Jews. I therefore hold the latter interpretation,   
with Bengel, Meyer, and Stier.

**45.**] And the very reason why  
ye do not believe *Me* (as contrasted with  
*him*) is, *because I speak the truth;*—you  
*not being of the truth,* but of him who is  
falsehood itself. This implies a charge of  
wilful striving against known and recognized   
truth. Euthymius fills up the context—“*If   
I told you lies, ye would have  
believed me, as speaking that which belongs   
to your father*:” see ch. v. 43.

**46.**] The meaning here of **sin** is  
to be strictly adhered to, and not softened  
into ‘*error in argument,*’ or ‘*falsehood.*’  
This would be to introduce, in this most,  
solemn part of our Lord’s discourse, a vapid  
tautology. The question is an appeal to  
His *sinlessness of life*, as evident to them  
all,—as a pledge for His truthfulness of  
word: which word asserted, be it remembered,   
that *He was sent from God.* And  
when we recollect that He who here  
challenges men to convict him of sin, never  
could have upheld *outward* spotlessness  
merely (see Matt. xxiii. 26–28), the words  
amount to a declaration of His absolute  
sinlessness, in thought, word, and deed.  
Or, the connexion may be as stated by  
Enthymius: “*If it is not because I speak  
the truth that ye disbelieve me, tell me,  
which of you convicts me of any sin done  
by me, on account of which you may have  
a pretext for disbelieving?*”

**If I say  
the truth**] and **if** it be thence (from the  
impossibility of convicting me of sin) evident,   
that **I speak the truth**, *why* **do ye  
not believe me?** (not “*believe on me,*”  
but simply **believe me, give credence to  
me.**)

**47.]** gives the answer to the  
previous question, and concludes the discourse   
with the final disproof of their  
assertion, ver. 41. This verse is cited  
1 John iv. 6.

**48.**] The Jews attempt  
no answer, but commence reviling Him.  
These are now properly **the Jews**, in  
St. John’s sense,—the principal among the  
Jews.

**a Samaritan**] So they called  
‘outcasts from the commonwealth of  
Israel:’ and so afterwards they called the  
Christians. They imply, that He differed  
from their interpretation of the law,—or  
perhaps, as He had convicted them of not  
being the genuine children of Abraham,  
they cast back the charge with a senseless  
recrimination. There may perhaps be a  
reference to the occurrence related in ch.  
iv. 5 ff.; but it has been shewn that *Thou  
art a Samaritan* is found in the Rabbis as  
addressed to one whose word is not to be  
believed.

**and hast a devil**] ‘As in the  
first clause they sundered Him from the  
communion of Israel, so now from that of  
Israel's God.’ Stier. Or perhaps they  
mean the reproach more as expressing  
aggravated madness owing to dæmoniacal  
possession. The **Say we not well?** alludes  
probably to the charge twice brought  
against Him by the Pharisees, ‘of casting  
out devils by the prince of the devils.’  
See Matt. ix. 34; xii. 24.

**49.**] The  
former term of reproach Jesus passes over,  
and mildly answers (1 Pet. ii. 23) the  
malicious charge of having a devil, by  
an appeal to his whole life and teaching  
(see ch. iv. 34), which was not the work  
of one having a devil. There is no *retort*  
*of the charge* in the emphatic **I** (it is not *I*  
but *you* that have a devil), as Cyril and  
Lücke imagine. At present the **I**, followed  
by **you**, both emphatic, only brings out the  
two parties into stronger contrast.

**and ye do dishonour me**] ‘Our mutual  
relation is not that which you allege, but  
this: that I honour Him that sent me,  
and ye, in dishonouring me, dishonour  
Him.’ It is the same contrast, the heiug  
(sprung) “*of* (from) *God*” and “*not of*