*was bound up*,—His having *descended from  
heaven*. All attempts to explain this  
otherwise than of His ascent into heaven,  
are simply *dishonest*,—and spring from  
laxity of belief in the historical reality of  
that event. That it is not recorded by  
John, is of no moment here. And that  
none but the Twelve saw it, is unimportant; for how do we know that our  
Lord was not here speaking to some among  
the Twelve? To explain it of His *death*,  
as part of His going up where he was before, is hardly less disingenuous.

**63.]  
spirit** and **flesh** do not mean the *spiritual*and *carnal sense of the foregoing discourse*,  
as many Commentators explain them: for  
our Lord is speaking, not of *teaching*  
merely, but of *vivifying* : He is explaining  
the *life-giving principle* of which He had  
been before speaking. ‘Such eating of My  
flesh as you imagine and find hard to listen  
to, could profit you nothing,—for *it* will  
have ascended up, &c.; and besides, generally, it is only the *Spirit* that can vivify  
the spirit of man; the *flesh* (in whatever  
way used) can profit nothing towards this.’  
He does not say ‘*My* Flesh profiteth nothing,’ but ‘*the* flesh.’ To make Him say  
this, as the Swiss anti-sacramentalists do,  
is to make Him contradict His own words  
in ver. 51.

**the words that I have  
spoken]** *viz*. *the words* **my flesh** *and* **my  
blood**, *above*. They are *spirit* and *life*:—  
spirit, not flesh only:—*living food*, not  
*carnal* and *perishable*. This meaning has  
been missed by almost all Commentators:  
Stier upholds it, and it seems to me *beyond  
question the right one*. The common interpretation is, ‘*the words which I have*  
*spoken*,’ i.e. ‘*My discourses*,’ are ‘*to be  
taken in a spiritual sense*, ‘*and are life*’  
But this is any thing but precise, even  
after the forcing of the meaning of the  
word “*spirit*.”

**64.]** ‘This accounts  
for your murmuring at what I said, that  
*ye do not believe.’*

**For Jesus  
knew...]** De Wette remarks, that the  
*foreknowledge* of our Lord with regard to  
Judas renders it impossible to apply the  
ordinary rules of moral treatment, as ‘Why  
did He then continue him as an Apostle?  
Why did He give him the charge of the  
purse, knowing him to be a thief? &c.”—  
to the ease: and it is therefore better not  
to judge at all on the matter.

The fact is, we come here to a form of the  
problem of *divine foreknowledge* and *human  
free-will*, which, in any of its endless combinations of expression, it is equally impossible for us to solve.

**from the beginning**, from their first coming to  
Him ;—the first beginning of their connexion with Him.

**65.]** These unbelievers had not that *drawing to Christ*,  
which leads (ver. 44) to true coming to  
Him. Observe the parallelism between *it   
were* **given** *him* here, and *all that which  
the Father* **giveth** *me*, ver. 37. Both these  
gifts are in the Father’s power.

**66—71.]** *Many of the disciples leave  
Him. The confession of the Twelve  
through Peter: and the Lord’s warning  
to them.*

**66. Upon this]** The *temporal* meaning prevails, but does not exclude the *causal*. It was *upon this being  
said*, and it was also *because this had been  
said.*

**many**, viz. of *those that believed  
not*: but not all.

**67.]** The first mention