the former were, to outward appearance,  
the servants of God, but inwardly served  
Mammon ;—the latter, *by profession* in  
the service of Mammon, were, by coming  
to Jesus, shewing that they inwardly  
served God.

**14—31.]** BY OCCASION OF THE COVETOUS PHARISEES DERIDING HIM, OUR  
LORD SPEAKS THE PARABLE OF THE  
RICH MAN AND LAZARUS. The Pharisees were not slow in perceiving that  
the scope of *all these things* was to place  
this world’s goods, and all that the covetous seek after, at a very low price. It  
will be observed that the sayings which  
follow are in reference to matters mentioned during the discourses, or arising  
out of the character of the Pharisees as  
commented on in them.

**15.]** See  
last. note, end. **justify yourselves  
before men**—a contrast to *“I have sinned  
before thee,”* ch. xv. 18: and **abomination  
in the sight of God,** to *“joy in the presence  
of the angels of God,”* ch. xv. 10.

**16.]** See Matt. xi. 12 and note. The  
connexion is,—*‘Ye are they that justify  
yourselves before men; ye are no publicans and sinners,—no poor and needy,—  
but righteous, and increased with this  
world’s goods. But, since John, a kingdom has been preached, into which every  
one, publicans and sinners too* (ch. xv. 1),  
*are pressing in. The true relation however of that kingdom to the law is not as  
ye suppose, to destroy the law* (Matt. v.  
17), *but to fulfil.’* Then, as an example,  
our Lord reiterates the decision which He  
had before given on a point much controverted among the Jews—the law of adultery. But this He does, not *without  
occasion given*, and close connexion with  
the circumstances, and with what had  
before been said. As early as Tertullian,  
in the third century, it was remarked,  
that an allusion was meant here to the  
adultery of Herod Antipas with his brother  
Philip’s wife, which the Pharisees had  
tacitly sanctioned, thus allowing an open  
breach of that law which Christ came to  
fulfil. To this mention of Herod’s crime  
the **until John** gave relevance. Still the  
idea must not be too lightly assumed.  
Bleek’s remark is worth notice, that, had  
such an allusion been intended, the last  
words of the verse would have been otherwise expressed. Antipas had not *married  
a divorced woman,* but abduced a married  
woman from her husband. See on  
Matt. v. 32.

**19–31.]** Our Lord, in  
this closing parable, grasps the whole  
covetous and self-seeking character of the  
Pharisees, shews them a case in which it is  
carried to the utmost, by one who *‘made  
no friends’*—with the unrighteous Mammon;—places in contrast with it a case  
of extreme destitution and poverty,—the  
very thing which the *covetous* most  
abhorred ;—and then passes over into the  
region beyond the grave, shewing them  
the contrast there also—and ending with  
a mysterious prophetic hint at the final  
rejection of the Kingdom of God and  
Himself by those for whom the law and  
prophets were insufficient to bring them  
to repentance. And while it does not  
appear that the *covetousness* of the Pharisees shewed itself in this particular way,  
our Lord here grasps the depravity by its  
root, which is, *a godless and loveless self-seeking*—saying in the heart, ‘There is  
no God’—and acting accordingly.  
The explanation of particular points see