptist, (p. 275,) and that of Schwegler, (see § 6,) which grants that the Gospel was written toward the end of the second century, discovers in it a relation partly irenical, partly polemical, toward the Gnosis, and also toward Ebionism. If now the question be, whether in the Gospel of John expressions occur which can be employed in confuting Gnostic, Zabian, or Judaic errors, no one will deny it. This, however, is not sufficient to establish a distinctively polemic aim on the part of John, for a pure Christianity, constantly and in its own nature, is in conflict with those errors. The characteristics of the Gospel can force us to the idea of an

aim so definitely polemic, only in case the didactic character peculiar to it can be accounted for in no other way than by equally definite considerations grounded on the history. This is, however, not the case. As to the opinion of Irenæus, it is well known that the Fathers in their contests with the heretics were ready to imagine things of this sort, to represent the Apostles as distinctly opposing the particular heresies of their day. Irenæus in the same passage maintains that John designed to combat the errors of the Nicolaitans, which is certainly not the case. Irenæus, moreover, from the fact that several passages in John could be employed against the Gnostics, might, without being led to it by any historical data, come to the *conclusion*, that it was the distinctive *object* of the Evangelist to contravert the Gnostic views. To this may be added, that those places which are regarded as polemic against Cerinthus, (*ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο*, &c. Storr, über den Zweck des Ev. Joh. § 43, seq.) and those which are supposed to have a controversial aspect toward the disciples of John the Baptist, (John i. 8, iii. 28, seq.) do not strictly answer their polemic intent, as Dr. Paulus has shown in his Introd. in N. T. Capita selecta, Ienæ, 1799; in fact, that Cerinthus might employ for his own purposes certain passages in John, cf. *same*, p. 112. It cannot, moreover, be shown at all that this polemical character pervades the whole Gospel. Under these circumstances, we cannot concede that John, in the composition of his work, had a distinct polemic dogmatic aim before his eyes, still less that this was his grand aim. It is, nevertheless, probable that cursorily here and there, (xix. 34, 35,) especially in the Introduction, he has an eye to erroneous opinions and doubts, which just at that time were current. (This is Rettberg's view, An Jesus in Exhibenda, etc. p. 9.) It is natural to all authors to have an occasional regard of this sort to their relations to their own times. This tendency is more obvious in John's first Epistle than in his Gospel, about which the judgment of Lücke, in his Introduction to the first Epistle of John, is very just.

If there be then no pervading controversial aim, did John perhaps design to place his Gospel in a definite relation to the other Gospels? He might have intended to present a more spiritual delineation of the doctrine and life of the Saviour.

This thought readily occurs to him who has been attracted by the wonderfully sublime simplicity, and the heavenly gentleness, which pervade this whole work, as well as by the many expressions in regard to the higher nature of Christ. The Alexandrine writers, who generally embrace the idea that there is a twofold spiritual point of view existing among Christians, express this thought. Clemens, in a fragment (preserved by Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. l. vi. c. 14,) of his lost *ὑποτυπώσεις*, says: *τὸν μέντοι Ἰωάννην ἔσχατον συνιδόντα, ὅτι τὰ σωματικὰ ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις δεδήλωται, προτραπεντα ὑπὸ τῶν γνωρίμων, πνεύματι θεοφορηθέντα, πνευματικὸν ποιῆσαι εὐαγγέλιον.* "But John, last of all, perceiving that what had reference to the *bodily*, was sufficiently detailed in the Gospels, encouraged by his friends, and divinely incited by the Spirit, composed a *spiritual* Gospel." Of the same stamp the earlier view of Lücke was, that the first three Gospels were to be regarded as proceeding from the position of the *πίστις*, (faith,) that of John from the position of the *γνῶσις*, (knowledge.) (Comm. 1st ed. Thl. i. p. 160, seq.) Since in addition John generally recounts those discourses and miracles of Christ which are not mentioned by the other Evangelists, many writers, both ancient and modern, have supposed that John had a general purpose of completing the earlier Gospels, especially of supplying what was wanting in their delineation of the divine in Christ, (*τὴν θεολογίαν.*) This is the view of Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. l. iii. c. 24, and also of Theodore of Mopsuestia in the Catena in Ev. Ioh. ed. Corder. Antv. 1630: *ἀλλ' οἱ περὶ τὴν Ἀσίαν πιστοὶ ἀξιοπιστότερον τῶν λοιπῶν εἰς τὴν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου μαρτυρίαν Ἰωάννην κρίναντες εἶναι τὸν μακάριον, προσήνεγκαν μὲν αὐτῷ τὰς βίβλους, μαθεῖν ἤν τινα περὶ αὐτῶν ἔχει τὴν δόξαν παὰ αὐτοῦ βουλόμενοι. Ὁ δὲ ἐπῄνεσε μὲν τῆς ἀληθείας τοὺς γεγραφότας, ἔφησε δὲ βραχέα μὲν αὐτοῖς παραλελεῖφθαι, καὶ τῶν μάλιστα ἀναγκαίων λεχθῆναι θαυμάτων τὰ διδασκαλικὰ ἅπαντα μικροῦ Εἶτα καὶ δεῖν ἔφασκε τοὺς περὶ τῆς ἐν σαρκὶ παρουσίας τοῦ Χριστοῦ διαλεγομένους μηδὲ τοὺς περὶ τῆς θεότητος λόγους παραλιπεῖν κτλ.* "When the believers in Asia judging St. John to be the most credible of all witnesses, solicited him to write the history of Jesus, and laid before him the other Gospels to have his judgment upon them, he pronounced them all to be truthful records; but said that some miracles of a very

instructive character were omitted. He said, besides, that the facts about the deity of Christ should be written as well as those that related to his appearing in the flesh, &c." Jerome, also, (Catal. de vir. illustr. c. 9,) speaks of the historic design of furnishing a complement to the other Evangelists. So likewise Storr, Hug, Feilmoser. The contrast in question to wit: that the fourth Gospel is more pneumatic than the others, certainly belongs to a later period, which reflected from its own point of view on the two classes of records. The Apostle himself would in all probability have judged in the matter as Herder does, vom Gottessohn nach Johannes, p. 34: "If you insist on calling this a Gospel of the Spirit, be it so, but the other Gospels are not therefore fleshly. They also contain living words of Christ, and build on the same foundation of faith." The object of *completing* the three synoptical Gospels which we have, cannot, then, in this specific sense be admitted. That this cannot have been the grand design, is shown by the unity of form in the Gospel; "this Gospel," says Hase, "is no mere patchwork to fill up vacant spaces;" and not even as a distinct subordinate purpose kept in view by the Evangelist throughout, can we perceive a design of filling out what had been omitted by the others. It is in conflict with such a view, in fact, that so much has been embraced in the fourth Gospel which is also found in the first three; that not a few of at least apparent contradictions to them occur, which might have been harmonized; that, on the other hand, the apparent contradictions between the synoptical Gospels themselves are *not* cleared up; that at chap. xx. 30, some statement of this aim might justly be looked for; and finally, that to embrace this view strictly, would force us to think of a literary assiduity of a comparatively modern stamp. In addition, at that period the Churches were acquainted with the history of our Lord less from the written records of the three Evangelists than from tradition. Nevertheless, there is some truth lying at the bottom of this theory. If John in his instructions imparted much, which passed beyond the circle of the ordinary oral tradition, and consequently beyond the synoptical Gospels which flowed from it, we can hardly think otherwise than that among his friends a longing would be excited to possess a history of the Lord in accordance with *his* delineation. If he

yielded to this desire, his work must of itself take the character of a complement, and only thus can we account for it, that so many significant facts are passed over, such as the baptism of Jesus by John, the temptation in the wilderness, the transfiguration, the institution of the Lord's Supper, the agony in Gethsemane. *That the reader is presupposed to be familiar with the ordinary traditional circle, is very clear* from chap. iii. 24, xi. 2, and also from i. 32.[1] (See Hug's Introduction, ii. § 53.) If he has, notwithstanding, given partly in a similar way with the others, large portions, as for example the history of the Passion and Resurrection, this is not to be wondered at, for without these no *Gospel* could be written; nevertheless, John maintains his own peculiar character in this division of his work. Besides, the only passages that coincide with the synoptical Gospels are chap. vi. 1–21, and xii. 1. The historical portion in chap. vi. is connected with the discourse that follows, although it may have also been introduced on account of the miracle; the narrative, xii. 1, may be introduced on account of the trait it presents of Judas, of whose deed of blackness John designs to give a history in which results are traced to their causes. This view of the origin of the Gospel, so natural in itself, is confirmed by the Ecclesiastical Tradition: the account quoted above from Clement is expressly referred by him to the tradition of the *ἀνέκαθεν πρεσβύτεροι*, (the earliest presbyters.) The intimation of the Apostle himself, chap. xx. 30, 31, serves at least to show, that out of the mass of material which lay before him, he had made a *selection* with distinct objects in view—what they were he does not tell us.

If he made a selection, the question arises, whether he merely intended to present something *more*, or whether this additional matter is placed under some definite point of view also. The earlier period reflected little about the literary character of the Gospels; the most recent, especially in the Criticism of Dr. Baur and his followers, has carried this tendency to extremes. Since Strauss especially, they find throughout this pseudonymous Gospel, as they regard it, the most obvious intent, the most distinct

[1] Add to these xiii. 27, xviii. 2, (where the concerting of Judas with the council is presupposed,) xviii. 19, (where the chief point in the hearing before Caiaphas is unnoticed,) xix. 7, xxi. 15.

designs and categories, to which the discourses and histories are adapted, the following up of a distinct plan, even to the minutest detail. The result naturally is: that to the degree to which we impute this reflective plan to the pseudonymous writer, we detract from his historic truthfulness. Bruno Bauer proceeds, most of all, in an arbitrary, irrational manner. After returning from the perusal of these recent critics, we feel afraid that we shall read the Evangelist with confused eyes—as Lücke (Comm. i. p. 183,) says, "will put meanings into him that he never had." Especially has criticism directed attention to the fact, that this Evangelist has made it his business to depict Jesus in constant conflict with the Jewish officials. Since this has been brought before the eye, those also who acknowledge the authenticity of John, as for example Lücke in his 3d ed. (see De Wette,) have obtained new insight into the composition of the Gospel. We, too, feel free to affirm that from its very commencement the Gospel pursues this theme: *The eternal conflict between the divine light and the corruption of men, exhibited in the opposition between the inimical Jewish party and the appearing of the Son of God, and protracted until the light is victorious.* As the overture expresses the idea of a musical composition, so the very Prologue embodies this theme, for it speaks of the contest of the world with the Logos before he became flesh; and as the theme of the Epistle to the Romans lies in chap. i. 17, so the idea which animates the Gospel of John is expressed in chap. i. 11–13. Two main divisions even of an outward character undoubtedly present themselves. The first, to chap. xii. embraces the Public Work of Jesus, and closes with a resumè of it, v. 44–50. For the second division, the History of the Passion and Resurrection, we are prepared by the discourse of Jesus, chap. xii. 23–32, in which the leading thought is: the setting of the sun is necessary, for without it there can be no rising. Chapter xiii. begins the History of the Passion, and at the outstart, as it were, v. 3, the Disciple points to the final glory. The exclamation of Thomas: "My Lord and my God," the sublimest acknowledgment of the risen Saviour, closes the second part, and by the words to which it leads: "Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed," forms the transition to the closing expression: "These are written, that

ye might believe that Jesus is the Son of God." In the first main division is delineated the gradual rise of the opposition of the Jewish rulers up to the decisive event of the resurrection of Lazarus, and the open outbreak of their hatred which followed. This recital closes with the official judgment of Caiaphas, chap. xi. 50, and involuntarily his decree becomes a prophecy of the significance of Christ's death. At an earlier period the *religious pragmatism* [disposition to exhibit the causes, relations and results of events. Tr.] had been noticed in the Gospel, that John everywhere sees a divine connection, and now and then refers to that course of providence which at time lingers, at others rushes on, chap. vii. 30, viii. 20, xiii. 1. In our view of the plan of the work, these intimations appear not simply as the casual effusions of a religious spirit, but as designed to subserve John's aim as a writer; nevertheless, we are decidedly under the conviction, that the history presented itself after this form to the Evangelist as he wrote it, and not as the result of previous reflection. Had such a plan been before the eyes of the Apostle from the beginning as a scheme of which he was conscious, would he not have expressed it in that closing formula, chap. xx. 31, where the Evangelist has reached the end of his recital?

§ 5. CONTENTS AND FORM OF JOHN'S GOSPEL AS COMPARED WITH THE FIRST THREE GOSPELS.

With reference to its contents and form, this Gospel is throughout peculiar, and in this peculiarity lie a charm and a power of attraction, which have not only caused it to be preferred to the other Gospels, but have led many to rank it above all other books of the Bible. [This Gospel speaks a language, to which no parallel whatever is to be found in the whole compass of literature; such childlike simplicity, with such contemplative profundity; such life and such deep rest; such sadness and such serenity; and above all, such a breath of love—"an eternal life which has already dawned, a life which rests in God, which has overcome the disunion between the world that is and the world to come, the human and the divine." (Hase, Kircheng. p. 39, 7th ed. translated by Blumenthal & Wing, New York, 1855.) If we cast our eyes over the whole body of

religious literature, there is certainly none whom we would feel tempted to place by John's side, unless, perhaps, it were Thomas á-Kempis; yet such a comparison would involve as complete a mistake, as to place in parallel the simplicity of Xenophon with that of Plato. In the Apostolic men, cited as scholars of John, in Polycarp, Ignatius, the author of the Epistle to Diognetus, there are, indeed, here and there, tones of assonance with John, but not the touch of John's pencil, while to Paul so many parallels, even besides Luther, present themselves.] All the leaders of the voice of the Church have been full of its praises. Chrysostom (Prooem. in Hom. in Ioh.) writes thus: *εἰ δὲ ῥητορικῶν αὐλητικῶν τε καὶ ἀθλητικῶν ἀνδρῶν, τῶν μὲν θεαταὶ, τῶν δὲ ὁμοῦ θεωρηταὶ καὶ ἀκροαταὶ μετὰ τοσαύτης κάθηνται τῆς προθυμίας, πόσην ἡμῖν καὶ σπουδὴν καὶ προθυμίαν ἂν εἴητε δίκαιοι παρασχεῖν, οὐκ αὐλητικοῦ τινος, οὐδὲ σοφιστικοῦ νῦν εἰς ἀγῶνα καθιέντος, ἀλλ' ἀνδρὸς ἀπὸ τῶν οὐρανῶν φθεγγομένου, καὶ βροντῆς λαμπροτέραν ἀφιέντος φωνήν; πᾶσαν γὰρ τήν οἰκουμένην ἐπέσχε καὶ κατέλαβε, καὶ ἐνέπλησε τῇ βοῇ, οὐ τῷ μέγα ἀνακραγεῖν, ἀλλὰ τῷ μετὰ τῆς θείας χάριτος κινῆσαι τὴν γλῶτταν. καὶ τὸ δὴ θαυμαστὸν, ὅτι οὕτω μεγάλη οὖσα ἡ βοὴ οὐκ ἔστι τραχεῖά τις, οὐδὲ ἀηδὴς, ἀλλὰ πάσης μουσικῆς ἁρμονίας ἡδίων καὶ ποθεινοτέρα καὶ θέλξαι ἐπισταμένη πλέον· καὶ πρὸς τούτοις ἅπασιν ἁγιωτάτη καὶ φρικωδεστάτη, καὶ τοσούτων γέμουσα ἀπορρήτων, καὶ τοσαῦτα κομίζουσα ἀγαθὰ, ἃ τοὺς μετὰ ἀκριβείας καὶ προθυμίας λαβόντας καὶ διαφυλάττοντας οὐκ ἔνι λοιπὸν ἀνθρώπους εἶναι, οὐδὲ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς μένειν, ἀλλ' ἀνωτέρω πάντων ἑστάναι τῶν βιωτικῶν, καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἀγγελικὴν μεθαρμοσαμένους λῆξιν καθάπερ τὸν οὐρανὸν, οὕτω τὴν γῆν οἰκεῖν.* "If the spectators of the Athletes, or those who are at once auditors and spectators, of rhetoricians and pipers, sit with so great readiness; what readiness and earnestness does it become you to manifest, when you are summoned to the spectacle, not by a piper, not by a sophist, but by a man who speaks from heaven and emits a voice clearer than thunder? He has pervaded and embraced the whole world, he has filled it with his cry, not by the greatness of the sound, but by a tongue moved by divine grace. And what is wonderful, is that this great cry is not harsh, not destitute of sweetness, but sweeter and more charming, endowed with more power to attract than all the harmony of music: and besides all these, it

is most holy and awe-inspiring, filled with such secrets, conveying such good things, that those who receive and guard it with diligence and earnestness, are no longer men, no more abide upon earth; they have placed themselves above the things of time, they are partakers of the state of angels, and thus dwell upon earth, as if it were heaven." In a similar manner Augustine (Tract. 36, in Iohan.) declares: *in quatuor evangeliis seu potius in quatuor libris unius evangelii sanctus Iohannes apostolus, non immerito secundum intelligentiam spiritalem aquilæ comparatus, altius multoque sublimius aliis tribus erexit prædicationem suam, et in eius erectione etiam corda nostra erigi voluit. Nam cæteri tres evangelistæ tanquam cum homine Domino in terra ambulabant, de divinitate eius pauca dixerunt, ipsum autem quasi piguerit in terra ambulare, sicut ipso exordio sui sermonis intonuit, erexit se non solum super terram et super omnem ambitum æris et cœli, sed super omnem etiam exercitum angelorum, omnemque constitutionem invisibilium potestatum, et pervenit ad eum, per quem facta sunt omnia, dicendo: In principio erat verbum, etc. Huic tantæ sublimitati principii etiam cætera congrua prædicavit, et de Domini divinitate quomodo nullus alius est locutus. Hoc ructabat quod biberat. Non enim sine causa de isto in illo ipso Evangelio narratur, quia et in convivio super pectus Domini discumbebat. De illo ergo pectore in secreto bibebat, sed quod in secreto bibit, in manifesto eructavit.* "In the four Gospels, or rather in the four books of the one Gospel, the Apostle St. John, not undeservedly with reference to his spiritual understanding compared to an eagle, has lifted higher and far more sublimely than the other three his proclamation, and in lifting it up he has wished our hearts also to be lifted. For the other three Evangelists walked, so to speak, on earth with our Lord as man, of his divinity they said but few things, but John, as if it oppressed him to walk on earth, has opened his words as it were with a burst of thunder, has lifted himself not only above earth and every sphere of sky and heaven, but even above every host of angels, and every order of invisible powers, and reaches to Him by whom all things were made, as he says: 'In the beginning was the word,' &c. He proclaims other things in keeping with this great sublimity with which he begins, and speaks of the divinity of our Lord as no other person

has spoken. He pours forth that into which he had drunk. For not without a reason is it mentioned in his own Gospel, that at the feast he reclined upon the bosom of his Lord. From that bosom he had in secresy drunk in the stream, but what he drank in secret he poured forth openly." And Origen (Comm. p. 6, ed. Huet,) says: *τολμητέον τοίνυν εἰπεῖν ἀπαρχὴν μὲν πασῶν γραφῶν εἶναι τὰ εὐαγγέλια, τῶν δὲ εὐαγγελίων ἀπαρχὴν τὸ κατὰ Ἰωάννην· οὗ τὸν νοῦν οὐδεὶς δύναται λαβεῖν μὴ ἀναπεσὼν ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος Ἰησοῦ . . καὶ τηλικοῦτον δὲ γενέσθαι δεῖ τὸν ἐσόμενον ἄλλον Ἰωάννην, ὥστε οἱονεὶ τὸν Ἰωάννην δεχθῆναι ὄντα Ἰησοῦν ἀπὸ Ἰησοῦ.* "We may presume then to say that the Gospels are the first fruits of all the Scriptures, and the first fruits of the Gospels is that of John, into whose meaning no man can enter, unless he has reclined upon the bosom of Jesus, . . he must become a second John, and take John as a Jesus from Jesus." (Origen means to say, the expositor must so enter into the spirit of John, that John, as one filled by Jesus, appears as the counterpart of Jesus himself.) The devout Ernesti styles this Gospel, *the heart of Christ.* Herder exclaims: "It is written by the hand of an angel."

This impression is a result as well of the literary form of the Gospel as of its substance. As regards the substance, it is more detached from special Jewish references than the others, and appeals in a more lively manner to the sensibilities than do the instructions mostly bearing on practical life, which are recorded in the synoptical Gospels. The superhuman in Christ, the necessity of faith in him, regeneration, the mystical union of believers with him and with one another, the commandment of love and the blessing attached to it, these are the chief themes of John's teaching, and many of the facts recorded by him and peculiar to his Gospel, correspond with them; among these are presented the condescending love of Christ, shown in his seeking men, his tender relation as a man to John, his position of earnestness yet of forbearance toward his betrayer, his superhuman knowledge, his glorification in suffering, and the obstinate unbelief of the world. To this substance, the peculiar character of the author's spirit impressing itself on the language, has imparted a form which enlists the sensibilities in a high degree. The noble simplicity on the one side, on the

other, the hovering nature and the dim mystery of the narration, the tone of grief and of longing, with the light of love shedding its tremulous beam on the whole, these impart to the Gospel a charm, a peculiar originality, to which, out of the writings of John, no parallel can be found. To these is to be added, the plastic power of the narrative to bring its scenes vividly before the eye; the localities are fully marked, chap. i. 28, iv. 5, v. 2, vi. 59, x. 23—the dates, iv. 6, v. 9. vi. 4, vii. 2—personal traits, xi. 5, xii. 29, xviii. 10, vii. 25—manners, ii. 6, iv. 9, xviii. 39, xix. 31—gestures and passions, xviii. 6, viii. 11, 35, 38. The fact too, that Christ's discourses rather than outward occurrences, are given at large, that the Disciple not only stands *before* the history of the Lord, but *in* it and *over* it, and, as is the method in every work of art, reproduces it from a noble subjectivity, and accompanies it with remarks of his own, (ii. 21, iii. 16, 31, vi. 64, vii. 39, x. 6, xii. 33 and 35–50, xix. 35, xx. 30, 31,) contributes to impart to this delineation a life and vivifying character beyond that of the other Evangelists. The sense of the first mentioned peculiarities has been expressed in a manner singularly striking by Claudius: (Wandsbecker Bote, Th. i. p. 9, A.) "I love best of all to read in St. John. There is in him something so perfectly wonderful—dusk and night, and the quick lightning throbbing through them! The soft clouds of evening, and behind the mass the big full moon bodily!—something so sad, so high, so full of presage, that one can never weary of it. When I read John, it always seems to me that I see him before me, reclining at the Last Supper on the bosom of his Lord, as if his angel held the light for me, and at certain parts would place his arm around me, and whisper something in my ear. I am far from understanding all I read, yet often John's idea seems to hover before me in the distance; and even when I look into a place that is entirely dark, I have a presension of a great, glorious sense, which I shall some day understand, and hence I catch so eagerly at every new exposition of the Gospel of John. 'Tis true—most of them only ruffle the evening clouds, and never trouble the moon behind them." What is said of him, who learned from the tender, gentle disciple of love himself, *thus* to depict him, what is said of Claudius by Hamann, might have been written of the Gospel of

the disciple of love: "On thy harp rests a light ethereal essence, which, even when the strings have ceased to tremble, moves in waves at freedom in the air, and fills the heart with gentle sadness."

Precisely these peculiarities, nevertheless, in the substance and form of the Gospel, which have excited the praises of the leading spirits of all ages, have furnished the points on which in recent times the most formidable attacks have been made on its genuineness and authenticity. The more widely the fourth Gospel deviates from the type of the first three, the more diverse the history and the discourses both in form and substance; the more readily could doubt be excited, first, of its authenticity, and then of its genuineness. But even if the latter be left at rest, the *former* may be shaken. If we reflect, for example, first on the strong impress of subjectivity in this delineation of the life of Christ, in the arrangement of the work and the order of the matter in general, and especially in the relation of the discourses; if we call to mind the late period at which it was consigned to writing—more than forty years after the events; if we remember that this same John, when Paul met with him in Jerusalem, (Gal. ii. 9,) appears as a Judaist, while the Gospel occupies a thoroughly free position; if we consider especially the great affinity between John's diction in his Epistles and that of Christ's discourses in his Gospel, yea, that it seems as though the Evangelist had even put his own words into the mouth of *the Baptist*, (ch. i. 16, iii. 31,) must we not come to the conclusion, that if John may be regarded in a general way as its author, his Gospel is for the most part a free product of the imagination in the latter years of his life, when the remembrance of events that had occurred, and of discourses he had heard more than forty years before, had grown faint, while in the meantime, in the circle of Asia Minor, with its Hellenistic culture and Gnostic influences, a freer, more ideal mode of contemplation had been aroused in the Disciple? Recently Schweizer (das Ev. Joh. nach sein. inn. Werth. u. nach sein. Bed. krit. unters.—the Gospel of John critically examined as to its internal value and meaning, p. 239, seq.) has instituted an examination of those events, in which we may regard the Apostle as seeing or hearing for

himself, and those in which he could not have been present, but must have received his information through another medium, as for example the conversation with Nicodemus, the one with the woman of Samaria, the scene in the Sanhedrim, the hearing before Pilate, &c., and this examination also leads to a relative uncertainty of the detail. What can stand as historic after all the deductions which must ensue from this process, is the total to which, in De Wette's judgment, the authentic in the Gospel is reduced, as the result of the attacks of Strauss and Weisse. And even this remnant has been called into dispute by those who think the authenticity must be rejected; in fact, the enthusiastic judgment pronounced by the earlier centuries on its substance and form, has been completely reversed. The era of illumination at the beginning of our century had already pronounced this judgment, (Vogel, Joh. u. sein. Ausl. &c.—John and his Expositors before the last judgment, part 1, p. 26:) "Our Gospel is adapted to the infirmities of men *who have had no effusion of the philosophic spirit.* It is of little use to Christians of our day." Bretschneider, in his Probabilia, c. i. § 8, has attempted to make a comparison to their disadvantage, of the discourses of Christ in the fourth Gospel with those in the synoptical ones; on this point, he complains of the "loquacity" with which Christ speaks of the dignity of his person, of the "obscurity of the words and their artificial ambiguity," of the "great repetition of the very same things," of that "sublimity so foreign to human sympathies, so chilling, and calculated to repel rather than attract the mind," and as the opposite of this, praises highly the practical fruitfulness and nervous style of the first Gospels. The most recent criticism since Strauss has adopted this esthetic judgment; and the matter has reached such a point, that in some issues of the Halle Litteraturzeit, (e. g. 1841, No. 15, 16,) the Christ of John has been denounced as but an unworthy, vaunting thaumaturgist, unfit to serve as a moral ideal. It is contended, that the narratives and dialogues of Jesus are formed after one and the same manner in John, that one and the same tone runs through every thing, the misapprehension on the part of the hearers, the presentation of sublime truths transcending the sphere of the speaker, the long and tautological

spinning out of simple ideas—in all of which there is evidence of the unhistorical character of the events as well as of the discourses. We will first take up the *events*, afterward the *discourses*.

When dialogues like the one with Nicodemus and that with the woman of Samaria are designated as presenting internal marks of improbability, it must be done primarily upon a basis of exegetical views, the correctness of which cannot be conceded, as when, for example, it is insisted upon—as Bauer and Schwegler especially have done—that according to John's account, Nicodemus actually understood the expression of Jesus in regard to the new birth in a *physical* and literal sense; and so in other cases of the same kind. A correct exposition of such portions will prove that they contain in them internal marks of historical anthenticity. It is true, John was not present when these things occurred, but did not Nicodemus after his conversion attach himself to the Apostles? And as to the conversation with the Samaritan woman, did she not herself, according to chap. iv. 39, inform her own people of what Jesus had said to her? Besides, Jesus remained there two days with his Disciples, so that if he did not himself acquaint his Disciples with what passed at the interview, they nevertheless had abundant opportunity of reaching a knowledge of it. That the idea of a distinctive *mannerism*, running through all John's dialogues, is groundless, has been shown by Schweizer, in the work quoted, p. 30, seq. No proof is needed, as regards the *events*, that the matter of them could be impressed upon the memory; the common order of things leaves us no room to doubt it. As evidence that they actually have been retained with great fidelity, we may in our Evangelist appeal to the great degree in which our intuitive perception confirms his narrative. It cannot be denied that to innumerable defenses of Christianity, we may apply what Gibbon said of the Athanasian creed: "It was *rhetoric construed into logic.*" Yet on the other side, too, it is a mere rhetorical artifice, when Strauss (Leben Jesu, Th. i. p. 60, 1st ed.) tries to meet Heydenreich's declaration, that the *individual character* stamped upon the biblical history, sufficiently demonstrates that it is not mythical, by the statement, that a couple

of pages further on we encounter in this same writer exactly the opposite argumentation, to wit: that in the legends that are framed, every thing becomes more *circumstantial* and *more ornate*. Both these views are beyond question perfectly true, and it looks as though Strauss tried to array these two truths against each other, because he did not feel himself strong enough to undertake to meet them himself. In the myth which is formed unconsciously and involuntarily from common report, you miss as a general rule the individualizing; on the other hand, just to the degree to which reflection consciously works upon the common report, the individualizing takes place, but in a way that is *designed*, and therefore untrue. Has not the effort been made on the one side to establish the mythical character of the feeding of the six thousand, and of Jesus' walking on the sea, because the *power of coming home to our intuition, which characterizes fact*, is wanting in them? And who, on the other side, does not already know from the Apocryphal Gospels, the designedly individualizing character of the legend? Is it not adduced as proof on the one side, that the Epistle to the Hebrews is not from Paul, because there is a want of individual references in it; and on the other, is not that very touch of individuality in 2 Peter i. 17, 18, because of "its obvious designedness," adduced as proof against the genuineness of *that* Epistle? We may, it is true, be asked to furnish the criteria by which we may distinguish this designed individualizing from that which is natural and really historical. This demand we may be in a position up to a certain point to satisfy, but suppose that we could not do it, we need be as little embarrassed by this as a painter would be, who, without being able to give the specific rules by which he judges, yet with unerring tact, decides what is *portrait*, what *study*, and what a *fancy sketch*. We can confidently maintain that the historian will at once recognize in John *not an air-drawn ideal*, but *a portrait after the original*.

The difficulties connected with the *discourses* are greater. It is undoubtedly true, that the discourses of the Saviour in John have something hovering and diffluent in their character, and are consequently less easy to retain in the memory, so that the difficulty which exists at the very first, of impressing such

discourses word for word on the memory, seems to become an impossibility, when we think of the long interval. If we consider besides the difference of the contents from those of the synoptical discourses, since in it the thoughts are connected and expressed in a diffluent manner, while in the others we meet with parables and pointed sentences; if we notice, moreover, the similarity between the thoughts and style in John's Epistles and those of Christ's discourses in the Gospels, and especially the circumstance, as some maintain, that the Baptist has been made to speak in the Evangelist's own style, the authenticity of these discourses appears to be in the very greatest peril. Let us weigh these different points one by one.

This last circumstance has been pronounced by Strauss himself (3d ed. i. p. 713,) the "thing of chief moment in the whole matter." There are three passages in which John apparently attributes twice to the Baptist and once to Jesus words of his own, (chap. i. 16, seq. iii. 16, seq. iii. 31, seq.)

We commence with the first passage, ch. i. 16, seq. I think that it will be conceded that if the author of the fourth Gospel has consciously foisted these words upon the Baptist, he cannot with truth be regarded as a man of talent, which Strauss however concedes that he is. The expression "of his fullness have *we all* received," is indicative most clearly of a member of the Christian Church, while in the mouth of the Baptist it would be perfectly inexplicable. We must not neglect to notice, too, that the 16th v. is not linked to the 15th, but to the last words of the 14th, "full of grace and truth." The historical narrative of the witness of John comes in first at v. 30; here his witness, as at v. 7, also, is introduced to confirm the Evangelist's own declarations, on which point we must bear in mind that for him, as one who had been a disciple of the Baptist, his words possessed a double weight. "Of his fullness," manifestly is connected with the "full of grace and truth," to which words again "the grace and truth," v. 17, refer. We have here also an indubitable voucher for the fact, that the Evangelist, without distinguishing them in any marked way, passes from the remarks of another to his own. Let us now look at ch. iii. 16–21. That Jesus could not have spoken these words, will only be maintained with positiveness by those who have already made up

their minds that he cannot have spoken in general in the way in which John represents him as speaking. We will concede thus much, that in these words, more than in other discourses of Jesus, the Evangelist's mode of expression makes its appearance. What well grounded objection, however, can be urged against the view that from v. 16 he consciously expands the thought which had just been presented by the Saviour? The example from the first chapter has already given us a voucher that he does not strongly mark the transitions of the discourse. The first Epistle of John shows throughout, that it directly belongs to the peculiar features of the Evangelist not to designate fully transitions of thought. But is it really necessary in the case before us to appeal to a characteristic of the Evangelist? Does not every preacher among us connect in the same way his own inference with the text he quotes from the Bible?[1] If we desire an instance yet more specific, we have it in Gal. ii. 14; after Paul had mentioned in the direct course of his remarks, what he had said to Peter in Antioch, these remarks from the 15th v. without any observable transition, blend with what he has to say to the Galatians. Certainly similar vouchers could be adduced from various points, one for example which I meet in Jerome, Comment. on Isaiah liii. (ed. Vallarsii, p. 612.) He there says: "Clement, a man of the Apostolic age, writes to the Corinthians: the sceptre of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, came not in the pomp of pride, though he had all power, but in humility—in so much that being smitten by a servant of the high priest, he answered: If I have spoken evil, give testimony of the evil, &c." If we had not the Epistle of Clemens Romanus, we would have regarded all this as his words, as Martianay has actually done; but the text of the Apostolic Father demonstrates, that from the words "in so much" we have Jerome's own reflection. To this must be added, that John is accustomed to attach reflections of his own

[1] To this example Bauer (Kritik des Joh. p. 105, see what Strauss, 2d ed. i. 705, objects to the instance from Jerome,) has replied, that the preacher has before him an *acknowledged*, distinctly concluded sentence of another. Certainly, yet these sentences are some more, some less familiar. When the critic says, that no one *should* include any thing of his own, where the remark he quotes is not likely to be recognized nor the point at which it stops known, it may be a very good rule of style; but does John offend against none of the rules of style?

to the discourses of Christ. As in chap. xii. 44–50, he recapitulates in a comprehensive form the key-notes of Christ's discourses, might he not in the same way, when an opportunity offered, attach to some declaration of Christ himself a statement in the third person of those same fundamental doctrines? We come, then, to the third passage, iii. 31–36. That the Baptist himself uttered these words, is very improbable. The conclusion, however, that the Evangelist designed them to be regarded as the words of the Baptist, is, to say the least, equally inadmissible. In the very first place, to establish the position thoroughly that the Evangelist has incorporated reflections of his own, it would be necessary to show that portions of discourse occur *mingled with discourses of the Baptist*, which can, with the same plausibility, be referred to the Evangelist, as vs. 31 and 36 apparently can. Now the direct reverse is the case; that vs. 27–30, throughout accords with the tone of the Baptist's mind, cannot be denied; the Gospel of John accords here, at least, with the synoptical ones, Matt. iii. 11–14. Much stress has been laid upon the fact, that the parabolic element is so foreign to the author of the fourth Gospel, yet in these few words of the Baptist we have, v. 27, a gnome, and v. 29, a parabolic sentence; v. 30, is also expressed in a sententious Old Testament manner, at least is not worded after the style of the Evangelist. If, now, the Evangelist in the first chapter, having connected with an earlier declaration of his own a sublime expression of the Baptist, pursues his own remarks without anything intermediate, who can take offense that in this place the words of his beloved teacher of a former day: "He must increase, but I must decrease," are taken as a point of transition to a further delineation of the preëminence of Christ? In the first chapter, after mentioning the Baptist, he adds, v. 8: "He was not that light, but was sent to bear witness of that light;" in the same vein with that remark he here says, v. 31: "He that is of the earth, is earthy," &c. As, finally, in the first chapter, a strange hand smuggling itself in would have betrayed too great a clumsiness if it had put v. 16 in the mouth of the Baptist, so equally in this passage would it have been the case if, after his disciples, v. 26, had said to him: "All men come to him," after he had acknowledged it too in what

he says in reply, the contradictory words had been put in his mouth which closely follow in v. 32: "And no man receiveth his testimony." Do not these words, just as clearly as chap. i. 16, betray the emotion of the Disciple, who in the midst of the feeble Church stands over against an unbelieving world, in whom still resounds that word of the Master which we read in iii. 11, v. 38? (See xii. 37.)

We turn now to the second instance, and consider the diversity in the *contents* of the discourses of Jesus in the synoptical Gospels and in that of John. "The Christ of John differs from that of the synoptical Gospels to such a degree, that it would be easier to imagine two faces to one head, than that these two images can be equally faithful likenesses of the same individual." In these words of Weisse we have the doubt presented in its most glaring colors. Inasmuch as for the present, as we have said, we leave the form out of question, we simply ask whether the contents of Christ's discourses, according to John, cannot be authentic equally with those in the synoptical account? Before our day, the difference in the delineation of Socrates in Xenophon and in Plato had already been adduced as a parallel. In Xenophon, Socrates appears as a man destitute of a speculative turn, and thoroughly practical; according to Plato, as a profound spirit, who sought to refer practice itself for its ultimate basis to the speculative necessity. Against this parallel, which I have expanded and argued more at large in my Credibility of the Gospel History, (Glaubwürdigk. der Ev. Ges. 2d ed. p. 319,) Bauer, in his work before quoted, p. 412, alleges that so long as we cannot prove that Plato designed in his Dialogues to give historical notices of Socrates, and so long as it is clear from other history that the philosophical pupil recognized constantly as his teacher that very man, whom, according to that principle, (of the value of speculation,) he surpassed, the judgment must be valid, that Xenophon alone has given a true image of Socrates. We think it sufficient on this point, to make our defense with the authorities of which we have availed ourselves in the part of our work alluded to above, (Glaubw. p. 319.) An entirely different view from that of Mr. Bauer, in relation to the partially historic character of Socrates in Plato, is held by

Schleiermacher, Brandes and Hegel. Brandes, in his dissertation in the Rhenish Museum, Elements of the Socratic Doctrine, (Grundlinien der Lehre des Socrates, II. i. p. 122,)[1] says: "It was by no means usual in antiquity, as in recent times, to consider the picture of Socrates sketched by Xenophon as a true portrait, the Socrates of Plato, on the contrary, as an ideal, something as completely destitute of reality as Plato's theory of ideas itself." And yet Plato did *not at all design* a purely historic delineation, while the fourth Evangelist *did so design*. We can apply to the subject before us the pertinent language of Bengel, (Harmonie, p. 615:) "The same person may narrate the same thing on different occasions in a different way, and yet in each case with the fundamentals of truth. Compare Acts ix. and xxvi. with each other, and of the same kind chap. x. and xi. where the conversion of Paul and Cornelius is told twice. If a drawing is made of a city first from the east side, then from the west, though in both cases the tallest and most striking towers and edifices are presented, yet in all other respects the two sketches not only can, but must differ widely. And yet both are faithful copies of the original." We will not urge that the character and value of many of the expressions characteristic of John are of such a nature that it is utterly out of the question to regard them as the voluntary invention of any Jewish Christian of that day, though De Wette himself has decided for the authentic character of a number of John's expressions on the ground "that they glow with a lustre more than earthly." May we not suppose, that among the twelve Apostles one man could be found of as much originality as Paul? If we think of John as one of those mystic spirits, a *homo desideriorum*, as Am. Commenius expresses it, of a class rarely occurring, from his youth diverted from practical life and directed toward the invisible world, (*Appollonian* souls, these elect ones of our race were styled by the ancients,) and think of the other Apostles as possessing the traits still common to fishermen and publicans; surely the image of Christ which impressed itself on John, the discourses which had

[1] See Hegel, in his History of Philosophy, in his works, Th. iv. p. 124.

peculiar value to him, would not be the same we find in the other Evangelists. We are speaking here for the most part hypothetically, but the evidence which sustains our hypothesis offers itself readily to the eye. *For all the doctrinal matter characteristic of John*, (and on this argument the greatest weight should be laid,) *some parallels at least can be found in the synoptical Gospels and in the New Testament Epistles.* The most scrupulosity may be directed against the authenticity of the many discourses of Christ in regard to his mysterious relation to the Father; yet we have an expression of Christ, in regard to his relation to the Father, in Matt. which in its form sounds so much like John, that frequently persons not familiar with the Bible, have looked for it in John, (Matt. xi. 25.)[1] A second instance of this sort is not to be found in the synoptical Gospels, yet be it marked, that Christ in his discourses even in them designates himself as the Logos, who already has wrought under the Old Testament, Matt. xxiii. 37, (this cannot refer to Christ's repeated presence in Jerusalem,) Luke xiii. 34, compare with Matt. xxiii. 34. The mysterious communion of the Redeemer with those who believe in him, is spoken of in Matt. xxviii. 20; the promise of the Paraclete appears to be peculiar to John, yet Luke, chap. xxiv. 49, has it also. Of *love* in that universal sense in which John employs it, Christ does not speak in the first Gospels, but Paul does, as he does also of that mystical "being in Christ," whose tones pervade John. Whether Paul is indebted for this knowledge to expressions of Jesus, transmitted orally, or to the direct operation of Christ within him—in either case he confirms the doctrinal type of John as genuinely Christian. On the other side, let us not in the difference of contents forget the agreement. Where John does not report *discourses of a doctrinal character* where the discourses are connected with the history of Christ, there is almost an agreement to the letter, as in the narrative of Peter's denial, in that of the woman who anointed Christ's feet, (compare chap. xii. 7, 8, with Matt.

[1] In Matt. xvii. 26, is an expression which has not been noticed as it deserves, in which Christ speaks of his higher relation to God in a manner as original as it is profoundly spiritual—he is no subject in God's kingdom, he is the only begotten Son. "*My* Father" is used in its emphatic sense in Luke ii. 49 Matt. xv. 13, xviii. 10, xix. 35, xx. 23, xxvi. 29, et al. as it is in John.

xxvi. 10–12,) and in that of Pilate. The narrative of the woman who was taken in adultery, chap. viii. reminds us of the type of the other Gospels, even though we suppose it to be a record from the Apostle's narration, by another hand. Notice the argument with the Pharisees, x. 34, the practical confutation of them, v. 39, 42, 45, vii. 19. If we add to this, that the Evangelist in all probability had the contents of the other Gospels before his eyes, and *designed to give chiefly what they had not*, the difference of contents can excite no further scruple. — The writings which were occasioned by Bretschneider's Probabilia belong here: Rettberg's An Johannes in exhibenda Jesu natura reliquis canonicis scriptis vere repugnet? Gott. 1828; Reineke's work on the same subject, 1826, of less value; an essay in Heydenreich's Zeitschrift für Prediger-wissenschaft. 1 B. 1 H.; compare, also, Schott, Isagoge in Nov. Test. p. 129.

We come now to the *form*. We ask, in how far the narration of the discourses may be considered a *verbal* one? That it should be absolutely word for word, is made impossible by the fact that it translates from the Aramaic into Greek; even in the synoptical Gospels the different narrations of the very same discourse run into contrarieties in form. What judgment are we to form of the similarity of language in the Epistles of John and the discourses of Jesus given in his Gospel? Origen in his day, and more recently the work of Stronk, (de doctrina et dictione Iohannis ad Iesu magistri doctrinam dictionemque exacte composita. 1797,) go upon the supposition that the Disciple had formed himself thoroughly upon the style of the Master. How much of the same sort has occurred even in our own time, I have in my Glabwürdigkeit der Evang. Gesch. p. 337, attempted to show by instances from the most recent literature. John stood in the very sort of relation to Christ which makes a dependence of this character credible; between the Disciple and the Master on whose bosom he lies, must exist a close personal relation. Grotius makes the happy remark that John was more φιλήσους, Peter more φιλοχρίστος, (John loved Jesus, Peter loved Christ,) as Plutarch, Vita Alex. c. 47, says of Hephæstion and Craterus, Alexander's two friends, that the former loved Alexander,

the latter the king. If such a relation could effect as regards the substance, that he took up what was profoundest and most essential, so could it cause as to the form that he might take up what was adventitious, especially if we may suppose a certain softness and feminine character in him. Yet we cannot maintain this dependence as regards the casual elements of speech; the hovering nature and diffluence of these in John point rather to the character of the Disciple than of the Master. Still we are justified in supposing that the phraseology and certain leading terms are to be referred to the Master's account, and even Strauss has conceded more than we could have ventured to hope, when (Thl. i. p. 676, 1st ed.) he grants that the antitheses of "flesh" and "spirit," "light" and "darkness," "above" and "beneath," that moreover the mystic expressions "bread of life," "living water,"—*of which not one occurs in the synoptical Gospels*—are constituents of the original discourses of Christ, which the author "has only developed further in an Alexandrian or in a general Hellenistic spirit." But how could the Disciple remember these discourses after the lapse of from forty to sixty years? and if he was in Jerusalem all this time in the thrall of a gross Judaism, how can that fact be harmonized with his holding such discourses as these of Christ in his memory? If we concede that the diffluent form is the Evangelist's own peculiarity, that only the thoughts lying at the bottom of it belong to Christ, all that is essential as to the difficulty of his remembering vanishes. The more ardent his nature, the more profoundly must every thing impress him. We are reminded in this connection, how many examples there are in our own time of persons who attribute their awakening to some particular sermon or sermons, and who are able to repeat what impressed them, with tolerable fullness, even after they reach old age. Irenæus, in a passage preserved in Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. v. 20, and which will be given in full in the next §, declares, that in his old age he could remember very fully the discourses of Polycarp, which he had heard when a young man, and uses two expressions which we can employ here: "What we learn in our youth, growing with our minds, unites with them firmly," and: "Constantly by the grace of God I carefully ruminated on the things he said." It is not

probable, indeed, that John at an early period took notes for himself, but the impossibility of his doing so cannot be established. Who would imagine that the tanners and shoemakers, with whom Socrates conversed, would make notes? and yet this very fact is recorded of Simon the shoemaker. Of the pupils of the Rabbins (תַּלְמִידִים) it is now and then mentioned, that they wrote down sentences from the lips of their masters. Finally, we must remember the promise of our Lord, that the Spirit should recall to the memory of the Disciples what they had heard, John xiv. 26. If the Spirit of the Lord touched the soul of the Disciples in general, like an electric stroke, all the intellectual faculties, and of course the memory of the truths they had heard, must have shared the animating influence. He who believes that in accordance with God's purposes, Christ has appeared in history as a Redeemer, believes at the same time, by necessary implication, in a transmission of his discourses and acts faithful in all essential respects. Evidence, too, derived from the character of the discourses before us, present themselves that they are no invention from the Disciple's hand, and that De Wette goes too far when he speaks of "an intoxication of soul," in which he has mingled things of his own with the expressions of Christ. Christ in his discourses does not designate himself by the name of the Logos, and with all the greatness which he affirms of himself, there are expressions even in John which seem to lower him, (chap. xiv. 12, 28, x. 34.) If it can be shown that the discourses of the Baptist are narrated in all respects faithfully and in unison with the synoptical Gospels, would not this be a ground for a favorable inference, *a posteriori*, as to the discourses of Jesus? *Now with the exception of a single passage*, (the contested "he that cometh after me is preferred before me," i. 15,) *there is nothing in the discourses of the Baptist which is not either given in the first Evangelists, or susceptible of explanation from his Old Testament prophetical character.* Compare chap. i. 19–36, iii. 27–30. We have been supposing a complete discrepancy of form, yet this, like the discrepancy of matter, allows of limitation. As regards the gnomologic and parabolic form, compare chap. v. 35, iii. 8, iv. 34–38, ix. 39, x. 1, seq. xv. 1,

seq. xvi. 21 and 25. A number of sentences are coincident in the reciprocal accounts of the Evangelist: John xiii. 16, xv. 20, cf. Matt. x. 24; John xii. 24, xxv. 26, cf. Matt. x. 38, 39; John iv. 44, cf. Matt. xv. 57; John xiii. 20, cf. Matt. x. 40; John xiv. 31, cf. Matt. xxvi. 46. Again, the first Gospels have expressions which even in respect of form remind us of John: Matt. xi. 25–30, viii. 22, vi. 22, xix. 17, xxvi. 29, Luke vii. 35, 45, cf. Matt. x. 39, with John xii. 25, the use of ἀληθινός and ἀλλότριος Luke xvi. 11, 12, υἱοὶ τοῦ φωτός Luke xvi. 8, with John xii. 36.[1]

It yet remains for us to clear up the last scruple, which is how the discourses of our Lord, which exhibit a position of such freedom, could have lain dormant and inactive in him during the time he continued in a rigid Judaism? (Lützelberger, über d. Ap. Joh. p. 179.) The scruple sounds like a very important one, but it presupposes more than can be proved. For in what consisted the difference between James, John and Peter, on the one side, and Paul on the other? Both parties were united in the view that Gentiles were to be admitted to the Church; the only point on which a scruple was entertained, was whether they were to be exempt from the observance of the Mosaic law. Paul himself never designed to abrogate it at once among the Jewish Christians. The question then arose, whether, for the sake of unity among Christians, the Gentiles also should not be obligated to keep it. An agreement was effected at Jerusalem, which, from a spirit of *accommodation* toward the Jews, (Acts xv. 21,) imposed upon the Gentiles the avoidance merely of the grossest causes of offense. Now in all the discourses of Christ given by John, is there anything inconsistent with this? Can the scruple of the Disciples occasion surprise, when Jesus himself during his life subjected himself to the demands of the law? The case would have

[1] John xi. 11, where a pause observed in the discourse of Jesus is marked, may serve as a proof of accuracy as to form in recollecting the discourse of Jesus: so may viii. 23, "and he said unto them." Yet on the other side, we may observe a carelessness to a remarkable extent, as regards verbal agreement, in xii. 34, xi. 40, x. 28, vi. 36. The verbal fidelity of the narrative is made most evident where the Evangelist *interprets* the words of Christ, chap. ii. 20, vii. 38, xviii. 9, xii. 32, on the last of which passages, De Wette himself says: "It must be accepted as a fact, that Jesus used this expression." But yet the expression xii. 33, vii. 37, has the coloring peculiar to John!

been very different had John made the justification of man dependent on the observance of the law. Nor have the other Apostles done this in a single instance. On this point compare Schweizer, in his work before quoted, p. 238.

§ 6. ON THE GENUINENESS AND AUTHENTICITY OF JOHN.

In the early Church no opposition to this Gospel found vent, except that of the sect of Alogians, who also urged indeed difficulties from the historical difference between John's Gospel and the synoptical ones, but especially as they rejected the doctrine of the Logos, were led to object to it on doctrinal grounds. After them—not to mention some anonymous English deists—the first doubts of its genuineness were raised at the close of the last and beginning of the present century; its genuineness was contested by Eckermann, (1793,) Vogel, (1801,) Horst, (1803,) Ballenstedt, (1812.) The great difference in Christ's method of teaching, and the assumed coincidence with Philo's theology, were then the grand stumbling block of doubt.

These assaults were, however, destitute of foundation in various respects, especially of a historical sort. Bretschneider sought to furnish this in his Probabilia de Evang. et Epist. Iohannis apostoli indole et Origine, 1820; and that, too, on grounds and presumptions of many of which the most recent period has again availed itself. According to Bretschneider's theory, the author of this Gospel belongs to the first half of the second century, and is a writer with a doctrinal drift, who composed this work with the design of propagating the metaphysical doctrine of the deity of Christ. At that time, especially because of the partiality of the school of Schleiermacher for the Gospel of John, these arguments obtain no currency. The author retracted his doubts. The most important writings against his work, are those of Calmberg, de Antiquiss patrum pro Evangelii Ioh. authentia testimoniis, 1822, Hemsen, 1823, and Crome, 1824. The attachment to this Gospel only increased the more, while on the other hand the synoptical ones, by obvious prejudice, were lowered. Suddenly, Strauss appeared, and preëminently with arguments drawn from internal criticism, impugned the authenticity and historical basis of

the fourth Gospel more decidedly than those of the first three. While the first three were a confused, but *natural echo* of the original history of Jesus, John's was but an *artificial resonance*, produced in part with skill and taste. It might have been supposed that with this verdict, the age of brass for this Gospel had come; but it was only the age of iron. It was but the beginning of the end, for at once various persons began to make various uses of the separate materials out of which Strauss had built his theory, and, in part, applied them to the erection of new edifices; or should we rather say, of castles in the air. First appeared Weisse, (die Evang. Geschichte kritisch bearbeitet, 1838, 2 Th.) with the following so called essay toward mediation: John himself (though with too strong an imagination,) had written "Studies for a biography of Jesus," one or more laborers had reduced these studies to the dialogue form, and had added historical data, yet all this "has been spun out so awkwardly," that predicates like the following are heaped upon the delineation: "insipid, whimsical, incongruous, obscure, ambiguous, bordering on nonsense." The new hypothesis found a solitary adherent in Schenkel, (Stud. und Kritik. 1840, II. iii.) and has been attacked by Frommann, (Stud. und Kritik. 1840, II. iv.) and Lücke, 3d ed. Gfrörer, who, in his History of Early Christianity, has wholly surrendered the genuineness and authenticity of the first Gospels, refers to the fourth as "the Sanctuary and the truth." Here now we learn the following: The Gospel belongs to the Apostle John, but partly owing to the feebleness of an old man's memory, partly to his fancy, the history and discourses have in great measure been falsely detailed; for example, *Lazarus is only the young man of Nain*, the history of the man that was born blind is merely an embellishment of the same thing that Mark viii. 22, narrates, &c. De Wette, as is his wont, on this question hesitates between Yes and No, with a predominance of the Yes, however, though with a decided limitation of the authenticity. Lützelberger (Die Kirchliche Tradition, &c.—The Tradition of the Church in regard to the Apostle John and his writings proven to be groundless, 1840,) thinks that he has shown that the Apostle never was in Asia Minor, and that he died before Paul. His examination of the historic proofs of the genuine-

ness of the Gospel embraces much that is worthy of attention, but his positive idea is the most baseless that could well be imagined: that the unknown author (this is inferred from ch. iv.) was probably a Samaritan, who relied upon the Apostle Andrew for his information, and wrote the Gospel beyond the Euphrates. To Bruno Bauer (Kritik der Evang. Geschichte des Joh. 1840,) we owe the discovery, that the Gospel is throughout the pious reflection of the later Church, twined about some historic fragments so slender as hardly to be perceptible, and the whole thing done so awkwardly and senselessly, that the falsifier, for instance, thinking himself of Christ as ascended to heaven, commits the blunder, chap. iii. 13, *of making Christ while yet living speak of himself as one who had already ascended to heaven.* If the iron age, as regards the contents of the Gospel, may be regarded as having been reached in Bruno Bauer—for in a literary point of view the charge of want of sense degrades a writer more than that of deception—the age of brass as regards the estimate of the external grounds of genuineness seems to have come with Schwegler, (comp. the Dissertation on John's writings in his book: der Montanismus, &c.—Montanism and the Christian Church of the second century, 1841.) According to him, the Gospel was written about the year 170, in Asia Minor, in the circle of the adherents of the elder Apollinaris, and imputed to John to secure the favor of the Jewish-Christian readers; it embraces allusions to the prevalent disputes in regard to Easter, and designs to compose the difference between the Ebionite and Gnostic parties. Schweizer has made a new essay with a theory which makes a division in the Gospel, (das Ev. Joh. nach seinem innern Werthe und seiner Bedeutung, &c.—the Gospel of John according to its internal value and its importance for the life of Christ critically examined, 1841.) The supplemental chap. xxi., some particular verses, and the history of the healing at Capernaum, of the miracle at Cana and of the miraculous feeding, he supposes to be interpolations.

We will adduce first the *external testimonies of tradition which establish the genuineness of the Gospel.* We may here remark, that there has been up to this time an agreement in the sentiment, that the Gospel and first Epistle must have proceeded

from the same author, that the testimonies for the use in the Church of the Epistle are an argument for the Gospel also, though it does not necessarily follow from this that John was its author.

Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. iii. 39, says of Papias, who must have been cotemporary with Aristion, and the presbyter John, who were Disciples of our Lord, that he cited testimony from the first Epistle of John; Polycarp also, ad Philipp. c. 7, cites 1 John iv. 3. The fourth Gospel must then at the time immediately subsequent to the death of the Apostle, have been regarded as a Christian document. We would certainly suppose that Polycarp, a pupil of the Apostles, or at least since his Epistle is a brief one, that Ignatius, another of their pupils, who has left seven Epistles, would have some citations from the Gospel or allusions to passages in it. Yet the Letter to the Romans affords but one certain allusion, chap. vii.: "I desire the bread of God, which is the flesh of Jesus Christ—and I desire drink, which is his blood," comp. John vi. 33, 54, 55. But it should be observed that in *Letters*, in hortatory writings, less occasion offered for quoting the Gospel: in the letters of Ignatius we have only some five citations from the Gospels, whilst there are twenty-five or thirty from the New Testament Epistles; in the Letter of Clemens Romanus, only two from the Gospels, and some twenty-three from the Epistles of Paul alone; in the nine chapters of the Letter of Polycarp, some five from the Gospels, and about twenty from the Epistles; in the Letter to Diognetus, a solitary expression from Matthew, and about nine from the Epistles. The next witness is Justin Martyr, in the middle of the second century, who says: "Christ said, except ye be born again (*ἀναγεννηθῆτε*) ye cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven, but that those who have once been born cannot enter a second time into their mother's womb, is evident to all." Comp. iii. 3–5. The grounds on which it has been denied that there is a quotation in these words, are not sufficient; Credner and Schwegler maintain that the passage is borrowed from the *κήρυγμα Πέτρου*, because the "verily, verily" characteristic of John is wanting, because he has *ἀναγεννηθῆναι* and not *ἄνωθεν γεννηθῆναι*, because he has "kingdom of heaven" and not "kingdom of God," and because this same passage

occurs in Homil. Clem. xv. § 26, but in these Homilies not John but the *κήρυγμα Πέτρου* was employed, (Schwegler, Montanismus, p. 184;) but these Homilies (Hom. iii. § 52,) cite the expression which is undoubtedly John's: "My sheep hear my voice," cf. John x. 27, and the Recognitiones, l. vi. § 9, quote these words: "Verily I say unto you, except a man be born again of water he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven." Since in this place, too, where the citation from John is yet more unmistakable, the expression used is "kingdom of heaven," and not "kingdom of God," it proves that in quoting from memory the more current expression derived from the first three Gospels had been substituted for the "kingdom of God," peculiar to John.

With the mention made by Justin Martyr, we connect, that in the letter to Diognetus, which assuming the latest date must be referred to this time, if not to the Apostolic, (compare Semisch, Justin der Mätyrer, p. 185—Justin Martyr, his life, writings and opinions, Tr. by J. E. Ryland, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 2 vols. Bib. Cab.) In this, c. 10, occurs the expression: to whom (men) he sent his only begotten Son," and immediately after: "or how shouldst thou love him who before so loved thee;" they stand in precisely the same connection in 1 John iv. 9, 10, compare, too, v. 19: "We love him because he first loved us." From the middle of the first [second. Tr.] century we have also the testimony of the Valentinians (Valentinus died 160,) for the use of the Gospel. Irenæus expressly testifies (adv. hær. iii. 11, 7,) that the Valentinians used the Gospel of John in order that they might be able to appeal to a Disciple of Jesus. There is not, indeed, explicit evidence that Valentinus himself used it, but his pupil, Herakleon, wrote a commentary on it, and Ptolemy and Theodotus have also employed it. As this sect had their own Gospel, Evangelium Veritatis, they could have added the Gospel of John, only because it was anciently acknowledged in the Church, and in order to employ it in recommending their own views.

After the middle of the second century, the indubitable witnesses increase. First of all are to be mentioned the Montanists, (Montanus flourished about 160;) they rested

their appeal on the fulfillment in their sect of Christ's promise of the Paraclete. Schwegler has indeed pretended to maintain that this sect did not derive the name "Paraclete" from the Gospel, (in his work already cited, p. 188,) but in this position no one will concur with him. Valentinus himself, who enumerates as æons the products which originated from the union of *ἄνθρωπος* and *ἐκκλησία*, to wit: *Παράκλητος*, *Πίστις*, *Ἐλπίς*, *Ἀγαπη*, &c. has undoubtedly derived these terms from Christianity, and not, as that critic insists, from Philo. The Letter, also, of the Church of Lyons and Vienna, in the year 177, applies the term Paraclete to the Holy Ghost, Euseb. Hist. Eccles. v. 1; we find in it also a citation from John xvi. 2. Yet earlier must we place Tatian, the scholar of Justin, who in his Apology, c. 13, undoubtedly quotes the Gospel: This is what was said: *τοῦτό ἐστιν ἄρα τὸ εἰρημένον· ἡ σκοτία τὸ φῶς οὐκ καταλαμβάνει*, "The darkness comprehended not the light," and c. 19: *πάντα ὑπ' αὐτοῦ καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ γέονεν οὐδὲ ἕν*, "All things were by him, and without him was not any thing made." That the Diatessaron of Tatian opened with the first words of our Gospel: "In the beginning was the word," has been disputed by Credner, but, as Daniel has shown in his work, Tatianus der Apologet, p. 89, without good grounds. The Apology of Athenagoras, written about 177, embraces also (c. 10,) some words from John i. 3, and allusions to John xvii. 21, 22, 23. References to the Gospel, which can scarcely be denied, are to be found after the middle of the second century, in Celsus; see Origen, cont. Cels. v. 52, i. 66, 67. In the last of these passages he speaks of the demand which the Jews made of Christ *in the temple*, which Jesus declined to satisfy by an explicit sign. It is impossible here to mistake the reference to John ii. 18. There is nothing singular in the circumstance that none of the writers hitherto mentioned quote John by name, and that ordinarily there is not a literal agreement in the words, for it is well known that the citations by name, of the biblical writers, begin with the second half of the second century, and the citation by book and chapter still later. The first citation of the Gospel of John by name, appears in the Apology of Theophilus of Antioch, written about 180, (B. ii. c. 22;) Irenæus belongs to

the same period, (died 202,) in whom we have repeated citations by name, of the Gospel, the Revelation, and the first Epistle. His evidence derives greater weight from the fact that he was a native of Asia Minor, that he had known and heard Polycarp, though only as a *παῖς ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ ἡλικίᾳ* "a mere boy," and that the Gospel, from its suiting the purposes of the Valentinians, as well as on the account of the opposition in which it appeared to stand to the Chiliasm entertained by Irenæus, must have been less consonant with his inclinations as an individual. In a remarkable document he refers Florinus, his friend and former fellow pupil with Polycarp, to the fact that the communications of the venerable Bishop of Smyrna, in regard to John's doctrines, coincide with the writings of John, (Eusebius, Histor. Ecclesiast. v. 20:) "I saw thee in my youth in Lower Asia with Polycarp—*for I remember the events of those times much better than those of recent occurrence*—what we learn in fact in our youth, grows with our soul, and grows together with it so closely, that I can even yet tell the place where the holy Polycarp sat when he discoursed, his entrance and exit, the peculiarities of his mode of life, his bodily figure, the discourses which he addressed to the people, how he told of his familiar intercourse with John and with the rest who had seen the Lord, how he narrated their discourses, and what he had heard of them in regard to the Lord, about his miracles and doctrine, all of which, as Polycarp had received it from those who were eye-witnesses of the word of life, he narrated in harmony with the Holy Scriptures—these things, by the mercy of God then granted to me, I attentively heard, and noted down, not on paper, but in my heart, and by the grace of God I continually repeat it faithfully."

This very document, nevertheless, has been adduced by Lützelberger as an evidence that Irenæus not only received no testimony from Polycarp in regard to the Gospel, but that Polycarp himself knew only of *oral* communications from the Apostle; that in general the witness does not deserve much regard, since Irenæus was at that time a boy, (Credner even says, "a child.") Dodwell, we admit, goes too far when he attempts to show that the term *παῖς* in Irenæus embraces the age of twenty-five years; but that it cannot well indicate any

thing short of the sixteenth year, may be inferred from the improbability that a boy younger than this would have given the strict heed to the instructions of the Bishop, which this father of the Church represents himself to have done. Lützelberger maintains, that Irenæus would have been under the most urgent necessity of establishing the genuineness of the Gospel, for to conclude from the title which Irenæus has attached to that polemical Epistle, Florinus must have been attached to the principles of Marcion, and must have held with them that the Gospels had been corrupted by Jewish Christians; in place of this, we find only an appeal to an *oral* communication of Polycarp, and that too but a repetition of what John had *orally* taught. To this may be opposed the following: That Florinus was at that time a Marcionite is incorrectly inferred by Lützelberger from the superscription of the letter mentioned; (see Neander's Kirchengesch. i. 3, p. 11, 47—History of Religion and the Church, Tr. by Joseph Torrey, Boston, i. 677, 680;) that he possibly had doubts of the genuineness of the Gospel is conceded, although he might then, as he did at a later period, when a Valentinian, have derived support for his errors from an artificial exposition of the Gospel. The assertion, however, that Irenæus was unable to give any historical proof of the genuineness of the Gospel, can be supported by the fragment we have quoted only on the supposition that this father could have had no other object than to convince Florinus of his heresy by means of John's *writings*. But in our opinion this was not his object. Irenæus rested much more upon the hope that the testimony of the writings in question, which could not be eluded without some movement of a better consciousness, would appeal irresistibly to the consciousness of the heretic, when he reminded him of what he had heard with his own ears from the gray disciple of the Apostles, and had at that time listened to with confidence.—To trace the tradition further than Clemens Alexandrinus and Origen, after the testimonies adduced, would be superfluous. We may mention, however, that the learned Origen, who commented on the Gospel about 222, and who has mentioned every attack on the New Testament writings, even that on the 2d and 3d Epistles of John, without the shadow of a scruple uses the

Gospel as genuine, and that Eusebius, the man who seems to have been acquainted with the entire Christian literature in existence in his time, speaks of it at the beginning of the fourth century as "a Gospel familiar to all Churches under the heavens."

Let us yet glance at the testimony presented in c. xxi. 24, 25. Until the time of Tittmann, these words were regarded by a large majority as the words of the Evangelist. Theodore of Mopseustia was the first who regarded them as a testimony from another hand; subsequently some Catholic writers whom Maldonatus reproves; and besides these, Grotius, Basnage, and all the recent theologians. They cannot be ascribed to John. If they came from the same author as chap. xxi, then this whole chapter must be referred to another hand, and this is a perilous avowal, inasmuch as it would involve a concession that at that time others, besides John, knew so well how to write in John's style. But the contrast even between the simplicity of John in what precedes, and the hyperbole in v. 25, shows that this testimony alone proceeds from another hand. The expression "we know," also points to the fact, that the writer offered his testimony as the representative of a number of persons. What then does he testify? What is the force of the τούτων and ταῦτα? Do they refer merely to the narrative immediately preceding? This is not at all improbable. Since that narrative is a mere appendix, this witness may have felt himself called on to attest with his own hand that the Apostle was the author of it, and may have been led in this way to the remark, that many other things might have been added. We should, however, bear in mind the fact, that the writer of this verse apparently had in his eye the closing verses, 30, 31, of chap. xx. so that it is probable that in the τούτων and ταῦτα he designs a reference to the entire Gospel, and purposed by the addition of these closing words to designate, as it were, the appendix as a part of the entire Gospel. In this view, then, what does he attest? *The authenticity* and *credibility* of the Gospel. Weisse, Ev. Gesch. p. 100, and Lützelberger, p. 187, seq. object, that a Gospel which needed the appending of a testimony of this sort could not have been acknowledged to any great extent. "Are these words which indorse it," asks

Weisse, "of such weight as to counterbalance the suspicious circumstance, made obvious by their very existence, that previous to the publishing of the Gospel it must have passed through other hands?—through hands, too, which imagined that they could, by written additions made at their own pleasure, impart a higher credibility than it possessed in itself?" Do these words, then, presuppose a *doubt* of the authenticity? Is it not more probably the case, as Schweizer, p. 59, has already observed, that this attestation, like that of chap. xix. 35, rather had a practical aim—to give an urgent call upon the reader to lay the book to heart? Besides, how strange is this testimony of a person appearing in the name of a number of others, *yet totally omitting the mention of any name!* I regarded myself as justified in drawing from this the conclusion, that this testimony could not at least have originated with a forger, (Glaubwürdigkeit der Ev. Geschichte, p. 273, 2d ed.) "Had any unauthorized transcriber or forger of a later period desired to stamp upon the authenticity of the Gospel an apocryphal seal, would he have added this seal without associating the name with it, and thereby have deprived it of all its force?" Can this inference be disputed on valid grounds? Cannot this, at least, be inferred with certainty: *that an honest and conscientious cotemporary of the Apostle* has attested the genuineness of the Gospel? When Lützelberger, p. 195, meets this with the remark: "That only forgers of the clumsiest kind invent every thing with great preciseness, and by this very circumstance are detected at once," we would put but one question to him, whether he ever heard of a forger so "clumsy" as to suppose that he was doing great service to a friend by a brilliant testimony—*to which no name whatever was subscribed?* Did not this testimony proceed from an *honest* man, and from a *sensible* one too? But of what use would such a testimony be?—"it is," says Lützelberger, p. 195, "under the circumstances in which John must have stood, *unnecessary, amounting to nothing*, in fact, *absurd* and *senseless*." But how was it, if the first readers were generally acquainted with the man from whose hands they received the Gospel, if they were in fact familiar with his handwriting? There is nothing at the beginning or close of the first Epistle of John to designate the writer more clearly. Grotius already

raises the query, whether this witness may not have been the presbyter of the Church of Ephesus, in fact the presbyter John? We might perhaps suppose a circle of disciples, like Aristion, the presbyter John, and Andrew, who were in Ephesus in the second century, as Credner does, Einleit. p. 237. If perhaps this Gospel was first of all in use in the Church of Ephesus, and at a later period was circulated from this among the neighboring Churches, we have a still better solution of this subscription. There is, too, an ancient tradition that this was the case to which Usteri gives his assent in his Commentatio in qua Ev. Iohannis genuinum esse, &c. Zurich, 1823, p. 125, as also recently Baumgarten-Crusius in his Commentary on John, p. xxv. where he declares confidently that the *writing of the Gospel was not immediately followed by its publication.* Thus much then is established, *we have from cotemporaries and acquaintances of John a testimony for the genuineness of his Gospel.*

Certainly we might make yet further demands on the external testimony. Let it be added, however, to this, that (with the exception of the Alogiens, whose objections were derived from doctrinal interests,) from the beginning no opposition and no difference of views was expressed, and nothing but the extremest dogmatic prepossession can doubt the genuineness of this Gospel. We shall yet allude to but one point where doubt can readily find something on which to fix, and that is the testimony of Irenæus. On that same historical testimony, to wit: on that of the elders[1] of Asia Minor, on which rests his belief that John composed the Gospel, rests also his belief that the Apostle was the author of the Apocalypse. Since the latter, however, in the judgment of Credner, Lücke, Neander, is not genuine, since Credner, the zealous defender of John's authorship of the *Gospel*, presumes, in reference to the Apocalypse, to speak of the witnesses "of whom Irenæus boasts," what value can we attach to those statements of the elders in regard to the Gospel? To this add the questions with which Lützelberger presses the Apologists, how a man can deserve credit, who, from the tradi-

[1] It is usual to speak of the "presbyters" of Asia Minor, to whom Irenæus was indebted for his intelligence, but the word is more correctly translated by "elders;" cf. the expression *ἀπομνημονεύματα αποστολικοῦ τινος πρεσβυτέρου*, (the commentaries of a certain apostolic elder,) Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. v. 8.

tion of Churches of Asia Minor, communicates nothing but marvels and accounts manifestly false such as, 1) that the Apocalypse was revealed at the close of the reign of Domitian; 2) the strange prediction he has put in the mouth of Jesus in regard to the monstrous grape clusters in the kingdom of God; 3) the tradition, that Jesus was fifty years old, (comp. Lützelberger, p. 150, 151.) It is true that the things stated call for a cautious testing of the historical tradition of Irenæus. To commence with the last point, Credner (Einl. i. 1, p. 215,) has relieved the Church father of the reproach cast upon him. The prediction of our Lord which was transmitted by the elders, and referred to John as authority, (Iren. c. hær. v. 33:) "Days shall come, in which vines shall grow, of which each shall have ten thousand shoots, &c." which according to the declaration of Irenæus, has been embraced by Papias also in his book, can certainly not be adapted to the discourses of our Saviour in John's Gospel—compare, however, the καινόν in Matt. xxvi. 29. May not some expression similar to this very word of Christ in Matthew lie at the bottom of the tradition, some expression grossly colored and exaggerated by those who held Millennarian sentiments? If these ingredients of *oral* tradition tend to destroy its value, we ask: does not, on the other side, this very circumstance exalt the value of that which has been delivered in *writing*, and which is free from every element of that sort? As regards John's authorship of the Apocalypse, confidence rests upon something more than the mere testimony of the elders; if it be not genuine, internal and external reasons force us to the conclusion, that, at the least, *John the Presbyter* must be regarded as its author. But to refer the *Gospel* to this man hitherto unknown, would enter the mind of no one. The author of a work like our Gospel, says Lücke, must have had a "shape far more like life" than pertained to this enigmatical presbyter. That the Apocalyptic vision was assigned by the elders of Asia Minor to Domitian's time, when the internal marks of the book seem to establish the claim of the time of Galba, would certainly detract from the historical authority of those witnesses; nevertheless, so little that is satisfactory has been contributed as yet to the interpretation of the Apocalypse, that we are not justified in drawing any confident conclusion in this case. We have

entered into these arguments concerning the historical authority of the testimony to which Irenæus appeals, only from an unwillingness to pass by the strong side of the negative criticism without reference. The genuineness of the Gospel would not be in any more peril if we totally overlooked the testimony of Irenæus.

§ 7. THE MOST IMPORTANT COMMENTATORS ON THE GOSPEL.

As an Introduction to the Gospel: Dr. *Wegscheider*, vollständige Einleitung in das Evangelium Johannis. Gött. 1806. *Bertholdt*, Verosimilia de origine Ev. Ioh. in Opusc, ed. Winer, 1824. (Introduction to the New Testament, by S. Davidson, LL. D. London, Bagster, 1847. 3 vols. 8vo. i. 225–372. Tr.)

[I. *The Patristic Expositors.*]

Origen, (died 253,) Comm. in Ev. Ioh. In Jerome's time thirty-nine tomes or divisions of Origen's Exposition were extant; Eusebius says that only twenty-two had reached his time. Of this great work we have but portions, though not inconsiderable ones, (Opp. Orig. ed. de la Rue, T. iv. Opera Exegetica Orig. ed. Huet. T. i.) Important as this commentary is for Origen's doctrinal views, and beautiful as are passages of its matter having a general bearing on Christianity, those which in the stricter sense subserve the exegesis of the Gospel are but meagre. [Rather speculative emanationes script. than exposition.]

Theodorus of Mopsuestia, (d. 428,) *Apollinaris*, (400,) *Ammonius*, (250,) *Cyrill* of Alexandria, (400.) Important fragments of all these are to be found in the Catena Patrum in Ev. Ioh. ed. Corderius, Antwerpiæ, 1630. They are to some extent exegetical aids of value, especially the observations of Ammonius. [A. Cramer, Catenæ in Luc. et Ioh. Oxon, 1841. An abridgment of Chrysos. Scholia lies at the basis, with selections from Apollinar. Cyr. Orig. and especially Ammonius.]

(Catena Aurea: Commentary on the Four Gospels, collected out of the works of the Fathers, by S. Thomas Aquinas, vol. 4, St. John. Oxford, 1845. Tr.)

Chrysostom, (d. 407,) Homill. 87, in Ev. Ioh. Ed. Morelli, T.

ii. ed. Montf. T. viii.) (The Homilies of St. John Chrysostom on the Gospel of St. John. Library of the Fathers, Oxford. Tr.) These homilies are specially distinguished by great richness in practical observations. Chrysostom in addition explains the text in accordance with a sound grammatico-historical mode of apprehension. Even here, however, the purely exegetical value is diminished, by an undue propensity on the part of Chrysostom to give the text a polemic direction against heretical views.

Theophylact, (d. 1107,) Comm. in Ev. (ed. Venet. 4 voll. vol. ii.) He has collected the choicest portions of Chrysostom and other Fathers, usually combining them after his own judgment, and for the most part following the grammatico-historical method of exposition.

Euthymius Zigabenus, (about 1118,) Comment. in 4 Evv. ed. Matthiæ, Lips. 1792, 4 voll. in vol. iv. This commentary also is collected from the more ancient Fathers; a good deal is from Chrysostom. The collection has been prepared with discrimination, and very much of it is useful.

Augustine, (d. 430,) Tractatus 124, in Ioh. (ed. Antw. T. iii.) (St. Aug. on St. John. Library of the Fathers, Oxford. Tr.) These are homilies in which Augustine explains the text very diffusely, with many digressions. They present only here and there a gleam of light in the exposition of the Gospel itself on the principles of grammatico-historical interpretation, but as a compensation for this they offer a treasure of profound Christian thoughts, which has not yet been sufficiently drawn upon.

[II. *Expositors of the Catholic Church.*]

[*Erasmus*, in the Critic. sacr. and paraphr.]

Maldonatus, (d. 1583,) Comm. in 4 Evv. Par. 1688, 2 vols. [New edit. by Martin, 2d ed. 1852.] One of the best expositors of the Romish Church. His erudition, especially in patristics, is great, as is his exegetical talent, which reluctantly endures the shackles of the Church, yet wears them nevertheless.

[*Este*, *Menochius*, *Tirinus*, *Cordoni*, in the Bibl. sacr. Ven. 1756, *Corn. a Lapide*, Comm. in 4 Evv. 1670. *Ad. Maier*, Comm. zum Ev. Joh. 1843, 2 Th. refers to and uses the recent aids.]

[III. *The Reformers.*]

Luther has commented on this Gospel from chap. i.–xx. in part however, in a fragmentary way only. (Walch's ed. vols. vii. and viii.) Where Luther in this commentary lays aside the polemic, he does not comment on the Gospel—he lives in it and conducts it to the soul of the reader like a divine well-spring of life, for every one who thirsts for life. In the exposition he usually strikes the true point, although his exegetical view may not always be properly established and carried through.

Melancthon, Enarratio in Ev. Ioh. (Opp. ed. Viteb. T. iv.) a collection of Lectures published by Caspar Cruciger. In a dedication to Duke Maurice, Cruciger claims this as his own work. (He used the MS. notes which Melancthon had given him. See Mel. Opera. ed. Bretschneider, vol. xv. 1, Transl.) The expositions are natural. In general the dogmatic interest predominates to the detriment of the exegetical. The briefer Annotationes by Melancthon, [Opera ed. Bretschneider, xiv.] which Luther issued in 1523, is a distinct work.

[*Bucerus*, Enarratio in Ev. Ioh. 1528. *Musculus*, Comm. in Ioh. 1545. *Brentius*, Comm. in Ioh. 1553. Opp. T. vi. the dogmatic preponderating. *Aretius*, (in Bern,) Comm. in Ioh. 1578; acute.]

Calvin, Comm. in Ev. Ioh. (Opp. ed. Amstel. T. vi.) (A Harmonie, &c. of M. John Calvine, Transl. by E. Piaget, whereunto is also added a Commentarie on St. John by the same author, London, 1584, 4to. Comm. on John in Calv. Transl. Society's Publications. Tr.) Calvin's Commentaries on the four Gospels are less elaborate than those on the Epistles, nevertheless, this great Reformer in this work also distinguishes himself as an interpreter, by easy, natural, and at the same time profound expositions. As regards exegetical talent, we must concede his preëminence over his colleagues.

Beza, Comm. in N. T. Gen. 1556.—Tig. 1653. (5th ed. 1665.) On the Gospels, yet more largely than in his commentary on the Epistles, Beza developes the philological knowledge and exegetical tact which he possessed. He nevertheless does not

elucidate all the difficulties, nor enter thoroughly enough into the spiritual meaning.

Zwingle, Annotatt. in plerosque N. T. libros. Tig. 1581. Many characteristic conceptions.

A sort of Catena of the Reformers is presented in the valuable collection of *Marloratus*, Expositio Catholica N. T. Viviaci, 1605, in which the best portions of Calvin, Melancthon, Bucer, Musculus, Brentius and others, are combined.

[IV. *Seventeenth Century.*]

Grotius, (d. 1645,) Comm. in IV. Evv. Par. 1644. Halæ, 1769, ed. Windheim, 2 vols. His Commentary on the Gospels is marked by an exegesis which is unforced, and by a richness in antiquarian and philological observations, as also in parallels from profane authors, which, it must be granted, are not always in their right place here.[1]

[*Joh. Piscator*, Comm. in libros N. T. 1613. *Paul Tarnov*, Ev. Ioh. 1629, in syllogistic scholastic form, polemico-dogmatic. *Chemnitz*, (d. 1586,) Harmonia Evang. (continued by *Pol. Lyser*, *J. Gerhard*,) 1704, 3 voll. carefully after the aids of the period. *Aeg. Hunnius*, (d. 1603,) Thesaurus Ev. ed. ult. 1705, brief dogmatic explanation. *Cocceius*, (d. 1669,) Opp. T. iv. Enters into dogmatics, but deficient in clearness and acuteness.]

[V. *Eighteenth Century.*]

Lampe, (d. 1729,) Comm. exegetico-analyticus in Ev. Ioh. Amst. 1735, 3 vols. 4to. This Lamp, it is true, has been set in a huge frame, hewn shapelessly out of abstract logic and unaccommodating theology, but has nevertheless been employed by subsequent commentators to a large extent as a light to their feet. Under the syllogistic coat of mail there throbs a heart of sensibility, and the erudition is so respectable as to make it doubtful whether any one of those who followed him, has devoted to the Gospel an equal amount of original labor.

Bengel, (d. 1752,) Gnomon N. T. 1773, (edited anew by Dr.

1 *Crell*, Opp. Exeg. T. iii. 1656, (to chap. 13,) is to be added, who has much peculiar to himself.

Steudel. 1835.) [New edit. Stuttg. and Berlin, 1855.] (B. Gnomon, translated by Fausset. T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1858. Tr.) *The pointings of his fingers are sunbeams*, and his *hints gleams of lightning*. When he treads the beaten path, what others employ wearisome pages in saying, he compresses into two or three words, often, too, through crag and forest he opens up new prospects.

[VI. *Nineteenth Century.*]

Charles Christ. Tittman, (d. 1820,) Meletemata sacra sive Comm. exegetico-critico-histor. in Ev. Ioh. Lips. 1816. (Translated by J. Young. Clark's Biblical Cab. 2 vols. Edinburgh, 1844. Tr.) Upon the whole, an exegesis quite easy and natural; but it fails in the depth required to develope the ideas, and in precision.

Paulus, Comm. zum. Evangel. Joh. in the 4th vol. of 2d ed. of his Comm. zu den Evangelien. The Gospel of John is only commented on to the xi. chapter, to the history of the Passion. This commentary is not quite so full as that on the synoptical Gospels. The present time is perhaps more conscious of the defects of this commentary, than of that which may be regarded as its merit. If the commentator were as thoroughly at home in the things of heaven as he is in the matters of earth, his book would be admirable. The author would doubtless have handled the legal technicalities of Palestine with more success than he would the history of His life in whose mouth was found no guile, and who was bruised for our iniquities.

Kuinöl, Comm. in Ev. Ioh. 3d ed. 1826. This commentary may yet have its use as a repertory of the views expressed in the exegetical period from 1750 to 1820, when the exposition of the words was as destitute of exactness as that of the things was of depth.

Lücke, Comm. zum Evang. Joh. 3d ed. vol. 1, 1840, vol. ii. 1843. In the first edition of this work, a youthful enthusiasm welled up, which yet, like that of Herder, was not clearly conscious of its object; this was, however, the first exegetical work in which the believing spirit of the more recent theology expressed itself in a living form. The second and third

editions have undergone important changes, and are distinguished alike by clearness and finish of expression, and thoroughness of investigation. [This commentary, which among recent ones is justly distinguished as the most excellent, has nevertheless, even in comparison with De Wette, several defects; it is defective in not referring to more of the previous writers, especially the Reformers, in not using several of the rarer aids; it wants independence of likes and dislikes. Expositions which have been generally received in the Churches of almost all confessions, are not regarded as worthy of an examination even, as for example, the Explanation of John iii. 5. There is, moreover, a want of independent philological research, and of a thorough penetration into the thoughts. On the other hand, the merits of this commentary, are a varied and thorough examination of the aids used, clearness and easiness of exposition, careful handling of the critico-historical questions.]

Olshausen, Biblischer Commentar zu sämmtlichen Schriften des Neuen Testaments, Th. v. ed. 3d. 1838. (Commentary on the Gospels, translated by H. B. Creak. Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark. Revised after the fourth German edition, by A. C. Kendrick, D. D. New York, Sheldon, Blakeman & Co. 1858. Tr.) The distinctive excellence of the exposition arises from the effort to evolve the *substance of the thought* in the particular biblical writers, and that, too, with reference to its unison with the Bible system of faith in general. It seems to us, however, that the exposition of the first three Gospels has been more carefully labored, and possesses higher claims to originality, than that of John.

Fikenscher, biblisch-praktische Auslegung des Ev. Johan. 3 vols. 1831–1833. This work is a biblical exposition for educated laymen, but embraces many valuable hints for the learned interpreter.

H. A. W. Meyer, kritisch-exeget. Commentar über das N. 5. Th. ii. 1834.[1] The commentary of the author increases in value in the subsequent volumes; the exposition of John must be regarded as scanty. [Independent and linguistic-logical acuteness, but wanting in unity of doctrinal position, and in the internal element of interpretation.]

[1] Second edition, 1852.

De Wette, Kurze Erklärung des Ev. Joh. 2d ed. 1839. The most important materials of exposition are compressed together in a judicious manner, and with independent judgment, though the mass of diversified notices, crowded together in so narrow a space, makes the impression indistinct; the brevity, too, of his own exposition, is such as to make it impossible to gain from it anything like a satisfactory insight into the more important passages. The criticism of Strauss has also had its influence on his exposition of this Gospel, though far less than on that of the first three Evangelists. [4th ed. much enlarged; edited by Brückner, 1852. With all the vaccillation of its doctrinal position, concise and full of spirit, and essentially enriched by the additions of the editor.]

[*B. Crusius*, 1843, 2 Th. Fuller use of his predecessors than Lücke has made; views peculiar in many respects.]

Frommann's Johanneischer Lehrbegriff, (System of John,) 1831, and *Neander's* Geschichte der Pflanzung, &c. 3d ed. 1841, p. 757, seq. (Planting and training of the Christian Church. Tr. by J. E. Ryland, Bohn, 1851, vol. i. 384,) may be used with great advantage as a preparation for the reading of the Gospel.

[*Luthardt*, Das Johann. Ev. nach seiner Eigenthüm-lichkeit, 2 abth. 1852. An Introduction, in which various parts may be used to advantage, an independent revision of recent expositions, not without arbitrariness in its own assumptions.]

[Practical Expositions. *O. v. Gerlach*, N. T. 2r Th. *Stier*, Reden Jesu, 4r Th. (*Stier:* Words of the Lord Jesus. Translated by Pope. T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1855.) Fr. *Besser*, Bibelstunden über das Ev. Joh. 1852.]

(Sumner, 3d ed. London, 1838. Hutcheson, Edinburgh, 1840. Jacobus, New York, 1856. Tr.)

CHAPTER I.

THE LOGOS.

I. Doctrine of the Logos in its Historical Aspect.

While the other Evangelists commence with the history of the God-man when he appears in the nature of man, John passes beyond his earthly manifestation, and shows that before his incarnation he had revealed Deity to men internally, that from eternity, indeed, he had constituted the principle of the revelation of God to himself. What value he attached to faith in the *eternal* existence of that Redeemer who appeared in time, is apparent from the fact that he commences his first Epistle, also, with the words, "that which was from the beginning."

By John only is Christ designated as the *incarnate Logos*. We feel that he employs the expression in this place, as a term not unknown to his readers, for he uses it not only here, but in 1 John i. 1, and Rev. xix. 13. In the more recent time, consequently, (with the exception of L. Lange in Stud. u. Krit. 1830, H. 3,) the merely *grammatical* exposition of the word, according to which the interpretation was either with Valla, Beza, Ernesti, Tittmann, ὁ λόγος = ἐπαγγελία and this = ὁ ἐπαγγελθείς (the promised one) or as abstr. for concr. for ὁ λέγων, the *Revealer of God*, or as some shallow expositors expressed it, "*the Teacher*," has been abandoned. Elsewhere in the New Testament, and out of it, we find doctrines which we may believe John had in his eye in this place; in fact, we find the word λόγος used in a similar sense. The doctrines which exhibit this affinity must be considered, *partly* that we may understand the meaning of the Evangelist better, *partly* that we may judge

how far he has had regard to them, or even been dependent upon them.

That the distinction between God as concealed and as revealed, has a certain necessary basis in the nature of thought, might be already deduced from the fact that the East, under various modifications, acknowledges it, and that it has penetrated even into the blank Monotheism of the Mohammedans, (see Tholuck's Abh. über die spekul. Trinitätslehre, &c.—Treatise on the speculative doctrine of the Trinity in the East, 1826.) We commence with the analogies to the doctrine of the Logos which present themselves in the *Old Testament*, and afterward in the *Apocryphal Books*. Although the Old Testament faith in God, as contrasted with the heathen polytheism, is a *strict* Monotheism, yet it cannot, like the religion of Mohammed, be termed an *abstract* Monotheism. Only by supposing a complete want of thorough acquaintance with the Old Testament, can we account for it, that those who are of the Hegelian philosophy in religion have maintained, for a long time, that the God of the Old Testament is one not immanent to the world, but merely transcendent; even the one passage, Ps. civ. 29, 30, expresses the opposite view most strongly. But undoubtedly the Old Testament points to a *distinction* between God in his immanence and in his transcendence. Just that far is there a certain truth in the theory. Does he appear and work in the world, especially for his people, then is the "Angel of Jehovah" יי מַלְאַךְ his representative, of whom it is said, Exod. xxiii. 21, "My *name* is in him." The opinion embraced by the older theologians cannot, indeed, be sustained, that this "Angel of Jehovah" is always to be regarded as a peculiar person, distinctly separate from other angels, (see the ample discussion of that view by J. A. Michælis, de Angelo Dei, Halæ, 1702. De Angelo interprete, 1707. Hengstenberg's Christologie, p. 219, seq.[1] (translated by Reuel Keith, D. D., vol. i. 164.)

[1] Hengstenberg's Christologie, ii. 1 abth. p. 23, (Keith's Tr. ii. 23,) should also be compared, where he discusses the "Angel of Jehovah" in Zechariah. Since in that place (as Dr. Hengstenberg argues, and as we also think is most probable,) this angel of God differs from the Angelus interpres, the delineation of Zechariah, which in so many points of view is important for Christology, coincides best with the older theological view of the "Angel of Jehovah." (See also Geschichte des Alten Bundes von J. H. Kurtz, 2te verb. Aufl. Berlin, 1853, i. § 50, and Genesis v. F. Delitzsch, 2te Ausg. Leipz. 1853, i. 330–337. Tr.)

Steudel has offered, indeed, in his Whitsuntide Programme of 1830: de Deo occulto et manifesto in libris V. T., some striking remarks against that view, although his own explanation is unsatisfactory. At present, most concur in the view that in the use of the word מַלְאָךְ by the Old Testament writers, there exists a certain indeterminateness, that sometimes (as the word does not properly designate a personal being, signifies *legatio*, not *legatus*,) they entitle a concrete appearance of God מַלְאָךְ, at others give the name to a personal created being.[1] (Hitzig on Isaiah, p. 622, v. Coelln's Bibl. Theol. i. p. 190, seq. Baumgarten-Crusius, Bibl. Theol. p. 307.) But in the former case even, God, in as far as he reveals himself to men, is distinguished from God *in himself;* he speaks of him, refers to him, he is his representative.—The expression, Is. lxiii. 9, "the angel of his face," is peculiar, a name given here to an angel who is the mediator of what God does for Israel. We could hardly explain the term as Steudel does, by Matt. xviii. 10; rather: "the angel in whom I am by my active providential presence."—We must consider, also, the exceedingly remarkable passage, Exodus xxxiii. 12–23. Here, first of all, Moses implores the Lord to make known to him, him who is to be sent with him. The answer, v. 14, is: "My face shall go with thee," and he adds: "*I* will bring thee to rest." Thereupon Moses repeats his request: "Yea, thy *face*, yea, *thou* must go with us," and God replies: "The very thing thou askest I will do." Moses, now emboldened, desires to see the *glory* of God. The answer is: "My beauty (טוּבִי) thou shalt see. I will pass by thee; when I am by, thou shalt look after me, (אָחוֹרַי) but my face (פָּנַי) thou canst not see." First of all, it is necessary to observe, at this point, that the פָּנַי is used here in different senses. For where it stands in opposition to אָחוֹרַי, it designates the *profundity* of the Godhead, as the face is the nobler part of man. Where, on the contrary, the face of God is said to go with them, it is a circumlocution for *person*, as in many other places. There is, besides, a distinction made

[1] Only in this way can the contradiction be harmonized, that in Exodus xxiii. 20, seq. the sending of the angel, in whom is the name of God, is represented as an evidence of the grace of God, while on the contrary, ch. xxxiii. 2–5, the sending with them of an angel *only*, is regarded as a sign of the withdrawal of his favor.

here between an inner and an outer side of God, his essence and his appearance; the former remains closed to man, the latter is opened. It is called the *glory*, the *beauty* of God. This *glory* of God, at other times, appeared also to the people, (כְּבוֹד יי) Exod. xvi. 10, xxiv. 16, xl. 34, 1 Kings viii. 11.[1]—The word of God is also mentioned as mediating the *creation of the world*, Ps. xxxiii. 6, (see 2 Pet. iii. 5;) and in Ps. cxlvii. 15, Is. lv. 11, as mediating *the government of the world*, the *manifestation* of the divine *energy*. (See the Festprogramm of Olshausen on Hebr. iv. 12, in his Opuscul.)—The Spirit of God, from the very beginning of the world, appears as the fructifying, motive principle, and is, furthermore, the principle by which all animated creatures have *life*, (Ps. civ. 29, 30, Job. xxxiv. 14,) and by which men have *wisdom* and *sanctifying power*, (Ps. li. 13, cxliii. 10.)—*Wisdom*, also, that is, the attribute of God which *assigns to things their objects*, appears in the Old Testament with a certain independency, even in Job xxviii. 12. seq. more distinctly Prov. viii. 22, seq. She is called the daughter of God, who arose as the firstling of his work, (רֵאשִׁית דַּרְכּוֹ) before the foundation of the earth she was anointed queen of the world; at the creation of the world, she was by God's side as the artificer by whom he arranged the whole. "The relation between God and the world, and between wisdom and the world, is contemplated as that of a tender parental love."[2] (Ewald Poet. BB. d. A. T. iv. p. 76.)

Yet more clearly does this distinction of God appear in that working out of Old Testament views which we find in the *Apocrypha*. According to Ecclesiasticus i. 1–10, wisdom is from eternity with God, before all that is finite she proceeded from God, and was poured out upon all his works; according to xxiv. 14, (Eng. Tr. xxiv. 9,) created from the begin-

[1] Steudel's mode of treating this part of Exod. xxxiii. in the dissertation we have cited, is very unsatisfactory. He understands it that the vision of the glory and beauty of God is here *refused* to Moses, (p. 29;) the whole narrative, in *his* opinion, means that the attributes of God, either singly or collectively, cannot be known by man in their *essence*, that man can only afterward recognize therein the traces of the divine mercy, (see xxxiv. 6, in which there is certainly a reference to xxxiii. 22.)

[2] The older theologians used Prov. xxxi. 4, to prove that wisdom is also called the *Son* of God. That expression, and indeed the whole passage, has certainly never been satisfactorily explained.

ning before the world, and enduring to the end, she has entered into the children of Israel, and has founded her glory in Jerusalem, and poured herself forth in the Book of the Law, (Ecclesiasticus xxiv. 10, seq.) According to Baruch, also, wisdom has been given to Israel, and has been made known in the Book of the Law for all eternity, (ch. iii. 37, 38, iv. 1.) In the Wisdom of Solomon, written in Alexandria, wisdom, from ch. vii. 7, to ch. xi. is depicted as the reflected splendor of the eternal light, the breath of the power of God, the effluence of his glory; in her is an understanding spirit, holy, one only, going through all rational spirits, (ch. vii. 22–26,) in all ages entering into holy souls, she prepares them to be prophets of God, (ch. vii. 27.) An approximation to what John teaches of the Logos, is presented in these Apocryphal writings, in this, especially, that they speak of a certain embodiment of wisdom in the people of Israel, in its law, and in its prophets.—The question, whether in the expressions used in Ecclesiasticus and the Wisdom of Solomon, wisdom (*σοφία*) is simply *a poetical personification*, or is regarded by the authors *dogmatically* as a *distinct hypostasis*, has for a long time been variously answered. The view to which Lücke assents, which is now most commonly entertained, and in our judgment is the true one, is this, that in the Book of Proverbs, and in Ecclesiasticus, there is merely a personification, but that this personification in the Wisdom of Solomon, from ch. vii. 22, passes over into a dogmatic hypostatizing. See also Dähne, Alexandrinische Religionsphilosophie, ii. p. 134, seq. 154, seq.

We must further trace the doctrine after the type of the *Jews of Palestine* and *those of Alexandria*. The Chaldee paraphrasts, from whom we ascertain the former, never speak of God as operating immediately, but constantly represent him as acting through the mediation of the מֵימְרָא or דִּבּוּר the word of God. In them we have, Gen. iii. 8, Deut. iv. 12, "The voice of the *word* of God spake;" Gen. xlix. 18, the Jerusalem Targum translates: "I wait not for liberation through Samson or Gideon, but for salvation through thy *word*." Jonathan, in particular, in place of the מֵימְרָא frequently employs the term Shekinah, "the habitation of the splendor, the glory," corresponding to the "glory" in

which God revealed himself under the Old Testament, (cf. the Septuagint, Deut. xii. 8, and see 2 Peter i. 17.) The Memra is also employed in a sense parallel with angel of the Lord, Judg. 11, seq. (J. H. Michælis, de usu Targumim antejudaico, Halæ, 1720. Keil, Opusc. ii. p. 526.) Under the coöperation of the Oriental and Greek philosophy, these tendencies of the doctrine of the hidden and revealed God were carried out further by the Cabbalists. Two leading works of this literature, the Book Jezira and the Book Sohar, are, to appearance, of so late an origin, that the latter, at least, can only be regarded as an interpolated writing of the Rabbi, Moses Leon, (see Tholuck's Commentatio de ortu Cabbalæ, 1837,) of the thirteenth century, but they follow more ancient speculations. In Sohar is found only the distinction between a great and small countenance of God, (אֲרִיךְ וְעִיר אַנְפִּין) an open and closed eye; in the Book Jezira, the Revealer is called the brightness of the unity of God, (זוֹהַר חָאַחְדוּת.)

As to Philo, it is this Alexandrian Jew, so conversant with Plato, in whom the inmost affinity of the Greek with the Hebrew wisdom meets us, for the God of Plato, the ὄν, the *αὐτὸ τὸ ἀγαθόν*, does not himself appear in this world of *becoming*, but is mediated through the ideas; Plato had also spoken of a *νοῦς βασιλικὸς ἐν τῇ τοῦ Διὸς φύσει*, (a regal principle of intelligence in the nature of Jove,) (Phileb. p. 30. d. Steph.) Thus did a more perfect doctrine of the Logos evolve itself to the Alexandrian. The absolute God begat his counterpart in the Logos, (though only a relative, not an absolute one, for the Logos is only *θεός*, not *ὁ θεός*,) who is the sum, the *μητρόπολις* of the divine *δυνάμεις* or *ἰδέαι*, the *κόσμος νοητός*; after this was the *κόσμος αἰσθητός* formed, through it he operates in the world. This sum of the divine *δυνάμεις* Philo calls *λόγος*, which term he prefers to that of *σοφία*, partly because in the sense of *reason*, it is closely connected with the Platonic *νοῦς*, and in the sense of *word*, with the Old Testament, partly because the word as *thought rendered external*, presents a designation conformable to the *κόσμος νοητός* stamped upon the actual world. This *λόγος* he also denominates *ὁ πρεσβύτατος υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*, (the eldest son of God,) *ὁ πρωτόγονος*, (the first born,) and even *ὁ δεύτερος θεός*, (the

second God,) although, as he adds, ἐν καταχρήσει. He sometimes uses σοφία, too, in the same sense as λόγος. (Dähne, Alexandrinische Religionsphilos. i. p. 220.)

If we seek for the *term ὁ λόγος before* John, we find it *predominant* only in Philo. Out of his writings, to wit: it occurs but once, Ecclesiastic. xxiv. 26, (28,) as a designation of the creative word of God, and Wisdom viii. 15, as a designation of the punitive power of God, which, in poetical personification, is represented as an angel. This fact might easily lead to the idea that John's doctrine, if not directly, yet mediately, might be connected with that of Philo. This opinion, first maintained by Ballenstedt, (in the book "Philo and John," Göttingen, 1812,) has recently been embraced by the major part of the theologians. De Wette and Lücke also concur in it; the latter says: "It is *impossible* to mistake as to the immediate historical connection of John's doctrine of the Logos with the Alexandrian in its more perfect form, as it is presented in Philo." In fact, since Gfrörer's work on Early Christianity, the belief has been embraced, that even the Pauline form of the doctrine of the Logos is connected with the Alexandrian Wisdom, (Col. i. 15, 16, 2 Cor. iv. 4, 1 Cor. i. 47, viii. 6;) in regard to the Epistle to the Hebrews, (ch. i. 1, seq.) this was believed still earlier, (see, opposed to this, Tholuck's Commentary, 2d ed. p. 67. Eng. Trans. i. 129.) On this point, also, De Wette and Lücke are in harmony with Gfrörer, (Lücke, Komm. 3d ed. i. Thl. p. 284, seq. 290.) For proof, Lücke appeals to Gfrörer, Philo, &c. ii. p. 280, seq. and Dähne in his work before quoted, ii. p. 237, seq.

We will first glance at the question, whether it is probable that the *Alexandrian Gnosis had also found an entrance among the Jews of Palestine.* Of that which Gfrörer advances, much needs a sifting before it can be received; much is unsound, or at least precarious. Proceeding on the supposition that the Essenes were, beyond doubt, an offshoot of the sect of Egyptian Therapeutæ, he would, from this fact, derive the date at which the Alexandrian Gnosis was transplanted. But at the very beginning, that derivation of Essenism from Egypt is very precarious: Neander, too, in the most recent edition of his Church History, 1842, 1 Thl. p. 105, ex-

presses an opinion adverse to it. The establishing of that date rests throughout on error. Gfrörer's strongest argument is the passage adduced, p. 349, from a Karaite author, according to which, Simeon Ben Schetach, a Rabbi of Palestine, who had been banished to Egypt some eighty years B. C. is alleged to have brought with him out of Egypt a Kabbala, that is a Tradition "of which not the remotest trace is said to remain in the written law." This passage, which is given in full in Trigland Notitia Karæorum, p. 87, seq. does not, however, refer at all to what we call the Caballa, that is, *the metaphysical speculations* of the Jews, but to the Talmudic doctrine, whose genuineness the Caraite writer attempts to invalidate, inasmuch as it was derived from Egypt. The *Rabbinic* writers, too, who make us acquainted with Ben Schetach, say no more, than that through him, on his return from Egypt, the "oral tradition" was invested with new brilliancy. (Liber. Cosri. edit. Buxt. p. 240.) It is true, other learned men, Brucker, especially, in his Hist. Philos. ii. 706, have advanced the opinion, that the statement of the Jews to which we have alluded, is inaccurate, and that Simeon more probably introduced into Palestine the Alexandrian metaphysics. This opinion, however, is a mere hypothesis. Gfrörer, Dähne, and in unison with them, Lücke, appeal further to the traces of Alexandrian views in Josephus, and to the fact that the Jewish writers complain of the influence of the Greek wisdom in Palestine, and that Gamaliel also was acquainted with it. Whatever is to be established by Josephus, is exceedingly precarious; in the passages cited from the Talmud, the point is: what are we to understand by the "Greek wisdom, the חכמת יוית?" It is certainly too hasty, without anything further, to understand by it, "the allegorical exposition." See in addition what I have remarked on this expression in the Treatise before alluded to, de Ortu Cabbalæ, p. 8. Although from the beginning we have been far from regarding as impossible, an influence on Palestine derived from the Alexandrian theosophy, yet we feel ourselves forced to declare, that what has hitherto been urged to sustain it, does not, in our judgment, warrant the confident language that has been employed. Lücke himself is disposed to think that with the theosophic views of the Chaldee paraphrasts, and

of Simon Magus, there has been a coöperation of Gnostic elements, which were brought back on the return from the exile. In this case, the necessity is still less of supposing an influence derived from Alexandria. As it is granted that Alexandria itself, in the centuries immediately preceding Christ, was influenced from the East, is not the remark at once suggested, that Palestine, also, may have been touched from the East? Compare here the weighty language of Neander used by him with reference to Simon Magus, in the Pflanzung der Christlichen Kirche, 3d ed. i. p. 80.[1] That John had adopted his doctrine of the Logos during his residence in Palestine, is nevertheless not maintained, but rather the belief that the *Palestinian-Gnostic* type of this doctrine is to be met with only in Paul and in the Epistle to the Hebrews.[2] John, on the other hand, in Ephesus, a city where, as in Alexandria, various religious elements were mingled, might (not indeed by the study of Philo's writings,[3] but from the circle of his own intercourse,) have become familiar with the *Alexandrian* type of the doctrine of the Logos, and adapted it to Christ. To the adoption of this view, in the first place, we are urged by no *necessity* whatever. If we bring together the points of the Old Testament to which the doctrine of the Logos can be linked, if we connect with those passages which Lücke has enumerated those that he has passed over, (he has made no reference to the "Angel of Jehovah," and to Exod. xxxiii. while Nitzsch, in his Dissertation "On the Essential Trinity of God," in the Stud. u. Krit, 1841, 2 H. p. 316, seq. attaches great importance to them;) little in fact remains to be done to develope it to the point at which we meet it in the Prologue of John. Nor is the fact to be passed over, that in its connection in the doctrine

1 In this place Neander cites from a Palestinian Apocryphal work, a passage overlooked by Gfrörer and Dähne, which yet, more than any thing before adduced from Palestinian authors, embodies a spirit allied to the Alexandrian theosophy.

2 Strauss, also, Glaubenslehre, i. p. 419, seq. supposes the Christology of Paul to proceed from an acquaintance with the Hellenistic Apocrypha, that of John from a direct adaptation of the doctrines of Philo.

3 Gfrörer also thinks that the Apostle did not derive his views from the works of Philo, but from a widely extended *circle*. The circulation of the writings of these theosophists must have been limited indeed, if it be true, as Valckenaer thinks he can show, that even Philo had never read the writings of his great predecessor, Aristobulus. See Valckenaer de Aristob. p. 95.

of Philo, the Logos has a different meaning from that which it has in its connection in the Christian doctrine of the Trinity. In Philo it is not so much the principle of the revelation of God with God himself, as that of revelation to the world.[1] (Bruno Bauer, in his Zeitschrift f. spekul. Theol. i. 2, in the Dissertation "über den alttestamentl. Hintergrund des Ev. Joh."—On the Old Testament background of the Gospel of John.)

