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1 And the third day there was a marriage in Cana of Galilee; and the mother of Jesus was there:
2 And both Jesus was called, and his disciples, to the marriage.
3 And when they wanted wine, the mother of Jesus saith unto him, They have no wine.
4 Jesus saith unto her, Woman, what have I to do with thee? mine hour is not yet come.
5 His mother saith unto the servants, whatsoever he saith unto you, do it.
6 And there were set there six waterpots of stone, after the manner of the purifying of the Jews, containing two or three firkins apiece.
7 Jesus saith unto them, Fill the waterpots with water. And they filled them up to the brim.
8 And he saith unto them, Draw out now, and bear unto the governor of the feast. And they bare it.
9 When the ruler of the feast had tasted the water that was made wine, and knew not whence it was: (but the servants which drew the water knew;) the governor of the feast called the bridegroom,
10 And saith unto him, Every man at the beginning doth set forth good wine; and when men have well drunk, then that which is worse: but thou hast kept the good wine until now.
11 This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and manifested forth his glory; and his disciples believed on him.

THESE verses describe a miracle which should always possess a special interest in the eyes of a true Christian. It is the first, in order of time, of the many mighty works which Jesus did, when He was upon earth. We are distinctly told, “This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee.”—Like every other miracle which John was inspired to record, it is related with great minuteness and particularity. And, like every other miracle in John’s Gospel, it is rich in spiritual lessons.

We learn, firstly, from these verses, how honourable in the sight of Christ is the estate of matrimony. To be present at a “marriage” was almost the first public act of our Lord’s earthly ministry.

Marriage is not a sacrament, as the Church of Rome asserts. It is simply a state of life ordained by God for man’s benefit. But it is a state which ought never to be spoken of with levity, or regarded with disrespect. The Prayerbook service has well described it, as “an honourable estate, instituted of God in the time of man’s innocency, and signifying unto us the mystical union that is between Christ and his Church.” Society is never in a healthy condition, and true religion never flourishes in that land where the marriage tie is lightly esteemed. They who lightly esteem it have not the mind of Christ. He who “beautified and adorned the estate of matrimony by His presence and first miracle that He wrought in Cana of Galilee,” is One who is always of one mind. “Marriage,” says the Holy Spirit by Paul, “is honourable in all.” (Heb. xiii. 4.)

One thing, however, ought not to be forgotten. Marriage is a step which so seriously affects the temporal happiness and spiritual welfare of two immortal souls, that it ought never to be taken in hand “unadvisedly, lightly, wantonly, and without due consideration.” To be truly happy, it should be undertaken “reverently, discreetly, soberly, and in the fear of God.” Christ’s blessing and presence are essential to a happy wedding. The marriage at which there is no place for Christ and His disciples, is not one that can justly be expected to prosper.
We learn, secondly, from these verses, that there are times when it is lawful to be merry and rejoice. Our Lord Himself sanctioned a wedding-feast by His own presence. He did not refuse to be a guest at “a marriage in Cana of Galilee.” “A feast,” it is written, “is made for laughter, and wine makes merry.” (Eccles. x. 19.) Our Lord, in the passage before us, approves both the feast and the use of wine.

True religion was never meant to make men melancholy. On the contrary, it was intended to increase real joy and happiness among men. The servant of Christ unquestionably ought to have nothing to do with races, balls, theatres, and such-like amusements, which tend to frivolity and indulgence, if not to sin. But he has no right to hand over innocent recreations and family gatherings to the devil and the world. The Christian who withdraws entirely from the society of his fellow-men, and walks the earth with a face as melancholy as if he was always attending a funeral, does injury to the cause of the Gospel. A cheerful, kindly spirit is a great recommendation to a believer. It is a real misfortune to Christianity when a Christian cannot smile. A merry heart, and a readiness to take part in all innocent mirth, are gifts of inestimable value. They go far to soften prejudices, to take up stumbling-blocks out of the way, and to make way for Christ and the Gospel.

