similarity, in this part of the discourse, to  
Matt. xxiv. 42 ff., but *no more*: and the  
close connexion quite forbids us to imagine  
that the sayings have been collected merely  
by the Evangelist.   
  
**35.**] There is a  
slight reference to, or rather another   
presentation of the truth set forth in, the  
parable of the virgins, Matt. xxv. 1 ff.  
But the image here is of servants waiting  
for their lord to *return from* the wedding ;  
—left at home, and bound to be in readiness   
to receive him. There is only a hint  
at the cause of his absence—He is gone to  
a wedding: the word used may mean  
almost any feast or entertainment—and  
the *main* thought here only is that He is  
away at a feast, and will return. But in  
the background lies the *wedding* in all its  
truth—not brought out here, but elsewhere,   
Matt. xxii 1 ff. ; xxv. 1 ff.  
  
**Let your loins be girded**] See John xiii.  
4.   
  
**your lights**] See note on Matt.  
xxv. 1.   
  
**36.**] **ye yourselves**, i.e. your  
whole conduct and demeanour.   
  
**37.**]  
See Rev. iii. 20, 21, where the same similitude   
is presented, and the promise carried  
on yet further,—to the *sharing of his  
Throne.* The Lord Himself, in that great  
day of his glory,—the marriage-supper of  
the Lamb,—will invert the order of human  
requirements (see ch. xvii. 8), and in the  
fulness of his grace and love will serve his  
brethren :—the Redeemer, his redeemed,—  
the Shepherd, his flock.   
  
**come forth**]  
more probably is the allusion to His *coming*  
*in turn to each*. Compare the washing of  
the disciples’ feet in John xiii. 1 ff., which  
was a foreshewing of this last great act of  
self-abasing love.   
  
**33.**] Olshausen observes that the *first* watch is not named,  
because the marriage itself falls on it: but  
his view that because the *fourth* is not  
named, our Lord follows the ancient custom  
of the Jews and divides the night into  
three watches, is probably incorrect: it is  
more likely (Meyer) that the fourth is not  
named, because the return was not likely  
to be so long delayed ;— for the *decorum* of  
the parable.   
  
**39.**] I am surprised that  
it should have been imagined that this  
verse has been inserted so as to break the  
connexion, and by a later hand. Nothing  
can be more exact and rigid than the connexion   
as it now stands. Our Lord transfers,   
to shew the unexpected nature of his  
coming, and the necessity of watchfulness,  
the relation between *Himself* and the *servants*,   
to that between the *thief* and the  
**master of the house**. For the purposes of  
this verse, *they* represent the master of the  
house—collectively, as put in charge with  
the Lord’s house and household (thus the  
verse is intimately connected with ver. 42):  
—and in the further application, individually—each   
as the householder of his  
own trust, he kept with watchfulness  
against that day:—*He* is represented by  
the thief —Rev. xvi. 15; iii. 3.  
Olshausen’s view, that the **master of the  
house** is the “*prince of this world*,” is  
surely quite out of keeping with the main  
features of the parable. That *he* should  
be put im the place of the watching servants   
seems impossible :"besides that the  
**faithful steward** below is this very “*master  
of the house*,” being such in the absence of