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VIII. 12. Πάντα όσον αὐτοῖς ἔδαφος ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει Ἐγώ εἰμί τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου· ὁ ἀσκουμένος μοι οὐ κῆ περιπατήση ἐν τῇ

Jesus declares Himself the Light of the World (VIII. 12–20)

VIII. 12. πάντα όσον αὐτοῖς ἐδάφος ὁ Ἰησοῦς, λέγει Ἐγώ εἰμι τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου. The introductory πάντα does not fix the context of the discourse which follows, for it is merely resumptive or indicative of the beginning of a new section, as at v. 21 (see on 11:1). Verses 12–20 have points of contact with c. 7 (cf. 7:39 and 8:14), and it is possible (although not certain; see on 4:43) that they should be taken in continuation of the sayings 4:40–50. If vv. 12–20 follow directly on 4:40, as we take them, we must suppose the words of 8:18 to be addressed to the Pharisees, who proceed (8:19) to find fault with them. This, indeed, is implied in ἐδάφος. Nevertheless, the proclamation "I am the Light of the World" recalls such sayings as 7:39, 43, which were addressed to all and sundry.

ἐδάφος λέγει, λέγω introducing the words spoken; see on 3:14, and cf. Mt. 14:23.

Ἐγώ εἰμι τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου. This is one of the great "I am's" of the Fourth Gospel, for which see Introd., p. cxxvii.

Just as the word of Jesus about the Living Water (7:37, 38) may have been suggested by the water ceremonial at the Feast of Tabernacles, so it has been thought that the claim "I am the Light of the World" may also have a reference to the feast ceremonial. On the first night of the feast, there was a ceremony of lighting the four golden candlesticks in the Court of the Women (see v. 20), and there is some evidence for the continuance of the ceremony on other nights. This may have provided the occasion for the words of Jesus about light and darkness. But Philo's account of the Feast of Tabernacles would furnish an equally plausible explanation. He says that this feast is held at the autumnal equinox, in order that the world (κόσμος) may be full, not only by day but also by night, of the all-beautiful light (τοῦ πανέμορφου φωτός), as at that season there is no twilight (de septem. 24). We have in this passage a close parallel to τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου, but no stress ought to be laid upon such verbal coincidences. The passage of Philo shows, however, that the Feast of Tabernacles suggested the idea of light to some minds.1

1 For the section 7:37–38, see the notes at the end of this volume on the Porcio de Adulera.

2 Strayer (J.T.S., 1900, p. 138) argues that the imagery was sug.
The Hebrews had thought of God as giving them light, and as being their light. "The Lord is my Light." The confession of a Psalmist (Ps. 27:1); "the Lord shall be thy everlasting Light." The promise of a prophet (Isa. 60:19). The latter Rabban applied the thought to the Messiah: "Light is the Name of Messiah," they said. The vision of Deuteronomy was larger, for he proclaimed that the Servant of Yahweh would be a Light to the Gentiles (Isa. 42:6-9; cf. Lk. 4:18). But the saying of every C. S. of the N. X. X. goes far beyond this, for the X. X. (see on 19) includes all created life. There is no Hebrew parallel to be found for such a thought, the expression of which here is thoroughly Johannine in form. See Intro., p. cxxvii.

In the Prologue, the Word of God is spoken of as the Light. John the Baptist was not the Light, but he came to bear witness of the Light (19), which was to φως τὸ ἀληθινὸν, lighting every man (19). In the Person of Jesus, the Light came into the world (19), as Jesus Himself said, ἐγὼ φῶς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἀληθινῷ (19). And so here (21a) and at ἐγώ, the majestic phrase ἐγὼ εἰμί τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου is put into the mouth of Jesus.

In the Sermon on the Mount, according to Mt. 5, Jesus said to His hearers ἐγώ εἰμί τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου. This is apparently to say more than Paul said to his converts when he called them φωτισμένοι ἐν κόσμῳ (Phil. 2:15); and it is not certain that Mt.'s Greek rendering of our Lord's words is accurate here. But if it is precise, the application of the words to φῶς τοῦ κόσμου to faithful citizens of the kingdom of heaven must be wholly different from its application when Christ used it of Himself and said, "I am the Light of the World." This is to make an exclusive claim, such as could be made by no other speaker, although others might claim to share in the assurance of Christ that His people are, as contrasted with non-Christians, the world's light. Cf. 7:18 and the note thereupon.

gusted by the Feast of Dedication or τὸ φῶς (19), in connection with which he puts this discourse.

1 Lightfoot, Hor. Heb., iii. 320.
2 This majestic claim is weakened in the form in which it appears in the Acts of John (5:93); κόσμον εἰς τὸν ἄληθινὸν πε. Westcott quotes from Buxtorf a sentence from the Jerusalem Talmud (Talmud, p. 2) to the effect that "the first Adam was the light of the world"; but the parallelism seems to be only verbal. Indeed, the Hebrews had not any clear idea of the kósmos as an ordered universe of being.

3 Abbott (Dict. 1748; cf. 435) urges that Mt.'s report must be wrong, and that what Jesus really said was, "Ye have the Light of the World." But there is no evidence for this, nor would it suit the context. Mt. 5:14.
THE SELF-WITNESS OF JESUS

κρίνεις ἡ ἐμὴ ἀληθινὴ ἡμέρα, ὅτι μόνος ὁ Κύριος ἐλήμη, ἀλλ' ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πέρας

ἐγὼ ὁ κρίνων ὁ δικός. The ultimate purpose of His coming into the world was to save it, not to judge it (5:17); and if an individual man would not obey His Word, Jesus did not judge him then: the spoken word would judge him at the Last Day (10:48). At that Great Assize, the Son of Man will be the Judge (see on 3:17 5:22, and Intro., p. civiii). But the saying ἐγὼ ὁ κρίνων ὁ δικός refers to the action of Jesus during His public mission on earth, and not to the future judgment of the world. There is a sense in which He did judge, or discriminate between one man and another, during His earthly ministry (see vv. 16, 26); but ἐγὼ ὁ κρίνων ὁ δικός expresses not only that this was not the purpose of His mission (see 3:17), but that it was not His habit. It was a charge made against Him that He did not discriminate sufficiently, that He consorted with publicans and sinners (Mk. 2:16, Lk. 15:2), that He did not repel the sinful woman at the Pharisee’s house (Lk. 7:37). Even in the case of the adulteress whose guilt was proved, when judgment must have been condemnation, He said ὅτι ἔγω σε καταψάλων (8:7). His example was consonant to His own precept μὴ κρίνεις (Mt. 7:2).

This saying of Christ ἐγὼ ὁ κρίνων ὁ δικός is found only in Jn., but its genuineness becomes the more apparent the more closely it is examined. It is a paradox, for it is seemingly contradicted in the next verse, but it is one of those terse, pregnant paradoxes of which the Synoptists have preserved many examples.\(^6\)

16. For Δικαίωσιν (BDITW 33) the rec. has Δική (KNIΔΕ). For δικάσθης see on 18. ἐγὼ κρίνω δὲ κατὰ κατὰ, "but if I judge, my judgment is sound," i.e. not merely true, but soundly based and complete. Cf. ἡ κρίσις ἡ ἐμὴ δικαιά ἡμέραν (5:28), where see note. The judgment of Christ is not that of a single individual, for μόνος ὁ Κύριος ἐλήμη, ἀλλ' ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πέρας με. Cf. vv. 26, 29, for the same thought, and again 16:15 ὁ Κύριος ἐμὴ μόνος, ὅτι ἐν τῷ πάσῃ ἐκεῖνῷ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τῇ ἐκείνῃ. The consciousness of this perpetual association with the Father is explicitly claimed by the Christ of Jn.; but it is implied, too, in the bitterness of the cry "Why hast Thou forsaken me," which is recorded only by Mk. and Mt. Herein was the anguish of the Cross, as they picture it.

The general principle to which the Pharisees appealed, sc. that judgment, like testimony, must not depend on one individual, is well illustrated in a Jewish saying (Ιτακε Ἀναθ., iv. 12, quoted by Westcott), "Judge not alone, for none may judge alone save One."\(^7\) Cf. Intro., p. cxc.
VIII. 18–19.] THE FATHER HIS WITNESS

καὶ μαρτυρεῖ πρὸς ἡμᾶς δὲ πέμψας με Πατέρα, 19. Ἰδεῖς ὅπως ἄλλοι ἤτοι διὰ τὴν Ἰσραήλ, ἢ δὲ τὸν Πατέρα, καὶ τὸν Πατέρα μοι οὐκ εἴπετε. οὕτως ἐκλείπειν οὐκ ἐγὼ τον Πατέρα, με, καὶ τὸν Πατέρα μοι οὐκ ἔδειξεν. οὖν, Πατέρα

is not trustworthy (v. 13); but Jesus replies to this by expressing Himself in terms which suggest His Divinity. This, however, is not said explicitly; and the point of His answer which the Pharisees understand is that He says that there is a second Witness, His Father who sent Him (cf. 3:3). There is a prophetic passage, Isa. 43:10 which has close verbal relations with this and v. 28: γένεις μου μάρτυρε, καὶ εἰς μαρτύροις, λατεία λόγιον εἴπατε Θεός, καὶ δὲ ταῖς μου ἐν εἴσοδοις, ἐν γνώσει καὶ πιστώσεις, καὶ κατανεύῃς ἐγώ εἰμι. The thought in Isa. 43:10, however, is of witness being borne to Jehovah (by) the people, (a) by His Servant, and, according to the LXX interpolation, (3) by Himself.

For the witness of the Father to the Son, see on 3:17.

19. καὶ ἄλλοι δὲ πέμψας με. This is the rejoiner of the Jewish objectors. They understand that by δὲ πέμψας (v. 16) Jesus means God the Father, and they do not ask "Who is He?" But they say "Where is He?" This second Witness, of whom Jesus had spoken, is not visible, and therefore (according to the Rabbinical doctrine of evidence) no appeal can be made to Him.

The answer of Jesus is, in effect, that their ignorance is inexcusable. God cannot, of course, be perceived by the senses. He is appealing to the witness of One whom no man can see.

ὁμοίως, ἡμᾶς δέχεται ὡς τὸν πατέρα μου. There is no inconsistency with ἦν καὶ ἠδεία, for there Jesus speaks only of the Jews' knowledge of Him as man, and of the family at Nazareth; here He speaks of their ignorance of His true Personality, which is Divine (cf. v. 14). Being ignorant of this, and therefore of His relation to the Father, they betray ignorance also of the Father Himself. Cf. οὐκ ἤρωμον ὁ Πατέρας (v. 33) and οὐκ ἤρωμον τὸν πατέρα ὁ Ἰησοῦς (v. 26). See Mt. 11:27, Lk. 10:22.

ὁμοίως, καὶ τὸν πατέρα μοι οὐκ ἔδειξεν. This principle is repeated 14:17, οὐκ ἤρωμον μοι καὶ τὸν πατέρα μοι οὐκ ἔδειξεν (cf. 14:26 and 14:7), and it is deep rooted in the Fourth Gospel. Jesus came to reveal the Father, not only by His words but by His life.

Note that ὁμοίως οὗτος of this verse is replaced by οὐκ ἤρωμον, 14:17, showing what precarious ground we are on when an attempt is made to distinguish ὁμοίως from ἔδειξεν (see on 1:18).

The phrase "your law" challenges scrutiny. Jesus accepted the "law," i.e., the Old Testament scriptures, very explicitly (see Intro., pp. cxvii, clv); and it is unlike the way in which He was accustomed to speak of it, that he should say "your law," thus dissociating Himself, as it were, from any recognition of its authority. He is represented in ro39 as again using this expression, and in 15:25 as speaking to His disciples of Scripture as "their law," i.e., the law of the Jews. It is true that in 18:19 and 10:34 the phrase appears in controversy with the Jews, and it might be thought that it supplied an argumentum ad dominum. Those who disputed with Jesus were shown to be in the wrong, on their own principles. But in the equally argumentative passage 7:18, 22, He speaks of "his law" and "the law of Moses"; and no such explanation can be given of the phrase "their law" in 15:25 which would definitely dissociate Him from the people of Israel, by suggesting that their Scriptures were not His Scriptures. In every place where δὲ νόμος is mentioned by Him in the Synoptists, whether it refers to the law which He came "not to destroy, but to fulfil," or in a wider sense to the O.T. books, He always says "the Law" (cf. Mt. 5:17, 17 11:13 12:22 23:8, Lk. 4:18, 21, 24 v. 16-18; the word νόμος does not occur in Mk.).

It is difficult to think that in these Johannine texts (3:17 10:34 15:25) the words of Jesus have been exactly reproduced.1

18. The use of ἐγώ εἰμι in solemn affirmation has been discussed in Intro., p. cxviii; and the present passage provides an instructive example of this usage.

ἐγώ εἰμι δὲ μαρτυρῶν περὶ θεοῦ. This is the style of Deity. As the Pharisees had urged, a man's witness about himself

See also McNells in Cambridge Biblical Essays, p. 242.
VIII. 21-23.] THEY COULD NOT FOLLOW HIM

21. And the Word they could not follow Him. For this verb and its usage in Jn., see on 7:30.

22. I go away," says to God.

23. And from henceforth. As in 7:24, this is the search of despair; they will seek Jesus as their Messiah, when it is too late, and αὐτὸν εὑρίσκετε μα is added by a few manuscripts from 7:24, where it is part of the text; but it is implied in any case.

καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν ἀπολλονήσεται, ἐν καὶ ye shall die in your sins," an O.T. phrase (cf. Exek. 38:18), and especially Prov. 24:34: ἀπολλονεὶ ὡς ἄρρητος ἐν ἀμαρτίαις, of which LXX rendering the phrase in the text may be a reminiscence. It is repeated v. 24, where see note. Those who too late seek Jesus as the Messiah, shall die in a state of sin, unredemed by Him.

ὅτου ἔγιν ὄντος ὁμοίως ὑπὸ δίκαιως ἡμῶν, "whither I go ye cannot come": this is repeated verbally at 13:31, where it is addressed to the disciples. Cf. 7:34, where the same thing (in substance) was said to the Jews, and see the note there.

29. ἔλεγεν, ὅτι οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, 33. the Jewish objectors.

μὴ ἀποκαλεῖτε δικαίως καὶ, "Is He going to kill Himself, that He says, 'Whither I am going you cannot come' ?" This is a quite different rejoinder from that of 7:34, made in reply to the same warning, the occasion and the interlocutors both being different. It has often been suggested that the rejoinder carries a scornful allusion to the belief that the depths of hell were reserved for suicides (cf. Josephus, B.J. III. viii. 5, ἵππον σκότωτον ὕπονοιν); but this is not certain. In any case, the Jews speak ironically: "If we cannot follow you, it must be because you will be no longer alive." The saying of mystery, "Whither I go you cannot come," which was uttered more than once (7:34, 13:38), naturally provoked different comments from different persons.

30. καὶ ἔλεγεν. The rec. has ἔδειξα, but καθεδει 

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN [VIII. 21-23.

Jesus develops His lofty claims: some of the Jews who hear believe (vv. 21-30).

21. The occasion of the discourse which follows is not mentioned. It may be a continuation of what precedes (see on v. 26), and if so oὐ may be causative, having reference to the fact that Jesus had not been arrested (v. 20; cf. 7:30). But perhaps oὐ is used as a mere conjunction (see on 1:20), and πάντως only marks (as in v. 14) the beginning of a new discourse. It is not possible to assign every discourse in Jn. to its original occasion; and one of the many rearrangements of the Gospel (that of F. W. Lewis) would place 8:21-28 after 7:53. Ver. 21 reproduces, though not verbally, the warning of 7:32, 33, and its last clause is addressed in identical terms to the disciples at 13:35 (where see note). But πάντως is not to be taken as an allusion to the repetition of 7:53; as has been said, it may only mark the beginning of a new discourse or paragraph (v. 14, 18); and see 1:25.

ἐνών εἰπὼν πάντως αὐτῶν. N.T. add εἰς ἵπποις (from 7:28), but om. καθεδείω.

κόσμου έστι, ευ ο άνιμ 1 κ α τού κόσμου τούτου. 24. είπον ανά μην διώκεμαι έν τούς άμαρτος όμων' εκ αέρα μη παντοτρείς ότι ευ ο άνιμ, αποδεκτείς έν τούς άμαρτος όμων. 25. Άγιον εύ ο

ευ έν τούς κόσμους. The contrast is the same as that of 31. The implied argument, sc. that the Jews' failure of understanding has its root in moral causes, has met us before (viii. 27-29), and is repeated 64.

διώκεμαι έν τούς κόσμους έστι. BT give the emphatic τοντέν τον κόσμον here, but the more usual τον κόσμον τοντέν in the second clause of the verse (so W in both clauses). ΧΩΛΑ give τον κόσμον τοντέν in both clauses, and κόσμος ους is the order in every other N.T. passage where the expression occurs. So, too, we always find δ σωτον ους (except Mt. 12:23).

The idea of imperfection which the word κόσμος, the totality of created being, suggests in Jn. has been noted on 51. This idea is specially brought out in the phrase δ κόσμος ους. When thus limited, the word does not embrace any plane of creation other than that of earth (119), and "this world" is contrasted with the spiritual or heavenly world, as being in a special degree affected by evil powers (161) and as awaiting the Judgment (5:25 12:4). The kingdom of Jesus is not of "this world" (18:39), from which He passed after His Passion (15:1). It is the place of our earthly discipline (I Jn. 4:6), in which he who hates his life shall keep it to life eternal (12:23). The phrase occurs with a like hint of evil, 1 Cor. 3:10 2 Cor. 3:11.

So here it is said of the Jews έν τούς κόσμον τούτων έστι. Cf. for the same construction έστι εκ τού κόσμου αυτοί. έν (emphatic) ἐκ εμοί ἐν τούς κόσμους τούτους. Cf. 17:14, 18.

It is the perpetual theme of the Fourth Gospel that He who was not "of the world" came "into the world" for its rescue. 23. είπον ανά μην, sc. at v. 21, where see note.

αποδεικνυόντες έν τούς άμαρτος όμων, the singular το άμαρτος being changed to the plural. To this no significance is to be attached, as when phrases are repeated in Jn., there are generally slight verbal alterations (see on 31).

διώκεμαι μη παντοτρείς ότι ευ ο άνιμ, αποδεικνυόντες ιτα. Jesus repeats with an awful solemnity that if His hearers do not accept Him for what He is, they will die in their sins. οτι ευ ο άνιμ may mean "that I am from above," as He had just asserted of Himself, ευ εν τούς άνιμ ειμι. But if this be the construction, it is very elliptical. It is more probable that we should take ευ ο άνιμ absolutely, "I am He," i.e.

1 Cf. Hobhouse, The Church and the World, p. 352, Note D.

VIII. 24-25.] HIS MYSTIC CLAIMS 301

ού το εύ ο άνιμ διώκεμαι Ή ο ισραήλ άν δ ρήξον δ τι και άλλο άλλο το? 26. Πολλά ήξε περί άλλων και άλλων και κρίνει ή άλ άλλο πρώτως "I am the Divine Deliverer," as at vv. 28, 58, and 13. For this use of ευ ο άνιμ as the equivalent of the Hebrew יבין, see Intro., p. cxx, where the expression is more fully discussed. We may here particularly compare Isa. 43:1 (see note on v. 28). Jesus had uttered His message; henceforth they had no excuse for their sin (15:23).

25. Άγιον εύ ο άνιμ έστι εις ελ; The Jews are puzzled by the last words of Jesus. They sounded like the Divine proclamations in the prophetic books. Who is this, that says I AM? And they ask Him, "Who art Thou?" (cf. 1:19).

But He gives no direct or simple answer (cf. 10:25 for a similar question, and a similar indirectness of reply. τον ρήξον δ τι και άλλο άλλο, "Primarily (in essence), what I am telling you," i.e. "I am what my words reveal." We have already noted (see on 51; and cf. 18:36 14:1 16:17) that άλλος cannot always be sharply distinguished from λέγω; and the construct δ τι λέγω is similar to δ λέγω εν έλλειπον of 12:46, or ταύτα λέγω ο ν. 28. τον ρήξον is never used in Jn. for "from the beginning," which is expressed by είς ρήξον (16:9), or more frequently by είς ρήξις (15:6, 1 Jn. 1:7 and passim). In the LXX τον ρήξις often stands for "at the beginning," "at the first"—e.g. Gen. 43:30, Dan. 9:2 (LXX), and Dan. 8 (Theod.)—which is a sound classical construction. (Cf. Herod. viii. 12:9 σώσεις ρήξις έτη, "being originally seven in number.") But in the present passage the rendering "I have spoken at the beginning" is inadmissible, inasmuch as the verb is in the present (λέγω) and not in the aorist (ήλθαν). These considerations seem to rule out the R.V. "Even that which I have also spoken unto you from the beginning." The R.V. margin treats the sentence as a question, and for τον ρήξον substitutes διώκεμαι. Thus τὸν ρήξον ωτι και άλλα διώκεμαι is translated "How is it that I even speak to you at all?" This rendering has the support of Chrysostom, and there is no doubt that τὸν ρήξις may stand for έλλειπον, omittio, especially in negative sentences. An apposite parallel to such a use is found in Clem. Hom. vi. 11, εί μη παραλογιζιοντις οί λέγω, τι και τὸν ρήξις διαλέγομαι; (a sentence in which some have found an echo of v. 25). The answer of Jesus, according to this view, is a severe rebuke, which has a note of impatience, comparable to Mk. 9:19: "O faithless generation, how long shall I be with you?" But it is difficult to connect a rebuke

με ἀλήθειαν ἐστιν, κάθε καὶ ἐκείνα πάρ' αὐτοῦ, τοῦτο λαλῶ εἰς τὸν

of this kind with the words which immediately follow in v. 26.

The Latin and Syriac vss. take the sentence as affirmative, not as interrogative; and herein they are probably right. But

neither can be followed in detail. Syr. sin. gives "The chief

is that I should speak myself with you, seeing that I have much

that I should speak concerning you and judge:" but this

provides no answer to the question "Who art thou?" Some

O.L. texts give "initium quod et loquor ubi ait," i.e. "I am

the beginning (cf. Rev. 1:8), that which I am saying to you"; but

πώς ἀναθεναν could not be attracted to δι' αὐτοῦ in this way. The

Vulgata has "principium quia et loquor ubi ait," which is still

farther from the Greek.

We come back to the rendering, "Primarily, I am what I am

telling you," as the least open to objection of the many

renderings that have been offered of this difficult passage.

τὸν ἄρχοντα means fundamentally or originally, or, in colloquial

English, "at bottom." In reply to the question "Who art thou?"

Jesus declares to the Jews that He is essentially what His words reveal, in particular such words as ἔγω εἰς τὸν ἄνω κόσμον (v. 23), and (above all) ἐγὼ εἰμί (v. 24).

26. πάλλω δὲ Ἰησοῦς παρ' ἡμῖν λαλῶν καὶ κρίνων. This seems
to take up the teaching of v. 16 above. Jesus does not dwell

upon His answer to the question "Who art thou?" He goes

on with His discourse, as there was much still to say. With

πάλλω ἔχω λαλήσει cf. πάλλω ἔχω λεγόντα of 16:12, a comparison

which confirms the conclusion (reached in the note on 31:3)

that λαλῶν and λέγων are not sharply distinguished by Jn.,

and that they are sometimes interchangeable.

His discourse was of judgment. He had

already said twice to the Jews that they would die in their sins

(vv. 21, 22), a ρήμα to which the words of v. 16 lead up.

ἀλλ' ὁ πάλω με ἀλήθειαν ἐν τάλα. This is again re-

sumptive of v. 16, where Jesus had said that His judgment was

ture, because it was not His own, but reflected the judgment of the

Father who had sent Him. The adversative ἀλλ' points

back to the objection which He continually rebuts, so that

He has no authority behind Him. "Whatever objection you

raise to my claim to judge, you must remember that He who

sent me is true." See on v. 16 above; and cf. 3:8, 48.

κάθε καὶ ἐκείνα παρ' αὐτοῦ, τοῦτο λαλῶ εἰς τὸν κόσμον. Cf.

15:30 πάντα δὲ ἐκείνα παρ' τοῦ πατρὸς μου ἐγνώρισεν ἐμί, and

see vv. 38, 40. Here the sayings "heard from the Father"

were sayings of judgment, as at 20, καθὼς ἀκούει κρίνω. And,

VIII. 26-28.] His lifting up on the cross

κόσμου. 27. οὐκ ἔγνωσαν ὅτι τὸν Πατέρα αὐτοῖς λαμβάνει. 28. οἵν

οὖν ἐκ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. Οὐκ ἔφθασεν τὸν θάνατον τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, τότε γνώρισεν

ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμί, καὶ ἐκ ἐμοῦ ποῦτον δύνης, ἀλλὰ καθὼς ἐδίδαξαν με ἐς

unlike those of 13:16, they were spoken "to the world"

(cf. 13:16).

To the speak εἰς τὸν κόσμον is a constr. that is not found again

in Jn.; but cf. 1 Cor. 14:15 εἰς ἑαυτόν λαλήσει, Mk. 13:15 εἰς

τοῦτο τὰ ἔθνη δι' ἐμαυθήσεται τὰ ἐθνῆ.

τοῦτο λαλῶ. So ἈΒΔΛΝΤΩΔης, but minor uncials sub-

stitute λέγω for λαλῶ.

27. οὐκ ἔγνωσαν ὅτι τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῖς λαμβάνει. This is one

of the evangelist's comments on his narrative (see Introd.,
p. xxxiv), and it seems to confirm what has been said on v. 25

about the Jews' misunderstanding of the words of mystery

which Jesus had uttered.

28. οἵν οὖν ἐκ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, "Jesus therefore said," sc.

because of their misunderstanding. ΚΔΙΝΔΤΓ add αὐτοῖς, but

om. BLTW; ΧΔ further add παρατηρ. ὁταν ἐπήκοα τὸν θάνατον τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, "When you shall

have lifted up," sc. on the Cross, "the Son of Man." See on

31:3 for ἔθνη in Jn., and cf. 2:8. In the present passage ἐγώ

must relate to the lifting up on the Cross, and not to the "lifting

up" of the Ascension, for the latter was not in any sense

the act of the Jews, as the Crucifixion was (cf. Acts 3:16).

For the title "the Son of Man," see Introd., p. cxxxi.

τότε γνώρισεν ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμί, "then ye shall know that I am

(the Son of Man)," the predicate of ἐγώ εἰμι being understood

from the preceding clause of the sentence. Otherwise, we

must take ἐγώ εἰμι as used absolutely, as in v. 24 (cf. 5:13

15:26), the phrase being then identical with the self-

identification of Yahweh in the prophets, ἐγώ ἐμί "I (am) He"

(see Introd., p. cxxv). On either interpretation, the style of the sentence is that of Divine proclamations: cf. Ezek. 18:11 ἐγνώρισεν ὅτι ἐγὼ κύριος.

108. the pressure of facts, the fall of Jerusalem and the

like, would convince them of the truth of His words: "cog-

nocesset ex re, quod nunc ex verbis non creditiss" (Bengel).

This, rather than the conviction of sin wrought by the Holy

Spirit (108), seems to be the force of τότε γνώρισεν.

ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι, but also the next clause ἐγὼ ἐμί τοῦν νόμον κτλ. This had been said before, 30:11

(cf. 12:28). For its significance, see note on 1:11.

Ignatius (Magn. 7) has ὁ κύριος ἐκείνος τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκδόθη ἔπειτα, a

reminiscence of these Johannine phrases.

ἀλλὰ καθὼς ἐδίδαξαν με ἐς πατέρα. Cf. v. 26, and see
VIII. 31-32.] THE FREEDOM OF TRUTH

31. "Jesus says o
30. and πατὴρ θεοῦ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα διαλεγόμενος αὐτὸν Ἰουδαίοις ἦν ἡμᾶς μείναις ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῷ ἐμῷ, ἂν δὲ οὐκ ἦσαν μοι ἡμῖν, 32. καὶ γνωστὸ ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια ἀληθινοῦς

Jesus tells the Jews who are inclined to believe Him, that truth would emancipate them from the slavery of sin (vv. 31-34).

31. "So He began to say to the Jews that believed Him," i.e., those who had been impressed by His recent utterances (but cf. vv. 33 and 40). πιστεύετε followed by a dative does not represent so high a degree of faith as πιστεύεις εἰς

tou; but it indicates a stage on the way to discipleship. You must believe what a man says before you can believe in him. For the constr. πιστεύεις εἰς τιν, see on 11; and cf. the note at 6 on πιστεύεις τιν. For the constr. ἔχεις τὸν σωτῆρα, see on 2.

ὁ δὲ διὰ τὸν λόγον τῷ ἔμῳ καὶ τῷ Ἰησοῦ. Cf. 2 Jn. 3, where we have ἔχεις μόνον ἐν τῷ διδάσκαλῳ ἤ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τῷ ἔμῳ. In vv. 37 and at 5 a different metaphor is employed, sce. that of the λόγος of God abiding in the believer. But (see on 5) the two expressions "abiding in His word" and "His word abiding in us" come to the same thing. See also on 5, 5'. ἀλήθεια μακάριος μου λευκός. This is the highest rank among Christians, sce. those who have reached the stage of discipleship. See on 5, where this is repeated.

32. καὶ γνωστὸ ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ. For the conception of ἀλήθεια in Jn., see on 14; and cf. vv. 40, 44, 45.

καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια ἀληθινῆ ἡ ἀλήθεια. The words express a great principle, which is applicable in many directions, and which has been enunciated by Jewish and heathen teachers as well as by Christian. It was a Stoic paradox that men are saved by knowledge, as is evident from the parable of Socrates (Cicero, Pro Rom. 5). This was repeated in another form by Seneca, "unum studium uerere liberale est quod liberum fact, hoc est sapientiae." (Ep. 1xxxviii. 2). Philo, in the same spirit, wrote a book to prove that the σώματος is free (quod omnis probus liber sit). In another book (de confus. link. 20) he asks τίς ἐν τῷ ἔλευσθε βαθμοτάτη, to which he gives the answer ἡ τοῦ μονος κρατικά σωφρ. But there is no trace of generalisations of this kind either in O.T. or N.T.

The freedom which truth brings (in the view of Jn.) is emancipation from the slavery of sin. This appears from v. 34, where see note. In v. 36 the Son is said to be the Agent of this emancipation (ἐν ὑδά τῶν ἔμων ἀληθείᾳ); and the
35. 'Ο δὲ δοῦλος οὐ μένει ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ τοῦ τοῦτον· ὁ δὲ μενεῖ

It is habitual, rather than occasional, sin that is here in view when it is said that a man mastered by it is a slave.

The Hebrews regarded sin in the light of violation of God's law, rather than as a state of slavery. This latter doctrine is Greek rather than Hebrew; it is not often expressed by Greek writers so clearly as by Xenophon: ἕνας δὲ δοῦλον στενού σιν δεῖ τὸν σινάστη συμπατίας, καὶ δείθησιν μὴ δοκεῖται πράξεις ταῦτης, τούτως τούτων διευθυνόμενος είναι· Εἰκονία, ἔνθα (Memorab. iv. 5). Cf. Eiconom. i. § 22. Paul has the same idea when he speaks of sinners as δοῦλοι τῆς διαρρίας (Rom. 6:6, 20), but it does not appear elsewhere in his epistles. He dwells often on the freedom of the Christian from the yoke of the Jewish law (Gal. 5:13), but that is a different conception. In 2 Pet. 2:21 we have the phrase δοῦλος τῆς διαρρίας, which is parallel to δοῦλος τῆς διαρρίας. But it is remarkable that the idea of sin as a master which makes slaves of men is found in the N.T. only here, and at Rom. 6:6, 20, 2 Pet. 2:20. It is not quite apposite to cite Jas. 1:21, 2 Cor. 3:17, which express the principle that the Christian law is a law of liberty.

Jesus tells the Jews that they are only slaves without tenure in the household of God: they are not true sons of Abraham, for they try to kill Him: their father is the devil. It is just because they have not God for their Father that they will not believe Jesus, who offers them eternal life (N.T. 25-26).

35. In the report of this discourse, there is at this point a sudden change of metaphor. In v. 34 the δοῦλος is the slave of sin (or of the devil); but in v. 35 a contrast is drawn between the positions of the δοῦλος and the νοῦς in a household presided over by its rightful master. A slave may be cast out at any moment; he has no covenant with his master. But if the heir emancipates him from his state of servitude, i.e., to his lawful master, he becomes a free man and obtains a footing in the house comparable to that of a son. This seems to be the trend of the argument, but it involves a transition from a particular conception of the δοῦλος to a quite different conception.

Δὸ δὲ δοῦλος οὐ μένει ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ ἐπὶ τῶν οἰκίας. The slave has no tenure. The story of Hagar and Ishmael (Gen. 21:9) suggests itself, but it is not clear that Jn. intends any allusion to it, or to Paul's use of it (Gal. 4:30). If a slave offends his master, he is liable to expulsion from the household. This
seems to be meant as a warning to the Jews, who are really slaves because of their sins, that they have no fixed tenure in the household of God (cf. 46 for oikia as equivalent to 44 household). A similar contrast between the slave and the son appears Heb. 2, where (quoting Num. 12) Moses is described as a faithful servant (διαρκέος) in the house (οἶκος) of God, but Christ as the Son of that house. For the οἶκος of the Father, cf. 12; and for the permanence of a son's tenure in his father's house, cf. Lk. 15:21; τίκον, οὗ πάντων μετ' ουφώς εἰ. For the phrase οὶς τῶν αἰώνων in Jn., see on 44.

The last clause, 46 μὲν, εἰς τῶν αἰώνων, is omitted by 45 and in the passage of the quotation by Clem. Alex. (see on v. 34). But the omissions here and in the preceding verse only serve to show that the difficulties of the argument were felt by scribes and exegetes alike. It is possible that the whole of v. 35 is an early gloss, brought in from familiarity with such passages as Gal. 4, Heb. 3.

87. οἶκα δὲ τῶν πατρῶν διαρκείοις καὶ. If v. 35 is part of the original text, then this sentence has in view the fact that the son and heir had a special privilege in the emancipation of his father's slaves. Cf. Gal. 3. But if v. 35 may be treated as a gloss, then v. 36 relates itself naturally to v. 34: "You are the slaves of sin; but if the Son (46 υἱὸς used absolutely, as at 40) make you free (cf. v. 39), you will be free indeed." What the Son does will be ratified by the Father.

ἐλευθέρως, ἐλευθερών, do not occur elsewhere in Jn., and in the Syriac only at Mt. 23 do we find ἐλευθερών. οὗτος is not used elsewhere by Jn.

The true text of this verse is doubtful, there being variants for nearly every word.

Westcott-Hort read: ἐτέρας ἡμέρας παρά τῷ πατρὶ λαλῆσαι καὶ ἄμειν σὺν ἑκείνῳ παρά τῷ πατρῶς τούτῳ, giving as the "Western" reading ἐτέρας ἡμέρας παρά τῷ πατρὶ μονάδι καὶ ἀμείν σὺν ἑκείνῳ παρά τῷ πατρὶ ἐμῶν τούτῳ.

NDNΓD and Syr. sin. support the insertion of μονάδι (om. BCLTW) after πατρὶ in the first clause, and of ἄμειν (also found in C) after πατρῶς in the second clause.

The Vulgate has: "ego quod igitur apud patrem loqueor, et ets quae uidistis apud patrem eum in facitis," and this the evidence of Tatian agrees.

If the pronouns μοναδι and ἀμείν are omitted, ἐτέρας must stand for the same person in both clauses, and the second clause would have to be imperative: "do ye therefore the things"
which ye heard from the Father.” But this does not agree well with the context.

We translate: “I speak of what I have seen with my Father; but (καὶ being used for διὰ λαλεῖν; see on ἀλλα) you do what you heard from your father,” sc. the devil (v. 41). ἡμι and ἡμείς are placed for emphasis at distinction of the beginning of the two clauses respectively.

καὶ ἡμῖν τὰ παρακαμφίγκτα μοι λαλᾶτε. Cf. v. 28 above, and see especially on 5th. παρά τά παράτησεν, is not to be referred to the pre-incarnate life of the Son (cf. 17th παρά σαυρίῳ), or interpreted with Abbott (Dict. 2555) as “in the home of my Father,” i.e. heaven. The reference is to the perpetual vision which the incarnate Son had of His Father’s will (see 5th). For ἐναύωσα as occasionally used of spiritual vision, see on 3rd. For λαλῶν in Jn., see on 3rd.

καὶ ἡμεῖς οὖν (cf. 16th καὶ). The contrast between λαλᾶτε and τεύχετε is marked. Jesus speaks of the truths which the Father has given Him, but the Jews do the sinful things which the devil suggests, the pres. tense τεύχετε indicating a continual doing. τὸ παρακαμφίγκτα ἡμῖν is identified with τὸ διαβόλου at v. 34, but this has not yet been made explicit by Jesus, and in fact, the Jews’ reply shows that they do not yet understand the tremendous severity of His words.

39. ὁ πατήρ ἡμῶν Ἄβραμά ἦστε. “Our father is Abraham.” They repeat what they have said before (v. 33). It was true, in so far as their physical pedigree was concerned; but Jesus tells them that they are not true sons of Abraham if their conduct is unlike his. His reply is almost in the words used by Paul (cf.) in the Angelic λογία (Rom. 9). He had admitted (v. 37) that they were στερμάτα Ἀβραάμ, but this natural descent did not, by itself, guarantee all the privileges which belong to the τέκνα who are Abraham’s true heirs (cf. Gal. 3:9).

εἰ τέκνα τοῦ Ἄβραμά ἦστε, τὰ ἐργα τοῦ Ἄβραμά τεύχετε. “If you are Abraham’s children, do Abraham’s works.” 편 Đức being imperative.

40. Although only read by B, is probably the true reading,5 and should be rendered in the imperative mood, with Syr. sin. ἔστηκεν ὑπὸ (W omits ὑπὸ) is read by CCLNW; but he has ὑπῆρξεν... ἔστηκεν, 104).

VIII. 39-41.] ARE THEY ABRAHAM’S SEED?

5 Ἐρωτήσας δὲ τὴν ἐπίσκοπον ὑμῶν λαλῆσαι, ὥς ἤρωθας παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ, τότε Ἄβραμά αὐτὸς ἐποίησεν. 42. ἡμεῖς ποιεῖτε τὰ ἐργα τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν. ἦσαν αὐτῷ ἡμεῖς ἐκ τορήσεως αὐτῶν ἐγνωριμέναι, ἐκ Παντόρα this requires the rec. ἔστηκεν instead of ἔστηκεν in the first clause, while ἔστηκεν is read by n3DLT.

40. καὶ ὃς, ἐπεξεργάζεται τὰ ἐργα τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν. A difficulty has been found in the use of this word as applied (here only) to Himself by Jesus. Nowhere else in the N.T. is He described as “a man,” for Rom. 5:15 and 1 Tim. 2:5 both imply that He was ἄνθρωπος in a unique sense. Cf. Acts 13:31, where He is spoken of as ὄνομα. But it is hypercritical to find offence in this manner of expression. It would be out of place in the writings of a second-century theologian, who had reached the point of seeing the difficulties in the formulation of the doctrine of the Incarnation; but for a first-century writer, who was combating with special care the idea that Christ had not come “in the flesh,” it is quite natural.4 The expression is used sine prejicidio deletatis, and that Jesus should have described Himself as “a person who has spoken the truth to you” in discussion with Jews who did not accept Him as divine is not surprising.

ὁ πατήρ παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ. This is the perpetual teaching of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel, sc. that His words reveal the mind of the Father, who taught them to Him; cf. v. 36 and the references given in the note at that place.

τοῖς Ἄβραμά ὡς ἐποίησεν. Abraham welcomed the heavenly messengers (Gen. 18:3); he did not seek to kill them.

41. Paulatim procedit castigatio is the comment of Grotius on the severe denunciation which follows.

ἡμεῖς ποιεῖτε τὰ ἐργα τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν. “You,” with emphasis, “do the works of your father,” sc. the devil, although that is not yet said explicitly.

The Jews still misapprehend what is meant. They say, first, that if it is being suggested that they are not the legitimate descendants of Abraham and Sarah, it is not true; and secondly, that if it is spiritual and not physical descent that is in question, then their Father is God. The sentence is very much compressed.

ἡμεῖς ἐκ πορείας καὶ ἐγνωριμεῖα (οἱ BD): οἱ γεγονότα τοῦ βασιλείου πορεία is the rec. reading with CDPWΔ. It has been held by some expositors, both ancient and modern, that the Jewish disputants mean to affirm by these words the legitimacy of the spiritual relation of Israel to Yahweh. See on 14.
for the conception of Israel as Yahweh’s wife, and Israelites as His children, in contradistinction to the heathen or Samaritans. Idolatry was fornication, and those who went after other gods were πάντα πορνεία (Hos. 5). This is a possible interpretation of ἐκ πορνείας οὐκ ἐγέννηθον, and accords well with what follows; but it is simpler to take the words literally and to regard them as a reaffirmation of ἀβραάμ ἐσμε… ὧν πατὴρ ἡμῶν Ἄβραμ ἐστίν (v. 33, 39), “we were not begotten of fornication” (see on 16).

ἐς πατήρ ἐχεις τὸν θεόν. As for spiritual parentage, it was a fundamental and often expressed principle of the Israelites that Yahweh was their Father; cf. Ex. 4, Deut. 3, Isa. 63 and 64. This is a wholly different figure from that of Israel as Yahweh’s wife, and it is difficult to believe that there is a sudden transition from the one figure to the other, as we must suppose if ἡμῶς ἐκ πορνείας οὐκ ἐγέννηθον is to be interpreted of spiritual fornication, i.e. idolatry.

The sentence “We have one Father, even God,” is then, not to be taken in strict connexion with what immediately precedes. It is a new plea, put forward for the Jewish disputants, who are beginning to understand that Jesus has been speaking of spiritual, not natural, parentage.

"If God were your Father, you would love me." This is the same argument as that in 1 Jn. 1, 3, 4. "If you were the children of God, you would love God, and, as whatever loves a father loves his son, therefore you would love Jesus, His Son." The Jews have turned the argument, so that now spiritual fatherhood is in question, and Jesus shows them what the consequences of this spiritual fatherhood must be.

ἐγὼ γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξῆλθον, sc. “for I, even I who speak to you (Ἰδίων ἐγὼ διὰ ἀφορμος ὑμῖν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ θέαμα. Attempts have been made to distinguish ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ (cf. 16) and ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ (cf. 13, 16), but they will not bear scrutiny.” See on 14; and cf. 16 and the note there. For ἐξῆλθον, see on 14.

The contrast in the two clauses of the verse is between γνώσετε and ἐκεῖνος rather than between λαλοῦν and λέγων. There is a difference between the usage of these words, but it cannot be sharply pressed in Jn.: see on 31.

You are the father of the devil," and the devil.” Simple language is ascribed to Jesus Mt. 13, 31. The sentence would admit of the translation, “You are of your father the devil.” According to the Ophites, Talmudics, the God of the Jews, was the father of the serpent (Iren. Haer. 1. xxx, 6, 10). But such a notion is not relevant to this context, the evangelist representing Jesus as telling the Jews plainly for the first time that they are the devil’s children, a climax of denunciation to which the preceding verses have led up. Closely parallel in language and in thought is 1 Jn. 3, 8 ἐπί τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστίν. ὅτι σὺ αὐτὸς ὁ διαβόλος ἀμαρτάνει.

For the constr. ἐκαί, see on v. 33 above.
viii. 44–46] Who accuses Jesus of sin?
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αὐτοῦ. 45. ἐγὼ δὲ διὰ τὴν ἀληθείαν λέγω, ὠς πιστεύετέ μοι. 46. τίς ἐξ ἢμῶν ἢλεγξεν με περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν; εἰ ἂληθείαν λέγω, διδότοι ἐμαν σα πιστεύετε μοι; 47. ὅτι ἐν τῷ θεῷ τὰ δόγματα τοῦ θεοῦ ἀκούεις.

will lead into all truth, because "He will not speak of Himself (οὗτος λέγω), but will speak of that which He shall hear." This contrast is noted by Origen (Comm. in Joann. 340).

ἡ πράξεις ἐστὶν καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἁμαρτ. Ἰν. uses the word ἁμαρτία frequently (ἐσ. Ἰν. 157; 32 33 34 35), just because he dwells on the significance of ἁμαρτία (see on 14). ὁ πατὴρ ἁμαρτ. may mean (a) the father of a liar, or (b) the father of a lie, according as ἀδικ. is masculine or neuter. Probably the latter rendering is right, ὁτι καὶ ὁ πατὴρ τοῦ φθονον ἀληθείας ἐστίν (Origen, Comm. in Joann. 347).

Westcott would render the sentence differently, sc. "Whenever a man speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own, for his father also is a liar." But it is difficult to supply a new subject to the verb, between ἡμεῖς and λαλῶ. 1 The point is not that the Jews have been lying, for they have not been charged with lying up to this point (cf. v. 55), but that they are following the promptings of their father the devil, who is both a murderer and a liar, in seeking to kill Jesus. And this leads up naturally to the next verse. They are trusting to the promptings of a liar but the devil will not trust Jesus who tells them the truth. Indeed, it is because He speaks the truth that His words are unwelcome, for His hearers are spiritual sons of one in whom the truth is not.

46. ἐγὼ δὲ διὰ τὴν ἀληθείαν λέγω, ὠς πιστεύετέ μοι, "But as for me (ἐγώ being placed first for emphasis), because I speak the truth, you do not believe me." Truth is uncongenial to them. Cf. 312; and see on 157 for τὴν ἀληθείαν λέγω.

πιστεύετε μοι is not to be confused with that deeper faith which is expressed by πιστεύετε ἐμα ν (see on v. 31).

46. τίς ἐξ ἢμῶν ἢλεγξεν με περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν; No answer to this challenge is recorded. Probably no answer was attempted. His hearers did not understand, of course, that Jesus was literally χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας (Heb. 4:15); but they could prove nothing to the contrary, and they knew it. The phrase ἢλεγξαν περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν occurs again 10:6, where see note.

1 After a pause, as we may suppose, Jesus then resumes the argument, "If I tell the truth (and none of you has accused me of being a liar), why do you not believe me?"

2 Westcott's rendering was suggested by Middleton (On the Greek Article, ed. 1888, p. 362), who mentions an emendation τα for τα before ἢλεγξαν, which would remove the difficulty about the subject of the verb.
316 THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN  [VIII. 47-48.
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47. δὲ ὁ τεῖς τοῦ θεοῦ, εἰς τὸν θεϊκὸν έλεημόνην. 48. Ἀπεκρίθη οὖν οἱ Τουρκίων καὶ έσθον αὐτῷ. Οὐ καλὰς λέγων ψήφισεν ἡμῖν ότι Ἀπαραξιότητα εἶ σεβασμάτων ἐγείρει; 49. Ἀπεκρίθη οὖν οἱ Τουρκίων έγείρειν

VIII. 48-51.] TO KEEP HIS WORD IS LIFE 317

διαμάντον αὐτόν ἐγείρειν, ἐξελέηται τὸν Πατήρα μου, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀπομακρύνουμεν. 50. Ἡ σκέψει τοῦ θεοῦ τὸ δόξαν μου έστιν ὁ θεός καὶ γεννών. 51. ἐν εἴρημεν λέγω ἡμῖν, ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ λόγῳ τρέφομαι, θάνατον οὕτως ἑφευρθή εἰς τὸν αἵματα.

Synoptists (Mt. 320) as having been made against Jesus by scribes from Jerusalem, that “He casts out demons by the prince of demons” but the emphasis laid in Jn. on demoniac possession is always in connexion with the demetiasia which was supposed to be its consequence (see Introd., p. clxxvi). It is not put forward in Jn. (either at 729 or 1020) as a sign of wickedness, which is implied in Mk. 325.

49. Jesus does not take any notice of the imputation. “You are a Samaritan.” That was not so offensive to Him as it was intended to be, for He looked to the day when the rivalries between Jews and Samaritans would disappear (420). His reply is mild and calm: “I am not mad.” His claim to be God’s messenger and to speak with a delegated authority (v. 42) did not arise out of a disordered brain, but from His fixed purpose of “honouring His Father,” αὐτοῦ τὸν πατήρα μου. Cf. 7:11 ὁ θεός τοῦ δόξαν τὸν πέμψτον ἐκτένις. For ὁ πατήρ μου, see on 2:16.

His Jewish adversaries, on the other hand, had been insuliting, ὑμεῖς ἀπομακρύνετε με. Cf. 5:28, where it has been said ὁ μηθύμων τῷ ἄθλῳ οὐκ ἔφθασε τὸν πατήρα. 50. However, He goes on to explain that their insulting words did not affect Him: ἐν εἴρημεν λέγων τὸ δόξαν μου: if He did so, it would be nothing (cf. 3:11 7:34).

ἐν εἴρημεν λέγων καὶ γεννών, “there is One who seeks (my honour), and (in doing so) pronounces judgment (as between us).” It is only the δόξα that comes from God that is worth having (5:29 8:42). To win the approval of God for any act or thought is to be “judged”; and this Jesus applied to Himself, strange as the thought may be to us of the Father “judging” the Son. But we cannot separate θεὸν from γεννών, and ὁ θεός refers to the Father as seeking to honour the Son (see on v. 54).

There is no incongruity, even of expression, with 5:28, where the office of the judgment of mankind is reserved to the Son Himself.

81. ἄφησεν ἐμὲ λέγων ἅμα παρέχειν a summary (see on r31) of what Jesus has been leading up to (cf. v. 34, 38). If they keep His teaching, they will have eternal life.

ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ θεοῦ, Ι. Μ. Ν. Β. Κ. Λ. Δ. Λ. Α. W. rec., with N8 has τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ (from v. 43). To keep the word of Christ or of God (τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ) is a characteristic
52. Ἐνδιὰν οὖν ὑπὸ τῆς ἀναγκαίης διδασκαλίας ἐγνώκαμεν ὅτι ἰδιώματος ἦταν. Ἀδραιώ, ἀνέστησαν καὶ οἱ προφήται, καὶ οὐκ ἦν γάρ ἐκ τῶν τῶν ἁλὸν
phrase in Jn.; cf. vv. 52, 55, 14a.1b, 15a.1b, 1 John 2. It is practically identical in meaning with γεύσεται τῆς ἀναγκαίης διδασκαλίας (see on 14a; and cf. Introd., p. lviii). Cf. 2b, where he who "hears" and "believes" is promised eternal life; and see 11a.1b 12a.

The phrase "shall never see death" is a Hebraism for "shall never die." See on 2a for ἀθάνατος, used as δεδομένος (see on 2a) is used here, in the sense of "participate in" or "have experience of." "To see death," meaning "to die," is found in Ps. 39a, Lk. 2a, Heb. 11a. The promise given here is not, of course, one of exemption from the death of the body, which is not in question. But the man who "keeps the word" of Christ has eternal life already. See 14a.

To the Jews' suggestion that Jesus is not as great as Abraham was, despite His claims, He replies that He was in existence before Abraham (vv. 52-53).

82. nBCW8 omit the rec. ὅτι (60 N) after ἐστών.
For οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι (cf. vv. 22, 34, 48, 57), see on 1a. They misunderstood the meaning of Christ's saying, interpreting it of exemption from physical death. They thought He was mad: διὸ ἐγνώκαμεν, "now we are sure," διὸ διαφόρον ἔγνως.
Cf. v. 48.

Abraham and the prophets had "kept the word" of Yahweh, and yet they had died (cf. Zech. 1b). Was Jesus really claiming to be greater than Yahweh? Was His word more powerful? He ventured to say τὰς τις τῶν λόγων μου γεύσεται, αὐτῷ μὴ γεύσομαι (the rec. has γεύσονται, but with insufficient support) διὸν μὲν ἐκ τῶν ἁλὸν.

γεύσονται ἑαυτῶν, "to taste of death," means "to die," and is used of the death of Jesus Himself at Heb. 2b. Cf. for the same usage Mt. 16a, Mk. 9b, Lk. 2 Esd. 2a.

The phrase is a Hebrew one, although not found in the O.T., and Wetzstein (on Mt. 16a) has collected some instances of its use in the Talmud. By pressing the distinction between διὰ τᾶς διασκέδασιν in v. 5a and γεύσεις βασιλέως in v. 5a, it has been inferred that Jn.'s report makes the Jews deliberately misquote what Jesus had said; but this is not probable. That they misunderstood it is certain.

In a saying of Jesus among the Oxyrhynchus Papyri1


VIII. 59-58. A GREATER THAN ABRAHAM

...
320 THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN [VIII. 55-58.

...The verb οἶδα is used in similar contexts 78 (where see note) 82a. 152. Although the Jews claimed God as their Father (v. 41), they did not know Him.

... Cf. 79. οἶδα οἶδα οἶδα did not claim the validity of His mission: ἦσαν δόμος ὄμων ἑαυτοῦ. He had not yet directly accused the Jewish objectors of lying, but He had told them that they were the children of the devil, who is the father of lies (v. 44).

... So ABDWΘ. ὅμως is read by κCLNTΔ (cf. Job 36), which would be doubtful Greek.

... τὸν λόγον ὁδοῦ της. See on v. 51 above.

56. Jesus now explains that He is truly “greater” than Abraham (cf. v. 53).

... Ἀβραὰμ ὁ πατὴρ ὁμῶν ἐγκλαμέασα (ἐκκλαμέασα, cf. 58) ὅμως της ἑαυτοῦ ἑαυτοῦ, i.e. probably the day of Christ's birth or appearance in the flesh (cf. Job 32). “The days of the Son of Man” (Lk. 17b 19) was the Rabbinical description of the Messianic age generally.

... The moment in Abraham's life to which reference is made is not clear (Berscheid, R. 44) that Abraham saw the whole history of his descendants in the vision of Gen. 15b, when he "rejoiced with the joy of the law." With this agrees 2 Esd. 24. "Abraham... thou lovedst, and unto him only thou shewedst the end of the times secretly by night." 1

... The constr. ἐγκλαμέασα ὅμως πατὴρ seems to mean "exulted in the anticipation of seeing," which is not far removed from "desired to see"; and this rendering is adopted several times in the Latin version of Origen (Lettmattch, vi. 38, ix. 145, xiv. 423; cited by Abbott, Diat. 3688), and also appears in the Syriac commentary of Isho’dad, which embodies much early material. We should expect an infinitive instead of ἔμειναι, but ἔμειναι cannot be judged incorrect. Milligan 1 cites from a third-century papyrus ἔμειναι ὅμως ὅμως ὅμως: “I was glad to have an opportunity of greeting you.”

... This seems to say that Abraham in the other world was joyfully conscious of Christ's appearance in the flesh, a strange and mysterious saying, which is taken up in one of the legends of the Desensus ad Inferos. There it is said that when the news of Christ came to Hades there was joy among the O.T. saints, χάρις ἐν χαρίς ἐν κλίτη μετὰ τὸν πατραχάνος καὶ τῶν προφητῶν ἔνωσε, καὶ χάρις ὅμως ἡ πληγοθή ἕτοι πρὸς ἔλληκοι. 2

87. καὶ Ἀβραὰμ ἐφακάς ὅμως: The Jewish objectors are represented as interpreting the reply of Jesus to mean that Abraham, while alive on earth, had seen Him. The rec. καὶ Ἀβραὰμ ἐφακάς is strongly supported, being read by ΝΑCDN; but the true reading seems to be καὶ Ἀβραὰμ ἐφακάς: "And did Abraham see thee?" This is read by Σ and supported by Syr. sin. and the Coptic vss. (including Q). ἐφακάς have ἐφακάς. The reading ἐφακάς ὅμως would be in uncial ευερσκετικός, which by dropping one of would become ευερσκετικός or ἐφακάς ὅμως, and the ἐφακάς was corrected into ἐφακάς, the rec. reading. In v. 56 Jesus had not said that He had seen Abraham, but that Abraham has seen Him, or His day; and there is no reason to suppose that the Jews are represented as misquoting His words, as we must assume if the received text be followed.

... This is plainly due to an attempt to reconcile the statement with such passages as Lk. 32. At fifty years of age, the Levi's were superannuated from further service (Num. 32) and all that the sentence means is, "You are not yet an old man." Irenæus, however, resting his argument on this passage, concludes that Jesus was not far short of fifty years of age at the conclusion of His earthly ministry (Her. ii. xxii. 6), and that therefore its duration exceeded the single year which the Synoptists suggest.

68. ἔμειναι ἔμειναι λέγει ὅμως. We have had this solemn

1 Vett. n. v. 1a.
2 Eovang. Nicomedi, i. ii. (t8).
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VII. 58-59.

58. Ἡμῶν οὖν λίθος κτλ. So again at 10:31-38, when He said "I and the Father are One," the Jews attempted to stone Him for blasphemy. The Temple was not finished, and stones form of affirmation (see on 2:6) twice before in this discourse, at vv. 34, 51; and in each case, as here, it sums up what has gone before.

10:32. before Abraham came into being, I AM." The contrast between the verbs γίνεσθαι and εἶναι as unmistakable as it is in Ps. 90, πρὸ τοῦ δὲ γενέσθαι ... ἐπὶ τοῦ αἰῶνα ὡς τοῦ αἰῶνος σὺ εἶ, "before the mountains came into being ... from age to age THOU ART." Of God it could not be said that He 18 came into being" or "became," for He IS. Cf. 11:18 and Col. 1:17 for this absolute use of εἶναι; see also on 1:18. It has been pointed out already (see Introd., p. cxvi) that ἡμῶν εἰμὶ used absolutely, where no predicate is expressed or implied, is the equivalent of the solemn καὶ ἐγὼ Εἰμί, Ἰησοῦς, which is the self-designation of Yahweh in the prophets. A similar use of the phrase is found at 13:11. It is clear that Jn. means to present Jesus as thus claiming for Himself the timeless being of Deity, as distinct from the temporal existence of man. This is the teaching of the Prologue to the Gospel about Jesus (v. 1) but here (and at 13:18) Jesus Himself is reported as having said Ἰ (am) Ἰησοῦς, ὃ, which is a definitive ascription of His Godhead, and was so understood by the Jews. They had listened to His argument up to this point; but they could bear with it no longer. These words of mystery were rank blasphemy (see 20:28), and they proceeded to stone Him.

For other occurrences in Jn. of ἡμῶν εἰμὶ without a predicate following, see 6:20 9:16, as well as vv. 24, 28 of the present chapter.

The angry people would stone Jesus, but He escapes from them into hiding (v. 59)

59. Ἡμῶν οὖν λίθος κτλ. So again at 10:31-38, when He said "I and the Father are One," the Jews attempted to stone Him for blasphemy. The Temple was not finished, and stones

VIII. 59-IX. 1.] THE MAN BORN BLIND

IX. 1. Καὶ παράγων εἰδὴν ἀνθρώπων τυφλὸν ἐκ γεννήσεως. 2. καὶ were lying about its courts (cf. Mk. 13:2); Josephus (Antt. xviii. ix. 3) gives an account of the stoning of soldiers in the Temple precincts.


After ἤπαθε the rec. text (so Νευμ. adds δικαίων διὰ μέσου αὐτῶν from Lk. 19:10) καὶ παρήλθην αὐτῶν, probably suggesting that the escape of Jesus from the angry Jews was miraculous. But of this there is no trace in the true text, ending with ἔφε, which is supported by WBDW"? latt sah arm. The words παρήλθην αὐτῶν are added in the rec. text to the interpolation from Lk. 19:10, in order to introduce c. 9.

See 10:28, where Jesus again escapes from the hostile Jews.

IX. 1 ff. The narrative of c. 9 may be intended to follow immediately the disputes of 8:55-9:25, but there can be no certainty as to this. The day on which the blind man's sight was restored was a Sabbath (v. 14), as was also the day of the impotent man's cure at Bethesda (4:6), but there may have been a considerable interval between the two healings. The next note of time that we have is the mention of the Feast of Dedication (10:22), and there is no doubt that cc. 9 and 10 must be taken together. The tone of the questioning and of the words of Jesus in c. 9 is different from that of c. 8, where the Jews become fiercely indignant with the claims which Jesus puts forward. It is probable that 9:1 marks the beginning of a fresh section of the narrative, which has no special relation with that of c. 8. The story in 9:1-24 is told very vividly and with much lively detail.

Care of a man blind from his birth (IX. 1-13)

1. καὶ παράγων εἰδὴν κτλ. This is an abrupt beginning, but the introductory καὶ is thoroughly Johannine. παράγων does not occur again in the Fourth Gospel; but cf. 1 Jn. 3:17.

1 Dr. L. C. Purser has pointed out to me a striking passage in Plutarch (De Is et Jesu Deipnoros, c. 20, p. 393) where εἶμι is similarly used for the timeless existence of Deity, being contrasted with γίνεσθαι; ἄλλα χρόνα ὁ θεός ... καὶ χάριν εἰς σώζειν καὶ ἀποκάλυψιν ... καὶ καθαρίσει τοῦ εὐτελοῦς φιλοτιμοῦσαν εἰς τοὺς καταφύγεις, ἐστιν γὰρ θεός ἔφη τὸ νῦν ἡμᾶς διδάσκοντος ἐν τωμαὶ ἐν τῷ θεῷ εἰς τιμὴν καὶ εἰς ἀξίαν. Plutarch uses the remarkable expression ἄλλα χρόνα ὁ θεός εἰς τοὺς καταφύγεις, "But He, being One with the One Now has filled up the Ever," and adds that we should address God as εἰς ἔκτις Ἰησοῦς, "Thou art One Being,"
instance of Jn.'s alleged habit of magnifying the miraculous element in the ministry of Jesus (see Intro., p. clxxv). This healing goes beyond any of the healings of blind men recorded by the Synoptists, Jn., after his wont, selecting one typical and notable case for record (see below on v. 6).

Diseases of the eye are common in the East, and it is not surprising that blind folk should have been brought for cure to Jesus. There is no mention in the O.T. of a blind person being cured (unless the case of Tob. xi 11 be reckoned as such); but to the prophet the blessings of the Messianic age included the opening of the eyes of the blind (Isa. 35), and the Baptist was reminded of this in connexion with the cures wrought by Jesus (cf. Mt. 11). Mk. records two special cases, sc. at Mk. 8 (to which further reference must be made) and Mk. 10 (cf. Mt. 20, Lk. 18). See also Mt. 9; Lk. 15; Mt. 21; Lk. 18. But the singularity of the case recorded by Jn. is that the blindness is said to have been congenital.

There is a passage in Justin (Tryph. 60) which seems to presuppose a knowledge of this verse. Justin has quoted Isa. 35 7, and he proceeds: ποιεῖ διὸ ὁ Ἰσαὰκ συνάμενον συμφέρειν ὑπὲρ τὴν ἐρυθράν γενηθῆναι ἑαυτόν . . . ἄνθρωπος, sc. Christ, τοὺς ἐκ γένεσιν καὶ κατὰ τὴν σάρκα περιορίζει καὶ κατοίκοις καὶ κηφίσσις ἰάσεις (cf. Apol. 1, 25). ποιεῖ is used of blindness, as well as of other bodily disabilities; but, apart from that, the phrase ἐκ γένεσιν indicates a knowledge of Jn. 9, for it occurs nowhere else in the Gospels, nor is the circumstance that Jesus healed men of congenital ailments mentioned elsewhere in the N.T.

2. ἵπτόμενοι αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ. These disciples may have been His Jewish adherents, as distinct from the Twelve, or the Twelve or some of them may be indicated (see on 2a). But the nature of the question which they put betrays an intimate relation of discipleship (note the word Ραββί, and see on 18); and the close connexion of 6 with 15, in which the discourse about the Good Shepherd seems specially appropriate to the inner circle of His followers, suggests that οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτῶν here at any rate includes the Twelve.

The question is as old as divinity. The first of the alternative answers suggested is that the man himself had sinned and that his blindness was a punishment divinely sent. As to this, it may be true in an individual case, but the whole drift of the Book of Job is to show that suffering is not always due to sin, and with this may be compared the words of Jesus at Lk. 15 (see on 14 above). In this particular instance which drew forth the disciples' question, as the man had been blind from birth, if his blindness was a punishment for his own sin, it must have been prenatal sin. This was a possibility, according to some Rabbinic casuists (see Bereshith, R. xxxiv, cited by Wetstein). Cf. v. 34. It is hardly likely that the questioners had in view sins committed in a former body, although the doctrine of the pre-existence of souls was not unknown to later Judaism; cf. Wisd., 3. 38.

The other alternative answer, as it seemed to the disciples, was that the man's blindness was divinely sent as a punishment for the sins of his parents, a doctrine which is frequently stated in the O.T. (Ex. 30; 34, Num. 14; Ps. 79; 109, Isa. 65). This was the doctrine of punishment which Ezekiel repudiated, declaring that justice is only to be found in the operation of the principle, "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." (Ezek. 18).

The question of the relation between sin and suffering was discussed by the Gnostic Basilides in a passage quoted by Clem. Alex. (Strom. iv. 12), but although the problem raised is similar to that in the text, the discussion does not contain any allusion to the story before us.

3. ἀνεκριθέν ἤτροφος. See for the omission of δ before ἤτροφος on 2a.

The answer of Jesus to the questioners approved neither of the alternatives which they put before Him. His answer, as set forth by Jn., is that the man's blindness was foreordained so that it might be the occasion of the exhibition of Divine power in his cure, ἵνα φανερωθῇ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ. Cf. 14 for the witness borne to the Divine mission of Jesus by His ἔργα; and 11 (where see note), where the sickness of Lazarus is said to have been "for the glory of God, that the Son of God may be glorified thereby."

The doctrine of predestination is apparent at every point in the Fourth Gospel, every incident being viewed sub specie aeternitatis, as predetermined in the mind of God. See on 2a and 3a.

4. ἡ μὴ ἔχει αὐτόν ἐκ τῶν ἐργῶν ἡμῶν. So nACNT160, the Lat., and Syr. vss. (including Syr. sin.). But nBDLW ἔχει ἡμᾶς δι', and for τῶν ἐργῶν με, nLW ἐκ τῶν ποιμαντῶν ἡμᾶς. The latter variant may be rejected, both on the MS. evidence and because the phrase "He that sent me" is characteristically Johannine (see on 4), while "He that sent us" would be foreign to the phraseology of the

1 For the elliptic in ἔλλαθε, cf. 11 15, 1 Jn. 2.
introduced by a clause which seems to limit its application to the time of the ministry of Jesus upon earth. "While I am in the world, I am a light of the world," He says; and He proceeds to impress His meaning upon His hearers by restoring His sight to the blind man. When Jn. says that Christ was "in the world" (11) He refers quite definitely to the period of His historical manifestation in the flesh (cf. also 17); and the context in the present passage shows that the same meaning must be given here to τὸ κόσμον. Christ is always, and always has been, and will be, τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου; but that thought is not fully expressed by ἦν ὡς τῷ κόσμῳ φῶς εἰμὶ τοῦ κόσμου. The thought here is that it had been eternally ordered in the Divine purpose that He should "work the works of God" during His earthly ministry; and another way of expressing this is to say that while He is in the world He is, inevitably, a light of the world, whose brightness cannot be hidden.

6. Jesus is represented here (as also at 5) as curing the sufferer without waiting to be asked. This is unlike the Synoptic narratives of healing, e.g. Mk. 5, 25, the cure of the blind man at Bethsaida, who was brought to Jesus by his friends. In that case, however, as in this, Jesus is said to have resorted to the use of physical means where the recovery of the patient, e.g. the eyes were treated with spittle (cf. also Mk. 7, 34).

The curative effects of saliva (especially of fasting saliva) have been, and still are, accepted in many countries. "Magyars believe that styes on the eye can be cured by some one spitting on them." 1 A blind man who sought a cure from Vespticus asked "ut... oculorum orbis dignaretur respergere oris excremento" (Tacitus, Hist. iv. 81). Lightfoot (Hor. Hebr. in loc.) quotes a Rabbinical story which embodies the same idea. It was, apparently, a current belief in Judea that spittle was good for diseased eyes, and that Jesus accommodated Himself to that belief is reported both by Mk. and Jn., although in neither case is it stated that He Himself accepted it as well founded. This tradition of Jesus curing blindness by means of His spittle is not found in Mt. or Lk. It is evidently the oldest tradition.

Severus Summonicus, a second-century physician, quoted by Athenaeus, prescribes the use of clay for smearing bad eyes, "turgentes oculos ulli circumline caeno." 2

These strange remedies may be compared with those mentioned in a second-century inscription: "Ophelros, τῶν ἐκ κοπίας ἐχθροματότων ἄδειος ἀδεία καὶ λαβάδι αἷμα τῶν ἐκ κοπίας." 3

1 See E.R.E. xi. 102, s.v. "Saliva."  
2 See, for other illustrations, Trench, Miracles, p. 294.  
3 See Moulton-Milligan, s.v. ἐκχύς.
IX. 7-8. CURE OF THE BLIND MAN

βῆθαρ τῶν Σιλωάσ. (ὁ ἐμφανίστηκεν Ἀπεσταλμός). ἀνέβαινεν σὺν καὶ ἐνίσχυτο, καὶ ἦλθεν βλέπων. 3. Οἱ οὖν γείτονες καὶ οἱ θεραπευται cf. also Neh. 3:8, Lk. 13:1. The waters which gather in the Pool are connected by a subterranean tunnel or conduit with the Virgin's Well (see on 5). ἄνθρωπος, is the root of the name Shiloah, or Siloam, which thus means, etymologically, "sent," this name having been given to the Pool because the water is "sent" or "conducted" thither by the artificial aqueduct which goes back to the time of Hezekiah, or even earlier. In the note δ ἐμφανίστηκεν Ἀπεσταλμός we observe the tendency to interpret Hebrew proper names for his Greek readers, of which we have many instances in Jn. (see on 18). Ἁλσώμα ὁ ἐμφανίστηκεν Ἀπεσταλμός is exactly parallel to Κηφᾶς δ ἐμφανίστηκεν Πέτρος (149). Hence it is unnecessary, and even perverse, to seek esoteric symbolism in the note δ ἐμφ. Ἀπεσταλμός, such as is suggested by commentators who call attention here to the fact that Jesus was "sent" by God (cf. v. 11). The evangelist knew that the name Siloam was given to the Pool because the water was conducted or "sent," there artificially; and he naturally passes on the information to his readers. The word Ἁλσώμα is not strictly a proper name, and this Jn. indicates by prefixing the article τοῦ Ἁλσώμα, as in Isa. 8:1, Lk. 13:1.

ἐνέβαινεν σὺν καὶ ἐνίσχυτο, καὶ ἦλθεν βλέπων. Οἱ οὖν γείτονες καὶ οἱ θεραπευται διεκτύμαναν τοῦ ἔμφαντος Ἀπεσταλμόν, ὡς οὖν εἰς τὸν κοιλήθραν. The man interpreted this command (v. 11) as meaning, "Go to the Pool, and wash." νῦν εἰς τὴν πτέραν, however, may be translated as "wash in the Pool," but in the of motion is not expressed only implied, e.g. λείψανα κατεφέραν εἰς πόλιν κατ. (Mt. 23:31, and cf. εἰσεναλθαόνοι εἰς ἑαυτὸν (26)). See, further, on 19.

The man, apparently, was not directed to bath in the Pool, but only to go there to wash off the clay with his eyes had been smeared. The Egyptian vss. render νῦν as meaning "wash thy face." (cf. v. 5).

The Pool of Siloam (there are two pools) is situated to the south of the Temple area, at the mouth of the Tyropoeon Valley. It is mentioned Isa. 8:1, where the waters of Siloah that go softly are contrasted with the waters of the Euphrates, strong and many, which typify the Assyrian power; 1

1 The paratactic style of this inscription, καὶ ... καὶ, is very like that of vv. 5-8, and shows that a redundancy of καί conjunctions does not always point to a Semitic original (cf. Intro., p. 19ff.).
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IX. 8-11.

10. His neighbours and those who had formerly noticed the poor man, were not sure of his identity, now that his sight had been restored. His appearance would naturally be changed. Some said he was the man, others thought not. But he himself (ἐγκαίνης, cf. vv. 11, 12, 25, 30) set them right. ἐγώ εἰμι, "I am the man." This is a simple affirmation of identity, not to be confused with the mystical ὑπερήφανος τοῦ τυφλοῦ in Jn. (see Introd., cxx).

11. οὗτος ὁ λάθος ἠλευθέρωθεν αὐτόν. The fact that the man’s sight had been restored is not challenged; it is only the manner of the cure that is in question. See vv. 15, 19, 26.

IX. 11-16.] Inquiry by the Pharisees

13. Ἀγνωστοὶ αὐτῶν πρὸς τοὺς Φαρισαίους, τῶν τούτων τυφλῶν. 14. ἐπὶ δὲ σάββατον ἐν ἑτέρῳ τοῦ τυφλοῦ ἐποίησαν ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἀνέφθη αὐτῶν τὸ δέος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. 15. τὰ πάντα ὁι ἡμῶν αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι πρὸς ἀνθρώποις ἐπιθύμειν, ὅ ποτε ἀντίκειτο Ἰησοῦς μὲν ὁ ἄνθρωπος τοῦ τυφλοσκοτοῦ, ὁ δὲ θεός ἦν ἡμῶς τῆς ἐξάφθονος μοι ἑπὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ ἐναντίον καὶ ἐπιθύμησα, καὶ ἔλεγον. 16. Ἐλεγαν αὐτὸν εἰς τῶν Φαρισαίων τῶι Οὐκ ἦτοι αὐτὸς παρὰ Θεοῦ ὁ ἄνθρωπος, ὅ ὅτι τὸ σάββατον ὤν πριν. ἄλλοι ἔλεγαν Πῶς δύναται ἄνθρωπος ἀνάγκας αὐτῶν, as τὸν ἐκ γενετοῦ τυφλοῦ, after an attack of headache recovers his sight (ἀναβλήθην ἀπ’ αἰτοῦ), although only temporarily.

18. ὅτι ἔσται ἐστιν; See on 7:11 for the same question.

The Pharisees investigate the cure of the blind man on the Sabbath (vv. 13-34)

18. The cure was so striking, and the technical breach of the Sabbath so obvious, that some of those who had been interesting themselves in the case brought the man that had been cured before the Pharisees, as the most orthodox and austere of the religious leaders (see on 7:25). This was not on the day of the cure, but on a later day. Note τὸν ποτε τυφλὸν.

14. ἰναὶ ἀνέφθης (cf. §e) ἐν ἑτέρῳ (so κατείλ. but the rec. has simply ἐν, with ADN1αθ) τῶν τυφλῶν ἐποίησαν. It was the kneading of the clay that primarily called for notice, as it was obviously a work of labour and so was a breach of the Sabbath.

18. τὰλῃ ὁι ἡμῶν κτιλ. The questioning (see v. 10) had to begin all over again, for this was an official inquiry, and the brevity and sharpness of the man’s answers now show that he is tired of replying to queries as to the manner and circumstances of his cure.

16. There was a division of opinion among the Pharisees who heard the story of the man whose sight had been restored. The strict legalists among them fastened on one point only, viz. that the Sabbath had been broken. οὐκ ἦτοι αὐτὸς παρὰ θεοῦ ὁ ἄνθρωπος, "this person is not from God," i.e. has not been sent by God, has no Divine mission. For παρὰ cf. рe, also 1 Macc. 2:10-12, and see on δαίμων for the deeper meaning which παρὰ θεοῦ has elsewhere.

ἐν τῶν σάββατον οὐ πρίν. This was the charge that had been made against Jesus on a former occasion, when He healed the impotent man at Bethesda and told him to carry his mat away (5:9). There was a twofold violation of the Sabbath laws apparent in this case, for not only had the clay been kneaded (v. 14), but it was specially forbidden to use spittle to cure bad
17. λέγουσιν οὖν τῷ τυφλῷ αὐτὸν: Ἰησοῦς ἐστιν. Ἐν σοὶ λέγεις περὶ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἡμέων σοι τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς; ὅ δὲ εἶναι ὅτι Προφήτης ἐστίν. 18. ὅπως ἐπιτύπωσαν οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι περὶ αὐτοῦ ὅτι ἦν τυφλὸς καὶ ἀνεφλέγας, ὥς ὅπως ἐφώνησαν ἐκείνοις εἰς ὄρασιν τοῦ Σαββάτου: "As to fasting spittle; it is not lawful to put it so much as upon the eyelids." 1

It is curious that the phrase τῷ σαββάτῳ περὶ αὐτοῦ does not occur again in the Greek Bible; but τηρεῖν is a favourite verb with Jn. (see on 20).

Others among the Pharisees took a larger view of the situation, probably such men as Nicodemus or Joseph of Arimathea. They called attention to the σημεῖα of Jesus as wonderful, no matter what the day was on which they were wrought. οὗτοι δὲ οὖν ἔβρασαν ἀμαρτωλοῖς (this word "sinner" is only found in Jn. in this chapter) τοιαῦτα σημεῖα (see on 21) τοῖς: How could a sinner do such things?

καὶ σημεῖα ήτο εἰς αὐτός. Cf. for similar divisions of opinion, 20 23, 26; and see also 48 71.

17. λέγουσιν καί τῷ τυφλῷ αὐτῷ: "they," i.e. the Pharisees collectively who were present, "say again to the blind man," i.e. they resume their inquiry, to get more details.

τῇ τί σημεῖον περί αὐτῶν; "What do you say about Him?"

ὅτι φίλημμα implies that as Jesus had opened his eyes, the man's opinion was worth having. "What do you say, inasmuch as it was your eyes that He opened?" conveys the sense. For the constr., cf. 21. Burney suggested that ἄρτι is here a mistranslation of the Aramaic relative γάρ, and points to the Vulgate gaut operavit. But it is not necessary to appeal to an Aramaic original here. See Abbott, Dint. 212.

The man's answer was προφήτης ἤτοι. He did not say that Jesus was "the prophet," as the multitude said after the miracle of the loaves (6:15), but only that He was "a prophet," a simple answer like that of the Samaritan woman (4:20), i.e. that He was an extraordinary person who could do extraordinary things.

18. Up to this point the Pharisees have not directly challenged the statement that the man's sight had been restored, having confined themselves to the question about the breach of the Sabbath which was involved. But the answer of the man, προφήτης ἤτοι, leads the more hostile of them (οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, see on 20) to suspect collusion between Jesus and the patient, and so they summon the parents for further inquiry as to their son's blindness and its cure.

1 Shabb. c. 21, cited by Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. on ἀφθαρσίαν.
Except when Jn. is interpreting Matthew (4th 45), this is the only place in the Gospel where we find κρίνει without the def. article: "if any one should confess Him as Christ." Cf. Rom. 10:9 for a similar constr.: "ἐάν ἀλογίσῃς Κύριον Ἰησοῦν, "if thou shalt confess Jesus as Lord."

 δικοστίγμασιν, "excommunicate." The word is found in the Greek Bible only here and at 24:22, 16. Full excommunication involved a cutting off from the whole "congregation of Israel" (cf. Mt. 18:17); but it is probable that the lesser penalty of exclusion from the synagogue for a month (the usual period) is all that is indicated here. That he who acknowledged Jesus as the Messiah was to be treated as δικοστίγμασιν is mentioned again 25, 23.

 23. διὰ τοῦτο, "wherefore," referring (as generally in Greek) to what precedes; cf. 13:11 15:16 16:19, 1 Jn. 4:4. For διὰ τοῦτο as referring to what follows, see on 32.

 διά τὴν ὕλην ἔχει, αὐτῷ ἀποκρίθησαν (κοι. εὐθ.). διά is ἐκτικαται, purporting to introduce the actual words spoken. Note that the order of the words has been changed, for in v. 21 we have αὐτῷ ἀποκρίθησαν, ἔχει αὐτῷ. Jn. is not punctilious in his narrative about reproducing the exact words or the order of words (see on 38).

 24. The Jewish leaders summon the man himself for re-examination (ἐκ δικαίους, v. 17). They now press him on the point of his former evidence, which they suggest was not true.

 25. ἐκάθισεν ὅρας ὁ ἄν. This does not mean here "Thank God" (cf. Lk. 17:19), but it is a form of exclamation meaning "Speak the truth," as at Josh. 7:18 (cf. 1 Ecd. 9).

 ἡμέρας ἀνατέλασει ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκκλησίας ἐστιν, "we know," speaking with ecclesiastical authority, "that this man is a sinner," although the blind man had said (v. 17) that He was a prophet. They suggest that the man was lying, and was in collusion with Jesus.

 26. The shrewdness and obstinacy of the man reveal themselves in his answer. He refuses to discuss their assertion that Jesus was a sinner. "One thing I know, that being a blind man, now I see." That is all he will say.

 27. See, for Jewish excommunications, Schürer, History of Jewish People, ii. ii. 51.

 28. Accordingly his questioners attempt a further cross-examination, hoping to elicit some damaging admission.

 29. ἀπεκρίθηδι δὲ αὐτῶν ἢ κλίνειν τόπου ἵστοιν. They profess complete ignorance of the antecedents of Jesus. Some of the people of Jerusalem knew, indeed, whence He came, τὸν ἄνθρωπον τόδε ἵστοιν (79, where see note), although there was a deeper sense in which none of the Jews knew it (80). But the Pharisees would not admit that they either knew or cared what was His origin or who were His kindred.

 30. The man whose sight had been restored is now thoroughly angry, and he goes on to argue in his turn, shrewdly enough, beginning with a mocking retort.
It is this point, viz. that the blindness was congenital, that is insisted on throughout; whereas in the case of the cure of the man at Bethesda, the circumstance that he had been infirm for thirty-eight years (5') passes out of view at once, and attention is concentrated on the fact that he was cured on a Sabbath day.

The argument is clear. God does not hear the prayers of sinners. Miracles are granted in answer to the prayers of a good man. Jesus has worked a miracle. Therefore Jesus is a good man.

What is called a "maxim which no one would dispute" (cf. 3), is stated in 1 Jn. 5:18, "If we say that we have no sin we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." The verse is put in the first place (with ἁμαρτάνειν, which is emphatic) for emphasis. Here the genitive, because it implies a hearing with attention; see on 3e.

The principle that God does not hear the prayers of sinners appears frequently in the O.T.; e.g., Job 21, Ps. 66, Isa. 1, Zech. 3. For the converse principle, that God hears the prayers of a godly man, cf. Ps. 14, 145, Prov. 15, 18, Lam. 1.

The phrase is not found again in the N.T. (it occurs in the LXX, e.g., Job 21); but cf. 1 Tim. 2, for "theology.

"I did the will of God" is a frequent thought in Jn.; see on 4a. For the answer always given to His prayers, cf. 13, 21.

The phrase ἐκ τῶν αἰῶνων occurs Lk. 10, Acts 21, 15, and is found in the LXX (i Chron. 16; Ps. 25, 90, Ecclus. 14, Jer. 25, etc.), as it is in the papyri. But ἐκ τῶν αἰῶνων does not occur again in the Greek Bible, the nearest phrase being ἐκ αἰῶνος. Prov. 21.

(Weinstein illustrates it freely from non-Biblical authors.) We have here an instance of the interchangeability of ἐκ and ἐν which we have already observed in Jn. (see on 4g, 4h.)

"Since the world began it was unheard of that any one opened the eyes of one who was born blind."
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faith was beginning to go deeper. He was on the point of believing in (see on 12:18 for the force of πιστεύω εἰς autoν; and cf. 4:35) the Son of Man (see Introd., p. cxxx). This is the criterion of Christian discipleship which was placed before him.

We follow NIDW and Syc. sin. in reading τον άλλον του ανθρωπου. But ALTheta and most MSS. read τον άλλον του θεου, which is the usual title in Jn. when confession of faith is in question. See, e.g., 15:20, 47; and cf. Mt. 16:26. According to 20:28, the purpose of the Fourth Gospel is that readers may believe that "Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God." But if "the Son of God" were the original reading here, it is surprising that scribes should have altered it to "the Son of Man," which does not appear in any of the other confessions of faith; while the change from the unusual "Son of Man" to "Son of God," the usual title in similar contexts, is easily explicable (see 6:60 for a similar alteration by scribes). Further, v. 36 shows that the would-be disciple did not understand who was meant by "the Son of Man" or that Jesus was claiming such a title for Himself. As we have seen (14:6), the Messiah was popularly designated "the Son of God," but "the Son of Man" was not a recognized Messianic title (see Introd., p. cxxx). The man to whom Jesus spoke was evidently puzzled (cf. 12:28).

36. ἀπεκρίθη ἦκενος καὶ εἶπεν καὶ τῆς ἑστη, κύριε; For this BW have the shorter form καὶ τῆς ἑστη, ἦκενος, κύριε: The man had accepted Jesus as a prophet (v. 17), and so he was ready to act on whatever Jesus bade him. He will put his trust in the "Son of Man" if he is told who He is, and where he may find Him. καὶ τῆς ἑστη; "Who then is He?" For the initial καὶ, cf. καὶ τῆς δύνασθαι σουμένης (Mk. 10:35, Lk. 18:25) and καὶ τῆς ἑστης μου πληρωθής (Lk. 10:26). Cf. also 14:25.

He addresses Jesus with respect: κύριε, "Sir" (see on 12:28). κύριε generally comes at the beginning of the sentence, but here and at v. 38 it comes at the end.

ἐν πιστεύω εἰς αυτόν, taking up the words of Jesus in the preceding verse. There is an ellipsis before εἰς, which has full telic force: "Who is He? for want to know in order that I may put my trust in Him." Cf., for a similar constr., 14:32.

37. The reply of Jesus, beginning καὶ ἀσχάσεις αὐτός, has a special force as addressed to a man who had been blind from his birth. "You have seen Him." This was one of the first blessings which came to him through the opening of his eyes." In his case, faith followed immediately on the "seeing" of Jesus, in marked contrast with the case of those to whom it was said ἀποκάλυψεν [με] καὶ ὁ πιστεύεις (6:29), where see note.

καὶ ἦκενος μετὰ καὶ ἦκενος ἑστιν, "He who is talking with you is He." Cf. 4:34 for a similar discovery of Himself to the Samaritan woman. For ἦκενος, used by the speaker or narrator of himself, see on 10:30.

38. The man's response is unhesitating: πιστεύω, κύριε, "I believe, Lord." κύριε being now used with a respect which has passed into reverence (see on 10:48), for the narrator adds καὶ προσεκύνησεν αὐτῷ, "and he worshipped Him." προσεκύνησεν (see on 4:20) is always used in Jn. to express divine worship.

The man who has been cured of his blindness now passes out of the story.

The whole of v. 38 and the words καὶ εἶπεν ἦν ἦκενος in v. 39 are omitted in N.W, the O.L. δ, and the fourth-century Coptic MS. described as Q. The O.L. δ also omits the clause, with the exception of καὶ προσεκύνησεν αὐτῷ. Such a consensus of Greek, Coptic, and Latin authorities for this omission is remarkable, as a textual phenomenon; but the omission cannot be original.

The inner meaning of the healing, and the condemnation of the Pharisees (v. 39-41)

39. Here is given, in brief, the interpretation of the story, for this miracle was a σημεῖον (v. 16). The cure of the man's blindness was symbolic of the giving of spiritual vision to those conscious of their spiritual blindness, who are therefore willing to be healed. But some do not feel the need of a Healer. This is the dividing line between man and man. And the mission of Jesus leads up to judgment, according as men do or do not recognize their Deliverer in Him.

ἐν κύριοις εἰς τῆς κύριον τοῦτον ἔδωκαν. Cf. 16:28, 18:27 for the saying "I am come into the world"; and cf. also 6:4. For the phrase "this world," see on 8:20. It means the earthly world, the home of fallen man, which is therefore imperfect. κύριος (a word not found again in Jn.) is the result of a κυριος or act of distinguishing between good and bad, and so of judging. So the sentence means, "It was with a view to that ultimate
41. The answer of Jesus is as overwhelming as it was unforeseen. The Pharisees had expected that He would say, 

"Yes, you are blind, despite your authoritative position as religious guides" (cf. Mt. 23:23). But instead of that, He said, 

"No, you are not wholly blind; that is the worst feature of your case."

εἰ τυφλός ἦτε, οὐκ ἂν ἔχετε ἀμαρτίαν· νῦν οὐ λέγετε ὅτι

Bλέπητε· ἢ ἀμαρτία ἵνα μένῃ.

X. 19. σύνεσις πάλιν εὑρίσκω ἐν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις διὰ τοῦ λόγου τοῦτου. 20. Εὐαγγ. δεὶ πολλοὶ εἰς αὐτῶν Δαμασκόν ἤγατο καὶ μαντεῖαν.

41. Some Pharisees who were near overheard what Jesus said, and interjected the scornful question, "Are we also blind?"

ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων ... ἃ μετ' αὐτοῦ ἔστη. The Sinai Syriac renders "who were near Him," μετά indicating proximity in place, but not necessarily any attachment of discipleship. See τοὺς πάντους, ὁ πάντως ἔστη μετὰ ἑαυτὸν (12); and cf. Mt. 9:13. The closing reply of Jesus (v. 41) to their question forbids the hypothesis that these Pharisees are to be reckoned among the half-believing Jews mentioned at 8:24. μὴ καὶ ἡμεῖς τυφλοὶ ἔσμεν; "Are we also spiritually blind," we who are the recognised religious teachers of the nation? The form of the question, μή καὶ ἡμεῖς ... , suggests that a negative answer is believed by the questioners to be the obviously true answer. See on 6:17.

X. 19. The sequence of ideas brings vv. 19-29 into direct connexion with c. 9 rather than with 10:1-28, and they are printed accordingly at this point. See Introd., p. xxiv, for some considerations which favour the order 9:1 10:18-28 10:12-18 11:30-32.

Diversity of opinion about Jesus (vv. 19-22)

σύνεσις. A division of opinion had appeared before among the crowd (9:5), but this was among the Jewish critics of Jesus, the Pharisees, who were not all of one mind about Him. The whole refers back to the σύνεσις of 9:24, which had originated in the cure of the blind man, and which is still apparent.

90. συνεστίον. This was an easy way of accounting for the strangeness of the teaching of Jesus, and we have had it before 7:52; cf. Wisd. 5:1, and see Introd., p. clxxvii.
The Feast of the Dedication: Jesus admits that He is Messiah, of which His words should have been sufficient proof (vv. 22-23).

22. Ἐγένετο τότε τὰ ἑκάστα ἐν τοῖς Ἱεροσόλυμαίς. τότε is read by BLW, but it has been replaced by δι' in NADΘ and the rec. text. τότε is not common in Jn., and indicates here that some time had elapsed since the last date mentioned, viz. the Feast of Tabernacles (727). Chapters 8 and 9 describe a period of continual controversy with the Pharisees, which was brought to a head by the healing of the blind man and the claims subsequently made by Jesus. The Feast of Tabernacles was celebrated about the month of October, and it was now December. Jn. is forward to give dates when he can (see Intro., p. cii).

The Feast of the Dedication (τεταρτημων, “Renewal”) was instituted by Judas Maccabaeus to commemorate the purification of the Temple from the pollutions of Antiochus Epiphanes by the dedication of a new altar (1 Macc. 4:46, 2 Macc. 10:9), and was kept at the winter solstice (Chisholm, 25); and during the following week Josephus notes that it was customary to light the lamps on the “candlestick” as a mark of rejoicing, and that the Feast was sometimes called τά φόρα (Antt. xii. vii. 6). The ceremonial was similar to that of Tabernacles (2 Macc. 10), the idea of light being conspicuous in both festivals. Hence the words “I am the Light of the World” (8:12, 19) would have been equally illustrated by the ritual of Tabernacles or of Dedication.

23. καὶ περετέκτον ἦ τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἐν τῇ στοι τοῦ Ἱεροσόλυμας. It was not a matter of obligation to attend at Jerusalem for the Feast of τὰ ἑκάστα, which might be observed elsewhere; and Jesus is not represented by Jn. as “going up” to Jerusalem for it. It happened that the season of the Dedication came on while He was there, and, as Jn. notes, it was winter.

τεταρτημων. ABLWΘ prefix τοῦ, which NIFΔ omit. Jn. usually omits the article before τεταρτημων (see on 21); and cf. 116.

κεριοῦ. The rec. prefixes κατ', but om. NBDLWΘ.

28. “It was winter, and Jesus was walking in the Temple, in Solomon’s porch.” That is, He was giving His teaching under shelter, because of the severity of the season, in the eastern cloister of the Temple precincts (for τέ ἱερόν, the Temple enclosure, see on 21). This vivid touch suggests that the writer is thoroughly familiar with the place and the conditions under which instruction was given there. At the time when the Fourth Gospel was written, the Temple had been for some years in ruins; but the note of time and circumstance is easily explicable, if we have here the reminiscence of an eye-witness of the scene.

ὁ ἐντὸς τοῦ Ἱεροσόλυμα is mentioned again, Acts 21:21.

24. εἰς τὸ ἱερόν ἔγενε ὁ Ἰουδαίος. “The Jews (see on 12) surrounded Him,” τ. that they might settle the question as to His claims.

τίνες τοῖς ἑκάστα ἔμελον ἢτιήσαν; “How long dost thou hold us in suspense?” This rendering of the R.V. is probably accurate, although no exact parallel for ἡμελον ἔμελον in this sense has been produced. We have the phrase at Ps. 55:8, meaning “lift up my soul,” and so Josephus uses it (Antt. iii. ii. 3). Here it is, “How long do you excite our spirits,” i.e. arouse our expectations?—in other words, keep us in suspense. The expression is idiomatic Greek, and has survived in modern Greek: ἢτιήσαν αὐτοί μοι ἐμελείς τινί διαί. “How long will you plague us?”

ἐνεπερρέψαν. Cf. Mt. 201, Lk. 236; and for ἐπερρέψαν, see on 7.

25. “Art thou the Christ?” is one of those questions which cannot be answered by a direct “Yes or No,” if misunderstanding is to be avoided. If He had said “Yes,”

1 See A. Palli, Notes on St. Mark and St. Matthew (1902), p. v.
they would have assumed that He claimed to be the Messiah of Jewish patriotic expectation; and this He was not. But He could not say "No" without disavowing His mission. So He answers by saying (1) that He had told them already; and (2) that His works sufficiently exhibit Him as the Anointed of God.

ἀγαθὸς δὲ ἦν ὁ Ἰησοῦς Ελλην ὁ Ἰωάννης, καὶ αὐτὸς πρεσβύτερος· τὰ ἔργα δὲ εἶχεν πολὺ ἐν τῷ ἱερατείῳ τοῦ Πατρὸς μου, τούτῳ μαρτύρων περὶ ἐμοῦ·

and of His followers as His sheep. The image is introduced without any explanation, but it is apparent from the Synoptic Gospels that it was one which Jesus often used, and which must have been familiar to His disciples. He called them His "little flock" (Lk. 12:32); and He declared His mission to be primarily addressed to "the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Mt. 10:5-6). One of the most touching of His parables is that in which He compared Himself with a shepherd seeking a lost and strayed sheep, while the rest of His flock are left temporarily by themselves (Mt. 18:11, Lk. 15:5). The wandering crowds move His pity, because they are as "sheep without a shepherd" (Mt. 9:36, Mt. 10:5). He told His disciples, in words from Zechariah, that when their Shepherd was smitten, they would be like sheep scattered abroad (Mt. 26:31, Mt. 26:31).

This was one of the illustrations by which Jesus was accustomed to describe His own ministry; and the apostolic writers speak of Him in the next generation as the "Shepherd of souls" (1 Pet. 2:25), "the great Shepherd of the sheep" (Heb. 13:20), without adding any comment or explanation.

This imagery, natural to a pastoral people, was already familiar to the Jews. In the Psalms, Yahweh is the Shepherd of His people (Ps. 23:1-4; 74:7-15; 80:7-15; 100:3-4; cf. Ezek. 34:26-29). And it is particularly to be observed that Messiah is spoken of in the O.T. as a Shepherd. Micah (5:5) and Isaiah (40:11) both speak of the future Deliverer as one who will feed His flock; and in the Psalms of Solomon (xvii. 47) the same picture is found of the Messianic king tending the flock of Yahweh. Cf. 2 Esd. 2:4. This idea of the Messiah as Shepherd is developed in the verses which follow here.

The sequence of thought in vv. 26-29, 1-18 must now be set out. In v. 24, the Jews ask Jesus for a plain answer to the question, "Art thou the Messiah?" In the note on v. 25 it has been pointed out that an answer "Yes" or "No" might have been misleading. Jesus first replies that He has, in effect, told them already, and then that His "works should be a sufficient witness. He now goes on to give a fuller answer. The reason why the Jews did not realise at once that He was the Messiah was that they were not His true "sheep." Were they His sheep, they would recognise His voice as that of their Shepherd, and would follow Him unhesitatingly (v. 27). He is indeed who gives His sheep eternal safety, and no one can snatch them out of His hand, or out of the hand of God who gave them to Him (v. 28). They are "the sheep of His hand," as the Psalmist has it (Ps. 80:3). It ought to be possible always to recognise a true shepherd. He comes into the fold through the door, and does not climb

X. 88 ff.

SHEPHERD AND SHEEP

The Jews do not believe in Jesus, because they are not of His flock. He is their true Shepherd, would they but recognise it; other shepherds are false guides (vv. 26-29, 1-6)
26. Ἄλλα ὑπείκε στοιχεῖον, ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι ἐκ τῶν προβάτων τῶν

over the wall, as a thief would do (v. 1). The porter opens
the door to him, and the sheep recognise his voice: he calls
them by name, and leads them forth (v. 3). He leads and they
follow, recognising his voice (v. 4), while they would run from
that of a stranger (v. 5). But the Jews did not understand
what bearing this allegory had on the question they had asked,
s. “Art thou the Messiah?” In particular, they cannot
perceive what or where is the door into the fold by which the
true shepherd enters. So Jesus explains this.

“I am the Door,” He says (v. 7). Accordingly all claiming
to be your Messianic shepherds who did not pass through this
Door are thieves and robbers (v. 8), as is further established
by the fact that the sheep of Israel did not attend to them (v. 8).

“I am the Door,” and not only for the shepherds, but for the
sheep. I am the Door for the shepherds because I am the
Door for the sheep. It is only through me that you can enter
the fold of safety, and be led out into good pastures (v. 9). The
thieves and robbers come only to destroy and kill. I am come
to give life abundantly (v. 10).

And then the main theme is resumed, the metaphor of
the Door having been explained. I am the Good Shepherd,
who gives His life for the sheep, unlike the hireling who runs
away when there is danger (vv. 11-13). I know my sheep, and
they know me just as the Father knows me and I know Him,
vv. 14, 15. I have other sheep besides those of the Flock
of Israel: them also I must lead, and they too shall hear my
voice. So shall there be One Flock and One Shepherd (v. 16).

The Father loves me, because I am thus laying down my
life, to take it up again (v. 17). My death is voluntary. But
the Father knows and approves. Indeed this is His command-
ment (v. 18). The fact is, that I and my Father are One
(v. 30).

28. ἓκαστος ἑαυτὸς ὁμοίως ὑποκείμενος εἰς τὸν σταυρόν του. So κΕΔΛΘΩς,
but the rec. has οὐ γὰρ ὑπὸ. The thought is the same as that
at 6:19, where see the note. Those who are not of the flock of
Christ have no faith. This is natural, for faith, in the Fourth
Gospel, is born of a certain spiritual affinity.

The rec. adds at the end of the verse καθὼς ἔστω ὑποκέιμενος, with
AD; but these words are not found in κΕΔΛΘΩς, and cannot
be regarded as part of the true text. If genuine, they must
refer to something that has preceded, and cannot be associated
with what follows (Tatian links them with v. 27). It is not
easy to find any previous saying of Jesus in Jn, to which
καθὼς ἔστω ὑποκέιμενος could be referred at this point, if the words

κΕΔΛΘΩς. 27. τὸ πρόβατα τὰ ἴματα τῆς φωνῆς μου ἀκούσαν, καὶ ἀκολουθοῦσί μοι, 28. καὶ ὁ πέως παῦντος ἔστω ὑποκέιμενος. καὶ ὁμοίως ἔστω ὑποκέιμενος εἰς τὸν σταυρόν τοῦτον. 29. ἦσαν δὲ τὰ πάντα μου ἐκδικητικὰ ματία ἀλήθειαν ἔστων ἡμῶν. 30. ὁ περὶ τὰς πάντας μου πάσσων μετέφερε καθὼς ἕτερον. The textual variants are puzzling. For δὲ (ἈΒΓΔΘ ΣΤΥΡ), κΕΔΛΘΩ latt. have δὲ; and for μετέφερε (κΕΔΛΘΩ ΣΤΥΡ), ΑΒ latt. have μετέφερε.

Thus the weight of MS. authority favours the reading δὲ ... μετέφερε. The Vulgate, following the O.L., clearly
supports this: “pater meus, quod dedist mihi multa omnibus est.” But the meaning then must be: “As for my Father, that
which He has given me (i.e. my flock of sheep) is greater than
all.” This is quite unsuited to the context, as not only here,
but in vv. 1-16, the main thought is of the weakness of the
sheep and their dependence on the Shepherd’s strength. To introduce at this point the idea of the Church as a mighty organization would be wholly irrelevant, and the reading δ...μετέχειν is to be rejected.

δωρεέω μου must be the subject of ἔχειν, and δὲ must be preferred to δ. The neuter singular is used several times in Jn. to denote the sum-total of those who have been given by the Father to the Son; and probably through reminiscence of such phrases as τὰ υἱῶν δὲ διδάσκων μου (καὶ, and sec note on δω.), and πᾶς δὲ δόθηκαν αὐτῷ (ἐνδ.), δὲ has got into the text at this point. μετέχειν has then been changed to μετέχον, so as to agree with δὲ.

Burney found in the aberrant δ...μετέχον an illustration of his theory that in the Fourth Gospel we have to do with a translation from an Aramaic source, καὶ...ὅτι being rendered δ...μετέχειν, instead of δ...μετέχον. This ingenious argument is, however, not necessary, as the variants can be explained otherwise.

