**good part**, the “*one*” being the middle  
term of comparison between the *natural*  
“*many*” and the *spiritual* “*good part.*”  
So that the whole will imply—only *within*  
the circle of Christ’s disciples, those who  
act from love (mistaken or otherwise) to  
Him—much as John vi. 27,—and will set  
before us the bread which perisheth on  
one hand, and that which endureth to  
everlasting life on the other. The **good  
portion** is the *one thing* which is needful  
—see John vi. 53,—the *feeding on the  
bread of life by faith*; which faith cometh  
by hearing, hearing by the *word of  
Christ*, which Mary was now receiving into  
her soul, and which (John vi. 54) shall  
never be taken away, but result in ever-  
lasting life.

The two types of character have ever been found in the Church;  
both, caring for Him, and for love to Him  
doing what they do: but the one busy and  
restless, anxious, and stirring; the other  
quiet and humble, content to sit at His  
feet and learn. We see here which of the  
two He praises. But on the other hand  
we must not derive any argument hence  
against an active Christian life of doing  
good: *this is*, in fact, to sit at His feet  
and learn—to take His yoke on us, and  
learn of Him. It is the bustling about  
the *many things* of which there is no need,  
which is blamed; not the working out the  
fruits of the Spirit, which are needful,  
being parts themselves of the *good part*.

**CHAP. XI. 1–13.**] JESUS TEACHES THE DISCIPLES TO PRAY. The locality  
and time of the following incident are  
alike indefinite. The only limits are  
those of the great journey which is the  
subject of this section. There is no reason  
for supposing this to be the *only occasion*  
on which the Lord delivered this prayer to  
His disciples. In the Sermon on the  
Moant, it stands in close connexion with  
what goes before;—and here also. In so  
weighty a summary of His teaching as  
that was, He was not likely, when speaking of prayer, to omit it;—when asked by  
His disciples to teach them to pray, He  
was not likely to depart from the form  
once given them. Such are ordinary  
probabilities, antecedent to every question  
affecting the two Gospels: and those critics  
who throw aside all such, are *far more  
prejudiced* in reality, than those who allow  
them full weight. “The peculiar and  
abridged form in Luke,” says Meyer, “is  
*a proof that the apostolic Church did not*  
*use the Lord’s prayer as a form*” Rather,  
we may say, a proof of the fidelity with  
which our Evangelist reproduced his original not correcting them, as  
others after him did, to suit the forms  
most probably in use. If the apostolic  
Church did not use the Lord’s Prayer as a  
form,—*when did its use begin*, which we  
find in every known Liturgy?

**1.**]  
**as John also....** of this fact we know  
nothing beyond the allusion here.

**2.**] **When ye pray say....** more definite  
than “*after this manner pray ye....*” in  
Matthew. On the prayer itself, see notes  
on Matt. vi. 9–13. The clauses printed  
in brackets in the text could hardly by  
any possibility have been *omitted* by any,  
had they ever formed a part of it. The  
shorter form, found in the Vatican, the  
most ancient of all our MSS., and in  
the recently published Sinaitic MS., was  
the original one: then the copyists inserted the clauses which were not found  
here, taking them from St. Matthew.  
That this, and not the converse process,  
must have been the one followed, is evident to any one who considers the matter. Stier's argument, that our text has  
not been conformed to Matthew, because  
the doxology has never been inserted here,  
seems to me to tend in quite another direction: the doxology was inserted *there*, because *that was form in general liturgical use*, and *not here*, because *this form  
was never used liturgically*.

**3.**]  
literally.... **for that day’s need**, or, **for**