

THE THIRD EPISTLE OF

JOHN

CHAPTER 1

1. *The elder.* See on 2 John 1.

Gaius. The name occurs several times in the New Testament, as ^{<4189>}Acts 19:29; 20:4; ^{<6162>}Romans 16:23; ^{<4114>}1 Corinthians 1:14. The person addressed here cannot be identified.

The well-beloved. Rev., *the beloved.* In the Greek order the name comes first. *Gaius the beloved.*

In the truth (ἐν αληθείᾳ). Rev., properly, omitting the article, *in truth.* See on 2 John 4.

2. *Beloved.* Compare the plural, ^{<6182>}1 John 3:2, 21; 4:1, 7, 11.

I wish above all things (περὶ πάντων εὔχομαι). Wrong. This sense of *περί* is contrary to New Testament usage. The preposition means *concerning*. So Rev. "I pray that *in all things* thou mayst prosper." *Εὔχομαι* *I pray* or *wish*, occurs only here in John's writings, and not often elsewhere. See ^{<4182>}Acts 26:29; ^{<6182>}Romans 9:3; ^{<5056>}James 5:16.

Mayst prosper (εὐοδοῦσθαι). Lit., *have a prosperous journey.* From *ἐν well*, and *ὁδός* *a way.* In this original sense, ^{<6110>}Romans 1:10. The word occurs only three times in the New Testament. See ^{<6102>}1 Corinthians 16:2.

Be in health (ὑγιαίνειν). Used in the New Testament both in a physical and moral sense. The former is found only here and in Luke's Gospel. See ^{<4151>}Luke 5:31; 7:10; 15:27. Paul uses it of *soundness in faith* or *doctrine.* See ^{<5111>}1 Timothy 1:10; 6:3; ^{<5112>}2 Timothy 1:13; ^{<5112>}Titus 2:2. Here of *Gaius' bodily health*, as is shown by *soul* in the next clause.

Soul (ψυχή). See on ^{<4123>}Mark 12:30; ^{<4145>}Luke 1:46. The *soul* (ψυχή) is the principle of individuality, the seat of personal impressions. It has a side in

contact with both the material and the spiritual element of humanity, and is thus the mediating organ between body and spirit. Its meaning, therefore, constantly rises above *life* or the *living individual*, and takes color from its relation to either the emotional or the spiritual side of life, from the fact of its being the seat of the feelings, desires, affections, aversions, and the bearer and manifester of the divine life-principle (πνεῦμα). Consequently ψυχή is often used in our sense of *heart* (^{<014>}Luke 1:46; 2:35; ^{<015>}John 10:24; ^{<016>}Acts 14:2); and the meanings of ψυχή *soul* and πνεῦμα *spirit*, occasionally approach each other very closely. Compare ^{<017>}John 12:27, and 11:33; ^{<018>}Matthew 11:29, and ^{<019>}1 Corinthians 16:18. Also both words in ^{<020>}Luke 1:47. In this passage ψυχή *soul*, expresses the soul regarded as moral being designed for everlasting life. See ^{<021>}Hebrews 6:19; 10:39; 8:17; ^{<022>}1 Peter 2:11; 4:19. John commonly uses the word to denote the principle of the natural life. See ^{<023>}John 10:11, 15; 13:37; 15:13; ^{<024>}1 John 3:16; ^{<025>}Revelation 8:9; 12:11; 16:3.

3. *Rejoiced greatly*. See on 2 John 4.

Brethren came (ἐρχομένων ἀδελφῶν). Lit., *coming*. The present participle denotes *coming from time to time*, and not coming on a single occasion, which would require the aorist. On *brethren*, see on ^{<026>}1 John 2:9.

Thou walkest in truth. See on ^{<027>}1 John 1:8. for the phrase *walk in*, see on 2 John 6. *Thou* is emphatic, suggesting a contrast with less faithful ones, as Diotrephes, ver. 9.

4. *Joy* (χαρὰν). The texts vary; some reading χάριν *grace* or *favor* from God, on which see 2 John 3. Note the Greek order: *greater joy than this have I not*.