The subject no doubt is a difficult and delicate one. On no point of Christian practice is it so hard to hit the balance between that which is lawful and that which is unlawful, between that which is right and that which is wrong. It is very hard indeed to be both merry and wise. High spirits soon degenerate into levity. Acceptance of many invitations to feasts soon leads to waste of time, and begets leanness of soul. Frequent eating and drinking at other men’s tables, soon lowers a Christian’s tone of religion. Going often into company is a heavy strain on spirituality of heart. Here, if anywhere, God’s children have need to be on their guard. Each must know his own strength and natural temperament, and act accordingly. One believer can go without risk where another cannot. Happy is he who can use his Christian liberty without abusing it! It is possible to be sorely wounded in soul at marriage feasts and the tables of friends.

One golden rule on the subject may be laid down, the use of which will save us much trouble. Let us take care that we always go to feasts in the spirit of our divine Master, and that we never go where He would not have gone. Like Him, let us endeavour to be always “about our Father’s business.” (Luke ii. 49.) Like Him, let us willingly promote joy and gladness, but let us strive that it may be sinless joy, if not joy in the Lord. Let us endeavour to bring the salt of grace into every company, and to drop the word in season in every ear we address. Much good may be done in society by giving a healthy tone to conversation. Let us never be ashamed to show our colours, and to make men see whose we are and whom we serve. We may well say, “Who is sufficient for these things?” But if Christ went to a marriage feast in Cana there is surely something that Christians can do on similar occasions. Let them only remember that if they go when their Master went, they must go in their Master’s spirit.
We learn lastly, from these verses, the Almighty power of our Lord Jesus Christ. We are told of a miracle which He wrought at the marriage feast, when the wine failed. By a mere act of will He changed water into wine, and so supplied the need of all the guests.

The manner in which the miracle was worked deserves especial notice. We are not told of any outward visible action which preceded or accompanied it. It is not said that He touched the water pots containing the water that was made wine. It is not said that He commanded the water to change its qualities, or that He prayed to His Father in Heaven. He simply willed the change, and it took place. We read of no prophet or apostle in the Bible who ever worked a miracle after this fashion. He who could do such a mighty work, in such a manner, was nothing less than very God.

It is a comfortable thought that the same almighty power of will which our Lord here displayed is still exercised on behalf of His believing people. They have no need of His bodily presence to maintain their cause. They have no reason to be cast down because they cannot see Him with their eyes interceding for them, or touch Him with their hands, that they may cling to Him for safety. If He “wills” their salvation and the daily supply of all their spiritual need, they are as safe and well provided for as if they saw Him standing by them. Christ’s will is as mighty and effectual as Christ’s deed. The will of Him who could say to the Father, “I will that they whom you have given me be with me where I am,” is a will that has all power in heaven and earth, and must prevail. (John xvii. 24.)

Happy are those who, like the disciples, believe on Him by whom this miracle was wrought. A greater marriage feast than that of Cana will one day be held, when Christ Himself will be the bridegroom and believers will be the bride. A greater glory will one day be manifested, when Jesus shall take to Himself His great power and reign. Blessed will they be in that day who are called to the marriage supper of the Lamb! (Rev. xix. 9)

NOTES. JOHN II. 1-11.

1.—[The third day.] The question naturally arises, “What day was this? From what day was it the third?” The most probable answer is, that it was the third day after the last event described in the preceding chapter; the third day after Nathanael was brought to Jesus and became a disciple. The meaning therefore is, “The third day after the conversation between Jesus and Nathanael.”

[A marriage in Cana.] Let it be remembered that we are told elsewhere that Nathanael was an inhabitant of Cana. (John xxi. 2.) This makes it far from improbable, that Nathanael, after he became a disciple, invited our Lord to visit the place where he lived. Cana is a place not mentioned in the Old Testament. Robinson, in his Biblical Researches, says it was a village about three hours’ journey from Nazareth.

[The mother of Jesus was there.] We must suppose that the Virgin Mary was in some way connected with the bride or bridegroom, and was therefore present at the marriage and assisting in the arrangements of the feast. Without some such supposition it is difficult to un-
derstand her speaking to the servants, as she afterwards does.

The absence of Joseph’s name, both here and in other places where the mother of our Lord is mentioned in the Gospels and Acts, has induced most commentators to think that Joseph was dead when our Lord began His public ministry. The point is one of which we know nothing except by conjecture. It deserves notice, however, that the Jews of Capernaum speak of Jesus as “the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know.” (John vi. 42.) If it had been profitable to us to know more about Joseph, we should have been told more. The Roman Catholic Church has already given him a superstitious reverence, upon the authority of tradition, and without the slightest warrant of Scripture. What would have not been said about Joseph by the Romish Church, if he had been more prominently mentioned in God’s Word?

