garment, and was woven of linen, or perhaps   
of wool.   
  
{24} The citation is verbatim  
from the LXX.   
  
**25.**] In Matt. xxvii.  
55, 56, and the parallel places, we learn  
that two of these were looking on afar off,  
after Jesus had expired, with Salome.  
Considering then that St. John’s habit of  
not naming himself might extend to his  
mother (he names his father, ch. xxi. 2),  
we may well believe that **his mother’s  
sister** here represents *Salome*, and that  
*four* women are designated by this description.   
So Wieseler and Meyer, Luthardt  
opposing them. So also Ewald: and, which  
is no mean evidence, the ancient Syriac  
version, inserting *and* between, “*the  
mother’s sister*, **and** *Mary*....”  
This Mary was wife of Klopas (Alphæus,  
see Matt. x. 3, and Introd. to Ep. of James,  
§ i. 4), the mother of James the Less  
and Joses; Matt., Mark.

**26. behold  
thy son**] The relationship in the flesh  
between the Lord and His mother was  
about to close; hence He commends her  
to another son who should care for and  
protect her. Thus,—as at the marriage  
in Cana, when His official independence of  
her was to be testified, so now,—He addresses   
her as **Woman**.   
  
**27.**] The solemn   
and affecting commendation of her to  
St. John is doubly made,—and thus bound  
by the strongest injunctions on both. The  
Romanist idea, that the Lord *commended  
all his disciples, as represented by the  
beloved one, to the patronage of His  
mother*, is simply absurd. The converse is  
true: He did solemnly commend the care  
of her, especially indeed to the beloved  
disciple, but in him to the whole cycle  
of disciples, among whom we find her,  
Acts i. 14.   
  
No certain conclusion  
can be drawn from this commendation,  
as to the ‘brethren of the Lord’ believing   
on Him or not at this time.  
The reasons which influenced Him in his  
selection must ever be far beyond our  
penetration:—and *whatever relations to  
Him we suppose those brethren to have  
been*, it will remain equally mysterious why  
He passed them over, who were so closely  
connected with His mother. Still the presumption,  
that they did not then believe  
on Him, is one of which it is not easy to  
divest one’s self; and at least may enter  
as an element into the consideration of  
the whole subject, beset as it is with uncertainty.   
  
  
**from that hour** is probably  
to be taken literally,—**from that time** ;—  
so that she was spared the pangs of witnessing   
what was to follow. If so, John  
returned again to the Cross, ver. 35,  
  
  
The words, **he took her to his own home**,  
need not imply that John had a house *in  
Jerusalem*. The name would equally apply  
to his lodging during the feast; only  
meaning, that henceforth, wherever he  
was, she was an inmate with him; and  
certainly that his usual habitation was  
fixed, and was his own.   
  
Ewald remarks,  
“It was for the Apostle in his later years a  
sweet reward to recall vividly every such  
minute detail,—and for his readers a sign  
that he alone could have written all this.”  
  
  
**28.**] **After this** is generally, but