My children (τὰ ἐμὰ τέκνα). Lit., *mine own children*.

Walk (περιπατοῦντα). Rev., *rightly, walking*. The participle expresses something habitual.

5. *Thou doest faithfully* (πιστὸν ποιεῖς). Rev., *thou doest a faithful work*. A third interpretation is *thou givest a pledge or guaranty*, and a fourth,

akin to this, *thou makest sure*. The Rev. is best. There is no parallel to justify the third and fourth. ^{fb73}

Thou doest (ἐργάση). Or lit., according to the etymology, *workest* (ἔργον *work*). See on ^{sb7b} James 2:9. The distinction between this verb and others signifying *to do*, such as ποιεῖν, πράσσειν, δρᾶν, which last does not occur in the New Testament, is not sharply maintained in Attic Greek. In certain connections the difference between them is great, in others, it is hardly perceptible. On ποιεῖν and πρα.σσειν, see on ^{sb7c} John 3:21. Ἐργάζομαι, like πράσσειν, contemplates the *process* rather than the *end* of action, carrying the ideas of *continuity* and *repetition*. It means *to labor, to be active, to perform*, with the idea of continued exertion, and therefore is used of servants, or of those who have an assigned business or office. See ^{sb7d} Matthew 21:28; 25:26; ^{sb7e} Luke 13:14; ^{sb7f} John 5:17; 6:27; 9:4; ^{sb7g} 1 Thessalonians 2:9. For the phrase ἐργάση εἰς *thou doest toward* (Rev.), see ^{sb7h} Matthew 26:10.

And to strangers (καὶ εἰς τοὺς ξένους). The best texts read, instead of εἰς τοὺς *to the* (strangers), τοῦτο, *that*; so that the sentence is, literally, “to them that are brethren, *and that* strangers.” For the phrase *and that*, compare ^{sb7i} 1 Corinthians 6:6; ^{sb7j} Philippians 1:28; ^{sb7k} Ephesians 2:8.

6. The Church (ἐκκλησίας). See on ^{sb7l} Matthew 16:18.

If thou bring forward on their journey (προπέμψας). Lit., *having sent forward*. The aorist tense represents the act as accomplished. Compare ^{sb7m} Acts 15:3; ^{sb7n} Titus 3:13. Rev., *set forward*.

After a godly sort (ἀξίως τοῦ Θεοῦ). Lit., *worthily of God*. So Rev. Compare ^{sb7o} 1 Thessalonians 2:12; ^{sb7p} Colossians 1:10.

Thou shalt do well (καλῶς ποιήσεις). For the phrase, see ^{sb7q} Acts 10:33; ^{sb7r} Philippians 4:14; ^{sb7s} James 2:8, 19; ^{sb7t} 2 Peter 1:19. Rev., renders the whole: *whom thou wilt do well to set forward on their journey worthily of God*.

7. For His Name's sake (ὕπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος). *His* is supplied by the A.V. It is not in the text. Rev., correctly, *for the sake of the Name*. The Name (Jesus Christ) is used thus absolutely in ^{sb7u} Acts 5:41; compare

^{<401E>}James 2:7. For a similar absolute use of *the way*, see on ^{<401E>}Acts 4:2. See on ^{<401E>}1 John 1:7.

Taking nothing of (μηδὲν λαμβάνοντες ἀπὸ). For the phrase *taking of, or from*, see on ^{<401E>}1 John 1:5.

The Gentiles (ἔθνικῶν). This word occurs elsewhere only in the Gospel of Matthew. The more common word is ἔθνη, which is the reading of the Tex. Rec. here: ἔθνω̄ν. See on ^{<401E>}Luke 2:32.

8. Ought (ὀφείλομεν). See on ^{<401E>}1 John 2:6.

To receive (ἀπολαμβάνειν). The best texts read ὑπολαμβάνειν *to support*; i.e., to *welcome* with the provision of hospitality. Rev., *welcome*. The verb means, originally, *to take underneath in order to raise*. Hence, *to support*. Figuratively, *to take upon the mind, to suppose*, as ^{<401E>}Luke 7:43; ^{<401E>}Acts 2:15: *to take up or follow in speech*; hence *to answer*, as ^{<401E>}Luke 10:30.

