**4.]** The answer of our Lord is beyond  
question *one of reproof*, and *disclaimer of  
participation in the grounds on which the  
request was made.* See instances, besides  
reff. in Josh. xxii, 24: Mark i, 24. And  
so all the early expositors understood it.  
Irenæus says, “The Lord, repelling her  
unseasonable urgency, said,” &c.;—and  
Chrysostom, “She wished... . to gain  
glory to herself by means of her Son,”  
and therefore He “answered her with  
severity.”

The Romanist expositors  
mostly endeavour to divest the answer  
of any aspect of rebuke, and maintain  
that it was so uttered for *our sakes*alone, to teach us that He did not perform  
His miracles from regard to human affinity,  
but solely from love and His object of  
manifesting His glory. So Maldonatus.  
And this is true:—but first among those  
to be taught this, was *she herself, who had  
tempted Him to work a miracle from that  
regard.*

It has perhaps not been  
enough noticed, that in this answer the  
Lord declares His period of subjection to  
her as His earthly parent to be at an end.  
Henceforth His thoughts are not her  
thoughts. At twelve years of age, see  
Luke ii. 49, He answers, ‘thy father and  
I,’ by ‘My Father:’—now, He is to be no  
longer before the world *as Mary’s son*,  
but as sanctified by the Father and sent  
into the world :—compare Matt. xii. 48—  
50, and Luke xi. 27, 28.

**Woman]** There is no reproach in this term: but  
rather respect. The Lord henceforth uses  
it towards her, not calling her ‘mother,’  
even on the Cross (see ch. xix. 26), doubtless for the reason alleged above.

**mine hour is not yet come]** This expression, **mine  
hour**, is generally used in John of the time  
of the *Death* of Christ :—see reff. But it  
is only so used because His death is in those  
passages the subject naturally underlying  
the narrative. It is, *any fixed or appointed time*; —and therefore here, the  
appointed time of His self-manifestation  
by miracles. This time was not yet come,  
but was close at hand. Some have supposed that the wine was not yet wholly  
exhausted, and that our Lord would wait  
till the miracle should be undoubted (so  
Trench): but Stier well remarks that the known *depth* of all His   
early sayings  
forbids us from attaching only this meaning to it;—and he sees in it a reference to  
the great marriage-feast and the new  
fruit of the vine in the Kingdom of God.  
If this be so, it can be only in the background; the words must have had a  
present meaning, and I believe it to be,  
‘*My time, the time at which, from the  
Father’s appointment and my own concurring will, I am to begin miraculous  
working, is not yet arrived: forestall it  
not’* Very similarly he speaks, ch. vii. 6,  
to His brethren, and yet afterwards goes  
up to the feast. The notion that **mine  
hour** refers to the hour of our Lord’s  
human infirmity on the Cross when (ch.  
xix. 27) He “acknowledged her as His  
mother,” Wordsw., seems wholly unfounded. Where do we find any such  
special acknowledgment there? And why  
should we go out of our way for a fanciful  
sense of words which bear an excellent  
meaning as referring to circumstances  
then present?

**5.]** There certainly  
seems beneath this narrative to lie *some  
incident which is not told us*. For not  
only is Mary *not repelled* by the answer  
just given, but she is *convinced that the  
miracle will be wrought*, and she is not  
without an anticipation of the *method of  
working it*: for how should He require  
the aid of the servants, except the miracle  
were to take place according to the form  
here related? I believe we shall find,  
when all things are opened to us, that  
there had been a previous hint given her,  
—where or how I would not presume to  
say,—by our Lord, of His intention and  
the manner of performing it, and that her  
fault was, *the too rash hastening on of  
what had been His fixed purpose.*

**6.]** These vessels were for the washings  
usual at feasts: see Mark vii. 4. There  
could be no collusion or imposture here, as  
they were *water-vessels*, and could have  
no remnants of wine in them (see also ver.  
10). And the large quantity which they  
held could not have been brought in unobserved. The word here rendered **firkin** is  
probably equivalent to the Jewish “*bath*”  
(which held 8 gall. 7-4 pints), and stands for  
it in the LXX, ref. 2 Chron. According