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JOHN XII. 1–11.

1 Then Jesus six days before the passover came to Bethany, where Laz­arus was which had been dead, whom he raised from the dead.

2 There they made him a supper; and Martha served: but Lazarus wasone of them that sat at the table with him.

3 Then took Mary a pound of oint­ment of spikenard, very costly, and anointed the feet of Jesus, and wiped his feet with her hair: and the house was filled with the odour of the oint­ment.

4 Then saith one of his disciples, Ju­das Iscariot, Simon’s *son,* which should betray him,

5 Why was not this ointment sold for three hundred pence, and given to the poor?

6 This he said, not that he cared for the poor; but because he was a thief, and had the bag, and bare what was put therein.

7 Then said Jesus, Let her alone: against the day of my burying hath she kept this.

8 For the poor always ye have with you: but me ye have not always.

9 Much people of the Jews therefore knew that he was there: and they came not for Jesus’sake only, but that they might see Lazarus also, whom he had raised from the dead.

10 But the chief priests consulted that they might put Lazarus also to death;

11 Because that by reason of him, many of the Jews went away, and believed on Jesus.

THEchapter we have now begun finishes a most im­portant division of St. John’s Gospel. Our Lord’s public addresses to the unbelieving Jews of Jerusalem are here brought to an end. After this chapter, St. John records nothing but what was said in private to the disciples.

We see, for one thing, in this passage, *what abounding proofs exist of the truth of our Lord’s greatest miracles.*

We read of a supper at Bethany, where Lazarus “sat at the table” among the guests,—Lazarus, who had been publicly raised from the dead, after lying four days in the grave. No one could pretend to say that his resur­rection was a mere optical delusion, and that the eyes of the bystanders must have been deceived by a ghost or vision. Here was the very same Lazarus, after several weeks, sitting among his fellow-men with areal material body, and eating and drinking real material food. It is hard to understand what stronger evidence of a fact could be supplied. He that is not convinced by such evidence as this may as well say that he is determined to believe nothing at all.

It is a comfortable thought, that the very same proofs which exist about the resurrection of Lazarus are the proofs which surround that still mightier fact, the resur­rection of Christ from the dead. Was Lazarus seen for several weeks by the people of Bethany, going in and coming out among them? So was the Lord Jesus seen by His disciples.—Did Lazarus take material food before the eyes of his friends? So did the Lord Jesus eat and drink before His ascension.—No one, in his sober senses, who saw Jesus take “broiled fish and a honeycomb,” and eat it before several witnesses, would doubt that He had a real body. (Luke xxiv. 42.)

We shall do well to remember this. In an age of abounding unbelief and scepticism, we shall find that the resurrection of Christ will bear any weight that we can lay upon it. Just as He placed beyond reasonable doubt the rising again of a beloved disciple within two miles of Jerusalem, so in a very few weeks He placed beyond doubt His own victory over the grave. If we believe that Lazarus rose again, we need not doubt that Jesus rose again also. If we believe that Jesus rose again, we need not doubt the truth of His Messiahship, the reality of His acceptance as our Mediator, and the certainty of our own resurrection. Christ has risen indeed, and wicked men may well tremble. Christ has risen from the dead, and believers may well rejoice.

We see, for another thing, in this passage, *what unkind­ness and discouragement Christ’s friends sometimes meet with from man*.

We read that, at the supper in Bethany, Mary, the sister of Lazarus, anointed the feet of Jesus with pre­cious ointment, and wiped them with the hair of her head. Nor was this ointment poured on with a niggardly hand. She did it so liberally and profusely that “the house was filled with the odour of the ointment.” She did it under the influence of a heart full of love and gratitude. She thought nothing too great and good to bestow on such a Saviour. Sitting at His feet in days gone by, and hearing His words, she had found peace for her conscience, and pardon for her sins. At this very moment she saw Lazarus, alive and well, sitting by her Master’s side,—her own brother Lazarus, whom He had brought back to her from the grave. Greatly loved, she thought she could not show too much love in return. Having freely received, she freely gave.