Fellow-helpers to the truth (συνεργοὶ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ). Lit., *fellow-workers*. The expression is explained in two ways: either *fellow-workers with the teachers* (τοιούτους *such*) in support of the truth; or *fellow-workers with the truth*. Adopt the latter, as Rev. ^{fb74}

9. I wrote unto the Church. The best texts insert τι *somewhat*, which indicates that the apostle did not regard the communication as specially important.

Diotrephes (Διοτρεφῆς). The name is from Δίος *of Zeus* (Jove), and τρέφω *to nourish*, and means *Jove-nursed*.

Who loveth to have the pre-eminence (ὁ φιλοπρωτεύων). From the adjective φιλόπρωτος *fond of being first*. The word occurs here only.

10. Prating (φλυαρῶν). From φλύω *to bubble up or boil over*. Hence of talk which is both *fluent* and *empty*. Compare the kindred adjective φλύαροι *tattlers*, ^{<51E3>}1 Timothy 5:13.

Them that would. Those who were disposed to receive the strangers.

Casteth them out. By excommunication, which, through his influence, he had power to bring about.

11. Follow (μιμοῦ). More correctly, as Rev., *imitate*. Elsewhere only ^{<SIB>}2 Thessalonians 3:7, 9; ^{<SIB>} Hebrews 13:7. The kindred word μιμητής *imitator*, uniformly rendered *follower* in A.V., occurs ^{<AUG>}1 Corinthians 4:16; 11:1; ^{<HRE>} Ephesians 5:1. Hence our word *mimic*; also *pantomime*. Μῖμος means both an actor and a kind of prose drama, intended as a familiar representation of life and character, and without any distinct plot.

That which is evil — that which is good (τὸ κακὸν — τὸ ἀγαθόν). Compare τὰ ἀγαθὰ *good*, τὰ φαῦλα *evil*, ^{<RFB>} John 5:29.

12. Demetrius hath good report (Δημητρίῳ μεμαρτύρηται). Lit., *unto Demetrius witness hath been born*. See ^{<RFB>} John 3:26.

13. I had (εἶχον). The imperfect tense: *I was having*, when I began to write.

Pen (καλάμου). Lit., *reed*. See ^{<HRE>} Matthew 11:7. *The staff or scepter placed in mockery in Jesus' hand*, ^{<VZ>} Matthew 27:29. *A measuring-reed*, ^{<HRE>} Revelation 11:1

14. Face to face. See on 2 John 12.

VOLUME 2

- ftb1** That he names himself in the Apocalypse, and not in the Gospel, is sufficiently explained by the fact that the Gospel is historical, intended to bring Christ into prominence and to keep the writer out of view. The Apocalypse, on the other hand, is prophetic, and the name of the author is required as a voucher for the revelations granted him. Compare ²¹⁷⁵ Daniel 7:15; 8:27.
- ftb2** I follow the general arrangement of Westcott.
- ftb3** For a list of these coincidences see Westcott's Introduction to his Commentary on the Gospel, in the Speaker's Commentary.
- ftb4** Cerinthus taught that the world was not made by the supreme God, but by another and remote power which is over the universe. Jesus was not born of the Virgin by miraculous conception, but was the Son of Joseph and Mary by natural generation, though specially endowed with justice and wisdom. After the baptism of Jesus the Christ descended upon Him in the form of a dove, from that sovereign power which is over all things. He then announced the unknown Father and wrought miracles; but toward the end of His ministry the Christ departed from Jesus, and Jesus suffered and rose from the dead, while the Christ remained impassable as a spiritual being.
- ftb5** The Docetes held that the body of our Lord was an immaterial phantom. Their name is derived from *δοκέω* (dokeo) *to seem*.
- ftb6** It is, of course, foreign to the scope of this work to discuss this, with other Johannine questions, critically. Such a discussion must assume the reader's acquaintance with Greek. The discussion concerning the differences in language will be found in Professor Milligan's excellent *Lectures on the Revelation of St. John*, Appendix 2:
- ftb7** I give the arrangement of the Prologue according to Godet.
- ftb8** Of course not anticipating the criticism which has eliminated this passage from text.
- ftb9** Austin used the Latin *vox*, and of course has in mind the secondary meaning as a *word* or *saying*.