The rendering, then, of the text which we adopt is simple: “My Father, who gave (them) to me, is greater than all things,” i.e. is all-powerful. For the “giving” by the Father to the Son, see on ἐκδότης, and cf. 177.

cαὶ αὐτοῖς βοήθαις ἀναβαίνειν ἐκ τῆς χειρὸς τοῦ πατρὸς. Jesus has already given the assurance that “no one can snatch His sheep away from Him.” They are the shepherds which His all-powerful Father has given to Him, and He adds (as self-evident) that “no one can snatch them away from the Father.” See Deut. 32:38 on ἔχειν δὲ κυρίαται ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν μου; and cf. Isa. 49:5, 51:4. This is at the heart of the comfortable saying of Wisd. 3:28 διακαθαρίζει τὴν χειρὶ θεοῦ.

The allegory of the Sheep and the Shepherd follows at this point. No one can snatch the sheep of Jesus from His safe-keeping, and He proceeds to explain with emphasis that it is only with Him that safety is assured (see Introduct., p. xxiv).

X. 1. ἅμα ἁμεῖν ἀμὴν ἡμῖν. For this solemn prelude to sayings or discourses of special significance, see on ἀμὴν 34. It is never used abruptly to introduce a fresh topic, out of connexion with what has gone before, nor does it begin a new discourse. It always has reference to something that has been said already, which is expanded or set in a new light (cf. ἀμὴν 33). Thus it introduces here the allegory of the sheep in the fold who recognize their shepherd, which arises out of the pronouncements... 3 Aramaic Origin, etc., p. 103. Torrey agrees with this (Harvard Theol. Rev., Oct. 1923, p. 325).
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tὸν ἄγνωκα τῶν προβάτων ἄλλα ἄνωθεν ἀναβαίνει, οὐκ εἰσιν ἐνδ. ἐπιτῆς ἔστιν καὶ λεγόμενοι· 2. ὁ δὲ εἰς ἐξιδρυμένος διὰ τῆς θύρας πουμένων ἐστὶν τῶν προβατότων. 3. τούτω δὲ θυρωπῶς ἀναγίγνεται, καὶ τὰ πρόβατα τῆς φωνῆς ἀστού ἀκοίμενοι, καὶ τὰ ἐκεῖ προβάτα φαίηναν καὶ ἀνοίγει καὶ in vv. 26-29. To begin this allegory by “Verily, verily,” is exactly in the Johannean manner.

Verses 1-5 are a parable of general application, of which Jesus explains the reference to Himself and His flock in vv. 7-16.

The αὐτοῖς τῶν προβατῶν is the open courtyard in front of the house, where the sheep were folded for the night. The word is used thus in Homer, where the Trojans are compared to δεῖς πολυμύρων ἀνθρώπων ἐν αὐτῇ Παλαιστίας. So Josephus represents Abraham as sitting ἐπὶ τῆς θύρας τῆς αὐτοῦ ἀλλήλος, where the LXX has σαφήνης (Gen. 18:1; cf. Ant. i. xi. 2). A shepherd, who had access to the courtyard, would naturally come in and go out by the θύρα. See on v. 16; and cf. 19th. 10 for these terms.

ἄλλα ἄνωθεν ἀναμένει, “but one climbing up another way,” is a man who gets over the wall into the courtyard. ἀλλήλος (LXX 3) is a legitimate form for ἀλλήλος, and is found in the papyri (see Moule-Milligan, s.v.). It does not occur elsewhere in the N.T.

καὶ οὐκ εὑρίσκομεν ἐν αὐτῷ, inserted for explicitness, as Jn. so frequently uses it (see on 34).}

κλέπτης ἐστιν καὶ λεγόμενος, “is a thief and a robber”; he has, presumably, come to steal the sheep and to carry them off with violence. See further on v. 8. κλέπτης is used again of Judas (32) and λεγόμενος of Barabbas (18). Cf. Obad. 2 for κλέπτων and λέγομαι coming by night.

2. ὁ δὲ εἰς ἐξιδρυμένος κτλ. On the other hand, a man coming into the court or fold by the door presumably is entitled to do so. He is a shepherd, whose business it is to look after the sheep. He is πουμένων προβατῶν (Gen. 49). The application of this to Jesus comes later. So far the picture is true of all sheepfolds and shepherds.

3. τούτω δὲ θυρωπῶς ἀναγίγνεται. “to him the doorkeeper opens,” the door when he comes. This, again, is part of the general picture. It does not appear that in the allegory the θυρωπῶς is significant. In every parable there are details in which a spiritual meaning is not necessarily to be sought.

καὶ τά πρόβατα τῆς φωνῆς ἀστού ἀκοίμενοι κτλ. The sheep hear his voice with obedient attention (see v. 27 and the note on ἀκοίμενοι with the gen. at 3). That is, they recognize his voice as that of a shepherd.
X. 6-7.]

Jesus is the Door

paroimia παροιμία is a word which in the LXX is often translated by ἐρωτεύοντος. 5. ἐρωτεύοντος is used when we speak of a question put to an expert or a learned man. In this case, it implies that the question was put to Jesus, not as a simple statement, but as a question or inquiry. In the next verse, it is used in a similar context, but with a different emphasis. In this case, it implies that Jesus was asked a question, not as a simple statement, but as a question or inquiry.

5. Τίνες δὲ τὰ τὸν παντότε ἔχωλα, ἐπιθυμοῦντες αὐτῶν πορευέται, καὶ τὰ προβάτα αὐτῶν ἀδικοῦσα, ὅτι οίδαν τὴν ψωμίν αὐτῶν 5. ἀλλὰ τοῦτο ἐστὶν μὴ ἅμα τούτου ἀλλὰ φεύγεται ἀπ' αὐτῶν, ὅτι οὐκ ἀδικοῦν τὸν ἀλλότριον τὴν ψωμίν. 6. Τάσην τὴν ἡμᾶς πράξεως ως καὶ ὅμοια. Several flocks under different shepherds might be brought into the same fold for a night.

All the sheep might discern the note of authority in the voice of any lawful shepherd. But it is only the shepherd of his own flock that a shepherd will call by name. This he does, as he leads them out to pasture; and it is only “his own sheep” that follow.

So καὶ ΔΩΛΩ, as against the rec. καὶ (ΤΔΘ). Jn. prefers καὶ παλαιών to καλῶν; but cf. Isa. 40:8 43:4 45:3 for the use of καὶ παλαιών. See on 1:6.

It is still common for Eastern shepherds to give particular names to their sheep, “descriptive of some trait or characteristic of the animal, as Long-ears, White-nose, etc.” 1

4. ὅτι τὰ τὴν πάντα ἔχωλα. So καὶ ΔΒΔΘ, but ΑΓΔ read ἐκ βιβλίων. The rec. has καὶ (with ΑΓΔΘ), but ΒΔΘ. It is better to follow the preceding verse. When he has put out of the fold all his own 5; he is careful to forget none, as he leads his flock to pasture. ἔχωλαν suggests a certain measure of constraint, the shepherd thrusting out a sheep that delays unduly in coming forth at his call.

The shepherd, having collected his own flock from the fold, goes before them (ἐπιθυμοῦντες αὐτῶν). At 3:8 ἐπιθυμοῦντες is used of priority in time; here it refers to space, as at 12:27. His own sheep follow him (cf. v. 27), because they know his voice (cf. v. 26). 5. They will not follow an ἀλλότριον, that is, any one who is not their own shepherd, whether he be the legitimate shepherd of another flock, or an impostor and a thief (v. 1) Rather will they run away from him, for they do not know or recognise his voice. This, as we shall see (v. 8), is a specially significant feature of the allegory. Cf. v. 26 above and v. 5 below.

ἀδικοῦσαν. So καὶ ΔΘ, but ΒΛΘ have ἄδικος. The τὰ προβάτα ἐπιθυμεῖναι. The τὰ προβάτα ἐπιθυμεῖναι occurs again in N.T. only in Jn. 16:23 (as well as also in 2 Pet. 2:12, where it introduces a quotation from Prov. 26:14). On the other hand, ἀδικοῦσα does not occur outside the Synoptics, except at Heb. 9:11. In the LXX both words are used to translate

1 C. T. Wilson, Peasant Life in the Holy Land, p. 165. The author’s observations illustrative of the relation of the shepherd to his sheep are very suggestive in connexion with c. 10.
FALSE MESSIAHS ARE THIEVES

(cf., e.g., Neh. 59). But even if the words be omitted, ἄνδρος involves a “coming” in the past; and we must translate “all that came before me are thieves and robbers.”

The reference is, undoubtedly, to v. 1. He who enters the fold by any other way than the “door” is “a thief and a robber.” Now Jesus claims to be the Door of the Fold of the Flock of Israel, and hence it follows that all who sought a way of access to the sheep before He was manifested as the “Door” may be described as “thieves and robbers.” This, nakedly stated, is a harsh saying. But, if the sequence of the argument be followed from v. 23 onward (see on v. 26), it is not so intolerant as it sounds (see also on 149). The distinction that is being drawn out is not that between the ministrations of older prophets and teachers, and the perfect ministration of Jesus, but rather (as Chrysostom points out) between those who falsely claimed to be heaven-sent deliverers and the true Messiah Himself.

The methods, e.g., of Judas of Galilee, who instigated the people to revolt against Roman taxation about the year A.D. 6, were violent, and led to murder and robbery (so Josephus, Ant. xviii. 156; cf. B. J. ii. viii. 1 and Acts 59). According to Acts 59, Thaddeus was an earlier impostor of the same type, although Josephus (Ant. xx. 1. 1) seems to put him later, if indeed he is describing the same person. And, apart from Judas and Thaddeus, we have the testimony of Josephus (Ant. xvii. x. 4, 18) that at the beginning of the first century Judea was the scene of innumerable risings and disorders, which were caused, in part at any rate, by current misinterpretations of the Messianic idea, associated by the Zealots with militant activities. It is true that we have no knowledge of any Jewish before Barocchba (A.D. 135) who claimed explicitly to be the Messiah. But there were the true pretenders to the office of leadership of the nation, and to such words of Jesus, “thieves and robbers,” were aptly applied. And the present tense εἰσίν confirms the view that this allusion was to leaders of revolt who belonged to the first century, some of whom were probably living at this time.

The convincing proof that none of these was the divinely appointed Shepherd of Israel was: ὁς ἦν ἐν τῷ πάντοτε τῷ πρόβατος, ἢ the sheep,” 6. the true sheep of Israel, who are always in view throughout this chapter, “did not listen to them” (cf. vv. 4, 5, where it was pointed out that sheep recognized their true shepherd’s voice, while they will not listen to one who is only an impostor). It was just because the Jews who were arguing were not the true sheep of Israel that they did not accept Jesus as their Shepherd (v. 26).
9. ἐγὼ εἶμι ἡ θύρα. Τοῦτο οὖν ἐὰν τις εἴναι οὕτως, σωθεῖται, καὶ

8. ἐγὼ εἶμι ἡ θύρα. This is repeated from v. 7, a repetition in the Johannine manner (see on 3:16), a slight change being made in the form of the saying. In v. 7 the stress is laid on Jesus being the Door through which a lawful shepherd would enter. But here the thought is simpler. He is the Door through which the sheep must enter the fold, a saying which is not relevant to the allegory of this chapter, but is consonant with the teaching of Jesus as presented by Jn. elsewhere. He is the Door into the spiritual fold, as He is the Way (and the only Way) of access to the Father (14:6; cf. Eph. 2:18, Heb. 10:20). The αὐτῷ (see v. 1) to which He is the Door is the fold of the house of Israel, the Jewish fold; nor has anything been said up to this point which suggests any wider fold (cf. v. 16, where the Gentile fold is indicated for the first time). But the saying I am the Door has always been quoted, from the first century onward, as having as wide an application as the parallel saying I am the Way.

Clement of Rome, commenting on Ps. 118:28, speaks of "that gate (πύλη) which is in righteousness, even in Christ" (8:28). Ignatius (Philad. 9) speaks of Christ as being θύρα τοῦ πατρός, "through whom Abraham and Isaac and Jacob enter in, and the prophets and the apostles, and the Church." Both these passages seem to carry an allusion to ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ θύρα. So also Hermas (Serm. ix. 12) has: ἡ πύλη ἄνθρωπος καὶ ἡ πύλη ὁ κύριος τοῦ θεοῦ, the explanation being added that the Rock is ancient, but the Gate recent (καινόν), because "He was made manifest in the last days of the consummation," ἵνα αἱ μελλόντες σωθῆναι ἴδων αὐτόν, εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν εἰσέλθωσιν τοῦ θεοῦ, words which recall the teaching of v. 9. According to Hegesippus (Euseb. H.E. i. xxiii. 8), James, the Lord's brother, was asked by inquirers τι ἐν θύρᾳ τῷ Χριστῷ; which carries an allusion either to this passage or to a Synoptic precept such as Lk. 13:34 ἐξαίρεσθαι ἐστίν ἡ αὐτή τῆς στίχου θύρα (Mt. 25:23 has πύλης).

The reminiscences of the Johannine "I am the Door" may be quoted from Gnostic sources. In the hymn in the second-century Acts of John (§ 96), we find the phrases θύρα εἰμί σου [τῷ] προσωπείῳ μου, ὡς εἰμι σου παράδοτος. The image of one knocking at a door is not identical with that of one entering by it; but it probably goes back to Jn. 10. Again, Hippolytus cites Jn. 10 from a Naassene writer in the form ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ πύλη ἡ ἀληθής, and he represents the Naassene as adding ὅτι εἶσαι σωθῆσαι τὰς ἀποκαλύφθαις εἰς τὰς τελείας ἀδιάφορος, ἓν μὲν ἀνεγερθηκεὶ ἐπὶ τὰς τελείας ἐξελθοῦσαι καὶ ἐξελθοῦσαι καὶ πολὺν εὑρήσεις. 10. ὁ λόγος οὗ ἐξαίρεται εἰ μὴ ἐκλάψῃς ἡ πύλη καὶ ἔσωσται ὁ λόγος ἐκλάψῃς εἰς τὴν ἐξομολογήσεις και περισσότερον ἔχων.

πάντα (Rev. v. viii. 21), a passage which recalls Jn. 5 as well as 10.1

Probably the proclamation "I am the Door" should be taken in connexion with the Synoptic saying about the Narrow Door (Mt. 7:23, Lk. 13:24). Jn., however, is careful not to suggest that the Door is narrow, while he implies that there is only one Door. The comparison with the Synoptists suggests that the αὐτῷ or fold of the spiritual Israel represents the kingdom of God.

ὁ δὲ τὸν τοῦτον σωθήσεται καὶ ἐκθέτεται. 10. ὁ λόγος οὗ ἐξαίρεται εἰ μὴ ἐκλάψῃς ἡ πύλη καὶ ἔσωσται ὁ λόγος ἐκλάψῃς εἰς τὴν ἐξομολογήσεις και περισσότερον ἔχων.

πάντα (Rev. v. viii. 21), a passage which recalls Jn. 5 as well as 10.1

Probably the proclamation "I am the Door" should be taken in connexion with the Synoptic saying about the Narrow Door (Mt. 7:23, Lk. 13:24). Jn., however, is careful not to suggest that the Door is narrow, while he implies that there is only one Door. The comparison with the Synoptists suggests that the αὐτῷ or fold of the spiritual Israel represents the kingdom of God.

ὁ δὲ τὸν τοῦτον σωθήσεται καὶ ἐκθέτεται. 10. ὁ λόγος οὗ ἐξαίρεται εἰ μὴ ἐκλάψῃς ἡ πύλη καὶ ἔσωσται ὁ λόγος ἐκλάψῃς εἰς τὴν ἐξομολογήσεις και περισσότερον ἔχων.

πάντα (Rev. v. viii. 21), a passage which recalls Jn. 5 as well as 10.1

Probably the proclamation "I am the Door" should be taken in connexion with the Synoptic saying about the Narrow Door (Mt. 7:23, Lk. 13:24). Jn., however, is careful not to suggest that the Door is narrow, while he implies that there is only one Door. The comparison with the Synoptists suggests that the αὐτῷ or fold of the spiritual Israel represents the kingdom of God.

οἱ δὲ τοῖς τοῦτον σωθήσεται καὶ ἐκθέτεται. 10. ὁ λόγος οὗ ἐξαίρεται εἰ μὴ ἐκλάψῃς ἡ πύλη καὶ ἔσωσται ὁ λόγος ἐκλάψῃς εἰς τὴν ἐξομολογήσεις και περισσότερον ἔχων.

οἱ δὲ τοῖς τοῦτον σωθήσεται καὶ ἐκθέτεται. 10. ὁ λόγος οὗ ἐξαίρεται εἰ μὴ ἐκλάψῃς ἡ πύλη καὶ ἔσωσται ὁ λόγος ἐκλάψῃς εἰς τὴν ἐξομολογήσεις και περισσότερον ἔχων.

πάντα (Rev. v. viii. 21), a passage which recalls Jn. 5 as well as 10.1

Probably the proclamation "I am the Door" should be taken in connexion with the Synoptic saying about the Narrow Door (Mt. 7:23, Lk. 13:24). Jn., however, is careful not to suggest that the Door is narrow, while he implies that there is only one Door. The comparison with the Synoptists suggests that the αὐτῷ or fold of the spiritual Israel represents the kingdom of God.

οἱ δὲ τοῖς τοῦτον σωθήσεται καὶ ἐκθέτεται. 10. ὁ λόγος οὗ ἐξαίρεται εἰ μὴ ἐκλάψῃς ἡ πύλη καὶ ἔσωσται ὁ λόγος ἐκλάψῃς εἰς τὴν ἐξομολογήσεις και περισσότερον ἔχων.
11. *Εγώ είμαι δ' ο πουμήν καὶ καλός. δ' ο πουμήν καὶ καλός τὴν ψυχήν

Jesus the Good Shepherd (τυχ. 11-30)

11. We have had the allegory of the Shepherd and the Sheep (vv. 1-5); then the explanation of what is meant by the Door (vv. 7-10); now we come to the great proclamation of Jesus as the Good Shepherd, as contrasted with the hireling.

Philo (de Agric. §§ 6, 9, 10) draws out a similar contrast between the ἄγνωστος ποιμήν, who does not allow his sheep to scatter, and the mere herd (Ἀγρότης ὁ ποιμήν), who permits the flock to do as it likes. But the similarity does not go beyond what may naturally be observed between the words of two writers who are expounding the same image; there is no literary connexion to be traced between Jn. 10 and Philo.

On ἴδε αὐτός, and the special appropriateness of this phraseology in passages such as this, something has already been said in the Introduction (p. cviii). Dods quotes, however, a striking parallel from Xenophon (Mem. ii. vii. 14), where ἴδε αὐτός is used only to mark a contrast, the sheep-dog being represented as saying to the sheep, ἴδε γάρ εἰμι δ' ο ψυχή σου ἀσώματα ἵππος, διότι μήτε ἡσαν ἀδριακοὶ κλέπται, μήτε ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσι βρέθησαι. If this had been found in Philo, it would probably have been claimed by somebody as the source from which Jn. derived the language of these verses. But literary parallels do not always imply literary obligation.

 ámbωτος τὸ καλὸν, "the Good Shepherd," Pastor bonus.

We have already noticed that Philo calls his good shepherd ἄγνωστος; and it is not possible to draw any clear distinction in such passages as the present between the two adjectives. No doubt, goodness and beauty were closely associated in Greek minds; and, if we please, we can find the thought of the beauty of holiness suggested by the application of καλός to the Good Shepherd (cf. καλὰ ἕργα in v. 32). But δ' καλός ὁ δοξίος in 2:10 is simply good wine, the adjective carrying no allusion either to moral or aesthetic beauty. In Tob. 1:22 and 2 Mac. 12:18 an "honest and good man" is καλός καὶ διανοησίας, a frequent Greek combination. And when καλός is combined, as here, with the description of a man pursuing a particular business, it simply conveys the idea that he discharges his office or fulfills his calling well, just as we would speak of "a good doctor." Thus we have καλὸς ὁ νέων, "a good steward" (1 Pet. 4:7); δ' ου ῶς δοῦλος καὶ καλὸς ἐνταποδότης, "the good paymaster of the reward," i.e. he who will make no default (Barnabas, xix. 11); and "good priests," καλὸς καὶ οἱ λατρεῖς (Ignotius, Philad. 9),
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in comparison with the High Priest, who is κρείνων. Barnabas in another place (vii. 1) speaks of "the good Lord," ὁ καλὸς κυρίος. Here, then, ὁ πουμήν ὁ καλὸς is simply the Good Shepherd, One who tends His flock perfectly, without any failure of foresight or tenderness, of courage or unselfishness.¹

τὴν ψυχήν αὐτῶν τιθησαν κτλ. He lays down His life for the sheep. All good shepherds are ready to risk their lives in defence of their flock (e.g. Jn. 15:13); He who is uniquely the Good Shepherd lays down His life.

For τίθην, καὶ δ' substitute the more usual καθίζων, but τὴν ψυχήν αὐτῶν τιθησαν is a characteristic Johannine expression for the "laying down," of His life by Jesus, occurring again vv. 15, 17, 13:28, 1 Jn. 3:18, and (of a disciple acting as Jesus did) 15:18. It stands in contrast with the Synoptics ἔδωκα τὴν ψυχήν αὐτού (Mk. 10:45, Mt. 20:28).

The expression τὴν ψυχήν τιθησαν, "to lay down one's life," ἔδωκεν ἀναμίσθημεν, is not found in the Greek Bible outside Jn. (cf. 15:13, 1 Jn. 3:18). Nor is it a classical phrase, but from ἔδωκεν ἀναμίσθημεν, "he died," is quoted by Dods, following Kypke. We have, indeed, in Jn. 19:28 (cf. 1 Sam. 19:25), ἔδωκεν τὴν ψυχήν μου ἐν χείλι μοι, "I took my life in my hand," i.e. I risked my life; but in Jn. τὴν ψυχήν τιθησαν means rather "to divest oneself of life," as at 13:15 τίθησι τὸ ῥήμα ταύτα διαίρεσθαι "He divests Himself of His garments."

ὁτὲ τῶν προβοκτῶν, "on behalf of the sheep." The Synoptists in similar contexts have δρέτη (Mt. 20:28, Mk. 10:45), but διέκρισι occurs only once in Jn. (11:18), and there it does not mean "instead of." In this passage the Death of Jesus is said to be "on behalf of the sheep": it is not explicitly declared that it was an act of love for all men, "to take away the sin of the world," as at 18:1, 1 Jn. 2:2. But there is no inconsistency with the catholicity of these great pronouncements; and, lest the allegory might be too narrowly interpreted, mention is made in v. 16 of "other sheep" who must learn to follow the Shepherd.

18. μετανοήσει καὶ οἶκος δ' ομοῖος. The rec. with AP has ἥν ὁ Ναοί have it before, μετανοήσει: om. BLW. Syr. cur. has the hireling, the false one," but this explanatory gloss is not in Syr. sin.

Blass (Gram. 255) suggests that οἶκος is a Hebraism, "since in the case of a participle with the article, the LXX render ἁμαρτίας by ὁμοίος (cf. στήριγμα ὁμοίου τίτκωσιν, Isa. 53:4). But although in ¹ καλὸς "denotes that kind of goodness which is at once seen to be good" (Hort, on 2 Pet. 2:19).
The Good Shepherd

The phrase "the Good Shepherd" is a metaphor for Jesus, as used by John in his Gospel. The passage contrasts a hired shepherd (v. 12) with the true Good Shepherd (v. 13), emphasizing the care and protection that belong to the latter. The hired shepherd is analogous to someone who is not committed to the flock and will only look after it so long as it is profitable. In contrast, the Good Shepherd is one who is committed to the welfare of the flock, risking his own life to protect it. The metaphor is also a reflection on the relationship between God and his people, with Jesus as the one who leads and protects them. The passage concludes with a reassurance that Jesus knows his own and his own know him. This is a response to the Jewish leaders who were trying to find a way to eliminate Jesus. The inextricable bond between Jesus and his followers is a key theme throughout the Gospel of John.
67 that the constr. καθὼς ... καὶ γointments may be taken in two different ways. In the present passage we may either (1) place a full stop after ζα, and then write a new sentence, or (2) as the Father knew me, so I know the Father," the constr. being the same as that at 156 20 16; or (2) we may treat καθώς γνωσθήκας ... τὸν νασπαν ἀνατρίχα ἄρετον as explanatory of the preceding words, or. "I know mine, and mine know me, even as the Father knoweth me, and I know the Father," the constr. then being similar to that at 67 17 17. The A.V. follows (1), the R.V. adopts (2); and both are legitimate renderings of the Greek, and consistent with Johannine usage. The difficulty of (1) is that the words "As the Father knoweth me, so I know the Father," would seem to be irrelevant to the context, unless we are to connect them with what is said in v. 17, and understand by v. 15, "As the Father knoweth me, so I know the Father, and, because I know Him and His will, I lay down my life for the sheep," 1 but this is to interpolate a thought which is not expressly stated. On the other hand, it may be objected to the rendering (2), that it suggests that the knowledge of Christ by His true disciples is comparable in degree and in kind to the knowledge that He has of the Father. No other statement in the Fourth Gospel or elsewhere claims for His disciples so intimate a knowledge of Christ as this would seem to do (the promise of 14 10 is for the future, not the present). But we have seen (on 6 7) that καθώς ... καὶ does not, in fact, imply a perfect or complete parallelism with what has gone before. All that is said here, if rendering (2) be adopted, as we believe it must be, is that the mutual knowledge by Christ's sheep of their Good Shepherd, and His knowledge of them, may be compared with the mutual knowledge of the Son and the Father; it is not the perfection or intimacy of the knowledge that is in view, it is its reciprocal character. Cf. 1 Cor. 11 7; 17 13; and see further on 17 17.

Adopting rendering (2), the sequence of thought in v.v. 14, 15, is plain: "I am the Good Shepherd, as is shown first by my knowledge of my sheep and theirs of me, and secondly by my readiness to lay down my life on their behalf." These are the two principal marks of the Good Shepherd which have been noted in the preceding verses.

The mutual knowledge of the Father and the Son which is brought in here parenthetically is explicitly stated in the great declaration Mt. 11 27, Lk. 10 21, and is implied at 17 21 and at many other points in the Gospel. That Jesus knew God in a unique manner and in pre-eminent degree was His constant claim (see on 17 18; and cf. also 8 17 17).

Tyre and Sidon," He did not wish His presence to be known (Mk. 7:24); and when the Syrophoenician woman asked Him to cure her daughter He is reported to have said to her, "Let the children first be filled," adding that children's bread should not be given to "dogs." This may have been a proverbial saying (which would mitigate its seeming harshness); but at any rate Mk. gives no hint that Jesus regarded non-Jews as having any claim on His ministry. In Mt. (15:24) Jesus actually says to the woman, "I was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel;" as He had said to the apostles in an earlier passage (10:5-6). Go not into any way of the Gentiles, and enter not into any city of the Samaritans; but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel."

But these are only seemingly instances of Jewish particularism. They do not explicitly convey more than that Jesus regarded His mission as directed in the first instance to the Jews; and, in fact, there are many indications that both Mt. and Lk. believed the Gentiles to be included within the redeeming purpose of Christ. The prophecies about Messiah being a light to the Gentiles are quoted (Mt. 4:17; cf. Lk. 1:72). The Roman centurion was commended for his faith (Mt. 8:10); so was the Samaritan leper (Lk. 17:17); and the example of the Good Samaritan is held up for imitation (Lk. 10:33). The saying, "Many shall come from the east and the west, and shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob," is in Mt. (8:11), and, in a different context, also in Lk. (13:29). The command to preach to all nations is in the Marcan Appendix (Mk. 16:15) as well as in Mt. 28:19; and, even if it be supposed that we have not in the latter passage the ipsissima verba of Christ, there can be no doubt that it represents one aspect of His teaching (cf. Mt. 24:14, Lk. 24:7).

In Jn.'s narrative the Gentiles come without argument or apology within the scope of the Gospel. Jesus stays two days with the Samaritan villagers, to teach them (4:10); He does not admit that descent from Abraham is a sufficient ground for spiritual self-satisfaction (8:56); He is approached by a party of Greeks (12:20-22); He declares that He is the Light of the world (8:12), which implies that the Gentiles as well as the Jews are the objects of His enlightening grace. And in the present passage (10:16) Jesus, in like manner, declares that He has "other sheep" besides the Jews, while it is not to be overlooked that He puts them in the second place: "They also I must lead." They are not His first charge; that was to shepherd "the lost sheep of the house of Israel." He "came to His own" (11:14) in the first instance.

Jn., then, is in agreement with Mt. and Lk. in his repre-
again: “I will set up one shepherd over them, even my servant David: he shall feed them” (Ezek. 34:23; cf. 37:24). The phrase “one shepherd” is also found in Eccles. 12:1, where it refers to God as the one source of wisdom.

In the next chapter, expresses the thought that the Death of Jesus had for its purpose the gathering into one of the scattered children of God: ἵνα συνεργάζωσθεν ἐν συνωφροσύνῃ διὸ εἰς τὸν πατέρα μου, ἵνα πάλιν λάβῃ αὐτήν. In 1:14 Jesus is to “lead” (ἀνέβησον) the Gentile members of His flock: in 1:14 He is to bring them together (συνωφροσύνῃ).

17. διὰ τοῦτο... δι' οὗ. See on 5:16 for this favourite Johannine construction, διὰ τοῦτο referring to what follows. The meaning here is that God’s love for Jesus is drawn out by His voluntary sacrifice of His life in order that He may resume it after the Passion for the benefit of man. The same idea is found in Paul: “Wherefore God also highly exalted Him” (Phil. 2:9). See also Heb. 2:5; and cf. Isa. 53:11 μόνος ὁ πατήρ. So ἀνέβησον; the rec. has ἀνέβησθι μόνος.

δια τοῦτο ἐγὼ τῷ πατρὶ ἐξέστησον μισθὸν. Ἰησοῦς generally uses ἐξέστησον of the mutual love of the Father and the Son (see on 3:16), but at 5:20 we find ἄνεβησον υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ. See also on 3:21, as to the alleged distinction in usage between ἐξέστησον and υἱὸν, a distinction which is not observed in the Fourth Gospel.

But ἵνα πάλιν λάβῃ αὐτήν. Ina must be given its full telic force. It was in order that He might resume His Life, glorified through suffering, that Jesus submitted Himself to death. Death was the inevitable prelude to the power of His Resurrection Life. It was only after He had been “lifted up” on the cross that He could draw all men to Himself (12:48). The Spirit could not come until after the Passion (7:39, where see note). The purpose of the Passion was not only to exhibit His self-sacrificing love; it was in order that He might return His Life, now enriched with quickening power as never before.

18. oúdeis ἦν ἄνθρωπος. Ἰησοῦς read ἦνεπρ, while the easier reading of the rec. text (麑ADWnte latt.) is ἦνεπρ. If the aorist ἦνεπρ is adopted, “no one took it from me.” Jn. is representing Jesus as speaking sub specie aeternitatis. The issue is so certain that He speaks of His death, which is still in the future, as if it were already past. Whether ἦν or ἦνεπρ

be read, it is the voluntariness of the Death of Jesus which is emphasised; cf. 18:9, Mt. 26:42.

ἀλλ’ ἐγὼ τῷ πατρὶ ἐξέστησον τῷ ἐμαυτῷ. This clause is omitted by D, probably because of its apparent verbal inconsistency with 5:20 (cf. 5:20 7:39) ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἐξέστησεν τῷ θεῷ τὸ θεόν τοῦ πατρὸς μου. But there is no real inconsistency. ἐξέστησεν here does not mean without authority from the Father, for that authority is asserted in the next sentence. It only implies spontaneity, voluntariness, in the use of the authority which Jesus has received from the Father, and in the obeying of the Father’s commandment. See on 5:18.

ἐξέστησον ἦν ἄνθρωπος. For ἐξέστησον, “authority,” as distinct from “power,” in Jn., see on 18:9. The authority which Jesus claimed from the Father was, first, the authority to lay down His life spontaneously (which no one has unless he is assured that his death will directly serve the Divine purposes); and, secondly, the authority to resume it again. That He had been given this latter ἐξέστησον in accordance with the consistent teaching of the N.T. writers that it is God the Father who was the Agent of the Resurrection of Jesus. Jesus is not represented as raising Himself from the dead. See on 18:9.

to τῷ πάλιν τῷ ἐμαυτῷ κτλ. This was the Father’s commandment, viz., that He should die and rise again. See further on 18:20 for the Father’s ἐξέστησεν addressed to Christ. This Johannine expression is recalled in Hermas (Serm. v. vi. 3), διὰ τῆς ἐξέστησος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ἡμῖν τῇ παρθενίᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ.

He says “my Father,” here and vv. 35, 29, 37. His relationship to God was unique; see on 18:9.

30. ἔγω καὶ ὁ πατήρ ἐμαυτῶν. As has been shown (Intro., p. xxv), this great utterance seems to have been made in explanation of v. 18, upon which it immediately follows in our arrangement of the text. None the less, it would not be out of place if it followed on v. 29, in the traditional order.

It has been customary, following the habit of the patristic commentators, to interpret these significant words in the light of the controversies of the fourth century. Bengel, e.g. (following Augustine), says: “Per sumus refutatur Sabellius, per unum Arius”; the words thus being taken to prove identity of essence between the Father and the Son, while the difference of persons is indicated by the plural ἐμαυτῶν. But it is an anachronism to transfer the controversies of the fourth century to the theological statements of the first. We have a parallel
The Gospel According to St. John [X. 30-32.]

31. Ἐβάστασαν τόλμην λίθων οἱ Ιουδαῖοι ὑπὲρ λεγάνων αὐτῶν. 32. ἀνεκρίθη αὐτῶν δὲ Ἑρωδιῆς Πολλὰ ἔργα ἔκασε ὡς καλὰ ἐκ τοῦ Ἱσραὴλ ἡμών ἡ τοίχων ἡς ἔργων ἡς ἐρεῖ λεγάνεται; 33. ἀνεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ ἐν ἑνόμισιν ἐκ Κορ. 3:1, where Paul says ὁ φασινεῖς καὶ ὁ πουλεῖ ἐν οἴνῳ, meaning that both the "planter" and the "waterer" of the seed are in the same category, as compared with God who gives the increase. A unity of fellowship, of will, and of purpose between the Father and the Son is a frequent theme in the Fourth Gospel (cf. 5:18, 15:21, and 17:11, 23), and it is tersely and powerfully expressed here; but to press the words so as to make them indicate identity of οἴνῳ, is to introduce thoughts which were not present to the theologians of the first century.

Ignatius expresses the same thought as that conveyed in this verse, when he writes ὁ ἐφικτός ἐνενέκτεν τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῶν ἐπερίπτερον, ὑστορεῖ (Magn. 7). Cf. 8:8 above.

The Jews accuse Jesus of blasphemy: He defends His claim to be Son of God (XX. 31-39)

38. The Jewish opponents of Jesus, with a true instinct, perceived that He was claiming to be more than man.

39. Ὑπερτερεῖ ἁπάντας ὑπὲρ τῆς ζωῆς κην. For ἵπτεραι, see on 12:9 below. Here it means "to lift up and carry off," and expresses more than ἀπαίων in the similar context in 8:38. They fetched stones from a distance, that they might stone Him. The verb λειμάζω does not occur in the Synoptic, but cf. 11:8.

40. ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῶν ὑπὲρ τῆς. He did not withdraw Himself immediately, as at 8:28, but proceeded to answer the thoughts which urged them to kill Him. Cf. 5:17 and Mk. 11:14 for ἀπεκρίθησας used of an answer to acts, rather than to words.

41. πολλὰ ἔργα καλὰ, "many noble works," καλῶς expressing goodness as well as beauty (see on ἐν 11; and cf. 1 Tim. 6:16). His works of healing were not only good works (as we use the phrase), but were works significant of the beauty of holiness. See on 23:3 for "signs" which He showed at Jerusalem on an earlier visit. These ἔργα were ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς. This He had repeatedly urged (5:18, 19, 20).

42. The rec. has μου after πατρός, but om. η Θεοῦ. For ἡ Θεία, Θα ἢ ἀπέσταλε. Φαν. ποινῶν αὐτῶν ἔργων ἢλπι λειμάζετε; He knew, indeed, that it was not merely because He had cured the impotent and the blind that they sought to kill Him, but because of the claims which He consistently made as to the source of His power and
a genuine reminiscence of one who remembered how Jesus argued with the Rabbis on their own principles.

The natural retort (obvious to a modern mind) would be that the argument is insecure, because it seems to pass from "gods" in the lower sense to "God" in the highest sense of all. But (1) ad hominem the argument is complete. On Jewish principles of exegesis it was quite sound. Jesus never called Himself "son of YHWH," a phrase would be impossible to a Jew. But "sons of Elohim" occurs often in the O.T. (Gen. 6, Job 4, Ps. 20, 89, etc.). That Jesus should call Himself τοῦ θεοῦ could not be blasphemeos, having regard to O.T. precedents, however unwarranted His opponents might think the claim to be. And (2) there is a deeper sense in which the argument as presented in Jn. conveys truth. The strict Hebrew doctrine of God left no place for the Incarnation. God and man were set over against each other, as wholly separate and distinct. Even in the Jewish scriptures there are hints and foreshadowings of potential divinity in man (cf. Ps. 82, Zech. 12); and it is to this feature of Hebrew theology that attention is drawn in v. 34. The doctrine of the Incarnation has its roots, not in bare Deism, but in that view of God which regards Him as entering into human life and consecrating human activities to His own purposes.

36. εἰς εἰκόνα εἰκόνος, "if then the Law (i.e. the Scripture) called them gods," ἵππος ὑμῶν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐγένετο, "to whom the message of God came," εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τῶν αποστόλων. If Luke used of "breaking," a law, see v. 31. Here we should render "the Scripture cannot be set at naught." The opposite of setting the Scripture at naught or "destroying" it is the "fulfilling" of it. See Mt. 5:17. The meaning of this parenthesis is that the words of Ps. 82 are full of permanent significance and must not be ignored. See Intro., p. cii.

38. τὸ γράφει, as always in Jn., signifies the actual passage of the O.T. which is cited or indicated, and not the whole body of the Hebrew Scriptures. See on 28.

80. ὃς δὲ παντικήγαγων, ἀμαρτησία is a Biblical word, connoting primarily the idea of setting apart for a holy purpose. Thus it is used of Yahweh hallowing the Sabbath (Ex. 20:11), and of the consecration of an altar (Lev. 16:3). It is applied to men who are set apart for important work or high office, e.g., to Jeremiah as prophet (Jer. 1), to the priests (2 Chron. 26:19), to Moses (Exod. 4:1), to the fathers of Israel (2 Kings. 21). In the N.T. of ἁγιασμόν are the Christian believers (Acts 20:26, 1 Cor. 1, Heb. 2:10, 10:12, 1 Tim. 2:10), a form of expression which we have in Jn. 17:18, where Jesus prays that the apostles may be ἁγιασμένοι ἐν λαμπρία. In that passage (where see note) He declares ἐγὼ ἁγιασάμην ἦμασίν, but here the Agent of His consecration is the Father. In virtue of this hallowing, Jesus is οὁ ἁγιασμός τοῦ θεοῦ (5:6, where see note). That He was set apart for His mission by the Father, who sent Him into the world, is the constant doctrine of the Fourth Gospel.

82. καὶ ἀπέτυχεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον. Cf. 17:18; and see on 37. ἃς λέγεται ὅτι εἰρ. "Do you say . . .?" ἃς being emphatic.

36. εἰς εἰκόνα, εἰκόνα τοῦ θεοῦ εἰμί. This He had repeatedly said, by implication, if not explicitly (cf. especially v. 30; and see v. 19). It was involved in the claim that He made when He spoke of God as "my Father": see on 28.

37. εἰς τοὺς ἔρημος τοῦ πατρὸς μου, μὴ πιστεύετε μοι. He returns to the argument which He has put forward all through. They had seen His works of healing; He had declared consistently that they were really the ἔρας of God Himself, whose Ambassador He was (v. 25); if they did not recognise these as works of God and accept their witness, He did not expect them to believe His words (μὴ πιστεύετε μοι: for πιστεύετε followed by a dative, see on 28). Cf. 5:28. 28. εἰς τοὺς καθὰ. But, on the other hand, if they recognized the divine character of these ἔρας of Jesus, they should accept their witness as to His authority. This would not produce the highest kind of faith, but it would be a beginning. See 5:36. The witness of the works will convince them of His trustworthiness, and so they will come to believe what He says. This, in turn, will lead on to belief "in Him" (see on 12), to faith in the majesty of His Person.

36. εἰς εἰκόνα, "that you may perceive, and so reach the fixed conviction of knowledge," ἤτοι ἐν ἐμόι δὲ παντικήγαγων
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Πατρί, 39. Ἴδες εἶναι αὐτῶν πάλιν πιάναι; καὶ ἐξέβλεψαν ἐκ τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῶν.

40. Καὶ ἐπήλθεν πάλιν πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου εἰς τὸν τόπον ὅπου

καὶ Ἰωάννης ἦν πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ ἔλεγεν ὅτι Ἰωάννης μιᾶς σημείων ἐκοίμησεν οὐδὲν, πάντα τῇ δὲ ἠκούει Ἰωάννης περὶ τοῦτον ἀλήθει ἦν. 42. καὶ πάλιν ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτὸν ἑκείνη.

before (see on 40). The use of πάλιν does not suggest that the former visit was a recent one, as Lange and others have supposed. Jesus returned to Bethany (or Bethabara) beyond Jordan (see on 18 for different views as to the exact place), which was in the district called Perea; and it is probable that this visit is to be identified with that mentioned Mk. 10; Mt. 19.

For the constr. ἵνα Ἰωάννης, see on 18. Jn. is careful to note that he means the place where John was baptizing first, not "Ἐνον near Salim," where we find him exercising his ministry at 32.

For τὸ πρῶτον, καὶ ἔκακο τοῦ πρῶτον; but the constr. τὸ πρῶτον appears again 14; 198.

καὶ ἐκείνη ἑκείνη. Jesus seems to have remained in Perea, until He went to Bethany for the raising of Lazarus (11), i.e. perhaps about three months.

41. That the people flocked to hear His teaching in Perea is confirmed by the Marcan tradition (Mk. 10; Mt. 19). They remembered what John the Baptist had said about Him, and remembered too that his witness had been found trustworthy. This was the reason why they came now in such numbers to see and hear Jesus.

Of John the Baptist, too, they remembered that he did no "sign," such as might be expected of a prophet; but nevertheless, although it was not confirmed by signs (see on 21), his witness was true. For the witness of the Baptist, cf. 11, 29-34 37-38. It made a profound impression. [ND omit ἐκείνη after ἔκακο, apparently not realizing that ἐκείνη here is recitation. The words which follow are set down as the actual words which the people used.

42. πάλιν ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτὸν, a favourite phrase of Jn. See on 40.

For the constr. τὸ πρῶτον, see on 18.
The sickness of Lazarus, and the discussion of it by Jesus and His disciples (XI. 1-10).

XI. 1. Ἰησοῦς δὲ τοὺς ἀσθενεῖς, Ἀλήφως ἀπὸ Βηθανίας, ἐκ τῆς κόμης Μαρίας καὶ Μαρθᾶς τῆς Ἀδελφῆς αὐτῆς. 2. Ἰησοῦς δὲ Μαρία καὶ Μαρθᾶ συνήθως τὸν Κύριον μήκες καὶ δοξάζεις τοῦ πάπα τοῦ των θρησκίων αὐτῆς.

The sickness of Lazarus, and the discussion of it by Jesus and His disciples (XI. 1-10).

XI. 1. Ἰησοῦς δὲ τοὺς ἀσθενεῖς. For the constr. of Ἰησοῦς with a participle, cf. 332 1350, and see note on 1. The name Lazarus, Λάζαρος, is a shortened form of Eleazar, Ἐλέαζαρ, and is found again in the N.T. only in the parable of Lk. 16. Bethany, which is about 2 miles from Jerusalem, is now called El 'Azariyyah, from the tradition of the miracle narrated here.

Lazarus is described as ἐκ Βηθανίας, ἐκ τῆς κόμης Μαρίας (καὶ Ἰούδες τῆς Μαρίας) καὶ Μαρθᾶς. So Philip is described as ἐκ Βηθανίας, ἐκ τῆς κόμης Ἄνθρου καὶ Πετροῦ (146, where see note). It has been suggested that we ought to distinguish "Bethany" from "the village of Mary and Martha," and place the latter (see Lk. 1025) in Galilee. But Lk. does not always arrange the incidents he narrates in such strict order that we can be sure either of the locality or the time at which a given incident is to be placed. It can hardly be doubted (cf. 192) that Lazarus, Mary, and Martha lived at Bethany together. The attempt to distinguish between ἔκ and ἐκ, so as to regard ἐκ Βηθανίας as indicating domicile, while ἐκ τῆς κόμης καὶ Ἰούδες would indicate place of origin (see Abbott, Dict. 2286 f.), is not only without corroborative evidence as to such a use of the two prepositions, but would make the opening sentence of this chapter very clumsy. See on 1.4.

Mary is mentioned before Martha, while elsewhere (Jn. 1148, Lk. 1058) Martha, as the mistress of their house, is named before Mary. At the time the Fourth Gospel was written, Mary was the more prominent of the two in Christian tradition, as is recorded in Mk. (14): "Wheresoever the gospel shall be preached throughout the whole world, that also which this woman hath done shall be spoken of for a memorial of her."

2. This verse seems to be an explanatory gloss added by an editor. There are two non-Johannine touches of style. The phrase τοῦ κυρίου (see on 4) appears instead of Jn.'s usual τοῦ Ιησοῦ. And, secondly, the characteristically Johannine ἔτυμον (v. 1) is altered to the more classical ἀκούσας.

The story by which Mary is identified is that of her anointing Jesus, and wiping His feet with her hair, which Jn. tells in the next chapter. But this story is also told of the sinful woman of Lk. 7. Christian readers of the next generation would not be helped by an explanatory note which might equally be applied to two distinct women; and the conclusion is inevitable that Jn. (or his editor) regarded Mary of Bethany as the same person who is described by Lk. as ἀμαρτωλός. The easiest way to identify her for the reader is to recall the singular gesture by which she was best known, and which she had enacted not once only, but twice. She was the best-known member of her family, and the note recalls that it was her brother, Lazarus, who was sick.

It is worth observing, in view of the discrepancy between Mk. 14 and Jn. 12, as to whether it was the head or the feet of Jesus that Mary anointed, that this note evades the difficulty by saying simply "anointed the Lord." ἀλήφως, ἀλήφως, ἰδαμαντός, θαλάς, are words common to this passage with both Lk. 7 and Jn. 12; and the reference is probably to both incidents. ἰδαμαντός is only found again in N.T. at 15, and there, as in Lk. 7, Jn. 12, of wiping feet.

Μαρία, rather than Μαρία, seems to be the best-attested spelling of Mary's name throughout Jn., although here NADLW68 have Μαρία, B 33 alone supporting Μαρία. This provides another reason for suspecting v. 2 to be non-Johannine. Cf., however, v. 20, 123; and see 1426.

8. ἀνέπτευσαν τὴν ἀνίκητον αὐτῶν. "So the sisters sent to Him," i.e. to Jesus; ἀνέπτευσαν τὴν ἀνίκητον τὸν Ἰησοῦν, κύριον. It is thus that the sisters address Jesus throughout (vv. 21, 27, 32, 34, 39), although Martha speaks to Mary of Jesus as ἄνδρα ἀνέπτευσα (v. 28), and the disciples address Him as Rabbi (v. 8). See the note on 148; and cf. 41326.

3. A favourite word with Jn. (see on 1.4).

8. θαλάς. "He whom thou lovest is sick." They feel it unnecessary to send any explicit invitation to Jesus to come and heal their brother: "Sufficit ut nostris. Non enim amas et deseris." (Augustine).

6. So ν. 36 ἰδών τῶν ἀγαθῶν αὐτῶν (cf. 208). But at v. 5 we have ὑγία τὸν Ἰούδα . . . τὸν Ἀλήφων. There is no real distinction in meaning between the two verbs. Cf. 138 58, and note on 2117. See Introd., p. xxxvii n.

4. ἀνέπτευσαν τὴν ἀνίκητον αὐτῶν πρὸς ἄνοιγμα. This was the
comment of Jesus when the tidings of Lazarus' illness reached Him. It was not a direct reply to the sisters' message, and we do not know if it was reported to them (v. 40).

The constr. πρὸς θάνατον is unusual, occurring again in the N.T. only at Ἰν. 5:12 ἄμερα πρὸς θάνατον, and in the LXX at σουκ. 14:17, while εἰς θάνατον is common (cf. 2 Kings 20, where it is said of Hezekiah that he was sick εἰς θάνατον). If a distinction is to be drawn between the two constructions, perhaps “this sickness is not πρὸς θάνατον is more reassuring than “this sickness is not εἰς θάνατον.” The latter would mean that the sickness would not have death as its final issue; the former ought to mean that the sick person is not in danger at all, that his sickness is not “dangerous,” as we would put it. Consequently the meaning that the disciples inevitably took from the words of Jesus was that Lazarus was not dead at the time of speaking, and further that Jesus was convinced he would recover. No doubt, the evangelist means his readers to understand that this was not the real meaning of Jesus' words (see v. 11). But it is strange that he should translate them by using πρὸς instead of εἰς; for, in fact, Lazarus' sickness was πρὸς θάνατον, although it might plausibly be argued that it was not εἰς θάνατον, as death was not the final issue.

Jesus adds that this illness had come upon Lazarus ἐνώπιον τῆς δόξης τοῦ Θεοῦ, “on behalf of God's glory,” i.e. in order that the glory and power of God might be revealed. The attempt to give εἰς a semi-sacrificial sense here, as if the sickness were a voluntary offering by Lazarus, is fanciful. ἐνώπιον is used exactly as in 5:20, i.e. “on behalf of.” The issue of the sickness and death of Lazarus was the revelation of the glory of God, as exhibited in his miraculous resurrection. The miracle was more than a “wonder”; it was a “sign” of ἡ δόξα τοῦ Θεοῦ. And so Martha was reminded, when it was over, that she had been told that she would see this glory (v. 40).

The glory of God was exhibited through the person and works of Jesus; this sickness, with its issue, had for its purpose ἵνα δοξολογηθῇ ὁ ὄριος τοῦ Θεοῦ, that He might be honoured by this revelation of His Father (cf. 5:24 ἵνα ἀνανεωθήκατε ἐν υἱῷ θεοῦ). We have seen (on 7:29) that the supreme “glorification” of Jesus is identified by Ἰν. with the Passion and its sequel, and it has been thought by some that this too is the reference in the present passage. If, ἵνα δοξολογηθῇ ὁ ὄριος τοῦ Θεοῦ would mean here that the final cause of Lazarus' sickness was that it might lead up to the Passion by making public the power of Jesus and thereby bringing the hostility of his enemies to a crisis (Westcott). But this is over subtle. The true parallel to 12:8 is 5:24. This revelation of the glory of God was that the Son might be honoured or “glorified” by so signal a mark of His Father's favour as the power to raise a dead man would exhibit. As in the Q.T., “the glory of God” is the visible manifestation of His presence. See also on 9:20 14:12, and cf. 17:1.

For the title “the Son of God,” see on 12:1 and 5:20. Only here and at 5:28 is Jesus said to have used this title as descriptive of Himself.

6. Moffatt transposes this verse, placing it after the parenthesis v. 4; and this is the most natural position for it, as it then explains in proper sequence why it was that the sisters sent to Jesus the news that Lazarus was ill. Jesus was their friend, and they hoped that He would come and heal their sick brother. In the traditional position of v. 5, it seems to suggest as the reason why Jesus did not immediately leave Peres and start for the sick man's house, that because He loved the household at Bethany, He stayed for two days longer where He was. That is, no doubt, a possible explanation of His action or delay, as that because He loved them, He wished to exhibit in their case the greatness of His power and the reach of His compassion. But, if that were so, He was content to leave the sisters in the agony of grief for three or four days, in order that the “glory of God” might be more signally vindicated in the end.

There is no textual authority for Moffatt's transposition of the text, and I have left v. 5 in its traditional position. It is possible, however, that v. 5 is an explanatory gloss added by an editor which has got into the wrong place (see 4:24 for a like case of displacement). Two small points suggest that v. 5 is not from the pen of the author of vv. 1, 3. In v. 1 we have Mary and her sister Martha, while in v. 5 we have the more usual order, Martha and her sister, a sudden change (but cf. v. 19). Again, the verb twice used in this chapter for the affection which Jesus had for Lazarus is ψιλοκω, (v. 3, 56), while in v. 5 it is δυναταί. We must not, indeed, sharply distinguish these verbs (see 9:1); but we should expect the same verb to be used in v. 3 and v. 5. It is possible that v. 5 is a non-Johannine gloss, which ought to be placed where Moffatt places it, after v. 2.

1 This is the true reading, but Θεος, 13 give in v. 5 τὴν Μαρφήνα καὶ τὴν ἀδελφήν αὐτῆς Μαρθᾶν, being influenced by v. 1.
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6. ὥσ᾽ οὖν ἤρωσεν ὅτι ἀσθενεῖ, τότε μὴ ἤμεν ἐν ἥ τοῦτο ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν· 7. ἦταν μὲτα τοῦτο λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς Ἀμώνας εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν πάλιν. 8. λέγων αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταί Παῦλος ὁ ἴδρυμαν, κλῆτος διὰ τοῦτο Ἰουδαίων, καὶ πάλιν ἐπέδρα αὐτῷ. 9. ἀνεπάγετο Ἰησοῦς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ πάλιν.

8. ὥσ᾽ οὖν ἤρωσεν κτλ. ὅτι is resumptive, and looks back to v. 4. “And so, when He heard, etc.” It was because of His confidence that the sickness was not πάντως ἰατροῦ, and that the issue of it would be for the glory of God, that He did not hasten to the bedside of His friend. For ὥσ᾽ οὖν, see on 460. ὅτε is rectantius: what the messenger from Bethany had said was ἀσθενεῖ.

τότε μὴ ἤμεν κτλ. He remained where He was for two days. Jn. consistently represents Jesus as never being in haste. He always knew when the time to move had come (cf. 24. 7-8).

Jn.’s tendency to indicate the time between one event and another has been already mentioned (see Introd., p. 611). He notes here that Jesus remained in His Peran retreat for two days (cf. 461) after the condition of Lazarus had been reported. From Bethany or Bethabara beyond Jordan (see on 128) whatever its exact situation, it would be a long and rough day’s walk to Bethany near Jerusalem, and the journey may well have occupied part of a second day. When Jesus reached the tomb, Lazarus had been dead more than three days (v. 39). Jn. may intend to convey that the patient was dead at the time that the message reached Jesus; but, on the other hand, Martha’s words in v. 21 suggest that she thought that if Jesus had started at once, He would have arrived while Lazarus was yet alive.

7. ἐμεῖνα (only here in Jn.) μετὰ τοῦτο, i.e. δεινὸν ἠκούον, μετὰ τοῦτο implies a short interval; cf. v. 11 and 25. 196. See Introd., p. 611.

After μαθηταῖς, ADiN add ἄλλος, but Κελωνία omit. For οἱ μαθηταί used absolutely, see on 28; and cf. vv. 8, 12, 54. Ἐπταίρως. This intransitive form occurs again in 130, 16 and 140 (so Mk. 13, 16, Mt. 26): “let us go.” So in Homer we have ἔπη used intransitively “go.”

εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν πάλιν, “back to Judea,” whence they had come to avoid the danger caused by the hostility of the Jews (109. 46).

8. ἀνεπάγετο. So the disciples called Him. See on 108 for the use of this title in Jn.

vοῦ κτλ., i.e. “quite recently (108, 46), the Jews (see on 118) were seeking to stone Thee”: cf. 71. 480.

καὶ πάλιν ἐπέδρα αὐτῷ; “and are you going back there?”

XI. 8-10.] TWELVE HOURS IN THE DAY

Οὐχί δέδοκα ἐδώκα εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν; ἐὰν τις περπατήσῃ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς ἡμέρας, οὐ προκύπτεται, ὅτι τὸ φῶς τοῦ θόρυβος τοῦτον διέκοιτο: 10. ἐὰν δέ τις περπατήσῃ ἐν τῇ νυκτί, προκύπτεται, ὅτι τὸ φῶς οὐκ ἦτο ἐν αὐτῷ.

For the Johannine use of ἑδωκα, see on 796. Probably their apprehension of danger was on their own account, as well as on that of their Master.

οὐχί δέδοκα ἐδώκα εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν. See on 190 for the omission of the article before ἑδωκα in this phrase.

οὐχί δέδοκα ἐδώκα εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν; “Are there not twelve hours in the day?” That is, Jesus tells them that their anxiety is premature. The hour of danger had not yet come. Jesus never acted before the appropriate time (see on v. 6).

This saying is the counterpart of 6. There Jesus had said that work must be done during the day, and that it could not be postponed until night without failure, and that this law applied to Him as well as to mankind at large. He implied that but a short time remained to Him. But in this passage the thought is different. The hour of His Passion was near, but it had not yet arrived. There was no need for undue haste. The “twelve hours” of His day were not yet exhausted.

For the twelve hours of the Jewish day, see on 190.

ἐὰν τις περπατήσῃ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ κτλ. We have already had the contrast between walking in the light and walking in darkness (see note on 384 for its significance). Here this solemn aporism is put in connexion with what goes before. The disciples were apprehensive. But Jesus assured them that the night had not yet come. So long as men walk in the light of day they are safe, but it is the night that is the time of hazard.

Here, however, a mystical meaning lurks behind the literal meaning of the words employed. It is literally true that a man walking in the daytime does not stumble, because he sees the φῶς τοῦ κόσμου τοῦτον, that is, the sun (see for the expression ἐν κόσμῳ αὕτον on 596). But Jesus had already spoken of Himself as the Light of the World (see on 898), and the suggestion is the same as in the former passage, i.e. that he who walks by the light that Jesus gives does not walk in darkness.

The answer of Jesus to the disciples, then, in these verses implies first that there is no danger yet, for the day—His day—is not yet over; and suggests also that danger need not be dreaded by those who follow Him on His appointed way.

10. ἐὰν δέ τις περπατήσῃ ἐν τῇ νυκτί κτλ. In this second clause it is the mystical and not the literal sense which is most clearly expressed. For we should expect v. 10 to run, “If any one walk in the night, he stumbles because he has no
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the Twelve knew that theirs was susceptible of increase (cf. Lk. 17). Although His friend has died and the sisters are in grief, Jesus rejoices because of His confidence not only that Lazarus will be called back to life, but because this sign of power will increase the faith of His disciples, and promote the glory of God (v. 4).

Abbott (Dict. 2009) translates, “I am glad on account of you, that ye may believe, because I was not there,” which is, indeed, a possible rendering, but unnecessarily subtle.

In πιστεύσεις is, as it were, in parenthesis, explaining why Jesus was glad that He was not present when Lazarus was still alive. For πιστεύσεις used absolutely, as here, the object of belief being left unexpressed, see on 1.

Bengel notes that no one is said to have died in the presence of Jesus, and suggests that perhaps death was impossible where He was: “Cum decoro divino pulchre congruit, quod prae sententiae a deo dei unum legimus omnia. But we cannot infer from the narrative that Jn. means to hint at this.

χαίρε is not elsewhere placed in the lips of Jesus, but He speaks of His joy (τα χαίρετα) at 15:11, and at 4:8 we have ὁ σωτήρνος ὁ θεὸς χαίρει ἐν τῷ θεῷ, where He refers to Himself as the Sower. In all these passages, it will be noticed that His rejoicing is connected with the fulfillment of His mission. So also at Lk. 24:11 it is said of Him ὁ θεῖος λαός τῆς Πατρὸς ἡ ἀνέγερσα, because of the acceptance of His message by the Seventy, and of their success. And the rejoicing of the shepherd, when the lost sheep is found (Mt. 18), Lk. 15), is, in like manner, drawn out by the happy issue of his labors, ἀλλὰ ἄγωμεν πρὸς αὐτὸν, “But, anyway, let us go to him,” as He had said before ἀγωμεν εἰς τὴν Ιουδαίαν (v. 7, where see note on ἄγωμεν). The repetition of this invitation, even though Lazarus was now dead and a visit to his bedside for the purpose of healing him was now impossible, seems to have convinced the hesitating disciples that Jesus had some great purpose in view when He proposed to return to a place where He and they would be in danger. At all events, no further objection is raised, and the loyal outburst of Thomas, “Let us also go, that we may die with Him,” is acted on by all.

16. θεμάς ὁ λεγόμενος Διδώνος. Θεμάς is a “twine” (found only in Gen. 25:35 38:3, Cant. 4:7, always in the plural, and always rendered by δίδωμι or δίδομος), and of this θεμάς is a

transliteration. Three times in Jn. (cf. 26:21 27:1) to this name the note is added ὁ λεγόμενος Διδώνος, an appellation which is not found in the Synoptists. This suggests (see on 4:11) that the apostle was called “Didymus” in Greek circles; if Jn. only meant to interpret Thomas, he would probably have written ὁ λεγόμενος Διδώνος (as at 21:1).

The personal name of the apostle is given as θαυματουργός in the Acta Thomas and elsewhere; and the attribution of this name to him led afterwards to the attempted identification of Thomas with “Judas of James” and “Judas the Lord’s brother.”

The character of Thomas comes out as clearly in the Fourth Gospel as does that of Nicodemus (see on 3.). The notices of him here, at 16 and 20:4, are remarkably consistent, one with the other, and reveal a man whose temper of mind we can thoroughly understand. Thomas always looks at the dark side of things, and is a pessimist by disposition, while entirely loyal to his convictions and ready to act on them at all cost. He is a man of independent mind who says what he thinks, and does not wait for the promptings of others. Here Thomas foresaw only too clearly that Jesus was going to His death, and he realized that to enter Judaea as His disciple was to risk the same fate. But Jesus was his Master, and he would not draw back when he found that Jesus was resolved to go back to Judaea. ἀλλὰ ἂν θεμάς καθι, “Thomas thereupon said, Let us also go (for δίδωμι, see on v. 7) that we may die with Him.”

This challenge was addressed to his “fellow-disciples,” ἱκανοθυμήσει does not occur again in the N.T., but as used here it suggests the Twelve, of whom Thomas was one, rather than any other circle of μαθηταί (see on 2). It is not implied that all of the Twelve were present during the retreat to Peræa or at Bethany when Lazarus was recovered from the tomb; but ἱκανοθυμήσει suggests that the disciples who were with Jesus on this occasion were of the inner circle.

It is probable that Peter was not among them. He is not mentioned once in Part II. of the Gospel, and there is no indication in Mk. (which is thought to depend on Peter’s information) that Peter knew anything about this Jerusalem ministry. Probably the Galilaean disciples were often at their homes when Jesus was in Judæa or in Peræa. If Peter had been present, we might have expected that he would take the lead...

1 The extraordinary statement in the Greek Acta Thomas (§ 31) that he was the twin brother of Jesus seems to be due to a misunderstanding of the original Syriac.

2 Cf. Intro., p. cixxiil.
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17. Ἐλθὼν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἅρπαν τῶν πάντων ὑμᾶς ἔχοντα ἐγέρθη ἐκ τοῦ νεκρού. 18. ὁ δὲ Βαθαίνας γράφει τῶν Ἱερουσαλημῶν ὡς ἀπὸ σταυροῦ ἔπαισεν. 19. πολλοὶ δὲ ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων in assuring Jesus that His disciples would not abandon Him, just as he was foremost when the danger was even nearer (13:26). From the Synoptists we should not have gathered that Thomas was one of the leaders of the apostolic company; but the notices of him in Jn. (see above; and also 21:2, where he is named immediately after Peter) indicate that he was prominent among them, so that the statement that he acted as spokesman for the rest on this occasion is not surprising.

Jesus goes to Bethany: His conversation with Martha (v. 17-21)

17. Ἐλθὼν δὲ καλ., “Jesus, then, having come, etc.” σὺν is resumptive, not causal.

18. ἅρπαν τῶν πάντων ὑμᾶς ἐγέρθη ἐκ τοῦ νεκροῦ καλ. He found Lazarus had been already four days in the tomb. For the constr. ἐγέρθη, see on 5:1. σὺν is om. by ABD, and its position varies in other MSS., but the weight of authority is in favour of its retention.

For the “four days,” see on v. 6 above; and cf. v. 39. The burial would have taken place as soon as possible after death (cf. Acts 5).

Augustine (in loc.) finds allegory in the “four days”: one day of death for original sin, one for violation of natural law, one for breaking the law of Moses, and one for transgressing the Gospel. This is no more, and no less, fantastic than the efforts of modern expositors to find allegory in Jn.’s narrative.

19. Moffatt places vvs. 18, 19, between v. 30 and v. 31, where they would fit very well. But there is no insuperable difficulty in their traditional position, and I do not venture to alter it.

18 ὁ δὲ Βαθαίνας καλ. Jn. alone of the evangelists uses ὁ δὲ in this way (cf. 18:19; and perhaps 19:1); Meyer suggested that it is employed by him thus instead of the present ἦν because he is writing after the devastation of Jerusalem and its suburbs. But if (as we hold) his narrative reproduces the reminiscences of the aged Apostle John, looking back on many years, ὁ δὲ is more natural than ἦν, without assuming any allusion to the fall of Jerusalem. See on 5:1.

The rec. inserts ἐγέρθη before Βαθαίνας, with ΝBDLWΘ; but ΝBDLWΘ om. ἐγέρθη as in v. 1.

For the form τῶν Ἱερουσαλημῶν, see on 17:10.

데 ἀπὸ σταυροῦ δεκαπέντε, “about fifteen furlongs.” Bethany is a little less than 2 miles from the city. The constr. of ἀπὸ with the genitive to indicate distance is not necessarily a Latinism, as, e.g., a millibus passuum duobus (Cassius, Bell. Gall. ii. 7). It occurs again at 21:8; cf. Rev. 14:10, and see Hermas, Pist. iv. 1, ἀπὸ γῆς ἐκ τῆς ἀναπείπτε ἐκ τοῦ σταυροῦ. 19. πολλοὶ δὲ. So ΝBDLWΘ, as against the rec. καὶ πολλοί (ΑΤΑ).

Δέκα τῶν Ἰουδαίων, i.e. of the citizens of Jerusalem. τῶν Ἰουδαίων often represents in Jn. the Jews who were hostile to Jesus (see on 14:5); but here that suggestion is not present.

Jerusalem being so near (v. 18), it was natural that many friends from the city should come to console with Martha and Mary on the death of their brother. Lightfoot gives (Hor. Hebr., in loc.) curious details about the ceremonial which was customary at these mournful gatherings. The first three days after death were kept with severity, the next four days with less strictness, the period of observance lasting for thirty days altogether. Cf. for the “seven days of mourning for the dead” (Ecclus. 22:14), Ex. 32:30, Job 8:1, Judith 15:24; and for the visits of neighbours to console, 2 Esdr. 10:8.

τῇ παραμυθείᾳ, “to comfort,” is found in the Greek Bible only here, v. 31, 1 Thess. 2:15, and 2 Macc. 16.

πρὸς τὴν Μαρθὰν καὶ Μαρίαν is the best-attested reading (ΝBDLWΘ), but the article should be prefixed to both or to neither of the names. D has πρὸς Μαρθὰν καὶ Μαρίαν. Syr. seems, on the other hand, to presuppose the article in both places, and reads “went forth to Bethany that they might comfort Martha and Mary,” omitting “concerning their brother.” See on v. 24 for Jn.’s consistent use of ᾧ Μαρθὰν, ᾧ Μαρίαν.

The rec. text, with ΑΣΤΓΔΘ, has ἔλθοντες πρὸς τὸν πρὸς Μαρθὰν καὶ Μαρίαν, which ought to mean “came to the women of the household of Martha and Mary”; but it can hardly be genuine. Perhaps πᾶς πρὸς came in from [ἐν] τῆς πρὸς in the next line. After ἔθηκα κατὰ ΑΣΤΓΔΘ, but om. ΝBDLWΘ.

20. The congruity of the characters of Martha and Mary, as suggested by what we read of them in Lk. 10:38, with what Jn. tells in this chapter about their demeanour is remarkable. Martha is the busy housewife who, as the mistress of the house, is the first to be told of the approach of Jesus (v. 20). She goes to meet Him, and expresses at once her own conviction and that of Mary (vv. 21, 32), that if He had been present, Lazarus would not have died. She is puzzled by the enigmatical words

1 See Lightfoot, Biblical Essays, p. 38.
of hope which Jesus addresses to her (v. 23), and supposes that He is giving the usual orthodox consolation (v. 24). She does not understand what He then says (v. 25, 26); but her faith in Him as the Messiah is strong, and of this she assures Him (v. 27), although she does not expect that He can do anything now to restore her brother. Then she goes to tell her sister that Jesus has arrived and is asking for her.

Before Martha told her, Mary had not heard of the arrival of Jesus (v. 29): she was seated inside the house (v. 20) as a mourner, and it had been to her that the condolences of the friends who had come from Jerusalem were specially addressed (v. 45). But as soon as she learnt that Jesus had come, she got up hastily and left the house without acquainting the mourners of her purpose in going out (v. 29). Her friends thought that she was going to wait at the tomb (v. 30). When she met Jesus, she fell at His feet (unlike her more staid sister), greeting him with the same assurance that Martha had given (v. 33), but wailing unrestrainedly (v. 33). Her cries of grief seemed to have affected the human heart of Jesus as the grave sorrow of Martha did not do (v. 33). But, as they proceeded to the tomb, Martha is with them, and, practical woman as she is, demurs to its being opened (v. 39). Throughout, her figure is in sharp contrast with that of her more emotional sister. See further, Introd., p. clxxxv.

ἡ ἀδελφῇ τῇ ἀδελφῇ. She is the first to be told, as the mistress of the house. ἄδελφος: what was said to her was ἰησοῦς ἵκετα. This is a common expression (see also r23), in accordance with the general usage of ἰησοῦς. (see on v. 2).

21. εἶσεν οὖν (on being resumptive) ἡ Μάρθα πρὸς Ἰησοῦν.

Cf. 9 for the constr. λέγειν πρὸς τινα. The rec. with ἀκοίμησεν inserts τὸν before Ἰησοῦν, but om. nBC*. See on r25.

κύριε. See on v. 3.

Εἰ ἦν δὲν ἔπληκτο, "if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died." Mary greets Jesus with the same words (v. 38). No doubt, Martha and Mary had said this to each other many times during the last four days. The greeting may imply a reproach, suggesting that if Jesus had arrived immediately after He heard of Lazarus' illness, He would have kept her from death (see on v. 6). On the other hand, the sisters do not say "if thou hadst come here," but "if thou hadst been here," which may only imply wistful regret.

ἀδελφὲς. So nBC*DLW, but ACTA have ἀδελφαὶ. Θα ἔρθης ἐν αὐτῷ. See further, Introd., p. clxxxv.

22. The rec. inserts διὰ before καὶ τῷ: om. nBC*. Jn. often uses καὶ adversatively (see on r18), and διὰ is not needed here.1 "Even now (although my brother is dead) I know that whatsoever thou shalt ask of God, God will give it thee." This is a deeper confidence than that which recognises the efficacy of the prayers of any good man (see 9s). Martha wistfully expresses faith in Jesus not only as her friend, but as the Son of God (v. 29). She understands, though dimly, that He stands in a special relation to God; and the repetition of διὰ at the end of the sentence is emphatic. Perhaps His remark in v. 4 had been reported to her.

διὰ ἰησοῦς τοῦ θεοῦ. Martha used, however, a verb to describe the prayers of Jesus which (according to Jn.) Jesus never used of them. ἀράται is often used in the Gospels of men's prayers to God, and Jesus used it thus at Jn. 14:14 15:26 16:29, but the word that He uses of His own prayers is ἐρωτάω. In Jn. (and in Jn. only) ἐρωτάω is used of prayer to God, and in the Gospel it is not generally used of the prayers of men, but of the prayers of Jesus (14:1 15:26 15:29). Too much, however, must not be made of this usage, for the distinction between ἀράται and ἐρωτάω had almost disappeared in later Greek (cf. Acts 18:9), and at R Jn. 14:1 15:26 is used of the prayer of Christians. See further on 16:29. It is remarkable that the words προσεύχομαι, παρακαλεῖ, and συνεχόμαι, which are all used elsewhere of prayer, do not occur in Jn.

But Martha, although she uses a word about the prayers of Jesus which He never applies to them, is right in substance; 1 Abbott [Dial. 1915] prefers to take καί τῷ as at 14:1 15:29, indicating as it were a last word on the subject; cf. Deut. 10:14, Ps. 39.
and her confession is a true, if imperfect, statement of what Jesus says Himself at v. 41.

24. _ἀναστήσω σοι_. This must often have been said both to Martha and Mary during the past four days; it was (and is) a commonplace of consolation in bereavement offered by friends. By the first century, belief in the resurrection, at any rate of good men, was widely spread among the Jews (see on 5:21). The doctrine is plainly expressed in the _Psalms of Solomon_ (about 80 B.C.): οἶς δὲ φθονόμενοι κύριον ἀναστήσωσιν εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον (liii. 16). And Jesus commends this assurance to Martha as a truth which should assuage her grief. A doctrine which is trite may, nevertheless, be both true and important.

24. Martha’s reply is not sceptical or querulous. She does not deny the tremendous doctrine of resurrection at the Last Day. She replies, wistfully enough, that she knows it and accepts it. But, like many another mourner, she fails to derive much immediate consolation from it. The Last Day seems very far off. Meanwhile, where is her brother? And what are the conditions of this Resurrection? What is the Resurrection?

The answer of Jesus is unexpected indeed. “I am the Resurrection” is the soul that has touched me has touched life; and the life of God is eternal. That is the whole answer. And Martha, not fully understanding it, recognises that He who spoke to her, spoke with an awful prescience, as befitted Him in whom she saw the Messiah.

25. _ἐγὼ εἰμί ῥημάτως καὶ ἡ ζωή_. The article, which is omitted by most ancient MSS., must be retained with B.C*DL6. Throughout the chapter (except at vv. 1, 39, which are not true exceptions), Jn. writes ῥημάτως. See on vv. 2, 20.

For the doctrine of the Last Things in Jn., see Introd., p. civii; and for the phrase ῥημάτως ζωή, which is peculiar to Jn., see on 6:28. For the word ἀναστάσις, used of a resurrection from death, see on 5:21.

25. _ἐγὼ εἰμί ἡ ἀναστάσις καὶ ἡ ζωή_. For the form of the solemn pronouncement, _ἐγὼ εἰμί_ . . . , and for the claim to an equality with God which is involved in such a way of speaking, see Introd., p. cxxix.

For the Divine prerogative of Jesus as a “quickeren” of the dead, see 5:21 and the note there. It is asserted again in the proclamation, four times repeated, ἀναστήσω αὐτοῦ [ἐγώ] τῇ
in Him is not to be postponed until then. If a man believe in Him, although his body dies yet his true self shall live (v. 26). Or, as it may be put in other words, no believer in Jesus shall ever die, so far as his spirit is concerned (v. 26). The consolation which Jesus offers to those mourning the death of a Christian believer is not that their friend will rise again at some distant day when the dead shall be raised by a catastrophic act of God (however true that may be), but that the Christian believer never dies, his true life is never extinguished. “Your friend is alive now; for in me he touched the life of God which is eternal; in me he had already risen, before his body perished.” This is the Johannine doctrine of life (see Introd., p. cxi); it is also the doctrine of Paul (cf. Col. 3:4).

Neither Jn. nor Paul discuss or contemplate the future life of those who are not “in Christ.” The assurance of life, here and hereafter, in the Fourth Gospel, is for all “believers”; and in this passage no others are in view.

καὶ ἡ ζωή. This second clause in the great pronouncement of Jesus is omitted by Syr. sin., and also by Cyprian (de Mortal. 21), who quotes these verses in the form: “Ego sum Resurrectionis. Qui credit in me, fictet moritur, uiet; et omnis qui unum ut credit in me non morietur in aeternum.” Cyprian appears to have missed the distinction between the two clauses 25 and 26, and he may have omitted et uita, not perceiving that the words are essential, if what follows is to be understood. But this does not explain the omission in Syr. sin. All other authorities have the words καὶ ἡ ζωή, which are indispensable for the argument.

Jesus is not only the Resurrection, and thus the pledge and the source of the believer’s revival after death; but He is the Life, for this revival is unending. In the two sentences which follow, the twofold presentation of Jesus as the Resurrection and as the Life is expanded and explained. He is the Resurrection, and therefore the believer in Him, though he die, yet shall live again. He is the Life, and therefore the believer in Him, who has been “raised from the dead” and is spiritually alive, shall never die. See further on v. 26.

That Jesus is the Life is, in one sense, the main theme of the Fourth Gospel. Cf. 1:14 14:20; and see Introd., p. cxi.

ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ καὶ ἡ ἀναστασις ἡ ζωή, “he who believes in me” (see on 1:12 for the constr. πιστεύων εἰς, and cf. 9:28). “He who believes in me” (sc. physically), yet shall he live” (sc. spiritually, in the spiritual body, as Paul has it). So it has been said already (3:8).

Westcott compares Philo’s saying that the wise man who appears to have died in respect of this corruptible life, lives in respect of the incorruptible life (quod est. 15). But the distinctive feature of the Johannine teaching is that the privilege of the immortal, spiritual life is for him who “believes in Christ,” and so has touched the life of God.

καὶ καί ἡ ζωή. The verse is susceptible of two meanings. (1) If πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ is understood as meaning “every living man,” sc. living in this earthly life (cf. ἀνάπως πνεύμων ζωής, Tob. 12:9), then v. 26 is but the repetition in other words of what has already been said in v. 25, “no living man who believes in me shall ever die.” Such repetition is quite in the Johannine style (see 3:8), and it gives a good sense here. (2) But inasmuch as ἀναστας in v. 25 refers to spiritual life, the life of the believer after the death of the body, it is preferable to take ζωή in v. 26 as having the same reference, and to treat v. 26 as continuing the topic of v. 25, but not repeating it. “Every one who is living (sc. in the heavenly life) and a believer in me shall never die.” Verse 25 gives only the promise of life after physical death; v. 26 gives the assurance of that future life being immortal. For this use of ζωή as indicating one who is living, not on earth, but in the spiritual world, cf. the saying of Jesus to the Sadducees, that God is not the God of the dead, but of the living (ζωον, Mk. 12:27 and parallels). For this use of εἰς τῷ αἰῶνα, “shall never die,” cf. 14:1, and esp. 5:27.

It should be observed that vv. 25, 26, do not suggest to Martha that Lazarus will live again on earth. They are general pronouncements applying to every believer in Jesus, and the emphasis is laid on the words δο πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ. It is this essential condition of life in its deepest sense that is proclaimed to Martha. She is asked if she believes it, and she says “Yes”; but her answer does not indicate that she understood what was involved.

II. 26-27. MARTHA’S CONFESSION

Martha’s reply is a confession of Jesus as the Messiah. It hardly goes farther; although, in terms, it embraces all that Jn. hopes his readers will reach, sc. that full faith which leads to life (20:25). She hastens to summon Mary, who may be expected to understand the mysterious sayings of Jesus better than she (cf. Lk. 10:38). Cf. 11:20 and Mk. 7:36. She acquiesces in the truth of what Jesus had said, because she believed Him to be the Christ.

ἐπάνω. See on v. 3.
Mary, being informed of Jesus' presence, hastens to speak to Him (vv. 28-32).

This is the true reading, with \( \text{BCLYW} \), rather than \( \text{ADG} \). Martha said one thing only in reference to Jesus' words of mystery; she did not make a speech.

She called \( \text{Greek} \) "Mary." \( \text{Aramaic} \) does not take the article here, suggesting that the actual name was called out by Martha.

\( \text{Aramaic} \), "secretly," presumably because she wished to see Jesus privately, without the crowd of mourning friends being present. However, this did not succeed, for they followed Mary out of the house (v. 31).\( \text{Aramaic} \) occurs elsewhere in N.T. at Mt. 13:37, Acts 16:26. D reads \( \text{Aramaic} \), which gives the same sense.

\( \text{Aramaic} \). So they called Jesus among themselves, although they addressed Him as \( \text{Greek} \). See on 1:28:13:18; and cf. 20:31.

\( \text{Aramaic} \). No mention has been made hitherto of the desire of Jesus to see Mary.

\( \text{Aramaic} \). \( \delta \) should be retained with \( \text{BCLYW} \).

\( \text{Aramaic} \) designates the person who has just been mentioned (see on 19).

\( \text{Greek} \) \( \text{Aramaic} \) \( \text{Aramaic} \) with her natural impul-

siveness (see Introductory Note on 124**: Mary rose up quickly from the seat of mourning (see on 20), and went to meet Jesus, as she had been bidden to do. The rec. (with \( \text{A9} \)) has \( \text{Aramaic} \). . . \( \text{Aramaic} \), but the aorist and imperfect tenses are significant.

30. \( \text{Aramaic} \) \( \text{Aramaic} \). It is useless to make guesses as to why Jesus had not yet come into the village. He may have been resting at the spot where Martha met Him first.

\( \text{Aramaic} \) is cm. by \( \text{Aramaic} \), but ins. \( \text{BCLYW} \). \( \text{Aramaic} \) has \( \text{Aramaic} \).

At this point \( \text{Aramaic} \) places vv. 18, 19. See on v. 18 above.

31. The friends who had come out from Jerusalem to mourn with the sisters (see on v. 19), when they saw Mary rise up (see on v. 20) and leave the house suddenly without giving any explanation, supposed that she had gone to weep at the tomb, a common habit of mourners.

\( \text{Aramaic} \) does not indicate \( \text{Aramaic} \); but the unrestrained wailing of Orientalas. It is used elsewhere, as here, of wailing for the dead; cf. Mt. 5:29 (of the wailing for Jairus' daughter), Lk. 8:13 (for the widow of Nain's son), Acts 9:25 (for Dorcas), Mt. 20:4 (Rachel wailing for her children). See on 20:31.

It is noteworthy, in view of the identity of Mary the sister of Martha with Mary Magdalene,1 that Mary Magdalene is represented (20:11, 22, 25) as \( \text{Aramaic} \) at the tomb of Jesus.

\( \text{Aramaic} \). So \( \text{Aramaic} \); the rec., with \( \text{Aramaic} \), has \( \text{Aramaic} \).

32. When Mary met Jesus, she fell at His feet, impulsive and demonstrative creature as she was, and said, as Martha had said, "Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died" (see on v. 21). She is described by Lk. (10:28) as sitting at His feet for instruction, and later she anointed His feet (12:3), probably for the second time (see Introductory Note on 12:4:2), not \( \text{Aramaic} \). \( \text{Aramaic} \) is the preposition used by Mk. (5:22:7:48) when telling of Jairus and the Syrophoenician woman falling at the feet of Jesus. So, too, it is used in Rev. 2:17 and (in the

1 Cf. Introductory Note on 124**.
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laid him?” This is a simple request for information. See on δ for other examples of questions asked by Jesus.

γλυκαμα, st. (apparently) Martha and Mary, who prefix their reply with the κενα of respect (see on ν. 3).

ἐγερεν καὶ Μ. Cf. 98

32. ἐδοξασεν ἐ τ’ ἡμερα. The prefix καὶ to ἐδοξασεν, but it is quite in the style of Ἰν. to begin the sentence without any conjunction. ἐδοξασεν does not occur again in the N.T. It means “to shed tears,” but not to “wait.” The word in Lk. 194, where Jesus “wept” over Jerusalem, is ἔκλειψεν: cf. Heb. 59, of Gethsemane, μετα δεκαλεγεντη λεχυρεν και δεκαβης. It is not said in the Gospels that Jesus “laughed,” while it is told here, and suggested elsewhere, that He “wept.” But to draw the inference that He never laughed would be misleading. To be incapable of laughter would be to fall short of the perfection of manhood. This was perceived by the compilers of the apocryphal gospels: cf. Gospel of Thomas, A 8, ἐγκαλε το παθον μεγα, and Pseudo-Matth. 31, “Jesus laeto vultu subridens.”

The ethics of Jesus were not those of the Stoics, and Ἰν. brings out, perhaps more clearly than the Synoptists, that He did not count at the Stoic ἀναλησια. Juvenal finely says of human tears, “haec nostris pars optima sensus” (Sat. v. 132).

36. The visitors from Jerusalem were impressed by the sight of Jesus weeping, and said to each other, “See, how He loved him,” how great a friend of Lazarus He was! Cf. vv. 3, 5, for ἐθασαν.

97. Some of them, however (δικά), expressed surprise that He who had cured the blind man at Jerusalem (52?) could not have kept His friend from death. Like Martha (v. 21) and Mary (v. 32), they seem to think that if Jesus had been present, Lazarus would not have died, although they are not so sure of it. They are not contemplating any raising of Lazarus from the dead; such a thing does not occur to them. They refer merely to a healing miracle at Jerusalem, of which they had recently heard, and which they may have witnessed.

A reference here to the Galilean miracles of raising from the dead (Mc. 5, Lk. 7) could hardly have been resisted by a writer who was inventing the story of the raising of Lazarus. But these citizens of Jerusalem may not have heard of any Galilean miracles.

85. That the article το is omitted before ἐτερογεν is in all the...

38. Ἡ τοιοῦτο ὀν καὶ τοιοῦτο ἐμβρυματευμένον ἐν λήμνῳ ἔφησεν εἰς το μνήμαν ἐν τῇ σταυρῷ, καὶ λύθος ἐπέκαθε ἐπὶ αὐτόν. 39. ἰδοὺ δε Ἰησοῦς ἀρατε τὸν λίθον. ἰδαίς αὐτοῖς ἡ ἄγαλμα τοῦ τετελεσμένου Μάρτυρος Κύριε, ἐδείκτης τοῦ τετελεσμένου γερν ἔστιν.

MSS. except Θ and 33 (which, however, preserves some good readings in this chapter; cf. v. 20) is contrary to the general usage of Ἰν. (see on δ).

Again (σελε) the agitation of Jesus was noticeable (ἐμβρυματευμένον ἐν λήμνῳ, see on v. 33), as He was approaching the tomb of Lazarus. It was a cave, such as was often used as a burial-place (cf. Gen. 23, Isa. 22, 2 Chron. 16), the cavern being sometimes natural, sometimes artificial. The body was either let down through a horizontal opening, as is the European practice, or placed in a tomb cut in the face of the rock. In either case the opening was closed by a stone, which had to be a heavy one to keep wild animals out. Cf. 20, Mk. 15, Mt. 7, Lk. 24. If the cave were a subterranean one, then λύθος ἐπέκαθεν επὶ αὐτόν must be rendered “a stone lay upon it” ; if it were cut in the face of the rock, then the stone lay against the opening.

The raising of Lazarus (vv. 39-44)

89. ἀρατε. The aorist imperative is the command of authority; see on δ. The same verb is used of the removal of the stone at the tomb of Jesus (cf. 20). ἡ ἄγαλμα τοῦ τετελεσμένου, “the sister of the deceased,” τετελεσμένος occurs only here in Ἰν., and is infrequent in the N.T. (cf. Mk. 96). The rec. substitutes the more usual τετελεσμένος.

Martha, although she had joined the party which was visiting the tomb, had no thought of the resurrection of her brother, and, with her strong sense of decorum (Lk. 10), was horrified to think of the exposure of the corpse, it being now the fourth day after death. She was sure that putrefaction had begun, which shows that the body had not been embalmed, but had only been bound with swaths (v. 44), spices being probably used, after the Jewish custom (cf. 10). It is not alleged by ιν. that Martha was stating a fact when she said δεικτηθεὶς, “be stinketh.” That was merely what she thought must be the case.

δεικτηθεὶς is only used again in the Greek Bible at Ex. 8, where it is used of the dead frogs. τετελεσμένος does not occur again in the Greek Bible (except by mistake for τετελεσμένος in the A text of s Sam. 5); but in Herod. ii. 89 τετελεσμένος γενέτευκα is “to be four days dead,”
40. ἀληθῶς δὲ ἤργοις ὁ υἱὸς σου δέν ἰνν παντεύεσθαι δύο τινι, as here. Lightfoot (Hor. Heb., in loc.) cites a Jewish tradition to the effect that "for three days (after death) the spirit wanders about the sepulchre, expecting if it may return into the body. But when it sees that the form or aspect of the face is changed, then it hovers no more, but leaves the body to itself" (Bereshit. Rabba, fol. 114. 3). The same tradition is found in The Rest of the Words of Bereshit, § 9 (ed. Harris, p. 63).

For the three days of weeping, followed by four days of lamentation, see on v. 19; and cf. v. 17 for τερατοφαίος.

40. Jesus rebukes Martha, although gently, for her lack of understanding: "Said I not to thee, that if thou believedst, thou shouldest see the glory of God?" Some commentators suppose the allusion to be to what Jesus had said about the sickness of Lazarus being for "the glory of God" (v. 4, where see note). But this was said to the disciples in Farsea, not to Martha, and there is no hint that it was reported to her. Nor is there anything in v. 4 about belief being a condition precedent to the vision of the Divine glory. It is more probable that the reference is to Martha's previous conversation with Jesus (vv. 25–27), where she declared her belief in Him as the Christ. Such confessions of faith are elsewhere (see on 18) answered by a benediction from Jesus, in which He promises to the faithful as a reward a vision of the Advent of the Son of Man in glory; and it may be that some such promise, although not recorded, was given by Jesus to Martha (see on 6:29).

ἀν παντεύομαι δύο τοῖς δύον τοῖς Θεόν. Whatever this promised vision was to be, it was a spiritual vision that is meant, for ὅποιαμαι is always used in Jn. of seeing spiritual or heavenly realities, as at 18 (where see note). Bearing this in mind, it is difficult to suppose that "thou shalt see the glory of God" means "thou shalt see Lazarus restored from the grave," nor is there any suggestion that Martha understood this to be the meaning. Paul's phrase that Christ was "raised from the dead, through the glory of the Father" (Rom. 6), may, however, be thought to supply a parallel; and the "glory of God" which Martha was to "see" with the eye of faith would then be the Divine power which was put forth in the raising of Lazarus. Thus the larger promise of vision, which it may be supposed was given in response to Martha's confession of faith, was about to receive a special exemplification in the revival of her brother. Even this, however, is not free from difficulty; for it would suggest that the sight of the raising of Lazarus could have been perceived only by those who had faith (ἀπετευνύμενοι), whereas the whole tenor of the story is that all the bystanders, Jews and disciples alike, were witnesses of it. But perhaps what is meant is that only those who had faith could see the inner meaning of this "sign," and discern in it the exhibition of the Divine glory.

41. ἔδωκαν τὸν λίθον, as Jesus had bidden them (v. 39). The rec. text adds after λίθον the explanatory gloss ὅποι δὲ νόησιν κείμενος: om. K€€.L.D.

ἱερα τῶν ὄβουλων. This is a natural prelude to prayer or thanksgiving; cf. Ps. 121 ἡ φωνή τῶν ὄβουλων μου εἰς τά ὀφθαλμά, and Lk. 18:10. So, again, did Jesus "lift up His eyes" before His great high-priestly prayer (17); and, as the Synoptists tell (Mt. 26:30), before the blessing of the loaves, although Jn. omits this detail (see note on 6:23). "To lift the eyes" is used more generally of any careful or deliberate gaze (see on 4:36).

καὶ ἔδωκεν πάσης. It was thus that Jesus began His own prayers or thanksgivings, even as He taught men to begin with "Our Father." Other instances in Jn. are 14:22, 171, and in the Synoptists, Mk. 14:36, Lk. 22:46 (cf. Mt. 26:39), Lk. 10:13 (Mt. 26:38), and Lk. 22:48, 46. He does not say "Our Father," but "My Father" (see on 11), or "Father," simply, as here; for His relation to the Eternal Godhead is different from that of men in general. Bengel's comment on the simple invocation πατέρ (at 171) is suggestive: "Nomina dei non sunt cumulandis in oratione."

εἰδοντας σοι. For εἰδονται in Jn., see on 6:13, ἵπτῃ γραφαῖς μου, "because Thou didst hear me," the aor. indicating some definite act of prayer, whether spoken or only mental, perhaps before v. 4. He gives thanks before the visible answer to His prayer, because He is in no doubt as to the issue. His prayers were always directed to the realisation of the Father's will (5:29), and this cannot be frustrated (see on 12:28).

For ἄλλως with a gen. case as commoting sympathetic or appreciative hearing, see on 3.

42. ἐγὼ δὲ ἠκούει τόν Ἰησοῦν εἰκῇ. "But I knew that thou hearest always." This is a phase of Jesus' consciousness of Himself as in unique relation with the Father, which appears all through the Fourth Gospel, and which is most explicitly stated in the words ἐγὼ δὲ παντεύομαι ὄβουλοι (10:27).

We examine, first, the rec. reading ἄλλα δὲ τῶν δύον τῶν
Secondly, the reading of ὁ, μουσαύω, might readily be corrupted into the rec. εἰσνε; and the verb παύω gives us a meaning as unexceptionable as ἐσθάνω is difficult. At 5:28 Jesus says τά ἐξ αὐτοῦ μαρτυρείται περὶ ἑως ἢ ὁ παύρος ἐξ ἡσυχασίας (cf. also 12:28, 29). And so here, reading παύω, we translate "because of the multitude standing by I do it," that they may believe that thou dost send me." There is thus no intimation that the thanksgiving of Jesus in v. 41 was uttered only to impress the bystanders. The words of v. 41 were the inmost expression of His personal life. Rather in v. 42 does He speak of the purpose with which He is about to perform the sign that will convince the onlookers of His Divine mission.

The only authority, as it seems, corroborating παύω, the reading of ὁ, is the Armenian version, which, for the widely attested "I said it," gives "I do it." This appears also in two Armenian MSS. of Ephraem's Commentary on Tatian's Diatessaron, as well as in a homily on the Raising of Lazarus ascribed to Hippolytus, part of which is extant only in Armenian. The text of ὁ (whose home is in the neighbourhood of Armenia) has been thought to show special affinities to the Armenian version; and it is possible that "I do it" in Jn. 11:4 is mistaken for the version from which with which he was most familiar, not only in ὁ, but in Ephraem's Commentary and in the Hippolytus homily. If this be so, the reading παύω has its roots in the Armenian version, the sources of which are imperfectly known.

It has been shown that the Armenian version of the Gospels rests in part on the Old Syriac. In this instance, however, the Syriac gives no support to παύω, the Armenian deserting the Syriac here as in other instances; and it is probable that here same Greek authority is behind the Armenian vulgate.

The attestation of παύρος μου παύω is undoubtedly weak, but the phrase could so readily be corrupted into παύρος ἐσθάνω (which has the non-Johannine παύρος as well as the disconcerting ἐσθάνω), that παύρος μου has been adopted in this edition as probably the original Greek.

1 See Dr. J. A. Robinson's Appendix to Hamlyn Hill's Earliest Life of Christ, etc., p. 367, to which he has kindly directed me.  
3 See Streeter, The Four Gospels, p. 86 f.  
4 See Elken, Harvard Theological Review for July 1923.  
5 By J. A. Robinson, Eucheliana, p. 73 f.  
6 Streeter, loc. cit. p. 89.
43. καὶ τοστα ἑτῶν φωνή μεγάλη ἐκράζασεν ἀδέρφη, δεῦρο ἥμω.

43. φωνή μεγάλη ἐκράζασεν εκτ. As in the Synoptic accounts of the raising of Jairus' daughter (Mk. 5:23) and of the widow of Nain's son (Lk. 7:15), the dead person was recalled to life by an authoritative command from Jesus Himself. This is repeated with emphasis at 12:44. It is His voice which, being heard by the dead as addressing them personally, is spoken of as the effective instrument of their resurrection (cf. 5:37, 29).

The verb κραύγαιων occurs only once in the LXX and there, as here, is associated with "a loud voice"; δόλος ἐκράζασεν φωνῆς μεγάλης (Ezra 3:12) describes the joyful shouts of the people. The verb is found in the N.T. (in the best texts) only in Jn., where it has six times (cf. 12:18 18:60 19:11-15), and at Mt. 21:9, where the words of Isa. 26:2 are rendered "He shall not cry aloud\)" (ἀρετή λαύσαι). It is only here that the verb is used of an utterance of Jesus.

Two of the Words from the Cross are said to have been uttered φωνῆς μεγάλης (Mt. 27:46); and in Rev. 1:16 the voice of the glorified Son of Man is described as φωνῆς μεγάλης, as is also (Mt. 27:51) the voice of the Trumpet at the coming in glory of the Son of Man. Cf. Rev. 21:9. In represents the voice of Jesus when He summoned Lazarus from the grave as in like manner "a great voice."

ἀδέρφη (note the personal call), δεῦρο ἥμω, ἀνερ γραφῶ, "Come out." δεῦρο occurs only here in Jn.

44. The rec. text, with MACWΓΔ฿, prefixes καὶ to ἔδρασα, but om. BC piè. The absence of a conjunction is quite in Jn.'s manner.

The dead body had been bound as to feet and hands with swaddles (cf. 19:9), and the face had been bound with a napkin (cf. 20), after the Jewish custom. It is idle to speculate as to how the evangelist means us to understand the emergence from the tomb. The bandages would, seemingly, forbid the free use of the limbs; and they had to be loosened (ἵνα εἰρήνη ἀνθίνω) as soon as Lazarus appeared.

The word κορία appears elsewhere in the Greek Bible only at Prov. 7:18, where it stands for part of the covering of a bed. Moulton-Milligan (εν.) note its occurrence in the form κορίς in a medical papyrus. However, there is no doubt as to its meaning here, sq. "bandage" or "swathe."

For δεῦρο, see on 7:36. σωδίκων is a Latin word, "a napkin"; it occurs again in N.T. at 20, Lk. 19:29, Acts 15:18.

44. ἔδρασεν δ ἐφες φωνῆς μεγάλης τοὺς πόδας καὶ τὰς χεῖρας κυρίου, καὶ ἔδρασεν οὕτως οἱ συμβαῖντες περίδεος. Ὑπετελείτο ἀδέρφη τῷ ἁγίῳ καὶ ἔδρασεν αὐτὸν ὡπόγια.

45. Πολλοὶ οὖν ἐκ τῶν ἱσθομάτων, οἱ ἄλλοι πρὸς τὴν Μαρίαν

BC piè have ἐδρασεν αὐτόν. NADEΔ om. αὐτόν. Θ has ἀδέρφης ἀνθίνω.

For ὡπόγια, see on 7:36; ἔφθεια ἀνθίνω ὡπόγια is equivalent to "let him go home." This simple and kindly counsel is comparable with that of Mt. 5:48; cf. also Lk. 7:12.

It is noteworthy how few are the apocryphal legends about Lazarus. A priori, it might have been expected that pious fancy would have delighted in depicting his experiences in the unseen world, and his sayings when he was restored to earth. But there is little of the kind. Epiphanius says that among the traditions with which he was familiar, there was one which gave the age of Lazarus at thirty, and alleged that he lived for thirty years longer after his resurrection (Her. lxvi. 34). There is nothing impossible in that. The grim legend (cited by Trench, without giving his authority) that after Lazarus returned from the tomb, he was never known to smile, is probably a mediæval fancy. The Anaphora of Pilate (B 5) says that Lazarus was raised from the dead on a Sabbath day, an idea which is probably due to imperfect recollection of the healings in cc. 5 and 9. A Sahidic sermon in F. Robinson's Coptic Apocryphal Gospels, p. 170 L, represents the miracle as having been wrought by Jesus in order to convince Thomas, who expressed a desire to see a man raised from the grave; and that Jesus told him that His action in calling Lazarus forth was a figure of what would happen at the Resurrection on the Last Day.

The impression made on the bystanders (vv. 45, 46)

46. Many of the spectators became believers in Jesus because of the raising of Lazarus (cf. 12:11), just as many had become believers after former healings (7:52). Some of them reported the story to the Pharisees.

οὐκ ὅτι ἐκ τῶν ἱσθομάτων, οἱ ἄλλοι πρὸς τὴν Μαρίαν, to be rendered "many, therefore, of the Jews, &c., those who had come to Mary (vv. 39, 51), and had seen what He did, believed on Him." The "many" are defined as those who had come to visit Mary.

D for οἱ ἄλλοι reads τῶν ἄλλων, altering the sense, which then would be that many of the Jews who had come to visit the sisters believed on Jesus in consequence of the
XI. 47–48. ANXIETY OF THE SANHEDRIM

εὐγενὴς Τῷ ποιομένῳ, δὲν οδὸς δὲ ἄνθρωπος πολλὰ ποιεῖ σημεῖα;
48. εἰνάδεικνύειν ἄνθρωπον ὁ τόπος πρὸς τὸν Ἱσσαύην, καὶ ἔλεγον ἄνθρωποι ἥμων καὶ τὸν τόπον καὶ τὸ ἔθνος.

ςυνήφασις . . . συνέβη, the Ferrar cursives adding the explanatory gloss kata τοῦ Ἱσσαύην. This is the only occurrence of the word συνέβη in Jn.

καὶ εἶπαν τῷ ποιομένῳ, "They were saying (to each other), What are we doing?" sc. Why are we doing nothing? The parallel Acts 18 τῷ ποιομένῳ;

"What are we to do?" has a slightly different tinge of meaning. ποιομένος in the present tense cannot be rendered "What shall we do?" 1

dὲν οδὸς δὲ ἄνθρωπος καὶ, "for this person is doing many signs"; the turn of phrase expressing contempt. For "many signs" in Jerusalem, cf. 20; but the reference here is to the report brought by those who had been present at the raising of Lazarus (v. 45).

48. The Jewish leaders were anxious lest the growing fame of Jesus should suggest to those who were being convinced of His claims, that He was the national Deliverer of their expectation (cf. 60); and that thus a rebellion should break out, which would call down stern punishment from their Roman rulers. It was, indeed, the charge preferred against Him before Pilate that He claimed to be the "King of the Jews" (cf. 18:35).

ἐναύξασθαι ἀδέως ἡμῶν καὶ, "if we let Him go thus," i.e. without intervening and curbing His activities, "every one will believe in Him" (cf. v. 49).