But there were some present who found fault with Mary’s conduct, and blamed her as guilty of wasteful extravagance. One especially, an apostle, a man of whom better things might have been expected, declared openly that the ointment would have been better em­ployed if it had been sold, and the price “given to the poor.” The heart which could conceive such thoughts must have had low views of the dignity of Christ’s person, and still lower views of our obligations to Him. A cold heart and a stingy hand will generally go together.

There are only too many professing Christians of a like spirit in the present day. Myriads of baptized people cannot understand zeal of any sort for the honour of Christ. Tell them of any vast outlay of money to push trade or to advance the cause of science, and they approve of it as right and wise. Tell them of any expense incurred for the preaching of the Gospel at home or abroad, for spreading God’s Word, for extend­ing the knowledge of Christ on earth, and they tell you plainly that they think it waste. They never give a farthing to such objects as these, and count those people fools who do. Worst of all, they often cover over their own backwardness to help purely Christian objects, by a pretended concern for the poor at home. Yet they find it convenient to forget the notorious fact that those who do most for the cause of Christ are pre­cisely those who do most for the poor.

We must never allow ourselves to be moved from “patient continuance in well-doing,” by the unkind re­marks of such persons. It is vain to expect a man to do much for Christ, when he has no sense of debt to Christ. We must pity the blindness of our unkind critics, and work on. He who pleaded the cause of loving Mary, and said, “Let her alone,” is sitting at the right hand of God, and keeps a book of remembrance. A day is soon coming when a wondering world will see that every cup of cold water given for Christ’s sake, as well as every box of precious ointment, was recorded in heaven, and has its rewards. In that great day those who thought that any one could give too much to Christ will find they had better never have been born.

We see, lastly, in this passage, *what desperate hardness and unbelief there is in the heart of man*.

Unbelief appears in the chief priests, who “consulted that they might put Lazarus to death.” They could not deny the fact of his having been raised again. Living, and moving, and eating, and drinking within two miles of Jerusalem, after lying four days in the grave, Laza­rus was awitness to the truth of Christ’s Messiahship, whom they could not possibly answer or put to silence. Yet these proud men would not give way. They would rather commit a murder than throw down the arms of rebellion, and confess themselves in the wrong. No won­der that the Lord Jesus in a certain place “marvelled” at unbelief. Well might He say, in a well-known parable, “If they believe not Moses and the Prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead.” (Mark vi. 6; Luke xvi. 31.)

Hardness appears in Judas Iscariot, who, after being a chosen Apostle, and a preacher of the kingdom of heaven, turns out at last a thief and a traitor. So long as the world stands this unhappy man will be a lasting proof of the depth of human corruption. That any one could follow Christ as a disciple for three years, see all His miracles, hear all His teaching, receive at His hand repeated kindnesses, be counted an Apostle, and yet prove rotten at heart in the end, all this at first sight appears incredible and impossible! Yet the case of Judas shows plainly that the thing can be. Few things, perhaps, are so little realized as the extent of the fall of man.

Let us thank God if we know anything of faith, and can say, with all our sense of weakness and infirmity, “I believe.” Let us pray that our faith may be real, true, genuine, and sincere, and not a mere temporary impression, like the morning cloud and the early dew. Not least, let us watch and pray against the love of the world. It ruined one who basked in the full sunshine of privileges, and heard Christ Himself teaching every day. Then “let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall.” (1 Cor. x. 12.)

NOTES. JOHN XII. 1-11.

1*.—*[*Then Jesus six days...passover...Bethany.*]Every intelligent reader of the Gospel will see that John purposely omits at this point certain events which are recorded by Matthew, Mark, and Luke. He passes at once from our Lord’s retirement to the city called Ephraim to His return to Bethany for the last time. In this interval will be found the things related in Matthew x. 17-34; Mark x. 32-52; Luke xviii. 31, to xix. 1-28. In whatever part of Palestine this city Ephraim was, it is almost certain that between it and Bethany Jesus passed through Jericho, healed two blind men there, converted the publican Zaccheus, and spoke the parable of the nobleman who went into a far country, after giving to his ten servants ten pounds.

