**23.]** The most probable rendering of the   
original here is, **Jesus said to him the saying,  
“If thou canst believe, all things are,**” &c.:  
a saying which doubtless He often uttered  
on similar occasions, Some, omitting the  
**believe**, would set an interrogation after  
**canst**, and suppose our Lord to be citing  
the Father's words: “*didst thou say,  
‘If thou canst?’—all things are*,” &c.  
Others, as Dr. Burton, suppose it to mean:  
—‘Believe what you have expressed by  
your **if thou canst**,’ &c. But both these  
renderings involve methods of construction  
and expression not usual in the Gospels.  
The **if thou canst believe** is a manifest  
reference to the **if thou canst do any  
thing** before, and meant to convey a   
reproof, as the father’s answer testifies.  
The sentence, also, unless I am mistaken,  
is meant to convey an intimation that the  
healing was not to be *an answer* to that  
challenge, so that *the Lord’s power* was to  
be challenged and proved,—but an answer  
to *faith*, which (of course by laying hold  
on Him who is Almighty) *can do all  
things*.

**24.]** Nothing can be more  
touching and *living* than this whole most  
masterly and wonderful narrative. The  
poor father is drawn out into a sense of  
the unworthiness of his distrust, and “the  
little spark of faith which is kindled in  
his soul reveals to him the abysmal deeps  
of unbelief which are there.” (Trench,  
p. 367.) “Thus,” remarks Olshausen (B.  
Comm: i, 534), “does the Redeemer shew  
himself to the father as a Creator and  
bringer out of faith first, before He heals  
his son. In the struggle of his anxiety,  
the strength of Faith is *born*, by the aid  
of Christ, in the soul empty of it before.”

There is strong analogy in the Lord’s  
treatment of the father here, for the   
*sponsorial engagement* in infant baptism. The  
*child* is by its infirmity *incapacitated*;  
it is therefore *the father’s faith* which is  
tested; and when that is proved, the child  
is healed. The fact is, that the analogy  
rests far deeper: viz. on the ‘inclusion’  
of ‘the old man’ in Adam and the ‘new  
man’ in Christ: see Rom. v. 12—21.

**25.]** This took place at a distance  
from the crowd, among those who had  
run forward to meet our Lord, ver. 16.

**I charge thee]** The personal   
pronoun is emphatic, as opposed to the want  
of power on the part of the disciples. This  
is the only place where we have such a  
charge as **enter no more into him**,—shewing   
the excessive malignity and tenacity  
of this kind (see ver. 29) of spirit. This is  
also shewn by ver. 26.   
  
**27.]** See ch. v. 41; also Matt. xvii. 6, 8: Rev. i. 17:  
Dan. x. 9, 10.

**29.]** The answer is given   
more at length in Matthew, ver. 20, and  
the Lord there distinctly includes the   
*disciples* in the faithless generation, by   
telling them “*Because of your unbelief.*”  
The assurance also occurs there, which was  
repeated Matt. xxi. 21, where see notes.

**This kind]** That there are *kinds*,