

CHAPTER 26

INTRODUCTION TO MATTHEW 26

Ver. 1. *And it came to pass, when Jesus had finished all these sayings,* etc.] Meaning either all that are recorded by this evangelist, all the sermons and discourses of Christ, delivered both to the people of the Jews, and to his disciples; his conversation with the former, and his divine instructions and prudent advice to the latter, together with all his excellent parables, which are largely related in this book; or else what is said in the two preceding chapters, concerning the destruction of Jerusalem, and the end of the world, the state of the church, and conduct of his servants to the end of time, expressed in the parables of the virgins and talents, and concerning the last judgment and final state of all men:

he said unto his disciples; who now were alone with him: having finished his prophetic, and being about to enter on his priestly office, he gives his disciples some intimations of its near approach.

Ver. 2. *Ye know that after two days is [the feast of] the passover,* etc.] Which was kept in commemoration of the deliverance of the Israelites from Egypt; and was typical of Christ the passover, who was now to be sacrificed for his people. This was said on Tuesday, and on the Thursday following, the passover began. Christ speaks of this as a thing well known to the disciples, as it must be, since it always began on a certain day, the fourteenth of the month Nisan; which month answered to part of our March, and part of our April; and though there was very frequently an intercalation of a whole month in a year, made by the sanhedrim, to keep their festivals regularly in the proper season of the year; yet previous public notice was always given of this, either by fixing a paper upon the door of the sanhedrim^{f1467}, signifying such an intercalation made, which served for the inhabitants of Jerusalem; or by sending messengers with letters into all distant places^{f1468}, acquainting them with it. So that the times of these festivals were always well known; even to the common people:

and the son of man is betrayed to be crucified; it must not be thought that this was equally known by the disciples, as the former; for though they

might know, or at least remember, that Christ had told them that he should suffer many things of the priests, Scribes, and elders, who would deliver him to the Gentiles, to be crucified; yet might not understand that this passover was to be the time, when this should be done: by “the son of man”, Christ means himself, who was truly and really man, the seed of the woman, the son of Abraham and of David; a character by which the Messiah is described in the Old Testament, (~~1817~~Psalm 80:17) (~~2013~~Daniel 7:13), and hence frequently used by Christ of himself; which, as it expresses the truth of his human nature, so the weaknesses and infirmities he bore in it; and is very properly used here, when he is speaking of his being to be betrayed and crucified. What he says of himself is, that he is “betrayed”; that is, is to be betrayed, or will be betrayed, meaning at the passover, which was to be in two days time. Christ speaks of his being betrayed, as if it was already done; not only because it was so near being done, there being but two days before it would be done; but because it was a sure and certain thing, being determined in the purpose of God, and foretold in prophecy that it should be; and besides, Judas had now resolved upon it within himself, and was forming a scheme how to bring it about. And this respects not only the act of Judas in betraying him into the hands of the chief priests, but also the delivery, as the word here used signifies, of him by them, to the Roman governors; for they, as Stephen says, were also his betrayers and murderers; yea, it may include the delivery of him by Pilate, to the Jews and Roman soldiers; and the rather, because it follows, “to be crucified”; which was a Roman, and not a Jewish punishment. This was typified by the lifting up the brazen serpent on a pole, and foretold by the prophets of the Old Testament, (~~1926~~Psalm 22:16 ~~3820~~Zechariah 12:10), and predicted by Christ himself, sometimes more covertly, (~~3823~~John 12:32,33), and sometimes in express words, (~~4109~~Matthew 20:19), and was a very painful and shameful death, and which showed him to be made a curse for his people. It appears from hence; that the crucifixion and death of Christ, were not casual and contingent events, but were determined by the counsel of God, with all circumstances attending: the betraying and delivery of him were by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God; and not only his death, but the manner of it by crucifixion, was pointed out in prophecy, and was a certain thing; and the very time of his death was fixed; which shows the early concern of God for the salvation of his people, and his wonderful grace and mercy to them: and it is clear from hence, that Christ had perfect knowledge of all this: he knew not only that he should be betrayed, but he knew from the beginning who would betray

him; he not only knew that he should die, but he knew what kind of death he should die, even the death of the cross; and he knew the exact time when he should die, that it would be at the following passover, which was just at hand; and he had suggested this to his disciples, and therefore he speaks of it as a thing known unto them; at least what they might have known, and concluded from what he had said to them, (~~408~~ Matthew 20:18,19), and the whole is a considerable proof of his being God omniscient. And he thought fit to put his disciples in mind of it, because the time drew nigh; that their memories being refreshed with it, they might be prepared for it, and not be surprised, shocked, and offended at it, when it came to pass; which shows the tender concern our Lord had for them.

Ver. 3. *Then assembled together the chief priests*, etc.] About the same time, two days before the passover, that Jesus said these things to his disciples, as is plain from (~~414~~ Mark 14:1). By “the chief priests” are meant, either such who had been high priests, or such as were the heads of the twenty four courses of the priests; or rather, the principal men of the priesthood, who were chosen out of the rest, to be members of the great sanhedrim:

and the Scribes; the doctors, of the law, who wrote out copies of the law for the people, and interpreted it to them in a literal way: this clause is left out in the Vulgate Latin, and in Munster’s Hebrew Gospel, and in the Arabic and Ethiopic versions, and in the Alexandrian copy, and some others, but is retained in, the Syriac version; and no doubt, but these men had a place in this grand council:

and the elders of the people; these were the civil magistrates; so that this assembly consisted both of ecclesiastics and laymen, as the sanhedrim did, of priests, Levites, and Israelites ^{f1469}: these came

unto the palace of the high priest, who was called Caiaphas; his name was Joseph, but his surname Caiaphas; a word not of the same original with Cephas, as Camero thought; for these two words begin with different letters, nor are the rest the same. Now, though a king of Israel might not sit in the sanhedrim, yet an high priest might, provided he was sufficiently qualified with wisdom ^{f1470}. The president of this grand council at this time, should be Rabban Gamaliel, Paul’s master; unless it was Caiaphas, at whose house they were: how they came to meet at the high priest’s palace, deserves inquiry; since their proper and usual place of meeting, was a chamber in the temple, called Gazith ^{f1471}, or the paved chamber: now let it

be observed, that according to the accounts the Jews themselves give, the sanhedrim removed from this chamber, forty years before the destruction of the temple ^{f1472}; and which, as Dr. Lightfoot conjectures, was about a year and a half before the death of Christ; and as others say ^{f1473}, four years; at least three years and a half before that time: but then, though the sanhedrim removed from the paved chamber, they met at Chanoth, “the sheds”, which was a place within the bounds of the temple, in the mountain of the house; and the question still returns, how came it to pass they did not meet there? To me the reason seems to be, that they chose not to meet there, but at the high priest’s palace, because of privacy, that it might not be known they were together, and about any affair of moment; and particularly this: the high priest’s house was always in Jerusalem, and he never removed from thence; nor did he go from the temple thither only in the night, or an hour or two in the day; for he had an apartment in the temple, which was called the chamber of the high priest, where he was the whole day ^{f1474}.

Ver. 4. *And consulted that they might take Jesus by subtlety*, etc.] The Jews had often attempted his life, but he escaped out of their hands; they had sent officers to apprehend him, but to no purpose; they therefore meet and consult together, to form some scheme, and make use of some stratagem, that they might lay hold on him, and keep him; they were for doing this in the most private manner they could:

and kill him; not with their own hands, nor privately; but their scheme was to apprehend him privately, by some secret artifice, and then deliver him to the Roman governor; to put him to death according to law, publicly, for crimes they had to charge him with; hereby (^{300P}Psalm 2:2), had its accomplishment, at least in part.

Ver. 5. *And they said, not on the feast day*, etc.] Upon mature deliberation, it was an agreed point with them, at least it was carried by a majority, that nothing of this kind should be attempted to be done on the feast day, on any of the days of the feast of passover, which was now at hand; though this was contrary to their common rules and usages: for, a person that sinned presumptuously, and such an one they accounted Jesus to be, they say ^{f1475},

“they do not put him to death by the order of the sanhedrim of his own city, nor by the sanhedrim of Jabneh; but they bring him up to the great sanhedrim at Jerusalem, and keep him “until the feast”,

and put him to death, *l grb*, “on a feast day”; as it is said, (⁴⁸¹⁷³Deuteronomy 17:13), “and all the people shall hear and fear”, etc.”

But what influenced them at this time to take another course, is the reason following;

lest there be an uproar among the people: they had no fear of God before their eyes, or in their hearts, only the fear of the people; many of whom believed in Christ, and others that did not, yet had a great veneration for him, having seen his miracles, and received favours from him; themselves, or their friends and relations, being cured by him of various diseases: besides, at the feast, people from all parts came up to Jerusalem; and they knew that large numbers from Galilee, where he had the greatest interest, would be present; and they feared, should they attempt anything of this nature at this time, the people would rise, and rescue him out of their hands. But God had determined otherwise, and his counsel shall stand; it was his pleasure, that he should be put to death at this feast, that the truth might answer the type of the passover lamb; and that all Israel, whose males now met together, might be witnesses of it: and so it was, that though these men had concluded otherwise in their council; yet an opportunity offering by Judas, to get him into their hands, they embrace it; and risk the danger of the people’s uprising, who they found compliant enough to their wishes.

Ver. 6. *Now when Jesus was in Bethany*, etc.] Which was about fifteen furlongs from Jerusalem, (⁴⁸¹¹⁸John 11:18), or about two miles from it. The time of Christ’s death being at hand, he keeps nigh to Jerusalem, where he was to suffer and die, in the room and stead of sinners:

in the house of Simon the leper; so called, to distinguish him from others of the name. This epithet was either a family one, some person of note in it having been a leper; or else he is so named, because he himself had been one, but was now cured; though the reason interpreters give for this, that otherwise he would not have been suffered to live in a town, is not a good one; for lepers, according to the Jewish ^{f1476} canons, were only forbid Jerusalem, and towns and cities that were walled round, and not others, such as the village of Bethany. There were many lepers healed by Christ, which, among other things, was an evidence of his being the Messiah, and a proof of his deity, and this Simon was one of them; whether the same

mention is made of in (~~401E~~ Matthew 8:1), is not certain, nor very probable; since that man lived in Galilee, at, or near Capernaum; this at Bethany, near Jerusalem: however, he was one of those lepers that had a sense of his mercy, and was grateful for it, as appears by his entertaining Christ at his house; and may teach us thankfulness to Christ, who has healed all our diseases; and particularly, the spreading leprosy of sin, with which all the powers and faculties of our souls were infected; and which was not in our own power, or any creature's, to cure, but his blood cleanses from it: and it may be observed, that Christ goes in and dwells with such whom he heals, and with such he is always welcome.

Ver. 7. *There came unto him a woman*, etc.] By some thought to be the same that is spoken of in (~~407B~~ Luke 7:37), and by most, to be Mary, the sister of Lazarus, (~~411B~~ John 12:3), which may be true; for it is possible that one and the same woman, might perform a like action at different times; for to neither of the above, at the same time, will the following agree: not to the former, for though that was done in the house of one Simon, yet not Simon the leper, but Simon the Pharisee; who though he had a particular respect for Christ, which few of that sect had, yet appeared to be then of a Pharisaical spirit; that was done in Galilee, this near Jerusalem in Bethany; the woman there anointed the feet of Christ, but this woman poured the ointment on his head; nor did any such conversation as here follow upon it, between Christ and his disciples; but what discourse was had on that occasion, was between Simon and Christ. Not to the latter, for that does not appear to be done in Simon's house, but rather in the house of Lazarus; no mention is made of the alabaster box, nor was the ointment poured on his head, but on his feet; besides, that was done six days before the passover, whereas this was but two; moreover, Judas only objected to that, but the disciples in general had indignation at this; and though the objections to it, and Christ's defence of it, are much in the same language, in one place as in the other, yet it was no unusual thing with Christ, to make use of the same words on a like incident, or when the same objections were made. The fact here recorded, is the same as in (~~414B~~ Mark 14:3), where it stands in the same order as here, and seems to have been done at the supper, of which mention is made, (~~413D~~ John 13:2), when Satan entered into Judas, and put it into his heart to betray his master, the account of which follows this here:

having an alabaster box of very precious ointment; Mark calls it, "ointment of spikenard", (~~414B~~ Mark 14:3), which was very odorous, and of

a very fragrant smell; (see ²⁰¹² Song of Solomon 1:12). Some there render it, “pure nard”; unadulterated, unmixed, sincere and genuine; others, “liquid nard”, which was drinkable, and easy to be poured out; and some “Pistic” nard, so called, either from “Pista”, the name of a place in India, from whence it was brought, as some think; or as Dr. Lightfoot, from **aqtsyp**, “Pistaca”, which is the maste of a tree ^{f1477}, and of which, among other things, Pliny says ^{f1478}, the ointment of nard was made. The Persic version in both places read it, “ointment of Gallia”; and the just now mentioned writer ^{f1479}, speaks of “nardum Gallicum”, “Gallic nard”, which is what may be meant by that interpreter; but be it what ointment it will; it was ointment, very precious: very costly, and of a very great price; for the disciples observe, it might have been sold for more than three hundred pence: and for the better preserving of such ointments incorrupt, they used to be put into vessels made of “alabaster” ^{f1480}; though some think not the matter, but the form of these vessels is referred to; and observe, that vessels of gold, silver, and glass, for this use, being made in the form of “alabasters”, were called by that name; and that this might be made of the latter, since Mark says, that she brake the box; not into pieces, for then she could not be said to pour it out; but either the top, or side of it: though some critics observe, that the word signifies no more, than that she shook it, that the thicker parts of the ointment might liquify, and be the more easily poured out. The Arabic version has omitted that clause, and the Syriac, Persic, and Ethiopic, read it, “she opened it”; that is, as the Persic adds, “the top of the vessel”: she took off the covering of the box, or took out the stopple,

and poured it on his head, as he sat at meat: which was usually done at festivals, or at any considerable entertainments, as at weddings, etc.

“Says Rab, they “pour ointment on the heads of the doctors”; (the gloss is, the women put ointment on the heads of the scholars;) says R. Papa to Abai, does the doctor speak of the ointment of the bridechamber? He replies, thou orphan, did not thy mother cause for thee, that “they poured out ointment on the heads of the doctors”, at thy wedding? for lo! one of the Rabbins got a wife for his son, in the house of R. Bar Ula; and they say, that R. Bar Ula got a wife for his son in the house of one of the Rabbins, **ḥbrd aqyra aj çym gydrdw**, “and poured ointment on the head of the doctors” ^{f1481}.”

to this custom are the allusions in (~~1923b~~ Psalm 23:5 ~~2100b~~ Ecclesiastes 9:8). The pouring of this ointment on the head of Christ was emblematical of his being anointed with the oil of gladness above his fellows; of his having the holy Spirit, and his gifts and graces without measure; which, like the ointment poured on Aaron's head, that ran down to his beard, and the skirts of his garments, descends to all the members of his mystical body: and was a symbol of the Gospel, which is like ointment poured forth; and of the sweet savour of the knowledge of Christ, which was to be diffused, throughout all the world, by the preaching of it; and was done by this woman in the faith of him, as the true Messiah, the Lord's anointed, as the prophet, priest, and king of his church.

Ver. 8. *But when his disciples saw it*, etc.] What the woman did, what a costly box of ointment it was, and with what profusion she used it,

they had indignation: Mark says, "within themselves", (~~414b~~ Mark 14:4); either among themselves, or their indignation was secret in their breasts; their resentment was private, though it might be betrayed by their looks, and afterwards showed itself in words. This indignation was either at the woman, for the Evangelist Mark observes, that "they murmured against her", (~~414b~~ Mark 14:5), that she should act such an imprudent part, and be guilty of such extravagance; or at Christ himself, for suffering such an action to be done unto him; for so the Syriac version reads the above clause in Mark, and "they murmured *wb*, against him"; so De Dieu observes it should be rendered; though Tremellius, Boderianus, and others, translate it, "against her": or else their indignation was neither at Christ, whom they dearly loved; nor at the woman, they being taught to love their enemies, and much more the friends of Christ; but at the action, which they looked upon as an ill judged thing, that sprung from misguided zeal, and which they thought could never be acceptable to their master, who was not used to encourage such profuseness and extravagance.

Saying, to what purpose is this waste, or "loss?" They call that waste, or loss, which was spent on Christ himself; whereas, whatever is laid out for the honour of Christ, or the good of his interest, ought not to be reckoned loss, for it will be returned with great increase and advantage; but they could not see what end was to be answered by this expense. It is easy to observe the variableness and inconstancy of the disciples: one time, because the inhabitants of a certain village did not receive Christ, they were for calling for fire from heaven to destroy them; and here is a poor woman

that exceeds, as they thought, in her respects to him, and they are filled with indignation.

Ver. 9. *For this ointment might have been sold for much*, etc.] Mark says, “for more than three hundred pence”, (⁴¹⁴⁵Mark 14:5): now if this is to be understood of Roman pence, each penny being seven pence half penny of our money, three hundred pence come to nine pounds, seven shillings, and six pence; but if it is to be understood of the penny of the sanctuary, which was one shilling and three pence, they come to just as much more: it might well be called very precious and costly ointment; and this was the reason of the disciples indignation, that so much cost and expense should be thrown away, as they thought, in such a manner, which might have been applied, in their opinion, to a better purpose. For had it been sold for its worth, so much might have been had for it,

and given to the poor; which was a very plausible objection to the action; and which they seem to have taken from Judas, who had made the same, on a like occasion, about four days before this, and he might instigate the disciples now: which shows what mischief an hypocrite may do in a church, and what influence he may have over good men to draw them into his measures, under the specious pretences of carefulness, frugality, and doing good to the poor. It seems our Lord inured his disciples to this good work of relieving the poor: they kept one common purse, and one of them, who was Judas, was appointed the bearer of it; whatever they collected, or was made a present to them, they put into this purse; out of which they were provided with the necessaries of life; and the rest expended on the poor.

Ver. 10. *When Jesus understood it*, etc.] The indignation of his disciples at this action of the woman’s; which he might know, as man, partly by their looks, and partly by their words; though without these, as God, he knew the secret indignation, and private resentment of their minds:

he said unto them, why trouble ye the woman? by blaming her, and censuring the action she had done; as it must, no doubt, greatly trouble her to meet with such treatment from the disciples of Christ: had any of the Pharisees blamed her conduct, it would have given her no pain or uneasiness; but that Christ’s own disciples should show indignation at an action done by her from a sincere love to Christ, and to do honour to him, must cut her to the heart: and so it is when either ministers of the Gospel, or private believers, are blamed for their honest zeal in the cause of Christ,

by any that profess to love him; this grieves them more than all the enemies of religion say or do unto them:

for she hath wrought a good work upon me; upon his body, by pouring the ointment on it: the Persic version reads it, “according to my mind”: it was done, in the faith of him, as the Messiah; it sprung from real and sincere love to him, and was designed for his honour and glory; and so had the essentials of a good work in it. This is the first part of our Lord’s defence of the woman: he goes on in the next verse.

Ver. 11. *For ye have the poor always with you*, etc.] This is said in answer to the objection of the disciples, that the ointment might have been sold, and the money given to the poor. Christ seems to have respect to (^{<48151>}Deuteronomy 15:11), and which, agreeably to the sense of the Jews, refers to the times of the Messiah: for they say^{f1482},

“there is no difference between this world (this present time) and the times of the Messiah, but the subduing of kingdoms only; as it is said, (^{<48151>}Deuteronomy 15:11), “for the poor shall never cease out of the land”: the gloss on it is, from hence it may be concluded, that therefore, *twyn*[*çy μl w*[*l* , “for ever there will be poverty, and riches”.”

