Gen. i. 31; ii. 2,—and of which His faithful ones shall in the end **partake:**  
see Heb. iv. 3–11: Rev. iii. 21.

Notice the identity of the praise and portion  
him who a been faithful in less, with  
those of the *first*. The words are, as  
has been well observed, “not, ‘good and  
successful servant,’ but ‘good and faithful servant:’” and faithfulness does not  
depend on *amount*.

**24, 25.] {24}** This  
sets forth the excuse which men are perpetually making of human infirmity and  
inability to keep God’s commands, when  
they never apply to that grace which might  
enable them to do so—an excuse, as here,  
self-convicting, and false at heart.

**reaping where thou hast not sown]** The  
connexion of thought in this our Lord’s  
*last* parable, with His *first* (ch. xiii. 3–9),  
is remarkable. He looks for fruit where  
He has sown—*this is truth*: but not beyond  
the power of the soil by Him enabled—*this  
is man’s lie*, to encourage himself in idleness.

**{25} I was afraid]** See Gen. iii. 10.  
But that pretended fear, and this insolent  
speech, are *inconsistent*, and betray the  
falsehood of his answer.

**thou hast  
that is thine]** This is also false—it was  
not so—for there was *his lord’s time*,—and  
*his own labour, which was his lord’s*—*to be  
accounted for.*

**26, 27.] {26}** St. Luke prefixes “*out of thine own mouth will I judge  
thee*,”—viz. ‘because, knowing the relation  
between us, that of absolute power on my  
part over thee,—if thou hadst really  
thought me such an hard master, **thou  
oughtest &c.**, in order to avoid utter ruin.  
But this was *not* thy real thought—thou  
wert **wicked and slothful**.’

**thou  
knewest, &c.** is not concessive, but hypothetical;—God is *not really* such a  
Master.

**{27} the exchangers**, in Luke  
(xix. 23) “*the bank*” (exchange).

There was a saying very current among

the early Fathers, “*Be ye worthy exchangers,*”

which some of them seem to attribute to the Lord, some to one  
of the Apostles. It is supposed by some  
to be taken from this place, and it is  
just possible it may have been: but it  
more likely was traditional, or from some  
apocryphal gospel. Suicer discusses the  
question, and inclines to think that it  
was a way of expressing the general moral  
of the two parables in Matt. and Luke.

But, in the *interpretation*, who are  
these **exchangers?** The explanation (Olsh.,  
and adopted by Trench, Parables, p. 247)  
of their being those *stronger characters*who may lead the more timid to the useful  
employments of gifts which they have not  
energy to use, is objectionable (1) as not  
answering to the *character addressed*—he was not timid, but false and slothful:—and (2) nor to the *facts of the case:*for it is impossible to employ the grace  
given to one through *another's* means,  
without working one’s self.

I rather  
take it to mean, ‘If thou hadst really been  
afraid, &c., slothful as thou art, thou  
mightest at least, without trouble to thyself,  
have provided that I should have  
not been defrauded of the interest of my  
money—but now thou art both slothful  
and wicked, in having done me this injustice.’ Observe there would have been  
no praise due to the servant—but “*that  
which is mine*” would not have lost its  
*increase*. The *machinery of religious and  
charitable societies in our day* is very  
much in the place of the *exchangers*. Let  
the subscribers to them take heed that  
they be not in the degraded case of this  
servant, even if his excuse had been genuine.