Lightfoot points out that a comparison of Mark iii. 18, Mark vi. 3, and John xix. 25, makes it exceedingly probable that the Virgin Mary’s sister, called elsewhere Mary, the wife of Cleopas or Alphaeus, and all her family, lived at Cana. He observes, that in the list of our Lord’s “brethren” or cousins we find the following names,—James, Joses, Juda, and Simon. Of these he thinks that James, Juda, and Simon were apostles. James the apostle is expressly called “the brother of our Lord,” and the son of Alphaeus, and Jude is expressly called brother of this James. (Gal. i. 19; Jude 1.) The remaining brother, Simon, he thinks was the apostle who is called Simon the Canaanite. This, Lightfoot argues is a proof that his father and mother lived at Cana; and hence he concludes that this marriage feast was in the house of Alphaeus. That Alphaeus and Cleopas were the same person is a general and well-founded opinion.

2.—[Jesus was called...disciples.] Our Lord was doubtless invited as the Virgin Mary’s son. His disciples were invited as His friends and companions. We cannot, of course, suppose, at so early a period of our Lord’s ministry, that He was recognized as a religious teacher, or those with Him as disciples of a new faith. The disciples here spoken of must be the five mentioned in the last chapter, viz., Andrew and his companion (probably John), Simon Peter, Philip, and Nathanael.

[To the marriage.] We know nothing about the names of the bride and bridegroom. There is a legend among Romish writers that the bridegroom was John the apostle, and that though married, John left wife and home at once, in order to become Christ’s disciple! The whole story is utterly destitute of Scriptural foundation, and a tissue of improbabilities. Baronius conjectures that the bridegroom was Simon the Canaanite, but without any proof worth mentioning.

Let it be noted, that the presence of Jesus, and His disciples, and the Virgin Mary at a marriage, is a significant fact, which stands out in strong contrast to the Patristic and Roman Catholic doctrine, of the imperfection of the state of marriage compared to that of celibacy. “Forbidding to marry” is a doctrine of Antichrist, not of Christ. (1 Tim. iv. 3.)

The Roman Catholic argument, that Christ, by His presence, made marriage a sacrament, is utterly worthless. Dyke remarks that we might as well call feasts and burials sacraments, because Christ was present at them. He says, “There is required a word of institution to make a sacrament. Let the Papists show any such word here used. And if Christ did make marriage a sacrament, why do they call it a work of the flesh? Are sacraments works of the flesh?”

The suggestion of some modern writers, that our Lord’s presence at a marriage feast condemns those Christians who decline to go to such amusements as balls, and routs, and dancing-parties, has no weight in it at all. The objects for which people meet together at a marriage feast and at a ball are widely different. The one is a mere irrereligious assembly for
pleasure and recreation of a very questionable tendency, entailing late hours, and ministering to worldliness, levity, and the love of display. The other is a gathering of friends to witness the most important step in life that two persons can take, and a gathering closely connected with a religious ceremony.

3.—[When they wanted wine.] The Greek words so rendered mean literally, “Wine having failed.” This circumstance probably shows the poor and humble condition of those to whose marriage Jesus was invited. His acquaintances and those of his mother were not wealthy persons.

It throws light on this expression, and indeed on the whole story, to remember that a marriage feast among the Jews was often an affair of several days’ duration, and an occasion when many were invited. Consequently it entailed not only much expense, but a considerable consumption of food and wine. Thus Samson’s marriage feast lasted seven days. (Jud. xiv. 10-18.) Thus the marriage feast described in the parable of the King’s Son, was a feast which large numbers were invited to attend. (Matt. xxii. 2, etc.) This being the case, we may well understand that in the feasts of those who were not wealthy the wine might soon run short, without them having been any excess of drinking. So it seems to have happened in the case before us.

[The mother of Jesus... saith... no wine.] This little sentence has given rise to various and strange interpretations.