- ftb10** The word *hypostasis* is equivalent to *substance*. In theological language it is used in the sense of *person* as distinguished from *essence*. Hence the adverb *hypostatically* signifies *personally* in the theological sense, which recognized three *persons* in the Godhead with one *essence*.
- ftb11** So the Rev., but not consistently throughout. A.V. *by*. See my article on the Revised New Testament. *Presbyterian Review*, October, 1881.
- ftb12** This reading is very earnestly defended by Canon Westcott, and is adopted in Westcott and Hort's text, and supported by Milligan and Moulton. It is rejected by Tischendorf and by the Revisers; also by Alford, DeWette, Meyer, and Godet. Grammatical considerations seem to be against it (see Alford on the passage), but Canon Westcott's defense is most ingenious and plausible.
- ftb13** *i.e.*, attributing human form and human modes of activity to God, as when we speak of the *hand*, the *face*, the *eye* of God, or of God *begetting* as here.
- ftb14** I follow Meyer and Godet. De Wette, Alford, Milligan and Moulton adopt the other interpretation, referring ἔμπροσθεν, to *rank* or *dignity*. So Westcott, who, however, does not state the issue between the two explanations with his usual sharpness.
- ftb15** It is hardly necessary to refer the critical student to the admirable note of Bishop Lightfoot, in his *Commentary on Colossians*, p. 323 sq.
- ftb16** Dr. Scrivener, "Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament." remarks: "Those who will resort to ancient evidence exclusively for the recension of the text, may well be perplexed in dealing with this passage. The oldest manuscripts, versions, and writers are hopelessly divided." He decides, however, for the reading υἱὸς. So Tischendorf's text, and of commentators, Meyer, De Wette, Alford, Godet, Schaff (in Lange). Westcott and Hort's text gives Θεὸς, with ὁ μονογενὴς υἱὸς in margin. So Westcott (*Commentary*), Milligan and Moulton, and Tregelles. See Schaff's note on the passage in Lange; Scrivener, p. 525; and "Two Dissertations," by F. J. A. Hort, Cambridge, 1877.
- ftb17** I take this division from Westcott.
- ftb18** The student should by all means read Canon Westcott's admirable summary in the Introduction to his *Commentary on John's Gospel*.

- ftb19** It is not easy to adjust all the references to the hour of the day in John's Gospel to either of the two methods. Thus 19:14 places the crucifixion at the *sixth* hour, or *noon*, reckoning by the Jewish mode, while Mark (15: ^{ftb25} names the *third* hour, or between 8 and 9 A. M. The two passages in chapter 4, 6, 52, afford little help, especially the latter. Perhaps, after all, the passage most nearly decisive is 11:9. There are strong authorities on both sides. For the Roman method, Tholuck, Ebrard, Ewald, Wescott; for the Jewish, Lucke, De Wette, Meyer, Alford, Lange, Godet.
- ftb20** In ^{<RB>} John 9:35, where Jesus himself formulates a confession, the reading is disputed; three of the leading MSS. reading *Son of man*. See on that passage.
- ftb21** I do not raise the question whether the narratives of John and of the Synoptists refer to the same event.
- ftb22** Or, according to some high authorities, "ye all know."
- ftb23** This view, however, is opposed by Meyer, Lange, De Wette, Alford, and Godet.
- ftb24** Condensed from Dr. Thomson's "Central Palestine and Phoenicia," in "The Land and the Book." An interesting description of the excavations made on the summit of Gerizim, by Lieutenant Anderson, will be found in the same volume, pp. 126-128.
- ftb25** In ^{<UB>} Matthew 13:57, Tischendorf reads as her, *ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ πατρίδι*, *in his own country*. Westcott and Hort, *ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ*.
- ftb26** I have given what seems, on the whole, the most simple and natural explanation, though against a host of high authorities. The various interpretations form a bewildering jungle. All of them are open to objection. One of the most clear and simple discussions of the passage may be found in Schaff's Popular Commentary on the Gospel of John, edited by Professors Milligan and Moulton, where this explanation is adopted, though Professor Schaff in Lange calls it "far-fetched." This is also the view of Canon Westcott. Other explanations are: Galilee generally; Nazareth; Lower Galilee, in which Nazareth was situated, as distinguished from Upper Galilee, in which was Capernaum.
- ftb27** Bishop Lightfoot (Commentary on ^{<RB>} Galatians 3: ^{ftb22} urges with much force that this is *invariably* its meaning. The passage cited in