Be the question as it may as to whether the Evangelist is indebted mediately to the influence of Philo for the doctrine of the Logos in this shape, yet is the point of essential importance this, whether he and Paul have associated only in an *incidental* manner, their Gnosis with their faith in Christ. Against this we must declare ourselves in the most decided manner. We fully subscribe to what has been said by Neander in his Pflanz. 3d ed. ii. p. 690, (Planting and Training, i. 505:) "Certainly it could be nothing merely accidental which induced men so differently constituted and trained as Paul and John, to connect such an idea with the doctrine of the person of Christ, but the result of a higher necessity, which is founded in the nature of Christianity, in the power of the impression which the life of Christ had made on the minds of men, *in the reciprocal relation between the appearance of Christ, and the archetype that presents itself as an inward revelation of God, in the depths of the higher self-consciousness. And all this has found its point of connection and its verification in the manner in which Christ, the unerring witness, expressed his consciousness of the indwelling of the divine essence in him.*"[2] In fact, the witness of Christ of himself, that he is the Son of God, which is found not

[1] Frommann, Joh. Lehrbegriff, p. 142, alleges also, as a distinction, that the Logos of Philo *came into being*, while on the contrary, the Logos of John "*was* in the beginning." But as John also regards the Father as the Original, as God *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, the "*was*" employed by the Evangelist cannot exclude the idea of generation from God. Though Philo, on the one side, calls the Logos "first born," on the other he designates him as "without beginning." As he makes time to commence with the world, he could not regard the being begotten as a temporal relation.

[2] Compare with this, Neander's Kirchengeschichte, i. 3, p. 989: "Providence had so ordered it, that in the intellectual world in which Christianity made its first appearance, many ideas, apparently at least, closely related to it, should be current, in which Christianity could find a point of connection for the doctrine of a God revealed in Christ."

only in John, but in Matt. xi. 27, xviii. 35, ("*My* heavenly Father,") xxii. 44, xxiii. 37, xi. 10, (cf. Mal. iii. 1,) and xxviii. 18, 20, is quite sufficient to explain the application of the doctrine of the Logos to him. And if no other necessity for supposing a connection with Philo can be established, the whole matter is narrowed to this, that the Evangelist, from the circle around him, borrowed the *designation* by the name Logos, "in order to lead those who busied themselves with speculation on the Logos, as the centre of all theophanies, to lead them from their religious idealism to a religious realism, to the recognition of that God who was revealed in Christ."[1] Neander, same work, p. 549, (Eng. Tr. 402.) In the same manner entirely, Nitzsch, (in his work already quoted,) p. 321, expresses himself, and protests against the idea that the Christology of Paul, of John, and of the Epistle to the Hebrews, presents merely a conception which was the growth of time, (p. 305.) Frommann, (in his work quoted,) p. 146, says: "We do gross violence to the exalted and simple Christian spirit of our Apostle, if we represent him as an immediate disciple of that Alexandrian scholasticism which, with all its show of monotheism, was close upon the borders of pantheism." Bruno Bauer himself, in his Kritik der evang. Geschichte des Joh. p. 5, declares that the doctrine of the Logos is to be ascribed to existing elements only thus far: "that they invested with new importance, and advanced to a more decided form, views already firmly established in the mind of the Disciple of the Lord;" the Apocryphal books, he remarks, might already have excited reflection upon the internal distinction of the Godhead, and adumbrated the doctrine of the Logos. Cf. also, Olshausen's Comm. p. 30, seq.

II. THE DOGMA CONTAINED IN THE DOCTRINE OF THE LOGOS.

The view widely embraced at the end of the eighteenth century, and defended by Teller, Löffler, Stolz, Eichhorn, Ammon and others, that the Logos in this place is but a personification of the divine reason, as in the Wisdom of Solomon, ch.

[1] As early as Count Lynar, in his Paraphrase of the Gospel of John, Halle, 1771, we have the remark: "The Logos, a term under which, as every one knows, both Jews and Gentiles of the present time understand something more than human, under which name I propose to describe Jesus, who is not yet sufficiently understood." Morus takes the same view.

vii. 27, x. 16, 17, may be regarded at this day as superseded; a confutation of it may be found in an Essay by Süsskind, in Flatt's Magazin. f. Dogmatik u. Moral St. 10. As at this time a dogmatic hypostatizing is acknowledged in the Wisdom of Solomon itself, there is the less hesitation in conceding it here. It is now the problem of Theology to grasp the relation of this hypostasis to God, or rather *in God*. Exegesis cannot well avoid linking itself here to the results of Dogmatik.

In place of the term ὑπόστασις, abstractive τρόπος ὑπάρξεως, ἰδιότης, commonly employed in the East, the Western Church used the term *person*. Yet this term is not applied to the hypostases of the Godhead in the sense in which it is used of human individuals. The unsatisfactory character of the expression was felt, in fact, very strongly already, by Augustine, who says: "Tres—quid tres?" (three—three what?) and elsewhere: "personæ, si ita dicendæ sunt," (persons, if they may so be called.) *Person* applied to men, designates the human individual as an impress of the conception of the human species under an incommunicable modification of being in the single one. In *this* sense, the term cannot be applied to the Godhead, partly because Godhead is not a conception of a species, but exists once only, and partly because the same essence belongs to all the persons, and the formula of the Church runs: Una essentia in tribus personis. It is very certain that the Aristotelian Boethius, whose definition became the current one in the Occidental Church: "Persona est naturæ rationalis individua substantia," by no means proposed in that way to define the *divine* persons, but designated the divine Trinity as diversitas *relationum*, (de trinitate, c. 5, p. 159, seq.) And thus the speculative theologians of the West commonly used the expression, subsistentiæ, relationes subsistentes, (Thomas, Summa. qu. 40, Art. 2.) The persons then of the Godhead, are: *real distinctions, having a necessary basis in the essence of the Godhead, and at the same time are relations.* God has knowledge of himself in a triple action of self-consciousness; he knows himself as subject, as object, and at the same time as the identical in subject and object.[1] As an analogy, the human spirit may be

[1] See Nitzsch, (in place already cited,) who shows that the reference of the Trinity to a necessary internal Modality, if you choose to call it so, can by no means be denominated *Sabellianism*.

referred to in its self-distinguishing, as *thinker*, and as *thought of itself*, and again, as *act of thinking*. God as object of himself is the *Word*, for in the Word (that is, regarded as an internal thing,) the spirit becomes objective to itself. The Word is consequently the principle through which God is revealed to himself. The Word is distinct from him, and at the same time the distinction is taken away, for God would not have perfectly rendered himself objective, had not (so to speak,) his thought of himself been as great and as substantial as he is.[1] As he now contemplates himself in the Word, he beholds the fullness of his own essence, and in this the archetypes of the world, for the works of God which, according to Rom. i. 20, mirror "the eternal power and Godhead" of God, must have been thoughts of God. In the Word, therefore, lies the *κόσμος νοητός*, (the intelligible world,) and so far the counterpart of God. The other counterpart of man, by which he is conscious of his individuality, is external to him, God has it in himself, in his Word. First, in having reference to this counterpart, he is also love. As the abstract One, he would be without love, for it pertains to the notion of love to find oneself in *another*. In his distinction *from* his counterpart, and in his reference *to* it, he is love. This love, accordingly, has reference also eternally to the world—but not to the world in its limited being, in its *actually entering on existence*, but as it is rendered objective to him in the Word, in his own essence. It is, then, not a counterpart *for itself*, but only *for him*. In virtue of his love, it attains now also existence *for itself*, that is the *κόσμος νοητὸς* becomes realized in the *κόσμος αἰσθητός*; the creation of the world ensues. Hence we have the Bible formula, that the world was created *of* the Father, *by* the Son. (John i. 3, 1 Cor. viii. 6, Eph. iii. 9, Col. i. 16.) This explains, too, why every revelation of God, whether in the Old Testament, (John xii. 41,) in the consciousness of the human soul, (John i. 5–9,) or in Christ, is referred to the Logos. What does the expression, "God reveals himself," mean, but this: he imparts the thought, the knowledge

1 Luther also calls the Logos "a discourse," or a "thought of God of himself;" the dissimilarity in human analogy he traces profoundly to this, that God is causa sui, and then adds: "although in fact *our* word gives a little information, indeed gives cause for meditating on the thing."

of himself? God's thought of himself, God objectively conceived, is the Logos. In Christ, however, the Logos has become man, inasmuch as this man is the archetype of humanity, which was contemplated in the Logos, which archetype, in virtue of that, views God with the same absoluteness of knowledge, is participant also of the love of God, in the same way as the Logos in his preëxistent state.[1] Luther says strikingly: "The other sons of God first become such through this Son, who, therefore, is the only begotten"—their creation, like their new creation, he says further, is founded in the Word, to wit: through the original man.

Among the theological discussions of a very recent date, in regard to the Trinity, the greatest interest is claimed by the missives of Lücke and Nitzsch, the first of whom presents with plainness the considerations opposed to the doctrine of an immanent divine Trinity, the latter, with an equal absence of reserve, meets these scruples, (Stud. u. Kritik. 1840, II. 1, 1841, II. 2.) The Dissertation by Dean Mehring, in Fichte's Zeitschrift fur Spekulat. Theol. 1842, 5 Bd. H. 2, also deserves notice. Among the philosophical dissertations, Billroth's Religionsphilosophie, p. 57, seq. and Erdmann, Natur oder Schöpfung, (Nature or Creation,) p. 70, seq. may be referred to.

PROLOGUE.—V. 1–18.

The train of thought in the Prologue is now to be explained. The grand thought which stands before the soul of the Evangelist is, *that the Logos has appeared as a human person.* The Evangelist, however, starts from a remoter point, and commences with the thought, that from eternity the Logos has revealed God to himself, (v. 1, 2,) that through him the world has been brought into existence, as also the consciousness of God in man, (v. 3, 4.) But mankind have not had the proper disposition of

[1] As regards the question, whether the Logos only, and not the Godhead, became man, the answer is to be found in the formula employed by Bernard: Credimus ipsam divinitatem sive substantiam divinam sive naturam divinam dicas, incarnatam esse, sed in *filio*, ("we believe that the Deity itself, call it divine nature, or divine substance, as you please, became incarnate, but *in the Son.*") It is further to be remarked, in regard to Christ, that the sphere of his earthly being does not present the incarnation of the Logos in its complete unfolding; that follows the condition of exaltation.

mind for this light, (v. 5.) As John purposes to make a transition to the personal appearing of the Logos, he prefaces it with a mention of the testimony of the Baptist, which was designed to produce faith in him that was to come, (v. 6–9.) He that was to come was, in fact, already present, but had been rejected, (v. 10.) He now came to his own peculiar people, and these also rejected him, (v. 11.) But the richest blessing became the portion of those who acknowledged him that had appeared, (v. 12, 13.) Thus he prepares for the delineation of the appearing of the Word in flesh, so abundantly rich in blessing, whose two grand benefits, designating them in the strongest manner, are called the *grace* and the *truth*, (v. 14, 17.)

V. 1. Ἐν ἀρχῇ, in the view of most expositors, is connected with the בְּרֵאשִׁית ("in the beginning") of the Old Covenant, to carry on, as it were, to a higher point, the beginning there mentioned. It may be so; nevertheless, if that רֵאשִׁית means the beginning of the creation itself, ἀρχή must here have another meaning, for the Logos was not merely *at*, but *before* the creation of the world. It is most probable that John, by ἐν ἀρχῇ here and ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, 1 John i. 1, means ἀπ' αἰῶνος, which is used, Prov. viii. 23, (Septua.) in regard to wisdom, in place of which Ecclesiasticus xxiv. 14, (9,) has ἀπ' ἀρχῆς. "We show unto you τ. ζωὴν τ. αἰώνιον," says the Evangelist, 1 John i. 2. Our conception cannot grasp an infinite range of time. When we wish, therefore, to speak of eternity, we fix a beginning, which we call *original* beginning.—John says: "He *was* in the beginning;" but according to the doctrine of the Church, the Son is *begotten*. But as the Church in this conception denies the prius and posterius, it follows that the existence of the Son is to be regarded as posterior to that of the Father, only in the order of *apprehension*, not of time. The sunbeam is dependent on the sun, and yet is not later than it. In fact, there is a reciprocal condition, since the Father without the Son cannot be Father, in fact, not self-conscious God; the effect is thus, on the other side, cause also.

Πρός with the accus. here in the sense of *with*, cf. Winer, § 53, h. and the παρὰ σοί, xvii. 5; so too (ἡ ζωὴ) ἥτις ἦν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, 1 John i. 2. By the word "*with*" as indicative of

space, is designated that idea which we call *distinction*, which is, however, annulled by the θεός ἦν which follows, as Luther expresses it: "That sounds as if the Word were something different from God, he resumes, therefore, and *closes the ring*." θεός is not to be regarded as the subject; the οὗτος, v. 2, which again is connected with ὁ λόγος, shows that the latter is the leading idea. θεός without the article, designates God as the divine substance; on the other hand, ὁ θεός is meant to designate God as subject and (in connection with what precedes,) the Father himself. The consubstantiality of the Logos with the Father, is thus expressed, as Erasmus remarks. Those who maintain in general a close connection of the Evangelist with Philo, suppose that θεός without the article signifies, as in Philo, God in a subordinate sense, ὁ δεύτερος. The bearing of this on the doctrine of the Trinity would not be unessential, for the Son would in that case no longer be the absolute image of the Father.

V. 2, 3. The discourse again takes up the first words of v. 1, as the thought of the creation of the world connects itself with that of the eternal existence of the Word. Only in virtue of his eternal existence could the Logos effect the temporal existence of the world. The temporal beings are the thoughts of God which have become existent, and which were contained in archetype in the Logos; according to Col. i. 16, all things were created *in* the Logos. The proposition χωρὶς αὐτοῦ κ. τ. λ. is not to be regarded as merely rhetorical, repeating in a negative form the thought which before had been expressed positively. That a special emphasis is attached to it, is clear from the fact that we have not the mere οὐδέν. But why this express testimony, that *everything* existed through the mediation of the Logos? According to Lücke and Olshausen, to exclude the Philonic view of the ὕλη, (matter as a principle of being.) But the testimony is designed to assure us, not of the *dependence of everything on God*, but of *its existence by means of the Logos*. Must not, then, the purpose of the Evangelist rather have been to represent the Logos as exalted above all orders of spirits, as Paul expressly gives prominence to the very same idea to the Colossians, Col. i. 16.

V. 4, 5. Luther: "John now sharpens the pin and makes a

new point, as he designs to bring in the thread of the *human race*," (an allusion to lace-weaving. Tr.) As the *existence* of beings has its root in the Logos, so also has their *life*. This life, however, was in men a *self-reflected life*, a consciousness of God effectuated by self-consciousness. That φῶς does not strictly designate the self-consciousness, is manifest from v. 5 and 9, (cf. Matt. vi. 23,) yet the consciousness of God presupposes a capacity of self-consideration. Καταλαμβάνειν cannot idiomatically signify "suppress," (Origen, Chrysostom, Schultheß,) it means "comprehend," in the spiritual sense, too, in expressing which the middle voice is usual, cf. v. 10, ἔγνω, and iii. 19. In unison with this, Paul says, Rom. i. 19, that God was manifest in the heart of the heathen, and was not acknowledged. The abstract σκοτία designates the concrete collective idea of humanity not penetrated by the consciousness of God. With the Aorist, we have φαίνει in the present, as the Evangelist has before his mind an act yet in continual progress.

V. 6–8. The thought that mankind did not comprehend the Logos at that time, already excites in the mind of the Evangelist a reflection on the unbelief that attended his appearing in humanity. He thus had occasion for the admonitory remark, that by God's arrangement through the Baptist, John's cherished teacher, preparation for faith in the incarnate Logos had been made, and so far rendered easy—"that all men (are the *heathen* already embraced in this, as Luther supposes?) through him might believe." The explicit assurance in v. 8, appears superfluous, nevertheless, v. 20 and ch. iii. 28, show (cf. Paul, Acts xiii. 25,) that the establishment of what is here asserted, seemed of importance to the Evangelist; the earliest traces of disciples of John the Baptist, who regarded him as the Messiah, are found in the second century, but there might already exist an occasion for these remarks of the Evangelist, in the fact that even after the appearance of Jesus, a secluded circle of John's disciples remained.—The construction with ἵνα serves for the circumscribing of the idea of *should*, (cf. ix. 3, xiii. 18, Mark v. 23.)

V. 9. The point of time is now specified at which that witness resounded. The translation of Luther, which is also the one of the Vulgate, Syriac, Chrysostom, Calvin, (and the English

authorized version. Tr.) cannot therefore be allowed, since to justify it, an οὗτος would be indispensable before the ἦν. We must connect the ἦν with ἐρχόμενον, and ἦν ἐρχόμ. is susceptible of two interpretations. It may mark the imperfect: "He came just then into the world," (De Wette, Lücke, 3d edit.) On this view, indeed, the thesis cannot well be connected with what precedes, which would seem to make τότε necessary, although this objection may be met by the consideration, that the following theses also are pretty abrupt. There is yet another difficulty, however. If we take it in this way, v. 10 must be understood of Christ after his appearing, and would not the ἦν then be out of place? since De Wette and Lücke themselves cannot avoid translating: "was (appeared.") We prefer, therefore, with Theodorus of Mopsuestia, Grotius, Lampe, Schott, Olshausen, to understand the partic. pres. ἐρχόμενος of him who was shortly to enter the world, and to translate: erat venturum; the proposition is then more closely connected with v. 8, as an elucidation. Ἀληθινός, "that which answers to its idea," (iv. 23, vi. 32.) A share of the light is indeed ascribed to the Baptist, but the true light illumines *all men*.

V. 10, 11. With the thought that the *Light was first to come*, is connected by reference to v. 5, what obviates a possible misunderstanding, and by which, at the same time, the thought expressed in v. 11 is strengthened. As v. 9 has already referred to the personal appearing, we now have the masculine αὐτόν. Instead of a conjunction making a clear logical determination, we have, like the Hebrew, merely καί, the first καί having an augmentive, the second an adversative sense. V. 11 can only be understood of the personal appearing of the Logos, as is shown by the ἦλθε and by v. 12 and 13; though Luther interprets ἦλθε as referring to Christ's appearance subsequent to his baptism. Τὰ ἴδια, his own, that is his own property, peculiar possession, not essentially different from the concrete οἱ ἴδιοι. If this designated no more than the previous κόσμος, it would be the men in general, who belonged, in a more specific sense than other beings, to the Logos, since they are conscious life, inasmuch as they bear in them the consciousness of God; but the impression is irresistible, that ἴδιοι is

meant to express more than ὁ κόσμος. In this light, the view of Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, Beza, and the recent writers, commends itself, that Israel is referred to ὡς σχοίνισμα κληρονομιας αὐτοῦ, ("as the portion of his inheritance,") Ecclesiasticus xxiv. 13, Exod. xix. 5. If we take ἴδιοι in this sense, can we not say that the whole Gospel is an expansion of this theme, since the party in apposition is always designated by John as οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι? (see on i. 19.)—The rejection of Messiah expressed in as unqualified a manner as in iii. 32, receives, nevertheless, in v. 12, its limitation. The Baptist had designed to lead "all" to faith, (v. 7,) but the great mass had been blind.

V. 12–13. The Evangelist depicts the more copiously the richness of blessing shared by the few. Ἐξουσία has, in the classics, the meaning of prerogative, ἡ ἀξίωσις, (Beza, cf. 1 Joh. iii. 1,) but certainly not in the New Testament, nor can that of δύναμις, internal power, (1 Cor. i. 18,) be supposed here; better, therefore, according to the classic usage, where it has the meaning of *ability*, as Erasmus: ut liceret filios Dei fieri, (that they might become sons of God.) In what way is this ability brought about? We may answer in the words that follow: by the χάρις and ἀλήθεια, (the "grace" and "truth.") Τέκνα θεοῦ cannot here have the derivative sense "protegé, favorite;" the thought, rather, as v. 13 shows, is that of a regeneration, a participation of the divine φύσις, (2 Pet. i. 4,) so that Christ is preëminently the υἱὸς τ. θεοῦ, cf. 1 John iii. 9, 1 Pet. i. 22, 23. At the same time the condition or mediation of the new birth is given, *Faith*. The idea of spiritual birth is then, v. 13, rendered more distinct by putting it into antithesis with natural birth. We may regard the three members as distinct designations; Luther: the corporeal descent, the adoption, the sonship as a title of honor, or the second and third as subdivisions of the first, though in that case οὔτε—οὔτε would be required. The blood through which the chyle is distributed to the different parts of the body, is the seat of life, hence the connection between child and parents is called *blood* relationship, and in classic usage, also, we have the expression "to spring from the *blood*, that is from the seed of any one," (Acts xvii. 26.) The plural is used in the classic poetry for the singular. The idea of the older theologians that these words have a controversial

aim against the Jewish pride of Abrahamic descent, cannot be well allowed in this connection. The lowliness of bodily descent, is depicted in antithesis to spiritual generation, yet more particularly in the expression, "the lust of the flesh," (Eph. ii. 3,) that is, the natural impulse, and the "*desire of man*," that is, a more particular limitation of the fleshly desire. Over against this stands the "divine counsel of love." Ἐξ marks in Greek, not merely the point of material origin, but also the efficient cause, cf. on iii. 6.

V. 14. In v. 11, the incarnation of the Logos was already presupposed. Linked with the thought of the regeneration, effected thereby, that incarnation is now depicted with an enthusiasm inspired by its glory. The Evangelist speaks with the enthusiasm of an eye-witness, and with like fervor he speaks in the beginning of his first Epistle, written in extreme old age. Καί, as in the Greek classics, and like the Latin atque, serves for the continuation or elucidation of a discourse, cf. v. 16, 19, 24. Σάρξ, like the fuller phrase σάρξ καὶ αἷμα, (Heb. ii. 14,) designates humanity with reference to its character, as endowed with the senses and passions, cf. Heb. v. 7, 2 Cor. xiii. 4. We are not to understand by it the body merely, which would lead us into the error of Apollinaris, which was, that Christ had not a human soul, but that in its place was substituted the Logos. The word σάρξ is selected by the Evangelist to mark the incarnation as an act of humiliation, perhaps, too, with a glance toward the docetic denial of the sensuous nature. (1 John iv. 2.) In men, in general, the Logos was divine consciousness as potential, but not come to energy in will or cognoscence; in Christ, the divine consciousness alike in will and cognoscence attains to absolute energy, and therefore unites itself with the self-consciousness in personal unity. Σκηνόω, properly "to pitch tent," in a wider sense, "*to dwell.*" The expression is used solemnly in the first sense, to express the reality of his abode among men; (Luther: "not like the angel Gabriel,") cf. μονὴν ποιεῖν, John xiv. 23; though the image of pitching a tabernacle may serve to express the *transientness* of the abode of God's Son in the *lowly* condition of humanity. (Phil. ii. 7.) According to Olshausen, Meyer and Lücke, there is an allusion to the name Shekinah, (that is, dwelling,) see above,

p. 62, as too, the mention of the δόξα, which properly formed the Shekinah, immediately follows. That the Evangelist was induced to the selection of the Greek σκηνοῦν by the mere similarity of *sound* with the Hebrew word, is not to be supposed, and if he designed an allusion to that idea, the expression "he pitched a tabernacle" is not distinct enough; yet the mention of the δόξα certainly favors the view. Δόξα designates, first of all, in the Old Testament, the radiance (כָּבוֹד) the sensible token of the presence of God; to this a reference might be found, as though the Evangelist would say: "the sensible manifestations of God under the old covenant are now completed," for in them *that which appeared*, and *he who appeared*, were distinct, but this is the case no more. According to New Testament phraseology, the δόξα is imparted to Christ, and them that are his, only in *the other world.* (vii. 39, xii. 23, xiii. 32, xvii. 1, 5, 24.) To this δόξα pertains also the immediate dominion of the spirit over nature; since this, however, is averred of the Saviour even in this world, John here, and ii. 11, already ascribes to the Son of God a δόξα in this world. It is nevertheless possible that in this he had in his mind the spiritual glory, also, of Christ. Luther has less fitly everywhere translated δοξαζειν by verklären, (transfigure,) instead of verherrlichen, (glorify.) Ὡς is to be taken as the falsely so-called בְּ veritatis, (this was thought to stand merely for asseveration,) in Hebrew, i. e. the object is attached to its idea, "such as is due one who is the only begotten," cf. Is. i. 7, Neh. vii. 2, Matt. vii. 29. Μονογενὴς, "that which exists once only, that is, singly in its kind." Would the others become what Christ is, (John xvii. 22, Rom. viii. 29,) they become such through the ἐξουσία bestowed by him. Παρὰ πατρός may be construed with δόξα, but it is better to connect it with μονογενοῦς, in which lies the verbal conception of γεννηθέντος. Olshausen thinks that here only the Logos in itself is denominated μονογενής, and appeals to the ὢν εἰς τ. κόλπον τ. πατρός, v. 18, but as we shall show, not with justice. Πλήρης may, by anacoluthon, be referred to μονογενοῦς, as Eph. iii, 17, but it is better to take καί ἐθεασαμεθα—πατρός as a parenthesis called forth by strong emotion, so that πλήρης refers to ἐσκήνωσεν. All that Christ has been to the world, is comprised in the two blessings of salvation, χάρις and ἀλήθεια; what

they embrace is brought out more clearly in the antithesis, v. 17.

V. 15. He again returns to the testimony of his beloved instructor, and inserts it parenthetically in the same way as the exclamation in v. 14; the mention of the *χάρις*, v. 16, is again then connected with v. 14. The vivid feeling, as though what he speaks of were actually present, causes him to use the present, and even *κέκραγε* belongs to the perfects, that have the force of the present; the expression cited is the one employed by the Baptist on the occasion mentioned in v. 30. *Ὃν εἶπον* with the accus. of the person, *of whom* we speak, Matthiæ, ii. 162, cf. *ὃν ἔγραψε*, v. 46. The discourse of the Baptist has the pointed antithetical character which is displayed in the prophetic expressions in the Old Testament. The exposition must be determined by the force of *ἔμπροσθεν*. According to the current usage, this designates only *before* with reference to space or time, but not *precedence;* it is accordingly interpreted of preëxistence, among the more recent writers, by Wahl, Bretschneider, Lex. 3d ed. Meyer, Hengstenberg, (Christol. iii. 490); in the proposition which specifies the reason, they then understand *πρῶτος* also as referring to the preëxistence. If with this conception we were to translate *γέγονεν*, "he has become," it could not well be taken except in an Arian sense—the Arians, indeed, make their appeal to this interpretation; but we may also translate, "he has been." In that case, however, it is impossible to deny the tautological character of the proposition, and if, to avoid this, we understand *πρῶτος* of dignity, why have we *ἦν*, and not *ἐστί*? We must, then, proceeding from the signification which relates to physical space, adopt the meaning of *precedence*, as in Genesis xlviii. 20, (Septuag.) thus: "he has been preferred before me, has obtained a higher position"—which meaning may also be justified by v. 27, where the Baptist acknowledges himself as filling but the position of a slave in relation to Christ. The *πρῶτος* which follows, has likewise been referred to the *dignity* by Chrysostom, Erasmus, Calvin, Maldonatus, Lampe, in which case, however, as we have already remarked, we would expect *ἐστί*, and prefer, therefore, to refer it to the preëxistence, (Luther, Beza, Calovius, Le Clerc, Lücke.) The eternal being of the Logos, or Messiah, is the reason of his precedence. As the

language here relates only to a comparison of two persons, πρῶτος is used in the sense of πρότερος; the genitive is used in consequence of the comparison. (Winer, 4th ed. p. 222.) The criticism of Strauss and Bauer, as this expression is one that could not have been anticipated from the Old Testament position of the Baptist, regards it as a fiction of the Evangelist, derived from his own point of view. In reply to this, we observe: 1,) that the historic notice in v. 30, in regard to the expression, is an argument for its authenticity; 2,) so, too, is its pointed antithetical character; compare the language of the Baptist, iii. 27–30; 3,) that the view of the preëxistence of the Messiah was not foreign to the Jewish conception, (Bertholdt, Christ. Judæor. p. 131. Schmidt, Bibl. f. Kritik. u. Exeg. i. p. 38. Justin Martyr, Dial. c. Tryph. p. 226, 336, ed. Col.) and especially, that a man like the Baptist might have been led to it by an examination of such passages in the Old Testament, as Mal. iii. 1, Micah v. 1, Daniel vii. 13. It cannot, indeed, be demonstrated that John represented himself as that messenger, that Elijah, who is spoken of in Mal. iii. 1, 23,[1] but it had been done, according to Luke i. 16, 17, 76, by Zacharias, his father; Christ himself designates him in the same way, Matt. xi. 10, Mark ix. 12, 13; the passage of Isaiah which the Baptist applies to himself, is like that in Malachi, in fact, according to Hengstenberg, the basis of it; how probable is it, then, that the Baptist himself had observed and applied to himself specially, the words in Mal. iii. 1, and that is the very passage in which the Messiah is designated as the *Lord* and *Angel of the Covenant.* May he not also have referred the κύριος in Mal. iii. 23, (Eng. Tr. 4, 5,) to Christ as Jehovah?

V. 16, 17. The ἡμεῖς πάντες clearly points to the members of the Christian Church, the πλήρωμα to πλήρης, and χάριν to χάριτος, v. 14; we cannot, therefore, regard these as words of the Baptist, as Origen, Erasmus and Strauss suppose. Καί before χάριν is epexegetical. Ἀντί, "instead of," that is, one in place of the other, alternately, as we say, "one *after* another," thus *ever new* gifts of grace; the fullness is consequently an *exhaustless one,* sufficient for *all.* Instead of this use of

[1] What Hengstenberg, in pass. adv. ref. to, advances, to establish a reference to Mal. iii. 1, in the words ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχ., does not seem to me to be convincing.

ἀντί in Greek, it is more common to employ παρά with the accusative.—V. 17 proves this χάρις to be the distinctive quality of the New Covenant. The antithesis which is made in this place by John, as in Paul, too, between νόμος and χάρις, is worthy of remark. The χάρις is the leading idea, but the ἀλήθεια also forms an antithesis to νόμος. Bengel: Lex iram parans et umbram habens, (the law preparing wrath, and having the shadow.) By the legal relation, condemnation falls upon men; the law, indeed, in its sacrifices and ceremonies, had grace also, but only *symbolically*, (Col. ii. 17, Heb. x. 1,) as opposed to which, the unveiled, absolute *truth* now appears. For ἐγένετο, John could not well have written ἐδόθη; it is the historical fact of the appearing of Christ in humanity, by which *grace* and *truth* have become the portion of mankind. Cf. the ἐγενήθη, 1 Cor. i. 30.

V. 18. Now follows a detailed statement in relation to the ἀλήθεια. The proposition, that God cannot be looked upon, stands in the Old Testament, Exod. xxxiii. 20; the mode, however, in which even in that passage the view of the back of God is spoken of, leads to the belief that in that proposition not merely a sensible vision, but an adequate knowledge also was contemplated. Cf. ἀόρατος, Col. i. 15. A decided distinction is supposed, John vi. 45, 46, between hearing God and seeing him, and the first is attributed to men in general, the second to the Son alone. Hearing causes us to have perception of the object in *motion*, consequently in *communication* with us; vision perceives the object in the condition of rest, is consequently better adapted to express that knowledge which springs from personal unity with God. That sole absolute knowledge of God, Christ also claims for himself in Matt. xi. 27. That in the passage before us, ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός designates, as Olshausen thinks, the Logos only, is shown to be untenable by the ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο; the language is employed to mark the Logos personally united with the humanity. Υἱὸς θεοῦ, used of Christ, refers in the profoundest sense to the unity of essence, as Christ himself intimates, Matt. xxii. 43. We have, consequently, in this chapter, v. 50, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ and ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ associated, as also xi. 27, and Matt. xvi. 16, xxvi. 63.—Εἰς has reference to the corporeal idea "to be *on* the

breast." In oriental usage, the one best beloved lies in the bosom of the host, so that his head rests on his breast, and *he can impart and receive confidential communications*, (John xiii. 23.) In Latin proverbially: in gremio, sinu, alicujus esse; Calvin: "Sedes consilii pectus est," (the breast is the seat of counsel.) *Ἐξηγήσατο* requires as an object "*it*," (Eng. Tr. him,) which is not expressed in Greek and Hebrew.

ACCREDITING OF CHRIST BY THE TESTIMONY OF THE BAPTIST. v. 19–34.

The preparatory thoughts have been expressed: the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth, has appeared, but—his own have not received him. The history which begins at this point, gives the amplification. The *οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι* first appear here, under which name John, throughout the entire Gospel, designates the party inimical to the Son of God. This national appellation is ordinarily regarded as a designation of the *representatives* of the people, hence, members of the Sanhedrim. These certainly are so designated *in specie*, cf. for example, vii. 13, where the *ἀρχιερεῖς* and *οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι* are identified; but on the other hand, the people are called *Ἰουδαῖοι*, so as specifically to distinguish them from the *ἀρχιερεῖς*, (xii. 10, 11;) by the name *Ἰουδαῖοι* are meant, in general, all with whom Jesus had to deal, whether high or low, enemies or friends, cf. viii. 31. A reason for the use of this generic name of the people by John, must be sought for; we find it, as has already been remarked, p. 17, (of the translation,) in this, that he exhibits the conflict between the divine light and the corruption of men in the Jewish nation, where, in consequence of their election, it presents itself in the most glaring form.[1]—The intimate connection of the author of this Gospel with the Baptist, displays itself here also in his thorough acquaintance with his testimony. So complete was his familiarity

[1] By an independent process I have reached the same conclusions, especially in reference to v. 11, with those presented in the treatise by Fischer, on the expression *οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι* in the Gospel of John, in the Tub. Zeitschr. 1840, H. 2. As for the rest, the writer, who is dependent on Strauss, thinks that from the data specified, the conclusion is justified that the Gospel was composed from a later Gentile-Christian point of view.

with it, that he here does what elsewhere occurs only in the history of the passion, he follows in chronological order the succession of the days, (*τῇ ἐπαύριον*, v. 29, 35. ii. 1,) and the day on which the deputation came forms the starting point. "The narrator must indeed have a personal and historical interest in that day, as was actually the case, since he, as that Disciple whose name is not given, who at that time left the Baptist for Jesus, had found in those days the influences that determined his whole course of life." (Schweizer.)

V. 19–23. By the *Ἰουδαῖοι*, we are evidently here to understand the Sanhedrim, which necessarily watches the more closely a teacher appearing in an extraordinary form, as no prophet had appeared for almost four hundred years. This superior tribunal was also under special obligation to prevent the appearing of false prophets, (Matt. xxi. 23.) In addition to this, the Messianic baptism performed by the Baptist could not but excite mistrust and solicitude, (John xi. 48–50,) for which reason the question, v. 25, bears specially upon his baptism. We are not, indeed, to suppose that the various opinions mentioned here prevailed in the Sanhedrim itself, it is more probable that the popular views had reached their ears. Among the people, the intense longing for the Messiah, connected with the extraordinary features in the appearing of the Baptist, had aroused, during the first excitement, surmises whether he might not be the Messiah. (Luke iii. 15, Acts xiii. 25.) The importance which the Evangelist attached to the refusal of any such dignity on the part of the Baptist, is shown by his expressing it, not only in a positive, but in a negative form.—*Ὅτι* is used not only in the New Testament, but in the classics also, to introduce the orat. directa, Plato Critias, p. 52, a. It was very natural to think of Elias, as Mal. iii. 23, was usually taken in a literal sense, (Matt. xi. 14, Mark ix. 12.) Now, although the Baptist, as was remarked on v. 15, probably had referred to himself the expressions in Malachi, yet he must respond negatively to their question, since those who inquired, intended not Elias in the ideal, but Elias in the literal sense. (Cf. the popular notions, Mark vi. 14, 15.) Besides this, some special, distinguished prophet was expected by the people, as precursor of the Messiah, by some, especially Jeremiah. (Matt. xvi. 14,

cf. 2 Macc. xv. 13, 14, 4 Ezra xvi. 2–18, 2 Macc. ii.) In vii. 40, also, we are to understand by ὁ προφητὴς, a great prophet, preëminently the object of expectation; probably from the interpretation given to Deut. xviii. 15. The brevity of the Baptist's answers may be accounted for, by the compendious character of the narrative, but v. 22 shows that he, in accordance with his rugged, ascetic character, actually answered no more than the question demanded. In other places, also, his discourses are brief and pointed. His positive answer he gives by quoting the verse, Isaiah xl. 3, in which, according to the report of all the Evangelists, he found a delineation of his own mission. The meaning of "making straight the way," is brought out more clearly in the expressions derived from Malachi, and applied to the Baptist, (Luke i. 17.) The prophet in the passage quoted, speaks of the manifestation of *God*, yet the Baptist *may* have understood, by the κύριος and σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ, (Luke iii. 6,) in a direct sense, the Messiah.

V. 24–28. For the question as to the right to baptize, the Evangelist seems to design furnishing a motive, when he states that those who were sent were Pharisees; this sect was extremely rigid in matters pertaining to the ritual. A lustration of the people in the time of the Messiah was expected, in accordance with Ezek. xxxvi. 24, 25, seq. Mal. iii. 2, 3, and as this was ascribed in the Old Testament, in part to the Messiah himself, in part to his legates, we have, with the Messiah, the prophets also here mentioned who were to prepare the way for his advent. Instead of οὔτε—οὔτε, the best evidence sustains the reading οὐδέ—οὐδέ. What John means by baptism *in*, that is, *with* water, is made clear by the antithesis which he had in his mind in connection with it. In v. 33, the antithesis is βαπτίζειν ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ; thus the merely ritual symbolical baptism, and the real baptism, which imparts the Spirit, stand opposed to each other. But in the account given, Luke iii. 16, with ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, we have also πυρί. If this πυρί is not to be regarded as merely an explanatory addition of the narrator, if it is the Baptist's own phrase, (perhaps a reminiscence from Mal. iii. 2, 3,) we have the more special antithesis of a purification from outward, gross offenses, which operates more in a negative way, and an internal purification

working positively through the impartation of the Spirit; the same antithesis would then meet us which lies in the words εἰς μετάνοιαν and εἰς πίστιν καὶ ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. The expression μέσος—οἴδατε presupposes that Christ was no longer in private, that he had already appeared, cf. Luke xvii. 21, if ἐντὸς ὑμῶν there means "among you;" had the Baptist himself not yet known Jesus as the Messiah, would he have said: ὃν ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε? (Jacobi, in the Studien u. Kritiken, 1838, p. 851.) It appears, then, that we are to suppose the baptism of Jesus to have taken place *before* this language was used, on which point, see what is said at the close of this division. Ὅς—γέγονεν is to be regarded as spurious, as perhaps, also, αὐτὸς ἐστίν. The figurative, concrete expression, by which the Baptist designates his inferiority, was fixed, as Acts xiii. 25 shows, in the Evangelical tradition. The untieing and bearing the sandals, was the duty of slaves; how highly above himself must he then have esteemed Christ! On the construction of ἄξιος with ἵνα instead of with the infinitive, see Winer, 4th ed. p. 312. (Agnew and Ebbeke's Transl. p. 264.) Origen supposed that for ἐν Βηθανίᾳ, the reading should be ἐν Βηθαβαρᾷ, as tradition in his time assigned the latter place on the Jordan as that at which the baptism had been performed, and no other Bethany than the one near Jerusalem was known to him. But we must follow the unanimous testimony of the Codices, and it is just as supposable that there were two Bethanys as two Bethsaidas, to which there is probably an allusion in the πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου.

V. 29. From the solitude in which Jesus, after his baptism, had abode, he comes again to the Jordan. Of the object of Jesus' coming, nothing specific is mentioned, since the Evangelist is concerned only with *the testimony of the Baptist.* If the words be not, as most regard them, a sudden prophetic inspiration, they are yet uttered with a design presupposed, especially v. 36, of directing the Disciples to Jesus. The grand significancy of Jesus, he finds in his propitiatory office. In the expression ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, it is an obvious inference from the article ὁ, that a designation already well known is alluded to, somewhat like ἡ ῥίζα τοῦ Ἰεσσαί, (Isaiah xi. 10, Romans xv. 12,) and it is most natural to think of Isaiah liii. 7. By the genitive τοῦ θεοῦ, this Lamb is more particularly characterized, either as

destined by God, or as *well-pleasing* to God, cf. ἔργα τοῦ θεοῦ, (vi. 28.) Αἴρειν ἁμαρ=נָשָׂא עָוֹן is in many connections, equivalent to ἀφαιρεῖν, "to take away sins." But αἴρειν also means, in the Septuagint, to *bear*, (Lamentations iii. 27,) hence αἴρειν ἁμαρ. for סָבַל עָוֹן. If the Baptist had in his eye the prophecy in Isaiah liii. we must adopt the *latter* meaning, since in Isaiah liii. 11, we have expressly עֲוֹנֹתָם הוּא יִסְבֹּל καὶ τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν ἀνοίσει. The bearing of the sins of the world is, therefore, the *suffering* for the sins of the world, which, indeed, is the basis on which the taking away is accomplished. It is true, lambs were only used under certain circumstances for sin offerings;[1] but the more readily could the Baptist designate Christ as the expiating *lamb*, if he intended, at the same time, to direct attention to the feature of patient suffering, which had been held up by Isaiah. That the words of the Evangelist are to be explained in the mode mentioned, is confirmed, too, by this, that in Rev. v. 6, 12, xiii. 8, Christ, with reference to his expiatory death, is called ἀρνίον ἐσφαγμένον, cf. also, 1 Peter i. 19. The difficulty, however, now arises, that the Baptist, on this view, must have known something of a suffering Messiah, and yet this idea was one which remained wholly unknown to the most intimate Disciples of Christ, in fact, to those very ones, also, who, like John, had had intercourse with the Baptist, (Matt. xvi. 21–23.) Strauss and Bauer draw the inference that the Evangelist here also imputes his own creed to the Baptist. Were we compelled to concede that Jewish antiquity knew absolutely nothing of a suffering Messiah, yet even then he who concedes to the Baptist an extraordinary inspiration, such as v. 33 expressly testifies of, can have no difficulty in allowing a similar one here. Do we not find a similar prophetic glance of the spirit in Simeon, Luke ii. 25? (Krabbe, Leben Jesu, p. 155.) Had not the Baptist already announced that the Messiah would establish his kingdom only by conflict with the portion of the people whose minds were alienated from God, (Matt. iii. 12, Neander, Leben Jesu, 3d ed. p. 66, M'Clintock and Blumenthal's Tr. § 40.) Even though he speaks here of redemption in its widest extent

1 Levit. iv. 32, Numbers vi. 14. Nevertheless, Bähr, Symbolik des Mos. Kultus, ii. p. 364, seq. shows that the daily morning and evening sacrifices of lambs had also an expiatory force.

—*τοῦ κόσμου*—yet this cannot appear strange upon the lips of one who had declared that God could raise up children to himself from the stones that lay by Jordan. But the position which has been taken anew by De Wette, and falsely grounded on John xii. 34, that the times before the Christian era were entirely unacquainted with a suffering Messiah, cannot by any means be conceded. Numerous passages from the Rabbins argue the very opposite. See Martini, Pugio fidei ed. Carpzov, p. 852; Hulsius, in his instructive work, with which few are acquainted, Theol. judaica. Bredæ, 1653, p. 309; Schmidt, Bibl. f. Krit. u. Exeg. i. p. 43–49; Hengstenb. Christol. I. i. p. 252–292, I. ii. p. 291, seq. It is true that the age of the Rabbinical authors, from whom these testimonies are adduced, is uncertain; yet, supposing that the whole of them wrote subsequently to the birth of Christ, would this doctrine, so hateful to a carnal Judaism, be brought out at the very period when the Christians were everywhere proclaiming a crucified Messiah in that preaching, which was unto the Jews a stumbling block? Would the Jews have taken refuge in the figment of a twofold Messiah, one a suffering, the other exclusively a glorious one, if the doctrine of a suffering Messiah had not found confirmation in their ancient exegetical tradition? The opinion defended formerly by many, (Herder, Gabler, Paulus,) that the Baptist only meant to allude to the gentleness with which the innocent martyr bore the sinful treatment of the world, (cf. *ἔχθραν αἴρειν*, 1 Macc. xiii. 17,) need no longer be confuted, as it has been universally abandoned.

V. 30, 31. We have here the expression of the Baptist which has already been introduced, v. 15. The *περὶ οὗ εἶπον* refers to an expression which he had already employed in regard to the appearing of Jesus, as in v. 27 the *ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος* alludes to an earlier application of the same phrase. In v. 31, the baptism of Christ is already presupposed to have taken place, for although the *ἦλθον βαπτίζων* embraces John's whole work, yet the baptism of Christ must be regarded as included, in fact, must be preëminently the object of allusion, since, not by the activity of John, as preparatory to the future appearing of the Messiah, but by the baptism of Jesus, did Jesus become *φανερός* before Israel. If we think now, accord-

ing to Luke iii. 21, of the people as present at the baptism of Jesus, and of the grand aim of the Baptist, as that of convincing the people, the *φανεροῦσθαι* may be explained with reference to those facts. But that John could have not meant this, that he rather regarded the conviction to be wrought in the Baptist himself, as the grand aim, is clear from v. 33, and also here from the antithesis *οὐκ ᾔδειν αὐτόν*. We must, then, take it in this way: the Baptist had baptized, in order that *he* might learn to know the Messiah, and that consequently, the people might also. *Κἀγώ*, not "I also," but "and I." It is proper to consider how the *οὐκ ᾔδειν αὐτόν* is to be harmonized with Matt. iii. 14, in which passage it is presupposed that prior to the baptism of Jesus, the Baptist acknowledged in him, if not specially, the Messianic dignity, at least, a very high one. Different modes of conciliation have been adopted: 1,) the journey from Nazareth to the hill country of Judea, and back, would take six days—the young kinsmen had, therefore, visited but once or so, or not at all; John, therefore, did not know Jesus *personally*, (so recently again, Hug.) 2,) in Matt. iii. 14, the Baptist testifies that he had already known the holy innocence of Jesus, but not *his dignity as Messiah*, (Hess, Tittman, Kuinöl, Kern.) 3,) first at the approach of Jesus, he had a presentiment that this was the Messiah, which presentiment was exalted to an infallible divine certainty by the baptismal act, (Bengel, Kuhn, Leben Jesu, p. 116,) or as Neander (l. c. p. 80,) expresses it, "the words *οὐκ ᾔδειν* are to be understood relatively of a knowledge not yet confident; in the light of the divine inspiration, all earlier knowledge seemed to him as ignorance."

V. 32–34. As the repetition at the beginning of v. 33 shows, we have not here a testimony from another date; the Evangelist stops only because, as in this division in general, so also here, he is concerned with the *μαρτυρία*. The act of baptism itself, the Evangelist presupposes as known; the statement is peculiar to John that the Baptist was prepared by a revelation for the manifestation at the baptism of Jesus. The dove, the symbol of innocence and purity, (Matt. x. 16;) the abiding and the tranquil hovering over Christ, expressed the tranquil and equable movement of the power of the Spirit in him, in contrast with the detached impulses given to the prophets, (Isaiah xi. 2.)

According to the description in John, and also in Matthew, this baptism had a significance preëminently for the Baptist himself, he, and no other spectator, beheld the opening heavens and the dove; for had others seen it, why the emphatic "*I* saw," "the same said unto *me?*" This view does not at all exclude the supposition that Jesus also had the same vision, as Mark i. 10 compels us to believe.[1] But does it not seem from Luke iii. 21, as though the people assembled at the time, also saw the miraculous sign? But in the condensed phraseology there used, there lies properly no more than this, that Jesus came to the baptism, and that the miracle attending it happened at the same time when *all the people* came to John's baptism, (Usteri, Studien u. Krit. 1829, 3 H. p. 444.) *What*, then, did John and Jesus, respectively, behold? Did all occur outwardly or inwardly? Origen supposed that only an emotion of the mind occurred, in virtue of which the Baptist supposed himself to see outwardly what was revealed to his internal eye; Theodore of Mopsuestia, also, explains the occurrence as a πνευματικὴ θεωρία. What is said of the heavens being opened, must, of necessity, be taken in this way; those who resist a conclusion of this sort *here*, are nevertheless obliged, in Acts vii. 56, to concede an internal vision, where Stephen, in the *hall of the Sanhedrim*, sees the heavens opened, and Jesus at the right hand of God. That Luke, in speaking of the Holy Ghost, uses the expression σωματικῷ εἴδει, is not opposed to this view, for in visions of this sort, that which is seen internally presents itself under the same form in which it is an object of sight. According to 2 Cor. xii. 2, Paul saw and heard, and yet knew not whether it occurred in the body or out of the body. With this the question connects itself, whether the act of baptism had for Christ merely a symbolical significance, or whether an *impartation* of the Spirit in the act, is to be thought of? If we regard the grand object of the miracle at the baptism, to be the certification to the Baptist of the Messiahship of Jesus, there is no necessity for supposing, in addition, a special operation of the Spirit on Jesus beyond that which, in the nature of the case, would be induced by an act of inauguration of this kind, (Neander, Kern.) A solemn con-

[1] Hoffman, l. c. p. 394, asks what can be brought against this view, since the *fact* was the same for both, and the laws of the soul's life are the same.

secration of this kind was undoubtedly the soliciting agent for the πνεῦμα in Jesus, (John iii. 34, Acts x. 38;) by that solicitation, however, of the power, it was, in a certain measure, vivified in him, in that sense, namely, in which it is said, Hebrews v. 8, that Christ *learned* obedience, since the solicitation to the act authenticated the propension to ὑπακοή which lay in him.

V. 34. The perf. μεμαρτύρηκα presents the testimony as closed and firmly established in its validity. What the idea of υἱὸς θεοῦ comprehended in the Baptist's mind, cannot be determined with certainty, yet from what has been observed on v. 15, it may be inferred that he meant more by the expression than the Messianic dignity in general, cf. on v. 15 and 18.

We have yet to ask, in what relation the testimony presented by John to the legation stands to that of a similar character uttered before the people, of which Luke iii. 16, and Matt. iii. 11, give an account. It is certainly very arbitrary criticism, when from this harmony is drawn the inference that John's account is a mere arbitrary remodeling of the narrative of Luke, when De Wette regards Luke's narrative as a corrupted tradition, and Bauer sets down both narratives as inventions. The legation certainly was sent after the Baptist had already been in his work for some time; if now, at his first appearing, the people were ready to see in him the Messiah himself, (Luke iii. 15,) *must* he not have explained himself? And is there anything surprising in the fact that before the authorities he explains himself in regard to his work and destination, in the same pregnant expressions in which he had addressed the people? Is it not evident from v. 30 and 36, that he was in the habit of repeating certain pregnant expressions? The expressions, moreover, coincide only in a single dictum.—We must inquire further, how the baptism of Christ is chronologically to be arranged in John? The opinion of Olshausen, that it followed on the evening of the day on which the legation arrived, or on the morning of the following day, in whose later hours the Baptist gave the testimony, v. 32, cannot be entertained, for the temptation of the forty days is immediately connected with the baptism, and that could not possibly be brought into the arrangement here. With entire unanimity, the recent critics and interpreters fix the baptism at a period prior to the legation of the Sanhedrim.

For this, arguments may be drawn from the two circumstances, that the Baptist must have been engaged in his work for some time, before we can imagine that an investigation by the authorities would take place, and especially that we have the expression *μέσος—οὐκ οἴδατε*, v. 26. In the third edition, Olshausen, also, has changed his earlier opinion.

GATHERING OF THE FIRST DISCIPLES OF JESUS.—v. 35–52.

V. 35–37. John again is standing at the Jordan, waiting for those who are to be baptized, his two disciples with him; they can hardly be supposed to be other than those who, on the previous day, had received the significant testimony; for the addition *ὁ αἴρων—κόσμου* is wanting here, without which the mere *ἴδε ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ* is not intelligible; we must, therefore, suppose a reference to something preceding. One of the Disciples, according to v. 41, is Andrew; the one whose name is not given, is probably the Evangelist himself, since in other passages it is usual with him to omit his own name, (xiii. 23, xviii. 15, seq. xix. 26, xx. 2–4 and 8.) This feature answers most perfectly, alike with the other historical traits preserved of John, and with his literary character, in which a certain delicacy and virgin reserve appear. Characteristic, also, is the reverential timidity with which these two Disciples walk in silence behind Jesus.

V. 38–40. Jesus tenderly draws them on to open their hearts to him, they respond with the question as to where he dwelt—probably as to his abode for the night? (cf. *μένειν*, Judges xix. 9, Septuag.) They will not trouble him on the way, they wish to speak with him alone. The formula employed by the Saviour in his answer, is very common among the Rabbins, especially when attention is to be aroused to something; John, too, has it again in v. 47. Christ then invites them forthwith to accompany him. They go, and feel interested to such a degree, that they remain to the close of the day. According to the Jewish computation, which reckoned to the day twelve hours, which were longer or shorter according as the day broke earlier or later, the tenth hour would be about four o'clock in the afternoon. The *τὴν ἡμέραν ἐκείνην* would then be limited to about two hours. In this

passage, however, as also (iv. 6,) xix. 14, it answers better to take the *Roman* computation of the hours. According to the investigations of Hug, (Bemerk, zur Leidensgesch.—Observations on the History of the Passion, in the Freiburger Zeitschr. II. 5, p. 91, cf. Rettig, in the Stud. u. Krit. 1830, II. 1,) the Romans, in the time of the Republic, divided the hours from midnight to midnight, yet in the time of Horace, in common life, they reckoned the hours from daybreak, without dropping the other computation, however. That both modes of computation were usual among the Jews, we know from Josephus, who in his de bell. jud. 6. ix. 3, employs the Jewish, and in Vita. c. 54, the Roman division. The present μένει in v. 40, as in iv. 1, v. 13, vi. 24, is explained by the rule, that the Greeks, when they narrate that a person has heard or said something, place themselves in the point of time at which it happened. Winer, 4th ed. p. 244.

V. 41–43. Between the readings πρῶτος and πρῶτον the evidence fluctuates. If we read πρῶτος, the sense is: both Andrew and John went to seek Simon, and to make the communication to him, and his brother found him first, cf. πρῶτος, John xx. 4. Ἴδιος, in the later Greek usage, like proprius at times in the later Latinity, does not differ from the possessive pronoun. Peter here appears as one of those who belonged to the circle described in Luke ii. 38, of those who looked for the redemption of Israel; he had probably, also, been one of the Baptist's disciples. The Hebrew name *Messiah* occurs, iv. 25, also. In this beautiful scene, we behold the commencement of all Christian activity in missions. The Saviour, with that piercing glance which tested men, and to which the Evangelist so often gives prominence, (v. 48, ii. 25, iii. 3, vi. 71, cf. Luke v. 22,) looked through the Disciple brought to him. It is a custom of the Arabians and Hebrews to derive significant surnames from peculiar events in life, or from personal characteristics; the Rabbins, also, have attached to them certain standing surnames, (Bashuisen, Clav. talmud. p. 52.) Christ now selects for Peter one of this kind, he names him *Rock*, in Aram. כֵּיפָא. But it is a question whether this appellation, like that given to the sons of Zebedee, Mark iii. 17, can be given to the *character* of Peter? Would it not rather presuppose a *firm*

character like that of Paul? In fact, the subsequent conduct of Peter is in such contrast with this appellation, that the penetration of Christ can only be vindicated, by referring it less to the character of the Disciple, than *to that which he became historically for the Church*, and this is also the prominent reference in Matt. xvi. 18. Ὁ υἱὸς Ἰωνᾶ, the full name, serves only to give solemnity to the language, (Matt. xvi. 17, John xxi. 15.)

V. 43, 44. If ἠθέλησεν is designed to express no more than the mere *design* of leaving the country about Jordan, we can see no reason why prominence is given to this. We are led, therefore, to suppose that Philip, after the journey had commenced, was found by the way, on the road, where also was the fig-tree under which Nathaniel was sitting, (Matt. xxi. 19.) The remark, v. 45, seems to point to the fact, that the two brothers had brought about the acquaintance of Jesus with Philip. This confirms the presupposition which would naturally exist, that more words had been exchanged between Jesus and Philip than are here given. An earlier acquaintance with Matthew, must also (Luke xi. 13,) have preceded the "Follow me," (Matt. ix. 9.)

V. 45, 46. It is not, indeed, absolutely necessary that this scene with Nathaniel should have taken place immediately, yet it is most natural to suppose that Philip, who had now attached himself to the little society, found his friend on the way. Nathaniel seems also to have been one who had previously hoped for the Messiah; in heart-stirring words Philip utters the joy of longing fulfilled. For ὅν, cf. i. 15. Since Nathaniel himself was a native of Cana, (xxi. 2,) it may be asked whether he here expresses himself from a sense of the contempt with which Galilee was regarded, (vii. 52,) or whether it was the village of Nazareth merely, which, on account of its smallness, (cf. Hengstenberg, Christol. ii. 1, p. 1, seq.) appeared to him so contemptible. In either view, it is characteristic of the whole Christian interest, that Christ arose from a small, despised town, of a despised province, of a despised people, and we may apply here what Paul says, 1 Cor. i. 27. Philip appeals to the test of experience.

V. 47–50. Nathaniel had been resting under the fig-tree, and now comes to meet Jesus, who also here exhibits that

power of looking into the soul, which our Evangelist is wont to present as marking him. That *Ἰσραηλίτης* is an honorary title, cannot be satisfactorily proven, and *Ἰουδαῖος* might have been used with the same force, (Rom. ii. 29.) Christ recognizes in the man an ideal of his people, a mind to which all hypocrisy is foreign. It is not what Christ acknowledges him to be, that surprises the young man, it is that he shows himself able to read his heart. In the words that follow, *ὄντα—συκῆν* are to be connected with *εἶδον*, and not with with *φωνῆσαι*, as v. 51 shows. Under the shade of the fig-tree, the Jew was wont to repose, as beneath a leafy roof, occupying himself with reading of the law, (Winer, Realw. at the word Feigenbaum.) It cannot be meant that Jesus supernaturally, by a far glance, had known the outward occupation of the man, for how could he have drawn from this merely, a safe conclusion as to what was passing in his mind? Nor is the impression made, that Philip went far from the way to seek Nathaniel. The miraculous feature which surprised Nathaniel so much, is consequently to be found in the fact that his state of mind was known by Jesus. As nothing impresses a man more profoundly, than to find that even the tenderest and most sacred emotions of his heart are penetrated, this simple-hearted man breaks forth in an acknowledgment of allegiance to Jesus, (1 Cor. xiv. 25.) It corresponds with the internal emotion which might be anticipated in him, that over an official title he gives precedence to a designation which expresses the inner character of the Messiah. If Olshausen's "doubtless" be too strong, we may nevertheless regard it as highly probable, that Nathaniel, in his heart, perhaps, had just been praying for the coming of the redemption of Israel, and these very prayers mark the *true Israelite.*

V. 51–52. The introduction of v. 52 with the special *καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ*, is designed to throw into yet greater prominence what is said in that verse, which is connected with v. 51, cf. on v. 32. As the Redeemer, in the history of Nicodemus, leads on to a higher and more spiritual degree, the faith which had been excited by miracles, so he does here. We find here, for the first time, the name "*Son of man,*" which, with the exception of Acts vii. 56, occurs only in the Gospels. That this appellation is derived from Daniel vii. 13, is put beyond question,

especially by Luke xxi. 27, Rev. i. 13; on the other hand, it is certain that among the Jews the Messiah was not designated by this name, (John xii. 34.)[1] Why, then, would Jesus, if he meant to designate himself as Messiah by it, select so unusual an appellation? The opinion that it is simply equivalent to Messiah, (thus Chemnitz, Beza, Scholten, Lücke, Strauss,) must, therefore, be abandoned, as Matt. xvi. 13 also shows. We have then to choose, either with De Wette, to hold that he designs to mark his humiliation in humanity, or with Harduin, Mosche, Schleiermacher, Olshausen, Neander, that he so calls himself as the one who expresses the idea of humanity, in whom it becomes glorified, (Matt. ix. 8.) We confess that the remarks with which De Wette, on Matt. viii. 20, has met our earlier view, have caused us to waver in it, and have inclined us to prefer what is properly the most ancient opinion, which is, that prominence is given by the predicate to the point *of the manifestation* in humanity, in antithesis, consequently to the higher nature, (Justin Martyr, Dial. c. Tryph. ed. Thirlb. p. 355; Irenæus, c. hær. l. 3, c. 19; Tertullian, de Carne Christi, c. 5.) If we explain the predicate "the mortal, the incarnate," the appellation is, in fact, more closely connected with the Old Testament. Ezekiel gives himself this name in contrast with God, and in Daniel, too, this meaning is the basis of the appellation; it is also thus taken in Heb. ii. 6. The antithesis which then exists between "Son of God" and "Son of man," is more after the analogy of Holy Scripture than the other view, according to which the true humanity and the Deity are opposed to each other, as two diverse aspects of the same thing; and it offers, too, a far more satisfactory solution of the abandonment of the expression by the Apostles after the exaltation of Christ.[2] De Wette does not, indeed, seem to have reflected that by his admission, that Jesus, even in the synoptical Gospels, continually designates himself as a higher being, who has appeared in humanity, John's delineation of Jesus, against which the rationalistic

[1] ("I cannot, with Tholuck, draw from John xii. 34, the inference that the Jews were unacquainted with the term by which Daniel designates the Messiah."—De Wette, 3d ed. On Matt. viii. 20. Tr.)

[2] Neander, indeed, Leben Jesu, p. 144, seq. has applied in an interesting way, *his* idea on the different passages, but especially in John iii. 13, does the second view decidedly commend itself more.

view is directed, is confirmed. The opened heaven here, as at the baptism of Jesus, can only designate the rich impartation of divine power, and the efficient succor from on high; the angels, of whose appearing we first read in the history of the Passion, can be regarded only as a symbol of the mediating divine powers—as, indeed, in the Old Testament, מַלְאָךְ designated originally, not a personal being, but "divine mission," (Ps. xxxiv. 8, Sack, Comment. Theol. p. 19. See Cölln. Bibl. Theol. I. p. 191.) In all probability, Jesus had before his eyes the image of the ladder reaching to heaven, on which the angels of God ascended and descended, Gen. xxviii. 12, and in that place, also, it designates the agency of the powers of God in the welfare of the patriarch. It is remarkable that the καταβαίνειν, like עָלָה in Genesis, is placed first, for the intercourse between heaven and earth is represented, not as something which is to begin, but as already begun, and therefore an uninterrupted one, (De Wette.) The meaning, then, of this sublime passage is, that Nathaniel should come to recognize in that Messiah who had appeared as a feeble mortal, the unbroken revelation of heavenly powers. Luther: "We must, therefore, explain this history in a spiritual way. When Christ became man, and had entered on the office of preacher, heaven was opened, and it remains open, and since that time never has been closed, nor shall it ever be closed, though with our bodily eyes we behold it not. Christ bends over us, but invisibly. Christ means to say: Ye are now citizens of heaven, ye have now your citizenship above in the heavenly Jerusalem, ye are in communion with the blessed angels, who, without intermission, ascend and descend for you. Heaven and earth have now become one, and it is as if ye sat on high, and the blessed angels served you." Calvin, also: "*Multum autem errant meo judicio, qui anxie quærunt tempus et locum, ubi et quando Nath. et reliqui cœlum apertum viderint. Potius enim quiddam continuum designat, quod semper extare debebat in ejus regno. Fateor quidem aliquoties discipulis visos fuisse angelos, qui hodie non apparent.—Sed si probe reputemus, quod tunc factum est, perpetuo viget. Nam quum prius clausum esset regnum Dei, vere in Christo apertum fuit.*" "In my opinion they make a great mistake, who are solicitous as to the time and place, the when and

where, Nathaniel and the others beheld heaven opened. For he rather designates something which was to continue, something meant to be permanent in his kingdom. I admit that to the Disciples angels sometimes appeared, who no longer appear.—But if we look at it aright, what was then done, continues forever. For the kingdom of God, which was before closed, was in Christ truly opened." It might already be inferred from this promise of Christ to Nathaniel, that at a later period he would be received into the number of Apostles, as in ch. xxi. 2, he is actually found among them, and from the connection of ch. i. and ii. we must suppose him to be embraced among the *μαθηταί* of ch. ii. 2. As his name does not occur in the enumeration of the Apostles, Matt. x. and Luke vi. but a Bartholomew is coupled with Philip, the inference is correctly drawn, that under that name, equivalent to son of Ptolemæus, we have a surname of Nathaniel.

In what relation does this calling of the Disciples stand to that detailed in Matt. iv. 18, seq. Mark i. 16, seq. Luke v. 1, seq. according to which the two pairs of brothers, Peter and Andrew, James and John, were called from their occupation as fishermen, to Jesus, and received, as we must believe, especially from Luke v. 11, permanently into association with Jesus? The usual answer, that here, only the first meeting, while in the synoptical Gospels, the entrance into an enduring connection, may be narrated, has been met by Strauss with the objection that in John, from the time of this first gathering, and in the synoptical Gospels, from the time of the calling they mention, the Disciples just named constantly appear as attendants of the Saviour, and besides this, the difficulty that if we suppose subsequently to the miracle at Cana a new and temporary dispersion of the Disciples, the overwhelming effect produced by the miraculous draught of fishes on those who had witnessed the turning of water to wine, would be wholly unaccountable. Neander meets the difficulty by the supposition, that between the calling of Nathaniel and that of Philip, and consequently between v. 44 and 45, a longer space of time is to be put, during which the Disciples had again dispersed, and during which the

[1] Bauer, l. c. p. 58, seq. is specially vigorous in pointing out contradiction and absurdity in the evangelical narrator at this point.

miraculous draught of fishes occurred. *Τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ*, ii. 1, must then be dated from the calling of Nathaniel. The following conciliation seems to us more plausible. From Perea, whither the Disciples had been drawn only by the call given through the preaching of the Baptist, since they now had given up this association, they must return again to Galilee; this they did in company with the Master whom they had recently found. The way to Capernaum and Bethsaida lies through Cana, there they stop with Jesus; having reached home, they again pursue their occupations. Jesus, however, before he takes his journey to the Passover, calls them to be his constant followers. Luther already has the remark: "The Evangelist is not speaking of the calling of the Apostles, but that they alone went about with him as companions." This holds good until the first journey to the Passover.

CHAPTER II.

THE FIRST MIRACLE IN GALILEE.—v. 1–12. PURIFICATION OF THE TEMPLE.—v. 12–22. FAITH OF MANY OF THE CITIZENS OF JERUSALEM.—v. 23–25.

V. 1, 2. So vividly does the Evangelist move amid the events of the time in which his first calling occurs, that he also mentions in this place the date: three days after the commencement of the journey to Galilee. The mother of Jesus had already come from Capernaum to Cana to the wedding feast; Jesus, who went by the road from Jordan through Cana, (on his journey from Jerusalem to Galilee also, he first comes to Cana, iv. 45,) was, together with his new Disciples, invited to the feast by the family of friends. In two days he could readily pass over the road from Bethany on Jordan to Cana, which makes the reference to i. 44, of the statement of time, the more easy.

V. 3–5. It was, indeed, usual to keep up wedding festivals for several days, (Gen. xxix. 27, Judges xiv. 14,)[1] but verse 10 shows that the want occurred toward the end of the supper, so that the celebration could not have been prolonged, as some suppose, beyond one day. The mother of Jesus applies to him —perhaps only in order to obtain from him assistance of some sort in the emergency, [Lücke: something extraordinary,] if not exactly a miraculous one? Or, shall we say, that Mary, in order to spare their hosts the mortification, only designed to ask Jesus to give to the guests a sign to break up, (thus Bengel, Hoffman.)[2] But the answer of Christ, in which he puts her off,

[1 See Winer's Realw. 7th ed.]

[2 Calvin: That he should say something to hush the guests. 7th ed.]

can hardly be explained except on the supposition that his mother urged him to a *miraculous* assistance. But how was his mother led to do this? Had Jesus previously performed in the domestic circle[1] much that was wonderful, or was the power of miracles first aroused when he had entered on the exercise of his Messianic vocation? We do not feel disposed to take ground against those who, like Hase, (Leben Jesu, 3d ed. p. 91, cf. Lücke,) embrace the first of these views. Yet Mary's desire does not necessarily decide for this view. For the exhibition of extraordinary power on the part of her divine son, she was beyond doubt prepared. She expected them with his entrance on his public career.[2] He had just returned from his solemn baptism at the Jordan, for the first time with Disciples attending him. His philanthropic disposition was known to her; might she not expect some proof of that disposition under these circumstances, when on it was depending the happiness of a pious, poor family, and the sparing them the mortification on their festal wedding day? Yet to Jesus the occasion may have seemed less fitting, and in this way the answer in which he puts off the request may be explained. Or shall we say that he desired to appear first in *Jerusalem* in his miraculous endowments, (see on iv. 45.) The time determined on by himself had, at all events, not come, as the οὔπω ἥκει ἡ ὥρα μου shows. This expression designates, in general, the entrance of a decisive point, (John xvi. 21, iv. 23;) John uses it, elsewhere, with reference to that point in the life of Jesus most decisive of all, the hour of his death and his glorification, (vii. 30, xii. 23, 27, xiii. 1;) in Matt. also, xxvi. 18, Christ says ὁ καιρός μου ἐγγύς ἐστιν. Here is the decisive point of the public appearance as Messiah. The pres. ἥκω has in Greek usage the meaning of the preterit, as also in viii. 42. The phrase τι ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί is a literal translation of the Hebrew מַה־לִּי וְלָךְ (Jos. xxii. 24, Judges xi. 12, 2 Sam. xvi. 10, 1 Kings xvii. 18, 2 Kings iii. 13, Matt. viii. 29, xxvii. 19, Mark i. 24.) It is also found in the classics,[3] (Bernhardy, Synt. p. 98.) The radical idea appears to be: "What have we in common? Our relations are wholly different." The formula

[1 So Hunnius and Le Clerc. 7th ed.]

[2 Chrysostom: She wished to glorify herself through her son. 7th ed.]

[3 Arrian, dissert T. iii. in the index, p. 458. 7th ed.]

there is used to express unwillingness to be disturbed or hindered by any one. It always implies reproof, although sometimes a friendly one merely, (2 Sam. xvi. 10,) here: "Mingle not thyself in my concerns; we pursue different aims and thou comprehendest me not." If Christ, then, did not consider this as a suitable occasion for the performance of a miracle, why does he, nevertheless, follow his mother's suggestion? Because it could not, on the other hand, be regarded as an unsuitable one, for it offered him an occasion for proving his philanthropic disposition. As *Messiah* he uttered the *reproof*, as a *son* he complied with the *request*.[1] The address γύναι is not disrespectful, but solemn, cf. the address from the cross, xix. 26. In Dion Cassius Hist. li. 12, Augustus thus addresses Cleopatra: "θάρσει, ὦ γύναι, καὶ θυμὸν ἔχε ἀγαθόν," ("Take courage, O woman, and keep a good heart,") cf. Wetstein. That the look of Jesus expressed more than his words convey, may be gathered from the address of his mother to the servants.

V. 6–8. By the purifying, we are to understand the usual washing of the hands, Matt. xv. 2, Mark vii. 3. The Attic metetres contained 21 Würtemberg quarts, (about 8⅞ gallons English. Tr.) so that the entire capacity of the vessels, supposing all the water to have been converted into wine, would give 13 ahms (Strasburg,) of wine, (about 53¼ gallons English. Tr.) The ἕως ἄνω serves to augment the miracle; by it, moreover, the possibility of deception is excluded. *Triclinium*, a room with three κλίναις, three sets of cushions. The person who presided over this, and arranged the feast, was called by the Romans, triclinarches,[2] (see the Dissertation by J. E. Walch on the Triclinarches, Jena, 1753.) He is not to be confounded with the συμποσιάρχης, modimperator among the Romans and Greeks, who was elected from the guests, to preserve order during the meal.

V. 9, 10. The master of the feast supposed that the wine had been provided by the bridegroom, and half sportively gives him an admonition. Μεθύσκομαι, like the Hebrew שָׁכַר

[1 According to Besser, (compare Bullinger,) for this reason especially, that in her words to the servants he perceives the evidence of her *faith*. 7th ed.]

[2 The architriklinos, or archon of the triklinion, bearing among the Greeks the name trapezopoios also, is defined by Athenæus as "one who superintends the tables, and preserves order." 7th ed.]

means not merely to become drunk, but also to drink largely; as we say, "to have well drunk," (Septuag. Gen. xliii. 34, Hagg. i. 6, Rev. xvii. 2.)

V. 11. The first words, with which iv. 54 is to be compared, can only be translated as Luther has done: "this miracle, the first which Jesus wrought, he performed in Cana of Galilee." During the brief abode in Capernaum, v. 12, no miracle (iv. 45,) was wrought; in iv. 54, therefore, prominence is given to the fact that the second Galilean miracle was wrought in this very Cana again. The impression produced on the guests is not mentioned, but only the aim which it attained, as regarded the Disciples. *Πιστεύειν* is used of the different degrees of a weaker or stronger faith, (v. 22, xi. 15, xiii. 19, xx. 8.) In regard to *δόξα*, see on i. 14.

As the miracles which Christ wrought on irrational nature are in general more remarkable than the miracles of healing, since in the latter a psychologic mediation is possible, which is entirely wanting in the former, it is precisely *this* miracle which is designated by Strauss as the very acme of the miraculous, since it involves a qualitative transmutation of an elementary substance, a transubstantiation proper. The period of illumination had naturally already stumbled at this miracle.[1] Paulus' exposition of it may claim a notice in commentaries even for the future, at least as a characteristic voucher for the tendency of the mind from which it proceeded. The event reduces itself to a happy wedding jest, as Jesus, by means of wine privately brought with him, intended to give the company an agreeable surprise. The earnest solemn address of Jesus, v. 4, is therefore "spoken in the tone of one who jests, and who checks his mother lest her precipitancy should spoil the joke he has in view." The *δόξα* is "the frank humanity of Jesus," in which they were "won to confide," (*ἐπίστευσαν*) since a seriousness which would lay men under constraint had been anticipated on the part of the Messiah.[2] The exposition of the

[1 Venturini, Langsdorf, Gfrörer, explain it as natural. 7th ed.]

[2 Strauss finds the mythical basis in Moses' conversion of the bitter water into sweet, Exod. xiv. According to Br. Bauer, "mine hour" refers to the time of our Saviour's passion, when he should for the first time distribute the true miraculous wine. Baur, in accordance with the pragmatic character of this Gospel, would explain this miracle as a symbol that the time had come for

miracles from the "genuine historical" position of Gfrörer, has not been able to go much beyond this. The miracle at Cana, we learn from this writer, is, to be sure, historical; only we must not at all suppose that Jesus had bewitched the wine, when he might easily have bought it for a few pieces of money, but the mother of Jesus had *brought it with her* as a *present* to the poor couple, and during the meal, when the right time had come, gave her son the sign to present the gift.[1] So long as the genuineness of the Gospel is firmly established, the aversion to miracles, has in the case of miracles like this, no other refuge than such as have been mentioned. Even Strauss, when for a little while he assumes the air of one about to concede the genuineness of the Gospel, finds relief (in his essay: "The transient and permanent in Christianity,") in the frivolous remark: "The transmutation of the water—how often has wine been drawn in the most natural manner from a vessel which previously contained water." Schweizer regards this narrative as one of the interpolated parts of the Gospel. His hypothesis of interpolation, in spite of the acuteness with which he has labored to maintain it, does not, as a general thing, sustain itself. If, then, the historical character of the miracle is firmly established, how is it as regards the way it is to be conceived of? The ultimate cause of a miracle lies in God, who, as the absolute power over nature, operates through the doer of the miracle. As the cause of nature's conformity to law, or as it has in more recent times been expressed, as the absolute and universal law of nature, God must also have power over the particular laws, as of gravitation, organic life, &c. that is, within subsisting nature. He can put forth a particular and immediate operation. Such is the case, when after the entrance of death into the organism, the vital function begins anew. In the contest with the most recent rejecters of miracles, the question is reduced to this:

Jesus, the true Bridegroom, to make the transition from the water—the preparatory position of the Baptist—to the wine of the higher Messianic glory. In the older writers we find allusions to the antitheses between the Old Testament and New Testament positions, thus Erasmus, Luther, and so, also, Luthardt, conformably to the sense of σημεῖον, as an indication of something higher; according to Hofman, (Schriftbew. II. 2, 381,) "a predelineation of the marriage supper in heaven, Rev. xix. 8." 7th ed.]

[1] Kern, also, has not been able to come to any more satisfactory account than this. Tubing. Zeitschrift. 1839, 2 H. p. 26.

Would a will in unison with God *desire* in this way to operate on the laws of nature?—would it be willing to do it, since these very things are the general will of God for nature? (Strauss, Streitschriften, 3 II. p. 116, Glaubenslehre, 1, p. 245.) Against this, only the counter question need be urged: How is this *absolute* universality established? So established, that even in an ethico-teleological interest no exception can be allowed? Yet even he who holds that an immediate creative activity in the God-man is admissible, will ask in these particular cases, whether there is any occasion to fall back upon that, whether an activity mediated by the nature given be not sufficient, that is, whether the doer of the miracle has not been merely the agent in soliciting an extraordinary process conditionary in the object. Augustine had already applied in this sense to the miracle before us, the category of "an *accelerated process of nature.*" The change of substance of the water, which year by year is taken up into the vine, appears here only in an accelerated form; thus Hase, Leben Jesu, § 58, 2d ed., Olshausen. The more rational and insinuating this formula sounded, the more energetically did Strauss direct his ridicule against it, and it actually seemed as though its glimmer of philosophy had been at once extinguished by the dry remark, that in the transmutation of water in Cana, it was just the most important thing of all that was wanting, to wit: the *vegetable agent, the vine.* Nevertheless, this objection of his has not prevented Hase, in the 3d ed. p. 92, nor Olshausen, 3d ed. from persisting in what they had said, without, indeed, making any reply to the objection of the critic.[1] If the Apologists by their analogy intend the *identity* of the process, they are certainly wrong; if, on the other hand, they mean, as in fact the expression seems to imply, only the *similarity*, if they mean a smaller and yet similar miracle, (this plus and minus need not seem strange, even Strauss has not only spoken of degrees of the miraculous, but of degrees of the *impossible* itself, II. p. 155, 1st ed.) they are right. Can, then, Strauss deny the transmutation of inorganic matter into organic

[1] When Olshausen there remarks, that Strauss himself had since in his Streitschriften, 3, p. 113, acknowledged the formula of an accelerated process of nature, it is in *this* connection calculated to mislead. The critic makes the concession, indeed, p. 115, that in miracles of healing especially, this category is applicable, but not in transmutation of substances.

by the organic process? Must we not, in the assimilation of nutriment, speak of *transmutation*—in the case of the plant, of the transmutation of the elementary matter of water (more strictly of carbonic acid and nitrogen,) in the plant? The critic, indeed, speaks as though the elementary matter did nothing more than excite an activity in the plant, but in this he will find nobody to agree with him. In his fencing, his hardest coup is, that the accelerated process of nature will not answer, because not *must* but *wine* was made, that there must be an accelerated artificial process of the wine-press also, &c.—as though a process of nature could not produce results like or identical with those of art.[1] In general, nothing compels us in the case before us to assume a transmutation of substance. The miracle becomes intelligible on the supposition of such a change in the chemical qualities of the water as would impart to it the color and taste of wine; so Neander, who refers to instances mentioned by Athenæus and Theopompus, of springs of water which had the intoxicating property of wine, to which may be added the example in Vitruvius, viii. 3, which Lampe quotes from Casaubon.

But not merely the *possibility*, but the *conformity to any good purpose, and the propriety* of this miracle particularly, have been called into question. While the miracles of Christ on other occasions were worthy of honor as the emanation of his mercy, this which was an abetting of the luxury of a banquet, seems almost immoral. But we have already intimated, that we must suppose that a family with which the mother of Jesus was on intimate terms, was a poor and pious one, and for their poverty there is a palpable evidence in the want of wine on an occasion when in Palestine such a deficiency could scarcely occur, except with very poor persons. "This is now the second honor, (the first was his presence,)" says Luther, "that he presented to the poor couple at their wedding good wine—he had, perchance, no gold nor jewel to give them." Maldonatus: "*Voluit Christus non solum præsenti inopiæ subvenire, sed multum etiam vini sponso remanere, tum ut illius paupertatem sublevaret,*

[1 P. Lange, (Leben Jesu, II. 1, p. 307,) says that the elevated frame of mind on the part of the Master of the feast and of the guests, caused them to taste the water as wine.]

tum ut diuturnum testimonium ac monimentum esset facti miraculi." "Christ desired not only to relieve a present necessity, but that a quantity of wine might remain for him who had just married, alike that He might assist him in his poverty, and leave a lasting witness and memorial of the miracle that had been wrought." In fact, under the circumstances stated, the vast quantity of wine is accounted for in a very satisfactory manner. Thus, then, this miracle is an expression of love on the part of Christ, and to his Disciples, as we read, a stimulus of faith.

THE PURIFICATION OF THE TEMPLE.—v. 12–22.

V. 12. From the southern and higher side of the region which lay around the sea of Galilee, Jesus repaired to Capernaum, which lay on the north, consequently *κατέβη*. As his mother and brethren accompanied him thither, and as Capernaum is called, Matt. ix. 1, *his own* city, we may conclude that the family had gone to settle there,[1] or at least, that Jesus was in the habit of sojourning there for considerable periods of time; yet at this time he remained but a little while, and, as it appears, without any display of miracles, (see iv. 44, 45.) He purposes to make Jerusalem the first theatre of his activity as Messiah. As the Disciples accompanied him on the journey to the Passover which he was now about to make, we are to suppose that in the interval he had united them with him in a permanent manner.

V. 13–16. Having arrived in Jerusalem, Jesus at once appears in that holy place, which he had once, as a boy, declared to be the house of *his* father, and performs the act of a prophet and judge in it, by which he, as it were, takes possession of it, (Calvin.) In addition to the three courts of the temple, there was yet a large space outside, which embraced a place which was paved, open at the top, and surrounded by a great colonnade; this was the Court of the Gentiles; and this we must regard as meant here by the general appellation, *ἱερόν*. Lattice-work, to which there was a flight of four steps, separated this place from the inner temple, and on the entrance of

[1 Wieseler, Chronol. Synopse. p. 169. Luther: There in Capernaum, Christ had been Pastor, and had labored in the word of God. 7th ed.]

this lattice, was an inscription which forbade any ἀλλόφυλος (foreigner,) to advance further. The traffic may originally have been pursued without the precincts of the temple, and only by degrees have insinuated itself into it. It certainly promoted the object for which the temple was resorted to, and found an excuse in this fact. The occasion may have been given by persons from other lands, who came to the feasts, who would desire to purchase sheep and oxen for sacrifice, and in doing so, find it necessary to exchange their foreign money, and would also embrace this opportunity of discharging the temple tribute, (Exod. xxx. 13, seq.) which could not be paid in foreign money. The rebuke of Christ, as we read in this Gospel, was directed to the business to which the temple was now exclusively devoted; the stronger expression, Matt. xxi. 13, points at the same time, to sinful practices in the commercial transactions. The scourge which he lifted served, without being used, to direct greater attention, on the part of the rude mass, to his words. That Christ should have used it, is opposed to our conceptions of his dignity; but independently of this, we would be the less inclined to such a view, as confessedly (even by Strauss, 3d ed. retracted, 4th ed.) such means would not have sufficed for the end in view; this, the overpowering personal majesty of Christ alone could effect, which created the impression that here one had appeared with divine authority; cf. what is said of the impression produced by the appearance of Jesus, ch. vii. 46, and xviii. 6. An interference in God's name in the reform and regeneration of civil and religious institutions, was, indeed, allowed to the position of the Old Testament prophets. Nor must we confine our view exclusively to the special practical aim of this temporary purification of the temple; the Saviour certainly contemplated in this single transaction the symbol of his entire work—purifying the house of God. If the sellers of doves are treated with more mildness than the others, the reason, perhaps, is to be found in the nature of that bird, or probably in the fact that doves were offered by the poor.

V. 17. This same formula ἐμνήσθησαν is found also in v. 22 and chap. xii. 16, but with the addition, "after the resurrection of Jesus;" as this addition is wanting here, we are left to infer that the passage of the Old Testament occurred to them at the

time. As David in Psalm lxix. 10, is speaking of himself, we can of course suppose no direct prophecy, and can only say with Luther: "the individual is an inference from the genus." In the fact, to wit: that such a *consuming* zeal is predicated of the Old Testament saints in general, the Disciples find a justification for the zeal of the Lord; cf. on quotations of this sort, Tholuck's work, "Das Alte Testam. im N. T. (The Old Testament in the New,) 2d ed. 1839." (3d ed. 1849. Tr.)

V. 18. The "Jews" are here, as in i. 19, members of the Sanhedrim. They do not deny, in the general, that an act of such zeal is admissible, but they desire evidence of the right of Jesus to do it. According to v. 23, Jesus at this first presence performed many miracles, but as his entrance into the temple had occurred before these, the demand of the Jews is easily explained. *Δεικνύειν* like *ἀποδεικν.* and *ἐπιδεικν.* exhibere, to show, x. 32, 1 Macc. vi. 34. *Ὅτι* like the German *dass*, (Engl. that, seeing that,) is used in similar connection, equiv. to *εἰς τοῦτο ὅτι*, vii. 35, ix. 17.

V. 19. The imperative *λύσατε* is the permissive imperat. as in Matt. xx. 32. *Τοῦτον* must have been spoken *δεικτικῶς*, (pointing with the finger,) and as the Saviour had just purified the temple, there has been an inclination to take the following view of the meaning of his words: "Carry on your desecration of the sanctuary, of which you have just been giving an example, carry it on to the destruction of the temple itself, the centre of your symbolical worship, and in a little space of time I will establish a new spiritual temple in its place;" thus Henke, Herder, Lücke, Bleek. A similar view was held among the ancient writers, by Athanasius, Opera, i. 545. Since it is unmistakably the case, that the Disciples have applied many passages of the Old Testament (without, indeed, denying the historical reference,) in a different sense from that which the historic exposition demands, and since, moreover, they were accustomed to the symbolic character of the discourses of Jesus, it cannot be regarded as singular, that at a later period they may have felt themselves obliged to seek a deeper meaning in such an expression as that before us, and consequently have explained it incorrectly. A meaning which is not historically

exact, is attached to expressions of Christ, in xviii. 9; cf. xvii. 12, as also, vii. 39. Nevertheless, we feel compelled, after repeated reflection, to persist in the opinion, that no important objection can be urged against the interpretation which the Disciple himself gives; that, on the contrary, there are many difficulties in the way of that more recent exposition mentioned above. This, too, is the view of Flatt, Symbolæ in Ev. Ioh. p. 1; Heydenreich, in Hüffell and Heydenreich's Zeitschrift. f. Predigerw. 2 bd. 1 H.; Meyer, Kling, in the Studien u. Kritiken, 1836, H. 1; Neander, (l. c. p. 400.) We begin with the difficulties which conflict with the modern view. The argument used by others, that the New Testament kingdom of God would not have been designated as a resuscitation of the temple, we do not consider valid, for in substance both economies certainly form a unity, as in John x. 16, the "fold," and Hebrews iii. 2–6, the house of God in the Old and New Testament are considered as identical. We would rather urge the following: 1) Even Strauss, Lücke and De Wette, now concede what was urged by me in earlier editions, that the vouchers for ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις, meaning *in a short time*, do not seem to answer their object; the proverbial expression, Hosea. vi. 2, Luke xiii. 32, is only *analogous*. 2) The declaration of the witnesses, Mark xiv. 58, Matt. xxvi. 61, is called by the Synoptists a *false* witness. We cannot, indeed, impute to these witnesses the spiritual apprehension of which we have spoken; by the "temple made without hands," they probably, in a material sense, understood an ethereal temple to descend from heaven. Some of the people, nevertheless, understood the false testimony as implying that Jesus had promised a reformation of the temple, as we see in Acts vi. 12–14. When Lücke and De Wette say that the falsehood lay in this alone, that they had imputed to *Jesus* the design of destroying the temple, while in fact he had said: "Destroy *ye* this temple," this difference has no essential bearing on the matter. As to the main point, the witnesses who are called false had repeated correctly, as also Lücke himself subsequently declares: "On historical grounds, I do not shrink from regarding the apprehension, or rather the explanation of the false witnesses in Mark, as more correct than that

of the Apostle," (John.) 3) Had Christ, when he used τοῦτον, pointed to the building, the Jews *must* have supposed that a destruction of that building was meant, and almost unavoidably must the expresssion have appeared to them as a boast, (Matt. xxvii. 40.) So far the difficulty. That, on the other hand, the explauation of the Evangelist gives a pertinent sense, cannot be denied. He who, Matt. xii. 6, used the expression: "I say unto you, That in this place is one greater than the temple," might well in this place reply: Destroy, as this is in keeping with your unhallowed disposition, this temple, in which in a far more real manner than in yours, the Deity has made his habitation, and I will raise it up again. The answer to this is indeed urged, that such a reply must have been absolutely unintelligible to those who put the question; but is it more so than when Jesus refers the Samaritan woman to a period when men should worship only in spirit and in truth—an expression whose authenticity is expressly conceded by De Wette himself. This argument, of which we hear so much, with which, however, the very interpreters who use it rarely remain consistent, we cannot in general acknowledge as valid. How many expressions of our Lord, which were originally unintelligible, at a late period bore fruit not only in his Disciples, but beyond doubt in his very opponents who were susceptible to the truth. And besides, *do not exalted spirits utter many a thought out of their own selfconsciousness, without calculating to what extent it may be comprehended by those who hear them?* To this may be added, that even in Matt. xii. 38–41, and xvi. 4, Christ proceeds in entirely the same manner. On the other side, they who make the reply, that if Christ in using these words pointed to his own body, his words could not at least have been referred to the temple-building, leave out of the account that ill-will which the superiors of the people displayed in all particulars, (viii. 22, 57.)—How widely this expression of our Lord must have been circulated, is clear, not only from the allegation of it by the false witnesses, and by the accusers of Stephen, but from the mockery of those persons at the cross, Matt. xxvii. 40; and as John is the only Evangelist who has narrated it in a congruous, historical connection, and in its

original form, we have in this fact an important evidence of his historical fidelity.

V. 20. As they refer Christ's words to the external temple, the mention especially of the space of three days makes on them the impression of a boast. In the 18th or 15th year of Herod, the rebuilding of the temple erected by Zerubbabel had commenced; it was not entirely finished until under Agrippa II., A. D. 64; we may suppose that at this time, probably after the completion of some main part of the edifice, a cessation in building had taken place.

V. 21, 22. It is clear from v. 22, and from xx. 9, cf. with Luke xxiv. 46, that the Apostles and our Lord himself found prophecies in the Old Testament in regard to the resurrection. Luke xxiv. 26 shows, too, that in doing this, passages were had in mind, in which the "glory" of Christ was spoken of, therefore, especially Isaiah liii. In addition, the mode in which Christ, John iii. 14, establishes in the Old Testament in a typical manner the idea of expiation by one crucified, gives us an important hint as to how we are to understand these authentications of the resurrection. Cf. on v. 46.

A purification of the temple when Jesus last repaired to the Passover, is also recounted in Matt. xxi. 12, Luke xix. 45. The identity of these two occurrences was first maintained by some English theologians, Pearce and Priestly, and subsequently by a majority of the recent writers, (by Krabbe himself, l. c. p. 248.) After most writers (even Strauss, 1st ed.) had contended at first for the correctness, chronologically, of the position it held in the synoptical Gospels, the opinion now is that the position in John is the correct one, as also Strauss held in the 3d ed. though decidedly on the other side in the 4th ed. The Synoptists, it is supposed, had probably got an account of our Saviour's driving the dealers out of the temple, but without a complete historical detail, and as they knew of no other Passover, at least furnish an *account* of no other than the last, they "have disposed of it" in this place. We ask, first, has the repetition of the action during Christ's last entry into the temple any improbability? We can find none. We should not be surprised if the dealers had by the very next Pass-

over renewed their evil course; in fact, the opposite could only be anticipated in the degree to which this extraordinary appearance in the department of religion, made an impression on their consciences. Perhaps, however, the disorder was abated for the second year; if, however, in the third year, the impression from the earlier period did not remain in sufficient strength to prevent its repetition, there is nothing in this to occasion surprise. Christ, in the Synoptists, does not allude to his having acted in a similar manner before, but the tradition transmits in all cases only the more striking characteristics of the discourse. To these would especially belong what Christ says, v. 19, as we see by the repeated allusions to it, of which mention has already been made. If, now, what the Evangelists recount, is the same fact mentioned by John, would we not expect to find in them this important expression of Christ? We would lay no weight upon the other points of dissimilarity in the narratives, but that this expression is wanting in the Synoptists, we must regard as an evidence that they narrate a different occurrence. It has, indeed, been thought that in Matt. xxi. 23, Luke xx. 2, we have the same thing that John ii. 18 mentions, but the question of the superiors there refers to the *teaching*, and occurs, according to Matthew, on the following day, according to Luke, on one of the following days.

EFFECT OF THE MIRACLES IN JERUSALEM.—v. 23–25.

V. 23–25. On the following days Jesus performed a number of miracles, which are also alluded to in ch. iv. 45. Jesus, nevertheless, penetrated the hearts of men, and did not consider those his true Disciples who had been moved to the recognition of him merely by miracles or even by superficial impressions, (viii. 31.) On the importance attached by Christ himself to miracles, cf. especially Neander, l. c. p. 273, seq. Most of all under the bondage of the senses, was that class for whom miracles had no other than a sensuous and selfish object, (John vi. 26;) those were a step higher, who demanded the miracle, indeed, from personal interest, but who allowed themselves to be led by it to a loftier aim, (iv. 53;) of a yet higher grade were those who felt the need of faith, but who required the media-

tion of such proofs of divinity as addressed the senses, (iii. 2;) highest of all, those who, by the word and appearing of Christ, were enabled to believe, (x. 38, xiv. 1.)—John loves to give prominence to our Lord's profound knowledge of men, (ch. vi. 61, 64, v. 42; of. also, Matt. ix. 4.) The article before ἄνθρωπος, designates each particular man whom he meets, each one with whom Christ has to do, (Winer, p. 103, Agnew and Ebbeke's Tr. 95.) His not committing himself to them, cannot, indeed, mean that he refrained from disclosing himself further, for Nicodemus also was of this number, but that he felt a distrust in their actual discipleship, (vi. 61–66.)

CHAPTER III.

CHRIST LEADS TO A HIGHER POSITION OF FAITH ONE WHOSE BELIEF HAD BEEN EXCITED BY MIRACLES.[1]—V. 1–15

V. 1, 2. THE Evangelist gives an example of one of those who have attained to what Luther calls "the *milk*-faith," an example in which Christ revealed deep insight into the human breast. The ordinary view assigns Nicodemus too low a place. The impression which Nicodemus had already received, must have been a strong one, for there was no little for him to overcome before he could go, even by night, to Jesus. He was a distinguished member of the highest judicature of the land, and, as we may conclude from that fact, a man of property, and advanced in life, (v. 4;) as a Pharisee, he was specially exposed to temptations to self-righteousness. Luther: "Here we have a pretty spiritual play presented to us, how the best reason and most beautiful piety upon earth stumbles at genuine truth and spirituality. He is assisted, so should we paint it, by power, the highest piety and prudence, all combined, and yet more, even by love to Christ; yet see how he stumbles." That, nevertheless, some of the prominent men had received like impressions, may be concluded from the οἴδαμεν, from the example of Joseph of Arimathea, and from what the Evangelist says, (xii. 42.) To what now does Nicodemus confess? To faith in the prophetic dignity of our Lord, cf. with the "come from God," the "sent from God," i. 16. And for the superhuman origin of what Jesus *did*, he draws an inference in regard to

[1] On this division, cf. the Dissertation in Knapp, Scripta varii argumenti, No. vi., on v. 14, 15, the Dissertation by Jacobi, in the Studien u. Kritiken, 1835, II. 1, which enters thoroughly into the author's meaning.

what he *taught*, and acknowledges God as the common author of both.

V. 3. Luther: "That might be thought, forsooth, an unfriendly answer to a friendly salutation." If we presuppose the insight of Jesus into the heart of the Pharisee, the abrupt character of the answer will not surprise us. Of a similar nature in this respect is the answer vi. 26. The full discussion of the conception of "*kingdom of God*," (for which Matthew has "kingdom of the heavens,") belongs to Matt iii. 2. See Tholuck's Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, on Matt. v. 3. As a designation of the kingdom of the Messiah, the expression is found, Daniel vii. 14, xviii. 27. It bears this name, because, in this kingdom to whose final consummation we are pointed, 1 Cor. xv. 28, all the powers which oppose God shall be overthrown. According to the different degrees of enlightenment, the expression was naturally understood by the Jews in a more or less spiritual sense.—The expression *ἰδεῖν*, according to Hebrew usage, "to experience, participate in," (iii. 36, viii. 51.) Whether *ἄνωθεν* here is equivalent to *δεύτερον*, (a second time, again,) or to *οὐρανόθεν*, (from heaven, from above,) has been up to the most recent period a matter of dispute; Origen, Cyrill, Nonnus, Erasmus, Lücke, Meyer, De Wette, take the latter view; the Syriac, Vulgate, Coptic, Olshausen, Neander, the former. It is certainly worthy of notice, that in v. 31 and xix. 11, *ἄνωθεν* is equivalent to *οὐρανόθεν*, and that in i. 13, 1 Joh. ii. 29, iii. 9, iv. 7, v. 1, iv. 18, we have only the conception of "being born *of God*," which is equivalent to *οὐρανόθεν*. Nevertheless, the fact that Nicodemus puts this counter-question, and that in this question he uses the words "to be born the second time," is decisive for the first mode of taking the expression, which has, in the New Testament, the parallels, "begotten again, born again," 1 Pet. i. 3, 23, "regeneration," Titus iii. 5, "new creature," Gal. vi. 15. *Ἄνωθεν*, however, is not exactly the same as *πάλιν*, but means *over again*, that is, *anew;* Gal. iv. 9, we have *πάλιν ἄνωθεν* together. Nicodemus was thus referred at once to the centre of the Christian faith. The sixth verse indicates more clearly what our Lord meant by the new birth; that it is the origin of a condition, in which the Spirit of God is throughout the deciding principle. The Rabbins were not

unacquainted with this image; they call a proselyte a new creature, בְּרִיָּה חֲדָשָׁה (Schöttgen, Horæ Talmud. I. 704; Lightfoot, Horæ Talmud. p. 984;) it is possible that Paul presupposed the expression as familiar, even if Christ did not, in this place.

V. 4. That a man familiar with Scripture, and advanced in years, should have been so little versed in figurative expressions as Nicodemus appears in this place, and in a yet higher degree in the question repeated, v. 9, (when at the same time it was common to call proselytes new-born, or new creatures,) has to the most recent criticism appeared so incredible, that it regards the conversation as a fiction, in which the contrast has been purposely depicted in the most glaring light, in order to represent the Jewish master as a fool, (Strauss, Bauer;) it is characteristic of the author's manner, too, say they, to spin out the dialogues of Jesus by carnal misapprehensions on the part of the hearers. This last position, in its general application, as well as in reference to this passage, has been criticised by Schweizer, l. c. p. 32. He endeavors to show that Nicodemus throughout is not speaking of *understanding*, but of *believing*. If understanding were the thing involved, why does the scribe, v. 9, repeat the question, since then he could have been thinking of none but a spiritual birth, and why does Christ, v. 12, reproach them that they did not *believe?* The language, v. 4, is to be understood as *comparative*, urging a parallel case; Nicodemus doubts whether so great a thing can be accomplished, and answers, therefore, that this demand would be as difficult to fulfill as for a man to enter the second time into his mother's womb, and be born. To this idea, which had presented itself to me also, at an earlier period, I am now inclined to give the preference. We must, then, take the first question in v. 4 as purely figurative, the second, on which Bengel finely remarks: animosius objicit Nicodemus, we must take as an explanation by comparison: "Can one who is old be born anew? It is as impossible as it would be, &c." There, is then, also, a better occasion for v. 8 in the connection of the discourse; v. 5 and 6 confirm, in figurative expressions, the *necessity* of the new birth; v. 8 shows the *possibility* of it, namely, by the Spirit of God freely working. If it still be thought necessary, however, to find in these ques-

tions the language of one who does not *understand*, they may be thus taken: "You cannot mean to be understood literally; what, then, is your meaning?" (Lücke, Olshausen.)—By the γέρων ὤν, Nicodemus applies to himself the words of Christ, (Beza.)

V. 5. First, the necessity is once more confirmed, then the nature of this birth explained—the same antithesis as in i. 13. By the statement of the begetting *principle*, the mode of generation is also characterized. But what means the specification ἐξ ὕδατος? Chrysostom already explained it of baptism, and ingeniously after the analogy of physical generation, the paternal principle was found in the Spirit, the maternal in the water, (Theodorus of Mopsuestia, Ammonius, Maldonatus,) thus, too, the Catholic and Lutheran interpreters; Bucer, also, and subsequently, Tittman, Knapp, Fikenscher. For this an argument is found in the connection in which elsewhere in the New Testament, regeneration and baptism are placed, (Eph. v. 26, 1 Pet. iii. 21, Titus iii. 5,) and ἐν ὕδατι καὶ αἵματι in John himself, 1 John v. 6, which Lücke even, interprets of baptism. It is probably the dogmatic difficulty that in this way Christ's own words would ascribe to baptism a like share with the Spirit in regeneration, which has led especially the Reformed expositors to abandon this interpretation. Zwingle interprets "water" as a figurative designation of "knowledge, clearness, heavenly light," (cognitio, claritas, lux cœlestis.) Calvin, as epexegesis: "aquæ spirituales, non fluviales," (waters of the spirit, not of the river;) so, also, Beza, with a reference to the addition πυρί, Luke iii. 16. A reference of a comparative nature to the baptism of John is assumed by Beausobre and Herder, the former says: "Si quelqu'un n'est né non seulement de l'eau, mais aussi de l'esprit," (unless a man be born not only of water, but of the spirit also.) Recently, however, an effort has on the one side been made to reach a fuller meaning, and on the other, with no dogmatic aim, to fix the meaning. The former by Olshausen. Calvin already mentions, that some regarded water as an elementary symbol of the tender disposition, and the spirit or wind of the facile, movable disposition of mind without which conversion is impossible. Thus, also, Olshausen ingeniously regards the water as the symbol of the soul yielding

itself up in love; the spirit designates, as it were, the masculine potency by whose coöperation the new birth is effected. But in the compass of the New Testament usage such a symbolical meaning of water has no analogy; on the contrary, the reference to baptism has the greatest analogy. To this view, consequently, even the negative critics have returned. But in the very fact, that in the juxtaposition of "water" and "spirit," we must by the former understand baptism, and that mention of it at this time and to this man is improbable in the last degree, Strauss and Bauer think they have found a new evidence of the fictitious character of the whole interview. But the idea of an intentional interpolation of this reference to water, from a doctrinal interest for the sacrament, (to give additional authority and value to baptism,) is the less tenable, as the expression is dropped in iii. 8. (Neander's L. J., M'Clintock and Blumenthal's Tr. 175.) It would be more plausible to say, that the Disciple, from the later consciousness in which baptism and regeneration are brought into closer mutual relations, had *involuntarily* inserted the expression, "of water." Is it, however, true, that Christ himself could not have spoken of baptism? His Disciples certainly baptized, see chap. iv. 2. In addition, could not the Saviour express from his own consciousness what his hearers at the time would not understand? see on ii. 19. We ask further, is it true that if we refer "water" to baptism, it can be apprehended only in accordance with the Catholic or with the Lutheran doctrine of baptism? The mention of the spirit alone, in v. 8, already contradicts such an opinion. It may still be said in accordance with the Reformed doctrine, that baptism is mentioned as a pignus, signaculum, (pledge, seal.) Or we may say with Neander and Lücke: "The water may have already been known to Nicodemus from the baptism of John, as a *symbol of the purification* of the inner man." Nevertheless, should not the mode in which elsewhere "of water" and "of the spirit" are placed in opposition, (i. 26, 31, 33, Acts i. 5,) make it probable that our Lord actually had John's baptism, and by consequence, the baptism of repentance in his mind, so that precisely these two points are made prominent, on which, according to the doctrine of the Church, regeneration rests? The ἐξ here and

in v. 6, does not, indeed, as in i. 13, designate the "causa efficiens," but the element from which, according to the perception of the senses, the birth proceeds.

V. 6. The dignity of this birth is stated as in i. 13. The antithesis here, too, is simple: bodily and spiritual birth. The neuter more general than the masculine. From the act of begetting on the natural side of humanity, originates a product, in which nature preponderates, and which, first by a new act of grace from above, becomes genuine *spirit*. That the πνεῦμα, "Spirit," means πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ, "Spirit of God," is shown by v. 8. The product which in a spiritual generation proceeds from this Spirit, is of like kind.

V. 7, 8. These verses rigidly taken, do not lead to the view, that Nicodemus, v. 4, had expressed an inability to understand, but that he had declared his doubt of the possibility of such an extraordinary change. They show, namely, that the Spirit of God exhibits an uncontrolled activity surpassing all understanding. Πνεῦμα and רוּחַ mean both *wind* and *Spirit*. The first time, as the οὕτως shows, we are not to understand the Spirit, (Origen, Augustine, Bengel,) but wind, which is used also in Ecclesiastes xi. 5, as an image of the inexplicable, and in Xenophon, Memorab. iv. 3, 14, as an image of the Deity who is invisible in his essence, and is to be traced only in his operations. There is a threefold point of comparison: the wind blows with a strength which man cannot resist; its operation is perceptible; but its mode is incomprehensible—we know in fact in but few cases, the causes of the disturbance of the equilibrium of the atmosphere.[1] It is a question whether the last member is to be understood yet more strictly in its particulars, whether by it is intimated that the first beginnings and preparation for regeneration, and its last goal reaching into eternity, are incomprehensible to man.

V. 9, 10. The words do not compel us to suppose that Nicodemus does not yet *understand:* they have not the character of a question, but of an *exclamation*. In this way, Luther regards it in one of his expositions of the Gospel, (B. xi. p.

[1] Luther: "David has hit it, Psalm cxxxv. 7. He bringeth the wind out of his secret places, (Eng. Tr. treasuries,) consequently so that no man knoweth and seeth it."

2974,) in the other, however, he says of Nicodemus, "the longer he listened, the less he understood," (p. 1556.)—Even now, Nicodemus cannot comprehend the greatness of such a change. Christ had spoken of the power of the Spirit of God; of this, a teacher of the Old Testament law must have known, (Ps. li. 12, Ezek. xviii. 31, xxxvi. 24–28, Jerem. xxxi. 33.) The article before διδ. is rhetorical, (Bernhardy, Synt. p. 315, Passow, ii. p. 311,) which is evident, too, from the solemn τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. Erasmus, Bengel, Knapp: "tu ex eruditione notus ille et clarus Israelitarum doctor es," (art thou that teacher of the Israelites, known and distinguished by thy learning?) Whether we translate "knowest not," or "understandest not," it amounts to the same thing.

V. 11. The 12th and 13th verses have inclined expositors to the view that the plural is to be taken as the rhetorical plural for the singular, (Theoph.;) especially as Christ specifically attributes the ὁρᾶν to himself, (John vi. 46.) But common as this use is in epistolary style, it is not found in ordinary discourse. But it does not seem admissible to regard the prophets as included, or John the Baptist, (Knapp,) since no such reference is hinted at. Or, as v. 10 had referred to the testimony of the prophets, in regard to the operation of the Spirit, did Christ mean to designate himself and the prophets together as witnesses for the transforming power of the Spirit of God? Maldonatus, with a view peculiar to him: de omnibus bonis testibus, (all good witnesses are included.)—The plural λαμβάνετε may be compared with οἴδαμεν in v. 2.