Our Lord’s words also show, that there will be always poor persons in the world; that there will be always such with his people, and in his churches; for God has chosen, and he calls such by his grace; so that men may always have opportunities of showing kindness and respect to such objects: in Mark it is added, “and whensoever ye will ye may do them good”, (^{<4147>}Mark 14:7); by relieving their wants, and distributing to their necessities:

but me ye have not always; referring not to his divine and spiritual presence, which he has promised to his people, churches, and ministers, to the end of the world, but to his corporeal presence; for he was to be but a little while with them, and then go to the Father; be taken up to heaven, where he now is, and will be until the restitution of all things; so that the time was very short in which any outward respect could be shown to him in person, as man.

Ver. 12. *For in that she hath poured this ointment*, etc.] Which was so very precious, and cost so much,

upon my body: for being poured on his head, it ran down all over his body.

She did it for my burial; not for the interment of his body, but for the embalming of it, previous to it: the Jews used to embalm their dead, to show their constant respect to the deceased, and their belief of the resurrection; at least not only used to wash them, but anoint them with oil; for so runs one of their canons ^{f1483}:

“they do all things necessary to the dead, (i.e. on the sabbath day,) *ʿyks*, “they anoint him”: that is, as Bartenora adds, “with oil”; and they wash him;”

but the body of Christ, when dead, was not to be so used: the women intended it, and prepared materials for it, but the sabbath coming on, they rested according to the commandment; though, according to this canon, they might have anointed him, but they waited till the sabbath was over; and early on the first day, in the morning, they came to the sepulchre, in order to do it, but it was too late, Christ was risen; (see ^{<0256>}Luke 23:56 ^{<0100>}Mark 16:1). Now either this woman had some revelation made to her, that the death of Christ was near at hand, and she feared, or knew, she should not be able to anoint him when dead; and therefore, as Mark has it, “she hath done what she could; she is come aforehand to anoint my body to the burying”, (^{<0148>}Mark 14:8): or if she had no knowledge of all this, nor any such intention, yet the Holy Ghost directed her to this action, with this view, as it were, for the performing of these funeral rites before he was dead; and so the Syriac version renders it, “she hath done it, *ynrbqml d ʿEya*, as it were, to bury me”.

Ver. 13. *Verily I say unto you*, etc.] The following words are prefaced in this manner, to excite attention, and command belief:

wheresoever this Gospel shall be preached in the whole world. The Syriac version reads it, *ytrbs*, “my Gospel”; and so the Persic version; and has respect chiefly to the doctrine of his death, burial, and resurrection, which this action of the woman had relation to; for though the incarnation of Christ, and all the actions of his life, and whatsoever he did for the good, and in the room and stead of his people, are good news and glad tidings to the sons of men, and so the Gospel; yet his dying for sin, and making atonement for it, thereby satisfying justice, fulfilling the law, destroying death, and him that had the power of it, and his lying in the grave, and

leaving the sins of his people behind him, and rising again for their justification, which were the ends of his coming into the world, make up the most glorious and principal part of the Gospel: and these words of Christ show that “this” Gospel should be preached; for which purpose he gave a commission and gifts to his disciples, and has done so, more or less, to men, ever since, for the conversion of sinners, and the edification of saints, and the glory of his name; and that this Gospel shall be preached all over the world, as it was by the apostles, agreeably to the commission; and will be again, towards the close of time, when the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the Lord and then

there shall also this, that this woman hath done, be told for a memorial of her; of her faith, love, and gratitude; for the memory of the just is blessed, and the righteous are had in everlasting remembrance. Christ suggests, that, though the disciples blamed this action, it should be spoken of by others to her praise and commendation, in all succeeding ages, throughout the world: “a good name”, the wise man says, “is better than precious ointment”, (²⁰⁰⁶Ecclesiastes 7:1). This woman got a good name, and obtained a good report by her precious ointment; and if this woman’s action was to be told for a memorial of her, much more what Christ has done and suffered should be told as a memorial of him.

Ver. 14. *Then one of the twelve, called Judas Iscariot*, etc.] Who was provoked and exasperated, to the last degree, by this action of the woman, and Christ’s defence of it, and because the ointment was not sold, and the money put into his hand; and being instigated by Satan, who had now entered into him, formed a scheme in his mind to betray his master, and was resolved to put it in execution, whereby he might, in some measure, satisfy both his avarice and revenge; and, as an aggravation of this his wickedness, he is described, as “one of the twelve”: of his twelve disciples; so the Persic and Ethiopic versions: this is a way of speaking used by the Jews ^{f1484}; they call the twelve lesser prophets, **רצ[מנח** or **רצ[yrt** “the twelve”, without any other word added thereunto. He was not an open enemy, nor one of Christ’s common hearers, nor one of the seventy disciples, but one of his twelve apostles, whom he made his intimates and associates; whom he selected from all others, and called, qualified, and sent forth to preach his Gospel, and perform miracles: it was one of these that meditated the delivery of him into the hands of his enemies, and never left pursuing his scheme till he had effected it, even Judas Iscariot by name; so

called, to distinguish him from another disciple, whose name was also Judas. This man

went to the chief priests; of his own accord, unasked, from Bethany, to Jerusalem, to Caiaphas's palace, where the chief priests, the implacable enemies of Christ, with the Scribes, and elders of the people, were met together, to consult his death: Mark adds, "to betray him unto them", (^{<4140>}Mark 14:10), which was manifestly his intent in going to them; and Luke, that he "communed" with them "how he might betray him unto them", (^{<4274>}Luke 22:4); in the safest, and most private manner; and both observe that they were glad; for nothing could have fallen out more to their wishes, who were met together on this design. The Jews, in their blasphemous account of Jesus ^{f1485}, say as much: they own, that Judas, or Juda, as they call him, offered to betray him into the hands of the wise men, saying to them, almost in the words expressed in the following verse,

"if you will hearken unto me, **wṭwa rwsma**, "I will deliver him into your hands tomorrow";"

and which agrees very well with the time also: for it was two days before the passover that Jesus was in Bethany, where he supped with his disciples, and washed their feet, and had the box of ointment poured on his head; and on the night of the day after all this was done, Judas set out from thence to Jerusalem; (see ^{<4330>}John 13:30), so that it must be the next day before he could meet the high priests, and on the morrow, at night, he delivered him into their hands; on the proposal of which, they say, that Simeon ben Shetach, whom they make to be present at this time, and all the wise men and elders, **hl wdg hj mç wj mç** "rejoiced exceedingly".

Ver. 15. *And said [unto them]*, etc.] Though the words, "to them", are not in the original text, they are rightly supplied; as they are by the Vulgate Latin, Syriac, Arabic, Persic, and Ethiopic versions, and in Munster's Hebrew Gospel; and mean the chief priests to whom Judas went, and to whom he made the following proposal;

what will ye give me, and I will deliver him to you? They did not ask him to do it, he first made the motion; a barbarous and shocking one! to deliver his Lord and Master, with whom he had familiarly conversed, and from whom he had received so many favours, into the hands of those that hated him; nor was he concerned what they would do to him, or what would become of him, when in their hands: all his view, and what he was intent

upon, was, what they would give him for doing it. They did not tempt him, by first offering him so much money, if he would betray him; but he himself first moves it to them, and tempts them with it to offer him an handsome reward: and it is to be observed, that he does not mention the name of Jesus, either because they might be talking of him, when he came into their company; or else as suiting his language to theirs, who, when they spake of him, usually said, “he”, or “that man”, or “this fellow”. And in the same rude way Judas now treats his master:

and they covenanted with him for thirty pieces of silver; that is, thirty shekels of silver; for it is a rule with the Jews, that when mention is made in Scripture of pieces of silver, without expressing the species, shekels are meant: so Onkelos, and Jonathan ben Uzziel, in their Targums on (⁽⁻⁰²¹⁶⁾Genesis 20:16 45:22), render pieces of silver, by shekels of silver; so pieces of gold signify shekels of gold: thus the 1700 pieces of gold in (⁽⁻⁰⁰³⁵⁾Judges 8:26), are, in the Septuagint, Arabic, and Vulgate Latin versions, called so many shekels of gold; and our version supplies the word “shekels” also, as it does in (⁽⁻⁴⁹¹⁵⁾2 Chronicles 9:15,16), and yet some learned men have asserted ^{f1486}, that there were no shekels of gold among the Jews, though express mention is made of them in (⁽⁻¹⁹²⁵⁾1 Chronicles 21:25). The value of a shekel of gold, according to Brerewood ^{f1487}, was, of our money, “fifteen shillings”; and some make it to come to a great deal more; to “one pound sixteen shillings and sixpence” sterling: had these thirty pieces been pieces, or shekels of gold, they would have amounted to a considerable sum of money; but they were pieces of silver, and not talents, or pounds, but shekels. The silver shekel had on one side stamped upon it the pot of manna, or, as others think, “a censer”, or incense cup, with these words around it, in Samaritan letters, “shekel Israel”, “the shekel of Israel”; and, on the other, “Aaron’s rod” budding, with this inscription about it, “Jerusalem Hakedushah”, “Jerusalem the holy” ^{f1488}. As for the weight and value of it, R. Gedaliah says ^{f1489}, we know by tradition that the holy shekel weighs 320 grains of barley of pure silver; and the same writer observes ^{f1490}, that the “selah”, or holy shekel, is four “denarii”, or pence; that is, Roman pence, each being of the value of seven pence halfpenny of our money: and to this agrees what Josephus ^{f1491} says, that a “shekel” is a coin of the Hebrews, which contains four Attic drachms, or drams; and an Attic dram is of the same value with a Roman penny: so that one of these shekels was worth about “half a crown”; and it usually weighed half an ounce, as not only some Jewish writers affirm, who

profess to have seen them, and weighed them themselves, as Jarchi^{f1492}, Gerundensis^{f1493}, Abarbinel^{f1494}, and Gedaliah ben Jechiaiah^{f1495}; but other writers also, as Masius^{f1496} Arias Montanus^{f1497}, Waserus^{f1498} and Bishop Cumberland. Now thirty

shekels of silver were the price of a servant, (^{213}Exodus 21:32). So^{f1499} Maimonides observes, that the

“atonement of “servants”, whether great or small, whether male or female, the fixed sum in the law is “thirty shekels of good silver”, whether “the servant” is worth an hundred pound, or whether he is not worth but a farthing,”

and which was in value of our money about “three pounds fifteen shillings”. This was the “goodly price”, which Christ, who appeared in the form of a servant, was prized at, according to the prophecy in (^{3112}Zechariah 11:12,13), and which the high priests thought a very sufficient one; and the wretch Judas, as covetous as he was, was contented with.

Ver. 16. *And from that time he sought opportunity to betray him.*] Luke adds, “in the absence of the multitude”, (^{216}Luke 22:6); in the most private manner, when he was alone, and in some solitary place, that no tumult might arise, and that there might be no danger of a rescue: for so he, and the chief priests, had consulted, and settled it, as what would be most prudent and advisable; and therefore, from that time forward, being prompted on by Satan, and the lucre of the money he was to receive, he narrowly watched, and diligently observed, the best and most fitting season to perform his enterprise, and quickly offered.

Ver. 17. *Now the first day of the feast of unleavened bread,* etc.] There were seven of these days, and this was the first of them, in which the Jews might not eat leavened bread, from the fourteenth, to the twenty first of the month Nisan; in commemoration of their being thrust out of Egypt, in so much haste, that they had not time to leaven the dough, which was in their kneading troughs: wherefore, according to their canons^{f1500}, on the night of the fourteenth day; that is, as Bartenora explains it, the night, the day following of which is the fourteenth, they search for leaven in all private places and corners, to bring; it out, and burn it, or break it into small pieces, and scatter it in the wind, or throw it into the sea. Mark adds, “when they killed the passover”, (^{142}Mark 14:12); and Luke says, “when

the passover must be killed”, (~~Q217~~Luke 22:7); which was to be done on the fourteenth day of the month Nisan, after the middle of the day; and this was an indispensable duty, which all were obliged to: for so they say ^{f1501},

“every man, and every woman, are bound to observe this precept; and whoever makes void this commandment presumptuously, if he is not defiled, or afar off, lo! he is guilty of cutting off.”

The time of killing the passover was after the middle of the day; and it is said ^{f1502} that

“if they killed it before the middle of the day it was not right; and they did not kill it till after the evening sacrifice, and after they had offered the evening incense; and after they had trimmed the lamps, they began to slay the passovers, or paschal lambs, unto the end of the day; and if they slayed after the middle of the day, before the evening sacrifice, it was right.”

The reason of this was, because the lamb was to be slain between the two evenings; the first of which began at noon, as soon as ever the day declined: and this was not done privately, but in the temple; for thus it is ^{f1503} affirmed,

“they do not kill the passover but in the court, as the rest of the holy things.”

The time and manner of killing the lamb, and by whom, of the sprinkling of the blood, and of their flaying it, and taking out the fat, and burning it on the altar, may be seen in the Misna ^{f1504}.

The disciples came to Jesus; that is, Peter and John, as may be learnt from (~~Q218~~Luke 22:8), for these only seem to have had any notion of Judas’s betraying Christ, from what had been said at the supper in Bethany, two days before; the rest thought he was gone to prepare for the feast, and therefore were under no concern about it; but these two judged otherwise, and therefore came to Christ to know his mind concerning it; for it was high time that a preparation should be made; for this was Thursday morning, and the lamb was to be killed in the afternoon, and ate at even.

Saying unto him, where wilt thou that we prepare for thee to eat the passover? This question in Luke follows upon an order which Christ gave to these disciples; “saying, go and prepare us the passover, that we may

eat”, (^{<2718>}Luke 22:8): for masters used to give their servants orders to get ready the passover for them; and which were expressed in much such language as this ^{f1505}:

“he that says to his servant, **j sp ta yl [j wj ɕw ax**, “go and slay the passover for me”: if he kills a kid, he may eat of it.”

It is reported ^{f1506} of

“Rabban Gamaliel, that he said to his servant Tabi, **hl xw ax**, “go and roast” the passover for us upon an iron grate.”

The disciples having received such an order from their master, inquire not in what town or city they must prepare the passover, for that was always ate in Jerusalem; (see ^{<5165>}Deuteronomy 16:5-7 ^{<2111>}Luke 2:41,42), where they were obliged, by the Jewish canon ^{f1507}, to lodge that night; though they might eat the unleavened bread, and keep the other days of the feast any where, and in every place ^{f1508}; but they inquire in what house he would have it got ready; for they might make use of any house, and the furniture of it, where they could find room, and conveniency, without any charge; for they did not let out their houses, or any of their rooms, or beds, in Jerusalem; but, at festivals, the owners of them gave the use of them freely to all that came ^{f1509}: and it is ^{f1510} observed among the wonders and miracles done at Jerusalem, that though there were such multitudes at their feasts, yet

“a man could never say to his friend, I have not found a fire to roast the passover lambs in Jerusalem, nor I have not found a bed to sleep on in Jerusalem, nor the place is too strait for me to lodge in, in Jerusalem.”

Ver. 18. *And he said, go into the city to such a man*, etc.] That is, to such a man in the city of Jerusalem, for, as yet, they were in Bethany, or at the Mount of Olives however, without the city; he does not mention the man’s name, but describes him, as Mark and Luke say, and tells them, “there shall meet you a man bearing a pitcher of water; follow him into the house, where he entereth in”, (^{<4143>}Mark 14:13) (^{<2210>}Luke 22:10); who seems to be not the master of the house, but a servant, that was sent on such an errand. This is a very considerable instance of our Lord’s prescience of future contingencies; he knew beforehand, that exactly at the time that the disciples would enter Jerusalem, such a man, belonging to such a house,

would be returning with a pitcher of water in his hand; and they should meet him; and follow him, where he went, which would be a direction to them what house to prepare the passover in;

and say unto him; not to the man bearing the pitcher of water; but, as the other Evangelists say, to the good man of the house, the owner of it, who probably might be one of Christ's disciples secretly; for many of the chief rulers in Jerusalem believed on Christ, though they did not openly confess him, for fear of the Pharisees, as Nicodemus, and Joseph of Arimathea; and this man might be one of them, or some other man of note and wealth; since they were to find, as they did, a large upper room furnished and prepared. For, it seems, that without mentioning his name, the man would know him by their language, he dictates to them in the following clause, who they meant;

the master saith; the Syriac and Persic versions read, our master; thine and ours, the great master in Israel, the teacher sent from God:

my time is at hand; not of eating the passover, as if it was distinct from that of the Jews, and peculiar to himself, for he ate it at the usual time, and when the Jews ate theirs; and which time was fixed and known by everybody, and could be no reason to move the master of the house to receive him: but he means the time of his death, that he had but a little while to live; and that this instance of respect would be the last he would have an opportunity of showing him whilst living, and the last time Christ would have an opportunity of seeing him; and he might say this to prepare him to meet the news of his death with less surprise:

I will keep the passover at thy house with my disciples; not with him and his family, but with his disciples, who were a family, and a society of themselves, and a sufficient number to eat the passover together; for there might be two companies eating their distinct passovers in one house, and even in one room: concerning which is the following rule,

“*dj a tybb μyl kwa wyhç twrwbj ytç*, “two societies that eat in one house”; the one turn their faces this way and eat, and the other turn their faces that way and eat, and an heating vessel (in which they heat the water to mix with the wine) in the middle; and when the servant stands to mix, he shuts his mouth, and turns his face till he comes to his company, and eats; and the bride turns her face and eats^{f1511}.”

Ver. 19. *And the disciples did as Jesus had appointed them*, etc.] They went into the city of Jerusalem; they met the man carrying a pitcher of water home; they followed him into the house he entered; they addressed the master of the house, in the manner Christ directed, who showed them a large upper room, prepared with all proper furniture for such an occasion, as Christ had foretold:

and they made ready the passover; they went and bought a lamb; they carried it to the temple to be slain in the court, where it was presented as a passover lamb for such a number of persons; they had it flayed, cut up, the fat taken out, and burnt on the altar, and its blood sprinkled on the foot of it: they then brought it to the house where they were to eat it; here they roasted it, and provided bread, and wine, and bitter herbs, and a sauce called “Charoseth”, into which the herbs were dipped: and, in short, everything that was necessary.

Ver. 20. *Now when the even was come*, etc.] The second evening, when the sun was set, and it was dark, and properly night; for

“on the evenings of the passovers near the Minchah, a man might not eat אַחַד תְּחַלּוּל, “until it was dark”^{f1512}.”

This was according to the rule, (^(12:8)Exodus 12:8),

he sat down with the twelve, his twelve disciples; so the Vulgate Latin, and all the Oriental versions, and Munster’s Hebrew Gospel; and which also adds, “at table”; even all the twelve apostles, who were properly his family, and a sufficient number for a passover lamb^{f1513}: for

“they do not kill the passover for a single man, according to the words of R. Judah, though R. Jose permits it: yea, though the society consists of an hundred, if they cannot eat the quantity of an olive, they do not kill for them: nor do they make a society of women, servants, and little ones?”

Judas was now returned again, and took his place among the disciples, as if he was as innocent, and as friendly, as any of them: this he might choose to do, partly to avoid all suspicion of his designs; and partly that he might get intelligence where Christ would go after supper, that he might have the opportunity he was waiting for, to betray him into the hands of his enemies. “He sat, or lay down with them”, as the word signifies; for the posture of the Jews, at the passover table especially, was not properly

sitting, but reclining, or lying along on coaches, not on their backs, nor on their right side, but on their left; (see Gill on “~~4323~~John 13:23”). The first passover was eaten by them standing, with their loins girt, their shoes on, and staves in their hands, because they were just ready to depart out of Egypt: but in after passovers these circumstances were omitted; and particularly sitting, or lying along, was reckoned so necessary to be observed, that it is said ^{f1514}, that

“the poorest man in Israel might not eat, **bsyc d[**, “until he lies along”, or leans;”

that is, as some of their commentators ^{f1515} note, either upon the couch, or on the table, after the manner of free men, and in remembrance of their liberty: and another of them ^{f1516} says,

“we are bound to eat, **hbshb**, “lying along”, as kings and great men eat, because it is a token of liberty.”

