that he probably wrote after the destruction  
of Jerusalem, it is more natural (as Meyer  
himself confesses) to explain the past tense  
by his regarding Jerusalem and its neighbourhood as laid waste at the time when  
he published his Gospel.

**19.]** Lightfoot gives an account of the ceremonies practised during the thirty days of mourning.

**20.]** The behaviour of the two  
sisters is quite in accordance with their  
character, Luke x. 38—42: and thus we  
have a most interesting point of connexion  
between two gospels so widely various in  
their contents and character. Stier thinks,  
as also Trench, that Mary *did not hear*of the approach of Jesus, and that we  
must not bring the characters to bear on  
this case. But this is at least questionable.

**21.]** This saying has evidently been  
the leading thought of the four days since  
their brother’s death. Mary repeats it,  
ver. 32.

**22.]** She seems to express  
some expectation of the raising of her  
brother; but it is too great a thing for  
her to venture to mention:—possibly she  
had not dared to form the thought fully,  
but had some vague feeling after help,  
such as she knew He would give. I can  
hardly sce, as some have done, an unworthy  
spirit in the form of her expression, in ver.  
22. It was said in the simplicity of her  
faith, which, it is true, was not yet a fully  
ripened faith: but it differs little from our  
Lord’s own words, ver. 41. The repetition  
of the word **God** is to be noticed, as expressive of her faith in the unity of purpose and action between Jesus and God.

**23.]** I believe these words of our  
Lord to contain no allusion to the *immediate* restoration of Lazarus; but to be  
designedly used to lead on to the requisite  
faith in her mind.

**24.]** She understands the words rightly, but gently repels  
the insufficient comfort of his ultimate  
resurrection.

**25, 26.] {25}** These words, as Stier observes, are the *central point* of  
the history; the *great testimony to Himself,* of which the subsequent miracle is *the* proof. The *intention* of the saying  
seems to have been, to awaken in Martha  
the faith that He could raise her brother  
from the dead, in its highest and proper  
form. This He does by announcing *Himself* (it is the expressed emphatic personal pronoun,—**I, and no other**...) as ‘THE  
RESURRECTION’ (meaning,—that resurrection in the last day shall be only *by my  
Power,* and therefore I can raise now as  
well), and more than that, THE LIFE  
ITSELF: so that **he that believeth in me**(i.e. Lazarus, *in her mind*)**, even though  
he have died, shall live; {26} and he that  
liveth** (physically;—‘is not yet dead’) **and  
believeth in me, shall not die for evermore:** i.e. ‘faith in Me is the source of *life,* both here and hereafter; *and those  
who have it, have Life, so that they shall*NEVER DIE;’ *physical death* being overlooked and disregarded, in comparison with  
that which is really and only *death*. The  
word **liveth** *must be* (against Lampe,  
Olshausen, and Stier) taken of *physical  
life,* for it stands opposed to **though he  
have died.**

**he that believeth in me**is the subject of both clauses; in the former it is said that he “*though he have*