V. 12. Τὰ ἐπίγεια and τὰ ἐπουράνια, 1 Cor. xv. 40, Phil. ii. 10, mark the antithesis of nature between earthly and heavenly things and beings. The sense, then, may be thus taken: "I have now spoken to you in earthly illustrations, how would you believe if I had imparted heavenly things without a veil," (Luther, Beza, Maldonatus,)—but to this, v. 13 is opposed. It would be much more natural to expect, in this connection, that the "earthly" would have reference to the regeneration previously mentioned, and then by the "heavenly" most writers understand the redemption spoken of in v. 14. Yet it appears impossible that Christ would have uttered "the heavenly" in the presence of those who were not in a condition to receive in

faith "the earthly;" the view, therefore, may be held that v. 14 has no immediate reference to v. 12, since, also, the redemption by the cross is likewise an earthly fact. So Olshausen, according to whose opinion Christ did not impart the "heavenly things" to Nicodemus and those who attended him, for from the use of the plural, Olshausen infers that he brought such with him. Bengel: Causa, cur scriptura de multis rebus sileat, (the reason why Scripture is silent on many points.) But what, then, can be the meaning of these "heavenly things?" Could Christ give other communications than those from the sphere of religion? Is it not intimated, also, v. 31, that he expressed "the heavenly things." According to Olshausen, it is the proper πῶς (how) of the new birth, in regard to which our Lord is silent, "because it would have to be sought in the ultimate principles of the spiritual world." But the question of Nicodemus certainly had not this metaphysical purport, in fact it is, as we have already remarked, less a question than an exclamation. Nor can we acknowledge the validity of *that* difficulty, that the expiatory death, as over against the fact of the new birth, cannot be termed ἐπουράνιον. As regards the new birth, it can be said of *it* without scruple, that it is ἐπίγειον, for it is an earthly fact, which hardly requires the ingenious remark of Bengel, that it occurs in margine cœli, (on the verge of heaven.) The crucifixion, it is true, equally occurred on earth; but as this mere fact, it is not an object of faith, this it first becomes by the significance which attaches to it by its connection with the divine counsel, but this counsel is ἐπουράνιον. Thus in Wisdom ix. 16, τὰ ἐπὶ γῆς and τὰ ἐν οὐρανοῖς are contrasted, and the latter is explained, v. 17, as the βουλή of God. Relying upon that very passage, Lücke would thus express the antithesis: "the easily understood—the hard to be understood," (cf. the similar view in Cyrill and Beza.) But in v. 13, standing in immediate connection, there is an express antithesis of γῆ and οὐρανός, cf. v. 21, so that in v. 12 the meaning deduced cannot be adhered to.

V. 13. If men will not believe Christ, it is impossible that they should understand the ἐπουράνια, (i. 18.) As the "descending from heaven" cannot be taken literally, just as little can the "ascending;" and "heaven" can only be the designation of the

sphere of that absolute knowledge which proceeds from unity with God, (cf. i. 52.) Yet more clear does this become from the addition ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ. The participle cannot be taken as the partic. imperf. and be resolved into ὃς ἦν, for a perfectly idle tautology would thus arise. It follows, also, from this proposition, that in Christ's judgment heaven and earth are no self-separating opposites. We see from these words, that the figurative style predominates far more in the discourses of our Lord, than is acknowledged by most.

V. 14, 15. If Christ, now, notwithstanding the refusal in v. 12, designs here to make known to Nicodemus "the heavenly things," we would certainly anticipate in an author exact in the use of the particles, some other particle of transition than the mere καί; either καὶ—δέ, or merely δέ, or at any rate οὖν. Nicodemus had been placed in the subjective centre of the kingdom of God, the new birth had been announced to him. Christ judges him worthy to be introduced into the objective centre also, the doctrine of redemption. He lets himself down to the scribe's feeble measure of knowledge, by pointing out to him in a well known Old Testament fact, the appearance of that very idea which would be actualized in Christ's own death. The Israelites bitten by poisonous serpents, could be cured by looking in faith upon the brazen serpent, (Numb. xxi. 8, 9, Wisd. xvi. 6, 7.) We have here, also, a proof of the profound manner in which the Old Testament was interpreted by our Saviour, and an intimation of the way in which he is to be understood, when he finds even in Moses prophecies in regard to himself, (v. 46.) Precisely those two features of the doctrine of redemption, against which the opposition of carnal Israel was directed, justification by faith, and that, too, a faith in a *crucified* one, (1 Cor. i. 23, Rom. ix. 32,) are typified in this Old Testament fact. Many have, indeed, given the type a yet more special application. That which healed was (without poison, indeed,) the same that had slain; the crucified one, who delivers, is, likewise in appearance only, a sinner and malefactor, (Rom. viii. 3;) thus Luther, Bengel, Olshausen, Jacobi. The purpose of the Saviour, at least with reference to Nicodemus, was not to enter into such minute doctrinal details.—The meaning of ὑψοῦν must be determined by reference to viii. 28,

cf. xii. 32, 33. In the latter passage, the exaltation to heaven is the subject of discourse, but John finds in it an allusion to the crucifixion; when Christ says, chap. viii. 28: "When *ye* have lifted up," he had in his mind, no doubt, their crucifying him. In Chaldee, too, זקף also means "to raise, to hang," in Syriac, ܙܩܦ (זקף) "to crucify." A double sense *may* lie in it, (see p. 228,) but the phrase "lifted up the serpent," which is in opposition with it, presents no argument for it. Death on the cross is presupposed, also, in Matt. xx. 19, x. 38. In the words, "*every one* that believeth on him," the universality of the redemption is intimated. — Was, now, this profounder intimation lost upon the mind of the scribe? The history proves the reverse, and thus justifies the Saviour in judging fit to utter the "heavenly things" in the ears of Nicodemus. He who then came to Jesus by night, ventured, ch. vii. 51, to offer a word for Jesus in the high council, and when we see that after Christ's crucifixion, when all earthly expectations had vanished, Nicodemus was still active in honoring the crucified Saviour, even in the grave, (xix. 39,) does it not seem as though especially this word in regard to the expiatory death had, in the end, disclosed its meaning to him. It may be, that on this night the words made upon the scribe the impression (as Jacobi expresses it,) as of a *speaking in an unknown tongue*, but they were not utterly lost upon him.

THE EVANGELIST CONTINUES THE THOUGHT, THAT THE MISSION OF CHRIST INTO THE WORLD IS THE WORK OF GOD'S LOVE, AND THAT UNBELIEF CONDEMNS BUT ITSELF. — V. 16–21.

V. 16, 17. If the observation made ii. 19, be considered just, that Christ expressed from his own consciousness what far transcended his hearer's point of view, this division might be regarded as a continuation of the discourse with Nicodemus; at least, the correction of the idea that the Messiah had appeared only as a judge to the Gentiles, was exactly in place in a conversation with a scribe. Thus it is taken, also, among recent writers, by Knapp, Meyer, Hug. Since Erasmus, however, most interpreters have supposed that the Evangelist connects an independent train of thought of his own, enlarging

on the theme presented by the Saviour's discourse. If we could doubt that such is the case here, yet we could not as regards v. 31–36; and if the matter be indubitable there, there can be no further scruple here. In opposition to the carnal view, which imagined a judgment on the heathen world to be a prominent design of the Messiah, the Evangelist gives a special emphasis to "every one that believeth," and shows that by the appearing of the only begotten Son, life has also been offered to the "world." That in ἔδωκεν there is a reference to the death on the cross, may more readily be admitted, as such a reference has preceded it; nevertheless it is not necessary to complete it by adding εἰς τὸν θάνατον, (Olshausen,) nor with Meyer, τ. κόσμῳ, but it corresponds with "resign, give up," vi. 51, Luke xxii. 19, at other times παρέδωκεν; it is consequently parallel with the subsequent ἀποστέλλεσθαι εἰς τὸν κόσμον, but with prominence given to the idea that this was connected with humiliation and suffering, (Phil. ii. 7.)

V. 18, 19. A highly spiritual conception of the idea of the judgment, which also lies at the basis of the words in xii. 46–48, (cf. Acts xiii. 46, Titus iii.11, John ix. 41.) If in the appearing of Christ, forgiveness of sins, life and salvation, are offered to men, and if faith be the channel through which these blessings are conferred on men, unbelief is a judgment of one's self. Luther: "To *have* sin is not what does the harm, but the insisting that we have *no* sin does the great harm." The Evangelist derives the unbelief, not merely from ignorance, but also from love of darkness. That man should love darkness appears incomprehensible, but v. 20, 21, assign the causes.

V. 20, 21. The more man abandons himself to evil, the more does he regard it as his proper self, and loves it as himself. As that which is holy is in opposition to him, and reproves his evil works, he feels himself mortified in that character which is proper to him, and begins to hate what is holy. Christ presents this as the reason, ch. vii. 7, why he was hated by the world. Man begins to love the objectively holy, in the degree in which he recognizes that the evil attaching to him is something alien from him, and, therefore, does not fear the reproving of it. He then feels himself attracted by the object-

ive appearance of the holy, as his efforts are thereby sanctioned and promoted. If we compare in Rom. xiii. 12, 1 Thess. v. 8, and in John xi. 9, 10, how the spiritual and physical meanings of ἡμέρα and φῶς play allusively into one another, we shall be inclined to think that in v. 20 there is an allusion to the fact that evil seeks the shroud of night. Ἀλήθεια, in the practical sense of אֱמֶת, like the expression, "das rechte," ("what is right,") in German, expresses at once the theoretical and practical, (1 John i. 6.)—Ἐν θεῷ, that is, so that the works have God as their source. It is in John we find direct expressions, according to which even those not yet converted can stand in a fellowship with God, (viii. 47, xviii. 37.)

Strauss has pronounced the whole scene with Nicodemus a fiction, originating in the fact that the reproach that the Gospel was confined in its operations to the lower classes, goaded the souls of the early Christians. But with historical, as well as Christian penetration, Neander, in reply, has pointed to the fact, that the Christians of those earlier times gloried, on the very contrary, in this, that the humble had been exalted by Christ to so high a point, (1 Cor. i. 26, 27.) According to Bauer, too, the conversation must be a mere fiction, because, through the whole of it, the reflective point of view of the later Church can be recognized. Weisse does not go so far, who, though he remarks that the conversation held without the presence of others, and first communicated by Nicodemus to the Disciples, could not be very faithfully detailed, yet directs attention to the fact, that from *this very* conversation originate allusions in Justin Martyr, Clemens Romanus and Ignatius, which, if they be independent of John's Gospel, prove that John was not advancing mere inventions of his own; the presumption, indeed, is made without good cause, that those passages are independent of our Gospel, (see above, Introd. § 6.) The privacy of the conversation has, in general, given a support to the doubt of its genuineness. De Wette says: "The depth and spiritual fullness of the discourses detailed, we can, as regards their essence, derive only from the original sources; the delineation of them, we cannot regard as the work of conscious invention, but as a *Spirit-drunken, poetical, free reproduction.*" But no unprejudiced person can deny, that everything to

v. 15, which was said by Christ, was properly adapted to a scribe like Nicodemus, and the subsequent spiritual growth of the scribe confirms this. To assume with positiveness that not one of the Disciples of our Lord could have been present at the interview, would involve a presumption which has nothing to establish it, for Nicodemus had reason, indeed, to fear the Jews, but had no reason to fear the Disciples of our Lord. The possibility, then, that John had direct knowledge of what passed, must be conceded. Nevertheless, if it be granted that John got his knowledge of it through Nicodemus, yet if the conversation made that profound impression upon Nicodemus, which, from the subsequent history, it is evident it did, he would have been in a situation, at a later period, in his close relations with the Disciples, to give them an account faithful in all essentials.

A new Testimony of the Baptist for Christ.—v. 22–30.

V. 22–24. From the metropolis, Jesus went into the province of Judea. Through his Disciples, as ch. iv. 2 informs us, he baptized; meanwhile the Baptist also continued his baptism. We have here additional matter, exciting no little difficulty. First, this, that according to Matt. iv. 12, Mark i. 14, it seems as though Jesus had first made his appearance in Galilee in his active vocation, subsequently to the removal of John from the stage. That John should have continued his work *at the same time* with Jesus, appears also surprising in a high degree. Should the morning star continue to shine after the sun has risen? On the contrary, we would even have anticipated that the Baptist himself would unite with the circle of the Disciples of Jesus. The difficulty, indeed, goes yet further—that Christ should have caused baptism to be administered during the time of his life on earth, is difficult to credit, since in fact he had not yet established a Church, (Bretschneider, Weisse.) Thus one difficulty attaches itself to the other. The following, however, may be advanced in reply. If the Baptist continued, simultaneously with Jesus, to work independently, he must have done so because his position was regarded by himself as the Old Testament one, to wit: to baptize into "one that was to come," and thus to extend among the people in ever widening circles,

a penitent mind and the longing after the Messiah, (Kern, Tüb. Zeitschr. 1836, ii. 11, p. 54.) If we may regard the procedure of the Baptist, ch. i. 35, as exhibiting his rule, he was not in every case urgent in insisting on fellowship with Christ, but confined himself to giving hints to the more susceptible spirits; even in ch. i. 26, he merely intimates that the Messiah is present, without specifically designating Jesus as such. His expressions here, too, v. 29, 30, confirm the relation in which he stands, just as the history narrates it, for they speak not of his *retirement*, but of his *decline;* they speak not of his attaching himself to the Saviour, but only of his calm inward sympathy with Christ's self-dependent activity. As regards Christ's baptism, it certainly could not at this period have the character it had subsequently to his resurrection, ascension and outpouring of the Spirit, (Matt. xxviii. 19.) To say, nevertheless, as Tertullian already does, that it was only John's baptism, is not correct; for there was connected with it a confession of faith, a confession of Christ as Messiah who had *already appeared*, while John's baptism required only a penitent confession in order to participate in the kingdom of Messiah *to come*. As regards, finally, the difference between John and Matt. iv. 12, we can certainly perceive from v. 24, that the oral tradition fixed the imprisonment of John pretty nearly about the same time with the appearance of Jesus. But the passage in Matthew does not necessarily lead to this view, if we bear in mind the very compendious character of the narrative of that Evangelist. The special activity of Jesus in Galilee, according to John, first falls, also, in the period after the return from the first Passover, (iv. 45;) after his return from his baptism at Jordan, he had remained but a short time in Galilee, (ii. 12.) That point of time was also in Matthew's eye, but as he was not acquainted with the intervening occurrence, it gives an appearance as if he differed from John.—Ænon and the larger Salim, according to v. 26, lay on this side Jordan, and according to Eusebius, (Onomas.) the place was still pointed out at Jordan, and Robinson found a village of Salim in the neighborhood of Nablous. On the motive assigned for baptizing at this place, in the words "because there was much water there," Bauer makes merry: "had not the Jordan, on whose banks we must picture

to ourselves the scene as taking place, abundance of water at other points, too?" But the precise fact had in view, is that the Baptist had abandoned his usual place of baptism at the Jordan.[1]

V. 25–28. The *οὖν* has reference to the fact previously stated, that Jesus and John were baptizing at the same time. *Ζήτησις*, Acts xv. 2, a *question*, hence *disputation*, called by the Rabbins, קְשָׁיָא. By the connection, it would seem that the Jew[2] gave a preference to the baptism of Jesus. The excitement of John's disciples displays itself, also, in the hyperbolical expression: "all men come to him." *Μαρτυρεῖν*, with dative, to offer testimony in any one's favor. The language of the Baptist bears to a remarkable extent the stamp of genuineness in its Old Testament gnomologic form, v. 27, 30, connected with the figurative expression, v. 29. The general sentiment, v. 27, can either be placed in close connection with v. 28, "I can arrogate nothing to myself, but can only assume the position allotted to me by God," (Cyrill, Bengel, Lücke, Neander,) or with v. 26, "Jesus would not have it in his power to maintain such a position, if God had not assigned it to him," (Chrysostom, Olshausen, De Wette.) The Baptist may, however, have uttered the general sentiment, with reference to their *mutual* relation. The reasoning of Gamaliel, Acts v. 38, seq. is of a similar character.—*Ἀλλ' ὅτι* is a mingling of two constructions, (Winer, p. 552.) *Ἐκεῖνος*, in v. 28, is by Bengel and De Wette not referred to *ὁ χριστός*, as in that case *αὐτοῦ* would be required, (cf. however, vii. 45, Acts iii. 13,) but to Jesus, v. 30.

V. 29, 30. The Baptist now declares what is the position assigned him. The Old Testament frequently designates God as the husband of his people, (cf. in the New Testament, 2 Cor. xi. 2, Eph. v. 32, Rev. xxi. 2, 9.) As the Messiah is the representative of God, a similar affirmation can be made of him. Maldonatus thus expresses the sense of the first words in v. 29: quamvis in nuptiis multi sunt, non omnes sponsi sunt, (although

[1] Neander, Lücke and De Wette, following Rosenmuller, observe that עֵינָיִם is an intensive form, with the signification of "abounding in springs." It is, indeed, not an intensive form, but an adjective form, (Ewald, Hebr. Gramm. 3d ed. § 341,) nevertheless the etymology justifies the observation of the Evangelist. [*Αἰνών*, equiv. to עֵינוֹן עֵינָן adj. from עַיִן "place rich in springs," Ewald, Lehrbuch, 6th ed. p. 365. 7th ed.]

[2] (The critical authority for *Ἰουδαίου* is considered now as decisive. Tr.)

many are at the wedding, not all are bridegrooms.) The expression, "friend of the bridegroom," has a technical meaning, as according to Hebrew usage, a שׁוֹשְׁבִן παρανύμφιος acted as mediator in the marriage suit and contract. Ἑστηκώς, he stood without interfering, as a spectator who sympathizes, but takes no part. As regards the "voice of the bridegroom," Meyer was the first who referred to the passages in the Old Testament, in which the voice of the bridegroom and the voice of the bride are a designation of the festal joys of the wedding, (Jer. vii. 34, xvi. 9, xxv. 10.) Subsequently, De Wette and Lücke also understood by the joyous voice of the bridegroom, the jubilee of the wedding festivities. But in this sense it presents itself in the Old Testament passages, only in the distinct phraseologic connection; the difficulty, too, is suggested, that then the comparison has no proper applicability to the thing compared. We reach this much better, when we have in our mind the interview of the bridegroom with the bride, during which the friend who has brought about the connection stands aside as a sympathizing listener. Understood in this way, the expression is in perfect correspondence with the position which the Baptist assumed after the appearance of Jesus. Χαίρειν διά, instead of with ἐπί or ἐν, is an unusual connection, is found, however, also, 1 Thess. iii. 9; cf. θαυμάζειν διά, vii. 21. The *dat. modi*, χαρᾷ, instead of the accus. is also unusual, cf. however, Septuag. Is. lxvi. 10. The last words in v. 29 express, definitively, in what the destination of the Baptist consisted. The expression, "my joy is fulfilled," belongs to the phraseology peculiar to John, (xv. 11, xvi. 24, 1 John i. 4;) yet the sense here is somewhat different, and has a historical reason, for the Baptist had hitherto rejoiced in *hope*. V 30 is intelligible only on the supposition that the Baptist continued to labor at the same time with Christ.

THE EVANGELIST PURSUES THE THOUGHT, THAT CHRIST IS THE ABSOLUTE TEACHER AND MEDIATOR BETWEEN MEN AND GOD. v. 31–36.

V. 31, 32. It is true that even recently Hug has characterized the position of Strauss, that the Baptist could not have uttered the following words, as "more impertinent than true," and it is

undeniably the fact, that the leading thought, v. 31, 32, coincides in essentials with i. 30; but v. 35, 36, especially, are too specifically of John's (the Evangelist,) type of Christianity; v. 32, also, is in opposition to v. 26; it is to be noticed, too, that the Old Testament figurative mode of expression only goes to v. 30. That the Disciple should, with nothing interposed to mark it, have added, to use Bacon's words, an emanatio concionis Iohanneæ, is to be accounted for only from his peculiar mystical tendency, which did not separate so rigidly between objective and subjective. Conformably to the fact that the Baptist had established the distinction between Christ and himself, especially in the preëxistence of Christ, the Evangelist here also, has established the specific distinction from the Baptist and all others in this, that the origin of the Redeemer cannot be referred to a merely human descent. The first, ἐκ τῆς γῆς, designates the *origin*, the second, the *kind* and *character*, and with the character corresponds the *doctrine*. The antithesis in ἐπάνω πάντων ἐστί corresponds to the ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἐστι, and the καὶ —μαρτυρεῖ to the ἐκ τῆς γῆς λαλεῖ. Christ, indeed, ch. vi. 46, claims for himself exclusively the *seeing*, and ascribes to man only the power of *hearing* the Father; but in other places this distinction is not observed, (ch. v. 30.) We can, moreover, in the *hearing*, suppose the distinction that in Christ the hearing does not consist in a single act. In the plaintive words καὶ—λαμβάνει, we recognize the voice of the Evangelist, (i. 11, xii. 37.)

V. 33, 34. The accountability which attaches to unbelief is pointed out, (Chrysostom.) As the words of Christ are the words of God, the rejection of *his* testimony is also a rejection of the testimony of God, (1 John v. 10.)—Ὃν ὁ θ. ἀπ. used of the Messiah, v. 38, xi. 42, xvii. 3, xx. 21, with εἰς τ. κόσμον, x. 36, xvii. 18, cf. xviii. 37, xi. 46. Nearly like it ἐκ τ. θεοῦ ἐρχ., sometimes with εἰς τ. κόσμον, viii. 42, xvi. 28, xiii. 3. The question rises, whether these formulas have the same meaning, and merely designate the prophetic dignity, (thus the Socinians, Grotius.) The phrase, "whom God hath sent," is certainly applicable to every prophet, but in John it designates not merely the outward sending, but the *inward calling*, see vii. 16, viii. 42, Isa. xlviii. 16—used of Christ, the internal calling to

Messiahship. With the addition, "into the world," the phrase already implies more, De Wette: "the appearing in the visible world;" Baumgarten-Crusius, on ch. i. 9: "an extraordinary entrance into life," it is used only of the Messiah, (cf. xii. 46, also, vi. 14.) Yet more decided is the reference to the preëxistence in *ἀπό* or *παρὰ θεοῦ ἐρχ.* It is used, indeed, iii. 2, of the divine call in general, but differently, viii. 42, xvi. 28, xiii. 3, as the antithesis *πορεύομαι πρὸσ τ. π.* shows, as also the motive assigned, viii. 42, by *οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ ἐλήλ.* Augustine, on viii. 42, distinguishes between *processi a Deo*, that is, the eternal generation, and *veni*, that is, the incarnation; so, also, Ammonius, Hilary. On the other hand, Origen, Euthymius, Maldonatus, refer both to the incarnation. Among the recent writers, compare especially Tittmann, on xiii. 3, and Frommann, Joh. Lehrbegr. p. 388.—*Οὐ γὰρ–δίδωσι*, in virtue of the present, and the want of *αὐτῷ*, stands as a general proposition, and the expositor, therefore, if he take it in a general sense, (as was already done by Bucer,) must see that he gives it a conformable signification.

Bucer: "By God's giving his Spirit to any one, thus, to the prophet, the Baptist, He is not rendered poorer, so that He cannot impart it to the others." A superfluous observation, for which there is no sort of necessity. Bauer presses the pres. *δίδωσι*, and the want of the *αὐτῷ*, to such a degree as to find therein the evidence of the consciousness of the later Church forcing itself in. But why should not the thought that lies in it be, that God *can* and *will* do it, and (as the connection would lead us to conclude,) has here done it? The direct reference to Christ is as tenaciously to be adhered to as if *αὐτω* were supplied, and this would be so much the less arbitrary, since, as Calvin observes, v. 35 is to be regarded as determinative and explanatory. Erasmus had already made the remark in general, that the Greeks frequently omit the pronoun where we would expect it, John vii. 17, after *διδαχῆς*, so also, ch. x. 29, xvi. 8, cf. similar cases, 2 Cor. xi. 20, Eph. ii. 10, (see Fritzsche on Matt. p. 138,) iii. 18, 1 Pet. ii. 11. The Rabbins say that the prophets obtained the Spirit only בְּמִשְׁקָל "by measure." Ἐκ designates the rule and periphrases adverbs, (2 Cor. viii. 13.)

V. 35, 36. Love is the principle of impartation, we need not be surprised, therefore, that with the absolute love of the Father to the Son, He imparts to him not only the Spirit, but absolutely all things, (xiii. 3, xvii. 1, 2, Matt. xxviii. 18, xi. 27;) in ch. v. 20, also, the absoluteness of religious knowledge in the Son has its origin in the love of the Father. If, now, the Son be the medium for all the blessings that proceed from the Father, it follows that "eternal life," also, can only be attained through his mediation, and the organ for possessing it is faith, by which the thing hoped for is already possessed as a thing present. Here, indeed, eternal life is regarded, first, as a present thing, as in v. 24, xvii. 3, then, in its consummation, as something future; that, nevertheless, the *οὐκ ὄψεται* presupposes an *οὐχ ορᾷ*, may be inferred from the antithesis *μένει ἡ ὀργή*. The condition of man without faith, is a condition in *ὀργή*, (Eph. ii. 3,) and the correlative of it is misery, the *θάνατος*, (1 John iii. 14.) *Ἀπειθεῖν* alternates with *ἀπιστεῖν*, Rom. xi. 30. *Ἐπί cum acc.* embraces, as i. 33, rest and motion.

CHAPTER IV.

MINISTRY OF CHRIST AMONG THE SAMARITANS.—v. 1–42.

V. 1–4. FROM v. 35 of this chapter, it may be inferred that the Redeemer at this time remained about half a year in the surrounding country. His appearance as a reformer excited the opposition of the Pharisees more than did the Old Testament activity of the Baptist; as Christ, however, regarded it as yet too soon to arouse more violently the spirit of persecution, he repaired to Galilee. On pres. *ποιεῖ*, *βαπτίζει*, cf. on i. 40; on the baptism of Jesus, see on iii. 22. Why did Jesus not perform baptism himself? It is best simply to say: because this was a matter which could be attended to by others, which was not the case with preaching, (thus Thomas Aquinas,) cf. 1 Cor. i. 17. The scrupulous Jew, in order to avoid Samaria, was accustomed to make the journey to Jerusalem by the right side of the Jordan in Perœa; Christ, however, was above this prejudice, (Luke ix. 52,) for which reason, also, the command to the Disciples, Matt. x. 5, cannot have originated in mere prejudice.

V. 5. *Συχάρ*, an unusual appellation of the city שְׁכֶם, which elsewhere is called *Συχέμ* or *τὰ Σίκιμα*, and lay on the direct road to Jerusalem, (Eusebius, Onomast. p. 143, ed. Bonfrère.) The form *Συχάρ* is regarded by some as a derisive name given by the Jews, equivalent to שֶׁקֶר "falsehood, idolatry," as the Samaritans were regarded as idolaters, (Sir. l. 26, [28.]) On the other part the Samaritans called the בֵּית הַמִּקְדָּשׁ in Jerusalem בֵּית הַמִּכְהָשׁ domus percussionis, (house of smiting.) Perhaps, however, the change of the *μ* into the *ρ* is accidental, as the liquids are elsewhere interchanged, as Nebuchadrezzar in Jeremiah, *Βελίαρ* and *Βελίαλ*.—What is here said of Jacob's field

and the present of it to Joseph, rests upon a traditional working out of the material in Gen. xxxiii. 19, Joshua xxiv. 32, Septuagint, Gen. xlviii. 22. In Jacob's field, near the south-east entrance, lies a vale bordered by high mountains, and on the narrow base it supplies, rises Sichem, and there yet exists a well, with plantations of olive and fig trees near it, which Jews, Christians, Mohammedans and Samaritans point out as Jacob's Well, (see Robinson;) Schubert arrived at this spot about the same time [spoken of here,] just about noon, and found that a poor family had pitched their tent and were spending a holiday by the cool spring. To the left, Gerizim rises in sight to the altitude of some eight hundred feet, with its springy base covered with lively green; on the right the somewhat steeper and less watered Ebal, from which the words of the curse were spoken, (Schubert's Reise, &c.—Journey in the East, iii. p. 137.)

V. 6–8. The well in its present condition is nine feet in diameter, and one hundred and five feet deep; when Maundrell visited it in the month of March, it had fifteen feet of water. The present city (under the modern name of Nablous,) lies about half an hour distant; as there are a number of springs in its immediate vicinity, it may be asked why the woman came here for water; the ancient city may, however, have been nearer, nor is it said that the woman came out of the city, (ἐκ τῆς Σαμαρείας is equiv. to Σαμαρεῖτις.) She may, perhaps, have come from the neighborhood of the city, (Robinson's Palestine, iii. 322, seq.[1])—The sixth hour, according to the Jewish computation, was about noon. Rettig, who presupposes that the woman was drawing water for the cattle, thinks that from this passage he can make it probable that John followed the Roman computation, that it was consequently the sixth hour of the morning, since it was usual to travel through the night, and this was the hour at which cattle were watered; but v. 15, 28, render it difficult to suppose that the woman had drawn water for the cattle. According to v. 35, too, this journey occurred in autumn, when it was rarely hot, (Buhle, Calendar. Palæst. p. 52,) and when traveling by night was uncommon. No positive evidence, therefore, for

[1] (Biblical Researches, vol. iii. p. 111. Last edit. (1856,) ii. 285. Tr.)

the Roman computation can be derived from this passage. Since Erasmus, οὕτως has been regarded as anaphora of the partic. as is exceedingly common in the classics, cf. also, Acts xx. 11; Josephus, Antiqq. viii. 11, 1; de bell. jud. ii. 8, 5. But Fritzsche (Hall. allg. Litteraturz, 1839, Ergänzungsbl. No. 28,) has shown that in all examples of this sort, οὕτως stands *before* the *temp. fin.* Consequently, we must take οὕτως equivalent to αὕτως, in the sense of ἁπλῶς, ὡς ἔτυχεν, as Chrysostom, Cyrill. Bengel, do, which will imply that Christ made no further preparations, that he reposed under the open sky. To this amounts, too, the observation peculiar to Erasmus and Calvin: "Cum dicit *sic* sedisse, quasi, gestum hominis fatigati exprimit," (where it says he sat *thus*, the air of a weary man is expressed.)

V. 9, 10. The woman recognized the man of the Jewish land, probably by his accent; perhaps, too, there was a difference in the clothing; perhaps the question implies not merely surprise, but a slight contempt. How violent the hatred of the Jews to the Samaritans was, is expressed in Tr. Sanhedr. fol. 104: "He who receives a Samaritan into his house, and entertains him, deserves to have his children driven to exile;" the hatred of the Samaritans to the Jews is shown, Luke ix. 53. This hatred matured to its full strength from the time of the building of the temple on Gerizim.—Forgetting his own bodily need, Jesus enters into the spiritual need of her who asks the question. He draws her attention to the fact, that *He*, the maker of a request, can *bestow* a far greater thing than he *asks*. The greatness of the gift is conditioned by the dignity of the giver; yet the gift appears most prominently as the main idea, because of the antithesis to that which he himself had just desired, (cf. Calvin, Piscator.) He calls his gift, living water, to wit: κατ ἐξοχήν, ἀληθινῶς, (by preëminence, truly,) cf. xiii. 14, and on vi. 32. By the gift he means the *life*, emanating from him, and the point of comparison is its freshness and perennial character. Calvin: "Aquam, meo judicio, bonorum omnium vacuitati, qua laborat ac premitur humanum genus, opponere voluit." (He designs, in my opinion, to contrast the water with that void of all good under which mankind labors and is weighed down.) The aorists, ᾔτησας and ἔδωκεν, not

with Luther, "thou wouldst ask," but with the Vulgate, "thou wouldst have asked."

V. 11, 12. The woman, taking the words of Christ literally, sees in them only an unseemly depreciation of the well, hallowed by ages; he cannot draw spring water from *this* well, she concludes, therefore, he would give her water from some other source than the well. The address, κύριε, was in that day the usual form of courtesy, (xii. 21.) With οὔτε, a change of construction is made, as 3 John v. 10.

V. 13, 14. He justifies the promise, that *He* in the true sense can give living water. The water from the spring refreshes but for a time. The exception might be taken, however, that the life emanating from Christ must be constantly made our own anew, and then that appears to be true which Sir. xxiv. 29, (Ecclesiasticus xxiv. 21,) says of wisdom: "They that drink me shall yet be thirsty." But the true sense is to be determined partly from vi. 35, partly by v. 14, which here follows. The figure means, this water will once for all be received into the inner nature, will be immanent in man, and will attend him through every stage of his being, even to eternity. The need of an increase of this water is not thereby excluded. Rather has the image been explained fully and correctly by Calvin, thus: Spiritum sanctum scatebram esse perpetuo fluentem, ita non esse periculum ut exarescant, qui spirituali gratia renovati sunt, (the Holy Spirit is a gushing spring ever flowing, so that they who have been renewed by spiritual grace are in no danger of becoming completely dry.) To take another image: the spark which goes forth from the fire of the Redeemer becomes in every human breast a self-existent flame. After Christ has brought into being to individuals the communion with God, it advances in all these individuals to a consummation. The same thought is found in viii. 12, cf. vii. 38. "Springing up into everlasting life" expresses, that death not only does not interrupt this *life*, this communion with God, (xi. 25,) but that it rather brings it to perfection. Bengel: Vita æterna confluens talium fontium imo oceanus, (eternal life the confluence of such springs, yea, an ocean.)

V. 15. The woman has again missed the spiritual sense, except that she has so far been reached by the words, v. 14,

that she infers from them that a water is spoken of, after using which thirst shall no longer be felt. Analogous is the request of the people, ch. vi. 34.

V. 16–18. Why did Jesus wish the husband also to be called? Shall we say, that he anticipated that he would prove more intelligent? If we consider that, according to v. 18, Jesus knew that it was not her husband, we will be led to the view that he did so to afford an opportunity to the woman of making a confession, with the design of arousing in her a feeling of guilt, which, when aroused, even in ruder natures, calls forth soonest the desire and susceptibility for higher truths, (Zwingle, Calvin, Melancthon.) It nevertheless has been objected by Strauss, that the procedure of our Lord seems to fail of its aim; for the woman, v. 19, (as is assumed in Strauss' exposition,) diverges from the ungrateful theme, and instead of pursuing the contemplated aim further, Jesus enters upon her question. This certainly seems to throw doubt upon the view mentioned, but what if Christ regarded the question of such a character as that by its answer a yet higher aim might be reached?—as by it, indeed, the conversation was actually put upon a spiritual basis. Besides, may we not say, that in the "all things that ever I did," there lies a confession of guilt? It may, indeed, be understood as a mere exhibition of her astonishment at Christ's prophetic endowment, yet the expression rather leads to the supposition that a consciousness of her evil actions had been aroused in the woman. In what, then, did her guilt consist? It seems clear that *καὶ νῦν ὃν ἔχεις κτλ.* refers to an illicit connection. But how is it with the five husbands, were they separated because of her disorderly life? or were they also paramours, as Chrysostom and Calvin suppose, (cf. the exposition which is given by Matthies, in his commentary on 1 Tim. iii. 2.) The latter view is not favored by the expression, since in that case it would rather be *καὶ αὐτὸς δὲ ὃν νῦν ἔχεις κτλ.* Probably Grotius is right, in thinking that the woman herself had deserted the first ones, (an abuse in opposition to the law, which first spread itself in the later time,) and the sixth was not her husband, because she was not legally divorced from the earlier ones. *Καλῶς*, perhaps, ironical. *Ἀληθές* as predicate of *τοῦτο*, in the sense of the adverb, Winer, § xvii. 9. We

have here an instance of a prophetic knowledge of Christ, which enters into details, somewhat like Mark xiv. 13. To what extent we are to suppose in the Redeemer a prophetic knowledge of this sort in regard to particulars, is difficult to determine.

V. 19, 20. That the woman makes such a sudden transition to this remote subject, may be accounted for, as already remarked, by her wish to avoid an unpleasant topic. It is possible, however, that she was actually concerned to see a reliable settlement of that mooted question on which the enmity of the two nations rested. Gerizim, lying by the road and meeting the eye, would the more readily prompt the query. The "fathers" are the immediate ancestry back to the time of Nehemiah. John Hyrcanus, about 129 B. C. had destroyed the temple, but an altar had again been reared, and the Samaritans of the present day still pray upon this mountain. (Robinson.)

V. 21, 22. While Christ maintained the law to the end of his life, and enjoined obedience to the commands of the scribes, (Matt. xxiii. 3,) his prophetic glance beheld in the future the time when the spirit would throw off these fetters and create a new form for itself. Analogous with this is the prohibition laid upon the Apostles of extending their operations beyond Israel, (Matt. x. 5,) together with the prophecies of the reception of the Gentiles, (see on x. 16.) The abrogation of the Jewish law is also intimated by the Synoptists, Luke v. 36, seq. Mark ii. 28. It is surprising, to be sure, that Jesus presents in explicit terms before this woman the highest point of view, yet we must confess that the occasion offered by this question was not less fitting than that given by the question of the scribes, Luke v. 33, and can it be properly said that the position of those scribes was much higher than that of this Samaritan woman? Certainly the reply of our Lord at that time must have sounded in their ears, as well as in those of the Disciples, like words in an unknown tongue. Yet who would deny that those very words, after they had long slumbered in the souls of the hearers uncomprehended, may have become things of life at a later epoch of development?—Our Lord commences his discourse in an exceedingly solemn manner. By the prefatory words: "believe me," the object is characterized

as one in which the natural course of things would be in the highest degree improbable and unexpected. *Τῷ πατρί*, Bengel: familiarissime ad arcem fidei admittit mulierem, (he admits the woman most familiarly to the citadel of the faith.) The God whom the Samaritans worship is designated in the same way as in Acts xvii. 23. The Samaritans acknowledged the Pentateuch only, and as they were destitute of the Prophets and Psalms, they wanted not only the complete development of theological truth, but especially also the entire compass of the Messianic prophecies. God was consequently for them in a certain degree an unknown God, hence also the neut. *ὅ*, "a Being whom ye know not." De Wette pronounces this exposition "entirely false," and gives (as Bengel had already done,) this sense, "ye worship, and thereby do ye know not what." But how can this lie in the words?—Under the *ἡμεῖς*, Jesus embraces himself as well as the Jews—could he be *man* in fact, without belonging to a distinct *nationality*? *Προσκυνεῖν* here with accus., subsequently, v. 23, with dative. Salvation was to come from the lineage of David, and by consequence from the Jews; they could not, therefore, remain without an accurate knowledge of God. Christ speaks to foreigners in a more exalted way of the national importance of the Jewish people, than he does to that people itself.

V. 23, 24. As v. 21, 22, have expressed negatively the essence of the future worship of God, it is now expressed with equal solemnity, in v. 23, 24, in a positive manner. This time is yet future, but to the same extent to which the spiritual life has already begun, (ch. v. 25,) the spiritual worship also has. *Πνεῦμα*, as what follows proves, presents itself as the leading idea. Some take it objectively, as designating the Holy Spirit as the elemental principle of worship, *ἀλ.* then, according to some, Christ, the absolute truth, (Athanasius, Ambrose, Basil, Bengel;) according to others, "spirit and truth," designates the frame of mind in which the worship is offered, the spirit of faith and prayer, and the uprightness of the intention, (Luther, Melancthon, Bucer, Calvin.) But the axiom, v. 24, that the *mode of worship* must correspond with the *essence* of God, as also v. 21, 22, clearly shows that to the outer sanctuary the inner sanctuary of the human spirit is opposed, as Augustine says:

In templo vis orare, in te ora, (you wish to pray in the temple, pray in yourself.) So also Chrysostom. And yet more unmistakably is this apprehension of it justified by ἀληθείᾳ presenting itself epexegetically, which just as strongly as in ch. i. 17, designates as the absolutely highest, this species of divine worship, in antithesis to the Old Testament σκιά, (shadow.) It certainly seems now as though these words authorized a mysticism which rejects every species of outward worship. But we are to distinguish between an external cultus, which has been enjoined with the design of a preparatory discipline to advance men toward that which is internal, and train them for it, (such a cultus is certainly superfluous in the measure to which Christ is formed in believers,) and a cultus which can only be regarded as piety representing itself outwardly—and such a cultus will not be wanting, even in the most spiritual Christian. While the cultus of the former kind pertains to the legal point of view, the latter corresponds with the spiritual point of view of the New Testament, (2 Cor. iii. 6.)

V. 25, 26. The language of the woman shows, that for the time this word also of our Lord remained closed to her. Nevertheless, the Redeemer had opened up a sublime religious prospect in the future, on this she keeps her thought, and connects it with the instruction which was to be obtained from the Messiah. As the Samaritans acknowledged only the books of Moses, they may perhaps have linked their Messianic expectations with Deut. xviii. 18, in accordance with which they would be obliged to regard the Messiah rather in the light of a divinely illuminated teacher. He is, in fact, delineated more as a prophet, than as a king, in the letters sent to England in 1718, by the modern Samaritans, (Repert. für bibl. u. morgenl. Litteratur. B. ix. p. 28.)[1] As the Saviour but rarely discovers himself in his Messianic character, (cf. John ix. 37, with Matt. xvi. 20,) yet in this particular case has no scruple in doing so, he acts, perhaps, with a reference to this very disposition of the Samaritans to intermingle less of political anticipation. Lücke maintains that the form ἐγώ εἰμι is in classic style incon-

[1] If we could regard the Carmina Samaritana, edited by Gesenius, Leipzig, 1824, as expressing their ancient views, they would argue in general for a spiritualistic direction on the part of the Samaritans. But traces of Mohammedan speculation and theosophy can be shown in these poems.

ceivable, and would derive it from the Hebrew, although elsewhere he observes that it differs from אֲנִי הוּא. But how could "ich bin *es*," (I am *he*,) be expressed in Greek and Latin otherwise than by ἐγώ εἰμι, ego sum?

V. 27–29. The Oriental contempt for woman appears with special strength in the Rabbins; the tract, Kidduschin, f. 17, says: "R. Samuel observes: No man salutes a woman," and tract. Sota, f. 20: "He who instructs his daughter in the law is as one who plays the fool."—The reverential timidity of the Disciples, mentioned in v. 27, furnishes a hint as to the relation in which they stood to our Lord; we see their consciousness of their distance from him, (xxi. 12.) That the impression made upon the woman was no ordinary one, may be seen in the fact that *she*, in *her* zeal, forgot her occupation, as Jesus in his had forgotten his need, and leaving her water-pot she hastens to the city to associate others with herself in the blessing of which she had been made partaker. We see, too, what part of the conversation had made the greatest impression upon her, to wit: that this man had disclosed the course of her life. That she still did not trust her own judgment as to his Messiahship, cannot seem strange, after that ignorance of divine things which she had previously made so manifest.

V. 30–34. The act of going out is in v. 30 expressed in the aorist; the act of coming, in the imperfect, as during the coming the conversation which follows took place. The Disciples here display precisely the same incapacity of soaring from the sensuous to the spiritual, which had been displayed by the woman. Already, while in conversation with the Samaritan woman, and yet more, when he beheld the Samaritans streaming forth from the city, the prophetic glance in the spirit of the Redeemer opened upon the future spiritual harvest among this people. With this thought he strengthened his soul. It now throws into the background his need of food, as it had previously his need of water.—In ἵνα the final idea is adhered to, in so far as it can express the *striving* to do the divine will, but in the later Greek it undoubtedly is used as a mere circumscription of the infinitive, as Origen also, has here τοῦ ποιῆσαι, see on i. 27.

V. 35. In the kingdom of nature there lies a great interval

between seed time and harvest. Christ's sowing, short as is the time, commences already to ripen. Ὑμεῖς λέγετε, "Say ye," points to a proverbial expression, so that the present tense expresses the *habit*, (Matt. xvi. 2.) The proverb is usually regarded as a comforting assurance for the waiting husbandman, that the harvest is not far off; but on this view the antithesis is less clear, which, nevertheless, is strongly indicated by the "*behold.*" Maldonatus more correctly considers it a phrase with which the farmer averse to labor comforts himself, like: adhuc seges in herba est, (the crop is still in the blade;) the ἔτι shows, too, that the interval is to be regarded as long. The sowing in Palestine went on from the beginning of November; the harvesting of the barley did not take place till in the middle of April, consequently *about* four months lay between seed time and harvest. As our Lord points them to the fields, it is highly probable that it was just then seed time; and we are thus furnished with the date, to wit: that Jesus had remained in Judea from April, when the Passover occurred, until in November. "I say" forms the antithesis to "ye say." In a spiritual sense, the seed fields are already ripe, for the Sichemites are approaching through them.

V. 36, 37. Beyond doubt, the approaching Samaritans themselves were, v. 35, already designated as a harvest; just as clearly evident, however, is it from the words that follow, that the Saviour regarded this harvest only as the beginning; in relation, consequently, to the far greater harvest which was close at hand, and which was allotted to the Apostles, (cf. xiv. 12, xii. 24,) he designates himself rather as the sower. It is, indeed, in other cases true, that higher joy is destined for the reaper than for the sower, but not in this instance, for as the fruit falls to the share of Christ himself, he shares in their joy as he had shared in the labor with them, yea, preëminently for them had undertaken these labors, (v. 38.) Ἵνα designates the *objective* aim, and consequently characterizes this result as designed of *God*. Men are the grain; eternal life, in which the redeemed are, as it were, placed in security, the granary, (ch. xv. 16, Matt. xiii. 30, Rom. i. 13.) The thought expands itself into a glance at the relation of the entire operations of the Apostles to those of our Lord; in the entire work of the Apostles his appearing and his

work in humanity were necessarily presupposed, (xiv. 12.) Ἐν in v. 37, equivalent to "*in*," as ix. 30, "in this department of the spiritual harvest." Λόγος denotes proverb; among the Greeks, also, we have the same one which is mentioned here, ἄλλοι μὲν σπείρουσ', ἄλλοι δ' αὖ ὀμήσονται: "Some sow, others again reap."—The article before ἀληθινός presents a difficulty, and as in Cod. G K L it is probable that on account of this very difficulty it is omitted, we must seek an explanation of it. If it is a predicate, we must translate: "here is that proverb true, that is, verifies itself." If it is adjective, we must interpret it: "here that true proverb is in place," (2 Peter ii. 22.) In both cases ἀληθινός appears to be used for ἀληθής, as in xix. 35, yet it may be made a question whether the Evangelist did not perhaps mean to say: "here only, that is under these circumstances of a spiritual nature, that proverb verifies itself in the highest sense," (Olshausen.)

V. 38. The Saviour regards the impression which would be left among this people by his meeting the Samaritans, as the basis of their subsequent conversion and introduction into the Church. From Acts viii. 14, their willingness appears to have been unusually great, and as it was John who was deputed to go from Jerusalem to them, we can the more readily understand that this expression of our Lord had in his eyes a special importance. The use of the plural ἄλλοι creates some surprise, but is sufficiently explained by the reference to the preceding proverb.

V. 39–42. We witness here among the people an extraordinary impulse toward faith, and a readiness for it, by which the strong and joyous hopes previously expressed by the Saviour are justified. It is worthy of notice, that no miracle on the part of Christ is mentioned, that on the contrary the mere *word* leads them to recognize in him the Redeemer; λαλία is perhaps with design employed instead of λόγος—(though Beza contends for the contrary,) as Calvin says: "videntur jactare, sibi solidius jam esse fundamentum, quam in lingua mulieris, quæ ut plurimum futilis esse solet," (they seem to glory that they have now a firmer basis than a woman's tongue, which is usually very unreliable.) In the expression ὁ σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου, "the Saviour of the world," is signified the

universality of the Messiah's destination. That the people actually employed this expression, cannot be maintained positively; nevertheless, this very destination of a universal character was, on the ground of the Old Testament prophecies, acknowledged by every pious Israelite, (Luke ii. 32.)

The mythical exposition which in this narrative is a complete failure, was dropped by Strauss in his third edition, (in the fourth taken up again!) The delineation of the woman's character is in fact so individualizing, her various expressions which are detailed are so consonant with her character, that they alone are enough to induce us to the recognition of a historical fact. As regards, however, the remarks made by Jesus in this conversation, the scruple may be raised against their historical truth: first, that the Disciples were not present when they were uttered; in the next place, that the woman had not the capacity to repeat words which she did not at all understand; and finally, that there appears no motive why Christ should repeat them to his Disciples. In spite of this difficulty, even De Wette acknowledges features of psychological truthfulness, and that very declaration of Christ, whose meaning must have been most inaccessible to the woman, v. 21–23, he declares to be "indubitably genuine." We suggest the question, whether v. 27, which implies a desire on the part of the Disciples to know what had passed in the conversation, does not give support to the opinion that Jesus himself made the communication to his Disciples? As the woman had narrated to her countrymen the part of the conversation which was most striking and intelligible to her, as this very communication, moreover, had produced a great impression upon them, (v. 29, 39,) the desire of the Disciples must have been increased the more, and there seems accordingly to have been a sufficient motive for Christ's repeating what had passed.

SECOND MIRACLE OF CHRIST IN GALILEE. — V. 43–54.

V. 43–45. The sentiment which in Luke iv. 24, Matt. xiii. 57, was expressed by the Saviour, with special reference to Nazareth, rests upon an observation of the fact, that men are altogether disinclined to acknowledge anything extraordinary

in those whose development in the natural way they have witnessed, and whom they have been accustomed to regard as equals. While, however, the observation of this fact must have deterred Jesus from returning to Galilee, it is, nevertheless, as it seems, adduced as a *reason* for his return. The following may be specially mentioned as unsatisfactory expedients of the older writers to get rid of the difficulty: *First*, *Πατρίς* is taken as native *town*, so that the meaning is: "he went to Galilee, to wit: to *Cana*, (v. 46,) but not to Nazareth, for a prophet, &c."—(Cyrill, Calvin, Beza, Piscator, Grotius, Olshausen.) *Second*, *Πατρίς* is Judea, where Jesus was born, (Origen, Maldonatus, Lücke, 2d ed., Ebrard, Kritik d. ev. Gesch. i. 350.) Amid the many exceptions to which these, in common with each and all the expedients resorted to, were open, arose even a doubt whether these words could have proceeded from John. Strauss, in the extremest perplexity, has advanced the assertion, that the anonymous Evangelist having learned something by hearsay of Christ having expressed such a sentiment, has here at random inserted it, "in such a way, to be sure, as to show that he could have no definite idea in his mind." To impute a proceeding so perfectly senseless to an author whose taste and talent are conceded by Strauss himself, was certainly a conclusion too monstrous. Schweizer thinks that Judea is here presupposed as the *πατρίς*, "country" of Jesus; but this is so different from the genuine John, that it would give some justification to the idea that the paragraph which follows is a Galilean interpolation in the Gospel of John. According to Bauer, also, the Evangelist considers Judea as the "country"—but only "from an esthetic mode of viewing history, according to which Judea alone was worthy to be regarded as the native country of Jesus." A solution has, however, been suggested by Neander, against which neither Strauss (3d ed., retracted in the 4th ed.) nor Schweizer knows what objection to urge. Neander's view is, that in v. 44 it is assigned as a reason for the return of Jesus, that the Galileans had become more inclined to faith, through the miracles which had been witnessed in Jerusalem, a view which goes on the presumption that Jesus during his abode in Galilee, mentioned ii. 12, had performed no miracle. The Evangelist in this case certainly expresses his meaning

very obscurely; the objection, too, may be urged, as Bauer has done, that according to iv. 12, the return to Galilee seems to have been brought about by the danger which threatened him in Judea. A solution was first given by myself in the fifth edition of this Commentary, which has since, with some modifications, been adopted by De Wette and Lücke. In Greek, *γάρ*, whether used as *argumentative* or as *explanatory*, sometimes precedes the sentence which contains the argument or explanation, (Hartung, Patikellehre, i. p. 467.) If we now translate *γάρ*, "namely, to wit," v. 44 then serves to indicate why the Evangelist attributes the faith of the Galileans to their having seen the miracles performed in Jerusalem, namely, to show that this readiness was not in contradiction with the earlier words of Christ. *Ἐμαρτύρησεν* is to be taken as pluperfect; *αὐτός* shows that this observation was not a merely derisive one made by others.

V. 46–53. Those who had been at the feast had extended the fame of Jesus so widely, that a certain functionary of the king's court, or military officer, (for the word *βασιλικός* can mean either,) was induced to seek his aid. This man appears to have been one of the officers of Herod Antipas, and was either a Jew or a proselyte to Judaism. The words addressed to him, as the man already possesses a degree of faith, seem the more harsh, as Jesus in the case of a man hitherto unknown to him, could not well utter the reproach of want of faith in his words, as he does in the case of the Jews, (x. 38.) But as the faith of this man rested merely upon hearsay in regard to the miraculous works of Jesus, it was naturally weak, and it was not a religious want, but simple necessity, which had led him to Jesus; that faith in the proper sense was a result of the miracle, is shown by v. 53. Our Lord consequently reproaches him, that he had been led to come to him, not by the need of the heart, but by the need of a miracle. The words of reproof looked like putting him off; the man, therefore, begs that Jesus would not interpose a longer and critical delay. Yet more wonderfully than the suppliant anticipated, did the miraculous power of our Lord display itself; Jesus performs the cure by a power operating at the distance between Cana and Capernaum; cf. on miracles of this class, Krabbe, Leben

Jesu, p. 285, seq. In this very way, however, a severer test of the father's faith was made. He endures the test, goes his way, and the rejoicing servants, unable to wait for the time of his arrival, announce to him what has occurred, and in the very same words in which it has been foretold by the Lord. The question of the father, v. 52, proves that he was concerned not merely about the result of the curing, but also about the confirmation of his faith in Jesus. The fact, also, that he leads his family to acknowledge the Lord, speaks for the liveliness of the impression he had received. — Impartial critics like Lücke and Neander have acknowledged that this narrative is not identical with the one in Matt. viii. 5, and Luke vii. 2, as Strauss, Weiss, Gfrörer, have recently maintained, and that it is not, appears especially from this, that in Matt. (viii. 10, 11,) and Luke, the centurion is designated as a model of faith, while on the contrary, the royal officer here is represented as one whose faith is weak. Nor would John have been likely to narrate this particular miracle, with which no discourses are linked, had it been identical with one already familiar from the tradition.

V. 54. *Πάλιν δεύτερον* is meant to refer adjectively to *σημεῖον*, (xxi. 16.) According to the explicit observation in ii. 11, the meaning of the Evangelist must be, that this is the second miracle in Galilee, which harmonizes with the presupposition which v. 45 presents, that during his first appearance in Galilee no other miracle than the one in Cana was performed. The Evangelist, moreover, regards it as worthy of note, that *this* Galilean miracle also occurred in Cana. That meaning is, indeed, not clearly expressed; by forcing the words the meaning may be put upon them, that Jesus designed to make Galilee alone the theatre of his miracles. Induced by his interest in making out this narrative to be a Galilean interpolation, Schweizer has actually maintained this.

CHAPTER V.

THE HEALING OF THE SICK MAN AT THE POOL OF BETHESDA ON THE SABBATH.—v. 1–15.

V. 1. WHILE in John *μετὰ τοῦτο* marks the immediate consecution of events, *μετὰ ταῦτα* links together facts more remote from each other in point of time, (Lücke.) The weight of testimony for the reading *ἑορτὴ* without an article is decisive, (Griesbach, Lachmann.) Were the article genuine, we would be compelled to regard the chief festival, that is the Passover, as the one meant. If it is not genuine, the Passover *may* be meant, but so also may some other feast. As, namely, the genitive *τῶν Ἰουδαίων* is already sufficiently definitive, the article may be dispensed with before *ἑορτὴ*, (Winer, p. 118;) it is wanting even without such a genitive in Matt. xxvii. 15, Mark xv. 6, where, nevertheless, the Passover is meant. If the Evangelist here means the Passover, then four Passovers are mentioned by him, (ii. 13, v. 1, vi. 4, xiii. 1,) and the time of Christ's ministry is made to extend over more than three years. The majority of expositors think the Passover is meant, thus Irenæus, [Eusebius,] Luther, Scaliger, Grotius, Lightfoot, [Hengstenberg.] Against this view, however, the following difficulties may be urged: 1) that then too contracted a range of events falls between the two Passovers, ch. v. 1 and vi. 4; 2) that as Jesus, when the Passover mentioned, vi. 4, was observed, did not go to the feast, and not till he again, ch. vii., goes to the feast of Tabernacles, a year and a half would have elapsed without his appearing at the feast, a thing hardly to be supposed, (Hug.) *Hardly* to be supposed—and yet it is not impossible, see on vi. 4, and vii. 1, 2. The first argument would have weight only in case the Evangelist had intended to

give a full biography. As Christ returned to Galilee at the beginning of the winter, the supposition is most natural that this feast was the Passover which occurred the following spring. Since Kepler, the feast of Purim is the one which has been specially advocated, (Hug, Meyer, Olshausen, Neander.[1]) But the positive arguments of Hug will not stand the proof, and *against* this view are these facts: 1) that this feast falls a month before the Passover, and it is not probable that Jesus, if he attended the Passover mentioned, vi. 4, then returned to Galilee; or if he did not attend it, that he neglected the leading festival, and repaired to a feast not established in the Old Testament, but only in the ordinance of the later Judaism. It is true, the reply may be made, that he attended the feast of Dedication, chap. x. 22, which was not required by the law; but it is to be observed that he was on that occasion already in Jerusalem, and did not go there for the purpose of attending that feast; 2) as the feast of Purim was not necessarily kept in the capital, but could be observed any where, there would seem to be so much the less motive for a journey to *this* feast. The supposition that it was the feast of Pentecost, (Cyrill, Chrysostom, Erasmus, Bengel,) or the feast of Tabernacles, (Cocceius,) is irreconcilable with the date which iv. 35 furnishes, since the former occurs fifty days after Easter, and the latter in autumn.

V. 2. A learned dissertation on this passage by Joh. Conr. Hottinger, may be found in the Thesaurus Novus Philol. et Theol. T. ii. p. 476. The Evangelist says "now there *is*," from which the inference might be drawn that Jerusalem was standing when he wrote, (thus Bengel;) the explanation, however, is that this pool remained after the destruction of the city, in fact it was still pointed out in the time of Tertullian and even of Eusebius.[2] *Πύλῃ* is to be supplied after *προβατικῇ*, Nehem. iii. 1, 32, xii. 39. *Ἡ ἐπιλεγομένη*, for which Cod. D reads *λεγομένη*, indicates an additional name, and such the word Bethesda shows itself according to its meaning בֵּית חַסְדָּא

[1] Neander feels that every thing else favors the supposition that it was the Passover, and is led to the supposition that it was the feast of Purim only by the want of the article, (Leben Jesu, 3d ed. p. 434; Tr. 217.)

[2] Might not the present, perhaps, be used simply for the vividness with which the object is present to the mind's eye? cf. 1 John iv. 17.

(Syr.) "house of mercy, place of grace." By porches we are not to understand mere colonnades *open* at the sides, but along the one side might run a wall, as was the case with the porch (*ποικίλη*,) at Athens; we may either suppose them to have been covered rows of columns inclosing the pool, in the form of a pentagon, and giving shelter to the sick, or possibly in accordance with the later usage of *στοά*, suppose them to have been bathing houses close by the pool. The identity with the ancient Bethesda, of the deep reservoir in Jerusalem, which in our day bears the name of Bethesda or sheep-pool, Robinson regards as improbable, and is more inclined to find it in the intermitting Fountain of the Virgin, on the south-eastern slope of the Temple Mount, (Palästina, B. 2, p. 136, seq. 158, seq.; Biblical Researches, (1856,) vol. i. 293, 330.) From v. 7, and the close of v. 3, it appears that this spring probably was gaseous, and bubbled at intervals; nothing is said to show whether *κατὰ καιρόν* refers to *regular* periods. There is a gaseous spring of this kind in Kissingen, for example, which after a rushing sound *about* the same time every day commences to bubble, and is most efficacious at the very time the gas is making its escape. Eusebius, in his Onomasticon, ed. Bonfrère, p. 41, mentions that in his time two pools by the name of Bethesda were pointed out, the water of one of which at times became red in a singular way; this would indicate mineral properties.

V. 3, 4. Not merely persons afflicted with diseases of the lighter sort, but even the blind were found there—among the blind, however, are to be included the various classes of sufferers with ophthalmic diseases; the gas spring at Kissingen, of which we have just spoken, is especially used in diseases of the eye. Among the "withered" we are to comprehend the paralytic, a class to which, indeed, the sick man whom Jesus cured belonged, for paralysis is sometimes produced by extraordinary debilitation of the muscles, that is by a *dwindling* of them.

Cod. B & C* omit v. 4 and the close of v. 3; some Coptic MSS. also, and Nonnus, Cod. C, and some of the less important MSS. omit v. 4. Most of the Minusc. mark it with asterisks, that is, with the sign of its being suspicious, or with the obelus, the sign of spuriousness; the last words of v. 3, *ἐκδεχ. —κίνησιν*, are wanting in A. L. 18. On the other hand, this

passage is found in the ancient Vulgate and Peschito versions, and so early as Tertullian. In recent times, Bretschneider in his Probabilia, and Bauer, in order to help out the position that the Gospel is spurious, have been decidedly for the genuineness of this passage, and De Wette has been inclined to the same view; since Mill, the other expositors have decided for the spuriousness of it. Notwithstanding the antiquity of the witnesses which accredit the passage, we must adopt the latter view, particularly when regard is had to the numerous variations in those which have the passage, and to the fact that no reason for the omission can be given, (compare what Lücke, 3d ed. urges against De Wette and Bauer.) As Tertullian, Chrysostom, and others, find a symbol of the baptismal water in this water so wonderfully impregnated with divine power, a dogmatic interest would rather have led to the retention than to the exclusion of the passage; we think, therefore, that the addition originated with some reader in Palestine, who held the opinion that angels preside over the particular powers of nature. The idea of angel, and the modern idea of power, run into each other in the Old Testament, for originally, מַלְאָךְ is an abstract form, legatio, a *beaming forth* of God; cf. Rev. xvi. 5.

V. 5. Luther and most others unite ἔχειν ἐν τῇ ἀσθενείᾳ equivalent to ἀσθενῶς ἔχειν, "who had been sick thirty-eight years," to which De Wette objects, that *then* the part. præs. ἔχων would not be proper. But the participle present stands with the perfect, when the action is considered as continuing, (Buttman, 15th ed. p. 433; 18th ed. translated by Edward Robinson, p. 400.) The interpretation of De Wette, is however, certainly admissible: "who had passed eight and thirty years in the sickness," (*that* sickness;) the article "the" (that) carries in it a reference to the diseases mentioned in v. 3.

V. 6, 7. Πολὺν χρόνον ἔχει cannot, according to the usage of the language, refer to the age of the man, but refers to the time spent in a certain condition, either in sickness or in lying there. Moved with compassion, Christ asks him whether he wishes to be healed, a question designed either to arouse and thereby fix the attention of the sick man, perhaps of the bystanders also, or designed also to mediate the healing efficacy

of Jesus; cf. Mark x. 51. Among the curiosities of interpretation, that of Dr. Paulus deserves mention, which supposes the man to have been a beggar too lazy to work, to whom Jesus says: Are you really *willing* to be cured?

V. 8, 9. The miraculous character of the cure is made more apparent by the ability of the cripple at once to carry his couch with him. In order to make the reader feel more vividly the greatness of the miracle, the result is related by the Evangelist in the very same words which Jesus had employed. It was this carrying of the couch, too, which furnished the occasion for the charge of a breach of the Sabbath.

Against the internal probability of the whole narrative, Bauer has urged with great assurance a series of difficulties, in which he had been preceded by Bretschneider, in his Probabilia, in fact by the audacious Woolston. One of these is so startling as to deserve some notice. It is asked, whether it is credible that no one should, for so long a time, have exercised compassion, and put the man into the water; whether, in fact, the man must not have had persons to carry him daily to the place, and who might, consequently, have helped him into the water? If the text asserted that for *thirty-eight years* he had found no such helping hand, the whole matter would certainly be rendered incredible. This is not said in the text, however, and many circumstances suggest themselves by which the difficulty is relieved. We are not told how long the sick man had been in the habit of lying near the pool, and whether he did so *daily*, nor whether the fountain gushed up daily, or only after long intervals; it is not necessary to suppose that he was always carried, for according to v. 7, he could move himself. Was this perhaps a place where those who went to the temple were in the habit of giving alms, so that for this reason many sick persons staid there? &c.

V. 10–13. The Gemara forbids healing on the Sabbath, except where life is in peril, (Matt. xii. 11, 12,) much more the carrying of a bed. By "the Jews" it would seem (v. 15, 33,) we are to understand members of the Sanhedrim, those who had just witnessed the healing and heard the words of Jesus. The answer of the sick man who had been healed, v. 11, shows that he recognized in the worker of the miracle a prophet; he

attaches more importance to *his* word than to that of the rulers. In the cases of healing narrated in the synoptical Gospels, Jesus frequently withdraws from the multitude or forbids the making known of what he has done. Were the Disciples of Jesus perhaps not present, so that the man healed could obtain no account from them in regard to Christ's person, or was it that Christ withdrew himself so quickly from his eyes?

V. 14, 15. As the man who had been healed repairs to the temple, we may conclude that his soul was under religious impulse; it is possible that the warning of Jesus had in view some definite moral delinquency of the man, from which his disease had proceeded as a natural result, (Luke v. 20;) as, however, all sickness and all evil has for its object the "chastening" of man, the warning of the Saviour can be explained without that assumption. From what has preceded, it is to be inferred that the man who had been healed did not make mention of Jesus' name to the authorities with a bad motive; he only desired to show them the obedience which was due them, (Bengel,) and perhaps indulged the hope of making a better impression upon them (Euthymius, Calvin, Bucer,) thereby.

VINDICATION OF JESUS IN REGARD TO THE CURE ON THE SABBATH.—v. 16–30.

V. 16–18. In consequence of this, the members of the Sanhedrim again appear upon the stage, to call Jesus to account. The observance of the Sabbath was grounded upon God's resting on the seventh day, by which, however, was only meant that God ceased to create any thing new. With profound truth the Saviour now points to the fact, that therein is involved no cessation of *activity*, (Psalm cxlvii. 8,) which daily, and consequently on the Sabbath too, is renewed. As Christ, elsewhere in John, in what he does exhibits himself as the mirror of the Father, so he does here. Although in the Old Testament, in some few passages, God is designated as the father of the people, it was an unusual thing for an individual Israelite to employ this name; wherever Christ uses it, he alludes to a special relation to the Father, Luke ii. 49, Matt.

xviii. 35, hence the charge of blasphemy which the Jews bring. On ἴδιος, cf. Rom. viii. 32.

V. 19, 20. As in the discourses of Christ recorded by John, it is usual with our Saviour to confirm what has given offense to those who opposed him, and then to state it still more strongly, (viii. 58, x. 32, seq.) so is it here. Luther says: "An admirable apology, which makes the matter worse." What he affirms of himself, v. 17, in a single respect, in v. 19 he maintains of himself in all respects; confirms it, v. 20, by the thought that the bond of love between the Father and Son is the ground of the continued communication, and strengthens it by the prospect that this connection with the Father would be made manifest by yet higher operations than the healing which just occurred, (Zwingle.) It is to be observed here (see i. 51, iii. 13,) how much the thought is accommodated to the sphere of the image, the sphere of the figure. In the words, "of himself," De Wette finds "an obscure, partial reference to the human in the incarnate Logos, for inasmuch as the Son unites in himself divinity and humanity, his bent and will are also divine, and the antithesis 'of himself' with God, cannot take place." But as the term "Son" designates the human individual absolutely united with God, so is there a possibility, though purely an abstract one, that this individual will may detach itself from its basis and oppose it; comp. vii. 17. The "can do nothing" is a moral inability based in the will of the Son. Bengel: hoc gloriæ est, non imperfectionis, "this is a feature of glory, not of imperfection." Τούτων, "those," v. 20, refers to the cure which Christ had just wrought under the impulse and after the likeness of the Father. It may be doubted (see Beza,) whether ἵνα is not merely ecbatic, Rev. xiii. 3, (see Tholuck on Romans iii. 19,) yet certainly its use as telic can also be justified.

From the separate manifestations of miraculous power, the discourse leads to the great and peculiar work of Christ, the quickening anew of man, with which the judgment is to be regarded as connected, (v. 21–23.) This internal requickening, which is the communication of an *eternal* life, has already commenced, (v. 24–27.) Its full realization will accompany the resurrection and the final judgment attending it, (v. 28,

29.)[1] Either because it was thought incongruous that two operations so diverse as bodily and spiritual quickening, should be immediately connected with one another, or because no meaning could be derived from the proposition in regard to Christ as the raiser of the dead, the majority have interpreted the whole passage of the resurrection of the body only, (Beza, Bucer, Storr, Schott, Käuffer, de biblica ζωῇ αἰωνίου notione, Dresd. 1838,)[2] or only of the spiritual moral resurrection, (Eckermann, Ammon, Eichhorn;)[3] on the other hand, the best expositors, Lücke, Neander, Olshausen, De Wette, have returned to the view of Augustine, Calvin, Hunnius and Calovius, that both references are to be retained. Olshausen has, however, on this point, a view peculiar to himself, inasmuch as he refers verse 25 to the so-called resurrection of the righteous, to the raising of the bodies of those who have heard the word of God and attained to regeneration, so that not until v. 28, 29, does the discourse turn upon the general resurrection.—Not merely in this passage, but in Paul also, surprise may be excited by the close connection and reciprocal dependence in which the bodily and the spiritual resurrection are placed. The question hinges upon the idea which we form of the resurrection of the body; were it a purely outward occurrence in the way in which the words of v. 28 depict it, the bond of union between the spiritual and the physical resurrection could here be sought only in the *creative omnipotence;* but starting from the declaration, Rom. viii. 10, 11, which on this point is of such weight, the new investiture with the body is to be regarded as the ultimate point of the working of the principle of redemption. As the soul in the formation of the embryo is the "prius" of it and its shaping principle, thus the spirit of man filled by

[1] In the Freiburger Zeitschr. für Theologie, 2 B. 2 H. there is a treatise, in its essential features worthy of commendation, directed more immediately against Gfrörer, by Maier, entitled: "Exegetico-dogmatic development of the New Testament conceptions *ζωή, ἀνάστασις, κρίσις.*" In regard to the biblical doctrine of the *ζωή*, the treatise of Mau: "on death the wages of sin," 1841, is worthy of special note, particularly the second part, which treats of *life.*

[2] The words "and now is," this view supposes to be uttered with reference to Lazarus, &c. See the refutation in Frommann, l. c. p. 639, and Lücke, 3d ed.

[3] On the opposite side, cf. Suskind "on the expressions of Jesus, in which he attributes to himself the resurrection of the dead," in the Magazin für Dogm. u. Moral St. 10.

Christ forms its new externality. If this view be correct, and this is no place to argue it, the transition from the spiritual to the physical resurrection, and such passages, also, as vi. 39, 44, are still more satisfactorily explained. It is true it must then be conceded, that in vss. 28, 29 the figurative character predominates in the very strongest manner. Yet it does not answer altogether to take the literal meaning, since a hearing of the voice of the Son of man is something which cannot, in the proper sense, be ascribed to the dust which is lying in the graves; cf. on v. 20.

V. 21–23 express also, in general, the thought, that in Christ is the quickening principle, the negative side of which is designated by the "raiseth up," the positive by the "quickeneth." "Whom he will" gives prominence to the perfection of the power, which, however, in the Son as in the Father, is rational and conformed to law, so that it would be but a further explication of the sense to interpret: "and this takes place according to definite laws." This now finds its elucidation in what immediately follows, in regard to "the judgment," for a judgment without a rational rule would be inconceivable; it is, however, here and in v. 27, regarded as the *higher thing* in its relation to the resurrection, for the quickening is but one of the acts embraced under the judicial functions. And when it is denied that the Father judges, it is done in the same way in which, v. 19 and vii. 17, it is denied that the Son can do any thing of himself—to wit: in isolation from the Father, (cf. v. 30.) It imports that the entire activity of God for the human race reveals itself alone through the *mediation of the Son.* From such a unity of power must result an equal recognition of the Father and of the Son on the part of men. What is withheld from the Son, is therewith withheld from the Father also, cf. John xiv. 6, 1 John ii. 23. The older expositors found a difficulty in the designation, "which hath sent him," as if in this connection it expressed too little; cf. however, what is said on ch. iii. 34.

V. 24, 25. After a repetition of the thought, (iv. 14, iii. 36,) that by means of faith the principle of a life is received, which cannot be interrupted by death, with a solemn asseveration the assurance is given, that in this sense the new quickening has

begun. The "condemnation" is here, as in v. 29, the antithesis to the true life, ex notione adjuncta, consequently *κρίνειν* is equivalent to *κατακρίνειν*. That immediately after death the believer participates in the absolute blessedness, (of heaven,) cannot therefore be deduced from these words, but only this, that he is sure of "everlasting life." The older expositors observe that the "passing unto life" is only a present thing to faith, (Zwingle, Beza, Maldonatus;) the more recent, as Calvin had already done, suppose that it already has begun in reality, (Heb. vi. 5;) the latter view certainly is found in 1 John iii. 14, but the former is also correct, insomuch as the absolute realization of "everlasting life" pertains to the world to come, (see on iii. 36;) as too, the "coming into condemnation" is also regarded as future. "The voice," in v. 25, is certainly not equivalent to "my word," in v. 24; it is the resurrection call as in v. 28, but this latter can also be regarded as spiritual. Those are spoken of who by inward sympathy prove themselves Jesus' "own sheep," (x. 3, 14.)

V. 26. As in xi. 25, xiv. 6, vi. 57, xiv. 19, Christ designates his own person as the bearer of life. The first question to be asked is, whether the Father and Son are equal as regards the *possession* of life or as regards the mode of its causation. As "having anything *in one's self*" usually precludes the causality of another, the proposition is almost universally taken in the latter sense, (Euthymius, *πηγάζει*, "he is the fountain;" Bucer, vitam a nullo alio pendentem, "a life dependent on no other person;") and the only difference in the views is as to whether the words refer to the Son as Logos, (i. 4,) (Augustine, Ambrose,) or in his human nature, (Athanasius, Cyrill, Calvin, Beza, Lampe.) The latter question must be decided in favor of the last named view, or at least in conflict with the opposite view, for the term "Son" never designates the Logos in the abstract, (see on i. 18.) And as regards the meaning of the phrase: "to have life in himself," the interpretation: "he is himself the principle of life," is favored not so much by ch. x. 18, to which Lampe refers, as by the analogies of iv. 14, vii. 38, where it is said of believers even, that the life received from Christ becomes an independent principle in them. This thought, too, suits the connection, for a prerogative of the Son

is to be expressed, which is stated yet more strongly in v. 27. Thus the meaning is presented: "The Son is able to consummate this quickening process, inasmuch as he, though conditioned by the absolute causality of the Father, is the self-dependent principle of a creative-spiritual life." Neither, however, is the other interpretation to be rejected, according to which Christ ascribes to himself a *possession of life* coextensive with that of the Father. This view is favored by the usage of the Evangelist, in which ἐν ἑαυτῷ is connected with ἔχειν to indicate an immanent spiritual possession, ch. v. 42, vi. 53, 1 John iii. 15, v. 18. Cf. the Dissertation by Marck in Exercitationes Scripturarum ad loca N. T. n. xii.

V. 27. Here, as in v. 22, the power to execute "judgment" is exhibited as the higher idea, under which falls also the impartation of life. The clause with ὅτι, in which the reason is stated, deserves consideration. It is first of all to be observed, that the omission of the article before υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, decides nothing as to its meaning, as that term, like κύριος and υἱὸς θεοῦ, has become a fixed designation; the article is also omitted before υἱὸς θεοῦ, Matt. xiv. 33, xxvii. 43, Luke i. 35, John xix. 7. This causal connection will be differently understood, as different views are held as to the meaning of υἱὸς ἀ. as a predicate of Christ, (see on i. 52.) If we hold that it means "Messiah," we interpret thus: "because the judgment is an essential part of the Messiah's office," as also it is ascribed in that case to the Messiah, Dan. vii. 12, 13, (Wolf, Lücke, Kuinöl,) whilst Grotius, Lampe, give prominence to the idea "because he humbled himself to become incarnate," in accordance with Philip. ii. 9. As in Hebrews ii. 17, 18, the necessity of having a merciful high-priest is assigned as the reason for the incarnation, several have supposed that here also, where the *Judge* is spoken of, we are to interpret in accordance with that passage: "because the incarnate Messiah will judge men most mildly," (Wetstein, Scholten,)—and this is the view even of such expositors as explain υἱὸς ἀνθρ. of the ideal man, (Olshausen, 3d ed., Neander.) This would certainly be then a strong accommodation, of the same kind as the childlike artless expressions in ch. xiv. 16, which against such opposers would be so little in place that we might rather with Zwingle say: "He gives prominence to his

humanity, that they might be reminded that he who was then speaking with them would one day be their judge." The views just mentioned (with the exception of the very first,) all presuppose that directly or indirectly there lies in the term a reference to the incarnation. We have already, on i. 52, expressed our concurrence in this view, and would with De Wette, with a reference to v. 22, interpret: "because the entire activity of the Father is mediated through the incarnate Logos."

V. 28, 29. A looking forth into the future still further, in which the words "and now is" are not repeated. The restoration of life to the body is one day to take place, in virtue of the immanent principle of the new life which proceeds from Christ; this thought is expressed in the form of an image in prevalent use, a form which is the less to be urged, since elsewhere another mode of presenting the same idea is employed, 1 Cor. xv. 52, 53, 2 Cor. v. 4. The image which "the voice" conveys, is expressed in a manner yet more marked by the "trumpet," 1 Cor. xv. 52, which sounds for the decampment—the intimation, consequently, of a grand catastrophe. The deciding principle is not faith, as might be anticipated, but works, in the same way, however, as in Matt. xxv. 35. From the doctrinal point of view, what Bucer says is correct: Quisque, ut est, ita et operatur, opera de animo testantur, ("as a man is, so he acts, works are the witness of the soul.") Viewed, however, from the position of historical exegesis, it must be added, that the eschatology especially is presented by our Redeemer himself more after the Jewish mode of contemplating it, (Luke xvi.) and that the general idea of future retribution is expressed under various images, which the Apostles then explain in a concrete manner. The genitives *ζωῆς* and *κρίσεως* express what is closely connected with the *ἀνάστασις* and is the sequel of it. If in *ζωή* there lay simply the idea of duration, the force of *κρίσις* would be that of annihilation; as, however, *ζωή* ex adjuncto[1] designates that which corresponds with the true idea of life, and consequently, happy life, (the *true* life on its subjective side, as it enters into self consciousness,) the idea

[1] When Mau, l. c. says, that in using *ζωὴ αἰώνιος*, the vita beata is so far from being a notio secundaria, that on the contrary, the idea of life would be but an imperfect one without this notio, he is correct as regards the *New Testament* idea of *ζωή*.

of the κρίσις is that of misery, 2 Maccab. vii. 9, αἰώνιος ἀναβίωσις ζωῆς, "everlasting (resurrection of) life," and in the same chapter, v. 14, ἀνάστασις εἰς ζωήν, "resurrection to life." As only at this ἀνάστασις a higher perfection is attained, it is called by way of preëminence ἡ ἀνάστασις, (*the* resurrection,) and in Philip. iii. 10, 11, cf. Luke xiv. 14, appears as something given by divine mercy. There is no other passage except Acts xxiv. 15, in which the "resurrection" of the "unjust" is spoken of; cf. Tholuck, Komment. zu Hebr. vi. 2. (Comment. on Ep. to Hebrews, transl. by J. Hamilton, vol. i, p. 246.) The "unjust" are indeed already in this world devoid of the "life," but it is brought to perception only in a negative way; the judgment consists in the perception of this want, as an antitheses to that *which should be*. Herein, *first of all*, is grounded the distinction between the "judgment" in this world, and that in the world to come; with the internal discordance will then also harmonize the external.

V. 30. The aim of the discourse to this point has been to give prominence to the superhuman powers of the Son, and as Christ throughout John, gives prominence to the thought, that in all that he does the Father is the ultimate cause, that consequently, whatever he affirms of himself serves only to glorify the Father, so here he returns to the thought that even in those greatest works the Father is the ultimate cause.

THE UNBELIEF OF THE JEWS REPROVED.—v. 31–47.

V. 31, 32. Although the following discourse treats of a different subject, yet a transition is observable. It lies in v. 30, in his effort to repudiate all self-glorification; with this design our Lord places himself on the same point of view as that of his opposers, who must have been disposed to apply the principle of the civil law to the testimony of the religious self-consciousness. In a happy accommodation to this notion, (which is, however, something more than mere accommodation, see for example ch. xvi. 32,) he shows that in a certain measure he is prepared to satisfy this demand, although on the other side, when his opposers raise the objection in their own person, he rejects it as invalid, (viii. 14;) nevertheless, in that very passage

he afterward condescends to the same accommodation, (viii. 16, 18.) Already in accordance with the analogy of the passage just quoted, the inclination would be felt to understand by the "other witness," the Father, (Cyrill, Augustine, Bengel.) Chrysostom and De Wette prefer, however, here also to understand the allusion as made to the *Baptist;* the latter writer urging this reason, that otherwise the train of thought would be interrupted by the testimony of the Baptist, when on the contrary we would anticipate an advance from the lower to the higher; the words too, "and I know, &c." applied to the Father, would be insipid. On the other hand, this powerful expression of self-witness, (in ch. viii.) resembling the one in vii. 29, argues for the reference to the Father, (iii. 11.) With entire propriety could Christ still further increase the weight of this testimony of the Father, by a juxtaposition of it with that of the Baptist.

V. 33–35. They had themselves desired a testimony, for they had taken the Baptist for the Messiah, and on that account interrogated him; he had only borne a witness of the truth in favor of the truth, (dative commodi.) The Saviour gives himself a place above all prophets, inasmuch as he declines *human* testimony; Bengel: Ego, quicquid sum, id sum citra humanæ auctoritatis beneficium, "whatever I may be, I am such without the aid of human authority." As, however, there was a divine testimony in that of the Baptist, Olshausen thinks that Christ declines that testimony only so far as it is to be considered human. He naturally declines it in that sense in which it had been desired by the Jews; they had sent to John as to a prophet. Christ, nevertheless, for the benefit of the people, wished to mention this testimony. That this testimony actually might have produced great blessings, the words that follow attest.—"He was" implies that the Baptist had already left the stage. The article before λύχνος, according to Bengel, has reference to Ecclesiasticus xlviii. 1, where it is said of Elijah, with whose character the appearing of John corresponded: "Then stood up Elias the prophet as fire, and his word burned like a lamp." But the expression in that passage does not correspond accurately enough with the one in this, nor was it sufficiently known to justify us in expecting any such reference

to it. Lücke, however, starts the question: "Whether from similar descriptions of Elias, a characteristic expression like the one before us may not have been formed with application to John, to which Christ here refers?" De Wette, however, interprets it: "He was *the* burning light, that light, namely, which should have guided you in the way." The "burning" refers not to the ardent zeal, but designates that condition of ignition whose result is the "shining," (Luke xii. 35.) *θέλειν*, not merely "ye were willing," but "it pleased you," (Mark ix. 13, xii. 38.) The emphasis lies not merely on "for a season," but also on "to rejoice." The preacher of repentance should have aroused earnest resolutions; but men sought him from mere curiosity, (Matt. xi. 7.) It is a question to what the words "for a season" refer; we suppose it to allude to the fact, that the throng about John gradually diminished, especially after he had directed attention to Jesus; cf. Mark ix. 13.

V. 36–38. The discourse returns to what had been said in v. 32. In the comparative *μείζω τοῦ Ἰωάννου*, "greater than—of John," is a breviloquence for *τῶν ἔργων τοῦ Ἰ.* "the works of John," as is common in Greek and Hebrew, (Matt. v. 20.) Chap. x. 25, likewise designates the "works" of Christ as the "witness" of the Father. Do the "works" embrace the entire sphere of the Messiah's activity, and consequently comprehend his teaching and his life so as to correspond to the collective *τὸ ἔργον*, xvii. 4? (Stark in the first Excursus to his Paraphr. et Commentar. in Evang. Iohan. chap. 13–17, Jena, 1819; Schott Opuscul. i. p. 216. Lücke, De Wette.) Or are only the *miracles* meant, as also Olshausen recently, appealing to x. 25, xxxii. 38, xiv. 11, maintains? The 20th verse already establishes the first view, as does xiv. 11. The whole work of Christ is accordingly, to the soul that is illumined, a witness that he is from God. In v. 20 he has declared that the greatest works are yet to come, yet there is in the present already a testimony. The *ἐγώ* is not emphatic, and is wanting in Cod. A B D L.—Great difficulty is connected with the decision of the question, whether the witness of the Father, v. 37, is different from that furnished in the works, and how many witnesses consequently are mentioned altogether. Luther and Chemnitz designate as the first witness, v. 35, the Baptist; as the second, v. 36, the

works; as the third, v. 39, the Scriptures; as the fourth, v. 45, Moses. Augustine, Hilary, Maldonatus, Grotius, acknowledge only a two-fold witness, the one in the works, the other in the Scriptures. We first ask, whether the witness, v. 37, is to be regarded as distinct from that in the works? To this is opposed, that the sentence then seems superfluous, and by the words, "which the Father hath given me," the very same thought has been sufficiently expressed, that moreover the *αὐτός* appears to designate a direct witness in distinction from the *ἔργα*; perhaps, too, it is in point to direct attention to the perfect tense *μεμαρτύρηκεν*, while previously *μαρτυρεῖ* had been used. But in what, then, consists this direct testimony? According to Cyrill, Theophylact, Calvin, Cocceius, it is the witness of the prophets, so that v. 39 is a further expansion of the thought, and the intermediate words, according to Calvin, are to be taken thus: "Ye are blind to all the divine forms of revelation, and have not received his word in you." According to Chrysostom, Lampe, Bengel, the allusion is to the direct testimony of God at the baptism and transfiguration of Jesus: "Ye have heard and seen voices and shapes in which the Father made himself known to you, and have not considered, nor have ye at all the word of Scripture in your heart." Lücke (3d ed.) and De Wette regard the word of God as the direct testimony. "For none of the modes of divine revelation have ye the tone of mind, although in my work ye might, as it were, hear God and see him, (Lücke compares xiv. 9,) and ye have not appropriated the direct witness of God in his word." Yet De Wette hesitates very much whether the preference is not to be given to the view of Olshausen, which is, that the witness is not that of Scripture, but of the direct operation of the Spirit of God in man, (vi. 45, 1 John i. 10.) "Neither your internal ear, nor your internal eye is opened to God; ye can have no internal theophanies, as the prophets had, neither have you in you, in an internal manner, that light of God which illumines all men." First of all, we must declare ourselves as opposed to the view that the voice and form of God at Christ's baptism are meant. The expression *εἶδος αὐτοῦ* would be inappropriate; it is, on the whole, a matter of doubt whether spectators were present at the baptism; the *πώποτε* would, on that view,

be used without any motive. But in addition, we cannot bring ourselves to view φωνή and εἶδος in the way assigned as a designation (Crell says "proverbial,") of internal revelation; we believe that then neither the perfects nor the πώποτε would have been used; cf. the perf. in iii. 13, Rom. ix. 19. We must therefore take "voice" and "shape" as the designation of *sensible* revelations of God, as Neander: "It is an unheard of thing, that the voice of God should be sensibly perceived, or his shape sensibly seen." That the fleshly mind of the Jews actually longed for this sort of revelation, is evident from John xiv. 8; the Saviour does not here mean to deny the theophanies, but simply to show what they really are—manifestations, which are not coincident with the reality. For the reasons assigned, we cannot, however, agree with Neander, when by the witness of the Father he understands that which is given in the *works*, (Leben Jesu, 3d ed. p. 440. 4th ed. Transl. by M'Clintock and Blumenthal, p. 221,) but we follow those interpreters who regard it as the testimony given in the divine word, yet so, however, that in accordance with the view peculiar to John's Gospel, it is regarded as a thing which has *already passed over into subjectivity*, as 1 John i. 10 (cf. with v. 8,) indisputably shows. We accordingly paraphrase the passage thus: "But the Father has also given a direct witness in regard to me. Think not in this of palpable testimony, such is not furnished, and ye have never received such, neither have ye embraced his word in your heart, otherwise ye must have felt yourselves impelled to faith in him whom he has sent." It is true that on this supposition the syntactical construction does not correspond with precision to the thought, for we would expect τὸν δὲ λόγον αὐτοῦ δύνασθε ἔχειν ἐν ὑμῖν, but syntactical defects of this kind are frequent in John, thus, (v. 43,) vii. 18, viii. 28, xiv. 10, xvi. 10, 1 John i. 6, 7; especially is xvi. 10 to be compared.

V. 39, 40. Ἐρευνᾶτε, according to Cyrill, Erasmus, Beza, and most interpreters, is in the indicative; according to Chrysostom, Augustine, Calvin. in the imperative. A positive decision for either view cannot be derived from the words; either interpretation is consistent with the sense we give; but ἐρευνᾶν in the indicative means "to indulge in subtle inquiries,

to analyze by the letter," (according to Josephus, De Bello Judaic, ii. chap. viii. § 14, Antiq. xvii. 2, 4, the Pharisees boasted *μετὰ ἀκριβείας ἐξηγεῖσθαι τὰ νόμιμα*, "of the exact skill they had in interpreting the law," but how *ταπεινῶς* (humbly) they proceeded in it, we may gather from the keen reproach of Justin Martyr, Dial. c. Try. who says, they searched out trifles, *τὰ δὲ μεγάλα καὶ ἄξια ζητήματα μήποτε τολμῶσι λέγειν μηδὲ ἐξηγεῖσθαι*, "but they neither dared to speak of nor to investigate great and important questions.") Christ says, *δοκεῖτε*, "ye think," because the sense in which they supposed they possessed eternal life in the Scriptures, was a perverted one; they strove after a dead wisdom of the letter, cf. Romans ii. 18–21, and in the Talmud. Tr. Pirke Aboth: קוֹנֶה לוֹ חַיֵּי עוֹלָם הַבָּא קוֹנֶה לוֹ דִבְרֵי תוֹרָה. "He possesses eternal life who comes to the possession of the words of the law." Compare also, "in whom ye trust," v. 45. If our views be correct, that the word of God, v. 38, is to be regarded as that which has passed over into the subjectivity, it follows that by the witness of the Holy Scriptures we are to understand not merely detached prophecies, but the whole spirit of the Old Testament, which passing over into the individual must beget a longing after Christ. That Christ reproves their want of solicitude in regard to religion, is shown by the words, "that ye might have life." With this corresponds the charge in v. 42, that they were destitute of the love of God, so too, vii. 17. The *καί* in v. 40 is both adversative and copulative, "and yet."

V. 41–44. They had been reproached because they had not the word of God living within them; this is expressed in other words, when it is denied that they have love to God. It is also, however, made conspicuous in their selfish ambition, in which especially their alienation from God displayed itself The older Commentators lose here the thread of the closer connection of ideas. We would state it thus: "The real ground of your not coming to me is, that you do not understand my appearing. I am free from all selfishness, but I perceive of you that ye have no such love of God in you. As only like is drawn by like, ye have not received me; when, on the contrary, others come in their own interest, ye will receive them. Where there is a selfish striving after personal honor, and not

the pure love of God, faith is impossible." A similar train of thought is found in vii. 16–19. *Δόξα* in v. 41–44, vii. 18, viii. 50, Bretschneider translates "applause;" in this sense *δόξα θεοῦ* is also used in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers, and it runs indeed into the other, cf. however, viii. 50, 54. To the striving after human glory is opposed the love of God, for this, as v. 44 points out, involves the striving after glory with God. The foretelling of false Messiahs, corresponding with Matt. xxiv. 23, seq. is deserving of remark. In the course of history, sixty-four of these have appeared; a Bar Cochba found twenty-four thousand adherents. It shows a profound insight into the human heart, when the Saviour deduces the adhesion to false Messiahs from the fact that affinity begets sympathy, when he considers the striving after human glory as the chief cause of unbelief, as following this language of his the Evangelist also does in xii. 43.—The adjective *μόνου* is used as an adverb.

V. 45–47. As in v. 38, vii. 17, 19, Christ points out that the genuine spirit of the Old Testament must also lead to faith in his person. *Κατηγορεῖν* is to be taken ideally, like *κρίνειν* in Matt. xii. 41, 42. If the spirit and the word of Moses lead to Christ, the unbelieving are already judged by Moses. On *ἔγραψεν* the commentators refer to the different Mosaic prophecies, especially to Deuteron. xviii. 18. But the train of thought in our passage leads us to take it in a universal sense, by virtue of which Bengel adds to *ἔγραψεν* a "nusquam non," "he writes everywhere." If v. 46 is interpreted in accordance with v. 38, 39, our Saviour means to say, that a love of God such as the law requires would recognize an affinity in Christ, and would feel itself drawn to him; Bengel: Fide *explicita* opus erat, "an *explicit* faith was needed." There is certainly, however, no necessity for interpreting v. 43 in such strict connection with 38, 39. Christ may have had in his eye the indirect and typical prophecies of Moses, as well as the direct ones.

It is conceded by Strauss, that the matter of this Discourse is in keeping with the character of Christ, as we learn it from the other Evangelists, and with the attendant circumstances; but the form and style become for this very reason the more suspicious, as they have the very closest analogy with the First Epistle of John and with those parts of the Gospel in which the

author speaks, (Leb. Jes. 3d. ed. § 80; 4th ed. § 81.) Weisse's theory is, that we are to regard as an original element all which has affinity to the discourses in the Synoptists, but that even this has been expanded in a theoretical form by the author of this Gospel; according to Bauer, the discourse is a pure invention. Adhering to what we have said in the introduction to this Commentary, we do not contend for the verbal accuracy of the details, but nevertheless would remark, that since the Evangelist, xii. 43, adopts the words used by Jesus in this chapter, it shows that elsewhere, where John's own phraseology corresponds with that in the discourses of Christ which he reports, we may be allowed to believe that he has adopted Christ's modes of expression.

CHAPTER VI.

The Miracle of the Feeding. — v. 1–13.

As the Evangelist here, deviating from his general rule, narrates a miracle which the other Evangelists have related, we may find the occasion for it in his design of reporting the discourses connected with it. (So already Calvin.) He advances in mediam rem, for the return of our Lord from Jerusalem to Galilee is not mentioned. If the festival, ch. v. 1, is the Passover, there lies (as v. 4 of this chapter speaks again of a Passover,) the interval of a whole year between chapters v. and vi. According to the account of Mark vi. 30, seq. Luke ix. 10, seq. the Disciples had returned to Christ from their first missionary journey; scarcely could they give an account to Jesus of what they had experienced, for the throng of people increased so greatly that they could not find time even to eat. Hereupon, our Lord retires into solitude with them, to the eastern side of the sea, according to Luke ix. 10, to Bethsaida Julias. The people, however, followed him on foot, attracted by the healing of the sick, and in v. 4 there lies, perhaps, the intimation (cf. οὖν, v. 5,) that the crowd of people had been still further swelled from the caravans of travelers on their way to the feast. The discourses of our Lord chain the attention of the people, the third hour has arrived, (Matt. xiv. 15,) the villages that lie around are too remote for food to be bought. The Saviour under these circumstances performs one of those miracles in which he displays his tender philanthropy.

V. 1–4. Two names are given this sea, probably for the benefit of the Greek reader. It is singular that John (cf. v. 15,) uses the indefinite τὸ ὄρος, which we find in Matt. v. 1, Luke ix. 28. Mark iii. 13. I have in my Commentary on the

Sermon on the Mount, thrown out on Matt. v. 1 the conjecture, that τὸ ὄρος, as in Hebrew and in the Septuagint, is used for ἡ ὀρεινή, (see Ebrard, Kritik d. Ev. Gesch. i. §. 71,) for the sea of Tiberias lies in a hollow surrounded by hills, from which the traveler must ascend at either side to get into the country. My conjecture is confirmed by what Robinson says, iii. part, 2 abth. p. 499: (Biblical Researches iii. 253, (1856,) ii. 499.) "The lake presents indeed a beautiful sheet of limpid water, in a deep depressed basin, from which the shores rise in general steeply and continuously all around. The hills are round and tame."—It would not be safe to draw the inference from v. 4, that Christ did not go to this feast; see, however, the remarks on ch. vii. 1, 2.

V. 5–9. Criticism has expressed itself in the strongest terms in regard to the improbability that Christ, on seeing such a crowd, should at once have been struck with the idea of feeding them. Even if we had not the accounts of the first three Evangelists, (of this miracle,) an impartial critic, in view of the way in which the Evangelists narrate other occurrences, would feel obliged to admit that in every case much may have preceded, which the Evangelist John, restricting himself to certain topics, omits as he hurries to his theme. But it appears also from Matt. xiv. 15, seq. that the people had been with Christ a considerable time; that they had been instructed, and their sick had been healed, and that the Disciples had commenced to draw the attention of our Lord to the need of food for the people.[1] Matthew agrees, too, with John in the statement that Jesus, first of all, asked the Disciples to provide food. That Philip was specially addressed, is accounted for by Bengel, on the supposition that the arrangements of domestic matters had been committed to him, and by Chrysostom and Theodore of Mopsuestia, by supposing him specially weak in that faith which soars above the external, (xiv. 8.) The πειράζειν "proving" referred not to the question, whether the Disciple had the faith of miracles, but Christ would test how he would relieve himself from the difficulty. He immediately makes an accu-

[1] Ebrard, l. c. I. 477, supposes that Jesus ascended the mountain, after performing the cures mentioned in v. 2, and it was when the people instead of dispersing, streamed *thither*, that he thought of feeding them.

rate computation; the sum of two hundred denarii, equivalent to eighty florins,[1] exceeds the amount of money they had in common. As here, and so likewise in xii. 22, Andrew appears in close relation to Philip. Ἕν, if it be genuine, gives prominence to the fact, that there was *only* one boy. Barley bread was the coarsest food. The Talmud. Tr. Pesachim. f. 3. "Jochanan said: The barley is fine. The answer was: Tell that to the horses and asses." Ὀψάριον, properly προσφάγιον, anything eaten with bread, but particularly, as Plutarch, Sympos. iv. 4, already observes, fish, which were used by the poor as a relish; those here offered for sale were probably already cooked.

V. 10–13. There was grass in the place, for it was about spring time. Ἀναπίπτειν and ἀνακλίνεσθαι, to recline at table. Εὐχαριστήσας, indeed, designates only the prayer before taking food, but v. 23 shows incontestably, that the Evangelist saw in this prayer the medium through which the miracle was wrought. Luke (ix. 16,) has, "looking up to heaven he blessed *them*," (the loaves and fishes,) cf. John xi. 41. (On the controversy, whether the εὐλογία used 1 Cor. x. 16, in speaking of the Lord's Supper, designates the *blessing* merely, cf. Maldonatus on Matt. xiv.) Διέδωκε, according to Matthew, xiv. 19, includes the assistance of the Disciples. These, after the conclusion of the miracle, had to collect the fragments, and perhaps for the very purpose of giving more prominence to the miraculous character of the transaction, (cf. 2 Kings iv. 43.) The number of the baskets corresponds with that of the Apostles; the fragments of the fishes are, for reasons easily imagined, not mentioned again, cf. however, Mark vi. 43.

The natural occurrence to which Dr. Paulus, by the aid of an artificial exegesis, would reduce this miracle, (a hospitable sharing with one another the provisions brought with them, to which they were induced by Christ's benevolent example,) is still regarded by several of the most recent expositors as the basis of the account, which, as is wont with a legend, took the shape of a narrative of a miracle, and in this form was delivered to the writers of the Gospels, (thus Gfrörer, Kern,

[1] From thirty to thirty-four dollars, American currency. Tr.

Hase.) To hold this view would make it necessary to presuppose that the first two Gospels are not genuine, and that the author of the fourth Gospel was accidentally absent from the scene. If the latter view, (the *twelve* baskets may be borne in mind,) like the former, is to be regarded as baseless and arbitrary, neither legend nor myth (according to the canon recognized by Strauss, 4th ed. i. p. 62,) can have any thing to do with this case. Among those who recognize the historical character of the narrative, Olshausen, as he has done with the miracle of the water changed into wine, attempts by the application of the category of an accelerated process of nature to this feeding, to bring it near to what ordinarily occurs, and consequently near to our conception. In reply to this, Strauss had also shown his ability to make the thing ridiculous, for he enumerates one after the other, first, the steps of the natural process through which the seed matures to grain, then the stages of the artificial process through which the miller and baker carry the grain and the cook takes the fish to make them fit to be eaten, and then puts the question, whether it is supposable that Christ by the most rapid acceleration caused all these processes to follow each other. On this point, however, it will be enough to give the remark of Krabbe: (Leben Jesu, p. 273,) "If we here see a manifestation of divine causality going forth from Christ, the different human acts are not to be brought into any sort of comparative reference. That which human activity produces in a succession of time, we grant to the divine causality as a thing wrought at once in its totality." Certainly, the formula of an accelerated process of nature may be applied here, as the divine causality produces a similar result in a natural way, (for example, the bread-fruit tree,) to that which human art does in its way. It is, however, peculiar to this miracle, that it is not merely the internal process which is withheld from view, but the external also. And not only is it difficult to determine the outward *how*, whether, to wit: as Hilary already asks, the miracle occurs in the hand of Christ or of the Apostles, (Chrysostom, Calvin,) or of the people, but the *what* also, that is, whether we are to suppose that the increase of the loaves and fishes took place in their *number* or in their *substance*. In regard to the former, the more obvious view, accord-

ing to v. 11, Mark vi. 41, is, that the blessing and influence of God, to which εὐλόγησε, εὐχαριστήσας refer, were manifested while Christ held the food in his own hand, (cf. also, Mark viii. 19.) Beyond that point, however, the process is withheld from our conception, so that we must confess ourselves unable to solve the questions which go further.

CHRIST WALKS UPON THE SEA.—V. 14–21.

V. 14, 15. The miracle at first makes such an overwhelming impression upon the people, that they regard Christ as the prophet promised in Deuteronomy xviii. 15. Under the dominion of earthly expectations regarding the Messiah, they wish now to take him (ἁρπάζειν,) with them to Jerusalem, in order to make him a king,—a fact which makes it clear why Jesus frequently prohibited persons from noising abroad his miracles. When in Luke, immediately after the account of this miracle, Jesus lays before his Disciples, in solitude, the question, "Whom say the people that I am?" (Luke ix. 18,) it might seem as if this stood in connection with the fact mentioned by John, but according to Matthew, Jesus did not dismiss the people until the Disciples had departed by ship. According to Matthew and Mark, moreover, Jesus after performing the miracle withdrew to a mountain, to be alone with God. When in Matthew he commands the Disciples to go before him unto the other side, while he sent the multitudes away, there lies in it an intimation that he would follow, and meet them in Capernaum. John gives Capernaum as the point to which they crossed; Mark says Bethsaida, the places lying close to each other; Matthew says Gennesaret—the name of the entire region.

V. 16–20. The ὀψία mentioned here, is the ὀψία δευτέρα, between seven and nine o'clock, cf. Matt. xiv. 15, with v. 23. Ἔρχεσθαι, according to the Greek and Hebrew usage, has the sense, "to go, to take a direction to a point;" the imperfect presents the action as in progress. The sea measured, according to Josephus, at its greatest width, forty stadia, that is about a German mile,[1] and could consequently be crossed in a

[1] About five miles and three-quarters, English. Tr.

short time; but when they were about the middle, (according to Matthew,) a storm arose, which detained them till toward morning, for when Jesus reached them, (Mark vi. 48,) about the fourth watch of the night, which was reckoned from four to six o'clock, they had just passed over two-thirds of it. When they unexpectedly saw Jesus near the vessel, they were terrified at his appearance, as if he had been a spirit.

V. 21. This passage, considered without reference to the other Evangelists, seems to affirm that Jesus was not taken into the vessel, because they were already so near the shore. As according to the others, however, he was received, the question is raised, whether the two statements can be harmonized? Beza already remarks that θέλειν in the *verb. fin.* united with the infinitive, imparts to it the idea of willingness, and accordingly translates: volente animo eum reciperunt, "they received him with willingness." In the *nature of the case*, it was to be expected that they would be represented as "*willing*," in contrast with their previous *fear*, and certainly there is no *philological* objection to this view. See Buttman's Greek Grammar, 10th ed. p. 744; Sturz. Lexic. Xenoph. under the word θέλειν; cf. also, Ast on βούλεσθαι, in Plato, de Legibus. xii. 9; Winer, 4th ed. p. 438. In John, too, viii. 44, θέλετε has this meaning, so also in Luke xx. 46, 1 Cor. x. 27; the actual performance of the action need not be mentioned, as the passage last cited shows, (cf. i. 43.) Καί before εὐθέως does not express antithesis, but introduces a new feature; after εὐθέως, supply: "After they had received him." If the wind had subsided, and but a third of the passage remained, it is evident that they must soon have reached the land, and the sooner if the point of landing was Bethsaida Julias, (Luke ix. 10,) for in that case they had not the entire width of the sea to cross.

The view which was maintained con amore in the days of "enlightenment," (Lange, Stolz, Paulus,) that ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης meant *by* the sea, that Jesus went by land round the sea, and thus appeared to them suddenly, is especially incapable of being harmonized with the account in Matthew, and has in general been abandoned at the same time with the explanation of the miracles as natural events, although so far as the language is concerned, it may at least be harmonized with the account in

John, for ἐπί with a genitive can in many cases be translated "*by*," where the banks, especially of streams, are referred to, which lie *above* the waters; 2 Kings ii. 7, Septuagint, (ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου,) Dan. viii. 2, John xxi. 1. Since rationalism has abandoned this exposition, nothing, really, but the mythical theory is left—but that a mere emanation of the fancy should have obtained in both classes of the Gospels the very same carefully designated historical position, does not seem probable even to those who are favorable to the myth; Kern persuades himself, therefore, that John only *supposed* that Jesus walked upon the water; Hase helps himself out by supposing that John was accidentally absent; De Wette (on Matt. xiv.) stands perfectly at a loss. Some of the defenders of the miracle, Damascenus for example, supposed that the miracle was to be explained as an influence exercised on the waters; most, however, as an operation, and that a transient one, on the bodies, (for Peter is not to be left out of consideration.) Olshausen, on the other hand, following the Valentinians, has supposed a quality specially inherent in the Saviour's body: "That a more exalted physical nature, teeming with the powers of a higher world, should rise above the earthly level, is less surprising;" according to him, the process of glorification of Christ's physical nature begins during his earthly life. But how are we to understand this? If a diminution of the specific gravity of Christ's body was a part of this process, so that at last it became lighter than the air, does it not then seem to be another miracle, that he could *walk upon the earth?* This view applied to the earthly existence of the Saviour, leads, in more respects than one, to strange results. In proof of the power of the will to overcome the principle of gravitation, an appeal has been made to our daily experience that the hand or foot can be lifted by the mere exercise of the will, (Twesten, Dogmatik, i. p. 380.) This theory assumes, that between Christ's walking on the sea and the lifting of an arm, there is simply a quantitive distinction of the will; but the latter operation, in fact, which is the result of muscular contraction, cannot be regarded as annulling the law of gravitation. Nothing analogous then would remain except the fact, which Kieser and Kerner (die Seherin v. Prevorst, i. p. 94.—Seeress of Prevorst,) assure us fre-

quently occurred, that persons under the magnetic influence did not sink in the water. But this would prove nothing, except that in a sphere different from that occupied by the miracles of Christ, things inexplicable like them occur. We have, therefore, in this case also, to adhere to the canon, which is applicable to all Christ's miracles: that the will, which is in absolute unity with the Ground of all the laws of nature, is likewise the Power over all the particular laws of nature.—The teleological objection is yet to be considered, that the miracle is aimless, and appears merely as ἐκπληκτικόν, "astounding." To this may be replied: Does not every action which establishes in the Disciples a consciousness of Christ's unity in power with the Father, (chap. xi. 22,) attain its moral end? Hess: "Thus did he convert before them into a thing of vision, that image under which the devout olden time represented God: 'Who treadeth on the waves of the sea as on dry land,'" (Job ix. 8.) Such actions of the Saviour have besides, however, their subjective reasons. In the present instance, the reason, according to Mark vi. 48, was that Christ from the mountain looked down upon the peril to which his Disciples were exposed by the storm, and hastened, consequently, to help them. The danger could have been no ordinary one, for the Disciples, as we remarked before, had been obliged to contend for six hours with the storm. The occasion for this miracle, consequently, offered itself in an appeal to his compassionate love.