Hence they elsewhere say ^{f1517},

“it is the way of servants to eat standing; but here (in the passover) to eat, **ybwsm**, “sitting”, or “lying along”, because they (the Israelites) went out of bondage to liberty. Says R. Simon, in the name of R. Joshua ben Levi, that which a man is obliged to in the passover, though it be but the quantity of an olive, he must eat it, **bswm**, “lying along”.”

The account Maimonides gives of this usage, is in these words ^{f1518}:

“even the poorest man in Israel may not eat until he “lies along”: a woman need not lie; but if she is a woman of worth and note, she ought to lie: a son by a father, and a servant before his master ought to lie: “but a disciple before his master does not lie, except his master gives him leave” (as Christ did his); and lying on the right hand is not lying; and so he that lies upon his neck, or upon his face, this is not lying; and when ought they to lie? at the time of eating, the quantity of an olive, of unleavened bread, and at drinking of the four cups; but at the rest of eating and drinking, if he lies, lo! it is praiseworthy: but if not, there is no necessity.”

This custom was so constantly and uniformly observed at the passover, that it is taken particular notice of in the declaration, or showing forth of

the passover by the master of the family, when he says ^{f1519}, “how different is this night from all other nights”, etc. and among the many things he mentions, this is one;

“in all other nights we eat either sitting, or lying along; that is, which way we please, but this night all of us ^{ybwsm}, “lie along”.”

Ver. 21. *And as they did eat*, etc.] The passover lamb, the unleavened bread, and bitter herbs: he said it was usual, whilst they were thus engaged, to discourse much about the reason and design of this institution. What they talked of may be learnt from what follows ^{f1520}:

“it is an affirmative precept of the law, to declare the signs and wonders which were done to our fathers in Egypt, on the night of the fifteenth of Nisan, according to (^{-0213B}Exodus 13:3), “remember this day”, etc. and from whence on the night of the fifteenth? from (^{-0213B}Exodus 13:8), “and thou shalt show thy son”, etc. at the time that the unleavened bread, and bitter herbs lie before thee. And though he has no son, or though they are wise, and grown up, they are bound to declare the going out of Egypt; and everyone that enlarges, or dwells long on the things that happened and came to pass, lo! he is praiseworthy. It is a command to make known to children, even though they do not ask; as it is said, “and thou shalt show thy son”: according to the son’s knowledge, his father teaches him; how if he is a little one, or foolish? he says to him, my son, all of us were servants, as this handmaid, or this servant, in Egypt; and on this night the holy, blessed God redeemed us, and brought us into liberty: and if the son is grown up and a wise man, he makes known to him what happened to us in Egypt, and the wonders which were done for us by the hands of Moses, our master; all according to the capacity of the son. And it is necessary to make a repetition on this night, that the children may see, and ask, and say, how different is this night from all other nights? until he replies to them, and says to them, so and so it happened, and thus and thus it was. — If he has no son, his wife asks him; and if he has no wife, they ask one another, how different is this night? and though they are all wise men, everyone asks himself alone, how different is this night? and it is necessary to begin with reproaches, and end with praise, how? he begins and declares, how at first our fathers were in the days of Terah, and before him, deniers (of the

divine being), and wandering after vanity, and following idolatrous worship; and he ends with the law of truth, how that God brought us near to himself, and separated us from the nations, and caused us to draw nigh to his unity; and so begins and makes known, that we were servants to Pharaoh in Egypt, and all the evils he recompensed us with; and ends with the signs and wonders which were wrought for us, and with our liberties: and he that expounds from — “a Syrian was my father, ready to perish”: till he has finished the whole section: and every one that adds and enlarges in expounding this section, lo! he is praiseworthy. And everyone that does not say these three words on the night of the fifteenth, cannot be excused from blame; and they are these, the passover, the unleavened bread, and the bitter herbs: “the passover”, because God passed over the houses of our fathers in Egypt, as it is said, (⁴⁰²⁷Exodus 12:27), “the bitter herbs”, because the Egyptians made bitter the lives of our fathers in Egypt: “the unleavened bread”, because they were redeemed: and these things all of them are called the declaration, or showing forth.”

Christ now took up some part of the time, at least, whilst they were eating, in discoursing with his disciples about the traitor:

he said, verily I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me; meaning to the chief priests and Scribes, who should condemn him to death, and deliver him to the Gentiles, to be mocked, scourged, and crucified, as he had told them some time before, (⁴⁰¹⁸Matthew 20:18,19), though he did not tell them as now, that it should be done by one of them; he had indeed signified as much as this two days before, at the supper in Bethany, but none seemed to understand whom he meant, but Peter and John, and the thing wore off their minds; and therefore he mentions it again to them, with great seriousness, and in the most solemn manner, declaring it as a certain and undoubted truth.

Ver. 22. *And they were exceeding sorrowful*, etc.] Partly that Christ should be betrayed at all, into the hands of his enemies, by whom they knew he would be ill used; and partly, that so vile an action should be done, by one from among themselves; and greatly, because they knew not, nor could not conceive, who of them could be guilty of such an horrid sin:

and began everyone of them to say unto him, Lord, is it I? excepting Judas, who afterwards spoke for himself. This they said, though conscious

to themselves the thing had never entered into their hearts; nor had they taken any step towards it, but with their whole souls abhorred it; yet, as knowing the treachery and deceitfulness, of their hearts, which they could not trust to; and fearing lest should they be left thereunto, they might commit such a dreadful iniquity; and as desirous of being cleared by Christ from any such imputation, and even from all suspicion of anything of this kind.

Ver. 23. *And he answered and said,* etc.] In order to make them easy, and point out the betrayer to them,

he that dippeth his hand with me in the dish, the same shall betray me.

This seems to refer to the dipping of the unleavened bread, or bitter herbs, both, into the sauce called “Charoseth”, which the Jews ^{f1521} say,

“was made of figs, nuts, almonds, and other fruits; to which they added apples; all which they bruised in a mortar, and mixed with vinegar; and put spices into it, calamus and cinnamon, in the form of small long threads, in remembrance of the straw; and it was necessary it should be: thick, in memory of the clay.”

The account Maimonides ^{f1522} gives of it is,

“the “Charoseth” is a precept from the words of the Scribes, in remembrance of the clay in which they served in Egypt; and how did they make it? They took dates, or berries, or raisins, and the like, and stamped them, and put vinegar into them, and seasoned them with spices, as clay in straw, and brought it upon the table, in the night of the passover.”

And in this he says, the master of the family dipped both the herbs, and the unleavened bread ^{f1523}, and that both separately and conjunctly; for he says ^{f1524}, that

“he rolled up the unleavened bread and bitter herbs together,
I bj mw and dipped them in the Charoseth.”

And this was twice done in eating the passover; for so it is observed ^{f1525} among the many things, which distinguished this night from others: “in all other nights we dip but once, but in this night twice”. By this action, Christ gave his disciples a signal, whereby they might know the betrayer: for this is not the general description of one, that sat at the table, and ate of his

bread with him, and so fulfilled the prediction, in (^{<3940>}Psalm 41:9), though this is too true; but then, this was saying no more than he had before done, when he said, “one of you shall betray me”; though the phrase is so ^{f1526} used; for instance,

“if a man goes and sits at table with them, [^]hm [l bwj w, and “dips with them”, though he does not eat the quantity of an olive, they bless for him.”

But this refers to a particular action then performed by Judas, just at the time Christ spoke these words; and who might sit near him, and dip into the same dish he did; for since there were thirteen of them, there might be more dishes than one; and two or three might have a dish to themselves, and Judas dip in the same dish with Christ.

Ver. 24. *The son of man goeth*, etc.] Meaning himself, not to the Mount of Olives, or Gethsemane, or the garden, whither he went a little after this, but out of the world, to his Father: the phrase is expressive of his death, as in (^{<6234>}Joshua 23:14 ^{<6993>}Psalm 39:13), and denotes the voluntariness of it, and which is no ways inconsistent with the divine determinations about it: nor the violence that was offered to him by his enemies.

As it is written; in the book of God’s eternal purposes and decrees; for Luke says, “as it was determined” (^{<4222>}Luke 22:22): or as it was recorded in the books of the Old Testament; in (^{<4920>}Psalm 22:1-31), (^{<2501>}Isaiah 53:1-12) and (^{<2700>}Daniel 9:1-27) for Christ died for the sins of his people, in perfect agreement with these Scriptures, which were written of him:

but woe unto that man by whom the son of man is betrayed; for God’s decrees concerning this matter, and the predictions in the Bible founded on them, did not in the least excuse, or extenuate the blackness of his crime; who did what he did, of his own free will, and wicked heart, voluntarily, and to satisfy his own lusts:

it had been good for that man if he had not been born. This is a Rabbinical phrase, frequently, used in one form or another; sometimes thus; as it is said ^{f1527} of such that speak false and lying words, and regard not the glory of their Creator, ^{aml [l ^wty al d ^wl bj}, it would have been better for them they had never come into the world; and so of any other, notorious sinner, it is at other times said ^{f1528}, ^{yrba al d hyl bj}, or ^{f1529}, ^{arbn al ç wl j wn}, “it would have been better for him if he had not been

created”; signifying, that it is better to have no being at all, than to be punished with everlasting destruction; and which was the dreadful case of Judas, who fell by his transgression, and went to his own place.

Ver. 25. *Then Judas, which betrayed him,* etc.] Or that was about to betray him, as the Ethiopic version reads it: he had taken a step towards it, was seeking an opportunity to do it, and at length effected it: the Persic version reads, Judas Iscariot; who after all the rest had put the question,

answered and said, Master, is it I? Who though he knew what he had been doing, and what he further resolved to do, and was conscious to himself he was the man; nay, though he had been pointed out as the person, and the most dreadful woe denounced on him, that should be the betrayer, in his hearing; yet all this did not at all affect his marble heart; but in the most audacious manner, and without any concern of mind, or show of guilt, asks if he was the person; suggesting, that surely he could, not mean him. It is observed by some, that the word Rabbi, used by Judas, is a more honourable name than that of Lord, used by the disciples; thereby reigning to give Christ more honour, and exceed in his respect to him, than the rest of the disciples; in order, if he could, to cover his wicked designs:

he said unto him, thou hast said: that is, it is as thou hast said; thou hast said right, thou art the man; a way of speaking used, when what is asked is assented to as truth: thus it being

“said to a certain person, is Rabbi dead? He replied to them,
 ᵂwtyrma ᵂwta, “ye have said”; and they rent their clothes ^{f1530}.”

Taking it for granted, by that answer, that so it was.

Ver. 26. *And as they were eating,* etc.] The paschal lamb, and just concluding the whole solemnity, which was done by eating some of the ^{f1531} lamb: for

“last of all he (that kept the passover) eats of the flesh of the passover, though it be but the quantity of an olive, and he does not taste anything after it; and at the same time he eats the quantity of an olive of unleavened bread, and does not taste anything after it; so that his meal endeth, and the savour of the flesh of the passover, or of the unleavened bread, is in his mouth; for the eating of them is the precept.”

So that the paschal supper was now concluded, when Christ entered upon the institution of his own supper:

Jesus took bread; which lay by him, either on the table, or in a dish.

Though this supper is distinct from the “passover”, and different from any ordinary meal, yet there are allusions to both in it, and to the customs of the Jews used in either; as in this first circumstance, of “taking” the bread: for he that asked a blessing upon bread, used to take it into his hands; and it is a rule^{f1532}, that

“a man does not bless, wdyb μj l h swptyç d[, “until he takes the bread into his hand”, that all may see that he blesses over it.”

Thus Christ took the bread and held it up, that his disciples might observe it:

and blessed [it]; or asked a blessing over it, and upon it, or rather blessed and gave thanks to his Father or it, and for what was signified by it; and prayed that his disciples, whilst eating it, might be led to him, the bread of life, and feed upon him in a spiritual sense; whose body was going to be broken for them, as the bread was to be, in order to obtain eternal redemption for them: so it was common with the Jews, to ask a blessing on their bread: the form in which they did it was this^{f1533}:

“Blessed art thou, O Lord, our God, the king of the world, that produceth bread out of the earth.”

What form our Lord used, is not certain; no doubt it was one of his composing, and every way suitable to the design of this ordinance. It was customary also when there were many at table, that lay down there, however, as Christ and his disciples now did, for one to ask a blessing for them all; for so runs the rule^{f1534},

“if they sit to eat, everyone blesses for himself, but if they lie along, μl kl Ærbm dj a, “one blesses for them all”.”

Moreover, they always blessed, before they brake:

“Says Rabba^{f1535}, he blesses, and after that he breaks:”

this rule Christ likewise carefully observes, for it follows,

and brake it. The rules concerning breaking of bread, are these^{f1536};

“The master of the house recites and finishes the blessing, and after that he breaks: — no man that breaks, is allowed to break, till they have brought the salt, and what is to be eaten with the bread, before everyone — and he does not break neither a small piece, lest he should seem to be sparing; nor a large piece, bigger than an egg, lest he should be thought to be famished; — and on the sabbath day he breaks a large piece, and he does not break, but in the place where it is well baked: it is a principal command to break a whole loaf.”

Christ broke the bread, as the symbol of his body, which was to be broken by blows, and scourges, thorns, nails, and spear, and to be separated from his soul, and die as a sacrifice for the sins of his people: and having so done, he

gave it to the disciples; which being a distinct act from breaking the bread, shows that the latter does not design the distribution of the bread, but an act preceding it, and a very significant one: and which ought not to be laid aside: according to the Jewish ^{f1537} usages,

“He that broke the bread, put a piece before everyone, and the other takes it in his hand; and he that breaks, does not give it into the hand of the eater, unless he is a mourner; and he that breaks, stretches out his hand first and eats, and they that sit, or lie at the table, are not allowed to taste, until he that blesses, has tasted; and he that breaks, is not allowed to taste, until the Amen is finished out of the mouth of the majority of those that sit at table.”

And said, take, eat, this is my body; in Luke it is added, “which is given for you”, (^{<0219>}Luke 22:19); that is, unto death, as a sacrifice for sin; and by the Apostle Paul, (^{<6124>}1 Corinthians 11:24), “which is broken for you”; as that bread then was, and so expressive of his wounds, bruises, sufferings, and death, for them. Now when he says, “this is my body”, he cannot mean, that that bread was his real body; or that it was changed and converted into the very substance of his body; but that it was an emblem and representation of his body, which was just ready to be offered up, once for all: in like manner, as the Jews in the eating of their passover used to say ^{f1538} of the unleavened bread,

“*ayn[d amj l ah*, this is “the bread of affliction”, which our fathers ate in the land of Egypt.”

Not that they thought that was the selfsame bread, but that it resembled it, and was a representation of the affliction and distress their fathers were in at that time: to which some think our Lord here alludes: though rather, the reference is to the passover lamb, which is frequently, in Jewish writings, called “the body” of the lamb: thus mention being made of the bringing of the herbs, the unleavened bread, and the sauce “Charoseth”, with other things to the master of the house, it is added ^{f1539}:

“and in the sanctuary (whilst that stood) they bring unto him, **j sp l ç wpwg**, “the body of the lamb”.”

Again, elsewhere ^{f1540} it is said,

“they bring a table furnished, and on it the bitter herbs and other greens, and the unleavened bread, and the sauce, **j sph çbk l ç wpwgw** “and the body of the paschal lamb”.”

And a little further ^{f1541},

“he recites the blessing, blessed art thou O Lord, etc. for the eating of the passover, and he eats, **j sp l ç wpwgm**, “of the body of the passover”.”

And now it is, as if Christ had said, you have had “the body” of the lamb set before you, and have eaten of it, in commemoration of the deliverance out of Egypt, and as a type of me the true passover, quickly to be sacrificed; and this rite of eating the body of the paschal lamb is now to cease; and I do here by this bread, in an emblematical way, set before you “my body”, which is to be given to obtain spiritual deliverance, and eternal redemption for you; in remembrance of which, you, and all my followers in successive generations, are to take and eat of it, till I come. The words, “take, eat”, show that Christ did not put the bread into the mouths of the disciples, but they took it in their hands, and ate it; expressive of taking and receiving Christ by the hand of faith, and feeding on him in a spiritual manner.

Ver. 27. *And he took the cup and gave thanks*, etc.] For the Jews blessed, or gave thanks for their wine, as well as for their food, and generally did it in this form ^{f1542}:

“Blessed art thou, O Lord, our God, the king of the world, who hast created the “fruit of the vine”.”

Hence the phrase, “the fruit of the vine”, in (~~4069~~ Matthew 26:29), not that we are to suppose, that Christ used or confined himself to this form of words: and it is to be observed, that they not only gave thanks for their wine before food, and whilst they were eating ^{f1543}, but also after meat; and as this relates to the blessing of the cup after eating, or as the Apostle Paul says, “when he had supped”, (~~4125~~ 1 Corinthians 11:25). I shall only transcribe what the Jews say ^{f1544} concerning that:

“When wine is brought to them after food, if there is but that cup there, the house of Shammai say, *^yyh l [Aërbm*, “he blesses”, or gives thanks “for the wine”, and after that gives thanks for the food: the house of Hillel say, he gives thanks for the food, and after that gives thanks for the wine.”

And as this was usual at ordinary meals, to bless or give thanks for the wine, so at the passover; and which our Lord continued in his supper, and is to be practised by us. It should be further known, that the wine at the passover, and so what Christ used at his supper, was red.

“Says R. Jeremiah ^{f1545} it is commanded to perform this duty, *µwda ^yyb* “with red wine”.”

And elsewhere it is said ^{f1546},

“that it is necessary, that there should be in it (the wine) taste and look.”

The gloss on it is, *µwda ahyç*, “that it should be red”: and which, as it most fitly represented the blood sprinkled on the door posts of the Israelites, when the Lord passed over their houses; so the blood of Christ, shed for the remission of the sins of his people. It is scarcely worth observing the measure of one of the cups, that was used at such a time: they say ^{f1547}, that the four cups which were drank at this feast, held an, Italian quart of wine, so that one cup contained half a pint. More particularly, they ask how much is the measure of a cup? the answer is, two fingers square, and a finger and a half and the third part of a finger deep; or as it is elsewhere ^{f1548}, the fifth part of a finger:

and gave it to them, saying, drink ye all of it; for this is not to be restrained from one sort of communicants, and only partook of by another; but all are to drink of the cup, as well as eat of the bread: whether here is

not an allusion to the custom of the Jews at the passover, when they obliged all to drink four cups of wine, men, women, and children, and even the poorest man in Israel, who was maintained out of the alms dish^{f1549}, may be considered.

Ver. 28. *For this is my blood of the New Testament*, etc.] That is, the red wine in the cup, was an emblem and representation of his precious blood, whereby was exhibited a new dispensation, or administration of the covenant of grace; and by which it was ratified and confirmed; and whereby all the blessings of it, such as peace, pardon, righteousness, and eternal life, come to the people of God: the allusion is to the first covenant, and the book of it being sprinkled with the blood of bulls, and therefore called the blood of the covenant, (^{<1248>}Exodus 24:8). But the second covenant, or the new administration of the covenant of grace, for which reason it is called the New Testament, is exhibited and established in the blood of Christ the testator. It was usual, even among the Heathens, to make and confirm their covenants by drinking human blood, and that sometimes mixed with wine^{f1550}.