καὶ διάδοθαι ἦμων καὶ τὸν τόπον καὶ τὸ ἔθνος. This has a verbal resemblance to the LXX of Dan. 13 καὶ ἔδωκεν Ῥώμην, but there is no allusion here to that passage. "Romans" are not mentioned by the Synoptists (cf. 19:9)

καὶ ἀριστεύειν ἡμῶν καὶ τὸ τόπον καὶ τὸ ἔθνος. The position of ἡμῶν is emphatic. "They will suppress our place and our nation." ὁ τόπος seems to mean the Holy Place, i.e. the Temple, with which the chief priests were specially concerned. Cf. 43 and Mt. 24.24 Acts 6.2, 21.20. At 2 Macc. 5 the τόπος is the Temple, and the fortunes of the τόπος and the ἔθνος are associated, as they are here.

The apprehension attributed in this verse to the Jewish leaders, of the destruction of the Temple and the nation, might, no doubt, be regarded as a prophecy after the event, for Jerusalem had fallen twenty years or more before the Fourth Gospel was written. But, on the other hand, there is an antecedent probability that such anxieties must always have been present,

4 Cf. Abbott, Diat. 2493, 2766.
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Counsel of Caiaphas to the Sanhedrim, and their resolve

(IV. 47–53)

47. οἱ ἄρχοντες καὶ οἱ ἄνθρωποι, sc. the principal members of the Sanhedrin (see on 72). From this time onwards, the chief priests take the lead in the arraignment of Jesus. These leaders summoned an informal council.
49. ἐξ ἐκ τῆς ἡμέρας Καίσαρος, ἄρησεν αὐτῷ τὸν ἐνεπιστομὸν Ἰωάννου, ἂνεν αὐτοῦ Ὡμείν οὐκ ἀπεκαθόρισεν ἀποδήλων, 50. ὅπερ λογίζετο ὅτι σύμφωνας during the first century, to the minds of the chief priests, who were well aware that any Messianic rebellion would be sternly repressed by their Roman masters.

40. ἐξ ἐκ τῆς ἡμέρας. For ἐκ before a gen. pl. in sentences of this kind, see in LXX.

Καίσαρας, ἄρησεν αὐτῷ. The office of high priest, under the ancient Hebrew laws, was for life; but in Roman times the high priest only held his position at the pleasure of the imperial authority. He might be high priest for one year only, or for a term of years, according as he pleased his Roman masters. Annas was high priest from 6 A.D. to 15 A.D., when he was deposed by the procurator Valerius Gratus. But he retained his influence throughout his life, and several of his sons held the office after him. In the year 18 A.D., Joseph Caiaphas (as Josephus calls him), the son-in-law of Annas, succeeded to this great position, which he held until 36 A.D., thus being high priest throughout the whole period of Pontius Pilate’s procuratorship. His name is not mentioned by Mk., but he appears as the principal person at the trial of Jesus in Mt. 26:6; see further on 148).

The phrase ἄρησεν αὐτῷ τὸν ἐνεπιστομὸν Ἰωάννου is applied to him thrice (v. 51, 18) by Jn. This does not imply that Jn. supposed mistakenly that the high priest was appointed annually, like the Asiarchs. But the phrase is repeated with emphasis, “high priest in that fatal year” (for such a use of ἔνεπος, cf. 18, 19), because Jn. thinks it so remarkable that the high priest, whose duty it was to enter the holy of holies and offer the atonement for that year, should unconsciously utter a prophecy of the efficacy of the Atonement which was presently to be offered on the Cross. This was the acceptable year of the Lord.1

iotic év οἴκειον εἰς οἰκείον κτῆτος. The council was an informal one, and Caiaphas was not presiding. But he speaks very sharply to the other members, for their irresolution. “You people” (ὑμεῖς is contemptuous) “know nothing at all”; you do not understand that it is in your interests that the man should die. Why hesitate about it? This is the obvious policy. Caiaphas was evidently a strong man, who knew his own mind; and the sharpness of his speech provides an illustration of what Josephus says about Sadducean manners.2 The behaviour of the Sadducees to one another is rather rude, and their intercourse with their equals is rough, as with strangers.

1 Cf. Lightfoot, Biblical Essays, p. 29.

XI. 49-51.] PROPHECY OF CAIAPHAS 405 ἦλθον εἰς ἐν αὐτὸν ἐνεπιστομὴν ἵνα τῶν λαῶν καὶ μὴ ἐλθὼν ἡ ἐνέργεια (Bell. Jud. ii. viii. 14). For the relation of the Sadducees or priestly party to the Pharisees, see on 78.

80. ἀρρητὸν λογίζετο. So ὅταν διαλογίζετο. Neither verb occurs again in Jn.; the simple verb being customary in Paul, and the compound in the Synoptists. ἑν σφακάδοις λόγοι (cf. 18 for the constr.; and cf. 18 for ἐν...ἀνθρώπῳ), “that it is expedient for you,” perhaps spoken contemptuously.

330, with some Latin and Coptic vss., have ἔνεπος. ἔνεπος is read by ΔΔΘΩ, with Latin, Syriac (including Syr. sin. and Syr. cur.), and Coptic support (including Q).

ἐν ἔνα ἐν αὐτὸ τὸν ἐναθλόν ὄνομα τῶν λαῶν ἀθλόν: a fine sentiment in its proper setting, and one which could be copiously illustrated from history. Caiaphas, from his point of view, was giving political if cynical advice. Better that one man die than that the nation perish.

λαός is used by Jn. only in this saying of Caiaphas (repeated 18); ἔνεπος is used by him only in this passage and at 18. ἔνεπος has reference to the Jews as a political unit, organised for civic and social life; λαός is used when their relation to God, as His peculiar people, is in view. But it is as impossible to provide exact and exclusive definitions of these two Greek words as of the English words “nation” and “people.” It is doubtful if in this verse any stress should be laid on the difference between ἔνεπος and λαός. ἔνεπος is used of the Jewish nation at Lk. 7:23 and elsewhere; while ἔνεπος in the plural is always in sharp contrast to λαός.

51. This is one of those editorial comments of which Jn. gives his readers many (cf. Introd., p. xxxiv). The words of Caiaphas, he notes, were an unconscious prophecy, for it was true in a deeper sense than Caiaphas understood that the death of Jesus would be expedient for the Jews, as well as for the wider circle of all God’s children.

The Jews ascribed a measure of prophetic faculty to the high priest, when, after being duly vested, he “inquired of Yahweh” (Ex. 28, Lev. 8, Num. 27). Josephus has left on record that he, as a priest, claimed to have power to read the future (Bell. iii. viii. 3). And Philo says that the true priest is always potentially a prophet (de const. principium, 9). The word ἐναθλός is applied to Zacharias the priest (Lk. 1:16), just as it is here (its only occurrence in Jn.) to Caiaphas: “He, being high priest that year (see on v. 49), prophesied.”

Caiaphas spoke not “of himself” but being, as it were, inspired by the Spirit of God, ἐναθλός. See on 15.
Note that ἐπροφητήσεως (κρῆσις) is the true form of the aorist, not προφητήσεως, with the rec. text. The augment precedes the preposition, there being no simple verb φέρομαι.

ὅτι ἦμελλεν Ἰησοῦς ἐπροφητήσεως καὶ ήμελλεν (κρῆσις) καὶ ἦμελλεν. The def. art. before Ἰησοῦς is omitted by κρῆσις (see on τα). For ἦμελλεν, see on 19.

For ἦμελλεν, used of the Death of Jesus, cf. 12. It conveys these passages the sense of predestined inevitability, which is always present to the mind of Jn. (see on 4 and cf. Introd., p. cii). See also for κρῆσις on 10. ὑπὲρ τοῦ θάνους. See for ὑπὲρ on 18; and cf. 6. ἦμελλεν, Jn., adjusts the phrase of Caiaphas ἐμπέπρεπεν τῷ λαῷ (v. 51) to ὑπὲρ τοῦ θάνους, perhaps because he wishes to suggest that by their rejection of Jesus the Jews had forfeited their privilege as the λαὸς of God. But he is prone, when he repeats a phrase, to alter it slightly (see on 19); and in any case, as we have seen, we cannot distinguish very sharply between ἔθνος and λαὸς.

58. The Death of Jesus was not only on behalf of Jews. This is the teaching of Jn. Cf. 3. 12. 12, 13. 1. 2, as a few of the passages which make this plain. It is natural that in a Gospel written amid Greek surroundings and primarily for Greek readers, the scope of the Christian message of salvation as extending beyond the borders of Judaism should be explained with special emphasis.

Its larger purpose was "to gather into one the scattered children of God," ὰς καὶ τὰ τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ τὸ διακορυμενόν συνάγητε ἐλε. The phrase looks outward to the future, when those who are potentially God's children shall have become τέκνα θεοῦ, begotten of God, through faith in Jesus (see on 12. 13 for τέκνα θεοῦ in Jn.); and it looks onward also to the more distant future, when all those children of God shall be gathered into one. It should be observed again at this point (see on 19) that the ideas of the universal Fatherhood of God, and of the whole human family as His children, are not explicit in Jn. All who will "believe" may become His children; but this faith is presupposed.

τὰ διακορυμενά. These potential children of God are "scattered," as Jn. writes. They are, to his mind, in every part of the world. The verb διακορυμαῖον does not occur again in Jn., but is frequently used in the LXX of the scattering of Israel among the nations, which is a thought foreign to the context here; for the "children of God who are scattered abroad" are not all of Israel. Jn. has συνάγησαν at 10, but there the allusion is to the wolf scattering the flock, of which there is no suggestion in the present passage.

There seems to be a reminiscence of this verse in the Didache (ix. 4), where mention is made of the Eucharistic 1 Iουνίας: ὃς ἐδώκα τό κλάωμα διακορυμενόν ἐνάντιον τῶν ὀρέων καὶ συνάχθην ἐνίπτων ἐν, κατά τῶν ἁγίων τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐν τῆς τιμῇ τῆς ψυχῆς. See on 9.

συνάγησαν εἰς ὑμῖν. Cf. 10, διὰ μὲ ἄγνωστον κλῆ, where see note. For the nature of this unity, see on 2; and cf. Eph. 19.

58. ἐκάκωσα ἐν τῆς ἡμέρᾳ καὶ. "From that day, therefore (sc. because they were impressed by the advice of Caiaphas), their plan was to kill Him." The hostility of the ecclesiastical authorities had been gradually intensified; it began with the cruces on Sabbath days, and the claim of Jesus to Divine authority (3; 7; 53); but after the raising of Lazarus, and Caiaphas' warning, they came to the decision (ποιῆσαι) that He must die (cf. 12. 10 for a similar phrase).

For ἥμελλε, L reads ἥμελλ: there is a similar variant at 9, where see note. Jn. is prone to note the time at which things happened: see Introd., p. cii.

Jesus withdraws to the north-east of Jerusalem (vv. 54-57)

56. ὅτι (because of the machinations of His enemies) Ἰησοῦς ἔφυγεν παραπόλεμος (see for this word on 4) περιπάτει (see on 7) ἐν τοῖς Ιουδαίοις (the hostile Jews; see on 185).

He withdrew "to the country near the desert," i.e. the hill country to the north-east of Jerusalem, which was thinly populated. The town or village of Εφραίμ is not mentioned elsewhere in the N.T. "But it is mentioned by Josephus (Bell. Jud. iv. 9), in connexion with the mountain district (ἡ ὕπαρξη) north of Jerusalem, as a small fort (ἐπαλλέλως) . . . Josephus couples it with Bethel, and it is a coincidence that where it occurs in 2 Chron. 13 (ἡ Ἱσραήλ) Bethel is named with it. The two places were probably not far apart. It is generally identified with El-Tayibeh, 4 miles north-east of 1 Lightfoot, Biblical Essays, p. 177; cf. G. A. Smith, Hist. Geogr., P. 352.
408 THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN [XI. 54-56.

The text discusses the arrest of Jesus at Bethel, on the road from Samaria to Jericho, which is distant about 15 miles.

Cod. Bezae reads χωράν instead of καλοῦρεις (Saphurius). Harris ingeniously suggests that Σαμοίρεις is a mere corruption from the Syriac words answering to whose name is Εράναμ, which were inserted as a gloss, σαμωνια for the Hebrew שמה. Septuagint in Galilee has been supposed by some to be indicated by Σαμούρης, but this place is too far away to suit the conditions of the narrative.

κατεῖραν. This is the reading of καλοῦρεις (cf. τοῦ υἱοῦ του θεοῦ). ADPΔΔ read διήρρησι, which occurs at σαμωνια καὶ διήρρησιν αὐτῶν, μένει a favourite word with Ιωακ. (cf. e.g. 21:44), and is used with μέν, as here, at 1 Jn. 2:19.

The rec. text adds αὐτοῖς after μεθύνον. om. καὶ ΒΔ. See on 22.

55. ή δέ έσχάτο το πάσχα των ιουδαίων. For this phrase, see on 22, as also for the phrase καὶ ἐσχάτων εἰς τηρούμα (cf. 1:17).

δέ της χώρας. Many went up "from the country parts," ή χώρα not referring here to the Ephræm district (v. 54).

Το ἑλεύσοντας Εράναμ. Ceremonial purity was requisite if a man was to keep the Passover duly (cf. Num. 6:16, 2 Chron. 30:17, 18); and the necessary ritual of purification might last a whole week, or a much shorter time if the pilgrim had not been gravely polluted (see Lightfoot, Hor. Heb., in loc.). Accordingly many pilgrims had to arrive in Jerusalem some days before the Passover, πρὸ τοῦ πάσχα. See 18:28 for the emphasis that was laid on ritual purity; and cf. Acts 21:44.

Διατέθηκε in Acts 20:22 is not found in the Synoptics, and is used by Ιωακ. again only at 1 Jn. 3:3 (of spiritual purification).

56. Just as at an earlier Passover (2:11), the pilgrims were curious to see and hear Jesus: ἐφέσων αὖ τῷ τοῖν οίκον. And the knots of people in the Temple precincts, where they naturally gathered, as well as because it was there that Jesus had been accustomed to teach, were full of eager speculation. "What do you think?" "Surely He isn't coming to the Feast?" This, they thought, was unlikely, because of the order for His arrest which had been made by the authorities.

D reads τι δοκεῖτε; instead of τι δοκεῖ ἡμῖν; and Syr. sine.

1 Rendel Harris, Codex Bezae, p. 184.

XI. 58-57, XII. 1 ff.] HIS ARREST ORDERED 409

ὅτι οὐ μὴ δόθη εἰς τὴν δομήν; 57. ἀπάντησεν δὲ οἱ δραματείς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ἐσταλεί ἰνα ἐὰν τις ἑαυτὸς ποιήσῃ ὡς εἰτέι παράκολουθον αὐτῶν.

puts the two questions into one. "Do ye suppose that perchance He cometh not to the Feast?" The A.V. takes the Greek similarly: "What think ye, that He will not come to the Feast?" But the better reading, and the better rendering of the Greek, give two short ejaculatory questions instead of one (see Abbott, Dial. 2184).

57. ἀπάντησεν δὲ. The rec. text, with D, adds καί, the effect of which is to disconnect v. 57 from v. 56. But καί must be omitted with καταλής. It spoils the sense, which clearly is that the people thought it improbable that Jesus would come up to Jerusalem, for the Sanhedrin had given orders (ἀπαντήσαντες δὲ) for His arrest.

For οἱ δραματείς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι, cf. v. 47; and see on 72. ἐσταλείς (οὐκ) seems to be preferable to ἐσταλείς of the rec. text (ADPΔΔ); they gave "directions," that if any one knew where Jesus was, he should give information (ῥυτίσθητε, only here in Jn., but cf. Acts 23:39), in order that they might arrest Him. ἵνα μὴ ἄνακοινων αὐτῶν. This is the only place where Ιωακ. has ἵνα, it being used here (as Blasis suggests, Gram., p. 211) for variety, as οὐ has occurred immediately before.

Introductory Note on the Anointing at Bethany (c. 14-18)

There are three evangelical traditions of the anointing of Jesus at an entertainment in a private house: that of Φκ. 14:3-8 (followed by M., 20:30-34), that of Jn. 12:1-8, and that of Lk. 7:36-50. From the second century to our own time the comparison of these narratives has been attempted by critical readers, and various answers have been given to the questions which arise. Were there three anointings or only two? Or did one incident furnish the material for all three stories?

Few modern expositors hesitate to identify the incident described in Mk. 14 with that of Jn. 12. The place is the same, viz. the καμάρι of Bethany near Jerusalem; and in both traditions the scene is laid in the week before the Crucifixion. Jn. putting it on the Sabbath before the Passover, while Mk. suggests (although he does not say it explicitly) that it is to be dated two days only before that feast (cf. Mk. 14:1-2). Mk. does not name the woman who anointed Jesus, but Jn. says that it was Mary, the sister of Martha and Lazarus. In
Mk. the host is "Simon the Leper," but Jn. says that Martha waited on the company, which might mean that she was the mistress of the house; Lazarus, in any case, is included among those at table. In the Marcan story the woman anoints the head of Jesus (a frequent mark of honour to a distinguished guest; cf. Lk. 7:44), no mention being made of His feet, or of the use of her hair as a towel. Jn., however, says nothing either of anointing the head of Jesus or of washing His feet; but he relates that Mary anointed His feet, and then wiped them with her hair. This is, prima facie, a strange statement. Anointing the feet of a guest might follow the washing of them, but why should the ointment be wiped off? And it is improbable that a suitable towel (see 13:5) would not be at Mary's disposal in a house where the acting hostess was her sister. That she should have used her hair for the purpose of wiping the feet of Jesus on this occasion, either after washing or anointing them, is an extraordinary circumstance, to which we shall return presently.

It is not doubtful, however, despite the superficial differences between the Marcan and Johannine stories, that they refer to the same incident, and that Jn. is conscious of the fact and familiar with the earlier narrative. Like Mk., Jn. mentions the criticism made about the waste of the precious ointment (a criticism which he ascribes to Judas); and like Mk., he recalls the Lord's rebuke, "The poor ye have always with you, but me ye have not always." Again, Mk.'s προσέλαβεν μιρασίαν τού σώμα μου εἰς τὸν ἐνταφιασμόν is reflected in Jn.'s ἐν ὑπηρέτησι τοῦ ἐνταφιασμοῦ μου τηρηθέν αὐτῷ. And Jn.'s καθὼς πιστεύεις πολτήσας is a reproduction of Mk.'s καθώς πιστεύεις πολτήσας. We may say with confidence that the Marcan and Johannine narratives are versions of the same story. Jn. having corrected Mk. where he thought it necessary to do so. The narrative of Lk. 7:36 is markedly different from both Jn. and Mk. The place where the incident happened is not named, but the context suggests that it was somewhere in Galilee, and that it occurred during the period of John the Baptist's imprisonment. But Lk. does not always observe strict chronological sequence, and the story may have been inserted at this point in connexion with the accusation that Jesus was "a friend of publicans and sinners" (v. 34). The host, on this occasion, was a Pharisee named Simon, and the woman who is the central figure was a sinner (ἀσαφείας).

The story tells of her coming into the house—uninvited, as was possible in a country where meals were often semi-public—and standing behind Jesus, as He reclined at table. As she wept, her tears dropped on His feet, and she wiped them off with her long flowing hair. Then she kissed them, and anointed them with ointment which she had brought with her, probably with the hope of being allowed to anoint His head. This would have been an ordinary act of courtesy, but anointing of the feet is not mentioned again (except Jn. 12:8) in Scripture, and was evidently unusual. Simon the Pharisee was shocked that a guest who had been entertained as a possible prophet should submit to the ministrations of a sinful woman; but Jesus rebuked him with the parable of the Two Debtors, and the story ends with the benediction given to her who had been forgiven much and who had therefore loved much.

The moral of this narrative is wholly unlike anything in the narratives of Mk. 14 and Jn. 12; nor does there seem to be any connexion with the narrative of Mk. 14. The name of the host, indeed, both in Lk. and Mk. was Simon, but Simon the Pharisee is not necessarily to be identified with Simon the Leper, for Simon was the commonest of Jewish names. Nor can we suppose that a leading Pharisee would have entertained Jesus at his house during the week before His Passion, when He was already the subject of orthodox suspicion. The unnamed woman may be the same in both narratives, nevertheless, although Mk. does not note that she was or had been a sinner; but that Mk. and Lk. deal with quite different incidents is plain.

The resemblances, however, of the Lucan story to that in Jn. 12 are striking. In both, it is the feet (not the head, as in Mk.) which are anointed, and the language used is similar in both cases. Thus Lk. 7:36 has τοις δικαίως δύοντο δακρύματα τοῦ πόδα αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῖς θρήσμοις τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτῆς ἐξαμαστῆναι ... καὶ ἐκλύθη τὸ νόσος, while Jn. 12:3 has ἔκλυθη τοῦ πόδα τοῦ Ιησοῦ καὶ ἐξαμαστῆναι τοῖς δρέπανοι τῆς αυτῆς τοῦ πόδα αὐτοῦ.

It will be observed that there is no formal washing of Jesus' feet in either story, and that the falling of the woman's tears upon them, which is so touching a feature of Lk.'s account, has no place in Jn. But the linguistic similarities between the two verses just cited show conclusively that Jn. intended to tell a story similar to that told by Lk.; while, on the other hand, his version is as puzzling as Lk.'s is lucid. Why should Mk. and Jn. have the same story appear with dishevelled hair, and use this instead of a towel? Why should she anoint the feet of Jesus

---

1 J. B. Mayor (D.B., iii. 286) cites Aristoph. Vesp. 608, where a daughter is represented as anointing and kissing her father's feet.
at all? The woman of Lk. 7 did so from penitent humility, but does this apply to Mary of Bethany? And why should Mary wipe off the unguent once it was applied? The ἀμωμεῖος only wiped off her falling tears.

We shall approach these difficulties presently, but at this point we seem called to recognise the fact that Jn. is writing in terms of the Lucan story. He is not necessarily describing the same incident as Lk., but he is describing an incident so similar in some exceptional features, that we must believe him to be writing of the same woman that Lk. has depicted. This involves the conclusion that Jn. regarded Mary of Bethany as the sinful woman of whom Lk. tells. Lk. does not make this identification. He mentions Mary afterwards as being at the house of Martha her sister, the situation of which is not indicated (1080), and records how Mary was praised by Jesus as having “chosen the good part,” in comparison with the housewife activities of her sister. This is not inconsistent with the conclusion that Mary had formerly been of loose behaviour, but it does not suggest it directly.

The relations between the various evangelical narratives of the anointing of Jesus have been discussed at length, both in ancient and modern times, and we cannot stay here to examine the opinions of individual Fathers or critics.1 Clement of Alexandria (Ped. ii. 62) identifies the anointings of Lk. 7 and of Jn. 12; Mk. 14; so does Tertullian (de pudic. xi.). Origen is not consistent with himself, at one time speaking of three (Comm. in Mt. 77 or two anointings (Hom. in Cant. 119), at another time of only one (Fragm. in Joann. 118, ed. Brooke, ii. 287). Ephraim Syrus (Hom. i. “On our Lord”) has a lengthy commentary on the sinful woman, whom he explicitly distinguishes from Mary of Bethany. Tatian treats the story of Lk. 7 in like manner as distinct from the story of Jn. 12, Mk. 14. But, since the time of Gregory the Great, the Roman Church has been accustomed to identify Mary of Bethany, Mary Magdalen, and the ἀμωμεῖος of Lk. 7. The Breviary office for the Feast of St. Mary Magdalen (July 22) draws out this identification, and treats the story of Mary as that of one who, once a greater sinner, became a great saint.

This identification has been accepted in the present commentary. Of Mary Magdalen, i.e. Mary of Magdala (a village some 3 miles from Capernaum, now called Mejdel), Lk. tells that “seven devils had gone out of her” (Lk. 8?), a statement that is made immediately after the story of the ἀμωμεῖος. She is named along with other women who had been “healed of evil spirits and infirmities”; and Lk.’s statement about her is repeated in the Marcan Appendix: “He appeared first to Mary Magdalen, from whom He had cast out seven devils” (Mk. 169). This description would not necessarily point to special vise, for it might only refer to madness; but it remains, for all that, a very apt description of a woman who had been rescued as the ἀμωμεῖος was, and would be a convenient euphemism. Further, the identification of Mary Magdalen with Mary of Bethany enables us to interpret the otherwise difficult words of Jn. 12, “Suffer her to keep it against the day of my burying” (cf. Mk. 149, Mt. 269). No evangelist speaks expressly of Mary of Bethany as going to the tomb to anoint the Lord’s body on the day of the Resurrection, but all four name Mary Magdalen as taking part. The equation of Mary Magdalen to Mary of Bethany explains quite simply the Lord’s words about the latter at the Supper at Bethany (Jn. 137, where see note)—words which are otherwise left without fulfilment.

We hold, then, that a comparison of Jn. 12 with Lk. 7 makes it necessary to identify the woman that was a sinner with Mary Magdalen and also with Mary of Bethany, or at any rate to recognise that Jn. identified them.

There is another significant bit of evidence for the latter conclusion. At Jn. 138 is a parenthetical explanation (whether by Jn. or by a later editor need not now be discussed; see note in loc.), that Mary of Bethany is ἡ ἀλεξάσα τοῦ πνεύμον μωρό καὶ ἡμάξασα τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ τῶν βραχίων αὐτῆς. Now this would not identify Mary of Bethany for the reader, if another woman had also 10 anointed the Lord with ointment and wiped His feet with her hair.” If we distinguish the woman of Lk. 7 from the woman of Jn. 12, this singular gesture may be attributed to two women, and thus the note of 121 would be useless for its purpose of identification. It is plain that the Fourth Gospel regards the ἀμωμεῖος of Lk. 7 as the sister of Lazarus and Martha.

It is to be observed, however, that while Jn. uses the same words of Mary’s action that Lk. does of the action of the ἀμωμεῖος, he does not necessarily imply that the narratives of Jn. 138 and Lk. 78 refer to the same incident. Mary may have, in the days of His public ministry, anointed the feet of Jesus in penitence (Lk. 78); and, then, having repented and returned to her family, when Jesus came to her home the day before His entry to Jerusalem, have repeated an act so full of memories for her (Jn. 123). No emphasis is laid in Lk. on the costliness of the ἀλεξάσα τοῦ πνεύμον μωρό; the woman had brought with her an ordinary supply of ung-uent. But in Jn. and Mk.
The Supper at Bethany (XII. 1-8)

XII. 1. ὁ ὧν Ἰησοῦς πρὸ τοῦ ἡμερῶν τοῦ πάσχα ἦλθεν εἰς

the special quality of the ointment is a principal feature of
the story. It was "very precious," so exceptionally costly
that the use of it called forth criticism. If Mary desired to
repeat the act which had in the first instance called forth
the benediction of Jesus, it would be quite natural that she
should provide herself with unguent of specially fine quality.
And the circumstance that she used her hair for a towel would also
be explained by her purpose of reproducing the former scene.
It could not be exactly reproduced; there were no tears of
penitence on the second occasion. But, just on that account,
a true narrative of what happened would be at once like and
unlike the story of Lk. 7; and this is what we find in Jn. 12.
Thus, while we do not identify the incident recorded in Lk. 7
with that recorded in Jn. 12 and Mk. 14, we may regard Lk. 7
as telling of the first occasion on which Mary anointed Jesus,
the second being that narrated in Jn. 12 and (with less
exactness) in Mk. 14, Mk. missing the point that it was the
feet (not the head) of Jesus that were anointed at the house in
Bethany shortly before His Passion.

The Supper at Bethany (XII. 1-8)

XII. 1. ὁ ὧν Ἰησοῦς. ὧν is not causal; it does not carry
us back to ἤσο, where it is said that the priests were planning
to arrest Him. His motive in going to Bethany was not to
seek a place of safety, but it was on His way to Jerusalem,
whither He was proceeding for the feast. ὧν is only copula-
 ticative, "and so" (see on i20). He knew, indeed, of the enmity
of the priestly party; but that did not move Him from His
purpose. Indeed, Jn. lays special emphasis on the continual
consecration on the part of Jesus of what was impending
(cf. 181).

According to the Synoptists (Mk. 111, Mt. 272, Lk. 216), He
lodged at Bethany during the nights that remained before
the end.

πρὸ τοῦ ἡμερῶν τοῦ πάσχα, a transposition of πρὸ, the phrase
meaning "six days before the Passover." Meyer cites Αἰμων
1πρὸ ὧν ἦν οἱστο τοῦ στιγμῆς for the same construction.
Jn. is prone to record dates (see Introductory, p. cii); and he notes that the
day of the arrival of Jesus at Bethany was the Sabbath before
the Passover, i.e., in our reckoning, the Saturday preceding

1 Salmon held Jn. to believe that Mary had anointed the Lord’s
feet twice, but he did not discuss the matter fully (Human Element in
the Gospels, p. 454).

XII. 1-2.] THE SUPPER AT BETHANY 415

Bethany, εἰς τός τῶν Ἀδάρος, ἐν γγερέρ ἐκ τοῦ ἀντών Ἰησοῦς. 2. ἐπὶ μὲν
ἀνθρώπος ἐκ τοῦ δικαιοῦ ἤστι, καὶ ἡ Μάρτα δικαιούτοι, ὁ δὲ Ἀδάρος ἐκ

Palm Sunday. He may have arrived just as the Sabbath was
beginning, i.e., on the Friday evening; or He may have only
come from a short distance, and so have refrained from
exceeding the limit of a Sabbath day’s journey.

From Mk. 14, Mt. 26, we might infer that the supper at
Bethany was held later in the week, "two days before the
Passover." but neither statement is quite definite as to the
date. What Jn. tells here is more probably accurate.

ὁ ὧν Ἰησοῦς. On this account, Bethany was a place
of special danger. It was no place to come for one who feared
the vindictiveness of the priests which had been excited by
the raising of Lazarus.

For the constr. ὧν Ἰησοῦς, see on i28,
ὁ ἰησοῦς is added after Ἀδάρος by ADGΔ, with support
from the vs., including the Coptic Q, but om. κι.λ.ν.

ἐν γγερέρ ἐκ τοῦ ἀντών Ἰησοῦς. The rec. text omits ἰησοῦς,
which indeed is unnecessary to the sentence, but κι.λ.ν insert it.
Perhaps all the words after Ἀδάρος, etc. [ὁ ἰησοῦς]
ἐν γγερέρ ἐκ τοῦ ἀντών Ἰησοῦς, are a gloss that has crept in from
v. 9, where ἐν γγερέρ ἐκ τοῦ ἀντών Ἰησοῦς is quite in place and appropriate;
here it is superfluous. Cf. v. 17.

Syr. sin. gives here: "came Jesus to the village Beth
Ania unto Lazar, him that was dead and lived. And he made
for Him a supper there, and Lazar was one of the guests that
sat down to meet with Him, but Martha was occupied in
serving."

2. ἐν κατοικία ἐκ τοῦ δικαιοῦ ἤστι. The subject of ἐν κατοικία
is undefined. Probably we should understand that the
villagers of Bethany prepared a supper for Jesus, having
still in vivid recollection the fame of His recent miracle.
Mk. says that the entertainment was in "the house of Simon the
Leper," and this may be an accurate report, although of Simon
we know nothing (see p. 410). From the way in which the
presence of Lazarus as one of the company is mentioned by
Jn., it would seem probable that at any rate the supper was not
in his house. On the other hand, ἐν κατοικία ἐκ τοῦ δικαιοῦ
might mean that it was the well-known household of Bethany,
Martha and Mary and Lazarus, who gave the feast, and the
Sina Syriac (quoted on v. 1) understands the text thus.
Lazarus would in any case be a figure to attract attention and
curiosity, which may account for the words ὁ δὲ Ἀδάρος ἐκ

ἐν κατοικία ἐκ τοῦ δικαιοῦ ἤστι. That Martha was serving
(δικαιοῦ) would be more natural if she were in her own house,
XII. 9.]

THE PRECIOUS OINTMENT

This is the reading of B 33, and is probably right, despite the authority of KADLWΩ for Μαρά. See on 1270.

λαβίσα λίτραν κρέμον. λίτρα (lithra) occurs again in N.T. only at 15:8. Mk. says of the woman (whom he does not name) ξοώνα εἰλάσασα κρέμον, "having an alabaster casket or flask of ointment," and then goes on to tell that she broke the flask and poured the contents on the head of Jesus. To anoint the head of a guest (cf. Ps. 23) was an act of Eastern courtesy and respect, but Jn. treats the incident differently, and tells that Mary anointed Jesus' feet. The Lat. fuldensis tries to combine the two, and its text here gives "habens alabastrum . . . et fraxtō effudit super caput hisus recumbentis et unxit pedes." Syr. sin. has a similar conflated text.

This marked difference between the narratives of Mk. and Jn., which clearly refer to the same incident, is considered above (p. 410).

καβδον πιστης πολυτιμον. This is almost identical with Mk.'s καβδου πιστης πολυτιμου. A special point is made in both narratives (not in the earlier story, Lk. 7:50) of the costliness of the ointment provided (cf. "the chief ointments" of Amos 6:6). The adj. πιστης (only here and at Mk. 14:4 in the Greek Bible) is of uncertain meaning. It may be derived from πίστεως, and it is applied, as Abbott (Diat. 1136) has pointed out, to a "faithful" wife. Thus it might mean here genuine, as indicating the quality of the spikenard. The vgl., however, at Mk. 14:4 (but not here), renders it spicati, and Wetstein called attention to the word σκεκτων, which means a luxurious unguent. It is possible that, as Abbott suggests, some form of σκεκτων originally stood in the Gospel texts, and that it was altered to πιστης by an attempt at allegorical interpretation. Swete quotes Jerome as playing on the word thus: "ideo usa woaci estis piziti." Another, less likely, derivation of πιστης is from πίστις, so that it would mean "potable," as some perfumes were; but this would be quite out of place in the present context. Yet another explanation is quoted by Dods (in loc.) from the Classical Review (July 1890), sc. that we should read not πιστης, but πιστωκης, the latter word referring to the Pistorius terribilinus, which grows in Palestine "and yields a turpentine in such incon siderable quantities as to be very costly." Whatever the precise derivation of the word may be, the combination καβδου πιστης (καβδου, like πιστης, occurring again in the N.T. only at Mk. 14:4) is so unusual, that we must suppose Jn. to have followed here either the actual text of Mk., or a familiar tradition embodying these words.

With this costly unguent, Jn. tells that Mary anointed the feet of Jesus. He insists upon the word feet, repeating τους νωπας twice, that there may be no misunderstanding, and to show that he is deliberately correcting Mk.'s account. He adds, in words that reproduce Lk.'s story of the sinful woman (Lk. 7:46), that Mary wiped the Lord's feet with her hair (και ζηλωθεν των περιθων ηδη τους νωπας ανεπος). Attention has already (p. 411) been directed to the fact that a perfumed anointing of feet (as distinct from the washing of them, of which there is no mention here) is a custom not mentioned in Scripture elsewhere than here and Lk. 7:46. It is further to be observed that for a woman to have her hair unbound was counted immodest by the Jews,1 and that Mary should unloose her hair at an entertainment where men were present requires some special explanation. A towel would be readily accessible (cf. 12:2) whether this supper was in the house of Martha and Mary, or not; and it would be more seemly and convenient to use it. But for what purpose were the Lord's feet wiped after the unguent had been applied? In the story of Lk. 7:46 the woman wiped His feet with her unbound hair, because her tears had fallen on them by inadvertence, but she did not wipe off the ointment. These considerations seem to prove that when Jn. reproduces as nearly as possible the words of the earlier narrative (Lk. 7:46) he does so, not by any inadvertence or mistaken recollection, but because the act of Mary recorded

1 See Lightfoot, Hor. Hebr. in Jn. 12.
THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN [XII. 3-4.

This seems to be a page from a book discussing a passage from the Gospel of John, possibly John 12:4-6, which reads:

"Judas was a thief."
kai to gnostikon éxwn to balleíma ebstantai. 7. éven oin ever that may be, the bitterness of the words about Judas in this verse is easily explained if they go back to one who was a former comrade in the inner circle of the Twelve, who had had no suspicions even at the end (see on 13:29, 30), and whose indignation, when disillusioned, was all the more severe.

tó gnóstikon: cf. 13:26. A gnóstikon originally meant at a feast to hold the reeds or tungs (glynos) of musical instruments, and hence any kind of box, e.g. it is used for a coffin (by Aquila, Gen. 55:26). The word became accepted by Aramaic speakers, and appears as δόμνσιν in the Talmud. It stands for a coffin into which money is cast, at 2 Chron. 24:5-10. evlallon ein to gnóstikon, and this is the sense in which the word is used here. The gnóstikon or money-box of the disciples was kept by Judas (it was not necessarily carried about with him habitually): to gnóstikon éxwn is the phrase), and into it well-wishers (cf. Lk. 8:9) were wont to throw (δόμνσιν) small coins to provide for the needs of Jesus and His followers. In this it was like the begging-bowl of an Eastern holy man. To translate it "pursue" is misleading; and the Latin "literally" render it by locuti, i.e. a box or coffin with several compartments. See Field, loc. cit., on gnóstikon and bernastai.

For éxwn (nBDLW®) the rec. has éxow as (Ap. A).

to balleíma, se. the money cast into the box by well-wishers and friends; cf. 2 Chron. 24:10 quoted above.

ebstantai. The verb bernastai is used (12:9, 15:19, 15b) of carrying or bearing something heavy; but here and at 20:10 it is equivalent to the vulgar English, "to lift," i.e. to carry off furtively or uncrupulously, and so "to steal." Field gives a convincing illustration of this usage from Diog. Laer. iv. 59 μαντήσεν τον δαμασκηνο... δων ξυλίνα δόμνσιν, "Then when the servants found this out, they used to steal whatever they pleased." Deissmann (Bible Studies, Eng. Tr., p. 257) cites some further instances from the papyri of this use of bernastai.

Hence we must translate, "he was a thief, and having the money-box used to steal what was cast into it." To render bernastai here as if it only meant that Judas, the treasurer, used to carry about what was put into it, would give a tame and superfluous ending to the sentence.


The rec. text, with Ap. A, and reads tētopres, while nBDLW® support ézta... tērēm. 1 See also Moulton-Milligan, Vocab. 106.
11. The priests were specially urgent about the putting away of Lazarus, because, on his account (ὑς αὐτοῦ), many of the Jews (cf. τὸν ἐμν. 11) "began to go away" (ἐγένετο), perhaps to Bethany, which was the centre of attraction, "and began to believe in Jesus." (ὑπάρχον τοῦ ἴδε οἴες; cf. note on τὴν μετανοεῖ.) The force of the imperfect tenses must be observed. The verb ἀπέλθω, "to withdraw," is a favourite word with Jn. (see on γῆς), and ἔμπροσθεν here may mean simply "they began to withdraw," i.e. from their allegiance to the chief priests, as at ὄ, where Jesus asks His disciples, "Would you also go away?"

The triumphal entry to Jerusalem (v. 12–19)

12. The Synoptic accounts of the entry to Jerusalem are found at Mk. 11:10, Mt. 21:9, Lk. 19:29–50. As has been pointed out above (on v. 1), Mk. (followed by Mt.) places the supper at Bethany later in the week of the Passion, but Jn., putting it on Saturday, Nisan 9, halts Jesus and the disciples at Bethany for that night, the entry taking place on Sunday, Nisan 10. Christian tradition has followed Jn. in putting the triumphal entry on Palm Sunday.

Τής ἑορτάσματος, sc. on the Sunday. Jn. is fond of these notes of time (see Introd., p. 611). ὀλίγος ποιός (see on 4:3) κατ., "a great crowd that had come up to the feast," sc. those that came from the country parts to the metropolis, including doubtless many Galileans (see 4:48). ἀκούοντες, "having heard," sc. from those who had come by way of Bethany. ὅτι is restiatus. The words they heard were: ἐρχεται Ἰησοῦς εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα. Ὀροφει ὁ Ἱερός, while καὶ Ἰερόων; it is usually B that omits the def. art. (see on 2:2).

The entry of Jesus would naturally provoke curiosity and enthusiasm, coming (as Jn. represents it to have done) not long after the raising of Lazarus (11:11). The most conspicuous discrepancy between Mk. and Jn. is at this point, Mk. not mentioning Lazarus at all, but describing none the less the triumphal entry, while the enthusiasm with which Jesus was received is expressly connected by Jn. with the miracle at Bethany (see Introd., p. 233).
occurs again in the Greek Bible only at τι Μακκ. 13\textsuperscript{31}, in the account of Simon's triumphal entry into Jerusalem, μετά ἀφάνειας καὶ βασιλέως κτλ. (cf. τι Μακκ. 13\textsuperscript{2}). To carry palms was a mark of triumphant homage to a victor or a king (cf. Rev. 7\textsuperscript{9}). Either βασιλέως or βασιλική, separately, would mean "palm," so that Jn.'s τα βασιλεία των βασιλείων is superfluously precise (see Abbott, Dict. 2047). ii. the palm branches of the palm trees," perhaps trees which grew on the slopes of Olivet. The Synoptists do not mention the bearing of palms: Mt. has σωβάς, i.e., "litter" of leaves, even, which were strewn in the road; Mt. says εὐγενεῖς κλάδους από τῶν δέντρων καὶ δεσμάτων απὸ τὴν ἱδρία. There seem to have been two crowds, one accompanying Jesus, the other going out from the city to meet Him (ἐλευθερίαν τοις ὕπατοις αὐτοῦ); see Swift on Μκ. 11\textsuperscript{3}, and cf. v. 18 below.

καὶ ἐκραίγαμον κτλ., "they kept crying Hosanna." ἐκραίγαμον is read by κΕρDLW, as against ἐκραῖος of the rec. text (AT\textsuperscript{1}). For ἐκραῖον applied to the shouting of crowds, cf. Εκατ. 3\textsuperscript{2}; and see note on 11\textsuperscript{6} above.

Before ἐκαταναλέω, the rec., with MADW, ins. λέγεται: om. BL\textsuperscript{1}/\textsuperscript{2}.

The words from the Psalter with which (according to the Synoptists as well as Jn.) the acclimating crowds greeted Jesus as He rode into the city, were the words with which in the original use of the Psalm the priests blessed the procession entering the Temple. "Hosanna: Blessed in the Name of Yahweh is he that cometh" (Ps. 118\textsuperscript{26}). The sense is mislaid if τοὺς δέντρα καὶ κλάδους is connected with ἐκραίγαμον. The Hebrew priests were chosen to bless in the name of Yahweh (Deut. 21\textsuperscript{5}); and so also it is written of David ἐκραίγετο τῶν λαῶν ἐν ὄνοματι καὶ κράτει τοὺς δόμους ἐρξάντος (2 Sam. 6\textsuperscript{9}). Cf. also τι Κινγκς 21\textsuperscript{16}, τι Κινγκς 24\textsuperscript{4}; and see note on 16\textsuperscript{2}.

The quotation of Ps. 118\textsuperscript{26}, 28 by the crowds who hailed Jesus on His entry to Jerusalem was something more than a mere blessing of welcome, as of One who had done wonderful things (cf. Ps. 118\textsuperscript{9}). It recognised in Him ἐρξάμενος, "the Coming One," even as Martha had said to Him ὑπὸ δέντρον ὑπὸ δὲ ὑπὸ τὸν τάφων ἐρξάμενον (11\textsuperscript{27}; cf. Mt. 11\textsuperscript{3}).

The cry of Hosanna (in Aramaic ἀσάνα), rendered σάνα δή in the LXX of Ps. 118\textsuperscript{26} was the refrain sung by the people in the processional recitation of Ps. 118 at the Feast of

Tabernacles. When v. 25 was reached, the palm branches which were carried by the worshippers were waved; and hence these sprigs of palm with myrtle and willow (λαλαεῖν was the technical name) came themselves to be called ἁγιασμένον.

The practice, however, of bearing palm sprigs and crying Hosanna was not confined to the Feast of Tabernacles, although it originated in the Temple services at that festival; and we have already cited from τι Μακκ. 13\textsuperscript{21} an instance of palm branches being borne on the occasion of a popular welcome to a hero at another time of the year. There is thus no historical improbability in Jn.'s statement that palms and hosenans were accompaniments of the entrance of Jesus to the city.
narrating the entry into Jerusalem, do not quote the prophecy. Mt. (21) gives it in the form Εἶπα τῷ θυγάτηρ Σιών, ἵνα δὲ διαβεβαιώσω τοῖς πατέρας αὐτοῦ, καθήμενος ἐπὶ πάλαι δον. The full quotation, as given by Mt., is misleading. The story, as told by the other evangelists, is simply that an ass's colt was found and that Jesus rode on it. But Mt., misunderstanding the Hebrew repetition in Zech. 9,

"... upon an ass, and upon a colt, the foal of a she-ass;" where only one animal is indicated, tells us that παίδων animals were fetched, and garments put on them that they might be ridden. Jn., on the contrary, gives only that part of the prophecy which is relevant, i.e., "sitting on an ass's colt."

It is not to be thought that there is any suggestion of humility in riding upon an ass. On the contrary, the ass and the mule were the animals used in peace by great persons for their progressions, as the horse was used in war. The sons of the judges rode upon asses (Judg. 10; 12); so did Ahithophel (2 Sam. 17); so did Mephibosheth, Saul's son, when he went to Jerusalem to meet David (2 Sam. 19); cf. Judg. 5. Indeed Zech. 9 shows plainly that the prophecy was specially of One coming in peace.

The LXX translators did not understand this. They have φῶλος only in Judg. 10; 14, probably because they thought of an ass as a beast of burden exclusively; thus in Zech. 9 they have not noticed that ἅπερ is the regular word for ἄρτι-ass (Gen. 32), which may be either used for riding or for carrying loads.

The king, then, in the vision of Zechariah, rode upon an ass to signify that he came in peace, not to destroy but to save; and the entry of Jesus to Jerusalem on an ass was understood by the populace, in like manner, as the entry of the Prince of Peace.

A similar reminiscence of the evangelist is set down at 23, where see note. The saying of Jesus about restoration,

The Greek Inquirers (vv. 20–22)

20. The episode of the Greek inquirers is introduced immediately after the complaint made by the Pharisees, "the world is gone after Him." Among those who were excited and moved by the reports about Jesus and Lazarus were some Greek pilgrims; it was not only Jews and Galileans who were attracted by what they had heard of the wonderful things that had happened at Bethany, but Greeks as well. And Jn., alone among the evangelists, notes that some of them told Philip of their desire to see Jesus, and that Jesus was informed of it. This incident is naturally recalled in a Gospel written primarily for Greek readers. It is, however, not explicitly said that the request of the Greeks for an interview with Jesus was granted, or that they were present while the sayings of vv. 23–28 were being pronounced.

But, although there is no positive statement to this effect in the text, it has been generally held since the days of Tatian that v. 20 begins a new section of the Gospel, and that vv. 20–22 are to be read in connexion with what follows. On this supposition, it is natural to seek in the words of Jesus here some message which may be taken as specially appropriate to Greeks. It has been suggested, e.g. by Lange, that the tremendous paradox of v. 25, "he that loveth his life loseth it, and he that hateth his life shall keep it," has a peculiar applicability, if regarded as the judgment of Christ on Greek ideals of life. For the Greek, the ideal of manhood was to reach the fullness of a spiritual life; a man should develop his own personality: the larger and richer his life, the more nearly he approached his highest. There is something of this in Christianity as well as in Greek paganism, for Christianity holds up the Perfect Man as exemplar. But the Christian ideal involves sacrifice, and this was foreign to the philosophy of Greece. Jn. may mean us to understand v. 25 as implying the condemnation by Jesus of Greek ideals of life. Again, v. 25, "I will draw all men to myself," is a universal promise, including not only Jews but Gentiles like the Greek inquirers. And some have found in the exhortation, "Believe in the light, that ye may become sons of light" (v. 46), an allusion to the prophecy, "The glory of the Lord is risen upon thee... Nations
20. "ἀληθῶς μὲν δὲ ἐλληνὶς ἔτι ἐκ τῶν ἀναβαίνων ἦν προσκυνήσας ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ 21. οὗτος οὖν προσήλυτος Φιλίππης τῷ ἱστό τῆς Βηθσαϊδᾶς τῆς Γαλααίας, καὶ ἠρώτων αὐτόν λέγοντες Κύριε, θλιμμένος (ὠθή) shall come to thy light, and kings to thy brightness" (Isa. 60:1). Yet it must be owned that if vv. 23-28 are to be interpreted as addressed in particular to the Greeks whom Jesus now saw for the first time, the use of the Jewish title "Son of Man" (see Introd., p. cxxii) is puzzling (v. 23); and it is even more difficult to suppose that Jesus revealed to these strangers the anguish of His soul in words like those of v. 27. It is possible that vv. 20-22 should be linked as closely with v. 19, but as having no special relation with vv. 23 ff., a new paragraph beginning at v. 23 (where see note).

ὃν δὲ ἔλεγεν ἔτι (this is the reading of ΝΒΔΛΨ, as against ἔλεγεν of the rec. text) ἐκ τῶν ἀναβαίνων (for ἀναβαίνων of "going up" to Jerusalem, cf. 2:12) ἐν προσκυνήσεσιν (see on 4:20 for the absolute constr. of προσκυνήσεως) ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ. Among (ἐκ) those who went up to the feast were many strangers (cf. 1 Kings 8:41). These men were not ἐλληνικοί, i.e. Greek-speaking Jews (see on 7:58), but ἐλληνικοί, Greeks who had become proselytes of the gate, and accordingly attended the Jewish festivals (see Acts 17:4 for "devout Greeks" at Thessalonica); and cf. Acts 26:8 for the Ethiopian eunuch who came up to Jerusalem to worship. To such proselytes the Court of the Gentiles in the Temple precincts was appropriated. It was from this court (see on 2:8) that the moneychangers and the cattle were expelled by Jesus on the occasion when He cleansed the Temple; and if this episode is rightly placed by the Synoptists in the last week of Jesus' ministry (but see on 4:25), the Greek inquirers may have been moved to seek speech with Him by the impression which His strong action had made on them, as well as by the reports of the raising of Lazarus.

21. οὗτος οὖν προσήλυτος Φιλίππης τῷ ἱστό τῆς Βηθσαϊδᾶς τῆς Γαλααίας. For the notices of Philip in Jn., see on 7:43. He had a Greek name, and this may have encouraged the Greek proselyte to speak to him. They may have come from the Greek cities of Decapolis.

Objection has been taken to the phrase "Βηθσαῖδης τῆς Γαλααίας," i.e. Bethsaida Julia, for no other Bethsaida is known (see on 6:4), on the ground that the next appearance of this descriptive title is in Claudia Polleneus (c. 140 A.D.), and that such language suggests a second-century writer. But there is abundance of evidence that the north-eastern side of the lake, where Bethsaida is situated, was reckoned as in the province of Galilee by the year a.d. 82. The Greeks address Philip with respect, as κύριος, "Sir." He was not a Rabbi or teacher, but κύριος was an appropriate mode of address from those who saw in Philip the disciple and friend of One on whom they looked with reverential admiration (see on 1:26).

θλιμμένος τῶν Ἰσραήλ ῥωτεῖν. There is no suggestion that they understood or imagined that Jesus was the Christ. They say τῶν Ἰσραήλ (using His personal name; cf. 1:26), not τῶν Ἰσραήλ. And they mean by "seeing Him, having a private conversation; any one could see Him in the Temple courts, but they wished for something more intimate. The request may well have embarrassed Philip. The Twelve had been forbidden to preach to Gentiles (Mt. 10:6); and although the Jews at Jerusalem had wondered whether one of the mysterious sayings of Jesus could mean that He proposed "to teach the Greeks" (7:58), it is a question how far Jesus had explained to the apostles the full scope of His mission. This has been considered above (see on 10:58); but we must mark here that although in the Fourth Gospel the Gentiles are more explicit than in the Synoptists brought within the range of Jesus' mission, it is in that Gospel that we can most clearly trace a hesitation on the part of one of the Twelve to admit that Jesus has a message for Greeks as well as for Jews. As has been said above (on v. 20), we are not told whether Jesus gave an interview to these inquirers or whether He refused it.

22. ἔρχεται δὲ Φιλίππης καὶ λέγει τῷ Ἄνδρει. For the close association between Philip and Andrew, and for the vivid characterisation of each of which is apparent in Jn., see on 6. Philip is cautious, perhaps a little dull; Andrew is the practical man to whom others appeal in a difficulty. Andrew is one of the inner circle of the Twelve (Mt. 13:10), and perhaps might venture to proffer an unusual request to Jesus, where Philip would hesitate.

For the second ἔρχεται the rec. text has καὶ πάλιν, omitting καὶ before λέγειν. But the best-attested reading is ἔρχεται Άνδρεας καὶ Φιλίππης καὶ λέγοντες τῷ Ἰησοῦ. The singular ἔρχεται followed by the plur. λέγοντες is quite a classical usage in the LXX. and the like.

1 See Sunday, Sacred Sites, p. 95; G. A. Smith, Hist. Geogr. of Holy Land, p. 458; Ehr. Text and Testament, pp. 265 ff.; the last-named work giving a full discussion of the situation of Bethsaida.
Jesus announces His impending Passion (v. 23): here is the supreme exemplification of the Law of Life through Death (v. 24-26)

23. ὁ δὲ Ἰσραήλ ἀπεκρίνεται ἀπερτῶς λέγων Ἐλαμβάνειν ἡ ὁρα ἵνα

The Greek may have heard what He said, but there is no hint of it in what follows.

For the unusual constr. ἀπεκρίνεται λέγων, see on ἔρωσις; and cf. ἀκούειν ἦ ὁρα. The time of the Passion had come. Cf. ἢ ἔλαμβαν ἡ ὁρα ὅρα and ἔλαμβαν οὕτως ἔρως. The phrase occurs in the Synoptics only in the account of the words of Jesus at Gethsemane immediately before the Betrayal, ἢ ἔλαμβαν ἦ ὁρα, Mk. 14, Mt. 26, (cf. ἢ κατά τὸ καιρόν ἔγραψεν ἔσται, Mt. 26, which was said at an earlier stage, before the preparation of the Last Supper).

The Fourth Gospel is written throughout, as Jesus Himself spoke, sub specie aeternitatis. He is represented as knowing from the beginning the time and manner and sequel of the end of His public ministry in the flesh. Twice in this Gospel He is made to say "my time (καιρός) is not yet come" (7, 8); and twice Jn. comments "His hour (ὥρα) was not yet come" (7, 9, see on τό).

It will be noticed that, with the possible exception of this passage (4), the phrase "the hour has come" is always (1 τό 17, Mk. 14) applied to the hour immediately before the Betrayal. It is not used loosely, as if it only meant "the time is near," and in every case the verb ἔλαμβαν (ἤλαμβαν) comes first, the phrase ἔλαμβαν ἦ ὁρα being strikingly and austere impressively and final. Its presence suggests that what is about to be narrated relates to the last scenes, and we shall see (on v. 27) that there are some indications that in what follows Jn. is giving us his version of the prayers of Jesus at Gethsemane.

 infuriat in ὅρα ἔλαμβαν ἦ ὁρα ἔλαμβαν ἦ ὁρα ἔλαμβαν ἦ ὁρα, "the hour is come that the Son of Man should be glorified." For ἔλαμβαν ἦ "glorified," see in His Death, see on τό, and cf. 7, 8. This is quite a different use of ἔλαμβαν from that of ἔλαμβαν, where ἔλαμβαν ἦ ὁρα ἔλαμβαν ἦ ὁρα "means "that the Son of God might be glorified" by the manifestation of the Father's power in the recovery of Lazarus. Here, with the
This great saying may have been repeated by Jesus more than once, representing as it does the central lesson of His teaching and His life. In the Marcan tradition it is placed after the Confession of Peter (Mk. 8:34; Mt. 16:16; Lk. 9:18), when Jesus began to tell the Twelve that His Mission would issue in death. It is found also in other settings in the Mk.-Lk. tradition (Mt. 10:35, Lk. 17:32), where it comes from the source Q. In its most literal meaning it was applicable to the choice between martyrdom and apostasy, which Christians of the first century (as well as later) were sometimes called to make. But selfishness is always the death of the true life of man.

The strong expression “hatheth his life” (ο μετω την ψυχήν αυτήν) is softened down in the Synoptic parallels, but it is found in another context, Lk. 14:25.

26. In this verse is the third illustration of the paradox of v. 23, that the Passion of Jesus is His glorification. The life of ministry is a life of honour.

εάν ἔμαι τῷ διακονῷ κ.τ.λ. The doctrine of diakonía, i.e., of the dignity of ministry, occupies a large place in all the Gospels. It is, naturally, an instinct of discipleship to minister to a master; and the ministry of women disciples to Jesus (Mk. 1:30; 14:12; Lk. 10:40). Jn. 13:23 needs no special comment (Lk. 17). But the repeated teaching of Jesus goes much beyond this. He taught that the path to pre-eminence in His Kingdom is the path of service, of ministry (Mt. 10:30; 16:28, Lk. 23:42), and that true greatness cannot be otherwise attained (Mk. 10:42). Actually, the test by which His professed disciples shall be judged at the Last Judgment is the test of ministry; have they ministered to man, and therefore to Christ? (Mt. 25:31). This is the essential of discipleship, for ministry was the essential characteristic of the life of Christ, who came not διακονήθης ἀλλα
27. Νῦν ἡ ψυχὴ μου πέτακαν, καὶ τί εἶτω; ἐμπέθερς, σῶσόν με

Lk. 22:45. Indeed, no passage in Jn. illustrates so powerfully as this the words of Mk. 14:36 ὁ μὲν πνεύμα πρόῳ θυσίαν, ἢ δὲ σῶψ ἀκρότητι. And, finally, in Lk.'s narrative the sequel of the Agony is διότι δὲ ἀλήθεια ἐγγυνος ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐνεχος συνών (Lk. 22:46). Is this another version of Jn. 12:38 ἰδεῖν ἰδεῖν, ἐγγυνος ὁ ἄνθρωπος;? It is noteworthy that while Mk., followed by Mt., asserts that John the son of Zebedee was present with Peter and James when the Agony of spirit began (Mk. 14:38), Lk. does not mention the names of any disciples as specially witnesses of the scene in the garden. The tradition of Mk. is different from the tradition of Lk.; and it would seem that the tradition of Jn. as to the Agony is different from both of his predecessors. Such a crisis of spiritual decision may, indeed, have recurred, Jn. mentioning the earlier occasion, while the Synoptists tell only of the later. But even this does not give a complete solution of the questions raised by the divergences of the evangelists in regard to the Agony; for Jn. at 18:11 puts the saying, "The cup which the Father hath given me, shall I not drink it?" (cf. Mk. 14:26, Lk. 22:48), into the mouth of Jesus at Gethsemane (although after His arrest) and not in connexion with the narrative of c. 18.

Nor, again, is it a sufficient explanation to say that Jn. does not narrate the Agony in the garden because he wishes to bring out the Divine self-surrender exhibited in the last scenes; for Jn. all through his Gospel lays special stress on the human emotions which Jesus felt. Jn. knew of the Agony in the garden, but we cannot tell why he chooses to reproduce some of the words then spoken by Jesus at the point in the narrative which we have now reached, rather than in what is (apparently) the proper place, viz. c. 18.

"now, at last": the hour had come; cf. v. 23.

ἐἴμι, ἡμέρα ἡ μόνῃ τετράδης. Cf. 12:24 and 13:18, where see the note. As is shown, we cannot in such phrases distinguish ψυχή from πνεύμα. His "soul" was troubled. See the note on 4 to the emphasis laid by Jn. on the complete humanity of Jesus; and cf. Ps. 42: ὅσιος ἐγώ ἐστιν ἐν ὕπατρίῳ μου ἲπαρσίδα (cf. also Ps. 69). This troubling of spirit was truly human (Heb. 5).

καὶ τί εἶμι; "and what shall I say?" εἶμι, the deliberative subjunctive (see Abbott, Dict. 2512), being used to express a genuine, if momentary, indecision.

πάντες, σώσόν με ἐν τῇ δοξῇ ταύτῃ. This is the natural, human prayer of One face to face with a cruel death.

XII. 27-28. JESUS' AGONY OF SPIRIT

ἐκ τῆς δοξῆς ταύτης. ἀλλὰ δὲ τοῦτο ἤλθον ἐς τῇ δοξῇ ταύτῃ.

28. πάντες, δοξασθήτω τῷ δυναμικῷ ἐν τῇ δοξῇ ταύτῃ.

For σώσαν so on 31.

pántes. So Jesus was accustomed to begin His prayers; see on 11. For the aor. imper. εἴμι, see on 29.

ἐκ τῆς δοξῆς ταύτῃ: the hour had come (v. 23), and He wished to be saved from its horrors. No distinction can be drawn between ἐκ and ἐν in a constr. like this (see on 14:6). ἀλλὰ δὲ τοῦτο ἐνα, "and yet for this very purpose," sc. that His ministry should be consummated in the Passion, "did I come to this hour?" cf. 18:12. He cannot now draw back from the accomplishment of what He had come to do, in fulfilment of the mission He had received. "Concurrebat horror mortis et ardor obedientiae" (Bengel).

28. πάντες, δοξασθήτω τῷ δυνατῷ, "Father (see preceding verse), make Thy Name glorious," sc. in the fulfilment of the mission of Redemption, which was the Passion of Christ. As "save me from this hour" is the prayer of the σῶμα, so this is the prayer of the πνεύμα, willing to suffer all, if thereby the Name of God may be glorified. For "the Name" of God, as expressing His character revealed in and by the Son, see on 14:31 171. The "glory" of His Name is His glory as exhibited in the world (cf. Isa. 63:14 66), and that the Father was "glorified" in the Death of Jesus is said again at 13:10, where see note.

In Ps. 79: we have βασιλέως ὑμῶν, δ θεὸς δ σωτὴρ ὑμῶν, ἰδεῖν τῆς δόξης τοῦ ἀνώτατος σου, but the Psalmist's prayer was that the people might be delivered, and that in this deliverance the glory of the Name might be exhibited. Here the prayer is not for deliverance; it is a prayer of submission to what was impending, because through the Passion God's Name would be glorified. This is the most complete and perfect example of the prayer enjoined upon every disciple, ἥγαστριο ἐν τῇ δοξῇ σου (Mt. 6). In the Lord's Prayer this comes first, before any petition; it is the condition to be accepted before the petition "deliver us from evil" can be offered. But in the case of Jesus it involved the surrender of all thought of such deliverance. "Glorify Thy Name" carries with it the "Thy will be done" of resignation.

There is a variant reading (Lk. 1, 13, 33), δοξασθήτω σου τὸν τὸν, which may (as Abbott suggests, Dict. 2762), being used by the misreading of a scribal, τοῦνα being written τοῦς, and then τοὺς at the end of a line being read as τοῦρ, "the Son." But it is more likely that δοξασθήτω σου τὸν τὸν has been imported here from 172; and the fact that D adds τῷ τῆς
figuration (Mk. 9) of Jesus, and the present verse. In both the
Synoptic passages, 
the bath-gôl or heavenly Voice speaks in almost the same words. It
combines Ps. 2 and Isa. 42: "Thou art My Son... My chosen in whom My soul delighteth"; that is, it was expressed in
Scripture phrases. Jn. does not tell of the Transfiguration,
and he says nothing about the voice from heaven at the Baptism
(cf. 1:23). But he mentions here a bath-gôl of which, on the
other hand, the Synoptists say nothing. Even if we are right
in regarding vv. 28–30 as the Johannine version of the agonised
prayer at Getsemane, there is nothing in any of the Synoptic
accounts of Getsemane which corresponds with this comforting
voice, although Lk. (23:46) tells of angelic ministration.

That is, according to the Gospel narratives, heavenly voices
were heard by Jesus at three great moments of crisis and
consecration in His ministry: after His Baptism, at His Trans-
figuration, and just before His Passion. In no case is it said
that others understood or interpreted these "voices"; and if
we put this into our modern ways of speech, we should say
that their messages were subjective in the sense that they
conveyed a meaning to none but Him to whom they were
addressed, while objective in the sense that He was not deluded
or deceived, for they were truly messages from God.

In v. 28 the Voice is an answer to the prayer δέξαι
to δοκέω, and according to Jn. it said to Jesus καὶ δοκέω καὶ
πάλιν δοκέω, i.e. "I did glorify My Name, and will glorify it
again." This is not a quotation from the O.T., as the bath-gôl
often was, although there are O.T. passages verbally like it.
The pregnant saying of 1 Sam. 22:12, and the promise of Divine deliverance in Ps. 91:13, which ends
ἐγέλασαν καὶ δοκέων ἔδραν, both speak of God "glorifying"
His pious servants; but the thought here is of God glorifying
His own Name, which is quite different. The bath-gôl, if it
may be so called, in this passage is of the nature of an echo,
the word "glorify" in the prayer being twice repeated in
answer. It is just possible, as Abbott suggests (Dist. 178 f.),
that we should illustrate this by the one or two instances of an
echoing bath-gôl that appear in the Talmud. But, whether
this be so or not, it is plain that Jn. means us to understand
that a sound was heard after Jesus had prayed, which
conveyed an assurance to Him that His prayer was answered, while
at the same time it impressed the bystanders with the sense that,
at all events, something unusual was taking place.

δέξασθαι, as e.g., at the raising of Lazarus, where the
spectators saw τὸν δέξαν τὸν θνῄς (11:45). All the
cases of Jesus during His earthly ministry were ad maiorem Dei gloriæ.
THE PASSION A JUDGMENT
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32. καὶ γέγονεν ἄλλα δ' ἔμαθεν. 31. τῶν κρατών ἐστιν τοῦ κόσμου τοῦτον· τῶν δ' ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τοῦτον ἐνθαλμάτα ἔχει· 32. καὶ γέγονεν ἄλλα δ' ἔμαθεν. 31. τῶν κρατών ἐστιν τοῦ κόσμου τοῦτον· τῶν δ' ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τοῦτον ἐνθαλμάτα ἔχει· 32. καὶ γέγονεν ἄλλα δ' ἔμαθεν.

intended only to impress the crowd. No doubt, it might be said that the sound, whatever it was, suggested to the crowd that they would do well to mark what was happening, for it seemed to be a heavenly signal in answer to the prayer of Jesus. It was the signal for the judgment of the world (v. 31), now beginning. But we cannot attach any meaning to the words καὶ γέγονεν ἄλλα δ' ἔμαθεν (v. 28), which the crowd were not able to catch (v. 29), if they had no significance for Jesus. It was to Him that the heavenly Voice seemed to come, and in coming to give assurance to His spirit, that His impending Death was to the greater glory of God. It is not impossible that v. 30 has been added by the evangelist, in order to emphasise the voluntariness of Christ's surrender of Himself, as a superhuman Person who needed no support for His soul even in this dark hour. But v. 31, for all that, follows v. 30 in a true sequence: "The Voice was on your account. For now is the world of men like you being judged."

The Passion is conceived of as already begun (see John v. 23 and 7:38). It is a judging (κρίνειν), a testing of men (see 2:23, 9:18).

For τῶν κρατῶν τοῦτον, see on 8:23, and v. 25 above.

The phrase ἃ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τοῦτον appears again 14:30 16:11, but nowhere else in the N.T. (cf., however, ὁ θεὸς τῶν αἰώνων τοῦτον 2 Cor. 4:4 and Eph. 2:2). The title "the ruler of this world" is applied to Belial in the earlier part of the Ascension of Isaiah (i. 3, ii. 4, x. 29), which is probably contemporary with the Fourth Gospel; and Ignatius has ἃ ἄρχων τῶν αἰώνων τοῦτον several times, e.g. Eph. xvii. xix. According to Lightfoot (Hor. Hebr. in loc.) σφήκη ὑπὸ ἦν a well-known Jewish title for Satan 1 (for so Samseal, the Angel of Death), and it may be that the Johannine ἃ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τοῦτον goes back to this.

"The prince of this world has been already judged" (16:11); but here is in view the issue of the judgment, when he shall be finally cast out (ἐκβαλθῆναι ἐκ τῆς γῆς) of the world over which he claims dominion (cf. 1 Jn. 4). For ἐκβαλλοντες ἐκ, see on 6:63.

29. τὸν ἑαυτὸν ἐκ τῆς γῆς, sc. on the Cross. See the note on 11:4; and cf. 5:20. ἐκ τῆς γῆς is "from the earth" and not "out of the earth," as R.V. marg. has it, and as Westcott interprets because he finds the Ascension indicated here by ἐκβαλλοντες.

1 cf. also Schlaeffer, Die Sprache, etc., p. 121.
who is this son of man? 443

34. *Apostropho ouv aitw \( \delta \) blos h' hematides tov vnomou oti o xristos menei eis tov aionan, kai tov legen sti oti de dymiourgai tov thion tov athanaton, tis exis othos o thion tov athanaton;*

*The people ask who the "Son of Man" is (v. 34), and Jesus warns them to use the light while they can (vv. 35, 36).*

34. \( \theta ' \) apok. ouv aitw \( \epsilon \nu \). BLBW support \( \epsilon \nu \), which \( \Theta \) and the rec. text omit.

*Hematides tov vnomou oti o xristos menei eis tov aionan. "The Law" (see on 10:23) often includes more than the Pentateuch, and the reference is somewhat vague. Ezek. 37:25 has "David my servant shall be their prince for ever"; Ps. 89:11b are apposite, as also Isa. 51. Cf. Orac. Sibyll. iii. 767, and Psalms of Solomon, xvii. 4.*

\( \tau ' \) wov legein oti de dymiourgai tov thion tov athanaton; tis exis othos o thion tov athanaton; We have seen (Introd., p. cxxiii) that Jesus habitually spoke of Himself in the third person as "the Son of Man," and Jn. implies here that Jesus had used this way of speech when He said that He would be "lifted up," i.e., crucified. But His present hearers did not understand what He meant; they were not accustomed to His habits of speech, and the title "the Son of Man" was unfamiliar to them (cf. 5:28). "Who is this 'Son of Man?'" they asked. The form of the question is exactly the same as tis exis othos o thion tov athanaton; (178). There is no emphasis on othos in either passage. We must not translate "Who is this Son of Man," as if there were another "Son of Man," of whom they had often heard; for Jn. does not express emphasis by such a use of othos, and "the Son of Man" was not a recognized title of the Christ.

On the other hand, if we could suppose that in popular speech the Christ was sometimes called "the Son of Man," the meaning of the passage would be somewhat different. It would represent the crowd as puzzled that any one should seem to tell them that the Christ was to suffer a dishonourable death. "The Son of Man must be crucified, you say... Who can this Son of Man be?... He cannot be the Christ or the Son of Man of Daniel's vision (Dan. 7:13), whose dominion is to be everlasting." Cf. Exod. lix. 14. "With that Son of Man will they eat and lie down and rise up for ever." But if this was what the objectors meant, we should have expected them to say, "the Son of Man abides for ever," rather than "the Christ abides for ever," as more apposite to the objection which they are putting forward. We prefer the view that the

---

1 Cf. Introd., p. cxxiii.
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35. εἶτεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς Ἐστι μικρὸν χρόνον τὸ φῶς ἐν ἡμῖν ἐτῶν. περιπατήτευτε ὡς τὸ φῶς ἦτο, ίαν μὴ σκοτία ἐμάς καταλαβέτω καὶ ὁ περατῶν ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ οὐκ οἴδατε ποῦ ἄφηνεν. 36. ὁ τὸ φῶς ἦτο, περιπατήτευν εἰς τὸ φῶς, ἵνα ψέφισης γάρφην.

The title "Son of Man" as applied to Messiah was unfamiliar to them.

There is a passage in Justin (Tryph. 32) which recalls their argument on any interpretation. Justin has quoted Dan. 7, and Trypho the Jew objects, "These scriptures indeed compel us to expect that Great and Glorious One who as a son of man receives the eternal kingdom from the Ancient of Days; but this your so-called Christ became dishonoured and inglorious so that he fell under the last curse in the law of God (Deut. 21:29), for he was crucified." The Jews, with whom Trypho was in accord, did not expect a Suffering Messiah.

38. "Who is this Son of Man?" Jesus does not answer the question, or explain Himself further. But He repeats the austere warning which He gave before (9:4 and 20), where see note), that He would not be much longer among them: it would only be μετά χρόνου, "for a little while." Even this He expresses in mystic words which not all could have understood in their fulness; or, at least, the evangelist represents Him as speaking only indirectly of Himself and His approaching departure, when He said εἰ μὴ χρόνον τὸ φῶς ἐν ὑμῖν ἐστιν. He had claimed to be the Light of the World (8:12), but not many had believed that the Light was really among them, or had grasped what was meant.

ἐν δρόμῳ is the true reading (nBDWθ and the Latin vers.) rather than the rec., μετὰ ἡμῖν (A). Cf. for ἐν as equivalent to "among," Acts 4:26; and note ἐνπρὸς ἐν ἡμῖν (2:19).

He goes on with an exhortation: "Walk while ye have the light." ὡς τὸ φῶς ἦτο, ποῦ ἔστε ἐν τῷ δόξῳ τοῦ θεοῦ (2:19). For περιπατήσετε as used of conduct, cf. 8:18, and see especially 9:18, 19.

τὸ μὴ κοιμᾷ ὑμᾶς καταλαβὲτω, "lest darkness overtake you," and so get the better of you. See on 18, the only other place where καταλαβέτω is found in Jn. (but cf. 8:58 and note on 5:17); and cf. 1 Thess. 5, where the "day" is said to "overtake" one engaged in dark pursuits.

The second half of the verse is almost verbally identical with 1 Jn. 2:11 ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ περιπατήσατε καὶ οὐκ οἴδατε ποῦ ἄφηνεν. See 11:8.

44. Ἰησοῦς ἔ σκαβεν καὶ ἔ συν. The def. art. is omitted here before Ἰησοῦς, contrary to the usual usage of Jn. (see on 1:2). But He often omits it in the phrase ἐσκαβάτη Ἰησοῦς (see on 1:29), which is like the phrase here. For ἐσκαβάεσον, see on 7:33.

ἡ πιστεύσει εἰς ἐμὲ καθ., "he that believeth on me, believes not on me (only), but on Him that sent me." The affirmative sentence, followed by a negative clause to bring out the sense, is thoroughly Johannine. See on 1:20; and cf. 3:13.

1 Cf. Deissmann, Bible Studies, pp. 161 ff., for a full discussion of ἐσκαβάεσον with a genitive following.
For εἰς... (46) a characteristically Johannean construct, see on 1:18; and for the idea of the Father "sending" the Son, which is so frequent in Jn., see on 3:17. Cf. v. 49.

That he who believes on (or accepts) the Son accepts the Father, is a saying found in the Synoptists: ἀμὴν λεγεῖν τὸν θεὸν, ἐν αὐτῷ ὁ πνεύματα ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ μὴ ἀπολέσῃ (Mt. 10:36; cf. Lk. 9:26). Jn. here substitutes his favourite word πνεύματα for δύναμεις, and also uses πνεύματα for ἀστυνόμους (see on 2:17); but in 10:20 (where see note) he has λαμβάνεις instead of πνεύματα in a second citation of this saying of Jesus.

Cf. 5:29 πνεύματα τῆς πέμψεως μου, and (for the general sense of the verse) 8:18, 21. In 14:1 the argument is turned round: "Ye believe in God; believe also in me." 48. ἀμὴν λεγεῖν τὸν θεὸν. The verb is used here (as at 5:6 14:19) of spiritual vision. Not all those who saw Jesus with bodily eyes "saw the Father." For θεωρεῖν, see on 2:23; and cf. the saying ἑωρακαί ἐμὸν ὄρασιν τὸν πατέρα (14:9, where see note). So at v. 41 Jn. identifies the δόσις of Christ with the δόσις of God. Cf. 8:19.

τὸν πνεύματα μου. Ἡμ. 13 read ἀστυνόμους (see on 3:17 for πνεύματα and ἀστυνόμους). 49. ἅμα φοίνικα εἰς τὸν κόσμον διάφημα. Cf. 2:19 τὸ φῶς λαμβάνον εἰς τὸν κόσμον, and 5:24 ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐγώ ἐμὸν τὸν κόσμον. That Christ is the Light of the world is a principal topic with Jn.; cf. also 1:6, 8, 18.

In a ὅτι (B om. ἐν ἀστυνόμους) τὸ πνεύμα εἰς ἐμὸν κλη, "in order that every one that believeth in me may not remain in darkness" (going back to v. 35), SC. in the darkness which is the normal state of man before the revelation of Christ (cf. 1 Jn. 2:11). The form of the sentence is that of 3:18 ἐν τῷ πνεύματι ἐκ τῶν αἰωνίων μὴ ἀπόλεσῃ, and the meaning is the same, although a different metaphor is employed. Christos Illuminator is Christos Soter. 50. ἅμα πνεύμα ἐκ τῶν ἰδιωτῶν, SC. with appreciation and understanding of what they signify: if it were only the mere physical hearing that was meant, ἀστυνόμου would take the acc., and we should have τὰ διήθματα. See on 3:21. It is only the man who is neglectful of Christ’s words, while understanding them at all the time, that is here contemplated.

ὅμοιος ὁ δόξα. So sàbdlw, but rec. has πνεύματα. D@ on μονογενὴς, πνεύματα, the motive apparently being to place vv. 47 and 48 in sharp contrast. But v. 48 is, in fact, a reaffirmation of v. 47; the distinction suggested by Westcott,
sent Him, and thus provides the ultimate test by which men are judged.

He had said this before (5:22). We cannot distinguish δὲ ἐξαντλῶν from ἐξ ἐντολῆς; see on 5:21. As He had said that He could do nothing of Himself (5:19), so now He declares of His words that they, too, are words of the Father. For His "mission" from the Father, see on 3:17 and the references given there.

ὁ αὐτὸς μεν ἐν τῷ ἑαυτῷ, "Himself hath given me commandment..." the perfect tense expressing continuing action (cf. 1:42). The reg. ἑαυτῷ has only secondary uncial support. See 1:17 πᾶς ὁ πάτερ καὶ ἡ δόξα μοι ἐδώκαν αὐτὸς; and cf. 10:18, 42, 18:2 for the ἐντολὴ of the Father to Christ. Of the Prophets to come (Deut. 18:18), Yahweh had said, "I will put my words in His mouth, and He shall speak unto them all that I shall command Him." Indeed, the formula of all the prophets was, "Thus saith Yahweh." 

τι εἶναι καὶ τι λαλῆσαι. Perhaps both the substance and the form of His words are suggested by the two verbs; but it seems simpler to treat them as identical in meaning here (see 3:30, v. 50), the repetition being in the style of dignity.

Justin (17:6) recalls this Johannine doctrine of the relation of the Son to the Father: "He never did anything except what God willed Him to do or to speak" (φεολογία καὶ πράξει καὶ ἔνθεσιν).

50. καὶ οὐδὲ ἦν κατ' θελ. Cf. 5:28 5:29, this form of solemn assurance being used in each case by Jesus, when speaking of His knowledge of the "witness" or "commandment" of God, or of God Himself.

καὶ εἶναι ἐν Οὐρανῷ ἀφοί τόσον. See for τοῦ ἀποκλείσας on 3:18; and cf. 6:4, where Peter confesses to Jesus ἰδοὺ ὁ θεὸς ἀποκλείσας ἑαυτὸν ἐκείνον. It is instructive to recall the Synoptic story that the answer to the young man who asked τι ποιήσω ἵνα ἑξονταμενον αἰλουρομοῦν; was to refer him to the Ten Commandments ( Mk. 10:16). It is not only for Jn. but for the Synoptics too, that the Divine Commandment, when fully realised, is Eternal Life, although in the Synoptists the idea of eternal life as already present is only latent and is not made explicit.

καὶ εἶρην μοι ἐπὶ πάντα ἅμα ὅμως λαλῶ. This is the secret of the absolute value of the words of Jesus; cf. 8:28 and 14:24.4

XII. 36-38. THE UNBELIEF OF THE JEWS

36. Ταύτα δὲ ἁλληγορεῖ Ἡσαύρα, καὶ ἀποκλείσας ἐναπόθερον δὲ αὐτῶν. 37. Ὅταν, δὲ αὐτὸς σημαίνει καταπληκτικοὺς εἰσαγομένων αὐτῶν αὐτὸν ἐπιστάσεως εἰς αὐτῶν, 38. ἵνα δὲ λόγος Ἰσαὰκ τοῦ προφήτου πληρωθῇ

The final rejection of the Jews: the evangelist's comments on their unbelief as foreordained in prophecy (vss. 36-43)

36b. It is explained above (on v. 44) that the section vss. 44-50 has been transposed, so as to place v. 44 immediately after v. 36a. Thus the connexion of ideas is unbroken, and we now come to v. 36b.

"These things spake Jesus, and He departed and bid Himself from them." This is the conclusion of Part II. of the Gospel, the climax of the Jerusalem ministry, the rejection of Jesus by the Jews. He had hidden Himself before (5:26), when the Jews sought to stone Him; but He went into seclusion now because He had given His last warning. The time for teaching was over.

In Mk. (5:37-36) the final word to the Jews is, "Watch, lest the Master coming suddenly find you sleeping." But the final word in Jn. is more sombre, and is suggestive in its phrases of the judgment that afterwards came on the Jews: "Walk while ye have the Light, lest darkness overtake you... While ye have the Light, believe in the Light" (vss. 35, 36). He had reiterated His augutet claims (vss. 44-50), and then He withdrew. Jn. does not say where He withdrew, but according to Lk. 21:36 it seems to have been in Bethany that He passed the last nights.

37. Verses 37-43 contain an explanatory commentary by the evangelist upon the Rejection of Jesus by the Jews, its causes and its extent.4

τοῦτος, "so many" (cf. 6:21), not "so great." For the term ἑαυτῷ, see on 2:23. Many had believed in consequence of the "signs" that had been wrought; cf. 5:40 6:7 11:45, 46, it being clear that Jn. knew of many "signs" other than those which he describes (cf. 20:26). But the nation as a whole did not accept Him (cf. 11:31 12:22 26:29), although some in high station were among those that believed, while they were afraid to confess it (v. 48). For the constr. ἐπιστάσεως εἰς αὐτῶν, see on 12:48.

38. Jn. does not hesitate to say that the unbelief of the Jews was "in order that..." the prophecies of Isaiah should be fulfilled. ἵνα πληρωθῇ must be given its full telic force, see Intro, p. cliv. Paul (Rom. 10:14) quotes Isa. 53 to illustrate this unbelief and as a prophecy of it, but he does not say ἵνα πληρωθῇ. As Jn. does (cf. 14:19).

4 Cf. Intro, p. xxx. 4 Cf. Intro, p. xxxiv.
THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN [XII. 38-40.

καρδία καὶ ὦταρκαὶ, καὶ ἱδαπάτα: καὶ ἀπολύεται ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἰσραήλ, 38. διὰ τοῦτο ἐξεσάρξωσαν ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἰσραήλ. 39. διὰ τοῦτο ἐξεσάρξωσαν ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἰσραήλ. 40. Τούτων ἔχουν ἀπόκρυφα τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς καὶ ὑπονοοῦντας ἀπόκρυφα τῆς καρδίας, ἐστὶ μὴ ὑπονοοῦντας τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς καὶ ὑπονοοῦντας τῆς καρδίας.

The quotation is from Isa. 53:1-2, introduced by the opening word ψῆφος, which is also added in the LXX. Here, probably, Jn. is influenced by the LXX version.

There was a twofold fulfilment: (1) the people did not believe the words of Jesus, and (2) they did not recognise the "arm of the Lord" in His signs. In the O.T. the "arm of God" is often figurative of His power (Deut. 31, cf. Lk. 11), especially in Deutero-Isaiah (46:9-10; 53:9-10). One of the theses of Cyprian's Testimonii (v. 4) is "Quod Christus idem manu et brachium Dei," and he quotes Isa. 53:1-2 as here; but it would be to go beyond the evidence to conclude that this idea is in the thought of Jn.

40. διὰ τοῦτο, i.e. because of the prophetic words of Isaiah which follow: they had to be fulfilled, for they were the expression of Divine foreknowledge.1
di toû toû refers to what follows, not to what precedes; see note on 5:1, and cf. I Jn. 3.

διὰ τοῦτο, "because again Isaiah said, etc." 40. This second quotation, from Isa. 53:9, differs markedly from the LXX. (1) The LXX has altered the Hebrew, which ascribes the hardening of Israel's heart to God's agency, and throws the sentence into a passive form: ἐπαραγόμενα ἐκ τῆς καρδίας τῶν ἱδαπάτων καὶ τῶν ὄπισθων τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν. Jn., however, reproduces the sense (although not the exact phrases) of the Hebrew "He hath hardened their heart." (2) The LXX has μὴ ἐπέστρεψαν τοῖς πονηροῖς. Indeed 259 is actually reproduced in the Pesh. rendering of Isa. 66:1. Burney infers that Jn. is here translating direct from the Aramaic.

The passage Isa. 66:1 is quoted also by Mt. (3:19), who takes it verbally from the LXX. He places it in the mouth of Jesus Himself; it is not in Mt., as in Jn., an illustrative passage quoted by the evangelist. It is quoted also in Acts 28:28 from the LXX, where Paul is represented as applying its words to the Jews at Rome. Probably Isa. 66:1 was regarded by Christians from the beginning as predictive of the Rejection of Jesus by the Jews (cf. Mk. 14:62; Lk. 18:37).

The prophets often speak of people who "have eyes and

1Aramatic Origin, p. 160.

41. τοῦτο ἐξεσάρξωσαν Ἐσσαλ. see not, and ears and hear not" (Jer. 5:24, Ezek. 12:1; cf. Isa. 44:19), and the same thing may be observed in every age and country. The child's story of "Eyes and no Eyes" has a universal application. But Isa. 66:9 speaks of a penal blindness, an insensibility which was, as it were, a Divine punishment for sin. So at Isa. 44:19 we have, "He hath shut their eyes, that they cannot see; and their hearts, that they cannot understand." And in Deut. 29:4 the case of Moses when the Israelites did not recognise the meaning of the "signs" in Egypt is, "The Lord hath not given you an heart to know and eyes to see and ears to hear unto this day." Paul makes this doctrine his own: "God gave them eyes that they should not see, and ears that they should not hear" (Rom. 11:8). That sin causes a blindness of the soul, a moral insensibility to spiritual truths, is a law of the natural, that is of the Divine, order.

Jesus rebukes the multitudes (Mt. 8:14) who did not rightly interpret the miracle of the loaves, by saying, "Having eyes, see ye not? and having ears, hear ye not?" In explaining the Parable of the Sower to His disciples, while He did not explain it to the multitudes, He gave the reason, "Unto them that are without all things are done in parables, that seeing they may see and not perceive, and hearing they may hear and not understand, lest haply they should turn again and it should be forgiven them" (Mt. 13:14, Lk. 8:10). Mt. 13:13 gives the same saying, and represents Jesus as quoting Isa. 6:9 in full from the LXX, which does not ascribe the moral blindness of the people to the agency of God.

Jn., however, never shrinks from a direct statement of events as predestined; if things happened, it was because God intended them to happen. He does not attempt here to soften down the tremendous judgment of Isa. 6:9-10.

The verb πάνων has been generally translated "hardened." But this is a misleading rendering. Πάνων is synonymous, rather than harshness; and the prophet's πάνως αἰτῶν τῆς καρδίας is strictly parallel to the first half of the verse, τεταφθήκες αἰτῶν τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν. We should translate: "He hath blinded their eyes, and darkened their hearts," for πάνως τῆς καρδίας is precisely "blindness of heart." See 6:9 above; and cf. 8:14.

1Aramatic Origin, p. 160. 2See, for a full note on πάνων, J. A. Robinson, Ephesians, pp. 264 f. 3See, for a full note on πάνως, J. A. Robinson, Ephesians, p. 264 f.
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40-49. THE REJECTION OF JESUS

40. Ὅτι εἶδεν τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἠλάφυ φερί αὐτοῦ. 41. Ὅτις μέντοι καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἀρχιτῶν παλαιοῦ ἔποιοντο εἰς αὐτόν, ἀλλὰ διὰ to the rec. ἐπιστράφωσαν. I.WH have ἐπιστράφωσαν. Field points out that στράφωσαν is to be taken in a middle sense, "turn themselves"; cf. a similar usage at 20:14, 18.

41. The true reading is διότι (NAB), not διὰ of the rec. text or διὰ with W. It was not when Isaiah saw his vision of Yahweh and the seraphim that he announced the blindness of men's eyes (Isa. 6:2-10), but it was because the vision was so dazzling that he realised how far men were from being equal to it.

The vision was not with the eye of sense; it was spiritually that Isaiah "saw the Lord," a statement that the Targum characteristically softens by saying he saw the glory of the Lord. But Jn. goes further. He declares that in this vision Isaiah saw the glory of Christ, and spoke of Him (ἐδίδει τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, καὶ διὰ δύοννν ναί αὐτοῦ, αὐτοῦ necessarily referring to the same person in both limbs of the sentence). This illustrates well the freecy, so to speak, with which Jn. treats the O.T. In the vision of Isa. 6, the prophet contemplates the awful glory of the invisible God; but the evangelist, in affirming that he spoke of the glory of Christ, identifies Christ with the Yahweh of Israel. It was a later Christian thought that the Logos was the agent of the O.T. theophanies, and it may be that Jn. means to suggest this. In any case, he seems to be aware of the Targum which says that Isaiah saw the glory of Yahweh (see on 14).

48. ὅμως μέντοι. The Coptic Q omits both words. Neither of them is used by the Synoptists, ὅμως occurring again in N.T., only 1 Cor. 14, Gal. 3:19. For μέντοι, cf. 427:218 20a 21a.

τῶν ἀρχιτῶν, etc. the principal men in the Sanhedrin; cf. 47c, 48, and see on ἔρωτα for the composition of the Sanhedrin.

καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἀρχιτῶν, "even of the rulers," who were most difficult to convince, "many believed on Him" (for the constr. see on 14b, e.g. men like Nicodemus (3f) and Joseph of Arimathea. See note on ἀλλος for the phrase πολλῶν ἐπιστράφωσαν εἰς αὐτόν. The Pharisees had put it to the common folk, many of whom were attracted by Jesus (vv. 11, 37), as a test question, "Hath any of the rulers believed in Him?" (48d). This had now actually come to pass, but fear of the fanaticism of the Pharisees (cf. v. 19) prevented their belief from showing itself in open confession of the claims of Jesus. It has been suggested that the young ruler who made the Great Refusal may have been among these secret disciples.


PART III.—THE PASSION AND RESURRECTION (XIII.—XX.)

Hitherto the exoteric or public teaching of Jesus has been expounded: in Part I, as addressed to would-be disciples, and in Part II, to Jews, for the most part incredulous. In Part III, we have only the exoteric and private teaching reserved by Jesus for His chosen friends and future ambassadors.
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XIII. 1. ἔφοβος τοῦ γεγονότος τοῦ πάσχαν εἶχον ἵνα ἴδω συνεπεξεργάζεται ἵνα τοῖς κόσμοις πάντοις πρὸς τὸν Πάσχαν, ἀναφέρει τὸν οἶκον τοῦ ἄνω τοῦ κόσμου, ἵνα τὸν θάνατόν αὐτοῦ.

Part III. begins with a carefully constructed editorial introduction (13). It is noteworthy that, while vv. 1–3 are full of Johannine phrases, a greater use is made of subordinate and dependent clauses than is customary with Jn., who prefers parataxis in narration.

The Foot-washing at the Last Supper (vv. 1–11)

XIII. 1. ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπέκτεινεν ἀπὸ τοῦ λαβάνον, ἵνα διασαφώση τοῖς ἄλλοις. ὁ δ’ ἐστιν ἀποκάλυψις τοῦ Πάσχαν, ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τοῦ πάσχαν. The rec. has ἀποκάλυψις. D has παρατύφημι. For ἀπεκτείνειν (GrkBLWy) the rec. has ἀπεκτείνων. D has παρατύφημον. For ἀπεκτείνειν in the sense of “when,” see on 12.

ἐν μισθῷ κτλ. Harris has suggested that this is a Passover language; and in one of Bede’s Homilies we find “Pascha transitus libri interpretatur.” But κτλ. ἀπεκτείνειν is never used elsewhere in the Greek Bible with this suggestion. Its use here of a departure from this life to the unseen world is, indeed, also without Biblical parallels; but cf. 5. 14, 1 Jn. 2.

ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τοῦ πάσχαν. See for this phrase the note on 28. For κόσμος generally, see on 19.

πρὸς τὸν πατέρα. Christ’s departure or ascension is spoken of again as a “going to the Father,” 14. 28. 16. 28. τοῦ δὲ τοῦ κόσμου. They were “in the world,” as He said 17. 11, although in another sense they are distinguished from “the world,” out of which they had been given to Him (17. 9). These men He had loved.

eἰς τὸν θανάτον αὐτοῦ. To translate these words “He loved them unto the end,” although linguistically defensible, reduces the sentence to a platitude. This verse introduces an incident to which Jn. gives a good deal of space, and which he regards as of high consequence. “Jesus, knowing 1 See Expository Times, Nov. 1916, p. 88, and Feb. 1927, p. 235.

XIII. 1–2] HIS LOVE FOR HIS DISCIPLES

2. καὶ διδάσκων γνωμήν, τοῖς διδάσκοντες γνωμήν ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς τὸν κόσμον ἐν παραδόσει αὐτοῦ Ἰωάννου Ἰσχαρίωτης. 3. εἶπον δὲ ἵνα that His hour was come that He should depart out of this world unto the Father, . . .”. The reader expects that this solemn prelude is to be followed by a statement that Jesus did or said something of special significance. The statement is ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ, and it seems to mean, “He exhibited His love for them to the utmost,” i.e. in a remarkable manner.

First, as to ἔδωκεν. If “He continued to love them” were the meaning, we should expect the impf. rather than the aor. tense. The aor. indicates a definite act, rather than a continuing emotion; so ἔδωκεν in 3: 16 is used of the love of God as exhibited in the gift of His Son. Abbott (Dialog) quotes a similar Pauline use in Rom. 8: 9, Gal. 2: 2, Eph. 5: 2, and also Ignatius, Magn. 6. Thus ἔδωκεν may mean here “He showed His love,” i.e. by His action, unprecedented for a master, in washing the feet of His disciples. And so the words καθὼς ἔδωκεν ἔμεινεν ἀμφατῶς of v. 34 bear a definite reference to the ἔδωκεν in v. 1 and to the foot-washing which followed.

Secondly, ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου is often used as equivalent to “wholly,” or “utterly,” as at Jn. 3: 16, 1 Cor. 2: 6, 2 Mac. 8: 8, 1 Thess. 2: 16. Abbott (Dialog) cites Hermas, Pis. 111. x. 5, where ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου means “joyful exceeding,” or “joyful to the uttermost.” It can equally well mean “to the end,” e.g. Mt. 26: 59, where it is said that “he that endures ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου shall be saved”; but this rendering does not suit the context here.

Accordingly, we translate v. 1, “Jesus, knowing that His hour was come that He should depart out of this world unto the Father, having loved His own which were in the world, exhibited His love for them to the utmost,” i.e. gave that remarkable manifestation of His love for His disciples which is told in the narrative of the foot-washing that follows.

2. For γνωμήν (GrkBLWy) the rec. text, with ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς γνωμῆς, has γνωσθείς, which wrongly suggests that the supper was ended.

δεῖπνον γνωσθείς, “while a supper was going on,” “during supper,” there being no def. art. and no suggestion that this was the supper of the Passover feast, as the Synoptists state.

τοῦ διδάσκοντος ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου, κτλ., “the devil having already put it into the heart of Judas, etc.” So the Synoptists (Mk. 14, Mt. 26, Lk. 22) represent the matter, Judas having made his bargain with the chief priests on a previous day of the same week; Lk. alone (as Jn. does here) ascribing
the Paschal Feast, which Jn. pointedly does not do, there can be no doubt that Jn. 13 is intended to describe the same supper as that of Mk. 14, Mt. 26, Lk. 22. We cannot harmonise the various narratives precisely, but they have much in common. We place the incidents in order as follows:

1. The supper begins.
2. The disciples dispute about precedence (Lk. 22:24; not in Mk., Mt., Jn.).
3. Jesus washes the feet of the disciples, by His example rebuking their self-seeking, and bidding them remember that their Master was content to act as their slave (Jn. 13:1-10; cf. Jn. 13:14 and Lk. 22:28).
4. Jesus announces that a traitor is in their midst (Jn. 13:1-30; 11:18, 21, Mk. 14:18, Mt. 26:21, Lk. 22:11).
5. The disciples begin to ask which of them was thus designated (Jn. 13:21, Mk. 14:19, Mt. 26:21, Lk. 22:21).
6. Jesus tells John the beloved disciple that the traitor is the one to whom He will give the sop from the dish (Jn. 13:26-28; cf. Mk. 14:19, Mt. 26:21; not in Lk.).
7. Jesus gives the sop to Judas (Jn. 13:18), thus or otherwise conveys to Judas that He knows of his intentions (Mt. 26:22). This is not in Mk. or Lk., neither of whom at this point names Judas as the traitor.
8. Judas goes out at once (Jn. 13:30; not in Mk., Mt., Lk.).
10. Jesus predicts His impending Passion in the words, “I will no more drink of the fruit of the vine, until I drink it new in the kingdom of God” (Mk. 14:25, Mt. 26:28, Lk. 22:17; not given thus by Jn., but cf. Jn. 13:36-38 and 15:21).

On examination of this table, it will be noticed, first that Jn. and Mk. (whom Mt. follows) never disagree as to the order of the various incidents; the important differences being that Jn. describes the Feet-washing, which Mk. does not mention, and that he omits the Institution of the Eucharist. Jn. also tells that it was to the beloved disciple that Jesus conveyed the hint which might have enabled the company to have identified the traitor (see on 13:29); and he alone mentions expressly that Judas left the room.
The order, however, in which Lk. mentions the several incidents is different. His order is 1, 10, 9, 4, 5, 2, 11, omitting 3, 6, 7, 8; the most remarkable feature in his narrative being that he puts the announcement that a traitor was present after the Institution of the Eucharist, thus implying that Judas received the Bread and the Cup along with the rest. The position, also, which he gives to the mysterious saying numbered 10 above, differs from that assigned to it by Mk. and Mt. Lk., in short, follows a different tradition from that of Mk. and Mt. in his narrative of the Eucharist. The longer recension of the words of Institution as given by him (see Introd., p. cxvii) seems to have been derived from Paul; but that cannot be said of the Western version, which may be the original. From whatever source Lk. has derived his narrative of the Last Supper, it has marks of confusion. We are justified, then, in preferring to his order of incidents here that which is given in the two Gospels Mk. and Jn., which probably rest respectively on the reminiscences of Peter and of John the son of Zebedee, both of whom were present at the Supper.

At what point in the narrative of Jn. are we to suppose that the Institution of the Eucharist took place? The foregoing comparison with Mk. suggests that we should put it after Judas had left (v. 30), and before the prediction of the Passion as near (v. 37, 38). That Jn. knew of the Institution of the Eucharist is certain; and we have found reason for holding that the words of Institution are reproduced in 18, where see note. We hold that there has been a dislocation of the text after 13, and that the original order was c. 15, c. 16, c. 17, c. 18, c. 14, c. 17. It may be that a paragraph has been lost after 13, and it is tempting to conjecture that this paragraph told of the first Eucharist. But, if this were not so (and there is no external evidence for it), we must fall back on the conclusion that Jn. has designedly omitted to tell of the Institution of the Eucharist (although he betrays his knowledge of it in c. 6), while his reasons for this omission cannot now be discovered. See on v. 31.

XIII. 5. ἔγειρεν οὖσα τῶν τίθησιν, “He rises from the supper,” that is, from the couch on which He had been reclining. This shows that the Feet-washing which follows was not before supper, and so is not to be regarded as the cleansing of the feet which was preparatory to a meal. Where sandals are worn, the feet get dusty and tired, and it was a courtesy of hospitality to arrange that water was available for washing them (Lk. 7, 42; cf. Gen. 18, 24; 43, 24; Judg. 19, 1; Sam. 24, 3; 1 Kings. 4, 31). But in this case, the supper had not only begun, but was probably ending. In the talk that followed, the disciples began to dispute about their precedence (Lk. 22, 25), perhaps in reference to the order in which they were placed at the meal; and Jesus, rising from His place, proceeds to give them the object-lesson. “Whether is greater, he that sitteth at meat, or he that serveth? Is not he that sitteth at meat but he that serveth?” (Lk. 22, 26). So, stripping off His outer robe or pallium (ὑπερσακής) and appearing in His tunic only, He girded Himself with a towel, as a slave would do, that He might pour water upon their feet. Weststein recalls the story of Caligula, who was wont to insult members of the Senate by making them wait at table succinctos linere (Suetonius, Caes. 26). This story indicates how great an act of condescension the Feet-washing by Christ must have seemed to His disciples to be.

After ἀληθεύω D adds ἀνέριον.

With the Septuagint, cf. 211. Lk. 13, 17 illustrate the “girding” himself for his work which was appropriate to a slave. The towel (linenum) was fastened to the shoulder, so as to leave both hands free.

6. The word νυμμια does not occur again in Greek literature, but Biblical or secular, except in quotations of this passage. It must mean some washing utensil, but “basin” may easily convey a wrong impression. Orientals do not wash, as we do, in a basin which visibly retains the water that has been used; that they would regard as an unclean practice. The Eastern habit is to pour water from a ewer over hands or feet (cf. 2 Kings 4, where Elah performs this duty for his master Elijah); the water being caught below in a basin with a strainer, and then passing through the strainer out of sight. The assistance of a servant is necessary, as both the ewer and the basin have to be held. At the Last Supper, the disciples were reclining on the usual divans or couches, their feet being stretched out behind (see Lk. 7, 46, where the sinful woman was “standing behind” at the feet of Jesus, when she let her tears fall upon them). Jesus first poured (βάλεις, cf. Mt. 26, 27) water into the νυμμια, which was ready in the room for such a purpose (ἀπὸ τοῦ νυμμια, “the ewer”), and then He poured the...
water over the disciples' feet, drying them with the towel with which He had girded Himself. He did all that was the duty of a slave for his master who was having his feet washed.\footnote{See, for details, art. "Bason" in D.C.G. For the pluralistic use of ἔρχεσθαι in the Synoptists, see Hunkin in J.T.S., July 1924, p. 390. Here, however, ἐρχομαι is not pluralistic, the aorist marking the definite time when the feet-washing began. A curious turn is given to this incident in the eccentric Latin paraphrase of the Gospels known as the Huntington Palimpsest, of which E. S. Buchanan has printed the text (New York, 1896). It represents Jesus as "washing the feet of Simon Isariot," and Simon Peter protesting: "Thou wilt not wash his feet!"