DISCOURSE TO THE PEOPLE IN THE SYNAGOGUE AT CAPERNAUM, IN REGARD TO THE TRUE BREAD OF LIFE.—v. 22–59.

V. 22–24. There is no reason for thinking that every individual of the five thousand who had been fed, returned on the following morning; but a part had assembled again, and others probably united with them. As regards the construction, the Cod. A D L have in v. 22, the reading εἶδον, and the structure of the sentence is then regular; but v. 23 has pretty clearly the character of a parenthesis, for which reason it is preferable with Cod. B to read ἰδών, so as to take v. 24 as an interruption of the sentence commenced, which completed would have been: "They concluded that Jesus had gone by

land to Capernaum, and hurried, therefore, to follow him in the ships." The sense of ὅτι πλοιάριον κτλ. may then be this: "When they saw that there was but one ship, that is, the one in which the Disciples departed, and which had returned toward morning, that consequently Jesus could not have followed them by ship, (in which case, also, the one in which he went would have returned,) and as they knew that, &c." This was probably the way it was understood by the glossarists, who interpolated in v. 22 the words: ἐκεῖνο εἰς ὃ ἐνέβησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ; thus Meyer takes it. But the presumption that the ships must necessarily have returned, would have been too unwarranted. Better, therefore: "As they knew that on the day before but one vessel had been there, in which the Disciples alone left, and now found that Jesus, too, was no longer there;" the aorists ἦν and συνεσῆλθε are consequently, in accordance with the Grecism mentioned in i. 40, iv. 41, to be taken as pluperfect. When Strauss speaks of a fleet as necessary to transport the five thousand, he only displays his determination to fix impossibilities on the Evangelist. Who would think it even probable that every man of that entire multitude returned, and that they all, without exception, would determine to pass over; besides, if the πλοιάρια embraced not merely skiffs, but trading ships also, (τὰ πλοῖα is substituted in the next verse for πλοιάρια,) they might hold a large number.

V. 25. As the close of v. 24 already informed us, they had the distinct object of finding Jesus, and they now found him at the very place it would have been most natural to seek him—in the synagogue. Here, too, whoever wishes to press the letter, can bring out the contradiction, that according to this verse they met him by the sea-shore. Their question about the time, involves the question as to the way in which Christ had crossed over; they assume that Jesus came by land. As the confirmation of the miracle is presented in so incidental a manner, it is a proof how little the Evangelist is disposed to give it special prominence.

V. 26, 27. Just as in the case of Nicodemus, the answer of Jesus is designed to meet the mental wants of the questioners; they occupy the lowest position, for they are merely concerned about the temporal advantage of the miracle. The charge

seems to be contradicted by the readiness of the people to take him as Messiah, but might not this enthusiasm quickly be dissipated? *Ἐργάζεσθαι*, in the classic and Hellenistic writers, "to earn;" without longing on their part, this food could not be obtained. *Σφραγίζεσθαι* has the same meaning as in iii. 33.

V. 28, 29. The people have an indistinct perception that the words of Jesus demand a performance of the works of the law, works pleasing to God, (Jerem. xlviii. 10.) Christ opposes to the many works that one which Paul especially designates as the source of righteousness.

V. 30, 31. This demand of a new miracle, as if the feeding of the five thousand had been wholly insignificant, is regarded by Kern, Bauer and Weisse, as historically impossible; according to Schweizer, no part of the discourse had reference to the preceding history of the feeding, which has been foisted in by the Galilean diceuast. Already Bucer and Grotius remark, that the speakers here can hardly be those who were witnesses of that miracle. That in v. 24 the *ὄχλος* (people) is regarded as identical with that of the previous day, cannot, in fact, be urged against this explanation; where is the warrant that no other persons had joined them, and who expects of John such a nice discrimination of the speakers? But there is no necessity for resorting to this supposition, for what Lücke says is certainly justified on psychological grounds, that: "The carnal belief in miracles is insatiable, it craves miracle after miracle," and Grotius quotes the words: *μετὰ τ. δόσιν τάχιστα γηράσκει χάρις*, "After the gift, the thanks soon grow old." When Jesus spoke, v. 27, of an enduring meat, might not these words excite in the carnal multitude the hope of a new and yet more marvelous supply of food? Luther remarks, also, perhaps with justice, that we may suppose them to have been irritated by the reply of Jesus. This would explain the contemptuous *τί ἐργάζῃ*, "what dost thou work," or it may have resulted also from the selfish motive of urging Christ to do yet more. A similar motive explains the selection of the expression, "bread *from heaven*," Ps. lxxviii. 24, to depreciate yet further the earthly bread of which they had partaken. In Matt. xvi. 1, we have the same view that a brilliant miracle must be "from heaven"

V. 32, 33. As elsewhere in the discourses of Christ in John, our Saviour adopts and confirms in a profounder sense the words of his opponents, so here he styles his appearing on earth a bread from heaven, for by it not merely nourishment in general, but the true life, was imparted to mankind. As Moses had not in the fullest sense given bread from heaven, there is a total negation of his having given it. *Καταβαίνων* here and in v. 50, stands in the participle present; on the contrary, in v. 41, 51, it is in the participle aorist; only in the latter case is there a reference to the historical appearing in Christ of the bread of heaven, here consequently the sense is: "That only deserves the name of the bread of God which descends from heaven, and has the power of imparting life to the whole world."

V. 34–36. The request in v. 34 recalls to mind the very similar one, iv. 15. Bucer, Calvin, Maldonatus, who had regarded those words (of the Samaritan woman,) as irony, find also in these an expression of scorn. Luther supposes that they had in their mind, food for the body. We suppose that although they did not comprehend in its proper sense what was promised by the Lord, they might, nevertheless, with a dim presension of something exalted, ask of him a gift whose promise was clothed with such sublime predicates. Christ now tells them who is the subject to which the category expressed in v. 33 is applicable. As bread and water satisfy bodily need, so he satisfies spiritual need, and adequately, too, so that in him the satisfaction is absolute and there is no need of seeking any other. The condition is, the coming to him—evidently, as the connection shows, under the presupposition of need; that this coming designates faith, is shown by v. 36, 40, 47. In v. 36, the first *καί* has created difficulty; it is the result, in fact, of an idiom peculiar to John. The Evangelist partly unites adversative periods, where the Greek writers would use *τέ—δέ*, or *καί—δέ*, and coördinate periods also by the double *καί*, as in vii. 28, ix. 37, xii. 28, xv. 24; see the remark on xvii. 25. *Ὁρᾶν* like *θεωρεῖν*, v. 40, 1 John iii. 6, referring to their perception of what he had done. Christ had not used precisely this language, either to this Galilean multitude or the people in general; there is consequently here an inexactness, like that in x. 26, xii. 34.

V. 37–40. The style here has a certain breadth. Luther says: "John describes this sermon with great diligence and pleasure." Why did they not believe? Because they were destitute of the inward sense of want, and came to him outwardly indeed, but not inwardly. This inward sense of want is represented as the gift of the Father, (cf. *δέδοται*, Matt. xix. 11,) is more particularly described, v. 44, 45, and afterward especially in the prayer, ch. 17, is frequently made prominent. The Son of God has appeared in order to satisfy the divinely originated wants which lie in the very nature of man, and acts therefore in constant unity with the Father. Grotius supposes that *διδόναι* is used here cum effectu aliquo, like *κλητοί* in Paul's Epistles, but xvii. 12 shows that those committed to him by the Father may yet be lost by their own fault. Christ comprehends all his gifts in the one gift of true life, and casting his glance, as it were, over the course of the development of that life, points to its final aim, when the outward shall become like the inward, cf. the remarks on ch. v. 21, seq.

V. 41, 42. *Γογγύζω*, according to the Greek usage, implies a murmuring of disdain. The human birth of Christ seems to exclude the supernatural origin, cf. on vii. 27.

V. 43–47. The point of our Saviour's reply is, that all dispute about his person is fruitless, until the internal sense of want is experienced. In what this consists, we are told, v. 45, 46. Luther: "You wish to subject me to measure and square, and judge my word by your reason, but I say to you, that is not the right way and path—you will not come to Him till the Father opens to you his great mercy, and himself teaches you that from his fatherly love he sent Christ into the world. (For) the drawing is not as a hangman draws a thief to the gallows, but it is a friendly alluring, and drawing to himself." Ammonius: *οὐκ ἔστι τὸ τυχὸν ἡ εἰς ἐμὲ πίστις, ἀλλὰ τῆς ἄνωθεν δεῖται ῥοπῆς, ἵνα γνῶς τὰ ὑπὲρ νοῦν. Ὥσπερ ἰατρῷ προσάγει ὁ πατὴρ τ. Χριστῷ τ. ἀσθενεῖς ἀνθρώπους.* ("Faith in me is no thing of chance, but there is need of an influence from above, that you may know the things that pass understanding. The Father conducts sick men to Christ, as to a physician.")—In a free citation from the Old Testament, he shows by Isaiah liv. 13, that there is the promise of a time when *all* shall permit

themselves to be taught of the Father. This teaching of the Father consists in an internal guidance to the Son, for, as Schleiermacher expresses it, human nature is *put to* the Redeemer. Didymus: "He therefore who hears *κατὰ τ. κοινὰς ἐννοίας*, according to the conception which men have in common, and learns from the Father, cometh by faith to the Lord." If the expression be not taken in a false sense, it might be said that the Christian truth is an "engrafted word," (Jas. i. 21.) Theophylact observes that as the magnet does not attract every thing, but only iron, so also to be attracted by Christ, there must exist a certain frame of mind, (the feeling of what we should be, and are not.) There is a parallel, therefore, in the thought, ch. viii. 47, x. 27, xviii. 37. Since Christ speaks not merely of the teaching, but adds the *μαθών*, it follows that men may act contrary to the voice of that internal need, as in the case of Judas, (xvii. 12.) Since Christ elsewhere imputes to himself also a hearing of the Father, (ch. v. 30, viii. 40,) it is added by way of limitation, that the hearing which believers have is not like the hearing which the Son has; that the Son has in addition the vision of the Father, which presupposes in his self-consciousness the unity with the Father, (see on ch. i. 18.)[1] Hereupon the high importance of faith in him is again made prominent.—*Ἕλκειν, ἑλκύειν*, different from *σύρειν*, is chosen with reference to the "*come*" which is used tropically, and designates even in the Old Testament the mighty internal and external operations by which God arouses the attention of men to divine things, Jer. xxxi. 3, Song of Sol. i. 4. In Paul's Epistles the external and internal activity of the Father, by which he leads to the Son, is embraced in the word *καλεῖν*. The genitive *θεοῦ* with *διδακτοί* designates God as the emanating point of the teaching, cf. Matt. xxiv. 35, 1 Thess. iv. 9.

V. 48–50. Repetition of the thought in v. 32, 35. If the antithesis adduced in evidence be taken in perfect strictness, the inference from it is either that believers do not even

[1] Calvin and Luther take it in a sense entirely different; the Father never draws apart from Christ, but only in and through the preaching of Christ.—How, moreover, Bauer can say that the original germ of this declaration is to be found in Matt. xi. 27, would be intelligible, only in case it were there said: "No one knows the *Son*, but he to whom the *Father* will reveal him," but it says just the reverse.

physically die, or that all who are unbelievers are to expect either in general no existence, or at least no full life after they die. That the former is not meant, is proven by xi. 25, and by the *ἀναστήσω κτλ*, v. 54; the latter, consequently, is meant, as then it follows at once that nothing but faith in Christ can give true life even in this world. That the hearers should have connected this meaning with it at this time, is not, indeed, to be expected. In order that he may take the *ἵνα* more strictly, De Wette proposes to translate *οὗτος*, "*of such a kind* is the bread, to wit: that it can impart immortality," but his view is opposed to v. 33; *ἵνα*, consequently, is rather to be taken here in accordance with the same usage by which it elsewhere stands after the demonstrative, (Winer, p. 314. Tr. p. 257.)

V. 51–59. For the exposition of this passage, which from its actual or supposed reference to the Lord's Supper has occupied the attention of commentators to a large degree, cf. the Zeitsch. of Heydenreich and Hüffel, 2 B. 2 H. p. 239; the very excellent observations of Kling, Stud. u. Krit. 1836, H. 1; F. E. Müller, numne locus Io. vi. 51–58, idoneis argumentis ad verum et proprium s. cœnæ usum trahi queat. 1839; Tischendorf, de Christo pane vitæ s. de loco Io. vi. 51–59, cœnæ s. potissimum ratione habita. 1839; the history of the ancient exposition is given by Lücke in the 2d Excursus, (left out in the 3d edition;) the modern views are to be found in Lindner, die Lehre, &c. The doctrine of the Lord's Supper, p. 241, seq.

What is expressed antithetically in v. 50 is explained in v. 51 in a direct manner. *Ζῶν* is not precisely equivalent to *ζωοποιῶν*, it only expresses the *possession* of the life, v. 57, iv. 10. *Καί—δέ* designates a more detailed statement, as in John i. 3, or a correction, as in xv. 27. Zwingle: Dixi diu me panem esse vitæ, sed nondum quo pacto id fiat, hoc iam aperiam, "I long ago called myself the bread of life, but have not defined the sense in which I am such; this I will now explain." *Ἣν ἐγὼ δώσω* is wanting in so many of the authorities, that Lachmann omits it, but it can hardly be dispensed with grammatically, (Müller, Lücke.) The future already shows in the first part, that not the appearing of Christ in human life in itself, but the offering up of this life for the world possesses the nourishing power, as it is also expressed in chap. xi. 24.

Yet at the first δώσω, the question may arise, whether it applies to the historical *institutory act* of this food which took place in the expiatory death, or to the continued exhibition in the continued appropriation of which v. 53 speaks, (thus Calvin takes it.) The hearers see clearly that Christ cannot, in the literal sense, give his "flesh" as food, and confer together, therefore, with one another as to the real meaning of the word. Σάρξ cannot essentially differ from ἡ ψυχή, Matt. xx. 28, but the preceding image of bread naturally led to the use in this place of σάρξ instead of ψυχή, (1 Pet. iii. 18, Eph. ii. 15.) As Christ in his answer to the question of the Jews, now declares that his flesh and blood must be partaken of and be in reality food and drink, the habit of our Redeemer of giving prominence to the very thing which has given offense to his hearers, and of confirming it, sometimes though not always with "verily, verily," (v. 19, vi. 32, viii. 58, x. 1,) leads to the presumption that the eating of his flesh is here to be taken in a stricter sense than before. This would be the case, if Christ had reference to the Lord's Supper. The usual objection, that such a reference would at that time have been entirely unintelligible to his hearers, has no force, (see what we have said on ii. 19;) on the other hand it serves to strengthen that view, and to confute the latter, which assumes that there is a mere repetition of the same thought here, that our Saviour no longer speaks of his "flesh" merely, but of his "blood" also, that the strong expression τρώγειν (manducare) is used, and (a fact on which Scheibel lays all stress,) we have in v. 55, ἀληθῶς. This exposition, then, after Chrysostom, Cyrill, Ammonius, has become the current one in the Catholic Church, (Cajetan, Jansen, and some others deviating, however;) on the opposite, the earlier Lutherans (probably from an apprehension that otherwise they could not escape the doctrine of transubstantiation,) would not concede that there was any reference to the Lord's Supper; in fact, Calixtus, who supposed that there was such a reference, was on that very account charged by Calovius with heresy. But in recent times. Dr. Scheibel, in sustaining the Lutheran doctrine, has dwelt with the greatest emphasis on this passage, in his work: "The Lord's Supper. Breslau, 1823," and Olshausen and Kling have maintained, that if not

the rite, yet at least the idea from which has proceeded the institution of the Supper, is here the subject of discourse, cf. Müller, l. c. p. 89, seq. Bretschneider, Strauss and Bauer, also think that a reference to the Sacrament is to be conceded, and with it, consequently, one proof more that the discourse is not genuine; according to Hase, (Life of Jesus, 3d ed. § 80,) this turn at least of the discourse belongs not to the Redeemer, but to the doctrinal system of his Disciple.—We proceed to weigh the conflicting exposition. The answer to a misapprehension introduced by "verily, verily," is not always a strengthened assertion, but sometimes a mere bringing out of the thought previously expressed, as in ch. v. 19. In this place it is a bringing out, and is a strengthening only so far as the negative form of the proposition imparts to it the character of reproof. Several of the ancient Greek interpreters, Calvin, and among modern writers, Schulz,[1] and at an earlier date, Lücke, discover in the words simply the declaration in a stronger form that the earthly appearing of Christ must be received into inmost union with the believer; the discourse, says Clemens Alexandrinus, is about the ἐνστερνίζεσθαι τὸν Χριστόν, (taking Christ into the heart,) and Basil, Ep. 141, says: ἡ σὰρξ καὶ τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, πᾶσα αὐτοῦ ἡ μυστικὴ ἐπιδημία, (the flesh and the blood of Christ, his whole mystic sojourning.) According to Augustine on this passage, it is the Church as Christ's body which imparts the food and the drink; Calovius designates Eph. iii. 17 as parallel. In support of this may be adduced the fact, that v. 57, 58, certainly revert to the thought in its more general form in v. 51.[2] But it would be in conflict with the constant character of Christ's replies in John, if this reply did not connect itself with the sharper pointing of the thought at the close of v. 51. It must consequently be said that Christ designates his propiatory death as a true food of believers, as is acknowledged by Luther, Melancthon, Beza, Calovius, Grotius, and more recently especially by Kuinöl and Lindner, and afterward by De Wette,

[1] D. Schulz: Die Christl. Lehre vom h. Abendmahl nach dem Grund-text des N. T. Leipzig, (1824,) 1831, 8vo. Tr.

[2] Augustine, who considered the Lord's Supper as an image of the mystical communion, directs attention to the difference, that the spiritual bread of which our text speaks imparts salvation to all who partake of it, while the Lord's Supper is received by some to condemnation, (1 Cor. xi. 29.)

Lücke, 3d ed , Müller, p. 31, cf. also, Sengler, über das Abendmahl, p. 136, seq. Already in Augustine we find the remark, (not indeed on this passage, but in his De doctrina Christi, l. iii. c. 16.)—Edere ejus carnem et bibere ejus sanguinem .... figura est, præcipiens, passioni dominicæ esse communicandum et suaviter atque utiliter recondendum in memoria, quod pro nobis caro ejus crucifixa et vulnerata sit; (to eat his flesh and drink his blood, is a figure teaching us that we are to have communion in the passion of our Lord, and are to treasure in our memory sweetly and to our use, that for us his flesh was crucified and wounded.) Luther: "Wherever Christ the Lord is preached, that for our sins he gave his body to death, and shed his blood for us, and I take it to my heart, believe it firmly and cling to it, that is, to eat his body and drink his blood. To *eat*, means in this place, to *believe:* he that believeth, also eats and drinks Christ." Melancthon: Ego hanc concionem nec de ceremonia cœnæ domini nec de manducatione ceremoniali intelligo, sed sicut supra Christus præfatus est de fide, qua credimus placatam esse iram dei morte filii, corpus suum offerentis pro nobis et sanguinem suum fundentis—ita cætera de eadem fide intelligo. (I do not understand this discourse as having reference to the ceremony of the Lord's Supper, or to ceremonial eating, but as the words of Christ which preceded above were about faith, whereby we believe that God's wrath was propitiated by the death of his Son, who offered his body and shed his blood for us—so I understand the other words of the same faith.) By this exposition, too, the addition of the τὸ αἷμα is more satisfactorily accounted for, since this, as the designation not merely of a natural death, but of a supplicium, expresses elsewhere, and especially in the institution of the Supper, the propiatory death, (Beza.) The gradation now presents itself more clearly. If the choice of the word σάρξ before, was occasioned merely by the trope of ἄρτος, the addition of the αἷμα is made in order to designate more properly and more nearly as a nourishment, the bodily nature of the Son of man, which was made a sacrifice, and the necessity of this participation is expressed in the form of a threatening. As in this faith, faith in the propitition which is in Christ has its point, it mediates preëminently

the communion with him, (v. 56,) and the life everlasting, (v. 54.) After this thought has been expressed, the more general reference of the believer to Christ is made prominent from v. 57.

We shall now reply to the arguments by which it is proposed to verify the position, that this discourse must be about the Lord's Supper, and inquire, finally, if such be the case, which of the three views expressed in the Confessions of the three Churches, (Catholic, Lutheran, Reformed,) is most favored by its language. 1) The expression *τρώγειν* has no special weight; the word had lost the strict idea of manducare, as we can see from John xiii. 18, Matt. xxiv. 38, Polybius, Fragm. xxxii. 9, 9. The trope is scarcely stronger, when Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus xxiv. 21, says of herself: *οἱ ἐσθίοντές με ἔτι πεινάσουσι καὶ οἱ πίνοντές με ἔτι διψήσουσι*, (they that eat me, shall yet be hungry, and they that drink me, shall yet be thirsty,) cf. Prov. ix. 2, 5, Eccles. xv. 3. 2) On the external evidence, *ἀληθής*, v. 55, would be the preferable reading, though in accordance with John's usage, we would rather have anticipated *ἀληθινή*. *Ἀληθῶς* and *ἀληθής* bring us, however, to the same sense; the latter, "a food which is not deceptive," (Luther: the *true* food,) which actually appeases the want; the former, "a food indeed," that is, a food which imparts what we would expect from food. Even in his 3d edition, Olshausen thinks he discovers in *ἀληθῶς* a point of evidence for the Lutheran view; he explains it: "This is no empty image, *but it is so to be taken in truth*"—more correctly: "it corresponds in truth to the idea of food." 3) The fact that in v. 54 the resurrection is made dependent on the participation of the flesh and blood of Christ, would certainly accord with that view of the Lord's Supper which makes it the basis of the new corporiety of believers.[1] But this view (which has also been adopted by the Catholic theologian Maier, in his treatise mentioned on v. 21,) has more than one difficulty. It is devoid of a scriptural foundation, (2 Cor. v. 1, has been without war-

[1] Luther (Walch. Th. xx. p. 1094:) "If ye eat him *spiritually* through the Word, he remains in us spiritually in the soul; if we eat him *bodily*, he remains in us bodily; as we eat him, he abides in us and we in him. For *he* is not concocted and changed, but without intermission he changes *us*, *the soul into righteousness*, *the body into immortality*."

rant used to sustain it,) is rather, indeed, in conflict with the view of the resurrection, which may be deduced from Rom. viii. 11; it leads to a superstitious use of the Lord's Supper, as for example that of the Greek-Catholic Church, which, following authorities of the ancient Church, gives the Lord's Supper to infants; finally, according to v. 40, 57, 58, faith in Christ is a cause of the re-awakening, a cause which in itself is operative. 4) Kling has thought that he has discovered a cogent argument in this, that *σάρξ* and *αἷμα* can designate the earthly person of our Lord, only when they are united in one formula, but not when, as is the case here, they are separate. But the separation arises, of necessity, from the fact that Christ could not say: *σάρκα καὶ αἷμα φαγεῖν*, (*eat* flesh and *blood*.) What we maintain, moreover, is not that *αἷμα* is connected with *σάρξ* merely to amplify the same idea, but rather to give prominence to the fact that the discourse turns on the corporeal nature given in death.—If the discourse were about the Supper, the Catholic doctrine, to close on this point, would have the advantage in it; yet the Reformed doctrine might appeal to v. 67, as proof against a corporeal participation in the Supper.

Διά cum. accus. in v. 57, designates the *ground*, and so far the instrumental cause, (cf. Winer, p. 339.)—The locality of this discourse is first given here, probably to account for the appearance of the Disciples mentioned v. 60.

THE OFFENSE GIVEN TO THE DISCIPLES BY THE PRECEDING DISCOURSE.—V. 60–71.

V. 60–62. The Apostles, as we see from v. 67, are not included in these *μαθηταί*, nor can the people who flocked thither be meant; we are led to the supposition, then, that they were followers from Capernaum, whom he knew before this, and who had assembled themselves there in the synagogue—they are designated more particularly in v. 66, as persons who had been in the habit of attending Jesus on his journeys through Galilee. *Σκληρὸν ῥῆμα* designates, in other places, a rough, and therefore disagreeable, word. In Euripides Traj. inc. 74,

the *σκληρὸ ἀληθῆ* stands in antithesis to the *μαλθακὰ ψευδῆ λέγω*.[1] In correspondence with this is the question *τοῦτο ὑμᾶς σκανδαλίζει*; *Ἀκούειν*, not "*understand*," (Bretschneider,) but, as *ἀκούσαντες αὐτοῦ*, and the genitive *αὐτοῦ* indicate, is, as in x. 20, "*to listen to*"—they may have stopped their ears, (Acts vii. 56.) From what arose the offense? Most of the older writers suppose from the discourse in regard to eating his flesh being taken in a fleshly (*κατὰ κυριολεξίαν*,) sense—hence the dogmatic phrase, manducatio Capernaitica—but we cannot regard these multitudes as so coarse as this, (the question, v. 52, proves, at least, that the coarse sensuous apprehension of the words seems to them inadmissible,) to say nothing of these *Disciples*. Kuinöl, Lücke, De Wette, find then the offense in the declaration that the Messiah is to die. But this thought had been expressed only mediately, not directly, and the expression, "who can listen to him," cannot well be explained on this theory. Does not this expression bear in it an intimation that Jesus had, in their opinion, spoken with too much assumption and severity? *We* find the offense consequently in this, that Christ, in a different form, has continually renewed the declaration, that there can be no life if we do not partake of him, his flesh and blood, (in same way, Bucer, Lampe.) In the sentence broken off in v. 62, *τί ἐὰν θεωρῆτε* is *first* to be supplied; cf. the aposiopesis in the conditional sentences, Luke xiii. 9, Mark vii. 11. According to several of the critics, he means to say: "how much easier, then, would it be for you to believe!" Erasmus: "When the sensible appearing is glorified, how easily then will the misunderstanding of sense be removed." Calvin: "When I shall be glorified, how shall the offense which is taken at my lowly appearing then cease;" Lücke, 2d ed. "—How shall the richer impartation of the Spirit put aside the offense." But *οὖν* shows clearly enough that we have rather to expect a *strengthening* of the proposition, (Kling,) and must therefore add mentally: "How much *harder* will that be to you, how much more offense

[1] Dante says, (entirely in the same sense as here, in the sense of "offensive,") when he reads the well-known inscription on the portal of Hell: "il senso lor mi è *duro*," (these words import *hard* meaning,) which the commentators on the poet explain by dispiacevolo, (unpleasant, offensive,) cf. canto xxxii. 14.

will that give you!" According to Meyer, De Wette, Lücke, 3d ed. who have found the offense in the declaration in regard to the death of the Messiah, this harder thing, which is yet to come, lies in the experience that this death is a mournful reality. But we are constrained to ask, whether the expression *ἀναβαίνειν*, connected as it is with the *ὅπου ἦν τὸ πρότερον*, (cf. xvii. 5,) does not necessarily direct us to the circumstance of his glorification? That this includes the reality of the death, is conceded, yet on the other hand again, it cannot be denied that this designation gives prominence to the side of the glorification. If in v. 60 we must find the offense in the emphatic and apparently arrogant manner with which Christ urges the participation of his essence, the connection of this question would then be: "Do ye think I have gone too far in what I have maintained as to partaking of my essence, what then would ye think if I entered on my original glory?"—Olshausen is confident that the difficulty is to be found in the fact, that the glorified corporeal nature of Jesus was to be taken up into heaven; by which mode of apprehending it, the reference of the preceding discourse to the Lord's Supper would receive farther confirmation, cf. however, against this view, Lücke.

V. 63. The various significations of the words *πνεῦμα* and *σάρξ* have also in this verse led to diversity in the ways of apprehending them, which, however, fall into two classes, the point of division being the question whether we are to maintain in the first half of the verse a reference to Christ's *discourses*, or only to his *person*. On the former supposition: "The Spirit must be within the Disciples, the fleshly sense can aid nothing in understanding; (Augustine, Sermo 2, de verb. ap., Bucer, Melancthon,) in the discourse the spirit is to be retained, not the outward covering of the figure," (Euthymius, Mosheim;) on the latter supposition: "My earthly appearing does not in itself give life, but only in so far as it is the vehicle of the Spirit," (Cyrill, Augustine, Calovius, Bengel, with a special reference to the *σάρξ* in the Lord's Supper,) and the latter mode of apprehending it in De Wette, Lücke, (3d ed.) is so modified that in it lies a consoling thought for the Disciples, who were not willing to let go of his earthly covering. But if we are to think exclusively of the *σάρξ* of Christ, would it not have been

more specifically marked by the addition of μοῦ?[1] Besides, is not the application of the generic proposition to the σάρξ of Christ particularly out of keeping here, where just before so great an affirmation had been made about this very σάρξ? When Lücke remarks: "The holy offering up of the flesh was essentially life-giving, but not the flesh of Christ *without the holy offering*," he affirms what can only be said conditionally, and here at least that antithesis of the *living* and of the *offered* flesh is not made prominent. We think the design of this addition is to reprove the want of a deeper insight into the preceding discourse; the first half of the verse expresses the general principle, the second makes a specific application of it to that discourse: "in that discourse is spirit and life, but you have allowed yourselves to be frightened away by its form and fashion, without penetrating to its depths." We have yet, in regard to the reading, to observe, that the testimony predominates for λελάληκα, which we would refer, not to the instruction in general which Jesus gave, but to the discourse he had just uttered; Lücke, indeed, supposes that then there must be ταῦτα τὰ ῥήματα, but is not the idea sufficiently defined by the ἃ λελάληκα?

V. 64, 65. The more faith there is in the person of the Redeemer, the more there is of the interest which goes with faith, the more earnest will be the striving to pierce into the depth of his words. That faith, however, that interest in his person, can spring alone from the needs of a nature in affinity with God; the Saviour, therefore, refers back to v. 44. As the Evangelist already has in his mind's eye what he designs mentioning in v. 70 with this observation in regard to the glance of the Lord which looks within them, (ii. 25,) he interweaves a reference to Judas, on which cf. what is said in v. 70. Ἐξ ἀρχῆς cannot well refer to the beginning of his office as teacher, John is speaking of persons who attached themselves to the Saviour at various dates; it means, therefore, at the beginning of his acquaintance with each individual.

[1] Those expositors say, indeed, that a *generic* proposition is the *most direct* sense. Lücke: "The absolute antithesis of the divinely spiritual, eternal, and of the humanly sensuous, transitory principle of life:" is not, however, this antithesis so extensive, and its application to the σάρξ of *Christ* so strange, (and this is a point which the expositors have first to clear up,) that on this very account we would desire the μοῦ?

V. 66–69. That these Disciples had been led to the Lord by no inward sense of need, they prove by leaving him in a way which had so little to justify it. Calvin: Certe, quid utile esset, optime tenebat filius Dei, videmus tamen eum non effugere, quin multos ex suis offendat. Ergo utcunque multi abhorreant a pura doctrina, supprimere tamen eam fas non est, (Surely, the Son of God knew best what would be useful, yet we see that he did not escape giving offense to many of his Disciples. Though very many, therefore, shrink back from a pure doctrine, it is not right to suppress it.) The question put to the Apostles is a question of trust, not of *mistrust*; μή presupposes a negative reply; the ardent Peter, of all who are addressed, is the first to speak. His words show us clearly what deep root, in spite of all their dullness and weakness, the word of our Lord had taken in them, so much so, indeed, that even in xv. 3 he could make the declaration that they were already clean through the reception of this word. The exclamation, too, of Thomas, John xx. 8, gives evidence how the depths of the soul of that very Disciple, in whom reflection was the predominating faculty, had been kindled by the ray of the Spirit which emanated from the Saviour. The confession of Peter gives the confirmation to v. 35. It may be asked, whether Peter considered the ζωὴ αἰώνιος only as the future goal to which these words conducted the mind,(Euthymius, Luther,) or whether he would designate by it the impression already received. If we may assume a retrospective glance to v. 63, the latter is the more probable view; in the Jewish conception, and consequently mostly in the synoptical Gospels, the reference to the world to come predominates, and is, therefore, the more probable in Peter's mouth. Faith here stands before knowing, as in xvii. 8; the reverse is the case in x. 38, 1 John iv. 16; chronologically the two points are not to be held apart from one another; γινώσκειν, however, refers to the entrance into the consciousness of an assurance which is felt, and in so far embraces in it the *evidence*, not merely the outward, but also the inward experimental evidence: when John, 1 Ep. v. 20, speaks of a διάνοια, ἵνα γινώσκωμεν, this διάνοια lies in faith. Instead of υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, the external authority favors the reading ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ, as in Mark i. 24, Luke iv. 34; the further addition of

τοῦ ζῶντος in some Codices, shows that the original expression had been altered; thus υἱὸς θεοῦ has come into the text from Matt. xvi. 16: the appellation, "the hallowed one of God," is more general than that of "the Son;" in John x. 36, it is paraphrased.

V. 70, 71. This question of Jesus justifies the question which in v. 67 had been put with at least a slight sound of mistrust. Even in the narrower circle of the twelve, there was one unworthy of trust, (cf. xiii. 18.) It is a question that may be mooted, whether διάβολος means a *devil* or an opposer, (cf. Septuag. Ps. cix. 6, Esth. vii. 4, viii. 1.) In opposition to the first view, Olshausen urges that the name διάβολος in the New Testament is applied to but one individual, the prince of devils, and consequently always has the definite article; from him are distinguished οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ, τὰ δαιμόνια, "his angels," "the devils." But the meaning "enemy, opposer," which Luther, Grotius, Lücke, De Wette, also prefer, gives too languid a sense, and requires, moreover, some addition to define it more particularly. Olshausen, 3d ed., has consequently abandoned this view, and gives this explanation: "Is there not among you, who are the children of God, one who is Satan himself? (*der* Satan")(?) As Christ in Matt. xvi. 23, to Peter as the organ of Satan, gives the name Satan itself, he can surely the more readily here give to Judas, who has abandoned himself to Satanic influence, the name of *a* devil, that is, a man resting under diabolic influences. It is not, to be sure, involved in this designation itself, that Jesus at this period already foresaw that Judas would betray him, but this does follow from the intimation of John, v. 64. But in advance we must concur in what Neander, l. c. 625, (transl. 379,) says: "But it need not appear strange to us if John, after so many proofs of the superhuman prescience of Jesus, attributed to the indefinite intimations of Christ, given by him to Judas in order to make him know himself, more than they, strictly taken, contained." Add to this, that John is the very writer in whom that ἐξ ἀρχῆς certainly cannot be urged, as if it must imply in the very strictest sense the beginning of acquaintance. We indeed maintain what has not hitherto been brought to notice, that the question of Christ himself contradicts, as also does xvii. 12, the strict

reference to the first beginning. When our Saviour, to wit: expresses his surprise, or his displeasure, that in that little circle chosen by himself there should be a διάβολος, does not this show that it was unexpected and painful to him? To this is to be added, that Judas, in ch. xvii. 12, is included in the number of those whom the Father had drawn to the Son. With entire propriety, therefore, we may concur in the view presented especially by Ullmann, (Sündlosigkeit, 4th ed. p. 140, Sinless Character of Jesus, translated by E. A. Park, in Biblic. Cabinet, vol. xxxvii. Edinburgh, T. Clark, 1841.) Kern, Neander, that he had brought with him a susceptibility for the good. We are not to forget that when the Saviour made this declaration, Judas had been more than a year in association with him: it was in intercourse with Jesus which we know must have had a general tendency to mature the moral decision of his Disciples, that the impure element in his nature was brought out.[1]

[1] Lücke: The germ of evil as little as the germ of good, could escape the eye of the Holy One. But not until this critical moment, when so many were forsaking him, does his prophetic eye distinctly see in Judas the enemy that is to be. At an earlier date he had spoken nothing, probably had thought nothing, in regard to this.

CHAPTER VII.

JESUS GOES TO THE FEAST OF TABERNACLES.—v. 1–9.

V. 1. ON this verse Strauss and Bauer have believed that they could establish the important position, that John knew only of Judea, as Matthew knew only of Galilee, as the proper theatre of the active life of our Lord. This view certainly has a good deal of plausibility, which vanishes, however, if we may be allowed to suppose that Jesus did not repair to the feast but at the time of the Passover, ch. vi. 4; this observation then serves to complete what has been said in vi. 4. The multitudes who had been miraculously fed continue, after the discourse in ch. vi., their journey to the capital, but Jesus does not go with them at this time; the supposition that he did not visit the last Passover is favored by the fear of snares which our Lord continued constantly to feel, furthermore by the demand which his brethren urged, finally by the allusion in v. 21 to the miracle which he had wrought at the Passover *before the last.* The omission to visit the leading feasts is not entirely inconceivable, as the character of the demand on the part of his brethren in v. 3, and the question xi. 56, allow us to infer.

V. 2–5. The feast of Tabernacles—in commemoration of the journey through the desert, and of the abode in tents during that time, observed also as a festival of the first gathering and of the vintage—is called by Josephus ἡ ἑορτὴ ἡ ἁγιωτάτη καὶ μεγίστη, (the most holy and the greatest of festivals;) by Plutarch, sympos. iv. 6, 2, ἑορτὴ μεγίστη καὶ τελειοτάτη τῶν Ἰουδαίων, (the greatest and most perfect festival of the Jews.) It occurred in October, with which consequently, it corresponds to allow about six months for the sojourn of Jesus in Galilee. No mention is made of a subsequent return to Galilee; accord-

ing to x. 22, Jesus remains in the metropolis during the feast of the dedication also, then goes to Peræa, x. 40, and in ch. xi. again appears in Bethany. The starting out on this journey is therefore to be arranged in the harmony with Luke ix. 51.— If the brethren appear in this place as unbelieving, this is in accordance with Mark iii. 21, and with the fact that on the cross Jesus committed not to them, but to John, the care of his mother; yet after the resurrection they appear with the Apostles as believers, Acts i. 14. In relation to the question, which seems inextricably involved, in regard to these brethren of Jesus, nothing can be inferred from the passage before us but this: that no one of the ἀδελφοί could have belonged to the Apostles, that consequently James, the son of Alpheus, who was one of the Apostles, (Matt. x. 3,) cannot be regarded as ἀδελφὸς τοῦ κυρίου, though Hug, Kuhn, (Giessener Jahrbb. für Theolog. (1834,) H. 1,) still insist that he may have been, resting on the fact that πιστεύειν designates feebler and stronger degrees of faith.[1] In this narrative of the unbelief, in fact of the scorn of our Saviour's nearest connections, there lies a very important argument against the imputing to John, that he made it a rule always to be glorifying Christ—neither an unhistorical legend, nor a Disciple giving play to his fancy, would have invented this trait. We would be compelled to concede its psychological correctness, did it rest on no other ground than that of the proverb, iv. 44, to wit: that it is so much harder to acknowledge an extraordinary mission to mankind, in the case of one whose natural development we have witnessed. This conduct of the brethren of Jesus becomes yet more intelligible, if we accept what Schaf, in his work cited in the note, says, p. 90, seq. in regard to the internal development of James. As the piety of James partook of a strict Old Testament character, we may easily believe that he clung to a conception of the Messiah with which the manner of Christ's appearing was in conflict. He expected him to wield a power in civil matters, to make a brilliant display of himself in the central city of the theocracy. That his works had been done in a

[1] The whole question, and the passages of our commentary with reference to it are examined in full, in a very valuable treatise by Schaf, the latest which has appeared: "das Verhältniss des Jakobus, Bruder des Herrn, zu Jakobus Alphäi," Berlin 1842, p. 50 seq.

corner of Galilee, awakened distrust in their character, a distrust to which, perhaps, the εἰ has reference, though it does not necessarily involve a doubt of the mere fact of their having been done, (v. 23.) He demands then, not without irony, that Jesus should appear in the metropolis—and here in the interest of apologetics, it is worthy of notice that our Evangelist, in these words makes an allusion to an important activity on the part of Jesus in the working of miracles in Galilee, though he has given no account of it. The μαθηταί can hardly be other than those who were in the metropolis; we must explain as one of the instances of the inexactness in the style of John, (see on iii. 35, vi. 36, vii. 17, xix. 12,) that this is not expressed more precisely.—As regards the construction, v. 4, Lücke observes: "It agrees well with the more polished Greek style, as αὐτός is the impressive resumption of the subject in οὐδείς," (Matt. xii. 50, Mark xv. 43;) this usage of αὐτός is, to be sure, common enough, but not the structure of the sentence with καὶ ζητεῖ κτλ, for which the Greek would have substituted the participle; on the other hand, the sentence in Hebrew can be in correspondence with it, cf. on ו Ewald, Hebr. Gr. p. 252. Ἐν παῤῥησίᾳ, cf. xi. 54. Luther: [the corresponding German phrase,] auf dem Plane, (on the field.) [Παῤῥησία, not "frankness," (Beza, Meyer,) but "publicity," v. 10, 11, 54.]

V. 6, 7. Great as is the want of respect shown in the words of his brethren, the reply of the Redeemer displays the wonted character of elevation. The older expositors, Chrysostom, Lampe, and again recently Bauer, Ebrard, in v. 6 and 8, Bengel only in v. 8, interpret ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ἐμός of the time of the passion. When against this view the recent critics urge the difficulty, that the conformity between the two parts of the sentence in v. 6 would thus be destroyed, Bauer might be justified in maintaining that it is sufficient, if the parts of the antithesis have a point of contact in the thought, that he and they appear publicly before the world, that our Lord may nevertheless have regarded the fact that the trial of his passion had not yet come, as the reason why he would not appear; such a reference, certainly, imparts additional significance to the proposition in v. 8, cf. v. 20. But on the other side the question arises, if Christ would not go up at the beginning of

the feast, "because the time of his passion had not yet come," would he have gone up at the midst of it? Would there not lie in the words a declaration, that he would no more visit a festival until the last Passover? We have, consequently, to explain the phrase *ὁ καιρὸς πεπλήρωται* or *πάρεστι*, as in ii. 4. (Calvin, Piscator, Calovius,) "The proper time to do a thing," or in specie, "The proper time to go to the feast." *They* have no need to be so careful in the selection of the time, for kindred does not repel kindred, for *they*, as Luther expresses it, "are hale fellows well met, they are hand in glove with the high priests."—"If I," continues Luther, "would speak what the Papists like to hear, I would be very glad, too, to take lodgings with the Bishop of Magdeburg or at Rome." Christ in words of reproof places himself over against the world, (iii. 19, xvii. 14.)

V. 8, 9. As regards the reading, the first *ταύτην* in v. 8 is, according to the authorities, to be omitted; on the other hand, a majority of the authorities give before *ἀναβαίνω* the *οὔπω* of the received text, (Knapp, Lachmann.) Despite the external authorities, however, this reading of the received text is suspicious, as there is no difficulty in understanding how it may have arisen from an explanatory or apologetic gloss, the object of which was to remove from Christ's lips the apparent untruthfulness—the fickleness of purpose; the reproach of fickleness resting on *οὐκ* as the reading, had been brought against Christ by Porphyry already, (Jerome, Cont. Pelag. ii. 17.) In vi. 17, also, where accuracy would require *οὔπω* instead of *οὐκ*, we have in the Cod. B D L the explanatory *οὔπω*. If *οὐκ* is to be regarded as the authenticated reading, how can the Saviour be vindicated from the charge of a want of truthfulness? Chrysostom, Lücke, Olshausen, urge the strict idea of the present in *ἀναβαίνω*, which involves the *νῦν*, (I *go* not, i. e. *yet*.) Meyer supplies the words: "With you, in the caravan;" the solution of Wolf, De Wette, is better, that this *οὐκ* is limited by the *οὔπω* which follows. *Οὐκ* certainly occurs frequently in inexact usage where *οὔπω* should be the word, as in Mark xi. 13, Ezra iii. 6, cf. Mark vii. 18 with Matt. xv. 17. At an earlier period this mode of relieving the difficulty seemed to me to be incompatible with the words *εἰς τὴν ἑορτὴν*

ταύτην, (*this* feast,) which seem to be antithetical to *journeys to other feasts;* it also seemed to me that the ὅτι ὁ καιρός κτλ. must refer to the time of the passion, in which case we would be the more obliged to suppose that he declined going to the feast altogether. The former difficulty expressed by me has been adopted by Bauer, and pushed to the last extreme. My opinion now, however, is that it is capable of the following solution: "At other times Jesus invariably appeared at the beginning of the feast; here he declares that he will not yet go to *this* feast, because the proper time had not yet come; if he came unexpectedly, and did not appear until in the midst of the feast, the disturbance would be less." That the fear of disturbance was not groundless, is seen in the picture given us of the state of feeling at Jerusalem.

THE CONTROVERSIAL DISCOURSES OF JESUS IN THE MIDST OF THE FEAST OF TABERNACLES.—v. 10–36.

V. 10–13. Had Jesus appeared in the caravan with his connexions, and the people of his country, attention would have been directed to him from the beginning. On ὡς, De Wette correctly observes: "It marks the subjective character of the opinion, persons might say it was done in secret, or they might not, just as they chose to regard it; it is not used as it is i. 14." Ἐκεῖνος, without mentioning his name, contemptuous, like the Latin, iste; so in viii. 10, Matt. xxvii. 73. [Not exactly contemptuous, but as a designation of an absent person whom they all know.] Ἀγαθός, after the old classic usage; "good for its purpose, honest," so here in antithesis to πλάνος, (Matt. xxvii. 63.) The authorities remain in a state of irritation, from the time of the Passover in ch. v. in consequence of the words of reproof in which Jesus had addressed them, (cf. on v. 16,) so that they are cherishing the purpose of murdering him, (v. 19, 25.)

V. 14–16. The feast lasted eight days; on the fourth consequently, when he was no longer expected, Jesus made his appearance. We are not told whether his Disciples accompanied him, or had gone on before with his brethren. In either case, whether he went with them or was entirely alone, he

could journey without attracting the same attention as if he had gone with the caravan. He appears in the temple at once —in what part of it? Was it in the בֵּית הַפַּרְתֵּשׁ, which was in the great colonnade which encircled the fore-courts, where we suppose the scene in Luke ii. 46 to have occurred, or was it in the fore-courts? To the latter supposition, viii. 20, Mark xii. 41, John x. 23, would lead us. Among the hearers, according to v. 20, 32, we are to suppose there were scribes and persons from the populace. Whether these *Ἰουδαῖοι* belonged to the former, or to the latter class, cannot indeed be determined with certainty, yet the calm manner of the question may be regarded as favoring the idea that it was put by persons from the populace.[1] The fact that Christ, v. 19, charges on those whom he addresses, a desire to put him to death, does not prove the reverse, for he is speaking to the multitude in the mass. Christ's teaching in the temple, and this marveling on the part of the people in particular, bring up the question: whether it was allowed to every one to appear in the character of a public teacher? The reverse is shown by Matt. xxi. 23. From the Talmud, we learn that no man could appear as a teacher who had not for some years been תַּלְמִיד and חָבֵר (collega,) of a Rabbi, then followed the act of promotion, (נְקַט רְשׁוּת, *ἐξουσίαν λαμβάνειν*,) cf. the thorough treatise by Pacht, de eruditione Judaica, Gott. 1742, and Jost, Gesch. des Judenthum, vol. 3, p. 108. We certainly do not know, indeed, whether so early as the time of Jesus these matters were regulated in this way, but under Hillel and Schammai, the Rabbinical schools had already in all essential respects taken their shape. *Γράμματα*, not "the Holy Scriptures," (Syriac, Luther, Meyer, Bretschneider, lex. 3d ed.) otherwise it would be qualified by *ἱερά*, but "learning," (Acts xxvi. 24;) if the *people* said this, the appellation is still more easily accounted for, for to the people every religious discourse appeared to give evidence of such a learning as the Rabbins possessed.

[1] Meyer, who, like most of the critics, supposes the scribes to put the question, and translates: "How comes it that this man understands writings, without having learned them?" knows not what motive to assign for a question so devoid of passion, except this: "This question was designed to divert the interest of the hearers from the *matter* of the teaching of Jesus, and to diminish respect for him personally, as *one who was unlearned*." The first aim would have been entirely too subtle, the latter would not have been presented in *this* form of discourse.

V. 16, 17. The antithesis is that between a self-consciousness which is isolated from God and one which is in union with him, so that certainly no more is affirmed in these words than what even a prophet might have uttered; but prophets have but single illuminations, while Christ speaks of his entire doctrine; he never speaks and acts from his own isolated self-consciousness, (v. 28, viii. 16, 28.) Herein there also lies indirectly a setting of them right in relation to that question of surprise; for he who knows himself to be one with God *immediately*, does not attain to truth by mediated modes, and consequently, therefore, neither by the gradual way of reflection nor by what other men impart and teach. On chap. iii. 34, was shown that the πέμπειν of God is the internal manifestation of God. In what then consists that criterion of the divine character of his doctrine, which our Lord here furnishes? As we who are Christians are wont to regard the operation of the doctrine of Christ upon us as an evidence of the most universal character, that it is of God, the attempt has been made in various forms to verify in these words, also, an allusion to this power of Christian truth to form its own testimony. Those theological systems which regard Christ's teachings as preëminently moral teachings, as the giving of moral law, might understand this θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ as meaning this divine law, and might find the criterion of its divinity in the perfection imparted to the spirit by following that law, (thus Semler,[1] Lange, Herder, Kuinöl, and also Ebrard.) But to conceive of Christ after the Socinian manner as a new lawgiver, is to ignore his character as a Redeemer, and if we cannot conceive of his διδαχή as νόμος, it cannot well be designated by the expression τό θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ. Proceeding from the juster perception, that

[1] Mea doctrina, says Semler, divinam voluntatem optime describit. Quicunque igitur experiri vult ipse animumque omnino adjicit rebus illis, quas commendo, etc. (My doctrine best exhibits the divine will. Whoever, therefore, wishes to test it, must by all means apply his mind to the things which I commend, &c.) The *Socinians* do not appear to have explained it in this way, at least Crell (Opp. Ex. T. ii. p. 80,) follows the exposition which *we* have preferred. In *Episcopius*, the Arminian divine, who elsewhere is wont to give an acute exposition of the ethical expression, I have found no exposition of this expression. (Such a passage, however, is to be found in Episcopii Opera Theolog. Amstel. MDCL. 1. 3. "Sic Joh. Cap. vii. 17. Siquis velit, &c. id est facere quod secundum *rectam rationem*, aut *legis Mosaicæ* prescriptum fieri decet, &c." The whole in illustrating the position that "probitas" is essential to a student of theology. Tr.)

faith in Christ is the grand feature of Christianity, Augustine, Luther,[1] Melancthon, Lampe, Storr, Tittmann, Weber, (opuscul. comm. iv.) referring to vi. 29, (Ernesti refers to vi. 40,) have understood by the divine θέλημα κατ' ἐξοχήν, the demand of *faith in Christ:* where this demand is satisfied, conviction of the divinity of the doctrine is produced. And indeed, several writers again have understood the γινώσκειν, of the proof from its operation, the experimental evidence; by Augustine, however, the idea of the intellectual γνῶσις in contradistinction to πίστις is urged, and consequently, from this expression also is deduced the significant principle, "nisi credideritis, non intelligetis," (unless ye believe, ye cannot understand.) If, however, the expression ποιεῖν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ were meant to designate specially faith in Christ, we would have the phrase authenticated by its use elsewhere in this distinct sense, but not even in vi. 29 is it to be found. Nor could such a faith as this, a faith adopted by way of trial, be the true faith; it would be the fides carbonaria, and a mere assensus intellectualis. On the other hand let it be noticed, that in the kindred passage, v. 38–44, and in viii. 42, 47, the earnest, moral and religious striving of piety of an Old Testament type is represented as a medium through which men are led to faith in Christ; that exposition then of this passage is least forced which by the θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ understands the acknowledged will of God, first of all revealed in the Old Testament, (Chrysostom, Erasmus, Calvin, Bucer, John Gerhard, and the recent critics;) this view, besides, is favored by the connection in v. 18, 19. The principle which lies at the basis of the words of Christ, and which recurs in various forms in the discourses of Jesus as given by John, is that significant principle of Plato, τὸ ὅμοιον τῷ ὁμοίῳ ἥδεται, (like delights in like;) il faut aimer les choses divines pour les connoître, (divine things must be loved in order to be known,) says Pascal, i. 3. By using θέλῃ ποιεῖν instead of ἐάν τις ποιῇ, the whole weight is still more definitely laid on the bent of the will. If now Christ urges the earnestness of moral striving, of the fulfilling of the law,

1 "If ye would do that, (listen to me,) and not make resistance, the Holy Spirit would enlighten and teach you that the will of the Father is in Christ. This is the beginning, if a man would be learned in divine things: the beginning is, *to believe the word* of God."

the expression can be so taken as to guide us to precisely the same affirmation which Paul makes in regard to the νομός as ὁ παιδαγωγὸς εἰς Χριστόν: "He who earnestly strives to satisfy the law of God, will be led to a knowledge of his inability, and thereby be led to the faith that my doctrine, and specially the doctrine of the atonement, is of God." But as the νόμος in this sense is not spoken of in John, since rather, in the parallels cited from John, the law is designated as mediating to faith in the Gospel, *inasmuch as its contents in their spirit are similar to the contents of the doctrine of Jesus*, this side is to be held in this passage also; cf. also, iii. 21, viii. 47. It is yet to be noticed, that the pronoun is wanting with διδαχῆς; this may be explained by a designed antithesis between διδαχῆς and ποιεῖν, cf. however, what is said on iii. 34. Luther takes the article as demonstrative: "*this* doctrine."

V. 18. We have first to look at the form in which the sentence is constructed. There is no conformity between the two members of the sentence, cf. the observation on ch. v. 41. The first half embraces the *major*, the second the *minor* and the syllogism; the syllogism, however, which should be οὐχ ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ λαλεῖ, presents that thought in another form. He who through a mediate activity has attained to a doctrine, gives the credit of it to his own activity and his own acuteness; he who, on the other hand, comes to a knowledge of the truth in virtue of his immediate unity with God, refers back throughout to God. As herein full freedom from self-seeking is revealed, Christ had already, ch. v. 44, declared that the basis of unbelief in him is the striving after our own glory, which makes us incapable of acknowledging the divine in such a manifestation as is free from self-seeking. Here Christ attributes to a character thus free from self-seeking, the predicates of truthfulness and of moral purity. Ἀδικία, might indeed, like שֶׁקֶר, designate the theoretic side, error, (Grotius,) so that the same thought would be expressed positively and negatively; but no necessity exists for taking it in this way. According to the general opinion, v. 18 directly connects a second proof with what has preceded. Yet, with Schott and Neander, we might regard this verse as continuing the thought expressed in v. 17. "He who is free from ambition, and makes the will of God the rule

of his conduct, will acknowledge the divinity of my doctrine, for—he will recognize in me also one who is not striving after his own glory, and who is therefore true." Thus the transition would correspond with that which takes place in passing from ch. v. 38–40, to v. 41. But this connection of the thoughts has too little to mark it, and leaves too much to be read into the text. Yet so much may be true, that the thought in v. 18 is not connected with the other in a merely outward manner, but is brought in by this, that the holy principle of the doctrine of Christ finds expression also in that relation which he shows he sustains to the Father.

V. 19, 20. The hearers are designated as those who do not make even the doing of the will of God their law, entirely in accordance with ch. v. 45, as we interpret it, cf. also, viii. 37, seq. As a proof of this, the extremest transgression of the law is adduced, the murderous designs of the officials; but the multitude of those who are at the feast (cf. the antithesis, v. 25,) regard this suspicion as so extravagant, that they attribute it to the inspiration of the Spirit of lies. There is no necessity indeed, for supposing that in the *δαιμονίζεσθαι*, the *μαίνεσθαι* is involved, though the latter is certainly regarded as a consequence of the former, (x. 20.) In ch. viii. 48, there probably lies a retrospective reference to this reproach.

V. 21–23. Christ considers the rancor occasioned by the healing, ch. v., as the principal cause of the enmity of the rulers. We can hardly imagine that he would have referred to that occurrence which took place at the Passover before the last, had he also been present in the metropolis at the last Easter festival, vi. 4. Yet this argument cannot be considered as decisive. For might not Jesus—even if other signs no less striking had succeeded that miracle—might he not go back to the *beginning* of that public hostility? Let it be remembered, too, that in that miracle there was the additional offense that it took place on the Sabbath, and that it is this very offense to which prominence is here given. The Vulgate, Euthymius, and others, begin v. 22 with *διὰ τοῦτο*, which however cannot be justified; we must construe it with *θαυμάζειν*, cf. Fritzsche on Mark vi. 6, and Rev. xvii. 7. *Θαυμάζειν* has the accessory idea of terror, like תמה and שׁוֹמֵם, which means *horrore per-*

fundi, obstupescere, Septuag. Eccles. v. 7, Ecclesiasticus xxvi. 11. Chrysostom: τουτέστι, ταράττεσθε, ἐκθορυβεῖσθε, (that is, are troubled, are disquieted.) The reasoning of Christ gives evidence of that acute use of the Old Testament in his discourses, of which we find a number of instances in the synoptical Gospels, for example in Matt. xii. 5. The circumcision must be performed on the eighth day, (Lev. xii. 3;) if that day comes on the Sabbath, this rite, though it brought so much labor with it, the washing, binding, applying the plaster, &c., was to be attended to on that day, despite the sanctity of the Sabbath. The parenthetic proposition in v. 22, is not designed to claim for the law of the Sabbath a higher authority than for circumcision, (Chrysostom,) but is to be regarded merely as a limitation having reference to the antiquity of the rite. Καί expresses the sequence of the action, "and so:" Luther translates it "noch," equivalent to "und doch"—(yet, and still.) Ὁ νόμος Μωϋσέως refers, according to our interpretation, to the ἐντολή, enjoining circumcision on the Sabbath, (let James ii. 10, be weighed, however;) according to Bengel, Semler, it refers to the ἐντολή of the Sabbath, and ἵνα μή means: "so that it is not," "without being." But thus the inference loses in point, and ἵνα without necessity is regarded as equivalent to ὥστε, cf. however, ch. v. 20, vi. 50. The question now arises, however, what is the antithesis in ὅλον? It seems to rest upon the assumption that circumcision insured medical advantages, (cf. Winer, Reallex.) But is not Bauer correct in the remark, that circumcision, as the law contemplated it, is a purely religious symbol? Would we not, therefore, rather suppose a reference to the symbolic spiritual meaning of it? But if this be so, the antithesis does not present itself, nor does it even when, with Augustine, Bengel, Olshausen, we refer ὅλον to body and soul; still we hold fast to the religious significance of circumcision as a sign of the covenant, but derive from ὑγιῆ ποιεῖν the general idea, and interpret: "Ye transgress the law to perform a sacred, beneficent work, on that one portion of man; will you be angry at *me*, when I perform a work with the same characteristics, on the entire man?" By the want of distinctness in the antithesis, we might be inclined, with Kling, (Bengel, in his German translation, presented the same view before

him,) to lay the emphasis on ὑγιῆ, and to give prominence in περιτέμνειν to the *infliction of the wound*, but the expression is not περιτέμνειν at all, but περιτομὴν λαμβάνειν, which utterly precludes any prominence of the idea of wounding. On the other side, as circumcision was accompanied by healing, some have been inclined to bring out *this* point from the περιτομὴν λαμβ. so that the healing of one member and the healing of the entire man are contrasted, (Cyrill, Lampe, Meyer,) but this also is inadmissible. Not to enlarge on this point, the position of the ὑγιῆ ἐποίησα does not allow the emphasis to be laid on it.

V. 24. We might be tempted to give to κρίνειν κατ' ὄψιν the sense of πρόσωπον λαμβάνειν, (Lampe, Bretschneider, Lex. 3d ed.) as well because of the antithesis τὴν δικαίαν κρίσιν, as because of the connection: "Judge righteously, and not in such a way as to excuse a transgression in yourselves, and condemn it in me." Ὄψις, indeed, means the same as πρόσωπον, but the distinct phrase λαμβ. ὄψιν is wanting here. Κατ' ὄψιν consequently can only designate, like viii. 15, the judgment based upon the outward appearance, and thus the righteous judgment is that which is in accordance with the internal essence. This internal essence is the *intention:* in *their* transgression of the Sabbath, the intention respecting another positive commandment; on Christ's part in the miracle of healing, the intention of pitying love, the fulfilling of the most primitive of all commandments. The article τήν designates either the righteous judgment in *this case*, or the absolute rule of a righteous judgment. Bengel: judicium verum unum est; hæc vis articuli, (true judgment is one; this is the force of the article.)

V. 25–27. The residents of Jerusalem were aware of the determination of the rulers to put Jesus to death. The conjecture which they express, seems to be serious, not ironical. Yet they confute that opinion of their own, by the assumption that the πόθεν of the Messiah is not to be known, whereas they do know the πόθεν of Jesus. Do they mean by πόθεν, the birth-place or the parents? From vi. 42, we would suppose the latter, and in reply to the question אִי מִזֶּה there follows in the Hebrew a statement of the *parentage*, 2 Sam. i. 13. Let it be observed, however, that according to ix. 29, the πόθεν embraces

the characteristics in general, (cf. also, xix. 9.) We may therefore give as the sense: "We are acquainted with him, we know what sort of a person he is!" In addition, the answer of Christ refers to the character of his person as well as to his origin. Their opinion, as it would seem, has its basis in the passage of Daniel, (cf. also, Mal. iii. 1,) in which the Messiah appears in the clouds. The question may indeed be put, whether his birth in Bethlehem, and his descent from David, did not designate clearly enough whence he came; but not unfrequently the popular consciousness allows opinions which contradict each other, to stand side by side unharmonized, at least *we* do not know how to harmonize them; in v. 42, some of these very people (probably the more intelligent ones,) speak of Messiah's descent from David. I had directed attention to the fact that the Jew in Justin Martyr, Dial. c. Tr. p. 226 and 336, ed. Colon. expresses a similar thought; Lücke acknowledges that such is the case in the former passage; Olshausen, 3d ed. and Bauer, deny it. I believe that I must myself confess, that these ideas can hardly be said to be related, yet they show what manifold shapes the anticipation of the Messiah took in the popular mind.

V. 28, 29. With a loud voice, consequently with special emphasis, (vii. 37, xii. 44,) Jesus speaks of the contrast between what he knew of himself and what *they* knew of him. In these words, as in viii. 14, 23, the majesty and the indignation of a king whom his subjects refuse to recognize, find utterance. They know not his nature, (Matt. xi. 27,) how can they know his origin. The double *καί* is to be taken as in vi. 36. The words are certainly not to be regarded as a simple confirmation of their knowing his earthly origin, as De Wette supposes, but as holy and earnest irony. *Καί* before *ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ* must be regarded as antithetical: "and yet." The unity with God, of which self-consciousness assures him, forms the antithesis to the earthly *πόθεν*, cf. on vii. 17, iii. 34. *Ἀλλά*, equivalent to imo. *Ἀληθινός* either in the sense of *genuine*, (i. 9,) as Lücke, De Wette, take it, or synonymous with *ἀληθής*, as most critics take it, in accordance with the use of *ἀληθινός* in (iv. 37,) xix. 35, Rev. iii. 14, xix. 9, 11. Luther: "Though I preach the truth to you over and over again, I must yet lie to you. Our Lord

God must in the world always be a learner and a liar, and let himself be mastered by its reason. Wherefore, Christ comforts himself here: 'Though I must be before you as a liar, nevertheless God sent me, and I know that he is true.'" If with the first named expositors we interpret: "He who sends me is a genuine, true sender," that is, he who alone properly can send, the sense, indeed, is very appropriate, but this thought would have been expressed in a different way: ὁ ἀληθινός πέμπων, or in some similar manner. We therefore take ἀληθινός as equivalent to ἀληθής, and find the explanation of this title in the living witness to himself, which the Saviour bore within him; from this same witness proceed the words ὃν κτλ. which follow, expressing the contrast. So also does v. 29.

V. 30, 31. Some of the magistrates desire to arrest Jesus at once, but their courage fails them. Ὥρα here means the grand point of time in the life of our Lord, the time of his passion and death, (xvii. 1.) Lücke: "This is the religious pragmatism of history, with which no pious mind can dispense. At the same time we must not forget that it is John who more than any of the other Evangelists unveils the natural connection and the train of the development of that great hour, as it now hastens, and now lingers, and has thus skillfully united the religious view of the hour of Jesus with the intellectual." It may be asked, whether the faith to which, according to v. 31, many of the people attained, was a faith in Christ's work as a prophet, or in his work as Messiah. It seems to us that the former alone is the correct view, (Maldonatus, Heumann,) though most critics declare themselves for the latter, cf. however, also, v. 40. How perverse it is to impute, as has become the fashion in our day, so much design to the Evangelist; how little he aims at placing in the foreground the working of miracles, is manifest also from the cursory manner in which he here makes mention of the great number of the miracles. Besides, one might also most believe that these people out of the ὄχλος were persons who had come from Galilee to the feast, (v. 20,) at least these would most naturally have expressed themselves in this way.

V. 32–34. Ἀρχιερεῖς, the heads of the different classes of priests, ἄρχοντες τῶν πατριῶν τῶν ἱερέων, (1 Chron. xxiv. 6, 2,

Chron. xxxvi. 14;) φαρισαῖοι is the name of the party, not of the calling, the ἀρχιερεῖς could also have been embraced under the term; since there were also Sadducees in the Sanhedrim, (Acts xxiv.) it may perhaps be merely intimated that the persecution proceeded from the party of the Pharisees alone, (v. 48,) or — may the φαρισαῖοι designate the νομικοί and γραμματεῖς, who under those names do not appear in John?[1] (Cf. in the division which is not genuine, viii. 3, there indeed the γραμματεῖς are mentioned *together with* the Pharisees.) It is not clear whether the Pharisees who heard what was said, made report to the Sanhedrim, who then gave the order to arrest Jesus, or whether they made the arrangement themselves on the spot. But v. 45 is decisive for the former view, on which verse it is to be noted, that the Sanhedrim usually convened in the temple itself, in the לִשְׁכַּת הַגָּזִית, the stone chamber between the fore-court of the Gentiles and the inner court, (tr. Ioma, f. 25.) We see that Jesus knew of their determination. In explaining the difficult expression which occurs here, we must have in our eye the parallel passage, viii. 21, and the partial repetition of the expression before the Disciples, in xiii. 33. The different interpretations divide themselves first of all into two classes: according to the one, ζητεῖν designates an inimical seeking, the laying of a snare, (Origen, Grotius, Crell,) according to the other it designates a seeking out in order to obtain help, (Chrysostom, Erasmus, Calvin, Zwingle, Meyer.) Had the former been the case, a different structure of the sentence would be looked for, perhaps μικρὸν καὶ ζητήσετέ με καὶ οὐχ εὑρήσετε, (xvi. 17;) the expression, "seek and not find," has in it, moreover, something of the character of a phrase, and serves to designate a seeking of aid when the right time has passed away, cf. Amos viii. 12, Prov. i. 28, Hos. ii. 7, Isa. lxv. 1. To this is to be added that in viii. 21, instead of οὐχ εὑρήσ. we read ἀποθανεῖσθε ἐν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ὑμῶν, and that in xiii. 33, ζητεῖν cannot be taken at all in an inimical sense. Does it mean then, a seeking from a sense of penitence and of longing? (John xix. 37.) In chap. viii. 28, xii. 32, xvi. 10, conversions are spoken of which were to take

[1] Cf. Winer, Reallex. at the word Schriftgelehrte; Gfrörer, das Jahrhundert des Heils, 1 Abth. p. 140, seq.

place in consequence of the lifting up of Christ; and Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. iii. 35, tells us that in consequence of the fearful judgments of God on Jerusalem, *μυρίοι ἐκ περιτομῆς* (innumerable persons of the circumcision,) became believers. But of *these* it could *not* be said, that they had *not* found him, that *they had died in their sins*, (viii. 24.) Under the *μέ*, consequently, we would have to regard as contemplated, not the person of Christ, but the Messiah in the *Jewish* sense: "Then shall ye seek that Messiah, whom, in my person, ye have despised," (Luke xvii. 22, Matt. xxiv. 23,) thus Zwingle, Lampe, Kuinöl, Neander, l. c. p. 531, (Trans. p. 294.) But the *ἐγώ* and xiii. 33 are against this view. Nothing remains, then, but as Theodorus Heracleæ, Maldonatus, Grotius, De Wette, Lücke, 3d ed., have done, to regard the expression as a formula to designate the complete separation, the entire disappearance, (Ps. x. 15, xxxvii. 10, Isa. xli. 12;) in this case, indeed, we must also again reduce the contents of *ὅπου—ἐλθεῖν* simply to the thought of the absolute separation, (by Christ's death and ascension,) a view in which viii. 21 is specially in the way, but which is favored by xiii. 33. It must, consequently, be said, that on the one side Christ, from his self-consciousness, speaks of the exaltation on which he would then enter, an exaltation above all that men could attempt against him, and on the other side warns them to use the time with which they were yet favored, (xii. 35.) Without any necessity, Nonnus and Theophylact already, have the reading *εἶμι* instead of *εἰμί*, ("I go," instead of "I am;") the formula *ὅπου εἰμί* is also found in xii. 36, xiv. 3, xvii. 24, the present tense serves merely to give it the vividness of a thing present: "where I *then* am."

V. 35, 36. The question proceeds from the arrogance of hatred, as in viii. 22. *Διασπορά* is taken by most as concrete, for *οἱ διασπαρέντες*, the genit. *Ἑλλήνων* then points to the place of the dispersion, more correctly, however, is it interpreted *per meton.*, the place of those who are scattered among the Gentiles, (Syriac, Cyrill, Grotius,) as the *εἰς* also shows, thus Judith, ch. v. 21, (19,) *ἐκ τ. διασπορᾶς, οὗ διεστάρησαν ἐκεῖ*, (from the place where they were scattered.) They ask, whether Jesus will betake himself to those Jewish congregations, in order from

thence (as the Jews would not accord him their faith,) to operate upon the Gentiles?[1]

DISCOURSE ON THE LAST DAY OF THE FEAST — TRANSACTIONS IN THE SANHEDRIM. — v. 37–52.

V. 37–39.[2] The feast of Tabernacles lasted, strictly speaking, seven days, (Lev. xxiii. 34, Deut. xvi. 13,) yet in the law there is mention already made of an eighth day, (Lev. xxiii. 36, cf. Nehem. viii. 18, Numb. xxix. 35.) On the question whether the seventh or eighth day was the *great* day of the feast, (cf. xix. 31,) the evidence is wanting; according to the current tradition of the Rabbins, the pouring of the water, to which there seems to be an allusion here, took place only on the *seven* days of the feast, yet Rabbi Juda, tr. Sukka, iv. 1, 9, speaks also of a pouring of water on the *eighth* day; and as in Numb. xxix. 35, and in Josephus, Archæol. iii. 10, 4, the eighth day, together with the first, is designated as a special day of rest, and of the festal assembling of the congregation, *this* may be regarded as the *μεγάλη ἡμέρα*. A universal jubilee of the people (Plutarch calls it a bacchanalian one,) and various pompous ceremonies took place at this feast, so that the Rabbins were accustomed to say: "The man who has not seen these festivities, does not know what a jubilee is," cf. H. Majus, dissert. de haustu aquarum. On every day of the feast, at the time of the morning sacrifice, a priest brought into the forecourt, in a golden vessel, water from the spring of Siloah, which rises within the mount on which the temple stood, and poured it, mingled with the sacrificial wine, into two bowls which stood upon the altar, and in which there was an opening by which it made its escape. During the performance of this rite, the priests caused trumpets and cymbals to be sounded, and the words of Isaiah xii. 3, were sung: "With joy shall we draw water out of the wells of salvation." The exegetical

[1] Neander, l. c. p. 531, supposes that the Jews may have begun to surmise the tendency of Christ's teaching to embrace mankind universally.

[2] Cf. on this division, the Dissertation of Nösselt, Opuscul. diss. iii. p. 48: Flatt. Opusc. diss. ii.

tradition has ascribed a special Messianic reference to these words of the prophet, which he in fact does utter in a song of thanksgiving, having reference to the times of the Messiah. Jonathan translates those words תקבלין אילפנו חדת בחדוא מבחירי צדיקיא, "ye shall receive the new doctrine with joy from the elect righteous ones." Later Rabbins call this festivity, שמחת התורה, (joy of the law,) because the water was a symbol of the divine grace. It is assumed then by the expositors with entire probability, that the Redeemer cried thus, just at the point of time when the priest was carrying that sacred water through the fore-court, and the people were abandoning themselves to a jubilant joy at the sight of this symbol. It is noted by John. that on this occasion Jesus stood, (he usually *sat* when he taught,) and with a loud voice cried in the midst of the multitude.—The exalted words, testifying of the highest self-consciousness, announced that in him was actually imparted what was there expressed in symbol. We have an instance of a similar exalted testimony within himself, ch. viii. 12. He represents here also the sense of the need of redemption as the condition of participation in the blessings which proceed from him, and represents faith as the organ by which that participation is effected. *Κοιλία* like בֶּטֶן and קֶרֶב, for that which is within man, in general, cf. Ecclesiasticus xix. 22, Prov. xx. 27: in Arabic, also, بطن stands for قلب, "body" for "heart"—yet would Christ have used this expression, and not rather simply have said *ἐξ αὐτοῦ*, if he had not designed an allusion to the *κοιλία* of the golden vessel from which the water was poured out? (Bengel.)—Though Christ, iv. 14, declared that the water of life which he should give would be a self-dependent spring within the heart, yet this expression goes beyond that; on others also shall the streams of this spring pour themselves forth. (Chrysostom.) The reference to the Old Testament creates a difficulty; a passage literally corresponding is not to be found, though abundance of water is in various forms promised, as an image of energies which impart life, cf. on the one side, Isa. xliv. 3, lviii. 11, on the other, the passages which speak of a spring of water which is to go forth from the temple, Joel iii. 23, (iv. 18,) Zech. xiv. 8, Ezek. xlvii. 1–12.—As regards now the interpretation given by the Evangelist, he has

taken *ῥεύσουσι* as the future absolute, on the ground that not until Christ was glorified was the Spirit to be poured out upon the Disciples, (Luke xxiv. 49, Acts ii. 33;) in consequence of this interpretation, when Christ appealed to the Old Testament, John thought of Joel iii. 1. What are we to think then of this explanation which the Evangelist furnishes? *First of all*, if the water, as in iv. 14, designates metaphorically *energies of life*, such had certainly already, through our Lord's words as their medium, been conferred on the Disciples, (iv. 14, vi. 68, v. 25.) Is not such a communication of *life* also a communication of the *Spirit?* It certainly is, for the language is: "My words are *Spirit* and *life*." But Jesus himself, not only in the passages we have cited from Luke and Acts, but also in John, ch. xiv. and xvi., designates the sending of the Spirit as a thing of the future. If now quickening be a necessary consequence of the impartation of the Spirit, it would be entirely in accordance with the *fact*, if the Disciples dated the proper fulfilling of the promise from the time of the subsequent outpouring of the Spirit, and so much the more since with *that* event the life first began to *flow forth* from the Disciples. If the *οὔπω ἦν* is to be explained by reference to the outpouring of the Spirit, the Evangelist is not giving a declaration in regard to the *existence* of the Holy Ghost, but is speaking of his manifestation in his operations, on which account, so far as the fact is concerned, the addition of *δεδομένον* (Lachmann,) by a number of authorities is correct; in Acts xix. 2, *εἰ πνεῦμα ἅγιόν ἐστιν* is also probably to be taken in the same way. But the question then rises, why the operation of the Holy Spirit is dated from that period, though he had wrought already under the Old Testament, and during the life of Christ? Does the expression designate merely the strength of the distinction as to the *amount* of activity and power? Thus especially it is regarded by the Lutheran interpreters, who use it in maintaining the *similarity* between the operations of the Spirit under the Old and under the New Covenant. Or is there also a distinction in the *character* of the outpouring? Certainly the latter. The Holy Spirit in the specific Christian sense is that spirit which was wrought, in virtue of the *unio mystica*, with the glorified Christ, the new spirit of adoption which rests on the con-

sciousness of the finished propitiation, the spirit in the power of which the redeemed man knows himself more and more as the organ of that Christ who works in him and through him. This Spirit could descend upon the Disciples only after the propitiation had actually been accomplished, and Christ spiritually glorified. He then made the Church the body for his manifestation, (Eph. i. 23,) and in it continued his work upon earth. The faith of the Disciples then no longer had its centre in the sensible manifestation of Christ, but in his spiritual internal testimony, in the *unio mystica*, in the strength of which a Paul could now speak (cf. John xiv. 19, 20,) of the *δοκιμὴ τ. λαλοῦντος ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστοῦ*, (2 Cor. xiii. 3,) of the *κατεργάζεσθαι τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὀἰ ἐμοῦ*, (Rom. xv. 8.) There first was verified, that the living water which he had given them had become a self-dependent spring within them, (iv. 14.)

V. 40–44. The expression *ὁ λόγος* allows us to assume, that in what has preceded the Evangelist has merely given us the theme, as it were, of a discourse of Christ. On *ὁ προφήτης*, see i. 21. *Γάρ* in the question v. 41, is to be explained by the presupposition of a negative reply, Winer, p. 417. The objection, v. 42, resting on the popular opinion that Jesus was of Galilean origin, is urged by the more intelligent ones, who had in their eye, Micah v. 1, Isa. xi. 1, Jer. xxiii. 5. Under the *τινές*, it may be that we are to understand those very *ὑπηρέται*, who had mingled themselves among the people.

V. 45–49. The officers return to the authorities, to wit: in the assembly of the members of the Sanhedrim, and confess that they have been held back from any act of force by the transcendent power of Christ's words. It was, indeed, particularly the higher authority with which Christ appeared, by which they were struck and paralyzed, (Matt. vii. 29.) Besides, as Augustine says: Cujus vita fulgur, ejus verba tonitrua, ("his words are thunder, whose life is lightning.") If now, in perusing the words of Christ, the reader is led to confess what those hearers then confessed, there lies in this the true proof of the inspiration of the Evangelists, to wit: the proof of the fidelity of their narration. The arrogance of these hierarchical doctors of the faculty is characteristic, who, because of their knowledge of the Scriptures, regard themselves as the sole rule of the

truth; on the way in which this arrogance had gradually strengthened, see Gfrörer, das Jahrh. des Heils. 1 Abth. p. 240, seq. The unlettered populace were called עַם הָאָרֶץ, (people of the land,) and שֶׁקֶץ, (worms,) and in the Talmudic tr. Pirke Aboth. (ii. 5,) which contains many expressive sayings of the Rabbins, we have the words לֹא עַם הָאָרֶץ חָסִיד, "he that hath not studied is never pious."

V. 50–52. Pleasingly, and at the same time in a mode psychologically correct, are presented the tokens of the growing faith of Nicodemus. Still fettered in part by that same fear of man which had allowed him only with caution and by night to come to Jesus, he confines himself to requesting a proceduce in accordance with the principle of legal rectitude, (Deuter. xix. 15.) To ἀκούσῃ and γνῷ, Meyer and De Wette supply "the law itself," which is personified in the Judge; were the *judging* the thing spoken of, there would be no objection to this view, but as the thing spoken of is the judicial *hearing*, the verbs must be taken impersonally or ὁ κριτής be supplied from the connection, Winer, p. 339. To their blinded passion this love of rectitude on the part of Nicodemus is at once a suspicious matter; they express in their scornful question the idea that none but a man from the despised province would be among the followers of Jesus. In their haughty contempt toward this province, (the Talmud tr. Erubin. f. liii. 1, says: "Because of their wretched pronunciation, the law has not been intrusted to the Galileans,") and in their blind anger they overlook the fact also, that at least two prophets, Jonah and Elijah, were of Galilee, and probably also Nahum and Hosea. Luther: "Nicodemus had touched their consciences and confused them, so that they did not know what they were saying." According to Bretschneider, in his Probabilia, the mistake was not made by the scribes, but by the Evangelist, who, as Bauer thinks, in his extreme fondness for *contrasts*, forgot the historical data. But who is more likely to have been guilty of such forgetfulness, the Evangelist, who, according to Bauer, composed the Gospel from his own reflections, or a passionate hierarchy in the heat of conflict?[1]

[1] Ebrard, l. c. i. p. 493, relieves the difficulty by understanding it of the province of Galilee in antithesis to Judea, in which case the language would refer only to prophets *after* the exile.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE WOMAN TAKEN IN ADULTERY. — CHAP. VII. 53 – VIII. 11.

THE *genuineness* of this section is more than doubtful, inasmuch as there is a concurrence of strong reasons for suspecting it, derived from various sources. As regards the Codices, we indeed find the narrative in Cod. D G H K M U, and in nearly two hundred of the Minuscula, but it is wanting in A B C, on which fact, however, it is to be observed, that the Cod. A is defective from John vi. 50 to viii. 12, (though the relative size of the space proves that this history was wanting from the beginning,) and Cod. C is defective from chap. vii. 3 to viii. 34. As regards the testimony of Cod. D, its authority is weakened by the fact, that in some other places it has apocryphal additions, Matt. xx. 28, Luke vi. 5. Several Codices mark the passage with the obelus or asterisk as the sign that it is to be rejected or is suspicious, others put it at the end of the Gospel, others after vii. 36, and even after Luke 21. Euthymius on chap. viii. remarks: *χρὴ δὲ γινώσκειν ὅτι τὰ ἐντεῦθεν* vii. 53 *ἄχρι τοῦ* viii. 12 *παρὰ τοῖς ἀκριβέσιν ἀντιγράφοις ἢ οὐχ εὕρηται ἢ ὠβέλισται· διὸ φαίνονται παρέγγραπτα καὶ προσθήκη*, (it is needful to know, that the words between vii. 53 and viii. 12 are either not found at all in the accurate manuscripts, or are marked with an obelus; hence, they seem to be interpolated and an appendage,) to meet which, indeed, the assurance is given us on the other side by Jerome, c. Pelag. ii. 17, that this passage is found in multis et græcis et latinis codd, and some scholia assert that they are embraced in *ἀρχαίοις ἀντιγράφοις*. On this point, however, the additional circumstance presents itself, that, as is usual in the case of interpolations, there is in this passage specially an extraordinary number of variations; in fact, three divergent

texts in all are found. The testimony of the Church fathers, moreover, is unfavorable to the genuineness of the section, since it is at least not mentioned by Origen, Appolinaris, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Cyrill, Chrysostom, Basil, Tertullian, Cyprian and others; and is likewise wanting in the most ancient manuscripts and editions of the Syriac translation, in most of the Codices of the Coptic, &c. The first citations from the Greek text occur in the Apostolic Constitutions at the end of the third century, and in Ambrose, Augustine and Jerome; the oldest testimony for it, to wit: in the second century, is given by the Itala, yet in this translation too, the Cod. Verc. and Brix. omit the division. Can the omission, perhaps, be explained on doctrinal grounds? Ambrose, Apol. Dav. thinks, siquis ea auribus otiosis accipiat, erroris incentivum incurrit, (if any one receives it with idle ears, he encounters an incentment to error,) and Augustine, de adulterinis conjugiis, ii. 7, expresses the conjecture, that it may have been omitted, because it might give occasion to lightness of sentiment on the subject of adultery; the polemical writer, Nikon, moreover, in the thirteenth century, maintains that the Armenian Church arbitrarily erased the narrative, because it might be pernicious. But what Augustine says is merely *conjecture*, (credo;) this solicitude, too, is found for the first time in the fourth century in Augustine, and then already the narrative *had been* omitted in many Codices, but subsequently, after this solicitude had been expressed, it was *never on that account* omitted.—To these *external* grounds of suspicion are yet to be added the *internal*. According to (Le Clerc,) Olshausen and Strauss, it embraces contradictions which are incapable of explanation; this we cannot concede. On the other hand it is manifest, that in its *style* it is remote from that of John, and that it *has no connection with what precedes it*. When, for example, in v. 53, viii. 1, it says that Jesus went to the Mount of Olives, and that on the following day he again taught the people in the temple, we can hardly suppose otherwise than that ἕκαστος refers to the ὄχλος, and that ἐπορεύθη speaks of these people going to their houses. But immediately previous, the ὄχλος, the people, are not the subject of discourse. Nothing, consequently, would remain but to suppose that it speaks of

the going out of the members of the Sanhedrim, and as the mention of this without some further motive would seem to be rather superfluous, the sense would have to be: "With the matter undecided, without coming to any conclusion, they went home." As regards the language, the first thing which strikes us is the πᾶς ὁ λαός, an expression occurring in the Synoptists, but for which John habitually substitutes ὁ ὄχλος; the phrase καθίσας ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς, and the words ὄρθρου and γραμματεύς, occur in the Synoptists but not in John; finally, we have here several times the connection with δέ, while John uses οὖν and καί.—The state of the critical data being such, it implied even in Heumann's day great assurance to venture the observation which he makes: "I confess that I doubt, if we consider all the critical marks of interpolated writings, whether a solitary one of them will be found in this history," (!) but yet more amazing is it that even in our day Ebrard can assure us, (l. c. i. p. 494:) "The external testimony *against* the genuineness is entirely *insignificant*." After Erasmus, Calvin, Beza, had expressed simply doubt, Grotius, Le Clerc, Wetstein, Semler, and almost all the recent writers, have expressed themselves decidedly against the genuineness of the passage. But the most recent negative criticism of Strauss, Bauer, (Weisse judges more impartially,) again pleads for its genuineness, (Strauss does so in his 4th ed. after passing by the section in silence in the 3d ed.) in order in this way more effectually to defend the position, that the entire book is spurious. Yet apart from these, the genuineness has been maintained in the most recent period by Stäudlin, (in a Progr. 1806,) Kuinöl, Schulthess, Scholz.—The question of *authenticity*, however, is entirely distinct from that of genuineness; it is a magisterial sentence without ground, when Hase, l. c. p. 148, declares that the authenticity cannot be maintained, when the genuineness is denied. Neander, with mature historical tact, makes the remark: "Only, to make the largest concession, could the spirit of the Marcionite system have originated such a narrative, if we suppose that it is not from a true tradition we derive it; yet on that supposition it would have taken a different form, would have taken shape in a more decided opposition to the Mosaic point of view, and in that case could not have obtained such

general acceptance in the Catholic Church." In fact, the narrative bears something of that spirit in it which is so peculiar to the Gospel—and which, therefore, through all ages, has been understood by so few, so that even the Church of the first century had already begun to ignore it—the spirit of a free pitying love, over against a legalistic ascetic piety. The conduct of our Lord in this situation is depicted also with a detail marked by peculiarities, which a legend certainly would not have invented. We believe, therefore, that it belongs to the circle of the synoptical tradition of the Gospel[1]—the traces of the citation of it extend, as we have said, back to the period when the Itala was translated. But if the narrative belongs to the circle of the synoptical tradition, how did it get into this place in John? If we may be allowed to suppose that our Saviour's spending the night outside the city, during the last Passover, (Luke xxi. 37, xxii. 39,) was occasioned by the danger impending over him, we must also, because of v. 2, place this incident in the time of the last Passover, and those manuscripts have consequently followed a true tact, which have put this narrative at the close of Luke 21. For its insertion here, we know of no other reason than that now received by most, that it appeared to give a striking conformation to the words *ἐγὼ οὐ κρίνω οὐδένα*, in v. 15.

CHAP. vii. 53—viii. 2. The remark has already been made, that the words, v. 53, can of course be understood only of a departure for their homes, at the close of a day, when Jesus had been teaching in the temple, (Luke xxi. 38.)

V. 3–5. It has been thought that three internal improbabilities may be detected in these words, and these Olshausen, especially, has felt himself obliged rigorously to urge: 1) If these persons came under the commission of the Sanhedrim, how could they afterward, without anything further, permit the woman to go? If they came on a prompting of their own, how could they, as if they were official persons, claim the carrying out of the Mosaic law? 2) In the Pentateuch, stoning

[1] When Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. iii. 39, mentions that Papias narrates what is also found in the Gospel *κατ' Ἑβραίους*, the history of a woman who was accused, *ἐπὶ πολλαῖς ἁμαρτίαις*, (of many sins,) a number, even Olshausen among them, have found in this a trace of the narrative here; but the *ἐπὶ πολλαῖς ἁμαρτίαις* points rather to the narrative in Luke vii. 47.

is indeed appointed as the punishment in certain cases of *fornicatio*, but in cases of adultery, merely death in general, (Deut. xxii. 22, Lev. xx. 10;) the Talmud, indeed, expressly designates strangulation as the punishment in such cases. 3) How could the question be supposed to *tempt* Jesus? Whether he advised severity in accordance with the law, or advised mildness, in either case, it could do him no injury, as he would simply be expressing a private opinion. Besides, they could hardly expect from Jesus a sentence in direct conflict with the explicit direction of the law, (Strauss.)—None of these difficulties seem to us so formidable. Our reply to the *first*, is: the scribes, by whom the members of the Sanhedrim are also meant, (v. 9,) act as private persons; their arrogant self-righteousness displays itself in some measure in their dragging offenders to legal punishment. Their design was to take the woman before the court, which, as was observed on vii. 32, was sitting in a hall of the temple; as they pass by Jesus, the thought is started, of bringing him, who as the friend of sinners was so odious to them, into difficulty by this case, and they therefore request a decision from him.[1]—As regards the *second* question, it is first of all to be observed, that the confirmatory statement from the Mischna is by no means to be considered decisive. It proceeds, in fact, from a canon of interpretation whose incorrectness can be demonstrated, to wit: that where merely the words מות ימות are found, the death is always by strangling; but cf. Exod. xxxi. 14, xxxv. 2, with Numbers xv. 32–34. Even in Christ's time, moreover, the Mosaic law was no longer carried out in all points, as for example, the bitter water was no longer given to the adulteress as a test, (Num. v. 11, seq.) and after the destruction of the city, the changes were many and great, (cf. Michælis, Mos. Recht, § 262.) Still, even in the case before us, a consonance with the Mosaic law

[1] Since according to v. 9, members of the Sanhedrim are included, it might be supposed there was a deputation of the Sanhedrim, (Meyer,) but this surely could not have been *officially* sent. If the supposition is allowable, that, because of the frequency of adultery, the legal penalty was no longer enforced, (Ebrard,) it would certainly be easier to understand how it would come to pass, that a teacher might be consulted as an individual; yet in such a case, his position of variance toward Moses would have had in it nothing offensive; but that they, in case he had decided *with* the law, would have reproached him with "unheard of severity," is, with their reverence for the law, not very likely.

can be proven. First, we may consider the supposition by which Selden, Lightfoot, and Meyer, meet the difficulty, to wit: that the woman was *betrothed;* in the case of such a woman, if violation occurred in the city, where she could cry for help, (the case was different when it occurred in the field,) she was to be stoned to death, (Deut. xxii. 23, 24,) and Philo thinks that the term μοιχεία is applicable to this form of crime also. Yet we are forced to ask: Had this been the case here, would there not, in order to characterize the crime, have been added, that it occurred *in the city?* On the other hand, Ebrard, as it seems to us, has made the agreement between this transaction and the law highly probable, (especially if we connect with what he says the remarks of Michælis.) His view is this: "In Deut. xxii. 20–25, four cases of *fornicatio* are mentioned: for the first and third, v. 20 and 23, stoning is designated as the mode of execution; in the cases of the second and third, v. 22 and 25, only the word "die" is used; but as in v. 25 it says, "the *man only* shall *die*," in opposition to v. 24, where it is said, "*both* shall be *stoned*," it clearly follows that in the second and fourth cases also, no other penalty than that by stoning is contemplated."— As regards the *third* question, there certainly lay something ensnaring in the matter, in as far as Christ might decide *against* the law, as in that case he would be marked as one who despised the law. Only in case he decided *for* the stoning, is it difficult to see wherein the point of the testing would lie. Luther, indeed, following Augustine, says: "If he answers *yes*, he contradicts his preaching; if he says *no*, he contradicts Moses." Calvin even thinks that the temptation consisted in the incitement to legal rigor, and as the result, to inconsistency with his ordinary, mild manner of acting; as, however, Christ never declared as a *rule*, the release of the sinner from punishment— especially from that determined by the civil law—it is not probable that the Pharisees had drawn such an inference from his conduct and his teachings. We prefer, therefore, with Euthymius, Crell, Neander, to suppose that the πειράζειν does not involve the idea of reducing him to a dilemma, but rested on their fixed presumption, that Jesus would in this case also, display that mildness toward sinners which was so hateful to them, cf. Luke vii. 49, xv. 1, 2, Matt. xxi. 31.—In καταλιθάζῃ, let the

augm. perf. in aor. 1, be noticed, which occurs elsewhere only in *εἰρήθην*, (Buttmann, Ausfuhrl Gramm. ii. 415.) According to the law, the adulterer was also to be put to death, but he seems in this instance to have made his escape. They place the woman in the midst of the crowd which had gathered around Jesus, so that the eyes of all were turned upon her. *Ἐπαυτοφώρῳ* is added, that no room for doubt about the truth of the accusation may be left.

V. 6–8. Some Codices add *προσποιούμενος*, others *μὴ προσπ.* both evidently glosses. To *ἔγραψεν* various expositors have supplied, and even some Codices have actually added: *ἑνὸς ἑκάστου τὰς ἁμαρτίας*; had Jesus, however, written any particular words, the Evangelist would have mentioned what they were —besides, this was hardly possible on the floor, which was a paved one, and probably kept clean. If we may not urge the *words that were written*, yet the *act of writing* may be significant; the meaning of it according to Bengel and Michaelis is: "Why do you question me? What stands written suffices." Obscurely enough would this have been expressed, and certainly if this had been the meaning the act would not, in v. 8, have been repeated. Rather is the explanation completely satisfactory which imputes to it the same significance which it still has among us. The writing or drawing (*γράφειν* signifies either,) on the ground was in the ancient world, as among us, the sign of profound meditation and of abstraction from all that is going on around, also of irksomeness, which, occupied with nothing external, is absorbed in the train of thought which passes within. See the Scholion on Aristophanes, Acharn. v. 31, in which passage come one after the other the words, *κἄπειτ' ἐπειδὰν ὦ μόνος, ἀπορῶ, γράφω, παραπίλλομαι, λογίζομαι*, (afterward when I am alone, I hesitate, I write, I twitch my hair, I calculate,) so that one word explains the other. In the Talmud also, tr. Gittin, f. vii. 1, are found traces of a similar usage among the Jews. Jesus, consequently, expresses in this way, first of all, that he is giving no heed to the question. And wherefore? Probably on the same ground as in Luke xii. 14, because he is not willing to interfere in decisions on questions of civil law; thus Neander, Lücke, Olshausen. This is also Luther's view, who adds these words: "Our Lord means to

say, why do you question me? and will not favor them with a word, turns himself in another direction, and will not attend to them nor answer them." But can it then be said that the mere expression of a judicial sentence is here involved? Such a sentence, in fact, the Sanhedrim alone could give. The law (a fact which must not be overlooked,) was a *religio*-political one, and what it affirms they themselves adduce, they consequently wish merely to know what religious attitude toward the law Jesus would assume. We cannot, therefore, well suppose any design in the writing other than in its repetition, v. 8. We, consequently, coincide with Bengel: Silenti actione cogitationes adversariorum vagas, festinantes et securas fixit et conscientiam eorum excitavit, (by a silent action he fixed the wandering, hasty, self-reliant thoughts of his enemies, and aroused their conscience.) If we dared not assume, a priori, that they became accusers with a self-righteous and malignant satisfaction, yet v. 7 would prove that they did. On *such* accusers that deportment of the Saviour must have had the effect we have intimated. What passed in the mind of Jesus while he was silent, is shown by v. 7. The word of Christ is not to be regarded as demanding an abrogation of judicial punishment, but as a more concrete expression for *καταχρίνειν*. Thus this word of his strengthens the influence upon the thoughts of the people, which his silence had already been calculated to effect, and his relapse into silence gives free play to the chastening of conscience. There is evidence that at this period many of the Rabbins, high in position, were living in adultery, (Wagenseil on the Sota, p. 525, seq., Justin Mart. dial. c. Tryph. p. 363, ed. Col.) yet it is hardly necessary to demonstrate this to justify the result of which v. 9 tells us.

V. 9. Musculus: Fuit procul dubio tantopere hoc Christi responso illorum verberata conscientia, ut primum prorsus obmutuerint, nec habuerint, quod in speciem regererent. Deinde, ne ulterius quid, quod minus vellent, ubi se denno erexissit, audirent, confestim se ex medio subducunt, (beyond doubt, their conscience was severely smitten by this answer of Christ's, so that at first they were entirely silent, nor had they anything specific to reply. Afterward, when he lifted up himself a second time, they feared they might hear something

further, which might be still less pleasant, and hurriedly withdrew,) cf. the admirable remarks of Calvin.—*Εἷς καθ' εἷς*, a solecism for *καθ' ἕνα πάντες*, Mark xiv. 19, Rom. xii. 5, 3 Maccab. v. 34. *Ἕως τῶν ἐσχάτων* does not seem to belong to the original text. Some interpret *πρεσβύτεροι* and *ἔσχατοι* as having reference to age: "Old and young," (Grotius, Seiler,) but if we read *ἕως ἐσχάτων*, the *ἔσχατος* compels us to refer the *πρεσβ.* to the *rank;* (Aristophanes: *ὁ ἔσχατος δῆμος*, the lowest of the people,) as in Latin, primores and homines postremi, (1 Cor. iv. 9.) A withdrawal in the exact order of rank is of course not intended, but merely that the one class withdrew, as well as the other; yet the remark may be made, that when the principal persons departed, their inferiors would have the less courage to remain.

V. 10, 11. Olshausen discovers in the course here pursued by Jesus, a threefold difficulty. First, that Jesus, by making the exercise of the penal authority dependent on the moral character of the judge, undermines the foundation of civil law. Secondly, that in an unseemly manner he withdrew the criminal from her judge. Thirdly, that an exhortation to repentance, so necessary under the circumstances, is wanting. Yet he himself observes in part, what serves to resolve these scruples. The main point to be kept in view is this: Christ fixes his eye not so much on the act of the adulteress, as on the *intention of her accusers;* regarded in this aspect, which is so entirely in keeping with the character of Him who had come into the world as its *Redeemer*, (iii. 17,) the conduct of Christ is perfectly intelligible. The sad mingling of what belongs to religion with what is demanded by civil order in his own day, led Luther especially to take that view, from which also this conduct of our Lord, as regards its relation to the *law*, is to be explained. In the Mosaic institutes, the State and the Church, the legal and the religious point of view, coincide; in the Christian system, they are separate. The conception of the state rests upon that of the law, and *retribution*, that is, punishment is needed, that the law may be carried out; Christ on the contrary, and the Church with him, works upon the mind, and this is done through nurturing love; the *discipline* of the Church consequently, is not a *κόλασις*, but simply a *παιδεία*, which ceases

where there is penitence, (2 Cor. ii. 6, 7.) In consonance with this, Luther says: "He does not take from their right, he lets Moses stand untouched, he says to them neither nay nor yea, yet in a masterly manner he says both. Why do ye not what Moses has commanded? But if ye wish to judge her in accordance with *my* kingdom, commit her case to me. For my judgment is: This adulteress is not alone; there is not one of you that is not as bad and wicked as she is." That the exhortation to *penitence* is wanting, cannot be maintained — it lies in the *μηκέτι ἁμάρτανε*, Augustine: ergo et dominus damnavit, sed peccatum, non hominem, (therefore, our Lord did pass condemnation, but on the sin, not on the person.) The exhortation is a brief one, but how mightily had the *circumstances* spoken! In her fears, the woman had already passed under the sentence of death, she had endured the public disgrace; the question: "Where are thine accusers," had made her feel how much she owed to Jesus, and that Jesus who but a moment ago with his searching words had thrilled the hearts of her accusers, turns now upon *her* the look of pitying love! Was it in the power of *words* to *strengthen* the impression—would they not have *weakened* it?

A SECOND TESTIMONY OF CHRIST TO HIMSELF. — v. 12–20.

V. 12. Was this discourse, also, uttered during the last day of the feast? If v. 12 is connected with vii. 52, we must suppose it to have been uttered *after* those transactions, and in that case it can hardly belong to the same day. Although the first mention of the departure from the temple is made in viii. 59, there is yet a change of place supposed in v. 20. These discourses naturally fall then into the time *succeeding* the feast. The testimony of Christ to himself in this passage has an analogy with that in vii. 37; after the analogy of that and the character of these figurative discourses of Christ elsewhere, it has been thought necessary to search for some distinct occasion for this comparison of himself with light, and such an occasion has been found in our Lord's being supposed to cast his eyes on the two tall golden candlesticks, which during the feast of Tabernacles were lighted on either side of the altar of burnt

offering, where also was the γαζοφυλάκιον—according to Maimonides, they were lighted every day. If the discourse, however, was uttered *after* the feast, the possibility of such an allusion falls to the ground. Lyser and Heumann suggest that the rising sun gave occasion for the metaphorical language. We do not feel ourselves able to decide anything definitely on this point. As Christ in vii. 37 had designated himself as the fountain of the *powers* of life, so here he designates himself as the fountain of that *illumination* from which *life* comes, life *for the whole world*. By speaking of following him, he introduces the image of a guiding star, by which we are led on our pathway, and he who follows him receives this light of life into his soul.

V. 13, 14. Such exalted representations in regard to his person must in the nature of the case excite opposition; no man could receive a testimony of this sort, given of himself by the witness, unless he were in affinity with him, so as to feel it at the same time within himself. Having no such affinity, they at once charge him with falsehood, but the Redeemer, in the power of a self-consciousness closely conjoined with God, was able to maintain the truth of what he had affirmed, (vii. 28, 29.) Augustine: Lumen et alia demonstrat et se ipsum. Testimonium sibi perhibet lux, aperit sanos oculos et sibi ipsa testis est, (Light, which brings other things to view, brings itself to view. Light furnishes its own testimony, it opens healthful eyes, and itself is a witness to itself.) The inference of his adversaries was indeed conceded by Christ in the discourse, chap. v. 31, but only by accommodation, and the same accommodation follows here in v. 18.

V. 15, 16. He animadverts on the tone of mind from which that judgment proceeded. Σάρξ may be the outward appearing of Christ, (cf. κατ' ὄψιν, vii. 24,) or it may mean the σάρξ of those who judged him, in antithesis to the pneumatic tone of mind from which an acknowledgment of his witness to himself would have to proceed. The ἐγώ—οὐδένα, Bauer regards as absolutely out of place, and ascribes it entirely to the disposition of the Evangelist to exaggerate. Cyrill, Flatt, Kuinöl, supply, to complete the sense, κατὰ τὴν σάρκα, (according to the flesh,) but in this way the resumption in the proposition καί—ἐγώ, which is clearly absolute, is falsified, (De Wette;) it is better, there-

fore, to take *κρίνω* in the connection in the same evil sense in which we find it used in the connection in Matt. vii. 1 also. Christ has no pleasure in judging, and where *pleasure* is felt in it, it is the infallible sign of a heart of impurity; that he judges, however, is shown by v. 16, but he does it only in fellowship with the Father; it springs, therefore, from motives which are objective, and consequently, pure.

V. 17, 18. The thought expressed in v. 16 leads to an accommodation similar to that which we have in ch. v. 31, 32. We see from expressions like these, and like those in verse 29 and in xvi. 32, that the identity of the self-consciousness of Christ with that of God has not abrogated the distinction between them.—Cf. Deut. xix. 15.

V. 19, 20. That the Jews knew very well whom he meant by the Father, we see clearly from chap. v. 18, x. 33, but they deride after the manner of men who cling to what seems to be the evidence of the senses. In correspondence with the statement elsewhere made, that the knowledge of the Father is indispensable to the acknowledgment of Christ, the converse as regards the relation may be affirmed. It cannot be determined with entire certainty what is here meant by the *γαζοφυλάκιον*, see Lücke on this passage, and De Wette on Luke xxi. 1. According to the Talmud, there were in the Sanctuary thirteen boxes for the reception of offerings, which are, perhaps, here named collectively *γαζοφυλάκιον*; from Mark xii. 41, seq. we must suppose they were placed in the fore-court of the women. *Ἐν* designates place, (Luke xiii. 4.) The designation by John of the locality may be incidental, but may be designed to mark the fact that Jesus taught in a place where multitudes assembled, in order that the extraordinary fact that *οὐδεὶς ἐπίασεν αὐτόν* (no man laid hands on him,) may be made more prominent, in which case *καί* must be taken as adversative, (and yet.)

JESUS WARNS THEM—DISCOURSES OF HIS DIGNITY.—v. 21–29.

V. 21, 22. Whether this discourse immediately followed, or is given without respect to the order of time, cannot be determined. On one of the middle days of the feast, Christ had uttered something of the same kind, vii. 33, 34; here *οὐχ*

εὑρήσετε is omitted, and καὶ ἐν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ὑμῶν ἀποθανεῖσθε is added. Ἁμαρτία cannot, as Calvin supposes, have a different sense from the plural in v. 24. The thought is consequently this: "Ye shall die in an unredeemed condition." It would seem on this view, in conflict with the exposition we have adopted on vii. 34, as if ζητεῖν must designate the longing after the Messiah, and ὅπου—ἐλθεῖν the result of dying without a Redeemer. But such a conception of the meaning of ζητεῖν has nothing whatever in its favor, and in this very connection v. 24 is also against it, for as unbelief is the reason why they die in their sins, the ζητεῖν cannot be a longing after Christ; we are forced, therefore, with Calvin, to limit it to "a seeking for aid from necessity, without faith, and consequently *no seeking* at all." If, however, we make this distinction, must not the language refer to *calamities* at least? But if we admit this, we are the more necessitated to interpret the expression in consonance with vii. 33, xiii. 33. In this way we are led to the sense: "Use the present moment, for soon I shall be no more with you; ye shall seek me in vain, and shall pass away in your sins, but I shall be forever delivered from your snares." There need be no difficulty in adopting this view, because it would require us to insert the words "in vain," since they must be added, even if we assume that ζητεῖν means the seeking of help. In John, least of all, can we be surprised at inexactness of phraseology, (cf. the remarks on vii. 3, xvi. 10, &c.)

V. 23. Calvin: Pergunt non modo in securo contemptu, sed etiam in protervia, (they persist not only in their contemptuous security, but even in wantonness,) as in vii. 35. As the Jewish abhorrence of suicide was very great, and as the opinion prevailed among them that the self-murderer was condemned to the lowest hell, (Josephus, De bello Judaic. iii. 8, 5,) the words imply the most unmitigated scorn, and intimate besides, why they would not wish to follow him—to wit: into hell.

V. 23, 24. Verse 23 may be regarded either as a solemn rejoinder to their scoff, or merely as a continuation of v. 21. The former would undoubtedly be the preferable view, if τὰ κάτω meant the world below, שְׁאוֹל, but the words ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου show that it refers to the earth, (Acts ii. 19;) the transition to v. 24, would consequently, if that supposition were correct, be

difficult to explain. The connection, therefore, as Crell already gives it, is this: "Ye are earthly minded, I am heavenly; if therefore ye be not justified by faith in me, ye must perish in your sins." On ἐγώ εἰμι, compare remarks at iv. 26.