Which is shed for many, for the remission of sins; that is, was very shortly to be shed, and since has been, for all the elect of God; for the many that were ordained to eternal life, and the many that were given to Christ, the many that are justified by him, and the many sons he will bring to glory: whereby the full forgiveness of all their sins was procured, in a way consistent with, and honourable to the justice of God; full satisfaction being made to the law of God, for all their transgressions.

Ver. 29. *But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth*, etc.] From whence it seems natural to conclude, that Christ had drank of the cup in the supper, as well as at the passover; and it is reasonable to believe, that he also ate of the bread; since it appears from what has been observed before, (see Gill on "^{<4055>}Matthew 26:26"), that none might eat, till he that blessed and brake the bread had tasted of it^{f1551}: the reason why wine is here called

the fruit of the vine, and not wine, (see Gill on "^{<4057>}Matthew 26:27"). The design of this expression is to show, that his stay would be very short: the cup he had just drank of, was the last he should drink with them: he should drink no more wine at the passover; he had kept the last, and which now of right was to cease; nor in the Lord's supper, for though that was to continue to his second coming, he should be no more present at it corporeally, only spiritually; nor in common conversation, which is not

contradicted by (^{<4101E>}Acts 10:41). Since, though the apostles drank with him in his presence, it does not necessarily follow, that he drank with them; and if he did, it was not in a mortal state, nor in the ordinary manner and use of it, but to confirm his resurrection from the dead, nor can it be proved that he drank of the fruit of the vine: the design of the phrase, as before observed, is to signify his speedy departure from his disciples. The allusion is to an usage at the passover, when after the fourth cup, they tasted of nothing else all that night, except water; and so Christ declares, that he would drink no more, not only that night, but never after.

Until the day I drink it new with you, in my Father's kingdom: Mark says, "in the kingdom of God", (^{<41425>}Mark 14:25); and Luke, "until the kingdom of God come", (^{<42218>}Luke 22:18); and both the Syriac and Persic versions read it here, "in the kingdom of God"; by which is meant, something distinct from the kingdom of the Son, or of the Messiah, which was already come; and appeared more manifestly after the resurrection of Christ, upon his ascension to heaven, and the effusion of the holy Spirit, and the success of the Gospel, both among Jews and Gentiles; and which will be more glorious in the latter day: and when all the elect of God are gathered in, and have been presented to Christ by himself, he will then deliver up the kingdom to the Father, and God shall be all in all; and then the kingdom of the Father will take place here mentioned, and which is no other than the ultimate glory; so called, because it is of the Father's preparing and giving, and in which he will reign and dwell, and the saints with him, to all eternity; which must not be understood to the exclusion of Christ, for it is called his kingdom also, (^{<42230>}Luke 22:30), in this state, Christ will drink new wine, not literally, but spiritually understood; and which designs the joys and glories of heaven, the best wine which is reserved to the last: which is sometimes signified by a feast, of which wine is a principal part; by sitting down as at a table, in the kingdom of heaven, with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, (^{<41811>}Matthew 8:11), and expressed by "wine", because of its refreshing and exhilarating nature, in God's presence is "fulness of joy"; and by "new wine", because these joys are the most excellent, because they are always new, and never change; they are "pleasures for evermore": to "drink" hereof, denotes the full enjoyment of them, which Christ, as man and mediator, and his people with him, shall be possessed of; and is different from the superficial "taste of the powers of the world to come", (^{<3015>}Hebrews 6:5), which hypocrites have, and those real prelibations of glory which saints have in this life; there being a difference between

drinking and tasting, (^{<1273>}Matthew 27:34), and this will be social; Christ and his true disciples shall be together; and drink this new wine together; or enjoy the same glory and felicity in the highest measure and degree, they are capable of; and which society therein will yield a mutual pleasure to each other, as the words here suggest. The Jews often express the joys of the world to come, by such like figurative phrases: they make mention of, **ytad aml [d ^yy**, “the wine of the world to come”^{f1552}; and of **ynj wr rkç**, “a spiritual drink”, in the last days, which is called the world to come^{f1553}: and so they explain^{f1554} after this manner, (^{<2360>}Isaiah 64:4). “Neither hath the eye seen, O God”, etc., **^yy hz**, “this is the wine”, which is kept in the grapes from the six days of the creation; of which they often speak in their writings^{f1555}

Ver. 30. *And when they had sung an hymn*, etc.] The “Hallel”, which the Jews were obliged to sing on the night of the passover; for the passover, they say^{f1556}, was **l l h ^w[j**, “bound to an hymn”. This “Hallel”, or song of praise, consisted of six Psalms, the 113th, 114th, 115th, 116th, 117th, and 118th^{f1557}: now this they did not sing all at once, but in parts. Just before the drinking of the second cup and eating of the lamb, they sung the first part of it, which contained the 113th and 114th Psalms; and on mixing the fourth and last cup, they completed the “Hallel”, by singing the rest of the Psalms, beginning with the 115th Psalm, and ending with the 118th; and said over it, what they call the “blessing of the song”, which was (^{<4950>}Psalm 145:10), etc., and they might, if they would, mix a fifth cup, but that they were not obliged to, and say over it the “great Hallel”, or “hymn”, which was the 136th Psalm^{f1558}. Now the last part of the “Hallel”, Christ deferred to the close of his supper; there being many things in it pertinent to him, and proper on this occasion, particularly (^{<4980>}Psalm 115:1 116:12-15 118:22-27), and the Jews themselves say^{f1559}, that **j yçm l ç wl bj**, “the sorrows of the Messiah” are contained in this part: that this is the hymn which Christ and his disciples sung, may be rather thought, than that it was one of his own composing; since not only he, but all the disciples sung it, and therefore must be what they were acquainted with; and since Christ in most things conformed to the rites and usages of the Jewish nation; and he did not rise up from table and go away, until this concluding circumstance was over; though it was allowed to finish the “Hallel”, or hymn, in any place they pleased, even though it was not the place where the feast was kept^{f1560} however, as soon as it was over,

they went out to the Mount of Olives; he and his disciples, excepting Judas: first he himself alone, and then the disciples followed him, according to (^{<0273>}Luke 22:39), and the Persic version here reads it, “he went out”. This seems to be contrary to a Jewish canon; for the passover was *hnyl ʿw[j*, “bound to lodging a night”^{f1561}; that is, as the gloss explains it,

“the first night (i.e. of the passover) a man must lodge in Jerusalem; thenceforward it was lawful to dwell without the wall, within the border.”

And a little after, the same phrase, being bound to lodge, is explained, one night in the midst of the city: but Christ had more important business to attend unto, than to comply with this rule, which was not obligatory by the word of God, though the Jews pretend to found it on (^{<0567>}Deuteronomy 16:7)^{f1562}. The place where he went with his disciples, was the Mount of Olives, which was on the east side of Jerusalem; and was the place where the high priest stood, and burnt the red heifer, and sprinkled its blood^{f1563}: now from the temple, or from the mountain of the house, there was a causeway, or bridge on arches, made to the Mount of Olives, in which the high priest and the heifer, *hyd[sm l kw*, “and all his assistants”, (the priests that helped him in this service,) went to this mount^{f1564}: in this same way it is very probable, went Christ the great high priest, who was typified by the red heifer, and his companions the disciples, to the same place, where he had his bloody sweat, and where his sorrows and sufferings began.

Ver. 31. *Then saith Jesus unto them*, etc.] Either before they went out of the house, where they had been eating the passover, and the supper; or as they were going along to the Mount of Olives; which latter rather seems to be the case:

all ye shall be offended because of me this night. The words are spoken to the eleven disciples; for Judas was now gone to the high priests, to inform them where Jesus was going that night, and to receive of them a band of men and officers to apprehend him; which is what would be the occasion of all the rest of the disciples being offended: for when they should see their master betrayed by one of themselves, and the officers seize him and bind him, and lead him away as a malefactor, our Lord here suggests, that they would be filled with such fear and dread, that everyone of them would forsake him and run away, and provide for their own safety; yea, would be

so stumbled at this unexpected event, that they would begin to stagger and hesitate in their minds, whether he was the Messiah, or not, as the two disciples going to Emmaus, seem to intimate; they would be so shocked with this sad disappointment, and so offended, or stumble, as to be ready to fall from him: and their faith in him must have failed, had he not prayed for them, as he did for Peter; for they thought of nothing else but a temporal kingdom, which they expected would now quickly be set up, and they be advanced to great honour and dignity; but things taking a different turn, it must greatly shock and affect them; and it was to be the case not of one or two only, but of all of them: and that because of him, whom they dearly loved, and with whom they had been eating the passover, and his own supper, and had had such a comfortable opportunity together; and because of his low estate, his being seized and bound, and led away by his enemies; as the Jews were before offended at him, because of the meanness of his parentage and education: and this was to be that very night; and it was now very late, it may reasonably be supposed to be midnight: for since the last evening, or sun setting, they had ate the passover, the ceremonies of which took up much time, and after that the Lord's supper; then the Hallel, or hymn was sung, when Christ discoursed much with his disciples, and delivered those consolatory and instructive sermons, about the vine and other things, occasioned by the fruit of the vine, they had been just drinking of, recorded in the 15th and 16th chapters of John; and put up that prayer to his Father for them, which stands in the 17th chapter; and indeed within an hour or two after, (see ^{<11437>}Mark 14:37), this prediction of Christ's had its accomplishment, and which he confirms by a prophetic testimony:

for it is written, in (^{<3037>}Zechariah 13:7),

I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered.

This text is miserably perverted by the Jewish writers; though they all agree, that by "the shepherd", is meant some great person, as a king; so the Targum renders it, "kill the king, and the princes shall be scattered": one ^{f1565} of them says, that a wicked king of Moab is designed; another ^{f1566}, a king of the Ishmaelites, or of the Turks; and a third ^{f1567}, that any, and every king of the Gentiles is meant; a fourth says ^{f1568}, it is a prophecy of the great wars that shall be in all the earth, in the days of Messiah ben Joseph; and a fifth ^{f1569}, after having taken notice of other senses, mentions this as the last: that

“the words “my shepherd, and the man my fellow”, in the former part of the verse, are to be understood of Messiah, the son of Joseph; and because he shall be slain in the wars of the nations, therefore the Lord will whet his glittering sword against the nations, to take vengeance on them; and on this account says, “awake, O sword! for my shepherd, and for the man my fellow”: as if the Lord called the sword and vengeance to awake against his enemies, because of Messiah ben Joseph, whom they shall slay; and who shall be the shepherd of the flock of God, and by reason of his righteousness and perfection, shall be the man his fellow; and when the nations shall slay that shepherd, the sword of the Lord shall come and smite the shepherd; that is, every shepherd of the Gentiles, and their kings; for because of the slaying of the shepherd of Israel, every shepherd of their enemies shall be slain, and their sheep shall be scattered; for through the death of the shepherds, the people that shall be under them, will have no standing.”

Now though this is a most wretched perversion of the passage, to make the word “shepherd” in the former part of it, to signify one person, and in the other part of it another; yet shows the conviction of their minds, that the Messiah is not be excluded from the prophecy, and of whom, without doubt, it is spoken, and rightly applied by him, who is concerned in it, the Lord Jesus Christ; who feeds his flock like a shepherd, is the great shepherd of the sheep, the chief shepherd, the good shepherd, that laid down his life for the sheep; which is intended by the smiting of him: in the text in (^{<3810>}Zechariah 13:7) it is read, “smite the shepherd”; being an order of Jehovah the Father’s, to Justice, to awake its sword, and sheath it in his son, his equal by nature, his shepherd by office; and here, as his own act, and what he would do himself, “I will smite the shepherd”; for his ordering Justice to smite, is rightly interpreted doing it himself. The Jews cannot object to this, when their own interpreters in general explain it thus, **tyrky** **muçh**, “God shall cut off the shepherd”^{f1570}. The sufferings of Christ, which are meant by the smiting him, were according, not only to the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, the will of his good pleasure, but according to his will of command; which justice executed, and Christ was obedient to, and in which Jehovah had a very great hand himself: he bruised him, he put him to grief, he made his soul an offering for sin; he spared him not, but delivered him up into the hands of men, justice, and death, for us all: the latter clause, “and the sheep of the flock shall be

scattered”, respects the disciples, and their forsaking Christ, and fleeing from him, when he was apprehended; for then, as was foretold in this prophecy, and predicted by Christ, they all forsook him and fled, and were scattered every man to his own, and left him alone. In Zechariah it is only said, “the sheep shall be scattered”, (^{<3817>}Zechariah 13:7): here, the sheep of the flock; though the Evangelist Mark reads it, as in the prophet, (^{<4117>}Mark 14:27), and so the Arabic here, and the sense is the same; for the sheep are the sheep of the flock, Christ’s little flock, the flock of slaughter, committed to his care; unless it may be thought proper to distinguish between the sheep and the flock; and by “the flock” understand, all the elect of God, and by “the sheep”, the principal of the flock; “the rams of his sheep”, or “flock”, as the Syriac version renders it; the apostles of Christ, who are chiefly, if not solely intended; though others of Christ’s followers might be stumbled, offended, and staggered, as well as they; as Cleophas was, one of the two that went to Emmaus.

Ver. 32. *But after I am risen again*, etc.] This he says for their comfort, that though he, their shepherd, should be apprehended, condemned, and crucified, should be smitten with death, and be laid in the grave, yet he should rise again; and though they should be scattered abroad, yet should be gathered together again by him, their good shepherd; who would after his resurrection, appear to them, be at the head of them, and go before them, as a shepherd goes before his sheep: for it follows,

I will go before you into Galilee; the native place of most, if not all of them. This the women that came to the sepulchre after Christ’s resurrection, were bid, both by the angel, and Christ himself, to remind the disciples of, and ordered them to go into Galilee, where they might expect to see him: accordingly they did go thither, and saw and worshipped him; (see ^{<4117>}Matthew 28:7,10,16,17).

Ver. 33. *Peter answered and said unto him*, etc.] Who was always a forward man, free to speak his mind, and was often the mouth of the rest; observing what Christ had affirmed concerning all of them, that that very night, in a very short space of time, they would be offended because of him; and knowing the strong love he had for Christ, and being persuaded it could never be his case, thus addresses him;

though all men shall be offended because of thee, yet will I never be offended: his sense is, that though all the men in the world, friends, and foes, though even all the rest of the disciples, who were his most intimate

friends, most closely attached to him, and who dearly loved him, and sincerely believed in him, should be so stumbled at what should befall him, as to flee from him, and be tempted to relinquish his cause, and interest; yet nothing should ever cause him, in the least, to stumble and fall, to desert him, or hesitate about him, or cause him to take the least umbrage and offence at what might come upon him; and this he was positive of would be the case, not only that night, but ever after. No doubt he said this in the sincerity of his heart, and out of his great fervour of affection for Christ; but what he failed in, was trusting to his own strength, being self-confident; and in entertaining greater opinion of himself, and his steady attachment to Christ, than of the rest of the disciples; and in contradicting what Christ had so strongly affirmed of them all, without any exception, and so of himself, and had confirmed by so glaring a prophecy concerning this matter.

Ver. 34. *Jesus said unto him, verily I say unto thee,* etc.] Christ, the more strongly to asseverate what he was about to say, uses the word verily, or prefixes his “Amen” to it, as being a certain truth, and what Peter might assure himself of would certainly come to pass:

that this night before the cock crow, thou shalt deny me thrice; which is, as if he should say, thou wilt not only be offended because of me, and flee from me, and be scattered with the rest, as will be the case of all of you; but thou wilt deny that thou knowest me, that thou belongest to me, or hast any concern with me; and this thou wilt do not only once, but again and again, even three times, one after another, and that this very night, before the cock has done crowing. In Mark it is said, “that this day, even in this night, before the cock crow twice, thou shalt deny me thrice”, (~~4140~~ Mark 14:30); which may be reconciled with the words of Matthew, and the other evangelists, by observing, that the word “twice” is not in Beza’s ancient copy, which he gave to the university of Cambridge, nor is it in the Ethiopic version; which if allowed to be the true reading, the difficulty is removed at once; but whereas it is in other copies, no stress must be laid on this, nor is there any need of it: for whereas the cock crows twice in the night, once at midnight, and again near break of day; and which latter crowing being louder, and more welcome, and most taken notice of, is, by way of eminence, called the cock crowing; and is what Matthew here has respect to, and so designs the same as Mark does; and the sense of both is, that before the cock crow a second time, which is most properly the cock crowing, Peter should three times deny his master,

as he did; (see ^{<4135}Mark 13:35), where cock crowing is distinguished from midnight, the first time the cock crows, and means the second time of crowing; and where Mark is to be understood in the same sense as Matthew, and both entirely agree. So cock crowing and midnight are distinguished by the Jews, who say ^{f1571},

“that on all other days they remove the ashes from the altar, **r bgh tayrqb**, “at cock crowing”, or near unto it, whether before or after; but on the day of atonement, **twxhm**, “at midnight”.”

and who also speak of the cocks crowing a first and second, and even a third time ^{f1572}.

“Says R. Shila, he that begins his journey before cock crowing, his blood be upon his head. R. Josiah says, he may not proceed **bwçyç d[**, “until he repeats”; that is, until he crows twice: and there are, who say, until he trebles it, or crows a third time: of what do they speak? of a middling one, i.e. which neither crows too soon, nor too late.”

Ver. 35. *Peter saith unto him*, etc.] Mark says, “he spake the more vehemently”, (^{<4145}Mark 14:31); his spirits were raised to a greater pitch of resentment, and he expressed himself in stronger terms, and in more peremptory and self-confident language;

though I should die with thee, yet will I not deny thee: he seems to have understood Christ, that he should suffer death, and that he would be in great danger himself, and therefore rather than lose his life would deny his master; wherefore he most confidently affirms, that should this be the case, should he be called to suffer death for his sake, or along with him, he would most cheerfully embrace it, rather than be guilty of so dreadful a crime, which he could not look upon but with the utmost detestation and abhorrence, as to deny his dear Lord and Saviour:

likewise also said all the disciples; that they would never be offended because of him, and would die with him rather than deny him. This they said, being also self-confident and ignorant of their own weakness, and drawn into these expressions through Peter’s example; and that partly to show their equal abhorrence of so horrible an iniquity, as denying Jesus; and partly to remove all suspicion from them, lest they should be thought to have less love and zeal for Christ than Peter had.

Ver. 36. *Then cometh Jesus with them,* etc.] The eleven disciples,

unto a place called Gethsemane; the Syriac version calls it Ghedsiman; the Persic, Ghesmani, so the Arabic; the Vulgate Latin, and the Ethiopic, Gethsemani: in Munster's Hebrew Gospel, and in the Vulgate Latin, and Arabic versions, it is called a "village"; and in the Ethiopic version, "a village of wine"; and in the Syriac and Persic versions, a place. Here, according to an Ethiopic writer, the Virgin Mary was buried by the apostles ^{f1573}. Its etymology is very differently given: some read, and explain it, as if it was $\mu\gamma\eta\mu\zeta$ *yg*, "a valley of fatness", or "of olives", as it is called in Munster's Hebrew Gospel; (see ^{<2301>}Isaiah 28:1); others as if it was $\gamma\eta\mu\gamma\delta$ *yg*, "a valley of signs", or a very famous valley; so Mount Sinai is called ^{f1574}, $\gamma\eta\mu\gamma\delta$ *rh*, "Harsemanai", the mountain of signs: but, to take notice of no more; the true reading and signification of it is, $\mu\gamma\eta\mu\zeta$ *tg*, "an olive press", or a press for olives: so we read ^{f1575} of a chamber in the temple which is called "the chamber", $\alpha\gamma\eta\mu\zeta$ *tyb*, "Beth Semania", or "Bethsemani", where they put their wine and oil for temple service. It is very probable that at, or near this place, was a very public olive press, where they used to squeeze the olives, for the oil of them, which they gathered in great plenty from off the Mount of Olives; at the foot of which this place was; and a very significant place it was for our Lord to go to at this time, when he was about to tread the wine press of his Father's wrath, alone, and of the people there were none with him: for it follows,

and saith unto the disciples, sit ye here, while I go and pray yonder:

perceiving a time of distress was coming upon him, he betakes himself to prayer, an example worthy of our imitation; in the performance of which duty he chose to be retired and solitary, and therefore left eight of his disciples at a certain place, whilst he went to another at some distance, convenient for his purpose; who perhaps might be the weakest of the disciples, and not able to bear the agonies and distress of their Lord and Master.