Some have thought, as Bengel, that Mary suggested to our Lord that it was time for Him and His disciples to depart and leave the feast, in order to spare the feelings of the bride and bridegroom, and to avoid exposing their poverty.

Some have thought, as Calvin, that she wished our Lord to occupy the minds of the guests by profitable discourse, and so to take off their attention from the deficiency of wine.

By far the most reasonable and probable idea is, that Mary conjectured that our Lord might in some way supply the deficiency of wine. How it would be done she could not tell. There is not the slightest ground for supposing that our Lord had ever worked a miracle up to this time. But it would be foolish to suppose that Mary did not remember well all the miraculous circumstances of our Lord’s birth, and all the words spoken before by the angel Gabriel concerning Him.—We cannot doubt, that although our Lord had lived a quiet life at Nazareth for thirty years, and done no miracles, His mother must have observed in Him a perfection of word and deed utterly unlike the behaviour of common men.—We cannot doubt that she was aware of all the events of the last few weeks,—our Lord’s baptism by John, John’s public proclamation of Him as the Messiah, and the gathering around Jesus of a small knot of disciples.—Remembering all these things, we surely need not wonder that Mary’s expectations were greatly raised. She looked for her Son speedily doing some great miracle. She was in daily expectation that He would prove Himself the Messiah by some mighty act. And it was under these feelings that she turned to Him, saying, “They have no wine.” It is as though she said, “Surely the time is come for declaring Thyself. Manifest Thy power, as I have long expected Thee to do, by providing a supply of wine.”

The argument which the Roman Catholics draw from this expression in favour of the Virgin Mary’s intercession in heaven for sinners, and the consequent lawfulness of praying to her, is utterly worthless, and most unhappy. For one thing, it does not follow, because the petitions of living saints are heard upon earth, that the petitions of dead saints in heaven are effectual. For another thing, it is an unfortunate fact, that this petition, the only one that we ever find addressed to our Lord by the Virgin Mary, brought from Him an immediate rebuke! Men must be in great straits for an argument when they can reason in this way in defence of the invocation of saints!
Melancthon, Chemnitus, and others, think that this want of wine at the marriage-feast is purposely mentioned in order to remind married persons, or those who intend marriage, that matrimony brings with it cares as well as comforts, and specially cares from poverty. They that marry do well, and with Christ’s blessing will have happiness. But they must not expect to escape “trouble in the flesh” from the very day of marriage. (1 Cor. vii. 28.)

4.—[Jesus saith, Woman, what, etc.] This remarkable verse has naturally attracted great attention. In interpreting it, it is very important to avoid the extremes into which some Protestants, and nearly all Roman Catholic writers have fallen, in their interpretations.

On the one side we must not lay too much stress on the expression “Woman.” It is surely a mistake to suppose, as Calvin and others suggest, that it conveys any reproof, or is anywise inconsistent with reverence and respect. The very same expression was used by our Lord, when He addressed His mother for the last time on the cross, and affectionately commended her to John’s care. He said, “Woman, behold thy son.” (John xix. 26.) The Virgin Mary was an erring woman, like all other believing women, but we must not lay more blame on her than Scripture warrants.

On the other side, it is useless to deny that our Lord’s words were intended, as Chrysostom, Theophylact, and Euthymius say, to be a rebuke to Mary. She erred here, perhaps from affectionate desire to bring honour to her Son, as she erred on other occasions. The words before us were meant to remind her that she must henceforth leave our Lord to choose His own times and modes of acting. The season of subjection to her and Joseph was over. The season of His public ministry had at length begun. In carrying on that ministry, she must not presume to suggest to Him. The utter contrariety of this verse to the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church about the Virgin Mary, is too palpable to be explained away. She was not without error and sin, as Romish writers have dared to assert, and was not meant to be prayed to and adored. If our Lord would not allow His mother even to suggest to Him the working of a miracle, we may well suppose that all Roman Catholic prayers to the Virgin Mary, and especially prayers entreating her to “command her Son,” are most offensive and blasphemous in His eyes.

The Greek expression, rendered “What have I to do with thee,” would be translated literally, “What to Me and thee?” It is an elliptical expression, of which the full meaning probably is, “What is there in common to Me and thee?” “My thoughts,” as Bengel says, “are one thing, and thine another.”—It is the same phrase that is used in an interrogative form in Matt. viii. 29; Mark i. 24; v. 7; Luke viii. 28; and in an imperative form in Matt. xxvii. 19.

