*make*, the parable does not say: but let us  
remember, the Creator speaks, and sets  
forth a law of his own creation, with  
which our judgments must be in accord.  
This verse resumes again the leading argument, and sets forth the inconsistency of  
the Pharisees in representing Him as in  
league with evil, whose works were uniformly good. But the words have a  
double reference: to our Lord Himself,  
who could not be evil, seeing that His  
works were good; and (which leads on to  
the next verse) to the Pharisees, who  
could not speak good things, because their  
works were evil.

**35—37.**] {35} The treasure spoken of is that inner storehouse  
of good and evil only seen by God and  
(partially) by ourselves. And on that account—because words, so lightly thought of by the world and the careless, spring  
from the inner fountains of good and ill,  
therefore they will form subjects of the  
judgment of the great day, when the  
whole life shall be unfolded and pronounced upon. See James iii. 2–12.

**{36} idle** is perhaps best taken here in its  
milder and negative sense, as not yet determined on till the judgment: so that  
our Lord’s declaration is a deduction “a  
minori,” and if of every *idle* saying, then  
how much more of every *wicked* saying!

**37.**] The *speech*, being the *overflow  
of the heart*, is a specimen of what is  
within: is the outward utterance of the  
*man*, and on this ground will form a subject of strict enquiry in the great day, being a considerable and weighty part of our works.

**38.**] St. Luke (xi. 15,  
16) places the accusation of casting out  
devils by Beelzebub and this request together, and then the discourse follows. It  
seems that the first of the discourse  
gave rise, as here related, to the request  
for a sign (from Heaven); but, as we  
might naturally expect, and as we learn  
from St. Luke, on the part of *different  
persons from those who made the accusation*. In consequence of our Lord declaring that His miracles were wrought  
by the Holy Ghost, they wish to see some  
decisive proof of this by a sign, not from  
Himself, but *from Heaven*. The account in ch. xvi. 1–4 manifestly relates  
to a different occurrence: see notes there.  
Cf. John vi. 30, 31; xii. 28.

**39.**] **adulterous** (see reff.), because they  
been the peculiar people of the Lord, and  
so in departing from Him had broken the  
covenant of *marriage*, according to the  
similitude so common in the prophets.

The expression **there shall no sign  
be given to it** does not, as has been maintained, exclude our Lord’s miracles from being *signs*: but is the direct answer to  
their request in the sense in which we  
know they used the word, ‘a sign, not  
*wrought Him, and so able to be suspected of magic art*, but one *from Heaven.*’  
Besides, even if this were not so, how can  
the refusing to work a miracle to *satisfy  
them*, affect the nature or signification of  
those wrought on different occasions, and  
with a totally different view? The *sign  
of Jonas* is the most remarkable foreshadowing in the O.T. of the resurrection  
of our Lord. It was of course impossible  
that His resurrection should be represented  
by an actual resurrection, as his birth was  
by births (Isaac, Samson, Samuel, Mahershalalhashbaz), and His death by deaths  
(Abel; the substitute for Isaac; Zechariah the prophet; the daily and occasional  
sacrifices); so that we find the events  
symbolic of his resurrection (Joseph’s history; Isaac’s sacrifice; Daniel’s and Jonah’s deliverance), representing it in a  
figure (lit., “*a parable,*” Heb. xi. 19). In  
the case before us the figure was very