Ver. 37. *And he took with him Peter, and the two sons of Zebedee,* etc.]

James and John, who perhaps were the strongest, and best able to bear the shocking sight, and were his favourite disciples; who were admitted to be with him at other times, when the rest were not; as at the raising of Jairus's daughter, (^{<4057>}Mark 5:37), and moreover, these were at his transfiguration on the mount, (^{<4070>}Matthew 17:1), which was a representation and presage

of his glory; and so were very proper persons to be witnesses of his sorrows and agonies, which were the way to it; and three of them were taken by him for this purpose, being a sufficient number to bear testimony, since by the mouth of two or three witnesses everything is established:

and began to be sorrowful; his soul was troubled on the same account six days before, (~~4127~~ John 12:27), but was now sorrowful. He was a man of sorrows all his days, and acquainted with griefs, being reproached and persecuted by men: but now a new scene of sorrows opened; before he was afflicted by men, but now he is bruised, and put to grief by his Father: his sorrows now began, for they did not end here, but on the cross; not that this was but a bare beginning of his sorrows, or that these were but light in comparison of future ones; for they were very heavy, and indeed seem to be the heaviest of all, as appears from his own account of them; his vehement cry to his Father; his bloody sweat and agony; and the assistance he stood in need of from an angel; and the comfort and strength he received from him in his human nature: all which, put together, the like is not to be observed in any part of his sufferings:

and to be very heavy; with the weight of the sins of his people, and the sense of divine wrath, with which he was so pressed and overwhelmed, that his spirits were almost quite gone; he was just ready to swoon away, sink and die; his heart failed him, and became like wax melted in the midst of his bowels, before the wrath of God, which was as a consuming fire: all which shows the truth, though weakness of his human nature, and the greatness of his sufferings in it. The human nature was still in union with the divine person of the Son of God, and was sustained by him, but left to its natural weakness, without sin, that it might suffer to the utmost, and as much as possible for the sins of God's elect.

Ver. 38. *Then saith he unto them*, etc.] The three disciples, Peter, James, and John, who, by his looks and gestures, might know somewhat of the inward distress of his mind; yet he choose to express it to them in words, saying,

my soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death. That Christ had an human soul, as well as an human body, is clear from hence; and which was possessed of the same passions as ours are, but without sin, such as joy, love, grief, sorrow, etc. and at this time its sorrows were exceeding great: his soul was beset all around with the sins of his people; these took hold on him, and encompassed him, which must, in the most sensible manner, affect

his pure and spotless mind; the sorrows of death and hell surrounded him on every side, insomuch that the least degree of comfort was not let in to him; nor was there any way open for it, so that his soul was overwhelmed with sorrow; his heart was ready to break; he was brought even, as it were, to the dust of death; nor would his sorrows leave him, he was persuaded, until soul and body were separated from each other; see a like phrase in (^{ⲁⲓⲓⲁⲛ}Judges 16:16),

tarry ye here. The Ethiopic adds, “till I shall return”, for he was going a little further from them, to vent his grief, and pour out his soul unto God. Munster’s Hebrew Gospel reads it, “expect me”, or “wait for me here”, signifying, that he should return to them shortly;

and watch with me. It was night, and they might be heavy and inclined to sleep: he knew it would be an hour of temptation both to him and them, and therefore advises them to watch against it; and to observe how it would go with him, and what should befall him, that they might be witnesses of it, and be able to testify what agonies he endured, what grace he exercised, and how submissive he was to his Father’s will.

Ver. 39. *And he went a little further*, etc.] Luke says, (^{ⲁⲓⲓⲁⲓ}Luke 22:41), “about a stone’s cast”, about fifty or sixty feet from the place where they were,

and fell on his face, and prayed; partly to show his great reverence of God, the sword of whose justice was awaked against him, the terrors of whose law were set in array before him, and whose wrath was pouring down upon him; and partly to signify how much his soul was depressed, how low he was brought, and in what distress and anguish of spirit he was, that he was not able to lift up his head, and look up. This was a prayer gesture used when a person was in the utmost perplexity. The account the Jews give of it, is this ^{f1576},

“ⲙⲏⲏⲡ ⲓ ⲓ ⲁⲓⲓ ⲡⲱⲛⲉⲕ, “when they fall upon their faces”, they do not stretch out their hands and their feet, but incline on their sides.”

This was not to be done by any person, or at any time; the rules are these ^{f1577}:

“no man is accounted fit ⲡⲱⲛⲡ ⲓ ⲓ ⲓ ⲡⲱⲡⲓ, “to fall upon his face”, but he that knows in himself that he is righteous, as Joshua; but he inclines his face a little, and does not bow it down to the floor; and

it is lawful for a man to pray in one place, and to “fall upon his face” in another: it is a custom that reaches throughout all Israel, that there is no falling upon the face on a sabbath day, nor on feast days, nor on the beginning of the year, nor on the beginning of the month, nor on the feast of dedication, nor on the days of “purim”, nor at the time of the meat offering of the eves of the sabbath days, and good days, nor at the evening prayer for every day; and there are private persons that fall upon their faces at the evening prayer, and on the day of atonement only: they fall upon their faces because it is a time of supplication, request, and fasting.”

Saying, O my father; or, as in Mark, “Abba, Father”, (^{<4146>}Mark 14:36); “Abba” being the Syriac word he used, and signifies, “my father”; and the other word is added for explanation’s sake, and to denote the vehemency of his mind, and fervour of spirit in prayer. Christ prayed in the same manner he taught his disciples to pray, saying, “our Father”; and as all his children pray under the influence of the spirit of adoption, whereby they cry “Abba, Father”. God is the Father of Christ, not as man, for as such he was without father, being the seed of the woman, and made of a woman, without man; nor by creation, as he is the Father of spirits, of angels, and the souls of men, of Adam, and all mankind; nor by adoption, as he is the Father of all the chosen, redeemed, and regenerated ones; but by nature, he being the only begotten of the Father, in a manner inconceivable and inexpressible by us. Christ now addresses him in prayer in his human nature, as standing in this relation to him as the Son of God, both to express his reverence of him, and what freedom and boldness he might use with him; what confidence he might put in him; and what expectation he might have of being heard and regarded by him; and what submission and resignation of will was due from himself unto him.

If it be possible, let this cup pass from me; meaning not only the hour, as it is called in Mark, the present season and time of distress, and horror; but all his future sufferings and death, which were at hand; together with the bearing the sins of his people, the enduring the curse of the law, and the wrath of God, all which were ingredients in, and made up this dreadful bitter cup, this cup of fury, cursing, and trembling; called a cup, either in allusion to the nauseous potions given by physicians to their patients; or rather to the cup of poison given to malefactors the sooner to dispatch them; or to that of wine mingled with myrrh and frankincense to intoxicate them, that they might not feel their pain, *see Gill* “^{<4152>}Mark 15:23”, or to

the cup appointed by the master of the family to everyone in the house; these sorrows, sufferings, and death of Christ being what were allotted and appointed by his heavenly Father: and when he prays that this cup might pass from him, his meaning is, that he might be freed from the present horrors of his mind, be excused the sufferings of death, and be delivered from the curse of the law, and wrath of God; which request was made without sin, though it betrayed the weakness of the human nature under its insupportable load, and its reluctance to sufferings and death, which is natural; and yet does not represent him herein as inferior to martyrs, who have desired death, and triumphed in the midst of exquisite torments: for their case and his were widely different; they had the presence of God with them, Christ was under the hidings of his Father's face; they had the love of God shed abroad in them, he had the wrath of God poured out upon him; and his prayer bespeaks him to be in a condition which neither they, nor any mortal creature were ever in. Moreover, the human nature of Christ was now, as it were, swallowed up in sorrow, and intent upon nothing but sufferings and death; had nothing in view but the wrath of God, and the curse of the law; so that everything else was, for the present, out of sight; as the purposes of God, his counsel and covenant, his own engagements and office, and the salvation of his people; hence it is no wonder to hear such a request made; and yet it is with this condition, "if it be possible". In Mark it is said, "all things are possible unto thee", (~~411435~~ Mark 14:36); intimating, that the taking away, or causing the cup to pass from him, was: all things are possible to God, which are consistent with the perfections of his nature, and the counsel of his will: and all such things, though possible in themselves, yet are not under such and such circumstances so; the removal of the cup from Christ was possible in itself, but not as things were circumstanced, and as matters then stood; and therefore it is hypothetically put, "if it be possible", as it was not; and that by reason of the decrees and purposes of God, which had fixed it, and are immutable; and on account of the covenant of grace, of which this was a considerable branch and article, and in which Christ had agreed unto it, and is unalterable; and also on the score of the prophecies of the Old Testament, in which it had been often spoken of; and therefore without it, how should the Scriptures be fulfilled that thus it must be? they would not have been the Scriptures of truth. Besides, Christ had foretold it himself once and again, and therefore consistent with the truth of his own predictions, it could not be dispensed with: add to all this, that the salvation of his people required his drinking it; that could not be brought

about no other way in agreement with the veracity, faithfulness, justice, and holiness of God. This condition qualifies and restrains the above petition; nor is it to be considered but in connection with what follows:

nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt; which shows that the request was far from being sinful, or contrary to piety to God, or love to men, or to true fortitude of mind; the pure natural will of Christ, or the will of Christ's human nature, being left to act in a mere natural way, shows a reluctance to sorrows, sufferings, and death; this same will acting on rational principles, and in a rational way, puts it upon the possibility the thing, and the agreement of the divine will to it. That there are two wills in Christ, human and divine, is certain; his human will, though in some instances, as in this, may have been different from the divine will, yet not contrary to it; and his divine will is always the same with his Father's. This, as mediator, he engaged to do, and came down from heaven for that purpose, took delight in doing it, and has completely finished it.

Ver. 40. *And he cometh unto the disciples*, etc.] The three he took with him, Peter, James, and John, after he had finished his prayer;

and findeth them asleep: many things might contribute to, and bring this drowsiness upon them; as the great fatigue they had had in preparing the passover in the day, the plentiful meal they had eaten at night, though without excess, and the lateness of the night, it being now probably midnight; but the chief reason of their sleepiness was their sorrow, as is expressed in (^{<4226>}Luke 22:45), what Christ had said to them of his soul troubles, and what they saw in him, had filled their hearts with sorrow, which brought on them an amazement and stupidity of mind; and this issued in sleep. We have other instances of persons in excessive grief and trouble falling asleep, as Elijah in (^{<1194>}1 Kings 19:4,5), and Jonah in (Jon 1:5), so that this did not arise from a secure, lazy, indolent frame of spirit; or from any disregard to Christ, and neglect of him, and unconcernedness for him; but from their great sorrow of heart; for, the trouble and distress that he was in, added to the causes above mentioned. Though some have thought, that Satan might be, concerned in it, who induced this sleepiness, or increased it, that he might the more easily surprise them with his temptations, he was preparing for them, which I will not deny. Now, though this sleep was natural bodily sleep, which the disciples fell into, yet was an emblem of, and carried in it a resemblance to, the spiritual sleep and drowsiness of the people of God; for as this was after a delightful

entertainment and conversation with Christ at the passover and Lord's supper, so it sometimes is, that the children of God fall into a sleepy frame of soul, after much communion with Christ, as the church did in (^{21RE}Song of Solomon 5:1, 2), and as this sleep befell them, when Christ was withdrawn a little space from them; so it was with the church, when her beloved was absent from her, (^{21RE}Song of Solomon 3:1 5:2), and with the wise virgins when the bridegroom tarried, (^{41RE}Matthew 25:6), and as this was not an entire thorough sleep; they knew all the while what Christ was doing, and could relate, as they have done, the circumstances of it; so the children of God, when asleep, they are not like unregenerate persons, in a dead sleep of sin, that hear, and see, and feel, and know nothing; but though they are asleep, their hearts are awake, as was the church's, (^{21RE}Song of Solomon 5:2), yet as the disciples were so much asleep, that the bare words of Christ did not arouse them from it for a while; so such is the sleep of the saints sometimes, that they are not to be aroused by the bare ministry of the word, though the most powerful arguments, and the most moving and melting language are made use of, as were with the church, (^{21RE}Song of Solomon 5:2-4),

and saith unto Peter, what! could ye not watch with me one hour? This was said particularly to Peter, because he had so lately, in such a confident manner, declared, that he would not be offended with Christ, but abide with him, stand by him, and even die with him, was there an occasion for it; and yet, in so short a space of time, was fallen asleep, as were the rest who said the same things also: and it is as if Christ should say, how will you be able to stand by me throughout this night, when ye cannot watch with me so much as one hour, though I so earnestly desired you to tarry here, and watch with me, and you saw in what distress I was in? how will you be able to withstand the temptations that will beset you quickly, and perform your promises of love, fidelity, constancy, and close attachment to me, in the greatest dangers, when you cannot keep yourselves awake one hour for my sake?

Ver. 41. *Watch and pray*, etc.] These two are very justly put together. There is, and ought to be, a watching before prayer, and “unto” it; a watching all opportunities, the most suitable and convenient to perform it; and there is a watching in it, both over our hearts, thoughts, words, and gestures, and after it, for a return of it, and answer to it: the reason of this exhortation follows,

that ye enter not into temptation; not that they might not be tempted at all; for none of the saints have been, or are without temptations; and they are needful for them; and it is the will of God they should be attended with them; and he has made gracious provisions for their help and relief under them; but that they might not enter into them, throw themselves in the way of temptation, be surprised by them at an unawares, fall into them headlong, be immersed in them, fall by them, and be overcome with them, so as to forsake Christ, or to deny him:

the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak: meaning either that the evil spirit Satan was very desirous of having them in his hands; very forward and ready to make the onset upon them; was cheerful, alert, and confident of victory; and was strong, robust, and powerful; and they were but flesh and blood, very weak and infirm, and unequal to the enemy; which is a sense not to be despised, seeing it carries in it a very strong reason why they ought to watch and pray, lest they fall into the temptations of such a powerful adversary; (see ^{<4162>}Ephesians 6:12 ^{<4118>}1 Peter 5:8), or else by “spirit” may be meant the soul, as renewed and regenerated by the spirit of God; particularly the principle of grace in it, which is born of the Spirit, and is called by the same name, and which lusts against the flesh, or corrupt nature: this was willing to watch and pray, and guard against falling into temptations; was willing to abide by Christ, and express its love to him every way; but “the flesh”, or “body”, so the Syriac, Arabic, and Ethiopic versions read, is “weak” and infirm, prone to sleep, indulges ease, and unfit to bear trouble, but ready to sink under it, and is for fleeing from it: and so the words contain our Lord’s excuse of his disciples in their present circumstances. Munster’s Hebrew Gospel reads the words thus, and “indeed the spirit is **tdqwc**, watchful, but the flesh is weak”. The Ethiopic version after this manner, “the spirit desires, and the body is fatigued”. The Persic version, contrary both to the letter and sense of the words, renders them, “my spirit is firm, but my body is infirm”.

Ver. 42. *He went away again the second time*, etc.] To the same place as before, or at some little distance; after he had reproved his disciples for their sleeping, and had exhorted them to watchfulness and prayer, suggesting the danger they were liable to, and the condition they were in:

and prayed, saying, O my Father, if this cup may not pass away from me except I drink it, thy will be done. The sense of this prayer to his God and Father is, that if his sufferings and death could not be dispensed with; if it

was not consistent with the decrees of God, and the covenant of grace, that he should be excused from them; or if the glory of God, and the salvation of his people required it, that he must drink up that bitter cup, he was content to do it; desiring in all things to submit unto, and to fulfil his Father's will, though it was so irksome and disagreeable to nature.

Ver. 43. *And he came and found them asleep again*, etc.] For they were aroused and awaked, in some measure, by what he had said to them; but no sooner was he gone but they fell asleep again, and thus he found them a second time; or, "he came again and found them asleep"; so read the Vulgate Latin, the Syriac, Arabic, and Ethiopic versions, and Munster's Hebrew Gospel:

for their eyes were heavy; with sleep through fatigue, sorrow, etc. Mark adds, "neither wist they what to answer him", (^{<4140>}Mark 14:40); they were so very sleepy, they knew not how to speak; or they were so confounded, that he should take them asleep a second time, after they had had such a reproof, and exhortation from him, that they knew not what answer to make him; who probably rebuked them again, or gave them a fresh exhortation.

Ver. 44. *And he left them, and went away again*, etc.] At some little distance from them; they being so overpowered with sleep, that he could have no conversation with them:

and prayed the third time; as the Apostle Paul did, when under temptation, he prayed thrice that it might depart from him, (^{<4718>}2 Corinthians 12:8),

saying the same words: the Arabic version renders it, "in the words which he before expressed"; and Munster's Hebrew Gospel reads, "he said the same prayer"; not in the selfsame words, or in the express form he had before delivered it; for it is certain, that his second prayer is not expressed in the same form of words as the first: but the sense is, that he prayed to the same purpose; the matter and substance of his prayer was the same, namely, that he might be exempted from suffering; but if that could not be admitted of, he was desirous to be resigned to the will of his heavenly Father, and was determined to submit unto it.

Ver. 45. *Then cometh he to his disciples*, etc.] The three that were nearest to him, "the third time", as Mark says, (^{<4144>}Mark 14:41), and as it was;

and saith unto them, sleep on now, and take your rest. The Evangelist Mark adds, “it is enough”, (~~4144~~Mark 14:41); which has induced some interpreters to think, that these words were spoken seriously by Christ: though the sense cannot be that they had watched sufficiently, and now might sleep, and take their rest, for they had not watched at all; but rather, that he had now no need of them, or their watching with him; the conflict was over for the present; or, as the Syriac version renders it, “the end is come”; and so the Arabic; and to the same purpose the Persic, “the matter is come to an end”, or to an extremity; the sense being the same with what is expressed in the following clause, “the hour is at hand”; and shows, that the words are to be understood in an ironical sense, sleep on and take your rest, if you can: I have been exhorting you to watchfulness, but to no purpose, you will be alarmed from another quarter; a band of soldiers is just at hand to seize and carry me away, and now sleep if you can: that this is the sense appears from the reason given, and from the exhortation in the following verse, and the reason annexed to that:

behold the hour is at hand, and the son of man is betrayed into the hands of sinners: by the son of man Christ means himself, and under this diminutive title expresses his Messiahship, this being a character of the Messiah in the Old Testament; and the truth of his human nature, and the weakness and infirmities of it: by the “betraying”, or delivery of him, is intended either the betraying of him by Judas into the hands of the high priest, Scribes, and Pharisees; or the delivery of him, by them, into the hands of Pilate, and by him to the Roman soldiers; all which were by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God. The high priest, elders, Scribes, and Pharisees, notwithstanding all their pretensions to religion, righteousness, and holiness, were very wicked persons; though the Gentiles, the band of Roman soldiers, Judas brought with him to take Christ, are here rather meant, it being usual to call the Gentiles sinners. This betraying and delivery of Christ into the hands of these, was determined by God; the time, the very hour was fixed, and was now approaching; the last sand in the glass was dropping; for as soon as Christ had said these words, Judas, with his band of soldiers, appeared.