Why St. John did not record these facts we do not know, and it is mere waste of time to inquire. A reverent mind will be con­tent to remember that John wrote by inspiration of God, and was guided by infallible direction, both as to what he recorded and what he did not record. Reason and common sense, more­over, tell us that if the four Evangelists had all narrated exactly the same things, their value as independent witnesses would have been greatly damaged. Their variations and diversities are a strong indirect proof of their credibility. Too close an agree­ment would raise a suspicion of collusion, and look like an at­tempt to deceive.

The expression, “six days before the passover,” is remarkable, because at first sight it seems to contradict Mark’s narrative of the anointing, which Mark expressly says was “two clays before the passover.” (Mark xiv. 1.) Hence some maintain that the Greek words should be translated, “Before the six clays of the passover feast,” leaving the precise day indefinite and uncertain. To this, however, it is reasonably objected that the passover feast was more than six days, and that the proposed translation is not a probable rendering of the Greek words.—To this I must add, that in my opinion there seems no necessity for departing from the English version. It is not only possible, but probable, as Lightfoot maintains, that there were two distinct anointings of our Lord, one six days before the passover, and the other two days before. [The reader is requested to refer back to the notes on John ii. 2, where he will find this point fully discussed.]

The passover was slain on the Thursday evening. At this rate our Lord must have arrived at Bethany on Friday, the afternoon or evening before the Sabbath. Thus he must have spent His last earthly Sabbath with Mary, Martha, and Lazarus, at Beth­any.

That the disciples must have journeyed to Bethany with a full impression that a great crisis was at hand, and the end of their Master’s ministry approaching, one can hardly doubt, after read­ing the plain warnings recorded in Matthew, Mark, and Luke. But whether they really thought their Master would be put to death, or whether they did not secretly expect He would soon manifest His Divine power, take His kingdom and reign, is more than questionable.

A more deliberate, voluntary, calm walking up to death than our Lord’s last journey into Judaea, it is impossible to conceive.

[*Where Lazarus...been dead...raised from the dead.*]These words seem to show that Lazarus lived at Bethany, and was not merely a visitor or lodger there. They also show the immense importance of the miracle wrought on him. Within two miles of Jerusalem and the temple, there lived for weeks, if not for mouths, a man well known to many Jews, who had been actually raised from his grave after being four days buried. He had not been raised only, and then disappeared from public notice, but he lived where He was raised.

Lightfoot draws out the following interesting scheme of our Lord’s disposal of time during the last six clays before His cruci­fixion: (1) On Saturday He supped with Lazarus. (2) On Sun­day He rode into Jerusalem publicly on an ass. This was the day when the Jews used to take out a lamb from the flock, for each family, and to keep it separate for the passover. On this day the Lamb of God publicly presented Himself in Zion. (3) On Monday He went to Jerusalem again, and cursed the barren fig-tree on the way. (4) On Tuesday He went again to Jerusa­lem, and spoke for the last time to the people. Returning, He sat on the Mount of Olives and delivered the famous prophecy of Matthew xxiv. and xxv., and supped that night with Simon the leper. (5) On Wednesday He tarried in Bethany. (6) On Thursday He went to Jerusalem, ate the passover, appointed the Lord’s Supper, and the same night was taken before the priests as a prisoner. (7) On Friday He was crucified.

2.—[*There they made him a supper.*]These words show the joyful hospitality with which the Master was received by the disciples. The expression, “they,” may perhaps be used indefinitely, ac­cording to a common Hebraism. (Compare Matthew v. 15; x. 10; xiii. 48, and John xv. 6.) It then simply means, “a supper was made.” If not so used, it evidently can apply to none but Mary, Martha, and Lazarus.—Whether the supper was on Friday evening, when our Lord arrived, after the Sabbath began, or on the Saturday, or the Sabbath Day, is immaterial. It is evident that hospitality was thought no breach of the Sabbath among the Jews.

Lightfoot says the feast of the Jews, on this particular clay, six days before the passover, was always peculiarly liberal and sumptuous.

Hutcheson observes: “It is not unlawful at some times to enjoy the liberal use of the creatures in a sober manner. Christ doth not decline this supper; sometimes He went to the feasts of Pharisees, and sometimes of Publicans.” (Luke vii. 36; Matt. ix. 11.)