But thou shalt know presently." μετά ταύτα (see Introd., p. cviii) is equivalent to "afterwards," and is quite vague as to the length of time that is to elapse.

For the distinction between εἰσακείων and γυναικείων, see on 129, cf. v. 12.

The Foot-washing is explained vv. 12 f. as being a lesson in humility. The disciples had been disputing about precedence (see on v. 4 above), and Jesus reminds them, as He had done before, of the dignity of service and ministry. See on 128, where the high place which δικαιονία occupies in the teaching of Christ is discussed. Here He illustrates, by His action (cf. Lk. 22\textsuperscript{23}), this essential feature of His mission, and He bids His disciples to follow His example (v. 16). As to the possibility of a deeper symbolism, see on v. 10 below.

8. ὅτι ἐν δόξῃ μου τῶν ποδῶν. "Thou shalt assuredly never (ἐν τῷ ὑπάρχει; see on 41) wash my feet," μου being emphatic because of its position in the sentence (acc. to BCL); but the rec. text, with οὐ, puts it after τοιούτως.

The answer of Jesus, "If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me," is very severe. "To have part with another," or to be his partner, is to share in his work, and ultimately in his glory. The unfaithful slave is contrasted with the hypocrites (Mt. 21\textsuperscript{19}; cf. Ps. 50\textsuperscript{19}). The Levites had no part in the inheritance of Israel, their work being different from that of the other tribes (Deut. 10\textsuperscript{3} 11\textsuperscript{18}); Simon Magus had no part in the apostolic endowments of the Spirit, being animated by ideals wholly different from those of the apostles (Acts 8\textsuperscript{3}); a Christian has no part with an unbelieving heathen (1 Cor. 6\textsuperscript{19}). So to decline the call of ministry, to which every disciple is called, is to have no part with Christ, to be no partner of His, for His work was pre-eminently a work of ministry (see on 12\textsuperscript{20}). Peter's refusal to allow his Master to minister to him was really to reject that principle of the dignity of ministry and service which was behind the work of Jesus.

It was not said affirmatively that he whom Jesus washed was thereby recognised as His partner; for the feet of Judas were washed by Him, and He knew Judas for a traitor.

9. For Ἰωάννης Πέτρος, B has Πέτρος Ἰωάννης, by inadvertence: D omits Ἰωάννης.

Peter does not yet understand what is meant by the strange act of his Master. He now thinks that the "washing"
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μαν μόνον ἄλλα καὶ τὰς γέφεις καὶ τὴν κεφαλήν. ἔνα λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Παῦλος γι' ἑαυτοῦ ὁ λεμονέας σιλ ξης χρείαν εἶ μὴ τοῖς πώλοις ἐνάσχαι,
of which Jesus has spoken is for bodily cleansing, or (perhaps) is a symbol of spiritual cleansing; and he cries with his accustomed impulsiveness, "Lord (κατά μήτραν), not my feet only, but also my hands and my head," thus missing the point of the action of Jesus. It was not a symbol of cleansing, but an illustration of the dignity of service, even menial service; and therefore the washing was of the feet, rather than of the hands or the head.

10. B om. ὁ before Πάνω, ins. ΠΑΣΩΔΘ. For the rec. order of χρείαν ἔχει, ἐπὶ ABCW have εἰς ἔχει χρείαν.

It omits the words εἰ μὴ τῶν πώλοις, possibly, as Abbott (Dict. 259e) suggests, by homoioteleson. Sometimes writes εἰ as ἐν, and Abbott thinks the archetype may have been

οὐκεύσασιν
κνητούστολασιν
ναόται

However that may be, BC*L retain εἰ μὴ τῶν πώλοις, AC* having ἓ τῶν πώλοις, while E* has τῶν πώλοις only; D expands and gives αὐτὶ χρείαν ἔχει τὴν κεφαλήν ενάσχαι εἰ μὴ τῶν πώλοις μόνον.

If the words εἰ μὴ τῶν πώλοις are omitted (κατὰ μήτραν and some O.L. authorities), the answer of Jesus is clear, "He that has been bathed needs not to wash," thus indicating that His words must be understood as Peter supposed; the pedilium was an illustration only of the dignity of service. But the variants which show τῶν πώλοις was probably in the original text, and that the omission of the words is due either to homoioteleson or to the difficulty of reconciling εἰ μὴ τῶν πώλοις with the words ἄλλα ἐστιν καθαρός διὸς which follow.

ὁ λεμονέας σιλ. λεμονέας is frequently used of bathing the whole body (e.g. Lev. 14: 6–14, 17, Num. 15: 7, Deut. 22: 15, Acts 6: 1). Guests were accustomed to bathe before they went to a feast (Wetstein gives many illustrations of this); when they arrived at the house where they were to have dinner or supper, it was only necessary that their feet should be washed (see on v. 4). There was no need for the head or the hands to be washed. And so Jesus reminds Peter, who has been wrong in thinking that the washing of his feet by His Master was for the purpose of bodily cleansing.

The man who has bathed before the meal is καθαρὸς διὸς, and Jesus adds, of the disciples who were present, ἢ μὲς καθαροὶ ἔστε.
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ἄλλα ἐστιν καθαρὸς διὸς καὶ ἢ μὲς καθαροὶ ἔστε, ἄλλα ἄλλα πώλοις.

καθαρός is often used of external cleanliness, as at Mt. 23: 27–28, and cf. Heb. 10: 28 λεμονέας τὸ σῶμα ἡμῶν καθαρός, where καθαρός refers to the purity of the water to be used in baptism; but in the other only place where it occurs in Jn. (15: 1) the word is used of spiritual purity. To this other meaning of καθαρός Jesus returns here; then to the words "but ye are clean." He adds, "but not all," Judas being the exception. As far as bodily cleanliness was concerned, no doubt Judas was on a par with the rest; but not in a spiritual sense.

ἄλλα ἄλλα πώλοις. This, according to Jn., is the first hint given by Jesus that one of the Twelve would be a traitor; although Jn. has stated (6: 64) that He had known this ἐκ ἀρχῆς, and repeats the statement here (v. 11).

In this verse a new idea emerges, since that of spiritual purity, being suggested by the double meaning of καθαρός; and we have to inquire if (as some have thought) Jn. sees a deeper symbolism in the feet-washing than the lessons of humility and of the dignity of service. In v. 8 we had, "If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me." This, apart from its context, would naturally refer to the spiritual cleansing which is needful before the disciple can be Christ's partner, and perhaps (see on v. 9) Peter understood it thus. But in the narrative this is not the interpretation of His action furnished by Jesus Himself (vv. 13–16); although it has been thought that Jn. tells the story in terms which imply it.

Yet (1) if the cleansing be the spiritual purification which is the issue of Christ's atonement, then we have an idea introduced which is foreign to the context and which does not appear again in c. 13. It is worth adding that the conception of Christ washing away sin in His blood is not explicit anywhere in the N.T. (In Rev. 1 the true reading is λευκόν, not λουκόν, and Rev. 7: 14 refers to man's part in redemption, "I washed their robes in the blood of the Lamb." (2) More plausible is the interpretation which finds in the pedilium the symbol of baptism. This goes back to Tertullian (de bapt. xii.), but Tertullian is inclined to find a fore-shadowing of baptism in any N.T. phrase which alludes to water. The washing of Christian disciples in the water of baptism is, however, a familiar image in the N.T.; cf. 1 Cor. 6: 18, Eph. 5: 26, Tit. 2: 6, and Heb. 10: 28 λεμονέας τὸ σῶμα ἡμῶν καθαρός.

Holtzmann suggested 1 that Jn. in this passage is giving an account of the institution of Baptism as a Christian rite, and that he gives it here instead of narrating, as the Synoptists 2 Life of Jesus, Eng. Tr., p. 42.
do, the institution of the Eucharist, because he wishes to call attention to the high dignity of baptism. "In doing so, he at the same time very plainly offers the suggestion that washing the feet should be allowed to take the place of complete immersion." The last sentence is not only an anachronism, for baptism by affusion rather than by immersion is, so far as we know, a concession much later than the latest date that can be assigned to the Fourth Gospel, but no baptismal rite has ever been known which substituted the pouring of water on the feet for pouring it on the head or the body. The pedilauism, indeed, is prescribed in some early Gallican "Ordines Baptismi" and also in the baptismal offices of the Celtic Church. But it was no part of the actual baptism; it was a supplementary ceremony, intended to illustrate for the new Christian what manner of life his should be—humble and ministerial, as was his Master's.

If there be any allusion to baptism here, it must lurk in the word λειλομένων, "bathed," and this is specially contrasted with the "washing" (πέπνεε) of the feet. The esoteric meaning of v. 10 would then be that, as baptism cannot be repeated, the baptized person needs but to have regard to the removal of the occasional defilements of sin with which he is troubled. Even this seems too subtle.

The simplest explanation is that provided in vv. 13-16; the sudden turn of the argument in v. 11 being due to the ambiguity of the word καθαρίζω, which suggests the introduction of the saving clause "but not all."

11. The saying "but not all" was not understood by the disciples, who did not suspect Judas. After the Passion, it would have needed no explanation; but Jn., in explaining what it meant, is reproducing the situation as it presented itself to an eye-witness.

δὴ τὸ πάντοτε εἰσέλθῃ καὶ καθαρίζῃ τὰς ἐμὸς ἐσώτερα ἀστικάτας καθαρίζων, "for He knew the man that was delivering Him up," the pres. part. indicating that the movement of treachery had already begun (see on v. 2). Jn. is always careful to bring out the insight of Jesus in regard to men's characters and motives (see on 21). This explanatory comment is characteristic of his manner of writing (see on 23).

δὲ τὸ πάντοτε οὖν καὶ καθαρίζω, "wherefore He said, etc." δὲ (omm. Mallen, but ins. BCLW) is rectitantis, introducing the words actually spoken.

See Abrahams, in J.T.S., July 1912, in reply to C. F. Rogers in the same journal for April 1912, on the Jewish method of baptism.
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12. "Ouυς οὖν ἔδωκα τοῖς ἀπόστολοι καὶ λέξεις ταύτα καθαρίζων τὰς ἐμὸς ἐσώτερα ἀστικάτας καὶ καθαρίζων πάντας, οἵτως αὐτοῖς ἔσωσται τί πεπνυμένα ὄμην;" 13. ὁ λάτρης φωνεῖ μὲ τὸν εὐαγγελίαν καὶ στὸν κόσμον καὶ λαλεῖς ἑξὶν γερμ. 14. εἰ συν ἔγινον ἐνα οὖν τοῖς νῦσσοι τοῖς νῦσσοι τῷ κόσμῳ καὶ τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ, διήκειτε ἑλλῆνιστες πάντες τοῖς νῦσσοι

οἱ πάντες . . . Cf. v. 18 εἰ συνεργία πάντων ἐρώτων (and Mt. ἐρωτεύσω) for this Greek order of words.

The spiritual meaning of the Feet-washing (vv. 12-20)

12. δὴ . . . ἀπόστολος, "When then He had washed their feet," αὐτοῖς indicating that He ministered to them all.

καὶ λαλεῖς τῇ ἡμέρᾳ αὐτοῦ, "and had taken His garments," i.e. had resumed the ἀλλήλης which He had taken off (v. 4).

καὶ ἐκδόθη πάλιν, "and had reclined (as, as we should say, sat down) again." He resumed His place at the table, which He had left when ἔγνωσεν ἐκ τοῦ δείπνου (v. 4).

For καὶ ἐκδόθη, Καθὼς ἔδωκαν διακονεῖτε, αὐτοῖς διακονεῖτε τῷ πεπνυμένῳ ὄμην; γυναῖκες may be either imperative (as at Josh. 23:18, Dan. 3:3, Jn. 15:16) or interrogative, as it has usually been understood. Abbott (Diat. 224.3) prefers to take γυναῖκες as imperative here, the Lord bidding the disciples to recognize, and mark the meaning of, His ministry to them. The words go back to γυναίκης μετὰ τοῦ τραύματος of v. 7, in any case. They introduce the interpretation of the strange action of Jesus in washing the disciples' feet.

For γυναῖκες, see on 18.

18. ὁ λάτρης φωνεῖ με καὶ, "You address me as Teacher and Lord." φωνεῖ (see on 18) is the word regularly used by Jn. for calling a person by his name or title.

For the titles Rabbi (διδάσκαλος) and Marti (μάς), by which the disciples were accustomed to address Jesus, see on 18 above. διδάσκαλος, δ ἐκιάροις, are called by the grammarians titular nominales.

καὶ καθαρίζω καὶ καθαρίζων, εἰς γαρ, "and you say well, for so I am." Cf. with εἰς γαρ the καὶ ἐγγενές of 1 Jn. 3:1. Christ affirms His own dignity, even while stooping to what the disciples counted a menial office. He will not permit them to be in any doubt about this.

14. εἰ συν ἔγινον καλά, "If then, I, your Lord and Teacher, have washed your feet, a fortiore, you ought to wash the feet of one another." By this example were the dignity and the duty of mutual ἀλληλούϊα recommended (see on 2:26) to Christian disciples.

The precept was not taken by the Church to be the initiation
of a sacramental rite; the *pedilium* was never counted as a sacrament, although the custom grew up by the fourth century, in certain parts of the Western Church, of washing the feet of the poor on the Thursday before Easter. In England, the sovereign, or in his stead the Lord High Almoner, used to do this with ceremony until 1731; and in Rome the Pope still presides at the *pedilium*. The pious widows described in 1 Tim. 5:10 "washed the saints' feet," but only as an incident of their hospitable ministrations.

\[\text{\textit{ἐξέλευτε}}.\] The verb occurs again in Jn. at 19, 1 Jn. 2:12. 14.

15. *εὐθετείμα* is not found again in Jn., and is applied nowhere else in the N.T. to the example of Christ. It is used of the noble example of Eleazar’s death at 2 Macc. 6:30. Cf. Heb. 4:18, 3:15, Jas. 4:14, 2 Pet. 3. 1. 16. The term (BCDWE) is perhaps to be preferred to ἄνιψος of κας fam. 1. 1.

17. ἐκαθός ἐκαθός ἐκαθός, "that as I have done to you, so you should do:" a practical illustration having been provided of the meaning of the precept, "Learn of me, for I am meek and lowly in heart" (Mt. 11:29). For the constr. ἐκαθός ... ἐκαθός cf. vv. 35, 34.

18. ἐκαθός ἐκαθός ἐκαθός, as usual, introduces an aphorism of special significance. See on 14.

19. ἐκαθός ἐκαθός ἐκαθός, where the different lesson is drawn from it.

20. ἐκαθός ἐκαθός ἐκαθός, "nor is he that is sent greater than Him that sent him." άνεστος is not found again in Jn., and is here used in its etymological sense of a "messenger," as at 1 Kings 14, 2 Cor. 8, Phil. 2. 1. The Synoptists tell that Jesus gave the title άνεστος to the Twelve (Lk. 6:19), and they occasionally apply it to them. But Jn. always uses the older descriptions "the Twelve," or "the Disciples." It is possible that Jn. discovers a special allusion to the Twelve in the words "he that is sent is not greater than Him that sent him," and that the word άνεστος is specially significant here of their mission; but this is not certain. See on 24.

21. ἐκαθός ἐκαθός ἐκαθός, "If ye know these things," αἰ, if you thoroughly understand and appreciate what I have been saying to you (for the force of ἐκαθός, see on 14). Judas had not reached to this point.

22. *προδότης* ἐκαθός, "blessed are ye, if ye do them." The dignity of διακονία is an easy lesson to understand, is hard to put into practice (cf. Lk. 11:28). Yet it is he who does this, who humbles himself like a child, who is great in the kingdom of heaven (Mt. 18:3). προδότης is used only once again by Jn., at 30:36, where he quotes other words of Jesus, μακαρισε is used only once again by Jn., at 30:35, where he quotes other words of Jesus, μακαρισε is used only once again by Jn., at 30:35, where he quotes other words of Jesus, μακαρισε is used only once again by Jn., at 30:35, where he quotes other words of Jesus, μακαρισε is used only once again by Jn., at 30:35, where he quotes other words of Jesus.

23. ἐκαθός ἐκαθός ἐκαθός ἐκαθός. So He had said before (v. 10). The treachery of Judas (who had no share in the benediction of v. 17) did not come upon Jesus unawares (see on 66).

24. ἐκαθός ἐκαθός ἐκαθός, is to be preferred to the rec. αἰς (ADWBL) before άμελτοι: "I know the kind of men whom I chose," αἰ, when selecting the Twelve out of a larger company of disciples. See 66, where the same word άμελτοι is used; and 1:28, 36.

25. ἐκαθός ἐκαθός ἐκαθός, may be a note added by the evangelist after his manner, but possibly he intends to place the phrase and the quotation in the mouth of Jesus Himself (cf. 17:5). If this be so, the sentence is elliptical, and we must understand the meaning to be: "I know whom I chose, but none the less this treachery will come, that the Scripture might be fulfilled." (cf. 9:35 for a like ellipse). The treachery of Judas was foreordained in the eternal counsels of God; he was destined to deliver up Jesus to the Jews (see 67:12).

The quotation is from the Hebrew (not the LXX) of Ps. 41:9: "he that eateth my bread lifted up his heel against me." To eat bread at the table of a superior was to offer a pledge of loyalty (2 Sam. 9:14, 1 Kings 18:18, 2 Kings 25:17); and to betray one with whom bread had been eaten, one’s "messenger," was a gross breach of the traditions of hospitality.

VOL. II.—22
In 13:19-21, the text discusses the concept of apostolic dignity.

The passage states that Jesus foretells His betrayal, the others not recognizing that Judas is designated by being handed a sop: Judas leaves the room (John 13:27). This is in contrast to the minister who has a less prominent role in the events, but Jesus is not recognized for His true humanity by some of the disciples.

Jesus, being the Son of God, is more than just a human being; His divine nature sets Him apart from the others. This is emphasized in the text, where Jesus is described as the One who is more than just a human being, but also as One who is designated by being handed a sop. This is a significant contrast to the others, who are not recognized for their true humanity.

The text also highlights the importance of recognizing Jesus for who He truly is, and the need for the disciples to understand His true nature. This is a critical message for all who follow Jesus, as it reminds them of the importance of recognizing His divine nature and the significance of His teachings.

In summary, the passage in 13:19-21 highlights the importance of recognizing Jesus for who He truly is, and the need for understanding His true nature. This is a critical message for all who follow Jesus, as it reminds them of the importance of recognizing His divine nature and the significance of His teachings.
disciple may have been present as a young and favoured follower, a "supernumerary apostle," lacks evidence. It is highly unlikely that Jesus would have bestowed special marks of His love and favour on one whom He did not include within the circle of the Twelve, and of whom, besides, the Synoptists know absolutely nothing.\footnote{Cf. Jellicher (Introduct., p. 415), who holds, however, that the "beloved disciple" is only an ideal figure.}

The posture at table of guests at a feast seems to have been that of reclining sideways on couches or divans, the left arm on a cushion while the right hand was on the table, the right hand being thus free for taking food; the feet were stretched out behind. The host or principal person was in the centre, and the place of honour was above him, that is, to his left; the next highest place being below him, or to his right.\footnote{See Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. in loc., and in Mt. 26:25.} Thus the person on the right of the host would be so placed that his head would be close to the host's breast, and that it would be easy therefore to say a word to him confidentially. The host would occupy a similar position in relation to the chief guest on his left, and would readily be able to address him privately.

It is plain that, at the Supper, the beloved disciple (i.e., as we take it, John the son of Zebedee) lay on the right of Jesus, ἰδιαίτερος τῷ κόσμῳ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. There is no certain indication as to the disciple on His left (which was the place of honour). Some have thought it was Peter, but, if that were so, he would have addressed his question (v. 24) to Jesus directly, without the intervention of John. And the fact that he made signs to John would suggest that he was not very near him at table. It is more probable that the chief place (on the left of Jesus) was occupied by Judas, for Jesus was able to speak to him privately without the conversation being overheard (see v. 27 and cf. Mt. 26:25). That Judas was the treasurer of the little company (see on 12) may point to his enjoyment of some kind of precedence; and if this were so, he would naturally occupy the chief place at table, next to Jesus. See also on 67.

That John the son of Zebedee was given a place of honour at the supper is reminiscent of the request of Mk. 10\textsuperscript{7} that he and his brother should be given the two highest seats in the Messianic kingdom; and it is possible that it was their custom to occupy the places of honour at the common meals of the Lord and His disciples. This would suggest that James was on the left of Jesus, as John was on His right, at the Last Supper; but more probably on this occasion Judas was next his Master.

\footnote{\textsuperscript{1} Critical of Fourth Gospel, p. 93.}
24. *βάλει οὖν τῷ Σιμών τῷ Πέτρῳ.* "Simon Peter," taking the initiative as usual, beckons to him, sc. to John. The text in the latter part of the verse is not quite certain.

(c) BCL and the Latin vss., followed by most modern editors, after Πέτρος read καὶ λέγει ἀπὸ ἑαυτῷ ἄκουε τὸν φρόνει τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. 

But the verb *νοεῖν,* "to make signs," is not usually accompanied by an intensification that the person making signs also *σπάει.* Again, *σπάει* is difficult to translate. The R.V. renders "tell us*;" but why should Peter have expected John to answer out of his own knowledge? They were all puzzled, and John knew no more than the others. Abbott (Dial. 1390) takes *σπάει* as meaning "say," sc. to Jesus, that is, "ask Him." But why, then, do we not find *παραγως* (cf. q q add *μετέτρησα*).

(2) The other reading, *νειν δὲ τῷ Σιμών Πέτρῳ* πυθόμενον τις ἐν νοί, has in its favour that *νειν* is followed by an infinitive, as it is in the only other place where it occurs in the N.T. (Acts 24:16), and that it does not represent Peter as making signs and speaking as well. It is supported by *ADWΔΔ* and the Syriac vss. (including the Sinai Syriac), *πυθόμενος* is a Johannean word, occurring at 42 on.

The only objection to this reading is that the optative mood (*νειν*) is very rare in the N.T., as it was going out of use at this period, and that it never occurs again in Jn.

In any case, according to the Fourth Gospel, John is prompted by Peter to ask Jesus whom He had in mind. Mk., followed by Mt., represents all the disciples as asking "Is it I?" Lk. says that they questioned each other. Perhaps all these things happened, but it may at least be claimed that Jn.'s narrative is peculiarly vivid.

25. *ἀναστάτως.* So *BC* on. The rec. *προσεύχοντας*, following *S* *AC* *D* *WΔΔ*, suggests too violent a change of posture for the occasion. The rec. inserts 话剧 after *προσεύχοντας*, with Α, but it is om. by BC; *D* *L* *W* have 话剧.

ἀναστάτως ἐκάλεσεν οὖν ἐπὶ τὸ στήθος τοῦ Ἰη* 2 See Field, *loc. cit.*

*He (i.e. John) leaning back just as he was (cf. 4 for *σπάει*) on the breast of Jesus,* i.e. leaning back, keeping the same attitude that has been described in v. 23. For the frequent use of *έκαλεν* by Jn., see on 21.

ὁ λόγος is omitted by the rec., with *ADWΔΔ*; but BCLΔ have it, and it gives an intimate touch to the narrative here.

26. *ἀποκρίνεται οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς.* "Jesus answereth," viz. in a whisper so that the others could not hear, which his position on the right of Jesus would enable him to do.

τί λέγει; "Who is it?" But Jesus does not give the name of the traitor in reply. He answers in a way that even John does not seem to have been able to interpret (see on vv. 21, 28).

οὖν is omitted by the rec., with *ADWΔΔ*; but BCLΔ have it, and it gives an intimate touch to the narrative here.

So Jesus answers" (cf. for the present tense 23, 29); see for oun on 71. *ὁ λόγος is omitted (wrongly) by *S* *AC* *D* *WΔΔ*, but it is read by *S* *BC* 1. Οmit, after its frequent habit (see on 12), ὁ before Ἰησοῦς. *ὁ* and *παί* add καὶ λέγει after Ἰησοῦς, but om. *ABCLWΔ*. *ψωμῖν," a *morsel,* is not found in the N.T. outside this passage, but is a common word, and is the usual word for "bread" in modern Greek (cf. Judg. 19). The best reading (BCL cop.) is ἐγὼ βάφω τὸ ψωμῖν καὶ δώσω αὐτῷ, the constr. βάφω καὶ δώσω being thoroughly Johannean; but the rec. text has ἐγὼ βάφω τὸ ψωμῖν ἐκάλεσεν, following *ADWΔΔ.* For βάφω in the second clause of the verse, the rec. has *ἐβάφω* (ΑΔΔΔ). After the second ψωμῖν the rec. omits λαμβάνει (with *S* *ADWΔΔ*), but the words are found in *S* *BC* and must be retained, as adding a new and vivid detail. For Ἰησοῦς (the true reading here; see on 67), which is found in *BC*, the rec. has Ἰησοῦς (ΑΔΔΔ). In Mk. (followed by Mt.), the same reply in substance is given to the disciples' enquirer inquiry as to which of them would be the traitor (cf. μητακομίσον μετ᾿ ἑμῖν ἐλα τῷ τραπέζων, Mk. 14:19); Lk. does not mention it. Jn. relates that Jesus gave to the beloved disciple a more precise clue, by saying that the traitor would be he to whom Jesus would Himself give the " sop," having first dipped it. This is, no doubt, a correct detail. But it does not appear that John identified the traitor even when this clue was provided (v. 28).

It was a token of intimacy, to allow a guest to dip his bread in the common dish or τραπέζων: thus Boas says to Ruth βάφεις τὸ ψωμῖν αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ ἑκ (Ruth 2:14). And it is still a favorite of Eastern hospitality for the host to dip a choice morsel in the central dish and hand it to a guest. This is what Jesus did for Judas, who was probably reclining at table next to
XIII. 27–30.] JUDAS DEPARTS

Jesus. The looking forward to the inevitable Passion was torture; that there should be no longer delay was the natural wish of His heart. Attention has been called above (134) to the emphasis laid by Jn. on the true humanity of Jesus, as indicated by the human emotions of which Jn. tells.

28. τοῦτο δὲ οὖν καὶ κ. None of the disciples understood what was the reference of this injunction “Do it more quickly,” which had been said aloud so that all could hear it. This explicit statement must include the beloved disciple as well as the rest (see on v. 26).1

For the constr. οὖν τῶν ἀνακεκλημένων, οὖν not being followed by οὐ, cf. 2212, and see on 186 19; and for the position of οὐδὲ in the sentence, see on 186.

29. τινὲς γὰρ καὶ κ. Jn. is apt thus to introduce with γάρ his own comments on the incidents or sayings which he records; see on 198.

The disciples did not know what the order “Do it more quickly” meant, and they held different views about it. Judas, being the treasurer (for τὸ γλασσακόμιον, see on 1218), was naturally also the purveyor and the almoner of the little company. Some thought that he was bidden to hasten the purchase of what was needed for the Passover feast. This indicates again that the Passover was still to come, and that the Last Supper, for Jn., was not the Paschal meal (see on v. 1); for, had it been Passover night, nothing could have been bought. Another explanation was that Judas was told to give some alms to the poor, as he was accustomed to do (129), perhaps in order that aid might be given to a poor household to provide the Paschal lamb for the morrow.

In v. 29, δὲ is omitted before Ἰωάννας and Ἰησοῦς by Μ. See vv. 26, 27, and note on 128.

30. λέγειν αὖτὶ τὸ γλασσακόμιον καὶ. “So, having taken the sop, that one went out immediately.” Jn. lays stress on the acceptance of the sop by Judas, the suggestion being that Judas had recognised the significance of the offer of it by Jesus, and understanding now that Jesus knew his purpose he proceeds

---

1Newman’s astounding comment on “What thou doest, do quickly,” as justifying or illustrating the rapid recitation of the words in the Canon of the Mass, is one of the curiosities of literature (Less and Gain, ch. xx.).
teachings are specially opposite, when read in public worship between Easter and Pentecost, has been recognised by Christendom for many centuries, the Greek, Syrian, and Latin Churches (as well as the Anglican) making use of selections from these chapters as the Gospels for some of the Sundays after Easter. It is not impossible that Jn. has preserved in cc. 14-17 some of the Lord’s post-resurrection counsel with other words spoken after the Last Supper. Thus 16b-17 present an interesting resemblance to words ascribed to Jesus after His Resurrection in an addition to Mk. 16:14, preserved in the Trèver MS. (see on 16:14 below). But it can hardly be doubted that cc. 14-17 belong to the eve of the Passion, or that 16a must precede 13m.

The Vine and the branches (vv. 1-8)

XV. 1. The comparison of Jesus to a Tree, and of His disciples to the branches which derive their life from the life of the Tree, is similar in some respects to an illustration used by Paul to explain the relation of the individual Israelite to his forefathers, Abraham and the rest. “If the root is holy, so are the branches” (Rom. 11:16). Israel is compared to an olive tree, the roots being the patriarchs and the branches their descendants. But the illustration of Jesus conveys a deeper lesson, as we shall see.

The question presents itself: Why is the vine selected as the tree best fitted to bring out the lesson which it was the purpose of Jesus to teach? A vine has none of the dignity of the olive, with its fine trunk and spreading branches. Vines, indeed, in the East generally trail on the ground, although they are sometimes supported on stakes (cf. Ezek. 17:5), or entwine themselves round a greater tree (as in the parable in Hermas, Sim. i). The olive was regarded in an older parable as fit to be the king of trees (Judg. 9). It is the most important of the fruit trees of Palestine, and was a familiar object in Jerusalem, as the name “the Mount of Olives” indicates. Vines were also plentiful, especially in Judea (cf. Gen. 49:11), but for strength and stameness they are much inferior to the olive, as to many other trees.

The reason generally assigned by exegetes for the employment here of the figure of a vine is that it is frequently used in the O.T. as a type of Israel. But it is always thus used of degenerate Israel. “What is the vine tree more than any other tree?” Ezekiel asks (15:5), and he declares that as vine branches are only fit for burning, the vine of Jerusalem must be devoured by fire. So again (Ezek. 19:7), Israel was once a fruitful vine, but she was plucked up and destroyed. The
choicest vine was planted in the vineyard of Yahweh, but it only brought forth wild grapes (Isa. 5). Israel was planted as a noble vine, but it became degenerate (Jer. 2). Israel is a luxuriant vine, but judgment comes on her (Hos. 10). The vine from Egypt of God's planting spread far and wide, but the fences of its vineyard were broken, and it was ravaged by wild beasts (Ps. 80). God had chosen "all of the trees...</p> <p>... one vine," as He had chosen one people, but it came to dishonour (a Ed. 5). Always in the O.T., where Israel is compared to a vine, the comparison introduces a lament over her degeneracy, or a prophecy of her speedy destruction. See also Rev. 14, where the vintage of the earth is cast into the winepress of the wrath of God. None the less, the vine was the national emblem, and on the coins of the Maccabees Israel is represented by a vine. And it has been thought that when Jesus said "I am the True Vine," the comparison in view was that between the degenerate vine of Israel and the Ideal Vine represented by Himself. That is to say, the True Vine is now brought before the disciples as the new ideal of the spiritual Israel.

This, however, involves a comparison of the Church of Christ with the True Vine (cf. Justin, Tryph 110), rather than an identification of Christ Himself with it. No doubt, by describing His disciples as the branches, Jesus connected them as well as Himself with the mystic vine of His similitude; but the emphasis in the sentence ἐκ τῶν Ἰδον ἐκ τῆς ἀνθρώπου is on Ἰδον, as in all the other great similitudes of the Four Gospels. ἐκ τῶν Ἰδον marks the style of Deity, which cannot be shared (see Intro., p. xxviii). The main thought is not of the Vine as the Church, but of the Vine as representing Him who is the source of the Church's life. We take the view that the Vine of the allegory was directly suggested here by the wine of the first Eucharist, which had just been celebrated, ἐκ τῶν Ἰδον ἐκ τῆς ἀνθρώπου. Burkitt 3 points out that an early Syriac rendering of this similitude was "I am the Vineyard of Truth," i.e. the True Vineyard. This does not appear in Syr. sin. or the Peshitta, but it may have been in the Diatesarion. The confusion between Vineyard and Vine may be due to ἔκτισιον having been taken as equivalent to ἔκτισεν, a usage which Moulton-Milligan (s.v.) illustrate from the papyri. ἔκτισιον occurs again in the N.T. only in Jas. 2, Rev. 14, and Mk. 14 (and par.), where Jesus said that He would not drink again of τὸ γεύμα τῆς ἔκτισιον until He drank it new in the kingdom of God.

For ἔκτισιον, see on ὡς. Jesus is the genuine Vine.

1 See Intro., p. xxii. 2 Ec. da Mepharres, ii. 143. 151.
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διὰ καρπῶν πλείονα φέρει. 3. ἦν οὖν ὁμοίως καθαρὸς ἄντως διὰ τῶν λόγων ἐν λελάληκα ὕμων· 4. μετάνοι ἔν ἔμοι, κάθαρεν ἐν ἔμοι. καθαρὸν τὸ κλῆρον οὗ δύναται καρπῶν φέρειν ἐκ ταύτῃ τινὶ μὲ μέγα ἐν τῇ

But pruning may be good for them, none the less. Such pruning, according to Justin (Προφήτ. 110), illustrates God's painful discipline for His true servants. The vine is a tree which specially needs attention, and it is essential to its fruitfulness that the already fruitful branches should be pruned regularly. Perhaps this is a warning anticipatory of the more explicit warning of νν. 20, 21.

3. ἦν οὖν καθαρὸς ἄντως. So Jesus had said before (13:19), the primary reference then being to bodily cleanliness, although with an allusion to spiritual purity as well (see note in loc.). Here, the thought is carried on from v. 2, which spoke of the cleansing of the branches by the Great Husbandman (καθαράν). The disciples were not useless branches, presently to be cut off; they were in the way of bearing fruit, and already they had been "cleansed" διὰ τῶν λόγων ἐν λελάληκα ὕμων, "by the word which I have spoken to you."

We have seen (on 62) that διὰ followed by an acc. is to be distinguished from διὰ with a gen. The text here is not διὰ τῶν λόγων, which would suggest that the Word of Jesus is the instrument of cleansing; but διὰ τῶν λόγων signifies rather that it is because of the Word abiding in them (v. 7) that they are kept pure. The λόγος which had thus, in some measure, been assimilated by them (cf. 15:8) was the whole message that Jesus had delivered during His training of the Twelve. In so far as this continued to "abide" in them (v. 7), in that degree were they "clean." As it abides in them, so do they abide in the True Vine (1 Jn. 2:4).

The cleansing of τῶν διάκων ἐν ῥήματι of Eph. 5:8 does not constitute a true parallel to the thought here.

4. μετάνοι ἐν ἔμοι, κάθαρεν ἐν ἔμοι. This is an imperative sentence (for the aor. impf. see on 5). No doubt, the practical precept which was the issue of all the teaching of Jesus was just this; but we must not join the words to the preceding διὰ τῶν λόγων ἐν λελάληκα ὕμων, as if the precept itself were the λόγος. The words ἐν ἔμοι μετάνοι, κάθαρεν ἐν ἔμοι had been used before (69), but the promise of that passage has not heretofore been turned into an explicit precept (cf. 14:9). For λόγος as signifying not a single sentence, but the whole purport of the Divine revelation given by Christ, see on 59.

καθαρὰ τὸ κλῆρον ἔνθα. Even the fruitful branch does not

XV. 4-5.] UNFRUITFUL SHOOTS CAST OUT 481

οῖς, οὖν οὔτε ἤμειν ἕως ἃ ἔμειν ἔν ἔμοι μέχρις. 5. ἦν εἰμι ἡ ἐρμήνευσις τῶν λόγων. ὁ μένος ἐν ἔμοι κάθαρος ἐν αὐτῷ, ὁ οὖν ἐφέρει καρπὸν τοῦλον, ἅτι χαράς ἐμοί ὁ διάκομι σωτήρας αὐτῶν· 6. ἦν μὲ τις μέγα ἐν ἔμοι, ἐξελέηται ἐν τῷ κλῆρῳ καὶ ἐπεράθη, καὶ

bear fruit of itself (cf. for ἐκ τοῦ δαμασκ, 5:10 7:18 11:16), but only in so far as it assimilates and is nourished by the sap of the vine. So the disciple of Jesus cannot bear fruit, unless he abide (ἐν τῷ μέγα ἐνα), as the vine. Here is the difference between the natural and the spiritual order. The vine shoot has not the power of choosing whether it will "abide" in the vine, or cut itself loose. But in the spiritual sphere this "abiding" is not maintained without the constant and conscious endeavour of the disciple's own will. Hence the urgency of the precept μετανοεῖ ἐν ἔμοι.

5. εἰμι ἡ ἐρμήνευσις κτλ., "I am the Vine, ye are the branches," the main theme being repeated with slight verbal alteration, as frequently in Jn. Cf. the repetitions of "I am the Bread of Life" (5:26 6:35 6:45) "I am the Door" (10:7), "I am the Good Shepherd" (10:14), and see on 31. ὁ μένος ἐν ἔμοι κάθαρος ἐν αὐτῷ. The two "abidings" go together; see on 69.

οῖς ἐφέρει καρπὸν τοῦλον. This was the purpose for which the disciples were chosen (v. 16). For the emphatic οἴτω, "he is it that ...", cf. 4. ἔνας χαρᾶς ἐμοί ὁ διάκομι σωτήρας αὐτῶν. The branch is wholly dependent on the tree, by whose sap it is quickened and made fruitful.

6. ἦν μὲ τις μέγα κτλ. μέγα is the true reading (ἡ ἐρμήνευσις αὐτῷ with the pres. subj. is rare in the N.T., but we have it three times in νν. 4, 6).

ἐκάθεντος ἐν τῷ κλῆρῳ. The branch that does not bear grapes is cast out (apparently, out of the vineyard). The aorists ἐβληθης, ἐξελεηθής seem to look forward to the future judgment of mankind, and treat it as already past, so certain and inevitable is it. Abbott (Dict. 2445) compares Isa. 45:8 ἐξελεηθής ὁ χρυσός καὶ τὸ δῶρον ἑξελέηται, τὸ δὲ ρύμα τοῦ θεοῦ ἢμων μικρόν, where the aorists are used in the same way. But a Greek aorist may be used without reference to any special moment of time.

ἐξελεηθής (it does not occur again in Jn.) is the word used, Mk. 4, of the withering of the seed that had no root, as here of the vine shoot that is no longer "in" the vine.

καὶ συνεφάσως αὐτῇ. So Mt. 13:7; the rec. has αὐτῷ with ABPE. They "sew" (i.e. the servants of the Lord of the Vineyard, the subject being understood, but not expressed) "collect" the useless branches.
THE LOVE OF JESUS

9. καθὼς ἠγάπησεν με ἐν Πατρί, καί ἐμὸς ἡγάγωνος μείναι the planting of the Lord, that He might be glorified." The perfection of human character is the glory of God: all good works are ad maiorem Dei gloriam (cf. Mt. 5:9). So Jesus spoke of His signs as exhibiting the glory of God (14:49).

The σινόν, ἔσοβας is used prophetically. The issue is so sure that it is spoken of as already a fact. See, for a similar usage, v. 6 and 12v. 3, 11.

For the phrase ὁ πατὴρ μου, see on 218. γενόμενα. So καί: γενόμενα is read by BDLb. If γενόμενα is read, the rendering is "that ye bear much fruit and become my disciples." But γενόμενα is better: "that ye bear much fruit: so shall you become my disciples," or literally "disciples to me." ἄμελεν (cf. 13:20) expressing the relationship more affectionately than μοι (which is read by δ). Cf. 8:4, "if ye abide in my word, ye are truly my disciples." It is to have gone a long way in the Christian course to be able to appropriate the promise of v. 7; but the final cause of such progress is that "fruit" may appear, not in service only but in the development of character, to the glory of God. And the highest aspiration of all is to become "a disciple." True discipleship is hardly begun until the earthly life is near its end and the fruit hangs thick and ripe upon the branches of the Vine." Cf. the saying of Ignatius, when on his way to martyrdom, νῦν ἡμῖν μακάριος ἂνα (Rom. 5).

The love of Jesus for His disciples (vv. 9-11)

9. καθὼς ἠγάπησεν με ἐν Πατρί, καί ἐμὸς ἡγάγωνος μείναι (13:20), "As the Father loved me, so also I loved you." The words are spoken in retrospect of His association with the apostles, now that the hour of parting has come; but they convey an assurance of the depth and intimacy of His love to all future disciples.

For the context, καθὼς . . . καί ἐμὸς ἡγάγωνος (13:20), see on 69v. 10v.; and cf. also 17v. The verb ἠγάπησεν, see on 211v.

μείνατε ἐν τῇ ἡγαύῃ τῇ ἔμῃ, "abide in my love," i.e. "continue in the shelter of my love for you." See on 5v. for the Johannine use of the phrase ἡγαύη τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Judas had fallen away from the reach of this love of Christ, and so may any disciple. Hence the need of the precept μείνατε, "continue." (Cf. Judas ἐσώθει ἐν ἡγαύῃ τῷ ἔμῃ.) This is perhaps the nearest approach to an authoritative command to obey a moral or spiritual precept" that occurs.

1 Swete, The Last Discourse, etc., p. 81c.
XV. 10–12.] LOVE THE BRETHREN

καὶ μὴν αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ. 11. Ταῦτα λέληκα ἐμῶν ἵνα ἦτο χαρά ἡ ἑαυτῆ ἐν ἑαυτῇ καὶ ἢ χαρὰ ἐκαθὼς πληροθηῇ.

12. Δύναται ἤτοι τῇ ἑαυτῇ ἢ ἐμῶν ἵνα ἀγαπήσῃ ἄλλους καθὼς καὶ μὴν αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ.

The truth is, that we must not expect a continuous logical sequence in the discourses of the Fourth Gospel. The sacred words are set down as they are remembered by the aged disciple of Jesus, but there is no attempt to present them in the manner which would be suitable to a theological treatise.

In these Last Discourses the phrase ταῦτα λέληκα ἐμῶν recurs like a solemn refrain seven times (14:21 16:1 4:4 21:33 14:20) just as εὐαγγελίζομαι λέληκα recurs several times in Ezekiel (33:12 13:17 16:15 17:21 28:3 etc.). The εὐαγγελίζομαι of dignity (see Intro., p. cxvii) is, however, not prefixed to λέληκα in Jn. It is improbable that there is significance in there being seven repetitions of ταῦτα λέληκα ἐμῶν and no more. 169 is a reference to 16:14 "because I said these things"; and in 16:25 "εἰ προφητεύων comes between ταῦτα and λέληκα, the emphasis being on the words "in proverbs" and not on "these things have I spoken." See, for similar refinements, on 6:28-29.

In each case ταῦτα refers to what has been said in the preceding sentences; and in three cases the purpose of the teaching is indicated, so that the disciples might have joy (15:11), that they might have peace (16:25), and that they might be warned of future persecution (16:5).

To come back on a phrase in this way is thoroughly characteristic of the style of Jn.: cf. note on 3:18.

The New Commandment to love the brethren (20:13–17)

12. αὐτοὺς ἦτοι ἠμῶν ἡ μιᾷ ἡμῶν καθὼς ἦτοι ἡμῶν. Jesus had spoken of "commandments" to the disciples whom He was so soon to leave, and had promised that if they kept His commandments they would "abide in His love." But He gives no...
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13. μείζων ταύτης ἀγάπην οὖσα ἦταν, ἵνα τις τήν ψυχήν αὐτοῦ θῇ ἐκείνῳ τῶν φίλων αὐτοῦ. 14. ἄρεις φίλοι μου ἓστε, detailed instructions, no set of precepts for the conduct of their lives. He gives only one commandment, for it will be enough, if fully realized. 

ἐνα ἀγαπήν ἀλλήλους καθε, "that you love one another." This was the commandment, repeated a little later in the evening, when it is described as a new commandment, as something that had never been enjoined before (13:35, where see note). That Christian disciple must "love" Christian disciple, because of their common discipleship, was a new idea, perhaps not yet universally understood.

καθε ἡ ἀγαπήν ἡμᾶς. This mutual love is to be no faint affection of goodwill; it must be a love which will pour itself out in sacrifice, if it is to be like the love of Jesus for all of them. This is the commandment which must be fulfilled by the disciple who will claim the promise "Ye shall abide in my love" (v. 10). You can live in the shelter of my love only if you love one another. Cf. Eph. 5:2.

Abbott (Diat. 2353) calls attention to the frequent use of the present subjunctive in these Last Discourses, "that you may be loving," etc., the precept extending to all future generations of Christian disciples.

18. μείζων ταύτης ἀγάπην καθ. He reminds the disciples what was the measure of His love for them, having just told them that their love for each other must be of the same type. He was about to lay down His life for them, and this is the supreme sacrifice of love. A man can show no greater proof of his love for his friends than to die on their behalf. The love of God, indeed, has a wider range, as Paul reminds us: "While we were yet sinners, Christ died for us," thus showing the all-embracing character of God's love (Rom. 5:8). But here something less is commended to the imitation of the Christian disciple, for the "new commandment" does not speak of universal brotherhood, but only of the obligations of Christian brethren to each other. The precept is reproduced, 1 Jn. 3:24: ἐν ταύτῃ φιλομανοῦ τὴν ἀγάπην, ότι ἔχειν ἐντὸς ἡμῶν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἐθέμενον καὶ ἔχεις ἀφαίρεσεν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀδικίαν τῶν φιλῶν θέμενος. For the expression τὴν ψυχὴν τίδινα, see on 13:1; and for the position of ἀφαίρεσεν, see on 11:16. 

In v. 19 τῆς τῆς ψυχῆς καθ. This is in apposition to ταύτῃ: cf. 4:14 for a similar use of ἕτε. τῆς is omitted by C,D,E, and some Latin vss., but C,ABD, have it.

14. ἄρεις φίλοι μου ἓστε καθε. This is another way of expressing what has already been said in v. 10. Those who 

XV. 14–15.] SLAVES AND FRIENDS 487

ἐν ταύτῃ ἐγὼ ἄντλησαμεν ἑαυτῶν. 15. οὐδεὶς λέγει ἦμας δοῦλους, abide in Christ's ἀγάπη is His φίλοι: see on 21:14 for φίλον and φίλον. 

ἀκαθάρτων ἑαυτῶν. According to Mt. 28:18, this was also to be the burden of the apostles' preaching: διδάσκοντες ἀνέμοις τών ἄνθρωπων ἑαυτῶν τὴν ἀγάπην τῆς Ἰησοῦς Χριστοῦ ἡμῶν. 

κατὰ τὸ κράτος τουτῷ. Ἰσ. 13:3, 15:18, and δοῦλος, "slave," is the correlative of μάρ, "Lord." He had implied that to be His δοῦλον was a dignity. 

There is nothing derogatory in being described as δοῦλος κυρίου, ἵναι τραβηκνούτα; on the contrary, it was a title of honour, and as such is used of Joshua (Josh. 24:14), Moses (Deut. 34:10), David (Ps. 89:20 etc.); in the N.T. Simeon uses it of himself (Lk. 2:25), the Epistle to Titus begins Πάλαι δοῦλος Θεοῦ, and the Epistle of James has ἰδίως δοῦλος Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δοῦλος (Jas. 1:1). To this day, Adh-Allah is a favourite name in the East. Abraham was singularly honoured by being called the friend of Yahweh (אֱלֹהִים מִצְבַּח הַנָּהוֹג, Is. 41:8; cf. 2 Chron. 20:5, Jas. 2:23), and still is called by the Arabs, El-Khalil.

This distinction between God's "slave" and His "friend" appears in Philo. He says that while we speak of God as the δοῦλος κυρίου, in the kópios of the external world, in reference to the spiritual world (τοῦ γενόσεως ἡμάς) He is called σωτήρ καὶ εὐαγγέλτης. "For wisdom is God's friend rather than His slave" (φιλόν γὰς τῷ σωτῆρι μέναν ἡ δοῦλος, de sobrietate, 11). Philo then cites Gen. 18:1 in the form "Shall I hide it from Abraham my friend?" According to the Book of Wisdom (18:7), to be God's friend (φίλον) is a privilege of holy men in every generation.

Thus the difference drawn out in the text between the δοῦλος and the φίλον of Jesus corresponds to the difference, familiar to the Jews, between the δοῦλος and the φίλον of God, and conveys an additional suggestion of the Divinity of Jesus, which is behind the teaching of the Fourth Gospel from beginning to end.

The chief officials of an Eastern monarch were called his "friends" (1 Mac. 21:3-13 19: etc.), and Swete suggests that there is here an allusion to this nomenclature. "He has lifted them out of the condition of menial service, and raised them gradually into that of the friends of the Messianic king." But this does not seem to be in harmony with vv. 14, 15, where the
duties and privileges of "friends" as distinct from "slaves" are explained.

To be a δοῦλος of Jesus was the first stage in the progress of a Christian disciple; and the early Christian leaders, speaking of themselves, claim to be His δοῦλοι (Acts 4:10, Rom. 1:1; Gal. 1:10, etc.), while they do not venture to claim the further honour of His φίλος, which was given to the Eleven on the eve of the Lord's Passion. The difference appears in this, that a slave obeys his lord, without claiming to know the reason for his lord's actions, while a friend shares his knowledge and is admitted to his secrets. δοῦλος ὁκ ὁφείτε κῦλ. Thus the apostles did not know the significance of the action of Jesus in washing their feet (13:14).

δόμος ἐκ εἰρήκα φιλουμ. So Luke records (Lk. 12), at an earlier stage of their training, that Jesus addressed His disciples as "my friends." And He had implied many times that they were His friends, because He had expounded to them more freely than to others the mysteries of the kingdom of God (Mk. 4:11).

δόμος ἐκ εἰρήκα φιλουμ. Always His message was of the things which He had "heard" from His Father (cf. 3:4); but He did not disclose everything to the multitude. It was only to His chosen friends that He had made known the σωμα of the Father (17:28); but from them He had hidden nothing that they were able to bear (cf. 16:15).

γνωρίζεται, "to make known," occurs in Jn. again only at 17:26.

16. The apostles were henceforth His chosen friends, and hence was encouragement for them, who were so soon to take up their mission, in the absence of their Master. It would be a mission of difficulty, but their Call was their Power.

οὐχ δὲ με ἐξελάφασε, ἀλλ' ἐγὼ ἐξελέψασαι ἤμαθα, "You did not choose me, but I chose you," the personal pronouns being repeated for emphasis. See on 6:2 and v. 19, where the aor. ἐξελάφασα is used as here to mark the moment when the apostles were selected from the larger body of disciples. Each of them was a σκηνος ἐλάφος (Acts 9:25), and had been chosen by Jesus after a night of prayer (Lk. 6:12). It is constantly taught in the Fourth Gospel that God's love precedes the movement of man's soul to Him (see on 3:19).

XV. 16.] PRAYER OFFERED IN CHRIST

ὑπερ ὑμῶν καὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν καὶ τῶν μετ' ὑμῶν, ὅ τι ἔμε ἐν ἀνήλτητω τῷ Πατρὶ ἐν τῷ ὑπ' ὑμῖν ὑμῖν. 17. τεκάτο

καὶ ὑμεῖς ὑματι, ἐν ἁγίῳ ὑμωμεν, υπερ ὑμῶν υμωμεν ἐν ἀνήλτητω τῷ Πατρὶ ἐν τῷ ὑπ' ὑμῖν ὑμῖν. 17. τεκάτο

καὶ τῶν δε δοξάσας, "and appointed you," sc. to your special work; cf. for τῇμα used thus, Acts 20:31, 1 Tim. 2:8.

Τὸ ὑπερ ὑμῶν ὑμῶμεν is used at Lk. 16:8 of the "going forth" of the Seventy on their mission. For δοξάσας in Jn., see on 7:23.

καὶ κατὰ τὸ ἔργον, primarily the fruit of success in their apostolic labours, but also indicating the perfecting of personal character (cf. v. 4).

καὶ δ ὑμῶν ὑμωμεν, "and your fruit may abide." Jesus had said to a group of disciples on a former occasion, ἡ ἐφικμὸν ... ὑπερ ὑμῶν ὑμωμεν (φήσας), and the thought is the same in this passage. Cf. Rev. 14:13 and 1 Cor. 15:25.

Τὸ ὑπερ ὑμῶν ὑμωμεν (οὐ RADN), but BL have ἔτη ἐν τῷ ὑπ' ὑμῖν ὑμῖν (cf. v. 7). This great promise occurs six times (with slight variations) in the Last Discourses (cf. 16:28, 21:24, 14:14, 15:17), and in these passages the philosophy, so to speak, of Christian prayer is unfolded, as nowhere else in the N.T.

In the Sermon on the Mount we have the simple words ἀρετῇ καὶ διδασκαλίᾳ ὑμῶν (Mt. 7). But, when the Lord's Prayer is prescribed for use, it is made plain that there are conditions which must be fulfilled, if prayer is to be acceptably offered, and one of these is They Will be done. Prayer that is not submissive to that condition has no promise of answer. Another condition is suggested Mt. 18:12: "If two of you shall agree as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them by my Father." Prayer may be selfish, so that the granting of one man's petition may be the refusal of another's. But if men agree, that barrier is removed. If all men agree in asking the Eternal for the same thing, the prayer could be offered with entire confidence. And Jn. tells that Jesus expressed the supreme condition of Christian prayer by saying that it must be offered ἐν τῷ ὑπ' ὑμῖν ὑμῖν, "in my Name." For Christ embraces all men. A petition which is one that He could offer is one the fulfilment of which could hurt none and would benefit all (cf. 11:28). So, in Johannine language, the prayer which is of certain efficacy must be ἐν τῷ ὑπ' ὑμῖν ὑμῖν, and that is enough. Jn. does

1 The words καὶ ὑματι are omitted (because of homoioteleuton, ἐξελάφασα ὑματι immediately preceding), by A 23 250, suggesting that the exemplars of these MSS. were written in lines of twelve letters (cf. Introd., p.xxxii).
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not speak of importunity in prayer, as Lk. does (Lk. 11:8); but it is reiterated in the Fourth Gospel that the will of the man who prays must be in harmony with Christ's will (cf. 1 Jn. 5:14). The man must be in the will of Christ, a phrase used several times in these Last Discourses (14:25, 15:4, 15:26; cf. 6:38, 1 Jn. 5:20), with which Paul's Χριστοлагον should be compared (Rom. 12:2, 1 Cor. 15:32, 2 Cor. 5:17). This condition has already been expressed in different words at v. 7: "If ye abide in me, and my sayings abide in you, ask (ἀρέσσομαι) what you will, and it shall be done to you." To pray "in the Name" of Christ is not any magical invocation of the Name, nor is it enough to add per Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum, but it is to pray as one who is "in Christ." Such are the prayers of the saints.

For the significance of "the Name," see on 12; and for in τῶν θεοπάτων μου in other contexts, cf. Lk. 10:15, Jn. 14:6, 20:24, Eph. 3:17. The repeated ηῷ...ηῷ challenges attention. The final cause of the choice of the apostles was that they should "go forth and bear fruit," in their own lives as well as in their missionary labours, so that at last they should become masters of effectual prayer.

17. τοῦτο ἐνεπλευράσατο δόμος (cf. v. 14), ἵνα δεισδέκητε ἄλλους (v. 12). The purpose of these instructions was that they might appreciate the urgency of this novel precept (see on 13) which enjoined the love of Christian disciple for Christian disciple. This is not any vague recommendation of universal brotherhood; it is something much more definite. Indeed, as vv. 18, 19 show, the doctrine of mutual love cannot be extended so as to embrace all mankind. For the "world" hates Christians, as it hated Christ. There can be no reciprocity of δικαιοσύνη, in the special sense in which it is here enjoined, between the Church and the world.

See on 1 for the Johannean use of the term κόσμος. It is solemnly repeated five times in vv. 18, 19.

The world hates Christian disciples because it hated Christ (vv. 18-20)

18. εἰ ὁ κόσμος δόμα μυτε κτλ. The disciples are not to expect that the world will love them (cf. 1 Jn. 3:19), and of its future hostility they are now warned explicitly (see on 16 below). Jesus had told His "brethren" that the world could not hate them (7), but that was because they were on the world's side, and not on His, as all His disciples must be, γνωστεῖτε δὲ χριστιανόν μου μεταφοράς, "know (sciunt) that he has hated me first," γνωστεῖτε is imperative, like γνωστακτεῖν in v. 20. Despite His words on a former occasion (7), the disciples had not yet realised the measure of the "world's" hatred for Jesus, the world being here represented by the hostile Jews.

ὁμιλεῖ is omitted by Νb, but is found in ΝaBLNо f g l v. etc. and the Syriac vss. If it be omitted, the constr. is easy; but if it be retained, πρῶτοι ἄλλοι presents the same difficulties as πρῶτον μου in 19. Abbott (Dict. 1901) would translate here "that it hath hated me, your Chief," which might be defended by the vg. πρῶτον νοῦς. But this seems unsatisfactory, and it is best to take πρῶτον ἄλλοι, as if it were πρῶτον μου (see on 19).

19. εἰ ὁ κόσμος κτλ. Those who are of the world (cf. 1 Jn. 4:4) are sharply contrasted by Jn. with the Christian disciples, whose "otherworldliness" he always speaks of with emphasis. See, particularly, 17th. One of the characteristics of the writings of Jn. is that he always paints in black and white, without allowing for intermediate shades of colour. He will have no compromise with evil. For him the Church and the world are set over against each other, and he does not contemplate their reconciliation.

δόμος of τοῦ Μωίεως, "the world would have loved its own," which is in harmony with worldly ideals. The apostles, on the other hand, are not of the world. Out of it they had been chosen (see v. 16, and cf. 19), and so the world hated them. δοῦνο ταῦτα refers to what has gone before, as at 6:80. Thus vv. 16-20 taught the apostles that if to abide in Christ is the secret of fruitful lives and of effectivenes in prayer, it also provokes the world's hostility. But this hostility carries with it a promise and a benediction (cf. 1 Pet. 4:14, Mt. 5:11).

With the Johannean teaching as to the hatred of the Church by the world (7, 17, 1 Jn. 3:19), the fine saying of Ignatius: "Christianity (χριστιανισμός) is not talk, but power, when it is hated by the world" (Rom. 3).
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20. ἔμενεν τῷ λόγῳ αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ ἐπον ὄμων. Οὐκ ἔστιν διάλεκτος μεταξὺ τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ. ἔμενεν ἡ ἐκκλησία, καὶ ἐκκλησία διακόνων ἐς τὸν λόγον μου ἔφησαν, καὶ τὸν ἐκτέρων τυρπῆσαν. 21. ἄλλα

20. ὑποκάμιον ἐπὶ ἐπον ὄμων. Οὐκ ἔστιν διάλεκτος μεταξὺ τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ. ἔμενεν ἡ ἐκκλησία, καὶ ἐκκλησία διακόνων ἐς τὸν λόγον μου ἔφησαν, καὶ τὸν ἐκτέρων τυρπῆσαν. 21. ἄλλα

We have already had the saying οὐκ ἔστιν διάλεκτος μεταξὺ τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ at 13:16 (where see note), but Jesus probably repeated it more than once, the reference here perhaps being to the occasion when He gave a charge to the newly chosen apostles (Mt. 10:16; cf. Lk. 9:69). They had been warned then that they would not be exempt from persecution (cf. Mt. 10:19-20); it was even more necessary that they should bear this in mind in the days that were coming. He had told them that He counted them as friends rather than servants (v. 15), but for all that the saying “The servant is not greater than his lord” would be applicable to their situation in a hostile world. The moral He had drawn from this saying at the Last Supper, earlier in the evening, was different (13:19).

εἰ ἔμεν διακόνων, “If they persecuted me,” the subject being ἔμεν διακόνων, taken as a noun of multitude, from v. 19. Ἰν. has already spoken of the persecution (διακονίας) of Jesus by the Jews, because of the freedom with which He treated the rules of the Sabbath (εcomings).

καὶ ὑμᾶς διακόνων, “they will persecute you also,” a warning repeated in other language at 10:9. Lk. records a similar warning (Lk. 21:12), and Mk. 10:46 notes that Jesus accompanied a promise of temporal blessings to the faithful with the significant addition of μετὰ διακόνων. There is no reason to doubt that Jesus did thus predict that persecution would be the lot of His disciples; and it is unnecessary to accumulate proofs that the prediction came true (cf. 1 Cor. 4:18, 2 Cor. 4:4, 2 Tim. 3:12).

εἰ τὸν λόγον μου ἐπήρθαν, καὶ τὸν ἐκτέρων τυρπήσαν, “If they kept my word, they will keep yours also.” For the phrase τὸν λόγον τοῦ ματαίων, a favourite phrase in Ἰν., see on 8:14-16. In Ezek. 3: Yahweh is represented as saying to the prophet, “They will not hearken unto thee, because they will not hearken unto me.” And this would apply to the apostles of Jesus. But the saying recorded here by Ἰν. goes farther. Those who observe the word of Jesus will also observe the word of His apostles, it being implied of course that the apostles will utter no “word” for which they have not the authority of their Master. A world which “observed” the teaching of Jesus would inevitably “observe” the teaching of those who could rightly claim His commission. The difficulty of drawing inferences from this great assurance, once Christendom was divided, is illustrated by the whole course of Christian history. Jesus, however, goes on to insist that it is the other alternative which the apostles must prepare to face; not acquiescence, but opposition, will be the portion of those who proclaim His gospel.

21. ἄλλα τάξιν πάντας παθήσωσιν εἰς ὄμος διὰ τὸ ἄνομο μου, ὅτι σὺς οἴκος Ἰουδαίων. Jesus would inevitably “observe” the teaching of those who could rightly claim His commission. The difficulty of drawing inferences from this great assurance, once Christendom was divided, is illustrated by the whole course of Christian history. Jesus, however, goes on to insist that it is the other alternative which the apostles must prepare to face; not acquiescence, but opposition, will be the portion of those who proclaim His gospel.

τάξιν πάντας παθήσωσιν εἰς ὄμος (the rec. has ὄμος, with ADPN, but ΨBD*1.0 support εἰς ὄμος), “but all these things will they do to you.” The “things” are not defined here. The whole verse is repeated in slightly different words at 10:8 (see note), where it follows the mention of persecution and death; and if we could treat it here as a gloss that has crept into the text from below, the sequence of thought in vv. 20-24 would be easier to follow. But this would be an arbitrary alteration of the text. The sequence in Ἰν. is not always determined by logical considerations, and his reports of the words of Jesus are not to be taken as complete or exhaustive. Much more, doubtless, was said on this last night; what is preserved represents the long-pondered reminiscences of an aged disciple.

διὰ τὸ ἄνομο μου, “for my Name’s sake.” Persecution will come, but it will be easier to bear if they remember why it comes, and whose cause it is that they are upholding. This, again, had been said to them before, when they received their apostolic commission: ἔσοτε μαχθαῖς ἐκ τῶν πάντων διὰ τὸ ἄνομο μου (Mt. 10:33; see above on v. 20). The same warning appears in the Marcan tradition in a different context (Mk. 13:9, Mt. 24:12, Lk. 21:12), but in identical terms. A few verses before these passages in Mk. and Lk., the apostles had been told that they would be haled before rulers and kings, ἔαν κεκαθάρθη μου (Mk. 13:9) or ἐκκεντροῦ τοῦ ἀνεκτήματο μου (Lk. 21:12); and there is no substantial difference in meaning between these expressions and διὰ τὸ ἄνομο μου.

The Name of God is equivalent in the O.T. to His revealed character (see on 1:19); and in Is. Sam. 12:2, 2 Chron. 6:5, Jer. 14:22, we find διὰ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ μέγα, “on account of His great Name,” it being implied of course that the apostles will suffer no “word” for which they have not the authority of their Master. A world which “observed” the teaching of Jesus would inevitably “observe” the teaching of those who could rightly claim His commission. The difficulty of drawing inferences from this great assurance, once Christendom was divided, is illustrated by the whole course of Christian history. Jesus, however, goes on to insist that it is the other alternative which the apostles must prepare to face; not acquiescence, but opposition, will be the portion of those who proclaim His gospel. Cf. Polycarp,
Phil. 8: οτι πάσχεις δι' αυτήν αὐτοῦ, δοξάζων αὐτόν.
In the persecutions of the early centuries, to confute "the Name" was to court death. Cf. 1 Pet. 4:16; Acts 5:29; Ignatius, Eph. 3.

ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν τὸ πέμπετα με. Ignorance of the character of God is the cause of failure to recognise the claims of Christ, who came as the Ambassador of the Father. Cf. Lk. 23:35; Acts 3:17, for ignorance as the cause of the Jews’ rejection of Christ; and see further on 169.

Jesus said before (8:18; cf. 14:9) that to know Him is to know the Father; here He says that to know the Father is to know Him (cf. 8:14). For the conception of Jesus as "sent" by the Father, which so frequently appears in Jn., see on 3:17.

22. That the Jews did not "know" God as revealed in Christ would be the cause of their hatred of Christ and of Christians (v. 21); and this ignorance is now shown to be inexcusable, (a) because the words of Jesus should have found an echo in their minds (v. 22), and (b) because His works should have convinced them of His Divine mission (v. 24).

The constr. αἰτία... ἀδικία... has εἴρην... τῷ 22... is identical with vv. 22, 24; and it is noteworthy that αὐτὸς is omitted, which perhaps makes the sentence more emphatic, "If I had not... assuredly they would have no sin." In both verses εἴρην (καὶ ἐκτός) is to be preferred to the rec. ἐκτός.

εἰ μὴ εἴρην. This is the Messianic ξύρεσις. He who was to come had come.

καὶ ἠλέησα αὐτοῖς, "and discarded to them"; see on 3:17 for ἠλέησα. Cf. 12:46.

απερίτατα ὧν εἴρην. For ἀδικίας ἦσαν, cf. 9:20; 1 Jn. 3.

But their failure to accept Jesus, when they had heard Him speak, was a moral failure, and therefore blameworthy. See on the parallel passage 64. Involuntary ignorance, on the other hand, is excusable; cf. Acts 17:30.

ὡς δέ, "but now, as things are.

πρέπει... ὧν εἴρην καθ. πρέπει... does not occur again in Jn.; cf. Ps. 141 (LXX).

Those who hate Christ, hate God, because in Christ’s words and works God is revealed.

ὅτι... μυσίν καθ. Cf. 5:28; 1 Jn. 2:28.

The Jews were blameworthy because they did not recognize that the "works," as well as the "words" of Jesus revealed God.

The Jews hated Jesus. ἐκοίμησα... εἰς αὐτοῖς ἐν αὐτοῖς ἀλλοι ἐπόδημοι, ἀπερίτατα ὧν εἴρην... ἀδικίας δι' αὐτῶν ἡ ἐξόρνησις τοῦ Πατερᾶ μου. 24. Σὺ δέ ἐστιν ὁ λόγος ὃ σὺ ἐπὶ τῷ φως ἀνεψεύδηκεν γεγραμμένος ὅτι Ἐμφάνισαν με δωρεάν.

In all the Gospels, the impression made by His works of wonder is noted; e.g. Mk. 1:23, Lk. 4:30, Jn. 2:28. It is not the highest kind of faith that is thus generated (14:15), but nevertheless such faith is, in its measure, worthy and laudable (see on 261). And, more often than once in the Fourth Gospel, Jesus Himself appeals to the witness of His ἔργα in confirmation of His Divine mission (8:28; 10:32; 20), as He does here. As His words were greater than those of any other (7:18), so were His works such as αὐτοῖς οὗτοι ἔτοιμοι (cf. 9:18; Mt. 9:21). If He had not wrought works of this wonderful character among them (ἐν αὐτοῖς), the Jews would not have been counted blameworthy; but as things were, they were left without excuse (Mt. 12:24, Lk. 10:19).

See NABBDLO; the rec. has παραίτησις.

καὶ... ἐν αὐτοῖς... "but now they have both seen and hated both me and my Father;" the perfects indicating the persistence of their hostility (cf. Abbott, Dial. 444). The construction of the sentence, καὶ ἐν πώς θείως... as well as ἐμφανίσας... has the τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν πνεῦμα καὶ τὸν Πατερᾶ μου, καὶ τὸν Πατερᾶ μου... but the original fault of the Jews was, as He had said before (6:28), ἐπικράτησε με καὶ οὐ ποιήσατε... (see on 147). Neither in His words nor in His works did they discern the Divine mission of Jesus; and, not discerning who had sent Him, they hated Him and therefore implicitly His Father (v. 23).

For the ellipse ἄλλα ἤπειρος, cf. 9:2; and see on 14:18.

ἐκοίμησα... δὲ λόγος καθ. The hatred of the Jews for Jesus was part of the mysterious purpose of God, disclosed in the O.T. scriptures. See Introd., p. clv.

The phrase "their law" has already been discussed in the note on 8:17. "The law" is used for the whole of Scripture (see on 15:26); but although a Greek Christian might readily say "their law," to suppose that Jesus thus separated Himself from the Jewish race is hard of credence. Two of His Words from the Cross are quotations from the Psalms, which, if the phrase "their law" be His, He declines to recognise as having any special value for Him.

The allusion is either to Ps. 34:19 or Ps. 69:4 (most probably from Ps. 69, as this was regarded as a Messianic Psalm; see on 245), in both of which αἱ μυσίν τε... δωρεάν...
reproduces the Hebrew. The hatred of the Jews for Jesus was gratuitous and without cause (apologia; cf. πρόφασιν ὑπὲρ ἰδίων of v. 22).

**Introductory Note on ἀπαλλελοῦν (v. 26).**

The term ἀπαλλελοῦν does not occur in the Greek Bible outside the Johannine writings. On the other hand, Jn. does not use ἀπαλλαγὴν or ἀπαλλελεῖται, the latter word being specially Lucan and Pauline, while the former is common to most of the N.T. writers.

Etymologically, ἀπαλλελοῦν is a passive form, and is equivalent to the Latin *advocatus*, signifying one who is "called in" to give help or advice, and being especially used of the counsel for the defence.1 In classical writers this is always the meaning. Demosthenes (De falsa leg. 345) has *αἱ τῶν παράδεκτων δήσεις καὶ στονδαλιν*; and in Diog. Laert., vi. 50, Dion is made to say, "I will do what is sufficient for you if you will send ἀπαλλλελοῦν (sc. representatives) and don't come yourself." The term is used in the same way in Philo. Thus the city of Alexandria is called the *ἀπαλλελοῦον* by whom the emperor might be propitiated (in Flacceum, 4; cf. also de Josepho, 42). In *de opif. mundi*, 6, Philo says that God employed no ἀπαλλελοῦον (i.e. helper) in the work of creation. Again, in *Vita Mon. iii. 14*, speaking of the high priest, "one consecrated to the Father of the world," Philo says that it was necessary that he should employ as his *ἀπαλλελοῦον*, "a son most perfect in virtue.* 2 Like manner, Barnabas (§20) has παλαιοῦον ἰδεῖν ἀπαλλελοῦον, "advocates of the wealthy"; and in *2 Clem. 6* we have the question, "Who shall be our ἀπαλλελοῦον, i.e. our advocate, if we are not found doing what is right?* So in the Letter of the Churches of Lyons and Vienne (about 177 A.D., Eus. H.E. v. 1), it is said that Vetius Epagathus, confessing that he was a Christian, was taken into the order of martyrs (ἐς τῶν κληρῶν τῶν μαρτυρῶν), being called ἀπαλλελοῦον Χριστιανῶν, having the Paraclete within himself.

It may be added that the word was borrowed from the Greek by the Jews, and appears in Talmudic writings (see Wetstein on *Jn. 14* as ἔφρα in the sense of *advocatus*.

Although the verb *παρακαλεῖν* does not appear in *Jn.*, an examination of its usage throws some additional light on the meaning of *παρακαλεῖν*. *παρακαλεῖν* is to call a person to stand by one (*παρά*), and hence to help in various ways, e.g.

(a) as a *witness*, to be present when a thing is done. Cf. Demosthenes, *C. Phorm.* § 29.

(b) as an *adviser*. Cf. Xenophon, *Anab. i. vii. 5*, Κλάρσεν δὲ καὶ εἰς παρακαλεῖν οὐχίνεισιν.


The verb is specially applied to the invoking of a god, and calling him in to help: e.g. Thucydides, i. 118 fin., αὐτὰ τῷ ἐξελλήφθαι καὶ παρακαλοῦμενος καὶ ἀληθεύοντας; Epictetus, *Disc. iii. xxi. 12*, τοῖς δὲ τοῖς παρακαλεῖται βοηθῶν; Plutarch, *Alexander*, 33, ἀρρενάζει τοῖς τοιούτοις.

It appears from these passages that *παρακαλεῖν* is naturally used for a Divine helper called in, either as a *witness* (15), or as an *advocate* (16), or as an *adviser* (16a). *παρακαλεῖν* is also used in the sense of *encourage*, e.g. Polybius, iii. xix. 4, οἱ παρακαλούμενοι κυριαρχεῖται σφάζεις αὐτῶν καὶ παρακαλοῦμενοι; but *παρακαλεῖν*, being a passive form, cannot be equivalent to "one who encourages."

The familiar rendering "Comforter" was introduced into our English versions by Wyclif, who meant by it "comfortator," i.e. strengthener, *not* *consoler* (see his rendering of Phil. 4:19). But there is some patristic authority for the translation "console." Origen (de princ. ii. vii. 4) says distinctly that while in 1 *Jn.* 2:2 ἀπαλλαγὴν means *intercessor*, in the Fourth Gospel it means *consoler*. So, too, Cyril of Jerusalem says (Cat. xvi. 20) that the Spirit is called *παρακαλεῖς* from *παρακαλεῖν*, "to console," as well as because He "helps our infirmities" and "makes intercession" for us (*Rom. 8*:). Gregory of Nyssa (c. Evnom. ii. 14) also calls attention to the two meanings of the verb *παρακαλεῖν*. It is perhaps in consequence of an early interpretation of *παρακαλεῖν* in *Jn.* 14 as "consoler," that Aquila and Theodotion render *ὑπη* in *Job* 16b by *παρακάλεω*, where the LXX has *παρακάλησαν*. But the weight of evidence is undoubtedly in favour of "advocate" rather than "comforter" as the rendering of *παρακαλεῖν* in *Jn.*; and the notes on 14:18-16:7 will show also that this rendering is more in accordance with the context in which it occurs. At 1 *Jn.* 2:2 "advocate" is ti. only possible rendering.

The R.V. margin suggests "Helper" as an alternative, and this is adopted by Moffatt. This might include the idea

---

1 See Lightfoot, *Revision of N.T.*, p. 50 f.

2 This "son" is not the Logos (as has been erroneously stated), but the Cosmic (cf. Drummond, *Phil. Studies*, ii. 12; Sunday, *Criticism of Fourth Gospel*, 197; and Bacon, *Fourth Gospel*, 298). Philo's use of *παρακαλεῖν* does not relate the term to his Logos.
26. "Ὅταν ἐλθῇ δὴ Παρακλήτῳ δὲν ἔγει πέμφη ἵμαν πάμε τοῦ of consoling as well as of pleading one's cause; but its vague-ness veils the meaning here and at 26."

Witness to Christ in the future will be borne by the Para-clete as well as by Christian disciples (vv. 26, 27)

26. ὅταν ἐλθῇ δὴ παράκλητο. After ὅταν the rec. inserts δὲ, with ADL9s, but om. nB6; the omission of a connecting particle is a familiar feature of Jn.'s style.

Verses 26, 27, follow at once upon the rebuke (vv. 21-25) pronounced upon the enemies of Jesus. Their hostility was blameworthy. And in the future they will be proved in the wrong by the witness of the Spirit (v. 26) as well as by the witness of the apostles (v. 27).

The rendering of δὲ παράκλητος by advocate is here demanded by the context, to which the rendering comforter would be quite foreign. Jesus had explained that the hostility of the Jews to Him was sinful, for they ought to have recognized His Divine mission in His words and works (vv. 22-24). They hated Him, not knowing Him, although they ought to have known Him. But when the Paraclete came, He would bear true testimony to Jesus, being indeed the Spirit of Truth (v. 26). The Paraclete is the Divine advocate defending the Righteous One, and pleading His cause against false accusers. He is not, as a Jn. 2:2, represented as pleading the cause of man with God, but rather as pleading the cause of Christ with the world. See further on 26; and cf. Intro., p. xxii.

So also at 16, the promise is that Jesus will send the Paraclete; but at 14 He is to be given by the Father in response to the prayer of Jesus, and at 28 the Father is to send Him in the Name of Jesus. The Lucan doctrine is that Jesus sends the Spirit, "the promise of the Father" (Lk. 24, Acts 2), see further on 14.

πάρακλητος τοῦ πατρός. Cf. 16; 17; and see on 13 for παράς as expressing the relation of the Son to the Father. The Paraclete is to be sent "from the Father's side."

τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἁληθείας. The full phrase occurs again 16, 17, 1 Jn. 4. In the last passage it is contrasted with τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς πλάνης, as in Testaments of XII. Patriarchs (Judah, xx.), where the spirit of truth and the spirit of deceit both wait upon man, and it is said that "the spirit of truth testifieth all things and accuseth all." It is probable that this sentence is a Christian interpolation introduced into the text of the Testaments; but see on 55, where there is another parallel to their language.

In these Last Discourses, however, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἁληθείας is but another name for the Paraclete who is to be sent after Jesus has been withdrawn from the sight of men. The spirit of truth is the Spirit which brings truth and impresses it on the conscience of the world. In this passage the leading thought is of the witness of the Spirit to Jesus, infallibly true, however perverted the opinion of the world about Him may be.

The phrase τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἁληθείας has, like the phrase ὁ ἀνέπος τῆς ζωῆς (see on 55), a double meaning. Primarily (a) it is the Spirit which brings truth and gives true testimony, but (b) this is the case because the Spirit has truth as the essential characteristic of His Being. So also, the Logos is πάθος ἁληθείας (14), and Jesus says, later in this discourse, ἔγει ἐμι... ἡ ἁληθεία (14).

δὲ παράκλητος ἐκπορευόμενος. ἐκπορευόμεθα occurs once elsewhere in Jn., sc. at 55, where it is used of the dead "coming forth" out of their graves. Here it is used in the same way of the Spirit "coming forth" from God in His mission of witness (cf. ἐν πνεύματι δόθη ἀποστολή ταύτῃ ἐκ πατρός, 1 Pet. 1:2). To interpret the phrase of what is called the Eternal Procession of the Spirit has been a habit of theologians, which has been the cause of the endless disputes between East and West as to the "Procession" of the Spirit from the Son as well as from the Father. As far back as the fourth century, at all events, the clause τὸ ἐκ (not τὸ) τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον has found a place in the Creed as descriptive of the Holy Spirit, and is taken from the verse before us. But to claim that this interpretation was present to the mind of Jn. would be to import into the Gospel the controversies and doctrines of the fourth century. δὲ παράκλητος ἐκπορευόμενος does not refer to the mysterious relationships between the Persons of the Holy Trinity, but only to the fact that the Spirit who bears witness of Jesus Christ has come from God (cf. Rev. 21, where in like manner the river of the water of life is described as ἑκατερίξεως ἐκ τοῦ θρόνου τοῦ θεοῦ).

ἕως μισθοφορεῖ δὴ ξεῖν ἰδοῦν. ἐκεῖνος calls special attention to the Spirit as the subject of the sentence, exactly as at 14. It is He, and none less than He, who shall bear augment and true witness to the world about Christ. Cf. 1 Jn. 5:7, τὸ πνεῦμα ἐστιν τὸ μισθοφόρον, ὅτι τὸ πνεῦμα ἐστίν ἡ ἁληθεία.

1 See Hort, Two Dissertations, p. 86.
GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN [XV. 26-XVI. 2.

IV. I. 27. καὶ ἔφα ὅτι ἂν μὴ δέχηται ὅτι ἄν

XVI. 2. τῷ Λατρείῳ προσδέχεται τῷ Ἡσυ. 3. καὶ πᾶν παίρνοντος ἄνω τοῦ πλευράς τοῦ Ἱησοῦ ἄνω. 4. καὶ τὰ τιμηθέντα ἄνω τοῦ Ἱησοῦ ἄνω.

However little modern conceptions of personality and of what it implies were present to the mind of the first century, the repeated application of ἔχων to the Spirit in these chapters (I. 15; 16: 11 12, 26) shows that for Jn. to προσδέχεται τῷ Ἡσυς meant more than a mere tendency or influence.

27. The Spirit was to be a Witness concerning Jesus in the future: the disciples’ ministry of witness had already begun.

καὶ ἔφα ὅτι δὲ μορφεῖται, “ye also bear witness”; (a statement of fact, not an imperative); cf. Lk. 24:49. The twofold witness of the Spirit and of the disciples is indicated Acts 5:22, but Jn. specially dwells on this witness of the first disciples (cf. 5:11, I Jn. 2:14, 3 Jn. 12; and see Introd., p. xci).

The qualification for “witness” is personal intimacy, ὅπως ἄν ἀρχή ἐνεργεῖ ἢ αὐτός: cf. Lk. 1:1, Acts 1:5.

ἀπήρριψε another occurs again 2:44 only, but is frequent in the Johannine Epistles, sometimes (e.g. 1 Jn. 2:6, 3:11, 2 Jn. 1:9) referring to the beginning of Jesus’ ministry, as here, but sometimes also to the beginning of all things (e.g. 1 Jn. 1:1 2:1, 3:1, as always in the Synoptists). See 2:44, 16, 2:16, “ye are with me from the beginning.” So Jesus said τὸν Κόσμον ἐνέργεια ἐν τοῖς ἐν σοί (1:9), using the present tense as here. The Twelve had been chosen ἐν παντί μετ’ ἀντίον (Μk. 3:14), and they continued to be in close fellowship with Him.

Future persecution (XVI. 1-4).

XVI. 1. ταῦτα λειτάρια ἄνω: see on 15:11. ταῦτα covers all that has been said about future persecution (15:28), as well as about the promise of the Paraclete, who was to bear witness concerning Christ.

μὴ πάρεικακάσθη. This image of the σκάβαλα of faith, the stumbling-blocks which trip up a disciple, is very common in the Synoptists, but in Jn. only here and at 6:6 (cf. 1 Jn. 216). These parting counsels were given in order that they might not be surprised or “offended” when troubles came.

2. ἄντων αὐτούς τοινυντου ἄνω, “they will put you out of synagogue,” i.e. excommunicate you. For ἄντων αὐτούς, see on 1:24 and 1:26.

ἀλλ’ ἔρχεται ἄνω, “indeed, furthermore, a time is coming.”
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ὅμως δοθή λατρείῳ προσδέχεται τῷ Ἡσυ. 3. καὶ πᾶν παίρνοντος ἄνω τοῦ πλευράς τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἄνω. 4. καὶ τὰ τιμηθέντα ἄνω τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἄνω.

ἀλλά has no adversee sense here, nor must we press ἄνω to mean “the predestined time,” as if it were ἦ ἄνω (but cf. v. 4), although, as we have seen (26), the idea of the inevitableness of what has been foreordained is a favourite one in Jn. See 20:19, ὦν, i.e. “when”; see note on 12:20.

τῶν δ’ ἀντικειμένων ἢ, “whosoever killeth you,” whether he be Jew or Gentile.

ὅτα τῷ Ἱησοῦ προσδέχεται τῷ Ἡσυ, “shall think (so blind will be he) that he is offering service to God.” (Ἀπολύω does not occur elsewhere in the Gospels.) Paul’s persecution of the early churches was a notable instance of such mistaken zeal (cf. Acts 22:1-26, also 15:39). A Midrash on Num. 24:12 (cited by De Wette) has the maxim, “Quisquis effundit sanguinem impius ident facit se si sacrificium offerat.” And among Gentiles the same fanaticism has often displayed itself. Tertullus (Adm. xxv. 44) evidently thought that persecution of Christians to their death was morally justified. Many persecutors are sincere, but their sincerity does not excuse them, if they might have learnt the truth, and did not do so.

3. ταῦτα παίρνοντο ἄνω. The rec., with ADL and some vs., retains ἄνω, which ABΓΔΘ omit. Probably it ought to be retained (cf. 15:28).

ὅτι ἰδοὺ ἔρχομαι καθι, “because they did not recognise the Father or me.” This is virtually repeated from 15:27 (where see note). That the Jews did not “know” God, and thus did not recognise Divinity in Jesus, has been said several times before (7:19 219); and that “the world knew Him not” (1:10) when He came is the constant theme of the “Gospel of the Rejection.”

Ignorance, or want of appreciation of the true bearing of facts, may often be at the root of wrong doing, and it is wholesome to remember this. “When some one does you an injury or speaks ill of you, remember that he either does it or speaks it, believing that it is right and meet for him to do so... So you will bear a gentle mind towards him... saying each time, ‘So it appears to him’” (Epictetus, Enchir. 42). Cf. Lk. 23:34 Acts 3:17, 1 Cor. 2:8.

But the ignorance of the Jews of the true character of Jesus is always treated in Jn. as blameworthy and as deserving of punishment, for they ought to have known.

4. For ταῦτα λειτάρια ἄνω, see on 15:11. It is preceded by ἄλλα, not because what follows is in contrast with what goes
before, but as a resumptive particle, v. 3 being in the nature of an explanatory parenthesis.

οὕτως αὐτῶν is the true reading (ἌΒΘ συν.), although αὐτῶς is omitted by κομικά, to assimilate the sentence to the more usual ὠς Ἡμᾶς. 

Thus refers primarily (but cf. v. 1) to the persecutions which have been foreshadowed (15:20, 16:8), of which Jesus says that when their hour comes the disciples will remember that He had predicted them. See on 13:19; and cf. 22.

ἐγὼ is emphatic, "that I told you." See Intro., p. cxvii.

Thus refers to ὧν ἐγὼ ἐκ τῶν διδαχῶν ὑμῶν. We cannot distinguish ἐξ ἀρχῆς from αὖ ἀρχῆς of 15:27 (see on 6:4). The statement is precise, "Those things I did not tell you from the beginning," that is, He did not speak in the early stages of His teaching of the persecutions which would come upon His disciples after He had gone. That is what one would have expected; and the predictions of future persecutions in the Synoptists are mainly found at the close of His ministry, e.g. Mt. 23:34, Mk. 13:9, Lk. 21:24. It is true that Mt. puts his parallel passage to Mk. 13:22 as early as the tenth chapter (Mt. 10:23); and it is also noteworthy that persecution is foreshadowed in the Sermon on the Mount (Mt. 5:10, Lk. 6:23). But Mt. has reason for our Lord's sayings in such contexts as suit the frame of his narrative, and it is not surprising that he has placed the warning about persecution immediately after the charge to the Twelve. Nor is it to be thought that all the reported sayings in the Sermon on the Mount were delivered at one time: the Beatitude of the Persecuted would naturally be one of the last that would have been proclaimed, so austere a saying is it.

There is, therefore, no good reason for doubting the statement which Jn. places in the mouth of Jesus, viz. that He did not speak at the beginning of His ministry of the advent in store for His followers, although the perpetual burden of His exhortation was that they must be ready to "take up the cross." Cf. 15:18.

The reason assigned for this reserve is δὲ μεθ ὧν ἦμεν, "because I was with you." That is, seemingly, as long as He was there, the attacks of His enemies would be directed against Him rather than against them; persecution of a serious kind would come upon them only after His departure.

The coming of the Paraclete consequent on the departure of Jesus (vv. 5-7)

5. ὡς ὧν ἐγὼ ἐκ τῶν διδαχῶν ὑμῶν, repeated verbally from 7:52, where see note on ἐκ τῶν διδαχῶν. Cf. vv. 10, 17, 28, and 14:12, καὶ δόθησα καθὼς τις ἐγὼ ἐκ τῶν διδαχῶν ὑμῶν, i.e. is used for ἐκ τῶν διδαχῶν, as often in Jn.: see note on 10:16. These words show that 13:20, 14! came after the present chapter in their original setting (see Intro., p. xx); for τὸν ἐδήσας is the question put by Peter directly, and indirectly by Thomas at 14:9. At the point which the discourse has now reached, the disciples were thinking rather of themselves and of the dangers in front of them (15:16, 16:4), than of the issue of their Master's mission.

For the Johannine use of ἐδήσας, primarily meaning "to ask a question," see on 11:26.

The "going" of Jesus "to the Father" throughout this chapter refers directly to His Death, when He re-entered the world of spirit (cf. Lk. 23:46). This was the moment when His mission was completed: τετελεσμένης (10:50). Jn. lays no stress on the Ascension as distinct from the Resurrection of Christ (although he makes allusion to the Ascension as a specific event, 6:68). See 20:17. For him the hour of the "glorification of Jesus was the hour of His Passion (cf. 12:23 and 14:31.

6. δὲ τούτῳ λεγομένῳ ὑμῖν, 5c, because He had told them of the persecutions which they would experience: see on 15:31.

8. is found in Jn. in this chapter only (vv. 20, 21, 23); λόγῳ, λόγων, are never used of Jesus in the Gospels.

7. For the asseveration τὴν ἀδέσποταν λέγει, cf. Rom. 9, 1 Tim. 2:5. Jesus had used it before, in disputation with the Jews (6:48-49). Here, however, it introduces with solemnity the enigmatical saying "it is expedient for you that I go away," and is used like the prelude ἔρχομαι λέγω ὑμῖν (vv. 20, 23), which is a feature of the Fourth Gospel (see on 11:32). Cf. the 11:18 (19) ὡς ὧν ἐγὼ ἐκ τῶν διδασάων. This was a hard and perplexing saying. The disciples, who had been accustomed to look to Jesus for counsel and guidance in every difficulty, were now told that it would be better for them that He should go away than that He should stay with them. (1) If hitherto, He had trained them for His service by precept and visible example, but this method of spiritual direction was only preliminary. His strange words told them now that there is a better education in discipleship than that which can be

οὗτως ἔσται ἡ ἀνάληψις. Ἡ γὰρ μὴ ἀνύψωσθαι τὸν Παρακλήτου οὐκ

was supplied by a visible master, whose will for his disciples can never be misunderstood. The braver and more perfect disciple is he who can walk by faith, and not by sight only (cf. 20:7). So much might be reasoned out after reflection on the way in which Jesus dealt with some would-be disciples who wished to be Jews by His side (cf. Lk. 8:26-27). (2) But the reason assigned by Jesus Himself for the profitableness to His disciples of His departure is quite different. He said that if He did not go away from them, the Paraclete would not come to them, and that the mission of the Spirit could not begin until He had gone. This is one of those profound spiritual sayings in the Fourth Gospel which cannot be fully explained; but we have it hinted at before in the evangelist's words, "The Spirit was not yet glorified" (15:26). Why the Spirit's influence could not be released during the earthly ministry of Jesus, as it was after His Passion and Resurrection, is a question to which no complete answer can be given. Perhaps it provides the supreme illustration of the gospel law that life comes only through death: a principle which is applied by Paul as well as by Jn., when he speaks of the Risen Christ (who had passed through death) as a Quickening Spirit. See further on 7:30 above. 1 It has been well said that "the coming of the Holy Ghost was not merely to supply the absence of the Son, but to complete His presence." 2

ἀνάληψις. Three verbs are used in this passage (vv. 7-9) of Jesus "going" to God; and attempts have been made to distinguish their meaning. Thus, ἀναληθεύω is "to depart." simply; πορεύομαι is "to journey," sc. with a definite purpose, the purpose here being the sending of the Paraclete; while ἴδανεν, the word most commonly used in Jn. by Jesus of His "going to the Father" (see on 7:3) is "to withdraw," sc. from the visible presence of men. But such distinctions are over subtle; e.g. in 11:1 ἴδανεν is not used of a withdrawing, but of going to Judea with a definite purpose. Again, Mk. 14:21 has ἴδανεν where the parallel Lk. 22:21 has πορεύομαι; in Tob. 8:21 B has πορεύομαι, while R has ἴδανεν. These verbs are discussed at length by Abbott (Diat. 1652-1664), who endeavours to distinguish the Johannine usage of each: see on 7:31, and cf. 6:22.

1 I have discussed this great topic more fully in Studia Sacra, pp. 147-150.
2 Gosc, Bampton Lectures, p. 152.

XVI 7-8.] The Work of the Paraclete

ὁ υἱὸς ἡμῶν ἐκκέντησεν ἐκ τῶν ὀρατῶν. So καθότι; but BL have ὁ υἱὸς ἁληθινός, an even stronger negative.

The language of this passage implies that the mission of the Paraclete, to help and to bear witness, will be of a different order from that influence of the Spirit of God which is a frequent topic of the O.T. writers. His mission will, henceforth, be primarily a mission of witness, bearing testimony to Jesus as the Revealer of God. The Spirit of God had always been at work in the world, inspiring, enlightening, strengthening mankind; but that He was to come as the παράκλητος of Jesus and His disciples was a new thing. Henceforth He will come ὁ δὲ παράκλητος ἡμῶν (see note on 14:26).

ὁ δὲ παράκλητος, τοιοῦτος αὐτοῦ πρὸς ὑμᾶς. See 15:25, where we have ἔγειρα τε πέραρσεν ὑμᾶς, ἔδωκεν ὑμῖν τὸ ἔλεος being identical in meaning. Jn. is apt (see on 3:20) to repeat an important statement in slightly different words.

The Work of the Paraclete (vv. 8-15)

8. In the following verses the work of the Paraclete is predicted in some detail. We have already had His office described as one of witness (15:26): He is to vindicate Jesus to the world. But He is also to vindicate the apostles in the testimony which they are to deliver (15:27). They will be exposed to persecution (16:2); but, notwithstanding this, they will have a powerful advocate by their side (16:7). He will be their παράκλητος no less than the παράκλητος of Jesus; or, rather, He will be theirs because He is His.

In the Synoptists, this promise of support and Divine help in persecution is recorded more briefly, but quite explicitly. "When they lead you to judgment . . . be not anxious what you shall speak . . . ; for it is not you that speak, but the Holy Spirit." (Mk. 13:11, Mt. 26:16, Lk. 21:12, 21-22). Here is assured to the apostles the help of the παράκλητος, as the advocate for their defence, who speaks through their mouths. In the present passage Jn. presents this thought more fully. The παράκλητος will not only provide their defence, but He will assume the part of the prosecutor, who convicts their accusers and the accusers of Jesus being in the wrong. All early Christian preaching was, of necessity, apologetic and polemical. The first heralds of the gospel had to defend their new message, and were constrained to attack the Jewish and heathen doctrines in which much of evil was present. Both in defence and attack, the Holy Spirit was their unseen παράκλητος.
8. καὶ Ὁ ἀγιός ἀληθῶς ἐλέγετε τὸν κόσμον περὶ ἀμαρτίας καὶ περὶ δικαιοσύνης καὶ περὶ κρίσεως. 9. περὶ ἀμαρτίας μὲν, δι’ αὐτὸ πιστεύσατε; 10. περὶ δικαιοσύνης, ἐξαιτεῖτε. ἐλέγατε τὸν κόσμον καὶ ἀληθῶς ἠκούσατε αὐτὸν ἀληθῶς

καὶ ὃ ἔλημεν ἡμεῖς ἀληθῶς μὴ τινα ἡμεῖς. ἐλέγατε τὸν κόσμον καὶ ἀληθῶς ἠκούσατε αὐτόν ἀληθῶς καὶ περὶ δικαιοσύνης καὶ περὶ κρίσεως. 9. περὶ ἀμαρτίας μὲν, δι’ αὐτὸ πιστεύσατε; 10. περὶ δικαιοσύνης, ἐξαιτεῖτε. ἐλέγατε τὸν κόσμον καὶ ἀληθῶς ἠκούσατε αὐτόν ἀληθῶς καὶ περὶ δικαιοσύνης καὶ περὶ κρίσεως.

XVI. 10-11.]

CONVICTON OF RIGHTEOUSNESS

10. περὶ δικαιοσύνης. Συγ. sin. has (at v. 8) “He will reprove the world in its sins and about His righteousness.” This brings out that the δικαιοσύνη of which the world will be “convinced” to its shame is the δικαιοσύνη of Christ. It will be “convicted of righteousness” by pointing to Christ and to the Righteous One (1 Jn. 2,1 Pet. 3, Acts 3,7). The Jews, as Paul says, are “ignorant of God’s righteousness” (Rom. 1.11); they had not perceived that a new type of righteousness had been exhibited in the Person of Jesus, in whom was “no unrighteousness” (7 above). But the words used here go deeper.

“He shall convict the world of righteousness, because I go to the Father.” Absolute Righteousness could be revealed only in the Risen Christ. With the Passion, His Revelation of the Father was completed (see on v. 5); and henceforth the Paraclete was to convince the world of the Perfect Righteousness which is in Christ revealed and made accessible to men.

It is opposite to cite here the testimony of one of the most impartial of modern historians. It was reserved for Christianity,” writes Lecky, “to present to the world the ideal character, which through all the changes of eighteen centuries has inspired the hearts of men with an impassioned love; has shown itself capable of acting on all ages, nations, temperaments, and conditions; has been not only the highest pattern of virtue, but the strongest incentive to its practice; and has exercised so deep an influence that it may be truly said that the simple record of three short years of active life has done more to regenerate and soften mankind than all the disquisitions of philosophers and all the exhortations of moralists.” If we put this tribute into Johannine language, we shall say that the Spirit has convinced the world of the Righteousness of Christ.

δεῖ γὰρ τὸν πατέρα ὑπάγει. Cf. vv. 5, 16, 17, 19, 28; and see 73 for δικαίωσις. After πατέρα, the rec. inserts μον, with ΑΓΑΘΩ, but om. ΕΒΔΛΩ.

καὶ οὐκ θεοπαίδευτε μον, “and ye behold me no longer,” sc. with the bodily eyes, for Jesus will have entered into the region of spirit. Cf. vv. 16, 17, 19. There is no contradiction between this and ήπειρα δικαίωσις μον of 14(9), δικαίωσις being here used of spiritual vision. See on 20 for the various usage of this verb in Jn.

11. περὶ δὲ κρίσεως. As the Spirit will convict the world of its sin, and reveal the true δικαιοσύνη, thereby the spiritual
significance of judgment will be disclosed (cf. 580, Acts 1721). There is nothing arbitrary in the Divine judgment; it is the inevitable issue of moral laws. Good is not the same as evil, and the sharpness of the distinction is revealed by the Spirit in His assurance of κρίσις, i.e., separation or judgment. He will convince the world at once of the justice and the inevitableness of God’s judgments.

The world (see 620) is not yet judged; but it will be judged at last; and the assurance of this is part of the message of Christ’s Passion; for in this, which was apparently defeat but really victory, ὑπὸ τοῦ σωσίματος τοῦτον (cf. 702 740 for this title) κατεργασατο, “the prince of this world has been judged.” See on 748 where this has been said before, in similar words; and on 749, where the Passion is regarded as already begun. For this aspect of the Passion, that it is the defeat of the Evil One, cf. Heb. 214, “that through death He might bring to nought him that had the power of death, that is, the devil.” In later times, pious imagination played round the idea of the defeat and judgment of Satan, and the legend of the Harrowing of Hell, first found in the Gospel of Nicodemus, was widespread. All that is said in Jn. is κατεργασατο, “he has already been judged” (cf. Lk. 162), and this will issue in final expulsion from the domain over which he claimed rule (749).

In the fifth century Freer MS. (W), which contains the last twelve verses of Mark, there is interpolated after Mk. 164, in which Jesus has rebuked the unbeliefs of the disciples, a remarkable passage which recalls the order of ideas in Jn. 1068, as follows: 14 And they excused themselves, saying that this age of lawlessness and unbelief is under Satan, who, through the agency of unclean spirits, does not allow the true power of God to be apprehended. Wherefore, they said to Christ, reveal now Thy righteousness. And Christ said to them, The limit of the years of Satan’s authority has been fulfilled (παρελθωσεν ὁ ἡμερολογιον τῆς Ἐρρονιδάς τοῦ Σατανᾶ), but other terrors (διὸ) draw near, and I was delivered up to death on behalf of those that have sinned, that they may be turned to the truth and sin no more, so that they may inherit the spiritual and incorruptible glory of righteousness in heaven. But go ye into all the world, etc.” Here we have a complaint of unbelief caused by Satan, to be cured by the revelation of Christ’s righteousness, to which Christ replies that Satan’s power is ended, that is, “he has been judged” (Jn. 1621). The impending “terrors” may be the persecutions foretold in Jn. 168. In this ἀποκάλυψις there may be preserved an independent tradition of words recorded in Jn. 16821.

XVI. 12-18.] THE SPIRIT’S TEACHING

12. Ἐπὶ πολλὰ ἔξω ὑμῶν λέγεις, ἄλλα ὡς διάκονος βασιλέα ἡμῶν. 13. ὅταν δὲ ἐμὸν ἡκίνησε τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἐλπίδας, ὅγγισεν ὃμας εἰς τὸν ἐλπιζόμενον παντὸς ὧν γὰρ λαλήσει, αὕτη ἐνάντια ἐκείνῳ,

12. on 748, but the rec. has λέγει. The constr. is thoroughly classical; cf. Demosth. Οἰνιάτικ. ii. τῷ μῖν ἄλλα εἴπει, πολλ' ἐχων εἶχαι. At 748 Jesus had assured His disciples that He had withheld from them nothing of His Father’s purpose, but this was necessarily subject to the reservation that there were some matters which they could not understand. All revelation is subject to the condition “Quicquid recipitur, recipitur ad modum recipientis.” So He now tells them that there are many things which they cannot yet bear (cf. 1 Cor. 3), butσατανοῦ is used figuratively (as at Acts 164) of “bearing” a mental burden; see on 748. For ἀρν. see on 748; its position here at the end of the sentence gives it emphasis.

The words of this verse show that the full Christian message is not contained in such teaching as, e.g., is found in the Synoptic Gospels. That marks a stage only in the revelation of God in Christ. If the challenge “Back to Jesus” means that we may safely neglect the interpretation of His gospel put forth by the Christians of the Apostolic age, then it is misleading. It is part of the teaching of Jesus Himself, if Jn. 168 truly expresses His mind, that much would be learnt of Divine things under the guidance of the Spirit, which could not have been taught with profit during His public ministry on earth.