Ver. 46. *Rise, let us be going,* etc.] Not to run away from the enemy, but to meet him: this was said, partly to arouse his sleepy disciples; and partly to show his love to his Father, and his submission to his will; as also to express the fortitude of his mind as man; he was now rid of his fears, and free from those agonies and dreadful apprehensions of things, he was but a

little while ago possessed of; and likewise, to signify his willingness to be apprehended, and to suffer, and die, in the room of his people:

he is at hand that doth betray me. This shows his omniscience: he not only knew, as he did from the beginning, who should betray him; but he knew when he would do it; and he knew where the betrayer now was, that he was just now coming upon him, in order to deliver him the hands of sinful men. And this he spake with trepidity of soul, with greatness of mind, being no more concerned at it, than when he gave him the sop, and bid him do what he did quickly: he does not mention his name; nor did he ever, when he spoke of him as the betrayer; either because the disciples, as yet, did not fully and certainly know who should betray him, and he would not now surprise them with it; or because they did, and therefore it was needless to mention his name; or rather, because he was unworthy to be mentioned by name: a “behold” is prefixed to this, partly to awaken the attention of his disciples; and partly to express what an horrid, insolent, and unparalleled action that was, Judas was now about to be guilty of.

Ver. 47. *And while he yet spake,* etc.] While he was thus speaking to his disciples, before the last words, he is at hand that doth betray me, were well out of his mouth; such an exact knowledge had Christ of every motion of Judas, of what he was about, and where he was:

lo! Judas, one of the twelve, came. The Persic version adds, “in sight”; of Christ, and the disciples; they saw him, and knew him, though some little distance: he came to Gethsemane, and into the garden, where they were, with a design to betray his master. He is described by his name Judas; as in (⁴²⁵⁴Matthew 26:14), for there was another Judas among the apostles; the Syriac and Persic read, Judas the betrayer, to distinguish him from the other: and also by his office, “one of the twelve”; i.e. apostles, whom Christ called from the rest of his disciples and followers, and bestowed extraordinary gifts upon, and sent forth to preach the Gospel, cast out devils, and heal all manner of diseases; and “lo!”, one of these betrays him! an apostle, and yet a devil! one of the twelve, one of his select company, and bosom friends, and yet a traitor!

and with him a great multitude, with swords and staves, from the chief priests and elders the people. Judas was at the head of them, went before them to show them where Christ was, and to deliver him into their hands: he had not been asleep, he had been with the chief priests, and acquainted them with the opportunity he had of making good his agreement with him:

he had got the band of soldiers, and other persons together, in order to make sure work of it. Thus we see how diligent wicked men are in the accomplishment of their evil designs, whilst good men are asleep and indifferent to godly and spiritual exercises. Judas is here described by his company; he who but a few hours ago was at table with his Lord, and the rest of the apostles, is now at the head of band of Roman soldiers, and other miscreants, and blood thirsty wretches, intent upon the death of his master. They may well be called a “multitude”, because made up of various sorts of persons, and these, many of them; of Roman soldiers, of the officers and servants of the chief priests; yea of the chief priests themselves, captains of the temple, and elders of the people, who were so eager upon this enterprise, that they could not forbear going in company with them, to see what would be the issue of it. And “a great one”; for the “band” of soldiers, if it was complete, consisted of a thousand men itself; and besides this, there were many others, and all to take a single person, and who had no more about him than eleven disciples; though the ^{f1578} Jews pretend he had two thousand men with him: and who came also “with swords and staves, or clubs”; the Roman soldiers with their swords, and the servants of the chief priests with their clubs: the reason of this posse, and of their being thus armed, might be either for fear of the people, who, should they be alarmed, and have any notice of their design, might rise and make an uproar, and attempt to rescue him; or that by having a Roman band with them, and the chief priests and their officers, it might appear, that what they did they did by authority; and that they seized him as a malefactor, as one guilty either of sedition, or heresy, or both. And this account is confirmed by the Jews themselves, who say ^{f1579}, that the citizens, of Jerusalem were μνynwzm, “armed”, and equiped, and so took Jesus: and this multitude also came “from the chief priests and elders of the people”. Mark joins the Scribes with them, (~~414B~~ Mark 14:43): these composed the sanhedrim, or great council of the nation, who had been consulting the death of Christ; had agreed to give Judas thirty pieces of silver to betray him into their hands; had obtained a band of soldiers of the Roman governor to apprehend him, and sent their officers and servants to assist herein; these all acted under their direction, influence, and authority. The Vulgate Latin, and Munster’s Hebrew Gospel read, “sent”, from them.

Ver. 48. *Now he that betrayed him gave them a sign*, etc.] By which it might be known who he was; for it being night, though they had lanterns and torches, as John says, (~~618B~~ John 18:3), yet Judas himself might not be

able to discern, him, so as to point him out, until he came very near him: moreover, Christ and his apostles might be clothed alike, so that a mistake might be easily made, and one of them be took for him: and so the Jews say ^{f1580}, that the two thousand men, they pretend were with him, were clothed with the same apparel; which story may take its rise from hence: add to this, that James, the son of Alphaeus, called the brother of our Lord, is reported to be very like unto him. Besides, it is very likely that the Roman soldiers, who were to be the principal persons in apprehending, binding, and carrying him away, might never have seen him, and so could not know him without some sign was given them; and which Judas gave them before he came out with them: and is as follows:

saying, whomsoever I shall kiss, that same is he, hold him fast. Judas might the rather pitch upon this to be the sign, partly because it might be what had been usual with the disciples, when they had been at any time absent from Christ, and which he admitted of; and partly because he might think this would best cover his treacherous designs, who, with all his wickedness, had not effrontery enough to come sword in hand and seize him in a violent manner, and besides, might not judge such a method advisable, had he impudence enough to prosecute it, lest this should put Jesus upon taking some measures to make his escape. The reason of his advice, “hold him fast”, was, because he knew that once and again, when attempts were made to seize him, he easily disengaged himself, passed through the midst, and went his way; (see ~~400~~ Luke 4:30 ~~405~~ John 8:59) (~~410~~ John 10:39); and therefore gave them this caution, and strict charge, lest, should he slip from them, he should lose his money he had agreed with the chief priests for; or to let them know, that when he was in their hands, he had made good his agreement, and should expect his money: and that it lay upon them then to take care of him, and bring him before the sanhedrim. The account the Jews themselves give of the directions of Judas, is not very much unlike this; who represent him advising in this manner, only as on the day before:

“gird yourselves ready about this time tomorrow, and the man whom shall worship and bow to, the same is he; behave yourselves like men of war, fight against his company, and lay hold on him ^{f1581}.”

Ver. 49. *And forthwith he came to Jesus,* etc.] As soon as ever he appeared, before the rest could come up; for, he went before them, as Luke

says, and that not only as, their guide to direct them to the person they wanted, but he separated himself from them, that it might not be thought that he came with them, or belonged to them:

and said, hail, master; and kissed him. Just as Joab asked Amasa of his health, and took him by the beard to kiss him, and smote him under the fifth rib, (⁴¹⁰⁹2 Samuel 20:9). The salutation he gave him was wishing him all health, prosperity, and happiness. The Syriac version renders it, “peace, Rabbi”; and the Persic, “peace be upon thee, Rabbi”; which was the very form of salutation the disciples of the wise men gave to their Rabbins.

“Says ^{f1582} Aba bar Hona, in the name of R. Jochanan, in what form is the salutation of a disciple to his master? *ybr Æyl [μwl ç*, “peace be upon thee, Rabbi”.”

In (⁴¹⁴⁵Mark 14:45), the word “Rabbi” is repeated, this being usual in the salutation of the Jewish doctors; and the rather used by Judas under a pretence of doing him the greater honour, and of showing the highest respect, and strongest affection for him. So this deceitful wretch still addresses him as his master, though he was now serving his most implacable enemies; and wishes him all peace and joy, when he was going to deliver him into the hands of those that sought his life; and to cover all, kissed him, as a token of his friendship and the sincerity of it. It is rightly observed by Dr. Lightfoot, that it was usual for masters to kiss their disciples, particularly their heads; but then not for disciples to kiss their masters: of the former there are many instances in the Jewish writings, but not of the latter: yet, I can hardly think that this was done out of open contempt and derision; but under a pretence of respect and love; and even as being concerned for his present case, and as condoling him under the circumstances he was now likely to be in, through an armed hand, which was just upon him; and which he, by this artifice, would have suggested he had no concern with.

Ver. 50. *And Jesus said unto him, friend,* etc.] Not in an ironical and sarcastic way, but because he pretended to be his friend, by saluting and kissing him, in the manner he had done; or rather, because Christ had always used him as his friend, his familiar friend, who had been of his councils, and had ate at his table; and therefore this carried in it something very cutting, had Judas had any conscience, or sense of gratitude:

wherefore art thou come? The Ethiopic version reads, “my friend, art thou not come?” that is, art thou come as my friend? is thy coming as a friend, or as an enemy? if as a friend, what means this company with swords and staves? if as an enemy, why this salutation and kiss? or what is thine end in coming at this time of night? what is thy business here? thou hast left my company, and my disciples, what dost thou do here? The Syriac version reads it, “to that”; and the Arabic, “to this art thou come?” to kiss me, and by a kiss to deliver me into the hands of my enemies? to which agrees what is said in Luke, “Judas, betrayest thou the son of man with a kiss?”

(^{<424>}Luke 22:48). This he said, to let him know he knew him, and therefore he calls him by name; and that he knew his design in kissing him, and that what he was doing was against light and knowledge; he, at the same time, knowing that he was the son of man, the true Messiah.

Then came they, and laid hands on Jesus, and took him; that is, the multitude, the Roman band, the captains and officers of the Jews, when Judas had given the sign; though not till Christ had given them a specimen of his power, in striking them to the ground; to let them know, that Judas could never have put him into their hands, nor could they have laid hold on him, had he not thought fit to surrender himself to them. The seizing and apprehending him is related by Luke and John as after the following circumstance; though the Ethiopic version here reads, “they lift up their hands, and did not lay hold on the Lord Jesus”.

Ver. 51. *And behold one of them which were with Jesus,* etc.] Either one of the three that Jesus took with him whilst he was in his agony, leaving the other eight at some distance; or of the eleven, who might now be all with him: however, it is certain, Peter is the person meant; for though he is not named here, nor by Mark, nor Luke, he is by John, (^{<430>}John 18:10); whose Gospel being wrote last, and many years after the rest, there was no danger like to accrue, by telling who it was that did the following action: he being now thoroughly awaked with the rest, by what Christ had said to him; and more so by the surprise of the multitude of armed men about him; and remembering his solemn protestations of abiding by his master; and seeing him just now ready to be seized, and carried away; without knowing his master’s mind, or waiting his answer to the question the other disciples put,

stretched out his hand, and drew his sword, and struck a servant of the high priest’s, and smote off his ear. It seems he had a sword by his side,

upon what account is not certain; this he drew, and struck at a servant of the high priest's, who might show great malignity against Christ, and was foremost, and most busy in apprehending him. The blow was levelled at his head, and with an intention, no doubt, to have, cleaved him down, but sloping on one side took off his ear. The servant's name was Malchus, as John says; and it was his right ear that was cut off, as both he and Luke relate, (^{<B1810>}John 18:10) (^{<D251>}Luke 22:50).

Ver. 52. *Then said Jesus unto him,* etc.] That is, unto Peter,

put up again thy sword into its place, or sheath. This Christ said not only to rebuke Peter for his rashness, but to soften the minds of the multitude, who must be enraged at such an action; and which was still more effectually done by his healing the man's ear: and indeed, had it not been for these words, and this action of Christ's; and more especially had it not been owing to the powerful influence Christ had over the spirits of these men, in all probability Peter, and the rest of the apostles, had been all destroyed at once.

For all they that take the sword, shall perish with the sword. This is not to be understood of magistrates who bear not the sword in vain, are ministers of God for good, and revengers of evil works; but of private persons that use the sword, and that not in self-defence, but for private revenge; or engage in a quarrel, to which they are not called; and such generally perish, as Peter must have done, had it not been for the interposition of almighty power. Though this seems to be spoken not so much of Peter, and of the danger he exposed himself to, by taking and using the sword, and so to deter him from it, but rather of these his enemies: and as an argument to make and keep Peter easy and quiet, and exercise patience, since, in a little time, God would avenge himself of them; and that the Jews, who now made use of the sword of the Roman soldiers, would perish by the sword of the Romans, as in a few years after the whole nation did.

Ver. 53. *Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father,* etc.]

Meaning, if he thought proper, or that there was any necessity for it, or that he was desirous of being rescued out of such hands he was falling into. This must be understood of him as man: for, as God, the angels were his creatures and ministering servants, whom he had the command of himself, and so had no need, as such, to pray to his Father to detach a number of them to his assistance, and which, as man, he could only want.

And he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels. A Roman legion consisted of about six thousand soldiers, or upwards; some add six hundred sixty six; and others make the number far greater. Twelve are mentioned, either with respect to the twelve apostles; or in allusion, as others think, to the Roman militia; a proper and full army with them consisting of such a number of legions: and that there is an innumerable company of angels, thousand thousands, and ten thousand times ten thousand, is certain; and the Persic version here reads; “twelve myriads” of legions; and that these are at the command of God, and he can dispatch them at once, on any emergent occasion, is very evident; and what is it that such a company of angels is not capable of, when a single angel slew in one night an hundred, fourscore, and five thousand men, (^{<12185>}2 Kings 19:35), wherefore had Christ had any inclination to have been rescued from the present danger, he stood in no need of Peter’s sword.

Ver. 54. *But how then shall the Scriptures be fulfilled,* etc.] That is, should Christ make such a request to his Father, and he should grant it, and an host of angels should be sent to rescue him, and he should be rescued by them; how then should the Scriptures, which speak of Christ’s being taken, and led as a lamb to the slaughter, and of his various sufferings, and the circumstances of them, have their accomplishment? “declaring”, as the Arabic version supplies, or as the Ethiopic version, “which say”,

that thus it must be; that the Messiah must be apprehended, and suffer, and die. The several parts of the sufferings of the Messiah are foretold in the writings of the Old Testament; the spirit of Christ, in the prophets, testified before hand of them; as that he should be reproached and despised of men, (^{<19216>}Psalm 22:6-8 ^{<25318>}Isaiah 53:3), be spit upon, smote, and buffeted, (^{<21016>}Isaiah 1:5,6 ^{<31016>}Micah 5:1), be put to death, (^{<19215>}Psalm 22:15 ^{<25312>}Isaiah 53:12), and that the death of the cross, (^{<19215>}Psalm 22:15,16 ^{<38210>}Zechariah 12:10), and be buried, (^{<25319>}Isaiah 53:9), and also the several circumstances of his sufferings, which led on to them, or attended them; as the selling him for thirty pieces of silver, (^{<38112>}Zechariah 11:12,13), the betraying him by one of his familiar friends, (^{<19419>}Psalm 41:9), the seizing and apprehending him, and which is particularly referred to here, (^{<25317>}Isaiah 53:7,8), his disciples forsaking him, (^{<38317>}Zechariah 13:7), and even his God and Father, (^{<19216>}Psalm 22:1), his suffering between two thieves, (^{<25312>}Isaiah 53:12), the parting of his garments, and casting lots on his vesture, (^{<19218>}Psalm 22:18), the giving him gall and vinegar when on the cross, (^{<19621>}Psalm 69:21), and not breaking any of his bones, (^{<19840>}Psalm 34:20), yea, the Scriptures not

only declared, that these things should be; but the necessity of them also, that they must be; because of the purposes and decrees of God, which are eternal, immutable, and unfrustrable; for as God had determined on his salvation of his people by Christ, and that through his sufferings and death, these were determined by him also, even the time, nature, manner, and circumstances of them; and which the Scriptures declare, and therefore must be likewise; and because of the covenant of grace, which is sure, unalterable, and unchangeable; in which Christ agreed to assume human nature, to obey, suffer, and die in it, and so do his Father's will, which was to bear the penalty of the law, and undergo the sufferings of death, and which therefore must be, or Christ's faithfulness fail. Moreover, on account of the law and justice of God, which required his bearing the curse, as well as fulfilling the precept of the law: and especially on account of the salvation of his people, which could not be effected without them, they must be. Christ, in these words, discovers a very great concern for the fulfilling of Scripture; and that because it is the word of God, which must not be broken; and because throughout it he is spoken of, in the volume of it, it is written of him, to do the will of God; even in the law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms: and besides, he was the minister of the circumcision, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers; and even agreeably to them, and upon the foundation of them, he had himself predicted his own sufferings: and as those were to be the rule of the faith and practice of his people in all ages, he was concerned for their accomplishment in every point; and which may teach us to value the Scriptures, and to be confident of the fulfilment of them in things yet future.

Ver. 55. *In that same hour said Jesus to the multitude*, etc.] That is, to the heads and chief of them, the chief priests, captains of the temple, and elders, as Luke says, (⁴⁰²⁵Luke 22:52), for though it was in the dead of the night, and the company such, as they would not have chose to have been seen in at another time; yet so intent were they upon this affair, that they could not satisfy themselves without being in it, and seeing the issue of it; and this the Jews themselves confirm in their account; for they say ^{f1583}, that the elders of Jerusalem took Jesus, and brought him to the city. Now in that same hour, immediately, that very moment, that Christ had made an end of rebuking Peter for his rash action, and reasoning with him upon it, he turned and addressed himself to these men, saying;

are ye come out as against a thief, with swords and staves, for to take me? as an highwayman, or notorious robber, that had done great mischief to the country; and being armed, and having associates, was not easy to be taken: the Syriac renders it, as a cut-throat: and the Persic, as a robber, and a cut-throat; a desperate villain, that would by no means yield, unless overpowered by numbers, by force of arms, by the dint of the sword, by knocks and blows: but how different from this, was the character of Jesus! who never did any injury to any man's person or property, but saved both; was meek, lowly, and humble in his deportment, throughout the whole of his life; never strove with men, or cried, and caused his voice, in any riotous manner, to be heard in the streets; and even when reviled, reviled not again, but took every insult patiently; and was now unarmed, and ready to submit at once; nay, before they could well come up to him, he asked them who they sought; and on mentioning his name, declared he was the person; and signified he was ready to surrender himself, only desired his disciples might have leave to go away: he adds,

I sat daily with you, teaching in the temple, and ye laid no hold on me.

The business he was employed was not thieving and stealing, but teaching; and that wholesome doctrine, which he, as man, had received from his Father, and as the great prophet in Israel taught; and with such power and authority, as the Scribes and Pharisees did not: the place where he taught, was the temple; not a corner, or a private place, but a place of public worship, and of public resort: the time when he taught there, was the daytime, and day by day; for some days past, it had been his custom in the daytime to teach in the temple, and at night to go out, and abide in the Mount of Olives; and his continuance day by day in the temple, or his constant teaching there, is signified by sitting daily there, and teaching; unless it should be thought rather to have regard to the posture in which he taught; (see ~~4081~~ Matthew 5:1). And yet, though this had been his common practice for some days past, and at other times before, yet no man laid hands on him then; which was not wanting to a good will in them, who were very desirous of it, and sought every opportunity to do it, but were prevented; either through fear of the people, or through Christ's making his escape from them; and particularly, by the singular providence and power of God, which restrained them, because his time was not yet come. However, Christ suggests by this, that they had no need to take such extraordinary methods to apprehend him, as to make use of one of his disciples to betray him; to come in the middle of the night to take him, and

that in such great numbers, and with swords and staves, when he was every day with them in the temple.