[*And Martha served.*]The natural temperament of this good woman comes out here as elsewhere. She could not sit still and do nothing while her Lord was in her house. She must be actively stirring and trying to do something. Grace does not take away our peculiar characteristics.

[*But Lazarus...sat at the table with him.*]This appears to most commentators, from Chrysostom downwards, to be purposely mentioned, in order to show the reality of Lazarus’ resurrection. He was not a ghost or a spirit. He had really been raised to life with a real body, and flesh and bones, and all the wants and conditions of a body. Thus we are practically taught that though a man’s body dies, it may yet live again.

Is not this feast a faint type of the Marriage Supper of the Lamb? Jesus Christ will be there; those believers who died and are raised again at His second advent will be there; and those who never died, but are found alive and believing when He comes, will be there. Then the number of guests will be complete.

3.—[*Then* *took Mary...ointment...anointed...feet...Jesus, etc., etc.*]This remarkable action of Mary, which, according to our Lord’s saying in Matthew and Mark, is related all over the world, de­serves our special consideration.

The action itself was not an uncommon one in Eastern coun­tries, where the heat is very great, and the feet exposed to it by wearing sandals are liable to suffer much from dryness and scorching. There was nothing, moreover, out of the common way in a woman doing this service. To “wash the saints’ feet,” St. Paul names among the good works of a Christian widow. (1 Tim. v. 10.)

The motive of Mary, in doing what she did, was evidently strong and grateful love to her Lord and Saviour. Not only from what she had learned from Him for her own spiritual bene­fit, but also for what He had done for her brother Lazarus, she felt there was nothing too great or too good to do for Him. Her feelings made her anxious to do her Master the highest honour, regardless of expense, and indifferent to any remark that witnesses might make.

The extent of her gratitude is shown by the lavish profuseness with which she used the ointment on this occasion, although it was very costly. This seems indicated by her “wiping our Lord’s feet with her hair,” having poured on them so much oint­ment that they needed wiping; and also by the “house being filled with the odour of the ointment.” She poured out so much ointment that the scent of it filled the whole apartment and the whole house where the guests were. Any one who knows the powerful odour of otto of roses, in the present day, will easily understand this.

What this “ointment of spikenard” was has puzzled the com­mentators in every age, as the Greek word throws no certain light on the question. Some think that it means “potable” oint­ment, that might be drunk; some that it means perfectly “pure” ointment, that might be trusted as genuine and unadulterated. Augustine thinks that the expression denotes the place from which the ointment came. The question is of no importance, and must be left unexplained for want of materials to explain it. Enough for us to know that it was something very valuable and costly. How costly an ointment might be, any one can guess who knows the value of pure otto of roses.

I can only repeat the opinion already expressed, that this anointing was certainly not the anointing which is described in Luke vii.; and most probably was not the anointing of Mark xiv. The anointing in Mark was two days before the passover, while this was six. In Mark the ointment was poured on the head, and here it was poured on the feet. In Matthew and Mark several “disciples” murmured, but here only Judas is named. These discrepancies, in my judgment, are insuperable, and make it necessary to believe that there were two distinct anointings at Bethany during the last six days preceding the crucifixion. I grant that it is a choice between difficulties, and that there are difficulties in the view I maintain. But I do not think them so weighty as those of the other view. At any rate, I am sup­ported by the great authority of Chrysostom, Chemnitius, and Lightfoot, as well as of Whitby and Henry.

What the significance of Mary’s wiping our Lord’s feet with the hairs of her head may be, is a difficult question. Perhaps, from our ignorance of Eastern customs in the days of our Lord’s earthly ministry, we are hardly qualified to give an opinion about it now. On points like these, where we are ignorant, it is wisest not to conjecture.

Calvin says: “The usual practice was to anoint the head, and on this account Pliny reckons it an instance of excessive luxury that some anointed the ankles. What John says about the feet amounts to this, that the whole body of Christ, down to the feet, was anointed.”

Rollock observes that at this time Mary seems to have had a deeper and more intimate perception of what there was in Christ, and of the real dignity of His person, than any of His disciples.

