Father, from the counsel of whose will the  
whole mediatorial office of Christ sprung:  
see ch. xii, 49.

**19—21.]** {21} The concluding words bind this discourse to the  
miracle of ch. ix., though not necessarily  
in *immediate* connexion.

**22—39.]***Discourse at the Feast of  
Dedication.* It may be, that Jesus remained at, or in the neighborhood of,  
Jerusalem during the interval (two months)  
between the Feast of Tabernacles and that  
of the Dedication. Had He *returned to  
Galilee,* we should have expected some  
mention of it. Still, by the words **in  
Jerusalem,** it would seem as if a fresh  
period and a new visit began; for why  
should such a specification be made, if the  
narrative proceeded continuously ? See on  
Luke ix. 51 ff.

**22]** This feast had  
become usual since the time when Judas  
Maccabæus purified the temple from the  
profanations of Antiochus. It was held  
on Chisleu (December) 25, and seven following days: see 1 Mace. iv. 41—59:  
2 Mace. x. 1—8.

**it was winter]** The  
notice is inserted to explain to Gentile  
readers the reason of our Lord’s walking  
in Solomon’s portico. This latter was on  
the east side of the temple, called also by  
Josephus, “*the Eastern porch.*” He says  
that it was an original work of Solomon,  
which had remained from the former  
temple.

**25.]** He had often told them,  
in unmistakeable descriptions of Himself:  
see ch. v. 19; viii. 36, 56, 58, &c. &c. But  
the great reference here is to His *works,*  
as in ver. 37.

**26.]** The difficulty of  
the words **as I said unto you** is considerable warrant for their genuineness: and  
they come much more naturally with this  
than with the following verse. I believe  
them to refer more to the *whole allegory,*  
than to any explicit saying of this kind;  
and this is shewn to my mind by the following words in ver. 27:—the link between the two, ‘*but ye hear not my voice,’*being understood. This was an obvious  
deduction from the allegory, and thus it  
might be said, “as I said unto you.” This  
reference to the allegory some two months  
after it was spoken, has been used by the  
rationalists as an argument against the  
authenticity of the narrative. But, as  
Meyer observes, it in reality implies that  
the conflict with the Jewish authorities is  
here again taken up after that interval,  
during which it had not broken out.

**27—29.]** {28} This leads to a further