18. We have here a new thought as to the office of the Paraclete. Hitherto He has been presented as the vindicator of Jesus to the world, by His witness (158), and His convincing and convicting power (168-21). But now He appears in a different capacity, e.g., as a Guide and Teacher of the faithful (vv. 13-15). Cf. 148, where a short summary is given of what is said more fully here as to the office of the Spirit in relation to the Church.

ὅταν δὲ ἐμὸν ἡκίνησε, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἐλπίδας. This is repeated from 158, where see the note.

διακόνος ὡς εἰς τὴν ἐλπίδα παντῶν. So AB, but the rec. has τῶν ἐλπιζόμενον παντῶν. εἰς τὴν ἐλπίδα παντῶν is read by κ.δ.λ.Μ. and supported by many O.L. texta: a reading perhaps due to the greater frequency of εἰς than εἰς after ἀνήκου in the Psalms (e.g. 297 674 1069 1706).

The Vulgate rendering docetit omne veritatem has been thought to represent διακόνει ὡς τὴν ἡ. παντ., a reading which is found in Cyril Hier. (Cat. xvii. 11) and in Eusebius, but which is not supported by any extant Greek
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MS. of the Gospel. Wordsworth and White (in loc.) suggest that we have here a trace of a Greek MS. used by Jerome which is now lost, but the inference is doubtful. Neither διδάσκωμεν nor διδάσκεται are used elsewhere by Jn., but the true Greek reading may be taken to be διδάσκεται οἷς εἰς κλα. The Spirit is represented as the Guide or Leader who points the Way (διδάσκεται) to the Truth (δίδασκεται), Christ being Himself both the Way and the Truth (14).

In Rev. 7:10 διδάσκεται is used of the Lamb leading the saints to fountains of living water; but the thought and the language of the verse before us seem to go back to the O.T. conception of the Divine leadership of Israel as a whole and of individual Israelites, which is so often expressed in the Psalms. Cf. Ps. 143:10 τῷ πνεύματι σου τῷ ἀγνῷ (ο.θ. ἀγαθῷ) διδάσκεται με ἀν τῇ εἰδώλῳ, Ps. 23:5 διδάσκεται με ἀν τῷ πνεύματι σου. See also Ps. 107.

We have a similar phrase in Philo (de vit. Mosh. iii. 36), who says that sometimes a guess is akin to a prophecy, for the mind would not hit on the point so directly, were not a divine spirit leading it towards the truth, εἰ μὴ καὶ θεῶν ἵνα πνεύματος τὸ πρόηγοντος πρὸς αὐτὸν τὴν ἀλήθειαν.

In this verse, then, the work of the Paraclete as a guide is brought into close relation with what is said in the Psalms (especially Ps. 143:10) as to the work of the Spirit of Yahweh. The Paraclete is not explicitly identified with the "Holy Spirit," a Name familiar to every Jew, until 14:16; but what is said at this point prepares us for the identification.

διδάσκεται οἷς εἰς κλα. "He will guide you," εἰς, the apostles, to whom the words were addressed. It is natural, and in a sense legitimate, for modern readers to give the promise a wider reference, and to interpret it of a gradual revelation of the truth to the Church under the guidance of the Spirit. But it is not clear that the author of the Fourth Gospel would have recognised such an interpretation of the words which he records. For him, the revelation to the apostles after the Descent of the Spirit was final and complete (cf. 20:16 and Heb. 11). In any case, by "all the truth" is meant here "all the truth about Christ and His Gospel"; the thought of the gradual revelation of scientific truth, and the ever-increasing knowledge of the works of God in nature, is not present in the text. The promise to the apostles did not mean, e.g., that they would be divinely guided into all truth as to economic law or as to the distribution of property (Acts 4:35).

See further on 14:16.

1 I have discussed this point in Hæmatheca (1855, p. 185, and 1897, p. 340).
2 Cf. Justin (Tryph. 39), εἰς πάντα τῆς διδάσκεσις μεταβαθεισμένον.
14. ἐκάνον ἐμὲ δοξᾶσθαι, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήφηται καὶ ἀναγεγέλται ἡμῖν. 25. ράγια δει ήξε ο Παντερ ἐμ Ἐστιν διὰ τούτῳ ἐστω ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἐμου λαμβάνει καὶ ἀναγεγέλει ἡμῖν.

14. ἐκάνον ἐμὲ δοξᾶσθαι. The Spirit was not to come until Jesus had been "glorified," i.e. in His Passion (v. 24); but thenceforth every fresh revelation of the Spirit, all new insight into the meaning of Christ's gospel, would be a fresh "glorification" of Christ, an enlargement of man's sense of His majesty. As the Son had "glorified" the Father while He was on earth (17), so the Spirit will "glorify" the Son after He has departed from human vision.

ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήφηται καὶ ἀναγεγέλει ἡμῖν. This "glorification" will be brought about by the Spirit's revelation of Christian truth. The advanced Christology of the Pauline Epistles, and of the Fourth Gospel itself, as compared with that to which the apostles had attainted before the Passion, is a signal illustration of this. See 14 with the question of Jude shows that very different thoughts as to the future "glorification" of Jesus filled the hearts of the apostles. They expected a visible manifestation in glory, which should convict the world and put it to shame.

15. ἐκαί ἔστε ὁ πατὴρ ἐμ ἐστω. This is the perpetual claim of the Johannine Christ, repeated once more at 17. So Paul can speak of "the unsearchable wealth of the Christ" (Eph. 3:9).

διὰ τούτου, referring to what precedes (see on 14). "Wherefore I said that (ὅτι rectitatis) He takes of man and shall show it unto you," repeated from v. 14, with the slight verbal change of ἐκβάλει (BDLW Lies) for λήφηται of v. 14 (which is retained by the rec. with ήμα, the Latin vss., and Syc. sin.). This repetition of a striking phrase, a word or two being altered, is a feature of Johannine style (see on 39). ἢμῖν ἔστω, thrice repeated at the end of vv. 13, 14, 15, is like a solemn refrain, calling special attention to the revealing office of the Spirit.

The disciples' perplexity as to Jesus' return (vv. 16-18)

16. μωρῶν, "a little while": see on 13 13 14. Jesus dwells again and again on the nearness of His Passion. οὖδεν is the true reading at this point (BDLWNG); but the rec. has οὐδὲν (assimilated to v. 17), with ΑΓ. καὶ οὖδεν θαυμάστε με is here repeated from v. 10.

"A little while, and ye no longer behold me," sc. with the
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16. ἔκερα καὶ οὐδέν θαυμάστη με, καὶ πάλιν μωρῶν καὶ ἐξοφλή με. 17. Εἶπαν οὖν ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ πρὸς ἄλλον ἔτοι τοῦτο δ λέγει ἤν ἡμῖν καὶ οὐ θαυμάστη με, καὶ πάλιν μωρῶν καὶ ἐξοφλή με; καὶ ὅτε εἶπα, προς τὸν Παντερ; 18. ἔλεγαν οὖν Τι ἐστιν τοῦτο δ λέγει, το μωρῶν; οὐκ ἀδικάμη τι λαλεῖ. 19. ἔγνω bodily eyes (see on 23 for θαυμά). On the day after these words were spoken, He would meet death, after which they would no longer be able to look upon His face as heretofore. It is to be observed that οὐδέν (see on 42) always means "no longer" in Jn., sc. that the action in question is discontinued; it does not necessarily mean "never again."

καὶ πάλιν μωρῶν καὶ ἐξοφλή με; "And again, a little while," sc. the period between His Death and His Resurrection, "and ye shall see me." ἐστιν, a verb always used in Jn. of the vision of spiritual realities (see on 23), now takes the place of θαυμά, παλικ δὲ ἠμείνα ἤνας, Jesus says, in like manner, at v. 22. The "seeing" of the Risen Lord in His spiritual body, and His "seeing" of His disciples after His Resurrection, are more suitably expressed by ἐπιθυμοῦ τις εἰς ὃς ἄρεθ (although cf. 20).

The rec. adds (from v. 10 or v. 17), after ἐξοφλή με, ὅτε έγνω υπάρχει τιν τοῦ πατέρα, with ἀνάθει; but the phrase is not found at this point in BDLW or Pap. Oxy. 1781.

17. The disciples were puzzled. ἐπανάρχει τὸν πατέρα (v. 10) seems to indicate a final withdrawal of His visible presence, and yet He used the word μωρῶν (v. 16), which suggested that it would be only temporary.

ἐπαν οὖν ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ κτλ. We must supply τιτί. For a similar elliptical construction, cf. 70; and for πρὸς ἄλλον, cf. 43.

They repeated the enigmatic words of Jesus to each other, being unable to catch their meaning.

Note that they quote Jesus as having said μωρῶν καὶ οὐ (not οὖν) θαυμάστη με, and Jesus is represented in verse 19 as repeating οὐθαυμάστη με. This provides one more illustration of Jn.'s habit of altering slightly a striking phrase when it is reproduced for the second or third time (see on 39). Such verbal alterations are not to be taken as indicating a subtle change of meaning; they exemplify merely the freedom of Jn.'s style.

18. τι ἐστιν τοῦτο. So BDLW and Pap. Oxy. 1781; but the rec. has τοῦτο τι ἐστιν, with ΑΓ. τὸ δὲ λέγει, το μωρῶν: "What is this that He says, this word μωρῶν?" το before μωρῶν singles out the word as the point of difficulty.
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Words of comfort and hope (vv. 20-24)

20. In the answer which Jesus gives to the bewildered disciples, he fixes on the word μικρόν, which was the centre of their difficulty, and says nothing about the meaning of "I go to the Father." Their short time of sorrow at his departure will be followed by a season of joy. That is enough for them to know at the moment.

21. εἰς χαρὰν γενομένην. These are the verbs used of the loud wailings and lamentations customary in the East after a death. They both occur Jer. 25:10; for κλαίει, see on 1111, and for βρείῃ, cf. 2 Sam. 17. That the women lamented for Jesus (ἀδερφῶν αὐτὸν) on the way to the Cross is told Lk. 23:28; and that they were wailing (κλαίουσα) on the way to the Resurrection is mentioned Mk. 16:10; cf. Jn. 20:11 Μαριὰμ . . . κλαίουσα. Pseudo-Peter (§ 2) adds that the apostles also exhibited their sorrow by weeping, ιεπρῆς . . . διπλωμένης καὶ δυστύχωμεν. It is plain that κλαίοντες καὶ βρείοντες in the present passage refers to the grief which the disciples will display when their Master is taken from them.

II. 18-20. WORDS OF COMFORT AND HOPE. 21. [literally, with the word μικρόν, which was the centre of their difficulty, and says nothing about the meaning of . . . their Master is taken from them.

δὲ κόσμος χαρίστευτο: but the hostile world, i.e. the Jewish adversaries of Jesus, will rejoice that the Prophet whom they hate has been removed.

ἀλλ' ἡ λίπη ρωμ. εἰς χαράν γενομένην. So it came to pass. ἐκλήκτων δια μαθητῆς θὸν τοῦ κύριου (204). Cf. ἀπὸ πένθους εἰς χαράν (Bleek. 99); and see Jer. 31:19. See also 2 Esd. 20.

καὶ γυν. καὶ ἡ ἄνω, woman, what follows being universally true: cf. διὰ χάσκος (104) or διὰ διόλου (104). Abbott (Dict. 104) takes the article as indicating that it is the woman of a household, i.e. the wife, that is in question. But this is to miss the point.

The image of a woman in a woman in the O.T., where the suddenness and inevitability of travail pains are often mentioned (e.g. Isa. 66:6; 2 Esd. 16); but the thought of the joy which follows the pain does not occur except here. Some expositors have thought that the Birth of the Church and the travail pains of the Passion are contemplated in this passage (cf. Isa. 66:6, Hos. 12:10, Mk. 12); but it is over subtle and inconsistent with the context to bring in such an idea.

The apostles were not in travail with the Church that was to be. The true (and only) exposition of this beautiful image is given in the verse which follows. The image provides a familiar and touching illustration of the truth that pain is often the necessary antecedent to the supreme joys of life.

καὶ γυν. ἄνω. For the constr. see 99. This is the application of the image of the joy which follows the pain of childbirth. "You now, indeed (for μέτα, see on v. 9), have grief," but presently you will rejoice. Αὐτής (H&BCA) is to be preferred to Αὐτής (καὶ γυν. ἄνω)

παῖνες ἐκ ὑῳμίου ὑδάτω. Here is even a greater promise than ὑδατήθη με of v. 16: it is better to be seen of God than to see Him (cf. Gal. 4:14). This was the promise of Jesus, that He would see His disciples after He was risen.

καὶ χαρίστευτο: but the hostile world, i.e. the Jewish adversaries of Jesus, will rejoice that the Prophet whom they hate has been removed.

The phrase is identical with that of Isa. 66:6 (ἀδερφοί, καὶ χαρίστευτο: θὸν κύριον ἡμῶν: cf. also Ps. 33:27). Cf. 20:18, when the promise was fulfilled in the first instance. Such joy is inalienable, ὑδατήθη μέτα ὑδάτω, the future which is certain being represented by a present

Nevertheless BD*N Pap. Oxy. 1781 have ἀρέτα, which Westcott adopts. But ΑCD*LΔ* and Pap. Oxy. 1228 give ἀρέται. W has ἄρετα.

28. ἐν βεβαιώσει τῆς ἐμφάνως ἐξε ὑμῶν ἐρωτήσεσθε αἰτίαν. This phrase occurs again at v. 26, and at 14:12; and in each case it signifies the day when the Spirit has been released, Jesus having been "glorified" (see on 7b). The teaching of the Fourth Gospel is that the moment of consummation of the work of Jesus is the moment of His Death: τελήσας τὸν θάνατόν μου (19:30). After His Resurrection, He gave the Spirit to the assembled disciples: λαμβάνει τῷ ἐμπόρῳ (20:22). The Day of Pentecost is described in Acts 2 as a Day when a special gift of spiritual power was manifested, and there is nothing in Jn. which is inconsistent with such a manifestation. But for Jn. the Day of the Spirit's Advent is the Day of the Resurrection of Jesus; and to introduce the thoughts of what happened at Pentecost into the exegesis of these Last Discourses is to make confusion. ἐν βεβαιώσει τῆς ἐμφάνως signifies the new Dispensation or Era of the Spirit, which began with the Resurrection, to the thought of Jn.

ἐν δὲ ὑμῶν ἐρωτήσεσθε αἰτίαν. ἐρωτάν may mean either "to ask a question," as often in Jn. (11:26, 25 15:6 16:12, 19, 20, 26 16:28, 30, 18:21, 21), or "to entreat, to beseech, to ask a boon" (as at 7b, 10, 11, 12, 21, 13, 20). We have already noted (on 14:28) that it is the verb used of the prayers of Jesus by Himself (16:24 21:17 14:23, 26), but that it is not used elsewhere in the Gospel of the prayers of men (cf., however, 1 Jn. 5:14). Hence ἐν δὲ ὑμῶν ἐρωτήσεσθε αἰτίαν may be translated in two ways:

(1) "In that day ye shall ask me no questions," as they had desired to do, v. 19; cf. v. 30. When the Paraclete came, they would no longer need to ask Jesus questions, such as those addressed to Him at 13:16 16b; for the Spirit would teach them all things (14:26 16:13). But this seems to break the sequence of thought, and there is no mention of the Spirit in the immediate context. Further, as Field points out, the emphatic position of ἐν before the negative and the verb, naturally suggests a comparison with τῶν παρελαμβανόντων in the next clause.

(2) It is better to render, "In that day, ye shall ask nothing of me." The visible company of Jesus would be withdrawn, so that they would no longer be able to ask favours of Him or prayer requests to Him, face to face. But there is a great compensation, and its promise is introduced by the solemn prelude ὑμῖν ἀρέτα ἐλεύθερον ἔχετε (see on 26). They can henceforth have direct access to the Father, and whatever they ask of Him, the due conditions of Christian prayer being observed (see on 14:16), shall be given.

The view that the contrast is between "asking me" and "asking the Father" has been rejected by some commentators because ἐρωτάν is used in the first case, and αἰτία in the second. But (see on 14:28) these verbs are not sharply distinguished in later Greek (cf., Acts 3:2 for an illustration of their being used interchangeably). The general purport of the teaching of these discourses is that it will be spiritually beneficial for the disciples that their Master should depart (16). New sources of knowledge and spiritual power will henceforth be available for them. They will be empowered to achieve great things on earth (14:12), and their prayers will have a potential efficacy, such as could not have been before it was possible to offer them in the Name of Jesus.

ὁ δὲ ὁ δύναμις ἐν τῷ ὑμῶν ἐρωτήσεται. This is the order of words in NBD*LΔ, and is supported by Origen and the paraphrase of Nonnus. The rec. has ἐν τῷ ὑμῶν ἐρωτήσεται ὑμῖν, with AC*DNW*19, the Syriac and Latin vss., generally.

If we adopt the former reading, which prima facie has the weight of MS. authority, the natural rendering of the sentence is, "If you ask anything of the Father, He will give it to you in my Name." This is difficult of interpretation. It is true that Jesus speaks later of "the Holy Spirit whom the Father will send in my Name" (14:26), where see note, but that is a way of speaking which has parallels at 5:20 10:36. To say that the Father gives in the Name of the Son a boon which has been sought in prayer is unlike anything elsewhere in the N.T. It is not adequate to interpret this as meaning only that the Son is the medium through which prayer is answered as well as offered. That is true in a sense (see on 14:28), but to speak of the Father acting ἐν δύναμις τοῦ ζωῆς is foreign alike to Johannean doctrine and to Johannine physiology. The phrase ἐν δύναμις μου occurs 13:1 16:23, 26 14:11, 31 (7 times in all) in these Last Discourses; and in every case (except the last, 14:28), to which reference has already been made) it has reference to the essential condition of Christian prayer, viz., that it should be offered "in the Name" of Christ.

The Greek, however, does not necessarily require us to connect ἐν τῷ ὑμῶν ἐρωτήσεται κυρίου with δύναμις. ὑμῖν, even if δύναμις ὑμῖν precedes ἐν τῷ ὑμῶν ἐρωτήσεται. For we have seen above (on 14:28) that εὐλογοῦμεν δόθηκεν ὑμῖν ἐν δύναμις κυρίου must be rendered "Blessed is the Name of the Lord is He that cometh," εἰ δύναμις κυρίου being taken with εὐλογοῦμεν, although δύνα-
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δόματι μου. 24. ἵνα ἔσονται ὑμεῖς ἐν τῷ δόματι μου ἀληθῶς καὶ λεῖψαντες ὑμῖν ἡ χάρις μου ἢ πεπληρωμένοι. 35. ἢ πεπληρωμένοι.

immediately precedes. In the present passage, in like manner, it is legitimate to take εν τῷ δόματι μου with αληθῶς τὸν πατέρα, although δόματι immediately precedes. The meaning, then, is exactly similar to that of 15:16: ης δὲ απελθήσας τὸν πατέρα ἐν τῷ δόματι μου δεῖ ὑμῖν. See on 14:12, 15. And that this is here also the true sequence of words is confirmed by the next verse, where Jesus goes on to say that hitherto the apostles had asked nothing in His Name. See on 20:31.

24. For ὑε ἁγίας, cf. 21:18. Hitherto they had asked nothing in the Name of Jesus. They could not have done so, nor had they before this been taught to do so. The dispensation of the Spirit had not yet begun. Not yet could a Christian disciple say έγὼ τὸν ἱσόμενον τῷ παρασκευήν . . . εν καὶ πνεύματι πρός τὸν πατέρα (Eph. 3:18). αἰτεῖς, “Be asking,” the pres. indicating continuous prayer; καὶ λήψασθε, “and ye shall receive.” The new mode of prayer has a more certain promise of response than anything that had gone before, although αἰτεῖς καὶ δοθένται ὑμῖν (Mt. 7:7) had been a precept of the Sermon on the Mount (see on 14:22).

Ἰνα ἡ χάρις μου ἢ πεπληρωμένοι. Christian prayer issues in the fullness of Christian joy. For this thought of “joy being fulfilled,” which is frequent in Jn., see on 15:11 above, with the references there given.

Jesus ceases to speak in parables, and promises the disciples direct access to the Father who loves them and to whom He returns (v. 25–28).

25. τοῦτο εἰ παρομοίας λελάθη ὑμῖν. For παρομία, see on 10:6, Ps. 78:6.

We have seen (on 15:11) that τοῦτο in the seven-times-repeated τοῦτο λελάθη ὑμῖν refers in each case to what has immediately preceded. So here τοῦτο points back to the sayings in 16:12 about the approaching departure of Jesus. The apostles had not understood the meaning of ἔσονται πρὸς τὸν πατέρα (v. 18), or of what Jesus had said about their seeing Him again. He puts it more plainly in v. 28, whereas they reply at once that now they know what He means (v. 29). Whatever allusion τοῦτο εἰ παρομοίας λελάθη ὑμῖν may carry to the veiled teachings suggested by the images of

XVI. 29–36. DIRECT ACCESS TO THE FATHER

ἐν παρομοίας λαλήσει ὑμῶν, ἀλλὰ παρομοία περὶ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἔστηκεν ὑμῖν. 26. εἰ εἰσελθή τῇ ἱμαρα ἐν τῷ δόματι μου αἰτήσεσθε, καὶ οὐ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐρωτήσω τὸν Πατέρα περί ὑμᾶς. 27. αὐτὸς γὰρ οὖν . . . Vine (15th) and of the Woman in Travail (16th), or more generally by the parables of the Ministry (Mk. 4:9), the primary reference here is to v. 15–18.

For the phrase ἐστηκεν ὑμῖν, see on v. 2 and 42. Here it must be equated with εἰ εἰσελθή τῇ ἱμαρα of v. 26 (see v. 23 above). When the visible presence of Jesus was withdrawn, and when His oral teaching was replaced by the fuller teaching of the Spirit (see on 14:16), then His revelation of the Father (the central theme of His ministry), conveyed through the Spirit, would be plainer.

For παρομία, “unreserved and open speech,” see on 7:1. ἀναγγέλλει. So ABC*DLWθ, but the rec. (with N) has ἀναγγέλλει (from vv. 13, 14, 15). On the other hand, ἀναγγέλλειν occurs again in Jn. only twice (2 Jn. 12, 18), while we have ἀναγγέλλειν at Jn. 4:36, 38, 16:12, 14, 15, 1 Jn. 1:1. It is doubtful if any distinction in meaning can be traced. παρομία περὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ἀναγγέλλειν ὑμῖν means “I will bring word to you plainly about the Father”; ἀναγγέλλειν, “to report,” being a quite appropriate word to employ of the revelations which the Spirit is to bring.

If it be urged that ἀναγγέλλειν must refer to some future oral teachings of Jesus Himself, then we must suppose that the post-Resurrection discourses contained such fuller and plainer doctrine (cf. 20:17); but it is most likely that the future disclosures of the Spirit are in view. 28. εἰ εἰσελθή τῇ ἱμαρα (see on v. 23) εἰ τῷ δόματι μου ἀληθῶς (see on 15:14 for this phrase). With the coming of the Paraclete, the doctrine of the Fatherhood of God as revealed in Christ would be better understood. They would know more of God as Father, and so would be bolder and more ambitious in prayer (cf. 1 Jn. 5:14 αὕτη ἡμῶν ἡ παρομία ἐγὼ ἐσώμεν πρὸς αὐτόν, οὐ μόνον τὸν πατέρα περὶ ὑμῶν, οὐκοῦν ἡμῶν). Cognitio parit orationem (Bengel), καὶ εἰ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐρωτήσω τὸν πατέρα περὶ ὑμῶν, “I do not say to you that I will entreat the Father for you” (see for ἐρωτήσω on 11:25, 18), because in the dispensation of the Spirit prayer in the Name of Jesus does not fail to reach the Father and to receive its answer. The prayers of those who are “in Christ,” and offered “in His Name,” are virtually His prayers. Before the Coming of the Spirit He did pray for His disciples (14:16, 17, 19, 20), but here the thought is of the ideal disciple after the Spirit has descended. This does
XVI. 28-29.] THE DISCIPLES NOW CONFIDENT

λέει τοῖς κόσμοις πάντως Ἀφίμι τοὺς κόσμους καὶ παρατάσσω πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα.

πώλη in v. 27 and έκ in v. 28 cannot be differentiated in meaning without over subtlety. The classical distinction between these prepositions was being obliterated by the first century. To interpret έκ Θεοῦ or έκ τοῦ πατρὸς in the Fourth Gospel as if we had to do with the formal theology of the Nicene Creed is not legitimate (see on 829). We cannot press the force of έκ so as to make it indicate the unique relation of the Son to the Father, in a fashion that πώλη will not indicate it equally well. It must be remembered that δὲν έκ τοῦ Θεοῦ at 829 does not mean Jesus, the Eternal Son, but any man who hears with understanding the Divine message.

πώλη in v. 27, έκ in v. 28, and έκ in v. 30 carry the same meaning for Jn.

καὶ θεοῦ (D has θεοῦ) εἰς τὸν κόσμον, sc. at the Incarnation. Cf. 1127 1829 for this phrase; and for κόσμου, see on 110.

πώλη (next marking the sequence; cf. 1 Jn. 2') Ἀφίμι τοὺς κόσμους. Hitherto the apostles had not understood that He was going to leave the world.

καὶ παρατάσσω πρὸς τὸν πατέρα. We shall have this phrase again 1115-16; it is not to be distinguished from ἠμῖν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα (1618-17; cf. 733 169 and note on 167).

The disciples now become confident of their faith, and are warned that it will fail them in the hour of trial (vv. 29-32).

29. The rec. adds αὐτός after λέειν, but om. N*BC*D*NN*Θ. "the, an interjection of astonishment admiration; see on 829 for its frequency in Jn.

νῦν ἐν παρασκευή λαλεῖν, "now you are speaking explicitly." But they did not really understand, as they thought they did. The promise of teaching in παρασκευή in v. 25 was for a future day.

The rec. omits ἐν before παρασκευή, but ins. ΒCBD.

καὶ παρασκευὴν αἰσθάνεται λέγειν. For παρασκευή, cf. v. 25; and see note on 106.

In the latter part of the Epistle to Diognetus, which Lightfoot places at the end of the second century, there is a reference to the manifestation of the Logos, παρασκευὴ λαλεῖν (§ 11), which may be a reminiscence of this verse. See on 175.
30. ἦν οἷον κτλ. They were so surprised that He had
discerned their thoughts, and so bewildered at His words
(see v. 19), that they assure Him of their absolute confidence
in Him as all-knowing. With οἷον τοῦτος see 21, 17. Jn.
comes back again and again to the penetrating insight of
Jesus into men’s thoughts; see on 26.

Thus in Jn's text, “that any one shall question thee,” ἵπτομαι
being here used in its most frequent sense of asking ques
tions; see on v. 23 above, ἵπτομαι, “by this,” ἵπτομαι, being used in a quasi-causal
sense, as at 13, where see note.

πιστεύοντες δέ τιναθεοῦ εἴηδεν. Nicodemus had confessed
as much (37); what Jesus had said of their faith was that they
had come to believe ἵπτομαι παρὰ τῷ πατρί ἐξῆλθον. But they
were not yet strong in this faith, as He reminds them in His
reply. See note on 14, and also on v. 28 above. Strictly,
ἵπτομαι ought to signify question, while παρὰ ought to signify to
signify origin; but these prepositions are not sharply
distinguished in Jn.

31. The form of the reply of Jesus is comparable with that in
13, the disciples’ expression of confidence being repeated, and
then a warning given. Here, however, the reply does not begin
with an interrogative. The stress is on ἵπτομαι, coming at the
beginning of the sentence (cf. Rev. 12,19).

ἵπτομαι πιστεύετε, “at this moment you believe.” He had just
before recognised their belief as genuine, as far as it went
(v. 27; cf. 17), and He does not question it now. But
He goes on to warn them that this faith will not keep them
faithful in the time of danger which is imminent.

To translate “Do ye now believe?” is inconsistent with
what has gone before, and also with the position of ἵπτομαι in
the sentence.

For ἵπτομαι as compared with ἦν, see on oθ.

For ἦν, see on 46; it has an adversative force: “At
this moment you believe, it is true, but an hour is imminent
when you will all abandon me.”

ἵπτομαι ἦν, “an hour is coming.” See on 46 and on vv. 25.
It is not ἦν ἵπτομαι, which would indicate the inevitability of
the predesigned hour, and this thought is not prominent yet.

καὶ ἐξέλθετε. The time for His arrest was at hand; cf.
ἐξέλθετε ἦν ἵπτομαι (12,26), and cf. 43, 50.

After all the rec. text has ἦν (with ὸ, but om.
ΚΑΒΕΔΚΛ).
The rec. text (cf. v. 22) has ἠχέε with D 69, but the true reading is ἠχέε, "ye are having tribulation"; their trial has begun. 

The verb ἑβάφαγε occurs only here in Jn. (cf. Mk. 6:9, Mt. 9:28); but the same counsel in different words is given again 14. 27.

ἔσεί is the εσε of dignity (see Introd., p. cxxvii).

πριν is rare in the LXX except in the later books, and in the N.T. except in the Apocalypse. It does not occur again in the Fourth Gospel, but is found 6 times in ἡ Jn. Sometimes it is transitive, as here and at Lk. 11:26, Rom. 12:1, Rev. 17:13, and ἡ Jn. 2:18, 11:22, 15:21, 15:22. It is used only once in the LXX of God as the Conqueror, συμφέρει ἐν τῇ κρίσει. In the N.T. it is applied to the conquests of Christ only here and at Rev. 10:11 5:6 12:17 (cf. ἡ Esa. 9:2 εἰς πᾶν τὸ ἐπιστέφανον ἔργα λύσεως). In all the passages of ἡ Jn. where it appears, it is used of the spiritual conquests of Christian believers. πριν, then, is a favourite word both with the author of the Fourth Gospel and the author of the Apocalypse, both of whom apply it—alone among N.T. writers—to the victory of Christ.

The phrase ὃν τὸν κόσμον is found only here and at ἡ Jn. 5:8. Here the majestic announcement ἔσεί νεκρά ὁ κόσμον is placed in the mouth of Jesus, when his public ministry had, to all seeming, ended in failure. In ἡ Jn., the apostle claims for himself and his fellow-believers that their faith is "the victory which overcomes the world." The words of ἡ Jn. 14:19 that they should do "greater things" than their Master did, are coming within the range of their spiritual understanding. ἔσεί νεκρά τὸν κόσμον is thus a prophetic word for those who are "in Christ."}

The aorist ἐδοξάσθη challenges attention, for we should expect the future tense, "Now shall the Son of Man be glorified." But it is a Hebrew usage to employ an aorist with prophetic anticipation of the future. Thus to Abraham it was said (Gen. 15:18), "Unto thy seed have I given this land," where the LXX marks the meaning by the rendering δώσεται. And this way of speaking is specially appropriate when the

Speaker is Divine (which ἡ Jn. never allows his readers to forget when he is recording the words of Jesus), and is One to whom the inevitable future is involved in the present, and is foreseen. See also, for the use of the aorist, ἠκούσας on 12:24, ὅς ἐδοξάζοι ἐν ἀντίοις. This is a different thought from that expressed in the first clause of the verse. Not only was Christ "glorified" in His Passion (see on 22:27), but God was glorified thereby (cf. 12:27). Martyrdom is always a glorifying of God, in whose name the martyr lays down his life. See 21:18, and the note there. In other passages of the Gospel we have the idea of the Father being glorified in Christ (e.g. 14:10 15:17, and cf. ἡ 1 Pet. 5:11) because of Christ's ministry and work; but here the idea is confined to that "glorification" of God by Christ's Passion, of which lower illustrations may be found in every martyrdom.

The reading ἐὰν δὲ ὁ θεὸς ἐδοξάση με ἐν αὐτῷ, ἐὰν δὲ ὁ θεὸς ἐδοξάσης ἐν αὐτῷ, καὶ ὁ θεὸς δοξάσει ἐν αὐτῷ, καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἐδοξάσει ἐν αὐτῷ. 33. τοῦτο ἐν τῷ μικρῷ μεῦ αὐτῶν.

In the Collect for Innocents' Day it is said that the infants were made to "glorify" God by their deaths.
Jesus gives the New Commandment of brotherly love to those whom He leaves behind (vv. 33-35)

33. ἐκεῖνος. From the thought of what the Passion means for Him, Jesus turns to the thought of how it will affect His disciples when He is gone and they are like fatherless orphans (1:19). So He addresses them tenderly, as the Head of His little family (τέκνα, "children"). ἐκεῖνος is a Johannine word (1 Jn. 2:1-2, 28; 2:18; 4:5; 5:2), only again in N.T. at Gal. 4:19; cf. τέκνα, Mk. 10:32).

Ἐν μέρει μεθ' ὑμῖν ἔμει. The rec., with ἐν ὑμῖν, adds χρόνον after μεθ', this being a reminiscence of 7:4 (where see note). The verse reproduces the words of 7:5 and of 15, the warning, which in those passages was addressed to unbelieving Jews, being repeated for the disciples, but not now in rebuke; and being followed in v. 36 by the consolatory promise that, although the disciples could not go where He was going immediately, yet they should follow afterwards. See on 7:46.

Ἐν ὑμῖν ἔμει. This would not be like the remonstrance search that was in store for the unbelieving Jews (see on 7:5; 8:29); but it would be a search in perplexity and tears, when their Master was taken from them (cf. 14:4-5).

καὶ ἐν τῷ ὕπαρχει ἡμῶν. It is not certain whether the reference is to 7:55 or to 8:51. Jn. represents the warning to the Jews as having been given twice, and it may have been so. διὸ γὰρ ὡσεὶ ἡμῖν ὑπάρχει ἡμῶν ἔλθων. This is verbally identified with 8:51. See the note on 7:46 for the meaning.

καὶ ὑμῖν λέγω ἄρτι, "so I tell you at this moment." ἄρτι is a favourite word with Jn. (see on 19).

34. ὁτόλαθεν κανέν. For ὁτόλαθεν as a commandment given by Jesus, cf. 13:10, 18, 14:24, 1 Jn. 2:14, 3:4. He claimed to "give commandments," and so claimed to be equal with God. See on 14:11.

Mandatum novum do vobis. So the Latin vulgate renders, and hence Thursday before Easter has been commonly called Maundy (Mandati) Thursday, from the words of the Antiphon appointed for that day in the Latin rite.

The disciples had been disputing that evening about precedence (see on v. 4), and the "New Commandment" bade them "Love one another." This ὁτόλαθεν κανέν had been already mentioned (1:19, although it is not there called "new"). It is often mentioned in 1 Jn. (e.g. 2:10, 3:11, 20, cf. 2 Jn.5): "Love one another, as I have loved you." The Old Command-
Peter breaks in with a wish to follow Jesus even to death: he is warned that he will soon deny his Master (vv. 36-38).

36. The story of the warning to Peter, and the prediction that he would deny Jesus, are common to all four Gospels (cf. Mk. 14:27, Mt. 26:34, Lk. 22:34). Mk., followed by Mt., says the warning was given after they had left the house and were on the way to Gethsemane. Jn. agrees with Lk. in placing the incident in the upper room; but the narrative of Jn. connects it more closely with what went before, sc. the announcement of the approaching departure of Jesus, than does that of Lk.

οὕτως εἰσήχθη Π. Φοίνικις, ίδρυσαν καὶ δοκίμωσαν. As usual, Peter is the first with his question, and he fastens on what Jesus had said about His "going away," not only in its relation to Him, but in its relation to the disciples. What is to happen to them? They had already found difficulty in the saying ὅπως οὖν τὸν πατέρα (16:22), where see note.

κύριος, ὅπως διδάχθης; Domine, quo vadis? words which

See Charies, Revelation, i. cxxx; cf. Abbott, Dist. 2332.
It seems to be an eccentric variant, rather than a relic of genuine tradition. At all events, Jn., who knew Mk., and who betrays knowledge of Mk.'s version of this warning by prefixing it with ὃς, does not accept it. His report of Jesus' prediction is simply that He told Peter that He would deny Him thrice before the cock crew. The fulfilment of the prediction is recorded in 18\textsuperscript{18}, where see the note.

It is not recorded that Peter gave any reply to this prediction, which, introduced as it was by the solemn "Verily, verily," must have been a grievous blow to him. He does not appear again until 18\textsuperscript{14}.

XIV. 1 ff. The opening verses of c. 14 are among the most familiar and the most precious in our Authorised Version of the Bible. It is an ungrateful task to disturb their beautiful cadences, charged with many memories, by offering a different rendering of the Greek text. But it must be attempted here, as at other points in the Fourth Gospel, if we are to express as nearly as we can the meaning of the evangelist's words. In v. 1, as will be seen, Tyndale's translation of 1534 has been preferred to the A.V. of 1611.

The promise of a future life, where the disciples would be with Jesus (XIV. 1-4)

1. ὁ προφήτης καὶ ἐξὸν τὸς μαθητὴν ἀποκρίνεται, probably to soften the apparent abruptness of the words which follow. But no introduction is necessary; for there is an intimate connexion between 13\textsuperscript{15} and 14. The warning to Peter that he would presently deny his Master must have shocked him, as it silenced him. He is not among the disciples who ask questions as to the meaning of Jesus' sayings in c. 14, nor is he mentioned again until c. 18. But the other disciples, too, must have been startled and saddened by the thought that the foremost among them would fail in the hour of trial. If that were so, who among them could be confident of himself? Indeed, they had already been warned that their faith would not be strong enough to keep them at the side of Jesus when the dark hour of His arrest came (16\textsuperscript{15}, 16). But this renewed suggestion of the instability of their allegiance, superadded to the announcements that Jesus had made of His impending departure from them (16\textsuperscript{15}, 13\textsuperscript{35}, 36), and of the persecutions which were in store for them (15\textsuperscript{15}, 16\textsuperscript{15}), had filled them with deep sorrow. So He sought to reassure them with a new message of consolation, which taught them to look beyond this earthly life to the life after death.

2. ὁ ἄγιος καὶ ὁ πατὴρ μου μαθητής ἔσται. The human experience of a "troubled" spirit had been His, more than once, during the last weeks (cf. 13\textsuperscript{35} 12\textsuperscript{17} 13\textsuperscript{35}, 14\textsuperscript{35}, and He knew how painful it was. πιστεύετε εἰς τὸν θεόν, καὶ εἰς ᾧ πιστεύετε. These are probably both imperatives: "believe in God" (cf. Mk. 13\textsuperscript{15}); in me also believe." Eicleif in God should, of itself, turn their thoughts to the security of the future life; and then, if they believed in Jesus, they would recall promises to them which He had made about this (see v. 3, with its two clauses).

Grammatically, ἐπηρεάζετε might be pres. indicative in either place or in both, and the familiar "Ye believe in God; believe also in me," gives a good sense. But it seems more natural to take πιστεύετε in the same way in the first clause as in the second.

The true source of consolation for a troubled spirit is faith in God (cf. Ps. 27\textsuperscript{18} 114\textsuperscript{14} etc.), and in Jesus whom God sent (cf. Mk. 5\textsuperscript{5}). The disciples had already professed (16\textsuperscript{15}) their faith in Jesus, but He had warned them that it was not ininvincible (16\textsuperscript{15}).

For the constr. ἐν τῷ πατρὶ, never used by Jn. of faith in man, see on 11\textsuperscript{15}.

2. ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ πατρὸς μου καλόν καὶ ἡμέρα; i.e. heaven; cf. Philo, who speaks of the soul returning εἰς τὸν πατρὶν ἐλεον (de somn., 43).

μαθητής. The idea that there are "many mansions" in heaven, corresponding to different degrees of human merit, may not have been entirely new in Jewish religion. In the Slavonic Book of the Secrets of Enoch (xi. 2) we find: "In the world to come . . . there are many mansions prepared for men: good for the good; evil for the evil" (cf. Ethiopic Enoch, xxxix. 4: "The mansions of the holy, and the resting-places of the righteous "). Charles dates the Slavonic Enoch as between 1 and 50 A.D.; but we cannot be sure that it was known in Palestine during our Lord's ministry. Nor can we be sure that μαθητής was the Greek behind the Slavonic word which Charles translates "mansions." If we were, then μαθητής meant "mansions" in the sense of "abodes," not of "stages," which are only halting-places.

VOL. II.—16
μονοῦ is found elsewhere in the Greek Bible only at v. 23 (where it must mean "permanent abode," not a mere passing stage) and 1 Macc. 7:50 (where again the idea of permanence is involved). In Pausanias (x. 41) μονοῦ is used in the sense of a stopping-place, a station on a journey; and this sense, if introduced into the present passage, suggests interesting speculations.

Thus Origen (De Principiis ii. 11. 6) says that departed saints first live in some place "on the earth, which Scripture calls Paraisos, where they receive instruction. If worthy, they quickly ascend to a place in the air and reach the kingdom, through mansions, which the Greeks call spheres, but Scripture heavens"; following Jesus, who "passed through the heavens" (Heb. 4:13). Origen then quotes Jn. 14:2-3, showing that he understood μονοῦ as stations or halting-places on the journey to God. His singular interpretation is not likely to be accepted, but his use of μονοῦ is to be noted.

An earlier citation of Jn. 14:2 is to be found in a passage quoted by Irenæus (Adv. Haer. v. xxvi. 12) from the "Sayings of the Elders," which is probably an extract from Papias. According to the Elders, some good men will be counted worthy of a habitation in heaven; others will enjoy paradise; others "the city," the Saviour being scorn of them all. This, the Elders say, is what is meant by the distinction between the thirtyfold, sixtyfold, hundredfold harvests in the Parable of the Sower. καὶ διὰ τῶν ἐφήκεν τῶν κυρίων, ὥστε τοῖς πολλοῖς μονοῖς εἶναι παλαιός. For all are of God, who gives to each his appropriate habitation. This is the triclinium, the couch for three, on which shall recline those who are called to the Marriage Feast. This, the Elders said, is the diakonía of those who are saved, who advance by steps of this kind, through the Spirit to the Son, and through the Son to the Father.

The first part of this implies that the μονοῖ are the permanent abodes of the blessed, which vary in glory; but the last sentence suggests, on the contrary, that the μονοῖ are stages, and that a saint may pass from one to another. The general patristic interpretation of μονοῦ is, however, "abiding-places," not monasteries, which are like inns on a journey, but permanent habitations.

Clement of Alexandria often has the word μονοῦ, and always with allusion to Jn. 14:2. In Strom. vi. 14 he refers (as Papias does) to the thirtyfold, sixtyfold, hundredfold harvests, which he says hint at (ὁμοιομακραί) the three μονοῖ where the saints dwell according to their respective merits. So, again, he says (Strom. iv. 6) that there are with the Lord καὶ μαθηταί C. L. Lightfoot, Supernatural Religion, p. 194, and Biblical Essays, p. 62.

XIV. 2.] A QUESTION SUPPORTING THIS 533

εἰ δὲ μὴ, εἴπον αὐτῷ ὅτι πορεύομαι ἔτοιμότατος πῶς ἢ; 3. καὶ

μονοῦ πλῆθος κατὰ ἀνθρώπους βλέπων. Clement taught consistently that there were degrees of glory in the heavenly world. In Strom. vii. 14 he explains that the "other sheep not of this fold" (Jn. 10:15) are deemed worthy of another fold and another μονοῦ in proportion to their faith. Once more, in Strom. iv. 1, he uses μονοῦ for the dwelling-place of God, as distinct from τοῖς αὐτῶν, which is the locality where the μονοῦ is situated.

These citations show that μονοῦ in v. 2 (as in v. 23 and 1 Macc. 7:50) must mean "abodes" or permanent dwelling-places, not merely temporary stations on a journey. The idea conveyed by the saying "In my Father's house are many mansions" is that of a hospitable palace with many chambers, rather than of a journey with many stages.

εἰκὸν is hardly to be distinguished from εἶκος, except that εἰκὸν is the larger word, embracing the precincts of the house as well as the house itself. Cf. 8:8, 2 Cor. 5:1; and see on 2:18. For the significance of the full phrase "My Father," cf. 2:18, 21 and vv. 20-23.

In heaven there are "many mansions," i.e. there is room for all the faithful, although it is not said that they shall all be housed with equal dignity.

εἰ δὲ μὴ occurs again in Jn. at v. 23 only; and then after an imperitive. It seems here to mean "if it were not so," i.e. if the preceding statement were not true. Cf. Abbott, Dict. 285. 3. δὲ before ἐπορεύομαι is omitted in the rec. text, with C. 083 TAV A E S. Accordingly the A.V. places a full stop after "told you," and proceeds with "I go to prepare a place for you," as a new sentence. But δὲ must be retained with SABCD*DLW, b c f 3 syr. and cop. vss. How to translate it is not obvious, for δὲ may mean either because or that.

(a) The R.V. takes δὲ as equivalent to because, with Meyer, Westcott, Gedeon, Swete, and others. "If it were not so, I would have told you, for (i.e. because) I go to prepare a place for you." It is difficult to accept the sequence of thought which this rendering involves, sc.: if there was not plenty of room, He would have told them this bad news, because He is going to prepare a place. But that He was going to prepare a place for them could not be a reason for telling them that there was not plenty of room. This translation, when analysed, is hardly intelligible.

(b) A second expedient is to treat εἰ δὲ μὴ, εἴπον αὐτῷ ὅτι, as parenthetical, and to connect directly "In my Father's house are many mansions" with "because I go to prepare a place for you." But again the sequence fails, for we should rather
THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN [XIV. 2-3.

καὶ προετοιμασάτο τότε πάντα, πάνω ἵνα καὶ παρελθόντες expect, “I go to prepare a place for you, because in my Father’s house are many mansions.’’

(c) It is more natural to take δι’ as after ἵνα δι’ ωθήμεν as meaning that; sc., it is what the grammarians call δι’ τότε on intro, introducing the actual words that might have been spoken. Syr. sin takes it thus: “I should have said that I go.” Then we render: “In my Father’s house are many mansions. If it were not so, I would have told you that I am going to prepare a place for you.” But the difficulty of this is that He was going to prepare a place for them, as v. 3 implies. Origen took the verse thus, assuming that δι’ is τότε on intro., although he notices the contradiction with v. 3.

(d) The remaining alternative is to take ἵνα ωθήμεν δι’ ἵνα καὶ τετραπλήσθη as interrogative: “If there were not many mansions, would I have said to you that I go to prepare a place for you?” There is only one difficulty about this rendering, sc. that hitherto there has been no record of Jesus having told His disciples that He was going to prepare a place for them. At 13:38 He had told Peter that He would follow Him later, and no doubt the other disciples expected that this promise was to be fulfilled in their case also. But the explicit words “I go to prepare a place for you” do not appear before this verse. Jn., however, more than once records references made by Jesus to former sayings of His which cannot be traced with certainty (see 6:6; 10:36; 11:28), so that there is no insuperable difficulty, on this head, of taking the sentence interrogatively. This rendering is adopted by Moffatt, Scrangan, and W. Bauer.

τοποθετεῖται. See on 16:7 for this verb.

τούτοις ἵνα. This was one of the purposes of His impending departure. He was the ἀρχηγός of all the faithful (Heb. 2:10). Jn. does not use τοῦτοις elsewhere, but the verb is used Mk. 13:34; Mt. 26:30; of the highest seats in the Messianic kingdom which have been “prepared” by God for those whom He has chosen (cf. Heb. 10:36). In the present passage, τοῦτοις does not carry the idea of predestination; it is only “to make ready,” as at Mk. 14:33. Lk. 23:43.

τότε is used of a “place” in heaven, Rev. 12:1; also in Clem. Rom. 5, where it is said of Peter ἔπρεπεν εἰς τὸν δούλημα τότε τῆς ἀδιάφορας. In the Revelation of Peter, τότε is similarly used; and also in the Acts of Thomas, c. 22. So εἰς καὶ ἵνα προετοιμασάτο, repeated in substance in 16:18.

1 See intr., p. 218.
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γόμας ἐν ἀρχής ἐπέτατεν, ἵνα δόνι εἴη καὶ ἤμελλεν ἣν. 4. καὶ δόνι εἴη ἐν ὑπόγειον ὁδόν, καὶ τῷ ὕπον ὁδόν.

τότε ἐπετέλεσεν the order of words in mBDLN; but the rec. has ἦν τότε, with Wδ. 

τοῦτοις ἵνα. The present tense expresses the certainty of the future return: “I am coming back.” This is an explicit announcement of the Parousia, or Second Advent. Not as much is said about this in Jn. as in the Synoptists; but it is nevertheless an integral element in Johannine doctrine, more emphatic in the First Epistle than in the Gospel (cf. 21:22, 28 and 1 Jn. 2:27). 1

καὶ παρελθόντες καὶ. Perhaps παρελθόντες has here, as at 21:4, the meaning of receiving with χαίρετο (cf. Cant. 8); but at 10:2 it is equivalent to “seise.” For this meeting of Master and disciples, cf. 1 Thess. 4:17.

καὶ τῷ ἐκόλουθῳ εἰς καὶ ἤμελλεν ἣν. This is, in a sense, true of earthly discipleship (12:26), but it is to be fulfilled more perfectly hereafter (17:28).

δόνι ἐν ὕπον ὁδόν ὁδόν τῷ ὕπον is the reading of mBC*LW.

But, as Field has pointed out, this is an ungrammatical construction. τῷ ὕπον δότω δότας is not good Greek, if it means τῷ ὕπον ἐν ὑπόγειον. Furthermore, the comment of Thomas in v. 5 distinguishes clearly between the goal and the way, so that we should expect to find the same distinction inherent in the words of Jesus which drew it forth. The rec. text is δόνι ἐν ὕπον ὁδόν ὁδόν, καὶ τῷ ὕπον ὁδόν ὁδόν. This is supported by ACDNTΛΘ with most cursive manuscripts, and by the Syriac, Coptic, and O.L. vs. generally. If this were the original reading, we can see how the words ὁδόν ὁδόν καὶ might have dropped out, the eye being caught by the second ὁδόν. To claim that the uncial δότω must outweigh the evidence of practically all the ancient versions, especially when they present an ungrammatical construction, is to claim too much for them. Accordingly, we follow the textus receptus here.

δόνι εἴη ἐν ὕπον ὁδόν. Peter had already shown that he, at any rate, did not know this, for he asked τοῦτον ἐν ὑπόγειον; (15:28). But the disciples ought to have known, for Jesus had told them several times. He was going, He had said, πρός τοῦ ὑπόγειον μετὰ, (18:25), πρός τοῦ τυπαρέω, (16:28), or to His Father’s house (v. 2). The phrase ἐν ὑπόγειον πρός τοῦ τυπαρέω had already been the subject of perplexed comment by the disciples (16:28). They had not understood how Jesus was to “go to the Father,” but that this was the goal of the journey, of which He had spoken to them so often on this last night, He had
5. Δέχετε αυτῷ οὖν κόρης, σῶν οὖν αἰματος που ἀναγέννησεν ἵνα ἀληθεύσην repeated again and again. And so He said now, “You know where I am going.”

καὶ τὴν ἀδελφὴν αὐτῶν. This too they should have understood. They did not yet know that for Him the Way to the Father was the Way of Death (see on 10), for even yet they had not realised that He was soon about to die. They may not have understood that they too, must die before they could inherit the heavenly mansions where He was to prepare a place for them (v. 2). It is not clear that they had abandoned hopes of a Messianic kingdom shortly to be established on earth, in which high stations of honour should be theirs. τὴν ἀδελφὴν αὐτῶν did not mean that they knew, or ought to have known, that the way to the Father was through death. But they ought to have known “that the way to the Father’s house was in fellowship with Jesus.” This, in some measure, they must have realised at the end of their training; and so He reminds them that they “knew the way.” They knew that only in that fellowship with Him which Jn. calls “believing on Him” could the way to life be trodden.

The question of Thomas, and the answer to it (v. 5-7)

6. Thomas now intervenes. Peter was the first to interrupt the great discourse by asking, “Whither goest thou?” (see 13). Thomas presses the question, and urges that they could not be expected to know the answer. The Eleven had been perplexed when this “going” of Jesus to the Father had been mentioned at an earlier point in the discourse (1611), and to their perplexities had not yet been removed. We have already had Thomas appearing as spokesman for the rest (14). Peter perhaps being absent on that occasion. But Peter is silent now, although present, probably because of the severity of the rebuke and warning which he had just received (15). He would hardly venture again to interrupt Jesus by questions.

For κόρης, see on 5. Thomas declares that they do not know where Jesus was going; and that therefore they cannot be expected to know the way. Yet one may know the way without knowing exactly the goal of one’s journey; and this is specially true of the Christian pilgrimage.

There are unimportant variants. ACGNDΩ with most vss. have καὶ after ἀναγέννησεν, and this may be right; but BC¹L and Syr. sin. omit καὶ, the omission being characteristic of Jn’s paraletic style. Again, for ὅπου ἀνέκουσα τὴν ἀδελφήν; (BC¹D a b c), the rec., with AC²NWKDΘ, has ἔνα
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τὴν ἀδελφήν; 6. λέγει δὲ Ἰησοῦς Ἐγώ ἐμι ἥ δικα τι καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια καὶ διάκονος τὴν ἀδελφήν; which looks like an explanatory correction of the shorter reading.

6. ΑCGDL om. θ before ἵνα, but ins. ACGDNWΘ. See on 10.

ἐγὼ εἰμί. On this majestic construction, see Introd., pp. cviii-ccxii.

ἐγὼ εἰμί ἡ ἀδελφή. This is the central thought here, the words following, sc. καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια καὶ ἡ ἀδελφή, being not directly involved in the context, but added to complete the great declaration.

To walk in God’s way has been the aspiration of pious men of every race; and Israel was especially warned not to turn aside from the δικαίος, which God had commanded (Deut. 5:28-31 (cf. Isa. 30:33)). “Teach me Thy way” is the Psalmist’s prayer (Ps. 27:11, cf. Ps. 25:4 86:11). Philo, after his manner, describes the “royal way” (δικαίος) as philosophy, and he says that Scripture calls it δικαίος and λόγος of God (De post. Caïni, 30), quoting Deut. 17:11. More apposite here, however, is the declaration of the Epistle to the Hebrews that the way to the holy place was not made plain before Christ (Heb. 9), who dedicated “a new and living way” through the veil of His flesh (Heb. 10). This is the doctrine which becomes explicit (cf. Eph. 2:19) in the words “I am the Way.” In the Acts (4:9-9) the Christian profession is called “the Way,” but this does not provide a true parallel to the present verse. Again, in the second-century Acts of John (§ 55) there is a Gnostic hymn ascribed to Christ which ends with ἡ ἀληθήν εἰς σον προμοδίτην, “A Way am I to thee, a wayfarer.” This, however, does not go so far as the claim involved in ἐγώ εἰμί ἡ ἀδελφή. The uniqueness of Christ’s claim in Jn. is that He is the Way, i.e. the only Way, to God. This is the heart of the Johannine message, which admits of no compromise with non-Christian religions, and in which there is no account of such. See on 10.

For ἀλήθεια in Jn., see on 14. Both the exclusiveness and the inclusiveness (cf. Col. 2:2) of the claim Ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἀλήθεια are thoroughly Johannine. This is to say much more than to admit, as the Pharisees did, that Jesus taught ἡ ἀδελφή τοῦ δικαίου ἐν ἀλήθειας (Mk. 12:14, Mt. 22:14, Lk. 20:42).

The idea of Christ’s teaching as true does not strictly come into the argument or exposition here; and it would seem that the juxtaposition of ἡ ἀδελφή and ἡ ἀλήθεια is due to a reminiscence of O.T. phraseology. Cf. “I have chosen the way of truth” (Ps. 119:50); and see the same expression, δόξα ἀλήθειας.
XIV. 7.] NOW THEY KNOW THE FATHER

language, except that in the former passage we have εἰς γνώσει instead of εἰς γνώσετε. ἀν' ἄριστο γνώσετε οὖν καὶ εἰσελθεῖτε οὖν.

7. The verb contains a rebuke. The disciples ought to have known what was meant by going to "the Father." That they did not know the Father was due to the fact that they had not yet learnt to know the Son. εἰς γνώσετε με, καὶ τὸν πατέρα μου ἀν' ἑστα. Jesus had said the same thing to His Jewish critics (8:18), in identical

καὶ τὴν ἑστια. ἀν' ἄριστο γνώσετε οὖν καὶ εἰσελθεῖτε οὖν.

καὶ τὴν ἑστια. ἀν' ἄριστο γνώσετε οὖν καὶ εἰσελθεῖτε οὖν.
Philip asks to be shown the Father. The coiningherence of the Father and the Son explained (vv. 8-14)

8. Λέγει αὖτε Φίλιππος καθήμενος, δέδωκαν ἡμῖν τὸν Πατέρα, καί for many of the opponents of Jesus who “saw” Him in the flesh did not thereby “see the Father.” Accordingly δεύτερον at 124 and πάρακτον in v. 9 must imply spiritual insight in some degree. Those who saw in the Works and Life of Christ something of His purpose and personality, thereby saw something of the nature of God who sent Him. Those who “saw and hated” Jesus, on the other hand, could be justly said to have “seen and hated” God the Father (142); the false impression which they acquired of Jesus, issuing in an equally false impression of God. Thus the strange statement, as it must have seemed, “You are beginning to know Him, and (indeed) have seen Him,” must mean that while the disciples would begin henceforth consciously to appropriate the new revelation of God as He is, they had already (although unconsciously) “seen” the reflection of His mind and purpose in the life of Jesus, with whom they had long been in close intimacy.

Abbott (Dist. 2760-2764) suggests as possible another rendering (apparently favoured by Nonnus) of ὤν δέδωκαν γινώσκητε αὐτῶν καὶ παρακάτων αὐτῶν, which takes γινώσκητε as an imperative, “From henceforth begin to know Him, and (then) you have seen Him.” But this makes παρακάτων αὐτῶν even more difficult than it is when we take γινώσκητε as indicative, for with this rendering there can be no reference to “seeing” God in Jesus, visible in the flesh.

Philip's Request. Philip's request is a request for something specific, but the text is not clear on what exactly he is requesting.

9. τοποθετησθε χρόνοι. So ABNIΔΔε, but δΝΔΛ have the datitive τοποθητήσθη χρόνοι.

There is some difficulty in the text regarding the request by Philip. In the Greek text, it seems to be a request for something specific, but the exact nature of the request is not clear. The request is made to Jesus, who is referred to as the “Son of Mary” (John 1:49), and is addressed to Philip, who is a disciple of Jesus (John 1:46).

After παρακατέω, the rec. ins. καί with ADLNIDΔε, but om. ΝΔΒ.

vv. καί λέγεις καθήμενος, “how is it that you say, etc.” νῦν being emphatic, “you who have followed me from the beginning” (142).

10. ὁ πατρός οὖν καθήμενος. This verse is a request for something specific. The request is made to Philip, who is a disciple of Jesus (John 1:46), and is addressed to Jesus, who is referred to as the “Son of Mary” (John 1:49).

Here is the mystery of that oneness with the Father which is always prominent in Jn. Jesus had held this Divine oneness up to the Jews as a belief which they might ultimately recognize as true (105), but He did not reproach them for not having reached it yet. Philip was in a different position, and ought to have learnt something of it before now. The two lines of testimony to which Jesus appeals in support of His claim to reciprocal communion with the Father, here as elsewhere, are His words and His works. See on 105, where the argument is almost identical with that of vv. 10, 11, and expressed in the same terms.

tά βίαμα. See on 34 for the “words” of Jesus as divine.

tά βίαμα δὲ εὖ λέγειν οὕτως. The rec. with ΝΔΔΔε has λαλεῖν from the next clause, but ΝΔΛN have λέγω (which has been omitted in B through misreading εὐλογεῖν). Λέγω is often used in Jn. interchangeably with λαλεῖν, as here. See on 31.
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\( \text{δ} \) ἔρχοντος οὗ λαλᾷ \( \text{ὁ} \) ὁ ἐπὶ τὴν \( \text{Παῦλῳ} \) ὁ ἐν ἐμὶ μένων πέμπει τῷ ἔρχετο ἀδικοῦ. 11. ἔπειτὰ λέγει οὗ ὁ ἐπὶ τῇ \( \text{Παῦλῳ} \) καὶ ὁ \( \text{Παῦλῳ} \) ἔν ἐμὶ ἐκ τῆς \( \text{μυθ.} \) ἔπειτὰ τῷ ἔρχετο \( \text{μικρωτάτῳ} \) μοι. 12. ἔπειτα ἂν ἦρευ \( \text{λόγῳ} \) ἂν \( \text{πεπῆρε} \) τὸ \( \text{μικρωτάτῳ} \) \( \text{τῷ} \) \( \text{μικρωτάτῳ} \) \( \text{τῷ} \) \( \text{μικρωτάτῳ} \) \( \text{τῷ} \) \( \text{μικρωτάτῳ} \).

δι' Ἐρατίου οὗ λαλᾷ. This He had said several times. See the references given in the note on 719. 2. \( \text{δ} \) δὲ παρήγαγεν \( \text{ὁ} \) ἐν ἐμὶ μένων. The second \( \text{δ} \), is omitted in BL, but is preserved in \( \text{kADNWΘ} \).

τούτῳ τῷ ἔρχετο ἀδικοῦ. So \( \text{kBD} \), but the rec., with \( \text{AΘ} \), has ἀδικοῦ τούτῳ τῷ ἔρχετο, a correction due to the tendency to describe the miracles as Christ's rather than as the Father's. But to distinguish this is contrary to Johannine teaching. See especially on 5:28. The ἔρχετο of Jesus is also the ἔρχετο of God the Father.

In this verse the words of Jesus are treated as among his works. Both are, as it were, the λαλία of the Father. But they may be considered separately, His words appealing more directly to the conscience and spiritual insight of His hearers, His 

11. 

παρακλήσεως τούτων. The plural shows that Jesus now addresses Himself not to Philip individually, but to the disciples collectively, whose spokesman for the moment Philip was. "Believe me," \( \text{πιστεύσατε} \) μοι. The plural shows that Jesus now addresses Himself not to Philip individually, but to the disciples collectively, whose spokesman for the moment Philip was. "Believe me," \( \text{πιστεύσατε} \) μοι. The plural shows that Jesus now addresses Himself not to Philip individually, but to the disciples collectively, whose spokesman for the moment Philip was. "Believe me," \( \text{πιστεύσατε} \) μοι.

\( \text{διὰ τῷ ἔρχετο} \) τὸ \( \text{μικρωτάτῳ} \) \( \text{μοι} \). This is the appeal to His miraculous works (cf. 5:25 10:7) in support of His great claim of unity with the Father. The faith which is generated by an appeal like this is not the highest type of faith, but it is not despised by Jesus. Better to believe because of miracles than not to believe at all. See on 6:26; and cf. 2:23 4:36.

The concluding \( \text{μοι} \) is omitted after \( \text{παρακλήσεως} \) by \( \text{kDLW} \), but \( \text{ἐνα} \). \( \text{ΑΘ} \).

12. \( \text{ἀμὴ} \) \( \text{ἀμὴν} \) \( \text{λέγω} \) \( \text{αμὴν} \), the customary prelude to a solemn and unexpected saying. See on 1:13.

He had appealed to His ἔρχετο. He now assures His hearers that the Christian believer shall be endowed with power to do the like or even greater things, and in particular that he shall have the secret of efficacious prayer (vv. 13, 14).

συνειδότατε σε ἐμεῖς. This He had hidden them all to do (v. 1), and He returns to the phrase, which involves more than
XIV. 18-17. ANOTHER PARACLETE

15. ἰδóν ἰησοῦν με, τὰς ἐνσώλας τὰς ἑώρας τὴν ἄλλην. 16. οὕτω ψυχήν τὸν Ἱουνίτα καὶ Ἀλέχον Παρασκέυον δόθη χρόνον ἵνα ὑμῖν ἐρώσις εἰς τὸν ἀλήθειαν. 17. τὸ Πνεῦμα τῆς ἀλήθειας, ἰδóν κάθεμι ὑμῖν.

Love issuing in obedience will be followed by the gift of the Paraclete, revealing the union of the Father and the Son (v. 15-20)

18. ἰδóν ἰησοῦν με, τὰς ἐνσώλας τὰς ἑώρας τὴν ἄλλην. The phrase τὴν ἀλήθειαν is thoroughly Johannine (cf. 15:26, 1 Jn. 2:23, 3:21, 5:6). It is the phrase used for “the Son of Man” (cf. Mt. 10:24, Lk. 17:22, Jn. 12:21). The phrase “Tôi παρασκεύασάς μοι” is found at v. 21 (Jn. 14:21). The phrase “μετὰ τοῦ κόσμου” implies that the Son’s presence is the result of His commandments.

In Jn. 17:7, the phrase “μετὰ τὸν κόσμον” is used interchangeably with “μετὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦ κόσμου” (Jn. 14:12, 15:13, 17:17, 1 Jn. 2:23). The phrase “μετὰ τὸν κόσμον” is used in Jn. 17:7, but not in Jn. 14:12, 15:13, 17:17, or 1 Jn. 2:23. The phrase “μετὰ τὸν κόσμον” implies that the Son’s presence is the result of His commandments.

18. τῷ ἰησοῦν ἀλήθειαν. See on 11:22, 15:26, 16:18, 17:18. The phrase “μετὰ τὸν κόσμον” is used in Jn. 17:7, but not in Jn. 14:12, 15:13, 17:17, or 1 Jn. 2:23. The phrase “μετὰ τὸν κόσμον” implies that the Son’s presence is the result of His commandments.

The phrase “μετὰ τὸν κόσμον” is used in Jn. 17:7, but not in Jn. 14:12, 15:13, 17:17, or 1 Jn. 2:23. The phrase “μετὰ τὸν κόσμον” implies that the Son’s presence is the result of His commandments.

The phrase “μετὰ τὸν κόσμον” is used in Jn. 17:7, but not in Jn. 14:12, 15:13, 17:17, or 1 Jn. 2:23. The phrase “μετὰ τὸν κόσμον” implies that the Son’s presence is the result of His commandments.

The phrase “μετὰ τὸν κόσμον” is used in Jn. 17:7, but not in Jn. 14:12, 15:13, 17:17, or 1 Jn. 2:23. The phrase “μετὰ τὸν κόσμον” implies that the Son’s presence is the result of His commandments.

The phrase “μετὰ τὸν κόσμον” is used in Jn. 17:7, but not in Jn. 14:12, 15:13, 17:17, or 1 Jn. 2:23. The phrase “μετὰ τὸν κόσμον” implies that the Son’s presence is the result of His commandments.

The phrase “μετὰ τὸν κόσμον” is used in Jn. 17:7, but not in Jn. 14:12, 15:13, 17:17, or 1 Jn. 2:23. The phrase “μετὰ τὸν κόσμον” implies that the Son’s presence is the result of His commandments.
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διώτατα λαβεῖτε, ὅτι οὐκ θεωρεῖ ἀληθῶς αὐτὸς γνωστὲς ὀράτως γνωστέται ἀληθῶς, ὅτι παρ' ἐμὶ μένει καὶ ἐν ἐμὶ ἐστὶν.  18. οὖν ἄνθρωπος ἄνθρωπον ἔρχεται πρὸς ὑμᾶς.  19. ἦν μικρὸν καὶ ἦν κόσμος

the “disciples” in regard to their faculty of spiritual perception, cf. 1 Cor. 2: 14.

dὲ κόσμος αὐτῷ διώτατα λαβεῖτε. It cannot have been said to the “world,” λαβεῖτε πνεύμα ἑως (20: 29). That gift could be received only by spiritually minded men.

ὅτι οὐκ θεωρεῖ ἰδιοτέρως θεωρεῖν (see on 20: 29) is generally used in 1 Cor. of bodily vision, but sometimes (as at 4: 14-16) of mental and spiritual appreciation. The analogy of v. 19 would suggest that bodily vision is intended here, as there. The only kind of vision that the “world” has is physical, and with this the Spirit cannot be perceived. Observe that it is not said that the disciples could thus (θεωρεῖν) behold the Spirit.

οὐδὲ γνώσετε. So it is said in the Prologue (1: 19), δὲ κόσμος αὐτῷ οὐκ ἐπιθυμεῖ. The world did not recognise Jesus as the Word, nor does it recognise the Spirit.

ὦτα γνωστέται αὐτῷ. Disciples are not “of the world” (1: 19); they can, and will, recognise the workings of the Spirit, as they have in some measure recognised Christ for what He was (cf. v. 9).

ὅτι υἱὸς ὅλων μου, ὅτα γινώσκεις, “because He abides with you,” καὶ ἐν ἑμὶ ἐστίν, “and is in you,” the present tenses being used prophetically of the future. The rec. has ἐν μοι (with ἐν σοι ἐν σοι) which is a correction of the better reading ἐστίν (2: 18).

Firstly it is said that the Spirit of Truth abides μετὰ τοῦ ἄνθρωπον, then ἐν ἑμῖν, and finally ἐν ὑμῖν, the last phrase signifying the indwelling of the Spirit in the individual disciple (Rom. 8: 9, 1 Jn. 2: 20, 2 Jn. 3), while the other phrases (the former of which occurs also in 2 Jn. 3) lay the emphasis on the fellowship of the Spirit with the disciples collectively, that is, with the Church (cf. η εἰρωνία τοῦ αἵματος τῆς γέννησις μετὰ πάντων ἡμῶν, 2 Cor. 13: 19).

οὖν ἀνθρώπος ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἔρχεται πρὸς ἑμᾶς. ἔρχεται πρὸς ἑμᾶς occurs in the N.T. again only at Jas. 1: 27, and there in its primary meaning of “fatherless.” It has been thought that this is the idea here also; at 2: 33 Jesus addressed his disciples as τῶν ὑλῶν, which suggests the relation of a father to his children. But, although ὁ ἄνθρωπος, both in the LXX and in classical literature, generally means “fatherless” in the most literal sense, it may be used of bereavement of any kind. ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ ἐκ τοῦ ἐν δόξα (Ps. 106: 7) appears in Coverdale’s Psalter as “Thou art the helper of the fatherless,” which brings out the sense well. Milligan (F. & H. s.v.) quotes a modern Greek song where fatherless must be the meaning; and also Epictetus, iii. xxxiv. 14 for this more general sense. The rendering “comfortless” of the A.V. cannot be defended.

“‘I will not leave you friendless’ means, then, ‘I will not leave you without a Helper and Friend (τὸν παράλογον), such as I have been.”

ἔρχεται πρὸς ὑμᾶς, “I am coming to you,” not, as in v. 3, in the Parousia, but after His Resurrection, when the Spirit will be imparted (20: 22). See on 16: 23 for the Day of the Spirit’s Advent.

10. ἦν μικρὸν (see on 16: 29) καὶ δὲ κόσμος μεθ᾽ ὑμῖν ἐρχεῖται, “the world perceiveth me no longer,” ἐρχεῖται (see on 20: 29) being used here of any kind of vision, for Jesus will have been removed from the world’s sight after His Passion.

ὃς δὲ εἰς ἑωρακτεῖ, “but you perceive me,” εἰς with the spiritual perception which the disciples were to have of the Risen Lord. Jesus had indeed told them at an earlier point in this last discourse that, like the world, they would see Him no longer with the eyes of the body after His Passion: ὁ ἐστιν ἑωρακτή με (16: 20). The assurance of the present verse is in verbal, although not real, contradiction with the former warning. He had led them step by step, in the endeavour to make them understand that it was better for them that He should be removed from their bodily eyes (16: 14), and that He would be present with them spiritually. And, at last, He assured them—so intimate and vital will His presence be—“you shall perceive me,” ὃς εἰς ἑωρακτεῖ με, the present tense being used prophetically to mark the certainty of the future.

ἡμεῖς ἐστίν is the verb used of Mary’s “seeing” the risen Lord (20: 16), as it is used here of the disciples’ “seeing” Him after His Passion, while such “seeing” would be impossible for the unbelieving world.

A comparison of 14: 16 with 16: 10 goes far to show that 16: 10 must be regarded as an earlier utterance than 14: 16. See Introit., p. xxv.

δὲ ἐφ᾽ ὑμῖν καὶ ὑμῖν ζητεῖτε. So BL, but ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ have ἡμέρα. This has been said before (6: 6, where see note), and the thought is present also in Paul (Rom. 5: 10, 1 Cor. 15: 22, 25, Gal. 2: 20, Eph. 2: ; cf. Rev. 20: 4). But the words “because I live, you also shall live,” have here a direct connexion with the context. Jesus has just assured the disciples that they shall “see” Him in His Risen Life. But this would only be possible—for ordinary physical vision is not in question—for those who are in spiritual sympathy with Him, who are “in Him” and in whom He abides (v. 20), who share His Life.

VOL. II.—17
The loving disciple is loved by God, and to him Jesus will manifest Himself (v. 21)

What has heretofore been said in terms primarily applicable to the listening disciples is now said more generally. The teaching of v. 21 is for all future believers. Not only for the apostles, but for every disciple, the sequence of spiritual experience is Obedience, Love, Life, Vision.

διότι οὐδὲν τὴς ἡμέρας (the phrase does not occur again) is to have them in one’s heart, to know them and apprehend their meaning; but τοιαύτης τοῖς ἀντίλοχοις is to keep them, which is a harder thing. See on v. 15 above, where (as at v. 23) it is said that love issues in obedience; here the point is, that obedience is the proof of love.

ἀγαπήν: he it is (and no other) who loves me.

δὲ δὲναις μὲν ἀγαπηθήναι οὖσα τῶν πατρὸς μου. This has been said before at 19:19, where φίλεως was used instead of ἀγαπηθήσεται. At 21:19 and where, in accordance with Jn. of usual style, the active voice (ὑπάρχει φίλεως) was preferred to the passive. Abbott (Diat. 1885) notes that in this verse...
THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN [XIV. 28-29.

καὶ μὴν παρ’ αὐτῷ παρείσχυμα. 24. ὁ δὲ ἄγιος με τὸν λόγον
μοι ἀνεισχύνει τούτοις, καὶ λόγος ἐστὶν ἡ ἀλήθεια τῆς ἀληθείας
ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς. 25. Χρησιμοποιηθεὶς γὰρ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἡ μεταφάσει
τοῦ λόγου αὐτοῦ ἀποκαλεῖται ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ Χριστοῦ. 26. Τοῦτο δὲ
τὸ παραπομπὸν τῆς ἐκκλησίας τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν τῷ κόσμω
ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ πατρὸς. 27. Χρησιμοποιηθεὶς γὰρ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ
τῆς πατροῦ παραπόμπωσις τῆς ἐκκλησίας τοῦ Χριστοῦ. 28. Χρησιμοποιηθεὶς
gὰρ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ τῆς πατροῦ παραπόμπωσις τῆς ἐκκλησίας τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

XIV. 28-24] THE INDWELLING OF GOD

this tremendous fact is prior to, and at the root of, every special
manifestation of God’s love to individual disciples.

καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐκκλησία. The singular ἐκκλησία πρὸς
τὸν λόγον (v. 18) is replaced by the plural ἐκκλησίαι, marking
the claim of equality with the Father, which is prominent
throughout the Fourth Gospel. Cf. 10:31 τῆς ἐκκλησίας. In both
passages the reference is to that Divine Advent in the disciple’s
heart which is mediated by the Spirit. Cf. Rev. 3:21 ἐκκλησίαι,
πρὸς αὐτὸν.

καὶ μὴν παρ’ αὐτῷ παρείσχυμα. The Spirit παρ’ ἑαυτῷ μοι ἀνεισχύνει
(v. 17), and the same must be true of the Father and the
Son. “In the coming of the Spirit, the Son too was to come;
in the coming of the Son, also the Father.” 1 In v. 2 (where see
note) the μοιαῖος where man shall dwell with God in the future
are promised; here we have the promise of a greater thing, the
dwelling of God with man in the present. The main thought
associated with the sanctuary in the Pentateuch was that there
Yahweh dwelt with His people (Ex. 25:8 26:32, Lev. 26:1-13; cf.
2 Cor. 6:16); but the indwelling promised here is associated with
no special sanctuary or holy place. It is a Presence, real
although invisible, in the disciple’s heart (Mt. 28:29), the peculiar
benefiction of the kingdom which does not come “by observa-
tion” (Lk. 24:36). So Jn. writes later of the disciple who
“keeps His commandments,” that Christ “abides in him,”
adding “this we know by the Spirit which He gave us”
(1 Jn. 2:28; cf. 1 Jn. 4:13).

τοποφέρωμα. So κληρωμ. 133: but Ἀδωνιδ. have τοποφέρωμα.
μοιαίος παραπόμπωσις occurs in Thucydides (i. 131), the phrase
being good classical Greek.

21. The implied argument of this verse is that the “world,”
which does not love Jesus and does not “keep His command-
ments,” is spiritually incapable of apprehending such spiritual
manifestations of God and Christ as those which have been
promised to faithful disciples. Nothing is said of a mani-
festation in glory, such as that which Jude and his fellow-
disciples longed to see (cf. v. 23).

οἱ ἅμα ἄγιος με τοῦς ἑαυτοῦ, “he that does not love me” (sc. the
world) does not keep my sayings” (ὁ λόγος as distinct from
λόγος, His full message). ἀληθεία here is practically equivalent
to ἀληθήσει (v. 23).

καὶ λόγος ἐστὶν ἡ ἀληθεία. καὶ ἐστιν ἡ ἀληθεία, in accordance with
1 Gore, Bampton Lectures, p. 132.
PARTING WORDS  

A summary of the Last Discourse (vv. 25-31)

This is the seventh time that this solemn refrain (see on 15:11) appears in the Last Discourse. Here τάσσα may embrace all that has been said throughout the evening, and not only the sentences immediately preceding: "These things have I spoken to you, while abiding with you," as in the flesh. But this temporary companionship in the body is now to be replaced by a permanent spiritual abiding, in the Person of the Paraclete.

This is the fifth (and last) time that the Paraclete is mentioned (see on 25:20 for the meaning of the word). Here τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ παρέκκλητον is for the first time identified with τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἰδίον, an august title familiar to every Jew (cf. Ps. 73:11, Isa. 63:10). The complete title does not occur again in Jn. (but cf. 20:22). We have it, however, in Mk. 3:13, Mt. 12:28; cf. Lk. 12:12.

The Old Syriac translates the Spirit as feminine, but the Pesitta does not follow this Semitic doctrine.

This is the Lucan doctrine, that the Father sends the Spirit (Lk. 24:49, Acts 2:2), and we have had it already at v. 16; but at 15:26 the Spirit is sent by the Son (see also 20:22). This is only an additional illustration of the Johannine doctrine that what the Father does, the Son does (see note on v. 13 above).

εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ. "In my stead" does not convey the meaning adequately. At 5:3 Jesus said that He had come "in the Name" of the Father, and at 10:30 that He wrought His works in the same Name; the meaning in both cases (see notes in loc.) being not only that He came as the Father's representative, but as One to whom "the Name," i.e. the providential power of the Father, had been given, and who was to reveal the Father's character and purpose. So here it is said that the Spirit will be sent "in the Name" of Christ, to explain

His mission and to reveal its consequences. As the Son was sent in the Name of the Father (5:23), so the Holy Spirit will be sent in future "in the Name" of the Son. This does not imply that the Holy Spirit was not operative before the Incarnation, but rather that after the Passion and Resurrection (see below 15:26), and cf. 15:23, He will come with the more effective quickening power of the new revelation of God in Christ.

It is He, the Spirit, whose twofold work is now described in relation primarily to the listening apostles, but probably what is said may apply in some measure to all Christian disciples of succeeding generations.

BL add כו after ו, and this would bring out the emphasis well; but it is omitted by most authorities. "And He will bring to your remembrance all that I said to you," the aor. σημοῖο indicating that the personal oral teaching of Jesus was ended. This is the second side of the work of the Spirit, who not only was to reveal what was new, but was to recall to the memory of the apostles the old truths that Jesus had taught. Cf. 22:12, Acts 11:14, for illustrations of the fact that after His Resurrection the apostles entered more fully into the meaning of His words than they had done at the time they were spoken. Here, however, the promise is that their memory of them shall be stimulated. Bengel says pregnant, "Exemplum praebet haec latina bonilla."

The Spirit is called πάντα. Οἰκομηνήρων does not occur again in Jn.; but cf. Lk. 22:48, where Peter "remembered" the words of Jesus. There is a literary parallel (but no more) in 23:38,
27. Εἴρητον ἔφη, διότι, εἰρήνη τῆς ἐλεημονός ἡμῖν εἰς κάθεν· ἓκείμενον δέδομεν εἰς δικαιότητι, ἡμῖν γὰρ παρατάσσεται ἡ ἐκκλησία, ἐφη, μὴ διαλέγοιτε μιᾷ καὶ ἕκαστος μὴ διαλυτάτω· 28. εἰρήνη δὲν ἔνθε εἰς ἐκκλησία ὑπόγειον ἐξερχόμεθα.

xxii. 25, where God says to Jacob after his vision, "I will bring all things to thy remembrance."

"27. εἰρήνη, i.e. τῆς 'peace,' the ordinary salutation and the ordinary word of farewell in the East. The words παρατάσσεται μιᾷ καὶ ἕκαστος in v. 25 are suggestive of His departure, and He is not forgetful of the parting word of peace. Except in salutations (20, 31, 38, 2 Jn. 8, 3 Jn. 14), εἰρήνη is used by Jn. only here and at v. 26; and in both cases it refers to the spiritual peace which Christ gives. Just as in the Priestly Blessing (Num. 6:26) the meaning of the familiar εἰρήνη is transfigured, "The Lord... give thee peace," so here εἰρήνη τὴν εἰρήνῃ δύναμιν ἔμπνευσεν more than the customary "Go in peace." The peace which Jesus bequeaths (ἀφήνῃ ὑμῖν) is His to give as a permanent possession (cf. 16), and is given, not by way of hope or assurance of good will only, as the world (i.e. the ordinary man of mankind; see on 1) gives it in farewell, but in the plenitude of Divine power. εἰρήνη δύναμιν is no less absolute a gift than that other εἰρήνη ἑαυτοῦ δύναμιν ἐκείνου (10).

It is noteworthy that in the Apocalypse εἰρήνη is used only of earthly peace (6; cf. 1), while in Jn. it is used only of spiritual peace. Paul has it in both senses, but more frequently in the latter (cf. Col. 3, 2 Thess. 3:18). μὴ παρατάσσεται ὑμῖν καὶ ἑκάστῳ. This is repeated from v. 1 (see note on 31), and now is added μηδὲ διαλύεται. This is the only occurrence of the verb διαλύεται in the N.T.; although we find διαλύεται (Mt. 4, 20; Rev. 21), and διαλύεται (2 Tim. 1:5). μηδὲ διαλύεται is the parting counsel of Moses (Deut. 31:9); also μηδὲ διαπλάσσεσθαι is the counsel of Joshua to his warriors (Josh. 10:28), as it was the word of Yahweh to him (Josh. 1:1). μηδὲ διαλύεται, "let not your heart be dismayed," is, in like manner, the parting word of Christ. There is no place for cowards in the ranks of His army; and the see of the Apocalypse ranks them with "the unbelieving... and murderers and liars," who, in his vision, have their portion in hell (Rev. 21).

28. Jesus has told them that they must not be cowards; now He tells them that they must not be selfish. His departure means for Him the consummation of the Divine glory. ἔκαστος δὲν ἔνθε εἰς ἐκκλησία (sc. at vv. 2–6) "γήμαρα" (see for this verb on 7) 29 and ἐρχόμεθα πρὸς ὑμᾶς (vv. 3, 18). His departure is the condition of His return through the Spirit. This has all been said before. He now makes a new appeal to them, based on their love for Him.

εἰρήνη μοι (see on 34) περί ὀρθοδοξίας used of the love of His disciples for Jesus; and cf. v. 25 above. "if ye loved me," it is a tender, half-playful appeal. He does not really question their love for Him, but He reminds them of it. εἰρήνην ὑμῖν (cf. 16), "you would have rejoicedphere. He is not referring to the Father's elevation to His true glory. No precise distinction can be drawn between ἑαυτοῦ and ἑαυτοῦ in such phrases (see on 10).

The rec. insert ἔνθεν after ἐν, but om. NABDL. Fam. 15 add μηδὲν ἔνθε παρατέρα. μηδὲν παρατέρα μεταχεὶ μιᾷ καὶ ἑκάστῳ. To this sentence theologians devoted close attention in the fourth century, but it would be out of place in a commentary on the Fourth Gospel to review the Arian controversy. It suffices to note that the filial relationship, upon which so much stress is laid in Jn., implies of itself that the Son is from the Father, not the Father from the Son. There is no question here of theological subtleties about what a later age called the "subordination" of the Son, or of any distinction between His οἰκεῖον and that of the Father. But, for Jn., the Father sent the Son (see on 3:1), and knew Him all things (see on 3:35). Cf. Mk. 13, Phil. 2, 1 Cor. 15, for other phrases which suggest that διὰ παραγωγῆς μεταχείται is a necessary condition of the Incarnation. It is the same Person that says "I and my Father are one thing" (10), who speaks of Himself as "a man who hath told you the truth which I have heard from God." (8:20). See on 5:28.

The root text has μηδὲν ἔνθε παρατέρα, with καθὼς ἐπιλειπόθη; but om. NABDL. 29. καὶ νῦν, "And now," sc. "to make an end" (cf. 17, 1 Jn. 2, for καὶ νῦν used thus; and see on 12), "I have told you to come before this, when it is come to pass ye may believe." See note on 13.

παρατέρα may be used here absolutely (see 17); or the meaning may be governed by 13, where the words are ἐν παρατέρᾳ... δυνατόν ὑμῖν, 'that I (am) He.' In vv. 26 ff., Jesus had told the disciples of His approaching departure, which as yet they had hardly brought themselves

1 For the patristic comments on this text, see Westcott in loc.; and cf. G. G. D. Dissertations, p. 264 f.
to believe, and of the coming of the Holy Spirit which would ensue. The experience of this heavenly illumination would convince them of His superhuman foreknowledge. Cf. vs. 32, 36, 37 and 14:10. We also have the reading "καὶ τοῦ κόσμου ἐκρηκτήν." The rec. inserts τούτον after κόσμου, as at 25:16, but Βδε. X. omit. For the phrase "the prince of this world," see on 14:30. It means Satan, not merely Satan in the form of Judas (cf. 4:3), but Satan himself, to meet whose last assault (cf. Lk. 4:5-8) Jesus now prepared.

καὶ ἐν ἑμνὶ οὐκ ἔχει χόντος καὶ has nothing in me," i.e. has no point in my personality on which he can fasten. Twice in the last hours, Jesus said that He Himself was not "of this world" (cf. 17:11, 22); and thus "the prince of this world" had no power over Him. This was to claim in serene confidence that He was sinless (cf. Heb. 4:15). But, although thus superior to the forces of evil, He must go to meet them in the agony of conflict, for this was the predestined purpose of God and the world. 31. ἀλλ' εἰς γινομένος κτλ. We must supply something before εἰς, "but I do these things that the world may recognise" my love for, and obedience to, the Father. For similar elliptical constructions with εἰς, see 9:12, 15:18, 1 Jn. 3:18. Otherwise we are obliged to take the whole clause as subordinating to "Aris, let us go hence," which is very harsh. Whichever constr. is adopted, the meaning is the same. Jesus assures His apostles once more that what He does at this critical hour is done voluntarily and in obedience to the Divine purpose. Having made this declaration, He offers His Prayer (c. 17) before He leaves the house to face arrest and death.

ἐν γινομένῳ . . . . cf. 17:23 for this ideal of the future; and cf. 1 Cor. 1:27 for the reality of the present.

δι' ἀγαθῶν τῶν πάσης. This is the only place in the N.T. where the "love" of the Son for the Father is mentioned explicitly. The love of the Father for the Son is mentioned often in Jn. (see on 3:16, where ἀγαθῶν is the verb employed, and 5:20, where we find διακονεῖν); but it is remarkable that Jn. never again speaks of Jesus as "loving" God. See on 3:18 for ἀγαθῶν in Jn.

XIV. 31, XVII. 1 ff.] THE DISCOURSE CLOSES 557

ἀνέβησα. So ΚΑΙΔΙΩ; but BL have οὖνεκλήσας, from the parallel saying at 14:14, where see the exegetical note. For the obedience of Christ to the commandment of the Father, see 4:35; 5:24, and cf. Phil. 2:6, Heb. 5:8. This obedience was perfect throughout His life on earth, but here the allusion is rather to the last act of self-surrender in going to meet the Passion. Here is the last word of Jesus to the Eleven: "As the Father commanded me, so I do." ἐνετέθης. According to Mk. 1:26, Mt. 26:26, these were the words with which Jesus summoned the sleeping disciples at Gethsemane, just before His arrest. Jn. adds ἐνετέθης, and puts the words in a slightly different context; i.e. they mark the conclusion of the Discourse in the Upper Room, which was followed by a short pause for prayer, the solemn prayer of c. 17 being said standing, before Jesus and His disciples left the house for Gethsemane and the arrest (18:18).

For those who accept the traditional order of chapters, the sharp finality of ἐνετέθης, ἐνετέθης is not easy of explanation. The allusion of the Vine (c. 15) comes in strangely after such words, which must mark a break in, or the termination of, the Last Discourse of Jesus. Several exeges resembles suppose that, after He had said "Aris, let us go hence," Jesus and His eleven disciples left the house, the rest of the discourse being spoken as they were walking to Gethsemane. It is difficult to suppose that teaching so profound and so novel was given under such conditions, or that Jn. intends thus to represent the course of events. Westcott suggested that before the little party crossed the Kidron they halted for a time in the Temple precincts, where quiet opportunity could be found for the delivery of cc. 15, 16 and for the great prayer of c. 17. But there is no evidence for such an hypothesis. The simplicity of the exegesis which emerges from placing the text in the order that is here adopted is a strong argument in its favour.

ἐνετέθης, it may be noted, is used thrice in c. 11 of a going forth to meet death (see on 11:7).

XVII. 1 ff. Of the Prayer of Jesus which is now recorded, it would be too much to suppose that we have the exact words, or even an exact translation of the Aramaic words which He used. We have not here a shorthand report, taken down at the time, but rather the substance of sacred interpolations preserved for half a century in the memory of a disciple. On the other hand, the occasion must have
been felt by all who were present to be specially momentous, and the words used of extraordinary significance. They would be remembered when other things were forgotten, as the Last Prayer of Jesus, said in the hearing of His disciples, when the Last Discourse was ended, before He went to meet the Cross. The topics upon which He dwelt—His coming glorification, His committal of His chosen friends to the compassionate protection of the Father while they were in the world with its trials, His intercession for those other disciples who were to receive the Gospel through the ministry of the Eleven. His prayer that the mutual love of Christian for Christian might at last convince the hostile world of the truth of His claims—these things could never pass from the memory of one who heard Him speak of them at the last. Phrase after phrase is repeated, and more than once, as is characteristic of the style of Jn.; but Jn. is drawing all the while upon the tenacious memory of an old man recalling the greatest days of his life. This, at any rate, seems more probable than the hypothesis that the Prayer is a free composition of the evangelist himself. To take such a view would be to ascribe the deepest thoughts in the Fourth Gospel to the disciple rather than to the Master. As Harnack says, the confidence with which Jn. makes Jesus address the Father, "Thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world" (v. 24), "is undoubtedly the direct reflection of the certainty with which Jesus Himself spoke." 2

No other long prayer of Jesus is recorded. His habit of prayer at crises or great moments is often mentioned (Mk. 1.36; Lk. 5.18; 22.46; Jn. 12.40), but these prayers were usually (as it seems) offered in private, and were overheard by none. Something, however, of His methods of prayer may be gathered from the Synoptists. Two, at any rate, of His ejaculations from the Cross were verses of the Psalms (Ps. 22.1-10), hallowed by long and venerable use. That they should come to His lips in the agony of death, shows that they were familiarly used by Him in life. Again, it was His habit to begin with the word "Father" (cf. Lk. 22.40, 22.44, Mt. 17.25, and Jn. 11.12, 17b, as this great Prayer begins (17)). He prayed, at the end at least, for His own needs, when distressed in spirit (Lk. 22.41, Jn. 12.27), and the prayer of c. 17 begins with intercession for Himself. He prayed for His disciples (Lk. 22.32), and He is represented as doing so in 17f-18f. The solemn note of thanksgiving at the beginning of His Prayer of Consecration (17f-9f) has a parallel at Jn. 12.46, and also in Mt. 21.37f, a passage which recalls the manner of Jn. 17.15f more than any other

1 What is Christianity ?, Eng. Tr., p. 132.

XVII. 1. THE LAST PRAYER

XVII. 1. Taavra ἐκλήτους Ἰησοῦ, καὶ ἐκάθε ἀριθμός τοῦ φθοράμος passage in the Gospels: "I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that Thou didst hide these things from the wise and understanding, and didst reveal them unto babes; yea, Father, for so it was well pleasing in Thy sight. All things have been delivered unto me of my Father, etc." 1 It has been pointed out 2 that several of the thoughts underlying the Lord's Prayer, which Jesus prescribed for the use of His disciples, appear also in the great Prayer of Intercession in c. 17. With the opening address, "Our Father," cf. 17.1.2.11.21.24.28 where "Father" is used in the special and personal sense in which Jesus was accustomed to use it. "Hallowed be Thy Name" is recalled, vv. 6, 11, 12, 26. Perhaps "Thy kingdom come" is the form in which we may express something of what Christ expressed when He said "Glory Thy Son" (vv. 1, 5). "As in heaven, so on earth," has echoes in vv. 4, 5. With "lead us not into temptation" cf. "I kept them...I guarded them" (v. 12). And "deliver us from evil" is almost verbally reproduced (v. 9).

None of these coincidences or parallels is likely to have been invented by one setting himself to compose a prayer for the lips of Christ on the eve of His Passion; but, when taken together, they show that the spirit which breathes throughout c. 17 is similar to that with which we have been made familiar when reading Jesus' words as recorded by the Synoptists and elsewhere in Jn.

The prayer of c. 17 falls naturally into three divisions. First, Jesus prays for Himself (vv. 1–8); then, for the eleven apostles, His intimate friends (vv. 9–19); and lastly, for the disciples of future generations, who were to be evangelised through the ministry begun by the apostles (vv. 20–26). That is, the prayer begins with what is immediate, intimate, and urgent, and only gradually passes into intercession for that which is distant and of universal import.

The prayer of Jesus for Himself, and His thanksgiving

(XVII. 1–8)

XVII. 1. ταύτα διαλέγεται Ἰησοῦ; "these things said Jesus," viz. the discourse ending 14h. The rec. has 5 before Ἰησοῦ, but N. om. See on 17f. "εἰς ἄρα...καὶ ἔκαθε..." εἰς ἄρα...εἰς ἀριθμὸν is found in N. B D L W G TH. 1 See Cheyne, The Lord's Prayer in the Early Church, p. 112.
speaketh, I say the I shall make him a son of God. 3. And by I am the Father and I am the Son. 4. And of the Father, who sent Me, I am the Son.

XVII. 2-8.] ETERNAL LIFE

561

The redemption of mankind through the Crucified is a glorification of the Father. The final cause of the Passion, viewed sub specie aeternitatis, is as ad majorem del gloriam, as was every incident in the ministry of Jesus. See on 10 and cf. 3 Pet. 41.

The constr. ἵνα . . . καθέσας . . . ἵνα, which we have here, appears also 1324. 1726, in each clause the case introduced by καθέσας being parenthetical, and the second ἵνα being restorative, the clause following it being identical in meaning with that introduced by the first ἵνα. Consequently ἵνα πάντως καθέσας καθέσας καθέσας, which in this verse is only another way of saying ἵνα καθέσας καθέσας καθέσας of v. 1.

καθέσας καθέσας καθέσας καθέσας. To the Son, the Father gave authority to determine the final destinies of mankind (see on 526). His δικαιοσύνη is over "all flesh" (although not fully acknowledged by the world), πάντα καθέσας being the render-ing of the phrase ὅτι δικαιοσύνης, very common in the O.T., representing all humanity in its weakness (see Hort on 1 Pet. 126), but infrequent in the N.T., except in quotations (cf. Mt. 2426, Rom. 326, 1 Cor. 128, Gal. 126).

ἵνα πάντως καθέσας καθέσας καθέσας. The meaning is that He may give eternal life to all whom thou hast given to Him" (see on 6), the latter clause limiting the πάντα καθέσας which has preceded. This consummation of His redemptive work is the "glorification" of the Father by the Son.

ἵνα πάντως καθέσας καθέσας καθέσας. The constr. with a nom-pendens is like ἵνα πάντως καθέσας καθέσας καθέσας, where see the note on the collective use of the neuter singular, which perhaps is here a forecast of ἵνα . . . ἵνα of v. 21. ἵνα πάντως καθέσας καθέσας καθέσας is the Universal Church (cf. v. 24).

There are many variants for δικαιοσύνη (v.26). Westcott adopts δικαιοσύνη (with BNUΔΘ), but ἵνα with the future is infrequent in Jn. 8 has δικαιοσύνη, and τὸ δικαιοσύνη is the Divine acceptance of His Sacrifice by the Father, the sealing of His Mission as complete. Cf. Phil. 21. "Wherefore God highly exalted Him (ὑψωθέντος) and gave Him the Name that is above every name."

ἵνα πάντως καθέσας καθέσας καθέσας. The redemption of mankind through the Crucified is a glorification of the Father. The final cause of the Passion, viewed sub specie aeternitatis, is as ad majorem del gloriam, as was every incident in the ministry of Jesus. See on 10 and cf. 3 Pet. 41.

The constr. ἵνα . . . καθέσας . . . ἵνα, which we have here, appears also 1324. 1726, in each clause the case introduced by καθέσας being parenthetical, and the second ἵνα being restorative, the clause following it being identical in meaning with that introduced by the first ἵνα. Consequently ἵνα πάντως καθέσας καθέσας καθέσας, which in this verse is only another way of saying ἵνα καθέσας καθέσας καθέσας of v. 1.

καθέσας καθέσας καθέσας καθέσας. To the Son, the Father gave authority to determine the final destinies of mankind (see on 526). His δικαιοσύνη is over "all flesh" (although not fully acknowledged by the world), πάντα καθέσας being the render-
καὶ δὲ ἀπεσταλεὶ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν.

4. ἐγὼ σε ἐθάνατον ἐκ τῆς γῆς, the Lord," διαφέρειν τοῦ γνωσθῆναι τοῦ κόσμου (Hos. 6f). Cf. Jer. 34.

τῶν μῶνον ἀληθῶν θεῶν. For μῶνος as applied to God, see on 3f above. He is described as ἀληθινός, Ex. 34f, Num. 14f, I Esd. 8f, Ps. 86f, i Thess. 1f, Rev. 19f, and cf. especially 1 Jn. 5f, ἀληθῆς εἶναι ὁ ἀληθινός θεός καὶ ἑαυτῶν. For ἀληθινός, see on 1f. The adjectives μῶνος and ἀληθινός express the central truth of Monothelism.

Westin quotes a verbal parallel from Athanasius (vi. p. 523f), describing the flattery of the Athenians in their reception of Demetrius, he says, ἐκδόομεν ὡς εἰς μῶνος τοῦ ἀληθοῦς. This shows how natural is the combination of μῶνος and ἀληθινός. Cf. Philo, Leg. All. ii. 17, μᾶς τὸν ἀληθῆ μῶνον θεόν.

That to know God is, itself, eternal life, is a doctrine which has its roots in Jewish sapiential literature. Wisdom is "a tree of life to them that lay hold on her" (Prov. 3f). Again, ἐκάθεν γνῶσις τῆς σοφίας ἑξαποθέτηκεν τῶν παρὰ αὐτής (Eccles. 1f). An even nearer parallel to Jn.'s definition of eternal life is: εἰδότας τὸ κράτος τῆς ἀληθείας (Wis. 5f).

Alford apparatus cites the words of Irenæus: ἵδε ὃποιον τῆς ζωῆς ἐκ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ παρακολύτους μετοχεῖς μετῆποτε ἐκ τούτοις ἔχει ἐκ τῆς γνώσεως θεοῦ, ἀλλά ἐν τῇ χριστιανίᾳ αὐτῶν (Her. iv. xx. 5). A little lower down (§ 5, where the Greek is deficient) Irenæus combines with wonderful insight the two thoughts that the giving of eternal life by the Son is a glorification of the Father (v. 2), and that eternal life is the knowledge of God (v. 3), although he does not cite the present passage. "Gloria enim ei uiueus homo; uta autem humanis uisus dei." It would not be easy to express these profound thoughts more succinctly.

The writer of the last paragraphs of the Epistle to Diognetus (whom Lightfoot identifies with Pantaenus 2), commenting on the presence in Paradise of both the Tree of Knowledge and the Tree of Life, says: οὐδὲ γὰρ τῶν ἀγάλματων, οὐδὲ γνῶσις ἐν τοῖς ἀληθινοῖς (§ 12f).

καὶ δὲ ἀπεσταλεὶ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν. To "know" Jesus Christ is eternal life; cf. 6f. Jn. treats this knowledge as on a par with the knowledge of "the only true God." So the apostles were hidden to "believe" not only in God, but in Christ (14f).

For the thought of Jesus as "sent" by God (cf. vv. 8, 18, 21, 23, 25), see on 3f above.

The only other place in the Fourth Gospel where the historical name "Jesus Christ" occurs is 2f (see note, in loc.)

Apostolic Fathers, p. 489.

XVII. 4–5.] "GLORIFY THOU ME"

τὸ ἐργον τελείωσον δ ἐδοκιμάσει μιᾷ βουλήσει. 5. καὶ γνῶσις ἐδοκιμάσεν με ὑμῖν. "Πάσης, παρὰ σεαυτῷ τῇ ἐδοκήσει ἢ ἔλεγον πρὸς τὸν κόσμον εἶναι ἐγὼ σε ἐθάνατον ἐκ τῆς γῆς. This is in direct sequence with v. 2 (v. 3 being parenthetical). He had spoken of the "glorification" of the Father by Him, which was to be consummated in the gift of eternal life through His ministry to those who viewed the Father had given Him. This "glorification" had been His aim throughout His earthly sojourn. "I glorified Thee on earth" (the aorist ἐδοκήσας being the aorist of historical retrospect) by making known as never before the nature of God. τὸ ἐργον τελείωσον δ ἐδοκιμάσει μιᾷ βουλήσει. This had been His purpose throughout (see on 4f), from the day when He asked αὐτὸς ὅτι ἐν τούτῳ τοῦ πατρός ὑμῶν, δεῖ εἶναι μου; (Lk. 22f). His "works" had been "given" by the Father to accomplish (§ 18f). They had now been accomplished, and presently He would say τετέλεσται (15f).

