to us the similarity of our future glorified  
state to their present one.

**are as angels of God in heaven**] because the *risen  
will not be in heaven*, but *on earth*. Tho  
*Rabbinical* decision of a similar question  
was, that a woman who had been the wife  
of two husbands on earth, is restored in the  
next life to the former of them.

**31—33.**] {32} Our Lord does not cite the strong  
testimonies of the Prophets, as Isa. xxvi.  
19: Ezek. xxxvii. 1–14: Dan. xii. 2, but  
says, as in Luke (xx. 37), ‘*even Moses has  
shewn*,’ &c., leaving those other witnesses  
to be supplied. The books of Moses were  
the great and ultimate appeal for all doctrine: and thus the assertion of the Resurrection comes from the very source whence  
their difficulty had been constructed. On  
the passage itself, and our Lord’s interpretation of it, much has been written.  
Certain in it is, that our Lord brings out  
in this answer a depth of meaning in the  
words, which without it we could not  
discover. Meyer finely says, “Our Lord  
here testifies of the conscious intent of  
God in speaking the words. God uttered  
them, He tells us, to Moses, in the consciousness of the still enduring existence of  
His peculiar relation to Abraham, Isaac, and  
Jacob.” The groundwork of our Lord’s argument seems to me to be this:—The words  
“I am thy God’ imply a *covenant;* there  
is *another side* to them: “thou art Mine”  
follows upon “I am thine.” When God  
therefore declares that He *is the God* of  
Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, He declares  
*their continuance*, as the other parties in  
this covenant. It is an assertion which  
*could not be made of an annihilated being  
of the past*. And notice also, that Abraham’s (&c.) *body* having had upon it *the  
seal of the covenant*, is included in this.  
Stier remarks that this is a weighty testimony against the so-called ‘sleep of the  
soul’ in the intermediate state. Compare  
“*for all live unto Him*” Luke xx. 38.  
Thus the burden of the Law, ‘I AM THE  
LORD THY GOD,’ contains in it the seed of  
immortality, and the hope of the resurrection.

**34–40.**] REPLY CONCERNING THE  
GREAT COMMANDMENT. Mark xii. 28–34. In the more detailed account of Mark  
(Luke has a similar incident in another  
place, x. 25), this question does not appear  
as that of one *maliciously* tempting our  
Lord: and his seems to me the view to be  
taken,—as there could not be any evil  
consequences to our Lord, whichever way  
He had answered the question. See the  
notes there.

**35. a lawyer**] These  
were Mosaic jurists, whose special province  
was the interpretation of the Law. *Scribe*  
is a wider term, including them.

**tempting**] See above.

**36. which is the  
great commandment**] This should more  
exactly be rendered, **which** (*what kind of  
a*) **commandment is great in the law?**  
In Mark, otherwise.

**40. the law  
and the prophets**] in the sense of ch. v. 17;  
vii. 12: all the details of God’s ancient  
revelation of His will, by whomsoever made.