not that, in the presence of such truths,  
such a trifle is worth mention, but that  
the shallow school of modern critics *do  
mention*, and *rest upon* such. On vv. 21,  
22, see notes on Matt. xi. 25–27,  
observing here the gradual narrowing of the  
circle to which our Lord addresses himself, ver. 22 (margin),—then ver. 23 the same, with **privately** added.

**23.**]  
This verse should not be marked off from  
ver. 22 by a new paragraph, as is done in  
the A.V.: much less, as in the Gospel for  
the 13th Sunday after Trinity, joined with  
what follows: except perhaps that the  
lesson taught us by its occurring there is  
an appropriate one, as shewing us how the  
*grace of Christian love*, which is the subject of the following parable, fulfils and  
abounds over, legal obedience. It is in  
connexion with the preceding, and comes  
as the conclusion after the thanksgiving in  
ver. 21. A similar saying of our Lord  
occurs Matt. xiii. 16, 17, but uttered altogether on a different occasion and in a different connexion.

**24. prophets  
and kings**] David united both these, also  
Solomon. There may be an especial  
reference to the affecting last words of  
David, 2 Sam. xxiii. 1–5, which certainly  
are a prophecy of the Redeemer, and in  
which he says, ver. 5, “This is all my  
salvation, and all my desire, though he  
make it not to grow:”—see also Gen.  
xlix. 18.

**25—37.**] QUESTION OF A LAWYER:  
THE PARABLE OF THE GOOD SAMARITAN.  
Peculiar to Luke. As Stier remarks, it is  
well that St. Luke has related the other incident respecting an enquiry of the same  
kind, for the critics would be sure to have  
maintained that this incident was another  
report of Matt. xix. 16. Such clear cases  
as this should certainly teach us caution, in  
cases where *no such proof is given* of the  
independence of the different narratives:  
and should shew us that both questions  
addressed to our Lord, and answers from  
Him, were, as matter of fact, repeated.

See however a case to which this  
remark does not apply, ch. ix. 57 ff.

**25.**] No immediate sequence from ver. 24  
is implied.

**lawyer**, a kind of scribe—  
“*a doctor of the law,*” ch. v. 17—whose  
especial office it was to teach the law, see  
Tit. iii. 13; “*one of the scribes,*” Mark  
xii. 28. There is no reason to suppose that the lawyer had any hostile intention towards Jesus,—rather perhaps a  
self-righteous spirit (see ver. 29), which  
wanted to see what this Teacher could  
inform *him, who knew so much already*.  
Thus it was a *tempting* or trying of Jesus,  
though not to *entangle* Him: for whatever had been the answer, this could hardly have followed.

**what shall I do**] He  
doubtless expects to hear of *some great  
deed*; but our Lord refers him back to  
the Law of which he is a teacher.

**26. how readest thou?** A common rabbinical formula for eliciting a text of  
Scripture.

**how?** i.e. to what purport; so that the answer should contain a  
summary of his reading in the Law.

**27.**] The first part of this, together with