For τελείωσα (ΝΑΣΚΝΗΝ) the rec. (with έ) has τελείωσαι, and for δοκιμάσω (ΝΑΣΚΝΗΝ) CDW have δοκιμάσαι. The variants δοκιμάσω, δοκιμάσαι frequently occur (cf. vv. 6, 8, 24, etc.) in similar contexts throughout the Gospel. Abbott (Diat. 2454) holds that "the aorist usually describes gifts regarded as given by the Father to the Son in His coming into the world to proclaim the Gospel; the perfect describes gifts regarded as having been given to the Son and now belonging to Him." But we cannot always press this distinction.

5. καὶ γνῶσις, "and now," that this earthly ministry is ended (cf. 14f for καὶ γνῶσιν).

δοκιμάσω με. There is emphasis on γνῶσις. The glorification prayed for here transcends the glorification in the Passion prayed for in v. 1. Here the thought is of a heavenly glorification already predicted, 13f, δὲ θὰ δοκιμάση αὐτὸν ἐν αὐτῷ. For Jesus asks now, with lofty assurance (εἰς τὸ προσεχήσασθαι ὑμῖν), that the eternal glory which was His before the Incarnation (cf. 1f) may be resumed in fellowship with the Father (παρὰ σεαυτῷ ἐκτὸς αὐτοῦ). Cf. Prov. 8f, Jn. 6f, and Rev. 5f. The glory of the Eternal Word is distinguishable from the glory of the Incarnate Word (see on 1f); the spheres of life are different, ἐν τῇ γῇ (v. 4), implying the Incarnate Life, but παρὰ σεαυτῷ implying life in the bosom of the Godhead.

As He had said, "Before Abraham was, I am" (8f), so here He expresses His sure conviction that He was in eternal relation with God. τὴν δοκήσει ἢ ἔλεγον... παρὰ σοι indicates a real, and not only an ideal, pre-existence.

πρὸ τοῦ τοῦ κόσμου εἶναι. See 1f, v. 24, and cf. Prov. 8f. For κόσμος, see on 1f.
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6. ἔφανερωσα αὐτὸν ἦν τοῦ νόμου τοὺς ἀνθρώπους οἱ ἄθικοι μοι ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου. οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι καί αὐτοί ἴδωκαν, καὶ τὸν λόγον σου τετήρησαν. 7. ὦν ἔγραμεν ὅτι πάντα διὰ διδάσκαλον μοι παρὰ αὐτὸν ἔφανερωσά τοῦ ἄνθρωπον. This means the same thing as ἔγραμεν σοι τὸ γράμμα τῆς γῆς of v. 4, and that ἔγραμεν τῷ ἄνθρωπῳ τοῦ νόμου σου, as διδάσκαλον μοι ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου, suggests the true nature of God as indicating His true nature, see on 13. In the apostolic age the words were interpreted of Christ (Heb. 2:4). As He looks back on His ministry, He can say that this has been accomplished: ἔφανερωσεν σου τὸ ἄνθρωπον. Although the disciples had not appreciated all of His teaching, they had learnt, through Him, something more of the nature of God than any Jew had learnt before.

8. τὸς ἄνθρωπος οἱ δώκανεν μοι ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου. See on 6. for the thought of disciples being “given” to the Son by the Father, which recurs throughout the Priestly Prayer of Jesus (v. 17, 29, 36, 24).

καὶ σὺν δὲ ἐμοῖς, “they were thine,” and σοὶ εἰρήνη, “they are thine” (v. 11). This means more than that they were “Israelites indeed” (14); it is rather that they were among the men ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ of whom He spoke before (9).

καὶ τὸν λόγον σου τετήρησαν. This was some of the fruit of His ministry; the chosen disciples (except Judas) had “kept” the Divine word revealed to them through Jesus. Cf. 8:14 for the phrase τὸν λόγον τηρεῖν, and see on 5.

δώκασα (κΑΒΔΩ) is the true reading in this verse, in both places where it occurs, as against the rec. δώκασε. The reference is to the definite “gift” of the faithful disciples chosen ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου. See on v. 4 above.

There is a passage in the Odes of Solomon (xxxi. 4, 5) which recalls the thought of this verse: “He offered to Him the sons that were in His hands. And His face was justified, for thus His Holy Father had given to Him.” Cf. also v. 11.

7. ὦν ἔγραμεν κατὰ βιβλίον. The disciples had said (16) ὄντων ὑδάτων ὅτι οἶδας πνεύμα κατὰ βιβλίον, but their confidence was not so deep-rooted as they had supposed. Yet they had come to recognise (ἔγραμεν expressing the gradual growth of their spiritual insight) that His words were divine (v. 8), and (as it is expressed in this verse) that “all things which Thou hast given me are from Thee” (see on 3).

Godet calls attention to the apparent scantiness of the spiritual harvest for which Jesus gives thanks in these verses.

Eleven Galilean peasants after three years’ labour! But it is unusual for Jesus, for in these eleven He beholds the pledge of the continuance of God’s work upon earth.

For δώκασα, there is a Western variant, ἔγραψα (n. lat. etyr. rho), the mistaken correction of a scribe who returns to the first person of v. 6.

For δώκασα (see on v. 4), AB have δώκασα. And for δώκασα (n. ABDW and NBNCLNW) the rec. has ἔγρας, with ADGΔΘ.

8. ὦν τὰ δόματα κατὰ βιβλίον, “that the words which Thou gavest me I have given unto them.” For δόματα, see on 3:1; cf. 5:20, 21.

These “words” of Jesus were “given” Him by the Father, as has been said before. See on 18, and cf. 15, 17, 14.

καὶ σὺν δὲ ἔμαθαν. The chosen disciples had received and appropriated His words, which “abode” in them (cf. 25). Here was the token that the disciples were, indeed, ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ (cf. 8).

The rec. has δέδωκα (so NBNCLNW) for δώκασα (ABCDW), but the sense requires the aorist here (see on v. 4). The δόματα of Jesus were “given” to Him by the Father, when He entered on His mission (see on 3).

καὶ ἔγραψαν... καὶ ἐκτίσθησαν. Here, again, we have the aorist tense. The disciples recognised, “knew of a truth,” i.e., inferred from what they saw and heard, that Jesus had come from God (cf. 3); and further, they believed (for this was not a matter of merely intellectual inference) that God had sent Him. But perhaps we must not lay stress on the distinction between ἔγραψαν and ἐκτίσθησαν here; for at 16. God has already said to the Eleven, ἐπετύπωσας ὅτι εἶχας πάντα τοῦ πατρὸς ἐξέβλησα. And at 17. δὸς γὰρ ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἐξάνωθε, ἀλλὰ ἐκεῖνος μὲ ἐπιστήμην is a single sentence, the “sending” by the Father being the only possible alternative to Jesus having come “of Himself.” Cf. 11. In παρετύπωσας ὅτι σὺ μὲ ἐπιστήμην, and for the “sending” of the Son by the Father, see on 3. For the combination of ἐπετύπωσας and ἐγραψας, see on 9.
9. Ἐπίω περὶ αὐτῶν ἐρωτά: σὲ περὶ τοῦ κόσμου ἐρωτά, ἀλλὰ περὶ ἐν δεδομένα μοι, ὅτι σοὶ ἐστιν. τοῦτο ὅταν μὴ γίνεται καὶ τὰ σὰ ἐμὰ, καὶ δεδώκαμεν ἐν αὐτῶν. ἱκ. καὶ οἰκείων ἐφίλῳ τῇ κόσμῳ.

The prayer of Jesus for the Eleven—(1) that they may be divinely guarded (vv. 9-16) and (2) that they may be consecrated men (vv. 17-19)

9. Ἐπίω περὶ αὐτῶν ἐρωτά. From v. 9 to v. 19, we have the prayer of Jesus for His chosen disciples, that the Father may guard them from evil, and that He may sanctify them in the truth. He had prayed for Peter that his faith should not fail (Lk. 22:32), but this prayer does not contemplate any failure of faith among the Eleven, in the days to come when their Master had returned to His glory. For ἐρωτά, which is the verb generally used by Jesus of His own prayers, see on 11:25, 16:28, and cf. 16:24-28.

οὐ περὶ τοῦ κόσμου ἐρωτά, ἵνα. "I am not praying for the world now,", the prayers which follow were for those who loved Him, not for those who rejected Him. But this is not to be interpreted as indicating that Jesus never prayed for His enemies (cf. Mk. 14:40 and His own prayer Mt. 26:42). The κόσμος (see on 11) was hostile to Him, but God loved it (13); and even this Prayer of c. 17, which was primarily a prayer for Himself and His own disciples, present and future, does not exclude the thought of the world’s acceptance of Jesus at the last day (v. 21).

The language of 1 Jn. 5:19, "there is a sin unto death: I do not say that he should pray for (ἐρωτάτω) for that," is verbally similar, but the thought there is different, viz. of the propriety or duty of praying for a fellow-Christian whose sin is ἐπὶ ὅπως ἐνσώθησαι. ἐν δεδομένα μοι, ὅτι σοὶ ἐστιν τῇ κόσμῳ, because they are God’s. See on v. 6, from which verse this clause is repeated.

Only in this chap. (cf. vv. 15, 20) is ἐρωτά used by Jn. absolutely or intrinsically, being generally followed, on the account of the person who is asked either to give something or to reply. See on [87].

30. καὶ τὰ ἐμὰ πάντα σὰ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ. So He had said before; see on 16:24.

οἰκείων ἐφίλῳ τῇ κόσμῳ. Cf. v. 14. The Father’s visible ministry in the world of men is over. Meyer cites Calvin’s comment: "nunc quasi provincia sua defunctus."

The rec. text has ἐνοτὸs, but not ἐνοτός. ἐνοτός ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐστι: the disciples are still in the world and have their service and ministry to fulfill. καὶ γὰρ πρὸς τῇ ἐρωταίαν, repeated v. 13; cf. 13:3 14:13.

After ἐρωταίαν D adds ἐνοτός ἐφίλῃ τῷ κόσμῳ καὶ τῷ κόσμῳ ἐφίλῃ, a Western gloss, which has some support from a c e, and which evidently was added because the scribe stumbled at the words, "I am no longer in the world."

πέρα. B reads πάντως (with N), as it also does at v. 21 (with D), at vv. 24, 25 (with A), and (testē Abbott, Dist. 2053) at 15:28. But, although the nom. with the article sometimes takes the place of the voc. (e.g. Mt. 11:28, Lk. 16:28), πάντως without the article is not easy to defend. At v. 5 D, in like manner, has πάντως for πέρα.

καὶ ἐνοτός ἐστιν. The holiness of God is fundamental in the Hebrew religion. This is a characteristically Jewish mode of address in prayer; cf. 2 Macc. 14:86, ἐγὼ πάντως δύναμιν
modern editors, including Westcott and Abbott (Diat. 240 ff.). Burney (Aramaic Origin, etc., p. 103), while recognizing that
θ is the reading best attested, holds that "of" must have been
intended by the evangelist, and he traces the variants to the
ambiguity of the relative particle η, which might stand for
either οἷος, δόμος, or θέλω. But this does not explain the
superior attestation of "οἷος, even if an Aramaic origin for the Fourth
Gospel were accepted.

We have seen (on 3:8) that it is a favourite thought with John
that the Father gave all things to the Incarnate Son; but it is
only here and at v. 14 that the idea is expressed that the Father
has given His "Name" to Christ, and that it is in this "Name"
that Jesus guarded His disciples. This does not mean only
that the Son was "sent" by the Father (see on 3:7), and that
therefore His ministry was accomplished in the Name of the Father
(see on 5:28) as His delegate and representative;
but that in Christ God was revealed in His providential love
and care, His "Name," that is, His essential nature as Father,
being exhibited in the Incarnate Son. Thus that "the Name
of the Father was "given" to Christ is yet another way of
expressing the essential unity of the Father and the Son (see
on 10:30). This transcends any such idea as that of Num. 6:27,
where the "Name" of Yahweh is "put" upon Israel by the
priestly blessing; or of Ex. 23:25, where it is said of the guardian
angel of the people, "My Name is in him"; or of Jer. 31:39,
where the "Name" of the Messianic King is "Yahweh our
Righteousness." The nearest parallel is Phil. 2:9, ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ ὥσπερ ὁ ἄνθρωπος πάντως καὶ ἀντέχεισα, "in the
Lord, fully and eternally." In such contexts the "Name" of God is equivalent to what a modern writer
would call His "Providence," and this, in the N.T. and
especially in John, is associated with the doctrine of God as
Father.

3 δέωμας μου. The reading here and in v. 12 presents
difficulty, and the variants are important.

(a) The rec. text has οἷος δέωμας μου, but this is poorly
attested (Dδ, 69 fgq vg. cop.), and οἷος may have come from r88,
from v. 6. It gives an excellent sense; that His disciples were
"given" to Jesus by the Father is said five times elsewhere
in this chapter (vv. 2, 6, 9, 12, 24; see on 6:30 for other
references).

(b) δ δέωμας μου is read by D3 ful. This might have the
same meaning as οἷος, and δ δέωμας is the right reading at
vv. 2, 24. For this collective use of the neuter sing., see on 6:30.
Field, whose opinion is always weighty, prefers δ.

(b) But the harder reading, θ, has such strong attestation
that it must be accepted. It is supported by the great bulk
of MSS and vss., including KABCLW, θ must refer to
δέωμα, so that "in Thy Name, which Thou hast given" is
the only possible rendering. This is accepted by most

XVII. 11.] THE FATHER'S NAME GIVEN 569
THE SON OF PERDITION

13. Not that I brought thee forth, to destroy thee; but that I might love thee, and thou mightest live. This is the prophecied role of the Son of God, as a light in the darkness, to reveal the truth and bring salvation to those who believe. The Son of God is the hope of the world, a beacon of light in the darkness of sin and death. His mission is not to condemn, but to save. The love of God is manifested in the sacrifice of His Son, who gave Himself for the sins of the world. The Son of God came to seek and to save that which was lost, to bring life and hope to all who believe. In Him, all who trust in Him shall find salvation and eternal life. Amen.
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εἰς τὸ κόσμον, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ τῆρησθη ἵστε ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου. 16. ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου οὐκ εἰσέλθει καθός ἐγὼ ὢν τῷ κόσμῳ. 17. ὑπάρχονεν

for a complete dissociation from heathen of evil lives, a Christian disciple would have to "go out of the world." On the other hand, he is equally explicit in his statement (Gal. 1:7) that the purpose of the sacrifice of Christ was that He might deliver us from this present evil age (ἀλώνιος). These two principles are tersely enunciated in the present verse. The apostles would have to live in the world, for that was to be the theatre of their evangelical ministry; but they would need the special grace of God to keep them from its evil influences.

ἀλλ' ἐνα τῆρησθη ἵστε ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου. This is the first petition of Jesus for the Eleven, viz. for their protection and deliverance. τῆρησθη ἵστε is found again in N.T. only at Rev. 3:10, a passage very similar to the present: ὅταν εἰσέλθησαν τῷ λόγῳ (cf. v. 6, τῷ λόγῳ τῷ θερμάκοι) . . . καθὼς ἐν τῷ τῆρησθή ἕκ τῆς ἑρας τῷ πνεύματι (cf. v. 11, τῆρησθης ἑωτός). A nearer parallel is in I Jn. 5:19, where it is said of a child of God, that Christ ἑωτός ἐστιν, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ὑμῶν ἰδία τοῦ ἑωτοῦ.

ὁ πνεῦμα appears again in I Jn. 2:14 5:19 (ο τῆρησθης ἐν τῷ πνεύματε). The agency of the personal devil, Satan, is not doubted by Jn.; cf. 13:2, and the references to ἀργος τοῦ κόσμου (1:24, 14:31, 16:11).

In its words ἀργος ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, we probably have an echo of the clause in the Lord's Prayer, ὅταν ἔχει ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος (Mt. 6:6; see above on v. 1.) Some commentators have endeavoured to distinguish the meaning of ἐκ from that of ἐν in constructions like this (see on 140), but this is over subtle. Cf. the parallelism in Ps. 140:1: ἐξολοθρεὶτε με ἐν δυνάμει πνεύματος ἐκ αὐθεντήει θνητοὶ πάντα με.

16. This verse is repeated from v. 14, οὐκ εἰσέλθη ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου, according to K edible.

17. Here is the second petition for the Eleven (cf. v. 15), viz. for their consecration. ἡμέρας (see on 106) connotes not so much the selection of a man for an important task as the equipping and fitting him for its due discharge. It is applied to the divine separation of Jeremiah for the work of a prophet (Jer. 1); and also to Aaron and his sons for their priestly office, Ex. 28, where the Divine command to Moses is ὑπάρχονεν ἐκ τῆς ἑρας τῷ πνεύματι. (See Additional Note on 18.)

ἁρπάζειν is not equivalent to καθίσαι; one who is not
THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN [XVII. 18-19.

aoréis en tē ἀληθείᾳ δὲ λόγος ἐστιν. 18. καθὼς ἐμὲ ἡγομένος ἐστὶν. Is not necessarily impure. Of the apostles it had already been said, ἡμῖν δὲ καθὼς λέγοντα ἐστιν, and the effective instrument of their purification was the λόγος which Jesus had spoken to them (15b), as the Divine λόγος is said here also to be the medium of their consecration. But the two ideas of ἀγαθομορία and καθορισμος are not identical. Just because the Eleven were already, in a sense, pure, being not "of the world," even as their Master was not "of the world" (v. 16), is their consecration for their future task a fitting boon to be asked in prayer of God who is Himself ἄγνος (v. 17). Cf. Paul’s prayer for his Thessalonian converts that God would consecrate them wholly (ἀγιώσας ἐμέλειας καθορισμένης, 1 Thess. 5:23).

ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ. Truth would be the medium of their consecration, as (although this is not expressed in the present passage) the "Spirit of Truth" would be the Agent (cf. xvi). See also 13a. So Paul said of his Thessalonian converts that God had chosen them εἰς σωτηρίαν ἐν ἀγαθομορίᾳ καθορισμὸς καὶ πίστιν ἀληθείαν (2 Thess. 2:13). Westcott makes the pregnant comment that "the end of the Truth is wisdom . . . but holiness."

After ἀληθείᾳ the rec. text adds σω, but om. ABLDELW. What is meant by ἀληθείᾳ is explained in the next clause.

ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ. It is not always noticed that this is a quotation from the LXX of Ps. 119:42: ὁ λόγος σου ἡ ἀληθεία. (cf. 2 Sam, 32a). Jesus had already said of the disciples, τὸν λόγον σου ἐπηρεάσας (v. 6, where see note); and thus they were in the way of consecration, which is in truth (cf. 14a). Such consecration is not an isolated event in the life-history of a disciple, but is a continuous process (cf. 3 λαμπρὸν, Heb. 2:3).

Westcott quotes an interesting parallel from a Jewish prayer for the new year: "Purify our heart to serve Thee in truth. Thou, O God, art Truth, and Thy word is truth, and standeth for ever."

18. καθὼς ἐμὲ ἀπέστειλα. For this thought, five times expressed in this chapter, cf. v. 3 and see on 13a.

That the relation between Jesus and His disciples is comparable with that between the Son and the Father is several times stated in the discourses of Jesus as reported by Jn. As is the love of the Father to the Son, so is the love of Jesus for His disciples (15a). The glory which the Father gave to the Son was given by Jesus to His disciples (17b). As the Son lives by the Father (καὶ τὸν πατέρα), so His disciples live by Jesus (καὶ ἐμέ, 6b). As the Father knows the Son, and the Son the

XVII. 18-19.] "I SANCTIFY MYSELF"

αὐτός ἐστίν τὸν κόσμον, καθὼς ἀπέστειλα αὐτὸν ἐκ τῶν κόσμων. 19. καὶ τίνι αὐτῶν ἐγὼ ἀγαθομορία ἐματσάτο, ἵνα δοθῶ καὶ αὐτοὶ ἡγομένοι ἐν ἀληθείᾳ.

Father, so does Jesus know His sheep, and they know Him (10b-12). As the Son is "in" the Father, so are His disciples "in" Jesus (14a). These are amazing teachings, but they are deep-rooted in the Fourth Gospel. And, corresponding to them, we have the saying of this verse that as the Father sent the Son into the world, so Jesus sent His apostles into the world.

The comparison καθὼς . . . καὶ in such passages can never be exact or definite (see on 6a), but at the same time it points in each case to something more than a superficial analogy.

καθὼς ἀπέστειλα αὐτὸν ἐκ τῶν κόσμων. The words carry a reference not only to the original choice of the Twelve, ἥν ἀποστάλη αὐτὸς ἐρώτατον (Mk. 3:14, cf. Lk. 6:6), but to their future mission, the apostles being used because of the certainty of this predetermined future in store for them. The actual commission is recorded at 20a: καθὼς ἀπέστειλαν με δοθήσεται καθὼς πέμην ἦμι . . . λάβετε πνεύμα τοῦ θεοῦ. (No distinction can be drawn between ἀποστάλλω and πέμω in such passages; see on 3a.) Cf. also 4b.

19. καὶ τίνι αὐτῶν ἐγὼ ἀγαθομορία ἐματσάτο. ἐγὼ is om. by NW, but ins. BCDLNΘE rightly; it is here emphatic.

ὁ πίστις ἐμετράτω. At 10a He had spoken of Himself as One ἐν δίκαιον ἰδιοτέραν. Here there is no inconsistency. The Father "consecrated" Jesus for His mission to the world; and now His mission is about to be consummated in death, Jesus 'consecrates' Himself, as He enters upon the Passion. So He had said before of His life, "I lay it down of myself" (10a). In His death He was both Priest and Victim.

The two petitions for the disciples were for their deliverance from the Evil One (v. 15), and for their consecration (v. 17). These are the two purposes of the Atonement, as set out (Tit. 2:4, "Who gave Himself for us, in order that He might (1) redeem us from all iniquity, and (2) purify to Himself a peculiar people zealous of good works.") So here the "consecration" of Himself to the Cross by Jesus was not only that (1a) His chosen apostles might in their turn be guarded and consecrated, but that the same consecration might be the portion of all future disciples (v. 19). There is a special emphasis on ἐγὼ. No one else could say, "I consecrate myself." It is only through His consecration that His disciples can be consecrated; and
The prayer of Jesus for all future disciples (vv. 20–26)

20. We now reach the third division of the Prayer of Jesus, which passes from the thoughts of the apostles to the thought of all those who should reach discipleship through their ministry. The prayer is a proleptic or anticipatory present participle, with the force of a future, *qui crediderint in me* (Vulg.). Some minuscule, which the text follows, through misunderstanding, have adopted *πιστεύοντων.*

Σαΐ τῷ λόγῳ αὐτῶν. The "word" of the evangelical preachers was the message of God in Christ which they brought, such preaching being an essential preliminary to faith. Cf. Rom. 10:14.

εἰς ζωήν. For *πιστεύω εἰς...* see on 11.

21. As the Church grew, so would the risk of disunion among its members be intensified. Jesus had already prayed that His apostles might be united in will and purpose even as the Father and the Son are united (v. 11, ἵνα δοθῇ ἐν καθεν ἱερεῖ). He now repeats this petition for all future disciples, ἵνα δοθῇ ἐν ζωήν, stating more fully what the meaning of this ideal unity was to be.

There is no suggestion of a unity of *organisation,* such as that which appears in Paul's conception of the Church as one body with many members, each performing its appropriate function (Rom. 12; 1 Cor. 12). No biological analogy is offered here to assist us in comprehending the sense in which Christians are intended to be *one.* Jesus had said already that His sheep would ultimately be One Flock, even as they had One Shepherd (10). But the mystical phrases used in this passage transcend even that thought. For He prays that the unity of His disciples may be realised in the spiritual life, after the pattern of that highest form of unity, in which the Father is...
XVII. 23-24.] "THAT THEY MAY BE WITH ME"

ἐπόθεσα καὶ ἐγκέμασα ἀστρετος καθες ἐμὲ ἤγανοφρα. 24. Πάντως, δὴ δεδουλεύς μοι, θέλω ἵνα ὁ οὐκ ἐμὶ εὖν καλὰν ἔχων εἰς ἐμὲ, ἵνα θεωρήσῃς τὴν δοξὴν τὴν ἐμὴν, ἵνα δεδουλεύς μοι χρὴ γιὰν ἄρτος μοι πρὸ καὶ ἐγκέμασαν αὐτοῖς καθες καὶ. For thus will the world be led to the knowledge that God loved it (ἀστρετοῖς) with the same kind of love as that with which He loved His Son (520), and that therefore He had sent His Son. These are the thoughts of the "comfortable word" of 318, which are here expressed as a prayer.

For ἐγκέμασα: there is a Western reading, ἐγκέμασα (D δ β, etc.), which is a mistaken correction (introduced from 159), the connexion of the passage with 328 having been missed.

26. There follows the thought of those who have been "perfected into one" on earth, sharing the fellowship of their common Lord in heaven, as they behold His eternal glory.

πάτερ. See on v. 11.

ἐκ δεδουλεύς μου. Ἐκ is for ἔκ (cf. v. 12), the neuter singular suggesting their unity, as at 327. 31, where see note.

θέλω. He does not now say ὅταν... (v. 20 and see on 1120), but θέλω, "I wish." He has said repeatedly that He did not come to do His own will (βδιναύμα), but the will of the Father (433, 521), and in the Agony at Gethsemane He distinguishes His own will from the Father's (οὐ... 326, ἄλλα... τι, Mk. 14:36). But at this moment of spiritual exaltation, the climax of His consecration of Himself to death, He realises the perfect coincidence of His will with the Father's, and so can say θέλω (cf. ὃ... 326 ὃ... ἔκλεψεν... 325). The use of θέλω at 2182 is different, for there it is the θέλω of authority which the master may address to a disciple.

ἐκ ὅντον εἰς ἐμὲ ἐκέμασαν δὲν μὲ... ἐμὲ, as hereafter in glory. See 1218 ἐκ... 1412 ἐκ... 16 for the thought of the spiritual fellowship of His disciples with Christ continuing after death. Cf. 2 Tim. 2:11, 15; Rom. 8:28.

ἐν τεθωρακίᾳ τὴν δοξὴν τὴν ἐμὴν. This is not the glory of the Incarnate Christ. That they had been permitted to see with the eyes of the body, ἔκτοιχθες τὴν δοξὴν αὐτῶν (see on 1108). θεωρίᾳ is used here of spiritual perception (cf. 1216), and see on 290. The δοξας, of which the vision is to be the portion of the saints, is the glory of the Eternal Logos, which He had with the Father "before the world was" (v. 5). They are to see Him "as He is" (1 Jn. 3).

ἐκ δεδουλεύς μοι. The rec. has ἐκδώκας with BNTΔ, but ΕΚΔΗΛΩ ἐκδώκας (see on v. 4), which is accepted by Westcott-Hort against the testimony of B.

Against the interpretation of ἐκδώκας here as referring to the affidanς. VOL. II.—19
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καταβολὴς κόσμου. 25. Πάντα δὲ δικάς, καὶ δὲ κόσμος σε οὐδὲ ἐγὼ, ἐγὼ δὲ σε ἐγὼς, καὶ ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐγνώκας ὅτι σὺ με ἀπέστειλας. 26. καὶ glory of the Eternal Word, several exegetes have urged that a “giving” of glory by the Father to the Son before the Incarnation is not explicitly mentioned elsewhere in the N.T. But there is no other passage which refers to the eternal relationships inherent in Deity with the same boldness and confidence of vision that appear in this Last Prayer of Christ. These are unique utterances (cf. also v. 5); and a clear distinction seems to be indicated between the δόθη of v. 22 which had been given to the disciples, and the δόθη of v. 24 which they might hope to contemplate hereafter, but which was given only to Christ.

δόθη ἡγάνεμας με πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου. This, in fact, is the δόθη of the Eternal Word. Eternal Love is Eternal Glory; even as Eternal Love and Eternal Glory may be regarded as respectively the subjective and objective aspects of Eternal Life. πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου. καταβολὴ occurs only once in the LXX (2 Macc. 26, of the foundation of a house), and eleven times in the N.T., in nine of which it is followed by κόσμον (ἀνά κατ. κόσμῳ, Mt. 25, Lk. 15, Heb. 4, Rev. 13, 17). We find πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, as here, at Eph. 1, 1 Pet. 1. The phrase also occurs in the Assumption of Moses, a first-century work, in a passage of which the Greek has been preserved (i. 13, 14, ed. Charles). The sentence “in that Thou hast loved me before the foundation of the world,” suggests the idea of predestination, so frequently appearing in Jn. (see on 25).

25. πάντα δικάς. That God is righteous is fundamental in the Jewish religion (cf. Jer. 12, Ps. 116, 119, and fundamental, too, in Christianity (Rom. 3, Rev. 16, 1 Jn. 1). The appeal at this point of the Prayer is to the justice of God, that He may distinguish between those who accept the Divine mission of Jesus, and the hostile world which rejects Him. For the former, Jesus has made the request that they may be with Him, hereafter (v. 24).

καὶ, before δὲ κόσμος, “is intended to keep the reader in suspense, aware that the meaning is incomplete” (Abbott, Dial. 2104). It is omitted by D. δὲ κόσμος σε οὐδὲ ἐγὼ. See on 28ff. ἐγὼ δὲ σε ἐγὼς. This is a parenthetical sentence, the real antithesis to “the world knew Thee not” being “but these knew,” which follows. Jesus, as Incarnate, habitually claims a unique knowledge of God (7, 8, 10).

καὶ οὖν ἐγνώκας κ.τ.λ. “But these knew that Thou didst send me,” this being the important thing to be assured of, viz. that God had sent Jesus, this refrain occurring for the last time (see on v. 8). The thought of Jesus returns from the Church of the future to the disciples in whose company He offered a last prayer. Its final clauses have to do with them. ἀποθάνομεν, too, knew this much at least, that the mission of Jesus was divine.

The contrast with the failure of “the world” to recognise Him is brought up by καὶ, used here adversatively, as often in Jn. (see on 33): “but these knew.”

καὶ ἐγνώκας αὐτοῖς τὸ δόθη σου, repeated in slightly different form from v. 6, where see note. For γνωρίζω, cf. 15.

καὶ γνωρίζω, sc. in the Church of the future, by the Spirit which is to come (16, 26).

καὶ ἐγνώκας ἤν ἡγάνεμας με ἐν αὐτοῖς ἡ. This is not a prayer that God may give disciples with the same kind of love as that with which He loved Christ. Already, at v. 23, we have seen that even “the world”—in its alienation and hostility—was thus loved by God, although the world did not recognise it. But the prayer is that the love of God for all Christian disciples, similar as it is to the love of God for Christ, may be “in them,” that is, their sense of it may become vivid and efficacious; so that they may recognise, in Paul’s words, “that the love of God has been shed abroad in their hearts, through the Holy Spirit” (Rom. 5).

For ἔως after ἐγνώκας D substitutes the more usual ἐγω, but there is an exact parallel to the true reading at Eph. 2: διὰ τὴν παλαιὰν ἐγνώκας αὐτοῖς ἢ γνώσθην ἡμᾶς (cf. 7, 8 for a similar construction). δοξάζετε αὐτοῖς. “I in them.” This has already been proclaimed as the ideal condition of the disciples of Christ (v. 23, where see note). Here the thought is, as in the preceding clause, of a growing sense of Christ’s presence in the believer’s heart. It is this for which the last petition is offered, “ut cor ipsum secatrum sit et palaestra huic amoris” (Bengel). Ego in ipso is the last aspiration of Jesus for His own, before He goes forth to meet death.

The arrest of Jesus in the garden (XVIII. 1-11)

XVIII. 1. τάφρα εἶναι. As soon as the Prayer of Consecration was ended (see Intro., p. xx), Jesus and His disciples
XVIII. 1. The scene in the upper room, perhaps implying (as was in fact the case) that they went outside the city.

νῦν τὸς μαθητὰς αὐτῶν, τῇ with the faithful Eleven (see on 2). This is one of the very rare occurrences of τῶν in Jn. (see on 13), and it is exchanged for μετὰ within a couple of lines, μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτῶν (v. 2).

κῶρον τοῦ χειμάρρου τοῦ Κεδρων. The Kedron gorge between Jerusalem and the Mount of Olives rarely has any water in it. It is called χειμάρρος by Josephus as well as in the LXX (Neh. 2:13, 1 Macc. 13:15), but it is nearly always dry, except after very heavy rain. The modern name is Wady Sitti Maryam.

The majority of texts (א ב ד א L N) give τοῦ κῶρον; τὸν κῶρον; and ΔΔ εὲ f g v give τοῦ κῶρου. This last, despite the weakness of the MS. support, we take to be the true reading (as the Syriac vss. suggest), and that from which both the others have originated, owing to misunderstanding on the part of scribes. For κῶρον is the transliteration of the Hebrew אָרֶץ, dark, the name as applied to a torrent being perhaps equivalent to our Blackwater. Josephus treats it as a declineable noun in the nom. case. Twice in the LXX (2 Sam. 15:4, 1 Kings 15:13) we find τῶν κῶρων after χειμάρρουs, the word being taken as a gen. pl., and the rendering of the phrase being “the ravine (or torrent) of the cedar trees.” It is said that at the time cedars grew on the Mount of Olives, and some may have been as low as the wady at its base. But it is not likely that the ravine was called Κεδρων on that account.

A Greek scribe, finding τοῦ κῶρον in his exemplar, would naturally take κῶρον as the gen. pl. of κῶρον, and would correct it either to τοῦ κῶρον or to τῶν κῶρων.

The reading has been much discussed, because assuming τῶν κῶρων to have been the original reading, it has been argued that the evangelist was but ill acquainted with Hebrew names, if he supposed that Κεδρων meant “of the cedars.” But, as the LXX shows in the passages cited above, χειμάρρος τῶν κῶρων was treated as a correct rendering of אָרֶץ כֶּרֶם, and it might have been adopted by Jn. as the title familiar to Greek ears. We hold, however, that it is not the original reading in this verse, so that the argument based on it is worthless.

νῦν ὁ μαθητής. Jn. does not give the name Θεσσαλονικη.

XVIII. 1-2. JUDAS KNEW THE PLACE

ἐκλάθη ἀυτὸς καὶ ὁ μαθητής αὐτῶν. 2. ἦν δὲ καὶ Ἰούδας ὁ παραδίδων αὐτῶν τὸν τόπον, ὅτι τολμᾶτα συνήχει τὴν ἤγη ἐκεῖ μετὰ τῶν νορ δει Lk.; Μk. 14:18, Mt. 26:18 have χορηγὸν (i.e. a farm or small property) οὗ τὸ δόμα Θεοῦ ἐγένετο. Jn. alone speaks of it as κῆπον, i.e. it was one of the private gardens in the eastern outskirts of Jerusalem (cf. 10:1 for the garden of Joseph). The word κῆπος is common in the LXX, but in the N.T. is found only here, at v. 26, 19:41 (cf. 20:16), and Lk. 13:18. For ὁ, see on 11:18.

ἐστὶν ὁ κῆπος, the verb showing that it was an enclosed place. The site that is now shown was recognised as the Garden of the Agony in the fourth century at any rate, and it is quite possible that tradition accurately preserved its position from the beginning.

Jn. does not insert at this point any account of the Agony in Gethsemane, as the Synoptists do (Mk. 14:32, Mt. 26:39, Lk. 22:46); but the allusion to “the cup which the Father gave” (v. 11, where see note) indicates that the omission was not due to ignorance. We have seen (on 12:27) that the prayer there recorded is virtually the prayer of anguish at Gethsemane.

It has been suggested, indeed, that the Prayer of the Agony, if it followed here, would be inconsistent with the Prayer of Consecration and Farewell that Jn. has just placed on record; so different are the sublime calm and dignity of c. 17 from the sadness and shrinking of “remove this cup from me—yet not what I will, but what Thou wilt” (Mk. 14:36). But such a criticism would be at variance with the facts of human experience, in which the moments of greatest spiritual depression and trial often follow close on moods of the highest spiritual exaltation. And it may have been so with the Son of Man Himself.

46 ἔμενεν ἔνας ὁ Ἰούδας. The garden was a favourite resort of Jesus and His disciples (τολμᾶτα συνήχει), and probably belonged to a friend. It is specially mentioned by Jn. that Judas knew the place. Jesus was not now trying to escape arrest (cf. 10:38), for Jn. is anxious to indicate that His surrender to His captors was voluntary. Jesus had told Judas to delay no longer the execution of his purpose (13:30), and He proceeded the same night to a place where Judas knew that He was accustomed to resort.

τὸ παραδίδωμι σοι, the pres. tense indicating that Judas was then engaged in the business of the betrayal. Cf. 13:31.


τολμᾶτα, only here in Jn. Jesus went to the garden, as His custom was (εἰρήνη ὁ δὲ, Lk. 22:29), and probably not
3. In the last visit to Jerusalem. 

3. The Synoptists say nothing about soldiers taking part in the arrest of Jesus, and mention only the emissaries of the Sanhedrin (Mark 14:54, Luke 22:41) stating that members of the Sanhedrin were themselves in the crowd). John mentions these latter (κας τοις ἄρχομενοι καὶ κας τῶν Φαρισαίων ὑπηρέται) in the same terms that he has done before when telling of a projected arrest (John 18:3, where see the note for the constitution and authority of the Sanhedrin), but he adds here that Judas had brought with him also a detachment of soldiers (η δε σταυρον). 

3. Troops were always quartered in Fort Antonia, at festival seasons when the city was crowded, to be ready in case of a riot; and a representation from the Sanhedrin to the military authorities that soldiers might be needed to help the Temple guard (ὑπηρέτοι: cf. John 18:3) would naturally have been acted on. Pilate, the procurator, seems to have known that something important was going to happen very soon, and was ready at an early hour in the morning to hear the case (Josephus, Ant. 20:79, for the dream of Pilate's wife). There is nothing improbable in Jn.'s statement that soldiers were present at the arrest. 

3. The term σταυρον (if the soldiers were legionnaires) was generally equivalent to the Latin cohort, which numbered 600 men. Polybius, indeed, uses it (xii. 22. 4) for manipulus, which is only one third of a cohort. But here (as is probable, they were auxiliaries) and in the N.T. elsewhere (see esp. Acts 21:28) it numbered 1000 men (240 horse and 760 foot), commanded by a chiliarch (cf. v. 12 below), a tribunus militum. It is not, however, to be supposed that John means that the whole strength of the regiment (cf. Mark 15:25) was turned out to aid in the arrest of Jesus; the words λαβὼν τὴν σταυρον indicate no more than that Judas had got the help of the "cohort," i.e. a detachment, with whom the commanding officer of the garrison came (Mark 14:42), in view of possible developments.

3. John inserts διὰ τὴν σταυρον (probably from Mark 15:25), which shows that the scribe of the common exemplar thought that τὴν σταυρον was not sufficiently definite.

3. καὶ κας τῶν ἄρχομενοι καὶ κας τῶν Φαρισαίων ὑπηρέται, i.e. officers of the Sanhedrin (see on Acts 5 for details about ὑπηρέτοι, as indicating the Sanhedrin in its official capacity). For ὑπηρέτοι, cf. Acts 26:14 and Mt. 26:5; they were the Temple police, under the control of the Sanhedrin. 

3. μετὰ σταυρον καὶ ἀρμαζόμενοι. It was the time of the Paschal full moon, but lights were brought, nevertheless, to search out the dark recesses of the garden, in case Jesus should attempt to hide Himself. 

3. φῶς (ἐβλέπει, in N.T.) is a "link" or "torch," made of strips of wood fastened together, and ἀρματος is an ordinary torch-light, the word being used in later Greek for a lantern. 

4. One of the Roman soldiers on duty; cf. Dion. Hal. iv. 15, ἐν τῷ ἐφιλοικίῳ ἀπεστάλε; ἐν τῶν σκηνῶν θάρσου, φῶς τε ἀρματος καὶ λαμπράντος. 

4. Lights also were carried, when necessary, by the Temple guard; thus Lightfoot (on Luke 22) quotes: "The ruler of the mountain of the Temple takes his walks through every watch with torches lighted before him" (Midrash L. 2).

4. οἱ δὲ ἀρματος or οἱ ἁλώνες. The Temple guard was not always armed (Josephus, Ant. iv. 6), but on this occasion they probably carried weapons as well as the soldiers. 

4. The rec. text with ἐξέδραμεν has ἐξέβαλεν, but ἐξέπεκτα καὶ ἐξέδραμεν (BCD) is more in the style of Jn. (see on v. 46).

4. καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς. He does not address Himself directly to Judas, but to those who had come, armed, to arrest Him, and He asks them ἔνδοκοι; cf. v. 20 (1). 

4. In the Synoptic narratives (Mark 14:45, Mt. 26:48, Luke 22:36) Judas comes forward and identifies Jesus by a kiss, that is, by kissing His hand, the recognised salutation from a disciple to His Master (not by kissing His cheek, as Western painters have been accustomed to depict the act). Jn. does not mention this treacherous sign, and his omission to do so is a difficulty in the way of critics who think that Jn. displays special animus against Judas (see on v. 45). His reason for the omission is...
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probably that he is laying stress throughout on the voluntariness of Jesus’ acceptance of arrest. Jesus does not wait to be identified by any one, for He at once announces who He is. Jn.’s narrative seems to suggest that He had not been recognised in the uncertain light, even after He came out of the garden and asked, “Whom seek ye?” Tatian places the kiss of Judas immediately before v. 4, i.e., before Jesus came out of the garden; and if it is sought to bring the evangelistic narratives into exact correspondence, Tatian’s solution may be the right one.1

Jn. says (v. 5) that “Judas, who was in the act of delivering Him up” (δὲ παρειδηθὼς αὐτῷ, cf. 134), was standing (εὐθὺς) with those who were making the arrest. Judas had done his part when he had guided the emissaries of the Sanhedrin to the place where Jesus was. The scene is described very vividly.

B. ἀπεκρίνεται Ἰησοῦς ἦσαν τῶν Ἰουδαίων. “Jesus the Nazarene,” or “Jesus of Nazareth,” was the name by which He had been popularly known. The blind man was told that it was “Jesus of Nazareth” who was passing by (Mk. 166, Lk. 186). The man with the unclean devil addressed Him as “Thou Jesus of Nazareth” (Lk. 206). The two disciples on the way to Emmaus spoke of Him thus (Lk. 2410). So did Peter in his sermon on Pentecost (Acts 226). In Mk.’s account of the resurrection, the young man at the sepulchre says to the women, “Ye seek Jesus of Nazareth” (Mk. 166). After His arrest, He was familiarly described in this way by the maid in the court of the high priest (Mk. 144, Mt. 262). It is clear that the instructions given to those sent to apprehend Him were that they should take “Jesus of Nazareth.” They inquired for Him by the designation by which He was best known. See 2319.

Jn.’s narrative indicates, as has been said above, that Jesus identified Himself voluntarily, by saying, “I am He,” in answer to the request for “Jesus of Nazareth.” And γωνία ἐμοῦ in v. 5 may mean simply, “I am He of whom you are in search” (cf. 426 97). The reading of ב γωνία ἐμοῦ Ἰησοῦς must carry this meaning.

6. The words which follow, “they retired and fell to the ground,” then, imply no more than that the men who came to make the arrest (some of whom at least did not previously

1 For a curious speculation as to a possible corruption of the text here, see Abbott (Jesp 1359).
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μου, οὐκ ἀπόλεσα ἐξ αὐτῶν αὐτῶν. 10. Ἑλέων οὖν Πέτρω ξέρων

9. Ἰνα πληρωθῇ δ' ὁ λόγος κτλ. For the phrase Ἰνα πληρωθῇ, introducing a saying of Jesus, see Intro., p. cxliii. Another example is in v. 32. For Jn., the words of Jesus were possessed of authority, and inspired, like the language of the O.T., by foreknowledge of future events. The λόγος, or ἰδιαίτερος λόγος, for which reference is here made, is that of 27:18 loosely quoted. ἤτις is recitans, but it does not introduce the exact words previously ascribed to Jesus.

The comment of Jn. (ὦν κτλ. ὁ λόγος κτλ.) would seem to limit the application of "I lost none of those whom thou gavest me" to the fact that the disciples were let go free when Jesus was arrested. Some at least of Jn.'s explanations of the words of Jesus are of doubtful accuracy (see on 21:6, 21); but it is hard to believe that he could have missed here the larger and more spiritual meaning of 27:18, which is already indicated at 6:30-10:58.

οὐδὲ δὲ ζωῆς μου, οὐκ ἀπόλεσα ἐξ αὐτῶν αὐτῶν. The close verbal parallel in 2 Esd. 2:36 is interesting: "servos quois tibi dedi, nemo ex eis interict, ego enim eos requiram de numero tuo," words which are addressed by God to the personified nations. Chapters 1. and 2. of 2 Esdras are Christian, and probably belong to the second century. The passage quoted above may be a reminiscence of Jn. 13:8 or Jn. 17:12 or Jn. 6:36. See on 3:31 above for other parallels between 2 Esdras and Jn.

10. The incident of one of the Twelve attacking the high priest's slave is in all the Gospels (Mk. 14:47, Mt. 26:52, Lk. 22:56), although the names, Peter and Malchus, are given by Jn. only.

It appears from Lk. 22:56, that the apostles had two swords in their possession; and Lk. also tells that, when they understood that the salvation of Judas was the signal for the arrest of Jesus, they exclaimed, "Lord, shall we smite with the sword?" It would seem that Peter, always hasty and impulsive, struck a blow without waiting for permission from Jesus. He had been forward in declaring that he would give his life for his Master, if there was need (13:37). He did not generally carry a sword; ξέρω μέχριν implies that he happened to have one with him at the time, presumably because he and others had learnt from what Jesus had said previously that their Master was in danger. It was unlawful to carry arms on a feast-day, and—although at such a crisis, an eager disciple like Peter would probably have had no scruple in breaking the law if the safety of his Master was at stake—the fact that two of the company had knives with them earlier in the evening tends to show that the Last Supper was not

XVIII. 10-11.] PETER WOUNDS MALCHUS

μέξιμον ἂν οὐκ οὖν ἐκχύνην ἐκ τῶν ἄρχουν ἄρχοντα τῶν ἀρχομένων δούλων καὶ ἀνέκοψεν αὐτὸν τὸ ὀνόμα τοῦ δούλου· ἐτέλεσε δὲ ὁ διηκόνη τοῦ διηκόνη τοῦ Μάλχου.

the Passover, and that the Johannine rather than the Synoptic tradition of the day of the Crucifixion is to be followed (see Intro., p. cxi).

Peter drew (see on 6:54 for ἀνίμως) the sword, καὶ ἐτέλεσεν τῶν ἄρχοντων ἀρχόντων· "and struck the high priest's slave." This man was one of the crowd which had gathered; he was not one of the Temple guard (ὑπηρεταῖς, v. 3). There was something of a scuffle, and Peter hit out.

καὶ ἀνέκοψεν αὐτὸν τὸ ὀνόμα τοῦ δούλου, "and cut off his right ear," the blow missing the slave's head, as he swerved to his left to avoid it. That it was the right ear is a detail only found in Lk. and Jn. ὁ διηκόνης, the true reading here (nbc's lw), is the word used by Mk. (τρίτον); ὁ διηκόνης, of the rec. text (ac df), is the word in Mt. 26:39 and in Lk. 22:39.

We have here, without doubt, a tradition of an historical incident. If it be asked why Peter was not immediately arrested by the Temple guard or the soldiers who were standing by, the answer may be that it was not observed in the scuffle who had dealt the blow. The earlier Gospels do not disclose Peter's name, although by the time that Jn. wrote, there would be no risk in giving it. Again, an injury to a slave would not excite much interest; had Peter struck one of the officials, it would have been a different matter. Lk. tells, indeed, that Jesus healed the wound (Lk. 22:51), apparently suggesting that the ear had not been wholly severed from the man's head.

ἐξ ᾖ δέναιᾳ τοῦ δούλου Μάλχου. Here, again, is a detail that comes from first-hand knowledge. No evangelist has it except Jn. The name Malchus is found five times in Josephus, and probably goes back to the root μαλ. or "king." Cf. Neh. 10:11.

11. Jesus forbid the use of arms in resisting His arrest. The Synoptists represent Him as expostulating against it, and especially against the violent way in which it was effected (Mk. 14:47, Mt. 26:52, Lk. 22:51); but in Jn.'s narrative there is none of this. He moves voluntarily towards the predestined end.

βδέλετ τὴν μάχαιραν εἰς τὴν θέσην, "put back the sword into the sheath." Mt., alone of the Synoptists, tells of this saying, which he gives in a more diffuse form: ἀνέκοψεν αὐτὸν τὴν μάχαιραν εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτής τίνες γὰρ οἱ λαβόντες μάχαιραν ἐν μάχαιρᾳ διαλύονται (Mt. 26:52), the latter clause suggesting the hand of an editor. According to Jn., Jesus gave no reason for the quiet command, "Put up your sword." See on v. 36 below.
After μαχαίρων the rec. adds σου (from Mt. 26:58), but om. ΝΑΒΔΙΝΔΘΟ.

This does not occur again in the N.T. τὸ πνεύμα ὑπὲρ τοῦ Πατρός, ou μὴ πει αὐτῷ: This recalls the prayer of Jesus at Gethsemane, as recorded by the Synoptists (Mt. 14:36, Mt. 26:38, Lk. 22:42). See on v. 1 above and on 12:27.

οὐ μὴ πιόν αὐτῷ is probably to be taken as an interrogative. Abbott, however (Dist. 934f., 2232), prefers to take it as an exclamation, “I am, of course, not to drink it!” [as according to your desire], comparing οὐ μὴ πιόν of Mk. 14:36, Mt. 26:38, Lk. 22:42. See on 6:7.

Jesus is bound and brought to the house of Ananias (vv. 12–14)

19. Jn. does not record explicitly that His disciples fled in fear after Jesus had been arrested (Mt. 14:43, Mt. 26:56), although he has told that Jesus earlier in the night had predicted that they would abandon Him (16:28). Jn. implies, however (see on v. 13), that Jesus was abandoned at this point by His friends. The arrest was effected by the Roman soldiers (see on v. 3 for στρατεύματος), with their commanding officer (cf. Acts 21:25 for χωρίον), acting in cooperation with the Temple police (ἡ ὥρα ἡ τῶν Ιουδαίων. συνκλημένων does not occur again in Jn., but it is the verb used by the Synoptists in this context, for ἡ συνελήφθην). That was a matter of course; probably His hands were fastened behind His back. The Synoptists do not mention this detail until a later point in the narrative (Mt. 26:54; Lk. 22:21; cf. v. 24). It was a patriotic fancy that the binding of Jesus was foreshadowed in the binding of Isaac at the altar (Gen. 22:52; see on 14:37 below).

18. ἤγαγον. So καθώς (and Lk. 21:24); the rec. has ἤγαγον (with AC*DLNT*), as at Mk. 14:43, Mt. 26:56).

πρὸς Ἀπαντὸν πράγμαν. Ananias was not, at this time, the high priest, but he had held the office before and was a personage of such influence that he was often called "high priest" in a loose way (cf. Lk. 3:1; Acts 4:6, and see on 7:1), although that great office was now held by his son-in-law Caiaphas (see on 11:6 above). It was to his house that Jesus was brought after

The title ἀρχιερεῖς included all ex-high priests (see Schürer, Hist. of Jewish People, Eng. Tr., II, p. 203).
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15. Ἡμελόθεα δὲ τῷ Ἰησοῦ Ἱησοῦν καὶ ἄλλος μαθητής.

225 and Cyril Alex. add after πρώτον, ἂν ἄν τιν ἢ Ἀννᾶς ἔδειχεν πρὸς Ἰωάνναν τὸν ἀρχιερέα.

These additions or transpositions are due probably to a desire to bring Jn.'s narrative of the examinations of Jesus by the Jewish authorities into line with the narrative of the Synoptists, who say nothing of the part played by Annas. If v. 24 is moved to a point between v. 13 and v. 14, then all that happens takes place in the house of Caiphas (as is explicitly said by Mt.), and Annas really does nothing, although Jesus in the Johnian narrative is brought to his house in the first instance.

But, if this were the original position of the words "Annas sent Him bound unto the high priest," it is difficult to find a reason for their being moved by a scribe to their traditional place, after v. 23. See, further, Introd., p. xxvii.

16. The reference is to Isa, the unconscious prophecy (as Jn. deems it) made by Caiphas, which expressed his deliberate conviction that Jesus must be brought to His death. For ἄποθανεν (καὶ ἐν οὐσίᾳ ἐκείνῳ), the rec. has ἄποθανατί (with AC*DNW), which may be the original reading, corrected by scribes to bring the words into verbal correspondence with 116.

At 116 we had συμφέρει... ἢς ἀπὸ διανομοῦ ἐν οὐσίᾳ, but here συμφέρει ἢς ἀπὸ διαγραφῆς ἐν οὐσίᾳ, a more correct constr.

Peter's first denial of Jesus (vv. 15–18)

16. Ἡμελόθεα, a descriptive imp. The Synoptists say that Peter was following (καὶ μακρὰ) at a safe distance (Mt. 14:29, Mt. 26:30, Lk. 22:25), but they do not mention a companion.

Σίμων Πέτρος. Jn. likes to use the double name (see on 3:29) when Peter has been absent from the picture for some little time, but he generally relapses into the simple "Peter" as the story proceeds; see, e.g., 13:24, 18:10, 20:1, 2, 3, 21:7, 13, 17, 20. 21. Jn. never gives the short title "Peter" to this apostle at the beginning of an incident in which he is concerned. In the present passage we have Simon Peter (v. 15), followed by Peter (vv. 16, 17, 18); then there is an interval, and so when the courtyard scene is resumed, we have Simon Peter again (v. 25), followed by Peter (vv. 26, 27).

καὶ ἄλλος μαθητής. So ἢ ἄλλος μαθητής. The rec. has ἀλλός μαθητής. (From v. 16) with καὶ ἅθελεν τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ, καὶ συνεπόθεν τῷ μαθητῇ, thus identifying Peter's companion here with "the Beloved Disciple."

This "other disciple" was "known to the high priest," and so was admitted into the courtyard or καιλή of the house where Jesus had been brought. He was sufficiently well known to the portress, at any rate, to persuade her to admit his companion. It does not follow that he was a personal friend of Annas or of Caiphas, or of the same social class, although this is possible. As Sanday put it: "The account of what happened to Peter might well seem to be told from the point of view of the servants' hall." 2 The word γνωστός as applied to persons is uncommon, as Abbott points out (Dict. x. ii. p. 251 f.), but it is to press it too far to interpret it here as meaning "a familiar friend," with an allusion to Ps. 55:8. Abbott adopts the curious view that the "other disciple" was Judas Iscariot, whose face would have been familiar to the portress, because of his previous visit or visits to the high priest in pursuance of his scheme of betrayal. But that Judas should wish to introduce Peter, or that Peter would have tolerated any advances from him or accepted his good offices, is difficult to believe.

The view most generally taken is as to the personality of this ἄλλος μαθητής is that he was John the Beloved Disciple, whose reminiscences are behind the Gospel, and whose identity is veiled in some degree (see on 13:23; and cf. 21:21). This agrees with the close association elsewhere of Peter and John (see Introd., p. xxxvi). Indeed, John the son of Zebedee had priestly connections. His mother was Salome, the sister of the Virgin Mary (see pp. 73, 84 f., and note on 19:25); and Mary was a kinswoman (ἐγγονή, Lk. 2:26) of Elisabeth, who was "of the daughters of Aaron" (Lk. 1). Hence John was connected with a priestly family on his mother's side, and there is no improbability in his being "known to the high priest."

But the available evidence does not permit us securely to identify the ἄλλος μαθητής, as Augustine says (Tract. crutii, 2), saying that it is not plain who he was. This unnamed disciple was probably some one of influence and social importance; if

2. It is taken by Chrysostom and Jerome (Epist. cxxvii, 5), both of whom regard John the son of Zebedee as the Beloved Disciple.
3. Nonius, in his paraphrase, explains the phrase by saying that it was because of John's fishing business, ἑωθικοῦ σκύλου σκύλου, which apparently means that the high priest bought fish from him; but this is not convincing.
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we were to guess, the names of Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea suggest themselves at once. There were disciples outside the circle of the Twelve, some of them men of rank, members of the Sanhedrin itself (see 14:49); and it is quite likely that Peter was known, by sight at least, to one of these who had attended at the house of Anna. It is probable that it is to this unnamed disciple (whether John or another) that the details given in vv. 19-23 about the private examination of Jesus at night by the high priest, and also perhaps about the private examination before Pilate (vv. 33 f.), are ultimately due. There are also traces of first-hand information in the statements that "it was cold" (v. 18), and that a kinsman of the slave Malchus identified Peter (v. 25).

εἰς τὴν ἀλήθευν καλά, "into the courtyard." All the evangelists represent this courtyard as the scene of Peter's denial. He was not admitted even so far, until his unnamed friend intervened, but was standing outside at the door. See on τό for αὐτῷ and θέρα. The examination of Jesus was not conducted in the outer court where all the servants were, but in a chamber of the house of Anna. Mk. implies that this chamber was not on the ground floor, as he says that Peter was κάτω ἐν τῇ ἀλήθεαι below in the court." (Mk. 14:66).

ADDITIONAL NOTE ON XVIII. 15.

Delf identified the ἄλος μαθητής of v. 15 with the Beloved Disciple, whom he distinguished from John the son of Zebedee. In connexion with the remark that he was "known to the high priest," Delf cited the statement of Polycrates (see Introd. p. l) that the Beloved Disciple wore the priestly frontal; and inferred that he belonged to an aristocratic priestly family in Jerusalem, it being thus easy for him to obtain access to the high priest's house. We have already treated of the problem of the ἄλος μαθητής.

But a larger question is raised by the words of Polycrates, to which some reference may be made at this point. Polycrates says of the Beloved Disciple ἐγνώρισεν ἵκρειν τὸ πέταλον τεφροεικός, an observation difficult to explain. This πέταλον was a golden plate attached in front to the turban or mitre of Aaron (Ex. 28:41; 29:39; Lev. 9:9), and in later times was part of the official dress of the high priest (cf. Josephus, Ant. iii. v. 6). Similar statements are made about James the Just, and about Mark.

Of James the Just, Epiphanius says: ὁ πέταλον ἐκ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἔχον αὐτής φορόν (Hist. xxix. 4). He adds that his authority was the διαμερισματος of former writers of repute; and Lawlor has shown that he is at variance with Hegesippus. Hegesippus, as quoted by Eusebius (Hist. ii. 23), said that to James alone was it allowed to enter the θύσια of the Temple, which he used to frequent in prayer for the people, and that his custom was to wear not woollen but linen garments. Epiphanius may be reproducing other words of Hegesippus when he tells (Hist. xxix. 4) that James exercised the priestly office according to the old priesthood (ἱεραποστολα καὶ τῆς παλαιας ἱερωνήμονι); but he is probably in error when he says that James alone was permitted to enter the Holy of Holies once a year, as the high priest did, ἀπὸ τῶν Κτησίων ἄνων οὖν καὶ μετὰ τῆς ἱερωνήμου (Hist. lxxviii. 13). He adds explicitly, δὲ Κτησίων ἐκήρυξεν τῇ ἱερωνήμῃ, καὶ πέταλον ἐκ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἔφορεν.

Of Mark, Valois quotes a legend as a note on Eus. Hist. v. 24, as follows: "beatam Marcum iuxta ritum carnalis sacrificii pontificialis apicis petalum in populo gestasse Judeorum... ex quo manifeente datur intelligi de stirpe eum leultica, ino pontificis Aaron sacrae successionis origine habuisse." 22 Mark was probably of Levite race (compare Acts 4:16 with Col. 4:10), and the Vulgate Preface to his Gospel speaks of him as "sacerdotum in Israhel agens," so that it is quite possible that he was one of the Jewish priests who accepted Christ (Acts 6:2; cf. Acts 21:19). The language of Polycrates, then, about John ἐγνώρισεν ἵκρειν τὸ πέταλον τεφροεικός is almost identical with what is

1 The word is used in Protevangelium 5 as if it meant the λεγέω or oracle of the Urim and Thummim, from which it was clearly distinguished.
2 Vincent (Ant. ii. ix. 3) and Routh (Reliquia Sacra, ii. 27) give the facts. A special treatise, De laminis pontificiis apostolorum Iacobi et Marcus (Tübingen, 1733), was written by J. F. Cotta—a scarce book, as to which I am indebted to Dr. Wieland, the University Library at Tübingen, for information. It does not seem to add anything to what was known before.
3 Epiphanius, pp. 10-11, 99.
4 The petals were worn only (Ex. 28:41; 40:18); and according to Josephus (Ant. xx. ix. 6), the Levites in the time of Agrippa obtained permission to do the same.
5 The passages from which Valois derived this is not known.
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told about James and Mark. If the πέταλον were worn by the high priest only on great occasions, it is impossible to suppose that John, James, or Mark ever wore it. But if it was (even occasionally) worn by the ordinary Jewish priest in N.T. times, Mark may have worn it. And if John and James were eligible for the priesthood, they too might have had the privilege. But while James and John were certainly akin to the priestly race on their mother’s side, the argument of Epiphanius to prove that James also was mingled with the priesthood by blood is not convincing. Yet we know so little of the insistence upon hereditary qualifications for the Jewish priesthood in the first century, that it is not easy to reject the explicit statements made about John and James as well as about Mark.

Jerome, when discussing the statement of Polycrates about John, understands ἵππης to mean a Christian priest, and translates: "qui supra pectus domini recubuit, et pontifex eius fuit, auream lanam in fronte portans" (de script. recli. 4). This explanation will not apply to the parallel traditions about James and Mark, upon the Jewish character of whose priesthood stress is laid. It is conceivable (although improbable) that the beloved Disciple might have been allowed by his Christian brethren to wear the insignia of a Jewish priest at Ephesus, where he was so greatly venerated. But neither James nor Mark would ever have been allowed such a distinction as Christian priests at Jerusalem while the Temple was yet standing. Further, it would be strange that Polycrates should call John a Christian ἵππης, while studiously avoiding in his case the title ἐνθρόνων, which he gives to others of repute. And, finally, that the mitre or πέταλον should have been used as an ornament of Christian bishops in the first century, but never heard of again until three centuries later at least, is highly improbable.

Others interpret the wearing of the πέταλον by John and the others as metaphorical only. The dress of the high priest is used in Rev. 2:12 as the symbol of the investiture of the true

---

1 The legend is that Mark was καθαρός ἀπὸ ἁλάτων, which would have made him ineligible as a Jewish priest, being blemished; but the Vulgate Preface says that he mutilated his thumb after he became a Christian, precisely that he might be counted as sacerdos reprensus.

2 The title ἵππης (sacerdos) for a Christian minister is used by Tertullian, Cyprian, and Origen (see my essay on Cyprian in Early Hist. of Church and Ministry, pp. 223, 228). It might therefore have been used by Polycrates; but the context makes it improbable that he did use it thus.

3 So Routh (Rel. Sacr. ii. 218), Stanley (Apostolic Age, p. 275); and cf. Lightfoot (Galatians, p. 325).

---

XXVIII. 15.] THE PETALON

Christian with the sacerdotal character; cf. Ex. 28:40, with the "white stone" and the "new name" of Rev. 21:7. This idea is worked out in detail by Origen (in Lev. Hom. vi.), who treats the πέταλον as symbolic of the knowledge of divine things by all baptized persons; cf. Clem. Alex. Strom. v. 6. If we pursue this line of thought, we recall that engraved on the πέταλον were the words "Holy to Yahweh," ἅγια γὰρ τιμία (Ex. 28:40), and the command to Moses was ἐγὼ σέ τίμησα, ὥσπερ ἔσοχεν ἐμοί (Ex. 28:41). The πέταλον, in short, was the symbol of consecration, which was the topic of Christ’s intercession for His apostles (Jn. 17). John, James, and Mark were all ἁγγεῖοι (Jn. 17:24); and the tradition of wearing the πέταλον in their case might have grown out of a metaphorical statement as to their personal holiness. But this view does not explain why the πέταλον symbol should have been used only of John, James, and Mark among the saints of the apostolic age.

We are inclined to accept the tradition that John, James, and Mark literally wore the πέταλον, at least occasionally, in virtue of their service as Jewish priests. It is to be remembered that John, James, and Peter were the "pillars" of the Jerusalem Church (Gal. 2); they were the heads of the conservative or Judaizing party as contrasted with Paul. Of these, Peter was suspect by the more rigid Jews (Acts 13:5). But his disciple Mark was under so much suspicion, for he had actually separated himself from Paul because of the latter’s liberal policy (Acts 13:13, 15:40). John had, indeed, incurred the hostility of the Temple authorities in early days (Acts 4:12); but there is no later indication of opposition to him by them, or any trace of distrust of him by his fellow-disciples. James was thoroughly respected by all. James, John, and Mark were, then, the three Christian leaders who were most fully trusted by the conservatives at Jerusalem. While whole-hearted disciples of Jesus, they were Jews who were understood to have pride in their Jewish heritage. Provided that they were qualified for the priesthood, there would be nothing surprising in their occasional discharge of priestly offices; for by the first disciples the Christian faith was not regarded as inconsistent with Judaism. Thus the tradition that they had been privileged to wear the priestly πέταλον is less improbable in their case than it would be in that of any other early leader of the Church of whom we have information.

1 Epiphanius (Hier. xxix. 4) applies the word ἁγγεῖος to James.

2 Barnabas had been too warm a supporter of Paul to be free from suspicion in Jewish circles (Acts 9:25).
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18. The soldiers had now gone back to barracks, the Temple police (θυρήφατοι) being sufficient guard. The policemen and the slaves lit a fire in the courtyard, as it was a cold night. ὅπειρος ἦν a touch peculiar to Jn., and suggests that the story has come from one who was present, and who shivered as he recalls how cold it was in the open court. Jerusalem is 2,400 feet above sea-level, and it is chilly at midnight in spring-time.¹

ἀθροισμὸς occurs again in the N.T. only at 21° (cf. Ecclus. xi.39, 4 Macc. 9:30): it means “a heap of charcoal,” probably burnt in a brazier. True coal was not known in Palestine until the nineteenth century. Lk. mentions the lighting of a fire, using the words ἄθροισμος πῦρ ἐν μέσῳ τῆς αὐλῆς, and says

₂众生al finds here a fulfilment of Zech. 14:17, “There be shall be cold and frost” (in the LXX and Peshitta). (Select. Dom. xvii.12.)
Cleansing of the Temple, and the words “Destroy this Temple and I will raise it up in three days,” have been given by Jn. in another context (2:19-21, where see note). Jn. merely says here that the high priest questioned Jesus about His disciples, probably as to who they were and as to their reason for attaching themselves to Him, and about His doctrine (Joh 8:13). This latter inquiry would cover everything. But the details given here of the reply of Jesus to the high priest are found only in Jn. (See also on v. 32.)

20. ἵππος ἀνέγειρεν Ἰησοῦν. See on 1:30 for the omission of ὅ before Ἰησοῦν.

Jesus, in His reply, ignores the question as to His disciples and does not mention them. As to His teaching, He declares that it was always available for, and open to, every one, and that there was nothing secret about it. The reply of Socrates to his judges has often been quoted as a parallel: “If any one says that he has ever learnt or heard anything from me in private, which all others could not have heard, know ye that he does not speak the truth” (Plato, Apol. 33 B).

ἐγὼ παρρησία λαλάμα (not ἐλάλησα, as the rec. text has it) τῷ κόσμῳ, “I have spoken openly to the world,” i.e. to all and sundry. ἐγὼ is emphatic: it was His teaching that was challenged. For παρρησία see on γ', and for κόσμος see on τ'. Cf. τοῖς λαλᾷ ἐπί τῶν κόσμων (3:23), where, however, the meaning is slightly different. The Jews had said of Him παρρησία λαλάμα (3:23), and when they had challenged Him on another occasion to speak plainly (ἐκεῖ ἦν παρρησία, 1:28) He had done so, with such openness that they had sought to arrest Him (10:25). When His own disciples had found difficulty in understanding His mysterious teaching about His approaching departure, He proceeded to make it quite plain (7:38-39).

ἐγὼ πάντων ὥσπερ ἐν συναγωγῇ (the true text has no article before συναγωγῇ) καὶ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, “I always taught in synagogue and in the temple”; i.e. it was His custom to teach in these public places, not that He never gave any private teaching to an inquirer like Nicodemus (3). The discourse about the Bread of Life was given in the synagogue at Capernaum, according to the Johannine narrative (6:45), and the Synoptists frequently speak of His practice of teaching in the synagogues of Galilee. Jn. tells of His teaching in the Temple several times (18:21; 20:20; 21:20). Cf. Mk. 1:29, καὶ ἔδραμεν ἄνω τῆς ἡμέρας ἡμῶν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἡδονισσών. The fact of His public teaching was notable. It had been given ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, ὅπως πάντες (not πάντως with the rec. text) οἱ Ἰουδαίοι συνάχθησαν, “where all the Jews come together.”

καὶ ἐν κρατήρι ἐθάλασσα ὅλος. This is like the utterance of Micah (3:12; 5:1). ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλήσεως λαλάμα (cf. Isa. 45:5). But we have had the contrast between ἐν κρατήρι and ἐν παρρησίᾳ before (see γ'); and it is not necessary to suppose that there is here a veiled allusion to the Isaiah passage, although it is possible.

See on γ' for Jn.'s use of λαλάμα as signifying frank and unreserved speech. It is noteworthy that the strongest repudiation in the Gospels of cryptic or esoteric teaching in the words of Jesus is found in Jn.
Peter's further denials of Jesus (vv. 25-27)

25. The courtyard scene is now taken up again from v. 18, where see note. We had there ὁ Πέτρος ἦσαν καὶ βηραμανόνας, and the phrase is repeated to bring us back to what has been said before, but with the characteristic substitution of ξίμων Πέτρος for ὁ Πέτρος of v. 18, as the apostle has been out of the narrative for some paragraphs (see on v. 15 above).

That there was some interval between the first denial of Peter and the third is apparent from the Synoptists, although they do not agree in small details. Mk. and Mt. suggest that the second interrogation of Peter followed hard upon the first, but this is told explicitly only by Lk. (μετὰ βραχίως, Lk. 22:69). Then Mk. 14:70 and Mt. 26:70 say that the third interrogation was μετὰ μικρῶν after the second, but Lk. allows an hour

2 See Schürer, Hist. of Jewish People, 11. i. p. 190 f. Schürer holds, however, that on this occasion the Sanhedrin did meet in Caiphas' house, referring to Mt. 26:57.

25. ἦν ὁ Ξίμων Πέτρος ἦσαν καὶ βηραμανόνας. Εἶπον οὖν ἀφήνες ἡμᾶς καὶ σὺ ἐν τῷ μαθητῶν αὐτῶν ἐν ἤμπροφατός καὶ ξίμων ὁ Ξίμων. 26. λέγει οὖν ἐν τῷ δικαίῳ τῷ ἀρχιστράτηγῳ, συγγενῆς δὲ τὸ ἀντίκεισθαι Πέτρος τῷ ἄνω Οὐσίου ἐκεῖ σε ἐδὸν ἐν τῷ νεκρῷ
to elapse (διαστήσας), οὐδὲ ἔδρα μᾶς, Lk. 22:50). Jn. brings the second denial nearer to the third than Lk. does; but that there was more than an hour's interval between the first denial and the third, as Lk. records, is quite in agreement with the Johannine account.

εἶπον οὖν ἀφήνες. The speakers are not defined; οἱ δὲ δεῦτοι. τὸν θείον. The question and answer are almost the same as those of v. 17; and the question is again expressed as if a negative answer were expected (see on v. 17). This is a point peculiar to Jn.'s narrative; he describes the first two interrogations as put in a form which almost suggested that Peter should say "No!" In this (see also on v. 27), Jn. gives a less severe account of Peter's lapse from courage and faithfulness than the Synoptists do.

26. The slaves of the high priest have been mentioned as present in the courtyard (v. 18). One of them is here described as a kinsman of Malchus (v. 10), a remark which has been thought to imply some acquaintance with the high priest's household (see on v. 16). The reason for the slave's insistent identification, viz. that he had seen Peter with Jesus at Gethsemane, is not found elsewhere; the Synoptists telling that Peter was suspected because of his Galilean accent. "Did not I see thee in the garden with Him?" θείος is emphatic, "I saw him with my own eyes." But the slave apparently was not able to satisfy the bystanders that he was right, for Peter's denial was accepted. The temptation to say "No" was even greater this time than before, for the mention of the blow struck at Malchus suggests that Malchus' kinsman suspected Peter of having been the assailant. Had Peter been arrested on this count, he would have been dealt with very severely. To be a "disciple" of Jesus was not a legal offence, although the confession of it might lead to trouble; but to have drawn a weapon and assaulted one of the high priest's household was another matter.

27. οὖν ὁ Ξίμων. No words are given; only the fact of the denial is recorded. This is in strong contrast to the denial with curses and oaths which is described by Mk. 14:70 (followed by Mt. 26:70, but not by Lk.). According to the Lucan narrative, at this point, "the Lord turned and looked upon Peter" (Lk. 22:50). Accordingly, we must suppose Jesus to have come down from the chamber
i.e. to the formal meeting of the Sanhedrin, not necessarily or probably held in the house of Caiaphas, over which Caiaphas would preside. Nothing is told here of the proceedings (see on v. 13, and cf. Mk. 15, Mt. 27), which were only formal, as the decision had been already reached at the irregular meeting in the house of Annas. But as the Sanhedrin could not execute the sentence of death (see v. 31) without the sanction of the Roman authorities, they had now to bring Jesus before Pilate, that He might give the necessary orders.

And 'from the house of Caiaphas' (cf. Mk. 15, Acts 40), but more naturally means 'from Caiaphas,' i.e. from the ecclesiastical court over which he presided. Some O.L. codices, e.g. e έξε, etc., have ad Caiphan, a reading due to a misunderstanding of the sequence of events. See Introd., pp. xxvi–xxvii.

If τω πραιτώρων, πραιτώρων signified a praetor's or general's quarters in a camp, and the word came to be used of the official residence of a governor (cf. το πραιτώριον of Herod at Cæsarea, Acts 50). It is not certain where the praetorium at Jerusalem, that is, Pilate's house, was situated; but it is probably to be identified with Herod's palace on the Hill of Zion in the western part of the upper city. Pilate was certainly lodged there on one occasion, for Philo (ad Caïum, 38) reports that he hung up golden shields in τον κατα την ιεροσολύμων 'πρώδον βασιλείαν.' Further, Cessius Florus, who was procurator of Judea about thirty-five years after Pilate, had at one time Herod's palace as a residence, for Josephus says so in a passage so illustrative of the Passion narratives that it must be quoted: Φλωρος δε τα εν της βασιλείας αυλήστη, τη δ έστεραν βίβα το αυτον βίβας κατέβα, και προσελάβετο οι τοι άρχοντες... παρετύησε το βίβατο (Bell. Jud., ii. 14, 8). And in i. 15, 5, Josephus explicitly calls the Procurator's residence 'παραβασιλεία απαλία; cf. Mk. 15, ὁτι την αύλην δ άται πραιτώρων.' The mention of the βίβα placed in full view of the high priests and the notables was not in the least contrary to the rules of the country. The reference to the praetorium is important as giving the location of the bodies and as the first reference to the place where Florus was put to death (cf. 19 below).

The other site suggested for the Praetorium is the Castle of Antonia, to the north of the Temple area, a fourth-century tradition placing Pilate's house in this neighbourhood. That a large part of the garrison lived here is admitted, but that does not favour the idea that it was the Procurator's residence. The course of the Via Dolorosa, as now shown, favours Antonia as the place of condemnation of Jesus; but there is no real authority behind this tradition.4

1 See G. A. Smith, Jerusalem, ii. 573 f.; G. T. Purves in D.B., 87.

Jesus is brought before Pilate and accused by the Jews (vv. 28–31)

28. Ἀγωγον οὖν τῷ Ἱησοῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ Καίσαρα εἰς τὸ πραιτώριον. We have in v. 24 the statement that Jesus was 'sent to Caiaphas,'

3 Human Element in the Gospels, p. 309.
THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN [XVIII. 28-29.

Jesus replied, "I am the Son of God."

PIATE, i.e. early in the morning of Friday, 14 Nisan (see on v. 27). Pilate must have known already that Roman soldiers had been sent to arrest Jesus the night before (v. 3), and he may have been warned to be ready at an early hour. The Jewish ecclesiastics who accompanied Jesus to the Praetorium did not enter in μὴ μακάρις ἀλλὰ φάγων τὸ πάρθηκα. See on v. 30. By going into a house from which the leaven had not been removed (Ex. 12:15), they would have been incapacitated from eating the Passover that evening. Ceremonial uncleanness in many cases lasted until sunset only (Lev. 11:24-25, Num. 9:2, Deut. 23:4, etc.); but in the case of the Passover one who was unclean had to postpone its observance for a whole month (Num. 9:2; cf. 2 Chron. 35:3). This would have been inconvenient for the priests, and so they remained outside the house, Pilate having to come out to ask for the charge against Jesus, and to go back again into the Praetorium to question Him as to His defence.

For ἀλλὰ φάγων (sABC*DNWΩ), the rec. has ἀλλά ταὶ φάγων. For φάγειν τὸ πάρθηκα, which must mean the eating of the Passover meal itself, see Mk. 14:22, Mt. 26:26.

The scruples of the priests about entering the Praetorium are recorded by Jn. only. It is an instance of his "irony" (see on v. 7) that he does not comment upon it. These men were about to pollute their souls by unscrupulous testimony which was to bring Jesus to a horrible death, yet were unwilling to incur technical or ceremonial uncleanness while giving that testimony. There is no perversity so sinister as that of the human conscience.

28. The narrative of Pilate's action in regard to Jesus is told with more fulness in Jn. than in the Synoptics (cf. Mk. 15:4-5, Mt. 27:11, Lk. 23:1). έξῆλθον ἀπὸ τῆς παραμόρφωσιν. As the Jews would not enter the Praetorium, Pilate came outside. This is the force of oὖν, "therefore." . . . The redundant ἐξῆλθον . . . έξῆλθον is for the sake of explicitness "he came out, outside." cf. v. 26 and see on v. 30. The rec. text, with ACΠDNW om. έξῆλθον, but ins. sBΧ*LNW.

Abbott points out (Diat. 1956) that Jn.'s habit is to introduce a personal name without the article; but here we have Παῦλος, as at Lk. 23:3.

For φάγειν (sABC*J1), the rec. has ἐξῆλθον.

s.n. "Praetorium"; Sanday, Sacred Sites, p. 32 f. Westcott and Swete favour Antonia.

[XXVII. 28-31.] JEWS CANNOT PUT TO DEATH

πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ φησίν, Τίνα καταγγέλλα τόσον βασίλευς τούτοις, τότε μὴ μακάρις ἀλλὰ φάγων τὸ πάρθηκα. See on v. 30. By going into a house from which the leaven had not been removed (Ex. 12:15), they would have been incapacitated from eating the Passover that evening. Ceremonial uncleanness in many cases lasted until sunset only (Lev. 11:24-25, Num. 9:2, Deut. 23:4, etc.); but in the case of the Passover one who was unclean had to postpone its observance for a whole month (Num. 9:2; cf. 2 Chron. 35:3). This would have been inconvenient for the priests, and so they remained outside the house, Pilate having to come out to ask for the charge against Jesus, and to go back again into the Praetorium to question Him as to His defence.

For ἀλλὰ φάγων (sABC*DNWΩ), the rec. has ἀλλὰ ταὶ φάγων. For φάγειν τὸ πάρθηκα, which must mean the eating of the Passover meal itself, see Mk. 14:22, Mt. 26:26.

The scruples of the priests about entering the Praetorium are recorded by Jn. only. It is an instance of his "irony" (see on v. 7) that he does not comment upon it. These men were about to pollute their souls by unscrupulous testimony which was to bring Jesus to a horrible death, yet were unwilling to incur technical or ceremonial uncleanness while giving that testimony. There is no perversity so sinister as that of the human conscience.

28. The narrative of Pilate's action in regard to Jesus is told with more fulness in Jn. than in the Synoptics (cf. Mk. 15:4-5, Mt. 27:11, Lk. 23:1). έξῆλθον ἀπὸ τῆς παραμόρφωσιν. As the Jews would not enter the Praetorium, Pilate came outside. This is the force of oὖν, "therefore." . . . The redundant ἐξῆλθον . . . έξῆλθον is for the sake of explicitness "he came out, outside." cf. v. 26 and see on v. 30. The rec. text, with ACΠDNW om. έξῆλθον, but ins. sBΧ*LNW.

Abbott points out (Diat. 1956) that Jn.'s habit is to introduce a personal name without the article; but here we have Παῦλος, as at Lk. 23:3.

For φάγειν (sABC*J1), the rec. has ἐξῆλθον.

s.n. "Praetorium"; Sanday, Sacred Sites, p. 32 f. Westcott and Swete favour Antonia.
The first examination of Jesus by Pilate (vv. 33–37)

38. The Roman soldiers, at this point, took charge of Jesus. Pilate retired from the open court, where he had met the Jewish leaders, and went back into his palace, summoning Jesus to come before him for private examination.

For έσοχθεν, see on 18. The disciple who seems to have been present during the examination of Jesus by Annas (see on v. 13) may also have been a witness of the scene in Pilate's palace which is here told so vividly. The priestly accusers of Jesus could not follow Him inside the house, because of their

scruples about ceremonial uncleanness (v. 28); but it is not likely that admission to the chamber of inquiry was forbidden to others duly introduced who wished to hear what was going on.

Στις ημερειας της ινανοικιας; This question was immediately put to Jesus by Pilate, as all the evangelists tell (Mt. 27:24, Lk. 23:14); but it is only Lk. who explains that Jesus had first been accused to Pilate of claiming to be a King (Lk. 23:2). Pilate fixes upon this point as one which it was necessary for him as procurator to examine, and he puts his question in a form which suggests that he expected a negative answer. "Thou (συς is emphatic) art Thou the King of the Jews?" Evidently, Pilate did not believe that Jesus was a revolutionary leader, as he had been informed (Lk. 23:24). There was nothing in His appearance or His demeanour to make such a charge plausible.

35. ἀκοαυς Ιησους. The rec. has ἀκοαυς αὐτος ὅ τι, but αὐτος is om. by ABC*DEFG* Π, and by Υ. ἀκοαυς Ἰησους is a frequent Johannine opening (see on 12), but cf. v. 37 and 194. We have ἀκοαυς (see on 57).

Ἀπὸ συναυτοῦ is the better reading (nBC*LN) as against the rec. ἀπὸ συναυτοῦ (σ,). The answer of Jesus is to put another question, viz. whether Pilate has any reason of his own, apart from the accusation just now made by the Jewish leaders (ὅ ὁλος ἐσαι σου ἐν Μιθαδικῇ), or supposing that Jesus had claimed to be "King of the Jews."

36. But Pilate will not bend words with an accused prisoner. What could be known about Jesus except what he had been told? "Am I a Jew?"

For the form of the question οίδας; see on 9. "Thy nation (for θὸς, cf. 11:25) and the chief priests have delivered Thee to me," the chief priests representing the head of the Sanhedrim (cf. 1:19 12:23).

τι εἶπας; "What did you do?" That was the point which Pilate wished to find out. What action of Jesus had provoked this fierce hostility? Was it an action which ought to be punished, from Pilate's point of view, with death?

1 The language in which the conversation with Pilate was carried on was probably Greek; but it is, of course, possible that Pilate was able to speak the vernacular Aramaic sufficiently for the purposes of a judicial inquiry.
36. ἄπεκριθη Ἰησοῦς ἦ δυνατὸν ἐντὸς ἐκ τῶν ἁβασταλκομένων εἰ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου ἢ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ ἡ ἐφίλη. ἦ δὲ ἄπειρα ἢ ἐφίλη.

36. But Jesus does not answer this question. He goes back to the charge that He had claimed to be “King of the Jews.” He had refused such a title already (32), but He had often spoken of a coming kingdom. It was the kingdom of which Daniel had written (Dan. 2:44, 44-27), a spiritual kingdom of which the saints were to be citizens. And this He states before Pilate, that there may be no ambiguity in His position. When cross-examined by the priests, as the Synoptists tell, He had accepted their statement that He claimed to be Messiah (Mk. 14:61, Mt. 26:6, Lk. 22:70), and so far there was some plausibility in their accusation of Him before Pilate. But He did not interpret the title of Messiah as implying earthly dominion and national leadership against the suzerainty of Rome; and this was the gravamen of the charge brought against Him, so far as Pilate was concerned. Hence He tells the procurator that His kingdom is not “of this world” (cf., for the phrase διὰ τοῦ κόσμου τοῦτον, 8:28, 43), He does not claim to be “King of the Jews” in any sense that was reasonable to Rome.

€ἰ ἐκ τῶν κόσμων τούτων καλ., “If my kingdom were of this world, then would my officers (ἄρχοντες) be for hire, so that I should not be delivered to the Jews,” i.e. the hostile Jews, as regularly in Jn. (see on 5:17).

Except in this passage, ἄρχοντες in Jn. is always used of the Temple police, the “officers” of the Sanhedrin. ἄρχοντες occurs only 4 times in the LXX (Prov. 14:31, Wisd. 6:4, Isa. 32:7, Dan. 3:6), and always means the minister or officer of a king, as here. Jesus tells Pilate that He, too, has His ἄρχοντες, as well as the high priests, but that just because His kingdom is of the spirit they are not defending Him by force.

Who are the officers here by the ἄρχοντες of Jesus? Certainly not the small and timid company of His disciples, who made no attempt to prevent His arrest, with the sole exception of Peter, whose action only showed the uselessness of trying to resist the police and the soldiers. Jesus, indeed, according to Mt. (26:54) as well as Jn. (18:11), forbade Peter to employ force; but He did not suggest that the resort to arms by the disciples would have been of any practical use. Pilate knew very well that the followers of Jesus were not numerous enough to resist by force the carrying out of any sentence of his.

The ἄρχοντες of Jesus upon whom He might call, if He would, were mentioned by Him, according to Mt. 26:4, at the moment of His arrest: “Thinkest thou that I cannot beseech my Father, and He shall even now send me more than twelve legions of angels?” These were the ἄρχοντες of the kingdom which Jesus had come to establish.

ἄρχοντες. The verb does not occur again in Jn.; cf. 1 Tim. 6:11. εἰ ἐκ τῶν καν., “but now, as things are, my kingdom is not from hence,” sc. of this world. ἑως ἐκ τοῦ καν., cf. 8:28, 43.

37. ἀπεκρίθη δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἢ καν.; Pilate fastens on this mention of Jesus’ kingdom: “Well then, are you a king?” The concluding σὺ is incredulous in its emphasis: “you poor prisoner.” ἑως ἐκ τοῦ καν. is found again in the Greek Bible only in the A text of 2 Kings 5:28.

ἄπεκριθη δὲ Ἰησοῦς. The art. is omitted, according to Jn.’s usual habit when using this phrase (see on 1:29, by LWTa; but it must be retained here, being read by KABDΦΩΝ. ἡ λέγει δὲ βασιλέας ἑως. Westcott-Hort note the margin that this might be taken as a question: “Do you say that I am a king?” But the Synoptists agree in giving as the reply of Jesus to the question: “Art thou the King of the Jews?” the words σὺ λέγεις (Mt. 15:2, Mt. 27:11, Lk. 22:27), which is neither a clear affirmation nor a denial, but an assent given as a concession. But cf. the answer ἡμέναι λέγεται ἢ ἑως ἐκ τοῦ καν. to the question of the priests, “Art thou the Son of God?” in Lk. 22:70. Here, in like manner, we must translate, “Thou sayest that I am a king.” This is the point on which Pilate has been insisting, that Jesus’ claim seemed to be one of kingship, and Jesus admits it again (cf. v. 36), but adds some explanatory words.

The R.V. margin offers the alternative rendering, “Thou sayest it, because I am a king,” but the Synoptic parallels do not support this.

It has been alleged that σὺ λέγεις or σὺ ἐίδας was a Rabbinic formula of solemn affirmation (Schöttgen on Mt. 26:59), but Dalman has shown that this cannot be sustained. Where “thou hast said” appears in the Talmud, it is merely equivalent to “you are right.” 1 In any case, we have here not an ellipse such as σὺ λέγεις, with nothing added, but a complete sentence, “Thou sayest that I am a king.”

After ἐκ τοῦ καν. the rec. adds ἑως (repeating it again in the next sentence, ἑως ἐκ τοῦ καν.) with ΛΤΔΘ, but ΚΔΒΠΛ omit the first ἑως. If it were genuine, it might carry a reference
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Pilate tries to save Him

Pilate suggests to the Jews, unwaveringly, that Jesus should be released (vv. 38-40)

Pilate is now convinced that Jesus' "kingdom" is not a temporal one, and that He is innocent of revolutionary designs. His rejoinder is perhaps wistful rather than cynical or careless: "What is truth?" But to this, the greatest of questions, he does not wait for an answer. He goes outside again (v. 29) to the Jews assembled in the courtyard, and roundly tells them that he can find no reason why Jesus should be put to death.

The phrase is reproduced by Justin of Christ: οἱ τοῦτο γεγονο-

Pilate's next effort to save Jesus, or to save himself from the shame of condemning one whom he believed to be innocent, was to appeal to a Passover custom of releasing a prisoner from custody. Of this custom we know nothing beyond what is told in the Gospels, but there is nothing improbable in the statement that it prevailed at Jerusalem. Livy tells of something similar at the Roman Lactatium (Livy, v. xi. 3), and there is an allusion to it in Dion. Halicarn. (xii. 9).

This συνθέμα (cf. i Cor. 8' 11' 18) is alluded to by the other evangelists (see Mk. 15', Mt. 27' 1); Lk. (21') even makes it an antéfegy.

Thus in the same words, Jesus being described as "the King of the Jews" by Pilate, with a contemptuous allusion to the charge made against Him by the chief priests.

At this stage in the narrative, Mt. 27' 1 tells that a dream of Pilate's wife was reported to him, warning him not to condemn Jesus. There is nothing of this in the other Gospels, but the incident, if genuine, would fully account for Pilate's hesitancy in signing the death warrant.

The word συνθέμα (see on 11' 11' 18 for this verb) of πάλιν πάλιν, "Then they yelled again, etc." Jn. condenses the story: he has not told before of the wild shouts of the crowd. After πάλιν, the rec. inserts πάντες, but om. nBL. For πάλιν, N substitutes πάντες.

1 See E.B. 476 for these passages.
XIX. 1. Pilate went back into the palace, where Jesus was, and ordered Him to be scourged, in the hope (apparently) that this sufficiently terrible punishment would satisfy the chief priests (cf. Lk. 23:15). Mk. 15:1, Mt. 27:26 connect the scourging and the mock coronation with the death sentence (see on v. 16 below), but Jn.'s narrative is very explicit and is to be followed here. The "Pillar of the Scourging" is now shown in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, but in the fourth century it was shown to the Bordeaux Pilgrim in the traditional house of Calaphas. The original pillar to which the Lord was bound was, no doubt, inside the Praetorium. Cf. Mt. 20:18, Lk. 18:22.

2. In the account of the mockery of Jesus by the soldiers of Pilate, Jn. follows Mk. 25:15, or, at any rate, uses phrases which recall Mk. There is no probability that he uses Mt. Lk. 23:11 ascribes this cruel indignity to the soldiers of Herod. The soldiers were amused by the idea that the poor prisoner claimed to be a king, and their rough jests were directed rather against the Jews than against Jesus personally. "This, then, is the King of the Jews!"

πλέοντες στέφανον ἐπὶ καρδιῶν. Verbally identical with Mt.

XIX. 2-4. [THE MOCKING]

ἐναντίον αὐτῶν τῇ κεφαλῇ, καὶ ἰμάτιον πορφυρὸν περιβάλλον αὐτῶν, 3. καὶ ἵψωσεν πρὸς αὐτόν καὶ ξιδύτω Ἀβιρί, ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων καὶ ἀδελφὸν αὐτῆς Ἰακώβαμα. 4. καὶ ἐξέστη τόλμη ἤξιον εἰς 2728; Mt. 15:1 has πλέοντες στέφανον στεφάνων. Lk. does not mention the mock coronation. Pseudo-Peter (§ 3) attributes the jest to an individual; τοι ἰμάτιον εἰς στέφανον ἀκάθαντον ἔκρινεν ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν τῶν εἰριστῶν. The scene was, however, a well-known Barabbas. Jn.'s description of him is powerful in its brevity, and provides a good illustration of his "irony" (see on v. 16). For ἀργυρίου, cf. 101:8.

The release of Barabbas, which must have followed here, is not explicitly related. Probably Pilate ascended his βήμα (cf. 19:2) to pronounce the formal sentence which would free the prisoner.

Jesus is scourged and mocked by the soldiers (XIX. 1–5).

Pilate makes another unavailing attempt to save Him (vv. 6, 7)
THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN [XIX. 4-8.]

ο Παῦλος καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· Πηκέρας ἢμιν αὐτῶν ἤφελκεν, ἵνα γνωτεί ὅτι οὐδὲναν αὐτῶν εὑρέσεσθαι εἰς αὐτό. 5. ἔξελθεν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ, φορών τὸν αὐτήν ἔστηθεν καὶ τὸ παραπόρφυρον ἐπέφερεν. καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· Ἰδοὺ ὁ ἄνθρωπος. 6. ὃς ἐστιν ὁ διὰ αὐτῶν σπέρματι καὶ κοι ἔξελθεν, καὶ ἔδειξεν καὶ; καὶ Ν. W. Omit καὶ; and Ν. W. Omit έλθετε σοι ἐν αὐτῷ. (as at 186; see 188 and cf. v. 5.)

Pilate says to the Jews that He is bringing Jesus out to them, that they may understand that, as he said before (184), he can find no fault in Him. Up to this Jesus had been inside the Praetorium, and the scourging and mockery were probably not visible to the waiting Jews.

184. A favourite word in Jn.; see on 189. 
185. δι' οὐδεμάν αὐτίναν αὐτόν εὑρέσασθαι εἰς αὐτόν. Ν. W. has the shorter form ὅτι αὐτίναν ἐκ τοῦ εὑρέσατο. The phrase has occurred 188, and appears again 196, in slightly different forms.

6. Jesus was brought out, no doubt weak and faint after the scourging; still wearing the mocking insignia of royalty. These He probably continued to wear until He was brought out for the last time for formal sentence (v. 15; cf. Mt. 27:4).

φοράς. This is the regular word for "wearing" clothes; cf. Mt. 11:18, Jas. 2:3.

καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ (sc. Pilate) Ἰδοὺ ὁ ἄνθρωπος. For Ἰδού (καὶ), the rec. has Jn.'s favourite Ἰδού (cf. vv. 4, 14). In this verse B omits ὁ before Ἰησοῦς (see on 189), and also before ἄνθρωπος (cf. Zech. 6:12 Ἰδού ἄνθρωπος, referring to "the Man whose name is the Branch," the future Builder of the Temple). For Ἰησοῦς Ν has ᾿Παῦλος by mistake.

Ἰδοὺ ὁ ἄνθρωπος, Ἰδοὺ ὁ ἄνθρωπος. This, on Pilate's lips, meant, "See the poor fellow!" δ ἄνθρωπος, expressing pity. This is a classical use (cf. Dem. de falsa leg. 402, § 198, and Meid. 543, § 91); see also Mt. 26:6. Pilate thought to move the priests to compassion by exhibiting Jesus to them, who had been scourged by his orders, and whom the soldiers had treated as an object of mockery and rude jesting.

Jn. may mean to represent Pilate, like Caiaphas (184), as an unconscious prophet, his words, "Behold the Man!" pointing to the Ideal Man of all succeeding Christian generations. Abbott (Dist. 1900) recalls some passages from Epictetus, in which δ ἄνθρωπος is thus used of the ideal of humanity. But such an interpretation of Pilate's famous words is probably a Christian afterthought.

The whole clause λέγει . . . ἄνθρωπος is omitted in the O. T. text a, σταυρός, and also by the Coptic Q, an interesting combination.

6. ὃς ἐστιν ὁ διὰ αὐτῶν σπέρματι καὶ κοι ἔδειξεν καὶ; The common people

XIX. 6-7.] CRUCIFY! CRUCIFY!

ἵνα τιμήσω, ἵνα τιμήσω, λέγων Χριστὸν σταυρίσων σταυρίσωσιν. λέγει τιμήσω διὸ Παῦλος ἄλλα τιμήσω αὐτῶν ἢμιν καὶ σταυρίζωσιν έκα. γε γερά ἑαυτῷ εὑρέσασθαι εἰς αὐτόν αὐτόν. 7. ἐναρκήσωσιν αὐτῷ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἡμῖν νόμον ἱσχύον, καὶ καθά τούτον νόμον ἱσχύει ἡ σωτηρία, ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἡμῶν ἐστίν. are not mentioned; the chief priests were the important persons whom Pilate wished to move from their purpose. But the sight of Jesus only angered them; and they, with their satellites (ὁ ἵππος), raised the shout of "Crucify!" It has been implied throughout that this was the death which they had designed for Jesus, but the word σταυρίζωσι is used now for the first time. Cf. Mt. 27:26.

For Ἰοδόν (καὶ) B, C, D, L, N, W. The rec. with B, C, D, L, N, W. After ἐκαραγάσωσιν (cf. 188), the rec. adds λέγων with ABD and Ν. W. (cf. 7); but om. N. Again, after σταυρίζωσιν διὸ καὶ Ν. W. and Μ. add οὕτως (as at v. 15); but om. B.

Ἄλλως ἔστω αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπὶ. "Take Him yourselves, etc." Pilate repeats this suggestion, which had disconcerted the priests when he made it before (184, where see note). He now adds "and crucify Him," although he and they both knew that the Sanhedrin could not legally do this. He also says for the third time that he can find no just cause for a death sentence (cf. 180 and v. 4). Jn., like Lk. (23:14-16), is careful to record that Pilate three times affirmed his conviction of Jesus' innocence.

7. The chief priests, however, make an unexpected rejoinder. They tell Pilate that, according to Jewish law, Jesus ought to be put to death as a blasphemers, and they warn him by implication that he must not set aside their law in such a matter. It was the Roman practice to respect the laws and customs of Judea, as of other distant provinces of the empire; and of this the accusers of Jesus remind Pilate.

The whole νόμον ἱσχύον, viz. Lev. 24:14, which enacted that a blasphemer should be stoned to death. The chief priests knew that this could not be put into operation (see on 188). In any case, the witnesses had to cast the first stone (Deut. 17), and those who bore witness as to the blasphemy of Jesus were not in agreement with each other (Mk. 14:60). The Sanhedrin, therefore, were content, in this particular case, that the responsibility lay with Pilate.

καὶ τῷ νόμῳ (the rec. adds ἵππος with ABD, but om. Ν. W. D, L, N, W. A. C. ἤσβις ἡ σωτηρία. For the verb ἰσβι, see on 13:14.

ὅτι εἰ Ἰησοῦς ἡμῶν ἐστίν. This charge was better founded than the charge of treason, alleged to be inherent in
THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN [XIX. 9–11.]

8. Οτι οιν ζυγυνετ του Παλαισταντος των η μεγαλον, μεγαλον εποβοληθη, και η ευχεται ει σπαντων παλαι και διαιτη με του Θεου; Jesus' claim to be a king. "Son of God" was a recognized title of Messiah (see on 14); and in his examination before the chief priests Jesus had admitted that He was the Messiah (Mt. 26, Mt. 27, Lk. 22), in the last passage the phrase οιν οτι θεον being explicitly used. But He had been suspected of, and charged with, blasphemy on several occasions before this, according to Jn. See 23:12, 22. To the question τινα σειαν σοι ποιει (22), the Jews had good ground for believing that με θεον would be His answer.

The omission of the def. articles in οιν οτι θεον is probably due to the tendency to drop the article before familiar titles rather than to the phrase being used in any sense less exalted than the highest, as may be the case at Mt. 14:35. But in this, the Messianic sense, Pilate could not have understood it, any more than the centurion at the Cross (Mt. 27:25). It must have suggested to Pilate a vague, mysterious claim on the part of Jesus to be more than human; and hearing of it awakened in his mind a superstitious fear. με θεον is frequently used in inscriptions as a title of the Emperor.

The second examination of Jesus by Pilate (ex. 8–11)

8. Πετ οιν εκκενασ του Παλαισταντος των η μεγαλον κτλ. Observe that εκκενασ followed by the acc. does not connote an intelligent hearing (see on 3); as Abbott says (Dict. 2536), "the hearing does not produce (upon Pilate) any result beyond emotion."

μεγαλον εποβοληθη, "he was more alarmed than he had been before" (see on 18).

9. The first questioning of Jesus by Pilate has been described, 23:20–24.

κα η ευχεται ει σπαντων παλαιτον: cf. 18:33.

Pilate's question, ἤδε ετι σοι, is no formal interrogation as to the birthplace or domicile of Jesus. He had learnt already that He was of Galilee (Lk. 23:6). But Pilate has been moved by the dignified bearing of the prisoner, and is uneasy because of the strange claim which He was said to have made for Himself, that He was οιν θεον (v. 7). The question recalls the similar question Ζης ἐπι στ, which was put by the Jews who were impressed, despite their incredulity, by His words (22).

τη θεραπευσιν (cf. 29, Lk. 24, 20, 25) οι θεον ατρο.


XIX. 9–11.] THE SILENCE OF JESUS 619

Πηθα Ι τοι; δ δ Θεον απακρινον οι θεων αυτον. 10. λεγει οιν αυτον ο Παλαισταντος θεον οι θεον; ως οις οικος ιερουσαλαιν οι θεων απακρινον οι οικος στην ανθρωπος σε; 11. απεκριθη αυτον.

