

THE SECOND EPISTLE OF

JOHN

CHAPTER 1

1. *The elder* (ὁ πρεσβύτερος). The word is used originally of seniority in *age*. So ^{<4125>}Luke 15:25. Afterward as a term of rank or office. Applied to members of the Sanhedrim (^{<4162>}Matthew 16:21; ^{<4162>}Acts 6:12). Those who presided over the Christian assemblies or churches (^{<4163>}Acts 11:30; ^{<4167>}1 Timothy 5:17, 19). The twenty-four members of the heavenly court in John's vision (^{<4169>}Revelation 4:4, 10; 5:5, 6, 8, 11, 14). Here, with reference to official position, coupled, presumably, with age.

Unto the elect lady (ἐκλεκτῇ κυρίᾳ). An expression which baffles all the commentators. It is supposed by some that the title describes *a person*, by others, *a society*. The views of the former class as to *the person* designated, are

- (1.) That the letter was addressed to a certain Babylonian named *Electa*.
- (2.) To a person named *Kyria*.
- (3.) To *Electa Kyria*, a compound proper name.

Those who regard the phrase as describing *a society*, divide on the question whether *a particular Christian society* or *the whole Church* is intended. It is impossible to settle the question satisfactorily.

Children (τέκνοις). May be taken either in a literal or in a spiritual sense. For the later, see 1 Timothy 1, 2; ^{<4165>}Galatians 4:25; 3 John 4. Compare also vv. 4, 13. The explanation turns on the meaning of ἐκλεκτῇ κυρίᾳ. If it mean *the Church*, *children* will have the spiritual sense. If it be a proper name, the literal.

Whom (οὗς). Comprehensive, embracing the mother and the children of both sexes.

I love (ἀγαπῶ). See on ^{<651>}John 5:20.

In the truth (ἐν ἀληθείᾳ). Omit *the*. The expression *in truth* marks the atmosphere or element of truth in which something is said, or felt, or done. See ^{<677>}John 17:17. *In truth* is equivalent to *truly, really*. Compare ^{<1006>}Colossians 1:6; ^{<676>}John 17:19.

That have known (οἱ ἐγνωκότεσ). Either *have come to know*, or as Rev., *know*. The perfect tense of γινώσκω, *to learn to know*, is rendered as a present: *I have learned to know, therefore I know*. See on ^{<688>}1 John 2:3.

2. *Which dwelleth* (τὴν μένουσαν). Rev., *abideth*. Enlarging on the idea of *the truth: that which abideth*. See on ^{<649>}1 John 4:9, on the phrase *to abide in*, see on ^{<686>}1 John 2:6.

Shall be with us (μεθ' ἡμῶν ἔσται). *With us* has the emphatic position in the sentence: *and with us it shall be*. Note the change from *abideth in* to *shall be with*, and see on ^{<646>}John 14:16, 17.

3. *Grace be with you, mercy and peace* (ἔσται μεθ' ἡμῶν χάρις ἔλεος εἰρήνη). The verb is in the future tense: *shall be*. In the Pauline Epistles the salutations contain no verb. In 1 and 2 Peter and Jude, πληθυνθείη *be multiplied*, is used. *Grace* (χάρις) is of rare occurrence in John's writings (^{<614>}John 1:14, 16, 17; ^{<610>}Revelation 1:4; 22:21); and the kindred χαρίζομαι *to favor, be kind, forgive*, and χάρισμα *gift*, are not found at all. See on ^{<683>}Luke 1:30. *Mercy* (ἔλεος), only here in John. See on ^{<685>}Luke 1:50. The pre-Christian definitions of the word include the element of *grief* experienced on account of the *unworthy* suffering of another. So Aristotle. The Latin *miser cordia* (*miser* "wretched," *cor* "the heart") carries the same idea. So Cicero defines it, *the sorrow arising from the wretchedness of another suffering wrongfully*. Strictly speaking, the word as applied to God, cannot include either of these elements, since *grief* cannot be ascribed to Him, and suffering is the legitimate result of sin. The sentiment in God assumes the character of *pitying love*. Mercy is kindness and goodwill toward the miserable and afflicted, joined with a desire to relieve them. Trench observes: "In the Divine mind, and in the order of our salvation as conceived therein, the *mercy* precedes the *grace*. God so loved the world with a pitying love (herein was the *mercy*), that He gave His only-begotten Son (herein the *grace*), that the world through Him might be

saved. But in the order of the manifestation of God's purposes of salvation, the grace must go before the mercy and make way for it. It is true that the same persons are the subjects of both, being at once the guilty and the miserable; yet the righteousness of God, which it is quite as necessary should be maintained as His love, demands that the guilt should be done away before the misery can be assuaged; only the forgiven may be blessed. He must pardon before He can heal.... From this it follows that in each of the apostolic salutations where these words occur, grace precedes mercy" ("Synonyms of the New Testament").