opposition to this view by Professor Thayer (Lexicon of the New Testament), ^{<RB>}John 7:38; 10:35; ^{<RB>}Romans 4:3; ^{<RB>}Galatians 3:22; 4:30; ^{<RB>}James 2:8; ^{<RB>}1 Peter 2:6; ^{<RB>}2 Peter 1:20, do not appear to me to be conclusive; on the contrary, several of them seem to make rather for Bishop Lightfoot's view.

ftb28 The correct reading in ^{<RB>}Matthew 11:16 is **παιδίους**.

ftb29 Edersheim ("Life of Jesus") says that the Talmud names certain kinds of fish, specially designated as *small fishes*, which might be eaten without cooking: that small fishes were recommended for health, and that the lake of Galilee was particularly rich in these, the salting and pickling of which was a special industry among the fishermen.

ftb30 For a full description see the article "Feast of Tabernacles," in McClintock and Crooks' Cyclopaedia, vol. 10, and Edersheim, "The Temple," ch. 14.

ftb31 I am inclined, however, to think that the distinction between these two, and also between these and **πορεύομαι**, which Canon Westcott claims is observed by John, will not bear too strict pressing. See his commentary on John 7, 33.

ftb32 I am aware of the objection to this rendering based on the canon that **τὴν ἀρχὴν** has this meaning only in negative sentences, an objection which is certainly not parried by Godet's attempt to explain this passage as *essentially* negative. But this rule is not absolutely universal (see Thayer's Lexicon, **ἀρχή**, 1, b.), and this explanation seems to me, on the whole, to fall in better than any other with the general sense of the passage as I understand it. I always differ from Canon Westcott with reluctance; but without going so far as to say, with Alford, that his interpretation is ungrammatical, I must confess that it seems to me artificial and forced, as also does Meyer's rendering, which is open besides to serious criticism on grammatical grounds. The student will find the different interpretations well summed up and classified in Schaff's Lange, and also more briefly in Westcott's additional note to ch. 8. See also Meyer.

ftb33 I adopt this rendering, though with some hesitation, as best representing what seems to me the line of thought in the whole passage, and as avoiding most of the grammatical difficulties. 1, though

grammatically defensible, necessitates the awkwardness of rendering **αὐτοῦ** as neuter, by inference or derivation from the masculine **ψεύστης**. It is much more natural to take it as masculine. Both 1 and 2 require **ὁ πατήρ** to be taken as the *predicate*, whereas, having the article, it would naturally be expected to be the subject. The main objection to 3, is the omission of the subject with **λαλή**, which is harsh. Professor Kendrick (American edition of Meyer) cites as a parallel **φησί** in ^{<4700>}2 Corinthians 10:10, and very justly observes that “if any objection may lie against this construction, it does not approach in harshness to that which makes **πατήρ αὐτοῦ** a predicate in the sense ordinarily assigned to it. It is adopted by Westcott, and Milligan and Moulton.

ftb34 Huther on ^{<4801>}1 John 3:1, claims that this sense would be admissible only in the event of the phrase being used invariably with **ὑπερ τινος**, *on behalf of one*.

ftb35 Rev., *God*, with *the judges* in margin.

ftb36 Trench (Synonyms) appears to overlook the exception in 2 Corinthians, though he cites the passage. He says that **χρίειν** is *absolutely restricted* to the anointing of the Son by the Father, p. 131.

ftb37 Perhaps the nearest approach to such a sentiment in Homer is the case of Thetis, weeping for and with her son Achilles (“Iliad,” 1:360; 51, 66).

