has the definite article, **the woman**. This  
is said by some Commentators to be in  
allusion to the frequent use and notoriety  
of the comparison. We often have it in  
the O. T.,—see Isa. xxi. 3; xxvi. 17, 18;  
xxxvii. 3; lxvi. 7, 8: Hos. xiii. 13, 14:  
Mic. iv. 9, 10.

**when she is in  
travail**] literally, **is bringing forth**.

The deeper reference of the comparison  
has been well described by Olshausen :  
‘Here arises the question, how are we to  
understand this similitude? We might  
perhaps think that the suffering Manhood  
of Christ was *the woman in her pangs*, and  
the same Christ glorified in the

Resurrection, *the Man born*; but the Redeemer  
(ver. 22) applies the pangs to the *disciples*:

how then will the “*man*” who  
is born apply to them?’ Then, after condemning

the shallow and unsatisfactory  
method of avoiding deep research by asserting

that the details of parables are  
not to be interpreted, he proceeds:  
‘Hence the proper import of the figure  
seems to be, that the Death of Jesus  
Christ was as it were an anguish of birth  
belonging to all Humanity, in which the  
perfect Man was born into the world; and  
in this very birth of the new man lies the  
spring of eternal joy, never to be lost, for  
all, inasmuch as through Him and His  
power the renovation of the whole is rendered

possible.’ And indeed the same is  
true of every Christian who is planted in  
the likeness of Christ. His passing from  
sorrow to joy—till ‘Christ be formed in  
him,’ is this birth of pain. And the whole  
Church, the Spouse of Christ,—nay, even  
the whole Creation, travaileth in pain  
together (Rom. viii. 23) till the number of  
the elect be accomplished, and the eternal  
joy brought in.

**22**.] **I will see you  
again**—in the same manifold meaning as  
before noticed—**will see you**—at My

Resurrection—by My Spirit—at My second  
Advent.

**23.**] **that day**, in its full  
meaning, cannot import *the forty days* :  
for, Acts i. 6, they did then *ask* the Lord  
*questions*—nor this present dispensation of  
the Spirit, during which we have only the  
firstfruits, but not the full understanding   
so as not to need to ask any thing;  
(for is not *prayer itself* an *asking* ?)—but  
that great completion of the Christian’s  
hope, when he shall be with his Lord, when  
all doubt shall be resolved, and prayer shall  
be turned into praise. The Resurrection-visiting,

and the Pentecost-visiting of them,  
were but foretastes of this. Stier well remarks,

‘The connexion of the latter part of  
this verse is,—the way to **asking nothing**  
any more, is to ask and to pray the more  
diligently, till that day comes.’

It has  
been supposed wrongly that the words **me**  
and **the Father** are in opposition in this  
verse, and thence gathered that it is not  
lawful to address prayer to Christ. But  
such an opposition is contrary to the whole  
spirit of these discourses,—and *asking the  
Father in Christ’s name*, is in fact *asking*  
HIM.

In the latter clause, notice the  
right reading, **He will give it you in my  
name**, He being the *element*, the *region*, of  
all communication between God and the  
Church. Compare Rom. i. 8, where *thanks*  
are offered **through Jesus Christ**.

**24.**] It was impossible, up to the time of  
the glorification of Jesus, to pray to the  
Father in His Name. It is a fulness of  
joy peculiar to the dispensation of the  
Spirit, to be able so to do, Eph. ii. 18.

**ask, and ye shall receive**] See Matt, vii.