V. 25. Luther: "A sarcastic reply, as if they said: Pretty well, that is very likely. And who are you then, good Master Jesus?" This sentence, especially because of the τὴν ἀρχήν at the beginning of it, has been a crux interpretum, and has given rise to the most diversified interpretations and fancies. As τὴν ἀρχήν even in a philological respect has been explained in ways very different and sometimes in conflict with the usages of the language, we have first of all to specify what it may mean and what it cannot mean, cf. De Wette and Lücke. On this point it is considered as understood that ὅ, τι is to be taken as relative, that καί is not to be removed from the text, and that τὴν ἀρχήν is not *substantive*, but *adverbial*, like ἀχμήν. This *adverb cannot* mean "truly," (Kuinöl, Lücke, 2d ed.;) it can *hardly* mean, "to begin with, first of all," (Erasmus, Luther, Bucer, Grotius, Paulus, Olshausen;) "first of all, I am he whom I also tell you I am, that is, he who admonishes you," (Paulus;) "first of all—and I speak it openly—I have much to censure, and to rebuke in you, and am, therefore, he who earnestly admonishes you," (Olshausen;) "in the first place, I am what I have just declared myself to be—the light of the world," (Grotius;) "first, I am your preacher," (Luther.) All these ways of taking the expression suppose that our Saviour's design was primarily to lead the Jews to a different view of himself, so that when they stood on this point of view, he might reveal to them one yet higher. But on the one hand, the trailing character of these explanations, on the other, their inaptness, is manifest; it is besides questionable whether τὴν ἀρχήν is ever used in the sense of "first of all." According to ordinary usage it signifies, 1) in the beginning, equivalent to formerly, aforetimes; 2) from a former period, from the beginning, that is, *altogether*, and this is almost always its sense in negations; 3) from the beginning, Herodotus, i. 9. (Schweighäuser, Lex. Herod. i. p. 105. Hermann on Sophocles, Antig. v. 92.[1]) The exposition most widely

[1] Although the philologists we have named are sufficient authority for so understanding the word in that passage, yet the meaning of "altogether" might perhaps answer. Lücke has overlooked that meaning.

embraced (Nonnus, Melancthon, Beza, Camerarius, Calvin, Le Clerc, Heumann,[1]) is that which rests on this third signification of the word, and which takes *λαλῶ* in the sense of the præterite: "What I told you already in the beginning, (or *from the beginning*,) that am I;" Elsner adduces as a parallel the passage in Plautus, Capteivi iii. 4, 91: Eho, die mihi: quis igitur ille est? —quem dudum dixi a principio tibi, (come, then, tell me who he is?—He whom I've told you all along from the beginning. Riley's Translat. Bohn, 1852.) The *present tense λαλῶ*, as in xiv. 24, viii. 58, includes the *preterit*. To the view just presented De Wette objects, on the following grounds: 1) Because the collocation of the words is arbitrarily changed. But does not the emphasis lie on *τὴν ἀρχήν*? 2) *Λαλῶ* is taken as if it were *ἐλάλησα*. But has not De Wette himself, in vi. 63, acknowledged that the present tense may include time past? The *καί*, moreover, whether it be translated "also" or "even," is entitled to its due weight, and should this be met with the objection, that *λαλῶ* cannot stand for *λέγω*, the reply may be made, that here, either would be in place, cf. *λέγω* in v. 26, with *λαλῶ*, xvii. 13, and in addition, vi. 63, xii. 48, xvi. 25. We consequently still maintain that our interpretation is entirely admissible. De Wette, on the other hand, insists that the proposition is to be understood in this way: "To the question of the Jews, Jesus does not wish to make the reply: I am the Messiah, because they adhered so strongly to a dead, positive idea, and as they would not find this verified in him, they would only have been the more hardened against him: he refers them, therefore, to his discourses; first of all in these discourses was he to be recognized." This way of taking it is ingenious, but I object at the very outstart to translating "first of all," "preëminently;" the word cannot be equivalent to *inprimis*, although it has been proposed by some to take it in this sense even in Herodot. i. 9. Lücke, 3d ed., following Euthymius, and especially Locella, (Xen. Ephes. Annot. p. 164, seq.) renews the conception of it as interrogative: "Why am I yet speaking to you at all?" so as to make it a dismissal of the matter like that in x. 25, *εἶπον*

[1] Some of these expositors, without any thing further to justify it, translate in the preterit, others in the present; Beza, however, justifies the present, and Heumann also makes a remark upon it.

ὑμῖν καὶ οὐ πιστεύετε. On linguistic grounds, certainly no objection can be urged against this view. *Τί, τι* frequently occurs as absolute, in the sense of "wherefore," and that too by an elliptic usage, so that a *scire velim* must be supplied, (Stallbaum zu Euthyd. 271, A.) *Καί* in the gradation ad infra, "yet, still," is also familiar, (Rom. viii. 24.) But the want of congruity between this answer and that question, creates a serious difficulty, which would, however, be somewhat relieved if "at all" were left out; on this view, moreover, the connection of v. 26 is not a good one.

V. 26. With the complaint of their refusing to listen to an explanation oft repeated, are naturally connected the censure that they gave so much occasion for reproof, and the comfort which under the circumstances of the case is found in the thought, that the eternal fountain of truth, the Father himself, had imposed on him an internal necessity for uttering all these reproofs, (v. 15, 16.) *Ἔχω* with the infinitive, designates the objective ability, Acts iv. 14, (I could,) it here refers to the past time and the present. The two propositions, *ἀλλ'—κόσμον*, are to be regarded as premises from which the hearer is left to draw his own conclusions. *Εἰς τὸν κόσμον* for *τῷ κόσμῳ*, (Mark xiii. 10, Luke xxiv. 47,) so that *εἰς* in an expression of more vivacity, indicates the direction and the extension of what he speaks, (Lücke.)

V. 27–29. On v. 27, De Wette makes the remark, that their not understanding him seems highly improbable—certainly, especially as in v. 19, they understood the word; therefore, were it merely said *οὐκ ἔγνωσαν τὸν πατέρα, ὃν ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς*, (they knew not the Father, of whom he was speaking to them,) we would fain say with Lücke, that the words refer to the recognition of the *matter*, and consequently to unbelief, but the words are, "*that* he spake to them *of* the Father;" on the construction, cf. what is said on i. 46.—This want of openness of heart on their part, leads our Lord to reflect on the effect which his death would have, (xii. 24, 32, xvi. 7.) As we have *ὑψώσητε*, and not the passive as in xii. 32, iii. 14, it is perfectly clear that the reference is to the crucifixion, which however, as the transition to the glorification, (xiii. 31,) embraces the latter in it, (Calvin, Piscator, De Wette;) then under the co-working

of the Holy Spirit, would it become manifest to many that Christ had acted and spoken in unity with God. In the opposition of the more general *ποιῶ*, and of the more special *λαλῶ*, we miss the syntactical congruency, (see on ch. v. 38, p. 161.) He begins with the words *καὶ ὁ πέμψας κτλ.* to compose his soul, as to the misapprehension in regard to him which prevailed. Instead of the aorist *ἀφῆκε*, the present might have been anticipated, (Luther translates it "leaves,") but it has a retrospective regard to the *ὁ πέμψας*, so that the act of the sending and of the *οὐκ ἀφιέναι* is to be regarded as one thing, (Lücke.) The causal relation indicated by *ὅτι* is not obvious, and it may be asked: Is it not rather his not being left alone by the Father, that is the ground of the *ποιεῖν τὰ ἀρεστά*? ("I do always those things that please him.") Maldonatus consequently takes *ὅτι* here, in the direct sense of *ideo*, (therefore,) and Olshausen and Meyer insist on taking *ὅτι*, not as a designation of the *causa essendi*, but of the *cognoscendi*, "as is known by the fact that I do, &c." Better thus: *ἀφιέναι* carries in it the idea of abandonment, but the divine protection is over those alone who have a godly walk, (xv. 10.) The moral self-witness in this declaration would supply the place of one in v. 46, if from exegetical considerations no such witness could be acknowledged in that passage.

CHRIST SEVERELY REBUKES HIS OPPONENTS, AND SETS FORTH HIS EXALTED DIGNITY.—V. 30–59.

V. 30–32. From this self-testimony also, as in vii. 40, we see that susceptible natures were subdued by the direct impression made by words like these. The power of the word received internally, is also recognized by Christ as a principle of internal transformation, but in order to this, the word itself must be firmly adhered to. On v. 30–46, cf. Kling, Studien u. Kritik. 1836, H. 3, with *μένειν ἐν τῷ λόγῳ*, cf. *μένειν ἐν τ. διδαχῇ*, 2 John 9, *ἐν ἐμοί*, vi. 56, xv. 7; the opposite of this is illustrated in the persons mentioned in vi. 66. *Γνώσεσθε*, as in vi. 69, is primarily the insight into the truth, which is imparted by the operation of the word; it is in addition the scientific insight to which that experience impels cultivated minds, this

at least is not excluded, even though no direct regard was had to it. The truth here, however, is not so much the *truth of the doctrine*, as the *doctrine of the truth*, (xviii. 37,) the truth of which Christ was the bearer to men was to become recognized by its operation.[1] As the fundamental part of this doctrine, however, is that which pertains to Christ himself, we have in v. 36, ὁ υἱός instead of ἡ ἀλήθεια. The idea of the Christian ἐλευθερία, Bengel already correctly defines: Immunitas filiorum Dei ab omni potestate contraria, (the freedom of God's children from every power which is against them.) This Christian idea, which is thoroughly peculiar, is found to a remarkable extent in all the Apostles, not excepting James even, cf. 2 Cor. iii. 17, Rom. vi. 18, vii. 6, viii. 21, Gal. v. 1, 13, iv. 26, 31, 1 Pet. ii. 16, James i. 25, ii. 12; it embraces the freeing of the understanding, (2 Cor. iii. 17,) and the freeing of the will from sin, and by consequence, from the law also. Christian truth, experienced in its wholesome effect, is acknowledged and loved by men as the only power authorized of God, and connection with it in love, is the might which overcometh sin.

V. 33. Are those who make this reply the believers whom Christ had addressed? (Maldonatus, Bengel, Kling, Olshausen.) If this be so, how could Christ, v. 37, charge them with purposes of murder, and direct against them what may be considered altogether one of his severest discourses? Olshausen urges the ἀληθῶς, v. 31, the force of which is not: "Ye are disciples who are not yet perfect," (ἀληθινῶς,) but "ye are impure disciples." He supposes that in v. 37 no conscious purpose is ascribed to them, but simply, "the sinful element in general." But this answer is not very satisfactory, nor is that of Kling: "They had by their answer in v. 33, put themselves back again into the Jewish κόσμος, and were consequently treated by Jesus as those who belonged to this mass which was in a state of enmity against him." We have therefore, with the majority of the interpreters, to decide for the view, that those persons resume who, from v. 21 on, had been the speakers. Calvin: ego ita sentio, ut in promiscua turba fieri solet, confuse responsum fuisse Christo, (I suppose, that as

[1] Augustine, who abstractly separates cognoscere and credere, believes that the future γνώσεσθε has reference to the world to come.

is common in a mixed crowd, a confused response was made to Christ.) What he said of freedom, they referred to political freedom, of which they had been jealous from the time of the Maccabees downward, and to which they supposed themselves to have a claim, as Abraham's seed, (Gen. xviii. 18.) "The most ordinary laborer," says the Talmud, "who is of Abraham's seed, is the peer of kings," (Lightfoot.) But the question rises, can we suppose their passion to have blinded them so far, that they could forget, not only the earlier captivities, but the fact that they were then under the dominion of Rome? As this seems impossible, we might, with Lightfoot and Lücke, 3d ed., suppose that they mean personal, civil liberty, inasmuch as the Jew by birth, might not be a slave; would not the language, however, if this had been the design, rather have been: *οὐδείς ἡμῶν οὐδενὶ δεδούλευκεν*? (None of us has ever been a slave to any man.) Or might the assertion be ventured, that they said this with the intention of claiming that they had still maintained a certain independence all along? (Kling.)

V. 34–36. The truth so odious to them, expressed in v. 31, 32, is solemnly confirmed still further. *Τῆς ἁμαρτίας* is omitted in Cod. D, in Clemens Alexandrinus, and in some Latin Codices, and certainly looks like an explanatory gloss. If, then, it be omitted, the connection of v. 35 is closer; if it be retained as genuine, v. 35 is to be explained as giving prominence to the generic idea of *δοῦλος*. In considering v. 35, an answer is first of all to be given to the question as to the justness of the proposition, taken in its literal sense. If we regard it as the affirmation of a fact, it seems to be incorrect, for a servant is not necessarily either sold or cast out; we have, therefore, to confine ourselves to the *conception* of the family; with this conception the servant has no necessary connection, but the son has. Furthermore, it may be asked whether the *οὖν* in v. 36 involves a strict sequence, for if this be the case, we are tempted to adopt the view of the Greek expositors, and regard the words *μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* as embracing also the right possessed by the head of the family, the right of manumission, and consequently already, in v. 35, understand *ὁ υἱός* as referring to Christ himself. On the other hand, if v. 36 be not closely connected with v. 35, the *οὖν* may be referred to the *δοῦλος*

ἐστι τῆς ἁμαρτίας, and v. 35 is then an incidental remark in regard to the mournful consequences of such a δουλεία. But we think that in v. 36, ὁ υἱός must be taken as a resumption from v. 35, (Crell: a generali significatione ad specialem descendit—he descends from the general meaning to the special,) and would give the sense thus: "The service of sin is bondage; such bondsmen now as ye are do not properly belong to the family, but may be cast out at any moment; only the child of the house, in whom the spirit of the family has sway, as is the case with me, is unchangeably a member of the family: if now the child of the house makes you also freemen, as he is a freeman, then are ye free indeed." To this the reply is urged, that the right of manumission was vested in the master of the household, and not in the son; but the objection falls away, on the supposition that the application our Saviour designed to make of the figure had an influence on the phraseology, for in that case we think of ἐλεύθερος as the reciprocal idea of ὁ υἱός, and of the general proposition as presupposing that only a freeman can make others free. Calvin: Quod natura proprium habeat (filius,) nobis adoptione communicat, dum fide inserimur in ejus corpus ac efficimur ejus membra, (what the Son has by nature as his own, he imparts by adoption to us, when by faith we are inserted into his body and made members of him.) Ὄντως, as ἀληθινῶς does in other passages, points to the fact, that no other species of bondage so enslaves man in his genuine nature, as the abandonment to the blind power of the impulses, (Rom. vii. 17,) of that rational will of his, which was designed for communion with God.

V. 37, 38. As descendants of Abraham, they had claimed the prerogative of being freemen, but as vii. 19 demonstrates that the very persons who boasted that they were Moses' disciples, flew in the face of the law of Moses by their murderous purposes, so here our Saviour demonstrates to them, that in spite of that prerogative they claimed, they were the grossest servants of sin, they cherished murderous purposes against their fellow man, and this, too, from *obtuseness toward the word of God*, (v. 40.) Σπέρμα here, probably, in contradistinction from τέκνα, v. 39, is used simply to design physical derivation. Χωρεῖν means: 1) to have space for, hence cum. accus. "to contain;" 2) to make

room for another, that is, "to give away, to yield;" 3) to make room for one's self, that is, "to move onward, make progress, succeed." It may, consequently, be taken in two ways: 1) like προκόπτειν, προχωρεῖν, "to advance," and ἐν ὑμῖν, "among you." (Luther, Elsner, Kypke, Lücke.) To my objection, that this sense is flat and vulgar, Lücke replies: "If it be the correct hermeneutical remark, which could only be justified if the vulgar and flat were wont to be found in our Saviour's discourses. On p. 353, Lücke argues against an interpretation, on the ground that it makes the proposition sound "too *feeble.*" 2) "To make an entrance, penetrate," so that by ἐν the consequence of the abiding is anticipated, as Nonnus expresses it, δύνει ἐς, (enters in,) thus Grotius, Kuinöl, Meyer, [Luthardt.] Thus the lust of murder appears still more detestable, since it originates in obtuseness in regard to God's word.—Total contrast between them and himself; their mode of acting made them like the devil, in whom likewise the lust of murder sprung from hatred to the truth, (v. 44.) The *primary* conception of *the Father* connects itself with the idea of *dependence* on the part of the child, but there is also a reference to the similarity between them, as the verse immediately following shows. In regard to ὁρᾶν, as designating the mode in which God was manifest to Christ, cf. what is said on i. 18. Important critical authorities have the reading, ἠκούσατε παρὰ τοῦ πατρός, but probably only because it was regarded as offensive to apply also to the relation which our Saviour's opposers sustained to the devil, the expression ὁρᾶν παρὰ τ. πατρί. Λαλῶ is in apposition with ποιεῖν, for in the λαλεῖν the ποιεῖν of Christ consisted. Οὖν, "as ye show such a thirst for blood."

V. 39, 40. Without even yet seeing our Saviour's drift, they wish to turn off any unpleasant allusion he may be supposed to intend. Christ uses the term: "children of Abraham," in the sense in which Paul subsequently employed it as a metaphorical designation of those who are "in spiritual affinity" with him, (Rom. iv. 11, 12, ix. 8.) In German we can express the conception in the pun, "Wäret ihr Abraham's *Nachkommen*, so würdet ihr auch seinen Werken *nachkommen*," (were ye descendants of Abraham, ye would follow his works;) in this

passage, as in v. 37, the lust of murder is characterized further by a reference to its motive, *only through this motive* does it attain to the character of the diabolical.

V. 41–43. They now perceive this much, that Jesus characterizes them as illegitimate children in religion, and to this they make the rejoinder, that God alone is the Father, the founder of Israel, (Isa. lxiii. 16, lxiv. 8, Deut. xxxii. 6.) But were this the case, the kindred would recognize the kindred, (v. 42, vii. 17, 18.) *Ἥκω* in the sense of the preter. as in ii. 4; consequently, as the completion of the action which lies in *ἐξῆλθον*; a doubt may be felt whether no more lies in it than in *ἀπέστειλέν με ὁ θεός* according to the explanation given iii. 34, yet were such the case, the proposition *οὐδέ κτλ.* would be purely tautological; moreover, xvi. 28, xiii. 3, shows that *ἐξέρχεσθαι ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ* has reference to the preëxistence. As the thought unfolds, it presents the additional fact that the appearing of Christ is the result of his coming forth from God, and is not a thing of his isolated individuality.—Had there been that affinity with God on their part, the whole character of Christ's discourses would have been to them a demonstration of their origin. *Λαλία, λαλεῖν*, the externals of language; *λόγος, λέγειν*, of discourse as the bearer of thought, Tittmann, de synon. p. 92. Because the contents of the discourses had no influence on their souls, the external characteristics of them possessed no interest to them, and here it is natural to recall to mind that *ἐξουσία*, that "authority" with which Christ spake, (Matt. vii. 29, John vii. 46,) and perhaps, too, of the impress which love gave to his language. The inability expressed in "ye *cannot*," is to be regarded as a natural, moral inability; Melanethon: Qui veri sint Dei filii et domestici, non possunt paternæ domus ignorare linguam, (they who are truly sons of God and members of his family, cannot be ignorant of the language of their father's house,) cf. what is said on x. 27, of the *φωνή* of the good Shepherd.

V. 44, 45. Not until now is the aim of that discourse in regard to their father disclosed. The devil is their father, for from the beginning he had displayed the murderous spirit and the enmity toward the truth which they now display, (v. 37, 40, 47.) *Θέλειν* has reference to that condition of evil

in which it is no longer the mere sin of haste, but where, on the contrary, the individual has willfully fettered himself in it. What, then, were those plans of murder which the devil cherished originally? The majority of interpreters, ancient and modern, refer the predicate *ἀνθρωποκτόνος* to his seducing the first of mankind into sin, whereby the *θάνατος* was originated. But how can this be? If this *θάνατος* be *spiritual* destruction, how can it be placed in parallel with these plans to put Christ to death. This difficulty, derived from the connection, led Cyrill, and has led several of the recent writers, to regard the allusion as made to Cain's fratricide, which was occasioned by the instigation of Satan, to which, in fact, John refers also in 1 John iii. 12, 15; thus Döderlein, Nitszch, (Berl. theol. Zeitschrift, 3 H. p. 52, seq.) Lücke, Kling, De Wette. We would direct attention to an additional circumstance which gives support to this view: 1 John iii. 12 gives special prominence to the hatred of the righteousness, the *ἀληθεια*, of Abel, as furnishing the motive to his brother for murdering him—the very same thing is done by Christ here; *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς* creates no difficulty, for it has no reference *necessarily* to the *original* beginning of the history of man. Nevertheless, this exposition has serious difficulties. First of all, let it be observed, that the citation from 1 John iii. 12 does not present a perfect parallel, for there Cain's fratricide is by no means designated as instigated of Satan, but Cain is called a child of the devil, because he killed his brother—a crime which, according to 1 John iii. 8, can be charged on every sinner. If Christ, without anything more, declared that the devil was a murderer from the beginning, must we not presuppose that he had reference to some well known Jewish tenet? Still further, a genuine parallel is furnished by John himself, to wit: in 1 John iii. 8: *ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστίν, ὅτι ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ὁ διάβολος ἁμαρτάνει*, (he that committeth sin is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning.) Why has neither Lücke nor De Wette noticed the last words of this passage? It is conceded that they refer to the temptation of our first parents, and this analogy with the expression before us is so decided, that Lücke has been driven to the inconsistency of citing this passage as a parallel to that. In fact, the

derivation of spiritual and bodily death from the deception of our first parents by Satan, is in the Jewish theology also, a prevalent doctrine, a doctrine which we find in Wisdom of Solom. ii. 24, Hebrews ii. 14, and in the Rabbinical writings, cf. Tholuck's Kommentar zu Rom. v. 12, (4th ed.) p. 254. It is certainly most natural then to think of *this* reference. But it may be asked, how does this reference suit in the connection? Very well, in our judgment, even if under *ἀνθρωποκτόνος* we were to suppose an allusion to *spiritual* death merely, and to that solitary fact, (of the temptation,) since it is acknowledged that the ideas of spiritual and of bodily death and dying, through the Scriptures in general, and especially in that very passage in 1 John iii. 12, 15, run into each other. We do not regard it as in the least surprising, that in John the Jewish lust of murder is placed in parallel with the spiritual murder of our first parents by Satan. But let it be remembered, that the derivation of *bodily* death from that deceiving of the first pair, was also an established doctrine, (cf. Wisd. of Sol. ii. 24, Heb. ii. 14,[1]) and what then, if Christ preëminently had allusion to *that?* (Thus Luther, Th. xxii. p. 1094, Lyser, Gerhard, Loci T. xvii. p. 32, Tittmann, Krabbe, die Lehre von der Sünde und vom Tode, p. 134, seq.[2])—Yet further, it would in John, least of all, occasion surprise, if, after the analogy of the *ἁμαρτάνει*, 1 John iii. 8, (cf. Lücke,) the words *ἀνθρωποκτόνος ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς* bore in them a reference to more than one incitement to murder, and included the instigation to fratricide,[3] (thus Nonnus,

[1] In those Rabbinical passages, to be sure, as also in the passage from Sohar Chadasch, (which by the way may not be older than the fifteenth or the sixteenth century, cf. Tholuck's Dissert. de ortu Cabbalæ, p. 15,) f. xxvii. 3, בְּנוֹי דְּנָחָשׁ הַקַּרְמָנִי דְּקָטִיל לְאָדָם וּלְכָל ־ בְּרְיִין דְּאִתְיִין מִנֵּיהּ "*the children of that old serpent who has slain Adam and all his posterity*,"—in these passages, we say, *bodily* death is not expressly mentioned, yet it certainly is, if not exclusively, yet mainly what is meant, (see Tholuck's Kommentar zum Br. an d. Hebr. 2d ed. p. 174, and zum Br. an d. Rom. p. 247.)

[2] In the controversy with Krabbe, Mau, l. c. p. 94, opposes to this view the argument, that the *mode* in which the devil wrought the death of our first parents does not correspond with the mode in which the Jews sought to put Jesus to death; but is there not a sufficient parallel in the fact that both parties were impelled by hatred of the truth, in their desire to destroy?

[3] In the familar passage in Theoph. ad Autol. ii. 29, in Satan's seduction of our first parents, the physical murder is also regarded as his proper intent, and his drawing Cain on to the murder of his brother is regarded as a sequel to the seduction of Adam, to wit: that as Adam, despite the fall, lived and begat children, he might in *this* way bring death into the world.

Euthymius, Theodorus Herakleæ, in Catena patrum.) To bring out that parallel clearly, it certainly would have been noticed that this murder of Satan's was occasioned by his hatred of the truth; instead of which it simply says, that he *was* an enemy to the truth, and that this enmity formed his proper character.—*Ἀλήθεια*, with retrospective regard to the beguiling of our first parents by falsehood, and with prospective regard to the words which immediately follow, has ordinarily been understood of truth in opposition to falsehood; by Origen, however, Augustine, Beza, Heumann, and by recent writers, it has been taken in the philosophic sense of John, the sense of real being, so as to embrace at once theoretic and practical truth. *Ἑστηκεν*, by the Vulgate, Luther, and all the expositors down to Bengel, (by v. Cöln also, Bibl. Theolog. ii. 71,) is taken as the preterit, and the passage has consequently been used as a dictum probans, (proof text,) for the fall of the devil, (2 Pet. ii. 4;) only by Marck, (Exercitat. textual.) was brought out this idea, that if *ἀλ.* designates not metaphysical truth, but moral truth alone, the *ἑστηκεν* must be referred to the fact of the beguiling in the fall of man. But in all passages of the New Testament, the preterit is used in the sense of the present, just as it is in the classics, (John i. 26, iii. 29, xi. 56,) thus already the Syriac, ܠܐ ܩܐܡ (has not stood in the truth,) the Ethiopic, Origen, Theophylact, Euthymius. *Ἑστηκεν*, however, is not entirely synonymous with *ἐστί*, but has the force of "keeps not himself, does not persist,"[1] (see Tholuck on Rom. v. 2.) As regards *ἀλ.* the connection (v. 40, 45,) would already excite the expectation, that it would designate the objective element of truth, that is truth in the metaphysical sense, as it is styled; this view is confirmed by the *ὅτι κτλ.* which follows, and which created the greatest difficulty in the way of those who found in *ἑστηκεν* a reference to the *fall* of Satan, so much so, indeed, that Augustine, Piscator, Lampe and Lyser, regarded it, as in v. 29, as a designation of the *ratio cognoscendi*, "for it *is* certainly present," &c. Our opinion is that *ἀλ.* is here the subjective truth, the love of truth;

[1] It is worthy of note that in the book cited by Schöttgen, the Book Jalkut Ruboni, f. 136, 4, this identical expression is used by Adam: שֶׁלֹּא עָמַד בֶּאֱמוּנוֹת "who stood not in the truth." Yet it must also be noted that this book was written in Prague, at the close of the seventeenth century!

the subjective in affinity with the truth, conducts to the objective kingdom of the truth, (v. 47.) Origen thinks he must here enter on the knotty question, whether we can deny that the devil has *truth* in this, that is, in the formal sense; but the connection, (v. 45,) directs us to religious truth; according to James ii. 19, the demons believe in truth, to wit: the truth of the existence of God; but it is only His abstract existence in which they believe — had they the truth of the knowledge of God, they would not tremble before him. — The ὅτι κτλ. is now unfolded further. In the case of him whose subjectivity does not bear the truth in it, falsehood pertains to his personal character, (τὰ ἴδια, τὸ ἰδίωμα,) and his conduct bears the stamp of it. It has been supposed that we must of necessity regard the ὅτι which follows as causa cognoscendi, but this is a mistake; that the devil from his very nature originates nothing but lies, follows from the conception of him as ψεύστης; αὐτοῦ refers to the abstract which lies in ψεύστης, cf. on Rom. ii. 26. This passage particularly, decides the question whether our Saviour's discourses involve the personality of Satan. But the view is still held by v. Cölln, that "Jesus adopts the prevalent opinions of the Jews, in order to impart in the minds of his hearers an additional weight to his moral teachings," (in Bib. Theol. ii. 74;) against this view, see Neander, Leben Jesu, 3d ed. p. 286. With a regard to verses 37, 40, 47, we apply to the opposers of Jesus the language in this way: "Ye prove yourselves to be of the devil's kind, ye have pleasure in his works, for he plotted the murder and ruin of man from the beginning; lying is his most specific characteristic, and therefore ye, too, for the very reason that it is truth I speak, do not believe me."

V. 46. Chrysostom, Augustine, Luther, (Th. xii. p 1721,) Grotius, Heumann, take ἁμαρτία in the sense of "sin," whil on the other side, a large majority, induced by the connection, have preferred taking it in the sense of ψεῦδος in its various shades of meaning, "lie, error, deceit," thus Origen, Cyrill, Erasmus Schmid, Beausobre, Bengel, Kypke, Mosheim, Tittmann, Kuinöl, Lücke, 1st ed., Hase, (Leben Jesu, 3d ed. § 32.) Since, however, in the theology of Schleiermacher, the doctrine of the sinlessness of Christ has taken the place of

the Church's doctrine of his deity, a new effort has been manifest to retain for the doctrine of the sinlessness of the Redeemer this grand dictum probans. Ullmann (Sündlosigkeit, 3d ed.) would only maintain, as at an earlier period Crell and Lampe had done, the general idea, "fault," that is, practical *and* theoretical; but for the meaning "sin" *in specie*, we have the judgment of Olshausen, Lücke, 2d and 3d ed., De Wette, and even Ullmann, in the 4th ed. p. 67; against *his* exposition particularly, Christ. Fr. Fritzsche has protested in the programs which are now collected in the Opusc. Fritzschiorum. After a renewed investigation, I must confess, that for the present I cannot agree with the expositors last named. I have consulted all the expositors to whom I could have access, who defend the meaning "sin," but have not been able to convince myself that a satisfactory connection can be made out if their view be adopted. Let us examine Lücke, for instance: "As Christ elsewhere says in *positive* terms: If ye will not believe my words, yet believe my works, so here he says in negative terms: Ye do not believe me, though I speak the truth; wherefore do ye not? Can you perchance demonstrate that instead of doing the ἔργα τοῦ θεοῦ, (the works of God,) I have been doing the works of sin? if ye cannot do this, why then do ye not believe when it is truth which I speak to you?" But against this stands the fact, that this very thought, "*if ye cannot do this*," is not expressed, and that if this were meant we would look for an εἰ δὲ μή instead of εἰ δὲ ἀλήθειαν λέγω. Chrysostom and Euthymius apprehend it in a manner which grasps the connection with yet more clearness and acuteness: "The reason why ye do not believe me, is none other than downright hatred of the truth, εἰ δὲ μή, εἴπατε τὸ ἔγκλημα, (if this be not so, bring your accusation;)" but were this the meaning would we not expect γάρ after τίς, and as there is none, must not the second question be taken as antithetical to the first? We are forced, therefore, to look for some other mode of apprehending it. Ἁμαρτία has in classic usage the meaning of "error," (see Raphelens. Annotat. ex Herod., and Kypke, in loc.) and Bretschneider, Lexic. 3d ed., cites from the New Testament itself, several places, as properly belonging to this definition; Fritzsche makes special reference to 1 Cor. xv. 34. But the meaning, "fault,

error," will not answer at all, since in that sense it would give an appearance as if the ἀλήθεια of Christ were the product of meditation and of reflection, while it is in fact rather the *immediate* emanation of the unity of his self-consciousness with God, (v. 28, ch. vii. 17.) We believe that Melancthon and Calvin have hit the true point, when they retain indeed the signification "sin," but comparing 1 Cor. iv. 4, interpret the expression only of transgression within the sphere of his office, and *so far* only of error. If, as Tittmann especially does, we might take the ἀλήθεια *in specie* of the doctrina Christi *de Christo*, (cf. 55,) the expression would be rendered yet more clear; but embracing the practical Messianic activity, it may also be interpreted: "Have I in any case acted in conflict with the ἐντολή of the Father?"

V. 47. The διὰ τί in v. 46 is answered here. There is a weight laid anew upon the motive of the lust of murder and of the opposition in general; the great truth which had already in iii. 20, 21, been intimated, is now expressed in so many words, cf. v. 42, ch. vi. 44, 45, x. 27, xviii. 37.

V. 48–51. The ἡμεῖς and σύ may show that a retort was made on the part of the Jews. The approach of illegitimacy they meet with the counter one, "thou art a Samaritan," one of a nation a majority of whom were originally heathen, and whose worship was impure. He had called them "children of the devil," they declare him to "have a devil," the result of which would be insanity. The λέγομεν has perhaps a reference to v. 27.—The answer of Jesus touches merely the severest accusation, that of diabolic possession. The τιμῶ has reference to the testimony given by his words, to the ἀλήθειαν λέγειν, in which the testimony of himself is regarded as the main feature, (v. 55.) In place of the simple καί, either δέ or ὅμως might be anticipated. The glory of him who glorifies the Father will be vindicated by the Father.—In Calvin, we find the thought, that in v. 51 Christ addresses those whose susceptibilities were alive to the truth, and with him coincides De Wette. It is possible that in those words he had in his eye the hearts of the more susceptible, and that in a certain sense he recurs to the promise in v. 31; but we must nevertheless think of the words as addressed to the multitude, so that whoever

was willing to embrace them, might do so. *Τηρεῖν*, according to Kuinöl, Wahl, Bretschneider, "to observe," in the sense of "perform," which puts the *λόγος* consequently in the category of *prescription*. This conception of it is admissible, and indeed seems almost enjoined in xiv. 21, and faith may be looked upon as something prescribed by Christ for us to perform; nevertheless, Lücke and De Wette explain it as equivalent to *μένειν ἐν τ. λόγῳ*, (31,) consequently equivalent to *asservare, condere*, and Meyer even unites the two meanings, "to *hold fast* as the *rule* of life." Our word "keep," (bewahren,) can in fact embrace both; if now the *λόγος* and the *ἐντολαί* cannot properly be understood of mere *prescriptions*, but designate *doctrine*, then *τηρεῖν*, both here and in xv. 10, can the more readily be taken in the sense of "keep," cf. also, *τηρεῖν τ. ἐντολήν*, 1 Tim. vi. 14. The promise, "he shall not see death," as in vi. 59, means he shall not abide in death, but shall be partaker in the *true* life, (cf. xi. 25.)

V. 52, 53. In his putative assumption, they see the evidence that he is insane. *Ὅστις* differs from the simple *ὅς*, in that it includes the idea of character.

V. 54–56. The Father is the ultimate cause of all that Christ is, consequently the ground of his ability to affirm of himself what is so exalted. As the Jews are the servants of falsehood, inasmuch as they pronounce the *ἀλήθεια* of Christ to be *ψεῦδος*, Christ would be a *ψεύστης*, if contradicting his profoundest consciousness, he would speak of himself otherwise than he did. The thought that in that knowledge of God, which Christ, because of its being grounded upon his consciousness, imputes to himself, is also involved the divine volition, this thought is expressed in the additional words, *καὶ τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ τηρῶ*, cf. *τ. ἐντολὰς τ. πατρός μου τετήρηκα*, xv. 10. After having thus shown his right to affirm of himself what was so great, he expresses yet more distinctly that very thing which was so offensive to them, his superiority over Abraham. Abraham received prophecies in regard to the Messiah, Gen. xvii. 16, xviii. 18, xxii. 16, seq. and from these proceeded his rejoicing; *ἵνα* is not equivalent to *ὅτι*, but is used to express the idea "that he *was to* see it," (see i. 8. and cf. the use of *ἵνα*, xii. 23,)

(Winer, p. 314. Agnew and Ebbeke's Transl. p. 367.) The *day* of the Messiah, a Jewish term of solemnity, used to express the appearing of Christ Luke xvii. 22; in Paul we have ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου, to express his appearing in glory at his second coming. It is possible that the expression is based upon a current idea of the Jews; when, for example, after the promise, Gen. xvii. 16, it is said: "Then Abraham fell upon his face and laughed," Philo elucidates it thus: μειδῶν τῇ διανοίᾳ, πολλῆς καὶ ἀκράτου χαρᾶς εἰσοικισαμένης, (laughing in his mind, over the great and pure joy which entered it.) But what is the nature of that actual seeing and rejoicing, of which the words that follow speak? With Maldonatus, Lampe, Mosheim, Kuinöl, Lücke and De Wette, we would say, that such a sympathy is ascribed to Abraham as that spoken of in 1 Pet. i. 12, where the angels are said to look down with joy upon the redemption which has been wrought out; in Luke ix. 31, Moses and Elias speak with the Redeemer of his decease at Jerusalem. On the other side, all the more ancient expositors, and among the recent ones, Olshausen, refer it to a seeing in prophetic vision, while Abraham was yet on earth. Olshausen argues on these grounds: 1) the *preterit* εἶδε would not answer, for as Christ's work was a thing yet in progress, the *present* would be indispensable; 2) if in v. 56, the joy of Abraham in a Saviour who had actually appeared, is alone spoken of, v. 58 would not cohere with it. To this, the answer may be given: 1) the preterits εἶδε καὶ ἐχάρη, refer to the circumstance of the mission of Christ into the world; 2) v. 58 does not directly cohere with v. 56, but is only called forth by the objection of the Jews. The objections of a positive kind to the view against which we argue, are as follows: 1) the question as to the nature of that seeing, of which the εἶδε speaks. Olshausen says it was like John's seeing, in the Apocalypse, the coming of Christ—consequently, a prophetic vision, as opposed to the promise in the word. But we ask, in what then had Abraham a prerogative beyond that of other prophets? Is it not said, xii. 41, of Isaiah: εἶδε τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ? And again in Matt. xiii. 17, Luke x. 24, that the prophets *longed* to see the day of Messiah, from which it may be inferred, that those visions

insured them no full and perfect enjoyment. 2) An apocalypse so inspiring, must have formed a grand era in the life of Abraham, and could not well have been passed over without mention. Olshausen attempts, indeed, in his 3d ed., to meet these difficulties, but not, as it seems to us, with valid reasons.

V. 57–59. In order to bring home their sarcasm, they give a turn to the words of Christ, as if he pretended to have seen Abraham. They mention *fifty* years as the term of a full human life, (Josephus does the same,) a term at which also the Levites vacated their office: "You who have not yet lived out the half century, pretend to have seen Abraham!"[1] That very thing at which they direct their scorn and ridicule, Jesus could in a certain sense affirm of himself. Ἐγώ εἰμι might, as in other places, mean: "It is I," but in this place the connection demands: "I am." Εἰμί is used to express a former condition which is continued in the present, as in xiv. 9, xv. 27, Luke xv. 29, Colos. i. 17, (cf. Bähr,) Jer. i. 5, Septuagint: πρὸ τοῦ με πλάσαι σε ἐν κοιλίᾳ ἐπίσταμαί σε, cf. what is said on viii. 25, and in the Greek, the formulas ἀκούω, ἀδικῶ, (Bernhardy, Syntax, p. 370,) in Latin, audio, video, and in English, I understand. Γενέσθαι forms, as i. 6, 15, the antithesis. In this is involved the preëxistence, as in vi. 63, viii. 42, xiii. 3, xvi. 28, xvii. 5, and in the Synoptists, Matt. xxiii. 37 and 34, cf. Luke xiii. 34. Crell, Grotius and Paulus interpret the expression of the previous destination of the Messiah; but there would have been nothing in this peculiar to him, and it would not have implied that there was some truth in what the Jews had so scornfully deduced from his words.[2] This putative arrogance seemed to involve blasphemy, in view of which the spirit of fanaticism suggested the idea of stoning him, (x. 31, Acts vii. 59.) A disposition might be felt as regards ἐκρύβη, connected as it is by καί with ἐξῆλθεν,

[1] Heumann: "The journeys and the other hardships which Jesus underwent, account for his looking so old." (!)

[2] As a matter of history merely, the exegesis of F. Socinus yet requires mention. He says: (contra Volanum, p. 37,) Antequam Abraham fiat Abraham, i. e. pater multarum gentium, ego sum Messias. Sic monet, antequam gentibus concedatur, ut populus Dei sint, credendum esse Christo, (before Abraham shall become Abraham, that is, father of many nations, I am Messiah. Thus he reminds them that before the Gentiles can become the people of God they must believe in Christ.) A confutation of this view may be found in Calovius, Ex. 1, in Triga exercitat. Anti-socin., and in Episcopius, Instit. theol. l. iv. c. 33.

to take it as determining adverbially the meaning of the latter and equivalent to *κρυφῇ*, (secretly,) but such an interpretation has not an adequate ground; Jesus withdraws himself into the crowd, and is thus able to pass out unobserved, (Winer, p. 349;) there is not in this the intimation of a miracle indeed, in the strict sense of the word, but there is of a special providence. (Jer. xxxvi. 26.) *Διελθών—οὕτως* is, on external and internal grounds, to be thrown out of the text, and is evidently copied after the words in Luke iv. 30.

CHAPTER IX.

HEALING OF THE MAN THAT WAS BORN BLIND. — v. 1–41.

V. 1. THOUGH the closing words of viii. 59 be spurious, yet the connection of this verse is such, that what is here narrated, and consequently also the discourses in chap. x. which are so clearly united with it, appear to have occurred immediately afterward, and *παράγειν* seems to mean "to depart," (Matt. ix. 9;) this view is favored besides by the fact, that beggars were accustomed to stay in the vicinity of the temple, (Acts iii. 3,) and that the pool to which the blind man was sent lay in the Tyropœon, not far from the mount on which the temple stood. Yet if Jesus concealed himself in the crowd in order to go out of the temple without being observed, it is improbable that the Disciples would at once have gathered around him again; it is possible, therefore, that this occurrence is to be referred to another day, and that *παράγειν* means "to pass by," in which case John would connect the occurrences with the same disregard of chronological sequence which is shown in some cases by the Synoptists.—The narrative of this miracle has a special value in Apologetics. How often do we hear the expression of a wish, that the miracles of Christ had been put upon documentary record, and had been subjected to a thorough *judicial* investigation. Here we have the very thing that is desired; judicial personages—and those, too, the avowed enemies of Christ—investigate the miracle in repeated hearings, and—it holds its ground: a man blind from his birth has been made to see; besides this, the credibility of the narrative derives a special confirmation from the highly significant delineation of the characteristics of the man who was born blind, a sturdy, blunt man of the people. According to Strauss (2d part, p. 75,

4th ed.) and Bauer, the vivid delineation and careful authentication are purely *fabricated*.—When the Apologist finds himself cut off in this style from escape alike by land or sea, he has nothing left on which to build an argument, unless indeed he builds one on the *animus*, in which it is very clear this sort of criticism originates. Cf. on this narrative, Zorn, Opuscula sacra, i. p. 252, seq.

V. 2. The fact that the Disciples know at the outstart that the man was born blind, is considered by Bauer as sufficient in itself to show that this history is a mere fabrication—but may not the Disciples have learned this fact previously, or even have heard it from bystanders? If ἵνα be urged, it would be necessary to translate: "that it was *of need he should* be born blind," cf. what is said on iv. 34. As the idea of a man's being *born* blind on account of sinning in person, appears to have no meaning, Crell and Lampe have taken the sentence thus: "Has he, or (as this cannot be,) have his parents grievously sinned?" In the judgment of Calvin, Beza, Grotius, the belief of a metempsychosis, according to De Wette, the belief of the preëxistence of souls, according to Lightfoot and Lücke, a belief of the possibility that the embryo could sin, is to be imputed to the Disciples; but it is doubtful whether we have good reason for supposing such opinions to be current among the people.[1] It seems to us that v. 34 puts us on the track to

[1] Among the Jews of the Middle Ages, especially among the Cabbalists, the doctrine of the metempsychosis was widely received; according to Beer, (Lehren and Meinungen, der Juden, ii. p. 135,) the Cabbalists teach, in so many words, that blindness is to be accounted for, by adopting the view of a metempsychosis. But the learned Manasse Ben Israel, (at the end of the seventeenth century,) who maintained that this doctrine has been universally received, could appeal to nothing except the Sohar, a book which was written in the later part of the Middle Ages. Josephus, however, renders some aid. The well-known passages in Josephus, de bello jud. viii. 8, 14, and xviii. 1, 3, certainly allow of an interpretation which would find in them a reference to the resurrection; but on the other hand, the passage viii. 8, 5, hardly allows of a natural interpretation, which would deny that it gives evidence of an adoption of the doctrine of metempsychosis.—The doctrine of the preëxistence of souls is found in Philo and in Wisdom of Solomon, viii, 19, (for the explanation given by Baumgarten-Crusius, Bibl. Theol. p. 101, is inadmissible, and what moreover is said by Bauer, l. c. p. 343, is not to the point,) but this does not throw light upon the passage before us, for this Platonic doctrine of preëxistence, of which we find a trace in Josephus also, (adv. Ap. ii. 24,) hardly justifies the inference that *evil* souls were thought to have preëxisted, though Dähne (Alex. Religionsphil. ii. p. 168,) has adopted this view, in which he follows Eichhorn. What the Rabbins (quoted by Lightfoot and Schöttgen,) say of sinning on the part of the embryo in the womb, (Gen. xxv. 22,) is perhaps merely to be regarded as the private opinion of particular individuals.

the true view; the Pharisees, in that verse, say that the man was "*altogether* (ὅλος,)" and consequently, in soul and body, "born in sins." As among us, the people have the phrase, "such a man was born with a mark on him," may not this, though indeed not clearly expressed, (Neander,)—for the term is ἥμαρτεν—may not this have been the meaning of the Disciples?

V. 3. As to the judgment we are to form regarding the teleological import which our Lord assigns to the misfortune of this man, so much may be safely affirmed, that as nothing in the universe stands isolated, but everything is connected with the whole, each single existence, and each single condition, has as many aims as there are relations between it and other things; the aim, therefore, which our Lord here mentions, cannot be regarded as the only one, (cf. on Rom. xi. 11,) but the aim here spoken of was one which God contemplated, (xi. 4.) Ἔργα τοῦ θεοῦ, "the works willed and wrought of God," and here *in specie*, those performed by the Messiah. Ἵνα as in i. 8, xiii. 18.

V. 4, 5. This declaration would seem to have an object only in case the hearers may be presumed to have had in their minds some obstacle which might be interposed in the way of the healing; its performance on the Sabbath may have been such an obstacle, though this circumstance is not brought up till v. 14. It is possible that the Saviour contemplated only the approaching hour of death. Ἡμέρα and νύξ, the time of toil, and the time of rest; with this time of toil, the lifetime is made parallel. Ὅταν is translated by the Vulgate and Luther, "as long as," and this translation has been the received one up to a very recent period, until Fritzsche, in his Comm. in Marc, p. 86, questioned whether such can be its meaning; he prefers the causal signification, "quandoquidem," "since indeed," (in which sense Zwingle already had taken it;) Wahl, Meyer, Lücke, De Wette, have since taken the same view. It does not fit very well in the connection, and—has it the linguistic vouchers? Fritzsche makes a reference to Plato, Euthyd. § 56, ed. Heind. or p. 295, Steph., but in that passage, ὅταν certainly means no more than "when," cf. Schleiermacher; on the other hand, it certainly seems justified by the passage which Viger cites from Aristotle, de Mundo, c. 4. ed. Becker, T. i. p. 395,

but Kapp, in his edition, objects to that reading, and proposes to read ὅτι ἄν. We think that the temporal meaning is entirely in place; quo tempore, as Bretschneider interprets it, the *sense* of which is quamdiu, (so also Kling takes it.) Φῶς glances back at viii. 12, but here has a more special reference to the natural light, which was to be restored to the blind man, cf. v. 39.

V. 6, 7. In other instances, also, external means were employed in miraculous healings, 2 Kings iv. 41, Isa. xxxviii. 21, Mark vii. 33, and in the case of a blind man, Mark viii. 23. That in saliva there was not only in general a healing virtue, but that it had a specific efficacy in diseases of the eye, is mentioned by Pliny, Hist. natur. xxviii. 7. Serenus Sammonicus, Carmen de medicina, c. 13, v. 225, says: Si tumor insolitus typho se tollat inani, turgentes oculos vili circumline cœno, (if an unwonted tumor rise in empty pride, besmear thy swollen eyes all o'er with loathsome mire;) the same fact is shown by the history of the curing of a blind man by the Emperor Vespasian, see Suetonius, vita Vespas. c. 7, Tacitus, Histor. iv. 81, likewise, cf. the Rabbins in Lightfoot on this passage. That therapeutic power was of course limited, however, to the mere alleviation of inflammations, tumors, &c. Even Dr. Paulus has an insight into the fact, that a man born blind could not have obtained his vision through the external means employed by Jesus, and his way of getting out of the difficulty is too characteristic to be omitted here. "Perhaps Jesus, while he was mixing other ingredients to make something to spread on the man's eyes, accidently spat, and the blind man imagined, consequently, that the eye-salve was made with the spittle." (!) For the very reason, however, that these outward means appeared in themselves unnecessary, the fathers have tried their strength in allegorical explanations of them, or, like Chrysostom and Theophylact, (Melancthon and Calvin do the same,) assume that some moral object was contemplated, the object of arousing the popular observation more thoroughly by the man's going to the pool, or of putting the blind man's faith to the test, or of giving his faith, yet feeble, some outward action to which it might cling. We suppose that as in *several* cases, the look, the hand, the spittle of the Saviour

serves as the medium, (analogously to cases of magnetic influence,) the healing power of Jesus in these particular cases employed, in fact, certain "conductors," cf. Tholuck's Vermischte Schriften, Th. i. p. 80. As regards the washing in the pool, even some of the Rabbins, (see Schöttgen,) as also some recent travelers, attribute to the pool medicinal qualities, see Robinson, ii. p. 155, (last edition in English, i. 341;) we think, however, that the blind man was dispatched to the pool with no other object than that he might cleanse himself after the application to his eyes had done its work. The εἰς after νίψαι is perhaps to be explained by the formula, λούεσθαι ἐς λουτρῶνας, "to go to the bath-house to bathe," (Passow,) or even "washing off therein;" the article τοῦ is neuter, as in Luke xiii. 4, and in Josephus, de bello Jud. ii. 16, 2, vi. 7, 2, where he speaks of the country around the fountain. The pool lies at the entrance of the Tyropœon, south of the temple-mount. The interpretation which John gives of the name Σιλωάμ has at a recent date been pronounced ungrammatical; Lücke, 1st ed., says: "One is reluctant to believe that John understood his own vernacular no better than this." I have, however, in my contributions to the philology of the New Testament, (Spracherklärung des N. T. p. 120, seq.) directed attention to the fact that the yod in שִׁילֹחַ is to be regarded as dagesh forte resolved, and that the word is, consequently, to be regarded either as the *abstract*, equivalent to שִׁלַּח, effusio,[1] that is, aqueduct, or may even be like the form אִיּוֹב, יִלּוֹד, passively, equivalent to "the one sent;" the former view is approved by Gesenius; Hitzig has brought out the latter, Komm. z. Jes. p. 97. The question now arises, what is the Evangelist's object in making this remark? Is it a purely etymological gloss? (Olshausen.) But such a gloss here would be entirely without an object, and no such gloss is given even in ch. v. 2. The Evangelist, consequently, must be supposed to have discovered in that denomination a significance, something providential. This he has found either in reference to the blind man who was sent, Bengel: Et ab hoc tempore nomen loci erat monumentum miraculi facti, (and from henceforth the name of the place was a memorial of the miracle that had been done;) or he meant

[1] This word also allows of a passive translation, *gush*, that is, the fluid emitted.

to intimate that while the fountain whose name was equivalent to Messiah, accomplished the healing, it was nevertheless Christ himself who was the effective operator of it, (Theophylact, Beza.) — No mention is made of the man's being *led* to the pool, but the connection leads us to suppose that it was done.

V. 8–12. It is evident that the man had often been the object of notice on the part of passers-by, and was consequently well known. If the text does not lead to the inference that the desire to seek out Jesus (v. 12,) arose from a bad motive, yet we are compelled to suppose a motive of that sort as having prompted their laying of the matter before the Pharisees.

V. 13–16. The people fix their attention on the collateral circumstance that by this healing the Sabbath had been broken; in this the πηλὸν ἐποίησεν is the main fact, and on this the question of the Pharisees, in v. 15, turns. According to Lightfoot, it was expressly forbidden by some of the Rabbins, to apply saliva to the eyelids on the Sabbath; others, on the contrary, did allow this to be done in the case of *inflammation* of the eyes. In this respect even, we see that not all Pharisees were in the bonds of prejudice to the same degree. Παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ, a designation of a prophet, cf. v. 17, 29, 33, ἁμαρτωλός here *in specie*, contemner of God, cf. v. 31.

V. 17–23. As the argument to sustain the charge that Christ had broken the Sabbath was not satisfactory to all the members of the Sanhedrim, the very man who was healed must be brought to sustain it, but the man proves to have courage enough to express his convictions. Ὅτι, in v. 17, used as in ii. 18. As the man who had been healed, gave no support to what they had in view, they imagine that by summoning his parents they can make out a case of deception. In the answers of the parents, a character like that of their son is exhibited, a certain bluntness in conjunction with prudence. Ἡλικίαν ἔχει, to wit: an age at which he is competent to testify in court for himself. Just as in ch. xi. 57, the ἐντολή is not dated, so in this place, no mention is made of the time at which the high council had made the συνθήκη, (not so much *decree* as *agreement*,) of which v. 22 speaks.

V. 24–27. During the examination of the parents, the man

had been dismissed; he is now recalled, and the attempt made to excite his fear by the authority of the hierarchy. *Δὸς δόξαν*, we give God the glory, which is His due, when we acknowledge his attributes, especially his omniscience, (Jos. vii. 19, Ezra x. 11,) by our acts. The answer of the man is more reserved in its character this time. In the hope of discovering a contradiction, or of finding some reason for suspicion, they repeat the question as to *how* it was done, but at this juncture the indignation of the plain, sturdy man appears in such strength, as to pass over into scorn. *Οὐκ ἠκούσατε*, "ye have had no ears."

V. 28–33. They retaliate his sarcasm with abuse, and designate it a shame in itself to be a Disciple of Jesus, whose character nobody knew, (see on vii. 27,) while, on the other hand, Moses was the receiver of a revelation from God. The man that had been healed, rejoins with irony indeed, (*θαυμαστόν ἐστιν*,) but with the energy of simple-hearted straight-forwardness. *Γάρ*, elliptical, "speak not thus," like the German "denn doch," (still, nevertheless,) cf. the usage in *answers*, Acts viii. 31, 1 Cor. ix. 9. *Ἐν τούτῳ*, "in such a case as that before us," (iv. 37.) The *πόθεν* he explains in v. 33 by *παρὰ θεοῦ*.—*Ἁμαρτωλός*, as is clear from the antithesis, means a contemner of God. Cf. Isa. i. 15, Ps. lxvi. 18. Homer's Iliad, i. 218: *ὅς κε θεοῖς ἐπιπείθηται, μάλα τ' ἔκλυον αὐτοῦ*. The courage of the man had grown strong in the contest, (v. 25.)

V. 34. Grotius explains *ὅλος* as a hyperbole, "from youth up;" Maldonatus and De Wette regard it as equivalent to *ὅλως*, but if that had been its sense, *ἐγεννήθης* would not have been used; more correctly, "in body and soul," so that the defect of the body revealed the pollution of the soul, (this is what Chrysostom *means*, though he seems to coincide with Grotius.) A hierarchical haughtiness, such as displayed itself in vii. 49, must have been thoroughly aroused by this kind of treatment. *Ἐκβάλλω*, simply conjoined with *ἔξω*, (vi. 37, xii. 31,) seems to imply no more than the casting out from the hall of their sessions, (Fritzsche,) but the importance attached by Jesus to this occurrence, v. 22, leads us rather to suppose that the word involves an exclusion from the congregation, (Olshausen, De Wette;) in the Christian Church, the formula, *ἐκβάλλειν τῆς ἐκκλησίας*, was used.

V. 35–38. As in ch. v. 14, Jesus in this case also had conferred the benefit, without connecting instruction with it; this he now does, when the experience gained by the man has heightened his tendency to faith. On account of the courage which, prompted by his faith, he has displayed, Christ regards him as worthy to hear the whole truth. The question embraces the more, inasmuch as it already presupposes faith, though no more than the *willingness* to believe could be counted upon. Cyrill and Chrysostom think that σύ may be emphatic, "art thou he who believeth, &c." but this is itself inadmissible, and σύ in other places comes first, without being emphatic, (viii. 33, xviii. 34.) Shall we say that the man knew who was speaking with him? Theophylact, Erasmus and Lampe, not without reason, deny that he did; when Jesus sent him to the pool, he was yet unable to see, and on his return, it seems that he did not find Jesus. But would a blunt man, such as he, addressed in this manner by a stranger, meet him at once with a question involving confidence in him? The conjecture is indeed more probable, that he recognized Jesus—we will not say by his voice, but would prefer the supposition that some further words, not mentioned here, were exchanged. *Till now* he had seen but the prophet in Christ, (v. 33, 17.) Καί in v. 36, used when questions are put suddenly, as the καί connects more closely with what has just been said, (xiv. 22.) The doubtful καί in v. 37, is to be explained as in vi. 36. It is not improbable that ὁρᾶν in the ἑώρακας, refers to the man's having the evidence of *experience* regarding the Messiah, (xv. 24, vi. 36.) The lowliness, and the yielding spirit of the man toward Jesus, is in touching contrast with the defiant bearing he maintains toward the leaders of the people.

V. 39. This language, like that in Matt. xi. 25, is to be regarded as the words uttered aloud in soliloquy by our Lord, and suggested by what had occurred immediately before. The man who had been blind bodily, a member of the lowest class, had also been in ignorance, and had come to his natural and to his spiritual sight at the same time. With reference to this fact, Jesus speaks of his own work as the light of the world; in affinity with the substance of what he here says is Luke v. 32, xv. 7, Matt. xi. 25, 1 Cor. i. 20; a similar playing

over of the bodily into the spiritual is found in Matt. xix. 23, 24, xi. 5, viii. 22. In *κρίμα*, here, as in *κρίσις*, iii. 19, there might be a temptation to give prominence merely to the idea of separation. Zwingle: "Entscheid," (decision,) and so also Wahl, but according to the usage *κρίμα* means only "judgment," and indeed with this separation is linked that also which constitutes the judgment, to wit: *retribution*. In the *ἵνα* we are to regard as marked, the *purpose*, yet (according to the anti-calvinistic mode of apprehension,) not the direct but the indirect purpose, cf. Luke xii. 51. In *μὴ βλέποντες* and *βλέποντες*, some adhere solely to the subjective side, cf. v. 41: *λέγετε ὅτι βλέπομεν*, consequently, "who regard themselves as seeing or not seeing." But this very thing, as a general rule, takes place in the case of those who actually *are* either seeing or blind, we therefore add also the objective side, as is done in Matt. xi. 25, with *νήπιοι* and *συνετοί*, although indeed the *βλέπειν* and *συνιέναι* is but a relative one, and the *νήπιοι* who believe in Christ, in relation to *that* knowledge, are those who truly see.

V. 40, 41. Taking *τυφλοί* with strict reference to *τυφλοί* in v. 39, we see that the Pharisees have observed that *they* are designated as the *βλέποντες*, but at the same time also, as the *τυφλοί*, (Matt. xv. 14.) In what Jesus utters, the *τυφλοί* are not, indeed, those who had *become* blind, but those who were originally blind, but there is nothing that need surprise us in the interchange of these references. The construction with *εἰ—νῦν δέ* occurs in the classics, as it does several times in John also, chap. viii. 40, xv. 24. The proposition *οὐκ—ἁμαρτίαν* is difficult. As we have it in xv. 22, 24, also, we naturally desire to understand it in the same way in both cases; now in that passage it is a question whether *ἁμαρτία* designates sin or guilt in general, or the specific sin and guilt of unbelief; it is, however, beyond dispute that there the formula means, "they would have been (relatively) exempt from guilt or exempt from punishment." We might, according to that, accept Tittmann's interpretation here: "If ye were unlearned people, your unbelief in me might be forgiven, but as ye are learned in the Scriptures, your sin remains unforgiven." But would not this view entirely lose sight of the subjective side, to which, however, such special prominence is given by the

λέγετε, which here means "ye boast," (Acts v. 36.) We would, consequently, be obliged with Lücke to interpret the latter part thus: "Were you without the capacity for knowledge, there would be in your unbelief, no sin involving culpability, for in that case ye *could* not discern and believe; so long, however, as you do not put off your arrogant self-infatuation, your unbelief will not yield." But taken thus, the two members of the sentence are not in correspondence. There has been an inclination, therefore, to abandon the special reference to the sin of unbelief. "If ye were of the number of the more ignorant, who are wont to feel the need of redemption, your sins might be forgiven and your guilt taken away by me," (Calvin, Zwingle, Maldonatus, De Wette.) But in this way the connection would be destroyed with v. 39, in which the βλέπειν means no more than "to perceive Christ." We, therefore, despite what has been said, unite with Meyer in interpreting it of unbelief: "If ye belonged to the number of the ignorant, ye would, like them, have been believers, and thus would have been guiltless; as, however, ye presume upon your seeing, ye abide in your sin." The more comprehensive ἡ ἁμ. μένει in the antithesis, instead of ἔχετε ἁμαρτίαν, as in iii. 36.

CHAPTER X.

PARABOLIC DISCOURSE IN REGARD TO THE QUALIFICATION OF THE TRUE LEADER OF THE PEOPLE, AND THE CONDUCT OF THE SHEEP TOWARD HIM.—V. 1–6.

V. 1, 2. WITH a consciousness of belonging to those who see, these scribes presented themselves as leaders of the people, (Rom. ii. 19;) the blind man had given proof that a profounder need of the soul could not be intrusted to the guidance of such leaders; thus occasion was given for the following parable. With reference to form, however, the parable is imperfect, for the explanation is wanting, or rather where it would naturally come in, to wit: at v. 7, we have a new turn and a further expansion of the similitude; we have not, moreover, as elsewhere in the parable, some progressive *occurrence* from common life, but a *relation* is brought out; in the form, therefore, in which the discourse is presented, it is not so much a parable as an allegory, like xv. 1, seq.,[1] cf. Strauss, 4th ed. i. p. 680, and Tholuck's Glaubw. d. ev. Geschichte, 2d ed. p. 340. These false leaders of the people (this is the main thought,) do not approach the theocratic flock in the right way, consequently they lead it not aright, and it does not commit itself to them. —A reference to the shepherd-life of the East is essential to an understanding of the images here used, cf. the learned description in Bochart, Hierozoicon, 1 B. i. chap. 43 and 46. In the evening the flock was conducted to a roofless inclosure, surrounded with a low wall of stones, hence the "climbeth up;"

1 Lucke contends that it cannot be called an "allegory," but what he says does not bear upon the point. Calvin had already said on v. 7: (on the view, however, that it is an explanation of v. 1,)—nisi addita fuisset hæc expositio, tota oratio allegorica esset, ("if this explanation had not been appended, the entire discourse would have been allegorical.") Cf. Unger, de parab. p. 22.

sometimes watch was kept at the door by a servant furnished with arms, the "porter." In the morning the shepherd comes, is admitted by the "porter," and calls the bell-wether; the particular animals in the flock had, and in our own day still have their own names, *τὰ βουκολικὰ ἐπιφωνήματα*, (the shepherd-cries;) Longus, Pastor. l. iv. ed. Schæf. p. 133: *τὰς αἶγας προσεῖπε καὶ τοὺς τράγους ἐκάλεσεν ὀνομαστί*, "He spoke to the she-goats, and called the he-goats by name." Robbers often scaled the low wall at night. Cf. for interpretation, Wolle, de introitu in ovile, Lips. 1748; Voretzsch, de loco Joa. x. 1–18, Altenb. 1838; especially Chr. Fr. Fritzsche, in Fritzsch. opusc. comm. I.—By the "fold," *αὐλή*, is designated the theocracy of Israel, (Mich. ii. 12, Ezek. xxxiv. 14,) which is identical essentially with the Christian Church which proceeded from it, (v. 16.) The comparison of Israel with the flock, and of God with the shepherd, is a standing one in the Old Testament, yet the leaders of the people, princes and prophets also, have the name of "shepherds" assigned to them, (Jer. xxiii. Ezek. xxxiv. Zech. x. 2, Isa. xl. 11, Ps. lxxx. 2, Ecclesiastic. xviii. 13.) As points of similitude, the following may be adduced: the care of the shepherd on the one side, on the other the defenselessness of a flock, particularly of a flock of sheep, the close connection especially of a flock of sheep, &c. As regards, first, the meaning of the door, those expositors who allow no turn in the parable in v. 9, must here understand by it Christ himself, (Cyrill, Augustine, Calvin, Beza, Bengel, Kuinöl.) Will the connection allow it to be apprehended in this way? With reference to the fact that the Pharisees had tried to hinder from believing in Christ, him that was born blind, Christ might say: "Only those are genuine shepherds of the people, who attaching themselves to me, work in the theocracy," (Beza.) Independently, however, of other considerations, the fact that the comparison in v. 14–16, and in 27, 28, in v. 9–11, also, proceeds on the idea that Christ already, v. 2–4, has contrasted, if not exclusively yet preëminently, himself with the "thief," this fact raises the question, what can be meant by *his* entering in by the door? The idea of the *θύρα*, "door," would then have to be extended as far at least as has been done by Lampe, according to whose exposition Christ designates himself, v. 7, 9, as the door, inasmuch as

he confers the true righteousness of the kingdom of God, and ὁ εἰσερχόμενος διὰ τῆς θύρας, "he that entereth in by the door" is that leader of the people who is *previously prepared* by this righteousness. But this conception of the righteousness to be obtained through Christ pertains to the definite dogmatic connection of the Epistles of Paul, and cannot be introduced here. Already, therefore, Chrysostom and Theophylact *here* understood by the door the Holy Scriptures, inasmuch as the genuine shepherd must be acquainted with them; Theodorus of Heraclea, inasmuch as Christ is prophecied of in them; but Maldonatus and Crell first hit the true sense. The question is not what does the "door," θύρα, taken by itself mean, but what is meant by the entering in through the door and the not entering in by it, and these can only be, on the one hand, the regular divinely ordained avenue, that is, the divine calling, (Maldonatus: divina auctoritas,) and on the other, a presumptuous intrusion, (Jer. xxiii. 21.) He, consequently, who though uncalled, undertakes to lead the flock of God, comes to it not as a leader, but (impelled by self-interest,) as a thief and robber, who turns off the stream of true life from the Church and causes its spiritual death, (v. 10, Ezek. iii. 18, xxxiv. 8;) he, on the other hand, who called of God, undertakes its guidance, proves himself a shepherd of the sheep.

V. 3–5. When the true shepherd comes in the morning, the door is opened to him, the sheep recognize his voice, he calls each of them by its name, leads them out to pasture, goes before them as a guide, and they readily follow him. In explaining τὰ ἴδια, it is not necessary, with Fritzsche and Lücke, to suppose a reference to the fact, that *different* flocks are sheltered in the same drove, rather the ἴδια, v. 12, and ἔχω, v. 16, imply that the idea of proprietorship is to be made prominent; his own sheep he knoweth by name, (v. 14;) the knowing by name implies the most intimate acquaintance, cf. Isa. xliii. 1. From what follows, it is very clear that the Redeemer in this description of the shepherd, had in his eye himself, as the shepherd ordained of God, (cf. on v. 11;) this is deducible from the connection too, for what Jesus says has respect to the haughtiness with which the man that had been born blind encountered the

leaders of the people, and to the ready obedience with which he followed the Saviour's commands. It is a question whether *ὁ θυρωρός ἀνοίγει*, "the porter openeth," serves without peculiar signification only "to represent the regular manner of theocratic fellowship," (Grotius, Lücke,) or whether it has a special signification. If we have regard to the expression often recurring in John, *πᾶν, ὁ δίδωσί μοι ὁ πατὴρ, πρὸς ἐμὲ ἥξει*, "all that the Father giveth me shall come to me," (vi. 36, x. 29,) we might understand by "the porter," *God*, (Maldonatus, Bengel;) that the porter is a subordinate person, argues nothing against this view, for the master of the fold could not be mentioned, as this was the shepherd himself, we must therefore suppose the allusion to be made exclusively to the circumstance of the *opening*. The *ἀκούειν* is to be regarded as preceding the leading forth, the *οἴδασι τὴν φωνήν* takes place on the way to the pasture, and during the pasturing; on the spiritual tenor of the expression, see v. 14. Instead of *τὰ ἴδια πρόβατα*, Lachman, following Cod. B D L, Copt. and some others, reads *τά ἴδια πάντα*, and it certainly looks as though *πρόβατα* had been added by a transcriber, by way of explanation, (Fritzsche.)—The "stranger," *ἀλλότριος*, in v. 5, is not designed to take up again the idea of the "thief," *κλέπτης*, in v. 1, nor is it taken up again by the "hireling," *μισθωτός*, in v. 12, it only serves to characterize the sheep, (Lücke,) and the *φεύξονται* (will flee,) refers to the conduct toward the leaders of the people, on the part of the man that was born blind.

V. 6. The word *παροιμία* in Greek usage, "proverb," and as proverbs are usually figurative, also means figurative discourse; Basil, hom. in prov. Sal. init.: *παρὰ δὲ ἡμῖν παροιμία ἐστὶ λόγος ὠφέλιμος μετ' ἐπικρύψεως μετρίας ἐκδεδομένος*, "But by a proverb we mean a useful expression, in terms of moderate obscurity," cf. in John ch. xvi. 25, 29. מָשָׁל, and in Arabic, مثل signifies proverb as well as comparison, as also on the other hand, *παραβολή*, Luke, iv. 23, means proverb. John then comprehends under the expression, any figurative discourse, whether the parable proper or the allegory. The "understanding not," does not so much exclude every degree of comprehension, as a proper, thorough understanding.

FURTHER UNFOLDING OF THE PARABOLIC DISCOURSE. — V. 7–18.

V. 7, 8. We may suppose a pause in the discourse at this point, during which the Pharisees were talking with one another about the meaning of the "door," and as Jesus is wont in John, to augment the strength of his declarations, and as this augmentation is connected with the very expressions which give offense, (vi. 56, viii. 57,) thus, in this place, the thought previously expressed is augmented by Christ's affirmation of something yet higher in regard to himself, when he designates himself as the door. As those expositors, who do not allow a turn in the parable, induced by this expression, explained θύρα in v. 1 in accordance with the present passage, so we might allow the foregoing parable to have its influence on the interpretation of verses 7 and 9; the reference to the leaders and teachers would have to be retained, and the genitive τῶν προβάτων accordingly explained, "the door *to* the sheep," Luther, Erasmus, Bengel, Meyer; but already in v. 9, and yet more unmistakably from v. 11 on, the reference of Christ, not to the shepherd, but to the flock, is prominent, and in this point of view we conceive that there is a turn in the similitude, and interpret with Beza: Ostium, quo ingressus in caulam patet ovibus, (the door, by which the sheep enter the fold.)—V. 8, clear as the words are in themselves, appears to us one of the most difficult sentences in the New Testament. As regards the genuine reading, it is true that Cod D omits πάντες, Cod E M G S and some others omit πρὸ ἐμοῦ, which latter Bengel and Matthæi have also rejected; but the presumption is too obvious, that those words have been omitted, because the Manicheans relied upon this passage in arguing against the divine legation of the prophets under the Old Testament; besides this, the omission only makes the sentence more obscure, leaving the existing difficulty in its interpretation precisely the same. According to the simple meaning of the words, Christ here declares all the leaders of the people who had appeared before him, to have been uncalled, the ministers of selfishness, (Matt. xxiii. 13.) The remark, to be sure, may, without violence, be restricted to the cotemporaries of Jesus, and the

present εἰσι may be appealed to, to sustain such a view, although the present allows of being taken thus: "all who ever appeared are, &c." But the πάντες, strengthened yet further by ὅσοι, would still express this imputation with an unaccountable generality, as there were also among these leaders of the people such men as Nicodemus and Gamaliel; it would be a matter of surprise, too, that our Lord should give a prominence to their having come before him. It is difficult under these circumstances to see no more in the words than the meaning that, "he, Jesus, was the first of his time, who felt a genuine solicitude for the people," (thus Ebrard, Matt. ix. 36,) and we might almost feel tempted to limit it, by supposing that ἔρχεσθαι, according to Jer. xxiii. 21, is to be understood of an appearing on their own authority, as Clemens Alexandrinus, Stromata, i. p. 311, Augustine, c. Faust, l. 16, c. 12, Jerome, in c. 7 Hos., Euthymius and Tarnov take it; but that secondary notion does not lie in the mere ἔρχεσθαι. To this is added the difficulty that we find no strong antithesis to v. 7, which, however, could exist only in case Christ had there designated himself as the *shepherd*. As he calls himself the *door*, we anticipate here the idea: "all those who have not acknowledged me as the 'door.'" Those too have attempted to reach this idea, who, with Augustine (tr. 45, in Joan,) and Camerarius, interpret πρό by præter, me neglecto, (without me, neglecting me,) or with Elsner, Baier, (in thes. nov. phil-theol, in the learned dissertat in T. ii. p. 523,) and Kling, take ἔρχεσθαι πρό in the sense, "pass me by, neglect me." But in place of this, the language would demand παρὰ ἐμὲ παρῆλθον. Those who, like Chrysostom, Beza, Calvin, Grotius, understand the expression of false Messiahs, have obtained in a different way a limitation, and, as it seems, a more precise reference to v. 7. And in this it is not necessary, with Zwingle, (he says, that in German also, vor and für, *before* and *for*, are interchanged,) Luther, (Walch, xi. p. 1520,) Melancthon, Lampe and Wolf, to take πρό in the sense "instead of," (this only occurs when it is equivalent to ὑπερ, *in commodum*, for the advantage of,) but as Christ in calling himself the door of the sheep, designates himself indirectly as the Messiah, he might in this connection continue: "Those who have appeared before me in my character." According to Bucer, we

already find even in v. 12, a reference to false teachers and pseudo-Messiahs; according to Maldonatus, only the latter. But in this way of apprehending it, the expositor once more has history against him, which speaks of false Messiahs only *after* Christ. Even if we admit that Josephus has passed over some such appearances in silence, and if we could venture with Bauer to use the expression of Christ, Matt. xxiv. 24, as proof that the appearing of false Messiahs was at that time a familiar idea, still the objection could not be relieved, that the expression πάντες ὅσοι points to a greater historical importance of such false teachers. We confess, therefore, that we cannot relieve in any way which is entirely satisfactory, the difficulty raised by the expression.[1]—Τὰ πρόβατα is, indeed, indefinite, so that it might be taken in a universal way, in which case it would lose its historic accuracy, but v. 3, in which we first have the indefinite τὰ πρόβατα, afterward makes it specific by ἴδια.

V. 9, 10. The thought is again made emphatic, that only through the mediation of Christ can a man belong in a saving way to the theocracy. If it has been held that the reference in v. 7 is to the leaders of the people, it should not be abandoned here, and Lücke, even in the 3d edition, retains it to the exclusion of any other; others, who cannot deny that the *sheep* are designated as the subject, seek to help themselves by the remark, that the shepherd of Christ's flock must necessarily at the same time be a member of the flock. It appears to me that if there be a turn acknowledged in the parabolic discourse with reference to the "door" in v. 7, we ought to feel the less reluctant to acknowledge the same thing in regard to those that enter in. The leading idea is expressed by the first words, "shall be saved by me," δι ἐμοῦ σωθήσεται; within this "fold," αὐλή, is the source of the "salvation," σωτηρία, this fold is here, however, already regarded in the New Testament light, (see on v. 16 and v. 1.) With a backward glance at v. 3, 4, the benefit is further depicted in figurative form as the enjoyment of pasture, "he shall go in and out;" εἰσέρχεσθαι and ἐξέρχεσθαι, according to Fritzsche, taken in its proper sense, expresses the two features: Admittetur in locum munitum, et aperientur ei

[1] The interpretation of Olshausen (that of Placæus is like it,) we pass over, as it has too much against it.

fores eo eventu, ut pascatur, (he shall have entrance given to him into a secure place, and the doors shall be opened to him that he may be fed;) in our judgment the expression is chosen, that by it the *εἰσέλθῃ* may be amplified, cf. Numbers xxvii. 17, where undoubtedly the *shepherd* is spoken of; whether with the trope there be at the same time a distinct thought of the Hebrew phraseology in which "going in and out" designates "traffic and trade," (Deuter. xxviii. 6, Ps. cxxi. 8,) may be questioned. With v. 10, the comparison of the shepherd instead of that of the door again comes in, and in fact, from the words, "I am come," *ἐγώ ἦλθον*, on to v. 15, we regard the discourse as an amplification of what has been said, v. 9, of the welfare of the sheep. He who appears uncalled robs the sheep of their possession and of life itself, on the contrary, Christ gives them life and all fullness.

V. 11–13. The predicate which the Saviour had already appropriated, v. 2, now comes out with complete definiteness. Luther inaccurately translates: "*a* shepherd," the article rather proves that our Lord expressed ideally what pertains to the true shepherd; *ἀληθινός* might, without an essential change of the meaning, be substituted for *ὁ καλός*, (the true, cf. *καλὸς στρατιώτης*, 2 Tim. ii. 3.) The Messiah is indeed predicted of Ezek. xxxvii. 24, as the true shepherd, nevertheless it cannot be affirmed that the article refers to one already known from the prophecies, (Maldonatus, Bengel;) rather does our Lord justify the application of the predicate to himself by a reference to his consummate love for the sheep. It is true, as Fritzsche has endeavored to show, that the conception of the shepherd is not exhausted by that of *teacher*, especially if we consider that according to v. 12 the sheep *belong* to him, he has purchased them as his possession with his own blood, (Heb. xiii. 20, Acts xx. 28.) Alone by what Christ has done and suffered for those that are his, are they truly united with him. The expression *τὴν ψυχὴν τιθέναι ὑπέρ* has no exact correspondent analogy either in Greek or Hebrew, for in the formula שׂוּם נֶפֶשׁ בְּכַף, the meaning of שׂוּם is "to take," but Homer uses *ψυχὴν παρατίθεσθαι*, (to hazard life,) Polybius, *ψυχὴν κατατιθέναι*, (to lay down life.) Ὑπέρ does not in itself express the idea of substitution, (xi. 50,) yet in the *thing* a correlation has place,

for he who dies for another saves him from dying. It is worthy of note what importance is attached in v. 12, 13, to the fact, that already per se, and therefore apart from their acquisition by that love which endured every sacrifice, the sheep belong to Christ, cf. ἔχω, v. 16. A speculative apprehension of the doctrine of the Logos and of redemption, causes a recognition of that profound truth which lies at the base of this expression, (see above, p. 70.) The mention of the hireling hardly involves an allusion to the Pharisees, it serves merely by way of contrast to give prominence to the idea of the genuine shepherd. The αὐτά appears strange, if καὶ ὁ λύκος ἁρπάζει αὐτὰ κ. σκορπίζει τὰ πρόβατα be the genuine reading. Sentences like that in Xenophon, Cyrop. 1, 4, 2, καὶ γὰρ ἀσθενήσαντος αὐτοῦ οὐδέποτε ἀπέλιπε τὸν πάππον, ("Cyrus, when his grandfather fell ill, never quitted him,") cannot be compared, since here, only a *participial period* is thrown in, (Fritzsche, and also Fr. A. Fritzsche, conjectanea in Nov. Test. p. 12.) We may, perhaps, say with Fritzsche, that αὐτά designates a part of the sheep, the part killed, and τὰ πρόβατα, the whole flock, which is scattered. The hireling who serves merely for wages, and whose interest does not coincide with that of the flock, has nothing to gain by offering himself for them.

V. 14, 15. In virtue of the fact that the flock is the possession of the good shepherd, he stands also in a closer relation to it than the hireling can; there exists a reciprocal sympathy as between the Father and the Son, in which expression, as in chap. xvii. 21, seq. the immanence of the Father in the Son, and of the Father and the Son, in the Church, is presupposed, (xiv. 23.) On the part of the Son, this sympathy of love displays itself especially in his offering up of himself.

V. 16. Here, as in ch. xvii. 20, the glance at the little host immediately about him, expands itself into a prospect of generations to come. All the Evangelists corroborate the fact, that the Redeemer, who during his life never passed the borders of Israel, and confined his Disciples to the same limits, (Matt. x. 5,) in the most distinct manner prophesied the calling of the Gentiles, (Matt. xxi. 43.) As in the prophecies, so here too, the reception of the Gentiles into the kingdom of God is

represented as a reception into the Old Testament theocracy, just as Paul speaks of it, (Rom. xi. 17, cf. Heb. iii. 5, 6.) The propiatory death is the bond of unity between the two kinds, (John xi. 52, xii. 24, 25, Eph. ii. 14–18.) Many of the Gentiles also, are "children of God," (xi. 52,) in virtue of that internal sympathy with Christ, by which they will be enabled to know his "voice." The asyndeton *μία ποίμνη, εἷς ποιμήν*, is also used in the classics, when two ideas are closely connected, as *ἀνδρῶν, γυναικῶν*, Küster on Aristophanes Ranæ, v. 156, Schäfer on Longus, p. 403.

V. 17, 18. The thought in v. 15 is again entered into, the love of the Father to the Son rests upon the unison of will, viii. 29, xv. 10. *Ἵνα* designates not the subjective, but the objective design, the condition, see on iv. 36, cf. *τὴν ἐντολήν* at the close of v. 18. The atoning feature lies not in the physical event, but in the spiritual fact of the death of Jesus, cf. Rom. v. 19, Heb. ix. 14. Does this voluntary dying present an antithesis to all powers exterior to Christ, only, or also to the tendency to death, whose basis was in himself, in other words: does he mean to say that he might have remained untouched of death, as he was untouched of sin? See the discussion on this question in Mau, on Death, the wages of sin, p. 20, seq. in opposition to Krabbe, cf. also, Tholuck's Comment. on Heb. ii. 14. The connection, however, as well as the words *ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ*, "of myself," and *οὐδείς*, "no man," shows that here the antithesis is confined to other persons, (cf. also, v. 28.) Lücke was led in his earlier view to a forced exposition of this passage, by the fact, that elsewhere the resurrection of Christ is designated as the work of the Father; after such expressions as v. 30, there is, however, no room to doubt that the *ἐξουσία*, "power," of the Father is also that of the Son, though in such a way, of course, that the Father is always to be regarded as the absolute cause in the works of Christ. Christ calls himself, xi. 25, "the Resurrection," *ἡ ἀνάστασις*, and ascribes to himself, v. 21, a participation in the work of raising the dead; that nevertheless as regards his death and resurrection, as for every other act, the canon laid down, ch. v. 19, is available, that is, that the Father is to be regarded as the absolute cause. (cf. v. 38,) is intimated

by the closing words of v. 18. That expression, too, is worthy of note as a proof that Christ, according to John also, prophesied of his resurrection, (ii. 19.)

V. 19–21. Here also it is plain, that John does not delineate the opponents of Jesus as *utterly* unsusceptible; in part his words, in part his works, have made an impression upon some of the hearers who were Pharisees—it is remarkable that these, as it appears, recognize no (beneficent) demoniacal miracles.

DISCOURSES AT THE FEAST OF THE DEDICATION OF THE TEMPLE. v. 22–39.

V. 22, 23. Perhaps confiding in the division among the guides of the people, Jesus remains in the city or in its environs, (? see Neander, p. 538, Trans. p. 303;) thus, some three months later the feast of the Dedication draws near, which was annually celebrated in the month of December for eight days, in commemoration of the second consecration of the temple, after it had been desecrated by Antiochus Epiphanes, (1 Maccab. iv. 56, (59,) 2 Maccab. i. 18.) As it was the rainy season, our Saviour did not teach in the fore-courts, in the open air, but in that eastern porch of the fore-court of the Gentiles, which had continued to stand at the destruction of Solomon's temple by the Babylonians; in the very same place we subsequently find the Apostles, Acts v. 12.

V. 24, 25. By the "Jews," Ἰουδαῖοι, we are probably to understand (cf. also, v. 26,) the Pharisees, and particularly members of the Sanhedrim; we may from this fact already draw the inference, which is sustained by the sequel, that impure motives alone prompted the question. Αἴρειν (and especially ἐπαίρειν, ἔπαρσις,) is used in the classics and Septuagint in the sense, "to raise, agitate," in Philo it is used with μετεωρίζειν, (cf. Lücke.) On ἔργα, see v. 36.

V. 26–28. The fact that Christ refers back to the similitude at the beginning of the chapter, although three months had intervened, and the persons addressed were perhaps not the same, is used by Strauss as evidence that it is here not so much the Saviour who speaks as the Evangelist, who still had the words from the beginning of the chapter in his memory. But

if Christ observed here and there among those present but one or two who had heard the similitude, would it not have been proper, even after a yet longer interval, to make reference to it? *Καθώς εἶπον ὑμῖν* is wanting in Cod. B K L M*, and some other authorities; yet although it is supposable that a glossator might have introduced the reference, the omission, on the other hand, may be explained by the fact that the words *οὐ γάρ—ἐμῶν* do not occur just in that form in the earlier discourse; there are besides weighty authorities for the retention, (Fritzsche.) With Meyer, we divide by a comma merely, *καθὼς εἶπον ὑμῖν*, from what precedes, and after *ὑμῖν* insert a colon. For the very reason that he had not expressly uttered the words *οὐ γάρ—ἐμῶν* in a negative form, our Lord adduces the positive propositions from which that negative consequence is derived. References to something prior, which are not precise, are found also in v. 36, chap. xi. 40, xii. 34, vi. 36. The marks of his true sheep are partly subjective, partly objective: 1) They understand his call; 2) Christ knows them by their sympathy; 3) They direct themselves by his will; 4) He gives them eternal life; 5) They never lose it; 6) No power can snatch them away from him. The Reformed Church (the Calvinistic,) bases on v. 28 the doctrine, that the regenerate can never apostatize. Christ undoubtedly says, that no power can snatch away his sheep from him, (Romans viii. 37–39;) but he furnishes also the *marks* of his sheep, and only so far as the stipulations contained in v. 27 and 28 are fulfilled, so far consequently as the disciple of Christ *continues* with Christ, (viii. 31,) is he invincible. See Tholuck, Komm. zum Br. an d. Rom. (4th ed. 1842,) p. 456, (on Rom. viii. 28.)

V. 29, 30. Our Lord, in confirmation of what he has said, refers to the unity of his power with that of the Father. Stripping the thought of its veil of imagery, we have the same idea that is presented in Rom. viii. 28, 35. The world is so established and will be so ordered, that to him who remains with Christ, all that comes from without, though apparently an obstacle, will in fact promote his welfare. The connection justifies what is maintained by Lampe and Bengel, for example, that the word "all," *πάντων*, in *this* place does not comprehend the Son too, (it is otherwise in chap. xiv. 28,) it

only embraces the power inimical to the sheep. The thirtieth verse has been used since the Nicene Council as the grand proof text for the metaphysical unity of essence between the Father and Son, though it was not so used previously.[1] Euthymius, Calvin, Grotius, and even the Socinians, admit that the connection leads to the unity of power—they add: "and of will." Calovius, Bengel, and others do not deny this, but the latter remarks, as Chrysostom had already done: Unitas potentiæ *adeoque naturæ*, nam omnipotentia est attributum naturale. Per *sumus* refutatur Sabellius, per *unum* Arius. ("Unity of power, and *therefore of nature*, for omnipotence is an attribute of nature. The "*are*" refutes Sabellius, the "*one*" refutes Arius.") Against the validity of this conclusion the Socinians appeal to xvii. 21. It is enough for us to direct attention to the fact which has usually been overlooked in these controversies, that the discourse is not of the unity of the first and of the second "person," ὑπόστασις, of the Godhead, but of the union of God with this particular human individual, hence we subsequently have as equivalent, the formula, ἐν ἐμοὶ ὁ πατὴρ κἀγὼ ἐν αὐτῷ, "the Father is in me, and I in him," v. 38; "in me the Father entered into human consciousness, and I have in Him the ground of my existence and of my actions," (De Wette.)

V. 31–33. Already, viii. 59, the opponents of Christ, in order to execute vengeance against the blasphemy, which the law punished by stoning, had snatched up stones in a tumultuous manner—stones brought there by the building of the temple, which was not yet completed, may have been lying about. The reply of Jesus seems not without sarcasm. On ἔδειξα, cf. ii. 18, καλὰ ἔργα, either useful, beneficent, (1 Tim. vi. 18,) or noble, glorious, (1 Tim. iii. 1.) The present λιθάζομεν as temp. inf. of the action had in view. De Wette thinks that according to the usual type of John, the language of the Jews is to be regarded as the result of a misunderstanding, but how? Could they not say with justice of him who ascribed to himself like power with God, ποιεῖ σεαυτὸν θεόν, "he maketh himself God?"

[1] The polemic interest against the Sabellians led e. g. Novatian de trin. c. 22, to say: "Unitas ad concordiam et charitatis societatem pertinet," the oneness relates to harmony and the union of love.

V. 34–36. The reply of the Redeemer is a conclusion from the less to the greater, cf. e. g. Matt. xii. 27. "In the law," *νόμος*, that is in the Old Testament, (xii. 34, xv. 25,) more particularly in Ps. lxxxii. 6, the judges (and those moreover, *wicked* ones,) are addressed as "gods," *θεοί*, and "sons of the highest," *υἱοὶ ὑψίστου*, it cannot, therefore, be absolutely blasphemy, if a man calls himself "son of God," *υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*. But we are not to regard the citation made by Christ as merely an external argument from the *usage of the language*. Christ certainly presupposes a truth in this usage of language in Scripture. We have to inquire, therefore: Why those judges, (according to others, princes,) legitimately bear the title of "gods," *θεοί*? The answer depends upon the meaning attached to the words, "to whom the word of God came," *πρὸς—ἐγένετο*. According to Cyrill, Luther, (Walch, iii. 1163,) Bucer, Calvin, Lampe, Grotius, Olshausen, v. Cölln, (Bibl. Theol. ii. 95,) the "word," *λόγος*, is either the command of God by which they are constituted,[1] (so that *πρός* signifies "with regard to,") or it means the word of revelation, by which they were illumined. Conceived in this way, we have a climax in the *relation of God* to the Jewish judges on the one side, and to Christ on the other; the former receive God's word, Christ as the Messiah, is the absolute revelation of God. But can it be shown that all the particular judicial sentences are to be regarded as prophetic decisions, as divine revelation? Perhaps so in the case of Moses himself, (Ex. xviii. 15, 19;) but is this true also of those judges whom he appointed, (v. 25,) and of the priestly judges in the central sanctuary? (Deut. xvii. 8, xix. 17.) Lampe even remarks that the latter may have judged by Urim and Thummim. Olshausen may have been impelled by feeling the difficulty connected with this point, to embrace the prophets also under these words. The same difficulty had already led Crell to doubt the correctness of this meaning, and to think that "the word of God" referred only to the address contained in the Psalm, and this view has been followed by the more recent critics. Christ, therefore, presupposes an acquaintance with the Psalm, and as those addressed in it were judges,

[1] In Gerhard's Loci T. xiii. p. 250, the expression is adduced as a proof passage for the divine right of the magistracy.

there is a climax of *official dignity*. The judge, as does also the prince, represents by his plenipotence the omnipotent God;[1] Christ possessed a far higher power; could consequently lay claim in a far higher measure to that predicate, and yet more cogent would be this conclusion, if our Lord had in his eye, that the persons addressed in the Psalm are *unrighteous* judges. If it be the official dignity, on which is based the justification of the predicate "Son of God," the view, which discovers no more in that term than a title of office, can certainly appeal for confirmation to this passage, and already Camero remarks that this had been done by the hodierni Photiniani, (the Photinians of the present day;) but then, in the first place, the fact would be overlooked, that even here the official name must refer, at least, on the one side to the essence, that it bases itself, namely, upon the plenipotence, and in the second place, that v. 38 defines more particularly the meaning of "Son of God." In the words, "*I said* I am the Son of God," εἶπον, υἱὸς θεοῦ εἰμι, there is again an absence of exactness, as Christ had not said this explicitly; it is an ingenious remark of Theodore of Mopsuestia, that there is a designed climax in the antithesis between "gods" and "Son of God," and that, too, a climax from the greater to the less. The predicates with which, v. 36, the dignity of Messiah is designated, are certainly not distinctive enough, as others besides the Messiah may be sanctified, (consecrated,) and sent, (Jer. i. 5,) still it is like vi. 27, iii. 34, (cf. remarks on latter passage.) It is impossible to mistake the affinity between this argument and the character of the reasoning in the synoptical Gospels, in which Christ often proceeds with an indirect argument, (Matt. xii. 27, xxii. 43.) The procedure of Jesus forms a remarkable contrast with the other cases mentioned by John, in which he only states anew more strongly what had given offense.—The καὶ οὐ—ἡ γραφή remains to be considered. The subject of εἶπε is ὁ νόμος, or ἡ γραφή; the

[1] Cf. Jehoshaphat's address to the judges appointed by him, 2 Chron. xix. 5–7. Seneca (de clementia, l. i. c. i.) introduces Nero speaking in the following way: electus sum, qui in terris Deorum vice fungerer; ego vitæ necisque gentibus arbiter, qualem quisque sortem statumque habeat, in manu mea positum est; ("I have been chosen to perform in the world the part of the Gods; I am arbiter of life and death to the nations, to me has been committed the decision of the lot and condition of every man.")—According to the current view, the judges, Exod. xxi. 6, xxii 7, are called אֱלֹהִים, see on the other hand, Gesenius, Thesaurus, i. p. 96

argument is strengthened by the remark, that the Scripture is confessedly, in all its constituent parts, incontestible. In this very declaration of Christ, there would certainly be a proof for the most rigid doctrine as to the nature of inspiration, (Storr, Lehrbuch d. Dogmatik von Flatt, p. 199; transl. by S. S. Schmucker, D. D., 2d ed. p. 160,) did not, as the Orthodox exegesis admits, the entire demonstration partake of the character of an accommodation, and an argumentatio e concessis.[1]

V. 37–39. What are the Jews to believe? That he is "the Son of God," a conception whose purport is unfolded in v. 38, cf. v. 25. This they were to regard *him* as being, and to believe therefore in his *word*, and in the impression which it produces, (viii. 43.) If they cannot, however, dispense with the mediation of something which addresses the senses, his works can furnish testimony, corresponding to ch. xiv. 10, 11. These can lead to an acknowledgment that Christ works in unity with the Father, cf. on v. 30, and ch. v. 19, 30. The stoning had been arrested by this discourse, they now again attempt to seize him, but (probably in the same way as viii. 59,) he escapes from their hands.—On *this* division, v. 23–39, Weisse says: (ii. 256,) "Were it not for the reverence felt for a writing, which we have been accustomed to regard as most intimately connected with what is most sacred, what reader could keep his gravity during the scene which he is here expected to bring before his imagination!" As *no* reader probably will be able of himself to answer wherefore, he will have to glean it from that author.

MINISTRY IN PERÆA.—v. 40–42.

V. 40–42. To avoid the danger with which he was threatened by this outbreak, Jesus retires to the department of Herod Antipas, to Bethany, in fact, in the district in which John had commenced his ministry, and had uttered the testimony given, ch. i. 19, seq. These, and other declarations of John, lingered in the memories of the people, and there are traces of a sus-

[1] Schweizer, l. c. p. 47, seq. has in an acute manner attempted to prove from John, and especially from this passage, that Christ, in his citations from the Old Testament, consciously proceeded throughout on the principle of accommodation.

ceptibility, which had been aroused by them, for the reception of Jesus. A very important testimony against those who would explain the miracles of Jesus as fables, springing from the morbid love of marvels, is found in the observation, that the Baptist, though it might certainly be looked for from him as a prophet, performed no miracle.—How long Jesus remained here, depends on the time we allow for his staying in Ephraim, xi. 54, from whence he journeyed to the Passover. His operations were interrupted by the message from the family of Lazarus.

CHAPTER XI.

The Raising of Lazarus.—v. 1–46.

The great vividness of delineation, the genuine feeling, and the simplicity of this narrative of a restoration from death, furnish the probable solution of the fact, that such importance has always been attached to this miracle; at the very time of its occurrence its results were of the most important character, (xii. 9–11, 17, 18.) Bayle (Dict. article Spinoza, Trans. v. 216,) says of Spinoza: On m'a assuré, qu'il disoit à ses amis, que s'il eût pu se persuader la résurrection de Lazare, il auroit brisé en pièces tout son système, il auroit embrassé sans répugnance la foi ordinaire des Chrétiens, ("I have been assured that he said to his friends, that if he could be convinced of the reality of the resurrection of Lazarus, he would dash to pieces his entire system, and would embrace without reluctance the ordinary faith of Christians.") And wherefore was it that the Jewish philosopher believed not this narrative? When Strauss, even in the 3d ed. ii. p. 184, in the preparation of which, nevertheless, he had stipulated for a truce in regard to John, declares that he regards the narrative of this miracle as that "*which has the greatest internal improbability, and the least external confirmation*," we can look upon his expression only as a counter-trump called forth by the strong trump of the defenders, but resting on no solid reason, as the sequel will show. If the authenticity of the Gospel be established, it is impossible to refuse an acknowledgment of the miracle, except by an arbitrary treatment of the text. The arbitrariness with which a Gfrörer regards the history of this resuscitation, as identical with that of the young man at Nain, a painting filled out from the fancy of John, whose mind was enfeebled by age—the arbitrariness

with which Weisse maintains that it is a mere transmutation of a sentence of Jesus into a history—this arbitrariness can only be paralleled by the willful unbelief of those Pharisees who saw what was done, yet did not believe. A milder judgment is due to the shift resorted to by Hase, Leben Jesu, § 99, and Schweizer, l. c. p. 153, seq. who think the difficulty can be escaped by adopting the supposition that the faith of Christ anticipated that the death would prove only an apparent one; that is to say, the reality of the death of Lazarus cannot of course be established from v. 39 so as to force conviction. But then just so much the more cogently in consequence of the judicial examination does the healing of the man that was born blind, chap. 9, bear with it an apologetic force, which would indeed extend over this particular case also, for if a single act of this sort on the part of Jesus is conceded, it avails nothing to keep open an effugium, a way of escape in others. Who, moreover, can maintain in the face of a sentence like that in v. 25, the hypothesis of an apparent death? This hypothesis of an apparent death, as is well known, was already at an earlier period carried out as well as it could bear it, especially by Paulus and by Gabler, (though under the presumption that John had not been perfectly faithful in his report,) Journal, f. auserl. theol. Litt. B. 3, St. 2, and on the other hand has been confuted by Flatt, in the Magazin f. Dogm. u. Mor. St. 14, p. 91, and by Heubner, miraculorum ab Evangelistis narratorum interpretatio grammatico-historica, Viteb. 1807, as also by Strauss.

V. 1–3. It is worthy of note at the very beginning, that the Evangelist presumes his readers to be acquainted with this family, he subsequently, indeed, designates Mary more particularly, (he has also placed her name first,) yet so as to show that he supposes her work of love to which he alludes, already known. By the words "whom thou lovest," ὃν φιλεῖς, Lazarus is designated as the intimate friend of Jesus. Ἀπὸ and ἐκ do not differ in meaning. The close relation of friendship to the family is also deducible from the fact, that in their emergency they send at once for Jesus, whom, as is obvious, they already know as one who wrought miracles, (v. 22.)

V. 4, 5. *Πρὸς θάνατον*, equivalent to *θανάσιμος*, (1 John v.

16,) like εἰς θάνατον, 2 Kings xx. 1, Septuag. It is not designed to exclude altogether the idea of dying, but (as the words "but for the glory of God," ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ, show,) the *remaining* in death, (Chrysostom, Augustine, Calvin.) The dying, however, was to prove only the means to the glory of God, or more strictly, to the glory of the Son of God, (ix. 3.) Verse 11 shows that Jesus knew of the death of Lazarus. The enigmatical character of the reply still left to the sisters a gleam of hope even after the death of their brother, as v. 22 shows. The Disciples might see in it an act of healing at a distance, (Ebrard.) The affectionate purpose which can be traced in the expression, v. 4, has its spring, according to the Evangelist, in the love which Jesus bore to the whole family. Φιλεῖν, as distinguished from ἀγαπᾶν, like amare, designates the natural affection, while ἀγαπᾶν, like diligere, marks the esteem which is based upon reflection; in this place, consequently, when the relation to the sisters is spoken of, we have ἀγαπᾶν, while φιλεῖν had previously been used of the brother.

V. 6–8. Verses 6 and 7 stand in antithesis, as after ἔπειτα a δέ corresponding with the μέν should follow, which is omitted, however, after εἶτα, ἔπειτα, (Schäfer, Meletemata, p. 61.) The Evangelist, therefore, means to say that despite some delay, Jesus took his departure. Why did he delay for these two days? We reply: Had he arrived while Lazarus was yet sick, he might have found it impossible, in the bosom of the family he loved, to resist the entreaty to restore him to health; his special reason for delay then was his design of glorifying himself by raising Lazarus, and of revealing the "glory of God," δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ, (v. 15, 40, 42, 45, Chrysostom, Michælis,) at the same time with the disciplinary aim of testing the faith of the sisters, (Heumann, Matt. xv. 26,) and thus perfecting their faith—does not his very purpose lie at the root of the promises concealed in verses 23, 25, 26? Strauss, to be sure, pronounces it immoral in Christ to let his friend die, in order to glorify himself by a miracle, but Ebrard has very justly replied: "He, to whose omnipotence it was just as easy to raise a dead man as to heal a sick one, performed not only *no less an act of goodness*, in permitting the sickness of Lazarus to run to a fatal termina-

tion, and then raising him, but did in fact the very same thing with only a change of form."—V. 8 shows that the impression made upon the minds of the Disciples by the recent commotion in Jerusalem, was yet vivid. *Νῦν*, as in classic usage, in a more extended sense, Acts vii. 52.

V. 9, 10. The answer is clothed in the form of a question, which serves to make it more impressive. In explaining the parabolic language, the question rises, whether the same image is pursued in v. 10, or whether there is a turn in the thought. The former is the more simple, and with Melancthon, (Lücke, also, 3d ed., and Schweizer,) we explain it thus: Day and night, the opposition of the period in which business is to be transacted and of that in which it cannot be done, consequently the time for one's calling and that not devoted to our calling. The time for our calling has its determinate measure—the day in Palestine was divided into twelve hours, varying somewhat in length according to the season of the year, (see on i. 40.) During the day, that is, during the life spent in our calling, the sun is visible, so that we do not stumble, that is, we incur no danger. Outside the calling there is danger—the *ἐν* in v. 10, (*ἐν αὐτῷ*,) which is so singular, may be translated by "before, with," (Winer, p. 168, 1 John ii. 10,) yet it is not impossible that Christ, or the Disciple who reports his words, had given to the thought the turn, "there is no light in himself."[1] The Saviour, therefore, first of all, quiets them with the thought, that if, as in this case, there be indisputably a divinely appointed day's work, the man to whom it is assigned will always be protected.—By many others, "the day," *ἡμέρα*, is regarded only as the designation of *lifetime*, (Zwingle, Bucer, Le Clerc, Tittmann, Maldonatus, Meyer,) by which this advantage is gained, that the interpretation of the first half is approximated to the meaning of the expression ix. 4: "Even to the closing hour of the day appointed me, the divine protection will not fail me;" but if the latter half can, in this view, be explained in no other way than either with Heumann: (with perhaps an appeal to xii. 35,) "the night of death is coming, when my work will

[1] Schweizer: "The man who shuns the way of God, betakes himself to darkness, and first falls into real danger, because the true light is not *in* him."—"an expression which forsakes the image, and belongs only to the counterpart."

be broken off;" or with Meyer: "I shall not fall until the appointed period of my death has come;" this would be doing violence to the language, nor can the passage, xii. 35, be brought in with propriety here. In the main point, De Wette, by another way, coincides with our interpretation: "The twelve hours of the day are an image of the space in which a morally pure and prudent business has its play; the light of this world signifies the light of the Spirit, from which purity springs; the night, in part, want of prudence, partly impurity;" but the taking of ἡμέρα in this sense, has this against it, that then the limitation to the twelve hours does not suit, and the exposition of φῶς τοῦ κόσμου is unnatural. According to Chrysostom, Lampe, Neander, by the "day," we are to understand the time of Christ's presence, by the "light," Christ himself, so that the words contained a comforting assurance for the Disciples; so long as he was present, no evil could befall them.

V. 11, 12. The καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο λέγει indicates a pause. As Christ in v. 4 spoke of Lazarus as still sick, but here speaks of him as dead, it is probable that in the interval he had died; the acquaintance of Christ with the fact is obviously referred to his supernatural knowledge. The solicitude of the Disciples had, in v. 9, been allayed by pointing out to them that in the path of his vocation no evil can befall a man; and now they are encouraged yet more by having their sympathy aroused in the lot of Lazarus, for which reason, too, he is styled ὁ φίλος ἡμῶν, (*our* friend.) What is the Saviour's reason here, as well as in the case of the daughter of Jairus, Luke viii. 52, for designating death as sleep? As it was his purpose speedily to call back his friend to life, it was a natural and at the same time a more tender expression, which lends no aid to the modern imputation, that "the Christ whom John paints is ostentatious in his miracles." The Disciples would still more readily think of a deep sleep superinducing a crisis in the disease, if they had regarded what was uttered in v. 4 as an intimation of Christ's intention to heal him at a distance.

V. 13–15. The language of tender indirectness is now exchanged for an explicit declaration, and our Saviour's purpose in permitting the sickness to go on to death is expressed in direct terms, to wit: the strengthening of their faith—for we

are here to understand πιστεύειν, of a more exalted measure of faith, see on ii. 11.

V. 16. Θωμᾶς, equiv. to תאם, "twin." John in but three instances furnishes us with traits of this Disciple, namely, here and in xiv. 5, and in xx. 24, seq.; but they are in such harmony as to furnish a picture of character. Intellectual reflection predominates in this Disciple, immediateness of self-surrender and of trust was in defect; here, consequently, he is unable to lift himself up to Christ's word, he gives proof, indeed, of some devotion, as for love of him he will not shrink from death, but he shows faint-heartedness enough to doubt whether their lives will be saved.

V. 17–19. Jesus does not enter the village, he waits until Martha comes, in fact, has Mary also to come out to him, (v. 28, 30.) Why was this? Was it that he desired to avoid display? According to the ordinary view, it was simply because of the fact that the place of sepulture was outside of the village, and this view is favored by v. 31.—Since Chrysostom, the four days have been computed thus: On the day on which the messenger started Lazarus died, and he was buried on the same day, (for proof that this was usual, see Acts v. 6, 10, and Jahn, Archäol, i. 2, p. 427.) Jesus still remained two days in Peræa, one day was needed for the journey of from twenty-three to twenty-nine miles from Peræa to Bethany, thus Jesus would arrive on the fourth evening—but could that which follows occur then on the same evening? According to our view, (expressed on v. 11,) Lazarus was still alive on the day on which the messenger arrived; the fact, moreover, has been lost sight of, that according to the τεταρταῖος, "the *fourth*," v. 39, Lazarus at the time of the arrival of Jesus could have lain in the grave *three days* only, and here in v. 17 the fourth day, yet incomplete, is counted with them. We may regard it as certain, that Jesus did not make the whole journey in one day, for he went to the sepulchre the day he arrived, as a comparison of v. 17 and 39 shows, and he must, consequently, have spent parts at least of two days on the road; we may, therefore, suppose that Lazarus died in the night which followed the arrival of the messenger and was buried the day after, and that this part of the day on which he was buried, and the fourth,

which was not completed, are included in the computation of v. 17.—The nearness of Bethany to Jerusalem[1] is mentioned to show that it was easy for the friends who testified their sympathy, to visit the sisters; according to Maimonides, de Luctu, c. 13, § 2, the stated condolences lasted for seven days. The ἀπό gives this force: "lying at the end of fifteen stadia," (ten stadia are equivalent to the modern geographical mile of sixty to the degree,) Winer, p. 513. The αἱ περί in ancient Greek, designates the principal person and the company surrounding him, but in Plutarch and his cotemporaries it is a paraphrastic expression for one individual. Acts xiii. 13, is an instance of the older usage; here, however, we have the later usage, as the τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτῶν shows.

V. 20–22. The similarity of the character of Martha and Mary in John, (connect with this narrative, chap. xii. 1–8,) with the depicture of the same character given in Luke x. 38–42, is very remarkable. Martha (probably the elder sister,) appears here also as the active one, expressing her thoughts, (v. 39;) Mary is more completely absorbed in her anguish. As the tidings of Christ's arrival become known, Martha goes out for the purpose of meeting him, while Mary remains at home. Of Mary it is said, that she sought to indulge her sorrow by visiting the grave. While Martha is at once disposed when she meets Jesus to converse with him, Mary sinks at the feet of the Master weeping and uttering but a word, (v. 32.) Both sisters at the glimpse of Jesus express in their first words a regret which breathes their confidence in him; a regret that he had not been present. Bengel: Ex quo colligi potest, hunc earum fuisse sermonem ante fratris obitum: *utinam adesset dominus Jesus!* (from which may be gathered that before their brother's death this had been their language: O that the Lord Jesus were here!) In the minor of the conditional proposition the pluperfect is here connected with ἄν; in v. 32, the aorist has a similar meaning, (see iv. 10.) The assuredness of the conviction that the presence of Jesus would have prevented the death, is in itself no little evidence of strength of faith, but a greater one is found

[1] The village is still in existence, and is three-quarters of an hour's ride from the Damascus Gate of Jerusalem, Robinson, i. p. 130, (ii. 99–101, of the 1st ed., i. 431, last ed. Tr.)

in v. 22, if what is there uttered is, as it appears to be, an expression of the hope of a restoration from death, which may, it is true, have been excited by the assurance which Christ had given, v. 4.