4*.—*[*Then saith...Judas Iscariot, Simon’s son.*]We know nothing of this Simon, who he was, or why he is specially mentioned here. It is worth notice, that hardly any name occurs so fre­quently in the New Testament as this. We have the follow­ing:—

1. The Apostle Simon, called also Peter.
2. The Apostle Simon, called also Zelotes, and the Canaanite.
3. Simon the brother of our Lord, mentioned with James and Joses. (Matt. xiii. 55.)
4. Simon the leper, in whose house the anointing took place. (Matt. xxvi. 6.)
5. Simon the Cyrenian, who carried the cross. (Matt. xxvii. 32.)
6. Simon the Pharisee. (Luke vii. 40.)
7. Simon the sorcerer at Samaria. (Acts viii. 9.)
8. Simon the tanner. (Acts ix. 43.)

It would, of course, be interesting to know if Judas Iscariot was son of any of these, But we have no clue to guide us.

Wordsworth sees in the mention of Judas by name a strong internal evidence of the late date of St. John’s Gospel. Com­pare with this the fact that John alone mentions Peter and Mal­thus by name. (John xviii. 10.)

[*Which should betray him.*]These words would be more lit­erally rendered, “the one who was about to betray Him.”

On the occasion of the anointing related in Matt. xxvi. and Mark xiv., it is worth noticing that “some of the disciples,” and not Judas only, found fault with the action. It rather adds probability to the theory that there were two anointings at Bethany.

Chrysostom remarks, that Jesus knew from the beginning that Judas was a traitor, and often rebuked him with such words as, “One of you is a devil.” (John vi. 64.) Augustine also remarks that we must not suppose Judas never fell till he received money from the Jews. He was false from the begin­ning. He also says that he was present at the institution of the Lord’s Supper, and was a communicant.

5.—[*Why* *was not this ointment sold for three hundred pence...poor?* This carping question is a specimen of the way in which wicked men often try to depreciate a good action, and specially in the matter of giving money. When the deed is done they do not say downright that it ought not to have been done, but suggest that something better might have been done! Those who do good must he prepared to find their actions carped at and their motives depreciated, and themselves charged with neglecting one class of duties in over-zeal for doing others. If we do nothing until everybody commends and praises us, we shall nev­er do any good in the world.

We may learn from this verse the costly nature of Mary’s oint­ment. If workmen’s wages were “a penny a day,” (Matt. xx. 2,) about 7d. of our money, this holy woman must have poured on our Lord’s feet what was worth between £9 and £10 of our money, according to the estimate of Judas. But allowances must perhaps be made for an exaggerated statement being made by an envious and wicked man.

We may note here that giving to the poor was evidently as­sumed to be a part of every Christian’s duty. Compare this with Gal. ii. 10. In a country like England, where there is a poor law, Christians are sadly apt to forget this. The duty of “giving to the poor,” and not merely paying rates in obedience to law, is just as obligatory now as it was 1800 years ago.

Ecolampadius remarks that the more wicked and graceless people are, the more ready they are to find fault with and blame others, and to see no beauty in what they do.

Quesnel remarks, that Judas made a great ado about 300 pence,—viz., £10, and a little ointment, when he was about to sell the Son of God for 30 pieces of silver,—viz., £3 15s.

Henry observe, “Coldness of love to Christ, and a secret contempt of serious piety, when they appear in professors of religion, are sad presages of final apostasy.”

Stier remarks: “We have in the words of Judas an example of those judgments which have their foundation in the favourite principles of utilitarianism, and which may too often be applied falsely, to the wounding of pious hearts.”—“This lays bare the root of that suspicion with which missionary offerings for the extension of Christ’s kingdom are looked at, because of the poor whom we have at home.”—“We have here, furthermore, an ex­ample of all cold judgments passed on the virtuous emotions of warm hearts, of all more or less conscious or unconscious censures of the artless outgoings and acts of honest feelings, and of all narrow-hearted criticism of others according to our own mind and temper.”

6*.—*[*This he said not...cared for the poor.*]This is one of those parenthetical explanations or glosses, which are so frequent in St. John’s Gospel. The Evangelist tells us the true character of Judas, and the reason he said what he did. He did not really care about the poor, but put their interest forward as a special and plausible argument for depreciating Mary’s action, and dis­couraging such actions in others.