[ Mine hour is not yet come.] The simplest and most reasonable view of these words is to refer them to Christ’s “hour,” or time for working a miracle. It is like the expression, “My time is not yet full come.” (John vii. 8.) Our Lord did not tell Mary that He would not work a miracle; but He would have her know that she must not expect Him to do mighty works to please His relatives after the flesh. He would only work a miracle, upon this or any other occasion, when the fitting season for it, the time appointed in God’s counsel, had arrived.

There is a curious idea maintained by Augustine, Wordsworth, and others, that our Lord here referred to the hour of His crucifixion, and that He meant, “My hour is not yet come for recognizing thee and honouring thee publicly as my mother, but I shall do it one day on the cross.” This however seems a very far-fetched and improbable application of the words.

5.—[His mother saith... do it.] Two things are very noteworthy in this verse. One is the meekness with which the Virgin Mary submitted to the gentle rebuke which came from our Lord’s mouth in the last verse; the other is the firm faith which she still exhibited in our Lord’s power to work a miracle in order to supply the lack of wine, and in the probability of His working it.
Dyke observes, “The direction which Mary gives to the servants belongs to us all. We must perform simple obedience to Christ in all things; His sayings must be our doings. No reasoning of the matter must there be, no inquiry, as into men’s commandments and speeches; but this must suffice, ‘Christ hath said it.’ This is the blind obedience which Jesuits yield to their superiors, but it is the obedience that belongs to Christ. Many will do something that Christ says, but not whatsoever He says.”

It is not, perhaps, going too far to say, that after observing her Son’s perfect life and perfect wisdom during thirty years at Nazareth, Mary spoke the words before us with special confidence, and with a greater depth of meaning than appears on the surface of the sentence.—“Whatsoever He says deserves attention. Whatsoever He says, do it.”—At any rate the verse contains a deep practical lesson for the whole Church of Christ. Whatsoever Christ says, let us obey and do.

6 —[Six water-pots... after the manner ...Jews] St. John mentions these details in describing the miracle, with a special reference to Gentile readers. He meant them to understand that there was nothing remarkable in the circumstance that there were six large water-pots of stone in the place where the feast was held. The peculiar customs of the Jews about ceremonial washings and purifyings, made it necessary to have a large supply of water at hand. The words of St. Mark throw light on the verse before us: “The Pharisees, and all the Jews, except they wash their hands oft, eat not, holding the tradition of the elders,” etc. (Mark vii. 3, etc.) The presence of the six water-pots, therefore, could not arise from collusion or prearrangement. It was a natural consequence of Jewish habits in our Lord’s times.

[Two or three firkins apiece.] Many foolish and unprofitable remarks have been built on this expression, as to the very large quantity of wine which our Lord must have created when the miracle we are considering was wrought. It might suffice to reply that there is much uncertainty about the precise quantity of liquid which the ancient measure, which we here render “firkins,” contained. But the best and safest answer is, that we must not measure the demands of a Jewish marriage-feast, which perhaps lasted several days, and included a large number of guests, by the feasts of our own times.

7.—[Jesus saith... Fill the water pots, etc.] The remark is frequently made by commentators on this verse, with much propriety, that these simple words describe the duty of all who work for Christ, and especially of ministers and teachers. They are to hear Christ’s voice, and do as He tells them, and then leave the result to Him. Duties are ours. Events are God’s. It is ours to fill the water-pots. It is Christ’s to make the water wine.

[Up to the brim.] This circumstance is no doubt mentioned in order to show that there was no room left for trick, jugglery, or imposture. What was put into the water-pots was water, and only water, and they were so filled that nothing could be infused, or mingled with their contents.

8.—[And He saith... Draw out now.] It was at this moment, no doubt, that the miracle took place. By an act of will our Lord changed the contents of the water-pots. That which was poured in was water. That which was drawn out was wine. To Him who created the vine, and made it bear grapes at the first, the change was perfectly easy. He who could create matter out of nothing, could much more easily change one kind of matter into another.