The silence of Jesus under cross-examination is mentioned in all the Gospels. Mk. 14:63, Mt. 26:64 note His silence before the high priest; Lk. 23:9 says that He did not answer Herod at all; Mk. 15:25, Mt. 27:15 state that He would not reply to the accusations which the Sanhedrin put before Pilate; and in the present passage His silence is irritating to the dignity of Pilate, who in this repeated inquiry was trying to elicit something that would save Him. Salmon suggested that the silence of Jesus is sufficiently explained by bodily fatigue and exhaustion; and so far as this last examination by Pilate is concerned, it may well be that His exhaustion after being scourged was such that speech was difficult for Him. After the scourging Jn. ascribes only one sentence to Jesus (v. 11) before He was crucified. But bodily fatigue would not, by itself, explain His silence when cross-examined by the high priest (Mk. 14:64) or before Herod (Lk. 23:9); and His refusal to answer questions which were not asked in sincerity, but out of mere curiosity or with intent to betray Him into some dangerous admission, is explicable on moral grounds. Indeed, the dignity of His silence before His accusers does not need explication. He was moving to a predestined end, and He knew it.

Many commentators, following Chrysostom and Augustine, find in the silence of Jesus before His judges a fulfilment of Isa. 53.

16, Pilate's dignity is offended by receiving no answer to his question. The silence of Jesus amounts to contempt of court. ημαι, ἐπι θεασιν; "Do you not speak to me?" ηματι being placed first for emphasis. "I have power (ἐνωσια) to release you, and I have power to crucify you" (the text interchanges the order of these clauses).

ἐνωσια (see on 18) is "authority," rather than "power." Pilate had both, but he is reminded by Jesus that his authority, like all human authority, is delegated; its source is Divine, and therefore it is not arbitrary power which can be exercised capriciously without moral blame.

11. ἄνθρωπος αὐτος. ἐνωσια. ἈΝΩΘΟ ομ. αὐτος, which is retained by BDLMW; and LAMNO ins. δα ἐνωσια, but om. BD. Cf. for similar variants, 1864.

οι εἰκες ἐνωσιας κτλ. οι ΘΕΟ ομ. ΘΕΟ, but ΘΕΟ have ἕξομεν.

XIX. 12-18.] Cæsar’s Friend 621

12. δὲ τοῖς ἑπτάνοις ἐξετασμένοις ἐξετάζειν ἐξετάζειν δὲ ἑπτάνοις ἐξετάζειν δὲ ἑπτάνοις ἐξετάζειν δὲ ἑπτάνοις ἐξετάζειν δὲ ἑπτάνοις ἐξετάζειν δὲ ἑπτάνοις ἐξετάζειν δὲ ἑπτάνοις ἐξετάζειν δὲ ἑπτάνοις ἐξετάζειν δὲ ἑπτάνοις ἐξετάζειν δὲ ἑπτάνοις ἐξετάζειν δὲ ἑπτάνοις ἐξετάζειν δὲ ἑπτάνοις ἐξετάζειν δὲ ἑπτάνοις ἐξετάζειν δὲ ἑπτάνοις ἐξετάζειν δὲ ἑπτάνοις ἐξετάζειν δὲ ἑπτάνοις ἐξετάζειν δὲ ἑπτάνοις ἐξετάζειν δὲ ἑπτάνοις ἐξετάζειν δὲ ἑπτάνοις ἐξετάζειν δὲ ἑπτάνοις ἐξετάζειν δὲ ἑπτάνοις ἐξετάζειν δὲ ἑπτάνοις ἐξετάζειν δὲ ἑπτά

Pilate again fails to obtain the consent of the Jews to acquit Jesus; and pronounces the formal sentence of death by crucifixion (vv. 12-16).

12. ἐκ τούτου, "thenceforth." See on 696.
οἱ δὲ Ἰουδαῖοι ἐκραίναντες λέγοντες κτλ. ἐκραίναντες (BD$σ$) represents the yell of fury with which the Jews received Pilate’s last attempt to set Jesus free. The rec., with καὶ, has ἐκραίναντες, and ALNW have ἐκραίναντες, but the imperative does not represent the meaning so well as the aor. does. Mt. 27$καί$ relates that after Pilate’s failure to persuade the Jews he ostentatiously washed his hands, thereby endeavouring to shift his responsibility.

The last argument which the chief priests used, and which was effective, although their former overtures to Pilate (18-20) had failed, was an appeal to his fears. "If you release Him, you are no friend of Cæsar." There is no need to limit the term φίλος τοῦ Καίσαρος, as if it were an official title (cf. 18$καί$); the expression is used generally. The official title is probably not found before Vespasian.

ὅτα δὲ βασιλείας θαυμάσθηκεν κτλ., "every one who makes himself a king," which was the charge brought in the first instance against Jesus (see on 18$καί$), ἀναλύεται (only here in Jn.), "opposes Cæsar." Here was a veiled threat. If Pilate were sent to Rome to have set free a man making pretension to the title "King of the Jews," it might go badly with him. Treason to the emperor was the cardinal offence for a vicere朕 of procurator.

13. W we must read τῶν λόγων τούτων, with ἍΒΩ, rather than τῶν τῶν λόγων of the rec. text, which has come in from v. 8. Pilate not only heard what the Jews said, but he appreciated its force (see on 3$καί$ for ἀναλύεται followed by the gen.). The reference is to the threat of v. 12. Pilate could not afford to have it reported to the emperor that he had acquiesced in a prisoner who was accused of setting himself up as a king. His position would be safe only if the Jews asked for an acquittal; for then he could always say that the charge had broken down.

ἀγας ἢ τής "he led Jesus out," sc. from the Praetorium, where He had been under examination (v. 9).

ἔκδικεν ἐπὶ βῆματι must be rendered "he sat down on
'γετον, καὶ καθίσας ἐπὶ βήματος εἰς τόπου λεγόμενον Διόνυσων, the judgment seat," i.e. Pilate sat down, the examination being over, intending now to give judgment with full dignity. Before he finally passed sentence, he gave the priests another oppor-
tunity of claiming, or acquiescing in, the release of Jesus. This (intransitive) rendering of καθίσας agrees with Mt.'s report καθίσας δὲ ἀνείπ οὐν ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος (Mt. 27:26), as well as with the only other place where καθίσας occurs in Jn. (19:14). We have καθίσας ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος used of Herod and of Jesus in Acts 12:25 26, 17.

καθίσας, however, is used transitively in I Cor. 6:5, Eph. 1:19 (cf. Hermas, Vit. III. ii. 4), and Archbishop Whately maintained 1 that καθίσας should be rendered transitively here, the meaning being that Pilate did not sit on the βήμα himself, but set Jesus on it in derision. It is worthy of note that there was a tradition current in the second century that Jesus had thus been placed by the Jews on the judgment seat. It appears in the Gospel of Peter (§ 3): οἱ καθίσαντες δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν καθίσαντας κρίνεις, λέγοντες, Διόνυσος ἐκεῖ, βασιλεὺς τῶν Ισραήλ. Justin (whencesoever he obtained the tradition) has it also: διαστρέφοντες αὐτὸν (referring to Isa. 50:6) καθίσαντες ἐπὶ βήματος, καὶ τόν Κρίνον ἦν (Apol. I. 35). Perhaps it came from a misunderstanding of Jn. 19:14, attributing this derisive action to Pilate, not to the Jews. But a misunderstanding it must be, for, apart from the derivative use of καθίσας being always found elsewhere in the Gospels, it is inconceivable that a Roman procurator should be so regardless of his dignity, when about to pronounce sentence of death, as to make a jest of the matter. 2

ἐπὶ βήματος, "upon a judgment seat," sc. perhaps upon one improvised for the occasion, as the Jews would not enter the Praetorium, and judgment had to be given in public.

The text has ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος, but τοῦ is omitted by אBDFKM N, and it probably came in from such passages as Acts 12:25 26, 17.

Josephus (Bell. Jud. ii. ix. 3), when telling of another sentence pronounced by Pilate, has ἐπὶ τοῦ καθίσας ἐπὶ βήματος ἐν τῷ μεγάλῳ στάδιο, judgment in this case also being delivered in the open air. Here we have ἐπὶ βήματος εἰς τόπον κλ., instead of ἐπὶ τόπον. Perhaps ἐς is used because of the verb at the beginning of the sentence (see on 96); but it is possible that it is used for ἐπί here, as it often is in Mk. 4:9 and in Lk. and Acts. See on 11a 97

1 See Salmon, Introd. to N.T., p. 67 n.
2 See Zahn, Einleitung in N.T., § 69, and Abbott, Hist. 2557.

OE ἐκείνος καὶ λέγει τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις Ἰησοῦς, ὁ βασιλεὺς ἡμῶν. 15. ἑκάστῳ γὰρ τὸν ἔκκειν Ἰάκωβον ἀρχαῖον, στηρίσωμεν αὐτοῖς. λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Παῦλος τὸν βασιλέα ἡμῶν σταυροῦσα; ἀπεκρίθησαν οἱ ἄρχοις to the confusion between τὴν (3) and Π (6). But the textual evidence for ἐκείνος is overwhelming.

In Mk. 15:8 Jesus is said to have been crucified at "the third hour," the darkness beginning at "the sixth hour," and continuing until "the ninth hour," when He died. This is corrected by Jn., who tells that the Crucifixion did not begin until after "the sixth hour," i.e., after noon. The hypothesis that Jn.'s method of reckoning time was different from that of the Synoptists is inadmissible (see on 158). That a discrepancy should exist as to the actual hour will not surprise anyone who reflects on the loose way in which time intervals are often reported by quite honest witnesses. Jn. is especially careful to fix the time at which things happened, and is here followed by the Acts of John (§ 92), in which it is distinctly said "at the sixth hour." Indeed it is difficult to believe that all that happened on the day of the Passion before Jesus was actually crucified was over by 9 a.m., as Mk.'s report indicates.

For the "behold," a favourite word with Jn., see on 118; and cf. v. 14 above for the derivative ἴδε, ὁ βασιλεὺς ἡμῶν. The sarcasm of Pilate is directed against the Jews, not against Jesus.

15. ἑκάστῳ γὰρ τὸν ἔκκειν. So א BL, ἔκκειν being emphatic: the rec. text has א δὲ ἐκκείσασθαι. W has ἔκκειμαι. For ἔκκειμαι, see on 118 (cf. v. 6).


Τὸν βασιλέα ἡμῶν σταυροῦσα; Pilate's ironical question is made specially incisive by the prominence in the sentence of τὸν βασιλέα ἡμῶν.

εἰ ἄρχοις, who have been the prime movers throughout (cf. vv. 6, 21, and 129), in their eagerness to answer Pilate, not only deny that Jesus was their King, but repudiate the idea that they have any king but Caesar, thus formally denying the first principle of the Jewish theocracy that "Yahweh was their King" (1 Sam. 12:18). Implicitly, they denied the ideal of the Messianic King, in order to conciliate a heathen power; and thus, by saying "We have no king but Caesar," they abandoned that which was most distinctive of the religion of Judaism. In words, they not only rejected Jesus; they repudiated the claims of the Christ, to whose Advent they professed to look forward. So, at least, the Johannine narrative implies.

To be sure, they did not mean as much as this; they were so anxious to gain their point that they did not measure their words. By the time the Fourth Gospel was written, the Jewish state had been overthrown by Titus; and some of those who avowed before Pilate their unreserved loyalty to Caesar had doubtless fallen, fighting against Caesar's legions.

16. τὸν ἐν παρελθόντι καὶ. Pilate's efforts to save Jesus had failed. The people had taken up the cry, "Crucify Him!" The priests had just announced their loyalty to Caesar in extravagant terms, and Pilate was afraid of their inuendo (v. 15) that he was not overzealous in Caesar's cause. Therefore, afraid of the popular clamour, and not specially interested in the fate of an unpopular fanatic (as he deemed Jesus to be), he delivered him to them, i.e., to the Jews (cf. 18:38 ὑπὸ μὴ παραδέχωντος τοῦ Ἰουδαίου), "that He might be crucified."

The usual form of sentence in such cases was "I bis ad crucem," but the Gospels do not record that it was formally pronounced. This may have been done, but in any case Pilate's attitude was rather that he acquiesced in the capital penalty being inflicted than that he approved it. According to Roman custom, after the death sentence was pronounced, the criminal was first scourged, and then led off to execution without delay. So Josephus says of crucifixions under the procurator Florus: μακωπὸν τε πρὸ τοῦ βίωματος καὶ σταυροῦ προολογίσατο (Bell. jud. i. 14. 9). Mk. (followed by Mt.) represents the scourging of Jesus as taking place at this point, that is, after His sentence. According to Jn. (19), He had already been scourged by Pilate's order, in the hope that the Jews would be satisfied with this sufficiently terrible punishment (cf. Lk. 23:24). It is probable that Jn.'s report is the more accurate here; and it is not likely that Pilate would have permitted a second scourging.

The Crucifixion and the title on the Cross (vv. 17-22)

17. παρελθόντας οὖν τὸν Ἰακώβον. "So they received Jesus," sc. at the hands of Pilate (cf. 14, 15), the only other places where Jn. used παραλαμβάνων.

AW add καὶ ἀπεστάλη αὐτῷ, and D and Σ read καὶ ἁγιάζων; but BL 33 add nothing (cf. Mk. 15:9).

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN [XIX. 17.

17. Ἡ ἁρματικὴ τῆς τῶν Ἰησοῦ καὶ μαθητῶν ἀνθίς τῶν σταυρῶν ἐγέρθη εἰς τὸν λεγόμενον Κρανίον τόπον, ὅ λέγεται Λκ. 23:13, Mr. 27:30; from a reminiscence of which passages άγια γεν has crept into the Johannine text.

βαστάζων ἄτομον τῶν σταυρῶν. So ἡ, the rec. has βαστάζων τῶν σταυρῶν. Ἡ has αὐτῷ. For βαστάζων, see on 14.

καταδίκη, as condemned to be crucified was required to carry his own cross; cf. Plutarch (de verg. cuman. vind. 9), ἰδιάτως κακογραφημένων λειτουργίας τῶν αὐτῶν σταυρῶν, and Artemidorus (Onom. ii. 55), ὅ μελλόν σταυρόν προσφέρειν προτέρου αὐτῶν ἐπιτίθεται, a custom which gives special point to the exhortation, Mr. 8:34. The Synoptists speak of the Cross being borne by Simon of Cyrene, and do not mention that Jesus carried it Himself; however, the ancient explanation is sufficient, viz. that Jesus carried it as they were leaving the Praetorium, but that when He was found to be overburdened by its weight, Simon was compelled to carry it for Him. The patriotic idea that Jesus bearing His Cross was typified by Isaac, upon whom ἡ ἐβάλε (Gen. 22:2) was laid, as he went to the place of sacrifice, goes back to Melito 1 and Tertullian.2 See on 18:2.

Ἐξῆλθεν, “He went out,” for executions were not allowed within the city walls. See on v. 20.

4. Ἡ ἥτοι Κρανίον τοῦ κλ. Γολγοθᾶς is the transliteration of the Aramaic נָאִים הַבֵּיתָא which is transl. by κρανίον in Judg. 9:20, 2 Kings 9:32. For Ἐβαστασίζω, see on 5; and for Jn.'s habit of giving Aramaic names with their Greek equivalents, see on 11. Mr. 15:22 and Mt. 27:35 give the Greek name as Κρανίων, Lk. 23:33 giving Κρανίων, while Mt. and Mk. as well as Jn. supply also the Aramaic designation.

We do not know why this place was called “the Place of a Skull” (Calcarius). Origen is the first to mention a tradition, afterwards widely prevalent, that Adam was believed to be buried on this site (Comm. in Mt. 27:56); but no evidence has been found to show that this was a pre-Christian tradition, and the idea may have grown out of a passage like 1 Cor. 15:22. It has been suggested in modern times that this place-name was given because of the shape of the knoll or little hill where the Crucifixion was carried out. But there is no tradition whatever in favour of this, nor is there any evidence in the Gospel narratives to support the popular idea that Calvary was on a hill or rising ground. Yet another explanation of the name "Golgotha" is that it means "the place of skulls," i.e. a public place of execution, where the bodies of the victims were

2. Ἡρώδ. αἰ. Διδιτόμος, ετ.

19. 18-18.] THE CRUCIFIXION 627

Ἐβαστασίζων ἦταν Ἰησοῦς, 18. ὅπως αὐτὸν ἐσταυρώσαν, καὶ μετ' αὐτῶν ἀλλούς δύο εἰσέβαλεν καὶ ἐστείλαν, κατὰ τέκνα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. 19. Εἴρηται left. This would require κρανίων not κρανίον, not to speak of the facts that bodies were never left unburied in this way near a town, and that Joseph of Arimathea's "new tomb" (19) would certainly not have been built near a place so abhorrent to a Jew. The tradition reproduced by Origen may be pre-Christian; and if so it gives an explanation of the name Golgota, but no other explanation is, in any case, forthcoming. See on v. 20.

18. ὅπως αὐτὸν ἐσταυρώσαν, "where they crucified Him," i.e. the soldiers 3 (see v. 23), who were told off for the purpose.

καταδίκη, as condemned to be crucified was required to carry his own cross; cf. Barabbas was, 18:20); Lk. says κοινωνίας; Jn. does not apply any epithet to them. All the evangelists note that the Cross of Jesus was placed between the other two. Medieval fancy gave names to the robbers, Dismas or Titus or Παύλου to the penitent (who is generally represented as on the right side of the Cross of Jesus), Gestas or Dummerach or δοκτόρας being the impotent one.

ἐστείλαν καὶ ἐστείλαν. Cf. Dan. 12:2 (Theodotion); the LXX has the more usual ἐβαστάσαν καὶ ἐστείλαν: i.e. 1 Mac. 6:28 39.

19. τίτλον. The title or τίτλος, the technical name for the board bearing the name of the condemned or his crime or both, is only so called by Jn. In Mk. it is called ἐπίστατα. Also it is only Jn. who tells that Pilate wrote it. As it appears in Jn. it included both the Name (Ἱησοῦ ἐν Ναζαρηνώ; see 19) and an indication of the crime, conveyed in words of mockery (ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων). In Mk. and Lk. only the αὐτῷ is given, the name being absent, while Mt. has αὐτῷ ἐβαστάσαν Ἰησοῦν ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων. It is not possible to determine which form is verbally correct, but probably it was considered sufficient to give the αὐτῷ only. In Suetonius (Domit. 19) the terms of a similar τίτλος are preserved: "impie locutus parrimarius," i.e. "a parimarian (the name by which the adherents of a gladiatorial party were known) who has spoken impiously."

1. Le Blant argued that soldiers would not have been put to work of this kind, and that executions were entrusted not to the legionaries, but to civil police or apparitors attached to the court of the procurator. But his arguments are taken from the conditions of a later age. See the art. "Boureau" in Cabrol’s Dict. d’archéologie chrétienne for a full discussion. Cf. Acts 21:11. 12. the scourging of Paul was about to be entrusted to soldiers under the command of a centurion. The Gospel of Peter gives it in the form αὐτῷ ἐβαστάσαν ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων.

VOL. II.—22
XIX. 22-28.] LOTSCAST FOR HIS GARMENTS 629

22. Οἱ οὖν στρατιώται, οἱ ἱσταμένοι τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ἄβασκον τὰ ἱματιά αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐνώριαν τίτσαρα μήρα, ἐκάστῳ στρατιώτῃ μήρα, καὶ τὸν χειφέα. ἦν δὲ τὰ ἱμάτια ἄρραφα, ἐκ τῶν ἀνθρώπων διέδραμεν δὲ
to the cross, it was the expression of a legal decision. From the legal point of view he was right in refusing to alter its terms. *Littera scripta manet.*

To the form of expression, "What I have written, I have written," Lightfoot (Hor. Hebr. iii. 422) gives some Rabbinic parallels (cf. also Gen. 43:14, Esth. 4:13); but they are hardly apposite, as Pilate was not a Jew. Cf., however, ἰστριμόνες πρὸς Ἰησοῦν ( Acts 21:20). The perf. tense γέγραφα marks the permanence and abiding character of his act. Jn. uses the perfect as distinct from the aorist, with strict linguistic propriety.

The distribution among the soldiers of Jesus' garments (vv. 23, 24)

23. Δαμάσω τὰ ἱματιά αὐτοῦ. Nothing is said of the clothes of the crucified robbers. It was customary to remove the clothes before a condemned person was nailed to the cross, and by Roman law they were the perquisites of the soldiers who acted as executioners. But, presumably, the clothes of the malefactors were not worth anything, and so are not mentioned.

Of the soldiers there was the usual quaternary (τὰ ἱμάτια, Acts 12:18); and according to the Synoptists (Mt. 27:28, Lk. 23:27) a centurion was also present. The Synoptists do not give any detailed account of the doings of the soldiers; they merely say, paraphrasing the words of Ps. 22:16 (which was no doubt in their minds), that the soldiers divided the clothes, casting lots. But throughout the Johannine account of the Crucifixion (vv. 23–37), the fuller testimony of an eye-witness (see v. 35) reveals itself. This account is due to one who was near the Cross all the time. And so Jn. tells that it was for the ἄρδεα or long cassock-shaped coat (as distinguished from the ἴππων or outer cloak: cf. v. 2 and Mt. 26:58, Lk. 16:39), which was woven in one piece, that lots were cast; and he adds that this was τὸ ἱματίαν ἵππων, quoting Ps. 22:18 from the LXX:

διαμορφαντο τα ἱματια μου καπνου και τοι των ἵππων μου ἐβαλον ελθρον.

In this verse ἱματια and ἵππων represent distinct Hebrew

1 See art. "Bourreau" cited above.

2 Cf. Sir C. W. Wilson, Golgotha and the Holy Sepulchre (1907), the fullest and best discussion of the site of Calvary.
XXX. 24-25. WOMEN AT THE CROSS 631

there was a large crowd of women there at the cross, including Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James and Joseph, and Salome, the wife of Zebedee and mother of the apostles James and John, who were present at the cross. John enumerates Mary the mother of Jesus (whose presence the Synoptists do not mention), her sister, Mary the wife of Clopas, and Mary Magdalene, i.e., four persons and not three as one reading of the text might suggest. Not only do the Pesher make this clear by putting "and" before "Mary the wife of Clopas"; but the balance of the sentence, if four persons are indicated, is thoroughly Johannine. If we compare this with the Synoptic parallels we reach two important conclusions: (1) Salome was the sister of Mary the mother of Jesus, and therefore John the son of Zebedee and Salome was a maternal cousin of Jesus. (2) Mary the wife of Clopas is the same person as Mary the mother of James and Joseph (cf. Mt. 27:56, Mk. 15:40, Lk. 24:19). It would be impossible to equate the Synoptic "Mary, the mother of James and Joseph" with the Lord's mother, for no one can suppose that the Synoptists, when telling the names of the women at the cross, would have described the mother of Jesus in so circumspect a manner. This James is called by Mk. á ἱλασθεὶς δὲ μικρὸς τί "James the Little," the adjective not relating to his dignity, but to his stature. Of him we know nothing more.

Attempts have been made to identify Clopas with Alpheus, who was father of one of the Twelve (James the son of Alpheus, Mk. 3:18, Mt. 10:3, Lk. 6:18, Acts 1:13), but philological considerations will not permit us to reduce Clopas and
and in sympathy he was nearer to her than these stepsons. And so Jesus bade His mother look to John, His beloved friend and cousin, to be her "son." He is going from her, but John will take His place in such measure as is possible.

The words "Woman, behold thy son ... behold thy mother are more than a mere commendation or suggestion from a dying friend. They convey a command from Him who was, to Mary, as well as to John, Master and Lord. He did not address her as "Mother," even while He shows tender solicitude for her future. "Mother," as a title of address by Jesus, was abandoned long since, and for it "Woman," a usual title of respect, has been substituted. See on 4.

When Jesus said to John "Behold thy mother," John's own mother, Salome, was present and may have overheard the words. But the Virgin was her sister, broken-hearted and desolate, with whom she was in complete sympathy, for she too had accepted Jesus as Master. She was not necessarily set aside or superseded by the charge to her son to regard her sister Mary as a second mother, and treat her with filial care.

The place which this farewell charge occupies among the Words from the Cross is noteworthy, as will be seen if they are read in their probable sequence.

Additional Note on the Words from the Cross

The evangelical narratives of the Passion reflect at least three distinct lines of tradition. The Marcan tradition (which according to Papias goes back to Peter, whose disciple Mark was) is followed with amplifications of a later date by Matthew. It is also followed by Luke, who seems, however, to have had some additional source of information. His account of the trial before Herod (23:12), e.g., has no parallel in the other Gospels; and it has been often observed that Luke alone mentions Joanna, the wife of Chuza, Herod's steward, as one of the women who accompanied Jesus in His public ministry (Lk. 8) and were present at the Crucifixion (Lk. 23:49) and heralds of the Resurrection (Lk. 24:10). To this Joanna, Luke's special information as to the Passion may possibly be due. The third distinct tradition of the Passion is that of Jn., which goes back for details to the personal witness of the Beloved Disciple (19:27).

The Marcan tradition reports one Word from the Cross, the Lucan tradition three, and the Johannine tradition yet

1 See E.B., s.v. "Clara," and Delitzsch, Bible Studies, p. 315 n.
2 As reported by Euseb. (kur., in. 11, iv. 22).
3 For the spelling, see Westcott-Hort, Appendix, 156.
another three. There is nothing surprising in this variation. Independent witnesses may honestly and truthfully give different, although not inconsistent, reports of the same events. They report only what they have personally observed, and only such part of that as has specially impressed them or is suitable for the purposes of their narrative, if they are writing one. It may not be possible to harmonize precisely the various accounts of the Passion, or to place the Words from the Cross in exact chronological sequence. But there is no critical objection to the order which has generally commended itself to students of the Gospels, as being suggested by the sacred text. It may be set out as follows:

1. Πάντες ἀνθρώποι οὗς ἤδειξαν τοῦ κυρίου (Lk. 23:42). This comes in the Lucan narrative, according to the received text, immediately after the statement that Jesus had been crucified between the two thieves. But that it is part of the original text of Lk. is uncertain; it is omitted by ¹⁰BD⁷ and other authorities, and Westcott-Hort "cannot doubt that it comes from an extraneous source." Wherever it comes from, whether the knowledge of it came to Lk. from some eye-witness, such as Joanna, or whether it found its way into the text of Lk., after his narrative was completed, it has an unmistakable note of genuineness.

2. Δύναται λέγει σοι σήμερα μετ' εμοί ἐγώ ἐγώ ἐγώ περὶ τοῦ παραδίσου (Lk. 23:30). This was addressed to the penitent thief, and, like the first Word, must have been said at the beginning of the awful scene. "It was now about the sixth hour," is Lk.'s comment (Lk. 23:30); i.e. it was about noon. See on Jn. 19:14. The report of this saying must have come from one who stood near the Cross, and so was able to hear what was said.

3. Γίνου, ἡ ὅδε σου... ἡ μὴ γένοι τού (Jn. 19:26, 27). There is no difficulty in understanding why this saying should have been specially treasured in memory by the beloved Disciple, and thus recorded at last in the Fourth Gospel. It was specially addressed to him, and to her whom he was to cherish henceforth as a mother; there is no reason to suppose that other bystanders were unable to hear the words.

If we examine the sequence of these first three Words from the Cross, in the order seemingly suggested in the Gospel texts, we cannot fail to notice the narrowing of the circle of interest, as death draws near. That always happens. When death is at a distance, men are still concerned with the wider interests of life; then it draws closer, and it is only the nearer and more intimate interests that appeal; and the time comes when the energies of thought are taxed to the full by the messages of farewell to those who have been best beloved. So it was with the Son of Man. In the hour of death, the first movement of the heart of Jesus is towards those who had brought Him to the Cross. "Father, forgive them." His mission of Redemption is still in His thoughts. Then, as strength ebbs away, the cry of the penitent thief by His side reaches Him, and the response to the individual pleading does not fail. "This day shalt thou be with me." But the circle is narrowing fast. His dying eyes are fixed upon those who have been dearest. The forgiveness of enemies; the consolation of the fellow-sufferer; these give place to the thought of mother and of friend. "Behold thy son... behold thy mother." These are the stages of the approach of death, for the Perfect Man.

4. Ἐλθε, ἠλάμβανεν σαβαθοθανήν; θεί μου, θεί μου, ἵνα ἐλεήσῃς; (Mt. 27:46, Mk. 15:34). This is the only Word from the Cross which rests upon the Markan tradition, and may be taken as due to Peter. It was uttered "with a loud voice," and so could be heard even by those standing at a distance, as Peter probably was. (Cf. Mt. 27:46, ἐταφναίαν τοις ἐν αὐτῷ μικροῖς θωμούσιν.) There is no hint in any Gospel that he was one of the little circle who stood near the cross. This cry was misunderstood by the crowd, who thought that Jesus was calling for succour upon Elisha the prophet, an observation (Mk. 15:35), which shows that we have here to do with words actually used, and not with words afterwards placed in the mouth of Jesus, being thought appropriate as the opening phrase of a Messianic Psalm (Ps. 22). Indeed, the difficulty that interpreters have always felt in explaining these words of seeming despair as spoken by One who was Himself Divine, proves that they are not likely to have been the invention of pious fancy dwelling afterwards on the Agony of Gethseman. They were reproduced later in a Doctrinal form in the apocryphal Gospel of Peter: "Εἴη μου, ἵνα ἐλεήσῃς... με. Why they are not recorded by Lk. or Jn. it is idle to conjecture.

5. Τιμία (Jn. 19:28). This was spoken near the end. Although the actual word Τιμία is recorded only by Jn., yet the incident of the Lord's thirst being assuaged is given in Mk. 15:34 (Mt. 27:46). "I thirst" would naturally have been said in a low voice, so that it could be heard only by those near the Cross.

That Jn. should have specially recorded this word is in keeping with the emphasis laid, throughout the Fourth Gospel, on the humanity of Jesus. As He asked the Samaritan woman for water when He was thirsty (4), so now. Jn. is anxious to
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expel Docetic doctrine (I. Jn. 4), and both here and at 15 he brings out recollections of the Beloved Disciple which forbid any theory of Christ's Person that does not recognise His manhood. Jesus was thirsty at the Cross.

6. ἠρέτοντας (Jn. 19). That after He had assuaged His thirst, Jesus uttered a loud cry, just before the end, is recorded Mk. 15, Mt. 27; cf. also Lk. 23. But the spectator upon whose testimony Jn. is dependent not only heard the cry, but identified the word spoken. This, for Jn., who sees all through the Passion the predestined march of events to the fulfillment of God's purposes, is the Great Word. Everything had happened as it had happened, in order that the Divine purpose, as foreshadowed in the O.T., might be accomplished (ημεθράτης 96). And κατέληκεν marks this Consummation.

7. Πάτερ, εἰς χειράς σου παρατίθεμαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου (Lk. 23). Lk. specially notes that this was after the Great Cry (διαποιμηθα λεγώ μεγάλα), and that this was the last word spoken. To the utterance of faithful confidence from the ancient Psalm (31), the one word "Father" was prefixed, which charged it for future generations with a deeper meaning. In the Psalm, it is the trustful prayer of life; on the lips of Jesus (and thereafter; cf. Acts 7), it became a prayer of the dying. It is noteworthy that the two personal cries of Jesus from the Cross (Nos. 4 and 7) are old and familiar verses from the Psalter. Jn. does not record this, but we cannot know his reason. If it was indeed the last word spoken, the Beloved Disciple must have heard it, as well as the witness, Joanna or another, from whom it was transmitted to Lk. It is just possible that the words of Jn. 15, παρακέλευσεν τὸ πνεῦμά μου, contain a reminiscence of Lk.'s παρατίθεμαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου. But in any case, Jn. never attempts to tell all that had happened, or all that he knew; his method is to select and arrange the sayings and acts of Jesus which best bring out the main thesis of his Gospel (20). And ἔστιν in, his scheme, the final word of the Cross.

Of other arrangements of the Seven Words, that of Tatian, our earliest harmonist, is the most noteworthy. It differs in one particular only from that which has been set out here. Tatian in his Diatessaron puts "Father, forgive them . . ." immediately before "Father, into thy hands . . ."; thus contradicting the order in which Lk. (who alone records them both) places the two sayings, "Father, forgive them" and "This day shall thou be with me in Paradise." Bishop Andrews in his Litania places our No. 4 before our No. 2, an arrangement adopted also in some German hymns. Certainly


27-28.] John Took Her to His Home

λάγει τῷ μαθητῷ οὐκ ἠμέτρητον. καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἀράμματος ἐκείνης ἐκ τῆς ἱματος. 28. Μετὰ τὸ τάφον οἴκος ἐλθεὶς ἦν ἤματος cannot be reached, but a clearer insight into the significance of these Words is gained by any honest attempt to reach the order in which they were spoken.

27. ἐκ τῆς ἀράμματος. "From that hour." It has been thought that this implies that Mary did not wait for the end, but that John led her away at once. It may have been so, but in that case John returned soon, for he is present at the Cross later (vv. 28-35). Cf. 15.

That Jn. does not mention the cry Eil, Eil, lama sabachthani (which is reported by Mk. 15) followed by Mt. (27) as having been uttered "with a loud voice," may perhaps be explained as due to the absence of the eye-witness at this point. The aged disciple recalls only his own personal experiences. Another possible explanation is that Jn. has omitted this saying, because he wishes to emphasize the voluntary character of Christ's death. See on v. 30.

εἰς τῇ θεισον, "to his own home." The phrase is used thus Esth. 5, 3 Macc. 75, 37, Acts 21, and it is the most natural meaning. It occurs twice elsewhere in Jn. (11, 16), where the sense is probably the same, but it is not quite so clear as it is here (see note on 11). John brought the Virgin Mother to his own lodging (see on 20), and she lived with him thereafter; but we cannot build on the phrase εἰς τῇ θεισον a theory which would give him a house of residence at Jerusalem (see on 18).

28. μετὰ τάφον. The phrase does not convey that the incident of vv. 26-30 immediately followed on that of vv. 25-27. In fact, there was an interval of darkness and silence, of which all the Synoptists speak as lasting for some three hours (Mk. 15, Mt. 27, Lk. 23). But it means, as it does elsewhere in Jn. that the second incident was later than the first; whereas the phrase μετὰ τάφον does not carry the sense of strict chronological sequence so explicitly.

eἰς ἔαός ἔνηνεπ οὐκετά. The same phrase occurs in 13, where in like manner it leads up to the statement that the appointed hour had come. He knew that "all things had now been finished," ἐκ τῶν τηλεκολεστήν. Jn. never allows

1 Latham, The Risen Master, p. 216, suggests that John brought her to Bethany, and thinks that she could not have been in Jerusalem on the day of the Resurrection, or she would have been sent for when the tomb was found empty.

2 Cf. Introduction, p. 118.
the Cross, "with a loud voice." His parched throat must be cooled. It was necessary that He should ask for drink. And so, δὲ ὁ Ἰάσωμα τὸ δῶρον ὁ Κριτικὸς, "when He had therefore taken the wine," He cried θελεοῦσα, that all might know that great fact of which He was Himself assured, ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. It was this majestic word which seems specially to have impressed the centurion who was there. When the centurion, which stood by over against Him, saw that He had given the ghost, he said, "Truly this man was a Son of God." (Mt. 27:50). "Certainly this was a righteous man" (Lk. 23:47). At any rate, Jn. regards it as the Final Word, and will add nothing to it.

But whether this connection between the two words δῶρον and θελεοῦσα be suggested by Jn. or no (and it may be thought over subtle), δῶρον must be taken in its plain meaning of physical thirst. This Jesus felt, and a merciful bystander relieved Him.

We are not to confuse this incident with the refusal by Jesus, before He was crucified, of the drugged wine which it was customary to offer criminals who were condemned to the Cross (Mt. 27:53, Mt. 27:48). The Talmudists say of this kindly custom "they gave them to drink a little frankincense in a cup of wine . . . that their understanding might be disordered." This Jesus refused because He willed to endure the Cross with full and unimpaired consciousness. But now all is finished. The work of redemption has been completed. It is no part of Christ's revelation that the enduring of purposeless pain is meritorious. The pains of thirst were terrible to one exposed to the scorching heat of midday, while hanging naked on the Cross. And so Jesus said, "I thirst," in His death-agony.

It would seem that some provision had been made for relieving the thirst of the dying men, σημείωσεν δὲ αὐτῷ τὸ πεπραγμένον, "as a vessel full of vinegar was set there," it was quite ready. Some have imagined that this was a drugged potion, such as that of Mt. 27:54 (οἴνος ἐμαύη νόθα), given with the view of hastening the death of the sufferers. But there is no ground for this in the evangelical narratives. Mt., who follows the words of Ps. 69:21, takes the word χαλαρί from thence, this being the only place where χαλαρί is mentioned in the Gospels, viz. in connection with the draught offered to Jesus before He was crucified. Neither Mt. (see 27:48) nor any other evangelist mentions χαλαρί in connexion with the final draught accepted by Jesus at the end. Barnabas (§ 7) says, indeed, ἐπεξερεύνηκεν ἐπιτίκμονα δῶρον καὶ χαλάρι, but he probably

1 Abbott (Dist. 2115) connects παντα καθαρτηται with the ἀρνειών ή γεραφή.
29. σεβαστὸς ἄγων μετέτρεψεν ἀπογγέον ὁ μετέτρεψεν τὸ ἄγων ὡς οὕτως παρεδόθη προσῆγεται αὐτῶν τῇ στίχοις. 30. ὡς αὐτὸ had Mt. 2744 rather than Mt. 2763 in his mind. In any case, he is a confused writer, as is also the author of the Gospel of Peter who writes thus (§ 3): καὶ τοὺς αὐτῶν ἤλεγεν ἤτοιτα μαίνεται αὐτοὺς ἔρατες μετὰ άγων καὶ πεπληρώσεις εὐτυχίας. καὶ ἐπεκράτεσαν πάντα, καὶ ἐκθέλοντο κατὰ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτῶν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ. Nomaus (fifth cent.) suggests that Jesus asked for the draught in order that the end might come more quickly: τοὺσκερές ὁ ὕπο τὸ τετράγωνός καὶ στροφέων οὕτως ἔτυχεν. But there is no hint of such a motive in the canonical Gospels.

30. σεβαστὸς ἄγων μετέτρεψεν. So ABLW 33, but the rec., with ἡ ἁγωνία ἡν ρωτέροι τοῦ ἀγωνος (καὶ ἔτυκεν τῳ σκεπτότι, μετετρεύτι, οὕτως ἀνέτη. But there is no hint of such a motive in the canonical Gospels.

HE GAVE UP HIS SPIRIT

30. κλίνες τῇ κεφαλῇ, "having bowed his head." This detail is given only by Jo., and suggests that the account depends on the testimony of an eye-witness. κλίνες τῇ κεφαλῇ occurs again in N.T. only at Mt. 89, Lk. 298, "The Son of Man hath not where to lay his head." The only resting-place for Him was the Cross. Abbott argues that Jo. means here to imply that Jesus in death rested His head on the bosom of the Father. But this is to apply the allegorical method of Origen, and is quite unnecessary here.

παραβόλαις τῷ πνεύμα ὁ "He gave up his spirit." Mk. 1537 and Lk. 2473 have simply ἔπεσεν κατά, while Mt. 2790 has ἔπαθεν τῷ πνεύμα. παραβολάσεως is "to give up voluntarily" (see note on 648), and it may be that the verb is chosen deliberately, to emphasise the unique manner of the Lord’s death; cf. 16, "I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it up."

Or, the expression παραβολασία τῷ πνεύμα may carry a reminiscence of the Lord’s last words according to Lk. 2534 παραβολή με τῷ πνεύμα μου. See Additional Note on p. 636.

Or, we may have here a covert allusion to Isa. 5343: "He poured out His soul unto death," which the LXX turns into the passive form παραβόλος εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ, but which would more literally be rendered παραβόλην εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ. When it is remembered that the next clause of Isa. 5343 is: "He was numbered among the transgressors" (which is quoted as predictive of the Passion in Lk. 2343), it is not improbable that Jo. is here translating directly from the Hebrew of Isa. 5343, and that his intention is to describe the death of Jesus in the same words as those used by the prophet of the death of the Servant of Yahuwh. Isa. 53 is for Jo. a Messianic prophecy. See on 1228.

Aνy case, the verb παραβολάζεσαι expresses a voluntary act, and is thus in contrast with the ἔπεσεν τῷ πνεύμα of Mk. and Lk.

For the use of πνεύμα, see on 1128. It is not legitimate to lay any special emphasis on the employment here of πνεύμα, as distinct from ἐνυχ, even if the suggestion made above that Isaiah’s "poured out His soul" suggested Jo.’s παραβόλος τῷ πνεύμα be not adopted. Indeed in the second century ἰτις πνεύμα τῷ πνεύμα is used of Jo.’s own death.

1 Dist. 1450, 2644.

1 Abbott (Paradise, passim) has much to say about παραβόλης in Isa. 5343, but his treatment is very speculative and is not followed here.
So of the death of Agathonice by martyrdom it is said ευφροσύνης το γενέτηρια καὶ εὐπλοίδου σὺ τοις άγίοις; 1 and the same phrase is used of the martyrdom of Peter. 2

The piercing of the Lord's side, and the fulfilment of Scripture (ver. 31–37)

31. The statement that the "Jews," i.e. the Sanhedrists who had brought about the condemnation of Jesus, approached Pilate with the request that the death of those who had been crucified should be hastened, and their bodies removed, is peculiar to Jn. (see on v. 38). It has every mark of truth. Criminals crucified on a Friday might linger until the Sabbath, when they could not be buried, so that they would remain hanging on the Cross. But it was contrary to the Deuteronomical law that the dead bodies of criminals should remain on the cross after sunset (cf. Deut. 21:23, Josh. 20:10). Accordingly, Josephus (I. 7, v. 2) tells us that the Jews of his time were careful to bury before sunset the bodies of those who had been crucified. Thus it was urgent, from the Sanhedrists' point of view, that those crucified on a Friday should die on that day, and that their bodies should be removed forthwith. But this could be arranged only by an order from the Roman governor.

Now the usual Roman practice was to leave a corpse on its cross (cf. Horace, Epistles, i. xvi. 48), as in England the bodies of criminals used to be left hanging in chains. But there was no Roman law forbidding burial. Wetstein quotes Quintilian, Declam. vi., "omnes succiduntur, percussos sepeliri carnisext non vetat." And Philo mentions that he had known of bodies being taken down from the cross and handed over to the relatives of the condemned for burial, on the occasion of the emperor's birthday or the like (in Planc. 10). Hence, although Pilate, in ordinary circumstances, might have refused the request of the Sanhedrists, there was nothing to prevent him from granting it if he wished. And, in this case, apart from his evident unwillingness to condemn Jesus, there was the further consideration that Jerusalem, at the moment, was crowded with pilgrims who had come for the Passover, and that it was desirable to avoid a conflict between the Jews and the Roman authorities. 3

For παρασκευη, see on v. 14 above. It was "Preparation." 4

31. Of εὖ χαίροντας, ἐκείνη Παρασκευής ἦν, διὰ μὴ διηρύθῃ ἕως τοῦ σταυροῦ τοῦ σώματος ἐν τῷ συμβάντω, ὅτι γὰρ μεθαλαγμένη ἡ ἡμέρα ἔκκεντρον τῶν συμβάντων, ἔφευβεν τῶν Παλαιών ἡ κατάγουσα αὐτῶν τὰ σκέλη καὶ ἄνθρωπον. 32. ἤλθον οὖν οἱ σφυρακώτα, καὶ τῶν μὲν πρῶτον κατάλησαν τὰ σκέλη καὶ τοῦ άλλου τούτον συναντησόντος αὐτόν. 33. ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν Ἰσραηλίτων, ὅσιον ἦν ἀνθρώπος, ὅσιος ἀνθρώπος ἦν εἰς τὸ διανοητικόν. 34. ἡ γὰρ μνήμη. ἦν, "Ἀκολουθοῦτο τῷ παρασκευήτῃ" διὸ πρὸ τοῦ σαββάτου, ἢ μέρα ἢ πρώτη εἰσαχθήσεται ἡμία.

The crucifiguration, or breaking of the limbs, was done by a heavy mallet; and terrible as such blows would be, if inflicted on a man in health and strength, they were merciful if they ended quickly the torture of a lingering death by crucifixion.

36. ἢ μὲν ἄλοιπον ὁ χρόνος "Therefore," sc. in obedience to the orders they received, "the soldiers came," and broke the legs of the two robbers, who were not yet dead. The Gospel of Peter (which betrays knowledge of the Johannine narrative of the Passion) gives a curious turn to this incident. It represents the Jews as indignant with the penitent thief, because of his defence of Jesus' innocence (cf. Lk. 23:41), and as commanding, "that his bones should not be broken to the end that he might die in torment." (§ 4). This is inconsistent with what Pseudo-Peter says in § 3 about the illegality of allowing the bodies to remain on the crosses after sundown; but its interest is that it shows the freedom with which this apocryphal writer treats the Gospel narrative.

38. ὅσιον ἦν ἀνθρώπος τιθέμενον. Jesus died before the robbers did. According to Mk. 15:44, Pilate was surprised that He had died so soon; for in the case of a crucified person, death sometimes did not ensue for two or three days. A highly strung nature is less able to endure physical agony than one of coarser fibre; and Jesus was the Perfect Man. See above on v. 10.
This verse was introduced into St. Matthew's Gospel at an early period. א��ול, with some cursives, the Ethiopic va., and several "mixed" Latin texts of the British and Irish type, supply at the end of Mt. 27⁴⁸ the words ἀλάος ἐκ τῶν στρατιώτων λέγει ἵνα τις πιέση, καὶ ἐξεύρηκαν ἵππον καὶ ἀλάος. Mt. represents one of the bystanders (ἐκ ἕως ἀλάος) as offering Jesus the sponge of vinegar, while others were for waiting to see if Elijah would come to save Him. Then he adds the incident about the piercing of the Lord's side, the apparent inference being that it was to render fruitless any intervention on the part of Elijah. As the verse occurs in Mt., it represents Jesus as alive, His death following with a loud cry immediately after the piercing. It has been held that Chrysostom supports this view; but an examination of his homily on Mt. 27⁴⁸ will show that it is not so, despite some confusion in the order of his comments. For although he mentions the piercing immediately after the giving of the vinegar, he adds: "What could be more brutal than these men, who carried their madness so far as to insult a dead body?", a comment which he briefly repeats on Jn. 19⁴⁴. Tatian also has been cited in support of the interpolation at Mt. 27⁴⁸, but there is no trace of it in the Diatessaron. The probability is that ἐκ ἕως ἀλάος of Mt. 27⁴⁸ recalled to a copyst of τῶν στρατιώτων of Jn. 19⁴⁴ and suggested the interpolation. Perhaps Jn.'s ἀλάος ἐκ was read as ἀλάος by the scribe of Mt. The theory that the passage was part of the original Mt. (being omitted by the Syriac and O.L. vss. because of its inconsistency with Jn.), and that Jn. here silently corrects Mt. by placing the incident in its true context, is improbable, for there is no evidence to prove that Jn. knew Mt. at all.¹

The rendering of the Latin Vulgate opusit in this verse is a corruption of the Greek text. The true Greek reading is ἐστάετ, "pricked," which is the basis of most of the O.L. vss., ssp. psp, psp, psp, etc. But a Greek codex (and a have opusit, which presumably indicates a Greek variant opusit "opened." This was adopted by Jerome, and is supported by the Peshitta and the Jerusalem Syriac. But for the Greek ἐστάετ there is no MS. authority. Cod. 36 has ἐστάετ; Cod. 38 has ἐστάετ (corr. to ἐστάετ) by a second hand); Cod. 68, the Evangelistaria 257, 259, and (according to Tischendorf) Cod. 225 have ἐστάετ, all of which

---

¹ Cf. Westcott-Hort, Select Readings, p. 22; Nestle, Textual Criticism, p. 227; Salmond, Human Elements in the Gospels, p. 523; Abbott, Dist. 1756; and esp. Tischendorf's critical note on Mt. 27⁴⁸.

² Cf. Introd., p. xcvii.
The language of Jn. is compatible with this interpretation. In that case, the solemn attestation of v. 35 was added because Jn. regarded the incident as so extraordinary as to be difficult of credence. It had not been narrated by earlier evangelists, and exceptionally good testimony would be necessary if it were to be believed.

But it is more probable that Jn. regards the flow of blood and water from the pierced side of Jesus as a natural phenomenon, which he specially notes because he wishes to refute the Docetic doctrines prevalent when the Gospel was composed. Alike in the Gospel and in the First Epistle he is anxious to lay stress on the true humanity of Christ (see on x14); and when telling of the Passion he would guard against the Docetism which treated the Body of Jesus as a mere phantom. We know from the second-century Acts of John, as well as from other sources, something of the curious teaching which denied humanity to Christ and explained His Crucifixion as an illusion. In this Docetic work (§ 101), Jesus is actually represented as saying that there was no real flow of blood from His Body; οὕτως δὲ λέει Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὸ ἔξω. In opposition to this sort of thing, which goes back to the first century, Jn. is earnest in explaining that the Death of Jesus was a human death; His Body bled when it was pierced; it was no phantom.

In like manner, the language of the First Epistle is strongly anti-Docetic. "Every spirit which confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God," the spirit which denies this being the spirit of antichrist (v. 4). That the language of v. 3, "This is He who came by water and blood," even Jesus Christ; not with the water only, but with the water and the blood, carries a direct allusion to Jn. 19 and is doubtful. Perhaps the words are sufficiently explained of the historic Baptism of Jesus and of His historic Crucifixion. But the whole passage is strikingly similar to Jn. 19 in its insistence on the true humanity of Christ in the circumstances, alike, of His Life and His Death. This was what Jn. was most anxious to teach, viz. that the Man Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God (v. 3); and the incident recorded in Jn. 19 is so opposite in this connexion, as opposed to Docetic mysticism, that he calls attention to it by an emphatic and special attestation (v. 35).

One of the earliest extant comments on Jn. 19, is that of Irenaeus, who takes this view of the evangelist's purpose. To show the true humanity of Christ, Irenaeus calls attention to His being hungry at the Temptation, to His being tired (Jn. 4), to His tears (Jn. 11), to His bloody sweat (Lk. 22), and...
Lastly to the piercing of His side, when blood and water flowed forth. He concludes τοῦτο γὰρ πᾶντα σύμβολον αὐτοῦ τῆς ἁμαρτίας (c. Ησαυ. iii. xlix. 2; cf. iv. xxxiiii. 2). It will be observed that Irenæus has no thought of a miracle here, nor does he proceed to find any mystical meaning in the incident.

All later fathers are concerned with the symbolism. Among them may be named Claudius Apollinaris, bishop of Hierapolis about 171, a contemporary of Irenæus. A fragment ascribed to him 1 reads as follows: ὁ τὸν ἁμαρτωλὸν ἀπεκτέθη (cf. v. 37), ἐγέρθη ἐκ τῆς πλευρᾶς αὐτοῦ τὰ δύο πῶλα καθώς θάμαν καὶ ἰμαντίς, λύγοι καὶ πνεύμα. Here the Water and the Blood seem to correspond respectively to the Word and the Spirit (for it is arbitrary to suppose that the order is to be reversed), as they do in the famous Comma Joanneum about the Three Heavenly Witnesses; and this suggests a doubt as to the genuineness of the alleged quotation from Claudius Apollinaris. In any case, the writer holds that the Water and the Blood at the Crucifixion are "the two things that again purify," πῶλα probably referring to the purifications under the Old Covenant. He may have had in mind the dedication of the Covenant with Israel (Ex. 24:8), which in Heb. 9:2 is said to have been with the blood of the victims and with water (water is not mentioned in Ex. 24). The elder Lightfoot 2 suggested that this was in the thought of the evangelist here, but there is now hint of anything of the kind in his words.

Tertullian finds in the water and the blood, symbols of the two kinds of baptism, that of the martyr being a baptism with blood (de Pud. 22). In another place, he suggests that there is a prefiguration of the two sacraments, which is the favourite comment of later theologians. The passage (de Bapt. 16) is the first which indicates a connexion with x Jn. 5, and must therefore be quoted in full: Venerat enim per aquam et sanguinem, sicut Joannes scripit, ut aqua tingeretur, sanguis glaciscotur, proinde nos facetur aqua vocatus, sanguine electos. Hos duo baptismos de vulnere perfossi lateris emisit, quaterum qui in sanguinem eis crederent, aqua lavarentur, qui aqua lavissent, etiam sanguinem potarent." 3

1 See Routh, Rel. Sacr. i. 161.
2 Cf. Toplady's hymn, "Rock of Ages":

"Let the water and the blood,
From Thy riven side which flowed,
Be of sin the double cure.
Cleanse me from its guilt and power."

3 Hor. Hebr. iii. 440.
4 The author of the curious treatise Pintus Sophia (circa 280 A.D.) brings into juxtaposition (c. 141) the Water of x Jn. 4, the Blood of

xix. 35.

XIX. 35. THE TRUE WITNESS

ὁ ἑκάστου μαρτυρῶν, καὶ ἀληθινή ἀφοῦ ἔστω ἡ μαρτυρία, καὶ

We need not pursue the patristic interpretations further.

36. This verse is omitted in e (Cod. Palatinus of the fifth century), nor does it appear in the rearrangement of the Gospel texts called fu (Cod. Fuldaensis of the sixth century). From this slender evidence Blass 1 concluded that the verse was of doubtful genuineness, and must be treated as a later gloss. But such a conclusion is perverse in the face of the overwhelming mass of MSS and vst. which contain the passage, not to speak of its characteristically Johannine style.

ὁ ἑκάστου μαρτυρῶν. Jn. lays much stress on "witness" (see Intro.d., pp. xx-xiii), and here the witness of the incident that has just been recorded is John the Beloved Disciple, who has been mentioned in v. 26 as having been present at the Cross. This is strictly parallel to x 21, αὐτός ἐκεῖν ἐστιν ὁ μαθητὴς ὁ μαρτυρῶν πιστὸς, where also the Beloved Disciple is the witness to whom appeal is made.

καὶ ἀληθινή ἀφοῦ ἔστω ἡ μαρτυρία. This is (as again at x 21) the attestation of Jn. that the evidence of the Beloved Disciple is genuine and trustworthy (see on x 18 for ἀληθινός).

καὶ ἑκάστος ὁ ἕκαστος ἐστιν ἡ μαρτυρία. Here, once more, we have a parallel at x 24, πιστὸς ὁ ἑκάστος ἐστις ἡ μαρτυρία ἔστω. Nonnus is so certain of the parallelism that he alters ὁ ἕκαστος into ὁ ἑκάστος as at x 24. But the reference of ἑκάστος must be more closely examined.

It has been thought that ἑκάστος here designates the actual writer of the Gospel, including this verse. ἑκάστος is used at x 6 by the Speaker of Himself. A closer parallel is provided by Josephus. He writes of his doings in the third person, and says that once he had thought of escaping from the city, but that the people begged him to remain: ὁ ἐφιάλτων τοῦ ἑκάστου, ἑκάστου ἓκαστος, ἀλλὰ πλὴρα τῶν ἑκάστων αὐτὸν γὰρ ἥξιον τετελεσθαι ἑκάστου λογίου μένοντος (Bell. Jud. iii. 7, 10). Here ἑκάστος is the author; and to those who accept the view that the Beloved Disciple was the writer of the Fourth Gospel as well as the witness to whom he appeals, the language of Josephus helps to justify the use of ἑκάστος in x 25 although in Josephus it is markedly contrasted with ἑκάστος. Nevertheless, such a way of speaking would be curiously
indirect here. If the writer is the eye-witness, he has already said of himself that his witness is trustworthy, and he does not strengthen his affirmation by repeating it in so awkward a fashion.

Grammatically, εὐαγγέλιον is, indeed, resumptive of αὐτῷ in the the preceding clause, being used for the sake of emphasis; cf. τῷ ἐν οἴσε ἄντις, ὅτι παρ εὐαγγελίῳ εἴμι, καθέναι με ἐπιστάσει (see also τοῦ). As we take the word and εὐαγγέλιον ἂν ἄριθμος, the words of the evangelist, but not of the witness; and the repetition is not meaningless. "If he is the Beloved Disciple himself, "knows," for he is yet alive, "that he is telling true things." The evangelist's tribute is his own, and so is not exactly the certificate of 23 which is that of the elders of the Church. Jn. assures his readers that the aged apostle knows exactly what he is saying: εὐαγγέλιον ἂν. The alteration by Nonius of ἂν into ἵνα is a paraphrase which alters the sense.

A quite different explanation of εὐαγγέλιον has been held by some critics since the days of Erasmus. It is said to apply to Christ Himself, who may be appealed to as the Witness here, εὐαγγέλιον being used absolutely of Him as it is in π. 28., 31, where He has not been named in the immediate context. In τοῦ, on this showing, εὐαγγέλιον ἂν ἄριθμος λέγει is a parenthetical observation, claiming the support of Christ for the testimony borne by the Beloved Disciple: "Jesus knows that he is telling the truth." This is very unlike the manner of the author of the Fourth Gospel (although Paul has a similar assurance, 2 Cor. 13.). The same may be said of the attempt to refer εὐαγγέλιον here to God the Father, as at 26, 37, where εὐαγγέλιον is undoubtedly used of Him. It might be thought more plausible to hold that εὐαγγέλιον ἂν was an allusion here to the witness of the Paraclete (of whom εὐαγγέλιον is used 14, 15, 16, 18, 24); the words διδάσκαι, ματαιωθήσεται, ἐλθεῖν ἀναλύει are being associated with the witness of the Spirit in π. 17., 31.; but we have seen already that the exegesis which refers 1. 24. to 1. 19. is improbable.

The fact is that there is nothing distinctive of Deity in the use of εὐαγγέλιον by Jn. (see on 3.). In the Fourth Gospel εὐαγγέλιον stands in the same way for John the Baptist (39), or Moses (5), or the blind man (5), or Mary of Bethany (11, 20, 21, 22), or Peter (181., 20), or the Beloved Disciple himself (13, 21, 22). The pronoun is a favourite one with Jn., and he uses it to express emphasis or for clearness irrespectively of the person to whom it is applied. Here we hold it to refer

1 E.g. in our day by Zahn (Einl. S. 474), Sanday (Criticism of Fourth Gospel, 78), and Abbott (Diss. 238, 273).
38. After he had slain him, the chief priests and the scribes and elders of the people, 279\footnote{\textit{Apol.}, i. 52, \textit{Tryph.}, 64), and in \textit{Tryph.}, 32 distinguishes the two Advents, thus: διὸ ταρακούνα αὐτῶν γεγονήσιν ἐγγύσεις, μὲν μὲν ἐν τῷ ἐσχατοτέρῳ ὑμῖν, δευτέραν δὲ ὑπὸ ἐπιγνώσεως ἐν τῷ ἐσχατοτέρῳ.  

It is clear that Jn. did not use the LXX here, and while he may have translated independently from the Hebrew, it is more probable that he has adopted a version current in his time.

Abbott (\textit{Diat.}, 2318) suggests that Jn. means the prophecy to apply to the four soldiers (whom he fantastically supposes to represent the four quarters of the globe): “they shall look on Him whom they pierced.” But Zech. 12.10 refers in its original context to “the inhabitants of Jerusalem”, and it is more natural to take the Jews for the subject of “they shall look.” It was to the Jews that Jesus was delivered to be crucified (v. 16), and the “piercing” was, indirectly, their act.

\textbf{The burial of the Body of Jesus (\textit{vv.} 38-42)}

88. μετὰ ταῦτα is the phrase by which Jn. introduces new sections of the narrative. See \textit{Introd.}, p. cviii.

\textit{ἀρματαίας} ἀπὸ Λαμπρίτου. Arimathæa is probably to be identified with the O.T. Ramathaim-Loebah (1 Sam. 2:1; cf. 1 Macc. 11:44), a place about 12 miles E.N.E. of Lydda, and about 60 miles from Jerusalem. Joseph was a member of the Sanhedrin, ἐκεῖ ἀρχιερεῖ τῆς Λωρίσσης (Mk. 15:46), and rich (according to Mt. 27:57), Lk. 23:50 adding the information that he was a good and just man, who had not consented to the proceedings of his colleagues in the condemnation of Jesus. He was a disciple of Jesus, in the wider sense of μαθητής (cf. Mt. 27:57), although a secret one, ἀκροβυσσινός δὲ διὰ τῆς φαμαριας τῶν ἱερατῶν (cf. 7:13). Mk. only says of him that he was “looking for the kingdom of God.” Pseudo-Peter alleges that he was a friend of Pilate and of the Lord. But he was not a familiar figure among the disciples of Jesus, for the Galilean women do not seem to have been acquainted with him: they only watched what he and his servants did at the tomb (Mk. 15:47). It was only after the Crucifixion that Joseph and Nicodemus avowed their discipleship by their solicitude for reverent treatment of the body of Jesus. Mk. notes that Joseph went to make his request to Pilate, τολμήσας “having plucked up his courage” (Mk. 15:46).

Joseph's request and his subsequent action are narrated in all the Gospels (Mt. 27:57, Mk. 15:46, Lk. 23:50); in Pseudo-Peter (§ 4) the request is made in advance before the Crucifixion, and is referred to Herod before it is granted.

Turner has suggested \footnote{\textit{Ch. Quarterly Review, July 1912, p. 297.} that Joseph’s petition to Pilate was made at the time when the deposition from the Sanhedrin asked that the death of the crucified persons should be hastened (see above on v. 31); and, although Jn. introduces v. 38 with μετὰ ταῦτα, this is more probable than the alternative that Pilate gave two separate audiences on the subject of the death of Jesus and the subsequent disposal of His body.

At any rate, Pilate acceded to the request of Joseph that the body of Jesus should be given him for burial, and made no difficulty about it. ἐδοξασαν τὸ σῶμα is Mk.’s phrase (Mk. 15:47): he gave the corpse freely, (cf. Mk. 6:10, Mt. 14:3.)

After the σῶμα is given to Jn. uses the word σῶμα only of a dead body (see \textit{Introd.}, p. clxx). Joseph arrived at the Cross before the soldiers had finished their task; cf. ἀδεια, v. 31.

89. For ἀδεια (ABL) the rec. has the explanatory πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν, with ΝΔΠΝΔΑΩ. ΝΔΠΝΔΩ ἀδεια, “a roll,” but this is probably a corruption of μια, “a mixture” or “confection” (cf. Ecclus. 38:1), which all other MSS. authorities support, two cursives giving σμός or σμήνα. Originally the word was σμήνα which could easily be corrupted into σμήα. Neither word occurs elsewhere in N.T.

With ΝΔΠΝΔΩ, is to be preferred to ἀδεια of rec. text.

For Nicodemus see on 31\footnote{Ch. Quarterly Review, July 1912, p. 297.} 1; he is described here as ἥλιος ὁ ἄγων νικητὸς τοῦ πρῶτος, recalling his former interview with Jesus (see on 750). It has been suggested that he is to be identified with Joseph of Arimathea,\footnote{Ch. Quarterly Review, July 1912, p. 297.} which has no more probability than the fancy that he is only an ideal character invented by Jn. (see on 31). In this passage he is represented as assisting Joseph of Arimathea in the preparation of the body of Jesus for burial, after Pilate had given his permission: but with that timid caution which was a characteristic (see on 750) he does not seem himself to have approached Pilate in the first instance. Nicodemus was probably a rich man, for a hundred pounds weight of spicery was a costly gift. It is not
said that Nicodemus bought the spices for this special purpose (there would have been little time for that); probably he brought them from his own house.

The myrrh was a sweet-smelling gum which was mixed with the powdered aromatic wood of aloes. Myrrh and aloes are mentioned together as forming a fragrant mixture or confection several times in the O.T. (Ps. 44:4, Prov. 7:19, Cant. 4:16). The use of such spices, when a dead body was placed with honour in its sepulchre, is mentioned in connexion with the burial of King Asa (2 Chron. 16:14). They appear also to have been used for embalming, but nothing is said of such an intention in this case.

There was little time before the Sabbath came on, and no final disposition of the Body in its resting-place was attempted. Pseudo-Peter says that it was washed, which may be only an imaginative addition to the narrative. It was not anointed; the anointing (cf. Mk. 14:8, Mt. 26:12) was postponed until the day after the Sabbath, when the women came to do it, having bought spices on their own account (Mk. 16:1, Lk. 24:1).

40. ἦσαν δὲ ἐν κηρ. "Then they took the body of Jesus," i.e. Joseph and Nicodemus. Mk., followed by Mt., tells that Mary Magdalene and Mary the wife of Clopas were present at the burial; they had been at the Cross (as Jn. has told already, v. 25), and they waited until the end. Salome was also at the Cross (see on v. 25), but she may have accompanied her sister Mary the Mother of Jesus when she left the scene (v. 27); at any rate, she is not mentioned by name as having been at the burial (cf. Lk. 23:56).

ἐκέρ ων ἀνάθεται μετὰ τῶν ἄρωμάτων, "they bound it with strips of cloth, with the spices"; apparently the spices were scattered freely between the folds of the cloths, and the body was embedded in them. It was the custom of the Jews (as distinct from that of the Egyptians) to bury (ὑποθῆκεν; cf. Gen. 50:9 where this word is used of the embalming of Jacob) in this way. Cf. Jn. 19:44 for the "swathes" (κοφία) with which Lazarus had been bound.

The word ἄθρωμα, "linen cloth," occurs again only in 20:2-7 and Lk. 24:12 (cf. Judg. 14:16). The Synoptists in their accounts of the burial have the word σωμάτων. Milligan (iii.) cites the use of ἄθρωμα in papyri for burial linen, or for the wrappings of a mummy.

1 See Latham, The Risen Master, p. 36 f., for a suggestive study of what was done.
XX. 1. The narrative in Jn. 20 of the appearances of Christ after His Resurrection, like the narrative in Lk. 24 and the Marcan Appendix, tells only of appearances in Jerusalem or its immediate neighbourhood. On the other hand, the narrative of Mt. 28\textsuperscript{a,\textit{b}} tells of an appearance in Galilee, and in this it probably follows the Lost Conclusion of Mk. The Appendix to Jn. (c. 11) also lays the scene of a manifestation of Christ in Galilee. There are thus two traditions as to the appearances of the Risen Lord: one which places them in Jerusalem, and another which places them in Galilee. It may be impossible, from the evidence at our disposal, to construct a complete table which shall indicate the order in which they occurred; but there is no inherent difficulty in the circumstance that they were not all observed in the same locality. If it is accepted that Jesus rose from the dead, it was as easy for Him to manifest Himself to His disciples in Jerusalem and in Galilee, as in Jerusalem only or in Galilee only. The Jerusalem tradition is followed in c. 20, with the addition of particulars which no other authority gives, and which may plausibly be referred to the eye-witness whose testimony is behind the narrative. In c. 21 we have a version of the Galilean tradition (see p. 690,\textsuperscript{a}).

The Sepulchre found empty by Mary Magdalene, and by Peter and John (XX. 1-10)

1. τῇ δὲ μεθ ὧν συνήθοντο... τοῖς σχολείοις ἐν στίγμῃ. Mk. 16\textsuperscript{a} says in like manner, λίθον πρὸς τῇ μᾶς σωβατόν. For προφ., see on 18\textsuperscript{a}. Lk. 24\textsuperscript{a} and Mt. 28\textsuperscript{a} agree in mentioning "the first day of the week," and in describing the visit to the tomb as being made in the half-light just before dawn.

Jn. names Mary Magdalene only as visiting the tomb, but the plur. ὀμοίως of v. 2 suggests that she was not alone, and that her perplexity as to how the Lord's body had been disposed of was shared by others. It is unlikely that a woman would have ventured by herself outside the city walls before daylight, and the Synoptists agree in telling that she was accompanied by others. Mk. 16\textsuperscript{a} names as her companions Mary the mother of James (i.e. the wife of Cleopas; see on 21\textsuperscript{a}) and Salome, the Virgin's sister, who were also present at the Crucifixion with her (16\textsuperscript{a}). Mt. 28\textsuperscript{a} only names "Mary Magdalene and the other Mary." Lk. 24\textsuperscript{a} mentions "Mary Magdalene and Joanna and Mary the mother of James and the other women."

XX. 1-8.] WOMEN VISIT THE TOMB 657

ἐκ τοῦ μυστήριού. 2. τρεῖς ὄνειρο καὶ ἔρχεται πρὸς Σίμων Πέτρον καὶ Πseudo-Peter (§ 11) also notes that Mary Magdalene was accompanied by other women.

Jn. does not say what the purpose of this visit to the tomb was; and in this he is in agreement with Mt. 28\textsuperscript{a}, where it is merely told that they went "to see the sepulchre." But Mk. 16\textsuperscript{a} and Lk. 24\textsuperscript{a} 24\textsuperscript{a} explain that the purpose of the women was to anoint the body of Jesus. In Jn.'s narrative (see 18\textsuperscript{a}) the body was hastily laid in spices on the Day of Crucifixion by Joseph and Nicodemus, but there was no time for any anointing then, or final disposition of the body. Nothing further could be done on the Sabbath, and the women came as early as possible the next morning, with the spices and unguents that they had provided for themselves (Mk. 16\textsuperscript{a}, Lk. 24\textsuperscript{a}).

We hold that Mary Magdalene is the same person as Mary of Bethany (see Additional Note on 12\textsuperscript{a}-\textsuperscript{b}); and her desire to anoint the body of her Master is thus significant in connexion with His words to her when she anointed His feet at Bethany (14\textsuperscript{a}). She had kept the ointment "against the day of His burying." Jn., however, does not introduce this point expressly. He narrates Mary's visit to the tomb briefly, because what he is anxious to describe is the subsequent visit of Peter and the Beloved Disciple, which was suggested by her report.

Both Mk. and Lk. agree with Jn. in the statement that Mary (and the other women) found the stone taken away from the tomb. For τον λίθον ἁρματον ἐκ τοῦ μυστήριον, see on 11\textsuperscript{a}.\textsuperscript{1}

According to the Johannine narrative, Mary does not suspect as yet that anything out of the ordinary course of nature has happened. She sees that the stone which sealed the sepulchre has been removed, and (seemingly) she looks in to assure herself that the tomb is empty (v. 2); but her inference is only that the body has been removed to some other resting-place.

2. τρέχοντες δέν κτίλαν. The haste with which the women ran back from the tomb is mentioned also Mk. 16\textsuperscript{a}, Mt. 28\textsuperscript{a}.

ἔρχεται πρὸς Σίμων Πέτρον. Peter was still, despite his denial of Jesus, reckoned as the leader, or at any rate as one of the leaders, of the disciples; and so it is naturally to him that the surprising news of the tomb being empty is carried first. He has not been mentioned since 18\textsuperscript{a}; and so on his reappearance in the narrative, Jn., according to his habit (see on 18\textsuperscript{a}), gives his full name Simon Peter. The names of the

\textsuperscript{1} See Latham, The Risen Master, p. 37, and cf. p. 225.

\textsuperscript{1} Latham supposes that the other women looked into the tomb and reported its empress to Mary (i.e. p. 40).
disciples to whom the women brought the news are not specified in Mt. 28; but cf. Lk. 24.14.

καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἄλλον μαθητὴν κτλ. As Bengel observes, the repetition of πρὸς indicates that Peter and the "other disciple" were not lodging in the same house. The women had to visit them separately. Cf. πρὸς αὐτούς of v. 10, and see 29.

δὲ ἐξῆλθεν ἡ Ἰουσία. See 13, and cf. 21. This association of Peter and the "Beloved Disciple" is significant, in view of the identification of the Beloved Disciple with John, the son of Zebedee. See Introd., pp. xxxiv ff.

"Ἡραὶ τὸν κόσμον κτλ., "they have taken away the Lord from the tomb, and we do not know where they have laid Him." The subject of ἱηραὶ is indefinite; Mary and her companions did not know who they were. For the designation of Jesus as "the Lord," see the note on 14.

The plur. ἱηραὶ, as has been noted on v. 1, suggests that Mary was speaking for her companions as well as for herself.

8. Peter takes the lead, more suaviter. εἰσῆλθεν ὁ πέτρος καὶ ὁ ἄλλος μαθητής. For the singular verb ἐσῆλθεν, see Mt. 28.1.

καὶ ἦρωντο κτλ., "and they set out for the tomb." In the Musée du Luxembourg at Paris there is a remarkable picture by E. Burnand of Peter and his young companion hastening to the sepulchre, which will repay examination.

9. ἃ ἔθηκαν κτλ., "So they began to run together, and the other disciple ran on in front more quickly than Peter." προτέρχοντας occurs again in N.T. only at Lk. 19.4. Cf. 1 Mac. 16.3.

καὶ ἦλθαν πρῶτος κτλ. The Beloved Disciple was probably the younger man of the two.

8. καὶ παρεκάθισεν βλέπειν καὶ γίνεται τὰ ἱδώνα. This sentence invites comparison with the parallel passage Lk. 24.12 in the text, viz.: ὃ ἐν ἐκείνῳ ἠρων ἐκή πρὸς τὸ μυστήριον καὶ παρακάθισεν βλέπειν τὰ ἱδώνα καὶ διέλθε ὧλος πρὸς αὐτόν, ἰμπρπηγμένῳ τὸ γεγονός. With ἐπέλθε ὧλος πρὸς αὐτόν cf. Jn. 20.10, ἐπέλθαν δὲ μάθην τῆς ἱδώνας καὶ ἐμφάνισεν τοῖς ἰμπρπηγμένοις τοῖς μαθηταῖς.

The verse Lk. 24.23 is found in ΚΑΒΔΛΑΤΩ, the old and the Pesh. Syriac, and in cff., a strong combination. It is omitted in D a b e f g etc., and on that account Westcott-Hort place it in double brackets, treating it as a "Western non-interpolation." They regard it as "condensed and simplified" from Jn. 20.23, ἰμπρὴγματε τὸ γεγονός, being added to the Johannine account. Yet Hort's view of what he calls "Western non-interpolations" is not universally accepted, and, in this instance, it is hard to believe that a scribe would be bold enough to alter so materially a statement made in the Fourth Gospel after it had received general acceptance, and thus to omit all mention of the Beloved Disciple as Peter's companion. On the contrary, the evidence for Lk. 24 being part of the original text of Lk. is too strong to be set aside by the authority of D, an admittedly eccentric manuscript; and the textual inference from the verbal similarities between Lk. 24 and Jn. 20 seems to be that Jn., here as often elsewhere (see Introd., p. xcix), is using Lk.'s words for the purpose of correcting him. It was not Peter, he says, who peeped into the tomb and saw the linen wrappings lying on the ground, but it was the Beloved Disciple, who had arrived at the tomb before Peter did. He retains the words of Lk. so as to make it clear that he is dealing with the same incident, but he corrects the narrative of Lk. in so far as Peter is represented as being alone. Thus "he went home" in Lk. 24 becomes "the disciples went home" in Jn. 20.

The difference between Lk. and Jn. is that between a man who is reproducing a generally accepted tradition, and that of an author relying on and reproducing what he has been told by an eye-witness of, and a participator in, the events narrated. Lk., indeed, implies at 24.44 that he had heard that more than one disciple had gone to the tomb to verify the women's report that it was empty; but there is no reason to think that he alludes there to the visit of Peter and John. Pseudo-Peter says there were many visitors to the sepulchre.

τοποθέτησεν βλέπειν. τοποθέτησιν, in its primary and etymological meaning, would suggest "to stoop down for the purpose of looking." But in this sense the verb is seldom used, and in the LXX it always means "to peep" through a door or a window (cf. Gen. 26.8, Judg. 5.16, 1 Kings 6.1, 1 Chron. 25.20, Prov. 7.2, Cant. 2.14, Ecles. 12.21-22), without any stooping being implied. Cf. also Jas. 1.17. In Pet. 2.16, Nor does the word imply an earnest or searching gaze. The Beloved Disciple "peeped in and saw" is the rendering which best gives the sense.

1 See, e.g., Chase, Syno-Latin Test of the Gospels, p. 130 n., and Salmon, Some Criticisms of the Text of N.T., p. 130.

2 See Abbott, Dial. 1803.

3 So the Vulgate has here "cum se inclinasset, uidet."

4 Tatian makes no mention of stooping.


6 Vol. II—24
The Gospel According To St. John [XX. 8-9.]

John Believes

Milligan (I.e. ἄντιλαθος) cites a remarkable verbal parallel from a third-century magical papyrus, ἰνάπαμα τὰ φύλα ἐν συνθέρμα καί.

8. τὸτε ἐδίπλωσεν καὶ ἔδακρυσεν ρομποταὶ τοῦ μυριμον καὶ ἦλθεν κατὰ τὸν εἶδον συννόμων. 9. αὐτὸς ἦν ὁ τρισάξας τὴν γραφὴν. 8. τὸτε ἐδίπλωσεν καὶ ἔδακρυσεν ρομποταὶ τοῦ μυριμον καὶ ἦλθεν κατὰ τὸν οὐδεμισθεν καὶ τὸν ἔλθεν κατὰ τὸν οὐδεμισθεν καὶ τὸν ἔλθεν κατὰ τὸν οὐδεμισθεν καὶ τὸν ἔλθεν κατὰ τὸν οὐδεμισθεν καὶ τὸν ἔλθεν κατὰ τὸν οὐδεμισθεν καὶ τὸν ἔλθεν κατὰ τὸν οὐδεμισθεν καὶ τὸν ἔλθεν κατὰ τὸν οὐδεμισθεν καὶ τὸν ἔλθεν κατὰ τὸν οὐδεμισθεν καὶ τὸν ἔλθεν κατὰ τὸν οὐδεμισθεν καὶ τὸν ἔλθεν κατὰ τὸν οὗτοι κατὰ τὸν οὗτοι κατὰ τὸν οὗτοι κατὰ τὸν οὗτοι κατὰ τὸν οὗτοι κατὰ τὸν οὗτοι κατὰ τὸν οὗτοι κατὰ τὸν οὗτοι κατὰ τὸν οὗτοι κατὰ τὸν οὗτοι κατὰ τὸν οὗτοι κατὰ τὸν οὗτοι κατὰ τὸν ο المختلف. 8. τὸτε ἐδίπλωσεν καὶ ἔδακρυσεν ρομποταὶ τοῦ μυριμον καὶ ἦλθεν κατὰ τὸν οὐδεμισθεν καὶ τὸν οὗτοι κατὰ τὸν οὗτοι κατὰ τὸν οὗτοι κατὰ τὸν οὗτοι κατὰ τὸν οὗτοι κατὰ τὸν οὗτοι κατὰ τὸν οὗτοι κατὰ τὸν οὗτοι κατὰ τὸν οὗτοι κατὰ τὸν οὗτοι κατὰ τὸν οὗτοι κατὰ τὸν οὗτοι κατὰ τὸν οὗτοι κατὰ τὸν οὗτοι κατὰ τὸν οὗτοι κατὰ τὸν οὗτοι κατὰ τὸν οὗτοι κατὰ τὸν οὗτοι κατὰ τὸν οὗτοι κατὰ τὸν οὗτοι κατὰ τὸν οbyterian.

Peter may have told John what he saw; at any rate, John no longer refrained from entering the tomb, "and he saw and believed" (ἐδίπλωσεν καὶ ἔδακρυσεν). He had no vision of the Risen Christ, but the sight of the abandoned grave-cloths was sufficient to assure him that Jesus had risen from the dead. Jn. (16) and the Synoptists (Mk. 8) with parallele agree in telling that Jesus had, on one occasion or another, assured the disciples that He would rise from the grave, and that they would see Him again. They had not understood or appreciated what He meant. But when John, the Beloved Disciple, saw the grave-cloths and the napkin in the tomb, the meaning of the strange predictions to which he had listened came to him with a flash of insight. "He saw and believed." This was a moment in his inner life, which was so charged with consequence, that he could never forget it, and the incident is recorded here as explaining how and when it was that he reached the fulness of Christian faith. That he "believed" without "seeing" his Risen Lord was in marked contrast to the attitude of Thomas, to whom it was said, "Blessed are they that have not seen and yet have believed." (v. 29).

ὅπιστας. Syr. sin. has "they believed," and 69, 124 give ὅπιστας, a mistaken correction due to a desire to include Peter, as also "believing." For, although Peter "believed," it seems to have been after the Risen Christ had appeared to him (Lk. 24:44, 1 Cor. 15), and not after his first glance at the tomb. He went away, according to Lk. 24:14 (wondering at that which was come to pass.

Drusus has the eccentric reading οἷς ὅπιστας, the scribe being misled by the words which follow.

For παραθηκὼς used absolutely, without the object of belief being specified, see on 17.

8. ἀνείπτωσεν (cf. 15) γὰρ ἔφυτεν τὴν γραφήν. γὰρ is often used by Jn. to introduce a comment on incidents or words which have been recorded (cf. e.g. 31 and 53). Here γὰρ does not introduce the reason for, or explanation of, the faith of John. Its meaning is, "You must remember that, etc. Jn. is thinking of his readers, who may be surprised that Peter and the Beloved Disciple were not more quick to recognize what had happened. 11. You must remember that they did not
MARY SEES TWO ANGELS

As she wept, she "peeped" into the tomb. For parakustó see on v. 5.

12. καὶ θεωρεῖ δύο ἄγγελους κτλ., "and she notices (see on 25 and esp. v. 14 below) two angels in white" (in λευκοῖς, ἡτοι τὸ ἄνωθεν δυναμικὸς τὸν θεόν οὖ, ὑποκείμενον, the Greek idiom being the same as the English) "sitting, one at the head, and one at the feet, where the body of Jesus had lain."

All four Gospels agree in telling of an angelic appearance to the women at the tomb, but there are discrepancies in the various accounts. In Mk. 16 the women "entering into the tomb, saw a young man sitting on the right side, arrayed in a white robe"; in Mt. 28 the women (apparently) see an angel descending from heaven who rolls away the stone from the tomb and sits upon it. As in Mk., he tells the women that Jesus is risen, and has gone into Galilee. In Lk. 24, after the women have entered the tomb and found it empty, "two men stood by them in dazzling apparel," who remind them that when Jesus "was yet in Galilee" He had predicted that He would rise on the third day. The Marcan saying about the risen Lord having gone to Galilee is thus altered by Lk., who mentions no Galilean appearance, and follows a Jerusalem tradition. It is noteworthy that "two men in white apparel" are mentioned again by Lk. in Acts 1, as appearing to the apostles at the Ascension. In Jn. we have "two angels in white," who only ask Mary why she is weeping. They do not give any message or counsel, for Jesus Himself is immediately seen by Mary.

It was a common belief that angels or celestial visitors were clad in white. Cf. Dan. 10 εἰς ἱδιαίης βίαν, and Ezek. 9; Rev. 15 ἄγγελοι . . . ἀναβαίνοντες λόγω καθάρσεως καὶ ἄνωθεν. In Ἑν Λκ. xxxvii. 2 mention is made of beings coming forth from heaven "who were like white men." Mk. and Mt. only mention one angel, but Lk. and Jn. mention two. The appearance of a pair of angels seems to be a not unusual feature of what were believed to be heavenly visitations; e.g. in 2 Macr. 36 two young men appeared to Heliodorus, "splendid in their apparel" (διαφωτισθείς τοῦ προσώπου). So, too, in the Apocalypse of Peter (§ 3) two men suddenly appeared, καὶ ἐπέστη ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τὴν θέαν . . . τοῦ ἄγγελου. The development of legend is well illustrated by the fanciful narrative which is found in the Gospel of Peter of the appearances at the sepulchre. First (§ 9) the soldiers saw "three men coming out of the tomb, two of them supporting the other," i.e. two angels supporting Christ. Then (§ 10) the heavens are opened and "a
XX. 14. [APPEARANCE TO MARY]

καὶ θεωρεῖ τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἑπτάτην, καὶ σκότος ἐστὶν Ἰησοῦν ἑπτάτην.

καὶ. The absence of connecting particles in vv. 14–18 is noteworthy.

For τοῖς ὑστορον cf. 6:8 18. Mary turned round, perhaps being half-conscious (as often happens) that someone was behind her.

καὶ θεωρεῖ τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἑπτάτην, "and notices Jesus standing."

The two watchers in the tomb had been seated. θεωρεῖ (cf. v. 12, and see on 21) is the verb used in the promise to the disciples οὕτως θαυμάσετε με (14:19). Such "seeing" would be impossible for unbelievers; it was a vision possible only for faith.

καὶ ἠκούει ἵνα Ἰησοῦν ἑπτάτην. She did not recognise Him. A similar thing in like words is told of the disciples on the lake (21:1); and of the two on the way to Emmaus (Lk. 24:16). The Marcan Appendix says of this latter incident that He was "manifested in another form" (ἐν ἄλλῳ μορφῇ, Mk. 16:12). Cf. Mt. 28:17, where "some doubted." See further on 21.

This appearance of the Risen Lord to Mary is not mentioned by Lk., but the Marcan Appendix (Mk. 16) agrees with the Fourth Gospel in mentioning it as the first manifestation of Jesus after His Resurrection. Cf. Mt. 28:16.

An essential difference between the Gospel stories of visions of the Risen Lord, and the stories widespread in all countries and in all times of visions of departed friends after death, is that all the Gospels lay stress on the empty tomb.1 It was the actual body that had been buried which was revived, although (as it seems) transfigured, and, so to speak, spiritualised. This must be borne in mind when the evangelical narratives of the Risen Jesus speaking, and seeing (Lk. 24:24; cf. Jn. 20:12, 16), and being touched (Lk. 24:28; and perhaps Jn. 20:27) as well as seen, are examined critically. Such statements are difficult of credence, for no parallel cases are reported in ordinary human experience; but they must be taken in connexion with the repeated affirmations of the Gospels that the tomb of Jesus was empty, and that it was His Body and not only His Spirit which was manifested to the disciples. See also on v. 20.

The question has been asked, how did the evangelists believe the Risen Lord to have been clothed, not only when Mary saw Him in the garden, but when He manifested Himself to the assembled disciples (vv. 19, 26)? It is difficult to suppose (with Tholuck and others) that He appeared only in the loin-

1 I have endeavoured to draw out this distinction in Studia Sacra, p. 122 f.
15. λέγει αὐτῇ Ἰρσοῦν Γώα, τί κλαίς; τίνα ἔχεις; ἐναίθη δοκοῦσα δὴ τὸ κατωρθὸς κτεῖν, λέγει αὐτῇ Κύριε, εἰς σε ἤδεσσας αὐτήν, εἰσὶ μοί τοῖς θέμεσις αὐτῶν, κἀκεῖ ἅτεν ἤρησα. 16. λέγει αὐτῇ Ἰρσοῦν κloth which He had been crucified and buried. His appearances after death were more intense, indeed, than the appearances of dead men to their friends (for which there is some evidence); but just as in the latter case the eye of love clothes the vision in familiar garments, so it may have been in the more objective and more significant manifestations of the risen body of Jesus.

18. λέγει αὐτῇ Ἰρσοῦν. ΝΒΛ om. the rec. δ before Ἰρσοῦν (see on 14. 20).

Γώα, τί κλαίς; This is a repetition of the question put to Mary (v. 13) by the watchers at the tomb. In like manner, in Mt. 28: 10 the message given by the angel to the women is repeated by the risen Jesus, when they see Him. But, whether this be only a coincidence or no, in the Johannine story Jesus adds τίνα ἔχεις; He knew whom she was seeking, and what was the cause of her grief, whereas there is nothing in vv. 11-13 to show that the watchers at the tomb understood her tears, or knew that she was a disciple of Jesus.

Mary does not recognize Jesus at once, nor do His first words tell her who He was. She thinks He may be the gardener, probably because at so early an hour the gardener was the most likely person to be met in the garden (see 19). It is plain, however, that she does not find anything abnormal in the appearance or dress or voice of Him who speaks to her.

δ’ κατωρθὸς. The word does not occur again in the Greek Bible, but is common in the papyri (see Milligan t.s.i.).

Κύριε (an ordinary title of respect), εἰς σε ἤδεσσας αὐτήν. "Sir, if you have stolen Him away," Her mind is so full of her quest, that she does not answer the question "For whom are you looking?" She assumes that everyone must know who it is for βαστάζων in the sense of "to steal," see on εἰσε.

εἰπὲ μοι πωδ ἔχεις αὐτῶν κτῆς, "tell me where you have laid Him and I will take Him away." She does not stay to consider if she would have strength by herself to remove the body to a fitting resting-place.

1 E. C. Hoskins finds a mystical meaning in the whole story: "The risen Lord is a κατωρθός, for He is the Lord of the Garden, and once more He walks in His garden in the cool of the day, the early morning, and converses not with the fallen, but with the redeemed," C.f. Gen. 3 (J.T.S., April 1910, p. 213). The idea is worthy of Origen, but is too subtle to be convincing.

XX. 18-17. MARY RECOGNISES JESUS

Ἰρσοῦν Μαρία, στραφαία ἐκεῖνῃ λέγει αὐτῇ Ἐβαστάζων "Ραββουνί (δ’ λέγεται Διδάσκαλα)." 17. λέγει αὐτῇ Ἰρσοῦν Μὴ μοι ἀπετερούν.

16. λέγει αὐτῇ Ἰρσοῦν. Here (see on v. 13) BD om. δ before Ἰρσοῦν, but ins. ΚΑΝΝΥΠ. Μαρία. So κΒΔΝΗ 1: 33; but the rec., with ΑΠΔΘ, has Μαρία. See on 19 for the spelling of the name.

Apparently Mary had turned her face away from Jesus towards the tomb, taking no interest in the gardener who gave her no help in her quest; for when she hears her name, she turns round again (στραφαία) in amazement. Who is this that calls her "Mary"? The personal name, addressed to her directly, in well remembered tones, reveals to her in a flash who the speaker is.

λέγει αὐτῇ Ἐβαστάζων. So κΒΔΝΗ, although the rec., with ΑΠ, om. Ἐβαστάζων. Mary addresses Jesus in the Aramaic dialect which they were accustomed to use. See on 5. for Ἐβαστάζων.

"Rabboni" (δ’ λέγεται Διδάσκαλα). The form Rabboni, "my Teacher," is found in N.T. here alone and at Mk. 10, but it is hardly distinguishable in meaning from Rabbi, the pronominal affix having no special force. In his Greek readers, as he interprets τατ’ Rabbi (see on 19). It will be remembered that Martha and Mary were accustomed to address Jesus as the Rabbi ὁ συνήκον (see 17), when talking to each other.

An interpretative gloss is added here by κΒΔΝ and fam. 13 εἰς καὶ προσέγαμεν ἀπὸ αὐτῶν, which appears also in Syr. sin. in the form "and she ran forward unto Him that she might draw near to (or to touch) Him." So also the Jerusalem Syriac. The gloss "et occurrit ut tangeretur cum" is found in several Latin texts with Irish affinities; e.g. in the Book of Armagh, the Egeria, MSS. (mm), Cant. Stowe, and Rawl. G. 167. The idea behind the gloss is probably that Mary approached to clasp the Lord's feet in respect and homage; cf. Mt. 28 where it is said of the women that "they took hold of His feet, and worshipped Him."

17. This verse must be compared with Mt. 28 where, again, the Risen Lord is seen by Mary Magdalene and speaks to her and her companion. In that passage the women, returning from the tomb to tell the disciples of the angel's message, are at once in fear and joy. Jesus greets them by saying Χαῖρετ. They clasp His feet in worship. He then tells them not to fear, Μὴ φοβεῖτε, and adds καλοῦντες ἀναγεννηταὶ.

2 Burkitt observes (Christian Beginnings, p. 45) that Jael said Rabboni to Sisera, according to the Aramaic Targum (Judg. 4).
as practically equivalent to ἔστημι or πορεύομαι often used by Jesus when predicting His departure.  
Thus the message which Mary was bidden to give to the disciples would recall to them words such as those of τρυπήνας, 4.  
Jesus was going to the Father's house, where He would prepare a place for them. It is remarkable that the form of the message is like that of τρυπήνας (probably based on the lost conclusion of Mk.), although there the place where He is to see His disciples again is not heaven but Galilee (cf. Mk. 14:28). Lk. 24:46, as has been already said, alters the Marcan and Matthew tradition here, by substituting for the promise of a meeting in Galilee, the words μεταφέρετο αὐτοῦ ἐκείνῳ τῷ ἔναν τῷ Γαλιλαίῳ, λέγων, that the Son of Man must die and rise again, etc. Abbott's inference from this comparison is that a separation misunderstood by Mk. and Mt. as meaning Galilee, and omitted by Lk. because he could not understand it at all, was understood by Jn. to mean My Father's place, i.e. Paradise.  
This is precarious reasoning, and at any rate it is certain that Jn. (12) was aware of the Marcan (2 Marcan tradition and (9) that he corrected it, bringing the message into correspondence with a saying of Jesus which he has previously recorded more than once. 
Attention must now be directed to the words τῆς Μαθαίου, which (according to all extant texts) Jesus addressed to Mary, His reason being "for I have not yet ascended to My Father. It is not said explicitly in this chapter that Jesus was ever touched by His disciples after He was risen, although it is suggested both in v. 22 and in v. 27. In the latter passage, Thomas is actually invited to touch the Lord's wounded side (although it is not said that he did so), just as in Lk. 24:38, Jesus says ψηλαφοῦσα μοι to the assembled disciples. The only explicit statement in the Gospels of the Risen Christ being touched is Mt. 28. Nevertheless Lk. 24:38 and Jn. 20:27 sufficiently indicate that, in the judgment of the evangelists, it was possible to touch Him, and that He invited that experiment to be made. (See further on v. 23.) 
Hence "Touch me not, for I have not yet ascended," is difficult of interpretation, inasmuch as within a week at any rate, and before His final manifestation at His departure, Jesus had challenged the test of touch. We can hardly suppose that Jn. means us to believe that in the interval between v. 17 and v. 27 the conditions of the Risen Life of Jesus had so changed that what was unsuitable on the first occasion became suitable
on the second. And there is the further difficulty, that as the words μη μου ἀπτων οὐκ ἔγραψεν καλ. stand, it is implied that to "touch" Jesus would be easier after His Ascension than before. The gloss et occurred us tangerat euam, which is inserted before noli me tangere in some texts (see on v. 19), shows that the primitive interpretation of the words implied a physical touching, and not merely a spiritual drawing near. The parallel Mt. 28:16 confirms this. Accordingly, to give to the repulse, "Touch me not," a spiritual meaning, as if it meant that freedom of access between the disciple and the Master would not be complete until the Resurrection had been consummated in the Ascension and the Holy Spirit had been sent, seems over-subtle. Yet this is what the words must mean if μη μου ἄπτων is part of the genuine text of Jn.

Meyer cited a conjectural emendation of these words (by Gersdorff and Schultenius) which he dismissed without discussion, but for which nevertheless there is a good deal to be said. We have drawn attention already to the parallel passage, Mt. 28:18, but there is yet another point to be noted. By all the Synoptists the fear of the women at the tomb is emphasised. ἰδοὺ δὲ ἡ γῆ (Mk. 16:8), although the νεκρὸς had said μη δοκείτε (τὸν νεκρὸν) on the tombs (τοὺς νεκρούς). They were ἰδοὺς (Lk 24:28). And in Mt. 28:16 not only the angel, but Jesus Himself prefaced His message to the disciples by saying to the women (after they had clasped His feet) μη δοκείτε μοι. Now in our texts of Jn. there is no hint that Mary Magdalene (who is the only woman mentioned here by this evangelist) was frightened at all. She is without fear, apparently, when she recognises the Lord. The parallel passage, Mt. 28:9, would suggest (as the gloss here does) that she cast herself at His feet in ad Astrum homage. We should expect here (as in Mk., Mt.) that Jesus would encourage her by forbidding her to be afraid. Instead of this, we find the enigmatic words μη μου ἀπτου. But if these words are a corruption of μη πιῶν, as might very well be the case, "be not affrighted," all is clear. This is the verb used of the fright of the disciples in Lk. 24:28 (περιφθάσαντες), caused as Lk. says by their idea that they saw a spirit. And μη πιῶν would come exactly where μη δοκείτε comes in Mt. 28:18, viz. after the Lord's feet have been clasped in homage and fear. The sequence, then, is easy. "Be not affrighted, for I have not gone up to my Father": I am still with you, as you know me on earth; I have not yet resumed the awful majesty of heaven. Do not fear: carry my message to the disciples, as in the old days.

The best supported reading is μη μου ἄπτου, but B has μη ἄπτου μου, and two cursive (47τ and 2κετ) omit μου altoge-

gether. If the text were originally μη πιῶν, an easy corruption would be μη ἄπτου, and then μου would naturally be added either before or after ἄπτου to make the sense clear.

οὕτω γὰρ ἀναβήσατα πρὸς τὸν Πατήρα τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν λέγει ὁ Παύσας ὑμῖν ἐν τῷ Παντελεήμονι καὶ τῷ θεῷ ὑμῖν καὶ τῷ θεῷ τῆς γυναῖκος, ὡς ὁ Ἰσραήλ, ἐξήκοντες ἢ ἐξήκοντες ἢ ἐξήκοντες ἢ ἐξήκοντες ἢ ἐξήκοντες ἢ ἐξήκοντες ἢ ἐξήκοντες ἢ ἐξήκοντες ἢ ἐξήκοντες ἢ ἐξήκοντες ἢ ἐξήκο

XX. 17–18.] "MY GOD AND YOUR GOD" 671

οὕτω γὰρ ἀναβήσασθαι πρὸς τὸν Πατήρα τοῦ Πατρῷ προσευχὴν ἔπεσεν εἰς πρὸς τοὺς ἀδελ-

INDEX TO ST. JOHN [XX. 17.

is taken my final departure. For Jn., a week at the least (v. 27, and see on 21) elapsed between the Resurrection and that last of the manifestations of the Risen Christ which we call the Ascension. He says nothing of the interval of forty days for which our only authority is Acts 1:7. But Jn., nevertheless, uses language (62τ) which implies not only that the final departure of Christ was a startling and wonderful incident, but that it was visible, in this agreeing with Lk. 24:51, Acts 1:8; cf. Acts 1:10 (Lk. 24:51). Anabainov πρὸς τὸν πατέρα μου. That was what He had said often before (in effect); but now He adds καὶ πάντα δῶμαι. His Father was their Father too, although there was a difference in the relation (see on 21); and of this He would remind them now. Observe He does not say "Our Father," καὶ θεὸν μου. So He said "My God" on the Cross (Mk. 15:32); cf. Rev. 3. He is still Man, and so Paul repeatedly has the expression "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ" (Rom. 15:5, etc.). And His God is the God also of His disciples —the only God.

ἐναντίον τῆς Μαρίας καὶ τῆς Μαρίας τῆς αὐγήλας καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τῆς Μαρίας καὶ τῆς ἀνα-

νάστασις τῶν ἱδρών. This was the first thing Mary said before she gave her message (cf. v. 5). In support ζῆσε, as against the rec. ζήσει (with ADLΔ). θέων. For ὁ κόσμος as a title used by Mary, see on 41.

The appearance to Mary is not mentioned by Paul in his summary of the visions of the Risen Christ (1 Cor. 15:7). It is the appearances to the leaders of the future Church (Peter and James), and to the assembled disciples, that were regarded as the basis for the Church's faith in the Resurrection.
First appearance of the Risen Christ to the disciples: their commission and their authority (vv. 15-23)

19. ὁ δὲ ὤν ὄψις τῷ ἡμέρᾳ τὴν μαθητὴν τῷ μαθητὴν, καὶ τοὺς ἱδρύους καὶ ἀκολούθοντες ἦσαν οἱ μαθηταὶ διὰ τὸν φιλόσωφον τῶν

The rec. adds συνημέρων (N6), but nABDW omit. Perhaps it was inserted by scribes because of its occurrence in the words of the promise, Mt. 18:20.

Συνημέρων. No attempt is made to explain how He came.

καὶ ἤτοι τὸ κέρατον (repeated v. 26). Lk. 24:34 has the more usual ἐν μέρος αὐτῶν; but ἐν τῷ μέρος after a verb of motion is quite correct (cf. Mk. 3:19, Lk. 6:46), and has classical authority (e.g. Xenophon, Cyrop. iv. i. 1, σὺν ἐπὶ τοὺς Μάρκους).

Justin (Apoph. 106) finds in Jesus standing in the midst of His brethren (cf. v. 17) a fulfillment of Ps. 22:28 (quoted Heb. 2:9),

καὶ ἔλεγεν ἄντων Ἐξῆλθεν ἦς. These words are found also in most texts of Lk. 24:36, but being omitted there by D a b e f l r are described by Hort as a "Western non-interpolation" in that place. If that judgment is correct, scribes have brought the words into Lk.'s text from Jn., where there is no doubt of their genuineness. It is, however, possible that the words are part of the original text of Lk.; and in that case they furnish an additional illustration of the use of Lk.'s tradition by Jn. at this point (see v. 26). Throughout their accounts of the appearance of the Risen Jesus to the apostles, it is clear that Jn. and Lk. are following the same tradition, while Jn. does not hesitate to correct and amplify or reduce the current version of it (as found in Lk.) at several points.

Ὑπάτος ὁ Σ. is the ordinary Eastern salutation on entering a room, and is so used (Lk. 24:36, Jn. 20:19, 29). But in v. 21 Ἐξῆλθεν ὤν is solemnly repeated before the apostles receive their commission, and may carry an allusion to the parting gift of peace in 14:23.

20. Here, again, we must compare Lk. 24:46 καὶ τοῦτο εἶπεν ἔδειξαν αὐτῷ τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τὸν πόνον, which also Hort regards as a "Western non-interpolation," for these words in Lk. are omitted by D a b e f l r Syr. cur. They are identical with the words in Jn. 20:26, except that in Jn. we have τὴν πληροφορίαν, while in Lk. we have τὸν πόνον. Jn. being the only evangelist who mentions the piercing of the Lord's side (19:34), it is natural that τὴν πληροφορίαν should not appear in Lk.; but if (as Hort supposes) the scribes of Lk. took over the words in question from Jn., they must have deliberately substituted τὸν πόνον for τὴν πληροφορίαν.

