to his examination than the Feet,  
to which he must stoop. He requires  
no more than had been granted to the  
rest: but he had *their testimony in*   
*addition*, and therefore ample ground for  
faith to rest on. Olshausen calls him  
the ‘Rationalist among the Apostles.’  
  
  
**26.**] There is not the least reason  
for supposing, with Olshausen, that this  
appearance was in Galilee. The whole   
narrative points out the same place as before.  
  
  
The eight days’ interval is the first  
testimony of the recurring day of the  
resurrection being commemorated by the  
disciples :—but, it must be owned, a weak  
one ;—for in all probability they had been  
thus assembled every day during the   
interval. It forms however an interesting  
opening of the history of THE LORD’S DAY,  
that the Lord Himself should have thus  
selected and honoured it.   
  
**27.**] Our  
Lord says nothing of the “*marks of the  
nails* :”—He does not recall the malice of  
his enemies.   
  
The words imply that  
the marks were no *scars*, but *the veritable  
wounds themselves* ;—that in His side  
being large enough for a hand to be thrust  
into it. This of itself would shew that  
the resurrection Body was *bloodless*. It is  
“*reach hither and behold*” in the case of  
the *hands*, which were exposed—but merely  
“*reach hither and put*” in the case of the  
*side*, which was clothed. So Meyer: but  
it may be questioned, whether this was so.  
  
  
**be not faithless**] not merely, ‘Do  
not any longer disbelieve in my   
Resurrection ;’—but **Be not** (do not become)—as  
applied generally to the spiritual life, and  
the reception of God’s truth—**faithless**,  
**but believing**. That Thomas *did not*  
apply his finger or his hand, is evident  
from the reason given by our Lord for his  
faith below, being, not, “ *Thou hast touched  
me*,” but, **Thou hast seen me**.   
  
**28.**]  
The Socinian view, that these words, **My  
Lord and my God**, are *merely an   
exclamation*,   
is refuted, (1) By the fact that no  
such exclamations were in use among the  
Jews. (2) By the introduction to them,  
“*Thomas said* to him.” (3) By the   
impossibility of referring the words **my Lord**  
to another than Jesus: see ver. 13. (4)  
By the utter psychological absurdity of  
such a supposition: that one just   
convinced of the presence of Him whom he  
deeply loved, should, instead of addressing  
Him, break out into an irrelevant cry.  
(5) By the further absurdity of supposing  
that *if such were* the case, the Apostle  
John, who of all the sacred writers most  
constantly keeps in mind the object for  
which he is writing, should have recorded  
any thing so *beside that object*. (6) By  
the intimate conjunction of the *seeing* and  
*believing* in our Lord’s answer, which  
necessarily makes this his saying the   
*expression of his belief* :—see below.  
Dismissing it therefore, we observe that  
this is *the highest confession of faith  
which has yet been made* ;—and that it  
shews that (though not yet *fully*) the  
meaning of the previous confessions of His  
being ‘*the Son of God*’ was understood.

Thus St. John, in the very close of his  
Gospel (see on vv. 30, 31) iterates the  
testimony with which he began it—to the  
Godhead of the Word who became flesh :  
and by this closing confession, shews how  
the testimony of Jesus to Himself had  
gradually deepened and exalted the   
Apostles’ conviction, from the time when they  
knew Him only as “*the Son of Joseph*”  
(ch. i. 46), till now, when He is   
acknowledged as their LORD and their GOD.