“*Judas, betrayest thou the Son of man  
with a kiss?*”—which sense is involved in  
the text also: that variation shewing perhaps  
that one of the accounts is not  
an eye-witness.

**Friend**—see ch. xxii.  
12 and note. It is more than doubtful  
whether the words that follow can properly  
be rendered as a *question*. More  
likely do they mean, “Friend, there needs  
not this shew of attachment: I know  
thine errand,—do thy purpose.” But the  
command itself is suppressed. On any understanding  
of the words, it is an appeal  
to the conscience and heart of Judas, in  
which sense (see above) it agrees with  
the words spoken in Luke:—see note  
there. The fact that at this period our  
Lord was laid hold of and secured (by hand  
—not yet *bound*) by the band, is important,  
as interpreting St. Luke’s account  
farther on.

**51.]** The **one of them ...  
was** *Peter* ;—John ver. 10. Why he was  
not mentioned, is idle to enquire: one  
supposition only must be avoided—that  
there is any *purpose* in the omission. It  
is absurd to suppose that the mention of  
his name in a book current only among  
Christians, many years after the fact,  
could lead to his apprehension, which did  
not take place *at the time*, although he  
was recognized as the striker in the palace  
of the High Priest, John ver. 26. The real  
reason of the non-apprehension was that  
the servant was *healed* by the Lord.

This is the first opposition to ‘Thy will be  
done.’ St. Luke expresses it, that they *saw  
what would happen*—and asked, ‘Lord,  
shall we smite with the sword?’ Then,  
while the other (for there were but two  
swords in the company) was waiting for  
the reply, the rash Peter, in the very  
spirit of ch. xvi. 22, smote with the sword  
—the weapon of the flesh :—an outbreak  
of the natural man no less noticeable than  
that more-noticed one which followed before morning.

All four Evangelists  
agree in this account. Luke and John  
are most exact— the latter giving the  
name of the slave,—Malchus.

The  
aim was a deadly one, and Peter narrowly  
escaped being one “w*ho had committed  
murder in the insurrection*.” From Luke,  
ver. 51, we learn that our Lord said “*Suffer  
ye thus far*” (on the meaning of which  
see note there), touched the ear, and healed  
it.

**52.) thy sword**—not *mine*, nor  
on my side.

**his place** = “*the sheath*,”  
John. The sheath is *the place for the  
Christian’s sword*—“a sword out of its  
sheath is not in its place, unless as ministering  
to the divine anger,” Bengel; see  
note on Luke xxii. 36. Our Lord does  
not say ‘*Cast away* thy sword;’ only in  
His willing self-sacrifice, and in that kingdom  
which is to be evolved from his work  
of redemption, is the sword altogether out  
of place.

**for all &c.]** Peculiar to Matthew.  
There is no allusion, as Grotius and  
some of the ancients thought, to the Jews  
perishing by the Roman sword: for the  
very persons who were now taking Him  
*were Romans*. The saying is *general*—  
and the stress is on **take**—it was this that  
Peter was doing—‘taking up the sword’  
of his own will; taking that vengeance  
which belongs to God, into his own hand.

**shall perish with the sword** is a  
command; not merely a future, but an  
*imperative* future ; a repetition by the  
Lord in this solemn moment of Gen. ix. 6.  
This should be thought of by those well-  
meaning but shallow persons, who seek to  
abolish the punishment of death in Christian  
states.

John adds the words  
“*the cup which my Father hath given me,  
shall I not drink it?*” on which see notes  
there.

**53, 54** are peculiar to Matthew.

**53.]** The Majesty of our Lord, and  
His Patience, are both shewn here.

**twelve**—not perhaps so much from the  
number of the apostles, who were now  
“*the eleven*,” but from that of the *then*