With you. The best texts read *with us*.

From God — from Jesus Christ (παρὰ Θεοῦ — παρὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ). Note the repeated preposition, bringing out the twofold relation to the Father and Son. In the Pauline salutations ἀπό from, is invariably used with God, and never repeated with *Jesus Christ*. On the use of παρὰ from, see on ^{<RB>}John 6:46; ^{<RB>}1 John 1:5.

God the Father. The more common expression is "God *our* Father."

The Son of the Father. The phrase occurs nowhere else. Compare ^{<RB>}John 1:18; ^{<RB>}1 John 2:22, 23; ^{<RB>}1 John 1:3.

In truth and in love. The combination is not found elsewhere. The words indicate the contents of the whole Epistle.

4. I rejoiced. Expressions of thankful joy are common in the Pauline salutations. See Romans, 1 Corinthians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, 1 Thessalonians, 2 Thessalonians, Philemon.

Greatly (λίαν). The word is found in John's writings only here and 3 John 3.

I found (εὑρηκα). See on ^{<RB>}John 1:41. Rev., *I have found*.

Of thy children (ἐκ τῶν τέκνων). The rendering is obscure. Rev., rightly, supplies *certain*. Compare ^{<RB>}John 16:17.

In truth (ἐν ἀληθείᾳ). Compare 3 John 3. See on ^{<RB>}1 John 1:8.

5. New (καινήν). See on ^{<RB>}Matthew 26:29.

We had (εἶχαμεν). The apostle identifies himself with his readers.

6. Love (ἡ ἀγάπη). *The love just mentioned in the verb we love.*

That (ἵνα). See on ^{<6153>}John 15:13.

After His commandments (κατὰ τὰς ἐντολάς αὐτοῦ). For *walk*, with *κατά* *after, according to*, see ^{<6005>}Mark 7:5; ^{<6004>}Romans 8:4; 14:15; ^{<6001>}1 Corinthians 3:3; ^{<6002>}2 Corinthians 10:2. Very often with *ἐν* *in*. See ^{<6002>}John 8:12; 11:9, 10; ^{<6002>}2 Corinthians 4:2; ^{<6001>}1 John 1:7, 11. Both constructions are found ^{<6002>}2 Corinthians 10:2, 3.

From the beginning (ἀπ' ἀρχῆς). See on ^{<6001>}John 1:1.

In it (ἐν αὐτῇ). *In love: not the commandment.*

7. Deceivers (πλάνοι). See on *we deceive ourselves*, ^{<6008>}1 John 1:8.

Are entered into (ἐξῆλθαν εἰς). Rev., *are gone forth into*. The A.V. follows the reading εἰσῆλθον *entered into*. The tense is the aorist, strictly rendered, *went forth*. It may indicate a particular crisis, at which they went forth from the Christian society.

Who confess not (οἱ μὴ ὁμολογοῦντες). The article with the participle describes the character of this class of deceivers, and does not merely assert a definite fact concerning them. Compare ^{<6154>}Mark 15:41, "other women *which came up with Him*" (αἱ συνσυνβᾶσαι). *Confess*. See on ^{<6023>}Matthew 7:23; 10:32.

Is come (ἐρχόμενον). Wrong. The verb is in the present participle, *coming*, which describes the manhood of Christ as *still being manifested*. See on ^{<6155>}1 John 3:5. In ^{<6001>}1 John 4:2 we have the manifestation treated as a past fact by the perfect tense, ἐληλυθο.τα *has come*. Rev., *that Jesus Christ cometh*. So in ^{<5001>}1 Thessalonians 1:10, τῆς ὀργῆς τῆς ἐρχομένης *is the wrath which is coming*; which has already begun its movement and is advancing: not merely, as A.V., *the wrath to come*, which makes it wholly a future event. See on *lingereth*, ^{<6002>}2 Peter 2:3.

An antichrist (ὁ ἀντίχριστος) Rev, rendering the definite article, *the antichrist*. See on ^{<6008>}1 John 2:18.

8. Look to yourselves that (βλέπετε ἑαυτούς ἵνα). “Ἴνα in order that, marks the *intent* of the caution. See on ^{<4353>}John 15:13.

We lose (ἀπολέσωμεν). The best texts read ἀπολέσητε, *ye lose*. So Rev., with *destroy* in margin. For the meanings of the verb see on ^{<4025>}Luke 9:25.

We receive (ἀπολάβωμεν). The best texts read ἀπολάβητε *ye receive*. The compounded preposition ἀπό, has the force of *back*: *receive back* from God.

Reward (μισθὸν). See on ^{<4123>}2 Peter 2:13, and compare ^{<4152>}Matthew 5:12; ^{<4036>}John 4:36; ^{<4038>}1 Corinthians 3:8; ^{<4113>}Revelation 11:18; 22:12.