V. 23–27. Jesus testing her faith at first, still speaks indeterminately; this indeterminate declaration is regarded by Martha as a repression of her ardent hopes, v. 22. With sublimity and power, Jesus directs the glance of her faith upon his own person as the centre. In his own person lie the powers of the resurrection, (negatively,) and the ζωή, "the life," (positively,) see ch. v. 21, and Deut. xxx. 20. He is the vanquisher of death for the dead and for the living, *faith* is in both cases the condition; "though he were dead," κἂν ἀποθάνῃ, and "whosoever liveth," πᾶς ὁ ζῶν, stand in opposition. It is impossible to mistake here as to the use which the Redeemer makes of the event for the promotion of faith on the part of the sisters. Martha, like Peter, vi. 69, confesses her faith in that Messiah who is the raiser of the dead.

V. 28–31. Filled with joyous hope by the words of the Saviour, she hastens to her sister, and (only to arouse her to make haste, shall we say?) tells her that the Master calls her; she does it "secretly," λάθρα, desiring that the interview should be confidential, mindful too perhaps, in her love, of the peril which had recently threatened Christ in Jerusalem. The Orientals, to this day, (Niebuhr, Journey to Arabia, i. p. 86,) repair frequently, as in ancient times, to the graves of their loved ones, see Talmud, tr. Semachoth, c. 8. "For three days the grave of the dead is visited;" as Mary hastens to the vicinity of the place of burial, the Jews who were present suppose that she is about to perform that duty, and hasten after her.

V. 32–34. With the same words which her sister had used, she meets Jesus, casts herself reverentially at his feet, and weeps in silence. What is the meaning of ἐνεβριμήσατο—ἑαυτόν? Ἐμβριμάομαι, like βριμάω, βριμαίνω, means in the predominant usage, "to be moved with indignation, to threaten vehemently," (Suidas, Hesychius, Etymol. magn., Passow,) and is so used in the New Testament, Mark xiv. 5, i. 43, Matt. ix. 30. Retaining this signification, taking a wrong view at the same time of

the true human nature of Jesus, Chrysostom and Euthymius interpret: "he reproved his own rising emotion," (τῷ πνεύματι;) Cyrill, Theophylact: "through his divine nature he chided the human;" Theodore of Mopsuestia, Lampe: "he was angered at the unbelief of the Jews, (v. 38,) and of the sisters also." Reverting to this latter way of taking it, the most recent critics, Strauss and Fritzsche, maintain that it is entirely in keeping with Christ's character, as John delineates him, that as a thaumaturgus easily aroused, he should fly into a passion at every exhibition of a refusal to believe, in fact, should quiver with indignation, (cf. Fritzsche, in the Allg. Litteraturz, 1840, Nro. 100, and 1841, Nro. 115.) Jesus, it is true, weeps, and asks sadly: Where have ye laid him?—but his question, according to Fritzsche, is rather put in anger; his tears, according to Strauss, prove no more than that the passion of anger had passed over into that of sorrow. The Jews indeed, according to v. 36, see in the tears of Jesus a token of his love, but Strauss sees in this only an illustration of the type of John's representation, according to which, the enemies of Jesus put a false interpretation on *all* his actions. In this case, the ancient enemies of Christ certainly made no such misinterpretation; *that* was reserved for his enemies of modern times, and they have made it with a perverseness to which we shall not pay respect so far as to involve ourselves in a controversy with it. We proceed to a more particular examination of the meaning of ἐμβριμάομαι: the *analogy* of the language, if not the *usage*, justifies the adoption of the meaning, "to be moved with grief." *Βριμάομαι* designates the noisy manifestation of emotion, not only of indignation, but also of *fervor; βριμάσσω*, which is related, designates a shaking with *petulance; βράσσω*, when intransitive, means "to ferment," when transitive, "to shake violently"—ἐμβριμάομαι could therefore be used of the shaking, of the *groaning* produced by grief. It is related to fremere, which is also used in speaking of sorrow, Virgil, Æn. vi. 175, Ovid, Metam. iii. 628, (528, tr.) Gesenius, Thesaurus, takes fremo as the primary definition of רָגַשׁ, and as special senses "with indignation," "with *sorrow*." Τῷ πνεύματι may be considered parallel with ἐν ἑαυτῷ, v. 38, and we compare in addi-

tion, Mark viii. 12, *ἀναστενάξας τῷ πνεύματι*, that is, internally, though perhaps accompanied by a suppressed sound.[1] *Ταράσσω* with *ἑαυτόν*, paraphrastical for the middle *ταράσσεσθαι*, yet with a prominence of the spontaneity, (Winer, p. 234;) according to Lücke, it is *spiritual* agitation, as in ch. xiii. 21, *ἐταράχθη τῷ πνεύματι*, but the reflexive form would then be less easy to explain; let the fact rather be recalled, that it is this vehement, deep-seated, inward sorrow by which, more than by any other, an agitation of the upper part of the body is produced, (Euthymius.) If, then, the language marks the profoundest emotion of sorrow, the question arises, what was its object? According to Augustine, Olshausen, sorrow over death in general, over the mournful features of human life; according to De Wette, it was, "that the sisters whom he loved could not have been *spared this* sorrow," (compare, however, verses 4, 15, 42.) By Calvin and Maldonatus was already made the just observation, that the reason is clearly expressed in v. 33, the tears of Mary drew forth the tears of the Jews who followed her, and the sympathizing Saviour enters into this sorrow, (Rom. xii. 15;) yet a general sympathy with the griefs of human life may also be comprehended, (Calvin.) But, if it be asked, why weep, when the next moment life is to be restored to the dead? we reply with Neander: the sympathizing physician in the midst of a family drowned in grief—will not his tears flow with theirs, though he knows that he has the power of giving immediate relief? The same agitation is exhibited a second time, when the Saviour is standing by the grave, (v. 38.)

V. 35–37. On the way to the grave, which was at hand, the internal agitation finds vent in tears; the love of Jesus to Lazarus leads some of these Jews who seem to have been well-meaning, but who were not aware of what had passed between him and the sisters, to put the question with surprise, why Jesus had not brought help at an earlier period. If they had appealed to the earlier raisings of the dead in Galilee, the suspicion of the critics would have been excited, that this narrative was a fiction of a later author, who had

[1] Under the word "ergrimmte," Luther embraces both meanings, in Acts xvii. 16, that of anger, and in this passage, that of mournful emotion; see Walch, B. vi. p. 1097.

those accounts before him; now, however, as these citizens of Jerusalem (very naturally) make their appeal to the last great miracle which was fixed in *their* memories, Strauss urges Luke vii. 17, and presumes they must necessarily have known of any other restorations from death, had there been such.

V. 38–40. The rich Orientals buried their dead in sepulchres hewn in the rocks, (Matt. xxvii. 60,) through which were passages of the kind that may be seen to this day in the Catacombs at Rome; on both sides of these passages were openings (כּוּכִין,) in which the bodies were deposited; many of these caves entered into the earth horizontally, others perpendicularly; κἀκεῖτο, therefore, may just as well mean laid *upon* as laid *against*, cf. Nicolai, de Sepulchris Heb. c. x. 11.—What is Martha's object in the words, v. 39? Would she deter Jesus, because it is now too late? (Schweizer.) Or would she withhold from Jesus what could not but be physically revolting? (Bengel.) We think that our Lord's answer shows that in her mind despondency was predominant, which was not necessarily entirely relieved by the hope which had been aroused, (v. 28.) That corruption had actually taken place, it must be admitted, cannot be satisfactorily proven from her language, for the γάρ shows that she does not speak from direct knowledge.[1] The Apologists attach all weight to the fact, that putrefaction in Oriental countries takes place sooner than with us, and it is unquestionable that in warm climates the corpse in a relaxed condition goes into decomposition without the intervening condition of rigidity usual with us, Burdach, Physiol. iii. § 634. But we should not forget that the occurrence must have taken place in *winter*, (see on x. 22, and 40–42.) She is aroused from her despondency by a reference to the promise, v. 23, where indeed there is a verbal difference in the phrascology, (cf. v. 4, and on x. 26.)

V. 41, 42. Jesus solicits the Father for the miracle, as in vi. 11, yet he himself performs it, according to v. 11, 24, 43, and and so in vi. 6 also; but chap. v. 19, 26 and x. 18 have already shown that in every thing that is done by Christ, the Father is to be regarded as absolute cause; we have, moreover, on the

1 It is a matter of some surprise that Lazarus had not been embalmed, as the sisters had nard at least in the house, (xii. 3.)

part of Christ, perhaps, to imagine only a soliciting factor, to whom a process in the dead person, reducible to a divine causality, is respondent. What now occurs is an answer to a prayer of Christ—when did Christ make that prayer? Bengel thinks it was in v. 4, but if we could suppose that the Redeemer may have called every internal reference to the absolute ground of his own proper being, a prayer, this question could hardly be raised. Strauss finds something to stumble at in that the words addressed to God are interrupted by a reflection designed for those that stood by, and thus the prayer becomes, as Weisse styles it, a prayer for show. But does there not lie in this so-called reflection a monition to those that hear, and can we then allege that the reference to God, and the reference suggested by love to those that hear, exclude one another?

V. 43, 44. Does the act of restoration to life commence with this call? John appears to have thought so, but the thanks expressed in v. 41, permit the supposition that the moment of awaking was earlier, and that the call only effected the coming forth of him who had already been restored to life. In the interest of the natural explanation, Hase, l. c. § 99, remarks: death can only so far be brought into the question, "as in the mysterious approximation of death and life, life again by the interposition of Jesus overcame death," and Kern: (Tubing. Zeitschrift, 1839, 1 H. p. 182,) "Except that here also, the possibility must be admitted, that life had not been absolutely interrupted, but had only vanished to that point at which, without the vivific influence of Christ, it would have been separated from these earthly relations."[1] But can this view of the case be reconciled with verses 14 and 25?—In the same way as the Egyptian mummies, every limb was separately wrapped; the linen cloth, *σουδάριον*, on the mummies extends down to the breast.

V. 45, 46. It might be anticipated from what has preceded,

1 Were it otherwise, it has been asked, why did not Lazarus speak of that which is beyond the grave? But had he even done so, we would have had no reason whatever for surprise, that John should say nothing of it. We should remember, moreover, the cases of persons apparently dead, who, though on waking, they have declared that they experienced something extraordinary, yet with a sacred reserve, have refused to give any account of it.

that among the friends of the family there would be susceptible hearts, and the sequel confirms this; in some of the others, however, in this case, as too frequently elsewhere, was verified what Calvin says: "Those who have not a strong fear of God, and reverence for him, though they should see heaven and earth mingling together, with inflexible ingratitude would never cease to reject sound doctrine," (apud quos non viget Dei metus et reverentia, etiamsi cœlum videant terræ misceri, præfracta ingratitudine sanam doctrinam respuere numquam desinent.)

The pretended internal grounds opposed to the credibility of the narrative, have been considered in the preceding remarks; in closing, we return to the difficulty which has been urged among recent writers, especially by Schneckenburger, über den Ursprung des ersten kanon. Ev. ("On the Origin of the first Canonical Gospel,") p. 10, seq.—the silence of Matthew in regard to the raising of Lazarus, a difficulty which has been met by Kern, über den Ursprung des Ev. Matthäi, ("On the Origin of the Gospel of Matthew,") only so far as rather to cast the shadow of the suspicion on John. It is urged that not only must the other Evangelists have mentioned this raising from the dead, as one of the greatest of miracles, but they had the additional reason that it had the most direct part in bringing about the final catastrophe, the death of Jesus. The opinion (Grotius, Olshausen,) that the silence of the other Gospels, was occasioned by a foresight which desired to shield Lazarus, is encumbered with too many difficulties. Hase presents the correct solution: "The secret lies in the circumstances common to the synoptical Evangelists, and which have led to their silence in regard to all the earlier events in Judea," thus Kern, Lücke, Neander. If the synoptical Gospels have resulted from a uniting together of single groups of narrative in the oral or written tradition, if especially, the history of the passion was transmitted as a whole, we can comprehend how a single particular, and especially this narrative, which is only preparatory to the catastrophe, may have been omitted; Matthew and Mark are silent, too, in regard to the raising of the young man at Nain.

THE DETERMINATION OF THE SANHEDRIM TO PUT JESUS TO DEATH.—V. 47–57.

V. 47, 48. The Sanhedrim perceived that the decree of excommunication did not suffice to deter men from believing in Jesus. In order to terrify those that were favorable to him—and, as Calvin, correctly regarding the springs of mental action, has observed,—in order to tranquilize their own consciences, the matter was represented in such a way, as to create the impression that political danger threatened, in case Jesus was generally recognized and proclaimed as king of Israel, Calvin: Sceleri obtenditur speciosus color, boni publici studium—ita hypocritæ, etiamsi intus coargnat eos conscientia, postea tamen vanis figmentis se inebriant, ut videantur peccando innoxii, interea manifeste secum ipsi dissident, ("a specious color, the desire to promote the public welfare, is put upon their crime—thus hypocrites, though conscience is inwardly reproving them, intoxicate themselves with empty fancies, that they may seem guiltless of sinning, meanwhile they are clearly in conflict with themselves.") Ὅτι, which is left untranslated by Luther, is elucidative of the thought which remains to be supplied: "something must be done, *for* this man, &c." Τόπος may designate either the land, the city, or the temple; connected with ἅγιον, it is used of the temple, Acts vi. 13, Matt xxiv. 15, without ἅγιος, 2 Maccab. v. 19, Acts xxi. 28, where, however, it has οὗτος with it. We might suppose that ὁ τόπος καὶ τὸ ἔθνος, was phraseologic, like the German "Land und Leute," "land and people," (Eras. Schmid, Bengel,) but there are no examples of such a use. Αἴρειν, "to destroy," used both of men and things; ἡμῶν, however, may be connected with αἴρειν, and be taken as the genitive of separation, (Luke vi. 29,) and then αἴρειν means "to take away."

V. 49–52. The passionate reproach of the high priest: "Ye know nothing at all," οὐκ οἴδατε οὐδέν, censures them in general for debating on a matter where the proper course was so obvious. It was certainly remarkable that the man who bore the office of high priest the year that Jesus was put to death, and who consequently coöperated in producing his death, should

in these words involuntarily express the purpose of GOD in that death, (Schweizer;) he thus became like Balaam, as it were, a prophet against his will, (see Tholuck's Supplem. to comm. on Epis. to Hebrews, Beilage, 2d ed. p. 21.) Paulus, Kuinöl, Lücke, De Wette, supposed that the Evangelist regarded the gift of prophecy as connected with the office of high priest, and find this thought expressed in the words, v. 51, "being high priest," ἀρχιερεὺς ὤν; but Lücke himself, 3d ed., now confesses, that no express warrant for that opinion can be furnished; moreover, why on that supposition would the words, "that year," τ. ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐκείνου, be added? The Evangelist could not have meant it merely to fix the chronology of the event, after v. 49 this would have been superfluous; we have in xviii. 13 the same formula again, where De Wette is satisfied with the answer, that the τ. ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐκείνου is a "mere mechanical repetition." We would be much more near the truth in finding in it this meaning: "Who precisely in this *memorable year* was high priest," (Lampe, Schweizer.) Let us now direct our attention more closely to the interpretation which the Evangelist puts upon his words. Caiaphas had only spoken of the theocratic people, John gives to his words a reference to the *genuine* people of God, and with a retrospect to x. 16, speaks of a union of all nations, which is to be effected through the death of Christ. On the expression, "the children of God," τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ, Chrysostom observes: "Those that were to become such," ἀπὸ τοῦ μέλλοντος ἔσεσθαι, Calvin: "Erant in Dei pectore filii," "in the bosom of God they were already sons."

V. 53–55. Christ now escapes into the region of Jordan lying north of the Dead Sea, as in chap. x., after the commotion, he went to Peræa. Jerome says that Ephraim lay twenty Roman miles north of Jerusalem; Eusebius makes the distance eight Roman miles, (the Roman mile was about 1614 yards.) It is difficult then, however, to see how it could have lain near to *the wilderness*, to wit: of Judah;[1] it seems, therefore, that

[1] This Ephraim is by Lightfoot, Reland, and others, regarded as the same with the one mentioned in 2 Chron. xiii. 19, and by Josephus, de bello Jud. iv. 9, 9, and with some probability, as both passages point to a site north of Jerusalem. It would have lain then in the neighborhood of Bethlehem; on the way from Jericho

another Ephraim must be intended. The wilderness of Judah not only stretched to the north corner of the Dead Sea, but beyond it as far as Gilgal, cf. Tholuck's Exposition of the Psalms, Ps. lxiii. On this view, the synoptical Gospels representing Jesus as coming from Jericho to Jerusalem, and John representing him as coming from Ephraim, are in harmony, for by that site of Ephraim runs the road to Jericho.—The *χώρα*, v. 55, is the vicinity of Jerusalem. Those who were unclean were obliged to purify themselves previously to the Passover, by sacrifices and other ritual observances, (Numb. ix. 10, seq. 2 Chron. xxx. 17, seq.)

V. 56, 57. *Τί δοκεῖ ὑμῖν* is connected with what follows by the Vulgate, Ethiopic, Erasmus, Wahl, and is translated by the latter as a præter: "What think you, that he *has* not come?" *Τί δοκεῖ σοι*, however, usually serves as a preliminary question, and as regards the tense, the aor. conj. after *οὐ μή* but seldom marks past time, (Hartung, Partikell. ii. p. 156;) nor had the time for coming completely expired, so that it is better with Beza to translate: "That he will not come?" Thus the suspense on the part of those who repaired to the feast is brought before our eyes, and by the *καί*, v. 57, the expectation of the rulers of the people that he would come, is made coördinate with it.

to Bethel, Robinson, found a frightful wilderness, (ii. 560.) Where, however, *ἡ ἔρημος* stands without any thing additional, it either means the desert of Arabia or of Judah, perhaps the desert of Jericho.—As for the rest, the road from Jericho to Bethel is a day's journey.

CHAPTER XII.

Jesus anointed by Mary.—v. 1–8.

V. 1, 2. A week before the feast Jesus makes his appearance. The genit. τοῦ πάσχα is to be resolved into πρὸ τοῦ πάσχα, and πρὸ ἓξ ἡμέρων is equivalent to ἓξ ἡμέρας, as we say in German: "*vor* drei Tagen geschah es," (literally, "*before* three days it happened,") meaning *on* the third day. Amos i. 1, Septuag. πρὸ δύο ἐτῶν τοῦ σεισμοῦ, Thucydides, Hist. ii. 34; πρότριτα, equivalent to triduo ante, three days before. It has been made a question, how these six days are reckoned, whether they include the terminus a quo and ad quem, or only the term. a quo, or exclude both? (cf. Jacobi, in the Stud. 1838, 4 H. p. 894, and Neander, l. c. p. 593.) It is not probable that the journey and arrival took place on the Sabbath, they occurred perhaps, therefore, on Friday late in the evening, the meal-time would then be that which was observed at the beginning of the Sabbath.[1] We should have expected from the traits of Martha's character given in chap. xi., and in Luke x. 38, seq., that she would attend to the domestic arrangements, and give expression in *this* way to her love for our Lord; according to Matt. xxvi. 6 and Mark xiv. 3, the entertainment was given at the house of Simon, who formerly had been a leper—a circumstance which, when we consider the similarity which aside from this exists in the other particulars, is not of sufficient importance to justify the supposition that two distinct facts are described; the question might be asked, whether he may not have been Martha's landlord, or even her husband? (Heumann.)

1 According to tr. Schabbath. c. xvi. 2, cf. Maimonides, three meal-times were observed, Friday evening, Sabbath morning and Sabbath evening.

Mention is made of Lazarus sitting at the table with them, as evidence of his complete restoration.

V. 3. This superabounding token of love which our Saviour accepted in such a way as fully to acknowledge its merits, is in perfect keeping with the character of Mary. It was not unusual to connect the anointing of the feet with the ablutions which took place previous to entertainments, cf. Luke vii. 46, the Talmud tr. Menachoth, f. 82; Aristophanes, Vespæ, v. 605: *καὶ πρῶτα μὲν ἡ θυγάτηρ με ἀπονίζῃ καὶ τὼ πόδ' ἀλείφῃ καί προσκύσασα φιλήσῃ*, "and first my daughter washes me and anoints my feet, and stooping over me gives me a kiss." The nard, precious in itself, is here further characterized by the addition of *πιστικός*. Fritzsche on Mark xiv. 3, defended the derivation of that word from *πίνω*, "potable," the opposite is maintained by Winer, p. 90, and Bretschneider, but in the review of Bretschneider's Lexicon in the Hall. Litteraturz. 1840, p. 179, seq., Fritzsche maintains his opinion in such a way as to compel up to the present time a suspension of judgment. Whether the word mean "genuine" or "potable," it marks in either case the preciousness, which is also clear from the considerable price mentioned, (300 denarii are worth about $45.00.) The bestowment of an entire pound of this oil does in fact seem to be a great piece of luxury, yet the high price and the *συντρίψασα* in Mark xiv. 3, show that we could not well, with Meyer, maintain that only a part of that quantity had been bestowed. Matthew and Mark speak only of an anointing of the *head*, not of the feet; according to Luke vii. 46, the former was the usual, the latter the more extraordinary mode, which is the reason that John gives prominence to it. To the *κατέχεεν* used by Mark, *ἤλειψε* corresponds, for *ἄλειμμα* is the fluid, and *χρῖσμα* the tenacious ointment. The fact seems conclusively to prove that the family were in good circumstances, if the inference may not, perhaps, be drawn from the *τετήρηκεν*, (she hath kept,) that the oil by some chance or other obtained long ago had been preserved as a treasure.

V. 4–6. This one trait of Judas unlocks his soul to a glance, which renders clear all that follows. He has been put in charge of the money, which served at once for the wants of Jesus, and for the poor, and which was supplied entirely by charity,

(Luke viii. 3.) He could prevail upon himself, not once only, but repeatedly to purloin from this money, and yet present himself in the presence of Jesus, and was so hypocritical withal, as to wish to seem the friend of the poor at the very time he was robbing the poor. Such a man had already smothered conscience—such a man had no longer power to *pray*. To such a man, even the paltry reward offered him by the Sanhedrim must have been a lure, especially if he believed that Jesus could liberate himself again. Two perplexing questions now, indeed, arise: How did John know of the treachery of this Disciple? Why had Jesus suffered the money still to be in his charge? Had John marked it from certain symptoms, and was Christ, still cherishing hope, unwilling to remove him? That Christ had not even yet given him up, may perhaps be inferred from the narrative of the feet washing. *Βαστάζειν*, according to Theophylact and most of the recent writers, means here to "take away," (John xx. 15,) equivalent to "steal," but in the passages of the ancient authors, where it might be translated "steal," that meaning only can be a deduction from the former sense; Heumann (Lücke also, 3d ed., Bretschneider,) has consequently insisted, that it should be simply translated, "he bare," as has been done by the Vulgate, Syriac, Arabic, Persic, Luther, (Eng. Transl.,) yet the words then seem rather idle.

V. 7, 8. The coincidence with Mark xiv. 8, and Matt. xxvi. 12, is remarkable. Filled with a presentiment of that which was now close at hand, our Lord gives to the action a meaning as tender as it was judicious; according to which, that which seemed prodigality, answered a noble end. Is it at all probable that this trait could have been invented, and these words put in the mouth of Jesus. Does it not harmonize completely with those other expressions of his, which (in opposition to the Jewish formal piety,) bear on them the stamp of a piety genuinely human. We must connect it with such words as those in Luke xii. 33, to obtain the complete image of Christ. Over against a narrow, contracted piety, the Christian system of morals might make its appeal to this language of our Lord, to prove that earthly wealth, though it be employed but in subserving an idea, as in Art, for example, is likewise employed in accordance with the mind of Christ.

CHRIST'S ENTRANCE INTO JERUSALEM.—V. 9–19.

V. 9–11. During the Sabbath, the intelligence of the Saviour's arrival was spreading in the capital, especially had the account of the raising of Lazarus increased the intensity of interest on the part of those who had come from a distance to the feast; as soon as the law of the Sabbath permitted, or even early on Sunday, many streamed forth. The shameful design against Lazarus was only spoken of, but not generally approved.

V. 12, 13. It would seem, according to the other Evangelists, as though Jesus, without passing the night in Bethany, had gone at once with the caravan which was traveling to the feast, by a day's journey from Jericho to Jerusalem. But this merely *seems* to have been the case. Mark xi. 1, especially, shows very clearly that the Evangelist does not give the course of the journey by stations, but is only concerned to mark the place from whence the entrance took place; the eye is not directed to what lies between Jericho and the entry into Jerusalem.[1] "It is possible, too," says Hase, "that tradition, which felt little solicitude about exactness in distinguishing the dates, regarded as a single whole the entire journey from Jericho." The common view is, that Jesus remained over the Sabbath in Bethany, and made his entrance into Jerusalem on Sunday, (palmarum, Palm Sunday.) According to Mark xi. 11, the city was not reached until late in the day.[2] Especially among those who had repaired to the feast, probably, therefore, among the Galileans, the sympathy exhibited itself so strongly, that without regarding the interdiction of the Sanhedrim, (ix. 22,) they went forth to meet him on the morning of Sunday, with the tokens of honor which it is usual to offer to Eastern kings, 1 Mac. xiii. 51, 2 Mac. x. 7. The Targum, Esther x. 15, says: "When Mordecai went forth from the gate of the king, the

[1] If in Mark xi. 1, the three places, Bethphage, Bethany and the Mount of Olives, are mentioned in the order in which Jesus came to them, and if, with the later legendary tradition, we could locate Bethphage between Bethany and the Mount of Olives, (Raumer, Palästina, p. 305,) Bethany would then seem to be marked as the place whence he set out; but the whole of this is uncertain. Least of all, can the reading proposed by Fr. in loc. be correct.

[2] What is urged by Ebrard, ii. p. 588, against Strauss, does not entirely meet its object.

streets were covered with myrtle, and the porches with purple," cf. also, Herodotus, l. 7, c. 54. Branches of the palm were broken off and strewed upon the road, others spread their garments, (Mark xi. 8.) The artic. τῶν in v. 13, either refers to the palms that stood there, or to the fact that palm branches were generally used on such occasions. They sing a jubilant call from Psalm cxviii. 25, 26, which was also sung at the feast of Tabernacles, and in the great Hallel at the Passover, and which had a Messianic interpretation attached to it.

V. 14–16. When Jesus had reached the vicinity of the Mount of Olives, he met the crowds that were coming forth toward him, and he now causes the ass' foal to be brought. As regards the object of his triumphal entrance, we adopt the words of Hase, l. c. p. 173: "He received what by divine right belonged to him, and showed the world that he had the power of reigning, had he been willing to reign by force. The political hopes connected with the Messiah, had incited this triumphal reception; in the near prospect of his death, there existed no longer a reason why he should shun such a reception. On one occasion, at least, Jesus must openly proclaim himself Messiah, and this is the significance of this entrance." Neander, l. c. 596: "This was the result, caused by divine dispensation, of his previous labors.—It was *the* answer to many questions; the answer which annihilated the last doubt, and thus took its place as one of those events in history which interest the whole race." Jesus desired to declare himself the king of Israel, but only as the king of peace; he selected, therefore, the animal that was usually ridden in time of peace, while the horse was reserved for war, (Hos. xiv. 4, (3,) Prov. xxi. 31, Jere. xvii. 25,) and points directly to that prophecy (Zechariah ix. 9,) which likewise depicts the Messiah as king of peace. The difference in Matthew's account, which speaks of a she-ass and her foal, has been elucidated by Ebrard, p. 590, seq. in a manner worthy of notice. On v. 16, cf. ii. 17. It may be questioned, whether the ὅτε ἐδοξάσθη has reference to the impartation of the Spirit, (Acts ii. 33.) Καὶ ὅτι κτλ.—they were reminded of this, and consequently of the fulfillment, at the same time with the prophecy; it was *they*, too, who had brought the ass (Matt. xxi. 7,) to him.

V. 17–19. The Jews who had come out earlier, formed the one chorus, those who met them, (the καί in v. 18, must be regarded,) the other; Luke xix. 37 seems, as Gfrörer also observes, to point to a reminiscence of this fact.—It is not the friends of Jesus, (Chrysostom,) but his enemies, who desired energetic measures, who utter the expression, v. 19, "behold the world is gone after him."

DISCOURSE OCCASIONED BY THE DESIRE OF GENTILES TO SEE JESUS.—V. 20–36.

V. 20–22. As this, according to v. 36, is one of the last discourses, or the very last, and as of the discourses of Jesus in the temple in the last week in which his passion occurred, nothing more than this is narrated, it is the less to be supposed with Ebrard, that the occurrence took place on the same day. Filled with the fundamental thought of the obstinate unbelief of the chosen people, with which the depicture of the public life of our Lord closes, (v. 37, seq.) John paints one scene more, to present the longing of the Gentiles in contrast with this unbelief. The present ἀναβαινόντων shows, that we are to suppose that there were proselytes among them. Their reverence for a teacher so honored is too great to permit them to address him directly; but their request appears so extraordinary even to Philip, (Matt. x. 5,) that he first consults with Andrew, his friend, (i. 45.) θέλω is used, also, to designate a desire, (1 Cor. xiv. 5.)

V. 23, 24. The answer of Christ cannot well be looked upon as a refusal of the request—at any rate, if v. 23 could be so regarded, v. 24 could not. If it could be urged that, strictly speaking, they desired only to *see* Jesus, not to speak with him, it might be supposed that he was ready to comply with their desire, and on that occasion made to his Disciples the address that follows. The leading thought in that discourse is this, in the longing of these Gentiles is an anticipation of the future conversion of the world. Bengel: Præludium regni Dei a Judæis ad gentes transituri, (a prelude to the speedy transfer of the kingdom of God from Jews to Gentiles.) Zwingle already makes reference to iv. 35, where, too, the first fruits

excite anticipations of the harvest. The "glorifying," δοξασμὸς, therefore, both here and in v. 28, has a more special reference to the acknowledgment of Jesus in the world, (v. 32,) in connection with which at the same time "the glorifying," δοξασμός, of God was brought to pass, (xvii. 2, 4.) Inasmuch, however, as subjection to death was the medium of that glorious rising, as v. 25 immediately expresses that sublime thought, we may here suppose the death also to be included. The dying seed, which only throws off the visible integument, in order to unfold the inner germ to a tree, is a striking image of the Redeemer, who laid off all the external characteristics separable from him, that he might rise again as a spiritual principle in the great congregation, for which the path of deepest humiliation is the path of exaltation—as Heumann so significantly said: "The *cross* is but a *star* shorn of its beams;" corresponding with this is viii. 28.[1]

V. 25, 26. The law, whose force he acknowledges for himself, is the law for all his followers. That life which hesitates to lift itself into the divine, in which alone the ὄντως ζωή, (1 Tim. vi. 19,) can be found, destroys its own true existence. In the language of poetic inspiration, this truth is with special frequency set forth in the East, but just as commonly in a pantheistic mode of apprehension; the Oriental mysticism and philosophy demand that the form should be *destroyed*, which should rather be *transfigured*.[2]—Ψυχή, like נֶפֶשׁ, means both "self" and "life," for the self is the life. The usage of the Evangelist alternates between ἑαυτὸν ἀπολέσαι and τὴν ψυχὴν ἀπολέσαι, (losing himself, losing his life,) Matt. xvi. 25, Luke ix. 25, cf. the Greek φιλοψυχεῖν. In both instances here the meaning of "life" is to be retained. Μισεῖν, in accordance with the Hebrew

[1] From my Anthology of Oriental Mysticism, which certainly presents many yet unused parallels to Biblical phraseology, Olshausen cites the words of Dschelaleddin, (p. 109.)

> "Widely sow the wheat deep in the lap of earth,
> Soon the golden, rich, large ears of grain have birth;
> When again the flail shall smite the ears in twain,
> From the beaten ears comes bread to nourish man."

[2] Dschelaleddin, l. c. p. 102:

> "*Know the world of men is but a glass, my son.*
> *Filled with drops which from God's fount of being run.*
> Is the wide world, then, with the streets of heaven,
> But a single glass from His life stream riven,
> *Hasten, break the glass upon the stone in twain,*
> *That the drop may mingle with the stream again.*"

usage, is comparative, as in Luke xiv. 26, "to value less." Our life like ourselves should plainly not be the object fixed on as the highest aim, but should be subordinated to that which is the truly highest aim. By this subordination it is lifted up, (tollere,) already in the contracted sphere of time becomes limitless and eternal, and is thus *lifted up too* in such sense as to be above all danger, (conservare;) cf. with *φυλάξει* the *ζωογονεῖν*, Luke xvii. 33. The Saviour was about to give up his mortal life to promote the highest aim, and in this his Disciples are to follow him, and like him they shall be partakers in that "glory," *δοξασμός*, (xvii. 21–24.) On *εἰμί*, cf. vii. 34.

V. 27, 28. But the path to the rising lies through the setting, in the presence of which, considered in its isolation, the natural life is stricken with fear. We have in this struggle of choice, the prelude of the struggle in Gethsemane, (Bengel.) The two petitions, between which the choice is suspended, in expressing the two correspondent propositions, commence each with the address, "Father," *πάτερ*. The first is withdrawn —why? *Διὰ τοῦτο* refers to something present in the Saviour's thoughts, but under the emotion of his soul not expressed in language—it is, as most think, the consummation of the divine decree of atonement, through his passion. According to the older expositors, (Luther, also,) *σῶσον—ταύτης* is not connected with the question *τι εἴπω*, but forms an independent question; this opinion has been renewed by De Wette, and Lücke agrees with him. But after the expression of a doubt even in the *τί εἴπω*, as to what prayer should be offered, a positive petition could only accord with the laws of mental action, if it presented itself as the result of a *decision;* but this could not be the result here, for the prayer is at once again corrected. We decidedly, therefore, prefer the other view, (Theophylact, Grotius, Le Clerc, Kling, Schweizer.) Chrysostom already exhibits the logical relations of the propositions thus: *οὐ λέγω, ἀπάλλαξόν με ἐκ τ. ὥρας ταύτης· ἀλλὰ τί; πάτερ, δόξασόν σου τὸ ὄνομα. Καίτοι τ. ταραχῆς τοῦτο ἀναγκαζούσης λέγειν, τὸ ἐναντίον λέγω, δόξασόν σου τ. ὄνομα.* ("I do not say, Save me from this hour, but I say, Father, glorify thy name. Though agitation should force the utterance of the former, I say the reverse, Glorify thy name.")

V. 28–30. The voice of God declares that the sublime prayer, which had resulted from so great a conflict, is answered. (On the double *καί*, cf. what is said on vi. 36.) Three gradations in the way in which it was understood are noted: some regarded it as a natural phenomenon, some thought they heard a being of a higher sphere speaking, and others understood the words that were uttered. If we direct our attention, first of all, to the purport of the heavenly voice, we must explain *δοξασω* with immediate reference to verses 24 and 32; if *ἐδοξάσα* be regarded as strictly corresponding with this Future, it concerns the recognition of Christ, which had been brought about up to this time, (xvii. 10.) The different apprehensions of the voice were accounted for by the earlier expositors, on the supposition that it sounded immediately over Christ, and was consequently regarded by those who stood at some distance as only a heavenly language without words, and by those very remote, as a noise like thunder—or they fell back upon the tone of mind, in virtue of which the "carnal," *σαρκικοί*, must speedily have lost an accurate impression of what they heard, (Chrysostom, Ammonius.) How are we to understand, in general, the voices from heaven, not merely in the New Testament, (Acts ix. 7, xxii. 7, x. 13, 15,) but in Josephus also, (Antiq. xiii. 3, de bello jud. vii. 12,) and in the early Christian Church, (Ep. de Martyrio Polyc. c. 9,) and the "tolle, lege," (take, read,) when Augustine was converted? It is well known that vivid bodily sensations, and spiritual feelings also, under strong excitement, shape themselves, in the fancy, to forms which create sensuous impressions, to something that is heard or seen, see above on i. 32, 33. If that in which they originate be *merely* subjective, they form subjective visions, or (to give them their medical designation,) hallucinations; if that which they contain is objectively true, they are then objective visions. The vision here spoken of cannot have been subjective, as the multitude, who were indifferent, also perceived something. A sound like thunder must be presupposed, but according to the view of Lücke, De Wette, the distinct language which was heard pertains to the internal vision. The former commentator says—the voice of the thunder is a word of God, *first of all*, for Christ only; others, whose attention had

been arrested by the prayer, gave to the outward sound a higher significance, but it spoke nothing definite to them; the unsusceptible perceived only the physical phenomenon. It has been usual since Grotius, to appeal at the same time to a notion common among the Rabbins, that of the Bath-kol, בַּת־קוֹל, a phrase which means, *Daughter of the Voice*, that is, an internal second voice, evolving itself from an outward sound, and among others, according to Paulus, Lücke, De Wette, thunder was one of these outward sounds.[1] The interests of religion do not demand that this view should be absolutely rejected, for the coincidence of natural phenomena with Christ's word, and the frame of mind excited by them in the Disciples, could still not be regarded as mere accident. But if, as Lücke contends, Jesus alone gave that meaning to the natural phenomenon, are we to suppose that he afterward explained it to his Disciples? If this were the case, then the Disciples would here be comprehended under the "people," ὄχλος, and the "others," ἄλλοι. We adhere, therefore, to the opinion, that an outward sound was heard, which, by divine influence, shaped itself in the minds of the susceptible to the words mentioned, but in the less susceptible, only produced the impression that something had been uttered, (Neander, Kling, Olshausen.) That an actual occurrence, and not a mere fiction of the narrator is detailed, is clear, when we consider that the purposes of a writer of that sort would have been better subserved by inventing a heavenly voice, which all understood, and by which all were impressed. The comparison of Acts ix. 7, with xxii. 9, shows also, that the attendants of Paul heard a *voice*, whose *words* Paul alone understood.—Finally, in v. 30, the Redeemer declares that he needed not this voice of God for his own exaltation.

1 On the other hand, it has been observed by me, that in none of the various passages in Vitringa, Observat. Sacr., Meuschen, N. T. ex talmude ill. (here cf. the Dissertation by Danz, de inaugurat. Christi, p. 445, seq.) Buxtorf, lex. talm. s. h. v., is the term applied to thunder or any natural phenomenon, of which no more than an *interpretation* could be given, but is always applied to an actual voice of God or men. Lücke and De Wette controvert this, but with a citation, not to the purpose, from Lightfoot on Matt. iii. 17, for Lightfoot there merely explains as thunder, (tonitru,) the Bath-kol בַּת־קוֹל in dispute, which may be an actual voice. Lübkert: "Etwas uber Bath-kol," in the Stud. u. Kritiken, 1835, iii. H. has collected a large number of passages, which confirm our view; he doubts, moreover, whether that conception was formed *before* the time of Christ. Neander, also, l. c. p. 619, seq. agrees with our view.

V. 31–33. In sublime anticipation, the Saviour already beholds the realization of the divine promise. The non-messianic world, that is, "this world," ὁ κόσμος οὗτος, is powerless against his kingdom; the Ruler of it is overcome; *all*,[1] that is, both Gentiles and Jews, (Chrysostom, Calvin,) are exalted to be citizens of the Empire; analogous is the triumphant exclamation, Luke x. 18. Olshausen employs this in connection with Rev. xii. 11, 12, to attach to the words "shall be cast out," ἐκβληθήσεται ἔξω, the force, "from heaven," but if that had been meant, either heaven would be mentioned, or this representation must be a perfectly well known one. Ἔξω may have κόσμος supplied, "cast out of the world," but it is better to refer it to the ὁ ἄρχων, supplying ἡ ἀρχή, "cast out of his dominion," (Euthymius, Grotius.) "If I be lifted up from the earth," ὑψωθῶ ἐκ τῆς γῆς, leads immediately to that to which v. 34, 35, point, to his removal from the world, or more definitely, to his glorification in heaven, (Luther, in Walch, viii. p. 38;) as, however, in iii. 14, and in viii. 28, the same expression denotes the crucifixion, and as v. 24, to which this probably glances back, speaks of the glorification through suffering, we must here, with Erasmus, Beza, Heumann, suppose a two-fold signification, of which the Evangelist, v. 33, makes use, (xviii. 32.) The drawing unto him may, according to vi. 44, be simply the reception into communion; if there be, however, a backward glance to v. 26, it means communion with the Saviour in his *exaltation*.

V. 34. The people lay hold only on the idea of Christ's removal from the world, his words, therefore, seem to them in conflict with Isa. ix. 7, Dan. vii. 14, and like passages. "We have *heard*," ἠκούσαμεν, as they were acquainted with the Old Testament, which is meant here by "the law," νόμος, only by hearing it read, (Matt. v. 21.) The expression, "Son of man," υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, and "must," δεῖ, had not been used by Christ, v. 32; it appears that the Evangelist has given this reply with preciseness, but had not on the other hand quoted the previous words of Christ with preciseness. From their language, Who is

[1] If there be a hesitation in conceding that πάντες has reference to Gentiles and Jews, (Rom. xi. 32, John x. 16,) still an absolute universality does not necessarily follow, for it must always be firmly held, that only the *susceptible* are intended, cf. vi. 45 with 44.

this Son of man? *τίς—ἀνθρώπου*, may be inferred that this predicate was not a current designation of the Messiah, see on i. 52.

V. 35, 36. Without giving a direct answer to the question, which was not indeed necessary, as the beginning of v. 34 shows that they were able to furnish it themselves, the Saviour exhorts them to make a faithful use of his presence, (viii. 21.) "Darkness," *σκοτία*, the period when the Salvation is no longer personally among them—the result of which is that the footstep is no longer secure. "Children of light," *υἱοὶ φωτός*, used also, Luke xvi. 8, a Hebraistic designation of the relation of dependence, as the child is dependent on the mother. "Did hide himself from them," *ἐκρύβη ἀπ' αὐτῶν*, is meant to designate only his withdrawal from *public* labors.

CLOSE OF THE PUBLIC LABORS OF OUR LORD.—V. 37–50.

V. 37–41. The reader should recall what was observed in the Introduction to the Gospel, p. 17, in regard to the leading purpose of the Evangelist. The *miracles* would exercise the most striking power in convincing men, (x. 38.) In such appeals to the prophetic prediction of the people, as for example in Matt. xiii. 14, xxvi. 24, John xvii. 12, Rom. xi. 8, &c., lies apparently the doctrine of predestination. But in regard to this, it must be borne in mind, that according to the biblical view, as well as by the acknowledgment of philosophy, a divine decree is consummated in evil also, without thereby destroying human accountability,[1] (Matt. xviii. 7, Acts iv. 27, 28.) Not incorrectly in regard to the aim of such appeals to prophecy, De Wette says, "that thereby merely a lowly submission to divine rule is denoted;" still more correctly we may say: inasmuch as the prophesying verifies the divine *ὡρισμένον*, (determination,) (cf. Luke xxii. 22, and Matt. xxvi. 24,) the looking at it exalts faith above the events which seem destructive to the divine plan of the world. Thus John tranquilizes himself and

[1] For it is true, as Chrysostom here remarks: *οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐπειδὴ εἶπεν Ἡσαΐας, οὐκ ἐπίστευον, ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ οὐκ ἔμελλον πιστεύειν, διὰ τοῦτο εἶπεν Ἡσαΐας.* "For it was not because Isaiah said so, that they did not believe, but because they would not believe Isaiah said this."

his readers, v. 37, 38, by showing that even the unbelief of the people of God in the promised one was ordered in the divine plan of the world, and therefore what is in Isaiah liii. 1, had been predicted. In v. 39 it is continued: not only was this hardening foreseen and ordained, but it also occurred under divine causality, ὅτι goes back to *διὰ τοῦτο*. The way of apprehending it adopted by Luther, Grotius, De Wette, is syntactically different, they referring *διὰ τοῦτο* to what precedes, so that ὅτι introduces a new ground: "Because that divine prophecy must be fulfilled, they could not believe, for—." De Wette observes that *διὰ τοῦτο* occurs elsewhere, with a reference to what precedes, yet still when there is a new ground, an ὅτι is added, (Matt. xxiv. 44.) The citation from Isaiah vi. 10 is not exact, inasmuch as that which God there enjoins on the prophet is here expressed in the third person as an act of God, and only at the close does the first person again appear. As the causality of the hardening, God naturally can only be designated in a *relative manner*, *ἀφορμητικῶς* and *δικαστικῶς*; see as regards the doctrinal aspect, Tholuck's Comm. on Rom. i. 24, xi. 7, seq.—The application of the passage from the Old Testament to the case before us, will be justified by but a single observation. Isaiah beheld the *δόξα*, the glory of God; in the theophanies of the Old Testament, Jehovah unveiled himself to men through the Logos alone, (cf. the introduction to ch. i. p. 58, seq.) that glory then, כָּבוֹד, was consequently the glory of the Logos, and as the words "spake of him," *ἐλάλησε περὶ αὐτοῦ*, allude to Isa. vi. 8, seq. the judicial hardening is also to be traced to the Logos. According to 1 Cor. x. 4, also, the revelations under the old covenant proceeded from the Logos.

V. 42–43. This limitation shows that the Evangelist was not interested, as has recently been urged as a reproach against him, in exaggerating the unbelief of the Jews. Referring to Jesus' own words, chap. v. 44, John assigns a genuinely pragmatic reason why there was a defect of open confessors of Christ. The ἤπερ, originally poetical, passed at a later period into the *κοινή*, the common usage.

V. 44–50. The older interpreters found in these words a resumption of the public discourses of Jesus; Chrysostom, indeed, thinks that the *σημεῖα* (v. 37,) refers to miracles which

occurred in the interval, but are not mentioned. As, however, what follows, in great part expresses only reminiscences of earlier discourses, most writers since Michælis, Morus, (Bengel also,) have regarded what follows as recapitulation, and have taken the aorists ἔγραψε, εἶπε, as pluperfects. After Strauss, however, had objected, that "to give this retrospective signification there ought to be a corresponding indication in the words themselves, or in the context," (i. p. 683, Eng. Trans. ii. 171,) De Wette also supposes that "the recollection of the contents of Jesus' discourses shaped itself under the hand of the Evangelist to an actual discourse." On the other hand, Schweizer, l. c. p. 18, justly lays weight on the fact, that in contrast with the invariable habit of the Evangelist, a discourse of the Saviour would here be presented without any thing specific in regard to the circumstances under which it was delivered, which is so much the less admissible, "as a position of things previously existing had been expressly specified as terminated." Not the slightest difficulty can exist about taking the aorist as pluperfect, especially in recapitulating, yet the aorists may unhesitatingly also be regarded as narrative; it is in fact acknowledged that the Greeks, to use the language of Kühner, (ii. p. 76,) "employ the aorist when they speak of some appearance *frequently observed* in time past."—On v. 44, cf. x. 38, xiii. 20; on v. 45, cf. xiv. 9; on v. 46, cf. viii. 12, xii. 35–37; on v. 47 and 48, cf. iii. 17 and 18; on v. 49, cf. vii. 16–18; on v. 50, cf. viii. 30.

CHAPTER XIII

JESUS WASHES HIS DISCIPLES' FEET, THE LAST TOKEN OF LOVE. — V. 1–20.

V. 1. THIS repast of the Lord with his Disciples is the last, for immediately after the discourses which follow it he left the city. Now the Evangelist seems to say in these words, that the token of love given by the Saviour, the washing of his Disciples' feet, took place *before* the feast. The ἑορτή, the Passover, commenced on the fourteenth of Nisan, at six o'clock in the evening, with the eating of the Passover; it would seem, therefore, that the meal here described took place on the thirteenth of that month, in the evening. According to the synoptical Gospels, however, our Lord partook of the Passover with his Disciples on the same day with the Jews, (Matt. xxvi. 17, Mark xiv. 12, Luke xxii. 7.) This difference is one of the most litigated questions in the criticism of the Gospels. Yet more unequivocally than in the passage before us, John designates the day *on which the Passover should have been eaten*, as that on which Christ was crucified, ch. xviii. 28, xix. 14, 31. The contrary date fixed by the Synoptists, which would make the crucifixion fall on the fifteenth of Nisan, that is, on the first day of the feast, is encumbered with great difficulties, which lie in the very nature of the case: would Jesus, contrary to the law, have left the city on the night of the Passover? could the Sanhedrim have undertaken on that holy day to arrest, arraign, give a hearing to and sentence him? Is there not throughout, merely the exhibition of a fear of desecrating the following *Sabbath?* (xix. 31.) All the four accounts concur in the statement, that the Redeemer was crucified on Friday,

and lay in the grave on the Sabbath, (Saturday,) but the difference is this, that according to John this Friday seems to have been the fourteenth of Nisan, on the evening of which the Passover was eaten, but according to the Synoptists, on the contrary, seems to have been the fifteenth, consequently the first day of the feast. We regard it as most in keeping with a scientific love of truth, to confess at once that the union of the two accounts is encumbered with very great difficulties. A full statement of these difficulties is the less likely to prove detrimental to the faith, since, even granting that theological or historical reasons make a contradiction in this matter a thing not to be imagined, such a statement only gives an impulse to a more radical investigation. The larger portion of the modern critics have been led by an examination of this subject to the ultimate result, that there must be a mistake on one or other side, either on the part of John or on that of the first three Evangelists; while Bretschneider, in his Probabilia, and Weisse, charge it on John, by far the larger part, Usteri, De Wette, Theile, Lücke, Neander, find the mistake in the first three Gospels; Strauss, however, winds up with the observation, that no decision is yet to be hazarded as to which statement is the correct one, (4th ed. p. 400, Eng. tr. iii. 152.) Should we now disregard every thing that antiquity has told us of the authors of the first three Gospels, and regard these Gospels merely as a product which originated toward the close of the first century, from a wavering popular tradition, then certainly the statement as regards the time of the Last Supper of Christ has flowed from a troubled source. If, however, so arbitrary a procedure must be styled uncritical in the highest degree, if but this be fixed, that the Greek of Matthew is in harmony in the main points with its Aramaic original, that we are to regard Luke, the friend of Paul, as the author of the third Gospel, then to charge upon these first Evangelists an error in date is attended with difficulties not less serious than those connected with the resolution of the difference mentioned.

Beginning with the very year of our Lord's death, his last love feast, together with the Supper which was linked with it, was repeated by his Disciples. Will it be maintained that at the time of this earliest repetition a chronological error had

crept in? Is there not an unbroken chain of tradition *founded in facts*, according to which, Mark must have known when Peter commemorated the death of Christ, Luke must have known when Paul, Polycarp must have known when John did so? Irenæus, the pupil of Polycarp, mentions also, that in the controversies regarding the Easter festival, Polycarp *had appealed to the fact that the Apostle had observed Easter on the same day as the Jews*, (Eusebius, l. v. c. 24;) Polycrates, also, Bishop of Ephesus, in the middle of the second century, (quoted in the same passage in Eusebius,) in his letter on the Easter festival, appeals to seven kinsmen of his, who were bishops before him, whose tradition in regard to Easter he followed, and declares that John observed the same usage as regarded Easter.[1] There is yet another point of view in which these last witnesses are to be considered. If John celebrated the Supper at the same time with the Jews, can that conception of the passages in his Gospel be correct, according to which Christ was crucified on the day on which the Passover was observed? So improbable is this, that the most recent criticism, (Schwegler's) apprehending the passages in John in this way, supposes that the genuineness of the Gospel itself must be called into doubt. What, however, can be opposed to these objections? Shall it be said: This last meal on the thirteenth of Nisan must have been more important to the Disciples than the Passover itself; that perhaps on the day of our Lord's crucifixion they had tasted nothing; that perhaps at a later period the Passover was united with the Supper, which was instituted at that meal; that Matthew consequently, when some twenty years later he wrote his Gospel, may have mistaken one for the other? (Theile "on the time of Christ's Last Supper," in Winer, Neuem Krit. Journ. ii. p. 171.) Shall we add, with Lücke, 3d ed. p. 733: "As regards too, the day of the Saviour's death, the tradition was, perhaps, satisfied with settling this, that Jesus had been crucified[2] on the *παρασκευή* (the preparation) of the feast. The day of the resurrection was alone more accurately designated. From

[1] This passage contains as for the rest, some obscure places; cf. Neander, l. c. p. 636, (Eng. tr. p. 385.)

[2] In the Talmud, also, it is affirmed that Jesus, בְּעֶרֶב־פֶּסַח "on the day before the Passover," was *stoned* and *hung;* (!) Iken, diss. ii. p. 295. (Eisenmenger, Jud. Entdeck, l. i. 179. Tr.)

defect of chronological interest in an event which presented features of so much greater moment, which did not depend on the chronology, the absence of some definiteness was not at first felt, and the indefinite was propagated." If we had merely *statements* to do with, this might perhaps answer, but is there not a continuous train of tradition *resting on facts?* Do not Polycarp and Polycrates appeal to facts of their own time? And what shall we say of the fact that John himself kept Easter with the Jews? Is it sufficient, with Lücke, to see in this a mere accommodation to the usage of the Churches in Asia Minor, which usage arose independently of John? The matter would certainly be clearer, if we could suppose with Neander: (p. 636, Eng. tr. 385,) "That the Jewish Christians kept up the Jewish usage of the Passover, giving it, however, a Christian import; while the congregations of purely Gentile converts originally kept no festivals at all." From what time, however, is to be dated the error which originated in that usage, the error, that Christ, on that evening, partook of the Paschal Supper with his Disciples? According to Neander, Lücke, and even Usteri, (Comment. p. 19,) Paul was aware of the correct view, and intimates it when (1 Cor. xi. 23,) he does not say, "on the night of the Passover," but "the same night in which Christ was betrayed;" and when in 1 Cor. v. 7, he opposes to the Jewish Passover the offering of Christ—consequently, the spiritual Passover, as sacrificed at the same time with the Jewish Paschal lamb. Now it is confessed that precisely in the account of the Lord's Supper, Paul stands in connection with Luke, consequently Luke at least cannot have gone amiss. We put the general question: Would any of the Apostles who had been in the scenes of those great days, be at all likely to forget which had been the day of crucifixion; and if this could not be, could a Paul, a Luke, a Mark, be mistaken —to say nothing of Matthew?

Under an improbability so great, of any mistake having been made, we feel absolutely obliged to essay a reconciliation. The Christians of the earliest period were acquainted with a method of doing so; Polycrates, in the passage cited, appeals to the Gospels as harmonizing with the practice observed by John in regard to the Easter festival; and Apollinaris, in the fourth cen-

tury, in the Fragment Chronic. pasch. p. 6, where he combats the practice of the Christians of Asia Minor, who celebrated Easter at the same time with the Jews, and placed the day of our Lord's death upon the fifteenth of Nisan, observes by way of reproach, that according to their idea the Evangelists would appear to have fallen into a contradiction. Either a false interpretation is put upon the first Gospels, when according to them we transfer the last Supper to the fourteenth of Nisan, or upon John, when we put it, according to him, upon the thirteenth. The former was, until in the last century, the most general view, and the oldest and most common attempt at producing a harmony, was the supposition, that the *Redeemer himself* had anticipated the eating of the Passover, thus Tertullian, the auctor quæst. in N. T. (Pseudo-Augustine,) Clement, Origen, Chrysostom,[1] Apollinaris, Euthymius, those numerous Greek theologians who defended the Greek usage of *leavened* bread in the Lord's Supper, (see Usteri, l. c. p. 37,) various members also of the Church of Rome, as Lamy, Calmet; of the Protestant theologians, Cappellus, Lampe, Deyling, Gude, (in his very learned treatise, Demonstratio quod Chr. in cœna sua *σταυρωσίμῳ* agnum paschalem non comederit, "Demonstration that Christ did not eat the Paschal lamb at his last Supper," Lips., 1742, 2d ed.) Ernesti, Kuinöl. The mere extent to which this particular manner of reconciliation has been adopted, makes it proper to examine it; it has again found in the learned Movers a defender,[2] (in the Zeitschr. f. Phil. u. kathol. Theolog. 1833, H. 7 and 8.) In relation to the ground of an anticipation of the Passover on the part of the Redeemer, this most recent Apologist adopts the view already extensively received in the Greek Church, (see Usteri,) that in the Lord's Supper, which was *united*

[1] He is uncertain; on chap. xviii. 28, he says: *ἤτοι οὖν τὸ πάσχα τὴν ἑορτὴν πᾶσαν λέγει· ἢ ὅτι τότε ἐποίουν τὸ πάσχα, αὐτὸς δὲ πρὸ μιᾶς αὐτὸ παρέδωπε, τηρῶν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ σφαγὴν τῇ παρασκευῇ, ὅτε καὶ τὸ παλαιὸν ἐγίνετο τὸ πάσχα.* "Either he calls the *whole feast* the Passover, or they then kept the Passover; but he (Christ) observed it the day before, reserving the sacrifice of himself for the paraseeue, (preparation,) on which day formerly the Passover was kept" On Matt. xxvi. he adopts the idea of a delay of the feast on the part of the Jews.

[2] This treatise, although even in other respects not without importance, has been overlooked in almost all the recent works, even by Lücke, p. 717. Movers is censurable for presenting his exposition as a novel one without mentioning Grotius, Deyling, (obss. sacræ, i. p. 277, seq.) and others.

with the Passover, it was designed to give the spiritual antitype to the symbolical Paschal Supper, as the Redeemer, at the very hour at which the typical Paschal lamb was slain in the temple, offered himself as the true Paschal lamb. The circumstance, that the Evangelists call the day when the Passover was made ready, the first day of unleavened bread,[1] (Matt. xxvi. 17, Mark xiv. 12,) he, as Grotius had already done, obviates thus, that we are not to suppose that thereby is meant the hours of the day of the fourteenth of Nisan, on the evening of which it was usual to slay the Passover, but that the eventide of the thirteenth is meant, from which it was already usual to compute the fourteenth, to which Luke also (xxii. 7,) alludes by using ἦλθε, whereby the end of the thirteenth of Nisan is designated as the period when the command was given. In Matt. xxvi. 18, our Lord, by using the words, "my time is at hand," ὁ καιρός μου ἐγγύς ἐστι, pointed "clearly" to his intention of keeping the Passover at an extraordinary time.[2] But it may be objected, if our Lord had arranged for the Supper at the approach of the dusk of evening, could it have been got ready the same evening? But, says the Apologist, let it be noted: The large dining-room was already prepared for the meal, (Mark xiv. 15,) and that unknown friend to whom Jesus sent the Disciples, appears to have had every thing requisite already in readiness.[3] First of all, as a grand objection, arises this: Is it credible *that such an extraordinary Passover would have been allowed to pass by the priests in the temple*, that they would have consented to the offering, to the outpouring of the blood by the altar? If not, then the idea of a Passover must be altogether abandoned, and a return made to the view of those Greeks who regarded the Lord's Supper as a substitute for the Passover—this, too, in complete opposition to the text. Yet besides this, the text creates additional difficulties. From the connection in which in Mark xiv. 12, the words καί—ἔθυον stand with the question of the

[1] As the leaven was removed as early as the fourteenth of Nisan, this was also counted among the days of unleavened bread.

[2] Grotius already has this view; Neander appears by an independent process to have reached the same view, l. c. p. 635, (Eng. tr. 385.) Could not Luke xxii. 15 be used with still more plausibility for this view?

[3] It remains to be noticed that the person interested did not need to be present at the killing of the lamb, that this also could be done by substitution.

Disciples, we must believe that when they put the question they also took it for granted that the Saviour would keep the Passover at the usual time. Had he designed to make an exception in this particular case, must he not have expressly mentioned it in his reply? In addition, Mark xiv. 17, (cf. Matt. xxvi. 20,) undoubtedly points to the fact, that the arrangement was made by the Disciples in the earlier part of the day; to be sure, Luke xxii. 14 has, "when the hour was come," ὅτε ἐγένετο ἡ ὥρα, which accords more nearly with the solution we are now discussing. But besides, difficulty has been excited by this view, because it imposes a necessity of supposing that the Redeemer deviated in that holy festival from the legal appointment. The view consequently has been defended, especially since the period of the Reformation: that rather *on the part of the Jews*, in order to avoid the strictness of a Sabbath-keeping on two consecutive days, there had been a transfer to the Sabbath of the first feast day, which this time preceded the Sabbath, and in the ἔδει, Luke xxii. 7, it was thought there was evidence that our Lord, in his own celebration of the Passover, had remained faithful to the legal time. Among the Reformed, as well as among the Lutheran expositors, Calvin, Beza, Bucer, Flacius, Gerhard, Calovius, and many others, this is the prevalent expedient, which is defended also by Scaliger and Casaubon. The oldest trace of it is referred by Gerhard (Harmon Ev. ii. p. 934,) to Rupert, and by him to Paul Burgensis. Now it is certainly correct, that an expedient of the sort mentioned is practiced by the modern Jews, (see particulars in Iken, Dissert. iii. 417; Bynäus, de morte Christi, l. i. c. i.) but it has been shown by Cocceius, not. ad Sanh. c. i. § 2, Bochart and others, that passages occur in the Talmud which prove it not to have been the usage of *that* period.—A new path has been struck out by the learned men who attempted to show, that according as the new moon was determined either astronomically by the conjunction of the moon with the sun, or by its appearing in the heaven, the Jews themselves might fix the fifteenth of Nisan about a day earlier or later, and that the Karaites, whom Jesus followed, actually had fixed it by the appearing of the moon, (and thus indeed, at that time, one day earlier,) and the Rabbinical part fixed it by the calculus in con-

nection with the appearing. This latter view has been maintained with a very great expenditure of erudition by Iken, Dissertat. ii. With all the acuteness and learning, however, which have characterized this defense, it rests upon too many unsafe premises. Nothing is known of any such dissension in the time of Christ; according to Josephus, the Paschal lamb was slain by all Israelites on the same day; the very existence of the sect of Karaites in Christ's time, is more than uncertain, and it would be more natural to expect that the Rabbinists, who computed astronomically, would fix the new moon *earlier*, and the Karaites fix it *later*, than the converse.—The essay at explanation which had already been presented by Frisch, "On the Paschal Lamb," 1758, and combated in that day by Gabler, (Neues theol. Journal, Bd. 3, St. 5, 1799,) has been again brought out and invested with great plausibility at a very recent period, (Rauch, Stud. u. Kritik. 1832, H. 3.[1]) The view is this: The legal determination, by the fourteenth of Nisan, means not the *end* of the day, but its *beginning*, consequently the evening of the thirteenth. This is beyond dispute deducible from Josephus, Antiq. 2, 14, 16, where we read that the Jews were obliged to select a lamb on the tenth of Nisan, and to keep it until the fourteenth, and ἐνστάσης τῆς τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτης "at the beginning of the fourteenth," to kill it. The day of the crucifixion would consequently fall on the fourteenth of Nisan. After it has been furthermore shown that in the strict sense the Passover lasted only seven days, from the first day of the feast, the πρὸ ἑορτῆς τοῦ πάσχα, xiii. 1, is interpreted, "before the Passover properly so called"—which commenced, to wit: twenty-four hours later, on the fifteenth of Nisan. It is shown further, that on this view, John xix. 14 and 31 allow of a very satisfactory explanation, since then in xix. 14, the παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα is the day before the Passover proper, and in v. 31, that Sabbath is called μεγάλη, (high, great,) because the *first* day of the festival fell upon it, which, just as much as the last, was regarded as a grand day. In ch. xix. 28, however, there remains no other resource than the supposition that τὸ πάσχα there is meant to designate not the Paschal lamb, but

(1 Translated by Robinson, Biblical Repository, vol. iv. 1834. Tr.)

the unleavened bread, τὰ ἄζυμα, which was eaten throughout the festival proper. In examining this view, we must, first of all, look more narrowly at the expressions in regard to the legal participation in the Paschal Supper; such an examination establishes the fact, that even in the Pentateuch itself there is on this point a want of certainty in the specifications. To the idea that it was eaten on the evening of the thirteenth, is certainly opposed the fact, that the Israelites, according to Numbers xxxiii. 3, went forth on the fifteenth of Nisan, and if the departure, according to Ex. xii. 30, seq. followed in the same night, on the evening preceding which the Passover had been eaten, it follows that it must have been eaten on the evening of the fourteenth. But with this again it conflicts, that in the very same passage, Num. xxxiii. 3, the day of departure is called the "morrow of the Passover;" nor does it seem to fit in properly with that view, that in Ex. xii. 22, it is said that none shall go out *until the morning*. This unconnected exhibition in the Pentateuch renders it specially necessary to look at the later practice. In that practice, the time of the Supper fell upon the evening of the fourteenth of Nisan, and the passage adduced by Rauch, from Josephus, shows nothing to the contrary, for the expression, ἐνστάσης τῆς τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτης, would only necessarily mean: "at the day-break of the fourteenth day," in case these words formed an antithesis to another *time* of day; as it is, however, merely the *date of a day* to which they are opposed, as namely, the fourteenth day is opposed to the thirteenth, the only proper translation of them is, "at the beginning of the fourteenth day." To this must be added, that it is not at all credible, that between the Paschal meal, at which already unleavened bread was used, and the day of which was counted with the feast, that between this and the first day of the festival proper, a day having no connection with the feast would be thrown in.—The last attempt to harmonize the Synoptists with what is apparently the meaning of John, has been made by Ebrard, who maintains that as the 255,600 lambs, which, according to Josephus, were usually killed in the space of two hours, from three to five o'clock, must have required a longer time and more room, the Passover must have been slain and eaten as early as the thirteenth of

Nisan, especially by the poorer classes, and the Galileans, (l. c. ii. p. 631, seq.) Capellus, (in his Epis. ad Cloppenb. de die, etc. p. 112,) in order to establish his theory that the Paschal lamb could also be slain at home, had already made reference to a want of time, as also of space in the fore-court, for the number of offerings. Ebrard has indeed carried out his view learnedly and acutely, but even more than that of Iken it rests on insecure hypotheses. He is mistaken in attempting to prove from 2 Chron. xxxv. 11, that the priests (the *Levites* rather!) slew the lambs, the opposite is proven by 2 Chron. xxx. 17, and by the Mischna; it was the duty of the priests merely to burn the fat, and pour out the blood by the altar, (see Bynäus, p. 38; Gabler, neuest. Journal, ii. 1 St. p. 483; Winer, Realw. ii. p. 234.) Ebrard does not seem to have compared the Tr. Pesachim, in the fifth chapter of which there is a complete description of the whole series of occurrences, from which we learn, that the people in three successive companies came into the fore-court, that the priests themselves did not slay the lambs; indeed, Rabbi Jehudah expressly declares, in his time, when the third company was there, as it was but a small one, there was no time even to get through with the singing of the Hallel, (ch. v. § 7.) We pass by yet other observations that might be opposed to this theory, and only remark that, according to Maimonides, in case of necessity, they might help themselves through by taking the night also.

In the more recent period an effort has been made to refer back the data in John to the exegetical inferences from the synoptical Gospels, thus Lightfoot, Bochart, Bynäus, Reland, Guerike, in Winer's krit. Jour. B. 3, St. 6; Hemsen, Authentie des Johannes, p. 279, seq.; Kern, Tüb. Zeits. 1836, 3 H. p. 1; Hengstenberg, in the Evangel. Kirchenzeit. 1838, p. 98, seq. We will consider what shape, according to this view, is taken by the passages of John involved in this discussion.

I. Chap. xiii. 1.—If ἠγάπησεν is here meant to designate the sentiment of love, it is surprising that it is connected with a determining of time, and we might, therefore, understand by it an attestation of love *connected with* a deed, as Gerhard already observes: "non amor affectivus sed actualis," (not love as an emotion, but love as an act;) with this, however, the εἰς

τέλος is in conflict, which Lücke would translate "finally"—rather might it be rendered "wholly" (Cyrill?) The thought of the Disciple is certainly, however, only this: When the Saviour, previous to the last Passover, had the end of his life vividly before him, the love which he had previously felt was aroused in its full strength in this last hour—he is thinking at the same time of such declarations of love as that in Luke xxii. 15. Therewith this narration of the attestation of his love by this action of his connects itself. Γενομένου cannot mean "when it had been made ready," for v. 4 is opposed to this, but only "during the meal." It is in itself improbable that the proper translation is *a* supper, as in that case the language would rather have been, καὶ ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ δεῖπνον. The Evangelist seems to presume that it is a supper already familiar to the reader, to which also xxi. 20 refers. Under these circumstances, it is probable in the very highest degree that the designation, πρὸ τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ πάσχα, points to this very same meal. With the second "evening," ὀψία, began the fifteenth of Nisan, and the Paschal Supper took place, (Mark xiv. 17;) Winer, p. 116, (tr. 105,) also thinks that the omission of the article is an argument that it was the *well known* Supper. The Evangelist, consequently, means to say this: "Previous to the beginning of the feast, Christ still bore himself among his Disciples in the most loving manner, and during the Supper he gave a positive proof of this love."

II. Chap. xiii. 29.—The "feast," ἑορτή, it is alleged, is here mentioned as still impending, the Disciples suppose that Judas is ordered to purchase the things needed for the feast, or to give something to the poor for the same object; that "supper," δεῖπνον, consequently, is not the Paschal meal; had it, however, even been *after* it on the night of the first great day of the feast, it would no longer have been allowable to carry on traffic. This proof, also, has great plausibility, to which, however, is already opposed the weight of v. 1, 2. Even after the feast had commenced, might he not have been told, reference being had to the seven following days, to purchase things necessary for it? We, ourselves, would indisputably use such language on the morning of the first day of a festival. As regards the admissibility of traffic, we have only to recall the manifold casuistic limita-

tions of the Talmudists. The school of Hillel regarded the night preceding the feast-day as less holy than the day itself, as Tr. Pesachim, c. 4, § 5, proves. Furthermore, a purchase could be made even on the Sabbath, by leaving a pledge and afterward settling the account, (Tr. Schabbath, c. 23, § 1;) gifts, too, could be made to the poor under certain limitations, (Tr. Schabbath, c. 1, § 1,) and we may specially bear in mind on this point, that there was an obligation to furnish to every poor man the means of procuring four cups of wine, (Tr. Pesachim, c. 10, § 1.)

III. The main passage is chap. xviii. 28.—On the day of Christ's crucifixion the Jews would not pollute themselves by entering the house of a heathen, (ἵνα φάγωσι τὸ πάσχα.) Following the lead of Lightfoot, Bynäus, and others, it has been held that by the πάσχα we are here to understand the Chagiga, that is, the peace-offerings appointed for the feast days. On the part of the opponents, this view, that these are called פֶּסַח, has been contested, and by none so thoroughly as by Iken, whom Lücke and De Wette should not have passed here without mention. Even after the thorough contesting of the point by Iken, the fact remains, that in the Talmud some Rabbins have by פֶּסַח understood the peace-offerings. On the other side, he and those who follow him have not let pass undisputed the places cited in evidence, Deuteron. xvi. 2, 2 Chron. xxxv. 7, 8, 9. Nevertheless, it is certain that in both passages the word פֶּסַח embraces all the sacrifices connected with the feast of the Passover; that פֶּסַח, Deuteron. xvi. 2, designates merely the lamb, (De Wette,) cannot be granted, since it has not the article, the עָלָיו in v. 3 is also decidedly against it. Cf. also, 2 Chron. xxx. 22, where it is said: "they did eat throughout the feast seven days, offering peace-offerings, &c." Mosheim, consequently, whom Strauss follows, had very properly already reduced the objection to this; "if the offering of the Chagiga *together with* the Paschal lamb could be called פֶּסַח, it certainly could not be so called without it." On this point Hengstenberg, l. c., following the views of the older writers, has expressed himself with such solid judgment that it is a matter of surprise that no mention even of his Dissertation is made by Lücke or De Wette. If in the usage of the language with

more latitude, the whole feast is called פֶּסַח, and if on the following days also the sacrificatory feasts were partaken of, namely, the thank-offerings for the Passover, then there appears to be no reason why the expression φαγεῖν πάσχα might not be used of these offerings also, which stood in the most intimate relation with the Paschal lamb; if the term be used with reference to the first day, it designates the eating of the Paschal lamb, if with reference to the following days, it designates the eating of the other offerings which in connection with the Paschal lamb formed the feast. Thus, פֶּסַח, "to keep the Passover," occurs in the Rabbins with specific reference to eating the unleavened bread, (Reland, Antt. sacr. ed. Vogel, p. 270.) That we have τὸ πάσχα here, makes no difference, (Winer, Realwort. ii. p. 241, Anm. 3.) Lightfoot and Bynäus direct attention to the fact, moreover, that the entering of the house of a heathen produced one of those defilements which only lasted until sun-down. As now the time of the Paschal Supper proper came after sundown, the entrance into the house of a heathen could in this particular case have had no influence, and we must, therefore, suppose the Chagiga to be meant; that this argument is entirely valid, has been established by Hengstenberg against the more recent objections.[1] A doubt still remains after this explanation, and at the first glance seems to have force, and can likewise be turned in utramque partem, (against either side,) yet to the present time has not been thoroughly examined and cleared up from the Jewish antiquities, the doubt, whether on the first day of the feast, which according to Exod. xii. 16 was probably to be kept like a Sabbath, all the occupations involved in the trial, crucifixion and interment of Jesus, could have been carried on? Among those who consider the statement of the Synoptists as wrong, Lücke has thought it enough as regards the proof passages from the Talmud, simply to make reference to some of the recent Dissertations. Movers, for the most part, indeed, after Lightfoot, has collected most diligently the various examples. When now he shows from the Talmud that it was forbidden on the Sabbath to bear arms, to hold court, to carry wood, to go through the streets with spices, and

[1] The opposite view has been defended most thoroughly by Movers; we regret that want of space compels us to forego an examination of his objections in detail.

when we see the servants of the high priest on the night on which our Saviour was betrayed bearing arms, the high priest sitting in judgment, the condemned persons bearing the cross, Nicodemus bringing no less than one hundred pounds of spice, who can persuade himself that all this occurred on the first day of the high festival? Above all other considerations, we would direct attention to the fact, that with all the sanctity of that first day, according to the law and the Talmud, *the distinction, nevertheless, between a Sabbath and a feast day held good throughout.* In relation precisely to the first and the last day of the Passover, permission was given to prepare food upon them, a thing not at all allowed upon the Sabbath, (Exod. xii. 16;) the Tr. Be'za, or Iomtob, presents, moreover, manifold examples of things allowed on feast-days which were prohibited on the Sabbath, and the school of Hillel especially, gave still wider license in these matters, (Tr. Be'za, ch. 5, § 2.) But apart from this, all the instances cited lose their force when we remember that those ordinances were expressed only in general terms, that on the other hand, in reference to particular kinds of transactions, special prescriptions were given, as for example, in the case of a circumcision or of a funeral, much was allowed that under other circumstances was forbidden, (Schabbath, c. 23, § 5;) Movers himself proves that criminals might be arrested, (Acts xii. 3, 4—and this could hardly be done without arms?) as he has also with Lightfoot obviated the argument adduced by Lücke, that no one after the Paschal Supper could leave the city, by proving that the neighborhood of Bethphage was counted in the city. Strauss, therefore, over against the various Talmudic examples, pro et contra, has wisely reduced *this* objection to the one point, that in the intermediate feast days indeed, but probably not on the first and last, criminals might be executed. We have accordingly, these two questions to answer: 1) Was it in general permitted to hear causes, and have executions during the feast? 2) And if this were the case, could they also be attended to on the first and on the last day of the feast? With regard to the first question, Lücke traverses the indictment, only by quoting from Tr. Iomtob, c. 5. Movers adds Tr. Schabbath, c. 1, § 2, and out of Lightfoot, a passage from

the Babylonian Gemara, and from Maimonides, according to which latter, no judicial proceedings could be *commenced* on the evening before the Sabbaths and feast days. These very passages, however, prove that judicial action could be had. The passages, Schabbath, i. 2, and Iomtob, v. 2, merely give particular directions in regard to the court to be held, and indeed in the latter, the prohibition of holding a court is not embraced in the category of the מִצְוָה, the commandment proper, but of the רְשׁוּת, that is, what may be done on certain conditions. The extract from the Gemara treats merely of *criminal* cases, and *expressly* declares, that this does not hold good of cases in which money is involved, and what is the reason? Because the sentence of condemnation could not be pronounced till the following day, and that too after it had been reduced to writing, (Lightfoot, Opera, ii. 384, the passage too, p. 465, shows that the sentence of death could be passed on the Sabbath.) Nor can the fact be lightly passed over, that the Jews, (Matt. xxvi. 5,) as the reason why Jesus should not be seized and executed during the feast, allege, not the sanctity of the feast, but the danger of an uproar. But it is decisive, that the Gemara Tr. Sanhedrim, ch. x. ed. Cocc. p. 297, says in downright terms: "The Sanhedrim assembled in the session room of the stone chamber, from the time of the morning offering to that of the evening, *but on the Sabbaths and feast days they assembled themselves within* בחיל, *which is the lower wall, which surrounded the greater, in the vicinity of the fore-court of the women.*" Movers makes use of Lundius, p. 460, according to whose opinion this place was rather a law school, used for instruction in the law. But this is the isolated exposition of the Rabbi Salomo, the text clearly enough expresses the opposite, and it is moreover to be noted, that according to Sanh. c. 10, § 2, and Bartenora on the passage, at this very place was to be found one of the two courts of session for the twenty-three men—the locality probably which was then used by the Sanhedrim. Another passage, whose testimony is just as positive as to the directions for the feast, is the Mischna Sanh. x. 4: "An elder, who does not subject himself to the judgment of the Sanhedrim, shall be taken from the place where he lives to Jerusalem, shall be kept there until one of the three feasts, and shall be killed at

the time of the feast, for the reason stated, Deut. xvii. 13." Movers has nothing to meet this but the hypothesis, that perhaps nothing more is meant than the day before the feast. No distinction is made in any of these passages between the first day of the feast and the others. We consider it, therefore, as certain, that judicial proceedings were also held on the feast days, perhaps under certain legal provisos, (cf. Selden, de Syn. p. 805,) and that this very period, when large assemblages of the people came together, was, for the reason mentioned Deut. xvii. 13, selected for the execution of notorious criminals—a view attended with still less difficulty in the case before us, as it concerned the punishment of a blasphemer, the execution of whom was doing God *service*, (John xvi. 2,) and what pertained to the service of God never broke the Sabbath. Besides, it was not the Jews themselves, but the Roman soldiers, who actually executed the crucifixion.

IV. John xix. 14, 31.—Those who maintain a discrepancy between John and the Synoptists, suppose that in both these passages, παρασκευή must be taken for "the day of preparation for the Passover," and the more so, as the word μεγάλη in v. 31 probably designates the concurrence of the *first* day of the feast with the Sabbath. Now it is maintained by Bochart, Reland, Hengstenberg, that παρασκευή never means the preparation day to a feast, but always the one to a Sabbath; on the other hand, Ebrard will not concede that it may have designated merely a week day. The word corresponds to the Hebrew מכינה, præparatio, and designates originally the afternoon from three o'clock, when the cooking, &c., was done for the Sabbath, and is used in exactly the same way in the imperial proclamation in Josephus, Antiq. xvi. 6, 2; but like the German Sonn*abend*, (literally, sun-*evening* for Saturday,) Weih*nacht*, (Christmas *night* for Christmas,) it was also a designation of *days*. This is certain from Mark xv. 42, John xix. 42, hence also the Chaldee ערובתא, for the week day, Friday. The possibility that παρασκευή may also have been used for the preparation days of the feast, we might not in itself deny perhaps, although, as De Wette himself confesses, there is a complete want of examples of such use; but in the passages in John, this interpretation is completely excluded by the absolute use of ἡ παρασκευὴ τῶν Ἰου-

δαίων, ch. xix. 42. V. 31 shows, too, that the importance is attached to the Sabbath, and not to the first day of the feast, so that there we can by παρασκευή understand none other than the day preceding the *Sabbath*. As regards the grammatical admissibility in ch. xix. 14 of Luther's rendering, "the preparation day in the Passover," no difficulty whatever exists. This is shown by Ignatius, ad Phil. c. 13, σάββατον τοῦ πάσχα, and by Socrates, Hist. Eccles. v. 22, σάββατον τ. ἑορτῆς. The exception of Ebrard may seem to have more weight: "Why should the Evangelist, in xix. 14, instead of simply saying the first day of the Passover, designate this day as a *Friday occurring in the feast of the Passover*? What reasons can be assigned for this very peculiar appellation?" But it is preferable to translate "the preparation day in the Passover feast," by which this day will be designated as belonging to the feast, and John uses this expression, partly because it had become usual to designate the day of our Lord's death as a preparation day, partly because he already had in his eye, at this point, the fact mentioned in v. 31.[1]

V. 1-3. Although the attempt has been made by a few writers, (Lightfoot, Hess,) to show that this δεῖπνον was not the Paschal Supper, yet at present all unite in the opposite view, to which, as has been shown, the words of v. 1 lead us, as do the closing discourses, and especially xiii. 38, (Strauss.) That John passes by the institution of the symbolic action of the Lord's

[1] [The Discussion of the Passover Question, has, in the 7th ed. of Tholuck's John, been transferred from the opening of the thirteenth chapter to the Introduction, § 8, 2, p. 38-52. The history of the views entertained upon the different questions here involved, is arranged under the following heads: I. The Passover Question in the Ancient Church. II. In the Romish and Protestant Churches, down to the time of Schleiermacher. III. Since Baur. At the close of this historic sketch, Tholuck says: "We confess, that in this 7th ed. we still feel ourselves obliged to keep to that view which has been defended in the earlier editions of our Commentary. As the judgment in regard to the authorship of the Apocalypse has experienced such a revolution, it may perhaps not be among historic impossibilities that a revolution of judgment on this question may also take place."

The most important discussions of the Passover question, in English, are to be found in Robinson's Harmony of the Four Gospels, in Greek, p. 220, and in an article in the Biblic'heca Sacra for 1845. Davidson's Introduction to the New Testament. London: Bagster, 1848, p. 102-111. No discussion of the question we have yet seen from an English hand, equals in interest, or surpasses in value, the one furnished in Dr. Fairbairn's Hermeneutical Manual, or Introduction to the Exegetical Study of the New Testament. Clark & Co., Edinburgh, 1858; reprinted, Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co., 1859, p. 368-389. Dr. Fairbairn's conclusion is, "that our Lord kept the Passover with his Disciples on the fourteenth of Nisan, on the day prescribed by the law." Tr.]

Supper, yet mentions the feet washing, serves to confirm the fact that he presumed the ample Evangelical narration of the Synoptists to be known, and designed to present what was new.—The parenthetical sentence, v. 2, renders prominent the thought, that this frame of Judas' mind had not prevented this act of love from being performed to him also; the agreement with the high council had already been entered into, (Luke xxii. 3, seq.) but might yet have been broken; v. 27, therefore, designates the determination actually to fulfill it by delivering up Christ, as the acme of the crime. *Εἰδώς* is to be resolved into "although," for the words that follow are designed to give prominence to the contrast between the consciousness which Jesus had of his dignity and the lowliness of the action. In Matt. xi. 27, the Saviour employs similar language of himself; "that he was come from God," *ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἐξῆλθε*, is to be explained in the same sense as viii. 42. This observation of the Evangelist proves that to him also the scene that follows, appeared as one of the sublimest in the life of our Lord. In fact, we might, in contemplating this scene, say with Claudius: "Such an ideal of man, as presents itself here, never entered the heart of man. Whatever of greatness and glory antiquity may present—a dying Epaminondas, a dying Socrates—vanishes before this ideal of Deity in humiliation, and of a divine form of a servant." Even Schweizer, l. c. p. 160, declares that no where else "can be found a more beautiful narrative, full of such intrinsic truth." Weisse alone, where others have been pervaded by reverential astonishment, has taken offense and found fault, (ii. p. 272.)

V. 4, 5. Did not the feet-washing at other times precede the supper? We remark in reply, that the fact that they had already gone to the table, by no means implies necessarily that this washing did not precede their eating; it was customary to wash the outstretched feet as the guests lay upon the cushions, as in Luke vii. 38. Now, there has been the most decided recognition on all sides, that what is uttered Luke xxii. 26, 27, has reference to the transaction here under consideration, (Olshausen, Gfrörer, Neander;) supposing this view to be correct, we are to suppose an order in the events like the following: Christ had already lain down; as they had no servants, the feet-washing should have been done by one of the Disciples; the

things necessary for it are at hand; the Disciples are still disputing who shall undertake to do it; Jesus no longer remains *ἀναχείμενος*, (Luke xxii. 27,) but rises himself to perform this duty of a servant. With such a depicture of minutiæ as love would suggest, we have brought before us even his taking upon him the apparel of a servant: "laid aside his garments and took a towel and girded himself;" the word "began," *ἤρξατο*, paints the gradual course of the action, the wiping of the feet points to its completion.

V. 6–9. The words do not involve the idea that Peter was the first. So characteristically and so consonantly with the previous delineation of him is this Disciple here depicted, as De Wette also acknowledges, that it would involve gross blindness to regard scenes like this as *fictitious*. That feeling of distance from the Lord, that at the very beginning displays itself in Peter in so heart-moving a form, (Luke v. 8,) is aroused here also, when he beholds at his feet the "Son of the living God." Σύ is emphatic, the present *νίπτεις* is employed in regard to the contemplated action, as x. 33. *Μετὰ τοῦτο* may refer to the explanation given in v. 14, but Grotius, Lampe, not without probability, suppose it to refer to a later period of his life, when in the light given by the Holy Ghost the action in all its significance will become clear to him. If this utterance was a natural one, there mingles nevertheless in Peter's second exclamation something of self-will. Calvin: Laudabilis quidem *modestia*, nisi quovis cultu potior *obedientia* esset apud Deum, "A praiseworthy *modesty*, were it not that with God *obedience* is better than all service." The answer of our Lord is not so excessively severe as to make it necessary with Olshausen to refer *νίψω* to a spiritual washing. The meaning of the formula, *μέρος ἔχειν μετά τίνος*, which is to be explained less by reference to Luke xii. 46, than by the Hebrew phrase יֵשׁ חֵלֶק לִי עִם, (Gesenius, Thes. s. v. חֵלֶק,) is this: "to participate with any one in something." De Wette in adopting the sense: "Thou hast no fellowship with my lowly frame of mind," is neither sustained by the usage of the Hebrew phrase, nor by the context. Grotius more correctly: Non eris particeps meorum bonorum, "thou shalt not partake in my blessings." Maldonatus: Renuncio amicitiæ tuæ, "I renounce thy friendship." The

change to an expression of the very opposite character perfectly corresponds with the sanguine-choleric vehemence of Peter. Chrysostom: *καὶ ἐν τῇ παραιτήσει σφοδρός, καὶ ἐν τῇ συγχωρήσει σφοδρότερος γίνεται, ἑκάτερα δὲ ἐξ ἀγάπης*, "In his deprecation he was vehement, in his yielding more vehement, but both came from his love." As this expression reveals that no thought was so fearful to him as that of being sundered from the Lord, v. 10 now presents a recognition of his devotion on the part of Christ.

V. 10, 11. First of all let it be noticed, that *λοῦσθαι*, in contradistinction from *νίπτεσθαι*, signifies not "washing," but "bathing," טְבִילָה, and refers, therefore, to the purification of the entire body, and not of a portion merely. Sometimes a bath was taken before a meal, and on leaving the bath the feet again became soiled; now if Jesus and his Disciples had bathed that evening, these words may be regarded as simply furnishing the reason why the feet only needed to be washed at that time, (Heumann, Tittmann, De Wette,) and the figurative language first comes in with *καὶ ὑμεῖς κτλ.* But if the words, "clean every whit," *καθαρὸς ὅλος*, are to be taken in a physical sense, does not the direct linking on of the thought, "ye are also spiritually pure," seem too abrupt? Most writers, therefore, give also to the first words of the sentence a figurative sense, either exclusively or at the same time with a literal one. In v. 8 already, some had found a symbolical meaning intimated and the washing designated as a sacramental action: "If I wash thee not by baptism, from sin," (Origen, Augustine, Lampe;) in this place, where we have not merely *νίπτειν* but *λούσθαι*, this mode of apprehension is yet more obvious; the Reformed expositors, however, as Lampe, Cocceius, substitute for baptism the regenerative operation of the Holy Spirit, the washing of the feet is then the daily forgiveness of the sins of infirmity, or according to the Catholic apprehension, the sacrament of penance, pœnitentia. But as the words are at the same time an answer to v. 9, the proper sense cannot be abandoned. It is, to be sure, merely problematical that Jesus and his Disciples had bathed, but there is no difficulty in supposing a reference to what usually occurs, as when a person comes from the bath it is common for him to have need afterward to wash his feet,

yet is otherwise clean, thus the *heart* of the inner man is pure in you, (Neander.) If even the action had not been intended to have the symbolical meaning, yet this very exclamation of Peter which preceded it, in which were so beautifully revealed the pure depths of his soul, and at the same time was brought out the contrast between this genuine Disciple and the betrayer—this very exclamation must have given occasion to this turn of it. His declaration had shown anew how thorough was the internal hold which Christ had upon him, (vi. 68, 69,) now he who had received Christ's word so deeply into his inner nature was pure, (xv. 3,) only the extremities were yet to be purified, it was only needful that the internal principle should unfold itself further and penetrate the whole man, while in the case of a Judas this principle was wholly wanting. In these words, as in the whole scene of love in which he too was allowed to be a partaker, there was for Judas a final persuasion and warning.

V. 12–17. Now follows the meaning strictly had in view in the feet washing. In the mouth of the Disciples, *ὁ κῦριος* corresponded with the title רַב, and *διδάσκαλος* with מָרָא; how decidedly Christ claimed this high position among them, is shown by Matt. xxiii. 8. The nominative in Greek and Hebrew is also used for the vocative. The unwillingness to perform the feet washing had been on the side of the Disciples an "example," *ὑπόδειγμα*, of selfishness, the action of Jesus was an "example," *ὑπόδειγμα*, of condescending love; it is not therefore the deed in itself considered, which is the grand thing, but the tone of mind exhibited in it, and the explanation given by Chrysostom, Augustine, that humility is the hardest, and at the same time the most characteristic virtue of Christianity, is confirmed by the exhortation in v. 17, as our Lord directs attention to that great chasm, which especially in the case of this virtue, lies between knowing and doing. It is clear that the idea that a sacrament is instituted here, is entirely out of the question, nor, furthermore, is the action linked with a promise. As long as feet washing was rendered necessary by the use of sandals, it was practiced as a work of love, (1 Tim. v. 10,) at a later period, it was retained as a suggestive symbolical rite—first of all, in conformity with a reference of v. 10 to baptism, it was

annexed to the ceremony of baptism,[1] then as a repetition in the strict sense of the original symbolical action, was used in the Church of Rome, in which the Pope and Catholic monarchs, on Maunday Thursday, performed it on twelve poor, old men. The remarks of Bengel may always have a fitness as regards this: Magis admirandus foret pontifex, unius regis quam duodecim pauperum pedes seria humilitate lavans, "the Pope would do a more remarkable thing, if in unfeigned humility he washed the feet of one king, than he does in washing the feet of twelve poor men," and yet there glides into the mind what Claudius so beautifully says of ceremonies that have become empty: "They are the little flags which reach forth over the water, and mark where a ship with her rich lading has sunk." Luther on Gen. xliii. 24, commends in a case of actual necessity, the washing of feet, as an act of love; in the Moravian fraternity, the question whether it shall be performed, or not, is left to the decision of the stewards of the particular divisions, (Chöre.)

V. 18, 19. The thought previously aroused in regard to Judas once more strikes our Lord, but why and for what end is *λέγω* introduced? Does it point to the *μακάριοι?* (Maldonatus, Bengel.) Yet this expression is used conditionally and of the future. It has in view the entirely reciprocal relation of ministering love, which could have no applicability in the case of Judas. The recent expositors pass too lightly over the *ἐξελεξάμην*. Does Christ intend to say, that one of them does not belong to the chosen? But he says the reverse in chap. vi. 70: "Have I not chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?" It would seem at first view as though the idea of Augustine, Calvin, Zwingle, was justified; it looks as though *ἐκλέγειν* was here employed in an emphatic sense, "to choose to true fellowship, to salvation." But would the citation that follows be in that case introduced with *ἀλλ'*? The divine ordination would then in fact be a notion coördinate with the preceding. We would then be compelled with Maldonatus to interpret: Quomodo ignorare possum quales sint, quos elegi, "how could I be ignorant what kind of persons they would be whom I have chosen?" The reflection on the divine ordi-

[1] After the fourth century, the feet of the newly baptized were washed, Augustine, Ep. 119, ad Jan. c. 18, Bingham, Antiq. Eccles. iv. p. 394.

nation would then serve to produce a tranquilizing influence, (see on xii. 38.) After *ἀλλά* we must supply *ἐγένετο*, in the same way exactly as in xv. 25, 1 John ii. 19. The quotation from the Psalm, (Ps. xli. 10,) speaks of a treacherous revolt on the part of a table companion, that is, of a most intimate friend; the lifting up of the heel refers to the kick of a horse, (an image of similar character is used in Gen. xlix. 17.) Here, in fact the language is used of one who arose from the supper of love to consummate an act of betrayal, who so far from washing the feet of his Master, lifted up the heel against him; hereby, too, Christ has become like David his type and ancestor. *Ἀπάρτι*, in classic usage "just now," so the Ethiopic. The fulfilling of prophecy a seal of the Messiahship, xiv. 29, also.

V. 20. So little connection subsists between this and the preceding sentence, that there has been a disposition, with Gabler, Kuinöl, to regard it as a gloss taken from Matt. x. 40, but—laying aside the want of evidence—it is too decided a difference in the expression. Marked sentences, too, of the same sort, as may easily be shown, were repeated by Christ on different occasions, (see on xii. 25, Matt. xviii. 4, cf. here, also, v. 16 with xv. 20.) The prevalent opinion, in confirmation of which Olshausen appeals to xv. 20, seq. (?) is, that as the trial mentioned in v. 18 pertains to the Disciples as well as to the Master, it was his design to furnish encouragement, (Melancthon, Grotius;) but on that supposition the thought seems to be too isolated and abrupt, so that it might be said with Lücke: "The thought of the betrayer, of which Jesus, by the train of thought entered on v. 20, would rid himself, agitates and interrupts him anew." Zwingle, Heumann, regard it as his aim in presenting this glorious aspect, to keep back the other Disciples from an imitation of the apostasy; according to Piscator, Calvin, is shown: Injustum esse, ut quicquam ex dignitate apostolica imminuat quorundum impietas, qui in officio perperam versantur, "that it would be unjust to detract from the apostolic dignity, because some who held it were guilty of acts of wickedness."

DEPARTURE OF THE BETRAYER FROM THE CIRCLE OF THE DISCIPLES. — V. 21–30.

V. 21–26. It is in keeping with Christ's character, that the thought of the faithless Disciple mightily agitates his inmost soul. It comes out yet more distinctly in v. 21 than in v. 10 and 18, and in v. 26 is expressed in the most direct manner. We must suppose from v. 27 that the presence of the betrayer was oppressive to the Holy One of God, and that the declarations were indirectly designed to cause him to depart. The question rises, did he leave before the institution of the Supper? The other Evangelists make no mention of his departure, but what Matthew says, xxvi. 30, 31, and the fact that Judas does not until a later period (v. 47,) return again to the circle of the Disciples, implies that he did. In Matthew and Mark, the scene of the conversation in regard to the betrayer, which corresponds with the account in John, precedes the Supper, but Luke, who, however, has much that is not precise in the history of the Passion, places it after the Supper, (Luke xxii. 21.) As we must suppose the feet-washing to have taken place at the beginning of the meal, and these discourses are closely connected with it, we must, in consonance with Matthew and Mark, suppose that they preceded the institution of the Sacrament, a view which is confirmed by the fact, that v. 31, seq. form a suitable introduction to the institution. A conclusion could less safely be drawn from what is said in tr. Pesachim, c. 10, and Maimonides in Lightfoot, on Matt. xxvi. 26, in regard to the order of eating the Passover. After partaking of the Passover, two of the bread-cakes were solemnly consecrated, and wrapped about with bitter herbs were dipped into the sauce, with which part of the meal the breaking of the bread in the Lord's Supper would most naturally connect itself. If the ψωμίον, v. 26, is to be interpreted by reference to this, that feature of the institution certainly would not be very remote. Yet even in advance of the eating of the Passover, herbs and parsley were dipped in the sauce and handed about. The guests lay at the table supporting their heads with the left arm, which rested on the cushion, enabling the next person to

lean the back of his head upon the breast of the one who reclined by him. Just as characteristic of Peter as the delineation is vivid, is the curiosity of this Disciple to know to whom the Saviour alluded as his betrayer. When Strauss, from the preëminence assigned to John in this picture, draws proof that the author of this Gospel was an intriguer, who designed to give by it a preponderance to the party of John over that of Peter, we can only designate the author of such a fancy as a Rabulist, (pettifogging pleader.) The reading in v. 24, found in Cod. B C L and Origen, is worthy of remark: *καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· εἰπὲ, τίς ἐστιν, περὶ οὗ λέγει*, which implies that Peter presumed that John was already in the secret.

V. 27–30. Up to this moment we may suppose that there was a vacillation in the soul of the betrayer, whether he should execute his agreement or not; the increasing distinctness of the declarations of our Lord may have been in correspondence with the increasing distinctness of the purpose within the heart of Judas, and not until now, when his determination to give up his Lord, fully ripened, is fixed in his soul, (James i. 15.) can Jesus no longer endure his presence. On the comparative *τάχιον*, where we would look for the positive, (1 Tim. iii. 14, Acts xvii. 21,) see Winer, p. 219, (Eng. tr. p. 191.) If we are to imagine not merely that the words of Jesus, v. 27, but his declaration also, v. 26, were spoken aloud, we must interpret v. 28 under the supposition that the Disciples did not anticipate so speedy a performance of the deed of darkness, or at least did not dare to suppose that these words of the Lord which summoned Judas to the deed, were to be referred to it. On v. 29, see above, p. 313. It was night when the betrayer departed—certainly before midnight, for the Paschal Supper could not be prolonged beyond midnight, (tr. Pesachim, x. 9.) Olshausen observes, that the words, "it was night," *ἦν δὲ νύξ*, arouse in the reader a reflection on the affinity between the deed of Judas and the time and hour, but had the Evangelist designed this, he certainly would have used the word *σκοτία*, (darkness.)

DISCOURSE OF JESUS AFTER THE DEPARTURE OF THE BETRAYER. v. 31–38.

V. 31–33. Now the decisive moment has been reached as regards the cup of suffering, and at the same time as regards the glorification of God through Christ in humanity; Olshausen truly says: We are entering into the *Holy of Holies* in the Passion history. To what a pitch of exaltation we must suppose the Saviour's mind to have risen, is shown by the anticipation of the entire future which lies in the word "now," νῦν, a future which, as v. 33 renders still more clear, already stood before his soul as a thing of the present, (cf. xvii. 11,) although immediately afterward the future is again used. In what consists the being "glorified?" Must we not regard the δοξασμός, which is here spoken of in the proleptic aorist, as the same of which v. 32 speaks in the future? Most assuredly—here, too, chap. xii. 28 is to be compared. Bengel: Jesus passionem ut breve iter spectat et metam potius prospicit, "Jesus regards his sufferings as a short journey, and loves to look at the goal." As now he who becomes partaker of that glorification is the same person who utters in regard to himself the expressions, xiv. 11, xvii. 21, it is of course not the glorification of the human subject isolated from God that is meant, but rather this subject that is reflected in God himself. The glorification of God in Christ is God's becoming manifest in the world through him; the glorification of Christ in God is Christ's becoming hidden in him. According to Coloss. iii. 3, also, Christ is "hid in God," according to Acts iii. 21, he is at present hidden in heaven, according to both passages there is to follow upon this latency the yet higher grade of "appearing in glory," φανερωθῆναι ἐν δόξῃ.—The παρά, chap. xvii. 5, is in *substance* the same as ἐν in this place.[1]—On v. 33, cf. what we have said on viii. 21. In this expression we do not perceive a special *object*, but simply the utterance of sorrow over the necessity of separation.

V. 34, 35. The question arises, whether we can find a point in this discourse at which to introduce the institution of the Lord's Supper. The expositors remark a grooving between

[1] Olshausen feels himself obliged in v. 31 to give the preference to that interpretation of the phrase, "Son of man," ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, which has been maintained by us on chap. i. 52.

v. 32, 34, 35 and 36, yet it is possible to exhibit a connection, and the supposition that all was uttered in immediate succession, is admissible. The presumption, however, is pressed upon our notice, that v. 34 may refer to the Lord's Supper and may be connected with the institution of it, (Neander, Krabbe.) —When the expositors confined their view merely to the first half of v. 34, they felt a doubt as to the sense in which a command could be called new, which was found in the Old Testament, and pronounced by Christ to be the greatest in the Old Covenant, (Matt. xxii. 36, 38.) Some attempted to meet the difficulty by giving to *καινή* the unusual sense of "excellent," (Suicer, Wolf,) or of "ever becoming new," (Olshausen, who appeals to 1 John ii. 8, 2 John 5,) or adverbially, "renewedly," (Maldonatus;) others vindicated it by narrowing the sphere to which the commandment refers, regarding it as given exclusively for the circle of the Christian Church, (Grotius,) or exclusively for the Apostles, (Heumann,) or with reference to the obligation of the Christians both of Gentile and Jewish origin to love one another, (Le Clerc.) It was acknowledged already by Cyrill and Theophylact, that the newness lies in "as I have loved you," *καθὼς ἠγάπησα ὑμᾶς*, cf. xv. 12, but there is a want of justness in this interpretation, if it is understood to mean that this command is antithetical to the Old Testament command of love to our neighbor, Cyrill: *μέλλων ἀναβαίνειν εἰς οὐρανοὺς, θεμέλιόν τινα παντὸς ἀγαθοῦ τὸν τῆς ἀγάπης προκαταβάλλεται νόμον, ἀγάπης δέ οὐ τῆς κατὰ νόμον, ἀλλὰ τῆς ὑπὲρ νόμον. Ἐκεῖ μὲν γὰρ τὸ Ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον ὡς ἑαυτὸν, ἐνταῦθα δὲ τὸ, καθὼς ἠγάπησα ὑμᾶς, οὐχ ὡς ἑαυτὸν ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ ἑαυτόν*, "Being about to ascend into the heavens, he lays as a foundation of all good the law of love, of a love not according to the law, but of a love above the law. For there it stands: 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself,' but here, 'as I have loved you,' not then as thyself, but above thyself." But is it not rather true, that alike in an impure and a pure self-love exists a desire that others should be ready to sacrifice themselves for us, so that "to love our neighbor as ourself" embraces on our part an act of sacrifice of this very sort? There lies then in these words no antithesis to the Old Testament command, but if Christ in applying in general this word "new" to the "commandment," as he does to the "covenant" in the Lord's Supper, has used

it with a reference to the Old Covenant, it expresses *distinction* merely, not *antithesis*. The Old Testament may be diversely interpreted, the objective ideal of absolute love has first given it concrete shape. Here absolute self-renouncing love appears, the love of the high and holy for the lowly and sinful, (Rom. v. 6, 1 John iii. 16,) the love which regards it as more blessed to *give* than to receive, (Acts xx. 35,) the *all*-embracing love. Though the discourse points merely to the love of the Disciples to one another, yet their love was to be like that of *Jesus* to sinners, a love, therefore, which was to extend itself beyond their own narrow circle. It may be a matter of inquiry, however, whether Christ did not at the same time, if not exclusively, refer to his own earlier instructions, (Bengel, Knapp, Neander;) his death, which was so close at hand, would furnish the very occasion for speaking of that which had not previously been the subject of discourse, (xvi. 4.)—Brotherly love in *this* form had never been seen in the world, as it presented itself among these earliest confessors, cf. Acts iv. 32, ii. 46, seq. Neander's Denkwürd. Th. 1, p. 97, (Memorials of Christian Life, &c. translated by J. E. Ryland. London: Bohn, 1852,) Arnold, Abbildung der ersten Christen, B. 3, and the remarks on chap. xvii. 23. The heathen often exclaimed in amazement: (Tertul. Apol. c. 39,) "See how these Christians love one another, and how ready they are to die for one another!" In Minucius Felix, a heathen says of the Christians: "They love ere they know each other," and Lucian, in Peregr. says derisively of the Christians: "Their law-giver has persuaded them all to be brethren."

V. 36–38. The question of Peter seems to be connected with v. 33. Although the following is, according to the connection, simply a following into blessedness, yet we are led by ch. xxi. 22 and 18, to find in it an allusion to the death by martyrdom, so that the δύνασαι, perhaps, embraces also an ethical reference. Without a clear idea of the nature of the following, Peter simply thinks that danger is in the path, and is confident that he can brave it. Earnest yet forbearing is the tone of the question addressed to the Disciple who speaks so confidently, cf. in the synoptical Gospels, Matt. xxvi. 30, seq. Mark xiv. 26, seq. and especially Luke xxii. 31, seq.

CHAPTER XIV.

Comforting Discourses in reference to His death. v. 1–31.

It is worthy of attention, that the manner of expression in ch. xiv–xvi. has a decided and peculiar impress, whose prominent traits are a childlike tone, and a certain suspension and diffuseness in the character of the delineation. Not only do we frequently miss the connection and progress of the sentence, but even in the separate sentences, the thought, or at least the expression, (especially in xvi. 10,) is often not clear. As the peculiarity of character in these discourses renders them less easy to remember, so they actually give token that they have received from John that impress peculiar to him, which we observe in his first Epistle. The conversation of a characteristic sort, however, which is intermingled, xiv. 5, viii. 22, xvi. 17, and especially the misapprehension, xvi. 29, which could not have been invented, proves that we have not before us a mere fanciful subjective composition. Throughout the whole, too, is kept up a reference to the separation, and it is comprehensible psychologically, that this point of his history would be the very one at which Christ (to use Knapp's expression,) would begin to speak with the Apostles, remissiore animo et familiarius, ("with a freer mind and in a more familiar tone.") No where throughout the entire Gospel has the language of Christ such perfect artlessness, a character so adapted to the minds of his Disciples, as here, (xiv. 2, 3, 16, 18, 21, 23, xvi. 23, 24, 26,) as Luther says: "He speaks, as he must, who would charm and win the simple;" in using these

very expressions, then, for the purpose of doctrinal theology, there must not be too anxious an adherence to the letter.

V. 1. The Disciples were not indeed aware that their Lord was approaching a violent death, but they now knew and were troubled at the thought (xvi. 6,) that a separation, though it were but temporary, was before them. On the words πιστεύετε κτλ. Erasmus already remarks that they may be taken in four ways, πιστεύετε may be taken both times as imperative or as indicative, or the first time or the last as imperative or indicative. Luther translates both as indicative, Olshausen takes the second one as indicative and as a consequence of the first, in which case, however, the future would have been used; the Vulgate, Beza, Grotius, with more justice, regard the first as indicative; nevertheless, whether it be taken as a question or not, the second half cannot, without some violence, be attached to the first. It is better, therefore, to take both as imperative. Faith in God is faith in God's guidance and care, faith in Christ is faith in his word, (v. 11,) with a prominence of trust, (εἰς.)