There is something very instructive in this. The argument of Judas is frequently reproduced in the present day. Hundreds of people excuse themselves from one class of duties by pre­tended zeal for others, and compensate for neglecting Christ’s cause by affecting great concern for the poor. Yet in reality they care nothing for the poor, and only want to save their own money, and to be spared contributing to religious objects.

Some, for instance, will never give money to benefit the souls of their fellow-countrymen, and tell us we must first relieve their property and feed their bodies.—Some again will give nothing to help missions abroad, and tell us we must first mind the poor at home.—Even the shareholders of some great joint stock companies have been known to express great concern for the poor and working-classes, as an excuse for carrying on their business on Sundays.—The language of St. John about Judas Iscariot shows us that this apparent zeal for the poor should always be regarded with suspicion, and submitted to close analysis and cross-examination. He talked brave words about the poor, as if he cared more for them than any one! Yet there is not the slightest proof in the Gospels that he cared more for them than others. Above all, the conclusion of the verse lets out the truth, and the unerring pen of inspiration reveals the man’s true motives. These things are written for our learning. There are few greater impostors in the world than some of those who are pretending perpetually to care about the poor. The truest and best friends of the working-classes and the poor, the people who give most and do most for them, will always be found among those who do most for Christ. It is the succes­sors of Mary of Bethany, and not of Judas Iscariot, who really “care for the poor.” But they do not talk about it. While others talk and profess, they act.

[*But because he was* a *thief.*]This is strong language, and a veryheavy accusation. It seems to indicate that this was the habitual character of Judas. He always had been, and always was, a dishonest man. So says an inspired Apostle. In the face of this expression, it appears to me impossible to prove that Judas ever had the grace of God at any time, and that he only fell away at last. He was inwardly wrong at heart all the way through. Again, I find it impossible to believe that Judas was a high-souled and noble-minded, though greatly erring man, and that his motive in betraying his Lord was to hasten His kingdom, and to cut short the period of his humiliation. I cannot reconcile this with the word “thief.”

Let us note here how far a man may go in Christian profes­sion without any inward grace. There is no evidence that Judas up to this time was unlike other Apostles. Like them he had seen all Christ’s miracles, heard Christ’s teaching, lived in Christ’s company, and had himself preached the kingdom of God. Yet he was at bottom a graceless man. Privileges alone convert nobody.

Ferus remarks: “Let us never put confidence in man, or in any sanctity of position, office, or dress. If apostleship did not make Judas a saint, neither will position, office, or dress make thee a saint. In fact, unless you first have inward holiness, and have sought it from God, it may be that your office may render you more wicked.”

Let us note the amazing power of the love of money. No be­setting sin seems so thoroughly to wither up and blight and harden the heart. No wonder it is called “the root of all evil.” (1 Tim. vi. 10.) However many the faults and infirmities re­corded of saints in the Bible, we have not a single example of one that was covetous.

Chrysostom observes: “A dreadful thing is the love of money! It disables both eyes and ears, and makes man worse to deal with than a wild beast, allowing a man to consider neither conscience, nor friendship, nor fellowship, nor salva­tion.”

Quesnel observes that “Christ allows His money to be taken from Him, but never His sheep.”

[*And had the bag.*]The Greek word rendered “bag” is a curious one. The original idea is that of a bag in which musicians kept the mouthpieces or reeds of their instruments. From that, the idea evidently was attached to it, of a bag carried about by any member of a company, such as that of the dis­ciples, on behalf of his companions. Whether the common stock of provisions as well as of money was not kept in this bag perhaps admits of a question.

Theophylact says, that some think that Judas was trusted with the care of the money as one of the meanest and most in­ferior of Christian duties. Thus in Acts, the Apostles would not “serve tables.” (Acts vi. 2.)

