grace, the *rest* which Christ gives is yet  
to be viewed as a yoke and a burden, seen  
on this its painful side, of conflict and  
sorrow: but it is a *light yoke*; the inner  
rest in the soul giving a peace which  
passeth understanding, and bearing it up  
against all. See 2 Cor. iv. 16.

**XII. 1—8.**] THE DISCIPLES PLUCK EARS  
OF CORN ON THE SABBATH. OUR LORD’S ANSWER TO THE PHARISEES THEREON.  
Mark ii. 23–28: Luke vi. 1—5. In Mark  
and Luke this incident occurs after the  
discourse on fasting related Matt. ix. 14  
sq.; but in the former without any definite  
mark of time. The expression **at that time**  
is, I conceive, a more definite mark of connexion than we find in the other Gospels,  
but cannot here be fixed to the meaning  
which it clearly has in ch. xi. 25, where  
the context determines it. We can merely  
say that it seems to have occurred about  
the same time as the last thing mentioned  
—in the same journey or season.

The plucking the ears was allowed Deut. xxiii.  
25, but in the Talmud expressly forbidden  
on the Sabbath. It was also (Levit. xxiii.  
14, apparently, but this is by no means  
certain: see note on Luke) forbidden until  
the sheaf of first-fruits had been presented  
to God, which was done on the second day  
of the feast of unleavened bread at the  
Passover. This incident, on that supposition, must have occurred between that day  
and the harvest. It is generally supposed  
to have been on the first Sabbath after  
the Passover. For a fuller discussion of  
the time and place, see note on Luke as  
before.

**3.**] It appears from 1 Sam.  
xxi. 6, that hot bread had been put in on  
the day of David’s arrival; which therefore, Levit. xxiv. 8, was a sabbath. The example was thus doubly appropriate.  
Bengel maintains, on the commonly received interpretation of Luke vi. 1, that  
1 Sam. xxi. was the lesson for the day.  
But the Jewish calendar of lessons cannot  
be shewn to have existed in the form  
which we now have, in the time of the  
Gospel history.

**5.**] The priests were  
ordered to offer double offerings on the  
Sabbath (Num. xxviii. 9, 10), and to place  
fresh (*hot*, and therefore baked that day)  
shewbread. In performing these commands they must commit many of what  
the Pharisees would call profanations of  
the Sabbath. So that, as Stier (ii. 4),  
not only does the sacred *history* furnish  
examples of exception to the law of the  
Sabbath from *necessity*, but the *Law itself  
ordains* work to be done on the Sabbath  
as a *duty*.

**6.**] The Greek has merely  
**greater**, and the best MSS, have it in the  
neuter gender, which sustains the parallel  
better: **a greater thing than the temple  
is here**. See John ii. 19. The inference  
is, ‘If the priests in the temple and for  
the temple’s sake, for its service and ritual,  
profane the Sabbath, as ye account profanation, and are blameless, how much  
more these disciples who have grown  
hungry in their appointed following of  
Him who is greater than the temple, the  
*true Temple of God on earth*, the Son  
of Man!’ I cannot agree with Stier that  
the *neuter* would represent only “something greater, more weighty than the  
temple,—namely, merciful consideration of  
the hungry, or the like:” it seems to me,