V. 2, 3. At this very point where the discourse has so childlike an air, the reader has been led to take up a false impression by overlooking this very artlessness. We put a period after εἶπον ἂν ὑμῖν; because, however, the Greek and Latin expositors could not conceive of an assurance so childlike as would then lie in the sentence, (Calvin: si me unum maneret cœlestis gloria, nollem vos frustrari, "if glory in heaven awaited me alone, I would not have deceived you,") they connected εἰ δὲ μή — τόπον ὑμῖν, and the reading of a number of important witnesses, by which an ὅτι is put before πορεύομαι, has arisen from this interpunction, and from the interpolation of an ὅτι relativum after εἶπον, to give a clearer meaning. This reading, however, gives no clear sense whatever, see Lampe, Knapp. The discourse perhaps glances back in a comforting manner to xiii. 33; the assurance that there is room enough there, belongs to the domain of childlike conception, and cannot well be resolved into a distinct thought, as is the case also with the words, "I will come again," πάλιν ἔρχομαι, which the old interpreters referred to the general judgment, here represented as close at hand, at which Christ was to come for those raised from the dead, and Olshausen and Lücke interpret of his coming again

by the Holy Ghost: "every advance in spiritual communion with the glorified Redeemer augments in his Disciples the surety of the life of heavenly blessedness." On the other hand, in the words "to prepare a place," *τόπον ἑτοιμάσαι*, we may observe a fundamental idea, as Christ also is the mediator of the heavenly bliss, Calvin: naturâ exulat humanum genus a regno cœlorum, "mankind by nature live in exile from the kingdom of heaven."

V. 4–6. They might now have known that the *Father* in heaven was the goal, and *death* the path to that goal, but accustomed as they were to the figurative character of Christ's discourses, they are not certain as to his meaning here, and Thomas, intelligent and reflective, expresses this not without some agitation, in the words, "If we knew the goal we might perhaps surmise the way." The fourth verse had indeed spoken merely of the path and goal of Christ; as the Disciples, however, have the same path and the same goal, and as the question of Thomas, too, perhaps, also carried an allusion to this, Christ answers by giving a new turn to the thought, and now designates the Father as the goal, and *himself* as the way—to wit: for the Disciples.[1] Many regard *ζωὴ* as the leading idea, as for example, Grotius, who explains *ὁδός* as the *exemplar*, *ἀλήθεια* as the *doctrine*, *ζωὴ* as the *goal* and *issue*; according to the connection, however, the leading idea is rather *ἡ ὁδός*, as the explanatory *οὐδεὶς κλτ.* shows; too strong a distinction is drawn between the three ideas, when with Luther (viii. p. 71, ed. Walch,) and Calvin we interpret: "Ego sum principium (rudimenta fidei,) medium (perfectio fidei) et finis (beatitudo,) "I am the beginning, (the elements of faith,) the middle, (the perfection of faith,) and the end, (blessedness in heaven.)" On the other hand, however, it blends them too much, with Tittmann and Kuinöl, to connect *ἀλήθεια* merely adjectively with *ὁδός*, "*the true way to life*," Augustine: vera et vitalis via, "the true and life-giving way." *Ἀλήθεια* and *ζωή* rather express the mode *in which* Christ is the way, so that we may compare Hebrews x. 20, where Christ is called *ὁδὸς ζῶσα*, inasmuch as he is the life-giving way to the Father. Zwingle: Qui in Christo ambulat,

[1] Fritzsche, Opusc. p. 105, in order to avoid the supposition of a *turn* in the discourse, takes a wholly different view, according to which the connection between v. 5 and 6 is this: "He who is the way to God, as I am, clearly must, when he departs from men, go to God, and this can only come to pass by his laying off mortality."

nec falli nec mori potest, "he who walketh in Christ can neither be deceived nor die." From this then it follows, that true union with God must always be through Christ as its condition, (1 John ii. 23, 2 John 9;) De Wette, not improperly, adds: "The particularistic principle, that no man cometh to the Father but through Christ, in its bearing on those who have never known him as an historical personage, is softened by the fact that he is also the Eternal (ideal) Logos."

V. 7. *Ἐγνώκειτε*, not, with Luther and Kuinöl: "if ye knew," but "if ye had known." It is indeed singular that immediately on this our Lord seems to ascribe this knowledge to them. When indeed we compare the *præs.*, e. g. in verses 17, 19, the presumption offers itself that here, too, *γινώσκετε* and *ἑωράκατε* are to be taken in the sense of the future, that *ἀπάρτι* means "from henceforth," and that the *καὶ* before *ἀπάρτι* is adversative; but in *ἑωράκατε* the perfect excites a doubt, so that Chrysostom and Lampe, though they take *γινώσκετε* as future, yet in *ἑωράκατε* adhere to the meaning of the perfect, Chrysostom: "Soon will ye know him, and ye have already *seen* him, (to wit: without knowing him.)" Maldonatus, and more recently Fritzsche, decide that the taking the meaning as future, is entirely inadmissible; but is a prophetic prolepsis of this sort less admissible here, than with *δοξασθῇ*, v. 13? (Kuinöl, Lücke.) Still there is another mode of taking it which answers better, not indeed as it is presented in Olshausen, but as we have it in Calvin, Maldonatus, Grotius: *ἀπάρτι* in the sense of "even now," Calvin: Deum illis jam nunc conspicuum patere, si modo aperiant oculos, "God would now be revealed to them, if they would but open their eyes." An addition of this sort conveying a reproof, connects better with the preceding, than a promise full of hope would, and *ὁ ἑωρακώς—πατέρα*, v. 9, may then be regarded as a resumption.

V. 8, 9. As the Disciple does not understand in what sense the Father had already been seen by him, he desires such a manifestation as the prophets had; the *ἀρκεῖ ἡμῖν* has not indeed the same depth of meaning as Ps. lxxiii. 25, but exhibits an artless pious heartiness. In virtue of the unity with God, expressing itself in Christ's will, knowledge, and power, our Saviour had already, ch. viii. 19–42, pointed to the fact that

the invisible Father was to be seen in him, Bengel: Sicut anima, quæ per se non cernitur, cernitur ex eo, quod illa per corpus agit, etc., "as the soul in itself invisible, is seen by what it does through the body."

V. 10, 11. In regard to the reciprocal relation in this unity, see on x. 38. Christ points to the two manifestations by which they should recognize the unity, to wit: the words and the works. The want of congruity between the affirmative portion of the proposition and the negative is striking, as instead of ποιεῖ τὰ ἔργα we would expect λαλεῖ τὰ ῥήματα. Calvin, Nösselt, and others, have from this circumstance understood ἔργα to mean doctrina, but we have already recognized it as a peculiarity of John, that his counter propositions do not always exactly correspond, (cf. on viii. 28,) at times the substance of the second proposition goes beyond that of the first and embraces it, see especially 1 John i. 6, 7; it is, consequently, allowable with Bengel, Lücke, De Wette, to suppose that τὰ ἔργα comprehends the λαλεῖν. But a difficulty by no means slight presents itself in v. 11, where the ἔργα are mentioned in antithesis to the doctrine, and αὐτά, "the *very* works," seems to strengthen the assumption that ἔργα in v. 10 must have exactly the same meaning, (compare besides x. 38.) Although now we are willing to allow their full force to the objections urged by Fritzsche, (opusc. p. 109–114,) against a strict limitation of the idea, (in opposition to Lücke, who appears, however, completely to have overlooked them,) yet we cannot assent to the interpretation given by him, (and still earlier by Grotius:) "I speak not of myself, but the Father doeth the miracles which serve for confirmation;" for, 1) δέ, which clearly marks an antithesis, is thus looked upon as merely a connecting word; were it so used here, then the ἔργα, in order to be perspicuous, would absolutely require the addition of something, as perhaps, divinæ legationes documenta, (proofs of a divine mission;) 2) for consistency's sake, then, the meaning of "miracle" is retained by Fritzsche in v. 12 also, and μείζονα would then express a promise of *more extraordinary* miraculous acts. We suppose that even in a writer unlike John it would not seem too strange entirely, that the same word should be used successively, in a broader, and then with an allusive particle indeed, in a narrow-

er sense, but still less can this excite surprise in the case of a style whose character is so blending as John's.

V. 12–14. The discourse takes anew the direction of consolation, and the childlike form, as at the beginning of the chapter. The going to the *Father* corresponds to the sitting at the right hand of God, which, in accordance with the Old Testament usage, occurs in the first Evangelists, (Mark xvi. 19.) It designates, consequently, the entrance on the fullness of divine power, from which results the enlarged influence of Christ upon the world through the agency of his Disciples, a thought which had been expressed before, iv. 38, xii. 32, and is found again, xvi. 10, while the thought, that the Disciples would one day *do more remarkable miracles*, has nothing analogous elsewhere. We would say, therefore, that ἔργα has the same meaning here as in v. 11, "miraculous works," nevertheless, (in the same sense in which Lessing once said, that we are amply indemnified for the want of Christ's miracles, by seeing his prophecies in regard to the Church fulfilled,) the foundation of the Church itself may be designated as the greatest of miracles. If we only recall to our minds, that the number of Disciples whom Christ left upon earth hardly comprehended more than six hundred and twenty, (one hundred and twenty in Jerusalem, five hundred in Galilee,) that on the other hand, the result of the preaching on Pentecost alone was the conversion of three thousand souls, this expression does not seem surprising. Thus Luther: "The Apostles and Christians would *advance further* in their operations than Christ did, and bring more to him than he had done while in the body on earth.—Every single Christian is (through faith) such a man as Christ the Lord himself was upon earth, and executes such great things that he can govern the whole world in divine matters."—The medium of such great operations is the prayerful exaltation of believers to God in the name of the ascended Saviour. On ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ, compare Harless, Brief an die Epheser, p. 483, seq. Ὄνομα is the sum of a personality, Wahl interprets τὸ ὄνομα Ἰησοῦ: "Jesus, with all the ideas and all the memories connected with his name." To speak, pray in the name of any one, that is, having him present to the mind, having reference to him, and in the case before us the

reference may be of a subjective sort: "in trust upon Christ, and having his mind," and of an objective sort: "looking to the aim he had, and to his kingdom." The designation of the object of prayer by ὅ, τι ἄν, is, indeed, altogether a general one, nevertheless, all the objects of life should be settled with a reference to the kingdom of God. Already by his desire that prayer should be offered in *his name*, on which still more stress is afterward laid in chap. xvi. 24, Christ claims for himself the mediation through which prayer is heard, a claim still more strongly put forward in the words, "that will I do," ἐγὼ ποιήσω. The necessity for this mediation is apparently excluded in chap. xvi. 26, 27, but this appearance is simply the result of the childlike mode of expression, for in fact the mediation lies in that which in v. 27 of that very passage is given as the reason for which they will be heard.

V. 15–17. Another fruit of the departure to the Father, is the sending of the Spirit mediated ("I will ask," ἐρωτήσω,) and conditioned by it, (xvi. 7, Acts ii. 33, cf. on John vii. 39.) This Spirit is designated here, and in xv. 26, xvi. 13, as the Spirit of truth, πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, that is the Spirit who is the principle of truth and imparts the truth, (xvi. 13,) consequently the *gen. vossess. et effect.;* this truth, however, is not a power for the intellect merely, but for the feelings and the will also, and this Spirit is consequently called, v. 26, "the Holy Spirit," τὸ πν. τὸ ἅγιον. Bengel: veritas omnes in nobis virtutes veras facit, "truth makes all true virtues in us." This Spirit is distinct from the personality of Christ, is "another comforter," ἄλλος παράκλητος, and yet in v. 18 he is again conceived of as identical with Christ, for he is the power emanating from the personality of Christ, ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήψεται, says xvi. 14. This Spirit will become so immanent in the Disciples, that he, as we are told in Matt. xxviii. 20, of Christ himself, shall be with them "forever," εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. This promise is enhanced in v. 17, by the observation, that as man is partaker of this Spirit only by fellowship of life, the world has no means of receiving him; as γινώσκει is definitely distinguished from θεωρεῖ by οὐδέ, we may understand by the latter the perception, by the former the knowledge. That the present tenses follow immediately on this, is singular; the future ἔσται, it is true, according to Gries-

bach, alternates with them, but testimonies by no means light, read ἔστιν, it is therefore probably the so called absolute præs. which is here used, which expresses the circumstance, without reference to a particular time. On the idea expressed by παράκλητος, the Treatise by Knapp (Script. var. arg. p. 128,) deserves a reference. The first signification of παραχαλεῖν, is to *call hither*, then *to call* to one, *to exhort, to comfort.* Theodorus Mopsue., Ernesti and Michælis, adopted the meaning of *instructor*, Erasmus and Luther introduced that of *comforter*, a meaning which has also been defended by Van Hengel in his adn. ad Nov Testamentum, Amsterd. 1824, p. 40, seq. The former is philologically inadmissible, the latter certainly suits very well here, cf. v. 18, but does not suit in v. 26, xv. 26, xvi. 7, 8. In 1 John ii. 1, the meaning of "helper" is the acknowledged one, which is deduced from the originally passive form of the word, (compare the Latin advocatus;) it is current in the legal phraseology of the Greek, (see Reiske's Index to Demosthenes,) is found in Philo, (see Lösner,) and must have been very widely in use in the time of Christ, as the word has gone over into the Rabbinic also. This meaning suits in all the other passages, and here suits throughout, especially when we keep in view that Christ calls himself their previous παράκλητος, and in v. 18 says, he will not leave them orphans.[1]

V. 18, 19. The words sound as though the distinction between the Paraclete and Christ is removed, for inasmuch as he returns, in order that they may not be left orphans, he returns as a Paraclete. There are three modes in which ἔρχομαι may be taken, and it is important to adopt the right one. At v. 3, some writers had already thought that a return to the final judgment is meant, and the same view is entertained here by Augustine and Maldonatus, although the latter does not deny the difficulty lying in the fact that v. 23 indisputably must be understood of the adventus gratiæ. Most of the Greek expositors, as well as Erasmus, Beza and Heumann, under-

[1] Since Herder, (Christl. Schriften. Samml., iv. p. 86, seq.) this possession of the plenitude of the Holy Spirit has been reduced to the idea of an inspiration, a word, however, which designates every exaltation of emotion, whether that emotion be pure or false, so that in using it we still remain in the sphere of subjective humanity; but the Holy Ghost is the emanation from Christ in his exaltation, and his utterance is not merely that of exalted emotion; the expression *spirituating* will correspond better with the idea.

stand the return of Christ at his resurrection, a view favored by the *μικρόν*, and still more by xvi. 16, 20, 21. Nevertheless, we feel ourselves compelled to declare decidedly for the view, in which we are preceded by Luther, Calvin, Lampe, Flatt, (Symbolæ ad ev. Iohn. p. ii.,) the view which refers it to the spiritual coming through the Paraclete, and (for the present leaving out of view the reasons derived from ch. xvi.) we would merely observe, 1) that the connection with v. 21, 23, 28, leads to this view, 2) that *ζήσεσθε*, v. 19, on the opposite view would not allow of an explanation equally satisfactory, 3) that the dogmatic development of the idea of the Holy Spirit does not readily allow any other mode of apprehension. There comes then in the Paraclete another than Christ, and yet also Christ himself. Bengel: *Venio*, non *redeo*, adventus primi *continuationes* sunt cæteri potius quam *iterationes*, "I *come*, not I *return*, the other advents are rather *continuations* of the first, than *repetitions* of it." *Μικρὸν καί*, after the Hebrew מְעַט, so that *καί* is for *ὅτε*, as in the classics also *καί* in similar connection, (Viger, ed. Herm. p, 109.) *Ζῶ* first only of physical life, the present not in place of the future, but as a designation of time present, including the past, (see on viii. 25;) we may most appropriately compare Revelations i. 18, where the emphatic predicate, "he that liveth," *ὁ ζῶν*, is explained by the words, *ζῶν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων*, "I am alive forevermore;" *ζήσεσθε*, too, is then to be taken in the same sense, though here the spiritual reference may also be included.

V. 20, 21. A view of the effect of his exaltation, similar to that which our Lord had given, viii. 28, in speaking of its influence on his enemies; the promise that we have here, however, embraces more than that, for it implies that they should know him by experience as an internal principle, and v. 21 gives prominence to the conditions of the internal perception of Christ. Although the love which John defines is commonly considered as only a bliss of sensibility, yet it is in John preëminently that the moral feature of love, the unity of will with the object beloved, is constantly made prominent in the strictest manner, (1 John iii. 18, 24;) *ἔχων*, Augustine: Qui *habet* in memoria et *servat* in vita, "he that *hath* them in his memory and *keepeth* them in his life."

V. 22–24. Another of the interruptions which testify to the historical character of these communications. Judas Thaddeus, (Matt. x. 3,) who did not understand the spiritual nature of that revelation, and conformably to the current view, expected a manifestation of Messiah in glory before the whole world, is astonished that this revelation is to be confined to the limited circle of the Disciples who serve him. *Καί* in a question, as in ix. 36. On the phrase, *τί γέγονεν ὅτι*, Lücke remarks, that the Hebrew character has been *falsely* imputed to it by Grotius, but the evidence that such is its character is found in Ecclesias. vii. 10; for the Greek, cf. Kypke, Observ. The reply of our Lord, which especially in the negative part is devoid of formal exactness, is properly only an impressive repetition of v. 21, that his manifestation does not take place in an external manner, as that of a spirit perhaps, but by an internal appropriation.

V. 25, 26. The discourse already verges to its close, (v. 30.) What yet remains, our Lord commits to the teaching of the Spirit, who will come "in his name," *ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ*, that is, as his representative. As the words, *διδάξει*, "he will teach," and *ὑπομνήσει*, "bring to remembrance," are placed here side by side with each other, it seems that the Spirit will also teach something new, in the same way, xvi. 12, 16, with which xv. 15 is not in conflict. Now on the one side the Church of Rome, on the other, as Calvin has observed, the Fanatics and Pantheists, have with this word of our Lord supported themselves in the assumption, that a promise has been given of a continued revelation, whether through the Church as its organ, or through individuals. To cut off this interpretation, Grotius has referred the *ἃ εἶπον* to the *πάντα*, which *διδάξει* governs, Calvin and Gerhard have taken *καί* as explanatory. First of all let it be noted, that *πάντα* is not to be taken in a perfectly universal sense, but refers only to what has gone before, cf. on xvi. 13, xv. 5, and it may be then conceded that the *διδάξει* designates a distinct feature from that regarded by *ὑπομνήσει*, but after all, it merely amounts to the question, whether the blade in its relation to the seed, the stalk in its relation to the root, is to be called something else, or the same. This much is fixed and follows especially from xvi. 14, that the Spirit will only unfold what Christ has already given in prin-

ciple, cf. also, 1 John ii. 27, and observe how Paul, in opposition to those who would complete Christianity from without by philosophical tenets, urges the fact, that all the treasures of wisdom lie hidden in the counsels of redemption, (Coloss. ii. 3.) Hence, also, especially the controversial attacks of the Lutheran theologians upon the Church of Rome were directed not so much against the novelties of teachings as such, as against these novelties in so far as they *were out of harmony with the original ground.* We say, therefore, that διδάξει certainly refers to the doctrines of the propitiation, of the Church, &c., which were not stated in detail by Christ himself, and ὑπομνήσει to that invigorating influence, in virtue of which, what they had heard at an earlier period presented itself in new freshness to the souls of the Apostles.

V. 27. Amid the storms which lowered before them, their inward peace would prove abiding, resting as it did on this, that Christ had overcome the world, (xvi. 33;) when then, after his resurrection, as it were with a peace won by struggle, he stood among them, it was with the words so full of significance, εἰρήνη ὑμῖν: Peace be unto you, (xx. 19, 21, 26;) in virtue of the peculiar fountain of this peace, its own nature is peculiar, a fact pointed out by the words, "not as the world giveth," οὐ καθὼς κτλ. So peculiar was this very blessing esteemed, that "grace and peace," χάρις καὶ εἰρήνη, became the form of salutation among Christians. It is possible that the form was usual in bidding farewell; in the Old Testament, it is true, "peace be to you," שָׁלוֹם לָכֶם, was used as a form of comforting, but in the Rabbinical, "to give peace," נָתַן שָׁלוֹם, means "to greet," tr. Pirke, Aboth. c. 4, in Arabic, قال السلام, "he spoke the peace," is equivalent to, "he took his departure," and in the Syriac, ܢܫܕܘ ܠܗܘܢ ܫܠܡܐ, "they *gave* each other peace," (Assem. Bibl. Orient. i. p. 376.)

V. 28, 29. In the preceding verses Christ had expressed the thought, that his departure to the Father was something to be desired for the *Disciples'* sake, (xvi. 7,) now he mentions the consequence of that event as to his own person, cf. the expression of his longing after a return to the Father, in chap. xvii. 5. The words "my Father is *greater*, μείζων, than I," has been

made an important support for the Arians and Socinians. The orthodox polemical theology has replied in three modes; a number of the Anti-Nicene fathers, and Athanasius himself, vindicate the inferiority from the relation of the Father as "unbegotten," ἀγεννησία, and of the Logos as generated, and with them, of recent date, Olshausen concurs; Augustine refers to the distinction between God incarnate and God in himself; Chrysostom justifies the expression as one of accommodation to the infirmity of the Disciples. When, however, after the Reformation, the doctrine of the status exinanitionis and exaltationis was developed more fully, the interpretation of Augustine was opposed, on the ground that the inferiority must consist in something which the return of Christ to the Father would fully remove, consequently, not in the humanity itself, but only in the humanity in *its state of lowliness*, thus Luther: "For the kingdom which I shall receive at the right hand of the Father is over all, and it is better that I should pass from the earthly condition of meanness and infirmity into the power and dominion in which the Father is." Calvin: Non confert hic Christus patris divinitatem cum sua, nec humanam suam naturam divinæ patris essentiæ comparat, sed potius statum præsentem cœlesti gloriæ, ad quam mox recipiendus sit, "Christ does not here compare the God-head of his Father with his own, nor his human nature with the divine essence of the Father, but rather his present condition with that heavenly glory, into which he was soon to be received." [According to the *sense*, Storr correctly makes μείζων equivalent to *beatior*. There is no reference in it to the ample protection which his Disciples and his cause would thereby gain, (Theophylact, Euthymius, Lücke, De Wette,) for the subject of discourse here is, that which is gladdening as to his own person.—The Protestant interpreters explain it either exclusively of his subordination according to the human nature, inasmuch as this alone could go to the Father, (Hunnius, Gerhard,) or of his subordination according to the status exinanitionis, (Luther, Calvin, Beza, Luthardt,) or by a reference to both, (Eras. Schmidt, Calovius, Quenstedt.) Cf. Suicer, Thesaurus, ii. 1368; Quenstedt, Theol. didacpolem. i. 374. Only the humanity as *humbled* can be spoken of, for of the *exalted* humanity the μείζων in this sense no

longer holds good. Augustine: Quia naturæ humanæ gratulandum est eo, quod sic assumpta est a Verbo Unigenito, ut immortalis constitueretur in cœlo.]—The repetition of the expression, xiii. 19, does not seem here in v. 29 to have its fit occasion, but we have probably to gather from the entire context of the discourse, that the revelation of the power of Christ in his glory would furnish testimony to his dignity.

V. 30, 31. The Redeemer perceives in spirit the approaching steps of the betrayer, and sees in what he does the influence of the Prince of the world, who through him wishes to overthrow the kingdom of truth—*καί* is adversative. *Ἐν ἐμοί —οὐδέν* would be most easily interpreted if, with De Wette, we could venture to make the phrase, "he has nothing *in* me," (er *hat* nichts *an* mir,) interchangeable with "he cannot harm me," (er kann mir nichts *anhaben*,) which, however, is not allowable even in German; Meyer tries to reach the same idea by resolving the phrase thus: "*in* me, that is, within reach of my personality, he has nothing," equivalent to saying, "he has no power over me." As this interpretation also is violent, the exposition which takes *ἔχειν* in the sense, "to have influence," would suggest itself, were it not that the cases are rare in which it has this meaning without being followed by an infinitive, see Passow, 4th ed. ii. p. 588. If this difficulty be regarded as weighty, nothing remains but to take *ἔχειν* as meaning "to possess," and then either with a majority of the older writers, supplying nihil juris, (no right,) or to take *οὐδέν* in the sense of *οὐδὲν ἴδιον*, "nothing that he can call *his own*, that is, nothing sinful," thus Augustine, Olshausen. But it may well be questioned whether we are here to look in John for the thought expressed, Heb. ii. 14, that by means of sin the devil has the power of death over men. We would much more naturally expect here the thought expressed in x. 18, that Christ in encountering death rested under no outward necessity to do so. To this view v. 31 leads us, where the *ἐντολή* "command" is the same mentioned in x. 18.

CHAPTER XV.

The Allegory of the Vine.—v. 1–6.

The discourses that follow to chap xviiii. are connected with each other; that they were uttered on the way as they went by night out of the city (Grotius,) is hardly supposable, at least in the case of the prayer, ch. 17. It thus seems probable, that in the very intent of going, it happened, as is wont with persons about to depart, the impulse to communicate more still detained the Saviour in the room, (Gerhard.) We may compare the repeated forms of closing in Paul's Epistles, for example in the Epistle to the Romans.

V. 1. To everything that is uttered in this chapter, as in the allegory with which it opens, the feeling that the hour of separation has come, imparts its tone. Departing, yet remaining—this is the thought that lies at the root of this beautiful allegory. We may imagine that it was suggested by some outward occasion, a vine perhaps trailing by the side of the window. In Psalm lxxx. 9–12, also, the congregation of Israel had been compared to a vine nurtured by God, and sending its tendrils far and wide. The *natural* relation between this plant and its branches shooting forth in all the glories of their noble fruit, is realized in its most perfect sense (ἡ ἀληθινή) in the *spiritual* relations between Christ and those that are his. That which Paul says of the mystical unity of the Redeemer with his Church, has found its most beautiful expression in this passage in John; it is impossible here to be mistaken in referring this discourse to a higher relation than that which subsists between teacher and pupil in general; it speaks of an *essential* unity

mediated through faith. The drapery is not that of the parable, it is no *event* in history, but a *relation* in the world of nature which is spoken of, and this is employed from the commencement, to express a spiritual relation, so that the literal and figurative meaning run over into each other, cf. ἐν ἐμοί, v. 2 and 4. Under γεωργός, equivalent to ἀμπελουργός, Luke xiii. 7, we have here at the same time to find the idea of a possessor; the Father, who hath sent the Son into the world, is the possessor and fosterer of the vine together with its branches.

V. 2. There is a distinction made between two kinds of branches, unfruitful and fruitful, the αἴρει in relation to the former is explained in v. 6. Ἐν ἐμοί cannot express the relation as it is in fact, but only as it *seems* to be, since a real connection with Christ must of necessity bring fruit with it. The fruit-bearing of the genuine branches is subject to the law of gradual progression, and presupposes the fostering care of God. This is figuratively designated by καθαίρειν, "to purify, purge," (verbal play with αἴρειν,) by which in the language of vine-dressers is understood the "*deputatio*," the pruning away of the suckers, "that is the bastard or false shoots which bring no fruit and do nothing but waste the sap, which the good fruitful branches should have," (Luther.) In the application, the image may be taken yet more strictly, and by giving prominence to the feature of pain which cutting brings, may be referred to purification through affliction, (James i. 1–4.) It may be asked, whether the fruit-bearing is to be understood ad extra or ad intra, whether of the extension of the Gospel (Rom. i. 13, John iv. 36,) or of growth in spiritual life. As regards the *thing*, the two are inseparable, for he that is in the *light*, will also *shine;* to sustain the second of the meanings we might cite ποιεῖν οὐδέν, (in v. 5,) and v. 8; and on the other hand for the first, v. 16—but it is in general best not to separate them. It is very probable that the Redeemer had been led by the imperfection which was then characteristic of these very Disciples, to point them to growth under the fostering care of the Father. And this is the thought which leads to v. 3.

V. 3, 4. As the Redeemer, in xiii. 10, 11, had already declared that his Disciples were in the main already pure, and needed but the purifying of the extremities, he here returns to this

ground. In Coloss. iii. 9, 10, it is also said that they who have already put on the new (*νέον*) man, must continually *become* new, (*ἀνακαινούμενον.*) The word received in faith, is a principle ever purifying more and more, (v. 7, xvii. 17, Acts xv. 9.) According to Paul's explication of the doctrine, we are to understand by this "word," *λόγος*, especially "the word of the righteousness of God," *λόγος τῆς δικαιοσύνης τοῦ θεοῦ.* As v. 4 refers to the necessity of *remaining* in Christ, (viii. 31,) it contains at the same time an allusion to the necessary unfolding of that principle. *Κἀγὼ ἐν ὑμῖν* at first seems to be capable of no other construction than as a *promise*, (Euthymius, Calvin, Lücke,) but if we consider v. 5, the sense of the Evangelist seems to be that which is given by Bengel: Facite, ut maneatis in me et ut ego maneam in vobis, "so act that ye may remain in me and that I may remain in you." Augustine thus expresses the diversity in their mutual relation: Ita in vite palmites sunt, ut viti non conferant sed inde accipiant, unde vivant; ita vero vitis est in palmitibus, ut vitale alimentum subministret eis, non sumat ab eis, "the branches are in the vine not so as to impart anything to it, but so as to derive their life from it; the vine is in the branches in such a way as to minister to them the vital aliment, not in such a way as to receive it from them."

V. 5, 6. A strengthened expression of the same thought. The abiding in Christ through faith is so necessary a condition to the bringing forth fruit, that the one is not possible without the other. That *οὐδέν* is not to be taken as absolutely universal, but is to be limited to the sphere of religion, and particularly to inward and outward activity in the kingdom of God, is self-apparent in this passage, as in a similar restriction of *πάντα* in 1 John ii. 20. The result of not abiding in him is made yet more obvious than it had been by *αἴρει* in v. 2. The withered branch is used as fuel, (Matt. vi. 30,) in which may lie an allusion to the fire of hell, similar to that in Heb. vi. 8, and then the words "he is cast forth," *βληθῆναι ἔξω*, correspond with the separation of the bastard wheat mentioned in Matt. xiii. 41. The aor. *ἐβλήθη* and *ἐξηράνθη*, explained by Grotius as designating "what is usually done," are rather, as also *ἐδοξάσθη*, v. 8, to be interpreted, as has been done by Kühner: (ii. p. 78,) "The aorist like the perfect, but with far greater emphasis, is

used to designate future events, of whose impending occurrence the speaker is as firmly convinced as he is of facts that have already occurred."

FURTHER PROMISES AND EXHORTATIONS IN REGARD TO ABIDING IN CHRIST.—V. 7–17.

V. 7, 8. If a connection between v. 7 and 8 is to be established, it must be this, that v. 8 subjoins the reason of the promise in v. 7. The medium through which the fruit-bearing of the Disciples is brought about is faith, and prayer is an essential exhibition of that faith, (xiv. 13.) The hearing of prayer is promised to the widest extent, but nevertheless has its limitation, in the fact that only such prayer is spoken of as proceeds from inmost union with Christ, and herein consequently lies also a direction how to pray. In ἐδοξάσθη, as we have observed on v. 6, there is a prolepsis of the future. If we take ἵνα after the relative more strictly, we must find in the verb the idea of striving; see, however, v. 12, and what is said on vi. 50. Instead of γενήσεσθε, Lachmann reads γένησθε, which is supported, however, by testimony so slight as to stamp it at once as a mere marginal correction; the καί is the καί of sequence, "and so will ye be." On the dative ἐμοί, cf. Winer, p. 198.

V. 9–11. An explanation more at large in regard to the nature of remaining in Christ, and in v. 11 a statement of the object of the previous discourse. The relation of love between Christ and his Disciples is, according to v. 10, an ethical one, it rests on the same ethical basis as the love of the Father to the Son, (viii. 29,) for ἀγάπη ἡ ἐμή cannot mean amor mei, "love of me," (Grotius,) consistently either with philology or with the connection. In regard to τηρεῖν, see remarks on viii. 51.— V. 11. What had been said of their remaining one with the departing Redeemer, was under these circumstances a source of joy; in the same way xvii. 13, by which passage, too, the ἡ χαρὰ ἡ ἐμή here is to be interpreted, cf. also, ἡ εἰρήνη ἡ ἐμή, xiv. 27. As it is with the peace which he imparts and which proceeds from him, so also is it with his joy, (Calvin, De Wette.) Ἡ χαρὰ πληροῦται, is a phrase peculiar to John, 1

John i. 4, 2 John 12, found also in his Gospel, xvi. 24, xvii. 13, and expresses the absolute character of this joyousness.

V. 12, 13. Among the "commandments," *ἐντολαί*, mentioned in v. 10, that all-embracing "commandment," *ἐντολή*, which was delivered, chap. xiii. 34, is made prominent, and by the words, "As I have loved you," *καθὼς ἠγάπησα ὑμᾶς*, v. 13 is developed to its highest capacity. The final proposition with *ἵνα* in v. 13, dependent on *ταύτης*, serves here, as in 3 John 4, to periphrase the infinitive. To bring the expression into consonance with Rom. v. 7, 8, 10, we might say, that by the offering up of Christ, the Disciples were first converted from enemies into true friends; yet John had not this reference distinctly in his mind, and the discourse certainly had in view only the relation of friends which already existed.

V. 14–16. An intimation that they were not yet to the fullest extent worthy of the exalted name of friends, but were to render themselves more and more worthy of it, cf. v. 10, they obtained this name for the time, only because of the confidential relation in which they were united with Christ. The words, "all things that I have heard of my Father I have made known unto you," *πάντα—ὑμῖν*, at first seem to be in conflict with xvi. 12, but rather are the words, "that I have heard," *ἃ ἤκουσα*, to be limited to what the Redeemer had received to impart to them at that time, (xvii. 8.) The formation of this relation of friendship had originated with our Lord. The *ἐκλογὴ* is not simply "a choosing" to the Apostolic office, but at the same time "the choosing out of the world," *ἐκλογὴ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου*, (v. 19;) the words, "that ye should go," *ὑπάγειν*, pertain only to the picturesque delineation, (Matt. v. 24, xviii. 15,) the fruit (whether in them, or in others,) is of such a sort as to continue in life eternal, and by it is brought about so intimate a relation with the Father, that their prayer finds hearing, cf. remarks on v. 7.

V. 17. *Ταῦτα* (instead of *τοῦτο*, see Boissonade, on Aristæn. p. 436,) might be referred to the subsequent proposition *ἵνα κτλ.* so that this love among one another, would, as it were, be commended as a compensation for the enmity they would encounter in the world, and of which v. 18, seq. speaks, but *ταῦτα* in John always refers to what has preceded, (v. 11, 21, xiv. 25,

xvi. 1, 25, 33, xvii. 1, xviii. 1.) Thus then it is rather the preceding discourses (and commandments,) which are once more summed up according to their main scope.

ENMITY OF THE WORLD TOWARD THE DISCIPLES. — v. 18–27.

V. 18–20. As the principle which wrought in the Redeemer continues to work through his Disciples, (xvii. 14,) and as for the reasons mentioned, chap. vii. 7, the world encounters him in a hostile manner, this experience is one which the Disciples can not be spared. The expression in xiii. 16, is here brought to remembrance in a different application. *Εἰ*, with the indicative, v. 20, supposes two cases, without any further indication which of the two will occur, v. 21 first shows that the occurrence of the negative case is anticipated.

V. 21–25. By *ἁμαρτία*, v. 22–24, is understood by the expositors, as in ix. 41, the sin of unbelief, against which view De Wette urges the objection, that it is self-apparent that this sin could not have been charged upon them if Jesus had not come and preached. We think that it follows from v. 23, that by *ἁμαρτία*, in v. 22, is intended the guilt of hatred against divine things in general, so that the connection of the thought is this: The hatred toward you rests upon aversion to me, and this rests upon ignorance of the Father. Had I not appeared, this ignorance, and the aversion to what is divine connected with it, would have been comparatively guiltless, but after I have revealed the Father by my appearing and by my instructions, they are the more culpable. As in x. 37, xiv. 11, the works are introduced as a yet more striking testimony, (*τὰ ἔργα* forms the climax to *ἐλάλησα*,) and these are regarded as at once a testimony for the Father and the Son, (xvi. 3.) In regard to the double *καί* in v. 24, see on vi. 36. The quotation from Ps. lxix. 5, in v. 25, answers the same end as the one in chap. xiii. 18.

V. 26, 27. As viii. 28 points to the future for consolation against the prevailing unbelief, so also here, (xvi. 8.) That the words, "which proceedeth," *ἐκπορεύεται*, can not be understood of an immanent process in the God-head, consequently, can neither be used for nor against the doctrine of the Greek Church in regard to the "procession of the Holy Spirit," Beza

had already observed. [According to the Ancient Church, this *ἐκπορεύεσθαι* involves the origin within the Trinitarian relation, of the essence of the *πνεῦμα;* the Greek Church taught, consequently, that *διὰ τ. υἱοῦ, ἐκ τ. πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται τ. πν.* (Damascenus, de fide orthodox, i. 12.) The Latin Church, on the contrary, as she transferred to the *procession* of the Holy Ghost what is said of his *sending* from the Father *and* the Son, believed herself justified in adding the filioque, (Gerhard, Loci, i. 127.) It may certainly be a question whether the *ἐκπορ.* is to be conceived of as a metaphorical designation of relation without reference to time, as the Lutheran interpreters, (with a few exceptions,) and also in our day, Olshausen, Lücke, Baumgarten-Crusius, regard it, or is to be taken as parallel historically with *πέμπειν*, (Beza, Cocceius, Lampe.) Neither the argument of Gerhard *for* the former view, nor that of Lampe *against* it, renders a decision secure, (Twesten, Dogmatik, ii. 241.]—Although the "testimony," *μαρτυρία*, of the Spirit is mediated through the human "testimony," *μαρτυρία*, of the Disciples, yet the latter is here made coördinate with the former. Luther: "When ye shall have been comforted by the Holy Ghost, and your mind has been supported by fixed truth, he will impel you to testify of me. For first, he will give testimony internally in your hearts, and then outwardly by miracles and through your confession and preaching." *Καί—δέ*, "but also," the present *μαρτυρεῖτε*, expresses the enduring character, and is equivalent to *μάρτυρές ἐστε*, (Acts i. 18,) the present, *μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐστε*, includes the past, as viii. 25; with *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς*, cf. Acts i. 21, 22, John himself bears this testimony, 1 John i. 1. We have here then both the historical argument, from which the fides humana proceeds, and the testimonium spiritus, on which the fides divina rests.

CHAPTER XVI.

CHRIST ANNOUNCES MORE DISTINCTLY THE PERSECUTIONS TO WHICH HIS DISCIPLES WOULD BE EXPOSED, AND COMFORTS THEM BY POINTING THEM TO THE WORKING OF THE HOLY SPIRIT. — v. 1–15.

V. 1–3. *Ταῦτα* alludes to xv. 18–27, (cf. remarks on xv. 17,) there follows, however, an expanding repetition of the same train of thought; in v. 2–4 is depicted the opposition of the world, and then is given the comforting reference to the operation of the Holy Spirit. In v. 2 the Redeemer, as the words, "shall put you out of the synagogues," "think that he doeth God service," *ἀποσυναγώγους* and *λατρείαν προσφέρειν τῷ θεῷ* prove, had in his eye the species of persecution which would shortly threaten his Disciples, persecution on the part of the Jews. The less important is the exclusion from the synagogue, (ix. 22,) with *ἀλλά*, "yet more," (Acts xix. 2,) the severer one is added. *Ἵνα*, periphrasis of the infinitive, as in xii. 23, xiii. 1. *Προσφέρειν*, the solemn term for the offering of sacrifice, so that *λατρεία* does not thereby obtain the meaning of sacrifice, but only a more special reference to it. Inasmuch as heretics were persecuted for *the sake of God*, the persecution itself appeared as a service, a worship of God. But this blindness was not guiltless, inasmuch as the true knowledge of God must have led them to acknowledge the cause of Christ, (xv. 23.)

V. 4–6. *But*—that is, although this, in their defect of divine knowledge, might be expected. That Christ had not spoken "at the beginning," *ἐξ ἀρχῆς*, of these persecutions, appears to be in conflict with Matt. v. 10, x. 16. When Bengel replies:

Dixerat de odio mundi sed *minus aperte et parcius*, "he had spoken of the hatred of the world, but *less openly and more sparingly*," and when I observed: "Our Lord now *dwells* upon it," De Wette gainsays the view, and says: "This belongs to the hushing up style of harmony so much in favor." Such a declaration, however, cannot be made without the grossest misapprehension of the character of these last discourses, and without hermeneutic inconsequence. This expositor himself has repeatedly acknowledged the hovering character and the inexactness in John's style, especially in these last discourses, for example, in x. 26, xv. 14, 15, xvi. 5, 10. It was most natural at the time of Christ's departure, that his glance should be particularly directed to the sufferings yet impending, and no where else has he spoken so repeatedly and at large of the opposition of the world to his Disciples, as in chap. xv. to xvii. That it is the departure which leads to these thoughts is shown by the ὅτι—ἦμην. In the same way, too, on v. 5, De Wette remarks, that there is a contradiction to xiii. 36, xiv. 5, and as a solution of the difficulty in this place, where the Evangelist seems to come in conflict *with himself*, merely makes the remark: "There is a want of precision of statement, as in x. 26, &c." Chrysostom already attached to the question of Christ, the sense: Hitherto ye could ask me so many questions, and now ye are dumb and plunged into sorrow. Yet Christ does not merely reprove them in a general way for asking no questions, but—proceeding on his own view of the glorious issues of his "going his way to the Father," ὑπάγειν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα—he encourages them to allow themselves to be absorbed in this thought.

V. 7–11. He gives prominence to that result, which would furnish the most direct comfort to his Disciples, as in xiv. 12, seq., xv. 26. Instead of the ἀμὴν, ἀμήν, "verily, verily," of the first of those passages, there is here an assurance, in a childlike form, of the truth of what he utters, as in xiv. 2. For the reasons why the coming of the Spirit has been connected with his departure, see remarks on vii. 37. Augustine: Si alimenta tenera, quibus vos alui, non subtraxero, solidum cibum non esurietis, "if I should not take away the tender aliment on which I have fed you, ye would not hunger after solid food."

The beneficent working of the Spirit, is first of all that extension of truth in the *world*, of which mention is made in xv. 26, since the world will be convinced of its own *unbelief*, of the *innocence* of Christ, and of the absolute triumph which Christ is to gain over the kingdom of evil, (this "reproving," ἔλεγχος, continually moves on through the history of the world, cf. the present πιστεύουσι,) the beneficent operation mentioned in verses 12, 13, is consequently the same spoken of xiv. 26, the development of the truth in the *Disciples* themselves. Ἐλθών giving clearness to the representation, as in Eph. ii. 17. Ἐλέγχειν designates a conviction on a charge of wrong, which, in as far as it has that character, is to be conceived of as not without a certain pain. Since Beza, Bengel, it has been usual to get the more particular aim of the three substantives in v. 8, by adding to complete the sense, the subjects derived from v. 9 to 11, consequently "of the sin of the world, of the righteousness of Christ, of the judgment of the prince of this world," περὶ ἁμαρτίας τοῦ κόσμου, περὶ δικαιοσύνης τοῦ Χριστοῦ, περὶ κρίσεως τοῦ ἄρχοντος τοῦ κόσμου, according to which interpretation the ἐλέγχειν embraces the begetting of faith in the persecutors. Another exposition, in which μοῦ is not added to δικαιοσύνης to complete the sense, has again, at a recent date, been maintained by De Wette. Ἐλέγχειν, according to this view, designates in part externally the triumphant preponderance of the truth, so that its opponents are brought to shame, in part internally the effecting of a clear consciousness of guilt; the words: "of sin, because they believe not on me," περὶ ἁμαρτίας ὅτι οὐ πιστεύουσιν εἰς ἐμέ, are intended to express the idea, that the world over against the growing mass of believers, is to be exhibited more and more as standing under the wrath of God, and for the very reason that it believes not; "of righteousness," περὶ δικαιοσύνης, designates the light and life which Christ has brought into the world, (the righteousness, therefore, both of Christ and of believers,) and which will be carried on by the Spirit, to victory; the "judgment," κρίσις, is the result of the conviction alike as regards the "sin," ἁμαρτία, and the "righteousness," δικαιοσύνη. Calvin, also, gives a similar explanation: "The Spirit, conformably to the order of salvation, will first work the knowledge, that out of Christ sin reigns in the

world, then he will work the hungering after true righteousness, that is after justification by faith, (Matt. v. 3, 6,) then finally the conviction, that only through Christ this want of harmony may be removed." This interpretation can plead for itself, especially the fact that on the view it presents it is easier to account for δικαιοσύνης standing absolutely, than if after the ordinary view we understand by it the personal innocence of Christ, in which case a μοῦ could hardly be dispensed with. Not a few of the older expositors have for this reason understood δικαιοσύνῃ, in Paul's sense, of the δικαιοσύνη ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, the justification by faith, Cyrill, Augustine, Erasmus, Luther, Melancthon, Lampe and Storr. Melancthon says: Hanc ipsam rationis humanæ opinionem accusaturum esse spiritum affirmat, quæ fingit homines esse justos, id est habentes remissionem peccatorum propter propria honesta exercitia et virtutes, "he declares that the Spirit will accuse this very opinion of human reason, which feigns that men are righteous, that is have remission of sin, on account of creditable actions and virtues of their own." In this case v. 10 has the meaning: "for after my propitiating death I will ascend to my Father, to make a way of access for believers into my kingdom." The fact that Christ does not speak of his death, but of his glorification, as the origin of the righteousness, is not in conflict with this mode of understanding it, since his death, only by victory over death becomes a death with propitiatory power, (John viii. 28, Rom. iv. 25.) Nevertheless, the doctrinal type connected with this view of "the righteousness," is entirely peculiar to Paul, and stands in connection with an entire circle of expressions, (Storr, de voce δίκαιος et cognatis, Opusc. ii.) Where John uses the word δικαιοσύνη, it designates unblamableness of conduct, (1 John ii. 29, iii. 7, 10,) and it is worthy of note, that he is the very author who has given to Christ the predicate ὁ δίκαιος, (1 John ii. 29, iii. 7.) This circumstance strengthens the expositor in the conviction, that in v. 10 in the case of δικαιοσύνης the subject is to be drawn from the explanatory proposition following ὅτι, as in the two other sentences, v. 9, 11. Against the view of De Wette, however, remain besides the special objections: 1) "The statement that the world out of communion with Christ, is unredeemed, and so long as it believes not, rests under the

wrath of God, belongs to the doctrinal preaching of the Gospel to those yet unacquainted with the Gospel, not to the ἔλεγχος, of the world which actually persecutes the Gospel." 2) "The words, 'because they believe not,' ὅτι οὐ πιστεύουσιν, do not state the operation of the unbelief, but the fact that the world is unbelieving," (Lücke.) That the δικαιοσύνη designates the unblamableness of Christ, is the interpretation of Chrysostom, Euthymius, Beza, Bengel, Tittmann, Lücke and Olshausen, though the last author connects with it a reference to the δικαιοσύνη in believers: "The Spirit convinces of the righteousness, for he reveals how the Saviour, who no longer is the object of corporeal vision, yet works invisibly and perfects the internal life." The absence of the μοῦ after δικαιοσύνη, will excite less surprise, when we compare vii. 17, x. 29, and other passages. To the view maintained by us, no slight support is given by the analogous thought in 1 Timothy iii. 16: "was manifest in the flesh, justified (ἐδικαιώθη,) in the Spirit."—The explanatory proposition, v. 10: "because I go to my Father, and ye see me no more," ὅτι—θεωρεῖτέ με, certainly makes some difficulty in the way of our exposition; we must agree with De Wette, that instead of the negative καὶ οὐκέτι θεωρεῖτέ με, we would rather have looked for καὶ ὑμεῖς θεωρεῖτέ με, (xiv. 19,) inasmuch as the experience of the operation of the Spirit with and in the Disciples, must certainly confirm the faith in the δικαιοσύνη, whether we understand by it his *personal* holiness, or the life which emanates from him. There is certainly in the case of John a special temptation to suppose, that while he wrote this negative proposition, he actually in thought included with it the positive ὑμεῖς δὲ θεωρεῖτέ με, as xiv. 19. If this be regarded, however, as untenable, it may be enough to say, that the expression merely conveys in a negative way what is presented positively by πρὸς τὸν πατέρα ὑπάγω, (I go to my Father.) Inasmuch as the departure to the Father is the condition on which depend all the operations of Christ glorified, there lies in it, also, the reason whereby the Spirit will convince the world that Christ died as a spotless offering.—On the tenor of v. 11, cf. remarks on xii. 31.

V. 12, 13. From the efficacy of the Spirit on the world, the discourse makes a transition to his efficacy in the Disciples.

The greatest truths, which formed the centre of the Apostles' doctrine, as that of the propitiation, that of the Church, of the abrogation of the law for believers, and various other truths, had been indeed intimated by Christ in detached sentences, or had been expressed in principle, but the Disciples were not ripe for a full comprehension of them. *Βαστάζειν*, used also in Epictetus, Enchir. xxix. 5, of sufficiency of power, and not merely of intellectual power, but also, as this lies in the nature of religious intelligence, sufficiency of the ethico-religious development, cf. *χωρεῖν*, Matt. xix. 12. The reconciliation with xv. 15, lies in the fact that the things which they could not yet bear, Christ had not heard *for them*. *Πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν*, (Cod. A B, Origen, *εἰς τήν ἀλ. πᾶσαν*,) should not have been translated by Luther, [so English version, also. Tr.] "into *all* truth," (Mark v. 12, he translates correctly,) but should have been rendered, "into the *whole* of the truth." It is the domain then of Christian truth, which through Christ has come into the world, (i. 17,) which has been opened through its whole extent to the Apostles. There is included here all that is communicated in regard to the expansion of the kingdom of God, (according to Calvin, only what is taught of its spiritual nature,) and in regard to the eschatology, Bengel: Maxime huc spectat apocalypsis scripta per Ioannem, "the Revelation of John pertains most of all to what is here spoken of." In the proposition whose form is so childlike, *οὐ γὰρ—λαλήσει*: "He shall not speak of himself, but whatsoever he shall hear that shall he speak," the thought, as also in v. 14, obviously is, that the communication shall not be something absolutely new, but the unfolding of that given to them by Christ, cf. on xiv. 26. As a matter of course, too, the "things to come," *ἐρχόμενα*, are included in "whatsoever he shall hear," *ὅσα ἂν ἀκούσῃ*, (cf. *ἀναγγελεῖ*, v. 14, 15. 25.) According to Lücke, after "whatsoever he shall hear," *ἀκουσῃ*, we should supply *ἐκ τοῦ πατρός*, "of the Father," to sustain which, he appeals to xv. 15, 26; according to Kling and Olshausen, because of v. 14, 15, we should supply *ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ*, "of the Son." Luther says: "There is a holy conversation between the Father and the Word, and the Spirit is the hearer." The words in v. 15, *πάντα—ἐστι*, "all things that the Father hath are mine," would lead to the belief that *ἐκ τοῦ πατρός*

should be supplied after ἀκούσῃ, and that v. 14, 15, are designed to expand this thought and to include the Son. According to the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church, this ὁδηγήσει is continued in the Church of Rome also, since even of the Apostolic times it was still true in a certain measure: οὐ δύνασθε βαστάζειν ἄρτι, "ye cannot bear them now;" according to the Quakers and Mystics, this revelation of the Spirit goes on in the illuminated in general or in particular theosophists, according to the Hegelians, in the entire Christian world, in which the principle of free subjectivity is ever unfolding more widely. That Christ had the Apostles alone in his mind, is proven, especially by xiv. 26, and xv. 26, 27; inasmuch then as the πᾶσα ἡ ἀλήθεια is promised to them, there cannot exist between the Church and the Apostles that relation of further development which existed between the Apostles and Christ. In consonance with this, is the consciousness of the oldest post-apostolic teachers, for the Epistles of Barnabas, of Clemens Romanus, and of Polycarp, prove that they acknowledged a specific difference between themselves and the Apostles, and acknowledged the Apostolic teaching as the absolute rule for themselves and the whole Christian world, see the passages in Tholuck's Comment. z. Br. an d. Heb. 2d ed. p. 96. Consequently the further development in the Church through the Spirit, can only be regarded as one pertaining to the form, cf. the fuller discussion in the introduction to Ep. to the Hebrews, chap. vi.

V. 14, 15. All religious truth within Christianity, as regards its centre, rests upon Christ himself, what, therefore, the Spirit receives and reveals more fully, must serve to glorify Christ, and must proceed from Christ as its source.

V. 16. This communication of the Spirit, in which Christ himself returns, is soon to follow, cf. xiv. 19. Although the πάλιν μικρόν, and especially the description of the joy at beholding him again, perhaps, also, the ὄψομαι ὑμᾶς, v. 22, have led expositors to refer these words yet more decidedly than xiv. 19, to the time of the resurrection,[1] yet this verse stands in such

[1] Not merely those expositors who took xiv. 19 in that way, not merely all the Greeks explain this passage of the resurrection, but even Augustine does so; and Luther himself, who interpreted xiv. 19, of seeing him again both at his resurrection

a connection with the earlier and with the following ones, as to compel us to refer them to a seeing him again in the Spirit. In the verses immediately preceding, the sending of the Spirit was the subject of discourse, and v. 21–26 link with this seeing him again, the promise of a spiritual change such as was not wrought by the resurrection. It might certainly be possible that the resurrection of Christ, (inasmuch as when he had risen he could be looked upon as belonging to earth no more, and as he indeed appeared but transiently with the Disciples,) may be considered the beginning of the δοξασμός, and consequently embraced in one with the coming of the Spirit, and be represented as a continuous thing with it, in which case xx. 22 could properly be compared. It would be an analogous relation if John designated not merely the new birth, but the susceptibility for the Gospel also, as an εἶναι ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, (viii. 47,) or if he represented the φῶς in men as an indwelling of the λόγος in men. Verses 20, 21, might especially induce to the adoption of this view. But considered with reference to the Disciples, Christ risen had throughout a different signification from Christ glorified, and according to Luke xxiv. 49, Acts i. 8, we must believe that the outpouring of the Spirit presupposed the ascension as a thing accomplished.

V. 17, 18. Some of the Disciples confer together in regard to the enigmatical discourse, in which the words, μικρόν—ὄψεσθέ με, are as obscure to them as the last part of it. Ἔλεγον οὖν seems to imply that μικρόν gave them special difficulty.

V. 19–21. It certainly seems obvious here, that we are to think of their seeing him again after his resurrection, not so much because the period of time corresponds with the doubled μικρόν, (from midnight, about which time this discourse falls, to the hour of the afternoon at which Christ died, was about eighteen hours, and from his death to his resurrection, about thirty,) but especially, also, because the resurrection was certainly a joy to the Disciples, and it would be surprising if this joy were wholly unmentioned, and we were compelled to see only a reference to that spiritual joy which proceeded from the posses-

and in the Spirit, giving predominance to the latter reference, here makes the former predominate. The most recent defense of the reference of xiv. 18, seq. and of this passage to seeing Christ again personally, is that of Süszkind, Tüb. Mag. für Dogm. u. Moral. St. 7, p. 184, seq.

sion of the Holy Ghost. For this reason, as has been observed, there has been a disposition to regard as included the seeing him again after the resurrection. Yet it cannot be the main feature in the matter, as the last words in v. 21 already prove. The similitude now draws a parallel first of all between the sharp but brief pains of a woman in travail, and the transient mourning of the Disciples over the death of their Lord, and then between her joy over the new life and their joy in beholding him again. But the comparison may be taken yet more strictly. As in the case of the woman in travail, the anguish is the condito sine qua non, in fact, the cause of the joy, so here, the anguish at the separation from the bodily appearing of the Redeemer, may be regarded as the operative, or at least the coöperative cause of the subsequent joy, inasmuch as the spiritual possession of the Redeemer necessarily presupposed a separation from the possession of him in his bodily presence. Furthermore, the words, "that a man is born into the world," ὅτι ἐγεννήθη—κόσμον, seem also designed not merely to depict the greatness of the joy on the part of the woman in travail, but to have an independent significance. If we refer the expression to the seeing Christ after he arose, the new born man directs our thought to Christ given back from the dead, in which case, indeed, there is an inconcinnity in the comparison, as the mourning Disciples were previously regarded under the image of the woman in travail; if the seeing again spiritually is the subject of discourse, we may preserve an exact coherence with the illustration, and introduce the spiritual life of the Disciples newly aroused by the internal struggles and the pain, (Maldonatus, Lücke, De Wette.) When the new life of the Disciples should be brought into being by their separation from the visible presence of the Redeemer, they would certainly remember no more that transient pain. This depicture of the ardent maternal joy over a new human life, may be classed with those expressions of our Saviour, in which he exhibited a healthful feeling for what is purely human. The present τίκτῃ, as temp. inf., expresses what is about to happen, (x. 33,) ἡ ὥρα αὐτῆς, "the decisive moment."

V. 22–27. The effects of seeing him again are mentioned, which indicate that the Disciples will possess the Holy Ghost,

and which confirm the reference to a spiritual seeing of him again: 1) The steadfast abiding of the joy obtained. 2) The possession of the understanding necessary. 3) The rich experience of prayer answered. 4) The communication to their spirit made by the Redeemer without figurative expressions. 5) The relation of the expiatory work to the Father.—V. 22. The promise of eternal joy, as well as the assurance that in that day there should be nothing more to ask, certainly seems so strong as to make it pardonable in Augustine, when in contradiction to his own explanation of v. 16, which he referred to the resurrection, he here thinks that the seeing again in eternity is spoken of, and shows that he is inclined, even in v. 16, to interpret the *πάλιν μικρόν* thus: "Modicum est hoc totum spatium, quo præsens pervolat sæculum, "brief is this whole period through which the present world hastens." But over against the possession of the earthly appearing of Christ, which was to be removed, the new independent possession of Christ obtained in the Spirit was actually an abiding one, and they actually no longer sought the truth out of themselves from any teacher whatsoever; *ἐρωτᾶν* is retrospective to v. 19.—V. 23, 24. The spirit of the Apostles united with Christ, will offer prayer in conformity with the mind of Christ, and will behold its fulfillment, (xiv. 13, 14.)—V. 25–27. In a certain sense it may be said of all the instructions of Christ, that they were uttered *ἐν παροιμίαις*, since that which he revealed of God, he expressed only in the form in which it can have access *to us;* but it was specially true of his discourse in regard to his departure, of their seeing him again, and the result of it. If the truth was begotten independently in the Apostles through the Holy Spirit, there could remain for them none of the obscurity of figurative language in that truth which was so begotten as to be their own. In virtue of this possession of the truth, most eminently their own, they stood in an immediate relation to the Father, and needed no more a mediation for their prayers. This relation, however, is not to be understood as absolute, but as relative only, it is more and more brought to pass until it reaches the period of time designated in 1 Cor. xv. 28. This self-dependent possession of God is mediated on the part of the Disciples through love and faith

in Christ. Bengel: Amor et posterior est fide et prior: nam se invicem sustentant. Hoc loco amor præponitur, ut eo magis inter se respondeant hæc verba *amat, amavistis*, "love is both prior to faith and subsequent to it: for they mutually support each other. In this passage love is put first, that these words, '*he loves, ye have loved*,' may accord the more with each other." According to xiv. 16, Christ mediates the impartation of the Spirit, but the richer the possession of the Spirit, the more does the necessity for the continuance of that mediation cease. That is designated as the centre of their faith, to which also the prayer of the Redeemer (xvii. 8,) gives prominence.

V. 28–30. The thought at the close of v. 27 leads back to the one expressed in v. 16. On the form, ἐξῆλθον κτλ. cf. on iii. 34. The misapprehension of the Disciples is of such a nature, that if it were not recorded in history, an invention of it would be inconceivable. Augustine: Illi usque adeo non intelligunt, ut nec saltem, se non intelligere, intelligant, "so little do they understand, that they can not even understand that they do not understand." The explanatory answer which Jesus had given, commencing with v. 19, had probably not been much clearer to the Disciples than the mysterious language in v. 16; it is hard to say what meaning they supposed they saw in it, but the collateral circumstance, that Christ had anticipated them with his answer, (v. 19,) makes such an impression upon them, that this glance which penetrates their hearts becomes to them corroborative proof that he came forth from God, (on πιστεύειν, see remarks on ii. 11.) There is no occasion for supposing that they also misunderstood v. 23, and referred the promise to the present moment, (Lücke, De Wette;) it is only necessary to consider, that the entire discourse from v. 20, was the answer with which Jesus anticipated their question, so that νῦν, v. 30, is to be paraphrased: "Now, since thou givest us the answer to the question we intended to put."

V. 31, 32. The analogy with xiii. 38, would allow ἄρτι πιστεύετε to be taken as a doubting question, (Euthymius, Olshausen, De Wette.) It is true, the objection of Maldonatus may be urged, that the ἄρτι would be without meaning, and that the Disciples were actually at this moment pervaded with faith. Yet, if with Luther, Meyer, Lücke, we take it as asser-

tory, an ἀλλά would seem to be required in the following sentence. The announcement here made by Christ is in conformity with Matt. xxvi. 31, cf. 56. Jesus closes by consoling himself with a thought similar to that in viii. 28, 29.

V. 33. "The three ideas, the spiritual return of Christ in the souls of his Disciples, their emancipation to independence of life with the Father, and the victory over the world, form the thread which runs through all the farewell discourses," (Schweizer.) Thus all these discourses serve to give the Disciples peace *in Christ*, yet the language also glances back to the announcement he had made of the troubles that awaited them. The consolation in the words νενίκηκα τὸν κόσμον, "I have overcome the world," is of course not that of the example, (Grotius,) but according to xvi. 11, this, that Christ has broken the diabolical power which sways in a godless world, (Luke x. 18;) he who has faith in him, knows, in virtue of his redemption, that in this faith he possesses the victory, that he that is in him is greater than he that is in the world, (1 John v. 4, iv. 4.) Jerome: Propter fidei certitudinem in me debetis pacem habere, non sentiendo præsentia, sed certo sperando futura, "on account of the certainty of your faith, ye ought to have peace in me, not from what sense offers of the present, but from what hope makes sure of the future." Augustine: Non vicisset Christus mundum, si ejus membra vinceret mundus, "Christ would not have overcome the world, if the world could overcome his members."—The tranquil clearness with which these discourses terminate, forms the transition to that exaltation of the soul of Christ in prayer, which now follows.

CHAPTER XVII.

HITHERTO the glance of the Redeemer has only been directed sympathetically toward his Disciples, and the trials that awaited *them*, now those which he himself must encounter, present themselves anew to his soul. He prays—his prayer in its largest portion is intercession, and, therefore, beyond doubt directed to the consolation of the Disciples. Augustine: Tanti magistri non solum sermocinatio ad ipsos sed etiam oratio pro ipsis discipulorum est ædificatio, "not only the preaching of so great a master to them, but also his prayer for them, edifies his Disciples." How mighty in its effect upon the Disciples must have been the memory of that prayer! Our Lord himself intimates this in v. 13. "It is," says Luther, "assuredly beyond measure an ardent, heartfelt prayer, in which he opens both to us and to his Father the depth of his heart, and pours it all forth.—Plain and simple as it sounds, it is so deep, rich and broad, that no man can fathom it." Before the sainted Spener departed this life, he had this discourse read to him three times, "meaning thereby to intimate," says his biographer, (Canstein, Life of Spener, p. 146,) "that this chapter was peculiarly dear to him, yet he never had been willing to preach upon it, declaring that he did not comprehend it, and that the full understanding of it transcended the measure of faith which the Lord was wont to dispense to his people in their pilgrimage. [Bretschneider, with whom Strauss concurs, pronounces the prayer an oratio frigida, dogmatica, metaphysica.] The name which the prayer bears in the Church, "the sacerdotal prayer," oratio sacerdotalis, is based partly upon its intercessory character, partly on the fact that in v. 19 Christ consecrates himself to his expiatory death.

In the first part of the prayer, the Saviour speaks of his relation to mankind, and supplicates for that elevation of himself to glory which is associated with the consummation of the Father's glory in mankind, (v. 1–8;) in the second part, he beseeches that his Disciples may be watched over in the world and sanctified through the word of truth, (v. 9–19;) in the third part, he embraces in his prayer the believers of all time to come, "who are represented germinally in the Apostles," (Olshausen,) and implores for them perfect unity with himself, with one another, and with the Father, and at the same time a fellowship in glory, (v. 20–26.)[1] [The calm assurance and triumph of this prayer, have been urged against its genuineness, as if the agony of Gethsemane proved that it could not have been uttered. But the same assurance and triumph are involved in the *institution* of the Lord's Supper—and yet Gethsemane followed that, cf. John xii. 27. Between the prayer here and the agony in the garden, *hours* elapsed.]

THE PRAYER OF THE SAVIOUR FOR HIMSELF.—V. 1–8.

V. 1, 2. The lifting up of his eyes to heaven does not prove that our Lord uttered this prayer in the open air; the eyes of a person in prayer must be turned in some direction, the upward turning of them rests on that natural symbolism, in accordance with which even that man who possesses a clear view of the omnipresence of God, imagines to himself the heavens, in view of their brightness, height and illimitable extension, as the habitation of God. It is possible that through the window, simply closed with a lattice, the look of Christ extended out upon the nocturnal sky, bright with the Easter moon.—The glorification of the Father and of the Son are reciprocally conditional, as in xiii. 31, 32. *Δόξασόν σου τὸν υἱόν*, has a different meaning from *δόξασόν σου τὸ ὄνομα*, xii. 28, as v.

[1] Melancthon: Primum de se ipso precatur, postea de tota ecclesia et de hac petit quatuor res præcipuas ecclesiæ, conservationem veræ doctrinæ, concordiam ecclesiæ, applicationem sui sacrificii et ultimum ac summum bonum, ut ecclesia cum Christo ornetur vita, lætitia et gloria æterna, "first he prays for himself, then for the whole Church, and for it he implores the four principal things of the Church, the preservation of true doctrine, concord in the Church, the application of his sacrifice, and the last and highest good, that the Church with Christ may be invested with life, joy and eternal glory."

5 proves. It is the glorification of Christ, in virtue of which the limitations of the earthly condition cease and the Spirit proceeds from him, and so far this *δοξασμός* of the Son is also a *δοξασμός* of the Father. The operations of the Saviour had commenced on but a narrow point. They were, as v. 2 declares, to extend over all mankind, cf. also, xv. 8, the Disciples, also, were to be more thoroughly grounded, see *γνωρίσω*, v. 26. *Καθώς* is causal, proceeding from the idea of fitness, consequently *as, because, inasmuch as*, cf. Matt. xxviii. 18. As the rhetorical *πᾶν* which precedes is a collective, the *αὐτοῖς* which refers to it is in the plural.

V. 3. *Δέ* introduces the explanation of the way in which the impartation of life takes place. *Ἵνα* conveys the idea of the infinitive, cf. on iv. 34. The modern exegesis considered the knowledge as the condition and mediation of the possession of eternal life, so that *ἐστίν*, taken metonymically, was explained: "hoc modo paratur," "in this way is brought to pass," (Grotius.) Yet more abstractly were the *γινώσκειν* and the *αἰώνιος ζωή* kept asunder, by those who understood the "life eternal" exclusively of the world to come; already some of the Church-fathers wished to prove from this, that the blessedness of the world to come consisted only in the vision, the clear knowledge of God, against which Maldonatus says: Vita æterna hic appellatur inchoatio quædam vitæ cœlestis, "life eternal is the name here given to a beginning of the heavenly life." Knowing is in John's style of thought invariably to be regarded as simultaneous with believing, (see on vi. 69,) but in believing, the object of belief becomes the possession of man, passes over into his subjectivity, (see on Heb. xi. 1, iv. 2.) In faith and knowledge, consequently, eternal life is embraced, cf. *ἐστίν*, xii. 50.[1] The object of faith is God, the true God, that is, not God as the heathens know him, cf. 1 John v. 20, Rev. v. 7, 1 Thess. i. 9; the *μόνος* expresses that none other than he is the true one, (Romans xvi. 27, 1 Tim. vi. 16;) Christ is coördinate with God, as the one in whom this

[1] Irenæus, adv. hær. iv. 20: *ζῆσαι ἄνευ ζωῆς οὐχ οἷόν τε ἐστί· ἡ δὲ ὕπαρξις τῆς ζωῆς ἐκ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ περιγίνεται μετοχῆς· μετοχὴ δὲ θεοῦ ἐστι τὸ γινώσκειν θεὸν καὶ ἀπολαύειν τῆς χρηστότητος αὐτοῦ.* "To live without life is impossible, but the existence of life is derived from the participation of God; but the participation of God is to know God, and to enjoy his goodness."

absolute knowledge of God has been unveiled. "This passage presents a combined expression of Christian truth as opposed to Polytheism and Judaism," (Lücke.) From the fact that the Father is represented exclusively as the true God, and that Christ is mentioned together with him, the Arian, Socinian and Rationalistic expositors have drawn inferences opposed to the doctrine of the Church in regard to the deity of Christ. But God is said to be *μόνος*, not in antithesis to Christ, but to false gods; Nicolaus De Lyra: Est sensus, quod illa est sola deitas vera, quæ est in patre, et sic non excluditur filius, "the meaning is, that the only true deity is that which is in the Father, and the Son, consequently, is not excluded;" nor is the coördination of Christ in conflict with the Church doctrine, which does not maintain the absolute identity of the ideas, *God* and *Christ*, but rather, that Christ is that human individual originating in time, in whom God linked himself and humanity in an absolute manner. Had it been otherwise, Christ could not have offered prayer. [So far is the phrase, "the only true God," from excluding Christ from the predicate of God-head, that rather in him only the absolute God appears, and Bengel, on the words *ὃν ἀπέστειλας*, justly remarks: missio præsupponit filium cum patre unum, cf. on the idea involved, what is said on iii. 34.] A like coördination of God and Christ is found in xiv. 1. The Evangelist, moreover, 1 John v. 20, in all probability has applied to Christ also the predicate, *ὁ ἀληθινὸς θεός*. From a polemical interest, the older expositors (Ambrose, Augustine, Hilary,) construe thus: Ut te et quem misisti cognoscant solum verum deum, "that they may know thee and him whom thou hast sent, as the only true God."—Nevertheless, the question is to be weighed, whether *Χριστόν* is not to be construed with *γινώσκωσι*, "as the Christ," just as *τὸν ἀληθινὸν θεόν* is the predicate of *σέ*, (Le Clerc, Nösselt, Kuinöl, Meyer.) But doubt is at once thrown upon this by the fact that in the Gospels *Χριστός* usually has the article; in the Epistles, after it had become a current predicate, it has not the article, (Winer, p. 104, 4th ed.) Out of eighteen passages in John where it occurs with the addition of *Ἰησοῦς*, there is but one (ix. 22,) in which the article is wanting; the article is found, too, in 1 John ii. 22, iv. 3. v. 1. 6. 2 John 9. Nor will the

predicate be missed at all if, as in i. 17, 1 John i. 3, 7, we connect *Ἰησοῦς Χρ.*, since it indirectly lies in *ὃν ἀπέστειλας*. Christ's speaking of himself in the third person is in rhetorically solemn style; yet there is in it, perhaps, a glimpse of the Evangelist writing at a later period.

V. 4, 5. The petition in v. 1, is here expressed yet more specifically. In the *ἔργον*, the death which was before him may be considered as proleptically included, (v. 19;) especially striking is the prolepsis, v. 11, but as the further expansion of the thought, v. 6, 7, makes no mention of the death, it seems hazardous to presume a reference to it. The gathering and institution of the Church seem rather to be designated here as the *ἔργον*. The "being with the Father," *εἶναι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα*, had already, xiv. 28, been designated as the condition of "glory," *δόξα*, and so also here, cf. on xiii. 32. This "glory" is that which he possessed before he appeared on earth, and which by coming to earth he surrendered; entirely correspondent are Philip. ii. 7, 2 Cor. viii. 9, *ἤ* stands *per attract.* It appears to come in conflict with this, that according to v. 22, i. 14, ii. 11, Christ already possesses this glory in this world.[1] But we need but reflect in what this glory possessed by Christ consists, and we at once see that this conception, like others, as for example, "being in God," "believing," *εἶναι ἐν θεῷ, πιστεύειν*, has a narrower and a more extended meaning; while the Evangelist, by the "glory" he predicates of Christ during his sojourn on earth, means his power of working miracles; that glory which Christ anticipates in the world to come, is a freedom from every earthly limitation. On the "glory" which the Redeemer gives the Disciples, see remarks on v. 10, 22. [By this glory we cannot understand merely the gloria mediatoria, (Lampe,) nor simply, according to the analogy of the glory of God in the Old Testament, the attributes of God, which was the earlier view of Thomasius, (Christol. Beiträge, p. 93,) but as v. 22, and Heb. i. 3 show, it means "the majesty," that in virtue of which God is God; Gerhard, Loci. i.

1 Köstlin, Lehrbegriff des Ev. und der Briefe Johannis, "System of the Gospels and Epistles of John, 1843, p. 151," thinks he can venture so far as to say, "that no where in John is there a trace of the idea, that there was a humiliation in the *σάρξ ἐγένετο*, 'becoming flesh'"—according to John, Christ is *εὔδοξος, πλήρης*, and not *κενός*, as in Philip. ii. 7, 8.

243; Liebner, Christol. i. 322; Thomasius, Person Christi, i. 135; Gess, Person Christi, p. 295.] We might the more readily believe, that εἶχον here implies only the possession in the divine fore-ordination, (Grotius, Wetstein, Gabler,) as the language is not: "before I came into the world," πρὸ τοῦ με ἐλθεῖν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, but "before the world was," πρὸ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον εἶναι, cf. Ephes. i. 4. But παρά σοί is parallel with παρὰ σεαυτῷ, which no one would be willing, with Eckermann, to translate: "Glorify me now according to thy counsel;" the words, "before the world was," are placed in antithesis to the transient limitations of time. There is, consequently, here, as in vi. 62, viii. 58, a continuity of the consciousness of the historical Christ with the Logos. Among the Arminians, Episcopius already expressed a doubt about that way of understanding it, (of his having it in the divine fore-ordination,) since it makes Christ affirm of himself what could with equal truth be affirmed of every one; Semler felt the same difficulty. In Philip. ii. 6, Heb. xii. 2, the glorification appears as the reward of the "obedience," ὑπακοή, he displayed, a thought which does not appear here, nor can it be found in v. 22, 24.

V. 6–8. The ἔργον is further unfolded, it consists in the establishment of the Church, the ἄνθρωποι are first of all the band of Apostles, see v. 14, 20. The Church has been formed through the true knowledge of God, through the knowledge of the name of God, that is, of all that God is; the members have been brought into the Church through their affinity with God, through the internal calling of God, (viii. 47, vi. 45.) Led by the Father through the internal drawing, they have made the "word," λόγος, of Christ committed to them by God, their own possession, see on τηρεῖν, remarks on viii. 51. The grand constituent of this "word," is the doctrina de Christo, the acknowledgment of the full revelation in Christ, (xiv. 10,) cf. on ἀλήθεια above, remarks on viii. 46, on παρὰ σοῦ ἐξῆλθον, see remarks on iii. 34.

INTERCESSION FOR THE FIRST DISCIPLES.—V. 9–19.

V. 9. The preceding declarations had exhibited the close relation in which the Disciples stand to the Father, and now is

added the intercession for them, and the peculiar motive on which it rests. The person who prays is wont to strengthen his assurance by giving prominence to those parts of the objects of his petition which warrant that he will be heard; in accordance with this we are to explain in this place the exclusion of "the world," κόσμος. A father whose pious and cherished child is at the point of death, will say: "I pray not for ungodly children, but for this child, who served thee before all others," without meaning to imply that the others are not to be prayed for. The passage, 1 John v. 16, which might otherwise be compared, presents accordingly, no suitable parallel. But in v. 16, there is a like motive assigned for granting the petition, and in v. 20 there is an indirect prayer for those yet belonging to the "world," κόσμος, cf. the last words of v. 21, 23. Calvin and Melancthon both find in the words a committing of the non-elect to the judgment of God, the opposite view is expressed in a pleasing manner by Luther: "How squares his refusal to pray for the world with his teaching us, Matt. v. 44, that we are to pray even for our enemies? This is in brief the answer: to pray for the world and not to pray for the world, must both be right and good. For soon after he says himself: '*Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word.*' These very persons must yet be of the world, he must therefore pray for the world for the sake of those *who are yet to come forth from the world.* St. Paul was certainly of the world, when he persecuted and killed Christians, yet St. Stephen prayed for him, and he was converted. Thus, too, Christ himself prayed on the cross, (Luke xxiii. 34.) It is then true, that he prays for the world and does not pray for the world; but this is the distinction: In the same way and the same degree in which Christ prays for them that are his, he does not pray for the world." m

V. 10. In the fact that the Disciples belong to the Father, is embraced their belonging to the Son, the Son consequently is glorified in them. What species of glorification is meant? Verse 22, perhaps also v. 24, xv. 8, is to be brought in. As in v. 22, the conferring of the "glory," δόξα, on the Disciples is mentioned as the completion of the unity, we cannot imagine that any detached manifestations of glory, such as were pre-

sented in the miracles, or in the great operations of the Spirit, are there meant, but the expression must be taken with a compass wide enough to embrace in it the glory of the eternal world. That "glory" in its principle, was in the Disciples who had received the word with susceptible hearts, just as really a present thing as, according to xv. 3, the purity was. The full unfolding of it is reserved for eternity, (Col. iii. 3, seq.)

V. 11–13. The intercession is first directed to the preservation of the Disciples in that which they already possessed. As preservation from seduction into sin is spoken of, the Father has the predicate "holy," ἅγιε, applied to him. The difficult reading ᾧ in the dative, which has arisen from the noun just used being in that case, is placed alike by the external testimony and by its own difficulty, beyond doubt, and is preferable to the received οὗς, as well as to the reading ὅ. Instead of the "word," λόγος, of Christ, in which they were to be kept, the subject of that word, the "name of God," τὸ ὄνομα τ. θεοῦ, is here mentioned, (v. 6.)—In his very prayer there is a glimpse of a sad remembrance of his betrayer. That the Scripture might be fulfilled, he is lost, and that, too, although he had been given by God to the Redeemer, that is, had been led to him by an inward drawing of the heart, and although everything had been done by the Saviour for his preservation—thus it appears that Judas was not an involuntary instrument of a divine decree. "That the Scripture might be fulfilled," ἵνα πληρωθῇ ἡ γρ., a general reference to the Scripture, and the Scripture is the concrete expression for the divine decree, cf. Matt. xxvi. 24, and Luke xxii. 22, with each other. We are perfectly justified in adducing this passage as proof, that a susceptibility may be presupposed in the case of Judas. The expression υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας, 2 Thess. ii. 3, used of Anti-Christ, designates him to whom ἀπώλεια pertains, he has incurred it, and the ἀπώλετο shows that ἀπώλεια does not here mean moral corruption, but the misery which is the result of it, (John vi. 39.)—V. 13 shows that Christ is conscious of the effects which will be wrought by the reminiscence of this prayer; on ἡ χαρὰ πεπλήρωται and ἡ χαρὰ ἡ ἐμή, see on iii. 29, xv. 11.

V. 14–16. The motive of the prayer for their protection is that they bear the same principle within them as our Lord

himself, a principle conflicting with the world and rebuking it, (iii. 20, vii. 7,) and that they, therefore, cannot escape persecution. Persecution, however, is not to be overcome by faint-hearted flight, but by manly strength is to be overcome. Calvin: Vult Deus, suos certare, sed non patitur lethaliter vulnerari, "God wills that his people should do battle, but he permits them not to be wounded unto death." Luther: "They are not to depart from the world with me, for I have more work for them to do, to wit: that they make my little flock larger." Beza, Bengel, De Wette, appealing to 1 John ii. 13, v. 19, take ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ as masculine, ("from the evil one,") but there is nothing in the connection to favor that view.

V. 17–19. To the negative intercession for their preservation is attached the positive one for their confirmation. According to v. 18, it has become their high calling to continue the work of Christ on earth, in the midst of an opposing world, (xx. 21.) For this they need a consecration, and this consecration they receive through the principle of the λόγος, "word" of Christ imparted to them, (xv. 3;) we are consequently to take ἀλήθεια, as that which the word of Christ contains; the second ἀλήθεια, in v. 17, equivalent to ἡ ἀλήθεια, may designate the absolute truth. To this sanctification through the word is added here another means of consecration, to wit: the sacrificial death of Christ. Ἁγιάζω in the present with ὑπέρ can only be understood of Christ's self-consecration to his sacrificial death, the Epistle to the Hebrews represents him indeed as at once *sacrifice* and *priest*. Over against this ἁγιάζω the ἁγιάζεσθαι on the part of the Apostles designates the *consecration*, their official consecration, (x. 36,) which, however, comprehends sanctification. On the other side, also, the self-consecration of Christ rests upon his moral holiness; by this fact we explain the καί. To this καί and the conformation in love expressed by it, Theophylact and Euthymius attach the meaning presented in the proposition, "so that they also in the service of the truth may be consecrated to death." Olshausen, too, now says that the most obvious meaning certainly is: "Christ consecrates himself, in order that they through him may be consecrated, that is, may be hallowed," but the thought is then connected with it, that at the same time, they in common with himself,

are to lay down their lives out of love. But there is certainly nothing that offers any intimation of an idea of this kind, in fact by the addition of ἐν ἀληθείᾳ it is excluded. But how are we to understand ἐν ἀληθείᾳ? As the article is wanting, Chrysostom, Luther, Calvin, Zwingle, Meyer, take it adverbially in antithesis to the Old Testament sacrifices. The retrospect, however, to v. 17, cannot well be mistaken, a fact in view of which the article can be dispensed with here. Ἐν must not be translated "through" in this passage, since the sacrificial death of Christ is here represented as that which consecrates; if it be translated "in," it designates either the sphere of their activity, (Gerhard,) or the element of their life, "so that they may be sanctified in their possession of the truth," thus the death of Jesus Christ, which mediates the sending of the Holy Ghost, is designated as the highest agent of sanctification through the word, Bucer: Ego hac causa *ut illi per veritatem sanctificati sint — meipsum* modo *sanctificabo* tibi in cruce immolatum, "*that they may be sanctified through the truth, I now sanctify* to thee *myself* sacrificed upon the cross."

INTERCESSION FOR ALL (INCLUDING FUTURE) BELIEVERS. v. 20–26.

V. 20, 21. The hosts of all those, who not until after his own death, (xii. 24,) shall enter, through the preaching of the Apostles,[1] into the kingdom of God, rise before the consciousness of Christ, his desires for them are summed up in the single petition for their unity with him and the Father. And this unity is infinitely more than mere *unanimity*, since it rests upon unity of spirit and life, and the perfect communion of all good things pertains to its manifestations; according to v. 22, even the unity of the "glory." We are, therefore, compelled to say, that although that unity of *doctrine* of which the

[1] Calvin: Væ Papistis, quos non pudeat, execrabilem blasphemiam vomere, nihil nisi ambiguum et flexiloquum haberi in scriptura, itaque sola ecclesiæ traditio illis credendi magistra est. Sed nos meminerimus, solam a filio dei unico judice probari fidem, quæ ex apostolorum doctrina concipitur, "woe to the Papists, who are not ashamed to vomit forth the execrable blasphemy, that the Scriptures contain nothing that is not ambiguous and capable of distortion, and that, consequently, the tradition of the Church is sole mistress of what they are to believe. But we should remember, that the Son of God, our only judge, approves of that faith alone which is received from the teaching of the Apostles."

Catholic Church makes so much, (though it is not even a unity of individuals in *faith*,) must be looked upon as an element pertaining to this unity of faith among believers, yet such a unity of doctrine, without the unity of life and of faith on the part of all the individuals, comes amazingly short of a fulfilling of this solemn prayer of our Lord. If we apprehend the unity as possessing a profundity like the one described, then love is an essential manifestation of it, and the declaration that the world shall recognize his Disciples by their love to one another, (xiii. 35,) is comprehended in the words, "that the world may believe that thou hast sent me," ἵνα ὁ κόσμος πιστεύσῃ κτλ. and in those of v. 23, ἵνα γινώσκῃ κτλ. "that the world may know that thou hast sent me, &c."

V. 22, 23. The unity of the principle in the Father, the Son and believers, creates the presumption that there is also a unity of endowments, their "glory," δόξα, itself is alike. The connection, therefore, neither allows us, with Augustine, to refer δόξα abstractly to immortality, nor with Chrysostom, Grotius, Brentius, to the power of working miracles, nor with Calovius, to the glory of unanimity, (Chrysostom also gives prominence to this,) nor with Calvin, merely to internal glory; it is rather to be understood, by way of eminence, of the perfect unfolding of the δόξα in the eternal world, as also the further expansion of the thought in v. 24 shows. The idea of unity is expressed in a yet stronger way in v. 23, it is perfect *unity*, mediated through a communicatory love of God, which pertains with no less strength to believers than to Christ, their first-born brother, (Rom. viii. 20.) As the emphasis is laid upon the unity, the τετελειωμένοι εἰς ἕν must be understood adverbially, "completely one." The Evangelist, in his first Epistle, too, frequently uses the verb, τετελείωται, where we would look for the adjective, 1 John ii. 5, iv. 12, 17, 18, cf. εἶναι εἰς ἕν, 1 John v. 8. Since here also, the remoter aim, that of making an impression on the unbelieving world, is mentioned, a doubt might be excited whether δόξα extends to the glory of the heavenly world, but the scruple is removed by the observation, that it is not in fact a heavenly one merely. Mention has been made in the remarks on xiii. 35, of the strong impression created in the minds of the heathen by the mutual love of the early Chris-

tians; there is remarkable testimony given by the Dominican Lilienstein, the bitter enemy of the Waldenses, in regard to their spiritual δόξα, "glory:" Boni in moribus et vita, veraces in sermone, in caritate fraterna unanimes *tantum quod fides eorum*, etc., "pure in their morals and life, truthful in speech, of one accord in brotherly love, *only that their faith*, &c., (Leger, Gesch. der Waldenser, p. 502.) Many in that period were led to the faith by contemplating a testimony of this sort. As regards the extent of the conception of unity, Luther says: "Thou and I, he would say, are one, in one divine essence and majesty; after the same example they shall also be one among one another, and that, too, in such wise, that this same unity shall be one in us, that is, be incorporated in me and thee; in brief, that they all be one, and one only, in us both, yea, so completely 'one bread,' that they have all that thou and I are able to have; consequently he prays that *we also may become partakers of the divine nature*, as St. Peter says, 2 Peter i. 4; for although the Father and Christ are one in another way, a way more sublime and incomprehensible, in virtue of the divine essence, yet we so possess all this that it is ours and is enjoyed by us."

V. 24. According to our view, there is in this verse a further expansion of what had been said in v. 22, in regard to the "glory." θέλω is not always an expression of the controlling will, but also of the wish, (1 Cor. xiv. 5,) but a mere *velim* would not be strong enough here, the Son *wills*—but in unity with the Father. We might feel tempted to take θεωρεῖν, as ἰδεῖν has already been taken, (viii. 51, vi. 40,) in the sense, "to experience, become conscious of;" but as the being together in space is mentioned, it is preferable to adhere to the image, and to regard believers as the beholders. A *dependence* of their blessedness on that of the Son is thereby established, but it may be asked whether there also be a distinction of degree. Ambrose: volo, inquit, ut *sint* mecum, non ut *sedeant* mecum, *ubi* ego, non *quomodo ego*, ut *videant* claritatem meam, non ut *habeant*, "I will, he says, that they *be* with me, not that they may *sit* with me, *where* I am, not *as* I am, that they may *see* my glory, not that they may *have* it." On the contrary Euthymius: ἵνα ὦσι ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου, δηλονότι συμβασιλεύοντες, "that

they may be in thy kingdom, clearly, *reigning with thee.*" This has also the analogy of Scripture for it, 2 Tim. ii. 12, Rev. iii. 21. Does not the εἶναι μετ' αὐτοῦ, also, hint at this? We may say then with Bengel: ut spectent fruentes, "that they may behold it in fruition." What befalls the "Captain of our salvation," ἀρχηγὸς τῆς σωτηρίας, is also consummated in them that are his, through their connection with him. Luther: "We should make this sentence our pillow and a bed of down for our souls, and with a glad heart repair to it when the happy hour draws nigh," cf. also, 2 Tim. ii. 12, Eph. ii. 6, 1 Pet. iv. 13.

V. 25, 26. At the close there is yet one more glance at the opposition between the world and the Church. Δίκαιος, as a predicate of God, designates in all other places his retributive justice, how then are we to understand καί before ὁ κόσμος? 1) Lampe and Augustine: "Thou art righteous, *therefore* thou hast withdrawn from the evil world a knowledge of thee." Elsner: "Although the world knows thee not, yet, &c." 2) According to Chrysostom and Winer, adversatively, "and yet." Chrysostom: δοκεῖ δυσχεραίνων ταῦτα λέγειν, ὅτι τὸν οὕτως ἀγαθὸν κ. δίκαιον οὐκ ἠθέλησαν ἐπιγνῶναι; "he seems to utter the words as if unable to endure it, that they were unwilling to know Him who was so good and righteous;" according to Winer, p. 416, (tr. 347,) the discourse breaks off, Christ would say: "O righteous Father, thou hadst designed this glory for all, and — yet the world has not known thee." But would we expect the predicate "righteous" in such a case, and not rather "gracious?" 3) According to Meyer, καί means "even," and a reference to καταβολὴ κόσμου is designed, but who would expect such a reference here, when κόσμος in this passage is used in a moral signification, and in the other in a physical one. Neander consequently decides for the meaning "holy," and appeals to xvi. 10, 1 John ii. 29, iii. 7, 10. "O Father who art holy, and whom the world knoweth not;" but the sentence cannot be regarded as capable of being resolved into the adjective phrase, "O Father, holy, and by the world *unknown*," the ἐγὼ δέ κτλ, at once excludes such a possibility. The Vulgate, Luther and Beza, wholly omit the word which gives the difficulty. Heumann first struck upon the right track of exposition, and recently De Wette: "I believe that by the καί—καί the

Evangelist meant to unite things dissimilar, as in vi. 36, xv. 24, but afterward changed the construction." Lücke has thereupon drawn attention to the fact, that in the classics, also, τέ—δέ and καί—δέ are used, and in exactly the cases in which there is a negation in one of the two propositions, (Hartung on the Particles, i. p. 92; Rost, Greek Grammar, 6th ed. p. 725.) There lies then in the words, an appeal to the retributive justice of God, to decide judicially between the two generations opposed to each other, between the world and the children of God. The upward looking to the God who rules in righteousness, excites at the close of the prayer the assurance of the final triumph of the kingdom of truth.

After this triumphant elevation, soaring over all conflict, it certainly is surprising to witness the following of an hour of dejection like that in Gethsemane. The criticism which is adverse to the Gospel of John, has regarded itself, therefore, as justified the more in calling into question the genuineness of this prayer, and the historical apprehension of the frame of our Saviour's mind which it gives.[1] In fact, the credibility of the narrative of the agony in Gethsemane, has just as little been acknowledged by it, as that of the delineation of this triumphant exaltation. (Strauss' Life of Jesus, ii. 454, 4th ed.) That the delineation of John originated with a writer whose concern it was to "embellish," and at a time when the terrible features of the death of Christ had receded far behind its glorious ones, of course (according to this criticism,) allows of being made out quite a probable matter. If, however, the prayer given by John, and his silence in regard to the agony, are simply to be set to the account of an author intent upon embellishment, how is it that the same author, chap. xii. 27, seq. has mentioned an agony of soul entirely similar to the one in Gethsemane? Does not, too, the hour of suffering which pressed upon the Saviour, appear, according to xiii. 27, as something so fearful, that he longs for the hastening of the catastrophe? On the other hand: "Does not that which the synoptical Gospels detail, the institution of the Lord's Supper as a pledge of his abiding communion with the Church founded by him, does it not testify of the very same predominant thoughts in which the soul

1 There is an evidence of the genuineness of the prayer in xviii. 9, which see.

of Christ found repose, the same which are testified of in John by these, his last discourses with his Disciples, and by his last prayer?" (Neander.) Does he not immediately after the agony in Gethsemane, appear before his judges in the greatest elevation of soul? We dare not, however, in vindicating this fluctuation of his frame of mind, draw in that unphilosophical and untheological conception of the lamented Olshausen, that there was an involuntary ebbing and flowing of divine power—a conception which he also applies to the narrative of the temptation. It is enough simply to refer in part to the fact, that where no stoical eradication of the affections has taken place, the change of outward situation will also beget an internal succession of frames of mind, and in part to the fact, that a certain necessity, at once physical and psychical exists, of giving way momentarily to grief in order to overcome it. Cf. Dettinger, "The Agony of Jesus in Gethsemane," in the Tubing. Zeitschr. 1838, p. 111, seq.; Neander, Leben Jesus, p. 669, 3d ed. (M'Clintock and Blumenthal's tran. § 279.)

We shall only add in closing, a paraphrase of this prayer: "Father, the decisive hour is come, glorify thy Son, that he may yet more perfectly glorify thee in the entire human race, as thou, indeed, hast given him power over the entire human race, the power of imparting to it everlasting life. For in this consisteth life that passeth not away, to wit: in the knowledge of thee as the only true God, and of him who reveals thee. As far as I have hitherto been able to glorify thee upon earth, I have done so, in gathering a Church unto thee, and now glorify thou me with that glory which I possessed eternally, and but for a brief time laid aside. What thou art, I have made known to those whom thou hast brought to me, and who have received thy word; they have now known thee in me. For these I now pray also, for them who are thine, and at the same time mine, as I am glorified in them; I rise to thee, but they still remain in the world, preserve them now in the knowledge of thee. While I was among them I kept faithfully all whom thou ledst to me, except that one devoted to destruction, in whose fate also, however, thy fore-knowledge hath been consummated. Now come I to thee, and these, my intercessions, are designed to consummate their joyousness in me. In the

world persecution awaits them, they, indeed, belong as little to it as do I. But from this affliction they may not be withdrawn, for they are to convert the world, and I, therefore, pray only that thou mayest not permit them to sink under it, that thy word of truth may become to them a fountain of sanctification; yes, they are sent forth into the world to continue my work. In order that they may receive the consecration in the truth, I consecrate myself to death for them. But I pray also for all who shall through them attain unto faith, that unity may exist between them, thee and me, as thou, Father, art in me and I in thee: thus shall the world recognize that it is thou who hast sent me. Yea, my own glory have I imparted to them, that perfect unity may exist in them, and that the world may be made conscious that thou embracest them and me in the same love. Yes, Father, I pray that those whom thou hast brought to me may also be with me in the world to come, and there behold my eternal glory. Righteous Father, adjudicate between us; there is the world which knows thee not, here am I who know thee, and those whom I have taught, and shall still teach to know thee, that thou mayest embrace them in the same love in which thou embracest me, and that I may abide in them."

CHAPTER XVIII.

JESUS SEIZED IN GETHSEMANE.—v. 1–11.

V. 1. AT the last feast Jesus had spent his nights outside of Jerusalem, probably in order to secure himself against the snares that might be laid for him. He now leaves the city to repair to his usual place of resort, (v. 2.) In the vicinity of the city he had followers, (Matt. xxi. 3;) to one of these belonged the garden here spoken of, and which was probably connected with the farm. The brook Cedron flowed through a deep vale to the east of the city. It is true, most of the MSS. give the accent *Κέδρων*, "Brook of Cedars," probably, however, from ignorance on the part of the transcribers, instead of *τοῦ Κεδρών*, or *τοῦ Κεδρῶνος*, as Josephus declines it.

V. 2, 3. The transaction of Judas with the Sanhedrim is passed over by the Evangelist as a matter already known to the reader. As the matter was one in which the Jewish superiors were concerned, the Levitical temple-watch were taken along; the military attendance is mentioned only in Mark xiv. 51, where the *νεανίσκοι* are soldiers. *Σπεῖρα*, the Greek name for the cohort, which formed the tenth part of a legion, whose number varied at different times, as did that of the cohorts; in the time of Vegetius, the cohorts (with the exception of the *first*,) consisted of 555 men. On account of the possibility of an insurrection, the Sanhedrim had found it advisable to call out the Roman cohort, also, from the castle of Antonia. The

[1] On this last division (the history of the passion of our Lord,) are specially to be compared, among the older writers, Bynæus, De morte Jesu Christi, Amst. 1696, 2 vols.; among the more recent, Hess' Lebens geschichte, "History of the Life of Jesus," 3 vols. On Ch. 18, Gurlitt's Lectiones in N. T. Spec. iv. Hamb. 1805, may be used.

way, v. 29, in which Pilate comes out to meet the members of the Sanhedrim, seems to indicate that he was aware of their design. We are not, of course, to suppose that the *entire* cohort is meant; it is just as we would say: "he called in the police and *the* military." In consequence of the responsible nature of the transaction the Chiliarch, also, was with the detachment, as in Acts xxi. 32. *Φανός* in the older dialect, means *torch*, in the later, *lantern*, hence *λαμπάδες* is here used for torches. There was full moon, it is true, at Easter, still there were particular localities which were dark.

V. 4, 5. According to the Synoptists, the sign which Judas gave to indicate Jesus to them, was a kiss; Strauss, De Wette, consider this irreconcilable with John, according to whom Jesus offers himself for recognition, while the kiss of Judas is passed over by the Evangelist in silence. But without any violence the circumstance may be taken thus: the expression, "went forth," *ἐξελθών*, shows that Jesus, when he put the question, came from the bottom of the garden to the front part of it, (v. 26 shows that the scene did not occur outside of the garden.) Judas had caused the troop to stop, and had taken several steps toward the bottom of the garden, in order to mark Jesus; he then returns to the company to encourage them to advance. The Saviour regards it as in consonance with his dignity to advance of his own accord to meet his enemies. In this mode of conciliation the *εἱστήκει* may certainly lead us into a mistake, for in accordance with it Judas might be regarded as an idle spectator. The question rises, what general object had the Evangelist in this remark — we suppose he meant to intimate that Judas no longer considered himself as one of the Disciples. If he then, after giving the token by which Christ was to be recognized, returned to the company, the Evangelist might write, as he did, to intimate the part which Judas played.

V. 6. The older view, which saw in the falling of the company a miracle of the omnipotence of Jesus, has recently been defended by Meyer, Strauss, Ebrard, but erroneously. *Ἀπῆλθον εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω* means that the immediate effect of Christ's coming forth, was simply a recoil in consternation: the most natural way to take it is, that the words "*they* recoiled and *fell*," relate to different subjects, that those in front recoiled, and some of

those in the hindmost ranks fell down. When Strauss observes that it is hard to think of this with a serious face, it is no doubt true that silly people, all the world over, laugh when any one gets a fall, on the other hand, however, those that are serious will in the scene here presented certainly think less of the fall than of the cause that brought it about. Other cases may be cited from history, in which the dauntless stepping forth of a man has produced a great impression upon his persecutors, the terrors of whose guilty conscience were aroused. Such cases were those of Mark Antony, (Valerius Maximus, viii. 9, 2,) Marius (Vellejus, ii. 19, 3,) and Coligny, (Serranus, Comm. de statu religionis et reipubl. in Gallia, t. iii. p. 32.) We are reminded in this passage of the overwhelming impression produced by Christ, at an earlier date, on the watch of the temple, (ch. vii. 46.)

V. 7–9. A friendly solicitude for his Disciples is shown by our Lord in the midst of his own danger, so that in this respect also, John means to say, the word of our Lord, xvii. 12, received a fulfillment. It is impossible that the Evangelist could have been ignorant that spiritual protection is the subject of the language of that passage, but he means to say, that the words had providentially their fulfillment in this sense also. He treats the expression, therefore, as he does that of Caiaphas, xi. 50, and there lies in this an interesting hint as to the mode in which Old Testament expressions are cited by the Evangelists. It is also to be noticed, that had that prayer of our Lord been the invention of the Evangelist, he could not have referred in this way to that expression.

V. 10, 11. The other Evangelists mention the name neither of the Disciple who did the violence, nor of the servant who was wounded; we would most readily expect from Peter this rash act, originating in vehement love to his Lord, and the fact that John knew the name of the servant, coincides with the notice taken in v. 16 of the fact, that he was acquainted in the house of the high priest. *Τὸ ὠτίον*, equivalent to *οὖς*, is used, from the partiality of the later Greek for diminutives. According to Bengel and De Wette, the expression, *τὸ ποτήριον*, is retrospective to what had passed in Gethsemane, (Matt. xxvi. 39.)

CHRIST BEFORE THE HIGH PRIEST—IS DENIED BY PETER. v. 12–27.

V. 12–14. According to the Synoptists, Jesus had a hearing in the house of Caiaphas, in whose house also Peter's denial occurred; in John, a hearing before Annas is spoken of, in whose palace, consequently, the first denial by the Disciple would have taken place, and the first mention of Christ's being sent from Annas to Caiaphas, is in v. 24. Erasmus, therefore, takes v. 24 from its place and inserts it after v. 13, Cyrill and Beza read it twice, putting it after v. 13, and retaining it in v. 24. Of the recent writers, some attempt to bring the other Evangelists into unison with John, the majority interpret John in accordance with the Synoptists. According to Schleiermacher and Olshausen, all three denials took place in the court of Annas, and the reproving glance of our Lord, of which Luke speaks, occurred after the third denial, just as Christ was led from Annas to Caiaphas. It is the opinion of Schweizer also, that John alone gives the narrative correctly, and the fact that the second and third denial are detailed *after* the mention of Christ's being led away, v. 24, he accounts for, by supposing Peter still to have remained behind, in the house of Annas, after Jesus had been led away to Caiaphas. But if Peter would have placed himself in so perilous a position in the court of Annas, for the mere purpose of seeing what the issue was going to be, (Matt. xxvi. 58,) would Peter, after Christ had again been taken out to be led to Caiaphas, have remained quietly standing by the fire? Furthermore, if the ἀρχιερεύς, whose servant, according to v. 10, Peter wounded, is in the service of Caiaphas, would that relative of his who is mentioned in v. 26, have been in the service of Annas? Besides, can it be supposed that the Synoptists could have been so completely in error in regard to the locality of a fact, such as the denial of Peter, which, beyond doubt, was universally known at that time? One thing certainly favors that view, to wit: that in the hearing described in this place, there is no mention made of that which was the main thing in the hearing before Caiaphas, that is, of the question of the high priest which led

to the sentence of death. Nevertheless, we feel satisfied that the following view is the correct one. The Evangelist, by the incidental notice in regard to Caiaphas, in v. 13, 14, was not led to make express mention of the taking away of Christ to Caiaphas, and first brings it up in v. 24, so that here the aorist, as is often the case, especially in bringing in something that has been omitted, is to be taken in the sense of the pluperfect, (Calvin, De Dieu, Meyer, Lücke, De Wette, nor is Strauss disinclined to this view.) It will certainly be granted, that as Caiaphas in v. 13 is called ἀρχιερεύς, the ἀρχιερεύς in v. 15 can hardly be another person; why, too, is there this fuller characterizing of Caiaphas, if it was not he, but Annas, who conducted the hearing? It may in fact be questioned, whether v. 24 may not be regarded as a gloss, since other parenthetic insertions hardly ever occur without some particle like οὖν δέ or γάρ. Cf. v. 5, 14, ch. vi. 23, ix. 14, xi. 2, 30, 51, Matt. xiv. 3. That John simply mentions the preliminary questions in the hearing before Caiaphas, is to be explained by the fact, that he presumed the confession of Jesus in regard to his dignity as Messiah, to be already known from the common tradition; that confession made before Pilate, which Paul mentions as commonly known, is in fact the same, to wit: that he is the King Messiah, (1 Tim. vi. 13.)[1] If, now, John has mentioned nothing that occurred during the hearing before Annas, it is made the more clear, that this presentation before Annas is to be regarded as a mere subordinate act, which was done, perhaps, because his palace was at hand, and there was an intention of showing honor to a man who had himself been high priest for several years, and who is mentioned in Acts iv. 6, *before* Caiaphas, as ἀρχιερεύς, or it may have been done while they were waiting for the Sanhedrim to assemble with Caiaphas.

V. 15–18. According to the other Evangelists, also, Peter follows at a distance; John alone, who here, also, designates himself indirectly, makes mention of what more immediately concerned himself, that he also went in with the crowd, and that he secured an entrance for Peter. Among the Hebrews, women were the porters at the doors, (Acts xii. 13.) The four

[1] Chap. xix. 7 presupposes it as a known fact, that Jesus had been condemned because he declared himself the Son of God.

Evangelists harmonize in the narrative of a threefold denial on the part of Peter, but designate in different ways the persons who put the questions, and the respective localities. Dr. Paulus, in order to do full justice to the difference, runs the number of denials up to eight; most recently, Ebrard (ii. p. 671,) has brought forward the facts in such a combination, as apparently to justify the varying statements, each in its kind. At his very entrance the Disciple seems to have betrayed himself by his air of anxiety. The lax morality of rationalism has completely wiped away the guilt of the Disciple in his denial. In Dr. Paulus (Comm. iii. p. 649,) we have this: "Peter of course told *untruths*, but not *lies*, because none of the persons who questioned him had any business to take him to task. Nothing is less applicable (!) to him than the command of Jesus to 'confess him before men.'" Still in the judgment formed of the Disciple it is too often left out of account, that although his lie proceeded from a cowardice whose origin was want of faith, nevertheless, his entrance into a company where certain death threatened him if he were discovered to be the person that had wounded Malchus, resulted from a courage which only heart-felt love to Jesus could impart. For admirable practical reflections on Peter's denial, consult Melancthon in his Dissertation, De Infirmitate nostra, and Luther and Calvin.—The elevated situation of Jerusalem renders it so cold about Easter, as to make a watch-fire at night indispensable. According to Matt. xxvi. 58, Peter merely followed to know at once what was the issue; according to Luke xxii. 61, we may, however, suppose that the hearing occurred in an open room in the lower story, so that besides, what was said could be heard.

V. 19–24. It is natural that the *judicial* examination should begin with preliminary questions like those here mentioned. Christ, who left Herod and Pilate without reply, (Luke xxiii. 9, John xix. 9,) here, also, regards it as beneath his dignity to answer more particularly, as there was no disposition on the part of the interrogators to know the truth. His answer, which put aside the question, appeared to them as an offense against the reverence due the highest Jewish authority, and there follows a maltreatment of the holy one, at which Chrysostom bursts forth in the words: φρίξον οὐρανὲ, ἔκστηθι γῆ, τῇ τοῦ

δεσπότου μακροθυμίᾳ καὶ τῇ τῶν δούλων ἀγνωμοσύνῃ! "shudder O heaven, be astounded O earth, at the long-suffering of the master, and the crime of the servants." Christ simply appeals to the justice of his cause; there lies in this a proof that Matt. v. 39 is not to be taken by the letter.—On v. 24, see above.

V. 25–27. According to Matthew, Peter first confirms the second denial with an oath, and the third with repeated forswearing. According to the Synoptists, he was recognized on the third occasion by his Galilean dialect, which does not exclude John's statement. According to Luke, the cock crowed at the third denial, and at that moment our Lord, probably as he was conducted through the fore-court after the hearing, cast on the Disciple a mournful and reproving glance.

FIRST HEARING BEFORE PILATE.—v. 28–40.