[*And bare what was put therein.*]The last words would be more literally rendered, “the things put therein.” Some, as Origen, Theophylact, Pearce, Lampe, Tittman, Bloomfield, and Clarke, have thought that the word “bare” means “took away, carried off, stole, secreted, or set apart for himself.”—I doubt this. I prefer the simple idea of “carrying about.” It was the office of Judas to be the purse-keeper of the little company of disciples. The contributions in money and provisions of those friends who ministered to our Lord, such as “Joanna, Susanna, and many others,” (Luke viii. 3,) were probably meant by the things here mentioned. It is clear that our Lord had no earthly wealth, nor His disciples. It is equally clear that His friends, scattered all over Palestine, must have thought it a privilege, whenever He came among them, to contribute to His maintenance and support. Of these contributions in all proba­bility Judas was treasurer.

Let professing Christians note that to have money passing through their hands is a snare and a temptation. It is a snare by which many in every age have been cast down.

7.—[*Then said Jesus, Let her alone.*]This is unquestionably a re­buke to Judas, and a somewhat sharp one. It shows how jealously our Lord regards any attempt to hinder, check, or discourage the zeal of His own people. Even now, when some of His weak disciples undertake work which calls forth enmity and opposition, He can make all difficulties vanish, and say, “Let them alone.”

[*Against the day…burying...kept this.*]The first word here would be more literally rendered, “for” the day. I believe we must not interpret this sentence as if our Lord meant that Mary really knew that our Lord’s burial was at hand. I think it rather signifies, “The ointment which Mary has poured on my feet, though she meant it only as a mark of honour, happens to be a most suitable thing, as my death and burial are approach­ing. She little knew, in doing what she did, the nearness of my death; but, as it happens, her action is most seasonable.”

Some, as Chrysostom, think that our Lord intended to prick the conscience and soften the feelings of Judas by talking of His “burial,” and by the language of the next verse, “Me ye have not always.” It may possibly be so. But I rather think that in both instances He intended to direct the minds of all around Him, as He had evidently been doing for some weeks, to His approaching death and the conclusion of His ministry. He brings that conclusion in at every turn now.

Some think that the word “kept” refers to the ointment having been originally got by Mary for her brother Lazarus, and that there had been a long hoarding up of it from the day when Lazarus died, and that Judas blamed Mary for having “kept” it so long, and not having sold it. But this is purely conjectural.

May we not learn, from our Lord’s words here, that Christians do not always know the full meaning of what they do? God uses them as His instruments, without their being aware of it at the time. (Compare John xii. 16.)

Calvin says “Those are absurd interpreters who infer from Christ’s reply, that costly and magnificent worship is pleasing to God. He rather excuses Mary, on the ground of her having rendered an extraordinary service, which ought not to be regard­ed as a perpetual rule for the worship of God.”

8*.—*[*For the poor always...with you.*]It is clear from these words that poverty will always exist; and we need not wonder. So long as human nature is what it is, some will always be rich and some poor, because some are diligent and some idle, some are strong and some weak, some are wise and some foolish. We need never dream that by any arrangement, either civil or ecclesiastical, poverty can ever be entirely prevented. The ex­istence of pauperism is no proof whatever that States are ill governed, or that churches are not doing their duty.

Ecolampadius thinks that our Lord here refers to the poor as being His members, and that there is a latent reference to the language of the twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew, about works of mercy being regarded as works done to Christ’s brethren and to Christ Himself. (Matt. xxv. 40.)

It is noteworthy that Jesus in this sentence passes from a singular verb to a plural one, and seems to address not Judas only, but all present.

[*But me ye have not always.*]These words show, for one thing, that our Lord’s bodily presence on earth was a great and mirac­ulous event, and as such deserved to be marked with peculiar honour; and for another thing, that His departure was at hand, so that the opportunities for doing Him honour were becoming very few. Moreover, if words mean anything, the sentence completely overthrows the whole theory of Christ’s body being present under the forms of bread and wine, in the Lord’s Supper. That favourite Romish doctrine can never be reconciled with “Me ye have not always.”

We may surely learn, from this verse, that relieving the poor, however good a work, is not so important a work as doing honour to Christ. In times like these it is well to remember this. Not a few seem to think all religion consists in giving temporal help to the poor. Yet there are evidently occasions when the relief of the poor must not be allowed to supersede the direct work of honouring Christ. Doubtless it is well to feed, and clothe, and nurse the poor; but it is never to be forgotten, that to glorify Christ among them is far better. Moreover, it is much easier to give temporal than spiritual help, for we have our re­ward in thanks, and gratitude, and the praise of man. To hon­our Christ is far harder, and gets us no praise at all.