ftb38 As by Fra Angelico (Florence), Bonifazio (Louvre), and the superb picture by Sebastian del Piombo in the National Gallery, London.

ftb39 The meaning to *take* or *bear away* is claimed by some for ^{<4187>}Matthew 8:17 and ^{<4105>}John 20:25 (so Thayer, N. T. Lexicon). The former I think more than doubtful. Meyer declares it “contrary to the sense;” De Wette and Lange both render *bore*. Canon Cook says. “The words chosen by St. Matthew preclude the supposition that he refers the prophet’s words, contrary to the sense of the original, to the mere removal of diseases by healing them.” The words in Matthew are a citation from ^{<2510>}Isaiah 53:4, which Cheyne (“Prophecies of Isaiah”) renders, “surely our sicknesses he bore, and our pains he carried them.” Septuagint: “This man carries our sins and is pained for us.” Symmachus: “Surely he took up our sins and endured our labors.”

Edersheim remarks that “the words as given by St. Matthew are most truly a New Testament targum of the original.” Delitzsch, who thinks that the meaning *took away* is included in the sense of the Hebrew *nasa*, admits that its primary meaning is, *He took up, bore*. The meaning in ⁴³¹⁵John 20:25 may be explained as in ⁴³¹⁶John 12:6, as determined by the context, though it may be rendered if *thou hast taken him up*. Field (“Otium Norvicense”) cites a passage from Diogenes Laertius, 4:59, where it is said that Lacydes, whenever he took anything out of his store-room, was accustomed, after sealing it up, to throw the seal or ring through the hole, so that it might never be taken from his finger, and any of the stores be *stolen* (βασταχθείη).

ftb40 Field (“Otium Norvicense”), who holds by **τετήρηκεν**, observes that “the conjecture that the ointment may have been reserved from that used at the burying of Lazarus, is not fanciful, but an excellent example of undesigned coincidence, since we should never have perceived the propriety of the *might have been sold* of the first two Gospels, if John had not helped us out with his **τετήρηκεν**, *she hath kept*.”

ftb41 Meyer acutely remarks that this rendering “yields the result of an actual prayer interwoven into a reflective monologue, and is therefore less suitable to a frame of mind so deeply moved.”

ftb42 Godet, with his well-known aversion to departures from the Rec., holds by the reading **γενομένου**, and explains **γινόμενου** by *when the repast as a repast began*; adding that the correction was made in order to place the foot-washing at the beginning of the repast, the customary time for it. But the performance of the act during the course of the meal, is indicated by the words in ver. 4, *He riseth from (ἐκ) the supper*.

ftb43 I am surprised to find it adopted by Milligan and Moulton.

ftb44 Godet’s affection for the “received reading” carries him rather beyond bounds, when it leads him to say that **ἀναπεσὼν**” seems absurd.”

ftb45 Directed to an *end* (**τέλος**), and therefore marking a *purpose*.

ftb46 The explanation given by Milligan and Moulton is, that the Father’s house includes earth as well as heaven that it is, in short, the universe, over which the Father rules, having many apartments, some on this side, others beyond the grave. When, therefore, Jesus goes away, it is

only to another chamber of the one house of the Father. The main thought is that wherever Jesus is wherever we are, we are all in the Father's house, and therefore there can be no real separation between Jesus and His disciples. This is very beautiful, and, in itself, true, but, as an explanation of this passage, is not warranted by anything in it, but is rather read into it.