The words τὸν πόνον in Lk. 24:36, 40 provide the only
Biblical evidence for the belief that the Lord's feet as well as His hands were nailed to the Cross. In the narratives of the Crucifixion all that is said is "they crucified Him"; but it is not specified whether His hands and feet were tied or nailed to the Cross (both methods being common). Both Lk. and Jn. agree that His hands were marked, and Jn. speaks of "the print of the nails" in them (v. 25); but Jn. says nothing of the feet having been nailed. Pseudo-Peter, in like manner, speaks of drawing out the nails from the hands of Jesus, after He had died (§ 6), but does not mention the feet. So also Cyril of Jerusalem says nothing of the nailing of the feet, while he finds a symbolic meaning in the nailing of the hands (Cat. xliii. 30). The earliest reference (excepting Lk. 24:39, 40) to the nailing of the feet is in Justin's _Trypho_ (§ 97), who claims Ps. 22:30-31 as a literal prophecy of the Crucifixion. Having regard to the language of Jn. 20:29, as well as to the second-century tradition of Pseudo-Peter, it would seem as if the tradition of Lk. 24:39 [29] rests on the early application of "they pierced my hands and my feet" (Ps. 22:16) to the Crucifixion of Jesus rather than on the testimony of an eye-witness. Such testimony we believe to lie behind the narrative of the Fourth Gospel (cf. 19:37), and hence it is probable that the Lord's feet were not marked by the print of nails. Jn. in 20:29 is (in our view) deliberately correcting the account given in Lk. 24:39, 40 (for we take Lk. 24:39 to be as original as Lk. 24:40), so as to bring it into correspondence with the facts.


Jn. says only that Jesus _showed_ them His hands and His side; Lk. goes further and says that He invited them to dispel their doubts by handling and touching Him (φυλοφησα? το? με, Lk. 24:28); representing the disciples as disturbed and terrified by His sudden appearance. Jn. does not say that they touched Him, or that they were asked to do so; this omission being probably designed, so as to correct an over-statement in Lk.

A later tradition as to this incident, preserved in Ignatius (Smyrn. 3) must now be cited. Ignatius writes: "I know and believe that He was in the flesh even after the Resurrection, and when He came to Peter and his company (κυριος του? Πετρου), He said to them, 'Take, handle me,' and see that I Am not a bodiless demon (α?βαστε ψυλοφησα? το? με, και δει κινω το? και δεικνυων το? κυριου?). And straightway they touched Him (α?το?ι υγιη?, and they believed, being mixed with the...
parallel in form to the present passage) has to do in both cases
with a comparison of the Father’s relation to Christ and Christ’s
relation to the apostles, not to the general body of disciples.
It is natural to interpret the καθώς . . . καὶ γὰρ here as involving
the same comparison, and therefore to take the commission
here as entrusted to the apostles. Others may have been
present (see on v. 19), but the final commission was not
specifically given to any but the inner circle, who had been
lonelyly selected as those who were to be “sent forth.”
καὶ ἦσαν ποιμενεὶς ἐν δὲ πατρὶ. This is the constant theme
of the Johannine Christ when speaking of His authority. He
is, pre-eminently, δὲ ἀπόστολος (Heb. 3); for God the Father
has sent Him (cf. 37).
καὶ πάνω ἐπ’ αὐτοῦ. So καὶ ἀποστόλος, καὶ ἡ σοφία, καὶ ἰδιωταὶ, but no distinction can be drawn between πάνω
and ἐπ’ αὐτοῦ (see on 39 above).
The sending of the apostles by Christ was (in a deep sense,
although not with exact correspondence; see on 69) like the
sending of Christ by the Father. He had told them at the
Last Supper that whoever received those whom He sent re-
ceived Him, while those who received Him received the Father
that sent Him (136). Language of this kind is addressed in
the Fourth Gospel to the apostles alone; and it is difficult,
in the face of the parallel passages that have been cited, to
suppose that in this verse, and here only, the evangelist means
us to understand that the great commission was given to all
the disciples who were present, alike and in the same
deep sense. It is quite just to describe this verse as “The Charter
of the Christian Church” (Westcott), but the Charter was
addressed in the first instance to the leaders of the Church,
and not to all its members, present and future, without
discrimination.
The question as to who were the first recipients of the gift
and the authority conferred by Jesus in vv. 22, 23, has been
much debated in communion with modern controversies up to
Confession and Absolution; 1 but the exegete must ask one
question only, viz., “What did the evangelist intend his readers
to believe?” We must not assume, because Lk. 24, 42 tells
that others were with the Eleven on the evening of the Resur-
rection just before the Lord manifested Himself, that therefore
Jn. in his report of the same incident implies either (a) that
others beside the apostles were present when Jesus began to
speak, or (b) that His commission was not addressed exclusively
to the apostles even if others were there. On the contrary, the
language used by Jn. seems, as has been said, distinctly to
imply that the commission was given to apostles alone.
This was the interpretation put upon Jn. 20, 22 by the
earliest Christian writers who allude to these verses. Justin
(Tryph. 106) ignores the presence of any but apostles. Origen
(de princip. i. i. 7 and Comment. in Jn. 398) and Cyprian (de
unic. sanct. iv. 6) explicitly that Αἴτε πνεῦμα sancnum, etc., was addressed to the apostles. The Liturgy of
St. Mark (which may be as early as the second century) is
equally explicit. 2 I do not know, indeed, of any early writer who
takes a different view. The words of Cyprian (Epist.
ixxv. 16) in solos apostolos insufflavit Christus, etc., express the
accepted view as to the persons to whom the Lord said “Take
the Holy Spirit.” It would be going much further to claim
that Cyprian’s subsequent inference was justified, for he proceeds
to say: “potestas ergo peculatorum remittendorum apostolis
data est, et ecclesias quis quis illi christo missi constituerit, et
episcopi qui eis ordinacione uicaria successerunt.” The words
which are italicised need not necessarily be accepted by those
who recognise that Jn.’s narrative is a reflection of a commission
given in the first instance to the apostles alone.
22. καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἐπ’ αὐτοῦ ἐκφύησαν ἐκάθεν.
“He breathed upon them.” Ἐκφύησαν does not occur again in N.T., but it is the
verb used Gen. 2 (cf. Wisd. 15) of God “breathing” into
Adam’s nostrils the breath of life. So in Ezek. 37 “breath
on these slain that they may live” is addressed to the life-
giving Spirit. Milligan gives a parallel from a second or
third-century papyrus, ὁ ἐκφύησαν πνεῦμα ἐκφύησαν αὐτὸν ἐκ
κοινῆς.
The language of this verse goes back to Gen. 2, it being
implied that as the life of Adam was due to the “breath” of
God, so the gift of spiritual life to the apostles was imparted
by the “breath” of Christ. (Cf. 1 Cor. 15.) The Johannine
doctrine is that this quickening power of His Spirit could
not be released until the “glorification,” i.e. the death, of
Jesus (see on 20, 22) and in strict accordance with this, Jn.
represents the Spirit as given and received on the day of His
Resurrection. It is not that we have here a foretaste, as it were,
of a fuller outpouring of the Spirit which was manifested
at Pentecost (ἐρχεται ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος, as Bengel calls it); but that,
for Jn., the action and the words of Jesus here are a complete
fulfilment of the promise of the Paraclete. As has been said
on 1523 (where see note), there is nothing in the Fourth Gospel
inconsistent with the story of the Pentecostal effusion (Acts 2, 11);
but for Jn. the critical day, when the Spirit was not only promised, but given, is not Pentecost (as with Lk.) but the day of the Resurrection. We cannot distinguish here, any more than at 178, between πνεύμα and τὸ πνεύμα.

Ἀδείτε τὸ πνεύμα ἄγιον. The gift is freely offered, but that it may be “received” demands a responsive effort on the part of him to whom it is offered. Cf. τὸ πνεύμα ... δὲ δόμων ὁ δόμων λαβεῖν (149). An unspiritual man could not assimilate the gift. Δάσκαλος, τοῦτο ἔστω τὸ σῶμα μου (Mk. 142) does not mean that the sacramental gift can operate automatically, but that it is offered freely. So in the Acts (8:15, 17; 10:16) λαμβάνειν πνεύμα ἄγιον occurs several times, but always the “taking” implies a certain disposition on the part of him who takes.

For πνεύμα ἄγιον, see on 148.

28. ἐν τοῖς ἐφήτευσι τῆς ἀμαρτίας ἀφενται αὐτοῖς. ἐστι, as often, for ἐν, ἀφενται is the reading of κειμένων, as against the rec. ἀφεῖται. B* has ἀφεῖται. ἀφεῖται in the sense of “forgive” (sin) does not appear elsewhere in the Fourth Gospel, but cf. 1 Jn. 2:12 ἀφεῖται ἡμῖν ὅμως αἱ ἁμαρτίαι. In the Synoptics, Jesus declares to individuals “thine sins are forgiven” (Mk. 2 and parallels, Lk. 7); but here He seemingly commits, to those to whom He had imparted the Spirit, authority to use the like words.

“Whose soever sins you forgive, they are forgiven unto them.” The meaning of this passage must be sought quite apart from the inferences that have been drawn from it in later ages. As it stands, it is the parting commission of Jesus to the apostles, to whom He had previously promised the Holy Spirit, and to whom He had now imparted that Divine gift. Jn. says nothing about the authority of those who received it to impart the Spirit in their turn to others. That may be a legitimate inference, but it is an inference for the validity of which we must seek evidence elsewhere.

That the apostles interpreted their evangelical mission as giving them authority to hand it on, is, indeed, not doubtful. The terms of their commission as described in Mt. 28:18-20 (cf. Mk. 16:15) imply that it was to last “to the end of the world,” the apostolate being established in permanence. Clement of Rome, whose Epistle is contemporary with the Fourth Gospel, expresses the accepted view: “Jesus Christ was sent forth from God ... the apostles are from Christ ... preaching everywhere, they appointed their firstfruits,

when they had proved them by the Spirit, to be bishops and deacons to them that should believe” (Clem. Rom. 42). And it would appear in like manner that, as early as the time of Origen 1 at any rate, the bishops were regarded as having succeeded to the powers of binding and loosing committed to the apostles in Mt. 16:19.

But, whether these developments were legitimate or not, we are here concerned only with the meaning of the commission to the apostles as recorded in vv. 22, 23; and confining ourselves strictly to this, we start from the presupposition—common to Jews and Christians—that no one can “forswear” sin but God (Mk. 24). But God is always ready to forgive (1 Jn. 1:9); and the assurance of God’s forgiveness can always be given confidently to repentant sinners. This assurance may be given by any one; it needs no authority to give it, for it is a fundamental principle of the Gospel. But, then, no one can give this assurance in an individual case, without being certain that this individual sinner is, indeed, repentant in his heart. And to be sure of this, he who says “thy sins are forgiven” must be able to read men’s hearts. Jesus claimed that He could do this: “the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins” (Mk. 2:10). Of this the explanation is found in Jn. 20:

“He whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God, for He giveth not the Spirit by measure.” To Jesus, and to Him alone, was the Spirit given in its fulness, and so He alone could infallibly discern the secrets of the human heart (Jn. 20). He could say, therefore, “thy sins are forgiven thee” (Mk. 2) with a complete authority.

Now a main theme of the Fourth Gospel is that Jesus promised that He would send (14 X 10-13), and did in fact impart (20), the Spirit to the apostles. It was not confined to them, but was for every believing disciple (78). But it was more largely promised, and more explicitly bestowed, on them than on any one else. And it was in the power of this Spirit of God that they were authorised not only to proclaim universally the message of God’s forgiveness (Acts 10:4), but to say in individual cases “thine sins are forgiven.” Among the gifts of the Spirit was the gift of insight (cf. διακονίαν πνεύματος, 1 Cor. 12:28 and see Jn. 15). Hence the words λαβέτε πνεύμα ἄγιον govern the words giving the apostles authority to forgive or not to forgive. In so far as the Spirit was theirs, so far was their judgment of men’s hearts a true judgment.

Lk. does not tell of so explicit an authority being conferred upon the apostles; but the parting commission for him too is 4 comm. in Mt. xii. 14 (Lommatzsch, i. 155).
all the nations”]; and the authority is described as “the promise of the Father” which is presently to be granted (Lk. 24:47, 49). The parochial commission to the Eleven in Mt. 28:19 has one point of similarity with Jn. 20:23, viz. that it rest the command to make disciples upon the universal authority of Christ. “All authority has been given to me in heaven and on earth. Go ye therefore,” etc. Their power as evangelists would rest upon their being His disciples; just as in Jn. 20:23 their power of absolving is made dependent upon their assimilation of His Spirit. It is to be observed that Jn. makes no mention of any commission to baptize.

The passages in Mt., however, which are specially recalled by Jn. 22-23 are Mt. 16:14-19, 18, in both of which we find “What things soever you shall bind (διότι) on earth shall be bound in heaven; and what things soever you shall loose (διότι) on earth shall be loosed in heaven.” In Mt. 16:9 these words are addressed to Peter, as having the keys of the kingdom of heaven; in Mt. 18:18 they are (seemingly) addressed to the Twelve. To “bind” and to “loose” are Rabbinical expressions signifying to “prohibit” and to “permit” (many illustrations are given in Lightfoot’s Hor. Heb., on Mt. 16:9); and the use of these verbs would suggest to Jews a form of ecclesiastical discipline (cf. 1 Cor. 5, and esp. Acts 15:20 186). In Mt. 16:18 the context shows that something of this sort is indicated; the Divine ratification being promised of the Church’s action. The words refer to the “loosing” of “sin,” and imply forgiveness as well as discipline. To forgive sins is to loose; cf. τον ίδίου μηδέκα του δαιμόνιος έμπν (Rev. 1; see also Job 42:1, LXX).

Mt. 16:18 and Mt. 18:18 are passages which have marks of lateness; they are, e.g., the only two passages in the Gospels where the word “Church” is found; and the tradition preserved in them of the Lord’s commission to the Apostles is more likely to be dependent on that of Jn. 22:23 than vice versa. Indeed Jn.’s brief narrative here is clearly an original statement, and does not betray any acquaintance with Mt. 16:18-19.

αν των κρατήση κρατήσην. The Sinai Syriac renders “whom ye shall shut your door against, it shall be shut”; i.e. it takes κρατήση as governing τινώς, rather than τίς μετρήσῃ. κρατήση does not occur elsewhere in Jn., but it generally takes the accusative, and the parallelism of the sentence would suggest that κρατήσῃ and κρατήση δομολογούσι τον παρόντος των αδικίας.

The broad, unqualified form of this great assurance to the

---

24. Θρόνος είς είς εκ των δικαιών, διελεύσθη συμφέροντο καθήκουν, οι άντων οί δικαιωμένοι ἦσαν γενομένοι διώκοντες την Κυρίαν. ο δέ ενείαν ανελότος έλαβεν μηδέ εν τωι χερσόν ανεκτό των τύπτων των ἔλεοι και βαίλω των δακτυλίων μου εις των τύπτων των ἔλεοι και βαίλω μου την χειρα εις την πλευράν ανελότο, ού

apostles is characteristic of many of the sayings of Jesus as recorded in the Gospels, e.g. “Whatsoever you shall ask of the Father in my name, He will give it you” (15:23). He did not stay to explain the limitations or conditions of such a promise. It is a mark of every great teacher, confident in himself, that he does not weaken the force of his teaching by pointing out, at every stage, possible exceptions to the maxims which he has enunciated; and it was a mark of the greatest Teacher of all.

The incredulity of Thomas (vv. 24, 25) and its removal (vv. 26-29)

24. This section is peculiar to Jn., who is specially interested in Thomas (11:24 185). See on v. 28.

---

25. Εκ τοις δικαίοις. See on 11:11 for this expression. As has been noted there, Thomas was the pessimist of the apostolic band. We can imagine his saying “I told you so,” when the Cross seemed to be the end of all their hopes. His absence from the meeting of the disciples on the Resurrection day may have been due to a feeling that such gatherings were futile, henceforth. But he came to the second meeting a week later, although unconvinced by what the others had told him, just as Lk. tells that the others were unconvinced by the report of the women (Lk. 24:15).

---

26. Εκ των δικαιών. See on 6:31 for this phrase. The apostolic company are still described as “the Twelve” (cf. 6:7), although one had failed, in his allegiance and was now separated from them. “The Twelve” remained a convenient title for the inner circle of disciples; cf. 1 Cor. 13, Pseudo-Peter, § 13, and Acta Thaddaei, 6.

28. Εύκρινεν των κληρών. So Mary had said (v. 18). But Thomas was not satisfied. He claimed that he must test the matter by his sense of touch (a test which according to Jn. had not been offered to the other disciples, see v. 20), and not by sight only.

---

29. Αύτοί ουσίως των τύπων at the second occurrence of this word, a very natural mistake. The Vulgate has faxaram clavorum, followed by in locum clavorum: faxaram is the rendering of τύπων by γι, but d e f g give figuraum.
Thomas is represented as knowing of the thrust-in that Jesus did not have with the garments of Jesus, to assure himself. But, perhaps, all that is implied is that the test of touch was offered to Thomas, while the other disciples had been content will seeing the Lord’s hands and side (v. 20).**

The second manifestation was seemingly in the same room (πόσων) where He had shown Himself to them on the evening of the Resurrection day; there is no evidence that any manifestation of the risen Lord was granted during the week. Jn. follows his usual habit (see on 2:16) of giving dates for the incidents of his narrative.

This time Thomas was with his ten comrades (οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, instead of οἱ μαθηταὶ as in v. 19; see on 2:10), the doors again being shut, perhaps because they were still afraid of the Sanhedrin. Jn. writes here ἔρχεται αὐτοῦ, a solemn phrase which (unlike ἔρχεται from v. 19) may be intended to express that He was expected to come. The narrative proceeds exactly as in v. 19 (where see note) καὶ ἔστω ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν Ευαγγελία ὑμῖν. Jesus giving them the customary salutation of ἀληθεία, as before.

27. οἱ μαθηταὶ τῷ Θωμᾶ. Jn. tells the story, as if Jesus immediately addressed Himself to Thomas, and as if it were on his account that He had come among them again.

Jesus offers to Thomas at once the test which he had declared would be essential if he were to credit the story that the Lord had risen, and suggests it in almost the same words that Thomas had used (v. 25). He thus shows to Thomas that He knows what has been in his mind and how he had expressed it. And His words, revealing that this was He who could read men’s hearts (2:23), proved sufficient to sweep away all doubt from the mind of His incredulous disciple. There is no suggestion in the text that Thomas took advantage of the preferred test, or that he touched the body of the risen Jesus at all (see on v. 20 above).

The νῦν χεῖρές μου, “look at my hands,” which were probably uncovered. This is perhaps in contrast with...
THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN [XX. 20.

μου καὶ ὁ Θεός μου. 29. λέγει αὐτῷ ὡς ἦρεμος ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὤτι ἐκεῖνα με, πεταστέας; μακάριοι μή ὑδάτες καὶ πνευτεστάντες.


30. λέγει αὐτῷ ὡς. It omits δὲ, as usual (see on 189). δὲ κήρυκς μου. The rec. adds θεος, but om. nACDLWΘ. We should probably treat this as interrogative, "Hast thou believed, because thou hast seen Me?" (cf. 163). It was sight, not touch, that convinced Thomas. Jesus does not say, "Hast thou believed, because thou hast touched Me?" Thomas was convinced, just as the other disciples were, by seeing the Lord (v. 20). The faith which is generated thus is precious (cf. on 21) for the faith which rests on "signs"; but it was possible for Jesus' contemporaries alone to see Him as the disciples saw Him. By the time the Fourth Gospel was written, the first generation of Christian believers had passed away, and the path to faith for all future disciples could not be the path of sight (cf. 2 Cor. 5, 1 Pet. 1). So Jn. adds here as the last word of Jesus in the Gospel as originally planned. "Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed." 1

This Beatitude has been sometimes supposed to contain an implied rebuke to Thomas. But it can be no more a rebuke to him than to the other disciples ([Mk.] 164), who, equally, saw before they believed. If Thomas is rebuked at all, it is in the words μή γίνοις ὅσιος (v. 27, where see note). It is never taught in the Gospel that a facile credulity is a Christian virtue; and Thomas was not wrong in wishing for some better proof of his Master's Resurrection than hearsay could give. Indeed, Jesus had warned His disciples not to give credence to every tale that they heard about Him: "If any man shall say, Lo, here is the Christ... believe it not" (Mk. 1345). But cf. 40 for an illustration of the faith that does not require to "see." For παράκειμαι, see on 1315, and cf. Lk. 14.

After ἐστιν, & with 346, 556, supported by the Syriac vss. and some Latin texts with Irish affinities, add μή, an explanatory gloss.

1 Cf. 3 End. 17. "I take to witness the grace of the people that shall come, whose little ones rejoice with gladness; and though they see me not with bodily eyes, yet in spirit they shall believe the thing that I say, as behooved." 2 Cf. Latham, The Risen Master, pp. 186 ff., for the mental attitude of Thomas, as depicted by Jn.
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30. Πώλα μὲν οὖν καὶ ἄλλα σημεῖα γέγραπται ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐνάντιον τῶν μαθητῶν, & ὃς ἦν γνησίως ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ ταῦτα. 31. ταῦτα δὲ γέγραπται ὅταν πιστεύετε ὃτι Ἰησοῦς ἦν οὗτος ὁ Χριστός ὁ Υἱός τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ οὐ πιστεύετε ὅτι ἦν ἐκ τοῦ αὐτόν αὐτῶν.

Scope and purpose of the Gospel (xx. 30, 31)

30. These verses form the conclusion (εἰκαστία, as Tertullian calls v. 31, adu. Prax. 25) of the Gospel as originally planned, c. 21 being a supplement added before the book was issued (see p. 687).

Πώλα μὲν οὖν καὶ ἄλλα σημεῖα . . . Φόβος οὖν, cf. 1034. Jn. explains that it was not his purpose to write a complete narrative of Jesus' ministry. Other "signs" were done by Him (cf. 28 46 1207) which He does not stay to record, although they were done in the presence of the disciples, although they were the witnesses of His wonderful works, chosen by Jesus Himself (1529; cf. Acts 141 164). Such were, e.g., the healings of lepers and demoniacs, of which none is described in the Fourth Gospel. They were not written "in this book," although some of them were written in other books, such as the Synoptic Gospels, of which Jn. knew Mt. and probably Lk. also.

After ἀπεκρίνεται the rec. with nACDLWΘ adds ἄνωθεν, but om. ABA. The witnesses of the "signs" were not only the Twelve, but disciples generally. See on 24 for the omission of ἄνωθεν.

ἀνώτερον. This prep. occurs only once again in Jn. (1 Jn. 325). It is frequent in Lk., but is not found in Mk. Mt. See Abbott, Dial. 2335.

31. ταῦτα δὲ γέγραπται, δὲ corresponding to μὲν of v. 30. But the signs which have been chosen by Jn. for record were recorded with the aim of inspiring in his readers the conviction that Jesus is divine, so that with this belief they may have life in His name. The Gospel, like the First Epistle, was written with a definite purpose. Cf. ταῦτα γεγραμμένα, ἵνα εἰσέπροετε ὅτι τῷ ἤτοι ἐστε αἰώνιοι, τοὺς πιστεύσαντι ἐς τὸ θησαυρὸν τοῦ ἐνότος τοῦ Θεοῦ (1 Jn. 528).

ἐν τω πιστεύετε. So ἐν Θεῷ (as at 1030), as against the rec. πιστεύετε (nACDNW).

ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἦν οὗτος ὁ Χριστός ὁ θεός τοῦ Θεοῦ. This reproduces the terms of Martha's confession of faith (117), before Lazarus had been restored to her. But whereas on her lips, ὁ θεός τοῦ Θεοῦ was probably used only as a title of Messiah, as Jn. uses it here it appears to have a deeper significance (see on 130). The faith of future believers is to be not only
THE APPENDIX (CHAPTER XXI)

The Fourth Gospel was plainly intended to end with 20. Nothing following this is of the nature of an anticlimax. No copy, however, of the Gospel, so far as we know, was ever issued without the addition of c. 21, which is quoted by Tertullian (Scorp. 15) and is treated by Origen in his Commentary as on a par with cc. 1–20. It is probable that the Appendix was added as an afterthought, before the Gospel was published, and various opinions have been held as to its authorship, purpose, and source.

We have first to ask if c. 21 is by the same hand as cc. 1–20. The only evidence by which such a question can be determined is the evidence of vocabulary and style; and it is hardly possible within the brief compass of twenty-five verses to collect sufficient data. ἀνέφεραν (v. 6) does not occur in cc. 1–20, nor does ναῦζον (v. 3) in the sense of catching fish; but there is no fishing anecdote in the body of the Gospel. Similarly no stress can be laid on unusual words such as προσφάρειν (v. 5), or ἔριβος (v. 7); τοῖμαν and ἡτοίμασα (v. 12) do not appear elsewhere in Jn., and this must be noted, for they might very naturally have been used. So too in v. 4 we find ποιλεῖ, while ποιοῖ is the form adopted in 18, 29. In 19 we have Σιμών δέ ἦσαν ἰσαίου, while at 21 we have the shorter Σιμών ἰσαίου. But against these differences may be set remarkable agreements in style between cc. 1–20 and c. 21. The use of διέμενος διαμψα in v. 18, the evangelistic comment at v. 23; the verbal correspondence between v. 19 and 12, are among the more obvious. Such similarities might possibly be due to conscious imitation of the manners of Jn. by the author of the Appendix, but there are others, more subtle, which can hardly be thus explained. ἀρέτε in v. 8 is used exactly as at 11; ἔριβος in v. 13 just as at 6; σῖν (v. 9) is rare in Jn., but it is found 12, 19; μέτρον (v. 4) is thoroughly Johannean (cf. 14); and so in ἀνέφεραι (v. 9); see on 4.

Further arguments may be found in Lightfoot (Biblical Essays, p. 194), who accepts the Johannean authorship of the Appendix, as do Harnack (Chron. i. 670), Sanday (Criticism of Fourth Gospel, p. 81), and W. Bauer in his Handbuch; Plummer (Notes on Christian Antiquity, iii. 70); Moffatt (Intro. to N.T. p. 572), and Stanton (The Gospels as Historical Documents, iii. p. 28) take the other side.
The view taken in this commentary is that the author of c. 21 is the person whom we designate as Jn. But, whereas throughout cc. 1-20 Jn. is accustomed to reproduce the reminiscences of John the son of Zebedee, often in the form in which the aged disciple dictated them, this cannot be affirmed with confidence of the earlier part of c. 21, although it is true of vv. 15-23.

The correspondence between 21v-23 and Lk. 5v-21 are so close that they demand investigation; and it is necessary also to take account of the Synoptic parallels to the Lucan passage. The story of the Call of Peter and Andrew, and also of James and John (Mk. 1v-20, Mt. 4v-20, Lk. 5v-11) is not given by Jn., who reports instead an earlier incident, when these four disciples were attracted to Jesus for the first time (1v-14). The Lucan narrative differs from that of Mk., Mt. in significant particulars:

(a) Mk. does not tell explicitly of any call of the fishermen, as Mk., Mt. do; while he ends his story by saying that the four left all and followed Jesus (Lk. 5v-11), so that James and John followed as well as Peter and Andrew. Cf. Jn. 21v-20 where John (who has not been invited to do so) follows as well as Peter, to whom alone the call “Follow me” is addressed.

(b) In Mk., Mt. the promise, “I will make you fishers of men,” is explicitly given to Peter and Andrew, while the story suggests that it was intended for James and John as well. But in Lk. it is confined to Peter alone: “Fear not, from henceforth thou shalt catch men.” This is in remarkable correspondence with the giving of the commission, Pascite oves meas, to Peter alone, in Jn. 21v-17.

(c) Lk. interpolates the incident, which Mk., Mt. do not report, of Peter’s allegiance having been stimulated by a great catch of fish which he regarded as due to supernatural knowledge on the part of Jesus. So too in Jn. 21 it is Peter who is specially moved by the great fishie due, again, to the direction of Jesus, and he alone plunges into the water to great Jesus before the others (cf. at this point the story, peculiar to Mt. 14v-28, of Peter walking on the waters).

(d) That the vocabulary of Jn. 21 should recall that of Lk. 5v is not in itself remarkable, for in stories relating to successful catches by fishermen the same words would naturally occur; e.g. ἐπιβαίνειν “to embark” (Lk. 5v, Jn. 21v), ἀνοβεῖν “to disembark” (Lk. 5v, Jn. 21v), ἑπταείς (Lk. 5v, Jn. 21v). But the correspondence is not only one of vocabulary. In Lk. 5v the fishermen say ἐδείκτησαν ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ τοὺς ἀκατάστατους ὄξαν καταδίωκοντες; cf. Jn. 21v ἐν ἡμέραις τῆς νυκτὸς ἐκβιβάζοντος. In both cases, it is by the direction of Jesus that they cast the net into deeper waters (Lk. 5v, Jn. 21v, where see note); and in both cases they make a great catch. In Lk. 5v the nets were beginning to break (ἀρτυροῦντες), but they did not actually break, for the fishermen managed to secure them full of fish; so in Jn. 21v it is noted that the nets were not broken. That this should be mentioned shows that there was danger of them breaking, as in Lk. 5v.

These correspondences between the stories in Lk. 5 and Jn. 21 of a great draught of fishes are so close that they cannot reasonably be accounted for on the hypothesis that they represent distinct traditions of two distinct incidents. Accordingly, two alternative explanations offer themselves.

(a) The author of Jn. 21 may have taken his story directly from Lk. 5, putting it in a different context (Wollhausen, Pfleiderer). Pfleiderer regards Lk. 5v-21 as itself only an “agorical” narrative, and if this were the aspect under which it was viewed by Jn., his transference of the Lucan passage from one point to another would hardly call for comment. But that Lk. intended his story of the miraculous draught of fishes to be taken as an account of an incident that actually happened is not doubtful; nor is there any reason for thinking that Jn. understood it differently. Jn., however, corrects Synoptic narratives sometimes; and it is conceivable that he has deliberately retold this Lucan story, and ascribed it, not to the early days of our Lord’s ministry, but to the period after His Resurrection.

(b) A more probable explanation, however, is that Lk. 5v-21 and Jn. 21v are derived, in part, from the same source, viz., a Galilean tradition (see on 20v) about the Lord’s appearance to Peter after His Resurrection, and the restoration of Peter to his apostolic office.

(a) First, as to Lk. 5. We have seen that Mk. (followed by Mt.) tells us that when Peter, Andrew, James, and John abandoned their fishing and followed Jesus, He promised two of them (if not all four) that He would make them “fishers of men.” Lk. seems to have confused this promise with the commission afterwards given to Peter to feed the sheep of Christ; and accordingly in his account of the call of the disciples he has interpolated the tradition of a miraculous draught of fishes followed by a special charge to Peter. In Lk., the promise “henceforth thou shalt catch men” is for Peter alone.

Further, the words which Lk. ascribes to Peter, “Depart from me, for I am a sinful man,” (Lk. 5v) are not adequately explained by saying that Peter was moved to confess his sinfulness because of an extraordinary take of fish. But if such words were spoken when he met his Master for the first time

1 Prim. Christianit. iii. 79.
2 See Introd., p. xcii.
after he had denied Him, they are very appropriate. This sentence in Lk.'s narrative suggests of itself that the narrative belongs to the period after Jesus had risen.

(3) Next, in Jn. 21 there are indications that the story was originally current as a tradition, not of the third appearance of the risen Jesus to the disciples, but of His first manifestation of Himself after His Resurrection.

It is difficult to understand how disciples who already had twice conversed with the Risen Christ (20:26) should fail to recognize Him when He presented Himself by the lake-side (but see note on 21:4). That they should have gone back to their fishing after the extraordinary communication to them recorded in 20:26 is strange enough (Chrysostom can only suggest that they had gone back to Galilee through fear of the Jews); but it would be stranger still if they were not sensitive, after such an experience, to every slightest indication of the presence of Jesus.

Again, the story, as narrated, suggests that this was the first occasion on which Peter met and conversed with Jesus since the night when he denied Him. Vv. 15-19 relate how he was questioned by his Master, and finally reinstated, with a new and great charge, in his apostolic office. Is it likely that the person who first wrote down this story believed that Peter had seen the Risen Lord at least twice before, and had, along with his companions, been already granted the gift of the Holy Spirit and a commission to forgive sins? The inference that 21:15-19 must not be taken as posterior to 20:26 is difficult to evade.

It must not be overlooked, in this connexion, that the genuineness of πάντως in 21:1 is doubtful. Different MSS. place πάντως at different points in this verse (see note in loc.), and one uncial, at least, omits it altogether. It is probable that the adverb πάντως in v. 1 and the whole of v. 14 (οὐδεῖς ἄριστος ἢ Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστός) have been added by Jn. to his source to bring the tradition of an appearance in Galilee into harmony with those which he has already described at Jerusalem. V. 14 is obviously a parenthesis, for the narrative runs smoothly and consecutively from v. 13 to v. 15.

These considerations lead to the conclusion that Lk. 5:11 and Jn. 21 both go back to a current story that the first manifestation of the Risen Jesus to Peter (at any rate) was by the Sea of Galilee. According to Mk. 16:7 (followed by Mt. 28:7), the disciples had been told that Jesus would meet them in Galilee, and Mt. 28:14 states that He actually did so (see on 20:21). Another instance of the survival of such a tradition is provided by the Gospel of Peter (second century), the extant fragment ending as follows: "It was the last day of unleavened bread, and many went forth, returning to their homes, as the feast was ended. But we, the Twelve (see on 20:25) disciples of the Lord, wept and were grieved; and each one, grieving for that which was come to pass, departed to his home. But I, Simon Peter, and Andrew my brother, took our nets and went away to the sea, and there was with us Levi the son of Alphaeus, whom the Lord . . . " That is to say, Pseudo-Peter makes the apostles remain at Jerusalem until the Passover feast was over, but makes no mention of any appearances of the Risen Lord to them there. Instead, he represents them as returning to their homes, the Galilean fishermen going back to the Sea of Galilee. When the fragment ends, it seems as if an incident like that of Jn. 21:1-25 was being led up to.

Harnack holds 1 that this tradition, the source of Jn. 21:1-25 as of Lk. 5:11, was narrated in the Lost Conclusion of Mark. It may be so—the evidence is insufficient for certainty; but it seems more probable that Mt. 28:8 15 gives us part of what was in the original Marcan narrative.

However that may be, we have reached the conclusion that Jn. 21 and Lk. 5 point back to a common source, viz. a Galilean tradition about the Risen Lord. The question then arises, why did Jn. add c. 21 to the already completed Gospel?

(4) It has been suggested that c. 21 was added as a kind of postscript, because it was thought important that the rehabilitation of Peter should be placed on record. Of this there is no account in the Synoptists or in Jn. cc. 20-25. His denial is narrated in detail by all the evangelists, but his forgiveness and restoration to apostolic leadership is assumed without any explanation. That at some point after the Resurrection he regained his old position of leader is manifest from the narrative of Acts. How were the other apostles reassured as to his stability? The beautiful story of 21:13-19 is the only explanation that has been preserved, whatever be its source; and it is easy to realise that the Church at the end of the first century would be anxious to have it placed on record, more especially after Peter's career had been ended by a martyr's death. The statement in v. 24 that the story was certified by the Beloved Disciple, i.e. in our view by John the son of Zebedee, who at the time of its being added to the Fourth Gospel was the only living person who could bear witness to its truth, is in no way improbable. How Peter came to be restored to his apostolic office would not seem to the first generation of Christians to be a question of sufficient importance for inclusion in a Gospel, but when the second generation began to look back it was recognised as of peculiar interest.

1 Lukan the Physician (Eng. Tr.), p. 227.
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(2) But the principal motive for the addition of c. 21 was, no doubt, that misapprehensions as to the meaning of some words of Jesus might be removed.

The enigmatic promise (Mk. 93 and parallels) that there were some among the disciples of Jesus who would not die until "the kingdom of God came with power" must have made a profound impression (see on 143). "Mārān ᾧκα" was the watchword of apostolic Christianity (1 Cor. 1525), and at first it was expected that the Parousia (cf. 148 and 1 Jn. 228) would come soon. Paul, at one time thought that some of his contemporaries would live to see it (1 Thess. 425, 1 Cor. 1550). By the time that the Fourth Gospel was written, the hope of the speedy return of Christ was dying out; but it was still believed by some that the Lord had promised (either in the words preserved in 2128, or in similar words such as Mk. 93) that it would come to pass before all the apostles died. Accordingly, when the last survivor, John the son of Zebedee, was manifestly approaching the end of his course, there must have been some at least who were disconcerted. It was probably to reassure them that the story of the promise made by Jesus to John was added to the Gospel which was based on his reminiscences, and attention directed to its exact phrasing. Vv. 22-23 may have been written down after the death of John; but it seems more probable that the true account of this incident was gathered from his lips during the last days of his long life.

The Appendix, then, embodies a tradition that was current as to an appearance of the Risen Christ in Galilee, which is also used (but misplaced) by Lk. In c. 21, it appears in a version for some details of which the authority of the Beloved Disciple is expressly claimed (v. 24); but it would seem that it has been edited (vv. 2, 14) by Jn. so as to bring it into harmony with c. 20. The Gospel proper contained only such incidents and sayings of Jesus as would serve the special purpose of the writer (2026-28); but before it was issued to the Christian community it was thought desirable to add an Appendix embodying traditions about Peter and John of which incorrect versions were current.

1 For vv. 24, 25, see notes in loc.

An appearance of the Risen Christ by the Sea of Galilee

(XXI. 1–14)

XXXI. 1. μετὰ ταύτα. This introductory phrase does not connote strict sequence. It is used by Jn. to introduce a

1 See Intro., p. cvii.

XXI. 1. Μετά ταύτα ἐφανέρωσεν Ἰωάννης πάλιν δ' ἤρωτος τῶν μαθητῶν εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Τιβερίαδος ἐφανέρωσεν δὲ οὕτως. fresh section of his narrative, and hardly means more than "another time." ἐφανέρωσεν Ἰωάννης. For Ἰωάννης (cf. v. 14) and its use in Jn., see on 124. It is the verb used in the Appendix to Mk. (1612, 13) of the manifestations of the Risen Jesus to the two at Emmaus, and to the Eleven. He was not visible continuously between His Resurrection and final Departure.

δ' ἤρωτος. BC om. δ', but ins. ΝΑΚΩΔ (see on 28, 89).

τῶν μαθητῶν. Not to the Eleven, but to some of them only, οἱ μαθηταὶ might stand for "disciples" in the wider sense (see on 25), but that is not probable at this point, as we shall see.

ἐν τῇ θάλασσῇ τῆς Τιβερίας, "by the Sea of Tiberias." For this description of the Sea of Galilee, see on 64. According to the Marcan tradition (Mk. 167, Mt. 287), Jesus was to manifest Himself in Galilee (cf. Mt. 288g). Of any appearances there, the Gospels of Lk. and Jn. tell nothing, but in this Appendix to the Fourth Gospel such a manifestation is described in detail, implying (as the story is told by Jn.) that, after the three appearances at Jerusalem described in c. 20, some of the Eleven (at least) returned to Galilee, where Jesus met them. But see note above, p. 656.

πάλιν (a favourite Johannine word, cf. 148) is placed before ἤρωτος by καὶ and before ἐφανέρωσεν by D. It is omitted by some cursives.

ἐφανέρωσεν δὲ οὕτως. This brusque constr. does not appear again, in exactly this form in Jn.; but cf. 45, ἄκαθεν ὤντος ἐπὶ τῇ παρασκευῇ.

2 According to Pseudo-Peter (see p. 591 above), the disciples remained in Jerusalem until the end of the Passover Feast, when some returned to their homes in Galilee. This falls in with c. 21.

Peter and the sons of Zebedee were fishermen, who took up their work in partnership, as they had been accustomed to do (Mk. 149). διότι οὖν, "they were together," and with them were Nathanael and also Thomas. The words οὖν ἐλλατὶ ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν ἄνω ὡς suggest that all seven who were present were of the Twelve, for οἱ μαθηταὶ ἄνω may generally represent the Twelve in the Fourth Gospel. οἱ μαθηταὶ (without ἄνω) in vv. 4, 12 stands for the seven who have been already mentioned. See for this usage on 54.

Nomus, in his paraphrase of Jn., like Pseudo-Peter, says that Andrew was present on this occasion, and he may have
THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN [XXI. 2-3.

2. ἦσαν ὁμοὶ Σίμων Πέτρος καὶ Θωμᾶς ὁ λεγόμενος Λέοντας καὶ Ναθαναήλ ὁ ἀπὸ Κανά τῆς Γαλileeας καὶ οἱ τοῦ Ζεβεδεῖου καὶ ἄλλοι ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ δίκαιοι.

3. λέγει αὐτοῖς Σίμων Πέτρος ὡς ἠγάγατο δαίμονα, λέγοντας αὐτῷ, Ἐρχόμεθα καὶ ἑρμίτες σὺν σοί. Εἶδον καὶ έρημήσαν εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, καὶ ἐν ἑκάστι τοῦ νυκτὸς έπισκέψαν αὐτὸν.

been one of the two inimoci; it would be natural that he would, as formerly, accompany Peter in his fishing. Pseudo-Peter represents "Levi the son of Alphaeus," as one of the company, and it is possible that this is a true tradition and that he was the second unnamed disciple, although we should hardly expect that a former tax-gatherer (Mt. 9:24) would be of use in a fishing-boat. If we had to guess at the second inimocius, the name of Philip would naturally suggest itself. He was of Bethsaida, as were Peter and Andrew (2:1); and in the lists of the apostles he always appears among the first five, with Peter, Andrew, and the sons of Zebedee (Mt. 4:18, Mt. 10:3, Lk. 6:14, Acts 1:13). He is also associated with Peter, Andrew, and John, and with Nathanael in 20:14. The seven disciples present on the occasion now to be described would then be the seven most prominent in the Fourth Gospel and the seven who are named first in Acts 1:13. But the evidence as to the two inimocius is not sufficient for certainty.

Σίμων Πέτρος. See on 18:32 for the full name being used at the beginning of a new section, as is the habit of Jn.

ὁμοίως ἐν λεγόμενος Λέοντας. So he is described 11:2, where see note; cf. 20:41.

καὶ Ναθαναήλ ὁ ἀπὸ Κανά τῆς Γαλileeας. There is no reason for supposing (with Schmiedel) that this description is made up from a comparison of 10 and 21, or that it does not represent a genuine tradition as to Nathanael's home. See on 10:41.

οἱ τοῦ Ζεβεδείου. Zebedee's name is not mentioned elsewhere in the Fourth Gospel. "The sons of Zebedee," their names not being stated, is a phrase occurring in Mt. 20:20 and 21.

8. λέγει αὐτοῖς Σίμων Πέτρος. He characteristically takes the lead, saying, "I am off to fish." For ἐνδόξῳ, see on 7:28. The verb ἐλευθέρωσα occurs in the Greek Bible only once elsewhere, at Jer. 10:15.

To repeat the full name Σίμων Πέτρος is not in accordance with Jn.'s habit (see on 18:10); cf. vv. 7, 11, 15.

ηδονή εἰς τὸ σαλ. ηδονή is not a favourite Johannine word, occurring only twice in Jn. (see on 10:18).

ἐξῆλθαν, "they went out," not necessarily from the same house, but from the place where they were all gathered.

ἐδύσαντο εἰς τὸ πλοῖον. For this phrase, see on 6:7. The rec. has ἐδύσασαν. Probably τὸ πλοῖον was the large boat

which they were accustomed to use as they went about the lake with Jesus (see on 6:7).

The rec. adds ἐγώ, but om. nBCDLNWAΘ. ἐν ἑκάστι τοῦ νυκτὸς έπισκέψαν αὐτὸν. This recalls Lk. 5:2; the night is the best time for fishing, and yet they caught nothing; παθῶν is used several times by Jn. (see on 7:20) of "arresting" or "taking" Jesus; but to use it of the catching of fish, as here and at v. 10, is curious. Cf. Cant. 2:14, Rev. 19:20.

δ. ἐγώ ἐστιν ἡ γενετήρας, "when dawn was now breaking," and the light not yet good. Jn. never has ἐγώ in the body of the Gospel, while παθῶν occurs 18:2, 20:1 (see also on 14). Mt. has παθῶ (Mt. 21:7).

For γενετήρας (ABC*LEΘ), the rec. has γενναῖος (KDNWΘ). ἡ γενναῖος ἐστιν τὸν αἰγαλον. ἕστιν is read by ΚΑΘΘΘΘ (cf. Mt. 13:31, Acts 21:1 ἐστιν τὸν αἰγαλον); but BCNW have ἐστιν (cf. Acts 21:15 ἐστι τὸν αἰγαλον "towards the beach"). Perhaps εστί has come in here through assimilation to ἕστιν εἰς τὸ μίνιον (20:23, 24, where see note).

μένος is a Johannine word; see on 12:8.

For ἔλαβεν followed by the historic present ἦλθεν, see on 10. That disciples, who had so recently seen the Risen Lord twice, according to the Johannine tradition (20:16, 19), should not recognise Him, even after He had spoken to them, might, perhaps, be accounted for by their distance from the shore and the dimness of the early morning light. Again, the failure of the two disciples at Emmaus to identify Him at first (Lk. 24:31); and the failure of Mary Magdalene to recognise Him when she saw Him (20:14 ἐκάστι ἔγνω ἢ γεννεῖν ἢ ἧπερφαν, words identical with those used here) may be taken as showing that the Risen Lord was not recognisable, unless He chose "to manifest Himself." The latter may be the true explanation.1 But the present instance of the disciples' failure to recognise Him is perplexing, for (according to Jn.) they had already seen Him; even if we do not lay stress on the Marcan tradition according to which they had been told that they might expect to see Him in Galilee.

8. λέγει . . . ἡ γενναῖος. The rec. inserts δ. before ἀγων. with A*CDLNΘ, but om. ΝΒ. παθῶσα is not put into the mouth of Jesus in any other

1 On this cf. Sparrow-Simpson, The Resurrection and Modern Thought, p. 86: "Recognition, in some cases, instead of becoming easier, [became] increasingly difficult."
Gospel passage, when He is addressing His disciples. It is a colloquial form of address, as we might say “My boys,” or “lads,” if calling to a knot of strangers of a lower social class. παιδίον is thus used in Aristophanes (Nub. 137, Ran. 33).

The use of παῖδι in r. Jn. 21:15 is different.

Jesus says γενόσθε to the disciples at r. 13, but to have employed a tender term of this kind would at once have betrayed His identity by the lake-side.

μη τι προσφάγιον ἔχειτε; i.e. “have you caught any fish?”

Weinstein (approved by Field) quotes a scholium on Aristoph. Clouds, 731, viz. ἔχεις τι; schol. χωρίσων τά υἱαν ἡμῶν; ἡ ἀρνίασθε εἰς οὕτως ἡμῶν.

That is to say, ἔχεις τι is the phrase in which a bystander would say to a fisherman or fowler, “Have you had any sport?” προσφάγιον, lit. a “relish,” something to season food, is a Hellenistic word like ἄγριον or ὀξυόν for “fish,” which was the relish in common use. See on v. 10 below. προσφάγιον is not found elsewhere in the Greek Bible.

The form of the question, beginning with μη, suggests that a negative answer is expected (see on 6:7), so that we may render “Boys, you have not had any catch, have you?” And, accordingly, they answered, “No.” See on 4:20.

6. Then Jesus, perhaps having noticed from the shore that a shoal of fish was gathering at the farther side of the boat, called to the fishermen, “Cast your net towards the right side of the boat, and you will have a take.”

εἰς τα ἄγρια μεραῖ τοῦ πλῶν is a cumbersome phrase for which no linguistic parallel seems to be forthcoming. In Lk. 5 the advice of Jesus was similar, although expressed differently, viz. to let down the nets in deeper water. As the story is told, it would seem that Peter jumped into the water on the side of the boat nearest the land, being unimpeded by the net which now was on the other (the right) side, farther from the shore. While Peter does not occur again in Jn., and is the word used Lk. 5:4, 6; but nothing can be inferred from this, as it is the common word for a fishing-net.

After ἔρθετε, κατὰ and several Latin texts mostly of the Irish school (e.g. ardmach, dim., stowe, corp., and Rawl. 167)

1 See Abbott, Dict. 370.
2 Trench, with others, suggests that the “right” side is symbolic of the auspicious side; cf. Ezek. 1:4-5, etc.
3 Cf. Wordsworth-White in Loc., and Berger, La Vulgate, p. 45, for other Latin MSS. with this interpolation.
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10. The fishing boat (φίλαρμον) was the small fishing boat used for catching fish. The phrase "the boat which was set on fire" (οἱ δὲ φίλαρμον τὸ δικτυον τὸ ἐν τῇ γῇ τῆς Θάλα οὐ καὶ ἐκ τῆς ὑποτίμησις τρεῖς) seems to refer to the same boat, setting it on fire to destroy it. But here the φίλαρμον (v. 10) are the fresh fish which had just been caught, and in v. 11 the net is said to have been full of "great fishes." In fact, despite the derivation of the word, φίλαρμον came to mean "a fish" or "fish" vaguely, whether fresh caught or dried; just as ἐπὶ τὸ δορὸς τῶν ἀλεπορῶν in Num. 17:24 means "all the fish of the sea." See on v. 5.

The δόραμον which was cooking on the fire was not one of the fish which had just been caught; for it is only after the disciples see it that the net is drawn ashore. It was provided, along with the bread, by Jesus. Some have thought that the singular forms δόραμον, ἄρτος, are significant; and that there is here an allusion to a sacramental meal—one fish, one loaf. But neither δόραμον nor ἄρτος necessarily signify one fish or one loaf only; both may be taken generally as "fish," "bread." See further on v. 13.

The story of Lk. 24:41, where the disciples give Jesus a piece of broiled fish (γιάθος ἐν τῷ δόρῳ), presents some likeness to the present passage, but there the Risen Jesus asks for food (cf. 21:13) and eats it. Jn. does not say that He ate anything, but only that He presided at the meal by the lake-side.

11. "The fish which you caught just now." Prima facie, the story suggests that the fish on the fire was for the breakfast of Jesus Himself, and that He now invites the fishermen to bring some of the fish that they had caught, to cook them, and join Him at His meal. But this is not said directly.

For Πάθημα, see on v. 3. For μῖα, "just now," cf. 11.

12. άρθρον is δόρος, "So Peter," in obedience to the authoritative direction of Jesus, went aboard the dinghy, or little boat. Peter is always foremost in action.

"and drew the net to land," which was easier to do than to haul it over the gunwale into the dinghy.

The simplest explanation of the number of fish, 153, being recorded, is that (as fishermen are wont to do, because the catch has to be divided into shares) the fish were counted, and their great number remembered as a notable thing. But commentators, both ancient and modern, have not been con-
tent this with, and have sought for a symbolic meaning in the number 153, which they (in modern times at least) assume was invented in order to suggest something esoteric. See Introd., p. lxxxvii.

12. Jesus calls to the disciples, ἀλλὰ ἀρετήσατε, “Come and break your fast” (cf. for the constr. ἀλλὰ, ἀλλὰ εἰς τὰ ἐκπάθειαν, 4:20). ἀρετήσατε was the morning meal (Mt. 22:36, Lk. 11:57 14:3); the verb ἀρετήσατε occurs again in N.T. only at Lk. 11:57. Nothing is said of the cooking of any fish that had been caught, but the command of v. 10 suggests that it was thus that the disciples’ breakfast was provided.

οὐδεὶς ἔχει ἐκλεκτὸν. The intimate familiarity of the old days had passed; they knew that it was Jesus who was speaking to them, but they did not dare to question him as to His identity (cf. 4:27). Chrysostom says that they sat down for the meal in silence and trepidation, which may be implied.

οὐδεὶς... τῶν μαθητῶν. For this constr., without ἐκ before the gen. plural, as usual in Jn. (see on 1:19 20, cf. 13:28. On μαθηταὶ, see 2:22.

ἐξετάσατε ὅτι ἐστιν ὁ κύριος εὐς. It was not as at the Emmaus supper, where He was not recognised until He blessed and broke the bread (Lk. 24:30); here He was recognised before the meal began.

τολμᾶν and ἐκτίθεναι do not occur in the body of the Gospel. For ἐκτίθεναι, “to cross-examine,” cf. Mt. 2:26, Ecclus. 1:7; it is a natural word to use in this context.

13. ὥρα has been thought to imply that Jesus was standing at a distance from the lighted fire, and that He came to it only when the disciples were gathered for their breakfast. But ὥρα goes with λαμβάνει which follows (cf. ὥρα... καὶ λαμβάνει, 12:30), and hardly needs explanation, or a reference to 20:38.

The rec. ὁν (N 1560) after ὥρα is om. by nbdclw.

λαμβάνει τὸν ἄρτον καὶ δίδωσι τοῖς μαθηταῖς. Syr. sin. and D insert ἐκχυτέσατο before δίδωσι, this being evidently introduced from 6:41, to the language of which v. 13 is closely similar. No eucharistic meal is implied at 6:41 (see note in loc.), and there is here even less suggestion of such a thing. τὸν ἄρτον and τὸ δίδωμι do not indicate one loaf and one fish (see on v. 9); indeed the command “bring of the fish which you caught” (v. 10) implies that several fish had been prepared for the disciples’ breakfast. That Jesus “took”

The restoration of Peter to his apostolic office (vv. 15-17)

18. ὅτι ἐν τῷ ἀρετῶν, when the breakfast was over. Jn. is fond of these notes of time. See on 139.

Σιμών Ἱωάννου. This is the better reading (n*bcldlw), as against Σιμών Ἱωάννου of the rec. text; and so also at vv. 16, 17.

Note that we have here Ἰωάννου τοῦ Ἰωάννου, instead of Ἱωάννου τοῦ Ἰωάννου, as at 138.

Jesus addresses him by the personal name by which he was generally known, “Simon, son of John,” as He was accustomed to do. See on 48 for the designation Peter, which, it is to be observed, Jesus only uses once (Lk. 22:37) in addressing the apostle. Cf. Mt. 16:17, Lk. 22:38.

Peter had thrice denied His Master, and the solemn questioning of him, in the company of his fellow-disciples, as the prelude to his restoration to the Master’s favour and the renewal of His confidence, was fittingly repeated thrice. As Augustine has it, he was questioned “domine trina voce amoris, sollicitat trinam uocem negationis.” The questioning has reference to one thing only, and that is Peter’s ἴδιον for Jesus. He is not asked to renew his confession of faith (probably that had never quite left him, his Master having prayed that it

1 Enarr. in Ps. xcvii. 17.
should not fail, Lk. 22:35), nor is he asked if he is sure that he will be more courageous in the future than in the past. The Lord does not remind him in words of his failure when the great test came. If he loves, that is enough. This is the one essential condition of the apostolic office and ministry.

Attention has often been directed to the use of the two verbs άγαπάω and ϕιλέω in these verses; Jesus asking ἄγαπάω με λαβεῖν, Peter answering φιλέω σε, and on the third occasion of His query, Jesus changing the verb and saying ϕιλέω με, taking up Peter's own word. This distinction of verbs is not treated as significant by the ancient commentators, Syriac, Greek, or Latin (Ambrose in Lib. x. 176 being perhaps an exception); and, when the delight of Origen, e.g., in playing on words is remembered, it is sufficient to show that the apostolic expositors did not venture sharply to differentiate ἄγαπάω from φιλέω. But in modern times, the exegesis of the passage has largely turned on the idea that whereas Peter will say φιλέω σε, he does not presume to claim that he can say ἄγαπάω σε, ἄγαπάω being the more lofty word.1 It is necessary, then, to examine the usage of ἄγαπάω and φιλέω more closely.

**Additional Note on φιλέω and ἄγαπάω**

Of these two words it may be said that φιλέω is the more comprehensive, and includes every degree and kind of love or liking, while ἄγαπάω is the more dignified and restrained. But even so vague a distinction cannot be pressed very far. Both verbs are used in classical Greek to express sexual love (cf. Lucian, *Ver Hist.* ii. 25, and Aristotle, *Topica,* i. 15 [106, b 2]).2 So, in like manner, in the LXX sexual love is indicated by ἄγαπάω, ἄγαπάω, at 2 Sam. 13, Cant. 2:7 etc., and by φιλέω at Exclus. 9, Prov. 28 (in which latter passage *Aquila* and Thecodotion give ἄγαπάω). In Xenophon (*Memorabilia,* ii. vii. §§ 9 and 12), φιλέω and ἄγαπάω are used interchangeably, both indicating in turn affection (not sexual) and esteem. Cf. *Aelian,* *Var Hist.* ix. 4, where it is said of a man's relations with his brothers, πάντες σφόδρα ἄγαπασαν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐν αἷς ἐμποτίσαν τὸ μητέροις.

An analysis of the passages in which φιλέω and ἄγαπάω occur in Jn. shows that they are practically synonymous in the Fourth Gospel.

---

1 See, e.g., Trench, *Synopsis of N.T.*, p. 39 f.
2 These references are given by R. E. Sanders in a careful study of ἄγαπάω and φιλέω, first printed in the *Journal of Philology,* 1865, pp. 88-93.

---

**Additional Note**

Both verbs are used of God's love for man: ἄγαπάω at 3:14 (where see note) 14:23 17:33, x Jn. 4:18, etc., but φιλέω at 16:5 (cf. Rev. 3:19).

Both verbs are used of the Father's love for the Son: ἄγαπάω at 3:26 10:15 10:26 17:33 3:34 3:35 (cf. δὸς μόνον δὸς ἄγαπάω, Mk. 9), but φιλέω at 3:35.

Both verbs are used of Jesus' love for men: ἄγαπάω at 11:5 13:28 20:32 14:28 132:36 26:35, but φιλέω at 17:11 26. The last reference is specially noteworthy, as at 26 the beloved disciple is described as ἐν τῷ φιλέω τῷ Ἰωάννῃ, while we generally have ἐν ἄγαπάω (13:23 13:35).

Both verbs are used of the love of men for other men: ἄγαπασα at 13:34 15:13, 1 Jn. 2:10 3:14 13:32 1:47, 20, but φιλέω at 15:18. The noun ἄγαπασα is used for the love of men for each other at 15:16 15:13, 1 Jn. 4:7; but the word that came to be specially appropriated to the brotherly love of Christian for Christian was not ἄγαπασα but φιλάνθρωπος (see on 13:34, and cf. 3:18).


The love of men for God is generally described in the LXX by ἄγαπασα (Ex. 20:6) or ἐφαγάπασα (Wisd. 3); but in Prov. 38 we have φιλέω (δώ τοις με τοῖς φιλονόμοις ἄγαπε) 3. In this sense we have ἔφαγασαν 58, 1 Jn. 3:14 21 13:3, and ἄγαπάσας at 1 Jn. 4:14 14 3:24 (not in the Gospel).

The love of Jesus for the Father is mentioned only once in the N.T., viz. at 14:1 (where see note), and there the verb is ἀγαπάω.

Having regard to these facts, it would be precarious to lay stress on the change of ἄγαπάσας in vv. 15 and 16 to φιλέω in v. 17. And a closer examination gives further reason for treating them as synonymous here.

First, it is clear that the author uses them as synonymous. Jn. purports to give a translation in Greek of Aramaic words spoken by Jesus. He makes Jesus say ἄγαπέω μοι in vv. 15, 16, and φιλέω μοι in v. 17; but by prefixing τῷ τρόπῳ to φιλέω μοι in the latter passage (cf. δύνασαι in v. 16), he seems to make it plain that the verbs are to be taken as identical in meaning, and to exclude the idea that a new thought is introduced by the use of φιλέω.

Secondly, Peter is represented as saying "Yes" to the question ἄγαπάσας μοι; να, φιλέω σε is his answer. This is fatal to the idea that Peter will not claim that he loves Jesus with the higher form of love called ἄγαπάω, but that he ventures only...
THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN [XXI. 16.

'Ερώτησαν αὐτῷ, ἢς εἶναι μετὰ πλείων τοῖχων; λέγει αὐτῷ Ναζαρήτικος, Κύριε, σὺ οἶδα to say that he has φιλία for his Master. For why should he say "Yes," if he means "No"? Thirdly, the Syriac versions (both Old Syriac and Peshitta) use the same word to render ἀγαπᾷς and φιλεῖς in this passage, although two Syriac words were at their disposal. And this is the more remarkable because the Cuneoian and Peshitta in rendering ἀγαπᾷς at 14, where it occurs 3 times, use both the available Syriac words without distinction. In this connexion it is significant that ἀγαπᾷς and φιλεῖς are indifferently used in the LXX to translate the Heb. רַנס; this Hebrew root being nearly always rendered ἀγαπάω, and always behind φιλέω except when φιλέω means "to kiss," when it represents רָנס.

The Vulgate Latin distinguishes ἀγαπᾷς and φιλεῖς by the respective renderings diligit and amat; but the O.T. texts have amat throughout, in this agreeing with the Syriac. No distinction is drawn between ἀγαπᾷς and φιλεῖς here in the Arabic version of Tatian's Diatessaron.

We conclude that we must treat ἀγαπᾷς and φιλεῖς in vv 15-17 as synonymous, as all the patristic expositors do.

ἀγαπᾷς μετὰ πλείων τοῖχων; πλέον (NBDCL) must be preferred to the rec. πλείω.

What is the meaning of πλέον τοῖχων? It has been generally understood as meaning "more than your companions, the other apostles, love me," and this yields a good sense. Peter had claimed that his loyalty surpassed that of the rest (Mk. 14); and cf. 13). He had taken precedence of the others, in speech (6) and act (18), more than once. And the question of Jesus may mean, "Do you really love me more than the others do, as your forwardness in acting as their leader used to suggest?" But (a) if this be the meaning, the construction is elliptical and ambiguous. We should expect the personal pronoun αὐτῷ to be introduced before or after ἀγαπᾷς to mark the emphasis; (b) comparisons of this kind, πλέον between the love which this or that disciple displays or entertain, seem out of place on the lips of Jesus. To ask Peter if his love for his Master exceeds the love which, e.g., the Beloved Disciple cherished for Him, would be a severe test; and the question would be one which Peter could never answer with confidence.

3 See J. R. Harris, Odes of Solomon (ed. 192), p. 91.

For the distinction between diligit and amat, cf. Cicero, ad Brutum, 3.1.13: "Clodius ... unde me diligit, unde, si feceratis igitur, amabo me amat."
from βασιλεύς of vv. 15, 17. τομαίων is used in the LXX of feeding sheep, exactly as βασιλέως is (e.g. Gen. 30:17), and so too in its spiritual significance, e.g. Ps. 23:1 σύνεργάζοντας κομίτας μου; and Ezek. 34:10 τον μεν τομαίων τά πρόβατα μου.

The Vulgate has in vv. 15, 16, 17, pascit . . . pascit . . . pascit, no attempt being made to distinguish the Greek verbs; and it would be rash to assume that different Aramaic words lie behind βασιλεύς and τομαίων respectively in the present passage, more particularly as in the LXX βασιλεύς and τομαίων are used indifferently to translate πρόβατα.

We now turn to the various words used to describe the flock who are to be tended, and here we have to do with conflicting readings:

In v. 15, ἄγας is certainly right; C&D giving πρόβατα.
In v. 16, πρόβατα is read by BC as against πρόβατα, which has the support of ενεργεία.
In v. 17, πρόβατα is read by ACD, as against ABC, which have πρόβατα.

A careful study of the Syriac versions by Burkitt leads him to the conclusion that ἄγας . . . πρόβατα . . . πρόβατα were probably the original Greek words behind the Syriac. With this, the Latin Vulgate ἄγας . . . ἄγας . . . υποκρις shows, for πρόβατα as a diminutive may be very well represented by ἄγας. The O.L. versions, for the most part, do not distinguish, and give three times; but there are also traces of a reading πολλακος in vv. 16, 17.

These variants indicate, as it seems, that two or three different Aramaic words lie behind the Greek, although such an inference is not certain, having regard to what has been said above in relation to ἄγας—φίλοι and υπερασπίσται. And we incline to adopt the readings ἄγας . . . πρόβατα . . . πρόβατα in vv. 15, 16, 17 respectively, although the uncial evidence for πρόβατα in v. 16 is not very strong. Hence the charge to Peter first entrusts to his care the λαμβάνοντας τομαίων, then the young sheep, and lastly the whole flock, young and old.

With ἄγας, πρόβατα, may be compared τομαίων of 15:28. This use of diminutives indicates a tendency in the speaker's words. ἄγας occurs in the N.T. elsewhere only in the Apocalypse, where it is used as times of the Lamb of God (see on 15:19); it is infrequent in the LXX, πρόβατα does not appear again in the Greek Bible.

Some commentators (who find in the delivery of the special charge “Feed my lambs . . . my sheep” to Peter individually, an indication of his being entrusted with a higher commission than that of the other apostles) interpret the "lambs" the "faithful lambs," while the "sheep" whom Peter was to feed typify other pastures. This is anachronistic, and hardly more so than the interpretation which finds in this passage an anticipation of the primacy of the Roman See. Such thoughts were outside the purview of Christians at the time when the Fourth Gospel was published.

16. λέγει αὐτῷ καί τά δευτέραν. For this tautological phrase, see on 4:6.

Σήμερον ἰδοὺς, ἀγάπη με; The "more than these" of v. 15 is now dropped. And Peter's answer is the same as before: υπερασπίσται. The reply τομαίων τα πρόβατα μου is only to be distinguished from βασιλεύς τα ἄγας μου (v. 15) or βασιλεύς τα πρόβατα μου (v. 17), in so far as it entrusts a different section of the flock to the pastoral care of Peter. To distinguish τομαίων from βασιλεύς here is a modern subtlety, unknown to Christian antiquity; and it has been shown above to be without support from the LXX use of these verbs, which consistently represent the same Hebrew root.

17. το πρόβατον. Cf. δευτέραν in v. 16. This is the same question as before, repeated for the third time, and not a new question, as it would be if φίλος του; were different in meaning from ἄγας με; of v. 15, 16.

W has ἀγάπη here, as in vv. 15, 16.

Διδάσκει τὸ Πέτρος. He knew that he had given cause for the doubting of his love, and it grieved him that his repeated assurance that it still inspired him was not treated as sufficient by his Master. For τὸ Πέτρος here, see on 16:33.

With the above, ACD give prefixed γας, which is omitted by A.

For ἀγάπη (BCD), ενεργεία have ἄγας.

Peter leaves out υπερασπίσται in this third answer. He appeals to the knowledge of his feelings which he is assured Jesus must have.

πάντα σοι ἐδόθη (cf. 16:26). Long before this, the chosen companions of Jesus had learnt that His insight into human character and motive was uncerring; cf. 2:8 ἀγάπη για τον χάριτα υπερασπίσται. The verb γιατί νείκοι, of immediate observation, being used there, as here.

1 Ev. καί εἰς NE, ins. ANTP. BC om. ἄγας.
Prediction of Peter's martyrdom (vv. 18, 19); and a misunderstood saying about John (vv. 20–23)

28, 19. άραν άραν λέγω σοι. When Jesus warned Peter that he would deny Him, He prefaced the warning by the same impressive phrase (13, see on 13). There is no explicit reference to Peter's death in the words which follow. He has been bidden to feed the Lord's sheep, and He is reminded that, although, when he was young, he was unfettered and able to follow his own wishes, yet when he grew old he would be obliged to yield to the will of others. At this time he was no longer a youth; he had been married for some time (cf. Mt. 8), and was approaching middle life. The words άραν άραν σου may point only to the contrast between the alertness of youth and the helplessness of old age, which cannot always do what it would; and άραν σου may refer merely to the old man stretching out his hands that others may help him in putting on his garments, whereas the young man girds himself unassisted, before he sets out to walk (προαιρέσθη).

Further, άραν (only again at Acts 12 in the N.T.) is always used in the LXX, as in Greek generally, of girding on clothes or armour; and no instance is forthcoming of its use in the sense of binding a criminal, which must be supposed to be the meaning of δέλτα άταν σε if the Lord's words are taken as predictive of Peter's martyrdom. The order of the clauses in v. 18 is also strange if crucifixion was in the mind of the speaker; for we should expect the extension of the hands to be mentioned last.

On the other hand, this feature of death by crucifixion, that the hands were extended upon the cross, is specially mentioned as its characteristic by other writers. Wetstein quotes Arthem. Ort. i. 76, κατώτατοι δέ ον στυπνοθέτονται διά τον θάνατον και τον τιμονά του Χριστού, and Arrian, Epict. iii. 26, ετίκα ισασανιν θαυμάζουν διά τον στυπνοθέτον. Field adds a quotation from Dion. Hal. Ant. vii. 69, ώς έποντες της θάνατος είναι την τιμουρά, τας

1 It is used at 1 Mac. 67 of binding wooden "towers" on an elephant's back, but this does not help us here.

2 Trench gives other parallel passages (Méthodes, p. 458).

3 Cf. also Tertullian, adv. Judæos, 10, and Cyprian, Test. ii. 21.

4 Cf. Cyril. Hier. Cat. xvi. 22.
xxi. 20. Let there be no disciple who doth follow me, "This man, what?"

In this passage, John is questioning the purpose and meaning of the disciples' continued following of Jesus after his death. The text is part of a larger discourse in which John reflects on the aftermath of Jesus' crucifixion and resurrection, emphasizing the importance of faith and understanding in the context of the Christian community.

The passage highlights the transformation of the disciples' perspective on Jesus, moving from followers of a suffering teacher to believers in a resurrected savior. This shift is crucial for understanding the development of early Christian beliefs and the role of Jesus in the faith.

In the broader context of the Gospel of John, this passage underscores the unique nature of Jesus' message and the profound impact of his resurrection on his followers, setting the stage for the formation of the early Christian church.
XXI. 24. [AUTHENTICATION]

24. "The brethren" are the Christian community, who were to each other as brothers (see on 23 for the new commandment which enjoined this). The expression is not used thus in the Gospel narratives, where indeed it would be anachronistic, the sense of Christian brotherhood not being realised until after the Resurrection; but we have it often in the Acts (18 220 1–28, etc.), and it appears in Eph. 6 23, 1 Jn. 3 16, 3 Jn. 8 8.

25. The tenses of μαρτυρίαν rather suggests that he was alive; cf. "he knoweth" at 19. The term περὶ τῶν ἡμῶν probably refers to the whole content of the Gospel, and not merely to the episode recorded in c. 21, although it includes at any rate the latter part of this.

Prima facie, this indicates that the Beloved Disciple actually wrote the Gospel with his own hand, including the Appendix, and not only that his reminiscences are behind it. But γράφων is sometimes used when dictation only is intended. E.g. "Pilate wrote a title and put it on the cross" (19 24) means that Pilate was responsible for the wording of the title, but hardly that he wrote himself on the wooden board. So Paul says, "I write the more boldly to you" (Rom. 13 11), while it appears from Rom. 15 27 that the scribe of the epistle was one Ἄποστος. Cf. Gal. 5 13, and 1 Pet. 5 12. The employment of scribes was very common. Further, in Judg. 8 14, the LXX has ἡγαφόν πρὸς αὐτῶν (ν. ἔγραφαν), where the meaning is "he described," i.e. "he caused to be written down," not necessarily that the young prisoner wrote down the list of names suam manus. This is the meaning which we attach to ἠγαφέων in the present passage. The elders of the Church certified that the Beloved Disciple caused these things to be written. They were put into shape by the writer who took them down, and afterwards published them, not as his own, but as "the Gospel according to John." See Introd., p. lvii.

καὶ ὁ οἶκος, κτλ. Chrysostom (in loc.) seems to have read ὁ ὁς μὲν . . . , and this would give a good sense. "I know," that is, the writer whom we call Jn., knew, that the testimony of the aged disciple was truthful; but it was not to be taken as a complete account of all that Jesus did, μὲν in v. 24 being balanced by μὲν in v. 25. Such an attestation, however, by a writer who conceals his name and identity, would not be so impressive as ὁ οἶκος (which all the versions follow), the plural representing the concurrence of the presbyters of the Church at Ephesus where the Gospel was produced. For the early traditions to this effect, see Introd., pp. lvi, lix.

Jn. is prone to use ὁ οἶκος when he wishes to express the common belief and assurance of the Christian community, e.g. 1 Jn. 3 14, 14 19, 19, see also on 3 11. So BC 2 DW, while the rec. has ἀληθ. λέγεις ὡς μαρτυρίας τῆς, with MACTG. Cf. 3 Jn. 12, 1 Sunday presses this too far (Criticism of Fourth Gospel, p. 63).
THE “PERICOPE DE ADULTERAE”

(VII. 53-VIII. 11)

This section (separat) of the Fourth Gospel which contains this incident is contained in many late manuscripts and versions, but it cannot be regarded as Johannine or as part of the Gospel text.

It is not found in any of the early Greek uncials, with the single exception of Codex Bezae (D), being omitted without comment in

A and Δ omit it, while leaving a blank space where it might be inserted, thus indicating that their scribes deliberately rejected it as part of the Johannine text. A and C are defective at this point, but neither could have contained the section, as the missing leaves would not have had room for it.

The section is omitted also in important cursives, e.g. 22, 33, 365 (in which minuscule there is a note that the scribe knew of its existence).

The Ferrar cursives, e.g. fam. 13, do not give it in Jn., but place the section after Lk. 21v, where it would be, indeed, in better agreement with the context than before Jn. 8v. Cursives 1, 552, and some American MSS, place the section at the end of the Fourth Gospel. Cursives 225 places it after Jn. 7v.

The Old Syriac vs. (whether in Tatian’s Diatessaron, Syr. sin., or Syr. cur.) betray no knowledge of the passage, nor is it contained in the best MSS of the Peshitta. In like manner the Coptic vs. omit it, e.g. the fourth century Coptic Q (see p. xvi). Some of the O.L. MSS. are also without it, e.g. s/f 4th g.

Even more significant is the absence of any comment on the section by Greek commentaries for a thousand years after Christ, including Origen, Chrysostom, and Nonnus (in his metrical paraphrase), who deal with the Gospel verse by verse. The earliest Greek writer (Eustathius Zigabenus or Zygidenus) who comments on it lived about 1118, and even he says that the accurate copies of the Gospel do not contain it.

Further, the evidence of vocabulary and style is conclusive against the Johannine authorship of the section. The notes which follow demonstrate this sufficiently. Nor is its traditional place does it harmonise with the context. It interrupts the sequence of 7v and 8v; while 7v is not in harmony with what goes before, and has no connection with 8v.

The early Greek evidence in favour of the medieval view that the section is an authentic part of the Fourth Gospel reduces itself to the witness of Codex Bezae (D), a manuscript with many other Western interpolations. The section is found in the great mass of later uncials and cursives, whatever be the reason of this intrusion into the more ancient text. To be borne in mind, however, is the significant fact that in many of the later MSS, which contain it, the Pericope de adulterae is marked with an obelus (e.g. S) or an asterisk (e.g. EXA).

The Latin evidence in its favour is considerable. The section
appears in several O.L. texts, e.g. b e (see v. 7) and ff. (see v. 8), as well as in Jerome’s Vulgate. Jerome says expressly “in multís gRAecÍa et ínnumerus mariírum de adultéra,” etc. (ad loc. Pelág. li. 17). It is worth noting that (for cont. adult. ii. 6) accounts for some texts, hinting that the words of Jesus which it records might seem too tendentious.

The section is found also in some later Syriac and Coptic texts, while omitted in the earlier and better versions.

These facts show that the authorities on the side of the Pseudepigrapha are almost wholly Western, and do not become numerous in any language until after the acceptance by Jerome of the section as Johannine. Jerome seems to have followed here some Greek MSS. not now extant. This evidence is, however, wholly insufficient to justify the exclusion of the narrative in the Fourth Gospel. The ignoring of it by the early Greek MSS., even, and commentator is thus left unexplained.

Nevertheless, the story of the adulteress seems to be an authentic fragment of early tradition as to the sayings and actions of Jesus. The story is mentioned (although not referred to the Fourth Gospel) in the Apostolic Constitutions (ii. 24), a passage which goes back to the fourth century or perhaps even to the third. It must have been current as a tradition in the third century at any rate. Eusebius probably refers to it when he says of Papias that “he relates another story of a woman who was accused of many sins before the Lord which is contained in the Gospel according to the Hebrews” (H.E. iv. 39). Whether Papias got the story from the extra-canonical “Gospel according to the Hebrews,” or from some other source, is not certain. But that the Pseudepigrapha is the story which Papias told has been accepted by many scholars; and, accordingly, Lightfoot’s Apostolic Fathers, the passage [I.] vii. 53-viii. 11 is printed as one of the surviving fragments of Papias, bishop of Hierapolis.

This is highly probable, but is not certain. All we can assert with confidence is that the passage is very like the Synoptic stories about Jesus; while its tendentious and gravity commend it as faithfully reflecting what Jesus said and did when a woman who had sinned unchastely was brought before Him.

No reason for the ready acceptance in the West of the story as evangelical, and of its incorporation in the Latin Gospels as early as the fourth century, is necessary. It is not a story that is very difficult to assimilate, and has been current in the West from the third century. But by the time we reach the fourth century, ecclesiastical discipline began to be relaxed and to be less austere; and a story which had been formerly thought dangerous because of its apparent licentiousness would naturally be appealed to by canonists and divines as indicating the tenderness with which our Lord Himself regarded the cores of the dish. It was but a short step from this story to edifying to treat it as suitable for reading in Church. It would thus get into lectionaries, and in the Greek Menology it is of the lection for St. Pelagia’s day. From its insertion in Evangelistaria, it readily crept into Gospel texts, from which Jerome did not feel it practicable to expel it. Perhaps thus, or somewhat thus, its presence in the textus receptus of the Fourth Gospel is to be explained.

The text of the Pseudepigrapha which is given here is that adopted by Hort. The various readings are more numerous than in any other part of the N.T., and a large number of explanatory glosses were added to the text in the acceptance of these can hardly be improved. We have to do here only with the later uncial, and these are cited by the customary letters (EGH, etc.) as explained by Gregory or Scrivener. We cite the cursives – because of its remarkable agreement with D in this section. (See K. Lake, Texts from Mount Athos, p. 481.)

VII. 58. Woman brought to Him [VII. 58-59] [VII. 58-59].

The text has developed, with O.L. and v.g.; the rec. has ἀπαστραπέον with minor uncials and fam. 13.

παραστραπόν... occurs only at 7κη in Jn., who prefers ἀπαστραπέον (cf. 17κη 16κη 20κη); the context is common in the Synoptists.

VIII. 1. ὡς ὁ θεός ὁ θεός ἦν... is again, a Synoptic term, not occurring again in Jn. When Jn. introduces a place-name for the first time he is apt to add a word of explanation (4κη 11κη), but nothing of the kind is here.

The author of the Mount of Olives would fall in with the story referring to the week before the Passion, when Jesus lodged at Bethany; cf. Mk. 11κη 13κη.

ὁ Ἰακώβου... is Lucan (Acts 24κη; Acts 5κη); Jn. does not use it, but has Ἰωάνης instead (18κη 20κη 24κη).

The frequent use of ὅπως in this section to the exclusion of Jn.’s favourite ἐπειδή (see on 17κη) marks the style as non-Johannine.

The author of D 1072 has ἀπαστραπέον. The verb occurs in Jn. only once (1κη). ἦν is read by fam. 13.

ὁ ἄνδρος is found in Jn. only twice (1κη 16κη); he prefers ἄνδρος, which is current in MSS. give here.

The clause καὶ ἄνδρος... ἀπαστραπέον ἐστιν is omitted by fam. 13, while D om. καὶ καθάρισεν καθάρισεν ἀπαστραπέον.

For καθαρίσει, as describing the attitude of Jesus when teaching, see on 10κη (cf. Mk. 13κη). In generally implies the nature of Jesus’ teaching in the Temple (cf. 17κη 18κη), but at 17κη he writes simply καθαρίσας as here.

For ἐγένετο καὶ... fam. 13 gives καὶ πρωτεύειν καθαρίσει. There is no mention of scribes in Jn. “Scribes and Pharisees” is a frequent Synoptic phrase for the opponents of Jesus, whom Jn. prefers to describe briefly as “the Jews” (see on 1κη).

The woman was not brought before Jesus for formal trial, but in order to get His expression of opinion on a point of the Mosaic law, which might afterwards be used against Him (see v. 6), of which other examples are given by the Sycophants (cf. Mk. 12κή 2κή).

Some minor uncials ins. ἀπαστραπέον before γράφεται, but om. D 1072 and fam. 13.

ὁ ἄνδρος is supported by the uncial MSUTA and fam. 13; ἐγένετο is read by EGHK, and is smoothed down in D 1072 to ἐγένετο.

καταφέρατον... καταφέρατον... “to overtake,” occurs in Jn. 1κη 12κη.

Milligan gives a fourth- or fifth-century papyrus an exact parallel to the present passage, where it is used of direction in sin, visa.; ἀπαστραπέον καθαρίσας. And ὁ Ἰωάνης ἐπείδη ἄνθροπος... καθαρίσει.
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συνετε αὐτόν ἐν μέσῳ. 4. λέγων αὐτῷ Διδάκτι, ἢ γὰρ καταλεύκησαν εἰς αὐθεντὴν μακάριονον. 5. ἐν δὲ τῷ χόρῳ ἦσαν Ἰωάννης διαδίδοντα τὰς νοοῦσας λαβῶν ἥν ἄν ἐγείρετα: 6. τοῦτο δὲ ἔλεγεν ἄλλως αὐτόν, ἵνα ἐνημερώσῃ 

συνετε αὐτόν ἐν μέσῳ (ἐν τῷ μέσῳ, sam. 13). Cf. Acts 4 for the phrase descriptive of "setting" people in the midst of bystanders for the purpose of examining them.

4. After αὐτῷ, D has καταλεύκησαν αὐτόν, and EGHK 1071 καταλεύκησαν only. The phrase with καταλεύκησαν is Luke; cf. Lk. 10:48.

For διαδίδοντα, see 1. 5. For Ἰωάννης, D has Ἰωάννης (D 1071), MSA and fam. 13 have Ἰωάννης, while EGHKII give Ἰωάννης.

ἐν αὐθεντήν, in the act. "The phrase does not occur again in the Gospels, but is thoroughly classical. Cf. Philo, leg. leg. iii. 10: μελετᾶς δὲ τοῖς μόνοις αὐθεντήν ... ἀναφέρειν κ. ἔκλειδα. Milligan illustrates from a second-century papyrus to καταλεύκησαν ἐν αὐθεντήν ἀκατακχάτῳ.

ἐνημερώσῃ does not occur in Jn., but several times in the Synoptists.

5. ἐν τῷ μέσῳ δὲ λέγειν. In an ordinary case of adultery (e.g. Lev. 20:9) the penalty was death for both parties, but the manner of execution is not specified, the Talmud prescribing death by stoning. But in the exceptional and specially heinous case of a betrothed woman's unchastity, death was to be by stoning (Deut. 22:24). It was an unusual case like this that was put before Jesus.

The severe laws were rarely put in force, but nevertheless the dilemma was neatly framed. If He said that the guilty woman should be stoned, He would have been subject to the Roman law for inciting to murder; and although the Roman authorities were lax about such acts of violence (as in the case of Stephen, Acts 7), there would have been a good pretext for handing Him over to them to deal with. If, however, He inclined to more merciful treatment, as it was probably expected of Him, He would have been accused of casting His critics to be a blasphemer of the person who did not accept the enactments of the sacred law. Cf. Mk. 12:14 for the dilemma about the tribute money and Mk. 10:8 for the question about divorce, which, however, puzzling, would not involve difficulty with the Roman authorities.

Augustine, however, puts the dilemma in a simpler way: "Si ut iudicet, occidi percipior sanctuccius, si autem iudicet dimitteat, iudicium his (in Ps. 1. 8) 

The for the first clause D has Ἰωάννης ἐν τῷ μέσῳ ἀκατακχάτῳ. For ἀκατακχάτῳ (cf. 10:20), which is read by DMSU 1071 and 13, the rec. has ἀκατακχάτων (the verb used Deut. 22:24) as EGHKII.

After ἔλεγεν αὐτῷ, καταλεύκησαν MSU fam. 13 ἦσαν.

4. From βαπτιστὴν to καταλεύκησαν, αὐτόν is om. by DM, the clause appearing in the rec. supported by SUL fam. 13 (in the form καταλεύκησαν καὶ αὐτός). Such laying of traps for Jesus is often mentioned in the Synoptists, e.g. Mk. 6:3, Lk. 10:18.

6. καταλεύκησαν is supported by DM, but καταλεύκησαν followed by a genitive, at 13, αὐτόν ἔστω is read here, but καταλεύκησαν at v. 8, "having stopt the doors," καταλεύκησαν occurs again in the Greek Bible only at 1 Kings 6:8, in the sense of "peeping out," see, for ἀπακτοῖς, on 20. For καταλεύκησαν, "to stop," Milligan cites Aristob. loc. i.

καταλεύκησαν. So DEHGM, but EGHK 13 have ἔστω, καταλεύκησαν does not occur again in N.T., but appears several times in LXX, often meaning "to register," a sense also found in papyri. It indicates a record or register of something blameworthy in Job 13, 11:25; Ecclus. 49:18; and this meaning is accepted in some ancient comments, both here and at v. 8.

In a short recension of the story found in an Armenian MS. of the Gospels of A.D. 980, we have: "He Himself, bowing His head, was writing with His finger on the earth, to declare their sins; and they were stoned, there being no stone on the ground." And again, after ἔστω τοῦ μόνοις ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, as if Jesus was writing down the names and sins of the assembled, so Jerome has the same translation: "Jesus inscribed digito scribatur in terra, scumm, uidelicet qui accessabant et omnium pacta mortuum, sequentes quod scriptum est in prophetae Resurrectorum vatum in terra sorbantem" (ad loc. Ps. 15, 17, Ps. 113).

There is, however, no evidence that Jesus was writing anything by way of record. That He was able to write may be assumed, although in no other place in the N.T. is He said to have written anything. But it is probable that on this occasion He was only scribbling with His finger on the ground, a mechanical action which would suggest only an unwillingness to speak on the subject brought before Him, and preoccupation with His own thoughts.

If, however, the meaning ofregister for καταλεύκησαν is to be pressed, the emphasis must be placed on ἀπακτοῖς: "He began to register the accusation in the dust," as if He would have no permanent record.

After ἔστω the rec. adds, with EGHKII, the gloss μὴ προγεγραμμένος; "affecting that it was not so," etc. as though He heard them not.

This is a classical use of προγεγραμμένος with a neg. (cf. Thucyd. ii. 47); the verb occurs again in the N.T. only at Lk. 24:20 (cf. 1 Sam. 21:18), προγεγραμμένος, "signed himself," etc. to be read.

καταλεύκησαν ἀπακτοῖς, "they went on asking," as in Acts 12:16 ἀπακτοῖς, ἔστω does not occur in Jn.

6. D om. αὐτόν, ἔστωτες then being used absolutely or intransitively, as in the (unusual) instance of Jn. 17.

καταλεύκησαν as τοῦ, while fam. 13 give ἔστωτες. In the N.T. only at Lk. 24:20, "to lift oneself up"; ἔστωτες in all but 152 is αὐτόν. So DSU 1071 fam. 13. M om. αὐτόν. EGHK have ἔστω ἀπακτοῖς, the rec. reading ἔστω, ἔστωτες καταλεύκησαν. Let him that is faultless, etc. This is the true Synoptic note. ἔστω does not indicate only innocence of overt sins of the flesh, but freedom from sinful desire cherished and

---

8 See Conybeare, D.B. i. 156; and Burkitt, Two Lectures on the Gospels, p. 88.
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"Go, and sin no more."

The rec. adds τεκαραπώσα κατά τον υἱόν τοῦ δικαίου, but om. DMSUP 1071. The compound καταραπώσα is not johannine. In this verse, Jesus is represented as waiting for a little before He spoke. "Has no one proceeded to condemn you?" is His question at last.

α ἔλεη τὸν ὄσιόν ἡμών. "No one, sir." That is all the woman says from beginning to end. Indeed, she has no excuse for her conduct.

Οὗτος ἐγώ οὐ καταράπωσον. The verbal similarity of these words to εἰλήθε τὸ εὐθύνε τοῦ δικαίου of 8:16 (where see note) may have suggested the position which the interpolated section occupies in the rec. text, viz. at the beginning of c. 8. But καταραπώσα conveys condemnation in a degree which the simple verb εἰλήθε does not connote. Jesus does not say here that He does not pass judgment, even in His own mind, upon the woman's conduct, but that He does not condemn her judicially or undertake the duty of a judge who had to administer or interpret the Mosaic law (cf. Lk. 12:14). Still less does His reply convey forgiveness; the woman who was forgiven in Lk. 7:17 was a penitent, but there is no hint of penitence in this case.

Probably, the apparent leniency of the words α ἔλεη τὸν ὄσιόν ἡμών (which could readily be misunderstood) led to their omission in the tenth-century Armenian MS. quoted above on 6:6, and also in a Syriac paraphrase given by Dorotheus Baralibbi. The Armenian codex ends, "Go in peace, and present the offering for sins, as in their law is written," while the Syriac paraphrase has only, "Go thou also now and do this sin no more." The warning αὐτὰρ ἐπισμάτων is found also at 5:18, where (as here) the person addressed has not confessed any sin. The woman had still time to repent.

The phrase is Lukan (Lk. 11:15; 12:12-21), but not johannine.

1 See Gwynn, Trans. R.I. Acad. xvii. p. 292.
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Abiding in Christ. 212.
Abraham seeing Christ's day. 320.
Abraham's seed. 305.
adultery. 718.
allegorical method. lxxviil.
Alogi. lxxiv.
avacoluthion. 15.
angels. 653.
Annas. 590.
another disciple. 593.
Antichrist. lxxi.
Antiochene Acts of Martyrdom. lxxvi.
Apion. 644.
apocalypse. lxiv.
appearances. 653, 672, 692.
appendix. 657.
Aramaic names and forms. 54, 58.
59, 151, 227, 329, 351, 623, 626, 657.
ataris ibibendi. 77.
Ascension. 668.
authentication. 712.
authorship of Gospel. lxvii.
baptism. 39, 104, 128.
baptism, a seal. 191.
Baptist, the. 6, 7, 8, 35, 42, 127, 249.
Barabas. 614.
barley leaves. 178.
Bartholomew. 669.
belief. 161.
Bethabara. 42.
Bethany. xcvii, 372.
Bethany beyond Jordan. 41
Bethesda. xix, xcvii, clxxix, 226.
Beth-Nimra. 42.
blasphemy. Jesus accused of. 237, 597.
blessing. 181.
blind, healing the man born. 323.
blood and water. 647.
bread of God. 155, 156.
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Bread of Life. Jesus the. 190, 197, 206, 297, 214.
brother of Jesus. 84, 266, 269.
brother, figure of the Church. 130.
bronze. 654.
burial of Jesus. 654.
Caesar. 621.
Capharnaum. 403, 591, 602, 605.
Cana of Galilee. site of. 72.
mourning at. 72, 81.
Cana, miracle at. clxxvi, 72, 82.
Capernaum. 83; site of. 84, 189.
Carthage. Calendar of. xiii.
Cerinthos. clxxxv, lxxiv.
Charis. cxi.
children of God. 16.
Christology. cxxii.
Chronicles of Eusebius. xli.
Chronology of Fourth Gospel. 42, 625.
citations. early. of Fourth Gospel. lxxi.
clausura. mystic. 201.
Claudius Apollinaris of Hierapolis. 21.
commentaries on Fourth Gospel. clxxvi.
commission to the Apostles. 676.
consolation. 573, 575.
consolatio. 72, 13.
Crucifixion. 624, 627.
crusisfractio. lxxiv, 643.
Day. the Last. 201, 244.
Dedication. Feast of. 343.
delation. 18.
denial. 592, 602.
devil, the. 223, 313.
dignity, apostolic. 459.
disciple, the unnamed. clxxxvi, 54, 594, 654, 657.
disciples. perplexity of. 216, 513.
detection of many. 220.
steadfastness of the twelve, 220; hated by the world, 491; confident, 521.

discipleship, badge of, 528.
disciples of the text, xvi-xvii.

docetism, clxx, 19, 647.
door, Jesus the, 351.
dove at the Baptism, 48, 49, 50.

Ecce Homo, 616.

Elijah, 37.

elliptical construction, 9, 325, 467, 495.

emphasis by doubling, 66, 205.

Ephesus, xvi, 1.

epigram, 407.

eschatology, current Jewish, 119.

eternal life, 116, 120, 126, 222.

enharmonic doctrine, clxxvi.

evangelist, the, characteristics of, Ixxxiii; a Jew, Ixxxviii; literary method of, Ixxxiii.

Evil One, the, 573.

examinations of Jesus by Pilate, 608, 618.

experience, spiritual, sequence of, 548.

faith, 192; confession of, 159.

Father, the, relation of the Son to, 239; witness to the Son of, 210; direct access to, 510.

Feast of the Jews, 225.

feasts, Jewish, 89, 773.

fear, direct, 689.

five thousand, feeding of, xcvii, clxxx, 171; differences in Jewish account from those of the Synoptists, 179; note on fishes, 178.

flask, 209.

flesh and spirit, 106, 107.

flock, one, shepherd, oac, 381.

food, Jewish rule as to, 130.

Fourth Gospel, summary of argument as to authorship, Ixviii; comparison with Mark, xcv, Luke, xciv, chronology of, ccl.; doctrinal teaching of, xciv.

Freer MS, passage from, 508.

future disciples, prayer for.

Gabibha, 525.

galilæan, 564.

garments, distribution of, 669.

Gentile fold, 561, 562.

gEphesians, Ixxxvii, geographical notes in the Gospel, Ixxx.

Gerizim, Mount, 145.

glosses, Marcion, Ixxxi, xxviii.

Gnosis, excluded from Fourth Gospel, 3.

god, glory of, 574; glorified, 525; indwelling of, 551.

Golgotha, 627.

Gospel, the, scope and purpose of, Ixxxv; grace, 25, 26; Christ the giver of, 28.

Hadrian, xi.

harvest, time of, 153.

heart, blindness of, 451.

Hebraism, 318.

Hebrew names, interpretation of, Ixxx.

Hosanna, 424.

humility of Jesus, emphasis of John on, 135.

"I am," the phrase, cxvii.

Jacob's well, 135.

Jesus, the words of, in John and the Synoptists, cxviii; self-witness of, 247, 293; pre-existence of, 221, 222; His agitation, 192; His agony of spirit, 455; reiterated His claims, 445; glorification of, 415; rejection of, 455; love of, 483; manifestation of, 540; arrest of, 581, 584; examination of, before Anna, 599; Peter's denial of, 592, 621; brought before Pilate, 604-605; scourged and mocked, 614; crucified, 625; burial of, 612; resurrection of, 659; appearances of, 657, 672, 602.

Jerusalem, John's intimate knowledge of, Ixxx, 98; triumphal entry into, 423.

Jewish worship, Jesus associates Himself with, 148.

Jews, the explanation of their unbelief, The Devil's seed, 309; spiritually dead, 213.

John, the son of Zebedee, xcxxxv.

John, problem of His death, xcxxxvi; testimony of Irenaeus, xcxxxvii; testimony of Polycrates, l-ll; testimony of Papias, lii; testimony of Clement of Alexandria, lv; testimony of Origen, lv; testimony of the Gaetic Acts, Johannis, lv; of Terrill, iv; of Hippolytus, iv.

Jordan, 370.

joy, 485, 518, 572.

judas iscariot, 224.

Jude, 549.

judgment, clx, 508.

judgment seat, 622.

Jesus glad, 607.

Kedron, 582.

Kephna, 59, 60.

Kiddush, evil.

Kingdom of God and the new birth, clxvii.

King of the Jews, 609.

lake, storm on, 185.

Lamb of God, 43-47.

Last Day, 187.

Last Supper, the, 454, 457; the places at, 457.

Lazarus, raising of, clxxx, 392, 374, 375.

life, the power of, 243; through death, 433, 434; future, promise of, 530; eternal, 561.

Life, Christ the, 538.

Life, the Son the, 243.

Light of Life, 293.

Light of the World, 291.

illeg, 200.

Logos, the doctrine of, cxxxviii; personality of, cxxi; pre-existence of, cxxi; hymn, cxxiv; the Divine Logos, 1, 2, 13; pre-existent, 3; the creative, 3; the life, 4; the Light, 5; became flesh, 20; His glory, 23; revealer of God, 243.

Lord, the use of, xcvii; love, 455, 722; of the Son for the Father, 566; additional note on, 703; love of God, 254.

Malchus, 580.

man blind from birth, clxxxix.

Mandana Liturgies, clxiv.

manus, 194, 196.

manners and customs of Jews, allusions to, lxxxvi.

mansion, the many, 531.

martyrdom of John, cxxxviii-xlix; Peter, prediction of, 228.

Martyrology, Syriac, xxii.

Mary of Bethany, 372, 373, 375.

Mary Magdalen, xxvi.

Messiah, used without article, 151.

Messias, false, 533.

Messianic king, Jesus acclaimed 48, 183.

ministry, dignity of, 435.

miracles, the Johannine, clxxxvi.

mission, the divine, of Christ, 475.

Mithraism, chs., mocking, the, 614.

Monarchian Preface, viii.

money-changers, 90.

Moses, 114, 257, 257, 258, 261.

Muratorian Fragment, 128, 171.

Nathanael, call of, 61, 62, 64, 68, 69; promise to, 70.

New commandment, the, 455, 526.

Nicodemus, discourse with, 99.

note, 508, 513.

nobilissimus's son, healing of, clxxx, 165.

numbers, lxxxvii, 81, 83.

ointment, 417.

old Testament, the authority of, cxiv.

Orphics, the, 513.

Oxyrhynchus Papyrus, xxix.

sugar, clxix, 20.

sacraments, the, xvii, 406; His witness to Christ, 499; His coming, 503; work of, 503; as Guide, 503; His work of prediction, 511; another, 545.

parasis, lxxxix.

Paschal Hallel, the, cxvii.

Passion, the, a judgment, 447.

Passover, the, 171, 226.

peace, gift of, 554.

palæstina, 463.

pardon, the, a judgment, 503.

persecution, 493, 500.

person of Christ, doctrine in the
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Synoptists, Paul, and John, cxvlii-cxviii.
Petalon, the, 594 f.
Peter, the call of, 57, 59; confession of, 61; his restoration, 661, 701.
Pharisceus, inquiry as to cure on the Sabbath, 332, 428.
Philipp., the call of, 61, 410, 540, 541.
Philip of Side, epitome of the history of, cxxviii.
Pilate, 604 f.
plium, 640.
Prædestination, 604.
Prayer, 429, 517, 543.
Predestination, John's doctrine of, 70, 219, 467.
Preparation, the, 633, 655.
purity, spiritual, 453.
"Q." cxxiv, cxxviii, cxix, cxixi.
Quadratus, 11.
Quakers, 12.
Rabbi, 54, 55, 101.
Rabban, 636.
Rebirth, 103.
reverent in stiriwum, 91.
repentances in Fourth Gospel, lxxix.
Resurrection, 201, 386.
righteousness, conviction of, 507.
Sabbath, healings on, 237, 236, 331, 265.
Salam, 128.
saliva, curative effects, 327.
Samarian woman, discourse with, 114, 116.
Sanhedrin, function and composition of, 227.
Saviour, xvi.
Scripture, the witness of, 253; fulfilled at the Crucifixion, 651.
Serpent, the Brazen, 112.
 servants of Jesus, 610.
seven, the number, lxxixviii.
Shekhinah, the doctrine of, 12.
Shepherd and the Sheep, allegory of, 344 f.
side pierced, 645.
Siham, Pool of, 358.
Simon Magnus, 144.
sin, slavery of, 307; Hebrew and Greek doctrines regarding, 307, 325; vomiting of, 679.
Skull, the Place of, 629.
slaves and friends, 429.
solominy, restoration of, 63, 433.
Son of Man, in John and the Synoptists, cxixii; in Psalter, cxvii, 244.
Son of God, a title of the Messiah, 52, 64, 390.
sop, the, significance of, 473.
Spirit, 284.
Stoics, the, lxxixiii.
style, 7.
Synchris, 134.
Synoptists, the, use by John of, cxxiv.
Tabernacles, Feast of, 256, 270.
Temple, cleansing of, 86; building of, 56.
Thomas, 380; incredulity of, 561; confession of, 563.
time, method of reckoning, 356.
Toilet, 46.
tomb, Peter and John at, 659; women visit the, 656.
"Touch Me not," 659.
Trial of Jesus, 601.
triduum, 77.
truth, 25, 26, 27; freedom of, 207; the Spirit of, 499; Christ the, 357.
Vine, the allegory of, 477.
vision, promise of spiritual, 366.
Voice from heaven, 429.
voluntariness of the death of Jesus, 365.
washing the disciples' feet, 459; spiritual meaning of, 455.
Water of Life, the, 281.
Water, the Living, 138, 140, 141.
Way, Christ the, 537.
witness, the idea of, 311.
word in the Fourth Gospel, 656; words from the Cross, 631-636.
work, witness of, 569.
wrath of God, the, 127.
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Abbott, Ezra, lxxxiii, lxxxv, 104.
Abraham, bishop, 636.
Apocr., xiii, adv. 20, 440, 508.
Apol., 523.
Apostle, 283.
Apostolic Constitutions, 314, 716.
Apolinarius, Claudius, ii, iii, 144.
Appian, 523.
Apuleius, chil.
Aquila, 651, 702.
Aristophanes, 506, 666.
Aristotle, 12, 702.
Arna, 17.
Arnold, Matthew, lxxvi.
Arrian, 170.
Artemidorus, 103, 114.
Athanasius, 24, 282.
Augustine, lvi, lxxvii, cxxvi, 18, 27, 38, 67, 71, 395, 392.
Bacher, cit.
Bacon, W. B., xxii, xxvi, xxxvi, xxxviii, xcvii, xcviii, 102.
Ball, C. J., 6, 45, 46.
Barnes, W. E., 233.
Baruch, Apocalypse of, clvii, 245, 274, 438.
Baruch, Rest of the Words of, lxxii.
Basili, xlii, 287.
Basilides, lxxvii, lxxviii, 13.
Bauer, W., citii, cxxvi, 534, 587, 689.
Bede, Venerable, 454.
Beermann, G., xvii.
Beneficence Rule, 146.
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