9. Whosoever transgresseth (πᾶς ὁ παραβαίνων). The best texts read προάγων *goeth onward*. So Rev., with *taketh the lead* in margin. The meaning is, *whosoever advances beyond the limits of Christian doctrine*. Others explain of those who would set themselves up as teachers, or *take the lead*. Such false progress is contrasted with *abiding* in the teaching. On the construction, πᾶς *every one*, with the article and participle, see on ^{<4131>}1 John 3:3.

Abideth — in (μένων ἐν). See on ^{<4131>}1 John 2:6.

Doctrine (διδασχῆ). Better, as Rev., *teaching*.

Of Christ. Not the teaching *concerning* Christ, but the teaching of Christ Himself and of His apostles. See ^{<4033>}Hebrews 2:3. So according to New Testament usage. See ^{<4339>}John 18:19; ^{<4022>}Acts 2:12; ^{<4124>}Revelation 2:14, 15.

In the doctrine of Christ. Omit *of Christ*. Διδασχῆ *teaching*, is used thus absolutely, ^{<4167>}Romans 16:17; ^{<4009>}Titus 1:9.

10. If there come any (εἴ τις ἔρχεται). Better, Rev., *if anyone cometh*. The indicative mood assumes the fact: if anyone comes, as there are those that come. *Cometh* is used in an official sense as of a teacher. See on ^{<4131>}1 John 3:5.

Bring (φέρει). For the use of the verb see ^{<4329>}John 18:29; ^{<4258>}Acts 25:18; ^{<4125>}2 Peter 2:11; 1:17, 18; ^{<4013>}1 Peter 1:13.

Neither bid him God speed (καὶ χαίρειν αὐτῷ μὴ λέγετε). Lit., *and say not unto him “greeting!”* Χαίρειν *rejoice, hail*, was the customary form

of salutation. It was also used in bidding farewell; but in the New Testament always of greeting (^{<4852>} Acts 15:23; 23:26; ^{<500>} James 1:1). ^{fb70}
 “Now whoever cometh and teacheth you all these things, before spoken, receive him; but if the teacher himself turn aside and teach another teaching, so as to overthrow this, do not hear him” (“Teaching of the Twelve Apostles,” ch. 11. See on ^{<1000>} Matthew 10:10).

11. *Is partaker* (κοινωνεῖ). The verb occurs nowhere else in John’s writings. The kindred noun **κοινωνία** *fellowship*, is peculiar to the First Epistle. See on ^{<610>} 1 John 1:3; also on *partners* (^{<450>} Luke 5:10); *fellowship* (^{<480>} Acts 2:42); *partaker* (^{<600>} 1 Peter 5:1.).

***Paper* (χάρτου).** Only here in the New Testament. The Egyptian papyrus or byblus, *Cyperus papyrus*, anciently very common, but not now found within the limits of the country. It is a tall, smooth flag or reed, with a large triangular stalk, containing the pith which furnished the paper. The paper was manufactured by cutting the pith into strips, arranging them horizontally, and then placing across them another layer of strips, uniting the two layers by a paste, and subjecting the whole to a heavy pressure. The upper and middle portions of the reed were used for this purpose. The fact that the plant is no longer found is significant in connection with Isaiah’s prophecy that “the *flags* (Hebrews *suph*, papyrus) shall waste away” (^{<2900>} Isaiah 19:6). The plant grew in shallow water or in marshes, and is accordingly represented on the monuments as at the side of a stream or in irrigated lands. ^{fb71} The Jews wrote on various materials, such as the leaves of the olive and palm, the rind of the pomegranate, and the skins of animals. The tablet (**πινακίδιον**, ^{<400>} Luke 1:63) was in very common use. It consisted of thin pieces of wood, strung together, and either plain, or covered with papyrus or with wax.

***Ink* (μέλανος).** Lit., *that which is black*. The word occurs only once outside of John’s Epistles (^{<4000>} 2 Corinthians 3:3), and only three times in all (2 John 12; 3 John 13). Ink was prepared of soot or of vegetable or mineral substances. Gum and vitriol were also used. Colored inks, red and gold, were also employed. ^{fb72}

***To come unto you* (γενέσθαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς).** Or, *to be present with you*. For the phrase, see ^{<4000>} 1 Corinthians 2:3; 16:10.

Face to face (στόμα πρὸς στόμα). Lit, *mouth to mouth*. Compare πρόσωπον προς πρόσωπον, *face to face*, ^{<AKR2>}1 Corinthians 8:12.

Full (πεπληρωμένη). Rev., rightly, *fulfilled*.

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 ⁴⁸⁹⁵ 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 ⁴⁰⁵⁷ 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 ⁴⁸⁹² 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.