- ftb47** W. Aldis Wright ("Bible Word-Book") is wrong in calling this "the primary meaning" of the word. No authorities for the use of *mansio* in this sense are quoted earlier than Pliny and Suetonius, and none for this use of **μονή** earlier than Pausanias (A.D. 180). Canon Westcott's interpretation is effectively demolished (usually no easy thing to do) by J. Sterling Berry, in *The Expositor*, 2nd series, vol. iii., p. 397.
- ftb48** The student will find the whole question discussed by Bishop Lightfoot ("On a Fresh Revision of the New Testament," p. 58 sqq.); Julius Charles Hare ("Mission of the Comforter," p. 348); and Canon Westcott (Introduction to the Commentary on John's Gospel, Speaker's Commentary, p. 211). See also his note on **1** John 2:1, in his Commentary on the Epistles of John.
- ftb49** This does not, as Godet says, turn the promise into "a moral precept." It is a hortatory encouragement. But then the reading occurs in God. A.!
- ftb50** The technical terms are **τελικῶς** (*telicos*), *of the design and end*, and **ἐκβατικῶς** (*ekbatikos*), *of the result*.
- ftb51** Godet says that this expression "is nowhere else found in the mouth of Jesus." But see **Matthew** 8:3; **Mark** 14:36; **John** 21:22.
- ftb52** Mr. Field's remark ("Otium Norvicense") that it is improbable that the word would continue to be used in the older sense (*rod*) after it had acquired the later meaning (*hand*), can hardly be called conclusive.
- ftb53** Mr. Field ("Otium Norvicense") claims that **λύσσω**, is the milder word, and cites a curious illustration from Plutarch ("Life of Cleomenes"). Cleomenes and his party escape from prison, and endeavor to raise the town and to get possession of the citadel. Failing in this, they resolve upon suicide. It is arranged that one of the number is not to kill himself until he shall be assured that all the rest are dead. When all are stretched on the ground, the survivor goes round and *tries*

each with his dagger (τῷ ξιφιδίῳ παραπτόμενος). When he comes to Cleomenes, he *pricks* (νύξας) him on the ankle (παρὰ τὸ σφυρόν), and goes him contract his face.

- ftb54** See William Stroud, “Physical Theory of the Death of Christ.”
- ftb55** ἔχεις τι, *have you anything*, is the usual question addressed by a bystander to those employed in fishing or bird-catching. Equivalent to *have you had any sport?* See Aristophanes, “Clouds,” 731.
- ftb56** About A.D. 550, generally believed to have been a Bishop. The author of a work “De Partibus Divinae Legis,” a kind of introduction to the sacred writings.
- ftb57** This is the view of Alford and Westcott. Ebrard and Huther maintain the personal sense.
- ftb58** So Alford, Huther, Ebrard.
- ftb59** The student should consult, on John’s use of the term *Life*, Canon Westcott’s “additional note” on ^{<GR5>}1 John 5:20. “Commentary on the Epistles of John,” p. 204.
- ftb60** Let the student by all means consult Canon Westcott’s “additional note” on p. 27, of his “Commentary on the Epistles of John.”
- ftb61** But not New Testament epistles. Χαίρειν *greeting*, occurs in *no* address on Apostolic epistle, except in that of James. See on James. 1:1.
- ftb62** The student may profitably consult on Plato’s view of sin, Ackermann, “The Christian Element in Plato,” p. 57, sq.
- ftb63** The story may be found at length in Godet’s “Commentary on John,” vol. 1, p. 58.
- ftb64** *i.e.*, the genitive case, *of God, of the Father*, represents God as the *subject* of the emotion.
- ftb65** Because the verb separates *not* from *all*. In such cases, according to New Testament usage, the negation is universal. The A.V. *not all* makes it partial. See, for instance, ^{<GR5>}1 John 3:15; ^{<AB2>}Matthew 24:22.
- ftb66** I am indebted for the substance of this note to Canon Westcott.
- ftb67** So Alford and Huther, agt. Westcott. Westcott rightly observes that the preposition ἐν *in*, is constantly used in the context to express the

presence of God in the Christian body; but it is most commonly joined there **μένει** *abideth*, vv. 12, 13, 15, 16, and the objective statement, *God sent*, etc., defining the manifestation of God's love, does not adjust itself naturally to the subjective sense implied in *in us*.

