congregation, here the whole.

The **gates of  
hell** (**Hades**), by a well-known Oriental  
form of speech, is equivalent to the *power  
of the kingdom of death*. The form is  
still preserved when the Turkish empire  
is known as ‘the Ottoman Porte.’ is  
promise received a remarkable literal fulfilment in the person of Peter in Acts xii.  
6–18, see especially ver. 10.

The meaning of the promise is, that over the  
Church so built upon him who was by the  
strength of that confession the Rock, no  
adverse power should ever prevail to extinguish it.

**19.**] Another personal  
promise to Peter, remarkably fulfilled in  
his being *the first to admit both Jews and  
Gentiles into the Church*; thus using the  
power of the keys to open the door of salvation. As an instance of his shutting it also, witness his speech to Simon Magus,  
Acts viii. 21.

**whatsoever thou shalt  
bind, &c.**] This same promise is repeated  
in ch. xviii. 18, to *all the disciples generally,* and to *any two or three gathered  
together in Christ’s name*. It was first  
however verified, and in a remarkable and  
prominent way, to Peter. Of the *binding*,  
the case of Ananias and Sapphira may  
serve as an eminent example: of the  
*loosing*, the “*Such as I have, give I thee,*”  
to the lame man at the Beautiful Gate of  
the Temple. But strictly considered, the  
binding and loosing belong to the *power  
of legislation* in the Church committed to  
the Apostles, in accordance with the Jewish way of using the words *bind* and *loose*  
for *prohibit* and *allow*. They cannot relate to the *remission and retention of sins*,  
for though to *loose sins* certainly appears  
to mean *to forgive sins, to bind sins* for  
*retaining* them would be altogether without example, and, I may add, would bear  
no meaning in the interpretation: it is *not  
the sin*, but the *sinner*, that is *bound*,  
“*liable to eternal sin*” (so in text) (Mark  
iii. 29). Nor can the ancient custom of  
fastening doors by means of cord be alluded  
to; for the expressions clearly indicate  
*something bound* and *something loosed*,  
and not merely the power of the keys just  
conferred. The meaning in John xx. 23,  
though an expansion of this in one particular direction (see note there), is not to be confounded with this.

**20.**] See note on ch. viii. 4.

**21—28.**] OUR LORD ANNOUNCES HIS  
APPROACHING DEATH AND RESURRECTION. REBUKE OF PETER. Mark viii.  
3l–ix.1. Luke ix. 22–27. See note on  
ver. 13. Obscure intimations had before  
been given of our Lord’s future sufferings,  
see ch. x. 38: John iii. 14, and of His  
resurrection, John ii. 19 (x. 17, 18?), but  
never yet plainly, as now. With St. Mark’s  
usual precise note of circumstances, he  
adds, “*He spake that saying openly.*”

**21.**] On **must**, which is common to  
the three Evangelists, see Luke xxiv. 26:  
John iii. 14, and ch. xxv. 54.

**suffer many things**] “*be rejected*” in  
Mark and Luke. *These many things* were  
afterwards explicitly mentioned, ch. xx.  
18: Luke xviii. 31, 32.

**elders and  
chief priests and scribes**] The various  
classes of members of the Sanhedrin: see  
note on ch. ii. 4.

On the prophecy  
of the *resurrection*, some have objected  
that the disciples and friends of our Lord  
appear *not to have expected it* (see John  
xx. 2: Luke xxiv. 12). But we have it  
directly asserted (Mark ix. 10 and 32)  
that they *did not understand the saying*,  
and therefore were not likely to make it a ground of expectation. Certainly enough  
was known of such a prophecy to make the  
Jews set a watch over the grave (Matt.  
xxvii. 63), which of itself answers the objection. Some Commentators reason about  
the state of the disciples after the crucifixion, just as if they had not suffered any  
remarkable overthrow of their hopes and  
reliances, and maintain that they *must*  
have remembered this precise prophecy if  
it had been given by the Lord. But on  
the other hand we must remember how  
slow despondency is to take up hope, and