[The governor of the feast.] This person appears to have been one who presided at large entertainments like that before us, and superintended all the proceedings. The Greek word so rendered is precisely the same as that translated “ruler of the feast,” in the following verse. The presence of such a person at feasts, was a well-known custom among the Greeks and Romans.

9.—[Tasted... wine... knew not whence it was.] The testimony of the ruler of the feast is spe-
cially adduced, in order to show the reality of the miracle. He knew nothing of what had been done to the water-pots. He had not seen the water poured in by our Lord’s command. There was no collusion or conspiracy between him and the servants, much less between him and our Lord. Hence the value of his testimony. He not only testifies that the liquid which a few minutes before was water was now wine, but that it was also wine of more than common goodness and strength,—not wine mixed with water, but pure, good wine.

Let the word “tasted” be carefully noticed in this place. It supplies a strong incidental argument against the Romish doctrine of transubstantiation. The occasion before us is the only known occasion on which our Lord changed one liquid into another. When He did so change it, the reality of the change was at once proved by the “taste.” Why is it then that in the pretended change of the sacramental wine in the Lord’s Supper into Christ’s blood the change cannot be detected by the senses? Why does the wine after consecration taste like wine, just as it did before?—These are questions which the Roman Catholics cannot satisfactorily answer. The pretended change of the bread and wine in the Lord’s Supper is a complete delusion. It is contradicted by the senses of every communicant. The bread after consecration is still bread, and the wine is still wine. That which contradicts our senses we are nowhere required in God’s Word to believe.

10.—[Everyman at the beginning, etc.] The words in this sentence must not be pressed too closely, in order to bring out of them a spiritual meaning. The ruler of the feast makes a general remark about the way in which banquets were usually managed. The ordinary custom was to bring the best wine first, and the inferior wine last. But the wine before him, drawn from the water-pots, was so singularly good, that the custom on this day seemed reversed. The verse is a strong incidental testimony to the reality and greatness of our Lord’s miracle. Not only did He change water into wine, but into wine so singularly good as to excite remark and attention.

[When men have well drunk.] Foolish remarks have sometimes been made on this expression, as if our Lord had countenanced excessive drinking on this occasion. For one thing, it may be remarked that the Greek word rendered “have well drunk,” does not necessarily imply intoxication. It may be justly interpreted, as Schleusner and Parkhurst observe, “have drunk sufficiently, or drunk freely.”—Men who have had enough, are indifferent as to the quality of the wine set before them. For another thing, we must remember that the ruler of the feast was only making a general remark about men’s ordinary customs in supplying wine to their guests. There is nothing whatever to show that he was alluding to the guests actually before him.

[Thou hast kept the good wine until now.] A good practical remark has often been raised from these words of the ruler of the feast. The world gives its best things, like the best wine, first, and its worst things last. The longer we serve the world, the more disappointing, unsatisfactory, and unsavoury will its gifts prove. Christ, on the other hand, gives His servants their best things last. They have first the cross, the race, and the battle, and then the rest, the glory, and the crown. Specially will it be found true at His second advent. Then will believers say emphatically, “Thou hast kept the good wine until now.” These are pious and useful thoughts. But it may be doubted whether they are more than accommodations.

This is perhaps the proper place to remark, that it seems utterly impossible, on any fair and honest interpretation, to reconcile the passage before us with the leading principles of what is commonly called “Teetotalism.” If our Lord Jesus Christ actually worked a miracle in order to supply wine at a marriage feast, it seems to me impossible, by any ingenuity, to prove that drinking wine is sinful. Temperance in all things is one of the fruits of the Spirit. An intemperate man is an unconverted man. Total abstinence from fermented liquors is in
many cases most useful and desirable. But to say, as many do say, that to drink any fer-
mented liquor at all is “a sin,” is taking up ground that cannot be maintained in the face of
the passage before us, without wresting the plain meaning of Scripture, and charging Christ
with abetting sin.

11.—[This beginning of miracles, etc.] The plain meaning of this sentence seems to be that
this was the first miracle which our Lord Jesus Christ ever worked. The miracles which
some have reported that He worked in His infancy and childhood, are destitute of the slight-
est foundation in Scripture, and utterly unworthy of credit. Those who wish to see their ab-
surdity will find specimens of them in the preliminary Essay to Trench’s Notes on Miracles.