Augustine remarks: “In respect of the presence of His Majesty, we have Christ always; in respect to the presence of the flesh, it was rightly said, ‘Me ye will not have always.’ The Church had Him in respect of the flesh for a few days; now by faith it holds, not with eyes beholds Him.”

Zwingle observes that this sentence “excludes Christ’s corporal presence from the Lord’s Supper. According to His Divine nature, Christ is always present with His people. According to His human nature, He is in one place in heaven, at the right hand of God.” Most of the other reformers make the same comment.

Rollock remarks, that our Lord’s defence of Mary in this passage must not be alleged as a warrant for extravagant and profuse expenditure in the public worship of Christians. Jesus Himself points out that the occasion was extraordinary and singular; viz., on the eve almost of His burial, an occasion which could only happen once. This seems to imply that on ordinary occasions such an expenditure as that of Mary would not have been justifiable.

9*.—*[*Much people...knew...there.*]We need not doubt that the news of our Lord’s arrival at Bethany would soon spread, like lightning, partly because Bethany was so near Jerusalem, partly because of the recent miracle wrought there, partly because of the order of the rulers to give information where Christ was, partly because of the approach of the Passover, and the crowds assembling all around Jerusalem.

[*They come...not...Jesus’ sake...see Lazarus...dead.*]This sen­tence is a genuine exhibition of human nature. Curiosity is one of the most common and powerful motives in man. The love of seeing something sensational and out of the common way is almost universal. When people could see at once both the subject of the miracle and Him that worked the miracle, we need not wonder that they resorted in crowds to Bethany. Yet within ten days a far greater miracle was to take place, viz., our Lord’s own resurrection.

10.—[*But* *the chief priests consulted.*]It admits of doubt whether the word rendered “consulted” would not be better rendered “purposed” or “determined,” as in Acts xv. 37; xxvii. 39; 2 Cor. i. 17. This is the view of Schleusner and Parkhurst.

[*That they might put Lazarus.. death.*]It is difficult to con­ceive a greater proof of hardened and incorrigible wickedness of heart than this sentence exhibits. The chief priests could not possibly deny the fact of Lazarus having been raised, or ex­plain it away. He was a witness whose testimony against their unbelief was overwhelming. They must therefore stop his mouth by killing him. And these were the chief ecclesiastical leaders of Israel!—Moreover Lazarus had done them no harm. Though a disciple, there is no proof that he was a leading follower of Christ, much less a preacher of the Gospel. But he was an in­convenient standing evidence, and so he must be removed!

11*.—*[*Because...many...Jews went away*.] This sentence shows the immense effect that the raising of Lazarus had on the public mind, in spite of all the priests could do to prevent it. In every age people will think for themselves, when God’s truth comes into a land. Prisons and threats and penalties cannot prevent men thinking. Mind and thought cannot be chained. When ecclesiastical tyrants burn martyrs, and destroy Bibles, and si­lence preachers, they forget there is one thing they cannot do. They cannot stop the inward machinery of people’s thoughts.

The expression, “went away,” will hardly bear the sense put on it by Pearce, of “withdrawing themselves from the service of the synagogue.” It probably only means “went to Bethany.” Bloomfield says, “it denotes their ceasing to pay that regard to the teaching of the Scribes, which they formerly had done.”

[*And believed in Jesus.*]I dare not think that this “believing” means more than intellectual conviction that Jesus must be the Messiah. I see no evidence that it means the faith of the heart. Yet it is probable this was exactly the state of mind in which many hundreds or thousands of Jews were before the crucifixion, the resurrection, and the day of Pentecost, convinced but not converted, persuaded that Jesus was the Christ of God, but afraid to confess Him. Hence on the day of Pentecost we can­not doubt that many hundreds of Peter’s hearers were prepared to believe. The stony ground of prejudice and ignorant adhe­sion to Judaism had been broken to pieces, and the seed fell in­to soil prepared for it.

Poole thinks that Lazarus after his marvellous resurrection, “possibly spake of it, to the honour and glory of God,” and that this excited the special anger of the priests.