Galilaeans) who had attached themselves  
to Jesus. Whether we read **ariseth** or  
**hath arisen**, the assertion is much the  
same: for the expression “*no prophet*”  
cannot include *the* Prophet, or the Messiah. It was *not historically true* ;—for two prophets at least had arisen from Galilee: Jonah of Gathhepher and the greatest of the prophets, Elijah of Thisbe; and perhaps also Nahum and Hosea. Their contempt for Galilee made them lose sight of historical accuracy.

——————————

**[**This passage is to be treated very differently from the rest of the sacred text.

In the Alexandrine, Vatican, Paris, and  
Sinaitic MSS., the ancient Syriac Versions,  
and all the early fathers, it is omitted: the  
Cambridge MS. alone of our most ancient,  
authorities contains it. Augustine states,  
that certain expunged it from their MSS.,  
because they thought it might encourage  
sin. But this will not account for the  
very general omission of it, nor for the  
fact that ch. vii. 53 is included in the  
omitted portion. Eusebius assigns it apparently to the apocryphal “Gospel according to the Hebrews.” Other things to be  
noted respecting it are, (1) that in the  
MSS. which contain it, the *number* *of  
variations* is very much greater than in  
any equal portion of Scripture: so much is  
this the case, that there are in fact three  
separate texts, it being hardly possible to  
unite them into one. (2) That in the  
original, the style, and manner of narrating, are entirely different from those of  
our Evangelist. It is not merely that  
many words and idioms occur which John  
never uses, but that the whole cast and  
character of the passage is alien from his  
manner, in whichever of the existing texts  
we read it. (3) The great majority of  
those MSS. which contain the passage,  
place it *here*. Some however insert it after  
the end of Luke xxi., which certainly  
seems a more fitting place, seeing that the  
incidents evidently belong to the later  
part of our Lord’s ministry. (4) I have  
adopted the plan also followed in the last  
edition of my Greek Testament, and have  
printed it beneath the text of St. John,  
which I have allowed to go on independently of the inserted passage. See  
the whole matter discussed and the authorities given, in my Greek Testament.

**53**.] The circumstance that this verse is  
included in the dubious passage is remarkable, and seems to shew, as remarked  
above, that the doubt *has not arisen from  
any ethical difficulty*, as Augustine hints, —  
for then the passage would have begun  
with ch. viii, 1. Nor can this verse  
have been expunged to keep up the connexion with ch. viii. 12—for that is just as  
good *with it*,—if understood, as usually, of  
the members of the Sanhedrim. We must  
now regard it as fragmentary, forming the  
beginning of the account of the woman  
taken in adultery. It is therefore not  
clear to what the words apply. Taken in  
conjunction with what follows (see on ch.  
viii. 5.), I should say that they indicate  
some time during the last days of the  
Lord’s ministry, when He spent the nights  
on the Mount of Olives, as the date of the  
occurrence. Certainly the end of Luke  
xxi. seems to be its fitter place.

**CHAP. VIII. 1.**] St. John *never elsewhere  
mentions the Mount of Olives* (not even in  
ch. xviii.1) : and when he introduces a new  
place, it is his habit to give explanations (see ch.1.45; xix.13,17). Stier, who says,  
“The simple answer to Alford’s remark is,  
*that John here, and here only, mentions  
the Mt. of O*.,” omits all allusion to this  
habit of the Evangelist, which *alone gives  
weight* to my remark.

Most of the  
many differences from the style and expression of St. John must be gathered  
from the notes in the Greek Test., as they  
cannot be made clear to the mere English