Lightfoot suggests the five following reasons why the miracle now before us was pur-
posely the first that Christ worked. (1) As marriage was the first institution ordained by God,
so at a marriage was Christ’s first miracle. (2) As Christ had showed Himself miraculous a
little while ago by a fast, so He doth now by an extraordinary provision at a feast. When He
would not make stones bread, it was not because He could not. (3) He would not make
stones into bread to satisfy Satan, but He was willing to turn water into wine to show forth
His own glory. (4) The first miracle wrought in the world by man was transformation (Exod.
vii. 9), and the first miracle wrought by the Son of man was of the same nature. (5) The first
time you hear of John the Baptist, you hear of his strict diet, and so the first time you hear of
Christ in His public ministry, you hear of Him at a marriage feast.

[Manifested forth His glory.] I am unable to see that these words refer to the expression
used in the first chapter, “We beheld His glory.” (John i. 14.) I believe the meaning
to be that “by this miracle Jesus now for the first time opened or revealed His glorious and divine
power, and His commission to be the Messiah.” After thirty years’ seclusion at Nazareth,
He now for the first time lifted up the veil which He had thrown over His divinity in becom-
ing flesh, and revealed something of His almighty power and Godhead.

[His disciples believed on Him.] These words cannot of course mean that Andrew, and
John, and Peter, and Philip, and Nathanael now believed on Jesus for the first time. The
probable meaning is, that from this time forth they believed more confidently, more implic-
itly, and more unhesitatingly. From this time they felt thoroughly convinced, in spite of
much remaining ignorance, that He whom they were following was the Messiah.

I cannot close the note on this wonderful miracle without saying something about the al-
egorical and typical meanings assigned to it by the Fathers and many other commentators.
Many see in the miracle an allegorical history of the introduction of the Gospel into the
world. Like the marriage feast, the Gospel was an occasion of joy. As at the marriage feast,
the personal presence of Jesus was the great feature of the Gospel. The times of the Jewish
dispensation were times of deficiency and dim light. The coming of Christ supplied all that
was lacking. Revealed religion before Christ was like water. Christ coming into the world
turned the water of the old dispensation into wine. The good wine was reserved until the
time of Christ. The first miracle wrought by Moses was turning water into blood. The first
wrought by Christ was turning water into wine.

These are undoubtedly pious thoughts, and full of truth. I should be sorry to speak
harshly of them, or to pronounce decidedly that they may not be legitimately deduced from
the miracle. I only venture the remark, that it is far wiser to abstain from allegorical inter-
pretations as a general rule, and to be content with the plain meaning which appears on the
surface of Scripture. Once begin allegorizing Scripture, and you never know where you are
to stop. You may prove anything, and find anything in the Bible upon the allegorical sys-
tem, and at last throw open the floodgate to a torrent of wild fanaticism.

The allegorical lessons drawn from this miracle by Augustine, Bernard, and Alcuin, are
striking examples of the extremes into which allegory may run. When such a man as Augustine, for instance, tells us that the two or three firkins mean the two races of men, Jews and Greeks, or the three sons of Noah,—or when he says that the six water-pots in the miracle before us denote six successive prophetic periods in the days between Adam and Christ, one cannot but feel that there is something wrong. These are his words, “The six water-pots, containing two or three firkins a piece, are six ages, containing the prophecy belonging to all nations, whether as referred to two kinds of men, Jews and Gentiles, as the apostle often says, or to three, on account of the three sons of Noah.” The system of interpreting Scripture which can lead a good man into such assertions as this, must surely be a dangerous two-edged weapon, and likely to do more harm than good.

That all our Lord’s miracles were deeply significant, I do not deny. That all were intended to convey deep spiritual lessons, beside supplying proofs of His divinity, I make no question. All I maintain is that they require reverent and delicate handling, and that to rush hastily into allegorical interpretations of them, and invest every minute portion of them with a figurative meaning, is an unwise mode of handling Scripture, and eminently calculated to bring the Bible into contempt.

Hardly any commentator has drawn more useful practical lessons from this miracle than Melancthon. Those who think lightly of Protestant divinity would do well to compare his commentary on the whole passage with that of Augustine.