- ftb68** An interesting paper on "The sin unto Death," by the Rev. Samuel Cox, D.D., may be found in "The Expositor," 2nd series, vol. 1, p. 416. He holds to Bengel's view of a *sinful state or condition*.
- ftb69** The student will do well to study Canon Westcott's "Additional Note" on this phrase, "Commentary on the Epistles of John," p. 204 sqq.
- ftb70** Lightfoot renders **χαίρετε** *farewell* in ^{<SIB1>}Philippians 3:1; and describes it as a *parting benediction* in 4:4; but, in both cases, says that it includes an exhortation to *rejoice*. The *farewell* is needless in both instances.
- ftb71** For fuller details, see article *Papyrus* in "Encyclopaedia Britannica," 9th edition, vol. xviii.
- ftb72** See Edersheim, "Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah," 2, 270.
- ftb73** Canon Westcott says "no parallel is quoted for" the Rev. rendering, but ^{<G05>}Revelation 21:5, can hardly be esteemed a parallel to *his* rendering "thou makest sure."
- ftb74** The ordinary usage of **συνεργός** with the genitive of the person co-operated with (^{<SIC1>}Romans 16:21; ^{<SIB1>}1 Corinthians 3: seems against the second explanation; but against the former is the fact that the thing *for which*, or *on behalf of which*, one is a fellow-worker, is also used in the genitive (^{<G024>}2 Corinthians 1: or with **εἰς** *unto* (^{<S041>}Colossians 4:11; ^{<G023>}2 Corinthians 8:23). There is no instance of the *davious commodi* (so Alford, Huther), *dative of reference*. On the other hand the kindred verb **συνεργέω** occurs with the dative of the thing co-operated with in ^{<S022>}James 2:22: **ἡ πίστις συνήργει τοῖς ἔργοις**, *faith wrought with his works* (see Huther's note). I agree with Canon Westcott that this construction is sufficient to support the Rev. rendering. Huther, Alford, and Ebrard all adopt the other explanation.
- ftb75** "Die Heimlich Offenbarung Johannis:" published in 1498

- ftb76** See Bishop Lightfoot's Essay on the Christian Ministry, in his "Commentary on Philippians."
- ftb77** This is the explanation of Trench, Plumptre, Düsterdieck, and Alford, and seems on the whole, to be the preferable one. Professor Milligan argues at length for the second explanation, which is Bengel's.
- ftb78** The literature of hymnology is very rich in hymns depicting the glory of the heavenly city. In Latin there are *Jerusalem luminosa* which reappears in *Jerusalem my happy home*, and *O Mother dear Jerusalem: Urbs beata Jerusalem*, which reappears in *Blessed city, heavenly Salem: Urbs Sion Aurea*, in *Jerusalem the golden* and *Jerusalem the glorious*. Of this *O bona patria*, translated in *To thee, O dear, dear Country*, is a portion. Also Bernard's *Me receptet Sion, Illa*. In English may be noted, besides the translations just referred to, *Sweet place, sweet place alone; Hear what God the Lord hath spoken; Jerusalem, my happy home, when shall I come to thee?* In German, Meyfart's *Jerusalem du hochgebaute stadt*, and Hiller's *O Jerusalem du Schone*. Of Meyfart's hymn there are two English translations, one by Miss Winkworth, *Jerusalem, thou city fair and high*, and the other by Bishop Whittingham of Maryland, *Jerusalem, high tower thy glorious walls*.
- ftb79** So Professor Milligan, who thinks that the whole scene is founded on Isaiah 6., which, he remarks, is always justly regarded as one of the greatest adumbrations of the Trinity contained in the Old Testament.
- ftb80** I.e., the halo round the moon.
- ftb81** Dante's reference is to ~~2300~~ Isaiah 61:7, where, however, there is no reference to garments, but merely to a double compensation.
- ftb82** John.
- ftb83** This cubical plan, applied not only to the Tabernacle, but to the Ark of the Flood, the Temple of Solomon and the "Kings House," is minutely worked out in "The Holy Houses" by Dr. Timothy Otis Paine; a book full of curious erudition. in which the Tabernacle, the Ark of Noah, the Temple, and the Capitol or King's House, are treated as developments from a common type; but which proceeds on the utterly untenable hypothesis that the temple of Ezekiel's vision was Solomon's; and that, accordingly, from the two books of Kings and the

prophecies of Jeremiah and Ezekiel all the data are furnished for a complete restoration of the Temple; the prophetic vision of Ezekiel supplying the details omitted in the historic record of Kings.