V. 28–32. The sentence of death passed by the Sanhedrim could not be executed without permission from the Governor of the province, the procession therefore goes to him. The Pretorium lay, perhaps, at the fortress of Antonia, and was possibly the former palace of Herod, see Winer on the word Richthaus. *Πρωΐ*, (as Griesbach and Lachmann read,) the fourth watch of the night before morning twilight; about six o'clock the judge took his seat, (xix. 14.) On *ἵνα φάγωσι*, see what is said on xiii. 1.—Pilate now makes his appearance in the history, and is depicted more fully by John than by the other Evangelists — in a way so striking in its psychological features, so consonant with what we know from other sources, of Roman men of rank, that this single delineation furnishes in itself a remarkable evidence for the historical character of the Gospel. The character of the governor is given in our remarks on v. 38.—Jesus, attended by a guard, was conducted into the interior of the palace, Pilate in concession to the religious scruples of the Jews, comes out to make the examination; we may perhaps infer from this question, that intimation had been given him of the contemplated seizure of Jesus. If the authorities had not regarded him as worthy of death, they would not have brought him to the procurator, as none except sentences in criminal cases needed confirmation by him. In conformity with the

Roman legal usage, which was followed even in the most corrupt period, (Acts xxvi. 16,) and because he was aware of the base designs of the Jewish superiors, (Matt. xxvii. 18,) Pilate demanded a statement of the accusation. Fearing that he would not comply with their wishes, they refuse to give it. In keeping with his character, as we know it from other sources, he returns their insolence with a sneer, (cf. xxxix. 19, vi. 19.) This challenge of Pilate's has been misunderstood by some writers, who have inferred from it that the Jews must have had the jus vitæ et necis, "authority to inflict capital punishment," (Selden, de synedr. l. 2, c. 15; Wagenseil, Confut. R. Lipm. p. 299; Bynæus, De Morte Christi, l. 3, c. 1; cf. on the other side, Iken, Dissert. ii.;) they help themselves out of the difficulty presented by the answer, "it is not lawful for us to put any man to death," ἡμῖν οὐκ ἔξεστιν κτλ. by giving them the force that on *high feast days* the Jews could not inflict capital punishment. But, to pass over other proofs, the opposite is sufficiently clear from Josephus, (Antiquit. xx. 9, 1,) who says, that Annas had taken advantage of the absence of the procurator, to have James, ὁ δίκαιος, "the just," executed, and that the charge made against him to the præses Albinus, stated that "it was not lawful for Annas without his consent to convoke a council of judges," ὡς οὐκ ἐξὸν ἦν Ἀνάνῳ χωρὶς τῆς ἐκείνου γνώμης καθίσαι συνέδριον. The Jews were compelled by the sneering reply of Pilate, to bring a distinct charge, as the question of the governor, v. 33, shows, and at this point comes in Luke xxiii. 2.—By the political accusation, that Jesus had set himself up for a king, they hoped soonest to succeed; they were induced, indeed, subsequently to turn to the religious aspect of the accusation, (xix. 7,) but, nevertheless, go back again to the former, (xix. 12,) and as sedition by the Roman law was punishable with crucifixion, by so doing they bring about the fulfillment of the prophetic declarations of Jesus in regard to his death on the cross, (iii. 14, viii. 28, xii. 32, especially is Matt. xvi. 24 remarkable,) since in case the religious accusation had been carried through, his death would have been by stoning. But the words still present a difficulty—John already traces the fulfillment of the prophecy to the fact that the Jews were entirely destitute of the jus gladii. the right to inflict capital

punishment. Are we to suppose that a Roman procurator never would have passed sentence of death on an offense which was capitally punishable by the Jewish law merely? So Neander (p. 686,) thinks. But, xix. 7, they urge upon him, in fact, their Jewish law, Annas was reproved by Albinus, not because he had passed the sentence of death, but because he had executed it on his own authority; the Romans might, as they actually did, guarantee them their ancestral laws, without warranting them to inflict on criminals the punishment enjoined by law?[1] That the Jews preferred urging with Pilate the political accusation, seems then to have originated in the hope of attaining their object *more quickly*, and thus, also, John seems to have had in mind, as his narrative implies, though he does not mention it, that they were obliged to bring the political accusation in order *more easily* to obtain the Roman sanction.

V. 33–35. The accused is to be compelled to make his own confession. "Art thou *the* King of the Jews," asks Pilate, and means, therefore: *the* well known, expected one, the Messiah. Some doubt may be felt as to the precise point of the Saviour's counter-question. According to the view of the more recent writers, Christ wished to ascertain whether Pilate used the term in its Roman, that is, its political sense, or in its Jewish theocratic sense, that he might be guided by the reply, in giving an affirmative or negative to the question, (Meyer, Olshausen, Neander.) But can this thought lie in the words? Was not "the King of the Jews," in the Jewish sense also, a political ruler? According to Le Clerc, (Heumann takes a similar view,) Christ wishes to ascertain whether his question originated in a striving after truth, or was merely inquisitorial. It is better with the ancient writers, (as early as Chrysostom,) to regard the object of the question as this, whether Pilate himself had seen Christ presenting himself in any such way, as he would expect from that King of the Jews; it is an indirect reference to the fact, that the governor well knew the baselessness of the charge. Calvin: Responsum Christi huc tendit, in ea accusatione nihil esse coloris, "the point of Christ's reply

[1] "In accordance with the Romish policy, a governor was certainly not directed to rescue from the religious fanaticism of a subjugated people, a victim regarded apart from this, with indifference," Hase, Leben Jesu, § 117, 3d ed.

is, that this accusation was without any color of truth." With this corresponds also the rejoinder of the governor, that he had never troubled himself about the Messiah. Bengel: Hanc (posteriorem quæstionis) partem voluit Iesus observari a Pilato, Pilatus priorem partem arripit non sine iracundia, "this latter part of the question Jesus wishes to be noticed by Pilate; Pilate, not without anger, catches at the first part."

V. 36, 37. Jesus confesses to his regal dignity, but not in the worldly sense. "*Of* this world," ἐκ τ. κ. τ. can only designate dependence on, connection with, and means, consequently, "bears not the character of earthly relations to the world," or with a yet stricter sense, to which ἐντεῦθεν alludes, "has not descended from these relations to the world, has not come to me according to the laws of the world." Ἠγωνίζοντο, not with Beza, certassent, they would have fought, but: they would fight —from the present moment, and with respect to the fact, that the moment for surrendering Jesus had not yet come, (v. 31, xix. 16.)—The inference drawn by the judge is probably not to be regarded as a stroke of irony against the abject appearance of Jesus. Οὐκοῦν means *therefore*, οὔκουν means nonne and nonne ergo, not and not therefore. (Sophocles, Ajax, v. 79, cf. Passow. 4th ed.) (and Liddell and Scott's Greek English Lexic. based on Passow. Tr.) In all the grandeur of his consciousness, the Saviour now claims for himself a kingdom, but —in the realm of truth. To reveal the absolute truth in the highest of all spiritual spheres, the religious, is the calling of his life. Luther has taken the ὅτι demonstratively, in the sense of "that," and has not expressed it, but it is causal. Εἰς τ. κ. ἐρχ., in its fullest significance, (as we explained it on iii. 34,) pointing, indeed, to his higher origin, so that it serves to make complete the γεγέννημαι. "To be of the truth," εἶναι ἐκ τ. ἀλ. (1 John ii. 21, iii. 19,) is equivalent to ἐκ θεοῦ, "to be of God," see viii. 47, x. 24, 27. Does there lie in this call what is found in it by Chrysostom? ἐπισπᾶται διὰ τούτων καὶ πείθει γενέσθαι τῶν λεγομένων ἀκροατήν, "he draws him by these words, and persuades him to become a hearer of the things spoken." Or shall we say with Bengel: Provocat a cæcitate Pilati ad captum fidelium. "he appeals from the blindness of Pilate to the dis

cernment of believers"—in the same way as in the last clause of Matt. xi. 19

V. 38. Our judgment in regard to the personal character of the governor, depends especially on the way in which this expression is taken. The most favorable judgment for Pilate is that of Olshausen, who finds in these words "the melancholy expression of heartfelt wretchedness," the plaint of a seeker after truth, who had searched all systems in vain; Winer, also, (Realwörterbuch,) defends Pilate. It would be a complaint, then, like that expressed with resentful sadness by the elder Pliny, that truth is so dark, ut solum certum sit, nihil esse certi nec miserius quidquam homine nec superbius, "that nothing is certain, but this, that all is uncertain, and that man is at once the most miserable and the most proud of all beings." To this view is at once opposed in some measure, the analogy, for such earnest searchers after truth were certainly rare among the high officers of the Roman government, (cf. the words of Felix with which he breaks off the conversation with Paul, Acts xxiv. 25.) Again, if this man felt any concern about the truth, why does he at once turn his back, and with the exclamation he has made, take his departure? Why does he not *ask?* It may be said, it was no part of his duty as the examining magistrate, to engage in the investigation of questions of doctrine, (Schweizer,) but what prevented his doing so in this private audience? might he not, in fact, in his very character of examining magistrate, have gone further than he did? Besides, would so earnest a friend of religious truth have had such lax moral principles as Pilate had? Would a truly earnest Roman, out of mere dread of men, have sacrificed an accused person, of whose innocence he was convinced? And finally, when in xix. 9 he puts to the Redeemer the question concerning his origin, would Christ have met it with silence had he presumed that the interrogator felt an earnest want? We concur, therefore, in judgment with Neander: (cf. Calvin, Meyer, Lücke,) "He was the representative of the tone of thought common to a large part of the cultivated men, especially men of rank in the Roman world of that day, who were too completely under the bondage of a worldly mind to allow a germi-

nation of any feelnig of need which transcended the limits of the earthly."[1] With this, the scorn he exhibits toward the Jews, and toward Jesus himself, in the question, v. 37, and in xix. 5, is in consonance, cf. what is said above on v. 31. Nor is there any thing incompatible with such a character, in the impression made upon him by the declarations of Jesus, chap. xix. 7, 8, 12, as little as in the good nature which impels him to wish to liberate the enthusiast—the sequel shows how pliant is this kind of good nature when unattended by principle. As regards the testimonies about this man from other historical sources, Philo (leg. ad Caj.) calls him: *τὴν φύσιν ἀκαμπὴς κ. μετὰ αὐθάδους ἀμείλικτος*, "a nature inflexible and implacable in its arrogance;" Josephus and Philo mention a number of things done by him willfully and out of hatred to the Jewish people, by which insurrections were excited. It was for this reason he was deposed, and as Eusebius, Hist. eccles. ii. 7, referring to Greek historians, mentions, died by his own hand. —As he supposed that he saw traces of the enthusiast in the Saviour's reply, he expresses his judgment that he is innocent.

V. 39, 40. Pilate gathers from the further accusations of the members of the Sanhedrim, that Jesus belongs to the jurisdiction of Herod, and seeks to throw off the burden from his own conscience. In vain—it is thrust back upon *him*, for Herod returns to him the accused person. In vain does he resort to a custom, of whose origin we are ignorant, of releasing a prisoner at the Passover; the Holy One of God and a robber, are presented to the people, that they may choose between them—persuaded by the fanatical priests, they choose the robber.

[1] Cf. Neander's Kirchengesch, Bd. i. p. 15, (Torrey's tran. vol. i. p. 8.) In the same vein, the heathen Cæcilius said to the Christians: (in Minutius, Octavius, c. xii. § 7, c. xiii. § 1, 11, 12,) "Would you be wise, or even modest, cease to rack your brains about the zones of heaven, and the secrets and destinies of the world. If they look before their feet, that is enough for such illiterate, unrefined, rude and rustic people, who have not even sound sense in common things, to say nothing of spiritual ones."

CHAPTER XIX.

Scourging of Jesus.—v. 1–6.

V. 1–3. John introduces this scourging without stating the motives that led to it; we first learn from verses 5–7, that the design was, by this severe maltreatment, to satisfy in some degree the thirst on the part of the people for blood, and thus to release Jesus; Luke xxiii. 16, points to the same reason. On the other hand, however, it would seem, according to Matthew xxvii. 26, Mark xv. 15, as though the scourging, as in many other cases, had merely been preparatory to the crucifixion, (Heyne, Opusc. Acad. vol. iii.: Cur virgis cæsi Romano more, qui mox securi percutienda essent, "why it was the Roman custom to scourge persons previously to beheading them.") The apparent contradiction is relieved by the fact that this scourging, which was executed as the milder punishment, (Hug, Freib. Zeitschr. v. p. 4, thinks, as an inquisitorial torture,) as it failed of the object for which it was designed, took the place of the scourging which preceded crucifixion. As the procurator had no lictors, which were assigned only to the præses of Syria, the punishment is here inflicted by soldiers; it might be supposed that they would execute it not without severity, death, indeed, was sometimes the result, (Cicero, Act. 10, in Verr. c. 54.) They unite mockery with it, as the men of war of Antipas had done; the mantle (Luke xxiii. 11,) was still at hand, and they mimic the ceremonial of homage paid to Oriental kings.[1] And the image which the brutal insolence of soldiers,

[1] A similar instance is related by Vopiscus, of Proculus, § 2: quum in convivio quodam ad latrunculos luderetur, atque ipse decies imperator exisset, quidam non ignobilis scurra *Ave*, inquit, *Auguste!* allataque lana purpurea humero eius ingessit eumque adoravit, "when he was playing chess at a party, and had come out *imperator* ten times, a certain, not ignoble, member of the guard, said to him, Hail Augustus, and the purple cloth being brought, placed it on his shoulder and did him reverence."

as if by the sport of accident, here creates, has become the most touching representation of divine majesty in the form of a servant, and consequently, also, the sublimest subject of Christian art! How great would have been the loss to our race had they been deprived of this image of majesty in its voluntary humiliation! How calmly, yet mightily has it preached through all time, in palace, cottage and cell! A Christ *stoned* —how different the impression!

V. 4, 5. According to Hug, Pilate by producing Christ to the people after his shameful scourging, wished to create in their minds the impression, that he had undergone the quæstio per tormenta, "the trial by torture," without any evidence of guilt being brought to light. But there is no intimation of this in the words, and Luke xxiii. 16 is opposed to the supposition of a quæstio per tormenta. The design of the governor in producing him is certainly not to be gathered from the text, the antithesis to it is the leading away to the place of execution. Ἴδε ὁ ἄνθρ. Luther translates: "see what a man," and Augustine says: si regi invidetis, iam parcite, quia delectum videtis; flagellatus est, spinis coronatus est, amaris conviciis illusus est; fervet ignominia, frigescat invidia, "if you hate the king, yet spare him now that you see him cast down; he has been scourged, crowned with thorns, taunted with bitter reproaches; the ignominy burns, let the hate grow cold." This is the ordinary view, and according to Olshausen, the language "expresses the deepest sympathy."—According to Grotius and Neander, on the contrary, the meaning is: "can you believe that such a man as that would set himself up for a king?" We regard *this latter* interpretation as inadmissible, for even the most insolent rebel must have submitted to the scourging and derision. On the other hand it is certainly possible that Pilate designed to excite sympathy by the exclamation, and the language is not opposed to this, for ἴδε can also refer to the character of the person brought forth, as in v. 14. The exclamation may, however, simply intimate his presence: "There he is once more."

V. 6, 7. As the superiors and their people again urge that Christ be put to death, a sarcastic reply, like that of xviii. 31, is made by the governor. They now catch at the religious

ground of complaint, and demand the infliction of the punishment allotted to false prophets, (Deut. xiii. 1–5, Lev. xxiv. 16.)

SECOND HEARING BEFORE PILATE — SENTENCE IS PRONOUNCED. v. 8–16.

V. 8, 9. Amid all the indifference of a man of the world, the presentiment of a supernatural world is not wholly suppressed; the appearance of Christ had already made an extraordinary impression on him, and when they now designate this Jesus as a Son of God, Pilate recalls to memory the myths of appearances of the Deities on earth. The new hearing has not reference to the place of Christ's earthly birth, he already knew that Jesus was a Galilean, the question *πόθεν*, embraces, also, as in ix. 29, (cf. *ἐντεῦθεν*, xviii. 36,) the *nature* of his origin. Arrian, Dissert. Epictet. l. 3, c. 1: "Epictetus has not told me this — for whence (*πόθεν*) was he — but a god has told me." As Jesus is silent, we must conclude that he had no confidence in the susceptibility of the man for the answer.

V. 10–12. In the answer of Christ, *ἐξουσία* is regarded by Calvin and Piscator as a designation of official authority: (Romans xiii. 1–4,) "Thy power is derived from the ordinance of God, therefore, the Jews, who have wished to subserve their own arbitrary will by means of the magistracy which God has instituted, incur the greater guilt." But this causal connection of *διὰ τοῦτο*, is a very hidden one. Since Chrysostom, a majority, by *ἐξουσία* understand the authority de facto to pass sentence on Jesus, which view is favored by the neuter *δεδομένον*. The *διὰ τοῦτο* is then difficult, Heumann explaining it as meaning "nevertheless," Lampe: "therefore, since the Jews have no such power," Grotius: "since God so specially cares for me, as the Jews might know from the prophecies." Neander and De Wette present the best view: "because thou almost without a will of thine own, and constrained by the intrigues of the Sanhedrim, condemnest me." There lies then in these words something calculated to humble the arrogance of Pilate, (Chrysostom: *κατασπῶν αὐτοῦ τὸ φρόνημα κ. τὸν τύφον*, "depressing his pride and arrogance,") but there is in them, also, an extreme mildness in the distinction they draw between the sin

of infirmity and the more willful blindness. Who will believe that such an answer as this is drawn from the fancy of the Evangelist, not from Christ himself? ὁ παραδιδούς, collectively of the Jews, (Bengel: Caiaphas.)—Pilate appears to have felt in some measure the exalted character of the reply, the accused seems as it were to sit in judgment on his judge, there is consequently no rising of irritability on the part of the governor, but an increase of the feeling of kindness. But the crafty party of the priests knew how to approach the man on his weakest side. He that does not fear God supremely, is condemned to tremble before men. Amicus Cæsaris, "friend of Cæsar," was the honorary title of legates and prefects, and Tacitus (Annal. iii. 38,) says of the suspicious Tiberius: majestatis crimen omnium accusationum complementum erat, "the charge of offense against his majesty was the burden of every prosecution." Ἀντιλέγειν, also of factious opposition. That very danger which Pilate now escapes by abandoning the innocent, he actually fell into a few years later.

V. 13–16. The sentence was pronounced sub divo, "in the open air," not de plano, or ex æquo loco, "a place on a level with the audience," but ex superiori, "from an elevation." There stood the judgment seat upon a Mosaic pavement, pavimentum tessellatum, (Suetonius, Cæsar, c. 46.) If in the word Γαββαθᾶ the reading with one β be correct, the most probable derivation is from גַּבָּא, the *back*, because of its arched form, (see Tholuck's Beitr. zur Spracherkl. des N. T. p. 119–123.) On παρασκευὴ τ. πάσχα, see above, on xiii. 1. According to Mark, xv. 25, Jesus was crucified about the third hour, (nine o'clock,) with which could not be reconciled the pronouncing of the sentence at the sixth hour, that is, about noon. The harmony is most easily established by the supposition which already commends itself at i. 40, that John follows the Roman computation of time, and that, consequently, the sixth hour of the morning is here meant. De Wette is wrong in maintaining that this is "palpably too early." As the members of the Sanhedrim urged the accusation, πρωΐ, that is, between three and six o'clock, (it is clear from Mark i. 35, John xx. 1, that πρωΐ means before sunrise,) it is entirely credible that the sen-

tence followed at sunrise.[1] In order also to avoid too great a sensation among the people, they must have sought to have the sentence pronounced as early as possible. Even now the earnestness of Pilate does not go far enough to suppress his sarcasms.

THE CRUCIFIXION AND DEATH OF OUR LORD. — v. 17–30.

V. 17, 18. The crucifixion, according to the Roman law, was executed outside of the city, (so Plautus and Cicero, quoted by Hug, Freib. Zeitschr. v. p. 11;) the Jewish usage as to the place of execution, was the same. The custom of compelling the persons sentenced to bear their own cross, is also mentioned by Plutarch, De sera numinis vind. c. 9. *Γολγοθᾶ*, by euphony, for the Chaldee, גֻּלְגַּלְתָּא, "the skull."[2] The usual explanation is, "place where the skulls of criminals were lying," the genitive, *κρανίου*, forms then the *comp.*, (Fritzsche, on Mark xv. 22,) though in that case we would expect the genitive plural, and in the Aramaic, בֵּית גֻּלְגֻּלְתָּ. Bengel, therefore, (ad Matth.) understood it of the skull-shape, and Thenius, in Illgens, Zeitschr. f. Kircheng, 1842, 3 H. shows that a hill of that shape lay to the north of the city. Lipsius, de Cruce, first published Antwerp, 1595, is still the most instructive work in regard to the cross and the sufferings connected with it. The condemned persons were stripped, with the exception of an apron about the body, were drawn up with cords upon the cross, which was about a man's height, and the hands and feet first tied and afterward nailed to it. The nailing of the feet was contested by Dr. Paulus in so plausible a manner, that a majority abandoned the idea, but we may regard it as completely established by Hug, l. c. and Bähr, (see the literature in Hase, Leben Jesu, § 120, and Lücke, on xx. 25.)

V. 19–22. An inscription, titulus, over the head of the criminal, pointed out his offense, and "the first public recogni-

[1] *No Roman sentence before sunrise was valid.* Gellius, Noctes Att. xiv. 7: Senatus consulta ante exortum solem aut post solis occasum facta, rata non esse, "the decrees of the senate passed before sunrise, or after sunset, were not valid."

[2] We would expect the form גֻּלְגַּלְתָּא, but Buxtorf, Lex. Talmud, was acquainted with no other than גַּלְגַּלְתָּא; the Targum, 2 Kings ix. 35, also has גּוּלְגַּלְתָּא.

tion of Jesus was made through the ironical lapidary style of the procurator in the three languages of the world," the Hebrew (or strictly speaking, the Chaldee,) for the natives of Palestine, the Greek for the many foreigners, the Latin as the language of the commanding authority. The imperative present γράφε, which stands at other times with the negative, when something commenced is to be interrupted, is here to be explained by the fact, that the action is still regarded as capable of being revoked. To this in the mouth of Pilate, is opposed the perfect.

V. 23, 24. The only earthly property which the Saviour left fell not to his Disciples, but in conformity with the Roman law, to the executioners. In the ἱμάτια are included the upper garment, the girdle, the linen shirt, &c., the under garment was woven in one piece, like the garment of the high-priest, (Joseph. Antiq. iii. 7, 4;) according to a statement in Isidor. Pelus. Epp. i. 74, it was especially the poorer classes in Galilee who wore this kind of garment. The clothes were divided into four parts, as the Roman detachment usually consisted not of three, but of four men, (Acts xii. 4;) lots were cast on the under-garment, that it might not be injured by tearing. This incident recalls to memory the depicture of suffering in the twenty-second Psalm. It is indeed of his own sorrows David speaks in that Psalm, but the hopes to which he soars from the 24th verse, are so extraordinary, and historically considered so inexplicable, (when he speaks of his deliverance as a banquet of which rich and poor shall partake, as a consequence of which all the kindreds of the nations shall turn unto the Lord,) that we cannot but recognize in him a condition of prophetic ecstasy. The same prophetic spirit caused him in separate particulars to use expressions which were literally fulfilled in the sufferings of our Lord. In the passage which he has cited exactly from the Septuagint, the Evangelist by ἱματισμός understands the under garment.

V. 25–27. The women from Galilee, who followed Jesus to Jerusalem, (Matt. xxvii. 55,) gather here, also, at the place of anguish. According to the common view, Κλωπᾶς is equivalent to Ἀλφαῖος, חַלְפַּי, cf. however, the work of Schaf, quoted on vii.

2–5. on Wieseler's hypothesis,[1] see Ebrard in loc. Of the seven words on the cross we find one in Matthew, three in Luke, three in John. That touching scene, which shows that in the midst of his last agony the Redeemer forgot not his personal, earthly ties and duties, is recorded by that Disciple only whom it immediately concerned. So slight was the elevation of the cross, that the mother had it in her power for six fearful hours of anguish, to read in the countenance of her Divine son his agony and his triumph; the less right she had, in moments like these, to expect from his lips a word in regard to his personal relations, the more affecting must have been his address to her. That Joseph, her husband, was not living, may be gathered with certainty from these words of the Redeemer; but it has been thought strange that the sorrowing mother was not committed to the ἀδελφοῖς, whether we regard them as brothers or as cousins of Christ. But these ἀδελφοί were at that time still unbelieving; the external circumstances of John may have rendered him the very one to whom this duty was easy, and finally—what if he preëminently possessed a filial disposition?— If we suppose now that εἰς τὰ ἰδια refers to the house of John's father in Galilee, we must infer that the words ἀπ' ἐκείνης τῆς ὥρας, are to be taken very vaguely, for the Apostles remained in a body at the capital through the entire week of the festival, (xx. 26.) Does the acquaintance of John with the high-priest warrant, perhaps, the supposition that he had a house in Jerusalem also? It is certain, nevertheless, that εἰς τὰ ἴδια need not always be understood of a man's own property, and the meaning may be: "he received her, and at a later period kept her with him, where he resided."

V. 28, 29. The common interpretation connects the telic proposition, ἵνα κτλ. with λέγει, (Jesus said, "I thirst"—in order that, &c.) cf. xiv. 31. The telic proposition expresses then the subjective judgment of the Evangelist, who designs to direct attention to the fulfillment of Psalm xxii. 16: (15,) "My tongue cleaveth to my palate."[2] Not until he had drunk to its

[1] His theory is, that Salome was the sister of Jesus' mother, and John a cousin of Jesus, and consequently already bound by ties of blood to care for Mary, Stud. u. Kritik. 1840, p. 669, seq.

[2] According to the current view, there is a reference to Psalm lxix. 22; εἰς τὴν

dregs the cup of suffering, does the dying Saviour allow himself any thing to refresh him, and thereby fulfills a touch of the picture of suffering in Ps. xxii. The only objection to this view is, that the scriptural allusion is vaguely expressed, when we might naturally look for reference to a particular passage, see vss. 24, 36, 37, ii. 17, xii. 37, seq. We cannot appeal to xvii. 12 for counter evidence, since there no single passage of Scripture is had in view. Semler has, consequently, given this interpretation: Postea cum sciret Jesus, iam omnia ista in ipso completa esse, quibus opus esset, ut Scripturæ oracula eventu non carerent, dixit: sitio, "when Jesus knew that all things needful to the fulfillment of the prophecies of Scripture were completed in him, he said: 'I thirst.'" The final proposition on this view, serves to define more clearly the preceding one, as in chap. xi. 4. In the same way Van Hengel (Annotatio in N. T. Amst. 1824,) construes it, and in accordance with this sense brings in v. 30: "Conscious that all was fulfilled, he speaks of his thirst, and after he had drunk and obtained strength, he cries aloud." This sense is neither indicated, nor does it seem very appropriate; yet it is a question whether the preference should not be given to this construction. As soon as the criminal arrived at the place of execution, we are told in the Talmud, it was the custom to offer him a cup of drugged wine, which served to stupefy him. This had been refused by Christ after he had tasted it, for he wished to suffer and die in the full possession of his consciousness. At a later period there is mention made, Luke xxiii. 36, of vinegar being offered in mockery, but this seems to be different from the fact here under consideration. More probably the fact here mentioned by John coincides with Matt. xxvii. 48, Mark xv. 36; if the drink was brought, on our Saviour's exclaiming: Eli, Eli, &c., in Matthew, it is not easy to see how that should give occasion for bringing it, and perhaps the words, "I thirst," followed soon after the exclamation mentioned by Matthew. The Oriental hyssop, which grows to the length of a yard, could be conveniently used to support a sponge. As one whose

διψαν μου ἐπότισάν με ὄξος, "*in my thirst* they gave me vinegar to drink." The διψῶ, however, does not here present itself as the leading idea, and the giving of the vinegar to Christ was a kindness; in the Psalm, on the contrary, it is an image of grief, neither should Matt. xxvii. 34 be referred to Psalm lxix.

dying was not passive, but *active*, not a thing endured, but an *act*, (John x. 18,) the Redeemer, with a clear consciousness of the moment at which his life ends, encounters death, and testifies that his work on earth has been performed.

THE TAKING DOWN FROM THE CROSS AND THE BURIAL.—v. 31–42.

V. 31–35. According to the Jewish law, the person hanged was to be taken down the same day, (Deuteronomy xxi. 23,) especially on feast-days, and this feast-day was specially holy; on the words, "for that Sabbath day, &c." see above, on xiii. 1. On this point the Romans were compliant. *Παρασκευή*, means the day of preparation, not for the feast, but for the Sabbath, (v. 42.) The breaking of the legs has been regarded by many as a means of putting to death. But that it was not designed in and of itself to produce death, Neander (p. 709, tran. p. 426,) shows by a reference to Polyb. Hist. i. c. 80, § 13, and to Ammian Marcellin. Hist. xiv. 9, where it is expressly said: fractis cruribus, *occiduntur*, "after their legs have been broken, *they are killed.*" The breaking of the legs was not always connected with the crucifixion, (the Jews, consequently, had first to get Pilate's permission,) but was a special aggravation of the punishment, (Hug, l. c. p. 64.) As those who had been suspended but a few hours on the cross might be restored, this barbarous act was performed to prevent such a restoration; they were probably left to languish away in this miserable condition. Approaching on both sides, the soldiers performed their work on the two who were crucified with him; in the case of Jesus himself, the act appeared superfluous, as they discovered in him the signs of death; in order, however, to make yet more sure of his death, one of them thrust his lance into the side of our Lord, cf. an instance of such a finishing blow with a lance, in the Martyrology of the Acta Sanctorum, quoted by Neander, (p. 709, tran. p. 426.) That in the case of Christ, this thrust must have produced death, had not death previously taken place, is clear from the magnitude of the wound, for Thomas was told to put, not his finger, but his *hand* into the side, (xx. 27,) the body must, consequently, have been pierced not only by the point of the lance, but by the broad

part of it also.—The fact of the gushing forth of blood and water, already creates in itself an anatomical difficulty, and yet greater is the difficulty connected with the answer to the question, for what object the Evangelist adduces it, especially when we consider the earnest asseveration, v. 35. Neander (p. 712, tran. 427,) limits himself to a brief remark, Lücke leaves the whole matter undetermined, and without reply passes by the objections urged by Strauss. We will commence with the explanation of v. 35. First of all, as to the construction, we may, as in xx. 21, consider the ἵνα κτλ. as dependent on μεμαρτύρηκε, and regard what lies between them as parenthetical. It is preferable, however, to insert something before ἵνα, "and writes this," as in i. 8, (De Wette.) As to the apprehension of this testimony as a whole, Weisse, (ii. 326, seq.) Lützelberger, (p. 192,) Schweizer, (p. 60,) consider it as in the highest degree singular and equivocal; the preterite μεμαρτύρηκε, and the ἐκεῖνος, clearly argue, in their judgment, that the author of this testimony either distinguishes himself from the Evangelist, or betrays himself as distinct from him. It is said in reply, that the perfect μεμαρτύρηκε, may, as in chap. i. 34, mean: "wishes to have it testified." We may, besides, oppose to it the present οἶδεν, the force of which Schweizer sees no other way of obviating than by the remark, that the later writer, although John was in heaven, conceived of himself as joining in with him. These words have, undoubtedly, a certain circumstantiality, but why should not the Evangelist have appealed first to his authority as a witness of the truth, and after that to his inmost consciousness of the truth?—What then is it which he so solemnly testifies, and by which he designs to give strength to the Christian faith of the reader? If it be simply the flowing of blood and water from the wound, what is the element of faith? The most obvious supposition is, that in opposition to the assertion of a death in appearance merely, he certifies the reality of the death of Jesus, (Beza, Semler, Rosenmuller, Kuinöl, Neander.) But at the very outstart is opposed to this the fact, that no doubt of the reality of the death of Jesus ever rose in the early Church, which, according to Weisse, is the strongest of the evidences against the supposition of an apparent death. Besides, does the flowing out of blood and water

confirm the death which had ensued? Already in Calvin we have an allusion to the fact, that "coagulating blood resolves itself partly into water." But it has been urged by Strauss, that only *without* the body is the blood decomposed into clots and water. But how, if the author of the Gospel, together with these soldiers, was *mistaken* as to having seen such a decompounding in what flowed from the wound? or if he, as Strauss will have it, taking that error as the basis, has invented the whole statement "in order to get a certain proof of the death of Jesus?" But when the Evangelist writes: "forthwith came there out blood and water," it does not look as though he meant coagulated clots of blood, he seems rather to speak of running blood, and if this be the meaning, it cannot be the Evangelist's object to prove that Jesus was actually dead. Could he, perhaps, have assumed that death was produced by the thrust, and have mentioned the water and blood as a proof against the Docetæ of the reality of Christ's body? (Hammond, Paulus, Olshausen.) But why, then, is *water* brought into the question? Is not the matter thereby pushed to the miraculous? Indeed, the ancient Church downward even to Calovius and Bengel, considered the fact a mysterious one. Ambrose (in Luc. c. 23,) says: In corporibus nostris sanguis post mortem congelascit, sed hoc loco adhuc fluidus est, "in our bodies the blood congeals completely after death, but here it is still fluid," in the same way, Origen, Contra Celsum, ii. 36, and Euthymius: ἐκ νεκροῦ γὰρ ἀνθρώπου, κἂν μυριάκις νύξῃ τις, οὐκ ἐξελεύσεται αἷμα, "from the body of a dead man, though it should be pierced ten thousand times, blood would not issue." With 1 John v. 6 to appeal to, they found therein symbolically typified the two fountains of salvation flowing from Christ for the Church, the baptismal water and the eucharistic wine. The very converse has been maintained by Weisse: that in this mystical understanding of the passage, 1 John v. originated the invention of this pretended fact. But how? Is it a correct view, that v. 35 refers only to the last words of v. 34? The γάρ, v. 36, proves the very reverse; verses 36 and 37 show that the testimony of the Evangelist attaches weight preëminently to the fact, that by divine dispensation the body of Jesus remained in every respect unmutilated. Under these

circumstances, it must remain undecided, whether the Evangelist mentions the flowing forth of the blood and water with a special object, or merely in view of its historical importance in connection with the mention of the thrust with the lance.—In what way, now, is the fact to be regarded anatomically? The view might be taken, that Jesus was killed by the thrust with the lance. Assuming this view, it might be said, that the "blood and water," *αἷμα καὶ ὕδωρ*, was a reddish lymph, (Paulus,) (which is contradicted, however, by the depth of the wound,) or it is what is called the lymphatic humor, which, in cases of bleeding to death in the open air, follows the blood, (Hase, 3d ed.) But it is far more probable that the Evangelist coincides in the opinion he imputes to the soldiers, that death had already taken place. The question then comes up: can blood and water flow from corpses? The statements on this point are conflicting. Krabbe (Leben Jesu, p. 508,) asserts that anatomists confirm the separation of blood in corpses, into clots and serum; Hase (2d ed. p. 258,) says, that precisely at the time that a corpse begins to putrefy, blood and water flow out; Winer, (Realwörterb. i. 673,) that blood and water flow from the parts where the great veins lie; Strauss and De Wette mention the testimony of anatomists, that within an hour after death the blood coagulates and ceases to flow out, and this is certainly the statement of anatomists in general; the varying testimonies arise from the fact, that a difference is made by the time of dissection, by the influence of climate, and especially by the character of the disease. And at this point the question comes up, as to what portion of the body the spear came in contact with. Already Calvin and Grotius, and subsequently the physician Gruner, held the view, that the part struck was the pericardium, in which, especially during powerful anguish, a vapor collects, which changes into water on coming in contact with the air, (Hildebrand, Anatom. iii. p. 308.) The explanation is, however, a highly precarious one, (Strauss, ii. 549, Eng. tran. iii. 292.) The question has been brought to a new and apparently satisfactory result, by the learned investigation of Ebrard, (ii. 698, seq.) On the basis of medical observation, he directs special attention to the influence exercised by stretching of the muscles, and by extra-

vasation, on the condition of the blood of persons in suffering, and of the dead, and closes his examination with this result: "The lance might strike several blood-vessels, it might come in contact with points at which extravasated blood was collected, where serum and placenta were in a state of separation, and the former alone flowed out, and as the lance entered more deeply, it might touch places in which the blood was fluid."

V. 36, 37. That the body of Jesus did not suffer that mutilation, and was but pierced with a lance, was an exemption of such a character that in this incidental feature, also, Christ, the true Easter lamb of the spiritual Church, was conformed to the Paschal lamb of the Old Testament, (Exod. xii. 46;) thereby also, was fulfilled a prophecy of Zechariah, which seems to speak determinately of the death of the Messiah, although its interpretation, as indeed the exposition of this remarkable prophet, in general, is still veiled in mystery. That we cannot, with Calvin, Grotius, Rosenmuller, understand in Zechar. xii. 10, the word דָּקַר metaphorically in the sense, "to wound," (hurt the feelings, or the character. Tr.) has recently not only been established by Hengstenberg, but has been acknowledged by Hitzig and Ewald; for certainly the person pierced, who is introduced as speaking, cannot be Jehovah, but is that mysterious angel of the Lord, who appears repeatedly in this very prophet. Both the prophet and Evangelist, by the expression "they shall look," ὄψονται, design to indicate a penitential contemplation, (viii. 28.) It is worthy of remark that the literal translation of the Old Testament passage here, coincides with that in Rev. i. 7, while the Septuagint expresses the metaphorical meaning: ἐπιβλέψονται πρός με, ἀνθ' ὧν κατωρχήσαντο, "they shall look upon me, because they have mocked me."

V. 38–40. The proof of the reverence which these two men of rank, secretly adherents of Jesus, pay to his lifeless body, is the more remarkable, as by this ignominious death of his the faith which they had in him, and the hopes which in their minds were linked with him, seemed to have been proved to be groundless. With how much more strength does Nicodemus seem invested here, than in ch. vii. 51! Now he has reached the meaning of the declaration iii. 14. From Luke xxiii. 53, we might be led to suppose that Joseph himself had effected

the taking down of the body from the cross, against which view it appears, according to John, that this had already been done by the soldiers, for *αἴρειν* must here be understood differently from v. 31, (there referring to the taking down from the cross, here meaning) "to take away." The body, then, which had been taken down by the soldiers, was committed to Joseph, cf. Matt. xxvii. 58, Mark xv. 43, seq.[1] — The large quantity of pulverized myrrh and aloes which was scattered between the wrappings, is in keeping with the greatness of the veneration felt by Nicodemus.

V. 41, 42. According to the Synoptists, the grave belonged to Joseph himself, and John also leaves this to be inferred, for they could not have laid the body of a crucified man in any new family sepulchre they might please. As, however, the vicinity of this sepulchre is assigned as the reason why the interment took place in it, it is to be supposed that Joseph may not at first have intended to give up his family vault for this purpose.

1 Unless, indeed, it be understood in this way, that after the breaking of the legs they waited a while, although no one asked for the body; in that case *αἴρειν* can be taken in the same sense in v. 31 as in 38.

CHAPTER XX.[1]

THE resurrection of our Lord is not less a postulate of history than of doctrinal theology. Without it, the Christian Church is inconceivable. The greater the importance of the fact, the clearer the testimony of history for it, the more have the enemies of Christianity been tempted to make their assault upon it, and the more unsuccessful have their assaults been. There could be but a single election: Christianity was either to be despoiled of her Good Friday or of her Easter; it was either to be made good that the Saviour rose, but had not really died, or that he really died but did not rise. The latter alternative was the one embraced so early as the time of the Jewish opposers of Christ (Matt. xxviii. 13,) and of Celsus, and at a later period by the English Deists: Woolston, (Discourses on the Miracles of the Saviour, 1727–1729,) Chubb, (Posthumous Works, 1748, i. 330, seq.) and "The Resurrection considered," 1744,(attributed to Morgan,) and the author of the "Wolfenbüttel Fragments," (in the *fourth* Contribution.) These older assaults sacrificed to the aversion felt by their authors toward miracles, the character of the Apostles for honesty, but they could not solve that mystery of a falsehood which could have been invented for no advantage but that of bonds and martyrdom, a falsehood which was defended with a joyousness of faith and with an enthusiasm which overcame the world, a falsehood for which, after all, no other motive could be assigned than the improbable wish of avenging the delusion practiced on themselves, by deluding others. German rationalism has given up this mode of getting out of the difficulty, and has acknowleged that something must have occurred between the

[1] A good dogmatico-historical monograph on the resurrection of Christ is furnished in the work: De Jesu in vitam reditu, by Dœdes, Utrecht, 1841.

period when the Apostles were like frightened deer, and gathered with closed doors in Jerusalem, and that period when, threatened by the authorities of their country, they boldly proclaimed: "We cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard," (Acts iv. 20.) "If," says Dr. Paulus, (Komm. iii. p. 867,) "if we take in, with a historic glance, the account of the origin of Christianity, from the last evening of the life of Jesus to the end of the fifty days that followed, it is undeniable that in this brief interval something of a wholly extraordinary character in inspiring their courage, must have occurred to have brought the Apostles, who timorously fled on that night, who were to the last degree destitute of self-reliance and helpless, to have brought them to the point at which they stood, when exalted above all fear of death in the presence of the judges of the murdered Jesus, judges exasperated to the last degree, they exclaimed: 'We ought to obey God rather than men.'" "Something extraordinary must have occurred," so Strauss, also, declares, (ii. p. 631, 4th ed., Eng. tr. iii. 366.) But that extraordinary occurrence is not, as one might in accordance with the laws of the mind expect, to be sought in an impulse from some external source, not (as rationalism supposed,, in the resuscitation of one, who, while *apparently dead*, had been interred, but in an internal process of the imagination which embodied into a personal appearing that Jesus whom faith knew as glorified with God, and whose spiritual nearness it experienced. The death of Christ and Good Friday with it, belong to reality, but Easter morning lies in the domain of the fancy. Without entering into a reply to what has been leveled against this point in the warfare upon it, (and it has justly been styled the Achilles heel of the whole mythical treatment of the life of Jesus,) we would merely remark, that it stands or falls with the historical credibility of the narrative in regard to Thomas, stands or falls, consequently, with the genuineness of the Gospel of John. The hypothesis mentioned, has remained the undivided property of its author. Weisse, indeed, has employed himself in reshaping those fancies in regard to the risen Christ, with which Strauss would have nothing to do, by explaining them as ghost-like influences of the Redeemer after his death. — The negative criticism has derived here also, the

external support for its attacks from the discrepancies of the Evangelists. They are undoubtedly more numerous on this point than on others in the history, though (with two exceptions perhaps,) not of any more importance. The most serious difficulty, is that which rests on Matt. xxviii. 7, 10, cf. xxvi. 32, inasmuch as Matthew seems to know of no other appearings of Jesus to the *Disciples*, than those in Galilee. If we consider ourselves authorized to judge in a general way of that passage without reference to the character of the Gospel of Matthew, we might with Dœdes, l. c. 128, and Ebrard, ii. p. 728, say that Christ's language referred to his appearing in the presence of the mass of his Disciples; it is self-evident, too, that he did not command his Disciples to depart immediately, but only at the close of the week of the feast. But it is better to bear in mind in addition, that the Gospel of Matthew is, as a general thing, an account especially of what was acted on the theatre of Galilee. We would only direct attention, then, further to the fact that in Matt. xxviii. 16 mention is made of a mountain designated by Jesus as a spot where the Disciples were to assemble, which shows that there were appearances of Christ which Matthew left unmentioned. On the patristic attempts to reconcile the discrepancies, see Niemeyer de Evang. de narrando in Christi reditu dissensione, 1824, on those of a more recent date, see Griesbach, who (in his Dissertation de fontibus unde Evang. suas de resurrectione domino narrationes, Op. ii.,) carries out the view that each Evangelist records the reports about the risen Saviour in the order in which they came to him. The most recent attempts will be found noticed in Ebrard.

The enemies of the Redeemer were to see him no more when he had risen, this was the privilege of his friends alone, but he no longer makes his abode even in their circle, but appears only at intervals. The forty days preceding the Ascension, are a period of transition to our Lord himself, who was no longer bound by the ordinary conditions of earthly being; they were also a period of transition for the Disciples, who were to be weaned from the relations of outward sense to him.

CHRIST APPEARS TO MARY MAGDALENE AFTER HIS RESURRECTION. — V. 1–18.

V. 1, 2. Just at this point we find the three Synoptists differing from one another, and from John. Before entering in detail upon these differences, on which critics have in recent times laid such stress, it must first of all be made clear, why such differences are inevitable in all historical writings, in the next place, that they are found in all profane authors, and finally, what their relation is to the interests of religion; here belongs my dissertation "on the relation of differences in detail, to truth upon the whole," in my Glaubwürdigkeit der ev. Geschichte, "Credibility of the Evangelical History," p. 370, seq. 2d ed. (p. 456, seq.) The most recent criticism has banished all attempts at reconciliation "to the lumber-room of antiquated harmonistics." But as there is no department of history where the very same thing must not be employed, it can only be regarded as the result of enmity to the evangelical history, when men repel, just in its case, all efforts at reconciliation. It is possible that in the events here detailed, it may be as Olshausen, following Griesbach and Hess, represents it: "The accounts of the Synoptists, (and of John,) form two parallel series; John relates merely what he witnessed, the Synoptists probably heard what they relate, from one of the women. By simply assuming now, that Mary Magdalene separated herself from the women, first came to the sepulchre alone, and then called Peter and John thither, the parallel character of the two accounts becomes clear and palpable. The course of events is then the following: Early in the morning, Mary Magdalene with the other women, repairs to the sepulchre, but hastens in advance of them, and to her amazement finds the sepulchre empty. Mary at once goes in haste to Peter and John, meanwhile the other women come up, see the angels, and hear their words. After the women have gone, Mary comes back with the two Disciples, who after examining the grave return home, while Mary still remains at the grave weeping, and here the angels show themselves to her also, and then our Lord himself appears. After this appearing, which was confined to

Mary, our Lord revealed himself to the women also on their way back." (Translation of Olshausen's Comm. vol. iv. 273, Clark's For. Theol. Libr.) The absence of a solicitous exactness on the part of the Evangelists in their narratives, which makes it so easy to show contradiction in them, is here proven by the use of the plural *οἴδαμεν*, in v. 2, which, as Strauss cannot deny, (ii. p. 573, Eng tr. iii. 314,) removes the main point in the difference, since it is apparent from the use of the plural, that John also knew of several women, though he only mentions the Magdalene. *Σάββατα* here means *week*, and the cardinal number (*μιᾶ*) is used instead of the ordinal in accordance with the usage of the later Hebrew, and especially of the Aramean, (Winer, p. 224, 4th ed., Eng. transl. 196.) The fact of the taking away of the stone, leads to the inference of the taking away of the body—not exactly with an inimical design, as the question of Mary to the gardener, v. 15, shows. The woman hastens not to her female, but to her male, friends. It may be asked whether she must not necessarily encounter her female friends as she returned; but on the other side it may be asked: what if these were going by the usual road, and Mary, as the means of returning more *quickly*, struck into a by-way? What if it was necessary for her to take a different path from theirs to get to Peter? Cf. what Hess (Th. iii. p. 465, seq.) adduces from Josephus.—From the repetition of the *πρός*, Bengel concludes that John was not in the same place as Peter.

V. 3–10. The imperfect *ἤρχοντο*, is used of an action in passing. The inquisitiveness prompted by love, perhaps, also, his more youthful years, caused John to run in advance of Peter; he sees, with what could have been no slight surprise, the linen clothes lying, a fact which contradicted the supposition that the body had been taken away. The more courageous Peter enters the vault, (cf. on xi. 38,) and now notices that the different parts of the burial clothes are laid apart as carefully as if the person on whom they had been had done it, John also sees this, and ventures to believe in a resurrection. That the *ἐπίστευσεν* refers to faith in the account given by the Magdalene, v. 2, (Erasmus, Grotius, Heumann,) is inadmissible, since the very fact that the linen clothes were carefully laid aside would, on the contrary, put a robbery out of the question.

But neither can we, with Ebrard, refer the ἐπίστευσεν to the same object as εἶδε, to wit: the linen laid off with regularity, for then the connection with v. 9 is broken, nor is it said that Peter had given John an assurance about it, on the contrary, according to v. 5, John had seen the things himself. It is true the πιστεύειν here, also, (see on ii. 11,) expresses a lower degree of faith, the mere faith in a probability, like that faint hope expressed by the Disciples who went to Emmaus, Luke xxiv. 21. The account of the same fact in Luke xxiv. 12, mentions Peter only, to whom *wonder* merely is attributed; a similar absence of care on the part of the narrator is very clearly seen there, moreover, since from the τινές, v. 24, it is manifest that Peter did not go to the grave alone. A faith in the resurrection of Christ based on Scripture, John represents as the higher grade, the Scripture here, also, representing only the objective divine counsel, cf. ἔδει, Luke xxiv. 26. As to the difficulty often urged, of understanding how the Disciples should not have remembered the predictions of the resurrection so distinctly made, we have but to bear in mind, that while they easily comprehended the verbal meaning of the announcements, they may have regarded the expressions as figurative, (cf. Luke ix. 45, Mark ix. 10.)

V. 11–13. The hurrying Disciples had been slowly followed by Mary; it may be asked then: why did she still weep when the Disciples must have comforted her? It is questionable, whether they met her on her return. But if they did, the reason of their hope, which was still far from certainty, might not at once comfort her woman's heart which had been so deeply agitated. Luther makes some fine suggestions in regard to the unbounded character of her sorrow. He directs attention, for example, to the fact that the other women, when they see the angelic appearance, fly, (Mark xvi. 5,) but not so Mary: "so full of devotion, longing and love toward the Lord Jesus Christ is she, that she neither sees nor hears." The angelic appearances cannot well be transferred to the realm of mere fancy, although the Apostles themselves supposed that the women were susceptible of an illusion of the fancy, (Luke xxiv. 23,)—"none but the angels at the resurrection seem to belong to *history*," (Hase, ev. Dogm. p. 115, 2d ed.)—but just as little

have the writers of the Bible apprehended such appearances as ordinary facts of the world of sense. They several times connect with angelic appearances, the terms ὀπτασία and ὅραμα, (Luke i. 22, Acts x. 3;) the angels, consequently, may have been perceived only when the mind was in an exalted condition, and by the inner sense.

V. 14, 15. The woman turning round perceived Jesus, without recognizing him—was this the result of her sorrow merely? See in answer to this question, what is said on v. 19.—The sepulchre lay in a garden, and whom would she more naturally expect to see at this early hour of the morning than the gardener? Hug has directed attention to an additional circumstance which may strengthen this conjecture, (Freib. Zeitschr. II. 7, p. 162, seq.) When persons were crucified they were stripped with the exception of the subligaculum, the cloth about the loins; Jesus had no other covering than this when he was interred. But this was also the solitary piece of clothing worn by laborers in the field: and thus Mary's conjecture is made natural. *Αὐτόν*, Bengel: putat, hortulano statim constare, quem velit, "she thinks that the gardener will at once understand whom she means." *Ἀρῶ*, Bengel: parata est novum sepulcrum quærere, "she is prepared to seek a new sepulchre," but there lies more in her words than this: Luther, "In sooth, she would have had a goodly burden, a woman undertaking to carry a dead body. But just so every Christian heart, which truly loves Christ, is ready to think that it has strength enough to do whatever it wills to do."

V. 16–18. It seems as if while she speaks to the gardener, as she supposes, she turns her eyes away from him, and not until he speaks to her again turns herself round; that tone in which she as a penitent sinner had heard herself addressed in the most important moment of her life, she now recognizes once more; she breaks forth into the wonted address and perhaps sinks at the feet of the risen Redeemer, or places her hands upon him to be satisfied of his reality. Cod. 13 adds: *καὶ προσέδραμεν ἅψασθαι αὐτοῦ*, "and she ran to touch him." The language of our Lord, *μή μου ἅπτου*, has seemed so difficult to understand, that a change in the reading itself has been proposed. Even Lücke is disposed to read *σύ μου ἅπτου*, as Schul-

thess had suggested. The main question in forming our estimation of the numerous efforts at explanation is, whether they harmonize with the meaning of ἅπτεσθαί τινος? We would make the following classification of them: 1) ἅπτεσθαι, *to touch, to finger, to feel.* *a*) Dr. Paulus: "Do not lay a finger on me for my wounds still smart." *b*) Weisse: "Do not lay a finger on me, for I am still spiritual and have a body yet to attain." *c*) Schleiermacher, Olshausen, (1st and 3d ed.) "Do not touch me, for I am still passing through the process of glorification, and my flesh is still susceptible of injury." But thus the process of glorification would be preposterously represented after the analogy of a cicatrizing wound. *d*) Fr. v. Meyer, Fikenscher: "Thou needest not touch me — to wit: to test whether I am a spirit or not, (v. 27, Luke xxiv. 39,) — for I have not yet been taken from the earth." — 2) *To lay hold of, cling to* any one, here especially of clinging to the knees or to the feet to kiss them, as in Matt. xxviii. 9. *a*) Beza, Piscator, Gerhard, Maldonatus, Heumann, Mosheim: "Do not delay with me, thou wilt have time enough for intercourse with me, for I will remain several weeks with you, hasten rather, &c." *b*) Camero, Kypke, Kuinöl, Meyer: "Embrace not my knees, for I am not yet glorified, and this divine reverence to me is not yet proper." *c*) Chrysostom, Luther: "Do not kiss and lay a finger on me so familiarly as in former days, for although I have not yet ascended, I am soon to ascend." *d*) Augustine, Calvin, Melancthon, Grotius, Lampe, Olshausen, (2d ed.) Neander: "Thou must not so cling to my earthly appearance, for I am not yet in that glorified condition in which thou mayest abide with me." 3) *To dwell upon a thing spiritually.* De Wette: "Be not absorbed in my present appearance, the abandonment of yourself to this feeling cannot truly satisfy you." This third mode of apprehending the expression, has this especially to favor it, that it dispenses with the necessity of supposing some *gesture* on Mary's part to give completeness to the narrative of the Evangelist, a gesture of which he has made no mention, and yet of which had it occurred we would expect some mention in a method of narration so plastic as his. Against it lies the objection that the usage of ἅπτεσθαί τινος in this sense is not sufficiently established; used of things, it

certainly means, "*to engage in, trouble one's self with*, and of persons, in a bad sense, to designate a violent assault, (Plato, Pol. V. 465, B. Menex. 244, A.) but is it used also in a good sense? Passow certainly, in the 4th ed. of his Lexicon, admits that it may be used of persons with whom one has to do, either in a good or in a bad sense. Against the *second* interpretation may be urged, that it seems to make the expression mean too much. Nevertheless the very expression ἅπτεσθαι ποδῶν, γονάτων, is connected with προσκυνεῖν in Pindar, Nem. viii. v. 22, in Homer, and in the Septuagint, 2 Kings iv. 27, and expresses a supplicatory embracing of the knees, nor is it easy to believe that Mary, under the impulse of the vehement emotion excited by seeing our Lord, would have refrained from expressing her feelings by a gesture, and supposing her to have made one, we are reminded very naturally of Matt. xxviii. 9, where it is said of the women: αἱ δὲ προσελθοῦσαι ἐκράτησαν αὐτοῦ τοὺς πόδας, καὶ προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ, "they came and held him by the feet and worshiped him." If we decide for this meaning of ἅπτεσθαι, the method of taking it suggested under *d*, would deserve the preference; for the *first* has against it, that if it were correct, the reason for forbidding the touching, would have been differently stated, perhaps by οὔπω γὰρ ἀναβαίνω, or something of the sort; to the view under *b*, is opposed the fact, that Christ, Matt. xxviii. 9, does not prevent the adoration, and that the προσκύνησις, as it was not a *divine* adoration, was not rejected by him even at an earlier period, (Luke v. 8, Matt. xvii. 14, Mark x. 17;) to the view under *c*, the meaning of the word is opposed. In the *first* class, the most tenable view is that of Fr. v. Meyer, although the thought οὐ γὰρ πνεῦμά εἰμι, is certainly not expressed with sufficient clearness by οὔπω γὰρ ἀναβέβηκα. Lücke adduces as an additional reason against it, that Christ himself, Luke xxiv. 39, John xx. 27, invited a test by the touch, but to this the reply may be made: that supposing Mary to have placed her hand upon him to assure herself of his reality, the words μή μου ἅπτου are not to be regarded as prohibitory, but, as what follows shows, as a tranquilizing address, "Thou needest not feel me, for, &c." In our judgment, more than one of the views offered may claim a character of probability, but we are not prepared to decide which is entitled to the preference.—The words

ἀναβαίνω, &c., which recall the promise in the last discourses of Jesus, comprehend in them something consolatory. They express the triumphant exaltation of the Redeemer himself to glory, and a participation on the part of the Disciples in that love of the Father, which he, the first-born enjoys; of both these, his farewell discourse had spoken, (xiv. 28, xvii. 20–26.)

THE RISEN SAVIOUR APPEARS TO THE APOSTLES.—v. 19–23.

V. 19, 20. It would seem that this is the same appearance after the resurrection, detailed in Luke xxiv. 36, seq.; there is a similarity not only in the facts, but in the words of Christ, (v. 48, 49.)[1] As to the reading, we would observe, that according to Cod. A B D, *συνηγμένοι* should be rejected from the text. In the opinion of the Fathers, and the theologians of the Lutheran Church, it is a just inference from the text, that Jesus passed through the closed doors, and consequently must have risen in a glorified body.[2] This view seems to be favored by the fact that his Disciples did not recognize him, v. 14, ch. xxi. 4, Luke xxiv. 13, seq., by the express declaration, Mark xvi. 12, the sudden appearing, John xxi. 1, and the vanishing, Luke xxiv. 31, to which is to be added the doctrinal argument, that the resurrection of Christians in glory is designated as a repetition or continuation of the resurrection of Christ, (1 Cor xv. 20, Col. i. 18.) Thus it is viewed at a recent date, by Olshausen, Krabbe, ("The Doctrine of Sin," p. 299, seq.) F. Kuhn, ("How did Christ pass through the door of the grave?" 1838.) Reasons, not destitute of weight, are in conflict with this view. The fact, indeed, that Christ after his resurrection partook of earthly nourishment, (Luke xxiv. 42, John xxi. 13,) may be set aside by the distinction, that the *capacity* to assimilate food does not necessarily presuppose its *necessity;* but when the risen Saviour attributes to himself flesh and *bones*, Luke xxiv. 39,

[1] Neander compares, also, the appearing before the *δώδεκα*, "twelve," 1 Cor. xv. 5; he thinks in general, that Paul there brings in the appearances of Christ after his resurrection in chronological order, a supposition which would render it necessary to transpose from Galilee to Jerusalem, the appearing before the five hundred.

Cf Suicer, Thes. eccles. i. p. 1413; Whitby, de interp. script. e patr. p. 288, s; Gerhard, Harm. Ev. sect. 212; Quenstept, Syst. Theol. P. III. p. 634. A Lutheran disputation for this view, armed at every point, was prepared by Günther, Leipzig, 1693

can this body be that *σῶμα τῆς δόξης*, which is ascribed to him in his present condition? (Philip. iii. 21.) Can this be harmonized with the fact that according to 1 Cor. vi. 13, there shall be in the glorified state no questions either about the *κοιλία*, or about the *βρώματα*, and that "flesh and blood" are excluded from the perfected kingdom of God? (1 Cor. xv. 50.) On the other hand: were there no analogy between the risen Christ and Christians when they shall rise, how could Paul parallel them? Again: if Christ remained subject to all the earlier conditions of his earthly being, how, during the fifty days that followed his resurrection, could he keep aloof from the circle of his Disciples, when he must, on this supposition, have been impelled to seek in it to allay their agitation? We, consequently, find ourselves compelled to take an intermediate view, to suppose an essential change potentially in bodily organism, which did not, however, come to its completion until the act of ascension. It may be rendered very doubtful whether the passages in John compel us to suppose that a miracle took place. A decided conclusion could be drawn from the *ἔστη εἰς τὸ μέσον*, v. 19, 26, only in case it had not been preceded by *ἦλθεν* and *ἔρχεται*, cf. Luke xxiv. 36. The fact that *τῶν θυρῶν κεκλεισμένων* is repeated in v. 26, without the addition of *διὰ τὸν φόβον τῶν Ἰουδαίων*, could be strictly demonstrative only in case it were connected, not with *ἔρχεται*, but with *ἔστη εἰς τὸ μέσον*. Granting, however, that John speaks of a miraculous appearing when the doors were closed, this would be far from compelling us to think of a body of flesh and bones impenetrating the wood of the door. The remark is already made by Bucer and Calvin, that John does not write *διὰ θυρῶν κεκλεισμένων*; we may rather then, on the supposition that John speaks of a miracle, imagine a miraculous opening of the door, which is not mentioned, however, because the Disciples did not *perceive* the mode of entrance.—The risen Saviour presented himself in their midst with the salutation of peace, (see on xiv. 27.) After he had vanquished death, and obtained the forgiveness of sins, there was peace: the repetition in v. 21 and v. 26, shows that something emphatic lies in this salutation. On v. 20, cf. further the remarks on v. 25.

V. 21–23. They are comforted by a reference to that exalted

destination, which had also been spoken of in ch. xvii. 18. The breath is the symbol of the Spirit, as is the wind, ch. iii. 8; it is Jesus who breathes on them, that is, through him the Spirit is mediated. Only by the power of the Holy Ghost can a judgment be formed as to the moral position of men and its relation to the kingdom of God; so far the promise in v. 22 is connected with that in v. 23. This judgment of the Spirit, however, is not an indistinct emotion, but is connected with the rule of faith and life; so far the jus clavium, "the power of the keys," is in the later Church a right of the clergy.[1] It is an important question, whether the breathing is to be regarded as the symbol of an endowment yet to be conferred, or of one imparted at the time. The latter view is the prevalent one; but as the pouring out of the Spirit took place at Pentecost, we already find that Chrysostom discriminates between diverse operations of the Spirit, in unison with whose view Gerhard says: Dicendum, quod spiritum sanctum jam ante acceperint *ratione sanctificationis*, hic accipiunt eum ratione *ministerii Evangelici;* in die Pentecostes accipiunt eum ratione *miraculosorum donorum*, "it may be said, that they had already received the Holy Spirit *in respect of sanctification*, here they receive him in respect of the *ministry of the Gospel;* on the day of Pentecost they receive him in respect of the *gifts of miracles*." These diverse qualities, however, are all grounded in the same spiritual substance, we must, consequently, regard the whole of them as from the beginning imparted potentially, and only becoming operative by degrees, or we must bring them into a gradual relation. Calvin, Bengel, Lücke, Olshausen, regard the outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost as a *quantitive* climax of the Spirit, as the culminating point; but if the Spirit had been imparted before *Pentecost*, why not, also, before this *breathing* on the Disciples? Olshausen, in fact, supposes that there was an impartation of the Spirit at the time of the sending forth of the Apostles, mentioned in Matt. x. In what, then, does this solemn act differ from that continued impartation of the Spirit which took place without any such act? Moreover, had this act been one of

[1] The promise, Matt. xvi. 19, is *related;* it would not merely be related, but would correspond with it, if the "finding" in that passage could be taken as equivalent to the κοατειν, "the retaining," in this.

essential moment to the Apostles, could Thomas, who was absent at the time, be deprived of it without detriment? Again, does not the expression, vii. 39, compel us to regard the specific impartation of the Spirit as a consequence of Christ's δοξασμός, "glorification," and does not his "glorification" begin with his "sitting at the right hand of the Father?" Finally, it is to be noted that in Luke xxiv. 49, also, reference is made only to the future. We must return, then, to the view of Grotius and Lampe, according to which the symbol typifies something future. Lücke employs as an argument against this, Ezek. xxxvii. 9. But what can that passage decide in *this* question? The prophet calls to the wind, which becomes a breath of life in the dead. We cannot even affirm that there is here a symbolic, prophetic action, the wind itself is considered as the breath of life.[1] In fact, most of the symbolical actions of the prophets are typifications of something future, (of this we have a New Testament example in Acts xxi. 11.) With more justice, Strauss, (ii. p. 646,) adduces the laying on of hands for the impartation of the Spirit, an appeal, too, might be made to the imperative λάβετε. But an absolute present time must not be inferred from the use of it, since it must be conceded that the Apostles were at that time in no condition to exercise those functions of spiritual judgment of which v. 23 speaks.

CHRIST APPEARS TO THOMAS AND THE OTHER APOSTLES. v. 24–29.

V. 24, 25. In proportion as we have marked the disposition of recent times to consider the Apostles as credulous, in that proportion is there something striking in the appearance of a Disciple with so much critical reflection as Thomas displays. Evidence is afforded in his language, ch. xi. 16, that the inmost soul of this Disciple had been arrested by the truth pertaining to Christ's person, and still further evidence is furnished by the exclamation in which he breaks forth in v. 28 of this chapter. In virtue of this impression, he, too, must have felt that cer-

[1] If it be not better on the whole, with Hävernick, Komm. zum Ezek. in loc., to take רוּחַ in the sense of *Spirit*, in which case the passage is still less adapted to prove what Lücke would use it for.

tainty which the Disciples who went to Emmaus expressed, that all could not be at an end with this Jesus. But the reflection of his intellect suppressed the wishes and anticipations which were aroused in his feelings. His disposition to doubt transcended in fact the limits of mere caution. It is not enough for him to *see* the prints of the nails, he will *feel* them, and even this will not satisfy him, he desires in addition to thrust his hand into the Saviour's side. It seems almost inconceivable that from the omission of a mention in this place and at v. 20, of prints in the feet, the inference could be drawn that the feet were not pierced with nails in crucifixion, yet even Lücke confidently draws this inference. If Thomas, after feeling the Saviour's hands and side, had insisted on feeling his feet also, would not this doubting mood leave upon the mind the impression of an absurdity? Besides this, for any one whom the testimony of Luke xxiv. 39, seq. does not satisfy, the fact that the feet, also, were nailed in crucifixion, may certainly be regarded as placed beyond all doubt by the investigations of Hug and Bähr.

V. 26–29. On the eighth day of the week of the feast, (the feast days may be reckoned as seven and as eight,) we again find the Apostles together, probably shortly before their departure from Jerusalem. Ἔσω seems to intimate that they usually met in one and the same place. Our Saviour's language to Thomas, which seems to give proof of an extraordinary knowledge, testifies of his disapprobation, yet he kindly complies, at the same time, with the demands of this extreme doubt. But the mere appearing and word of the risen Saviour arrest the doubting Disciple in his inmost soul, so that he omits the application of the very test he had desired,[1] and breaks forth with an intensity of exclamation, which is to be regarded not as the result of the momentary impression, but as the exponent of all the impressions cherished in the preceding period. The εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "said unto him," shows that his expression was addressed to the Saviour, and was not, as Theodore of Mopsuestia and Dr. Paulus understand it, a mere exclamation of amazement. To avoid misapprehending the answer of our Lord, we must

[1] The words ὅτι ἑώρακάς με, "because thou hast seen me," show that Thomas did not *place his hands* upon Christ.

bear in mind, that what he says is meant only to have reference to the domain of religion, but it is essential to religious faith, in antithesis to the outer world, to hold fast to that which is invisible, *παρ' ἐλπίδα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι*, "against hope in hope," Rom. iv. 18; the language here, indeed, pertains to a historic fact lying in the sphere of the senses, but, as De Wette very truly remarks, this fact has a truth connected with it pertaining to the sphere of ideas, (xiv. 18, seq. xvi. 21,) and the recognition of that truth inclines the mind to the reception of the historical fact. Had the later times which follow Christ's departure from our earth, been, like Thomas, willing, only on the evidence of the senses, to believe in him who had risen from the dead, the Christian Church could have no existence.—As the Evangelist closes his Gospel with these words of our Lord, he insists upon the basis of them, as it were, that his readers should confide in the testimony here given, and thus v. 30, 31 are attached to the close. The aorists *ἰδόντες* and *πιστεύσαντες* are to be explained by the use of the aorist in general propositions and proverbs, as in James i. 11, 24, Luke i. 52.

V. 30, 31. There are two ways in which these closing words may be construed. The majority refer *ταῦτα* to *σημεῖα*, and connect v. 30, 31 very closely: "Jesus truly had done — but these *σημεῖα*," &c. *Μὲν οὖν* may, however, as in some other places, be used as a formula of closing, (Luke iii. 18, Acts v. 41,) where we would use "but yet," and then the verses are more completely separated, and *ταῦτα* is equivalent to *τ. βιβλ. τοῦτο*. The meaning of *σημεῖα* will be determined by the one or the other of these constructions. We can hardly, in accordance with John's usage elsewhere, (ix. 16, x. 41, xi. 47,) apply the expression *σημεῖα ποιεῖν* to any thing except the miracles of Christ. Yet the first construction seems to force us to understand by *σημεῖα*, the miraculous appearings of the Saviour after his resurrection, which indeed are called *τεκμήρια*, "proofs," Acts i. 3. This view is confirmed by John's language: "in the presence of *his Disciples*," *ἐνώπιον τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ*, while the miracles were performed before all the people, (Luke xxiv. 19.) This view is the one held by Chrysostom, Euthymius, Maldo-

natus,[1] Semler, Olshausen, Lücke, and many others. It is a view, however, which we cannot adopt. First of all is opposed to it, that the text does not express the "auch" (*also*) which Luther adds, and which we would naturally expect, "*also* many other things;" it does not read as in xxi. 25, *καὶ ἄλλα πολλά*, but we have merely the *increasing καί*, which is not expressed in German, (Kühner, ii. 422.) (In English, "and indeed, and truly.") The proposition, consequently, is not connected with what precedes. Further, we ask, could John have known of *many* other appearings of Christ after the resurrection? In ch. xxi. 14, he speaks of a third appearing only, which took place before all the Disciples. Again, how could he have been led to use *σημεῖα ποιεῖν* in speaking of miraculous appearings? Finally, does not the expression *ἐν τ. βιβλ. τ.*, "in this book," show that he had the entire book in his eye? in which case it is not credible, that here at the close of his entire work he meant only to speak of the last things narrated in it, and on them especially to establish the faith and life of the Church. It is no doubt possible that *ταῦτα* refers to the miracles narrated in the earlier parts of the Gospel, in which case the first construction may be retained, without deviating from the ordinary meaning of *σημεῖα ποιεῖν*. Nor will it be thought incredible, after comparing ch. xii. 37, that he meant to furnish a ground for faith, in the miracles he has detailed. On the other hand, if the second construction be followed, (cf. what Beza already notices in regard to *μὲνοῦν*,) then *ταῦτα* covers the entire contents of the Gospel, exactly as in xxi. 24, and the observation, v. 30, forms so much more natural a close, as John is the very Evangelist who has narrated but few *σημεῖα*. The fact that he has written: *ἐνώπιον τῶν μαθητῶν*, "in the presence of his *Disciples*," we explain by supposing that he here names the *μαθηταί*, "Disciples," as the witnesses, through the medium of whom the faith of the Church arose, that very faith which the Evangelist designed by this Gospel to exalt. Besides, the *μαθηταί*, "Disciples," were always the most immediate witnesses of the miracles, cf. vii. 3.

[1] Maldonatus urges that mode of understanding it, as a proof that John did not close his Gospel *here*, but only the materials in regard to the first manifestations after the resurrection; so, too, Heumann.

CHAPTER XXI.

WITH the close of ch. xx. the Gospel was closed. We have now an appendix, which bears throughout the characteristics of John's spirit and style, and which closes with a testimony from some other hand. Supplements like this are found, also, in the historians, as for example, in Nepos' Life of Atticus. But the recent and most recent criticism judges in a wholly different way in regard to this chapter. The opponents of the genuineness of John's Gospel have made this appendix, and especially its closing verses, a point from which they have proceeded to contest the authenticity of the Gospel itself. Cf. the Introduction, § 6. But we see that those, also, who have defended the genuineness of the Gospel, unite, with hardly an exception, in the judgment that *this* chapter is not genuine, as for example Credner, Lücke, Neander, De Wette and Schweizer; of recent writers, only Meyer, Olshausen and Guericke, can be mentioned on the other side. Lücke thinks that "the entire chapter, as respects language, delineation and matter, presents the most singular phenomena," (ii. p. 805,) "the style of thought, the language, the mode of recital throughout the chapter, betray an author wholly different from the Evangelist," (p. 825.) To the exaggeration in this judgment—which in Schweizer, p. 120, seq., goes almost even further—we would put a limitation by the declaration of Credner, who has applied himself with special diligence to the investigation of the peculiarities of the New Testament style: (Einleit. ins N. Test. i. 1, p. 232,) "There is not a single external testimony against the 21st chapter, and *regarded internally, this chapter displays almost all the peculiarities of John's style.*" The differences of style are in fact so inconsiderable, that they can hardly be regarded as having weight in the face of the numerous coincidences with

John, which Guericke, (in his Introduction, p. 310,) following Credner, has gathered together. Now, this harmony with John, in point of style, furnishes at once a very strong proof of the genuineness of this chapter, for if it were designed, (and undesigned it could not be,) where does there exist in the ancient Church an example of a *falsarius* making so happy a counterfeit? We cite the words in which Lücke states what he has to confirm his doubt: (with which cf. Schweizer, p. 57,) "The authenticity of this chapter stands or falls with the originality of the last two verses; these in structure and in contents cohere closely with the preceding ones. On the other side, as the point of view from v. 1 to 14 is abandoned at v. 15, the appendix requires some sort of a conclusion, v. 24 at least. The writer of v. 24 also wrote what precedes it. And, as there is no reason for separating v. 24 from v. 25, as on the contrary the latter verse corresponds closely with the hyperbolical tone of narration in v. 11, it follows that if v. 24 and 25 were not written by John, neither is he the author of verses 1–23." In addition to this: "If v. 23 presupposes the death of the Evangelist, there can no longer be a dispute as to the author; if John himself had written the sentence, there would have been a much more natural way of correcting 'the saying,' λογός, than by emphasizing the conditionating '*if* I will,' ἐὰν θέλω." Schweizer finds in these last words "a verbal trifling unworthy of the Evangelist." We enter, first of all, our most decided protest against this imputation of a verbal trifling, and ask, whether the child-like tone of John's mind does not reveal itself in the very fact that he clings in perfect simplicity to the words of his Master, and repels an inference which, however flattering, was yet unsure? We are inclined to think that the occasion for this appendix was furnished by the saying that was in currency about him, that he would not die. A lowly, child-like man would be the very one to feel a hearty desire to repel an expectation of that sort, and it is our opinion, that partly to give a vivid picture of the circumstances under which this last expression was uttered by our Lord, partly to link it with the appearings after his resurrection, which had been previously detailed, he gives the *complete* account of this delightful interview in Galilee. If this be the occasion of the appendix, and

if this chapter be but an appendix, we are at a loss to know how Dr. Lücke can, with justice, insist that the Evangelist must yet have added a closing word. The Evangelist had, in fact, already closed, ch. xx. 30, 31. The necessity, therefore, is by no means clear, "that the author of v. 24 must have also written what precedes it." If it be further affirmed, that the hyperbole in v. 25 corresponds with that in v. 11, we do not apprehend that any such correspondence exists, for while in v. 25 every one acknowledges a hyperbole, we cannot comprehend why the number of the fishes, one hundred and fifty-three, must be, not historical, but hyperbolical. We believe that with far better conscience the question may be started: Is it credible that the same pen which wrote v. 25 could have written that simple narrative which is found in this chapter?—There are no doctrinal interests for whose sake an earnest defense of John's authorship in this last chapter is necessary; if, with Neander and Lücke, the view is held, that the account flowed from the oral tradition of the Evangelist, it amounts to the same thing. But the unprejudiced testing of the points involved in criticism, compels us, as regards the authorship of this chapter, to differ from the highly esteemed expositors we have just mentioned.[1]

JESUS APPEARS IN GALILEE.—MIRACULOUS DRAUGHT OF FISHES. v. 1–14.

V. 1–3. After the festival had ended, the Disciples had returned to Galilee, where, in the brief interval which yet remained until Pentecost, they stayed and again pursued their calling. The expresssion *φανέρωσεν ἑαυτόν*, "he showed himself," implies that there was in his appearing something wonderful, (Mark xvi. 12.) *Ἐπὶ τ. θαλ.*, "on the shore of the sea," that is, "*at* the sea," cf. on vi. 19. They had cast their nets during the night, as at this time, as Aristotle already mentions, fishing could be conducted to the best advantage. On Nathaniel, see above on i. 52.

V. 4–8. The question of Jesus implies a design on his part of taking a meal in company with his Disciples, (v. 12.) The

[1] The literature of the earlier controversial writings on this point, is specially designated in Lücke, ii. p. 824.

Disciples may, however, have taken him for a stranger, desiring to purchase food for his breakfast. The Disciple who loved the Lord is distinguished by a profounder sympathy, in virtue of which he at once, partly by the miracle, partly by his form and voice, recognizes him. Peter, on the other hand, here also is the swifter of the two in forming a resolution. *Γυμνός*, as is well known, does not always designate a complete nakedness, yet we may suppose that Peter had on nothing besides the subligaculum, of which mention has been made on xx. 15. As to the *ἐπενδύτης*, Euthymius speaks of a light garment without sleeves and coming only to the knee, and which we should probably fancy as narrow, like a kind of shirt, which he says was in common use by fishermen; Theophylact speaks of a light garment which the fishermen either wore over the other clothes, or next to the skin. The raiment mentioned by Euthymius would at least have been a hindrance in swimming, and *διεζώσατο* may then be translated, either "he girded *up*," or "he girded *around* him." *Τῷ πλοιαρίῳ* is the *dat. instr.*

V. 9–14. How the fire of coals and the food had been prepared is not clear, for they could not have been got ready by Peter in such haste. There is nothing improbable in the statement, that the Disciples, astonished at the large number of fishes taken, counted them, and just as little in the fact that the number impressed itself on their memory. The recent writers regard the tenor of v. 12 as strange and obscure, but what else can be the intention of the Evangelist than this, that the Disciples, far from the familiarity which had been their wont, refrained from expressing the joy they felt at beholding their Lord again? How natural is this in the position in which the Lord places himself to them after his resurrection, and how artlessly is it expressed by the Evangelist!—The appearing to the women is not included in v. 14, but merely the two appearings in the circle of the Disciples, mentioned in ch. xx.

CONVERSATION OF CHRIST WITH PETER.—v. 15–23.

V. 15–17. They are still sitting at the meal, which, to draw an inference from v. 12, had been passed through more silently than usual. The reproving look which the Redeemer had cast

on Peter after his denial, (Luke xxii. 61,) was still burning in his soul; he was deposed as it were from his earlier official dignity, and must be restored to it again.[1] The mode in which this is done, is one so full of spirit, so far beyond the reach of invention, that any presumption of a mere fiction in the case is put to the blush: *Love to Christ is the grand essential for feeding his flock.* With the threefold denial corresponds the triple hammer-stroke of this question on the heart of Peter. The first question is a remembrancer to him of his language, when he was guilty of the assumption of ascribing to himself a love stronger than that of all the rest, (Matt. xxvi. 33.) The words, "Simon, son of Jonas," with which Christ addresses him, have a character of solemnity, (Matt. xvi. 17.) In his reply the Disciple no longer ventures to glance aside at the rest; yet far from a sickly humility, he has the courage, despite his confusion, to reply affirmatively, and to appeal to the witness of Him, in whose power to search the depths of the heart he had confidence. The questions which follow and which pierce yet more deeply, drop the allusion to the other Disciples. *Βόσκειν* and *ποιμαίνειν*, *πρόβατα* and *ἀρνία* (Matt. x. 16, Luke x. 3,) are synonymous, the diminutive *ἀρνίον* had, like *ὠτίον*, lost its diminutive signification, (see xviii. 26;) *φιλεῖν* and *ἀγαπᾶν* have here the same meaning, (see xi. 5.) The object of the humiliation is sufficiently attained at the third question, but the Disciple, despite his grief, cannot refuse to do justice to the assurance of his own self-consciousness. The conviction *σὺ πάντα οἶδας*, "thou knowest all things," might be deduced from experiences like that in Matt. xvii. 27. The argument for the primacy of Peter, is in a forlorn condition if the defenders of it are compelled to attach to this passage the importance that Maldonatus does: Quæro, cui universa illa (ecclesiæ) cura, nisi Petro, quæro ubi, nisi hic, commissa sit? "I ask, to whom was that entire care of the Church committed except to Peter, I ask, where but here was it committed to him?"[2]

[1] Zwingle: Petrus de novo quasi inauguratur apostolico muneri ex Christi gratia, a quo negando culpa sua merito exciderat, ut superabundet gratia, ubi delictum abundaverat, "Peter is inaugurated, as it were, anew into the Apostolic office, by the grace of Christ, (from which at his denial his own fault had deservedly cut him off,) that where sin had abounded, grace might much more abound."

[2] He sustains himself especially by the argument, that in the general expression, "my sheep," the other Apostles must be included.

V. 18, 19. An intimation of the serious trial the office would bring with it; what our Lord, ch. xiii. 36, had already intimated to the Disciples, he here repeats in an expression, which after the style of the prophetic expressions, has a figurative character, and presents the future, but with a veil over it. We assume that the explanation John gives in v. 19, with which cf. xii. 33, xviii. 32, is the correct one; the expression *δοξάζειν τ. θ.* for the death by martyrdom, is in keeping with the partiality which John has all along shown for the idea involved in *δοξάζειν*.—V. 18 presupposes that Peter was no longer a young man — we know that when he came to Christ he was already married; it is also presupposed that he would reach old age — he actually labored for more than thirty years after. The most obvious sense offered by the sentence, is that first given by Fikenscher: "In thy youth thou didst dispose of thyself at thine own pleasure, with thine advancing years thou shalt be more and more dependent on another, who will gird thee and do with thee as he pleases." Olshausen interprets in a similar way: "in the vigorous fullness of thy youthful strength thou hast done as it pleased thee, in thine old age this vivacious spirit shall be broken." To adopt this idea and yet allow the claims of John's interpretation, would require us to say, that in the crucifixion of Peter the language of our Lord was verified in a higher and more definite sense. We approach more clearly to the meaning John gives, when we regard the *girding* in old age simply as a figurative prophetic designation of *binding*, as in Acts xxi. 11, (Beza, Calvin, Heumann, Meyer.) *Ἐκτείνω* would then mean "to stretch out," and would refer to the fettering or binding of the hands, and *οἴσει* to the leading away to execution. But persons sentenced to be crucified, at least when they were compelled to carry their cross, could not well have been led to execution with their hands bound; but *ἐκτείνειν* can also refer to the *spreading out* of the hands, and certainly if John did not give it this interpretation then a reference to the *manner* of death cannot be found in the expression. The most probable view will always be that John discovered in the words *ἐκτενεῖς τὰς χεῖράς*, the distinct allusion to crucifixion. In this case, however, the *οἴσει κτλ.* seems to make a hysteron-proteron, which has been obviated in an

inadmissible way, by Casaubon, when he refers the words ἐκτενεῖς — ζώσει, "thou shalt stretch forth thy hands and another shall gird thee," to the Roman custom of stretching on the furca and carrying it about, and by Bengel, according to whom the tying to the cross and the nailing respectively took place before the cross was set up. The hysteron-proteron must be acknowledged, but may be defended on the ground that the words ἐκτενεῖς τὰς χεῖράς, "thou shalt stretch forth thy hands," present the main idea, and the words "shall gird thee," ζώσει σὲ, may be understood of the binding with the subligaculum,[1] (see on xx. 15.) As regards the testimonies in Church history with reference to the close of the life of this Disciple, it will be sufficient to cite Hase: (Church History, § 58,) "According to the witnesses since the middle of the second century, who are not indeed perfectly good authority, yet are independent of Romish influence, he was crucified at Rome." His martyrdom in Rome is firmly established, the specific death of crucifixion is mentioned by Tertullian and Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. iii. 1.— Great difficulty has been felt in the exposition of the words, ἀκολούθει μοι, "follow me," as it would seem especially when we refer to xiii. 36, as though it must be understood of following in the death of martyrdom; yet we find ourselves compelled by the ἀκολουθοῦντα, v. 20, to take in its literal sense, the following spoken of. In our judgment, the preceding conversation (cf. τούτων, v. 15,) took place in the presence of the Disciples. Jesus now rose, in order to speak aside with Peter, whom he commands to follow him.

V. 20–23. Whether from curiosity or the sympathy of attachment, John feels urged to follow them. He designates himself here, not merely as the Disciple ὃν ἠγάπα ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "whom Jesus loved," but by referring to a particular circumstance, in which his intimate relation to our Lord was specially displayed. This fuller designation is not, indeed, merely designed to render the words "whom Jesus loved," more clear, but rather serves to intimate how Peter found occasion for the question, v. 21. Peter had understood that serious and painful

[1] In the Evang. Nicod. c. x. p. 582, ed. Thilo, in narrating the crucifixion, are these words: ἐξέδυσαν τ. Ἰησοῦν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ, καὶ περιέζωσαν αὐτὸν λεντίῳ, "they removed from Jesus his garments, and girded him (περιέζωσαν) with a cloth."

trials awaited himself, and there now rises in his mind the desire, not wholly a pure one, of knowing whether a like destiny awaited that Disciple who had been in such intimate confidence. The reply of our Lord is, therefore, severe, and dismisses Peter's question.[1] In a similar spirit to that in which Paul, Gal. vi. 4, says: τὸ ἔργον ἑαυτοῦ δοκιμαζέτω ἕκαστος, "let every man prove his own work," our Lord wishes that all glancing to one side or the other should cease, and that the Disciple, in rigid earnestness, should keep before his eye his own calling alone. When Christ himself, in the Gospel, speaks of his coming, the expression embraces also all his manifestations in the course of history, (Mark ix. 1, Matt. xxvi. 63,) but in the language of the Apostles, the coming of the Lord designates his last coming to judge the world, as the close of all the judgments which take place in the lapse of time, (Rev. ii. 5, iii. 11.) The childlike Disciple will not allow that interpretation of the words which is most glorious for himself, to pass, he simply abides by the conditional "*if* I will." Should he remain alive until the consummation of the kingdom of God and the resurrection of the dead, he would wholly escape death, for which would be exchanged that metamorphosis of which Paul speaks, (1 Thess. iv. 17, 1 Cor. xv. 51.) "This saying" was not, however, entirely suppressed even by this authentic contradiction. Augustine narrates the legend, that while yet living, the Disciple had caused a grave to be dug, into which he had descended, and apparently expired, though in fact his death was only a slumber, for the earth which covered him still moved lightly as he breathed. In the Greek Church this legend was embellished in various ways, and was yet extant in the period of the Byzantine historians, (John Müller's Works, vol. vi. p. 74, 82.) The English sect of "Seekers," under Cromwell, expected the reappearance of the Apostle as the forerunner of the return of Christ.

[1] The posture of matters is apprehended by Chrysostom in a different way. The fuller designation "who also leaned on his breast, &c." is designed, he thinks, to give prominence to the confidence which Peter had now attained, so that he who formerly had directed to our Lord, through John, a question relating to Judas, now himself interrogates the Lord — and about John! The question of Peter is a question of sympathizing love; he is not willing to be separated from his friend.

SUPPLEMENTARY TESTIMONY.—v. 24, 25.

V. 24, 25. We have already in the Introduction, § 6, expressed ourselves at large in regard to the character and object of this testimony, which has such importance on the question regarding the authenticity of this Gospel. We offer here but a remark in regard to the singular. *Οἴδαμεν*, as it is followed by *οἶμαι*, leaves it in doubt whether a single individual is speaking of himself. In the Greek epistolary style, the singular and plural interchange, but does this take place in the historical style? It is more probable that an individual speaks in the name of a number of persons. *Ὅσα*, (Lachmann, *ἅ*) "all which," almost relative. *Καθ' ἕν*, one after the other without omission. *Αὐτὸν τὸν κόσμον*, the world *itself*, great as it is. The infinitive aorist instead of the future after the verb to *believe*, as well as after the verbs *to hope*, *to wish*, Winer, p. 306, Agnew and Ebbeke's transl. p 261.

SUPPLEMENT.

WHILE this Commentary (the German original of the 6th edition,) was passing through the press, two works on this Gospel, deserving of notice, made their appearance: The Commentary of Baumgarten-Crusius, 1st vol., 1st divis., (ch. 1–8,) Jena, 1843; Köstlin's Lehrbegriff—Doctrinal System of the Gospel and Epistles of John, as also the related New Testament Systems. Berlin, 1843.

The work of the Jena theologian, now deceased, presents in the text, for the most part, only the interpretation peculiar to the author, and indicates the interpretations of others, (chiefly in notes,) with greater brevity than we find in Lücke. It may claim the merit of an independent exposition which enters into the spirit of the Gospel. The position which the author, who did not belong decidedly to any of the present theological schools, takes as regards the question about the genuineness and authenticity of this Gospel, is deserving of notice. With freedom, firmness, and historical tact, he presents briefly the reasons why its genuineness must be acknowledged; and, as regards the authenticity of the facts, he adheres firmly, in a general way, to those views which the extreme criticism of our day hoped to render antiquated, by imposing on them the name of "antiquated systems of harmonistics and of apologetics;" only as regards miracles the lamented author takes a negative, but exceedingly obscure, position. He defends the originality of the discourses of the Redeemer in John, though he will not deny the influence of the hand that committed them to writing. We shall merely touch here on what he says in regard to the doctrine of the Logos. This doctrine, according to the view of the author, cannot be regarded as a gradually heightened

hypostatizing of the Old Testament doctrine of the *Word* and *Wisdom* of God. It is rather in Judaism an exotic growth, devised in Alexandria with the design of forming a connecting link with the Grecian philosophy. "The probability is against the idea that the doctrine of the Logos had found an introduction and obtained weight among Jews and Christians *out of* Alexandria, at the time the prologue to John's Gospel was composed." Only *individuals* had introduced it into the immediate circles of the Evangelists; Apollos, perhaps, was one of these. John has not made it the subject of any speculations of his own, but has merely adopted it to secure an expression corresponding with his exalted opinion in regard to Christ.

The author of the new "System of John," which originally appeared in Tübingen as a prize dissertation, takes, as a basis, the views of Dr. Baur and Schwegler. The Gospel had its origin in the second century, and was composed with the irenico-apologetic object of harmonizing the conflicting parties in the Christian community. Throughout the discourses of Christ, and even through John the Baptist as an organ, none other than the unknown Evangelist himself speaks in this Gospel. From the basis of Judaism he has completely sundered himself. The fundamental idea of his book is to be found in the thought that Christianity is the absolute religion. This absolute religion has appeared personally in the incarnate "Logos," with whom, for the first time, light and life have been imparted to the world, so that out of him is nothing but death and darkness. The author claims that by his labor, considered *as an objective historical exhibition*, he has lifted himself far above the position occupied by Frommann, but his claim cannot be allowed, unless the presumption may be justified that the view taken by Dr. Baur of the history of doctrines in the first and second centuries, is the only one historically established.

APPENDIX FIRST.

I.

FROM THE SEVENTH EDITION. INTRODUCTION, § 2.

The Author's witness of himself

On two occasions has the Evangelist pointed directly to himself as a witness of the events which he relates, i. 14, xix. 35; on a third, xxi. 24, Disciples testify of him the same thing. In those passages where he introduces a Disciple without naming him, with the predicate ὃν ἐφίλει ὁ Ἰησοῦς, he points indirectly to his own person. From the following it appears clearly that the Apostle John is understood: in ch. xiii. 25, the one to whom that honorable predicate just mentioned is given, is called ὁ ἀνακείμενος ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ; now the same person who was ἀνακείμενος ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος is, xxi. 20, according to the connection, no other than John; and Polycrates the Ephesian (Euseb. v. 24,) also calls him in his letter, ὁ ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος τοῦ κυρίου ἀναπεσών. Baur, it is true, has persuaded himself that the Evangelist thereby wished to designate himself only as the one who wrote the Apocalypse, as him who with a spiritual insight had written the history of Jesus, as that apocalyptic writer had written the history of the Church's future. The timid delicacy in this half-veiled designation, which in a modified form, is also found in i. 40, will appear to an unprejudiced reader as a distinctive trait of the literary idiosyncrasy of the whole Gospel.—In i. 14, and 1 John i. 1, he makes himself known as a witness *with others:* if Baur will have us to understand this as an *inward* seeing only, it can be considered as nothing but an expedient to avoid an accusation of literary deception. A similar inward seeing, a hypophetic seeing in

the spirit of the Apostolic disguise, which was adopted by Anonymus, is to be understood also in the other passage, xix. 35, where it is expressly stated that the author was standing by the cross, and that his narrative is that of an eye-witness. In this theory (of the position of later writers, as the hypophetic priests of acknowledged authorities,) Köstlin[1] imagines that he has found the key to a large part of the pseudonymous Church-literature—certainly a more spiritualistic and more suitable turn for certain times and circles, than when Hilgenfeld simply suggests for consideration, (Evang. Joh. p. 353,) that at the period in question "no such thing as *literary property* was known." He seems, however, not to have been entirely wrong, for Dionysius of Corinth, at the time of the supposed origin of the Gospel, under Marc Aurelian, complains: "By request of the brethren I have written some letters which have been filled with weeds, and otherwise changed by taking from and adding to them by the apostles of the devil; woe will befall them. It is therefore not astonishing at all, that some persons should have dared to falsify the Scriptures of the Lord also, since they have laid hands on inferior writings," (Euseb. iv. 23.) We may compare with this an expression by Serapion of Antioch, at the end of the second century, when he found in a congregation of Cilicia a spurious εὐαγγέλιον Πέτρου, containing heretical doctrines: "My brethren, we accept Peter and the other Apostles as well as Christ; but the pseudo-epigraphic writings that are circulated under their names, we as judges ὡς ἔμπειροι reject, knowing that writings of that sort have not been transmitted to us," (Euseb. vi. 12.) Also Tertullian's statement, derived from an occurrence in the Church of Asia Minor, de bapt. 17: quod si, qui Pauli scripta perperam legunt, exemplum Theclæ ad licentiam mulierum docendi fingendique defendunt, sciant, in Asia Presbyterum, qui eam scripturam construxit, quasi titulo Pauli de suo cumulans, convictum atque confessum *id se amore Pauli fecisse, loco decessisse.*

[1] "Über die pseudonyme Litt. der ältesten kirche," Zeller Jahrbuch, 1851.

II.

FROM THE SEVENTH EDITION. INTRODUCTION, § 5.

CONSTRUCTION.

BY those who preceded Lücke, and by himself, 2d ed., the days of the feast are regarded as the fixed data on which the related events occurred. In a character so meditative as that of the Evangelist, we might be led to expect, from the beginning, a *systematic arrangement*, by which the progress of the history is conditioned. De Wette first points out the existence of an internal plan: the introductory history, and the history, and two divisions again of these, which represent the opposite phases in the history of Jesus, viz. how, during his sojourn upon earth, his glory, δοξα, became apparent, but was mostly rejected by a callous world, and how, by his death, he was glorified, ch. ii.–xii.; the other, the glorification of Jesus through death, (ch. xiii.–xvii.,) his internal glory in his humility, love, calmness of soul, in his consciousness of victory, and ch. xviii.–xx., the history of his external glorification." The history of his public labors finds, unmistakeably, a final resting-place in ch. xii. 37–50. The sorrowful complaint about the mass of his people, who were unbelievers, with but a few timid exceptions, forms the theme of this closing part. Casting a glance back to the beginning, we find the final result already expressed in the prologue, v. 11, 12: "He came unto his own, and his own received him not, but as many as received him, to them gave he power to become children of God, even to them that believe on his name." If we consider the peculiar circumstance, that the adversaries with whom Christ had to deal are mostly introduced as *οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι*, whereby we are to understand the nation as a whole, (iv. 22, xi. 19, 33, xii. 9,) but especially as representatives of the people, and at the same time as the centre of opposition, the Jewish Elders, (i. 19, ii. 18, ix. 16–22, xviii. 12, 14,) it follows that, v. (5) 11, 12, the theme of the following historical narrative may be considered to be: *the history of the divine life, which appeared personally in humanity, how it was rejected by its*

own people, but became to the small number who received it, a source of life. The fact that the history of the Redeemer is presented in this point of view, imparts to the depicture the tinge of sorrow which it bears. — There is some truth in the reproach made, that the opposition is not introduced genetically in its gradual development. In the first four chapters it merely makes its appearance in iv. 1, but at once in ch. v. reaches its full extent, ripened into a plot to commit murder, v. 16. Yet such expressions are not to be solicitously urged, "they are to be understood from the *tendency* evincing itself by many indications." (Reuss, Denkschrift, p. 52.) Just as that, which according to the Evangelist, was from the first germinating in the heart of Judas, finally burst forth, so the Evangelist saw, also, from the beginning, in the yet wavering opposition, the principle destined finally to appear openly, under the direction of that God who had foreseen his ὥρα, (vii. 30, viii. 20, xiii. 1,) and over against this opposition is gathered, uninterruptedly, the small flock of God's children, to whom the ὅσοι δὲ ἔλαβον αὐτόν pointed. But, as the grain of wheat cannot produce much fruit without dying, so, also, during his life the period has not arrived when he can draw all to himself, (viii. 28, xii. 32,)—the road to perfect glory passes by the cross; hence the opposition reaches the climax in the face of a most striking σημεῖον, performed before the very eye of the Sanhedrim, the raising of Lazarus. What before had been merely a plan of the Elders, now becomes a firm determination, ch. xi. Then follow, ch. xii., the prophetic anointing for his burial, his entrance into the city, where by the altar of God is erected the altar upon which God's prophet is to be sacrificed, (Luke xiii. 13.) Here the pre-announcement of his approaching δοξα is made in the act of the Gentiles, who are anxious to have a glimpse of him, then in the word pronounced by himself, v. 24, and, finally, by the divine voice, v. 31. — The succeeding events, including the death and the resurrection, (comp. xiii. 31,) are presented in ch. xiii.–xx. See Luthardt, i. 255, in his thorough examination of the different opinions on the construction. He thinks himself able to show three subdivisions within each of the three main divisions.

APPENDIX SECOND.

FROM THE SEVENTH EDITION, p. 61–66.

The Logos.

The Evangelist introduces the Logos as an idea not unknown to his readers. It must have been familiar to himself, consequently, also, to the circle of his readers; for he has also introduced it with substantially the same meaning in Revelat. xix. 13, and in 1 John i. 1.—It must seem most natural to the expositor to presuppose that the Old Testament revelation would furnish the point with which this idea would link itself. Now there certainly is already in the Old Testament an apprehension of the distinction between God as he is *in himself*, and as he is *to the world*, a distinction which may be recognized in Exodus xxxiii. 12–23, a passage which deserves a profounder investigation than it has yet received, cf. Kurtz, Gesch. des Alten Bundes, ii. 1855, p. 321.[1] In the revelations under

[1] Maimonides, More Nevochim, i. 21, has put upon it the rational construction: Thou shalt discern my thirteen attributes, but not my essence. The tenor of the paraphrase given in the two Palestinian Targums (about 500, A. D.) is very mysterious. In the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, v. 23, is thus interpreted: "I will remove the hosts of my ministering angels, (thus it takes the words "my hand," the Polyglot incorrectly transire faciam,) and thou shalt see the knot of the phylacteries of the brightness of my shekinah, (שְׁכִינָה) but the face of the brightness of my shekinah thou canst not see." This passage proves to what an extent the translations of these Targumists are affected by tradition, for in the Talmud this notion of the divine phylacteries occurs as one generally received. Gemara Berach. f. vii. 1. "R. Chana, in the name of R. Simeon, the holy, said in regard to the words in Exodus xxxiii. 23: 'and I will take away my hand and thou shalt see my back.' This teaches us that God showed to Moses the knots of the phylacteries, קשר של תפילין." The same work, f. vi. 1, treats more at large of these phylacteries of God. The knot is tied on the *back of the head*. That in this there is an intimation given of insight into the mysteries of God, is pointed out by the Targum Jeruschalmi: "I will remove my angel and thou shalt see the *adytum* דְּבִירָא, for the brightness of my shekinah thou canst not see."—The difference between the new view presented by Hofmann, with which Kurtz also concurs, (l. c. p.

the old covenant it is the מַלְאַךְ יי, through whom they are mediated, and of him it is said, Exodus xxiii. 21: "my name is in him." This *embassy* of God, (for such in accordance with its form, is the proper meaning of the word מַלְאַךְ) or *appearing* of God, is also named (in Exodus xvi. 10, xxiv. 16,) כְּבוֹד יי, the glory or the reflected splendor of God; it is called in Isaiah lxiii. 9, the angel of the face, (or presence,) that is the angel through whom God becomes manifest to the finite world, and in Mal. iii. 1, is called the angel of the covenant. Wherever now in the Old Testament, Jehovah, or the Malcach Jehovah, (as for example in Judges vi. 11,) is mentioned, the Targumists substitute for these names, the terms מֵימְרָא דיי or even שְׁכִנְתָּא, that is habitation, tabernacle of God, (see Gfrörer, Jahrhund. des Heils, 1 Abth. p. 306, Lutterbeck "neutest. Lehrbegriffe," i. 196.) Now Onkelos and the Targum of Jonathan on the prophets, belong, according to the most recent critical investigations, to the first half of the first century after Christ, (see Zunz, "gottesdienstlich. Vorträge der Juden," p. 62,) they were constantly read at the time of the discourses in the synagogues. Were we now to confine ourselves to this point and keep ourselves within the limits of an explanation which would suppose a merely natural genesis of the idea, it certainly could occasion no surprise if the Apostles, in accordance with the impressions made upon them by the person and the works of Christ, and by his testimony in regard to himself, should have seen in Christ the appearing of that very word of the Old Testament, of that very angel of revelation, should in fact have seen in him the culminating point of the revelations made to the fathers, (Heb. i. 1.) It allows of proof, moreover, that not alone did the Apostles do this, but that Christ also considered himself in identity with that Old Testament principle of revelation: and here belong not merely John xii. 39, 1 Cor. x. 4, 1 Peter i. 11, but also Matt. xxiii. 34, 37.

But how came the Scribes, whose theologumena are comprised in the Targum, to employ the term "*Word*" as a designation of

817,) and that of Hengstenberg (Christologie, i. 125, 2d ed.) is rather an exegetical than a doctrinal one. In advance of a discussion of the detached passages which present difficulties, the question might arise, whether an angel, in whom, according to Kurtz, "there is a personal and eternal presence of God," is to be regarded as a creature, and not rather as a theophany.

the Mediator of revelation? The support for it was likewise furnished in the Old Testament in which, on the one hand, the "Word of God" is the Mediator of the divine *will* to the world, (Ps. xxxiii. 6, clvii. 15, 18, Isaiah lv. 11, Ecclesiast. xliii. 26, Wisdom of Solomon xvi. 12;) and on the other hand, of the *knowledge* of God, (cf. Ps. xxxiii. 6 with v. 4, Ps. cxlii. 19 with v. 15, and Ps. cxlviii. 8;) the Word of God is deposited in the *law*, and is received by the prophets through the revelations made to them. Inasmuch, however, as not merely the omnipotence, but also the knowledge of God manifests itself in his "*Word*," the transition was an easy one, by which, under this term the divine *wisdom* was made a parallel thought. She it is who "in the beginning of His ways," projected and carried out the divine plan of the world, (Prov. viii. 21, seq. iii. 19,) she is consequently "the thought of the world itself, the thought which has a creative working and ordering, which emanated from God, and from which is derived all proportion and law in nature," (Oehler, "Grundzüge der alttest. Weisheit," 1854, p. 6.) As the knowledge of God, she is of herself, also, the instructress of men, (Prov. viii. 32, Job xxviii. 28.) It has been her constant striving to embody herself in mankind; according to Sirach, she has been a wanderer even among the Gentile nations, has made her habitation among the peculiar people, and has entered into the book of the law, (Ecclesiasticus xxiv. 12, seq., Baruch iii. 37, 38, iv. 1.) In Ps. xxxiii. 6, the word of the Lord, with a certain self-dependence, is presented in a parallel delineation with the spirit of the Lord; in Proverbs and in Sirach, (Ecclesiasticus,) wisdom is personified; in the Book of Wisdom she is hypostatized by imputing to her a spirit which is rational, holy, one only, penetrating all rational spirits, (Wisdom vii. 22–26.)—While the wisdom of God is thus bending herself to enter into a closer union with finite spirits, the shape of Messiah on the other side, as prophecy advances, lifts itself more and more to a dignity which is divine. According to Micah, (v. 1,) the going forth of the Messiah is from eternity; according to Malachi, (iii. 1,) he is the angel of the covenant; according to the Septuagint, Isaiah ix. 6, he is the ἄγγελος τῆς μεγάλης βουλῆς, (the messenger of great counsel;) according to Daniel vii. it is he who cometh in the clouds, into whose kingdom of God,

the last of all kingdoms, those which have risen in the history of our world pour themselves, as rivers into the sea. The book of Enoch, whose most ancient fragment is as old as the period A. 110–130 before Christ, (Dillmann, Buch Henoch, 1853, p. xxiv.) furnishes evidence that these representations of Daniel must have exercised a wide influence in the century before Christ. In this book of Enoch it is said of Messiah that he was elected before the creation of the world, that the angels know him and praise his name, and that it was to him in his state of preëxistence that Enoch was taken up into heaven.

Were we allowed now to presuppose such a preparation as existing, why may not that Christologic advance, which criticism thinks can not be earlier than the second century, why may it not have been complete in the time of the Apostles, and adequate to contemplating in Christ the incarnation of the world-creating Logos? Let us only, in addition, bring to mind that although the Apostles were ἰδιῶται, unlearned, yet the manner in which they use the Scriptures shows that we are to regard them as men whose habit it was thoughtfully to search the Holy Scriptures. One of them, Paul, was moreover a Scribe, and it is in him especially, and in the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, that we find, with nothing but a change of terms, John's doctrine of the Logos, (Col. i. 15, 16, 2 Cor. iv. 4, Hebrews i. 2.) But not alone on considerations of a natural character do we maintain our position: would not that Spirit promised to them, the Spirit who guides into all truth, (xvi. 13, 14,) under whose operation that Christologic view in the sphere of the Old Testament was matured to the point at which we see it when Christ appeared, would he not complete his operation in the Apostles by turning those preparatory rays on that very Personage to whom they in truth pertained?—We consequently, then, discover no necessity for resorting to other sources than the Bible, in order to explain the origin of the doctrine of the Logos. It has, to be sure, been customary since Semler, to resort to Philo for this purpose, and in connection with this to institute an investigation whether the Logos of Philo is to be regarded merely as a divine principle of revelation in the world, or also of revelation to himself, that is, whether he imagined the Logos himself to be a hypostasis

Cf. the literature pertaining to this subject, in Dorner, Lehre von der Person Christi, i. 1, p. 22. But even in Baumgarten-Crusius we already have a sounder judgment: (Dogmengeschichte, p. 1030,) "It must be acknowledged, that faith in the deity of Christ derived its origin far less from surrounding testimonies or opinions, than from a profound and a sublime *emotion*, which sprung from a contemplation of what Christ had been." Thus also Dorner, p. 102, Neander, Schmid, Bibl. Theol. ii. 369, Meyer. The necessity of deriving from Philo the Logos of John, has been expressly contested by Hofmann and Luthardt, but we would be just as far from assenting to the view, which sets aside the entire speculative basis and the Old Testament development of doctrines, and understands by the Logos simply the historical Christ, the appearing of him who is the subject of the "Apostolic annunciation," or according to Luthardt, of the revealing word of God in general: "He who (as the incarnate) is a Logos of God for the world of men, has become man." Cf. the criticism relating to this point, by Weitzsäcker in Reuter's Rep. 1854, p. 111.

Lücke and even Gfrörer, have also found that it is improbable that a direct use was made of the writings of Philo: there is no proof that these writings were circulated out of Palestine in the first century, cf. Köstlin in Zellers Jahrb. 1854, p. 413. That in John's circle in Ephesus there may have also been Jews of Philonian culture, is not to be denied. If an influence from this source may have actually been exerted on the Apostle's circle of ideas, it would perhaps be most natural to suppose, as Neander does, (Pflanzung, p. 637,) no more than that the link was of an antithetical character: "what hitherto has been the object of your speculative musing, I mean the Logos, has now appeared in the body as man." But when we discover even in the Apocalypse, and in 1 John i. 2, that the Apostle gives prominence to the very same view, where there was no occasion for any antithetical reference of this kind, does not such a connecting appear in the highest degree improbable?

On the basis of the biblical expressions in the Old and New Testaments consequently, we obtain this as the substance of the doctrine: the being of God is to be regarded as one having a distinction in itself. In his Son, his Word, his Wisdom, he

himself has placed his counterpart, in which he has revealed to himself and personally loved the fullness of his own being. In this Word, in which he has expressed himself to himself, lay the *κόσμος νοητός*, the system of the world, and as in this was grounded the creation, that is the actual coming forth of the idea of the world in a distinct existence, it follows that the entire relation of God to the created world, all revelation in it, and consequently, also, the highest, the incarnation of God, is mediated through this Word.

(Cf. on the doctrine of the Logos, Lectures on the History of Christian Dogmatics, by Dr. A. Neander; edited by Jacobi. Translated by Ryland. London: Bohn, 1858, vol. i. 130–171. Tr.)