here spoken of inclusively in the language  
of the allegory, as coming in by and with  
*him.* His was the first attempt to lead  
human nature, *before* Christ came; before the series of dispensations of grace  
began, in which pasture and life is offered  
to man by Him.

Meyer understands  
the Pharisees, &c. who taught the people  
before Christ *appeared* as the Door of the  
sheep: but this does not seem to reach  
the depth of the requirements of the saying.

**are,** not *were*, because their essential nature as belonging to and being  
of the evil one is set forth, and the inclusion of these present Pharisees in their  
ranks.

**but the sheep did not hear  
them... ]** This of course cannot be understood absolutely,—‘*the sheep never for  
one moment listened to them;*’ but, did  
not listen to them in the sense of becoming  
their disciples eventually. So that the fall  
of our first Parents would be no exception  
to this; whom of all men we must conclude, by the continuing grace and mercy  
of God to them after that fall, to have been  
of His real sheep. And since then, the  
same is true; however the sheep may for a  
while listen to these false shepherds, they  
do not *hear them,* so as to follow them.  
Those who do, belong not to the true flock.

**9.]** expands and fixes ver. 7.  
“There is no entrance for salvation into  
the church but by Me, whether it be for  
shepherd, or for sheep.” Erasmus. See  
Numb. xxvii. 16, 17. The sequel of the  
verse shaws that this combined meaning is  
the true one. Meyer, who understands it  
all of *shepherds alone,* finds great difficulty  
in the interpretation of the latter words:  
“shall go in and out *before the sheep,* and  
find pasture for them,” is certainly a forced  
meaning.

**10.]** the gracious intent of  
the Saviour in this ;—to *give life,* and in  
*abundance.* This verse forms the transition from Him as *the Door,* to Him as  
*the Shepherd.* He is here set in opposition  
to *the thief* (see on ver. 8), and thus insensibly passes into the place of a *shepherd,*  
who has been hitherto thus opposed. Then  
the words, **that they might have life,** bind  
on to those in the last verse, “*shall find  
pasture*”—and **that they might have it  
more abundantly:** as if it bad been said,  
not merely as a door to pass through, but  
actively, abundantly, to *bestow* abundance  
of life. We are thus prepared for—

**11.]** the announcement of Himself as THE  
GOOD SHEPHERD—the great antagonist of  
*the robber*—the pattern and Head of all  
good shepherds, as *he* of all thieves and  
robbers: the Messiah, in His best known  
and most loving office: cf. Ezek. xxxiv.  
11—16, 23; xxxvii. 24, and Isa. xl. 11.  
But He is **the good Shepherd** in this verse,  
as having most eminently *the qualities of a  
good shepherd,* one of which is to *lay down  
His life* for the sheep. These words here  
are not so much a prophecy, as a declaration, implying however that which ver. 15  
asserts explicitly.

**12.]** The imagery  
is here again somewhat changed. The  
false shepherds are here compared to hirelings, i.e. those who serve *merely* for gain;  
the *hireling* who fulfils the character implied by the word. The idea is brought in  
by the words “*layeth down his life for the  
sheep,*” which introduce the thought of  
a time of danger, when the true and false  
shepherds are distinguished.

**the  
wolf]** The purposes of this **wolf** are the  
same as those of the thief in ver. 10, and in  
the allegory he is the same;*—the great  
Foe of the sheep of Christ.* Lücke and  
De Wette deny this, and hold ‘any enemies  
of the theocracy’ to be meant;—but no  
deep view of the parable will be content  
with this,—see Matt. vii. 15, where the  
“*ravening wolves*” are “*false prophets,*”