however believes it to have been the same.  
This was the residence, and probably birthplace, of Nathanael. If his calling took  
place in its neighbourhood, our Lord may  
have gone on and spent the intervening  
day at Nazareth. Dr. Robinson satisfactorily establishes that Kâna-el-Jelîl,  
about 3 hours N. 1/2 E. from Nazareth, is  
the site of this miracle. The name is identical, and so stands in the Arabic Version  
of the N. T. He shews this to have been  
recognized in early tradition, and its  
honour to have been only recently usurped.  
by Kefr Kenna, a village 1 1/2 hour N.E.  
from Nazareth, on one of the roads to  
Tiberias. See a very interesting description of Kâna-el-Jelîl in “The Land and the  
Book,” pp. 426, 427.

**the mother of Jesus]** St. John *never names* her, as being  
already well known : or perhaps more probably from his own intimate connexion  
with her, in pursuance of the injunction  
cb. xix. 26, 27. He never names either  
himself, or his own brother, James.

**2. and his disciples]** It does not appear  
*who these were*, unless we assume that they  
were those called in ch. i., which seems  
most probable. John himself was most  
likely present. He does not relate so circumstantially any thing which he had not  
witnessed.

In this case, there must  
have been some other reason for the invitation, besides mere previous acquaintance, This would be the probable reason  
for *Jesus himself* being invited; but the  
*disciples*, being from various places in the  
district, can hardly *all have been* (De  
Wette) *friends of the family*. 'The fact  
of Jesus having attached disciples to Himself must have been known, and they  
were doubtless invited *from consideration  
to Him.*

Our Lord at once opens  
His ministry with the character which  
He gives of himself, Matt. xi. 18, 19, as  
distinguished from the asceticism of John.  
He also, as Trench admirably remarks  
(Miracles, edn. 2, p. 98, note), gives us his  
own testimony against the tendency which  
our indolence ever favours, of giving up  
those things and occasions to the world  
and the devil, which we have not Christian  
boldness to mingle in and purify. Even  
Cyprian, for instance, proscribes such festivals,—“ Let the wicked feasts and licentious banquets at marriages be avoided, of which the contagion is perilous.” And  
such is the general verdiet of modern  
religionism, which would keep the leaven  
distinct from the lump, for fear *it* should  
become *unleavened*. ‘The especial honour  
conferred upon *marriage* by the Lord  
should also be noticed. ‘He here adorned  
and beautified it with his presence, and  
first miracle that he wrought.”

**3.]** There is no necessity to suppose that  
the feast had lasted several days, as Do  
Wette and Lücke do. It has been suggested that the unexpected presence of  
the disciples may have occasioned a failure  
in the previously sufficient supply : a gloss  
in one of the old Latin MSS. has, “And  
it came to pass, that through the great  
number of guests the wine was used up.”

The mother of Jesus evidently is *in  
a position of authority* (see ver. 5) in the  
house, which was probably that of a near  
relative. The conjectures and traditions  
on the subject are many, and wholly unsatisfactory.

A graver question arises  
as to the intent with which this, **They have  
no wine**, was said. She cannot have had  
*from experience* any reason to suppose  
that her Son would work a miracle, for  
this (ver. 11) *was His first*. Chrysostom  
and others suggest that, knowing Him to  
be Who He was, she had been by the  
recent divine acknowledgment of Him  
and His calling disciples to Himself, led to  
expect the manifestation of His Messianic  
power about this time; and here seemed  
an occasion for it. Some of the other  
explanations are: “that she had always  
found Him a wise counsellor, and mentioned the want to Him merely that He  
might suggest some way of remedying it.”  
Cocceius. “Do thou depart, that the  
other guests may do the same, before the  
lack of wine is noticed.” Bengel. “That  
by some pious exhortation He might prevent the guests from feeling annoyance,  
and at the same time spare the bridegroom’s shame.” Calvin, “Jesus had  
wrought miracles, but in secret, before  
this.” Tholuck.

On the whole, the most probable explanation is that of Lücke,  
which somewhat modifies the first hero  
mentioned,—that our Lord Himself had  
recently given some reason to expect that  
He would shew forth His glory by wonderful works. So, very nearly, Stier.