Ver. 56. *But all this was done, that the Scriptures of the prophets might be fulfilled*, etc.] Some have thought these to be the words of the evangelist, making this remark upon what was said and done; but by what both Mark and Luke record, (^{<1144>}Mark 14:49 ^{<1275>}Luke 22:53), they appear to be the words of Christ himself; who observes this, partly to make himself, as man, easy under the treatment he met with; and partly, to fortify the minds of his disciples against offence at it; and also to throw conviction, or confusion, into the minds of his enemies. The Scriptures of the prophets he refers to, as having, or about to have, by this conduct, their accomplishment, were such, as regarded the betraying him by Judas, the taking him in this secret, private, insidious, yet violent manner; in all which he showed great meekness, calmness, and submission, as (^{<1940>}Psalm 41:9 ^{<2901>}Lamentations 4:20 ^{<2817>}Isaiah 53:7,8). As also what respected the scattering, and hasty flight of his disciples from him, (^{<3817>}Zechariah 13:7), which in the next clause is shown to be accomplished.

Then all the disciples forsook him and fled; not only went away from him, and left him alone, as he foretold they would, (^{<6162>}John 16:32), but they ran away from him in a precipitant manner, like timorous sheep, the shepherd being about to be smitten; and they fearing, lest Peter's rash action should be imputed to them all, and they suffer for it; or lest they should be laid hold on next, and bound, as their master was, or about to be. Every thing in this account is an aggravation of their pusillanimity, and ingratitude; as that they were the "disciples" of Christ that forsook him, whom he had called, and sent forth as his apostles to preach his Gospel; and to whom he had given extraordinary gifts and powers; who had forsaken all and followed him, and had been with him from the beginning; had heard all his excellent discourses, and had seen all his miracles, and yet these at last forsake him, and even "all" of them: John the beloved disciple, that leaned on his bosom, and Peter, that professed so much love to him, zeal for him, and faith in him; the three that had just seen him in his agony and bloody sweat, and everyone of them left him; not one stood by him, and this too, after they had had a fresh instance of his power, in striking the men to the ground, that came to take him; and when he was suing for them with their enemies, to let them go peaceably and safely: so that they had no need to have fled in such haste; and to leave him "then", in the midst of his enemies, in his great distress and trouble, was very unkind and ungrateful:

and to this account of the evangelist, pretty much agrees what the Jews themselves say of it; for they report ^{f1584}, that

“when his disciples saw that he was taken, and that they could not fight against them, **ϕυλ grb wxwry**, “they ran away on foot”, and lift up their voice and wept greatly.”

Though they also pretend, that the citizens of Jerusalem killed many of them, and that the rest “fled” to the mountain, which is false.

Ver. 57. *And they that had laid hold on Jesus*, etc.] Who were the band, and the captain, and the officers of the Jews, as (^{<4B1D>}John 18:12), or as the Jews themselves say ^{f1585}, the elders of Jerusalem; who not only laid fast hold on him, but bound him; and that both for greater security of him, some of them perhaps knowing how he had made his escape from them formerly; or at least taking the hint from Judas, to hold him fast, and lead him away safely; and by way of reproach and contempt, thereby showing that he was a malefactor, and had done some crime worthy of bonds; and having him thus in fast and safe custody, they

led him away to Caiaphas, the high priest; who was high priest that year; for the priesthood was frequently changed in those times, and men were put into it by the Roman governor, through favour or bribery. The year before this, Simeon, or Simon ben Camhith, was high priest; and the year before that, Eleazar, the son of Ananus; and before him, Ishmael ben Phabi, who were all three, successively, made high priests by the Roman governor: as was also this Caiaphas, this year; and who by Josephus ^{f1586}, and in the Talmud ^{f1587} likewise, is called Joseph. From whence he had his name Caiaphas, is not certain: Jerom ^{f1588} says, it signifies “a searcher”, or “a sagacious person”; but may be better interpreted, he adds, “one that vomits at the mouth”; deriving the word, as I suppose, from **awq**, “to vomit”, and **yp**, “the mouth”; (see Gill on “^{<4B1D>}Matthew 26:3”). It was to the house, or palace of this man, the high priest, that Jesus was led;

where the Scribes and elders were assembled: a council was held about a week before this, in which Caiaphas assisted, and then gave counsel to the Jews, that it was expedient, that one man should die for the people, (^{<4B1D>}John 11:47,49,50), whether that was held at his house, or elsewhere, is not certain, very probably it might; however, it is clear from (^{<4B1D>}Matthew 26:2,3), that two days ago, the chief priests, Scribes, and elders, were assembled together in his palace, to consult about putting Jesus to death;

and here they were again met together on the same account, waiting to have him brought before them.

Ver. 58. *But Peter followed him afar off*, etc.] The Ethiopic version adds, alone; and which seems to be the true case; for though there was another disciple who also followed Jesus, and is thought to be John, yet it looks as if they followed him separately, and not together; for the other disciple went into the palace with Jesus, but Peter not till afterwards, being espied by his fellow disciple standing without. These two it seems, having a little recovered themselves from the fright they had been put into, stopped and turned back, and followed after Jesus, to see what would be the issue of things. Peter's following Christ, showed love to him; he was lothe to leave him, his bowels moved towards him, and he wanted to know how it would fare with him, and what would become of him; and yet keeping at a distance, following him afar off, betrayed fear, lest he should be observed, and taken up, and come into danger: however, he proceeded on his way in a slow pace, till he came

unto the high priest's palace, and went in and sat with the servants, to see the end; of the matter, or business, as the Ethiopic and Persic versions add; to see how it would go with him, whether he would exert his divine power, and deliver himself out of their hands, which he knew he was able to do, when he would again join him; or what punishment they would inflict upon him, whether they would scourge him, and then let him go; or whether they would sentence him to death; that so he might know how to provide for his own safety: all which was indulging curiosity, and the carnal reasonings of his mind; and it showed want of integrity at that time, and some degree of hypocrisy, in placing himself among the servants of the high priest, as if he was none of the followers of Jesus, but was of the same complexion and cast with them: he had got into bad company, and was in the way of temptation; and though he had no design in following Jesus, and in going into the high priest's palace, and seating himself among the servants to deny his Lord, yet all this led on to it; for which reason these several circumstances are taken notice of, the account of which denial of his, is afterwards related.

Ver. 59. *Now the chief priests and elders, and all the counsel*, etc.] Or sanhedrim, which consisted, as the Jewish writers say^{f1589}, of priests, Levites, and Israelites, of both ecclesiastics and laics; the ecclesiastics were the priests and Levites, and the laics the Israelites, or elders of the people;

for if priests and Levites could not be found, a sanhedrim might consist of those only; and so those words in (^{f1590}Deuteronomy 21:2), “thy elders”, are thus interpreted ^{f1590}, *l wdgh ^yd tyb hz*, this is the great sanhedrim; and though a king of Israel might not sit in the sanhedrim, yet an high priest might, if he was a man of wisdom ^{f1591}, and it seems as if Caiaphas was now at the head of this council, by its being assembled at his palace; which though it was not the usual place where they met, yet might be chose at this time for greater secrecy. Now these thus assembled together,

sought false witness against Jesus, to put him to death; they first take him up, and then seek out for witnesses against him; being determined, right or wrong, to put him to death, if possible; and false witnesses too, even those whose business it was, to examine and detect false witnesses, and to inflict the same punishment upon them, which they by their false testimony intended to have brought on another, (^{f1592}Deuteronomy 19:18,19). And besides, it was in the night, when it was forbid by their canons to begin the trial of capital causes, or to receive and admit of witnesses ^{f1592}. Indeed the Syriac and Persic versions read, only witnesses, or witness, and leave out the word “false”; perhaps imagining, that men could never be so wicked, to seek out for false witnesses: but this need not be wondered at, when these men were bent upon the death of Christ at any rate; and were aware that nothing true could be objected to him, that would legally take away his life; and besides, their manner of procedure in judgment against a false prophet, a deceiver, and one that enticed to idolatry, and such an one they would have Jesus to be, was quite different from what they took with other persons: their canon runs thus ^{f1593}:

“the judgment of a deceiver, is not as the rest of capital judgments; his witnesses are hid; and he has no need, or ought not to have any premonition, or warning, as the rest of those that are put to death; and if he goes out of the sanhedrim acquitted, and one says I can prove the charge against him, they turn him back; but if he goes out condemned, and one says I can prove him innocent the do not return him.”

So in the Misna ^{f1594} it is said,

“of all that are condemned to death in the law, none have their witnesses hidden but this (the deceiver, or one that entices to idolatry) — and they hide his witnesses behind a wall, or hedge; and he (whom he endeavoured to seduce) says to him, say what

thou hast said to me privately; and if he repeats it to him, he must say, how shall we leave our God that is in heaven, and go and serve stocks and stones! if he repents, it is well; but if he should say, so we are bound to do, and so it becomes us, they that stand behind the wall, or hedge, shall carry him to the sanhedrim and stone him.”

In the Gemara it is thus expressed ^{f1595},

“they light up a lamp in the innermost house, and set the witnesses in the outermost house, so that they can see him and hear his voice, and he cannot see them.”

And then follows what is said before, to which is added, “so they did to Ben Stada”; by whom they mean Jesus of Nazareth. Moreover, this need not seem strange, that they took such a course with Christ, when in the case of Stephen, they suborned and set up false witnesses against him. The sanhedrim cannot be thought to do this in person, but they sent out their officers to seek for such men, as could or would produce anything against him, and no doubt promised them an handsome reward.

Ver. 60. *But found none*, etc.] That were fit for their purpose;

yea, though many false witnesses came, yet found they none; whose testimonies were sufficient to put him to death, which was what they were resolved upon, or whose witness were not alike and agreed; for according to their law, a man must not die by the mouth of one witness only, but by the mouth of two or three witnesses agreed in a point; and though they might be willing enough to dispense with the law in this case, yet might have some regard to their own character and reputation; and especially as they meant to deliver him to the Roman governor, in order to be condemned by him; they knew they must have a charge, and this supported with a proper evidence, or they could not hope to succeed; for which reason, they could not put up, as they otherwise willingly would, with any sort of witnesses:

at the last came two false witnesses; who were agreed in a point, and whose testimonies were alike; at least, had a greater appearance of truth and agreement than the rest; though Mark says, “neither so did their witnesses agree together”, (~~4145~~ Mark 14:59), as to prove the point, for which it was given.

Ver. 61. *And said, this fellow said,* etc.] Or saith, as De Dieu observes, the Syriac version of this place should be rendered; that is, he has not only said in times past, referring to (~~John~~ John 2:19), but continues to say it, and glory in it:

I am able to destroy the temple of God, and to build it in three days; in which they did injury, both to his words and sense: he did not say, “I am able to destroy the temple”, but only said, “destroy this temple”; signifying neither his power, nor his will and inclination to it; but put it upon the Jews, and left it to them to do it: nor did he say one word about the temple of God, or as it is in (~~Mark~~ Mark 14:58), “this temple that is made with hands”; the temple at Jerusalem, which was made by the hands of men, and devoted to the worship of God; but only “this temple”, referring to his body, or human nature; in which he, the Son of God, dwelt, as in a temple; nor did he say that he was able to “build” it in three days, but that he would “raise it up” in three days; intending the resurrection of his body by his own power, after it had been dead three days; and so they perverted his sense, as well as misquoted his words; applying that to the material temple at Jerusalem, what he spoke of the temple of his body, and of its resurrection from the dead, on the third day; designing hereby to fix a charge, both of sacrilege and sorcery upon him: of sacrilege, in having a design upon the temple of God to destroy it; and of sorcery, or familiarity with the devil, and having assistance from him, or knowledge of the magic art, that he could pretend in three days to rebuild a temple, which had been forty and six years in building; and was what could never be done, but by help of Beelzebub, the prince of devils, by whom it was insinuated he did all his miracles.

Ver. 62. *And the high priest arose and said unto him,* etc.] He rose up from his seat in great wrath and anger; partly being vexed, that they could get no other and better testimony; and partly because of Christ’s contemptuous silence, giving no answer to the witnesses, as judging they deserved none; and which highly provoked the high priest, and therefore in passion said,

answerest thou nothing? what is it which these witness against thee? Is it true or false, right or wrong? The Vulgate Latin renders it, “dost thou answer nothing to those things which these witness against thee?” To which agree the Arabic version, and Munster’s Hebrew Gospel.

Ver. 63. *But Jesus held his peace*, etc.] Knowing it would signify nothing, whatever he should say, they being set upon his death, the time of which was now come; and therefore he quietly submits, and says nothing in his own defence to prevent it. To be silent in a court of judicature, Apollonius Tyanaeus ^{f1596} says, is the fourth virtue; this Christ had, and all others:

and the high priest answered and said unto him; though Christ had said nothing, a way of speaking very frequent among the Jews, and in the sacred writings:

I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God; the Christ; the anointed, that David speaks of in the second Psalm, and who is there said to be the Son of God, (^{<BIB>}Psalm 2:2,7), to which the high priest seems to have respect; since there is no other passage, in which both these characters meet; and which was understood by the ancient Jews of the Messiah, as is owned by modern ones ^{f1597}. Jesus was given out to be the Messiah, and his disciples believed him to be the Son of God, and he had affirmed himself to be so; wherefore the high priest, exerting his priestly power and authority, puts him upon his oath; or at least with an oath made by the living God, charges him to tell the truth, and which when ever any heard the voice of swearing, he was obliged to do, (^{<BIB>}Leviticus 5:1).

Ver. 64. *Jesus saith unto him, thou hast said*, etc.] That is, thou hast said right; or as Mark expresses it, “I am”, (^{<BIB>}Mark 14:62), the Christ, the anointed of God, who was so from everlasting, and in time; being before the world was, installed into, and invested with the office of mediator; and in the fulness of time, anointed with the holy Spirit without measure: he might truly say he was the Messiah, since all the characters of him in the books of the prophets, met in him; and all the miracles he was to work in proof of his Messiahship were wrought by him: as also that he was the Son of God, not by creation, as angels and men; nor by adoption, as saints; nor as man, or in the human nature, in which he was the son of man, and not the Son of God; nor was he begotten as man, whereas he is called the only begotten Son, and the begotten of the Father; and was he the Son of God as man not the first, but the third person must be his Father; besides, he was the Son of God before his incarnation: nor as mediator neither; he was the Son of God, antecedent to his office as mediator; his sonship is distinct from it, is an illustration of it, and what puts virtue into it; but he is so as God, as a divine person, by natural and eternal filiation; being begotten of

the Father in the divine essence, and of the same nature; and having the same perfections with him, and in all things equal to him; and is the sense in which he always affirmed God to be his Father, and himself to be his Son. For this phrase, “thou hast said”, as answering to an affirmation, “I am”, (see Gill on “⁴¹⁵⁵Matthew 26:25”). Now, though Christ had so fully answered to the adjuration, and so strongly affirmed himself to be the Messiah, the Son of God, yet he knew they would not believe; and therefore refers them to an after proof thereof, which whether they would or not, would oblige them to acknowledge the whole:

nevertheless, I say unto you, hereafter shall ye see the son of man, sitting at the right hand of power: the Vulgate Latin, and Munster’s Hebrew Gospel, read “the power of God”, as in (⁴²³⁹Luke 22:69), though it is not absolutely necessary; for “power” designs God himself, who is all powerful; as appears by the creation of all things out of nothing, the upholding of all things in their being, the redemption of men, the conversion of sinners, and the preservation of his saints. In the Jewish writings ^{f1598}, God is frequently called, *hrwbgh*, “the power”: such a thing, say they, we have heard, *hrwbgh ypm*, “from the mouth of power”, or might; that is, from God himself: and so he is by the Grecians called *δυναμις*, “power” ^{f1599}: by “the son of man”, is meant Christ in the human nature; who then appeared at their bar as a mere man, in a very despicable form and condition, but hereafter they should see him in a more glorious one, and at “the right hand of God”: a phrase expressive of his exaltation, above all creatures whatever: respect is had to the prophecy of him in (³⁸¹¹Psalms 110:1). “Sitting” there, denotes his having done his work; and his continuance in his exalted state, until all enemies are subdued under him: and when he says they should “see” him, his meaning is not, that they should see him at the right hand of God with their bodily eyes, as Stephen did; but that they should, or at least might, see and know by the effects, that he was set down at the right hand of God; as by the pouring forth of the holy Spirit upon his disciples, on the day of pentecost; by the wonderful spread of his Gospel, and the success of it, notwithstanding all the opposition made by them, and others; and particularly, by the vengeance he should take on their nation, city, and temple; and which may be more especially designed in the next clause;

and coming in, the clouds of heaven. So Christ’s coming to take vengeance on the Jewish nation, as it is often called the coming of the son

of man, is described in this manner, (^{<1027>}Matthew 24:27,30). Though this may also be understood of Christ's second coming to judgment, at the last day; when as he went up to heaven in a cloud, he will return, and come also in the clouds of heaven; (see ^{<4009>}Acts 1:9,11) (^{<6007>}Revelation 1:7), when he will be seen by the eyes of all, good and bad; and when this sanhedrim, before whom he now was, will see him also, and confess that he is Lord and Christ, and the Son of God. Though the former clause seems to have regard to what would quickly come to pass, and what they should soon observe, and be convinced of; for **απ ἄρτι**, rendered "hereafter", may be translated "henceforwards"; or as it is in the Syriac, Persic, and Ethiopic versions, "from this time"; meaning, that in a very little while, they should begin to see the effects of his being set down at the right hand of God, and which would be full proofs of it, and should see him come in the clouds of heaven, at the last day: reference seems to be had to (^{<2073>}Daniel 7:13), where one like unto the son of man is said to come in the clouds of heaven, and which is understood of the Messiah by many, both of the ancient and modern Jews ^{f1600}: with whom one of his names is "Anani" ^{f1601}, which signifies "clouds".

Ver. 65. *Then the high priest rent his clothes*, etc.] Both his outer and inner garments. This he did, to show his zeal for the honour and glory of God, his grief and concern at the profanation of his holy name by a false oath, and his abhorrence of, and indignation at the blasphemy he supposed Christ to be guilty of, in asserting himself to be the Son of God. Some have thought, that Caiaphas in this action, transgressed the law, in (^{<0210>}Leviticus 21:10), where it is said, that "the high priest — shall not uncover his head, nor rend his clothes": and it is one of the Jews' negative precepts ^{f1602}, that

"an high priest is prohibited, **μὴ ᾤσῃ**, "ever" to rend his garments:"

and that therefore being transported with passion at the greatness of the supposed crime, could not forbear expressing his detestation of it in this manner, though it was forbidden him: but it does not appear to have been unlawful: as for the law in Leviticus, it only regards the rending of garments at funerals, or in mourning for the dead, as the context shows; and so Jonathan ben Uzziel paraphrases the text, "nor rent his clothes":

yqyna t [çb "in the time of mourning"; and so the Jewish ^{f1603} interpreters, in general, expound it; and besides, this prohibition, according to them, only regards the manner of rending: their rule is this ^{f1604};

“an high priest rends below, and a common person above:” the sense of which, according to their commentators, is ^{f1605},

“that if anyone dies for whom an high priest is obliged to rend his garments, he must rend below, at the extreme part of his garment, near his feet; and as for what is written, nor rend his clothes; the meaning is, he shall not rend as other men do, above, over against the breast, near the shoulder, as the rest of the people.”

Moreover, a priest might not go into the sanctuary, nor perform any part of service with his clothes rent; the canon runs thus ^{f1606},

“the judgment, or the law of them that rend their garment, and of those that uncover the head, is one and the same, as it is said, (^{<8006>}Leviticus 10:6), lo! if he is in service, and rends his garments, he is guilty of death by the hands of heaven, though his service is right, and not profaned.”

And indeed no man, whether a priest or an Israelite, might go into the temple with his clothes rent; and a priest might not rend his sacerdotal garments, on any account; yet such were not these that Caiaphas now had on; but in case of hearing blasphemy, everyone, be he what he would, was obliged to rend his garments ^{f1607}:

“Whosoever hears the cursing of the name (of God) is obliged to rend, even at the cursing of the surnames he is obliged to rend; and he that hears it from an Israelite, both he that hears, and he that hears from the mouth of him that hears, he is obliged to rend; but he that hears from the mouth of a Gentile, is not obliged to rend; and Eliakim and Shebna would not have rent, but because Rabshakeh was an apostate.”

So when witnesses expressed the blasphemy of such they testified against, the judges were obliged to rise up and rend their garments; concerning which, take the following rule ^{f1608}:

“a blasphemer is not guilty, unless he expresses the name (of God); says R. Joshua ben Korcha, all the day the witnesses are examined by the surnames; but when the cause is finished, they do not put to death because of the surnames, but they bring every man out, and ask the chief among them, and say to him, say expressly what thou hast heard, and he says it: then the judges stand upon their feet,

ˆy[r w q w, “and rend their garments”, and do not sow them up again; and then the second and the third say, I have heard the same as he.”

From all which it appears, that Caiaphas did what was the custom of the nation to do in such a case. The observation, that some learned men have made, that the high priest’s rending his garments, was, though without his intention, an emblem and presage, of the rending of the priesthood from him, and his brethren, and the entire change of it; as the abolition of the whole ceremonial law, was signified by the rending of the veil of the temple in twain; and as the removing of the kingdom from Saul, was represented by Samuel’s rending his mantle; and the revolt of the ten tribes to Jeroboam, by Abijah’s rending his garment into twelve pieces, and giving ten to him; would have had a much better foundation to be built on, were these clothes that Caiaphas rent, his priestly ones: but such they were not; for both the high priest, and the other priests, only wore their sacerdotal garments in the temple; nor was it lawful for them to go out in them elsewhere; for so the Jews say ^{f1609};

“it is forbidden to go out into the province; city, or country, in the garments of the priesthood; but in the sanctuary, whether in the time of service, or not in the time of service, it was lawful.”

In the temple, there were chests on purpose for the garments of the priests ^{f1610}; from whence they took them, and where they laid them up when they had performed their service: of these there were ninety six in number; for as there were twenty four courses, there were four chests for every course; in which the garments were put by themselves, the breeches by themselves, the girdles by themselves, the bonnets by themselves, and the coats by themselves; sealed up with an inscription on them, showing what was in them: and when the men that belonged to such a course, came to perform their service in turn, they opened these chests, and clothed themselves: and when they went out of their service, they put them up in them again, and sealed them; and as for

“the high priest, he left his golden garments, w l ç h k ç l b, “in his chamber”, (an apartment in the temple, peculiar to him, and for this use,) in the night, and at whatsoever time he went out of the sanctuary ^{f1611},”

Nor might he go abroad with them, unless *l wdg Ærwxl* , “in great necessity” ^{f1612}; as Simeon the Just went out in priestly garments to meet Alexander the Great, to appease him, being warned of God so to do: hence the Apostle Paul knew not Ananias the high priest, (^{<423f>}Acts 23:5), which he must have done, had he had on his priestly garments: for when the priests were not in the temple, and out of service, they wore no distinguishing habits, but were dressed as laics, and as the common people were ^{f1613}. The reason of Caiaphas’s rending his clothes, is expressed in, the next clause,

saying, he hath spoken blasphemy: not only because Jesus asserted that he was the Messiah, but also the Son of God; hereby making himself equal with God, which is the sense in which the Jews always understood this phrase; and he appearing to them to be but a mere man, they charged it as blasphemy against God, to assume such a character and relation to himself:

what further need have we of witnesses? of seeking after others, as they had done: or of further examining and taking the depositions of those, who were before them: he was for putting a stop to the process, and bringing the cause at once to an issue: and therefore addresses the court in the following manner;

behold now, ye have heard his blasphemy: out of his own mouth, as (^{<427b>}Luke 22:71), expresses it; and with their own ears, and at that very time; so that they had no need of recourse to things past, or examine witnesses about what they had heard from him formerly: and therefore he proposes, that they would attend to, and take notice of his present words; and which, as he suggests, were shocking and astonishing: for the word, “behold!” may not only be a note of attention, but of astonishment.

Ver. 66. *What think ye?* etc.] Of the words just now spoken by him; do not they in your opinion amount to a charge of blasphemy and what punishment do you think ought to be inflicted on him? is he guilty of death, or not? This question he put, as being president of the court:

they answered and said, he is guilty of death; they were unanimous in their vote, for Mark says, “they all condemned him to be guilty of death”; only Joseph of Arimathea must be excepted, who consented not to their counsel and deed, (^{<425b>}Luke 23:51), and so must Nicodemus, if he was present; who seeing what they were determined to do, withdrew themselves before the question came to be put, and so it passed “nemine contradicente”; and

indeed, if he had been guilty of blasphemy, as they charged him, the sentence would have been right. Now this was in the night, in which they begun, carried on, and finished this judicial procedure, quite contrary to one of their own canons ^{f1614} which runs thus:

“pecuniary causes they try in the day, and finish in the night; capital causes (such was this) they try in the day, and finish in the day; pecuniary causes they finish the same day, whether for absolution, or condemnation; capital causes they finish the same day for absolution, and the day following for condemnation; wherefore they do not try causes neither on the sabbath eve, nor on the eve of a feast day.”

But in this case, they begun the trial in the night, examined the witnesses, finished it, and passed the sentence of condemnation, and that in the eve of a grand festival, their Chagigah.

Ver. 67. *Then did they spit in his face*, etc.] Not the judges, the members of the sanhedrim, but the servants of the high priest, and the officers that had Jesus in hold, and were the guard upon him; (see ^{<223>}Luke 22:63), who seeing him condemned as guilty of death, thought they might insult him at pleasure, and use him in the most indecent and barbarous manner; and therefore, in a way of contempt, spit in his face; than which nothing was more reproachful and disgraceful: the Jews ^{f1615} say, that he that spits before, or in the presence of his master, is guilty of death, so nauseous and filthy was it accounted; and how much more must it be so, to spit in the face of anyone? hereby a prophecy was fulfilled, (^{<2816>}Isaiah 50:6), “I hid not my face from shame and spitting”: and hereby, together with his sweat and blood, his visage was more marred than any man’s, and his form than the sons of men:

and buffeted him; cuffed, or boxed him with their double fists:

and others smote him, with the palms of their hands; gave him many a slap on the face with their open hands, or struck him on the face with rods, as the word will bear to be rendered: they rapped him with the wands they had in their hands, and struck him on the head with the rods or staves they had with them; whereby was accomplished the prophecy, in (^{<3811>}Micah 5:1), “they shall smite the judge of Israel with a rod upon the cheek”. This was very injurious treatment, the Jews themselves being witnesses; who have in their canons enjoined ^{f1616}, that

“if a man strikes his neighbour with his double fist, he must give him a shekel; R. Judah says, on account of R. Jose the Galilean, a pound: if he gives him a slap of the face, he must pay him two hundred zuzims, or pence; and if with the back of his hand (which was accounted ^{f1617} the more ignominious) four hundred zuzims: if he plucked him by his ear, or plucked off his hair, or spit, so as that the spittle came upon him, or took away his cloak — he must pay four hundred zuzims, and all according to his honour or dignity.”

All these indignities were done to Christ; (see ~~2306~~ Isaiah 50:6).

Ver. 68. *Saying, prophesy unto us, thou Christ,* etc.] Not that they owned him to be the Messiah; but because he asserted himself to be the Messiah, and his followers believed in him as such, they call him so; and in an ironical and sarcastic way, call upon him to divine, and tell them who the persons were, that used him in this manner; suggesting, that if he was the Christ, or Messiah, he would know all things, and what were done to him:

who is he that smote thee? for they had covered his face, or blindfolded him, as the other Evangelists say, (~~4146~~ Mark 14:65 ~~4226~~ Luke 22:64), and then bid him tell them who smote him last. Christ did not think fit to give them an answer to this question, but he will let them know hereafter, who the particular person, or persons were, that smote him; and when it will appear to all the churches, and to all the world, that he is the Lord God omniscient. Some learned men have observed ^{f1618}, that there was a play formerly used, called by the ancients, *κολλαβισμος*, at which, one person having his face covered, the rest smote him; or one put his hands over his eyes, and another smote, and asked him who it was that smote? and such an exercise is yet in being among us, which is commonly called Blindman’s Buff; and such pastime as this the Jews had with Christ; in this ludicrous way did they use him, and made him their sport and diversion, as the Philistines did Samson; but it will cost them another day.

Ver. 69. *Now Peter sat without in the palace,* etc.] Peter’s denial of his Lord, the account of which follows, is related among the sufferings of Christ; and indeed, the ill usage he met with from his enemies, their spitting in his face, buffeting him with their fists, smiting him on the cheeks with their hands, and rods, did not give him so much pain and grief, as to be denied by his own disciple: we are before told, (~~4188~~ Matthew 26:58), that Peter followed Christ afar off, and went into the high priest’s palace, and sat with the servants there, to see what would be the end and issue of these

things: and here now he was in the apartment, where the council sat, and were examining and trying Jesus; though, as Mark says, “beneath in the palace”, (^{<41146>}Mark 14:66); in the lower part of the room, in the great hall, in the midst of which the servants had made a fire: the Arabic version reads it, “in the area of the court”: here Peter had placed himself, and here he sat making his observations:

and a damsel came unto him; one of the maids of the high priest, as Mark says, (^{<41146>}Mark 14:66); and according to the Evangelist John, was she that kept the door, and had let him in, (^{<43816>}John 18:16,17),

saying, thou also wast with Jesus of Galilee. The Arabic and Persic versions read, Jesus the Nazarene, or of Nazareth, as below. So she called him, not so much to distinguish him from any other of that name, as by way of reproach; suggesting, that he could not be the Messiah, or that prophet; since Christ comes not out of Galilee, nor does any prophet arise from thence: and when she charges him with being “with” him, her meaning is not, that he was with him in the garden, when he was taken; where it cannot be thought she was to see him; nor with him in the temple, or in any part of Jerusalem, where she possibly might have seen him; but that he was a disciple of his, one that believed in him, embraced him as the Messiah, had imbibed his principles and doctrines, and was of his party; and was only come thither as a spy, to see what would be done to him.

Ver. 70. *But he denied before them all*, etc.] Which was a very great aggravation of his sin; for, as it is to a man’s commendation to profess a good profession of Christ before many witnesses, so it is to his disgrace, and is resented by Christ, to deny him before men: he did not deny that Christ was God, or the Son of God, or that he was come in the flesh, or that Jesus was the Christ, or that he was the only Saviour of sinners; but that he was with him, or one of his disciples;

saying, I know not what thou sayest: which was a very great falsehood; he knew the sense and import of her words; he denied that which was most true; he had been with him from the beginning, had heard all his discourses, and seen his miracles; he had been with him at particular times, and in particular places, when and where some others of the disciples were not admitted, as at the raising of Jairus’s daughter, at the transfiguration in the mount, and in the garden, very lately; and yet, O base ingratitude! now denies that he had been with him; or that he knew what was meant by such an expression. He denied that he was a disciple of Christ, which was his

greatest character, and highest glory; and this denial did not arise from any diffidence of his being one, or from a sense of his unworthiness to be one, but from the fear of man, which brought this snare upon him: and the more his weakness is discovered in it, that he should be intimidated by a servant maid into such a denial, who but a few hours before had confidently affirmed, that though he should die with Christ, he would not deny him; and who had so courageously drawn his sword in his master's cause, in the face of a band of soldiers, and a multitude of armed men with swords and staves. This was his first denial; a second follows.

Ver. 71. *And when he was gone out into the porch*, etc.] The Vulgate Latin, Arabic, and Ethiopic versions read, “the gate”: and so does Munster's Hebrew Gospel; but more rightly it is rendered, “the porch”: he did not attempt to go out at the door, and run away, though he could gladly have done it; but he feared to do this, lest, as this would discover him, they should pursue him, and overtake him, and bring him before the sanhedrim: he chose rather to keep his ground, but was very uneasy; and therefore moved into the porch, where he sat very pensive, considering what was proper for him to do; when

another maid saw him, and said unto them that were there, this [fellow] was also with Jesus of Nazareth: she speaks of Christ in the same contemptuous manner, as her fellow servant had done; for this appellation of Christ was commonly, if not always used by way of contempt; and she means the same thing by his being with him, the other did, and is rather more spiteful, and bent on mischief; for, the other addressed him alone, and what she said, said to himself; but this directs her speech to the servants and officers that were near at hand, and uses him in a very scurrilous manner: this sorry fellow, that is sauntering and lurking about here, is certainly one of this man's disciples.

Ver. 72. *And again he denied with an oath*, etc.] He denied a second time, that he had ever been with Jesus, or was a disciple of his; and to put it out of all doubt, and an end to all dispute about it, and further charge of this kind, as he hoped, he annexed an oath to it: he swore by the God of truth; made a solemn appeal to the omniscient God, the searcher of hearts, that he was so far from being ever with Jesus of Nazareth, or a disciple of his, that, says he,

I do not know the man: meaning not only that he had no personal knowledge of him, or acquaintance with him; but that he had never seen

the man in his life, nor did he know what manner of man he was. This, as it was a downright falsehood, it was what he had no need to have said; for there were multitudes that knew Christ in this sense, who never joined with him, or became his disciples. This was so much overdoing it, that it was much it had not given them a suspicion of him. Those that would excuse Peter's sin, by supposing that he meant, that he knew Christ to be God, and did not know him as a mere man, have no foundation for such a supposition; and indeed, such an ambiguous expression, and mental reservation, is no other than dealing fallaciously. Peter knew Christ in every sense; he knew him spiritually, whom to know is life eternal: and he valued the knowledge of him above all things else: he knew him to be God, and the Son of God; he knew him as mediator, and the Saviour of lost sinners; he knew him as man, and had had personal intimacy and conversation with him of a long time, and yet now denies he knew him; and that with an oath, adding perjury to lying; and so it is, that one sin leads on to another. This instance of Peter's shows the wickedness and deceitfulness of man's heart; and what the best of men are, or would be, when left to themselves, and of God: they become like other men, even like the men of the world, whose mouths are full of cursing and bitterness.

Ver. 73. *And after a while*, etc.] Mark says, "a little after", (^{<4147>}Mark 14:70), and Luke observes, that it was "about the space of one hour after", (^{<4229>}Luke 22:59): so that here was time to reflect upon what he had been saying, and to guard against another temptation, should he be attacked; but, alas! as yet he was unmindful of his Lord's words, and persists in the denial of him, and that with greater aggravation, than at his first surprise: and indeed his temptation was now more violent: for there

came unto him they that stood by; the officers and servants of the high priest, his attendants that waited upon him, and who stood by the fire, where Peter was warming himself: before he was attacked by single maidservants, now by a body of men, and one of them the kinsman of the man whose ear he had cut off, and who challenged him, as having seen him in the garden: and another confidently affirmed, and swore to it, that he was with Jesus, and was a Galilean; and all of them agreed in this,

and said to Peter, surely thou also art one of them, for thy speech betrayeth thee: not his spiritual speech, for he had not been speaking in the language of a disciple of Christ, like one that had been with Jesus; nor his swearing neither, for this rather showed him to be one of them; but his

country language, the brogue of his speech, the Galilean dialect which he spoke: for in Mark it is said, “thou art a Galilean, and thy speech agreeth thereunto”, (⁴¹⁴⁰Mark 14:70): for though the same language was spoken in Galilee as at Jerusalem, yet it was not so accurate and polite in Galilee, nor so well pronounced; words of different signification were confounded together. Hence the Talmudists say ^{f1619}, that

“the men of Judah, who were careful of their language, their law was confirmed in their hands; the men of Galilee, who were not careful of their language, their law was not confirmed in their hands — the men of Galilee, who do not attend to language, what is reported of them? a Galilean went and said to them, *ʿaml rma* *ʿaml rma*, they said to him foolish Galilean, *rmj*, “Chamor” is to ride upon, or “Chamar” is to drink, or “Hamar” is for clothing, or “Immar” is for hiding for slaughter.”

By which instances it appears, that a Galilean pronounced “Chamor”, an ass, and “Chamar”, wine, and “Hamar”, wool, and “Immar”, a lamb, all one, and the same way, without any distinction; so that it was difficult to know which of these he meant. Many other instances of the like kind are given in the same place, which show the Galilean to be a more gross, barbarous, and impolite language, than what was spoken at Jerusalem; and Peter using this dialect, was known to be a Galilean: just as the Ephraimites were known by their pronouncing Shibboleth, Sibboleth.

Ver. 74. *Then began he to curse, and to swear*, etc.] He swore before, and now he began “to curse”; not Christ, as Saul compelled some to blaspheme him, who professed him, and as the Jews formerly cursed Christ, and his followers, in their synagogues: for Peter’s crime was bad enough, it need not be made worse than it was: he could never call Jesus accursed; in so doing he would have sinned the sin against the Holy Ghost; but he cursed himself; “he began to imprecate himself”, as the Arabic version renders it; he made dreadful imprecations and wishes; wished that all the miseries and calamities he could think of might fall upon him, if he was one of the disciples of Jesus of Nazareth, or knew anything of him: saying,

I know not the man; if I do, God do so to me, or more also: let vengeance light upon me; may I be the most miserable creature in the world, if I know anything of him;

and immediately the cock crew: as he was swearing and cursing in this manner; as soon as ever the words were out of his mouth, and he had in this sad and solemn manner three times denied that he knew Christ, or was ever with him, or a disciple of his. It is forbid, by a Jewish canon, to keep cocks at Jerusalem; it runs thus ^{f1620}:

“they do not bring up cocks in Jerusalem, because of the holy things, neither do the priests in all the land of Israel, because of the purifications.”

Whether this canon was then in being, or how it was dispensed with, or whether there was any particular providence in the cock being here now, and so nigh the high priest’s palace, is not certain; but one there was: nor can the Jews deny that there were cocks at Jerusalem; for they themselves speak of a cock, *μυλ ἄωρυβ Ι ἰσραήλ* ^{f1621}, “that was stoned at Jerusalem”.

Ver. 75. *And Peter remembered the words of Jesus*, etc.] Forgetfulness of God, of his works, of his words, and of his law, of his revealed mind and will, is often the cause of sin; and a remembrance of things is necessary to the recovery of a fallen or backsliding professor; as, of what he is fallen from, of the love and kindness of God formerly shown to him, of his evil ways and works he is fallen into, and of the words and truths of Christ he has been very indifferent unto and lukewarm about:

which said unto him, before the cock crow, or is done crowing,

thou shalt deny me thrice; which he was put in mind of on hearing the cock crow. So by one means, or another, sometimes by some remarkable providence, and sometimes by the ministry of the word, God is pleased to alarm and awaken sleepy professors, backsliding believers, and remind them of their condition and duty, and restore them by repentance, as he did Peter:

and he went out; of the high priest’s palace, either through fear, lest he should be seen weeping, and be suspected; or rather through shame, not being able to continue where his Lord was, when he had so shamefully denied him; as also to leave the company he had got into, being sensible he was wrong in mingling himself with such, and thereby exposed himself to these temptations; as well as to vent his grief in tears privately:

and wept bitterly; being thoroughly sensible what an evil and bitter thing the sin was, he had been guilty of: his repentance sprung from Christ’s

looking upon him, and from his looking to Jesus, and was truly evangelical: it was a sorrow after a godly sort, and was increased by the discoveries of Christ's love unto him; and was attended with faith in him, and views of pardon through him: the Persic version adds, "and his sin is forgiven"; which, though not in the text, yet is a truth; for Peter's repentance was not like Cain's, nor Esau's, nor Judas's; it was not the repentance of one in despair, but was a repentance unto life and salvation, which needed not to be repented of.